THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Hawker, Robert- Herdman

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Hawker, Robert, D.D.

an English divine, was born at Exeter, England, in 1753, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He obtained the vicarage of Charles, Plymouth. which he held until his death in 1827, with the respect and love of his people. In doctrine he was a Calvinist, with a strong Antimomian tendency. His writings are, *The Poor Man's Commentary on O.T. and N.T.* (last edit. Lond. 3 vols. 4to): — *Sermons, Meditations, Lectures,* etc., included in his *Works, with a Memoir of his Life,* by the Rev. J. Williams, D.D. (Lond. 1831, 10 vols. 8vo). See Burt, *Observ; on Dr. Hawker's Theology;* Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (Lond. 1839), p. 344.

Hawkins, William

an English clergyman, was born in 1722, and was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he became fellow, and was made professor of poetry in 1751. He was afterwards successively prebendary of Wells, rector of Casterton, and vicar of Whitchurch, Dorsetshire. He died in 1801. He published *Discourses on Scripture Mysteries,* Bampton Lectures for 1787 (Oxford, 1787, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons. — Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1,* 1422; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 804.

Hawks, Cicero Stephen, D.D.

a Lishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., in 1812. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1830, and studied law, but never practiced. In 1834 he was ordained deacon, and in 1835 priest, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. His first parish was Trinity Church, Saugerties, N. Y. (1836); in 1837 he removed to Buffalo, N. Y., and shortly afterwards to Christ Church, St. Louis, Mo. In 1844 he was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Missouri, in which office he' labored diligently and successfully until his health gave way. He died at St. Louis April 19, 1868.

Hawks, Francis Lister, D.D.

an eminent minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., June 10, 1798. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1815; afterwards studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1819. In 1823 he was elected to the Legislature of N. C., and soon became

distinguished for eloquence. After a few years of very successful practice as a lawyer, he determined to enter the ministry, and became a student under Dr. Green, of Hillsboro (afterwards bishop Green). In 1827 he was ordained deacon; and in 1829 became assistant to Dr. Croswell, rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn. In the same year he was called to be assistant to bishop White, then rector of St. James's Church, Philadelphia. In 1830 he was elected professor of divinity in Washington College (now Trinity), Hartford, Conn.; in 1831 he became rector of St. Stephen's, New York, and at once was recognized as among the chief pulpit orators of the city. In the same year he was called to the rectorship, of St. Thomas's Church, N. Y. In 1835 he was elected missionary bishop of the Southwest, but declined the appointment. In the same year the General Convention appointed him to collect documents on the history of the Church, and to act as conservator of the same. He spent several months in England in 1836, and returned with eighteen folio volumes of manuscript, illustrative of the planting and early history of the Protestant Episcopal Church. From these materials he prepared his *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (vol. 1, Virginia, 1836; vol. 2, Maryland, 1839). It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Hawks did not continue this valuable work. In 1837, in connection with the Rev. C. S. Henry, he established the New York *Review*, a quarterly journal of very high character, of which ten volumes were published. In 1839 he founded a school called St. Thomas's Hall, at Flushing, L. I., and made heavy outlays upon the buildings, grounds, etc., which involved him in serious financial embarrassments, ending in the ruin of the school in 1843, He was charged with extravagance, if not with dishonesty; but no one now believes the latter charge. However, he resigned his charge of St. Thomas's Church, and removed to Mississippi, where he established a school at Holly Springs. In 1844 he was elected bishop of Mississippi; objections were made on account of his troubles in connection with St. Thomas's Hall, but his vindication was so complete that the Convention adopted a resolution declaring his innocence. Nevertheless, he declined the bishopric, and accepted the rectorship of Christ Church, New Orleans, where he remained for five years, during part of which time he served as president of the University of Louisiana. In 1849 he accepted the rectorship of the Church of the Mediator, New York, which was afterwards merged in Calvary parish, of which he remained rector until 1862. His friends raised $30,000 to clear his church of debt, and adjust certain old claims from St. Thomas's Hall; they also settled upon him a liberal salary. Here he regained his old

pre-eminence as a preacher, and at the same time devoted himself to active literal labors. In 1852 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, but declined the office. In 1862, owing to differences of opinion between him and his parish concerning the Civil War, he resigned the rectorship of Calvary; and, after a short stay in Baltimore, he was called to take charge of the new par" ash of Our Savior in New York. His last public labor was a service at the laying of the corner stone of the new church, Sept. 4, 1866; on the 26th of that month he died. Dr. Hawks's writings include, besides *Law Reports,* the following: *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (1836-39, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Commentary on the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* (1841, 8vo): — *Egypt and its Monuments* (N. Y. 1849, 8vo): — *Auricular Confession* (1849, *12mo): — Documentary History of the Prot. E. Church, containing Documents concerning the Church in Connecticut* (edited in connection with W. S. Perry, N. Y. 1863-4, 2 vols. 8-o); besides several historical and juvenile books. He also contributed largely to the *New York Review,* the *Church Record,* and other periodicals. — Amer. *Quarterly Church Review,* 1867, art. 1; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 804.

Hawley, Gideon

a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 5, 1727 (O. S.), in Bridgeport, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1749, and, having entered the ministry, went to Stockbridge in 1752 as missionary to the Indians. In May, 1753, in company with Timothy Woodbridge, he started through the wilderness, and reached the Susquehanna at Onohoghgwage, where he planted a mission, but was compelled to leave it by the French War, May, 1756. Having returned to Boston, he went as chaplain under colonel Gridley to Crown Point; and April 10, 1758, was installed pastor over the Indians at Marshpee, where he remained until his death, Oct. 3, 1807. — Sprague, *Annals,* 1, 495.

Hay

(ryxj; *chatsir', grass,* <18812>Job 8:12; 40:15; <19A414>Psalm 104:14; *leeks,*-<04115>Numbers 11:15; also a *court-yard,* <23413>Isaiah 34:13; 35:7; Greek χόρτος, *fodder,* i.e. *grass* or herbage, <40630>Matthew 6:30, etc., or growing *grain,* <40126>Matthew 13:26, etc.). We are not to suppose that this word, as used in the, Bible, denotes dried grass, as it does with us. The management of grass by the Hebrews, as food for cattle, was entirely different from

ours. Indeed, hay was not in use, straw being used as provender. The grass was cut green, as it was wanted; and the phrase *mown-grass* (<19716>Psalm 72:6) would be more properly rendered *grass that has just been fed off:* So in <20725>Proverbs 27:25, the word translated *hay* means the first shoots of the grass; and the whole passage might better be rendered, “The grass appeareth, and the green herb showeth itself, and the plants of the mountains are gathered.” In <23516>Isaiah 15:6, *hay* is put for *grass.* In summer, when the plains are parched with drought, and every green herb is dried up, the nomads proceed northwards, or into the mountains, or to the banks of rivers; and in winter and spring, when the rains have re-clothed the plains with verdure, and filled the water-courses, they return. *SEE GRASS*; *SEE LEEK*; *SEE FUEL*; *SEE MOWING.*

Haydn, Joseph

one of the greatest composers of Church music in modern times, was born March 31,1732, at Rohran, in Austria. The son of parents who were very fond of music, he showed from his earliest youth a remarkable talent for the art. He studied first with a relative in Haimburg; and from his eighth to his sixteenth year, he was in the choir of St. Stephen’s Cathedral at Vienna. After this, for a time, he supported himself by giving private instruction. The first six piano-sonatas of Em. Bach fell into his hands by accident, and filled him with enthusiasm. The celebrated Italian singer Porpora, whom he accompanied on the piano in musical circles, introduced him into the highest classes of society. Encouraged from all sides, he wrote several quartettes (which, however, did not escape censure) and trios, and his first opera, *Der hinkende Teufil,* for which he received 24 ducats. In 1759 he received from count Morzin an appointment as musical director, and soon after contracted a marriage, which, however, remained without children, and was, in general, not a happy one. In 1760 he was appointed by prince Esterhazy as chapel-master, which position al. lowed him for thirty years to give free play to his musical genius. During this time, which was mostly spent at Eisenstadt, Hulgary, or (during winter months) in Vienna, he composed most of his symphonies, many quartettes, trios, etc., 163 compositions for the baryton (the favorite instrument of the prince), eighteen operas, the oratorio *II Ritorno di Tobia* (1774), fifteen masses and other ecclesiastical works, music for Giethes “Gotz von Berlichingen,” and the composition of the “Seven Words,” which in 1795 was ordered from Cadiz as an instrumental composition to be played between the lessons of the Seven Words. Dismissed from his position after the death of

prince Esterhazy (1790), but retaining his title and his salary, he went as concert director to London, where he attained the zenith of his artistic career. During his two stays in London (1790-92 and 1794-95) he wrote the operas *Orfeo* and *Eurydicp,* his 12 so-called English symphonies, quartettes, and other works. He was constantly employed as leader in concerts and societies, and was overwhelmed with marks of love and affection. After returning to Vienna, he composed, in 1797, his great oratorio *The Creation,* which was finished in April, 1798, and produced for the first time on March 19, 1799, in Vienna, and soon after in all the large cities of Europe, with immense applause. It remains to this day the greatest of sacred oratorios, except Handel's *Messiah.* In the mean while he finished his last oratorio, *The four Seasons* (text by Van Swieten after Thomson), which was produced for the first time April 24, 1801. He died May 31,1809. According to a list of his works, prepared by Haydn himself, they comprise 118 symphonies, 83 quartettes, 24 trios, 19 operas, 5 oratorios, 163 compositions for the baryton, 24 concerts for different instruments, 15 masses, 44 piano sonatas, 42 German and Italian hymns, 39 canons, 10 Church compositions, 13 songs in three or four parts, the harmony and thee accompaniment for 365 old Scotch airs, and several smaller pieces. In the library of the Esterhazy family at Eisealstadt, many unpublished manuscripts are said to be still extant. See Framery, *Notice sur J. H.* (Paris, 1810); Pohl, *Mozart und Haydn in London* (Vienna, 1867, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

Haymo, Haimon, Haimo, or Aimo

a theologian of the 9th century, the place of whose birth (about A.D. 778) is uncertain. In his youth he embraced the rule of St. Benedict in the abbey of Fulda; afterwards he studied under Alcuin, at St. Martin of Tours, with Rabanus Maurus. He then appears successively as teacher at Fulda, as abbot of Hirschfeld, in the diocese of Mentz, and finally bishop of Halberstadt (Saxony) in 841. He was present at the Council of Mentz in 847, and died March 23 (or 26), 853. His writings which are chiefly compilations from the fathers, enjoyed great reputation; they consist of, *Glossae continues super Psalterium* (Colon. 1523, 8vo; 1561, 8vo): — *In Cantica Canticorum* (Colon. 1519, fol.; Worms, 1631, 8vo, *etc.):* — *Glossae in Isaiam* (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): — *Glossae in Jeremiam, Ezechielern, et Danielem* (so scarce that some doubt their having been printed at *all):* — *In duodecimo Prophetas minores* (Colon. 1519, et al.): — *Homiliae super Evangelia totius anni* (Colon. 1531; Paris, 1533; Antw.

1559): — *In Epistolas S. Pauli* (now generally supposed, however, to be by St. Remy of Auxerre): — *Super Apocalypsim Explanatio* (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): — *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi* (D'Achery, *Spicilegium,* 1, *42): — De varietate librorum tres libri* (Paris and Colon. 1531, 8vo): — *Breviarium Historiae ecclesiasticae* (Colon. 1531, 8vo; often reprinted). Other works have been ascribed to him by Johannes Trithemius, but it is not certain that they were by him, and, at any rate, they are now lost. His writings are collected in Migne, *Patrol. Latina,* vols. 116, 117, 118. See Lelong, *Bibl. Sacra;* Trithemius, *De eccles. Script.; Hist. litter. de la France,* 5, 111-126; Hoefer, *Norin. iio. Généralé. 23,* 121; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Literature* 2, 506; Mosheim, *Ch. History,* cent. 9 pt. 2,ch. 2, n. 50.

Haynes, Lemuel

a Congregational minister of New England, a mulatto.. He was born at West Hartford, Conn., July 18,1753, and was educated in the family of Mr. Rose, of Granville, Mass. In 1774 he enlisted in the Continental army, and in 1775 was in the expedition against Ticonderoga. Soon after this he commenced study with the Rev. Daniel Ferrand, and on Nov. 7, 1780, his credentials as a minister were granted. Soon afterwards he received a call to take charge of the Granville church. Here he labored five years with great acceptability. In 1783 he married Miss Elizabeth Babbit, a white lady of good intellect and sincere piety. Soon after this he was ordained, and went to Farmington, Conn., and thence to Vermont, and spent thirty years as pastor of a Congregational church at Rutland, whence he removed to Manchester, where he was involved in a very singular and noted trial for murder, not as accomplice, but as a defender of the accused. In 1822 he was called to the charge of the church in Granville, N. Y., an offshoot of the former in Massachusetts. Here he remained till his death in September 1834. Mr. Haynes was characterized from early life by a swift and subtle intellect, and a restless thirst for knowledge. He read Greek and Latin with critical accuracy. His wit was proverbial and refined. In Vermont he was very successful in opposing infidelity. Many anecdotes of his shrewd and sensible wit are on record. — Sherman, *New England Divines,* p. 267; Sprague, *Annals,* 2, 176.

Hayti

a name sometimes given to the second largest island in the West Indies. The more usual name is *San Domingo,* under which head all that is common to the whole island will be treated. Hayti proper is the western and French-speaking part of the island, which in 1808 was organized as a separate commonwealth under president Christophe, who in 1811 had himself crowned as hereditary emperor under the name of Henry I. In 1822 the French and the Spanish portions of the island were again united into one republic under general Boyer. This union lasted until 1844, when not only the Spanish portion became again an independent state, but the French part split into two, which were harassed by almost uninterrupted conflicts between the blacks and the mulattoes. The brief and beneficent administration of general Richer (1846-47) was followed by that of general Faustin Soulouque, who undertook an unfortunate campaign against the Dominicans, and in August 1849, proclaimed himself emperor, under the name of Faustin I. He was in 1858 overthrown by general Geffrard, who, as president, introduced many reforms, and was, in turn, overthrown in February, 1867, by Salnave, under whose administration the country was disturbed by uninterrupted civil wars, until his overthrow and execution, January, 1870.

The area of the republic is estimated at 10,205 square miles, the population at about 570,000. Nominally nearly the entire population belongs to the Roman Catholic Church; but, even according to Roman Catholic writers, many of the population are even today more pagan than Christian. The frightful religious and moral condition of the people is attributed by Roman Catholic writers to the habit of the French government of not establishing regular bishoprics, but of leaving the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in the hands of apostolical prefects, who had neither the influence nor the power of bishops, were more dependent upon the colonial government, and could not defend the interests of the Church and of religion against the secular power and the planters, who were chiefly intent on making the most out of slave labor. The care of the parishes was, before the beginning of the French rule, almost exclusively in the hands of the Capuchins and Dominicans. In 1703 the Capuchins left their parishes, and were succeeded by the Jesuits, who took charge of the districts from Samana to the Atrabonite, while the Dominicans assumed the administration of those from the Atrabonite to Cape Tiburon. Secular priests were left only hi the churches of Vache Island. When the Jesuits were expelled in 1768 they

were again followed by the Capuchins. During the war of independence nearly all the churches were closed, and the celebration of divine service was almost wholly suspended; but, the war being ended, the Constitution of 1807 declared the Catholic Church the only form of religion recognized by the government, and Christophe, by a decree issued in 1811, announced the establishment of one archbishopric and three bishoprics. The pope was asked to sanction this arrangement, but, owing to the death of Christophe, which occurred soon after, and to other causes, the plan was never carried out. In 1822, when the whole island was under one government, the archbishop of San Domingo appointed for the western part two vicars general, of whom the one resided at Cape Hayti, and the other at Port-au-Prince. In 1827 Pope Leo XII again conferred upon the archbishop of San Domingo the jurisdiction over the whole island; but the religious condition of the people grew worse and worse. There was an almost absolute want of priests, and the few who were to be found were mostly worthless characters, who had for immoral conduct been expelled from other dioceses. In 1842, bishop Rosati, of St. Louis, was commissioned by pope Gregory XVI to visit Hayti, and, as apostolical delegate, to conclude a Concordat with president Boyer; but this step also was thwarted by the overthrow of his administration (1843). The emperor Soulouque protected and endowed the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time introduced religious toleration, and thus enabled Protestant missionaries to organize a few missions. In 1852 pope Pius IX sent bishop Spaccapietra to Hayti to make another effort to conclude a Concordat. The mission was again unsuccessful; and in an allocution of Dec. 19, 1853, the pope complained that the emperor and his government had a false idea concerning the Church, and that, as a great portion of the clergy were unwilling to adopt a strict rule of life, the bishop was compelled to leave the country. Negotiations with president Geffrard were more successful, and on Sept. 16, 1861, a Concordat was promulgated. According to it, one archbishopric (Port-au-Prince) and four bishoprics (Les Cayes, Cape Hayti, Gonaives, and Port de Paix) were established in 1862; the archbishop (a Frenchman, Testard du Cosquer) was appointed in 1863, but none of the four episcopal sees had been filled up to January, 1870. The number of parishes is 49. For public education very little has as yet been done. There were in 1868 about 150 public schools, with about 13,000 pupils.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States sustained in 1889 a bishop at Port-au-Prince, and 15 clergymen, filling 17 mission stations,

with a total of 382 communicants, 189-day scholars, and 124 Sunday school scholars. The contributions for the year were $317.55.

The English Wesleyans, who were the first Protestant body to establish a Protestant mission in Hayti, had in 1868 6 circuits, 6 chapels, 4 other preaching places, 210 members, and about 890 regular attendants, but in 1889 only 4 preachers. — Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. und Statistik,* vol. 3:1869. (A. J. S.)

Ha’zaël

(Heb. *Chazal’*, לאזח also לאהזח whom *God beholds*, i.e. cares for; Sept. Ἀ ζαήλ,Vulg. *Hazael,* but *Azael* in Amos 1:4; hence Latin *Azelus*, Justin. 36:2), an officer of Benhadad, king of Syria, whose eventual accession to the throne of that kingdom was revealed to Elijah (1 Kings 19:15), B.C. cir. 907; and who, when Elisha was at Damascus, was sent by his master, who was then ill, to consult the prophet respecting his recovery (2 Kings 8:8). B.C. cir. 884. He was followed by forty camels bearing presents from the king. The answer was, that he *might* certainly recover. “Howbeit,” added the prophet, “the Lord hath showed me that he shall surely die.” He then looked steadfastly at Hazael till he became confused, on which the man of God wept; and when Hazael respectfully inquired the cause of this outburst, Elisha replied by describing the vivid picture then present to his mind of all the evils which the man now before him would inflict upon Israel Hazael exclaimed, “But what is thy servant, the [not *a*] dog, that he should do this great thing?” The prophet explained that it was as king of Syria he should do it. Hazael then returned, and delivered to his master that portion of the prophetic response, which was intended for him. But the very next day this man, cool and calculating in his cruel ambition, took a thick cloth, and, having dipped it in water, spread it over the face of the king, who, in his feebleness, and probably in his sleep, was smothered by its weight, and died what seemed to his people a natural death (2 Kings 8:15). We are not to imagine that such a project as this was conceived and executed in a day, or that it was suggested by the words of Elisha. His composure at the earnest gaze of the prophet, and other circumstances show that Hazael at that moment regarded Elisha as one to whom his secret purposes were known. (See Kitto’s *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). He was soon engaged in hostilities with Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoram, king of Israel, for the possession of the city of Ramoth-gilead (2 Kings 8:28). The Assyrian inscriptions show that about this time a

bloody and destructive war was waged between the Assyrians on the one side, and the Syrians, Hittites, Hamathites, and Phoenicians on the other. *SEE CUNIFORM INSCRIPTIONS*. Benhadad (q.v.) had recently suffered several severe defeats at the hands of the Assyrian king, and upon the accession of Hazael the war was speedily renewed. Hazael took up a position in the fastnesses of the Auti-Libanus, but was there attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss, killing 16,000 of his warriors, and capturing more than 1100 chariots. Three years later the Assyrians once more entered Syria in force; but on this occasion Hazael submitted, and helped to furnish the invaders with supplies. After this, internal troubles appear to have occupied the attention of the Assyrians, who made no more expeditions into these parts for about a century. The Syrians rapidly recovered their losses, and towards the close of the reign of Jehu, Hazael led them against the Israelites (B.C. cir. 860), whom he "smote in all their coasts" (<121032>2 Kings 10:32), thus accomplishing the prophecy of Elisha (<121312>2 Kings 8:12). His main attack fell upon the eastern provinces, where he ravaged "all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan" (<121033>2 Kings 10:33). After this he seems to have held the kingdom of Israel in a species of subjection (<121303>2 Kings 13:3-7, and 22), and towards the close of his life he even threatened the kingdom of Judah. Having taken Gath (<121217>2 Kings 12:17; comp. <300302>Amos 6:2), he proceeded to attack Jerusalem, defeated the Jews in an engagement (<142424>2 Chronicles 24:24), and was about to assault the city, when Joash induced him to retire by presenting him with "all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house" (<121218>2 Kings 12:18). This able and successful, but unprincipled usurper left the throne at his death to his son Benhadad (<121324>2 Kings 13:24). B.C. cir. 835. Such was the prosperity and influence of his reign that the phrase "house of Hazael" occurs in prophetical denunciation (Amos 1:4) as a designation of the kingdom of Damascene Syria. *SEE DAMASCUS*.

Hazai'ah

(Heb. *Chazayah'*, hyzj}, whom *Jehovah beholds;* Sept. Ὀζία*)*, son of Adaiah and father of Colhozeh, a descendant of Pharez (<160105>Nehemiah 11:5). B.C. considerably ante 536.

Hazar

(also HAZOR) is frequently prefixed to geographical names, in order to indicate their dependence as *villages (*rx#; *chatser',* a *hamlet; SEE VILLAGE*) upon some town or other noted spot, or in order to distinguish them from it; e.g. those following. "The word *Bazar,* when joined to places situated in the desert or on the outskirts of the inhabited country, as it frequently is, probably denoted a piece of ground surrounded by a rude but strong fence, where tents could be pitched, and cattle kept in safety from marauders. 'Such places are very common at the present day in the outlying districts of Palestine. In other cases Hazar may denote a castle or 'fortified town' *SEE HAZER.*

Haz'ar ad'dar

(Heb.' *Chatsar'-Addar',* rxij}rDa; *village of Addar;* Sept. ἔπαυλις Ἀράδ, v.r. Ἀδδαρά and Σάραδα), a place on the southern boundary of Palestine, between Kadesh-Barnea and Azmon (<04404>Numbers 34:4); elsewhere called simply ADAR (<06503>Joshua 15:3). *SEE HAZERIM.* It probably lay in the desert west of Kadesh-Barnea (q.v.), perhaps at the junction of wadys El-Fukreh and El-Madurah, east of I Jebel Madurah. *SEE TRIBE.* Rev. J. Rowlands thought he discovered both this locality and that of the adjoining Azmon in the fountains which he calls *Adeirat* and *Aseimet,* west of wady el-Arish (Williams, *Holy City,* 1, 467); but the names are more correctly Kudeirat and Kusaimet, and the locality is too far west.

Ha'zar-e'nan

(Heb. *Chatsar'-Eynan',* ^ny[er[ij} *village of fountains,* also [in <26477>Ezekiel 47:17] HA'ZARE'NON, *Chatsar'-Eynon',* ^/ny[erxij} *id.;* Sept. Ἀσερναΐν or ἡ αὐλή τοῦ Αἰναν), a place on the boundary of Palestine, apparently at the north-eastern corner, between Ziphron and Shepham (<04410>Numbers 34:9, 10), not far from the district of Hamath, in Damascene Syria (<26477>Ezekiel 47:17; 48:1). Schwarz *(Palestine,* p. 20, note) thinks it identical with the village *DeirHanon,* in the valley of the Fijeh or Amana, near Damascus; but there is no probability that this was included within the limits of Canaan. "Porter would identify Hazar-enan with *Kuryetein*='the two cities,' a village more than sixty miles east-north-east of Damascus, the chief ground for the identification apparently being

the presence at Kuryetein of ‘large fountains,’ the only ones in that ‘vast region,’ a circumstance with which the name of Hazar-enan well agrees *(Damascus,* 1, 252; 2, 358). The great distance from Damascus and the body of Palestine is the main impediment to the reception of this identification” (Smith). We must therefore seek for Hazar-enan somewhere in the well-watered tract at the northwestern foot of Mount Hermon, perhaps the present *Hasbeya,* near which are four springs (Ain Kunieb, A. Tinta, A. Ata, and A. Hersha). *SEE HASPETA*.

Ha’zar-gad’dah

(Heb. *Chatsar’-Gaddah’,* rxij}hDG; *village of fortune;* Sept. Ἀσεργαδδά v.r. Σερείμ*),* a city on the southern border of Judah, mentioned between Moladah and Heshmon (16152Joshua 15:27). Modern writers (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 707), following the suggestion of Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v.; who, as suggested by Schwarz, *Palestine,* p. 100, has probably confounded this place with En-Gedi), have sought for it near the Dead Sea; but the associated names appear to locate it nearer midway towards the Mediterranean. *SEE HAZERIM*. Mr. Grove suggests (Smith, Dict. s.v.) that it is possibly the modern ruined site marked as *Jurrah* on Van de Velde’s *Map,* west of el-Melh (Moladah), “by the change so frequent in the East (?) of D. to R.” *SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF*.

Ha’zar-hat’ticon

(Hebrew *Chatsar’ hat-Tikodn’,* ^/kyTæa rxij} *hamlet of the midway,* q.d. *middle village;* Sept. confusedly Εὐσὰν καὶ τοῦ Εὐνάν, αὐλὴ τοῦ Σαυνάν, *Vulg. dongus Tichon),* a place on the northern boundary of Palestine, near Hamath, and in the confines of Hauran (26716Ezekiel 47:16); apparently, therefore, on the northern brow of Mount Hermon, which may have given origin to the name as a point of division between Coele-Syria and Damascene Syria. It is possibly only an epithet of the HAZOR *SEE HAZOR* (q.v.) of Naphtali.

Hazarma’veth

(Hebrew CHATSAR- MA’VET, twm;rxij} *court of death;* Sept. Σαρμώθ and Ἀραμώθ, Vulg. *Asarmoth),* the name of the third son of Joktan, or, rather, of a district of Arabia Felix settled by him (10026Genesis 10:26; 13020 1 Chronicles 1:20); supposed to be preserved in the modern province of

Hadramaut, situated on the Indian Ocean, and abounding in frankincense, myrrh, and aloe; but (as intimated in the ominous name) noted for the insalubrity of the climate (Abulfeda, *Arabia,* p. 45; Niebuhr, *Beschrieb. der Arab.* p. 283; Ritter, *Erdk. 11,* 3,609). It was known also to the classical writers (Χατραμωτεῖται, *16,* 768; Χατραμμῖται or Χατραμωνῖται, PtoL 6:7, 25: *Atramitae,* Dimon. *Perieq.* 957; Χατραμωτίτης, Steph. Byz. p. 755). This identification of the locality rests not only on the occurrence of the name, but is supported by the proved fact that Joktan settled in the Yemen, along the south coast of Arabia, by the physical characteristics of the inhabitants of this region, and by the identification of the names of several others of the sons of Joktan. The province of Hadramaut is situated east of the *modern* Yemen (anciently, as shown in the article ARABIA *SEE ARABIA* , the limits of the latter province embraced almost the whole of the south of the peninsula), extending to the districts of Shihr and Mahreh. Its capital is Shibam, a very ancient city, of which the native writers give curious accounts, and its chief ports are Mirbat, Zafari, *SEE SEPHAR,* and Kishim, whence a great trade was carried on in ancient times with India and Africa. Hadramaut itself is generally cultivated, in contrast with the contiguous sandy deserts (called El-Ahkaf, where lived the gigantic race of Ad), is partly mountainous, with watered valleys, and is still celebrated for its frankincense (El-idrisi, ed. Jomard, 1, 54; Niebuhr, *Descrip.* p 245), exporting also gum-arabic, myrrh, dragon's blood, and aloes, the latter, however, being chiefly from Socotra, which is under the rule of the sheik of Keshim (Niebuhr, 1. c. sq.). The early kings of Hadramaut were Joktanites, distinct from the descendants of Yaarub, the progenitor of the Joktanite Arabs generally; and it is hence to be inferred that they were separately descended from Hazarmaveth. They maintained their independence against the powerful kings of limver until the latter were subdued at the Abyssinian invasion (ibn-Khaldfin, *ap.* Caussin, *Essai,* 1, 135 sq.). The modern people, although mixed with other races, are strongly characterized by fierce, fanatical, and restless dispositions. They are enterprising merchants, well known for their trading and travelling propensities.

Ha'zar-shu'al

(Hebrew *Chatsar'-Shual',* rxij}l [ẁv, *village of* the *jackal;* Sept. Ἁσαρσουλά,Ἐσερσουάλ and Ἁσερσωάλ), a city on the southern border of Judah (<061528>Joshua 15:28; <161126>Nehemiah 11:26, where it is mentioned

between Beth-palet and Beer-sheba), afterwards included in the territory of Simeon (<06910>Joshua 19:3; <13028>1 Chronicles 4:28, where it is mentioned between Moladah and Balah); hence probably midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. *SEE HAZERIM*. Van de Velde, on his *Map*, conjectures the site to be that of the ruins *Samweh*, which he locates nearly half way between Beer-sheba and Moladah. But *SEE SHEMA*.

Ha'zar-su'sah

(Hebrew *Chatsar'-Susah'*, hsWs rxij}, *village of* the *horse*, <06915>Joshua 19:5; Sept. Ἀσερσουσίμ,Vulg. *Hasersusa)*, or HA'ZAR-SUSIM *(Chatsar' Susim'*, µysWs rxij} *village of horses*, <13031>1 Chronicles 4:31; Sept. ἡμισυ Σωσίμ,*Vulg. Hasersusim)*, a city of the tribe of Simeon, mentioned between Beth-marcaboth and Beth-lebaoth or Beth-birei; doubtless, as thought by Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 124), the same as SANSANNAH, in the south border of Judah (<06531>Joshua 15:31), one of Solomon's "chariot-cities" (<14014>2 Chronicles 1:14). *SEE HAZERIM*. It is true that "neither it nor its companion, BETH-MARCABOTH, the house of chariots,' is named in the list of the towns of Judah in chap. 15, but they are included in those of Simeon in <13031>1 Chronicles 4:31, with the express statement that they existed before and up to the time of David" (Smith). Stanley suggests, "In *Bethmarkaboth*, 'the house of chariots,' and *Hazar-su. sim*, 'the village of horses,' we recognize the depots and stations for the horses and chariots, such as those which in Solomon's time went to and fro between Egypt and Palestine" *(Sin. and Pal.* p. 160). "It is doubtful whether there was any such communication between those countries as early as the time of Joshua; but may not the rich grassy plains around Beersheba (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 1, 203) have been used at certain seasons by the ancient tribes of Southern Palestine for pasturing their war and chariot horses, just as the grassy plains of Jaulan are used at the present day by the Druse chiefs of Lebanon, and the Turkish cavalry and artillery at Damascus?" (Kitto). "Still it is somewhat difficult to ascribe to so early a date the names of places situated as these were in the Bedouin country, where a chariot must have been unknown, and where even horses seem carefully excluded from the possessions of the inhabitants-' camels, sheep, oxen, and 'asses' (<09709>1 Samuel 27:9)."

Haz'azon-ta'mar

(<14202>2 Chronicles 20:2). *SEE HAZEZON-TAMAR*.

Hazel

Picture for Hazel

(זָל, *lûz*, of doubtful etymology [see Luz]; Sept. καρυΐνη, Vulgate *tamygdalinus)*, apparently a nut bearing tree, which occurs in Genesis 30:37, where it indicates one of the kinds of rod from which Jacob peeled the bark, and which he placed in the water-troughs of the cattle. Authorities are divided between the *hazel* or *walnut* and the *almond-tree*, as representing the *lûz;* in favor of the former we have Kimchi, Jarchi, Luther, and others; while the Vulgate, Saadias, and Gesenius adopt the latter view. The rendering in the Sept. is equally applicable to either. On the one hand is adduced the fact that in the Arabic we have *louz*, which is indeed the same word, and denotes the almond. Thus Abu'l-Fadli, as quoted by Celsius *(Hierobot.* 1, 254), says, "*Louz* est arbor nota, et magna, foliis mollibus. Species duae, hortensis et silvestris. Hortensis quoque duse sunt species, dulcis et amara;" where reference is evidently made to the sweet and bitter almond. Other Arab authors also describe the almond under the name of *louz.* But this name was well known to the Hebrews as indicating the almond; for R. Saadias, in Ab. Esra's *Comment.*, as quoted by Celsius (p. 253), remarks: "Lus est amygdalus, quia ita eam appellant Arabes; nam hne duse linguae, et Syriaca, ejusdem sunt familiae." It is also alleged that there is another word in the Hebrew language, *egoz* (זגז), which is applicable to the hazel or walnut. *SEE NUT*. The strongest argument on the other side arises from the circumstance of another word, *shaked* (שקד), having reference to the almond; it is supposed, however, that the latter applies to the *fruit* exclusively, and the word munder discussion to the tree; Rosenmüller identifies the *shaked* with the cultivated, and *lûz* with the wild almond-tree. *SEE FRUIT*.

The almond is diffused by culture from China to Spain, and is found to bear fruit well on both sides of the Mediterranean; but there is no region where it thrives better than Syria, or where it is so truly at home. Accordingly, when Jacob was sending a present of those productions of Canaan which were likely to be acceptable to an Egyptian grandee, "the best fruits of the land," besides balm, and myrrh, and honey, he bade his sons take "nuts and almonds" (Genesis 43:11); and the original name of that place so endeared to his memory as Bethel, originally called Luz, was probably derived from some well-known tree of this species. To this day "Jordan

almonds" is the recognized market-name for the best samples of this fruit, in common with Tafilat dates, Eleme figs, etc. The name, however, is little more than a tradition. The best "Jordan almonds" come from Malaga. *SEE ALMOND*.

Hazelelpo'ni

or rather ZELELPONI (ynæP l]l x] *shade* looking *upon me [or protection of* the *presence,* sc. rod;: Furst], with the article, ynæP l]l Xh; *hats-Tselelponi',* strictly, perhaps, rather an epithet, the *Zelelponite,* q. d. *overshadowed;* Sept. Ἐσηλελφώνι,Vulg. *Aselelphuni),* the sister of Jezreel and others, of the descendants of Hezron, son of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:3). B.C. cir. 1612.

Hazelius, Ernest Lewis, D.D.

was born in Neusalz. Prussia, Sept. 6, 1777. He was descended from a long line of Lutheran ministers. His theological studies were pursued at Niesky, a Moravian institution under the superintendence of bishop Anders. In 1800 he was appointed teacher of the classics in the Moravian Seminary at Nazareth, Pa. The position he accepted in opposition to the wishes of his friends, and at once embarked for America. In this institution he labored with efficiency for eight years, and was advanced to be head teacher and professor of theology. Differing from his brethren in their views of church government and discipline, he concluded to change his ecclesiastical relations, and to unite with the Lutheran Church, in whose service his fathers had so long lived and labored. In 1809 he removed to Philadelphia, and for a time had charge of a private classical school. For several years he labored as a, pastor in New Jersey, and in 1815 was elected professor of theology in Hartwick Seminary, and principal of the classical department. In 1830 he was chosen professor of Biblical and Oriental literature, and of the German language, in the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.; and in 1834 he accepted the appointment of professor in the theological seminary of the Synod of South Carolina. All these positions he filled with ability and great satisfaction to the Church. He died Feb. 20,1853. As a scholar he occupied a high rank. The doctorate he received simultaneously from Union and Columbia Colleges, N. Y. His attainments in literature were varied and extensive. He published *Life of Luther* (1813) *Materials for Catechization* (1823): — *Augsburg Confession, with Annotations: — History o' the Christian Church (1842):*

— *Hist. of the American Lutheran Church* (1842): — *Life of J. H. Stilling* (1831). (M. L. S.)

Ha'zer

(רָצֵר; *Chatser',* from רָצַר; to *surround* or enclose), a word which is of not unfrequent occurrence in the Bible in the sense of a "court" or quadrangle to a palace or other building, but which topographically seems generally employed for the "villages" of people in a roving and unsettled life, the semi-permanent collections of dwellings described by travelers among the modern Arabs as consisting of rough stone walls covered with the tent-cloths, and thus holding a middle position between the tent of the wanderer-so transitory as to furnish an image of the sudden termination of life (Isaiah 38:12) —and the settled, permanent town. *SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS*.

As a proper name it appears in the A.V.

1. In the plural, HAZERIT, and HAZEROTH, for which see below.

2. In the slightly different form of HAZOR.

3. In composition with other words, giving a special designation to the particular "village" intended. When thus in union with another word the name is HAZAR *SEE HAZAR* (q.v.). It should not be overlooked that the places so named are all in the wilderness itself, or else quite on the confines of civilized country.

Haz'erim

[many *Haze'rim]* (Hebrew *Chatserim',* חֲצֵרִים *villages;* Sept. Ἀσηρώθ, Vulg. *flaserim),* the name of a place, or perh. rather a general designation of the temporary villages in which the nomade AVITES resided, especially between Gaza and "the river of Egypt" or el-Arish (Deuteronomy 2, 23). Schwarz suggests *(Palestine,* p. 93) that these "Hazerim" may be a general designation of the many towns by the name of HAZOR and HAZAR found in this region; if so, these probably all lay near each other; and it is a singular fact that the sites of at least two of them, Hazar-gaddah and Hazar-susah, seem to have been immediately adjoining one another.

Haz'eroth

[many *Haze'roth]* (Heb. *Chatseroth',* t/rxe{ *villages;* Sept. Ἁσηρώθ, but Αὐλών in Deuteronomy 1:1), the sixteenth station of the Israelites, their third afte, leaving Sinai, and either four or five days' march from that mountain towards Canaan (Numbers 11:35; 12:16; 33:17, 18; Deuteronomy 1:1; comp. Numbers 10:33). It was also the first place after Sinai where the camp remained for a number of days. Here Aaron and Miriam attempted to excite a rebellion against Moses; and here the guilty Miriam was smitten with leprosy (Numbers 12). Burckhardt suggested *(Travels, p.* 495) that it is to be found in *Ain el-Iludhera,* near the usual route from Sinai to the eastern arm of the Red Sea; an identification that has generally been acquiesced in by subsequent travelers. It is described by Dr. Robinson as a fountain of tolerably good water, the only perennial one in that region, with several low palm-trees around it; he also remarks that the identification of this spot with Hazeroth is important as showing the route of the Israelites from Sinai to the Arabab, which, if it passed through this place, must have continued down the valley to the Red Sea, and could not have diverged through the high western plateau of the wilderness *(Researches,* 1, 223). *SEE EXODE*. Its distance from Sinai accords with the Scripture narrative, and would seem to warrant us in identifying it with Hazeroth. There is some difficulty, however, in the position. The country around the fountain is exceedingly rugged, and the approaches to it difficult. It does not seem a suitable place for a large camp. Dr. Wilson mentions an undulating plain about fifteen miles north of Sinai, and running 'a long way to the eastward,' called *el-Hadherah;* and here he would locate Hazeroth *(Lands of the Bible,* 1, 256). Stanley thinks that the fountain called *el-'Ain,* some distance north of the fountain of Hudherah, ought rather to be regarded as the site of Hazeroth, because 'Ain is the most important spring in this region,' and must therefore have attracted around it any nomadic settlements, such as are implied in the name Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel might have been' *(Sinai and Pal.* p. 82). The approach to 'Ain is easy; the glens around it possess some good pastures; and the road from it to the AElanitic Gulf, along whose shore the Israelites appear to have marched, is open through the sublime ravine of Wetir. Still, those familiar with the East know with what tenacity old names cling to old sites; and it seems in the highest degree probable that the old name Hazeroth is retained in Hudherah. But probably the name may have been given to a wide district (Porter; *Handbook for Sinai and Pal.* 1,

37 sq.). Schwarz, however *(Palest.* p. 212), regards the site as that of *Ais el-Kudeirah,* a large fountain of sweet running water at some distance beyond the ridge which bounds the western edge of the interior plateau of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's *Researches,* 1, 280); a position far too northward.

Haz'ezon-ta'mar

(Hebrew *Chatsalson'-Tamar',* rm;T;ˆxx}j¡ <01447>Genesis 14:7; Sept. Ἀσασονθαμάρ*),* or HAZ'AZON-TA'MAR (Heb. [precisely the converse of the rendering in the A.V.] *Chatsetson'-Tamar',* ˆ/xx}j irm;T; <14202>2 Chronicles 20:2; Sept. Ἀσασὰν Θαμάρ), the name under which, at a very early period in the history of Palestine, and in a document believed by many to be the oldest of all these early records, we first hear of the place which afterwards became EN-GEDI *SEE EN-GEDI* (q.v.). The Amorites were dwelling at Hazazon-Tamar when the four kings made their incursion, and fought their successful battle with the five (<01447>Genesis 14:7). The name occurs only once again-in the records of the reign of Hezekiah (<14202>2 Chronicles 20:2) — when he is warned of the approach of the horde of Ammonites, Moabites, Mehunim, and men of Mount Seir, whom he afterwards so completely destroyed, and who were no doubt pursuing thus far exactly the same route as the Assyrians had done a thousand years before them. Here the explanation, "which is En-gedi," is added. The existence of the earlier appellation, after En-gedi had been so long in use, is a remarkable instance of the tenacity of these old Oriental names, of which more modern instances are frequent. *SEE ACCHO*; *SEE BETHSAIDA*, etc. Schwarz, however, unnecessarily supposes *(Palest.* p. 21) the two passages to refer to different localities, the earlier of which he assigns (on Talmudical evidence) to ZOAR (q.v.).

Hazazon-tamar is interpreted in Hebrew to mean the *"pruning* or felling *of* the *palm"* (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 512), or perhaps better, *"a row of palm-trees"* (Fürst, *Lex. s.v.*). Jerome *(Quaest. in Genesis)* renders it *urbspalmarum.* This interpretation of the name is borne out by the ancient reputation of the palms of En-gedi (Ecclus. 24:14, and the citations from Pliny, given under that name). The Samaritan Version has ydk gwlp =the *Vallky of Cadi,* possibly a corruption of En-gedi. The Targums have *En-gedi.* Perhaps this was the "city of palm trees" *(Ir hat-temar-im)* out of which the Kenites, the tribe of Moses's father-in-law, went up into the wilderness of Judah, after

the conquest of the country (<070116>Judges 1:16). If this were so, the allusion of Balaam to the Kenite (<042421>Numbers 24:21) —is at once explained. Standing as he was on one of the lofty points of the highlands opposite Jericho, the western shore of the Dead Sea as far as En-gedi would be before him, and the cliff, in the clefts of which the Kenites had fixed their secure "nest," would be a prominent object in the view. This has been alluded to by Prof. Stanley *(Sinai and Pal.* 1). 225, n. 4). De Saulcy *(Narrative,* 1, 149) and Schwarz *(Palestine,* p. 109) think that a trace of the ancient name is preserved in the tract and wady *el-Husasah* (Robinson's *Researches,* 2, 243, 244), a little north of Ain-Jidy.

Ha'ziel

(Heb. *Chaziel',* לאזיה *vision of God;* Sept. Αζιήλ v.r. Ἰειήλ), a "son" of the Gershonite Shimei, and chief of the family of Laadan (<132309>1 Chronicles 23:9). B.C. 1014.

Ha'zo

(Heb. *Chazo',* וחז perhaps for תזח; *vision;* Sept. Ἀζαῦ,Vulg. *Azau),* one of the sons of Nahor by Milcah (<012222>Genesis 22:22). B.C. cir. 2040. The only clew to the locality settled by him is to be found in the identification of Chesed, and the other sons of Nahor; and hence he must, in all likelihood, be placed in Ur of the Chaldees, or the adjacent countries. Bunsen *(Bibelwerk,* I, 2, 49) suggests *Chazene* by the Euphrates (Stephan. Byzant.), in Mesopotamia, or the Chazene (Χαζηνή*)* in Assyria (Strabo, 16, p. 736),

Ha'zor

(Heb. *Chatsor',* רצח; *village SEE HAZER*-; Sept. Ἀσώρ, but ἡ αὐλή*)* in <244928>Jeremiah 49:28, 30, 33), the name of several places. *SEE EN-HAZOR*; *SEE BAALHAZOR*; *SEE HAZOR-HADATTAH*; *SEE HAZERIM*.

1. A city near the waters of lake Merom (Huleh), the seat of Jabin, a powerful Canaanitish king, as appears from the summons sent by him to all the neighboring kings to assist him against the Israelites (<061101>Joshua 11:1 5). He and his confederates were, however, defeated and slain by Joshua, and the city burned to the ground (<061110>Joshua 11:10-13; Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 5, 1): being the only one of those northern cities which was burned by Joshua, doubtless because it was too strong and important to leave

standing in his rear. It was the principal city of the whole of North Palestine, “the head of all those kingdoms” (<06010>Joshua 10:10; see Jerome, *Onomast.* s.v. Asor). Like the other strong places of that part, it stood on an eminence (<06113>Joshua 11:13, A.V. “strength”), but the district around must-have been on the whole flat, and suitable for the maneuvers of the “very many” chariots and horses which formed part of the forces of the king of Hazor and his confederates (<06104>Joshua 11:4, 6, 9; <07043>Judges 4:3). But by the time of Deborah and Barak the Canaanites had recovered part of the territory then lost, had rebuilt Hazor, and were ruled by a king with the ancient royal name of Jabin, under whose power the Israelites were, in punishment for their sins, reduced. From this yoke they were delivered by Deborah and Barak, after which Hazor remained in quiet possession of the Israelites, and belonged to the tribe of Naphtali (<06936>Joshua 19:36; <07042>Judges 4:2; <09209>1 Samuel 12:9). Solomon did not overlook so important a post, and the fortification of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, the points of defense for the entrance from Syria and Assyria, the plain of Esdraelon, and the great maritime lowland respectively, was one of the chief pretexts for his levy of taxes (<11095>1 Kings 9:15).. Later still it is mentioned in the list of the towns and districts whose inhabitants were carried off to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (<12529>2 Kings 15:29; Josephus, A*nt. 9:*11, 1). We encounter it once more in 1 Macc. 11:67, where Jonathan, after encamping for the night at the “water of Gennesar,” advances to the “plain of Asor” (Josephus, *Ant. 13,* 5, 7; the Greek text of the Maccabees has prefixed an *n* from the preceding word πεδίον*;* A.V. “Nasor”) to meet Demetrius, who was in possession of Kadesh (11, 63; Josephus as above). *SEE NASOR.* Raumer queries whether it may not have been the ancient town of *Naason,* which king Baldwin IV passed on his way from Tiberias to Saphet (Will. Tyr. p. 1014); and his reason for this conjecture is that the Vulgate gives Naason for the *Asor (*Ἀσώρ*)* of Tobit 1, 1 (Raumer, *Palastinza.s.* 114, n.). *SEE ASOR.*

The name Hazor still lingers in several places around the upper valley of the Jordan (Robinson, *B. R. 3,* 63, 81, 401). There is one *Hazury* on a commanding site above Caesarea Philippi, and close to the great castle of Subeibeh. Here Keith *(Land of Israel,* p. 374) and Stanley *(Sin. and Pal.* p. 389) would place the ancient capital of Canaan. But the territory of Naphtali hardly extended so far eastward. Another *Hasur* is in the plain, a few miles west of the site of Dan; but neither does this site quite accord with the Scripture notices (Porter’s *Damascus,* 1, 304; Van de Velde,

Memoir, p. 318). Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 91) thinks a village which he calls *Azur*, between Banias and Meshdel (el-Mejel), may be the ancient Hazor; he probably refers to the *Ain el-Hazury* marked on Zimmerman's *Map* a little north-east of Banias, which, however, is too far east. There is a place marked as *Azur* on Zimmerman's *Map*, a little north-east of Kedes (Kadesh), which unquestionably lay in Naphtali; but M. De Saulcy *(Narrat.* 2, 406) denies that this can have been the Hazor of Jabin (which he distinguishes from the Hazor of Solomon), and in a long argument (p. 400-405) he contends that it was situated on the site of some extensive ruins, which he reports at a place called indefinitely *el-Khan*, on the hills skirting the north-easterly shore of the lake el-Huleh, in the direction of Banias. Van de Velde *(Memoir*, p. 318) likewise thinks the Hazor of Joshua different from that of Judges (although both were ruled by *a* Jabin, evidently a hereditary title), and inclines to regard En-Hazor (0697Joshua 19:37) as identical with the latter, and with a ruined *Hazur* in the middle of Galilee (about two hours from Bint Jebeil); while he seems to acquiesce in the identification of the eastern Hazor with a *Hazur* (Porter, *Danascus*, 1, 304) or *Kasr Autar* (Seetzen), or, as he himself calls it, *Tell Haze*, covered with remains, and jutting out from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh plain. The Hazor of 0696Joshua 19:36, he believes to be *Tell Hazur*, southeast of Ramah. All this, however, is vague and confused. Mr. Thomson, who visited this region in 1843, believed Hazor may be identified with the present castle of *Hunin*, north of the Huleh *(Biblioth. Sacra*, 1846, p. 202). The editor (Dr. Robinson), however, thinks the arguments adduced more plausible than sound *(ib.* p. 212), and advocates the opinion of Rev. E. Smith, that *Tell Khureibeh*, at the south end of the plain of Kedes, is better entitled to be regarded as the site of Hazor *(Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1847, p. 403). Accordingly, in the new ed. of his *Researches*, after noticing and rejecting several other sites proposed (3, 63, 81, 402), he at length fixes upon this as best agreeing with the ancient notices of this city *(ib.* p. 365). There are, as the name *Khureibeh*, "ruins," implies, some ancient ruins on the tell, but they are those of a village. There are still other ruins of an ancient town which occupy a commanding site on the south bank of wady Hendâj, overlooking the valley and lake of Merom, and about six miles south of Kedesh, which is a not improbable site for the ancient Hazor (Robinson, *Bibl. Res. 3*, 363, 365); and the plain beneath it, stretching to the shore of the lake, might take the name of the city *Asur*, as Josephus seems to indicate '(1. c.). Ritter *(Erdk. 15*, 260) — accepts the *Hazury* proposed by Burckhardt *(Trav.* p. 44); apparently the inconsiderable ruin

on the rocky declivity above Banias (Robinson, *Res.* new ed. 3, 402). Captain Wilson prefers the isolated *Tell Harah,* covered with ruins, about two miles southeast of Kedesh *(Jour. Sac. Lit.* 1866, p. 245). But none of these last cited places retain the ancient name. Finally, Dr. Thomson is confident *(Land and Book,* 1, 439) that the true spot is *Hazere* (the above *Hazur* of Van de Velde, east of a more northern Ramah), in the center of the mountainous region overhanging lake Huleh on the northwest, containing numerous ancient remains, and locally connected by tradition with the Israelitish victory; although Dr. Robinson (incorrectly) objects to this site *(Bib. Res.* new ed. 3:63) that it is too far from the lake, and within the territory of Asher.

2. A city in the south of Judah (but probably not one of those assigned to Simeon, since it is not named in the list, <6691>Joshua 19:1-9), mentioned between Kedesh (Kadesh-Barnea) and Ithant (<6652>Joshua 15:23, where the Vat. MS. of the Sept. unites with the following name, Ἀσοριωνάν, Alex. MS. omits, Vulg. *Asor).* We may reasonably conjecture that this was the central town of that name, the other Hazors of the same connection (HazorHadattah, and Kerioth-Hezron or Hazor-Amam) being probably so called for distinction' sake; and in that case we may perhaps locate it at a ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Map* as *Tayibeh* (the *et-Taiyib* of Robinson, *Res. 3* Appendix, p. 114), on a tell around the south-west base of which runs the wady ed-Dheib, emptying into the Dead Sea. See Nos. 3 and 4.

3. HAZOR-HADATTAH (for so the Heb. hTdij}r/xj; i.e. *New Hazor,* should be understood; since there is no copula between the words, and the sense in verse 32 requires this condensation; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Asor nova),* a city in the south of Judah (but not the extreme Simeonite portion), mentioned between Bealoth and Kerioth (<6655>Joshua 15:25); probably, as suggested in Keil and Delitzsch's *Commentary,* ad loc. (Edinb. ed. p. 160), the ruined site *el-Hudhairah* of Robinson's *Researches* (3, Append. p. 114), south of Hebron, in the immediate vicinity of el-Beyudh (the Beiyudh of Van de Veldes *Map,* about half way between Kerioth and Arad). See Nos. 2. and 4.

4. HAZOR-AMAM (to be so joined for the same reasons as in No. 2), probably identified with Kerioth-Herzon (in the Heb. the four names stand ^/rxj,t/Yrae[}µma}r/xj;ayhæ, *villages of Chetsron which is Chatsor Amam;* Sept. αἱ πόλεις Ἀσερών [v.r. Ἀσερώμ], αὕτη ἐστὶ Ἀσω″ρ καὶ

Αμάμ, [v.r. Ἀσερωμάμ*];* Vulg. *Carioth, Hesron, haec est Asor, Amam),* a town in the south of Judah (but apparently not in the Simeonite territory), mentioned between Bealoth and Shema (<06154>Joshua 15:24-26); no doubt (if thus combined) the modern *el-Khureyetein,* as suggested by Robinson *(Researches, 3,* Append. p. 114). *SEE KERIOTH*.

5. (Vat. MS. of Sept. omits; Vulg. *Asor.)* A city inhabited by the Benjamites after the Captivity, mentioned between Ananiah and Ramah (<16133>Nehemiah 11:33); possibly the modern *Gazur,* a short distance east of Jaffa (for others of the associated names, although likewise within the ancient territory of Dan, are also assigned to Benjamin), since Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v. Asor) mention a Hazor in the vicinity of Ascalon, although they assign it to Judah, and confound it with those in the south of that tribe (Robinson's *Researches,* 2, 370, note). From the places mentioned with it, as Anathoth, Nob, Ramah, etc., it would seem to have lain north of Jerusalem, and at no great distance there from. Schwarz thinks it is called *Chasor* (rsj) in the Talmudical writers *(Palest.* p. 162). Robinson suggests the identity of Hazor and the modern *Tell Asur,* a ruin on a little hill about six miles north of Bethel *(Bib. Res. i1,* 264, note). This, however, appears to be too far from Ramah. Tobler mentions a ruin called *Khurbet Arsur,* near Ramah, a little to the west, the situation of which would answer better to Hazor *(Topogr.* 2, 400; Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. — 319). The place in question is probably the same with the BAAL-HAZOR *SEE BAAL-HAZOR* (q.v.) of <10123>2 Samuel 13:23.

6. A region of Arabia, spoken of as an important place, in the vicinity of Kedar, in the prophetic denunciations of desolation upon both by Nebuchadnezzar (<24928>Jeremiah 49:28-33). It can hardly be *Petra,* as supposed by Vitringa *(on Isaiah,* i, p. 624), nor the *Asor* placed by Eusebius 8 miles west of Philadelphia (Hitzig, *Jesaias,* p. 196), but probably is a designation of the confines of Arabia with south-eastern Palestine, inhabited by nomade tribes dwelling in mere encampments. *SEE HAZAR*.

Hazzurim

SEE HELKATH-HAZZURIB.

Head

(properly vaw, *rosh,* κεφαλή*),* the topmost part of the human body.

Picture for Head

I. *Anatomically* considered, the general character of the human head is such as to establish the identity of the human race, and to distinguish man from every other animal. At the same time, different families of mankind are marked by peculiarities of construction in the head, which, though in individual cases, and when extremes are compared together, they run one into the other, to the entire loss of distinctive lines, yet are in the general broadly contrasted one with the other. These peculiarities in the structure of the skull give rise to and are connected with other peculiarities of feature and general contour of face. In the union of cranial peculiarities with those of the face, certain clear marks are presented, by which physiologists have been able to range the individuals of our race into a few great classes, and in so doing to afford an unintentional corroboration of the information which the Scriptures afford regarding the origin and dispersion of mankind. Camper, one of the most learned and clear-minded physicians of the 18th century, has the credit of being the first who drew attention to the classification of the human features, and endeavored, by means of what he termed the facial angle, to furnish a method for distinguishing different nations and races of men, which, being himself an eminent limner, he designed for application chiefly in the art of drawing, and which, though far from producing strictly definite and scientific results, yet affords views that are not without interest, and approximations that at least prepared the way for something better (see a collection of Camper's pieces entitled *l'Euvres qui ontpour Objet l'Histoire Naturelle, la Physiologie, et l'Anatomie comparae*, Paris, 1803). It is, however, to the celebrated J. F. Blumenbach, whose merits in the entire sphere of natural history are so transcendent, that we are mainly indebted for the accurate and satisfactory classifications in regard to cranial structure which now prevail. Camper had observed that the breadth of the head differs in different nations; that the heads of Asiatics (the Kalmucs) have the greatest breadth; that those of Europeans have a middle degree of breadth; and that the skulls of the African Negroes are the narrowest of all. This circumstance was by Blumenbach made the foundation of his arrangement and description of skulls. By comparing different forms of the human cranium together, that eminent physiologist was led to recognize three great types, to which all others' could be referred-the Caucasian, Mongolian, and Ethiopic. These three differ more widely from each other than any other that can be found; but to these three, Blumenbach, in his

classification of skulls, and of the races of men to which they belong, added two others, in many respects intermediate between the three forms already mentioned. In this way five classes are established, corresponding with five great families.

1. The Caucasian family, comprising the nations of Europe, some of the Western Asiatics, etc., have the head of the most symmetrical shape, almost round the forehead of moderate extent, the cheek-bones rather narrow, without any projection, but a direction downwards from the molar process of the frontal bone; the alveolar edge well rounded; the front teeth of each jaw placed perpendicularly; the face of oval shape, straight, features moderately prominent; forehead arched; nose narrow, slightly arched; mouth small; chin full and round.

2. The second is the Mongolian variety.

3. Ethiopian.

4. Malay and South Sea Islanders.

5: American. The description of their peculiarities may be found in Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Man,* 2nd ed. 1, 167 sq. The reader may also consult Lawrence's *Lectures on the Natural History of Man;* J. Muller's *Handbuch der Physiologie.* But the most recent, if not the best work on the subject before us is Prichard's *Natural History of Man* (1843), a work which comprises and reviews, in the spirit of a sound philosophy, all that has hitherto been written and discovered on the origin, physical structure, and propagation over the earth of the race of man. In this invaluable work full details may be found of the methods of studying the human head of which we have spoken, and of some others, not less interesting in themselves, nor less valuable in their results (see particularly p. 116 sq.).

II. *Scriptural References.* — This part of the human body has generally been considered as the abode of intelligence, while the heart, or the parts placed near it, have been accounted the place where the affections lie (<010315>Genesis 3:15; <190303>Psalm 3:3; <210214>Ecclesiastes 2:14). The head and the heart are sometimes taken for the entire person (<230105>Isaiah 1:5). Even the head alone, as being the chief member, frequently stands for the man (<200106>Proverbs 10:6). The head also denotes sovereignty (<461103>1 Corinthians 11:3). Covering the head, and cutting off the hair, were signs of mourning

and tokens of distress, which were enhanced by throwing ashes on the head, together with sackcloth (<300810>Amos 8:10; <180120>Job 1:20; <030205>Leviticus 21:5; <051401>Deuteronomy 14:1; <101030>2 Samuel 13:10; <170401>Esther 4:1); while anointing the head was practiced on festive occasions, and considered an emblem of felicity (<211008>Ecclesiastes 9:8; <192305>Psalm 23:5; <420746>Luke 7:46). *SEE ANOINT*. It was not unusual to swear by the head (<400536>Matthew 5:36). — Kitto, s.v. The phrase *to lift up the head* of any one, is to exalt him (<190303>Psalm 3:3; 110:7); and *to return* or *give back upon one's head,* is to be requited, recompensed (<190716>Psalm 7:16; <290304>Joel 3:4; <260910>Ezekiel 9:10; 11:21; 16:43; 17:19; 22:31). So, *your blood be on your own heads* (<441806>Acts 18:6); the guilt of your destruction rests upon yourselves (<100116>2 Samuel 1:16; <110233>1 Kings 2:33, 37). The term *head* is used to signify *the chief,* one to whom others are subordinate; the *prince* of a people or state (<070708>Judges 10:18; 11:8; <091517>1 Samuel 15:17; <190843>Psalm 18:43; <230708>Isaiah 7:8, 9); of a family, the head, chief, patriarch (<021604>Exodus 6:14; <040702>Numbers 7:2; <130524>1 Chronicles 5:24); of a husband in relation to a wife (<010316>Genesis 3:16; <461103>1 Corinthians 11:3; <490523>Ephesians 5:23). So of Christ the *head* in relation to his Church, which is his body, and its members his members (<461227>1 Corinthians 12:27; 11:3; <490122>Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; 5:23; Colossians 11:18; 2:10, 19); of God in relation to Christ (<461103>1 Corinthians 11:3). *Head* is also used for what is *highest, uppermost:* the *top, summit* of a mountain (<010805>Genesis 8:5; <021709>Exodus 17:9,10; 19:20). The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established at the *head* of the mountains, and shall be higher than the hills, i.e. it shall be a *prince* among the mountains (Isaiah 2, 2). Four *heads* of rivers, i.e. four rivers into which the waters divide themselves (Genesis 2, 10). *Head* stone of-the corner (<198822>Psalm 118:22), either the highest, forming the top or coping of the corner; or lowest, which forms the foundation of the building. *SEE CORNER*.

III. *Hair of the Head* ([r P) was by the Hebrews worn thick and full as an ornament of the person (comp. <260803>Ezekiel 8:3; <240729>Jeremiah 7:29); a bald head, besides exposing one to the suspicion of leprosy (<031343>Leviticus 13:43 sq.), was always a cause of mortification (<120223>2 Kings 2:23; <230317>Isaiah 3:17, 24; comp. Sueton. *Caes.* 45; *Domit.* 18; Homer, *Iliad*, 2, 219; Hariri, 10, p. 99, ed. Sacy); among the priestly order it therefore amounted to a positive disqualification (<032120>Leviticus 21:20; Mishna, *Bechoroth, 7,* 2); among the Egyptians, on the contrary, the hair was regularly shorn (<014114>Genesis 41:14), and only allowed to go uncut in seasons of mourning (Herod. 2, 36). Hair so long as to descend to the shoulders, however,

seems only in early times to have been the habit, in the male sex, with youth (<10146>2 Samuel 14:6; Joseph. *Ant. 8*, 7, 3; Horace, *Od.* 2, 5, 21; 3:20, 14). Men cropped it from time to time with shears (רִאשׁ; comp. <26440>Ezekiel 44:20, and the κόμη μικρά of the Babylonians, Strabo 16:746). *SEE NAZARITE*. Among the late Jews long hair in men was esteemed a weakness (<46114>1 Corinthians 11:14; comp. Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 14; Clem. Alex. *Paed. 3*, 106; Epiphaii. *Haer.* 68, 6; Jerome *ad Ezech.* 44); but it was otherwise in Sparta (Aristot. *Rhet.* 1, 9; Herod. 1, 82; Xenoph. *Lac. 11*, 3; comp. Aristoph. *An.* 1287 sq.); and to the priests any curtailment of it was forbidden (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 118; for the long hair on the Persepolitan remains, see Niebuhr, *Trav.* 2. 128; and for that of the Asiatic priests in general, see Movers, *Phonic.* 1, 682: on the Assyrian monuments it is always, in the case of natives at least, represented as long and elaborately curled; see Layard, passim). Only in cases of religious vows did males suffer it to grow uncut (<441818>Acts 18:18; see Kuinol, ad loc.). Females, on the contrary, set great value upon the hair (1 Corinthians 1. c.; compare <22401>Song of Solomon 4:1; <420738>Luke 7:38; <431102>John 11:2 [Rev. 9:8]; Philostr. *Ep.* 26; Plutarch, *De vit. cere al.* 3; Harmer, 3:319; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. 6*, 108; Kype, *Observ.* 2, 220). There were various modes of putting up the hair (<26440>Ezekiel 44:20; comp. Herod. 4:175,191); and it was a statute that men should not cut off the earlocks (תַּפְאָתָם; <031927>Leviticus 19:27; A.V. "round the corners of the head"). Women, especially, were wont to curl the hair (<230324>Isaiah 3:24; see Gesen. ad loc.; comp. Serv. *ad — En. 12*, 98), and to braid it (<121030>2 Kings 9:30; Judith 10:3; <600303>1 Peter 3:3; <540209>1 Timothy 2:9; comp. Joseph. *War, 4*, 9, 10; Homer, *Il.* 1, 330; 14:175; Harmer, 2, 381: to go with disheveled hair *[passis crinibus]* was a mark of grief, 3 Macc. 1:9; comp. <420738>Luke 7:38; Lightfoot,Opp. p. 1081; but rustic maidens often let the hair fall in loose tresses [תַּלְתַּלִּים; <220706>Song of Solomon 7:6; comp. Anacr. 29, 7], merely bound with a ribbon), or even to interweave it with gems or other finery *(Iliad*, 17, 52), and in later times to ornament it most elaborately (see Lightfoot, *Opp.* p. 498; Hartmann, *Hebr.* 2, 208 sq.). *SEE HEAD-DRESS*. Even men sometimes appeared with curls (Joseph. *Ant. 14*, 9, 4; comp. *War, 4*, 9,10; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 479; Plutarch, *Lycurg.* 22), which, however, was generally disapproved (Philo, *Opp.* 2,.306, 479; Cicero, *Sext.* 8; Artemid. 2, 6; Martial, 2, 36; Phocyl. *Sentent.* 194 sq.; Clement Alexand. *Pced. 3*, p. 101). *Combs* are nowhere mentioned in the O.T. (other nations knew them, Ovid, *Fast.* 1, 405; Petron. *Sat.* 126; *Apul. Asin.* 2, p. 213; comp. *Iliad, 14*, 176), although

they, as well as hairpins, are referred to in the Talmud (Hartmann, p. 224 sq.). Hair-powder was unknown to the ancients. On the other hand, they used to anoint the hair with costly oils (<19235>Psalm 23:5; 133:2; <40617>Matthew 6:17; <42746>Luke 7:46; Joseph. *Ant. 19:*4, 1; as also non-Jewish nations, Plutarch, *Pracepta cozjug.* 29; Horace, *0.* 2, 11, 16; 3:29, 2; Ovid, *Ars Am.* 1, 505; Tibul. 1, 751; Suetonius, *Cces.* 67; Apud. *Metam.* 2, 30, Bip.), and gave it a brilliant luster by a mixture of gold-dust in these unguents (Joseph. A*nt. 8,* 7, 3; comp. Lamprid. *Commod.* 17), as the hair of Orientals is generally black (<22401>Song of Solomon 4:1; 5:11: David's rufous hair is named as peculiar, <09162>1 Samuel 16:12). A common method of dressing the hair among many ancient nations (Pliny, 15:24; 23:32, 46; 26:93; 28:51; Athen. 12:542; Val. Max. 2, 1, 5; Diod. Sic. 5, 28; but not among the Greeks, Plutarch, *Apopht. reg.* p. 19, Tauchn.), and one highly esteemed by modern Orientals, namely, to stain it reddish-yellow by means of *henna*, *SEE CAMPHIRE*, although perhaps not unknown to the Hebrewesses (see <22705>Song of Solomon 7:5), as an imitation of the generally prized golden locks *(flavi crines)* of antiquity *(Iliad, 1,* 197; 2, 642; Virg. En. 4, 549; Ovid, *Fast.* 2, 763; Stat. Achil. 1, 162; Petron. *Sat.* 105; Apul. — *Metam.* 2, 25, Bip.; see Brouckhus. *ad Tibull.* 1, 6, 8), was a practice that does not appear to have anciently prevailed in the East; and modern Arabs are only accustomed to dye the hair when gray (Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1, 303). False hair has been incorrectly inferred from the Mishna *(Shabb. 6,* 5), although used among the Medians (comp. Xenoph. *Cyr.* 1, 3, 2, κόμαι πρόσθετοι), and occasionally by old men (Ovid, *Ars Am. 3,* 16), or for some special purpose (Polyb. 102, 78; Petron. *Sat.* 110; Juven. *Sat. 6,* 120: Josephus condemns its use, περιθετὴ κόμη, *Life,* 11); but wigs, although common in ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Ey.* 2, 325, 326, 329), are unknown in the modern East (see Nikolai, *Ueb. d. falschen Haare u. Periicken in alt. u. n. Zeit.* Berl. 1801; Heindorf, on Horat. *Satir.* p. 183; Beroald, on Apul. *Met.* p. 244; Fabric. *Bibliogr. Antiq.* p. 847). See generally Schwebel, *De vett. in capillis ornandis studio* (Onold. 1768). On the treatment of the hair in mourning, *SEE GRIEF*. See Junius, *De coma, c.* animad. Gruteri (Amst. 1708); Salmasius, *De ccesarie viror. et coma mulier.* (L. B. 1644) Henning, *De capillis vett.* (Magdeb. 1678). *SEE HAIR*.

Head-band

(only in pl. µyrAaqa; *ashshurim'*, from rvq; to *gird),* rather *a-girdle* or belt, probably for the waist, as a female ornament (<23320>Isaiah 3:20; "attire," <24232>Jeremiah 2:32). *SEE HEAD-DRESS*.

Headdi

SEE HEDDA.

Head-dress

Picture for Head-Dress 1

Picture for Head-Dress 2

Picture for Head-Dress 3

The Hebrews do not appear to have regarded a covering for the head as an essential article of every-day dress. *SEE HEADBAND*. The earliest notice we have-of such a thing is in connection with the sacerdotal vestments, and in this case it is described as an ornamental appendage "for glory and for beauty" (<02840>Exodus 28:40). *SEE MITER*. The absence of any allusion to a head-dress in passages where we should expect to meet with it, as in the trial of jealousy (<04518>Numbers 5:18), and the regulations regarding the leper (<03345>Leviticus 13:45), in both of which the "uncovering of the head" refers undoubtedly to the *hair,* leads to the inference that it was not ordinarily worn in the Mosaic age; and this is confirmed by the practice, frequently alluded to, of covering the head with the mantle. Even in after times it seems to have been reserved especially for purposes of ornament: thus the *tsaniph'* (ãynæx) is noticed as being worn by the nobles (<18914>Job 29:14), ladies (<23323>Isaiah 3:23), and kings (<23603>Isaiah 62:3), while the *peer'* (rae) was an article of holiday dress (<23610>Isaiah 61:3, Auth. Vers. "beauty;" <26417>Ezekiel 24:17, 23). and was worn at weddings (<23610>Isaiah 61:10): the use of the µίτρα was restricted to similar occasions (Judith 16:8; Bar. 5, 2). The former of these terms undoubtedly describes a kind of *turban.* its primary sense (ãnx; "to roll around") expresses the folds of linen *wound round* the head, and its form probably resembled that of the high-priest's *mitsne'pheth* (a word derived from the same root, and identical in meaning, for in <38105>Zechariah 3:5, *tsaniph=mitsnepheth),* as described by Josephus *(Ant. 3:*7, 3). The renderings of the term in the A.V., "hood"- (<23323>Isaiah

3:23), “diadem” (<18294>Job 29:14; <23603>Isaiah 62:3), “miter” (<38105>Zechariah 3:5), do not convey the right idea of its-meaning. The other term, *peer*, primarily means an *ornament*, and is so rendered in the A.V. (<23610>Isaiah 61:10; see also verse 3, “beauty”), and is specifically applied to the headdress from its ornamental character. *SEE DIADEM*. It is uncertain what the term properly describes: the modern turban consists of two parts, the *kauk*, a stiff, round cap occasionally rising to a considerable height, and the *shash*, a long piece of muslin wound about it (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 104): Josephus’s account of the high-priest’s head-dress implies a similar construction, for he says that it was made of thick bands of linen doubled round many times and sewn together, the whole covered by a piece of fine linen to conceal the seams. Saalschütz *(Archceöl.* 1, 27, note) suggests that the *tsaniph* and the *peer* represent the *shash* and the *kauk*, the latter rising high above the other, and so the most prominent and striking feature. In favor of this explanation it may be remarked that the *peer* is more particularly connected with the *migbaah*, the high cap of the ordinary priests, in <02928>Exodus 39:28, while the *tsaniph*, as we have seen, resembled the high-priest’s miter, in which the cap was concealed by the linen folds. The objection, however, to this explanation is that the etymological force of *peer* is not brought out: may not that term have applied to the jewels and other ornaments with which the turban is frequently decorated (Russell, 1, 106). The term used for putting on either the *tsaniph* or the *peer* is vbij ;to bind round” (<02909>Exodus 29:9; <03803>Leviticus 8:13): hence the words in <26160>Ezekiel 16:10, “I girded thee about with fine linen,” are to be understood of the turban; and by the use of the same term <32005>Jonah 2:5 represents the weeds wrapped as a turban round his head. The turban, as now worn in the East, varies very much in shape (Russell’s *Aleppo, 1*, 102). It appears that frequently the robes supplied the place of a headdress, being so ample that they might be thrown over the head at pleasure: the *radid* and the *tsaiph*, at all events, were so used, *SEE DRESS*, and the veil served a similar purpose. *SEE VEIL*. The ordinary head-dress of the Bedouin consists of the *keffyeh*, a square handkerchief, generally of red and yellow cotton, or cotton and silk, folded so that three of the corners hang down over the back and shoulders, leaving the face exposed, and bound round the head by a cord (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1, 48). It is not improbable that a similar covering was used by the Hebrews on certain occasions: the “kerchief” in <26318>Ezekiel 13:18 has been so understood by some writers (Harmer, *Observations*, 2, 393), though the word more probably refers to a species of veil; and the σιμιλίνθιον τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς

φόρημα), was applicable to the purposes of a head-dress. *SEE HANDKERCHIEF*. Neither of these cases, however, supplies positive evidence on the point, and the general absence of allusions leads to the inference that the head was usually uncovered, as is still the case in many parts of Arabia (Wellsted, *Travels*, 1, 73). The introduction of the Greek hat (πέτασος) by Jason, as an article of dress adapted to the *gymnasium*, was regarded as a national dishonor (2 Macc. 4:12): in shape and material the *petasus* very much resembled the common felt hats of this country (Smith, *Dict. of Ant.* s.v. Pileus). *SEE BONNET*.

Picture for Head-Dress 4

Picture for Head-Dress 5

Picture for Head-Dress 6

Picture for Head-Dress 7

The monuments and paintings in the tombs of Egypt supply us with numerous forms of headdresses; and there is no doubt that many of these were the prevailing costume at the period when the Israelites sojourned there. Among the ruins of Persepolis are found numerous sculptures which give the shape of various coverings for the head used by men. The care bestowed upon this part of the toilet among the Assyrians and Babylonians is abundantly illustrated in the volumes of Botta and Layard. "The Assyrian head-dress is described in <26B2315>Ezekiel 23:15, under the terms yjwrs] µylwbfæ exceeding in dyed attire;' it is doubtful, however, whether *tebulim* describes the colored material of the head-dress *(tiarae* a coloribus quibus *tinctae* sint); another sense has been assigned to it more appropriate to the description of a turban *(fasciis obvolvit*, Geseniuti *Thesaurus*, p. 542). The associated term *seruchey* expresses the flowing character of the Eastern headdress, as it falls down over the back (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 308). The word rendered 'hats' in <270321>Daniel 3:21 (alBrK) properly applies to a *cloak*"

The µyspbæ, *shebisim'* (<231818>Isaiah 3:18), rendered in our version "cauls," or, as in the margin, "networks," were most probably some kind of reticulated head-dresses, and so the word is understood in the Talmud. *SEE CAUL*.

Picture for Head-Dress 8

A very peculiar kind of head-dress worn in some parts of Palestine, especially by the Druses of Mount Lebanon, and thought to be referred to by the ˆrq, *ke'ren*, or "horn" of 1 Samuel 2:1, is the *tantura.'* It is made of gold or silver, frequently of other metal either gilt or silver-plated, and sometimes of mere wood. The more costly ones are highly ornamented, and occasionally set with jewels; but the length and position of them is that upon which the traveler looks with the greatest interest, as illustrating and explaining a familiar expression of Scripture. The young, the rich, and the vain wear the *tantura* of great length, standing straight up from the top of the forehead; whereas the humble, the poor, and the aged place it upon the side of the head, much shorter, and spreading at the end like a trumpet. *SEE HORN*.

For other forms of royal headdresses, *SEE CROWN*, for military ones, *SEE HELMET*.

Head of the Church

a title which properly belongs only to Christ (Ephesians 5:23), as the *Supreme Governor* of the whole *body* of the faithful. It is applied to the sovereign of Great Britain as the ruler of the temporalities of the Church. "Some have imagined (the members of the Romish Church, for instance) that the Christian world is 'permanently,' and from generation to generation, subject to some one spiritual ruler (whether an individual man or a Church), the delegate, representative, and vicegerent of Christ, whose authority should be binding on the conscience of all, and decisive on every point of faith." But, had such been our Lord's design, he could not possibly have failed, when promising his disciples "another Comforter, who should abide with them forever," to refer them to the man or body of men who should, in perpetual succession, be the depository of this divine consolation and supremacy. It is also incredible, had such been our Lord's purpose, that he himself should be perpetually spoken of and alluded to as the Head of his Church, without any reference to any supreme head on earth as fully representing him, and bearing universal rule in his name. It is clear,. therefore, that the Christian Church universal has no spiritual head on earth (Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.). *SEE POPE*; *SEE PAPACY*; *SEE PRIMACY*.

Heal

(properly ap;r; θεραπεύω) is used in Scripture in the wider sense of *curing* in general, as applied to diseases, and even to inanimate objects. It occurs also in the special sense of restoring from apostasy. *SEE DISEASE*; *SEE CURE*.

Heap

The Hebrew word vyrÛgE *gadish'*, rendered "'tomb" in <18213>Job 21:32, and "heap" in the margin, properly signifies *a stack, a heap,* hence *a tomb, tuzmulus,* a sepulchral mound that was made by a pile of earth or stones. The ancient *tumuli* were heaps of earth or stone, and probably such a pile was usually made over a grave as a monument. Travelers in the East have often seen heaps of stones covering over or marking the place of graves. The Hebrew phrase lr'G;µynIbaeA}lG *gal abanim' gadol'*, rendered "a great heap of stones," refers to the heaps or tumuli which were raised over those whose death was either infamous or attended with some very remarkable circumstances. Such was the monument raised over the grave of Achan (<06026>Joshua 7:26); and over that of the king of Ai (<06829>Joshua 8:29). The burying of Absalom was distinguished by a similar erection, as a monument of his disgrace to future ages (<10817>2 Samuel 18:17). The same word lG; *gal*, is commonly used in reference to the *heaps* or *ruins* of walls and cities (<18817>Job 8:17; <23502>Isaiah 25:2; 51:37; <24910>Jeremiah 9:10). Modern travelers abundantly testify to the accurate fulfillment of Scripture prophecy in relation to the sites of numerous ancient cities, particularly of such as were doomed to become desolate *heaps* (Bastow). *SEE PILLAR*; *SEE STONE*. Other Heb. terms translated *heap* are: rm,j, *cho'mer*, a *pile* (<02814>Exodus 8:14, elsewhere a HOMER, as a measure); y[ime mei', a *heap* of rubbish (<23701>Isaiah 17:1); dn:[' *ned*, a *mound* (<23711>Isaiah 17:11; poet. of waves, <02508>Exodus 15:8; <06013>Joshua 3:13, 16; <19307>Psalm 33:7; 78:13); hm;r{} *aremah', a pile* (e.g. of rubbish, <16033>Nehemiah 3:34; of grain, <22703>Song of Solomon 7:3; of sheaves, <08307>Ruth 3:7; <16315>Nehemiah 13:15; <37216>Haggai 2:16, etc.); lT,e *tel*, a *hill* (<06113>Joshua 11:13; espec. a mound of rubbish, <05217>Deuteronomy 12:17; <06828>Joshua 8:28; <24902>Jeremiah 49:2, etc.); with others of a more miscellaneous signification. *SEE MOUND*.

Hearers

(audientes), a name given to a class of catechumens in the early Church who were admitted to hear sermons and scriptures read in the church, but were not allowed to share in the prayers. The Apostolical Constitutions (lib. 8, c. 5) orders the deacon to dismiss them with the words *Ne quis audientium, ne quis infidelium (*"Let none of the hearers, let none of the unbelievers, be present"), before the proper liturgy began. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 8 c. 4 bk. 10 ch. 2 bk. 18 ch. 1.

Hearse or Herse

Picture for Hearse

(from Lat. *herpix,* Low Lat. *hercia,* French *herze, a harrow).* The Low Latin *hercia* also signified a candelabrum, shaped like a harrow, which was placed at the head of a grave, a coffin, or a cenotaph. In the Middle Ages the name *hearse* was applied to a canopy (in Italian, *catafalco),* which was placed over the coffins of the distinguished dead, while they were kept in the church previous to interment. Hearses were also frequently prepared to receive the bodies of the dead in churches, at stations along the route, where they were being borne to a distance for final interment. Hearses were often made with great magnificence. They were frequently adorned with illustrations of the last judgment, and other subjects taken from the Scriptures. Candles were set in sockets in great numbers, and were kept burning as long as the corpse, remained in the hearse. The name *hearse* was also applied to a frame of wood or of metal that was placed over some of the reclining statues which were so frequently put over the tombs of distinguished persons. Over this hearse a pall was frequently hung. The modern use of the word *hearse* is confined to a framework or a wagon to bear the dead to the grave. The hearse varies greatly in form and ornamentation in different countries. — Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn, 1861); Parker, *Dict. of Architecture* (Oxford, 1850); Migne, *Dictionnaire des Origines* (Paris, 1864). (G. F. C.)

Heart

in the Biblical sense *(*καρδία*;* בֵּלֵב or בְּבֵלֵב often exchanged for בֵּרֵךְ, in a more extended sense, as in <19903>Psalm 39:3,4; 109:22; <09237>1 Samuel 25:37, the whole region of the chest, with its contents; see Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology, §* 12, 13. According to Hupfeld, בֵּלֵב in <19710>Psalm

17:10, and <19737>Psalm 73:7, means simply *the heart*, which is not very likely).

1. In the Biblical point of view, human life, in all its operations, is centered in the heart. The heart is the central organ of the physical circulation; hence the necessity for strengthening the body as a support for the heart (bl e d[̇s; <01815>Genesis 18:5; <07015>Judges 19:5; <19415>Psalm 104:15); and the exhaustion of physical power is called a drying up of the heart (<19A15>Psalm 102:5; 22:15, etc.). So, also, is the heart the center of spiritual activity; for all spiritual aims, whether belonging to the intellectual, moral, or pathological spheres, are elaborated in the heart, and again carried out by the heart. In fact, the whole life of the soul, in the lower and sensual, as well as in the higher spheres, has its origin in the heart (<20423>Proverbs 4:23, For out of it are the issues of life"). In order to follow this train of thought, and to establish in a clearer light the Biblical view of the heart, it will be best to consider the relation the heart bears to the soul (ψυχή, vpn). This is one of the difficult questions in Biblical psychology; Olshausen (in the *Abh. de naturae humanae trichotomia, opusc. theol.* p. 159) says, "Omnium longe difficillimum est accurate definire quidnam discrimen in N.T. inter ψυχήν et καρδίαν, intercedat." Nevertheless, the task is facilitated by the fact that there is essential agreement on this point in the anthropologies of the Old and New Testament.

(1) We first note that, while, as before said, the heart is the center of all the functions of the soul's life, the terms "heart" and "soul" are often used interchangeably in Scripture. Thus, in <05605>Deuteronomy 6:5 (compare <40237>Matthew 22:37; <41230>Mark 12:30, 33; <42027>Luke 10:27), and <05616>Deuteronomy 26:16, we are commanded to love God and obey his commandments with all our heart and all our soul (compare <13809>1 Chronicles 28:9); the union of the faithful, in <44032>Acts 4:12, is designated as ην ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία. (In these passages, as in others, for instance, <05118>Deuteronomy 11:18; 30:2; <24241>Jeremiah 32:41, there is, moreover, to be noticed that the heart is always named first.) Thus the indecision and division of the inner life can be designated either by δίψυχος (<59008>James 1:8) or by καρδία δισσή. It is said of both ἁγνίζειν καρδίας (<59048>James 4:8) and ἁγνίζειν ψυχάς (<60122>1 Peter 1:22); also /vpn;Ëpiv;(<19425>Psalm 42:5; comp. <18306>Job 30:16) and /BlæEpiv; (<25220>Lamentations 2:10; <19609>Psalm 62:9), the self-impelling to the love of God applies as well to the soul (Psalm 103) as to the μybbl;, of which the

heart is the center, etc. But in the majority of passages, where either the heart or the soul are separately spoken of, the term “heart” can either not be exchanged at. all for the term “soul,” or else only with some modification in the meaning.

(2) Note also the following fundamental distinction: The *soul* is the bearer of the personality (i.e. of the *ego,* the proper self) of man, in virtue of the indwelling *spirit* (<20127>Proverbs 20:27; <461211>1 Corinthians 2:11), but yet is not itself *the person* of man; the heart, on the contrary (the ˆf,þ,yrEbDj;, <20127>Proverbs 20:27), is the place where the process of self-consciousness is developed, in which the soul finds itself, and thus becomes conscious of its actions and impressions as its own (“in corde actiones animae humanae ad ipsam redeunt,” as is concisely and correctly said by Roos in his *Fundam. psychol. ex s. scr.,* 1769, p. 99). Accordingly the soul, not the heart, is spoken of when the 8:39; <422165>Luke 16:15; <20703>Proverbs 17:3; <191710>Psalm 7:10; 17:3; <241120>Jeremiah 11:20). Therefore also man is designated according to his heart in all that relates to habitual moral qualities; thus we read of a wise heart (<111252>1 Kings 5:12; <21008>Proverbs 10:8, etc.), a pure heart (<191412>Psalm 41:12; <400508>Matthew 5:8; <540105>1 Timothy 1:5; <550222>2 Timothy 2:22), an upright and righteous heart (<012005>Genesis 20:5,6; <191102>Psalm 11:2; 78:72; 101:2), a single heart (<490605>Ephesians 5:5; <510322>Colossians 3:22), a pious and good heart (<420815>Luke 8:15), a lowly heart (<401129>Matthew 11:29), etc. In all these places it would be difficult to introduce vp,n,or ψυχή:

(2) We must also observe that the original divine rule of conduct for man was implanted in his heart, and therefore the heart is the seat of the συνείδησις, or *conscience,* which has a mission to proclaim that rule (<450215>Romans 2:15). All subsequent divine revelations were also directed to the heart (<050606>Deuteronomy 6:6); so the law demands that God should be loved with the whole heart, and then, as though by radiation from this center, with the whole soul (comp. <051118>Deuteronomy 11:18; <191911>Psalm 119:11, etc.). The teaching of wisdom also enters the heart, and from thence spreads its healing and vivifying influence through the whole organism (<200420>Proverbs 4:21-23). The prophetic consolations must speak to the heart (<234002>Isaiah 40:2), in contradistinction from such consolations as do not reach the bottom of human nature; thus also in <401309>Matthew 13:9; <420815>Luke 8:15, we find the heart described as the ground on which the seed of the divine Word is to be — sowed. That which becomes assimilated to the heart constitutes *the* θησαυρὸς τῆς καρδίας (<401235>Matthew 12:35).

This, however, may not only be ἀγαθός, but also πονηρὸς; for the human heart is not only a recipient of divine principles of life, but also of evil.

(3) In opposition to the superficial doctrine which makes man in regard to morals an indifferent being, Scripture presents to us the doctrine of the natural wickedness of the human heart, the bl er xy (<01821>Genesis 8:21), or, more completely, rxy bl eT bv jmi (6:5; compare <13809>1 Chronicles 28:9), and considers sin as having penetrated the center of life, from whence it contaminates its whole course. “How can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh” (<40234>Matthew 12:34; comp. <21811>Ecclesiastes 8:11; <19737>Psalm 73:7); and those things which come out of the heart defile the man (<40518>Matthew 15:18). The heart is described as “deceitful (or, more properly, bq[; *crooked*, the opposite of rvy; *straight)* above all things, and desperately wicked” (vWna) (<24709>Jeremiah 17:9); so that God alone can thoroughly sound the depths of its wickedness (compare <62020>1 John 3:20). Hence the prayer in <19139>Psalm 139:23. In this natural state of insusceptibility for good the heart is called uncircumcised, lr[; (<04641>Numbers 26:41; compare <05016>Deuteronomy 10:16; <26409>Ezekiel 44:9). Man, frightened at the manifestation of divine holiness, may take within himself the resolution of fulfilling the divine commands (<05524>Deuteronomy 5:24); yet the divine voice complains (<05529>Deuteronomy 5:29), “Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me!” etc. Therefore the whole Revelation has for its object to change the heart of man; and its whole aim is to destroy, by virtue of its divine efficacy, the insusceptibility (“stupiditas, qua centrum animse laborat,” as Roos expresses it, p. 153) and the antagonism of the heart, and to substitute for them the fear of God in the heart (<24240>Jeremiah 32:40), so that the law may be admitted (<24133>Jeremiah 31:33). This is the effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, whose workings, as shown in the O.T., point to the regeneration of the heart in redemption (<26626>Ezekiel 36:26 sq.; 11:19), transforming the prophets to new creatures by means of a change of heart (<09106>1 Samuel 10:6, 9), and implanting a willingness to obey God’s law in the pious (<19512>Psalm 51:12-14).

(4) On the part of man, the process of salvation begins in the heart by the faith awakened by the testimony of revelation; which, as giving a new direction to the inner life, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a fastening (according to the original meaning of ˆymæh), a

strengthening (/ymah, <19271>Psalm 27:14; 31:24), a supporting of the heart (comp. particularly <19307>Psalm 112:7) on the ground which is God himself, the bb;lēdWx (<19736>Psalm 73:26). The N.T. says in the same manner: καρδίᾳ πιστεύεται (<451009>Romans 10:9, 10), πιστεύειν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας; faith is a μὴ διακρίνεσδαι ἐν καρδίᾳ (Mark 21:23). God purifies the heart by faith in Christ (<441509>Acts 15:9), for by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement the heart is rid of the bad conscience (<581022>Hebrews 10:22; compare <620319>1 John 3:19-21), and the love of God is shed in it by the Holy Ghost (<450505>Romans 5:5). The same spirit also seals in the heart the assurance of being a child of God (<470122>2 Corinthians 1:22); the heart becomes the abode of Christ (<490316>Ephesians 3:16), is preserved in Christ (<510315>Colossians 3:15; <500407>Philippians 4:7), and strengthened in sanctification (<520313>1 Thessalonians 3:13, etc.).

When, on the contrary, man rejects the testimony of revelation, the heart becomes hardened, turns to stone (hvqhāæ <19508>Psalm 96:8; <202814>Proverbs 28:14; /Māæ <142613>2 Chronicles 36:13; qzęæ <020421>Exodus 4:21; dBKāæ <090606>1 Samuel 6:6), for which we find it also said that the heart is shut (<232418>Isaiah 44:18), made fat (<230610>Isaiah 6:10; compare <191970>Psalm 119:70). In the N. Test. we find πωρώσις καρδίας (<410305>Mark 3:5; <490418>Ephesians 4:18); σκληροκαρδία (<401908>Matthew 19:8, etc.). The most important passage in this respect is <230610>Isaiah 6:10, where we find it particularly stated how the unsusceptible heart renders one unable to see the work of God, to hear his Word, and how this inability reacts on the heart, and renders its state incurable.

3. Finally, the question of the position the heart, as center of the spiritual life of the soul, holds in regard to the heart, considered as the center of the organic (physical) life, cannot be fully treated except in a thorough investigation of the relations between the body and soul in general. We will only remark here that the Scriptures not only draw a parallel between the body and the soul, by virtue of which the bodily actions are considered as symbols of the spiritual, but also establish the position that the soul, which is the bearer of the personality, is the same which directs also the life and actions; and thus the bodily organs, in their higher functions, become its adjuncts. Now, in view of the well-known fact that emotions and sufferings affect the physical economy for example, that the pulsations of the heart are affected by them--no one will consider it a mere figure of speech when the Psalmist says, “My heart was hot within me” (<19903>Psalm 39:3), or

Jeremiah speaks of “a burning fire shut up in his bones” (<2401>Jeremiah 20:9; comp. 4. 19; 23:9).

But there is one point worthy of special attention in Biblical anthropology, namely, the specific relation the Bible establishes between certain parts of the bodily organism and particular actions (see what Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology, §* 12, 13, deduces from the Biblical signification of the µymajer; the *liver*, the *kidneys),* and then the part attributed to the heart in knowledge and will, considered aside from the head and brain. It is well known that all antiquity agreed with the Biblical views in these respects. In regard to Homer’s doctrine, see Nagelsbach’s *Homer. Theologie,* p. 332 sq. We may also on this point recall the expressions *cordatus, recordari, vecors, excors,* etc. (see especially Cicero, *Tusc.* 1, 9, 18, and Plato, *Phaed.* c. 45, and-the commentators on these passages). As Delitzsch correctly observes, the spiritual signification of the heart cannot be traced back to t from the *mere* fact of its being the central organ of the circulation. The manner in which that writer has made use of the phenomena of somnambulism to explain this is deserving of due notice, yet physiology has thus far been unable to throw any light on the subject. — Oehler, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 15 sq.

4. The heart expresses the middle of anything: “Tyre is in the heart,” in the midst, “of the sea” (<2704>Ezekiel 27:4). “We will not fear, though the mountains be carried into the heart of the sea” (<1902>Psalm 46:2). “As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (<4012>Matthew 12:40). Moses, speaking to the Israelites, says, “And the mountain burnt with fire, unto the heart of heaven;” the flame rose as high as the clouds.

To “say in one’s heart” is a Hebrew expression for *thinking* (<1906>Psalm 10:6; 14:1). *SEE SOUL*.

5. Of special religious importance are the following practical uses of the word:

Hardness of heart is “that state in which a sinner is inclined to and actually goes on in rebellion against God. This state evidences itself by light views of the evil of sin; partial acknowledgment and confession of it; frequent commission of it; pride and conceit; ingratitude; unconcern about the Word and ordinances of God; inattention to divine providences; stifling

convictions of conscience; shunning reproof; presumption, and general ignorance of divine things."

Keeping the heart is "a duty enjoined in the sacred Scriptures. It consists, says Flavel, in the diligent and constant use and improvement of all holy means and duties to preserve the soul from sin, and maintain communion with God; and this, he properly observes, supposes a previous work of sanctification, which hath set the heart right by giving it a new bent and inclination.

1. It includes frequent observation of the frame of the heart (<19706>Psalm 77:6).

2. Deep humiliation for heart evils and disorders (<14226>2 Chronicles 32:26).

3. Earnest supplication for heart purifying and rectifying grace (<19912>Psalm 19:12).

4. A constant holy jealousy over our hearts (<20714>Proverbs 27:14).

5. It includes the realizing of God's presence with us, and setting him before us (<19608>Psalm 16:8; <011701>Genesis 17:1).

This is,

1. The hardest work; heart work is hard work indeed.

2. Constant work (<021712>Exodus 17:12). 3. The most important work (<202326>Proverbs 23:26).

This is a duty which should be attended to if we consider it in connection with,

1. The honor of God (<236603>Isaiah 66:3).

2. The sincerity of our profession (<121031>2 Kings 10:31; <263231>Ezekiel 32:31, 32).

3. The beauty of our conversation (<201226>Proverbs 12:26; <19601>Psalm 45:1).

4. The comfort of our souls (<471305>2 Corinthians 13:5).

5. The improvement of our graces (<19615>Psalm 63:5, 6).

6. The stability of our souls in the hour of temptation (<46163>1 Corinthians 16:13).

The *seasons in which we should more particularly keep our hearts are,*

1. The time of our prosperity (<05610>Deuteronomy 6:10, 12).

2. Under afflictions (<58705>Hebrews 7:5, 6).

3. The time of Sion's troubles (<19601>Psalm 46:1, 4).

4. In the time of great and threatening danger (<23260>Isaiah 26:20, 21).

5. Under great wants (<50406>Philippians 4:6, 7).

6. In the time of duty (<03003>Leviticus 10:3).

7. Under injuries received (<45217>Romans 12:17, etc.).

8. In the critical hour of temptation (<40641>Matthew 26:41).

9. Under dark and doubting seasons (<58128>Hebrews 12:8; Isaiah 1, 10).

10. In time of opposition and suffering (<60412>1 Peter 4:12, 13).

11. The time of sickness and death (<24911>Jeremiah 49:11).

The means to be made use of to keep our hearts are,

1. Watchfulness (<41337>Mark 13:37).

2. Examination (<20426>Proverbs 4:26).

3. Prayer (<42101>Luke 18:1).

4. Reading God's Word (<43039>John 5:39).

5. Dependence on divine grace (<19611>Psalm 86:11). See Flavel, *On Keeping the Heart;* Jamieson, *Sermons on the Heart."*

Hearth

is the representative in the Eng. Version of several Heb. words. ja; *ach* (Sept. ἐσχάρα,Vulg. *arula),* a large *pot,* like a brazier (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 69), a portable *furnace* in which fire was kept in the king's winter apartment (<24622>Jeremiah 36:22, 23). At the present day the Orientals sometimes make use of such stoves instead of fireplaces for warming

rooms; they are called in Persian and Turkish *tannur*. They have the form of a large pitcher, and are placed in a cavity sunk in the middle of the apartment. When the fire has done burning, a frame like a table is placed over the pot, and the whole is then covered with a carpet; and those who wish to warm themselves sit upon the floor, and thrust their feet and legs, and even the lower part of their bodies, under the carpet. rYKa;, *kiyôr'*, a fire-pan or small *basin* for holding fire (<380206>Zechariah 12:6; elsewhere for roasting in, <091214>1 Samuel 2:14; or generally for washing, "laver," <021808>Exodus 30:18, etc.). dqem, *moked'*, a *burning* (as rendered in <232314>Isaiah 23:14), hence a *Jigot* as fuel ("hearth," <19A204>Psalm 102:4); and from the same root dWqy; *yakûd'* (literally *kindled)*, a burning mass upon a hearth (<233014>Isaiah 30:14). The Heb. word tWG[;, *uggoth';* Sept. ἐγκρυφίαι, refers to cakes baked in the ashes (<011806>Genesis 18:6).' These cakes serve in the East at the present day for ordinary food, especially upon journeys and in haste. By the hearth we are to understand, according to the present usage in the East, that a fire is made in the middle of the room, and, when the bread is ready for baking, a corner of the hearth is swept, the bread is laid upon it, and covered with ashes and embers; in a quarter of an hour they turn it. Sometimes they use convex plates of iron (Arabic *tajen*, whence the Gr. τήγανον*)*, which are most common in Persia and among the nomadic tribes, as being the easiest way of baking and done with the least expense, for the bread is extremely thin and soon prepared. See BREAD. This iron plate is either laid on, or supported on legs above the vessel sunk in the ground, which forms the oven. *SEE OVEN*. (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed. 1*, 58; P. della Valle, *Viaggi*, 1, 436; Harmer, *Obs.* 1, 477, and note; Rauwolff, *Travels*, ap. Ray, 2, 163; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 231; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 45; Schleusner, *Lex. Vet. Test.* s.v. τήγανον*;* Gesenius, s.v. hG;[u p. 997). *SEE FIRE*.

He-Ass

r/mj}, *chanmor'* (<011216>Genesis 12:16; elsewhere simply "ass"), the general designation of the donkey (<021313>Exodus 13:13, etc.) for carrying burdens (Exodus 42:26) and ploughing (<232124>Isaiah 30:24),being regarded as a patient (<014914>Genesis 49:14) and contented animal for riding in time of peace (<101927>2 Samuel 19:27; <380909>Zechariah 9:9); different from the proud (<211009>Ecclesiastes 10:9) and warlike horse (<232001>Isaiah 20:16). As a beast of

burden, it was eaten only in times of famine (1065 2 Kings 6:25). *SEE ASS'S HEAD*.

Picture for He-Ass

The prohibition of the use of horses to Israel caused the ass to be held in higher estimation than it holds in our times. It was, at least down to the days of Solomon, the principal beast of burden. But we must not attribute this election wholly to the absence or scarcity of the horse, for in Western Asia the ass is still largely used for the saddle. Though inferior in dignity to the horse, he is still, in his native regions, a very superior animal to the poor, weather-beaten, stunted, half-starved beast of our commons. Chardin and others describe the Arabian ass as a really elegant creature. The coat is smooth and clean, the carriage is erect and proud; the limbs are clean, well formed, and muscular, and are well thrown out in walking or galloping. Asses of this Arab breed are used exclusively for the saddle, and are imported into Syria and Persia, where they are highly valued, especially by the mollahs or lawyers, the sheiks or religious teachers, and elderly persons of the opulent classes. They are fed and dressed with the same care as horses, the headgear is highly ornamented, and the saddle is covered with a fine carpet. They are active, spirited, and yet sufficiently docile. Other breeds are equally useful in the more humble labors of ploughing and carrying burdens. White asses, distinguished not only by their color, but by their stature and symmetry, are frequently seen in Western Asia, and are always more highly esteemed than those of more ordinary hue. The editor of the *Pictorial Bible* says that these "are usually in every respect the finest of their species, and their owners certainly take more pride in them than in any other of their asses. They sell at a much higher price; and those hackney ass-men who make a livelihood by hiring out their asses to persons who want a ride, always expect better pay for the white ass than for any of the others." After describing their more highly ornamented trappings, he observes, "But, above all, their white hides are fantastically streaked and spotted with the red stains of the henna plant, a barbarous kind of ornament which the Western Asiatics are fond of applying to their own beards, and to the manes and tails of their white horses." *SEE HORSE*.

The constitution of the ass is formed for a dry, rugged region, a rocky wilderness. Its hoofs are long, hollow beneath, with very sharp edges, a peculiarity which makes it sure-footed in ascending and descending steep

mountain passes, where the flat hoof of the horse would be insecure. It prefers aromatic, dry, prickly herbs to the most succulent and tender grass; is fond of rolling in the dry dust; suffers but little from thirst or heat; drinks seldom and little; and seems to have no sensible perspiration, its skin being hard, tough, and insensitive. All these characters suit the arid, rocky wildernesses of Persia and Western Asia, the native country of this valuable animal *SEE ASS*.

Heat

(usually µjÒchom, hMÞhi *chammah'*, or hm;je *chemah')*, besides its ordinary meaning, has several peculiar uses in Scripture. In <23910>Isaiah 49:10, and <66716>Revelation 7:16, there is a reference to the burning wind of the desert, the *simoom* or *samiel,* described by travelers as exceedingly pestilential and fatal. It is highly probable that this was the instrument with which God destroyed the army of Sennacherib (<12907>2 Kings 19:7, 35). Its effects are evidently alluded to in <19A315>Psalm 103:15, 16, and in <24011>Jeremiah 4:11. Thevenot mentions such a wind, which in q658 suffocated 20,000 men in one night, and another which in 1655 suffocated 4000 persons. It sometimes burns up the corn when near its maturity, and hence the image of "corn blasted before it be grown up," used in <12916>2 Kings 19:26. Its effect is not only to render the air extremely hot and scorching, but to fill it with poisonous and suffocating vapors. The most violent storms that Judaea was subject to came from the deserts of Arabia. "Out of the *south* cometh the whirlwind," says Job (<18709>Job 37:9); "And there came a great wind from *the wilderness"* (<18119>Job 1:19). <38914>Zechariah 9:14: "And Jehovah shall appear over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord Jehovah shall sound the trumpet, and shall march in the whirlwinds of *the south.*" The 91st Psalm, which speaks of divine protection, describes the plague as arrows, and in those winds there are observed flashes of fire. In <04103>Numbers 13:3, the place in which the plague was inflicted upon the Israelites is for that reason called *Taberah,* i.e. a burning. A plague is called rbÞD, *deber',* as a desert is called rBÞ;dmæ *midbar',* because those winds came from the desert, and are real plagues. This *hot wind,* when used as a symbol, signifies the fire *of persecution,* or else some prodigious wars which destroy men. For *wind* signifies *war;* and *scorching heat* signifies persecution and *destruction. So* in <40136>Matthew 13:6, 21, and <42806>Luke 8:6-13, *heat* is tribulation, temptation, or persecution; and in <60412>1 Peter 4:12, *burning* tends to temptation. A gentle

heat of the sun, according to the Oriental interpreters, signifies the favor and bounty of the prince; but great heat denotes punishment. Hence the burning of the heavens is a portent explained in Livy (3, 5) of slaughter. Thus in <19C106>Psalm 121:6: "The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night," is in the next place explained thus, "Jehovah shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul." *SEE FIRE*.

Heath

*(*r[;r][i *arar',* <24T706>Jeremiah 17:6; Sept. ἀγριομυρίκη, *Vulg. myricce;* or r[eer[} *aroem ',* <24T806>Jeremiah 48:6; Sept. ὄνος ἄγριος, perh. by reading d/r[; a wild ass; Vulg. *myricae)* has been variously translated, as *myrica, tamarisk; tamarin* which is an Indian tree, the tamarind; *retama,* that is. the broom; and also, as in the French and English versions, *bruiere, heath,* which is, perhaps, the most incorrect of all, though Hasselquist mentions finding heath near Jericho, in Syria. Gesenius, however, renders it *ruins* in the latter of the above passages (as in <23T702>Isaiah 17:2), and *needy* in the former (as in <19A218>Psalm 102:18). As far as the context is concerned, some of the plants named, as the *retain* and *tamarisk,* would answer very well, *SEE TAMIARISK*; but the Arabic name, *arar,* is applied to a totally different plant, a species of juniper, as has been clearly shown by Celsius *(Hierobot.* 2, 195), who states that Arias Montanus is the only one who has so translated the Hebrew in the first of the passages in question (<24T706>Jeremiah 17:6): "For he shall be like the *heath* in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited." Both the Heb. words are from the root r ri[; "to be *naked."* in allusion to the *bare* nature of the rocks on which the juniper often grows (comp. <19A217>Psalm 102:17, tLipæ]r[;r][ih; "the prayer of the destitute," or ill-clad). Several species of juniper are no doubt found in Syria and Palestine. *SEE CEDAR*; *SEE JUNIPER*. Dr. Robinson met with some in proceeding from Hebron to wady Musa, near the romantic pass of Nemela: "On the rocks above we found the juniper-tree, Arabic *ar'ar;* its berries have the appearance and taste of the common juniper, except that there is more of the aroma of the pine. These trees were ten or fifteen feet in height, and hung upon the rocks even to the summits of the cliffs and needles" *(Bibl. Researches,* 2, 506). In proceeding S.E. he states: "Large trees of the juniper become quite common in the wadys and on the rocks." It is mentioned in the same situations by other travelers, and is no doubt common enough, particularly

in wild, uncultivated, and often inaccessible situations, and is thus suitable to <24806>Jeremiah 48:6: “Flee, save your lives, and be like the *heath* in the wilderness.” This appears to be the *Juniperus Sabina,* or savin, with small scale-like leaves, which are pressed close to the stem, and which is described as being a gloomy-looking bush inhabiting the most sterile soil (see *English Cyclop. Hist. 3:*311); a character which is obviously well suited to the *naked* or *destitute* tree spoken of by the prophet. Rosenmüller’s explanation of the Hebrew word, which is also adopted by Maurer, “qui destitutus versatur” *(Schol. ad <24806>Jeremiah 17:*6), is very unsatisfactory. Not to mention the *tameness* of the comparison, it is evidently contradicted by the antithesis in ver. 8: “Cursed is he that trusteth in man he shall be like the juniper that grows on the bare rocks of the desert: Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord he shall be as a tree planted by the waters.” The contrast between the shrub of the arid desert and the tree growing by the waters is very striking; but Rosenmüller’s interpretation appears to us to spoil the whole. Even more unsatisfactory is Michaelis *(Supp. Lex. Heb.* p. 1971), who thinks “Guinea-hens” *(Numida meleagris)* are intended! Gesenius *(Thes.* p. 1073 4) understands these two Heb. terms to denote “parietinse, aedificia eversa” (ruins); but it is more in accordance with the scriptural passages to suppose that some tree is intended, which explanation, moreover, has the sanction of the Sept. and Vulgate, and of the modern use of a kindred Arabic word. — Smith. Modern travelers do not mention the species; but those which have been named as growing in Palestine are the Phoenician juniper, the common savin, and the brown-berried juniper. The first of these is a tree of about twenty feet high, growing with its branches in a pyramidal form. Rosenmüller states that “Forskal found it frequently in the sandy heaths about Suez. The caravans use it for fuel.” The species best known in America are the common red cedar *(Jun. Virginiana)* and the Bermuda cedar, from which the wood of lead pencils is manufactured. They all have long, narrow, prickly leaves, and bear a soft, pulpy berry, from which a carminative oil is extracted. The wood is light, highly odorous, and very durable. *SEE JUNIPER*.

Heath, Asa

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hillsdale, N. Y., July 31,1776. His parents were Congregationalists. At thirteen he was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. F. Garrettson (q.v.). He began to preach in 1797 on Cambridge Circuit, N. York, under the direction of the Rev. Sylvester

Hutchinson. In 1798 he was stationed at Pomfret, Conn., with Daniel Ostrander. In 1799 he was sent to the province of Maine, and stationed on the Kennebec Circuit, embracing all the territory from Waterville to the Canada line, making more than two hundred miles travel to reach all the appointments. In 1800 Portland was his field of labor; 1801, Readfield; 1802, Falmouth; 1804-5, Scarboro'; in 1806- he located in consequence of bodily infirmities. In 1818 he re-entered the traveling connection, and was appointed presiding elder of Portland district, which position- he occupied for three years; 1821, Scarboro'; 1822, Kenmiebec; in 1823 he again located, and removed to Monmouth, Me.; in 1827 he re-entered the traveling ministry again, and held an effective relation to the Conference fifteen years. In 1842 he became superannuate, and this relation continued until Sept. 1, 1860, when he died in peace. As a preacher, he was sound in doctrine, clear in exposition, simple yet forcible in illustration, and impressive in delivery. — *Zian's Herald,* Oct. 5, 1860.

Heathcote, Ralph, D.D.

an English divine, was born in 1721, and died May 28, 1795. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge; took orders, and in 1748 was made vicar of Barkby, near Leicester; assistant preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1753; succeeded his father as vicar of Sileby in 1765; became rector of Sawtry-all-Saints, Huntingdonshire, in 1766; a prebend in the collegiate church in Southwell in 1768: and in 1788 vicar-general of Southwell Church. Besides works on other subjects, he wrote *Cursory Animadversions upon the Middletonian Controversy in general* (1752): — *Remarks upon Dr. Chapman's Charge* (1752) *A Letter to Rev. T. Fothergill (1753): — Sketch of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy* (1785, *8vo): — The Use of Reason asserted in Matters of Religion* (1755, 8vo; and a defense of the same, in 1756, *8vo): — Discourse on the Being of God, against Atheists, in two Sermons* (being the only ones of his twenty-four Boyle sermons which he published, 1763, 4to). Dr. Heathcote wrote several articles for the first edition of the *General Biographical Dictionary,* and assisted Nichols in editing a new edition of the same, published in 1784, 12 vols. 8vo. — Alibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 814; Rose, *New Genesis Biog. Dict. 8:*241; *Gentleman's Magazine,* 65, 66, 71. (J. W. M.)

Heathen

The Hebrew word ywG, *goy* (plur. µyæG, *Egyim'),* together with its Greek equivalent ἔθνς *(ἔθνη),* has been somewhat arbitrarily rendered "nations," "gentiles," and "heathen" in the A.V. It will be interesting to trace the manner in which a term, primarily and essentially general in its signification, acquired that more restricted sense which was afterwards attached to it. Its development is parallel with that of the Hebrew people, and its meaning at any period may be taken as significant of their relative position with regard to the surrounding nations.

1. While as yet the Jewish nation had no political existence, *gôyim* denoted generally the nations of the world, especially including the immediate descendants of Abraham (<011818>Genesis 18:18; compare <480316>Galatians 3:16). The latter, as they grew in numbers and importance, were distinguished in a most marked manner from the nations by whom they were surrounded, and were provided with a code of laws and a religious ritual which made the distinction still more peculiar. They were essentially a separate people (<032023>Leviticus 20:23); separate in habits, morals, and religion, and bound to maintain their separate character by denunciations of the most terrible judgments (<032614>Leviticus 26:14-38; Deuteronomy 28). On their march through the desert they encountered the most obstinate resistance from Amalek, "chief of the *gôyim"* (<042420>Numbers 24:20), in whose sight the deliverance from Egypt was achieved (<032645>Leviticus 26:45). During the conquest of Canaan, and the subsequent wars of extermination which the Israelites for several generations carried on against their enemies, the seven nations of the Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, Hivites, Jebusites, Perizzites, and Girgashites (<022424>Exodus 34:24), together with the remnants of them who were left to prove Israel (<062313>Joshua 23:13; <070301>Judges 3:1; <197855>Psalm 78:55), and teach them war (<070302>Judges 3:2), received the especial appellation of *goyim.* With these the Israelites were forbidden to associate (<062307>Joshua 23:7); intermarriages were prohibited (<062312>Joshua 23:12; <111102>1 Kings 11:2); and, as a warning against disobedience, the fate of the nations of Canaan was constantly kept before their eyes (<031824>Leviticus 18:24, 25; <051812>Deuteronomy 18:12). They are ever associated with the worship of false gods and the foul practices of idolaters (Leviticus 18, 20), and these constituted their chief distinctions, as *goyim,* from the worshippers of the one God, the people of Jehovah (<041541>Numbers 15:41; <052810>Deuteronomy 28:10). This distinction was maintained in its full force during the early

times of the monarchy (<10723>2 Samuel 7:23; <11104>1 Kings 11:4-8; 14:24; <19435>Psalm 106:35). It was from among the *gôyim,* the degraded tribes who submitted to their arms, that the Israelites were permitted to purchase their bond-servants (<03544>Leviticus 25:44, 45), and this special enactment seems to have had the effect of giving to a national tradition the force and sanction of a law (comp. <01215>Genesis 21:15). In later times this regulation was strictly adhered to. To the words of <21207>Ecclesiastes 2:7, "I bought men-servants and maid-servants," the Targum adds, "of the children of Ham, and the rest of the foreign nations." Not only were the Israelites forbidden to intermarry with these *gôyim,* but the latter were virtually excluded from the possibility of becoming naturalized. An Ammonite or Moabite was shut out from the congregation of Jehovah even to the tenth generation (<05203>Deuteronomy 23:3), while an Edomite or Egyptian was admitted in the third (verses 7, 8). The necessity of maintaining a separation so broadly marked is ever more and more manifest as we follow the Israelites through their history, and observe their constantly recurring tendency to idolatry. Offence and punishment followed each other with all the regularity of cause and effect (<07212>Judges 2:12; 3:6-8, etc.).

2. But, even in early Jewish times, the term *goyim* received by anticipation a significance of wider range than the national experience (<03333>Leviticus 26:33, 38; <05301>Deuteronomy 30:1), and, as the latter was gradually developed during the prosperous times of the monarchy, the *gôyim* were the surrounding nations generally, with whom the Israelites were brought into contact by the extension of their commerce, and whose idolatrous practices they readily adopted (<26230>Ezekiel 23:30; <30526>Amos 5:26). Later still, it is applied to the Babylonians who took Jerusalem (<16508>Nehemiah 5:8; <19701>Psalm 79:1, 6, 10), to the destroyers of Moab (<23108>Isaiah 16:8), and to the several nations among whom the Jews were scattered during the Captivity.

(<19647>Psalm 106:47; <24628>Jeremiah 46:28; <25103>Lamentations 1:3, etc.), the practice of idolatry still being their characteristic distinction (<23618>Isaiah 36:18; <24402>Jeremiah 10:2, 3; 14:22). This signification it retained after the return from Babylon, though it was used in a more limited sense as denoting the mixed race of colonists who settled in Palestine during the Captivity (<16057>Nehemiah 5:17), and who are described as fearing Jehovah while serving their own gods (<12729>2 Kings 17:29-33; <15621>Ezra 6:21).

Tracing the synonymous term ἔθνη through the apocryphal writings, we find that it is applied to the nations around Palestine (1 Macc. 1:11), including the Syrians and Philistines of the army of Gorgias (1 Macc. 3:41, 4:7, 11, 14), as well as the people of Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon (1 Macc. 5, 9, 10, 15). They were image-worshippers (1 Macc. 3:48; Wisd. 15:15), whose customs and fashions the Jews seem still to have had an unconquerable propensity to imitate, but on whom they were bound by national tradition to take vengeance (1 Macc. 2:68; 1 Esdr. 8:85). Following the customs of the *goyim* at this period denoted the neglect or concealment of circumcision (1 Macc. 1:15), disregard of sacrifices, profanation of the Sabbath, eating of swine's flesh and meat offered to idols (2 Macc. 6:6-9, 18; 15:1,2), and adoption of the Greek national games (2 Macc. 4:12, 14). In all points Judaism and heathenism are strongly contrasted. The "barbarous multitude" in 2 Macc. 2, 21 are opposed to those who played the man for Judaism, and the distinction now becomes an ecclesiastical one (comp. <401817>Matthew 18:17). In 2 Esdr. 3:33, 34, the "gentes" are defined as those "qui habitant in saeculo" (comp. <401062>Matthew 6:32; <421230>Luke 12:30).

As the Greek influence became more extensively felt in Asia Minor, and the Greek language was generally used, Hellenism and heathenism became convertible terms, and a Greek was synonymous with a foreigner of any nation. This is singularly evident in the Syriac of 2 Macc. 5, 9,10, 13; comp. <430735>John 7:35; <461032>1 Corinthians 10:32; 2 Macc. 11:2.

In the N.T., again, we find various shades of meaning attached to ἔθνη. In its narrowest sense it is opposed to "those of the circumcision" (<441045>Acts 10:45; comp. Esther 14:15, where ἀλλότριος.= ἀπερίτμητος), and is contrasted with Israel, the people of Jehovah (<420232>Luke 2:32), thus representing the Hebrew μyIAG at one stage of its history. But, like *goyim*, it also denotes the people of the earth generally (<442626>Acts 22:26; <480314>Galatians 3:14). In <400607>Matthew 6:7, ἐθνικός is applied to an idolater.

But, in addition to its significance as an ethnographical term, *goyim* had a moral sense which must not be overlooked. In <190905>Psalm 9:5, 15, 17 (comp. <260721>Ezekiel 7:21) the word stands in parallelism with [v;r; *rasha'*, the wicked, as distinguished by his moral obliquity (see Hupfeld on <190101>Psalm 1:1); and in verse 17 the people thus designated are described as "forgetters of God," that know not Jehovah (<240325>Jeremiah 10:25). Again, in <195905>Psalm 59:5, it is to some extent commensurate in meaning with ˆwa;

ydgB, "iniquitous transgressors;" and in these passages, as well as in Psalm 10:15, it has a deeper significance than that of a merely national distinction, although the latter idea is never entirely lost sight of.

In later Jewish literature a technical definition of the word is laid down which is certainly not of universal application. Elias Levita (quoted by Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes denthum*, 1, 665) explains the sing *goy* as denoting one who is not of Israelitish birth. This can only have reference to its after signification; in the O.T. the singular is never used of an individual, but is a collective term, applied equally to the Israelites (Joshua 3:17) as to the nations of Canaan (Leviticus 20:23), and denotes simply a body politic. Another distinction, equally unsupported, is made between µyæ, *gôyim*, and µyMa, *ummim*, the former being defined as the nations who had served Israel, while the latter were those who had not *(Jalkut Chadash*, fol. 20, note 20; Eisenmenger, 1, 667). Abarbanel, on Joel 3:2, applies the former to both Christians and Turks, or Ishmaelites, while in *Sepher Juchasin* (fol. 148, col. 2) the Christians alone are distinguished by this appellation. Eisenmenger gives some curious examples of the disabilities under which a *goy* labored. One who kept Sabbaths was judged deserving of death (2, 206), and the study of the law was prohibited to him under the same penalty, but on the latter point the doctors are at issue (2, 209). *SEE GENTILE*.

3. In modern use, the word heathen (probably a corruption of ἐθνικός, *ethnicus*, of which it is a translation; or derived from *heath*, that is, people who live in the wilderness, as *pagan* from *pagus*, a village) is applied to all nations that are strangers to revealed religion, that is to say, to all except Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. It is nearly synonymous with *Gentiles* (q.v.) and *Pagams* (q.v.). At the time of the Crusades the Moslems were also called heathen; but as they receive the doctrine of the one God from the O.T., they are not properly so called. On the relation of the heathen to Judaism, see above, and also the article GENTILES *SEE GENTILES* . See also the same article (vol. 3:p. 789) for their relation to Christianity at its origin. We add the following statements:

"The old Oriental forms of heathenism, the religion of the Chinese (Confucius, about 550 B.C.), the Brahminism, and the later Buddhism of the Hindus (perhaps 1000 B.C.), the religion of the Persians (Zoroaster, 700 B.C.), and the Egyptians ('the religion of enigma'), have only a remote and indirect concern with the introduction of Christianity. But they form to

some extent the historical basis of the Western religions; and the Persian dualism, especially, was not without influence on the earlier sects (the Gnostic and the Manichbean) of the Christian Church. The flower of paganism appears in the two great nations of classic antiquity, Greece and Rome. With the language, morality, literature, and religion of these nations the apostles came directly into contact, and through the whole first age the Church moves on the basis of these nationalities. These, together with the Jews, were the chosen nations of the ancient world, and shared the earth among them. The Jews were chosen for things eternal, to keep the sanctuary of the true religion. The Greeks prepared the elements of natural culture, of science and art, for the use of the Church. The Romans developed the idea of law, and organized the civilized world in a universal empire, ready to serve the spiritual universality of the Gospel. 'Both Greeks and Romans were unconscious servants of Jesus Christ, 'the unknown God.' These three nations, by nature at bitter enmity among themselves, joined hands in the superscription on the cross, where the holy name and the royal title of the Redeemer stood written, by the command of the heathen Pilate, 'in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin' (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* 1, 44).

4. As to the *religion* of heathenism, it is "a wild growth on the soil of fallen human nature, a darkening of the original consciousness of God's deification of the rational and irrational creature, and a corresponding corruption of the moral sense, giving the sanction of religion to natural and unnatural vices. Even the religion of Greece, which, as an artistic product of the imagination. has been justly styled the religion of beauty, is deformed by this moral distortion. It utterly lacks the true conception of sin, and consequently the true conception of holiness. It regards sin not as a perverseness of will and an offence against the gods, but as a folly of the understanding, and an offence against men, often even proceeding from the gods themselves; for 'infatuation is a daughter of Jove.' Then these gods themselves are mere men, in whom Homer and the popular faith saw and worshipped the weaknesses and vices' of the Grecian character, as well as its virtues, in immensely magnified forms. They have bodies and senses, like mortals, only in colossal proportions. They eat and drink, though only nectar and ambrosia. They are limited, like men, to time and space. Though sometimes honored with the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, yet they are subject to. an iron fate, fall under delusion, and reproach each other with folly. Their heavenly happiness is disturbed by all the troubles of

earthly life. Jupiter threatens his fellows with blows and death, and makes Olympus tremble when he shakes his dark locks in anger. The gentle Venus bleeds from a spear-wound on her finger. Mars is felled with a stone by Diomedes. Neptune and Apollo have to serve for hire, and are cheated. The gods are involved by their marriages in perpetual jealousies and quarrels. Though called holy and just, they are full of envy and wrath, hatred and lust, and provoke each other to lying and cruelty, perjury and adultery. Notwithstanding this essential apostasy from truth and holiness, heathenism was religion, a groping after 'the unknown God.' By its superstition it betrayed the need of faith. Its polytheism rested on a dim monotheistic background; it subjected all the gods to Jupiter, and Jupiter himself to a mysterious fate. It had at bottom the feeling of dependence on higher powers, and reverence for divine things. It preserved the memory of a golden age and of a fall. It had the voice of conscience and a sense, obscure though it was, of guilt. It felt the need of reconciliation with deity, and sought that reconciliation by prayer, penance, and sacrifice. Many of its religious traditions and usages were faint echoes of the primal religion; and its mythological dreams of the mingling of the gods with men, of demigods, of Prometheus delivered by Hercules from his helpless sufferings, were unconscious prophecies and fleshy anticipations of Christian truths. This alone explains the great readiness with which heathens embraced the Gospel, to the shame of the Jews. These elements of truth, morality, and piety in heathenism may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man, even in his fallen state, retains some traces of the divine image, a consciousness of God, however weak, conscience, and a deep longing for union with the Godhead, for truth and for righteousness. In this view we may, with Tertullian, call the beautiful and true sentences of the classics, of a Socrates, a Plato, an Aristotle, of Pindar, Sophocles, Plutarch, Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, 'the testimonies of a soul constitutionally Christian,' of a nature predestined to Christianity. Secondly, some account must be made *of* traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down from the general primal revelations to Adam and Noah. But the third and most important source of the heathen anticipations of truth is the all-ruling providence of God, who has never left himself without a witness. Particularly must we consider the influence of the divine Logos before his incarnation, the tutor of mankind, the original light of reason, shining in the darkness and lighting every man, the sower scattering in the soil of heathendom the seeds of truth, beauty, and virtue" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, *§* 12).

The question of the *salvation* of the heathen has been a subject of much discussion. “The great body of the Jews, from the earliest ages, denied salvation to the heathen on the principle *extra ecclesiam non dari salutem.* But this is entirely opposed both to the Old Testament and to the spirit of Christianity. Even Mohammed did not go to this degree of exclusiveness. Nor did the more ancient Grecian fathers deny salvation to the heathen, although they philosophized about it after their manner. E.g. Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria held that the Λὸγος exerted an agency upon the heathen by means of reason, and that the heathen philosophers were called, justified, and saved by philosophy. But afterwards, especially after the 3rd century, when the false Jewish notions respecting the Church were introduced into the West, and the maxim was adopted, *Extra ecclesiam non dari salutem* (which was the case after the age of Augustine), they then began to deny the salvation of the heathen, though there were always some who judged more favorably. Thus Zwingle, Curio, and others believed that God would pardon the heathen on account of Christ, although in this life they had no knowledge of his merits. See the historical account in Beykert’s Diss. *De salute gentium* (Strasburg, 1777), and a short statement of the opinions of others in Morus, p. 128, 129, where he justly recommends to our imitation the exemplary modesty of the apostles when speaking on this point. The whole subject was investigated anew on occasion of the violent attack which Hofstede, a preacher in Holland, made upon the *Belisaire* of Marmontel. This gave rise to Eberhard’s *Apologie de Socrates.* Compare also Tollner, *Beweis dass Gött die Menschen auch durch seine Offenbarung in der Naturzur Seligkeit führe”* (Knapp, *Christian Theology*, *§* 121). “The truth seems to be this, that none of the heathens will be condemned for not believing the Gospel, but they are liable to condemnation for the breach of God’s natural law; nevertheless, if there be any of them in whom there is a prevailing love to the Divine Being, there seems reason to believe that, for the *sake* of Christ, though to them unknown, they may be accepted by God; and so much the rather, as the ancient Jews, and even the apostles, during the time of our Savior’s abode on earth, seem to have had but little notion of those doctrines which those who deny the salvability of the heathen are most apt to imagine to be fundamental. Comp. Romans 2:10, 26; Acts 10:34, 35; Matthew 8:11, 12; 1 John 2:2” (Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lect. 172). The question is very ably treated in an article on “The true Theory of Missions” in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1858. The writer states that the extreme evangelical theory, which assumes the certain damnation of all who have

not learned the name and faith of Christ, is “the accepted theory of the Romish Church, and of a part of the Protestant Church, perhaps of the majority of the latter.” He adds in a note the following: “The Presbyterian Confession of Faith (chap. 10:§ 4) uses language of remarkable boldness on this point, saying, ‘Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; *much less* can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatever, *be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature* and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious and to be detested.’ This is sufficiently positive, especially as it contradicts both our Savior and the apostle Paul. It represents heathen who live according to their light as ‘*much less*’ able to be saved than men who hear the Gospel and reject it, thus directly contradicting our Savior, who declared that those who rejected his words would receive a heavier condemnation than even the depraved, unrepentant inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, or Tyre and Sidon (<40 11 20>Matthew 11:20-24). The ‘Confession of Faith’ declares the salvation of conscientious heathen to be ‘much less’ possible than that of unbelieving hearers of the Gospel; while Christ asserts that even the most flagrant sinners of the heathen shall find it ‘more tolerable’ in the Day of Judgment than such unbelievers. Equally at variance with the ‘Confession of Faith’ is the declaration of Paul in <45 02 14>Romans 2:14, 26, 27, in which he shows how those ‘having not the law may be a law unto themselves,’ and how their ‘uncircumcision shall be counted for circumcision…’ “The facts of human history and the declarations of the Bible alike declare that mercy is a prominent attribute of the divine character, and that this world is for some reason, known or unknown, under its care. We cannot, therefore, resist the conviction — it is an affirmation of the moral sense of all men that, guilty though the human race may be, and deserving of destruction, yet every man lives under a dispensation of mercy, and has an opportunity for salvation. To assert gravely, then, that the heathen who have never heard of Christ are shut out from all possible hope of pardon, and are riot in a salvable position in their present circumstances, is to offend the moral sense of the thoughtful men as well as that of the common multitude. It is worse than denying that an atonement has been made for all mankind, and restricting it to the elect alone; for that doctrine, however theoretically untrue, is saved from much of its practical evil by our inability to point out the elect in advance, so that

our hopes are not cut off for any particular man. But this theory points to actual masses of men, to the entire population of whole countries, and dooms them to a necessary perdition with no present hope of pardon; and it extends this judgment backwards to generations in the past who are represented as having had no share in that mercy which we have such reason to believe to be universal in its offers. Such a theory practically denies the divine grace by suspending its exercise, so far as the heathen (the majority of the human race) are concerned, upon the action of those already enlightened. It declares that there is no possible mercy for the heathen unless *Christians* choose to carry the Gospel to them. Does it seem rational, or in harmony with the universality and freedom of God's grace, that the only possibility of salvation for the mass of mankind should be suspended, not on anything within their control, but on the conduct of men on the opposite side of the globe? By such representations the minds of men are shocked, and a reaction takes place, which is unfavorable not only to the cause of missions, but to evangelical religion as well. They are led to think of evangelical religion as a severe, gloomy, remorseless system, which represents God as without mercy, or which confines that mercy within an exceedingly narrow compass. By describing the salvation of pagans as absolutely impossible, an influence is exerted in favor of universalism and infidelity." The writer further asserts that no passage in the Bible asserts this theory, nor does any doctrine of the Bible imply it. John Wesley's views on this subject are given in his sermon on *Living Without God,* from which we extract the following: "I have no authority from the Word of God to 'judge those that are without,' nor do I conceive that any man has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mohammedan world to damnation" *(Works,* N. Y. ed. 2, 485). Again, the *Minutes* of Aug. 8, 1770, declare that "he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, according to the light he has, is accepted of God." For this Wesley was attacked by Shirley and others, and defended by Fletcher, in his *First Check to Antinonmianisms* (New York edit.), 1, 41. See, besides the works above cited, Watson, *Theolog. Institutes,* 2, 445; Whately, *Future State,* p. 207; Constant, *De la Religion* (Bruxelles, 1824); Rougemont, *Le Peuple Primitif* (Paris, 1855-57, 3 vols. 8vo); Presence, *Hist. des Trois Premiers Siecles de l'Eglise,* vol. 1; translated under the title *The Religions before Christ* (Edinb. 1862, 8vo); Sepp, *Das Heidenthum* (Regesb. 1853, 3 vols.); Maurice, *Religions of the World* (Boson, 1854,18mo); Trench, *Hulsean Lectures* for 1846 (Philadel. 1850,12mo); Wuttke, *Gesch. des Heidenthumis,* etc. (Bresl. 1853, 8vo); Hardwick,

Christ and other Masters (1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Schaff, *Apostol. Church*, p. 139 sq.; Scholten, *Gesch. d. Religion u. Philosophie* (Elberf. 1868, 8vo); Pfleiderer, *Die Religion, ihre Wesen und ihre Geschichte* (Leipsic, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ*, trans. by Darnell (Lond. 1862,2 vols. 8vo); *N. British Review*, December, 1867, art. 1; Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development of Religious Belief* (Lond. 186970, 2 vols. 8vo).

Heathenism

SEE PAGANISM.

Heaven

There is, says Daubuz, a threefold world, and therefore a threefold heaven- the *invisible*, the *visible*, and the *political* among men, which last may be either *civil* or *ecclesiastical*. We shall consider these in the inverse order.

A. *Terrestrially and Figuratively regarded.* — Wherever the *scene* of a prophetic vision is laid, *heaven* signifies symbolically the ruling power or government; that is, the whole assembly of the ruling powers, which, in respect to the *subjects* on *earth*, are a political heaven, being over and ruling the subjects, as the natural heaven stands over and rules the earth. Thus, according to the subject, is the term to be limited; and therefore Artemidorus, writing in the times of the Roman emperors, makes Italy to be the heaven: "As heaven," says he, "is the abode of gods, so is Italy of kings." The Chinese call their monarch *Tiencu*, the son of heaven, meaning thereby the most powerful monarch. And thus, in <40240>Matthew 24:30, *heaven* is synonymous to *powers and glory;* and when Jesus says, "The powers of the heaven shall be shaken," it is easy to conceive that he meant that the kingdoms of the world should be overthrown to submit to his kingdom. Any government is a world; and therefore, in <23515>Isaiah 51:15, 16, heaven and earth signify *apolitical universe*, a kingdom or polity. In <23617>Isaiah 65:17, a new heaven and a new earth signify a new government, new kingdom, new people. *SEE HEAVEN AND EARTH*.

B. *Physically treated.* —

I. *Definitions and Distinctions.* — The ancient Hebrews, for want of a single term like the κόσμος and the *mundus* of the Greeks and the Latins used the phrase *heaven and earth* (as in <01001>Genesis 1:1; <24234>Jeremiah

23:24; and <44724>Acts 17:24, where *"H. and E."*= "the world and all things therein") to indicate *the universe,* or (as Barrow, *Sermons on the Creed, Works* [Oxford ed.], 4:556, expresses it) "those two regions, superior and inferior, into which the whole system of things is divided, together with all the beings that do reside in them, or do belong unto them, or are comprehended by them" (compare Pearson, *On the Creed,* who, on art. 1 ["Maker of H. and E."], adduces the Rabbinical names of a *triple* division of the universe, making the sea, μy; distinct from the bWvy; ἡ οἰκουμένη. Compare also the Nicene Creed, where another- division occurs of the universe into *"things visible and invisible").* Deducting from this aggregate the idea expressed by "earth" *SEE EARTH*; *SEE GEOGRAPHY*, we get a residue of signification which exactly embraces "heaven." Barrow (l. c.) well defines it as "all the superior region encompassing the globe of the earth, and from it on all sides extended to a distance inconceivably vast and spacious, with all its parts, and furniture, and inhabitants not only such things in it as are visible and material, but also those which are immaterial and invisible (<51016>Colossians 1:16)."

1. Wetstein (in a learned note on <47212>2 Corinthians 12:2) and Eisenmenger *(Entdecktes Judenthunm,* 1, 460) state the *Rabbinical* opinion as asserting *seven heavens.* For the substance of Wetstein's note, see Stanley, *Corinthiun,* 1. c. This number arises confessedly from' the mystic: value of the numeral *seven;* "omnis *septenarius* dilectus est in saeculumine superis." According to Rabbi Abia, there were six antechambers, as it were, or steps to the seventh heaven, which was the "ταμεῖον in quo Rex habitat"-the very presence-chamber of the divine King himself. Compare Origen, *Contra Celsum, 6,* 289, and Clemens Alex. *Stromlata, 4,* 636; 5, 692. In the last of these passages the prophet Zephaniah is mentioned, after some apocryphal tradition; to have been caught up into "the fifth heaven, the dwelling-place of the angels, in a glory sevenfold greater than the brightness of the sun." In the Rabbinical point of view, the superb throne of king Solomon, with the six steps leading up to it was a symbol of the highest heaven with the throne of the Eternal, above the six inferior heavens (<111018>1 Kings 10:18-20). These gradations of the celestial regions are probably meant in <300906>Amos 9:6, where, however, the entire creation is beautifully described by *"the stories* [or steps of the heaven," for the empyreal heaven; "*the troop* [or globular aggregate, the *terra firma;* see A. Lapide, ad loc.] of the earth," and "the waters of the sea" [including the atmosphere, whence the waters are "poured out upon the face of the

earth"]. As for the *threesald* division of the celestial regions mentioned in the text, Meyer thinks it to be a fiction of the learned Grotius, on the ground of the Rabbinical *seven* heavens. But this- censure is premature; for

(1) it is very doubtful whether this *hebdomadal* division is as old as Paul's time;

(2) it is certain that the Rabbinical doctors are not unanimous about the number seven. Rabbi Judah *(Chagiga,* fol. 12:2, and *Aboth Nathan,* 37) says there are "two heavens," after <05104>Deuteronomy 10:14. This agrees with Grotius's statement, if we combine his *nubiferum* ([yqr) *and astriferumi* (µymv) into one region *of physical heavens* (as indeed Moses does himself in <01014>Genesis 1:14,15, 17, 20), and reserve his *angeliferum* for the µymçh ymç "the heaven of heavens," the supernal region of spiritual beings, Milton's *"Empyrean" (P. L. 7:sub fin.).* See bishop Pearson's note, *On the Creed* (ed. Chevallier), p. 91. The learned note of De Wette on <471202>2 Corinthians 12:2 is also worth consulting.

(3) The Targum on <140618>2 Chronicles 6:18 (as quoted by Dr. Gill, *Comment.* 2 Corinth. 1. c.), expressly mentions the triple distinction *of supreme, middle,* and *lower* heavens. Indeed, there is an accumulation of the threefold classification. Thus, in *Tseror lansamsor,* fol. 1, 4, and 3:2,3, and 82, 2, three worlds are mentioned. The doctors of the Cabbala also hold the opinion of *three* worlds, *Zohar,* Numbers fol. 66, 3. And of the highest world there is further a *tripartite* division, of *angels,* µykalm]Mhi µl;[; of *souls,* t/vpn;] and of *spirits,* µyjwr h; µl;[. See Buxtorf's *Lex Rabbin.* col. 1620, who refers to D. Kimchi on <191909>Psalm 19:9. Paul, besides the well-known <471202>2 Corinthians 12:2, refers again, only less pointedly, to *a plurality* of heavens, as in <490410>Ephesians 4:10. See Olshausen (ed. Clark) on the former passage.

2. Accordingly, Barrow (p. 558, with whom compare Grotius and Drusius on <471202>2 Corinthians 12:2) ascribes to the Jews the notion that there are *three heavens: Coelum nubiferum,* or the firmament; *Ccelum astriferum,* the starry heavens; *Coelum angeliferum,* or "the heaven of heavens," where the angels reside, "the third heaven" of Paul. This same notion prevails in the fathers. Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa *(Hexaem.* , 42) describes the first of these heavens as *the limited space of the denser* air *(*τὸν ὅρον τοῦ παχυμερεστέπου ἀέρος*), within which arrange the clouds, the*

winds, and the birds; the second is the region *in which wander the planets and the stars (*ἐνῳ δὲ πλανῆ ται τῶν ἀστέρων διαπορεύοται*),* hence aptly called by Hesychius κατηστρισμένον, *locum stelliferum;* while the third is *the very summit of the visible creation (*τὸ ο υν ἀκρότατον τοῦ αἰσθηροῦ κόσμου*), Paul's third heaven, higher than the aerial and stellar world, cognizable* [not by the eye, but] *by the mind alone (*ἐν στασίμ"ῳ καὶ νοητῇ φύσει γενόμενος*),* which Damascene calls *the heaven of heavens, the prime heaven beyond all others (*οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὸ πρῶτος οὐρανός, *Orthod. Fid.* lib. 2, c. 6:p. 83); or, according to St. Basil *(In Jesaiarm, visione* 2, tom. 1, 813), *the throne of God (*θρόνος θεοῦ*),* and to Justin Martyr *(Quaest. et Resp. ad Graecos, ad ult. Quaest.* p. 236), *the house and throne of God (*οἶκος καὶ θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ).

II. *Scripture Passages arranged according to these Distintions.* — This latter division of the celestial regions is very convenient and quite Biblical.

(I.) Under the first head, *caelum nubiferum,* the following phrases naturally fall —

(a) "Fowl," or "fowls of the heaven, of the air," see Genesis 2, 19; 7:3, 23; 9:2; <051747>Deuteronomy 4:17; 28:26; <121124>1 Kings 21:24; <181207>Job 12:7; 28:21; 35:11; <191808>Psalm 8:8; 79:2; 104:12; <240733>Jeremiah 7:33 et passim; <262905>Ezekiel 29:5 et passim; <270228>Daniel 2:38; <280218>Hosea 2:18; 4:3; 7:12; <360103>Zephaniah 1:3; <410403>Mark 4:3 (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*);* <420805>Luke 8:5; 9:58; 13:19; <441012>Acts 10:12; 11:6 in all which passages the same original words in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek Scriptures (μyaev;ˆyaev; οὐρανίο*)* are with equal propriety rendered indifferently "*air"* and "heaven" — similarly we read of "the path of the eagle *in the air"* (<203019>Proverbs 30:19); of "the eagles of *heaven"* (<250419>Lamentations 4:19); of "the stork of the *heaven"* (<240807>Jeremiah 8:7); and of" birds of *heaven"* in general (<211020>Ecclesiastes 10:20; <240425>Jeremiah 4:25). In addition to these zoological terms, we have meteorological facts included under the same original words; e.g.

(b) "*The dew of heaven"* (Genesis; 27:28, 39; <053328>Deuteronomy 33:28; <270415>Daniel 4:15 et passim; Haggai 10 <380812>Zechariah 8:12):

(c) "*The clouds of heaven"* (<111845>1 Kings 18:45; <19E708>Psalm 147:8; <270713>Daniel 7:13; <402430>Matthew 24:30; 26:64; <411462>Mark 14:62):

(d) *The frost of heaven* (<183829>Job 38:29):

(e) *The winds of heaven* (<11 18 55>1 Kings 18:55; <19 78 26>Psalm 78:26; <27 08 08>Daniel 8:8; 11:4; <38 06>Zechariah 2:6; 6:5 [see margin]; <40 24 31>Matthew 24:31; <41 13 27>Mark 13:27):

(f) *The rain of heaven* (<01 08 02>Genesis 8:2; <05 11 11>Deuteronomy 11:11; 28:12; <24 14 22>Jeremiah 14:22; <44 14 17>Acts 14:17 *[οὐρανόθεν ὑετούς];* <59 05 18>James 5:18; <66 18 06>Revelation 18:6):

(g) *Lightning, with thunder* (<18 37 03>Job 37:3, 4; <42 17 24>Luke 17:24).

(II.) *Celum astriferum.* The vast spaces of which astronomy takes cognizance are frequently referred to: e.g.

(a) in the phrase "*host of heaven,*" in <05 17 03>Deuteronomy 17:3; <24 08 02>Jeremiah 8:2; <40 24 29>Matthew 24:29 [δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν*];* a sense which is obviously not to be confounded with another signification of the same phrase, as in <40 02 13>Luke 2:13 *SEE ANGELS*

(b) *Lights of heaven* (<01 01 14>Genesis 1:14,15,16; <26 32 08>Ezekiel 32:8):

(c) *Stars of heaven* (<01 22 17>Genesis 22:17; 26:4; <02 32 13>Exodus 32:13; <05 01 10>Deuteronomy 1:10; 10:22; 28:62; <07 05 20>Judges 5:20; <16 09 23>Nehemiah 9:23; <23 13 10>Isaiah 13:10, <34 03 16>Nahum 3:16; <58 11 12>Hebrews 11:12).

(III.) *Calum angeliferums.* It would exceed our limits if we were to collect the descriptive phrases which revelation has given us of heaven in its sublimest sense, we content ourselves with indicating one or two of the most obvious:

(a) *The heaven of heavens* (<05 10 14>Deuteronomy 10:14; <11 08 27>1 Kings 8:27; <14 02 06>2 Chronicles 2:6, 18; <16 09 06>Nehemiah 9:6 <19 05 16>Psalm 115:16; 148:4:

(b) *The third heavens* (<47 12 02>2 Corinthians 12:2):

(c) *The high and lofty [place]* (<23 47 15>Isaiah 47:15): (d) *The highest* (<40 21 09>Matthew 21:9; <41 11 10>Mark 11:10; <40 02 14>Luke 2:14, compared with Psalm 168:1). This heavenly sublimity was graciously brought down to Jewish apprehension in the sacred symbol of their Tabernacle and Temple, which they reverenced (especially in the *adytum* of "the Holy of Holies") as "the place where God's honor dwelt" (<19 26 08>Psalm 26:8), and amidst the sculptured types of his celestial retinue, in the cherubim of the mercy-seat (<12 19 15>2 Kings 19:15; <19 80 01>Psalm 80:1: <23 37 16>Isaiah 37:16).

III. *Meaning of the Terms used in the Original. —*

1. By far the most frequent designation of *heaven* in the Hebrew Scriptures is µyaeïv; *shama'yim,* which the older lexicographers [see Cocceius, Lex. s.v.] regarded as the *dual,* but which Gesenius and Fürst have restored to the dignity, which St. Jerome gave it, of the *plural* of an obsolete noun, ymiv;as (µ r æê. *plur.* omf y/G and µyaeïfrom ym). According to these recent scholars, the idea expressed by the word is *height, elevation* (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1453; Furst, *Hebr. Wort.* 2, 467). In this respect of: its essential meaning it resembles the Greek *obpavoi* [from the radical *6 p,* denoting *height]* (Pott, *Etymol. Forsch.* 1, 123, ed. 1). Pott's rendering of this root *op,* by "sich *erheben,"* reminds us of our own beautiful word *heaven,* which thus enters into brotherhood of signification with the grand idea of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek.. Professor Bosworth, in his Anglo-Sax. Dict. under the verb *hebban,* to raise or elevate, gives the kindred words of the whole Teutonic family, and deduces there from the noun *heofon* or *heofen,* in the sense of *heaven.* — And although the primary notion of the Latin *caelum* (akin to κοῖλος and our *hollow)* is the less sublime one of a covered or vaulted space, yet the loftier sense of *elevation* has prevailed, both in the original (see White and Riddle, s.v. Caelum) and in the derived languages (comp. French *ciel,* and the English word *ceiling)*

2. Closely allied in meaning, though unconnected in origin with µyaeïv; is the oft-recurring µ/r m; *mardm'.* This word is never Englished *heaven,* but "*heights,"* or *"high place,"* or *"high places."* There can, however, be no doubt of its celestial signification (and that in the grandest degree) in such passages as <19B818>Psalm 68:18 [Hebr. 19]; 93:4; 102:19 [or in the Hebr. Bib. 20, where /vnÞdq;µ/r M]mais equal to the µyaeïv;mof the parallel clause]; similarly, <183102>Job 31:2; <235715>Isaiah 57:15; <244530>Jeremiah 25:30. Dr. Kalisch *(Genesis,* Introd. p. 21) says "It was a common belief among all ancient nations that at the summit of the shadow of the earth, or on the top of the highest mountain of the earth, which reaches with its crest into heaven the gods have their palace or hall of assembly," and he instances "the Babylonian *Albordsh,* the chief abode of Ormuzd, among the heights of the Caucasus; and the Hindoo *Meru;* and the Chinese *Kulkun* (or Kaen-lun); and the Greek *Olympus* (and Atlas); and the Arabian *Caf;* and the Parsee *Tireh."* He, however, while strongly and indeed most properly censuring the identification of Mount *Meru* with Mount *Moriah* (which had hastily been conjectured from "the accidental resemblance of the names"), deems

it *improbable* that the Israelites should have entertained, like other ancient nations, the notion of *local height* for the abode of him whose "glory the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain;" and this he supposes on the ground that such a notion "*rests essentially on polytheistic ideas.*" Surely the learned commentator is premature in both these statements.

(1.) No such improbability, *in fact*, unhappily, can be predicated of the Israelites, who in ancient times (notwithstanding the divine prohibitions) exhibited a constant tendency, to the ritual of their tm/B; or "*high places.*" Gesenius makes a more correct statement when he says *[Hebr. Lex.* by Robinson, p. 138], "The Hebrews, like most other ancient nations, supposed that sacred rites performed on *high places* were particularly acceptable to the Deity.. Hence they were accustomed to offer sacrifices upon mountains and hills, both to idols and to God himself (<091012>1 Samuel 9:12 sq.; <131029>1 Chronicles 13:29 sq.; <110304>1 Kings 3:4; <121202>2 Kings 12:2, 3; <234507>Isaiah 45:7); and also to build there *chapels, fanes, tabernacles* (tm/BhiyTB; <111332>1 Kings 13:32; <121729>2 Kings 17:29), with their priests and other ministers of the sacred rites (tm/BhiymhKo <111232>1 Kings 12:32; <121732>2 Kings 17:32). So tenacious of this ancient custom were not only the ten tribes, but also all the Jews, that, even after the building of Solomon's Temple, in spite of the express law of Deuteronomy 12, they continued to erect such chapels on the mountains around Jerusalem."

(2.) Neither from the character of Jehovah, as the God of Israel, can the improbability be maintained, as if it were of the essence *of polytheism* only to localize Deity on mountain heights. "The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," in the proclamation which he is pleased to make of his own style, does not limit his abode to celestial sublimities; in one of the finest passages of even Isaiah's poetry, God claims as one of the stations of his glory the shrine of "a contrite and humble spirit" (<235715>Isaiah 57:15). His loftiest attributes, therefore, are not compromised, nor is the amplitude of his omnipresence compressed by an earthly residence. Accordingly, the same Jehovah who "walketh on *the high places,* tm/Bi, of the earth" (<300413>Amos 4:13); who "treadeth on *the fastnesses,* tm/B; of the sea" (<180908>Job 9:8); and "who ascendeth above *the heights,* tm/B; of the clouds," was pleased to consecrate Zion as his dwelling-place (<198702>Psalm 87:2), and his rest (<191213>Psalm 132:13, 14). Hence we find the same word, µ/rm; which is often descriptive of the sublimest

heaven, used of Zion, which Ezekiel calls "the mountain of the height of Israel," לארץ ישראל הרים (17:23; 20:40; 34:14).

3. גלגל *galgal'*. This word, which literally meaning a *wheel*, admirably expresses *rotatory movement*, is actually rendered "*heaven*" in the A.V. of Psalm 77:18: "The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven," גלגל [Sept. ἐν τῷ τροχῷ; Vulg. *in rota*]. Luther's version agrees with the A. Vers. *in Himmel;* and Dathe renders *per orbem*, which is ambiguous, being as expressive, to say the least, of the globe of the earth as of the circle of heaven. The Targum (in Walton, vol. iii) on the passage gives; גלגלא *(il rota)*, which is as indeterminate as the original, as the Syriac also seems to be. De Wette (and after him Justus Olshausen, *Die Ps erklärt*, 1. c.) renders the phrase "in the whirlwind." Maurer, who disapproves of this rendering, explains the phrase "rotated." But, amidst the uncertainty of the versions, we are disposed to think that it was not without good reason that our translators, in departing from the previous version (see Psalter, ad loc., which has, "the voice of thy thunder was heard *round about*"), deliberately rendered the passage *in the heaven*, as if the גלגל were the correlative of ארץ, both being poetic words, and both together equalled *the heaven and the earth.* In James 3:6, the remarkable phrase, τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, *the course, circuit, or wheel of nature*, is akin to our גלגל. (The Syriac renders the τροχόν by the same word, which occurs in the psalm as the equivalent of גלגל, Schaaf's *Lex. Syr.;* and of the same indefiniteness of signification.) That the general sense "*heaven*" best expresses the force of Psalm 77:18, is rendered probable, moreover, by the description which Josephus gives *(Ant. 2*, 16, 3) of the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea, the subject of that part of the psalm, "Showers of rain descended from *heaven*, ἀπ, οὐρανοῦ, with dreadful thunders and lightning, and flashes of fire; thunderbolts were darted upon them, nor were there 'any indications of God's wrath upon men wanting on that dark and dismal night."

4. As the words we have reviewed indicate *the height and rotation* of the heavens, so the two we have yet to examine exhibit another characteristic of equal prominence, *the breadth and expanse* of the celestial regions. These are שחק *shach'ak* (generally used in the *plural)* and יקע. They occur *together* in Job 37:18: "Hast thou with him *spread out* (יקעת) *the sky or expanse* of heaven?" — (שחקים), where ל is the sign of the

objective). We must examine them separately. The root qjv; is explained by Gesenius to *grind to powder*, and then to *expand by rubbing or beating*. Meier *(Hebr. Wurzelw. — b.* p. 446) compares it with the Arabic *shachaka, to make fine, to attenuate* (whence the noun *shachim, a thin cloud).* With him agrees Furst *(Hebrew. — b.* 2, 433). The Heb. subst. is therefore well adapted to designate the sky region of heaven with its cloud dust, whether fine or dense. Accordingly, the meaning of the word in its various passages curiously oscillates between *sky* and *cloud.* When Moses, in <053326>Deuteronomy 33:26, lauds Jehovah's "riding in his excellence on *the sky;"* and when, in <102212>2 Samuel 22:12, and repeated in <191811>Psalm 18:11 (12), David speaks of "the thick clouds of *the skies;"* when Job (37:18) asks, "Hast thou with him spread out *the sky?*" when the Psalmist (<197717>Psalm 77:17 [18]) speaks of "*the skies* sending out a sound," and the prophet (<234508>Isaiah 45:8), figuratively, of their "pouring down righteousness;" when, finally, <245109>Jeremiah 51:9, by a frequently occurring simile [comp. <661805>Revelation 18:5, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*]*, describes the judgment of Babylon as "lifted up even to *the skies,"* in every instance our word µyqjÞv in the *plural* is employed. The same word in the same form is translated *"clouds"* in <183805>Job 35:5; 36:28; 37:21; 38:37; in <190805>Psalm 36:5 (6); 57, 10 (11); 68:34 (35) [margin, *"heavens"*]; 78:23; in <202020>Proverbs 3:20; 8:28. The prevalent sense of this word, we thus see, is a *meteorological* one, and falls under our first head of *caelum nubiferum:* its connection with the other two heads is much slighter. It bears probably an *astronomical sense* in <198937>Psalm 89:37 (38), where "the faithful witness in heaven" seems to be in apposition to the sun and the moon (Bellarmine, ad loc.), although some suppose the expression to mean *the rainbow,* "the witness" of God's covenant with Noah; <010913>Genesis 9:13 sq. (see J. Olshausen, ad loc.). This is perhaps the only instance of its falling under the class *caelum astriferum;* nor have we a much more frequent reference to the higher sense of the *coehln angeliferum* (<198906>Psalm 89:6 containing the only explicit allusion to this sense) unless, with Gesenius, *Thes.* s.v. we refer <195803>Psalm 58:35 also to it. More probably in <053326>Deuteronomy 33:26 (where it is parallel with µyaeÞv; and in the highly poetical passages of <234508>Isaiah 45:8, and <245109>Jeremiah 51:9, our word µyqjæ;v]may be best regarded as designating the empyreal heavens.

5. We have already noticed the connection between µyqæ;v] and our only remaining word [yqæ; *raki'a*, from their being associated by the sacred writer in the same sentence (<183718>Job 37:18); it tends to corroborate this connection that, on comparing <010106>Genesis 1:6 (and seven other passages in the same chapter) with <053326>Deuteronomy 33:26, we find [yqæ; of the former sentence, and µyqæ;v] of the latter, both rendered by the Sept. στερέωμα and *firmamentum* in the Vulg., whence the word "*firmament*" passed into our A.V. This word is now a well-understood term in astronomy, synonymous with sky or else the general heavens, undivested by the discoveries of science of the special signification which it bore in the ancient astronomy. *SEE FIRMAMENT*. For a clear exposition of all the Scripture passages which bear on the subject, we may refer the reader to professor Dawson's *Archaia*, especially chap. 8, and to Dr. M'Caul on *The Mosaic Record of Creation* (or, what is substantially the same treatise in a more accessible form, his *Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis*, sec. 9:p. 32-44). We must be content here, in reference to our term [;yqæ; to observe that, when we regard its origin (from the root [qi;r; *to spread out* or *expand* by beating; Gesen. s.v.; Fuller, *Misc. Sacr.* 1, 6; Furst, *Hebr.* — *w.* — b. s.v.), and its connection with, and illustration by, such words as µyqæ;v], *clouds*, and the verbs jpif;(<234813>Isaiah 48:13, "My right hand *hath spread out* the heavens") and hf,n;(<234022>Isaiah 40:22, ''*Who stretcheth out* the heavens like a curtain" [literally, *like fineness]*, "and *spreadeth them out* as a tent"), we are astonished at certain rationalistic attempts to control the meaning of an intelligible term, which fits in easily and consistently with the nature of things, by a few poetical metaphors, that are themselves capable of a consistent sense when lcell subordinate to the plainer passages of prose. The fuller expression is µyaeêV;hi [;yqæ;(<010114>Genesis 1:14 sq.). That Moses understood it to mean a *solid* expanse is clear from his representing it as the barrier between the upper and lower waters (<010106>Genesis 1:6 sq.), i.e. as separating the reservoir of the celestial ocean (<190408>Psalm 104:3; 29:3) from the waters of the earth, or those on which the earth was supposed to float (<190606>Psalm 136:6). Through its open lattices (t/Bya;) (<010711>Genesis 7:11; <121202>2 Kings 7:2, 19; compare κόσκινον, Aristophanes, *Nub.* 373) or doors (µyaeil.Dæ<197823>Psalm 78:23) the dew, and snow, and hail are poured upon the earth (<183822>Job 38:22, 37, where we have the curious expression "bottles of heaven," "utres caeli"). This firm vault, which Job describes as being "strong as a molten looking-glass"

(<18378>Job 37:18), is transparent, like pellucid sapphire, and splendid as crystal (<27123>Daniel 12:3; <02410>Exodus 24:10; <26122>Ezekiel 1:22; <66406>Revelation 4:6), over which rests the throne of God (<23601>Isaiah 66:1; <26126>Ezekiel 1:26), and which is opened for the descent of angels, or for prophetic visions (<01817>Genesis 28:17; <26101>Ezekiel 1:1; <44756>Acts 7:56; 10:11). In it, like gems or golden lamps, the stars are fixed to give light to the earth, and regulate the seasons (<01114>Genesis 1:14-19); and the whole magnificent, immeasurable structure (<24137>Jeremiah 31:37) is supported by the mountains as its pillars, or strong foundations (<19807>Psalm 18:7; <10218>2 Samuel 22:8; <18411>Job 24:11). Similarly the Greeks believed in an οὐρανὸς πολύχαλκος (Hom. *Il.* 5, 504), or σιδήρεος (Horn. *Od. 15*, 328), or ἀδάματος (Orph. *Hymn. ad Coelum)*, which the philosophers called οτερέμνιον or κρυσταλλοειδές (Empedocles, *ap. Plut. de Phil. plac.* 2, 11; Artemid. ap. Sen. *Nat. Quaest. 7*, 13; quoted by Gesenius, s.v.). It is clear that very many of the above notions were metaphors resulting from the simple primitive conception, and that later writers among the Hebrews had arrived at more scientific views, although, of course, they retained much of the old phraseology, and are fluctuating and undecided in their terms. ‘Elsewhere, for instance, the heavens are likened to a curtain (<19402>Psalm 104:2; <23422>Isaiah 40:22). *SEE COSMOGONY*.

IV. *Metaphorical Application of the Visible Heavens.* — A door opened in heaven is the beginning of a new revelation. To ascend up into heaven signifies to be in full power. Thus is the symbol to be understood in <23143>Isaiah 14:13, 14, where the king of Babylon says, “I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God.” To descend from heaven signifies, symbolically, to act by a commission from heaven. Thus our Savior uses the word “descending” (<43051>John 1:51) in speaking of the angels acting by divine commission, at the command of the Son of man. To fall from heaven signifies to lose power and authority, to be deprived of the power to govern, to revolt or apostatize.

The *heaven opened.* The natural heaven, being the symbol of the governing part of the political world, a new face in the natural, represents a new face in the political. Or the heaven may be said to be *opened* when the day appears, and consequently *shut* when night’ comes on, as appears from Virgil *(AEn. 10*, 1), “The gates of heaven unfold,” etc. Thus the Scripture, in a poetical manner, speaks of the *doors* of heaven (<19823>Psalm 78:23); of the heaven *being shut* (<11835>1 Kings 8:35); and in <26101>Ezekiel 1:1, the heaven is said to *be opened.*

Midst of heaven may be the air, or the region between heaven and earth; or the middle station between the corrupted earth and the throne of God in heaven. In this sense, the air is the proper place where God's threatenings and judgments should be denounced. Thus, in <13216>1 Chronicles 21:16, it is said that David saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and the heaven as he was just going to destroy Jerusalem with the pestilence. The angel's hovering there was to show that there was room to pray for mercy, just as God was going to inflict the punishment: it had not as yet done any execution.

C. *Spiritual and Everlasting Sense,* i.e. the state and place of blessedness in the life to come. Of the nature of this blessedness it is not possible that we should form any adequate conception, and, consequently, that any precise information respecting it should be given to us. Man, indeed, usually conceives the joys of heaven to be the same as, or at least to resemble, the pleasures of this world; and each one hopes to obtain with certainty, and to enjoy in full measure beyond the grave, that which he holds most dear upon earth-those favorite employments or particular delights which he ardently longs for here, but which he can seldom or never enjoy in this world, or in the enjoyment of which he is never fully satisfied. But one who reflects soberly on the subject will readily see that the happiness of heaven must be a very different thing from earthly happiness. In this world the highest pleasures of which our nature is capable satiate by their continuance, and soon lose the power of giving positive enjoyment. This alone is sufficient to show that the bliss of the future world must be of an entirely different kind from what is called earthly joy and happiness, if we are to be there *truly* happy, and *happy brever.* But since we can have no distinct conception of those joys which never have been and never will be experienced by us here in their full extent, we have, of course, no words in human language to express them, and cannot therefore expect any clear description of them even in the holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible describes this happiness sometimes in general terms, designating its greatness (as in <450818>Romans 8:18-22; <470417>2 Corinthians 4:17, 18), and sometimes by various figurative images and modes of speech, borrowed from everything which we know to be attractive and desirable.

The greater part of these images were already common among the Jewish contemporaries of Christ; but Christ and his apostles employed them in a purer sense than the great multitude of the Jews. The Orientals are rich in

such figures. They were employed by Mohammed, who carried them, as his manner was, to an extravagant excess, but who at the same time said expressly that they were mere figures, although many of his followers afterwards understood them literally, as has been often done in a similar way by many Christians.

The following are the principal terms, both literal and figurative, which are applied in Scripture to the condition of future happiness.

a. Among the *literal* appellations we find ζωή, ζωὴ ηἰθ῎νιος, which, according to Hebrew usage, signify “a happy life,” or “eternal well-being,” and are the words rendered “life,” “eternal life,” and “life everlasting” in the A. Vers. (e.g. <401714>Matthew 7:14; 19:16, 29; 25:46): δόξα, δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, ‘‘glory,” “the glory of God” (Romans 2, 7, 10; 5, 2); and εἰρηνη, ,” peace” (<450210>Romans 2:10). Also αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης, “an eternal weight of glory” (<470417>2 Corinthians 4:17); and σωτηρία, σωτηρία αἰώνιος, “salvation,” “eternal salvation” (<581909>Hebrews 5:9), etc.

b. Among the *figurative* representations we may place the word “heaven” itself. The abode of departed spirits, to us who live upon the earth, and while we remain here, is invisible and inaccessible, beyond the bounds of the visible world, and entirely separated from it. There they live in the highest well being, and in a nearer connection with God and Christ than here below. This place and state cannot be designated by any more fit and brief expression than that which is found in almost every language, namely, “heaven” — a word in its primary and material signification denoting the region of the skies, or the visible heavens. This word, in Heb. μyaev; in Gr. οὐρανός, is therefore frequently employed by the sacred writers, as above exemplified. It is there that the highest sanctuary or temple of God is situated, i.e. it is there that the omnipresent God most gloriously reveals himself. This, too, is the abode of (rod’s highest spiritual creation. Thither Christ was transported: he calls it the house of his Father, and says that he has therein prepared an abode for his followers (<431402>John 14:2).

This place, this “heaven,” was never conceived of in ancient times, as it has been by some modern writers, as a particular planet or world, but as the wide expanse of heaven, high above the atmosphere or starry heavens; hence it is sometimes called the *third* heaven, as being neither the atmosphere nor the starry heavens.

Another figurative name is “Paradise,” taken from the abode of our first parents in their state of innocence, and transferred to the abode of the blessed (<42343>Luke 23:43; <47204>2 Corinthians 12:4; <66207>Revelation 2:7; 22:2).

Again, this place is called “the heavenly Jerusalem” (<48426>Galatians 4:26; <58122>Hebrews 12:22; <66312>Revelation 3:12), because the earthly Jerusalem was the capital city of the Jews, the royal residence, and the seat of divine worship; the “kingdom of heaven” (<40250>Matthew 25:1; <59205>James 2:5); the “heavenly kingdom” (<55418>2 Timothy 4:18); the “eternal kingdom” (<61011>2 Peter 1:11). It is also called an “eternal inheritance” (<60104>1 Peter 1:4; <58915>Hebrews 9:15), meaning the possession and full enjoyment of happiness, typified by the residence of the ancient Hebrews in Palestine. The blessed are said “to sit down at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” that is, to be a sharer with the saints of old in the joys of salvation; “to be in Abraham’s bosom” (<42162>Luke 16:22; <40811>Matthew 8:11), that is, to sit near or next to Abraham [see BOSOM]; “to reign with Christ” (<55211>2 Timothy 2:11), i.e. to be distinguished, honored, and happy as he is to enjoy regal felicities, to enjoy “a Sabbath,” or “rest” (<58410>Hebrews 4:10, 11), indicating the happiness of pious Christians *both* in this life and in the life to come.

All that we can with certainty know or infer from Scripture or reason respecting the blessedness of the life to come may be arranged under the following particulars:

I. We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings and adversities of this life.

II. Our future blessedness will involve a continuance of the real happiness of this life.

I. The entire exemption from suffering, and all that causes suffering here, is expressed in Scripture by words which denote rest, repose, refreshment, after performing labor and enduring affliction. But all the terms which are employed to express this condition define (in the original) the promised “rest” as rest after labor, and exemption from toil and grief, and not the absence of employment, not inactivity or indolence (<53107>2 Thessalonians 1:7; <58409>Hebrews 4:9,11; <66143>Revelation 14:13; compare 7:17). This deliverance from the evils of our present life includes,

1. Deliverance from this earthly body, the seat of the lower principles of our nature and of our sinful corruption, and the source of so many evils and sufferings (<470601>2 Corinthians 6:1, 2; <461542>1 Corinthians 15:42-50).

2. Entire separation from the society of wicked and evil-disposed persons, who in various ways injure the righteous man and embitter his life on earth (<550418>2 Timothy 4:18). It is hence accounted a part of the felicity even of Christ himself in heaven to be "separate from sinners" (<580726>Hebrews 7:26).

3. Upon this earth everything is inconstant and subject to perpetual change, and nothing is capable of completely satisfying our expectations and desires. But in the world to come it will be different. The bliss of the saints will continue without interruption or change, without fear of termination, and without satiety (<422036>Luke 20:36; <470416>2 Corinthians 4:16,18; <600104>1 Peter 1:4; 5:10; <620302>1 John 3:2 sq.).

II. Besides being exempt from all earthly trials, and having a continuance of that happiness which we had begun to enjoy even here, we have good reason to expect hereafter other rewards and joys, which stand in no natural or necessary connection with the present life; for our entire felicity would be extremely defective and scanty were it to be confined merely to that which we carry with us from the present world, to that peace and joy of soul which result from reflecting on what we may have done which is good and pleasing in the sight of God, since even the best men will always discover great imperfections in all that they have done. Our felicity would also be incomplete were we compelled to stop short with that meager and elementary knowledge which we take with us from this world-that knowledge so broken up into fragments, and yielding so little fruit, and which, poor as it is, many good men, from lack of opportunity, and without any fault on their part, never here acquire. Besides the natural rewards of goodness, there must therefore be others which are *positive*, and dependent on the will of the supreme Legislator.

On this point almost all philosophers are, for the above reasons, agreed — even those who will admit of no *positive punishments* in the world to come. But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of the positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it; for it always represents the joys of

heaven as resulting strictly from *the favor of God,* and as being *undeserved* by those on whom they are bestowed. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions here performed. But on this subject we know nothing more in general than this, that God will so appoint and order our circumstances, and make such arrangements, that the principal faculties of our souls, reason and affection, will be heightened and developed, so that we shall continually obtain more pure and distinct knowledge of the truth, and make continual advances in holiness.

We may remark that in this life God has very wisely allotted various capacities, powers, and talents, in different ways and degrees, to different men, according to the various ends for which he designs them, and the business on which he employs them. Now there is not the least reason to suppose that God will abolish this variety in the future world; it will rather continue there in all its extent. We must suppose, then, that there will be, even in the heavenly world, a diversity of tastes, of labors, and of employments, and that to one person this, to another that field, in the boundless kingdom of truth and of useful occupation, will be assigned for his cultivation, according to his peculiar powers, qualifications, and tastes. A presentiment of this truth is contained in the idea, which was widely diffused throughout the ancient world, viz. that the *manes* will continue to prosecute in the future life the employments to which they had been here accustomed. At least such arrangements will doubtless be made by God in the future life that each individual will there develop more and more the germs implanted within him by the hand of the Creator; and will be able, more fully than he ever could do here, to satisfy the wants of his intellectual nature, and thus to make continual progress in the knowledge of everything worthy of being known, of which he could only learn the simplest elements in this world; and he will be able to do this in such a way that the increase of knowledge will not be detrimental to piety, as it often proves on earth, but rather promotive of it. To the sincere and ardent searcher after truth it is a rejoicing and consoling thought that-he will be able hereafter to perfect that knowledge which here has so many deficiencies (46331 Corinthians 13:9).

But there is danger of going too far on this point, and of falling into strange misconceptions. Various as the tastes and wants of men in the future world will doubtless be, they will still be in many respects different from what they are here, because the whole sphere of action, and the

objects by which we shall there be surrounded, will be different. We shall there have a changed and more perfect body, and by this single circumstance shall be freed at once from many of the wants and inclinations which have their seat in the earthly body. This will also contribute much to rectify, enlarge, and perfect our knowledge. Many things which seem to us very important and essential during this our state of infancy upon earth will hereafter doubtless appear in a different light: we shall look upon them as trifles and children's play, and employ ourselves in more important occupations, the utility and interest of which we have never before imagined.

Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by *immediate divine revelations* (lumen gloriae), especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e.g. children and others who have died in ignorance, for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures, but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made for all such persons in the world to come. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlarging and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the *vision of God* (visio Dei intuitiva, sensitiva, beatifica, comprehensiva). The question is whether the saints will hereafter behold God with the eyes of the mind, i.e. merely know him with the understanding.

But in the Scriptures God is always represented as a being invisible by the bodily eye (ἀόρατος), as, indeed, every spirit is. The texts of Scripture which speak of *seeing God* have been misunderstood: they signify, sometimes, *the more distinct knowledge of God,* as we speak of knowing by seeing, of seeing with the eyes of the mind (<43118>John 1:18; <62302>1 John 3:2; 4:12; comp. 5:20; <54616>1 Timothy 6:16); and Paul uses βλέπειν and γινώσκειν as synonymous (<46132>1 Corinthians 13:12, 13; comp. 5:10). Again, they express the idea *of felicity,* the enjoyment of God's favor, the being thought worthy of his friendship, etc. Still more frequently are both of these meanings comprehended under the phrase *to see God.* The image is taken from Oriental princes, to see whose face and to be in whose presence was esteemed a great favor (Matthew 5, 8; <19074>Hebrews 7:14).

"Without holiness, οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον." The opposite of this is to be removed from God and from his face. But Christ is always represented as one who will be *personally visible* to us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. Herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John 14, 17, etc.); and the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase *being with Christ.* To his guidance has God entrusted the human race, in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2 Corinthians 4:6), we see "the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;" he is "the visible representative of the invisible God" (Colossians 1:15).

According to the representations contained in the holy Scriptures, the saints will dwell together in the future world, and form, as- it were, a kingdom or state of God (Luke 16; 20:38; Romans 8:10; Revelation 7:9; Hebrews 12:22). They will there partake of a common felicity. Their enjoyment will doubtless be very much heightened by friendship, and by their confiding intercourse with each other. We must, however, separate all earthly imperfections from our conceptions of this heavenly society. But that we shall there recognize our former friends, and shall be again associated with them, was uniformly believed by all antiquity. And when we call to mind the affectionate manner in which Christ soothed his disciples by the assurance that they should hereafter see him again, should be with him, and enjoy personal intercourse and friendship with him in that place to which he was going (John 14:3; comp. 1 Peter 1:8), we may gather just grounds for this belief. Paul, indeed, says expressly that we shall be with Christ, in company with our friends who died before us (αυα caiaϟ aaϟol, 1 Thessalonians 4:17); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. *SEE ETERNAL LIFE*.

Heaven And Earth

is an expression for the whole creation (Genesis 1:1). In prophetic language the phase often signifies the political state or condition of persons of different ranks in this world. The heaven of the political world is the sovereignty thereof, whose host and stars are the powers that rule, namely, kings, princes, counselors, and magistrates. The earth is the peasantry, plebeians, or common race of men, who possess no power, but are ruled by superiors. Of such a heaven and earth we may understand mention to be made in Haggai 2:6; 7:21, 22, and referred to in Hebrews 12:26.

Such modes of speaking were used in Oriental poetry and philosophy, which made a heaven and earth in everything, that is, a superior and inferior in every part of nature; and we learn from Maimonides, quoted by Mede, that the Arabians in his time, when they would express that a man was fallen into some great calamity, said, "His heaven has fallen to the earth," meaning his superiority or prosperity is much diminished. "To look for new heavens and a new earth" (<61313>2 Peter 3:13) may mean to look for a new order of the present world.

Heave-offering

(hmWrT] *terumiah'*, from µWr, to be *high;* Sept. usually ἀφαίρεμα*)*, a term including all that the Israelites voluntarily (<022502>Exodus 25:2 sq.; 35:24; 36:3) or according to' a precept (<022915>Exodus 30:15; <031714>Leviticus 7:14; <041519>Numbers 15:19 sq.; 18:27 sq.; 21:29 sq.; comp. <264513>Ezekiel 45:13) contributed of their own property to Jehovah (not as an offering in the usual sense, but) as a present (<234020>Isaiah 40:20), to be applied to the regular cultus, i.e. for the establishment and maintenance of the sanctuary and its accessories (<022502>Exodus 25:2 sq.; 30:13 sq.; 25:5 sq., 21, 24; 26:3, 6; <150825>Ezra 8:25, etc.), or for the support of the priests (<022928>Exodus 29:28; <041808>Numbers 18:8 sq.; 5, 9). Prescribed contributions were, in addition to the annual temple-tax *SEE TEMPLE*, chiefly that share of the booty taken in war which be' longed to the priests (<042129>Numbers 21:29 sq.), the yearly first-fruits (<041519>Numbers 15:19 sq.; comp. <100121>2 Samuel 1:21), and the tenths which the Levites were required to make over to the priests out of the natural tithes paid to them (<041825>Numbers 18:25 sq.; what the Levites retained for their own use not being thus styled). The term hmWrT]seems to stand in a narrower sense in <161037>Nehemiah 10:37; 12:44; 13:3, *SEE FIRSTLING*, and the Talmudists so call only the agricultural first-fruits appropriate to human use, together with the Levitical tenths (see the tract *Terumoth* in the Mishna, 1, 6). Heave-offerings are coupled with first fruits in <262040>Ezekiel 20:40, and with tithes in <390308>Malachi 3:8. In <264501>Ezekiel 45:1; 48:8 sq., 12, 20 sq., the same word is applied to that portion of the Holy Land which is represented as set apart for the maintenance of the sanctuary and the priests. For the care of all such contributions, as well as for voluntary offerings and tithes in general, a special class of officers was (from the time of king Hezekiah) detailed, of whom a higher priest had the superintendence (<142111>2 Chronicles 21:11, 12, 14; <161244>Nehemiah 12:44; 13:5). Heave-offerings could be used or consumed only by the priests and

their children (Numbers 18:19; Leviticus 22:10). Latei regulations are detailed in the Talmudical tract *Terumolth*. *SEE WAVE-OFFERING*.

Heave-shoulder

(hm;WrT]q/v, Sept. βραχίων ἀφαιρέματος.) is the name applied to the (right) shoulder that fell to the priests in the presentation of animals as a thank-offering (Leviticus 7:34; Numbers vi. 20; 18:18), which could be eaten only by such of their families as were in a ceremonially clean state (Leviticus 10:14). *SEE OFFERING*.

Hebard, Elijah

a Methodist Episcopal minister. He was born at Coxsackie, N. Y., Sept. 8,1788; was converted at thirteen; entered the New York Conference in May, 1811; in 1819 was appointed to New Haven; in 1820 and 21 to New York; in 1834 was transferred to Genesee Conference, and stationed at Rochester; was presiding elder on Ontario District in 1837-40; in 1846 he superannuated; and died at Geneva, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1858. He was a diligent student, a sound theologian, and a good scholar in Greek and *Hebrew*. — *Minutes of Conferences, 7,* 205.

He'ber

the name of seven men, with a difference of orthography in the original. *SEE EBER*.

1. EBER (Heb. *E'ber,* r b,[e one of the *other side,* i.e. of the river, q. d. immigrant; Sept. Ἔβερ and Ἤβερ, Vulg. *Heber),* son of Salah, who became the father of Peleg at the age of 34 years, and died at the age of 464 (Genesis 10:24; 11:14; 1 Chronicles 1:25). His name occurs in the genealogy of Christ (Luke 3:35, Ἑβέρ, "Heber"). B.C. 2448-1984. There is a degree of interest connected with him from the notion, which the Jews themselves entertain, that the name of Hebrews, applied to them, was derived from this alleged ancestor of Abraham. No historical ground appears why this name should be derived from him rather than from any other personage that occurs in the catalogue of Shem's descendants; but there are so much stronger objections to every other hypothesis, that this, perhaps, is still the most probable of any which have yet been started. (See Gesenius, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift,* p. 11.) Hence *"the children of Eber"* (r b,[e/nB; Genesis 10:21), and simply in poetry

Eber (רבע; Numbers 24:24; Sept. Ἔβραῖοι, Vulg. *Hebraei)*, i.q. HEBREWS (עברים). Several other persons of this (Heb.) name occur, but no others are anywhere Anglicized "Heber."

2. "EBER" (same Heb. word as above; Sept. Ἰωβήδ, Vulg. *Heber)*, the last-named of the seven chiefs of the Gadites in Bashan (1 Chronicles 5:13, where the name is Anglicized "Heber"). B.C. between 1612 and 1093.

3. "EBER" (same Hebrew word as above; Sept. Ὠβήδ, Vulg. *feber)*, apparently one of the sons of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:22, where the name is Anglicized" Heber"). B.C. ante 598.

4. "HEBER" *(Che'ber,* חבר, *conmunity*, as in Hosea 6:9; Proverbs 21:9; or a *spell*, as in Deuteronomy 18:11; Isaiah 47:9, 12; Sept. Χόβορ, Χοβέρ, Χάβερ), son of Beriah, and grandson of Asher (Genesis 46:17; 1 Chronicles 7:31, 32). B.C. apparently ante 1873. His descendants are called HEBERITES (Heb. *Chebri'*, חברי, Sept. Χοβερί, Numbers 26:45, where the name of the progenitor is written חבר).

5. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Χάβερ, Vulg. *Haber)*, "a descendant of Hobab, which latter was son of Jethro, and brother of the wife of Moses. His wife was the Jael who slew Sisera (B.C. 1409), and he is called Heber the Kenite (Judges 4:11, 17; 5:24), which seems to have been a name for the whole family (Judges 1:16). Heber appears to have lived separate from the rest of the Kenites, leading a patriarchal life amid his tents and flocks. He must have been a person of some consequence, from its being stated that there was peace between the house of Heber and the powerful king Jabin. At the time the history brings him under our notice, his camp was in the plain of Zaanaim, near Kedesh, in Naphtali" *SEE JAKL*; *SEE KENITE*.

6. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Ἀβάρ*)*, apparently a son of Mered (of Judah) by Jehudijah, and "father" of Socho (1 Chronicles 4:18). B.C. post 1612. *SEE MERED*.

7. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Ἀβέρ), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

Heber, Reginald

bishop of Calcutta, was born at Malpas, Cheshire, April 21, 1783. He gave early indications of poetical talent. At thirteen he was placed in the school of a clergyman near London; in November 1800, he was entered at Brasenose College, Oxford, and in the same year he gained the prize for Latin verse. In the spring of 1803 he wrote his prize poem, *Palestine,* which has obtained a permanent place in English literature. In 1804 he became a fellow of All Souls. About the middle of 1805, in company with Mr. John Thornton, he set out on a Continental tour, and spent a year traveling through Russia, the Crimea, Hungary, Austria, and Prussia. In 1807 he took orders, and was instituted by his brother Richard to the family living at Hodnet. Here, as he himself described, he was in a "half-way situation between a parson and a squire." "While discharging the duties of his parish with great fidelity, he was ardently devoted to the pursuits of literature. He was a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly Review* from its commencement. In 1812 he commenced the preparation of a *Dictionary of the Bible,* on which he labored with much delight; but other duties compelled him to suspend this work, and no part of it was ever published. In the same year he published a small volume of *Hymns adapted to the Weekly Church Service* (new ed. London, 1838, 12mo). The composition of his *Hymns,* with a view of improving the psalmody and devotional poetry used in churches, was also a favorite recreation. He was an elegant versifier, and continued to indulge his poetical talents even while engaged in visiting his diocese in India. He had a great distaste for controversial theology, and only once was engaged in a discussion of this kind, in reply to what he conceived were the unwarrantable imputations of a writer in the *British Critic.* His political views were those of the High Church and Tory party, but quite devoid of bitterness. In 1815 he was appointed Bampton lecturer, and the subject he selected was *The Personality and Office of the Christian Comforter* (2nd ed. Lond. 1818, 8vo). In 1817, Dr. Luxmore, the bishop of St. Asaph, appointed Heber to a stall in that cathedral, at the request of his father-in-law the dean. In 1819 he edited the works of bishop Jeremy Taylor (15 vols. 8vo, with *Life of Taylor).* In April, 1822, he was elected preacher of Lincoln's Inn, for which he had formerly been an unsuccessful candidate." In December of

that year, the see of Calcutta, vacated by the death of bishop Middleton, was offered to him, "Twice the offer was declined on account of his wife and child, but immediately after the second refusal he wrote (Jan. 12. 1823) stating his willingness to go to India. He congratulated himself upon the fact that no worldly motives led him to this decision. The prospects of usefulness in so grand a field as India overbore all pecuniary considerations, and they had no influence in determining his conduct when the proposition of going to that country was first made to him. Besides, he had often expressed his liking for such a sphere of action, and he had a lurking fondness for all which belongs to India or Asia." On the 22nd of April he saw Hodnet for the last time, and, after having been consecrated, he embarked for his diocese on the 16th of June 1823. The diocese of Calcutta extended at this time over the whole of India, and embraced Ceylon, the Mauritius, and Australasia. In India the field of the bishop's labors was three times larger than Great Britain and Ireland. The number of chaplains who constituted his staff at Bengal was fixed at twenty-eight, but this number was never completed, and of the number who were appointed several were on furlough. The bishop had no council to assist him, was required to act on his own responsibility, and to write almost every official document with his own hand. On the 15th of June 1824, bishop Heber began the visitation of his vast diocese. He visited nearly every station of importance in the upper provinces of Bengal and north of Bombay, and after an absence from Calcutta of about eleven months, during which he had seldom slept out of his cabin or tent, he arrived at Bombay. The journal which he kept during his visitation (published under the title *Narrative of a Journey in Upper India*, Lond. 1829, 3 vols. 8vo, since reprinted in Murray's *Home and Colonial Library)* shows the extent of his observations on general subjects, and the graphic power which he possessed of describing the novel scenes in which he was placed. From April to August he remained at Bombay to investigate and superintend the interests of the western portion of his diocese. On the 15th of August he sailed for Ceylon, and after remaining there some time he proceeded to Calcutta, which he reached on the 21st of October. If it had been possible to have educated his children in India, he was now prepared, he states, to end his days among the objects of his solicitude. In February, 1826, he left Calcutta for Madras to visit the southern provinces. On the 1st of April he arrived at Trichinopoli, and on the 3rd, after investigating the state of the mission and confirming fifteen natives, on whom he bestowed the episcopal benediction in the Tamul language, he retired to use a cold bath, in which

he was found dead about half an hour afterwards. Within less than three weeks he would have completed his forty-third year. The candor, modesty, and simplicity of bishop Heber's manners, his unwearied earnestness, and his mild and steady zeal, combined with his talents and attainments, had inspired veneration and respect not only among the European, but the native population of India" *(English Cyclopaedia,* s.v.). In theology he was an Arminian. His whole life, after his elevation to the episcopate, was devoted to its great duties. He had a profound faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and of their adaptation to the heathen. His heart daily breathed the most earnest wishes for the diffusion of its precious blessings. His tastes and pursuits were all subordinated to that grand object, and, had he been spared to the usual term of life, there is no doubt that a career, begun in the spirit and prosecuted on the system of itinerancy he had adopted, would have yielded a rich harvest of spiritual fruit to the Lord of his vineyard. Besides the works above mentioned, he published *Parish Sermons* (Lond. 1844, 5th ed. 2 vols. 8vo). His *Poetical Works* are printed in various editions. See *Life of Heber,* by his Widow (Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 4to); Robinson, *Last Days of Heber* (1830, 8vo); *Memoir of Heber,* abridged from the large ed. (Boston, 1856.12mo); Krohn, *H.'s Leben u. Nachrichten über Indien* (Berlin, 1831, 2 vols.); *Quarterly Review* (London), 43, 366; *Edinburgh Review,* 52, 431; Villemain, *Revue des deux Mondes,* Dec. 15,1857; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 606.

He'berite

(Numbers 26:45). *SEE HEBER*, 4.

Hebrew

(Heb. *Ibri* yrb[æ, *plur.* µyrb[æ or µyYrb[æ Exodus 3:18; fem. hYrb[æ "Hebrewess," plur. tWYrb[æ Greek Ἑβραῖος*)*, a designation of the people of Israel, used first of their progenitor Abraham (Genesis 14:13; Sept. τῷ περάτῃ). This name is never in Scripture applied to the Israelites except when the speaker is a foreigner (Genesis 39:14, 17; 41:12; Exodus 1:16; 2:6; 1 Samuel 4:6, 9, etc.), or when Israelites speak of themselves to one of another nation (Genesis 40:15; Exodus 1:19; Jonah 1:9, etc.), or when they are contrasted with other peoples (Genesis 43:32; Exodus 1:3, 7, 15; Deuteronomy 15:12; 1 Samuel 13:3, 7). See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* s.v. (The only apparent exception is Jeremiah 34:9; but here there is probably such an implied

contrast between the Jews and other peoples as would bring the usage under the last case.) By the Greek and Latin writers this is the name by which the descendants of Jacob are designated when they are not called Jews (Pausan. 5. 5,2; 6:24, 6; Plut. *Sympos. 4,* 6, 1; Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 1); and Josephus, who affects classical peculiarities, constantly uses it. In the N.T. we find the same contrast between Hebrews and foreigners (<44601>Acts 6:1; Phil. 3:5): the Hebrew language is distinguished from all others (<42338>Luke 23:38; John 5, 2; 19:13; <44240>Acts 21:40; 26:14; Rev. 9:11); while in <47122>2 Corinthians 11:22 the word is used as only second to *Israelite* in the expression of national peculiarity. On these facts two opposing hypotheses have been raised; the one that Israelite or Jew was the name by which the nation designated itself (just as the Welsh call themselves *Cymry,* though in speaking of themselves to a Saxon they would probably use the name *Welsh);* the other is that "Hebrew" is a national name, merely indicative of the people as a people, while Israelite is a sacred or religious name appropriate to them as the chosen people of God. This latter opinion Gesenius dismisses as "without foundation" *(Lexicon* by Robinson, s.v.), but it has received the deliberate sanction of Ewald *(Ausführl. Lehrb. der Heb. Spr.* p. 18, 5th ed.).

Derivation of the Name. —

I. From Abram, *Abraei,* and by euphony *Hebrcei* (August., Ambrose). Displaying, as it does, the utmost ignorance of the language, this derivation was never extensively adopted, and was even retracted by Augustine *(Retract.* 16). The euphony alleged by Ambrose is quite imperceptible, and there is no parallel in the Lat. *meridie =medidie.*

II. According to the sacred writer, yrb[, *Hebrew, is* a derivative from rb[, Eber, the ancestor of Abraham; at least the same persons who are called Hebrews are called rb[ynb, *sons of Eber* (<01021>Genesis 10:21); and rb[*Eber* (<04224>Numbers 24:24); and this is tantamount to a derivation of the name Hebrew from Eber. In support of this, it may be urged that lrb[is the proper form which a patronymic from rb[would assume; according to the analogy of ybawm, *a Moabite* ynd, *a Danite,* ybylk, *a Calebite,* etc. (Hiller, *Onomast. Sac.* c. 14:p. 231 sq.). What adds much force to this argument is the evident antithesis in <01413>Genesis 14:13, between yrb[h µrba and yrmah armm; the former of these is as evidently a patronymic as the latter. This view is supported by Josephus,

Suidas, Bochart, Vatablus, Drusius,Vossius, Buxtorf, Hottinger, Leusden, Whiston, and Bauer. Theodoret *(Quaest. in Genesis* 61) urges against it that the Hebrews were not the only descendants of Eber, and, therefore, could not appropriate his name; and the objection has often been repeated. To meet it, recourse has been had to the suggestion, first adduced, we believe, by Ibni Ezra *(Comment. ad Jon.* 1, 9), that the descendants of Abraham retained the name Hebrew from Eber, because they alone of his descendants retained the faith which he held. This may be, but we are hardly entitled to *assume* it in order to account for the fact before us. It is better to throw the *onus probandi* on the objector, and to demand of him, in our ignorance of what determined the use of such patronymics in one line of descent and not in others, that he should show cause why it is inconceivable that Abraham might have a good and sufficient reason for wishing to perpetuate the memory of his descent from Eber, which did not apply to the other descendants of that patriarch. Why might not one race of the descendants of Eber call themselves by pre-eminence sons of Eber, just as one race of the descendants of Abraham called themselves by preeminence sons of Abraham. But Eber, it is objected, is a name of no note in the history; we know nothing of him to entitle him to be selected as the person after whom a people should call themselves. But is our ignorance to be the measure of the knowledge of Abraham and his descendants on such a point? Because *we* know nothing to distinguish Eber, does it follow that *they* knew nothing? Certain it is that he was of sufficient importance to reflect a glory on his father Shem, whose highest designation is "the father of all the children of Eber" (<01021>Genesis 10:21); and certain it is that his name lingered for many generations in the region where he resided, for it was as "Eber" that the Mesopotamian prophet knew the descendants of Jacob, and spoke of them when they first made their appearance in warlike force on the borders of the promised land (<04424>Numbers 24:24).

On the other hand, it is contended that the passage <01021>Genesis 10:21 is not so much genealogical as ethnographical; and in this view it seems that the words are intended to contrast Shem with Ham and Japhet, and especially with the former. Now Babel is plainly fixed as the extreme east limit of the posterity of Ham (Genesis 10), from whose land Nimrod went out into Assyria (Genesis 11, margin of A. Vers.): in the next place, Egypt (Genesis 13) is mentioned as the western limit of the same great race; and these two extremes having been ascertained, the historian proceeds (ver. 15-19) to fill

up his ethnographic sketch with the intermediate tribes of the Canaanites. In short, in Genesis 6-20 we have indications of three geographical points which distinguish the posterity of Ham, viz. Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. At the last-mentioned city, at the river Euphrates, their proper occupancy, unaffected by the exceptional movement of Asshur, terminated, and at the same point that of the descendants of Shem began. Accordingly, the sharpest contrast that could be devised is obtained by generally classing these latter nations as those *beyond* the river Euphrates; and the words "father of all the children of Eber," i.e. father of the nations to the east of the Euphrates, find an intelligible place in the context.

It must also be confessed that in the genealogical scheme in <01110>Genesis 11:10-26, it does not appear that the Jews thought of Eber as a source primary, or even secondary of the national descent. The genealogy neither starts from him, nor in its uniform sequence does it rest upon him with any emphasis. There is nothing to distinguish Eber above Arphaxad, Peleg, or Serug. Like them, he is but a link in the chain by which Shem is connected with Abraham. Indeed, the tendency of the Iraelitish retrospect is to stop at Jacob. It is with Jacob that their history as a nation begins: beyond Jacob they held their ancestry in common with the Edomites; beyond Isaac they were in danger of being confounded with the Ishmaelites. The predominant figure of the emphatically *Hebrew* Abraham might tempt them beyond those points of affinity with other races, so distasteful, so anti-national; but it is almost inconceivable that they would voluntarily originate and perpetuate an appellation of themselves which landed them on a platform of ancestry where they met the whole population of Arabia (<01025>Genesis 10:25, 30).

III. Hence others (as Jerome, Theodoret, Origen, Chrysostom, Arias Montanus, R. Bechai, Paul Burg., Munster, Grotius, Scaliger, Selden, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Eichhorn) prefer tracing yrb[to the verb rbi[; *to pass over,* or the noun rb,[e *the region or country beyond,*. By those who favor the former etymology, "Hebrew" is regarded s equivalent to "the man who passed over;" by those who favor the latter, it is taken to mean "the man from the region beyond;" and under both suppositions it is held to be applied by the Canaanites to Abraham as having crossed the Euphrates, or come; from the region beyond the Euphrates to Canaan. Of' these etymologies the former is now generally abandoned; it is felt that the supposition that the crossing: of the Euphrates was such an unparalleled

achievement as to fix on him who accomplished it a name that should descend to his posterity, and become a national appellation, is somewhat too violent to be maintained; and, besides, as the verb רבע signifies to pass from *this* side to *that,* not from *that* side to *this,* it would not be the term applied by the people of Canaan to designate the act of one who had come from the other side of the Euphrates to them. The other etymology has more in its favor. It is that sanctioned by the Greek translators (Sept. ὁ περάτης, Aq. περαίτης*);* it is in accordance with the usage of the phrase הרהנ רבע which was employed to designate the region beyond the Euphrates (<062402>Joshua 24:2, 3; <100216>2 Samuel 10:16; <131916>1 Chronicles 19:16); and it is not improbable that Abraham, coming among the Canaanites from beyond the Euphrates, might be designated by them "the man from the region beyond," just as Europeans might call an American "a transatlantic." But, though Bleek very confidently pronounces this view "without doubt the right one" *(Einleitung ins A. T.* p. 72), it is open to serious, if not fatal objections.

1. There is no instance of רבע by itself denoting the region beyond the Euphrates, or any other river; the phrase invariably used is הרהנ רבע. Rosenmüller following Hyde *(Histor. Relig. Vet. Pers.* p. 51), seeks to supply this desiderated instance by taking רבע as epexegetically of רשא in <042424>Numbers 24:24 — " affligant Assyriam et totam transfluvialem regionem." But the learned writer has in his zeal overlooked the second ומע, which quite precludes his exegesis. Knobel avoids this error by simply taking רשא =Assyria, and רבע =Mesopotamia; but in this case it is the proper name רבע, *Eber,* and not the preposition רבע, *trans,* which is in question.

2. If ירבע was the proper designation of those who lived on the other side of the Euphrates, we should find that name applied to such as *continued* to dwell there, not to a race descended from one who had left that region never to return.

3. Though Abraham, as having been originally a transfluvian, might be so called by the Canaanites, it is improbable that they should have extended this name to his posterity, to whom it in no sense applied. No one would think of continuing the term "transatlantic" to persons born in. Britain on the ground that a remote ancestor had come from across the Atlantic to settle in that country! As to the sanction which this etymology derives from

the Sept., no great weight can be attached to that when we remember how often these translators have erred in this way; and also that they have given *i3paioaj* as the rendering of rb[ynb in Numbers 24:24; "Plus vice simplici hallucinati sunt interpretes Graeci eorum ut nobis standum cadendumve non sit autoritate" (Carpzov, *Crit. Sac. V. T.* p. 171). We may add that the authority of the Sept. and Aquila on such a point is urged with a bad grace by those who treat with contempt the etymologies of the Hebrew text as resting on mere Jewish tradition; if a Jewish tradition of the time of Moses is subject to suspicion, *afortiori* is one of the age of Ptolemy Lagi and of Alexandrian origin. Ewald pronounces this derivation "quite uncertain." 4. This derivation is open to the strong objection that Hebrew nouns ending in y are either patronymics or gentilic nouns (Buxtorf, Leusden). This is a technical objection which-though fatal to the περάτης, or *appellative* derivation as traced back to the verb-does not apply to the same as referred to the noun rb[. The analogy of Galli, Angli, Hispani, derived from Gallia, Anglia, Hispania (Leusden), is a complete blunder in ethnography; and, at any rate, it would confirm rather than destroy the derivation from the noun.

IV. Parkhurst, whose works occasionally present suggestions worth consideration, has advanced the opinion that yrb[is a derivation from the verb rb[in the sense *of passing through or from place to place* (compare Genesis 18:5; Exodus 32:27; Ezekiel 35:7; 2 Chronicles 30:10, etc.); so that its meaning would be *a sojourner* or *passer through,* as distinct from a *settler* in the land. This undoubtedly exactly describes the condition of Abraham and his immediate descendants, and might very naturally be assumed by them as a designation; for, as the apostle says, "they confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Hebrews 11:13). In this case the statement in Genesis 10:21; Numbers 24:24, must be understood as referring to the posterity of Eber generally, and not to the Hebrews specially or exclusively. The most serious objection to Parkhurst's suggestion arises from the form of the word yrb[. A word from rb[, to convey the meaning of *transitor,* or *one passing through,* we should expect to find in the form yb#[or rb#o

On the whole. the derivation of *Ibri* (Hebrew) from *Eber* seems to have most in its favor and least against it. (See on this side Augustine, *De Civit. Dei, 6,* 11; Buxtorf, *Diss. 3,* 27; Bochart, *Phaleg,* 2, 14; Hottinger, *Thes.*

Phil. p. 4; Leusden, *Phil. Heb.* Diss. 21; Morinus, *De Ling. Primcev.* p. 64; Pfeiffer, *Diff. Script. Locc., Opp.* p. 49; Carpzov, *Crit. Sac.* p. 165; Hezel, *Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr.* sec. 4; *Ewald, Asfiihrl. Lehrbuch der Heb. Gram.* p. 19, 5th edit.; *Geschichte des V. Israel,* 1, 334; Havernick, *Introd. to the O.T.* p. 125; Baumgarten, *Theol. Comment. sum Pent.* ad loc. On the other side, see Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genesis* 16; Chrysostom, *Hom.* 35 *in Genesis;* Selden, *De Diis Syris,* p. 13; Walton, *Proleg.* p. 15 sq., in Dathes edit. p. 68; Gussetius, *Comment. Ling. Heb.* Diss. Proem. p, 7; Michaelis, *Spicileg. Geogr. Heb. Ext.* 2, 66; Gesenius, *Gesoh. der Heb. Spr.* p. 11; *Grammar,* sec. 2.) *SEE JEW*.

Hebrew Of The Hebrews

(Ἑβραῖος ἐξ ̔ Εβραίων, emphatically a Hebrew, one who was so by both parents, and that by a long series of ancestors, without admixture of Gentile or even proselyte blood. In this way the Hebrews formed a superlative of intensity-as "holy of holies," i.e. the most holy place; "vanity of vanities," i.e. exceedingly vain; "heaven of heavens," i.e. the highest heaven. Hence Paul, when speaking of the ground of precedence which he might claim above the false teachers at Philippi, says that *"he is a Hebrew of the Hebrews"* (Phil. 3:5), i.e. one of full Hebrew descent, and acquainted with the Hebrew language. Although he was born at Tarsus, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem (<442203>Acts 22:3). To this same fact he seems to appeal again in a similar case, *"Are they Hebrews? so am I"* (<471122>2 Corinthians 11:22). He was a *genuine* Hebrew man in *every* important respect (<442139>Acts 21:39, 40).

Hebrews, The

(<440601>Acts 6:1), i.e. Hebrew-speaking Jews, in contrast with those speaking the Greek language. *SEE HELLENIST*.

Hebrew Language

the language of the Hebrew people, and of the Old-Testament Scriptures, with the exception of the few chapters written in Chaldee. *SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE*. The importance of this subject in a religious and especially an exegetical aspect justifies a somewhat copious treatment of it here. (See Ewald's *Hebrew Grammar,* § 1-18, 135-160.)

In the Bible this language is nowhere designated by the name *Hebrew*, but this is not surprising when we consider how rarely that name is employed to designate the nation. *SEE HEBREW*. If we except the terms "lip of Canaan" (ˆ[nk tpc) in <231918>Isaiah 19:18-where the diction is of an elevated character, and is so far no evidence that this designation was the one commonly employed-the only name by which the Hebrew language is mentioned in the Old Testament is "Jewish" (tydwhy used adverbially, *Judaiae, in Jewish,* <121826>2 Kings 18:26, 28; <233611>Isaiah 36:11, 13; <142813>2 Chronicles 32:18 [in <160124>Nehemiah 13:24, perhaps the *Aramaic* is meant]), where the feminine may be explained as an abstract of the last formation, according to Ewald's *Hebrews Gram.* § 344,457, or as referring to the usual gender of ˆwvl understood. In a strict sense, however, "Jewish" denotes the idiom of the kingdom of Judah, which became the predominant one after the deportation of the ten tribes. It is in the Greek writings of the later Jews that "Hebrew" is first applied to the language, as in the ἑβραϊστί of the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and in the γλῶσσα τῶν Εβραίων of Josephus. (The ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος of the New Testament. is used in contradistinction to the idiom of the Hellenist Jews, and does not mean the *ancient* Hebrew language, but the then vernacular Aramaic dialect of Palestine.) Our title to use the designation *Hebrew* language is therefore founded on the fact that the nation which spoke this idiom was properly distinguished by the ethnographical name of *Hebrews.*

The Hebrew language belongs to the class of languages called Shemitic-so called because spoken chiefly by nations enumerated in Scripture among the descendants of Shem. The Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, with the Germanic and Celtic languages, are the principal members of another large class or group of languages, to which have been affixed the various names of Japhetic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, and Aryan. This latter class embraces most of the languages of Europe, including of course our own. The student, therefore, who, besides mastering his own language, has passed through a course of Greek, Latin, French, and German (and few of our students, except with a professional view, extend their linguistic studies farther), has not, after all his labor, got beyond the limits of the same class of languages to which his mother tongue belongs, and of which it forms one of the most important members. But when he passes to the study of the Hebrew language he enters a new field, he observes new phenomena, he traces the operation of new laws.

I. *Characteristics of the Shemitic Languages, and in particular of the Hebrew. —*

1. With respect to *sounds,* the chief peculiarities are the four following:

(1.) The predominance *of guttural* sounds. The Hebrew has four or (we may say) five guttural sounds, descending from the slender and scarcely perceptible throat breathing represented by the first letter of the alphabet (a) through the decided aspirate h, to the strong j and gurgling [. To these we must add r which partakes largely of the guttural character. Nor were these sounds sparingly employed; on the contrary, they were in more frequent use than any other class of letters. In the Hebrew dictionary the four gutturals occupy considerably more than a fourth part of the whole volume, the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three fourths. This predominance of guttural sounds must have given a very marked character to the ancient Hebrew, as it does still to the modem Arabic.

(2.) The use of the very strong letters f, x, q, which may be represented by *tt* or *ts, q,* in pronouncing which the organ is more compressed and the sound given forth with greater vehemence. These letters, especially the last two, are also in frequent use.

When the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phoenicians, they softened or dropped these strong letters (f being softened into θ, and x, q being dropped except as marks of number), and changed the guttural letters into the vowels α, ε, η, o

(3.) The Shemitic languages do not admit, like the Indo-European, of an accumulation or grouping of consonants around a single vowel sound. In such words as *craft, crush, grind, strong, stretch,* we find four, five, and six consonants clustering around a single vowel.' The Shemitic languages reject such groupings, usually interposing a vowel sound more or less distinct after each consonant. It is only at the end of a word that two consonants may stand together without any intermediate vowel sound; and even in that case various expedients are employed to dispense with a combination which is evidently not in accordance with the genius of the language.

(4.) The vowels, although thus copiously introduced, are nevertheless kept in strict subordination to the consonants; so much so that it is only in rare

and exceptional cases that any word or syllable begins with a vowel. In Hebrew we have no such syllables as *ab, ag, ad,* in which the initial sound is a pure vowel; but only *ba, ga, da.* If Sir H. Rawlinson is correct, it would appear that the Assyrian language differed from the other Shemitic languages in this particular. In his syllabic alphabet a considerable number of the syllables begin with a vowel.

If we endeavor to calculate the effect of the foregoing peculiarities on the character of the language, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Shemitic languages are of a more primitive type than the European-much less matured, polished, compacted-the natural utterance of a mind vehement and passionate, impulsive rather than calmly deliberative.

2. With respect to *roots and words,* the Shemitic languages are distinguished in a very marked manner:

(1.) *By the three-letter root.* This is one of the most striking characteristics of these languages, as it does not appear that there is any language not belonging to this class in the formation of whose roots the same law has been at work. It is very difficult to ascertain the origin of this singular phenomenon. It may possibly be regarded as a kind of equivalent for the compound roots of other languages (which are altogether wanting in the Shemitic); an original *two-letter* root being enlarged and expanded into a greater or less number of *three-letter* roots, for the purpose of giving expression to the various modifications and shades of the primitive root idea. The attempt has indeed been made, and with no small measure of success, to point out and specify the two-letter roots from which the existing three-letter roots have been derived; but it has been properly remarked that such an investigation carries us quite away from the Shemitic province. When we reach the two letter root we have left behind us the Shemitic languages altogether, and drawn forth a new language, which might be regarded, did we not know that the most ancient is not always the most simple, as the one primeval language of mankind. By “three-letter roots” We mean those having three consonants forming a dissyllable, and we must except from our remarks those containing the so-called weak letters, which assimilate themselves very strongly to the monosyllabic roots of primitive verbs in the Indo-European group of languages. See PHILOLOGY, COMPARATIVE.

(2.) The consideration of the Hebrew three-letter root, and its possible growth out of a more original two-letter root, leads on to the notice of

another prominent feature of the Shemitic languages, viz. *the further growth and expansion of the three-letter root itself into a variety of what are called conjugational forms, expressing intensity, reflexiveness, causation,* etc. A similar formation may be traced in all languages; in some non-Shemitic languages, as the Turkish, it is very largely and regularly developed (Max Miller, *Lectures on Science of Language,* p. 318, etc.). In English we have examples in such verbs as *sit* and *set, lie* and *lay, set* being the causative *of sit, lay* of *lie;* or we may say *sit* is the reflexive *of set,* and *lie* of *lay.* So in Latin *sedo and sedeo, jacio andja. ceo,* etc., in which latter root the conjugational formation is still farther developed into *jacto* and *jactito.* But what in these languages is fragmentary and occasional, in Hebrew and the cognate languages is carried out and expanded with fullness and regularity, and consequently occupies a large space in the Shemitic grammar. The conjugations are of three sorts:

(a) Those expressing *intensity, repetition,* etc., which are usually distinguished by some change *within* the root;

(b) those expressing *reflexiveness, causation,* etc., which are usually distinguished by some *addition to* the root;

(c) the *passives,* distinguished by the presence of the *u* or *o* sound in the first syllable.

(3.) Another prominent distinction of the Shemitic languages is *the extent to which modifications of the root idea are indicated, not by additions to the root, but by changes within the root.* "The Shemitic roots," says Bopp *(Comparative Grammar of the Indo European Tongues,* i, 99), "on account of their construction, possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal molding of the root, while the Sanskrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions." These internal changes are principally of two sorts:

(a) *Vowel changes.* Nothing is more remarkable in the Shemitic languages than the significance of their vowel sounds; the sharp *a* sound, formed by opening the mouth wide, being associated as a symbol with the idea of activity, while the e and *o* sounds are the symbols of rest and passiveness. In the Arabic verb this characteristic is very marked, many of the roots appearing under three forms, each having a different vowel, and the signification being modified in

accordance with the nature of that vowel. The same law appears in the formation of the passives. Thus *katala-pass. kutela.*

(b) *Doubling of consonants,* usually of the middle letter of the root. By means of this most simple and natural device, the Shemitic languages express *intensity* or *repetition* of action, and also such qualities as prompt to repeated action, as *righteous, merciful,* etc. By comparing this usage with the expression of the corresponding ideas in our own language, we observe at once the difference in the genius of the two languages. We say *merciful, sinful,* i.e. full of mercy, full of sin. Not so the Shemitic. What we express formally by means of an added root, the Shemitic indicates by a sign, by simply laying additional stress on one of the root letters. And thus again the observation made under the head *sound* recurs, viz. that in the formation of the Shemitic languages the dominant influence was that of instinctive feeling, passion, imagination-the hand of nature appearing everywhere, the voice of nature heard in every utterance: in this, how widely separated from the artificial and highly organized languages of the Indo-European family (Adelung, *Mithridates,* 1, 361).

(4.) The influence of the imagination on the structure of the Shemitic languages is further disclosed *in the view which they present of nature and of time.* To these languages a neuter gender is unknown. All nature viewed by the Shemitic eye appears instinct with life. *The heavens declare God's glory; the earth showeth his handiwork. The trees of the field clap their hands and sing for joy.* This, though the impassioned utterance of the Hebrew poet, expresses a common national feeling, which finds embodiment even in the structure of the national language. Of inanimate nature the Hebrew knows nothing: he sees life everywhere. His language therefore rejects the neuter gender, and classes all objects, even those which we regard as inanimate, as masculine or feminine, according as they appear to his imagination to be endowed with male or female attributes. As his imagination thus endowed the lower forms of nature with living properties, so, on the other hand, under the same influence, he clothed with material and sensible form the abstract, the spiritual, even the divine. In Hebrew the abstract is constantly expressed by the concrete-the mental quality by the bodily member which was regarded as its fittest representative. Thus *hand* or *arm* stands for *strength;* ãa, *nostril,* means also *anger;* the *shining of the face* stands for *favor and acceptance,* the *falling of the face* for *displeasure.* So also to *say* often means to *think;* to

speak with one mouth stands for *to be of the same sentiment.* The verb to *go* is employed to describe *mental* as well as bodily *progress.* One's *course of life* is his *way, the path of his feet.* Nor only in its description of nature, but also in its *mode of indicating time,* do we observe the same predominant influence. The Shemitic tense system, especially as it appears in Hebrew, is extremely simple and primitive. It is not threefold like ours, distributing time into past, present, and future, but twofold. The two so-called *tenses* or rather *states* of the verb correspond to the division of nouns into abstract and concrete. The verbal idea is conceived of either in its realization or in its non-realization, whether actual or ideal. That which lies before the mind as realized, whether in the actual past, present, or future, the Hebrew describes by means of the so-called preterit tense; that which he conceives of as yet to be realized or in process of realization, whether in the actual past, present, or future, he describes by means of the so-called future tense. Hence the use of the future in certain combinations as a historical tense, and of the so-called preterit in certain combinations as a prophetic tense. Into the details of the tense usages which branch out from this primitive idea we cannot now enter. It is in the structural laws of the Hebrew language that its influence is most strongly marked: in the Aramsean it is almost lost. (See Ewald, *Lehrbuch, §* 134 *a; Journal of Sacred Literature* for Oct. 1849.)

(5.) The influence of the imagination upon the structure of the Shemitic languages may also be traced in the *absence of not a few grammatical forms which we find in other languages.* Much that is definitely expressed in more highly developed languages is left in the Shemitic languages, and especially in the Hebrew, to be caught up by the hearer or reader. In this respect there is an analogy between the language itself and the mode in which it was originally represented in writing. Of the language as written, the vowel sounds formed no part. The reader must supply these mentally as he goes along. So with the language itself. It has not a separate and distinct expression for every shade and turn of thought. Much is left to be filled in by the hearer or the reader, and this usually without occasioning any serious inconvenience or difficulty. The Shemitic languages, however, do not all stand on the same level in this respect. In the Syriac, and still more in the Arabic, the expression of thought is usually more complete and precise than in Hebrew, though often for that very reason less animated and impressive. A principal defect in these languages, and especially in the Hebrew, is the fewness of the particles. The extreme simplicity of the

verbal formation also occasions to the European student difficulties which can be surmounted only by a very careful study of the principles by which the verb-usages are governed.

In this respect the Hebrew occupies a middle position between those languages which consist almost entirely of roots with a very scanty grammatical development, and the Indo-European class of languages in which the attempt is made to give definite expression even to the most delicate shades of thought. The Greek, says Paul, seeks after wisdom: he reasons, compares, analyzes. The Jew requires a sign-something to strike the imagination and carry conviction to the heart at once without any formal and lengthened argument. The Greek language, therefore, in its most perfect form, was the offspring of reason and taste; the Hebrew, of imagination and intuition. The Shemites have been the quarriers whose great rough blocks the Japhethites have cut, and polished, and fitted one to another. The former, therefore, are the teachers of the world in religion, the latter in philosophy. This peculiar character of the Shemitic mind is very strongly impressed upon the language.

A national language being an embodiment and picture of the national mind, there is thus thrown around the otherwise laborious and uninteresting study of grammar, even in its earliest stages, an attractive power and value which would not otherwise belong to it. It was the same mind that found expression in the Hebrew language, which gave birth, under the influence of divine inspiration, to the sublime revelations of the Old Testament Scriptures. And it would be easy to trace an analogy between these revelations and the language in which they have been conveyed to us. It is curious to find that even the divinest thoughts and names of the Old Testament connect themselves with questions in Hebrew grammar. Thus, when we investigate the nature and use of the Hebrew plural, and discover from a multitude of examples that it is employed not only to denote *plurality,* but likewise *extension,* whether in space or time, as in the Hebrew words for *life, youth, old age,* etc., and also whatever seems bulky before the mind, we are unwittingly led on to one of the most important questions in the criticism of the Old Testament, viz. the origin of the plural form of the divine name µyh l a *(Elohim),* in our version rendered *God.* Or, again, when we study the difficult question of the *tenses,* and endeavor to determine the exact import and force of each, we speedily discover that the grammatical investigation we are pursuing is one of unspeakable moment, for it involves the right apprehension of that most sacred name of

God which the Jew still refuses to take upon his lips, the four-letter name hwhy, *Jehovah* (q.v.).

3. In the *syntax and general structure* of the Shemitic languages and writings we trace the operation of the same principles, the same tendencies of mind which manifest themselves in the structure of *words.* In this respect the Hebrew language exhibits a more simple and primitive type than any of the sister tongues. The simplicity of the Hebrew composition is very obvious even to the reader of the English Bible, or to the scholar who compares the Greek Testament, the style of which is formed on the model of the Old Testament, with the classical Greek writers. We observe at once that there is no such thing as the building up of a lengthened period, consisting of several propositions duly subordinated and compacted so as to form a harmonious and impressive whole. Hebrew composition consists rather of a succession of co-ordinate propositions, each of which is for the moment uppermost in the view of the speaker or writer, until it is superseded by that which follows. This results at once from the character of the Shemitic mind, which was more remarkable for rapid movements and vivid glances than for large and comprehensive grasp. Such a mind would give forth its thoughts in a rapid succession of independent utterances rather than in sustained and elaborated composition. It is a consequence of the same mental peculiarity that the highest poetry of the Shemitic nations is lyrical.

The Hebrew composition is also extremely *pictorial* in its character-not the poetry only, but also the prose. In the history the past is not described, it is painted. It is not the ear that hears, it is rather the eye that sees. The course of events is made to pass before the eye; the transactions are all acted over again. The past is not a fixed landscape, but a moving panorama. The reader of the English Bible must have remarked the constant use of the word *behold,* which indicates that the writer is himself, and wishes to make his reader also, a spectator of the transactions he describes. The use of the tenses in the Hebrew historical writings is especially remarkable. To the young student of Hebrew the constant use of the *future* tense in the description of the *past* appears perhaps the most striking peculiarity of the language. But the singular phenomenon admits of an easy explanation. It was because the Hebrew viewed and described the transactions of the past, not as all past and done, but as in actual process and progress of evolvement, that he makes such frequent use of the so-called future. In imagination he quits his own point of time, and lives over the past. With his

reader he sails down the stream of time, and traces with open eye the winding course of history. It is impossible always to reproduce exactly in English this peculiarity of the Hebrew Bible.

Further, in writing even of the commonest actions, as that one *went, spoke, saw*, etc., the Hebrew is not usually satisfied with the simple statement that the thing was done, he must describe also the process of doing. We are so familiar with the style of our English Bibles that we do not at once perceive the pictorial character of such expressions as these, recurring in every page: *he arose and went; he opened his lips and spake; he put forth his hand and took; he lifted up his eyes and saw; he lifted up his voice and wept.* But what we do not consciously perceive we often unconsciously feel; and doubtless it is this painting of events which is the source of part at least of the charm with which the Scripture narrative is invested to all pure and simple minds.

The same effect is also produced by the *symbolical way of representing mental states and processes* which distinguishes the Hebrew writers. Such expressions as *to bend* or *incline the ear* for "to hear attentively," to *stiffen the neck* for "to be stubborn and rebellious," to *uncover the ear* for "to reveal," are in frequent use. Even the acts of the Divine Mind are depicted in a similar way. In the study especially of the Old Testament we must keep this point carefully in view, lest we should err by giving to a symbolical expression a literal interpretation. Thus, when we read (Exodus 33:11) that "the Lord spake unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend," we must remember that it was a Hebrew who wrote these words, one who was accustomed to depict to himself and others the spiritual under material symbols, and thus we shall be guarded against irreverently attaching to them a meaning which they were never intended to bear. But, though such modes of expression are open to misapprehension by us whose minds are formed in so very different a mould, nevertheless, when rightly understood, they have the effect of giving us a more clear and vivid impression of the spiritual ideas which they embody than could be conveyed to us by any other mode of representation or expression.

The simplicity and naturalness of the language further appears in the prominence which is constantly given to the word or words embodying the leading idea in a sentence or period. Thus the noun stands before the adjective, the predicate stands before the subject, unless the latter be especially emphatic, in which case it is not only put first, but may stand by

itself as a nominative absolute without any syntactical connection with the rest of the sentence.

The constant use of the *oratio directa* is also to be specially noted, as an indication of the primitive character of the language. The Hebrew historian does not usually inform us that such and such a person said such and such things; he actually, as it were, produces the parties and makes them speak for themselves. To this device (if it may be so called) the Bible history owes much of its freshness and power of exciting and sustaining the interest of its readers. No other history could be so often read without losing its power to interest and charm.

Lastly, in a primitive language, formed under the predominating influence of imagination and emotion, we may expect to meet with many elliptical expressions, and also with many redundancies. Not a little which we think it necessary formally to express in words, the Hebrew allowed to be gathered from the context; and, conversely, the Hebrew gave expression to not a little which we omit. For example, nothing is more common in Hebrew than the omission of the verb *to be* in its various forms; and, on the other hand, a very striking characteristic of the Hebrew style is the constant use of the forms yhiw] hyhiw], *and it came to pass and it shall come to pass,* which, in translating into English, may be altogether omitted without any serious loss. In the Hebrew prose, also, we often meet with traces of that echoing of thought and expression which forms one of the principal characteristics of the poetic style; as in Genesis 6:22, "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him-so *did he;"* and similar passages, in which we seem to have two different forms of recording the same fact combined into one, thus: "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him;" "According to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he."

II. *History of the Hebrew Language. —*

1. Its Origin. — The extant historical notices on this point carry us back to the age of Abraham, but no further. The best evidences which we possess as to the form of the Hebrew language prior to its first historical period tend to show that Abraham, on his entrance into Canaan, found the language then prevailing among almost all the different tribes inhabiting that country to be in at least dialectical affinity with his own. This is gathered from the following facts: that nearly all the names of places and

persons relating to those tribes admit of Hebrew etymologies; that, amid all the accounts of the intercourse of the Hebrews with the nations of Canaan, we find no hint of a diversity of idiom; and that even the comparatively recent remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages bear a manifest affinity to the Hebrew. But whether the Hebrew language, as seen in the earliest books of the Old Test., is the very dialect which Abraham *brought with him* into Canaan, or whether it was the common tongue of the Canaanitish nations, which Abraham only *adopted* from them, and which was afterwards developed to greater fullness under the peculiar moral and political influences to which his posterity were exposed, are questions which, in the absence of conclusive arguments, are generally discussed with some dogmatical prepossessions. Almost all those who support the first view contend also that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. S. Morinus *(Ling. Princaev.)* and Loscher *(De Causis Ling. Hebr.)* are among the best champions of this opinion; but Havernick has more recently advocated it with such modifications as make it more acceptable *(Einleit. in das Alte Test.* 1, 1, 148 sq.). The principal argument on which they depend is that, as the most important proper names in the first part of Genesis (as Cain, Seth, and others) are evidently founded on Hebrew etymologies, the essential connection of these names with their etymological origins involves the historical credibility of the records themselves, and leaves no room for any other conclusion than that the Hebrew language is coeval with the earliest history of man. The evidence on the other side is scanty, but not without weight.

(1.) In <05265>Deuteronomy 26:5, Abraham is called a Syrian or Aramean (yMarea), from which we naturally conclude that Syriac was his mother tongue, especially when we find,

(2.) from <013147>Genesis 31:47, that Syriac or Chaldee was the language spoken by Laban, the grandson of Nahor, Abraham's brother. Moreover, it has been remarked

(3.) that in <231918>Isaiah 19:18, the Hebrew is actually called the *language of Canaan;* and

(4.) that the language itself furnishes internal evidence of its Palestinian origin in the word µy; *sea*, which' means also *the west,* and has this meaning in the very earliest documents.

(5.) Finally, Jewish tradition, whatever weight may be attached to it, points to the same conclusion (Gesenius, *Geschichte,* sect. 6:4).

If we inquire further how it was that the Canaanites, of the race of Ham, spoke a language so closely allied to the languages spoken by the principal members of the Shemitic family of nations, we shall soon discover that the solution of this difficulty is impossible with our present means of information; it lies beyond the historic period. It may be that long before the migration of Abraham a Shemitic race occupied Palestine; and that, as Abraham adopted the language of the Canaanites, so the Canaanites themselves had in like manner adopted the language of that earlier race whom they gradually dispossessed, and eventually extirpated or absorbed. However this may be, leaving speculation for fact, is it not possible to discover a wise purpose in the selection of the language of Tyre and Sidon — the great commercial cities of antiquity as the language in which was to be embodied the most wonderful revelation of himself and of his law which God made to the ancient world? When we remember the constant intercourse which was maintained by the Phoenicians with the most distant regions both of the East and of the West, it is impossible to doubt that the sacred books of the Hebrews, written in a language almost identical with the Phoenician, must have exercised a more important influence on the Gentile world than is usually acknowledged.

Of course the Canaanitish language, when adopted by the Hebrews, did not remain unchanged. Having become the instrument of the Hebrew mind, and being employed in the expression of new and very peculiar ideas, it must have been modified considerably thereby. How far may possibly be yet ascertained, should accident or the successful zeal of some explorer bring to light the more ancient monuments of the Phoenician nation, which may still have survived the entombment of centuries.

2. *Influences modifying the Form of the Hebrew Language, and the Style of the Hebrew Writings. —*

(1.) *Time.*

The history of the Hebrew language, as far as we can trace its course by the changes in the diction of the documents in which it is preserved, may here be conveniently divided into that of the period preceding and that of the period succeeding the Exile. If it be a matter of surprise that the thousand years which intervened between Moses and the Captivity should

not have produced sufficient change in the language to warrant its history during that time being distributed into subordinate divisions, the following considerations may excuse this arrangement. It is one of the signal characteristics of the Hebrew language, as seen in all the books prior to the Exile, that, notwithstanding the existence of some isolated but important archaisms, such as in the form of the pronoun, etc. (the best collection of which may be seen in Havernick, c. p. 183 sq.), it preserves an unparalleled general uniformity of structure. The extent to which this uniformity prevails may be estimated either by the fact that it has furnished many modern scholars, who reason from the analogies discovered in the changes in other languages in a given period, with an argument to show that the Pentateuch could not have been written at so remote a date as is generally believed (Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebr. Sprache, §* 8), or by the conclusion, a *fortiori,* which Havernick, whose express object is to vindicate its received antiquity, candidly concedes, that "the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are the *earliest* in which the language differs sensibly from that in the historical portions of the Pentateuch" *(Einleit.* 1, 180). — Even those critics who endeavor to bring down the Pentateuch as a whole to a comparatively late date allow that a portion at least of its contents is to be assigned to the age of Moses (Ewald, *Lehrbuch,* sec. 2, c): and thus, unless it can be shown that this most ancient portion bears in its language and style the stamp of high antiquity, and is distinguished in a very marked manner from the other portions of the Pentateuch (which has not been shown), the phenomenon still remains un-explained. But, indeed, the phenomenon is by no means unexampled. It does not stand alone. — It is said, for example, that the Chinese language displays the same tenacity and aversion to change still more decidedly, the books of the great teacher Confucius being written in language not essentially different from that of his commentators fifteen hundred years later. So we are informed by a writer of the 15th century that the Greeks, at least the more cultivated class, even in his day spoke the language of Aristophanes and Euripides, maintaining the ancient standard of elegance and purity (Gibbon, 8:106). Or, to take another example more closely related to the Hebrew, it is well known that the written Arabic of the present day does not differ greatly from that of the first centuries after Mohammed. In each of the cases just mentioned, it is probable that the language was as it were stereotyped by becoming the language of books held in highest esteem and reverence, diligently studied by the learned, frequently committed to memory, and adopted as a model of style by succeeding writers. Now, may not the

sacred writings of the Mosaic age have had a similar influence on the written Hebrew of the following ages, which continued undisturbed till the Captivity, or even later? We know how greatly the translations of the Bible into English and German have affected the language and literature of England and Germany ever since they were given to the world. But among a people like the ancient Hebrews, living to a certain extent apart from other nations, with a literature of no great extent, and a learned class specially engaged in the study and transcription of the sacred writings, we may well suppose that the influence of these writings upon the form of the national language must have been much more decided and permanent. The learned men would naturally adopt in their compositions the language of the books which had been their study from youth, and large portions of which they were probably able to repeat from memory. Thus the language of these old books, though it might differ in some respects from that spoken by the common people, would naturally become the language of the learned and of books, especially of those books on sacred subjects, such as have alone come down to us from ancient Israel. In explanation of the fact under discussion, appeal has also been made *(a)* to the permanence of Eastern customs, and *(b)* to the simple structure of the Hebrew language, which rendered it less liable to change than other more largely developed languages (see Ewald, *Heb. Gram.* § 7). It has also been remarked that some of the peculiarities of the early writings may be concealed from view by the uniformity of the system of punctuation adopted and applied to the Scriptures by the Hebrew grammarians.

In the canonical books belonging to the first period the Hebrew language thus appears in a state of mature development. Although it still preserves the charms of freshness and simplicity, yet it has attained great regularity of formation, and such a precision of syntactical arrangement as insures both energy and distinctness. Some common notions of its laxity and indefiniteness have no other foundation than the very inadequate scholarship of the persons who form them. A clearer insight into the organism of language absolutely, joined to such a study of the cognate Syro-Arabian idioms as would reveal the secret, but no less certain, laws of its syntactical coherence, would show them to what degree the simplicity of Hebrew is compatible with grammatical precision. One of the most remarkable features in the language of this period is the difference which distinguishes the diction of poetry from that of prose. This difference consists in the use of unusual words and flexions (many of which are

considered to be Aramaisms or archaisms, although in this case these terms are nearly identical), and in a harmonic arrangement of thoughts, as seen both in the parallelism of members in a single verse, and in the strophic order of larger portions, the delicate art of which Ewald has traced with pre-eminent success in his *Poetische Biicher des Alte Bundes,* vol. 1.

The Babylonian Captivity is assigned as the commencement of that decline and corruption which mark the second period in the history of the Hebrew language; but the Assyrian deportation of the ten tribes, in the year B.C. 720, was probably the first means of bringing the Aramaic idiom into injurious proximity with it. The Exile, however, forms the epoch at which the language shows evident signs of that encroachment of the Aramaic on its integrity, which afterwards ended in its complete extinction. The diction of the different books of this period discovers various grades of this Aramaic influence, and in some cases approaches so nearly to the type of the first period that it has been ascribed to mere imitation.

The writings which belong to the second age-that subsequent to the Babylonian Captivity-accordingly differ very considerably from those which belong to the first; the influence of the Chaldee language, acquired by the Jewish exiles in the land of their captivity, having gradually corrupted the national tongue. The historical books belonging to this age are the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. In the prophets who prophesied during and after the Captivity, with the exception of Daniel, the Chaldee impress is by no means so strong as we might anticipate, they having evidently formed their style on that of the older prophets. It is important, however, to observe that the presence of what appears to be a Chaldaism is not always the indication of a later age. Chaldee words and forms occasionally appear even in the most ancient Hebrew compositions, especially the poetical, the poet delighting in archaic and rare words, and substituting these for the more usual and commonplace. But between the Chaldaic archaisms and the Chaldeisms of the later Scriptures there is this marked distinction, that the former are only occasional, and lie scattered on the surface; the latter are frequent, and give a peculiar color and character to the whole language.

A still more corrupt form of the language appears in the Mishna and other later Jewish writings, in which the foreign element is much more decided and prominent.

(2.) *Place.* — Under this head is embraced the question as to the existence of different dialects of the ancient Hebrew. Was the Hebrew language, as spoken by the several tribes of Israel, of uniform mould and character? or did it branch out into various dialects corresponding to the leading divisions of the nation? In attempting to answer this question, there is no direct historical testimony of which we can avail ourselves. From ‹16:13:23› Nehemiah 13:23, 24, we learn nothing more than that the language of Ashdod differed from that of the Jews after their return from captivity, which is only what we might have anticipated. The notices in ‹07:12:06› Judges 12:6 and 18:3, which are more to the purpose, refer rather to a difference in pronunciation than in the form of the language. Notwithstanding it seems *primafacie* probable (a) that the language of the trans-Jordanic tribes was in course of time modified to a greater or less extent by the close contact of these tribes with the Syrians of the north and the Arab tribes of the great eastern desert; and (b) that a similar dialectic difference would gradually be developed in the language of Ephraim and the other northern tribes to the west of the Jordan, especially after the political separation of these tribes from the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Possibly in the *Jewish language* of ‹12:18:28› 2 Kings 18:28 we may discover the trace of some such difference of dialect; for we can scarcely suppose the name *Jewish* to have been introduced in the very brief period which intervened between the taking of Samaria and the transaction in the record of which it occurs; and, if in use before the taking of Samaria and the captivity of the ten tribes, it must have been restricted to the form of the Hebrew language prevailing in Judea, which, being thus distinguished *in name* from the language of the northern tribes, was probably distinguished in other respects also. It is not improbable that some of the linguistic peculiarities of the separate books of Scripture are to be accounted for on this hypothesis.

3. *When the Hebrew Language ceased to be a living Language. — The* Jewish tradition, credited by Kimchi,. is to the effect that the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken by the body of the people during their captivity in Babylon; and this is the opinion of many Christian scholars also, among whom are Buxtorf and Walton.. Others, as Pfeiffer and Loscher, argue that it is quite unreasonable, considering the duration and other circumstances of the Exile, to suppose that the Jews did not retain the partial use of their native tongue for some time after their return to Palestine, and lose it by slow degrees at last. There can be no doubt that

the Hebrew was never spoken *in its purity* after the return from captivity; but that it ceased altogether to be the language of the people after that period, and was retained only as the language of books and of the learned, has not been established. The principal evidence relied on by those who hold this opinion is derived from 16008Nehemiah 8:8: "So they read in the book, in the law of God, *distinctly,* and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." *Distinctly,* vrpom, i.e. says Hengstenberg, "with the addition of a translation" *(Genuineness of Daniel,* ch. 3, sec. 5). But, though this gloss has some support in Jewish tradition, it is at variance both with Hebrew and with Chaldee usage vrpom means *made clear or distinct,* as is evident from 04534Numbers 15:34 (the meaning of vrpm in 15018Ezra 4:18, is disputed); and it vrpom Warqy can scarcely be otherwise rendered than "*they real distinctly"* (see the Lexicons of Cocceius, Gesenius, and Furst; Buxtorf and Gussetius render by *explanate, explicate*). This, indeed, is evident from the context; for if we should render with Hengstenberg, "*They read it with the addition of a translation,"* to what purpose the clause which follows, "*and gave the sense,"* etc? At the same time, though this passage does not furnish sufficient evidence to prove that in the time of Nehemiah Hebrew had ceased to be the language of every-day life, it does seem to point to the conclusion that at that time it had considerably degenerated from its ancient purity, so that the common people had some difficulty in understanding the language of their ancient sacred books. Still we believe that the Hebrew element predominated, and, instead of describing, with Walton (*Prolegomena 3,* sec. 24), the language of the Jews on their return from exile as "*Chaldee with a certain admixture of Hebrew,"* we should rather describe it as *Hebrew with a large admixture of Chaldee.* Only on this hypothesis does it appear possible satisfactorily to account for the fact that Hebrew continued even after this period to be the language of prophets and preachers, historians and poets, while there is no trace of any similar use of the Chaldee among the Jews of Palestine (compare also 16324Nehemiah 13:24).

At what time Chaldee became the dominant element in the national language it is impossible to determine. All political influences favored its ascendency, and with these concurred the influence of that large portion of the nation still resident in the East, and maintaining constant intercourse with a Chaldee-speaking population. To these influences we cannot wonder that the Hebrew, notwithstanding the sacred associations

connected with it, by-and-by succumbed. On the coins of the Maccabees, indeed, the ancient language still appears; but we cannot conclude from this circumstance that it maintained its position as a living language down to the Maccabean period (Ronan, *Langues Semitiques,* p. 137). The fragments of the popular language which we find in the New Testament are all Aramaean, and ever since the Hebrew has been preserved and cultivated as the language of the learned and of books, and not of common life. On the history of the *post-Biblical Hebrew* we do not now enter.

III. *Of the Written Hebrew.* — The Shemitic nations: have been the teachers of the world in religion; *by the invention of the alphabet* they may likewise lay claim to the honor of having laid the foundation of the world's literature. The Shemitic alphabet, as is well known, has no signs for the pure vowel sounds. All the letters are consonants; some, however, are so weak as easily to pass into vowels, and these letters we accordingly find in use, especially in the later Scriptures, as vowel marks. Two interesting questions here present themselves: 1. As to the age and origin of the characters or letters which appear in all extant Hebrew MSS. and in our printed Hebrew Bibles; and, 2. As to the origin and authority of the punctuation by which the vowel sounds are indicated.

1. On the former of these questions there are two conclusions which may be relied on as certain:

(1.) That the present square characters were not in use among the Jews previous to the Babylonian Captivity. The Jewish tradition is that they were introduced or reintroduced by Ezra (Gesenius, *Geschichte,* p. 150; Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae,* <4018>Matthew 5:18).

(2.) That the square characters have been in use since the beginning of our era (Hupfeld in *Stud. und Krit.* for 1830, p. 288). But between these two limits several centuries intervene; is it mot possible to approximate more closely to the date of their introduction? The only fact to which appeal can be made with this view is- this, that on the coins of the Maccabees the square characters do not appear; but whether we are entitled to conclude from this that these characters had not then come into use in Judaea is very doubtful (Gesenius, *Geschichte,* sect. 43, 3). The probability is that the introduction of these characters, called by the Jewish doctors Assyrian, and generally admitted to be of Aramaean origin, had some connection with the introduction of the Aramaean language, and that the change from the

ancient written characters, like that from the ancient language, was not accomplished at once, but gradually. It is possible that in the intensity of national feeling awakened during the Maccabean struggle, there was a reaction in favor of the ancient language and writing.

The earliest monuments of Hebrew writing which we possess are these *genuine* coins of the Maccabees, which date from the year B.C. 143. The character in which their inscriptions are expressed bears a very near resemblance to the Samaritan alphabet, and both are evidently derived from the Phoenician alphabet. The Talmud also, and Origen and Jerome, both attest the fact that an ancient Hebrew character had fallen into disuse; and by stating that the Samaritans employed it, and by giving some descriptions of its form, they distinctly prove that the ancient character spoken of was essentially the same as that on the Armenian coins. It is therefore considered to be established beyond a doubt that, before the exile, the Hebrews used this ancient character (the Talmud even calls it the "Hebrew"). The Talmud, and Origen, and Jerome ascribe the change to Ezra; and those who, like Gesenius, admit this tradition to be true in a limited sense, reconcile it with the late use of the ancient letters on the coins, by appealing to the parallel use of the Kufic characters on the Mohammedan coins, for several centuries after the Nishi was employed for writing, or by supposing that the Maccabees had a mercantile interest in imitating the coinage of the Phoenicians. The other opinion is that, as the square Hebrew character has not, to all appearance, been developed directly out of the ancient stiff Phoenician type, but out of an alphabet bearing near affinity to that found in the Palmyrene inscriptions, a combination of this palaeographical fact with the intercourse which took place between the Jews and the Syrians under the Seleucidae, renders it probable that the square character was first adopted at some inconsiderable but indefinable time before the Christian sera. Either of these theories is compatible with the supposition that the square character underwent many successive modifications in the next centuries, before it attained its full calligraphical perfection. The passage in <4018>Matthew 5:18 is considered to prove that the copies of the law were already written in the square character, as the *yod* of the ancient alphabet is as large a letter as the *aleph;* and the Talmud and Jerome speak as if the Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament were, in their time, already provided with the final letters, the *Taggin,* the point on the broken horizontal stroke of j, and other calligraphical minutia.

The characters in use before the Babylonian exile have been preserved by the Samaritans even to the present day without material change (Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.* sect. 51, 1; comp. on this subject also Kopp, *Bilder und Schriftemz,* 2, sect. 165-167; Ewald, *Lehibuich,* sect. 77; Gesenius, *Geschichte der Hebrsischen Sprache* ü. *Schrift,* sect. 41-43).

2. *As to the origin and authority of the punctuation,* the controversy which raged so fiercely in the 17th century may be said now to have ceased; and the views of Ludovicus Cappellus, from the adoption of which the Buxtorfs anticipated the most dangerous consequences now meet with almost universal acquiescence. The two following conclusions may now be regarded as established:

(1.) That the present punctuation did not form an original part of the inspired record, but was introduced by the Jewish doctors long after that record had been closed, for the purpose of preserving, as far as possible, the true pronunciation of the language; and

(2.) That the present pointed text, notwithstanding its comparative regency, presents us with the closest possible approximation to the language which the sacred writers actually used. It would be tedious to go over the evidence by which these positions are established. Those who wish to do so will find the fullest information in the great work of Ludovicus. Cappellus, entitled *Arcanum Punctationis Revelatum,* with the reply of the younger Buxtorf. Keeping these conclusions in view in interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall be careful neither, on the one hand, to neglect the traditional text, nor, on the other hand, servilely to adhere to it when a change of the points would give a better sense to any passage.

The origin of the vowel points is to be ascribed to the effort which the Jewish learned men made to preserve the pronunciation of their sacred language at a time when its extinction as a living tongue endangered the loss of the traditional memory of its sound. Every kind of evidence renders it probable that these signs for the pronunciation were first introduced about the 7th century of the Christian era, that is, after the completion of the Talmud, and that the minute and complex system which we possess was gradually developed from a few indispensable signs to its present elaborateness. The existence of the present complete system can, however, be traced back to the 11th century. The skilful investigation of Hupfeld (in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830, p. 549 sq.) has proved that the vowel-

points were unknown to Jerome and the Talmud; but, as far as regards the former, we are able to make a high estimate of the degree to which the traditionary pronunciation, prior to the use of the points, accorded with our Masoretic signs; for Jerome describes a pronunciation which agrees wonderfully well with our own vocalization. We are thus called on to avail ourselves thankfully of the Masoretic punctuation, on the double ground that it represents the Jewish traditional pronunciation, and that the Hebrew language, unless when read according to its laws, does not enter into its full dialectical harmony with its Syro-Arabian sisters. *SEE MASSORAH*.

Although it may be superfluous to enforce the general advantages, not to say indispensable necessity, of a sound scholar-like study of the Hebrew language to the theological student, yet it may be allowable to enumerate some of those particular reasons, incident to the present time, which urgently demand an increased attention to this study. First, the English-speaking race have an ancient honorable name to retain. Selden, Castell, Lightfoot, Pocock, Walton, Spencer, and Hyde, were once contemporary ornaments of its literature. We daily see their names mentioned with deference in the writings of German scholars; but we are forcibly struck with the fact that, since that period, Great Britain has hardly, with the exception of Lowth and Kennicott, produced a single Syro-Arabian scholar whose labors have signally advanced Biblical philology; while America, although possessing some well-qualified teachers, has produced but little that is original in this direction. Secondly, the bold inquiries of the German theologians will force themselves on our notice. It is impossible for us to ignore their existence, for the works containing them are now speedily circulated among us in an English dress. These investigations are conducted in a split of philological and historical criticism which has never yet been brought to bear, with such force, on the most important Biblical questions. The wounds which they deal to the ancient traditions cannot be healed by reference to commentators whose generation knew nothing of our doubts and difficulties. The cure must be sympathetic; it must be effected by the same weapon that caused the wound. If the monstrous disproportion which books relating to ecclesiastical antiquity bear, in almost every theological bookseller’s catalogue, over those relating to Biblical philology, be an evidence of the degree to which these studies have fallen into neglect, and if the few books in which an acquaintance with Hebrew is necessary, which do appear, are a fair proof of our present ability to meet the Germans with their own weapons, then there is indeed

an urgent necessity that theological students should prepare for the increased demands of the future.

III. *History of Hebrew Learning.* — It is not till the closing part of the 9th century that we find, even among the Jews themselves, any attempts at the formal study of their ancient tongue. In the Talmudic writings, indeed, grammatical remarks frequently occur, and of these some indicate an acute and accurate perception of the usages of the language; but they are introduced incidentally, and are to be traced rather to a sort of living sense of the language than to any scientific study of its structure or laws. What the Jews of the Talmudic period knew themselves of the Hebrew they communicated to Origen and Jerome, both of whom devoted themselves with much zeal to the study of that language, and the latter of whom especially became proficient in all that his masters could teach him concerning both its vocabulary and its grammar (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.;* Jerome, *Adv. Rufin.* 1, 363; *Epist. ad Damas.; Praef ad Jobun, ad Paralipom.* etc.; Carpzov, *Crit. Sac. 6* § 2). As represented by Jerome, the Church was quite on a par with the synagogue in acquaintance with the language of the ancient Scriptures; but how imperfect that was in many respects may be seen from the strange etymologies, which even Jerome adduces as explanatory of words, and from his statement that from the want of vowels in Hebrew "the Jews pronounce the same words with different sounds and *accents, pro voluntate lectorun ac varietate regionum" (Ep. ad Evangelums).*

Stimulated by the example of the Arabians, the Jews began, towards the end of the 9th century, to bestow careful study on the grammar of their ancient tongue; and with this advantage over the Arabian grammarians, that they did not, like them, confine their attention to one language, but took into account the whole of the Shemitic tongues. An African Jew, Jehuda ben-Karish, who lived about A.D. 880, led the way in this direction; but it was reserved for Saadia ben-Joseph of Fayum, gaon (or spiritual head) of the Jews at Sora in Babylonia, and who died A.D. 942, to compose the first formal treatise on points of Hebrew grammar and philology. To him we are indebted for the Arabic version of the O.T., of which portions are still extant, *SEE ARABIC VERSIONS*; and though his other works, his commentaries on the O.T., and his grammatical works, have not come down to us, we know of their existence from, and have still some of their contents in, the citations of later writers. He was followed by R. Jehuda ben-David Chajug, a native of Fez, who flourished in the 11th

century, whose services have procured for him the honorable designation of “chief of grammarians.” From him the succession of Jewish grammarians embraces the following names [for details, see separate articles]. Re Salomo Isaaki (yvr, Rashi), a native of Troyes in France, d. ab. 1105; Abu’l Walid Mervan ibn-Ganach, a. physician at Cordova, d. 1120; Moses Gikatilla, ab. 1100: Ibll-Esra, d. 1194; the Kimchis, especially Moses and: David, who flourished in the 13th century; Isaak benMose (Ephodaeus, so called from the title of his work d/paehcef}m); Solomon Jarchi wrote a grammar, in which he sets forth the seven conjugations of verbs as: now usually given; Abraham de Balmez of Lecci; and Elias Levita (1472-1549). The earliest efforts in Hebrew lexicography with which we are acquainted is the little work of Saadia Gaon, in which he explains seventy Hebrew words; a codex containing this is in the Bodleian library at Oxford, from which it has been printed by Dukes in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenländer, 5,* 1, 115 sq. In the same codex is another small lexicographical work by Jehuda ben-Karish, in which Hebrew words are explained from the Talmud, the Arabic, and other languages; excerpts from this are given in Eichhorn’s *Biblioth. der Bibl. Litt. 3,* 951-980. More copious works are those of Ben-Ganach, where the: Hebrew words are explained in Arabic; of R. Menahem. ibn-Saruk, whose work has been printed with an English translation by Herschell Philipowski (Lond. 1854); of R. Salomo Parchon (about 1160), specimens of whose work have been given by De Rossi in his collection of Various Readings, and in a separate work entitled *Lexicon Heb. select, quo ex antiquo et inedito R. Parchonis Lexico novas et diversas rariorum et difficiliorum vocum. significationes sistit,* J. B. De Rossi (Parm. 1805); of David Kimchi, in the second part of his *Michlol,* entitled: µyvæ,vihi rpoe(often printed; best edition by Biesen-thal and Leberecht, 2 vols. Berl. 1838-47); and of Elias. Levita *(Tishbi,* Bas. 1527, and with a Latin translation by Fagius, 4to, 1541). The Concordance of Isaac Nathan (1437) also belongs to this period.

The study of the Hebrew language among Christians, which had only casually and at intervals occupied the attention of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages, received an impulse from the revived interest in Biblical exegesis produced by the Reformation. Something had: been done to facilitate the study of Oriental literature and to call attention to it by the MSS., Hebrew and Arabic, which the emperor Frederick II brought into Europe after the fourth crusade in 1228 (Cuspinian, De *Caesaribus,* p. 419; Boxhorn, *Hist. Univ.* p. 779); and a few men-such as Raymund

Martini, a native of Catalonia (born 1236), Paulus Bugensis, Libertas Cominetus, who is said to have known and used fourteen languages,. etc. appeared as lights in the otherwise beclouded firmament of Biblical learning. But it was not until the beginning of the 16th century that any general interest was awakened in the Christian Church for the study of Hebrew literature. In 1506 appeared the grammar and lexicon of Reuchlin, which may be regarded as the first successful attempt to open the gate of Hebrew learning to the Christian world; for though the work of Conrad. Pellican, *Del odo legendi et intelligendi Hebraea* (Basel, 1503), had the precedence in point of time, it was too imperfect to exert much influence in favor of Hebrews studies. A few years later, Santes Pagnini, a Dominican of Lucca, issued his *Institutionum Hebraicarun. Libb. 4* (Lyons, 1526), and his *Thesaurus Ling. Sanct.* (ibid.. 1529); but the former of these works is inferior to the Grammar of Reuchlin, and the latter is a mere collection of excerpts from David Kimchi's *Book of Roots,* often erroneously understood. No name of any importance occurs in the history of Hebrew philology after this till we come to those of Sebastian Münster and the Buxtorfs. The former translated the grammatical works of Elias Levita, and from these chiefly he constructed his own *Dictionarum Hebr., adj. Chald. vocabulis* (Basel, 1523), and his *Opus Grammaticum ex variis Elianis libris concinnatum* (Bas. 1542). The latter rendered most important service to the cause of Hebrew learning. *SEE BUXTORF*. The grammars and lexicons of the older Buxtorf were for many years the principal helps to the study of Hebrew in the Christian Church, and one of them, his *Lexicon Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinicum* (Basel, 1640), is still indispensable to the student who would thoroughly explore the Hebrew language and literature. The names also of Forster and Schindler may be mentioned as marking an epoch in the history of these studies. Previous to them scholars had followed almost slavishly in the track of rabbinical teaching. By them, however, an attempt was made to gather materials from a wider field. Firster, in his *Dict. Hebr. Nov.* (Basel, 1557), sought to determine the meaning of the words from the comparison of the different passages of Scripture in which they occur, and of allied words, words having two consonants in common, or two consonants of the same organ. Schindler added to this the comparison of different Shemitic dialects for the illustration of the Hebrew in his *Lex. Pentaglotton* (Han. 1612). The example thus set was carried forward by Samuel Bohle, a Rostock professor *(Dissertt. pro formali Signif. S. S. eruenda,* 1637), though by his fondness for metaphysical methods and conceits he was often betrayed into

mere trifling; by Christian Nolde, professor at Copenhagen *(Concordant. particularum Ebraeo. Chald. V.* T. Hamb. 1679); by Joh. Cocceius (Coch), professor at Leyden *(Lex. et Comment. serm. Hebr.* Lond. 1669); by Castell *(Lex. Heptaglot.* Lond. 1669); by De Dieu in his commentaries on the O.Test.; and by Hottinger in his *Etymologicuma Orient. sive Lex harmonicum heptaglot.* (Frankf. 1661). Sol. Glass also, in his *Philologia Sacra,* 1636, rendered important service to Hebrew learning and O. — T. exegesis.

Meanwhile a new school of Hebrew philology had arisen under the leading of Jakob Alting and Johann Andr. Danz. The former in his *Fundamenta punctationis linguae sanctae sive Grammat. Hebr.* (Gron. 1654), and the latter in his *Nucifrangibulum* (Jena, 1686), and other works, endeavored to show that the phenomena which the Hebrew exhibited in a grammatical respect, the flexions, etc., had their basis in essential properties of the language, and could be rationally evolved from principles. Peculiar to them is the "systema morarum," a highly artificial method of determining the placing of long or short vowels, according to the number of *norae* appertaining to each or to the consonant following, a method which led to endless niceties, and no small amount of learned trifling. The fundamental principle, however, which Alting and Danz asserted is a true one, and their assertion of it was not without fruits. Nearly contemporary with them was Jacques Gousset, professor at Gröningen, who devoted much time and labor to the preparation of a work entitled *Commentarii Ling. Heb.* (Amst. 1702), in which he follows strictly the method of deducing the meanings of the Hebrew words from the Hebrew itself, rejecting all aid from rabbins, versions, or dialects. The chief merit of Gousset and his followers, of whom the principal is Chr. Stock *(Clavis Ling. Sanct. V. et N. Ti.* Lips. 1725), consists in the close attention they paid to the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, and Havernick thinks that adequate justice has not been done to Gousset's services in this respect *(Introd. to O.T.* p. 221. Eng. trans.).

Hitherto not much attention had been paid to etymology as a source for determining the meaning of Hebrew words. This defect was in part remedied by Caspar Neumann and Valentin Loscher, the former of whom in different treatises, the latter in his treatise *De Causis Ling. Heb.* (Frankf. and Leipsic, 1706), set forth the principle that the Hebrew roots are *biliterae,* that these are the "characteres significationis," as Neumann called them, or the "semina vocum," as they were designated by Loscher, and that from them the triliterals, of which the Hebrew is chiefly composed, were

formed. They contended also that the fundamental meaning of the biliterals is to be ascertained from the meaning of the letters composing each, and for this purpose they assigned to each letter what the former called "significatio hieroglyphica," and the latter "valor logicus." This last is the most dubious part of their system; but, as a whole, their views are worthy of respect and consideration (see Hupfeld, *De emendanda lexicog. Semlit. ratione,* p. 3).

A great advance was made in the beginning of the 18th century by the rise almost simultaneously of two rival schools of Hebrew philology-the Dutch school, headed by Albert Schultens, and the school of Halle, founded by the Michaelis family. In the former the predominating tendency was towards the almost exclusive use of the Arabic for the illustration of Hebrew grammar and lexicography. Schultens himself was a thorough Arabic scholar, and he carried his principle of appealing to that source for the elucidation of the Hebrew to an extent which betrayed him into many mistakes and extravagances; nevertheless, to his labors Hebrew philology owes an imperishable debt of obligation. Besides his commentaries on Job and Proverbs, which are full of grammatical and lexicographical disquisition, he wrote *Origines Hebraeae seu Heb. Ling. antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiae penetralibus revocata* (Frankfort, 1723), and *Institutiones adfundamenta Ling. Heb.* (Leyd. 1737). To this school belongs Schroder, professor at Gröningen, who published in 1776 a Hebrew grammar of great excellence, and which has passed through many editions, under the same title as the second of the works of Schultens above noted; and Robertson, professor at Edinburgh *(Grammatica Hebr.* Edinb. 1783, 2nd ed.). Both these works excel that of Schultens in clearness and simplicity, and in neither is the Arabic theory so exclusively adhered to. Venema, as a commentator, was also one of the luminaries of this school.

The school of Halle was founded by Johann Heinrich and Christian Benedikt Michaelis, but its principal ornament in its earlier stage was the son of the latter, John David, professor at Göttingen. *SEE MICHAELIS*. The principle of this school was to combine the use of all the sources of elucidation for the Hebrew-the cognate dialects, especially the Aramaic, the versions, the rabbinical writings, etymology, and the Hebrew itself as exhibited in the sacred writings. The valuable edition of the Hebrew Bible, with exegetical notes, the conjoint work of J. H. and Christ. B. Michaelis, some grammatical essays by the latter, and the *Hebrische Grammatik*

(Halle, 1744), the *Supplementa ad lexica Hebraica* (6 parts, Gött. 1785-92), and several smaller essays of John David, comprise the principal contributions of this illustrious family to Hebrew learning. To their school belong the majority of more recent German Hebraists Moser *(Lex. Man. Heb. et Chald.* Ulm, 1795),Vater *(Heb. Sprachlehre,* Lpz. 1797), Hartmann *(Anfangsgriinde der Heb. Sprache,* Marburg, 1798), Jahn *(Grammatica Ling. Heb.* 1809), and the *facile princeps* of the whole, Gesenius *(Hebr. Deutsches Handwörterbuch,* Lpz. 1810-12, and later; *Heb. Grammatik,* Halle, 1813, and often since; *Geschichte der Heb. Spr. und Schrift,* 1815, and since; *Ausführliches Gram. — Krit. Lehrgebaude der Heb. Spr.* 1817; *Lexicon Manuale,* 1833, and later; *Thesaurus Phil. Crit. Ling. Hebr. et Chald.* Lpz. 1835-1858). *SEE GESENIUS*. Gesenius has been followed closely by Moses Stuart in his *Grammar of the Hebrew Language,* of which many editions have appeared. Under the Halle school may also be ranked Joh. Simonis *(Onomast. Vet. Test.* Halle, 1741; *Lexicon Man. Heb. et Chald.* 1756; re-edited by Eichhorn in 1793, and with valuable improvements by Winer in 1828); but, though a pupil of Michaelis, Simonis shows a strong leaning towards the school of Schultens.

Among recent Hebraists the name of Lee *(Grammai of the Heb. Lang. in a Series of Lectures,* Lond. 3rd edit. 1844; *Lexicon Heb. Chald. and Engl.* 1840), Ewald *(Krit. Gramm. der Heb. Spr. Ausfuhrlich bearbeitet,* Lpz. 1827; 7th ed. 1863, under the title of *Ausführliches Lehrb. der Heb. Spr. des A. B.),* and Hupfeld *(Exercitationes Ethiopiae,* 1825; *De emend. Lexicogr. Sem. ratione Comment* 1827; *Ueber Theorie der Heb. Gr.* in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1828; *Aus: Hebr. Gram.* 1841), are the most prominent. Each of these pursues an independent course, but all of them incline more or less to the school of Alting and Danz. Lee avows that the aim of his grammatical investigations is to "study the language as *it is,* that is, as its *own analogy* collected from itself and its cognate dialects exhibits it" *(Grammar,* Pref. p. 4, new ed. 1844). Ewald has combined with his philosophical analysis of the language, as it exists in its own documents, a more extended use of the cognate dialects; he contends that, to do justice to the Hebrew, one must first be at home in all the branches of Shemitic literature, and that it is by combining these with the old Hebrew that the latter is to be called from the dead, and piece by piece endowed with life *(Grammatik,* Pref. p. 9). Hupfeld's method is eclectic, and does not differ from that of Gesenius, except that it assigns a larger influence to the

philosophic element, and aims more at basing the grammar of the language on first principles analytically determined; by him also the Japhetic languages have been called in to cast light on the Shemitic, a course to which Gesenius too, after formally repudiating it, came in his later works to incline.

Among the Jews, the study of Hebrew literature has been much fettered by rabbinical and traditional prejudices. Many able grammarians, however, of this school have appeared since the beginning of the 16th century, among whom the names of the brothers David and Moses Provengale, Lonzano Norzi, Ben-Melech, Süsskind, and Lombroso are especially to be mentioned. A more liberal impulse was communicated by Solomon Cohen (1709-62), but Mendelssohn was the first to introduce the results and methods of Christian research among his nation. First *(Lehrgeb. d. Aram. Idiome mit Bezug auf' die Indo-Germ. Spr.* I. *Chald. Gram.* 1835; *Charuze Peninim,* 1836; *Concordantice Libr. Vet. Test.* 1840; *Hebr. and Chald. Handworterbuch über der A. T.* 2 vols. 1857) seeks to combine the historical with the analytical method, taking note of all the phenomena of the Hebrew itself, illustrating these from the cognate tongues, and those of the Indo-Germanic class, and at the same time endeavoring on philosophic grounds to separate the accidental from the necessary, the radical from the ramified, the germ from the stem, the stem from the branches, so as to arrive at the laws which actually rule the language. All his works are of the highest value. Mr. Horwitz has also published an excellent *Heb. Grammar* (Lond. 1835). We especially notice the philosophical method pursued by Nordheimer *(Heb. Grammar,* N. Y. 1838-42, 2 vols. 8vo). The latest Jewish production in English is Kalisch's *Hebrew Gramm.* (Lond. 1863, 8vo).

See generally Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* (1715-53); Loscher, *De Causis Ling. Ebr.* (1706); Hezel, *Gesch. der Hebr. Spr. and Litter.* (1776); Gesenius, *Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr.* (1815); Delitzsch, *Jeshurun, Isagoge in Gramm. et Lexicogr. linguce Hebr.* (1838); Fiirst, *Biblioth. Judaica,* passim; also his appendix on Jewish Lexicography to his *Lex. Hebr.* — Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature,* per. 2, § 16; per. 3:§ 27; *Bibliograph. Handbuchfür Hebr. Sprachk.* (Lpz. 1859, 8vo). *SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.*

Hebrews, the Epistle to the

the last of the Pauline Epistles, according to the arrangement of the Received Text of the New Testament.

I. *Its Canonicity.* — The universal Church, by allowing it a place among the holy Scriptures, acknowledges that there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with the rest of the Bible. But the peculiar position which is assigned to it among the epistles shows a trace of doubts as to its authorship or canonical authority, two points which were blended together in primitive times. Has it, then, a just claim to be received by us as a portion of that Bible which contains the rule of our faith and the rule of our practice, laid down by Christ and his apostles? Was it regarded as such by the primitive Church, to whose clearly expressed judgment in this matter all later generations of Christians agree to defer? Of course, if we possessed a declaration by an inspired apostle that this epistle is canonical, all discussion would be superfluous. But the interpretation (by F. Spanheim and later writers) of <GLOBE>2 Peter 3:15 as a distinct reference to Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews seems scarcely tenable. For, if the "you" whom Peter addresses be all Christians (see <GLOBE>2 Peter 1:1), the reference must not be limited to the Epistle to the Hebrews: or if it include only (see <GLOBE>2 Peter 3:1) the Jews named in <GLOBE>1 Peter 1:1, there may be special reference to the Galatians (<GLOBE>Galatians 6:7-9) and Ephesians (<GLOBE>Ephesians 2:3-5), but not to the Hebrews. Was it, then, received and transmitted as canonical by the immediate successors of the apostles?

In the Western Church this book underwent a somewhat singular treatment. The most important witness here, Clement of Rome (A.D. 70 or 95) refers to this epistle in the same way as, and more frequently than, to any other canonical book. It seems to have been "'wholly transfused," says Mr. Westcott *(On the Canon,* p. 32), into Clement's mind. After his time it seems to have come under some doubt or suspicion in the West. It is not cited or referred to by any of the earlier Latin fathers except Tertullian, who ascribes it to Barnabas, and says it was "receptior apud ecclesias illo apocrvpho pastore moschorum," that is, the pastor of Hermas *(De Pudicit.* c. 20). Irenaeus is said by Eusebius to have made quotations from it in a work now lost *(Hist. Eccl* 5, 26), but he did not receive it as of Pauline authorship (Phot. *Biblioth. Cod.* 252, p. 904, cited by Lardneer, 2, 165); and as Eusebius connects the Wisdom of Solomon with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as cited by Irenaeus, it is probable the latter viewed the two as on the same footing. It is omitted by Caius, who only reckons thirteen Pauline epistles (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl. 6,* 26; Jerome, *De Vir. illust.* c. 59); Hippolytus expressly declares it not to be Paul's (Phot. p, 301); it is omitted in the Muratori fragment; and by the Roman Church generally it

seems to have been suspected (Euseb. *H. E. 3,* 3; 6:20). Victorinus has one or two passages which look like quotations from it, but he does not mention it, and certainly did not receive it as the work of Paul (Lardleer, 3, 300). In the 4th century it began to be more generally received. Lactantius, in the beginning of the century, apparently borrows from it; Hilary of Poictiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Faustinus, and Marcellinus (who cites it as *divina Scriptura);* Victorinus of Rome, Ambrose, Philaster (though admitting that some rejected the epistle); Gaudentius, Jerome, and Augustine, in the latter half and the end of the century, attest its canonicity, and generally its Pauline origin.

In the Eastern churches it was much more generally, and from an earlier date, received. It is doubtful whether any citation from it is made by Justin Martyr, though in one or two passages of his writings he seems to have had it in his eye. Clement of Alexandria held it to be Paul's, originally written by him in Hebrew, and translated by Luke (Eusebius, *H. E. 6,* 14). Origen wrote homilies on this epistle; he frequently refers to it as canonical, and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, 2, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handed it do-n as Paul's (Euseb. *H. E. 6,* 25), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had never been questioned by any of those who had lived before him, we must understand him at least to affirm that in the Church of Alexandria it had from the earliest period been received. Dionysus of Alexandria acknowledged it as part of sacred Scripture, and as written by Paul. By Basil, the Gregories, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and all the Greeks, as Jerome attests, it was received. Eusebius, though he ranks it in one place among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, in deference to the doubts entertained respecting it in the Roman Church, nevertheless asserts its apostolic authority, and includes it among the books generally received by the churches. In public documents of the Eastern Church also, such as the Epistle of the Synod at Antioch, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catalogue of the Council, its claims are recognized. In the Syrian churches it was received; it is found in the Peshito version; it is quoted by Ephrem as Paul's; and it is included among the canonical Scriptures in the catalogue of Ebedjesu (Lardner, 4:430, 440). To this uniform testimony there is nothing to oppose, unless we accept the somewhat dubious assertion of Jerome that it was rejected by the heretical teacher Basilides *(Proem. in Ep. ad Tit.;* but compare Lardner, 9:305).

At the end of the 4th century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal view of the Latin churches was of less weight than the view not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin churches united with the East in receiving the epistle. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a decretal of pope Innocent, A.D. 416, gave a final confirmation to their decision.

Such was the course and the end of the only considerable opposition which has been made to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its origin has not been ascertained. Some critics have conjectured that the Montanist or the Novatian controversy instigated, and that the Arian controversy dissipated so much opposition as proceeded from orthodox Christians. The references to Paul in the Clementine Homilies have led other critics to the startling theory that *orthodox* Christians at Rome, in the middle of the 2nd century, commonly regarded and described Paul as an enemy of the faith-a theory which, if it were established, would be a much stranger fact than the rejection of the least accredited of the epistles that bear the apostle’s name. But perhaps it is more probable that that jealous care with which the Church everywhere, in the 2nd century, had learned to scrutinize all books claiming canonical authority, misled, in this instance, the churches of North Africa and Rome. For to them this epistle was an anonymous writing, unlike an epistle in its opening, unlike a treatise in its end, differing in its style from every apostolic epistle, abounding in arguments and appealing to sentiments which were always foreign to the Gentile, and growing less familiar to the Jewish mind. So they went a step beyond the church of Alexandria, which, while doubting the authorship of this epistle, always acknowledged its authority. The church of Jerusalem, as the original receiver of the epistle, was the depository of that oral testimony on which both its authorship and canonical authority rested, and was the fountainhead of information which satisfied the Eastern and Greek churches. But the church of Jerusalem was early hidden in exile and obscurity. And Palestine, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became unknown ground to that class of “dwellers in Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome,” who once maintained close religious intercourse with

it. All these considerations may help to account for the fact that the Latin churches hesitated to receive an epistle, the credentials of which, from peculiar circumstances, were originally imperfect, and had become inaccessible to them when their version of Scripture was in process of formation, until religious intercourse between East and West again grew frequent and intimate in the 4th century.

Cardinal Cajetan, the opponent of Luther, was the first to disturb the tradition of a thousand years, and to deny the authority of this epistle. Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza questioned only its authorship. The bolder spirit of Luther, unable to perceive its agreement with Paul's doctrine, pronounced it to be the work of some disciple of the apostle, who had built not only gold, silver, and precious stones, but also wood, hay, and stubble upon his master's foundation. And whereas the Greek Church in the 4th century gave it sometimes the tenth place, or at other times, as it now does, and as the Syrian, Roman, and English churches do, the fourteenth place among the epistles of Paul, Luther, when he printed his version of the Bible, separated this book from Paul's epistles, and placed it with the epistles of James and Jude, next before the Revelation; indicating by this change of order his opinion that the four relegated books are of less importance and less authority than the rest of the New Testament. His opinion found some promoters, but it has not been adopted in any confession of the Lutheran Church.

The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews is, then, secure, so far as it can be established by the tradition of Christian churches. The doubts which affected it were admitted in remote places, or in the failure of knowledge, or under the pressure of times of intellectual excitement; and they have disappeared before full information and calm judgment.

II. *Authorship.* — From the above testimonies it will be perceived that the assertion of the canonicity of this book is mostly identified with the assertion of its Pauline authorship. The former of these positions does not, it is true, necessarily depend upon the latter, for a book may be canonical, yet not be the production of any individual whose name we know; but, as the case stands, the external evidence for the canonicity of the book is so nearly commensurate with that for the Pauline authorship of the book that we cannot make use of the one unless we admit the other. This gives immense importance to the question on which we now enter; for if it could

be shown that this epistle is not Paul's, the entire historical evidence for its canonicity must be laid aside as incredible.

1. *History of Opinion on this Subject.* — In this epistle the superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting. Its omission has been accounted for, since the days of Clement of Alexandria *(apud* Euseb. H. *E, 6,* 14) and Chrysostom by supposing that Paul withheld his name lest the sight of it should repel any Jewish Christians who might still regard him rather as an enemy of the law (<442121>Acts 21:21) than as a benefactor to their nation (<442417>Acts 24:17). Pantaenus, or some other predecessor of Clement, adds that Paul would not write to the Jews as an apostle because he regarded the Lord himself as their apostle (see the remarkable expression, <580301>Hebrews 3:1, twice quoted by Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1, 12, 63).

It was the custom of the earliest fathers to quote passages of Scripture without naming the writer or the book which supplied them. But there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, Paul was regarded as the author. "Among the Greek fathers," says Olshausen *(Opuscula,* p. 95), "no one is named either in Egypt, or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this epistle proceeds from Paul." The Alexandrian fathers, whether guided by tradition or by critical discernment, are the earliest to note the discrepancy of style between this epistle and the other thirteen. They received it in the same sense that the speech in <442201>Acts 22:1-21 is received as Paul's. Clement ascribed to Luke the translation of the epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of Paul. Origen, embracing the opinion of those who, he says, preceded him, believed that the thoughts were Paul's, the language and composition Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian, knowing nothing of any connection of Paul with the epistle, names Barnabas as the reputed author according to the North African tradition, which in the time of Augustine had taken the less definite shape of a denial by some that the epistle was Paul's, and in the time of Isidore of Seville appears as a Latin opinion (founded on the dissonance of style) that it was written by Barnabas or Clement. At Rome Clement was silent as to the author of this as of the other epistles which he quoted; and the writers who follow him, down to the middle of the 4th century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is Paul's.

The view of the Alexandrian fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its way in the Church. It was adopted as the

most probable opinion by Eusebius (Blunt, *On the right Use of the early Fathers*, p. 439-444); and its gradual reception may have led to the silent transfer, which was made about his time, of this epistle from the tenth place in the Greek Canon to the fourteenth, at the end of Paul's epistles, and before those of other apostles. This place it held everywhere till the time of Luther; as if to indicate the deliberate and final acquiescence of the universal Church in the opinion that it is one of the works of Paul, but not in the same full sense as the other ten epistles, addressed to particular churches.

In the last three centuries every word and phrase in the epistle have been scrutinized with the most exact care for historical and grammatical evidence as to the authorship. The conclusions of individual inquirers are very diverse, but the result has not been any considerable disturbance of the ancient tradition. No new kind of difficulty has been discovered; no hypothesis open to fewer objections than the tradition has been devised. The laborious work of the Rev. C. Forster *(The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews)*, which is a storehouse of grammatical evidence, advocates the opinion that Paul was the author of the language as well as the thoughts of the epistle. Professor Stuart, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,* discusses the internal evidence at great length, and agrees in opinion with Mr. Forster. Dr. C. Wordsworth *(On the Canon of the Scriptures,* Lect. 9) leans to the same conclusion. Dr. S. Davidson, in his *Introduction to the New Testament,* gives a very careful and minute summary of the arguments of all the principal modern critics who reason upon the internal evidence, and concludes, in substantial agreement with the Alexandrian tradition, that Paul was the author of the epistle, and that, as regards its phraseology and style, Luke co-operated with him in making it what it now appears. The tendency of opinion in Germany has been to ascribe the epistle to some other author than Paul. 'Luther's conjecture that Apollos was the author has been widely adopted by Le Clerc, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, Alford, and others. Barnabas has been named by Wieseler, Thiersch, and others. Luke by Grotius. Silas by others. Neander attributes it to "some apostolic man" of the Pauline school, whose training and method of stating doctrinal truth differed from Paul's. The distinguished name of H. Ewald has been given recently to the hypothesis (partly anticipated by Wetstein) that it was written neither by Paul nor to the Hebrews, but by some Jewish

teacher residing at Jerusalem to a church in some important Italian town, which is supposed to have sent a deputation to Palestine.

2. *Arguments for and against the different Authors proposed, other than the Apostle Paul.* — Most of these guesses are quite destitute of historical evidence and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditionary account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability, but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of Paul's contemporaries.

(1.) *Silas.* — The claims of this companion of Paul to the authorship of one epistle find no support from the testimony of antiquity. The suggestion of them is entirely modern, having been first advanced by Bihme in the introduction to his commentary on this epistle (Lips. 1825), and by Mynster in the *Studien und Kritiken,* 2, 344; but they have adduced nothing in support of these claims which might not with equal plausibility have been urged on behalf of any other of the apostle's companions.

(2.) *Clement of Rome.* — Origen tells us that the tradition which had reached him was that some held this epistle to have been written by Clement, bishop of Rome, while others said it was written by Luke the evangelist (ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl. 6,* 25). Erasmus espoused the claims of Clement, and Calvin inclined to the same view. Some evidence in favor of this hypothesis has been thought to be supplied by the resemblance of some passages in Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians to passages in one epistle; but these have much more the appearance of quotations from the former, or reminiscences of it on the part of the author of the latter, than such similarities of thought and expression as would indicate a community of authorship for the two. A close comparison of the one with the other leaves the impression very strongly that they are the productions of different minds; neither in style nor in the general cast of thought is there any prevailing affinity between them. Clement also was in all probability a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was undoubtedly by birth and education a Jew. Perhaps what Origen records means nothing more than that Clement or Luke acted as the party who reduced the epistle to writing, leaving the question of the authorship, properly so called, untouched. His whole statement is-" not heedlessly *(*οὐκ εἰκῇ*)* had the ancients handed it down as Paul's; but who wrote the epistle God truly knows. But the story which has come down to us from

some is, that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; from others, that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts." Jerome also, in referring to the tradition, explains it thus — " quem [Clementem] aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone" *(De Viris illust.* c. 5).

(3.) *Luke.* — The claims of Luke apparently rise a degree higher from the circumstance that, besides being named by Origen and Jerome as dividing with Clement the honors which, as these writers testify, were in certain quarters assigned to the latter, there is a character of similarity with respect to language and style between this epistle and the acknowledged productions of the evangelist. This has led several eminent scholars to adopt the hypothesis that, while the thoughts may be Paul's, the composition is Luke's. But against this conclusion the following considerations may be urged.

1. Where there is no other evidence, or at least none of any weight, in favor of identity of authorship, mere general similarity of style cannot be allowed to possess much force. Luke, however, is known to have been in such a connection with Paul as to justify in some sort the assumption of his having written on the apostle's behalf.

2. Assuming the epistle to be the production of Paul, it is easy to account for the resemblance of its style to that of Luke, from the fact that Luke was for so many years the companion and disciple of Paul; for it is well known that when persons for a long time associate closely with each other, and especially when one of the parties is an individual of powerful intellect whose forms of thought and modes of speech imperceptibly impress themselves on those with whom he associates, they fall insensibly into a similarity of tone and style both of speaking and writing (so Chrysostom, *Hom. iv in Matthew*, quoted by Forster, *Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 648). The resemblances, however, in this case (see them pointed out by Alford, vol. 3, passim) are too striking and minute to be fully explained in this general manner.

3. It is not in the Epistle to the Hebrews alone that a resemblance to the style of Luke may be detected: the same feature pervades all Paul's epistles, especially those of a later date, as has frequently been observed by critics. In fine, while there are such resemblances of style, etc., as have been referred to between this epistle and the writings of

Luke, there are *differences* of a nature so weighty as completely to overbalance these resemblances, and authorize the conclusion that the author of the latter could not also be the author of the former. Both Stuart *(Comment.* 1, 333, London, 1828) and Eichhorn *(Einleit. 3,* 465) justly lay stress on the greater predominance of Jewish feelings in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in any of Luke's writings, and still more on the marked familiarity with the peculiarities of the Jewish schools displayed by the writer of the epistle, but of which no traces are apparent in any of the writings of the evangelist. Both writings display the combined influence of the Palestinian and the Hellenistic character on the part of their author; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews the former so decidedly predominates over the latter, while the reverse is the case with the writings of Luke, that it seems to the last degree improbable that the same person could have written both. Luke, moreover, was a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was evidently a Jew. It appears, therefore, that for the theory which ascribes the composition of this epistle to Luke as of his own dictation, there is no evidence of any kind which will bear examination, but, on the contrary, not a little against it.

4. Nevertheless, the association of Luke with Paul, and the many marked coincidences between Luke's phraseology and that of this epistle, give a strong color of probability to the supposition that the evangelist had something to do with its authorship, doubtless as assistant or under another's authority; for it cannot be presumed that he would have personally assumed the responsibility of a work like this, evidently conceived, written, and sent out as of apostolical authority, and with the personal allusions to the history apparently of Paul which we find in the final salutations. But if Luke were joint author with Paul, what share in the composition is to be assigned to him? This question has been asked by those who regard joint authorship as an impossibility, and ascribe the epistle to some other writer than Paul. Perhaps it is not easy, certainly it is not necessary, to find an answer which would satisfy or silence persons who pursue a historical inquiry into the region of conjecture. Who shall define the exact responsibility of Timothy, or Silvanus, or Sosthenes, in those seven epistles which Paul inscribes with some of their names conjointly with his own? To what extent does Mark's language clothe the inspired recollections of Peter, which, according to ancient tradition, are recorded in the second

gospel? Or, to take the acknowledged writings of Luke himself — "what is the share of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke 1:2), or what is the share of Paul himself in that gospel which some persons, not without countenance from tradition, conjecture that Luke wrote under his master's eye in the prison at Caesarea; or who shall assign to the follower and the master their portions respectively in those seven characteristic speeches at Antioch, Lystra, Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem, and Caesarea? If Luke wrote down Paul's Gospel, and condensed his missionary speeches, may he not have afterwards taken a more important share in the composition of this epistle?

(4.) *Barnabas.* — The hypothesis which claims the authorship of this epistle for Barnabas has in its support the testimony of Tertullian *(De Pudicitia,* c. 20), with whom, as we learn from Jerome *(Epist.* 129, *ad Dardanum),* several *(plerique)* among the Latins concurred. For this opinion Tertullian, in the passage referred to, assigns no reasons, and Jerome appears to have treated it as a mere conjecture resting upon Tertullian's authority alone; for, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 5), he refers to this opinion as one "juxta Tertullianum," whilst he says that the opinion that Luke was the author was one "juxta quosdam." Hug is of opinion *(Introd.* p. 596, Fosdick's transl.) that in this passage we have not Tertullian's own view so much as a concession on his part to those whom he was opposing, and who, because of the very passage he is about to quote from the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hebrews 6:4-8), were inclined to reject the claims of that epistle to be esteemed the production of Paul. This conjecture is of use, as it tends to show that Tertullian might have another reason for ascribing this epistle to Barnabas than his total ignorance that it had ever been imputed to Paul, as has been confidently inferred by several writers from the fact that it was obviously to the interest of his argument to uphold the Pauline origin of this epistle had he been aware of it. In recent times the ablest defender of this hypothesis is Ullmann, who has devoted to it an article in the first volume of his journal, the *Studien und Kritiken;* but the evidence he adduces in favor of it is very feeble. After enlarging on the testimony of Tertullian, he proceeds to the internal evidence in favor of Barnabas; but of the *six* reasons he assigns for ascribing the epistle to him, none possesses any force. *The first,* viz. the traces in the epistle of an Alexandrian education on the part of the author, supposing it granted, would not apply particularly to Barnabas, who was a native of Cyprus, and who, though Ullmann says "he had *perhaps* been in

Alexandria," for aught we know had never seen that seat of allegorical learning. The *second*, viz. that Barnabas, being a Levite, was more likely, on that account, to understand the Jewish ritual, as we see the author of this epistle did, is of no weight, for there is nothing stated in the epistle on that head which any intelligent Jew might not have known, whether a Levite or not. The *third*, viz. that what the author of this epistle says concerning the law, divine revelation, faith, etc., is very Pauline, and such as we might expect from a companion of Paul, such as Barnabas was; *the fourth*, viz. that the tenor of the epistle is worthy such a man as Barnabas; *the fifth*, viz. that the writer of this epistle speaks of the Savior very frequently by the appellation o ‘I2(oaÇo, which Dr. Ullmann thinks indicates that the writer must have known our Lord during his personal ministry, which was *probably* the case with Barnabas; and the *sixth*, viz. that the names of persons mentioned in this epistle are names which Barnabas *might* have referred to had he written it-are reasons such as it would be idle to refute, and such as fill us with surprise that a man of Ullmann's learning and vigor should have gravely adduced them. With regard to the fifth also, Olshausen has justly observed *(Opusc. Theologica*, p. 115) that if it were certain that Barnabas had enjoyed the advantage of our Lord's personal ministry, it would clearly prove that he was not the author of this epistle, for the latter distinctly classes himself with those by whom this advantage had not been enjoyed (ch. 2, 3). Stuart and some others have laid great stress on the contrast afforded by this epistle to the extant epistle which passes under the name of Barnabas, with respect to style, tone, and general character, as supplying indubitable evidence that the former is the production of a different and a far superior mind. Of this there can be no question, and, were we quite certain that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was really his production, the argument would be conclusive. But, though some very distinguished names may be cited in support of its authenticity, the greater weight, both of authority and evidence, is against it. *SEE BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF*. The total absence of any reason in favor of imputing the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas affords sufficient ground for rejecting this hypothesis without our attempting to adduce dubious and uncertain reasons against it.

(5.) *Some Alexandrian Christian. — This* hypothesis rests on certain features of the epistle which are said to betray Alexandrian culture, habits, and modes of thought on the part of the writer. These have been much insisted upon by Eichhorn, Schulz, Bleek, and others: but they are not

such, we think, as carry with them the weight which these writers have allowed to them. The standard of comparison by which the supposed Alexandrian tone of this epistle is evinced is supplied by the writings of Philo, between which and this epistle it is affirmed that there is so close a resemblance that it can be accounted for only on the supposition that the author of the latter was, like Philo, an Alexandrian Jew. Now, before this reasoning can be so much as looked at, it behooves those who use it to point out clearly how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian education or habits of thought; because, unless this can be done, it will be impossible to show that any alleged peculiarity *necessarily* bespeaks an Alexandrian origin, and could not possibly have appeared in the writings of a pure Jew of Palestine. No attempt, however, of this sort has been made; on the contrary, it has been assumed that whatever is Philonian is therefore Alexandrian, and hence all resemblances between the writings of Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews have been urged as certain proofs that the latter must have been written by a converted Jew of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, we would by no means concede; and we feel confirmed in this by an examination of the evidence adduced in support of the alleged Alexandrian character of this epistle. As Stuart has, we think, clearly shown (i, 321), and as even Tholuck, though obviously inclining the other way, has candidly admitted *(Comment. on the Hebrews,* 1, 68, § 7), there is nothing in this evidence to show that this epistle might not have been written by a Jew who had never left the bounds of Palestine. It is worthy of notice that several of the points on which Eichhorn chiefly insists as favoring his view, such as the prevalence of typical expositions of the Mosaic ritual in this epistle, and the greater elegance of its language and style *(Einleit. 3:*443 sq.), are given up by Bleek, and that of the two chiefly insisted upon by the latter, viz. the close affinity between this epistle and the writings of Philo, and the alleged mistake in regard to the furniture of the tabernacle which Bleek charges upon the author of this epistle in chap. 9:3, 4, and which he thinks no Jew of Palestine could have committed, both are relinquished by Tholuck as untenable (comp. the valuable remarks of Hug, *Introd.* p. 584, note, Fosdick's transl.). With regard to the latter, it may be remarked that, even supposing it proved that the writer of this epistle had erred in asserting that the pot containing the manna and Aaron's rod were placed in the ark of the testimony, and that, supposing θυμιατήριον to denote the *altar of incense,* and not the *censer,* he had fallen into the mistake of placing this within instead of without the veil, nothing could be thence

deduced in favor of the Alexandrian origin of the author. For, with regard to the former of these, it was a matter on which the Jews of Palestine had no better means of information than those of any other place, since, in the Temple as then standing, none of the furniture of the Holy of Holies had been preserved; and with regard to the latter, as it could not be the result of *ignorance* either in a Jew of Palestine or in a Jew of Alexandria, but must have been a piece of mere *inadvertence* on the part of either, it seems rather too much to conclude that it was such as the latter alone was capable of committing. That, however, there is no blunder in the case, has, we think, been very satisfactorily shown by Deyling *(Obs. Sac.* tom. 2, No. 47) and others (comp. Stuart, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, ad loc.).

(6.) *Apollos.* — The first to suggest Apollos as the probable author of this epistle was Luther (*Werke*, ed. Walch, 12:204,1996, etc.). He has been followed by the majority of recent German scholars, many of whom have supported his conjecture with much ingenuity. It has undoubtedly been shown by them that Apollos *may* have been the writer; and they have, we think, proved that of all Paul's companions this is the one who was most fitted by education, life-circumstances, modes of thought, and religious stand-point, to have accomplished such a task had it fallen to his lot. Beyond this, however, their arguments seem to us signally to fail. What weight they have is derived almost entirely from the, assumed Alexandrian tone of the epistle; so that in setting aside this we of necessity invalidate what has been built on it. But it may be permitted us to remark that, even supposing the former established, the latter would by no means follow, any more than because a work produced in Germany in the present day was deeply tinctured with Hegelianism, it would follow from that alone that it must be the production of some certain individual rather than of any other disciple of Hegel's school. The adoption of this theory by Tholuck, after his exposure of the unsoundness of Bleek's reasonings, is matter of surprise. "Still," says he (1, 69), "could it be rendered probable that any distinguished person having intercourse with Paul were an Alexandrian, and of Alexandrian culture, we might, with the greatest appearance of truth, regard him as the author of the epistle. Now such a one is found in the person of Apollos." What is this but to say, "The arguments for the Alexandrian origin of this epistle, I must confess, prove nothing; but show me an end to be gained by it, and I will admit; them to be most conclusive!" Such a statement affords, we think, very clear evidence that the disposition to ascribe this epistle to Apollos is to be traced not to any

constraining force of evidence, but exclusively to what Olshausen, in his strictures on Bleek *(Opusc.* p. 92), justly denounces as the main source of that able writer's errors, on this question — " Quod non ab omni partium studio alienum animum servare ipsi contigit." It may be added that if this epistle was the product of Apollos or any other Alexandrian convert, it is very strange that no tradition to this effect should have been preserved in the church at Alexandria, but, on the contrary, that it should be there we find the tradition that Paul was the author most firmly and from the earliest period established.

3. We now pass on to the question of the *Pauline* origin of this epistle. Referring our readers for particulars to the able and copious discussion of this question furnished by the works of Stuart *(Commentary,* Introd.), Forster *(The Apostol. Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* etc.), and Hug, we shall attempt at present a condensed outline of the evidence both for and against the Pauline authorship of this epistle.

a. *Internal* evidence,

1. In favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle.

(1.) A person familiar with the doctrines on which Paul is fond of insisting in his acknowledged epistles will readily perceive that there is such a correspondence in this respect between these and the Epistle to the Hebrews as supplies good ground for presuming that the latter proceeded also from his pen. Thai Christianity as a system is superior to Judaism with respect to clearness, simplicity, and moral efficiency; that the former is the substance and reality of what the latter had presented only the typical adumbration; and that the latter was to be abolished to make way for the former, are points which, if more fully handled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are familiar to all readers of the epistles of Paul (comp. <470306>2 Corinthians 3:6-18; <480322>Galatians 3:22; 4:1-9, 21-31; <510216>Colossians 2:16,17, etc.). The same view is given in this epistle as in those of Paul of the divine glory of the Mediator, specifically as the reflection or manifestation of Deity to man (compare <510115>Colossians 1:15-20; Philippians 2: 6; <580103>Hebrews 1:3, etc.). His condescension is described as having consisted in an impoverishing, and lessening, and lowering of himself for man's behalf (<470809>2 Corinthians 8:9; <500207>Philippians 2:7, 8; <580209>Hebrews 2:9); and his exaltation is set forth as a condition of royal dignity, which shall be consummated by all his enemies being put under his footstool (<461555>1

Corinthians 15:25-27; <2Ti 2:8>Hebrews 2:8; 10:13; 12:2). He is represented as discharging the office of a “mediator,” a word which is never used except by Paul and the writer of this epistle (<Gal 3:19>Galatians 3:19, 20; <Heb 8:6>Hebrews 8:6); his death is represented as a sacrifice for the sins of man; and the peculiar idea is announced in connection with this, that he was prefigured by the sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation (<Rom 3:22-26>Romans 3:22-26; <1Co 5:7>1 Corinthians 5:7; <Eph 1:7>Ephesians 1:7; 5:2; Hebrews 7-10). Peculiar to Paul and the author of this epistle is the phrase “the God of peace” (<Rom 15:33>Romans 15:33, etc.; <Heb 13:20>Hebrews 13:20); and both seem to have the same conception of the spiritual “gifts” (<1Co 12:4>1 Corinthians 12:4; <Heb 2:4>Hebrews 2:4). It is worthy of remark, also, that the momentous question of a man’s personal acceptance with God is answered in this epistle in the same peculiar way as in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. All is made to depend upon the individual’s exercising what both Paul and the author of this epistle call “faith,” and which they both represent as a realizing apprehension of the facts, and truths, and promises of revelation. (Bleek and Tholuck have both endeavored to show that the πίστις of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not the same as the πίστις of Paul’s acknowledged writings, but, in our view, with singular want of success. Tholuck’s chief argument, which he urges as of more weight than any Bleek has advanced, is, that the writer has not here contrasted νόμος and πίστις, the ἔργα νόμπυ and the ἔργα πίστεως, as Paul would have done. But how can this be said when the great lesson of the epistle is, that *always,* even *under the law itself;* πίστις was the medium of acceptance and the channel of divine blessing to men? When Paul says, “We walk by faith, not by sight” [<2Co 5:7>2 Corinthians 5:7], and the writer to the Hebrews. says that faith, by which the just live, is the evidence of things not seen [10:28; 11:1], what essential difference in their notion of faith and its working can be discerned?) By both, also, the power of this gracious principle is frequently referred to and illustrated by the example of those who had distinguished themselves in the annals of the Jewish race (comp. <Rom 3:4>Romans 3:4; 5:2; <Heb 3:6>Hebrews 3:6; <Gal 3:5>Galatians 3:5-14; <Heb 10:38>Hebrews 10:38; 11:40).

(2.) Some of the figures and allusions employed in this epistle are strictly Pauline. Thus the word of God is compared to a *sword* (<Eph 6:17>Ephesians 6:17; <Heb 4:12>Hebrews 4:12); inexperienced Christians are *children* who need *milk,* and must be instructed in the elements, whilst

those of *maturer* attainments are *full-grown men* who require *strong meat* (<460301>1 Corinthians 3:1, 2; 14:20; <480419>Galatians 4:9; <510314>Colossians 3:14; <580512>Hebrews 5:12, 13; 6:1); redemption through Christ is an *introduction* and an *entrance with confidence* unto God (<450502>Romans 5:2; <490218>Ephesians 2:18; 3:12; <581019>Hebrews 10:19); afflictions are a *contest* or *strife*, ἀγών (<500130>Philippians 1:30; <510201>Colossians 2:1; <581032>Hebrews 10:32); the Christian life is a *race* (<461024>1 Corinthians 9:24; Phil. 3:14; <581201>Hebrews 12:1); the Jewish ritual is a λατρεία (<450904>Romans 9:4; <580901>Hebrews 9:1, 6); a person under the constraint of some unworthy feeling or principle is "subject to bondage" (<480501>Galatians 5:1; <580215>Hebrews 2:15), etc.

(3.) Certain marked characteristics of Paul's style are found in this epistle. This department of the internal evidence has more, perhaps, than any other been canvassed by recent critics, and in some cases opposite conclusions have been drawn from the same phenomena. Thus the occurrence of era ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in this epistle has been adduced by the German scholars *against* the Pauline origin of it, whilst Stuart and Forster have both rested on this fact as strongly *in favor* of that conclusion; and as it appears to us with justice, for if it be made out from Paul's acknowledged writings that the use of unusual words is a characteristic of his style (and this has been placed by these writers beyond all question), it is obvious that the occurrence of the *same* characteristic in this epistle, so far from being an argument *against*, is, as far as it goes, an argument *for* our ascribing it to Paul. On arguments, however, based on such minute phenomena, we are not disposed to rest much weight on either side. Every person must be aware that an author's use of words is greatly modified by the circumstances under which he writes, or the design he has in writing; and the literature of every country presents us with numerous cases of authors whose works, written at different periods, and with different designs, present far greater diversities of expression than any which have been pointed out between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Hence cautious critics have declined to rest much in questions of literary parentage upon what Bentley calls *(Dissert. on Phialaris*, p. 19, London, 1699) "censures that are made from stile and language alone," and which, he adds, "are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices." Apart, however, from such minute niceties, there are certain marked peculiarities of

style which attach to particular writers, and flow so directly from the character of their genius or education that they can hardly express themselves in discourse without introducing them. Now such peculiarities the writings of Paul present, and the occurrence of them has always been felt to afford no small evidence of the authenticity of any production claiming to be his in which they are found. Paley, in enumerating these *(Horae Paulinae,* ch. 6, No. 2, 3), has laid stress chiefly on the following: A disposition to the frequent use of a word, which cleaves, as it were, to the memory of the writer, so as to become a sort of *cant* word in his writings; a propensity "to go off at a word," and enter upon a parenthetic series of remarks suggested by that word; and a fondness for the paronomasia, or play upon words.

(4.) There is a striking analogy between Paul's use of the O.T. and that made by the writer of this epistle. Both make frequent appeals to the O.T.; both are in the habit of accumulating passages from different parts of the O.T., and making them bear on the point under discussion (comp. <46310>Romans 3:10-18; 9:7-33, etc.; <58005>Hebrews 1:5-14; 3; 10:5-17); both are fond of linking quotations together by means of the expression "and again" (compare <45159>Romans 15:9-12; <46109>1 Corinthians 3:19, 20; <58005>Hebrews 1:5; 2:12,13; 4:4; 10:30); both make use of the same passages, and that occasionally in a sense not naturally suggested by the context whence they are quoted (<46157>1 Corinthians 15:27; <49022>Ephesians 1:22; <58208>Hebrews 2:8; <45017>Romans 1:17; <48011>Galatians 3:11; <58038>Hebrews 10:38); and both, in one instance, quotes passage in a peculiar way (comp. <45129>Romans 12:19; <58030>Hebrews 10:30). On the other hand, great stress has been laid by the opponents of the Pauline origin of this epistle on the fact that whilst Paul, in his acknowledged writings, quotes from the Hebrew original in preference to the Sept., where the latter differs from the former, the author of this epistle quotes exclusively from the Sept., even when it departs very widely from the Hebrew. To this it may be replied, 1st, that both Paul and the author of this epistle quote *generally* from the Sept.; secondly, that where the Sept. differs from the Hebrew, Paul does not *always* follow the Hebrew in preference to the Sept. (comp. <45124>Romans 2:24; 10:11-18; 11:27; 15:12; <46019>1 Corinthians 1:19, etc.); and, thirdly, That the writer of this epistle does not *always* follow the Sept. where it differs from the Hebrew, but occasionally deserts the former for the latter (e.g. <58030>Hebrews 10:30; 13:5); (comp. Davidson,

Introd. 3, 231). There is no ground, therefore, for this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle.

(5.) The Epistle to the Hebrews contains some personal allusions on the part of the writer which strongly favor the supposition that he was Paul. These are the mention of his intention to pay those to whom he was writing a visit speedily, in: company with Timothy, whom he affectionately styles. "our brother," and whom he describes as having been set at liberty, and expected soon to-join the writer (Hebrews 13:23); the allusion to his being in a state of imprisonment at the time of writing, as well as of his having: partaken of their sympathy while formerly in a state of: bondage among them (Hebrews 13:19; 10:34); and the transmission to them of a salutation, from the believers in Italy (Hebrews 13:24), all of which agree well with the supposition that Paul wrote this epistle while a prisoner at Rome.

2. Let us now glance at the main objections which from various sources have been urged against its Pauline origin.

(1.) It is unaccountable that Paul, had he written this epistle, should have withheld his name. But is it less unaccountable that Clement, or Apollos, or Luke, had any of them been the author should have withheld his name?

(2.) "This epistle is more calmly and logically written than it was possible for the energetic Paul to have written; all the analogies between Judaism and Christianity are calmly investigated and calmly adduced; the materials are arranged in the strictest order, and carefully wrought out according to this disposition, and conclusion follows conclusion with the greatest regularity; the language also is rotund and choice, and the representation unusually clear. All this is unlike Paul" (Eichhorn, *Einleit. 3,* 459). This is a singular assertion to make respecting the author of the Epistle to the Romans, a production characterized most eminently by these traits, excepting, perhaps, a less degree of calmness, which the special object of the present epistle may have more peculiarly called for.

(3.) "Whilst we occasionally meet Pauline *termini,* we find precisely in the *leading ideas* of the epistle a terminology different from that of Paul" (Tholuck, 1, 39, English transl.). The in-stances specified by Tholuck are the use of ἱερεύς, ποιμήν, and ἀπόστολος, as

designations of Christ; of ὁμολογία, which he says is confined to this epistle; of ἐγγιζειν τῷ θεῷ; and of τελειοῦν, with its derivatives in the sense in which it is used, ^{Hebrews 7:19}Hebrews 7:19. Now, with regard to this objection, it may be observed, 1st, That supposing all the instances adduced by Tholuck to be unimpeachable, and supposing no reason could be assigned why Paul should use such in writing to Hebrews, when he did not use them in writing to' others, still the objection cannot have much weight with any person accustomed to weigh evidence, because not only is the number of Pauline *termini* found in this epistle far greater than the number of termini which, according to Tholuck, are "foreign to the apostle to the Gentiles;" but it is always less likely that the peculiar phrases of a writer should be borrowed by another, than that a writer noted for the use of peculiar words and phrases should, in a composition of a character somewhat different from his other productions, use terms not found elsewhere in 'his writings. But, secondly, let us examine the instances adduced by Tholuck, and see whether they bear out his reasoning. "Paul nowhere calls *Christ priest."* True; but though Paul, in writing to churches composed more or less of Gentile converts, whose previous ideas of priests and priestly rites were anything but favorable to their receiving under sacerdotal terms right notions of Christ and his work, never calls Christ a priest, is that any reason for our concluding that in writing to Jews, who had amongst them a priesthood of divine organization, and writing for the express purpose of showing that that priesthood was typical of Christ, it is inconceivable that the apostle should have applied the term *priest* to Christ? To us the difficulty would rather seem to be to conceive how, in handling such a topic, he could *avoid* calling Christ a priest. Paul nowhere calls Christ a *shepherd* and an *apostle,* as the writer of this epistle does. But the whole weight of this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle must rest on the assumption that Paul never uses figurative appellations of Christ in his writings; for if he does, why not here as well as elsewhere? Now it could only be the grossest unacquaintedness with the apostle's writings that could lead any to affirm this. The very opposite tendency is characteristic of them. Thus we find Christ termed τέλος νόμου (^{Romans 10:4}Romans 10:4), διάκονον περιτομῆς (15, 8), τὸπάσχα ἡμῶν (^{1 Corinthians 5:7}1 Corinthians 5:7), ἡ πέτρα (1 Corinthians 4), ἀπαρχή (^{1 Corinthians 15:23}1 Corinthians 15:23), εἷς ἀνήρ (^{2 Corinthians 11:2}2 Corinthians 11:2), ἀκρογωνιῖος (^{Ephesians 2:20}Ephesians 2:20), etc. With these instances before us, why should it be deemed so utterly

incredible that Paul could have called Christ ἀπόστολος and ποιμήν, that the occurrence of such terms in the epistle before us is to be held as a reason for adjudging it not to have been written by him? With regard to the use of ὁμολογία in the sense of *religious profession*, the reader may compare the passages in which it occurs in this epistle with (Romans 10:9); (2 Corinthians 9:13); (1 Timothy 6:12), and judge for himself how far such a usage is foreign to the apostle. The phrase ἐγγίζειν τῷ θεῷ occurs once in this epistle (Hebrews 7:19), and once in James 4:8; Paul also once uses the verb actively (Philippians 2:30); and, on the other hand, the author of this epistle once uses it intransitively (Philippians 10:25). As there is thus a perfect analogy in the usage of the verb-between the two, why it should be supposed improbable that Paul should use it in reference to God, or why a phrase used by James should be deemed too Alexandrian to be used by Paul, we feel ourselves utterly at a loss to conceive. With regard to the use of τελειοῦν, Tholuck himself contends (Appendix, 2, 297) that it everywhere in this epistle retains the idea of *completing;* but he cannot understand how Paul could have contemplated the work of redemption under this term in this epistle, since in no other of his epistles is it so used. This difficulty of the learned professor may, we think, be very easily removed by remarking that it does not appear to have been Paul's design elsewhere, so fully at least as here, to represent the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, as that arises from the former being sufficient, whilst the latter was not sufficient to *complete* men in a religious point of view, i.e. to supply to them all they need, and advance them to all of which they are capable. That this is the theme of the writer, the passages in which the word in question occurs show; and we see no reason why such an idea might not have occurred to Paul as well as to any other man. Arguments drawn from such special terms, moreover, must always be precarious when urged as objections, because they are not only indefinite, but are mostly *negative* in their character. A minute examination shows that they are not of much force in the present case; for if the expressions referred to do not occur in the same form in Paul's other epistles, yet *similar* phrases undoubtedly prevail, and the variation here is sufficiently accounted for by the different character and object of this epistle. See this and all the other questions connected with this epistle amply reviewed by Dr. Davidson *(Introd. to the N.T. 3,* 163-295), who, however, inclines to

the opinion that these peculiarities indicate the co-operation of some other hand with Paul in the composition of the epistle.

b. It yet remains that we should look at the *external* evidence bearing on this question. Passing by, as somewhat uncertain, the alleged testimony of Peter, who is supposed (<2 Peter 3:15, 16) to refer to the Epistle to the Hebrews as the composition of Paul, and passing by also the testimonies of the apostolic fathers, which, though very decisive as to the antiquity and canonical authority of this epistle (see Forster's *Inquiry,* sec. 13), yet say nothing to guide us to the author, we come to consider the testimony of the Eastern and Western churches upon this subject. As respects the former, there are two facts of much importance. The one is; that of the Greek fathers not one positively ascribes this epistle to any but Paul; the other is, that it does not appear that in any part of the Eastern Church the Pauline origin of this epistle was ever doubted or suspected (compare Olshausen, *Opusc. Theolog.* p. 95).

In the Western Church this epistle did not, as we have seen, meet with the same early and universal reception. But of what value is the state of opinion in the early churches of the West in the question of evidence now before us? To judge of this, we must bear in mind that the sole amount of evidence arising from the testimony of the Latin churches is *negative;* all we can conclude from it, at the most, is that they had no sufficient evidence in favor of this epistle being Paul's; they do not seem to have had a shadow of historical evidence against its being his. The claims of Barnabas, Clement, and Luke rest upon mere individual conjecture, and have no historical support. Supposing, then, that the rejection of this epistle by the Latins cannot be accounted for by circumstances peculiar to them, still this fact cannot diminish the weight of evidence accruing from the unanimity of the Greeks and Asiatics. Had the Latins been as unanimous in favor of Apollos or Clement as the Eastern churches were in favor of Paul, the case would have been different. The value of Paul's claims would in that case have been equal to the difference between the value of the Eastern tradition and the value of the Western. This would have furnished a somewhat puzzling problem; though ever in that case the superiority of the Eastern witnesses to the Western would have materially advanced the claims of the apostle. As the case stands, *all* the positive external evidence extant is in favor of the Pauline authorship of this epistle; and the only thing against it is that in the Latin churches there appears to have been no commonly received tradition on the subject. Under such circumstances, the claims of

the apostle are entitled to be regarded as fully substantiated by the external evidence.

The result of the previous inquiry may be thus stated.

1, There is no substantial evidence, external or internal, in favor of any claimant to the authorship of this epistle except Paul.

2. There is nothing incompatible with the supposition that Paul was the author of it.

3. The preponderance of the internal, and all the direct external evidence goes to show that it was written by Paul. (See the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* Oct. 1867.)

4. The apparent coincidences with Luke's phraseology merely go to show, if they indeed be anything more than casual, that he exercised more than usual liberty as an amanuensis or reporter of Paul.

III. *Times and Place of Writing.* — Assuming the Pauline authorship of the epistle, it is not difficult to determine *when* and *where* it was written. The allusions in Hebrews 13:19, 21, point to the closing period of the apostle's two years' imprisonment at Rome as the season during "the serene hours" of which, as Hug describes them (*Introd.* p. 603), he composed this noblest production of his pen. Modern criticism has not destroyed, though it has weakened this conclusion, by substituting the reading πρὸς Ἑβραίους, "the prisoners," for τοῖς δεσμοῖςμον (A.V. "me in my bonds"), 10, 34; by proposing to interpret ἀπολελυμένον, *13,* 23, as "sent away" rather than "set at liberty;" and by urging that the condition of the writer, as portrayed in Hebrews 13:18, 19, 23, is not necessarily that of a prisoner, and that there may possibly be no allusion to it in Hebrews 13:3. In this date, however, almost all who receive the epistle as Paul's concur; and even by those who do not so receive it nearly the same time is fixed upon, in consequence of the evidence furnished by the epistle itself of its having been written a good while after those to whom it is addressed had become Christians. The references to former teachers (Hebrews 13:7) and earlier instruction (Hebrews 5:12 and Hebrews 10:32) might suit any time after the first years of the Church; but the epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The whole argument, and especially the passages Hebrews 8:4 sq., 9:6 sq. (where the present tenses of the Greek are unaccountably

changed into past in the English version), and Hebrews 13:10 sq., imply that the Temple was standing, and that its usual course of divine service was carried on without interruption. A Christian reader, keenly watching in the doomed city for the fulfillment of his Lord's prediction, would at once understand the ominous references to "that which beareth thorns and briers, and is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned;" "that which decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away;" and the coming of the expected "Day," and the removing of those things that are shaken (6, 8; Hebrews 8:13; Hebrews 10:25, 37; 12:27). Yet these forebodings seem less distinct and circumstantial than they might have been if uttered *immediately* before the catastrophe. From the expression "they of (ἀπό) Italy" (13, 24), it has been inferred that the writer could not have been in Italy; at Winer *(Grammatik,* § 66, 6) denies that the preposition necessarily has that force. Alford *(Comment. 4,* Proleg. p. 68 sq.), after Holzmann *(Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, 2, 297 sq.), contends that it was addressed to the Judaico-Christian Church at Rome; but in that case, how could it have been needful to inform *then* of Timothy's release (as the author does in the same connection. Hebrews 13:23)?

IV. *To whom addressed.* — That the parties to whom this epistle was addressed were converted Jews the epistle itself plainly shows. Ancient tradition points out the church at Jerusalem, or the Christians in Palestine generally, as the recipients. Stuart contends for the church at Caesarea, not without some show of reason; but the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the ancient tradition. Two things make this clear, says Lange: the one is, that only the Christians in Jerusalem, or those in Palestine generally, formed a great Jewish-Christian Church in the proper sense; the other is, that for the loosening of these from their religious sense of the Temple-worship there was an immediate and pressing necessity *(Apostol. Zeitalter,* 1, 176). We know of no purely Jewish-Christian community, such as that addressed in this epistle, out of Palestine, while the whole tone of the epistle indicates that those for whom it was intended were in the vicinity of the Temple. The inscription of the epistle, προς Εβραίους, which is of great antiquity, favors the same conclusion (Roberts, *Discussions on the Gospels,* p. 215 sq.). Ebrard limits the primary circle of readers even to a section of the Church at Jerusalem. Considering such passages as 5, 12; 6, 10; 10, 32, as probably inapplicable to the whole of that church, he conjectures that Paul wrote to some neophytes whose conversion, though not mentioned in the Acts, may have been partly due to the apostle's

influence in the time of his last recorded sojourn in Jerusalem (<4012>Acts 21:22). This, however, is unnecessary.

V. *In what Language was it written?* — Like Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for much unimportant controversy respecting the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria (preserved in Euseb. *H. E. 6:*14), to the effect that it was written by Paul in Hebrew, and translated by Luke into Greek; and hence, as Clement observes, arises the identity of the style of the epistle and that of the Acts. This statement is repeated, after a long interval, by Eusebius, Theodoret, Jerome, and several later fathers; but it is not noticed by the majority. Nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the epistle. No person is said to have used or seen a Hebrew original. The Aramaic copy, included in the Peshito, has never been regarded otherwise than as a translation. Among the few modern supporters of an Aramaic original, the most distinguished are Joseph Hallet, an English writer in 1727 (whose able essay is most easily accessible in a Latin translation in Wolf's *Curae Philologicae, 4,* 806-837). The same opinion has found in Michaelis a strenuous defender *(Introd. 4,* 221). The arguments he adduces, however, are more specious than sound; and it has been abundantly shown by Lardner, Hug, Eichhorn, and others, that this opinion is untenable. Bleek (1, 623) argues in support of a Greek original on the grounds of

(1) the purity and easy flow of the Greek;

(2) the use of Greek words, which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long paraphrase;

(3) the use of paronomasia-under which head he disallows the inference against an Aramaic original which has been drawn from the double sense given to διαθήκη (ix, 15); and

(4) the use of the Sept. in quotations and references which do not correspond with the Hebrew text. Why Paul should have written in Greek to persons residing in Judaea is best answered by the reasons which Hug *(Introd.* p. 326 sq.) and Diodati *(De Christo Graeca loquente exercitatio,* etc., edited by O.T. Dobbin, LL.B., London, 1843, and republished in the *Biblical Repository* for Jan. 1844) have

adduced to show that Greek was at that time well known to the mass of the Jews (compare Tholuck, 1, 78).

VI. Some have doubted whether this composition be justly termed an epistle, and have proposed to regard it rather as a treatise. The salutations, however, at the close seem rather to favor the common opinion, though it is of little moment which view we espouse.

VII. *Condition of the Hebrews and Scope of the Epis*tle. — The numerous Christian churches scattered through out Judaea (<40 9 31>Acts 9:31; <48 1 22>Galatians 1:22) were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews (<52 2 14>1 Thessalonians 2:14), which would become more searching and extensive as churches multiplied, and as the growing turbulence of the nation ripened into the insurrection of A.D. 66. Personal violence, spoliation of property, exclusion from the synagogue, and domestic strife were the universal forms of persecution. But in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. Their magnificent national Temple, hallowed to every Jew by ancient historical and by gentler personal recollections, with its irresistible attractions, its soothing strains, and mysterious ceremonies, might be shut against the Hebrew Christian. And even if, amid the fierce factions and frequent oscillations of authority in Jerusalem, this affliction were not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which every Hebrew Christian bore within him — the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. Paralyzed, perhaps, by this consciousness, and enfeebled by their attachment to a lower form of Christianity, they became stationary in knowledge, weak in faith, void of energy, and even in danger of apostasy from Christ. For, as afflictions multiplied round them, and made them feel more keenly their dependence on God, and their need of near, and frequent, and associated approach to him, they seemed, in consequence of their Christianity, to be receding from the God of their fathers, and losing that means of communion with him which they used to enjoy. Angels, Moses, and the high-Priest-their intercessors in heaven, in the grave, and on earth-became of less importance in the creed of the Jewish Christian; their glory waned as he grew in Christian experience. Already he felt that the Lord’s day was superseding the Sabbath, the New Covenant the Old. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices, and the holy city, when they should cease to exist? What

compensation co-aid Christianity offer him for the loss which was pressing the Hebrew Christian more and more?

James, the bishop of Jerusalem, had just left his place vacant by a martyr's death. Neither to Cephas at Babylon, nor to John at Ephesus, the third pillar of the Apostolic Church, was it given to understand all the greatness of this want, and to speak the word in season. But there came from Rome the voice of one who had been the foremost in sounding the depth and breadth of that love of Christ which was all but incomprehensible to the Jew-one who, feeling more than any other apostle the weight of the care of all the churches, yet clung to his own people with a love ever ready to break out in impassioned words, and unsought and ill-requited deeds of kindness. He whom Jerusalem had sent away in chains to Rome again lifted up his voice in the hallowed city among his countrymen; but with words and arguments suited to their capacity, with a strange, borrowed accent, and a tone in which reigned no apostolic authority, and a face veiled in very love from wayward children who might refuse to hear divine and saving truth when it fell from the lips of Paul.

He meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is, "Your new faith gives you Christ, and in Christ all you seek, all your fathers sought. In Christ, the Son of God, you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more prevailing than the high-priest as an intercessor: his Sabbath awaits you in heaven; to his covenant the old was intended to be subservient; his atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; his city heavenly, not made with hands. Having him, believe in him with all your heart with a faith in the unseen future strong as that of the saints of old, patient under present and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love."

Such was the teaching of the Epistle to the. Hebrews. We do not possess the means of tracing out step by step its effect upon them, but we know that the result at which it aimed was achieved. The Church at Jerusalem did not apostatize. It migrated to Pella (Eusebius, *H. Eccl. 3,* 5); and there, no longer dwarfed under the cold shadow of overhanging Judaism it followed the Hebrew Christians of the Dispersion in gradually entering on the possession of the full liberty which the law of Christ allows to all.

The primary design of this epistle, therefore, was to dissuade-those to whom it is written from relapsing into Judaism, and to exhort them to hold

fast the truths of Christianity which they had received. For this purpose the apostle shows the superiority of the latter dispensation over the former, in that it was introduced by one far greater than angels, or than Moses, from whom: the Jews received their economy (1-3), and in that it affords a more secure and complete salvation to the sinner than the former (4-9). In demonstrating the latter position, the apostle shows that in point of dignity, perpetuity, sufficiency, and suitableness, the Jewish priesthood and sacrifices were far inferior to those of Christ, who was the substance and reality, while these were but the type and shadow. He shows, also, that by the appearance of the antitype the type is necessarily abolished; and adduces the important truth that now, through Christ, the privilege of personal access to God is free to all. On all this he founds an exhortation to, a life of faith and obedience, and shows that it has ever been only by a spiritual recognition and worship of God that good men have participated in his favor (11). The epistle concludes, as is usual with Paul, with a series of practical exhortations and pious wishes (12-13).

But this great epistle remains to after times a keystone binding together that succession of inspired men which spans over the ages between Moses and John. It teaches the Christian student the substantial identity of the revelation of God, whether given through the prophets or through the Son; for it shows that God's purposes are unchangeable, however diversely in different ages they have been "reflected in broken and fitful rays, glancing back from the troubled waters of the human soul." It is a source of inexhaustible comfort to every Christian sufferer in inward perplexity, or amid "reproaches and afflictions." It is a pattern to every Christian teacher of the method in which larger views should be imparted, gently, reverently, and seasonably, to feeble spirits prone to cling to ancient forms, and to rest in accustomed feelings.

VIII. *Literature.* —

1. Of general introductory treatises,. besides the formal *Introductions* of Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Davidson, Bleek, Home, etc., and the prolegomena in the regular commentaries of Stuart, Alford,. etc., the following express treatises in volume form may be especially named: Ziegler, *Einleit.* (Gött. 1791, 8vo); Bratt, *De ar. qum. et auct.* etc. (Gryph. 1806, 4to); Seyfarth, *De Indole,* etc. (Lips. 1821, 8vo); Winzer, *De Sacerdotis officio,* etc. (Lips. 1825, 4to); De Groot, *Comparatio,* etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1826, 8vo); Bleek, *Einleit.* (Berl.. 1828, 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius,

Conjecture, etc. (Jenae,. 1829, 4to); Gelpe, *Vindicice,* etc. (L. B. 1832, 8vo); Grossmann, *De philos. Jud.* etc. (Lips. 1834, 4to); Stenglin, *Zeugnisse*, etc. (Bamb. 1835, 8vo); Forster, *Apostolical Authority*, etc. (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Thiersch, *De Ep. ad: Hebr.* (Marburg, 1848, 8vo); Mole, *De Christologia*, etc. (Halle, 1854); Wieseler, *Untersuchung*, etc. (Kiel, 1861, 8vo); Riehm, *Lehrbegr*. etc. (1867, 8vo).

2. The following are special *commentaries* on the whole of the epistle alone, the most important of which are here designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Athanasius, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* I, 2); Chrysostom, *Homiliae* (in *Opp. 12,* 1); Cyril, *Commentaria* (in Mai, *Script. Vet. 8,* 2, 147); Alcuin, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* I, 2); Aquinas, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 7); *Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.;* also in English, by Cotton, Lond. 1605, 4to; by a clergyman, London, 1841, 12mo; by Owen, Edilbi 1853, 8vo); Zuingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp. 4*, 564); Ecolampadius, *Explanationes* (Argent. 1534, Basil, 1536, 8vo); Megander, *Adnotationec* (Tig. 1539, 8vo); GranAdis, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1546, 8vo); Bachmeister [ed. Streuensee], *Disputatio* (Rost. 1569, 8vo; also in Germ. Hal. 1755, 8vo); Brentz, *Commentarius* (Tub. 1571, 4to); Hyperius, *Commentarii* (Tig. 1585, fol.); Grynaeus, *Explanatio* (Basil. 1587, 8vo); Buccafoci, *Commentarius* [including John] (Rom. 1587, 4to); Hunn, *Exegesis* (F. ad M. 1589, 8vo); De Ribera [concluded by others], *Commentarius* (Salaen. 1598, Cologne, 1600, Turin, 1605, 8vo); Galenus, *Commentarius* (Duac. 1578, Lov. 1599, 8vo); — Dering, *Lectures* [on chap. 1-6] (in *Works);* Cameron, *Responsiones (in. Opp.* p. 366); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ii, 61); Rung, *Analysis* — (Vit. 1600, 8vo); Nahum, *Commentarius* [including Galatians and Ephes.] (Han. 1602, Svo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Genesis 1605, 1610, 12mo; — also *Analysis*, Edinburgh, 1605, 8vo); Junius, *Enarratio* (Heidelberg, 1610, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 1, 1368); De Tena, — *Commentarius* (Toledo, 1611, 1617, fol.; with additions iby others, London, 1661, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri);* Lyser, *Commentarius* (Vit. 1616, 4to); Capellus, *Observationes* (Sed. 1634, 8vo); Cocceius, *In. Ep. ad H.* (in *Opp. 12*, 315); Alting, *Praelectiones* [on chap. 1-10] (in *1Opp.* 4); Scultetus, *Ideae* (Fracof. 1634, 8vo); Slichting, — *Commentarius* (Rac. 1634, 8vo); Jones, *Commentary* [includ. Philem.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Dickson, *Explanation* (Aberd. 1635, 1649; Glasg. 1654; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Rapine, *Expositio* (Par. 1636, 8vo); Guillebert, *Paraphrase* ,[in French] (Paris, 1638, 8vo); Gerhard, *Commentarius:*(Jena, 1641, 1661, 4to); Vincent, *Commentaria* (Paris, 1644, fol.); Douname, *Commentary*

(London, 1646, fol.); — Lushington, *Commentary* [chiefly a translation of Crell and Slichting] (Lond. 1646, fol.); Godeau, *Paraphrase* fin French] (Paris, 1651, 12mo; in English, Lond. 1715, 12mo); Gouge, *Commentary* (London, 1655, fol.); Horne, *Expositio* (Bruns. 1655, 4to) Major, *Commentaria* (Jen. 1655, 1668, 4to); Wandalin, *Paraphrasis* (Havn. 1656, 4to); Caspar Streso, *Commentarius* (Hague, 1661, 4to); Lamson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1662, fol.); Owen, *Exposition* f Rabbinical illustrations] (London, 1668-74, 4 vols. fol.; Edinb. 1812-14,-7 vols. 8vo; London, 1840, 4 vols. 8vo; Edinb. 1854, 7 vols. 8vo; abridged, London, 1790, 1815, 4 vols. 8vo); *Seb. Schmid, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1680, Lips. 1698, 4to); Mains, *Paraphrasis* (Giess. 1687, 1700, 4to); Wittich, *Investigatio* (Amsterd. 1691, 4to); *Van Hoeke, *Commentarius* (Lugd. B. 1693, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1707, 4to); Groenwegen, *Vytlegginge* (Leyden, 1693, 1702, 4to); Nemeth, *Explicatio* (Franec. 1695,1702. 4to); De Marck, *Commentarius* [including min. proph.] (Tüb. 1696, 5 vols. 4to; 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Ackersloot, *Vytlegginge* (Hag. 1697, 4to; in German, Bremen, 1714, 4to); Creyghton, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1699, 4to); Heidegger, *Exegetica* [including some other books of Scripture] (Tig. 1700, 1706, 1710, 4to); Schomer, *Exegesis* [includ. part of 1 Peter] (Rost. 1701, 4to); Braun, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1705, 4to); Olearius, *Analysis* (Lips. 1706, 4to); Brochmand, *Commentarius* (Havn. 1706, 4to); Starck, *Notce* (Lips. 1710, 4to); *D'Outrein, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1711, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1713, 1718, 2 vols. 4to); Limborch, *Commentarius* [includ. Acts and Rom.] (Rotterd. 1711, fol.); Clement Streso, *Meditatien* (Amst. 1714, 4to); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (Frankfort et Lips. 1717, 4to); Vermaten, *Ontleeding* (Amsterd. 1722, 4to); IHulse, *Verklaaring* (Rotterd. 1725, 2 vols. 4to); Peirce [continued by Hallet], *Paraphrase* (London, 1727, 4to; also [with Colossians and Phil.] ib. 1733, 4to; in Latin, with additions, by J. D. Michaelis, Hal. 1747, 4to); Duncan, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1731, 8vo; 1844, 12mo); Cellarius, *Auslegung* (Ulm, 1731, 4to); *Rambach, *Erklarung* [ed. Neubaier] (Frankf. 1742, 4to); Carpzov, *Exercitationes* [comparison with Philo] (Helmst. 1750, 8vo; in Germ. lb. 1795, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1750, 8vo; in Latin, by Semler, Halle. 1779, 8vo); Sykes, *Paraphrase* Arian] (Lond. 1755, 4to); *Cramer, *Erklarung* (Copenh. 1757, 4to); Michaelis, *Erklarung* (Frankf. 1762-4, 1780V, 2 vols. 8vo); Streuensee, *Erklarung* (Flensb. 1763,4to); Baumgarten, *Erklarung* (Hal. 1763, 4to); C. F. Schmid, *Observationes* (Lipsiae, 1766, 8vo); Zacharia, *Erklarung* (Gött. 1771; ed. by Rosenmüller, ib. 1793, 8vo); Morus. *Uebersetzung* (Leipz. 1776, 1786,

8vo); Blasche, *Commentar* (Leipzig, 1781, 8vo); Abresch, *Annotationes* (L. B. 1786-7, 3 vols. 8vo); Delphinus, *Commentarius* [includ. John] (Rom. 1787, 8vo); Storr, *Erläuterung* (Tub. 1789, 1809, 8vo); *Ernesti, *Lectiones* [edit. Dindorf] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hezel, *Versuch* (Leipzig, 1795, 8vo); Valnecker, *Scholce* (in his selections, Amsterd. 1815, ii, 345600); Schulz, *Anmerk.* (Breslau, 1818, 8vo); Maclean, *Commentary* (London, 1819, 8vo); W. Jones, *Lectures* (Lond. 1821, 8vo); Boehme, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1825, 8vo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (Andover, 1827, 1833, 1851, 1860; Lond. 1837, 8vo); G. V. Sampson. *Notes*- (Lond. 1828, 8vo); *Bleek, *Commentar* (Berlin, 182841; Elberf. 1838, 1868, 8vo); *Kuinol, *Commentarius* (Lipsie, 1831, 8vo); Paulus, *Erläuterung* (Heidelb. 1833, 8vo); Klee, *Commentar* (Mainz, 1833, 8vo); Knox, *Serm0ons* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Bishop Parry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Conder, *Notes* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Duke of Manchester, *Argumenet* [of chap. 1-4, 11] (Lond. 1835, 8vo); *Tholuck, *Commentar* (Hamburg, 1836, 1840, 8vo; translated, London, 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1842, 8vo; Brunswick, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurice, *Lectures* (London, 1846, 8vo); Stengel, *Erklarung* (Karlsruhe, 1849, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leipz. 1850, 8vo; translated, Edinburgh, 1868-70, 2 vols. 8vo); Miller, *Notes* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); *Turner, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Ellard, *Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1854, 8vo); Lineman, *Erklarung* (Götting. 1855, 8vo); Tait, *Exposition* (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Patterson, *Commentary* (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); F. S. Sampson, *Commentary* [ed. by Dabney] (New York, 1856, 8vo); Boultbee, *Lectures* (London, 1856,12mo); Anon. *Comparison with Old Test.* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Am. Bib. Union, *Trans. with Notes* (N. Y. 1858, 4to); Haldane, *Notes* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Knowles, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 8vo); John Brown, *Exposition* (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Kluge, *Erkilda'sun* (Neu Rup. 1863, 8vo); Dale, *Discourses* (London, 1865, 8vo); Blech, *Predigten* (Danz. 1865, in pts. 8vo); Hartmann, *Ausleg.* (Berl. 1866, 8vo); Longking, *Notes* (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Lindsay, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1867, 5 vols. 8vo); Kurtz, *Erklar.* (Mitau, 1869, 8vo); Ewald, *Erklar.* (Gött. 1870,8vo). *SEE EPISTLE*.

He'bron

(Heb. *Chebron'*, ˆ/ r b]j ,, a *community;* Sept. Χεβρών), the name of an important city and of several men, also (in a different Heb. form) of a smaller town.

1. A place in the south of Palestine, situated 20 Roman miles south of Jerusalem, and the same distance north of Beersheba (Eusebius, *Onom.* s.v. Ἀρκώ); and still extant, 18 miles south from Jerusalem, in 310 32’ 30” N. lat., 350 8’ 20” E. long., at the height of 2664 Paris feet above the level of the sea (Schübert). It is one of the most ancient cities existing, having been built “seven years before Zoan in Egypt,” and being mentioned even prior to Damascus (<04132>Numbers 13:22; <01318>Genesis 13:18; comp. 15:2). Its earlier name was KIRJATHARBA that is, *the city of Arba*, from Arba, the father of Anak and of the Anakim who dwelt in and around Hebron (<01202>Genesis 23:2; <06445>Joshua 14:15; 15:3; 21:11; <07010>Judges 1:10). It appears still earlier to have been called MANURE, probably from the name of Abraham’s Amoritish ally (<01239>Genesis 23:19; 35:27; comp. 14:13, 28); but the “oak of Mamre,” where the patriarch so often pitched his tent, appears to have been not in, but near Hebron. (See below.) The chief interest of this city arises from its having been the scene of some of the most remarkable events in the lives of the patriarchs. Sarah died at-Hebron, and Abraham then bought from Ephron the Hittite the field and cave of Machpelah, to serve as a family tomb (<01232>Genesis 23:2-20). The cave is still there, and the massive walls of the Haram or mosque, within which it lies, form the most remarkable object in the whole city. The ancient city lay in a valley, and the two remaining pools, one of which at least existed in, the time of David, serve, with other circumstances, to identify the modern with the ancient site (<01714>Genesis 37:14; <10412>2 Samuel 4:12). Much of the lifetime of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was spent in this neighborhood, where they were all entombed, and it was from hence that the patriarchal family departed for Egypt by the way of Beersheba (<01714>Genesis 37:14; 46:1). After the return of the Israelites, the city was taken by Joshua and given over to Caleb, who expelled the Anakim from its territories (<06106>Joshua 10:36, 37; 14:6-15; 15:13-14; <07012>Judges 1:20). It was afterwards made only of the cities of refuge, and assigned to the priests and Levites (<06207>Joshua 20:7; 21:11, 13). David, on becoming king of Judah, made Hebron his royal residence. Here he reigned seven years and a half, here most of his sons were born, and here he was anointed king over all Israel (<09201>1 Samuel 2:1-4, 11; <11201>1 Kings 2:11; <10501>2 Samuel 5:1,3). On this extension of his kingdom Hebron ceased to be sufficiently central, and Jerusalem then became the metropolis. It is possible that this step excited a degree of discontent in Hebron which afterwards encouraged Absalom to raise in that city the standard of rebellion against his father (<12509>2 Kings 15:9,10). Hebron was one of the places fortified by Rehoboam (<14110>2

Chronicles 11:10); and after the exile, the Jews who returned to Palestine occupied Hebron and the surrounding villages (Nehemiah 11:15). Hebron is not named by the prophets, nor in the New Testament; but we learn from the Apocrypha, and from Josephus, that it came into the power of the Edomites, who had taken possession of the south of Judah, and was recovered from them by Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 5, 65; Josephus, *Ant. 12*, 8, 6). During the Great War, Hebron was seized by the rebel Simon Giorides, but was recaptured and burnt by Cerealis, an officer of Vespasian (Joseph. *War*, *4*, 9; 7:9). Josephus describes the tombs of the patriarchs as existing in his day; and both Eusebius and Jerome, and all subsequent writers who mention Hebron down to the time of the Crusades, speak of the place chiefly as containing these sepulchers. In the course of time, the remarkable structure enclosing the tombs of Abraham and the other patriarchs was called the "Castle of Abraham;" and by an easy transition, this name came to be applied to the city itself, till in the time of the Crusades the names of Hebron and Castle of Abraham were used interchangeably. Hence, as Abraham is also distinguished among the Moslems by the appellation of *el-Khulil*, "the Friend" (of God), this latter epithet became, among them, the name of the city; and they now know Hebron only as el-Khulil (Robinson's *Researches*, 2, 456). Soon after the Crusaders had taken Jerusalem, Hebron also appears to have passed into their hands, and in 1100 was bestowed as a fief upon Gerhard of Avennes; but two years after it is described as being in ruins (Wilken, *Gesch. der Kreuz.* 2, 44; Saewulf, *Peregrin.* p. 269). In 1167 Hebron was raised to the rank of a bishopric (Will. Tyr. 20:3), and the title of bishop of Hebron long remained in the Romish Church, for it occurs so late as A.D. 1365. But it was merely nominal; for after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, Hebron also reverted to the Moslems, and has ever since remained in their possession. In the modern history of Hebron, the most remarkable circumstance is the part which the inhabitants of the town and district took in the rebellion of 1834, and the heavy retribution which it brought down upon them. They held out to the last, and gave battle to Ibrahim Pasha near Solomon's Pools. They were defeated, but retired and entrenched themselves in Hebron, which Ibrahim carried by storm, and gave over to sack and pillage. The town has not yet recovered from the blow it then sustained. In the 14th century pilgrims passed from Sinai to Jerusalem direct through the desert by Beersheba and Hebron. In the following century this route seems to have been abandoned for that by Gaza; yet the pilgrims sometimes took Hebron in their way, or visited it from Gaza. The

travelers of that period describe as existing here an immense charitable establishment, or hospital, where 1200 loaves of bread, besides oil and other condiments, were daily distributed to all comers, without distinction of age or religion, at the annual expense of 20,000 ducats. Hebron continued to be occasionally visited by European travelers down to the latter part of the 17th century, but from that time till the present century it appears to have been little frequented by them. The principal travelers who have been more recently there are Seetzen, Ali Bey, Irby and Mangles, Poujoulat, Monro, Stephens, Paxton, Lord Lindsay, Russegger, Schubert, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Olin, De Saulcy, Stanley, etc.

The town of Hebron lies low on the sloping sides of a narrow valley (of Mamre), surrounded by rocky hills. This is thought to be the “valley of Eshcol,” whence the Jewish spies got the great bunch of grapes (Numbers. 13:23). Its sides are still clothed with luxuriant vineyards, and its grapes are considered the finest in Southern Palestine. Groves of gray olives, and some other fruit-trees, give variety to the scene. The valley runs from north to south; and the main quarter of the town, surmounted by the lofty walls of the venerable *Haram,* lies partly on the eastern slope (01374Genesis 37:14; comp. 23:18). The houses are all of stone, solidly built, flat roofed, each having one or two small cupolas. The town has no walls. The streets are narrow, seldom more than two or three yards in width; the pavement, where one exists, is rough and difficult. The shops are well furnished, better indeed than those of towns of the same class in Egypt, and the commodities are of a very similar description. The only display of local manufactures is the produce of the glass-works, for which the place has long been celebrated in these parts. Gates are placed not only at the entrance of the city, but in different parts of the interior, and are closed at night for the better preservation of order, as well as to prevent communication between the different quarters.

There are nine mosques in Hebron, none of which possess any architectural or other interest, with the exception of the massive structure which is built over the tombs of the patriarchs. This is esteemed by the Moslems one of their holiest places, and Christians are rigorously excluded from it. The only Europeans who, in a late period, have found their way to the interior, were Ali Bey and Giovanni Finati, the Italian servant of Mr. Bankes. The best account of it is that furnished by the Rev. V. Monro, who states that “the mosque, which covers the cave of Machpelah, and contains the patriarchal tombs, is a square building, with little external decoration, at the

south end of the town. Behind it is a small cupola, with eight or ten windows, beneath which is the tomb of Esau, excluded from the privilege of lying among the patriarchs. Ascending from the street, at the corner of the mosque, you pass through an arched way by a flight of steps to a wide platform, at the end of which is another short ascent; to the left is the court, out of which, to the left again, you enter the mosque. The dimensions within are about forty paces by twenty-five. Immediately on the right of the door is the tomb of Sarah, and beyond it that of Abraham, having a passage between them into the court. Corresponding with these, on the opposite side of the mosque, are those of Isaac and Rebekah, and behind them is a recess for prayer, and a pulpit. These tombs resemble small huts, with a window on each side and folding doors in front, the lower parts of which are of wood, and the upper of iron or bronze bars plated. Within each of these is an imitation of the sarcophagus that. lies in the cave below the mosque, which no one is allowed to enter. Those seen above resemble coffins with pyramidal tops, and are covered with green silk, lettered with verses from the Koran. The doors of these tombs are left constantly open; but no one enters those of the women-at least men do not. In the mosque is a baldachin, supported by four columns, over an octagonal figure of black and white marble inlaid, around a small hole in the pavement, through which a chain passes from the mop of the canopy to a lamp continually burning to give tight in the cave of Machpelah, where the actual sarcophagi rest. At the upper end of the court is the chief place of prayer; and on the opposite side of the mosque are two larger tombs, where are deposited the bodies of Jacob and Leah" *(Summer's Ramble,* 1, 245). The cave itself he does not describe, nor does it appear that even Moslems are admitted to it; for Ali Bey (a Spaniard traveling as a Moslem) does not even mention the cave below while describing the shrines of the mosque. John Sanderson (A.D. 1601) expressly says that none might enter, but that persons might view it, as far as the lamp allowed, through the hole at the top, Moslems being furnished with more light for the purpose than Jews. At an earlier period, however, when the Holy Land was in the power of the Christians, access was not denied; and Benjamin of Tudela says that the sarcophagi above ground were shown to the generality of pilgrims as what they desired to see; but if a rich Jew offered an additional fee, "an iron door is opened, which dates from the time of our forefathers who rest in peace, and, with a burning taper in his hands, the visitor descends into a first cave, which is empty, traverses a second in the same state, and at last reaches a third, which contains six sepulchers, those of Abraham, Isaac,

and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, one opposite the other. All these sepulchers bear inscriptions, the letters being engraved; thus, upon that of Abraham: This is the sepulcher of our father Abraham, upon whom be peace;' even so upon that of Isaac and all the other sepulchers. A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchers continually, both night and day; and you there see tubs filled with the bones of Israelites; for it is a custom of the house of Israel to bring hither the bones and relics of their forefathers, and leave them there, unto this day" *(Itinerary*, 1, 77; ed. Asher, Berlin, 1840). The identity of this place with the cave of Machpelah is one of the few local traditions in Palestine which even Dr. Robinson suffers to pass without dispute, and may therefore be taken for granted. M. Pierotti, an engineer to the pasha of Jerusalem, has lately had an opportunity of leisurely examining the building; and in the spring of the year 1862 the prince of Wales and his suite were allowed to visit the interior, of which a description is given in App. 2 to Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, pt. 1: "We reached the south-eastern corner of the massive wall of enclosure…. Up the steep flight of the exterior staircase, gazing close at hand on the polished surface of the wall, amply justifying Josephus's account of the marble-like appearance of the huge stones which compose it, we rapidly mounted. At the head of the staircase, which by its long ascent showed that the platform of the mosque was on the uppermost slope of the hill, and therefore above the level where, if anywhere, the sacred cave would be found, a sharp turn at once brought us within the precincts, and revealed to us for the first time the wall from the inside.... We passed at once through an open court into the mosque. With regard to the building itself, two points at once became apparent. First, it was clear that it had been originally a Byzantine church. To any one acquainted with the cathedral of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and with the monastic churches of Mount Athos, this is evident from the double narthex, or portico, and from the four pillars of the nave. Secondly, it was clear that it had been converted at a much later period into a mosque I now proceed to describe the tombs of the patriarchs, premising always that these tombs, like all those in Mussulman mosques, and, indeed, like most tombs in Christian churches, do not profess to be the actual places of sepulture, but are merely monuments or cenotaphs in honor of the dead who lie beneath. Each is enclosed with a separate chapel or shrine, closed with gates or railings similar to those which surround or enclose the special chapels or royal tombs in Westminster Abbey. The first two of these shrines or chapels are contained in the inner portico, or narthex, before the entrance

into the actual building of the mosque. In the recess on the right is the shrine of Abraham, in the recess on the left that of Sarah, each guarded by silver gates. The shrine of' Sarah we were requested not to enter, as being that of a woman. A pall lay over it. The shrine of Abraham, after a momentary hesitation, was thrown open. The: chamber is cased in marble. The so-called tomb consists of a coffin-like structure, about six feet high, built up of plastered stone or marble, and hung with three carpets — green embroidered with gold. Within the area of the church or mosque were shown the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah. They are placed under separate chapels, in the walls of which are windows, and of which the gates are grated, not with silver, but iron bars. Their situation, planted as they are in the body of the: mosque, may indicate their Christian origin. In almost all Mussulman sanctuaries, the tombs of distinguished persons are placed, not in the center of the building, but in the corners. To Rebekah's tomb the same decorous rule of the exclusion of male visitors naturally applied as in the case of Sarah's. But on requesting to see the: tomb of Isaac, we were entreated not to enter… The chapel, in fact, contains nothing of interest; but I mention this story both for the sake of the singular sentiment which it expresses, and also because it well illustrates the peculiar feeling which has tended to preserve the sanctity of the place-an awe, amounting to terror, of the great personages who lay beneath, and who would, it was supposed, be sensitive to any disrespect shown to their graves, and revenge it accordingly. The shrines of Jacob and Leah were shown in recesses, corresponding to those of Abraham and Sarah, but in a. separate cloister opposite the entrance of the mosque… It will be seen that up to this point no mention has been made of the subject of the greatest interest, namely, the sacred cave itself, in which one at least of the patriarchal family may possibly still repose intact the embalmed body of Jacob. It may well be supposed that to this object our inquiries throughout were directed. One indication alone of the cavern beneath was: visible. In the interior of the mosque, at the corner of the shrine of Abraham, was a small circular hole, about eight inches across, of which one foot above the pavement was built of strong masonry, but of which the lower part, as far as we could see and feel, was of the; living rock. This cavity appeared to open into a dark space beneath, and that space (which the guardians of' the mosque believed to extend under the whole platform) can hardly be anything else than the ancient cavern of Machpelah. This was the only aperture which the guardians recognized. 'Once,' they said, '2500 years ago, a servant of a great king had penetrated through some other entrance. He descended in

full possession of his faculties and of remarkable corpulence; he returned blind, deaf, withered, and crippled. Since then the entrance was closed, and this aperture alone was left, partly for the sake of suffering the holy air of the cave to escape into the mosque, and be scented by the faithful; partly for the sake of allowing a lamp to be let down by a chain, which we saw suspended at the mouth, to burn upon the sacred cave. We asked whether it could not be lighted now. No,' they said; 'the saint likes to have a lamp at night, but not in the full day-light.' With that glimpse into the dark void we and the world without must for the present be satisfied. Whether any other entrance is known to the Mussulmans themselves must be a matter of doubt. The original entrance to the cave if it is now to be found at all, must probably be on the southern face of the hill, between the mosque and the gallery containing the shrine: of Joseph, and entirely obstructed by the ancient Jewish wall, probably built across it for this very purpose.' This account is somewhat at variance with the results? of the researches of I. Pierotti, who states, in a letter to the London *Times,* April 30, 1862, "The true entrance to the patriarchs' tomb is to be seen close to the western wall of the enclosure, and near the north-west comer; it is guarded by a very thick iron railing, and I was not allowed to go near it. I observed that the Mussulmans themselves did not go very near it. In the court opposite the entrance-gate of the mosque there is an opening, through which I was allowed to go down for three steps, and I was able to ascertain by sight and touch that the rock exists there, and to conclude it to be about five feet thick. From the short observations I could make during my brief descent, as also from the consideration of the east wall of the mosque, and the little information I extracted from the chief santon, who jealously guards the sanctuary. I consider that a part of the grotto exists under the mosque, and that the other part is under the court, but at a lower level than that lying under the mosque." *SEE MACHPELAH.*

The court in which the mosque stands is surrounded '*by* an extensive and lofty wall, formed of large stones, and strengthened by square buttresses. This wall is the greatest antiquity in Hebron, and even Dr. Robinson supposes that it may be substantially the same which is mentioned by Josephus *(Ant.* 1, 14; *War, 4,* 9, 7), and by Eusebius and Jerome *(Ononast.* s.v. Arboch), as the sepulcher of Abraham; A common Moslem tomb in the neighborhood of Hebron passes as the tomb of Abner. He was certainly interred in this city (<1032>2 Samuel 3:32); and the head of Ishbosheth, after his assassination, was deposited in the same sepulcher (<1042>2 Samuel 4:12);

but there is slight evidence in favor of the tradition which professes to point out this locality to the modern traveler. Besides this venerable wall, there is nothing at Hebron bearing the stamp of antiquity save two reservoirs for rainwater outside the town. One of these is just without the southern gate, in the bottom of the valley. It is a large basin 133 feet square, and 21 feet 8 inches deep. It is built of hewn limestone of very solid workmanship, and obviously of ancient date. The depth of water of course varies at different times of the year: in May it is 14 feet. The descent is by flights of steps at the four corners, by which the water is brought up in vessels and skins, and poured out into troughs for the flocks, or carried away for domestic uses. Just at the north end of the main part of the town is another and smaller pool, also occupying the bed of the valley, and measuring 85 feet by 55, with a depth of 18- feet, containing (in May) 7 feet of water. These cisterns, which are connected with no perennial springs, and which are filled only by the rains, seem (at least in summer) to be the main dependence of the inhabitants for water, although that of the larger pool is neither clear nor clean. As these pools are doubtless of high antiquity, one of them is in all likelihood the “pool of Hebron” over which David hanged up the assassins of Ishbosheth (<1042>2 Samuel 4:12).

The present population of Hebron has not been clearly ascertained, but is probably about 5000. Most of the inhabitants are Moslems, of fierce and intolerant character. There are no resident Christians. The Jews amount to about 50 families, mostly natives of different countries of Europe, who have immigrated to this place for the purpose of having their bones laid near the sepulchers of their illustrious ancestors. They have two synagogues and several schools. As usual, they have a quarter of the city to themselves, where the streets are marrow and filthy, and the houses mean. In a few instances, however, they are in tolerable repair, and whitewashed.

The environs of Hebron are very fertile. Vineyards and plantations of fruit-trees, chiefly olive-trees, cover the valleys and arable grounds; while the tops and sides of the hills, although stony, are covered with rich pastures, which support a great number of cattle, sheep, and goats, constituting an important branch of the industry and wealth of Hebron. The hill-country of Judah, of which it is the capital, is indeed highly productive, and under a paternal government would be capable of sustaining a large population. That it did so once is manifest from the great number and extent of ruined terraces and dilapidated towns. It is at present abandoned, and cultivation ceases at the distance of two miles north of the town. The hills then

become covered with prickly and other stunted trees, which furnish Bethlehem and other villages with wood. About a mile from the town, up the valley, is one of the largest oak trees in Palestine. It stands quite alone in the midst of the vineyards. It is 23 feet in girth, and its branches cover a space 90 feet in diameter. This, say some, is the very tree beneath which Abraham pitched his tent; but, however this may be, it still bears the name of the patriarch (Porter's *Handbook*, p. 67 sq.). *SEE OAK*.

2. The third son of Kohath the Levite, and hence the uncle of Moses (Exodus 6:18; 1 Chronicles 6:2,18; 15:9; 23:12, 19). B.C. ante 1738. His descendants are called HEBRONITES (Numbers 3:27, etc.).

3. A son of Mareshah, and apparently grandson of Caleb of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:42,43). B.C. post 1612.

4. (Heb. *Ebron'*, ˆ/r b][, prob. for ˆ/Db][¡ *Abdon*, as many MSS. read; Sept. Ἐβρών, Vulg. *Abran.)* A town on the northern border of Asher (Joshua 19:28); possibly the same (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.) elsewhere (Joshua 21:30) called ABDON *SEE ABDON* (q.v.).

He'bronite

(Heb. *Chebroni'*, ynæb] j , Sept. Χεβρών ald Χεβρωνί, Vulg. *Hebronitce)*, a designation of the descendants of HEBRON, the third son of Kohath, who was the second son of Levi, the younger brother of Amram, father of Moses and Aaron (Exodus 6:18; Numbers 3:19; 1 Chronicles 6:2,18; 23:12). The immediate children of Hebron are not mentioned by name (comp. Exodus 6:21, 22), but he was the founder of a "family" *(mishpachah)* of Hebronites (Numbers 3:27; 26:58; 1 Chronicles 26:23, 30,31) or Bene-Hebron (1 Chronicles 15:9; 23:19), who are often mentioned in the enumerations of the Levites in the passages above cited. JERIAH was the head of the family in the time of David (1 Chronicles 23:19; 26:31; 24:23: in the last of these passages the name of Hebron does not now exist in the Hebrew, but has been supplied in the A.V. from the other lists). In the last year of David's reign we find them settled at Jazer, in Gilead (a place not elsewhere named as a Levitical city), "mighty men of valor" (l yjæ ynB), 2700 in number, who were superintendents for the king over the two and a half tribes in regard to all matters sacred and secular (1 Chronicles 26:31,32). At the same time

1700 of the family under Hashabiah held the same office on the west of Jordan (ver. 30).

Heckewelder, John Gottlieb Ernestus

a distinguished Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, born at Bedford, England, Mar. 12,1743, where his father, who had fled from Moravia for the sake of religious liberty, was engaged in the service of the Church. On the 2nd of April 1754, young Heckewelder came to America with his parents. At the age of nineteen years (1762) he accompanied Christian Frederick Post, an Indian teacher and colonial agent, to the Tuscara was Valley, in Ohio, where they attempted t establish a mission among the natives. This enterprise proving a failure, Heckewelder labored for some time as the assistant of David Zeisberger, on the Susquehanna. In the spring of 14.1 he joined this illustrious evangelist at Friedenstadt, on the Beaver Creek, Pa., and for the next fifteen years shared all the hardships, sufferings, and triumphs of the Indian mission, at its various stations in Ohio and Michigan. *SEE ZEISBERGER, DAVID*. In the course of this period he married Miss Sarah Ohneberg (July 4, 1780), at Salem, Ohio, which was probably the first wedding ever solemnized in that state. Having severed his connection with the mission (October, 1786) on account of his wife's feeble health, he was appointed (1788) agent of the "Society of the United'-Brethren for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen" *SEE ETTWEIN, JOHN*, and made repeated but unsuccessful attempts, in consequence of the Indian War, to survey a tract of land in the Tuscara was Valley, granted to the Christian Indians by Congress as an indemnification for their losses in the Revolution. In 1792 and 1793 he was twice appointed assistant peace commissioner by the United States government, and was active in aiding the other commissioners to bring about a pacification. These humane efforts, however, proved abortive, and the war continued, ending in the total defeat of the Western tribes. In 1801 he settled at Gnadenhitten, Ohio, and devoted himself to the duties of his agency until 1810, when he resigned. The rest of his life he spent at Bethlehem hi literary labors, producing two works, namely, *An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the neighboring States* (Philadelphia, 1818; transl into French by Duponceau, Paris, 1822, 8vo); and *A Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohegan Indians* (Philadelphia, 1820). He died January 31, 1823. General Cass criticized his writings in the *North Amer. Review,* vol.

26. See also Rondthaler, *Life of Heckewelder* (Phila. 1847, 12mo). (E. de S.)

Hedding, Elijah, D.D.

a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Pine Plains, N.Y., June 7, 1780. Trained religiously by a pious mother, he was converted on the Vergennes Circuit, Vermont, in 1798, and in 1800 was licensed to preach. His early labors in the itinerant ministry were full of toil and privation, and he often met with fierce persecution; but powerful revivals followed his ministry, especially in Vermont and New Hampshire. On the 16th of June 1801, he was admitted on trial in the New York Annual Conference, and appointed to Plattsburg Circuit; in 1802 to Fletcher; in 1803 to Bridgewater Circuit, New Hampshire; after which his work as a preacher lay wholly in New England. In 1807 he was made presiding elder of the New Hampshire District. The country was mountainous, newly settled, and poor; and Mr. Hedding's whole receipts for the first year were $4.25, besides his traveling expenses. In 1808 he was elected a delegate to the General Conference held at Baltimore. A plan for a "delegated" General Conference was discussed by this body, and at first rejected; a rupture seemed imminent, but a reconsideration was brought about, largely through Hedding's influence, and the plan was finally adopted. In 1809 he was appointed to the New London District, and in 1810 he married. In the ten years before his marriage he traveled 3000 miles a year, and preached nearly every day. His pay for this time averaged $45 per annum. "The circuits were large, often requiring three to five hundred miles to complete one round, and this round was completed in from two to six weeks, during which a sermon was to be preached and a class met daily; and often three sermons and three classes to be attended on the Sabbath. The journeys, too, were performed on horseback, through rough and miry ways, and through wildernesses where no road as yet had been cast up. Rivers and swamps were to be forded. Nor could the journey be delayed. On, on, must the itinerant press his way, through the drenching rains of summer, the chilling sleet of spring or autumn, and the driving blasts or piercing cold of winter; and often amid perils, weariness, hunger, and almost nakedness, carrying the Bread of Life to the lost and perishing. And then, when the day of toil was ended, in the creviced hut of the frontier settler, the weary itinerant, among those of kindred hearts and sympathies, found a cordial though humble place of repose." "For twenty-four years before his election to the episcopacy he received his annual appointments at Conference, and

prosecuted the duties assigned him on circuits, and stations, and presiding elders' districts. The fields of his labor lay, after the first few years, wholly in the New-England States; and when the New-England Conference was separated from New York, he became identified with that work. In the introduction and establishment of Methodism in New England-itself one of the most romantic, as it is perhaps the best recorded portion of Methodist history-he was an active and most: efficient agent, and in its stirring scenes and forlorn but heroic labors he spent the flower of his manhood; and upon it, no doubt, he left the impress of his own great spirit, which remains his noblest and most enduring monument." From 1808 to 1824 he was a delegate to every General Conference, and was always eminent in. influence and power at the sessions of that body. *In* the "Presiding Elder Question" at the Conferences of 1820 and 1824, he stood with those who favored the election of presiding elders by the Conferences; but his; zeal in the cause never degenerated into rashness, or became liable to the charge of disloyalty. In 1824 he was elected bishop. He accepted the office with great reluctance, and filled it with the most distinguished ability and acceptance for 26 years. "In the exercise of the episcopal functions he developed rare qualifications as a pre-siding officer, and especially as an expounder of ecclesiastical law. The soundness of his views upon the doctrines and discipline of the Church was so fully and so universally conceded, that in the end he became almost an oracle in these respects, and his opinions are regarded, with profound veneration. As a theologian and divine, his views were comprehensive, logical, and well matured. Not only had they been elaborated with great care, but the analysis was very distinct; and the successive steps were not only clearly defined in the original analysis, but distinct even in the minutiae of their detail. His discourses were after the same pattern — an example of neatness, order, perspicuity, and completeness. From the year 1844, age and increasing infirmities compelled him to seek relief from the heavy burden of labor he had previously preformed, and his visits to the Annual Conferences became less frequent. Yet his labors and responsibilities were still very great. He was almost incessantly sought unto by ministers in almost every part of the United States for counsel and assistance, and for information upon points of ecclesiastical law and in the administration of discipline." In 1850 he had a severe attack of acute disease, but he partially recovered, and lingered, after suffering severely, until the 9th of April 1852, when he died in peace and triumph at his home in Poughkeepsie. His intellect suffered neither weakness; nor obscuration to the last. "About three o'clock in the morning,

a change took place betokening the near approach of death. Early in the morning his sufferings: were great; his extremities were cold, and his death agony was upon him; but his intellectual powers — consciousness, perception, memory, reason, were unaffected. Several Christian friends witnessed his dying struggles, and the glorious triumph of his abiding faith. The Rev. M. Richardson came in, and inquired whether his prospect was clear; he replied with great emphasis, 'Oh yes, *yes*, YES! I have been wonderfully sustained of late, beyond the usual degree.' After a pause, he added, *'I trust in Christ, and he does not disappoint me. I feel him, I enjoy him, and I look forward to an inheritance in his kingdom."* A full account of the labors of this great and good man will be found in the *Life and Times of the Rev. E. Hedding, D.D.*, by D. W. Clark, D.D. (New York, 1855, 8vo; reviewed by Dr. Curry in the *Methodist Quarterly*, Oct. 1855); see also Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church;* Sprague, *Annals, 7*, 354; *North American Review*, 72, 349.

Hedge

the rendering in the A.V. (besides derivatives from ËWs or Ëkis;. rendered as a *verb)*, 1, of three words from the same root (rdG), which, as well as their Greek equivalent *(φραγμός)*, denotes simply that which surrounds or encloses, whether it be a stone wall (rdeGe *ge'der*, <202431>Proverbs 24:31; <234210>Ezekiel 42:10) or a fence of other materials. rdeG; *gader'*, and hrdeG] *gederah'*, are used of the hedge of a vineyard (<042224>Numbers 22:24; <199040>Psalm 89:40; <130423>1 Chronicles 4:23); and the latter is employed to describe the wide walls of stone, or fences of thorn, which served as a shelter for sheep in winter and summer (<043216>Numbers 32:16). The stone walls which surround the sheepfolds of modern Palestine are frequently crowned with sharp thorns (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 299), — a custom at least as ancient as the time of Homer *(Od. 14*, 10), when a kind of prickly pear (ἄχερδος) was used for that purpose, as well as for the fences of cornfields at a later period (Arist. *Eccl.* 355). In order to protect the vineyards from the ravages of wild beasts (<198012>Psalm 80:12), it was customary to surround them with a wall of loose stones or mud (<402133>Matthew 21:33; <411201>Mark 12:1), which was a favorite haunt of serpents (<211008>Ecclesiastes 10:8), — and a retreat for locusts from the cold (<340317>Nahum 3:17). — Such walls are described by Maundrell as surrounding the gardens of Damascus. "They are built of great pieces of earth, made in the fashion of brick and hardened in the sun. In their

dimensions they are each two yards long and somewhat more than one broad, and half a yard thick. Two rows of these, placed one upon another, make a cheap, expeditious, and, in this dry country, a durable wall" *(Early Travels in Pal.* p. 487). A wall or fence of this kind is clearly distinguished in <2305> Isaiah 5:5 from the tangled hedge, 2, hkwcm, *mzesukah'* 1(jkwsm, <3704> Micah 7:4), which was planted as an additional safeguard to the vineyard (comp. Ecclus. 28:24), and was composed of the thorny shrubs with which Palestine abounds. The prickly pear, a species of cactus, so frequently employed for this purpose in the East at present, is believed to be of comparatively modern introduction. The aptness of the comparison of a tangled 'hedge of thorn to the difficulties which a slothful man conjures up as an excuse for his inactivity will at once be recognized (<2059> Proverbs 15:19; comp. <2806> Hosea 2:6). The narrow paths between the hedges of the vineyards and gardens, ': with a fence on this side and a fence on that side" (<0224> Numbers 22:24), are distinguished from the ~" highways," or more frequented tracks, in <4423> Luke 14:23 (Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture,* p. 166; Trench, *On the Parables,* p. 193). — Smith, s.v.

Hedge, Levi, LL.D.

a professor in Harvard University, was born in 1777 at Hardwick, Mass. He graduated at Harvard University in 1792. "His whole life, from his childhood, may be said to have been connected with the University. In 1795 he was appointed tutor, and subsequently received the appointment of permanent tutor; in 1810 he was made college professor of logic and metaphysics; and in 1827 he was transferred to the Alford professorship of natural religion, moral philosophy, and civil polity. In 1830 he was compelled by an attack of paralysis to resign his position. He died Jan. 3, 1844. He is remembered by many pupils as a faithful instructor and kind friend." He published a" System of Logic" (1818, 18mo), which passed through several editions, and has been translated into German. He was the father of Dr. F. H. Hedge, an eminent Unitarian *minister. Christian Examiner, 36,* 299.

Hedio, Gaspar or Caspar

one of the early German Reformers, was born at Ettlingen, Baden, in 1494. He studied theology at Freiburg and Basle, where in 1519 he sustained, in presence of Capito, the theses afterwards printed under the title *Conclusiones ex Evangelica Scriptura et veteri utriusque linguae*

theologia mutuatas disp. Caspar Iledio (1519, fol.). They are 24 in number, treating on the attributes of God and predestination, and evince a decided tendency towards the Reformation. In 1520 he began to correspond with Luther and Zwingle; in the same year he was called to Mentz on the recommendation of Capito, and was made court preacher and vicar to the archbishop. He resigned his offices in 1523, and retired to Strasburg. The chapter of that city offered him the pulpit of the cathedral, but the bishop refused to confirm the offer until Hedio had promised to confine himself to preaching the Word of God. His preaching was very popular, because it was simple and Biblical. He was naturally timid, and incapable of taking a leading part in the religious movement then going on; but his services as coadjutor to Bucer and Capito in consolidating the Reformation in Strasburg were very great. In 1551 he was sent, with Lenglin and Soll, to confer with the German theologians on the subject of the Confession of Faith. He died at Strasburg Oct. 17,1552. Among his writings are *Chronicon Germanicum, oder Beschr. aller alten christl. Kirchen bis aufs Jahr* 1545 (Strasb. 1530,3 vols. *fol.): — Smaragdi abbatis Commentarii in Evangelia et Epistolas,* which he translated himself into *German: — Chronicon abbatis Urspergensis correctum, et Paralipomena addita ab anno* 1230 *ad ann.* 1537, translated also into German by him*self: — Sententinae Ph. Melanchthonis, Mart. Buceri, Gasp. Hedionis et aliorums de pace Ecclesiae, annl.* 1534 (1607, 8vo). Melchior Adam considers him also as the translator of the histories of Eusebius, Hegesippus, and Josephus, and other works. See Melchior Adam, *Vitae Germanorum Philosophorums* (Heidelberg, 1615-1620, 4 vols. 8vo), 1, 116; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, Nouv. *Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 718. (J. N. P.)

Hedschra or Hedjra

SEE HEGIRA.

Heduosmon.

SEE MINT.

Hedwig, St.

was the daughter of Agnes and Berthold, duke of Carinthia. She married Henry, duke of Poland and Silesia, by whom she had three sons and three daughters. They afterwards made a vow of chastity, Henry becoming

priest and subsequently bishop, while Hedwig entered a Cistercian convent near Trebnitz, without, however, taking the veil. She died there October 15, 1243, and was buried in the convent. She was canonized by pope Clement IV in 1267 (or 1268). She is commemorated on the 17th of October. See Arnaud d'Andilly, *Vie des Saints Illustra;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, *23*, 728.

Heerbrand, Jakob

a Lutheran theologian, was born at Giengen Aug. 12, 1521. After studying at Ulm and Wittenberg, he was ordained at Tübingen, from whence he was banished for objecting to the Interim; but he was soon recalled, and made pastor of Herrenberg. In 1551, duke Christopher sent him as one of the theological delegates to the Council of Trent. Charles, prince of Baden, employed him in reforming the churches in his dominions, and in 1560 he was chosen professor of divinity at Tübingen, where he died May 22, 1600. Of his works, which are numerous both in German and Latin, the principal is *Compendium Theologiae* (Tübingen, 1578, fol., often reprinted), a work which long held its place as a textbook. The negotiations between the Tübingen theologians of that time and the patriarch of Constantinople caused this compend to be translated into Greek (by M. Crusius), and to be sent to Constantinople. The Greek translation was published, together with the original, at Wittenberg in 1782. His opponents used to call him, on account of his polemical zeal, Hollbrand ("hell-fire"). See Melchior Adam, *Vit. Theologorum, 1,* 137; Hook, *Eccl. Biography,* vol. 5.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 5, 627.

Heermann, Johann

a Silesian Protestant pastor and hymn writer, was born at Rauten, Silesia, Oct. 11, 1585. At school he displayed early talent. In 1611 he became pastor at Koben. During the Thirty Years' War Silesia was the seat of war and plunder, and Heermann was often obliged to conceal himself to save his life. He gave up his pastoral charge at Koben in 1638, and died Feb. 17, 1647. In the height of his troubles in 1630, he published a volume of hymns under the title *Devoti llusica Cordis,* and his productions afterwards were very numerous. Heermann's hymns are "distinguished by great depth and tenderness of feeling, by an intense love of the Savior, and by humility, while in form they are sweet and musical." Many of them are still in use in Germany, and some have been translated into English. Two of them-"A

Song of Tears" and "A Song of Comfort" — together with several hymns written during his last illness, are given in Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany,* p. 197 sq, with a sketch of the life of Heermann. Others are given in Miss Winkworth, *Lyra Germanica,* and in Schaff, *Christ in Song* (N. York, 1869). A selection from his hymns, in German, may be found in Wackermagel, *Heermann's eistliche Liedei* (Stuttgart, 1856). Of his other works we mention *Heptalogus Christi* (on the seven words on the cross), Breslau, 1619; new edit. Berlin, 1856.

He'gai

(Heb. *Hegay',* ygheperh. *eunuch,* Esther 2:8, 15; Sept. Τα ,Vulg. *Egeus)* or He'ge (Heb. *id.* aghidem, Esther 2:3; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Egeus),* the eunuch having charge of the harem of Xerxes, and the preparation of the females sought as concubines for him. B.C. 479. Winer *(Wörterbuch* s.v.) thinks he may be the same with *Hegias (*Ἡγίας*),* who is mentioned by Ctesias *(Perseus,* 24) as present at the check of the Persian army at Thermopylae.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich

the greatest of modern German metaphysicians. The following sketch of his life is modified from the *English Cyclopaedia.* He was born at Stuttgart Aug. 27, 1770, and was educated at the gymnasium of his native city. From 1788 to 1793 he studied at Tübingen, where he had for his class fellow the illustrious Schelling; and where he acquired not only a knowledge of the history of philosophy, but also a thorough acquaintance with the natural and political sciences. Upon being admitted doctor in philosophy, he accepted an engagement as private tutor, in which capacity he lived for some years, first in Switzerland, and afterwards at Frankfort-on-the-Main, until, on the death of his father in 1800, he was enabled, by the inheritance of a small patrimony, to devote himself to the study of philosophy. He accordingly proceeded to Jena, where Schelling was teaching his system of "Absolute Identity," of which Hegel was at this period one of the warmest partisans. "Here he composed his first philosophical work, entitled *Ueber die Differens der Fichte schen und Schellingschen Philosophie*

On the Difference of the Systems of Fichte and Schelling); — which treatise, notwithstanding the sincerity with which Hegel then advocated the

views of the latter, contained the germ of that dissent which was afterwards expanded into a peculiar theory. He was also associated with Schelling in conducting the *Kritische — Journal der Philosophie* (Critical Journal of Science);;and among the most important of the articles contributed by him is that “On Faith and Science,” which contains a luminous review of the doctrines of Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte, whose several systems are represented as nothing more than so many forms of a purely subjective philosophy. In 1806, when Schelling went to Würzburg, Hegel was appointed to supply his place as lecturer. Now for the first time Hegel openly avowed his dissatisfaction with the system of Schelling. The difference between the ideas of the master and disciple was marked still more strongly in the *Phoenomenologie des ,Geistes* (Phenomenology of Mind), which was published at Bamberg, whither Hegel had retired after the battle of Jena. This work he used to call his Voyage of Discovery, as indicating the researches he had passed through in order to arrive at a clear knowledge of the truth. It contains an account of the several grades of development through which the ‘self,’ or ‘ego,’ proceeds: first of all from consciousness into self-consciousness; next into reflective and active reason, from which it becomes philosophical reason, self-cognizant and self-analyzing, until at last, rising to the notion of God, it manifests itself in a religious form. The title ‘Pheanomenology’ points out the limits of the work, which is confined to the phenomena of mind as displayed in the elements of its immediate existence, that is, in experience. It traces the course of mind up to the point where it recognizes the identity of thought and substance, of reason and reality, and where the opposition of science and reality ceases. Henceforward mind develops itself as pure thought or simple science, and the several forms it successively assumes, which differ only in their subject-matter or contents, are the objects of logic, or ‘dialectic.’ In 1808 he was called to preside over the gymnasium of Nurnberg. In 1812 he published his Logic *(Wissenschaft der Logik)*, which was designed, with the ‘Phenomenology,’ to complete the whole body of science. Hegel employs the term logic in a very extended sense. He does not confine it, as is usually the case, to the account of the abstract forms of thought and the laws of connection of ideas, but understands by it the science of the self-sufficient and self determining idea-the science of truth and of reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are one and identical, it followed that whatever is true of the former is true also of the latter, and consequently the laws of logic become ontological. From this point of view Hegel describes in this work the progress of

reason; how, by virtue of a peculiar and inherent impulse, it passes constantly onwards, until at last it returns into itself. The general merits of this work were at once admitted, and the high powers of philosophical reflection which it evinced were acknowledged by the offer of a professorship at Heidelberg in 1817. His first course of lectures was attended by a numerous and distinguished class, attracted by the profoundness and originality of his views, notwithstanding the great obscurity of his style. By the publication of the *Encyklopadie der philos. Wissenschaften* (Encyclopedia, of Philosophical Sciences) in 1817, his reputation as a philosopher was established, and Hegel was invited by the Prussian government to fill the chair at Berlin, which had remained vacant since the death of Fichte in 1814. This work, being designed as a manual for his class, takes a general view of his whole system, and exhibits in the clearest manner the ultimate tendency of his views. Considering logic as the base of all ontology, and starting from the idea in itself or potentially, he considers it as the essence and primary substance. He then examines thought as at first existing in itself, then *in other* or in nature; next in the mind of the individual, in a purely subjective point of view; and then objectively, in its outward realization; and, lastly, as he terms it, absolutely, that is, as manifesting itself in art, religion, and philosophy. From 1817 until death terminated his career there is nothing to relate in the life of Hegel beyond the constantly increasing celebrity of his lectures and the publication of several works. He successively published the *Philosophy of Jurisprudence,* two new editions of the *Encyclopedia,* the first volume of the second edition of his *Logic,* and several articles in the *Annals of Scientific Criticism,* which he had established as an organ of his system, and of its application to every branch of art and science" *(Eng. Cyclop.).* He died Nov. 14,1831, of cholera.

Hegel's influence upon the philosophy and theology of Germany has been very great. It is impossible, in brief space, to give a full idea of the Hegelian system. "The transcendental idealism of Kant formed the transition from the *empiricism* of the 18th century, and effected, as it were, a compromise between the ancient realism and the skepticism of Hume. To the system of Kant succeeded the pure and absolute idealism of Fichte, destined to be displaced in its turn by Schelling's system of absolute identity and intellectual intuition, which was itself to be further modified and developed by the *dialectical momentum* of Hegel. Essentially the systems of Hegel and Schelling are both founded on the same principle, namely, the absolute

ideality of thought and being; for there is evidently but little difference between the doctrine of Schelling, which supposed that the human mind contained within it the fullness of reality and truth, the consciousness of which it may attain to simply by contemplating its own nature, and that of Hegel, according to whom the *concrete notion*, or the reason, comprises within itself all verity, and that, in order to arrive at the science thereof, it is only necessary to employ logical thought, or dialectic. The difference is purely a difference of method. For the rigorous formalism of Fichte, Schelling had substituted a sort of poetical enthusiasm, and, banishing from philosophy the scientific form it had received from Wolff, had introduced into it the rapturous mysticism of the intellectual intuition. Hegel, however, insisting that the scientific system is the only form under which truth can exist, re-established the rights and utility of method by his doctrine of the dialectical momentum, or development of the idea. Indeed, with Hegel the method of philosophy is philosophy itself. This he defines to be the knowledge of *the evolution of the concrete*. The concrete is the idea, which, as a unity, is diversely determined, and has in itself the principle of its activity. The origin of the activity, the action itself, and the result are one, and constitute the concrete. Its movement is the development by which that which exists merely potentially is realized. The concrete in itself, or virtually, must become actual; it is simple, yet different. This inherent contradiction of the concrete is the spring of its development. Hence arise differences, which, however, ultimately vanish into unity. There is both movement, and repose in the movement. The difference scarcely becomes apparent before it disappears, whereupon there issues from it a full and concrete unity. Of this he gives the following illustration: the flower, notwithstanding its many qualities, is one; no single quality that belongs to it is wanting in the smallest of its leaves, and every portion of the leaf possesses the same properties as the entire leaf. He then observes that although this union of qualities in sensible objects is readily admitted, it is denied in immaterial objects, and held to be irreconcilable. Thus it is said that man possesses liberty, but that freedom and necessity are mutually opposed; that the one excluding the other, they can never be united so as to become concrete. But, according to Hegel, the mind is in reality concrete, and its qualities are liberty and necessity. It is by necessity that man is free, and it is only in necessity that he experiences liberty. The objects of nature are, it is true, subject exclusively to necessity; but liberty without necessity is an arbitrary abstraction, a purely formal liberty" *(English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.).

Hegel “rejected the intellectual intuition of the philosophy of nature, and studied to make philosophy an intelligible science and knowledge by means of dialectics. He called philosophy the Science of Reason, because it is the idea and consciousness of all *esse* in its necessary development. It is his principle to include all particular principles in it. Now as the Idea is reason identical with itself, and as, in order to be cognizant of itself, or, in other words, as, in order to be self-existing *(fir sich seyn),* it places itself in opposition to itself, so as to appear something else, without, however, ceasing to be one and the same thing; in this case philosophy becomes divided:

1. Into logic considered as the science of the Idea in and for itself.

2. Into the philosophy of nature considered as the science of the Idea representing itself externally (reason thrown out in nature).

3. Its third division is that of the philosophy of mind, expressing the return of the Idea within itself, after having thrown itself without externally.

All logic, according to Hegel, presents three momentums:

1. The abstract or intelligible momentum, which seizes the object in its most distinct and determinate features, and distinguishes it with precision.

2. The dialectic or negative rational momentum consists in the annihilation of the determinations of objects, and their transition to the opposite determinations.

3. The speculative momentum perceives the unity of the determinations in their opposition.

Such is the method which philosophy aught to follow, and which is frequently styled by Hegel the immanent movement, the spontaneous development of the conception. Logic is essentially speculative philosophy because it considers the determinations of thought in and for itself, consequently of concrete and pure thoughts, or, in other words, the conceptions, with the significations of the self-subsisting foundation of all. The primary element of logic consists in the oneness of the subjective and objective; this oneness is the absolute science to which the mind rises as to its absolute truth, and is found in the truth, that *pure Esseis pure*

conception in itself; and that pure conception: alone is true Esse. The absolute idealism of Hegel has considerable affinity with Schelling's doctrine of Identity on this point, but it shows a clear departure from it in the method. With Hegel, logic usurps the place of what had been previously styled Metaphysics and Critique of pure Reason. The first, and perhaps the most suggestive, of Hegel's works, his *Phenomenology of the: Mind,* contains a history of the progressive development of the consciousness. Instinctive or common knowledge: only regards the object, without considering itself. But the consciousness contains, besides the former, also a perception of itself, and embraces, according to Hegel, three stages in its progress consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. The first represents the object standing in opposition to the *Ego,* the second the *Ego* itself, and the third accidents attaching to the *Ego,* i.e. thoughts. This phenomenology constituted at first a. sort of introduction to pure science, whereas later it came to form a part of his doctrine of the mind. Purer science or logic is divided, 1st, into the logic of *Esse* or being *(das Seyn);* 2nd, into the logic of qualified nature *(das Wesen);* 3rd, into logic of the conception or of the idea. The two first constitute the objective logic, and the last division the subjective logic, containing the substance of vulgar logic. Hegel treated as fully of the philosophy of right and of art as of the metaphysical part of his system. According to his view, the *essential'* in man is thought; but thought is not a general abstraction, opposed to the particular abstraction; on the contrary, it embraces the particular within itself (concrete generality). Thought does not remain merely internal and subjective, but it determines and renders itself objective through the medium of the will (practical mind). To will and to know are two inseparable: things; and the free-will of man consists in the faculty of appropriating and of rendering the objective world his own, and also in obeying the innate laws of the universe, because he wills it. Hegel places the existence of right in the fact that every existence in general is. the existence of a free-will. Right is usually confounded with morality, or with duty placed in opposition to inclination. There exists, however, a higher morality raised above this, which bids us act according to truly rational ends, and which ought to constitute the true: nature of man. We find the objective development of this higher morality in the State and in history (Tennemann, *Manual of the History of Philosophy,* § 424).

Hegel's view of the philosophy of religion is thus stated by Schwegler: "All religions seek a union of the divine and human. This was done in the crudest form, by

> **(a.)** the natural religions of the Oriental world. God is with them, but a power of nature, a substance of nature, in comparison with which the finite and the individual disappear as nothing.
>
> **(b.)** A higher idea of God is attained by the religions of spiritual individuality, in which the divine is looked upon as subject-as an exalted subjectivity, full of power and wisdom in Judaism, the religion of sublimity; as a circle of plastic divine forms in the Grecian religion, the religion of beauty; as an absolute end of the State in the Roman religion, the religion of the understanding or of design.
>
> **(c.)** The revealed or Christian religion first establishes a positive reconciliation between God and the world by beholding the actual union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, the God-man, and apprehending God as triune, i.e. as himself, as incarnate, and as returning from this incarnation to himself. The intellectual content of revealed religion, or of Christianity, is thus the same as that of speculative philosophy; the only difference being that in the one case the content is represented in the form of the representation, in the form of a history, while in the other it appears in the form of the conception" (Schwegler, *Hist. of Philosophy,* transl. *by* Seelye, N. Y. 1864, p. 364).

If, now, after having acquired a general idea of Hegel's philosophical system, we ask what solution that system gives to the questions which most interest humanity; what becomes in it of a just and merciful God, of the individuality and personality of man, the free agency and morality of his acts, his hopes of another life, of a brighter future, we shall find no satisfactory answer. The system claims to agree completely with true Christianity, yet its tendencies seem to be pantheistic and anti-Christian. Hegel himself constantly asserts that his philosophical system is in no way contradictory to the Christian religion, and only differs from it in its forms and expressions. Yet in his system the absolute idea, whose evolution constitutes both the spiritual and the material world, becomes, in its last development, *the universal mind,* the absolute and infinite subject; and this absolute subject is put in the place of God, who therefore can have no self-conscious existence except in finite and individual subjects. And since this system has no substance but the idea, no reality but the development of the

idea, and no absolute reality except the mind, which is its end, it follows that finite and individual subjects themselves are but fleeting forms of the universal mind, which is their substance. What becomes, then, of the immortality of the soul, which presupposes in it an independent substantiality, a true personality, an undying individuality? And if the universal mind be but the logical sum of finite minds, without other consciousness than what it finds in individuals, it follows that pantheism can only be avoided by falling into atheism; *our* personality can only be saved at the expense of that of God himself. Hegel's moral system seems to float between two extremes, each as dangerous as the other. In either case free agency and morality appear equally endangered. While actually destroying all distinctions — which, it is true, he considers as continually produced by universal motion, the single existing actuality-does not Hegel at the same time obliterate all distinction between good and evil, and destroy one of the surest pledges of a future life? If all is but evolution, the evolution of a given content, then all is virtually determined; and freedom, though proclaimed by the very essence of the mind, becomes necessity, in finite beings: all that they consider as their own work, the effect of their individual action, becomes really but a part of the universal work, an effect of the eternal activity of the general and absolute mind.

The essence of Hegel's religious philosophy is found in the doctrine that the world, including nature and humanity, is only the self-manifestation of God. Such a system, presented with the wonderful dialectical skill that Hegel possessed, could not fail to exert a great effect upon the theology of his age. Soon after he commenced the publication of *The Journal for Scientific Criticism* (1817), the Hegelian philosophy began to show its power. This magazine was at first exclusively devoted to the external propagation of Hegelianism, and it added greatly, during Hegel's lifetime, to the number of proselytes. Immediately after the death of Hegel his orthodox followers effected the publication of all his works (G. W. F. Hegel's *Werke, durch einen Verein von Freunden des Verewigten,* etc., Berlin, 1834-45, 18 vols. 8vo). Disputes soon arose in the Hegelian school concerning the Person of God, the Immortality of the Soul, and the Person of Christ, which terminated in the division of the school into two camps. Daumer, Weisse, Goschel, Rosenkranz, Schaller, and others (called the *right* wing), attempted to connect the theistic idea of God with the common notion of the divinity contained in the Hegelian philosophy, and to prove the former from the latter; whilst Michelet, Strauss, and others (the

left wing), maintained that the pantheistic idea of God was the only true result of the Hegelian principle, and represented God as the universal substance or the eternal universe, which becomes first absolutely conscious of itself in humanity. Goschel, Heinrichs, Rosenkranz, Marheinecke, and others, attempted, besides, to justify the ecclesiastical idea of Christ, as specifically the only God-man, on philosophical grounds, whereas Bauer, Conradi, Michelet, Strauss, and others, maintained that the unity of the divinity and of humanity was not realized in one individual, but in the whole of humanity, so that the latter in reality is the God-man. Finally, Strauss and Feuerbach (the extreme *left)* developed Hegelianism into full-blown atheism and infidelity. "The Hegelian school pretended to find an equivalent for the objects of Christian faith and the propositions of Christian theology in the dogmas of their system. The latter were said to be the pure and final rendering of that which Christianity presents in a popular form. The substantial contents of both were averred to be identical. The Trinity, the Atonement, and the other doctrines of the orthodox creed had now — so it was claimed-received a philosophical vindication, and the vulgar rationalism which had flippantly impugned these high mysteries was at length laid low. These sounding pretensions could only mislead the undiscerning. A philosophy which denies the distinct personality of God, and consequently must regard prayer as an absurdity, can by no legerdemain be identified with Christian doctrine. The appearance of the *Life of Christ* by Strauss, and the subsequent productions of Baur and his school, through the applications which they made of the Hegelian tenets to the New-Testament history and the teaching of the apostles, placed this conclusion beyond a doubt" (Fisher, *Essays on the Supernatural,* p. 587).

It is not to be understood that Hegel's system is now *universally* held to be pantheistic or even anti-Christian in tendency. An analysis and translation of Hegel's *Phenomenology,* also *Outlines* of his *Logic,* are given in the *Journ. of Spec. Philos.* vols. 1, 2, 3, (St. Louis, 1868-9), by the editor, W. T. Harris, which journal demands the careful study of all who profess to judge of Hegelianism. The points made in the *Journal* are also summed up by a writer in the *Amer. Quar. Church Review,* Oct. 1869, who maintains not only that Hegel's system is not pantheistic, but that it is the widest and deepest system of thought yet offered to mankind, and that, too, in full harmony with Christianity. We cite from this article the following passages: "To help us to the highest education of our reason is the aim of Hegel, and this help is the inestimable gift he offers to all who will understand him. To

him philosophy is not philosophy unless it ‘stands up for all those great religious interests to which alone we virtually live.’ Every step of his system is towards the deep truths of the faith; but these things are not mere dogmas with Hegel; they appear as the logical results of the most logical of systems” *(Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 1, 256). “In the Christian religion,” says Hegel, “God has revealed himself, that is, he has given us to understand what he is; and the possibility of knowing him thus afforded us renders such knowledge a duty. God wishes no narrow-hearted souls or empty heads for his children, but those whose spirit is of itself, indeed, poor, but rich in the knowledge of him, and who regard this knowledge as their only valuable possession” *(Amer. Ch. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 415). “They who regard God as negative unity, and the creature not as self-determining, these are pantheists. With such a God we should only seem to be; we should only be ‘modes’ of that ‘substance.’ But man, being a self-determining creature, is his own negative unity, and hence his immortality. ‘He cannot be a mere phase of a higher being, for he is essentially a reflection of that.’ We are made in God’s image, and in him spiritually we see ourselves: who does not see, then, that the highest thought in Hegel’s philosophy is only an elucidation of’ the central dogma of the Christian faith. God is this ideal unity, and each person of the Holy Trinity is that one God in his entirety. To sum up briefly the points of this comparison: We have found that Hegel’s doctrine of Being is the direct converse of the pantheistic theory; for whereas the latter considers pure Being identical with the All, Hegel regards it as equivalent to nonentity Secondly, pantheism has always held fast to the abstractions of the understanding, and hence it has attacked all forms of Becoming; but Hegel’s invincible dialectic has demolished this strong position, and led us up to the higher ground of the concrete notion. Thirdly, the pantheistic view of the Negative is abstract. ‘Being alone is, and non-being is not.’ But with Hegel the ultimate form of the negative is immanent contradiction; the negative is not *for itself;* but out of it is constituted the true positive. (This leads to the view of the Universal as the only real, independent individual, the I Am that I Am.) Fourthly, the true pantheists held Distinction to be impossible, while the theory of the materialistic pantheists was Atomism, the abstract and separate validity of Identity and Distinction; but Hegel leaves both theories far behind him when he penetrates to the inmost depths of the subject, and arrives at Self-determination as the origin and principle of all distinction whatever. (This, again, leads to the self-determination of the Absolute — the spirituality of God.) Fifthly, the unity of pantheism is a

‘negative unity,’ which annuls the independence of multiple factors; but with Hegel the true unity, the unity of the Absolute, is purely affirmative, subsisting through the very independence of its members. (And here we reach a development of the great Christian idea of the Trinity.) Here is not pantheism taking a new dress, but pantheism receiving a flat contradiction upon its cardinal principles” *(ibid.* p. 403-4).

Literature. — For an able article on Hegel’s philosophy, and its influence on religion and theology in Germany, see Ulrici, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 5, 629-646. See also, besides the works cited above, Kahnis, *History of German Protestantism,* p. 196, 244; Saintes, *History of Rationalism,* chap. 13, 18; Schaff, *Apostolic Church, §* 34; *Princeton Review,* Oct. 1848, art. 4; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy,* chap. 5.; *Bibliotheca Sacra, 8,* 503; Vera, *Introduction* a *la Philosophie de Hegel* (Paris, 1855); Haym, *Hegel und seine Zeit* (Berlin, 1858); Chalybaeus, *History of Philosophy from Kant to Hegel;* Sibree, translation of Hegel’s *Philosophy of History* (London, Bohn); Sloman and Wallon, translation of Hegel’s *Subjective Logic* (Lond. 1855); Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (4th edit. Lond. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 531 sq.; Stirling, *Secret of Hegel,* giving a translation of portions of Hegel’s *Logic* (London, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Saisset, *Modern Pantheism,* 2, 11 sq.; Rosenkranz, *Hegel als deutscher Natural philosoph* (Leipz. 1870).

Hegesippus

one of the earliest writers on Church History (between A.D. 150 and 180), was originally a Jew, born near the beginning of the 2nd century. He was converted to the Christian faith, and came to Rome about A.D. 168, where he died, according to the Alexandrine Chronicle, in the reign of Commodus, about A.D. 180. He wrote a collection *of* Υπομνήματα, or *Memorials of the History of the Church,* in five books, from the birth of our Lord to the time of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, who succeeded Anicetus in A.D. 170. This work is all lost except a few fragments preserved by Eusebius, and one in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius. Several extracts may be found translated by Lardner *(Credibility,* vol. 2). All that remains of Hegesippus is given by Routh *(Reliquiae Sacrae,* 2nd edit. 1, 205 sq.), and also by Grabe *(Spicilegium,* 2, 203 sq.) and by Galland *(Bibl. Patr.* 2, 59). “The reports of Hegesippus on the character and martyrdom of St. James the Just, Simeon of Jerusalem, the rise of heresies, the episcopal succession, and the preservation of the orthodox doctrine in

Corinth and Rome, as embodied in the history of Eusebius, command attention for their antiquity; but, as they show that his object was apologetic and polemical rather than historical, and as they bear a somewhat Judaizing (though by no means Ebionistic) coloring, they must be received with critical attention" (Schaff, *Church History*, vol. 1, § 123). The Socinians of the 17th century use his brief statements as proof of' the general spread of Judaizing tendencies in the 1st and 2nd centuries, and Baur, of Tübingen, and his school, have recently reproduced this view. Bishop Bull answered the former, and Dorner, in his *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, 1, 219 (Edinburgh trans. 1, 139 sq.), has refuted the latter. "The evidence tends to prove that he was not even a Hebrew Christian in the sense of observing the law, and there is the most complete proof that he did not regard the observance of the law as essential to salvation. With the destruction of this premise, the keystone of the two theories of the early Unitarians and of Baur is utterly destroyed. The Unitarians maintained that Hegesippus was an Ebionite or Nazarene, and that consequently the whole Church was in his day Ebionitic? though, unfortunately, the few Platonizing writers, who formed a miserable exception to the mass, have been the only writers that a subsequent corrupt age has preserved to us. Baur finds in Hegesippus a most determined antagonist of Paul, and his testimony is appealed to as proof that the Petrine faction had gained the predominance not only in the churches of the East, but even in. those of the West. Both theories run directly contrary to the repeated testimony of Eusebius, and to all the information which we have in regard to the Western churches, and they both fall to pieces unless it be proved that Hegesippus insisted upon the observance of the law as essential to salvation" (Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature, 3*, 188 sq.). See also Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature;* Neander, *Church History*, 1, 675, 676; Lardner, *Works*, vol. 2; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1. 265; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca, 7*, 156; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. 2; Illgen, *Zeitschrift*, 1865, pt. 3.

Hegira

an Arabic word signifying *flight (Hejra)*, now used to designate the epoch from which the Mohammedans compute time. The flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina is fixed by the Mohammedans on July 15, A.D. 622. The process of converting the years of the Hegira into the date after the birth of Christ is as follows. Divide the given number by thirty (the quotient expresses the intercalary cycles elapsed since the Hegira, the

remainder represents the number of years elapsed in the current intercalary cycle); multiply the quotient by 10,631 (the number of days contained in an intercalary cycle), adding to the product the sum of the days contained in the elapsed years of the current cycle, the days of the elapsed current months of the current year up to the time of reckoning, and to the result add again 227,015 (the number of days elapsed between Jan. 1 of the year 1, and July 15, 622, the date of the Hegira). The stun of days thus obtained is most readily converted into Julian years by dividing it by 1461 (the number of days in a Julian intercalary period), then multiplying the quotient by four, and adding to the product the number of whole years contained in the remainder of the division, which is obtained by dividing this remainder by 365. The number of days still remaining shows the day of the month in the current Julian year. Or else the following proportion may be made use of (T representing any date in the Turkish. calendar, and C the corresponding date in the Julian calendar): C =0.970203 T + 621.567785, and T = 1.030712 C 64.65745. If the date is subsequent to the Gregorian reform in the calendar, which can only be the case for modern times, then the Turkish date must first be converted into the Julian, which is then altered to the Gregorian by adding ten days to it for the period extending from Oct. 5, 1582, to the end of February, 1700; eleven days after the latter until the end of February, 1800, and twelve days for all subsequent dates. In making this reduction, the difference between the time at which the day begins in the Turkish and in the Christian calendar must be taken into consideration whenever the time of day of the event calculated is known, as it may make a difference in the date of one day more or less. The Turkish year begins at the end of July. The year 1859 A.C. is in their calendar 1275-76. A simpler mode of reduction, but not strictly accurate, is as follows: The Mohammedan year a lunar year of 354 days, and therefore 33 Mohammedan years =32 Christian. To reduce years of the Hegira, therefore, to years of the Christian era, subtract one from every thirty-three years, and add 622. Thus A.D. 1861 = 1277 of the Hegira. — Pierer, *Universal Lexikon, 8:*721.

Hegius, Alexander

(the name, according to some accounts, being Latinized from the name of his native village, Heck), a German humanist of the 15th century, was born within the diocese of Mitnster about 1433 or 1455 (the exact date is undetermined), and died at Deventer, Holland, in the latter part of 1498. He claims notice here because of his influence in reviving classical learning,

especially by means of the celebrated college which he established at Deventer. This school is named by Hallam *(Lit. of Europe,* 1, 109, Harpers' ed.) as one of the three schools thus early established in Western Europe, outside of Italy, for instruction in the classic languages, "from which issued the most conspicuous ornaments of the next generation." Hegius is said to have been a friend of Rudolph Agricola, and to have himself received instruction in classical literature from Thomas a Kempis. Among his pupils may be named Erasmus, Hermann von dem Busche, Murmellius, and others, whose labors and success in literature add lustre to their teacher's fame. Hegius's writings were but few, and those mainly in the form of poetry and brief grammatical and philosophical treatises; one of a theological type is found in a miscellaneous collection of writings by him, published at Deventer, 1530, 4to, and entitled *De Incarnationis Mysterio Dialogi duo, quibus additum de Paschae et Celebratione et inventione.* Hallam *(1. c.* note) attributes to him "a small 4to tract entitled *Conjugationes Verbornum Graeca, Daventrice Noviter extremo labore collectae et impressae,"* without date or printer's name, and which he regards as the first book printed this side of the Alps in Greek. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 616; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 23,* 763. (J. W. M.)

He-Goat

(prop. rWT[; *attud',* so called as being *adult;* also rtpæ; *tsaphir',* so called from *leaping,* <142921>2 Chronicles 29:21; <150835>Ezra 8:35; Dan. 8:5, 8 [<160617>Ezra 6:17]; vyæ[; *ta'yish,* a *buck,* <013035>Genesis 30:35; 32:14; <141711>2 Chronicles 17:11; <202831>Proverbs 30:31). *SEE GOAT.*

Heidanus, Abraham

professor of theology at Leyden, was born at Frankenthal, in the Palatinate, Aug. 10,1597. He was educated at Amsterdam and Leyden, and in 1627 was appointed to a pastoral charge in the latter city. In 1647 he became professor in the University of Leyden. Heidanus held a mild view of the doctrine of predestination, and adopted the Cartesian philosophy, of which he became a strong advocate. This involved him in various controversies, in which he bore himself admirably. Yet, when nearly eighty years old, he was dismissed from his professorship by the curators of the University. He died at Leyden Oct. 15, 1678. His *Corpus Theologiae Christianae* was posthumously published (1686, 2 vols. 4to).

Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, D.D.

a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born near Zurich July 1, 1633. He studied at Marburg and Heidelberg, where he graduated, and soon after became extraordinary professor of Hebrew, and then professor of theology. In 1659 he went to Steinfurt as professor of theology and ecclesiastical history. War having dispersed the students of Steinfurt, Heidegger returned to Zurich in 1665, and was professor of moral philosophy in the University of the city until 1667. He died at Zurich Jan. 18, 1698. He was the compiler of the famous *Formula Consensus,* adopted by the Synod of Zurich in 1675. *SEE HELVETIC CONFESSIONS*. His writings are chiefly polemical; the most important are *Disputatio: theologica de fine nundi* (Steinfurt, 1660,4to): — *Defide decretorum Concilii Tridentini Quaestiones theologicae* (Steinfurt, 1662 8vo):*De Articulis fundamentalibus Judaicae Religionis* (Steinfurt, 1664, 4to): — *De Hist. sacra Patriarcharum* (Amst. 1667-1671,2 vols. 4to; Zurich, 1729, 2 vols. 4to): — *Anatome Concilii Tridentini* (Zurich, 1672, 2 vols. 8vo):*Dissertationes selectae sacram theologiam dogmaticam,* etc. *illust.* (Zur. 1675-1690, 4 vols. *4to): — Enchirid. Biblicum succinctius* (Zurich, 1681, 8vo; Amst. 1688, 8vo; Jena, 1723, *8vo): — Histor. Papatus, novissimo Historica Lutheranismi et Calvinismi Fabro opposita* (Amst. 1684, 4to; 2nd ed. 1698, 4to; French,Amst. 1685, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Mysterium Babylonis, seu in Divi Johannis theologi: Apocalypseos prophetiam de Babylone magnum diatribe.* (Leyden, 1687, 2 vols. 4to): — *In viam Concordiae ecclesiasticce Protestantium Manuductio* (Amst. 1687. 8vo): *Tumulus Concilii Tridentini,* etc. (Zurich, 1690, 2 vols,. *4to):* — *Labores exegetici in Josuam, Matthaeum, Romanos, Corinthios et Hebrceos* (Zurich, 1700, 4to): — *Corpus Theologiae christ.* (Zurich, 1700, fol.): — 1, *Medzulla Medulle Theol. christ. in gratiam et usum tyronum,* etc. His. autobiography was published by Hofmeister under the: title *Hist. Vitae J. H. Heideggeri, cui non pauca historian Ecclesiae temporis ejusdem, nec non litteras concernantia inseruntur* (Zurich, 1698, 4to). — Niceron, *Memoires pour servir, 17,* 143; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 766sq.; Schweizer, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 5, 652.

Heidelberg Catechism

one of the symbolical books of the Reformed Church. Its name is derived from the city in which it was compiled and first printed. It is also sometimes styled the Palatinate Catechism, from the territory (the

Palatinate) of the prince (Frederick III) under whose auspices it was prepared. The original German title (of the *editio princeps)* is *Catechismus, oder Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen und Schulen der Churfürstlichen Pfalz getrieben wirdt: Gedruckt in der Churfürstlichen Stad Heydelberg, dulrch Johannemr llayer,* 1563 (Catechism, or Christian Instruction, according to the Usages of the Churches and Schools of the Electoral Palatinate).

I. *History.* — Soon after the introduction of Protestantism into the Palatinate in 1546, the controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists broke out, and for years, especially under the elector Otto Heinrich (1556-59), it raged with great violence in Heidelberg. Frederick III, who came into power in 1559, adopted the Calvinistic view on the Lord's Supper, and favored that side with all his princely power. He reorganized the Sapienz College (founded by his predecessor) as a theological school, and put at its head (1562) Zacharias Ursinus, a pupil and friend of Melancthon, who had adopted the Reformed opinions. *SEE URINUS*. In order to put an end to religious disputes in his dominions, he determined to put forth a Catechism, or Confession of Faith, and laid the duty of preparing it upon Zacharias Ursinus (just named) and Caspar Olevianus, for a time professor in the University of Heidelberg, then court preacher to Frederick III. They made use, of course, of the existing catechetical literature, especially of the catechisms of Calvin and of John Lasco. Each prepared sketches or drafts, and "the final preparation was a the work of both theologians, with the constant co-operation of Frederick III. Ursinus has always been regarded as the principal author, as he was afterwards the chief defender and interpreter of the Catechism; still, it would appear that the nervous German style, the division into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in the Catechism of Calvin and the previous draft of Ursinus), and the genial warmth and unction of the whole work, are chiefly due to Olevianus (Schaff, in. *Am. Presb. Rev.* July 1863, p. 379).

When the Catechism was completed, Frederick laid it before a synod of the superintendents of the Palatinate (December, 1562). After careful examination it was approved. The first edition, whose full title is given above, appeared in 1563. The preface is dated January 19 of that year, and runs in the name of the elector Frederick, who probably wrote it. A Latin version appeared in the same year, translated by Johannes Lagus and Lambertus Pithopeus. The German version is the authentic standard. Two other editions of the German version appeared in 1563. What is now the

eightieth question *(What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Roman Mass?*) is not to be found an the first edition; part of it appears in the second edition; and in the third, of 1563 — it is given in full as follows: "What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are engrafted into Christ, who with his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priest; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. (And thus the Mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Christ, and an accursed idolatry.)" The occasion for the introduction of this eightieth question appears to have been the decree of the Council of Trent "touching the sacrifice of the Mass," Sept. 17, 1562. This declaration, and the anathemas pronounced at Trent against the Protestant doctrine of the sacraments, had not time to produce their effect before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism. But the elector soon saw the necessity for a strong and clear declaration on the Protestant side, and such a declaration is furnished in this eightieth question, which was added to the Catechism in 1563. The first edition of 1563 was for a long time lost; that given by Niemeyer *(Collectio Confessionum,* p. 390) is the third of that year. But in 1864 pastor Wolters found a copy and reprinted it, with a history of the text *(Der Heidelb. Katechismus in seiner ursprüzglichen Gestalt,* Bonn, 1864, sm. 8vo), which cleared up all doubt as to the various editions of 1563. In 1866 professor Schaff published a very valuable edition, revised after the first edition of 1563, with an excellent history of the Catechism *(Der Heidelb. Kat. nach d. ersten Ausgabe von* 1563 *revidirt,* Philad. 18mo). — Other editions appeared in 1571 and 1573, and in this last the questions are divided, as now, into lessons for fifty-two Sundays, and the questions are numbered. An abstract of the Catechism appeared in 1585. The larger Catechism has since been republished by millions; no book, perhaps, has gone through more editions, except the Bible, Bunyan's *Pilgrim,* and Kempis. It has been translated into nearly every spoken language. It was, of course, at once used throughout the Palatinate by command of the elector. But it soon spread abroad wherever the Reformed Church had found footing, especially in North Germany and parts of

Switzerland. It was early received in the Netherlands, and formally adopted at the Synod of Dort, 1618. Long and bitter controversies with Roman Catholics and Lutherans on the Catechism only endeared it the more to the Reformed. It is to this day an authoritative confession for the Reformed churches (German and Dutch). The (Dutch) Reformed Church directs all her ministers to explain the Catechism regularly before the congregations on the Sabbath day.

II. *Contents.* — The Catechism, in its present form, consists of 129 questions and answers. It is divided into three parts:

1. Of the misery of man.
2. Of the redemption of man.
3. Of the gratitude due from man (duties, etc.).

The arrangement of the matter is admirable, looking not simply to logical order, but also to practical edification. The book is not simply dogmatic, but devotional. It assumes that all who use it are Christians, and is thus not adapted for missionary work. As to the theology taught by the book, it is, in the main, that of pure evangelical Protestantism. On the doctrine of predestination it is so reticent that it was opposed, on the one hand, by the Synod of Dort, the most extreme Calvinistic body perhaps ever assembled, and, on the other (though not without qualification), by James Arminius, the greatest of all the opponents of Calvinism. On the nature of the sacraments the Catechism is Calvinistic, as opposed to the Lutheran doctrine. Dr. Heppe *(deutscher Protestantismus,* 1, 443 sq.) goes too far in asserting that the Catechism is thoroughly Melancthonian, and in no sense Calvinistic. Sudhoff answers this in his article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie,* 5, 658 sq.; but he himself goes too far, on the other side, in finding that the Calvinistic theory of predestination, though not expressly stated, is implied and involved in the view of Sin and grace set forth in the Catechism (see Gerhart's article in the *Tercentenary Monument,* p. 387 sq., and also his statement in this Cyclopaedia, 3, 827). Olevianus, it will be remembered, was educated under the influence of Calvin; Ursinus under that of Melancthon. Dr. Schaff remarks judiciously that "the Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the Church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the *twofold* predestination), which belong rather to scientific

theology and private conviction than to a public Church confession and the instruction of youth" *(American Presb. Review,* July, 1863, p. 371).

Literature. — The 300th anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism was celebrated in 1863 both in Europe and America. One of the permanent fruits of this celebration was the publication of *The Heidelberg Catechism, Tercentenary Edition* (New York, 1863, sm. 4to). This noble volume gives a comprehensive Introduction (by Dr. Nevin), and a critical edition of the Catechism in four texts Old German, Latin, Modern German, and English-printed in parallel columns. The Introduction gives an admirable account of the literature and history of the Catechism. The text used is that given by Niemeyer, and not that of the first edition of 1563, which, as has been stated above, was reprinted in 1864. See also Dr. Schaff as edition cited above, and an article by him in the *American Presbyterian Review* for 1863. The Latin text (with the German of the 3rd ed. of 1563) is given in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum,* p. 390 sq.; also in an edition by Dr. Steiner, *Catechesis Religionis Christianae seu Catechismus Heidelbergensis* (Baltimore, 1862). Another valuable fruit of the anniversary is *The Tercentenary Monument* (Chambersburg, 1863, 8vo), containing twenty essays by eminent Reformed theologians of Germany, Holland, and America, on the Catechism, its origin, history, its special relations to the German Reformed Church, and cognate subjects. For the older literary history, see Alting, *Historia Ecclesiae Palatinae* (Frankf. 1701); Struve, *Pfilzische Kirchenhistorie* (Frankfort, 1721); Mundt, *Grundriss der pfalzischen Kirchengeschichte bis* 1742 (Heidelb. 1798); Kocher, *Katechetische Geschichte der Reformirten Kirche* (Jena, 1756); Planck, *Geschichte d. prot. Theologie,* 2, 2,. 475-491; Van Alpen, *Geschichte u. Litteratur d. Heidelb. Katechismus* (Frankf. 1800); Augusti, *Einleitung in die beiden Haupt-Katechismen d. Evang. Kirche* (Elberf. 1824); Ersch und Gruber's *A11. Encykl.* 2, 4. 386 sq.; Nevin, *Hist. and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism* (Chambersburg, 1847); Sudhoff, *Theologisches Handbuch zur Auslegung d. Heidelb. Kat.* (Frankf. 1862). An elaborate article on the literature of the Catechism, by Dr. Harbaugh, is given in the *Mercersburg Review,* October, 1860. A copious list of writers on the Catechism (covering twelve pages) is given at the end of Bethune, *Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism* (N. York, Sheldon and Co., 2 vols. 12mo), an admirable practical commentary, with a valuable historical introduction. Among the older commentators are Ursinus, *Explicationes Catechesis Palatinae* (Opera, 1612, vol. — 1); Ursinus,

Apologia Catechismi Palatinae (Opera, vol. 2). Translations-- Ursinus, *The Summe of Christian Religion*, lectures on the *Catechism*, transl. by H. Parrie (Lond. 1617 4to). The best transl. of Ursinus's Commentary is that of the Rev. G.W. Williard (Columbus, 1852, 8vo, 2nd ed.), with Introduction by Dr. J. W. Nevin. See also Cocceius, *Heid. Cat. explicata et illustrata* (Lugd. Bat. 1671, Amst. 1673); Driesseln. *Ad Cct. Heid. Malnuductio* (Gron. 1724, 4to), Kemp. *Fifty-three Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism*, trans. by Van Harlingen (New Brunswick, N. J., 1810, 8vo). For the views of the early Dutch Arminians on the Catechism, see *Considerationes Remonstrantinum in Cat. Heidelb.* (in *Act. et Script. Synod.* Harderwlyk, 1620). See also Wolters, *Zur Urgeschichte d. Heidelb. Kat.*, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, Heft 1; Trechsel, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, Heft 3; Plitt, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, Heft 1: *Mercersburg Review*, October, 1860.

Heidenheim (Heydenheini), Wolf or Benjamin ben-Simson

a Hebrew scholar and typographer, is distinguished in Hebrew literature by his exertions to provide editions of the Pentateuch free from the errors which marred preceding copies. Indeed, the city in which he lived, *Rodelheim*, near Frankfort on the Maine, became in his day the center of attraction for Hebrew typography. But he has also left us works of his own which betoken a thorough acquaintance with Hebrew philology. Jost even assigns him a place by the side of Mendelssohn. Heidenheim died in 1832, at * a very old age. His most important works are yfep.vj]maeymæ[efbai a tract on the Hebrew accents (Rodelheim, 1808, 12mo): — ˆwvLhia/bm] a treatise on different parts of Hebrew grammar (Rodelheim, 1806, 12mo): — µybæyaeryam]vmiWj , the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary, etc. (Rodelh. 1818-1821,8vo). We have also from him a catalogue of his works, containing 800 in number, under the title µyræSh]itmyvæ] (Rodelh. 1833, 8vo). Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 1, 369; Etleridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 422; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Hdbch.* p. 60; Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden.* p. 361; Kitto, ii, 267. (J. H. W.)

Heifer

(hlg][, *eglah'*, fem. of lg,[e "calf;" hrP; *parah'*, fern. of rP; "bullock;" Sept. and N.T. δάμαλις; Vulg. *vacca).* The Hebrew language has no expression that exactly corresponds to our "heifer," for both *eglah* and *parah* are applied to cows that have calved (<0907>1 Samuel 6:7-12; <1210>Job

21:10; Isaiah 7:21); indeed, *eylah* means a young animal of any species, the full expression being רְקַבָּר עֶלֶת, "heifer of kine" (Deuteronomy 21:3; 1 Samuel 16:2; Isaiah 7:21). The heifer or young cow was not commonly used for ploughing, but only for treading out the corn (Hosea 10:11; but see Judges 14:18), when it ran about without any headstall (Deuteronomy 25:4); hence the expression an "unbroken heifer" (Hosea 4:16; Auth. V. backsliding"), to which Israel is compared. A similar sense has been attached to the expression "calf of three years old," שְׁלֹשׁ עֶגְלָה, i.e. *unsubdued*, in Isaiah 15:5; Jeremiah 48:34: but it has by some been taken as a proper name, *Eglath Shelishiyah,* such names being not very uncommon. The sense of" dissolute" is conveyed undoubtedly in Amos 4:1. The comparison of Egypt to a "fair heifer" (Jeremiah 46:20) may be an allusion to the well-known form under which Apis was worshipped (to which we may also refer the words in ver. 15, as understood in the Sept., "Why is the bullock *[*μόσχος ἐκλεκτός*]* swept away?"), the "destruction" threatened being the bite of the gad-fly, to which the word *keretz* would fitly apply. "To plough with another man's heifer" (Judges 14:18) implies that an advantage has been gained by unfair means. The proper names Eglah, Eneglaim, and Parah are derived from the Hebrew terms at the head of this article. *SEE RED HEIFER*.

Heilmann, Johann David

a learned German theologian, was born at Osnabrück Jan. 13,1727. He studied at Halle, became rector of Hameln in 1764, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1754, where he died Feb. 22. 1764. His principal writings are *Specimen observ. ad illustrat. N.T.* (Halle, 1743, *4to): — Paralliae entre l'esprit d'irrèligion d'oujourdhui et les anciens adversaires de la religion Chretienne* (Halle, 1750, 8vo): — *Compendium theologiae dogmatica* (Göttingen, 1761 and 1.774 8vo): — *Opuscula theol. Arjnumenti* (ed. Danovius, Jena, 1774-77, 2 vols. 8vo). — G. G. Heyne, *Heilmanni Memoria* (Göttingen, 1764); Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrt. Lexikon,* continued by Adelung, 2, 1868.

Heilprin, Jechiel

a distinguished Jewish philologist and historian, flourished in the first part of the 18th century. He Is said to have been born at Minsk in 1728, but the time of his death is unknown. He wrote (תּוֹלְדוֹת הַיְּהוּדִים) a History. of the

Jews, divided into three parts: Chronicles of Historic Events, from the Creation to his own Time. 2. Alphabetical Catalogue of the Mishnaic and Talmudic Doctors. 3. Alphabetical Index of Jewish Literati (Karlsr. 1769, and Zolkien, 1808, folio). Also *(*µyyæ#Kæ yKe][,8s) a Hebrew Rabbinic Dictionary adapted to the Rabboth, Sifra, Mekiltha, Yolkut, and the works of the Cabalists (Dyrchenfurt, 1806, fol.). Furst commends the excellency of these works, and believes that the first part of Heilprin's history is an able contribution to Hebrew literature. — Furst, *Bib;. Judaica,* 1, 372; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebr, Literature,* p.449. (J. H. W.)

Heineccius, Johann Michael

a Lutheran divine, was born at Eisenberg Dec. 12, 1674, and was educated at Jena, Frankfort, and Giessen. After a visit to Holland and Hamburg, he settled for a time in Helmstadt as tutor *(Docent),* but in 1699 became deacon at Goslar. In 1709 he removed to Halle as pastor, and in 1720 was appointed consistorial counselor and ecclesiastical inspector of the circle of the Saal *(Saalkreis).* He died Sept. 11,1722. His chief work, *Eigentliche und woahrhafige Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer historie, Glaubenslehren und Kirchengebrduchen* (Leipsic, 1711), presents historically the doctrines, government, liturgy, and morals of the Greek. Church, ancient and modern. It is still a work of great value. Besides works in the departments of antiquities: and history, Heineccius wrote *Prüfung der sogenannten neuen Propheten und ihres ausserordentlichen Aufstandes* (Halle, 1715), against the French prophets (q.v.): *Sendschreiben an Thomas Ittig wegen des Termini Gracaiae,* on the Terminist controversy: — *De Jurisconsultis Christianis priorumn sceculorun eorumque in ecclesiam meritis* (Halle, 1713): — *Colloquia religiosa publice et. privatim inter bina haec saecula habita* (Halle and Magdeburg, 1719, 4to). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 624; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 782; Sax, *Onomasticon literarium,* pt. 6:p. 45. (J. W. M.)

Heinicke, Samuel

a German philanthropist, "the most distinguished of the early teachers of the deaf and dumb in Germany," was born April 10, 1729, at Nautzschütz, near Weissenfels, in Prussia, and died at Leipsic April 30, 1790. He passed his early life as a farmer and soldier, then pursued a course of study in the University of Jena, was subsequently for ten years a tutor: of the children

of count Schimmelmann at Hamburg, and then removed to Eppendorf. In this latter place, as early as 1754, he became much interested in a deaf and dumb child, and devised a system of instruction for it, which proved so successful as to attract other deaf mutes to him for instruction, and led to the establishment by the elector of Saxony in 1772 of a school at Leipsic for the education of deaf mutes. This school, "the first ever established or supported by the civil government," was placed under Heinicke's charge, was continued after his death under the charge of his widow, and is still existing and prosperous. The "method of instruction was by articulation and reading on the lip," and is said to have been superior in some respects to that of the abbé de l'Epee. Heinicke's labors and noble character gained for him deservedly the affection of the German people, though his method of treatment of his pupils was probably too harsh, and some of his writings were marred by coarse and ill-natured criticisms of opinions differing from his own. He wrote upon the education of deaf mutes and theological-subjects, viz.: *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments zum Unterrichte taubstummer Personen* (Hamburg. 1776, 8vo; only first part *given): — Beobachtungen über Stumme und über die menschliche Sprache in Briefen* (Hamb. 1778, 8vo): — *Ueber die Denkart der Taubstummen und die Misshandlungen, denen sie durch unsinnige Kuren und Lehrarten ausgesetzt sind* (Leipsic, 1780, 8vo): — *Ueber alte und neue Lehrarten* (Leipsic, 1783) — *Wichtige Entdeckungen und Beitrdge zur Seelenlehre und zur menschlichen Sprache* (Leipsic, 1784, 8vo): — *Metaphysik fur Schulmeister und Plusmacher* (Halle, 1785): — *Ueber graue Vorurtheile und ihre Schaedlichkeit* (Copenhagen and Leipsic, 1787): — *Scheingötterei der Naturalisten, Deisten und Atheisten* (Koethen, 1788): — *Neues AB C, Sylben und Lesebuch nebst einer Aneisung, das Lesen in kurzer Zeit acf die leichteste Art und ohne Buchstabiren zu lernen* (many editions, last Leipsic, 1790). Schlichtegroll assigns to Heinicke also a work on Kant's philosophical works, printed in German (Presburg, 1789, 8vo), but Meusel only the preface to it. Heinicke also wrote articles in *thee Teutscher Merkur* and *Teutsches Museum,* in which he maintained, against the views of the abbd de l'Epde, that deaf mutes should be taught not only to write, but also to speak. — New *American Cyclopedia, 6:*301; 9:59; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 23,* 786 sq.; Petschke, *Historische Nachricht von dem Unterrichte der Tautbstummnen und Blinden* (Leipsic, 1793); Schlichtegroll, *Nekrolog* (1790), p. 313-315; Meusel, *Lexikon der von* 1750 *bis* 1800 *verstorbenen deutschen Schrijtsteller* (Leipsic, 1802-16). (J.W.M.)

Heinsius, Daniel

an eminent scholar, was born in 1580 at Ghent. He studied law for some months at Franeker, but, determining to devote himself to letters, he went to Leyden, where he studied under Joseph Scaliger. In 1599 he began to teach Latin in the university, and on the death of Scaliger (1609) he was made professor of history. He was afterwards made librarian to the University, and historiographer to the States of Holland. He was secretary to the Synod of Dort, 1618. *SEE DORT*. He died Feb. 23, 1655. Besides editing many Latin and Greek classics, he published *Sacrarum exercitationum ad N.T.* libri 20 (Lugd. Bat. 1639, fol.): — *Aristarchus sacer, sire Exercitatiozes ad Nonni Paraphrasin in Johannern* (Lugd. Bat. 1627, sm. 8vo). Heinsius was a strong advocate of a special Hellenistic dialect.

Heir

(some form of the verb ׁרי; to *possess;* Gr. κληρόνομος, a *receiver by lot).* The Hebrew institutions relative to inheritance were of a very simple character. Under the patriarchal system the property was divided among the sons of the legitimate wives (<01210>Genesis 21:10; 24:36; 25:5), a larger portion being assigned to one, generally the eldest, on whom devolved the duty of maintaining the females of the family. *SEE BIRTHRIGHT*. The sons of concubines were portioned off with presents (<01401>Genesis 49:1 sq.), but this may have been restricted to cases where the children had been adopted by the legitimate wife (<01003>Genesis 30:3). But Jacob made the sons whom he had by his concubines heirs, as well as the others (<01412>Genesis 49:12-27). Moses laid no restrictions upon the choice of fathers in this respect; and we may infer that the sons of concubines, for the most part, received an equal share with the other sons, from the fact that Jephthah, the son of a concubine, complained that he was excluded from his father's house without any portion (<07101>Judges 11:1-7). Daughters had no share in the patrimony (<01314>Genesis 31:14), but received a marriage portion, consisting of a maid-servant (<01294>Genesis 29:24, 29) or some other property. As a matter of special favor they sometimes took part with the sons (<18215>Job 42:15). The Mosaic law regulated the succession to real property thus: it was to be divided among the sols, the eldest receiving a double portion (<05217>Deuteronomy 21:17), the others equal shares: if there were no sons, it went to the daughters (<04708>Numbers 27:8), on the condition that they did not marry out of their own tribe (<04806>Numbers 36:6

sq.; Tob. 6:12; 7:13), otherwise the patrimony was forfeited (Josephus, *Ant. 4,* 7, 5). If there were no daughters, it went to the brother of the deceased; if no brother, to the paternal uncle; and, failing these, to the next of kin (Numbers 27:9-11). In the case of a widow being left without children, the nearest of kin on her husband's side had the right of marrying her, and, in the event of his refusal, the next of kin (Ruth 3:12, 13): with him rested the obligation of redeeming the property of the widow (Ruth 4:1 sq.), if it had been either sold or mortgaged: this obligation was termed hLa;GI hi f Pv]mi ("the right of inheritance"), and was exercised in other cases besides that of marriage (Jeremiah 32:7 sq.). If none stepped forward to marry the widow, the inheritance remained with her until her death, and then reverted to the next of kin. *SEE WIDOW*. The object of these regulations evidently was to prevent the alienation of the land, and to retain it in the same family: the Mosaic law enforced, in short, a strict entail Even the assignment of the double portion, which under the patriarchal *regime* had been at the disposal of the father (Genesis 48:22), was by the Mosaic law limited to the eldest son (Deuteronomy 21:15-17). The case of Achsah, to whom Caleb presented a field (Joshua 15:18, 19; Judges 1:15), is an exception; but perhaps even in that instance the land reverted to Caleb's descendants either at the death of Achsah or in the year of Jubilee. The land being thus so strictly tied up, the notion of *heirship,* as we understand it, was hardly known to the Jews: succession was a matter of right, and not of favor-a state of things which is embodied in the Hebrew language itself, for the word v r;y; (A.V. "to inherit") implies *possession,* and very *forcible* possession (Deuteronomy 2:12; Judges 1:29; 11:24), and a similar idea lies at the root of the words hZ;j a} and h l ;j n} generally translated "inheritance." Testamentary dispositions were, of course, generally superfluous: the nearest approach to the idea is the *blessing,* which in early times conveyed temporal as well as spiritual benefits (Genesis 27:19,37; Joshua 15:19). It appears, however, that eventually the father had at least the right of expressing his last wishes or *will* in the presence of witnesses, and probably in the presence of the heirs (2 Kings 20:1). The references to wills in the apostle Paul's writings are borrowed from the usages of Greece and Rome (Heb. 9:17), whence the custom was introduced into Judaea: several wills are noticed by Josephus in connection with the Herods *(Ant. 13,* 16, 1; 17:3, 2; *War,* 2, 2, 3).

With regard to *personal* property, it may be presumed that the owner had some authority over it, at all events during his life-time. The admission of a slave to a portion of the inheritance with the sons (Proverbs 17:2) probably applies only to the personality. A presentation of half the personality formed the marriage portion of Tobit's wife (Tob. 8:21). A distribution of goods during the father's lifetime is implied in Luke 15:11-13: a distinction may be noted between οὐσία, a general term applicable to personalty, and κληρονομία, the *landed* property, which could only be divided after the father's death (Luke 12:13).

There is a striking resemblance between the Hebrew and Athenian customs of heirship, particularly as regards heiresses (ἐπίκληροι), who were, in both nations, bound to marry their nearest relation: the property did not vest in the husband even for his life-time, but devolved upon the son of the heiress as soon as he was of age, who also bore the name, not of his father, but of his maternal grandfather. The object in both countries was the same, viz. to preserve the name and property of every family (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Epiclerus). *SEE INHERITANCE*.

In Colossians 1:15, Christ is called "the first-born of every creature," i.e. "the *heir* of the whole creation," as in Hebrews 1:2 he is called the "*heir* of all things." Believers are called "*heirs* of the promise," "of righteousness," "of the kingdom," "of the world," "of God," "joint heirs" with Christ, inasmuch as they are partakers of the blessings which God bestows upon his children, implying admission to the kingdom of heaven and its privileges (Galatians 3:29; Hebrews 6:17; 11:7; James 2:5; Romans 4:13; 8:17), and finally possession of the heavenly inheritance (John 17:22-24; Revelation 3:22). *SEE ADOPTION*.

He'lah

(Heb. *Chelah'*, חֶלַע *; rust*, as in Ezekiel 24:6; Sept. Ἀλαά v.r. Ἀωδά), one of the two wives of Ashur (a descendant of Judah), by whom she had three sons (1 Chronicles 4:5, 7). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

Helai Codex of the O.T.

SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

He’lam

(Heb. *Cheylam7’*, µlyjeplace *of abundance,* 2 Samuel 10:16; but in ver. 17, *Chelanm’*, µlajeLwith *he* ‘directive,” hm;lajeJosephus Χαλαμά], for which the margin prefers µa;ljeSept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate *Helamn),* a place “beyond the river” (i.e. either east of the Jordan or west of the Euphrates, although Josephus, *Ant. 7:*6, 3, understands it to mean east of the Euphrates), where David gained a victory over the combined forces of the Syrians under Hadadezer. apparently between Damascus and the country of the Ammonites. Ewald *(Is’. Gesch.* 2, 620) compares the *Alanmatha* (Ἀλάμαθα) of Ptolemy (5, 15, 25), on the west bank of the Euphrates, near Nicephoritm. *SEE DAVID.*

Hel’bah

(Heb. *Chelbah’*, hBl;j , *fatness;* Sept. Ἐλβά v.r. Χεβδά and Σχεδία*),* a town in the tribe of Asher, from which the Canaanites were not expelled, mentioned between Achzib and Aphik (Judges 1:31); but not (as Gesenius suggests) identical with Ahlab, which is also mentioned in the same verse. Perhaps it was situated in some fertile tract (as the names imply) in the valley of the Kishon, possibly at *Ilaifit.*

Hel’bon

(Heb. *Chelbon’*, ˆ/bl , *feet,* i.e. fertile; Sept. Χελβών v.r. Χεβρών), a name which occurs only in Ezekiel 27:18, where “the wine of Helbon” is named among the commodities brought from Damascus to the great market of Tyre. The Syriac, Symmachus, the Chaldee, and Vulgate, all regard the ‘word as an appellative descriptive of the quality of the wine as *pingue vinuni* or *vinumu dulce coctum.* — But it is better to accept the indication of the Sept., which, by giving the proper name Χελβών, must be supposed to have had in view a place, which has hence generally been inferred to be the same with that old city of Syria that appears under the form of *Chalybon* (Χαλυβάν) in Ptolemy *(Geog.* 5, 15) and Strabo (15, 505). — The latter author mentions this Chalybon as a place famous for wine; and in describing the luxury of the kings of Persia, he says they would have wheat brought from Assos in Eolia, Chalybonian wine out of Syria, and water from the Eulaeus (the river Ulai of Daniel 8:2), which was the lightest of any. Both Hesychius and Plutarch *(Vit. Alex.* 2) speak of this famous wine. It has generally been thought that the name was derived

from Chalybon, where it was supposed the wine was produced. But is it not strange that Damascus should be represented as supplying the wine of Helbon to the marts of Tyre? Why would not the native merchants themselves carry it thither? A passage which Bochart quotes from Athenaeus (1, 51) throws light on this point: "The king of the Persians drank Chalybonian wine alone; which, says Poseidonius, *was also produced in Damascus"* (Bochart, *Opp.* 2, 486). We are thus led, both by the statement of Ezekiel and by that of Poseidonius, who was himself a native of Syria, to look for a Helbon or Chalybon at or near Damascus. Seleucus Nicator is said to have changed the name to *Bercea* (Niceph. Callist. 14:39); but the old name, as we see from Ptolemy, was not forgotten, and on the capture of the city by the Arabs in the 7th century it was again resumed (Schultens, *Index Geogr. in vitam Saladini,* s.v. Halebum). The city referred to has usually been identified with the modern *Aleppo,* a large city of Syria. called *Huleb* by the Arabs; but Russel states *(Natural Hist. of Aleppo* Lond. 1794, 1, 80) that but little wine is made there, and that the white wines especially are poor and thin, and difficult to keep; nor has this place ever obtained any celebrity for its vintages. Hence Prof. Hackett is inclined to adopt the suggestion made to him while visiting this region in 1852 by Dr. Paulding, one of the American missionaries there, that the Biblical Helbon should rather be sought in one of the principal villages of the same name lying in the *wady. Helbon,* on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon, north of the Barrada. He was informed by those who had visited the place that the grapes produced there are remarkable for their fine quality, and that the wine obtained from them is regarded as the choice wine of that part of Syria *(Illustrations of Scripture,* N. York, 1855, p. 214). Dr. Robinson, to whom he mentioned this suggestion, visited the place in his last journey to Palestine, and fully accords with the identification. He thus describes the valley and town: "Wady Helbon is a valley an hour or more in length, shut in by high and rugged sides. The bottom is a strip of level ground, everywhere well cultivated. Throughout the whole extent of the valley there are well-kept vineyards. Even places so steep that the vinedresser cal approach them with difficulty are made to produce an abundance of grapes. In Damascus the grapes are chiefly esteemed for their fine flavor, and from them is made the best and most highly prized wine of the country. The village of Helbon is nearly midway up the valley. There are many ruins in and around it, but mostly dilapidated; and hewn stones, capitals, friezes, and broken columns are built into the walls of the modem dwellings. On the west of the village

is an extensive ruin, supposed to have once been a temple. On some of the blocks are fragments of Greek inscriptions no longer legible" (new ed. of *Researches, 3,* 471, 472).

Helchi'ah

(Χελκίας, 1 Esd. 8:1) or Helchi'as *(Helcias,* 2 Esd. 1:1), the Greek aid Latin forms of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH *SEE HILKIAH* (q.v.).

Hel'dai

(Heb. *Chelday',* ydil]j , *worldly;* Sept. Χολδαΐ, but οἱ ἄρχοντες in <38160>Zechariah 6:10; Vulg. *Holdai),* the name of two men.

1. A Netophathite and descendant of Othniel, chief of the twelfth division (24,000) of David's forces (<13275>1 Chronicles 27:15). B.C. 1014. In <13130>1 Chronicles 11:30 (where he is called HELED) his father's name is said to be Baanahb; and in the parallel passage (<10239>2 Samuel 23:29) he is called HELEB.

2. One of those lately returned from the Captivity whom the prophet Zechariah was directed to take with him when he went to crown the high-priest Joshua, as a symbol of the future Messiah's advent (<38160>Zechariah 6:10). B.C. 520. In ver. 14 the name is written HELEM.

Heldua

the first station mentioned iii the *Jerusalem Itinerary* south of Berytus and north of Porphyreon; now probably khan *el-Khulda* (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 435). — Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 320.

He'leb

(Heb. *Che'leb,* b l ,j ,*fatness,* as often; Sept. ῾Ελάδ,Vulg. *Heled),* son of Baumah the Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (<10239>2 Samuel 23:29); elsewhere more correctly called HELED (<13130>1 Chronicles 11:30), or, still better, HELDAI (<13615>1 Chronicles 26:15).

He'led

(Heb. *Che'led,* d l ,j ,this *world,* as transitory; Sept. Ἐλάδ, Vulg. *Heled),* son of Baanah, a Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (<13130>1

Chronicles 11:30); called in the parallel passage (2 Samuel 23:29) HELEB, but more accurately HELDAI in 1 Chronicles 27:15.

He'lek

(Heb. *Che'lek,* qlj ea *portion,* as oftens Sept. Χελέχ and Χέλεχ,Vulg. *Helec),* the second son of Gilead of the tribe of Manasseh (Joshua 17:2), whose descendants were called HELEKITES (Hebrew *Cheli',* yqælj , Numbers 26:30; Sept. Χελεκί). B.C. cir. 1612.

He'lekite

(Numbers 26:30). *SEE HELEK.*

He'lem

the name of one or two men, variously written in the Hebrew.

1. HE'LEM (mlj ea *stroke;* Sept. Ἐλάμ, Vulg. *Helem),* a brother of Shamer (or Shomer) and great-grandson of Asher, several of whose sons are enumerated in 1 Chronicles 7:35.; perhaps the same with HIOTHAM, ver. 32. B.C. prob. cir. 1658.

2. CHE'LEM. (mlj ein Chaldee a *dream,* as often in Dan.; or *robust;* Sept. οἱ ὑπομένοντες αὐτόν,Vulg. *Helesm),* one of those associated with Zechariah in the typical crowning of the high-priest, or, as it appears, himself also crowned (Zechariah 6:14, "Heled," prob. by erroneous transcription for Heled or HELDAI, ver. 10). Helena, ST., mother of Constantine the Great. She was born about 274; Gloucester, Triers, and Bithynia dispute the honor of being her birthplace. Some consider her as of noble family, while the older authorities state that she was daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper. Constantius Chlorus is said to have married her for her beauty. She is also said to have at first been only his concubine, but this, perhaps, is a mistake, arising from the fact that the Roman law applied to women marrying above their station a name which had also this meaning. When Constantius became emperor he repudiated her, and she resided, perhaps, in the neighborhood of Triers until her son Constantine called her back with the title of Augusta. She did much towards softening the naturally tyrannical disposition of her son. She undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land about 325, where, by so-called miraculous agencies, she is said to have discovered, under the ruins of a heathen temple, the

sepulcher and cross of Christ, the latter of which was "proved genuine by the miracles it wrought!" She built a church on the site, which remains to this day in part. All this gave a great impulse to pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and indirectly to the Crusades. She left Palestine in 327, returned to her son, and died probably soon after. The Romans claim to have her remains in the church of Ara Caeli. The monks of Hautvilliers, near Rheims (France), claim, on the other hand, that one of their order, as early as in the 9th century, brought the body of the saint from thence to their convent. Unfortunately, the Venetians state, on the other side that the saint was buried at Constantinople, and that her remains were thence transferred to their city. So devotees kneel in three different places, on the 18th of August, before the remains of the daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper, who subsequently became a sainted empress. — Monographs on St. Helena and her history are enumerated in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* p. 125. See Eusebius, *Life of Constantine;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* and the articles Cross; *SEE JERUSALEM*.

He'leph

(Heb. *Che'leph,* ãl ,j , an *exchange, as* in <04822>Numbers 18:21, 31; Sept. joins' with prefixed preposition Μεέλεφ; Vulg. *Heleph),* a city mentioned apparently as the starting-point of the northern border of Naphtali, beginning at the west (<06033>Joshua 19:33). Van de Velde thinks it may be the same with *Beit-lf,* a village with ancient remains (comp. Robinson, *Later Researches,* p. 61, 62), nearly due east of the Ras Abyad, and west of Kades, on the S. edge of a very marked ravine (wady el-Ayun), which probably formed part of the boundary between Naphtali and Asher (Van de Velde, *Syria, 1* 233); nor is the objection of Keil *(Comment.* ad loc.), that the position is represented as being at the intersection of the northern border of Palestine with the eastern line of Asher, altogether correct, since several of the associated names are likewise somewhat interior.

He'lez

(Heb. *Che'lets,* / l ,j e or / l ,j , in pause / l ,* j *Cha'lets,* perh. *loin* or *strong;* Sept. Χαλλίς. or Χελλης v.r. Σελλής; Vulg. *Heles, Helles),* the name of two men.

1. Son of Azariah and father of Eleasah, of the tribe of Judah (<13039>1 Chronicles 2:39). B.C. apparently ante 1017.

2. An Ephraimite of Pelon, and one of David's warriors, and afterwards captain of his seventh regiment (2 Samuel 23:26; 1 Chronicles 11:27; 28:10). B.C. 1014 et ante.

Helfenstein, Charles

a minister of the German Reformed Church, and son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein was born March 29, 1781. He spent his youth as a printer, and afterwards studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained by the Synod of the German Reformed Church in May, 1801, and was pastor successively at Allemangel, Berks County, Pa.; Goshenhoppen, Montgomery County, Pa.; Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pa.; Hanover and Berlin, York County, Pa.; Rockingham County, Va.; and Mechanicsburg, Cumberland County, Pa. He died Dec. 19,1842. With many innocent eccentricities, he was actuated by deep earnestness, a childlike piety, and a kindly spirit. He preached in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Helfenstein, John Conrad Albert

one of the fathers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Feb. 16, 1748. He studied theology at the University of Heidelberg, and was sent by the Synod of Holland, in company with Rev. J. H. Helfferich and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, as missionaries to America. He arrived in New York Jan. 14, 1772, and soon after took charge of the congregation at Germantown, Pa. Towards the close of 1775 he accepted a call from Lancaster, but in 1779 returned to his Germantown congregation, and labored there until his death, May 17, 1790. He was an eloquent and successful preacher, and his ministry, both at Lancaster and Germantown, proved a great blessing. Several small volumes of his sermons have been published. — Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church,* 2, 222 sq.

Helfenstein, Jonathan

a German Reformed minister, third son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein was born in Germantown. Pa., Jan. 19, 1784. He studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed in 1805, and ordained in 1807; pastor of the German Reformed congregation in Carlisle till 1811, when he was called to Frederick, Md., where he labored with great success

to the time of his death, Sept. 29, 1829. He was a zealous pastor; aid an impressive preacher in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Helfferich, John Henry

a minister of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Oct. 22, 1739. After studying theology, he was licensed Sept. 22, 1761, and labored for a time in his own country. In January 1772, he arrived in New York as a missionary, together with Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein and Rev. J. G. Gebhard. He soon after settled at Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., where his charge comprehended as many as seven congregations at one time. Here he remained, declining all calls from other churches, and labored faithfully until his death, Dec. 5, 1810. "During his ministry Mr. Helfferich baptized 5830, and confirmed 4000 souls. He may be regarded as the father of the German Reformed Church in the field over which his labors extended. Though that part of the Church did not escape the general stagnation of a later period through German rationalism and indifference, yet the vantage-ground upon which it was placed, by means of his labors, has been a blessing to it down to our day." — Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church*, 2, 241 sq.

Helfferich, John

a son of Rev. John Henry Helfferich, was born in Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1795. He completed his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Samuel Helfenstein in Philadelphia, was licensed in 1816, and ordained in 1819. He became pastor of the same congregations in Lehigh County, Pa., which his father had served for many years, in which field he continued to labor with much zeal and success to the end of his life. He died suddenly, April 8, 1852. During his ministry he baptized 4591, and received into full communion with the Church, by confirmation, between two and three thousand persons. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

He'li, or rather Eli

(Ηλί, in some ed. Ηλί or Ηλεί, Heb. רֹאֵלִי *Ei)*, a name that occurs once in the N.T. and once in the Apocrypha.

1. The third of three names inserted between Achitob and Amarias in the genealogy of Ezra, in 2 Esd. 1:2, for which there is no corresponding name in the Heb. list (Ezra 7:2, 3).

2. The father-in-law of Joseph, and maternal grandfather of Christ (Luke 3:23). B.C. ante 22. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*.

Heli'as

the Latin form (2 Esd. 7:39) of the name of the prophet ELIJAH.

Heliodörus

(Ἡλιόδωρος, i.e. *gift of the sun,* a not unfrequent Greek name), the treasurer (ὁ ἐπὶ τῶνπραγμάτων*)* of Seleucus Philopator, who was commissioned by the king, at the instigation of Apollonius (q.v.), to carry away the private treasures deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem. According to the narrative in 2 Macc. 3:9 sq., he was stayed from the execution of his design by a "great apparition" (ἐπιφάνεια), in consequence of which he fell down "compassed with great darkness," and speechless. He was afterwards restored at the intercession of the high-priest Onias, and bore witness to the king of the inviolable majesty of the Temple (2 Macc. 3). The full details of the narrative are not supported by any other evidence. Josephus, who was unacquainted with 2 Macc., takes no notice of it *(Ant. 12,* 3, 3); and the author of the so called 4 Macc. attributes the attempt to plunder the-Temple to Apollonius, and differs in his account of the miraculous interposition, though he distinctly recognizes it *(De Mltcc. 4* οὐρανόθεν ἔφιπποι προυφάνησαν ἄγγελοι.... καταπεσὼν δὲ ἡμιθανὴς οᾹπολλώνιος ..). Heliedorus afterwards murdered Seleucus, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the Syrian crown (App. *Syr.* 45). B.C. 175. — Comp. Wernsdorf, *De ide Libr. Macc.* § liv. Raffaelle's grand picture of "Heliodorus" has often been copied and engraved.

Heliodorus of Emesa

in Syria, flourished in the latter part of the 4th century after Christ. He was the author of the celebrated romance entitled *AEthiopia,* or account of the love and adventures of Theogenes and Chariclea, the oldest and best of the Greek romances, and the model of many subsequent ones. This was written in early life, and afterwards Heliodorus became a Christian, and was made

bishop of Tricca, in Sicily, where he introduced the regulation that every married priest should, upon his ordination, separate from his wife or be deposed (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 22). Nicephorus states *(Hist. Eccles. 12,* 34) that a provincial synod, because of the injurious tendency of the *Ethiopica* upon the minds of the young, decreed that Heliodorus should either condemn and disown it, or resign his bishopric. This statement is generally rejected as improbable, since it is made by no other author, and the *Aithiopica* contains nothing of a corruptive tendency. The best edition of the Greek text is that by Coraes (Paris, 1804,2 vols. 8vo). — Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Mythology,* 2, 373; Dunlop, *Hist. of Fiction* (London, 1845, 1 vol. 8vo), p. 18-24; Photius, *Cod.* 73; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 5, 699. (J. W. M.)

Heliogabalus (Elagabalus)

emperor of Rome, was born at Emesa about A.D. 205. His name was Varus Avitus Bassianus, but he was made priest of Elagabalus (El-Gabal), the Syro-Phoenician Sun-god, about A.D. 217, and took that name. In May, 218, through the intrigues of his mother, Julia Maesa, with the soldiery, he was proclaimed emperor; and, soon after, Macrinus, who was marching to put down this usurpation, was defeated. His reign, which lasted not quite four years, was characterized by superstition, licentiousness, and cruelty to a degree hardly rivaled by the worst Roman emperors. He introduced the worship of the Sun god into Rome, and even passed a decree that no other celestial power should be worshipped. The praetorians slew him in camp, A.D. 222. As he himself introduced a new religion into Rome, it was not his policy to persecute, and so, during that time, the Christians had “rest.”

Hel’kai

(Heb. *Chelkay’,* yqil] , for hyqil] ,*Jehovah* is his *portion;* Sept. Ἑλκαΐ*),* son of Meraioth, and one of the chief priests in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (16:15Nehemiah 12:15). B.C. post 536.

Hel’kath

(Heb. *Chelkath’,* tqil] , 06:25Joshua 19:25, but tq;l] , even without pause-accent, 21:31Joshua 21:31;” construct” of , hq;l] , *smoothness,* as in 27:16Genesis 27:16, *or potion,* as in 33:19Genesis 33:19, etc.; Sept. Χελκάθ),

a town of Asher, on the eastern border, mentioned as the starting-point in the direction (apparently southward) to Achshaph (Joshua 19:25); assigned as one of the Levitical cities (Joshua 21:31). In 1 Chronicles 6:75, it appears to be erroneously written HUKOK. *SEE HUKKOE*. p the *Onomnasticon* it is simply mentioned by Eusebius as *Eoiri,* by Jerome as *Elcath;* but neither seems to have known it. De Saulcy inclines to identify it with a village called *Kirkeh,* which he reports not far southeast of Akka *(Narrative,* 1, 68); and Schwarz *(Palestine,* p. 191) thinks it is the modern *Yerka,* about seven miles north-east of Akka; but neither of these positions is in the neighborhood indicated by the text, which rather requires a locality nearer the north-eastern angle of the tribe, not unlikely at the ruined village *Ukrith,* about twelve miles S.E. of Tyre, as proposed by Van de Velde *(Memoir,* p. 320). *SEE HELKATH-HAZZUARIM*.

Hel'kath-haz'zurim

(Heb. *Chelkath'hats-Tsutrms',* µyrx;Bh;Ath; qlj; *,plot of the rocks),* a designation of the plain just below the pool of Gibeon, on the east, acquired from the deadly combat between twelve of Ishbosheth's men and as many of David's, which formed a prelude to the general engagement (2 Samuel 2:16). *SEE GIBEON*. As to the name, "Ewald approves the reading which the Sept. seem to have followed (μερὶς τῶν ἐπιβούλων, apparently from their reading µyrx;h;), as that which alone gives a suitable meaning to the name *(Gesch. Isr.* 2, 575, note 1). Gesenius renders by 'the field of swords,' which can hardly be admitted; for, though rWx is used in the sense of an 'edge,' it is never used simply for 'sword.' Furst gives *Felsenkahlheit,* 'rock-smoothness,' as the meaning, the place being smooth and level as a surface of rock. Aquila gives κλῆρος τῶν στερεῶν, and the Vulg. *Ager robustorum,* taking rWx in a figurative sense, of which, however, there is no other instance"

Helki'as

(Χελκίας), a still different Greek form (1 Esd. 1:8) of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH.

a term which originally corresponded more exactly to HADES, being derived from the Saxon *helan*, to cover, and signifying merely the *covered*, or invisible place-the habitation of those who have gone from this visible terrestrial region to the world of spirits. But it has been so long appropriated in common usage to the place of future punishment for the wicked, that its earlier meaning has been lost sight of. In the English Bible it is used in the wider sense.

I. *Hebrew and Greek Terms.* — *The* three words, which all but monopolize the subject, are לשאול *Sheol'*, in the O.T.; and Ἅιδης, *Hades*, and Γέεννα, *Gehenna*, in the N.T. לשאול occurs 65 times; in 61 of these it is rendered in the Sept. By Ἅδης; twice by θάνατος (2 Samuel 22:6, and Proverbs 23:14); and twice omitted in the common text (Job 24:19; Ezekiel 32:21). In the Vulg. לשאול is translated 48 times by *Infernus*, and 17 times by *Inferus* [mostly *Inferi* (plur.)]. In our A.V. it is represented 31 times by *Grave*, 31 times by *Hell*, and 3 times by *Pit*. In the N. Test. our word *Hell* occurs 23 times; 12 times it stands for Γέεννα, and 11 times *[perhaps* the twelfth should be added, see Tischendorf and Bruder *(Concord.)* on Revelation 3:7] for Ἅδης. The Vulg. closely follows the original in its N.T. renderings; in all the twelve passages Γέεννα is simply copied into *Ge'henna*, while *Infernus* stands for every occurrence of Ἅδης, except once (Matthew 16:18), where the phrase πύλαι ᾅδου *("gates of hell")* becomes "portae *inferi*." Since, therefore, לשאול Ἅδης, and Γέεννα, are employed in the sacred original to designate the mysteries of HELL, we proceed to give first their probable derivation, and then their meaning, so far as Holy Scripture assists ῥ in its discovery.

(I.) *Their Derivation.* —

1. לשאול (or, as it is occasionally written, שׁאל), שׁאל is by most of the old writers (see Cocceius, *Lex.* p. 840,841; Schindler, *Lex. Pent.* 1782; Robinson, *Key to Hebrew Bible*, 2, 217; and Leigh, *Crit. Sacra*, 1, 238; 2, 6) referred for its origin to שׁאל; to *demand*, *seek*, or *ask*. They are not agreed as to the mode of connecting the derivative with this root; Cocceius suggests an absurd reason, "לשאול notateum locum in quo quiest *in quaestione est" (!)* A more respectable solution is suggested by those who

see in the *insatiableness* of לְאַוִי (Proverbs 30:15, 16) a good ground for connecting it with the root in question. Thus Fagius on Gin. 37; Buxtorf, *Lexicon,* s.v. referring to Isaiah 5:14; Habakkuk 2:5; Proverbs 27:20. (Ernst Meier, *Hebr. W-w-b,* p. 187, also adopts this root, but he is far-fetched and obscure in his view of its relation to the derived word). (A good defense [by a modern scholar] of this derivation of Sheol from the verb שָׁאַל is given by Giider, *Lehre.v. d. Erschein. Jesu Christi unter den Todten* [Berne, 1853], and more briefly in his art. *Hades* [Herzog, 5, 441, Clark's trans. 2, 468]. His defense is based on the many passages which urge the insatiable *demand* of Sheol for all men, such as those we have mentioned in the text, and Genesis 37:35; 1 Samuel 28; Psalm 6:6, and 89:49. See also Venema [on Psalm 16:10]; J. A. Quensted, *Tract. de Sepultura Veterum, 9,* 1.) Bottcher *(De Inferis, p.* 76, § 159) finds in the root שָׁאָה *to be hollow,* a better origin for our word. Gesenius *(Thes.* p. 1347), who adopts the same derivation, supposes that שְׁאוֹל means *to dig out,* and so contrives to unite שְׁאוֹל and שָׁאַל, by making the primary idea of *digging* lead to the derived one of *seeking* (see Job 3:21). Bottcher goes on to connect the German words *Hohl* (hollow) and *Hohle* (cavity) with the idea indicated by שְׁאוֹל, and timidly suggests the possibility of *Hölle* (Hell) coming from *Hohle.* Whilst decidedly rejecting this derivation, we do not object to his derivation of the *Hebrew* noun; amidst the avowed uncertainty of the case, it seems to be the least objectionable of the suggestions which have been offered, and, to provide an intelligible sense for the word *Sheol,* most in harmony with many Biblical passages. Bottcher defines the term to mean "*vastus locus subterraneus"* (p. 72, § 153). This agrees very well with the rendering of our A.V. in so far as it has used the comprehensive word *Hell,* which properly signifies "a covered or concealed place."

2. *Hades.* — The universally allowed statement that the N.T. has shed a light on the mysteries of life and immortality which is only in an inferior degree discovered in the O.T., is seldom more distinctly verified than in the uncertainty which attaches to *Sheol* (the difficulty of distinguishing its various degrees of meaning, which it is generally felt exist, and which our A.V. has endeavored to express by an equal balance between *Hell* and *Grave),* in contrast with the distinction which is implied in the about equally frequent terms of *Hades* and *Gehenna,* now to be described. The "Αρικ of the N.T. was suggested, no doubt, by its frequent occurrence in

the Sept. The word was originally unaspirated, as in Homer's Ἄϊδαο πύλαι *(Il.* 5, 646; 9:312), and Hesiod's Ἀΐδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον *(Theog.* 311), and Pindar's Ἀΐδαν λαχεῖν *(Pyth.* 5, 130). This form of the word gives greater credibility to the generally received derivation of it from a privat. and ἰδεῖν, *to see.* (The learned authors of Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lex.* [s.v. Ἅδης] throw some doubt on this view of the origin of the word, because of its aspirated beginning, in Attic Greek. But surely this is precarious ground. Is it certain that even in *Attic* writers it was invariably aspirated? AEschylus [*Sept. c. Theb.* (Paley) 310] has Ἄϊδα προϊάψαι *[with the lenis]*, according to the best editing. It is true that this is in a chorus, but in the *Agam.* 1505, also a choral line, we read μηδὲν ἐν Ἅιδου μεγαλαυχείτῳ [with the aspirate], as if the usage were uncertain. Possibly in the elliptical phrase ἐν Ἁιδου [scil οἴκῳ] the aspirate occurs because the genitive is really the name of the *God* [not of the region, which might, for distinction, have been *then* unaspirated]). Plutarch accordingly explains it by ἀειδὲς καὶ ἀόρατου *(De Isid. et Osir.* p. 382), and in the *Etymol. Magn.* δης is defined as χωριον ἀφεγγές, σκότους αἰωνίου καὶ ζόφου πεπληρομένον...ἐν ω οὐδὲν βλέπομεν. *Hades* is thus *"the invisible place or region;" "Locus visibus nostris subtractus,"* as Grotius defines it.

3. *Gehenna (*Γέεννα*)* is composed of the two Heb. words ayGe *(valley)* and µ/Nha *(Hinnon*, the name of the proprietor of the valley). In the Sept. Γαίεννα is used in <06816>Joshua 18:16 to designate *"the valley of the son of Hinnom,"* the full expression of which is µNbA^b,yGe The shorter appellation µNhagge occurs in the same verse. The Rabbinical writers derive µNha from µhn; *"rugire" [to groan* or *mourn,* in <262423>Ezekiel 24:23], as if indicative of the cries of the children in the horrid rites of the Moloch-worship (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Rab.* p. 108; Glassius [ed. Dathii], *Philolog. Sacr.* i, 806). The etymological remarks have paved our way to the next section of our subject.

(II.) *Biblical Meaning of these three Terms. —*

1. Meanings of l/av] *Sheol. —*

(1.) The *"Grave."* Much controversy has arisen whether within the meaning of *Sheoel* should be included *"the grave;"* indeed this is the only question of difficulty. The fact, which we have already stated, that our

A.V. translates לאו]quite as often by "grave" as by the general term "hell," supplies *aprima facie* reason for including it. Without, however, insisting on the probability that polemical theology, rather than Biblical science, influenced our translators, at least occasionally, in their rendering of the word, we may here adduce on the other side the telling fact that of all the ancient versions not one translates in any passage the Hebrew *Sheol* by the equivalent of *grave.* The other Greek translators, like the venerable Sept., so far as their fragments show (see Origen, *Hexapla, passim),* everywhere give Ἅιδης for לאו](sometimes they use for the locative case the older and better phrase εἰς, ἐν Αιδου, sometimes 'the more recent and vulgar εἰς τὸν Ἅιδην, ἐν τῷ Ἅιδῃ). The Samaritan text in the seven passages of the Pentateuch has either לשיא *(Siol)* or לאשיא. Onkelos and Jonathan everywhere, except in five passages, retain לאו]. The Peshito everywhere in both Testaments renders the Hebrew *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades* by [לאושי *Shiul;* and, as we have already seen, the Vulg. translates the same words in both the O.T. and the N.T. by *inferus* (plur. *Inferi* mostly), and, above all, *Infernus* (see above for particulars). It is to the later Targumists (the pseudo-Jonathan and the *Jerusalem* Targum), and afterwards to the Rabbinical doctors of the Middle Ages, that we trace the version of the "sepulcher" and "the grave" (thus in Genesis 37:35: 42:38; 44:29, 31, these Targumists ren*dered Sheol* by רבק תיב] *[the house of burial];* similarly did they render Psalm 141:7; Job 7:9; 14:13; 17:13,16; 21:13; Ecclesiastes 9:10, and other passages, in which it is observable how often they have been followed by our translators). See, for more information on this point, archbishop Usher, *Works* [by Elrington], 3:319-321; and, more fully, Bottcher (p. 68-70, sec. 146-149), who quotes Rashi and Aben Ezra [on Genesis 37 55J; D. Kimchi *(Lib. Radia.* s.v. לאו]); and other Rabbis who expressly admit *the grave* within the scope of the meaning of *Sheol;* Bottcher also quotes a very long array of commentators and lexicographers [Rabbi Mardochai Nathan, with extravagant one-sidedness, in his *Hebr. Concord.* gives no other sense to *Sheol* but רבק, *the grave],* who follow the Rabbinical doctors herein; and he adds the names of such writers as deny the meaning of the *grave* to the Hebrew *Sheol:* among these occur the learned Dutch divines Vitringa and Venema. The latter of these expressly affirms, "לאו]*nullo modo ad sepulchrum pertinebit" (Comment. ad Ps.* i, 504). To the authorities he mentions we would add, as maintaining the same view, the learned Henry

Ainsworth (on <0137>Genesis 37:35, *Works*, p. 135), who draws an important distinction; "l/av] *the grave*, the word meaneth not the grave digged or made with hands, which is named in Hebrew rbq, but it meaneth the common place or state of death" (a similar distinction is drawn by Luther *[Enarr. in Genes.* 42:38]; rbq is only the grave in which an actual interment takes place; none that die *unburied* can have this word used of them; *their* receptacle is lwaç, "commune quoddam raceptaculum non corporum tantum sed et animarum, ubi omnes mortui congregantur." Ann. Seneca *[lib. 8, controvers.* 4] observes between *natural* burial and *artificial — "* Omnibus natura sepulturam dedit," etc. So Lucan, 7:818, says — " Capit omnia tellus Quae genuit; caelo tegitur, qui non habet urnam." Pliny [*Hist. Nat. 7*, 54] distinguishes between natural burial by applying to it the Word *sepelire*, and burial by ceremony by using of it the synonym *humare);* Nicolaus *(De Sepulchris Hebr.* i, 8-14), who shows that l/av]is never used of funeral pomp, nor of the burial of the body in the ground; Eberhard Busmann, who [in 1682] wrote, *Dissertatio philol. de Scheol Hebr.*, makes a statement to the effect that he had examined all the passages in the O.T. and pronounces of them thus — "*Nullum eorumu* (excepto forsan uno vel altero, de quo tamen adhuc dubitari potest) *de sepulchro necessario est intelligendum* multa tamen contra ita sunt comparata ut de sepulchro nullo modo intelligi possint neac debeant." Some modern writers, who have specially examined the subject, also deny that l/av]*ever* means "the grave." Thus Breecher, *On the Immortality of the Soul as held by the Jews* (and Pareau, *Comment. de Immort. ac vitae fut. notit.* 1807).

These reasons have led learned men, who have especially examined the subject, to exclude *the grave* (specifically understood as a *made* or *artificial one)* from the proper meaning of Sheol. We cannot but accept their view *in critical exactness.* But there is an inexact and generic sense of *Sheol* in which the word *grave* well expresses the meaning of the Scripture passages just mentioned, and (in justice to the A.V. it may be admitted) of most of the others, which our translators rendered by this word. (The passages in which the A.V. renders l/av]by *grave* are these — <0137>Genesis 37:35; 42:38; 44:29, 31.; <0902>1 Samuel 2:6; <1102>1 Kings 2:6, 9; <1907>Job 7:9; 14:13; 17:13; 21:13; 24:19; <1905>Psalm 6:5 [Hebr. 61; 30:3 [4]; 31:17 [18]; 49:14 [15], twice; 49:15 [16]; 88:3 [4]; 89:48 [49]; 141:7; <2012>Proverbs 1:12; 30:16; <2109>Ecclesiastes 9:10; <2206>Song of Solomon 8:6;

[23]Isaiah 14:11 [marg. of 5:9 has *grave*]; *38:*10, 18; [26]Ezekiel 31:15; [28]Hosea 13:14, twice; and in [32]Jonah 2:2 [3] the *maryin* has "grave.") Of this more vague sense Usher *(Works, 3:*324) says-" When *Sheol* is said to signify *the grave,* the term *grave* must be taken in as large a sense as it is in our Savior's speech (John 5, 28), and in [23]Isaiah 26:19, according to the Sept. reading; upon which passage writes Origen thus--'Here and in many other places the graves of the dead are to be understood, not such only as we see are builded for the receiving of men's bodies-either cut out in stones, or digged down in the earth; but *every place wherein a man's body lieth either entire or in part*' otherwise they which are not committed to burial, nor laid in graves, but have ended their life in shipwrecks, deserts, and such like ways, should not seem to be reckoned among those which are said to be raised from the grave' *(In Esai. lib.* 28 *citatus a Pamphilo, in Apol.)"* We have here, then, the *first* meaning of the Hebrew l/av]largely applied, as we have seen, in our A.V. to "the grave," considered in a universal sense (see the passages in the last note), commensurate with *death* itself as to the extent of its signification. (Comp. "*the grave and gate of death"* of the English Liturgy, Collect for Easter Even.) Though we carefully exclude the artificial grave, or rbq, from this category, there is no doubt, as bishop Lowth has well shown *(De Sacra Poesi Hebr.* Prael. 7 [ed. Oxon. with notes of Michaelis and Rosenmüller, 1821], p. 65-69), that the Hebrew poets drew all the imagery with which they describe the state and condition of the dead from the funeral rites and pomp, and from the vaulted sepulchers of their great men. The bishop's whole treatment of the subject is quite worth perusal. We can only quote his final remarks: "You will see this transcendent imagery better and more completely displayed in that noble triumphal song which was composed by Isaiah (Isaiah14:4-27), previous to the death of the king of Babylon. Ezekiel has also grandly illustrated the same scene, with similar machinery, in the last prophecy concerning the fall of Pharaoh (32:18-32)." For an excellent vindication of the A.V. in many of its translations of *the grave,* we refer the reader to the treatise of archbishop Usher *'(Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, Works* [ed. Elrington], 3, 319-324 and 332-340). We doubt not that, *if grave* is an admissible sense of' l/av], our translators have, on the whole, made a judicious selection of the passages that will best bear the sense: their purpose was a popular one, and they accomplished it, in the instance of *uncertain* words and phrases, by giving them the most *intelligible* turn they would bear, as in the case before us.

We undertake not to decide whether it would be better to leave the broad and generic word *Sheol,* as the great versions of antiquity did, everywhere; whether, e.g., Jacob's lament (<0137>Genesis 37:35; 42:38) and like passages would be more suitably, if not correctly, rendered by the simple retention of the original word, or the equally indefinite *hades.* There is some force in the observation often made (see Corn. a Lapide, on <0137>Genesis 37:35; Bellarmine and others, adduced by Leigh, *Crit. Sacrae,* 1, 239) that "it was not the *grave* of Joseph which Jacob meant, for he thought indeed that his Son was devoured of wild beasts, and not buried." See more on this passage in Pearson, *Creed* [ed. Chevallier], p. 437; Fulke, *Translations,* etc., p. 314; both which writers defend the version of *grave.* Ainsworth ad loc. (among the older commentators) and Knobel (among the moderns) contend for the general word *hell* [Knobel, *Schattenreich*]. Rosenmüller learnedly states both views, and leans in favor of "locum, ubi mortui umbrarum instar degunt" *(Scholia,* 1, 576).

(2.) The other meaning of לאוְ "*Bell,*" so rendered in thirty-one passages of A.V., according to the more ancient and, as it seems to us, preferable opinion, makes it *local,* i.e. *the place of disembodied spirits.* (Ἅιδης δὲ τόπος ἡμῖν ἀειδής, ἤγουν ἀφανὴς καὶ ἄγνωστος, ὁ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθιν ἐκδημούσας δεχόμενος, Andr. Caesaricus *in Apocal.* c. 63.) A later opinion supposes the word to indicate "not the place where souls departed are, but *the state and condition of the dead,* or their permansion in death," as bishop Pearson calls it *(Creed* [ed. Chevallier], p. 439). On this opinion, which that great divine "cannot admit as a full or proper exposition," we shall say nothing more than that it is at best only a *deduction* from the foregoing *local* definition. That definition we have stated in the broadest terms, because, in reference to Dr. Barrow's enumeration *(Serm. on the Creed* [Art. "He descended into Hell"], *Works* [Oxford, 1830], 5, 416, 417) of the questions which have arisen on the subject before us, we believe that Holy Scripture warrants the most ample of all the positions suggested by that eminent writer, to the effect that the *Sheol* or *Hell* of which we treat is not merely 'the place of good and happy souls," or "that of bad and miserable ones," but "indifferently and in common, of both those." We propose to arrange the Biblical passages so as to describe, first, *the state of the occupants of Sheol,* and, secondly, the *locality of it,* in some of its prominent features. As to the first point, *Sheol* is (a) the receptacle of the spirits of *all that depart this life.* (Among the scriptural designations of the inhabitants of Sheol is µyaB;r][rhiq]in (in

<21216>Proverbs 21:16) is rendered "congregation of the *dead"* (or *departed)* in the A.V. This is better than the Sept. rendering συναγωγὴ γιγάντων, and Vulg. "coetus *gigantum."* There is force in the word lhq thus applied, derived from the use of the word to designate the great "*congregation"* of the Jewish nation; *SEE CONGREGATION*. For the use of the word µyapr as applicable to *the dead*, see especially Bottcher, *De Infe.* p. 94-10, § 193-204. The word occurs in this sense also in the grand passage of Isaiah 14. [In ver. 9 *"Sheol* stirs up its *Rephaim"* on the entrance of the spirit of the king of Babylon.] µyapr is met with in six other places in the same sense of *departed spirits.* It is connected with hp,r; "weak," which occurs in <04138>Numbers 13:18, and other passages [see Furst, *Hebr. W. — b.* ii, 383]. The gentile noun [mentioned in <01405>Genesis 14:5 and elsewhere, and rendered *Rephain* and *Giants]* is of the same form, but probably of a different origin [see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1302].) This general signification appears from <19947>Psalm 89:*47,* 48, and <23818>Isaiah 38:18, 19 (in which latter verse the opposition in its universal sense between *sheol* and the state of life in this world is to be observed). We do not hesitate, with archbishop Usher *(Works, 3:*318), to translate l/avai in these passages *"hell"* or *"sheol,"* instead of *"grave,"* as in the A.V. *Sheol*, therefore, *is (b) the abode of the wicked*, <04633>Numbers 16:33; <18249>Job 24:19; <19917>Psalm 9:17 *(Hebr.* 18); 31:17 (18); <20105>Proverbs 5:5; 9:18; <23509>Isaiah 57:9; and *(g) of the good* [both in their "disembodied" condition], <19610>Psalm 16:10, comp. with <44027>Acts 2:27, 31; <19003>Psalm 30:3 (4); 49:15 (16); 86:13; <23810>Isaiah 38:10, compared with Job in, 17-19; <28134>Hosea 13:14, comp. with <46555>1 Corinthians 15:55. — With regard to the second point, touching some *local* features of *Sheol*, we find it described as *very deep* (<18108>Job 11:8); *dark* (<18021>Job 10:21, 22); (yet *confess and open* to the eye of God, <18206>Job 26:6); *with "valleys"* (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1348) *or depths* of various gradations (<19613>Psalm 86:13 [compared with <05522>Deuteronomy 32:22]; <20918>Proverbs 9:18); *with bars* (<18176>Job 17:16, comp. with <32206>Jonah 2:6) and *gates* (<23810>Isaiah 38:10); *situated beneath us;* hence the dead are said "to go down" (dry) to Sheol, <04630>Numbers 16:30,33; <26315>Ezekiel 31:15,16, 17 (compared with <18709>Job 7:9; <01428>Genesis 42:38). Comp. Josephus *(Ant. 17:*1, 3), who, when describing the tenets of the Jewish sects, attributes to the Pharisees the belief of a future state, in which "rewards and punishments" will be dealt out "to men in their disembodied state" *(*ταῖς ψυχαῖς*)* "under the earth" *(*ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμάς, κ. τ. λ.). On the phrase of the creed

"*descended* into hell," and sundry uses of dry; and κατελθεῖν as not necessarily implying local *descent*, but rather "*removal from* one place to another," see Usher *(Works, 3:*392, 393). We have seen how some have derived the name of *Sheol* from its insatiability; such a quality is often attributed to it: it is *all-devouring* (<20112>Proverbs 1:12); *never satisfied* (<20216>Proverbs 30:16; <23514>Isaiah 5:14), and *inexorable* (<22607>Song of Solomon 8:7).

2. There is in the *Hades (*῞Αιδης*)* of the N.T. an equally *ample* signification with the *Sheol* of the O.T., as the abode of both happy and miserable beings. Its characteristics are not dissimilar; it is represented as "*a prison*" (comp. <60319>1 Peter 3:19, where inhabitants of *hades* are called τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα*);* with *gates* and bars *(*πύλαι δου, <401618>Matthew 16:18; comp. with the phrase εἰς ῞Αδου of <442727>Acts 2:27, 31, with the ellipsis of δῶμα, οἶκον*);* and *locks* (the "keys" of *Hades*, αἱ κλεῖς τοῦ ῞Αιδου, being in the hands of Christ, <660118>Revelation 1:18); its situation is also *downwards* (see the ῞εως δου καταβιβασθήσῃ of <401123>Matthew 11:23, and <421015>Luke 10:15). As might be expected, there is more plainly indicated in the N.T. the *separate* condition of the righteous and the wicked; to indicate this separation other terms are used; thus, in <422343>Luke 23:43, *Paradise* (παράδεισος no doubt different from that of Pali, <471204>2 Corinthians 12:4, which is designated, in <660207>Revelation 2:7, as ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ θεοῦ, the *supernal* Paradise; see Robinson, *Lexicon,* N.T., p. 13,547; Wahl, *Clavis*, N.T., p. 376; Kuinol [ed. London] on N.T. 2, 237; and especially Meyer, *Kommentar u. d. Neue Test.* [ed. 4] 6:292, and the authorities there quoted by him) is used to describe that part of Hades which the blessed dead inhabit — a figurative expression, so well adapted for the description of a locality of happiness that the inspired writers employ it to describe the three happiest places, the Eden of Innocence, the Hades of departed saints, and the heaven of their glorious rest. The distinction between the upper and the lower *Paradise* was familiar to the Jews. In Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthun*, 2, 295-322, much of their curious opinions on the subject is collected. In p. 298 are given the seven names of the *heavenly* Paradise, while in the next three are contained the seven names of the *lower* Paradise of *Hades. SEE PARADISE*.

Another figurative expression used to designate the *happy* part of Hades is "Abraham's bosom," ὁ κόλπος Ἀβρααμ, <421622>Luke 16:22. (St. Augustine

who says [*Quaest. Evang.* 2, 38] "Sinus Abrahn e requies est beatorum pauperim in quo post harc vitam recipiuntur," yet doubts whether *hades* is used at all in N.T. in a good sense: He says [*Ep.* 187, *Works,* 2, 689], "Whether *the bosom of Abraham,* where the wicked Dives was, when in his torment he beheld the poor man at rest, were either to be deemed the same as *Paradise,* or to be thought to pertain to hell or hades, *I cannot define* [non facile dixerim];" so also he writes *on Psalm 85* [*Works, 4:*912]). For an explanation of the phrase, *SEE ABRAHAM'S BOSOM*.

3. We need not linger over the Biblical sense of our last word Γέεννα. *Gehenna.* We refer the reader to a "Discourse" by the learned Joseph Mede (Works, p. 3133) on *Gehenna,* which he shows was not used to designate "hell" before the captivity. He, in the same treatise, dwells on certain Hebrew words and phrases, which were in use previous to that epoch for designating *Hades* and its inhabitants-among these he especially notes µwapr and 8r lhq, on which we have observed above. As Παράδεισος is not limited to the finite happiness of Hades, but embraces in certain passages the ultimate blessedness of heaven, so there is no violence in supposing that Γέεβννα (from the *finite* signification which it possibly bears in Matthew 5, 29, 30; 23:15, equivalent to the Τάρταρος referred to by Peter, <610204>2 Peter 2:4, as the place where the fallen angels *are reserved unto judgment,* or "until sentence," comp. <650106>Jude 1:6) goes on to mean, in perhaps most of its occurrences in the N.T., the final condition of the lost, as in <402333>Matthew 23:33, where the expression ἡ κρίσις τῆς γεέννης probably means *the condemnation* [or sentence] *to Gehenna* as the ultimate doom. *SEE GEHENNA*.

IV. *Synonymous Words and Phrases.* — (Most of these are given by Eisenmenger, *Entdeck. Jud.* 2, 324, and Galatinus, *De Arcanis, 6:*7, p. 345.)

1. hmWD, *Dumah,* in <19B517>Psalm 115:17, where the phrase D ydeWAlK; all that go down into silence," is in the Sept. παντες οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς δου, while the Vulg. has *"omnes qui descendunt in infe rum"* (comp. <19A917>Psalm 94:17).

2. ˆ/Dbæa} *Abaddôn,* in <183106>Job 26:6, is in poetical apposition with l/av] (comp. <202720>Proverbs 27:20 [Kethib], where a} is in conjunction with v, forming an hendiadys for *destructive hell;* Sept. ῞Αιδης καὶ ἀπώλεια; Vulg. *Infernus et perditio;* A.V. "Hell and destruction").

3. tjvi raB] *Beer Shachath,* <19552>Psalm 55:24; A.V. “pit of destruction “Sept. Φπέαρ διαφθορᾶς; Vulg. *Puteus interitus* (see also passages in which r/B and tjvi occur separately).

4. twm;lK;i *Tsalmaveth,* with or without Ëvj, in <19A701>Psalm 107:10, and other passages; Sept. Σκία θανάτου; Vulg. *Umbra smortis;* A.V. “shadow of death.”

5. /ra,At/YTæjTi *Tachtiy6th Erets,* in <234423>Isaiah 44:23; A.V. “lower parts of the earth” *[Sheol* or *Hades,* Gesen.]; Sept. Τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς; Vulg. *Extrema terrce* (comp. <261620>Ezekiel 26:20, etc., where the phrase is inverted, twytjtA/ra); of similar meaning is t/YTæjTir/B, <198806>Psalm 88:6 (7).

6. hTpæ *Tophteh,* in <233033>Isaiah 30:33 [according to Eisenmenger]; for another application of this word, see Gesenius, *Thes.* s.v.; and Rosenmüller. ad loc.

7. The phrase first used of Abraham, <012508>Genesis 25:8 (where it occurs, in the solemn description of the holy patriarch’s end, *midway between death and burial),* “He was gathered to his fathers,” is best interpreted of the departure of the soul to *Hades* to the company of those who preceded him thither (see Cajetan, ad loc., and Gesen. *Thes.,* s.v. ãsa;[Niphal], p. 131, col. 1).

8. Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, “the outer darkness” of <400812>Matthew 8:12, et passim, refers probably to what Josephus *(War, 3,* 25) calls -δης σκοτιώτερος, “the darker *Hades.”*

V. *Biblical Statements as to the Condition of those in* “hell.” — The dreadful nature of the abode of the wicked is implied in various figurative expressions, such as “outer darkness,” “I am tormented in this flame,” “furnace of fire,” “unquenchable fire,” “where the worm dieth not,” the blackness of darkness,” “torment in fire and brimstone,” “the ascending smoke of their torment,” “the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone” (<400812>Matthew 8:12; 13:42; 22:13; 25:30; <421624>Luke 16:24; comp. <402541>Matthew 25:41; <410943>Mark 9:43-48; <650113>Jude 1:13; comp. <661410>Revelation 14:10, 11; 19:20; 20:14; 21:8). The figure by which hell is represented as burning with fire and brimstone is probably derived from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as that which describes the smoke as ascending from it (comp. <661410>Revelation 14:10, 11, with <011924>Genesis 19:24, 28). To

this coincidence of description Peter also most probably alludes in <61206>2 Peter 2:6. *SEE FIRE*.

The names which in many of the other instances are given to the punishments of hell are doubtless in part figurative, and many of the terms which were commonly applied to the subject by the Jews are retained in the New Testament. The images, it will be seen, are generally taken from death, capital punishments, tortures, prisons, etc. And it is the obvious design of the sacred writers, in using such figures, to awaken the idea of something terrible and fearful. They mean to teach that the punishments beyond the grave will excite the same feelings of distress as are produced on earth by the objects employed to represent them. We are so little acquainted with the state in which we shall be hereafter, and with the nature of our future body, that no strictly literal representation of such punishments could be made intelligible to us. Many of the Jews, indeed, and many of the Christian fathers, took the terms employed in Scripture in an entirely literal sense, and supposed there would be actual fire, etc., in hell. But from the words of Christ and his apostles nothing more can with certainty be inferred than that they meant to denote great and unending miseries.

The punishments of sin may be distinguished into two classes:

1. *Natural* punishments, or such as necessarily follow a life of servitude to sin.

2. *Positive* punishments, or such as God shall see fit, by his sovereign will, to inflict.

1. Among the natural punishments we may rank the privation of eternal happiness (<40721>Matthew 7:21, 23; 22:13; 25:41; compare 2 Thessalonians 1, 9); the painful sensations which are the natural consequence of committing sin, and of an impenitent heart; the propensities to sin, the evil passions and desires which in this world fill the human heart, and which are doubtless carried into the world to come. The company of fellow-sinners and of evil spirits, as inevitably resulting from the other conditions, may be accounted among the natural punishments, and must prove not the least grievous of them.

2. The positive punishments have already been indicated. It is to these chiefly that the Scripture directs our attention. “There are but few men in such a state that the merely natural punishments of sin will appear to them

terrible enough to deter them from the commission of it. Experience also shows that to threaten positive punishment has far more effect, as well upon the cultivated as the uncultivated, in deterring them from crime, than to announce, and lead men to expect, the merely natural consequences of sin, be they ever so terrible. Hence we may see why it is that the New. Testament says so little of natural punishments (although these, beyond question, await the wicked), and makes mention of them in particular far less frequently than of positive punishments; and why, in those passages which treat of the punishments of hell, such ideas and images are constantly employed as suggest and confirm the idea of positive punishments" (Knapp's *Christian Theology, §* 156).

As the sins which shut out from heaven vary so greatly in quality and degree, we should expect from the justice of God a corresponding variety both in the natural and the positive punishments. This is accordingly the uniform doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The more knowledge of the divine law a man possesses, the more his opportunities and inducements to avoid sin, the stronger the incentives to faith and holiness set before him, the greater will be his punishment if he fails to make a faithful use of these advantages. "The servant who knows his lord's will and does it not, deserves to be beaten with many stripes:" "To whom much is given, of him much will be required" (<40:10:15>Matthew 10:15; 11:22, 24; 23:15; <42:12:48>Luke 12:48), Hence Paul says that the heathen who acted against the law of nature would indeed be punished; but that the Jews would be punished more than they, because they had more knowledge (<45:02:09>Romans 2:9-29). In this conviction that God will, even in hell, justly proportion punishment to sin, we must rest satisfied. We cannot now know more; the precise degrees, as well as the precise nature of such punishments, are things belonging to another state of being, which in the present we are unable to understand. For a naturalistic view of the subject, with a copious review of the literature, see Alger, *Doctrine of a Future Life* (Bost. 1860). For the theological treatment of this topic, *SEE HELL PUNISHMENTS*.

Hell, Christ's Descent Into

(descensus ad inferos; κατάβασις εἰς ἅδου*),* a phrase used to denote the doctrine taught, or supposed to be taught, in the fifth article of the Apostles' Creed.

I. *History of the Clause.* — *The* clause is not found in the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381), nor in any creed before that date. Pearson states that it was not "so anciently used in the Church" as the rest of the Apostles' Creed; and that it first appears in the Creed of Aquileia, 4th century, in the words *descendit in inferna.* King, in his *Histor. Symbol. Apost.* c. 4, asserts that it was inserted as a testimony against Apollinarism; but this view is controverted by Waage in his *Commentatio* on this article of the Creed (1836). It is certain, however, that the clause was afterwards used by the orthodox as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy which denied to Christ a rational human soul (see Neander, *Church History,* Torrey's ed., 2, 433). Rufinus († 410), while stating that it is found in the Creed of Aquileia, denies that it existed before that time in the Creed as used in the Roman or Eastern churches. Rufinus adds that "though the Roman and Oriental churches had not the words; yet they had the sense of them in the word *buried,"* implying that the words "he descended into Hades" are equivalent to "he descended into the grave." Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 37, 41, gives it as stated in the Arian Creed adopted at Sirmiumn A.D. 350, and at Rimini in 360. It is given in the Athanasian Creed (5th century). It fails to be found, except in the Athanasian Creed and in a few MSS., before the 6th century, but became quite common in the 7th, and is universal after the 8th century (Pearson, *On the Creed,* art. 5, notes). It remains in the Apostles' Creed as used in the Greek and Roman churches; the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England. It is also retained in the Creed as used by the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a note in the rubric. that "any churches may omit the words *He descended into hell,* or may, instead of them, use the words *He went into the place of departed spirits,* which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed." The clause was omitted by the Convention of 1785, but, the English bishops objecting, it was replaced, with the qualification named, after a great deal of discussion in 1786, 1789, and 1792 (see White, *Hist. of the Prot. Episcopal Church;* Muenscher, in *Bib. Sac.* April, 1853). It is omitted in the Creed as used by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

II. *The Doctrine-*

1. *Scripture.* — There is no passage in which it is expressly stated that Christ descended into hell, but there are several which express or imply that his soul went, after his death, into the "place of departed spirits.

(1.) Thus David says (Psalm 16:9, 10): *"Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."* And Peter applies this passage to Christ (Acts 2:25-27): *"For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."*

(2.) The passage in Ephesians 4:8-10 *("Now that he ascended,"* etc.), is supposed by some writers to imply the descent into Hades, but the best interpreters apply it to the Incarnation.

(3.) Paul, in Romans 10:7 (*'Who shall descend into the deep,"* etc. τίς καταβὴσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*)*, seems to imply a descent of Christ "into the abyss."

(4.) 1 Peter 3:18-20: *"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he night bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."* This passage is relied on by many, not only as strongly asserting that Christ descended into Hades, but also as explaining the object of that descent. But the weight of interpretation, from Augustine downwards, seems to be against this view. Dr. A. Schweitzer, in a recent monograph *(Hinabgefahren z. Hille als Mythus,* etc., Zurich, 1868, p. 49), interprets the passage to mean that the preaching spoken of was "addressed to 'the spirits in prison' in the days of Noah, while they were yet in the flesh; and this preaching consisted, to a great extent, in the building of the ark. By this work, undertaken at the command of the Spirit of Christ, and prosecuted, through many years, to completion in the sight of the people, they were warned to repent; but the people persisted in disobedience, and at last the flood swept them away" *(Baptist Quarterly Review,* July, 1869, p. 381). This view accords with that held by Augustine, Aquinas, Scaliger, Beza, Gerhard, Hammond, Leighton, and others, and which has of late been readopted by Dr. Hofmann *(Schriftbeweis,* II, 1, 33m), of the influence of the pre-existent Spirit of Christ at the time of the Deluge. It is

also the interpretation of the passage given by Dr. A. Clarke *(Comm. on 1 Peter).* So also Dr. Bethune: "Christ, in Noah, by his Spirit, preached to them before the Flood, just as in his ministers he preaches to us by his Spirit now" *(Lectures on the Heidelbery Catechism,* 1, 406). Alford *(Comment.* ad loc.) gives a copious account (chiefly translated from Meyer) of the views of various commentators, ancient and modern; on the passage, and subjoins his own view, as follows: "I understand these words to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption, preach salvation, in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the. Flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned-whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable by us — we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations so far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced; it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution, but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice-the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it; and as we cannot say to what other cases this κἠευγμα may have applied, so it would be presumption hi us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning, here these sinners above other sinners appears to be their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?" *(Comm. on N.T.* vol. 4, pt. i, p. 368).

2. *The Fathers.* — In several of the Ante-Nicene fathers we find the doctrine that "Christ descended into Hades to announce to the souls of the patriarchs and others there the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them to his kingdom of glory." So Justin Martyr († 167?), *Dial. cuns Tryph.* § 72, cites a passage from Jeremiah (cut out, he says, by the Jews) as follows: "The Lord God remembered his dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and he descended to preach to them his own salvation." Irenaeus († 200?), *Adv. Haer. 4,* 27, 2: "The Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there also, and declaring the remission of sins received by those who believe on him" (see also 5, 31, 2). Clement of Alexandria († 220) devotes chap. 6 of book 6 of

the *Stromata* to the "preaching of the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in Hades." See also Tertullian, *De Anima, 7,* 55; Origen, *Cont. Cels.* 2, 43. The Gnostics generally denied the *descensus cad isnferos;* but Marcion (2nd century) regarded it as intended to benefit the heathen who were in need of redemption. The later fathers were still more distinct in their utterances; see Cyril, *Catech. 4,* 11; 14:19; Ambrose, *De Incar.* 37, 42; Augustine, *Epist.* 164 et al.; Jerome, *Epist.* 22 et al. "The later fathers generally adopted the notion that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ said to the thief on the cross that he should be with him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which, therefore, they distinguished from Hades. Hades, indeed, they looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better. Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the Limbus Patrum. Yet the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the mediaeval Church. Another opinion, however, grew up also in the early ages, namely, that Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those who in old times had-been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and hell. This appears to have been the opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades, and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at times he appears to have admitted that it did); and, thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence. Some, indeed, went so far as to think that hell vas cleared of all souls that were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; but this was reckoned as a heresy.... One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress (on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades was this. The Arians and Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ. 'Now the true doctrine of our Lord's humanity, namely, that 'he was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was most strongly maintained by asserting the article of his descent to Hades. For whereas his body was laid in the grave, and his soul went down to Hades, he must have had both body and soul. Accordingly, the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's soul to hell" (Browne, *On the Thirty-nine Articles,* p. 93). Nevertheless, it was *not* opposition to Apollinarism that originally led to the adoption of the clause into the Creed; the Gnostics, long before, had

denied the *descensus ad inferos,* but Apollinaris *did not deny it* (Neander, *Ch. Hist.,* Torrey, 2, 433).

In what may be called the mythology of Christendom, the "descent into hell" has always played an important part. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus contains a vivid description of it, very highly colored. A voice like thunder is heard crying, "Lift up your gates, and be ye lift up," etc. But the gates were made fast, but on a repetition of the call were opened, "and the King of glory entered, in form as a man, and all the dark places of Hades were lighted up." "And straightway Hades cried out (ch. 22),' We are conquered. Woe unto us! But who art thou, that hast such power and privilege? And what art thou, that comest hither without sin, small in seeming but excellent in power, the humble and the great, slave at once and master, soldier and king, wielding power over the dead and the living, nailed to the cross, and the destroyer of our power? Truly thou art the Jesus of whom the arch satrap Satan spake to us, that by thy cross and death thou shouldest purchase the universe!' Then the King of Glory, holding Satan by the head, delivered him to the angels, and said, 'Bind his hands and feet, and neck and mouth, with irons.' And giving him over to Hades, he said, 'Receive and hold him surely until my second advent' (ch. 24). Then the King of Glory stretched out his right hand, and took the forefather Adam, and raised him up, and turning to the rest also, he said, 'Come with me, all of you, as many as have died by the wood which this man ate of; for lo! I upraise ye all by the wood of the cross!' After these things he brought them all forth. And the forefather Adam, filled with exceeding joy, said, 'I render thee thanks, O Lord, that thou hast brought me up from the depths of Hades.' Thus, too, said all the prophets and saints: 'We thank thee, O Christ, Savior of the world, that thou hast redeemed our life from corruption.' And while they were saying these things, the Savior blessed Adam in the forehead with the sign of the cross, and did the like to the patriarchs and the prophets, and the martyrs and forefathers, and taking them with him, he rose up out of Hades. And as he journeyed, the holy fathers, accompanying him, sang, 'Praised be he who hath come in the name of the Lord. Hallelujah!"'(Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* 1, 667 sq.; Forbes, *On the Thirty-nine Articles,* 1, 52 sq.) A dramatic representation of the "descent into hell," in imitation of the above picture in Nicodemus, is given in the discourse *De Adventu et annunciatione Joannis.Bpt. ap. Inferos,* commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa (tc.

360); see Augusti's edition of Eusebius of Emesa, p. 1 sq. (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines, §* 134).

3. *Middle Age.* — These images took possession of the popular mind, and were even held as true pictures by many of the clergy. In the medieval mysteries, "the harrowing of hell" was one of the most popular representations. Death and hell were pictured as dismayed at the loss of their victims, as Christ was to set all the captives free. So the *Vision of Piers Plowman* declares that Christ

"Would come as a Kynge,
Crouned with aungels,
And have out of helle
Alle mennes soules."

The subject was also a favorite one in the religious art of the 14th and 15th centuries.

The scholastic divines divided Hell into three different apartments: "1. Hell, properly so called, where the devils and the damned are confined; 2. Those subterranean regions which may be regarded as the intermediate states between heaven and hell, and be again subdivided into

(a.) Purgatory, which lies nearest to hell;
(b.) The *limbus infantum (puerorum),* where all those children remain who die unbaptized;
(c.) The *limbus patrun,* the abode of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach redemption to the souls in prison.

The limbus last mentioned was also called Abraham's bosom; different opinions obtained concerning its relation to heaven and hell" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines, §* 208). Aquinas taught that Christ rescued the souls of the pious of the old dispensation from the *limbus patrum (Summa Suppl.* qu. 69, art. 5).

4. *Modern.* —

(1.) The *Greek Church* holds that the *descensus* was a voluntary going down into Hades of the human soul of Christ united to his divinity; that he remained there during the period between his death and his resurrection, and devoted himself to the work he had performed on earth: i.e. that he offered redemption and preached the Gospel to those who were subject to Satan's power in consequence of original sin, releasing all believers, and all

who died in piety under the O.T. dispensation, from Hades. *(Conf. Orthod.* 1, 49, ed. Kimmel, 1840, p. 118).

(2.) The *Roman Church* rests its doctrine in tradition alone. It teaches that Christ, in his entire personality, including his divine and human natures, descended voluntarily, for the sake of the saints of Israel, into the *linbus patrum,* or into the *ignus purgatorius* (fire of purgatory), and there demonstrated himself Son of God by conquering the daemons, and by granting to the souls of the ancients who dwelt in Hades their freedom from the *limbus, and* admission to felicity in heaven. "His soul also really and substantially descended into hell, according to David's testimony: T*hou wilt not leave my soul in hell'*… (<19510>Psalm 15:10). He descended in order that, clothed with the spoils of the arch-enemy, he might conduct into heaven those holy fathers and the other just souls whose liberation from prison he had purchased," etc. *(Cat. Concil. Trid.* art. 5).

(3.) *Lutherans.* — Luther himself did not speak positively on this topic. He agreed at first with Jerome and Gregory in supposing a *limbus patrum* whither Christ went. But whenever he mentioned the subject after 1533, he was accustomed to remark that Christ destroyed the power of the devil and of hell, whither he went with soul and body. The later Lutheran theology recognized the descent as a real descent into hell. Christ, the God-man, after the resurrection and the reunion of his soul with his body, immediately before his reappearance on earth, i.e. early on Easter morning, went, body, and soul, to the hell of the damned, the time which elapsed between his death on the cross and the resurrection having been spent in Paradise. The "descent into hell" was the first act accomplished by the God-man after his entrance into his divine unlimited power, and is therefore considered as the first degree of the state of *exaltation.* It thus constitutes also his first entering into possession of the kingdom of his power, and in the revelation of his victory over the devil, and the consequent inability of the latter to prevail against believers, whence the" descent" is also designated as "the triumph over the devil and his angels." His preaching in hell is designated as condemnatory *(legalis and damnatoria, Formula Concordiae,* art. 9). The Lutheran divines have generally maintained the doctrine as thus put forth, though not without controversy among themselves. AEpinus (Johannes Hoch, † 1533) taught that Christ's descent into hell belonged, not to his state of *exaltation,* but to that of *humiliation,* his soul suffering the punishments of hell while his

body remained in the grave. He denied that 1 Pet. 3:18 refers to "the descent into hell" at all.

(4.) *Reformed.* — In the Reformed theology in general, the "descent into hell" has been interpreted metaphorically, or as meaning simply either the burial of Christ or his sufferings. So Calvin: "It was necessary for Christ to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death."… He was treated as a criminal himself, to sustain all the punishments which would have been inflicted on transgressors; only with this exception, that it was not possible that he should be holden of the pains of death. Therefore it is no wonder if he be said to have descended into hell, since he suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors" *(Institutes,* bk. 2, ch. 16 § 10). The Heidelberg Catechism substantially follows Calvin: "*Quest.* 44. Why is there added 'he descended into hell?' That in my greatest temptations I may be assured, and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies, in which he was plunged during all his sufferings, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." Dr. Nevin remarks on this answer that it gives the words of the Creed" a signification which is good in its own nature, but, at the same time, notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause — itself." The doctrine is stated in the Westminster Catechism (Larger), answer to question 50, as follows: "Christ's humiliation after death consisted in his being buried and continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day, which has been otherwise expressed in the words 'he descended into hell." Beza maintained that the descent into Hades simply meant the burial of Christ; and in this opinion he was followed by Drusius, by Dr. Barrow, and other English divines: and so Piscator, and several of the Remonstrants (Arminius, Curcellaeus, Limborch), refer it to the state of death *(status ignominiosus)* as part of the humiliation to which the Prince of Life was subjected.

Church of England. — The third article of religion runs as follows: "As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down into hell." In the first book of Edward VI it was more fully stated as follows: "The body of Christ lay in the sepulcher until his resurrection; but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify." And in the Creed-in Meter, given at the end of the old version of the Psalms in the Prayer book, it is stated as follows:

"His body then was buried
As is our use and right;
His spirit after this descent
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were,
The true light of their hearts."

Pearson, after an elaborate but not always luminous examination of the clause, sums up his own view of the doctrine as follows: "I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore, as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ descended into hell" *(Exp. of the Creed,* Oxford, 1820, p. 376). Some of the divines of the Church of England held the Calvinistic view of this subject; others held the old theory of the descent of Christ into hell that he might triumph over Satan, as he had before triumphed over death and sin (Heylyn, *Hist. Presb.* p. 349; Bilson, *Survey of Christ's Sufferings,* 1604). Hugh Broughton (t 1612) taught conclusively that *Hades* is simply the place of departed souls, and that the rational soul of Christ, in. his intermediate state, went into this locality. This has since been the generally received opinion in the Church of England; so Horsley, "Christ descended to the invisible mansion of departed spirits, and to that part of it where the souls of the faithful, when delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity… In that place he could not but find the souls that are in it in safe keeping; and, in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed he would hold conference with them; and a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction, to a general communication with all" *(Sermons,* vol. 1, Serm. 20). Dr. Joseph Muenscher discusses the whole subject, historically and critically, in an able article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April, 1859, and concludes, as to the Protestant Episcopal Church,

that her doctrine, as given in the Liturgy and Homilies, “can only be reconciled with that of the Creed and Articles by a liberal construction of the Creeds.’ And this has been done by the American Church herself in the rubric prefixed to the Creed, in which she substitutes the words ‘he went into the place of departed spirits’ as of equivalent import. The terms in which this substitute is couched are quite general and indefinite. By employing the verb *went* in the place of *descended,* she virtually repudiates the hypothesis of a subterranean cavity as the receptacle of disembodied souls. And the phrase “place of departed spirits” *determines nothing* as to an immediate locality, separate and distinct from both heaven and hell. It merely affirms that the soul of Jesus at his death went to its appropriate place in the invisible, spiritual world. Thus understood, the dogma of Christ’s descent into hell is freed from all difficulty and mystery, and made plain to the comprehension of every mind, as well as consonant with the general tenor of Scripture. The results to which we are brought by the preceding remarks are:

1. That the soul of man does not die or sleep with the body, but, immediately after the dissolution of the latter, passes into a separate, disembodied, conscious state, and into its appropriate place (so far as spirits may be supposed to occupy place), either of enjoyment or suffering-its heaven or its hell-according to the moral character which it may possess.

2. That there is no third intermediate place of spiritual existence; no subterranean habitation of disembodied souls, either of probation or of purgation; no imaginary paradise in the under world where the souls of the pious are preserved in safe-keeping; no limbus patrum, no *limbus infantum,* no purgatory.

3. That our Savior, according to the Creed, was perfect man a well as perfect God, having a human soul no less than a human body.

4. That when crucified he died in reality, and not merely in appearance (syncope), since there took place an actual separation of his soul and body.

5. That the idle and unprofitable question as to the object of Christ’s descent into Hades is precluded; a question which greatly perplexed the fathers, the schoolmen, and the Reformers, and led to the invention of many absurd and unscriptural theories.”

See Petavius, *De Theol. Dogmat.* (Antw. 1700). tom. 2, pt. 2, p. 196; Knapp, *Theology, §* 97; Dietelmayr, *Hist. dogmates de descensu Christi ad inferos* (2nd ed. Aitorf, 1762, 8vo); Hacker, *Dissert. de descensu Christi ad Inferos* (Dresden, 1802); Pearson, *On the Creed,* art. 5; Edwards, *History of Redemption,* notes, p. 351,377; Stuart, *Exegetical Essays on oFuture Punishment;* Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom,* p. 342; Burnet, Hardwick, Browne, *On the Thirty-nine Articles,* art. 3; Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harpers' ed.), 1, 210; Kinig, *die Lehre von Christi Hollenfahrt* (Frankf. 1842); Bittcher, *de Injeris rebusque post mortem futuris,* etc. (Dresden, 1846,2 vols.); Guder, *Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Christi u. d. Todten* (Berlin, 1853); Glider, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6:*178; *Zeitschriftifir die Lutherische Theologie,* 1868, No. 4; *Biblical Repository,* April, 1843, p. 470; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* Nov. 1847, p. 708; Huidekoper, *Christ's Mission to the Under World* (Boston, 1854); Bp. Hobart, *On the State of the Departed;* Bethune, *Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism,* lect. 19; *Christian Examiner, 1,* 401; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics, §* 171; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Index, s.v. Hell); *Church Review,* July, 1857; Muenscher, in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April 1859. For old monographs on the subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* p. 67. *SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.*

Hell Punishments, Nature Of

— The term HELL *(Hölle),* as stated above, originally denoted the "nether world," the "place of departed spirits." It came to be almost exclusively applied at a later period to the "place of torment" for the wicked. The scholastic divines distinguished between the *Limbus,* or place of the souls of departed spirits, and *hell,* properly so called, where the damned suffer their punishment (Aquinas, *Summae Suppleml.* qu. 69).

The nature of the punishments of hell has been very variously understood in different times. In the early Church the fire of hell was generally considered as a real, material fire. So Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Origen, however, "believed the misery of the wicked to consist in separation from God, the remorse of conscience, etc. *(De Princ.* 2, 10. *Opp.* 1, 102). The eternal fire is neither material nor kindled by another person, but the combustibles are our sins themselves, of which conscience reminds us: thus the fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this world. The separation between the soul and God may be compared with the pain which we suffer 'when all the members of the body

are torn out of their joints. By ‘outer darkness’ Origen does not so much understand a place devoid of light as a state of complete ignorance; he ‘thus appears to adopt the idea of *black bodies* only by way of accommodation to popular notions. It should also be bone in mind that Origen imagined that the design of all these punishments was to heal or to correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favor of God” (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 78).

From the latter part of the 3rd century onward to the rise of scholasticism, the punishments of hell were generally described by material images, and, indeed, were considered; to a large extent, as material punishments. Gregory of Nazianzus († 389?) supposed the punishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separation from God, and in the consciousness of their own moral debasement *(Orat. 16,* 9, p. 306: Τοῖς δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βάσανος μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ ἀπεῤῥφθαι θεοῦ, καὶ ἢ ἐν τῷ συνειδότι αἰσχύνη πἐραςοὐκ ἔχουσἀ*)*. Basil, on the contrary, gives a more vivid description of that punishment *(Homil. in Psalm* 23; *Opp.* 1, 151, and elsewhere). Chrysostom represents the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures (in *Theod. lapsum,* 1, c. 6, *Opp. 4,* 560, 561). Nevertheless, in other places (e.g., in his *Ep. ad Rom. hom. 31 Opp. 10,* 396) he justly observes that it is of more importance to know how to escape hell than to know where it is and what is its nature. Gregory of Nyssa *(Orat. Catech.* 40) endeavors to divest the idea of hell of all that is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an ἐπίγειον θηρίον*)*. Augustine imagines that separation from God is in the first instance to be regarded as the death and punishment of the damned *(De morib. eccles. cuth.* c. 11); but he leaves it to his readers to choose between the more sensuous or the more spiritual mode of perception. It is, he says, at all events, better to, think of both *(De civit. Dei, 21* 9, 10).

From the 8th to the 16th centuries the tendency was to regard the punishments of hell more as physical and material than as moral and spiritual; in the doctrine of the Church the two sorts of punishment were combined. Aquinas treats of the punishments of hell under the title *Poena Damnatorum (Summae Suppl.* qu. 97), and teaches, 1. that the damned will suffer other punishments besides that of fire; 2. that the “undying worm” is remorse of conscience; 3. that the “darkness” of hell is physical darkness, only so much light being admitted as will allow the lost to see and apprehend the punishments of the place; that, as both body and soul are to

be punished, the fire of hell will be a material fire. Augustine's view, he says, is to be considered rather as a passing opinion than as a decision *(loquitur opinando et non determinando).* The fire, according to Aquinas, is of the same nature as our ordinary fire, though "with different properties;" and the place of punishment, though not certainly known, is probably under the earth. Others of the schoolmen, however (especially the Mystics), made the suffering of hell to consist rather in separation from God, and in the consequent consciousness of sin, and of unavailing repentance, than in material penalties.

The Reformation made little change in the doctrine as to the nature of future punishment. The substance of the Reformed doctrine is given in the *Westminster Confession,* chap. 33, as follows: "The wicked, who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;" and in the *Larger Catechism,* quest. 29, "*What are the punishments of sin in the world to come? A.* The punishments of sin in the world to come are everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell-fire forever." In general, both Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians agree in making that punishment to consist (1) of the *pena damni,* penalty of loss or deprivation, separation from God, and hence loss of all possible sources of enjoyment (40621Matthew 6:21; 22:13; 25:41; compare Wesley, *Sermons,* 2, 148), of which loss the damned will be fully conscious; (2) of the *pana sensus,* penalty of sense or feeling, as the natural consequence of sin. "These punishments are inevitable, and connected as closely and inseparably with sin as any effect with its cause. From the consciousness of being guilty of sin arise regret, sorrow, and remorse of conscience, and it is these inward pangs which are the most grievous and, tormenting. The conscience of man is a stem accuser, which cannot be refuted or bribed, and the more its voice is disregarded or suppressed here upon earth, the more loudly will it speak hereafter. Add to this that the propensity to sin, the passions and evil desires which in this world occupy the human heart, are carried along into the next. For it cannot be supposed that they will be suddenly eradicated as by a miracle, and this is hot promised. But these desires and propensities can no longer find satisfaction in the future world, where man will be placed in an entirely different situation, and surrounded by a circle of objects entirely new, hence they will become the more

inflamed. From the very nature of the case, it is plain, therefore, that the state of such a man hereafter must necessarily be miserable. Shame, regret, remorse, hopelessness, and absolute despair, are the natural, inevitable, and extremely dreadful consequences of the sins committed in this life." (3) Besides these natural penalties of sin, there will also be *positive* penalties inflicted by divine justice. The New Testament speaks far more distinctly and frequently of these positive punishments than of the natural ones, and especially of the "undying worm," and of "the eternal fire." The general tendency of modern theology is to regard these expressions as figurative representations of the positive penalties of hell Doddridge remarks that, "On the whole, it is of very little importance whether we say there is an external fire, or only an idea of such pain as arises from burning; and should we think both doubtful, it is certain God can give the mind a sense of agony and distress which should answer and even exceed the terrors of those descriptions; and care should certainly be taken so to explain Scripture metaphors as that hell may be considered as consisting more of mental agony than of bodily tortures" *(Lect. on Divin.* 223).

Of similar tenor are the following remarks by Dr. Wardlaw: "What the nature of that suffering shall be it is vain for us to attempt to conjecture. It has been conceived that if we suppose clear apprehensions of God and sin in the understanding; an unslumbering conscience; an unceasing conflict between full, irrepressible convictions of all that is awful in truth, and an enmity of heart remaining in all its virulence; passions raging in their unmitigated violence; regrets as unavailing as they are torturing; conscious desert and unalleviated hopelessness; with the entire removal of all, in whatever form, that on earth enabled the sinner to banish thought and exclude anticipation, we have materials for a sufficient hell. I will not deny it…. I cannot but think, therefore, that there must be something more than conscience, something of the nature of positive punitive infliction: conscience attesting its justice, certifying its being all deserved. What shall be the precise nature of that infliction is another question. There may surely be something of the nature of punitive infliction without adopting the theory of literal fire, of a lake of fire, a lake burning with brimstone. I have no more belief, as I have just said, in a literal fire than in a literal worm; and no more belief in either than in the existence, for the heaven of the Bible, of a literal paradise, in the center of which grows the tree of life, or of a literal city, of which the length, and breadth, and height are equal, of which the foundations are precious stones, the gates of pearl, and the streets of gold,

with a pure river of living water flowing through the midst of it. But the mind of fallen man is in love with sin, and in selfish hatred of God and holiness. In a mind of this character the difficulty may amount to impossibility of awakening any adequate sense of future suffering, or any salutary alarm in the anticipation of it, by any representation of it more directly spiritual, or even mental. In these circumstances, then, if an impression of extreme suffering is to be made, it seems as if figure, taken from what is still in the midst of all the perversions of depravity felt to be fearful, were almost, if not altogether, indispensable for the purpose. The figures of Scripture on this subject are felt, and felt powerfully, by every mind. The very mention of the "worm that dieth not" awakens a more thrilling emotion, undefined as it is (perhaps, indeed, the more thrilling that it is undefined), than anything you can say to an unregenerate man about the operations of conscience, and the "fire that never shall be quenched" than any representation you can ever make to him of sin, and the absence of God, and the sway of evil passions, and the pangs of remorse, and horribleness of sin-loving and God-hating company. Such images have the full effect intended by them. They give the impression, the vivid and intense impression, of extreme suffering; although what proportion of that suffering shall be the native and necessary result of the constitution of human nature when placed in certain circumstances, and what proportion of more direct penal infliction, the Scriptures do not tell us, entering into no such discussions. And it would be useless for us to conjecture, or to attempt the adjustment of such proportions" *(Systematic Theology*, Edinburgh, 1857, 3:700). For a copious list of books on the subject, see Abbot's bibliographical appendix to Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, § 3 F, 3.

On the *Duration* of the punishment of hell, *SEE UNIVERSALISM*.

Hellenist

(῾Ελληνιστής, A.V." Grecian;" comp. ῾Ελληνισμός, 2 Macc. 4:13). In one of the earliest notices of- the first Christian Church at Jerusalem (<4601>Acts 6:1), two distinct parties are recognized among its members, *"Hebrews"* and *Hellenists*, who appear to stand towards one another in some degree in a relation of jealous rivalry. So, again, when Paul first visited Jerusalem after his conversion, he spoke and disputed with the *Hellenists* (<4029>Acts 9:29), as if expecting to find more sympathy among them than with the rulers of the Jews. The term Hellenist occurs once again

in the N.T. according to the common text, in the account of the foundation of the Church at Antioch (<44120>Acts 11:20), but there the context, as well as the form of the sentence *(*καὶπρὸς τούς, though the καὶ is doubtful), seems to require the other reading "Greeks" (Ἕλληνες), which is supported by great external evidence as the true antithesis to "J Jews" *(*Ἰουδαίοις, not ῾Εβραίοις, 5, 19). *SEE HEBREWS*.

The name, according to its derivation. whether the original verb *(* ῾Ελληνίζω*)* be taken, according to the common analogy of similar forms (μνδιζω, ἀττικίζω, Φιλιππίζω*)*, in the general sense of *adopting the spirit* and character of Greeks, or, in the more limited sense, of *using the Greek language* (Xenophon, *Anwb. 7*, 3, 25), marks a class distinguished by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Hellenists as a body included not only the proselytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage *(*οἱ σεβόμενοι ῞Ελληνες,, <44170>Acts 17:4 (?); οἱ σεβόμενοιπροσήλυτοι, <44136>Acts 13:43; οἱ σεβόμενοι,, <44177>Acts 17:17), but also those Jews who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew. Hellenism was thus a type of life, and not an indication of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used (῞Ελληνες, <43120>John 12:20), the point of race and not of creed is that which is foremost in the mind of the writer. (See *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. and April, 1857.) *SEE GRECIAN*.

I. As to the particular class in question, referred to in the Acts, the following are the different opinions that have been held:

1. That the distinctive difference between them was simply one of *language,* the Hebrews speaking the Aramaic of Palestine, the Hellenists the Greek. This is the most ancient opinion, being that expressed in the Peshito, and given by Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.; and it is the one which has received the largest number of suffrages in more recent times. Among its advocates are Joseph Scaliger, Heinsius, Drusius, Grotius, Selden, Hottinger, Hug, etc.

2. That the distinction was partly of *country*, partly of *language:* the Hebrew being a native of Judaea, and using the Aramaic language, the Hellenist born among the Gentiles, and using the speech of the country of

which he was a native. So Erasmus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Wahl, De Wette, Davidson, Alford, Baumgarten, etc.

3. That the difference was one of *religious history,* the Hebrew being a born child of the covenant, the Hellenist a proselyte from heathenism. So Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Basnage, Pfannkuche, etc.

4. That the difference was one *of principle:* the Hebrew adhering to the one set of beliefs or modes of thought, the Hellenist adopting another. According to some, this difference had the effect of constituting the Hellenists into a distinct sect among the Jews, such as the Essenes; whilst others, without going this length, regard the two classes as standing to each other very much in the relation in which parties in the state holding different political views, or parties in the same Church having different aims and modes of regarding religious truth in modern times, may stand to each other; the Hebrews being like the Conservative or High-Church party, while the Hellenists advocated a more progressive, unfettered, and comprehensive scheme of thinking and acting. This latter view, in its substance, has recently found an able advocate in Mr. Roberts *(Discussions on the Gospels,* p. 148 sq.). According to him, "the *Hellenists* were those Jews, whether belonging to Palestine or not, who willingly yielded to the influence of Gentile civilization and habits, and were thus distinguished by their free and liberal spirit; the *Hebrews,* again, were the rigid adherents to Judaism, who, in spite of the providential agencies which had been long at work, endeavored to keep up those peculiar and exclusive usages by which the Jews had for so many centuries been preserved distinct from all other nations."

We are not disposed to reject entirely any of these opinions. Each of them seems to have an element of truth in it, though the contributions they make to the whole truth on this subject are by no means of equal importance. The last alone points to what must be regarded as the fundamental and formative characteristic of Hellenism among the Jews. There can be no doubt historically that some such distinction as that to which it refers did subsist in the Jewish, nation (see Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthuns,* 1, 99 sq., 345 sq.), and had come to a height at the commencement of the Christian era; and nothing can be more probable than that the existence of such a distinction should manifest itself in the very way in which the distinction between the Hebrews and the Hellenists is asserted to have shown itself in Acts 6:1 sq. It is in agreement with this, also, that Paul should have

entered into discussion chiefly with the Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem; for it is probable that as his early Hellenic culture pointed him out as the person most fitted to meet them on their own ground, he may have been specially set upon this work by the other apostles. Kitto, s.v. Still this difference of views could hardly of itself have constituted so marked and obvious a distinction as is implied in the various texts above cited, unless it had been exhibited in some outward characteristic; and no external sign could have been more certain, natural, and palpable than that familiar use of the Greek language which at once betrayed a foreign Jew, to whom it was vernacular, in contrast with the Palestinian Jew, by whom Greek, although too prevalent in that age everywhere to have been unknown to any, was nevertheless always spoken with a Hebrew coloring and accent. *SEE DISPERSION*.

II. It remains to characterize briefly the elements which the Hellenists contributed to the language of the N.T., and the immediate effects which they produced upon the apostolic teaching:

1. The flexibility of the Greek language gained for it in ancient times a general currency similar to that which French enjoys in modern Europe; but with this important difference, that Greek was not only the language of educated men, but also the language of the masses in the great centers of commerce. The colonies of Alexander and his successors originally established what has been called the Macedonian dialect throughout the East; but even in this the prevailing power of Attic literature made itself distinctly felt. Peculiar words and forms adopted at Alexandria were undoubtedly of Macedonian origin, but the later Attic may be justly regarded as the real-basis of Oriental Greek. This first type was, however, soon modified, at least in common use, by contact with other languages. The vocabulary was enriched by the addition of foreign words, and the syntax was modified by new constructions. In this way a variety of local dialects must have arisen, the specific characters of which were determined in the first instance by the conditions under which they were, formed, and which afterwards passed away with the circumstances that had produced them. But one of these dialects has been preserved after the ruin of the people among whom it arose, by being consecrated to the noblest service which language has yet fulfilled. In other cases the dialects perished together with the communities who used them in the common intercourse of life, but in that of the Jews the Alexandrine version of the 0. Test., acting in this respect like the great vernacular versions of England and

Germany, gave a definiteness and-fixity to the popular language which could not have been gained without the existence of some recognized standard. The style of the Sept. itself is, indeed, different in different parts, but the same general character runs through the whole, and the variations which it presents are not greater than those which exist in the different books of the N.T.

The functions which this Jewish-Greek had to discharge were of the widest application, and the language itself combined the most opposite features. It was essentially a fusion of Eastern and Western thought; for, disregarding peculiarities of inflection and novel words, the characteristic of the Hellenistic dialect is the combination of a Hebrew spirit with a Greek body, of a Hebrew form with Greek words. The conception belongs to one race, and the expression to another. Nor is it too much to say that this combination was one of the most important preparations for the reception of Christianity, and one of the most important aids for the adequate expression of its teaching. On the one hand, by the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the deep, theocratic aspect of the world and life, which distinguishes Jewish thought, was placed before men at large; and, on the other, the subtle truths which philosophy had gained from the analysis of mind and action, and enshrined in words, were transferred to the service of revelation. In the fullness of time, when the great message came, a language was prepared to convey it; and thus the very dialect of the N.T. forms a great lesson in the true philosophy of history, and becomes in itself a monument of the providential government of mankind.

This view of the Hellenistic dialect will at once remove one of the commonest misconceptions relating to it. For it will follow that its deviations from the ordinary laws of classic Greek are themselves bound by some common law, and that irregularities of construction and altered usages of words are to be traced to their first source, and interpreted strictly according to the original conception out of which they sprang. A popular, and even a corrupt dialect is not less precise, or, in other words, is not less human than a polished one, though its interpretation may often be more difficult from the want of materials for analysis. But in the case of the N.T., the books themselves furnish an ample store for the critic, and the Sept., when compared with the Hebrew text, provides him with the history of the language which he has to study.

2. The adoption of a strange language was essentially characteristic of the true nature of Hellenism; the purely outward elements of the national life were laid aside with a facility of which history offers few examples, while the inner character of the people remained unchanged. In every respect, the thought, so to speak, was clothed in a new dress. Hellenism was, as it were, a fresh incorporation of Judaism according to altered laws of life and worship. But, as the Hebrew spirit made itself distinctly visible in the new dialect, so it remained undestroyed by the new conditions which regulated its action. While the Hellenistic Jews followed their natural instinct for trade, which was originally curbed by the Mosaic law, and gained a deeper insight into foreign character, and with this a truer sympathy, or at ‘least a wider tolerance towards foreign opinions, they found means at the same time to extend the knowledge of the principles of their divine faith, and to gain respect and attention even from those who did not openly embrace their religion. Hellenism accomplished for the outer world what the Return accomplished for the Palestinian Jews: it was the necessary step between a religion of form and a religion of spirit: it witnessed against Judaism as final and universal, and it witnessed for it as the foundation of a spiritual religion which should be bound by no local restrictions. Under the influence of this wider instruction, a Greek body grew up around the synagogue-not admitted into the Jewish Church, and yet holding a recognized position with regard to it-which was able to apprehend the apostolic teaching, and ready to receive it. The Hellenists themselves were at once missionaries to the heathen and prophets to their own countrymen. Their lives were an abiding protest against polytheism and pantheism, and they retained with unshaken zeal the sum of their ancient creed, when the preacher had popularly occupied the place of the priest, and a service of prayer, and praise, and exhortation had succeeded in daily life to the elaborate ritual of the Temple. Yet this new development of Judaism was obtained without the sacrifice of national ties. The connection of the Hellenists with the Temple was not broken, except in the case of some of the Egyptian Jews. Unity coexisted with dispersion; and the organization of the Church was foreshadowed, not only in the widening breadth of doctrine, but even externally in the scattered communities which looked to Jerusalem as their common center. In another aspect Hellenism served as the preparation for a catholic creed. As it furnished the language of Christianity, it supplied also that literary instinct which counteracted the traditional reserve of the Palestinian Jews. The writings of the N. Test., and all the writings of the apostolic age, with the exception of the original

Gospel of Matthew, were, as far as we know, Greek; and Greek seems to have remained the sole vehicle of Christian literature, and the principal medium of Christian worship, till the Church of North Africa rose into importance in the time of Tertullian. The Canon of the Christian Scriptures, the early creeds, and the liturgies, are the memorials of this Hellenistic predominance in the Church, and the types of its working; and if in later times the Greek spirit descended to the investigation of painful subtleties, it may be questioned whether the fullness of Christian truth could have been developed without the power of Greek thought tempered by Hebrew discipline.

The general relations of Hellenism to Judaism are well treated in the histories of Ewald and Jost; but the Hellenistic language is as yet, critically speaking, almost unexplored. Winer's Grammar *(Gramm. d. N.T. Sprachidions,* 7th ed. 1868) has done great service in establishing the idea of law in N.T. language, which was obliterated by earlier interpreters, but even Winer does not investigate the origin of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect. The idioms of the N.T. cannot be discussed apart from those of the Sept., and no explanation can be considered perfect which does not take into account the origin of the corresponding Hebrew idioms. For this work even the materials are as yet deficient. The text of the Sept. is still in a most unsatisfactory condition; and while Bruder's Concordance leaves nothing to be desired for the vocabulary of the N.T., Trommius's Concordance to the Sept., however useful, is quite untrustworthy for critical purposes. *SEE GREEK LANGUAGE*.

Heller, Yomtov Lipman B.-Nathan

a distinguished Rabbi of the Polish school, born at Wallerstein, duchy of Anspach, Germany, in 1579. He filled the appointment of Rabbi to the great synagogues at Vienna, Prague, and Krakau. While at Prague (1629) he was prosecuted by the government upon a charge that he had written in praise of the Talmud to the injury of the Christian religion, was imprisoned, and fined 10,000 florins. After his release he went to Poland, where, in 1644, he became Rabbi of the synagogue at Krakau. Here he died in 1654. Heller wrote his autobiography (hbya tlygm), printed in 1836, which contains a complete list of all his works. Among the most important of them, are his glossaries to the Mishna (fy twpswt). These are considered by Oriental scholars as very valuable. — Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden. 3,* 243; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature,* p. 448.

Helm

πηδάλιον, the *rudder* of a ship (^{Jas}James 3:4). *SEE RUDDER*.

Helmet

Picture for Helmet

([bʸK or [bʃq *kob, kob,* περικεφαλαία*)*, a military cap for the defense of the head in battle (1 Samuel Helmont, FRANCOIS MERCURE, baron VAN, was born at Vilvorde in 1618. In his youth he studied medicine, and applied himself especially to alchemy. He then joined a band of gypsies, with whom he traveled through part of Europe, but was arrested in Italy in 1662, and cast into the dungeons of the Inquisition. In 1663, being liberated, he went to Sulzbach, where he worked with Knorr of Rosenroth at the *Kabbala denudata.* He published, about the same time, a work on the alphabet of the primitive tongue, i.e. Hebrew (Sulzbach, 1667, 12mo), which, according to him, is so natural that every letter expresses merely the position of the lips while pronouncing it: he pretended to teach the deaf and dumb to articulate all the sounds of his alphabet at first sight. He believed in the transmigration of souls, the universal remedy, and the philosopher's stone. He traveled afterwards through England, and returned through Hanover to Berlin, in a suburb of which city he died in 1699 (Moreri says he died at Cologne; Toppens, in Switzerland; Wachter, at Emmerich, in Dec. 1698). Leibnitz wrote on him the following epitaph:

"Nil patre inferior, jacet hic Helmontius alter,
Qui junusxi varias mentis et artis opes:
Per quem Pythagoras et cabbala sacra revixit
Elcensque, parat qui sua cuncta sibi."

Besides the alphabet above mentioned, he wrote *Opuscula Philosophica, quibus continentur principia philosophie antiquissim et recentissimae,* etc. (Amsterd. 1690, *12mo): — Quaedam prcemeditatae et consideratce Cogitationes super quatuor priora capita libri primi Moisis, Genesis nominati* (Amst. 1697, *8vo): — De Attributis divinis,* etc. See Adelung, *Hist. de la Folie humaine, 4:*294-323 Moreri, *Grand Dict. hist.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 864.

Helmuth, Justus Christian Henry, D.D.

a Lutheran minister, was born at Helmstadt, in the duchy of Brunswick, in 1745.. His father dying when he was yet a boy, he left home without the knowledge of the family, and was overtaken on the highway by a nobleman in his carriage, who entered into a conversation with him, and inquired whither he was going. The lad informed him that he had left home because he was angry with God, having prayed earnestly to him during his father's illness for his restoration to health, but God had not answered his petition. Interested in the artless reply of the innocent boy, the nobleman took him into his carriage and afterwards sent him to Halle at his expense, to be educated at the Orphan House, and afterwards at the University. His first sermon was preached in the chapel of the Orphan House, and among his hearers was Bogatzky, the author of the *Schatz-Kastlein* (Golden Treasury), who predicted the future greatness of the young preacher. He was ordained by the *Consistorium* at Wernigerode, and was sent by the theological faculty at Halle as a missionary to America in 1769. The first ten years of his ministry he labored in Lancaster, Pa., with great acceptance. In 1779 he accepted a unanimous call to Philadelphia, where he continued the pastoral work as long as his physical strength admitted. For eighteen years he was professor of German and Oriental languages in the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he received in 1785 the degree of D.D. In connection with his colleague, Dr. Schmidt, he organized a private seminary for candidates for the Lutheran ministry, which was in operation twenty years. In the pulpit he had more than ordinary power. His preaching was characterized by great unction and overwhelming pathos, and often produced wonderful results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever he visited the sick and dying without fear. He buried 625 of his members. He died in the 80th year of his age, Feb. 5,1824. He was the author of a work on *Baptism and the Sacred Scriptures,* published in 1793; also of a practical treatise on *Communion with God;* numerous devotional books for children, and a volume of Hymns. He edited likewise the *evangelical Magazine,* published for some years in Philadelphia in the German language. (M. L. S.)

Heloise

SEE ABELARD.

He'lon

(Heb. *Chelon',* ˆl je *strong;* Sept. Χαιλών*),* the father of Eliab, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode (<04010>Numbers 1:9; 2:7; 7:24, 29; 10:16). B.C. ante 1658.

Help

besides its ordinary signification of *assistance* in general, has in two passages of the N.T. a technical application.

1. HELPS *(*βοήθειαι*),* nautical *apparatus* for securing a vessel, when leaking, by means of ropes, chains, etc., passed around in the process of "undergirding" (q.v.), in the emergency of a storm (<44717>Acts 27:17). *SEE SHIP*.

2. HELPS *(*ἀντιλήψεις*;* Vulg. *opitulationes;* <46128>1 Corinthians 12:28). This Greek word, signifying *aids* or assistances, has also a meaning, among others, corresponding. to that in this passage, in the classical writers (e.g. Diod. Sic. 1, 87). In the Sept. it answers to hrz][, (<19219>Psalm 22:19), to ˆ/[m; (<19682>Psalm 108:12), and to [/rz; (<19808>Psalm 83:8). It is found in the same sense, Ecclus. 11:12; 2 Macc. 11:26; and in Josephus *(War, 4,* 5, 1). In the N.T. it occurs once, viz. in the enumeration of the several orders or classes of persons possessing miraculous gifts among the primitive Christians *(ut supra),* where it seems to be used by metonymy; the abstract for the concrete, and to mean *helpers;* like the words δυνάμεις, "miracles," i.e. *workers* of miracles; κυβερνήσεις, "governments," i.e. *governors,* etc., in the same enumeration. Many persons h1 this country, by a similar idiom, call their servants "help." Great difficulty attends the attempt to ascertain the nature of the office so designated among Christians. Theophylact explains ἀντιλήψεις, ἀντεχεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενῶν, *helping* or sup*porting the infirm.* So also Gennadius, in AEcumenius. But this seems like an inference from the etymology (see the Greek of <44035>Acts 20:35). It has been *assumed* by some eminent modern writers that the several "orders" mentioned in ver. 28 correspond respectively to the several "gifts" of the Spirit enumerated in ver. 8, 9. In order, however, to make the two enumerations tally, it is necessary to make "divers kinds of tongues" and "*interpretation* of tongues" in the *one* answer to "*diversities of tongues"* in the *other,* which, *in the present state of the received text,* does not seem to be a *complete* correspondence. The

result of the collation is that ἀντιλήψεις answers to "prophecy;" whence it has been inferred that these persons were such as were qualified with the gift of "lower prophecy," to *help* the Christians in the public devotions (Barrington's *Miscellanea Sacra,* 1, 166; Macknight on 1 Corinthians 12:10-28). Another result is that "governments" answers to "dissenting of spirits." To both these Dr. Hales very reasonably objects as unlikely, and pronounces this tabular view to be "perplexed and embarrassing" *(New Analysis,* etc., Lond. 1830, 3:289). Bishop Horsley has adopted this classification of the gifts and office-bearers, and points out as "helps," i.e. persons gifted with "prophecies or prediction," such persons as Mark, Tychicus, Onesimus. Vitringa, from a comparison of ver. 28, 29, 30, infers that the ἀντιλήψεις denote those who had the gift of *interpreting foreign languages (De Synag. Vet.* 2, 505, Franque. 1696); which, though *certainly possible,* as an *arbitrary* use of a very significant word, stands in need of confirmation by actual instances. Dr. Lightfoot also, according to his biographer, adopted the same plan and arrived at the same conclusion (Strype's *Life of Lightfoot,* prefixed to his *Works,* p. 4, Lond. 1684). But Lightfoot himself explains the word "persons who accompanied the apostles, baptized those who were converted by them, and were sent to places to which they, being employed in other things, could not come, as Mark, Timothy, Titus." He observes (ii, 781) that the Talmudists sometimes call the Levites μynhkl yd[sm, "the helpers of the priests." Similar catalogues of miraculous gifts and officers occur Romans 12:6-8, and Ephesians 4:11, 12; but they neither correspond in *number* nor in *the order of enumeration.* In the *former,* "prophecy" stands first, and in the *latter* second; and in the former many of the terms are of wide import, as "ministering," while *minute distinctions* are made between others, as between "teaching" and "exhortation," "giving" and "showing mercy." Other writers pursue different methods, and arrive at different conclusions. For instance, Hammond, arguing from the etymology of the word, and from passages in the early writers, which describe the office of relieving the poor as peculiarly connected with that of the apostles and bishops by the deacons, infers that ἀντιλ. "denotes a special *part of the office* of those men which are set down at the beginning of the verse." He also explains κυβερνήσεος as another part of their *office* (Hammond, *Comment.* ad loc.). Schletisner understands "*deacons* who had the care of the sick." Rosenmüller, "Diaconi qui pauperibus, peregrinis, aegrotis, mortuis, procurandis praserant." Bishop Pearce thinks that both these words may have been originally put in the *margin* to explain δυνάμεις, "miracles or

powers," and urges that ἀντιλ is nowhere mentioned as a gift of the Spirit, and that it is not *recapitulated* in ver. 29, 30. Certainly the *omission* of these two words would nearly produce exactitude in the *recapitulation.* Bowyer adopts the same conjecture, but it is without support from MSS. or versions. He also observes that to the end of ver. 28 some copies of the Vulgate add "interpretationes sermonum," ἑρμηνει᾽ας γλωσσῶν*;* as also the later Syriac, Hilary, and Ambrose. This *addition* would make the *recapitulation perfect.* Chrysostom and all the Greek interpreters consider the ἀντιλ and κυβερν. as importing the *same thing, namely, functionaries* so called with reference to the *two* different-parts of their *office:* the ἀντιλ superintending the care of the poor, sick, and strangers; the κυβερν the burial of the dead and the executorship of their effects including the care of their widows and orphans, rather *managers than* governors (Blomfield's *Recensio Synopt.).* After all, it must be confessed, with Doddridge, that "we can only guess at the meaning of the words in question, having no principles on which to proceed in fixing it absolutely" *(Family Expositor,* on 461228 1 Corinthians 12:28). (See Alberti, *Glossar. p.* 123; Suicer, *Thesaurus,* in voc.; Salmasius, *De Faenore Trapezitico.* p. 409, — Wolfii *Curae Philolog.* Basil. 1741.) Stanley remarks *(Commentae* ad loc.) that the word "ἀντίληψις, as used in the Sept., is not (like διακονία*)* help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but be a superior to an inferior (comp. 199118 Psalm 89:18; Ecclus. 11:12; 51:7), and, thus is inapplicable to the ministrations of the deacon to the presbyter." Probably it is a general term (hence the plur.) to include those occasional labors of *evangelists* and special laborers, such as Apollos in ancient times and eminent revivalists in modern days, who have from time to time been raised up as powerful but independent. promoters of the Gospel. *SEE GIFTS, SPIRITUAL*.

Help-meet

(or rather, as the best editions of the Bible now punctuate it, HELP MEET for *him,* /Dgn K] r z,[*, e'zer, ke-negdo', a help as his counterpart,* i.e. an aid suitable and supplementary to him), a delicate and beautiful designation of a wife (10218 Genesis 2:18-20), which exactly expresses her relation. *SEE MARRIAGE*.

Helve

Picture for Helve

(/ [,ets, *wood*, as often elsewhere), the *handle* or wooden part of an axe (Deuteronomy 19:5). *SEE AXE*; *SEE TREE*.

Helvetic Confessions

the later Confessions of faith of the Reformed churches of Switzerland. *SEE BASLE, CONFESSIONS OF*.

I. *The Confessio Helvetica prior* (the second Confession of Basle) was framed by a convention of delegates from Baslq, Zurich, Berne, Schaffhausen, Mülhausen, St. Gall, and Biel, which began its sessions at Basle Jan, 30, 1536. Among the eminent theologians who took part in it were Megander of Berne, Granaeus and Myconius of Basle, Leo Judae and Bullinger of Zurich. During their sessions, Bucer and Capito, who were striving earnestly to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches, arrived in Basle, and seem to have exercised a decided influence in the formation of the Confession, though they had no vote in the Convention. The Confession was drawn up by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynaeus, in Latin, and translated into German by Leo Juda (Augusti, *Lib. Symb. Reform.* p. 626). In March, 1536, it was adopted as the standard of doctrine. It consists of twenty-seven short articles: 1-5 of Scripture and Tradition; 6:of God; 7, 8:of Man, the Fall, and Original Sin; 9:of Free Will; 10-13, the Person and Work of Christ as Savior; 14-19, the Church and Ministry; 20-24, the Sacraments; 26, Civil Government; 27, Marriage. The Latin title of the Confession is *Ecclesiarum ver Helfetiam Confessio fidei summaria et generalis, composita Basilece,* A.D. 1536. It is Calvinistic and (moderately) Zwinglian in doctrine. The Confession, in both German and Latin, is given in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confesssionum,* p. 105-122.

II. *Confessio Helvetica Posterior*, the second Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1566. The first Confession above mentioned, though generally received, did not give universal satisfaction in Switzerland, especially as it was believed that the Lutheran influence had been allowed to operate in its formation. Bullinger undertook to revise it, and, at the request of the elector Palatine. Frederick III, he finished the work, with the aid of Beza and Gualter, and handed over the Confession, thus prepared, to the elector, who printed it in German, and adopted it (A.D. 1565, as the Reformed

standard in his territory. The elector also made use of it to vindicate the Reformed doctrines against the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg, January 1566. The attention of the Swiss churches was called to this revised-Confession as a standard under which they could all agree. By the year 1578 the Confession had received the sanction of the Swiss cantons, and had also been approved by the Reformed churches of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France (the latter receiving it in Beza's translation). It adopts Calvin's doctrine on the Lord's Supper, but "presents the Augustinian doctrine of election in a mild form, far behind Calvin" (Gieseler, *Church History*, ed. H. B. Smith, 4:422). No Reformed Confession has been more widely diffused. The title of the Confession is *Confessio et Expositio Brevis et Simplex sincerae Religionis Christianae.* It consists of thirty chapters: chaps. 1 and 2 treat of the Scriptures, Tradition, etc.; 3, of God and the Trinity; 4 and 5, of Idols or Images of God, Christ, and the Saints, and of the Worship of God through Christ, the sole Mediator; 6, of Providence; 7, of the Creation of all Things, of Angels, Devils, Man; 8, of Sin and the Fall of Man; 9, of Free Will. The condition of man after the fall is thus stated: *Non sublatus est quidenm homini intellectus, non erepta ei voluntas, et prorsus in lapidernt vel truncum est commutatus* (The intellect of man was not taken away by the fall, nor was he robbed of will, and changed into a stock or stone). Art. x treats of Predestination and Election. The second paragraph runs thus: *Ergo non sine medio, licet non propter ullum meritum nostrum, sed in Christo et propter Christum, nos elegit Deus, ut qui jam in Christo insiti per fidem, illi ipsi etiam sint electi, reprobi vero, qui sunt extra Christum, seculndum illud Apostoli,* 471352 Corinthians 13:5 (Therefore, not without a medium, though not on account of any- merit of ours, but in Christ, and on account of Christ, God elected us; so that they who are engrafted in Christ by faith are the elect, while the reprobate are those who are out of Christ, according to the apostle, in 471352 Corinthians 13:5). This chapter has been the subject of much controversy, both Calvinists and Arminians finding their own doctrine in it. Chap. 11 treats of Christ as God-man, the only Savior; 12 and 13, of the Law and the Gospel; 14-16, of Repentance and of Justification by Faith; 17-22, of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; 23 and 24:of Assemblies, Worship, Feasts, and Fasts; 25-29, Catechism, Rites, Ceremonies, etc.; 30, of the Civil Magistracy. This Confession is given in Latin in the *Sylloye Confession-um* (Oxon. 1827, 8vo); by Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 462 sq.; by Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum*, p. 1-102. A tercentenary edition, edited by Dr. E. Bohl, was published at Vienna, 1865

(120 pp. 8vo). See Gieseler, *Church History,* 1. *c.;* Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* 2, 469; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 221; Fritzsche, *Conf. Hel. Posterior,* Zurich, 1839; Augusti, *Allg. christl. Symbolik,* 1861, p. 158.

Helvetic Consensus

(Formula Consensus Helvetica), a confession of faith drawn up in 1675 by J. G. Heidegger at the request of the Calvinistic divines of Switzerland. It was chiefly designed to restrain the progress of the mitigated Calvinism of Amyraldus and the school of Saumur generally, which was spreading in Switzerland. *SEE AMYRALDUS.* Turretin, Zwinger, Werenfels, Hottinger, and other Swiss theologians aided in its preparation, but its form is chiefly due to Heidegger.

It consists of a preface and twenty-six canons. Canons 1-3 treat of the Scriptures; and the second (against Cappel) maintains that the Hebrew text is to be received as divinely inspired, not only as to the substance, but as to the very words, consonants, vowels, and vowel points *(tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltent potestatem, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba* Θεόπνευστος*).* The remaining canons are chiefly occupied with definitions of the Calvinistic view of predestination, sin, grace, the extent of the atonement, etc., all which are set forth in language as decided as that cited above with regard to the Scriptures. The *Formula* is given in full by Augusti *(Corpus Libr. Symbol. Reform.* D. 443 sq.) and by Niemeyer *(Collectio Confess. p.* 729). Within a year from its promulgation it was adopted by the magistrates of Basle, Zurich, Berne, etc., but it was not received at Geneva until 1679. It was finally made authoritative throughout Switzerland: all ministers, teachers, and professors were bound to subscribe to it; and it was ordained that no candidate for the ministry should be admitted except upon declaration that he received it *ex anivso* (Augustli 1. c. p. 646). But these strong measures, together with the influence of the French clergy, and especially the intercession of Frederick William of Brandenburgh, produced a reaction; and in 1686 the magistrates of Basle allowed the admission of candidates without subscription to the *Formula.* By 1706 its strict obligation had fallen into disuse at Geneva. In the other cantons it was still retained, but gave rise to long conflicts. In 1722 the kings of Prussia and England sent letters to the Swiss Cantons, for the sake of the unity and peace of Protestantism, to drop the use of the *Formula* as a binding creed.

In 1723 they renewed these letters to the same purpose. By 1740 the Formula had fallen entirely into disuse. “It never acquired authority outside of Switzerland. Within about fifty years it was abrogated. One of the strongest advocates of this last measure was Turretin’s own son, Alphonso Turretin, who was as zealous in opposing as his father had been in advocating it. If there was ever a creed which deserves to be called the manifesto of a theological party rather than a confession of faith on the part of the Church, the *Formula Consesus* is that one” (Fisher, in *New Englander,* July, 1868, p. 502). See Hottinger, *Formulae Consensus Historia* (1723, 4to), in favor of the Consensus; Pfaff, *Schediasma theol. de Form. Consens. Helvet.* (Tübingen, 1723, 4to), on the Lutheran side; Schröckh, *Kirchen. seit der Reformation, 8,* 659 sq.; Barnaud, *Memoirs pour servir ha ‘histoire des troebles a l’occasion du Consensus* (Amst. 1726, 8vo); Mosheim, *Ch. History,* cent. 17 pt. 2, ch. 3; Trechsel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 5, 719 sq.; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrins, 2,* 472; Augusti, *Allg. christl. Symbolik,* 1861, p. 160; Schweizer, in *Zeitschrifi für d. hist. Theol.* 1860, p. 122; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* ed. H. B. Smith, § 222, and references there.

Helvetius, Claude Adrien

a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finance, and, through the influence of queen Maria Leczinska, became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his *De l’Esprit,* which was a summary of the doctrines of the *Encyclopedia.* The book was bitterly denounced; and, “to regain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively published three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimer of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris.” The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dee. 26, 1771, leaving a work behind him entitled *De l’Homme, de ses Faculty, et de son Education,* which was published the same year at London and Amsterdam by prince Gallitzin, 2 vols. 8vo. “By *esprit* Helvetius understood as well the mental faculties as the ideas acquired by them. Both faculties and ideas he reduced to simple sensation,

and he accounts for man's superiority over the brutes by the finer organism of his senses and the structure of his hands. Man, he considers, is the work of nature, but his intelligence and virtue are the fruit of education. The end of virtue is happiness, and utility determines the value of all actions, of which those are virtuous which are generally useful. Utility and inutility are, however, merely relative, and there is consequently nothing which is either absolutely good, or absolutely evil. The happiness and enlightenment of the people he makes to be the true end of all human government; and, denying a divine Providence in the government of the world, he declares all religion to be a cheat and a prejudice" *(Engl. Cyclopedia,* s.v.). His system is simply the lowest materialism. There have been several editions of his complete works (Lond. 1777, 2 vols. 4to; 1794, 5 vols. 8vo; Paris, 1795,14 vols. 18mo, ed. by Lefebvre; Paris, 1818, 3 vols. 8vo). See St. Lambert, *Essai sur la Vie et les Ouvrages d'Helvetius; English Cyclopedia,* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 23,* 885; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy,* p. 110, 337; Remusat, in *Revue d. deux Mondes,* Aug. 15, 1858; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought,* lect. 5.

Helvicus (Helwig)

was born Dec. 26, 1581, at Sprendlingen, Darmstadt, where his father was minister. He studied at Marburg, and was able to teach Hebrew at twenty. It is said that he spoke Hebrew as freely as his mother tongue. In 1605 he was made professor of Greek and Hebrew at the School of Giessen, which in 1606 was erected into a university by the landgrave. In 1610 he was made professor of divinity. He died Sept. 10, 1617. His most important work is *Theatrum Historicum et Chronologicum sive Chronologiae Systema novum* (1610, often reprinted, and translated into English); also a *Chronologia Universalis* (1612).

Helvidius

a so-called heresiarch of the 4th century, a layman who opposed the growing superstitions of the Church, and especially the nascent worship of the Virgin Mary. He was a pupil of Auxentius, bishop of Milan, and the precursor of Jovinian (q.v.). Jerome was at the time preaching the "gospel of celibacy," and Helvidius opposed this tendency also. He maintained that Mary had other children besides Jesus, and supported his opinion by the N. Test., and by the authority of Tertullian and Victorinus. "He affirmed also that by this opinion he in nowise infringed on the honor of Mary. He

attacked also the exaggerated under valuation of married life. He quoted the examples of the patriarchs, who had maintained a pious life in wedlock; while, on the other hand, he referred to the examples of such virgins as had by no means lived up to their calling. These opinions of Helvidius might lead s to conclude that the combating of a one-sided ascetic spirit was a matter of still more weight with him than the defense of his views with regard to Mary. Perhaps, also, he may have been led into these views simply by exegetical inquiries and observations, and so had been drawn into this opposition to the *oven aluation* of celibacy merely for the purpose of defending his opinion against an objection on the score of propriety" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Torrey's, 2, 340). Augustine *(De Haeres.* c. 84) calls his followers *Helvidiani.* Jerome wrote a treatise against him *(adv. Helvidiusm),* in which we find some passages of Helvidis's writings. See Epiphanius, *Haeres.* c. 70, 78; Augustine, *Haeres.* c. 56, 84; Neander, I. c.

Helyot, Pierre

a Franciscan monk of great learning (known also as father HIPPOLYTUS), was born at Paris in 1660, and died in 1716. He went twice to Rome on business of the order, and traveled through the whole of France. He is chiefly distinguished as the author of the *Histoire des ordres monastiques religieux et militaires* (Paris, 1714-21, 8 vols. 4to), of which he gathered the materials during his travels, and which is to this day the most complete work of the kind, though several of the orders are not treated in it. He died during the publication of the fifth volume, and the work was finished by Bullot. A new edition by Migne appeared at Paris in 1847-50 (4 vols. royal 8vo). See Lelong, *Bibl. history de la France;* Querard, *La France litter.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 23, 893.

Hem of a garment

(ׁשּול, *shul*, Exodus 28:33, 34; 29:24-26; elsewhere the "skirt" of a robe; κράσπεδον, Matthew 9:20; 14:30; elsewhere "border"). The importance which the later Jews, especially the Pharisees (Matthew 23:5), attached to the hem or fringe of their garments was founded upon the regulation in Numbers 15:38, 39, which ascribed a symbolical meaning to it. We must not, however, conclude that the fringe owed its origin to that passage; it was in the first instance the ordinary mode of finishing the robe, the ends of the threads composing the woof being left in order to prevent the cloth from unraveling, just as in the Egyptian *calasiris*

(Herod. ii, 81; see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians,* ii, 90), and in the Assyrian robes as represented in the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, the blue ribbon being added to strengthen the border. The Hebrew word tx;yIc;, *tsitsith',* "fringe" (Numbers 15:38, 39), is expressive of the *fretted edge:* the Greek κράσπεδα.(the etymology of which is uncertain, being variously traced to κροσσός, ἄκρος πέδον, κρηπίς) applies to the *edge* of a river or mountain (Xenoph. *Hist. Gr. 3:*2, § 16: 4:6, § 8), and is explained by Hesychius as τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου κεκλώσμένα ῥάμματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρον αὐτοῦ. The *beged* or outer robe was a simple quadrangular piece of cloth, and generally so worn that two of the corners hung down in front: these corners were ornamented with a "ribbon of blue," or, rather, *dark violet,* the ribbon itself being, as we may conclude from the word used, lyteP;, as narrow as a thread or piece of string. The Jews attached great sanctity to this fringe (Matthew 9:20; 14:36; Luke 8:44), and the Pharisees made it more prominent than it was originally designed to be, enlarging both the fringe and the ribbon to an undue width (Matthew 23:5). Directions were given as to the number of threads of which it ought to be composed, and other particulars, to each of which a symbolical meaning was attached (Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 198). It was appended in later times to the *talith* more especially, as being the robe usually worn at devotions, whence the proverbial saying quoted by Lightfoot *(Exercit.* on Matthew 5, *40),* "He that takes care of his fringes deserves a good coat" (see Hilder, *De Hebraeor. vestib friimbriatis,* Tübingen, 1701). *SEE FRINGE*.

He'mam

(Genesis 36:22). *SEE HOIAM*.

Heman

(Heb. *Heyman',* ^m;yhe; i. q. ^m;yhea}m, ChlaId. *faithful;* Sept. Αἰμάν or Αἱμάν, v.r. Ἀμάν, Ἀνάν, Αἰμουάμ, etc.), the name of two men.

1. A person named with three others celebrated for their wisdom, to which that of Solomon is compared (1 Kings 4:31), probably the same as the son of Zerah and grandson of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:6). B.C. post 1856; *SEE ETHAN*.

2. Son of Jobl, and grandson of Samuel, a Kohathite of the tribe of Levi, and one of the leaders of the Temple music as organized by David (1

Chronicles 6:33; 15:17; 16:41,42). B.C. 1014. This, probably, is the Heman to whom the 88th Psalm is ascribed. He had fourteen sons and three daughters (1Ch 25:5 1 Chronicles 25:5), some of whom are enumerated in ver. 4. Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun are termed "seers" in 2Ch 29:14 2 Chronicles 29:14, 30; 35:15, which refers rather to their genius as sacred musicians than to their possessing the spirit of prophecy (1Ch 15:19 1 Chronicles 15:19; 25:1; 2 Chronicles 5, 12), although there is not wanting evidence of their occasional inspiration. *SEE ASAPH*.

He'math

(Heb. *Chammath',* tMij¡ the same name as *Hammath;* Sept. Ἀιμάθ*;* Vulg. translates *calor),* a Kenite, ancestor of the Rechabites (1Ch 2:55 1 Chronicles 2:55). B.C. prob. cir. 1612. "Hemath," in Am 6:14 Amos 6:14, is an incorrect Anglicized form of t m;j }*(Chamath',* Sept. Ἀιμάθ v.r. Ἐμάθ, Vulg. *Enath),* the city HAMATH *SEE HAMATH* q.v.

Hen'dan

(Heb. *Chemdan',* ^Dmj , *pleasant;* Sept. Ἀμαδά, Vulgate *Hemdam),* the first named of the foul "children" of Dishon, which latter was a son of Seir and one of the Horite "dukes" antecedent to the supremacy of the Edomites in Mt. Seir (Ge 36:26 Genesis 36:26). B.C. cir. 1964. In 1Ch 1:41 1 Chronicles 1:41, the name is, by an error of transcribers, written *Hamran* (Heb. *Chamrani,* ^rmj¡ Sept. correctly Ἀμαδί, Vulg. *Hanran,* Eng.Vers. "'Amram"). "The name Hemdan is by Knobel *(Genesis,* p. 256) compared with those of *Humeidy* and *Hamady,* two of the five families of the tribe of Omriln r Amran, who are located to the E. and S.E. of Akaba (Robinson, *Researches,* 1, 268); also with the *Bene-Hanzyde,* who are found a short distance S. of Kerek (S.E. comer of the Dead Sea); and from thence to El-Busaireh, probably the ancient Bozrah, on the road to Petra. (See Burckhardt, *Syria,* etc., p. 695, 407.)

Hemerobaptistae

*(*ἡμεροβαπτισταί*).* Eusebias *(Hist. Eccles. 4:*22) cites from Hegesippus a list of heresies prevalent among the Jews, mad names, as one of the heretical sects, the *Hemerobaptistae.* Epiphanius *(Haeres.* 17) also names this sect, and derives their name from the fact that they hold daily ablutions to be essential to salvation (see also *Apost. Const.* lib. 6 cap. 6). Mosheim

(Commentaries, Introd. chap. 2, § 9, endeavors to show that the so-called "Christians of St. John" are descended from these ancient Hemerobaptists. See Suicer, *Thesaurus* (Amst. 1728), 1, 1331; and the articles *SEE CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN*; *SEE MENDEANS*. '

Heminge

SEE HEMMING.

Hemlock

appears in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. words in some of the passages where they occur.

1. ROSH (ראֹשׁ and רֹאשׁ) is thought originally to signify "poison," and is therefore supposed to indicate a poisonous, or, at least, a bitter plant. This we may infer from its being frequently mentioned along with *laanah* or "wormwood," as in <05918>Deuteronomy 29:18, "Lest there should be among you a root that beareth *gall (rosh)* and *wormwood (laanah);"* so also in <24915>Jeremiah 9:15; 23:15; and in <25319>Lamentations 3:19, "Remembering mine affliction and my misery, the *worm-wood* and the *gall."* That it was a berry bearing plant has been inferred from <05222>Deuteronomy 32:32, "For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and their grapes are grapes of *gall (rosh);* their clusters are bitter." In <24814>Jeremiah 8:14; 9:15; 23:15, "water of *gall" (rosh)* is mentioned, which may be either the expressed juice of the fruit or of the plant, or a bitter infusion made from it. That it was a plant is very evident from <28004>Hosea 10:4, where it is said "their judgment springeth up as *hemlock (rosh)* in the furrows of the field;" also in <30612>Amos 6:12, "For ye have turned judgment into *gall (laanah,* 'wormwood'), aiff the fruit of righteousness into *hemlock (rosh)."* The only other passages where it occurs are in speaking of the "poison" (<18016>Job 20:16) or "venom" of asps (<05203>Deuteronomy 22:33), or "gall" in a figurative sense for sorrow (<25305>Lamentations 3:5), or as food (<19621>Psalm 69:21). *SEE GALT*; *SEE POISON*.

Though *rosh* is generally acknowledged to indicate some plant, yet a variety of opinions have been entertained respecting its identification: some, as the Auth. Vers. in <28004>Hosea 10:4, and <30612>Amos 6:12, consider *cicuta* or *hemlock* to be the plant intended. Tremellius adopts this as the meaning of *rosh* in all the passages, and is followed by Celsius *(Hierobot.* 2, 49). The *cuta* of the Romans, the ρχιῶΕτΟη of the Greeks, is generally

acknowledged to have been what we now call *hemlock*, the *conium maculatum* of botanists. There can be no doubt of its poisonous nature (Pliny, *Hist. Nat. 25:*13). Celsius quotes the description of Linnaeus in support of its growing in the furrows of fields, but it does not appear to be so common in Syria. Celsius, however, adduces Ben-Melech, the most learned of Rabbins, as being of opinion that *rosh* was *conium* or *hemlock.* But there does not appear any necessity for our considering *rosh* to have been more poisonous than *lacnah* or *wormwood*, with which it is associated so frequently as to appear like a proverbial expression (<05298>Deuteronomy 29:18; <24015>Jeremiah 9:15; 23:15; <25319>Lamentations 3:19; <30512>Amos 6:12). The Sept. translators render it *agrostis*, intending some species of grass. Hence some have concluded that it must be *loliumn tenulentum*, or *darnel*, the zizanium of the ancients while others have thought that some of the *solaneae or luridae* of Linnaeus, as the *belladonna* or the *solanun nigrum*, common nightshade, or still, again, the *henbane*, is intended. But no proof appears in favor of any of this tribe, and their sensine properties are not so remarkably disagreeable as to have led to their being employed in what appears to be a proverbial expression. Hiller, in his *Hierophyticon* (ii, 54), adduces the *centaury* as a bitter plant, which, like others of the tribe of gentians, might answer all the passages in which *rosh* is mentioned, with the exception of that (<05232>Deuteronomy 32:32) where it is supposed to have a berried fruit. Dr. Harris, quoting Blayney on <24814>Jeremiah 8:14, says, "In <19921>Psalm 69:21, which is justly considered as a prophecy of our Savior's sufferings, it is said, They gave me *rosh* to eat,' which the Sept. have rendered χολήν, *gall.* Accordingly, it is recorded in the history, <402734>Matthew 27:34, They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall,' ὄξος μετὰ χλῆς. But in the parallel passage (<411523>Mark 15:23) it is said to be 'wine mingled with myrrh,' a very bitter ingredient. From whence I am induced to think that χολή, and perhaps *rosh*, may be used as a general name for whatever is exceedingly bitter: and, consequently, when the sense requires, it may be put specially for any bitter herb or plant, the infusion of which may be called 'waters of *rosh.'* *SEE MYRRH*.

2. LAANAH' (hn;[il) occurs in the passages above cited and in a few others, where it is translated "wormwood" (<05298>Deuteronomy 29:18; <20504>Proverbs 5:4; <24015>Jeremiah 9:15; 23:15; <25315>Lamentations 3:15, 19; <30507>Amos 5:7); and only in a single passage is it rendered "hemlock" (<30512>Amos 6:12). *SEE WORMWOOD*.

Hemmenway, Moses, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in 1735 at Framingham, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1755, and was ordained pastor in Wells, Mass., Aug. 8, 1759, where he labored until his death, April 5,1811. He published *Seven Sermons on the Obligation and Encouragement of the Unregenerate to labor for the meat which endureth to everlasting Life (1767): — Vindication of the Power, Obligation, etc., of the Unregenerate to attend the means of Grace, against the Exceptions of Samuel Hopkins in his Reply to Mills (1772): — Remarks on Rev. Mr. Hopkins's Answer to a Tract entitled "A Vindication,"* etc. (1774): *A Discourse on the divine Institution of Pure Baptism as a standing Ordinance of the Gospel (1781): — A Discourse on the Nature and Subjects of Christian Baptism (1781): — Discourse concerning the Church, in Schich the several Acceptations of the Word are explained,* etc. *(1792): — Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Emmons's Dissertation, on the scriptural Qualifications for Admission and Access to the Christian Sacraments, and on his Strictures on a Discourse concerning the Church* (1794), and several occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals,* 1, 541.

Hemmerlin or Hämmerlein, Felix (Malleolus)

a Swiss theologian, was, born at Zurich in 1389. After studying the canon law at the University of Erfurt he went to Rome. On his return to Switzerland in 1421 he was appointed canon at Zoffingen, and the year after he was made provost of St. Ursus, in Soleure. With the revenues of these livings he collected a large library. He took part in the Council of Basle (1441-3), and was conspicuous there for his zeal in reforming ecclesiastical discipline. He made many bitter enemies, and in 1439 they made an attempt on his life, and wounded him seriously. This did not, however, deter him from continuing his reproofs of the loose lives of the clergy, and the general lack of discipline. After long-continued disputes with his colleagues at Zurich, he was stripped, through their influence, of all his emoluments. He also drew upon himself the hatred of a party of his countrymen by the thirtieth chapter of his treatise *De Notilitate,* in which he condemned the Swiss confederates, who in 1444 made war on his native city. Some members of this party, who attended the Carnival at Zurich in 1554, seized Hemmerlin and carried him to Constance, where he was thrown into prison, and treated with great cruelty. He was unwilling to retract any of his writings, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment

in a convent. He was taken to a monastery of barefooted monks at Lucerne, and died there in 1457, a martyr to his devotion, not, indeed, to evangelical, but to ecclesiastical discipline. Many of his writings are collected in *Varice Oblectationis Opuscula et Tractatus* (Basle, 1497, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 268; Reber, *Felix Hemzerliz* (Zurich, 1746); Herzog, *Real Encyklopädie,* 5, 732.

Hemming (Hemingius)

an eminent theologian of Denmark, was born in the isle of Lalald in 1513. He studied four years at Wittenberg under Melancthon, and imbibed his mild spirit. Returning to Denmark, he became preacher, and afterwards professor of Hebrew and theology at Copenhagen. In 1557 he became professor of theology and vice-chancellor. He was a voluminous writer in exegetical, dogmatical, and practical theology, and his Latin style is highly praised. Opposing the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, he was greatly reproached by the Lutherans as a Crypto-Calvinist. In his *Syntagmina Instit. Christ.* (1574) he expressed himself on the Eucharist in a conciliatory way; but this so-called recantation has been interpreted in accordance with the Calvinistic doctrine, as well as with the Lutheran. In 1579 he was made canon of Roeskilde, where he died in peace in 1600. His *Opuscula Theologica,* including his shorter treatises, were edited by Goulart (Geneva, 1586, fol.).

Hemsen, Johann Tychsen

a German theologian, was born at Boldixum (Schleswig) Oct. 15,1 1.92. He studied at Copenhagen and Göttingen, where he graduated in 1821. In 1823 he became extraordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen, and died there May 14, 1830. He wrote *Anaxagoras Klazonenemnsis, seu de vita ejus ephilosophiat* (Gött. 1821, 8vo):*Die Authenticitaet d. Schriften d. Evangelisten Johannes* (Schleswig, 1823; against Bretschneider's *Probabilien): — De Christologia Joannis Baptistce* (Gott. 1824): — Der *Apostel Paulus, sein Leben, Wirken, und seine Schriften,* posthumous (Gött. 1830, 8vo), etc. He also wrote in the *Gelehrte Anzeigeen* of Göttingen, and the *Neue Krit. Bibliothek* of Seebold; and edited Staüdlin's *Gesch. u. Littérateur d. Kirchengesch.* (Hanover, 1827), and *Berengarii Turonensis Liber de sacra Caena, adversus Lanzfrancum* (Lpz. 1830). 'See *Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen* (1830), 1, 422-424; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 23,* 901. (J. N. P.)

Hen

(Heb. *Chen,* ˆj,e *grace,* as often; Sept. translates χάρις, Vulg. *Hem),* the son of Zephaniah, to whom the prophet was sent with a symbolical crown (<380614>Zechariah 6:14); probably a figurative name for JOSIAH (ver. 10).

Hen

(ὄρνις, a *bird,* especially the domestic fowl, <401337>Matthew 23:37; <421334>Luke 13:34). We have no evidence that the ancient Hebrews were accustomed to the breeding of poultry, but that the later Jews were acquainted with it (Chald. aT;l]Wgn]r]T) is evident from 2 Esdras 1:30; <401337>Matthew 23:37; <421334>Luke 13:34; 22:60,61. Michaelis is of opinion that the incubation of the common hen is referred to in <241711>Jeremiah 17:11. The original country of the common poultry fowl is India, where it is called the jungle bird. *SEE COCK*. The metaphor used in the passages of the Gospels where the term "hen" occurs has always been admired for its beauty. When the hen sees a bird of prey coming, she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with her wings from the danger. The Roman army, as an eagle, was about to fall upon the Jews; our Lord-expresses a desire to guard them from threatened calamities, but they disregarded his invitations and warnings, and fell a prey to their adversaries. Thee word there employed is used in the same specific sense in classical Greek (Aristoph. *Av.* 102, *Vesp.* 811). That a bird so intimately connected with the household, and so common in Palestine, as we know from Rabbinical sources (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 256), should receive such slight notice, is certainly singular (see Reland, *De yalli cantu Hier. au*dito, Rotterd. 1709; Detharding, id. Rost. 1752); it is almost equally singular that it is nowhere represented in the paintings of ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, 1, 234). *SEE FOWL*.

He'na

(Heb. *Hena',* [nhe signif. unknown; Sept. Ἀνά, but in <231713>Isaiah 37:13 blends with the following name into Ἀναεγγουγαμά, q.d. "Ana-near-Ava;" Vulg *Ana),* a city (apparently of Mesopotamia) mentioned in connection with Sepharvaim and Ivah as one of those overthrown by Sennacherib before his invasion of Judaea (<121834>2 Kings 18:34; 19:13; <231713>Isaiah 37:13). According to the conjecture, of Busching *(Erdbeschr. 11,* 263, 757), it is the town which is still called by the Arabs *Anah.* It lies on

the Euphrates, amid gardens, which are rich in dates, citrons, oranges, pomegranates, and other fruits. The modern site is on the right bank of the stream, while the name also attaches to some ruins a little lower down upon the left bank; but between them is "a string of islands" (Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition*, 1, 53), upon one of which stands a castle. Perhaps, in ancient times, the city lay, for the most part, or entirely, upon this island, for Abulfeda says that "Anah is a small town on an island in the middle of the Euphrates" (see Assemani, *Bibl.Orient. 3*, 2, 717; Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 562). The inhabitants are chiefly Arabs and Jews. Conjecture further identifies *Ana* with a town called *Anat* (t is merely the feminine termination), which is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions as situated on an island in the Euphrates (Fox Talbot's *Assyrian Texts*, p. 21; Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 355), at some distance below its junction with the Chabour, and which appears as Anatho (Ἀναθω) in Isidore of Charax *(Mans. Parth.* p. 4). Hitzig, however *(Comment. on Isaiah* 1. c.), thinks the name an appellation, equivalent to "the *Lowland,"* and in this signification First *(Heb. Lexikon*, s.v.) concurs (q. d. [nK; *SEE CANAAN*). *SEE SEPHARVAIM*.

Hen'adad

(Heb. *Chenadad'*, ddn;j,eprobably for ^jeddh;*favor of Hadad;* Sept. ʾ Hναδάδ*)*, a Levite whose sons were active in the enterprises of the restoration after the captivity (1509Ezra 3:9); two of the latter, Bavai and Binnui, are named (1618Nehemiah 3:18, 24; 10:9). B.C. ante 535.

Hendel, William D.D.

one of the pioneers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born in the Palatinate in the first half of the 18th century. Having completed his theological studies, he came to America in 1764, and in Jan. 1765 became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Lancaster, Pa. During the years 1769-1782 he had charge of the congregation at Tulpehocken and neighboring congregations. Indeed, he served as many as nine at a time, besides making frequent missionary excursions. In Sept. 1782, he accepted a call to return to his Lancaster congregation. He was made D.D. by the College of New Jersey in 1788. In February, 1794, he removed to Philadelphia, which was his last station. Shortly after his arrival the yellow fever broke out the second time, and while faithfully ministering to the sick and dying, he died of the fever Sept. 29, 1798. Dr. Hendel was

a good scholar, and a man of great pulpit talents. — Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church*, ii, 120 sq.

Henderson, Alexander

a minister of the Church of Scotland, was born in Fifeshire about 1583. He studied at St. Andrew's, where he passed A.M. in 1603, and where, about 1610, he was professor of philosophy. About 1615 (according to M'Crie) he was presented to the parish of Leuchars by archbishop Gladstanes. As the episcopal government was very unpopular with the people, they resisted Mr. Henderson's settlement, even to the extent of closing the church doors against him. In a few years, however, Henderson became convinced that "episcopacy was unauthorized by the Word of (God, and inconsistent with the reformed Constitution of the Church of Scotland." He entered into the strife against prelacy with great vigor. In 1619 he was called before the High Commission at St. Andrew's, but defended himself successfully. When the episcopal liturgy was ordered to be used in Scotland in 1637 he joined in the resistance made to it. He was one of the writers of the renewed "League and Covenant," sworn to by thousands at Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh, March 1, 1638. He was moderator of the famous General Assembly of that year, and he executed the functions of his office with singular skill, firmness, and prudence. At the nineteenth session Henderson preached a powerful sermon, and at its close pronounced the sentence of deposition (against the bishops) which had been adopted by the Assembly. He was removed, much against his will, in 1638, from the church at Leuchars to Edinburgh. In 1640 he was made rector of the University of Edinburgh. During 1642 he was employed in managing the correspondence with England regarding reformation and reunion of the churches. In 1643 he was again moderator of the General Assembly; and in that year he, with others, represented Scotland at the Westminster Assembly, and he resided in London for three years. In 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge, and also at Newcastle in 1686. In the papers on episcopacy delivered by him in these conferences he displayed great learning and ability. His constitution was broken by long and excessive labors. In the summer of 1846 he returned to Edinburgh, and on the 19th of August in that year he died of the stone. The Constitution of the Scottish Church was framed chiefly by Henderson. "He was evidently of that sort of men of which martyrs are made, and needed only a change of circumstances to have given his name a high place among those who have sealed a good

confession with their blood. Nearly every considerable production of that memorable period bears his impress. The Solemn League and Covenant was his own composition. The Directory was formed under his eye. He wrote the principal part of the Confession of Faith with his own hand. And the form of Church government which the Assembly attempted in vain to give to the Church of England was little more than a transcript of that which he had a little before drawn up for the Church of Scotland" (Curry, in *Methodist Quarterly*, 1848, p. 600). "So long as the purity of our Presbyterian establishment remains." says Dr. Aiton, "as often as the General Assembly of our Church is permitted to convene — while the Confession of Faith and Catechisms Larger and Shorter hold a place in our estimation second to the Scriptures alone — and till the history of the revolution during the reign of Charles I is forgotten the memory of Alexander Henderson will be respected, and every Presbyterian patriot in Scotland will continue grateful for the Second Reformation of our Church, which Henderson was so instrumental in effecting." His life was spent in active labors, allowing little time for writing, except the documents and pamphlets necessary to the great controversy in which he took so large a part. Two of his sermons — preached severally before the two houses of Parliament (1644) and the House of Lords (1645)are given at the end of M'Crie's *Life of Alexander Henderson* (Edinburgh, 1846). See also Howie, *Scots' Worthies*, p. 349; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England, 8*, 293-325; Hetherington. *Church of Scotland,* vol. 1; Cunningham, *Church Principles* (Edinburgh, 1863), p. 384 sq.

Henderson, Ebenezer, D.D.

an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Dunfermline Nov. 17, 1784. At an early age he determined to devote his life to foreign missions, and went to Denmark, in order to sail thence for India. But he found work in the north of Europe in the circulation of the Bible, which occupied him for twenty years. After several years spent in this way in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, he was deputed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1814 to proceed to Iceland on a similar mission; and in 1819 he was sent through Russia on the same errand. In 1826 he was appointed president of the Missionary College at Hoxton; and in 1830 he was made professor of theology and Biblical literature at the Highbury College. His studies in the language and literature of the Bible had been carried on vigorously during his previous long career-in the service of the Bible Society, and he distinguished himself, both as professor and as author, by thorough and

scholarly work. In 1850 he was compelled by decline of health to relinquish his literary labors, and after a short service as pastor at East Sheer he gave up all public work. He died at Mortlake, Surrey, and May 16, 1858. Dr. Henderson's reputation as a Biblical critic was equal to that of any man of his time in England, and he was widely known and respected in other countries. He received the degree of D.D. from Amherst College, Mass., and from the University of Copenhagen at the same time. His knowledge of the languages of the Bible was accurate, and he used freely most of the important living languages. He was orthodox in his theology, and never handled the text of the Bible in the reckless and arbitrary manner which was common in Germany in his time. He was not an elegant writer, and his translations of Scripture are not always in good taste; but most persons competent to judge will agree to Dr. W. L. Alexander's judgment that "his contributions to Biblical literature are among the most valuable the age has produced, especially his lectures on Inspiration, and his commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets." His writings include *Iceland, Journal of a Residence in that Island* (Edinb. 1818, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, with Observations on the Rabbinical and Caraib Jews* (Lond. 1826, 8vo): — translation of M. F. Roos, *Exposition of Daniel* (1811, 8vo): — The *Mystery of Godliness*, on 1 Timothy 3:16 (Lond. *1830): — Divine Inspiration* (Lond. 1836, often reprinted, *8vo): — Commentary on Isaiah, with a new translation* (London, 1840, *8vo): — Comm. on the Minor Prophets, with a new translation* (London, 1845, 8vo): *Comm. on Jeremiah, with translation* (Lond. 1851, 8vo): — *Comm. on Ezekiel* (Lond. 1855, 8vo). He edited, with additions, Stuart's translation of Ernesti, *Elements of Interpretations* (1827, 12mo), Egid. Gutbirii *Lexicon Syriacunz* (1836, 24mo), and a new edition of Buck, *Theological Dictionary* (Lend. 1833, and often). A *Life* of Dr. Henderson has recently been issued (1869).

Henderson, John

a Scotch merchant and philanthropist, was born in 1782 at Borrowstanes-; was bred to business, and was eminently successful in. trade. His religious life was even more earnest than his mercantile zeal, and he devoted a large part of his income to benevolence. He took especial interest in the observance of the Lord's Day, and offered prizes to workingmen for essays on Sabbath Observance. *SEE SABBATH*. He was one of the most active promoters of the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.), and contributed largely to its funds. The Waldensian churches, as well as Foreign Missions, received

large benefactions from him; while at home, he was a constant contributor to the erection of churches, and for all works of benevolence. It is said that for years his charitable outlays amounted to more than £30,000 a year. He died at his residence, The Park, near Glasgow, May 1, 1867. — *Evangelical Christendom,* June 1867.

Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm

a German theologian was born Oct. 20, 1802, at Frondenberg, in Westphalia, and was prepared for the ministry under the instruction of his father, who was pastor at Frondenberg. Entering the University of Bonn, he gave himself earnestly to Oriental and philosophical studies, an early fruit of which appeared in his translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (Bonn, 1824), and in an edition of the *Moallakah* of Amralkais (Bonn, 1823). In 1823 he went to Basle, where, under the influence of the Missionary Institute, he became earnestly interested in religion and theology. In 1824 he became *privatdocent* in theology at Berlin; in 1826, professor extraordinary; in 1828, ordinary professor; and in 1829, doctor of theology. For many years his organ was the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung,* begun in 1827, an orthodox journal, which, during its active and often stormy career, has rendered great service against Rationalism, but has also been noted for its violent polemical spirit in favor of Lutheranism, and, of late, even *of,* Ritualism, as well as of absolutism in Church and State. He was, after 1848, a bitter opponent of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, so much desired by Frederick William III, and by Neander and other leading theologians, against whom Hengstenberg's severity of language was often inexcusable. His contributions to the *Kirchenzeitung,* during his forty-two years' connection with it, were enough to make many volumes; but he was, besides, a laborious writer, especially in exegetical theology. He died June 3, 1869. His principal works are *Christologie des alten Testaments* (Berlin, 2nd edit. 3 vols. 8vo, 1854-57; translated by Reuel Keith from 1st edit., N. York, 1836-39, 3 vols. 8vo; also transl. by Theo. Meyer from 2nd edit. Edinburgh, 4 vols. 8vo, 1863): — *Beitrage zur Einleitung ins alte Test.* (Berlin, 1831-39, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Die Bücher Moses u. Egypten* (Berlin, 1841, 8vo): — *Conmmentar iiber die Psalmen* (Berlin, 2nd edit. 1849-52, 4 vols. 8vo; translated by Fairbairn and Thompson, Edinburgh, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Erlauterungen 2. d. Pentateuch,* vol. 1. *(Die Geschichte Bileams,* etc.), transl. by Ryland, Edinb. *1858: — Oezebarung Johannis* (2nd edit. Berlin, 1861-62, 2 vols. 8vo; transl by Fairbairn from 1st edit.,

Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Das Evangelium d. Johannes erlutert* (Berlin, 1861-2, 2 vols.; translated, Edinb. 1865,2 vols. 8vo): — *Ezechielerklart: Ecclesiastes: — Das Hohelied Salomonis aucsgelegt* (Berlin, 1853, 8vo). There are also the following additional translations from the *Einleitung: Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch,* by Ryland (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); *Egypt and the Books of Moses,* by Robbins (Edinburgh, 8vo; Andover, 1843); *On the Genuineness of Daniel and Zechariah,* bound with Ryland's translation of the *History of Balaam* (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); *Comm. on Ecclesiastes,* with *Treatise on the Song of Solomon, Job, Isaiah,* etc. (Philadelphia, 1860).

Henhöfer, Aloys

a German divine, was born at Volkersbach, near Ettlingen, of Roman Catholic parents, July 11, 1789. His mother destined him for the Roman Catholic priesthood, and hoped that he would become a missionary. He studied at the University of Freiburg, and at the Roman Catholic Seminary of Meersburg. After his ordination as priest, he was tutor fob some years in a noble family, and in 1818 became pastor at Muhlhausen. Here he soon found the need of a deeper personal religion, and was greatly edified by the conversation of Fink, one of Sailler's disciples, and by reading the *Life of Martin Boos.* His preaching became earnestly evangelical, and crowds flocked to hear him. His orthodoxy was soon questioned, and, on examination, he avowed his doubts as to the Romanist doctrine of the Mass. His excommunication followed (Oct. 16, 1822), and gave occasion to his book *Christliches Glaubensbekenntniss d. Pfiarre's Henhöfer.* A flock of his converts speedily gathered around him, and in 1823 he was installed as its Evangelical Protestant pastor. In 1827 he was called to Spock, near Carlsruhe, where he labored as pastor for thirty-five years. His influence was felt widely in the revival of evangelical religion throughout Baden. He died December 5, 1862. Besides numerous pamphlets on the Roman Catholic controversy, and on practical questions, he published *Der Kampf des Unglaubens nit Aberglauben u. Glauben, ein Zeichen unserer Zeit* (Heidelberg, 1861): — *Predigten* (posthumous, Heidelberg, 1863). See also Frommel, *Aus dem Leben des Dr. Aloys Henhifer* (Carlsruhe, 1865, 8vo).

Henke, Heinrich Phillip Konrad

a German theologian, was born at Hehlen, in Brunswick, July 3, 1752. His early proficiency was so great that before he went to the university he was employed as a gymnasial teacher (1771-72). After studying philology and theology at Helmstadt, he was made professor of philosophy there in 1777, and in 1780 professor of theology. In 1803 he became principal of the Carolinum, Brunswick. After a very successful career, both as teacher and writer, he died May 2, 1809. In theology he belonged to the rationalistic school of Semler, and his Church History is written in a spirit of bitter hatred of ecclesiastical authority. His *Life* by Bollmann appeared at Helmstadt in 1816. As a critic he certainly had great merits, but his rationalistic views have made his writings short-lived. His reputation chiefly rests on his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche* (Brunsw. 1799-1808, 6 vols. 8vo; finished by Vater, 1813-20, vols. vii and 8). It is a "clever and spirited work; but the Church appears in it, not as the temple of God on earth, but as a great infirmary or bedlam" (Schaff; *Ch. History*, 1, 22; see also Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, p. 177). He wrote also, *Lineamnenta institutionum fidi Christianae historico-criticarusm* (Helmstadt, 1783; 2nd ed. 1795; German, *1803): — Magazine. d. Religions-philosophie, Exegese und Kirchengesch.* (Helmst. 1793-1804, 12 vols.): — *Archiviur. die neueste Kirchengesch.* (Weimar, 1794-99, 6 *vols.): — Religionsannalen* (Brunsw. 1800-05, 12 numbers) — *Kirchengesch. des* 18ten *Jahrh.* (Brunsw. *1802): — Hist. Untersuchungen in d. Christ. Glaubenslehre* (Helmst. 1802): — *Beitrdge z. neuesten Gesch. d. Religion*, etc. (Berlin, 1806, 2 vols.). See F. A. Ludewig, *Abriss einer Lebensgesch. Henkes;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23*, 933.

Henkel, Charles

was descended from a long line of ministerial ancestors in the Lutheran Church. He was born May 18, 1798, in New Market, Va. He studied theology under the direction of his father, the Rev. Paul Henkel, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1818, and immediately commenced his ministry in Mason County, Va. In 1820 he removed to Columbus, Ohio; and in this field continued, amid many deprivations and toils, till 1827, when he took charge of the Somerset pastorate. His health, however, gradually failed, and he died Feb. 2, 1841 He was a man of vigorous mind, and a diligent student. Several of his sermons were published. On one occasion he was engaged in a public controversy with a Roman Catholic

priest; and was very successful in exposing the absurdities of that false system. (M. L. S.)

Henkel, Paul

a divine of the American Lutheran Church, was born in Rowan County, N. C., Dec. 15,1754. In 1776 he was awakened under the preaching of Whitefield, who at that time was exciting deep interest throughout the country. He commenced a course of study under the direction of pastor Krüch, of Frederick. Md., with a view to the Lutheran ministry. He was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and in 1792 became pastor at New Market, Va. His labors extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton, and Wythe counties. His position was very much that of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together the scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacraments. In 1800 he accepted a call to Rowan, his native county, N. C.; but, the location being unfavorable to the health of his family, he removed in 1805 to New Market, and labored as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were required, and depending for his support solely upon the good-will of the people. He made repeated tours through Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio. In 1809 he wrote a work on *Christian Baptism* in the German language, which he subsequently translated into English. In 1810 he published a German *Hymnbook,* and in 1816 one in English, many of the hymns being his own composition. In 1811 he published his German, and, soon after, his English Catechism. He also published a German work in rhyme, entitled *Zeitvertreib,* designed to satirize the fanaticism, the folly, and vices of the day. Mr.Henkel adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of his Church. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations made by Melancthon in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period his doctrinal position was the unaltered *Confession.* As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Lutheran Church. His habits of life were plain and simple, and, although opposed to everything that looked like ostentation in the discharge of his official duties, he invariably wore his clerical robes. In person he was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church. Towards the close of his life he was attacked with paralysis, and died November 17, 1825. (M. L. S.)

Hennepin, Louis

a Recollect missionary and traveler, was born in Flanders about 1640. In 1675 he was sent to Canada, and in 1678 started to accompany the traveler Lasalle. He founded a convent at Fort Cataracouy, and with two other monks followed Lasalle in his tour among the Canadian lakes in 1679. Lasalle sent him, in 1680, with another person named Dacan, to find the sources of the Mississippi. They followed the stream tip to the 46° lat. north, but were stopped by a fall which Hennepin called Sault de St. Antoine de Padoue. He was then for eight months a prisoner among the Sioux, but was liberated by the French, and returned to Quebec April 5, 1682. After his return to Europe he was-for a while keeper of the convent of Renty, in Artois, and finally retired to Holland. The date of his death is not ascertained. Hennepin disparaged the Jesuits as missionaries, and was, in turn, disparaged by the Jesuit Charlevoix. He wrote *Description de la Louisiane, etc., avec la carte du pays, les moeurs et la maniere de vivre des sauvages* (Paris, 1683 and 1688, 12mo; 1688, *4to): — Nouvelle Decouverte d'un tris grand pays situe dans l'Amneique, entre le Nouveau Mexique et la mitner Glaciale, avec cartes, etc., et les avantages que l'on en peut tirer par l'etablissement des colonies* (Utrecht, 1697, 12mo, and in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord,* vol. 9:etc.): — *Nouveau Voyage dans un pays, etc., depuis* 1679 *jusqu'à* 1682, *avec les reflexions sur les entreprises du sieur Lasalle* (Utrecht, 1698, 12mo; *Recueil des Voyages au Nord,* vol. 5, 1734). — See Charlevoix, *Hist. Géneralé de la Nouvelle France;* Dinaux, *Archives hist. du Nord;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23* 940 sq. (J. N. P.)

Henninger, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Washington Co., Va.; was converted while young; entered the Western Conference in 1807; was made presiding elder in 1816 on French-Broad District; located in 1818, and yet labored with zeal until he re-entered the itinerancy in Holston Conference in 1825, and so labored until his death, Dec. 3, 1829. Mr. Henninger was a faithful, popular, and successful minister, and a consistent and devout Christian. During the latter part of his life he was very efficient as presiding elder, and as agent for Holston College. — *Minutes of Conferences, 3,* 56; Radford, *Methodism in Kentucky,* 2, 57.

He’noch

(1 Chronicles 1:3, 33). *SEE ENOCH*.

Henoticon

(Greek, ἑνωτικόν, *uniting into one),* the name given to a “Decree of Union” issued by the Greek emperor Zeno, A.D. 482, by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, with a view to reconcile the Monophysites and the orthodox to the profession of one faith. It recognized the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, but did not name the decrees of Chalcedon. It thus required a sacrifice of opinion on the part of the Monophysites; but, at the same time, it deprived the orthodox of the advantages they had gained at the Council of Chalcedon. The Roman patriarch, Felix II, condemned it in 483, and in 518 it was suppressed. — Moshefn, *Church Hist.* cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. 5, § 19. The *Henoticon* is given, in Greek, in Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 1, §10 *SEE MONOPHSITES*.

Henricians

SEE HENRY OF LAUSANNE.

Henry of Ghent

(Henricus de Gandavo: proper name *Goethals),* a theologian of the 13th century. He was born at Ghent in 1217, studied at the University of Paris, and was a pupil of Albertus Magnus. Admitted to lecture at the Sorlonne, he acquired great distinction as a teacher of philosophy and theology, ard obtained the surname of *Doctor Solemnis. “He* was endowed with great sagacity of understanding, attached to the system of the Reslists, and blended the ideas of Plato with the formularies of Aristotle: attributing to the first a real existence independent of the divine Intelligence. He suggested some new opinions in psychology, and detected many speculative errors, without, however, suggesting corrections for them, owing to the faultiness of the method of the philosophy of his time” (Tennemann). Henry became canon, and afterwards archdeacon of Tournay, and died there A.D. 1293. His writings arc, *Quodlibetac in 4 Libb. Sententialrum* (Paris, 1518, fol. reprinted with commentary by Zuccoli, 1613, 2 vols. fols.): — *Summa Theologiae* (Paris, 1520, fol.):*De Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis (in Fabricius, ibl. Eccl.).* See Duph;, *Eccles.*

Writers, cent. 13; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philosophie, 8*355; Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Phil.* § 267.

Henry of Gorcum

(Henricus Gorcomitss), so named from his birthplace, Gorcum, in Holland, a philosopher and theologian of the 15th. century, vice-chancellor of the Academy of Cologne. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Aquinas, and Peter Lombard; also *Tract. de cerenmoniis Ecclesiasticis: — De Celebritate Festorumn: Contra Hussitas.*

Henry of Huntingdon

an early English historian, was born about the end of the 11th century. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon before 1123. At the request of Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, he wrote a general history of England, from' he landing of Julius Caesar to the death of Stephen (1154), in eight books. It is to be found in Savile's *Scriptores post Bedam praecipui* (Lond. 1596, fol.; Francof. 1601); also in English, *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon,* etc., edited by T. Forester (Lond. 1853, sm. 8vo). Warton *(Anglia Sacra,* ii, 694) gives a letter of Henry of Huntingdon to the abbot of Ramsey, *Epistola ad Walterum de Miundi Contemptu,* which contains many curious anecdotes of the kings, nobles, prelates, and other great men who were his contemporaries. It is given ah o in D'Achery, *Spicilegium, 3, 503. — English Cyclopedia;* Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica,* 1, 1439; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo Norman Period).*

Henry of Lausanne

(frequently called HENRY OF CLUGNY), founder of the sect of *Henricians* in the 12th century. He is represented by Papal writers as a heretic and fanatic, but the truth seems to be that he was one of the "reformers before the Reformation." He is said to have been an Italian by birth, and a monk of Clugny. Disgusted with the corruptions of the times, he left his order, and became "a preacher of repentance." At first he was held in high honor even by the clergy. The field of his labor was the South of France; the time between A.D. 1116 and 1148. His first efforts were made at Lausanne and its neighborhood (hence his surname). His piety, modesty, and eloquence soon gained him a wide reputation. He preached vigorously against that "sham Christianity which did not prove its genuineness by the fruits of good living, and warning against the prevalent

vices. This led him next to warn men against their false guides, the worthless clergy, whose example and teaching did more to promote wickedness than to put a stop to it. He contrasted the clergy as they actually were with what they ought to be; he attacked their vices, particularly their unchastity. He was a zealot for the observance of the laws of celibacy, and appeared in this respect, like other monks, a promoter of the Hildebrandian reformation. It was probably his practical, restless activity, and the opposition that he met with on the part of the higher clergy, which led him to proceed further, and, as he traced the cause of the corruption to a deviation from the primitive apostolical teaching, to attack errors in doctrine. He must have possessed extraordinary power as a speaker, and this power was enhanced by his strict mode of living. Many men and women were awakened by him to repentance, brought to confess their sins, and to renounce them. It was said a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching. The people were struck under such conviction by his sermons, which seemed to lay open to them their inmost hearts, that they attributed to him a sort of prophetic gift, by virtue of which he could look into the very souls of men" (Neander, *Church History,* Torrey's, 4, 598). He was invited to Mans, where Hildebert, the bishop, favored him at first; but his preaching soon excited the people against the priests to such a degree that even the monasteries were threatened with violence. Hilbebert drove him from Mans; and, after various wanderings, he joined the disciples of Peter of Bruys, in Provence. The archbishop of Aries arrested him, and at the second Council of Pisa, 1134, he was declared a heretic, and confined in a cell. "Subsequently, however, he was set at liberty, when he betook himself again to South France, to the districts of Toulouse and Alby, a principal seat of anti-churchly tendencies, where also the great lords, who were striving to make themselves independent, favored these tendencies from hatred to the dominion of the clergy. Among the lower classes and the nobles Henry found great acceptance; and, after he had labored for ten years in those regions, Bernard of Clairvaux, in writing to a nobleman and inviting him to put down the heretics, could say, The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests, the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are leveled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated.' When Bernard says, in the words just quoted, that the communities are without priests, he means the priests had gone over to the Henricians, for so he complains in a sermon, in which he speaks of the rapid spread of this sect: 'Women forsake their husbands, and husbands

their wives, and run over to this sect. Clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches; and they have been found sitting with long beards (to mark the *habitus apostolicus)* among weavers"'(Neander, 1. c.). Bernard of Clairvaux opposed him earnestly. Pope Eugene II sent Bernard, with the cardinal of Ostia, into the infected district. Henry was arrested, and condemned at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 1148, to imprisonment for life. He died in prison A.D. 1149. See Basnage, *Hist. des Eglises Reformes, 4,* ch. 6:p. 145: Neander, *Ch. Hist. 4,* 601 sq.; Neander, *Heilige Bernard* p. 294 sq.; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer,* cent. 12; Gieseler, *Church History,* period 3 § 84.

Henry of St. Ignatius

a Flemish theologian, was born at Ath in the 17th century. He joined the Carmelites of his native city, and for many years- taught theology in their schools. During a journey he made to Rome in 1701-1709, he acquired great influence with pope Clement XI. On his return he wrote a number of books of Jansenist tendency, and in which he showed himself especially severe on the Jesuit casuists. He died about 1720. The most important of his Writings are, *Theologia vetus fundamentalis* (Liege, 1677, fol.) *Holinismus, profligatus* (Liege, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Artes Jesuiticae* (Strasb. 3rd ed. 1710; 4th ed. 1717, 12mo):*Tuba magna mirum clangens sonum, ad SS. D. N. papam Clementem XI etc. de necessitate reformandi Soc. Jesu* (Strasb. [Utrecht] 1717, 2 vols. 12mo). See Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs- Eccls.* pt. 1; Richard et Giraud, *Bibl. Sacrae;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 154.

Henry of Zütphen

SEE MOLLER.

Henry IV

king of France and Navarre, son of Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d'Albret, was born at Pau, in Bearn, Dec.15, 1553. He was carefully educated in Protestant principles by his excellent mother, who recalled him to her home at Pau from the French court in 1566. In 1569 he joined the Huguenot army at La Rochelle, and was acknowledged as their leader, the actual command, however, being left with Coligni (q.v.). The peace of St. Germain (1570) allowed him to return to court, and in 1572 he married Margaret, sister of Charles IX. The massacre of St. Bartholomew followed

soon after, and Henry's life was only spared on that awful night on his promise to become a Roman Catholic. During the next three years he was watched as a prisoner, though not in confinement. In 1576 he again took the field as the head of the Huguenots; and, after years of alternate victory and defeat, he made peace with Henry III, whose death in 1589 made him, in right of the Salic law, king of France. A large part of the nation, however, was too strongly Roman Catholic to allow his accession to the throne in peace. The "League" made the duke of Maine lieutenant general of the kingdom; but in 1590 the battle of Ivry, between the duke and Henry, ended in a grand victory for the latter. In 1593 Henry agreed to become a Roman Catholic, and publicly recanted at St. Denis. By the year 1598 all France was peaceably subject to him. "Henry was censured for his change of religion, and by none more earnestly than by his faithful friend and counselor, Duplessis Mornay. On the other hand, many of the Roman Catholics never believed his conversion to be sincere. But the truth probably was, that Henry, accustomed from his infancy to the life of camps and the hurry of dissipation, was not capable of serious religious meditation, and that he knew as little of the religion which he forsook as of that which he embraced. In his long conference at Chartres in September, 1593, with Duplessis Mornay, which took place after his abjuration, he told his friend that the step he had taken was one not only of prudence, but of absolute necessity; that his affections remained the same towards his friends and subjects of the Reformed communion; and he expressed a hope that he should one day be able to bring about a union between the two religions, which, he observed, differed less in essentials than was supposed. To this Duplessis replied that no such union could ever be effected in France unless the pope's power was first entirely abolished *(Mem. et Correspondence de Duplessis Miornay depuis l'an* 1571 *jusqu'en* 1623, Paris, 1824-34) *(English Cyclopaedia,* s.v.).

His reign was a very successful one, but we are concerned here only with its relations to the Church. On the 15th of April 1598, Henry signed the Edict of Nantes (q.v.) to secure justice to his Protestant subjects, and liberty of conscience. During Henry's life no public persecution of Protestants was possible, but the ignorant intolerance of the rural functionaries and priests often frustrated his good wishes and commands. On the 14th of May 1610, he was assassinated in his carriage by one Ravaillac, supposed to have been a tool of the Jesuits.

Henry VIII

king of England, was born in Greenwich June 28, 1491. He was second son of Henry VII and queen Elizabeth (of York). His elder brother Arthur, Prince of Wales, dying in 1502, Henry became heir apparent. In 1503 a dispensation was obtained from Julius II (pope) to allow Henry to marry his brother Arthur's widow (Catharine of Aragon) — a match which turned out sadly enough. Henry came to the throne April 22, 1509. The early years of his reign were comparatively uneventful. Wolsey became prime minister about 1513, and governed, for about fifteen years, with a view to his own ambition as well as to the passions of his master; but, on the whole, England prospered under his administration. *SEE WOLSEY*. Henry was at this time an ardent advocate of Roman views in 1521 he published his *Adsertio septen, Sacramen form adversus Martinum Lutherun* (4to), for which service the pope conferred on him the title of *Defensor Fidel*, which the sovereigns of England still retain. (See, for details of the controversy between Henry and Luther, Waddington, *History of the Reformation*, ch. 21.) In a few years Henry began to grow weary, of his queen. His male children died, and he fancied that Providence punished him in this way for having contracted in unlawful marriage with his brother's widow. The question of the legitimacy of this marriage had never been fully settled, even by the pope's authorization. At all events, it was easy for a prince of Henry's temperament to believe that the marriage was unlawful, when such a belief was necessary to the gratification of his passions. Moreover, the Spanish queen was unpopular in England. Henry had recourse to an expedient suggested by Cranmer, "namely to consult all the universities of Europe on the question 'whether the papal dispensation for such a marriage was valid,' and to act on their decision without further appeal to the pope. The question was accordingly put, and decided in the negative by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, etc., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists" (Palmer, *Ch. History*, p. 159). Henry had clearly made up his mind to marry Anne Boleyn as soon as the divorce from Catharine could be accomplished. "Anne was understood to be favorably disposed towards those new views on the subject of religion and ecclesiastical affairs which had been agitating all Europe ever since Luther had begun his intrepid career by publicly opposing indulgences at Wittenberg ten years before. Queen Catharine, on the other hand, was a good Catholic; and, besides, the circumstances in which she was placed

made it her interest to take her stand by the Church, as, on the other hand, her adversaries were driven in like manner by their interests and the course of events into dissent and opposition. This one consideration sufficiently explains all that followed. The friends of the old religion generally considered Cathainle's cause as their own; the Reformers as naturally arrayed themselves on the side of her rival. Henry himself again, though he had been till now resolutely opposed to the new opinions, was carried over by his passion toward the same side; the consequence of which was the loss of the royal favor by those who had hitherto monopolized it, and its transference in great part to other men, to be employed by them in the promotion of entirely opposite purposes and politics. The proceedings for the divorce were commenced by an application to the court of Rome in August 1527. For two years the affair lingered on through a succession of legal proceedings, but without any decisive result. From the autumn of 1529 are to be dated both the fall of Wolsey and the rise of Cranmer. *SEE CRANMIER, THOMAS*. The death of the great cardinal took place on the 29th of November 1530. In January following the first blow was struck at the Church by an indictment being brought into the King's Bench against all the clergy of the kingdom for supporting Wolsey in the exercise of his legatine powers without the royal license, as required by the old statutes of *provisors* and *premunire;* and it was in an act passed immediately after by the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, for granting to the king a sum of money to exempt them from the penalties of their conviction on this indictment, that the first movement was made toward a revolt against the see of Rome, by the titles given to Henry of 'the one protector of the English Church, its only and supreme lord, and, as far as might be by the law of Christ, its supreme head.' Shortly after, the convocation declared the king's marriage with Catharine to be contrary to the law of God. The same year Henry went the length of openly countenancing Protestantism abroad by remitting a subsidy to the confederacy of the elector of Brandenburg and other German princes, called the League of Smalcald. In August, 1532, Cranmer was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury. In the beginning of the year 1533 Henry was privately married to Anne Boleyn: and on the 23rd of May following archbishop Cranmer pronounced the former marriage with Catharine void. In' the mean time the Parliament had passed an act forbidding all appeals to the See of Rome. Pope Clement VII met this by annulling the sentence of Cranmer in the matter of the marriage, on which the separation from Rome became complete. Acts were passed by the Parliament the next year declaring that

the clergy should in future be assembled in convocation only by the king's writ, that no constitutions enacted by them should be of force without the king's assent, and that no first-fruits, or Peter's pence, or money for dispensations. should be any longer paid to the pope. The clergy of the province of York themselves in convocation declared that the pope had no more power in England than any other bishop. A new and most efficient supporter of the Reformation now also becomes conspicuous on the scene, Thomas Cromwell (afterwards lord Cromwell and earl of Essex), who was this year made first secretary of state, and then master of the rolls. *SEE CROMWELL, THOMAS*. In the next session, the Parliament, which reassembled in the end of this same year, passed acts declaring the king's highness to be supreme head of the Church of England, and to have authority to redress all errors, heresies, and abuses in the Church; and ordering first-fruits and tenths of all spiritual benefices to be paid- to the king. After this, various persons were executed for refusing to acknowledge the king's supremacy; among others, two illustrious victims, the learned Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and the admirable Sir Thomas More. *SEE FISHER, JOHN*; *SEE MORE, THOMAS*. In 1535 began the dissolution of the monasteries, under the zealous superintendence of Cromwell, constituted for that purpose visitor general of these establishments. Latimer and other friends of Cranmer and the Reformation were now also promoted to bishoprics; so that not only in matters of discipline and polity, but even of doctrine, the Church might be said to have separated itself from Rome. One of the last acts of the Parliament under which all these great innovations had been made was to petition the king that a new translation of the Scriptures might be made by authority and set up in churches. It was dissolved on the 18th of July 1536, after having sat for the then unprecedented period of six years. The month of May of this year witnessed the trial and execution of queen Anne — in less than six months after the death of her predecessor, Catharine of Aragon — and the marriage of the brutal king, the very next morning, to Jane Seymour, the new beauty, his passion for whom must be regarded as the true motive that had impelled him to the deed of blood. Queen Jane dying on the 14th of October, 1537, a few days after giving birth to a son, was succeeded by Anne, sister of the duke of Cleves, whom Henry married in January, 1540, and put away in six months after-the subservient Parliament, and the-not less subservient convocation of the clergy, on his mere request, pronouncing the marriage to be null, and the former body making it high treason 'by word or deed to accept, take, judge, or believe

the said marriage to be good.' Meanwhile the ecclesiastical changes continued to proceed at as rapid a rate as ever. In 1536 Cromwell was constituted a sort of lord lieutenant over the Church; by the title of vicar general, which was held to invest him with all the king's authority over the spirituality. The dissolution of the monasteries in this and the following year, as carried forward under the direction of this energetic minister, produced a succession of popular insurrections in different parts of the kingdom, which were not put down without great destruction of life both in the field and afterwards by the executioner. In 1538 all incumbents were ordered to set up in their churches copies of the newly-published English translation of the Bible, and to teach the people the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in English; the famous image of our Lady at Walsingham, and other similar objects of the popular veneration, were also, under Cromwell's order, removed from their shrines and burnt *(English Cyclopedia,* s.v.).

But Henry never abandoned the special Romanist opinions to which he had committed himself personally by controversy. "When, in 1538, the princes of the League of Smalcald offered to place him at its head, and even to alter, if possible, the Augsburg Confession so as to make it a common basis of union for all the elements of opposition to Rome, Henry was well inclined to obtain the political advantages of the position tendered him, but hesitated to accept it until all doctrinal questions should be settled. The three points on which the Germans insisted were the communion in both elements, the worship in the vulgar tongue, and the marriage of the clergy. Henry was firm, and the ambassadors of the League spent two months in conferences with the English bishops and doctors without result. On their departure (Aug. 5,1538) they addressed him a letter arguing the subjects in debate the refusal of the cup, private masses, and sacerdotal celibacy to which. Henry replied at some length, defending his position on these topics with no little skill and dexterity, and refusing his assent finally. The Reformers, however, did not yet despair, and the royal preachers even ventured occasionally to debate the propriety of clerical marriage freely before him in their sermons, but in vain. An epistle which Melancthon addressed him in April, 1539, arguing the same questions again, had no better effect. Notwithstanding any seeming hesitation, Henry's mind was fully made lip, and the consequences of endeavoring to-persuade him against his prejudices soon became apparent. Confirmed in his opinions, he proceeded to enforce them upon his subjects in the most arbitrary manner;

‘for, though on all other points he had set up the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession,’ yet on these he had committed himself as a controversialist, and the worst passions of polemical authorship-the true ‘odium theologicum’ acting through his irresponsible disposition, rendered him the cruelest of persecutors. But a few weeks after receiving the letter of Melancthon, he answered it in his own savage fashion” (Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 481). In 1539, under the ascendancy of bishop Gardner (q.v.), the “Six Articles” were enacted, in favor of transubstantiation, communion in one kind, celibacy, private masses, and auricular confession. *SEE ARTICLES, SIX*, vol. 1, p. 442. Cromwell endeavored to mitigate the severity of the government in its cruel persecutions of all who would not accept these articles, and lost his own head for his temerity in 1540. In the same year Henry was divorced from Anne of Cleves and married to Catharine Howard, who, in 1541, was herself repudiated and executed for adultery. He then married his sixth wife, Catharine Parr, who survived him. The licentious monarch died Jan. 28 1547.

Much has been made by Roman Catholic controvertists of the bad life of Henry VIII as an argument against the Reformation. On this point we cite Palmer, as follows: “The character of Henry VIII, or of any other temporal or spiritual promoters of reformation in the Church, affords (even if it were not exaggerated) no proof that the Reformation was in itself wrong. Admitting, then, that Henry and others were justly accused of crimes, the Reformation which they promoted may in itself have been a just and necessary work; and it would have been irrational and wrong in the Church of England to have refused all consideration of subjects proposed to her examination or approbation by the royal authority, and to refuse her sanction to reforms in themselves laudable, merely because the character of the king or his ministers were unsaintly, and his or their private motives suspected to be wrong. Such conduct on the part of the Church would have been needlessly offensive to temporal rulers, while it would (in the supposed case) have been actually injurious to the cause of religion, and uncharitable judgment of private motives. It must be remembered that although Henry and the protector Somerset may have been secretly influenced by avarice, revenge, or other evil passions, they have never made them public. They avowed as their reasons for supporting reformation the desire of removing usurpations, establishing the ancient rights of the Church and the crown, correcting various abuses prejudicial to true religion, and therefore the Church could not refuse to take into

consideration the specific object of reformation proposed by them to her examination or sanction. Nor does the justification of the Church of England in any degree depend on the question of the lawfulness of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon or with Anne Boleyn; such matters, as Bossuet observes, "are often regulated by mere probabilities," and there were at least abundant probabilities that the marriage with Catharine was null ab initio; but this whole question only affects the character of Henry VIII and of those immediately engaged in it; it does not affect the reformation of the Church of England" (Palmer, *On the Church*, part 2, chap. 1). *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF*.

Henry, Matthew

a celebrated English nonconformist divine and commentator, was born at the farmhouse of Broad Oak, Flintshire, the dwelling of his maternal grandfather, Oct. 18, 1662. His parents had retired to that place because his father, Rev. Philip Henry (q.v.), had been ejected from his parish by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. His early education was obtained in the school of Mr. Doolittle at Islingrton. In 1685 he entered Gray's Inn as a student of law: but his religious life had been settled at an early-age, and his bent of mind was towards the ministry. While at Gray's Inn he devoted much of his time to theological studies. In 1686 he returned to Broad Oak, and soon began to preach, by the invitation of his friend, Mr. Illidge, at Nantwich. The fame of his discourses having spread, he was invited to Chester, where he preached in the house of a Mr. Henthorne, a sugar-baker, to a small audience which formed the nucleus of his future congregation. But in 1687 king James granted license to dissenters to preach. Mr. Henry accepted a call to a dissenting congregation in Chester, where he remained twenty-five years. During this period he went through the Bible more than once in expository lectures. In 1712 he accepted the charge of a chapel in Hackney, London. "At the commencement of his ministry, therefore, he began with the first chapter of Genesis in the forenoon, and the first chapter of Matthew in the afternoon. Thus gradually and steadily grew his 'Exposition' of the Bible. A large portion of it consists of his public lectures, while many of the quaint sayings and pithy remarks with which it abounds, and which give so great a charm of raciness to its pages, were the familiar extempore observations of his father at family worship, and noted down by Matthew in his boyhood." He suffered much from the stone in his later years, but his labors continued unabated. It was his habit to make a visit to Chester once a year. In 1714 he set out on this journey, May 31.

On his return he was taken ill with paralysis at Nantwich, where he said to his friend, Mr. Illidge, *"You have been used to take notice of the sayings of dying men; this is mine: that a life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world."* He died June 22, 1714. Mr. Henry was a faithful pastor, a discriminating preacher, and a laborious, versatile, and original author. "Although his publications furnish much less to afford gratification, in a literary point of view, than do the works of many who are justly designated 'fine writers,' they possess a vigor which, without the least endeavor to attract, awakens and sustains the attention in an uncommon degree. In a single sentence he often pours upon Scripture a flood of light: and the palpableness he gives to the wonders contained in God's law occasions excitement not unlike that which is produced by looking through a microscope. The feelings, too, which his subject had called forth in himself he communicates admirably to others. In his whole manner-the same at nine years old as at fifty-there is a freshness and vivacity which instantly put the spirits into free and agile motion — an effect somewhat similar to that play of intellectual sprightliness which *some* minds (obviously the greatest only) have the indescribable faculty of creating. But the crowning excellency remains; nothing is introduced in the shape of counteraction. There are no speeches which make his sincerity questionable; no absurdities to force suspicion as to accuracy in theological knowledge, or inattention to the analogy of faith; no staggering, and untoward, and unmanageable inconsistencies; nothing by which 'the most sacred cause can be injured;' or the highest interests of men placed in jeopardy; or which can render it imperative, exactly in proportion as the understanding is influenced, to repress or extinguish the sentiments, 'in order to listen with complacency to the Lord Jesus and his apostles"'(Foster, *Essays,* p. 440). His most important work is *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (many editions; best, London, 1849, 6 vols. 4to; New York, 6 vols. imp. 8vo). It was completed by Henry up to Acts; the rest was framed on his MSS. by a number of ministers. It is a popular rather than a scientific commentary, abounding in practical wisdom; and it has been more widely circulated than any work of the kind, except, perhaps, Clarke's Commentary. He also published a *Life of Philip Henry,* and a number of sermons and practical writings, which may be found in his *Miscellaneous Works,* edited by J. B. Williams (Lond. 1830, imp. 8vo; N.Y. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). See Williams, *Life and Writings of M. Henry* (prefixed to his *Miscel. Works);* Tong, *Life of M. Henry* (1716, 8vo; also reprinted with the

Exposition); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 824; *Literary and Theological Review,* 1, 281; Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Lit.* 2, 222; Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters,* 1, 493.

Henry, Paul Emile

a Protestant writer, was born at Potsdam March 22, 1792. He was of French extraction, and studied at the French College in Berlin. He afterwards devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. He was consecrated minister at Neufchatel in 1813, visited Paris in 1814, during the occupation of the city by the Allies. Having returned to Berlin, he was appointed catechist of the Orphan Asylum, pastor of the church of Frederickstadt in 1826, and director of the French Seminary. He died at Berlin Nov. 24,1853. He wrote *Das Leben Johann Calvin's* (Berlin, 1844; Hamb. 183-544, 3 vols. 8vo; 1846, 8vo; transl. by Stebbing, *Life and Times of Calvin,* Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo). He published also a German translation of the Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Church (Berlin, 1845). He intended publishing a collection of Calvin's letters as a continuation of the Life of that reformer, but died before it was completed. See Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, *24*, 225.

Henry, Philip

an English dissenting divine, was born Aug. 24,1631, at the palace of Whitehall, where his father was page to James, duke of York. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he obtained a studentship in 1648. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1657, and settled at Worthenbury, Flintshire. He married Miss Mathews, a lady of fortune, and became possessed of the estate of Broad Oak, Shropshire. He was driven out of his church by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. "Our sins," he said, "have made Bartholomew-day, in the year 1662, the saddest day for England since the death of Edward the Sixth, but even this for good." By the Conventicle and Five-mile acts he was driven from his house, and compelled to seek safety in concealment. In 1687, when king James proclaimed liberty of conscience, Mr. Henry immediately fitted up part of his own house for worship. His labors were not confined to Broad Oak, but it was his habit to preach daily at different places in the neighborhood. But his labors hastened his rest; for, when writing to a friend who anxiously inquired after his health, he says, "I am always habitually weary, and expect no other till I lie down in the bed of spices."

He died June 24,1696, exclaiming, “O death, where is thy sting?” An account of his *Life and Death* was written by his son Matthew, and has often been reprinted (see Henry, *Miscellaneous Works,* vol. 1: N. York, Carters. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). A volume of his *Sermons,* with notes by Williams, was first published in 1816 (London, 8vo), and has since been reprinted in the *Miscellaneous Works* of Mr. Henry, above cited. See *Life* by Matthew Henry: Jones, *Christian Biography;* Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters,* 1, 433.

Henry, Thomas Charlton, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 22, 1790, and educated at Middlebury College, Vt., where he graduated in 1814. After studying theology at Princeton, he was ordained in 1816; became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Columbia, S. C., 1818; and removed to the Second Church, Charleston, in 1824. In 1826 his health failed, and he spent several months traveling in Europe. He died in Charleston of yellow fever, Oct. 4, 1827. He published. *A Plea for the West* (1824): — *An Inquiry into the Consistency of Popular Amusements with Christianity* (Charleston, 1825, 12mo): — *Etchings from the Religious World* (Charleston, 1828, 8vo): — *Letters to an Anxious Inquirer* (1828, 12mo; also London, 1829, with a memoir of the author). — Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 826; Sprague, *Annals, 4,* 538.

Henschenius, Godfrey

a Dutch Jesuit and ecclesiastical historian, was born at Venrai, Flanders, Jan. 21, 1601. In 1635 he was appointed assistant to Bollandus in compiling the *Acta Sanctorum* (q.v.). After the death of Bollandus in 1665, when only five volumes of that work had made their appearance, father Daniel Papebroch was associated with Henschenius in the task of completing it. Henschenius continued the work until his death in 1681. — Aiegambe, *Script. Soc. Jesu, s.v.; Hoefer,: — Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 231.

Henshaw, John K., D.D.

a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Middletown, Conn., June 13, 1792, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1808. He was bred a Congregationalist, but, under the influence of Rev. Dr. Kewley, then of Middletown, he became religious, and entered the Protestant

Episcopal Church. Bishop Griswold appointed him a lay reader, and by his zealous labors several congregations were established in different parts of Vermont. On his twenty-first birthday he was ordained deacon, and soon after he was called to St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where, on his twenty-fourth birthday.' (June 13, 1816), he was ordained priest. In 1817 he was called to St. Peter's, Baltimore, where he served as pastor with uninterrupted success for twenty-six years. In 1830 the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Middlebury College. In 1843 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, and made rector of Grace Church, Providence. He was alike energetic and successful in his parish and in his diocese, and during his administration the Church grew not only in numbers, but in power. In 1852 he was called to perform episcopal functions in the diocese of Maryland during bishop Whittingham's absence; and on the 19th of July 1852, he died of apoplexy, near Frederick, Maryland. Bishop Henshaw was a man of clear, sound, and vigorous intellect: he was trained to patient labor, and his moral power was very great indeed. These qualities fitted him eminently for his work, and both within and without the Church he was recognized as in every way worthy to exercise the high functions of a Christian bishop. He published several *Sermons, Charges, and Discourses: — An Oration delivered before the Associated Alumni of Middlebury College* (1827): — A volume of *Hymns (1832): — The Usefulness of Sunday Schools: — Henshaw's Sheridan* (1834): — *Theology for the People of Baltimore* (1840, 8vo): — *Memoir of Right Rev. Richard Channing Moore, D.D.* (1842): *An Inquiry concerning the Second Advent* (1842). See Sprague, *Annals,* 5, 545; *Church Review,* 5, 397.

He'pha

(Heb. *Cheyphah',* hpyj, in the Talmud. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 197; mentioned by several ancient writers [Reland, *Palcest.* p. 699] as lying on the Phoenician coast of Palestine; the *Sycaminos* of the *Onomast.,* the Jerusalem Itin., and Josephus *[Ant. 13,* 12, 3]), the modern *Haijf,* a place of considerable trade at the foot of Carmel, on the bay of Acre (Robinson, *Researches, 3,* 194), with the ruins of Sycaminos 11 mile north-west of the present town (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 320).

He’pher

(Heb. Che’pher, rp,je a *well,* or *shame;* Sept. Ὄφέρ or Ὄφέρ, Ἔφερ and Ἀφέρ, but Ηφάλ in 1Ch 1:6), the name of a city and of three men. *SEE GATH-HEPHER*.

1. A royal city of the Canaanites captured by Joshua (Jos 12:17); probably the same district as “the land of Hepher,” in the vicinity of Sochoh and Aruboth, assigned to Ben-Hesed, one of Solomon’s table-purveyors (1Ki 4:10). The locality thus indicated would seem to be in the vicinity of *Um-Burj,* south of Suweicheh.

2. The youngest son of Gilead, and great-grandson of Manasseh (Nu 26:32). He was the father of Zelophehad (Nu 27:1; Jos 17:2, 3), and his descendants are called HEPHERITES (Nu 26:32). B.C. ante 1618.

3. The second son of Ashur (a descendant of Judah) by one of his wives, Naarah (1Ch 4:6). B.C. cir. 1612.

4. A Mecherathite, one of David’s heroes, according to 1Ch 11:36; but the text is apparently corrupt, so that this name is either an interpolation, or identical with the ELIPHALET of 2Sa 23:34. See UR.

He’pherite

(Heb. *Chephri’,* yrpej , Sept. Οφερί*)*, a descendant of HEPHER 2 (Nu 26:32).

Heph’zi-bah

(Heb. *Chephtsi-bah’,* HbpyxpeJ , *my delight* is *in her)*, a (fem.) real and also symbolical name.

1. (Sept. Ἐψιβά,*Vulg. Hacphsiba.)* The mother of king Manasseh, and consequently queen dowager of king Hezekiah (2Ki 21:1). Notwithstanding the piety of her husband, and her own amiable name, her irreligion may be inferred from the character of her son. — B.C. 709-696.

2. (Sept. Θέλημα ἐμὸν,*Vulg. Voluntas mea in ea.)* A figurative title ascribed to Zion in token of Jehovah’s favor (in the return from the

Captivity, and especially in the Messiah's advent), in contrast with her predicted desolation (<26204>Isaiah 62:4).

Heraclas, Saint

patriarch of Alexandria, was a brother of Plutarch, who was martyred about A.D. 204, under Septimius Severus. They had both been heathen, but were converted by Origen, who was then teaching at Alexandria. After escaping from the persecution to which his brother fell victim, Heraclas became an ascetic, but still continued to study Greek philosophy under Ammonius Saccas. He was next associated with Origen as a catechist, and when the latter was compelled to leave Egypt on account of his difficulty with Demetrius of Alexandria, Heraclas remained alone in charge of the theological school of that city. He retained this position until he became himself patriarch. He died in 246. The Roman martyrology commemorates him on the 14th of July. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. 6,* 15; Tillemont, *Memoires Eccles.* vol. 3; Baillet, *Vies des Saints,* July 14th.

Heracleon

SEE HERACLEONITES.

Heracleonites

a Gnostic sect of the 2nd century, so named from Heracleon (a disciple of Valentinus), who was distinguished for his scientific bent of mind. "He wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, considerable fragments of which have been preserved by Origen; perhaps also a commentary on the Gospel according to Luke. Of the latter, a single fragment only, the exposition of <42208>Luke 12:8, has been preserved by Clement of Alexandria *(Strom. 4,* 503). It may easily be conceived that the spiritual depth and fullness of John must have been pre-eminently attractive to the Gnostics. To the exposition of this gospel Heracleon brought a profound religious sense, which penetrated to the inward meaning, together with an understanding invariably clear when not led astray by theosophic speculation. But what he chiefly lacked was a faculty to appreciate the simplicity of John, and earnest application to those necessary means for evolving the spirit out of the letter, the deficiency in which among the Gnostics generally has already been made a subject of remark. Heracleon honestly intended, indeed, so far as we can see, to derive his theology from John. But he was entirely warped by his system; and with all his habits of

thought and contemplation, so entangled in its mesh-work that he could not move out of it with freedom, but, spite of himself, implied its views and its ideas in the Scriptures, which he regarded as the fountain of divine wisdom" (Neander). His fragments are gathered in Grabe, *Spicilegium*, 2, 83. See Neander, *Ch. History*, 1, 434; Mosheim, *Comm.* 1, 472; Lardner, *Works*, 2, 256; and the article *SEE GNOSTICS*.

Heracles

SEE HERCULES.

Heraclitus

(Ἡράκλειτος), a philosopher of Ephesus, flourished about B.C. 500. He belonged to the Ionian school. "He was a profound thinker, of an inquisitive spirit, and the founder of a sect called after him, which had considerable reputation and influence. His humor was melancholy and sarcastic, which he indulged at the expense of the democracy established in his native town, and with which he was disgusted.' The knowledge he had acquired of the systems of preceding philosophers (vying with one another in boldness), of Thales, Pythagoras, and Xenophanes, created in him a habit of skepticism of which he afterwards cured himself. The result of his meditations was committed to a volume (Περὶ φύσεως), the obscurity of which procured for him the appellation of σκοτεινός. He also made it his object to discover an elemental principle; but either because his views were different, or from a desire to oppose himself to the Eleatme, he assumed it to before, because the most subtle and active of the elements" (Tennemann, *Manual History of Philosophy*, § 102).

"According to Heraclitus, the end of wisdom is to discover the ground and principle of all things. This principle, which is an eternal, ever-living unity, and pervades and is in all phenomena, he *called fire*. By this term Heraclitus understood, not the elemental fire or flame, which he held to be the excess of fire, but a warm and dry vapor; which therefore, as air, is not distinct from the soul or vital energy, and which, as guiding and directing the mundane development, is endued with wisdom and intelligence. This supreme and perfect force of life is obviously without limit to its activity; consequently, nothing that it forms can remain fixed; all is constantly in a process of formation. This he has thus figuratively expressed: 'No one has ever been twice on the same stream.' Nay, the passenger himself is without identity: 'On the same stream we do and we do not embark; for we are and

we are not.' The vitality of the rational fire has in it a tendency to contraries, whereby it is made to pass from gratification to want, and from want to gratification, and in fixed periods it alternates between a swifter and a slower flux. Now these opposite tendencies meet together in determinate order, and by the inequality or equality of the forces occasion the phenomena of life and death. The quietude of death, however, is a mere semblance which exists only for the senses of man. For man in his folly forms a truth of his own, whereas it is only the universal reason that is really cognizant of the truth. Lastly the rational principle which governs the whole moral and physical world is also, the law of the individual; whatever, therefore, is, is the wisest and the best; and 'it is not for man's welfare that his wishes should be fulfilled; sickness makes health pleasant, as hunger does gratification, and labor rest.' The physical doctrines of Heraclitus formed no inconsiderable portion of the eclectical system of the later Stoics, and in times still more recent there is much in the theories of Schelling and Hegel that presents a striking though general resemblance thereto." Hegel declared that the doctrine of Heraclitus, that all things are "perpetual flux and reflux," was an anticipation of his own dogma, "Being is the same with non-being." "The fragments of Heraclitus have been collected from Plutarch, Stobaeus, Clenens of Alexandria, and Sextus Empiricus, and explained by Schleiermacher in Wolf and Buttmann's *Museum der Aitherthusmswissenschcft,* vol. 1" (English *Cyclopedia).* Professor Bernays, of Bonn, gathered from Hippocrates a series of quotations from Heraclitus, and published them under the title *Heraclitea* (1848). The *epistles* which bear the name of Heraclitus are spurious; they are given, with valuable notes and dissertations, in *Die Heraclitischen Briefe, ein Beitrag z. philos. u. relig. Lit.* (Berl. 1869). See Smith, *Dict. (f Class. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Lewes, *Hist. of Philos.* 1867, 1, *65* sq.; Lassalle, *Die Philosophie el. Herakleitos* (Berlin, 1858). Heraclius. *SEE MONOTHIELITE*. Herald only occurs in <2004>Daniel 3:4; the term there used (z/rK; *kar6z)* is connected etymologically (Gesenius, *Thesaur. p. 712)* with the Greek κηρύσσω and κράζω, and with our "cry;" There is an evident allusion to the office of the herald in the expressions κηρύσσω, κράυζ, and κήρυγμα, which are frequent in the N.T., and which are but inadequately rendered by "preach," etc. The term "herald" might be substituted in <5401>1 Timothy 2:7: <5001>2 Timothy 1:11; <6105>2 Peter 2:5, as there is evidently in these passages an allusion to the Grecian games (q.v.). Herb is the rendering of the following terms in the Auth. Vers. of the Bible: usually bc,[e *e'seb,* any *green plant* or *herbage* collectively, often

rendered “grass;” applied generally to annual plants without woody stems, growing in the fields (<01:02:05>Genesis 2:5; 3:18; <02:09:22>Exodus 9:22; 10:12,15) and on mountains (<23:42:15>Isaiah 42:15; <20:27:25>Proverbs 27:25), growing up and setting seed (<01:01:11>Genesis 1:11, 12, 29), and serving as food for man (<01:01:30>Genesis 1:30; 3:18; <19:04:14>Psalm 104:14) and for beast (<05:11:15>Deuteronomy 11:15; <19:46:20>Psalm 106:20; <24:14:06>Jeremiah 14:6; <27:04:15>Daniel 4:15, 23,32,33; 5:21); comprehending, therefore, *vegetables*, *greens*, and sometimes all *green herbage* (<30:07:01>Amos 7:1, 2). Men are said to “flourish as a *green herb”* (<19:72:16>Psalm 72:16; 92:7; <18:05:25>Job 5:25); also *to wither* (<19:10:04>Psalm 102:4, 11). Hence, too) those seized with fear and turning pale (Gr. χλωροί*)* are compared to the *herb. of the field* which grows yellow and withers (<12:19:26>2 Kings 19:26; <23:37:27>Isaiah 37:27). qry; *yarak’*, properly signifies *green*, and is applied to any green thing, verdure, foliage of fields and trees (<12:19:26>2 Kings 19:26; <23:37:27>Isaiah 37:27; 15:6, <02:10:05>Exodus 10:15; <04:22:04>Numbers 22:4; <19:37:02>Psalm 37:2; <01:01:30>Genesis 1:30; 9:3); specially *a plant*, *herb* (<05:11:10>Deuteronomy 11:10; <11:21:02>1 Kings 21:2); a portion *of herbs*, vegetables (<20:15:17>Proverbs 15:17). avD, *de’she*, and

ryxj; *chatsir’* properly designate *grass*, the first when young and tender, the latter when grown and fit for mowing. *SEE BOTANY*. r/a, *6r* (lit. *light)*, in the fern. hr/a, *orah’*, plural t/r/a, *oro’th’*, “occurs in two passages of Scripture, where it is translated *herb* in the Auth.Vers.: it is generally supposed to indicate such plants as are employed for food. The most ancient translators seem, however, to have been at a loss for its meaning. Thus the Sept. in one passage (<12:04:39>2 Kings 4:39) has only the Heb. word in Greek characters, ἀριώθ, and in the other (<23:26:19>Isaiah 26:19) ἴαμα, *healing.* The Vulg., and the Chaldee and Syriac versions, translate *oroth* in the latter passage by *light*, in consequence of confounding one Heb. word with another, according to Celsius *(Hierobot.* 1, 459). Rosenmüller says that *oroth* occurs in its original and generic signification in <23:26:19>Isaiah 26:19, viz. *green herbs.* The future restoration of the Hebrew people is there announced under the *type* and figure of a revival of the dead. T*hy dew is a dew of green herbs,’* says the prophet, i.e. as by the dew green herbs are revived, so shalt thou, being revived by God’s strengthening power, flourish again. The other passage, however appears an obscure one with respect to the meaning of *oroth.* Celsius has, with his usual learning, shown that mallows were much employed as food in ancient times. Of this there can be no doubt, but there is no proof adduced that

oroth means mallows; there are many other plants which were and still are employed as articles of diet in the East, as purslane, goosefoot, chenpodiums, lettuce, endive, etc. But *oroth* should be considered in conjunction with *pakyoth;* for we find in 2 Kings 4:39, that when Elisha came again to Gilgal, and there was a dearth in the land, he said unto his servant, 'Set on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets; and one went out into the field to gather *herbs (oroth),* and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof *wild gourds (pak-yoth)* his lap full, and came and shred them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not.' As *pakyoth* is universally acknowledged to be *the fruit* of one of the gourd tribe, so it is not unreasonable to conclude that *oroth* also was the fruit of some plant, for which the *pakyoth* had been mistaken. This may be admitted, as nothing better than conjecture has been adduced in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit *of the pakyoth,* or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person" (Kitto). But perhaps, as this was a time of great famine, the servant went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoriness and nutritiousness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the *pakyoth* and any particular kind of *oroth* of which he was in quest, but rather from indiscriminately seizing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard *oroth* in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. *SEE GOURD.*

The "bitter herbs" (µyrmrm *merorim')* with which the Israelites were commanded to eat the Passover bread (Exodus 2:8; Numbers 9:11: the same Heb. word occurs also in Lamentations 3:15, "He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood") doubtless in general "included the various edible kinds of bitter plants, whether cultivated or wild, which the Israelites could with facility obtain in sufficient abundance to supply their number either in Egypt, where the first Passover was eaten, or in the deserts of the peninsula of Sinai, or in Palestine. The Mishna *(Pesachim.* c. 2, § 6) enumerates five kinds of bitter *herbschazereth, 'ulshin, thamcah, charchabina,* and *maror* — which it was lawful to eat either green or dried. There is great difficulty in identifying the plants which these words respectively denote, but the reader may see the subject discussed by Bochart *(Hieroz.* 1, 691, ed. Rosenmüller) and by Carpzovius *(Apparat. Hist. Crit.* p. 402). According to the testimony of

Forskal, in Niebuhr's Preface to the *Description de I'Arabie* (p. 44), the modern Jews of Arabia and Egypt eat lettuce, or, if this is not at hand, bugloss, with the Paschal lamb. The Greek word 7ρχ-πιX is identified by Sprengel *(Hist. Rei Herb.* 1, 100) with the *Helminthia echioides,* Lin., bristly helminthia (ox-tongue), a plant belonging to the chicory group. The *Picris* of botanists is a genus closely allied to the *Helminthia.* Aben Esra, in Celsius *(Hierob.* 2, 227), remarks that, according to the observations of a certain learned Spaniard, the ancient Egyptians always used to place different kinds of herbs upon the table, with mustard, and that they dipped morsels of bread into this salad. That the Jews derived this custom of eating herbs with their meat from the Egyptians is extremely probable, for it is easy to see how, on the one name, the bitter-herb salad should remind the Jews of the bitterness of their bondage (Exodus 1:14), and, on the other hand, how it should also bring to their remembrance their merciful deliverance from it. It is curious to observe, in connection with the remarks of Aben Esra, the custom, for such it appears to have been, of dipping a morsel of bread into *the* dish (τὸ τρυβλίον*)* which prevailed in our Lord's time. May not τὸ τρύβλιον be the salad-dish of bitter herbs, and τὸ ψσώμιον the morsel of bread of which Aben Esra speaks? The *merdrim* may well be understood to denote various sorts of bitter plants, such particularly as belong to the *crucifers,* as some of the bitter cresses, or to the chicory group of the *compositae,* the hawkweeds, and sow-thistles, and *wild* lettuces, which grow abundantly in the peninsula of Sinai, in Palestine, and in Egypt (Decaisne, *Florula Sinaica,* in *Annal. des Scienc. Nat.* 1834; Strand, *Flor. Palaest.* No. 445, etc.)" *SEE BITTER HERBS.*

Herbart, Johann Friedrich

an eminent German philosopher, was born at Oldenburg May 4, 1776. He became professor of philosophy in the University of Göttingen in 1805, afterwards at Kinigsberg in 1809, and finally returned to Göttingen in 1833. He died there, Aug. 14, 1841. His most important works are: *Kurze Darstellung eines Planes z. philosoph. Vorlesungen* (Gött. *1804): — Deplatonici systematis fundamento* (Gött. 1805): *— Allg. praktische Philosophie* (Getting. 1808): *Hauptpunkte d. Metaphysik* (Gött. 1808): — *Lehrbuch z. Einleitung in d. Philos.* (Konigsb. 1815; 4th ed. 1841): *Lehrbuch d. Psychologie* (Konigsb. 1816; 3rd ed. 1834): *Psychologie als Wissenschaft* (Königsberg. 1824,2 parts): — *Allg. Metaphysik* (Konigsb. 1828, 2 parts; 2nd ed. Halle, *1841): — Gesprache i. d. Bose* (Konigsb. 1817): — *Encyk. d. Philosophie* (Konigsb. 1831; 2nd ed. 1841): —

Analytische Beleuchtung d. Naturrechtes u. d. Moral (Götting. 1836): — Zur *Lehre von der Freiheit d. menschl. Willens* (Gött. *1836): — Psychologische Untersuchungen* (Götting. 1839,2 vols.). Herbart's philosophical essays and pamphlets were published by Hartenstein (Lpz. 1841-43, 3 vols.), who also published a complete collection of his works *(Sammtliche Werke,* Lpz. 1850-52, 12 vols.).

Herbart was at first a Kantian, but afterwards, influenced by the study of ancient Greek philosophy, he created a philosophical system of his own, which is distinguished by ingenuity above all the other post-Kantian systems. "Although Herbart occasionally professes to be a follower of Kant, still he is of opinion that Kant's *Criticism of Pure Reason* is almost without any objective value, and that its method must be entirely abandoned if metaphysics are to be founded on a secure and permanent basis. Herbart's realistic tendency further reminds us of the monades of Leibnitz. Philosophy, according to Herbart, has not, like ordinary sciences, any particular set of subjects which are its province, but it consists in the manner and method in which any subject whatsoever is treated. The subjects themselves are supposed to be known, and are called by him 'notions' (Begriffe), so that philosophy is the methodical treatment and working out of those 'notions.' The different methods of treatment constitute the main departments of philosophy. The first of them is logic, which considers the nature and clearness of notions and their combinations. But the contemplation of the world and of ourselves brings before us notions which cause a discord in our thoughts. This circumstance renders it necessary for us to modify or change those notions according to the particular nature of each. By the process of modification or change something new is added, which Herbart calls the supplement or complement (Erganzung). Now the second main department of philosophy is metaphysics, which Herbart defines to be the science of the supplementary notions. The method of discovering the supplementary notions which are necessary in order to render given facts which contain contradictory notions intelligible, is, according to him, the method of relations, and it is by this method alone that the other notions of the world and of ourselves can be properly defined. Hence arises what he calls practical metaphysics, which is subdivided into psychology, the philosophy of nature, and natural theology. A third class of notions, lastly, add something to our conceptions, which produces either pleasure or displeasure, and the science of these notions is aesthetics, which, when

applied to given things, forms a series of theories of art, which may be termed practical sciences. They are founded upon certain model notions, such as the ideas of perfection, benevolence, malevolence, justice, compensation, equity, and the like. In his metaphysics Herbart points out three problems containing contradictions, viz. things with several attributes, change, and our own subjectivity (das Ich). In order to solve these contradictions, and to make the external and internal world agree and harmonize so as to become conceivable, he assumes that the quantity of everything existing (des Seienden) is absolutely simple. Things therefore *which* exist have no attributes referring to space and time, but they stand in relation to a something, which is the essence of things. Wherever this essence consists of a plurality of attributes there must also be a plurality of things or beings, and these many simple things or beings are the principles of all things in nature, and the latter, consequently, are nothing but aggregates of simple things. They exist by themselves in space so far as it is conceived by our intellect, but not in physical space, which contains only bodies. We do not know the real simple essence of things, but we may acquire a certain amount of knowledge concerning internal and external relations. When they accidentally meet in space they disturb one another, but at the same time strive to preserve themselves; and in this manner they manifest themselves as powers, although they neither are powers nor have powers. By means of these principles Herbart endeavors to reform the whole system of psychology which he found established by his predecessors; for, according to him, the soul, too, is a simple being, and as such it is and remains unknown to us; and it is neither a subject for speculation nor for experimental psychology. It never and nowhere has any plurality of attributes, nor has it any power or faculty of receiving or producing anything; and the various faculties usually mentioned by psychologists such as imagination, reason, etc., which sometimes are at war and sometimes in concord with each other, are, according to Herbart, mere fictions of philosophers. In like manner he denies that it possesses certain forms of thought or laws regulating our desires and actions. The soul as a simple being, and in its accidental association with others, is like the latter subject to disturbance, and exerts itself for its own preservation. The latter point is the principal question in Herbart's psychology, and he endeavors to deduce and calculate the whole life of the soul, with the aid of mathematics, from those mutual disturbances, 'checks, and from its reactions against them. Hence he is obliged to deny man's moral or transcendental freedom, although he allows him a certain free character. He

maintains the immortality of the soul, because the simple principles of all things are eternal; but he denies the possibility of acquiring any knowledge whatever of the Deity" *(English Cyclopedia*, s.v.). On the whole, it *may* be said that Herbart was a careful observer of psychological phenomena; but that speculation, in the proper sense, was not congenial to him. See also Thilo, *Die Wissenschaftlich Zeit der mod. specul. Theologie*, etc. (Leipsic, 1851, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual Hist. of Philosophy*, p. 462; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 482-489; Schwegler, *Epit. Hist. Phil.*, transl. by Seelye, p. 304 sq.; Hollenberg, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, *19*, 630 sq.

Herbelot, Bartholomew D' (or D'Herbelot)

a distinguished French Orientalist, was born at Paris Dec. 4, 1625. He studied at the University *of* his native city, where he acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. He then visited Italy, in order to establish relations with the people of the Oriental countries, of which there were a large number at Genoa, Leghorn, and Venice. At Rome he became acquainted with Lucas Holstenius and Leo Allatins, and was highly esteemed by the cardinals Barberini and Grimaldi, as well as by queen Christina of Sweden. On his return to France he received a pension of 1500 francs from Fouquet, and was afterwards appointed royal secretary and interpreter of Oriental languages at Paris. On a second journey to Italy in 1666, the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored to persuade him to remain, and presented him with a number of Eastern MSS., but in vain. He returned to Paris, where Colbert granted him again a pension of 1500 francs, and Louis XIV appointed him professor of Syriac at the College of France, after the death of James d'Auvergne in 169-2. Herbelot died Dec. 8,1695. He wrote *Bibliothéque Orientale. ouv Dictionnaire universal contenant tout ce quifait connaitre les peuples dle l'Orient.* It was published after his death by Ant. Galland (Paris, 1697, fol.; Maestricht, 1776, fol.; supplement, 1781, etc.; best ed. Par. 1782, 8vo). The title of this work gives a good idea of its character: it is a storehouse of whatever belongs to Oriental literature. The book, however, is merely a translation of passages, alphabetically arranged, from Hadji Khalfah's-bibliographical dictionary, and of some hundred and fifty MSS. Herbelot did not take the trouble to compare their statements with those of other writers, so that it contains only the views of the Mohammedans on themselves and their neighbors. Yet it is a very useful work for students and being the only one of its kind, is still highly

considered. Desessarts has given a popular abridgment of it (Paris, 1782, 6 vols. 8vo); it was translated into German by Schultz (Halle, 1785-1790, 4 vols. roy. 8vo). Herbelot wrote also a catalogue of part of the MSS. contained in the Palatine Library at Florence, which was translated from Italian into Latin, and is to be found in Schellhorn's *Amenitates litterarios.* See Cousin, *Eloge de D'iHerbelot* (in the *Journal des Savants, Jan.* 3rd, 1696); Perratult, *Homes illustres,* 2, 154-158; Goujet, *Mem. sur le College de ,France, 3,* 155-158; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25,* 283. (J.N.P.)

Herbert, Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury)

a distinguished English Deist, was born at Eyton, Shrewsbury, in 1581 or 1582. He was educated at Oxford, served with great credit in the war in the Netherlands, and on his return became one of the most accomplished gentlemen at the court of James I, who made him a knight of the Bath, and sent him minister to France in 1618. On a second mission to France he published a work embodying the principles of deism, entitled *Tractatus de Veritate, prout distinguitur a Revelatione,* etc. (Paris, 1624, 4to). In 1631 he was made a peer. In 1645 he published, a new edition of the *Tractatus,* adding to it his *De Religione Gentilium* (also published separately at Amsterdam, 1663, 4to; and in an English translation, by Lewis, *The Ancient Religion of the Gentiles,* London, 1705, 8vo). He died at London Aug. 20, 1648. His *Life, written by himself,* and *continued to his death,* was published by Horace Walpole (London, 1764; new edition, with additions, London, 1826, 8vo).

"Herbert of Cherbury was the contemporary of Hobbes of Malmesbury, to whose principles of philosophizing he was directly opposed, notwithstanding the striking coincidence of many of the results at which they respectively arrived. He maintained the theory of innate ideas, and made a certain instinct of the reason (rationalis instinctus) to be the primary source of all human knowledge. Accordingly he did not, with Aristotle and the Stoics, compare the mind to a pure tablet, or to the tabula rasa of the schoolmen, but to a closed volume which opens itself at the solicitation of outward nature acting upon the senses. Thus acted upon, the mind produces out of itself certain general or universal principles *(communes notiones),* by reference to which all debatable questions in theology and philosophy may be determined, since upon these principles, at least, all men are unanimous. Consistently with these views, he does: not, with Hobbes, make religion to be founded on revelation or historical tradition, but upon

an immediate consciousness of God and of divine things. The religion of reason, therefore, resting on such grounds, is, he argues, the criterion of every positive religion which claims a foundation in revelation. No man can appeal to revelation as an immediate evidence of the reasonableness of his faith, except those to whom that revelation has been directly given; for all others, the fact of revelation is a matter of mere tradition or testimony. Even the recipient of a revelation may himself be easily deceived, since he possesses no means of convincing himself of the reality or authenticity of his admitted revelation. Herbert made his own religion of reason to rest upon the following grounds: There is a God whom man ought to honor and reverence; a life of holiness is the most acceptable worship that can be offered him; sinners must repent of their sins, and strive to become better; and after death every one must expect the rewards or penalties befitting the acts of this life. Lord Herbert is one of the numerous instances on record of the little influence which speculative opinions exercise upon the conduct of life. Maintaining that no revelation is credible which is imparted to a portion only of mankind, he nevertheless claims the belief of his hearers when he tells them that his doubts as to the publication of his work were removed by a direct manifestation of the divine will" *(English Cyclopedia).* He states the phenomena of this revelation as follows: "Thus filled with doubts. I was, on a bright summer day, sitting in my room; my window to the south was open; the sun shone brightly; not a breeze was stirring. I took my book *On Truth* into my hand, threw myself on my knees, and prayed devoutly in these words: 'O thou one God, thou author of this light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light, I implore thee, according to thine infinite mercy, to pardon my request, which is greater than a sinner should make. I am not sufficiently convinced whether I may publish this book or not. If its publication shall be for thy glory, I beseech thee to give me a sign from heaven; if not, I will suppress it.' I had scarcely finished these words when a loud, and yet, at the same time, a gentle sound came from heaven, not like any sound on earth. This comforted me in such a manner, and gave me such satisfaction, that I considered my prayer as having been heard." His style is very obscure, and his writings have been but little read, in spite of the talent and subtlety of thought which they evince. He is properly regarded as the founder of the school of English Deists, although he was himself a skeptic of a very high and pure sort rather than an infidel. Herbert did not profess, in his writings, to oppose Christianity, but held that his "five articles" embraced the substance of what is taught in the Scriptures.

"The ideas which his writings contributed to Deistical speculation are two, viz. the examination of the universal principles of religion, and the appeal to an internal illuminating influence superior to revelation, 'the inward light,' as the test of religious truth. This was a phrase not uncommon in the 17th century. It was used by the Puritans to mark the appeal to the spiritual instincts, the heaven-taught feelings; and, later, by mystics, like the founder of the Quakers, to imply an appeal to an internal sense. But in Herbert it differs from these in being universal, not restricted to a few persons, and in being intellectual rather than emotional or spiritual" (Farrar, *Critical History*, p. 120). For an examination and refutation of his theory of religion, see Leland, *Deistical Writers*, letter 1, and Halyburton, *Nat. Religion* (Works, 1835, 8vo, p. 253). See also Kortholt, *De Tribus impostoribus* (Herbert, Hobbes, Spinoza; Hamb. 1701, 4to); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures*, 1838; Remusati *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1854, p. 692; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, lect. iv; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines* bk. 2, ch. 4:§ 2; *Contemporary Review*, July, 1869.

Herbert, George

brother of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, was born at Montgomery Castle April 3,1593. He was educated at Cambridge, where he became a fellow in 1615. In the year 1619 he was made university orator, and a letter of thanks which he wrote in that capacity to James I excited the monarch's attention, who declared him to be the jewel of that university, and gave him a sinecure of £120 per eannum. He became intimate with Bacon and Wotton and had prospects of great success in public life, but the death of his friends, the duke of Richmond and the marquis of Hamilton, followed by that of king James, frustrated these expectations, and Herbert determined to devote himself to the ministry. He was accordingly ordained, and in 1626 was made prebendary of Layton, in the diocese of Lincoln. In 1630 he became rector of Bemerton, near Salisbury. A quotidian agile soon destroyed his health, and he died March 3, 1633. George Herbert's piety was humble and profound. He was zealous in his pastoral duties; an undue reverence for ceremonies, as such, was his chief failing. A beautiful sketch of him is given on Walton's *Lives* (often reprinted). "Men like George Herbert are rare. It is not his wide learning, nor his refined taste; not his high spirit nor his amiability, nor his strictness of life; but the rare combination in one person of qualities so diversely beautiful. He was master of all learning, human and divine; yet his learning is not what strikes the reader most, it is so thoroughly controlled and subordinated by his

lively wit and practical wisdom. He was a man of extraordinary endowments, both personal and such as belonged to his rank, not lost in indolence, nor wasted in trivialities, but all combined and cultivated to the utmost, and then devoted to the highest purposes" *(Christian Remembrancer,* 1862, p. 137). His writings include *The Temple: sacred Poems and private Ejaculations* (Lond. 1633,12mo; and many editions since, in various *forms): — The Country Parson, his Character and Rule of holy Life* (many editions). There are several editions of his complete works, such as, *Works, Prose and Verse, with Walton's Life and Coleridge's Notes* (London, 1846, 2 vols. 12mo); *Works, with Sketch of his Life* by Jerdan (1853, small 8vo; *not.* including all of Herbert's works); *Works, Prose and Verse,* edited by Willmott (1854, 8vo); *Life and Writings of G. Herbert* (Boston, 1851, 12mo). The best edition of his *Works* is Pickering's (Lond. 1850, 2 vols.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 829; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography, 3,* 48; *Christian Examiner,* vol. 51; *Brit. Quarterly Review,* April 1854, art. 2.

Her'cules

(Ἡρακλῆς) is mentioned in 2 Macc. 4:19 as the Tyrian god to whom the Jewish high-priest Jason sent a religious embassy *(*θεωροί*),* with the offering of 300 drachmae of silver. That this Tyrian Hercules (Herod. ii, 44) is the same as the Tyrian Baal is evident from a bilingual Phoenician inscription found at Malta (described by Gesenius, *Monum. Ling. Phaen.* 1, 96), in which the Phoenician words, "To our Lord, to Melkarth, the Baal of Tyre," are represented by the Greek Ἡρακλεῖ Ἀρχηγέτει. Moreover, Herakles and Astarte are mentioned together by Josephus *(Anf. 8,* 5, 3), just in the same manner as Baal and Ashtoreth are in the Old Testament. The further identity of this Tyrian Baal with the Baal whom the idolatrous Israelites worshipped is evinced by the following arguments, as stated chiefly by Movers *(Die Phonicier,* 1, 178). The worship of Baal, which prevailed in the time of the Judges, was put down by Samuel (1 Samuel 7:4), and the effects of that suppression appear to have lasted through the next few centuries, as Baal is not enumerated among the idols of Solomon (1 Kings 11:5-8; 2 Kings 23:13),. nor among those worshipped in Judah (2 Kings 23:12), or in Samaria, where we only read of the golden calves of Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:28; 15:26). That worship of Baal which prevailed in the reign of Ahab cannot, therefore, be regarded as a mere continuation or revival of the old Canaanitish idolatry (although there is no reason to doubt the essential identity of both Baals), but was introduced

directly from Phoenicia by Ahab's marriage with the Sidonian princess Jezebel (¹¹¹⁶³¹1 Kings 16:31). In like manner, the establishment of this idolatry in Judah is ascribed to the marriage of the king with a daughter of Jezebel (comp. Josephus, *Ant. 8*, 13, 1; 9:6, 6).

The power of nature, which was worshipped under the form of the Tyrian Hercules, Melkarth, Baal, Adonis, Moloch, and whatever his other names are, was that which originates, sustains, and destroys life. These functions of the Deity, according to the Phoenicians, were represented, although not exclusively, by the *sun,* the influence of which both animates vegetation by its genial warmth, and scorches it up by its fervor (see Davis, *Carthage,* p. 276-9).

Almost all that we know of the worship of the Tyrian Hercules is preserved by the classical writers, and relates chiefly to the Phoenician colonies, and not to the mother state. The eagle, the lion, and the thunny-fish were sacred to him, and are often found on Phoenician coins. Pliny expressly testifies that human sacrifices were offered up every year to the Carthaginian Hercules *(Hist. Nat. 36,* 5, 12), which coincides with what is stated of Baal in ²⁴²⁰⁰⁵Jeremiah 19:5, and with the acknowledged worship of Moloch. Mention is made of public embassies sent from the colonies to the mother state to honor the national god (Arrian, *Alex.* 2, 24; Q. Curt. 4:2; Polyb. 31:20), and this fact places in a clearer light the offence of Jason in sending envoys to his festival (2 Macc. 4:19).

Movers endeavors to show that Herakles and Hercules are not merely Greek and Latin synonymes for this god, but that they are actually derived from his true Phoenician name. This original name he supposes to have consisted of the syllables רא (as found in יראה, *lion,* and in other words), meaning *strong,* and לך, from לכי, *to conquer;* so that the compound means *Arconquers.* This harmonizes with what he conceives to be the idea represented by Hercules as the destroyer of Typhonic monsters *(1. c.* p. 430). Melkarth, the Μελίκαρθος of Sanchoniathon, occurs on coins only in the form תרקלם. We must in this case assume that a *kaph* has been absorbed, and resolve the word into Ëלם אתרק, *king of the city,* πολιοῦχος. The bilingual inscription renders it by Ἀρχηγέτης; and it is a title of the god as the patron of the city. *SEE BAAL*.

Herd

Picture for Herd

(prop. rqB; of neat cattle; rd,[, a flock of smaller animals; hnqi]mæ, as property; ἀηρλη, a drove). The herd was greatly regarded both in the patriarchal and Mosaic period. Its multiplying was considered as a blessing, and its decrease as a curse (<01132>Genesis 13:2; <05714>Deuteronomy 7:14; 28:4; <19738>Psalm 107:38; 144:14; <24523>Jeremiah 51:23). The ox was the most precious stock next to horse and mule, and (since those were rare) the thing of greatest value which was commonly possessed (<11805>1 Kings 18:5). Hence we see the force of Saul's threat (<09107>1 Samuel 11:7). The herd yielded the most esteemed sacrifice (<04703>Numbers 7:3; <19931>Psalm 69:31; <23603>Isaiah 66:3); also flesh-meat and milk, chiefly converted, probably, into butter and cheese (<05214>Deuteronomy 32:14; 2 Samuel 10-12:29), which such milk yields more copiously than that of small cattle (Arist. *Hist. Anim. 3*, 20). The full-grown ox is hardly ever slaughtered in Syria; but, both for sacrificial and convivial purposes, the young animal was preferred (<02901>Exodus 29:1) —perhaps three years might be the age up to which it was so regarded (<01509>Genesis 15:9) —and is spoken of as a special dainty (<01708>Genesis 17:8; <30604>Amos 6:4; <42523>Luke 15:23). The case of Gideon's sacrifice was one of exigency (<07025>Judges 6:25), and exceptional. So that of the people (<09432>1 Samuel 14:32) was an act of wanton excess. The agricultural and general usefulness of the ox in ploughing threshing and as a beast of burden (<13240>1 Chronicles 12:40; <23469>Isaiah 46:9, — made such a slaughtering seem wasteful; nor, owing to difficulties of grazing, fattening, etc., is beef the product of an Eastern climate. The animal was broken to service probably in his third year (<23515>Isaiah 15:5; <24634>Jeremiah 48:34; comp. Pliny, *HI. N. 8*, 70, ed. Par.). In the moist season, when grass abounded in the waste lands, especially in the "south" region, herds grazed there; e.g. in Carmel, on the west side of the Dead Sea (<09252>1 Samuel 25:2; <14610>2 Chronicles 26:10). Dothan also, Mishor, and Sharon (<01937>Genesis 37:17; comp. Robinson, 3:122; Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 247, 260, 484; <13729>1 Chronicles 27:29; <23650>Isaiah 65:10) were favorite pastures. For such purposes Uzziah built towers in the wilderness (<14269>2 Chronicles 26:19). Not only grass, but foliage, is acceptable to the ox, and the- woods and hills of Bashan and Gilead afforded both abundantly; on such upland (Psalm 1,10; 65:12) pastures cattle might graze, as also, of course, by river sides, when driven by the heat from the regions of the "wilderness."

Especially was the eastern table-land (Ezekiel 39:18; Numbers 32:4) "a place for cattle," and the pastoral tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, who settled there, retained something of the nomadic character and handed down some image of the patriarchal life (Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 324, 325). — Herdsmen in Egypt were a low, perhaps the lowest, caste; hence, as Joseph's kindred, through his position, were brought into contact with the highest castes, they are described as "an abomination;" but of the abundance of cattle in Egypt, and of the care there bestowed on them, there is no doubt (Genesis 47:6, 17; Exodus 9:4, 20). Brands were used to distinguish the owners' herds (Wilkinson, 3:8, 195; 4:125-131). So the plague of hail was sent to smite especially the cattle (Psalm 78:48), the firstborn of which also were smitten (Exodus 12:29). The Israelites departing stipulated for (Exodus 10:26) and took "much cattle" with them (Exodus 12:38). *SEE EXODE*. Cattle formed thus one of the traditions of the Israelitish nation in its greatest period, and became almost a part of that greatness. They are the subject of providential care and legislative ordinance (Exodus 20:10; 21:28; 34:19; Leviticus 19:19; 25:7; Deuteronomy 11:15; 22:1, 4, 10; 25:4; Psalm 104:14; Isaiah 30:23; Jonah 4:11), and even the Levites, though not holding land, were allowed cattle (Numbers 35:2, 3). When pasture failed, a mixture of various grains (called, Job 6:5, lylB; rendered "fodder" in the A.V., and, Isaiah 30:24, "provender;" compare the Roman farrago and *ocymum,* Pliny, 18:10 and 42) was used, as also ˆbT, "chopped straw" (Genesis 24:25; Isaiah 11:7; 65:25), which was torn in pieces by the threshing-machine, and used probably for feeding in stalls. These last formed an important adjunct to cattle keeping, being indispensable for shelter at certain seasons (Exodus 9:6, 19). The herd, after its harvest duty was done, which probably caused it to be in high condition, was especially worth caring for; at the same time, most open pastures would have failed because of the heat. It was then probably stalled, and would continue so until vegetation returned. Hence the failure of "the herd" from "the stalls" is mentioned as a feature of scarcity (Habakkuk 3:17). "Calves of the stall" (Malachi 4:2; Proverbs 15:17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle "in cities" when they passed the Jordan to share the toils of conquest (Deuteronomy 3:19), i.e. probably in some pastures closely adjoining, like the "suburbs" appointed for the cattle of the Levites (Numbers 35:2, 3; Joshua 21:2). Cattle were ordinarily allowed as a prey in war to the captor (Deuteronomy 20:14; Joshua 8:2), and the case of Amalek is

exceptional, probably to mark the extreme curse to which that people was devoted (<12714>Exodus 17:14; <09153>1 Samuel 15:3). The occupation of herdsman was honorable in early times (<01406>Genesis 47:6; <09105>1 Samuel 11:5; <13729>1 Chronicles 27:29; 28:1). Saul himself resumed it in the interval of his cares as king; also Doeg was certainly high in his confidence (<09207>1 Samuel 21:7). Pharaoh made some of Joseph's brethren "rulers over his cattle." David's herd-masters were among his chief officers of state. In Solomon's time the relative importance of the pursuit declined as commerce grew, but it was still extensive (<21007>Ecclesiastes 2:7; <11023>1 Kings 4:23). It must have greatly suffered from the inroads of the enemies to which the country under the later kings of Judah and Israel was exposed. Uzziah, however (<14460>2 Chronicles 26:10), and Hezekiah (32:28, 29), resuming command of the open country, revived it. Josiah also seems to have been rich in herds (35:7-9). The prophet Amos at first followed this occupation (<30101>Amos 1:1; 7:14). A goad was used (<07031>Judges 3:31; <09121>1 Samuel 13:21, dm;l]mi ^b;r]D), being, as mostly, a staff armed with a spike. For the word Herd as applied to swine, *SEE SWINE*. On the general subject, Ugolini, 39: *De Re Rust. vett. Hebr.* c. 2, will be found nearly exhaustive. *SEE CATTLE*.

Herder, Johann Gottfried von

one of the most variously gifted of German writers, was born August 25, 1744, at Mohrungen, in East Prussia, where his father kept a little girls' school. His early training was strict and religious. A preacher named Trescho taught him Greek and Latin; and the pastor's books of theology were devoured by the young student. A complaint in the eyes brought him under the notice of a Russian surgeon, who offered to instruct him in surgery gratis. Herder accepted the offer, but at Konigsberg fainted at the first dissection which he attended, and thereupon resolved to study theology. He gained the acquaintance of persons who appreciated him, and procured him a place as instructor in the Frederick's College at Konigsberg. Here he became intimate with Kant and Hamann, who greatly influenced the development of his mind. With the most indefatigable industry he studied philosophy, natural science, history, and languages, and in 1764 became assistant at the cathedral school at Riga, to which office that also of preacher was attached. Here he laid the foundations of his great celebrity as a pulpit orator. Some literary disputes disgusted him, and he went to France, and was there chosen by the prince of Holstein-

Oldenburg as his traveling companion. He would have gone from France to Italy had he not been arrested by the complaint in his eyes at Strasbourg, where he first became acquainted with Gothe. In 1776 he was called to Weimar as court preacher, and in that little capital, then celebrated as the Athens of Germany, he spent the remainder of his life, respected as a preacher and as an active promoter of education and other public improvements, and laboring unweariedly in his multifarious literary pursuits. He died Dec. 18, 1803. Herder's literary activity was enormous. There is hardly a field of literature which he left unexplored. His collected writings amount to sixty volumes *(Sämmtliche Werke*, Stuttgardt, 1827-30, 60 vols. 18mo; also 45 vols. 8vo, edited by Heyne and Miller. Tübingen, 1805-1820). They may be divided into four classes-History, Belles-Lettres, Philosophy, and Theology. In philosophy, Herder was rather an observer than a metaphysician. His reputation in that field rests chiefly on his *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit* (4th ed. Leips. 1841, 2 vols.), translated into English by Churchill, under the title *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (2nd edit. London, 1803, 2 vol. 8vo) As a theologian, Herder is noted not for science or system so much as for his freedom of thought and his genial spirit. In some respects he was the precursor of Schleiermacher, and his rationalism, though low enough, was of a totally different school from that of Semler, Paulus, and the neologists generally. He sought especially to render *Biblical studies* more profitable by making them more free, and by investing them with a human and scientific interest. In his work on the *Geist der ebrdischen Poesie* (1782; translated by Dr. Marsh, of Vermont, under the title *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, 1833, 2 vols. 12mo), he dwelt especially on the aesthetical and human side of the Bible, which, in his' view, instead of weakening its claims to divine authority, greatly strengthens them. He was the first to show critically the poetical beauties of the Bible, which he did not consider as mere ornaments, but rather as being grounded in the inner nature of the revelation, and not to be separated from a correct view of the inspiration of the contents of the O.T. Though others, Lowth for instance, had already treated this subject of the poetry of the Hebrews, none had seen so deeply into its nature, or shown so plainly the true spirit which pervaded it. By this poetical consideration of the O.T. history, and of the series of religious precepts based on this history, he rid the Bible from the mistakes of such interpreters as Michaelis and others. His *älteste Urkunde d. Menschengeschlechts, eine nach Jahrhunderten enthüllte heilige Schrift*, which appeared in 1774, revolutionized the system of O.T. exegesis by attempting to treat the

history of creation (Genesis 1) from a different standpoint from the one which generally prevailed. In his *Erlaüterungen z. A. T. aus einer neu eröfneten morgenländischen Quelle* (the. Zend Avesta), which he published in 1775, he also endeavored to render the exegesis of the N.T. more accurate and profound, by showing the influence of Parseeism on the Hebrew and, incidentally, on the Christian mode of thought. He worked especially on the books of James and Jude, under the title *of Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon* (1775), and on the Apocalypse in *Das Buch v. der Zukunft des Herrn* (Riga, 1779). In the former work he considers James and Jude as the real brothers of the Lord according to the flesh, while in the second he maintains that the predictions of the Apocalypse were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. Herder also wrote on various points of the history of the New-Testament revelation and of Biblical dogmatics, especially in his *Christliche Schriften.* In these he treats of the gift of tongues on the first Christian Pentecost; of the resurrection as a point of faith, history, and dogma; of the Redeemer as presented in the three gospels; of the Son of God, the Savior of the world; of the spirit of Christianity; of religion, doctrinal meanings, usages, etc. “One of the chief services of Herder to Christianity was his persistent labor to elevate the pastoral office to its original and proper dignity. He held that the pastor of the church should not be solely a learned critic, but the minister of the common people. In his day the pastor was considered the mere instrument of the state, a sort of theological policeman — a degradation which Herder could hardly permit himself to think of without violent indignation. In his *Letters on the Study of Theology*, published in 1780, and in subsequent smaller works, he sought to evoke a generation of theologians, who, being imbued with his own ideas of humanity, would betake themselves to the edification of the humble mind. He would eject scholasticism from the study of the Bible, and show to his readers that simplicity of inquiry is the safest way to happy results. He would place the modern pastor, both in his relations to the cause of humanity and in the respect awarded him by the world, close beside the patriarch and prophet of other days; and that man, in his opinion, was not worthy the name of pastor who could neglect the individual requirements of the soul. According to Herder, the theologian should be trained from childhood in the knowledge of the Bible and of practical religion. Youth should have ever before them the example of pious parents, who were bringing them up with a profound conviction of the doctrines of divine truth. To choose theology for a profession from mercenary aims would preclude all possibility of: pastoral usefulness. ‘Let

prayer and reading the Bible be your morning and evening food,' was his advice to a young preacher. Some of the most eloquent words from his pen were written against the customary moral preaching which so much afflicted him. 'Why don't you come down from your pulpits,' he asks, 'for they cannot be of any advantage to you in preaching such things? What is the use of all these Gothic churches, altars, and such matters? No, indeed! Religion, true religion, must return to the exercise of its original functions, or a preacher will become the most indefinite, idle, and indifferent thing on earth. Teachers of religion, true servants of God's word, what have you to do in our century? The harvest is plenteous, but 'the laborers are few; pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send out laborers who will be something more than bare teachers of wisdom and virtue. More than this, help yourselves!' The counsel given by Herder to others was practiced first by himself. He lived among critical minds, who spurned humble pastoral work, but he felt it his duty, and therefore discharged it to the best of his ability. His preaching was richly lucid, and not directed to the most intelligent portion of his auditors. He took up a plain truth and strove to make it plainer. Yet, while the masses were most benefited by his simplicity of pulpit conversation, those gifted men who thought with him arose from their seats profoundly impressed with the dignity and value of the Gospel. A witty writer of the time, Sturz, gives an account of Herder's preaching that throws some light upon the manner in which the plain, earnest exposition of God's word always affected the indifferent auditor. 'You should have seen,' says this man, 'how every rustling sound was hushed and each curious glance was chained upon him in a very few minutes. We were as still as a Moravian congregation. All hearts opened themselves spontaneously; every eye hung upon him and wept unwonted tears; deep sighs escaped from every breast. My dear friend, nobody preaches like him' (Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, ch. vii). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 5, 747; *Erinnerungen aus d. Leben Hersder's* (Tübingen, 1820, 8vo); Quinet, *Ideen* z. *Gesch.* (Par. 1834); E.G. Herder, *Herder's Character bild* (Erlang. 1846, 6 vols.); article by Bancroft, *North American Review,* July, 1836, p. 216; Menzel, *German Literature* (American translation, ii, 419); review of Marsh's translation, *Christian Examiner, 18:*167; Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries,* translated by Hurst, vol. 2, lectures 1-5.

(prop. r qéB, a tender of oxen; in distinction from h [ér, a feeder of sheep; but practically the two occupations were generally united). From the earliest times the Hebrews were a pastoral people. Abraham and his sons were masters of herds and flocks, and were regulated in their movements very much by a regard to the necessities of their cattle, in which their wealth almost entirely consisted. In Egypt the Israelites were known as keepers of cattle. When they left Egypt, they, notwithstanding the oppressions to which they had been subjected, took with them "flocks and herds" (<scripRef passage="Exodus 12:38" />Exodus 12:38); and though during their wanderings in the wilderness their stock was in all probability greatly reduced, before they entered Canaan they had so replenished it by their conquests in the pastoral regions beyond Jordan that they took with them a goodly number of animals wherewith to begin their new life in the land that had been promised them. Of that land large tracts were suited for pasturage; certain of the tribes were almost exclusively devoted to pastoral occupations; and traces of a nomadic life among other tribes than those settled on the east of the Jordan are found even as late as the time of the monarchy (compare <scripRef passage="1 Chronicles 4:38-43" />1 Chronicles 4:38-43) the pastoral life has always had a charm for the Shemitic peoples; and among them, as well as among other nations, it has always been held in honor. In the open and spacious fields bordering on the Jordan and in the hill-country of Palestine it is a life of comparative ease and of great independence even in the present day; men possessed of flocks and herds become quietly and gradually rich without any severe exertion or anxiety; and but for feuds among themselves, the oppression of superiors, and the predatory tendency of their less respectable neighbors, their life might flow on in an almost unbroken tranquility. The wealth of sheiks and emirs is measured chiefly by the number of their flocks and herds; and men who would count it an intolerable indignity to be constrained to engage in any handicraft occupation, or even in mercantile adventure, fulfill with pride and satisfaction the duties which their pastoral life imposes upon them. It was the same in ancient times. Job's substance consisted chiefly of cattle, his wealth in which made him the greatest of all the men of the East (1:3). The first two kings of Israel, Saul and David, came from "following the herd" to ascend the throne (1 Samuel 9; 11:5; <scripRef passage="Psalm 78:70" />Psalm 78:70). Men very great," like Nabal, derived their riches from their flocks, and themselves superintended the operations connected with the care of them (<scripRef passage="1 Samuel 25:2" />1 Samuel 25:2 sq.). Absalom, the prince of Israel, had a sheep-farm,

and personally occupied himself with its duties (2 Samuel 13:23). Mesha, king of Moab, was "*a* sheepmaster" (dqwn, 2 Kings 3:4). The daughters of chiefs and wealthy proprietors did not think it beneath them to tend the flocks and herds of their family (Genesis 29:9 [comp. 24:15, 19]; Exodus 2:16; comp. Homer, *II. 6*, 423; *Odys. 12*, 121; 13, 221; Varro, *De Re Rust. 2*, 1). The proudest title of the kings of Israel was that of shepherds of the people (Jeremiah 23:4; Ezekiel 34:2, etc.; comp. ποιμένες λᾶῶν in Homer and Hesiod, *passim*, and Plato, *De Rep. 4:*15, p. 440, D.), and God himself condescended to be addressed as the Shepherd of Israel (Psalm 80:1), and was trusted in by his pious servants as their shepherd (Psalm 23:1). In later times the title of shepherd was given to the teachers and leaders of the synagogues, who were called µysæ[Pi (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews in Matthew 4:*23); but this was unknown to the times before Christ.

By the wealthier proprietors their flocks and herds were placed under the charge of servants, who bore the designation of hnqmæy[æ, y[ep, y[ep rmwe, or ydæbo These were sometimes armed with weapons, to protect themselves and their charge from robbers or wild beasts; though, if we may judge from the case of David, their furniture in this respect was of the simplest description. Usually they carried with them a staff (lQæifbv) furnished with a crook, which might be used for catching an animal by the foot; those who had the charge of oxen carried with them a sharper instrument (Judges 3:31; 1 Samuel 13:21). *SEE GOAD*. They had also a wallet or small bag (fWqlyi, πῆρα) in which to carry provisions, ammunition, or any easily portable article (1 Samuel 17:40, 43; Psalm 23:4; Micah 7:14; Matthew 10:10; Luke 9:3, 10). Their dress consisted principally of a cloak or mantle (the *burnuis* of the modern Arabs) in which they could wrap the entire body (Jeremiah 43:12). For food they were obliged to be contented with the plainest fare, and often were reduced to the last extremities (Amos 7:14; Luke 15:15). Their wages consisted of a portion of the produce, especially of the milk of the flock (Genesis 30:32 sq.; 1 Corinthians 9:7). That they cultivated music is not unlikely, though it hardly follows from 1 Samuel 16:18, for David's case may have been exceptional; in all countries and times, however, music has been associated with the pastoral life. When the servants belonging to one master existed in any number, they were placed under a chief (hnqmæci, Genesis 47:6; ἀρχιποιμήν, 1 Peter 5:4);

and under the monarchy there was a royal officer who bore the title of µy[æb;ryBai, "chief of the herdsmen" (<09207>1 Samuel 21:7; compare <13729>1 Chronicles 27:29, and "magister regii pecoris," *Livy*, 1, 4).

Picture for Herdman

The animals placed under the care of these herdsmen were chiefly sheep and goats; but besides these there were also neat cattle, asses, camels, and in later times swine. It would seem that the keeping of the animals last named was the lowest grade in the pastoral life (<42515>Luke 15:15); and probably the keeping of sheep and goats was held to be the highest, as that of horses is among the Arabs in the present day (Niebuhr, *Arabie*, 1, 226). The herdsman led his charge into the open pasture-land, where they could freely roam and find abundant supply of food; the neat cattle were conducted to the richer pastures, such as those of Bashan, while the sheep, goats, and camels found sufficient sustenance from the scantier herbage of the more rocky and arid parts of Palestine, provided there was a supply of water. While in the fields the herdsmen lived in tents (t/nK]v]mæ <22108>Song of Solomon 1:8; <23812>Isaiah 38:12; <24608>Jeremiah 6:3), and there were folds (t/rdeG; <04216>Numbers 32:16; <10708>2 Samuel 7:8; <36206>Zephaniah 2:6), and apparently in some cases tents (µylæa,h', <14445>2 Chronicles 14:15) for the cattle. Watch-towers were also erected, whence the shepherd could descry any coming danger to his charge; and vigilance in this respect was one of the shepherd's chief virtues (<33048>Micah 4:8; <34818>Nahum 3:18; <42008>Luke 2:8). If any of the cattle wandered he was bound to follow them, and leave no means untried to recover them (<26342>Ezekiel 34:12; <42505>Luke 15:5); and harsh masters were apt to require at their servants' hands any loss they might have sustained, either by the wandering of the cattle or the ravages of wild beasts (<01308>Genesis 31:38 sq.), a tendency on which a partial check was placed by the law, that if it was torn by beasts, and the pieces could be produced, the person in whose charge it was should not be required to make restitution (<02213>Exodus 22:13; comp. <30312>Amos 3:12). To assist them in both watching and defending the flocks, and in recovering any that had strayed, shepherds had dogs (<18001>Job 30:1), as have the modern Arabs; not, however, "like those in other lands, fine, faithful fellows, the friend and companion of their masters but a mean, sinister, ill-conditioned generation, kept at a distance, kicked about, and half starved, with nothing noble or attractive about them" (Thomson, *Land and Book,* 1, 301), a description which fully suits Job's disparaging comparison. The flocks and herds were

regularly counted (<032732>Leviticus 27:32; <243313>Jeremiah 33:13), as in Egypt (Wilkinson, 2, 177).

The pastures to which the herdsmen conducted their flocks were called t/xWj *the places without, the country, the desert* (<183850>Job 5:10; 18:17; <202126>Proverbs 8:26; compare ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμος, <410145>Mark 1:45); also t/an] (<242537>Jeremiah 25:37; <300102>Amos 1:2), rBn]dmaeBn (<196513>Psalm 65:13; <240909>Jeremiah 9:9, etc.), hwn;(<090708>1 Samuel 7:8; <281213>Hosea 9:13, etc.), rBn]dmae(<196513>Psalm 65:13; <234211>Isaiah 42:11; <242310>Jeremiah 23:10; <290122>Joel 2:22, etc.). In summer the modern nomads seek the northern and more hilly regions, in winter they betake themselves to the south and to the plain country (D'Arvieux, 3:315; 5, 428); and probably the same usage prevailed among the Hebrews. In leading out the flocks the shepherd went before them, and they followed him obedient to his call; a practice from which our Savior draws a touching illustration of the intimate relation between him and his people (<431004>John 10:4). The young and the sickly of the flock the shepherd would take in his arms and carry, and he was careful to adapt the rate of advance to the condition and capacity of the feebler or burdened portion of his charge, a practice which again gives occasion for a beautiful illustration of God's care for his people (<234011>Isaiah 40:11; comp. <013313>Genesis 33:13). These usages still prevail in Palestine, and have often been described by travelers; one of the most graphic descriptions is that given by Mr. Thomson *(Land and Book,* 1, 301 sq.; compare Wilson. *Lands of the Bible,* 2, 322). As the Jews advanced in commercial wealth the office of shepherd diminished in importance and dignity. Among the later Jews the shepherd of a small flock was precluded from bearing witness, on the ground that, as such fed their flocks on the pastures of others, they were infected with dishonesty (Maimon. *in Denui,* 2. 3). *SEE SHEPHERD*.