THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Heres - Holden, Henry

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

He’res

part of the name of two places, different in the Hebrew. *SEE KIR-HERES*; *SEE TIMNATH-HERES*.

1. HAR-CHARES (ס ר ֶ ח ַ ה *mountain of* the *sun;* Sept. τρος τὸ ὀσρακώδης,*Vulg. mons Hares, quod interpretatur testateceues,* i.e. of tiles; Auth. Vers. “mount Heres”), a city (in the valley, according to the text, but in a part of Mt. Ephraim, according to the name) of Dan, near Aijalon, of which the Amorites retained possession (Judges 1:35). It was probably situated on some eminence bordering the present Merj Ibn-Omeir on the east, possibly near the site of Emmaus or Nicopolis. We may even hazard the conjecture that it was identical with Mt. Jearim (q.d. Ir-Shemesh, i.e. sun-city), i.e. Chesalon (q.v.).

2. IR HA-HIERE (ס ר ֵ ה ִ ר ִ י [ע *city of destruction;* Sept. πόλις ἀσεδεκ v.r. αχερὲς*;* Vulg. *civitas solis,* evidently reading ס ר ֶ ח ִ ר ִ י [ע *city of the sun),* a name that occurs only in the disputed passage Isaiah 19:18, where most MSS. and editions, as also the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, the Syriac, and the English, read, one (of these five cities) *shall be called The city of destruction, i.e.* in the idiom of Isaiah, *one of these cities shall be destroyed,* a signification (from ס ר ח; to *tear* down) for which Iken *(Dissert. phil. crit.* 16) contends. The Jews of Palestine, who approved this reading, referred it to Leontopolis and its temple, which they abhorred, and the destruction of which they supposed to be here predicted. But instead of ס ר ח,*her, heres,* the more probable reading is ס ר ֶ ח **,** *cheres,* which is read in sixteen MSS. and some editions, and is expressed by the Sept. (Complut.), Symmachus, Vulgate, Saadias, and the margin of the English version, and has also the testimony of the Talmudists *(Menachoth,* fol. 11.0, A.). If we follow the certain and ascertained usus loquendi, this latter denotes *city of the sun,* i.e. *Helieopolis* in Egypt, elsewhere called *Beth-Shemnesh,* and *On* The Arabic meaning of the term is *to defend, to preserve,* and the passage may be rendered, *one shall be called A city preserved,* i.e. one of those five cities shall be preserved. (See Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.) Whichever interpretation may be chosen, this reading is to be preferred to the other. *SEE IR-HA-IEETRES*.

He’resh

(Heb. *Che’resh,* v r ,j , *silence;* Sept. Ἀρές), one of the Levites that dwelt in the “villages of the Netophathites” near Jerusalem. on the return from Babylon (1 Chronicles 9:15). B.C. 536.

Heresiarch

a leader in heresy, founder of a sect of heretics. *SEE HERESY*.

Heresy

in theology, is any doctrine containing Christian elements, but along with them others subversive of Christian truth.

I. *Origin and early Use of the Word.* — The word *a7peatO (heresis)* originally meant simply *choice* (e.g. of a set of opinions); later, it was applied to the *opinions* themselves; last of all, to the *sect* maintaining them. “Philosophy was in Greece the great object which divided the opinions and judgments of men; and hence the term heresy, being most frequently applied to the adoption of this or that particular dogma, came by an easy transition to signify the sect or school in which that dogma was maintained;” e.g. the heresy of the Stoics, of the Peripatetics, and Epicureans. Josephus also speaks of the three *heresies* (αἱρέσεις, *sects, Ant. 12* 5, 9 =φιλοσοφίαι, *18,* 1, 2) of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. In the historical part of the New Testament, the word denotes a sect or party, whether good or bad (Acts 5:17; 15:5; 24:5; 26:5; 28:22). In Acts 26:4, 5, St. Paul, in defending himself before king Agrippa, uses the same term, when it was manifestly his design to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals. In the Epistles the word occurs in a somewhat different sense. Paul, in Galatians 5:20, puts αἱρέσεις, *heresies,* in the list of crimes with uncleanness, seditions *(διχοστασίαι),* etc. In 1 Corinthians 11:19 (there must also be *heresies* among you), he uses it apparently to denote schisms or divisions in the Church. In Titus 3:10 he comes near to the later sense; the “heretical person” appears to be one given over to a self-chosen and divergent form of belief and practice. John Wesley says: “Heresy is not in all the Bible taken for ‘an error in fundamentals’ or in any thing else, nor schism for any separation made from the outward communion of others. Both heresy and schism, in the

modern sense of the words, are sins that the Scripture knows nothing of" *(Works,* N. Y. edit. 7, 286). In the early post-apostolic Church, if "a man admitted a part, or even the whole of Christianity, and added to it something of his own, or if he rejected the whole of it, he was equally designated as a heretic. Thus, by degrees, it came to be restricted to those who professed Christianity, but professed it erroneously; and in later times, the doctrine of the Trinity, as defined by the Council of Nice, was almost the only test which decided the orthodoxy or the heresy of a Christian. Differences upon minor points were then described by the milder term of *schism;* and the distinction seems to have been made, that unity of faith might be maintained, though schism existed; but if the unity of faith was violated, the violator of it was a heretic." In general, in the early Church, all who did not hold what was called the Catholic faith (the *orthodox)* were called *heretics.* At a very early period the notion of willful and immoral perversity began to be attached to heresy, and thus we may account for the severe and violent language used against heretics. "Charges, indeed, or insinuations of the grossest impurities are sometimes thrown out by the orthodox writers against the early heretics; but we are bound to receive them with great caution, because the answers which may have been given to them are lost, and because they are not generally justified by any authentic records which we possess respecting the lives of those heretics. The truth appears to be this, that some flagrant immoralities were notoriously perpetrated by some of the wildest among their sects, and that these have given coloring to the charges which have been thrown upon them too indiscriminately. But, whatsoever uncertainty may rest on this inquiry, it cannot be disputed, first, that the apostolical fathers, following the footsteps of the apostles themselves, regarded with great jealousy the birth and growth of erroneous opinions; and next, that they did not authorize, either by instruction or example, any severity on the *persons* of those in error. They opposed it by their reasoning and their eloquence, and they avoided its contagion by removing from their communion those who persisted in it; but they were also mindful that within these limits was confined the power which the Church received from the apostles who founded it over the spiritual disobedience of its members" (Waddington, *History of the Church,* ch. 5, p. 59).

II. *Relations of Heresy to the Church and to Doctrine.* — "Heresies, like sin, all spring from the natural man; but they first make their appearance in opposition to the revealed truth, and thus presuppose its existence, as the

fall of Adam implies a previous state of innocence. There are religious errors, indeed, to any extent out of Christianity, but no heresies in the theological sense. These errors become heresies only when they come into contact, at least outwardly, with revealed truth and with the life of the Church. They consist essentially in the conscious or unconscious reaction of unsubdued Judaism or heathenism against the new creation of the Gospel. Heresy is the distortion or caricature of the original Christian truth. But as God in his wonderful wisdom can bring good out of all evil, and has more than compensated for the loss of the first Adam by the resurrection of the second, so must all heresies in the end only condemn themselves, and serve the more fully to establish the truth. The New Testament Scriptures themselves are in a great measure the result of a firm resistance to the distortions and corruptions to which the Christian religion was exposed from the first. Nay, we may say that every dogma of the Church, every doctrine fixed by her symbols, is a victory over a corresponding error, and in a certain sense owes to the error, not, indeed, its substance, which comes from God, but assuredly its logical completeness and scientific form. Heresies, therefore, belong to the process by which the Christian truth, received in simple faith, becomes clearly defined as an object of knowledge. They are the negative occasions, the challenges, for the Church to defend her views of truth, and to set them forth in complete scientific form" (Schaff, *Apostolic Church, §* 165).

Heresy and Schism. — Near akin to heresy is the idea of *schism* or Church division, which, however, primarily means a separation from the government and discipline of the Church, and does not necessarily include departure from her orthodoxy… Thus the Ebionites, Gnostics, and Arians were heretics; the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, schismatics. By the standard of the Roman Church, the Greek Church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. Of course, in different branches of-the Church…there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, and likewise of schism and sect" (Schaff. *Apost. Church, §* 165). "Heresy, as distinguished from schism, consists in the adoption of opinions and practices contrary to the articles and practices of any particular church, whereas schism is secession from that church, the renouncing allegiance to its government, or forming parties within it; for surely Paul (in 1 Corinthians and elsewhere) censures men as causing divisions who did not openly renounce allegianice. Neither schism nor heresy, then, is properly an offence against the Church universal, but

against some particular Church, and by its own members. On the same principle, no Church can be properly called either heretic or schismatic; for churches being independent establishments, may indeed consult each other, but if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is neither schism nor heresy, but corrupt faith or bigoted narrowness. Accordingly, our Reformers, whilst they characterize the Romish Church as one that has *erred*, have very properly avoided the misapplication of the terms 'schismatic' and 'heretic' to it. Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a schismatic and a heretic because of his former connection; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the schism was founded in *error*, the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members, but not that of schism or heresy. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede; but, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing his country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously weighed; but with respect to distinct churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime. So far from the separation between the Romish and Protestant churches having anything of the character of schism or heresy in it, the Church of England (supposing the Church of Rome not to have needed any reform) would have been justified in renouncing its association with it simply on the ground of expediency" (Hinds, *Early Christian Church).*

III. *List of the principal Early Heresies.* — Following list includes the chief heresies of the first six centuries; each will be found in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia: *Century I.* Nazarenes, who advocated the observance of the Jewish law by the worshippers of Christ. Simonians, followers of Simon Magus, who prided themselves in a superior degree of knowledge, and maintained that the world was created by angels, denied the resurrection, etc. Nicolaitanes, followers of Nicolaus of Antioch. Cerinthians and Ebionites, followers of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, and adopted the principles of Gnosticism. Many of them were Millenarians. *Century I.* Elcesaites, the followers of Elxai or Elcesai, who only partially admitted the Christian religion, and whose tenets were mostly of philosophic origin. Gnostics, so called from their

pretences to γνῶσις, superior knowledge: this seems to have been the general name of all heretics.

(1.) Among *Syrian* Gnostics were the followers of Saturninus, who adopted the notion of two principles reigning over the world, assumed the evil nature of matter, denied the reality of Christ's human body, etc. Bardesanians: their principles resembled those of Saturninus. Tatianists and Encratitae, who boasted of an extraordinary continence, condemned marriage, etc. Apotactici, who, in addition to the opinions of the Tatianists, renounced property, etc., and asserted that any who lived in the marriage state were incapable of salvation.

(2.) Gnostics of *Asia Minor*. — Cerdonians, who held two contrary principles, denied the resurrection, despised the authority of the Old Testament, and rejected the Gospels. Marcionites, who resembled the Cerdonians, and in addition admitted two Gods, asserted that the Savior's body was a phantasm, etc. The followers of Lucian and Apelles may be classed among the Marcionites.

(3.) Among E*gyptian* Gnostics were the Basilidians, followers of Basilides, who espoused the heresies of Simon Magus, and admitted the fundamental point on which the whole of the hypotheses then prevalent may be said to hinge, namely, that the world had been created, not by the immediate operation of the divine being, but by the agency of sons. Carpocratians, Antitactae, Adamites, Prodicians, the followers of Secundus, Ptolemy, Marcus, Colobarsus, and Heracleon.

(4.) *Inferior* sects of Gnostics-Sethians, Cainites, Ophites.

Heresies not of Oriental origin: Patripassians, whose principal leader was Praxeas; Melchizedechians, under Theodotus and Artemon; Hermogenians, Montanists, Chiliasts or Millenarians. *Century II.* The Manichaeans, the Hieracites, the Patripassians, under Noetus and Sabellius; heresy of Baryllus; Paulianists, under Paul of Samosata, Novatians, under Novatus and Novatian;. the Monarchici, the Arabici, the Aquarians, the Origenists. *Century IV.* Tha Arians, Colluthians, Macedonians, Agnolete, Apollinarians, Collyridians, Seleucians, Anthropomorphites, Jovinianists, Messalians, Timothe ans, Priscillianists, Photinians, Donatists, Messalians, Bonlosians. *Century V.* The Pelagians Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopaschites. *Century VI.* The Aphthartodocetse, Severiani, C:)rrupticohe, Monothelites.

IV. *Punishment of Heresy.* — Soon after the triumph of Christianity over paganism, and its establishment by the State, the laws became very severe against heretics. Those of the *State,* made by the Christian emperors from the time of Constantine, are comprised under one title, *De Haereticis,* in the Theodosian code. (See below.) The principal are the note of infamy affixed to all heretics in common; commerce forbidden to be held with them; privation of all offices of dignity and profit; disqualification to dispose of their property by will, or to receive property; pecuniary mulcts; proscription and banishment; corporal punishment, such as scourging. Heretics were forbidden to hold public disputations; to propagate their opinions; their children could not inherit patrimony, unless they returned to the Church, etc. The laws of the *Church* consisted in pronouncing formal *anathema,* or excommunication, against them; forbidding them to enter the church, so much as to hear sermons or the reading of the Scriptures (this was but partially observed); the prohibition of all persons, under pain of excommunication, to join with them in any religious exercises; the enjoining that none should eat or converse familiarly with them, or contract affinity with them; their names were to be struck out of the diptychs; and their testimony was not to be received in any ecclesiastical cause (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* vol. 2). Augustine's view of heresy is deserving of special notice, as it forms the basis of the doctrine and practice of the Middle Ages. *In De Civit. Dei, 18,* 51, he says; "Qui ergo in ecclesia morbidum aliquid pravumque sapiunt, *si correpti,* ut sanum rectumque sapiant, *resistunt contumaciter,* suaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed *defensa repersistunt, heretici funt,* et foras exeuntes *habentur in exercentibus inimicis."* The earlier fathers of the Church had steadily refused using force in opposing heresy (Hilarius, *Pictav. ad Constant.* 1, 2 and 7; *contr. Auxent.* lib. init.; Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* § 33), and at most permitted the secular powers to interfere to prevent the organization of heretical communities (Chrysost. *Homil.* 29, 46, *in Matthew),* and even this was often censured (see Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 5. 19, where it is said that the misfortunes which befell Chrysostom were by many considered as a punishment for his having caused churches belonging to the Quartodecimani and Novatians of Asia to be taken away from them and closed). Augustine, on the contrary *(Retractat.* 2, c. 5; ep. 93, *ad Vincentiuum,* § 17; ep. 185, *ad Bonifitc.* § 21; *Opus. inper:* 2, 2), basing himself on the passage Luke 14:23 *(cogite intrare,* etc.), completely reversed his former opinion that heretics and schismatics were not to be brought back by the aid of secular power, and stated explicitly, as a

fundamental principle, that *"damnata haeresis ab episcopis non adhuc examimanda, sed coercenda est potestatibus Christianis.'* He only rejects the infliction of capital punishment, yet more on account of the general opposition of the ancient Church to this mode of punishment than from leniency towards heresy. It is, consequently, not strange if even this protest against the execution of heretics came subsequently to be disregarded, and the punishment even approved (see Leo M. *ep.* 15, *ad Turribium;* Hieronymus, *ep.* 37, *ad Bipar.).* In the Middle Ages we find the Roman Church, on the: one hand, condemning capital punishment by its canon law, and at the same time demanding the application of this punishment to heretics from the secular law. Julian the Apostate had long before reproached the Christians of his time for persecuting heretics by force (ep. 52, and *alp. Cyrill. c. Julianumm VI).* As to the principles which guided the conduct of the secular powers towards heretics, we find that it wavered long between an entire liberty in establishing sects, submitting them to mere police regulations, restricting them in the carrying out of their system of worship, depriving them of some political rights and privileges, formally prohibiting them; and finally punishing them as criminals. Through all these variations the fundamental principle was adhered to that the secular power possesses in general the right to punish, repress, or extirpate heresy. Hesitation is shown only in the mode of applying this principle, not in the principle itself. Moreover, the exercise of this right was in no way subject to the decision of the Church, and the secular power could by itself decide whether and how far a certain heresy should be tolerated-a right which the states retained without opposition until the Middle Ages. The numerous laws contained in the *Codex Theodosianus, 16,* tit. 5, *De Haereticis,* to which we may add 16, tit. 1, 2, 3, are the principal sources for the history of the laws concerning sects in antiquity. History shows us that in the use of compulsion and punishments against heretics the secular power anticipated the wishes of the Church, doing more than the latter was at first disposed to approve. Julian the Apostate granted full freedom to heretics with a view to injure the Church. Augustine first succeeded, in the 5th century, in establishing an agreement between Church and State on this question, yet without contesting the right of the State to use its independent authority. This is proved by Justinian's *Institutes* (compare cod. 1, tit. 5), which interfere directly with the private rights of heretics; and in case of mixed marriages, they order, regardless of the *patrial potestas,* that the children shall be brought up in the orthodox faith (cod. 1, tit. 5; 1, 18).

In the Middle Ages the notion of heresy and of its relations to the Church and the State acquired a further development. At one time, in view of the authority of the pope in matters of faith and of the doctrine *offides implicita et explicita,* the notion of heresy was so modified that the act of disobedience to the pope in refusing to accept or reject some distinction according to his command; was considered almost as its worst and most important feature. The Scholastics treated the doctrine concerning heresy-scientifically. Finally the Church came to deny to the State the right to tolerate *any* heresy it had condemned. It even compelled the secular powers to repress and extirpate heresy according to its dictates by threats of ecclesiastical censure, by inviting invasion and revolution in case of resistance, and by commanding the application of secular punishments, such as the sequestration of property, and the deprivation of all civil and political rights, as was especially done by Innocent III. Nevertheless, the Church continued in the practice, whenever it handed over condemned heretics to the secular powers for punishment, of requesting that no penalty should be inflicted on them which might endanger their lives; but this was a mere formality, and so far from being made in earnest that the Church itself made the allowableness of such punishment one of its dogmas. Thus Leo X, in his bull against Luther, in 1520, condemns, among other propositions, that which says that *Haereticos comburere est contra voluntatem Spiritus* (art. 33), and recommended the use of such punishment himself. About the same time, a special form of proceedings was adopted against heretics, and their persecution was rendered regular and systematic by the establishment of the *Inquisition* (q.v.). Thus, in course of time, a number of secular penalties came to be considered as inevitably connected with ecclesiastical condemnation, and were even pronounced against heretics by the Church itself without further formalities. The Church, whenever any individual suspected of heresy recanted, or made his peace with the Church, declared him (in full court, after a public abjuration) released either partially or fully from the ecclesiastical and secular punishment he had *ipso facto* incurred. This implied the right of still inflicting these punishments after the reconciliation (which was especially done in the cases of sequestration of property, deprivation of civil or ecclesiastical offices, and degradation, while a return to heresy after recantation was to be punished by death). See the provisions of the Canon Law as found in *X. de haeretic.* 5, tit. 7; c. 49; *X. de sentent. excommun.* 5 39; *tit. de Haer.* in 6, 5, 2; *De haeret.* in Clement. 5, 3; *De haeret.* in Extravag. comm. 5, 3; and comp. the *Liber septimus,* 5,

3, 4. and the laws against heretics of the emperor Frederick II, which are connected with the ecclesiastical laws (in Pertz, *Monurin.* 2, 244, 287, 288, 327, 328); and the regulations concerning mixed marriages and the marriage of heretics. All these are yet considered by the Roman Catholic Church as having the *force of law,* though, under present circumstances, they are not enforced (comp. Benedict XIV, *De synod. Dioc. 6,* 5; 9, 14, 3; 13, 24, 21).

Even in the 18th century Muratori defended the assertion that the secular power is bound to enforce the most severe secular penalties against heretics *(De ingeniorum meoderatione in religiones negotio,* 2, 7 sq.). In the beginning of the 19th century, pending the negotiations for the crowning of Napoleon I, pope Pius VII declared that he could not set foot in a country in which the law *recognized the freedom of worship of the different religions.* The same pope wrote in 1805 to his nuncio at Vienna, "The Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from using the properties of the Church, but has also established, as the punishment for the sin of heresy, the sequestration of private property, in c. 10, *X. d. haeret.* (5, 7), of principalities, and of feudal tenures, in c. 16, eod.; the latter law contains the canonical rule that the subjects of a heretical prince are free from all oaths of fealty as well as from all fidelity and obedience to him; and there is none at all acquainted with history but knows the decrees of deposition issued by popes and councils against obstinately heretical princes. Yet we find ourselves now in times of such misfortune and humiliation for the bride of Christ that *the Church is not only able to enforce these, ifs holiest maxims, against the rebellious enemies of the faith,* with the firmness with which they should be, but it even cannot proclaim them openly without danger. Yet, if it cannot exert its right in depriving heretics of their estates, it may," etc. With this may be compared the permission granted in anticipation, in 1724 (Bullar. *Propagande,* 2, 54, 56), to the Ruthenes, in case of conversion, to take possession of the properties they had lost by their apostasy; the satisfaction manifested by the Church on the expulsion of the Protestants from Salzburg (Bull. *Propag.* 2, 246); and many things happening every day in strictly Roman Catholic countries, under the eyes of the Roman See. Quite recently, Philippi, in his *Canon Law,* honestly acknowledged the validity of the old laws against heretics, and asserted their correctness. Even now, in all countries where the secular power has not put an end to this, the bishops promise, in taking the oath of obedience to the pope, *haereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles*

eidemn Domnino nostro vel successoribus praedictispro posse persequar et impugnabo. Yet the Roman See has renounced, since Sept. 17, 1824, the use of the expression of "Protestant heretics" in its official acts; and it has even admitted that, under the pressure of existing circumstances, the civil powers may be forgiven for tolerating heretics in their states! Still, as soon *as circumstances will permit,* the Roman See is prepared to apply again the old laws, which are merely temporarily suspended in some countries, but in nowise repealed.

Governments, however, naturally take a different view of these laws. The secular power, even while it freed itself from its absolute subjection to the Church, still continued to persecute in various ways the Protestants whom the Church denounced as heretics. We even see them deprived under Louis XIV of the right of emigration; while, in refusing to recognize the validity of their marriage, the civil authorities showed themselves even more severe than the Church. But, becoming wiser by experience, and taught by the general reaction which its measures provoked in the 18th century, the State has confined itself to interfering with heresy so far only as is necessary to promote public order and the material good of the State; thus claiming only the right to repress or expel those whose principles are opposed to the existence of government, or might create disorder. This right, of course, has been differently understood in different countries according to local circumstances, and has even become a pretence for persecutions against denominations which a milder construction of it would not have deprived of the toleration of the State, as in the persecution of dissidents in Sweden, etc.

Let us now compare this practice of the Romish Church and of Roman Catholic states with the dogmatic theory of the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas treats heresy as the opposite of faith, connecting it with *imfidelitas in communi* and *apostasia a fide.* He treats *schism,* again, as opposed to *charitas.* He defines heresy *as infidelitatis species pertinens ad eos, quifidem Christi profitentur, sed ejus dogmata corrunpunt* (1. c., qu. 2, art. 1), yet (art. 2) he remarks at the same time that some holy fathers themselves erred in the early times of the Church on many points of faith. In art. 3 he comes to the question whether heretics are to be tolerated. He asserts that they also have their use in the Church, as serving to prove its faith, and inducing it diligently to search the Scriptures, yet their usefulness in these respects is involuntary. Considered for themselves only, heretics "are not only deserving of being cut off from communion with the Church,

but also with the world by being put to death. But the Church must, in her mercy, first use all means of converting heretics, and only when it despairs of bringing them back must cut them off by excommunication, and then deliver them up to secular justice, which frees the world of them by condemnation to death." He only admits of toleration towards heretics when persecution against them would be likely to injure the faithful. In this case he advises sparing the tares for the sake of the wheat. He further maintains that such heretics as repent may, on their first offense, be entirely pardoned, and all ecclesiastical and secular punishment remitted, but asserts that those who relapse, though they may be reconciled with the Church, must not be released from the sentence of death incurred, lest the bad example of their inconstancy might prove injurious to others.

The Reformation protested against these doctrines. Luther, from the first, denounced all attempts to overcome heresy by sword and fire instead of the Word of God, and held that the civil power should leave heretics to be dealt with by the Church. On this ground he opposed Carlstadt. Yet it was a fundamental principle with all the Reformers, that governments are bound to prevent blasphemy, to see that the people receive from the Church built on the Word of God the pure teaching of that word, and to prevent all attempts at creating sects. This led to the adoption of preventive measures in the place of the former penalties of confiscation, bodily punishment, and death. These preventive measures confined the heresy to the individual, and extended as far as banishment, when no other means would avail. Luther admitted the use of secular punishment against heretics only in exceptional cases, and then not on account of the heresy, but of the resulting disorders. Even then he considered banishment sufficient, except when incitations to revolution, etc., required more severe punishment, as was the case with the Anabaptists; Vet he often declared against the application of capital punishment to such heretics. Zwingle took nearly the same stand as Luther on this point, yet was somewhat more inclined to the use of forcible means. The Anabaptists were treated in a summary manner in Switzerland. Calvin went further, and with his theocratic ideas considered the state as bound to treat heresy as blasphemy, and to punish it in the severest manner. His approbation and even instigation of the execution of Servetus gave rise to a controversy on the question whether heresy might be punished with the sword (compare Calvini *Defensis orthodoxae fidei*, etc.). Calvin's views were attacked not only by Bolsec, but also by Castellio, who, under the pseudonym of Martin Bellius, wrote on this occasion his *De hereticis*

(Magdeb. 1554), quoting against Calvin the opinions of Luther and of Brentius. Lalius Socinus, in his *Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum* (1554), also advocated toleration. Among all the German theologians, Melancthon alone sided with Calvin, consistently with the views *(Corp. Ref:* 2, 18, an. 1530; and 3:195, an. 1536) which he had long previously defended against the more moderate views of Brentius (see Hartmann and Jager, *Johanns Brem*, 1, 299 sq.).

In England, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, an act of Parliament was passed to enable persons to try heretics, and the following directions were given for their guidance: "And such persons to whom the queen shall by letters patent under the great seal give authority to execute any jurisdiction spiritual, shall not in any wise have power to adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or *by some of the first four general councils*, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be judged or determined to be heresy by, the high court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation." "This statute continued practically in force, with certain modifications, till the 29 Charles II, c. 9, since which time heresy has been left entirely to the cognizance of the ecclesiastical courts; but, as there is no statute defining in what heresy consists, and as, moreover, much of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts has been withdrawn by the various toleration acts; and, above all, as the effect of various recent decisions has been to widen almost indefinitely the construction of the doctrinal formularies of the English Church, it may now be said that the jurisdiction of these courts in matters of heresy is practically limited to preventing ministers of the Established Church from preaching in opposition to the doctrine and the articles of the establishment from which they derive their emoluments, and that, even in determining what is to be considered contrary to the articles, a large toleration has been judicially established. See the recent trial of Dr. Rowland Williams, and the judgment given by Dr. Lushington in the Court of Arches" (Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). The Protestant churches generally, in the 19th century, deny the power of the State to punish heresy. The Roman Church retains its old theories upon the subject, but its power is limited by the progress of civilization. *SEE TOLERATION*.

The *history* of the various heresies is given, with more or less fullness, in the Church histories. Walch's *Entweiner vollstdnd. Historie d. Ketzereien,* etc. (17621785, 11 vols.), gives a history of doctrines and heresies (so-called) up to the 9th century. "As a history of heresies, divisions, and religious controversies, it is still indispensable. Walch is free from polemic zeal, and bent upon the critical and pragmatic representation of his subject, without sympathy or antipathy" (Schaff, *Apost. History;* §31). See also Lardner, *History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries, with additions by Hogg* (Lond. 1780, 4to; and in Lardner, *Works,* 11 vols. 8vo); Füssli, *Kirchen-u. — Ketzerhistorien-d. mittlern Zeit* (Freft. 1770-1774, 3 vols.); Baumgarten. *Geschichte d. Religionsportheien* — (Halle, 1766, 4to). Professor Oehler commenced in 1856 the publication of a *Corpus Haeresiologicum,* designed to contain, in 8 vols., all the principal works on heresies, with notes and prolegomena. See also Burton, *Enquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age (Bampton Lecture for* 1829, 8vo); Campbell, *Preliminary Diss. to Comm. on Four Gospels;* Herzog, *Real Encyklopadie,* 5, 468; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism,* bk. 3:ch. 3:et al.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* p. 252, 480; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), 1, 344; Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Ryland's transl.), 1, 16. *SEE HAERETICO COIBURENDO*; *SEE PERSECUTION*; *SEE TOLERATION*.

Heretic

SEE HERESY.

Heretics, Baptism by

When the line between the orthodox and the heretics, *SEE HERESY*, was clearly drawn in the early Church, the question whether baptism performed by heretics should be regarded as valid by the orthodox began to be mooted. It afterwards became of great moment, especially with regard to the claims of the Church of Rome.

1. As early as the 3rd century heretical baptism was pronounced invalid. Clemens Alexandrinus calls it false and foreign *(Stromat.* 1, 375). Tertullian declared that it was of no value *(De Baptismo,* cap. 15). "Cyprian, whose epistles afford the clearest information on this subject, followed Tertullian in rejecting baptism by heretics as an inoperative mock baptism, and demanded that all heretics coming over to the Catholic Church be baptized (he would not say re-baptized). His position here was

due to his High-Church. exclusivism and his horror of schism. As the one Catholic Church is the sole repository of all grace, there can be no forgiveness of sins, no regeneration or communication of the Spirit, no salvation, therefore no valid sacraments, out of her bosom. So far he had logical consistency on his side. But, on the other hand, he departed from the objective view of the Church, as the Donatists afterwards did, in making the efficiency of the sacrament depend on the subjective holiness of the priest. 'How can one consecrate water,' he asks, 'who is himself unholy, and has not the Holy Ghost?' He was followed by the North African Church, which, in several councils at Carthage in the years 255-6, rejected heretical baptism; and by the Church of Asia Minor, which had already acted on this view, and now, in the person of the Cappadocian bishop Firmilian, a disciple and venerator of the great Origen, vigorously defended it against the intolerance of Rome. The Roman bishop Stephen (253-257) appeared for the opposite doctrine, on the ground of the ancient' practice of the Church. He offered no argument, but spoke with the consciousness of authority, and followed a catholic instinct. He laid chief stress on the objective nature of the sacrament, the virtue of which depended neither on the officiating priest nor on the receiver, but solely on the institution of Christ. Hence he considered heretical baptism valid, provided it had been administered in the right form, to wit, in the name of the Trinity, or even of Christ alone; so that heretics coming into the Church needed only confirmation, or the ratification of baptism by the Holy Ghost. 'Heresy,' says he, 'produces children and exposes them; and the Church takes up the exposed children, and nourishes them as her own, though she herself has not brought them forth.' The doctrine of Cyprian was the more consistent from the churchly point of view, that of Stephen from the sacramental. The one preserved the principle of the exclusiveness of the Church, the other that of the objective force of the sacraments, even to the borders of the opus-operatum theory. Both were under the direction of the same hierarchical spirit, and the same hatred of heretics; but the Roman doctrine is, after all, a happy inconsistency of liberality, an inroad upon the principle of absolute exclusiveness, an involuntary concession that baptism, and, with it, the remission of sins, and regeneration, therefore salvation, are possible outside of Roman Catholicism. The controversy itself was conducted with great warmth. Stephen, though advocating the liberal view, showed the genuine papal arrogance and intolerance. He would not even admit to his presence the deputies of Cyprian, who brought him the decree of the African Synod, and called this bishop, who in every respect far

excelled Stephen, and whom the Roman Church now venerates as one of her greatest saints, a ‘pseudo-Christum, pseudo-apostolum, et dolosum operarium.’ He broke off all intercourse with the African Church, as he had already done with the Asiatic. But Cyprian and Firmilian, nothing daunted, vindicated with great boldness, the latter also with bitter vehemence, their different view, and continued in it to their death. The Alexandrian bishop Dionysius endeavored to reconcile the two parties, but with little success. The Valerian persecution, which soon ensued, and the martyrdom of Stephen (257) and of Cyprian (258), suppressed this internal discord. In the course of the 4th century, however, the Roman practice gradually gained on the other, was raised to a doctrine of the Church by the Council of Nice in 325, and was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Trent, with an anathema on the opposite view” (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* ch. 6 § 104).

2. The decree of the Council of Trent as to baptism by heretics is as follows: “If any man shall say that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism, let him be anathema” (sess. 7:can. 4). This, at first view, may appear liberal; but the indirect intention of it is to claim all baptized persons as under the jurisdiction of Rome. Canon 8 affirms that the baptized are bound “by all the precepts of the Church, whether written or transmitted.” Canon 14 declares that any one who shall say “that those who have been baptized when infants are to be left to their own will when they grow up, and are not meanwhile to be *compelled* to a Christian life by any other penalty save exclusion from the Eucharist and the other seven sacraments till they repent,” is to be anathema.

3. Luther admitted the validity of Romish baptism, and in this he is followed by Protestants generally, who do not rebaptize converts from Rome. The Protestant churches (except the Baptist) admit the validity of each other’s baptism. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 7:*538; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity,* p. 363; Elliott, *Romanism,* bk. 2, ch. 2; Guericke, *Christl. Symbolik, §* 59.

Heriger

SEE LOBBES.

denoted by several Heb. words: hZ;j]a} RXI *achuzzah'*, a "possession;" hl;j]n; *nachalah'*, or tl;j]n;*nachalath'*, "heritage," etc.; also hV;r]y] *yerushshah';* hv;r]wOm, *morashah'*. Only *sons* (compare <012110>Genesis 21:10 31:14 sq.), and, indeed, only those of regular wives (comp. <012110>Genesis 21:10 sq.; 24:36; 25:5 sq. — Jephthah is no exception, <071102>Judges 11:2, 7; *SEE BASTARD*), had any legal title to the paternal inheritance, according to ancient usage among the Israelites; and amongst these the first-born, who might be of the favorite or a less favored wife, enjoyed a double portion (<052115>Deuteronomy 21:15 sq.). *SEE PRIMOGENITURE*. Daughters became heiresses, when sons existed, only by the special grant of the father (<061518>Joshua 15:18 sq.; comp. <182215>Job 42:15), but regularly in the absence of male heirs (<042708>Numbers 27:8); yet heiresses (ἐπικληροι — such, according to many, was Mary, the mother of Jesus) were not allowed to marry a man of another tribe (<043606>Numbers 36:6 sq.; comp. Tobit 6:12 sq. 7, 14; Josephus, *Ant. 4:*7, 5; see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht,* 2, 81; Buxtorf, *Sponsal. et Divort.* p. 67 sq., in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 30; Selden, *De successione in bona. pat.* c. 18), so as not to interrupt the regular transmission of the estate (see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthumsk. 3,* 206, 213; Gans, *Erbrecht,* 1, 337 sq.; comp. Rhode, *Rel. Bild. d. Hindu,* 2, 608). On the heirship of distant kinsmen, see <042709>Numbers 27:9 sq. (comp. Philo, *Works,* 2, 172; see Mishna, *Baba Bathra, 4,* 3, c. 8, 9; Gans, *Erbrecht,* 1, 152 sq.). Respecting written wills, we find nothing legally prescribed (see S. Rau, *De Testamentificatione Hebraeis yet. ignota,* praes. L. Van Wolde, Traj. ad Rhen. 1760; also in Oelrich's *Collect. Opusc.* 1, 305 sq.), and as the heirship-at-law had undisputed force as a legal principle (<042111>Numbers 21:11), it must have operated as a testamentary disposition of the inheritance, to the exclusion of any more formal method of bequest (Gans, *Erbrecht,* 1, 149 sq.); for the passage in Tobit 8:23 does not refer to a devise by will, and <201702>Proverbs 17:2 only shows that slaves might become heirs by a special arrangement of their masters (see Rosenmüller in loc.; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* 1, 483), while <011503>Genesis 15:3 refers to an earlier period. But in later times regular testaments must have obtained among the Jews (<480315>Galatians 3:15; <581917>Hebrews 9:17; comp. Josephus, *Ant. 13,* 16, 1; 17:3, 2; *War,* 2, 2, 3), in imitation of the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Heres, Testamentum); and in the Talmudical law of heritage they became of effect (Gans, *Erbrecht,* 1, 171), although not in the extensive sense of

the Roman law. Sometimes the parent divided the inheritance (i.e. a portion of it) among his children during his lifetime (2152Luke 15:12; comp. Tobit 8:23; see Rosenmüller, *l'morgenl.* 5, 197). (On the subject generally, see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht,* 2, 76 sq.; J. Selden, *De successione in bona defuncti ad leg. Hebr.* Lond. 1636; also in his *Uxor. Ebr.* and in his *Works, 2,* 1 sq.) *SEE INHERITANCE*.

Hermann of Cologne

(prince archbishop), son of Frederick I, count of Wied, was educated for the priesthood, elected archbishop in 1515, and confirmed by pope Leo X as Hermann V. Having imbibed the principles of the Reformation, he first attempted a Roman Catholic reform in Cologne, but, finding this impossible, he at last assumed a Protestant position, and invited Bucer and Melancthon, in 1542, to assist him. Had he succeeded in his plans, the whole Rhine country would probably have become Protestant; but he was excommunicated by the pope, menaced by the emperor, and abandoned by his estates. He finally resigned his office in 1547, and retired to his estates in Wied, where he died Aug. 15, 1552. He was beloved by his people, honored by the emperor Charles V, and esteemed by the great leaders of the Reformation. An account of Hermann's relation to his times is given in Deckers, *Hermann* von *Wied* (Cologne, 1840). His *Form of Service* was made use of in the framing of the English "Book of Common Prayer." See Hase, *Church History, §* 337-340; Hardwick, *History of the Reformation,* p. 65, 213. *SEE COMMON PRAYER*.

Hermann of Fritzlar

a mystic, was born at Fritzlar, in Hesse, towards the middle of the 14th century. Nothing certain is known of his position or social relations: it is probable, however, that he was a rich layman, like Nicholas of Basle, who retired from the world to devote himself to reading and writing theological works. One of his earlier works, to which he refers himself, *Die Blume der Schauung* (doubtless of speculative tendency), appears to have been lost. We have, however, his *Heiligenleben* (printed in Pfeiffer's *Deutschen Hystikern des* 14 *Jahrh.* 1, 1-258, from the Heidelberg MS. executed under his supervision in 1343-1349). It is an extensive work, compiled from sources now mostly lost. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* (J. N. P.)

Hermann of Lehnin

SEE LEHNIN.

Hermann of Salga

SEE SALGA.

Hermann of Weid

SEE WIED.

Hermann, or Hermannus, Contractus

So called from disease having shrunk up his limbs, was a monk of Reichenau, and one of the learned men of the 11th century, being well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Arabic. He was born in 1013, and was the son of the count of Weringen in Suevia. He wrote a Chronicle *(De Sex cetatibus mundi),* which commences at the Creation and ends A.D. 1052. The events occurring before the Christian era are very briefly noticed, but afterwards he enters into more details, and amplifies as he approaches nearer to his own times. The "Chronicle" was continued by Berthold of Constance up to 1065, and published at Basle in 1536, and again at St. Blaise in 1790 (2 vols. 4to). It may be found also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. 18. Trithemius ascribes the hymns *Alma Redemptoris mater* and *Salve Regina* to Hermann. See Dupin, *Eccl. Writers, 9,* 102.

Hermann or Hermannus

abbot of Tours, A.D. 1127, resigned his office in consequence of long-continued illness. He wrote *Tractatus de Incarnatione Christi* (ed. C. Oudin, Vet. Sac. Lugd. Bat. 1692); *three* books of the *Miracles* of Mary of Laon; and a *History of the Monastery of St. Martin in Tours,* which are given in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* 2, 888. — Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers, 10,* 181.

Hermann von der Hardt

a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Melle (Westphalia) Nov. 15, 1660. He studied at Osnabruck, Jena, and Hamburg. In 1681 he began to lecture privately at Jena, but, not succeeding as well as he had expected, he went to Leipzig in 1686, where he joined the celebrated *Collegiun philobiblicum.* In 1688 he became librarian and

secretary of duke Rudolph August of Brunswick, and the latter caused him finally to be appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of Helmstadt in 1690. He afterwards became senior of the University and provost of the convent of Marienburg. He died Feb. 28, 1746. Hermann was a very active and ingenious scholar, but his tendency to paradoxical assertions caused him to fall into errors, which, however, were perhaps too severely condemned by his adversaries. He wrote. *Autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrim virorum*, etc. (Brunsw. 1690-1693, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Ephenmerides Philologicae, quibus difciliora quaedam loca Pentateuchi ad Ifebraicorum bntium tenorenm explicata*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1693, 1696, and *1703): — Hoseas illustratus chaldaica Jonathanis versione et philologicis celebrium rabbino-rum Raschij Aben Esrae et Kimchi comsmentariis* (Helmst. 1702, 1775): — — Magnum *cecumenicun Constaninense Concilium de universali Ecclesice reformatione, unione et fide,* etc. (Frankf. and Leipz. 1700, 1742, 4 vols. *fol.): — Historia litteraria Reformationis* (Frankfort and Leipz. 1717)*: — Evangelicae Rei Integritas in negotio Jonce quatuor libris declarata* (Frankf. 1719, 4to): — Enigmata *prisci orbis: Jonas in luae in historia Manassis et Josice; Enigmata Graecorum et Latinorum ex caligine; Apocalypsis exc tenebris* (Helmst. 1723, fol.). This work attracted great attention when first *published: — Tonzus primus in Jobuln, historian populi Israelis in Assyriaco exilio, Samaria eversa et regno extincto*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1728. fol.). See J. Fabricius, *Hist. Bibloth.* pt. 2; p. 342847,351-352; *Nova Actea Eruditorum* (an. 1746, p. 475480); Breithaupt, *Memoria Hern. v. d. Hardt* (Helmst. 1746); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 23,* 362.

Hermann, Nikolaus

one of the earliest evangelical hymnologists, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. His intimate relation with the minister of the church of his place (which he served as organist), Mathesius, the biographer of Luther, gave to his compositions a true reform spirit and the child-like simplicity of a Christian mind. They have been preserved in general use even to our own day. — Brockhaus, *Conversations Lexicon, 7,* 841; Gervinus, *Gesch. d. poetischen Nationalit. d. Deutschen, 3,* 10, 32.

Hermaphrodite Orders

SEE MONASTICISM.

Her'mas

(Ἑρμᾶς, from Ἑρμῆς, the Greek god of gain, or *Mercury)*, the name of a person to whom Paul sends greeting in his Epistle to the Romans (16:14), and consequently then resident in Rome and a Christian (A.D. 55); and yet the origin of the name, like that of the other four mentioned in the same verse, is Greek. However, in those days. even a Jew, like Paul himself, might acquire Roman citizenship. Ireneeus, Tertullian, and Origen agree in making him identical with the author of *"the Shepherd"* of the following article, but this is greatly disputed. He is celebrated as a saint in the Roman calendar on May 9. — Smith, s.v.

Hermas

one of the so-called apostolical fathers (q.v.), the supposed author of a tract that has come down to us under the name of Ποιμήν, *The Shepherd*, and generally designated by the title *Pastor Hermae.* The authorship. of the tract is uncertain, but it is clearly *not* the work of the Hermas (Ἑρμᾶς) mentioned in <5614>Romans 16:14, as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome believed, and as the tract itself seems to pretend. The author appears to have been a layman of the 2nd century, probably a Roman tradesman "who had lost his wealth through his own sins and the misdeeds of his neglected sons" (Hilgenfeld; Schaff, *History of the Church, §* 121). Others ascribe it to Hermas or Hermes, brother of Pins, bishop of Rome from A.D. 142 to 157. Of the Greek original we have nothing left but fragments, which are given in Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N. Test. 3*, 378, and in Grabe, *Spicileg.* 1, 303. M. d'Abbadie claims (1860) to have discovered a third in Ethiopia, which he has transcribed and translated into Latin (Lpz. 1860); but whether the text from which it is taken is correct is a matter for further investigation. The Greek text was at an early period translated into Latin, and, since the beginning of the 15th century, often published (Paris, 1513, fol.; Strasb. 1522, 4to; Basle, 1555 and 1569, fol.; Oxford, 1685, 12mo; with additions by Le Clerc, Amst. 1698, 1724; Paris, 1715, 12mo). It is also inserted in the various collections of the fathers in Cotelier, *Patres cevi apostolici* (Paris, 1672, fol.), and in French in Desprez's *Bible* (Paris, 1715, fol. vol. 4). It is also given in the various editions of the Apostolical Fathers (q.v.). Of late years this tract has been the subject of more editing and literary criticism than almost any relic of the early Church. In 1857 Dressel published at Leipzig a new Latin translation of the *Pastor* which he found in a MS. at Rome, and which differs from the other. The edition

contains also a Greek text of the *floqstal*—revised by Tischendorf. This text, it is claimed, was found in a, convent of Mount Athos by Simonides. Tischendorf considers it, however, only as a retranslation from the Latin into Greek, and places its origin in the Middle Ages. Tischendorf himself discovered, in the *Codex. Sinaiticus,* the Greek text of book 1 of the *Shepherd,* and the first four chapters of book 2; this is given in the recent edition of Dressel, *Patres Apost.* (Lips. 1863); also by Hilgenfeld, who has carefully edited the *Pastor Hermae* in his *Nov. Test. extra Canuonern receptum* (fasc. 3, Lips. 1866). The *Ante-Nicene Christian Library,* vol. 1 (Edinb. 1867), contains a new and good translation of the *Shepherd,* following the text of Hilgenfeld, who makes use of the text found in the Sinaitic Codex.

The *Pastor* is written in the form of a dialogue, and is divided into three parts: 1 *Visiones;* 2. *Mandata;* 3. *Similitudines.* Hermas, in his childhood, had been brought up with a young slave. In after life, and when he was married, he met her again, and experienced for her a passion which, however pure in itself, was yet forbidden by the Church under the circumstances. Soon afterwards the young slave died. One day, as Hermas was wandering in the country, thinking of her, he sat down and fell asleep. "During my sleep," says he, "my mind carried me away to a steep path, which I found great difficulty in ascending on account of rocks and streams. Arriving on a piece of table-land, I knelt down to pray; and as I was praying the heavens opened, and I saw the young maiden I was wishing for, who saluted me from the sky, saying, 'Good day, Hermas.' And I, looking at her, answered, 'What art thou doing there?' 'I have been called here,' she answered, 'to denounce thy sins before the Lord.' 'What!' exclaimed I, 'and wilt thou accuse me?' 'No; but listen to me...' etc. The conversation goes on with a blending of severity and tenderness. "Pray to the Lord," says the young girl, as she disappears from his sight; "*he* will heal thy soul, and will efface the sins of all thy house, as he has done those of all the saints." One cannot help noticing the striking similarity which exists between this *Vision* and the celebrated passage in the *Divina Commedia* where Beatrice appears to Dante. This vision is followed by three others. They are all invitations to penitence, and though in the first it appears as if the invitation was especially directed to Hermas, it clearly applies also to the Church in general. This becomes more evident in the following visions.

The *Mandata* begin also with a vision. An angel appears to Hermas under the form of a shepherd, wearing' a white cloak, and bearing a staff in his hand. This shepherd is the angel of penitence, and gives Hermas twelve precepts, which embrace the rules of Christian morals. They are given under the different headings:

1. *Defide in unum Deum;*

2. *Defugienda obt-rectatione, et eleemosynafacienda in simplicitate;*

3. *De fugiendo mendacio.;*

4. *De dinittenda adultera;*

5. *De tristitia cordis et patientia;*

6. *De dgnoscendis uniuscujusque hominis luobus geziis et utriusque inspirationibus;*

7. *De Deo timendo et daemone non timendo;*

8. *Declinandum est a malo et facienda bona;*

9. *Postulandum a Deo assidue et sine haesitatione;*

10. *De animi tristitia et non contristando Spiritum Dei, qui in nobis est;*

11. *Spiritus et prophetas probari ex operibus, et de duplici spiritu;*

12. *De duplici cupiditate. Dei mandata non esse impossibilia et diabolum non meetutendum credentibus.*

The *Similitudines,* finally, are a series of parables and allegories. The vine, with its rich fruits and flexible boughs, is used to symbolize the fruitfulness of the Church. The willow is made the emblem of divine law. This latter image is made by Hermas the ground of a most graceful allegory. *Similitudines* 1 to 4 are short and simple images or descriptions; *Simil.* 5 to 9 are visions of the approaching completion of the Church, 'and of judgment as well as invitations to penitence on that account; *Simil.* 10, finally, is a sort of conclusion of the whole.

This work was perhaps the most popular book in the Christian Church of the 2nd and 3nd centuries. Yet, while it pleased the masses, it did not always satisfy the teachers. Irenmaus *(adv. Haer. 4,* 3), Clement of

Alexandria *(Strom.* 1, 29), and Origen *(Explan. Epist. ad Romans* 16) held it in high estimation. Eusebius asserts *(Hist. Eccles. 3,* 3) that many other ecclesiastical writers contested its authenticity. Jerome, after praising Hermas in his *Chronicon,* accuses him of foolishness *(stultitia)* in his *Comment. in Habakkuk* (1, 1), and Tertullian treats him no better, designating the book as apocryphal in *De Pudicit.* (10). The learned Duguet, in his *Conferences ecclesiastiques* (1, 7), even claims to find in the *Pastor* the germ of all heresies which troubled the Church in the 2nd century. Others among modern theologians, and especially Mosheim, have violently attacked the *Pastor,* and considered Hermas as an impostor. The book "knows little of the Gospel, and less of justifying faith; on the contrary, it talks much of the law of Christ and of repentance, enjoins fasting and voluntary poverty, and teaches the merit, even the supererogatory merit, of good works, and the sin-atoning virtue of martyrdom" (Schaff, 1. c.). See Gratz, *Disquisitio in Past. Hermae* (Bonn, 1820); Hefele, *Patr. Apost. Prolegomena;* Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Vater* (Halle, 1853); Cave, *Hist. literaria;* Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca, 7,* 18; Tillemont, *Memoires eccles.* vol. 2, May 9th; Dom. Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacrae et eccles.* 1, 582; Hosheim, *Comment.* 1, 208-9; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 660, Iase, *Ch. Hist.* § 39 and Appendix; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 371; Schaff, *Church History, §* 121; Bunsen, *Christianity and Mlci2mkind,* 1, 182; E. Gaab, *Der Hirt d. Hermas* (Basel, 1866, 8vo); Zahn, *Der Hirt d. Hermas untersucht* (Gotha, 1868, 8vo); Alzog, *Patrologie, §* 19; Lipsius, in *Zeitsch rift J Wissenschftliche Theologie,* 1865, heft 3; Hilgenfeld, *Delr Hirt d. Hermcas u. sein neuester Bearbeiter, in Zeitsch f. Wiss. Theol.* 1869, heft 2; Lipsius (in same journal, 1869, heft 3), *Die Polenzik eines Apologeten* (a severe review of Zahn's *Hernmas).*

Hiermeneutae

*(*ἑρμηνευταί*,d inmtepreteers),* officers in the ancient Church, whose business it was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures, and in the homilies that were made to the people; an office chiefly used in those churches where the people spoke different languages, as in Palestine, where some spoke Syriac, others Greek; and in the churches of Africa, where some spoke Latin and others Punic. "So far was the primitive Church from encouraging ignorance, by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, that she not only translated them into all languages, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, who were *viva voce* to make men understand what was read,

and not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God, which is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages." — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 3. ch. 13:§ 4.

Hermeneutics

(from ἑρμηνεύω, *to explain),* the technical or scientific name of that branch of theology which consists in *exposition* in general, as distinguished from exegesis (q.v.) in particular. Reserving for the more usual and equivalent title INTERPRETATION (OF SCRIPTURE) the history and literature of the subject, we propose to give in the present article only a brief' view of those principles or *Canons* which should be observed in the elucidation of the meaning of the sacred text.

I. The first and most essential process is to apply the natural and obvious principles of a careful and conscientious exegesis to the passage and all its terms. This may be called the PHILOLOGICO-HISTORICAL rule. It embraces the following elements.

1. The diligent and discriminative use of an accurate and judicious *Lexicon.*

2. The painstaking and constant reference to the best *Grammars.*

A well-grounded knowledge of the language is implied in these prescriptions, yet the interpreter needs to confirm or modify his judgment by these independent authorities.

3. An intimate acquaintance with the *archaeology* involved, including geography, chronology, and Oriental usages,

4. The *context* should be carefully consulted; and the general-drift of the argument, as well as the author's special design in writing, must be kept in mind.

5. Especially is a cordial *sympathy* with spiritual truth a prerequisite in this task. A deep religious experience has enlightened many an otherwise ill-instructed mind as to the meaning of much of Holy Writ.

II. PARALLEL AND ILLUSTRATIVE PASSAGES from the same book or writer, or (if these are not to be had) from other parts of Scripture, are to be attentively considered, on the principle that *Scripture is its own best interpreter.* This is pre-eminently true of types, metaphors, parables, prophetical symbols, and other figurative representations. For this purpose

"reference Bibles" alone are not sufficient: the examination should include an extensive comparison of doctrine, theory, and topic, as well as of example, fact, and expression.

III. When various meanings-are assignable to a given passage or word, that should be selected which is the *broadest* in its import — and application; if possible, one that is — INCLUSIVE of all or most of the others. This rule should especially be observed in expounding the language of Christ, of God directly, or the more cardinal statements of inspiration.

In prophetical and eschatological passages of Scripture especially must the fact be borne in mind that one event or circumstance is often made the type or image of another; the two being generally related to the same essential principle as proximate and remote, or as personal and national, or as temporal and spiritual manifestations of the divine economy. In some cases this-correlation runs through an entire piece or book, e.g. the Canticles and many of the Psalms. *SEE DOUBLE SENSE (OF SCRIPTURE)*.

IV. The CONSENSUS of the universal Church in past and present time should have its due influence; not as being of absolute *authority*, but as an exponent of the aggregate and deliberate judgment of good and unprejudiced men. This will guard the expositor against fanciful subtleties and extravagant or dangerous impressions. To this end creeds, confessions, and articles of faith are useful, as well as the study of exploded or living-heresies, but more particularly a collation of the views of preceding commentators. In weighing none of these, however, is any superstitious reverence to be indulged, for the word of God itself is superior to them all, and it is not only possible, but certain, that in some points they have alike erred, as in many they have fluctuated or conflicted with each other. Even the objections and cavils of infidels and rationalists should not be overlooked, for "fas est ab hoste doceri."

V. Where different interpretations are possible, that must be selected which is most consistent with *common sense*. Especially must those be set aside which lead to a psychological or theological impossibility or contradiction. Such a principle we always feel bound to apply to the communication of a friend, and to every obscure passage in a rational writer. Interpreters, from overlooking this rule, have often increased rather than explained the difficulties of the sacred text. For example, to understand Paul as meaning in Romans 9:3 that he was willing to forfeit

his title to eternal bliss, is to attribute to him a sentiment incompatible with mental and moral sanity; and to refer the preference in (46)07:21 1 Corinthians 7:21 to a state of slavery, is to outrage the spontaneous instincts of the human mind. VI. It will sometimes become necessary to modify our conclusions as to particular passages in consequence of the discoveries and deductions of MODERN SCIENCE. Instances in point are the theories respecting the creation and deluge, arising from the progress of astronomical and geological knowledge. All truth is consistent with itself; and although the Bible was not given for the purpose of determining scientific questions, yet it must not, and need not be so interpreted as to contradict the "elder scripture writ by God's own hand" in the volume of nature. In like manner history is often the best expositor of prophecy.

Her'mes

(Ἑρμῆς, i.e. the Greek *Mercury* [q.v.]) the name of a man mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans as a disciple at Rome ((45)16:14 Romans 16:14). A.D. 55. "According to the Greeks," says Calmet *(Dict.* s.v.), "he was one of the seventy disciples, and afterwards bishop of Dalmatia." His festival occurs in their calendar upon April 8 (Neale, *Eastern Church,* 2, 774).

Hermes, Georg

a distinguished modem Romanist theologian and philosopher. He was born at Dreierwalde, near Muster, April 22, 1775, became gymnasial teacher in 1798, priest in 1799, and professor of theology at Minster in 1807. The bent of his mind was towards philosophy, and his theological studies were all through his life conducted on philosophical methods. His first publication of this class was the *Innere Wahrheit des Christenthums* (Münst. 1805, 8vo). In 1819 he published his *Philosophische Einleitung in die Christ Katholische Theologie,* which passed to a second edition in 1831. In 1819 he was appointed professor of theology in the new University of Bonn, where he soon added greatly to his reputation, and his system, before his death, had found its way into most of the Roman Catholic schools of Prussia. He died at Bonn May 26,1831. His followers have since been called *Hermesians.* The writings of Hermes published in his lifetime have been mentioned above. After his death appeared his *Christliche-Katholische Dogmatik* (Münst. 1834-5, 3 vols. 8vo). In 1832 the Hermesians established a journal at Cologne as their organ. During the lifetime of Hermes there had been many complaints of the heretical

tendencies of his system, which, in fact, demanded philosophy, rather than faith, as the basis of theology. Hermes admitted all the dogmas of the Church, but held that the ground of belief in these dogmas could only be laid in a philosophical proof, first, of a divine revelation; and, secondly, that the Roman Church is the medium of that revelation. At Rome the question was put into Perrone's hands, whose report strongly condemned Hermes and his doctrines. On the 26th of September. 1835, a papal brief was issued against them. The Hermesians, however, maintained that the doctrines censured were not contained in the system of Hermes. In accordance with their request to be allowed to present in Rome a Latin translation of the works of Hermes, and to plead their orthodoxy, in 1837 two of their prominent spokesmen, professor Braun, of Bonn, and professor Elvenich, of Breslau, arrived in Rome, but, finding that they would not get an impartial hearing, soon returned. In consequence of the pressure brought upon the Hermesians by the bishops, most of them now gradually submitted; two professors of the University of Bonn who refused to submit, Braun and Achterfeld, were in 1845 forbidden by the archbishop of Cologne to continue their theological lectures. In 1847, Pius IX again sanctioned the, condemnatory brief of 1835, and Hermesianism gradually died out. A sketch of the controversy from the Hermesian side may be found in Elvenich, *Der Hermnesianismus unl sein Rdmischer Gegner Perrone* (Breslau, 1844, 8vo). Perrone's refutation of Hermes is given in Migne's *Demonstrationes Evangeliques*, 2, 945 sq.

See also Stupp, *Die letzten Hermnesianer* (Cologne, 18445); Hagenbach, *History of 18th and 19th Centuries*, tr by Hurst, 2, 444; and art. *SEE GUNTHER*.

Hermes Trismegistus, or Mercurius

*(*Ἑρμῆς, ὁ Ἑρμῆς, Τρισμέγιστος*)*, the putative author of a large number of Greek works, many of which are still extant. The Greek Hermes was in the time of Plato identified with the Egyptian *Thot, Thoth, or Theut* (as it was also with the Alexandrian *Thoyji)*, a mythical personage regarded as the discoverer of all sciences, especially as the originator of language, of the alphabet, and of the art of writing; of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, etc. In Egypt, all works relating to religion or science bore the name of *Thot* or of *Hermes.* According to a passage in Clement of Alexandria *(Strom.* 1. 5), two of Hermes's books contained the hymns of the gods and rules of conduct for the kings, four related to astrology, etc. The

expressions used by Clement of Alexandria imply that there was a much larger number of so-called *Hermetic* books than he mentions. As for the 36,525 mentioned by lamblichus *(De Myst. Egypt.),* a number which corresponds to the great sacred period of Egypt, Goerres supposes it to refer to verses, not to books. All this leads to the belief that Hermes Trismegistus was but a personification of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Champollion junior, Hermes Trismegistus was, like Horus, represented by a hawk's head. The surname of *Trismegistus* (thrice great) appears to have been given to him on account of the many discoveries attributed to him. Looked at in the mystical sense, Thot, or the Egyptian Hermes, was the symbol of divine intelligence, thought incarnate, the living word-the primitive type of Plato's *Logos.*

It appears clear that a certain number of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were translated into Greek about the time of the Ptolemies. The authenticity of the fragments of these translations which have come down to us is more doubtful. It was the time when so many supposititious works of Orpheus, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, etc., were composed. Leaving aside Augustine's testimony *(De civitate) ei.* 1. 8:c. 26), Champollion junior considers the books of Hermes Trismegistus as containing really the old Egyptian doctrines, of which some traces can be found in the hieroglyphics. Besides, a careful examination of these remaining fragments discloses a theological system somewhat similar from that of Plato in his *Tinaeus;* a doctrine which differs entirely from those of all the other Greek schools, and which therefore was supposed to have been brought by him from Egypt, where he had been to consult with: the priests of that country. They are written in a barbarous Greek, in which it is easy to perceive the effort made by translators to follow literally the text of the original rather than the sense. Menard, a recent translator of Hermes, views the Hermetic books "as representing the final aspirations of the higher Greek wisdom, dimly anticipating the fuller revelation of the Christian faith; as a mystical system, hovering between the negations of Greek thought and the dogmas of the Christian faith" *(An. Pres. Rev.* January, 1869, p. 195). The following works, attributed to Hermes, have been published: Λάγος τέλειος*;* the Greek original, quoted by Lactantius *(Div. Instit. 7,* 18), is lost, and there remains only a Latin translation of it, attributed to Apuleius of Madaura, and which is entitled *Asclepius,* or *Hermetis Trismegisti Asclepius, sive de natura deorumus diulogns.* This work appears to have been written shortly before the time of Lactantius,

and in Egypt, probably at Alexandria. It is in the form of a dialogue between Hermes and Asclepius, his disciple, on God, the universe, nature, etc. The spirit of this work is 'thoroughly Neo-Platonic, and though the writer directs it against Christianity, he evidently borrowed many Christian doctrines to serve his end. The *Asclepius* was embodied in several editions of Apuleius, and in those of the *Paemander* by Ficinus and Patricius. These latter editions, and the Pcemander of Adrian Turnebus, contain Οροι Ἀσκληπίου πρὸς Ἄμμωνα βασιλέα, probably a translation by the author of the preceding work, and treating also of God, matter, and' man. Ἑρμοῦ τοῦ Τρισμεγίστου Ποιμάνδρης is an extensive work. The title Ποιμάνδρης, or *Paemander,* from Ποιμήν, *pastor* or *shepherd,* seems to be imitated from the Ποιμήν or *Pastor* of Hermas. *SEE HERMAS*. Indeed, the latter has sometimes been considered as the author of the *Paemander.* It is written in the form of a dialogue, and could hardly have been composed before the 4th century. It treats of nature, creation, and God. These different subjects are viewed from the Neo-Platonic stand-point, but intermingled with Christian, Jewish, and Eastern notions. The *Paemander* was at first published as a Latin translation by Ticinus, under the title *Mercurii Trismiegisti Liber de Potestate et Sapientia Dei* (Treves, 1471, fol.; often reprinted at Venice). The Greek text, with Ficinus's translation, was first published by Adr. Turnebus (Paris, 1554, 4to; latest edit., with a commentar, Cologne, 1630, fol.). It was translated into French by G. du Prdau, under the title *Deux livres de Mercurii Trismesgiste, un De la Puissance et Sapience de Dieu, l'autre De la Volonte de Dieu* (Paris, 1557, 8vo); and by *others:* — Ἰατρομαθηματικὰ ἢ περὶκατακλίσεως νοσούντων προγνωστικὰ ἐκ τῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης πρὸς Ἄμμωνα Αἰγύπτιον*;* this treatise, much less important than the preceding one, gives the means of foretelling the issue of a sickness by means of astrology: — De *Revolutionibus nativitatum,* another treatise on astrology (Basle, 1559, fol.): — *Aphorismi, sive centum sententiae astrologicae,* called also *Centiloquium,* supposed to have been written originally in Arabic, but of which we possess but the Latin translation (Venice, 1492, fol.; latest edit. Ulm, 1672, 12mo): — *Liberphysicomedicus Kiranidum Kirani, id est regis Persaruns, vere aureus gemeus,* another astrological work, which is known to us only in the Latin translation published by Andr. Privinus, though the Greek text is yet extant in MS. at Madrid. Some of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were evidently productions of the Middle Ages; these are *Tractatus vere aureus de Lapidis philosophici Decreto,* i.e. on the philosopher's stone (Latin, by

D. Gnosius, Leipz. 1610,1613, 8vo; and translated into French by G. Joly and F. Habert, Paris, 1626, 8vo); *Tabula smaraydina*, an essay on the art of gold-making, published in Latin (Nuremburg, 1541,.4to; Strasb. 1566, 8vo); Περὶ βοτανῶν χυλώσεως, published at the end of RBther's edition of L. Lydus's *De Miensibus*, with notes by Bihr; Περὶ σεισμῶν, a fragment consisting of sixty-six hexameters, attributed by some to Orpheus: it is to be found in Maittaire's *Miscellanea* (London, 1722, 4to), and in Brunck's *Analecta, 2,* 127. All the extant fragments of Hermes are given in French by Menard, *Hermes Trismegiste* (2nd edit. Paris, 1868). See J. H. Ursinus. *Exercitatio de Mercurio Trismegisto,* etc. (Nuremb. 1661, 8vo); Roeser, *De Hermete Trismegisto litterarum inventore* (Wittenb. 1686 4to)*; Colberg, *De libris antiqugitatem menteltibus, sibkyllarum, Hermletis, Zoroastris* (Greifswald, 1694, 8vo); G. W. — Wedel, *De Tabula Hermmetis smaragdina* (Jena, 1704,4to); Baumgarten Crusius, *De Librorum Hermeticorum Origine,* etc. (Jena, 1827, 4to); Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 1, 46, 94; F. Hoefer, *Hist. de la Chimie,* 1, 244; Pauly, *Real-Encyklop.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 377; Smith, *Dictionary of Mythology and Biography,* vol. 2; Warburton, *Divine Legation,* 1, 442; Mosheim, *Commentaries,* 1, 290; Cudworth, *True Intellectual System of the Universe.*

Hermesians

SEE HERMES, GEORG.

Hermetic Books

SEE HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

Herrians

a heretical sect of the 2nd century, which, according to Augustine, denied baptism by water on the pretence that this was not the kind of baptism instituted by Christ; for John the Baptist, comparing his own baptism with that of our Lord, says, "I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire" (Augustine, *Dee Haer.* c. 59). They affirmed that the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit, and therefore a baptism of fire was more suitable to their nature. Early ecclesiastical writers are not agreed as to what was meant by this expression. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions some who, when they had baptized men in water, also made a mark on their ears with fire, so joining

together baptism by water, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire (apud Combefis, *Auctarium*, 1, 202). Others, by some deceptive art during baptism, made fire to appear on the surface of the water, and confirmed this by a reference to some apocryphal writing of their own invention called "The Preaching of Paul or Peter," in which it was said that, when Christ was baptized, fire appeared on the water. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 11, ch. 2, § 3.

Hermias

a writer, supposed by some to date from the 2nd century. Nothing is known of his life, but we possess under his name a work entitled Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, "A satirizing of the Heathen Philosophers." It is written in the form of a dialogue addressed to the author's friends. Hermias reviews the opinions of the philosophers on nature, the universe, God, his essence, his relations to the world, the human soul, etc. He shows their differences and contradictions on all these points, and thus proves the insufficient cy and futility of all their theories. This little work, written in the manner and somewhat in the style of Lucian, is an interesting document for the history of ancient philosophy, but has no other merit, philosophical or theological. It was published, with a Latin translation by Seiler (Zurich, 1553, 8vo; 1560, fol.), and is inserted in several collections of ecclesiastical works, namely, in Morel, *Tabula compenediosa* (Basle, 1580,. 8vo); in several editions of Justin Martyr; in Worth's edition of Tatian (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); in the *Auctarium Bibl. Patr.* (Paris, 1624, fol.), and in Gallandii *Biblioth. Patr.* J. C. Dommerich published a separate edition, with notes by H. Wolf, Gale, and Worth (Halle, 1764, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 24; 387; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, 2nd cent.; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, 2, 179.

Hermit

(Gr. ἐρημός, *desert)*, one devoted to religious solitude; properly, the solitude of a wilderness. It became, at a later period, the name of certain classes of monks. *SEE MONASTICISM*; *SEE MONE*.

Hermog'enès

(Ἑρμογένης, *Merassry-born)*, a disciple of Asia Minor, and probably companion in labor of the apostle Paul; mentioned, along with Phygellus,

as having abandoned him during his second imprisonment at Rome, doubtless from alarm at the perils of the connection (2 Timothy 1:15). A.D. 64.' In the Roman Breviary *(in Fest. S. Jac. Apost. Pars. aestiva,* p. 485, Milan, 1851) the conversion of Hermogenes is attributed to St. James the Great, and in the legendary history of Abdias, the so-called bishop of Babylon (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N.T.* p. 517 sq.), Hermogenes is represented as first practicing magic, and converted, with Philetus, by the same apostle. Grotius, apparently misled by the circumstance that the historian or geographer Hermogenes, mentioned by the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius (2, 722, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* Didot. ed., 3:523), wrote on primitive history, and incidentally (?) speaks of Nannacus or Anacus- and may therefore probably be the same as the Hermogenes whom Josephus mentions as having treated on Jewish history *(Apion,* 1, 23) — suggests that he may be the person mentioned by the apostle Paul. This, however, is not likely. Nothing more is known of the Hermogenes in question, and* he cannot be identified either with Hermogenes of Tarsus, a historian of the time of Domitian, who was put to death by that emperor (Sueton. *Domit.* 10; Hoffman, *Lex. Univ.* s.v.; Alford on 2 Timothy 1:15), nor with Hermogenes the painter, against whom Tertullian wrote (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biography,* s.v.), nor with the saints of the Byzantine Church, commemorated on Jan. 24 and Sept. I (Neale, *Eastern Church,* 2, 770, 781).

Hermogenes

a heretic of the 2nd century. Our knowledge of him is chiefly derived from a treatise against him by Tertullian *(adv. Hermogenen),* and from an account in the newly-discovered MS. of Hippolytus. He was living, probably in Africa, when Tertullian wrote against him, and was a painter by profession. Tertullian charged that Hermogenes was a believer in the doctrines of the heathen philosophers, and especially in those of the Stoics, and especially that he taught the eternity of matter. Hermogenes argued that God must have made the world either out of his own substance, or out of nothing, or out of pre-existent matter. The first, he thought, was inconsistent with God's immutability; the second with the origin of evil; and therefore the third must be received as true. "He rejected both the Gnostic Emanation doctrine and the Church doctrine of Creation: the former contradicted the unchangeable nature of God, and necessitated attributing to him the origin of evil; the latter was contradicted by the nature of this world; for if the creation of the perfect God had been

conditioned by nothing, a perfect world must have been the result. Hence he believed that creation supposed something conditioning, and this he thought must be the *Hyle* which he received from Platonism into connection with the Christian system. He did not think that he gave up the doctrine of the μοναρχία as long as he admitted a ruling, all-powerful principle, and ascribed to God such a supremacy over the Hyle. He regarded the Hyle as altogether undetermined, predicateless, in which all the contrarieties that afterwards appeared in the world were as yet unseparated and undeveloped; neither motion nor rest, neither flowing nor standing still, but an inorganic confusion. It was the receptive, God alone the creative; his formative agency called forth from it determinate existence. But with this organization there was a residuum which withstood the divine formative power. Hence the defective and the offensive in nature; hence also evil. Had he been logical he must have admitted a creation without a beginning; he could not have regarded it as a single and transitive act of God, but as immanent, and resulting immediately from the relation of God to matter. He said God was always a ruler, consequently he must always have had dominion over matter" (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* Ryland's transl., 1, 118). The account in Hippolytus, Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων (bk. 24), agrees, in the main, with that given above, and adds that Hermogenes taught that Christ, after his resurrection, when he "ascended to heaven, leaving his body in the sun, proceeded himself to his Father." See Augustine, *De Haer.* 41; Tertullian, *adv. Hermogenem,* passim; Ritter, *Geschichte d. Philosophie,* 5, 178; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torrey's), 1, 568; Mosheim, *Comm.* vol. 1; Lardner, *Wornks,* 2, 203; 8:579; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* vol. 1, §47.

Her'mon

(Heb. *Chermon',* ˆ/mr]j „, according to Gesenius, from the Arabic *Charm-sn,* a *peak;* Sept. Ἀερμών*),* a mountain which formed the northernmost boundary (<061201>Joshua 12:1) of the country beyond the Jordan (<061117>Joshua 11:17) which the Hebrews conquered from the Amorites (<050308>Deuteronomy 3:8), and which, therefore, must have belonged to Anti-Libanus (<130523>1 Chronicles 5:23), as is, indeed, implied or expressed in most of the other passages in which it is named (<050448>Deuteronomy 4:48; <061103>Joshua 11:3, 17; 12:5; 13:5, 11; <199612>Psalm 89:12; 133:3; <220408>Song of Solomon 4:8). It has two or more summits, and is therefore spoken of in the plur. (µynaeWrj], <194207>Psalm 42:7; Sept. Ἑρμωνιείμ, Engl. Vers. "Hermonites"). In

(Deuteronomy 3:9 it is said to have been called by the Sidonians *Sirion* (ˆ/yrIc;), and by the Amorites *Shenir* (ryNIv;), both of which words signify "a coat of mail," as glittering in the sun. In Deuteronomy 4:48 it is called Mount *Sion* (ˆ/ayco), meaning "an elevation," 'a high mountain"- which it was well entitled to be designated by way of excellence, being (if correctly identified within Jebel *es-Sheik)* by far the highest of all the mountains in or near Palestine. In the later books of the Old Testament, however (as in 1 Chronicles 5:23; Song of Solomon 4:8), Shenir is distinguished from Hermon properly so called. Probably different summits or parts of this range bore different names, which were applied in a wider or narrower acceptation at different times (see Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 56). *SEE HIVITE*.

Hermon was a natural landmark. It could be seen from the "plains of Moab" beside the Dead Sea, from the heights of Nebo, from every prominent spot, in fact, in Moab, Gilead, and Bashan — a pale blue, snow-capped peak, terminating the view on the northern horizon. When the people came to know the country better when not merely its great physical features, but its towns and villages became familiar to them, then Baal Gad and Dan took the place of Hermon, both of them being situated just at the southern base of that mountain. Hermon itself was not embraced in the country conquered by Moses and Joshua; their conquests extended only to it (see Joshua 11:17; Deuteronomy 34:1; 1 Samuel 3:20). Hermon was also the north-western boundary of the old kingdom of Bashan, as Salcah was the south-eastern. We read in Joshua 12:5 that Og "reigned in Mount Hermon, and in Salcah, and in all Bashan" i.e. in all Bashan, from Hermon to Salcah Another notice of Hermon shows the minute accuracy of the topography of Joshua. He makes "Lebanon towards the sun rising," that is, the range of Anti-Lebanon, extend from Hermon to the entering into Hamath (13, 5). Every Oriental geographer now knows that Hermon is the southern and culminating point of this range. The beauty and grandeur of Hermon did not escape the attention of the Hebrew poets. From nearly every prominent point in Palestine the mountain is visible, but it is when we leave the hill-country of Samaria and enter the plain of Esdraelon that Hermon appears in all its majesty, shooting up on the distant horizon behind the graceful rounded top of Tabor. It was probably this view that suggested to the Psalmist the words "The north and the south thou hast created them: Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name" (Psalm 89:12). The "dew of Hermon" is once referred to in a

passage which has long been considered a geographical puzzle — " As the dew of Hermon, the dew that descended on the mountains of Zion" (Psalm 133:3). Some have thought that *Zion* (ˆ/Yx) is used here for *Sion* (ˆaycy), one of the old names of Hermon (Deuteronomy 4:48), but this identification is unnecessary. The snow on the summit of this mountain condenses the vapors that float during the summer in the higher regions of the atmosphere, causing light clouds to hover around it, and abundant dew to descend on it, while the whole country elsewhere is parched, and the whole heaven elsewhere cloudless. One of its tops is actually called *Abu-Nedy,* i.e. "father of dew" (Porter, *Handb.* 2, 463).

Since modern travelers have made us acquainted with the country beyond the Jordan, no doubt has been entertained that the Mount Hermon of those texts is no other than the present Jebel *es-Sheik,* or the Sheik's Mountain, or, which is equivalent, Old Man's Mountain. a name it is said to have obtained from its fancied resemblance (being topped with snow, which sometimes lies in lengthened streaks upon its sloping ridges) to the hoary head and beard of a venerable sheik (Elliot, 1, 317). This Jebel es-sheik is a south-eastern, and in that direction culminating, branch of Anti-Libanus. Its top is partially covered with snow throughout the summer, and has an elevation of 9376 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 170, 176). Dr. Clarke, who saw it in the month of July, says, "The summit is so lofty that the snow entirely covered the upper part of it, not lying in patches, but investing all the higher part with that perfectly white and smooth velvet-like appearance which snow only exhibits when it is very deep." Dr. Robinson only differs from the preceding by the statement that the snow is perpetual only in the ravines, so that the top presents the appearance of radiant stripes around and below the summit *(Bib. Researches, 3:*344). At his last visit to Palestine, he observes, under date of April 9 (new ed. of *Researches, 3,* 48), that "the snow extended for some distance down the sides, while on the peaks of Lebanon opposite there was none." In August, 1852, Rev. J. L. Porter, of Damascus, ascended Jebel es-Sheik from Rashey, and spent a night near its summit. He describes the highest peak as composed strictly of three peaks, so near each other as to appear one from below. On the south-easternmost of these peaks are some interesting remains, called Kulal Antar, probably relics of an ancient Syro-Phoenician temple, consisting of a circular wall around a rock about 15 feet high, which has a rude excavation upon it, and heaps of beveled stones adjoining it. The snow-banks explain the supply anciently made for cooling drinks in

Tyre and Sidon *(Bibliotheca Sac.* January 1854). The summit is about 9000 feet above the Mediterranean (Lieut.Warren, in the *Quarterly Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," No. 5, p. 210, where also are a description and cut of the ruined temple).

In two passages of Scripture this mountain is called *Baal-hermon* (ˆ/mr]j, l[Bi; <070303>Judges 3:3; 1 Chronicles 5, 23), and the only reason that call be assigned for it is that Baal was there worshipped. Jerome says of it, "Diciturque *in vertice ejus insigne templum,* quod ab ethnicis cultui habetur e regione Paneadis et Libani" — reference must here be made to the building whose ruins are still seen *(Onom.* s.v. Hermon). It is remarkable that Hermon was anciently encompassed by a circle of temples, *all facing the summit.* Can it be that this mountain was the great sanctuary of Baal, and that it was to the old Syrians what Jerusalem was to the Jews, and what Mecca is to the Moslems? (See Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Pal.* p. 454, 457; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 323 sq.) The above-described ruins seem to confirm this conjecture. *SEE BAAL-HERMON*.

It has been suggested that one of the southern peaks of Hermon was the scene of the Transfiguration. Our Lord traveled from Bethsaida, on the northern slope of the Sea of Galilee, "to the coasts of Caesarea-Philippi," where he led his disciples "into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them;" and afterwards he returned, going towards Jerusalem through Galilee (comp. <410822>Mark 8:22-28; <401613>Matthew 16:13; <410902>Mark 9:2-13, 30-33). No other mountain in Palestine is more appropriate to the circumstances of that glorious scene, except Tabor, to which many centuries' tradition has assigned this honor (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 358); but if it be as, signed to this locality, it will give additional celebrity to the prince of Syrian mountains (Porter's *Danascus,* 1, 306).

The mention of Hermon along with Tabor <199912>Psalm 89:12, led to its being sought near the latter mountain, where, accordingly, travelers and maps give us a "Little Hermon." But that passage, as well as <191303>Psalm 133:3, applies better to the great mountain already described; and in the former it seems perfectly natural for the Psalmist to call upon these mountains, respectively the most conspicuous in the western and eastern divisions of the Hebrew territory, to rejoice in the name of the Lord. Besides, we are to consider that Jebel es-sheikh is seen from Mount Tabor, and that both together are visible from the plain of Esdraelon. There is no reason to, suppose that the so-called Little Hermon is at all mentioned in Scripture.

Its actual name is Jebel ed-Duhy; it is a shapeless, barren, and uninteresting mass of hills, in the north of the valley of Jezreel and opposite Mount Gilboa (Robinson, *Researches, 3,* 171).

Her'monite

(Psalm 43:7). *SEE HERMON*.

Hernandez

SEE JULIAN THE LITTLE.

Her'od

Picture for Herod

(Ἡρώδης, *hero-like,* a name that appears likewise among the Greeks, Dio. Cass. 71, 35; Philost. Soph. 2, 1, etc.), the name of several persons of the royal family of Judaea in the time of Christ and the apostles (see Noldius, *De vita et gestis Herodum,* in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 174 sq.; *Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten,* 1, 160 sq. Other monographs are named by Volbeding, *Index Progammatum,* p. 16,77, and by Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica,* 1, 386; 2, 127-130. See also De Saulcy, *Hist. d'Hierode,* Par. 1867; Güder, *Ierodes,* Bern, 1869), Whose history is incidentally involved in that of the N. Testament, but is copiously detailed by Josephus notices of it also occur in the classical writers, especially Strabo (16, c. 2, 16). We therefore devote a large space to consideration of the subject.

The history of the Herodian family presents one side of the last development of the Jewish nation. The evils which had existed in the hierarchy that grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embodiment in the tyranny of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the hellenizing designs of Antiochus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in their spirit, by men who professed to observe the law. Side by side with the spiritual "kingdom of God" proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnificence of Solomon. The simultaneous realization of the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews, in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fulness of time a descendant of Esau established a false counterpart of the promised glories of the Messiah.

Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods. The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolas Damascenus, ap; Josephus, *Ant. 14*, 1, 3) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descent from one of the noble families which returned from Babylon; and, on the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africanus has preserved a tradition (Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* 2, 235), on the authority of "the natural kinsmen of the Savior," which makes Antipater, the father of Herod, the son of one Herod, a slave attached to the service of a temple of Apollo at Ascalon, who was taken prisoner by Idummean robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (comp. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium,* § 30), no less than the office, was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (comp. Routh, 1. c.). This story is repeated with great inaccuracy by Epiphanius *(Hoer.* 20). Neglecting, however, these exaggerated statements of friends and enemies, it seems certain that the family was of Idumaean descent:'(Josephus, *Ant. 14*, 1, 3), a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names that were retained in it (Ewald, *Geschichte, 4*, 477, note). But, though aliens by race, the Herods were Jews in faith. The Idumaeans had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 130; Josephus, *Ant. 13*, 9,1); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, looking upon Jerusalem as their mother city, and claiming for themselves the name of Jews (Josephus, *Ant. 20*, 7, 7; *War, 1*, 10, 4; 4, 4, 4).

The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centered in the endeavor to found a great and independent kingdom, in which the power of Judaism should subserve the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity, but the designs of Herod I and Agrippa I point to an independent Eastern empire as their end, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first *SEE HERODIAN*; and by a natural reaction the temporal dominion of the Herods opened the way for the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of unscrupulous ambition lost its power to quicken a united people. The high priests were appointed and deposed by Herod I and his successors, with such a reckless disregard for the character of their office (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums,* 1, 322, 325, 42 1), that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity (compare

⁴²³⁰²Acts 23:2 sq.; Jost, 1, 430, etc.). The nation was divided, and amidst the conflict of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the nobler hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous grandeur of a court. See the name of each member of the family in its order in this CYCLOPEDIA.

1. HEROD THE GREAT, as he is usually surnamed, mentioned in ⁴⁰¹⁰²Matthew 2:1-22; ⁴⁰¹⁰⁵Luke 1:5; ⁴²²³⁵Acts 23:35 was the second son of Antipater and Cypros, an Arabian lady of noble descent (Josephus, *Ant. 14:*7, 3). See ANTIPATER. In B.C. 47 Julius Caesar made Antipater procurator of Judea, and the latter divided his territories among his four sons, assigning the district of Galilee to Herod (Josephus, *Ant. 14,* 9, 3; *War,* 1, 10, 4). At the time when he was invested with the government he was fifteen years of age, according to Josephus *(Ant. 14,* 9, 2); but this must be a mistake. Herod died, aged sixty-nine, in B.C. 4, consequently he must have been twenty-six or twenty-five in the year B.C. 47, when he was made governor of Galilee *(*πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, given by Dindorf in the ed. Didot, but no stated authority). One of his first acts was to repress the brigands who were infesting his provinces, and to put many of their dealers to death upon his own authority. This was made known to Hyrcanus, and Herod was summoned to take his trial before the Sanhedrim for his deeds of violence. Herod, instead of appearing before the Sanhedrim clothed in mourning, came in purple, attended by armed guards, and bearing in his hands a letter from the Roman commander Sextus Caesar for his acquittal. This overawed the assembly; but Sameas, a just man (Josephus, *Ant. 14:*9, 4), stepped forward, and, boldly addressing the assembly, predicted that, should the offender escape punishment, he would live to kill all those who were his judges, and would not grant the pardon which the assembly seemed inclined to extend to him. He, however, escaped, and took refuge with Sextus Caesar, who soon appointed him governor *(*στρατηγός*)* of Caele-Syria. He then determined to march against Jerusalem, and would have done so had not his father Antipater and his family restrained him from committing any fresh acts of violence. In B.C. 44, after Caesar's death, Cassius took the government of Syria. Herod and his father Antipater willingly assisted Cassius in obtaining the taxes levied upon the Jews for the support of the troops. For this Herod was confirmed in the government of Caele-Syria (Josephus, *War,* 1, 11, 4). In B.C. 41 Antony came to Syria, and Herod, by making him valuable presents, soon formed with him a close personal intimacy (Josephus, *Ant. 14:*12,2). Hyrcanus, to

whose beautiful granddaughter Mariamne Herod was betrothed, induced Antony to make Herod and his brother Phasael tetrarchs of Judaea (Josephus, *Ant. 14*, 13, 1; *War*, 1, 12, 5). The invasion of the Parthians, who sided with Antigonus the Asmonsean, compelled Herod to give up Judaea and fly to Rome. Antony was then in great power, and took Herod under his protection, and, seeing that he might prove useful to him, obtained a decree of the senate appointing him king of Judaea, to the extinction of all the living Asmonaean princes (Josephus, *Ant. 14*, 9-14; *War*, 1, 10-14; Dion Cass. 48). These events took place in B.C. 40, and Herod, only staying seven days at Rome, returned speedily to Jerusalem within three months from the time he had first fled.

It was not, however, so easy for Herod to obtain possession of Jerusalem, or to establish himself as king of Judaea, as it had been to obtain this title from the Romans. The Jews still held firmly to Antigonus as the representative of the Asmonaean line, and it was not for several years that Herod made any material advance whatever. With the assistance of the Romans Herod made preparations to take Jerusalem. — He had endeavored to conciliate the people by marrying Mariamne, thinking that by so doing the attachment of the Jews to the Asmonaean family would be extended to him. After six months' siege the Romans entered the city (B.C. 37), and, to revenge the obstinate resistance they had received, began to ransack and plunder, and it was no easy task for Herod to purchase from the conquerors the freedom from pillage of some part of his capital. Antigonus was taken and conveyed to Antioch, where, having been previously beaten, he was ignominiously executed with the axe by the order of Antony, a mode of treatment which the Romans had never before used to a king (Dion Cass. 69, 22; Josephus, A*nt. 15*, 1, 2) Thus ended the government of the Asmonaeans, 126 years after it was first set up (Josephus, *Ant. 14*, 16, 4). Immediately on ascending the throne Herod put to death all the members of the Sanhedrim, excepting Pollio and Sameas (the famous Hillel and Shammai of the Rabbinical writers), who had predicted this result, and also all the adherents of Antigonus who could be found. Having confiscated their property, he sent presents to Antony to repay him for his assistance and to further secure his favor. He then gave the office of high-priest, which had become vacant by the death of Antigonus, and the mutilation of Hyrcanus, whose ears had been cut off by Antigonus (comp. ◁02116▷Leviticus 21:16-24), to an obscure priest from Babylon named Ananel. At this insult Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne

and Aristobulus, to whom the office of high-priest belonged by hereditary succession, appealed to Cleopatra to use her powerful influence with Antony, and Herod was thus compelled to depose Ananel, and to elevate Aristobulus to the high-priesthood. The increasing popularity of Aristobulus, added to the further intrigues of Alexandra, so excited the jealousy of Herod that he caused him to be drowned while bathing, and expressed great sorrow at the accident. *SEE ARISTOBULUS*. Alexandra again applied to Cleopatra, who at last persuaded Antony to summon Herod to Laodicea to answer for his conduct. Herod was obliged to obey, but was dismissed with the highest honors (Josephus, Ant. 15:3,1-8; comp. *14 Wa.*, 1, 22, 2). After the defeat of Antony at Actium, in B.C. 31, Herod had an audience at Rhodes with Octavius, who did not think that Antony was quite powerless while Herod continued his assistance to him (Josephus, *War*, 1, 20, 1). Herod so conciliated him that he obtained security in his kingdom of Judaea, to which Octavius added Gadara, Samaria, and the maritime cities Gaza and Joppa. Shortly after the regions of Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis were given him (Josephus, Ant. 15:5, 6, 7; 10, 1; *War*, 1, 20, 3, 4; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 9). Herod's domestic life was troubled by a long series of bloodshed. Hyrcanus, the grandfather of his wife Mariamne, was put to death before his visit to Octavius, and Mariamne, to whom he was passionately attached, fell a victim to his jealousy soon after his return. *SEE HYRCANUS*; *SEE MARIAMNE*. His remorse for the deed is well described by Josephus, who says that Herod commanded his attendants always to speak of her as alive *(Ant. 15*, 7, 7; *War*, 1, 22, 5). In B.C. 20, when Augustus visited Judaea in person; another extensive addition was made to his territories. The district of Paneas was taken away from its ruler Zenodorus for leaguing himself with the Arabs, and given to Herod. In return, Herod adorned this place by erecting a temple, which he dedicated to Augustus (Josephus, *Ant. 15*, 10,.3, *War*, 1, 20, 4; Dion. Cass. 54, 9). Not long after this, the death of his wife was followed by other atrocities. Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne, were put to death; and at last, in B.C. 4, Herod ordered his eldest son, Antipater, to be killed. *SEE ALEXANDER*; *SEE ARISTOBULUS*; *SEE ANTIPATER*. Herod's painful disease no doubt maddened him in his later years, and in anticipation of his own death he gave orders that the principal Jews, whom he had shut up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, should immediately after his decease be put to death, that mourners might not be wanting at his funeral (Josephus, Ant. 17. 6, 5). Near his death, too, he must have ordered the murder of the

infants at Bethlehem, as recorded by Matthew (<40216>Matthew 2:16-18). The number of children in a village must have been very few; and Josephus has passed this story over unnoticed; yet it is worthy of remark that he has given an account of a massacre by Herod of all the members of his family who had consented to what the Pharisees foretold, viz. that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity be deprived of the kingdom *(Ant. 17,* 2, 4). A confused account of the massacre of the children and the murder of Antipater is given in Macrobius: "Augustus cum audisset inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes, rex Judaeorum, intra bimatum jussit intefici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis por*cum* (?ὗν, *swine)* esse quam *filium* (? υἱόν, *son)" (Sat.* 2, 4). Macrobius lived in the 5th century (c. A.D. 420), and the words *intra bimatum* (a bimatu et infra, <40216>Matthew 2:16. Vulg.) seem to be borrowed; the story, too, is erong, as Antipater was of age when he was executed (Alford, ad-loc.). Macrobius may have made some mistake on account of Herod's wish to destroy- the heir to the throne of David. The language of the evangelist leaves in complete uncertainty the method in which the deed was effected (ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλεν). The scene of open and undisguised violence which has been consecrated by Christian art is wholly at variance with what may be supposed to have been the historic reality.

Herod was married to no less than ten wives, by most of whom he had children. He died a few days before the Passover, B.C. 4, his deathbed being the scene of the most awful agonies in mind and body. According to the custom of the times, he made his sons the heirs to his kingdom by a formal testament, leaving its ratification to the will of the emperor. Augustus assenting to its main provisions, Archelaus, became tetrarch of Juduea, Samaria, and Idumnea; Philip, of Trachonitis and Ituraea; and Herod Antipas, of Galilee and Perrua. His body was conveyed by his son Archelaus from Jericho, where he died, to Herodium, a city and fortress 200 stadia distant, and he was there buried with great pomp (Josephus, *Ant. 17,* 2; *War,* 1, 38, 9).

On the extirpation of the Asmonaean family, finding that there was then no one who could interfere with him, Herod had introduced heathenish customs, such as plays, shows, and chariot-races, which the Jews condemned as contrary to the laws of Moses (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 1); and on the completion of the building of Caesarea he also introduced Olympic games and consecrated them to Caesar, ordering them to be celebrated every fifth year (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 9, 6; 16:5, 1). With regard to the

prejudices of the Jews, Herod showed as great contempt for public opinion as in the execution of his personal vengeance. He signalized his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums,* 1, 318), and surrounded his person by foreign mercenaries, some of whom had formerly been in the service of Cleopatra (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 7,3; 17:1, 1; 8, 3). His coins and those of his successors bore only Greek legends; and he introduced heathen games even within the walls of Jerusalem (Josephus, *A nt. 15,* 8, 1). He displayed ostentatiously his favor towards foreigners (Josephus, *Ant. 16,* 5, 3), and oppressed the old Jewish aristocracy (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 1, 1). The later Jewish traditions describe him as successively the servant of the Asmonaeans and the Romans, and relate that one Rabbin only survived the persecution which he directed against them, purchasing his life by the loss of sight (Jost, 1, 319, etc.).

Notwithstanding that he thus alienated his subjects from him, he greatly improved his country by the number of fine towns and magnificent public buildings which he had erected. He built a temple at Samaria, and converted it into a Roman city under the name of Sebaste. He also built Gaba in Galilee, and Heshbonitis in Persea (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 8, 5), besides several other towns, which he called by the names of different members of his family, as Antipatris, from the name of his father Antipater, and Phasaelis, in the plains of Jericho, after his brother Phasael (Josephus, *Ant. 16,* 5, 2). On many other towns in Syria and Greece he bestowed money, but his grandest undertaking was the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. It was commenced in the 18th year of his reign (B.C. 21), and the work was carried on with such vigor that the Temple itself *(*ναός*)*, i.e. the Holy House, was finished in a year and a half (Josephus, *Ant. 15:*11,1, 6). The cloisters and other buildings were finished in eight years (Josephus, *Ant. 15:*11, 5). Additions and repairs were continually made, and it was not till the reign of Herod Agrippa II (c. A.D. 65) that the Temple *(*τὸ ἱερόν*)* was completed (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 9, 7). Hence the Jews said to our Lord, "Forty and six years was this Temple in building *[*ᾠκοδομήθη — and is not even yet completed], and wilt thou raise it up in three days!" (⁴⁰²⁰John 2:20). This took place in A.D. 26, not long after our Lord's baptism, who "was about thirty years of age" (⁴⁰²³Luke 3:23), and who was born some two years before the death of Herod, in B.C. 4, according to the true chronology. This beautiful Temple, though built in honor of the God of Israel, did not win the hearts of the people, as is proved by the revolt which took place shortly before Herod's death, when the Jews tore down the

golden eagle which he had fastened to the Temple, and broke it in pieces (Josephus, *Antig. 17, 6*, 2, 3)

The diversity of Herod's nature is remarkable. On regarding his magnificence, and the benefits he bestowed upon his people, one cannot deny that he had a very beneficent disposition; but when we read of his cruelties, not only to his subjects, but even to his own relations, one is forced to allow that he was brutish and a stranger to humanity (comp. Josephus, *Ant. 16*, 5, 4). His servility to Rome is amply shown by the manner in which he transgressed the customs of his nation and set aside many of their laws, building cities and erecting temples in foreign countries, for the Jews did not permit him so to do in Judaea, even though they were under so tyrannical a government as that of Herod. His confessed apology was that he was acting to please Caesar and the Romans, and so through all his reign he was a Jewish prince only in name, with a Hellenistic disposition (comp. Josephus, *Ant. 15*, 9, 5; 19:7, 3). It has even been supposed (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 1, 323) that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of genealogies which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures (Josephus, *Ant. 16*, 7,1). He maintained peace at home during a long reign by the vigor and timely generosity of his administration. Abroad he conciliated the goodwill of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostentatious display, and even his arbitrary tyranny, was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Bold and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, he had many of the characteristics which make a popular hero; and the title which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.

Josephus gives Herod I the surname of Great (῾Ηρώδης ὁ μέγας). Ewald suggests that the title *elder* is only intended to distinguish him from the younger Herod (Antipas), and compares the cases of ῾Ελκίας ὸμέγας *(Ant. 18:*8, 4) and Agrippa the Great, in contradistinction to Helcias, the keeper of the sacred treasure *(Ant. 20:*11, 1), and to Agrippa II. The title "Agrippa the Great" is confirmed by coins, on which he is styled ΜΕΓΑΣ

(Eckhel, *Doct. Nun. Vet. 3*, 492; Akerman, *Nusm. Chronicles 9:*23), and so, says Ewald, "it may similarly have been given upon the coins of Herod, and from this the origin of the surname may have been derived" *(Geschichte, 4*, 473, note). There are, however, *no coins* of Herod I with the title *great.* It is best to suppose that the title in Josephus is merely a distinguishing epithet, and not meant to express greatness of character or achievements.

Picture for Herod 1

2. HEROD ANTIPAS (Ἡρώδης, Matt., Mark, Luke; Ἀντίπας, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great, by Malthace, a Samaritan (Joseph. *Ant. 17*, 1, 3; *War*, 1, 28, 4). His father had already given him "the kingdom" in his first will. but in the final arrangement left him the tetrarchy of Galilee and Persea (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 8,1; *War*, 2, 9,1; <40140>Matthew 14:1; <42301>Luke 3:1 3:19 9:1; <44130>Acts 13:1), which brought him the yearly revenue of 200 talents (Josephus, *Ant. 18*, 5, 1). On his way to Rome he visited his brother Philip, and commencing an intrigue with his wife Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne, he afterwards incestuously married her. He had previously been married to a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petrsea, who avenged this insult by invading his dominions, and defeated him with great loss (Josephus, *Ant. 18*, 5, 1). An appeal to the Romans afforded the only hope of safety. Aretas was haughtily ordered by the emperor to desist from the prosecution of the war, and Herod accordingly escaped the expected overthrow. Josephus says that the opinion of the Jews was that the defeat was a punishment for his having imprisoned John the Baptist on account of his popularity, and afterwards put him to death, but does not mention the reproval that John gave him, nor that it was at the instigation of Herodias that he was killed, as recorded in the Gospels (Joseph. *Ant. 18*, 5, 4; <40140>Matthew 14:1-11; <41614>Mark 6:1416; <42089>Luke 3:19;. 9:7-9). The evangelists evidently give the true reason, and Josephus the one generally received by the people. In A.D. 38, after the death of Tiberius, he was persuaded, especially at the ambitious instigation of Herodias. to go to Rome to procure for himself the royal title. Agrippa, who was high in the favor of Caligula, and had already received this title, opposed this with such success that Antipas was condemned to perpetual banishment at Lyons, a city of Gaul (Joseph. *Ant. 18*, 7, 2), and eventually died in Spain, whither his wife Herodias had voluntarily followed him *(War*, 2, 9, 6). He is called (by courtesy) *kiny* by Matthew (<40149>Matthew 14:9) and by Mark (<41614>Mark 6:14). See No. 5.

Herod Antipas was in high favor with Tiberius; hence he gave the name of Tiberias to the city he built on the lake of Gennesareth (Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 2, 3). He enlarged and improved several cities of his dominions, and also built a wall about Sepphoris, and round Betharamphtha, which latter town he named *Julias,* in honor of the wife of the emperor (Josephus, *Ant.* 18; 2,1 1 comp. *War,* 2, 9, 1).

It was before Herod Antipas, who came up to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (comp. Joseph. *Ant. 18:*6, 3), that our Lord was sent for examination when Pilate heard that he was a Galilaean, as Pilate had already had several disputes with the Galileans, and was not at this time on veer good terms with Herod (<42301>Luke 13:1; 23:6-7), and "on the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together" (<42312>Luke 23:12; comp. Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 3, 2; <19835>Psalm 83:5). The name of Herod Antipas is coupled with that of Pilate in the prayer of the apostles mentioned in the Acts (4, 24-30). His personal character is little touched upon by either Josephus or the evangelists, yet from his consenting to the death of John the Baptist to gratify the malice of a wicked woman, though for a time he had "heard him gladly" (<41620>Mark 6:20), we perceive his cowardice, his want of spirit, and his fear of ridicule. His wicked oath was not binding on him, for Herod was bound by the law of God not to commit murder. He was in any case desirous to see Jesus, and "hoped to have seen a miracle from him" (<42308>Luke 23:8). His artifice and cunning are specially alluded to by our Lord, "Go ye and tell that *fox" (*τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, <42332>Luke 13:32). Coins of Herod Antipas bear the title TETPAPXOY. *SEE ANTIPAS*.

3. HEROD ARCHELAUS *(*Ἀρχέλαος, Matt.; Josephus; ῾Ηρώδης, Dion Cassius; coins), son of Herod the Great and Malthace, uterine and younger brother of Herod Altipas, and called by Dion Cassius ῾Ηρώδης Παλαιστηνός (4, 57). He was brought up with his brother at Rome (Josephus, *Ant. 17,* 1, 3). His father had disinherited him in consequence of the false accusations of his eldest brother Antipater, the son of Doris; but Herod, on making a new will, altered his mind, and gave him "the kingdom," which had before been left to Antipas (Josephus, *Ant. 17,* 8, 1). It was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat-of Joseph to Galilee (<40222>Matthew 2:22). He was saluted as "king" by the army, bit refused to accept that title till it should be confirmed by Augustus (Joseph. *Ant. 17,* 8, 2,4; *War,* 1, 1). Shortly after this a sedition was raised against him, which he quelled by killing 3000 persons, and he then set sail with his

brother Antipas to Rome (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 9, 2, 4; *War*, 2, 2,3). Upon this the Jews sent an embassy to Augustus, to request that they might be allowed to live according to their own laws under a Roman governor. Our Lord seems to allude to this circumstance in the parable of the nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom: "But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us" (<42192>Luke 19:1227). While he was at Rome, Jerusalem was under the care of Sabinus, the Roman procurator, and a quarrel ensued in consequence of the manner in which the Jews were treated. Quiet was again established through the intervention of Varus, the president of Syria, and the authors of the sedition were punished (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 10). Augustus, however, ratified the main points of Herod's will, and gave Archelaus Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea, with the cities of Caesarea, Sebaste, Joppa, and Jerusalem, the title of *ethnarch*, and a promise that he should have the royal dignity hereafter if he governed virtuously (Joseph. *Ant. 17*, 11, 4; *War*, 2, 6,3). Archelaus never really had the title of king (βασιλεύς), though at first called so by the people (Josephus, *Ant. 17:*8, 2), yet we cannot object to the word (βασιλεύει in Matthew, for Archelaus regarded himself as king (Josephus, *War*, 2, 1, 1), and Josephus speaks of the province of Lysanias, which was only a tetrarchy, as βασιλείαν τὴν Λυσανίου (*War*, 2, 11, 5). Herod (Antipas) the tetrarch is also called ὁ βασιλεύς (<40149>Matthew 14:9; <41614>Mark 6:14). When Archelaus returned to Judaea he rebuilt the royal palace at Jericho, and established a village, naming it after himself, Archelaus (Joseph. *Ant. 17*, 13, 1). Shortly after Archelaus's return he violated the Mosaic law by marrying Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and the Jews complaining again loudly of his tyranny, Augustus summoned him to Rome, and finally, A.D. 6, sent him into exile at Vienna in Gaul, where he probably died, and his dominions were attached to the Roman empire (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 13, 2; *War*, 2, 7; compare Strabo, 16, 765; Dion Cassius, 55, 25, 27). Jerome, however, relates that he was shown the tomb of Archelaus near Bethlehem (*Onomasticon, s.v.*). Coins with the title CONAPXOY belong to Archelaus. *SEE ARCHELAUS*.

4. HEROD PHILIP I (Φίλιππος, <41617>Mark 6:17; ῾Ηρώδης, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great by a second Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest (Josephus, *Ant. 18:*5, 4), and must be distinguished from Philip the tetrarch, No. 6. He was the husband of Herodias, by whom he had a daughter, Salome. Herodias, however, contrary to the laws of her

country, divorced herself from him, and married her uncle Antipas [see Nos. 2 and 5] (Josephus, *Ant. 18:*5, 4; Matt. 14:3; <41067>Mark 6:17; <42319>Luke 3:19). — He was omitted in the will of Herod in consequence of the discovery that Mariamne was conscious of the plots of Antipater, Herod the Great's son by Doris (Josephus, *War*, 1, 30,7). *SEE PHILIP*.

5. HERODIAS (Ἡρώδιας, <40141>Matthew 14:1-11; <41614>Mark 6:14-16; <42319>Luke 3:19) was the daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Herod I by the first Mariamne, and of Berenice, the daughter of Salome, Herod's sister, and was consequently sister of Herod Agrippa I (Josephus, *Ant. 18:*5,4; *War*, 1, 28, 1). She was first married to her uncle, Herod Philip I, the son of Herod I and the second Mariamne, by whom she had a daughter Salome, probably the one that danced and pleased Herod Antipas, and who afterwards married her uncle Philip II. Herodias soon divorced herself from him, and married Herod Antipas, who was also her uncle, being the son of Herod I and Malthace, and who agreed, for her sake, to put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia (Josephus, *Ant. 18:*5,1, 4). John the Baptist reproved her for her crimes in thus living in adultery and incest, and she took the first opportunity to cause him to be put to death, thus adding thereto the crime of murder. Her marriage was unlawful for three reasons: first, her former husband, Philip, was still alive *(*διαστασα ζῶντος, Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 5,4); secondly, Antipas's wife was still alive; and, thirdly, by her first marriage with Philip she became the sister-in-law of Antipas, who was consequently forbidden by the Jewish law to marry his brother's wife (<03816>Leviticus 18:16; 11:21; comp. Alford on <40404>Matthew 14:4). When Antipas was condemned by Caius to perpetual banishment, Herodias was offered a pardon, and the emperor made her a present of money, telling her that it was her brother Agrippa (I) who prevented her being involved in the same calamity as her husband. The best trait of her character is shown when, in true Jewish spirit, she refused this offer, and voluntarily chose to share the exile of her husband [No. 2] (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 7, 2). *SEE HERODIAS*.

6. HEROD PHILIP II (Φίλιππος, Luke and Josephus) was son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem *(*Ἱεροσολυμῖτις*)*, and was with his half brothers Archelaus and Antipas brought up at Rome (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 1,3; *War*, 1, 28, 4). He received as his share of the empire the tetrarchy of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and certain parts about Jamnia, with a revenue of 100 talents (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 11, 4; *War*, 2, 6, 3). He is only mentioned once in the N.T. (Luke 3:I, Φιλίππου τετραρχοῦντος*)*. He

was married to Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip I and Herodias, but left no children (Joseph. *Ant. 18*, 5, 4). He reigned over his dominions for 37 years (B.C. 4-A.D. 34), during which time he showed-himself to be a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 4, 6). He built the city of Paneas and named it Caesarea, more commonly known as Caesarea-Philippi (<40163>Matthew 16:13; <40827>Mark 8:27), and also advanced to the dignity of a city the village Bethsaida, calling it by the name of *Julias*, in honor of the daughter of Augustus. He died at Julias, and was buried in the monument he had there built (Josephus, *Ant. 18*, 2, 1; 4,6; *War*, 2, 9, 1). Leaving no children, his dominions were annexed to the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* 18 , 56). Coins of Philip II bear the title TETPAPXOY. *SEE PHILIP*.

7. HEROD AGRIPPA I (Ἡρώδης, Acts; Ἀγρίππας, Josephus) was the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and grandson of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant. 17*, 1, 2; *War*, 1, 28, 1). He is called "Agrippa the Great" by Josephus (*Ant. 17*, 2, 2). A short time before the death of Herod the Great he was living at Rome and was brought up with Drusus, the son of fiberius, and with Antonia, the wife of Drusus (Josephus, *Ant. 18*, 6, 1). He was only one year older than Claudius, who was born in B.C. 10, and they were bred up together in the closest intimacy. The earlier part of his life was spent at Rome, where the magnificence and luxury in which he indulged involved him so deeply in debt that he was compelled to fly from Rome, and betook himself to a fortress at Malatha, in Idumaea. Through the mediation of his wife Cypros and his sister Herodias, he was allowed to take up his abode at Tiberias, and received the rank of edile in that city, with a small amnnity (Joseph. *Ant. 16:*6,2). But, having quarreled with his brother-in-law, he fled to Flaccus, the proconsul of Syria. Soon afterwards he was convicted, through the information of his brother Aristobulus, of having received a bribe from the Damascenes, who wished to purchase his influence with the proconsul, and was again compelled to fly. He was arrested, as he was about to sail to Italy, for a sum of money which he owed to the Roman treasury, but made his escape and reached Alexandria, where his wife succeeded in procuring a supply of money from Alexander the alabarch. He then set sail, and landed at Puteoli. He was favorably received by Tiberius; but he one day incautiously expressed the wish that Caius might soon succeed to the throne, which being reported to Tiberius, he was arrested and thrown into prison, where he remained till the

accession of Cains in A.D. 37 (Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 6,10). Caius shortly after gave him the tetrarchy of Philip, the iron chain with which he had been fastened to a soldier being exchanged for a gold one (Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 6,10). He was also invested with the consular dignity, and a league was publicly made with him by Claudius. He then started to take possession of his kingdom, and at Alexandria was insulted by the people, who dressed up an idiot, and bore him in mock triumph through the streets to deride the new king of the Jews (Philo, *in Flaccuns,* 6). The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by the distinctions conferred upon Agrippa by the Romans, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting him in the emperor's favor. Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a countercharge against Antipas of treasonous correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusations, and, after his exile, Agrippa received from Caius the tetrarchy of Galilee and Pereea (Josephus, Ant. 18:7, 2); and in A.D. 41, for having greatly assisted Claudius, he received his whole paternal kingdom (Judeea and Samaria), and, in addition, the tetrarchy of Lysanias II (comp. Luke 3:1). Josephus says in one passage that Caius gave him this tetrarchy *(Ant. 18,* 6, 10), but afterwards, in two places, that Claudius gave it to him *(Ant. 19,* 5, 1; *War,* 2, 11, 5). Caius probably promised it, and Claudius actually conferred it. Agrippa now possessed the entire kingdom of Herod the Great. At this time he begged of Claudius the kingdom of Chalcis for his brother Herod (Josephus, *Ant. 19,* 5, 1; *War,* 2, 11, 5).

Agrippa loved to live at Jerusalem, and was a strict observer of the laws of his country, which will account for his persecuting the Christians, who were hated by the Jews (Josephus, Ant. 19, 7, 3). Thus influenced by a strong desire for popularity, rather than from innate cruelty, "he stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the Church." He put to death James the elder, son of Zebedee, and cast Peter into prison, no doubt with the intention of killing him also. This was frustrated by his miraculous deliverance from his jailers by the angel of the Lord (Acts 12:1-19). Agrippa I, like his grandfather, displayed great taste in building, and especially adorned the city of Berytus (Josephus, *Ant. 19,* 7, 5). The suspicions of Claudius prevented him from finishing the impregnable fortifications with which he had begun to surround Jerusalem. His friendship was courted by many of the neighboring kings and rulers. In A.D. 44 Agrippa celebrated games at Caesarea in honor of the emperor, and to make vows for his safety. At this festival a number of the principal

persons, and such as were of dignity in the province, attended. Josephus does not mention those of Tyre and Sidon as recorded in the Acts (<44120>Acts 12:20). Though Agrippa was "highly displeased," it does not appear that any rupture worthy of notice had taken place. On the second day Agrippa appeared in the theatre in a garment interwoven with silver. On closing his address to the people, they saluted him as a god, for which he did not rebuke them, and he was immediately seized with violent internal pains, and died five days after (Josephus, *Ant. 19,* 8, 2). This fuller account of Josephus agrees substantially with that in the Acts. The silver dress *(*ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν,Josephus; ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν, Acts); and the disease (τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι τὸν βίον κατέστπεψεν, Joseph.; γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν, Acts). The owl *(*Βουβῶνα ἐπὶ σχοινίου τινός*),* which on this occasion appeared to Agrippa as the messenger of ill tidings (ἄγγελος κάκων, Josephus, *Ant. 19:*8, 2), though on a former one it had appeared to him as a messenger of good news (Josephus, *Ant. 18,* 6, 7), is converted by Eusebius *(H. E.* 2, ch. 10), who professes to quote Josephus, into the angel of the Acts (ἐπάταξεναὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου, <44123>Acts 12:23. For an explanation of the confusion, compare Eusebius, *1.* c., ed. Heinichen, Excurs. 2, vol. 3:p. 556; Alford, ad loc.). *SEE AGRIPPA.*

8. HEROD AGRIPPA II *(*Ἀγρίππας, Acts; Josephus) was the son of-Herod Agrippa I and Cypros *(War,* 2, 11, 6). At the time of his father's death (A.D. 44) he was only seventeen years of age, and the emperor Claudius, thinking him too young to govern the kingdom, sent Cuspius Fadus as procurator, and thus made it again a Roman province (Josephus, *Ant. 19,* 9, 2; Tacit. *Hist. 5,* 9). After the death of his uncle Herod in A.D. 48, Claudius bestowed upon him the small kingdom of Chalcis (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 5, 2; *War,* 2, 12,1), and four years after took it away from him, giving him instead the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 7, 1; *War,* 2, 12, 8) with the title of king (<44253>Acts 25:13; 26:2, 7). In A.D. 55 Nero gave him the cities of Tiberias and Taricheae in Galilee, and Julias, a city of Peraea, with fourteen villages near it (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 8, 4; comp. *War,* 2, 13, 2).

Agrippa II exhibited the Herodian partiality for building. He much enlarged the city of Caesarea Philippi, and in honor of Nero called it Neronias. He also supplied large sums of money towards beautifying Jerusalem (which he encircled with the "third wall") and Berytus, transferring almost everything that was ornamental from his own kingdom to this latter place.

These acts rendered him most unpopular (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 9,4). In A.D. 60 king Agrippa and Bernice (q.v.) his sister, concerning the nature of whose equivocal intercourse with each other there had been much grave conversation (Juvenal, *Sat. 6,* 155 sq.), and who, in consequence, persuaded Polemo, king of Cilicia, to marry her (Josephus, *A nt. 20:*7, 3), came to Caesarea (Acts 25:13). It was before him and his sister that the apostle Paul made his defense, and somewhat *(*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*)* "persuaded him to be a Christian." Agrippa seems to have been intimate with Festus (Josephus, *Ant. 20,* 7, 11), and it was natural that the Roman governor should avail himself of his judgment on a question of what seemed to be Jewish law (Acts 25:18 sq., 26; comp. Josephus, *A t. 20,* 8, 7). The "pomp" (πολλὴ φαντασία*)* with which the king came into the audience chamber (Acts 25:23) was accordant with his general bearing.

The famous speech which Agrippa made to the Jews, to dissuade them from waging war with the Romans, is recorded by Josephus *(War,* 2, 16, 4). At the commencement of the war he sided with the Romans, and was wounded by a sling-stone at the siege of Gamala (Josephus, *War, 4,* 1, 3). After the fall of Jerusalem he retired with his sister Berenice to Rome, and there died in the seventieth year of his age, and in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). He was on intimate terms with Josephus, who gives two of his letters *Life,* 65), and he was the last Jewish prince of the Herodian line.

As regards his coins, Eckhel gives two with the head of Nero, one with the legend ΕΗΙΙΙ ΒΑΕΙΑΕ ΑΡΠΙΗΗΙΑ ΝΕΠΘΝΙΕ, confirming the account of Josephus as regards the city of Caesarea-Philippi, and the other bearing the pruenomen *of Marcus,* which he may have received on account of his family being indebted to the triumvir Antony, or else, as Eckhel thinks, more likely from Marcus Agrippa (Eckhel, *Doct. Num. Vet. 3:*493, 494; comp. Akerman, *Num. Chronicles 9:*42). There are other coins with the heads of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. *SEE MONEY*. *SEE AGRIPPA*.

Picture for Herod 2

9. BERENICE *SEE BERENICE* (q.v.).

10. DRUSILLA *SEE DRUSILLA* (q.v.).

He'rodian

(only in the plur. ῾Ηρωδιανοί*)*, the designation of a class of Jews that existed in the time of Jesus Christ, evidently, as the name imports, partisans

of Herod, but whether of a political or religious description it is not easy, for want of materials, to determine. The passages of the New Testament which refer to them are the following: <40306>Mark 3:6; 12:13; <40216>Matthew 22:16; <42020>Luke 20:20. From these it appears that the ecclesiastical authorities of Judaea held a council against our Savior, and, associating with themselves the Herodians, sent an embassy to him with the express but covert design of ensnaring him in his speech, that thus they might compass his destruction, by embroiling him. But what additional difficulty did the Herodians bring? Herod Antipas was now tetrarch of Galilee and Persea, which was the only inheritance he received from his father, Herod the Great. As tetrarch of Galilee he was specially the ruler of Jesus, whose home was in that province. The Herodians, then, may have been subjects of Herod, Galilueans, whose evidence the priests were desirous of procuring, because theirs would be the evidence of fellow-countrymen, and of special force with Antipas as being that of his own immediate subjects (<42307>Luke 23:7). Herod's relations with Rome were in an unsafe condition. He was a weak prince, given to ease and luxury, and his wife's ambition conspired with his own desires to make him strive to obtain from the emperor Caligula the title of king. For this purpose he took a journey to Rome, but he was banished to Lyons, in Gaul. The Herodians may have been favorers of his pretensions; if so, they would be partial hearers, and eager witnesses against Jesus before the Roman tribunal. It would be a great service-to the Romans to be the means of enabling them to get rid of one who aspired to be king of the Jews. It would equally gratify their own lord should the Herodians give effectual aid in putting a period, to the mysterious yet formidable claims of a rival claimant of the crown. If the Herodians were a Galilaean political party who were eager to procure from Rome the honor of royalty for Herod (<40614>Mark 6:14, the name of king is merely as of courtesy), they were chosen as associates by the Sanhedrim with especial propriety. This idea is confirmed by Josephus's mention of a party as "the partisans of Herod" *(*οἱ τὰ ῾Ηρώδου φανοῦντες *Ant. 14*, 15, 10). The deputation were to "feign themselves just men," that is, men whose sympathies were entirely Jewish, and, as such, anti-heathen: they were to intimate their dislike of paying tribute, as being an acknowledgment of a foreign yoke; and by flattering Jesus, as one who loved truth, feared no man, and would say what he thought, they meant to inveigle him into a condemnation of the practice. In order to carry these base and hypocritical designs into effect, the Herodians were appropriately associated with the Pharisees; for as the latter were the recognized conservators of Judaism, so

the former were friends of the aggrandizement of a native as against a foreign prince. (Comp. Fritzsche and Walch, ad loc. Other hypotheses may be found in Paulus on the passage in Matt.; in Wolff, *Curae Phil.* 1, 311 sq.; see also Kecher, *Analect.* in loc. Matt.; Zorn, *Hist. fisci. Juzd.* p. 127; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 275. Monographs on this subject are those of Steuch, *Diss. de Herod.* Lund. 1706; Floder, *Diss. de Herod.* Upsal, 1764; Schmid, *Epist. de Herod.* Lipsise, 1763; Leuschner, *De Secta Herodianor.* Hirschberg, 1751; Stollberg, *De Haerodianis,* Viteb. 1666; Jensius, *id.* Jen. 1688.) *SEE SECTS, JEWISH*.

Hero’dias

(Ἡρωδίας, a female patronymic from Ἡρώδης: on patronymics and gentile names in ιας, see Matthise, *Gk. Gramm. §* 101 and 103), the name of a woman of notoriety in the N.T., daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Agrippa I. She first married Herod, surnamed Philip, another of the sons of Mariamne and the first Herod *(Ant. 18,* 5, 4; comp. *War,* 1, 29, 4), and therefore her full uncle; then she eloped from him, during his lifetime *(ibid,),* to marry Herod Antipas, her step-uncle, who had long been married to, and was still living with, the daughter of Eneas or Aretas-his assumed name-king of Arabia *(Ant. 17,* 9, 4). Thus she left her husband, who was still alive, to connect herself with a man whose wife was still alive. Her paramour was, indeed, less of a blood relation than her original husband; but, being likewise the half brother of that husband, he was already connected with her by affinity — so close that there was only one case contemplated in the law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the married brother had died childless (<03B1B6>Leviticus 18:16, and 22:21, and for the exception <052505>Deuteronomy 25:5 sq.). Now Herodias had already had one child — Salome (the daughter whose dancing is mentioned in the Gospels) —by Philip *(Ant. 18,* 5, 4), and, as he was still alive, might have had more. Well therefore may she be charged by Josephus with the intention of confounding her country’s institutions *(Ant. 18,* 5, 4); and well may John the Baptist have remonstrated against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been a less hardened one (<401409>Matthew 14:9 says he “was sorry;” <411620>Mark 6:20 that he “feared” John, and “heard him gladly”). A.D. 28. The consequences both of the crime and of the reproof which it incurred are well known. Aretas made war upon Herod for the injury done to his daughter, and routed him with the loss of his whole army *(Ant. 18,* 5,

1). The head of John the Baptist was granted at the suggestion of Herodias (<4014B>Matthew 14:8-11; <4106A>Mark 6:24-28). According to Josephus, the execution took place in a fortress called Machaerus, on the frontier between the dominions of Aretas and Herod; according to Pliny (5, 15), looking down upon the Dead Sea from the south (compare Robinson, 1, 570, note). It was to the iniquity of this act, rather than to the immorality of that illicit connection, that, the historian says, some of the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod. In the closing scene of her career, indeed, Herodias exhibited considerable magnanimity, as she preferred going with Antipas to Lugdunum, and there sharing his exile and reverses, till death ended them, to the remaining with her brother Agrippa I, and partaking of his elevation *(Ant. 18,* 7, 2). This town is probably Lugdunum Convenarum, a town of Gaul, situated on the right bank of the Garonne, at the foot of the Pyrenees, now *St. Bertrand de Commines* (Murray, *Handbook of France,* p. 314); Eusebius, H. *E.* 1, 11, says *Vienne,* confounding Antipas with Archelaus. Burton on <4014B>Matthew 14:3, Alford, and moderns in general, Ly*ons.* In Josephus (War, 2, 9, 6), Antipas is said to have died in Spain-apparently, from the context, the land of his exile. A town on the frontiers, therefore, like the above, would satisfy both passages. *SEE HEROD.*

There are few episodes in the whole range of the New Testament more suggestive to the commentator than this one scene in the life of Herodias.

1. It exhibits one of the most remarkable of the undesigned coincidences between the N.T. and Josephus; that there are some discrepancies in the two accounts only enhances their value. More than this, it has led the historian into a brief digression upon the life, death, and character of the Baptist, which speaks volumes in favor of the genuineness of that still more celebrated passage in which he speaks of “Jesus,” that “wise man, if man he may be called” (A*nt. 18,* 3, 3; comp. 20, 9, 1, unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Eusebius, *Hist, Eccl.* 1, 11). *SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.*

2. It has been warmly debated whether it was the adultery or the incestuous connection that drew down the reproof of the Baptist. It has already-been shown that, either way, the offence merited condemnation upon more grounds than one.

3. The birthday feast is another undesigned coincidence between Scripture and profane history. The Jews abhorred keeping birthdays as a pagan custom (Bland on *Matt. 14:*6). On the other hand, it was usual with the

Egyptians (<01402>Genesis 40:20; comp. Josephus, *Ant. 12,* 4, 7), with the Persians (Herod. 1, 133), with the Greeks, even in the case of the dead, whence the Christian custom of keeping anniversaries of the martyrs (Bahr *ad Herod. 4,* 26), and with the Romans (Pers. *Sat.* 2, 1-3). Now the Herods may be said to have gone beyond Rome in the observance of all that was Roman. Herod the Great kept the day of his accession; Antipas-as we read here-and Agrippa I, as Josephus tells us (Ant. 19:7, 1), their birthday, with such magnificence that the "birthdays of Herod" (Herodis dies) had passed into a proverb when Persius wrote *(Sat.* 5, 180). *SEE BIRTHDAY*.

4. Yet dancing, on these festive occasions, was common to both Jew and Gentile, and was practiced in the same way: youths and virgins, singly, or separated into two bands, but never intermingled, danced to do honor to their deity, their hero, or to the day of their solemnity, Miriam (<02150>Exodus 15:20), the daughter of Jephthah (<071134>Judges 11:34), and David (<10614>2 Samuel 6:14) are familiar instances in Holy Writ: the "Carmen Saeculare" of Horace, to quote no more, points to the same custom amongst Greeks and Romans. It is plainly owing to the elevation of woman in the social scale that dancing in pairs (still unknown to the East) has come into fashion. *SEE DANCE*.

5. The rash oath of Herod, like that of Jephthah in the O.T., has afforded ample discussion to casuists. It is now ruled that all such oaths, where there is no reservation, expressed or implied, in favor of the laws of God or man, are illicit and without force. So Solomon had long since decided (<110220>1 Kings 2:20-24; see Sanderson, *De Juram. Oblig. Praelect. 3,* 16). *SEE OATH*.

Hero'dion

(Ηρωδίων, a deriv. from *Herod),* a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent a salutation as his kinsman (<451611>Romans 16:11). A.D. 55. According to Hippolytus, he became bishop of Tarsus, but according to others, of Patra.

Herodium

(Ηρώδιον), the name of a fortress (Josephus) or town (Pliny), built on a conspicuous spot by Herod the Great (Reland, *Palest.* p. 820), probably the site anciently occupied by BETH-HACCEREM (<240601>Jeremiah 6:1; <160314>Nehemiah 3:14), which the authority of Jerome has led some modern

travelers to identify with the well-known eminence called by the natives *Jebel el-Fureidis,* and by Europeans “the Frank Mountain.” If this identity be correct, the site has been the scene of many a remarkable change. Two great kings, in different ages and different ways, probably adorned it with magnificent works. From their lofty city the old inhabitants must have seen stretched before them, up the green vale of Urtas, the beautiful gardens and fountains of king Solomon, which suggested to the royal poet some of the exquisite imagery of the Canticles; and nearly a thousand years later, Herod the Great erected, probably on this very hill of Beth-haccerem, “a fortress with its round towers, and in it royal apartments of great strength and splendor” (Josephus, *Ant. 15,* 9, 4), making it serve as an acropolis amidst a mass of other buildings and palaces at the foot of the hill *(IV Car,* 1, 21:20). To this city, called after him Herodium, the Idumaean tyrant was brought for burial from Jericho, where he died (*Ant. 17,* 8, 3). The locality still yields its evidence of both these eras. Solomon’s reservoirs yet remain (Stanley, p. 165), and the present state of “the Frank Mountain” well agrees with the ancient description of Herodium (Robinson, *Researches,* 2, 173; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2, 427).

Herold, Johann

a German divine, was born at Hochstadt, Suabia, in 1511. His early history is not known. In 1539 he made his appearance in Basle as a defender of Protestantism. He was pastor of a parish near Basle for some years, but in 1546 retired from it and returned to Basle to devote his time entirely to literary labors. The date of his death is not ascertained; it was probably about 1570. Among his numerous writings are the following: *Heidenwelt und ihrer Gotter anfünglicher Ussprung* (Basel, 1544, fol.; also under the title, in a 2nd ed., *Theatrum Divum Dearumque* (Basil. 1628., fol.): — *Orthodoxographi Theologiae Doctores* LXXVI, *lumina clarissima* (Basil. 1555, fol.): — *Haeresiologia, sive Syntagma veterum theologorum per quos grassatae in Ecclesia haereses confutantur,* etc. (Basil. 1556, fol.).

Heron

Picture for Heron 1

Picture for Heron 2

(hpn;a} *anaphah’,* <03119>Leviticus 11:19; <05148>Deuteronomy 14:18), an unclean bird, for which the kite, woodcock, curlew, peacock, parrot, crane,

lapwing, and several others have been suggested. But most of these are not found in Palestine, and others have been identified with different Hebrew words. The root ãnaø *anaph'*, signifies to breathe, to snort, especially from *anger,* and thence, figuratively, *to be angry* (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 127). Parkhurst observes that "as the heron is remarkable for its *angry* disposition, especially when *hurt* or *wounded,* this bird seems to be most probably intended." But this equally applies to a great number of different species of birds, and would be especially appropriate to the *goose*, which hisses at the slightest provocation. The heron, though not constantly hissing, can utter a similar sound of displeasure with much meaning, and the common species, *Ardea cinerea,* is found in Egypt, and is also abundant in the Hauran of Palestine, where it frequents the margins of lakes and pools, and the reedy water courses in the deep ravines, striking and devouring an immense quantity of fish. The herons are wading birds, peculiarly irritable, remarkable for their voracity; frequenting marshes and oozy rivers, and spread over the regions of the East. Most of the species enumerated 2. English ornithology have been recognized in the vicinity of Palestine, and we may include all these under the term in question- "the anaphah *after his kind."* One of the commonest species in Asia is *Ardea russata* which is beautifully adorned with plumage partly white and partly of a rich orange-yellow, while the beak, legs, and all the naked parts of the skin are yellow. Its height is about seventeen inches. This is the *caboga,* or cow-heron so abundant in India. Several kinds of heron, one of which, from its form, would serve well enough to represent this little golden egret, are commonly depicted on those Egyptian paintings in which the subject-a favorite one-is the fowling and fishing among the paper-reeds of the Nile.

Bochart supposes that *anaphah* may mean the *mountain falcon,* called *cavorala* by Homer *(Odgs.* 1, 320), because of the similarity of the Greek word to the Hebrew. But if it meant *any* kind of *eagle* or *hawk,* it would probably have been reckoned with one or other of those species mentioned in the preceding verses. Perhaps, under all the circumstances, the *traditional* meaning is most likely to be correct, which we will therefore trace. The Talmudists evidently were at a loss, for they describe it indefinitely as a "high-flying bird of prey" *(Chulin, 63* a).

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew word by χαραδριός. This rendering, however, has been thought to lose what little weight it might otherwise have had from the probability that it originated in a false reading, viz. *aguphah,* which the translators connected with *ayctph,* "a bank." Jerome

adhered to the same word ill a Latin form, *caradrym* and *caradrium.* The Greek and Roman writers, from the earliest antiquity, refer to a bird which they call *charadrius.* It is particularly described by Aristotle *(Hist. An. 7,* 7), and by Elian *(Hist. An. 15,* 26). The latter derives its name from *xapcApa, a hollow* or chasm, especially one which contains water, because, he says, the bird frequents such places. It is, moreover, certain that by the Romans the *charadrius* was also called *icterus,* which signifies the jaundice, from a notion that patients affected with that disease were cured by looking at this bird, which was of a yellow color (Pliny, 34; Coel. Aurel. 3, 5), and by the Greeks, χλωρίων; and in allusion to the same fabulous notion, ἴκτιρος (Aristotle, *Hist. An. 9,* 13, 15, and 22; AElian, *Hist. A*n. 4:47). These writers concur in describing a bird, *sometimes* of a *yellow color,* remarkable for its voracity (from which circumstance arose the phrase χαραδριοῦ βίος, applied to a glutton), migratory, inhabiting watery places, and especially mountain torrents and valleys. Now it is certain that the name *charadrius* has been applied by ornithologists to the same species of birds from ancient times down to the present age. Linnus, under Order IV (consisting of vaders or shore birds), places the genus Charadrius, in which he includes all the numerous species *of plovers.* The ancient accounts may be advantageously compared with the following description of the genus from Mr. Selby's *British Ornithology,* 2, 230: "The members of this genus are numerous, and possess a wide geographical distribution, species being found in *every* quarter of the globe. They *visit the East* about April. Some of them, during the greater part of the year, are the inhabitants of open districts and wide wastes, frequenting both dry and moist situations, and only retire toward the coasts during the severity of winter. Others are continually resident upon the banks and about the mouths of rivers (particularly where the shore consists of small gravel or shingle). They live on worms, insects, and their larva? The flesh of many that live on the coasts is unpalatable." The same writer describes one "species, Charadrius pluvialis, called the *golden* plover from its color," and mentions the well-known fact that this species, in the course of molting, turns completely black. Analogous facts respecting the charadrius have been established by observations in every part of the globe, viz. that they are gregarious and migratory. The habits of the majority are *littoral.* They obtain their food along the banks of rivers and the shores of lakes; "like the gulls, they beat the moist soil with their pattering feet, to terrify the incumbent worms, yet are often found in deserts, in green and sedgy meadows, or on *upland moors."* Their food consists chiefly of mice,

worms, caterpillars, insects, toads, and frogs, which of course places them among the class of birds ceremonially *unclean.* On the whole, the evidence seems in favor of the conclusion that the Hebrew word *anaphah* designates the numerous species of *the plover* (may not this be the genus of birds alluded to as *the* fowls of the mountain, Psalm I, II; 2186Isaiah 18:6?). Various species of the genus are known in Syria and Palestine as the *C. pluvialis* (golden plover), *C. aedicnemus* (stone curlew), and *C. spinosus* (lapwing). (Kitto's *Physical History of Palestine,* p. 106.) In connection with some of the preceding remarks, it is important to observe that in these species a yellow color is more or less marked.

Herring, Thomas

archbishop of Canterbury, was born in 1693 at Walsoken, Norfolk, of which his father was rector. He studied at Jesus and Bennet colleges, Cambridge, and was made fellow of Corpus Christi in 1716. After having possessed various livings, he was raised in 1737 to the see of Bangor, whence in 1743 he was translated to York. After the defeat of the king's troops at Preston Pans in 1745, the archbishop exerted himself in his diocese with so much patriotism and zeal that he repressed the disaffected, inspirited the desponding, and procured at a county meeting a subscription of £40;000 towards the defense of the country. His zeal for the Hanoverian cause procured him the facetious title of "the red Herring." In 1747 he was removed to the see of Canterbury, and he died at Croydon in 1756. Herring was a man of great celebrity as a preacher. His *Sermons on Public Occasions* were published in 1763 (Lond. 8vo), with a memoir of Herring by Duncombe; followed by his *Letters to W. Duncome* (1727, 12mo). See *Biographica Britannica;* Rich, *Cyclop. of Biog.*

Herrnhut

a town of Saxony, in Upper Lusatia, in the circle of Dresden, at the foot of Hutberg Mountain, and about fifty miles from the city of Dresden. It was built by Zinzendorf in 1722 for the Moravian Brethren, who, from this town, are often called *Herrnahuters. SEE MORAVIANS.*

Herron, Francis D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., June 28, 1774. His parents were Scotch-Irish. Their high regard for know-ledge induced them to send him to Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., then under the care

of that distinguished Presbyterian, the Rev. Dr. Nesbitt. Here he graduated May 5, 1794. He studied theology with Robert Cooper, D.D., and was licensed by Carlisle Presbytery in 1797. He commenced his work as a missionary in the then backwoods of Ohio. In 1800 he became pastor of the Rocky Spring Church, where he labored for ten years with great success. In June 1811, he was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Penn. He found his new church embarrassed with debt, and the people "conformed to this world" to a degree almost appalling. But his earnestness and activity relieved the church of debt within a few years, and awoke the members to a sense of their spiritual danger. In 1825 the General Assembly resolved to establish a theological seminary in the West. Dr. Herron, with his naturally quick perception, urged Alleghany City, Pa., as the best location, and by great exertions obtained the decision to locate it there. He then undertook the toils and anxieties of its sustenance; and to no one does the Western Theological Seminary owe its success in a greater degree than to Dr. Herron. In 1827 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly held in Philadelphia. In 1828 and 1832 his ministrations were blessed by gracious revivals of religion; and in 1835 another revival occurred, marked by great excitement. In 1850 he resigned his charge, to the great regret of his people. Being then in his seventy-sixth year, he felt that his work was ended. He lived ten years longer; though the infirmities of age grew apace, his serenity and cheerfulness never failed. He died Dec. 6,1860. Such was the estimation in which his character and talents were held by his fellow-citizens, that the courts of Pittsburg adjourned on the announcement of his death, an honor never before paid to any clergyman in that city. — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 95.

Herse

SEE HEARSE.

Herüli (Eruli, Aeruli)

a German tribe, which first appeared with the Goths on the shores of the Black Sea, and thence took an active part in all the incursions of the Goths in the eastern provinces of the Roman empire. We afterwards find them in Attila's armies with the Scythians and Gepidae. After the death of Attila they established themselves as a powerful nation on the shores of the Danube, and levied tribute on the Lombards. According to Procopius, they were thoroughly barbarous. After the Lombards and other neighboring

nations had long been converted to Christianity, the Heruli still preserved their idolatrous worship, and continued to sacrifice human victims (see Procopius, *De bello Goth.* 2, c. 11). Under the leadership of Odoacer, they succeeded, in connection with the Turones, the Scythians, and the Rugii, in taking Rome, and from that time dates the downfall of the Western empire. About 495 they were defeated in an important battle by the Lombards. Paulus Diacon., in *De gest. Longob.*, reports a popular tradition, according to which, after this battle, the whole army of the Heruli became so bewildered in consequence of the anger of the gods that they took the green flax-fields for water, and, having got to them, opened their arms to swim, when the Lombards came up and killed them. A part of the nation then established themselves in Rugiland, at the mouth of the Danube, but finally decided to settle in the eastern Roman empire. The emperor Anastasius received them in his dominions, and assigned them a territory in I1-lyria, but was subsequently obliged to send an army against them to put an end to their depredations. Those who remained now subjected themselves to Rome, and aided greatly in overthrowing the power of the Ostrogoths in Italy. They were converted to Christianity under Justinian I, joined the Roman Catholic Church, and were gradually civilized. Their history ceased to present any characteristic features. See Morere, *Grand Dictionnaire* (ed. Drouet, Paris, 1759), vol. 5.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6*, 15. (J. N. P.)

Hervaeus, Natalis

(French, HERVS DE NIEDELLEC), surnamed *Brito,* a mediaeval French theologian and scholastic philosopher, was a native of Brittany, and died at Narbonne August 1323. He became a member of the Dominican convent at Morlaix, studied also at Paris, then taught in various provinces of France, and afterwards was rector and professor of theology in the University of Paris, where he lectured from 1307 to 1309 upon the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard. In 1318 he became general of his order. He was a zealous Thomist, and passed for one of the first theologians of his time. He left numerous writings, of which only the following have been printed: *Hervcei Britonis in IV Sententiarum Volumina Scripta subtilissima* (best ed. Venice, 1505, fol.)*;* — *Quodlibeta Iactgna* (Ven. 1486, fol.): — *De Beatitudine, De Verbo, De eEternitate Mlundi, De fateria Caeli, De Relationibus, De Pluralitate Formarum, De Virtuttibus, De Motu Angeli-the* whole published together by 0. Scot (Venice, 1513, in 1 vol. fol.): — *De Secundis Intentionibus* (Paris, 1489 and 1544, 4to): — *De Potestate*

Ecclesiae et Papae (Paris, 1500 and 1647). A list of his MS. writings is given by Quetif and Ichard *(Script. ord. Prced.* 1, 533). — Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scolastique*, 2, 396 sq.; Tennemann, *Man. Hist. of Phil.* p. 241 (Bohn's ed.). (J.W. M.)

Hervey, James

an English divine and popular writer, was born at Hardingstone, near Northampton, Feb. 26, 1714. At eighteen he was sent to Oxford, and there, becoming acquainted with John Wesley, he became seriously impressed with the importance of religion. He afterwards became a Calvinist. At twenty-two he became curate of Weston Favel, and a few years after curate of Biddeford. During that time he wrote his celebrated *Meditations and Contemplations* (1746, 8vo), which obtained immense circulation. It was followed by *Contemplations on the Night and Starry Heavens*, and *A Winter Piece* (1747, 8vo). In 1750, on the death of his father, he succeeded to the livings of Weston and Collingtree; and he devoted himself earnestly to his clerical duties. In 1753 he published *Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters on the Study and Use of History, so far as they relate to the History of the Old Testament, etc., in a Letter to a Lady of Quality* (1753, 8vo). In 1755 he published *Trieron and Aspasio, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important Subjects* (1755, 3 vols. 8vo), which was attacked by Robert Sandeman, of Edinburgh, on the nature of justifying faith, and other points connected with it, in a work entitled *Letters on Theron and Aspasio. SEE SANDETIAN*. John Wesley wrote a brief review of his *Theron and Aspasio*, and Hervey wrote in reply Eleven *Letters to John Wes*ley, but before his death he directed that the MS. of this work should be destroyed. "His brother, however, judged that it would be a desirable pecuniary speculation to publish it, and placed it in the hands of Cudworth, an erratic dissenting preacher, to be finished, giving him liberty 'to put out and put in' whatever he judged expedient. Cudworth's Antinomian sentiments led him to abhor Wesley's opinions; he caricatured them relentlessly by his interpolations of Hervey's pages, and sent forth in Hervey's name the first and most reckless and odious caveat against Methodism that ever emanated from any one who had sustained friendly relations to it. It was republished in Scotland, and tended much to forestall the spread of Methodism there. Wesley felt keenly the injustice and heartlessness of this attack, but his sorrow was mitigated by the knowledge that the most of the abuse in the publication was interpolated, and that Hervey, who had

delighted to call him his ‘friend and father,’ knew him too well to have thus struck at him from the grave. He answered the book; but time has answered it more effectually — time, the invincible guardian of the characters of great men.” He died Dec. 25, 1758. Mr. Hervey s writings are viciously turgid and extravagant in style. “He was eminently pious, though not deeply learned; habitually spiritually-minded; animated with ardent love to the Savior; and his humility, meekness, submission to the will of God, and patience under his afflicting hand, exemplified the Christian character. and adorned his profession.” His writings were collected and published after his death (London, 1797, 7 vols.). His correspondence was published separately (1760, 2 vols. 8vo). See Ryland, *Life of Hervey; Letters of Hervey,* and Life prefixed; Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.;* Jones, *Christian Biography;* Stevens, *History of Methodism,* 1, 372; Wesley’s *Works, 6,* 103, 125; Jackson *Life of Charles Wesley,* ch. 21: Coke and Moore, *Life of Wesley, 3,* 2.

He’sed

(Heb. *Che’sed,* dsj, *kindness,* as often; Sept. Ἐσεδ*),* the name of a man whose son (Ben-Hesed) was Solomon’s purveyor in the district of Aruboth, Sochoh, and Hepher (1 Kings 4:10). B.C. cir. 995. *SEE JUSHAH-HESED.*

Heser, George

a German ecclesiastical writer, was born at Weyern, near Passau, Austria, in 1609. He joined the Jesuits in 1625, and taught rhetoric, dialectics and controversy at Munich and Ingolstadt. In 1642 he became preacher at St.Maurice’s Church, Augsburg, and in 1649 went in the same capacity to St. Mary’s Church, Ingolstadt. In 1662 he retired to Munich, where he was still living in 1676. The exact time of his death is not ascertained. He is especially noted for his efforts in proving Thomas k Kempis (q.v.) as the author of *De imitatione Christi.* In his *Dioptra Kempensis* he has gathered a number of testimonies, and describes pretty accurately a number of editions and of translations of Kempis, which appeared during the 16th and 17th centuries. He wrote also *Vita et Syllabus omnium Operum Thomea a Kempis ab auctore anonymo, sed coaevo, non longe post obitum illius conscripta* (Ingolstadt, 1650,1 2mo; Paris, 1651, 8vo): — *Faemonitio nova ad lectorem Thomea a Kempis* (Ingolstadt, 1651, 18mo; Paris, 1651, *8vo):* — *LXX Palmae, seu panegyricus in laudem librorum IV Thoniae a*

Kempis, ex hominumpiorum elogiis LXX concidmnatus (Ingolstadt,1651, 8vo), etc. See Veith, *Biblioth. Augustana;* Ersch und Gruber, *Allem. Encyklopadie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 559.

Hesh'bon

(Hebrew *Cheshbon',* ˆ/Bv]j , *intelligence,* as in <21075>Ecclesiastes 7:25, etc.; Sept. Ἐσεβών; Josephus), a town in the southern district of the Hebrew territory beyond the Jordan, on the western border of the high plain *(Mishor,* <061317>Joshua 13:17). It originally belonged to the Moabites, but when the Israelites arrived from Egypt it was- found to be-in the possession of the Amorites, whose king, Sihon, is styled both king of the Amorites and king of Heshbon, and is expressly said to have "reigned in Heshbon" (<061310>Joshua 3:10; comp. <042126>Numbers 21:26; <051209>Deuteronomy 2:9). It was taken by Moses (<042123>Numbers 21:23-26), and eventually became a Levitical city (<062139>Joshua 21:39; <130681>1 Chronicles 6:81) in the tribe of Reuben (<043237>Numbers 32:37; <061317>Joshua 13:17); but, being on the confines of Gad, is sometimes assigned to the latter tribe (<062139>Joshua 21:39; <130681>1 Chronicles 6:81). After the Ten Tribes were sent into exile, Heshbon was taken possession of by the Moabites, and hence is mentioned by the prophets in their declarations against Moab (<231504>Isaiah 15:4; <244802>Jeremiah 48:2, 34, 45). Under king Alexander Janneus we find it again reckoned as a Jewish city (Josephus, *Ant. 13,* 15, 4). Pliny mentions a tribe of Arabs called *Esbonitae (Hist. Nat.* 5, 11; comp. Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 11). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome *(Ononmast.* s.v. Ἐσσεβών*)* it was still a place of some consequence under the name *of Esbus* (Ἐσβούς), but at the present day it is known by its ancient name, in the slightly modified form of *Hesban.* The region was first visited in modern times by Seetzen. The site is twenty miles east of the Jordan, on the parallel of the northern end of the Dead Sea. , The ruins of a considerable town still exist, covering the sides of an insulated hill, but not a single edifice is left entire. The view from the summit is very extensive, embracing the ruins of a vast number of cities, the names of some of which bear a strong resemblance to those mentioned in Scripture. These environs, occupying the elevated plain between the mountains of Jazer and the Jabbok, seem to be referred to in <061316>Joshua 13:16. There are reservoirs connected with this and the other towns of this region. These have been supposed to be the "fish-pools" (t/k r B] *cisterns)* of Heshbon mentioned by Solomon (<220704>Song of Solomon 7:4) *SEE BATH-RABBIAM*; but say Irby and Mangles, "The ruins are uninteresting, and the

only pool we saw was too insignificant to be one of those mentioned in Scripture" (p. 472). In two of the cisterns among the ruins they found about three dozen of human skulls and bones, which they justly regarded as an illustration (of 0137Genesis 37:20 *(Travels,* p. 472; see also George Robinson, lord Lindsay, Schwarz, Tristram, etc.). Dr. Macmichael and his party went to look for these pools, but they found only one, which was extremely insignificant. This is probably the reservoir mentioned by Burckhardt *(Syria,* p. 365). Mr. Buckingham, however, says, "The large reservoir to the south of the town, and about half a mile from the foot of the hill on which it stands, is constructed with good masonry, and not unlike the cisterns of Solomon, near Jerusalem, to which it is also nearly equal in size." Towards the western part of the hill is a singular structure, whose crumbling ruins exhibit the workmanship of successive ages the massive stones of the Jewish period, the sculptured cornice of the Roman era, and the light Saracenic arch, all grouped together (Porter, *Handb. for Palest.* p. 298).

Hesh'mon

(Heb. *Cheshmon',* ˆ/mvjj ,*faltness;* Sept. Åσεμω″ν*),* a city on the southern border of Judah (Simeon), near Idumaea, mentioned between Hazor-Gaddah and Beth-Palet (0657Joshua 15:27); hence probably somewhere between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. It is possibly the same as the AZMON *SEE AZMON* (q.v.) elsewhere (0654Joshua 15:4) located in.this vicinity. *SEE HAZAR-ADDAR*.

Hess, Johann

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

providing institutions for the relief of the poor. He died in 1547. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, 19,* 642.

Hess, Johann Jakob

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

Hesse

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

The zeal of Philip the Magnanimous for the success of the Reformation made the Hessian territory one of the strongholds of German Protestantism. But the vacillation of the succeeding princes between the Lutheran and the Reformed Creeds caused considerable trouble, especially in Hesse-Cassel, the State Church of which was often left in the dark as to whether it was Lutheran or Reformed. Theological controversies on this subject have been continued up to the present day. In the grand-duchy of

Hesse-Darmstadt, the majority of the Protestant churches, both Lutheran and Reformed, have joined (since 1822) the “Union” or United Evangelical Church. Before the union there were in the grand duchy about 406,000 Lutherans and 173,000 Reformed. According to the census of 1885, there were in the grand duchy in that year 643,881 Evangelical Christians (67.3 per cent. of the total population), 278,440 Roman Catholics (29.1 per cent.), 26,114 Israelites (2.7 per cent.). In the class of “other Christians” were included in 1867, 2987 German Catholics, 626 Mennonites, 119 Baptists, 31 Free Religious, 24 Separatists, 22 Greek Catholics, 20 United Brethren in Christ, 6 Darbyites, 4 Pietists, 2 Orthodox Catholics.

The National Evangelical Church comprises the members of the United Evangelical Church as well as the non-united Lutherans and Reformed. The Church constitution, introduced at the time of the Reformation, with two consistories and four superintendents, was changed in 1803. The office of superintendents was abolished; the two consistories were supplanted by Church and School councils which had no consistorial jurisdiction. The new councils were subordinate to the state ministers of the Interior and of Justice, who, in the exercise of their functions, were aided by inspectors. As in other parts of Germany, the Church lost the last remnant of self-government, and became wholly subject to the state. A reorganization of the constitution took place by a decree of June 6. 1832. The administration of all the affairs of the National Evangelical Church was transferred to a Supreme Consistory (Oberconsistorium) at Darmstadt, which consists of a president (a layman), three ministerial counselors, two lay counselors, and of one or several assessors. Only in rare cases the Supreme Consistory has to report to the state ministry for a final decision. Each of the three provinces of the grand duchy has a superintendent. The superintendents are the organs through whom the Supreme Consistory exercises its functions. Subordinate to the superintendents are the deans, thirty in number, who are appointed by the Supreme Consistory for the term of five years. Ev. ery congregation has a local church council to assist in the management of the external church discipline an$_d$ of the local church property. This Church council has two official members, the pastor and the burgomaster (or his representative), and from three to five extraordinary members, who are chosen by the former in union with the council of the civil community. Every parish is to receive an official “visitation” from the superintendent or a dean once within every three years. The highest dignitary of the Church is the “prelate’ (pralat), who is also, by virtue of his office, a member of the

First Chamber. A theological faculty is connected with the University of Giessen; besides, there is a preachers' seminary at Friedeburg. The theological faculty of Giessen has been and still is (Jan. 1870) under the control of the Rationalistic party; among its best known professors were Credner (q.v.) and Knobel (q.v.). As may therefore be expected, a considerable portion of the clergy belong likewise to the Rationalistic party; of late, however, the reaction in favor of evangelical principles has gained ground.

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

Hesse von Hessentein, Johann

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

Hesshusen (Hesshusius), Tillemann

a Lutheran theologian, was born November 3, 1527, at Wesel, in Cleves. In his youth he traveled over France, England, Denmark, and Germany; after which he went to Wittenberg, where, in 1550, he became Master of Arts and soon made his mark as a preacher. In 1552, when but twenty-five years old, he was appointed pastor of Goslar, and in 1553 was made D.D. But his peculiarities of mind and temper prevented his remaining long in any post. Always in conflict with the authorities, his friend Melancthon in vain procured him several advantageous situations, securing him, when but thirty years old, the nomination as professor of theology at Heidelberg, superintendent of the Palatinate, and president of the Church Council, which he lost again two years after, in 1559, after a bitter controversy with Klebitz (q.v.) on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He fought the same battle again with A. Hardenberg at Bremen. *SEE CRYPTO-CALVINISM*. Having finally sought a refuge in his native city of Wesel, he was driven from it in 1564 for writing his *Unterschied zwischen d. wahren katholischen Lehre d. Kirche u.* z. *d. Irrthümern d. Papisten u. d. rnmischen Antichrists,* which highly displeased the government. After varied fortunes, he was in 1573 appointed bishop of Sameland; but, having there awakened great opposition, his doctrines were condemned by a synod in- 1577, and he himself was afterwards driven out of the country. Shortly after he entered on his last situation as the leading professor of theology of the University of Helmstadt, where he died, Sept. 25,1588. During his whole career as a controvertist, Hesshusen was a strong advocate of extreme Lutheranism, against the Melancthonian Synergists. *SEE SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY*. After the promulgation of the Formula of Concord (q.v.), he opposed it (having subscribed it in 1578) on the ground that certain changes had been made in it before publication. Under his influence, the University of Helmstadt withdrew its sanction from the Formula. Among his writings, the most important are his *Commnentarii d. Psamen: — De justificatione peccatoris coram Deo* (1587): — *Examen Theologicum* (Helmstadt, 1586). See Jno. Ge. Leuckfeld *Hist. Heshusiana* (Quedlinburg, 1716); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 49; Planck, *Gesch. d. Prot. Theol.;* Gass, *Geschichte d. Prot. Theol.* vol. 2.

Hesychasts

(Greek ἡσυχασταί, ἡσυχάζειν, *to be quiet),* a party of Eastern monks of the 14th century, on Mount Athos. They taught a refined and exaggerated mysticism, or quietism (q.v.), seeking "tranquility of mind and the extinction of evil passions by contemplation." They believed that all who arrive at the blessedness of seeing God may also arrive at a tranquility of mind entirely free from perturbation, and that all enjoying such a state may have visual perception of divine light, such as the apostles saw when they beheld His glory shining forth in the transfiguration. The monk Barlaam (q.v.), who afterwards became bishop of Gerace, during a visit to the East, learned the doctrines and usages of these quietistic monks, and attacked them violently. They were vigorously defended by Palamas, afterwards bishop of Thessalonica. The charges brought against them were not merely that they professed to seek and obtain a divine and supernatural light not promised in Scripture, but also that the means they used were fanatical and absurd. These means included contemplation, introversion, and ascetic practices; especially it was said that they were accustomed to seat themselves in some secret corner, and fix their eyes steadfastly upon the navel, whence they were called ὀμφαλόψυχοι. As the fruit of such contemplation, a divine light, they said, such as that which shone on Tabor, was diffused through their souls. Palamas defended this theory by making a distinction between the essence *(*οὐσία*)* of God and his activity *(*ἐνέργεια*),* asserting that the latter, though eternal and uncreated, is yet communicable. To the charge that they thus claimed directly to see God, inasmuch as this uncreated light must be either of the substance or of the attributes of God, they replied that the divine light radiated from God through ἐνέργεια, but was not God. The whole matter was brought before a council at Constantinople in 1341. and the decision tending favorably to the Hesychasts, Barlaam retreated to Italy. But his cause was taken up by another monk, George Acyndinus, who attacked the doctrine of Palamas and the usages of the Hesychasts. He also lost his case before a synod at Constantinople. After the death of the emperor Andronicus, however, who had favored Palamas and the Hesychasts, things took a different turn for a while in favor of the Barlaamites; but after the triumph of the emperor John Cantacuzenus, who favored the other side, a synod at Constantinople, in 1351, approved the doctrine of the Hesychasts, especially the distinction between οὐσία and ἐνέργεια, and excommunicated Acyndinus and Barlaam. The sources of information on

these proceedings are the *Historia* of John Cantacuzenus (2, 39; 4,23, etc.), which is on the side of the Hesychasts; and the *Historia Byzantina* of Nicephorus Gregoras, which takes the other side. See Petavius, *De Dogm. Theol.* ,lib. 1, c. 12; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte, 34:*431; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. 14:pt. 2, ch. 5; Gass, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 52 sq.; Engelhardt, in *Zeitschrift d. hist. Theol. 8:*48; Gieseler, *Church History,* per. 3:§ 127; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 7:chap. 2, § 14; Dorner, *Person of Christ,* Edinb. translation, div. 2, vol. 1. p. 236. *SEE MYSTICISM*.

Hesychius

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

Hesychius

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

Hesychius of Jerusalem

a Greek ecclesiastical writer of the 5th century (supposed to have died about A.D. 434). Consecrated priest by the patriarch of Constantinople against his wishes, he spent the remainder of his life in that city. This is about all that is known with any certainty concerning his life. He appears to have enjoyed great reputation, and wrote a number of books, the principal of which are, *In Leviticum Libri septem* (Latin only, Basle, 1527, foloi; Paris, 1581, 8vo; and in *Bibliotheca Patrum, 12,* 52: Στιχηρὸν (or Κεφάλαια) τῶν προφητῶν καὶ Ησαΐου, *Sticheron* (or *Capita) in*

duodecimprophetas minores et Esaiam, published by David Hoeschel with Adrian's *Isagoge* (Augsburg, 1602, 4to), and inserted in the *Critici Sacri* (London, 1660), 8, *26:* — Ἀντιῤῥητικά or Εὐτικά, published with Marcus Eremita's *Opuscula* (Paris, 1563, 8vo), and reprinted in the *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum* of Fronton Ducueus (Paris, 1624, fol.), 1, 985. A Latin translation of this work was inserted in the *Biblioth. Patrum, 12:*194, under the title *Ad Theodulun Sermo compendiosus animae perutilis de Temperantia et Virtute, etc.: — Homiliae de Sancta Maria deipara,* published by F. du Duc in *Biblioth. veterum Patrum,* 2, 417: — Τὸ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἀνδρέαν ἐγχώμιον, *Oratio demonstrativa in S.Andream Apostolunt:* a Latin translation of this work was inserted in the *Biblioth. Patr. 12,* 188: — De *Resurrectione Domini nostri Christi,* and *De Hora tertia et sexta quibus Dominus fuisse crucifixus dicitur,* in Combefis, *Novum Auctarium: —* Εἰς Ἰάκωον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Δαιδ τὸν θεοπράτορα, of which extracts are given in Photius (cod. 275): — Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐυδόξουμάρτυπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Λογγίνου τοῦ ἐκατοντάρχου, in Bollandus, *Acta Sanct.* March, vol. 2, Appendix, p. 736: — ῾Η εὐαγγελικὴ συμφωνία, in Combefis, 1, 773; an extract of it was inserted in Cotelier, *Eccles. Grcec. Monument. 3,* 1, under the title Συναγωγὴ ἀποριῶν καὶ ἐπιλύσεων ἐκλεγεῖσα ἐν ἐπιτομῇ ἐκ τῆς Ε αγγελικῆς Ευμφωνίας. Part of the extant writings of Hesychius are given in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca,* vol. 93. See Photius, *Bibliotheca;* Cave, *Hist. Liter.* 1, 571; Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiastiques, 14,* 227; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 589.

Hetaeriae

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

Heterodox

a term "practically limited to belief in something that is contrary to the decision of some church or churches; thus, when a Romanist or a Lutheran, etc., speaks of heterodoxy, he means something in opposition to the teaching, respectively, of the Romish or Lutheran Church, etc., so that what is, or at least is understood by *heterodox,* at one time or place, will be

orthodox in another. See Martensen, *Dogmatics* § 28. *SEE HERESY*; *SEE ORTHODOX*.

Heterogeneous

SEE DIVERSE.

Heterousians

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

Heth

(Heb. *Chetf,* tj, *dread;* Sept. (ὁ Χεττα῀ος, and so Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 6, 2), a son (descendant) of Canaan, and the ancestor of the HITTITES (<01050>Genesis 5:20; <05701>Deuteronomy 7:1; <06104>Joshua 1:4), who dwelt in the vicinity of Hebron (<01238>Genesis 23:3, 7; 25:10). The ‘kings of the Hittites” is spoken of all the Canaanitish kings (<12206>2 Kings 2:6). In the genealogical tables of Genesis 10 and 1 Chronicles 1, Heth is named as a son of Canaan, younger than Zidon the firstborn, but preceding the Jebusite, the Amorite, and the other Canaanitish-families. The Hittites were therefore a Hamitic race, neither of the “country” nor the “kindred” of Abraham and Isaac (<01243>Genesis 24:3,4; 28:1, 2). In the earliest historical mention of the nation the beautiful narrative of Abraham’s purchase of the cave of Machpelah they are styled, not Hittites, but Bene-Cheth (A.V. “sons and children of Heth,” <01230>Genesis 23:3,5, 7, 10,16,18,20: 25:10; 49:32). Once we hear of the “daughters of Heth” (27:46), the “daughters of the land,” at that early period still called, after their less immediate progenitor, “daughters of Canaan” (28:1, 8, compared with 27:46, and 26:34, 35; see also <11101>1 Kings 11:1; <26603>Ezekiel 16:3). In the Egyptian monuments the name *Chat* is said to stand for Palestine (Bunsen, *Egypten*, quoted by Ewald, *Gesch.* 1, 317, note). *SEE HITTITE*.

Hetherington, William M.

a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, was born June 4, 1803, near Dumfries. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he distinguished himself in Greek and in moral philosophy. His first service in the ministry was at Hamilton, where he was assistant to Dr. Meek, whose daughter he married. In 1836 he became minister of Torphicken, and in 1844 at St. Andrew’s. At the “disruption” he went out with the Free

Church. In 1848 he was appointed to Free St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, and in 1857 he was called to the chair of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Free-Church College, Glasgow, where his labors as lecturer were excessive. In 1862 he was struck by paralysis, and on the 23rd of May 1865, he died. His writings, besides the- editorship of the Free-Church Magazine (1844-48), and numerous contributions to the *Presbyterian Review* and the *North British Review,* include the following: *Dramatic Sketches* (poems, 1829,8vo): — The *Fullness of Time* (1834), characterized by Southey as a very original and able treatise: — Roman. *History* (in *Encyclop. Brit.;* separately printed, 1852, 12mo): — *The Minister's Family* (1847; 5th edit. 1851, 12mo): — *History of the Church of Scotland* (1841, 8vo; last edit. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo): — His*tory of the Westminster Assembly* (1843, 12mo): — posthumous, *The Apologetics of the Christian Faith;* being a course of University lectures, with Introduction including a brief biographical sketch of the author by Dr. Alexander Duff (Edinburgh, 1867, 8vo).

Heth'lon

(Heb. *Chethlon',* ˆ l ɵ]j , *wrappedup,* i.e. a hiding-place; Vulg. *Hethalon),* a place the approach (Ë r Þ, "way") to which lay on the northern border of Palestine, between the Mediterranean and Zedad, in the direction of Hamath (<3675>Ezekiel 47:15; 48:1). In all probability the "way of Hethlon" is the pass at the (N. or S.) end of Lebanon, from the sea-coast of the Mediterranean to the great plain of Hamath, and is thus identical with "the entrance of *Hamath"* (q.v.)in <0808>Numbers 34:8, etc. See Porter, *Five Years in Damascus, 2,* 356.

Hetzel or Hezel, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich

a German Orientalist and theologian, was born at Konigsberg May 16, 1754. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Oriental languages at Giessen in 1766. In 1800 he was made librarian of the University of that city, and in 1801 was called to the professorship of Oriental literature in the University of Dorpat, which office he held until 1820. He died Feb. 1,1829. Hetzel wrote a number of-works on-the study of Oriental languages, the principal of which are *Ausfürliche hebräische Sprachlehre* (Halle, 1777, 8vo): — *Nominalformenlehre d. hebraischen Sprache* (Halle, 1793, *8vo): — Institutio Philologi Hebraei* (Halle, 1793, 8vo): — *Gesch. d. hebraischen*

Literatur (Halle, 1776)*: — Syrische Sprachlehre* (Lemgo, 1788, 8vo): — *Arabische Grammatik nebst einer kurzen arabischen Chrestomathie* (Jena, 1776,8vo). Among his theological works, the most important are *Die Bibel, Altes u. Neues Testament mit vollstandig erklarenden Bemerkungen* (Lemgo, 1780-1791, 10 *vols.): — Neuer Versuch 2. d. Brief and Hebraer* (Lpz. 1795, *8vo): — Biblisches Real lexikon* (Lpz. 1783-1785, 3 vols. roy. *8vo): — Geist d. Philosophie u. Sprache d. alten Welt* (Lübeck, 1794, 8vo). See Eichhorn, *Bibl. d. biblischen Literatur* (5, 1022 sq.); Pierer, *Universal Lex. 8,* 360; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Géneralé, 25,* 598.

Hetzer, Ludwig

was born in the canton Thurgau, Switzerland (date unknown). When the Reformation broke out in-Switzerland he was in the vigor of youth, and he entered into the movement with great zeal and energy. He was chaplain at Wadenschwyl, on Lake Zurich, in 1523, and in September of that year he published a tract against images, under the title *Urtheil Gottes wie man sich mit allen Gotzen und Bildnissen halten soil,* etc., which ran through several editions, and greatly stirred the popular mind. In October of the same year, when the second conference on the use of images. etc., took place at Zurich, he was appointed to keep the minutes, and to publish an official account of them. Zwingle and AEcolampadius appreciated his talents, especially his Hebrew learning, and, in spite of a certain heat and rashness which marked his character, they hoped much from his activity in the Reformation. In 1524 he went to Augsburg, with a recommendation from Zwingle, and there his learning and eloquence soon made him popular. But within a year, owing to a theological dispute with Urbanus Rhegius, in which Hetzer maintained Anabaptist views, he was compelled to quit Augsburg. Returning to Switzerland, he was kindly received at Basle by AEcolampadius, and was employed early in 1526 in translating Zwingle’s reply to Bugenhagen into German. He seems to have satisfied both Zwingle and AEcolampadius on this visit that he was not an Anabaptist; but before the middle of the same year he was expelled from Zurich for preaching the new doctrine. At Strasburg he agreed with Johann Denk (q.v.) to issue a translation of the Prophets of the O.T. It appeared in the spring of 1527, and passed in four years through thirteen editions. This work is now very scarce; two copies, however, belong to the library of the Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa. Hetzer seems to have imbibed the theological views of Denk, so far, at least, as the doctrine of the Trinity is concerned, and to have aided him in spreading his doctrines in Works,

Landau, and other places. He had previously been charged with looseness of morals, and in 1827 the crime of adultery was charged upon him. He was brought to trial and beheaded at Constance, Feb. 3,1529. Such is the common account of Hetzer's life, founded on contemporary writings and letters of Ambrose Blaurer, Zwingle, and others of the Reformers. See Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 16, ch. 3 § 5; Trechsel *Antitrinitarier,* 1, 13; Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 61. Baptist writers, however, deny the charges of Socinianism and immorality, and assert that Hetzer was not only a man of great learning, but of gentle spirit and deep piety; and that he died a martyr to his Baptist principles. See H. Osgood, in *Baptist Quarterly Review,* July 1869, p. 333.

Heubner, Heinrich Leonhard

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

Heugh, Hugh D.D.

a Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Stirling Aug. 12, 1782. His father was a minister in the Anti-Burgher party of the Secession Church. The son was educated at the College of Edinburgh, and licensed to preach in 1804. In 1806 he was ordained colleague to his venerable father, on whose death in 1810 he became pastor of the Stirling Church. His pastoral duties were performed with great fidelity: he was a preacher of uncommon power, and he aided all benevolent movements both by tongue and pen. In 1821 he became minister of the Regent Place Church in Glasgow, where he remained until his death, June 16, 1846. He published *The Importance of Early Piety.* (Glasgow, 1826, 8vo): — *State of Religion in Geneva and*

Pelgium. (Glasgow, 1844, 12mo). After his death Dr. Macgill published his *Life and Select Works* (Glasgow, 1852, 2nd ed., 2 vols. 12mo). — Jamieson, *Religious Biography,* p. 262; Kitto, *Journal of Sacred Lit. 6,* 410.

Heumann, Christoph August

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

Heusde, Von

SEE HOFSTEDE DE GROOT.

Hewing

(bxij) OF WOOD, a laborious service, chiefly of slaves and aliens, to which the Gibeonites were condemned for the supply (of the sanctuary by Joshua (Joshua 9:23). Some of the Rabbins understood, however, that while the Hebrews remained in camp, and before the land was divided, the Gibeonites performed this service for the whole body of the people; but even they admit that afterwards their service were limited to the sanctuary. This service must have been sufficiently laborious at the great festivals, but not generally so, as they probably undertook the duty by turns. They were not reduced to a condition of absolute slavery, but seem to have been rather domestic tributaries than slaves, their tribute being the required personal service. *SEE GIBEONITE*. In 1 Kings 5:15, we read that Solomon “had fourscore thousand hewers in the mountains.” The forests of

Lebanon only were sufficient to supply the timber required for building the Temple. Such of these forests as lay nearest the sea were in the possession of the Phoenicians, among whom timber was in such constant demand that they had acquired great skill in the felling and transport of it. *SEE LEBANON*. It was therefore of much importance that Hiram consented to employ large bodies of men in Lebanon to hew timber, as well as others to bring it down to the sea-side, whence it was to be taken along the coast in floats to Joppa. The forests of Lebanon have now in a great measure disappeared, but Akma Dagh and Jaewur Dagh (the ancient Amanus and Rhosus), in the north of Syria, still furnish an abundance of valuable timber, though vast quantities have been felled of late years by the Egyptian government. *SEE AXE*; *SEE WOOD*.

Hewit. Nathaniel, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister was born in New London, Conn., August 28,1788. He graduated A.B. at Yale College in 1808. He commenced the study of law, but soon became satisfied of his call to the ministry, and devoted himself to theology, under the tuition of Dr. Joel Benedict, of Plainfield, Conn. In 1811 he was licensed to preach by the New-London Congregational Association, and, after preaching for a while in Vermont, went to the new theological seminary at Andover to gain still further preparation for his work. In 1815 he was installed as pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Plattsburg, N. Y. After some years of very successful labor there, he was called to the Congregational Church at Fairfield, Conn. Here he became known as one of “the most eloquent and powerful preachers in the country, and here it was that his pulpit from Sabbath to Sabbath sounded out that clarion blast of God’s truth against intemperance, which, with a similar and equally powerful series of sermons at the same time from Dr. Lyman Beecher at Litchfield, soon aroused the whole Church and ministry of the land.” He and Dr. Beecher were apostles of the American Temperance Reformation. In 1828 he resigned his charge at Fairfield to become agent of the American Temperance Society, then newly formed. “He addressed himself to this work with the spirit alike of a hero and a martyr, and prosecuted it with amazing ability and success. Far and wide, as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, with invincible logic, with bold earnestness, with fearless fidelity, with torrents — often cataracts — of burning eloquence, he moved, and fired, and electrified the people. The reform made rapid headway. It enlisted the great majority of the moral and Christian portion of society, the

aged and the young, reclaiming many and guarding multitudes against intemperance. Of the astounding eloquence and effects of these discourses I have often heard, in forms and from quarters so various as to leave little doubt that what Luther was to the Reformation, Whitefield to the Revival of 1740, Wesley to primitive Methodism, that was Nathaniel Hewit to the early Temperance Reformation" (Atwater, *Memorial Discourse).* In 1830 he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn. In 1831 he went to England in behalf of the cause of temperance, and his great powers of eloquence were never more signally displayed than on this visit. In power of logical argument and impassioned delivery few orators of the time exceeded Dr. Hewit. Returning home, he resumed his labors at Bridgeport, where he served until 1853, when he resigned this charge, and assumed that of a new Presbyterian Church formed by members of his old parish. He had always been an adherent to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. The East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary owed its existence and maintenance largely to him. In 1862 he was compelled by growing infirmity to withdraw from active duty, and an associate pastor was appointed. He died at Bridgeport February 3, 1867.

Hey, John D.D.

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

Heydenreich, Karl Heinrich

a German philosopher, was born February 19,1764, at Stolpen, in Saxony. He embraced first the philosophy of Spinoza, later that of Kant, and taught the Kantian philosophy as professor at the University of Leipzig from 1789 to 1797. He died April 29, 1801. Among his writings *are Naturulnd Gött nach Spinoza* (Leipzig, 1788): — *Philosophie der natürlichen Religion*

(Leipzig, 1791, 2 vols): — *Einleitung i. d. Studien der Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1793)*: — Psychologische Entwickelung des Aberglaubens* (Leipzig, 1797).Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 24,* 621; Krug, *Handworterbuch d. philos. Tissenschaff,* 2, 422.

Heylin (or Heylyn), Peter,

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

Heylyn, John, D.D.

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

Heywood, Oliver

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

Hez'eki

(Heb. *Chizki',* yqzj; *strong;* Sept. Ἀζακί*)*, one of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (<130817>1 Chronicles 8:17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

Hezeki'ah

(Heb. *Chizkiyah',* hyqzj; *whom Jehovah has strengthened,* <121801>2 Kings 18:1, 10, 14, 15, 16; <130323>1 Chronicles 3:23; <160721>Nehemiah 7:21; <202501>Proverbs 25:1; "Hizkiah," <161007>Nehemiah 10:17; <360101>Zephaniah 1:1; also in the prosthetic form *Yechiskiyah',* hyqzjy; <150216>Ezra 2:16; <280101>Hosea 1:1; <330101>Micah 1:1; elsewhere in the prolonged form *Chizkiya'hu,* whyqzj; [in <122001>2 Kings 20:10; <130441>1 Chronicles 4:41; <142827>2 Chronicles 28:27; 29:1, 20, 30, 31, 36; 30:1, 18, 20, 22; 31:2, 8, 9, 11. 13, 20; 32:2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33; 33:3; Isaiah 1; 1; <241504>Jeremiah 15:4, it is both prosthetic and prolonged, *YechizlLiya'hu,* whyqzjy; Sept., Josephus, and N. Test. Ἐζεκίας), the name of four men. *SEE JEHIZKIAH.*

1. The thirteenth king (reckoning Athaliah) of the separate kingdom of Judah, son of Ahaz and Abi or Abijah (<121802>2 Kings 18:2; <142901>2 Chronicles

29:1), born B.C. 751750 (<12182>2 Kings 18:2), and his father's successor on. the throne for twenty-nine years, B.C. 726-697. In both the above texts he is stated to have been twenty-five years old at his accession; but some, computing (from a comparison with <14281>2 Chronicles 28:1) that Ahaz died at the age of thirty-six, make Hezekiah only twenty years old at his accession (reading k for hk), as otherwise he would have been born when Ahaz was a boy eleven years old. This, indeed, is not impossible (Hieron. *Ep. cad Vitalern*, 132, quoted by Bochart, *Geogr. Sacr.* p. 920; see Keil on <12181>2 Kings 18:1; Knobel, *Jes.* p. 22, etc.); but others suppose that *Ahaz* was twenty-five and not twenty years old at his accession (Sept., Syr., Arab., <14281>2 Chronicles 28:1), reading hk for k in <12162>2 Kings 16:2. Neither of these suppositions, however, is necessary, for Ahaz was fifty years old at his death, and the date there given of the accession of Ahaz is simply that of his viceroyship or association with his father. *SEE AHAZ*.

The history of Hezekiah's reign is contained in <12180>2 Kings 18:20; Isaiah 36-39, and 2 Chronicles 29-32, illustrated by contemporary prophecies of Isaiah and Micah. He is represented as a great and good king (<12185>2 Kings 18:5, 6), who set himself, immediately on his accession, to abolish idolatry, and restore the worship of Jehovah, which had been neglected during the careless and idolatrous reign of his father. This consecration was accompanied by a revival of the theocratic spirit, so strict as not even to spare "the high places," which, though tolerated by many well-intentioned kings, had naturally been profaned by the worship of images and Asherahs (<12184>2 Kings 18:4). On the extreme importance and probable consequences of this measure, *SEE HIGH PLACE*. A still more decisive act was the destruction of a brazen serpent, said to have been the one used by Moses in the miraculous healing of the Israelites (<042109>Numbers 21:9), which had been removed to Jerusalem, and had become, "down to those days," an object of adoration, partly in consequence of its venerable character as a relic, and partly, perhaps, from some dim tendencies to the ophiolatry common in ancient times (Ewald, *Gesch. 3*, 622). To break up a figure so curious and so highly honored showed a strong mind as well as a clear-sighted zeal, and Hezekiah briefly justified his procedure by calling the image ^T,v]j nq, "a brazen thing," possibly with a contemptuous play on the word v j n; "a serpent." How necessary this was in such times may be inferred from the fact that "the brazen serpent" is, or was, reverenced in the Church of St. Ambrose at Milan (Prideaux, *Connect.* 1, 19, Oxf. ed.). The history of this Reformation, of which <12184>2 Kings 18:4 sq. gives only a concise summary,

is copiously related, from the Levitical point of view, in 2 Chronicles 29 sq. It commenced with the cleansing of the Temple "in the first month" of Hezekiah's first year, i.e. in the month Nisan next after his accession, and was followed in the next month (because at the regular season neither Levites nor Temple were in a due state of preparation) by a great Passover, extended to fourteen days, to which not only all Judah was summoned, but also the "remnant" of the Ten Tribes, some of whom accepted the invitation. Some writers (as Jahn, Keil, and Caspari) contend that this passover must have been subsequent to the fall of Samaria, alleging that the mention of the "remnant" (<14B016>2 Chronicles 30:6) is unsuitable to an earlier period, and that, while the kingdom of Samaria still subsisted, Hezekiah's messengers would not have been suffered to pass through the land, much less would the destruction of the high places in Ephraim and Manasseh have been permitted (<14B031>2 Chronicles 31:1). But the intention of the chronicler at least is plain enough: the connection of <14B029>2 Chronicles 29:17 "the first month," with <14B02>2 Chronicles 30:2, "the second month," admits of but one construction that both are meant to belong to one and the same year, the first of the reign. Accordingly, Thenius, in the *Kgf. exeg. Hdb.* 2 Kings, p. 379, urges this as an argument against the historical character of the whole narrative of this passover, which, he thinks, "rendered antecedently improbable by the silence of the Book of Kings, is perhaps completely refuted by <12232>2 Kings 23:22. The author of the story, wishing to place in the strongest light Hezekiah's zeal for religion, represents *him,* not Josiah, as the restorer of the Passover after long desuetude, and this in the very beginning of his reign, without, perhaps, caring to reflect that the final deportation of the Ten Tribes, implied in <14B016>2 Chronicles 30:6, had not then taken place." But <12232>2 Kings 23:22, taken in connection, as it ought to be, with the preceding verse, is perfectly compatible with the account in the Chronicles. It says: "Surely *such* a Passover" — one kept in all respects "as it is written in the Book of the Covenant" "was not holden from the time of the Judges," etc. whereas Hezekiah's Passover, though kept with even greater joy and fervor than Josiah's, was held neither at the appointed season, nor in strict conformity with the law. Nor is it necessary to suppose that by "the remnant" the chronicler understood those who were left by Shalmaneser. Rather, his view is, that the people of the Ten Tribes, untaught by the judgments brought upon them by former reverses and partial deportations (under Tiglath-Pileser), with respect to which they might well be called a "remnant" (comp. the very similar terms in which even Judah is spoken of,

39:8,9), and scornfully rejecting the last call to repentance, brought upon themselves their final judgment and complete overthrow (Bertheau, *Kgf. exeg. 11db.* 2 Chronicles p. 395 sq.). Those, however, of the Ten Tribes who had taken part in the solemnity were thereby (such is evidently the chronicler's view of the matter, 31:1) inspired with a zeal for the true religion which enabled them, on their return home, in defiance of all opposition on the part of the scorners or of Hoshea, to effect a destruction of the high places and altars in Ephraim and Manasseh, as complete as was effected in Jerusalem before, and in Judah after the Passover.

That this prudent and pious king was not deficient in military qualities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the early part of his reign, before the overthrow of Sennacherib (<12B18>2 Kings 18:8), and by the efficient measures taken by him for the defense of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. Hezekiah also assiduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise management of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture and the increase of flocks and herds, he became possessed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (<14B27>2 Chronicles 32:27-29; <12B20>2 Kings 20:13; <23B39>Isaiah 39:2). Himself a sacred poet, and probably the author of other psalms besides that in Isaiah 38; he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph for the Temple worship, and certainly employed competent scribes to complete the collection of Solomon's Proverbs (<20B25>Proverbs 25:1). He appears also to have taken order for the preservation of genealogical records (Browne, *Review of Lepsius on Bible Chronology*, in Arnold's *Theological Critic*, 1, 59 sq.).

By a rare and happy providence, this most pious of kings was confirmed in his faithfulness and seconded in his endeavors by the powerful assistance of the noblest and most eloquent of prophets. The influence of Isaiah was, however, not gained without a struggle with the "scornful" remnant of the former royal counselors (<23B28>Isaiah 28:14), who in all probability recommended no the king such alliances and compromises as would be in unison rather with the dictates of political expediency than with that sole unhesitating trust in the arm of Jehovah which the prophets inculcated. The leading man of this cabinet was Shebna, who, from the omission of his father's name, and the expression in <23B22>Isaiah 22:16 (see Blunt, *Uindes. Coincidences)*, was probably a foreigner, perhaps a Syrian (Hitzig). At the instance of Isaiah, he seems to have been subsequently degraded from the high post of prefect of the palace (which office was given to Eliakim,

(Isaiah 22:21), to the inferior, though still honorable station of state secretary (רפס 2 Kings 18:18); the further punishment of exile with which Isaiah had threatened him (22:18) being possibly forgiven on his amendment, of which we have some traces in Isaiah 37, sq. (Ewald, *Gesch. 3:*617).

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

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

At what time it was that Hezekiah "rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not," we do not learn from the direct history: in the brief summary, 2 Kings 18:7, 8 (for such it clearly is), of the successes with which the Lord prospered him, that particular statement only introduces what is more fully detailed in the sequel (2 Kings 18:13; 19:37). That it precedes the notice of the overthrow of Samaria (ver. 9 sq.), does not warrant the inference that the assertion of independence belongs to the

earliest years of Hezekiah's reign (see Winer, *Real Wörterbuch* 1, 497, n. 2). Ewald, however, thinks otherwise: in the absence of direct evidence, makings history, as his manner is, out of his own peremptory interpretation of certain passages of Isaiah (ch. 1 and <232201>Isaiah 22:1-14), he informs us that Hezekiah, holding his kingdom absolved by the death of Ahaz from the obligations contracted with Tiglath-Pileser, prepared himself from the first to resist the demands of Assyria, and put Jerusalem in a state of defense. (It matters not to Ewald that the measures noted in <122010>2 Kings 20:20; <143203>2 Chronicles 32:3-5, 30, are in the latter passage expressly assigned to the time of Sennacherib's advance upon Jerusalem.) "From Shalmaneser's hosts at that time stationed in Phoenicia and elsewhere in the neighborhood of Judah, forces were detached which laid waste the land in all directions: an army sent against them from Jerusalem, seized with panic at the sight of the unwonted enemy, took to flight, and, Jerusalem now lying helplessly exposed, a peace was concluded in all haste upon the stipulation of a yearly tribute, and the ignominious deliverance was celebrated with feastings in Jerusalem" *(Gesch. des V. Israel, 2,* 330 sq.): all of which rests upon the supposition that Ewald's interpretation of <230122>Isaiah 1:22 is the only possible one it cannot be said to be on record as history.

As gathered *from the Scriptures only,* the course of events appears to have been as follows: Ahaz had placed his kingdom as tributary under the protection of Tiglath-Pileser (<121607>2 Kings 16:7). It would seem from <231027>Isaiah 10:27, and 28:22, that in the time of Shalmaneser, to which the latter passage certainly, and the former probably, belongs, Judah was still under the yoke of this dependence. The fact that Sargon (whether or not the same with the Shalmaneser of the history), in his expedition against Egypt, left Judah untouched (Isaiah 20), implies that Judah had not yet asserted its independence. A powerful party, indeed, was scheming for revolt from Assyria and a league with Egypt; but there appears no reason to believe that Hezekiah all along favored a policy which Isaiah in the name of the Lord, to the last, strenuously condemned. It was not till after the accession of Sennacherib that Hezekiah refused the tribute, and at the instigation of his nobles made a league with Egypt by ambassadors sent to Zoan (Tanis) (Isaiah 30, 31; compare 36:6-9). (Some, indeed [as Ewald and Caspari], place Isaiah 29-32 before the fall of Samaria, to which time ch. 28 must unquestionably be assigned. Possibly ch. 29 may belong to the same time, and ver. 15 may refer to plottings for a league with Egypt already carried on in secret. Knobel, *Kyf: exeg. Hdb.* p. 215, 223, decides

too peremptorily that such *must* be the reference, and consequently that ch. 29 falls only a little earlier than the following chapters, where the league is openly denounced, viz. in the early part of the reign of Sennacherib.)

The subsequent history, as gathered from the Scriptures, compared with the notices on the ancient monuments, is thought to be as follows. Sargon was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, whose two invasions occupy the greater part of the Scripture records concerning the reign of Hezekiah. The first of these took place in the third year of Semnacherib, and occupies only three verses (<12183>2 Kings 18:13-16), though the route of' the advancing Assyrians maybe traced in <23105>Isaiah 10:5; 11. The rumor of the invasion redoubled Hezekiah's exertions, and he prepared for a siege by providing offensive and defensive armor, stopping up the wells, and diverting the watercourses, conducting the water of Gihon into the city by a subterranean canal (Ecclus. 48:17). For a similar precaution taken by the Mohammedans, see Will. Tyr. 8:7, Keil). But the main hope of the political faction was the alliance with Egypt, and they seem to have sought it by presents and private entreaties (<23006>Isaiah 30:6), especially with a view to obtaining chariots and cavalry (<23201>Isaiah 32:1-3), which was the weakest arm of the Jewish service, as we see from the derision which it excited (<12823>2 Kings 18:23). Such overtures kindled Isaiah's indignation, and Shebna may have lost his high office for recommending them. The prophet clearly saw that Egypt was too weak and faithless to be serviceable, and the applications to Pharaoh (who is compared by Rabshakeh to one of the weak reeds of his own river) implied a want of trust in the help of God. But Isaiah did *not* disapprove of the spontaneously proffered assistance of the tall and warlike Ethiopians (<23102>Isaiah 18:2, 7, ace. to Ewald's transl.), because he may have regarded it as a providential aid.

The account given of this first invasion in the cuneiform "Annals of Sennacherib" is that he attacked Hezekiah because the Ekronites had sent their king Padiya (or" Haddiya," ace. to Col. Rawlinson) as a prisoner to Jerusalem (comp. <12808>2 Kings 18:8); that he took forty-six cities ("all the fenced cities" in <12813>2 Kings 18:13 is apparently a general expression; compare 19:8) and 200,000 prisoners; that he besieged Jerusalem with mounds (comp. <12932>2 Kings 19:32); and although Hezekiah promised to pay 800 talents of silver (of which perhaps only 300 were ever paid) and 30 of gold (<12814>2 Kings 18:14; but see Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 148), yet, not content with this, he muleted him of a part of his dominions, and gave them to the kings of Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 475 sq.).

So important was this expedition that Demetrius, the Jewish historian, even attributes to Sennacherib the Great Captivity (Clem. Alexand. *Stron. 1 p.* 147, ed. Sylb.). In almost every particular this account agrees with the notice in Scripture, and we may see a reason for so great a sacrifice on the part of Hezekiah in the glimpse which Isaiah gives us of his capital city driven by desperation into licentious and impious mirth (<232212>Isaiah 22:12-14). This campaign must at least have had the one good result of proving the worthlessness of the Egyptian alliance; for at a place called Altagft (the Eltekon of <061559>Joshua 15:59?) Sennacherib inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia, which had come to the assistance of Ekron. But Isaiah regarded the purchased treaty as a cowardly defection, and the sight of his fellow-citizens gazing peacefully from the housetops on the bright array of the car-borne and quivered Assyrians filled him with indignation and despair (<232201>Isaiah 22:1-7, if the latest explanations of this chapter be correct).

Hezekiah's bribe (or fine) brought a temporary release, for the Assyrians marched into Egypt, where, if Herodotus (2, 141) and Josephus *(Ant. 10,* 1-3) are to be trusted, they advanced without resistance to Pelusium, owing to the hatred of the warrior-caste against Sethos, the king-priest of Pthah, who had, in his priestly predilections, interfered with their prerogatives. In spite of this advantage, Sennacherib was forced to raise the siege of Pelusium, by the advance of Tirhakah or Tarakos, the ally of Sethos and Hezekiah, who afterwards united the crowns of Egypt and Ethiopia. This magnificent Ethiopian hero, who had extended his conquests to the Pillars of Hercules (Strabo, 15, 472), was indeed a formidable antagonist. His deeds are recorded in a temple at Medinet-Abu, but the jealousy of the Memphites (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 141) concealed his assistance, and attributed the deliverance of Sethos to the 'miraculous interposition of an army of mice (Herod. 2, 141). This story may have had its source, however, not in jealousy, but in the use of a mouse as the emblem of destruction (Horapoll. *Hierogl.* 1, 50; Rawlinson, *He*rod. ad loc.), and of some sort of disease or plague (? <091618>1 Samuel 6:18; Jahn, *Archi. Bibl.* § 185). The legend doubtless gained ground from the extraordinary circumstance which ruined the army of Sennacherib.

Returning from his futile expedition *(*ἄπρακτος ἀνεχώρησε, Josephus, *Ant. 10,* 1, 4), Sennacherib "dealt treacherously" with Hezekiah (<233301>Isaiah 33:1) by attacking the stronghold of Lachish. This was the commencement of that *second* invasion, respecting which we have such full details in <121817>2

Kings 18:17 sq.; [1409]2 Chronicles 32:9 sq.; Isaiah 36. That there *were* two invasions (contrary to the opinion of Layard, Bosanquet, Vance Smith, etc.) is clearly proved by the details of the first given in the Assyrian annals (see Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 477). Although the annals of Sennacherib on the great cylinder in the British Museum reach to the end of his *eighth* year, and this second invasion belongs to his fifth year, yet no allusion to it has been found. So shameful a disaster was naturally concealed by national vanity. From Lachish he sent against Jerusalem an army under two officers and his cup-bearer, the orator Rabshakeh, with a blasphemous and insulting summons to surrender, deriding Hezekiah's hopes of Egyptian succor, and apparently endeavoring to inspire the people with distrust of his religious innovations ([1410]2 Kings 18:22, 25, 30). The reiteration and peculiarity of the latter argument, together with Rabshakeh's fluent mastery of Hebrew (which he used to tempt the people from their allegiance by a glowing promise, ver. 31, 32), give countenance to the supposition that he was an apostate Jew. Hezekiah's ministers were thrown into anguish, and dismay; but the undaunted Isaiah hurled back threatening for threatening with unrivalled eloquence and force. He even prophesied that the fires of Tophet were already burning in expectancy of the Assyrian corpses which were destined to feed their flame. Meanwhile Sennacherib, having taken Lachish (an event possibly depicted on a series of slabs at Mosul, Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 148-152), was besieging Libnah, when, alarmed by a "rumor" of Tirhakah's advance (to avenge the defeat at Altaglf?), he was forced to relinquish once more his immediate designs, and content himself with a defiant letter to Hezekiah. Whether on the occasion he encountered and defeated the Ethiopians (as Prideaux precariously infers from Isaiah 20, *Connect.* 1, 26), or not, we cannot tell. The next event of the campaign about which we are informed is that the Jewish king, with simple piety, prayed to God with Sennacherib's letter outspread before him (comp. 1 Macc. 3:48), and received a promise of immediate deliverance. Accordingly "that night the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185.000 men."

There is no doubt that some secondary cause was employed in the accomplishment of this event. We are certainly "not to suppose," as Dr. Johnson observed, "that the angel went about with a sword in his hand stabbing them one by one, but that some powerful natural agent was employed." The Babylonish Talmud and some of the Targums attribute it to storms of lightning (Vitringa, Vogel, etc.); Prideaux, Heine *(De causa*

Strag. Assyr. Berl. 1761), Harmer, and Faber to the simoom; R. Jose (in *Seder Olam Rabba),* Marsham, Usher, Preiss *(De causa clad. Assyr.* Göttingen, 1776), to a nocturnal attack by Tirhakah; Paulus to a poisoning of the waters; and, finally, Josephus *(Ant. 10,* 1, 4 and 5), followed by an immense majority of ancient and modern commentators (including Michaelis, Ddderlein, Dathe, Heusler, Bauer, Ditmar, Gesenius, Maurer, Knobel, etc., and even Keil), to the pestilence (compare <10245>2 Samuel 24:15,16). This would be a cause not only adequate (Justin, 19:11; Diodor. 19:434; see the other instances quoted by Rosenmüller, Keil, Jahn, etc.), but most probable in itself, from the crowded and terrified state of the camp. There is, therefore, no necessity to adopt the ingenious conjectures by which Doderlein, Koppe, and Wessler endeavor to get rid of the large number 185,000. It is not said where the event occurred: the prophecies concerning it, Isaiah 10-37, seem to denote the neighborhood of Jerusalem, as would Psalm 76, if it was written at that time. On the other hand, the narrative would probably have been fuller had the overthrow, with its attendant-opportunities of beholding the bodies of their dreaded enemies and of gathering great spoil, befallen near Jerusalem, or even within the immediate limits of Judah. That version of the story which reached Herodotus (2, 140) —for few after Josephus will hold with Ewald *(Gesch. 3:*336) that the story is not substantially the same-indicates the frontier of Egypt, near Pelusium, as the scene of the disaster. The Assyrian army would probably break up from Libnah on the tidings of Tirhakah's approach, and advance to meet him. In ascribing it to a vast swarm of field-mice, which, devouring the quivers and bow-strings of the Egyptians, compelled them to flee in the morning, Herodotus may have misinterpreted the symbolical language of the Egyptians, in which the mouse denotes annihilation *(*ἀφανισμός, Horapoll. 1, 50): though, as Knobel (u. *s.* p. 280) has shown by apposite instance, an army of mice is capable of committing such ravages, and also of leaving pestilence behind it. That the destruction was effected in the course of one night is clearly expressed in <12935>2 Kings 19:35, where "that night" is plainly that which followed after the delivery of Isaiah's prophecy, and is evidently implied alike in <23603>Isaiah 36:36 ("when men arose early in the morning"), and ice the story of Herodotus.

After this reverse Sennacherib fled precipitately to Nineveh, where he revenged himself on as many Jews as were in his power (Tob. 1:18), and, after many years (not fifty-five days, as Tobit says, 1:21), was murdered by

two of his sons as he drank himself drunk in the house of Nisroch (Assarac?) his god. He certainly lived till B.C. 695, for his 22nd year is mentioned on a clay tablet (Rawlinson, *1. c.);* he must therefore have survived Hezekiah by at least one year. It is probable that several of the Psalms (e.g. 46-48, 76) allude to his discomfiture.

"In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." So begins, in all the accounts, and immediately after the discomfiture of Sennacherib, the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness and miraculous recovery (<12201>2 Kings 20:1; <14324>2 Chronicles 32:24; <23801>Isaiah 38:1). The time is defined, by the promise of fifteen years to be added to the life of Hezekiah, to the fourteenth year complete, or fifteenth current, of his reign of twenty-nine years. But it is stated to have been in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah that Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and thereafter threatened Jerusalem and came to his overthrow. The two notes of time, the express and the implied, fully accord, and place beyond question, at least, the view of the writer or last redactor in 2 Kings 18, 19; Isaiah 36, 37, that the Assyrian invasion began before Hezekiah's illness, and lies in the middle of his reign. In the received chronology, as the first year of Hezekiah precedes the fourth of Jehoiakim=-first of Nebuchadnezzar (i.e. B.C. 604 in the Canon, B.C. 606 in the Hebrew reckoning) by 29, 55, 2, 31, 3-120 years, the epoch of the reign is B.C. 724 or 726, and its 14th year B.C. 711 or 713. But it is contended that so early a year is irreconcilable with definite and unquestionable data of contemporary history, Egyptian, Assyrrian, and Babylonian. From these it has been inferred that during the siege of Samaria Shalmaneser died, and was succeeded by Sargon, who, jealous of Egyptian influence in Judaea, sent an army under a Tartan or general (<23001>Isaiah 20:1), which penetrated Egypt (<34308>Nahum 3:8-10) and destroyed No-Amon; although it is clear from Hezekiah's rebellion (<12187>2 Kings 18:7) that it can have produced but little permanent impression. Sargon, in the tenth year of his reign (which is regarded as parallel with the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), made an expedition to Palestine; but his annals make no mention of any conquests from Hezekiah on this occasion, and he seems to have occupied himself in the siege of Ashdod (<23001>Isaiah 20:1), and in the inspection of mines (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* 9). This is therefore thought to be the expedition referred to in <12183>2 Kings 18:13; <23601>Isaiah 36:1; an expedition which is merely alluded to, as it led to no result. But if the Scripture narrative is to be reconciled with the records of Assyrian history, it has been thought necessary to make a transposition

in the text of Isaiah (and therefore of the book of Kings). That some such expedient must be resorted to, if the Assyrian history is trustworthy, is maintained by Dr. Hincks in a paper *On the rectification of chronology, which the newly-discovered Apostles render necessary* (in *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1858). "The text," he says, "as it originally stood, was probably to this effect (<12813>2 Kings 18:13): Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah *the king of Assyria came up* [alluding to the attack mentioned in Sargon's "Annals"], 20:1-19. In those days was king Hezekiah sick unto death, etc., 18:13. And Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, etc., 18:13; 19:37." It has been conjectured that some later transcriber, unaware of the earlier and unimportant invasion, confused the allusion to Sargon in <12813>2 Kings 18:13 with the detailed story of Sennacherib's attack (<12814>2 Kings 18:14 to 19:37), and, considering that the account of Hezekiah's illness broke the continuity of the narrative, removed it to the end. According to this scheme, Hezekiah's dangerous illness (2 Kings 20; Isaiah 38; <14324>2 Chronicles 32:24) nearly synchronized with Sargon's futile invasion, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, eleven years before *Sennacherib's* invasion. That it must have *preceded* the attack of Sennacherib has also been inferred from the promise in <12006>2 Kings 20:6, as well as from modern discoveries (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 1, 145); and such is the view adopted by the Rabbis (Seder Olam, cap. 23), Usher, and by most commentators, except Vitringa and Gesenius (Keil, ad loc.; Prideaux, 1, 22). It should be observed, however, that the difficulties experienced in reconciling the scriptural date with that of the Assyrian monuments rests on the synchronism of the fall of Samaria with the 1st or 2nd year of Sargon (q.v.). Col. Rawlinson has lately given reasons himself *(Lond. Athenceum,* No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 246) for doubting this date; and it is probable that further researches and computations may fully vindicate the accuracy of the Biblical numbers.

Tirhakah is mentioned (<12909>2 Kings 19:9) as an opponent of Sennacherib shortly before the miraculous destruction of his army in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, corresponding to B.C. 713. It has lately been proved from the Apis tablets that the first year of Tirhakah's reign over Egypt was the vague year current in B.C. 689 (Dr. Hincks, in the *our. Sac. Lit.* October, 1858, p. 130). There is, therefore, a *prima' facie* discrepancy of several years. Bunsen *(Bibelwerk,* 1, p. 306) unhesitatingly reduces the reign of Manasseh from fifty-five to forty-five years. Lepsius *(Konigsbuch,* p. 104)

more critically takes the thirty-five years of the Sept. as the true duration. Were an alteration demanded, it would seem best to make Manasseh's computation of his reign commence with his father's illness in preference to taking the conjectural number forty-five, or the very short one thirty-five. The evidence of the chronology of the Assyrian and Babylonian-kings is, however, we think, conclusive in favor of the sum of fifty-five. In the Bible we are told that Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and that it was taken in the sixth year of that king (2 Kings 18:9, 10). The Assyrian inscriptions indicate the taking of the city by Sargon in his first or second year, whence we must suppose either that he completed the enterprise of Shalmaneser, to whom the capture is not expressly ascribed in the Scriptures, or that he took the credit of an event which happened just before his accession. The first year of Sargon is shown by the inscriptions to have been exactly or nearly equal to the first of Merodach-Baladan, i.e. Mardocempadus: therefore it was current B.C. 721 or 720, and the second year, 720 or 719. This would place Hezekiah's accession B.C. 726, 725, or 724, the first of them being the very date the Hebrew numbers give. Again, Merodach-Baladan sent messengers to Hezekiah immediately after his sickness, and therefore in about his fifteenth year, B.C. 712. According to Ptolemy's Canon, Mardocempadus reigned 721-710, and, according to Berosus, seized the regal power for six months before Elibus, the Belibus of the Canon, and therefore in about 703, this being, no doubt, a second reign. *SEE MERODACH-BALADAN.* Here the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the earlier dates of Hezekiah. Thus far the chronological data of Egypt and Assyria appear to clash in a manner that seems at first sight to present a hopeless knot, but not on this account to be rashly cut. An examination of the facts of the history has afforded Dr. Hincks *(Jour. of Sac. Literature*, Oct. 1858) what he believes to be the true explanation. Tirhakah, he observes, is not explicitly termed Pharaoh or king of Egypt in the Bible, but king of Cush or Ethiopia, from which it might be inferred that at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion he had not assumed the crown of Egypt. The Assyrian inscriptions of Sennacherib mention kings of Egypt, and a contemporary king of Ethiopia in alliance with them. The history of Egypt at the time, obtained by a comparison of the evidence of Herodotus send others with that of Manetho's lists, would lead to the same or a similar conclusion, which appears to be remarkably confirmed by the prophecies of Isaiah. He holds, therefore, as most probable, that, at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous expedition, Tirhakah was king of Ethiopia in alliance with the king or kings

of Egypt. In fact, in order to reconcile the discrepancy between the date of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah in B.C. 713, and its contemporaneousness with the reign of Tirhakah, who did not ascend the Egyptian throne till B.C. 689, we have only to suppose that the latter king was the ruler of Ethiopia some years before his accession over Egypt itself. *SEE TIRHAKAH*.

In this way, however, we again fall into the other difficulty as to the coincidence of this date with that of Sennacherib's invasion. It is true, as above seen, that the warlike operations of Sennacherib recorded in the Bible have been conjectured (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 383) to be those of two expeditions. *SEE SENNACHERIB*. The fine paid by Hezekiah is recorded in the inscriptions as a result of an expedition of Sennacherib's third year, which, by a comparison of Ptolemy's Canon with Berosus, must be dated B.C. 700, and this would fall so near the close of the reign of the king of Judah (B.C. 697) that the supposed second expedition, of which there would naturally be no record in the Assyrian annals on account of its calamitous end, could not be placed much later. The Biblical account would, however, be most reasonably explained by the supposition that the two expeditions were but two campaigns of the same war, a war but temporarily interrupted by Hezekiah's submission. Now as even the former (if there were two) of these expeditions of Selnacherib fell in B.C. 700, it would be thirteen years later than the synchronism of Tirhakah and Hezekiah as above arrived at. It is probable, therefore, that there is some miscalculation in these dates from the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, as indeed seems to be betrayed by the discrepancy between Sennacherib's invasion (B.C. 700) and Tirhakah's reign (not earlier than B.C. 689), as thereby determined, whereas the above Biblical passage makes them contemporaneous. Dr. Hincks *(ut sup.)*, however, proposes to solve this difficulty also by the uncritical supposition that the name of Sennacherib has been inserted in the Biblical account of the first Assyrian invasion of Judah (2 Kings 18:13; Isaiah 26:1; 2 Chronicles 32) by some copyist, who confounded this with the later invasion by that monarch, whereas the Assyrian king referred to was Sargon (Isaiah 20:1), his predecessor. A less violent hypothesis for the same purpose of reconcilement, and one in accordance with the custom of these Oriental kings, e.g. in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, is that Sargon sent Sennacherib as viceroy to execute this campaign in Palestine, and that the annals of the

reign of the latter refer to different and later expeditions when actually king. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*.

Some writers have thought to find a note of time in <12199>2 Kings 19:29; <23730>Isaiah 37:30, "Ye shall eat this year such as groweth of itself," etc., assuming that the passage is only to be explained as implying the intervention of a sabbath-year, or even of a sabbath-year followed by a year of jubilee. All that can be said is that the passage *may* be interpreted in that sense; and it does happen that according to that view of the order of sabbatic and jubilaean years which is the best attested, a sabbath-year would begin in the autumn of B.C. 713 (Browne, *Ordo Saeclorum*, sec. 272-280), i.e. on the perhaps precarious assumption that the cycle persisted without interruption. At most, however, this no more fixes the fourteenth of Hezekiah to the year B.C. 713, than it does to 706, or 699, or any other year of the series. But, in fact, it is not necessary to assume any reference to a sabbath-year. Suppose the words to have been spoken in the autumn, then, the produce of the previous harvest (April, May) having been destroyed or carried off by the invaders, there remained only that which sprang naturally from the dropped or trodden-out seed (jypæ), and as the enemy's presence in the land hindered the autumnal tillage, there could be no regular harvest in the following spring (only the vyjæ; αὐτόματα). Hence there is no need to infer with Thenius, ad loc. that the enemy must have been in the land at least eighteen months. or, with Ewald, that Isaiah, speaking in the autumn, anticipated that the invasion would last through the following year (*Die Propheten des A. B.* 1, 301, and similarly Knobel, *u. s.* p. 278).

There seems to be no ground whatever for the vague conjecture so confidently advanced (Jahn, *Hebr. Common.* § 41), that the king's illness was the same plague which had destroyed the Assyrian army. The word ^yjæ is not elsewhere applied to the plague, but to carbuncles and inflammatory ulcers (<021909>Exodus 9:9; <180201>Job 2:1, etc.). Hezekiah, whose kingdom was still in a dangerous state from the fear lest the Assyrians might return, who had at that time no heir (for Manasseh was not born till long afterwards, <122101>2 Kings 21:1), and who regarded death as the end of existence (Isaiah 38), "turned his face to the wall and wept sore" at the threatened approach of dissolution. God had compassion on his anguish, and heard his prayer. Isaiah had hardly left the palace when he was ordered to promise the king immediate recovery, and a fresh lease of life, ratifying

the promise by a sign, and curing the boil by a plaster of figs, which were often used medicinally in similar cases (Gesenius, *Thes.* 1, 311; Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2, 377; Bartholinus, *De Morbis Biblicis, 10:*47). What was the exact nature of the disease we cannot say; according to Meade, it was fever terminating in abscess. On this remarkable passage we must here be content to refer the reader to Carpzov, *App. Crit. p.* 351 sq.; Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 332 sq.; the elaborate notes of Keil on 2 Kings 20; Rosenmüller and Gesenius on Isaiah 38, and especially Ewald, *Geschichte 3,* 638.

The sign given to Hezekiah in the going back of the shadow on the "sun-dial of Ahaz" can only be interpreted as a miracle. The explanation proposed by J. von Gumpach *(Alt. Test. Studien,* p. 181 sq.) is as incompatible with the terms of the narrative (<23808>Isaiah 38:8, especially the fuller one, <12008>2 Kings 20:8-11) as it is insulting to the character of the prophet, who is represented to have managed the seeming return of the shadow by the trick of secretly turning the movable dial from its proper position to its opposite! Thenius *(u. s.* p. 403 sq.) would naturalize the miracle so as to obtain from it a note of time. The phenomenon was due, he thinks, to a solar eclipse, very small, viz. the one of 26th September, B.C. 713. Here, also, the prophet is taxed with a deception, to be justified by his wish to inspire the despairing king with the confidence essential to his recovery. The prophet employed for this purpose his astronomical knowledge of the fact that the eclipse was about to take place, and of the further fact that "at the beginning of an eclipse the shadow (e.g. of a gnomon) goes back, and at its ending goes forward:" an effect, however, so minute that the difference amounts at most to sixty seconds of time; but then the "degrees" would mark extremely small portions of time, possibly even 1080 to the hour (like the later Hebrew *Chakim),* and the so-called "dial" was enormously large! Not more successfully, Mr. Bosanquet *(Trans. of R. Asiat. Soc. 15,* 277) has recourse to the same expedient of an eclipse on Jan. 11, 689 B.C., which, in this writer's scheme, lies in the fourteenth of Hezekiah. "Whoever truly believes in the Old Testament, as Mr. Bosanquet evidently does, must also be prepared to believe in a miracle," is the just comment made by M. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assurs und Babels,* p. 49. Mr. Greswell's elaborate attempt to prove from ancient astronomical records that the day of this miracle was preternaturally lengthened out to thirty-six hours will scarcely convince any one but himself *(Fasti Temporis Catholici,* etc., and Browne's "Remarks" on the same, 1852, p. 23 sq.). *SEE DIAL*.

Various ambassadors came with letters and gifts to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery (<14>2 Chronicles 32:23), and among them an embassy from Merodach-Baladan (or Berodach, <12>2 Kings 20:12; ὁ Βάλαδας, Josephus, *1.* c.), the viceroy of Babylon, the Mardokempados of Ptolemy's canon. The ostensible object of this mission was to compliment Hezekiah on his convalescence (<12>2 Kings 20:12; <23>Isaiah 39:1), and "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (<14>2 Chronicles 32:31), a rumor of which could not fail to interest a people devoted to astrology. But its real purpose was to discover how far an alliance between the two powers was possible or desirable, for Mardokempados, no less than Hezekiah, was in apprehension of the Assyrians. In fact, Sargon expelled him from the throne of Babylon in the following year (the 16th of Hezekiah), although after a time he seems-to have returned and re-established himself for six months, at the end of which he was murdered by Belibos (Dr. Hincks, 1. c.; Rosenmüller, *uibl. Geograph.* ch. 8; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 1, 141). Community of interest made Hezekiah receive the overtures of Babylon with unconcealed gratification; and, perhaps, to enhance the opinion of his own importance as an ally he displayed to the messengers the princely treasures which he and his predecessors had accumulated. These stores remained even after the largesses mentioned in <12>2 Kings 18:14, 16. If ostentation were his motive it received a terrible rebuke, and he was informed by Isaiah that from the then tottering and subordinate province of Babylon, and not from the mighty Assyria, would come the ruin and captivity of Judah (<23>Isaiah 39:5). This prophecy and the one of Micah (<33>Micah 4:10) are the earliest definition of the locality of that hostile power, where the clouds of exile so long threatened (<03>Leviticus 26:33; <05>Deuteronomy 4:27; 30:3) were beginning to gather. It is an impressive and fearful circumstance that the moment of exultation was chosen as the opportunity for warning, and that the prophecies of the Assyrian deliverance are set side by side with those of the Babylonian captivity (Davidson, *On Prophecy,* p. 256). The weak friend was to accomplish that which was impossible to the powerful foe. But, although pride was the sin thus vehemently checked by the prophet, Isaiah was certainly not blind to *the political* motives (Joseph. *Ant. 10:*2, 2) which made Hezekiah so complaisant to the Babylonian ambassadors. Into those motives he had inquired in vain, for the king met *that* portion of his question ("What said these men?") by emphatic silence. Hezekiah's meek answer to the stern denunciation of future woe has been most unjustly censured as "a false resignation which combines selfishness with silliness" (Newman, *Hebr.*

Mon. p. 274). On the contrary, it merely implies a conviction that God's decree could not be otherwise than just and right, and a natural thankfulness for even a temporary suspension of its inevitable fulfillment.

After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. No man before or since ever lived under the certain knowledge of the precise length of the span of life before him. "He was buried in the going up (hl,[ṁ) to the sepulchers of the sons of David," <14233>2 Chronicles 32:33: from this, and the fact that the succeeding kings were laid in sepulchers of their own, it may be inferred that after Ahaz, thirteenth from David, there was no more room left in the ancestral sepulcher (Thenius, u. *s.* p. 410). In later times, he was held in honor as the king who had "after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him" (<12185>2 Kings 18:5); in <24617>Jeremiah 26:17 the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Sirach closes his recital of the kings with this judgment-that of all the kings of Judah, "David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High" (Ecclus. 49:4).

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

Hezekiah's Pool,

the modern traditionary name of a cistern or reservoir in the western part of the city of Jerusalem, referred by Robinson *(Later Researches,* p. 112) and Bartlett *(Walks about Jerusalem,* p. 82) to the military preparations of that king (<14303>2 Chronicles 32:3 sq.; compare <12020>2 Kings 20:20; Ecclus.

48:17 sq.; 2220Isaiah 22:9-11; 1982Psalm 48:12, 13), but disputed by Ritter *(Erdk. 17,* 371 sq.). *SEE JERUSALEM*.

2. The great-great-grandfather of the prophet Zephaniah (3601Zephaniah 1:1, where the name is Anglicized "Hizkiah"), supposed by some to be the same with the foregoing (see Huetius, *Denostr. Evang.* Lips. p. 512; contra Rosenmüller, *Proleg. ad Zeph.).* B.C. much ante 635.

3. A person mentioned in connection with Ater (but whether as father or otherwise is not clear), which latter was the father (or former residence) of ninety-eight Israelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1672Nehemiah 7:21). In 1607Nehemiah 10:17 his name (Anglicized "Hizkijah") appears in a similar connection (but without the connective "of") among those who subscribed the covenant of Nehemiah. B.C. ante 536.

4. The second of the three sons of Neariah, a descendant of Salathiel (1323 1 Chronicles 3:23); probably a brother of the Esli of 4025Luke 3:25, and also of the Azor of 4013Matthew 1:13. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16.) B.C. post 536.

Hezel

SEE HETZEL.

Hezer

SEE HETZER.

He'zion

(Heb. *Chezyon',* ˆ/yzj , *visionz;* Sept. Åζιών), the father of Tabrimon and grandfather of the Ben-hadad I, king of Damascene-Syria, to whom Asa sent a largess to conciliate his aid against Baasha (11518 1 Kings 15:18). B.C. ante 928. A question has long been raised whether this name (which only occurs in the above passage) indicates the same person as the REZON of 11123 1 Kings 11:23. Thenius, after Ewald, suggests that the successful adventurer who became king of Damascus, and was so hostile a neighbor to Solomon throughout his reign, was really called *Hezion,* and that the designation *Rezon* (ˆ/z r] "prince") was either assumed by him, or bestowed on him by his followers after he was seated on his new throne. There is, of course, no chronological difficulty in this supposition. Less

than forty years intervened between the death of Solomon, when Rezon was reigning at Damascus (<111125>1 Kings 11:25), and the treaty between Asa and Ben-hadad I (<111518>1 Kings 15:18, 19), during which interval there is no violence to probability in assuming the occurrence of the death of Rezon or Hezion, the accession and entire reign of Tabrimon his son, who was unquestionably king of Syria and contemporary with Asa's father (<111519>1 Kings 15:19), and the succession of Tabrimon's son, Beni-hldad I. This identity of Hezion with Rezon is an idea apparently as old as the Sept. translators; for they associated in their version with Solomon's adversary the Edomite Hadad [or, as they called him, *Ader*, τὸν Ἄδερ], "*Es-rom*, the son of Eliadah" (see the Sept. of <111114>1 Kings 11:14); a name which closely resembles our *Hezion,* though it refers to Rezon, as the patronymic proves (<111123>1 Kings 11:23). The later versions, Peshito *(Hedron)* and Arabic *(Hedron),* seem to approximate also more nearly to *Hezion* than to *Rezon.* Of the old commentators, Junius, Piscator, Malvenda, and Menochius have been cited (see Poli *Synops.* ad loc.) as maintaining the identity. Kohler also, and Marsham *(Can. Chronicles* p. 346), and Dathe have been referred to by Keil as in favor of the same view. Keil himself is uncertain. According to another opinion, Hezion was not identical with Rezon, but his successor; this is propounded by Winer *(B. R. W.* 1, 245, and 2, 322). If the account be correct which is communicated by Josephus *(Ant. 7,* 5, 2) from the fourth book of *Nicolaus Damascenus* to the effect that the name of the king of Damascus who was contemporary with David was *Hadad (*Ἄδαδος*),* we have in it probably the *dynastic* name which Rezon or Hezion adopted for himself and his heirs, who, according to the same statement, occupied the throne of Syria for ten generations. According to Macrobius *(Saturnalia,* 1, 23), *Adad* was the name of the supreme god of the Syrians; and as it was a constant practice with the kings of Syria and Babylon to assume names which connected them with their gods (comp. *Tabrimon* of <111518>1 Kings 15:18, the son of our Hezion, whose name= ˆ/M2ær +b f; "good is Rimmon," another Syrian deity, probably the same with Adad; see <120518>2 Kings 5:18, and <381211>Zechariah 12:11), we may not unreasonably conjecture that Hezion, who in his *political* relation called himself *Rezon,* or "prince," adopted the name *Hadad* [or, rather. *Ben-hadad,* "Son of the supreme God"] in relation to the *religion* of his country and to his own *ecclesiastical* supremacy. It is remarkable that even after the change of dynasty in Hazael this title of *Ben-hadad* seemed to survive (see <120303>2 Kings 13:3). If this conjecture be true, the energetic marauder who passes under the names of *Rezon* and *Hezion*

in the passages which we quoted at the commencement of this article was strong enough not only to harass the great Solomon, but to found a dynasty of kings which occupied the throne of Syria to the tenth descent, even down to the revolution effected by Hazael, “near two hundred years, according to the exactest chronology of Josephus” (Whiston’s note on *Ant.* 7 5, 2). *SEE REZON*.

He’zir

(Heb. *Chezi-r’*, רזחי a *swine*, or, according to First, *strong;* Sept. Ἰεζείρ and Ἡζείρ 5.r. Χηζίν*)*, the name of two men.

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

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

Hez’rai

(2 Samuel 23:35). *SEE HEZRO*. Hez’ro (Heb. *Chetsro’*, רצחי, i. q. *Hezron;* Sept. Ἀσαραί,Vulg. *Hezro)*, a Carmelite, one of David’s distinguished warriors (1 Chronicles 11:37). He is called in the margin and in 2 Samuel 23:35, HEZRAI *(Chetsray’*, יַצְרַי , Sept. Ἀσαρί,Vulg. *Hesrai)*. B.C. 1046. Kennicott, however *(Dissertation*, p. 207). decides, on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient version, that *Hezrai* is the original form of the name.

Hez’ron

(Heb. *Chetsron’*, חֶצְרֹן, *enclosed* [Gesen.] or *blooming* [Furst]; Sept. Ἀσρών, Ἀσερών*)*, the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The third son of Reuben (Genesis 46:9; Exodus 6:14; 1 Chronicles 4:1; 5:3). His descendants were called HEZRONITES *(Chetsroni’*, יַנֶצְחִ , Sept. Ἀσρωνί, Numbers 26:6, 21). B.C. 1874.

2. The oldest of the two sons of Pharez and grandson of Judah (Genesis 46:12; Ruth 4:18, 19; 1 Chronicles 2:5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 25); called ESROM (Ἐσρώμ) in Matthew 1:3. B.C. 1856.

3. A place on the southern boundary of Judah, west of Kadesh-Barnea, and between that and Adar (Joshua 15:3); otherwise called HAZOR (ver. 25). The punctuation and enumeration, however, require us to connect the associated names thus: Kerioth-hezron = Hazoranam. *SEE HAZOR*.

Hez'ronite

(Numbers 26:6, 21). *SEE HEZRON* I.

Hibbard, Billy

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

Hickes, George, D.D.

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

8vo). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog. 6:*32 sq.; Lathhury, *History of the Nonjurors.*

Hicks, Elias

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

Hicksites

SEE HICKS.

Hid'dai

(Heb. *Hidday',* yDhæ *exuberant* or *mighty;* Sept. Alex. MS. Ἀθθαί, Vat. MS. omits; Vulg. *Heddai),* one of the thirty-seven heroes of David's guard (1030 2 Samuel 23:30), described as "of the torrents of Gaash." In the parallel list of 1 Chronicles (11:32) the name is given as HURAI *SEE HURAI* (q.v.), in favor of which reading Kennicott *(Dissert.* p. 194) decides. — Smith.

Hid'dekel

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

or Tigris. The stream was known by either name indifferently; but, on the whole, the Arian appellation predominated in ancient times, and was that most commonly used even by Shemitic races. The Arabians, however, when they conquered Mesopotamia, revived the true Shemitic title, and this *(Dijleh)* continues to be the name by which the river is known to the natives down to the present day."

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

Hi’el

(Heb. *Chiel’*, לאיחיאל *life of*, i.e. *from God*, or perh. for יחיה־אל *God shall live;* Sept. Ἀχιήλ), a native of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho (B.C. post 915), above 700 years after its destruction by the Israelites, and who, in so doing (1 Kings 16:34), incurred, in the death of his eldest son Abiram and his youngest son Segub, the effects of the imprecation pronounced by Joshua (Joshua 6:26):

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

Hieracas

SEE HIERAX.

Hiërap’olis

Picture for Hierapolis

(Ἱεράπολις, *sacred city)*, a city of Phrygia, situated above the junction of the rivers Lycus and Maeander, not far from Colossse and Laodicea, where there was a Christian church under the charge of Epaphras as early as the time of the apostle Paul, who commends him for his fidelity and zeal (Colossians 4:12, 13). The place is visible from the theatre at Laodicea, from which it is five miles distant northward. Its association with Laodicea and Colossee is just what we should expect, for the three towns were all in the basin of the Mseander, and within a few miles of one another. It is probable that Hierapolis was one of the “illustres Asiue urbes” (Tacitus,

Ann. 14, 27) which, with Laodicea, were simultaneously desolated by an earthquake about the time when Christianity was established in this district. There is little doubt that the church of Hierapolis was founded at the same time with that of Colossae, and that its characteristics in the apostolic period were the same. Smith, in his journey to the Seven Churches (1671), was the first to describe the ancient sites in this neighborhood. He was followed by Pococke and Chandler; and more recently by Richter, Cockerell, Hartley, Arundel, etc. The place now bears the name of *Pambuk-Kalek* (Cotton-Castle), from the white appearance of the cliffs of the mountain on the lower summit, or, rather, an extended terrace, on which the ruins are situated. It owed its celebrity, and probably the sanctity indicated by its ancient name, to its very remarkable thermal springs of mineral water (Dio Cass. 68, 27; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 2, 95), the singular effects of which, in the formation of stalactites and incrustations by its deposits, are shown in the accounts of Pococke (2, pt. 2, c. 13) and Chandler *(Asia Minor,* c. 68) to have been accurately described by Strabo (13, 629). A great number and variety of sepulchers are found in the approaches to the site, which on one side is sufficiently defended by the precipices overlooking the valleys of the Lycus and Maeander, while on the other sides the town walls are still observable. The magnificent ruins clearly attest the ancient importance of the place. The main street can still be traced in its whole extent, and is bordered by the remains of three Christian churches, one of which is upwards of 300 feet long. About the middle of this street, just above the mineral springs, Pococke, in 1741, thought that he distinguished some remains of the Temple of Apollo, which, according to Damascus, quoted by Photius *(Biblioth.* p. 1054), was in this situation. But the principal ruins are a theatre and gymnasium, both in a state of uncommon preservation; the former 346 feet in diameter, the latter nearly filling a space 400 feet square. Strabo (loc. cit.) and Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 5, 29) mention a cave called the Plutonium, filled with pestilential vapors, similar to the celebrated Grotto del Cane in Italy. High up the mountain-side is a deep recess far into the mountain; and Mr. Arundell says that he should have supposed that the mephitic cavern lay in this recess, if Mr. Cockerell had not found it near the theatre, the position anciently assigned to it; and he conjectures that it may be the same in which Chandler distinguished the area of a stadium (Arundell, *Asia Minor,* 2, 210). The same writer gives, from the *Oriens Christianus,* a list of the bishops of Hierapolis down to the time of the emperor Isaac Angelus. (See Col. Leake's *Geogr. of Asia Minor,* p. 252, 253; Hamilton's *Res. in Asia Minor,* 1, 514, 517 sq.;

Fellows, *Lycia,* p. 270; *Asia Minor,* p. 283 sq.; Cramer's *Asia Minor,* 2, 37 sq.).

Hierapolis, Council Of

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

Hierarchy

*(*ἱεραρχία, from ἱερός, *sacred,* and ἄρχων, *ruler),* a term used to denote, in churches in which the whole ruling power is held by the priesthood, a sacred principality instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ 1, his Church, and consisting of orders of consecrated persons, with gradations of rank and power, who constitute exclusively the governing and ministering body in the Church. It implies the transmission, under what is called the Apostolical Succession, *SEE SUCCESSION*, of the authority to teach and govern given by Christ to his apostles; and thus the hierarchy, as a corporation, perpetuates itself. The hierarchy on earth is supposed to correspond with the hierarchy of "angels and archangels, and all the hosts" of heaven, with the Virgin Mary at their head. The Christian hierarchy, again, is supposed to correspond to the Jewish gradations of the priesthood. *SEE CHURCH*. The notion of a "continuity of plan running on from the Jewish hierarchical system into the Christian, i.e. the Romish spiritual monarchy, is an ideal analogy which has captivated" many an ardent imagination, from Cyprian down to Manning and Newman. For an exposure of its fallacy, see Taylor, *Ancient Christianity* (Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 403.

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

hierarchy *of jurisdiction.* The hierarchy of orders, again, includes the hierarchy by *divine right* (juris divini) and the hierarchy by *ecclesiastical right* (juris ecclesiastici).

(I.) *Hierarchy of Orders. —*

(1.) The hierarchy *juris divini* includes,

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

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

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

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

(II.) *Hierarchy of Jurisdiction. — This* embraces the manifold “principalities and powers” which have been constituted in the Church in the course of her progress towards universal dominion. It includes archdeacons, archpresbyters, deans, vicars, inferior prelates, and cardinals. In the order of bishops, again, there are archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs. The pope is at the head of all, the bearer of all the functions of every office, and the source of authority for each. *SEE PAPAL SYSTEM*. The Roman hierarchy is a vast politico-ecclesiastical corporation, with the pope at its head, claiming universal dominion over all men and over all governments. *SEE CURIA ROMANA*; *SEE POPE*. It is a great power, more important, as De Maistre, one of the greatest modern Roman

writers remarks, than sound doctrine, inasmuch as it is “more indispensable to the preservation of the faith” *(Lettres,* 2, 285). This idea of a hierarchy with a universal dominion, and with an infallible head, constituting a visible principality on earth, and therefore necessarily using secular means of support, and “therefore also unavoidably offering the highest possible excitements to carnal ambition,” is a magnificent one, considered merely as a human organization seeking power over men; but it is utterly out of harmony with Scripture, and with the character and claims of Christianity as a spiritual religion.

II. After the Reformation, the churches on the Continent of Europe relinquished the hierarchy, although it might have been retained with ease in Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, as numerous bishops became Protestants. The Church of England, however, retained it, and, in fact, she is distinguished from all other European Protestant churches by her claim to a regular hierarchy, in full apostolical succession. The High-Church notion of the hierarchy is stated by J. H. Blunt *(Dictionary of Historical and Doctrinal Theology*, s.v.) as follows: “Our Lord, the chief bishop, chose out twelve apostles and seventy disciples, corresponding to the twelve princes of tribes and the seventy elders, who, with Moses, governed God’s ancient people, in order to show that his Church is the true spiritual Israel of God. St. Paul gave authority to Timothy and Titus to constitute bishops and deacons; St. Paul exercised visitation over the priests summoned to Ephesus; with Barnabas he ordained priests (Acts 14:23). St. Peter gave charge to priests and deacons (1 Peter 5:1-5), and St. John received divine commission to exercise authority over the seven angels or bishops of the churches of Asia. In order to preserve the unity of the Church, Christendom was divided into dioceses, each with a number of priests and deacons under one head, the bishop, to regulate the faith and manners of the people, and to minister to them in God’s name. The hierarchy embraces the power of jurisdiction and of order, considered as a *principality*. The hierarchy of *order* was established to sanctify the Body of Christ, and is composed of all persons in orders. The hierarchy of *jurisdiction* was established for the government of the faithful, and to promote their eternal holiness, and is composed of prelates. The hierarchy of order by ministration of the sacraments and preaching the Gospel aims at elevating and hallowing the spiritual life; the hierarchy of jurisdiction is for the promotion of exterior discipline. The hierarchy of order confers no jurisdiction, but simply power to perform ecclesiastical functions and

administer sacraments, whereas the other hierarchy bestows jurisdiction, and consequently the right of making ordinances concerning the faith and ecclesiastical discipline, and to correct offenders. The principal duty of ministers of the Church is to lead men to the knowledge and worship of God, and the Church therefore requires laws and rules for the guidance of her ministers. The hierarchy of order, that of the ministration of the Word and sacraments, appertains to all clergy according to the measure of their power; the hierarchy of jurisdiction, which is, in fact, the hierarchy, being the chief power of the Church, pertains to prelates alone, but cannot exist without the other hierarchy, although the latter can be without jurisdiction, which it presupposes, and is its foundation. In the one the clerical character or *order*, i.e. the ecclesiastical office, only is regarded; in the other the degree, the rank' in jurisdiction of a prelate, is alone considered. Both have one origin and one object, and both flow from the clerical character; but order is of divine right, jurisdiction an ecclesiastical necessity, with its differences of chief bishops, prelacies, and ranks of ministers." The *Protestant Episcopal Church* retains the hierarchy of order, viz. bishops, priests, and deacons, together with the claim of apostolical succession. But the power of jurisdiction is divided with the laity, who are represented in the highest judicatory, the General Convention, and in this view that Church is not hierarchical. The *Methodist Episcopal Church* preserves the order of bishops, presbyters or elders, and deacons, but does not claim that her episcopacy retains the so-called apostolical succession; and she admits the laity to many of her offices, especially to those in which temporalities are concerned. The Presbyterian and Congregational churches of America are not hierarchical in government. *SEE BISHOPS*; *SEE CHURCH*; *SEE EPISCOPACY*; *SEE LAITY*; *SEE ORDERS*; *SEE PAPAL SYSTEM*; *SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH*; *SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*.

Hierax or Hieraoas

an Egyptian ascetic philosopher, native of Leontus or Leontopolis, classed among the heretics of the 3rd century. Epiphanius, Photius, and Peter of Sicily considered him a Manichaean. "He was, at all events, a perfectly original phenomenon, distinguished for his varied learning, allegorical exegesis, poetical talent, and still more for his eccentric ascetism. He taught that, as the business of Christ on earth was to promulgate a new law, more perfect and strict than that of Moses, he prohibited the use of wine, flesh, matrimony, and whatever was pleasing to the senses. Hierax

denied the historical reality of the fall and the resurrection of the body; excluded children dying before years of discretion from the kingdom of heaven; distinguished the substance of the Son from that of the Father; taught that Melchizedec was the Holy Ghost; obscured the sacred volume with allegorical interpretations; and maintained that paradise was only the joy and satisfaction of the mind. His followers were sometimes called Abstinents, because of their scrupulously abstaining from the use of wine and certain meats. He wrote some commentaries on Scripture, and hymns, which are only known by quotations in Epiphanius. See Lardner, *Works*, *3*, 285; Mosheim, *Comm.* 2, 404; Neander, *Church History*, 1, 713; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 510; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, *24*, 647.

Hier'eel'

(Ἱερεήλ), given (I Esdr. 9:21) as the name of one of the "sons of Emmer" who divorced their heathen wives after the Captivity; evidently the JEHIEL *SEE JEHIEL* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra 10:21).

Hier'emoth

(Ἱερεμώθ), the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

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

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

Hierie'lus

(Ἱερίηλος v.r. Ἰεζριῆλος), another of the "sons of Ela" who in like manner divorced his wife (1 Esdr. 9:27); the JEHIEL *SEE JEHIEL* (q.v.) of Ezra 10:26.

Hier'mas

(Ἱερμάς), one of "the sons of Phoros" who did the same (1 Esdr. 10:26); the RAMIAH *SEE RAMIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra 10:25).

Hierocles

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

Hierocles

a Neo-Platonist of the 5th century at Alexandria. He is said to be the author of a *Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras,* which is still extant; and also a *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate,* of which Photius has preserved large extracts. Stobeeus has also preserved the fragments of several other works which are ascribed to Hierocles. The Greek text of the *Commentary on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras* was first published by Curterius (Paris, 1583; reprinted at London, 1654; also 1742; and Padua, 1744). The fragments of the *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate,* in which Hierocles attempts to reconcile the free-will of man with the foreknowledge of God, have been edited by

Morell (Paris, 1593, 1597), and by Pearson (London, 1655, 1673); the latter edition contains the fragments of the other works of Hierocles. A complete edition of his works was published by Needham (Cambridge, 1709). Both Pearson and Needham confound this Hierocles with Hierocles, the prefect of Bithynia. The *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate* was translated into French by Regnaud (Lyons, 1560). Grotius translated part of this work into Latin in his *Sententiae Philosophorum de Fato* (Paris, 1624; Amst. i648; reprinted in the third volume of his theological works, 1679). The *Commentary on the Golden Verses* has been translated into English by Hall, London, 1657: Norris, London, 1682; Rayner, Norw. 1797; and into French (with life) by Dacier, Paris, 1706. See *English Cyclopedia,* s.v.; Smith, *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology,* 2, 453; Augusti, *Dogmengeschichte,* 1 and 2; Lardner, *Works, 8,* 127.

Hieroglyphics

(from ἱερός, *sacred,* and γλύφω, *to carve),* the term usually applied to the inscriptions in the so-called sacred or symbolical characters on the Egyptian monuments. *SEE EGYPT*. "They were either engraved in relief, or sunk below the surface on the public monuments and hard materials suited for the glyptic art, or else traced in outline with a reed pen on papyri, wood, slices of stone, and other objects. The scribe indeed, wrote from a. palette or canon called *pes,* with pens, *kash,* from two little ink-holes in the palette, containing a black ink of animal charcoal, and a red mineral ink. The hieroglyphics on the monuments are sometimes sculptured and plain; at others, decorated with colors, either one simple tone for all the hieroglyphs, which are then called monochrome, or else ornamented with a variety of colors, and then called polychrome; and those painted on coffins and other objects are often first traced out, and then colored in detail. On the papyri and some few inferior materials they are simply sketched in outline, and are called linear hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphs are arranged in perpendicular columns, separated by lines, or in horizontal, or distributed in a sporadic manner in the area of the picture to which they refer. Sometimes all these modes of arrangement are found together. One peculiarity is at once discernible, that all the animals and representations face in the same direction when they are combined into a text; and when mixed up with reliefs and scenes, they usually face in the direction of the figures to which they are attached. When thus arranged, the reliefs and hieroglyphs resemble a MS., every letter of which should also be an illumination, and they produce a gay and agreeable impression on the

spectator. They are written very square, the spaces are neatly and carefully packed, so as to leave no naked appearance of background.

“The invention of hieroglyphs, called *Neter kharu*, or ‘divine words,’ was attributed to the god Thoth, the Egyptian Logos, who is repeatedly called the scribe of the gods and lord of the hieroglyphs. Pliny attributes their invention to Menon. The literature of the Egyptians was in fact called Hermaic or Hermetic, on account of its supposed divine origin, and the knowledge of hieroglyphs was, to a certain extent, a mystery to the uninitiated, although universally employed by the sacerdotal and instructed classes. To foreign nations, the hieroglyphs always remained so, although Moses is supposed to have been versed in the knowledge of them (Philo, *vita Moysis);* but Joseph is described (<01423>Genesis 42:23) as conversing with his brethren through interpreters, and does not appear to allude to hieroglyphic writing. The Greeks, who had settled on the coast as early as the 6th century B.C., do not appear to have possessed more than a colloquial knowledge of the language (Diod. Sic. 81, 3, 4); and although Solon, B.C. 538, is said to have studied Egyptian doctrines at Sebennytus and Heliopolis, and the doctrines of Pythagoras are said to have been derived from Egypt, these sages could only have acquired their knowledge from interpretations of hieroglyphic writings. Hecatseus (B.C. 521) and Herodotus (B.C. 456), who visited Egypt in their travels, obtained from similar sources the information they have afforded of the language or monuments of the country (Herod. 2, 36). Democritus of Abdera, indeed, about the same period (B.C. 459), had described both the Ethiopian hieroglyphs and the Babylonian cuneiform, but his work has disappeared. After the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, the Greek rulers began to pay attention to the language and history of their subjects, and Eratosthenes, the keeper of the museum at Alexandria, and Manetho, the high-priest of Sebennytus, had drawn up accounts of the national chronology and history from hieroglyphic sources. Under the Roman Empire, in the reign of Augustus, one Chaeremon, the keeper of the library at the Serappeum, had drawn up a dictionary ‘of the hieroglyphs; and both Diodorus and Strabo mention them, and describe their nature. Tacitus, later under the empire, gives the account of the monuments of Thebes translated by the Egyptian priests to Germanicus; but after his time, the knowledge of them beyond Egypt itself was exceedingly limited, and does not reappear till the third and subsequent centuries A.D., when they are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, who cites the translation of one of the obelisks at Rome by

one Hermapion, and by Julius Valerius, the author of the apocryphal life of Alexander, who gives that of another. Heliodorus, a novelist who flourished A.D. 400, describes a hieroglyphic letter written by queen Candace (4, 8). The first positive information on the subject is by Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 211), who mentions the symbolical and phonetic, or, as he calls it, cyriologic nature of hieroglyphics *(Strom.* 5). Porphyry (A.D. 304) divides them also into coenologic or phonetic, and cenigmatic or symbolic. Horapollo or Horus-Apollus, who is supposed to have flourished about A.D. 500, wrote two books explanatory of the hieroglyphics, a rude, ill-assorted confusion of truth and fiction, in which are given the interpretation of many hieroglyphs, and their esoteric meaning. After this writer, all knowledge of them disappeared till the revival of letters. At the beginning of the 16th century these symbols first attracted attention, and, soon after, Kircher, a learned Jesuit, pretended to interpret them by vague esoteric notions derived from his own fancy, on the supposition that the hieroglyphs were ideographic, a theory which barred all progress, and was held in its full extent by the learned, till Zoega, at the close of the 18th century *(De Ornine Obeliscorum,* fol. Romans 1797), first enunciated that the duals or cartouches contained royal names, and that the hieroglyphs, or some of them, were used to express sounds" (Chambers, *Cyclopedia).*

Picture for Hieroglyphics 1

"The knowledge of hieroglyphics which we at present possess owes its origin to the Rosetta stone, which is now in the British Museum. This stone was found by the French among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, which is situated near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile, and was given up to the English in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Alexandria. It is supposed to have been sculptured about B.C. 195, and contains a decree in honor of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) written in three different characters. One of these is Greek, and a part of it has been explained to state that the decree was ordered to be written in Sacred, Enchorial, and Greek writing. Dr. Young *(Archaeologia,* 1817) was the first that attempted to decipher this inscription, in which he partially succeeded by counting the recurrence of the more marked characters in the hieroglyphics, and comparing them with those that occurred about the same number of times in the Greek. Champollion and Wilkinson have followed up Dr. Young's discoveries with great ingenuity, and we can now partially read inscriptions which before were wholly unintelligible to us. Among other obstacles, however, this remains in the way, viz. that the

Rosetta stone was sculptured about B.C. 195, and in Lower Egypt; while the major part of the inscriptions were written during the twelve previous centuries, and are found in Upper Egypt. Hieroglyphics are written either from left to right or right to left, according to the direction in which they face; though sometimes the columns are so narrow that they may be almost said to be written from top to bottom. They are partly pictorial; thus 'ox,' 'goose,' temple' are represented by pictures or pictorial symbols of an ox, etc. At other times they are phonetic, and written by an alphabet of about 140 letters, of which many are synonymous; some being adapted for writing, others for sculpture; some in use at an earlier period, others at a later. The powers of these letters are determined by the names of the kings in which they are found; but, as this cannot be done very exactly, they are generally arranged under about twelve of our primary letters. We cannot, however, distinguish accurately between the vowels, or P and PH, and other cognate letters. The names of sovereigns are always written within a-ring or cartouche: those of any other person are distinguished by a sitting figure following them: besides these there is nothing to mark the difference between a letter and a pictorial symbol. In some words the meaning is expressed twice; once by a phonetic combination, and again by a pictorial symbol; in others the more important part is symbolical, and the grammatical termination is spelled. Sometimes also we find a species of abbreviation; thus the word ox would be expressed by the first letter of the Coptic word signifying ox.

Picture for Hieroglyphics 2

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

this writing the hieroglyphics have almost wholly disappeared, though some still appear scattered here and there."

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

Hieromax

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

Hieromnemon

(Gr. ἱερομνήμων). I. The title m ancient history of that one of the two deputies sent by each tribe to the Amphictyonic Council who superintended the religious rites. II. An officer in the Greek Church, who, during service, stands behind the bishop, and points out to him in order the

psalms, prayers, etc. He also dresses the patriarchs, and shows the priests to their places. — Pierer, 8, 368; Brande, 2, 124. (J. W. M.)

Hieron, Samuel

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

Hieronymites

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

Hieron'ymus

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

Hieronymus

SEE JEROME, ST.

Hierophant or Mystagögus

(Gr. ἱεροφάντης, μυσταγωγός).

I. The high-priest of Demeter who conducted the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries and initiated the candidates, being always one of the Eumolpidae, and a citizen of Attica. The office was for life, and regarded

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

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

Hiester, William

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

Higden, Ranulph or Ralph

an English writer of the 14th century, was a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Werberg, in Cheshire, who died at a very advanced age in 1367 according to Bale, or in 1373 according to Pits. His *Polychronicon,* a chronicle of events from the Creation to A.D. 1357, was written originally in Latin, and translated into English in 1387 by John of Trevisa. From this translation Caxton made his version, and, continuing in an eighth book the Chronicle to 1460, published the whole under the title of *The: Polycronycon, conteynag the Barngqes and Dedes of many Times, in eight Books,* etc. (1482, fol.). Trevisa's translation "contains many rare words and expressions, and is one of the earliest specimens of English prose." The first volume of a new edition (containing also a translation by an unknown

writer of the 15th century), edited by C. Babington, B.D., appeared in 1865. The *Polychronicon* is frequently cited by English historians. Bale published the part relating to the Britons and Saxons in his *Scriptores Quindecim*, etc. (Oxford, 1691). Some have assigned the authorship of the *Chester Mysteries* (1382) to Higden, but on doubtful grounds. — Bale, *Illust. Maj. Brit. Script. Summe.;* Pits, *De illust. An Script.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 656; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop. 6,* 83; *Westminster Review,* July, 1865, p. 128. (J.W. M.)

Higgai'on

(Heb. *higgayon'*, ˆ/yGhi occurs in <19203>Psalm 92:3, where, according to Gesenius, it signifies the *murmuring* (Farst, *low* or solemn) *tone* of the harp, Sept. μετὰ ᾠδῆς ἐν κιθάρᾳ. In <19917>Psalm 9:17, *Higgaion Selah* is a musical sign, prob. for a pause in the instrumental interlude, Sept. ᾠδὴ διὰ ψάλματος; and so Symn. Aqu. and Vulg. *SEE SELAH*. In <19901>Psalm 19:15 the term signifies (and is rendered) *meditation,* in <25362>Lamentations 3:62 a *device.* "Mendelsson translates it *meditation, thought, idea.* Knapp *(Die Psalmen)* identifies it in <19917>Psalm 9:17 with the Arabic ygh, and agh, 'to mock,' and hence-his rendering 'What a shout of laughter!' (because the wicked are entrapped in their own snares); but in <19204>Psalm 92:4 he translates it by 'Lieder' *(songs).* R. David Kimchi likewise assigns two separate meanings to the word; on <19917>Psalm 9:17, he says, This aid is for us (a subject of) meditation and thankfulness,' while in his commentary on the passage, <19204>Psalm 92:4, he gives to the same word the signification of *melody,* This is the melody of the hymn when it is recited (played) on the harp.' 'We will meditate on this forever' (Rashi, *Comment. on <19917>Psalm 9:*17). In Psalm 9; 17, Aben Ezra's comment on 'Higgaion Selah' is, 'this will I record in truth:' on <19204>Psalm 92:4 he says, 'Higgaion means the melody of the hymn, or it is the name of a musical instrument.' It would seem, then, that Higgaion has two meanings, one of a general character implying *thought, reflection,* from hgh (comp. ybl ˆwyghy, <19917>Psalm 9:17, and μwyh lk yl[μnwyghw, <25362>Lamentations 3:62), and another in <19917>Psalm 9:17, and <19204>Psalm 92:4, of a technical nature, bearing on the import of musical sounds or signs well known in the age of David, but the precise meaning of which cannot at this distance of time be determined." *SEE PSALMS.*

Higgins, Solomon

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

Higginson, Francis

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

Higginson, John

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

High-Churchmen

a name first given (circa 1700) to the nonjurors in England who refused to acknowledge William III as their lawful king. It is now usually applied to those in the Church of England and in the American Protestant Episcopal Church who hold exalted notions (f Church prerogatives, and of the

powers committed to the clergy, and who lay much stress upon ritual observances and the traditions of the fathers. See Walcott, *Sacred Archceology*, p. 312; Hurst, *Hist. Rationalism*, p. 512 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. History*, 2, 339; Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 549; Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches*, p. 289, 317, 318, 343; Rose, *Hist. Chr. Ch.* p. 370; Eden, *Theol. Dictionary;* and articles *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF*; and *SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH*.

High Commission, Court of

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

High Mass

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

High place

(הָמָּב; *bamah';* often in the plural, תֹמָּב; Sept. in the historical books, τὰ ὑψηλά, τὰ ὕψη; in the Prophets, βωμοί; in the Pentateuch, στήλαι, <03260>Leviticus 26:30, etc.; and once εἴδωλα, <261616>Ezekiel 16:16; Vulg. *excelsa, fana)* often occurs in connection with the term *grove.* By "high places" we understand natural or artificial (תֹמָּבְיַת; 1 Kings 23:32; <121702>2 Kings 16:29; comp. <111107>1 Kings 11:7; <122315>2 Kings 23:15) eminences where worship by sacrifice or offering was made, usually upon an altar erected thereon; and by a "grove" we understand a plantation of trees around a spot in the open air set apart for worship and other sacred services, and therefore around or upon the "high places" which were set apart for the same purposes. *SEE GROVE*.

We find traces of these customs so soon *after* the deluge that it is probable they existed *prior* to that event. It appears that the first altar after the deluge was built by Noah upon the mountain on which the ark rested (<01080>Genesis 8:20). Abraham, on entering the Promised Land, built an altar upon a mountain between Beth-el and Hai (<01207>Genesis 12:7, 8). At Beersheba he planted a grove, and called there upon the name of the everlasting God (<01233>Genesis 21:33). The same patriarch was required to travel to the Mount Moriah, and there to offer up his son Isaac (<01202>Genesis 22:2, 4). It was upon a mountain in Gilead that Jacob and Laban offered sacrifices before they parted in peace (<01354>Genesis 31:54). In fact, such seem to have been the general places of worship in those times; nor does any notice of a temple, or other covered or enclosed building for that purpose, occur. Thus far all seems clear and intelligible. There is no reason in the mere nature of things why a hill or a grove should be an objectionable, or, indeed, why it should not be a very suitable place for worship. Yet by the time the Israelites returned from Egypt, some corrupting change had taken place, which caused them to be repeatedly and strictly enjoined to overthrow and destroy the high places and groves of the Canaanites wherever they found them (<02343>Exodus 34:13; <05105>Deuteronomy 7:5; 12:2, 3). That they were not themselves to worship the Lord on high places or in groves is implied in the fact that they were to have but one altar for regular and constant sacrifice; and it was expressly enjoined that near this sole altar no trees should be planted (<05621>Deuteronomy 16:21). *SEE ALTAR*. The external religion of the patriarchs was in some outward observances different from that subsequently established by the Mosaic law, and therefore they should not be condemned for actions which afterwards became sinful only because they were forbidden (Heidegger, *Hist. Patr.* II, 3 § 53). It is, however, quite obvious that if every grove and eminence had been suffered to become a place for legitimate worship, especially in a country where they had already been defiled with the sins of polytheism, the utmost danger would have resulted to the pure worship of the one true God (Havernick, *Einl.* 1, 592). It would infallibly have led to the adoption of nature-goddesses and "gods of the hills" (<111203>1 Kings 20:23). It was therefore implicitly forbidden by the law of Moses (<05211>Deuteronomy 12:11-14), which also gave the strictest injunction to destroy these monuments of Canaanitish idolatry (<03260>Leviticus 26:30; <04852>Numbers 33:52; <05329>Deuteronomy 33:29; where Sept. ταραχήλων), without stating any general reason for this command beyond the fact that they *had* been

connected with such associations. It seems, however, to be assumed that every Israelite would perfectly understand why groves and high places were prohibited, and therefore they are only condemned by virtue of the injunction to use but *one* altar for the purpose of sacrifice (Leviticus 17:3, 4; Deuteronomy 12, *passim; 16:*21; John 4:20). This practice, indeed, was probably of great antiquity in Palestine. Upon the summit of lofty Hermon are the remains of a small and very ancient temple, towards which faced a circle of temples surrounding the mountain. *SEE HERMON*. That a temple should have been built on a summit of bare rock perpetually covered with snow shows a strong religious motive, and the position of the temples around the mountain indicates a belief in the sanctity of Hermon itself. This inference is supported by a passage in the treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites of Syria, in which, besides gods and goddesses, the mountains and the rivers, both of the land of the Hittites and of Egypt, and the winds, are mentioned, in a list of Hittite and Egyptian divinities. The Egyptian divinities are spoken of from a Hittite point of view. for the expression ‘the mountains and the rivers of the land of Egypt” is only half applicable to the Egyptian nature-worship, which had, in Egypt at least, but one sacred river (Lepsius, *Denk Eanler, 3*, 146; Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, 2, 29; De Rouge, in *Rev. Arch.* nouv. ser. 4:372). *SEE HITTITE*. That Hermon was worshipped in connection with Baal is probable from the name Mount Baal-Hermon (Judges 3:3), Baal-Hermon (1 Chronicles 5:23) being apparently given to it, Baal being, as the Egyptian monuments indicate, the chief god of the Hittites. That there was such a belief in the sanctity of mountains and hills seems evident from the great number of high places of the old inhabitants, which is clearly indicated in the prohibition of their worship as compared with the statement of the disobedience of the Israelites. *SEE HILT*.

The injunctions, however, respecting the high places and groves were very imperfectly obeyed by the Israelites; and their inveterate attachment to this mode of worship was such that even pious kings, who opposed idolatry by all the means in their power, dared not abolish the high places at which the Lord was worshipped. It appears likely that this toleration of an acknowledged irregularity arose from the indisposition of the people living at a distance from the Temple to be confined to the altar which existed there; to their determination to have places nearer home for the chief acts of their religion-sacrifice and offering; and to the apprehension of the kings that if they were prevented from having places for offerings to the Lord in

their own neighborhood they would make the offerings to idols. Moreover, the Mosaic command was a *prospective* one, and was not to come into force until such times as the tribes were settled in the Promised Land, and "had rest from all their enemies round about." Thus we find that both Gideon and Manoah built altars on high places by divine command (<07065>Judges 6:25, 26; 13:16-23), and it is quite clear from the tone of the book of Judges that the law on the subject was either totally forgotten or practically obsolete. Nor could the unsettled state of the country have been pleaded as an excuse, since it seems to have been most fully understood, even during the life of Joshua, that burnt-offerings could be legally offered on *one* altar only (<06229>Joshua 22:29). It is more surprising to find this law absolutely ignored at a much later period, when there was no intelligible reason for its violation-as by Samuel at Mizpeh (<09710>1 Samuel 7:10) and at Bethlehem (<09165>1 Samuel 16:5); by Saul at Gilgal (<09139>1 Samuel 13:9) and at Ajalon (<09145>1 Samuel 14:35); by David on the threshing floor of Ornan (<13216>1 Chronicles 21:26); by Elijah on Mount Carmel (<11830>1 Kings 18:30); and by other prophets (<09105>1 Samuel 10:5). It will, however, be observed that in these cases the parties either acted under an immediate command from God, or were invested with a general commission of similar force with reference to such transactions. It has also been suggested that greater latitude was allowed in this point before the erection of the Temple gave to the ritual principles of the ceremonial law a fixity which they had not previously possessed. This is possible, for it is certain that all the authorized examples occur before it was built, excepting that of Elijah; and that occurred under circumstances in which the sacrifices could not possibly have taken place at Jerusalem, and in a kingdom where no authorized altar to Jehovah then existed. The Rabbins have invented elaborate methods to account for the anomaly: thus they say that high places were allowed until the building of the tabernacle; that they were then illegal until the arrival at Gilgal, and then during the period while the tabernacle was at Shiloh; that they were once more permitted while it was at Nob and Gibeon (compare <14003>2 Chronicles 1:3), until the building of the Temple at Jerusalem rendered them finally unlawful (R. Sol. Jarchi, Abarbanel, etc., quoted in Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 333 sq.; Relanid, *Ant. Hebr.* 1, 8 sq.). 'Others content themselves with saying that until Solomon's time all Palestine was considered holy ground, or that there existed a recognized exemption in favor of high places for private and spontaneous, though not for the stated and public sacrifices. Such explanations are sufficiently unsatisfactory; but it is at any rate certain that,

whether from the obvious temptations to disobedience, or from the example of other nations, or from ignorance of any definite law against it, the worship in high places was organized and all but universal throughout Judaea, not only during (<11012>1 Kings 3:2-4), but even after the time of Solomon. The convenience of them was evident, because, as local centers of religious worship, they obviated the unpleasant and dangerous necessity of visiting Jerusalem for the celebration of the yearly feasts (<12239>2 Kings 23:9). The tendency was engrained in the national mind; and, although it was severely reprehended by the later historians, we have no proof that it was known to be sinful during the earlier periods of the monarchy, except, of course, where it was directly connected with idolatrous abominations (<11107>1 Kings 11:7; <12313>2 Kings 23:13). In fact, the high places seem to have supplied the need of synagogues (<19408>Psalm 74:8), and to have obviated the extreme self-denial involved in having but one legalized locality for the highest forms of worship. Thus we find that Rehoboam established a definite worship at the high places, with its own peculiar and separate priesthood (<14115>2 Chronicles 11:15; <12309>2 Kings 23:9), the members of which were still considered to be priests of Jehovah (although in <12305>2 Kings 23:5 they are called by the opprobrious term µyrAmK). It was therefore no wonder that Jeroboam found it so easy to seduce the people into his symbolic worship at the high places of Dan and Bethel. at each of which he built a chapel for his golden calves. Such chapels were, of course, frequently added to the mere altars on the hills, as appears from the expressions in <11107>1 Kings 11:7; <12709>2 Kings 17:9, etc. Indeed, the word t/mB;became so common that it was used for any idolatrous shrine even in *a valley* (<24731>Jeremiah 7:31), or in the streets of cities (<12709>2 Kings 17:9; <26163>Ezekiel 16:31). These chapels were probably not structures of stone, but mere tabernacles hung with colored tapestry (<26616>Ezekiel 16:16; Aqu., Theod. ἐμβόλισμα*;* see Jeremiah ad loc.; Sept. εἴδωλον ῥαπτόν), like the σκηνὴ ἱερά of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. 20:65; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 5, 176), and like those mentioned in <12307>2 Kings 23:7; Amos 5, 26. Many of the pious kings of Judah were either too weak or too ill-informed to repress the worship of Jehovah at these local sanctuaries, while they of course endeavored to prevent it from being contaminated with polytheism. It is therefore appended as a matter of blame or a (perhaps venial) drawback to the character of some of the most pious princes, that they tolerated this disobedience to the provisions of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. On the other hand, it is mentioned as an aggravation of the sinfulness of other kings that they built or raised high places (<14211>2

Chronicles 21:11; 28:25), which are generally said to have been dedicated to idolatrous purposes. It is almost inconceivable that so direct a violation of the theocratic principle as the public existence of false worship should have been tolerated by kings of even ordinary piety, much less by the highest sacerdotal authorities (<12203>2 Kings 12:3). When, therefore, we find the recurring phrase, “Only the high places were not taken away; as yet the people did sacrifice and burn incense on the high places” (<12404>2 Kings 14:4; 15:5, 35; <14457>2 Chronicles 15:17, etc.), we are forced to limit it (as above) to places dedicated to Jehovah only. The subject, however, is made more difficult by a seeming discrepancy, for the assertion that Asa “took away the high places” (<14403>2 Chronicles 14:3) is opposite to what is stated in the first book of Kings (<11514>1 Kings 15:14), and a similar discrepancy is found in the case of Jehoshaphat (<14706>2 Chronicles 17:6; 20:33). Moreover, in both instances the chronicler is apparently at issue with *himself* (14:3; 15:17; 17:6; 20:33). It is incredible that this should have been the result of carelessness or oversight, and we must therefore suppose, either that the earlier notices expressed the will and endeavor of these monarchs to remove the high places, and that the later ones recorded their failure in the attempt (Ewald, *Gesch.* 3, 468; Keil, *Apolog. Versuch.* p. 290), or that the statements refer respectively to Bamoth dedicated to Jehovah and to idols (Michaelis, Schulz, Bertheau on <14706>2 Chronicles 17:6, etc.). “Those devoted to false gods were removed, those misdevoted to the true God were suffered to remain. The kings opposed impiety, but winked at error” (bishop Hall). At last Hezekiah set himself in good earnest to the suppression of this prevalent corruption (<12804>2 Kings 18:4, 22), both in Judah and Israel (<14301>2 Chronicles 31:1), although, so rapid was the growth of the evil, that even his sweeping reformation required to be finally consummated by Josiah (2 Kings 23), and that, too, in Jerusalem and its immediate neighborhood (<14403>2 Chronicles 34:3). The measure must have caused a very violent shock to the religious prejudices of a large number of people, and we have a curious and almost unnoticed trace of this resentment in the fact that Rabshakeh appeals to the discontented faction, and represents Hezekiah as a dangerous innovator who had provoked God’s anger by his arbitrary impiety (<12822>2 Kings 18:22; <14212>2 Chronicles 32:12). After the time of Josiah we find no further mention of these Jehovistic high places.

Picture for High Place 1

As long as the nations continued to worship the heavenly bodies themselves, they worshipped in the open air, holding that no walls could contain infinitude. Afterwards, when the symbol of fire or of images brought in the use of temples, they were usually built in groves and upon high places, and sometimes without roofs. The principle on which high places were preferred is said to have been that they were nearer to the gods, and that on them prayer was more acceptable than in the valleys (Lucian, *De Sacrif.* 1, 4). *SEE HILL*. The ancient writers abound in allusions to this worship of the gods upon the hill-tops; and some of their divinities took their distinctive names from the hill on which their principal seat of worship stood, such as Mercurius Cyllenius, Venus Erycina, Jupiter Capitolinus, etc. (see especially Sophocles, *Trachin.* 1207, 1208; Appian, *De Bello Mlithrid. §* 131; compare Creuzer. *Symbol.* 1, 150). We find that the Trojans sacrificed to Zeus on Mount Ida *(II. 10,* 171), and we are repeatedly told that such was the custom of the Persians, Greeks, Germans, etc. (Herod. 1, 131; Xenoph. *Cyrop. 8,* 7; *Mem. 3,* 8, § 10; Strabo, 15, 732). To this general custom we find constant allusion in the Bible (<2657>Isaiah 65:7; <2406>Jeremiah 3:6; <2613>Ezekiel 6:13; 18:6; <3043>Hosea 4:13), and it is especially attributed to the Moabites (<2502>Isaiah 15:2; 16:12; <2435>Jeremiah 48:35). Evident traces of a similar usage are depicted on the Assyrian monuments. The groves which ancient usage had established around the places of sacrifice for the sake of shade and seclusion, idolatry preserved, not only for the same reasons, but because they were found convenient for the celebration of the rites and mysteries, often obscene and abominable, which were gradually superadded. According to Pliny (book 12), trees were also anciently consecrated to particular divinities, as the esculus to Jove, the laurel to Apollo, the olive to Minerva, the myrtle to Venus, the poplar to Hercules. It was also believed that as the heavens have their proper and peculiar deities, so also the woods have theirs, being the Fauns, the Sylvans, and certain goddesses. To this it may be added that groves were enjoined by the Roman law of the Twelve Tables as part of the public religion. Plutarch *(Nuna,* 1, 61) calls such groves. ἄλση θεῶν, "groves of the gods," which he says Numa frequented, and thereby gave rise to the story of his intercourse with the goddess Egeria. In fact, a degree of worship was, as Pliny states, transferred to the trees themselves. They were sometimes decked with ribbons and rich cloths, lamps were placed on them, the spoils of enemies were hung from them, vows were

paid to them, and their branches were encumbered with votive offerings. Traces of this arborolatry still exist everywhere, both in Moslem and Christian countries; and even the Persians, who abhorred images as much as the Hebrews ever did, rendered homage to certain trees. The story is well known of the noble plane-tree near Sardis, before which Xerxes halted his army a whole day while he rendered homage to it, and hung royal offerings upon its branches (Herod. 5, 31). There is much curious literature connected with this subject which we leave untouched, but the reader may consult Sir W. Ouseley's learned dissertation on Sacred Trees, appended to the first volume of his *Travels in the East.* *SEE IDOLATRY*.

Picture for High Place 2

Mr. Paine remarks *(Solomon's Temple*, etc., Bost. 1861, p. 21), "the 'high place, hmB; *mound,* was small enough to be made and built in every street, at the head of every way (<2616424>Ezekiel 16:24, 25), in all their cities (<121709>2 Kings 17:9), and upon every high hill, and under every green tree (<111423>1 Kings 14:23). It could be torn to pieces, beaten small as dust, and burnt up (<122315>2 Kings 23:15). Thus it [often] was of combustible materials.... These mounds, with their altars, were built in the streets, where people could assemble around them. When on the hills out of the city they lasted many years; for' the mounds built by Solomon on the right hand or south side of the Mount of Destruction before Jerusalem, were destroyed by Josiah (<122313>2 Kings 23:13; <111107>1 Kings 11:7), nearly four hundred years after they were built. But mounds of earth no larger than Indian-corn or potato-hills will last a great number of years, and those somewhat larger for centuries (compare the Indian mounds in the West). That the mounds destroyed by Josiah had lasted so many centuries is a proof that they were not wholly of wood; that they could be burnt is a proof that they were not wholly of stone; that they could be beaten to dust indicates that they were made of anything that came readiest to hand, as earth, soil, etc. For the houses of the mounds, or high places, in which were images of their gods, see <121729>2 Kings 17:29; priests of these places of worship, <111232>1 Kings 12:32; 13:2, 33; <121732>2 Kings 17:32; 23:9, 20; beds for fornication and adultery, in the tents about the mounds, <235708>Isaiah 57:3-7; <261616>Ezekiel 16:16, 25, etc. Some of these houses were tents, for women wove them (<122307>2 Kings 23:7). The peoplemen, women, children, and priests-assembled in groves, on hills and mountains, or in the streets of their cities; threw up a mound, on which they built their altar; set up the wooden idol [Asherah] before the altar;

pitched their tents around it under the trees; sacrificed their sons and daughters, sometimes on the altar (Ezekiel 16:20), and committed fornication and adultery in the tents, where also they had the images of their gods."

High-priest

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

I. The *legal* view of the high-priest's office comprises all that the law of Moses ordained respecting it. The first distinct separation of Aaron to the office of the priesthood, which previously belonged to the firstborn, was that recorded in Exodus 28. A partial anticipation of this call occurred at the gathering of the manna (Exodus 16), when Moses bade Aaron take a pot of manna, and lay it up before the Lord: which implied that the ark of the Testimony would thereafter be under Aaron's charge, though it was not at that time in existence. The taking up of Nadab and Abihu with their father Aaron to the Mount, where they beheld the glory of the God of Israel, seems also to have been intended as a preparatory intimation of Aaron's hereditary priesthood. See also Exodus 27:21. But it was not till the completion of the directions for making the tabernacle and its furniture that the distinct order was given to Moses, "Take thou unto thee

Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him. from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons" (<2801>Exodus 28:1). So after the order for the priestly garments to be made "for Aaron and his sons," it is added, "and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute; and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his soils,' and "I will sanctify both Aaron and his sons to minister to me in the priest's office," <2929>Exodus 29:9, 44.

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

1. Aaron alone was *anointed.* "*He* poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him" (<0308>Leviticus 8:12) 'whence one of the distinctive epithets of the high-priest was jyvæhi ˆhKoh; "the anointed priest" (<0403>Leviticus 4:3, 5, 16; 21:10; see <0435>Numbers 35:25). This appears also from <2929>Exodus 29:29, 30, where it is ordered that the one of the sons of Aaron who succeeds him in the priest's office shall wear the holy garments that were Aaron's for seven days, to he *anointed* therein, and to be consecrated in them. Hence Eusebius *(Hist. Eccles.* 1, *6; Dem. Evang.* 8) understands the Anointed (A.V. "Messiah," or, as the Sept. reads, χρίσμα*)* in <2726>Daniel 9:26, the *anointing* of the Jewish high-priests: "It means nothing else than the succession of high-priests, whom the Scripture commonly calls χριστούς, anointed" and so, too, Tertullian and Theodoret (Rosenm. ad loc;) The anointing of the sons of Aaron, i.e. the common priests, seems to have been confined to sprinkling their garments with the anointing oil (<2921>Exodus 29:21; 28:41, etc.), though, according to Kalisch on <2908>Exodus 29:8, and Lightfoot, following the Rabbinical interpretation, the difference consists in the abundant pouring of oil (qxy) on the head of the high-priest. from whence it was drawn with the finger into two streams, in the shape of a Greek X, while the priests were merely marked with the finger dipped in *ail* on the forehead (jvm), But this is probably a late invention of the Rabbins. The anointing of the highpriest is alluded to in <1332>Psalm 133:2, "It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments." The composition of this anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, cassia, and olive oil, is prescribed <3022>Exodus 30:22-25; and its use for any other purpose but that of anointing the priests, the

tabernacle, and the vessels, was strictly prohibited, on pain of being "cut off from his people." The manufacture of it was entrusted to certain priests, called apothecaries (Nehemiah 3:8). But this oil is said to have been wanting under the second Temple (Prideaux, 1, 151; Selden, cap. 9). *SEE ANOINTING OIL*.

2. The high priest had a peculiar *dress,* which, as we have seen, passed to his successor at his death. This dress consisted of eight parts,. as the Rabbins constantly note, the *breastplate,* the *ephod* with its curious girdle, the *robe* of the ephod, the *miter,* the *broidered coat* or diaper tunic, and the *girdle,* the materials being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine (white) linen (Exodus 28). To the above are added, in ver. 42, the *breeches* or drawers (Leviticus 16:4) of linen; and to make up the number eight, some reckon the high-priest's miter, or the plate (/yxæ) separately from the bonnet; while others reckon the curious girdle of the ephod separately from the ephod. In Leviticus 8:7-12, there is a complete account of the putting on of these garments by Aaron, and the whole ceremony of his consecration and that of his sons. It there appears distinctly that, besides the girdle common to all the priests, the high-priest also wore the curious girdle of the ephod. Of these eight articles of attire, four, viz. the coat or tunic, the girdle, the breeches, and the bonnet or turban, h[Bgmæ, instead of the miter, tpnxmæ (Josephus, however, whom Bahr follows, calls the bonnets of the priests by the name of tpnxmæ. See below), belonged to the common priests. It is well known how, in the Assyrian sculptures, the king is in like manner distinguished by the shape of his headdress; and how in Persia none but the king wore the *cidaris,* or erect tiara. Bahr compares also the apices of the *flamen Dialis.* Josephus speaks of the robes (ἐνδύματα*)* of the chief priests, and the tunics and girdles of the priests, as forming part of the spoil of the Temple (*War, 6:*8,3). Aaron, and at his death Eleazar (Numbers 20:26, 28), and their successors in the high-priesthood, were solemnly inaugurated into their office by being clad in these eight articles of dress on seven successive days. From the time of the second Temple, when the sacred oil (said to have been hid by Josiah, and lost) was wanting, this putting on of the garments was deemed the official investiture of the office. Hence the robes, which had used to be kept in one of the chambers of the Temple, and were by Hyrcanus deposited in the Baris, which he built on purpose, were kept by Herod in the same tower, which he called Antonia, so that they might be at his absolute disposal. The Romans did the same till the government of Vitellius, in the reign of

Tiberius, when the custody of the robes was restored to the Jews *(Ant. 15:*11, 4; 18:4,3). Taking the articles of the high-priest's dress in the order in which they would naturally be put on, we have

(1.) The "breeches" or *drawers,* µyseKoxm; *miknesim',* of linen, covering the loins and thighs, for purposes of modesty, as all the upper garments were loose and flowing. Their probable form is illustrated by the subjoined cut, from Braun *(De Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebrceorum, p.* 364), who calls attention to the bands (Talmud, µyxnç) for drawing the top together, and the absence of any opening either before *(*hyr[h tyb, *apertura ad pudenda)* or behind (bqnh tyb, *apertura ad anum).*

Picture for High Priest 1

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

Picture for High Priest 2

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

Picture for High Priest 3

Picture for High Priest 4

(4.) The *"robe,"* ly[m; *m'eil',* of the ephod. This was of inferior material to the ephod itself, being all of blue (ver. 31), which implied its being only of "woven work" (hrea chcef[m; 39:22). It was worn immediately under the ephod, and was longer than it. though not so long as the broidered coat or tunic. (/Bve[Ti tn,tK), according to most statements (Bahr, Winer, Kalisch, etc.).

Nor do the Sept. explanation of lyimi ποδήρης, and Josephus's description of it *(War,* 5, 5, 7), seem to outweigh the reasons given by Bahr for thinking that the robe only came down to the knees, for it is highly improbable that the robe should thus have swept the ground.. Neither does it seem likely that the sleeves of the tunic, of white diaper linen, were the only parts of it which were visible, in the case of the high-priest, when he wore the blue robe over it; for the blue robe had no sleeves, but only slits in the sides for the arms to come through. It had- a hole for the head to pass through, with a border round it of woven work, to prevent its being rent. The skirt of this robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high priest went in and came out of the Holy Place. Josephus, in the An*tiquities,* gives no explanation of the use of the bells, but merely speaks of the studied beauty of their appearance. In his *Jewish War,* however, he tells us that the bells signified thunder, and the pomegranates lightning. For Philo's very curious observations, see Lightfoot's *Works, 9,* 25. Neither does the son of Sirach very distinctly explain it (Ecclus. 45), who, in his description of the high-priest's attire, seems chiefly impressed with its beauty and magnificence, and says of this trimming, "He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might be heard in the Temple, for a memorial to the children of his people." Perhaps, however, he means to intimate that the use of the bells was to give notice to the people outside when the high-priest went in and came out of the sanctuary, as Whiston, Vatablus, and many others have supposed. *SEE ROBE*.

(5.) The *ephod,* ^/pae consisted of two parts, of which one covered the back, and the other the front, i.e. the breast and upper part of the body, like the ἐπωμίς of the Greeks (see Smith, *Dict. of Antiquities,* s.v. Tunica). These were clasped together on the shoulder with two large onyx stones, each having engraved on it six of the names of the tribes of Israel. It was further united by a "curious girdle" of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen round the waist. Upon it was placed the breastplate of judgment, which in fact was a part of the ephod, being included in the term in such passages as 091228 1 Samuel 2:28; 14:3; 23:9, and was fastened to it just above the curious girdle of the ephod. Linen ephods were also worn by other priests (091218 1 Samuel 22:18), by Samuel, who was only a Levite (091218 1 Samuel 2:18), and by David when bringing up the ark (100614 2 Samuel 6:14),

The expression for wearing an ephod is "*girded* with a linen ephod." The ephod was also frequently used in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (see Judges 8:27; 17:5, etc.). *SEE EPHOD*.

Picture for High Priest 5

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

by preternatural illumination appears equally destitute of probability. It seems to be far simplest, and most in agreement with the different accounts of inquiries made by Urim and Thummim (<091403>1 Samuel 14:3, 18, 19; 23:2, 4, 9, 11, 12; 28:6; <072018>Judges 20:28; <101523>2 Samuel 5:23, etc.), to suppose that the answer was given simply by the Word of the Lord to the highpriest (comp. <481151>John 11:51), when he had inquired of the Lord, clothed with the ephod and breastplate. Such a view agrees with the true notion of the breastplate, of which it was not the leading characteristic to be oracular (as the term λογεῖον supposes, and as is by many thought to be intimated by the descriptive addition "of judgment," i.e. as they understand it,; decision"), but. only an incidental privilege connected with its fundamental meaning. What that meaning was we learn from <022830>Exodus 28:30, where we read, "Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." Now fP,vi]mis the judicial sentence by which any one is either justified or condemned. In prophetic vision, as in actual Oriental life, the sentence of justification was often expressed by the nature of the robe worn. "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels" (<236110>Isaiah 61:10), is a good illustration of this; comp. <236203>Isaiah 62:3. In like manner, in <660305>Revelation 3:5; 7:9; 19:14, etc., the white linen robe expresses the righteousness or justification of saints. Something of the same notion may be seen in <170608>Esther 6:8,9, and on the contrary ver. 12. The addition of precious stones and costly ornaments expresses glory beyond simple justification. So, in <236203>Isaiah 62:3, "Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God." Exactly the same symbolism of glory is assigned to the precious stones in the description of the New Jerusalem (<662111>Revelation 21:11, 12-21), a passage which ties together with singular force the arrangement of the tribes in their camps and that of the precious stones in the breastplate. But, moreover, the high priest being a representative personage, the fortunes of the whole people would most properly be indicated in his person. A striking instance of this, in connection, too, with symbolical dress, is to be found in Zechariah 3: "Now Joshua (the high-priest, ver. 1) was clothed with filthy garments and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair miter

(ãynæ) upon his head. So they set a fair miter upon his head, and clothed him with garments." Here the priest's garments, µyaeB], and the miter, expressly typify the restored righteousness of the nation. Hence it seems to be sufficiently obvious that the breastplate of righteousness or judgment, resplendent with the same precious stones which symbolize the glory of the New Jerusalem, and on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes, worn by the high-priest, who was then said to bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart, was intended to express by symbols the acceptance of Israel grounded upon the sacrificial functions of the high-priest. The sense of the symbol is thus nearly identical with such passages as <042321>Numbers 23:21, and the meaning of the Urim and Thummim is explained by such expressions as Ër:a ab;AyKæ rAa ymWq, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come" (<236001>Isaiah 60:1). Thummim expresses alike complete prosperity and complete innocence, and so falls in exactly with the double notion of light (<236001>Isaiah 60:1; 62:1, 2). The privilege of receiving an answer from God bears the same relation to the general state of Israel symbolized by the priest's dress that the promise in <235413>Isaiah 54:13, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord," does to the preceding description, "I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones," ver. 11, 12; comp. also ver. 14 and 17 (Heb.). It is obvious to add how entirely this view accords with the blessing of Levi in <053308>Deuteronomy 33:8, where Levi is called God's holy one, and God's Thummim and Urim are said to be given to him, because he came out of the trial so clear in his integrity. (See also Bar. 5, 2.) *SEE BREASTPLATE*.

(7.) The "bonnet," h[;Bgi]mæ, *'migbaah'*, was a *turban* of linen covering the head, but not in the particular form which that of the high-priest assumed when the mitre was added to it. *SEE BONNET*.

Picture for High Priest 6

(8.) The last article peculiar to the high priest is the *miter,* tp,n,x]mæ *mitsne'pheth,* or upper turban, with its gold plate, engraved with "Holiness to the Lord," fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. Josephus applies the same Heb. term (µασναεµφθής) to the turbans of the common priests as well, but says that in addition to this, and sewn upon the top of it, the high-priest had another turban of blue; that besides this he had outside the turban a

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

3. Aaron had peculiar *functions.* To him alone it appertained, and he alone was permitted, to enter the Holy of Holies, which he did once a year, on the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and burnt incense within the veil (Leviticus 16). He is said by the Talmudists, with whom agree Lightfoot, Selden, Grotius, Winer, Bahr, and many others, not to have worn his full pontifical robes on the occasion, but to have been clad entirely in white linen (Leviticus 16:4, 32). It is singular however, that, on the other hand, Josephus says that the great fast-day was the chief, if not the only day in the year when the high-priest wore all his robes *(War,* 5, 5, 7), and, in spite of the alleged impropriety of his wearing his splendid apparel on a day of humiliation, it seems far more probable that on the one occasion when he performed functions peculiar to the high-priest he should have worn his full dress. Josephus, too, could not have been mistaken as to the fact, which he repeats *(cont. Ap.* 2, 7), where he says the high priests alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, "propria stola circumamicti." For although Selden, who strenuously supports the Rabbinical statement that the high-priest only wore the four linen garments when he entered the Holy of Holies,

endeavors to make Josephus say the same thing, it is impossible to twist his words into this meaning. It is true, on the other hand, that Leviticus 16 distinctly prescribes that Aaron should wear the four priestly garments of linen when he entered into the Holy of Holies, and put them off immediately he came out, and leave them in the Temple; no one being present in the Temple while Aaron made the atonement (verse 17). Either, therefore, in the time of Josephus this law was not kept in practice, or else we must reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that in consequence of the great jealousy with which the high-priest's robes were kept by the civil power at this time, the custom had arisen for him to wear them, not even always on the three great festivals *(Ant. 18,* 4, 3), but only On the great day of expiation. Clad in this gorgeous attire, he would enter the Temple in presence of all the people, and, after having performed in secret, as the law requires, the rites of expiation in the linen dress, he would resume his pontifical robes, and so appear again in public. Thus his wearing the robes would easily come to be identified chiefly with the day of atonement; and this is, perhaps, the most probable explanation. In other respects, the high priest performed the functions of a priest, but only on new moons and other great feasts, and on such solemn occasions as the dedication of the Temple under Solomon, under Zerubbabel, etc. *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF*.

Picture for High Priest 7

4. The high priest had a peculiar place in the law of the manslayer, and his taking sanctuary in the cities of refuge. The manslayer might not leave the city of refuge during the lifetime of the existing high-priest who was anointed with the holy oil (<0425>Numbers 35:25, 28). It was also forbidden to the high priest to follow a funeral, or rend his clothes for the dead, according to the precedent in <0306>Leviticus 10:6. *SEE MANSLAYER*.

5. The other respects in which the high-priest exercised superior functions to the other priests arose rather from his position and opportunities than were distinctly attached to his office, and they consequently varied with the personal character and abilities of the high priest. Such were reforms in religion, restorations of the Temple and its service, the preservation of the Temple from intrusion or profanation, taking the lead in ecclesiastical or civil affairs, judging the people, presiding in the Sanhedrim (which, however, he is said by Lightfoot rarely to have done), and other similar transactions, in which we find the high-priest sometimes prominent,

sometimes not even mentioned. (See the historical part of this article.) Even that portion of power which most naturally and usually fell to his share, the rule of the Temple; and the government of the priests and Levites who ministered there, did not invariably fall to the share of the high-priest. For the title "Ruler of the House of God," µyhælaEhAtyBe dygan which usually denotes the high-priest, is sometimes given to those who were not high-priests, as to Pashur, the son of Immer, in <2401>Jeremiah 20:1; compare <1327>1 Chronicles 12:27. The Rabbins speak very frequently of one second in dignity to the high priest, whom they call the Sagan, and who often acted in the high-priest's room. He is the same who in the O.T. is called "the second priest" (<1220>2 Kings 23:4; 25:18). They say that Moses was sagan to Aaron. Thus, too, it is explained of Annas and Caiaphas (<4002>Luke 3:2) that Annas was sagan. Ananias is also thought by some to have been sagan, acting for the high-priest (<4202>Acts 23:2). In like manner they say Zadok and Abiathar were high priest and sagan in the time of David. The sagan is also very frequently called *Menmunneh*, or prefect of the Temple, and upon him chiefly lay the care and charge of the Temple services (Lightfoot, *passin).* If the high priest was incapacitated from officiating by any accidental uncleanness, the sagan or vice-high priest took his place. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud tells a story of Simon, son of Kamith, that "on the eve of the day of expiation he went out to speak with the king, and some spittle fell upon his garments and defiled him: therefore Judah his brother went in on the day of expiation, and sent in his stead; and so their mother Kamith saw two of her sons high-priests in one day. She had seven sons, and they all served in the high-priesthood" (Lightfoot, 9:35). It does not appear by whose authority the high-priests were appointed to their office before there were kings of Israel; but, as we find it invariably done by the civil power in later times, it is probable that, in the times preceding the monarchy, it was by the elders, or Sanhedrim. The installation and anointing of the high-priest, or clothing him with the eight garments, which was the formal investiture, is ascribed by Maimonides to the Sanhedrim at all times (Lightfoot, 9:22).

It should be added that the usual age for entering upon the functions of the priesthood, according to <1417>2 Chronicles 31:17, is considered to have been twenty years (by the later Jews thirty, <0403>Numbers 4:3; <1323>1 Chronicles 23:2), though a priest or high-priest was not actually incapacitated if he had attained to puberty, as appears by the example of Aristobulus, who was high-priest at the age of seventeen. Onias, the son of Simon the Just,

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

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

entered fully into this subject, both from the Jewish and the Christian point of view. **Picture for High Priest 8**

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

(a.) those before David;

(b.) those from David to the Captivity;

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

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

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

1. Aaron;
2. Eleazar;
3. Phinehas;
4. Eli;
5. Ahitub (<1Ch 9:11>1 Chronicles 9:11; <Ne 11:11>Nehemiah 11:11; <1Sa 14:3>1 Samuel 14:3);
6. Ahiah;
7. Ahimelech. Phinehas, the son of Eli, and father of Ahitub, died before his father, and so was not high-priest.

Of the above the first three. succeeded in regular order, Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's eldest sons, having died in the wilderness (Leviticus 10). But Eli, the 4th, was of the line of Ithamar. What was the exact interval between the death of Phinehas and the accession of Eli, what led to the transference of the chief priesthood from the line of Eleazar to that of Ithamar, and whether any or which of the descendants of Eleazar between Phinehas and Zadok (seven in number, viz. Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth,

Amariah, Ahitub), were high-priests, we have no positive means of determining from Scripture. ⁰⁷²⁰Judges 20:28 leaves Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, priest at Shiloh, and ⁰⁹⁰³1 Samuel 1:3, 9 finds Eli high priest there, with two grown-up sons priests under him. The only clew is to be found in the genealogies, by which it appears that Phinehas was 6th in succession from Levi, while Eli, supposing him to be the same generation as Samuel's grandfather, would be 10th. Josephus asserts *(Ant. 8,* 1, 3) that the father of Bukki-whom he calls Joseph, and *(Ant.* 5, 11, 5) Abiezer, i.e. Abishua-was the last high priest of Phinehas's line before Zadok. This is a doubtful tradition, since Josephus does not adhere to it in the above passage of his 5th book, where he makes Bukki and Uzzi to have been both high priests, and Eli to have succeeded Uzzi; or in book 20:10, where he reckons the high-priests before Zadok and Solomon to have been thirteen (a reckoning which includes apparently all Eleazar's descendants down to Ahitub), and adds Eli and his son Phinehas, and Abiathar, whom he calls Eli's grandson. If the last of Abishua's line died leaving a son or grandson under age, Eli, as the head of the line of Ithamar, might have become high priest as a matter of course, or he might have been appointed by the elders. His having judged Israel 40 years (⁰⁹⁰⁴1 Samuel 4:18) marks him as a man of ability. If Ahiah and Ahimelech are not variations of the name of the same person, they must have been brothers, since both were sons of Ahitub. Of the high priests, then, before David's reign, *seven* are said in Scripture to have been high priests, and *one* by Josephus alone. The bearing of this on the chronology of the times from the Exodus to David is too important to be passed over in silence. As in the parallel list of the ancestors of David (q.v.), we are compelled by the chronology to count as incumbents of the office in regular order the four others who are only named in Scripture as lineal descendants of the pontifical family. The comparative oversight of these incumbents receives an explanation from the nature of the times. It must also be noted that the tabernacle of God, during the high-priesthood of Aaron's successors of this first group, was pitched at Shiloh in the tribe of Ephraim, a fact that marks the strong influence which the temporal power already had in ecclesiastical affairs, since Ephraim was Joshua's tribe, as Judah was David's (⁰⁶²⁴Joshua 24:30, 33; ⁰⁷²⁷Judges 20:27, 28; 21:21; ⁰⁹⁰³1 Samuel 1:3, 9, 24; 4:3, 4; 14:3, etc.; ¹⁹⁶⁰Psalm 78:60). This strong influence and interference of the secular power is manifest throughout the subsequent history. This first period was also marked by the calamity which befell the high-priests as the guardians of the ark, in its capture by the Philistines. This probably suspended all inquiries by Urim

and Thummim, which were made before the ark (<1303>1 Chronicles 13:3; comp. <0702>Judges 20:27; <0902>1 Samuel 7:2; 14:18), and must have greatly diminished the influence of the high-priests, on whom the largest share of the humiliation expressed in the name Ichabod would naturally fall. The rise of Samuel as a prophet at this very time, and his paramount influence and importance in the state, to the entire eclipsing of Ahiah the priest, coincides remarkably with the absence of the ark, and the means of inquiring by Urim and Thummim.

(b.) Passing to the second group, we begin with the unexplained circumstance of there being two priests in the reign of David, apparently of nearly equal authority, viz. Zadok and Abiathar (<1511>1 Chronicles 15:11; <1017>2 Samuel 8:17). Indeed it is only from the deposition of Abiathar, and the placing of Zadok in his room by Solomon (<1125>1 Kings 2:35), that we learn certainly that Abiathar was the high-priest, and Zadok the second. Zadok was son of Ahitub, of the line of Eleazar (<0608>1 Chronicles 6:8), and the first mention of him is in <1228>1 Chronicles 12:28, as "a young man, mighty in valor," who joined David in Hebron after Saul's death, with 22 captains of his father's house. It is therefore not unlikely that after the death of Ahimelech. and the secession of Abiathar to David, Saul may have made Zadok priest, as far as it was possible for him to do so in the absence of the ark and the high-priest's robes, and that David may have avoided the difficult of deciding between the claims of his faithful friend Abiathar and his new and important ally Zadok (who, perhaps, was the means of attaching to David's cause the 4600 Levites and the 3700 priests that came under Jehoiada their captain, ver. 26,27). by appointing them to a joint priesthood: the first place, with the ephod, and Urim and Thummim, remaining with Abiathar, who was in actual possession of them. Certain it is that from this time Zadok and Abiathar are constantly named together, and, singularly, Zadok always first, both in the book of Samuel and that of Kings. We can, however, trace very clearly up to a certain point the division of the priestly offices and dignities between them, coinciding as it did with the divided state of the Levitical worship in David's time. For we learn from <1601>1 Chronicles 16:1-7, 37, compared with 39, 40, and yet more distinctly from <1403>2 Chronicles 1:3, 4, 5, that the tabernacle and the brazen altar made by Moses and Bezaleel in the wilderness were at this time at Gibeon, while the ark was at Jerusalem, in the separate tent made for it by David. *SEE GIBEON*. Now Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were left "before the tabernacle at Gibeoin" to offer burnt offerings

unto the Lord morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord (<1369>1 Chronicles 16:39, 40). It is therefore obvious to conclude that Abiathar had special charge of the ark and the services connected with it, which agrees exactly with the possession of the ephod by Abiathar, and his previous position with David before he became king of Israel, as well as with what we are told <1327>1 Chronicles 27:34, that Jehoiada and Abiathar were the king's counselors next to Ahithophel. Residence at Jerusalem with the ark, and the privilege of inquiring of the Lord before the ark, both well suit his office of counselor. Abiathar, however, forfeited his place by taking part with Adonijah against Solomon, and Zadok was made high priest in his place. The pontificate was thus again consolidated and transferred permanently from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar. This is the only instance recorded of the deposition of a high-priest (which became common in later times, especially under Herod and the Romans) during this second period. It was the fulfillment of the prophetic denunciations of the sin of Eli's sons (1 Samuel 2, 3).

Another considerable difficulty that meets us in the historical survey of the high-priests of the second group is to ascertain who was high-priest at the dedication of Solomon's Temple: Josephus *(Ant. 10*, 8, 6) asserts that Zadok was, and the *Seder Olam* makes him the high priest in the reign of Solomon. Otherwise we might deem it very improbable that Zadok, who must have been very old at Solomon's accession (being David's contemporary), should have lived to the 11th year of his reign; and, moreover, <1042>1 Kings 4:2 distinctly asserts that Azariah, the son of Zadok, was priest under Solomon; and <1360>1 Chronicles 6:10 tells us of an Azariah, grandson of the former, "he it is that executed the priest's office in the Temple that Solomon built in Jerusalem," as if meaning at its first completion. If, however, either of these Azariahs (if two) was the first high-priest of Solomon's Temple, the non-mention of him in the account of the dedication of the Temple, where one would most have expected it (as I Kings 8:3, 6,10,11, 62; 2 Chronicles 5, 7, 11, etc.), and the prominence given to Solomon-the civil power-would be certainly remarkable. Compare also <1484>2 Chronicles 8:14,15.

In constructing the list of the succession of priests of this group, our method must be to compare the genealogical list in <1360>1 Chronicles 6:8-15 (A.V.) with the notices of high-priests in the sacred history, and with the list given by Josephus, who, it must be remembered, had access to the lists preserved in the archives at Jerusalem, testing the whole by the application

of the ordinary rules of genealogical succession. Now, as regards the genealogy, it is seen at once that there is something defective; for whereas from David to Jechoniah there are 20 kings, froth Zadok to Jehozadak there are but 13 priests. Moreover, the passage in question is not a list of high priests, but the pedigree of Jehozadak. Then, again, while the pedigree in its first six generations from Zadok inclusive seems at first sight exactly to suit the history-for it makes Amariah the sixth priest, while the history (149112 Chronicles 19:11) tells us he lived in Jehoshaphat's reign, who was the sixth king from David, inclusive; and while the same pedigree in its last five generations also seems to suit the history-inasmuch as it places Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, fourth from the end, and the history tells us he lived in the reign of Josiah, the fourth king from the end-yet is there certainly at least one great gap in the middle. For between Amariah, the high priest in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Shallum, the father of Hilkiah, the high-priest in Josiah's reign-an interval of about 240 years-there are but two names. Ahitub and Zadok, and these liable to suspicion from their reproducing the same sequence which occurs in the earlier part of the same genealogy-Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. Besides, they are not mentioned by Josephus, at least not under the same names. This part, therefore, of the pedigree is useless for our purpose. But the historical books supply us with four or five names for this interval, viz. Jehoiada, in the reigns of Athaliah and Joash, and probably still earlier; Zechariah, his son; Azariah, in the reign of Uzziah; Urijah, in the reign of Ahaz; and Azariah, in the reign of Hezekiah. If, in the genealogy-of 1 Chronicles 6, Azariah and Hilkiah have been accidental transposed, as is not impossible, then the Azariah who was high-priest if Hezekiah's reign would be the Azariah of 13631 Chronicles 6:13,14. Putting the additional historical names at four, and deducting the two suspicious names from the genealogy, we have 15 high-priests indicated in Scripture as contemporary with the 20 kings, with room, however, for one or two more in the history. Turning to Josephus, we find his list of 17 high-priests (whom he reckons as 18 [*Ant. 20,* 10], as do also the Rabbins) in places exceedingly corrupt, a corruption sometimes caused by the end of one name adhering to the beginning of the following (as in Axioramus), sometimes apparently by substituting the name of the contemporary king or prophet for that of the high-priest, as Joel and Jotham (both these, however, confirmed by the Rabbinical list). Perhaps, however, Sudeas, who corresponds to Zedekiah, in the reign of Amaziah, in the *Seder Olam,* and Odeas, who corresponds to Hoshaiah, in the reign of Manasseh, according to the same Jewish chronicle, may really represent

high priests whose names have not been preserved in Scripture. This would bring up the number to 17, or, if we retain Azariah as the father of Seraiah, to 18, which, with the addition of Joel and Jotham, finally agrees with the 20 kings.

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

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

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

(3.) The revolt of the ten tribes from the dynasty of David, and from the worship at Jerusalem, and the setting up of a schismatical priesthood at Dan and Beersheba (11122311 Kings 12:31; 14143092 Chronicles 13:9, etc.).

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

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

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

(7.) In all these great religious movements, however, excepting the one headed by Jehoiada, it is remarkable how the civil power took the lead. It was David who arranged all the Temple service, Solomon who directed the building and dedication of the Temple, the high-priest being not so much as named; Jehoshaphat who sent the priests about to teach the people, and assigned to the high-priest Amariah his share in the work; Hezekiah who headed the reformation, and urged on Azariah and the priests and Levites;

Josiah who encouraged the priests in the service of the house of the Lord. On the other hand, we read of no opposition to the idolatries of Manasseh by the high priest, and we know how shamefully subservient Urijak the high-priest was to king Ahaz, actually building an altar according to the pattern of one at Damascus, to displace the brazen altar, and joining the king in his profane worship before it (2 Kings- 16:10-16). The preponderance of the civil over the ecclesiastical power, as a historical fact, in the kingdom of Judah, although kept within bounds by the hereditary succession of the high-priests, seems to be proved from these circumstances.

The high-priests of this series ended with Seraiah, who was taken prisoner by Nebuzar-adan, and slain at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar, together with Zephaniah, the second priest or sagan, after the burning of the Temple and the plunder of all the sacred vessels (<12518>2 Kings 25:18). His son Jehozadak or Josedech was at the same time carried away captive (<130615>1 Chronicles 6:15).

The time occupied by these (say) eighteen high priests who ministered at Jerusalem between the times of David and the exile was about 424 years, which gives an average of something more than twenty-three years to each high-priest. It is remarkable that not a single instance is recorded after the time of David of an inquiry by Urim and Thummim as a means of ascertaining the Lord's will. The ministry of the prophets seems to have. superseded that of the high-priests (see e.g. 2 Chronicles 15; 18; 20:14, 15; <121901>2 Kings 19:1, 2; 22:12- 14; <242101>Jeremiah 21:1, 2). Some think that Urim and Thummim ceased with the theocracy; others with the division of Israel into two kingdoms. Nehemiah seems to have expected the restoration of it (<160765>Nehemiah 7:65), and so perhaps did Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 4:46; comp. 14:41), while Josephus affirms that it had been exercised for the last time 200 years before he wrote, viz. by John Hyrcanus (Whiston, *note on* A*nt. 3:*8; Prideaux, *Connect.* 1, 150,151). It seems, therefore, scarcely true to reckon Urim and Thummim as one of the marks of God's presence with Solomon's Temple which was wanting to the second Temple (Prid. 1, 138,144, sq.). This early cessation of answers by Urim and Thummim, though the high-priest's office and the wearing of the breastplate continued in force during so many centuries, seems to confirm the notion that such answers were not the fundamental, but only the accessory uses of the breastplate of judgment.

(c.) An interval of about fifty-three years elapsed between the high-priests of the second and third group, during which there was neither temple, nor altar, nor ark, nor priest. Jehozadak, or Josedech, as it is written in Haggai (<30101>Haggai 1:1,14, etc.), who should have succeeded Seraiah, lived and died a captive at Babylon. The pontifical office revived in his son Jeshua, of whom such frequent mention is made in Ezra and Nehemiah, Haggai and Zechariah, 1 Esdr. and Ecclus.; and he therefore stands at the head of this third and last series, honorably distinguished for his zealous co-operation with Zerubbabel in rebuilding the Temple and restoring the dilapidated commonwealth of Israel His successors, as far as the O.T. guides us, were Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan (or Jonathan), and Jaddua. Of these we find Eliashib hindering rather than seconding the zeal of the devout Tirshatha Nehemiah for the observance of God's law in Israel (<16304>Nehemiah 13:4, 7); and Johanan, Josephus tells us, murdered his own brother Jesus or Joshua in the Temple, which led to its further profanation by Bagoses, the general of Artaxerxes Mnemon's army (Ant. 11:7). Jaddua was high-priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Concerning him, Josephus relates the story that he went out to meet Alexander at Sapha (probably the ancient Mizpeh) at the head of a procession of priests; and that when Alexander saw the multitude clothed in white, and the priests in their linen garments, and the high-priest in blue and gold, with the miter on his head, and the gold plate, on which was the name of God, he stepped forward alone and adored the Name, and hastened to embrace the high-priest *(Ant. 11*, 8, 5). Josephus adds many other particulars in the same connection; and the narrative, though sometimes disputed as savoring of the apocryphal, derives support from the circumstances of the times, especially the leniency of Alexander toward the Jews. *SEE ALEXANDER THE GREAT*. It was the brother of this Jaddua. Manasseh, who, according to the same authority, was, at the request of Sanballat, made the first high priest of the Samaritan temple by Alexander the Great. (See on this whole period, Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 1865, 1, 368 sq.)

Jaddua was succeeded by Onias I, his son, and he again by Simon the Just, the last of the men of the great synagogue, as the Jews speak, and to whom is usually ascribed the completion of the Canon of the O.T. (Prid. *Connect.* 1, 545). Of him Jesus, the son of Sirach, speaks in terms of most glowing eulogy in Ecclus. 1, ascribing to him the repair and fortification of the Temple, with other works. The passage (1-21) contains an interesting account of the ministrations of the high priest. Upon Simon's death, his son

Onias being under age, Eleazar, Simon's brother, succeeded him. The high priesthood of Eleazar is memorable as being that under which the Sept. version of the Scriptures is said to have been made at Alexandria for Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to the account of Josephus taken from Aristeas *(Ant. 12,* 2). This translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, valuable as it was with reference to the wider interests of religion, and marked as was the providence which gave it to the world at this time as a preparation for the approaching advent of Christ, yet, viewed in its relation to Judaism and the high-priesthood, was a sign, and perhaps a helping cause of their decay. It marked a growing tendency to Hellenism utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Mosaic economy. Accordingly, in the high-priesthood of Eleazar's rival nephews, Jesus and Onias, we find their very names changed into the Greek ones of Jason and Meenelaus, and with the introduction of this new feature of rival high-priests we find one of them, Menelaus, strengthening himself and seeking support from the Syro-Greek kings against the Jewish party by offering to forsake their national laws and customs, and to adopt those of the Greeks. The building of a gymnasium at-Jerusalem for the use of these apostate Jews, and their endeavor to conceal their circumcision when stripped for the games (1 Macc. 1, 14,15; 2 Macc. 4, 12-15; Joseph. *Ant. 12,* 5, 1), show the length to which this spirit was carried. The acceptance of the spurious priesthood of the temple of Onion from Ptolemy Philometor by Onias (the son of Onias the high priest), who would have been the legitimate high priest on the death of Menelaus, his uncle, is another striking indication of the same degeneracy. By this flight of Onias into Egypt the succession of high-priests in the family of Jozadak ceased; for although the Syro-Greek kings had introduced much uncertainty into the succession, by deposing at their will obnoxious persons, and appointing whom they pleased, yet the dignity had never gone out of the one family. Alcimus, whose Hebrew name was Jakim (<13242>1 Chronicles 24:12), or perhaps Jachin (<13910>1 Chronicles 9:10; 24:17), or, according to Ruffinus (ap. Selden), Joachim, and who was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator on Menelaus being put to death by him, was the first who was of a different family. One, says Josephus, that "was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of this family" of Jozadak.

What, however, for a time saved the Jewish institutions, infused a new life and consistency into the priesthood and the national religion, and enabled them to fulfill their destined course till the advent of Christ, was the cruel and impolitic persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. This thoroughly aroused

the piety and national spirit of the Jews, and drew together in defense of their Temple and country all who feared God and were attached to their national institutions. The result was that after the high priesthood had been brought to the lowest degradation by the apostasy and crimes of the last Onias or Menelaus, and after a vacancy of seven years had followed the brief pontificate of Alcimus, his no less infamous successor. a new and glorious succession of high-priests arose in the Asmonsean family, who united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot, Selden, and others, calls Judas Maccabneus "high-priest of the nation of Judah" *(Ant. 12,* 10, 6), but, according to the far better authority of 1 Macc. 10:20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabmeus that Alcimus himself died, and that Alexander, king of Syria, made Jonathan, the brother of Judas, high-priest. Josephus himself, too, calls Jonathan the "first of the sons of Asmonaeus, who was high-priest" (Life, 1). It is possible, however, that Judas may have been-elected by the people to the office of high-priest, though never confirmed in it by the Syrian kings. The Asmonoean family were priests of the course of Joiarib, the first of the twenty-four courses (<1 Chronicles 24:7), whose return from captivity is recorded <1 Chronicles 9:10; <Nehemiah 11:10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this cannot be affirmed with certainty; and Josephus tells us that he himself was related to them, one of his ancestors having married a daughter of Jonathan, the first high priest of the house. The Asmonaean dynasty lasted from B.C. 153 till the family was damaged by intestine divisions, and then destroyed by Herod the Great. Aristobulus, the last high priest of his line, brother of Mariamne, was murdered by order of Herod, his brother-in-law, B.C. 35. The independence of Judaea, under the priest-kings of this race, had lasted till Pompey took Jerusalem, and sent king Aristobulus II (who had also taken the high-priesthood from his brother Hyrcanus) a prisoner to Rome. Pompey restored Hyrcanus to the high-priesthood, but forbad him to wear the diadem. Everything Jewish was now, however, hastening to decay. Herod made men of low birth high priests, deposed them at his will, and named others in their room. In this he was followed by Archelaus, and by the Romans when they took the government of Judaea into their own hands; so that there were no fewer than twenty-eight high-priests from the reign of Herod to the destruction of the Temple by Titus, a period of 107 years. (Josephus tells us of one Ananus and his five sons who all filled the office of high-priest in turn. One of these, Ananus the younger, was deposed by king Agrippa for the part he

took in causing “James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ,” to be stoned *[Ant. 20,* 9,.1].) The N.T. introduces us to some of these later and oft-changing high-priests, viz. Annas and Caiaphas the former high-priest at the commencement of John Baptist’s ministry, with Caiaphas as second priest; and the latter high-priest himself at our Lord’s crucifixion (see Sommel, *De Anna et Caiapha,* Lund. 1772) — and Ananias (erroneously thought to be the Ananus who was murdered by the Zealots just before the siege of Jerusalem), before whom Paul was tried, as we read Acts 23, and of whom he said, “God shall smite thee, thou whited wall.” The same Caiaphas was the high-priest from whom Saul received letters to the synagogue at Damascus (<4401>Acts 9:1, 14). Both he and Ananias seem certainly to have presided in the Sanhedrim, and that officially; nor is Lightfoot’s explanation (8, 450 and 484) of the mention of the high-priest, though Gamaliel and his son Simeon were respectively presidents of the Sanhedrim, at all probable or satisfactory (see <4401>Acts 5:17,.etc.). The last high-priest was appointed by lot by the Zealots from the course of priests called by Josephus Eniachim (probably a corrupt reading for Jachim). He is thus described, by the Jewish historian. “His name was Phannias: he was the son of Samuel, of the village of Aphtha, a man not only not of the number of the chief priests, but who, such a mere rustic was he, scarcely knew what the high-priesthood meant. Yet did they drag him reluctant from the country, and, setting him forth in a borrowed character as on the stage, they put the sacred vestments on him, and instructed him how to act on the occasion. This shocking impiety, which to them was a subject of merriment and sport, drew tears from the other priests, who beheld from a distance their law turned into ridicule, and groaned over the subversion of the sacred honors” *(War, 4,* 3, 8). Thus ignominiously ended the series of high-priests which had stretched in a scarcely broken line through more than seventeen, or, according to the common chronology, sixteen centuries. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires, which the Jewish high-priests had seen in turn overshadowing the world, had each, except the last, one by one withered away and died-and now the last successor of Aaron was stripped of his sacerdotal robes, and the temple which he served laid level with the ground, to rise no more. But this did not happen till the true High-priest and King of Israel, the Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, had offered his one sacrifice, once for all, and had taken his place at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, bearing on his breast the judgment of his redeemed people, and

continuing a Priest forever, in the sanctuary which shall never be taken down!

Annexed is a list of the high priests from Aaron to the final overthrow of Jerusalem, derived from the Scriptures, Josephus, and an old Jewish chronicle, the *Seder Olam.* Details may be found under their respective names. **Picture for High Priest 9** **Picture for High Priest 10**

Highway

(usually hL;saem] *mesillah',* or [<23508>Isaiah 35:8] lWlsim; *meslul', a raised road, SEE CAUSEWAY* for public use; elsewhere simply jr'a]o *o'rach, a path.* or Ërd, *de'rek,* ὁδός, a *"way"* in general; once [<301516>Amos 5:16] /Wj, *chuts, outside).* Travelers have frequently noticed the lack of roads in Palestine. Travel and transport being all performed on the backs of beasts of burden, which usually move in single file, the most important routes are only marked by narrow winding paths; and the soil is often so hard as to take no impression from the feet of animals, so that the eye of an unpracticed traveler there perceives, even upon a common thoroughfare, no evidence that others have passed along the same way. No repairs are ever made, no labor employed to remove obstacles. — Bastow. Hence the striking character of the figure by which the preparation for the return of the captives and the Messiah's advent are announced as the construction of a grand thoroughfare for their march (<232116>Isaiah 11:16; 35:8; 40:3; 62:10). The Romans, however, during their occupancy of Palestine, constructed several substantial roads, which are laid down in the ancient itineraries, and remains of which subsist to this day. De Saulcy *(Dead Sea,* 1, 392) fancied he discovered traces of the old Moabitish highways (<042017>Numbers 20:17). *SEE ROAD.*

Higuerra, Hieronymus Romanus de la

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

Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Lit.* 3. 153; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé. 24,* 658 sq.

Hilaire

SEE HILARIUS.

Hilali Codex of the O.T.

SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

Hilaria

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

Hilariänus

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

Hilario or Hilarianus, Q. Julius

an ecclesiastical writer of the 4th century. We have no details concerning his life, as none are given either in his own works or in those of his contemporaries. He is considered as the author of *Expositum de die Paschce et Mensis,* at the end of Lactantius's works (Par. 1712), and in Galland, *Bibl. Patrums* (vol. 8:app. 2, p. 745, Venice, 1772, fol): — De *Mulndi Duratione,* or *De Curszu Temporum,* first published by Pithou in

the Appendix to his *Biblioth. Patrum* (Paris, 1579), and afterwards reprinted in Galland, 8:235. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. med. et infim. cetatis, 3,* 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 665.

Hilarion, St.

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

Hilarius Arelatensis, St.

(HILARY, bishop OF ARLES), was born about A.D. 403, of a noble family, and at an early age attached himself to Honoratus, first abbot of Lerins. When about twenty-five years of age he accompanied Honoratus to

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

Hilarius Diaconus

a deacon of the Church of Rome in the 4th century, who was sent by pope Liberius, with Lucifer of Cagliari and others, to plead the cause of the orthodox faith before Constantius at the Council of Milan. His boldness was so offensive that he was scourged and banished by order of the emperor. He afterwards supported the violent opinion of Lucifer (q.v.) that, all Arians and heretics must be rebaptized upon applying to be restored to communion in the Church. Two treatises, of doubtful authenticity, are ascribed to him: (1.) *Comm. in Epist. Pauli* (published often with the works of Ambrose); (2.) *Quaest. in Vet. et Nov. Test.,* published with the works of Augustine (Benedictine edit. 3, App.). The Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose inform us that the manuscripts of the "Commentary" on St. Paul's Epistles differ considerably, and that in some parts there appear t6 be interpolations of long passages. This commentary is said by Dupin to be "clear, plain, and literal, and to give the meaning of

the text of St. Paul well enough; but it gives very different explanations from St. Augustine in those places which concern predestination, provocation, grace, and free will." — Lardner, *Works, 4*, 382; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 4, pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 43; Dupin, *Eccles. Writ.* cent. 4; *English Cyclopedia.*

Hilarius Pictaviensis

(HILARY, ST., bishop or POITIERS), one of the most distinguished opponents of Arianism in the 4th century, was a native of the city whose name he bears. He was of noble descent, but a heathen. Having become a convert to the Christian faith, he was baptized, together with his wife and daughter. He was subsequently made bishop, about 350, notwithstanding his being a married man. In 356 he defended Athanasius, in the Council of Bziers, against Satunlinus, bishop of Arles (said to have been an Arian, and to have held communion with Ursatius and Valens). For this defense he was, by order of Constantius, exiled to Phrygia, but he still continued to defend the principles of the Church against the Eastern bishops, most of whom were Arians. "In 359 he attended the Council of Seleucia, in Isauria, which had been summoned by order of Constantius, and boldly defended the doctrine of the Trinity against the Arian bishops, who formed the majority of the council.' He afterwards followed the deputies of the council to the emperor's court, and presented a petition to Constantius, in which he desired permission to dispute publicly with the Arians in the emperor's presence. In order to get rid of so formidable an opponent, the Arians, it is said, induced the emperor to send him away from the court; but previous to his departure, Hilarius wrote an invective against Constantius, in which he denounced him as Antichrist, and described him as a person who had only professed Christianity in order that he might deny Christ. After the Catholic bishops had recovered their liberty under Julian, Hilarius assembled several councils in Gaul for the reestablishment of the Catholic faith and the condemnation of Arian bishops. He also traveled in Italy for the same purpose, and used every exertion to purify the churches of that country from all Arian heresies. When Auxentius was appointed bishop of Milan by the emperor Valentinian in 364, Hilarius presented a petition to the emperor, in which he denounced Auxentius as a heretic. Though this charge was denied by Auxentius, Hilarius still continued his attacks upon him for heterodoxy, and created so much confusion in the city that he was at length ordered to retire to his own diocese, where he died in the year 367."

In theology, Hilary maintained the Athanasian doctrines with so much vigor that he acquired the name of *Malleus Arianorum*. His exegetical writings show evident marks of the influence of Origen. Of his commentary on the Psalms, Jerome says, *"In quo opere imitatus Origenern, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit."* His theological system is to be gathered chiefly from his *De Trinitate*, lib. 12. He maintains the essential oneness and equality of the Son with the Father. As to the Holy Spirit, he teaches that "faith in him is necessarily connected with confessing the Father and the Son, and to know this is sufficient. If any one ask what the Holy Spirit is," and is not satisfied with the answer that he is through him and from him through whom are all things; that he is the Spirit of God, and his gift to believers, even apostles and prophets will not satisfy such a person, for they only assert this of him, that he is *(De Trinit.* 2, 29). He does not venture to attribute to him the-name of God, because the Scripture does not so call him expressly, yet it says that the Holy Spirit searches the deep things of God and it therefore follows that he partakes the divine essence *(De Trinit. 12,* 55). His view of the *body* of Christ is not entirely free from Docetism; and in speaking of thee human soul, he seems to think that the idea of a creature includes that of corporeity *(Com. in Matthew* 5, 8). As to predestination, he "emphatically asserted the harmonious connection between grace and free-will, the powerlessness of the latter, and yet its importance- as a condition of the operation of divine grace. 'As the organs of the human body,' he says *(De Trinit.* 2, 35), 'cannot act without the addition of moving causes, so the human has, indeed, the capacity for knowing God; but if it does not receive through faith the gift of the Holy Spirit, it will not attain to that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ stands open to all, and that which all want is given to every one as far as he will accept it.' 'It is the greatest folly,' he says in another passage, 'not to perceive that we live in dependence on and through God, when we imagine that in things which men undertake and hope for, they may venture to depend on their own strength. What we have, we have from God; on him must all our hope be placed' *(Comm. in Psalm* 57). Accordingly, he did not admit an unconditional predestination; he did not find it in the passages in Romans 9 respecting the election of Esau, commonly adduced in favor of it, but only a predestination conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of his determination of will; otherwise every man would be born under a necessity of sinning *(Comm. in Psalm* 57)."

As a writer Hilary is copious, and fertile in thought and illustration, but often turgid and obscure in style. A pretty full analysis of his writings is given in Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, 1, 302 sq. The chief among them are,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. *Fragmenta Hilarii*, containing passages from a lost work on the synods of Seleucia and Ariminum, etc., first published by Faber in 1598. Some of his works are lost, and others have been erroneously attributed to him. The works of Hilarius have been published by Mireeus (Paris, 1544), Erasmus (Basel, 1523; reprinted 1526, 1535, 1550, 1570), Gillot (Paris, 1572; reprinted, with several improvements, 1605, 1631, 1652); by Dom Constant, of the Benedictines (Paris, 1693, deemed by some the best

edition), the Marquis de Maffei (Verona, 1730), and Oberthir (178188, 4 vols. 8vo). See *Vita S. Hilarii, operibus ejus a Dom. Constant collectis praefixa; Gallia Christiana,* vol. 2, col. 1038; *Hist. litter. de la France,* vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 139; Cave, *Scriptores Eccles.* 1, 213; Tillemont, *Memoires, 7,* 432; Oudin, *Script. Ecclesiastici,* 1, 426; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, 5,* 1; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 660; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biogr.* vol. 2; *English Cyclopaedia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie, 6,* 84 sq.; Dorner, *Lehre 5. d. Person Christi, 1,* 1037; Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers,* cent. 4; Neander, *History of Dogmas;* Neander, *Ch. History,* 2, 396, 419, 427, 559; Waterland, *Works;* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 1, 248; Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe,* 2, 13, 151; Shedd, *Guericke's Ch. History,* p. 294,322, 372; *Miler, Hist. Ch. Christ,* 2, 81; Hook, *Eccl. Biog. 6:*46; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* Milman's ed., 2, 320; Schaff, *Hist. Chr. Church. 3:*589, 664, 959 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1, 399; 11:299; Lardner, *Works, 4:*178; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* 1, 1476; Milman, *Hist. Christianity,* 2, 437 sq.; 3:106,286,356; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte;* Taylor, *Ancient Christianity,* 1, 223, 326; *Christian Remembrancer,* July, 1853, p. 241; *Brit. and For. Evangel, Rev.* Oct. 1866, p. 689.

Hilarius or Hilarus I, Pope

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

Hilary

SEE HILARIUS.

Hilda, St.

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

Hildebert of Tours (Hildebertus Turonensis)

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

Hildebrand

SEE GREGORY VII.

Hildegarde or Hildegardis

abbess of St. Rupert's Mount, on the Rhine, was born at Bockelhein, in Germany, A.D. 1098. She attracted much attention by her pretended revelations and visions, which were held to be supernatural, and obtained the countenance of Bernard and others, and at last the approval of Eugenius III and the three succeeding popes, together with numerous prelates. She wrote *Three Books of Revelations* (Coloniae, *1628): — Life of St. Robert: —* three *Epistles,* various *Questions,* and an *Exposition of St. Benedict's Rule* (all Colon. 1566). Most of them may also be found in *Bibl. Max. Patrum,* vol. 23. She died A.D. 1180. — Neander, *Ch. Hist. 4,*

217, 586; Mosheim. *Ch. Hist.* cent. 12, pt. 2, ch. 2, n. 71; Baillet, *Vies des Saints,* Sept. 17; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon, 7:*921.

Hildegonde

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

Hildersham, Arthur

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

Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: — Sermons on Fasting, etc. (Lond. 1633, fol.). — Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans,* 1, 329, 546; Middleton, *Biog. Evangel. 3,* 25;. Hook, *Eccl. Biog. 6,* 70.

Hildesley, Mark

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

Hildreth, Hosea

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

Hildulf, also Hidulf, of St. Idon

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

Hi'len

(1 Chronicles 6:58). *SEE HOLON*.

Hilki'ah

(Heb. *Chilkiyah',* חִלְקִיָּה, *portion of Jehovah;* often in the prolonged form *Chilkiya'hu,* חִלְקִיָּהוּ, 2 Kings 18:18, 26; 22:4, 8, 14; 23:4, 24; 1

Chronicles 26:11; <14340>2 Chronicles 34:9, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22; <23220>Isaiah 22:20; 36:3, 32; Jeremiah 1, 1; Sept. Χελκίας), the name of a number of men, all priests or Levites.

1. The son of Amzi and father of Amaziah, the sixth in descent from Merari, son of Levi (<13606>1 Chronicles 6:45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. The second son of Hosah, of the family of Merari, appointed by David as a doorkeeper of the tabernacle (<13611>1 Chronicles 26:11). B.C. cir. 1014.

3. The father of Eliakim, which latter was overseer of the house (Temple) at the time of Sennacherib's invasion (<12818>2 Kings 18:18, 26, 37; <23220>Isaiah 22:20; 36:3). B.C. ante 713.

4. The father of Gemariah and companion of Elasab, who were sent with a message to the captives at Babylon (<24293>Jeremiah 29:3). B.C. long ante 587. He was possibly identical with the foregoing.

5. The father of the prophet Jeremiah (<24001>Jeremiah 1:1). B.C. ante 628.

6. Son of Shallum (<13613>1 Chronicles 6:13; <15701>Ezra 7:1), or Meshullam (<13911>1 Chronicles 9:11; <16111>Nehemiah 11:11), and father of Azariah, the high priest who assisted Josiah in his work of reformation (<12204>2 Kings 22:4-14; 23:4, 24; <14340>2 Chronicles 34:9-22; 35:8). B.C. 623. "He is especially remarkable for the discovery which he made in the house of the Lord of a book which is called The Book of the Law' (<12208>2 Kings 22:8), and The Book of the Covenant' (23:2). That this was some well known book is evident from the form of the expression" (Kitto). "Kennicott *(Heb. Teax.* 2, 299) is of opinion that it was the original autograph copy of the Pentateuch written by Moses which Hilkiah found. He argues from the peculiar form of expression in <14344>2 Chronicles 34:14, hvm dyBa/hy] trTr psE, 'the book of the law of Jelhovah by the hand of Moses;' whereas in the fourteen other places in the O.T. where the law of Moses or the book of Moses is mentioned, it is either 'the book of Moses,' or 'the law of Moses,' or 'the book of the law of Moses.' But the argument is far from conclusive, because the phrase in question may quite as properly signify 'the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses.' Compare the expression ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου (<48319>Galatians 3:19), and hvm dyB] (<02935>Exodus 9:35; 35:29; <16029>Nehemiah 10:29; <14536>2 Chronicles 35:6; Jeremiah 1, 1). Though, however, the copy cannot be proved to have been Moses's autograph from the words in question, it seems probable that it

was such, from the place where it was found, viz. in the Temple; and, from its not having been discovered before, but only being brought to light on the occasion of the repairs which were necessary, and from the discoverer being the high-priest himself, it seems natural to conclude that the particular part of the Temple where it was found was one not usually frequented, or ever by any but the high-priest. Such a place exactly was the one where we know the original copy of the law was deposited by command of Moses, viz. by the side of the ark of the covenant within the veil, as we learn from, <5310>Deuteronomy 31:9, 26" (Smith). "That it was the entire Pentateuch is the opinion of Josephus, Von Lengerke, Keil, Ewald, Havernick, etc.; but others think it was only part of that collection, and others that it was simply a collection of laws and ordinances appointed by Moses, such as are given in the Pentateuch, and especially in Deuteronomy. The objection to its being the whole Pentateuch is the improbability of that being read in the audience of the people at one time, as was this book (<5231>Deuteronomy 23:2); and there are many circumstances which render it probable that what was read to the people was the look of Deuteronomy, as the apparent allusion to <5291>Deuteronomy 29:1, and 30:2, in <5231>Deuteronomy 23:2, 3, and the special effect which the reading of the book had on the king, who did, in consequence, Just what one impressed by such passages as occur in <5168>Deuteronomy 16:18, etc., would be likely to do. At the same time, even if we admit that the part actually read consisted only of the summary of laws and institutions in Deuteronomy, it will not follow that that was the only part of the Pentateuch found by Hilkiah; for, as the matter brought before his mind by Huldah the prophetess (<1221>2 Kings 22:15 sq.) respected the restoration of the worship of Jehovah, it might be only to what bore on that that the reading specially referred. The probability is that the book found by Hilkiah was the same which was entrusted to the care of the priests, and was to be put in the side of the ark (<5310>Deuteronomy 31:926); and that this was the entire body of the Mosaic writing, and not any part of it, seems the only tenable conclusion (Hengstenberg, *Beitrigye,* 2, 159 sq.)"

7. One of the chief priests (contemporary with Jeshua as high-priest) who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<1612>Nehemiah 12:7). His son Hashabiah is named in ver. 21. B.C. 536.

8. One of those who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people (<1684>Nehemiah 8:4). B.C. cir...410. It is somewhat uncertain whether he even belonged to the Levitical family; the date of the

events with which he is associated seems to forbid his identification with the foregoing.

Hill

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

1. *Gib'ah,'*, h [bG; from a root akin to [bG; to *be high,* which seems to have the force of *curvature* or humpishness. A word involving this idea is peculiarly applicable to the rounded hills of Palestine, and from it are derived, as has been pointed out under GIBEAH, the names of several places situated on hills. Our translators have been consistent in rendering *gib'ah* by "hill:" in four passages only qualifying it as "little hill," doubtless for the more complete antithesis to "mountain" (<19512>Psalm 65:12; 72:3; 114:4, 6). *SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS*.

2. But they have also employed the same English word for the very different term *bar,* r hi which has a much more extended sense than gib'ah, meaning a whole district rather than an individual eminence, and to which our word "mountain" answers with tolerable accuracy. This exchange is always undesirable, but it sometimes occurs so as to confuse the meaning of a passage where it is desirable that the topography should be unmistakable. For instance, in <26204>Ezekiel 24:4, the "hill" is the same which is elsewhere in the same chapter (ver. 12, 13, 18, etc.) and book consistently and accurately rendered "mount" and "mountain." In <04444>Numbers 14:44, 45, the "hill" is the "mountain" of verse 40, as also in <05014>Deuteronomy 1:41, 43, compared with 24, 44. In <06519>Joshua 15:9, the allusion is to the Mount of Olives, correctly called "mountain" in the preceding verse; and so also in <10613>2 Samuel 16:13. The country of the "hills," in <05017>Deuteronomy 1:7; <06901>Joshua 9:1; 10:40; 11:16, is the elevated district of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, which is correctly called "the mountain" in the earliest descriptions of Palestine (<04329>Numbers 13:29), and in many subsequent passages. The "holy hill" (<19304>Psalm 3:4), the "hill of Jehovah" (<19403>Psalm 24:3), the "hill of God" (<19815>Psalm 68:15). are nothing else than "Mount Zion." In <12009>2 Kings 1:9, and 4:27, the use of the word "hill" obscures the allusion to Carmel, which in other passages of the life of the prophet (e.g. <11819>1 Kings 18:19; <12025>2 Kings 4:25) has the term "mount" correctly attached to it. Other places in the historical books in which the same substitution weakens the force of the narrative are as

follows: <010719>Genesis 7:19; <051107>Deuteronomy 8:7; <060636>Joshua 13:6; 18:13, 14; <070603>Judges 16:3; <091234>1 Samuel 23:14; 25:20; 26:13; <101834>2 Samuel 13:34; 1 Kings, 20:23, 28; 22:17, etc. *SEE MOUNTAIN*.

3. On one occasion the word *ma'aleh'*, hl,[]mi, is rendered "hill," viz. <090911>1 Samuel 9:11, where it would be better to employ "ascent," or some similar term. *SEE MAALEH*.

4. In the N.T. the word "hill" is employed to render the Greek word βουνός; but on one occasion it is used for ὄρος, elsewhere "mountain," so as to obscure the connection between the two parts of the same narrative. The "hill" from which Jesus was coming down in <420936>Luke 9:36, is the same as "the mountain" into which he had gone for his transfiguration the day before (comp. verse 28). In <400514>Matthew 5:14, and <420429>Luke 4:29, ὄρος is also rendered "hill," but not with the inconvenience just noticed. In <420139>Luke 1:39, the "hill country" (ἡ ὀρεινή) is the same "mountain of Judah" to which frequent reference is made in the Old Testament. *SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF*.

Hill-Gods

(µyrbæ;yhe-la, "gods of the hills") are mentioned (<112023>1 Kings 20:23) by the heathenish Syrians as being those of the Hebrews, because more powerful; and such deities *(dii montium),* i.e. those that have their dwelling or throne on hills, whence they command control of all the region within view, were generally worshipped by the ancient pagans (see Dougteei *Anal.* 1, 178; Deyling, *Observ. 3* no. 12) sometimes in general (Gruter, *Inscript.* f. 21; Lactant. *Mort. persec.* 11), sometimes as individuals (Arnobius, *Adv. gent. 4*, 9; Augustine, *Civ. dei, 4,* 8), since heights were generally regarded as seats of the gods (Herodotus, 1, 131; Xenophon, *Mem. 3*, 8, 10; Strabo, 15:732; Dougtiei *Anal.* 1, 108; Rimptsch, *De sacris gemtium in montibus,* Lipsime, 1719; Creuzer, *Symbolik,* 1, 158 sq.; Gesenius, *Jesa.* 2, 282; Gramberg's *Religionsid.* 1, 20). *SEE HIGH PLACE*. Grotius (ad loc.) specially compares the *dpe/ParTq Pun.* (See Walch, *De deo Ebroeor. montano,* Jen. 1746).

Hill, George, D.D.

a divine of the Church of Scotland, born at St. Andrews in 1748. He was educated at the university of his native place, where he obtained the Greek professorship, and afterward that of divinity. He subsequently became

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

Hill, George

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

Hill, Green

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

Hill, Noah

a learned Independent minister, was born at Cradley, England, 1739, and educated at Daventry, where he was classical master for ten years. He became rector of the Gravel Lane Chapel, London, 1 771, and preached

there thirty-seven years. He died in 1815. His *Sermons* (Lond. 1822, 8vo) are said to abound in felicitous illustrations.

Hill, Sir Richard

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

Hill, Rowland

brother of Sir Richard Hill, a popular and pious, though eccentric minister, was born at Hawkestone Aug. 13th or 23rd, 1744. His views were early directed towards the ministry in connection with the Church of England, and his religious life was greatly developed during his residence as a student at Eton and St. John's College, Cambridge, where he imbibed the principles of Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists, which he strenuously maintained through life. His religious zeal at college was strongly marked, but he did not allow it to interfere with his studies. He experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining admission into the Church-

six bishops refused in turn to ordain him, and he succeeded at length only through family affluence. After his ordination he resumed itinerancy, much against the wishes of his father. In 1773 he obtained the parish of Kingston, Somerset, and was married in the same year, yet still kept up his itinerant ministry. His vigor of thought, earnestness, eccentricity, and wit drew thousands to listen to him. In 1780 his father's death left him wealth; and, with the aid of his numerous friends, he built Surrey Chapel, London, in 1782. Here he preached to vast congregations for many years. He died April 11, 1833. In the controversy between the Arminian and Calvinistic Methodists Hill took an active part, and wrote several bitter pamphlets against John Wesley, especially *Imposture detected* (Bristol, 1777): — Full *Answer to John Wesley* (Bristol, 1777). When the strife ended Hill regretted his severe language, and suppressed one of his bitterest publications. See Sidney, *Life of Rowland Hill* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. 2, ch. 1 and 2; Wesley, *Works, 4,* 473; 6:193, 199.

Hill, William, D.D.

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

Hilla or Hillel Codex of the O.T.

SEE MANUSCRIPTS.

Hil’lel

(Heb. *Hillel’*, לֵלִה *praising;* Sept. Ἐλλήλ, Josephus, Ἔλληλος), a Pirathonite, father of the judge Abdon (Judges 12:13, 15). B.C. ante 1233.

Hillel I, Ha-Zaken

(הַזָּקֵן, or *the Great),* BEN-SIMON, was born at Babylon about B.C. 75. He was one of the most eminent Jewish rabbis, founder of a school which bore his name, and by his self-denying, holy life, and great wisdom and learning, exercised a very remark-able influence both upon the theology and literature of his nation. About B.C. 36 he came to Jerusalem, where, while obliged to work for his daily bread, he attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaja and Abtalion, then the presiding officers of the Sanhedrim. About B.C. 30 he was himself chosen president of the Sanhedrim. This office he held for forty years with great success. Etheridge says: “His administration, along with his coadjutor Shammai, forms an era in the history of rabbinical learning. His scholars were numbered by thousands. The Talmud commemorates eighty of them by name, among whom are the celebrated R. Jochanan ben-Zachai, and Jonathan ben-Uziel, the Chaldee Targumist on the Prophets.” Some have asserted (Ginsburg *in Kitto,* among others) that by his teachings he prepared his people for the coming of Christ, but we are inclined to believe that, while Hillel was a most noble leader of the Jews, teaching as he did that the cardinal doctrine and aim of life is “to be gentle, showing all meekness to all men.” and “when reviled not to revile again,” yet his views of the prophecies rather inclined him to give warning to his nation-especially prepared, by their social and political discomfort, to look more intently for the coming of that mysterious king who, according to their idea, was to free them from the oppression of Herod as well as Caesar, and establish in the land of Judah a throne that should have supremacy over all others-by asserting that “no such king will ever appear” *(Sanhedrin).* But it is undoubtedly true that he foresaw the dispersion of his nation, for the Talmud informs us that he drew up civil and political ordinances intended to regulate their relation to each other after their separation. While president of the Sanhedrim, his great aim was to give greater precision to the study of the law. Before his time tradition learning had been divided into six hundred, or, as some ‘have it, seven hundred sections. He simplified the subject by arranging this once complicated mass under six (Sedarim) treatises-the basis, really, of the

future Mishna labors of Akiba, Chijja, and Jehuda Hakkodesh in this department. Hillel was also the first who laid down definite hermeneutical rules for the interpretation of the O.T. They are very important for a proper understanding of the ancient versions (Midrash). His colleague, the vice-president of the Sanhedrim, Shammai, became displeased with the liberality of Hillel's mind, and this finally resulted in the establishment of "the school of Shammai" by the side of "the school of Hillel." Their points of difference related to questions of jurisprudence and Church discipline, not to dogmas, yet their disputes caused great excitement among the Jews. Hillel's party finally prevailed, in consequence, it is said, of a *bath kol* (q.v.) in his favor. Jerome and some other writers have considered Hillel as the founder of the sect of Pharisees, and Shammai as the first Scribe. This, however, is an error, for the Scribes and Pharisees did not constitute two distinct sects, and, moreover, were anterior to these two teachers. Hillel died when Jesus was about ten years of age. It seems strange that Josephus makes no mention of Hillel. Arnold (in Herzog, *Real Encyklop. 7*, 97, thinks that Pollio *(Ant. 16,* 1, 1, 10) stands for Hillel. To the school of Hillel is attributed the authorship of *Megillath Beth Hashmonaim,* a work on the history of the Maccabees, now lost. See Bartolocci, *Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.* 2, 783-796; G. E. Geiger et H. Giessman, *Brevis Commentatio de Hillel et Schammai,* etc. (Altdorf, 1707, 4to); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 686; *Engl. Cyclopaedia;* Fürst, *Kulturgesch.* 1, 13; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literat.* p. 33; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 8,* 207; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israel.* 1, 254; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Liter.* 2, 303; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* 2, 824-8. (J. H. W.)

Hillel II, ben-Jehudah III

(sometimes called *the younger,* because a descendant of Hillel I, or the elder, q.v.), came to the presidency of the Sanhedrim about A.D. 330 (some say A.D. 258), which he held for about thirty-five years. As president of the Sanhedrim, he was, of course, the head of the Jewish school at Tiberias, and it is said that while in this position he was often consulted by Origen. Some think him the Ellel mentioned by Epiphanius *(adver. Haeres. 30,* 4 sq.), who embraced the Christian faith on his deathbed. But this fact is unlikely, as the Jews of Hillel's time make no mention of it whatever. Had it occurred they would undoubtedly have execrated his name. It is an interesting fact, however, connected with Biblical literature to learn from Epiphanius that a Hebrew translation of the Gospel of John, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of Christ's genealogy as

recorded by Matthew, existed at this early period of Christianity, for it is said of the Ellel above referred to, that a Hebrew translation of the parts of the N.T. just mentioned was found secreted in the cabinet of the nasi (president), subsequently to his death. Hillel is said to have convoked a rabbinical synod which adjusted the period of the sun with that of the moon in calculating time, though it was not used until the change introduced under Alphonso, king of Castile (Bartolocci, *Magna Bibliotheca Rabbinicarum*, 2, 415 sq.). This calendar, while it greatly facilitated the uniform observance of the Paschal festival and other great festivals, tended to promote unity among a people dispersed through so many lands. "If the acts of this synod had been handed down in a written form, we should probably have had in them some light on the present discrepancies between the chronology of the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint." It is generally believed that the rabbins of this synod fixed the epoch of the Creation at the vernal equinox, 3761 years before the birth of Christ. Indeed, Hillel's great reputation, nay, immortality, rests upon his introduction of the calendar (q.v.) of the Jewish year, used even at present with little variation. "According to this calendar, the difference between the solar and lunar year upon which the cycle of the Jewish festivals depends, is yearly made up; the length of the month is made to approximate to the astronomical course of the moon, and attention is also paid in it to the Halachic matters connected with the Jewish festivals. It is based upon the cycle of nineteen years (hnblh rzjm), introduced by the Greek astronomer Meton, in which occur seven intercalary years. Each year has ten unchangeable months of alternately twenty-nine and thirty days; the two autumnal months, *Cheshvan* and *Kislev*, which follow the important month *Tisri*, are left changeable, *SEE HAPHTARAH*, because they depend upon certain astronomical phenomena and the following points of Jewish law:

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

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

3. That the *Hosanna Day* is not to be on a Sabbath. It is impossible now to say with certainty how much of this calendar is Hillel's own, and how much he took from the national traditions, since it is beyond question that some astronomical rules were handed down by the presidents. This

calendar Hillel introduced A.D. 359." A similarity of names has caused him to be considered as the author of a MS. copy of the O.T., which was preserved until the close of the 13th century, and was used to correct later copies. He died towards the close of the 4th century. — Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei,* p. 170,171; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraica;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 688; Etheridge, *Introd. Hebr. Lit.* p. 138; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden, 4,* 386 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* 2, 305. (J. H.W.)

Hiller, Matthias

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

Hiller, Philip Frederick

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

(translated by Hurst), 2, 393; Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 278.

Hillhouse, Augustus L.

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

Hilliard, Timothy

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

Hillyer, Asa, D.D.,

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

L.), *History of the Presbyterian Church, Madison, N. J.* p. 39 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit, 3,* 533.

Himerius

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

Himerius

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

Himyarites

(by the classics called *Homeritetn* or *Homeirites),* an Arabian people, claiming to be descend ants of Himyar, a grandson of Saba, one of the mythical fathers of the Arabians, who is said to have been a prince in South Arabia about 3000 before Mohammed's time. They established in that part of Arabia some very flourishing towns, including Saba and Aden (Athana), the former noted more especially from its mention in the Bible, and extended their dominion nearly over the entire coast of South Africa. At the time of Constantine the Great this people inclined to Christianity, but in 529 they were subjected by the Ethiopians, and were obliged to forsake

their Christian faith. About seventy years later the Persians took the most important cities from the Himyarites, and in A.D. 629 they were subjected to the Mohammedans, and embraced Islamism. The Himyarites had a language of their own, *SEE ARABIC LANGUAGE*, the so called Himyaritic, of which traces have lately been found in the ancient remains to which the Oriental scholar Gesenius, and, later, Rodiger, have given much study. Of late Osiander has undertaken this task, and apparently has been much more successful. The results of his investigations are found in *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenln'd. Gesellsch.* (vol. x and 19:Lpz. 1856 and 1865). — Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex. 7,* 929. *SEE JEWS.*

Hin

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

Hinchcliffe, John, D.D.

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

Hinckelmann, Abraham

a distinguished German theologian and Orientalist, born at Doebehl, near Hamburg, May 2,1652, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After filling several important appointments as minister, he was, in 1687, made court preacher to the landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, and honorary

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

Hinckley, John, D.D.

an English clergyman, was born in Warwickshire in 1617, and was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Coleshill, Berkshire, and the rectorships of Dray ton, Leicestershire, and Northfield, Worcestershire. He died in 1695. He published *Four Sermons* (Oxf. 1657, 8vo): — *Epistola Veridica* (1659, 4to): — *Persuasive to Conformity* (1670, 8vo), addressed in the form of a letter to the *Dissenters: — Fasciculus literarum, or Letters on several Occasions* (1680, 8vo). The first half contains letters exchanged between him and Richard Baxter on the divisions in the Church. — Hook, *Eccles. Biog. 6*, 74; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24*, 706; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 850. Hincks, Edward, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of England, and a distinguished Assyrian scholar, was born in August, 1792, and was prepared for college under his father's care. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, at a very early age, and obtained a fellowship before he was twenty-one, being *facile prinaeps* of all the candidates. After graduation he became rector of Ardtrea, one of the college livings, whence he was promoted to Killyleagh, in the diocese of Down (north of Ireland), and there he spent the last forty-one years of his life. Dr. Hincks was considered one of the best philologists in Europe. He contributed numerous valuable papers, especially on Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, to the Royal Irish Academy, the Royal Society of Literature, the Asiatic Society, and the British Association. "His talent for deciphering texts in unknown characters and languages was wonderful. It was applied to the study of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and to

the inscriptions in the cuneiform character found in Persepolis, Nineveh, and other parts of ancient Assyria. In this field especially he labored for years with great perseverance and success, having been the first to ascertain the numeral system, and the power and form of its signs by means of the inscriptions at Van. He was one of the chief restorers of Assyrian learning, throwing great light on the linguistic character and grammatical structure of the languages represented on the Assyrian monuments. Living in a remote country village, with very limited means at his command, he had to contend with great difficulties. In London, beside the British Museum, he would have accomplished more than he did" *(London A thenaeum,* December, 1866). He died December 3,1866. *SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS*; *SEE HIEROGLYPHICS*. (J. H. W.)

Hincks, John

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

Hincmar of Laon

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

Church Hist. 3, 364; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lex.* 5, 208; Illgen, *Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol.* 1858, p. 227.

Hincmar

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

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

Hind

Picture for Hind

(hl;Wai; *ayalah',* <0142>Genesis 49:21; <1022>2 Samuel 22:84; <1840>Job 34:1; <1933>Psalm 18:33; 29:9; Song of Solomon 2, 7; 3:5; <3019>Habakkuk 3:19; or tl;Wai; *aye'leth,* <2019>Proverbs 5:19; <2445>Jeremiah 14:5; "Aijaleth," Psalm 22:title), the *female* of the hart or stag, "doe" being the female of the fallow-deer, and "roe" being sometimes used for that of the roebuck. All the females of the *Cervidae,* with the exception of the reindeer, are hornless. *SEE DEER*. The hind is frequently noticed in the poetical parts of Scripture as emblematic of activity (<0142>Genesis 49:21; <1022>2 Samuel 22:34; <1933>Psalm 18:33; <3019>Habakkuk 3:19), gentleness (<2019>Proverbs 5:19), feminine modesty (<2207>Song of Solomon 2:7; 3:5), earnest longing (<1901>Psalm 42:1), and maternal affection (<2445>Jeremiah 14:5). Its shyness and remoteness from the haunts of men are also noticed (<1891>Job 39:1), and its timidity, causing it to cast its young at the sound of thunder (<1929>Psalm

29:9). The conclusion which some have drawn from the passage last quoted, that the hind produces her young with great difficulty, is not, in reality, deducible from the words, and is expressly contradicted by Job 39:3. It may be remarked on Psalm 18:33, and Habakkuk 3:19, where the Lord is said to cause the feet to stand firm like those of a hind on high places, that this representation is in perfect harmony with the habits of mountain stags; but the version of Proverbs 5:19, "Let the wife of thy bosom be as the beloved hind and favorite roe," seems to indicate that here the words are generalized so as to include under *roe* monogamous species of antelopes, whose affections and consortship are permanent and strong; for stags are polygamous. The Sept. reads hlyaein Genesis 49:21, rendering it στέλεχος ἀνειμένον, "a luxuriant terebinth," an emendation adopted by Bochart. Lowth has proposed a similar change in Psalm 29, but in neither case can the emendation be accepted. Naphtali verified the comparison of himself to a "graceful or tall hind" by the events recorded in Judges 4:6-9; 5:18. The inscription of Psalm 22:" the hind of the morning," probably refers to a tune of that name. *SEE AIJELETH*.

Hindostan

SEE INDIA.

Hinds, Samuel

bishop of Norwich, was born about 1798, on the isle of Barbadoes. At an early age he was sent to England, and educated at Oxford. In 1822 he took orders in the Church of England, and in 1849 he was appointed bishop of Norwich. Later, he was made vice principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He died in 1870. Bishop Hinds wrote *The three Temples of the true God contrasted* (1830; 3rd edit. 1857, 8vo): — *Inspiration and Authority of Script.* (1831, *8vo): — Script. and the Authorized Version of Script.* (1853, 12mo): — *Catechist's Manual* (2nd ed. 1855, 12mo): — *Hist. of Christianity* (1829, 1846, 1850, 1853, 2 vols. 8vo), which was originally contributed to the *Encyclop. Metropolitana. — A1*libone, *Dict. of British and American Authors,* 1, 850; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporais,* p. 884.

Hinduism or Hindu religion

the name of the variety of creeds derived from Brahmanic sources. It is the religion of the East, professed, in some form or another, by nearly half of the human race (see Max Müller, *Chips* from *a German Workshop,* 1, 23),

especially if Buddhism (q.v.) is included, or considered as a development of it. The different sects into which the Hindus (on the origin of the Hindus, and their gradual occupation of India, see Lassen, *Ind. Aterth.* 1, 511 sq.; Muller, *Science of Language,* p. 240 sq.; Donaldson, *New Cratylus,* p. 118,119, 2nd ed.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* 1, 171, 172, 2nd ed.) are divided at present are of modern origin, and the system of theology taught by them differs very much from the religion of their forefathers.

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

1. *The Vedic Period. — According* to the hymns of the Veda, the Hindus of that period regarded the elements of nature as heavenly beings, and worshipped and revered them as such. Among these were first in order *Agni,* the fire of the sun and lightning; *Indra,* the bright, cloudless firmament; the *Maruts,* or winds; *Sûrya,* the sun; *Ushas,* the dawn; and various kindred manifestations of the luminous bodies, and nature in general. "They are supplicated to confer temporal blessings upon the worshipper, riches, life, posterity the shortsighted vanities of human desire, which constituted the sum of heathen prayer in all heathen countries" (Wilson, *Lectures,* p. 9, 10). The great contrast in this particular between heathen and Christian worshippers has been well commented upon by Stuhr *(Religions-Systeme d. heidnischen Volker d. Orients,* Einleit. p. xii). Indeed, it is a fact worthy the notice of philosophers and of scholars in comparative science of religion that only a very small fraction of heathen prayers are offered for spiritual or moral benefits (compare Creuzer, *Symbolik, 4,* 162; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* 1, 181, 182). "We proclaim eagerly, *Maruts,* your ancient greatness, for the sake of inducing your prompt appearance, as the indication of (the approach of) the showerer of benefits;" or, "Offer your nutritious viands to the great hero *(Indra),* who is pleased by praise, and to *Vishnu* (one of the forms of the sun), the two invincible deities who ride upon the radiant summit of the clouds as upon a well-trained steed. *Indra* and *Vishnu,* the devout worshipper glorifies the radiant approach of you two who are the granters of desires, and who bestow upon the mortal who worships you an immediately receivable (reward), through the distribution of that fire which is the scatterer (of desired blessings)." Such is the strain in which the Hindu

of that period addressed his gods. Ethical considerations are foreign to these religious outbursts of the mind. Sin and evil, indeed, are often adverted to, and the gods are praised because they destroy sinners and evildoers; but one would err in associating with these words our notions of sin or wrong. A sinner, in these hymns, is a man who does not address praises to those elementary deities, or who does not gratify them with the oblations they receive at the hands of the believer. He is the foe, the robber, the daemon-in short, the borderer infesting the territory of the "pious" man, who, in his turn, injures and kills, but, in adoring Agni, Indra, and their kin, is satisfied that he can commit no evil act.

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

But in the worship of these powers of nature there is an inclination, at least, if not a real desire, to pay homage to one higher being that should prove the Creator of all perishable and changeable beings. There ensued, so

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

contain all the germs whence the three great systems of Hindu philosophy arose; and like the latter, while revealing the struggle of the Hindu mind to reach the comprehension of one supreme being, they advance sufficiently far to express their belief in such a being, but at the same time acknowledge the inability of the human mind to comprehend its essence" (Chambers, *Encyclopedia). SEE UPANISHAD.*

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

2. "The *Epic* period of Hinduism is marked by a similar development of the same creeds, the general features of which we have traced in the Vedic writings. The popular creed strives to find a center round which to group its imaginary gods, whereas the philosophical creed finds its expression in the ground works of the *Sânkhya, Nyâya,* and *Vedânta* systems of

philosophy. In the former, we find two gods in particular who are rising to the highest rank, Vishnu and Siva; for as to Brahman (the masculine form of Brahm), though he was looked upon now and then as superior to both, he gradually disappears, and becomes merged into the philosophical Brahma (the neuter form of the same word), which is a further evolution of the great soul of the Upanishads. In the *Râmâyana*, the superiority of Vishnu is admitted without dispute; in the great epos, the *Mahâbhârata*, however, which, unlike the former epos, is the product of successive ages, there is an apparent rivalry between the claims of Vishnu and Siva to occupy the highest rank in the pantheon; but Sanskrit philology will first have to unravel the chronological position of the various portions of this work, to lay bare its groundwork, and to show the gradual additions it received, before it will be able to' determine the successive formation of the legends which are the basis of classical Hindu mythology. Yet so much seems to be clear even already, that there is a predilection during this Epic period for the supremacy of Vishnu, and that the policy of incorporating rather than combating antagonistic creeds led more to a quiet admission than to a warm support of Siva's claims to the highest rank." For the character of these gods, and their relation to the Vedic and the Epic period, see below. "We will point, however, to one remarkable myth, as it will illustrate the altered position of the gods during the Epic period. In the Vedic hymns, the immortality of the gods is never matter of doubt; most of the elementary beings are invoked and described as everlastingness liable neither to decay nor death. The offerings they receive may add to their comfort and strength; they may invigorate them, but it is nowhere stated that they are indispensable for their existence. It is, on the contrary, the pious sacrificer himself who, through his offerings, secures to himself long life, and, as it is some-times hyperbolically called, immortality. The same notion also prevails throughout the oldest Brahmanas. It is only in the latest work of this class, the *Satapatha Brahmana,* and more especially in the Epic poems, that we find the inferior gods as mortal in the beginning, and as becoming immortal through exterior agency. In the *Satapatha-Brahmana,* the juice of the soma plant, offered by the worshipper, or at another time clarified butter. or even animal sacrifices, impart to them this immortality. At the Epic period, Vishnu teaches them how to obtain the *Amnrita,* or beverage of immortality, without which they would go to destruction; and this epic *Anrita* itself is merely a compound, increased by imagination, of the various substances which in the Vedic writings are called or likened to *Amnrita,* i.e. a 'substance that frees from death.' It is

obvious, therefore, that gods like these could not strike root in the religious mind of the nation. We must look upon them more as the gods of poetry than of real life; nor do we find that they enjoyed any of the worship which was allotted to the two principal gods, Vishnu and Siva."

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

3. "The *Pâranic* period of Hinduism is the period of its decline, so far as the popular creed is concerned. Its pantheon is nominally the same as that of the Epic period. The triads of principal Hindu gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, remain still at the head of its imaginary gods; but whereas the Epic time is generally characterized by a friendly harmony between the highest occupants of the divine spheres, the Pâranic period shows discord and destruction. The popular adoration has turned away from Brahma to

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

“The philosophical creed of this period, and the creed which is still preserved by the educated classes, is that derived from the tenets of the Vedanta philosophy. It is based on the belief of one supreme being, which imagination and speculation endeavor to invest with all the perfections conceivable by the human mind, but the true nature of which is nevertheless declared to be beyond the reach of thought, and which, on this

ground, is defined as not possessing any of the qualities by which the human mind is able to comprehend intellectual or material entity" (Chambers). *SEE VEDANTA*.

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

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

1. *Indra,* the god of the heavens;
2. *Agni,* the god of fire;
3. *Yama,* the god of hell;
4. *Surya,* the god of the sun:
5. *Varunr.,* the god of water;
6. *Purâna,* the god of the wind;
7. *Kuvera,* the god of wealth;
8. *Soma,* or *Chandra,* the god of the moon.

Many other deities were afterwards intruded in the list;" among them, *Ganesa,* god of wisdom and science; *Kamas,* god of love; *Ganga,* goddess of the river Ganges; *Naradas,* messenger of the gods, etc. Each of the gods besides has his legal spouse. The most important among these goddesses are *Sarasiwati,* wife of Brahma, goddess of eloquence, the protect-or of arts and sciences, and particularly of music, wherefore the vina, or lute, is her attribute; *Sri, Laksehni,* etc., wife of Vishnu, dispenser of blessings. But the most important of all is Siva's female partner, *Durga, Kali,* or *Calee,* goddess of evil and destruction, whose worship is by far the most extensive. Aside from these, there is yet a multitude of inferior gods, demigods etc., the principal of which are the seven or ten *Brahmadikas* or *Rishis* (seers), the most important of whom is *Dakshas,* with *Diti* and *Aditi* for wives; from Diti come the *Daityas* or *Asuras,* the daemons (of destruction), but from Aditi the *Suras* or *Devas* (i.e. gods). The *Gandharvas* are the musicians and dancers of heaven; the *Apsarasas,* the heavenly nymphs; the *Yakshas,* the keepers of treasures in the mountains;

the *Rakshasas,* the enemies of mankind and of all good. The earth is, besides, inhabited by a multitude of evil spirits. The existence of the three worlds (of the gods, the earth, and the lower world) is not considered eternal; it is to be destroyed by Kala, the god of time, who, in regard to this act, is called Mahapralaya, or the great end. Some *animals* also are the objects of religious adoration or fear, particularly the bull; also the snakes, whose connection with the demigods brought forth the monkeys, which are the objects of superstitious dread. Among the birds the *Ganada* is the most honored, and the Banian among trees.

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

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

(2.) *Saivas,* who worship Siva, and are more numerous than any other sect. The mark by which they are distinguished is three horizontal lines on the forehead, drawn in ashes, obtained from the hearth on which a sacred fire is kept; while that of the Vaishnavas consists in perpendicular lines, of which the number differs according to the sect to which the individual

belongs. “Sivaism recalls the ancient religion of nature, and the gross dualism of Phoenicia” (Pressense, *Religions before Christ,* p. 58).

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

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

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

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

The sects which have already been enumerated profess to follow the authority of the Veda, but there are other sects which disavow its authority, and are therefore regarded as forming no part of the Hindu Church. The most important of these are the Buddhists, the Jainas (q.v.), and the Sikhs. The Buddhists have long since been expelled from Hindustan, but it is evident that they were once very numerous in all parts of the country. *SEE BUDDHISM*. The sect of the *Sikhs* was founded by Nanak Shah about A.D. 1500. Their present faith is a creed of pure deism, grounded on the most sublime general truths; blended with the belief of all the absurdities of Hindu mythology and the fables of Mohammedanism (Malcolm). They despise the Hindus and hate the Mussulman, and do not recognize the distinction of caste. They also reject the authority of the Veda, the Purânas, and all other religious books of the Hindus; eat all kinds of flesh except that of cows; willingly admit proselytes from every caste; and consider the profession of arms the religious duty of every individual. An interesting account of this sect is given in Malcolm’s *Sketch of the Sikhs. — Asiatic Researches, 11,* 197-292; Cunningham, *Sikhs.* For the distinctions of *caste, SEE INDIA*.

IV. *Doctrines acid Worship. —* As already intimated, a broad distinction exists between the religion of the people and that of the learned. The

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

The *gnosis* of the learned Hindus consists in regarding union *(Yoga)* with God as the highest aim of man, this doctrine is further developed in the philosophy of the Veda. The liberation following death is twofold. Such souls as have arrived at high perfection are admitted into the Brahmic heavens *(Svarga),* where they enjoy much higher happiness than in the

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

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

as the income of the pagoda will permit. In some of the temples there are as many as 3000 Brahmins. Their priestly duties consist in offering sacrifices and reading the Veda. The worship is accompanied by songs and dances from the two higher classes of dancing girls, the *Devadasis* and the *Natakas.*

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

Hindu Literature

SEE SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Hindu Philosophy

is divided into six systems or *(astra,* namely, the *Nyaya, Vaiseshika, Sankhyd, Yoga, Mimansa,* and *Vedanta.* The Sankhya and Yoga agree in

all essentials, except that the former is atheistic and the latter theistic. The systems generally unite on certain points:

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

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

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

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

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

6. All the systematists teach the eternity of matter.

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

Hindus, Modern

a term recently used to designate a class of Hindu reformers, who call themselves Brahmists, and represent a school of thought which originated fifty or sixty ago with Rammohun Roy, who undertook to reform

Hinduism on the basis of the *Veda* alone, the religion of which he held to be a pure theism. In 1846 they became dissatisfied with the Veda, and adopted Intuitionalism. They have planted societies throughout Bengal, Madras, the North-west Provinces, the Punjab, and Bombay. They ignore idol worship, caste, metempsychosis, and all Brahminical ceremonies. *The Tuttu Bodheney Press*, of Calcutta, has issued a great number of their publications (see Dr. Duff, in *Christian Work* for 1862; *Foreign Missions*, by Dr. Anderson). *SEE RAMMOHUN ROY*. (J. T. G.)

Hindustan

SEE INDIA.

Hinge

Picture for Hinge

(ryxa, *sir*, that upon which a door *revolves*, <20614>Proverbs 26:14; also *the pangs* of childbirth, <23308>Isaiah 13:8, etc.; also a *messenger*, <20617>Proverbs 13:17, etc.; tPo, *poth*, lit. zan *interstice*, put. for *pudenda. muliebra*, <23317>Isaiah 3:17; fig, *female hinges, i.e.* the eyes or parts with sockets, <11750>1 Kings 7:50). "Doors in the East turn rather on pivots than what we term hinges. They were. sometimes of metal, but generally of the same material as the door itself, and worked in sockets above and below in the door-frame. As the weight of the door rests on the lower pivot, it opens with much less ease than one moving on hinges, particularly when the lower socket becomes worn by the weight and friction." — Pict. *Bible*, note on <20614>Proverbs 26:14. "In Syria, and especially the Hauran, there are many ancient doors consisting of stone slabs with pivots carved out of the same piece, inserted in sockets above and below, and fixed during the building of the house. The allusion in <20614>Proverbs 26:14 is thus clearly explained. The hinges mentioned in <11750>1 Kings 7:50, were probably of the Egyptian kind, attached to the upper and lower sides of the door (Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 177; Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 22, 192; Maundrell, *Early Travels*, p. 447, 448 [Bohn]; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 210; Lord Lindsay, *Letters*, p. 292; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. 1, 15)." *SEE DOOR*.

Hinman, Clark F., D.D.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Kortright, Delaware Co., N. Y., Aug. 3,1819. He graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1839, and

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

Hin'nom

(Heb. *Hinnom',* µNhnæ, for µNjnæ, *gracious,* or for µnyhnæ, *abundant),* or, rather, BEN-HINNOM (µNhnæB, *son of Hinnom;* Sept. υἱὸς Ἐννόμ*;* also in the plur. "sons of Hinnom"), an unknown person (prob. one of the original Jebusites), whose name (perh. as resident) was given to the valley ("Valley of Hinnom," otherwise called "the valley of the son" or "children of Hinnom," AyGemNhnæ, or hAˆbyGe, or hAynhnæ]AyGe, variously rendered by the Sept. φάραγξ Ἐννόμ, or υἱοῦ Ἐννόμ, or Γαιέννα, <061816>Joshua 18:16; ἐν γῇ Βενέννομ, <142803>2 Chronicles 28:3; 33:6; τὸ πολυάνδριον υἱῶν υἱῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν., <243202>Jeremiah 19:2, 6), a deep and narrow ravine, with steep, rocky sides, on the southerly side of Jerusalem, separating Mount Zion on the south from the "Hill of Evil Counsel," and the sloping, rocky plateau of the "plain of Rephaim" on the north, taking its name, according to Stanley, from "some ancient hero, the son of Hinnom," having encamped in it *(S. and Pal.* p. 172). The earliest mention of the valley of Hinnom in the sacred writings is in <061508>Joshua 15:8, where the boundary line between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin is described with minute topographical accuracy, as passing along the-bed of the ravine from En-Rogel to the top of the mountain "that lieth before the valley westward," at the north end of the plain of Rephaim. It is described in <061816>Joshua 18:16 as on the south side of Jebusi, that is, Mount Zion, on which the ancient stronghold of the Jebusites stood. The valley obtained wide notoriety as the scene of the barbarous rites of Molech and Chemosh, first introduced

by Solomon, who built" a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem (Olivet); and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon" (<111107>1 Kings 11:7). The inhuman rites were continued by the idolatrous kings of Judah. A monster idol of brass was erected in the opening of the valley, facing the steep side of Olivet, and there the infatuated inhabitants of Jerusalem burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire-casting them, it is said, — into the red-hot arms of the idol (<240731>Jeremiah 7:31; <140333>2 Chronicles 28:3; 33:6). No spot could have been selected near the Holy City so well fitted for the perpetration of these horrid cruelties: the deep, retired glen, shut in by rugged cliffs, and the bleak mountain sides rising over all. The worship of Molech was abolished by Josiah, and the place dedicated to him was defiled by being strewn with human bones: "He defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to Molech and he brake in pieces the images, and cut down their groves, and filled their places with the bones of men" (<122310>2 Kings 23:10, 14). The place thus became ceremonially unclean; no Jew could enter it (<143404>2 Chronicles 34:4, 5). From this time it appears to have become the common cesspool of the city, into which its sewage was conducted, to be carried off by the waters of the Kidron, as well as a laystall, where all its solid filth was collected. It was afterwards a public cemetery, *SEE ACELDAMTA*, and the traveller who now stands in the bottom of this valley and looks up at the multitude of tombs in the cliffs above and around him, thickly dotting the side of Olivet, will be able to see with what wondrous accuracy the curse of Jeremiah has been fulfilled: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor The Valley of the Son of Hinnom, but The Valley of Slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no more place" (7, 32). We learn from Josephus that the last terrible struggle between the Jews and Romans took place here *(War, 6,* 8, 5); and here, too, it appears the dead bodies were thrown out of the city after the siege (5, 12, 7). The inhuman rites anciently practiced in the valley of Hinnom caused the latter Jews to regard it with feelings of horror and detestation. The Rabbins suppose it to be the gate of hell (Lightfoot, *Opera,* 2, 286); and the Jews applied the name given to the valley in some passages of the Sept. Γέεννα, to the place of eternal torment. Hence we find in Matthew 5, 22, "Whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός — *the Gehenna* of fire." The word is formed from the Hebrew μnh ayg, "Valley of Hinnom." *SEE HELL*. The valley was also called TOPHETH (<122310>2

Kings 23:10; 2Ki 23:13 Isaiah 30:33; 2Ki 24:7 Jeremiah 7:31), either from תפי, "spittle," and it would hence mean "a place to spit upon," or from התפת, "place of burning." *SEE TOPHET*.

Most commentators follow Buxtorf, Lightfoot, and others, in asserting that perpetual fires were kept up for the consumption of bodies of criminals, carcases of animals, and whatever else was combustible; but the rabbinical authorities usually brought forward in support of this idea appear insufficient, and Robinson declares (1, 274) that "there is no evidence of any other fires than those of Molech having been kept up in this valley," referring to Rosenmuller, *Biblisch. Geogr*. II, 1, 156, 164. For the more ordinary view, see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 2, 454; 4,41; Keil *on Kings* 2, 147, Clark's edit.; and: comp. 2Ki 23:13 Isaiah 30:33; 66:24. *SEE MOLOCH*. It is called, 2Ki 24:23 Jeremiah 2:23, "the valley," κατ ἐξοχήν, and perhaps "the valley of dead bodies," 21:40, and "the valley of vision," 2Ki 22:1 Isaiah 22:1, 5 (Stanley, S. *and* P. p. 172, 482). The name by which it is now known is (in ignorance of the meaning of the initial syllable) *Wady Jehennam, or Wady er-Rubeb* (Williams, *Holy City*, 1, 56, Supplem.), though in Mohammedan traditions the name Gehenna is applied to the Valley of Kedron (Ibn Batutah, 12, 4; Stanley, *ut sup.). SEE GEHENNA*.

The valley commences in a broad sloping basin to the west of the city, south of the Jaffa road (extending nearly to the brow of the great wady on the west), in the center of which, 700 yards from the Jaffa gate, is the large reservoir, supposed to be the "upper pool," or "Gihon", *SEE GIHON* (2Ki 23:18 Isaiah 7:3; 36:2; 2Ki 14:20 2 Chronicles 32:30), now known as *Birket el-Mamilla*. After running about; three quarters of a mile east by south, the valley takes a sudden bend to the south opposite the Jaffa gate, but in less than another three quarters of a mile it encounters; a rocky hill-side which forces it again in an easterly direction, sweeping round the precipitous south-west corner of Mount Zion almost at a right angle. In this part of its course the valley is from 50 to 100 yards broad, the bottom everywhere covered with small stones, and cultivated. At 290 yards from the Jaffa gate it is crossed by an aqueduct on nine very low arches, conveying water from the "pools of Solomon" to the Temple Mount, a short distance below which is the "lower pool" (2Ki 23:29 Isaiah 22:9), Birket es-Sultan. From this point the ravine narrows and deepens, and descends with great rapidity between broken cliffs, rising in successive terraces, honeycombed with innumerable sepulchral recesses, forming the northern face of the "Hill of

Evil Counsel," to the south, and the steep shelving, but not precipitous southern slopes of Mount Zion, which rise to about the height of 150 feet to the north. The bed of the valley is planted with olives and other fruit-trees, and, when practicable, is cultivated. About 400 yards from the south-west angle of Mount Zion the valley contracts still more, becomes quite narrow and stony, and descends with much greater rapidity towards the "valley of Jehoshaphat," or "of the brook Kidron," before joining which it opens out again, forming an oblong plot, the site of Tophet, devoted to gardens irrigated by the waters of Siloam. Towards the eastern extremity of the valley is the traditional site of "Aceldama," authenticated by a bed of white clay still worked by potters (Williams, *Holy City,* 2, 495), opposite to which, where the cliff is thirty or forty feet high, the tree on which Judas hanged himself was located during the Frankish kingdom. (Barclay, *City of Great King,* p. 208). Not far from Aceldama is. a conspicuously situated tomb with a Doric pediment, sometimes known as the "whited sepulcher," near which a large sepulchral recess, with a Doric portal hewn in. the native rock, is known as the "Latibulum anostolo-rum," where the Twelve are said to have concealed themselves during the time between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. The tombs continue quite down to the corner of the mountain, where it bends off to the south along the valley of Jehoshaphat. None of the sepulchral recesses in the vicinity of Jerusalem are so well preserved; most of these are very old-small gloomy caves, with narrow, rock-hewn doorways. *SEE JERUSALEM*.

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

Hinrichs, Hermann Friedrich Wilhelm

a German philosopher of the old Hegelian school, was born at Karlseck, in Oldenburg, August 22, 1794. In 1812 he entered the University of Strasburg as a student of theology, but changed for law in 1813 at Heidelberg. Here he studied under Creuzer and Hegel, and became a *privatdocent* in 1814. In 1822 he was called to the University of Breslan as a professor of philosophy. In 1824 Halle gave him a call, which he 'accepted, and here he remained until his death, August 17, 1861. The work which gave to him particular prominence as a Hegelian was his *Die*

Religion im mern Verhaltniss zur Wissenschaft (Heidelb. 1822), an essay that gained him a prize sustained by Hegel himself. — Brockhauls, *Cone. Lex. 7,* 933; Vapareau, *Dict. des Contemp.* p. 885. , (J. H. W.)

Hinton, Isaac Taylor

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

Hiouen-tsang

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

Hip

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

Hip

Picture for Hip

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

Hip-knob

SEE FINIAL.

Hipplcus

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

Hippo

in Africa, now called *Bona,* a maritime colony. (See Schaff, *Ch. Hist. 3,* 993, note 1.) A general council was held at this place in 393. Aurelius,

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

Hippoltus, St.

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

first half of the 3rd century. Photius states that he was a disciple of Ireneus; Baronius says, of Clement of Alexandria; two assertions which appear equally well grounded. Portius adds that Hippolytus was the intimate friend and zealous admirer of Orngen, and that he invited him to comment on the Scriptures, furnishing him for that purpose seven amanuenses to write under his dictation, and seven copyists. Hippolytus himself testifies to his acquaintance with Origen. As for the other details given by Photius, they are based on a misinterpretation of a passage in Jerome. According to this father, Ambrosius of Alexandria, struck with the reputation Hippolytus had acquired by his commentaries on the Scriptures, invited Origen to attempt the same task, and furnished him with a number of secretaries for that purpose. The martyrdom of St. Hippolytus is not mentioned by Eusebius. Jerome, Photius, and other writers, however, call him a martyr, and his name appears with that title in the Roman, Greek, Coptic, and Abyssinian calendars Yet these martyrolegies differ so much from each other that they appear rather to refer to different parties of the same name than to one individual only. Prudentius, a Christian poet of the 4th century, wrote a long poem on the martyrdom of St. Hippolytus, but it is evident that he also confounded several parties of that name, and his pious legend is devoid of all historical authority. The date of St. Hippolytus's death is very doubtful. It is generally believed to have occurred under Alexander Severus, yet it is well known that this prince did not persecute Christians. If we admit that the *Exhortatorius ad Severinam,* mentioned among Hippolytus's works, is the same which Theodoret states was addressed to a certain queen or empress *(*πρὸς βασιλίδα τινά), and, further, that this Severina, according to Döllinger (see below), was the wife of the emperor Philip the Arabian, this would bring the martyrdom of the saint to the time of Decius's persecution (about 250), and perhaps later. In that case, Hippolytus, having been a disciple of Irenneus, who died about 190, must have been quite advanced in age at the time of his death. It is generally supposed that he suffered martyrdom near Rome, probably at the mouth of the Tiber. According to general opinion, it is thought he was thrown into the sea with a stone tied around his neck. In 1551 a statue was discovered at Rome, near the church of St. Lorenzo, which appeared to date back to the 6th century, and represented a man in monastic garb, in a sitting posture. The inscription bore the name of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, and on the back of his seat was found inscribed the *canon* or *paschal cycle* which he introduced into Rome, and also a list of his principal-works. Some of these works, mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and other

ecclesiastical writers, or named on the statue, are yet extant, and we have extensive fragments of several others. A number of them have been published separately. Fabricius gave a complete collection of them under the title *S. Hippolyti, episcopi et martyris, Opera non antea collecta et partem nunc primum e MSS. in lucen edita, Greece et Latine* (Hamb. 1716-1718, fol.). This was reprinted, with additions by Galland, and inserted in his *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Venice, 1766, fol.), vol. 2. A collection of fragments of Syriac translations of Hippolytus is given in the *Analecta* of Lagarde. The same scholar, in an appendix to his *Analecta* (Lagardii *ad Analecta sua Syriaca Appendix* [Lips. 1858]), gives Arabic fragments of a commentary of Hippolytus on Revelation.

A recent discovery has directed general attention to this old ecclesiastical writer. In 1842 M. Mynoide Minas, on his return from a mission on which he had been sent by M. Villemain, minister of public instruction in France, brought back from Mount Athos, among other unpublished works, a mutilated Greek MS. of the 14th century, written on cotton paper, without name of author, and containing a *Refutation of all Heresies (*κατὰπασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος). This MS. was deposited in the Imperial Library at Paris, where it remained undisturbed until M. Emmanuel Miller found it to contain the last part of a treatise, the beginning of which was printed in the works of Origen. At Miller's request, the University of Oxford consented to publish it, under his direction, at their own press, with the title, ᾽Ωριγένους φιλοσόφούμενα ἢ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος *(Origenis Philosophumena sive omnium Haeresium Refutatiae* Codiae Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller [Oxford, 1851, 8vol.). This work attracted great attention among the theologians and philologists of Germany and France, as well as of England. The first argument published to show that Hippolytus was the author of the MS. may be found in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for October, 1851, in an article by professor J. L. Jacobi, of the University of Berlin. After proving that Origen was not the author, Jacobi shows that the writer was certainly *contemporary* with Origen. "He places himself in that age, and all his statements harmonize with this view. Taking him, then, to have lived in the first quarter of the 3rd century at the time of Zephyriuus, bishop of Rome, and of Cailistus, we should be led by Eusebius to identify him with the learned presbyter Caius, or with Hippolytus. It is easily shown, however, that Caius could not have been the author of the book, for he was *specially* distinguished for his writings against Cerinthus, and for his peculiar views with regard to that

Gnostic leader; while our author has nothing of his own to offer about Cerinthus, and borrows all that he does say (and that is not much), word for word, from Irenaeus. Caius ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus our author assigns it to the apostle John. The former was a strenuous opponent of the sensual Chiliasm; the latter, while he blames much in Montanism, does not include Chiliasm under it, and indeed it is more than probable that he was a friend of that doctrine." On the other hand, there are the following, among other reasons, for ascribing the work to Hippolytus.

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

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

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

The importance of this newly-discovered work of Hippolytus in the sphere of Church History and archaeology can hardly be overstated. It throws great light upon the Gnostic and other heretical sects of the early Church. Names and even facts are given of which we knew absolutely nothing before; while others that were held to be as unimportant as they were obscure are brought out into light and prominence, illuminating many dark nooks of Church History. The book tells us, for instance, of a Gnostic, by name Justin, of whom we had not before heard: and describes at length Monoiamos and the Peraticians, of whom we knew only the names. The

Simonians, and the strange, fragmentary, and enigmatical ideas generally attributed to Simon Magus, are here treated with something approaching to orderly and clear connection. That part of the work which treats of the *morals* of the Roman Church and of its clergy is full of interest. Hippolytus censures them for unchastity, and casts it up to them as a great reproach that many, even of the higher orders of clergy, were married-some of them more than once. His account of Callistus throws much light upon the state of society and of religion in Rome at the time. The work shows us also that the received doctrine of the Church at that time-a century before the Council of Nice-was the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the person of Christ. Its revelations are fatal, too, to many of the claims of the papacy. Romanist writers, therefore, have sought to invalidate the conclusions drawn by Jacobi, Bunsen, and the Protestants generally. Professor Döllinger seeks to refute the "calumnies" of the book against Callistus in his *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (Ratisb. 1853, 8vo), and to settle the question of the authorship of the *Philosophoumena.* He undertakes to show also from the character of the work itself that the author was not a Catholic, but a heretic, in the judgment of the Church of the age when he wrote it. The abbd Cruice, of Paris, published *Etudes sur les... Philosophoumena* (Paris, 1853, 8vo), to show that the book is neither genuine nor authentic; and he has since followed it up by his *Histoire de l'Eglise de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, St. Zephyrin, et St. Calliste* (Paris, 1856). He has also published an elegant edition of the *Philosophoumena,* with Latin version, notes, and indexes (Par. 1861, 8vo). The best edition of the work, however, is that of Duncker and Scheidewin (Göttingen, 1859, 8vo). Another edition, which embraces all the Greek works of Hippolytus, was published by Lagarde *(Hippolyti Romani quae feruntur omnia Grae,* Leips. 1858). The subject is very ably treated in its theological aspects, especially in their bearing on the Romish controversy, by Wordsworth, *Hippolytus and the Church of Rome* (London, 1852, 8vo). A very good account of the history and contents of the book, with an English translation of the most important parts, is given by Tayler, *Hippolytus and the Christian Church of the Third Century* (Lond. 1853, 12mo), and by Volkmar, *Hippolytus u. d. rom. Zeitgenossen* (Zurich, 1855). The leading reviews have generally given articles on the subject: see especially *Methodist Quarterly Review,* Oct. 1851; Jan. 1863, p. 160; *Quarterly Rev.* (Lond.) 89, 87; *Journ, of Sacred Literature, Jan.* 1853, and Jan. 1854; *N. Brit. Review,* Nov. 1854; *Edinburgh Review,* Jan. 1853; Ulgen, *Zeitschriftf. hist. Theolog.* 1842, 3:48-77; 1862, 2, 218; *Journal des*

Debats, Dec. 1852; Baur, *Theolog. Jahrbücher* (Tübingen, 1853); *Studien u. Kritiken,* by Gieseler (1853). Another important work ascribed to Hippolytus, a collection of canons, has lately been published for the first time, in an Arabic translation, by Dr. Hamberg *(Canones S. Hippolyti Arabiae e codicibus Romanis cum versione Latina, annotationibus et prolegomenis,* Munich, 1870). The collection contains thirty-eight canons, which are known to have been in use in the 12th century in the Coptic Church. Before this time no mention is made of this work by any ecclesiastical writer; but the editor regards this as no argument against its authenticity (which he defends), as all the works of Hippolytus had fallen into oblivion. In case it is genuine, its contents are of considerable importance for the history of Christian doctrines and on the constitution of the Christian Church.

Lipsius

in his work *Zur Quellenkritik der Epiphanios* (Vienna, 1865), has shown that the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two sects, the conclusion of which is still extant under the title of a homily against the heresy of Noetus, is the basis of the *Philosophoumena,* and can, to, a large extent, be reconstructed from it. See also Schaff, *Church History,* vol. 1, § 125; Hare, *Contest with Rome,* p. 214; Neander, *History of Dogmas,* 1, 51; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 1, 66 sq.; Lardner, *Works,* 2, 409 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop. 6:*131 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24,* 777 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia,* 5, 376; and, for the Roman Catholic side, Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lexikonv* 5, 210 sq.; *Allgem. Real-Encyklop. d. Kathol. Deutschland,* 5, 374. Early monographs on Hippolytus were written by Frommann, *Intempret. New Test. ex Hippol.* (Coblentz, 1765, 4to); C. G. Hianell, *De Hippol.* (Götting. 1838, 8vo); Heumann, *Ubi et qualis episcop fuerit Hippolytus* (Götting. 1737, 4to); Woog, *Fragment. Hippolyti Martyris* (Lips. 1762, 4to). On the earlier writings of Hippolytus, see Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature,* 1, 158; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. 6,* 20-23; Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History,* 2, 35; Tillemont, *Memoires,* etc., 3, 104; Neander, *Ch. Hist,* cent. 3 pt. 2, ch. 2, § 7.

Hippolytus, Brothers (or Hospital Monks) of the Christian Love of

Picture for Hippolytus

a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, established about 1585 by Bernardin Alvarez, a citizen of Mexico, for nursing the sick. It was sanctioned by the popes Sixtus V and Clement VIII, and received the same rights as the order of Brothers of Charity which had been established by St. Johannes a Deo, and with which it had statutes, aim, and dress in common. It only differs from it by the color of the monastic dress. The order was named after the patron saint of the city of Mexico, in commemoration of the fall of paganism, and the capture of the city of Mexico by the Christians on the day of St. Hippolytus (August 13). It never spread beyond Spanish America. (A. J. S.)

Hippopotamus

an animal regarded by Bochart *(Hieroz. 3,* 705), Ludolf *(Hist. Aethiop. 1,* 11), Shaw *(Trav.* 2, 299, Lond. 8vo), Scheuzer *(Phys. Sac.* on Job 40), Rosenmuller *(Not. ad Bochart. Hieroz. 3,* 705, and *Schol. ad Vet. Test.* in Job 40), Taylor *(Appendix to Calmet's Dict. Bibl.* No. 65), Harmer *(Observations,* 2, 319), Gesenius *(Thes.* s.v. t/mhB), Fürst *(Concord. Heb.* s.v.), and English commentators generally, as being designated by the Heb. word t/mhB] *(behemoth'* in <1805>Job 40:15), by which, however, some writers, as Vatablus, Drusius, Grotils *(Crit. Sac. Annotationis ad Job.* 40), Pfeiffer *(Dubia vexata S.* S., p. 594, Dresden, 1679), Castell *(Lex. Hept.* p. 292), A. Schultens *(Comment. in Job.* 40), Michaelis *(Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* No. 208), have understood the elephant; while others, again, amongst whom is Lee *(Comment. on Job. 40:*and *Lex. Heb. s.v.* t/mhB), consider the Hebrew term as a plural noun for "cattle" in general; it being left to the reader to apply to the scriptural allusions the particular animal, which may be, according to Lee, "either the horse, or wild ass, or wild bull"(!). Compare also Reiske, *Conjecture in Job.* p. 167. Dr. Mason Good *(Book of Job literally translated,* p. 473, Lond. 1712) has hazarded a conjecture that the *behemoth* denotes some extinct pachyderm like the mammoth, with a view to combine the characteristics of the hippopotamus and elephant, and so to fulfill all the scriptural demands. Compare with this Michaelis (Sup. *ad Lex. Heb.* No. 208), and Hasaeus (in *Dissertat. Syllog.*

No. 7, § 37, and § 38, p. 506), who rejects with some scorn the notion of the identity of behemoth and mammoth. Dr. Kitto *(Pict. Bib.* Job 40) and Colonel Hamilton Smith (Kitto's *Cycl. Bib. Lit.* art. Behemoth). from being unable to make *all* the scriptural details correspond with any one particular animal, are of opinion that behemoth is a plural term, and is to be taken as a poetical personification of the great pachydermata generally, wherein the idea of hippopotamus is predominant. The term *behemoth* would thus be the counterpart of *leviathan,* the animal mentioned next in the book of Job; which word, although its signification in that passage is restricted to the crocodile, does yet stand in Scripture for a python, or a whale, or some other huge monster of the deep. *SEE LEVIATHAN*. According to the Talmud, behemoth is some huge land-animal which daily consumes the grass off a thousand hills; he is to have, at some future period, a battle with leviathan. On account of his grazing on the mountains, he is called "the bull of the high mountains." (See Lewysohn, *Zool. des Talmuds,* p. 355). "The 'fathers,' for the most part," says Cary (Job, p. 402), "surrounded the subject with an awe equally dreadful, and in the behemoth here, and in the leviathan of the next chapter, saw nothing but mystical representations of the devil: others, again, have here pictured to themselves some hieroglyphic monster that has no real existence; but these wild imaginations are surpassed by that of Bolducius, who in the behemoth actually beholds Christ!"

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

excidisse"). Many critics, Rosenmüller amongst the number, believe the word is the *plural majestatis* of hmhB] But in that case it would hardly be employed with a verb or adj. in the *singular*, and that *masc.*, as it is.

Picture for Hippopotamus 1

2. A careful examination of the text shows that *all* the details descriptive of the behemoth accord entirely with the ascertained habits of that animal. Gesenius and Rosenmüller have remarked that, since in the first part of Jehovah's discourse (Job 38, 39) land *animals and birds* are mentioned, it suits the general purpose of that discourse better to suppose that *aquatic or amphibious* creatures are spoken of in the last half of it; and that since the leviathan, by almost universal consent, denotes the crocodile, the behemoth seems clearly to point to the hippopotamus, his associate in the Nile. Harmer *(Observations,* 2, 319) says, "There is a great deal of beauty in arranging the descriptions of the behemoth and the leviathan, for in the Mosaic pavement the people of an Egyptian bark are represented as darting spears or some such weapons at one of the river-horses, as another of them is pictured with two sticking near his shoulders… It was then a customary thing with the old Egyptians thus to attack these animals (see also Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3. 71); if so, how beautiful is the arrangement: there is a most happy gradation; after a grand but just representation of the terribleness of the river-horse, the All mighty is represented as going on with his expostulations something after this manner: "But dreadful as this animal is, barbed irons and spears have sometimes prevailed against him; but what wilt thou do with the crocodile? Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?" — etc. In the *Lithostrotun Praenestinum,* to which Mr. Harmer refers, there are two crocodiles, associates of three river-horses, which are represented without spears sticking in them. though they seem to be within shot. Behemoth "eateth grass as an ox" (Job 40:15) — a circumstance which is noticed as peculiar in an animal of aquatic habits; this is strictly true of the hippopotamus, which leaves the water by night, and feeds on vegetables and green crops. Its strength is enormous, ver. 16, 18, and the notice of the power of the muscles of the belly, "his force is in the navel of his belly," appears to be strictly correct. The tail, however, is short, and it must be conceded that the first part of verse 17, "he moveth his tail like a cedar," seems not altogether applicable. His mode of attack is with his mouth, which is armed with a formidable array of teeth, projecting incisors, and enormous curved canines; thus "his Creator offers him a

sword," for so the words in ver. 19 may be rendered. But the use of his sword is mainly for pacific purposes, "the beasts of the field playing" about him as he feeds; the hippopotamus being a remarkably inoffensive animal. "With these apparently combined teeth the hippopotamus can cut the grass as neatly as if it were mown with the scythe, and is able to sever, as if with shears, a tolerably thick and stout stem" (Wood's *Nat. Hist.* 1, 762). brj, is perhaps the Greek ἅρπη. See Bochart (3, 722), who cites Nicander *(Theriac.* 566) as comparing the tooth of this animal to a scythe. The next verse explains the purpose and use of the "scythe" with which God has provided his creature, viz., in order that he may eat the grass of the hills. His retreat is among the lotuses *(tzelin;* A.V. "shady trees"), which abounded about the Nile, and amid the reeds of the river. Thoroughly at home in the water, "if the river riseth, he doth not take to flight; and he cares not if a Jordan (here an appellative for a 'stream') press on his mouth." Ordinary means of capture were ineffectual against the great strength of this animal. "Will any take him before his eyes?" (i.e. openly, and without cunning); "will any bore his nose with a gin?" as was usual with large animals. Though now no longer found in the lower Nile, it was formerly common there (Wilkinson, 1, 239). The method of killing it in Egypt was with a spear, the animal being in the first instance secured by a lasso, and repeatedly struck until it became exhausted (Wilkinson, 1, 240); the very same method is pursued by the natives of South Africa at the present day (Livingstone, p. 73; instances of its great strength are noticed by the same writer, p. 231, 232, 497). The skin of the hippopotamus is cut into whips by the Dutch colonists of South Africa, and the monuments of Egypt testify that a similar use was made of the skin by the ancient Egyptians (A*nc. Egypt. 3,* 73). The inhabitants of South Africa hold the flesh of the hippopotamus in high esteem; it is said to be not unlike pork.

Picture for Hippopotamus 2

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

(1.) The 20th verse, for instance, where it is said "the mountains bring him forth food." This passage, many writers say, suits the elephant well, but cannot be applied to the hippopotamus, which is never seen on mountains. In answer to this objection, it has been stated, with great reason, that the word *hàrim* (µyrhæ) is not necessarily to be restricted to what we understand commonly by the expression "mountains." In the Palestine

pavement alluded to above there are to be seen here and there, as Mr. Harmer has observed, “hillocks rising above the water.” In ⁂Ezekiel 43:15 (margin), the altar of God, only ten cubits high and fourteen square, is called “the mountain of God.” “The eminences of Egypt, which appear as the inundation of the Nile decreases, may undoubtedly be called *mountains* in the poetical language of Job.” But we think there is no occasion for so restricted an explanation. The hippopotamus, as is well known, frequently leaves the water and the river’s bank as night approaches, and makes inland excursions for the sake of the pasturage, when he commits sad work among the growing crops (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 188). No doubt he might often be observed on the hillsides near the spots frequented by him. Again, it must be remembered that the “mountains” are mentioned by way of contrast with the natural habits of aquatic animals generally, which never go far from the water and the banks of the river; but the behemoth, though passing much of his time in the water and in “the covert of the reed and fens,” eateth grass like cattle, and feedeth on the hill-sides in company with the beasts of the field. According to a recent traveler in Egypt, the Rev. J. L. Errington, “the valley of the Nile in Upper Egypt and Nubia is in parts so very narrow, that the mountains approach within a few hundred yards, and even less, to the river’s bank; the hippopotamus, therefore, might well be said to get its food from the mountains, on the sides of which it would grow.” There is much beauty in the passages which contrast the habits of the hippopotamus, an amphibious animal, with those of herbivorous land-quadrupeds; but if the elephant is to be understood, the whole description is, comparatively speaking, tame.

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

(3.) The expression in verse 17, “he bendeth his tail like a cedar,” has given occasion to much discussion; some of the advocates for the elephant maintaining that the word *zânâb* (בְּנָב) may denote either extremity, and

that here the elephant's trunk is intended. The parallelism, however, clearly requires the posterior appendage to be signified by the term. The expression seems to allude to the stiff, unbending nature of the animal's tail, which in this respect is compared to the trunk — of a strong cedar, which the wind scarcely moves.

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

Hippos

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

Hi'rah

(Heb. *Chirach',* hryjæ*nobility;* Sept. εἰράς*)*, an Adullamite and friend of Judah (<012801>Genesis 28:1,12; comp. ver. 20). B.C. cir. 1896-1876.

Hi'ram

(Heb. *Chiram',* µryjæ*high-born;* generally written "Huram," µrWj, *Chramz',* in Chronicles, and "Hirom," µ/ryjæ*Chirom,'* in <110510>1 Kings 5:10, 18; 7, 40; Sept. Χειράμ or Χιράμ*;* Joseph. Εἴραμος and Εἴρωμος), the name of three men.

1. HURAM (Sept. makes two names, Ἀχιρὰν καὶ Ἰωίμ), the last named of the sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:5). B.C. post 1856.

2. HIRAM, HURAM, or HIROM, king of Tyre at the commencement of David's reign. He sent an embassy to felicitate David on his accession, which led to an alliance, or strengthened a previous friendship between them. It seems that the dominion of this prince extended over the western slopes of Lebanon; and when David built himself a palace, Hiram materially assisted the work by sending cedar-wood from Lebanon, and able workmen to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:11; 1 Chronicles 14:1). B.C. cir. 1044. It was probably the same prince who sent to Jerusalem an embassy of condolence and congratulation when David died and Solomon succeeded, and who contracted with the new king a more intimate alliance than ever before or after existed between a Hebrew king and a foreign prince. The alliance seems to have been very substantially beneficial to both parties, and without it Solomon would scarcely have been able to realize all the great designs he had in view. In consideration of large quantities of corn, wine, and oil furnished by Solomon, the king of Tyre agreed to supply from Lebanon the timber required for the Temple, to float it along the coast, and deliver it at Joppa, which was the port of Jerusalem (1 Kings 5:1 sq.; 9:10 sq.; 1 Chronicles 2:3 sq.). The vast commerce of Tyre made gold very plentiful there; and Hiram supplied no less than 500 talents to Solomon for the ornamental works of the Temple, and received in return twenty towns in Galilee, which, when he came to inspect them, pleased him so little that he applied to them a name of contempt, and restored them to the Jewish king (2 Chronicles 8:2). *SEE CABUL*. It does not, however, appear that the good understanding between the two kings was broken by this unpleasant circumstance, for it was after this that Hiram suggested, or at least took part in, Solomon's traffic to the Eastern Seas, which certainly could not have been undertaken by the Hebrew king without his assistance in providing ships and experienced mariners' (1 Kings 9:27; 10:11, etc.; 2 Chronicles 8:18; 9:10, etc.). B.C. cir. 1010. *SEE OPHIR*; *SEE SOLOMON*.

Josephus has preserved a valuable fragment of the history of Mercander, a native of Ephesus, relating to the intercourse of Hiram and Solomon. professedly taken from the Syrian archives *(Apion,* 1, 18). "After the death of Abibalus, Hiromus, his son, succeeded him in his kingdom, and reigned thirty-four years, having lived fifty-three. He laid out that part of the city

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

sinned by pride, and was thrust down into hell. Eupolemon (Euseb. *Praep. Evang. 9,* 30) states that David, after a war with Hiram, reduced him to the condition of a tributary prince. *SEE DAVID*.

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

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

Picture for Hiram

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

1833) only five years before." (See also Thomson, *Lond and Book,* 1, 290 sq.)

3. The son of a widow of the tribe of Dan, and of a Tyrian father. He was sent by the king of the same name to execute the principal works of the interior of the Temple, and the various utensils required for the sacred services (<110713>1 Kings 7:13, 14, 40). We recognize in the enumeration of this man's talents by the king of Tyre a character common in the industrial history of the ancients (comp. those of Bezaleel, <023103>Exodus 31:3-5), namely, a skilful artificer, knowing all the arts, or at least many of those arts which we practice, in their different branches. *SEE HANDICRAFT*. It is probable that he was selected for this purpose by the king from among others equally gifted, in the notion that his half Hebrew blood would render him the more acceptable at Jerusalem. B.C. cir. 1010. He is called "Huram" in 2. Chronicles 2:13; 4:11, 16; and "Hirom" in the margin of <110740>1 Kings 7:40. In <141213>2 Chronicles 2:13, ybæ;µr₩j is rendered "Huram my father's;" so in, <141416>2 Chronicles 4:16, wybæ;µr₩j is rendered "Huram his father;" where, however, the words ybæ;and wybæcan hardly belong to the name, but are appellations; so that *"Huram my (oa, his) father"* seems to mean *Huramo my counselor,* i.e., *foreman,* or *master-workman.*

Hirca'nus

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

The name of Hyrcanus occurs at a later period under the: Maccabees. It has been thought. that it was adopted on account: of a victory gained by John, the son and successor of Simon Maccabaeus, over the Hyrcanians (Euseb. *Chronicles* lib. 2; Sulp. Severus, *Hist. Sacr*. lib. 2, c. 26). Josephus

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

Hireling

(rykæ; *sakir'*; μισθωτός), a laborer who, is employed on hire for a limited time (<18701>Job 12:1; 14:6; <41020>Mark 1:20). By the Mosaic law such a one was to be paid his wages as soon as his work was over (<31913>Leviticus 19:13). The little interest which would be felt by such a temporary laborer, compared with that of the shepherd or permanent keeper of the flock, furnish a striking illustration in one of our Lord's discourses (<43012>John 10:12, 13). The working day in the East begins with the rising of the sun, and ends when it sets. The parable in <40201>Matthew 20:1-14, is interesting, not only as showing what were the day's wages of a laborer at this period in Judaea, "a penny," i.e. the Roman *denarius*, about fifteen cents of our money, but also as showing that the salvation of the Gentiles can in itself become no impediment to the Jews; and as eternal life is the free gift of God, he has a right to give it in whatever proportions, at whatever times, and on whatever conditions he pleases. *SEE SERVANT*; *SEE WAGES*, etc.

Hirmologion

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

Hirmos

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

Hirnheim or Hirnhaym, Hieronymus,

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

Hirom

SEE HIRAM.

Hirsch, Andreas

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

Hirsch, Carl Christian

a German theologian, was born at Hersbruck October 20,1704. He studied at Altorf, Leipzig, and other universities, and went to the theological seminary at Nuremberg in 1729. He entered the ministry in 1734, and in 1740 was appointed deacon of Lorenz Church at Nuremberg. He died Feb.

27, 1754. His works are: *Hadriani Pontii Historiae Libri rariomres: — Venerab. Agnetis Blamabeck in Vita et Revelationes* (Frankf. and Leip. 1735): — *Catechismus Histo*:rice (Nurnb. 1752, 8vo): — *Lebensbeschreib. aller Geistlichen Niirnbergs* (continued by Wüffel and Waldau, published ‘in 1756-1785, 4to): to this work he devoted his time mainly. He also wrote a number of monographs inserted in the *Acta Histor. eccles.* and in the *Acta Scholast.* of Nuremberg. Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Append. 2, 2021; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24,* 793; Döring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl.* 1, 738.

Hirsch-Chotsch, Zebi, ben-Jerachmiel

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

Hirschau or Hirsau

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

Hirscher, Johann Baptist von

a celebrated German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Alt-Ergarten, Würtemberg, Jan. 20, 1788. He was educated at the Lyceum of Constance and at the University of Freiburg, and was made a priest in 1810. He held the position of instructor in philosophy and theology in different institutions until 1817, when he was called as professor of ethical and pastoral theology to the University of Tübingen. In 1837 he was called to the University of Freiburg, and in 1839 he became a member of the cathedral chapter of the archdiocese of Freiburg. He was also appointed an "ecclesiastical counselor," and, somewhat later, a privy counselor *(Geheim-Rath).* In 1849 he was delegate of the University of Freiburg in the First Chamber of the grand duchy of Baden, into which he was subsequently several times called by the confidence of the grand duke. In 1850 he became dean of the cathedral chapter. In 1863 he resigned his position at the university on account of ill health. He died Sept. 4,1865. Hirscher was one of the representative men of Roman Catholic theology in the 19th century. At the beginning of his literary career he was a zealous advocate of liberal reforms within his Church; subsequently he gradually became, with Mihler (q.v.), Drey (q.v.), and other professors of Tübingen, a more outspoken champion of the tenets of his Church in opposition to Protestantism, and joined his colleagues as founder and co-editor of the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (established 1819), one of the ablest theological organs of the Church of Rome. But, though a prolific and prominent writer in behalf of his Church, he continued, even in later life, to favor the introduction of some reforms, as the admission of the laity to diocesan synods, and laid, in general, greater stress on those points which the Roman Catholic Church has in common with orthodox Protestantism than on those which separate the two churches. He remained an opponent of Ultramontane theories, and was therefore, up to his death, the object of many attacks on the part of Ultramontane writers. Several of his earlier works, in particular the one entitled *De Missa* (Tübingen, 1821; German. transl. Baden, 1838), in which he advocated the use of the Latin language at divine service, were put in the Roman *Index.* The chief aim of most of his works is to represent the doctrines of his Church, especially those most offensive to Protestants and liberal Roman Catholics, in as favorable a light as possible. The most important among his works are *Ansichten von dem Jubilsum* (Tüb. 1826), the second edition of which appeared under the title *Die Lehre vom kathol. Ablass* (6th edit. Tüb. 1855): — *Gesch. Jesu*

Christi (Tüb. 1840; 2nd edit. *1845): — Katechetik* (4th edit. Tüb. 1840): — *Betrachtungen fiber saimmliche Evangelien der Fasten* (Tüb. 1848): — *Die kirchl. Zustlnde d. Gegenwart* (Tüb. *1848): — Die christl. Moral* (Tüb. 1835, 3 vols.; 5th ed. 1850-1851): — *Beiträge zur Homiletik u. Katechetik* (Tüb. 1852): — *Betrachtunan über die sonntiag lichen Evangelien des Kirchenjahres* (5th edit. Tüb. 1853, 2 vols.): — *Erörterungen fiber die grossen religiosen Fragen der Gegenwart* (3 numbers; 3rd ed. Freib. 1846-1857): — *Hauptstiicke des christkath. Glaubens* (Tüb. 1857): *Katechismus* (Freib. 1842, and many edit. since): — *Betrachtungen uoer sämmiliche sonntigl. Episteln* (Freiburg, 1860-1862, 2 vols.): — *Das Leben farice* (5th edit. Freib. 1865). He took a special interest in the education of poor and abandoned children, himself establishing three houses of refuge. He wrote on this subject the work — *Die Sorge fur die sittlich verwahrlosten Kinder* (Freib. 1856). A volume of minor posthumous works *(Nachgyelassene kleinere Schriften,* Freib. 1868) has been published by Rollfuss. This work contains also a biography of Hirscher. — Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* transl. by Smith, 2, 457; Hase, *Church History,* transl. by Blumenthal and Wing, p. 654; *Allgeem. Real-Encyklop. 7,* 128. (A. J. S.)

Hirt, Johann Friedrich

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

continued, under the title *Wittenb. Oriental. und-exeget. Biblioth.*, Jena, 1776-1779,4 vols. *8vo). — Jocher ,Gelehrt Lex.* Addend. 2, 2022; Döring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutsch.* 1, 740 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Géneralé, 24,* 795. — (J. H. W.)

Hirz, Naphthall, ben-Jacob-Elchanan

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

Hirzel, Bernhard

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

Hirzel, Johann Heinrich

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

Hiss

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

Histopedes

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

Histories

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

History

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

1. It is evident, however, that the Hebrew people were a *commemorative race;* in other words, they were given to creating and presenting memorials of important events. Even in the patriarchal times we find monuments set up in order to commemorate events. Jacob (Genesis 28:18) "set up a pillar" to perpetuate the memory of the divine promise; and that these

monuments had a religious import and sanction appears from the statement that “he poured oil upon the top of the pillar” (see <0345>Genesis 31:45; <0409>Joshua 4:9; <0912>1 Samuel 7:12; <0916>Judges 9:6). Long-lived trees, such as oaks and terebinths, were made use of as remembrancers (<0504>Genesis 35:4; <0626>Joshua 24:26). Commemorative names, also, were given to persons, places, and things; and from the earliest periods it was usual to substitute a new and descriptive name for an old one, which may in its origin have been descriptive too (Exodus 2, 10; Genesis 2, 23; 4:1). Genealogical tables appear, moreover, to have had a very early existence among the people of whom the Bible speaks, being carefully preserved first memoriter, afterwards by writing, among family treasures, and thus transmitted from age to age. These, indeed, as might be expected, appear to have been the first beginnings of history-a fact which is illustrated and confirmed by the way in which what we should term a narrative or historical sketch is spoken of in the Bible, that is, as “the book of the generation” (“of Adam,” Genesis 5, 1): a mode of speaking which is applied even to the account of the creation (<0204>Genesis 2:4), “These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created.” The genealogical tables in the Bible (speaking generally) are not only of a very early date, but are free from the mixtures of a theogonical and cosmogonical kind which are found in the early literature of other primitive nations, wearing the appearance of being, as far at least as they go, true and complete lists of individual and family descent (<0501>Genesis 5:1). But perhaps the most remarkable fact connected with this subject is the employment of poetry at a very early period to perpetuate a knowledge of historical events. Even in <0423>Genesis 4:23, in the case of Lamech, we find poetry thus employed, that is, by the great-grandson of the primitive father. Other instances may be found in Exodus 15; Judges 5; <0613>Joshua 10:13; <1018>2 Samuel 1:18.

2. The sources of Biblical history are chiefly the Biblical books themselves. Any attempt to fix the precise value of these sources in a critical point of view would require a volume instead of an article. Whatever hypothesis, however, may eventually be held touching the exact time when these books, or any of them, were put into their actual shape, as also touching the materials out of which they were formed, one thing appears very certain, that (to take an instance) Genesis, the earliest book (probably), contains most indubitable, as well as most interesting historical facts; for though the age, the mode of life, and the state of culture differ so widely

from our own, we cannot do otherwise than feel that it is among men and women, parents and children-beings of like passions with ourselves-and not with mere creations of fancy or fraud, that we converse when we peruse the narratives which this composition has so long preserved. The conviction is much strengthened in the minds of those who, by personal acquaintance with the early profane writers, are able to compare their productions with those of the Hebrews, which were long anterior, and must, had they been of an equally earthly origin, have been at least equally deformed by fable. The simple comparison of the account given in Genesis of the creation of the world with the Cosmogonies of heathen writers, whether Hindu, Greek, or Latin, is enough to assure the impartial reader that a purer, if not a higher influence, presided over the composition of Genesis than that whence proceeded the legends or the philosophies of heathenism; nor is the conclusion in the slightest degree weakened on a closer scrutiny by any discrepancy which modern science may seem to show between its own discoveries and the statements in Genesis. The Biblical history, as found in its Biblical sources, has a decided peculiarity and a great recommendation hi the fact that we can trace in the Bible more clearly and fully than in connection with any other history, the first crude elements and the early materials out of which all history must be constructed.

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

Without writing, history, properly so called, can have no existence. Under the head WRITING we shall trace the early rudiments and progress of that important art: here we merely remark that an acquaintance with it was

possessed by the Hebrews at least as early as their Exodus from Egypt-a fact which shows at least the possibility that the age of the Biblical records stands some thousand years or more prior to the earliest Greek historian, Herodotus.

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

The Talmud and the Rabbins afford very little assistance for the early periods, but might probably be made to render more service in behalf of the times of the Savior than has generally been allowed. The illustrations; which Lightfoot and Wetstein have drawn from these sources are of great value; and Gfrorer, in his *Jahrhundert des Heils* (Stuttgart, 1838), has made ample use of the materials they supply in order to draw a picture of the first century, a use which the learned author is at: no small pains to justify. The compilations of the Jewish doctors, however, require to be employed with the greatest caution, since the Rabbins were the depositories, the expounders, and the apologists of that corrupt form of the primitive faith and of the Mosaic institutions which has been called by the distinctive name of Judaism, comprising a heterogeneous mass of false and true things, the colluvies of the East as well as light from the Bible, and which, to a great extent, lies under the express condemnation of Christ himself. How easy it is to propagate fables on their authority, and to do a disservice to the Gospel records, may be learnt from the fact that older writers, in their undue trust of Rabbinical authority, went so far as to maintain that no cock was allowed to be kept in Jerusalem, because fowls. scratched unclean things out of the earth, though the authority of Scripture (which in this case they refused to admit) is most express and decided

(<4026>Matthew 26:34; <4140>Mark 14:30, 60, 72). On the credibility. of the Rabbins, see Ravii *Diss. Phil. Theol. de eo quod Fidei merentur,* etc., in Oelrich's *Collect. Opusc. Hist. Phil. Theol.;* Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 1095; Fabricius, *Bibliog. Anti. 1, 3,* 4; Brunsmann, *Diss. de Judaica* (Hafnie, 1705).

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

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

The subject matter contained in the Biblical history is of a wide and most extensive nature. In its greatest length and fullest meaning it comes down from the creation of the world till near the close of the 1st century of the Christian sera, thus covering a space of some 4000 years. The books presenting this long train of historical details are most diverse in age, in kind, in execution, and in worth; nor seldom is it the fact that the modern

historian has to construct his narrative as much out of the implications of an epistle, the highly-colored materials of poetry, the far-reaching visions of prophecy, and the indirect and illusive information of didactic and moral precepts, as from the immediate and express statements of history strictly so denominated.

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

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

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

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

4. Biblical history was often treated by the older writers as a part of Church History in general, since they considered the history given in the Bible as presenting different and successive phases of the Church of God (Buddei *Hist. Eccles.* 2 vols. 1726-29; Stolberg, *Gesch. der Religio Jesu,* 1, 111). Other writers have viewed this subject in a more practical light, presenting the characters found in the Bible for imitation or avoidance; among whom may be enumerated Hess *(Geschichte der Israeliten vor dlen Zeiten Jesu,* Zurich, 1775) and Niemeyer *(Characteristik der Bibel,* Halle,

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

German theologians are strongly imbued with the feeling that the history of the Hebrews has yet to be written. Niebuhr's manner of treating Roman history has had a great influence on them, and has aroused the theological world to new efforts, which have by no means yet come to an end; nor can we add that they have hitherto led to very definite and generally approved results. The works of the learned Jews, Jost *(Gesch. der Israeliten seit der Maccabaer,* 9 vols; *Gesch. des Judenthums und Seiner Sekten,* 1857-59,3 vols.), Herzfeld *(Gesch. d. Volkes Israel v. d. Vollendung des Zweiten*

Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mckabaers Schimen 1854-57, 2 vols. 8vo), Gratz *(Geschichte d. Juden,* 11 vols. 8vo, not yet completed), as well as that of Nork *(Das Leben Mosis vom A stron. Stand. betrachtet,* 1838), Raphall *(Post-bibl. History of the Jews,* N.Y. 1855, of which vols. 1 and 2 only ever appeared), and others, must not be overlooked by the professional student; nor will he fail, to study with care the valuable introductions to the knowledge of the Old Testament put forth in Germany, with which we have nothing comparable in our language. *SEE INTRODUCTION*. Of the more recent works we may mention Stahelin's *Kritisch Untersuchungyee über den Pentateuch,* etc. (1843), and Io Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus* (Götting. 1843 sq., 1851-3, 6 vols. 8vo), the first part of which has been translated into English (London. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo). The latter especially is learned, acute, and profound, but thoroughly pervaded by a rationalistic spirit. Kurtz's *Manual of Sacred History* (Philadel. 1858,12mo; from the German, Kinigsberg, 1850, 8vo), and *History of the Old Covenant* (Edinburgh, 1859, 3 vols. 8vo; from the German, Berlin, 1848-55, 3 vols. 8vo), are more evangelical, but less searching and original. Weber und Holtzmann's *Gesc. d. Volkes Israel* (Leipz. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo) is rationalistic. The latest is Hitzig's *Gesch. Isr.* (Lpz. 1870). For other works, see Darling, *Cyclopedia,* col. 1830 sq.

History, Church

SEE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

History of Doctrines

SEE DOCTRINES, HISTORY OF.

Histriomastix

is the name of a book written in 1663 by William Prynne, a Puritan barrister, against plays, masks, dancing, etc. It is a thick quarto of 1006 pages, and abounds with learning and curious quotations. The author of this work was arraigned before the Star Chamber Feb. 7, 1663, on account of passages which, it was alleged, reflected on the religious conduct of the royal house. But the fact was that the author condemned, and that justly, the levity and voluptuousness of the court, and the encouragement which even some of the prelates gave to its licentiousness. Prynne was sentenced" to have his book burned by the hands of the common hangman, to be put

from the bar, and to be forever incapable of his profession, to be turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and to suffer perpetual imprisonment." But more remarkable than this, if possible, was the violent speech of an English earl (Dorset) on this occasion. "I declare you (Prynne) to be a schism maker in the Church, a. sedition sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, omnium malorum nequissimus," continuing in this strain, and closing thus: "I would have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off." Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 1, 316, 317; Wood, *Athenae Oxon.* 2, 315; Granger, *Biog. Hist.* 2, 230; Carwithen, *History of the Church of England,* 2, 78-80. (J. H.W.)

Hitchcock, Edward, D.D., LL.D.

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

Theologian;" and 11:776-800, "Special Divine Interpositions in Nature"). Dr. William S. Tyler, professor in Amherst College, who preached a discourse at Dr. Hitchcock's funeral, which has been printed, gave "an admirable estimate and summary of his life, character, attainments, and influence." — Appleton's *Cyclop. 9*, 210, and *Annual*, 1868, p. 1428; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 379; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July 1864, p. 528.

Hitchcock, Enos, D.D.

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

Hitchcock, Gad, D.D.

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

Hitt, Daniel

a Methodist Episcopal minister of considerable eminence, was born in Fauquier County, Va., entered the itinerancy in 1790, became the traveling companion of bishop Asbury in 1807, and in 1808 was elected by the General Conference one of the agents of the Methodist Book Concern, the duties of which office he discharged for eight years. He next, with great fidelity, served as presiding elder until 1822, when he became the traveling companion of bishop M'Kendreee In 1823 he took charge of the Potomac

District; after two years' labors he passed to the Carlisle District, and there closed his earthly work. Mr. Hitt was a man of marked "simplicity and integrity," and "the affability of his manners and the sweetness of his disposition, in his private intercourse in society, gained him the affection of all." He died of typhus fever, in great peace and sure hope, in September 1825. — *Minutes of Conf.* 1, 507.

Hit'tite, or rather Chethite

(Heb. *Chitti'*, yTij;x]usually in the plur. µyTij;x]Sept. Χεττῖοι*;* also t j e ynB;], "children of Heth;" fem. tyTij;x]e<26003>Ezekiel 16:3; plur. t/YTij;x]e<11101>1 Kings 11:1; also t j et/nB;] "daughters of Heth," <01246>Genesis 27:46), the designation of the descendants of Heth, and one of the nations of Canaan (q.v.).

I. *Biblical Notices.* —

(1.) With five exceptions, noticed below, the word is yTij;x]=the Chittite;" in the singular number, according to the common Hebrew idiom.. It is occasionally rendered in the A.V. in the singular number," the Hittite" (<02338>Exodus 23:28; 33:2; 34:11; <06901>Joshua 9:1; 11:3), but elsewhere as a plur. (<01520>Genesis 15:20; <02388>Exodus 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23; <04329>Numbers 13:29; <05701>Deuteronomy 7:1; 20:17; <06930>Joshua 3:10; 12:8; 24:11; <07035>Judges 3:5; <11092>1 Kings 9:20; <14807>2 Chronicles 8:7; <15901>Ezra 9:1; <16908>Nehemiah 9:8; 1 Esdr. 8:69, Χεττάιοι).

(2.) The plural form of the word is µyTij;x]=the Chittim, or Hittites (<06104>Joshua 1:4; <07026>Judges 1:26; <11029>1 Kings 10:29; <12076>2 Kings 7:6; 2 Chronicles 1, 17).

(3.) "A Hittite [woman]" is tyTij;x]e(<26003>Ezekiel 16:3, 45). In <11101>1 Kings 11:1, the same word is rendered "Hittites."

In the list of the descendants of Noah, Heth occupies the second place among the children of Canaan. It is to be observed that the first and second names, Sidoli and Heth, are not gentile nouns, and that all the names following are gentile nouns in the sing. Sidon is called the first-born of Canaan, though the name of the town is probably put for that of its founder, or eponym, "the fisherman," Ἁλιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. It is therefore probable, as we find no city Heth, that this is the name of the ancestor of the nation, and the gentile noun, children of Heth, makes this

almost certain. After the enumeration of the nations sprung from Canaan, it is addled, “And afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad” (<01018>Genesis 10:18). This passage will be illustrated by the evidence that there were Hittites and Amorites beyond Canaan, and also beyond the wider territory that must be allowed for the placing of the Hamathites, who, it may be added, perhaps had not migrated from Canaan at the date to which the list of Noah’s descendants mainly refers (see verse 19). *SEE CANAANITE*.

1. Our first introduction to the Hittites is in the time of Abraham, when they are mentioned among the inhabitants of the Promised Land (<01150>Genesis 15:20). Abraham bought from the Bene-Chethe” Children of Heth” such was then their title — the field and the cave of Machpelah, belonging to Ephron the Hittite (<01203>Genesis 23:3-18). They were then settled at the town which was afterwards, under its new name of Hebron, to become one of the most famous cities of Palestine, then bearing the name of Kirjath-arba, and perhaps also of Mamre (<01239>Genesis 23:19; 25:9). The propensities of the tribe appear at that time to have been rather commercial than military. The “money current with the merchant,” and the process of weighing it, were familiar to them; the peaceful assembly “in the gate of the city” was their manner of receiving the stranger who was desirous of having a “possession” “secured” to him among them. The dignity and courtesy of their demeanor also come out strongly in this narrative. As Ewald well says, Abraham chose his allies in warfare from the Amorites, but he goes to the Hittites for his grave. But the tribe was evidently as yet but small, not important enough to be noticed beside “the Canaanite and the Perizzite,” who shared the bulk of the land between them (<01206>Genesis 12:6; 13:7). In the southern part of the country they remained for a considerable period after this, possibly extending as far as Gerar and Beersheba, a good way below Hebron (<01617>Genesis 26:17; 28:10). From their families Esau married his first two wives (<01634>Genesis 26:34; 36:2 sq.), and the fear lest Jacob should take the same course is the motive given by Rebekah for sending Jacob away to Haran. It was the same feeling that had urged Abram to send to Mesopotamia for a wife for Isaac. The descendant of Shem could not wed with Hamites, with the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell… wherein I am a stranger,” but “go to my country and thy kindred” is his father’s command, “to the house of thy mother’s father, and take thee a wife from thence” (<01602>Genesis 28:2; 24:4). *SEE HIVITE*.

From several of the above notices we learn that the original seat of the Hittites, the city of Hebron, was founded by one Arba of the Anakim, whence its earlier name, and had inhabitants of that giant race as late as Joshua's time. It is also connected with Zoan in Egypt, and is said to have been built seven years before that city (<04132>Numbers 13:22). Zoan or Avaris was built or rebuilt, and no doubt received its Hebrew or Shemitic name, Zoan, the translation of its Egyptian name HA-AWVAR, in the time of the first Shepherd-king of Egypt, who was of Phoenician or kindred race. It is also to be noted that, in Abraham's time, the Amorites, connected with the giant race in the case of the Rephaim whom Chedorlaomer smote in Ashteroth Karnaim (<01405>Genesis 14:5), where the Rephaite Og afterwards ruled, dwelt close to Hebron (ver. 13). The Hittites and Amorites, we shall see, were later settled together in the Orontes valley. Thus at this period there was a settlement of the two nations in the south of Palestine, and the Hittites were mixed with the Rephaite Anakim. *SEE HEBRON*.

2. Throughout the period of the settlement in Palestine, the name of the Hittites occurs only in the usual formula for the occupants of the Promised Land. Changes occur in the mode of stating this formula, but the Hittites are never omitted (see <02328>Exodus 23:28). In the enumeration of the six or seven nations of Canaan, the first names, in four phrases, are the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites; in two, which make no mention of the Canaanites, the Hittites and Amorites; and in three, the former three names, with the addition of another nation. In but two phrases are these three nations further separated. It is also to be remarked that the Hittites and Amorites are mentioned together in a bare majority of the forms of the enumeration, but in a great majority of passages. The importance thus given to the Hittites is perhaps equally evident in the place of Heth in the list of the descendants of Noah, in the place of the tribe in the list in the promise to Abraham, where it is first of the known descendants of Canaan (<02150>Exodus 15:20), and certainly in the term "all the land of the Hittites," as a (designation of the Promised Land in its full extent, from Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from Lebanon to the desert (<060104>Joshua 1:4). The close relation of the Hittites and Amnorites seems to be indicated by the prophet Ezekiel, where he speaks of Jerusalem as daughter of an Amnorite father and a Hittite mother (<261603>Ezekiel 16:3, 45). Indeed the Hittites and Amorites seem, in these last-cited passages, to be named for the Canaanites in general.

When the spies examined Canaan they found “the Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites” dwelling “in the mountains” (Numbers 13:29), that is, in the high tracts that afterwards formed the refuges and rallying points of the Israelites during the troubled period of the judges. There is, however, no distinct statement as to the exact position of the Hittites in Palestine. We may draw an inference from their connection with Jerusalem and the Amorites, and their inhabiting the mountains, and suppose that they were probably seated chiefly in the high region of the tribe of Judah.’ Of their territory beyond Palestine there are some indications in Scripture. The most important of these is the designation of the Promised Land in its full extent as “all the land of the Hittites” already mentioned, with which the notices of Hittite kings out of Canaan must be compared. Whatever temporary circumstances may have originally attracted them so far to the south as Beersheba, a people having the quiet commercial tastes of Ephron the Hittite and his companions can have had no call for the roving, skirmishing life of the country bordering on the desert; and thus, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, they had withdrawn themselves from in those districts, retiring before Amalek (Numbers 13:29) to the more secure mountain country in the center of the land. Perhaps the words of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 16:3,45) may simply that they helped to found the city of Jebus.

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

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

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

(2.) “Uriah the Hittite,” one of “the thirty” of David’s body-guard (2 Samuel 23:39; 1 Chronicles 11:41), the deep tragedy of whose wrongs forms the one blot in the life of his master. In both these persons, though warriors; by profession, we can perhaps detect traces of those qualities which we have noticed as characteristics of the tribe. In the case of the first, it was Abishai, the practical, unscrupulous “son of Zeruiah,” who pressed David. to allow him to kill the sleeping king: Ahimelech is clear

from that stain. In the case of Uriah, the absence from suspicion and the generous self-denial, which he displayed, are too well known to need more than a reference (<10111>2 Samuel 11:11, 12). He was doubtless a proselyte, and probably descended from several generations of proselytes; but the fact shows that Canaanitish blood was in itself no bar to advancement in the court and army of David.

Solomon subjected the remaining Hittites to the same tribute of bond-service as the other remnants of the Canaanitish nations (<11020>1 Kings 9:20). Of all these the Hittites appear to have been the most important, and to have been under a king of their own; for "the kings of the Hittites" are, in <11029>1 Kings 10:29, coupled with the kings of Syria as purchasers of the chariots which Solomon imported from Egypt. It appears that this was some different division of the Hittite family living far away somewhere in the north; although, from their connection in <12706>2 Kings 7:6, with the Egyptians, others have inferred that the noise came from the south, from which quarter it seems they and the Egyptians were the only people who could be expected to make an attack with chariots. This would identify them with the southern Hivites, who were subject to-the scepter of Judah, and show also that it was they who purchased Egyptian chariots from the factors of Solomon. It is evident in any case, however, that they were a distinct and independent body, apparently outside the bounds of Palestine. The Hittites were still present in Palestine as a distinct people after the Exile, and are named among the alien tribes with whom the returned Israelites contracted those marriages which Ezra urged and Nehemiah compelled them to dissolve (<15901>Ezra 9:1, etc.; comp. <16323>Nehemiah 13:23-28). 'After this we hear no more of the Hittites, who probably lost their national identity by intermixture with the neighboring tribes or nations. (See Hamelseld, 3:51 sq.; *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 166.) *SEE HEATHEN*.

4. Nothing is said of the religion or worship of the Hittites. Even in the enumeration of Solomon's idolatrous worship of the gods of his wives-among whom were Hittite women (<11101>1 Kings 11:1) no Hittite deity is alluded to (see <11105>1 Kings 11:5, 7; <12301>2 Kings 23:1). — See below.

5. The names of the individual Hittites mentioned in the Bible are as follow. They are all susceptible of interpretation as Hebrew words, which would lead to the "belief either that the Hittites spoke a dialect of the

Aramaic or Hebrew language, or that the words were Hebraized in their transference to the Bible records.

ADAH (a woman), <01302>Genesis 36:2.

AHIMELECH, <01266>1 Samuel 26:6.

BASHEMATH, accurately BAS'MATH (a woman); possibly a second name of Adah, <01234>Genesis 26:34.

BEERI (lather of Judith, below), <01234>Genesis 26:34.

ELON (father of Basmath), <01234>Genesis 26:34.

EUHURON, <01210>Genesis 23:10, 13,14, etc.

JUDITH (a woman), <01234>Genesis 26:34.

URIAH, <10103>2 Samuel 11:3, etc; 23:39, etc.

ZOHAR (father of Ephron), <01208>Genesis 23:8.

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

II. *Notices in Ancient Inscriptions. —*

1. The Egyptian monuments give us much information as to a Hittite nation that can only be that indicated in the two passages in the books of Kings above noticed. The kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties made extensive conquests in Syria and Mesopotamia. They were opposed by many small states, which probably always formed one or more confederacies. In the time of Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1450), the leading nation was that of the RUTEN (or LUTEN), which appears to have once headed a confederacy defeated by that king before Megiddo (De Rouge, *Revue Archeology* n.s., 4, 346 sq.). The KHETA were conquered by or tributary to Thothmes III (Birch, *Annals of Thothmes III,* p. 21); but it is not until the time of Rameses II (B.C. cir. 1306), second king (according to Manetho) of the nineteenth dynasty, that we find them occupying the most important place among the eastern enemies of the Egyptians, the place before held by the RUTEN. The name is generally written KHET, and sometimes KHETA, and was probably in both cases pronounced KHAT. It is not easy to determine whether it properly denotes the people or the country; perhaps it denotes the latter, as it rarely has a plural

termination; but it is often used for the former. This name is identical in radicals with that of the Hittites, and that it designates them is clear from its being connected with a name equally representing that of the Amorites, and from the correspondence of this warlike people) strong in chariots, with the non-Palestinian Hittites mentioned in the Bible. The chief or strongest city of the KCETA, or at least of the territory subject to or confederate with the king of the KHETA, was KETESH, on the river ARNUT, ANURTA, or ARUNATA. KETESH was evidently a Kadesh, "a sacred city," vdq, but no city of that name, which could correspond to this, is known to us in Biblical geography. It is represented in the Egyptian sculptures as on or near a lake, which Dr. Brugsch has traced in the modern lake of Kedes, fed by the Orontes, southward of Hems (Emesa). The Orontes, it must be observed, well corresponds to the ARUNATA. The town is also stated to have been in the land of AMAR (or AMARA), that is, of the Amorites. The position of this Amoritish territory is further defined by Carchemish being placed in it, as we shall show in a later part of this article. The territory of these Hittites, therefore, lay in the valley of the Orontes. It probably extended towards the Euphrates, for the KHETA are also connected with NEHARENA, or Mesopotamia, not the NAHIRI of the cuneiform inscriptions, but it is not clear that they ruled that country. Probably they drew confederates thence, as was done by the Syrians in David's time.

Picture for Hittite

The greatest achievement of Rameses II was the defeat of the KHETA and their allies near KETESH, in the fifth year of his reign. This event is commemorated in a papyrus and by several inscriptions and sculptures. The nations confederate with the KHETA were the ARATU (Aradus?), MAXAUSU (Mash?), PAXTSA or PATASA, KESHKESH, ARUTNU, KATAWATANA, KHERABU (Helbon?), AKATERA, KETESH, RETA, Arkites, TENTENE (or TRATENUEE), and KARAKAMASHA (Carchemish). These names are difficult to identify save the seventh and the last, but it is evident that they do not belong to Palestine. The Hittites are represented as having a regular army, which was strong in chariots, a particular which we should expect from the Biblical notices of them and of the Canaanites, where the latter name seems applied to the tribe so called. Each chariot was drawn by two horses, and held three- men, a charioteer and two warriors. They had also cavalry and disciplined infantry. In the

great battle with Rameses they had 2500 horses, that is, chariots. The representations of the KHETA in the sculptures relating to this campaign probably show that their forces were composed of men of two different races. Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that both belonged to the KHETA nation, and it seems hardly possible to form any other conclusion. “The nation of Sheta [the initial character is thus sometimes read *sh*] seems to have been composed of two distinct tribes, both comprehended under the same name, uniting in one common cause, and probably subject to the same government.” These supposed tribes differed in dress and arms, and one was sometimes bearded, the other was beardless *(Ancient Egyptians,* 1, p. 400 sq.). They are rather fair than yellow, and the beardless warriors are probably of a different race from the people of Palestine generally. In some cases they remind us of the Tatars, and it is impossible to forget that the Egyptians of the Greek period evidently took the KHETA for Scythians or Bactrians. The name Scythian is not remote, nor is that of the Kittas, or warrior — Tatars in the Chinese garrisons; but mere word resemblances are dangerous; and the circumstance that the Scythians appear in history when the Hittites have just disappeared is not of much value. But it is worthy of remark that in the time of Moses there was a Rephaite ruling the Amorites in Palestine, as the sons of Anak had apparently long ruled the Hittites in Hebron, so that we need not be surprised to find two races under the same government in the case of the Hittites of Syria.

In the twenty-first year of Rameses II, the great king of the Hittites, KHETSERA, came to Egypt to make a treaty of peace. A copy of the treaty is preserved in a hieroglyphic inscription. From this it appears that KHETSERA had been preceded by his grandfather SAPRARA, his father MAURASARA, and his brother MAUTNURA, and that in the reigns of SAPRARA and MAUTNURA peace had been made upon the same conditions. In a tablet of the thirty-fourth year of the same king, one of his wives, a Hittite princess with the Egyptian name RA-MIA-UR-NE-FRU, is represented as well as her father, the king (or a king) of the KHETA. Solomon also, as Dr. Brugsch remarks, took Hittite women into his harem (1 Kings 11:1). Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1200) had a war with the KHETA, mentioned in one of his inscriptions with KETE (KETESH) KARA[K]AMSA (Carchemish), ARATU (Aradus?), and ARASA, all described as in the land AMABA.

The religion of the Hittites is only known from the above treaty with Rameses II, though it is probable that additional information may be derived from an examination of proper names. In this inscription the divinities both of the land of KHETA and of Egypt are mentioned, probably because they were invoked to see that the compact was duly kept. They are described from a Hittite point of view, a circumstance which is curious as showing how carefully the Egyptian scribe had kept to the document before him. They are the gods of war, and the gods of women of the land of KHETA and of Egypt, the SUTEKH of the land of KHETA, the SUTEKH of several forts, the ASHTERAT (written ANTERAT) of the land of KHETA, several unnamed gods and goddesses of places or countries, and of a fortress, the mountains and rivers of the land of KHETA, and of Egypt, Amen, SUTEKH, and the winds. SUTEKI — , or SET, was the chief god of the Shepherd-kings of Egypt (one of whom appears to have abolished all other worship in his dominions), and is also called BAR; or Baal. SUTEKH is perhaps a foreign form, SET seems certainly of foreign origin. ASHTERAT is, of course, Ashtoreth, the consort of Baal in Palestine. They were the principal divinities of the KHETA, for they are mentioned by name, and as worshipped in the whole land. The worship of the mountains and rivers is remarkably indicative of the character of the religion, and the mention of the gods of special cities points in the same direction. The former is low nature-worship, the latter is entirely consistent with it, and, indeed, is never found but in connection with it.

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

These names are evidently Shemitic, but not Hebrew, a circumstance that need not surprise us when we know that Aramaic was distinct from Hebrew in Jacob’s time. The syllables SERA in KHET-SERA, and RAB in RAB-SUNUNA, seem to correspond to the SAR and RAB of Assyrian and Babylonian names. TETARA may be the same name as the Tidal of Scripture. But the most remarkable of all these names is MATREMA, which corresponds as closely as possible to Mizraim. The third letter is a. hard T, and the final syllable is constantly used for the Hebrew dual. In the

Egyptian name of Mesopotamia, NEHARENA, we find the Chaldee and Arabic dual It would therefore appear that the language of the KHETA was nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldee. TARKATATASA probably commences with the name of the goddess Derceto or Atargatis.

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

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

(a) <06104>Joshua 1:4, where the expression "all the land of the Hittites" appears to mean all the land of Canaan, or at least the northern part thereof.

(b) <07126>Judges 1:26. Here nearly the same expression recurs. See Luz.

(c) 1 Kings. 10:29; <14017>2 Chronicles 1:17, "All the kings of the Hittites and kings of Aram" (probably identical with the "kings on this side Euphrates," <11024>1 Kings 4:24) are mentioned as purchasing chariots and horses from Egypt, for the possession of which they were so notorious, that

(d) it would seem to have become at a later date almost proverbial in allusion to a alarm of an attack by chariots (<12706>2 Kings 7:6).

Hi’vite

(Heb. *Chivvi’*, yWajeae, asu. with the art., often collectively for the plur., “the Hivite,” i.e. Hivites; Sept.. o Ebaiog), a designation of one of the nations inhabiting Palestine before the Israelites. *SEE CANAAN*. The name is, in the original, uniformly found in the singular number. It never has, like that of the Hittites, a plural, nor does it appear in any other form. Perhaps we may assume from this that it originated in some peculiarity of locality or circumstance, as in the case of the Amorites. — “mountaineers,” and not in a progenitor, as did that of the Ammonites, who are also styled Bene-Ammon-children of Ammon, or the Hittites, Bene-Cheth children of Heth. The name is explained by Ewald *(Geschl.*. 1, 318) as *Binnenlander,* that is, “Midlanders;” by Gesenius *(Thes.* p. 451) *aspagani,* “villagers.” In the following passages the name is given in the A.V. in the singular, “the Hivite:” <010017>Genesis 10:17; <022328>Exodus 23:28; 33:2; 34:11; <060901>Joshua 9:1; 11:3; <130115>1 Chronicles 1:15; also Genesis. 34:2; 36:2. In all the rest it is rendered by the plural.

1. In the genealogical tables of Genesis “the Hivite” is named as one of the descendants-the sixth in order of Canaan, the son of Ham (<010017>Genesis 10:17; <130115>1 Chronicles 1:15).. In the first enumeration of the nations who, at the time of the call of Abraham, occupied the Promised Land (<011519>Genesis 15:19-21), the Hivites are omitted from the Hebrew text (though in the Samaritan and Sept. their name is inserted). This has led to the conjecture, amongst others, that they are identical with the Kadmonites, whose: name is found there and there only (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 140; Bochart, *Phal. 4,* 36; *Can.* 1. 19). But are not the Kadmonites rather, as their name implies, the representatives of the Bene-kedem, or “children of the East?” Moreover, in this passage, the position of the Hivites, if represented by the Kadmonites, would be at the head of the nations usually assigned to the Land of Promise, and this is most unlikely, unless the order be geographical. A more ingenious conjecture is that which suggests the identity of the Hivites and the Avites, or Avim, on the grounds

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

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

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

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

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

On the other hand,

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

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

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

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

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

2. We first encounter the actual people of the Hivites at the time of Jacob's return to Canaan. Shechem was then (according to the current Hebrew text) in their possession, Hamor the Hivite being the "prince (aycan) of the

land” (<0242>Genesis 24:2). The narrative of the transaction of Jacob, when he bought the “parcel of a field,” closely resembles that of Abraham’s purchase of the field of Machpelah. They were at this time, to judge of them by their riders, a warm and impetuous people, credulous, and easily deceived by the crafty and cruel sons of Jacob. The narrative further exhibits them as peaceful and commercial, given to “trade” (<0102>Genesis 10:21), and to the acquiring of “possessions” of cattle and other “wealth” (<0102>Genesis 10:23, 28, 29). Like the Hittites, they held their assemblies or conferences in the gate of their city (20). We may also see a testimony to their peaceful habits in the absence of any attempt at revenge on Jacob for the massacre of the Shechemites. Perhaps similar indications are furnished by the name of the god of the Shechemites some generations after this, Baal-berith-Baal of the league, or the alliance (<0733>Judges 8:33; 9:4, 46); by the way in which the Shechemites were beaten by Abimelech (40) and by the unmilitary character both of the weapon which caused Abimelech’s death and of the person who discharged it (<0905>Genesis 9:53). In the matter that led to the overthrow of this Hivite city we see an indication of the corruption that afterwards became characteristic of the Canaanitish tribes (<0318>Genesis 33:18-20; 34). Jacob’s Teproof of his sons seems to imply that the more powerful inhabitants of at least this part of the Promised Land were Canaanites and Perizzites, these only being mentioned as likely to attack him in revenge (<0340>Genesis 34:30). It is possible, but not certain, that there is a reference to this matter where Jacob speaks of a portion he gave to Joseph as having been taken by him in war from the Amorite (<0482>Genesis 48:22), for his land at Shechem was given to Joseph, but it had been bought, and what Simeon and Levi seized was probably never claimed by Jacob, unless, indeed, the Hivites, who might possibly be spoken of as Amorites (but comp. Genesis 34:30), attempted to recover it by force. Perhaps the reference is to some other occurrence. It seems clear, however, from the first of the passages just noticed (<0340>Genesis 34:30), that the Hivites ruled by Hamor were a small settlement. *SEE JACOB*.

The Alex. MS., and several other MSS. of the Sept., in the above narrative (<0342>Genesis 34:2) substitute “Horite” for “Hivite.” The change is remarkable from the usually close adherence of the Alex. Codex to the Hebrew text, but it is not corroborated by any other of the ancient versions, nor is it recommended by other considerations. No instances occur of Horites in this part of Palestine, while we know, from a later narrative, that there was an important colony of Hivites on the high land of

Benjamin at Gibeon, etc., no very great distance from Shechem. On the other hand, in (Genesis 36:2, where Aholibamah, one of Esau's wives, is said to have been the daughter of the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, all considerations are in favor of reading "Horite" for "Hivite." In this case we fortunately possess a detailed genealogy of the family, by comparison of which little doubt is left of the propriety of the change (comp. ver. 20, 24, 25, 30, with 2), although no ancient version has suggested it here. *SEE HORITE*.

3. We next meet with the Hivites during the conquest of Canaan (Joshua 9:7; 11:19), when they are not mentioned in any important position. Their character was then in some respects materially altered. They were still evidently averse to fighting, but they had acquired possibly by long experience in traffic-an amount of craft which they did not before possess, and which enabled them to turn the tables on the Israelites in a highly successful manner (Joshua 9:3-27). The colony of Hivites who made Joshua and the heads of the tribes their dupes on this occasion, had four cities-Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth. and Kirjath-jearim-situated, if our present knowledge is accurate, at considerable distances apart. It is not certain whether the last three were destroyed by Joshua or not (Genesis 11:19), Gibeon certainly was spared. In verse 11 the Gibeomltes speak of the m- elders" of their city, a word which, in the absence of any allusion to a Hivite king, has been thought to point to a liberal form-of government (Ewald, *Gesch.* 1, 318, 9). This southern branch of the nation embraced the Jewish religion (2 Samuel 21:1, 4; Joshua 9:21.27), and seem thus to have been absorbed.

4. The main body of the Hivites, however, were at this time living on the northern confines of western Palestine — " under Hermon in the land of Mizpeh" (Joshua 11:3) — "in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-Hermon to the entering in of Hamath" (Judges 3:3). Somewhere in this neighborhood they were settled when Joab and the captains of the host, in their tour of numbering, came to "all the cities of the Hivites" near Tyre (2 Samuel 24:7). A remnant of the nation still existed in the time of Solomon, who subjected them to a tribute of personal labor, with the remnants of other Canaanitish nations which the Israelites had been unable to expel (1 Kings 9:20). In the Jerusalem Targum on Genesis 10:17, they are called Tripolitans (yaeyrpæ), a name which points to the same general northern locality. The HERMONITES may perhaps be a later name for the Hivites; we recognize in the Egyptian REMENEN alone any trace

of the Hivites in the conquests of the Pharaohs who passed through this tract. Chaseaud *(Dmases,* p. 361 sq.) refers the modern DRUSES *SEE DRUSES* (q.v.) to them.

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

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

Hizki'ah

(Heb. *Chizkiyah',* hYqzj; Sept. Ἐζεκίας; Vulg. *Ezechia),* an ancestor of Zephaniah the prophet (<3001C1>Zephaniah 1:1). *SEE HEZEKIAH*.

Hizki'jah

(Heb. *Chizkiyah',* hYqzj; Sept. Ἐζεκία; Vulg. *Ezechia),* according to the punctuation of the A.V., a mal who sealed the covenant of reformation with Ezra and Nehemiah (<160107>Nehemiah 10:17). But there is no doubt that the name should be taken with that preceding it, as "Ater-Hizkijah," a name given in the lists of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. It appears also extremely likely that the two names following these in 10:17,18 (Azzur, Hodijah) are only corrupt repetitions of them *SEE HEZEKIAH*.

Hizr

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

Hjort, Victor Christian

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

Hoadley (or Hoadly), Benjamin

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

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

Hoadley, John, LL.D.

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

oratorio (1764), and others. He died March 16, 1776. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 852.

Hoag, Ephraim

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

Hoag, Wilbur

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

Hoar, Leonard

one of the early presidents of Harvard College, was born about 1630. He graduated at Harvard hi 1650, and in 1653 went to England and continued his studies at Cambridge University. He entered the ministry at Wensted, in Sussex County, in 1656, but his nonconformity to the English Church

caused his deposition in 1662. A few years afterward he decided to return to America. His first appointment was as assistant to Dr. Thacher, in Boston. In 1672 he was elected president of Harvard, but the college, which had suffered from mismanagement, was then slenderly supported, and he retired from this office in less than three years. See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 853; *Dictionnaire Universal, 19,* 309.

Hoard, Samuel, B.D.

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

Hoare, Charles James

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

theological essays and sermons, of which *Sermons on the Christian Character,* with occasional sermons (3rd edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo), deserve special notice. — Appleton's *Amer. Annual Cyclop.* 1865, p. 664; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 853.

Ho'bab

(Heb. *Chobab',* בֹּחָב *beloved;* Sept. Ὀβάβ, in *Judges* Ἰωβάβ), the son of Raguel the Midianite, a kinsman of Moses (<04103>Numbers 10:29; <070411>Judges 4:11). B.C. 1657. He has usually been identified with Jethro (see <021805>Exodus 18:5, 27, compared with <041029>Numbers 10:29, 30); but it is rather his father Reuel to whom the title "Moses's father-in-law" is intended to apply in <041029>Numbers 10:29; for that these two latter were' names of the same person, and that the father of Moses's wife, seems clear from <020206>Exodus 2:6, 21; 3:1. Hence Hobab was Moses's brother-in-law (and so we must render חֹתֵן in <070411>Judges 4:11, where the Auth.Vers. has "father-in-law," being, it is true, the same applied elsewhere to Jethro, but merely signifying any *male relative by marriage,* and rendered even "son-in-law" in <011914>Genesis 19:14); so that while Jethro (as was natural for a person of his advanced age) returned to his home (<021827>Exodus 18:27), Moses prevailed upon Hobab (whose comparative youth rendered his services the greater object to secure) to remain (as. seems implied by the absence of any refusal to his second importunity in <041032>Numbers 10:32), so that we find his descendants among the Israelites (<070411>Judges 4:11). *SEE JETHRO.*

Ho'bah

(Heb. *Chobah',* חֹבָה, *hiding-place; Sept.*. Χοβά), a place to the northward of Damascus (לְחוֹבָה מִצְּפוֹן לְדַמֶּשֶׂק, lit. on *the left),* whither Abraham pursued the kings who had taken Lot captive (<011415>Genesis 14:15); perhaps the *Chobai* or *Choba* mentioned in the Apocrypha. *(*Χωβαΐ, Judith 15:4; Χωβά, 4:4). Eusebius *(Onomast.* s.v. Choba) confounds this place with *Cocaba,* the seat of the Ebionites in the 4th century; and Burckhardt- *(Syria,* p. 312) found a village called *Kokab,* probably the same, which, however, lies south of Damascus. This is apparently also the village *Hoba,* visited in the year 1666 by Ferd. von Troilo, who says, "It lies a quarter of a (German) mile north from the town, on the left hand. Near the city of Damascus is seen a large hill, where the patriarch Abraham overtook and defeated the army of the four kings. There formerly dwelt

here a sect of Jews, converted to the (Christian) faith, who were called Ebionites; but at present the place is inhabited by a great number of Moors (Arabs) who have a mosque. In the neighborhood is a cave, in which the patriarch offered to the Divine Majesty his thanksgivings for the victory" *(Travels,* p. 584). On the other hand, Reland thinks of a castle called *Caucab,* mentioned by Edrisi as being on the lake of Tiberias *(Palaest.* p. 727). "Josephus mentions a tradition concerning Abraham which he takes from Nicolaus of Damascus: 'Abraham reigned at Damascus, being a foreigner… and his name is still famous in the country; and there is shown a village called from him *The Habitation of Abraham (Ant.* 1, 7, 2).' It is remarkable that in the village of *Burzeh,* three miles north of Damascus, there is a *oely* held in high veneration by the Mohammedans, and called after the name of the patriarch, *Masjad Abraham,* 'the prayer-place of Abraham.' The tradition attached to it is that here Abraham offered thanks to God after the total discomfiture of the Eastern kings. Behind the *wely* is a cleft in the rock, in which another tradition represents the patriarch as *taking refuge* on one occasion from the giant Nimrod. It is remarkable: that the word *Hobah* signifies 'a hiding-place.' (See: Ritter, *Syria, 4:*312; Wilson, *Lands of Bible,* 2, 331.) The Jews of Damascus affirm that the village of *Jobar,* not far from Burzeh, is the Hobah of Scripture. They have a synagogue there dedicated to Elijah, to which they make frequent pilgrimages (see Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine,* p. 491, 492; Stanley, *Jewish. Church,* 1, 481)."

Hobart, John Henry, D.D.

Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, was born Sept. 14, 1775. In 1788 he entered the College of Philadelphia, but soon after went to Princeton, where he passed A.B. in 1793 with high honor. In 1798 he took charge of two suburban churches near Philadelphia. The two following years he was called to New Brunswick, next to Hempstead, Long Island, and later became assistant minister of Trinity, New York. In 1799 he was chosen secretary to the House of Bishops, and subsequently to the Convention, and one of the deputies to the General Convention in 1801. In 1806 he was made D.D. by Union College, and in 1811 he was elected assistant bishop of New York. Afterwards he became diocesan of New York, and rector of Trinity Church. He was especially instrumental in the establishment of the General Theological Seminary, in which he held the chair of pastoral theology and pulpit eloquence. In 1823, his health becoming enfeebled, a voyage to Europe was deemed desirable, and he

remained there above two years. He preached in Rome when Protestant worship was barely tolerated, and made an effective appeal in behalf of the Waldenses. In his journey through the Italian States he encountered much annoyance, and when at Milan was examined before the civil magistrates as to the object of his tour. He defended himself with a freedom and frankness that left little doubt of his honesty. When in London he published two volumes of *Discourses preached in America,* which drew forth warm expressions of approbation from the leading periodicals. On his return, he resumed his various duties with zeal and energy, devoting himself to the promotion of every good work, and feeling a special interest in the cause of the Indians. He died at Auburn- Sept. 10, 1830. His publications include *A Companion to the Altar* (N. York, 1804, 8vo; many editions since) — *Festivals and Fasts* (N. York, 1804, 12mo; over twenty *editions): — Apology for Apostolic Order* (N. Y. 1807, 8vo; 1844, *8vo): — The State of departed Spirits* ((new ed. N. York, 1846, 12mo): — *Clergyman's Companion* (new ed. 1855, 12mo): — *Christian's Manual* (12mo; several editions); besides numerous *charges* and occasional discourses (reprinted, New York, 2 vols. 8vo). His *Posthumous Works, with a Memoir by the Rev. Dr. Berrian,* were issued in 1833 (N.Y. 3 vols. 8vo). See Schroeder,

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

Hobart, Noah

a Congregational minister, was born at Hingham Jan. 12, 1706. He graduated at Harvard College in 1724, and was ordained pastor of the First Congregational Church at Fairfield, Connecticut, Feb. 7, 1733. About this time a controversy arose in the Eastern States respecting the Episcopalians, in which Hobart enlisted, and wrote in behalf of the validity of Presbyterian ordination a pamphlet entitled *Serious Address to the Episcopal Separation* (1748; 2nd address, 1751; 3rd address, 1761). His opponents were Dr. Johnson and other ministers who had swerved from Congregationalism. Of Mr. Hobart's ability and learning, Dr. Dwight, who was one of the men of his time, says: "He possessed high intellectual and moral distinction. He had a mind of great acuteness and discernment; was a

laborious student; was extensively learned, especially in history and theology; adorned the doctrine which he professed by an exemplary life, and was holden in high veneration for his wisdom and virtue. Among the American writers of the last century, not one has, I believe, handled the subject of Presbyterian ordination with more ability or success." He died Dec. 6, 1773. Besides several sermons, he published *Principles of the Congreg. Church*, etc. *(1754). — Contrib. to Eccl. History of Connecticut*, p. 385; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2. 448; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1, 375.

Hobart, Peter

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

Hobbes, Thomas

an English philosopher and deist, was born April 5,1588, at Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. In 1608 he became tutor to lord Hardwick, subsequently earl of Devonshire; and, after their return from traveling, he resided in the family for many years, during which period he translated Thucydides, and made a Latin version of some of lord Bacon's works. In 1628 he went abroad with the son of Sir Gervase Clifton, with whom he remained some time in France. He returned in 1631 to undertake the education of the young earl of Devonshire. In 1634 he went with his new pupil to Paris, where he applied himself much to natural philosophy, and afterwards to Italy, where he formed an acquaintance with Galileo. He returned to England in 1637, and soon after wrote his *Elementa Philosophica de Cive* (Par. 1642). A second edition was printed in Holland in 1647, under the superintendence of M. Sorbire. In 1640, after the meeting of the Long Parliament, Hobbes withdrew to Paris. Here he became acquainted with Des Cartes and Gassendi. In 1647 Hobbes was appointed mathematical tutor to the Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. His treatises entitled *Human Nature* and *Me Corpore Politico* were published in London in 1650, and in the following year the *Leviathan.* Of

the last work he caused a copy to be fairly written out on vellum, and presented to Charles II; but the king, having been informed by some divines that it contained principles subversive both of religion and civil government, withdrew his favor from Hobbes, and forbade him his presence. After the publication of the *Leviathan* Hobbes returned again to England, and published his *Letter upon Liberty and Necessity* (1654), which led to a long controversy with bishop Bramhall. *SEE BRAMHALL*. It was about this time, too, that he began a controversy with Dr. Wallis, the mathematical professor at Oxford, which lasted until Hobbes's death. By this last controversy he got no honor. In 1666 his *Leviathan* and *De Cive* were censured by Parliament. Shortly after Hobbes was still further alarmed by the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons for the punishment of atheism and profaneness; but this storm blew over. In 1672 Hobbes wrote his own life in Latin verse, being then in his eighty-fifth year, and in 1675 published his translation of the Iliad and Odyssey. This translation is wholly wanting in Homeric fire, bald and vulgar in style and diction; and it must be allowed that the fame of the philosopher is anything but heightened by his efforts as a poet. Hobbes's *Dispute with Laney, bishop of Ely, concerning Liberty and Necessity*, appeared in 1676; and in 1679 he sent his *Behemoth, or a History of the Civil Wars from* 1640 *to* 1660, to a bookseller, with a letter in which he requested him not to publish it until a fitting occasion offered. It appears from this letter that Hobbes, being anxious to publish the book some time before, had with that view shown it to the king, who refused his permission, and for this reason Hobbes would not now allow the bookseller to publish it. It appeared, however, almost immediately after Hobbes's death, which took place by paralysis Dec. 4, 1679.

In *philosophy* Hobbes was the precursor of the modern materialistic schools of Sensationalism and Positivism. Professing to reject "everything hypothetical (of all *qualitatum occultarum),* he affected to confine himself to the comprehensible, or, in other words, to the phenomena of motion and sensation. He defines philosophy to be the knowledge, through correct reasoning, of phenomena or appearances from the causes presented by them, or, vice versa, the ascertaining of possible causes by means of known effects. Philosophy embraces as an object every body that admits the representation of production and presents the phenomena of composition and decomposition. Taking the term *Body* in its widest extent, he divides its meaning into natural and political, and devotes to the consideration of

the first his *Philosophia Naturalis,* comprehending the departments of logic, ontology, metaphysics, physics, etc.; and to that of the second his *Philosophia Civilis,* or *Polity,* comprehending morals. All knowledge is derived from the senses; but our sensational representations are nothing more than appearances within us, the effect of external objects operating on the brain, or setting in motion the vital spirits. Thought is calculation *(computatio),* and implies addition and subtraction. Truth and falsehood consist in the relations of the terms employed. We can become cognizant only of the finite; the infinite cannot be imagined, much less known: the term does not convey any accurate knowledge, but belongs to a Being whom we can know only by means of faith. Consequently, religious doctrines do not come within the compass of philosophical discussion, but are determinable by the laws of religion itself. All, therefore, that Hobbes has left free to the contemplation of philosophy is the knowledge of our natural bodies (somatology), of the mind (psychology), and polity. His whole theory has reference to the external and objective, inasmuch as he derives all our emotions from the movements of the body, and describes the soul itself as something corporeal, though of extreme tenuity." From these principles no *moral* or *religious* theory can flow, except that of infidelity. Though none of Hobbes's writings are expressly leveled against Christianity, few authors have really done more to subvert the principles of morality and religion. He makes self-love the fundamental law of nature, and utility its end; morality is nothing but utility, and the soul is not immortal. His writings gave rise to a very voluminous controversy. "The Philosopher of Malmesbury," says Dr. Warburton, "was the terror of the last age, as Tindall and Collins are of this. The press sweat with controversy, and every young churchman militant would try his arms in thundering on Hobbes's steel cap" *(Divine Legation,* 2, 9, Preface). His principal antagonists were Clarendon, in *A brief View of the dangerous and pernicious Errors to Church and State in Mr. Hobbes's Book entitled Leviathan;* Cudworth, in his *Eternal and immutable Morality;* and bishop Cumberland, in his Latin work on the *Laws of Nature.* Bishop Bramhall's controversy with Hobbes has been noticed above. We may also mention archbishop Tenison's *Creed of Mr. Hobbes examined,* and Dr. Eachard's *Dialogues on Hobbes.* Hobbes's whole works have been carefully re-edited by Sir William Molesworth, the Latin under the title *Opera Philosophica quae Latine Scripsit W. Hobbes* (Lond. 1839-45, 5 vols. 8vo); *English Works now first collected* (London, 1839, 4 vols. 8vo). See *English Cyclopedia;* Tennemann, Man. *Hist. Philos. §* 324; Mackintosh, *Ethical*

Philosophy, § 4; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 17 § 22; Hallam, *Lit. of Europe, 3,* 271; Leland, *Deistical Writers,* ch. 2; Morell, *Modern Philosophy,* pt. 1, ch. 1, § 1; Bayle, *Genesis Dict. s.v.*; Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* vol. 2; *British Quarterly Review, 6:*155; Lewis, *Hist. of Phil.* 2. 226-235; Krug, *Handworterbuch d. philos. Wissensch.* 2, 441-443; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism,* p. 114 sq.; *Christian Examiner, 29,* 320; Leidner, *Philos.* p. 270; Cudworth, *Intell. Syst.* 2; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought,* p. 121 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.;* Gass, *Gesch. d. protest. Dogmat. 3:*39, 322; Waterland, *Works* (see Index, vol. vi); Watson, *Works;* Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 10; Sigwart, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 2 (see Index); Schröckh, *Kirchen-Gesch. s. d.* Reform. 3; Doderlein, *Lit.* (see Index); *Westm. Review,* April, 1867, p..162; *Contemp. Review,* Feb. 1868, vol. 3; *Bibliotheca Sacra, 8,* 127.

Hobbhahn, Johann Wilhelm

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

Hobbs, Lewis

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

Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin

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

Hobnim

SEE EBONY.

Hoburg, Christian

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

Hocein

SEE HOSSEIN.

Hoch, John

SEE JEPINUS.

Hocheisen, Johann Georg

a German theologian, born at Ulm in 1677, was educated at the University of his native place and at Tübingen and Wittenberg. At the last school he at first devoted his time mainly to the study of philosophy, but afterwards changed to the study of theology. He next went to Hamburg, where his acquaintance with the great Fabricius led him to a more thorough study of

Greek and Hebrew. In 1705 he was made M.A. at Wittenberg, and immediately began there a course of lectures which procured for him an adjunct professorship in the philosophical department, he entering at the same time as a candidate of theology. In 1709 he was called as professor of Hebrew to the gymnasium at Breslau, where he died in 1712. Hocheisen contributed largely to the learned periodicals of his day. Of his published works the most important are *De Hebraeo-rum vocalium. officio et valore in constituenda syllaba* (Viteb. 1705, 4to): — *De Deismo in Cartesianismo deprehenso* (ibid. 1708, 4to): — De *Deismo in Theosophia deprehenso, contra Westphalun novatorem* (ibid. 1709, 4to). Some take him to be the author (though this is unlikely) of the first letter in *Vertrauter Brieefiechsel zweierguten Freunde 5. Wesen d. Seele* (1713 and 1734, 8vo), in which the soul is regarded only as a mere mechanism of the bodv. — Doiring, *Gelehrt. Theolog. Deutschlands, 1,* 744; Adelulg's Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. 2, 2029. (J. H. W.)

Hochmann (Of Hochenau), Ernst Christoph

a German mystic, and principal representative of the Wittgenstem separatists, born at Hochenau (Lauenburg) in 1661 (according to Hagenbach, 1670) and educated at Halle University. During his residence there (1699) he began to attract attention by his addresses to the Jews, whom he endeavored to convert to Christianity. In 1702 he made a journey through nearly all Germany, and attacked the lukewarmness of the clergy with great boldness, oftentimes entering the pulpit either during the discourse or immediately after it. He also conducted devotional exercises in private houses, which were largely attended by the people. "He was a man of rare gifts, and was inspired by a sincere and resigned type of piety, which brought many sides to his heart." He suffered great persecution, and was even imprisoned frequently, but it "was all borne by him with patience, and even with a certain degree of humor." His adherents, in spite of all these difficulties, were numerous, and his influence over them without bounds. Stilling says that an old pietist related to him "that Hochman once preached on the great meadow below Elberfeld, called the Ox Comb, with so much power and eloquence that his many hundreds of hearers fully believed themselves raised to the clouds, and that they had no other thought than that the morning of eternity had really dawned." The theological views of Hochmann were in the main the same as those of the great mystics, Jacob Baehme (q.v.), Weigel, Gichtel, etc. He opposed infant baptism, and held that the Lord's Supper should be administered

only to the chosen and faithful disciples of Christ. He also insisted on a complete separation of Church and State, and had most peculiar views of the matrimonial state. The charge has been laid against him that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, but we think without just cause. He was, however, a fervent believer in the doctrine of perfection, and held that only those men should preach the Gospel who felt that the Lord called them to this sacred work. He died in 1721. Hochmann's writings were published in pamphlet form, and were few in number. They are of value mainly as an index to his life and works as a Christian man. A complete list of them may be found in Gobel, *Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. rheinisch-westphal. evangel. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), 2, 809 sq. Among these we consider as particularly valuable his *Glaubensbekenntniss sammt seiner an die Juden gehaltenen Rede* (1703, 12mo): — *Necessaria supplicatio et dehortatio ad Germaniae Rectores s. Magistratus de dura persec. sic dictor. Pietistarum* (without year or date). — Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 1, 167-8; Adelung's Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. 2, 2029-2030; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 318; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6*, 163-164. (J. H. W.)

Hochstetter, Andreas Adam

a distinguished German theologian of the Lutheran confession, was born July 13, 1668, at Tübingen, and educated at the university of his native place. In 1688 the reigning prince of his country sent him abroad to visit the different universities of Germany, Holland, and England, where he formed an acquaintance with a number of distinguished scholars. He paid particular attention to the study of the Hebrew and English languages. In the latter he made great proficiency, and translated into Latin, among others, Stillingfleet's *Epistolam ad deistam*, etc. On his return he was appointed a professor extraordinary at his alma mater. In 1707 he was advanced regular professor of theology and city preacher of Tübingen, and in 1711 court preacher and *Consistorial Rath* at Stuttgart. Four years later, however, he returned again as professor to the university. He died April 27, 1718. His own works were mainly dissertations, of which the few published are in pamphlet form. A list of them is given by Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1633. (J.H.W.)

Hochstraten

SEE HOOGSTRATEN.

Hochwart, Laurentius *(Tursenrutanus)*

a distinguished German preacher and historian of the 16th century, born at Tirschenreut in 1493, and educated at Leipzig. His first years after graduation were spent in teaching, first at Freysing, and later at Ingolstadt. In 1528 he became pastor at Waldsassen, and later at Regensburg. In 1531 he had a call as preacher to the court at Dresden, but he gave the preference to an offer from Eichstadt which came at the same time. In 1533 he returned again to Regensburg, and later went to Passau, He died toward the close of 1569 or in the beginning of 1570. His valuable works were left unpublished, with the exception of his *Catalog. Ratisponensium episcoporum libriis 3* (printed in A. F. Oefel's *Rerum Boicarum script.* 1, 148-242). Among those unpublished the following are of especial, value: *Sermones Varii: — Monotessaron in quatuor Evangelia: — Chrom. ingens mun-di.*Wetzer ü.Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 1, 253; Herzog, *Real Encyklop. 6,* 164.

Hock, John

SEE JEPINUS.

Hock Tide

(from Anglo-Sax. *hocken*, to seize), or Hoke Days an English holiday, usually observed on Monday and Tuesday two weeks after Easter, in memory of the slaughter of the Danes by Ethelred, Nov. 13, 1002, according to Henry of Huntingdon, and mentioned in the Confessor's Laws. It was the custom formerly to collect money of the parishioners. A trace of this practice is found as late as 1667. Collections were also taken up at town gates, as at Chichester in the last century. Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology,* p. 312.

Hod

(Heb. *id.* dwh, *majesty*, as often; Sept. Ὼδ), one of the sons of Zophah. of the tribe of Asher (1 Chronicles 7:37). B.C. ante 1017.

Hodai'ah

(Hebrew *Hodayeva'hu*, whwydwh, marg more correctly, *Hodavya'hu,* whyvwdwh, a prolonged form *of Hodaviah;* Sept. Ὡδουΐα, Vulgate *Oduja),*

the first named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants. of Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3:24); probably a brother of the Nahum of Luke 3:25 (see Strong's *Harm. and Exposition of the Gospels,* p. 17). B.C. cir. 406. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*.

Hodavi'ah

(Heb. *Hodavyah',* הַוְדַוְיָה, *praise of Jehovah,* or perh. i.q. הַוְדָה, *praise ye Jehovah;* Sept. Ὡδουία or Ὡδουΐα), the name of three or four men.

1. A chieftain and warrior of the tribe of Manasseh East at the time of the Assyrian captivity (1 Chronicles 5, 24). B.C. cir. 720.

2. Son of Has-senuah and father of Meshullam, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 9:7). B.C. ante 588.

3. A Levite whose posterity (to the number of 74) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:40). In the parallel passage, Nehemiah 7:43, his name is written *Hodevah' (*הוֹדֶוָה, by contraction for *Hodaviah,* marg. הוֹדַיָה, by contraction for *Hodijah;* Sept. Οὐδουία, Vulgate *Oduja).* B.C. ante 536. Apparently the same is elsewhere called JUDAH (Ezra 3:9).

4. See HODAIAH. Hodegetics, a word properly signifying *the art of induction,* or, better, the art of *introduction (*τέχνη being understood with ὁδηγητική), but generally taken to signify introduction (ὁδηγία) itself, especially when reference is made to scientific Hodegetics. The *Hodegete (*ὁδηγητής*),* of course, is expected to be thoroughly conversant with the science of which he treats, and which he is to introduce, else he might easily lead ill the wrong direction, or into another department. Other names for this science are Methodology (from μεθοδος), or Propaedeutics (from πρό and παιδεύω, παῖς), or Isagogics (from εἰς and ἄγω*).* The difference between Hodegetics and Encyclopsedia (q.v.) of Theology is, that "the former has regard to the personal qualifications of the student, his method of study, his preparatory helps, etc., whereas the latter has regard to the various departments and systems of the science itself." The literature of Hodegetics is quite extensive. See Schlegel, *Summe 5. Esfahrungen und Beobb. z. Beford. d. Studien in gel. Schulen und auf. Univ.* (Riga, 1790); Kiesevetter, *Lehrb. d. Hod. o. kurze Aszweis. z. studieren* (Berl. 1811); Schelling, *Vorles. ib. d. Methode d. akadem. Studiums* (3rd edit. Tübingen, 1832); Scheidler, *Grundr. d. H. o. Methodik d. akadem. Stud.* (3rd ed.

Jena, 1847). — Krug, *Phil. Lex.* 5, 1, 531; Danz, *Univ. Wort. d. theol. Lit.* p. 404; *Bib. Sac.* 1, 179. *SEE INTRODUCTION*.

Hodegetria

(Ὁδηγητρία, the *guide)* is the name which the Greeks give to a painting, said to have been the work of St. Luke, because Michael Palaeologus, upon his entry at Constantinople, after the defeat of the Latins, had this portrait borne in advance, he and his army following on foot. The Virgin Mary is also worshipped under this name by the Sicilians, especially at Messina. At Rome they erected and dedicated a church to her, generally called the Constantinopolitan Church. — Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 320; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* 1, 495.

Ho'desh

(Heb. *Cho'desh,* vdjo, a *month,* as often; Sept. Ἁδά, Vulg. *Hodes),* one of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Judah, several of whose children are enumerated (1 Chronicles 8:9); called in ver. 8 more correctly BAARA *SEE BAARA* (q.v.).

Hode'vah

(Nehemiah 7:43). *SEE HODAVIAH* 3. Hodges, Cyrus Whitman, a Baptist clergyman, was born in Leicester, Vt., July 9, 1802. At the age of twenty he was licensed to preach in Brandon, Vt., and in the autumn of that year accepted an invitation to preach at Minerva for a year. In connection with this work he pursued his ministerial studies under the Rev. Daniel 0. Morton, at Shoreham, but so anxious was he to be fully engaged in the work of his calling that he abandoned the idea of a full course of study. He, however, diligently improved such opportunities as he had, and his literary and theological acquisitions became quite respectable. He was ordained in Chester, Warren Co., N. Y., in 1824, and remained there three years. He preached two years in Arlington, Vt.; four years in Shaftesbury; four years in Springfield; six years in Westport, N. Y.; and five years in Bennington, Vt. Thence he went to Bristol, where he finished his career. He died April 4,1851. He was a true Christian pastor; he believed heartily, entirely. His sincerity, his thorough consecration to his work, was the true secret of his effective and useful ministry. In 1850 Mr. Hodges published a small volume of sermons. — Sprague, *Annals, 6,* 724.

Hodges, Joseph

a Baptist minister, was born at Norton, Mass., May 19, 1806, and was a graduate of Waterville College in the class of 1830. He took the full course of study at the Newton Theological Institution (1830-33), and was licensed to preach by the Church at Canton, Mass. in April 1831. He was ordained at Weston, Nov. 18, 1835, and was pastor of the Church in that place four years (1835-39). He had pastorates of a shorter or longer duration at Amherst, Coleraine, Three Rivers, Palmer, East Brookfield, and North Oxford, all in Massachusetts, for fifteen years (1840-55). For six years (1855-61) he was an agent of the American and Foreign Bible Society. He died at Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 23,1863.

Hodges, Walter, D.D.

a clergyman of the Hutchinsonian school and provost of Oriel College, Oxford, flourished about the middle of the last century. He provoked a great deal of attention by his *Elihu, or an Inquiry into the principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job* (London, 1750, 4to; 1751, 8vo; 3rd ed. 1756; 12mo and others), in which he endeavored to show that Elihu is the Son of God, a discovery which he supposed would throw great light on the book of Job, and solve the controversies respecting the doctrines which have been agitated thereupon. He wrote also *The Christian Plan* (2nd edit., with additions, and with other theological pieces, London, 1775, 8vo), a no less curious work than the one above mentioned, though it failed to produce so much sensation. “The whole meaning and extent of the Christian plan he represents as embodied, according to his interpretation, in the Hebrew Elohim.” The other theological pieces in the addenda of this work are on the historical account of David’s life; and on *Sheol, or concerning the Place of departed Souls between the Time of their Dissolution and the general Resurrection;* also, *Oratio habita in domo convocationis. — Kitto, Cyclop.* 2, 317; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1, 1504; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 857.

Hodgson, Bernard, LL.D.

principal of Hertford College, is the author of *Solomon’s Song, translated from the Hebrew* (Oxford, 1785, 4to), in which his chief design has been to give as literal a rendering of the original as possible. Also, *The Proverbs o ‘Solomon, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes* (Oxford, 1788, 4to) *Ecclesiastes, a new translation from the original Hebrew* (Oxford, 1791,

4to). The notes are few in number, and are principally devoted to verbal criticism. — Kitto, *Cyclopaedia*, 2, 317.

Hodgson, Robert, D.D.

was dean of Carlisle in 1820, but the date of his birth is not known. He published mainly his sermons (London, 1803-42), and edited the works of his uncle, bishop Porteus, of London, with his life (Lond. 1816, 6 vols. 8vo), of whom he also published a biography (Lond. 1811, 8vo). He died in 1844. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 858.

Hodheilids

an heretical sect of the Mohammedans, who believe that the saints live' in Paradise in an undisturbed quiet. *SEE MOHAMMEDANISM*.

Hodi'ah

(הוֹדִיָה, the same as *Hodijah* [q.v.]), the wife of Mered (Sept. ἡ Ἰδουία; Alex. MS. Ἰουδαία), and the mother of Jered, and Heber, and Jekuthiel (1 Chronicles 4:19), the same who is called JEHUDIJAH (הַיְּהוּדִיָּה, *the Jewess*, i.e. his Jewish wife, as distinguished from Bithiah, who was an Egyptian) in the former part of the verse.

Hodi'jah

(Heb. *Hodiyah'*, הוֹדִיָה, *majesty of Jehovah;* Sept. Ὡδουία, Ὡδουίας, Ὡδούα, Ὡδουΐα), the name of at least two men.

1. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Nehemiah 8:7; 9:5),.and subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (10:18; his name is apparently repeated in ver. 13). B.C. cir. 410.

2. One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (Nehemiah 10:18). B.C. cir. 410.

3. *SEE JEHUDIJAH*.

Hodshi

SEE TAHTIM-HODSHI.

Hody, Humphry, D.D.

an English divine, was born Jan. 1, 1659, at Oldcombe, Somersetshire, and was educated at the University of Oxford. In 1684 he was elected a fellow of Wadham College, and in the same year he published a *Dissertatio contra Historiam- Aristeae de LXX Interpretibus.* Hody became principally known by his publications respecting the bishops who had been deprived of their bishoprics during the reign of William and Mary for refusing the oath of allegiance. The first work which he published on this subject was a translation of a Greek treatise, supposed to have been written by Nicephorus in the latter end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century, in which the writer maintains that "although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic." The original Greek work, as well as the English translation, were both published in 1691. Dodwell replied to it in *A Vindication of the Deprived Bishops* (Lond. 1692). In the following year Hody published *The Case of Sees Vacant by an Uncanonical Deprivation* (Lond. 1693, 4to), in which he replies to the arguments of his opponents. These exertions of Hody in favor of the ruling party in the Church did not pass unrewarded. He was appointed domestic chaplain to Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, which office he also held under Tillotson's successor. He was presented with a living in London, and was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford in 1698, and archdeacon of Oxford in 1704. He died Jan. 20,1706. He founded ten scholarships at Wadham College in order to promote the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages.

Of the other works of Hody, the most important are:

1. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata, libri 4* (Oxford, 1704, folio), which is said by Bishop Marsh to be "the classical work on the Septuagint." The first book contains the dissertation against the history of Aristeas, which has been mentioned above. The second — gives an account of the real translators of the Septuagint, and of the time when the translation was made. The third book gives a history of the Hebrew text and of the Latin Vulgate; and the fourth, of the other ancient Greek versions: —

2. *The Resurrection of the (same) Body Asserted* (Lond. 1694,8vo): —

3. *Animadversions on two Pamphlets lately published by Mr. Collier* (Lond. 1696, 8vo). Sir W. Perkins and Sir J. Friend had been executed in

1695 for treason against the government; but previous to their execution they had been absolved of their crime by some nonjuring clergymen. This act was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but was justified by Collier in two pamphlets which he published on the subject: —

4. *De Graecis Illustribus linguae Graecae litteraruque humaniorum instauratoribus* (Lond. 1742). This work was published several years after the author's death by Dr. Jebb, who has prefixed to it an account of Hody's life and writings. See *English Cyclopaedia;* Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* 1, 858; Hook, *Eccles. Biography, 6:*104; Kitto, *Cyclop.* 2, 317.

Hoi, Matthias

of Hohenegg, famous in history as the confessor of John George I, elector of Saxony. He was born of a noble family at Vienna in 1580, and educated at Wittenberg. In 1600 he commenced at this university a course of lectures, and published a program on the position which he was to take, *Oratio detestans Papam et Calvinistas,* in which he manifests that great hatred for Romanists and Calvinists which characterized all the acts of his life. Hoe distinguished himself greatly both as a student and a lecturer. In 1612 he was called to Dresden by the elector, and became court preacher and confessor. His talents and adroitness gave him, in time, complete possession of the judgment and conscience of the elector, whom he hindered from entering into a league with Frederick V, the unfortunate king of Bohemia, by representing to him that the Reformed religion, which Frederick professed, was fatally wrong, and could not exist without injury to Lutheranism. Hoe seems, indeed, to have hated the Reformed even more than he did the Romanists, and there appears not the shadow of a reason to assert that he was bribed by the emperor. To the declaration of his principles while a lecturer at Wittenberg, and above alluded to, he adhered until the end of his life, though it is said he greatly abated in his hatred against the Calvinists in his last days. His private character has been highly commented upon by all who knew him. He wrote a *Commenatarius in Apocalypsin* (Lpz. 1610-40, 2 parts), and a number of controversial works against the Reformed Church and the Romanists. He died in 1645. See Bayle, *Genesis Dictionary,* s.v.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* vol. 6:165; Mosheim, *Ch. History,* cent. 17:sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1, n. 12; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dognatik,* 2, 19, 78; Kurtz, *Ch. History,* 2, 183; Dorner, *Gesch. d. protest. Theol.* (see Index); Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 320-322. (J. H.W.)

Hoefel

SEE HOFEI.

Hoefling

SEE HOFLING.

Hoel

bishop of Mans in the 13th century, made himself quite conspicuous by the part which he took for the English in the revolt of the nobility of Mans against them after the death of William the Conqueror. He suffered imprisonment, and after the accession of Hugo was even obliged to seek a refuge in England. But we find him again at Mans in 1092, and an attendant at the councils of Saumur (1094) and Brives. Later he traveled for a time with pone Urban II. He died July 28, 1096. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, *24*, 859. (J. H. W.)

Hoeschelius, David

an eminent Greek scholar, born at Augsburg in 1556, was professor at St. Anne's College, and, later, the librarian of his native city. He died Oct. 30, 1617. He deserves a notice here on account of his valuable editions of some of the Greek fathers, and of a number of Greek authors who have written in the department of Christian antiquity and ecclesiastical history. — Bayle, *Hist. Dict. 3,* 478.

Hoeven

[pronounced *Hoovn*], Abraham (Des Amorie) van der a celebrated Dutch preacher, born at Rotterdam in 1798, was for a time professor at the seminary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and later professor at Utrecht. He died July 1855. Hoeven wrote *De Joanne Clerico et Philippo a Limborch* (Amst. 1843). — Pierer, *Universal-Lex. 8,* 435.

Hofacker, Ludwig

a German divine and celebrated preacher, born at Wildbad April 15,1798, and educated at the University of Tübingen. While here he became very zealous for the cause of religion; and especially endeavored to encourage the study of the Bible among his fellow students. He formed Bible-classes which were largely attended; and his intimate acquaintance with the works

of the orthodox commentators Bengel, Oetinger, and Steinhofer rendered him especial service in his sermons, which he frequently delivered at this time, always extemporaneously. After filling the vicariates of Stettin and Plieningen, he was appointed assistant to his father, preacher at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgardt. He was now only 28 years old, but his sermons attracted general attention, especially on account of his earnestness and piety. In 1826, after the death of his father, he was sent to Rielingshausen, near Marbach. It is said that his audience was composed not only of his own congregation, but that strangers came from afar to hear the young preacher. In the fall of 1827, urged by his admirers and many friends, he began the publication of some of his sermons: *Predigten* (1827; 27th ed. 1866). The rapid sale of these was really surprising. An edition of 1500 was exhausted almost immediately after publication. His sudden death, November 18, 1828, incited his friends to a publication of all his sermons., They have now been spread abroad in more than 100,000 copies, not only in Germany, but also in translations in France, England, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and our own country. Speaking of his ability, Knapp *(Leben v. L. Hofacker,* Heidelb. 1852) says that he was the greatest and most powerful preacher of the Würtemberg Church in this century. This opinion was confirmed by the celebrated F. W. Krummacher "The Suabian Land lost in him its most powerful preacher" (in his *Autobiography,* transl. by Easton, p. 207). A prayer book, compiled from posthumous works of Hofacker and from his sermons *(Erbauungs und Gebetbltch fjr alle Tage,* Stuttgard), appeared in 1869. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 646 sq.

Hofacker, Wilhelm

a younger brother of Ludwig (q.v.), and, like him. a celebrated preacher of the Würtemberg Church, was born February 16, 1805. In 1828 he became assistant to his brother, who was then in failing health. After his decease he traveled through Northern Germany on a literary tour. From 1830-1833 he delivered lectures at the University of Tübingen on Dogmatics, based on the work of Nitzsch, pursuing himself at the same time a course of study. In 1833 he was appointed at Waiblingen, and in January 1836, at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgardt, a church which his father and elder brother had served before him. Here he died, August 10, 1848. Like his brother, he was an earnest servant of the Church of Christ, and a regular attendant at the Bible and Missionary meetings of the University students while at Tübingen, where he also was educated. He was a zealous defender of the orthodox doctrine of the divinity of Christ, asserting that modem science is

more in harmony with the Christian doctrine of the orthodox Church than with the speculative theology of the Hegel-Strauss school. He published, besides a number of polemical articles in different theological periodicals, *Tropfiein aus der Lebensquelle* (Stuttg. 1863 and 1864), and *Predigten für alle Sonn und Festtage* (ib. 1853). Of his sermons nine editions have already been published. They contain a short biography written by Kapff, a German preacher, one of Hofacker's associates at Tübingen University. See Knapp, *Leben von L. Hofacker;* Hartmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 649 sq. (J.H.W.)

Höfel, Johann

a German lawyer, born at Uffenheim in 1600, and educated at the universities of Strasburg, Giessen, and Jena, deserves mention here on account of his *Musica Christiana* (1634), and *Historisches Gesangbuch* (Schleusingen, 1681). He died in 1683.Pierer, *Univers. Lex. 8,* 440.

Hofer, Joseph Anton

a German Roman Catholic priest, born at Kastelruth May 19, 1742, was educated at the University of Innspruck. In 1765 he was made priest, in 1722 professor of rhetoric and prefect of the Gymnasium at Brix, and in 1776 professor of ecclesiastical law; here he remained, with an interruption of four years only, which he spent at Innspruck, until the discontinuance of the school in 1807, when he was pensioned, retaining, however, the title of an ecclesiastical councilor (Rath) of the government. He died in 1820. Hofer contributed several articles to periodical literature. Of his published works, *Conspectus Juris eccles. publici* (Brixen, 1781, 4to) entitles him to a position in theological literature. Hofer published several sermons which are of superior merit. Of these the following are perhaps the best: *Ermahnungsrede am Titularfeste Mariä* (ib. 1793, 8vo): — *Kunstgriffe frommer Eltern z. Erziehung wohlgesitt. Kinder* (ib. 1794, 8vo): — *Untrügliches Kennzeichen d. sittlich. Aufersteh.* (ibid. 1798, 8vo). — Döring, *Gelehrten Theolog. Deutschl.* 1, 746.

Hoffbauer, Clemens Maria

a Roman Catholic, and the first Redemptorist (q.v.) in Germany, was born at Tasswitz, in Moravia, Sept. 26, 1751. His parents had intended him for the ministry, but the sudden death of his father left his mother in destitute circumstances, and at the age of fifteen Hoffbauer was apprenticed to a

baker. While engaged in his trade he studied Latin, and passed an examination in the lower class of a monastery school, determined to become a priest at some future time, if possible. The bishop of Tivoli (later Pius VII) finally took him under his protection, and Hoffbauer succeeded in making his way to Vienna, where he studied at the university. In 1783 he went to Rome, whither he had journeyed already twelve times, and joined the congregation of the Redemptorists. Two years later, after consecration to the priesthood, he returned to Vienna, and then to Warsaw, where a house and a church of St. Benno were placed at his disposal.. From this he and his associates afterwards bore the name of *Bennonites.* The success of the Redemptorists in the establishment of a monastery at-this place was so great that Pius VI, in 1791, decided to give them an annual support of 100 scudi. The Roman Catholics assert that many Protestants became converts of Hoffbauer, and that their confidence in him and his brothers of the monastery was unbounded. While the latter may be possible, the former is surely improbable. The effect of the French Revolution may have led some disturbing minds to join the ranks of the Roman Catholics, because many of that Church had taken such a peculiar attitude in France against true Christianity. Later Hoffbauer also established a monastery in Switzerland. Here he and his followers suffered great persecution, which, while it is possible that the disturbed state of the people gave rise to it, is more likely to have been provoked by Hoffbauer and his followers. This last supposition receives additional strength from the dealings of Napoleon while in Prussia. He imprisoned them one entire month in the fortress of Küstrin, and, after a search of their papers, demolished the monastery and discontinued the order. Some time later Hoffbauer succeeded in establishing an educational institution at Vienna, which had been presented to the Redemptorists by a converted (?) Protestant. In 1815 he went to Bulgaria, and returned to Vienna in 1818, where the government (Roman Catholic) ordered him from the country. The intercession of the clergy influenced the emperor not only to annul the order of the government, but to establish even a monastery at Vienna under his own protection. Hoffbauer died suddenly March 25, 1820. In his labors he was assisted by J. T. Hibel, who died in 1807. Initial steps have been taken for his beatification (q.v.). See Posl, *Derste deutsche Redemptorist, in s. Leben und Wirken* (Reg. 1844); S. Brunner, *H. und seine Zeit* (Vienna, 1850); *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* 5, 413 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hoffeditz, Theodore L., D.D.

a German Reformed minister, was born near Carhshaven, on the Weser, Germany, December 16,1783. He emigrated to America in 1807. He first followed the calling of a schoolteacher. Subsequently he studied theology with Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, D.D., in Philadelphia. He was licensed and ordained in 1813, and became pastor of German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa., and served this charge during the remainder of his life, with the exception of brief intervals, during which he served numerous congregations which he organized in neighboring counties. In 1843 he, with Rev. Dr. Schneck, visited Germany, bearing a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church to Dr. Krummacher to become professor of theology in the seminary at Mercersburg. He died July 10, 1858. Mild, warm-hearted, and zealous, Dr. Hoffeditz exerted a wide and blessed influence in the Church. One of his sons entered the ministry.

Hoffmann, Andreas Gottlieb

a very distinguished theologian and Orientalist, born April 13, 1796, at Welbsleben, near Magdeburg, was educated at the University of Halle where the influence of Gesenius led him to a thorough study of the Shemitic languages, especially the Syriac. After graduation he lectured at his alma mater for a short time on the Arabic language and in 1822 was called as extraordinary professor to Jena. Here he was advanced to the regular professorship in 1826, with the degree of S.T.D. and membership in the theological faculty. At the time of his death, March 16, 1864, he was senior of the theological faculty and of the *senate* of the university. As a professor at Jena he devoted himself mainly to the philological department of theology. His most popular lectures were on Hebrew Antiquities; but, like Gesenius, he lectured also on Church History, Isagogics, both of the Old and New Testament, Exegesis of the Old Testament, and on all the Shemitic and Eastern languages generally studied at a German university. In philology, his *Grammatica Syriaca* (Hal. 1827; translated into English by Day and Cowper) is by some of the best authorities considered superior to any other yet published, that of Ullmann included. Among his other works are *Entwurfd. hebr. Alterthümer* (Weim. 1832), which is based on the work of Warnekros (Weim. 1782 and 1794): — *Commentarius phil. crit. in Mosis benedictionem* (in pamphlet form, Halle; later, Jena, 1822, etc.): — *Apokalyptiker d. alt. Zeit unter Juden und Christen* (Jena, 1833-38, vol. 1, part 1 and 2, containing the book of Enoch). Hoffmann was also

editor of the second section of the great Encyclopaedia of Ersch und Gruber. In addition to these literary labors; he contributed largely to the German theological and philological periodicals. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 651; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 899; Brockhaus, *Conversat. — Lex.* 5, 20. (J. H.W.)

Hoffmann, Daniel

a Lutheran theologian, was born at Halle 1540, and educated at the University of Jena. In 1576 he was made professor of theology at the University of Helmstadt. In the theological controversies of his day he took an active part, contending against the Calvinistic theory of the sacraments, predestination, and also against the doctrine of Ubiquity (q.v.) as held by his own Church. He decried philosophy as hurtful both to religion and to the community, attempting to sustain his position by extracts from the Pauline epistles and the writings of Luther himself, who, as is well known, did in his earlier years hold that there is a contradiction between the truths of theology and those of philosophy. In his later years Luther radically changed his views. Hoffmann was attacked by the two great Aristotelian philosophers, Caselius and Martini, who also complained of him at the university. The duke of Brunswick, after consulting the University of Rostock, obliged Hoffmann to retract, and vacate his chair at the university. He died at Wolfenbüttel in 1611. His followers, on account of their adherence to a twofold doctrine, were called *duplicists,* and their opponents *simplicists.* His controversial writings are numerous, as *De duplici veritate Lutheri a philosophis impugnata* (Magdeb. 1600): — *Super quaestione, num syllogismus rationis locum habeat in regno fidez* (ibid. 1606). An account of his disputes may be, found in Thomasius, *De Controversia Hoffmanniana* (Erlangen, 1844, 8vo) *Halleus Impietatis Hoffmannianae* (Frankf. 1604). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 185 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 17 pt. 2, chap. 1, § 10; Enfield, *Hist. of Philos.* 2, 506; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* 2, 73 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict. 3,* 478 sq.; Krug, *Philos. Lex.* 5, 531 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform. 4,* 159-61. See HUNNIUS.

Hoffmann, Gottfried

born at Plagwitz, in Silesia, in 1678, studied at Leipzig, and was rector of the gymnasia at Lauban and Zittau. He died in 1712. His name is mentioned here on account of his contributions to hymnology, as

Leichengesange (Laub. 1704): — *uszlieder* (ib. 1705). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8,* 442.

Hoffmann, Heinrich

a German preacher of the 17th century at Masko, in Finland, was associated with other divines in translating the Bible into the Finnish language, published at Stockholm (1642, fol. and 1658). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8,* 447.

Hoffmann, Immanuel

born at Tübingen April 16,1710, was appointed archdeacon of Tübingen in 1741, and in 1756 professor of Greek in the university of the same place. He died in 1772. Hoffmann published a number of dissertations; of these, the following are considered the best: *Diss. in Oraculum* <4505>*Romans 10:*5-8 (Tüb. 1752,4to): — *Diss. de stilo Apostoli Pauli* (1757): — *Diss. in loca parallela,* 2 *Pet.* 2, 4-17; *Jude* 5-13 (1762, 4to): — *Commentatio in* <4019>1 *Corinthians* 1:19-21 (1766, 4to). He wrote also, but left unpublished, *Demonstratio Evangelica per ipsum scripturarum consensum in oraculis ex Vetere Testamento in Novo allegatis declarata,* partes 3 (Tübingen, 1773-82, 4to). T. G. Hegelmaier, who edited this work after the decease of the author, prefixed to it a life of Hoffmann, an ana excursus on the right method of interpreting the quotations made from the O.T. in the New. Orme speaks of this work as "full of learning, and in general very judicious." — Kitto, *Bib. Cyclop.* 2, 318.

Hoffmann, Johann

a distinguished German theologian, was born at Schweidnitz. The date of his birth is not known. He was for a time professor of theology at the University of Prague. In 1409 he and Otto of Münsterberg went to Leipzig, and induced many students to accompany them. They thus contributed to the founding of the Leipzig University. At first he was one of its professors, but in 1414 he was made bishop of Meissen. He died there in 1451. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex. 8,* 441.

Hoffmann (or Hofmann), Melchior

one of the most celebrated Anabaptist (q.v.) prophets, born at Hall, in Suabia, originally a furrier, went to Livonia about the time of the Reformation, and became a Protestant. His enthusiasm for the cause of the

Protestants led him to preach at Wolmar. On account of the great opposition which he there encountered, he went to Dorpat, where the opposition against him was no less great, and he became so embittered against the Roman Catholic priests that he sought to influence the people in favor of destroying all paintings in churches, and all monasteries. This course estranged from him even his own friends, and he left in 1525 for Wittenberg to consult with Luther and Bugenhagen, who encouraged him to return to Dorpat, admonishing his friends, at the same time, to harmonious action. But his success was no better than before, and he soon after left for Reval. Later we find him at Stockholm. In 1527 the king of Denmark appointed him preacher at Kiel, but his determination to explain the Bible apocalyptically, and his deviation from the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, made Luther and his followers opponents of Hoffmann, and, after a stay of only two years, a conference to examine his doctrines was appointed. He was condemned for heresy, deposed from his position, and ordered to leave the country. He now went to Strasburg, and next to Emden, where he allied himself with the Anabaptists, and soon became one of their principal leaders. At the latter place he so infatuated his followers that they took him for the prophet Elias, and announced the Day of Judgment as coming in 1536. From Emden he returned to Strasburg, but the disturbances which he provoked occasioned the calling of a synod (June, 1533), which condemned him and caused his imprisonment. He died in prison in 1542. On the person of Christ. Hoffmann, with many other Anabaptists, and like the Valentinians of the early ages, held that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom, laying great stress upon ἐγένετο (⁴⁸⁰¹John 1:14); that the Logos did not merely assume our nature, but he *became* flesh — hence his blasphemous expression, "Maledicta sit caro Mariae" (Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* 2, 349; comp. also Tuchsel, p. 34, 35). On the Eucharist he differed, as we have already stated, from Luther in his doctrine of the real (spiritual) presence, holding that the bodily bread is a seal, sign, and token in memory of the body; the body, however, is received in the word by an unwavering faith in our heart; the *word* is spirit and life; the *word* is Christ, and is partaken of by faith. Thus he thought it possible, while considering the bread only as a symbol, to adhere to the symbol of the real spiritual presence of Christ. The followers of Hoffmann, who took the name of their leader, flourished for a short time after his death near Strasburg and Lower Germany, but finally joined the other Anabaptist sects, from which Hoffmann, while alive, had kept distinct. Fuhrmann *(Handwörterb d. christl. Religions ü.*

Kirchengesch. 2, 325) says that a number of this sect went to England in 1535, and that there also they suffered greatly from persecutions; twenty-two of them were even imprisoned. Under Edward VI. (1548) they fared somewhat better, but after Mary's accession to the throne they were obliged to flee the country. Under the reign of Elizabeth they again ventured to reside in England, but in 1560 they were finally banished the country. A full account of Hoffimann and his sects is given by Krohn, *Gesch. d. fanat. u. enthus. Wiedert'ufer in Niederdeutschland* (Lpz. 1758, 8vo, containing, also, a complete list of the writings of Hoffmann, which were mainly apocalyptical); Herrmann, *Sur la vie et les ecrits de M. H.* (Strasburg, 1858). See also Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat. 4,* 442 sq.; Cunitz, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 191 sq.; Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* 2, 480; Niedner, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 64; Möller, *Cimbria litterata,* 2, 347 sq.; Rihrich, in *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* (1860, p. 3 sq.); Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* 2, 73; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.* p. 628. (J. H.W.)

Hoffmannites

SEE HOFFMANN, MELCHIOR.

Hoffmeier, John Henry

a minister of the German Reformed Church, born at Anhalt-Cöhten, Germany, March 17, 1760, was educated at the University of Halle. He spent some time as private tutor in Hamburg; then went to Bremen, where he preached a short time, and finally emigrated to America in 179a Here he became pastor of several German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa. In 1806 he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor till 1331. He was able to preach only in German; and, the English language being needed in his charge, he retired from the active duties of the ministry. He died March 18, 1838. Well educated and diligent in his. work, he was a successful minister. Two of his sons and three of his grandsons also devoted themselves to the ministry.

Höfling Johann Wilhelm

an eminent German Lutheran minister, born in Drossenfeld, near Baireuth, in 1802, was educated at the. Gymnasium of Baireuth and at the University of Erlangen, where he was an attentive hearer of Schelling, whose lectures strengthened his regard for historical Christianity. In 1823 he was

appointed minister at Wuirzburg, and in 1827 at Jost, near Nuremberg. During his residence here he published two little pamphlets in defense of positive Christianity against Rationalism, which was then making rapid progress. These, it is thought, procured him the appointment as professor of practical theology at the University of Erlangen (1833). He died April 5, 1853. Höfling was a firm adherent to the old Protestant idea of the ministry and of the Church, and defended them vigorously with all the means of modern science. His theological writings were mainly in the department of practical theology, especially on the constitution of the Church, worship, and related dogmas. Of his earlier works the best are *De symbolorum natura, necessitate, auctoritate et usu* (Erlangen, 1835; 2nd ed. *1841): — Liturqische Abhandl. v. d. Composition der christl. Gemeinde Gottesdienste* (ib. 1837). But his most important work is undoubtedly that on baptism: *Das Sakranent d. Taufe,* etc., *dogmatisch, historisch, und liturgisch dargestellt* (vol. 1, 1846; vol. 2, 1848). But his *Grundsatze evangel. — luther. Kirchenverjfssung* (1850; 3rd edition, 1852) attracted more general attention than any other work of his. Since his decease Thomasius and Harnack have edited and published his *Liturgisches Urkundenbuch* (1854), containing the rites of communion, ordination, introduction into the Church, and marriage. This book is only a fragment of a larger work, on which he had been engaged the last years of his life. See *Zum Gedachtnisz J. W. F. Höfling's,* etc., by Dr. Nagelsbach and Dr. Thomasius; Kurtz, *Text-book of Ch. Hist.* 2, 317, 373; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 6,* 170, 171. (J. H. W.)

Hofmann, Johann Georg

a German theologian, born at Windsheim October, 1724, was educated at Erlangen and Leipzig. In 1757 he began philosophical lectures at Leipzig, and in 1762 was honored with a professorship. In 1764 he went to Giessen as professor of Oriental languages, and in 1765 was made D.D. In 1769 he was called to Altorf as professor of theology, and here he became also archdeacon. He died May 10, 1772. His principal works are *Die Erbauung n. ihrem wahren Begriffe ihrem Mitteln und Hinderniszen* (Frankf. 1756, 8vo): — *Grammatica Hebraea Danziana methodo* (Gieszen, 1765, 8vo): — *Lock's paraphrast. Erklarung der Briefe and. Galater, Korinther, Romer, und Epheser, aus d. Engl. übers.* (Frankf. 1768-69, 2 vols. 4to), besides several essays. — Adelung's Jocher, *Gelehrt. — Lexik.* Add. 2, 2079.

Hofmann, Karl Gottlob, D.D.

a distinguished German theologian, born at Schneeberg Oct. 1,1703, was educated at the University of Leipzig, and lectured there for several years on philosophy and philology. Later he became a preacher at St. Paul's and St. Thomas's churches, and later still he was called to the St. Nicolas Church. In 1739 he was called to the University of Wittenberg as professor of theology. Here he became the senior of the theological faculty, and one of the brightest lights of the day. He died Sept. 19,1774. lie published many valuable works, of which Adelung's Jocher gives a complete list. We have space only to mention his *Introductio Theolog. — Crit. in Lectionem epist. Pauli ad Galat. et Coloss.* (Lips. 1750, 4to), and a series of minor works, under the title *Varia Sacra* (Wittenb. et Lips. 1751). He also edited and enlarged the *Introductio in Lectionent N.T.* of J. G. Pritius (Leipsic, 1737).Jocher. *Gelehrt. Lexik.* (Addenda by Adelung, 2, 2049); Kitto, *Biblical Cyclop.* 2, 318.

Hofmeister, Sebastian

SEE WAGNER.

Hofstede de Groot, Peter

a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born at Rotterdam in 1720, and educated at Groningen. Soon after the completion of his university course he was called to Rotterdam as professor of theology. Here he became a leader of a theological school of "mediation," known as the Groningen School, founded by the Platonist Van Heusde (17781839), who was also a professor in the Rotterdam University at that time. Hofstede, assisted by Pareau, published a dogmatic theology, containing a complete exposition of the doctrines of this school, which are nothing more or less than a spiritual Arianism. They held that there is in human nature a divine element which needs development in order to enable humanity to reach its destination. This destination is conformity to God. All religions have aimed and worked at the same problem, but Christianity has solved it in the highest and purest manner. Still there is only a difference in degree between that and other religions. God has fulfilled the desire of man, whom he had prepared for salvation by sending perfection embodied in Christ. To know Christ we need the exegetical study of that preparation of man for Christ which is furnished by the Old Testament. The New Testament is the fulfillment. The latter contains the sayings of Jesus and the conclusions of

the apostles. The writers of the Scriptures were not infallible, though they did not often err. Sin is regarded as a mere inconvenience, since *all sinners will eventually be holy and happy.* In stating the influences of the Groningen school in Dutch theology, Hurst *(Rationalism,* p. 366,367) says that it is similar to the position occupied by Channing with regard to the orthodoxy of the American Church. Hofstede was a violent opponent of the Lutheran Church; and when, in 1779, a Lutheran church was about to be established at the Cape of Good Hope, he protested loudly, and wrote *Oost-indiansche Kerkzaaken.,* or Ecclesiastical Affairs of India (Hague, 1779-1780, 2 vols. 8vo). Against Marmontel's celebrated novel *Belisaire* he also wrote a work exposing the vices of distinguished heathens, and showing their utter unfitness for a claim to salvation, to which Marmontel believed those entitled who had lived before Christ's coming. He died Nov. 27, 1803. See Schröckh, *Kirchen q. 8,* 735; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism,* p. 364-367; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought,* p. 445 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Genesis* 24,903 sq. (J.H.W.)

Hog

SEE BOAR; *SEE SWINE*.

Hoge, James, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Moorfield. Virginia, in 1784. He was educated chiefly by his father, though he spent one year at an academy in Baltimore. He was licensed to preach April 17, J805, was ordained in 1809, and was appointed missionary to the State of Ohio by the General Assembly. Within a year he organized a church at Franklinton, and in 1807 became minister of the First Church at Columbus, Ohio. Here he remained until 1858, when his age and infirmities induced him to resign. Dr. Hoge was the "father of the Presbytery of Columbus, and even of the Synod of Ohio." Not merely in his own parish, but in the Church courts and in the General Assembly, he was a man of great power and influence. The institutions for the deaf; dumb, and blind in Ohio were largely due to his exertions. Though born in a slave state, he was opposed to slavery, and was thoroughly loyal to the nation. He died at Columbus Sept. 22,1863. A memorial sermon, preached by the Rev. William C. Roberts Oct. 4,1863 (Columbus, Ohio, 1863), was reviewed in the *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1864, p. 89 sq. — Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac,* 1863, p. 232; 1864, p. 168.

Hoge, Moses, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born Feb. 15,1752, in Frederick County, Va. For a time he attended a classical school in Culpepper County. In 1778 he went to Liberty Hall Academy, and there completed his studies in 1780. In November, 1781, he was licensed to preach, and was ordained pastor of a church at Hardy Dec. 13. 1782. In 1787, the Southern climate proving injurious to his health, he removed to Shepherdstown, where he gathered a large congregation and acquired great popularity. In 1805 he opened a classical school, mainly for the education of his own sons. He maintained this, however, only a short time, when he was called to the presidency of Hampden Sianey College, as successor of Dr. Alexander. Five years later, while at the head of the college, the degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Princeton College. In 1812 the Synod of Virginia established a theological seminary, and Dr. Hoge was called to it as a professor. He accepted this position, retaining, however, the presidency of Hampden Sidney College. He died July 5,1820. He enjoyed the reputation of being a superior preacher. “John Randolph pronounced him the most eloquent man he had ever heard…Yet Dr. Hoge had some great disadvantages. His voice had considerable unpleasantness, arising from a nasal twang; so that he must be regarded as a very remarkable man to win such commendation from his gifted countryman.” He wrote, in 1793, in defense of the Calvinistic doctrine, a reply to the Rev. Jeremiah Walker, a Baptist minister who had suddenly passed from ultra Calvinism to the entire rejection of the Calvinistic doctrines. He also published *The Christian Panoply* (1799), designed as an antidote to Paine’s *Age of Reason.* It consists of two parts, the first containing the substance of Watson’s reply to Paine’s first part, and the second Hoge’s answer to the second part of Paine’s work. It had a wide circulation, and exerted a very important influence. A volume of his sermons was published shortly after his death, but their circulation has been very limited, and they hardly do justice to his character as a preacher. A memoir of Dr. Hoge was partly prepared by his sons, but seems to have been lost, as it has never gone into print. — Amer. *Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1864, p. 93 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3,* 426 sq. (J. H.W.)

Hoge, Samuel Davies, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. Moses, was born in Shepherdstown, Va., in 1791. His early instruction he received from his father, after whose assumption of the presidency of Hampden Sidney College-he became a

student in that college, and graduated in 1810. He also pursued his theological course under his father, filling at the same time, the appointment of tutor at his alma mater. Later he became professor, and at one time he acted even as vice-president. In 1816 he entered the active work of the ministry, serving the two churches of Culpepper and Madison, Virginia, at the same time. In 1821 he removed to Hillsborough, Ohio, serving also a church at Rocky Spring at the same time. Three years later he was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the Ohio University at Athens. The college being at this time without a president, Dr. Hoge performed the duties of that office, and greatly increased the prosperity of the institution. At the same time, he preached in the college chapel and in the church of the town whenever his time and health would permit. He died in December 1826. — Sprague, *Ann. of Am. Pulpit, 4*, 483.

Hog'lah

(Heb. *Choglah'*, hl;g]j ; from Arab. for *partridge;* Sept. Ἐγλά v.r. Αἰγλά, etc.), the third of the five daughters of Zelophehad the Gileadite, to whom, in the absence of male heirs, portions were assigned by Moses (<04633>Numbers 26:33; 27:1; 36:11; <06703>Joshua 17:3). B.C. 1619. *SEE BETH-HOGLAH*.

Hogstraaten

SEE HOOGSTRAATEN.

Ho'ham

(Heb. *Hoham'*, µhf;h, prob. for µhf;hy], whom *Jehovah impels or confounds;* Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate *Oham)*, the king of Hebron, who joined the league against Gibeon, but was overthrown in battle by Joshua and slain after being captured in the cave at Makkedah (<06103>Joshua 10:3). B.C. 1618.

Hohburg

SEE HOBURG.

Hohenburg or Odilienberg

an old, celebrated monastery on the Rhine, is said to have been founded by duke Ethicot, whose daughter Odilia was the first abbess. She is supposed to have died in 720. This monastery was celebrated for many years for the great learning of its inmates and the encouragement which it gave to all who devoted themselves to literary labors. About 1429, this, as well as the monastery at the foot of the hill, said to have been founded by Odilia, in order to save weary travelers the task of ascending the mount, was closed. One of the works published by an abbess of this monastery (Herrad, 1167), *Hortus deliciarum,* in Latin, contains contributions to Biblical history and to the entire field of theology. See Albricht, *History von Hohenb.* (Schletstadt, 1751, 4to); Silbermann, *Beschreib. v. Hohenb.* (Strasb. 1781 and 1835); Rettberg, *Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschl.* 2, 75-79; Mabillon, A*nn.* 1, 488 sq., 599; 2, 58; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 277. (J. H. W.)

Hohenlohe, Alexander Leopold Franz Emmerich

prince of a Hungarian Roman Catholic bishop, was born near Waldenburg Aug. 17,1794. His mother, baroness Judith de Reviczky, destined him for the clerical life, and after studying at the Academy of Berne, and the seminaries of Vienna, Tyrnau, and Elwangen, he was ordained priest in 1816. In the same year he made a journey to Rome, where he associated much with Jesuits, and finally joined their *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.* In 1819 he returned to Germany, and settled in Bavaria, where his birth and fortune soon procured for him a high position. His reputation is chiefly due to his pretended power to cure diseases in a miraculous way. He is said to have made cures in the hospitals of Würzburg and Bamberg. But the authorities at last interfered, and even the pope himself advised Hohenlohe to abstain from these pretensions, and the prince finally left Bavaria for Vienna. He next went to Hungary, and was made bishop in *partibus* of Sardica in 1844, and abbot of the convent of St. Michael of Gabojan. During the Revolution of 1848 he was driven from Hungary. and he went to Innspruck, where the emperor of Austria then resided. In Oct. 1849, he went to Vienna to visit his nephew, count Fries, who had just decided to become a priest. He died at his house Nov. 17,1849. The renown which Hohenlohe gained by his cures was not confined to his own country, but extended to England, Ireland, and even to our country, where the case of Mrs. Ann Mattingly, of Washington, D. C., who was said to have miraculously recovered of a tumor. March 10, 1824, in consequence

of his prayers, caused considerable excitement. The prince ceased these practices many years before his death, at least publicly. Various theories have been propounded to account for the cures attributed to him: the most rational is that which assigns them to the power of the imagination over so called nervous disorders. His principal works are *Der im Geiste der kathol. Kirche betende Christ* (Bamberg, 1819; 3rd edit. Lpz. 1824): — *Des katholischen Priesters Beruf Würde u. Pficht* (Bamb. 1821): — *Was ist d. Zeitgeist* (Bamberg, 1821), an attempt to show that none but a good Roman Catholic can be a good and loyal citizen, addressed to Francis of Austria and Alexander of Russ*ia: — Die Wanderschift einer Gött suchenzden Seele,* etc. (Vienna, *1830): — Lictblicke und Ergebnisse aus d. Welt ut. dem Priesterleben* (Ratisbon, 1836); a number of sermons, etc. His posthumous works were published by Brunner (Ratisbon, 1851). See Paulus, *Wundercuren z. Würtzb. u. Bamb. unternommen durch. M. Michel u. d. Pr. 5. Hohenlohe* (Lpz. 1822); *Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte d. neuest. Zeit,* p. 321; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* 5, 434 5 (gives a full account of his works); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 19,* 653 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24,* 914.

Hohenstaufen

SEE GUELPHS AND GHIBEL LINES.

Hohnbaum, Johann Christian

a distinguished German preacher, born at Rodach, near Hildburghausen, was educated at the University of Göttingen, under Michaelis, Walch, Hevne, and others. For a time he was private tutor and preacher. In 1777 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and, nine years later, minister and superintendent of his native city. He died Nov. 13,1825. Hohnbaum was an assistant in the preparation of the Hildburger *Gesangbuch* (hymn-book), and contributed also largely to different theological periodicals. His theological works are *Ueber d. heilige Abendmahl* (Cobl. 1781, 8vo): — *Predigten fiber Gesch. d. A. T.* (ibid. 1788-89, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Gesinge und Predigten* (ib. 1800, 8vo). — Döring, *Deutschl. Kanzelredner,* p. 143 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holbach, Paul Henry Thiry

baron of, *an* infidel of the 18th century, was born at Heidelsheim, in the palatinate (now grand-duchy) of Baden, in 1723. He went to Paris at an

early age with his father, who at his death left him heir to a large fortune. Holbach's house became then the headquarters of all the freethinkers and writers of his day. At the dinners which he gave twice a week, either in Paris or at his castle of Grandval, and which gained him the title *of first maitre d'hotel of philosophy,* met the abbot Galiani, Helvetius, D'Alembert, Diderot, Raynal, Grimm, Buffon, Rousseau, Marmontel, Duclos, Laharpe, Condorcet, etc. It was in these reunions that they exchanged their ideas, and prepared, at least in their minds, many of the articles which appeared in the first *Encyklopèdie* (Diderot's), besides many anonymous publications which were also sent forth, consisting either of original articles or of translations from the German or English. They carried their speculation, it is said, to such daring lengths that Buffon, D'Alembert, and Rousseau felt compelled to withdraw from the circle. Holbach himself was one of the most zealous of these champions of naturalism and contended not only against Christianity, but against every positive religion. He is said, according to Barbier, to have published no less than forty-seven anonymous writings of his own composition. His first philosophical work he published in 1767 under the name of Boulanger: it is entitled *Le Christianisme dévoilé, ou examen des principes et des effets de la religion révéléé* (Amst.). In this work he says explicitly that religion is in no way necessary for the welfare of empires; that the dogmas of Christianity are but a heap of absurdities, the propagation of which has exercised the most fatal influence on mankind; that its morality is nowise superior to the morality of other systems, and is only fit for enthusiasts incapable of fulfilling the duties imposed by society; finally, that through the eighteen centuries of its existence Christianity had led to the most deplorable results in politics. Soon after this work, which his infidel associates themselves declared the most terrible that had ever appeared in any part of the world, he published *L'Esprit du Clerge, ou le Christianisme primitif vengé des entreprises et des exces de nospretres modernes* (Lond. 1767), and *De l'Imposture sacerdotale, ou recueil de pieces sur le clerge* (Amst. 1767). In the same year Holbach published his most important work, *Systme de la Nature* (Lond. 1770), under the signature of "Mirabaud, secretaire perpetuel de l'Academie Française." It is not definitely known whether he wrote the book alone, or was assisted by La Grange, Grimm, and others, but it is generally conceded to have been sent forth by Holbach, and that he defrayed the expenses of publication. So radical was this work that even Voltaire attacked it in the article "God" of his "Philosophical Dictionary." Yet in 1772 Holbach published a popular

edition of that work under the title *Le bon Sens, ou idees naturm elles opposees aux idees surnaturelles* (Amst.; often reprinted under the name of the abbot Meslier). The wretched book was largely read by the common- people, and-contributed perhaps more than all the other philosophical works of the 18th century, taken together, to the subversion of morals and the spread of infidelity. It teaches the most naked and atheistical materialism, and even Voltaire abused it as immoral. In it Holbach discusser s the maxims of religious morality, takes a hurried glance t at social and savage life, touches the so-called "social compact," and in the course of his observations endeavors to teach, among other things, that self-interest is the ruling motive of man, and that God is only an ideal being, created by kings and priests. His *Systeme Social, ou les principes naturels de la morale et de la politique* (Amsterd. 1773), aims, as its title indicates, to establish the basis and rules of a moral and political system altogether independent of any religious system. This work was as ill received by the philosophers as by the religious party, and the Paris Parliament (in 1773) condemned this and all other preceding works, of Holbach to be publicly burned by the hangman. They were all secretly sent to Holland in MS., and printed there by Michael Rey, who circulated them in France, so that even the friends and guests of Holbach did not know him as their author, and often criticized his works severely while partaking of his hospitality. He was also one of the contributors to the celebrated Encyclopedia (q.v.) of Diderot. Holbach's biographers claim that he was a man of good heart, and that, notwithstanding the pernicious theories of materialism which he sought to inculcate, especially among the French people, his life was better than his books. They claim especially that he was a man of most unselfish benevolence, and that he made his house even an asylum for his foes. Thus he protected and gave a refuge to the Jesuits in the days of their adversity under Louis XV, though he hated their system, and had written against *them.* He died at Paris January 21, 1789. See Voltaire, *Dictionnaire Philosoph.;* Diderot, *Meimoires;* Damiron, *Etudes sur la philosophie d'Holbach* (in *Mim. de l' academie d. Sciences morales et politiques);* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 24,* 925 sq.; *Biog. Univ. 20,* 460 sq.; Schlosser, *Gesch. d.* 18 *und* 19 *Jahrhund.* 1, 580 sq.; 2, 534; Buhle, *Gesch. der neueren Philos. 6,* Abtheil 1, p. 94 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church History of the 18th and 19th Cent.* 1, 211 sq.; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Though,* p. 181 sq.; Vinet, *French Lit.* p. 352 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Rationalism,* p. 50; Morell, *History of Philos. p.* 111 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop. 6,* 220 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holberg, Ludwig von

a Danish divine, was born Nov. 6,1684, at Bergen, in Norway. He studied theology at Copenhagen University, and became a professor in that school. In 1735 he was elected rector of the University, and in 1737 treasurer. In 1747 the king created Holberg a baron on account of his literary services. He died Jail. 27, 1754. He is known as the creator of modern Danish literature, and deserves our notice on account of his *Kirchengeschichte* (1738-40, 2 vols.), and *Judische Gesch.* (1742, 2 vols.). Both these works are considered quite valuable even at the present time. — Brockhans, *Conv. Lex. 8,* 48 sq.; Gorton, *Biograph. Dict.* 2. (J. H. W.)

Holcombe, Henry, D.D.

a Baptist minister, was born in Prince Edward Count, Va., Sept. 22,1762. His early education was limited. While yet a boy, he entered the Revolutionary army. In his twenty-second year he was licensed to preach by the Baptists; and in Sept. 1785, was ordained pastor of the church at Pike Creek, S. C. Some time after, he was appointed delegate to the Convention of South Carolina, held at Charleston, to ratify the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he became pastor of the Baptist Church at Euhaw, preaching also at May River and St. Helena; but, the climate not agreeing with him, he removed to Beaufort. In 1799 he accepted a call to Savannah. Here he labored with great success, and was chiefly instrumental in organizing the Savannah Female Asylum (in 1801), at the same time conducting a Magazine, *The Georgia Analytical Repository.* He also took part in establishing Mount Euon Academy in 1804, and a Missionary Society in 1806. In 1810 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1812 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, where he labored with great acceptance until his death, May 22,1824. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, etc. — Sprague, *Annals, 6,* 215.

Holcombe, Hosea

a Baptist minister, was born in Union District, S. C., July 20, 1780. He was engaged in agricultural pursuits until 1800, when he turned his attention to theology, and was licensed the following year. He labored in his native region until 1812, when he went to North Carolina, and finally settled in Jefferson Co., Ala., in the fall of 1818. His ministrations in all these places were eminently successful, and he continued his labors until his death, July

31, 1841. Mr. Holcombe published a *Collection of Sacred Hymns* (1815): a work on Baptism, entitled *A Reply to the Rev. Finis Ewing, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Society* (1832): — *A Refutation of the Rev. Joshua Lawrence's Patriotic Discourse, or Anti-Mission Principles exposed* (1836): — *The History of the Alabama Baptists* (1840). — Sprague, *Annals, 6,* 442.

Holcot, Robert

an English scholastic of the 14th century, doctor of Oxford University, and a member of the Dominican order, was one of the most liberal interpreters of sacred Scripture in his day, yet an obedient son of the Roman Catholic Church, and a zealous advocate of Nominalism (q.v.). He died a victim of the plague in 1349. Holcot wrote mainly on the sacred Scriptures, but not many of his works have ever gone into print. This may account for the fact that many books whose authorship is doubtful are attributed to him by the Dominicans. Mazonius (in *Univ. Platonzis et Aristot. Philosoph.* p. 201) has severely criticised the philosophical views of Holcot. His most important published theological works are *De Studio Scripturae* (Venice, 1586, and often): — *In Proverb. Salom.* (Paris, 1515, 4to): — *In Cantica Canticorum et in septea Prioras Capita Ecclesiasticis* (Ven. 1509). Among the works attributed to him by the Dominicans we find *Moralisationes Histomriarum* (Paris, 1510, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, 24,* 941; Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1671. (J. H. W.)

Hold

[verb] is often used figuratively, but in obvious meanings, in the Bible. *To take hold of God* and *his covenant* is to embrace him as given in the Gospel, and by faith to plead his promises and relations (Isaiah 64:7, and 56:4). *Christians hold forth the word of life;* they, by practicing it in their lives, give light and instruction to others (Philippians 2:16). *Not holding of Christ the head* is neglecting to draw gracious influence from him, and to yield due subjection to him; as, for instance (Colossians 2:18,19), worshipping angels, etc. instead of Christ; insisting on penances, etc. instead of on the merit of Christ's work.

Hold

[noun] (hdWxm; *metsudah', a fortress*, as often rendered), the term especially applied to the lurking places of David (1 Samuel 22:4, 5; 24:22, etc.). *SEE STRONGHOLD*.

Holda

SEE HULDA.

Holden, Henry, D.D.

a distinguished English Roman Catholic controversialist, was born in Lancashire in 1596. He studied at the Seminary of Douai, and afterwards went to Paris, where he took the degree of D.D. He became a priest in the parish of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Much of his time was devoted to literary labors, which placed him among the most renowned theologians of that period. He died in 1665. His principal work is *Analysis Fidei* (Paris, 1652, 8vo; 2nd ed. by Barbon, 1767, 12mo; translated into English by W. G., 1658 4to). Dupiln commends this book very highly. In 1660 he published *Novum Testamenetum*, with marginal notes, and a *Letter to Arnauld* on predestination and grace. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. 17; Allibone. *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 863; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, *24*, 935