

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Holder, Wilhem - Hul**

*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**

## Holder, Wilhelm

(also known as *Frater Wilhelmus de Stutgardia Ordinis Minorum*), a Württemberg philosopher and theologian, was born at Marbach in 1542, and educated at Tübingen. He distinguished himself especially by his great opposition to scholastic philosophy and theology, against which he wrote *Mus exenteratus contra Joannern Pistorium* (Tüb. 1593, 4to): — a very rare and curious work on the Mass and baptism, of which extracts have been given in the *N. Götting. Hist. Mag.* vol. 2, pt. 4:p. 716 sq.: — also *Petitorium exhortatorium pro resolutorio super grossis quibusdam dubietatibus et quaestionibus*, e.c. (Tübing. 1594, 4to). He died July 24, 1609. — Adelung's Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1672; Krug, *Encyklop.* — *philos. Lex.* 2, 450.

## Holdheim, Samuel

a distinguished Jewish divine of the Liberalistic or so-called reform school, was born at Kempen, province of Posen, Prussia, in 1806. His early education was, like that of every other Jewish Rabbi of his time, confined to a thorough study of the Scriptures and the Talmud. In the latter his proficiency was very great, and was pretty generally known throughout his native province, even while he was yet a young man. With great perseverance, he paved his way for a broader culture than the study of the Talmud and the instructions of the Rabbins could afford him, and he went to the universities of Prague and Berlín. His limited preparation made it, however, impossible for him to graduate at those high schools. In 1836 he was called as Rabbi to the city of Frankfort on the Oder. Here he distinguished himself greatly by his endeavors to advance the interests of his Jewish brethren in Prussia, and to obtain liberal concessions from the government. He there published, besides a number of sermons delivered in behalf of the cause just alluded to, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (Frmkf. 1839, 8vo), in which he treats of the Jewish holy days, usages, etc. These sermons were the subject of consideration by the leading Jewish periodicals for successive months. Thus the distinguished Jewish scholar J. A. Frankel aimed to establish on these sermons the laws of Jewish Homiletics (comp. *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1840, No. 35, 39, 47, 49, 50). His scholarly attainments were such at this time (1840) that the University of Leipzig honored him with the degree of "doctor of philosophy." In the same year Holdheim accepted a call as chief Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and was installed Sept. 19 (1840). The prominence which this position gave

him greatly increased his influence both at home and abroad. and his movements for reform in the Jewish Ritual (q.v.) contributed perhaps more than the efforts of any other person to the reform movements at Berlin with which he was afterwards so intimately associated. In 1843 he published *Ueber d. Autonomie d. Rabbinen v2. d. Princip. derjuid. Ehe* (Schwerin and Berlin, 1843, 8vo). In this work he labored for a submission of the Jews in matrimonial questions to the law of the land in which they now sojourned, instead of adhering to their Talmudic laws, so conflicting with the duties of their citizenship, and so antagonistic to the principles of this liberal age. He held, first, that the autonomy of the Rabbins must cease; secondly, that the religious obligations should be distinct from the political and civil, and should yield to the latter as of higher authority; and, thirdly. that marriage is, according to the Jewish law, a civil act, and consequently an act independent of Jewish authorities. (On the controversy of this question, *SEE JEWS, REFORMED.*) In 1844 he published *Ueber d. Beschneidung zunächst. in religios-dogmat. Beziehung* (Schwrerin and Berlin, 1844, 8vo), in which he treats of the question whet-her circumcision is essential to Jewish membership, and in which his position is even more liberal than in the treatment of the questions previously alluded to. Holdheim was also a prominent member of the Jewish councils held from 1843 to 1846. In 1847 he was called to Berlin by the Jewish Reform Society of that city, consisting of members who, on account of their liberal views, had separated from the orthodox portion; and he entered upon the duties of this position on September 5. Here he labored with great distinction, and from this, the real center of Germany, he scattered the seeds of his extremely liberal views among his Jewish brethren throughout the entire length and breadth not only of his own country, but of the world. He died Aug. 22, 1860. Perhaps we call give no better evidence of Holdheim's influence in his later years than by citing the words of Rabbi Einhorn, now of New York city (in *Sinai: Organfiur Erkenntniss u. Veredlung d. Judenth.* Baltimore, 1860, p. 288, the November number of which gives a pretty full biography of Holdheim): "The great master in Israel, the high-priest of Jewish theological science, the lion in the contest for light and truth, no longer dwells among 11s." Besides a number of short treatises in pamphlet form, to which the controversy between the Reformed and Orthodox Jews gave rise, he published *Gesch. der jüd. Reformngemeinde*, (Berlin, 1857, 8vo): — *Religions-u. Sittenlehren d. Mischnah z. Gebrauch b.Religionsuntterr. 1. jüd. Religions-schulen* (Berlin, 1854, 12mo), and a larger work on the same subject under the title

הַנְּחִימָה; הַ [דָּבָר] *Jid. Glaubens-u. Sittenlehre* (ib. 1857, 8vo): *Gebete und Gesänge für das Neujahrs-u. Vershungsfest* (Berlin, 1859, 8vo); and *Predigten* (vol. 1, 1852; vol. 2, 1853; vol. 3, 1855), besides a number of sermons separately published since his death. A complete list of his works up to 1846 is given by Furst (*Biblioth. Judenth.* p. 404, 405). See Ritter (Dr. J. H.), *Gesch. der jüd. Reformation*, vol. 3 (Samuel Holdheim, Berl. 1865); Jost, *N. Gesch. d. Israel*, 1, 99 sq.; 3 (*Culturgesch.*), 205 sq.; *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, p. 374 sq. (J. H.W.)

### Holdsworth (Holsworth, Oldsworth, or Oldisworth), Richard

an English divine, was born in 1590, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Later he became a fellow of that university. In 1620 he was appointed one of the twelve preachers at Cambridge, was then called to St. Peter-le-Poor, London, and in 1629 was appointed professor of divinity at Gresham College. In 1631 he was made prebendary of Lincoln, in 1633 was further promoted to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon, and in 1637 was recalled to Cambridge as master of Emanuel College. He was a zealous adherent to the cause of Charles I, and suffered on this account by imprisonment at the outbreak of the Rebellion. He died in 1649. Holdsworth wrote, besides a large collection of sermons, of which a list is given by Darling (*Cyclopaedia Bibliogr.* 1, 1509) and by Allibone (*Dict. of Authors*, 1, 863), *Praelectiones Theologicae* (London, 1661, fol.), published by his nephew, Dr. Wm. Pearson, with the life of the author: — *Valley of Vision*, in twenty-one sermons (London, 1651, 4to), of which Fuller speaks in very commendatory terms, paying the following tribute to Holdsworth (also cited by Allibone): "The author was composed of a learned head, a gracious heart, a bountiful hand, and a patient back, comfortably and cheerfully to endure such heavy afflictions as were laid upon him." — Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6, 106 sq.

### Holdsworth, Winch, D.D.

fellow of St. John Baptist's College, was born in the first half of the 18th century, and educated at Oxford University. He is especially celebrated on account of his controversy with Locke, which arose from his views on the *Resurrection of the Body* (Oxford, 1720, 8vo; and the same defended, Lond. 1727, 8vo). — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 863.

## Hole, Matthew, D.D.

a learned English divine, was born about 1640. He entered the University of Oxford as servitor at Exeter College in 1657, was elected fellow in 1663, and became M.A. in 1664, prebendary of Wells in 1667, and rector of his college in 1715. He died in 1730. His sermons were of high repute in their day. Among his writings are *An Antidote against Infidelity* (Lond. 1702, 8vo): — *Practical Discourses on the Liturgy of the Church of England* (new ed. by the Rev. J.A. Giles, Lond. 1837, 4 vols. 8vo): — *A practical Exposition of the Church Catechism* (3rd ed. Lond. 1732, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Practical Discourses on the Nature, Properties, and Excellencies of Charity* (Oxf. 1725, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1515.

## Holgate

archbishop of York under king Edward VI, was one of the prelates of the Reformers who were silenced under queen Mary shortly after her accession to the throne of England, under the pretense that their marriage relations were non-ecclesiastical. Later (Oct. 4, 1553) he was imprisoned in the Tower, and kept there until January 18 of the following year, when he was pardoned. The dates of the birth and death of Holgate are not known. — Strype's *Memorials of the Reformation*, 4, 57 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Christian Church during the Reformation*, p. 234.

## Holidays

SEE HOLY-DAY; SEE FESTIVALS.

## Holiness

(ἁγιότης), prop. the state of sanctity, but often used of external or ceremonial relations (the more prop. ἁγιότης).

**I. Intrinsic Idea.** — “Holiness suggests the idea, not of perfect virtue, but of that peculiar affection wherewith a being of perfect virtue regards moral evil; and so much, indeed, is this the precise and characteristic import of the term, that, had there been no evil either actual or conceivable in the universe, there would have been no *holiness*. There would have been perfect truth and perfect righteousness, yet not *holiness*; for this is a word which denotes neither any one of the virtues in particular, nor the

assemblage of them all put together, but the recoil or the repulsion of these towards the opposite vices—a recoil that never would have been felt if vice had been so far a nonentity as to be neither an object of real existence nor an object of thought” (Chalmers, *Nat. Theol.* 2, 380). — Krauth, Fleming’s *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 217.

## II. Applications of the Term. —

**1.** In the highest sense, holiness belongs to God alone (<sup>2018</sup>Isaiah 6:3; <sup>6574</sup>Revelation 15:4), because he only is absolutely good (<sup>2289</sup>Luke 18:19), and thus demands the supreme veneration of those who would themselves become good (<sup>4049</sup>Luke 1:49; <sup>4771</sup>John 17:11; <sup>4484</sup>Acts 3:14 [4:27, 30]; <sup>6021</sup>John 2:20; <sup>5026</sup>Hebrews 7:26; <sup>6048</sup>Revelation 4:8). *SEE HOLINESS OF GOD.*

### 2. Men are called holy

**(a)** in as far as they are vessels of the Holy Spirit and of divine power, e.g. the prophets; and also in as far as they belong to an organization which is dedicated to God. In the N.T. Christians are especially holy, as being wholly consecrated to God’s service. (Comp. <sup>4827</sup>Romans 8:27; 12:13; <sup>4602</sup>1 Corinthians 6:2; <sup>4029</sup>Ephesians 2:19; 5:3; 6:18; <sup>5001</sup>Colossians 1:11; 3:12; <sup>6021</sup>2 Peter 1:21; <sup>6630</sup>Revelation 13:10; Jude 14.) — Men are also called holy

**(b)** in so far as they are or become habitually good, denying sin, thinking and acting in a godlike manner, and, in short, conforming, in their innermost being, as well as in their outward conduct, to the highest and absolute law or the will of God (<sup>4669</sup>Romans 6:19, 22; <sup>4004</sup>Ephesians 1:4; <sup>5008</sup>Titus 1:8; <sup>4015</sup>1 Peter 1:15; <sup>6616</sup>Revelation 20:6).

The *grounds* of this sanctification, according to outward appearance, are twofold, viz.:

**(a)** Holiness is given of God by the mediation of Christ, conditioned upon faith and an inward surrender, which are themselves likewise the gift of God.

**(b)** Man from within, by a proper purification of the heart, may attain this sanctity. Although the last cannot occur without the assistance of God, yet the personal activity of man is necessary and almost preponderant. Still, even interior holiness is, as above implied, the direct work of God.

**3.** As everything dedicated to God partakes in a certain manner of his holiness, so even things (e.g. the Temple), forms, and ceremonies (e.g. sacrifice): hence “to hallow” means also *to dedicate to God, to offer up, to bring as an offering, to present one’s self as dedicated to God through Christ* (Revelation 26:18; <sup><461></sup>1 Corinthians 6:11; <sup><465></sup>Ephesians 5:26; <sup><821></sup>Hebrews 2:11; 10:10, 14; <sup><477></sup>John 17:17). In the N.T., where the merciful assistance of God in customary purity or objective holiness appears prominent, the expression to “sanctify one’s self” is used only concerning Christ, and means here the same as *to offer up himself* as a sacrifice for human sin (<sup><379></sup>John 17:19). But as man may make himself holy, i.e. under the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he may work for his own purity; similar phraseology is used of Christians (<sup><237></sup>Matthew 23:17; <sup><379></sup>John 17:19; <sup><545></sup>1 Timothy 4:5).

**4.** That by which God reveals his holiness, e.g. the Law, is also holy (<sup><372></sup>Romans 7:12).

**III. Progression.** — Complete holiness, as applied to men, designates the state of perfect love, which exhibits itself in this, that every thought of man, every emotion and volition, hence also every deed, is determined by the will of God, and thus the old man, who has been fainting under the burdens of worldly lust, and has been carrying the chains of the flesh, is cast off, and the new man is fully put on. This sanctification is both a work of God and of man. This divine grace comes through Christ, first at conversion, and by successive steps thereafter under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Man must seize the proffered hand of God, use the means of grace afforded him, and by the assistance of God perfect holiness. Thus, on the one hand, everything comes from God, and, on the other, the personal work of man is necessary. Whatever the good man is, he is through God and his own will; the evil man, however, is so only through his own will, for evil is falling away from God. Goodness consists ultimately in susceptibility for the divine work of grace, while wickedness has its final ground in the free hardening of the heart against the divine influences.

Personal holiness is a work of development in time, frequently under a variety of hinderances and backslidings, and even with the possibility of entire ruin. Hence the admonitions to watchfulness, to continual prayer, to perseverance in faith, in love, and in hope, are abundant (<sup><413></sup>1 Corinthians 1:30; <sup><400></sup>2 Corinthians 7:1; <sup><402></sup>Ephesians 4:23, 24; comp. <sup><512></sup>Romans 12:2); hence also the apostle’s prayer that the love of the Philippians might

abound yet more and more (<sup><5100></sup>Philippians 1:9). But while the laying aside of the old, and the putting on of the new, are thus referred to man, of course it is not the meaning of the sacred writer that sanctification is accomplished by our own power. Christ is our sanctification, as he is our righteousness (<sup><4003></sup>1 Corinthians 1:30); yet all that Christ through the Holy Spirit works in man may become in vain, because man by his unfaithfulness can hinder the operation of the Spirit.

**IV. Metaphorical Representations of a State of Holiness.** — In the Scriptures this sanctification is described in manifold as well as strong and explicit figures as a “putting off” of the old man, and a putting on of the new man (<sup><5100></sup>Colossians 3:9), the subject becoming dead to the old, and having recovered the lost image of God. It is represented as self-denial (<sup><4025></sup>1 Corinthians 9:26, 27); as a cleansing (<sup><6000></sup>1 John 1:9; comp. <sup><3000></sup>Hebrews 1:3; 9:14; <sup><4050></sup>Ephesians 5:26; <sup><6009></sup>2 Peter 1:9); as a washing (<sup><4061></sup>1 Corinthians 6:11); as a taking away of sin (<sup><4029></sup>John 1:29); as being filled with the fruits of righteousness (<sup><5011></sup>Philippians 1:11); with the water of life (<sup><4073></sup>John 7:38; compare 4:14); as a shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart (<sup><4055></sup>Romans 5:5); as baptism into Christ (<sup><4058></sup>Romans 6:3; <sup><4010></sup>Ephesians 1:10; 2:5; <sup><6051></sup>Revelation 15:1); fellowship with God (<sup><6005></sup>1 John 1:3); as being in the Father, and in the Son, and in the light (<sup><6015></sup>1 John 2:5, 6, 10, 24; compare Ephesians 15; <sup><4040></sup>John 14:20); as the having God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit dwelling in us (<sup><4047></sup>John 14:17, 20; <sup><4021></sup>Galatians 2:20; <sup><4008></sup>1 Corinthians 5:15; <sup><6024></sup>1 John 2:24; 4:4, 12-15; <sup><4006></sup>Ephesians 4:6); as a birth unto God and Christ (<sup><6029></sup>1 John 2:29; 3:9, 10; 4:4-7; 5:18, 19); as being partaker of the divine nature (<sup><6004></sup>2 Peter 1:4); children of God (<sup><4084></sup>Romans 8:14; <sup><6012></sup>John 1:12; <sup><6001></sup>1 John 3:1, 2); born again (<sup><4005></sup>John 3:5, 7; <sup><4005></sup>Titus 3:5, 6); as being one with Christ and one another (<sup><4072></sup>John 17:22, 26). — Krehl, *Neutestam. Wörterbuch* p. 356. **SEE SANCTIFICATION.**

**HOLINESS**, as a note of the Church. **SEE SANCTITY. SEE HOLINESS OF GOD**, his essential and absolute moral perfection. Primarily, the word *holy* (*Sax. hali*; Germ. *heilig*, whole, sound) denotes perfection in a moral sense. As applied to man, it denotes entire conformity to the will of God. **SEE SANCTIFICATION.** “But when we speak of God, we speak of a Being who is a law unto himself, and whose conduct cannot be referred to a higher authority than his own.” **SEE HOLINESS**, above.



1. “As to the use of the words  $v/dq$ ; and ἅγιος, some critics assert that they are only used in Scripture, with reference to God, to describe him as the object of awe ‘and veneration; and it is true that this is their prevailing meaning—e.g. <sup><2369></sup>Isaiah 6:9; <sup><671></sup>John 17:11 (ἅγιε πάτερ) and that accordingly ἀγιάζεσθαι signifies *to be esteemed venerable, to be revered*. Still it is undeniable that these words in many passages are applied to God in a moral sense; e.g. <sup><689></sup>Leviticus 19:2, ‘Be ye holy, for I am holy;’ comp. <sup><614></sup>1 Peter 1:14-16. Thus also ὁσιότης, <sup><402></sup>Ephesians 4:24; and ἁγιωσύνη, ἁγιασμός, by which all moral perfection is so frequently designated, more especially in the New Testament. The different synonymical significations of the words  $v/dq$ ; and ἅγιος are clearly connected in the following manner: (a) *The being externally pure*; e.g. <sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 11:4; <sup><618></sup>Leviticus 11:43, 44; 20:7, 25, 26 sq. (b) *The being separate*, since we are accustomed to divide what is pure from what is impure, and to cast away the latter; and therefore (c) *The possessing of any kind of external advantage, distinction, or worth*. So the Jews were said to be *holy to God*, in opposition to others, who were κοινοί, *profane, common, unconsecrated*. Then everything which was without imperfection, disgrace, or blemish was called *holy*; and  $v/dq$ ; ἅγιος, *sacrosanctus*, came thus to signify what was *inviolable* (<sup><2348></sup>Isaiah 4:3; <sup><4687></sup>1 Corinthians 3:17); hence  $vDq\eta\alpha$  *asylum*. They were then used in the more limited sense of *chaste* (like the Latin *sanctitas*), a sense in which they are also *sometimes* used in the New Testament; e.g. <sup><504></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:3, 7 (comp. Wolf, ad loc.). They then came to denote any *internal* moral perfection; and, finally, perfection, in the general notion of it, as exclusive of all imperfection.”

2. “*The holiness* of God, in the general notion of it, is his moral perfection—that attribute by which all moral imperfection is removed from his nature. The holiness of the *will* of God is that, therefore, by which he chooses, necessarily and invariably, what is morally good, and’ refuses what is morally evil. The holiness and justice of God are, in reality, one and the same thing; the distinction consists in this only, that holiness denotes the internal inclination of the divine will—the disposition of God, and justice the expression of the same by actions. This attribute implies, 1. That no sinful or wicked inclination can be found in God. Hence he is said (<sup><3013></sup>James 1:13, 17) to be ἀπείραστος κακῶν, incapable of being tempted to evil (not in the active sense, as it is rendered by the Vulgate and Luther); and in <sup><406></sup>1 John 1:5, to be light; and without darkness; i.e. holy, anti without sin.

In this sense he is called  $r/hf$ ; καθαρός, ἄγνός (<sup><418></sup>1 John 3:3); also  $\mu\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ ; ἀπλόος, *integer* (<sup><983></sup>Psalm 18:31). The older writers described this by the word ἀναμάρτητος, *impeccabilis*. [The sinlessness of God is also designated in the New Testament by the words τέλειος (<sup><4158></sup>Matthew 5:48) and ὅσιος (<sup><666></sup>Revelation 16:5).] 2. That he never chooses what is false and deceitful, but only what is truly good-what his perfect intelligence recognizes as such; and that he is therefore the most perfect teacher and the highest exemplar of moral goodness. Hence the Bible declares that he looks with displeasure upon wicked, deceitful courses (<sup><4905></sup>Psalm 1:5 sq.; 5, 5: Thou hatest all workers of iniquity’); but on the contrary, he regards the pious with favor (<sup><4907></sup>Psalm 5:7, 8; 15:1 sq.; 18:26 sq.; 33:18)” (Knapp, *Theology*, § 29). Howe speaks of the holiness of God as “the actual, perpetual rectitude of all his volitions, and all the works and actions which are consequent thereupon; and an eternal propension thereto and love thereof, by which it is altogether impossible to that sin that it should ever vary.”

**3.** Holiness is an *essential* attribute of God, and adds glory, luster, and harmony to all his other perfections (<sup><4970></sup>Psalm 27:4; <sup><4951></sup>Exodus 15:11). He could not be God without it (<sup><4634></sup>Deuteronomy 32:4). It is *infinite* and *unbounded*; it cannot be increased or diminished. It is also *immutable* and *invariable* (<sup><386></sup>Malachi 3:6). God is *originally* holy; he is so of and in himself, and the *author and promoter* of all holiness among his creatures. The holiness of God is visible by his *works*; he made all things holy (<sup><4003></sup>Genesis 1:31): by his *providences*, all which are to promote holiness in the end (<sup><3810></sup>Hebrews 11:10): by his *grace*, which influences the subjects of it to be holy (<sup><5020></sup>Titus 2:10, 12): by his *word*, which commands it (<sup><4015></sup>1 Peter 1:15): by his *ordinances*, which he hath appointed for that end (<sup><2440></sup>Jeremiah 44:4, 5): by the *punishment of sin* in the death of Christ (Isaiah 53); and by *the eternal punishment* of it in wicked men (<sup><4100></sup>Matthew 20:46) (Buck). **SEE ATTRIBUTES.** The holiness of God, like his other attributes, constitutes the divine essence itself, and consequently exists in him in the state of absolute perfection. It were therefore impossible to consider it as a conformity of God to the laws of right, since God himself, on the contrary, is the idea and principle of holiness. But, on the other hand, we may not say that the will of God simply constitutes the essence of divine holiness. To mankind, indeed, the simple will of God is at once law in all things; but with regard to God himself, his will is holy because he wills only according to his immanent holiness, i.e. his own

nature. As the absolute Being, (God is necessarily in no wise dependent on *any* outward law; but as a morally perfect spirit God cannot but be true to himself, and thus manifest in all his agency his inherent moral perfection as his immanent law.

The earlier dogmatists of the Reformed Church largely discussed the question whether right is right because God wills it, or whether God wills right because it is right. Some (e.g. Polanus) maintained the former view as the only one consistent with the absolute nature of God. The later writers maintain the opposite view, e.g. Voetius: “God is subject to no moral duty from *without*, because he is no man’s debtor, and there is no cause outside of God that can bind or determine him. But *from within* he may be bound (so to speak), not, indeed, in the sense of subjection, because he is *his own debtor, and cannot deny himself*. Thus, in divine things, the Father is bound to love the Son, for he cannot but love him; while the Son, by the very necessity of his divine nature, is bound to work by the Father; nor can he do otherwise whenever a work outside of God is to be performed. So, also, in external acts, the creature having been once produced, God is bound to maintain it by his perpetual power and continual influence (as long as he wishes it to exist), to move directly upon it as its first mover, and guide it to his glory (~~2001~~ Proverbs 16:4; ~~45134~~ Romans 11:34-36). That is immutably good and just whose opposite he cannot wish.” So also Heidegger (*Corp. Theol.* 3, 89, 90): “Whatever is the holiness, justice, and goodness of the creature, nevertheless its rule and first norm in the sight of God is *not his free will and command, but his own essential justice, holiness, and goodness*.” On this subject Watson remarks as follows: “Without conducting the reader into the profitless question whether there is a fixed and unalterable nature and fitness of things, independent of the divine will on the one hand; or, on the other, whether good and evil have their foundation, not in the nature of things, but only in the divine will, which makes them such, there is a method, less direct it may be, but more satisfactory, of assisting our thoughts on this subject. It is certain that various affections and actions have been enjoined upon all rational creatures under the general name of righteousness, and that their contraries have been prohibited. It is a matter also of constant experience and observation that the good of society is promoted only by the one, and injured by the other; and also that every individual derives, by the very constitution of his nature, benefit and happiness from rectitude, injury and misery from vice. This constitution of human nature is therefore an

indication that the Maker and Ruler of men formed them with the intent that they should avoid vice and practice virtue; and that the former is the object of his aversion, the latter of his regard. On this principle, all the *laws*, which in his *legislative* character almighty. God has enacted for the government of mankind, have been constructed. The law is *holy*, and the commandment *holy, just, and good.*' In the administration of the world, where God is so often seen in his *judicial* capacity, the punishments which are inflicted, indirectly or immediately upon man, clearly tend to discourage and prevent the practice of evil. 'Above all, the Gospel, that last and most perfect revelation of the divine will, instead of giving the professors of it any allowance to sin, because grace has abounded (which is an injurious imputation cast upon it by ignorant and impious minds), its chief design is to establish that great principle, God's moral purity, and to manifest his abhorrence of sin, and inviolable regard to purity and virtue in his reasonable creatures. It was for this he sent his Son into the world to turn men from their iniquities, and bring them back to the paths of righteousness. For this the blessed Jesus submitted to the deepest humiliations and most grievous sufferings. He gave himself (as St. Paul speaks) for his Church, that he might *sanctify* and cleanse it; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, but that it should be holy and without blemish; or, as it is elsewhere expressed, he gave himself for us, to redeem us from our iniquities, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works' (Abernethy, *Sermons*). Since, then, it is so manifest that 'the Lord loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity,' it must be necessarily concluded that this preference of the one, and hatred of the other, flow from some *principle* in his very *nature*-' that he is the *righteous* Lord; of purer eyes than to behold evil; one who cannot look upon iniquity.' This principle is *holiness*, an attribute which, in the most emphatic manner, is assumed by himself, and attributed to him, both by adoring angels in their choirs, and by inspired saints in their worship. He is, by his own designation, '*the HOLY ONE of Israel*;' the seraphs in the vision of the prophet cry continually '*HOLY, HOLY, HOLY is the Lord God of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory*;' thus summing up all his glories in this sole moral perfection. The language of the sanctuary on earth is borrowed from that of heaven: '*Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art HOLY.*' If, then, there is this principle in the divine mind which leads him to prescribe, love, and reward truth, justice, benevolence, and every other virtuous affection and habit in his creatures which we sum up in the term *holiness*, and to forbid, restrain, and

punish their opposites—that principle, being *essential* in him, a part of his very nature and Godhead, must be the spring and guide of his own conduct; and thus we conceive without difficulty of the essential rectitude or holiness of the divine nature, and the absolutely pure and righteous character of his administration. This attribute of holiness exhibits itself in two great branches, *justice and truth*, which are sometimes also treated of as separate attributes.” See Watson, *Theolog. Institutes*, 1, 436; Knapp, *Theology*, § 29; Leland, *Sermons*, 1, 199; Abernethy, *Sermons*, 2, 180; Heppé, *Dogmatik der evangeform. Kirche*, p. 73 sq.; Pye Smith, *Theol.* p. 173 sq.; Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, 1, 10, 531, 541; Smith’s Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 110 sq.; Domeer, in *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1, 2; 2, 3; 3:3; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 19, 618; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*, 133; 3:321; 19:618-624; *Biblioth. Sac.* 12, 377; 13, 840; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 11, 505; Thomasius, *Dogmatik*, 1, 141; Staudenmeier, *Dogmatik*, 2, 590-610; Dwight, *Theol.* 1 (see Index); Martensen, *Dogmatik*, p. 99; Clark, *Otl. of Theol.* 2, 9 sq.; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1, 377; Wesley, *Works* 2, 430. **SEE GOD.**

## Holiness

a title of the Pope. **SEE POPE.**

## Holkot

**SEE HOLCOT.**

## Holland

also called THE NETHERLANDS, a kingdom in Europe, has an area of 13,890 English square miles. Holland still owns extensive colonies in the East and West Indies, and in South America, which together make an area of about 685,700 English square miles.

**I. Church History.** — At the beginning of the Christian were, the country which is now called Holland or the Netherlands was inhabited by Germanic tribes, of whom the Batavians and Frisians (q.v.) are best known. Their subjection, begun by Caesar, was completed by Germanicus. At the beginning of the 4th century the Franks conquered a large portion of the country; only the Frisians maintained their independence until the 7th century. Charlemagne appointed counts in Batavia and in Zealand, and compelled the people to embrace the Christian religion. After the division

of the empire of Charlemagne, the Netherlands were united with Lorraine, and they both were made a dependency of Germany. But gradually a number of princes became semi-independent; among them the bishops of Utrecht, who ruled over Upper-Yssel and Groningen. The most powerful among the princes were the counts of Flanders, and after the extinction of these last their land fell by marriage to the dukes of Burgundy, who gradually came into possession of the whole of the Netherlands, remaining, however, feudal to the German emperor. The marriage of the daughter of the last duke of Burgundy with Maximilian, archduke of Austria (later, emperor Maximilian I of Germany), made the Netherlands a part of the extensive dominions of the house of Hapsburg.

The Christianization of the country has been referred to in the arts. BELGIUM and FRIESLAND. Holland, like Belgium, early became distinguished for its excellent cathedral schools, especially that of Utrecht. A great-influence upon the religious life not only of Holland, but of many other countries, was exercised by the Brothers of Common Life, who were founded by Gerhard Groote (q.v.) (1340-1384). This order soon established a number of schools, especially in the Netherlands and the adjacent parts of Germany, which imparted not only elementary instruction, but also a higher education. Thus Holland became celebrated for its learning and scholarship, which in the 15th century was further promoted by the establishment of the University of Deventer. Many of the prominent men of Holland took an active part in the efforts to reform the Church of Rome; the best known of these reformers is John de Wessel. The Mennonites (q.v.) fully separated from the Church of Rome, and, living in a country which was favorable to religious toleration, suffered less from persecution than most of the mediaeval sects.

The Reformation of the 16th century found in few countries so congenial a soil as in Holland. Favored by the liberal traditions of the country, the national spirit of independence, and the extensive commerce with foreign countries, it spread rapidly. In vain did Charles V issue a number of cruel edicts (the first in March, 1520, the last in 1550) to put it down; it grew in spite of all persecution. Among the different reformed systems which then began to establish themselves, it was especially that of Calvin, first introduced by young Dutch students of Geneva, which struck deep root. The Lutheran doctrines, and, still more, Anabaptist movements, also found numerous adherents, but Calvinism soon obtained the ascendancy, owing to a large extent to the influence of the Reformed churches of England and

France. Thus arose the *Dutch Reformed Church*, embracing at its origin the reformed churches of Belgium, as well as those of Holland, as these countries were at this time politically united. [The inner history of this Church is given in the article REFORMED CHURCH.] Philip II was determined to destroy the new doctrine, and introduced into the Netherlands all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. This called forth a general opposition. The lower nobility united in presenting to the regent Margaret of Parma a protest against religious persecutions; the citizens assembled in the open field for divine service. In 1566, general attacks began against the Roman Catholic churches. In 1567, Philip sent duke Alba to 'the Netherlands with an army, consisting of Spaniards and Italians, to subdue the religious movement; but the cruel tyranny of the duke led to very different results. William of Orange, the stadtholder,' who had escaped death by flight, unsuccessfully at, tempted, at the head of an army of exiles, to expel the Spaniards, but in 1572 nearly the whole of the northern provinces fell into the hands of the patriots. The efforts of Alba to suppress the revolution by force of arms having entirely failed, he was recalled, and departed in Jan. 1574, boasting that during his administration 18,600 men had been executed, chiefly on account of religion. The efforts of his successors likewise failed to reestablish the rule of Spain. In 1579, the provinces of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Overijssel, and Guelderland formed the Union of Utrecht, and thus laid the foundation of the republic of the Seven United Provinces. From this time the history of the Netherlands divides itself into that of Holland, in which the ascendancy of Protestantism was henceforth established, and that of Flanders (subsequently *Belgium*, q.v.), or the ten provinces, which remained under the Spanish dominion, and adhered to the Roman Catholic Church. William of Orange was assassinated in 1584 by a partisan of Spain, but his son Maurice successfully defended the independence of Holland, and in 1609 compelled Spain to agree to a truce for twelve years. During the peace an unfortunate quarrel broke out between the Calvinists and the Arminians (q.v.). Maurice, who aspired to become hereditary sovereign of Holland, placed himself, from political reasons, at the head of the strict Calvinists, and when he prevailed, the venerable head of the Arminian party, Barneveldt, one of the most illustrious of the Dutch statesmen, was (May 13, 1619) executed, while Hugo Grotius, another distinguished leader of the Arminians, or, as they were generally called, Remonstrants, escaped by an

artifice. The war with Spain was renewed in 1621, but at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, Spain had to recognize the independence of Holland.

Under various political vicissitudes, Holland remained henceforth a Protestant country. On the establishment of the Batavian republic in 1795, in consequence of the conquest of the country by France, Church and State were separated; the constitution of the national Church remained however, substantially as before. Simultaneously with the erection of the kingdom of Holland under Napoleon, an attempt was made to reorganize the Church, at the head of which the national Synod was to be placed; but this plan, also, was not executed, as in 1810 Holland was incorporated with the French empire. An introduction of the Organic Articles (1812) was then meditated, but never carried through. The re-establishment of the Netherlands as an independent state, with which also Belgium was united, restored to the national Church most of the rights formerly possessed by her, and gave her for the first time a national Synod. In the new state a majority of the population belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, but the government knew how to maintain in its legislation the ascendancy of Protestantism, to the great dissatisfaction of the southern provinces, which revolted in 1830, and constituted the independent kingdom of Belgium (q.v.). From that time Holland again became a predominantly Protestant state, in which, however, the Roman Catholic Church comprises about two fifths of the entire population. Of late, an almost complete separation between Church and State has been effected.

**II. Church Statistics.** — The total population of the kingdom of Holland amounted in December 1888, according to an official calculation, to 4,505,932. This is exclusive of the grand duchy of Luxemburg (q.v.), which is governed by the king of Holland as grand duke, but is entirely independent from Holland in point of administration. A little over a majority of the entire population, according to the official census taken in 1879, 2,469,814, belong to the National Reformed Church. The present constitution of this Church, which almost makes it autonomous, was regulated by a law- of March 23, 1852. The Church embraces 43 classes in 10 provincial districts. A classis consists of the pastors and a number of the elders, but the number of the latter must not exceed the number of the pastors. Each classis meets annually, and elects a standing committee, which exercises ecclesiastical discipline. The General Synod, which meets every year in June at The Hague, consists of ten pastors, one being elected by each of the provincial synods, three elders, and the representatives of



the three theological faculties of Leyden, Utrecht, and Groningen. To these are added delegates appointed by the Commission of the Reformed Walloon Churches (those which use the French language), and by the East and West Indian churches. A Synodal Commission, consisting of the president, the vice-president, and the secretary of the Synod, of three preachers and elders, and one professor of theology, is chosen for a period of three years. The number of parishes in 1884 was 1345, which were administered by 1611 pastors. The Walloon churches were seventeen in number, with twenty-five pastors, and a population of 9678. They are placed under a special commission for the affairs of the Walloon churches, but form an integral part of the National Reformed Church. Theological faculties representing this Church are connected with the state universities of Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen, and the Athenaea of Deventer and Amsterdam. The famous theological schools of Harderwyk and Franeker (q.v.) have been abolished.

As the National Reformed Church in Holland, in the second half of the 18th and in the present century, fell more and more under the predominant influence of rationalism [for the doctrinal history of the Church, *SEE REFORMED CHURCH*, a number of the leading defenders of the ancient creed of the Church deemed it best to secede from the National Church, and to organize an independent Church (*De afgescheid. reform. kerk*). In 1884 this Church comprised forty classes in ten provinces, with about 200 ministers and 379 congregations. It has a theological school at Kampen, with fifty to sixty students. Its membership belongs chiefly to the poorer classes of the population, and numbers 139,903 souls. The Remonstrants and followers of Arminius (q.v.) have considerably decreased since the beginning of the present century. While in 1809 they still numbered thirty-four congregations and forty pastors, they had in 1884 only twenty-four congregations and twenty-four preachers left. They regard themselves as members of the Reformed Church, and call themselves the Remonstrant Reformed Brotherhood. They have been supported since 1795 by the state, and their pastors are educated at the Athenaeum of Amsterdam. Their Synod meets annually, alternating between Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Lutherans of Holland adopted as early as 1596 a constitution similar to that of the Reformed Church. Like them, they have elective pastors, elders, and deacons; and by the new regulations of 1858, a Church Council, Synodal Commission, and Synod, as the three stages of ecclesiastical representation. Their Synod likewise meets annually at the

Hague. The population connected with the Church amounted in 1884 to 61,825; the number of parishes and pastors is about fifty; the number of classes six. They have a theological seminary at Amsterdam. The professors of this seminary, as well as the pastors, receive salaries from the state. The Mennonites, whose origin falls into the time before the Reformation, have likewise decreased since the beginning of the present century. In 1809 they numbered 133 congregations and 185 ministers; in 1884, 126 congregations and 129 ministers. They, too, have a seminary at Amsterdam, with fifteen students in 1884. Rationalism largely prevails among them. The population connected with their congregations numbered in 1884, 50,705. The churches are self-supporting, and independent of each other. The Moravians have two churches and four ministers. The Jews in 1888 numbered about 100,000 souls.

Among the religious societies of Holland the following are the most important:

- (1.) The *Netherlands Bible Society*, which had in 1867 a circulation of 32,251 copies, and an income of \$-30,000.
- (2.) The *Sunday-school Union* had in 1867 established 271 Sunday-schools in ninety-five different places; they had together 1301 teachers and 24,400 children. It publishes a weekly paper, *The Christian Family Circle*.
- (3.) The *Society for Christian National-school Instruction* (established in 1860), whose design is the establishment throughout the country of schools in which a sound Christian education shall be given, as opposed to that given in the national schools. Eighty schools had in 1867 been established in different parts of the country on this principle. The income of the society was about \$9000.
- (4.) The *Netherlands Evangelical Protestant Union*, established in 1853, endeavors to “counteract the terrible power of Rome, and unbelief prevailing throughout the country, by means of colporteurs and evangelists.” The income of the society is about \$1500. (5.) The missionary societies of Holland labor exclusively in the Dutch colonies, and in the neighboring islands of the Indian Archipelago. Great open-air missionary gatherings are now held every year in Holland.

Until the Reformation, the whole of modern Holland belonged to the diocese of Utrecht (q.v.). In: 1559 this see was made an archbishopric, and five suffragan sees were erected-Haarlem, Middleburg, Deventer,

Leeuwarden, and Groningen. The success of the Reformed Church, after the establishment of the independence of Holland, put an end to all the dioceses. In 1583 an apostolical vicariate was established for those who continued to adhere to the Church of Rome. It was at first administered by the apostolical nuncio in Brussels. At the beginning of the 17th century the Dutch mission again received a resident vicar apostolic at Utrecht (who was to supply the place of the former archbishops), and five provicars at the former episcopal sees. In 1723 the Jansenist (q.v.) canons of Utrecht elected an archbishop; in 1742 a Jansenist bishop was elected for Haarlem, and in 1755 another for Deventer. All these sees are still extant, but the number of parishes and the membership have decreased. These have at present (1870) a population of about 4000 souls in twenty-five parishes. After the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic Church in the seven old provinces was divided into seven arch-presbyterates, who were placed under the papal nuncio at the Hague as "vice superior of the Dutch mission," while the: apostolic vicariates of Herzogenbusch, Breda, and Limburg (1840) were erected into districts which had formerly belonged to other states. On March 7. 1853, Pius IX re-established the regular hierarchy by erecting the archbishopric of Utrecht, and the four bishoprics of Haarlem) Breda, Herzogenbusch, and Roeremonde. The Catholic population in 1879 numbered 1,439,137 souls), with 39 convents of monks (containing 815 members) and 137 female monasteries (containing 2188 members). Among the monks are Jesuits, Redemptorists, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Norbertines. Several congregations of Sisters of Charity have arisen in Holland.

A complete Church History of Holland has been published by Glasius, *Geschiedeniss der christelike kerk en godsdienst in de Nederlanden* (Leyden, 1833 sq., 6 vols.). The introduction of Christianity into the Netherlands is specially treated of by Diest Lorgion (*Gesch. van de invoering des christend. in Nederlanden* (Leuw. 1841), and by Prof. Royaards (*Gesch. der invoering en vestiging van et christend. in Nederl. Utr. 1841; 3rd ed. 1844*). The latter began a Church History of Holland during the Middle Ages (*Gesch. van et gerestigde Christendom en de christ. kerk in Neederlande gedurende. de middeleeuwen* Utr. 1849-53, 2 vols.), but the death of this eminent historian (1854) prevented the completion of the work. A biographical Church History, from a Roman Catholic stand-point, was begun by Alberding Thijm (*Gesch. der kerk in de*

*Nederl.*; vol. 1. *H. Willibroodus, A postel der Nederlanden*, Amsterd. 1861; Germ. translated Munster, 1863). A work of great ability is the Church History of Holland before the Reformation, by Moll (*Kerkegeschiedeniss van Nederland voor de hervorming*, Arnheim, 1864 sq., 3 vols.). **SEE BELGIUM.** (A. J. S.)

### Holland, Guido

An English Jesuit, was born in Lincoln about 1587. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, devoting his time mainly to metaphysics. After graduation he went to Spain, and here pursued a course in theology. In 1615 he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was sent to England as a Roman Catholic missionary. He died Nov. 26, 1660. He wrote a work of some importance on the immortality of the soul, under the title *Praerogativa naturae humanae*. Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1674.

### Holland, John M.

A Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Williamson County, Tenn., about 1803 or 1804, was converted in early life, and entered the ministry in 1822. After holding several important charges, he was appointed presiding elder of the Cumberland District in 1829. Two years later he was sent to Nashville, and in 1832 was reappointed presiding elder over the Forked Deer District, transferred in 1833 to the Memphis, and in 1836 to the Florence District. In 1837 he was selected as the agent of La Grange College, but in 1838 he returned to the active work of the ministry as presiding elder of Holly Springs District, in Mississippi. In 1839 he was once more chosen agent for a college—this time for Holly Springs University; but in 1840 he again returned to the presiding eldership, that of the Memphis District. On this district he died in 1841. Holland was one of the most able and useful servants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day, and is generally acknowledged to rank foremost among the preachers of Tennessee. — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 7, 662.

### Holland, Thomas

A celebrated English divine, born at Ludlow, in Shropshire, in 1539, was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. His broad and thorough scholarship secured him the regius professorship at Oxford, and in this station “he distinguished himself so much by every kind of desirable attainment, divine or human, that he was esteemed and admired not only in our seminaries of

learning at home, but also in the universities abroad” (Middleton, *Ev. Biog.* 2, 373 sq.; compare also Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1674). He died March 17, 1612. Holland was a zealous Protestant, and labored earnestly to drive from Oxford all Papists and their sympathizers, of whom it had not a few at this early date of Protestantism in England. It is to be regretted that most of the works he left, and these were few indeed, were never printed. Allibone mentions *Oratio Oxon.* (Oxford, 1599, 4to) and *Sermons* (ibid. 1601, 4to).

### Hollaz, David

A German Lutheran divine, was born at Wulkow, near Stargard, in 1648. He studied at Wittenberg, and became successively pastor of Putzerkin, near Stargard, in 1670, co-rector of Stargard in 1680, rector and preacher of Colberg, and, finally, provost and pastor of Jakobshagen. He died in 1713. Aside from minor productions on different subjects, as sermons, etc., he wrote a work on dogmatics, which was long in great favor. It is entitled *Examen theologicum acroamaticum universam theologiam thetico-polemicam complectens* (1707, 4to; reprinted in 1717, 1722, 1725, 1735, and 1741; and, with additions and corrections, by R. Teller in 1750 and 1763). The popularity enjoyed by this work was not so much due to its scientific originality, for it was mainly based on the works of Gerhard, Calov, Scherzer, etc., as to its convenient arrangement, the clearness and precision of its definitions, and the careful and thorough classification of its contents. Another, and perhaps still more powerful cause of its success is to be found in its liberal spirit, coupled with unimpeachable orthodoxy. Hollaz occupies the first place among the Lutheran theologians of the close of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He sought to find a medium between the orthodox scholastic divinity and the wants of practical religion, and endeavored to reconcile ecclesiastical orthodoxy with freedom of thought. See Ernesti, *Neue Theol.* 5, 185; Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 1, 62; Ersch und Gruber, *Ally. Encyklopadie*; Herzog, *Real — Encyklop.* 6, 240; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* 2, 263, 264, 339; Gass, *Geschichte d. Dogmat.* 2, 495 sq.; Kurtz, *Church. Hist.* 2, 245; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 7, 16 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* p. 430 sq.

### Hollebeck, Ewald

A Dutch theologian, born at Hamstede in 1719, was educated at the University of Leyden. In 1762 he was called to his alma mater as professor

of theology. He is especially distinguished in the Church of Holland by his revolutionary efforts in the homiletical field of theology. He was the first to condemn the old method of making a sermon an exegetical dissertation, and to introduce the English method of preaching to the *edification* of the people. He set forth his views in *De optimo concionum genere* (Leyden, 1768; much enlarged, 1770, 8vo). At first he encountered great opposition; but, as he bore himself calmly in the contest, he soon got the better of his opponents, and, as a mark of his popularity at the university, he was elected rector in 1764. He died Oct. 24, 1796. — Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* 8, 653 sq.; Walch, *Neuest. Religionsgesch.* 2, 411 sq.; Ernesti, *U. Theolog. Biblioth.* 1, 230 sq.; Adelung's Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 2098; *Biog. Univ.* 20, 480.

### Holleshow, Johann Von

A Benedictine monk, born at Holleshow, in Bohemia, in 1366, was educated at Paris. He was one of the most violent opponents of Huss, and contributed more than any other person to his execution. This explains why the Hussites afterwards (1420) destroyed the monastery to which Holleshow belonged. He died in 1436. A list of his works is given in Adelung's Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 2098. (J. H.W.)

### Holley, Horace, LL.D.

A Unitarian minister, was born in Salisbury, Conn., Feb. 13, 1781; graduated at Yale College in 1803; in 1805 was minister of Greenfield Hill, Fairfield, and in 1809 minister of Hollis Street, Boston. In 1818 he became the president of Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky., which office he retained until 1827. He died on a voyage to New York July 31, 1827. He had great reputation as a pulpit orator, and published several occasional sermons and addresses. See *Memoir of Dr. Holley*, by his Widow; *North American Review*, 37, 403; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, I, 866.

### Holliday, Charles

A Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Baltimore Nov. 23, 1771, was licensed to preach in 1797, and entered the itinerancy in 1809. He was made presiding elder on Salt River District in 1813; located in 1816; was again presiding elder on Cumberland District, Tennessee Conference, 1817-21; on Green River District, Kentucky Conference, 1821-25 and on Wabash District, Illinois Conference, 1825-28. At the General Conference

of 1828 he was appointed Book Agent at Cincinnati, where he remained eight years. After this he was for several years presiding elder in the Illinois Conference. He was superannuated in 1846, and died March 8, 1850. Mr. Holliday was a "clear, sound, and practical preacher," a deeply pious Christian, and amiable and beloved in all the relations of *life*. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 4, 528; Redford, *History of Methodism in Kentucky*, 2, 95 sq. (G.L.T.)

### Hollingshead, William, D.D.

A Congregational minister, born at Philadelphia Oct. 8, 1748, was educated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1770, and entered the ministry in 1772. His first pastoral charge was at Fairfield, N. J. In 1783 he accepted a call from a church in Charleston, S. C. In 1793 Princeton College conferred on him the degree of D.D. He died Jan. 26, 1817. He published several sermons (1789, 1794, 1805). — Sprague, *Annals of Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 58.

### Hollis, Thomas, Sr.

One of the early benefactors of Harvard College, was born in London in 1659. His father, though a Baptist, was a member of the Independent Church at Pinner's Hall, and he followed in the same relation. Having accumulated a fortune in trade, he gave large sums to charity and to advance the Baptist and Independent Churches. Still more substantial marks of his liberality were conferred on Harvard College, Mass., in which he founded a professorship of mathematics and one of theology, and endowed scholarships for poor students, enriched the library and the cabinets, etc. He died in London in 1731. See Crosby, *Hist. of the Baptists*, 4, 229; Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, 2, 414; *Christian Examiner*, 7, 64; Skeats, *Free Churches of England*, p. 323.

### Hollis, Thomas, Jr.

Nephew of the preceding, was born in London in 1720, and devoted himself to literature and to the propagation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. He traveled over the Continent from 1748 to 1750, and then settled down on his estate at Corsecombe, Dorset. It is said that half of his large fortune was given away for benevolent purposes. Among his benefactions was a donation of books to the library of Harvard College to the value of £1400 sterling. He died at Corsecombe in 1774. His *Memoirs*

were published in 1780, in two splendid quartos, with engravings. See *Gentl. Mag.* vol. 74; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 866.

### Hollister, Theorem O.

A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1822 at Sharon, Conn. He was converted in early life, preached under the presiding elder in the state of New York, removed to Wisconsin, and joined the Wisconsin Conference in 1853. His appointments were: Summit, Fort Atkinson, Lake Mills, Greenbush, Sheboygan Falls, Fond du Lac Station, Fond du Lac District, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, and Hart Prairie. "He was truly a laborer in God's harvest, zealously affected always in every good thing, serving the Lord most emphatically with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength." He died at Salem, Wisconsin, March 13, 1869. Hollister was a self-educated man, but good native talent, a logical mind, and vivid imagination atoned for his earlier deficiency, and he ranked among the first in his Conference. See *Min. Ann. Conf.* 1869, p. 225.

### Hollman, Samuel Christian

A distinguished German theologian, born at Stettin Dec. 3, 1696, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After lecturing a short time at the universities of Greifswald and Jena. he returned in 1723 to Wittenberg, and was made adjunct professor of philosophy in 1724. Two years later he was promoted to an extraordinary professorship, and in 1734 was called as a regular professor to the University of Göttingen, then opening. He died in 1787. Hollman devoted his time mainly to philosophical studies. He was at first an opponent of Wolf's philosophy, later an admirer of it, and finally became an Eclectic. He wrote text books in metaphysics, which were well received, and used so long as eclecticism was in vogue in Germany. He was also active in awakening an interest in his contemporaries for the study of the natural sciences. His most important works are: *De stupendo naturae mysterio anima sibi ipsi ignota* (Greifs. and Wittenb. 1722-24, 4to) — *Commentatio philos. de harmoni inter animam et corpus praestabilita* (Wittenb. 1724, 4to) — *Apologia Praelectionum in N.T. Grec. habitarum* (ibid. 1727, 4to) — *Comm. phil. de miraculis et genuinis eorundem criteriis*, etc. (Frankf. and Lpz. 1727, 4to) — *Instit. philos.* (Wittenberg, 1727, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Ueberzeugender Vortrag v. Gött u. Schrift* (ibid. 1733, 8vo, and often) — *Von d. menschl. Erkenntniss u. d. Quell. der Weltweisheit* (ibid. 1737, 8vo) — *Hist pneumatologiae et*



*theologize naturalis* (Göttingen 1740, 8vo), etc. A list of his works is given in Jocher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Adelung's Add. 2, 2099 sq. See Krug, *Philos. Lex.* 2, 451 sq.

### Holm, Peter Jr.

A Danish divine, born at Moum, Norway, June 6, 1706, was educated at the university at Copenhagen, and afterwards lectured at his alma mater. In 1738 he was appointed professor of theology and philosophy, when, in addition to the duties of his chair, he instructed in Greek and Hebrew, and assisted in the revision of the Danish version of the Bible. In 1746 he was promoted to a regular professorship of theology. He died June 9, 1777. His writings, which, on account of his excessive labor in the revision of the Bible, were few in number, are mainly in the form of dissertations. A list of them may be found in Adelung's Addenda 2 to Jocher's *Gelehrt. Lex.* p. 2102. (J. H. W.)

### Holm-tree

(*πρίνος*, *ilex*) occurs only in the apocryphal story of Susanna (ver. 58). The passage contains a characteristic play on the names of the two trees mentioned by the elders in their evidence. That on the mastich (*σχίνον... ἄγγελος σχίσει σε*) will be noticed under that head. *SEE MASTICK*. That on the holm-tree (*πρίνον*) is: "The angel of God waiteth with the sword to cut thee in two" (*ἵνα πρίσαι σε*). For the historical significance of these puns, *SEE SUSANNA*. The *πρίνος* of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 3, 7, § 3, and 16, § 1, and elsewhere) and Dioscorides (1, 144) denotes, there can be no doubt, the *Quercus coccifera*, or the *Q. pseudococcifera*, which is perhaps not specifically distinct from the first-mentioned oak. The *ilex* of the Roman writers was applied both to the holm-oak (*Quercus ilex*), and to the *Q. coccifera*, or kermes oak. See Pliny (*N.H.* 16, 6). For the oaks of Palestine, see a paper by Dr. Hooker in the *Transactions of the Linnaean Society*, vol. 23, pt. 2, p. 381-387. — Smith, s.v. *SEE OAK*.

### Holman, David

A Congregational minister, was born in Sutton, Mass., Dec. 13, 1777. He entered the sophomore class at Brown University in 1800, and graduated in 1803. He studied theology with his brother, the late Rev. Nathan Holman, of Attleborough, and Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, commenced

preaching in Douglass, Mass., in the autumn of 1807, and was ordained Oct. 19, 1808. He continued pastor of the church in Douglass until Aug. 17, 1842, when he was obliged to resign on account of impaired health. "In 1848 he renewed his labors among his old flocks, and continued to perform the duties of a pastor for five years. Several revivals of religion were enjoyed during his ministry, as the results of which more than 200 were added to the Church. He died Nov. 16, 1866. See *Congreg. Quarterly*, 9, 208.

### Holman, William

A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born April 20, 1790, near Shelbyville, Ky., then in Virginia. He joined the Church in 1812; four years later he entered the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Limestone Circuit. In 1821 he was sent to the Newport Circuit, and a year later was appointed to Frankfort, the capital of the state. Here he built up a fine society, and remained four years. He next went to Danville and Harrodsburg, where he labored with equal zeal and success. After serving Lexington, Russelville, and Mt. Stirling in succession, he was appointed to Louisville, where he succeeded in building the Brook Street Church. He remained in this city "from 1833 to the close of his ministry, except two years, serving all the churches either as pastor or presiding elder. During the war he separated his connection with the "M. E. Church South," and, espousing the Federal cause, "accepted a post-chaplaincy, to the arduous duties of which he addressed himself with a faithfulness that was really surprising—visiting hospitals, and administering to the sick and dying night and day." He died Aug. 1, 1867. — Redford, *History of Methodism in Kentucky*, 2, 374 sq.

### Holmes, Abiel, D.D.

A Congregational minister, born in Woodstock, Conn., Dec. 24, 1763, was educated at Yale College (class of 1783), and served his alma mater as tutor a short time. He became pastor in Midway, Georgia, Nov. 1785, and Jan. 25, 1792, pastor of the First Church, Cambridge, Mass. When the increase of new theological opinions caused a division of the society, he retained his connection with the "orthodox" portion of the parish. A colleague having been settled with him, he resigned his share of the duties Sept. 26, 1831, and passed his last days at Cambridge. He died June 4, 1837. Dr. Holmes was a director of the American Education Society, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and of several other well-

known associations. The University of Edinburgh conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1805. He published *Proceedings of A Council at the Ordination of Rev. Abiel Holmes, at Midway, Georgia, with the Pastoral Address* (1787) — *Life of President Stiles* (1798, 8vo) — *Memoir of Stephen Pannenius, of Buda*, with his Latin Poem translated; also *Memoir of the Mohegan Indians*: both published in vol. 9, *Mass. Hist. Coll.* (1804) — *American Annals* (1805, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Biographical Memoir of the Rev. John Lothrop*, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. 1, 2nd series — *Historical Sketch of the English Translations of the Bible* (1815) — *Memoir of the French Protestants who settled in Oxford, Mass., in 1686*, printed in *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. 2, 3rd series (1826) — *Annals of America from the Discovery by Columbus in 1492 to the Year 1826* (1829, 2nd edit. 2 vols. 8vo); and a large number of occasional sermons and addresses. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2, 240; Allen, *American Biography*; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of American Literature*, 1, 511 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 868; *American Almanac*, 1836, p. 316.

### Holmes, Robert, D.D.

An English divine, born in Hampshire in 1749, was educated at New College, Oxford. He became successively rector of Staunton, canon of Salisbury, and finally (1804) dean of Winchester. In 1790 he succeeded Thomas Warton as professor of poetry at Oxford. He died at Oxford in 1805. Holmes wrote *The Resurrection of the Body deduced from the Resurrection of Christ* (Oxford 1777, 4to) — *On the Prophecies and Testimony of John the Baptist, and the parallel Prophecies of Jesus Christ* (Hampton Lectures for 1782, Oxford 1782, 8vo) — Four tracts on the *Principles of Religion as A Test of Divine Authority*; on the *Principles of Redemption*; on the *Angelical Message of the Virgin Mary*; and on the *Resurrection of the Body, with A Discourse on Humility* (Oxford 1788); etc. But his principal work was the collation of the Septuagint. “As early as 1788 he published at Oxford proposals for a collation of all the known MSS. of the Septuagint a labor which had never yet been undertaken on an *extensive scale*, and the want of which had long been felt among Biblical scholars. Dr. Holmes’s undertaking was promoted by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. In addition to the learned editor’s own labors, literary men were engaged in different parts of the Continent for the business of collation, and Dr. Holmes annually published an account of the progress which was made” (Kitto). The book of Genesis, successively followed by the other books of the Pentateuch, making together one folio volume, with

one title page and one general preface, was published at Oxford in 1798. From this preface we learn that eleven Greek MSS. in uncial letters, and more than one hundred MISS. in cursive writing (containing either the whole or parts of the Pentateuch), were collated for this edition, of which the *text* was a copy of the Roman edition of 1587 [that of Sixtus V]: the deviations from three other cardinal editions (the Complutensian, the Aldine, and Grabe's) are always noted. The quotations found in the works of the Greek fathers are also alleged, and likewise the various readings of the ancient versions made from the Septuagint. "The plan of this edition thus bore a close resemblance to what had been already applied by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach to the criticism of the Greek Testament, and the execution of it has been highly commended as displaying uncommon industry and apparently great accuracy." It is to be regretted that "the learned editor died in the midst of this honorable labor; but shortly before his death he had published the book of Daniel, both according to the Sept. version and that of Theodotion, the latter *only* having been printed in former editions, because the translation of this book is not contained in the common MSS., and was unknown till it was printed in 1772 from a MS. belonging to cardinal Chigi" (Kitto). The work was continued by the Rev. J. Parsons, B.D., and completed on the original plan. The title of the work is *Vetus Testamentum Graecum, cum variis Lectionibus* (Oxford 1798-1804, 15 vols. fol.). Tischendorf, however, condemns the work as inaccurately done (*Proleg.* to el. of Sept. 1856, p. 52-56). See Chalmers, *Biographical Dict.*; Bp. Marsh, *Divinity Lectures*, lect. 12; Lowendes, *Brit. Lib.* p. 28, 29; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 870; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1520; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2, 318. (J. H.W.)

### Holmpatrick, Council of

held at Holmpatrick, an island off the eastern coast of Ireland, in 1148, by the advice of the pope, Innocent II, to consider the question of granting the pall to the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. This synod was attended by fifteen bishops and two hundred priests. The council lasted four days, the first three of which were occupied with questions concerning the general welfare of the Church, confining the question of the palls to the last day. The result was a formal petition to pope Eugenius III (who had meanwhile succeeded Innocent), which Malachy O'Morgais, a former archbishop of Armagh, was commissioned to carry to Rome, in favor of the grant. Todd,

*Hist. of Ancient Church in Ireland*, p. 113; Landon's *Manual of Councils*, p. 265, 266.

## Holocaust

*SEE SACRIFICE.*

## Holofer'nés

Or, rather, OLOFERNES (Ὀλοφέρνης), a person mentioned only in the Apocrypha (Judith 2:4, etc.). The name occurs twice in Cappadocian history, as borne by the brother of Ariarathes I (B.C. cir. 350), and afterwards by a pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who was at first supported and afterwards imprisoned by Demetrius Soter (B.C. cir. 158). The termination (Tissaphernes, etc.) points to a Persian origin, but the meaning of the word is uncertain. — Smith. See Volkmar, *Einleitung in die Apokryphen* (Tub. 1860-3), 1, 179 sq.; Graitz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 4, 455. According to the account in the book of Judith, Nebuchadnezzar, "king of Nineveh," having resolved to "avenge himself on all the earth," appointed Holofernes general of the expedition intended for this purpose, consisting of 120,000 foot and 12,000 horse. Holofernes marched westward and southward, carrying devastation everywhere he came, destroying harvests, and flocks, and cities, as well as men, old and young; making even the "cities of the sea-coast," which had submitted to him, feel the weight of his arm. Having reached Esdraelon, he encamped "between Geba and Scythopolis" a whole month to collect his forces. The Jews, however, resolved to resist him, and fortified all the mountain passes. Dissuaded by Achior, "captain of the sons of Ammon," from attacking the Jews, he resented the advice and delivered Achior into the hands of the Jews in Bethulia, from whom, however, he met with a kind reception. Holofernes proceeded against Bethulia (q.v.) where he was brought to bay; and, instead of attacking it, seized upon two wells on which the city depended for water, and sat down before it to take it by siege. While here he fell a victim to the treachery of Judith, a beautiful Jewish widow, who artfully managed to be brought into his presence, and who, by playing the hypocrite, secured his favor and confidence. Having invited her to a banquet, he drank freely, and, having fallen asleep, fell beneath the arm of his fair guest, who cut off his head with his own sword, and escaped with her bloody trophy to her own people in Bethulia. The Jews immediately fell on their enemies, who, finding their general dead in his tent, fled in

confusion. Such is the story. It is scarcely necessary to add that it is wholly unhistorical. — Kitto. *SEE JUDITH.*

## Holomerians

*SEE SPIRITUALISM.*

## Ho'lon

(Heb. *Cholon'*, ח'ולון or ח'ולון *sandy*), the name of one or two places.

**1.** (Sept. Ἡλών, Ὠλών, etc.; Vulg. *Holon, Olon.*) A city in the mountains of Judah (<sup><1655></sup>Joshua 15:51, where it is mentioned between Goshen and Giloh); assigned to the Levites (<sup><16215></sup>Joshua 21:15, where it is mentioned between Eshtemoa and Debir); in the parallel passage (<sup><13768></sup>1 Chronicles 6:58) it is written HILEN (Heb. *Chiet'*, ח'ילון *Sept. Νηλών*, but transposes with Jether; Vulg. *Helon*). De Saulcy is inclined to identify it with the village *Nuhhalin*, on the hills (*Dead Sea*, 1, 453, 454) west of Bethlehem, or, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of *Researches*, 3, 284), at the bottom of wady el-Musurr, on its southern side; but this is not in the same group of towns with the others, which all lie in the south-west part of the mountain district (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). The position seems rather to correspond to that of *Beit Amreh*, a large ruined village on a hill near wady el-Khulil, northwest of Juttah, on the road to Hebron (Robinson, *Researches*, 2, 629 and note).

**2.** (Sept. Χελών, Vulg. *Helon.*) A city of Moab (<sup><2482></sup>Jeremiah 48:21). It was one of the towns of the *Mishor*, the level downs (A.V. “plain country”) east of Jordan, and is named with Jahazah, Dibon, and other known places; but no identification of it has yet taken place, nor does it appear in the parallel lists of Numbers 32 and Joshua 13. Smith. Perhaps it is the same as HORONAIM *SEE HORONAIM* (q.v.)

## Holste or Holstenius,

Lucas, born at Hamburg in 1596, was educated at the University of Leyden, and ranks as one of the first scholars of his time. Failing to secure a professorship, he traveled through Italy, England, and other countries, and settled at Paris, where he became acquainted with the distinguished Jesuits Dupuy, Peiresc, and other learned men of that order and he finally became a Roman Catholic, in consequence, he said, of his careful study of the works of the fathers, and of his seeking for the principle of unity in the

Church; but others think that his conversion was wholly due to his association with the Jesuits, and to his desire to have freer access to the libraries of France and Italy; and some even, among whom is Salmasius (see Moller, *Cimbr. Lit.* 3, 323), ascribe it to his severe poverty and great ambition. Soon after his conversion his friends introduced him to the pope's nuncio, cardinal Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII, whom he accompanied to Rome in 1527. He lived with the cardinal, and became his librarian. Later, he was promoted canon of St. Peter's, and finally he became librarian of the Vatican and *consultore* of the Congregation of the Index. He was sent on several missions to Germany; among others, to Innspruck, to receive the abjuration of queen Christina of Sweden. He was also instrumental in effecting the conversion of other distinguished Protestants to Catholicism. Holstenius, even in his eminent positions in the Church of Rome, retained some of the liberal principles imbibed as a Protestant, and they often severely provoked his Romish friends. Thus he advocated earnestly, but in vain, the union of the Greek and Roman churches in 1639, advising liberal action on the part of his own Church. In the Congregation of the Index also, he would never favor any stringency against valuable works of Protestants, and he was even obliged to retire from the council for this reason. In the dispute between the Jansenists and Molinists, he counseled pope Alexander VII against any decision likely to be in favor of the Jesuits, notwithstanding his relation to them. He died at Rome Feb. 2, 1661, leaving his patron, cardinal Barberini, his universal legatee. Holstenius, with much application and a great thirst for knowledge, lacked perseverance. He was apt to desert one branch of study suddenly for another; thus he had collected with great care and much application a vast quantity of scarce books and MSS., but had not progressed sufficiently far in his own works to make them of much value in their unfinished state. Among his published works are the following: *Porphyrii liber de Vita Pythagorae*, etc. (Rome 1630, 8vo; Cambridge 1655, 8vo), with a Latin version and notes, and a dissertation on the life and writings of Porphyrius, considered a model of learned biography — *Demophili, Democratis, et Secundi Veterum Philosophorum Sententiae Horales* (Rome, 1638, 8vo; Leyden, 1639, 12mo) — *Note in Sallustium Philosophum de Diis et Mundo* (Rome, 1638, 8vo) — *Observationes ad Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica* (Leyden, 1641, 8vo) — *Arrianus de Venatione*, with a Latin version (Par. 1644, 8vo) — *Adnotationes in Geographiam Sacrum Caroli a S. Paulo, Italian Antiquam Cluverii, et Thesaurum Geographicum Ortelii* (Rome, 1666, 8vo) — *Notae et*

*Castigationes Posthumae in Stephani Byzantini de Urbibus*, edited by Ryckius: *Liber Diurnus Ponticumae Romanorum*, a collection of papal acts and decrees. He also wrote a collection of the rules of the earlier monastic orders, published after his death (Rome, 1661; later at Paris; and, lastly, much enlarged, Augsburg, 1759, 6 vols, fol.), which is considered as among the most valuable of his writings; he also edited in his lifetime the *Antiquities of Praeneste*, by Snares. Many of his Latin letters have also been published in the *Collectio Roman aveterum aliquot histor. eccles. monumentorum*, etc. See Wilkens, *Leben d. gelehrten Lucae Holstenii* (Hamb. 1723, 8vo); *English Cyclop.*; Herzog, *Real-Lex.* 6, 241 sq.; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes History* vol. 3 (see Index); Gieseler, *Church Hist.* 3, 185, note; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform.* 7, 76; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gene.* 25, 4 sq.; Dupin, *Biblioth. Ecclesiastes* (17th century). (J. H. W.)

## Holstein

*SEE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.*

## Holy

*SEE HOLINESS.*

## Holy Of Holies

*SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

## Holy, Holy, Holy.

*SEE TRISAGION.*

## Holy Alliance

A compact formed between the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in 1815, for the humane and liberal administration of their governments. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 5, 669; Wing's Hase, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Hurst's Hagenbach, *Hist. Christ. Church in 18th and 19th Cent.* 2, 342 sq.; and the references in Poole's *Index*, s.v. *SEE ALLIANCE, HOLY.*

## Holy Ark

*SEE ARK* 3.



## Holy Ashes

are called, in the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the ashes used at the old ceremonial in Lent. *SEE LENT.*

## Holy Bible

*SEE BIBLE.*

## Holy-Bread

Skep or Maund is called, in the Roman and Anglican Churches, the basket used for the eulogia (q.v.). — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 312.

## Holy Candle, Blessing with the

Bishops Latimer and Tyndale say that in their day “dying persons committed their souls to the holy candle, and that the sign of the Cross was made over the dead with it, ‘thereby to be discharged of the burden of sin, or to drive away devils, or to put away dreams and phantasies.’” Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 313. Compare the use of tapers (holy candles) at *Candlemas.* *SEE CANDLE.*

## Holy Catholic Church

The “congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the whole world.” Some persons speak of this Church as if it were a visible community, comprising all Christians as its members, as having existed from the earliest days and as retaining the same authority, which it formerly had to frame and promulgate decrees. The opponents of such views maintain that no proof can be offered “that there is or ever was any one community on earth recognized, or having any claim to be recognized as the universal Church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches. They further allege that no accredited organ exists empowered to pronounce its decrees, nor any registry of those decrees. They consider therefore, that the Catholic Church is an invisible community (because its Head is so) in itself and regarded as a whole, though visible in its several parts to those of its members who constitute each separate part. *SEE CHURCH.*

## Holy City

*SEE JERUSALEM.*

## Holy Coat of Treves

### Picture for Holy Coat of Treves

A relic preserved with great reverence in the cathedral of Treves, in the southern part of France, and esteemed as one of the greatest treasures of that city. The priests claim that it was the seamless coat of our Savior, and that it was discovered in the 4th century by the empress Helena on her visit to Palestine, and by her deposited at Treves. The Treves relics were concealed from the Normans in the 9th century in crypts, but the holy coat was rediscovered in 1196. It was solemnly exhibited again to the public in 1512. Multitudes flocked to see and venerate it, and Leo X appointed an exhibition of it every seven years. The Reformation and wars prevented the regular observance of this great religious festival, but it was celebrated in 1810 and was attended by a concourse of more than 225,000 persons, and in 1844 by still greater multitudes. Miraculous cures were confidently asserted to be performed by the precious relic. The exhibition of the holy coat in 1844 is otherwise memorable for the reaction, which it produced, leading to the secession of Rongé and the German Catholics from the Church of Rome. See Gildemeister and Sybel, *Der heil. Rock zu Trier* (1845).

## Holy Cross

*SEE CROSS.*

## Holy-Cross-Day

*SEE CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE.*

## Holy Cross, Order of

*SEE CROSS, HOLY, ORDER OF.*

## Holy Day

A day set apart by certain churches for the commemoration of some saint or some remarkable particular in the life of Christ. It has been a question agitated by divines whether it be proper to appoint or keep any holy days (the Sabbath excepted). The advocates for holy days suppose that they have a tendency to impress the minds of the people with a greater sense of religion; that if the acquisitions and victories of men be celebrated with the

highest joy, how much more those events which relate to the salvation of man, such as the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, etc. On the other side, it is observed that, if holy days had been necessary under the present dispensation, Jesus Christ would have said something respecting them, whereas he was silent about them; that it is bringing us again into that bondage to ceremonial laws from which Christ freed us; that it is a tacit reflection on the Head of the Church in not appointing them; that such days, on the whole, are more pernicious than useful to society, as they open a door for indolence and profaneness; yea, that Scripture speaks against such days (~~404~~ Galatians 4:9-11). *SEE FEASTS; SEE FESTIVALS.*

### Holy Family

is the general title, in the language of art, of the various representations of the domestic life of the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus and his attendants. "In the early part of the Middle Ages, when the object in view was to excite devotion, the Virgin and Child were usually the only persons represented. At a later period, Joseph, Elizabeth, St. Anna (the mother of the Virgin), and John the Baptist were included. Some of the old German painters have added the twelve apostles as children and playfellows of the infant Christ, as well as their mothers, as stated in the legends. The Italian school, with its fine feeling for composition, was the first to recognize how many figures the group must comprise if the interest is to remain undivided and be concentrated on one figure, whether that figure be the Madonna or the Child. Two masters are pre-eminent in this species of representation—Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael" (Chambers). Mrs. Jameson (*Legends of the Madonna*, p. 252 sq.) also insists on drawing a distinction between the domestic and the devotional treatment. The latter, she says, is a group in which the sacred personages are placed in direct relation to the worshippers, and their supernatural character is paramount to every other. The former, a group of the Holy Family so called, in which the personages are placed in direct relation to each other by some link of action or sentiment which expresses the family connection between them, or by some action which has a dramatic rather than a religious significance.

### Holy Father

**I.** "The first person of the Trinity was represented as in Daniel's vision, 7:9, and vested in a cope, and wearing a tiara. It was contrary to our

Lord's declaration (~~166~~ John 6:46), and indefensible." Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 312.

**II.** A title of the pope (q.v.).

### Holy Fire

A ceremony in the Romish Church, observed on Holy Saturday (q.v.) of Easter, with especial pomp at Rome, where the pope himself is in attendance. A light is kindled by sparks struck from a flint, to commemorate Christ — according to the Missal — as the great cornerstone. This light is hailed by kneeling ecclesiastics saying "Light of Christ" (*Lumen Christi*), all the lights in the chapel having been previously extinguished, to be rekindled at the new fire. In the Church of the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem, at the Easter of the Oriental Church, the Holy Fire is claimed to be miraculous. "The Greek and Armenian clergy combine on this occasion, and amidst processions, solemnities, an excited multitude, and scenes disgraceful not only to the name of religion, but to human nature, the expected fire makes its appearance from within an apartment in which a Greek and an Armenian bishop have locked themselves."

### Holy Font

The vessel containing the baptismal water. *SEE FONT.*

### Holy Fridays

Fridays in Ember-weeks (q.v.). Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.*, p. 312. *SEE FRIDAY.*

### Holy Gates

*SEE JUBILEE (ROMAN CATHOLIC).*

### Holy Ghost

(*πνεῦμα ἅγιον*), the third person in the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and equal with them in power and glory (see 10th Art. of Religion, Church of England, and 9th of Methodist Episcopal Church). For the significations of the original words rendered in the English version by "Spirit," "Holy Spirit," "Holy Ghost," *SEE SPIRIT.* The Scriptures teach, and the Church maintains,

**I.** the *Procession*;

**II.** the *Personality*; and

**III.** the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghost. For the offices of the Holy Ghost, *SEE SPIRIT, SEE HOLY; SEE PARACLETE; SEE WITNESS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.*

**I.** PROCESSION *of the Holy Ghost.* — The orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Holy Ghost is God by an eternal *procession*. He proceedeth from the Father and from the Son. “When the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which *proceedeth* from the Father, he shall testify of me” (<sup><B156></sup>John 15:26). He is the Spirit of the Father, he is the Spirit of the Son: he is sent by the Father, he is sent by the Son. The Father is never sent by the Son, but the Father sendeth the Son; neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Ghost, but he is sent by both. The Nicene Creed teaches, “And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who *proceedeth* from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.” The Athanasian Creed, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*.” The article of the Church of England says, “The Holy Ghost, *proceeding* from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.” The term *spiration* was introduced by the Latin Church to denote the manner of the procession. When our Lord imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, “he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost” (<sup><B102></sup>John 20:22).

During the first three centuries there was nothing decided by ecclesiastical authority respecting the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) declared only that “the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father” (ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον), and the Greek fathers generally adhered to this view; so Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. Epiphanius added to the formula, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, the explanatory clause, ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον (<sup><B145></sup>John 16:15). John of Damascus represents the Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Son, as Novatian had done before him, relying on <sup><B126></sup>John 15:26. With this modification, the formula adopted at the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), and appended to the Nicene Creed, was retained in the Greek Church.

“But there were many in the *Latin* Church who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but *also from the Son*. They appealed to ~~John~~ John 16:13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is called the *Spirit of Christ*, e.g. ~~Romans~~ Romans 8:9 sq. To this doctrine the Greeks were for the most part opposed. It prevailed, however, more and more in the Latin Church; and when, in the fifth and sixth centuries, the Arians, who then prevailed very much in Spain, urged it as an argument against the equality of Christ with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Son, the Catholic churches of that region began to hold more decidedly that the Holy Spirit proceeded from *both* (*ab utroque*), and to insert the adjunct *Filioque* after *Patre* in the *Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum*. In this the churches of Spain were followed, first by those of France, and at a later period by nearly all the Western churches. But as the Eastern Church still adhered substantially to the more ancient formula, it accused the Western Church of falsifying the Nicene symbol; and thus at different periods, and especially in the 7th and 9th centuries, violent controversies arose between them” (Knapp, *Theology*, § 43; Hey, *Lectures on Divinity*, vol. 1). The true causes of these dissensions were, however, very different from those which were alleged, and less animated, it seems, by zeal for the truth than by the mutual jealousies of the Roman and Byzantine bishops. But, however uncertain the reason that provoked these disputes, they terminated in the 11th century in an entire separation of the Eastern and Western churches, continuing to the present time. The addition of the word *filioque* to the creed of the Western Church first appears in the acts of the Synod of Braga (A.D. 412), and in the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589). See Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 234; Harvey, *History of the Three Creeds*, p. 452; and the article *SEE FILIOQUE*.

The scriptural argument for the procession of the Holy Ghost is thus stated by bishop Pearson: “Now the procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly in relation to the Son, and is contained virtually in the Scriptures.

**1.** It is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Savior testifieth, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me’ (~~John~~ John 15:26). This is also evident from what has already been asserted; for inasmuch as the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and, being thus the same in the unity of the nature of

God, are yet distinct in the personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath already been shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

**2.** Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for the very reason that he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son, therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called ‘the Spirit of God,’ and ‘the Spirit of the Father.’ ‘It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you’ ([4000](#) Matthew 10:20). For by the language of the apostle, ‘the Spirit of God’ is the Spirit, which is of God, saying, ‘The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God; and we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God’ ([4021](#) 1 Corinthians 2:11,12). Now the same Spirit is also called ‘the Spirit of the Son’ for ‘because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts’ ([4006](#) Galatians 4:6). The Spirit of Christ: ‘Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his’ ([4800](#) Romans 8:9); ‘Even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets’ ([4011](#) 1 Peter 1:11). The Spirit of Jesus Christ,’ as the apostle speaks: ‘I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ’ ([5019](#) Philippians 1:19). If, then, the Holy Ghost be called ‘the Spirit of the Father’ because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also ‘the Spirit of the Son,’ he proceedeth also from the Son. Again: because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath, by the original communication, a right of mission; as, ‘the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send’ ([4946](#) John 14:26). But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you.’ Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner, neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit;

but both the Father and the Son send the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature, common to the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son" (Pearson, *On the Creed*),

## II. PERSONALITY *of the Holy Ghost.*

**1. Definition and History of the Doctrine.** — A person is "a thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection;" "a singular, subsistent, intellectual being;" "an intelligent agent." As personality implies thought, reason, reflection, and an individual existence, distinct from that of other beings, when we speak of the personality of the Holy Ghost we mean his distinct and individual existence as an intelligent and reflecting being. He is represented throughout the Scriptures as a personal agent, and the earlier Christian writers so speak of him, though without any aim at dogmatic precision. It is the habit of some writers, opposed to the orthodox doctrine, to assert that not only was the doctrine of the Holy Ghost not precisely defined in that early period, but that it was not received. "On the contrary, the thorough investigations of recent times show plainly that the ante-Nicene fathers, with the exception of the Monarchians, and perhaps Lactantius, agreed in the two fundamental points that the Holy Ghost, the sole agent in the application of redemption, is a supernatural divine being, and that he is an independent person; closely allied to the Father and the Son, yet hypostatically different from them both" (Schaff, *Ch. History*, 1, § 80). The first positive and dogmatic *denial* of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost seems to have been made by Arius, who applied the doctrine of subordination here, and placed the same distance between the Son and the Spirit as between the Father and the Son. According to him, the Holy Spirit was only the first of created beings, brought into existence by the Son as the organ of the Father. Later anti-Trinitarians represent the Holy Spirit simply as an operation of the divine mind, as the "exerted energy of God," or as an attribute only of the divine activity.

**2. Proof of the Personality of the Spirit.** "The Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testament not only as different from the Father and Son, and not only as the personification of *some attribute of God*, or of some effect which he has produced, but as a literal *person* (see Semler, *Disp. Spiritum Sanctum recte describi personam*). The proof of this is thus made out from the following texts:



(1.) From the texts <sup><B146></sup>John 14:16, 17, 26; 15:26. The Holy Spirit is here called **παράκλητος**, not *comforter*, *advocate*, nor merely *teacher*, as Ernesti renders it, but *helper*, *assistant*, *counselor*, in which sense it is used by Philo, when he says, God needs no **παράκλητος** (monitor). Of the *Paracletus*, Christ says *that the Father will send him in his (Christ's) name* (i.e. in his place) *to instruct his disciples*. To these three subjects similar personal predicates are here equally applied, and the *Paracletus* is not designated by the abstract word *auxilium*, but by the concrete *auxiliator*; so that we have the Father who sent him, the Son in whose place he comes, and the Holy Spirit who is sent. His office is to carry forward the great work of teaching and saving men which Christ commenced, and to be to the disciples of Christ what Christ himself was while he continued upon the earth. <sup><B156></sup>John 15:26, *When the Paracletus shall come, whom I will send to you from the Father (I mean the Spirit — i.e. teacher — of truth, who proceeds from the Father), he will instruct you further in my religion*; where it should be remarked that the phrase **ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ Πατρός** means *to be sent or commissioned by the Father*.

(2.) <sup><B144></sup>1 Corinthians 12:4-11, *There are various gifts (χαρίσματα), but there is one and the same Spirit (τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα), from whom they all proceed*. Here the **χαρίσματα** are clearly distinguished from the Spirit, who is the author of them. In verse 5 this same person is distinguished from Christ (**ὁ Κύριος**), and in ver. 6 from **ὁ Θεός**. In ver. 11 it is said *all these (various gifts) worketh one and the self-same Spirit, who imparteth to every man his own, as he will (καθὼς βούλεται)*.

(3.) Those texts in which such attributes and works are ascribed to the Holy Spirit as can be predicated of no other than a personal subject. In <sup><B163></sup>John 16:13 sq., he is said to 'speak,' to 'hear,' to 'take,' etc. So in <sup><B1210></sup>1 Corinthians 2:10, *God hath revealed the doctrines of Christianity to us by his Spirit* (the **πάρκλητος** before mentioned, who was sent to give us this more perfect instruction). *And this Spirit searches (ἐρευνᾷ) all things, even the most secret divine purposes (βάθη Θεοῦ; comp. <sup><B113></sup>Romans 11:33 sq.); in his instruction, therefore, we may safely confide*. The expressions, the Holy Spirit *speaks*, *sends any one*, *appoints (any one for particular purpose*, and others, which occur so frequently in the Acts and elsewhere, show that the Holy Spirit was understood by the early Christians to be a *personal agent* (<sup><B132></sup>Acts 13:2, 4; 20:28; 21:11 sq.).

(4.) The formula of baptism, <sup><4189></sup>Matthew 28:19, and other similar texts, such as <sup><4734></sup>2 Corinthians 13:14, where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are mentioned in distinction (ver. 35), may now be used in proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, since the other texts upon which the meaning of these depends have already been cited. From all these texts, taken together, we may form the following result: The Holy Spirit is represented in the Bible as a personal subject, and, as such, is distinguished from the Father and the Son. In relation to the human race, he is described as sent and commissioned by the Father and the Son, and as occupying the place, which Christ, who preceded him, held. In *this* respect he depends (to speak after the manner of men) upon the Father (<sup><4146></sup>John 14:16) and upon the Son (<sup><4146></sup>John 14:16, 26: also 16:14, *ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήγεται*); and in *this sense* he proceeds from them both, or is sent by them both. This may be expressed more literally as follows: The great work of converting, sanctifying and saving men, which the Father commenced through the Son, will be carried on by the Father and Son, *through the Holy Spirit*.

“The objectors to this doctrine frequently say that the imaginative Orientalists were accustomed to represent many things as personal subjects, and to introduce them as speaking and acting, which, however, they themselves did not consider as persons, and did not intend to have so considered by others; and to this Oriental usage they think that Christ and his apostles might here, as in other cases, have conformed. But, whenever Christ and his apostles spoke in figurative language, they always showed, by the explanations, which they gave, that they did not intend to be understood literally. But they have given no such explanation of the language, which they employ with regard to the Holy Spirit. We therefore fairly conclude that they intended that their language should be understood literally, otherwise they would have led their readers and hearers into error, and the more so as they well knew that their readers and hearers were accustomed to personifications” (Knapp, *Theology*, § 39).

The scriptural argument is thus logically developed by Watson.

**1.** The mode of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit in the sacred Trinity proves his personality. He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth would be a gross absurdity.

**2.** Many passages of Scripture would be wholly unintelligible, and even absurd, unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who

take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the *energy* or *power of God*, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: ‘God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power;’ that is, with the power of God and with power. That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost;’ that is, through the power of power. ‘In demonstration of the Spirit and of power’ that is, in demonstration of power and of power.

**3.** Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, impossible. The reality which this figure of speech is said to present to us is either some of the attributes of God, or else the doctrine of the Gospel. Let this theory, then, be tried upon the following passages: ‘He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.’ What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a *prosopopeia* as this passage would exhibit? The doctrine of the Gospel not speaking ‘of himself,’ but speaking ‘whatsoever he shall hear!’ The Spirit maketh intercession for us.’ What attribute is capable of interceding, or how can the doctrine of the Gospel intercede? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the New Testament, and in the most incidental conversations. ‘Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.’ How impossible is it here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel! So again: The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.’ Could it be any attribute of God, which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel? Finally, that the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the neuter noun Πνεῦμα, *Spirit*, and also by many distinct personal acts being ascribed to him, as ‘to come,’ ‘to go,’ ‘to be sent,’ ‘to teach,’ ‘to guide,’ ‘to comfort,’ ‘to make intercession,’ ‘to bear witness,’ ‘to give gifts,’ ‘dividing them to every man as he will,’ ‘to be vexed,’ ‘grieved,’ and ‘quenched.’ These cannot be applied to the mere fiction of a person, and

they therefore establish the Spirit's true personality" (Watson, *Theological Institutes*, 1, 637 sq.).

### III. DIVINITY of the Holy Spirit.

**1.** The same arguments that prove the personality of the Holy Ghost, go also, to a certain extent, to establish his divinity. The *direct* scriptural argument may be thus summed up:

**(a.)** Names proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as *Jehovah* (~~4825~~ Acts 28:25, with ~~2369~~ Isaiah 6:9; and ~~5807~~ Hebrews 3:7, 9, with ~~1270~~ Exodus 17:7; ~~2413~~ Jeremiah 31:31, 34; ~~5805~~ Hebrews 10:15, 16), *God* (~~4488~~ Acts 5:3, 4), *Lord* (~~4087~~ 2 Corinthians 3:17, 19). "The Lord, the Spirit."

**(b.)** Attributes proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as omniscience (~~4120~~ 1 Corinthians 2:10, 11; ~~2403~~ Isaiah 40:13, 14), omnipresence (~~4107~~ Psalm 139:7; ~~4027~~ Ephesians 2:17, 18; ~~4826~~ Romans 8:26, 27), omnipotence (~~4025~~ Luke 1:35), eternity (~~5894~~ Hebrews 9:14).

**(c.)** Divine works are evidently ascribed to him (~~4002~~ Genesis 2:2; ~~4863~~ Job 26:13; ~~4316~~ Psalm 32:6; 104:30).

**(d.)** *Worship*, proper only to God, is required and ascribed to him (~~2368~~ Isaiah 6:3; ~~4825~~ Acts 28:25; ~~4906~~ Romans 9:1; ~~4004~~ Revelation 1:4; ~~4734~~ 2 Corinthians 13:14; ~~4889~~ Matthew 28:19).

**2.** The argument for the personal divinity of the Spirit is developed by Watson as follows:

**(1.)** "The first argument may be drawn from the frequent association, in Scripture, of a Person under that appellation with two other Persons, one of whom, the Father, is by all acknowledged to be divine; and the ascription to each of them, or to the three in union, of the same acts, titles, and authority, with worship of the same kind, and, for any distinction that is made, of an equal degree. The manifestation of the existence and divinity of the Holy Spirit may be expected in the law and the prophets, and is, in fact, to be traced there with certainty. The Spirit is represented as an agent in creation, 'moving upon the face of the waters;' and it forms no objection to the argument that creation is ascribed to the Father and also to the Son, but is a great confirmation of it. That creation should be effected by all the three Persons of the Godhead, though acting in different respects, yet so that each should be a Creator, and, therefore, both a Person and a divine

Person, can be explained only by their unity in one essence. On every other hypothesis this scriptural fact is disallowed, and therefore no other hypothesis can be true. If the Spirit of God be a mere influence, then he is not a Creator, distinct from the Father and the Son, because he is not a Person; but this is refuted both by the passage just quoted, and by <sup><B316></sup>Psalm 33:6: ‘By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Hebrew, *Spirit*) of his mouth.’ This is farther confirmed by <sup><B334></sup>Job 33:4: ‘The Spirit of God hath made me, and the *breath* of the Almighty hath given me life;’ where the second clause is obviously exegetic of the former: and the whole text proves that, in the patriarchal age, the followers of the true religion ascribed creation to the Spirit as well as to the Father, and that one of his appellations was ‘the *Breath* of the Almighty.’ Did such passages stand alone, there might indeed, be some plausibility in the criticism which resolves them into a personification; but, connected as they are with the whole body of evidence, as to the concurring doctrine of both Testaments, they are inexpugnable. Again: If the personality of the Son and the Spirit be allowed, and yet it is contended that they were but instruments in creation, through whom the creative power of another operated, but which creative power was not possessed by them; on this hypothesis, too, neither the Spirit nor the Son can be said to create, any more than Moses created the serpent into which his rod was turned, and the Scriptures are again contradicted. To this association of the three Persons in creative acts may be added a like association in acts of preservation, which has been well called a *continued creation*, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: ‘These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to dust: thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth’ (<sup><B342></sup>Psalm 104:27-30). It is not surely here meant that the Spirit by which the generations of animals are perpetuated is *wind*; and if he be called an attribute, *wisdom*, *power*, or both limited, where do we read of such attributes being ‘sent,’ ‘sent forth from God,’ ‘sent forth from’ God to ‘create and renew the face of the earth?’

(2.) “The next association of the three Persons we find in the *inspiration* of the prophets: ‘God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,’ says Paul (<sup><B300></sup>Hebrews 1:1). Peter declares that these ‘holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost’ (<sup><B002></sup>2 Peter 1:21); and also that it

was ‘the Spirit of Christ which was in them’ (~~rom~~1 Peter 1:11). We may defy any Socinian to interpret these three passages by making the Spirit an influence or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. ‘God,’ in the first passage, is unquestionably God the Father; and the ‘holy men of God,’ the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the *influence* of the Father; but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit or the *influence* of ‘Christ.’ Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the Trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons, one of them God and the other a creature. Even if they allowed the pre-existence of Christ, with Arians, these passages are inexplicable. by the Socinians; but, denying his pre-existence, they have no subterfuge but to interpret ‘the Spirit of Christ,’ *the spirit which prophesied of Christ*, which is a purely gratuitous paraphrase; or ‘the spirit of an anointed one, or prophet:’ that is, the prophet’s own spirit, which is just as gratuitous and as unsupported by any parallel as the former. If, however, the Holy Ghost be the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, united in one essence, the passages are easily harmonized. In conjunction with the Father and the Son, he is the source of that prophetic inspiration under which the prophets spoke and acted. So the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead is said by Peter to have preached by Noah while the ark was preparing, in allusion to the passage ‘My Spirit shall not always strive (contend, debate) with man.’ This, we may observe, affords an eminent proof that the writers of the New Testament understood the phrase ‘the Spirit of God,’ as it occurs in the Old Testament, *personally*. For, whatever may be the full meaning of that difficult passage in Peter, Christ is clearly declared to have preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah; that is, he, by the Spirit, inspired Noah to preach. If, then, the apostles understood that the Holy Ghost was a Person, a point which will presently be established, we have, in the text just quoted from the book of Genesis, a key to the meaning of those texts in the Old Testament where the phrases ‘My Spirit,’ ‘the Spirit of God,’ and ‘the Spirit of the Lord’ occur, and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by Socinians to deny his personality itself indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be inevitably divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but in the following the Spirit is also eminently

distinguished from two other Persons: ‘And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me’ (<sup><23816></sup>Isaiah 48:16) or, rendered better, ‘hath sent me and his Spirit,’ both terms being in the accusative case. ‘Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them’ (<sup><23816></sup>Isaiah 34:16). ‘I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts, I will shake all nations and the Desire of all nations shall come’ (<sup><3704></sup>Haggai 2:4-7). Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah [according to the usual interpretation].

**(3.)** “Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship, and form the one divine ‘name.’ Thus the fact that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts, who spake unto the prophet, is, in <sup><4425></sup>Acts 28:25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the glory of Christ, proves indisputably that each of the three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition, ‘Holy, holy, holy!’ and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Triune Lord of hosts. Both the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father.”

**3.** In the *Apostolical Benediction*, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all, Amen,” the Holy Ghost is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, “to be the source of the highest spiritual blessings; while the benediction is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of prayer to each of the three Persons, and therefore is at once an acknowledgment of the divinity and personality of each. The same remark applies to <sup><6104></sup>Revelation 1:4, 5: ‘Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which was, and which is, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne’ (an emblematical reference, probably, to the golden branch with its seven lamps), ‘and from Jesus Christ.’ The style of this book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called ‘the seven spirits;’ but no created spirit or company of created spirits is ever spoken of under that appellation; and the place assigned to the seven spirits, between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates with certainty

that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent in both dispensations, is intended.

**4.** “The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of covenant by which the sacred Three become our one or only God, and we become his people: ‘Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ In what manner is this text to be disposed of if the personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that baptism is in the name of one *God*, one *creature* and one *attribute*? The grossness of this absurdity refutes it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the Three, therefore, are persons, are we to have baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or, rather, it would be idolatry itself; for, considering baptism as an act of dedication to God, the acceptance of God as our God, on our part, and the renunciation of all other deities and all other religions, what could a heathen convert conceive of the two creatures so distinguished from all other creatures in heaven and in earth, and so associated with God himself as to form together the *one name*, to which, by that act, he was devoted, and which he was henceforward to profess and honor, but that they were equally divine, unless special care was taken to instruct him that but one of the Three was God, and the two others but creatures? But of this care, of this cautionary instruction, though so obviously necessary upon this theory, no single instance can be given in all the writings of the apostles.”

**5.** A further argument is derived from the fact that the Spirit is “the subject of blasphemy: The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men” (<sup><4123></sup>Matthew 12:31). This blasphemy consisted in ascribing his miraculous works to Satan; and that he is capable of being blasphemed proves him to be as much a person as the Son; and it proves him to be divine, because it shows that he may be sinned against, and so sinned against that the blasphemer shall not be forgiven. A person he must be, or he could not be blasphemed: a divine person he must be to constitute this blasphemy a sin against him in the proper sense, and of so malignant a kind as to place it beyond the reach of mercy. He is called God: ‘Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? Why hast thou conceived this in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God’ (<sup><4113></sup>Acts 5:3, 4). Ananias is said to have lied particularly ‘unto the Holy



Ghost,' because the apostles were under his special direction in establishing the temporary regulation among Christians that they should have all things in common: the detection of the crime itself was a demonstration of the divinity of the Spirit, because it showed his omniscience, his knowledge of the most secret acts" (Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, 1, 629 sq.).

See, besides the works already cited, Hawker, *Sermons on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost* (London 1794, 8vo); Owen, *Discourses on the Spirit*; Pye Smith, *On the Holy Ghost* (London 1831, 8vo); *Christian Review*, 18, 515 (on the personality of the Spirit); Neander, *History of Dogmas*, 1, 171, 303; Neander, *Ch. History*, vol. 1, 2; Kahnis, *Die Lehre vom-Heil. Geist* (Leipsic, 1847, 8vo); Dewar, *Personality, Divinity, etc., of the Holy Ghost* (London, 1848, 8vo); Fritzsche, *De Spiritu. Sancto* (Halle, 1840); Büchschütz, *Doctrine de l'Esprit de Dieu* (Strasbourg, 1840); Hase, *Evangel. Dogmatik*, § 175; Guyse, *Godhead of the Holy Spirit* (London, 1790, 12mo); Pierce, *Divinity and Personality of the Spirit* (London, 1805, 12mo); Heber, *Personality and Office of the Spirit* (Bampton Lecture, 1816); Foulkes, *Divis. in Christendom*, 1, 70, 101 sq.; Bickersteth, *Christ. Stud. Assist.* p. 453; Bull, *Trinity*, 1, 135 sq.; 2, 470 sq.: Wilson, *Apost. Fathers*; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. 1, 2; Maonsell, *Redemption*, p. 156 sq.; Waterland, *Works*, vol. 6; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. 1; Milman, *Latin Christ.* 1, 98; Burnet, *Articles of the Christian Faith*, see Index; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* p. 312; Wesley, *Works*, 1 34 sq.; Leidner, *Philosophy*, p. 99; Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. 1; Smeaton, *Atonement*, p. 293, 296; Bethune, *Lect. on Catechism*, vol. 2: see Index; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* 1, 125, 258, 262, 453; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856, 2:298; 1867, vol. 3; *Mercersburg Rev.* Jan. 1867, p. 464; *Bib. Sac.* 1863, p. 600, 877; 1864, p. 119; *Am. Presb. Rev.* April, 1863, p. 336; *Chr. Rev.* 15, 115; April, 1852, art. 4; *Bullet. Theol.* 1, 1868; *Christian Observer*, vol. 20; *London Quart. Review*, April, 1867, 63, 257; *Ev. Ch. Reg.* vol. 1; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, April, 1869; *Congreg. Quart.* July, 1869; *Baptist Quart.* Oct. 1869, p. 498; *Christ. Remember.* July, 1853. **SEE MACEDONIANS; SEE TRINITY; SEE SOCINIANISM.**

## Holy Ghost, Blasphemy against the

**SEE BLASPHEMY.**

## Holy Ghost, Orders of

### Picture for Holy Ghost, Orders of

1. *Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia (Order of the Holy Ghost de Montpellier)*, established in 1178 by Guido of Montpellier, according to the rule of St. Augustine for hospital knights, In 1204 the order obtained the Hospital di Sassia, in Rome, in which the superior of the order took his seat as grandmaster. Henceforth the members of the order were divided into hospital knights, with simple, and into regular canons, with solemn vows. Pius II abolished the knights in 1459 in Italy, but in France they survived. Having been restored in 1693, the order was divided into the degrees of Knights of Justice and Grace, Serving Brothers and Oblates, and in 1700 was changed into regular canons, who still exist. At an early period in the history of the order a female branch was established.
2. *Sisters of the Holy Ghost of Poligsy*, established in 1212 and still continuing in France, a branch of the *White Sisters*.
3. *Hospitallers (brothers and sisters) of the Holy Ghost in France*, established in 1254 as a secular association, and connected with the Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia. The sisters, on account of their dress commonly called the *White Sisters*, are still numerous; they are devoted to the nursing of the sick and the poor, and to the education of young girls.
4. *Canons of the Holy Ghost*, probably founded in Lorraine by Jean Herbert, and confirmed in 1588 by Sixtus V, are devoted to instruction.
5. *The Society of Missionary Priests of the Holy Ghost* was founded in 1700 by abbé Desplaces and Vincent le Barbier for missions, seminaries, and the nursing of the sick; newly established in 1805; still exists, and is active in the foreign missionary fields of the Roman Catholic Church.

## Holy Grass

(*Hierochloa borealis*), a grass about a foot high, of a brownish glossy lax panicle, found in the northern parts of Europe, has a sweet smell like that of vernal grass. In Iceland, where it is plentiful, it is used for scenting apartments and clothes. In some countries it is strewed on the floors of places of worship on holy days, whence its name.

## Holy Handkerchief

“It is said that one of the women who followed Jesus to the crucifixion lent him her handkerchief to wipe the sweat and blood from his face, and that the impress of his features remained upon it. Of course, St. Veronica (q.v.) very carefully preserved the cloth, and it is now at Rome. Jesus, according to tradition, sent another handkerchief to Agbarus (q.v.), king of Edessa, who had requested a portrait of him. Veronica is only a mythical personage, the name being a hybrid compound signifying ‘true image.’ Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* p. 303. *SEE CHRIST, IMAGES OF.*

## Holy of Holies

*SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

## Holy, Holy, Holy

*SEE TRISAGION.*

## Holy Hours

*SEE HOURS, HOLY.*

## Holy Innocents

A festival in commemoration of the slaughter of infant martyrs (at Bethlehem, <sup><1216></sup>Matthew 2:16), of which the Greek menology and Ethiopic liturgy give the number at 40,000, is alluded to by the early Christian fathers, especially Irenaeus and Cyprian, Origen and Augustine, as of memorial observance. In the 4th century, Prudentius celebrates it in the hymn “All hail, ye infant Martyr-Flowers,” and, in connection with the Epiphany, also Fulgentius, in his homilies for the day. St. Bernard also alludes to them: “Stephen was a martyr before men: John before angels, but these before God, confessing Christ by dying, not by speech, and their merit is known only to God.” Violet was used on this day in memory of the sorrow of their mothers, and the Te Deum, Alleluia, and doxologies were forbidden. In England, at Norton (Worcestershire), “a muffled peal is rung to commemorate the slaughter, and then a peal of joy for the escape of the infant Christ; a half-muffled peal is rung at Minety, Maisemore, Leigh-on-Menldip, Wick, Rissington, and Pattington.” — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 313. *SEE INNOCENTS.*

## Holy Land

SEE PALESTINE.

## Holy League

**I.** The name given to an offensive and defensive alliance contracted between the party of the Guises in France, king Philip II of Spain, the pope, the monks, and the French Parliament, in consequence of the edict of toleration of May 14, 1576. The object of the league was the overthrow of the Huguenot party in France, and of its chief, king Henry III, whom one of the Guises was to succeed on the throne. Duke Henry of Guise (surnamed Le Balafre) was the head of the league. In order to avoid the danger, Henry joined the anti-Protestant movement himself, and was thus led to renew the persecutions against the Huguenots. The war commenced in 1577, but soon ended by the peace of Bergerac. When the duke of Alençon died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the league sprung again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of *Ligue des Seize*), took an active part in it. A treaty was finally concluded with Spain, and signed at the castle of Joinville Jan. 3, 1585, to prevent the accession of Henry of Navarre to the throne. The contracting parties also pledged themselves to the total uprooting of Protestantism in France and the Netherlands. The results of the league soon became manifest in the intolerant edict of Nemours in 1585, and led in 1587 to the war, known as the war of the three Henrys. (SEE FRANCE.) Henry III having caused Henry of Guise to be murdered at Blois in 1588, his brother, the duke of Mayenne, became chief of the league. Henry III was in turn murdered near Paris in 1589, and the war continued until the abjuration of Henry IV in 1588. The pope having absolved him, the members of the league gradually joined the royal standard, and the party ceased to exist. See Mignet, *Hist. de la Ligue* (Par. 1829, 5 vols.); Labitte, *De la Democratie chez les Predicateurs de la Ligue* (Paris, 1841); Riddle, *Persec. of Popery*, 1, 309 sq.; De Felice, *Hist. of Protestantism in France* (London 1853, 12mo); Ranke, *History of Papacy* (see Index); Wright, *Hist. of France*, 1, 680 sq.; Poujoulat, *Nouv. Coll. de Memoires pour servir A l'hist. de France* (Paris, 1839, 4to, 1st series, 4, 1

sq.); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10, 374. *SEE GUISE, HOUSE OF; SEE HUGUENOTS.*

**II. HOLY LEAGUE OF NUREMBERG, LIGA SANCTA**, contracted July 10, 1538, by the emperor Charles V, the archbishops of Abayence and Salzburg, dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, George of Saxony, Erich and Henry of Brunswick, for the defense of the Roman Catholic faith against the league of Smalcald (q.v.). The treaty was concluded for eleven years. The armies of the contracting parties were to be divided into two parts, respectively commanded by duke Louis of Bavaria and duke Henry of Brunswick. The truce of April 19, 1539, rendered, however, these combinations unnecessary. Leo, *Universalgesch.* 3, 157 sq.; Hardwick, *Church History during the Reformation*, p. 63 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. from the Reform* p. 83; Pierer, *Universal-Lex.* 10. 374.

### Holy Mortar

Is the "mortar used in cementing altar stones, and made with holy water." — Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Cyclop.* p. 314.

### Holy Mother

*SEE MARY, VIRGIN.*

### Holy Mountain

*SEE HERMON; SEE SINAI; SEE ZION.*

### Holy Night

The night before Holy Day, is the first Sunday in Lent. "By Theodulph's Chapters, the previous week was employed in shriving penitents." — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 313.

### Holy Office

*SEE MINISTRY; SEE INQUISITION.*

### Holy of Holies

*SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

## Holy Oil

A name applied in the 4th century to oil brought to Europe from Jerusalem. "It was carried in cotton within little phials, and distributed to the faithful at a time when relics were sparingly distributed." In Gregory of Tour's time, oil blessed at saints' tombs was very general, and in St. Gregory's day oil taken from lamps which burned before the graves of martyrs in the Catacombs was called "holy oil." "Several of these phials, which Gregory the Great gave to queen Theodolinda, are preserved at Monza." — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* p. 313, 314. *SEE AMPULLA; SEE CHRISMI.*

## Holy Orders

*SEE ORDINATION.*

## Holy Phial or Sainte Ampoule, Order of

The name of an old order of knighthood in France, which was composed of four persons, of the very first families in the province of Champagne, and were styled *Barons de la Sainte Ampoule*. At the coronation of the French kings they were hostages to the dean, priors, and chapter of Rheims until the return of the holy phial in which the coronation oil was kept, and which, according to the legend, was brought from heaven by the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, and put into the hands of St. Remy at the coronation of Clovis, an enormous crowd having prevented the messenger from bringing in time that which had already been prepared. The knights of this order were only knights while the holy phial was used at the coronation service. They wore as a badge a cross of gold enameled white, cantoned with four fleurs-de-lis, and on the cross a dove descending with a phial in its beak, and a right hand receiving it. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 393.

## Holy Place

*SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

## Holy Places

*SEE HEBRON; SEE JERUSALEM; SEE MECCA; SEE PALESTINE,* etc.

## Holy Rood

(*rode* or *rod*), “the name of the cross so often erected in churches.”-Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* p. 312. *SEE CROSS*; *SEE ROOD*.

## Holy-Rood Day

A festival on the 14th of September to commemorate in churches the Exaltation of the Cross; the Invention or Finding of the Holy Cross being celebrated on the 3rd of May. — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 314; Eadie, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 312. *SEE CROSS*.

## Holy Saturday

In some churches the Saturday before Easter is so called. *SEE HOLY WEEK*.

## Holy Scripture

*SEE SCRIPTURE, HOLY*.

## Holy Sepulcher

*SEE SEPULCHER OF CHRIST*.

## Holy Sepulcher

Orders of.

**1.** A religious order in the Roman Catholic Church according to the rule of St. Augustine, founded in 1114 by the archdeacon (subsequently patriarch of Jerusalem) Arnold; according to others, it was founded in 1099 by Godfrey of Bouillon. It embraced regular canons and canonesses, was at one time established all through Europe, and received a new rule under Urban VIII. The canons became extinct soon after the renewal of their rule, but the canonesses still have a number of houses in France, Germany (Baden), and the Netherlands, and, living in strict seclusion, occupy themselves with the instruction and education of young girls.

**2.** *The Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulcher in England*, established in 1174; extinct since the 16th century. The knights were obliged to guard, at least during two years, the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem.

**3. Knights of the Holy Sepulcher**, an order founded very likely by pope Alexander VI to guard the Holy Sepulcher, and at the same time to afford relief and protection to pilgrims to the Holy Land. Originally the pope was the grand master of the order, but he finally ceded this right to the “guardian father of the Holy Sepulcher.” The knights must be, according to the rules of the order, of noble descent, hear mass daily, fight, live, and die for the Roman Catholic faith, etc. But they enjoyed also extraordinary privileges, as exemption from taxation, permission to marry, possession of Church property, etc. When Jerusalem was recaptured by the Turks, the knights of the Holy Sepulcher went to Perugia, in Italy. “After a temporary union with the Hospitallers, the order was reconstructed in 1814 both in France and in Poland, and is still in existence within a very small circle of knights elected by the guardian father from the most respectable pilgrims who come to Jerusalem.”

### Holy Spear

(*ἅγια λόγχη*), as it is called in the Greek Church, is a kind of spear with a long handle, ending in a cross, “with which the altar-bread, called sphragis or holy lamb, is cut out from the loaf for consecration by the priest, with a solemn form in the liturgy of Chrysostom founded on <sup><280></sup>Isaiah 53:7-8; <sup><333></sup>John 19:34.” — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* p. 314.

### Holy Spirit

*SEE SPIRIT, WORK OF THE; SEE HOLY GHOST; SEE PARACLETE; SEE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.*

### Holy Synod

Is the title in the Greek Church of the highest governing body.

### Holy Table

As it is called in some churches, is the table on which are placed the bread and wine, the appointed emblems of the Savior’s death. *SEE ALTAR.*

### Holy Thursday

(called also MAUNDY THURSDAY, from *mandatum* [commandment]. The first word with which the Church services of the day begin), a day observed in some churches in commemoration of our Lord’s ascension. In



the Roman calendar it is the thirty-ninth day after Easter Sunday. *SEE ASCENSION DAY; SEE HOLY WEEK.*

### Holy Union

*SEE HOLY LEAGUE.*

### Holy Wars

*SEE CRUSADES.*

### Holy Water

In the Romish, as also in the Greek, Russian, and Oriental churches, denotes water blessed by a priest or bishop for certain religious uses. The theory of its first introduction seems to have been that water is a fitting symbol of purity, and accordingly, in most of the ancient religions, the use of lustral or purifying water not only formed part of the public worship, but also entered largely into the personal acts of sanctification prescribed to individuals. The Jewish law also prescribed this, and it was a practice held in common by many Pagan nations (compare Riddle, *Christ. Ant.* p. 725). The sprinkling of the hands and face with water before entering the sanctuary, still generally observed by the adherents to that law, was retained, or, no doubt, may have given rise to its adoption by the early Christian Church. But its use was certainly for a very different purpose. Thus bishop Marcellus ordered Equitius, his deacon, to sprinkle holy water, hallowed by him, in houses and churches, to exorcise devils, which is said to have been done also by pope Alexander I. "Joseph, the converted Jew, Epiphanius says, used consecrated water in exorcism. Holy water was used in all benedictions of palm and olive branches, vestments, corporals, candles, houses, herds, fields, and in private houses. By the canon law it is mingled with salt. The Council of Nantes ordered the priest before mass to sprinkle the church court and close, offering prayers for the departed, and to give water to all who asked it for their houses, food, cattle, fodder, fields, and vineyards. By the Capitulars of Charlemagne, Louis, and Lothaire, on Easter and Whitsun eves all the faithful might take, for purposes of aspersion in their houses, consecrated water before its admixture with chris (q.v.). In monasteries, a novice carried the holy water before the cross in procession" (Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 314). In the Romish Church of today holy water is directed to be made of pure spring water, with the admixture of a little consecrated salt. This water

(generally placed at the entrance of places of worship, and sanctified by a solemn benediction, prescribed in the diocesan ritual) the Romanist has come to look upon with the most superstitious regard, and it is used not merely for the sprinkling of persons on entering and leaving the church, but also in sprinkling books, bells, etc., and it is frequently taken to their homes, as having some peculiar virtue. Its use has thus become nothing more than a charm. In the Greek Church, holy water is usually consecrated by the bishop or his vicar-general on the eve of the Epiphany. No salt is employed, and they regard the use of it by the Latins as a grievous and unauthorized corruption. The Greeks perform the ceremony on January 6, the day on which they believe that Christ was baptized by John, and twice a year it is usual to drink a portion, viz. at the end of the midnight mass of Christmas and on the feast of Epiphany. In the Armenian Church, holy water is consecrated by plunging a cross into it on the day of the Epiphany, after which it is distributed among the congregation, who take it to their homes. The offerings made on this occasion form a considerable portion of the emoluments of the Armenian priesthood. On the practice of using water for baptism, *SEE BAPTISM*, — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* bk. 8, ch. 3 § 67; Eadie, *Eccl. Cyclop.* p. 313, 658, 659; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 369, 395; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 394. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Program.* p. 142.

### Holy-water Sprinkler

“the *aspergill*, a brush for scattering holy water. A horrible Tudor mace, with radiating spikes, was called the morning star, or sprinkler.” — Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 314.

### Holy-water Stock

#### Picture for Holy-water Stock

(i.e. pillar) or Stoup (*I.e.* bucket). A stationary stone basin (any porous substance which could suck it up was to be carefully avoided) for holy water, placed at the entrance of the house of worship, called by the French *benitier*. Pope Leo III erected one at Ostia. “The stoup is found in all periods of architecture, formed in the wall, set on a pillar, or in the porch, or standing on a pedestal.” The vessel used by the Temple priests was a brazen laver (see <sup><2016></sup>Isaiah 1:16; 52:2; <sup><2311></sup>Exodus 30:20; <sup><4001></sup>2 Corinthians 7:1; <sup><4502></sup>Psalms 51:2, 7). — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeology*, p. 314 sq.

## Holy-water Vat

(French, *benitier*; Latin, *situla, vas*), a vessel in which the holy water was carried about, and which, according to Micrologus, was first consecrated by pope Alexander V, as Cranmer says, to “put us in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ for our redemption, sprinkled on the cross.” Eadie says “this vessel was termed *ama* or *amula*. Du Cange recognizes *aspersol, aspergillum, and aspersorium* as the vessels from which the priests sprinkled the water, and *guadalerium* as that which contained it. The first three are plainly the same as the περιῤῥαντήριον of paganism.” “The fixed holy-water stoup (q.v.) was used by those who came too late into church to receive the aspersion by the sprinkler and water carried in the portable vat, which in the churches of the West represented the bodily ablution made by the Oriental Christians. Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, p. 315; Eadie, *Eccles. Dictionary*, p. 313.

## Holy Week

The last week of Lent (q.v.), i.e. the week before Easter, and specially devoted to commemorating the sufferings and death of Christ. In English use, it is also called *Passion Week* (a name appropriated, in Roman use, to the week before Palm Sunday). This institution is of very early origin, and was “formerly called the ‘Great Week,’ and in medieval times the ‘Authentic,’ with the same meaning; in Germany and Denmark, the popular title is ‘Still Week,’ in allusion to the holy quiet and abstraction from labor during its continuance.” In the Roman Catholic Church, the special characteristics of the celebration of the *Holy Week* are increased solemnity and gloom, penitential rigor, and mourning. If any of the ordinary Church festivals fall therein, they are transferred till after Easter. All instrumental music is suspended in the churches, the altars are stripped of their ornaments, the pictures and statues are veiled from public sight, manual labor is voluntarily suspended, the rigor of fasting is redoubled, and alms-deeds and other works of mercy and sedulously enjoined and practiced. The days specially solemnized are Palm Sunday, Spy Wednesday, Holy (or Maundy) Thursday, Good Friday (q.v.), Holy Saturday. Holy Thursday (q.v.), in the Roman Catholic Church, is specially designed as a commemoration of the Last Supper, and of the institution of the Eucharist. Besides these services, there are still others annexed to the day, as the solemn consecration of the oil or chrism (q.v.) used in baptism, confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, the washing of pilgrims’ feet,

and the chanting of the *Tenebrae* (darkness), consisting of the matins and lauds for the following mornings, which it is customary to recite at night. “During the service, a large candlestick, supporting fifteen lights, arranged in the form of a triangle, which denote Christ and the prophets who predicted his coming, stands in the sanctuary; the lights are one by one extinguished until only the upper one remains, which is taken down and placed under the altar until the close of the office, and then brought back; this symbolizes Christ’s burial and resurrection.” On Holy Saturday follow the solemn blessing of fire and the water of the baptismal font; the baptism of catechumens, and the ordination of candidates for the ministry. From the fire solemnly blessed on this day is lighted the Paschal Light, which is regarded as a symbol of Christ risen from the dead. This symbolical light is kept burning during the reading of the gospel at Mass throughout the interval between Easter and Pentecost. Wetzer, Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol. 2, art. Charwoche; Procter, *Cornm. Prayer*, p. 279 sq.; Guericke, *Antiquities*, p. 144 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 394; Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, p. 315; Appleton, *Amer. Cyclop.* 9, 240, 241. **SEE PASSION.**

### Holy Wells

Sacred springs in Popish countries scenes of pilgrimage and expected miracles.

### Holyoke, Edward

A Congregational minister, was born in 1690 at Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1705, was elected tutor in 1712, and on April 25, 1716, was ordained first pastor of the Second Church in Marblehead. In 1737 he was elected president of Harvard College, and remained in that office until his death, June 1, 1769. He published an *Answer to Whitefield* (1744), and a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 293. (G.L.T.)

### Holzhauser, Bartholomaus

Founder of the order of Bartholomites (q.v.) was born at Langnau, Switzerland, in 1613, and was brought up to his father’s trade, shoemaking. By the exertions of some charitable persons he was admitted into an establishment for poor students at Neuburg, and afterwards studied philosophy at Ingolstadt under the Jesuits. Ordained priest in 1639, he conceived the idea of bringing back the priesthood to the common life of the primitive Church. He founded at Tittmoningen an institution intended

to show the working of his system, and in 1640 founded a preparatory seminary at Salzburg in connection with it. He was successively curate of Tittmoningen, Loggenthal, and Bingen, where he died in 1658. His zeal and ascetic practices inclined him to revery and exaltation, so that he claimed to have visions; and it is said that, having been visited by Charles II, then a fugitive, he predicted that a better future awaited him. He wrote, *Constitutiones cum exercitiis clericorum* (Colon. 1662 sq.; approved by the Church of Rome in 1680) — *De humilitate*, together with a treatise *On the Love of God* (Mayence, 1663) — *Opusculum visionum variarum*. A biography of Holzhauser, and a German translation of his works, were published by Clarus (Ratisbon, 1852); a French translation, with a biography, by Gaduel (Paris, 1861). — Ersch und Gruber, *Ally. Encyklopadie*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 14; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 1, 700. (J.N.P.)

## Homage

*SEE ADORATION; SEE DULIA; SEE FIEF; SEE WORSHIP.*

## Homagium

Is a term applied in ecclesiastical language to the adoration (q.v.), which the clergy in the Roman Catholic Church pay to the pope. — Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Relig. und Kirchengesch.* 2, 333.

## Ho'mam

(Heb. *Homan*,  $\mu\text{m}/\text{h}$ , *discomfiture*; Sept.  $\text{A}\dot{\iota}\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , Vulg. *Homan*), the second named of the two sons of Lotan, son of Seir the Horite (<sup><1319></sup>1 Chronicles 1:39). In the parallel passage (<sup><1322></sup>Genesis 36:22) his name is written HEMAMI (Heb. *Heyman*  $\mu\text{my}\text{h}\epsilon$  Sept.  $\text{A}\dot{\iota}\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , Vulg. *Henlan*). B.C. considerably ante 1964. Homam is assumed by Gesenius to be the original form (*Thes.* p. 385 a). By Knobel (*Genesis*, p. 254) the name is compared with that of *el-Homaima*, a town now ruined, though once important, half way between Petra and Ailath, on the ancient road at the back of the mountain, which the Arabic geographers describe as the native place of the Abassides (Robinson, *Res.* 2, 572). (See Laborde, *Journey*, p. 207, *Ameinmz*; also the Arabic authorities mentioned by Knobel.)

## Hombergk zu Vach, Johann Friedrich

A learned jurist, born at Marburg April 15, 1673, was educated at the University of Utrecht. He visited England, remaining for some time in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and formed an intimate acquaintance with Richard Bentley. He died April 20, 1748. In addition to works on professional topics, he published, as the result of his private study of the New Testament, *Parerga Sacra sen interpretatio succincta et nova quorundam textuum Novi Testamenti* (Ultraj. 1708, 8vo), and enlarged and improved under the title *Parerga Sacra seu. observationes quaedam ad Novum Testamentum* (Ultraj. 1712, 4to). The criticisms contained in this work were attacked by Elsner, and defended by the author's son, — Emilius Ludwig, also a jurist — *J. H. Hombergk zu Vach Parerga sacra ab impugnationibus J. Elsneri vindicata* (Marb. 1739, 4to), replied to by a relative of Elsner: *Brevem Hombergianarum vindicarum adv. J. Elsnerum profligationem* (Berlin, 1742, 4to). "Hombergk takes a medium position between the Hebraists and the Purists." — Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 319; Bucher, *Gel. Lex.* 2, 1686.

## Homburg, Ernst Christoph

A German hymnologist, was born at Mühla, near Eisenach, in 1605. His profession was that of lawyer. In his early years he wrote secular verses, but in his riper years he was led to turn his thoughts to sacred themes, and the results are some very beautiful hymns, of which a few are found in the *Liturgy and Hymns* for the use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (1836), and in the *Christian Psalmist* (1832). The "Man of Sorrows" is generally regarded as the best of these. He died June 21, 1681. — Miller (Josiah), *Our hymns, their Authors and Origin* (London 1867, 12mo), p. 32.

## Home, David

A French divine of Scottish birth, who flourished towards the close of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, "was engaged by James I to attempt the impracticable task of uniting all the Protestant divines in Europe in one system of religious belief." The most important of his writings is *Apologia Basilica, seu Machiavelli Ingenium Examinatum*. He is also supposed to be the author of two satires against the Jesuits, entitled *Le Contre Assassin, ou reponse a l'Apologie des Jesuites* (1612, 8vo), and

*L'assassinat du Roi, ou maximes du Viel de la Montagne Vaticane*, etc. (1617, 8vo). — *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* 1, 271; Gorton, *Biogr. Dict.* vol. 2.

## Home Missions

SEE MISSIONS.

## Homer

(**rm**) , *cho'mer*, a *heap*, as in <sup><1884></sup>Exodus 8:14), a Hebrew measure of capacity for things dry, containing. ten baths (<sup><1876></sup>Leviticus 27:16; <sup><1812></sup>Numbers 11:32; <sup><3611></sup>Ezekiel 45:11, 13,14). In later writers it is usually termed a COR. SEE MEASURE.

The *le'thek* (**ĒtJ** , vessel for pouring; Sept. ἡμίκοπος, Vulg. *corus dimidius*, English. Vers. “half a homer”) was a measure for grain of half the capacity of the *homer* or *cor*, as seems probable from the only passage where it is mentioned (<sup><388></sup>Hosea 3:3). See *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, 1, 123.

## Homer, Jonathan, D.D.

A Congregational minister, was born October 1759. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, was ordained pastor of the First Church in Newton Feb. 13, 1782, resigned in April 1839, and died Aug. 11, 1843. Dr. Homer published a *Description and History of Newton* in the *Massachusetts Historical Collection*, vol. 5 (1798), and a few occasional sermons. He also superintended an edition of *Teal's Columbian Bible*. — *Sprague, Annals*, 2, 173.

## Homer, William Bradford

A Congregational minister, was born in Boston Jan. 31, 1817. He was educated at Amherst College, from which he graduated in 1836, and immediately entered on a course of theological study at Andover. While in the middle year of his course he declined the offer of a tutorship in Amherst College. He was ordained pastor of South Berwick, Me., Nov. 11, 1840, where he died, March 22, 1841. The remarkable development of Homer's intellect was a matter of great surprise to all of his instructors. When only eleven years old he was already thoroughly conversant with the Latin, the Modern Greek, and French languages. The last two he is said to have spoken with fluency. At Andover he closed the exercises of his class by an essay so scholarly in its bearings that he was requested to publish it.

An oration of his, delivered on leaving the president's chair of the Porter Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary, was also printed. His "writings" have been published, *with an Introductory Essay and a Memoir*, by Prof. Edward A. Park, of Andover Theological Seminary (2nd ed. Boston, 1849, 8vo). See also the *Christian Review* (May, 1849). — Sprague, *Annals*, 2. 753 sq.

## Homerites

SEE HIMYARITES.

## Homes or Holmes, Nathaniel

A learned English divine, was for a time incumbent of the living of St. Mary Staining, London, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1678. His publications, now become rare, include *The Resurrection Revealed* (London 1654, fol.; 2nd ed. 1833, 8vo) — *The Resurrection Revealed raised above Doubts and Difficulties, in ten Exercitations* (London, 1661, folio) — *A Continuation of the Histories of Foreign Martyrs from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to these Times* (in Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1684, 3:865) — *The New World, or the New Reformed Church discovered out of* <sup>60813</sup>2 Peter 3:13 (London, 1641, 4to). See Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, vol. 1; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 873.

## Homes, William

Was born in Ireland in 1663, and was ordained in that country in 1692. He immigrated to America in 1714, and became minister at Martha's Vineyard, Mass. He died in 1746. Homes published four sermons (1732, 1747, etc.). — Allen's *American Biographical Dictionary*.

## Homicide

SEE MAN-SLAYER.

## Homiletics

is the science of Christian address. The term is derived from **ὁμιλία**, *converse*, which, in early Christian usage, signified a religious address; or, more directly, from the adjective **ὁμιλητικός**, *conversational*, or pertaining to verbal communion. It came into permanent use during the



17th century, at a period when, under the influence of the scholastic method, the principal branches of theology received scientific designations derived from the Greek language: e.g. Apologetics, Dogmatics, Hermeneutics, Polemics. Although promptly naturalized on the continent of Europe, the term Homiletics was not for a long time generally adopted in England. In fact, its present accepted use in the English language is largely due to American authorship. — In Germany some attempts have been made to introduce other terms also derived from the Greek. Stier proposed *Keryktics*, from, κήρυξ *a herald*; and Sickel *Halieutics*, from, ἄλιεύς *a fisherman*; the latter being used tropically in the Gospels in application to the disciples as “fishers of men.” Both of these terms have been regarded as fanciful and undeserving of perpetuation, even though limited to missionary preaching. The term Homiletics is not entirely unexceptionable, but is retained and employed for lack of a better.

**I. History.** — With some authors, especially in Germany, the use of a scientific term to designate the theory of preaching has seemed to extenuate, if not to suggest, some practical errors in its treatment. Setting out with the idea of exhibiting a science in a scientific manner, not a few writers have ignored the proper origin and the religious design of preaching. They have treated it exclusively from the rhetorical and human point of view. They have cumbered it with artificial and arbitrary rules, apparently not having conceived of it as an agency specially and divinely appointed for the moral renovation of the world. But a perverted use of terms was not the origin of mistakes on this subject, nor was error in reference to it first developed in modern times. Indeed, misconceptions of the true design of preaching, as well as of the Christian truth it had been appointed to propagate, became common at a very early period in the history of the Church.

**1.** The true scriptural idea of preaching was corrupted in the ancient Church by (1) ritualistic tendencies; (2) rhetorical ambition. No sooner had the idea that the Christian ministry is a priesthood gained prevalence in the Church than preaching became secondary to sacerdotal rites, and the power of the Gospel waned under an increasing array of forms and ceremonies. Instead of being foremost as the grand agency of Christian propagandism, it became an appendage to public worship. Instead of going forth to find hearers in the marketplaces and by the wayside, preaching began to be regarded as one of the mysteries of the Church from which the heathen, and even catechumens of the first degree, were excluded.

Catechumens of the second degree were called by the Greek Church ἀκροώμενοι, and by the Latin *audientes*, “from their being admitted to hear sermons and the Scriptures read in the church; but they were not allowed to stay during any of the prayers, not even during those that were said over the rest of the catechumens, or energumens, or penitents; but before these began, immediately after the sermon, at ‘the word of command then solemnly used — ’ *Ne quis audientium*; Let none of the hearers be present — they were to depart the church” (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 10, c. 2, § 3).

Preaching, having become a ceremony, was next corrupted by embellishments, and an artificial style adopted from the Greek rhetoricians. Exhortations and sermons of a scriptural character began to be substituted by formal orations, and panegyrics upon martyrs and confessors subsequently worshipped as saints. Nevertheless, homilies, or familiar expositions of Scripture, were maintained by the ablest of the fathers, and were sometimes furnished for the use of clerics incompetent to produce original addresses (see Augustine, *Doctrina Christiana*, lib. 4). The 5th century has been called the oratorical period of the Church, with reference to the distinguished preachers who then flourished, such as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Two books which have come down to us from the last-named fathers are often quoted as containing the best specimens of homiletical literature that appeared both in the Greek and Latin churches during the long period of a thousand years, if indeed they have ever been excelled in those churches; yet neither of these words formally or fully discussed the subject of preaching. Chrysostom’s *περὶ Ἱερωσύνης*, being devoted to the subject of the priesthood, only alluded to preaching incidentally; nevertheless, it embodied some excellent precepts concerning it, such as may be supposed to have governed the studies and the habits of the writer himself, and by means of which he obtained his wonderful success. Yet no estimate of Chrysostom (the *golden-mouthed*) can be accepted as just which does not concede to him extraordinary genius and transcendent abilities as an orator. Augustine, in his *Doctrina Christiana*, treated the subject of preaching more fully, and discussed it more systematically. He divided his treatise into four books. Three of them are entitled *De inveniando*, and treat of invention in a broad sense, including the interpretation of the Scriptures. These books have not in modern times been very highly valued. The fourth relates to expression, *De projerendo*. Although a brief fragment, it has

been pronounced the best homiletical production that appeared between the days of Paul and Luther. It has been translated into various languages, and its most important precepts have often been quoted, and in various forms reproduced. The chief intrinsic interest of this fragment from the pen of Augustine consists in its showing the best views of an eminent Christian bishop of the 4th century, who, after his conversion, made his Roman rhetorical education in a high degree subservient to the promulgation of Christian truth. Well would it have been for the Church of the following centuries had the spirit and power of Augustine's instructions to preachers been held in remembrance and kept in practice. But, unhappily, even this light became obscured. The Scriptures of truth having lapsed out of use, ceremonies became multiplied more and more. The doctrine of Christ's eternal sacrifice for sin having become corrupted by incipient theories of transubstantiation, the pretended sacrifice of the Mass rose to greater prominence, and so far usurped the time of public worship that sermons and homilies gave place to a diminutive form of public religious address called *postils*. Even the function of postillating was chiefly confined to bishops, the common clergy not attempting or being allowed to preach. As if such a degradation of one of the highest offices ever committed to men was not sufficient, preaching sank still lower by being employed for the promotion of error under the guise of truth. Medieval preaching was largely occupied in eulogizing the Virgin Mary, and in exciting reverence for the pictures and images of saints. Thus preaching was made to corrupt the very religion it was designed to promote. Beyond this, it even became the agency of exciting millions of men to war and bloodshed. Successive crusades were preached by popes and friars, and even the cruel persecutions of the Albigenses were stimulated by the preaching of vengeance against innocent men, who sought to follow Christ in sincerity. For such ends, more than for the promulgation of truth, were several orders of preaching and mendicant monks established in the 13th century. Among these, the Dominicans were the founders and principal abettors of the Inquisition, while others, of less cruel temper, went about to harangue the masses in the interests of papal supremacy, and to promote the sale of indulgences.

**2.** It was not till medieval superstition had culminated in the grossest abuses, and the Reformation had begun to exert a counter influence, that the Scriptures began to be restored to their proper supremacy. From that period the original design and true character of preaching came to be better

comprehended. Much of the preaching of the Reformation was indeed controversial, but so far as it was founded on the Word of God it tended to revive scriptural conceptions of the preaching office. The diligence of the Protestant reformers in promulgating their views made preaching also necessary to Roman Catholics, among whom, from that time, it became more common, and, especially in Protestant countries, it was no longer confined to bishops, but enjoined upon the clergy of all grades.

**II. Literature.** — *The inspired Scriptures, especially those of the New Testament, must ever be considered the primary and most valuable source of homiletical instruction. Patristic literature on this subject, as already shown, is meager and fragmentary. Homiletical literature, in following ages, may be classified in four principal departments:*

1. Treatises on preaching;
2. Aids to preaching, so called;
3. Sermons, or the products of preaching;
4. Biographies of preachers and miscellaneous articles relating to the objects and manner of preaching.

The first only of these departments will be particularly considered in this article. Immediately consequent upon the revival of preaching in the 16th century, there also occurred a renaissance of homiletical productions, which have continued to multiply ever since. Prior to the middle of the 17th century there were extant some seventy different treatises, "writ particularly upon this subject," chiefly in the Latin language. These books were classified by Draudius in his *Bibliotheca Classica*, under the head of "*Concionatorum instructio*," and by Molanus, in his *Bibliotheca Materialium*, under the head of "*Concionandi munus*." To these, bishop Wilkins remarks, "may be added those many other discourses wherein these things have been largely handled by the by, though not chiefly intended, in all which many learned men have laid down such rules as, according to their several geniuses and observations, seemed most useful." In the enumeration of works referred to, no proper distinction was made between the office of preacher and pastor. Hence we find enumerated in the list the works of Bowls and Hemingius, both entitled *De Pastore*; also that of Hen. Diest, styled *De ratione studii Theologici*. Some of the earlier books on the subject of preaching by English authors were written in Latin, e.g. that of William Perkins, entitled "*Arte of Prophecyng, or a treatise concerning the sacred and only true manner & method of preaching*. First

written in Latin by Mr. William Perkins, and now faithfully translated into English (for that it containeth many worthy things fit for the knowledge of men of all degrees) by Thomas Tuke. Motto, ~~1688~~ Nehemiah 8:4, 5, 6 (Cambridge, 1, 613).” Cotton Mather’s *Malinductio ad Ministerinum*, written about 1710, in addition to a Latin title, had a very formal and sonorous Latin preface. In the text of his treatise the learned author makes this remark concerning homiletical literature prior to the period in which he wrote: “There is a troop of authors, and even an host of God, who have written on the Pastoral care from the days of Gregory down to the days of Gilbert; yea, and since these, every year some to this very day. I cannot set you so tedious a task as to read a tenth part of what has been offered on the art, and the gift, and the method of preaching.”

In modern times, several different epochs of homiletical literature may be recognized corresponding to the character of preaching at different periods and in different countries. In Germany, the Lutheran reformation was characterized by great earnestness and even bluntness in the mode of preaching, not only in controversial discourses, but even in the proclamation and enforcement of evangelical truth. Luther wrote no work on preaching, but by his example and occasional precepts, some of which are recorded in his *Table Talk*, he greatly influenced his coadjutors and followers as to their theory and practice as preachers. The following are some of Luther’s characteristic sayings. *Portrait of a good preacher*: “A good preacher should have these virtues and qualities:

1. He should be able to teach plainly and in order;
2. He should have a good head;
3. A good voice;
4. A good memory;
5. He should know when to stop;
6. He should study diligently, and be sure of what he means to say;
7. He should be ready to stake body and life, goods and glory, on its truth;
8. He should be willing to be vexed and criticized by everybody.”

*Advices to young preachers*: “*Tritt ferisch auf, this maul auf, hor bald auf;*” i.e. Stand up cheerily, speak up manfully, leave off speedily. “When you are about to preach, speak to God and say, ‘My Lord God, I wish to preach to thine honor, to speak of thee, to praise thee, and to glorify thy name.’” “Let all your sermons be of the simplest. Look not to the princes,

but to the simple and unlearned people. We should preach to the little children, for the sake of such as these the office of preaching is instituted. Ah! what pains our Lord Christ took to teach simply. From vineyards, sheep, and trees he drew his similes; anything in order that the multitudes might understand, embrace, and retain the truth.” “If we are found true to our calling we shall receive honor enough, not, however, in this life, but in the life to come.”

After Luther’s death a reaction occurred, in which there was a return to scholastic formulas and other objectionable features of the mediaeval homilies and postils. This second period has sometimes been called that of the postilists, in allusion as well to Protestants as Catholics. In the following period the pietism of Spener and Francke promoted a healthful reform in the Protestant pulpit of Germany, although the reform was to some extent neutralized by the nearly simultaneous development of the Wolfian philosophy, which gloried more in logical forms than in the power of the cross. This philosophy was fascinating to students, and, having gained an ascendancy in the universities, it antagonized the plainer and more evangelical mode of preaching commended by Luther and Francke.

Mosheim, the Church historian of the middle of the 18th century, was also a celebrated preacher, and is regarded as having introduced another homiletical epoch in Germany. His style was majestic and oratorical, similar to that of Tillotson in England, and Bourdaloue in France. By him it was well applied to religious instruction, but after him it greatly degenerated — many of his imitators being more noted for the form of sound words than for the spirit of vital piety. By degrees, preaching declined in its religious power, until sermons scarcely aimed at being more than didactic or rhetorical entertainments.

Reinhard, court preacher in Dresden about 1800, not only inaugurated a better style of preaching, but illustrated his theory in numerous published sermons (a collection of his sermons was published at Sulzb. 1831-7, in 39 vols. 8vo), and also in a series of letters entitled his “Confessions.” His style was characterized by richness of thought, clearness, definiteness, force, and dignity of expression. It prevailed both among the rationalists and the orthodox to the time of Schleiermacher. The power of Schleiermacher as a preacher corresponded to his great influence as a theologian, and his example is regarded as having introduced another period in German homiletics, although he did not write specially on that

topic. In the course of his life his own style of preaching improved, rising from the moralisms with which he commenced to a more evangelical tone in subsequent years.

Apart from those who have treated of preaching as a branch of practical theology, the more prominent German authors on homiletics during the current century have been Schott, Reinhard, Marheinecke, Theremin, Stier, Lentz, Paniel, Palmer, Ficker, and Schweitzer.

In France the golden age of pulpit oratory occurred about the close of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century. It was the age of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and Fenelon, among the Roman Catholics, and of Claude, Superville, and Saurin, among the Protestants. Fénelon and Claude became representative authors of the two churches: the former by his *Dialogues on Eloquence, particularly that of the Pulpit*; the latter by his *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon*. These valuable contributions to homiletical literature are still read with interest, not only in the French, but also in the English language. Even the former has been more appreciated and oftener reprinted by Protestants than by Romanists. France, in the 19th century, has also produced many examples of great preachers and good writers on homiletics. Without attempting to enumerate the former, the principal authors are Vetu, Martin, Bautain, and Mullois, of the Catholics, and Vinet, Vincent, and Coquerel, of the Protestants.

In Great Britain, the principal homiletical writers of the 18th century were John Edwards, 1705; Dr. Doddridge, 1751; Fordyce, 1754; and George Campbell, 1775.

Apart, however, from the influence of any of these writers, there arose during that century a style of Christian address destined to have a great influence upon the subsequent preaching of English-speaking countries. Allusion is made to the reformation that commenced in connection with the labors of Wesley, Whitefield, and others about 1740. The preaching of these men was characterized by a return to scriptural simplicity and fervor, and was followed by extensive religious awakenings, which in due time extended a quickening influence to ministers of all the churches. The Wesleyan reformation was further characterized by field-preaching, and by the employment of unordained men as lay preachers, who gave evidence of a divine impulse to call sinners to repentance. John Wesley, like Luther, though he wrote no treatise on preaching, gave numerous advices and some rules to preachers, which largely influenced the practice of those who

became associated with him, and which did not, as in the case of Luther, soon after become obsolete under the influence of formalistic reaction. In the minutes of one of his early conferences, Wesley gave rules for his preachers which have been officially perpetuated in Methodist societies and churches ever since. These rules pointed out in the briefest words the grand objects and essentials of preaching, regarding all rhetorical precepts and “smaller advices” as merely auxiliary. “Quest. What is the best general method of preaching? *Ans.* 1. To invite. 2. To convince. 3. To offer Christ. 4. To build up.” Here was the essence of the evangelical idea of preaching, and its fruits followed. Fletcher’s portrait of St. Paul expanded and illustrated the same idea; but no extended work on preaching was produced by any Methodist of that period.

The early part of the 19th century witnessed the publication in England of but few, if any, homiletical works of permanent value. Between 1808 and 1819 the Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, laboriously developed the system of Claude on the composition of a sermon in a series of plans of sermons on the principal texts of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. This work, which attained the magnitude of twenty-one octavo volumes, was designed to be a thesaurus of help and guidance in sermonizing. It contained no less than 2536 “skeletons,” enough to supply two sermons each Sabbath for nearly a quarter of a century. What more could a minister want? Such a wealth of supply would not have been provided had there not been a demand. The demand may have been healthy as far as it indicated a disposition on the part of the English clergy to escape from the still more indolent practice, not yet entirely extinct, of copying sermons in full, and reading manuscripts prepared for market, and sold in the shambles. Nevertheless, the idea that sermon plans for use, any more than sermons for delivery, could be an article of merchandise, was inherently wrong, and, as far as adopted, could only tend to mental torpor, and a servile dependence on the brain-work of others. Yet pulpit assistants, pulpit cyclopedias, books of sketches, and other devices for “preaching made easy,” have had their day in England, as well as in Germany and France. Simeon’s *Horae Homileticae*, notwithstanding inherent faults, was by far the noblest of its class. It may now be pronounced obsolete in reference to its primary design, yet one of its features is imitated in some of the best commentaries of the present day, by the insertion in a less formal manner of homiletical notes on important texts and passages.



Several valuable works on preaching have been published in England during the last thirty-five years. The following deserve mention: *The Ministerial Character of Christ practically considered* by Charles R. Sumner, bishop of Winchester (London, 1824, 8vo); *Apostolical Preaching considered*, by John Bird Sumner, lord bishop of Chester (1839; 9th ed. 1850); *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus*, a treatise on preaching as adapted to a Church-of England congregation, by W. Gresley (London 3rd edition 1844, 12mo); *Preaching, its Warrant, Subject, and Effects*, by W. S. Bricknell (London, 1845); *The Modern Pulpit, viewed in Relation to the State of Society*, by Robert Vaughan (London 1842, post 8vo); *Paul the Preacher*, by John Eadie, D.D. (London 1859, post 8vo; reprinted, N. Y. 12mo); *Thoughts on Preaching, specially in Relation to the Requirements of the Age*, by Daniel Moore (London 1861, cr. 8vo); *The Duty and Discipline of Extemporaneous Preaching*, by F. Barham Zincke (reprint, N.Y. 1867, 12mo); *Sacred Eloquence, or the Theory and Practice of Preaching*, by Thomas J. Potter (Roman Catholic) (Dublin, 1868).

As to homiletical authorship in America, Cotton Mather's *Manductio ad Ministerium, or Angels preparing to sound the Trumpets*, although rare and little known, had the pre-eminence of being the first and only work of its class up to 1824. At that date Henry Ware, Jun., of Cambridge, Mass., published his *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching*, a truly valuable work. In 1819 Ebenezer Porter, of Andover, republished Fénelon's *Dialogues*, Claude's *Essay*, and several minor works, under the title *The Young Preacher's Annual* (Boston, 1839, 8o). Subsequently the following principal works have appeared: *Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching*, by Ebenezer Porter, D.D. (And. and N. Y. 1834, 8vo); — *Sacred Rhetoric, or Composition and Delivery of Sermons*, by Henry J. Ripley (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); *The Power of the Pulpit, Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers*, by Gardiner Spring, D.D. (1854); *Preaching required by the Times*, by Abel Stevens, LL.D. (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); *The Model Preacher, a Series of Letters on the best Mode of Preaching the Gospel*, by William Taylor, of California (Cincinnati, 1859, 12mo); *Preachers and Preaching*, by Nicholas Murray, D.D. (1860); *Thoughts on Preaching*, by James W. Alexander, D.D. (1861, 12mo); *A Treatise on Homiletics*, by Daniel P. Kidder, D.D. (1864, 12mo); *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology*, by W. G. T. Shedd, D.D. (1867, 8vo); *Office and Work of the Christian Ministry*, by James M. Hoppin (1869, 12mo). The larger part of the last-named work is devoted to the subject of homiletics, although not so indicated in the title.

From the foregoing lists it may be seen that recently American authorship on this subject is somewhat in excess of English. Several of the last-named books have been written by teachers of practical theology representing different churches, and have the merit of discussing the subject not only from an evangelical point of view, but in the light of the most modern developments and applications of Christianity. The state of society in the United States of America is favorable to the illustration of the true theory of preaching, as well as to its most efficient practice. All the churches, as were those of primitive times, are dependent on voluntary support. Neither their congregations nor their success can be maintained without attractive, and, in some degree, effective preaching. Even the Roman Catholic Church has adopted regular Sunday sermons and weekday missions, a species of revival efforts. Contrary to its universal custom where maintained as a religion of the state, it here builds its churches and cathedrals with pews or sittings for audiences instead of open naves for processions and moving crowds. The people of America, of whatever class, are free to hear whom they choose, or not to hear at all, unless addressed in a manner adapted to please or profit them. Corresponding to this state of things, the preachers of all churches, together with errorists of every description, are in active competition for the ears and hearts of the masses. The people, too, having great advantages for education, and no reverence for prescriptive authority, demand the best forms of Christian address, and such appeals to their reason and their emotions as challenge their respect. To none of these conditions does a true Christianity object since it relies for its propagation upon truth and legitimate persuasion. Nevertheless, these circumstances make it obligatory on preachers of the Gospel to comprehend well their vocation, and the manner of "rightly dividing the truth." That this necessity is more and more recognized is an omen of promise to the Church of the future, especially as facilities for the easier and better comprehension of this branch of the minister's work increase.

**III. Principles.** — Homiletics, in a human point of view, may thus be considered a progressive science. It grows with the growing experience of the Church, and becomes enriched with the ever-accumulating examples of good and great preachers. It avails itself of the agency of the press to perpetuate specimens of the ever-multiplying homiletical productions of successive generations, and also to discuss the great problems of human destiny and influence. Thus the modern study and discussions of homiletics have had a tendency to place the subject in a clearer light, and to make it

more justly comprehensible than it has been at any former period since the days of the apostles. This result has not been attained by means of modern inventions, but rather by a return to the original idea of preaching, as indicated and illustrated by the author and finisher of the Christian faith; at the same time, all science is made auxiliary to the Savior's grand design in the appointment of preaching as an instrumentality for the diffusion of truth and the salvation of men. Space only remains for a brief summary of demonstrated and now generally accepted homiletical principles.

**1. *The true Idea of Preaching.*** — Preaching is an original and peculiar institution of Christianity. It was not derived from any pre-existing system. It had no proper counterpart even in Judaism, although a limited teaching office was committed to both the priests and prophets of the Jewish dispensation. *SEE PROPHET.* Old Testament examples of persons called preachers, like Noah, Solomon, and Ezra, fall far below the idea of preaching as appointed by Christ. *SEE APOSTLE.* Only in the Messianic prophecies was the office of Christian evangelism clearly foreshadowed (see <sup>2300</sup>Isaiah 61:1, 2). *SEE GOSPEL.* In the fullness of time, the Lord Jesus Christ, recognizing his predicted mission, authoritatively established and appointed the office and work of preaching as a principal means of evangelizing the world. *SEE PREACHING.* In preparation for this office he instructed his disciples both by precept and example, giving them before his ascension a worldwide commission to “go and teach all nations,” and “preach the Gospel to every creature.” In this appointment the Savior availed himself of no pre-existing rhetorical system, but rather a universal capacity of the human race now for the first time specially devoted to the divine use, and consecrated to the propagandism of revealed truth. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.* Yet he left his followers free to adopt, as auxiliary to their great work, whatever good thing might be derived from human study, whether of logic, rhetoric, or any other science. Thus, as Christianity multiplied its achievements and extended its influence along the ages, facilities for comprehending the philosophy and the art of preaching would of necessity increase.

The peculiarity of the preaching office is seen in the speciality of its address for moral ends, not merely to the judgment, but to the consciences of men; also in the grandeur of its aims, which are nothing less than the salvation of the human soul from sin in the present life, and its complete preparation for the life everlasting. As the objects of preaching are peculiar, so are the necessary prerequisites. Of these a true Christian experience and a special

divine call may be affirmed to be essential. The mere form or ceremony of preaching may be taken up and laid aside as easily as other forms, but true preaching, the preaching that Christ instituted and designed to be maintained in the Church, demands the constant power of an active faith, a holy sympathy, and a conscious mission from God.

**2. *The Subject Matter of Preaching.*** — In secular oratory, themes are perpetually changing with circumstances. In preaching, the theme is one. Nevertheless, the one theme prescribed to the preacher is adapted to all circumstances and all times. It may be summarily stated to be God manifested in Christ Jesus for the redemption of men. This central truth, which is the special burden of revelation, embraces in its correlations all other truths, natural as well as revealed. The word of God should be considered not only the textbook, but the grand treasury of truth for the preacher. In it he is furnished with history, poetry, experience, and philosophy, as well as perceptive instruction and full statements of the Gospel scheme; nevertheless, he may bring to its illustration whatever truth will aid in its corroboration and comprehension. Still, the preacher's great work must be to publish the doctrine of the cross, "the truth as it is in Jesus." To do this effectually, he not only needs an intellectual perception of its excellence, but the consciousness of its power as bestowed by the baptism "of the Holy Ghost and of fire." Thus the persecuted disciples "went everywhere preaching the word" (<sup><40R></sup>Acts 8:4), and Paul, as a representative apostle, emphatically declared, "We preach Christ crucified;" "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord;" "Christ in you the hope of glory whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (<sup><502></sup>Colossians 1:28).

**3. *Agencies of Homiletical Preparation.*** — In addition to the essential preliminaries of character and experience heretofore alluded to, the preacher must bring to bear on his theme such mental exercises as will enable him to elaborate it appropriately and to the best effect. The following are indispensable

(1.) *Interpretation*, by which the true meaning of God's word is elicited.

(2.) *Invention*, by which suitable materials, both of fact and of thought, are gathered from the universe of matter and of mind. Invention is

aided by generalization, analysis, hypothesis, comparison, and diligent exercise.

(3.) *Disposition*, by which all material employed is arranged in the most appropriate and effective order, whether in the introduction, argument, or conclusion of the discourse.

4. *Different Forms of Homiletical Production.* — The proclamation of Christian truth is not confined to any one form of address. Our Lord opened his public mission by a sermon—the Sermon on the Mount. Most of his other discourses were brief and informal, and many of his most important utterances fell from his lips in parables and conversations. The reported addresses of the apostles were exhortations rather than sermons according to the modern idea. In the early patristic age explanatory and hortatory addresses prevailed, resulting in the homily as the leading product of that period. As preaching declined in mediaeval times, the homily dwindled into the postil. The Reformation brought the sermon again into use, and secured for it the prominence, which it still maintains. In addition to re-establishing the sermon in its original prominence, modern Christianity has developed the platform address, in which a semi secular style of oratory is made auxiliary to various phases of Christian benevolence. At the present time, it is essential to both ministers and laymen, who would participate in the most prominent activities of the Church, such as Sunday-schools and missionary efforts, that they should cultivate the talent of effective platform speaking. Nevertheless, the sermon is likely to remain as it was in the beginning, the first and most important of homiletical productions. ‘Hence it should be specially studied, and thoroughly comprehended in all its capacities and bearings, as the standard form of clerical Christian address. *SEE SERMON.*

5. *Style and Qualities of Sermons.* — It is due to the dignity of Christian truth that the words in which it is uttered should be well chosen and fitly arranged. Hence the general qualities of a good style, such as purity, precision, perspicuity, unity, and strength, should be regarded as of primary and absolute necessity in pulpit style. At the same time, Christian discourse sternly rejects all the faults of style, which rhetorical laws condemn, such as dryness, tautology, floridity, and bombast. Preaching also requires more than mere rhetoric. In order to its higher objects, it demands certain peculiar combinations, such as a blending of dignity with simplicity, of agreeableness with pointedness, and of energy with love. The style of the

sermon should at once be fully within the comprehension of its hearers, and yet elevated by a certain scriptural congruity, which shows that it emanated from communion with God, and a familiarity with his inspired word.

Beyond mere verbal expression, sermons should possess several important qualities.

(1.) They should be *evangelical*, setting forth the unadulterated truth of the Gospel in its just proportions, and in an evangelical spirit.

(2.) Sermons should be *interesting*. To this end, the preacher must be deeply interested himself. He must utter his thoughts with clearness and vividness. He must use frequent illustrations. He must group things new and old in just and graphic combinations.

(3.) Sermons should be *instructive*. The minister of the Gospel must never forget the Savior's command to TEACH. Hence every sermon should be tributary to the diffusion of knowledge as well as holiness.

(4.) Sermons should be *efficient*. Failing to accomplish some of the special objects of preaching, they are failures themselves. Hence their great essentiality must be considered an adaptation to high and true religious results. If possible, all these qualities should be combined in every sermon, though in proportions to suit occasions.

6. *Delivery*. — Four different modes of delivery are recognized in Christian oratory:

(1.) the *extemporaneous*;

(2.) the *recitative*;

(3.) that of *reading*;

(4.) the *composite*, in which two or all of the foregoing are blended.

The last finds little favor among theorists, and is rarely practiced with any high degree of success.

The first is the normal mode of human speech. No other was practiced by the Great Preacher, the apostles, or the early fathers. Recitative came into the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, and reading in the 16th. Few questions pertaining to Homiletics have during the last 300 years been more zealously discussed than the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different modes of pulpit delivery. While it may justly be conceded that each mode has both advantages and disadvantages, especially when

considered in reference to the peculiar capacity of individuals, yet it may be affirmed as the result of all discussion and experience that the primitive mode of extemporaneous address is commended by the best modern opinion as a gift to be earnestly coveted by every minister of the Gospel, and as a result of proper effort within the reach of most, if not all earnest preachers.

**7. *Conditions and Elements of Success in Preaching.*** Mere eloquence, although a great auxiliary, is not of itself a guaranty of success in the proclamation of God's word. There is an infinite difference between the form and the power of preaching. The form is easy; the power is the gift of God crowning the highest human effort. To attain this great gift various conditions are prerequisite. A preacher must have clear and abiding conceptions of the dignity and overwhelming importance of his sacred vocation. With these must be associated a consuming love for his work, evidenced by tireless diligence and unslumbering faithfulness in its discharge. He must make preaching his great business, his absorbing employment. He must have discretion in the adaptation of his subjects, and style of address both to his hearers and to occasions. He must cultivate the habit of making all his observations, reading, and experience subservient to his capacity of instruction and religious impression. Above all, he must aim at the supreme glory of God, and at the end of his most earnest efforts depend with trustful confidence upon the divine blessing to give efficiency to his labors, and crown them with success. *SEE PASTORAL CARE.* (D.P.K.)

#### **IV. *Additional Treatises.*** —

**1,** Foreign (Latin, French, and German): Lange (Joannes), *Oratoria sacra* (Frankf. and Lpz. 1707, 8vo; Halle, 1713, 8vo); Vitringa (Camp.), *Animadversiones ad Method. homiliar. ecclesiasticar. rite instituendar.* (Jena, 1722, 8vo); Maitre (J. H. Le), *Rèflexions sur la manière de prêcher* (Halle, 1745, 8vo); Hollebeck (*Eberhard*) *De Opft. Concionum genere* (Leycd 1768, 8vo); Ammon (C. F.), *Handbuch d. Anleit. z. Kanzelberedsamkeit* (Gött. 1799; 3rd edit. Nürnberg. 1858, 8vo); *Gesch. d. Homiletik 5. Huss b. Luther* (Gött. 1804, 8vo); Tittmann (J. A. H.), *Lehrb. d. Homiletik* (Breslau, 1804; 2nd ed. Lpz. 1824, 8vo); Schott (A. H.), *Entw. einer Theorie d. Beredsamkeit, imit besonderer Anwenmd. a. d. Kanzelberedsamkeit* (Lpz. 1807, 1815, 8vo); *Theorie d. Beredsamkeit* (Lpz. 1815-28; 2nd edit. 1828-47, 3 vols. in 4 pts. 8vo); Fénelon (Fr.

Salignac de la Motte), *Dialogues sur l'éloquence de la chaire* (Paris, 1714, 8vo; translated by Stevens, London 1808; Bost. 1832, 12mo); Dahl (J. Ch. W.), *Lehrbuch d. Homiletik* (Lpz. and Rost. 1811, 8vo); Marheinecke (Ph.), *Grundleg. d. Homiletik* (Hamburg, 1811, 8vo); Theremin (F.), *Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend; oder. Grundlinien e. systemat. Rhetorik* (Berl. 1814; 2nd ed. 1837, 8vo), Kaiser (G. Ph. Ch.), *Entwurf e. Systems d. geistlichen Rhetorik* (Erlangen, 1816, 8vo); Grotefend (J. G.), *Ansicht. Gedank. Eu Erfahrungen ii. d. geistl. Beredsamkeit* (Hannov. 1822); Ziehnert (J. G.), *Casual-Homilet. und Liturg.* (Meissen, 1825); Schmidt (A. G.), *Die Homilie* (Halle, 1827); Van Hengel (W. A.), *Institutio oratoris sacri* (Lugd. 1829); Sickel (G. A. F.), *Grundr. d. christlichen Halieutik* (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Stier (Rudolf), *Kurz. Grundriss e. bibl. Keyltik* (Halle, 1830); Cheneviere (J. J.), *Observations sur l'éloquence* (Gen. 1834); Brand (J.), *Handb. d. geistl. Beredsamk.* (edit. by Hahn, Frankf. 1836, 1839; new ed. Const. 1850, 2 vols.); Zarbl (J. B.), *Handb. d. Kathol. Homiletik* (Landsh. 1838); Alt (J. K. W.), *Kurze Anleitung z. Kirchl. Beredsamk.* (Lpz. 1840); Palmer (Ch.), *Evangel. Homiletik* (Stuttgard, 1842; 4th edition, 1857, 8vo); Ficker (Ch. G.), *Grundlinien d. evang. Fomilet.* (Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Schweizer (A.), *Homilet. d. evang. prot. Kirche* (Lpz. 1848, 8vo); Baur (Gustav.) *Grundzüge d. Homilet.* (Giessen, 1848, 8vo); Gaupp (K. F.), *Pract. Theol.* (Berl. 1848, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. 2:pt. 1, Homiletics); Lutz (J.), *Handbuch d. Kathol. Kanz Beredsamk.* (Tübing. 1851); Vinet (A.), *Homiletique on theorie de la predication* (Paris, 1853); Beyer (J. H. F.), *Das Wesen d. christl. Predigt. n. Norm u. Urbild d. apostol. Predigt* (Göttingen, 1861, 8vo); Hagenbach (K. R.), *Grundlin. d. Lit. u. Homiletik* (Leipzig, 1863, 8vo); Lang (Gust.), *Handb. z. homilet. Behandl. d. Evangelien und der Episteln* (Bresl. 1865. 1869, 8vo); Wapler, *Disposit. ii. d. evangel. Perikopen* (Stendal, 1865, 8vo); Pröhle, *Predigt Entwürfe* (2nd ed. Nordhausen, 1865, 8vo); Roder (Max), *Homilet. Handbuch z. Gebr. b. Predigten* (a very superior work, to be in 5 volumes when completed, Nürnberg, 1863 sq. 8vo); Thym, *Homilet. Handb.* (1st part, Gratz, 1866, 8vo; 2nd part, 1868, 8vo); Zimmermann (Karl), *Beitr. z. vergleichenden Homilet.* (Darmst. and Lpz. 1866, 8vo); Palmer (Chr.), *Evangel. Homilet.* (5th ed. Stuttg. 1867, 8vo); Geissler (M.), *Pred. — Entwürfe mit Anleit. z. Predigt-Ausarbeiten* (Hamb. 1867, 8vo); Meineke (J. H. F.), *Tägl. Handb. Für Prediger*, edited by Dr., Wohlfarth (Quedlinburg and Lpz. 1867, 8vo); Stock (Prof. Chr.), *Homilet. Real-Lexikon* (new edit. St. Louis, Mo., and Lpz. 1867, 4to); Wallroth, *Ged.*



und Anl. z. Predigten (Oldenb. 1868, 8vo); Sommer (J. L.), *Predigtstudien* (Erlangen, 1868, 8vo).

**2.** In English: Barecroft (J.), *Ars Concionandi, or, Preaching*, etc. (London 1715; 4th ed. 1751); D'Oyley (Samuel), *Christ. Eloquence in Theory and Pract.* (London 1718, 1 2mo); Henley (John), *On Action in Preaching* (London 1730); Blackwell (S.), *Method of Preaching* (London, 1736, 24mo); Jennings (John), *Discourses* (London 1754, 12mo); Fordyce (David), *Theodorus; Dialogue on the Art of Preaching* (London 1755, 12mo); Glanville, *Essay concerning Preaching* (London, 1768, 12mo); Franke, *The most useful Way of Preaching* (London 1790, 8vo); Claude (John), *On the Composition of A Sermon* (5th ed. Cambr. 1827, 8vo; edited by the Rev. Chas. Simeon, N. Y. 1849, 18mo); Bickersteth (Edward), *On Preaching and Hearing* (4th ed. London, 1829, 12mo); Close (Francis), *Sermons on the Liturgy* (London, 1835, 12mo); Williams, *Christian Preacher* (collection of treatises by Wilkins, Jennings, Franck, Claude, etc., London 1843, 12mo); Beveridge (Bp. William), *Sermons* (vol 1-4 of his *Works*, Oxford, 1844-45, 8vo); *Thesaurus Theologicus* (vol. 9 and 10 of his *Works*, Oxford, 1847, 8vo); Ryland, *Pulpit and People* (1847, 8vo); Gouldburn (Edward M.), *Sermons* (London 1849, 8vo); Russell (W.), *Pulpit Eloquence* (2nd ed. Andover, 1853); *Short Sermons* (London, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Styles, *Nature and effect of Evangelical Preaching* (London 1856, 2 vols. 12mo); Moore, *Thoughts on Preaching* (London 1861, cr. 8vo).

## Homiliare

or Homiliarius is a term applied to a collection containing such homilies of the early fathers of the Church as were read on Sunday, on the festal days of the saints, on Easter, and Pentecost. See Durandi, *Rationale*, bk. 6:ch. 1; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 2, 337.

## Homiliarium

The name given to collections of sermons for the ecclesiastical year, to be read in case of incapacity preventing the preacher from delivering a sermon of his own. The idea of such a collection arose in the early part of the Middle Ages. The most celebrated work of the kind, which took the place of all preceding ones, is that known as Charlemagne's *Homiliarium* (see Neander, *Church Hist.* 3, 174). The title of the Cologne edition, 1530, sets forth Alcuin as its author (*Homilie seu mavis sermones sive conciones ad*

*populum, praestantissimorum ecclesiae doctorum, Hieronimi, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Origenis, Chrysostomi, Bedae, etc., in hunc ordinem digeste per Alcuinum Levitam, idque injungente ei Carolo M. Romano Imp. cui Asecretis fuit*). According to other accounts, however and even to the instruction by Charlemagne himself which accompanies the work — Charlemagne had caused this work to be done by Paulus Diaconus because (see Ranke in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, 2:387 sq.) “the Hours contained a number of fragments from the fathers used for reading which were full of faults and badly selected.” But it is possible that both had a part in it, Alcuin forming the plan and Paulus Diaconus executing it. The work acquired great importance from the fact that it established more firmly the system of Church lessons introduced by Jerome, which had heretofore been subject to various alterations. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 6, 249 sq.; Rheinwald, *Kirchl. Archäol.* p. 276; Siegel, *Handb. d. christl. — kirchl. Alterth.* 2, 331; Neander, *Ch. History*, 3, 126; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 35; and the art. *SEE HOMILY*.

## Homilies

*SEE HOMILY.*

## Homilists

Among the homilists who have distinguished themselves in the primitive Church, Origen (3rd century) ranks first. The schools of Alexandria and Antioch appear to have been the great centers of this class of sacred literature and in the early centuries we find the names of Hippolytus, Metrodorus, Clement of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus principally distinguished. But it was in the following centuries that the homily received its full development in the hands of the early Greek fathers Ephraim the Syrian, Athanasius, the two Gregories of Nazianzum and of Nyssa, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils of Alexandria and of Jerusalem, and Theodoret; in the Latin Church, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Peter Chrysologus, Fulgentius and Caesar of Aries. In later centuries, Venerable Bede, the popes Saobinian, Leo II and III, Adrian I, and the Spanish bishops Isidore of Seville and Ildefonsus, continued to use the homiletic form. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 399. *SEE CATECHETICS; SEE CATECHISTS; SEE HOMILETICS; SEE HOMILIARIUM; SEE HOMILY.*

## Homilius, Gottfried, August

One of the most celebrated German organists and Church composers of the 18th century was born at Rosenthal Feb. 2, 1714. In 1742 he became organist at the “Frauenkirche” at Dresden, and in 1755 was promoted musical director. He died June 1, 1785. Among his published musical works those considered best are, *Passionscantate* (1755), and *Weihnachtsantate* (1777). — Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* 8, 76.

## Homily

(Gr. **ὁμιλία**, *communion, a meeting*; hence *A discourse adapted to the people*), the name of a certain class of sermons. It is now applied to a simple exposition of a text, in contradistinction from the discussion of a topic. In the early Church the term **λόγος**, *oration*, was applied to less familiar discourses; **ὁμιλία** to the plainer, much as the term *lecture* is now used.

**1.** The distinction between the homily and the sermon is thus set forth by Vinet. “The special character of the homily is, not that it has to do most frequently with recitals, or that it is more familiar than other discourses, but that its chief business is to set in relief the successive parts of an extended text, subordinating them to its contour, its accidents, its chances, if we may so speak, more than can be done in the sermon, properly so called. Nothing distinguishes, essentially, the homily from the sermon except the comparative predominance of analysis; in other terms, the prevalence of *explanation* over *system*. The difficulty as to unity presented by this kind of discourse never amounts to impossibility. We do not at random cut from the general text of the sacred book the particular text of a homily. The selection is not arbitrary. The limit of the text is predetermined by reference to unity, which, therefore, we shall be at no loss to discover in it. The only danger is that unity of subject will be relinquished, as the thread of a path may be buried and lost beneath an intertwined and tufted vegetation. As the preacher appears to be more sustained by his text in the homily than in the synthetic sermon, the former is thought to be easier of execution. It certainly is easier to make a homily than a sermon, but a good sermon is made with more facility than a good homily. The great masters in the art of preaching — Bourdaloue, for example — have not succeeded in homily. The most excellent judges in the matter of preaching have recommended the homily” (*Homiletics*, p. 148 sq.).

**2.** In the primitive Church we find the style of the homily already in the discourses of Christ and his apostles. They frequented the synagogues of the Jews wherever they went, and in these it was customary, after the reading of the Scriptures, to give an invitation to any one to comment upon what had been read. In this way the disciples frequently took occasion to speak of Christ and his doctrines. Thus we find in the Acts (<sup><4015></sup>Acts 1:15; 2:14; 4:7; 5:29; 6:34; 13:40,41; 17:22; 20:18; 22, 23, 24) brief notices of several addresses made by Peter and Paul, and one by Stephen, which give us quite a distinct impression of their style of address. Tertullian and Justin Martyr inform us that a like practice was common in the churches of Africa and Asia. “We meet together to read the Holy Scriptures, and, when circumstances permit, to admonish one another. In such sacred discourse we establish our faith, we encourage our hope, we confirm our trust, and quicken our obedience to the word by a renewed application of its truths” (Tertullian, *Apol.* p. 39).

**(a)** A similar mode of discourse we find again in the early Greek Church, beginning with Origen (A.D. 320). This was in some respects, however, a new style of address, as it inclined to an allegorical mode of interpreting the Scriptures. But, aside from this characteristic, the sermons, or rather, homilies of this period, were soon followed by all the preachers, as Origen was considered by all a standard who was to be imitated, while there were others less commendable. In general they were faulty in style, corrupt with “philosophical terms and rhetorical flourishes, forms of expression extravagant and farfetched, Biblical expressions unintelligible to the people, unmeaning comparisons, absurd antitheses, spiritless interrogations, senseless exclamations, and bombast.” The causes which contributed to form this style are due to the prevalence of pagan philosophy among the Christian preachers of this time, many of whom were converts from paganism, and had received an imperfect preparation before entering on the discharge of their sacred office.

**(b)** In the early Latin Church, the homilies of this period are, if anything, even greatly inferior to those in the Greek. The cause of this was, as in the Greek Church, the imperfect education of those in the ministry, more especially their ignorance of the original languages of the Bible. See Eschenburg, *Versuche. Gesch. der öffentl. Religionsvorträge*, p. 300 sq.

**3.** In the Church of Rome, at an early period, when few of the priests were capable of preaching, discourses were framed out of the fathers, chiefly

expository, to be read from the pulpits. These were also called homilies.  
*SEE HOMILILRIUM.*

**4.** In England, homilies were early in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church. AElfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who, after Alfred, ranks first among the Anglo-Saxon vernacular writers, finding that but few persons of his day (latter part of the 10th century) could read the Gospel doctrines, as they were written in the Latin, the language of the Church, was led to compile a collection of eighty homilies, some of which were perhaps written by himself, but most of which he translated from the Latin. In these Anglo-Saxon homilies “almost every vital doctrine which distinguished the Romish from the Protestant Church meets with a direct contradiction,” and they proved of no little value in the religious controversy at the period of the English Reformation. They condemn especially, among other things, without reserve, the doctrine of transubstantiation (q.v.) as a *growing error*, and go to prove that the novelties, which are generally charged to the Protestants, are really of older date than the boasted argument of apostolical tradition. Some of the MSS. of these homilies, however, which had been stored away in monastic libraries, are found to be mutilated by the removal of all such obnoxious passages (comp. Soames, *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Bampton Lecture, Oxford, 1830, 8vo). A second collection of AElfric’s, undertaken at the request of Ethelward, commemorates the different saints revered by the Anglo-Saxon Church, and, like the former collection, was divided into two books. Of these homilies were published, *An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory, used anciently in the English-Saxon Church, giving an Account of the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christianity*, translated into modern English, with notes, etc., by Elizabeth Elstob (London 1709, 8vo; new ed. London 1839, 8vo); *Elfrici Homilie*, ed. Eliz. Elstob (of which only 36 pages were ever published; Oxford 1710, fol.). Another attempt was *The English-Saxon Homilies of Elfrici*, translated by Eliz. Elstob (Oxford 1715, folio, of which only two leaves were printed, now preserved in the British Museum). Besides these, there are some Anglo-Saxon homilies extant, to which the name of Lupus Episcopus is generally affixed. They are by Wanley (*Catalog. of A. — S. MSS.* p. 140 sq.), and apparently with good reason attributed to Wulfstan (q.v.), one of the Anglo-Saxon prelates of the 11th century. “The most remarkable of these is the one entitled in the MS. *Sermo lupi ad Anglos quando Dani maximepersecuti sunt eos*, in which the author sets before the eyes of his

countrymen the crimes which had disgraced the age preceding that in which he wrote, and the increasing wickedness of their own time.” See Wright, *Biog. British Lit.* p. 487 sq., 506 sq. *SEE ELFRIC.*

**5.** In the Church of England, the term homily has acquired a special meaning from the fact that in the time of the Reformation, a number of easy and simple discourses were composed to be read in the churches. “The Thirty-fifth Article of religion says, The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI; and, therefore, we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.’ The following are the titles of the homilies:

1. Of the right use of the church.
2. Against peril of idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of churches.
4. Of good work,; first of fasting.
5. Against gluttony and drunkenness.
6. Against excess of apparel.
7. Of prayer.
8. Of the time and place of prayer.
9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10. Of the reverend estimation of God’s Word.
11. Of alms doing.
12. Of the nativity of Christ.
13. Of the passion of Christ.
14. Of the resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.
16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.
17. For the Rogation days.
18. Of the state’ of matrimony.
19. Of repentance.
20. Against idleness.
21. Against rebellion.”

“The first volume of these homilies is supposed to have been composed by archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley and Latimer at the beginning of the Reformation, when a competent number of ministers of sufficient abilities to preach in a public congregation was not to be found.” It was published, as already stated, in the article above cited, in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. The second volume was perhaps prepared under Edward VI, but it was not published until 1563, during the reign of Elizabeth (comp. Hardwick, *Church History during the Reformation*, p. 206, 211. 249). “In neither of these books can the several homilies be assigned to their several authors with any certainty. In the second book no single homily of them all has been appropriated. In the first, that on ‘Salvation’ was probably written by Cranmer, as also those on ‘Faith’ and ‘Good Works.’ Internal evidence, arising out of certain homely expressions and peculiar forms of ejaculation, the like of which appear in Latimer’s sermons, pretty clearly betray the hand of the bishop of Worcester as having been engaged in the homily against ‘Brawling and Contention;’ the one against ‘Adultery’ may be safely given to Thomas Becon, one of Cranmer’s chaplains, in whose works, published in 1564, it is still to be found; of the rest nothing is known but by the merest conjecture. All members of the Church of England agree that the homilies ‘contain a godly and wholesome doctrine,’ but they are not agreed as to the precise *degree* of authority to be attached to them. In them, the authority of the fathers of the first six general councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the secondary inspiration of the Apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage and other ordinances, and regeneration in holy baptism, and the real presence in the Eucharist, are asserted” (Bp. Burnet). One of the best editions of the *Homilies* is that by Corrie at the University press (Cambridge, 1850, 8vo), and the latest, and perhaps most complete edition, is that published at Oxford (1859, 8vo). See also Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1, 1524; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, p. 272; Baxter, *Ch. History*, p. 379 sq., 486 sq.; Browne, *Exposit. 39 Articles*, p. 782 sq.; Wesley, *Works* — (see Index, vol. 7); Forbes, *On the 39 Articles*, 2, 685 aq.; Buchanan, *Justific.* p. 193, 198; Hook, *Ch. Dict.* p. 303.

**6.** For the Clementine Homilies, *SEE CLEMENTINES*; and on the points above given, see Schmidt, *Die Homilie* (Halle, 1827, 8vo); Augusti, *Denkwürdigk. a. d. Christi. Archaeol.* 6, 266 sq.; Schone, *Geschichtsforsch. fiber die Kirsch. Gebr.* 1, 74 sq.; 2, 226-53; *De concionibus veterum*, in Hoornbeck’s *Discellanae sacrae* (Ultraj. 1689);

— Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 4, 20, 21, 81 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 126; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 335; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 14 ch. 4; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 18; *Primit. Ch.* p. 387; *Apostol. and Primit. Ch.* 13; Bickersteth, *Christ. Stud. Ass.* p. 325, 470; Taylor, *Anc. Christ.*; Siegel, *Handb. christl. — kirchl. Alterth.* 2, 328 sq.; *London Review*, June 1854, Jan. 1857; *Bib. Sacr.* May and Aug. 1849; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* April, 1862, art. 2; *Methodist Quart. Rev.* 1, 283; 7, 63 sq. **SEE HOMILETICS**; **SEE HOMILISTS**; **SEE POSTILLE**.

### Homines intelligentiae

(French *hommes intelligence*, men of understanding), a heretical sect which flourished in the Netherlands about 1412, most likely a later branch of the Brethren of the Free Spirit (q.v.). It was founded by AEGIDIUS Cantor, and the most celebrated of their leaders was the German Carmelite Hildernissen. AEGIDIUS Cantor asserted that “he was the savior of the world, and that by him the faithful should see Jesus Christ, as by Jesus Christ they should see God the Father; that the ancient law was the time of the Father, the new law the time of the Son; and that there should shortly be a third law, which was to be the time of the Holy Ghost, under which men would be at full liberty.” They also held that there was no resurrection, but an immediate translation to heaven; and advanced the pernicious doctrines that prayer had no merit, and that sensual pleasures, being natural actions, were not sinful, but rather foretastes of the joys of heaven. They were accused of heresy, and, Hildernissen having recanted, the sect finally dissolved. — Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sacr.* 1, 405; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 2, 399; Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* 8, 511; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 339.

### Homoeousian or Homoiousian

A term describing the opinions of Arius and his fellow-heretics who declared the Son of God to be only of *like* substance (ὁμοιούσιος) with the Father. **SEE ARIANISM**.

### Homologoumena

(ὁμολογούμενα, universally *acknowledged*), the name given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3,5, 25) to those books of the New Testament, of the canonical authority of which no doubts had been expressed. Eusebius includes under the term the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of



Paul, and the first epistles of Peter and John, while the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, and the second and third epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, were placed among the Antilegomena. In a third or lower class, some, Eusebius says, placed the Apocalypse, though others placed it among the acknowledged books. It therefore properly belonged to the Antilegomena. Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* **SEE ANTILEGOMENA.**

### Homaeousian

A term used to describe the orthodox view of the person of Christ, established at the Council of Nice in opposition to Arius, viz., that the Son of God is “of the *same* substance (or *essence*) with the Father,” (ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ). **SEE ARIANISI; SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE TRINITY.**

### Honain, Ibn-Isaac

An Arabic-Nestorian philosopher and physician of the Abadite tribe, was born near Hirah in A.D. 809. He went to Greece, and there studied the Greek language and philosophy, and returned to Baghdad with a large collection of Greek books, part of which he translated into the Arabic and Syriac. He was assisted in this work by his son Isaac Ibn-Honain and his grandson Hobaish, who likewise distinguished themselves as philosophers. In this manner many works of the Greeks became accessible to the Arabians and the Syrians, and promoted among them more especially the study of Greek philosophy. It is to be regretted that after the completion of the translations the original works were burned, according, it is said, to a command of the caliph Al Mammun. Besides these translations, Honain wrote largely on medicine, philosophy, theology, and philology. He left also a Syriac grammar and a Syriac-Arabic dictionary, the first dictionary of the kind ever prepared. He died in 877. — Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 423; Assemani, *Bibl. Orientale*, 2, 270, 438; 3, pt. 2, p. 168; Krug, *Philosoph. Lex.* 2, 455 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 15, 75.

### Honduras

**SEE CENTRAL AMERICA.**

### Hone, William

An Independent minister, whose father is said to have been an occasional preacher among the Dissenters, was born in 1779 at Bath. He was brought

up in rigid religious notions, and in his early years not suffered to read out of any other book than the Bible. At the age of ten he was apprenticed to an attorney, but he finally quitted the law, and became a bookseller in London in 1800. He devoted himself at the same time to the study of literature, and wrote several works on that subject. In 1823 he published a work entitled *Ancient Mysteries described, especially the English Miracle Plays, founded on the apocryphal N.T. Storyn extant among the unpublished MSS. in the British Museum*, etc. (8vo). "This is a curious work, not at all addressed to the multitude, or chargeable with any irreverence of design or manner, but treating an interesting antiquarian subject in the dispassionate style of a studious inquirer." His acquaintance with members of the "Independents" led him to join the Independent Church, and finally he became a minister of that society. He died Nov. 6, 1842. Hone also published *The Apocryphal N.T.* (London 1820, 8vo; 4th ed. 1821), for an account of which see Horne, *Introduction to the Study of the Script.*, and *London Quart. Rev.* vol. 25 and 30. See his *Early Life and Conversion* (1841, 8vo); *English Cyclopaedia*; *Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1, 1525; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors, I*, 874. (J.H.W.)

### Honert, Johann Van Den

A distinguished Dutch divine, was born near Dortrecht Dec. 1, 1693. His early years were spent in military service, but on his father's accession to a professor's chair in the University of Leyden he decided to follow a literary life, and, after four years of study, he became a candidate for the ministry in his twenty-fourth year. In 1718 he was appointed minister at Catwick, on the Rhine; later, at Enkhuysen, and then at Haarlem. In 1727 he was called as professor of theology to the University at Utrecht, and in 1731 was honored with the professorship of Church History. In 1734 the University of Leyden called him as professor of theology, to which was added, in 1738, the department, which he last filled at the Utrecht University, and in 1746 the department of Homiletics. He died April 7, 1758. A complete list of his works, which in a great part have now nearly gone out of date, is given by Adelung (in Jöcher's *Gel. Lexik.* Addenda 2, 2123 sq.). His *De gratia Dei non universali, sed particulari* (Lugd. 1723, 8vo), which was intended to serve as an intermediary at the time when the Calvinistic predestinarian doctrine was much softened by the French and Swiss theologians, so rigidly opposed by many systematic theologians, involved him in a controversy with some of the Remonstrants (q.v.). (Comp. *Aeta hist. eccl.* 2, 819 sq.) His *Oratio de hist. eccles. studio*

*Theologis maxime necess.* (Lugd. 1734, 4to) was, like many other translations of German theological works, of great value to the Church of his country. He wrote also *Instit. Theol.* (Lugd. 1735). Honert was regarded by all parties as a very scholarly divine, and was consulted by all of them without distinction. — Gass, *Gesch. der Protest. Dogmat.* 3, 1862; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 339 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Honestus, St.

SEE DAMIAN, PETER.

## Honey

(**vbD]** *debash'*, sometimes rendered “honeycomb,” in composition with , **ry**, *ya'ar* or **āwλ**, *tsuph*; while **τρῆνο** *'pheth*, singly, is sometimes translated “honey-comb;” Greek **μέλι**) is represented by several terms, more or less accurately, in the original languages of Scripture.

- 1. ry**, *ya'ar*, which only occurs (in this sense) in <sup><0425></sup>1 Samuel 14:25, 27, 29; <sup><2181></sup>Song of Solomon 5:1; and denotes the honey of bees, and that only. The word properly signifies a *copse* or forest, and refers to the honey found in the woods.
- 2. τρῆνο** *'pheth*, honey that drops (from **āwλ**, to *sprinkle* or *distil*), usually associated with the comb, and therefore bee-honey. This occurs in <sup><0910></sup>Psalm 19:10; <sup><2183></sup>Proverbs 5:3; 24:13; 27:7; <sup><2181></sup>Song of Solomon 4:11.
- 3. vbD]** *debash'* (from its *glutinous* nature). This is the most frequent word. It sometimes denotes beehoney, as in <sup><0748></sup>Judges 14:8, but may also refer to a vegetable honey distilled from trees, and called *manna* by chemists; also the sirup of dates, and even dates themselves. It appears also sometimes to stand as a general term for all kinds of honey, especially the sirup of grapes, i.e. the newly-expressed juice or must boiled down. At the present day this sirup is still common in Palestine, under the same Arabic name *dibs* (Robinson's *Researches*, 2:442, 453), and forms an article of commerce in the East; it was this, and not ordinary bee-honey, which Jacob sent to Joseph (<sup><0431></sup>Genesis 43:11), and which the Tyrians purchased from Palestine (<sup><3217></sup>Ezekiel 27:17). The mode of preparing it is described by Pliny (14:11): the must was either boiled down to a half (in which case it was called *defurutum*), or to a third (when it was called *siracum*, or *sapa*, the **σίραϊος οἶνος**, and **ἔψημα** of the Greeks): it was mixed either with

wine or milk (Virg. *Georg.* 1, 296; Ovid, *Fast.* 4:780): it is still a favorite article of nutriment among the Syrians and has the appearance of coarse honey (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 82). It was used for sweetening food, like sugar with us (<sup><2161></sup>Exodus 16:31).

4. **āwḫ**, *tsuph* (literally a *flowing*), denotes rather the *cells* of the honeycomb full of honey (<sup><2161></sup>Proverbs 16:24; <sup><1911></sup>Psalms 19:11).

5. The “wild honey” (μέλι ἄγριον) which, with locusts, formed the diet of John the Baptist, was, according to some, the *manna* or vegetable honey noticed under *debash* (No. 3, above), but may very naturally refer to the honey stored by bees in the rocks of Judaea Deserta, in the absence of the trees to which they usually resort. Such wild honey is clearly referred to in <sup><16213></sup>Deuteronomy 22:13; <sup><18101></sup>Psalms 81:17. Josephus (*War*, 4, 8, 3) specifies bee-honey among the natural productions of the plain of Jericho: the same Greek expression is certainly applied by Diodorus Siculus (19:94) to honey exuding: from trees; but it may also be applied, like the Latin *mel silvestre* (Pliny, 11:16), to a particular kind of bee honey. A third kind has been described by some writers as “vegetable” honey, by which is meant the exudations of certain trees and shrubs, such as the *Tamnarix mannifera*, found in the peninsula of Sinai, or the stunted oaks of Luristan and Mesopotamia. A kind of honey is described by Josephus (*I. c.*) as being manufactured from the juice of the date.

Honey was not permitted to be offered on the altar (<sup><4821></sup>Leviticus 2:11). As it is coupled with leaven in this prohibition, it would seem to amount to an interdiction of things sour and sweet. Aben Ezra and others allege that it was because honey partook of the fermenting nature of leaven, and when burnt yielded an unpleasant smell—qualities incompatible with offerings made by fire of a sweet savor unto the Lord. The prohibition appears to have been grounded on the fermentation produced by it, honey soon turning sour, and even forming vinegar (Pliny, 21:48). This fact is embodied in the Talmudical word *hidbish* “to ferment” derived from *debash*. Other explanations have been offered, as that: bees were unclean (Phil. 2, 255), or that the honey was the artificial *dibs* (Bahr, *Symbol.* 2, 323). But Maimonides and others think it was for the purpose of making a difference between the religious customs of the Jews and the heathen, in whose offerings honey was much employed. The first fruits of honey were, however, to be presented, as these were destined for the support of the priests, and not to be offered upon the altar (<sup><4305></sup>2 Chronicles 31:5). It is

related in <sup><042></sup>1 Samuel 14:24-32, that Jonathan and his party, coming to the wood, found honey dropping from the trees to the ground, and the prince extended his rod to the honey-comb to taste the honey. From all this it is clear that the honey was bee-honey, and that honey-combs were above in the trees, from which honey dropped upon the ground; but it is not clear whether Jonathan put his rod into a honey-comb that was in the trees or shrubs, or into one that had fallen to the ground, or that had been formed there (Kitto's *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.). Moreover, the vegetable honey is found only in small globules, which must be carefully collected and strained before being used (Wellsted, 2, 50). In India, "the forests," says Mr. Roberts, "literally flow with honey; large combs maybe seen hanging on the trees as you pass along, full of honey" (*Oriental Illustrations*). We have good reason to conclude, from many allusions in Scripture, that this was also, to a considerable extent, the case formerly in Palestine. It is very evident that the land of Canaan abounded in honey. It is indeed described as "a land flowing with milk and honey" (<sup><088></sup>Exodus 3:8, etc.); which we apprehend to refer to *all* the sweet substances which the different Hebrew words indicate, as the phrase seems too large to be confined to the honey of bees alone. Yet the great number of bees in Palestine has been noticed by many travelers; and they were doubtless still more common in ancient times, when the soil was under more general cultivation. Where bees are very numerous, they sometimes resort to places for the deposit of their honey, which we would little think of. The skeleton of a lion, picked clean by birds, dogs, and insects, would afford no bad substitute for a hive, as in <sup><074></sup>Judges 14:8, 9 (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illus.* ad loc.). A recent traveler, in a sketch of the natural history of Palestine, names bees, beetles, and mosquitoes as the insects, which are most common in the country (Schubert, *Reise im Morgenlande*, 2, 120). In some parts of Northern Arabia the hills are so well stocked with bees that no sooner are hives placed than they are occupied (Wellsted's *Travels*, 2:123). Dr. Thomson speaks of immense swarms of bees in the cliffs of wady Kum, and compares <sup><021></sup>Deuteronomy 22:13 (*Land and Book*, 1, 460). Prof. Hackett saw hives in several places in Palestine (*Illustrations of Script.* p. 96). Milk and honey were among the chief dainties in the earlier ages, as they are now among the Bedawin; and butter and honey are also mentioned among articles of food (<sup><207></sup>Isaiah 7:15). The ancients used honey instead of sugar (<sup><090></sup>Psalms 119:103; <sup><104></sup>Proverbs 24:13); but when taken in great quantities it causes nausea, a fact employed in <sup><156></sup>Proverbs 25:16, 17, to inculcate moderation in pleasures. Honey and milk are put also for sweet

discourse (<sup>(2041)</sup>Song of Solomon 4:11). The preservative properties of honey were known in ancient times. Josephus records that the Jewish king Aristobulus, whom Pompey's partisans destroyed by poison, lay buried in honey till Antony sent him to the royal cemetery in Judsea (*Ant. 14, 7, 4*).  
**SEE BEE.**

## Honey

A portion of which, with milk, was sometimes given to newly baptized persons in allusion to the name anciently given to Canaan, and in token that they belonged to the spiritual Israel. Honey and milk had a distinct consecration (Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dict.*). See Augusti, *Christ. Archäol.* 2, 446 sq.; Riddle, *Christ. Antig.* p. 519 sq.; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, p. 326.

## Honolulu

**SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS.**

## Honor

- (1.) Respect paid to superiors, those to whom we owe particular deference and distinction.
- (2.) It is sometimes, in Scripture, used to denote real services: Honor thy father and mother (<sup>(422)</sup>Exodus 20:12);" that is, not only show respect and deference, but assist them, and perform such services to them as they need. By honor is also understood that adoration which is due to God only: "Give unto the Lord the honor due unto his name (<sup>(422)</sup>Psalm 29:2)."
- (3.) Specifically, it is used to denote the testimony of esteem or submission, by which we make known the veneration and respect we entertain for any one on account of his dignity or merit. The *word* is used in general for the esteem due to virtue glory, reputation, and probity. In every situation of life, religion only forms the true honor and happiness of man. "It cannot arise from riches, dignity of rank, or office, nor from what are often called splendid actions of heroes, or civil accomplishments; these may be found among men of no real integrity, and may create considerable fame; but a distinction must be made between fame and true honor. The former is a loud and noisy applause; the latter a more silent and internal homage. Fame floats on the breath of the multitude; honor rests on the judgment of the thinking. In order, then, to discern where true honor lies, we must not look

to any adventitious circumstance, not to any single sparkling quality, but to the whole of what forms a man; in a word, we must look to the soul. It will discover itself by a mind superior to fear, to selfish interest, and corruption; by an ardent love to the Supreme Being, and by a principle of uniform rectitude. It will make us neither afraid nor ashamed to discharge our duty, as it relates both to God and man. It will influence us to be magnanimous without being proud; humble without being mean; just without being harsh; simple in our manners, but manly in our feelings. This honor, thus formed by religion, or the love of God, is more independent and more complete than what can be acquired by any other means. It is productive of higher felicity, and will be commensurate with eternity itself; while that honor, so called, which arises from any other principle, will resemble the feeble and twinkling flame of a taper, which is often clouded by the smoke it sends forth, but is always wasting, and soon dies totally away” (Blair, *Sermons*, Serm. 33).

**(4.)** The term “honor” is also used to denote the personal quality of magnanimity, especially in relation to truth and fidelity. Among men of the world, the “sense of honor,” so called, takes the place of conscience; perhaps it might more justly be said that it *is* conscience, regulated, however, by the personal pride of the individual. Coleridge remarks that wherever “genuine morality has given way, in the general opinion, to a scheme of ethics founded on utility, its place is soon challenged by the spirit of HONOR. Paley, who degrades the spirit of honor into a mere club-law among the higher classes, originating in selfish convenience, and enforced by the penalty of excommunication from the society which habit had rendered indispensable to the happiness of the individuals, has misconstrued it not less than Shaftesbury, who extols it as the noblest influence of noble natures. The spirit of honor is more, indeed; than a mere conventional substitute for honesty; but, on the other hand, instead of being a finer form of moral life, it may be more truly described as the shadow or ghost of virtue deceased; for to take the word in a sense which no man of honor would acknowledge may be allowed to the writer of satires, but not to the moral philosopher. Honor implies a reverence for the invisible and super sensual in our nature, and so far it is virtue; but it is a virtue that neither understands itself nor its true source, and therefore often unsubstantial, not seldom fantastic, and often more or less capricious. Abstract the notion from the lives of lord Herbert of Cherbury, or Henry the Fourth of France, and then compare it with 1 Corinthians 13 and the

Epistle to Philemon, or, rather, with the realization of this fair ideal in the character of St. Paul himself. This has struck the better class even of infidels. Collins, one of the most learned of our English deists, is said to have declared that, contradictory as miracles appeared to his reason, he would believe in them notwithstanding if it could be proved to him that St. Paul had asserted any one as having been worked *by himself* in the modern sense of the word *miracle*; adding, ‘*St. Paul was so perfect A gentleman, and a man of honor!*’ I know not a better test. Nor can I think of any investigation that would be more instructive where it would be *safe*, but none, likewise, of greater delicacy from the probability of misinterpretation than a history of the rise of honor in the European monarchies as connected with the corruptions of Christianity, and an inquiry into the specific causes of the inefficacy which has attended the combined efforts of divines and moralists against the practice and obligation of dueling.” Of the merely worldly sense of honor, Carlyle remarks, sharply enough, that it “reveals itself too clearly as the daughter and heiress of our old acquaintance, Vanity” (*Essays*, 2, 74). Montesquieu remarks that what is called honor in Europe is unknown, and of course unnamed, in Asia; and that it would be difficult to render the term intelligible to a Persian.” See Montesquieu, *Spirit of Laws*, bk. 3, ch. 8; Coleridge, *Friend*, p. 377.

### Honoratus, St.,

a Manichean, and archbishop of Aries, was born, according to Baillet, in Belgian Gaul, in the second half of the 4th century. He belonged to a noble family who were pagans; and when he and his brother Venantius became Christians, they left their country and parents, and traveled through Achaia, and afterwards founded a monastery on the island of Serino, opposite Camles, which acquired great celebrity. Some of the most eminent bishops and theologians of the 5th and 6th centuries came out of this convent. Honoratus himself became archbishop of Aries A.D. 426, and died A.D. 429. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 25, 78.

### Honoratus, St.

Bishop of Marseilles, was born about 420 or 425, and is said to have been educated at the school of Lerins. He was the successor of the celebrated Tillemont in the episcopacy (probably in 475), but of his works very little is known at present. Some ascribe to him the authorship of a life of St. Hilarius, which other critics suppose to be the production of Viventius. He



died about 492, counting pope Gelasius I among his admirers. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 78.

## Honorius

Roman emperor, son of Theodosius I, was born in 384. He was named Augustus Nov. 20, 393, and succeeded his father Jan. 17, 395, as first emperor of the Western empire, with Rome as its capital, while the Eastern fell to the lot of his brother Arcadius. Honorius was at this time only ten years of age, and he was therefore put under the guardianship of Stilicho, a Vandal, who had aided him in ascending the throne, and whose daughter Maria he married. Honorius, soon after his accession, renewed and even rendered more stringent his father's enactments against heathenism; but the weakness of his government, together with the fears or heathenish tendencies of some of the governors, rendered these regulations almost of no effect in several provinces. It having been represented to Honorius that the continued existence of heathen temples kept up the heathen spirit among the people, he ordered (399) that all such temples should be quickly destroyed, so that the people should no longer have this temptation before them. As the heathen laid great stress on a prediction that Christianity would disappear in its 365th year, the destruction of their own temples at that time made great impression on them. Yet in some districts of Northern Africa the heathen still remained numerous enough not only to resist, but even to oppress the Christians. After the death of Stilicho, Honorius modified his severe course against heathenism: a law was promulgated for the Western empire in A.D. 410 "*ut libera voluntate quis cultum Christianitatis exciperet*" by which the penalties pronounced by preceding laws against all who participated in any but Christian worship were suspended. This law, however, remained in force but a short time, and the old enactments came again into use. An edict of 416 excluded the heathen from civil and military offices, yet we are told by Zozimus (5, 46) that such was the weakness of Honorius that at the request of a heathen general, who declined continuing in his service on any other terms, the edict was at once taken back. This vacillating, irresolute prince was also led to take part in discussions on the points of doctrine then agitating the Church. In 418 he promulgated an edict against Pelagius and the Pelagians and Caelicolae, which was framed more in a theological than an imperial style. He acted in the same manner towards the Donatists. The envoys of the North African Church succeeded in obtaining from the emperor a rule that the penalty of ten pounds of gold to which his father Theodosius had condemned heretic

priests, or the owners of the places where heretics assembled to worship, should only be enforced against those Donatist bishops and priests in whose dioceses violence had been offered to the orthodox priests. In an edict Honorius issued against the Donatists (405), he condemned them as heretics, and this with more severity even than the Council of Carthage demanded. Later he appointed a council, to be held at Carthage (411), to decide the difficulty between the Donatists and the orthodox party. The imperial commissioners, of course, decided for the latter, and new edicts were published exiling Donatist priests, and condemning their followers to be fined. The fanaticism of the oppressed party was excited by these measures, and the heresy only spread the more rapidly. While the reign of Honorius is thus of great importance in the history of the Church, the emperor himself showed the greatest want of energy in all his dealings, and his death, which occurred in August, 423, cannot be said to have been a loss to either the State or the Church. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 251; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, vol. 1; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. 29-33; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* chap. 8-10; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 66 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 54, 72, 83; *Christ. Remembrancer*, July 1868, p. 237. *SEE DONATISTS.*

## Honorius

An archbishop of Canterbury in 627. He instituted parishes in England; but little is known of his life and works. He died in 653.

## Honorius of Autun

(*Augustodunensis*), surnamed “the Solitary,” a scholastic theologian of the first half of the 11th century, is generally supposed to have been born in France, and was connected with a church at Autun, in Burgundy. His personal history is rather obscure; but if he be really the author of the *Elucidarium*, a summary of theology, published in France as the work of Anselm (Paris, 1560, 8vo), he deserves to be ranked among the most celebrated men of his century. The *Elucidarium* shows that Honorius was devoted to a practical mysticism, and in his work he seems to have followed the new Platonic-Augustinian theology. He condemned the Crusades and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, all decorations of the altar, the extreme unction, etc. On the doctrine of the Trinity, he held that the godhead consists of three distinct powers. He is also said to have been the author of a work, *De Praedestinatione et libero arbitrio* (Col. 1552; also

found in Cassander's *Works*, p. 623 sq.). In this work he holds that "God's foreknowledge has no compelling influence upon our actions, nor his predestination any necessitating power over our fate; for, as all futurity is present to an omnipresent Being, he knows our future acts, because he sees them as already done; and his predestination to either life or death is the consequence of his foreknowing the line of conduct which his creatures would choose to pursue." In many respects he agreed with Abelard (q.v.). Honorius also wrote several Biblical works, among which his *Introduction to the Explanation of Solomon's Song* is considered as his best production. All his theological and philosophical works are collected in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. 20. See Dupin, *Bibl. Nouv. des ant. eccl.* 9, 154; Oudin, *De Script. Ecclesiastes*; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 24, 361 sq.; 28, 335, 416 sq., 427 sq.; 29, 341; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philos.* 7, 435 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Lit.* 2, 680; Waterland, *Works* (see Index); Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 342; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 321 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 19 sq.; Darling, *Encyklop. Bibliog.* 1, 1526. (J. H.W.)

### Honorius de Sancta Maria

Who was also known as *Blaise Vauxelle*, was born at Limoges, in France, July 4, 1651. He joined the Carmelites at Toulouse in 1671, and then went on a mission to the Levant. Returning to France, he taught theology for some years, and became prior, counselor, provincial, and, finally, visitor general of the French Carmelites. He died in 1729. The most important and useful of his publications is entitled *Reflexions sur les Regles et sur Usage de la Critique, touchant l'Histoire de l'Eglise, les Ouvrages des Peres, les Actes des anciens Martyrs, les Vies des Saintes*, etc. (Paris and Lyons, 1712-1720, 3 vols. 4to). He wrote several treatises against Jansenism, and in favor of the bull *Unigenitus*; also *Vie de Saint Jean de la Croix* (Tournay, 1724) *Observations sur Histoire ecclesiastique de Fleury* (Mechlin, 1726-1729) — *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, etc. (Perpignan, 1689) — *Traditions des Peres et auteurs eccles. sur la Contemplation* (Paris, 1706, 2 vols. 8vo), which last was translated into Italian and Spanish, and to which he subsequently added *Des Motifs et de la Pratique de l'amour de Dieu* (Paris, 1713, 8vo); etc. — Moreri, *Nouv. Dict. History*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 83.

## Honorius I, Pope

Was a native of the Campania, and succeeded Boniface V in 625. His general administration of Church affairs has been favorably commented upon by historians, and his name is very prominent in the history of the paschal controversy in Ireland, and in that of the early Anglo-Saxon Church. The feast of the elevation of the cross was organized during his time (about 628), and he was very active in converting the heathen. He died in 638. Some of his letters are preserved in Labbe's *Collect. Conciliorum*, vol. 3. Honorius is especially distinguished for the part he took in the Monotheistic controversies of that period. While the controversy was gaining ground in the West, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to Honorius, explaining the Monotheistic doctrines in the most favorable light, and suggested that Honorius should impose silence on both parties in a dispute, which really did not affect the substance of the Catholic doctrine. Misled, it is alleged, by this statement of Sergius, Honorius consented, and even expressed himself in language, which would appear to condense the doctrine of two wills in Christ. After his death, attempts were made at Rome to exculpate his memory from all accusation of heresy, yet he was condemned and anathematized by the (Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 680, and this sentence was confirmed at different times, as, for instance, by Leo II, who anathematized him as heretic for having attempted *apostolicam ecclesiam — profi ana proditione immaculatam subvertere* (Mansi, 10, 731). Modern Roman Catholic historians have tried in various ways to exonerate Honorius. Baronius says that the acts of the Council of Constantinople were falsified; Bellarmine says that this was the case with Honorius's letter to Sergius; while Garier and Ballerini claim that he was not anathematized for heresy, but *propter negigentiam*. Some Roman Catholic historians, however, maintain that even in disclaiming the belief of two wills in Christ, Honorius merely denied the existence in Christ of two discordant or conflicting wills, that is, of a *corrupt and sinful human* will opposed to the divine will, and that he did not put forth any dogmatic declarations irreconcilable with the strict ultramontane doctrine of infallibility. Orsi went even so far as to maintain that Honorius composed this letter to Sergius as "a private teacher;" but the expression *doctor privatus*, when used of a pope, is like talking of wooden iron (comp. Janus, *The Council and the Pope*, p. 405). In modern times, the agitation of the question of papal infallibility has given a special interest to the letters of Honorius. The champions of infallibility,

following the lead of the above-mentioned writers, tried all kinds of arguments to explain away the assent of Honorius to the heretical doctrines of Sergius, without being able to adduce any new argument. The Jesuit Damberger even attempted a full justification of the course of Honorius. Most of the Roman Catholic writers, however, admitted that the words, though they may bear an orthodox construction, must have appeared as favoring the heretics, and that Honorius probably fell into a trap, which the shrewd patriarch of Constantinople had set for him. The Galileans, and the opponents of papal infallibility, have in general endeavored to show that Honorius was really a favorer of Monotheism. The ablest treatment of the subject from this school in the Roman Catholic Church may be found in the work on *The Pope and the Council* by Janus; two works by P. Le Page Renouf (*The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, London, 1868); and [in reply to the-ultramontane reviews of the first work by Dr. Ward, the editor of the *Dublin Review*, and the Jesuit Bottalla] *The Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered* (London, 1869); in two letters, by the distinguished French Oratorian and member of the French Academy, P. Gratry (*L'evêque d'Orleans et l'archeveque de Malines*, Paris, 1870); and in an essay by bishop Hefele, published in Naples, 1870. Renouf, whose thoroughness and keenness is admitted by all his opponents, in his works, undertakes to prove three assertions:

- 1.** Honorius, in his letters to Sergius, really gave his sanction to the Monotheistic heresy;
- 2.** Honorius was, on account of heresy, condemned by general councils and popes;
- 3.** Honorius taught a heresy *ex cathedra*. The fact that Honorius was condemned by general councils and popes as a heretic is admitted by many of those Catholic writers who insist that his words may be indeed, though they are obscure, explained in an orthodox sense. Since the convocation of the Vatican Council in 1869, many Roman Catholic theologians (among them Döllinger and Gratry), who were formerly regarded as personally favorable to the doctrine of papal infallibility, now, after a new investigation of the question, strongly urge the case of Honorius as an irrefutable argument against it. The literature on the Honorius question is so voluminous that, according to the opinion of the learned Döllinger, during the last 130 years more has been written on it than on any other point of Church History within 1500 years. Recent monographs on the

subject, besides the works already mentioned, have been written by Schneemann (*Studien über die Honoriusfrage*, 1864) and Reinerding (*Beiträge zur Honorius- und Liberiusfrage*, 1865). It is also extensively discussed in a number of articles in the theological reviews, especially those of the Roman Catholic Church, in the larger works on Church History, and in particular, since 1869, in a vast number of works treating of the question of papal infallibility. **SEE INFALLIBILITY**. See Richer, *Historiae Concil. Généralé*. 1, 296; Du Pin, *De antiqua eccles. disciplina*, p. 349; M. Havelange, *Ecclesie infallibilitas in factis dogmaticis* (*Journ. hist. — et litt.* April 1, 1790); F. Marchesius, *Clypeus fortium* (1680); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 88; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, 5, 407; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. sac.* 17, 522 sq.; Llorente, *Die Papste*, 1, 196-200; Schröckh *Kirchengesch.* 19, 492 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 3, 11 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 340 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*, 3, 179, 195; Dogmas, 2, 439; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 2, 169; Riddle, *History of the Papacy*, 1, 195; Hardwick, *Church Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 70 and n. 3, p. 75 and n. 8; Hagenbach, *fist. of Doctrines*, vol. 2; *West. Review*, Oct. 1868, p. 239; *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 160; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3, 322 sq.; Lefevre, in *Revue Cathol. de Louvaix*, February, 1870; Hefele, *Honorius u. d. sechste allgem. Concil.* (Tüb. 1870, 8vo). **SEE MONOTHEISM**. (J. H. W.)

## Honorius II

(*Peter Claudius*), Antipope, was elected in 1061, through the influence of Henry IV, in opposition to Alexander II, who had been chosen by the cardinals without his assent. The election took place in a council convened at Basle, and Honorius afterwards went to Rome. The German bishops, however, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander II at the Synod of Augsburg, 1062; and, finally, the Synod of Mantua, 1064, pronounced the deposition of Honorius, and he was obliged thereafter to confine himself to the bishopric of Padua, which he held before his election. Yet he upheld his pretensions to the pontifical see until his death in 1072. He was accused of simony and of concubinage. He is generally not counted among the popes on account of his deposition. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 5; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 22, 382, 385 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2, 119; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 318 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 323. **SEE ALEXANDER II**.

## Honorius II

(*cardinal Lambert*), Pope, originally bishop of Ostia, was elected pope by the cardinals in 1124, after the death of Calixtus II, while most of the bishops assembled at Rome elected Tebaldus, cardinal of Santa Anastasia. Tebaldus, finding that Honorius was supported by the powerful family of the Frangipani, and that the people were divided in opinion, to avoid further strife, waived his claim. Honorius himself also expressed doubts concerning the validity of his own election; he was subsequently reelected by the clergy and the people of Rome without opposition, and was consecrated Dec. 21, 1124. He refused the investiture of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria to Roger, count of Sicily; and Roger having besieged the pope within Benevento, Honorius excommunicated him; but afterwards peace was concluded between them, and Honorius granted the investiture. He confirmed the election of Lothaire II to the empire, and excommunicated his rival, Conrad of Franconia. He also confirmed the organization of the order of Premonstratensis, and at the Synod of Troyes (1128) that of the Templars; and condemned the abbots of Cluny and of Mount Cassin against whom complaints had been made. He died in the convent of St. Andrew, Feb. 14, 1130. — *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 89; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 6, 19 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2, 169; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 26, 95 sq.; Milman, *Lat. — Christianity*, 4, 144, 151 sq.; Wetzer ü. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 317 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 323 sq.

## Honorius III

(*Cencio Savelli*) — Pope, a native of Rome, was cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, and succeeded pope Innocent III in 1216. He showed a very accommodating spirit in his relations with the temporal powers. Thus, when Frederick II permitted his son Henry, already king of Sicily, to be elected king of Germany, in April 1220, he even consented to officiate at the coronation (November, 1220). But it is generally believed that the object of the pope in consenting so readily to the desires of Frederick II was to gain him for the great crusade against the Mussulmans in the East, which he contemplated. This good understanding between the pope and the emperor was interrupted when the latter, instead of proceeding directly to Palestine, tarried in Apulia and Sicily, and attempted to regain those countries. Honorius sent his chaplain, Alatrinus, to the imperial diet at Cremona in 1226, and the emperor was obliged to renounce his plan of

aggrandizement. Honorius even went so far as to threaten him (1225) with excommunication if he did not start for the Holy Land by August 1227, and he would probably have executed his threat had not death interfered. This conciliatory spirit Honorius failed to manifest towards count Raymond VII of Toulouse. He excited Louis VIII of France to make war against Raymond; but neither Honorius nor Louis lived to see the end of the conflict. He was also frequently at variance with the nobles and people of Rome, by whom he was a number of times driven from the city. His pontificate was therefore not a very quiet one. He died March 12, 1227. Officially Honorius confirmed the organization of the Dominicans in 1216, and of the Franciscans in 1223. He was the first pope who granted indulgences at the canonization of saints. He was considered a learned man in his day, and is supposed to have been the author of the *Conjuraciones adversus principem tenebrarum* (Rome, 1629, 8vo). — Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, vol. 5; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 90; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 6, 216-221; Neander, *Ch. History*, 4, 41, 177, 270, 341; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, 5 (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 3, 811 sq.; Ebrard, *Dogmengesch.* 2, 180; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 26, 328; 25, 145 sq., 329 sq.; 29, 632; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* 2, 341; Cave, *Hist. lit. script. eccl.* 2, 287; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 319; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 324; Raumer, *Geschichte d. Hohenstaufen*, 3, 307 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Honorius IV

(*Giacomo Savelli*), was pope from April 2, 1285, to April 3, 1287. He espoused the cause of Charles of Anjou against the Aragonese, who had occupied Sicily; and he even incited to a crusade against the latter, qualifying it as a "holy war." He distinguished himself greatly by his zeal for the preservation and augmentation of the privileges of the Church, and for the recovery of the Holy Land. He cleared the Papal States of the bands of robbers with which they were overrun, and imparted a new impulse to arts and sciences, which up to his time had been much neglected; among other improvements, he attempted to establish a course of Oriental languages at the University of Paris, but he did not succeed. During his brief pontificate he is said to have succeeded in enriching his family. Migne, *Dict. Ecclesiastes*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 91; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 301; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 26, 511 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 6, 326 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 6, 172; Riddle, *Hist. of the*



*Papacy*, 2, 235; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 65, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 322; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 325.

### Honorius, Bartholomew

A Premonstratist, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was born at Eerfel, in Brabant, became canon at Floreffe, near Naumur, later preacher at Helmont, and finally, being persecuted by the Calvinists, went to Rome; He wrote *Admonitio adfratres inferioris Germanice* (Herzogenb. 1578) — *Hodoeporicon celebriorum ordinis Prae monstratensis per orbem universum Abbatiarum-* (ibid. 1584) — *Quaestiones theologicae LXX adverseu Calvinis' tas* (ibid. 1586) — *Elucidarium Anselmi Cantuariensis* (ibid. 1586); and a number of other, but less valuable works. — Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* 8, 522.

### Honter, John

One of the apostles of Protestantism in Transylvania, was born at Cronstadt in 1498; studied at Wittenberg under Luther, and then went as a teacher to Cracow, whence he moved to Basle to continue his studies. In 1533 he returned to his native city, where he started a printing establishment, and published Luther's writings. He also published at his own expense a translation of Luther's works in Hungarian. In 1544 he was appointed pastor, and became quite popular as a preacher. He died Jan. 23, 1549. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 254; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 98; *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 59.

### Hontheim, John Nicolas Von

(known commonly as FEBRONIUS), suffragan bishop of Treves (in Rhenish Prussia), was born Jan. 27, 1701, and educated at the Jesuits College and university of that place. Having completed his studies, he went on a journey to Rome, and after his return (1727) was appointed successively to several high positions in the Church, and finally became suffragan bishop May 13, 1748, which post he filled until 1788. He died Sept. 2, 1790. His *Historia Trevirensis, diplomatica et pragmatica* (Trevir, 1750, 3 vols. fol., with a *Prodromus*, 1757, 2 vols. fol.; Augsb. 1757, 2 vols. fol.) is considered a work of great merit; but it was as the author of *De Statu Ecclesiae et legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis Liber singularis, ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christiana composites* (Bullioni apud Guillelmum Evrard, 1763, 4to), published under the

pseudonym of “Justinus Febronius,” that he attracted the attention of the Christian world. The daring expressions of independent thought, which characterize the entire work, created general excitement. As early as 1763-5 he issued an enlarged edition, and a third, still more enlarged, in 1770-74. An abridgment of the work appeared in German in 1764, another in Latin in 1777, and the translations into the various modern languages soon made it known throughout Europe (French, Sedan and Paris, 1767; Italian, Venice, 1767, etc.). Many Roman celebrities wrote against it, especially Zaccaria (to whose writings an answer is given in *Nova defensio Febronii contrap. Zaccaria*, Bullioni, 1763, 3 vols.) and Ballerini (*De potestate ecclesiastica Roman. Pontif. et concil. generalium contra opus J. Febronii* (Verona, 1768, 4to, and often). Pope Clement XIII caused the book to be entered on the *Index*, although it was dedicated to himself. Hontheim seeks especially to draw a line of distinction between the spiritual and the ecclesiastical, power of the Roman see. He seems to say to his readers, “Without becoming Protestants, you may very well oppose the encroachments and abuse of power of the papal court.” The principal points of which the work treats are, the constitution of the primitive Church, the representative character of general councils, the thoroughly *human* basis on which rests the primacy of the bishop of Rome, the fatal influence of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the tendency to usurpation of power by the nuncios, the illegal influence of the mendicant orders, and the monopoly of episcopal elections possessed by the chapters at the expense of the rights of the lower clergy and the people. As his assertions are accompanied by historical proofs, and his book contains hardly anything but quotations from the fathers in support of his views, it exerted great influence. As the work had been published under the *nom de plume* of Justinus Febronius, the system of Church government, which Hontheim propounded, is generally called Febronianism. During the years, which followed its publication, papal authority was greatly restricted in many countries. Hence, as soon as the real author of the *Dee Statu Ecclesiae* was known, he became the object of ceaseless persecutions. Pope Pius VI showed himself especially the enemy of Hontheim. The ex-Jesuit Beck, privy councilor of the elector Clement Wenceslas, not satisfied with persecuting Hontheim, persecuted also all the members of his family, most of whom held offices in the province of Trier. The old man (Hontheim was then nearly seventy-nine), tired of all these annoyances, and-perhaps frightened at the prospect of what he might still have to undergo, finally gave way, and submitted to the pope. When his recantation reached Rome

in 1778, Pius VI held a special consistory in order to apprise the whole Roman Catholic world of the event; but several Roman Catholic governments opposed the publication of the acts of this consistory in their states. Moreover, the effects of the dispute had been too widely felt to be obliterated by a tardy expression of repentance. The author himself wrote to his friends, "I gave way, like Ednelon, in order to avoid ceaseless annoyance. My recantation can do no harm to the Christian religion, neither can it in any way benefit the court of Rome; the thinking world has read my arguments, and has indorsed them." Some of the more liberal-minded Roman Catholic historians say that Hontheim, in his (first) recantation, declared his object to have been to affect a union of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. He believed that this could only be accomplished by altering or removing some of the institutions of the Romish Church. Later, he modified his recantation greatly by a subsequent *Commentary* (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1781), to which cardinal Gardi replied, at the special request of the pope. But eventually Hontheim made full submission to the Church. In 1788 he resigned his charges, and spent the last years of his life on his estate of Monquentin, in Luxemburg. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 91; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 255; Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 528; Mohler, *Symbolism*, p.45; Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. d. Deutschen*, 11, 456 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* 2, 343 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 22, 13; *s. d. Reform.* 6 — 532 sq.; Walch, *Neueste Relig. Gesch.* 1, 145 sq.; 7, 175 sq., 210 sq., 453 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* 7, 133 sq.; Baur, *Gallerie hist. Genmalde d. 18ten Jahrh.* 4, 402 sq.; Kurtz, *Text-book of Ch. History*, 2, 234; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 528. On the Roman Catholic side: Aschbach, *Kirch. Lex.* 2, 745 sq.; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 324 sq.; *Real-Encyklop. j.d. Kathol. Deutschland* 5, 473; Werner, *Gesch. d. kathol. Theol.* p. 209 sq., 273, and especially *Briefwechsel zw. d. Churfürsten Clemens Wene, 5. Trier u. d. Weihbisch. N. V. Hontheim 2. d. Buch J. Fabronius etc.* (Frankfort-a-M. 1813).

## Hood

(<sup><Aynæ</sup> *tsaniph'*), a *tiara* round the head, spoken of a female head band (<sup><2183</sup> Isaiah 3:23); elsewhere Tendered "diadem," e.g. a man's *turban* (<sup><1294</sup> Job 29:14); the high-priest's "mitre" (<sup><3115</sup> Zechariah 3:5); the king's *crown* (Isaiah lxii, 3, marg.). *SEE HEAD DRESS*, etc.

## Hood

(Saxon *hod*; comp. German *hut*, hat), borrowed from the Roman *cuculus*, is (1.) the *cowl* of a monk. (2.) In England, an ornamental fold that hangs down the back of a graduate to mark his degree. This part of the dress was formerly not intended for distinction and ornament, but for use. It was generally fastened to the back of the cope or other vesture, and in case of rain or cold was drawn over the head. In the universities the hoods of the graduates were made to signify their degrees by varying the colors and materials. By the fifty-eighth canon of the Church of England “every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, if they are graduates, shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the universities are agreeable to their degrees.” — Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.5.; Wheatly, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 102, 103.

## Hoof

(*hṣrPi parsah'*, cloven, i.e. a cleft hoof as of neat cattle, <sup><1206></sup>Exodus 10:26; Ezekiel 22; <sup><3043></sup>Micah 4:13, etc.; hence of the horse, though not cloven, <sup><2128></sup>Isaiah 5:28; Jeremiah 57:3; “claws” of any animal, <sup><3116></sup>Zechariah 11:16). In <sup><1818></sup>Leviticus 11:3 sq.; <sup><606></sup>Deuteronomy 4:6 sq., the “parting of the hoof” is made one of the main distinctions between clean and unclean animals; and this is applied even to the camel, after a popular rather than a scientific classification. *SEE CAMEL*.

## Hooght, Eberhard Van Der

A distinguished Dutch Orientalist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. He was a Reformed preacher at Nieuwendam, but spent the greater part of his time in the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. He died in 1716. He wrote *Janua linguae sanctae* (Amst. 1687, 4to; *ibid.* 1696 [?], 8vo) — *Medulla gramm. Hebr.* (Amst. 1696, 8vo) — *Syntaxis Ebraea, Chald. et Syr. Lex. Nouv Test. Graeco-Latinum*, etc. Especially celebrated is his edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* (Amsterd. and Utrecht, 1705, Oxford 1750, London, 1774, and often; lately again by Tauchnitz. Lpz. 1835, and often). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 524; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 381; 4, 117. *SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL*.

## Hoogstraten

(also called HOCHSTRATEN), JACOB VAN, prior of the Dominican convent of Cologne, and an ardent adversary of Reuchlin, Luther, and Erasmus, was born at Brabant in 1454. He studied at the University of Cologne without much success. Nevertheless, he was received master of arts in 1485, and afterwards made prior. His great zeal and opposition to the Reformation secured him the nomination of inquisitor at Louvain, besides a professorship of theology at the University of Cologne, for which he was in nowise qualified. In 1513 he summoned Reuchlin to appear before him, thereby transcending his powers, as Reuchlin, residing in another state, could only be summoned by the provincial of the order. He had already published his *Libellus accusatorius contra speculum ocul. Joh. Reuchlini*, when the chapter of Mentz took Reuchlin's case in hand. But pope Leo X gave commission to bishop George of Speer to settle the controversy. Hoogstraten, not appearing, lost his cause, and was condemned to pay the costs; but, as he refused to submit to the decree, the whole matter was brought before Leo X, and Hoogstraten was summoned to Rome. Unwilling either to offend the humanists in the person of Reuchlin, or the powerful Dominicans represented by Hoogstraten; the pope issued a *mandatum de supersedendo*. Returning to Cologne, Hoogstraten published in 1518 two so-called Apologies, full of malice, and in 1519 his *Destructio cabale, seu cabalistae perfidice a Joh. Reuchlino seu Capnione* (Col. 1519). He also opposed Luther in the most violent manner, proposing that he should be burned at once. Hoogstraten died at Cologne Jan. 21, 1527. His collected works were published at Cologne in 1526. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 257; Echard, *Scriptor. Ord. Praedicatorum*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 105; Raumer, *Gesch. Europa's*, 1, 210; Mayerhoff, *Joh. Reuchlin u. s. Zeit*, p. 158 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 30, 248; s. *d. Reform.* 1, 139; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* 3, 471 sq.; Mosheim, *Church History*, 3, 22.

## Hook

Is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original. **SEE FISH-HOOK; SEE FLESH-HOOK; SEE PRUNING-HOOK.** The idea of a *thorn* enters into the etymology of several of them, probably because a thorn, *hooked* or straight, was the earliest instrument of this kind. Tacitus thus describes the dress of the ancient Germans. "A loose mantle fastened

with a clasp, or, when that cannot be had, with a thorn” (*Germ.* 17). *SEE THORN.*

## Picture for Hook

**1.** **j j** ; *chach* (lit. a *thorn*), a *ring* inserted in the nostrils of animals, to which a cord was fastened in order to lead them about or tame them (<sup><1298></sup>2 Kings 19:28; <sup><2372></sup>Isaiah 37:29; <sup><3304></sup>Ezekiel 29:4; 38:4; compare <sup><3802></sup>Job 40:26); also a “chain” for a captive (<sup><3304></sup>Ezekiel 19:4, 9), and “bracelets” for females (<sup><1252></sup>Exodus 25:22, where others a *nose-ring*, others a *clasp* for fastening the dress). In the first two of the above passages, Jehovah intimates his absolute control over Sennacherib by an allusion to the practice of leading buffaloes, camels, dromedaries, etc., by means of a cord, or of a cord attached to a *ring*, passed through the nostrils (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 167-8, 2nd ed.). Such a ring is oftentimes placed through the nose of a bull, and is likewise used in the East for leading about lions, camels, and other animals. A similar method was adopted for leading prisoners, as in the case of Manasseh, who was led with rings (<sup><4331></sup>2 Chronicles 33:11). An illustration of this practice is found in a bas-relief discovered at Khorsabad (Layard, 2, 376; see also the cut under EYE). The term **vqém** is used in a similar sense in <sup><3804></sup>Job 40:24 (A.V. “bore his nose with a gin.” margin). Another form of the same term, **j /j** (A.V. “thorn”), is likewise properly a *ring* placed through the mouth of a large fish, and attached by a cord (<sup><mqh></sup>) to a stake for the purpose of keeping it alive in the water (<sup><3802></sup>Job 41:2); the word meaning the *cord* is rendered “hook” in the A.V. See below.

**2.** The cognate word **hKj i** *chakkah*’, means a *fishhook* (Job 41, 1, “angle;” <sup><3908></sup>Isaiah 19:8; <sup><3915></sup>Habakkuk 1:15). This passage in Job has occasioned the following speculations (see, for instance, Harris’s *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, art. Leviathal, London 1825). It has been assumed that Bochart has completely proved the Leviathan to mean the *crocodile* (Rosenmüller on Bochart, 3, 737, etc., 769, etc., Lips. 1796). Herodotus has then been quoted, where he relates that the Egyptians near Lake Maeris select a crocodile, render him tame, and suspend ornaments to his ears, and sometimes gems of great value; his fore feet being adorned with *bracelets* (2, 69); and the mummies of crocodiles, having their ears thus bored, have been discovered (Kenrick’s *Egypt of Herodotus*, p. 97, London 1841). Hence it is concluded that this passage in Job refers to the

facts mentioned by Herodotus; and, doubtless, the terms employed, especially by the Sept. and Vulg., and the *third and following verses*, favor the supposition, for there the captive is represented as suppliant and obsequious, in a state of security and servitude, and the object of diversion, “played with” as with a bird, and serving for the sport of maidens. Herodotus is further quoted to show that in his time the Egyptians captured the crocodile with a hook (ἄγκιστρον), with which (ἐξελκύσθη εἰς τὴν γῆν) he was *drawn* ashore; and accounts are certainly given by modern travelers of the continuance of this practice (Maillet, *Descrip. d’Egypte*, 2, 127, ed. Hag., 1740). But does not the *entire description* go upon the supposition of the *impossibility* of so treating *Leviathan*? Supposing the allusions to be correctly interpreted, is it not as much as to say, “Canst thou treat *him* as thou canst treat the crocodile and *other fierce creatures*?” Dr. Lee has, indeed, given reasons which render it *doubtful*, at least, whether the *leviathan does* mean the crocodile in this passage, or whether it does not mean some species of *whale*, as was formerly supposed the *Delphinus orca communis* or common grampus, found in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and also in the Nile. (See his examination of Bochart’s reasonings, etc., in *Translation and Notes on Job*, p. 197 and 529-539, London 1837). So the above term in Ezekiel 29: “I will put my hooks in thy jaws, and I will *cause thee to come up out of the midst of thy rivers*,” where the prophet foretells the destruction of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by allusions to the destruction, possibly, of a crocodile, the symbol of Egypt. Thus Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 8, 25) states, that the Tentyritee (inhabitants of Egypt) followed the crocodile, swimming after it in the river, sprung upon its back, thrust a bar into its mouth; which being held by its two extremities, serves as a bit, and enables them *to brace it on shore* (comp. <sup><459B></sup>Ezekiel 29:3, 4). Strabo relates that the; Tentyritae displayed their feats before the Romans (17 560, ed. Casaub.). **SEE LEVIATHAN.**

**3.** **www**; *vav*, a *peg* or *pin*, upon which the curtains of the Tabernacle were hung, springing out of the capitals(<sup><1265></sup>Exodus 26:32, etc.). The Sept. and Jerome seem to, have understood the *capitals of the pillars*; and it has been urged that this is more likely to be the meaning than *hooks*, especially as 1775 shekels of silver were used in making these **μῦwww** for the pillars, overlaying the chapiters, and filleting them (ch. 38, 28), and that the *hooks* are really the **μυσrq**, *taches* (<sup><1216></sup>Exodus 26:6, 11, 33,35; 39:33). Yet the Sept. also renders **μῦwww**, **κρίκοι**, *rings* or *clasps* (<sup><1271></sup>Exodus 27:10, 11, and **ἀγκύλαι**, <sup><12817></sup>Exodus 38:17, 19); and from a comparison of these, two

latter passages, it would seem that these hooks, or rather *tenters*, rose out of the chapters or heads of the pillars. The word seems to have given name to the letter **w** in the Hebrew alphabet, possibly from a similarity of the form in which the latter appears in the Greek *Digamma*, to that of a hook. Mr. Paine (*Solomon's Temple*, etc., p. 25) regards these “hooks” as having been rather *pins* driven into the heads of the pillars, and thus projecting upward from them like a small tenon, upon which the silver rods were slipped by means of a small hole or eye in the latter. This would serve: to keep the pillars together. *SEE TABERNACLE*.

4. **hN**χ~~α~~**æ**sinnah' (*lit. thorn*), Afish-hook (<sup><300D></sup>Amos 4:2; elsewhere a shield). *SEE FISHING*, etc.; *SEE ANGLE*.

In the same verse, **t/r**ys~~æ~~**æ**iroth', “fish-hooks,” where both Sept. and Vulg. seem to have taken **rys** in. the sense of a pot or caldron instead of a fish-hook. *SEE CALDRON*.

5. **gl** ~~ἄ~~**ῃ** mazleg' (<sup><00B></sup>1 Samuel 2:13, 14), “flesh-hook,” and the **t/g**l ~~ῃ~~**ῃ** “the flesh-hooks” (<sup><02B></sup>Exodus 27:3, and elsewhere). This was evidently in the first passage a. trident “of three teeth,” a kind of fork, etc., for turning the sacrifices on the fire, and for collecting fragments, etc. *SEE FLESH-HOOK*.

6. **t/r**m~~æ~~**ῃ** mazmeroth' (<sup><200B></sup>Isaiah 2:4, and elsewhere),. “beat their spears into pruning-hooks” (**δ**ρ~~ε~~**π**ανα, *falces*). The Roman poets have the same metaphor (Martial, 14:34, “Falx ex ense”). In <sup><300B></sup>Micah 4:3, *in ligones*, weeding-hooks, or shovels, spades, etc. Joel reverses the metaphor “pruning-hooks” into spears (3, 10, *ligo-nes*); and so Ovid (*Fasti*, 1, 697, *in pila ligones*). *SEE-PRUNING-HOOK*.

7. Doubtful is **μ**ῃ~~ῃ~~**ῃ** shephatta'yim, stalls for cattle: (“pots,” <sup><900B></sup>Psalms 48:13), also the cedar beams in the Temple court with hooks for flaying the victims (<sup><500B></sup>Ezekiel 40:43). Other meanings given are ledges (Vulg. *labia*), or eaves, as though the word were **μ**ῃ~~ῃ~~**ῃ** pens for keeping the animals previous to their being slaughtered; hearthstones, as in the margin of the A.V.; and lastly, gutters to receive and carry off the blood from the slaughtered animals. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1470) explains the term as signifying stalls in the courts of the Temple where the sacrificial victims were fastened: our translators give in the margin “andirons, or the two hearthstones.” The Sept. seems equally at a loss, **καὶ παλαιστὴν ἔξουσι**



γείσος; as also Jerome, who renders it *labia*. Schlusner pronounces γείσος to be a barbarous word formed from /yj , and understands *epistylum*, a little pillar set on another, and *capitellum*, columned. The Chaldee renders ḡl qnw[ , short posts in the house of the slaughterers on which to suspend the sacrifices. Dr. Lightfoot, in his chapter “on the altar, the rings, and the laver,” observes, “On the north side of the altar were six orders of rings, each of which contained six, at which they killed the sacrifices. Near by were *low pillars* set up, upon which were laid overthwart beams of cedar; on these were fastened rows of *hooks*, on which the sacrifices were hung; and they were flayed on marble tables, which were between these pillars” (see vers. 41, 42; *Works*, vol. 11, ch. 20, 14, London 1684-5-6). *SEE TEMPLE*.

8. Obviously an incorrect rendering for ḡmgḥi *ag-mon*’, a *rush-rope*, used for binding animals, perhaps by ‘means of the ring in their nose’ (<sup>1840D</sup>Job 41:2; elsewhere “rush” or “caldron”). *SEE FLAG*.

9. Finally, δρεπανηφόρα in 2 Macc. 13:2 is rendered “armed with hooks,” referring to the *scythe-armed* chariots of the ancients. *SEE CHARIOT*.

### Hook, James, LL.D.,

An English prelate, was born in London in 1771, and educated at St. Mary’s Hall, Oxford. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1814, dean of Worcester in 1825, and held also other preferments in the English Church. He died in 1828. Besides some dramatic pieces and novels which are ascribed to Hook, he published *Anguis in Herba, A true Sketch of the Church of England and her Clergy* (London 1802, 8vo) — *Sermons*, etc. (1812, 8vo, and another series in 1818, 8vo). For a biographical sketch of Hook, see *the London Gent. Mag.* April 1828. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 875.

### Hooke, Luce Joseph

A French theologian of English origin, was born about 1716, and educated at the seminary of “Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet.” He received the doctor’s degree from the Sorbonne, and was appointed professor of theology in 1750. The following year he presided at the discussion of abbé Parades’s (15.) thesis, which contained many heterodox doctrines, and which he had signed without reading. Hooke was deposed from his professorship; but the professors of the Sorbonne and of the College of

Navarre interceded in his behalf, and obtained the revocation of the order. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he was made librarian of the Mazarin Library, but he held this place only a short time, when he retired to St. Cloud. He died in 1796. Hooke published *Religionis naturalis revelatae et Catholiae Principil* (Paris, 1754, 2 vols. 8vo; 2nd ed. 1774, 3 vols. 8vo) — *Discours et Reflex. crit. sur l'hist. et le gouvernement de l'anc. Rome* (Paris, 1770-84, 4 vols. 12mo—a translation of one of his father's works from the *English*) — *Principe sur la Nature et l'Essence du Pouvoir de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1791, 8vo) (J. H.W.)

### Hooke, William

A Congregational minister, was born in Southampton in 1601, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. After having received orders in the Church of England, he became vicar of Axmouth, in Devonshire. About 1636 he emigrated to this country, as his nonconforming views had caused him considerable trouble, and in 1644 or 1645 he was installed pastor at New Haven, Conn. He was by marriage a cousin of Oliver Cromwell, after whose ascendancy he returned to England, and became Cromwell's domestic chaplain. After the death of Cromwell, Hooke became an ejected and silenced minister, and he spent his remaining days in retirement. He died near London March 21, 1678. Besides several sermons among them, *New England's Tears for Old England's Fears*, a Fast sermon (Tauntoli, 1640, London, 1641, 4to), which is considered one of the best productions of his day he published *The Privileges of the Saints on Earth beyond those in Heaven*, etc., containing also a *Discourse on the Gospel Day* (1673). Sprague, *Ann. Am. Pulpit*, 1, 104 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 878.

### Hooker, Asahel

A Congregational minister, was born in Bethlehem, Conn., Aug. 29, 1762. He graduated at Yale College in 1789, and was installed pastor at Goshen in September 1791. This charge he resigned on account of ill health June 12, 1810. After preaching in various pulpits, he became pastor of Chelsea parish, Norwich, Conn., Jan. 16, 1812, where he remained until his death, April 19, 1813. Mr. Hooker published several occasional sermons, and a number of articles in the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*. — *Sprague, Annals*, 2, 316.

## Hooker, Herman, D.D.

A Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Poultney, Vt., in 1804; graduated at Middlebury College in 1825, and later at the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was licensed as a Presbyterian, with great promise both as a scholar and speaker. He finally joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the partial loss of his sight and of his voice soon compelled his retirement from the ministry; and he became a bookseller at Philadelphia, continuing, however, at the same time, his theological studies. He died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 26, 1865. His principal works are, *The Portion of the Soul* (Philadelphia 1835, 32mo, and republished in England) — *Popular Infidelity* (Philadelphia 1836, 12mo) — *Family Book of Devotion* (1836, 8vo) *The Uses of Adversity and the Provisions of Consolation* (Philadelphia 1846, 18mo) — *Thoughts and Maxims* (Philadelphia 1847, 16mo) — *The Christian Life A Fight of Faith* (Philadelphia 1848, 18mo). He also published a large number of English and American works. “Dr. Hooker was a vigorous and close thinker, a clear writer, a devout and conscientious Christian, full of true and consistent charity. He made the Nashotah Seminary a residuary legatee, which bequest probably amounted to about \$10,000.” See *Church Rev.* Jan. 1866; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 878.

## Hooker, Richard

One of the most eminent divines in the history of the Church of England, was born in or near Exeter about 1553, according to Walton, or about Easter, 1554, according to Wood. His early education was received at the expense of his uncle, John Hooker, chamberlain of Exeter, and he was afterwards introduced by the same relative to the notice of bishop Jewel, who procured him in 1567 a clerkship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In December 1573, he became a student in that college, and a fellow and Master of Arts in 1577. In 1579 he was appointed lecturer on Hebrew in the university, and in October of the same year he was expelled his college, with Dr. John Reynolds and three other fellows, but he was restored the same month. About two years after he took orders, and was appointed to preach at Paul’s Cross. Having married the following year, he lost his fellowship, but he was presented to the living of Drayton-Beauchamp, in Bucks, by John Cherry, Esq., in 1584. Through the influence of the archbishop of York, he was appointed Master of the Temple in 1585. Here he became engaged in a controversy on Church discipline and some points

of doctrine with Walter Travers, afternoon lecturer at the Temple, who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Antwerp, and held most of the opinions of the divines of Geneva. Travers, being silenced by archbishop Whitgift, appealed to the Privy Council, but without success. His petition to the council was published, and answered by Hooker. Travers had many adherents in the Temple, and it was their opposition, according to Izaak Walton, which induced Hooker to commence his work on the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Finding that he had not leisure at the Temple to complete that work, he applied to Whitgift for removal to a more quiet station, and was accordingly presented to the living of Boscombe in Wiltshire in 1591. On the 17th of July in the same year he was made a prebendary of Salisbury. At Boscombe he finished four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which were published in 1594. On the 7th of July 1595, he was presented by the queen to the living of Bishopsbourne in Kent, which he held till his death, on the 2nd of November 1600.

“Hooker’s manner was grave even in childhood; the mildness of his temper was proved by his moderation in controversy; and his piety and learning procured him the general esteem of his contemporaries. His great work is his defense of the constitution and discipline of the Church of England, in eight books, under the title of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. This work obtained during the author’s lifetime the praise of a pope (Clement VIII) and a king (James I), and has ever since been looked upon as one of the chief bulwarks of the Church of England and of ecclesiastical establishments in general. As a work of solid learning, profound reasoning, and breadth and sustained dignity of style, it is indeed beyond praise; but the common objection is a just one, that Hooker’s reasoning is too frequently that of an advocate. The publication of the first four books has been mentioned above; the fifth was published in 1597. He completed the last three books, but they were not published till several years after his death. The account which Walton gives of the mutilation of the last three books is very improbable, and little doubt can be entertained of their authenticity, though they are certainly imperfect, and probably not in the condition in which he left them” (*English Cyclopaedia*). Hooker was charged with Romanizing tendencies, but the charge had no better foundation than his prelatial theory of the Church. For a series of shrewd and genial notes and criticisms on Hooker, see Coleridge, *Conspicuous Works*, N.Y. edition, 5, 28 sq. Of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* many separate editions have appeared. *His Works, with Life*, edited by Dr. Gauden, were published in London, 1662 (fol.); again in 1666 (fol.), with life by Izaak

Walton. The latest editions are Hanbury's, with life of Cartwright, and Notes, from the dissenting point of view (London, 1830, 3 vols. 8vo); Keble's (London 1836, 4 vols. 8vo, and 1841, 3 vols. 8vo; without the Introduction and notes, 2 vols. 8vo). See Hook. *Eccl. Biography*, 6, 126 sq.; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, 1. 22; Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, 2. 64; Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, 2, 98; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 880; Grant, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 443; Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of Engl.* p. 489, 537 sq., 543; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 1, 206; Bennett, *Hist. of the Dissenters*, p. 226; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of English.* p. 29 sq.; Cunningham, *Ch. Principles.* p. 321, 391 sq.; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index, vol. 2); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, 2, 79, 199 sq.; Bickersteth, *Stud. Assist.* p. 245; Tulloch, *English Puritanism and its Leaders*, p. 24 sq.; Calamy, *Hist. Account of my Life*, 1, 235 sq.; 2, 236; *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 27, 467, *Theolog. Magazine*, vol. 2.

### Hooker, Thomas

An eminent Congregational minister, was born July 7, 1586, at Marfield, Leicestershire, Eng. He was successively student and professor at Emanuel College, Cambridge. After preaching a short time in London, he settled in 1626 at Chelmsford as assistant minister. In 1630 he was silenced by archbishop Laud for nonconformity, and enjoined, under a bond of fifty pounds, to come before the Court of High Commission; but forfeiting the bond, he escaped to Holland, and remained three years, when he returned, and sailed, July, 1633, for Boston. He arrived in this country Sept. 4, and was ordained first pastor of the church in Cambridge, Oct. 11. After a stay of nearly three years (June, 1636), in company with Mr. Stone, the teacher in his church, and others, he started into what was then the wilderness, and settled at Hartford. He died at that place July 7, 1647. Hooker published *The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ* (1637) — *The Soul's Implantation; A Treatise containing The Broken Heart, The Preparing of the Heart, The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ, Spiritual Love and Joy* (1637) — *The Soul's Preparation for Christ.* (1638) — *The Unbeliever's Preparation for Christ*, parts 1 and 2 (1638) — *The Soul's Exaltation-embracing Union with Christ, Benefits of Union with Christ, and Justification* (1638) — *The Soul's Vocation, or Effectual Calling to Christ* (1638) — *Ten Particular Rules to be practiced every day by Converted Christians* (1641) — *Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline* (1648) — *Christ's Prayer for Believers; A Series of Discourses founded on John 17, 20-26* (1657) — *The Soul's*

*Possession of Christ — The Soul's Justification; Eleven Sermons on* ~~161~~ <sup>2</sup> *Corinthians* 5:21; ~~1013~~ *Proverbs* 1:28, 29; and a number of occasional sermons. See Neal, *Hist. of Y. England*; Sprague, *Annals*, 2:317; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:192, 298; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 1, 317; *Contrib. to Ecclesiastes Hist. of Connecticut* (1861, 8vo), p. 16., 23, 87, 404, 412.

### Hooper, George, D.D.

An English prelate, born in Worcestershire in 1640, was educated at St. Paul's and Westminster School, and afterwards at Christ Church Oxford. He first became chaplain of Morley, bishop of Winchester, and, later, archbishop Sheldon gave him the living of Lambeth. In 1677 he was appointed almoner of the princess of Orange. On the accession of William, the queen chose Hooper for her chaplain, and he was appointed dean of Canterbury in 1691. In 1703 he was: made bishop of St. Asaph, and in March following was transferred to the see of Bath and Wells. He died at; Barkley, Somersetshire, in September 1727. His principal works are, *A fair and methodical Discussion of the first and great Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, concerning the Infallible Guide* (London 1687) — *De Valentinianorum Haeresi Conjecturae, quibus illius origo ex Egyptiac Atheologia de ducitur* (ibid. 1711) — *An Inquiry into Ancient Measures, etc., and especially the Jewish, with an Appendix concerning our old English Money and Measures of Content* (ib. 1721). There has been but one complete edition of his. *Works*, namely, that published by Dr. Hunt, Hebrew professor (Oxford 1757, fol.). See Todd, *Lives of the Deans of Canterbury*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 124.

### Hooper

(HOPER, or HOUPER), John, an English, bishop, and one of the martyrs of the Reformation, was born in Somersetshire about 1495. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford. Having embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he was obliged to leave the university, and finally the country in 1540. He went to Switzerland, passing most of his time at Zurich. On the accession of Edward VI (1547) he returned to England, and acquired great reputation in London as a preacher. In 1550 he was made bishop of Gloucester, but his repugnance to wearing the vestments of that office caused considerable delay in his consecration. After entering on his duties, he labored with great zeal for the cause of the Reformation. In 1552 he

was appointed bishop of Worcester *in commendam*. In the early part of the reign of Mary (1553), he was arrested and condemned to be burned at the stake for his Protestant zeal. He firmly refused all offers of pardon which required the abandonment of his principles, and though, on account of the wood with which he was burned being green, he suffered the severest torments for nearly an hour, he manifested unshaken fortitude. He died. Feb. 9, 1555. Hooper was the author of a number of sermons and controversial treatises. Among his best works are *A Declaration of Christ and his Office* (1547, 8vo) — *Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ* (1549, 8vo) — *Twelve Lectures on the Creed* (1581, 8vo). Several letters of Hooper are preserved in the archives of Zurich. We have recent reprints, by the Parker Society, of *The Early Writings of Bishop Hooper*, edited by the Rev. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843, 8vo); and of his *Later Writings, with Letters*, etc., edited by the Rev. C. Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852, 8vo). A sketch of his life and writings is given in the *British Reformers*, vol. 4 (London Tract Society). See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 1; Fox, *Book of Martyrs*; Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 123; Burnet, *Hist. of English. Reformation*, vols. 2 and 3; Hook, *Eccl. Biography*, 6, 148; Tulloch (John), *English. Puritanism and its Leaders* (1861, 12mo), p. 8 sq.; Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of English.* p. 408, 446; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches*, p. 8 sq.; Middleton, *Reformers*, 3, 242; Hardwick, *Reform.* p. 215 sq. 409, 425 sq.; Wesley, *Works*, 2, 292; 5, 368; 6, 67, 197; Collier, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 5, 376 sq.; Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* 4, bk. 7, p. 66; *Brit. and For. Rev.* Oct. 1868, p. 881; Soames, *Hist. of the Reform.* 3, 558 sq.; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 1, 51 sq.; Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, p. 133; Punchard (George), *Hist. of Congregationalism* (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 12mo), 2, 194 sq., 297.

### Hoornbeek, Johann

A distinguished Dutch divine, was born at Harlem Nov. 4, 1617. He entered the ministry at Cologne in 1639, and was appointed to Utrecht as minister and professor of theology in 1644. In 1654 he went to Leyden as professor, where he died Sept. 1, 1666. He was a prolific and much esteemed writer. Among those of his works which may yet be of interest to the scholar are, *Epistola ad Joh. Duraeum de Independentismo* (Lugd. Bat. 1659) — *Brevis instit. studii theologici* (Ultraj. 1658) — *Summa controversiarum religionis* (1653), which is still, with Spanheim's, one of the most useful compendiums of reformed polemics — *Socinianismus conjutatts* (Utrecht and Amst. 1650-1664, 3 vols. 4to), an extract of which

was given by Knibble (Leyd. 1690) — *Miscellanea Sacra* (Utrecht, 1677). Of especial value is his *Theologia practica cum irenica* (Ultraj. 1663-1698, 3 vols. 4to: new edit. 1672). — Herzog, *Real Encyclop.* 6, 260; Bayle, *Gen. Dictionary*, s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 6, 149; Staiudlin, *Geschichte d. theol. Moral s. d. Wiederauflebung d. Wissenschaft*, p. 429 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* 8, 603 sq.; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* 2, 287, 293.

## Hope

(ἐλπίς), a term used in Scripture generally to denote the desire and expectation of some good (<490>1 Corinthians 9:10); specially to denote the assured expectation of salvation, and of all minor blessings included in salvation, for this life and the life to come, through the merits of Christ.

(1.) It is one of the three great elements of Christian life and character (<483>1 Corinthians 13:13). Faith is the root, love the fruit-bearing stem, and hope the heaven-reaching crown of the tree of Christian life. Faith appropriates the grace of God in the facts of salvation; love is the animating spirit of our present Christian life; while hope takes hold of the future as belonging to the Lord, and to those who are his. The kingdom of God, past, present, and future, is thus reflected in faith, love, and hope. Hope is joined to faith and love because spiritual life, though present, is yet not accomplished. It stands in opposition to seeing or possessing (<484>Romans 8:24 sq.; <490>1 John 3:2 sq.); but it is not the mere wish or aspiration for liberation and light which is common to all creation (<489>Romans 8:19-22), nor the mere reception of the doctrine of a future life, which may be found even among the heathen philosophers. It is, beyond these, the assurance that the spiritual life, which dwells in us here, will be prolonged into eternity. Hence, in the scriptures of the N.T., Christians are said to have *hope* rather than *hopes* (<485>Romans 15:4, 13; <486>Hebrews 3:6; 6:11,18). The Holy Spirit imparted to believers is the ground and support of their hope (<490>1 Peter 1:3; <423>Acts 23:6; <485>2 Corinthians 5:5; <481>Romans 8:11; 15:13; <485>Galatians 5:5). Hence the notion of hope appeared first in the disciples in its full force and true nature, *after* the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the test we do not find it with its significance (see <487>Hebrews 7:19).

Thus hope is an essential and fundamental element of Christian life, so essential, indeed, that, like faith and love, it can itself designate the essence



of Christianity (<sup><6185></sup>1 Peter 3:15; <sup><58023></sup>Hebrews 10:23). In it the whole glory of the Christian vocation is centered (Ephesians 1, 18; 4:4); it is the real object of the propagation of evangelical faith (<sup><5002></sup>Titus 1:2; <sup><5006></sup>Colossians 1:5, 23), for the most precious possessions of the Christian, the **σωτηρία ἀπολύτρωσις, υἰοθεσία, δικαιοσύνη**, are, in their fulfillment, the object of his hope (<sup><518></sup>1 Thessalonians 5:8 sq.; <sup><4182></sup>Romans 8:23; comp. <sup><3014></sup>Ezekiel 1:14; 4:30; <sup><8015></sup>Galatians 5:5; <sup><5908></sup>2 Timothy 4:8). Unbelievers are expressly designated as those who are without hope (<sup><402></sup>Ephesians 2:12; <sup><5043></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:13), because they are without God in the world, for God is a God of hope (<sup><6153></sup>Romans 15:13; <sup><6021></sup>1 Peter 1:21). But the actual object of hope is Christ, who is himself called **ἡ ἐλπίς**, not only because in him we place all our dependence (the general sense of **ἐλπίς**), but especially because it is in his second coming that the Christian's hope of glory shall be fulfilled (<sup><5001></sup>1 Timothy 1:1; <sup><5002></sup>Colossians 1:27; <sup><5013></sup>Titus 2:13). The *fruit* of hope is that through it we are enabled patiently and steadfastly to bear the difficulties and trials of our present existence, and thus the **ὑπομονή** is a constant accompaniment of the **ἐλπίς**, (<sup><5003></sup>1 Thessalonians 1:3; <sup><4182></sup>Romans 8:25), and even is sometimes put in its place with faith and love (<sup><5002></sup>Titus 2:2; compare <sup><5910></sup>2 Timothy 3:10; <sup><5011></sup>1 Timothy 6:11). As it is the source of the believer's patience in suffering, so it is also the cause of his fidelity and firmness in action, since he knows that his labor "is not in vain in the Lord" (<sup><4558></sup>1 Corinthians 15:58). Christianity is the religion of hope, and it is an essential point of its absolute character, for whatever is everlasting and eternal is absolute. To the Christian, as such, it is therefore not time, but eternity; not the present, but the future life, which is the object of his efforts and hope. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*, 6, 195; Krehl, *N.T. Handwörterbuch*, p. 372.

(2.) "One scriptural mark," says Wesley, "of those who are born of God, is hope. Thus St. Peter, speaking to all the children of God who were then scattered abroad, saith, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope' (<sup><6003></sup>1 Peter 1:3) — **ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν** a *lively* or *living* hope, saith the apostle, because there is also a *dead* hope as well as a *dead* faith; a hope which is not from God, but from the enemy of God and man, as evidently appears by its fruits, for as it is the offspring of pride, so it is the parent of every evil word and work; whereas, every man that hath in him the living hope is 'holy as he that calleth him is holy' — every man that can truly say to his brethren in Christ, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of

God, and we shall see him as he is,' 'purifieth himself even as he is pure.' This hope (termed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, <sup><802></sup>Hebrews 10:22, πληροφορία πίστεως, and elsewhere πληροφορία ἐλπίδος, <sup><801></sup>Hebrews 6:11; in our translation, 'the full assurance of faith, and the full assurance of hope,' expressions the best which our language could afford, although far weaker than those in the original), as described in Scripture, implies, first, the testimony of our own spirit or conscience that we walk 'in simplicity and godly sincerity;' but, secondly and chiefly, the testimony of the Spirit of God 'bearing witness with' or to 'our spirit that we are the children of God,' 'and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.'" The passage, "Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts" (<sup><820></sup>Psalm 21:9), suggests that hope is an inbred sentiment. Considered as such, it implies (a) a future state of existence; (b) that progress in blessedness is the law of our being; (c) that the Christian life is adapted to our constitution. See, besides the works above cited, *Homilist*, 5, 116; Jay, *Sermons*, vol. 2; Tyerman, *Essay on Christian Hope* (London 1816, 8vo); Craig, *Christian Hope* (London 1820, 18mo); Garbett, *Sermons*, 1, 489; Wesley, *Sermons*, 1, 157; Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity* (Bampton Lecture), p. 72, 75; Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 450 sq.; Pye Smith, *Christian Theology*, p. 622 sq.; Pearson, *On the Creed*, 1, 24, 401, 460, 501; Fletcher, *Works* (see Index, vol. 4); *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 10:694; Bates, *Works* (see Index in vol. 4); Harless, *System of Ethics* (Clark's Theol. Libr.), p. 174 sq.; Nitzsch, *System d. christl. Lehrb.*, § 209 sq.

### Hope, Matthew B.

A distinguished Presbyterian minister, and professor at Princeton, was born in Pennsylvania in 1812, and was educated at Jefferson College in that state. He entered the theological seminary at Princeton in 1831, and, after completing his theological course, he also studied medicine, and received the appropriate degree from the University of Pennsylvania: his object, in this additional course of study, being the more completely to prepare himself for the missionary work. He was ordained as a missionary, and stationed at Singapore, India; but his health failing him, he returned home, after a stay of two years only. He was soon afterwards elected assistant secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Education. In 1846 he accepted the office of professor of belles-lettres in the College of New Jersey. In 1854 he was also made professor of political economy. During the fourteen years of his connection with the college, he continued in the diligent and

thorough discharge of the duties of his professorship, with the exception of all interval of about fifteen months, the most of which was passed in Southern Europe, whither he had gone to seek some alleviation of a deeply-seated neuralgic affection. He died suddenly at Princeton, Dec. 17, 1859. He published a *Treatise of Rhetoric* (a syllabus for his college classes), and was a frequent contributor to the *Princeton Review*. — *Presbyterian*, Dec. 1859; *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 90; *Newark Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 1859.

### Höpfner, Heinrich

A German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1582, and educated at the university of his native place, and at Jena and Wittenberg. In 1612 he was appointed professor of logic at Leipsic, and very soon after was called to Jena as professor of theology. He died in 1642. Höpfner wrote *Commentarii in veterem quam vocant logicam* (Leipsic, 1620) *Tractatus in priorum et posteriorum Anal. libr. Aristotelis* (ibid. 1620) — *Saxonia evangelica* (ibid. 1625, 1672): — *De justificatione hominis peccatoris coram Deo* (ibid. 1639 and 1653; new ed. 1728 and often). — *Pierer, Univ. Lex.* 8, 530.

### Hoph'ni

(Heb. *Chophni*, חֹפְנִי; perh. *pugilist*, according to others *client*; Sept. Ὀφνί), the first-named of the two sons of the high-priest Eli (1 Samuel 1:3; 2:34), who fulfilled their hereditary sacerdotal duties at Shiloh. Their brutal rapacity and lust, which seemed to acquire fresh violence with their father's increasing years (1 Samuel 2:22, 12-17), filled the people with disgust and indignation, and provoked the curse which was denounced against their father's house first by an unknown prophet (ver. 27-36), and then by the youthful Samuel in his first divine communication (1 Samuel 3:11-14). They were both cut off in one day in the flower of their age, and the ark, which they had accompanied to battle against the Philistines, was lost on the same occasion (1 Samuel 4:10, 11). B.C. cir. 1130. The predicted ruin and ejection of Eli's house were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon. *SEE ZADOK*. The unbridled licentiousness of these young priests gives us a terrible glimpse into the fallen condition of the chosen people (Ewald, *Gesch.* 2, 538-638). The Scripture calls them "sons of Belial" (1 Samuel 2:12). *SEE ELT*.

## Hoph'ra

(Heb. *Chophra*, [rp] ; Sept. Οὐαφρῆ [compare Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 143j, Vulg. *Ephrec*), or PHARAOH-HOPHRA, king of Egypt in the time of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. B.C. 588. He formed alliance with the former against the latter, and his advance with an Egyptian army constrained the Chaldaeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem (<sup>357b</sup>Jeremiah 37:5); but they soon returned, and took, and destroyed the city. This momentary aid, and the danger of placing reliance on the protection of Hophra, led Ezekiel to compare the Egyptians to a broken reed, which was to pierce the hand of him that leaned upon it (<sup>330b</sup>Ezekiel 39:6, 7). This alliance was, however, disapproved by God; and Jeremiah was authorized to deliver the prophecy contained in his forty-fourth chapter, which concludes with a prediction of Hophra's death, and the subjugation of his country by the Chaldaeans. *SEE EGYPT.*

## Picture for Hoph'ra

This Pharaoh-Hophra is identified with the *Apries* ( Ἀπρίης ), Herod. 2, 161 sq., 169; 4, 159; Diod. Sic. 1, 68; Ἀπρίας, Athen. 13, 560) of ancient authors, and the *Ouaphris* (Οὐάφρις) of Manetho, the eighth king of the twenty-sixth or Saitic dynasty (Eusebius, *Chronicles* 1, 219). Under this identification, we may conclude that his wars with the Syrians and Cyreneans prevented him from affording any great assistance to Zedekiah. Apries is described by Herodotus (2, 169) as a monarch who, in the zenith of his glory, felt persuaded that it was not in the power even of a deity to dispossess him of his kingdom, or to shake the stability of his sway; and this account of his arrogance fully accords with that contained in the Bible. Ezekiel (29:3) speaks of this king as “the great dragon that lieth in the midst of the rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself.” His overthrow and subsequent captivity and death are foretold with remarkable precision by Jeremiah (44:30): “I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hands of his enemies, and into the hands of them that seek his life.” This was brought about by a revolt of the troops, who placed Amasis at their head, and, after various conflicts, took Apries prisoner. B.C. 569. He was for a time kept in easy captivity by Amasis, w-ho wished to spare his life; but he was at length constrained to give him up to the vengeance of his enemies, by whom he was strangled (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 209 sq.). See Raphel, *De Pharaone Hophra*, Luneb. 1734.) *SEE PHARAOH.*

## Hôpital (also Hospital), Michel de L'

A distinguished French statesman and opponent of the Inquisition, was born at Aigueperse, in Auvergne, about 1504. He studied law at Toulouse, and first became known as an advocate in the Parliament of Paris; and after discharging various public functions, he became chancellor of France in 1560, during the minority of Francis II. That country at this time was torn by contending factions. "The Guises, in particular, were powerful, ambitious, and intensely Catholic; and when one of the family, the Cardinal de Lorraine, wished to establish the Inquisition in the country, Hôpital boldly and firmly opposed it, and may be said to have saved France from that detestable institution. He summoned the states general, which had not met for 80 years, and, being supported by the mass of moderate Catholics, he forced the Guises to yield." His speech at the opening of the assembly was worthy of his wise and magnanimous spirit: "Let us do away," said he, "with those diabolical words of Lutherans, Huguenots, and Papists names of party and sedition; do not let us change the fair appellation of Christians." An ordinance was passed abolishing arbitrary taxes, regulating the feudal authority of the nobles, and correcting the abuses of the judicial system. He also secured various benefits for the persecuted Huguenots in various ways, but especially by the edict of pacification, which granted to the Protestants the free exercise of their religion (issued January 17, 1562). In 1568 he was instrumental in establishing the peace of Longjumeau, when, on account of his opposition to Catharine de Medicis, who was inclined to break the compact, he was suspected of being a Huguenot. Finding it impossible to prevent the execution of Catharine's plans, he resigned his position (October 7, 1568), and retired to his estate at Vignay, near Etampes. He died May 13, 1573. Hôpital's family had all embraced the Protestant faith, and this was well known even at court while he occupied his prominent position there. But his character was so blameless that he held his position for some time even during the fearful contests preparatory to the massacre of St. Bartholomew. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 31, 86 sq.; Chambers, *Encyclop.* 5, 414 sq.; Pierer, *Univers.* — *Lex.* 8, 334; Bayle, *History Dict.* p. 505 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 283 sq.; Raumer, *Gesch. Europa's*, 2; Soldan, *Gesch. d. Prot. in Frankf.* 2. **SEE HUGUENOTS.** (J. H. W.)

### Hopkins, Daniel, D.D.

A Congregational minister, was born Oct. 16, 1734, at Waterbury, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1758. After being licensed, he preached in Halifax, N. S., a short time. In 1775 he was chosen member of the Provincial Congress, and in 1778 one of the Council of the Conventional Government. He was ordained pastor of the Third Church in Salem Nov. 18, 1778, and remained in this place until his death, Dec. 14, 1814. He published two or three occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 581.

### Hopkins, Ezekiel, D.D.

An English prelate and author, was born at Sandford, Devonshire, in 1633. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and, after holding a short time the chaplaincy to the college; he became minister of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, and later of St. Mary's, Exeter. He finally removed to Ireland with his father-in-law, lord Robartes (afterwards earl of Truro), and was made dean of Raphoe in 1669, and bishop of the same place in 1671. He was transferred to Londonderry in 1681, but in consequence of the Roman Catholic troubles in Ireland he returned to England in 1688, and was appointed minister of Aldermanbury, London, in 1689. He died June 22, 1690. In his doctrines he was a Calvinist. His works are remarkable for clearness, strength of thought, originality, and pureness of style; the most important are, *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer* (1691) — *An Exposition of the Ten Commandments* (1692, 4to) — *The Doctrine of the two Covenants* (London 1712, 8vo); and *Works, now first collected, with Life of the Author*, etc., by Josiah Pratt (London 1809, 4 vols. 8vo). See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol. 2; Prince, *Worthies of Devon*; Chalmers, *Genesis Biogr. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 128; Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliog.* 1, 1535. (J. H.W.)

### Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., LL.D.

Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Vermont, was born of English parents in Dublin, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1792, and came to this country when about eight years old. He was educated chiefly by his mother. In 1817 he entered the legal profession, but six years later he quitted the bar for the ministry, and was ordained in 1824 as rector of Trinity Church, Pittsburg. In 1827 he was a prominent candidate for the office of assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, but as the vote of Mr. Hopkins was to decide between himself and Dr. H. U. Onderdonk, another

candidate, he cast his vote in favor of the latter. In 1831 he became assistant minister at Trinity Church, Boston, and professor of divinity in the Episcopal Theological Seminary of Massachusetts. In 1832 he was elected bishop of Vermont, and was consecrated Oct. 31. At the same time he accepted also the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Burlington, Vt., which he held until 1856. Besides this, he also established a school for boys, employing poor clergymen and candidates for orders as teachers. His heavy expenses from this enterprise embarrassed him seriously for many years. After relinquishing this school, he projected and established the "Vermont Episcopal Institute," a semitheological school, over which he presided until his death, January 9, 1868. In 1867, bishop Hopkins was present at the Pan-Anglican Synod held in Lambeth, and took a prominent part in its proceedings. In the dissensions dividing the Anglican Church he was a decided champion of the High-Church party, and refused to sign the protest of a majority of the American bishops against Romanizing tendencies. Several of the posthumous works of bishop Hopkins will be published by one of his sons. Bishop Hopkins was one of the most learned men of his denomination. He had remarkable versatility of mind, and was a persevering and successful student in the field of theology. Indeed, "it was hard to find a highway or byway of ingenious investigation where he has not left his footprint." The great mistake of his life, and one which he undoubtedly regretted before his death, was his apology for the institution of human slavery. But we have every reason to believe that the bishop was sincere in what he preached, and that, notwithstanding this failing, he was a devout and consistent man of God. He was a voluminous writer. Besides a number of pamphlets, sermons, and addresses, he published *Christianity vindicated in a series of seven discourses on the external Evidences of the V. Test.* (Burlington, 1833, 12mo) — *The primitive Creed examined and explained* (1834, 12mo) — *The primitive Ch. compared with the P. E. Ch.* (1835, 12mo) — *The Ch. of Rome in her primitive purity compared with the Ch. of Rome at the pres. day* (1839, 12mo) — *Causes, Principles, and Results of the Brit. Reform.* (Philadelphia 1844, 12mo) *Hist. of the Confessionals* (N. Y. 1850, 12mo) — *Refutation of Milner's End of Controversy* (1854, 2 vols. 12mo). An answer has recently been published by Kenrick, *Vindication of the Catholic Church* (Baltimore, 1855, 12mo). Bishop Hopkins's last works are a little *brochure* on the law of ritualism — an argument based on scriptural and historical grounds in behalf of the beauty of holiness in the public services of his Church; and a *History of the Church in verse for Sunday-schools.* — *Amer. Ch. Review*, April, 1868, p.

160; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, p. 897. (J. H. W.)

### Hopkins, Samuel, D.D.

A noted Calvinistic divine, was born at Waterbury, Conn., Sept. 17, 1721, and was at once set apart by his father for the ministry of the Gospel. He entered Yale College in September 1737. During his collegiate course the town of New Haven was stirred by the preaching of Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. The students were deeply affected, and Hopkins was one of the converted. After graduation he commenced the study of theology with president Edwards, and, though not an imitator of the president, he was more powerfully influenced by him than by any other man. In 1741 he began to preach, but with great embarrassment and despondency. During his first few months of probation he declined five invitations for settlement. On Dec. 23, 1743, he was ordained over an infant church of five members in Housatonic, now Great Barrington, Mass. He remained in this pastorate twenty-five years. He often preached extemporaneously, and was indefatigable in parochial labor. He gave offence to his people by his practice of reading portions of Scripture in the Sabbath services, a practice which was then unusual in New England. From 1744 to 1763 the prosperity of the church was more or less interrupted by the French and Indian war. Hopkins was obliged often to remove his family, and sometimes to go himself, for safety from Great Barrington. His criticisms on the military movements of the British army are quite acute: "Our generals are very grand. The baggage of each one amounts to five cartloads. Mighty preparations, but nothing done." On the banks of the Monongahela Washington was uttering almost the same words to general Braddock. His church, during his pastorate, increased in membership from five to 116. He labored faithfully among the Indians of his vicinity, and spent much of his time in personal intercourse with Jonathan Edwards, then of Stockbridge. He became unpopular with some members of his parish on account of his strict terms of Church communion, his bold assertions of Calvinistic doctrine, and his staunch patriotism. He was especially disliked by the British Tories. Some of his parishioners would give nothing for his support, and others had nothing to give. In great poverty, he left his parish in 1769. In April 1770, he was installed pastor of the church at Newport, which town was then a port of commercial importance, and for many years the rival of New York. During the first year of his pastorate Hopkins enjoyed a visit from Whitefield. His church in



Newport flourished until the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. In 1776 the town was captured by the British, and remained in their possession three years. Hopkins continued at his post until the last moment, and then was compelled to flee. He spent the interval in assisting his friend, Dr. Samuel Spring, of Newburyport (see *Life and Times of Gardiner Spring* [N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo], 1, 12 sq.), and in supplying destitute churches in Connecticut. During his absence his people were scattered, and his meetinghouse nearly demolished. He returned in 1779, and began to preach in a private room, but soon received aid from his friends in Boston and Newburyport for the restoration of his church edifice. He rejected eligible offers of settlement in other places, and remained faithful to his people, receiving no regular salary, but depending on precarious and meager contributions.

As soon as Hopkins commenced his pastoral labors at Newport he began to agitate the subject of slavery. At that time Newport was the great slave-market of New England. Hopkins affirmed that the town was built up by the blood of the Africans. Some of the wealthiest members of his church were slave-traders, and many of his congregation were slave owners. He astonished them by his first sermon against the slave system. The poet Whittier says: "It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of his universe, looked down upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport rising up before his slaveholding congregation, and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive, and the opening of the prison-doors to them that were bound." Only one family left his church; the others freed their slaves. He continued to preach on the subject, and made himself intensely unpopular throughout Rhode Island. In 1776 he published his celebrated *Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans*, together with his *Address to Slaveholders*, copies of which were sent to all the members of the Continental Congress, and to prominent men throughout the country. It was reprinted by the New York Manumission Society as late as 1785. Hopkins entered into correspondence with Granville Sharp, Zachary Macaulay, and other English abolitionists. From them he borrowed the idea of colonizing the blacks; and he devised a colonization scheme, in which he manifested a practical statesmanship unusual for a clergyman. When the Federal Constitution was framed in 1787, he pointed to the clause recognizing slavery in the United States, and said, "I fear this is an Achan, which will bring a curse, so that we cannot prosper." Of a movement so

vast as the anti-slavery reform in the United States no one man can claim to be the author; but Dr. Hopkins was most certainly the pioneer in that movement.

It is not, however, as a philanthropist, but as a theologian, that Hopkins is generally known. In his extreme indigence he writes: "I have been saved from anxiety about living, and have had a thousand times less care and trouble in the world than if I had had a great abundance. Being unconnected with the great and rich, I have had more time to attend to my studies, and particularly have had leisure to write my 'System of Divinity,' which I hope will not prove useless." By this system, and by his various independent treatises, he gave occasion for the name "*Hopkinsian*," as applied to the views of eminent New England divines. He regarded himself as an Edwardean. He had been the most intimate of president Edwards's companions, had revised the president's manuscripts, had carefully edited some of them, and was more exactly acquainted than any other man with the president's original speculations. He wrote the first memoir of Edwards, of which the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says, it is "equal in simplicity, though by no means in anything else, to the most exquisite biographies of Izaak Walton."

The prominent tenets of Hopkinsianism are the following:

1. All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence.
2. All sin consists in selfishness.
3. There are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate.
4. The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral.
5. A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though it should cast him off forever.
6. God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin.
7. The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to promote the general good.
8. Repentance is before faith in Christ.

**9.** Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have, and are accountable for, no sins but personal.

**10.** Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them.

Dr. Nathanael Emmons (q.v.), who was the most eminent defender of Hopkinsianism, and who described it as characterized by the ten preceding articles, added the following (see Park, *Memoir of Emmons*) as his own views, and as supplemental to those of his friend Hopkins:

**1.** Holiness and sin consist in free voluntary exercises.

**2.** Men act freely under the divine agency.

**3.** The least transgression of the divine law deserves eternal punishment.

**4.** Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things.

**5.** God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works.

**6.** Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness.

**7.** Preachers of the Gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately.

**8.** Men are active, not passive, in regeneration.

Some of these eight propositions are distinctly avowed, others more or less clearly implied in the writings of Hopkins. Emmons regarded Hopkinsianism as in some respects high and intense Calvinism; as, in other respects (the doctrine of general atonement for example), moderate Calvinism; and as, on the whole, "consistent Calvinism."

Amid his labors as a reformer and theologian, Dr. Hopkins vigorously discharged his parochial duties, until he was struck with paralysis, in his seventy-eighth year. He continued to preach during the next four years. With a revival of religion his ministry had commenced, with a revival also it ended—the rising and the setting of his sun. He wrote out a list of his

congregation, and offered a separate prayer for each individual. Thirty-one conversions followed. After his discourses on the 16th of Oct. 1803, he exclaimed, "Now I have done; I can preach no more." He staggered from the pulpit to his bed, from which he never rose. He died on the 20th of December 1803.

In person Dr. Hopkins was tall and vigorous; in his movements dignified, though unwieldy. His head was large and square, and his face beamed with intelligence. The movements of his mind were like those of his body, powerful, but often clumsy. Inflexible faithfulness to what he deemed his duty, with utter self-sacrifice for the right, was his main characteristic. "Love to being in general" was with him not the mere byword of a sect, but the enthusiastic purpose of his life. He had not the temperament, which inspires enthusiasm, and he had but little tact in personal intercourse with men; but in the depths of his indigence he was true to himself, and showed all the courage of a Hampden. He studied hardly ever less than fourteen hours a day, and sometimes even as many as eighteen in a little room of eleven feet by seven. Every Saturday he fasted, and thus gained spiritual strength for the toils of earth by communion with Heaven. He labored for Indians and selfish white men; for poor Negroes who had then no other friend; and for theological science, which gave him respect, but little *bread* — *vixit propter alios*. In 1854 his *Works* (before repeatedly reprinted) were published by the Massachusetts Doctrinal Tract Society (3 vols. 8vo), containing over 2000 pages, with a *Memoir* by Prof. Edward A. Park of 266 pages.

The character and writings of Dr. Hopkins have recently been depicted for general readers in a very striking way in Mrs. Stowe's *Minister's Wooing*. See also *Congreg. Quar. Rev.* 1864, p. 1 sq.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctr.* 2, 436, 438; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctr.* 1, 383, 408; 2, 25, 81, 489; Buchanan, *Justification*, p. 190. For the diffusion of Hopkinsianism and its later modifications, **SEE NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY**. On the relation of Hopkins's theory to the orthodox view of redemption, see Bangs, *Errors of Hopkinsianism* (N. York, 12mo); Hodgson, *New Divinity Examined* (N. York, 12mo); art. Edwards, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.; Christian Examiner*, 1843, p. 169 sq.; Adams, *View of all Religions*, p. 168; Spring, *On the Nature of Duty*; Ely, *Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism* (N. Y. 1811); *Bib. Sac.* April, 1852, p. 448 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 633, — 671; July, 1862 (art. 6); *New Englander*, 1868, p. 284 sq.; *Life*

*and Times of Gardiner Spring* (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo), 2 5 sq. (W. E. P.)

### Hopkins, William, 1

An English divine, was born at Evesham, Worcestershire, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He entered the ministry in 1675, and, after holding several minor appointments, was made vicar of Lindridge in 1686, and in 1697 master of St. Oswald's Hospital, Worcester. He died in 1700. He published *Sermons* (1683, 4to) — *Bartram* (or *Rartram*), *on the Body and Blood of the Lord* (2nd ed. 1688) — *Animad. on Johnson's Answer to Jovian* (London 1691, 8vo) — *Latin translated of A Saxon Tract on the Burial places of the Saxon Saints* (in Hickes's *Septentrional Grammar*, Oxford 1705). After his death, Dr. Geo. Hickes published *Seventeen Sermons, with Life* (London 1708, 8vo).

### Hopkins, William, 2

A Church of England clergyman, but an Arian in theology, was born at Monmouth in 1706. He entered All Souls College, Oxford, in 1724, and became vicar of Bolney, Sussex, in 1731. In 1756 he became master of the grammar school of Cuckfield, and died in 1786. His principal works are *An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People* on the doctrine of the Trinity (London 1754, 12mo) — *Exodus, A Correct Translation, with Notes critical and explanatory* (London 1784, 4to). He published also several anonymous pamphlets against compulsory subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 886; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, p. 1537.

### Hopkinsianism

A name given to the theological system of Dr. Samuel Hopkins (q.v.).

### Hoplotheca

(Ὁπλοθήκη, an *armory*) is the title of a book which contains the decisions of the Church fathers against heretical doctrines, and which was used to controvert such doctrines. It was most probably prepared at the request of the emperor Emanuel Comenus. — Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* 2, 347. (J. H.W.)

## Hopton, Susannah

A religious writer, born in Staffordshire, England, in 1627, was the wife of Richard Hopton, a Welsh judge. She became at one time a Roman Catholic, but, realizing her mistake, she returned to the Protestant Church. She died in 1709. Her writings are all on religious topics, intended to lead the reader to a devout and holy life. They are *Daily Devotions* (London 1673, 12mo; 5th ed. 1713) — *Meditations*, etc. (publ. by N. Spinckes, London 1717, 8vo). — She also remodeled the *Devotions in the ancient Way of Offices* (originally by John Austin, who died in 1669), with a preface by Dr. George Hicckes (q.v.) (1717, 8vo; new ed. 1846, 8vo). — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 887; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* 1, 1538.

## Hor

(Heb. *id.* **r/h** or **rh** Sept. “Ωρ), the name of two eminent mountains (**rh**; **rh**i.e. “Hor the mountain,” remarkable as the only case in which the name comes first; Sept. “Ωρ τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. *Mons Hor*). The word Hor is regarded by the lexicographers as an archaic form of *ar*, the usual Heb. term for “mountain” (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 391 *b*; Ffirst, *Handw.* s.v.), so that the meaning of the name is simply “the mountain of mountains,” as the Sept. have it in one case (see below, No. 2) τὸ ὄρος τὸ ὄρος; Vulg. *mons altissimus*; and Jerome (*Ep. ad Fabiolam*) *non in monte simpliciter sed in montis monte*. **SEE MOUNTAIN.**

**1.** An eminent mountain of Arabia Petraea, on the confines of Idumaea, and forming part of the mountain chain of Seir or Edom. It is first mentioned in Scripture in connection with the circumstances recorded in <sup>(**Q12**)</sup>Numbers 20:22-29. It was “on the boundary line” (<sup>(**Q13**)</sup>Numbers 20:23) or “at the edge” (<sup>(**Q37**)</sup>Numbers 33:37) of the land of Edom. It was the next halting-place of the people after Kadesh (<sup>(**Q12**)</sup>Numbers 20:22; 33:37), and they quitted it for Zalmonah (<sup>(**Q34**)</sup>Numbers 33:41), in the road to the Red Sea (<sup>(**Q14**)</sup>Numbers 21:4). It was during the encampment at Mt. Hor that Aaron was gathered to his fathers (<sup>(**Q37**)</sup>Numbers 33:37-41). At the command of Jehovah, he, his brother, and his son ascended the mountain, in the presence of the people, “in the eyes of all the congregation.” The garments, and with the garments the office, of high priest were taken from Aaron and put upon Eleazar, and Aaron died there in the top of the mountain. In the circumstances of the ascent of the height to die, and in the marked exclusion from the Promised Land, the end of the one brother

resembled the end of the other; but in the presence of the two survivors, and of the gazing crowd below, there is a striking difference between this event and the solitary death of Moses. *SEE AARON*. The Israelites passed the mountain several times in going up ‘and down the Arabah; and the station Mosera (<sup>4506</sup>Deuteronomy 10:6) must have been at the foot of the mount (<sup>4520</sup>Deuteronomy 32:50). *SEE MOSERA*.

The mountain now identified with Mount Hor is the most conspicuous in the whole range of Mount Seir, and at this day bears the name of Mount Aaron (*Jebel-Illarun*). It is in N. lat. 30° 18’, E. long. 35° 33’, about midway between the Dead Sea and the AElanitic Gulf. It may be open to question if this is really the Mount Hor on which Aaron died, seeing that the whole range of Seir was anciently called by that name; yet, from its height, and the remarkable manner in which it rises among the surrounding rocks, it seems not unlikely to have been the chosen scene of the high-priest’s death (Kinneir, p. 127). Accordingly, Stanley observes that Mount Hor “is one of the very few spots connected with the wanderings of the Israelites which admit of no reasonable doubt” (S. and P. p. 86). It is almost unnecessary to state that it is situated on the eastern side of the great valley of the Arabah, the highest and most conspicuous of the whole range of the sandstone mountains of Edom, having close beneath it, on its eastern side though, strange to say, the two are not visible to each other — the mysterious city of Petra. The tradition has existed from the earliest date. Josephus does not mention the name of Hor (*Ant.* 4, 4, 7), but he describes the death of Aaron as taking place “on a very high mountain which surrounded the metropolis of the Arabs,” which latter “was formerly called *Arke* (<sup>4506</sup>Ἀρκη), but now Petra.” In the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome it is *Ormons* — “A mountain in which Aaron died, close to the city of Petra.” When it was visited by the Crusaders (see the quotations in Robinson, *Researches*, 2:521) the sanctuary was already on its top, and there is little doubt that it was then what it is now — the *Jebel Nebi-Harlun*, “the mountain of the prophet Aaron.”

## Picture for Hor

Of the geological formation of Mount Hor we have no very trustworthy accounts. The general structure of the range of Edom, of which it forms the most prominent feature, is new red sandstone, displaying itself to an enormous thickness. Above that is the Jura limestone, and higher still the cretaceous beds, which latter in Mount Seir are reported to be 3500 feet

thick (Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 1, 194). Through these deposited strata longitudinal dikes of red granite and porphyry have forced their way, running nearly north and south, and so completely solidifying the neighboring sandstone as often to give it the look of a primitive rock. To these combinations are due the extraordinary colors for which Petra is so famous. One of the best descriptions of the mountain itself is that given by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 433 sq.). It is said to be entirely sandstone, in very horizontal strata (Wilson, 1, 290). Its height, according to the latest measurements, is 4800 feet (Eng.) above the Mediterranean, that is to say, about 1700 feet above the town of Petra, 4000 above the level of the Arabah, and more than 6000 above the Dead Sea (Roth, in Peterman's *Mittheil.* 1858, 1, 3). The mountain is marked far and near by its double top, which rises like a huge castellated building from a lower base, and is surmounted by the circular dome of the tomb of Aaron, a distinct white spot on the dark red surface of the fountain (Laborde, p. 143). This lower base is the "plain of Aaron," beyond which Burckhardt was, after all his toils, prevented from ascending (*Syria*, p. 431). "Out of this plain, culminating in its two summits, springs the red sandstone mass, from its base upwards rocky and naked, not a bush or a tree to relieve the rugged and broken corners of the sandstone blocks which compose it. On ascending this mass a little plain is found to lie between the two peaks, marked by a white cypress, and not unlike the celebrated plain of the cypress under the summit of Jebel Musa, traditionally believed to be the scene of Elijah's vision. The southernmost of the two, on approaching, takes a conical form. The northernmost is truncated, and crowned by the chapel of Aaron's tomb." The chapel or mosque is a small square building, measuring inside about 28 feet by 33 (Wilson, 1, 295), with its door in the S.W. angle. It is built of rude stones, in part broken columns; all of sandstone, but fragments of granite and marble lie about. Steps lead to the flat roof of the chapel, from which rises a white dome as usual over a saint's tomb. The interior of the chapel consists of two chambers, one below the other. The upper one has four large pillars and a stone chest, or tombstone, like one of the ordinary slabs in churchyards, but larger and higher, and rather bigger at the top than the bottom. At its head is a high round stone, on which sacrifices are made, and which retained, when Stephens saw it, the marks of the smoke and blood of recent offerings. "On the slab are Arabic inscriptions, and it is covered with shawls chiefly red. One of the pillars is hung with votive offerings of beads, etc., and two ostrich eggs are suspended over the chest. Steps in the northwest angle



lead down to the lower chamber, which is partly in the rock, but plastered. It is perfectly dark. At the end, apparently under the stone chest above, is a recess guarded by a grating. Within this is a rude protuberance, whether of stone or plaster was not ascertainable, resting on wood, and covered by a ragged pall. This lower recess is no doubt the tomb, and possibly ancient. What is above is only the artificial monument, and certainly modern." In one of the walls of this chamber is a "round, polished black stone," one of those mysterious stones of which the prototype is the Kiaaba at Mecca, and which, like that, would appear to be the object of great devotion (Martineau, p. 419 sq.).

The chief interest of Mount Hor will always consist in the prospect from its summit — the last view of Aaron — "that view which was to him what Pisgah was to his brother" (Ortlob, *De Morte Aaronis*, Lips. 1704). It is described at length by Irby (p. 134), Wilson (1, 292-9), Martineau (p. 420), and is well summed up by Stanley in the following words: "We saw all the main points on which his eye must have rested. He looked over the valley of the Arabah counter-sected by its hundred watercourses, and beyond, over the white mountains of the wilderness they had so long traversed; and at the northern edge of it there must have been visible the heights through which the Israelites had vainly attempted to force their way into the Promised Land. This was the western view. Close around him on the east were the rugged mountains of Edom, and far along the horizon the wide downs of Mount Seir, through which the passage had been denied by the wild tribes of Esau who hunted over their long slopes. On the north lay the mysterious Dead Sea, gleaming from the depths of its profound basin (Stephens, *Incidents*). "A dreary moment and a dreary scene such it must have seemed to the aged priest... The peculiarity of the view is the combination of wide extension with the scarcity of marked features. Petra is shut out by intervening rocks. But the survey of the Desert on one side, and the mountains of Edom on the other, is complete; and of these last the great feature is the mass of red, bald-headed sandstone rocks, intersected, not by valleys, but by deep seams" (*S. and Pal.* p. 87). Though Petra itself is entirely shut out, one outlying building if it may be called a building is visible, — that which goes by the name of the *Deir*, or Convent. Professor Stanley has thrown out a suggestion on the connection between the two, which is well worth further investigation. (See Robinson, *Researches*, 2:548, 579, 651.) The impression received on the spot is that Aaron's death took place in the small basin between the two peaks, and that the

people were stationed either on the plain, at the base of the peaks, or at that part of the *wady Abu-Kusheybeh* from which the top is commanded. Josephus says that the ground was sloping downwards (*κατάντες ἦν τὸ χωρίον*; *Ant.* 4:4, 7). But this may be the mere general expression of a man who had never been on the spot. (See Bertou, *Le mont Hor*, Pat, 1860.)

2. A mountain entirely distinct from the preceding, named in <sup>Q647</sup>Numbers 34:7, 8, only as one of the marks of the northern boundary of the land which the children of Israel were about to conquer. By many it has been regarded as a designation of Mount Casius, but this is rather the northern limit of Syria. The Targum Pseudojon renders Mount Hor by *Unzanos*, probably intending Amana. The latter is also the reading of the Talmud (*Götting*, 8, quoted by Fürst, s.v.), in which it is connected with the Amana named in <sup>Q048</sup>Song of Solomon 4:8. But the situation of this Amana is nowhere indicated by them. It cannot have any connection with the Amana or Abana River, which flowed through Damascus, as that is quite away from the position required in the passage. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 25), after Parchi (in Benj. of Tudela, p. 413 sq.), identifies it with *Jebel Nuria*, south of Tripoli, but on frivolous grounds; nor was the mount in question on the Mediterranean, and Palestine did not extend so far north. The original is *rh̄h; rh̄o* *mount of the mountain*, i.e. by a common Hebrew idiom, *the Mountain*, by way of eminence, i.q. the lofty mountain; Sept. τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. *mons altissimus*; and therefore probably only denotes the prominent mountain of that vicinity, i.e. Lebanon, or at most Mount Hermon, which is an offshoot of the Lebanon range. It can hardly be regarded here as a proper name. The northern boundary started from the sea; the first point in it was Mount Hor, and the second the entrance of Hamath. Since Sidon was subsequently allotted to the most northern tribe — Asher, and was, as far as we know, the most northern town so allotted, it would seem probable that the northern boundary would commence at about that point; that is, opposite to where the great range of Lebanon breaks down to the sea. The next landmark, the entrance to Hamath, seems to have been determined by Mr. Porter as the pass at Kalat el-Husn, close to Hums, the ancient Hamath — at the other end of the range of Lebanon. Surely “Mount Hor,” then, can be nothing else than the great chain of Lebanon itself. Looking at the massive character and enormous height of the range, it is very difficult to suppose that any individual peak or mountain is intended and not the whole mass, which takes nearly a straight course

between the two points just named, and includes below it the great plain of the Buka'a, and the whole of Palestine properly so called.

### Hore Canoncae, etc.

*SEE BREVIARY; SEE HOURS, CANONICAL;* etc.

### Ho'ram

(Heb. *Horam'*, *μῆροῦ* lofty; Sept. Ὠράμ 5. r. Ἐλάμ, Αἰλόμ), the king of Gezer, who, coming to the relief of Lachish, was overthrown by Joshua (~~6013~~ Joshua 10:33). B.C. 1618.

### Horapollo, or Horus Apollo

An Egyptian priest, and author of a treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. Several writers of this name are mentioned by Suidas, Stephanus of Byzantium under Phenebethis, Photius (p. 536, ed. Bekker), and Eustathius (Homer, *Od.* δ), but it is doubtful which of them was actually the author of the treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. The probability is that the work was originally written in the Egyptian language, and translated into Greek by Philip Horus was the name of one of the Egyptian deities, who was considered by the Greeks to be the same as Apollo (Herod. 2:141-156). We learn from Lucian (*Pro Imag.* § 27) that the Egyptians were frequently called by the names of their gods. But, whatever may be thought respecting the author, it is evident that the work was written after the Christian sera, since it contains allusions to the philosophical tenets of the Gnostics. The value of this work in interpreting existing hieroglyphics has been variously estimated. Champollion, Leemans, and other recent scholars esteem it more highly than former critics did. It was printed for the first time by Aldus (Venice, 1505), with the Fables of Esop. The best editions are by Mercer (1551), Hoeschelius (1595), De Pauw (1727), and Leemans (Amst 1834). The last discussed in his Introduction tie date and authorship of the work. See *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 166; Bunsen, *Egyptens, Stelle in d. Weltgesch.* 1, 402; Champollion, *Precis du Systeme Hieroglyphique des Anciens Egyptiens*, p. 347 sq. *SEE HIEROGLYPHICS.*

### Horayoth

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Horb, Johann Heinrich

A distinguished German Pietist, brother-in-law and co-worker of Spener, was born at Colmar, Alsace, June 11, 1645. He studied at the universities of Strasburg, Jena, Wittenberg, and Cologne, afterwards traveled through the Netherlands, England, and France, and finally returned to Strasburg in 1670. In 1671 he received an appointment as minister at Birkenfeld, and in 1673 at Trarbach. Here the boldness with which he presented his so-called pietistic views disturbed the equanimity of the orthodox authorities, and he was obliged to resign. He next became pastor at Windsheim, Franconia, and in 1685 accepted a call as pastor of St. Nicholas Church, Hamburg, where he found himself associated with two other pietists, John Winkler and Abraham Hinkelmann. Their joint teachings created great excitement, which culminated when, in 1693, Horb published, under the title of *D. Klugheit (d. Gerechten*, a translation of Pairet's excellent pamphlet, *Les vrais principes de l'education Chretienne des enfants*.

The agitation became so violent that in 1694 he was formally suspended, after which he retired to Steinbeck, where he died in Jan. 1695. He published *Hist. Origeniana*, etc. (Frankf. 1670, 4to) — *Hist. Manichaeorum* (Argent. 1670, 4to) — *Disquis. de ultima origine haereseos Simonis Magi* (Leipz. 1669, 4to; also in Vogt's *Bibl. hist. haeresiol.* 1, 308 sq.) — *Hist. haeres. Unitarior.* (Frankfort, 1671, 4to); and a collection of sermons, *D. Leiden Jesu Christi* (Hamburg, 1700). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie* 6, 261; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 847 sq.; Moller, *Cimbr. literata*, 2, 355 sq.; Walch, *Relig. Streitigkeit. in d. luth. Kirche*, 1, 615 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengeschichte*, 4, 526 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Horbery, Matthew, D.D.

An English divine, was born at Haxay, Lincolnshire, in 1707; educated at Lincoln College, and elected fellow of Magdalen College. He became successively vicar of Eccleshall canon of Lichfield, vicar of Hanbury, and rector of Staielake. He died in 1773. He was greatly respected as a sound, able, and learned theologian, and an amiable and excellent man. His sermons were praised by Dr. Johnson; they are written in nervous, animated language, yet with great simplicity. Van Mildert classes them "among the best compositions of English divines." His *Works*, including the *Sermons*, and an *Essay on the Eternity of Future Punishments*, have

been collected and published (Oxford, 1828. 2 vols. 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1539; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 6, 150; Waterland, *Works.*, 1, 116, 242, 254; 6, 416 sq.

### Horch, Heinrich, S.T.D.

A German Pietist and Mystic, was born at Eschwege, Hessen, in 1652. He studied theology and medicine at Marburg, where he came under the influence of the great follower of Spener (q.v.), Theodor Untereyk, and embraced the doctrines of the Mystics. He also studied the Cartesian philosophy with much interest. In 1683 he was appointed minister at Heidelberg, in 1685 court preacher at Kreuznach, but in 1687 he returned again to Heidelberg. At the university of that place he obtained the degree of doctor of theology. In 1689 he went to Frankfort as minister of a Reformed Church, and in 1790 was made professor of theology at Hernborn. By his firm adherence, however, to the Mystic Arnold (q.v.), and his peculiar views of theology, holding, e.g. that divine revelations still continue, that the symbolical books are useless, that the Eucharist and baptism are unnecessary, etc., he finally lost his position (1698). He afterwards traveled about, preaching in city halls and in cemeteries. At times he even entered churches, and preached in spite of the remonstrances of the ministers. He was arrested for this conduct in 1699, and became partially insane. He recovered, however, towards the close of the year 1700, and, by the interposition of his friends, he was granted a pension in 1708, which was continued until his death, August 5, 1729. Horch was also a Millenarian; he likewise demanded a second and more complete reformation of the Church, advocated celibacy, though he did not think the married life sinful, and is said to have been a member of the Philadelphia Society (q.v.), founded in 1696 by Jane Leade. He wrote a number of works, of which a complete list is given by Jocher (*Gel. Lex.*, Adelung's Supplem. 2, 2138 sq.), and of which the *Mystische u. Prophetische Bibel* (Marb. 1712, 4to) is especially celebrated as the forerunner of the Berleburg Bible (q.v.). See Haas (G. Fr. L.), *Lebensbeschreib. d. Dr. Horch* (Cassel, 1769, 8vo); Gobel (M.), *Geschichte d. christliche Lebens in d. rhein. westph. ev. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), 2, 741-51; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 6, 262 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 349 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 2, 369. (J. H. W.)

## Ho'reb

(Heb. *Choreb'*, **brĕj** or **brĕp** *desert*; Sept. **Χωρήβ** or **Χώρηβ**; occurs ~~<BR>~~Exodus 3:1; 17:6; 33:6; Dent. 1, 2, 6, 19; 4:10, 15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 29:1; ~~<18>~~1 Kings 8:9; 19:8; ~~<450>~~2 Chronicles 5:10; ~~<144>~~Psalms 104:19; ~~<301>~~Malachi 4:4; Ecclus. 48:7), according to some, a lower part or peak of Mount Sinai, so called at the present day, from which one ascends towards the south the summit of Sinai (Jebel Musa), properly so called (so Gesenius and others after Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 566 sq.); but, according to others, a general name for the whole mountain, of which Sinai was a particular summit (so Hengstenberg, *Auth. des Pentat.* 2, 396; Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, 1, 177, 551). **SEE SINAI.**

## Horebites

A sect of the Hussites, who, upon the death of Ziska, when they had retired from Bohemia, chose Bedricus of Bohemia as their leader. They called themselves Horebites because they had given the name of Horeb to a mountain to which they had retired. Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 20, 14, 688. **SEE HUSSITES.**

## Ho'rem

(Heb. *Chorem'*, **mrĕ'** *consecrated* [*but for-tress* according to Furst]; Sept. **Ὠράμ** [but most texts blend with preceding name into **Μεγαλααρίμ**, or **Μαγδαλιηωράμ**], Vulg. *Horemn*), one of the "fenced cities" of Naphtali, mentioned between Migdal-el and BethAnath (~~<103>~~Joshua 19:38). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 184) confounds it with the place preceding, and seeks to identify both in the modern village *Medj el-Kerum*, eight miles east of Akka; but this does not lie within the ancient limits of Naphtali (Keil, ad loc.). Van de Velde (1, 178, 9; *Memoir*, p. 322) suggests *Hurah* as the site of Horem. It is an ancient site, in the center of the country, half way between the Ras en-Nakhura and the lake Merom, on a *tell* at the southern end of the wady el-Ain, one of the natural features of the country. It is also in favor of this identification that Hurah is near Yaron, probably the representative of the ancient IRON, named with Horem. (Compare Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syren*, Berlin, 1854-9, 2, 130.)

## Hor-hagid' gad

(Hebrew *Chor hag-Gidgad'*, רַחַגְגִּדְגַּדְהָ hole of the Gidgad; Sept. ὄρος Γαδγιάδ, *Vulg. mons Gadgad*, both apparently reading or misunderstanding רחִי or רחִי for רַחַגְגִּדְגַּדְהָ the thirty-third station of the Israelites between Bene-Jaakan and Jotbathah (<sup><0832></sup>Numbers 33:32, 33); evidently the same with their forty-first station GUDGODHA, between the same places in the opposite direction, and not far from Mount Hor (<sup><1506></sup>Deuteronomy 10:6, 2). Winer (*Realwort.* s.v. Horgidgad) assents to the possibility of the identity of this name with that of wady *Ghudhaghid*, in the eastern part of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's *Researches*, 3, App. 210, b), although the names are spelt and signify differently (this valley would be in Hebrew characters x[āx]), but objects to the identification thus proposed by Ewald (*Isral. Gesch.* 2, 207) on the ground that ר/j can hardly mean a wide valley. This difficulty, however, does not weigh much, since the wady may only be the representative of the name anciently attached to some spot in the vicinity, more properly called a *chasm*; and even this spot is sufficiently a *gully* to form a receptacle for the loose sand washed down by the freshets, which may naturally have partly filled it up in the course of ages. With this identification Rabbi Schwarz likewise agrees (*Palest.* p. 213). **SEE EXODE.** The name *Gidgad* or *Gudgod*, according to Gesenius, is from an Ethiopic reduplicated root, signifying to *reverberate*, as thunder; but, according to Furst, signifies a *cleft*, from רWG or ddḡ; to *incise*. **SEE GUDGODAAH.**

## Ho'ri

(Heb. *Chori'*, ירְיָאוּ or ירְיָאֵי, prob. a "troglodyte," or dweller in a cave, י j o otherwise an *auger*; Sept. Χορροί, Οὐρί, and Χορρέ; *Vulg. Hori* and *Hurt*), the name of two men.

1. A son of Lotan and grandson of Seir, of the aboriginal inhabitants of Idumaea (<sup><0832></sup>Genesis 36:12; <sup><1019></sup>1 Chronicles 1:39). B.C. cir. 1964.
2. The father of Shaphat, which latter was the commissioner of the tribe of Simeon sent by Moses to explore the land of Canaan (<sup><0435></sup>Numbers 13:5). B.C. ante 1657.
3. (<sup><0850></sup>Genesis 36:30.) **SEE HORITE.**

## Ho'rim

(<sup><R12></sup>Deuteronomy 2:12, 22). *SEE HORITE*.

## Ho'rite

(Heb. *Chori'*, **yr**<sup>ח</sup>**ר** or **yr**<sup>ח</sup>**ר**<sup>ה</sup> prop. the same word as *Hori*; but, according to First, *noble*; often with the art. **yr**<sup>ח</sup>**ר**<sup>ה</sup>), a designation (both singly and collectively) of the people who anciently inhabited Mount Seir, before their supersedure by the Edomites; rendered "Horites" in <sup><O146></sup>Genesis 14:6 (Sept. **Χορρῖοι**, Vulg. *Corraei*); 36:21 (**Χορρῖος**, *Horrcaus*), 29 (**Χορρῖ**, *fHorrcei*); "Horite," <sup><O350></sup>Genesis 36:20 (**Χορρῖαῖος**, *Hornneus*), "Horims," <sup><R12></sup>Deuteronomy 2:12 (**Χορρῖαῖος**, *Horrhaeus*), 22 (**Χορρῖαῖος**, *Horrheai*), and "Hori," <sup><O350></sup>Genesis 36:30 (**Χορρῖ**, *Horrcei*). *SEE IDUMAEA*. There are indications of Canaanitish affinity between the Horites and the Hittites or Hivites (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1, 169, and *De Troglodytis Seir*, in his *Syntagma Comment.* 1759, p. 194; Faber, *Archaeol.* p. 41; Hamelsveld, 3, 29; but see contra Bertheau, *Gesch. der Isr.* p. 150). *SEE HITTITE*. "Their excavated dwellings are still found by hundreds in the sandstone cliffs and mountains of Edom, and especially in Petra. *SEE EDOM* and *SEE EDOMITE*. It may, perhaps, be to the Horites Job refers in <sup><S106></sup>Job 30:6,7. They are only three times mentioned in Scripture: first, when they were smitten by the kings of the East (<sup><O146></sup>Genesis 14:6); then when their genealogy is given in <sup><O350></sup>Genesis 36:20-30, and <sup><I138></sup>1 Chronicles 1:38-42; and, lastly, when they were exterminated by the Edomites (<sup><R12></sup>Deuteronomy 2:12, 22). It appears probable that they were not Canaanites, but an earlier race, who inhabited Mount Seir before the posterity of Canaan took possession of Palestine (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 1, 304, 5)" (Smith). Knobel (*Volkertafel d. Généralé*, p. 195, 206) holds that they formed part of the great race of the Ludim, to which also the Rephaim, the Emim, and the Amorites belonged (comp. Hitzig, *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, Lpz. 1869, 1, 29-36). In this case the Amorites were of Shemitic descent. According to the account in <sup><O350></sup>Genesis 36:20 sq., they were divided into seven tribes. *SEE CANAAN*.

## Hor'mah

(Heb. *Chormah'*, **hmr**<sup>ח</sup>**מ**]; *devoted city*, otherwise *peak* of a hill; Sept.

<sup>ε</sup>**ρνά** 5. r. occasionally <sup>ε</sup>**Ρρμάθ** and <sup>α</sup>**νάθεμα**), a royal city of the Canaanites in the south of Palestine (<sup><O214></sup>Joshua 12:14; <sup><O350></sup>1 Samuel 30:30),



near which the Israelites experienced a discomfiture from the Amalekites resident there, as they perversely attempted to enter Canaan by that route after the divine sentence of wandering (<sup><0445></sup>Numbers 14:45; 21:1-3; Deuteronomy 1, 44). Joshua afterwards besieged its king (<sup><0653></sup>Joshua 15:30), and on its capture assigned the city to the tribe of Judah, but finally it was included in the territory given to Simeon (<sup><0690></sup>Joshua 19:4; <sup><07017></sup>Judges 1:17; <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 4:30). It is elsewhere mentioned only in <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 4:30. It was originally called ZEPHATH (<sup><07017></sup>Judges 1:17), under which name it appears to have been again rebuilt and occupied by the Canaanites (see Bertheau, ad loc.; Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* 2, 220); whereas the name Hormah was probably given to the site by the Israelites in token of its demolition (see <sup><0203></sup>Numbers 21:3). Hence traces of the older name alone remain. *SEE ZEPHATH.*

### Hörmann, Simon

With the surname *Bavarus*, was prior in the monastery of Altenmünster St. Salvator, in Bavaria, and later general of the order. He died in 1701. His works are *Breviarium una cum Missali Monialium*, and an edition of *Revelationes caelestes S. Brigittae, ordinis S. Salvatoris Fundatricis* (Munich, 1680, fol.). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 537.

### Hormisdas

Pope, born at Frosinone, near Rome, was elected bishop of Rome in 514, as successor of Symmachus. In 515, by invitation of the Eastern emperor Anastasius, he sent an embassy to a council held at Heraclea for the purpose of settling the points of disunion between the Oriental and Occidental churches; but as this council, as well as a second one held in 517, did not bring about any favorable results, Anastasius, wearied by Hormisdas's refusal to make any concessions, broke off all relations with Rome. After his death in 518, his successor Justinus made another attempt at reconciliation, and the union of that Church with Rome was finally restored in 519, after a schism of thirty-five years. Hormisdas's conduct was much more measured in the controversy concerning Faustus of Rhegium, of whom he said that, though his writings may not deserve a place with those of the fathers, yet that such parts of them were to be received as did not conflict with the teachings of the Church. He died Aug. 6, 523. Eighty letters of Hormisdas are preserved in Labbe. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 6; Labbe, *Concilia*, 4, 1415; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 1,

342 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, 1, 199; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 279 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 325; Neander, *Ch. History*, 2, 533, 649 sq.; *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 384; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* 2, 280; Dorner, *Lehre v.d. Pers. Christi*, 2, 156; Wetzer ü. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 329; Döllinger, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.* 1, 151. **SEE EUTYCHIANS.** (J. H.W.)

## Horn

(<sup>h</sup>ṛq, *ke'ren*, identical in root and signif. with the Latin *cornu* and English. *horn*; Gr. κέρας) is used in Scripture with a great latitude of meaning.

**I.** *Literally* (<sup>h</sup>Joshua 6:4, 5; compare <sup>h</sup>Exodus 19:13; <sup>h</sup>1 Samuel 16:1, 13; 1 Kings 1, 39; <sup>h</sup>Job 42:14). — Two purposes are mentioned in the Scriptures to which the horn seems to have been applied. As horns are hollow and easily polished, they have in ancient and modern times been used for drinking vessels and for military purposes. They were especially convenient for holding liquids (<sup>h</sup>1 Samuel 16:1,13; <sup>h</sup>1 Kings 1:39), and were even made instruments of music (<sup>h</sup>Joshua 6:5).

**1.** *Trumpets* were probably at first merely horns perforated at the tip, such as are still used upon mountain farms for calling home the laborers at mealtime. If the A.V. of <sup>h</sup>Joshua 6:4, 5 (“rams’ horns,” <sup>h</sup>I bē’hi ṛq) were correct, this would settle the question, **SEE RAM’S HORN**; but the fact seems to be that <sup>h</sup>I bēy has nothing to do with *ram*, and that <sup>h</sup>ṛq, *horn*, serves to indicate an instrument which originally was made of horn, though afterwards, no doubt, constructed of different materials (comp. Varro, *L. L.* 5, 24,33, “cornua quod ea quae nunc sunt ex aere tunc fiebant e cornu bubuli”). **SEE CORNET.** The horns, which were thus made into trumpets, were probably those of oxen rather than of rams: the latter would scarcely produce a note sufficiently imposing to suggest its association with the fall of Jericho. **SEE TRUMPET.**

**2.** The word “horn” is also applied to a *flask*, or vessel made of horn, containing *oil* (<sup>h</sup>1 Samuel 16:1, 13; <sup>h</sup>1 Kings 1:39), or used as a kind of toilet bottle, filled with the preparation of antimony with which women tinged their eyelashes (Keren-happuch = *paint-horn*; name of one of Job’s daughters, <sup>h</sup>Job 42:14). So in English drinking-horn (commonly called a *horn*). In the same way the Greek κέρας sometimes signifies bugle, trumpet (Xenoph. *An.* 2, 2, 4), and sometimes drinking-horn (7, 2, 23). In

like manner the Latin *cornu* means *trumpet*, and also *oil-cruet* (Horace, *Sat.* 2, 2, 61), and *funnel* (Virgil, *Georg.* 3, 509). **SEE INK HORN.**

**II. Metaphorically.** — These uses of the word are often based upon some literal object like a horn, and at other times they are purely figurative.

**1. From similarity of Form.** — To this use belongs the application of the word *horn* to a trumpet of metal, as already mentioned. Horns of ivory, that is, elephants' teeth, are mentioned in <sup><2715></sup>Ezekiel 27:15, either metaphorically, from similarity of form, or, as seems more probable, from a vulgar error. **SEE IVORY.** But more specific are the following metaphors:

**(1.)** The altar of burnt offerings (<sup><0270></sup>Exodus 27:2) and the altar of incense (<sup><0230></sup>Exodus 30:2) had each at the four corners four horns of shittim-wood, the first being overlaid with brass, the second with gold (<sup><0275></sup>Exodus 37:25; 38:2; <sup><2470></sup>Jeremiah 17:1; <sup><3184></sup>Amos 3:14). Upon the horns of the altar of burnt offerings was to be smeared with the finger the blood of the slain bullock (<sup><0292></sup>Exodus 29:12; <sup><0347></sup>Leviticus 4:7-18; 8:15; 9:9; 16:18; <sup><0643></sup>Ezekiel 43:20). By laying hold of these horns of the altar of burnt offering the criminal found an asylum and safety (1 Kings 1 50; 2:28), but only when the crime was accidental (<sup><0214></sup>Exodus 21:14). These horns are said to have served as a means for binding the animal destined for sacrifice (<sup><1827></sup>Psalms 118:27), but this use Winer (*Handwörterb.*) denies, asserting that they did not and could not answer for such a purpose. These altar-horns are, of course, not to be supposed to have been made of horn, but to have been metallic projections from the four corners (<sup><0701></sup>γωνία κερατοειδής, Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 6). **SEE ALTAR.**

**(2.)** The *peak* or *summit* of a hill was called a horn (<sup><0311></sup>Isaiah 5:1, where hill= horn in Heb.; comp. <sup><0701></sup>κέρας, Xenophon, *An.* 5, 6, 7, and *cornu*, Stat. *Theb.* 5, 532; Arab. “Kurun Hattin,” Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 370; German *Schreckhorn*, *Wetterhorn*, *Aarhorn*; Celt. *cairn*).

In <sup><0311></sup>Isaiah 5:1, the emblematic vineyard is described as being literally “in a horn the son of oil,” meaning, as given in the English Bible, “a very fruitful hill” — a strong place like a hill, yet combining with its strength peculiar fruitfulness.

**(3.)** In <sup><0304></sup>Habakkuk 3:4 (“he had horns coming out of his hand”) the context implies *rays of light* (comp. <sup><0230></sup>Deuteronomy 23:2).

The denominative  $\hat{r}q$ ;= “to emit rays,” is used of Moses’s face (<sup><0349></sup>Exodus 34:29, 30, 35): so all the versions except Aquila and the Vulgate, which have the translations  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\varsigma \eta\nu$ , *cornuta erat*. This curious idea has not only been perpetuated by paintings, coins, and statues (Zornius, *Biblioth. Antiq.* 1, 121), but has at least passed muster with Grotius (*Annot. ad loc.*), who cites Aben-Ezra’s identification of Moses with the horned Mnevis of Egypt, and suggests that the phenomenon was intended to remind the Israelites of the golden calf! Spencer (*Leg. Hebr.* 3, *Diss.* 1, 4) tries a reconciliation of renderings upon the ground that *cornua*=*radii lucis*; but Spanheim (*Diss.* 7, 1), not content with stigmatizing the efforts of art in this direction as “prepostera industria,” distinctly attributes to Jerome a belief in the veritable horns of Moses. *SEE NIMBUS.*

## Picture for Horn 1

**2.** *From similarity of Position and Use.* — Two principal applications of this metaphor will be found — *strength* and *honor*. Of *strength* the horn of the unicorn, *SEE UNICORN*, was the most frequent representative (Dent. 32:17, etc.), but not always; comp. <sup><1221></sup>1 Kings 22:11, where probably horns of iron, worn defiantly and symbolically on the head, are intended. Expressive of the same idea, or perhaps merely a decoration, is the Oriental military ornament mentioned by Taylor (*Calmet’s Frag.* c14), and the conical cap observed by Dr. Livingstone among the natives of S. Africa, and not improbably suggested by the horn of the rhinoceros, so abundant in that country (see Livingstone’s *Travels*, p. 365,450, 557; comp. Taylor, 1. c.). Among the Druses upon Mount Lebanon the married women wear silver horns on their heads. The spiral coils of gold wire projecting oil either side from the female headdress of some of the Dutch provinces are evidently an ornament borrowed from the same original idea. But it is quite uncertain whether such dresses were known among the covenant people, nor do the figurative allusions in Scripture to horns render it in the least degree necessary to suppose that reference was made to personal ornaments of that description. (See below.)

## Picture for Horn 2

In the sense of *honor*, the word *horn* stands for the *abstract* (*my horn*, <sup><8165></sup>Job 16:15; *all the horns of Israel*, Lam. 2:3), and so for the supreme

authority (comp. the story of Cippus, Ovid, *Met 15*, 565; and the horn of the Indian sachim mentioned in Clarkson's *Life of Penn.*)

### Picture for Horn 3

Perhaps some such idea may be denoted by the horned conical cap peculiar to the regal apparel on the Ninevite sculptures. It also stands for *concrete*, whence it comes to mean *king, kingdom* (Dan. 8:2, etc.; <sup><3018></sup>Zechariah 1:18; compare Tarquin's dream in Accius, ap. Cicero, *Div.* 1, 22); hence, on coins, Alexander and the Seleucidae wear horns (see cut in vol., p. 140), and the former is called in Arab. two-horned (Kor. 18:85 sq.), not without reference to Dan. 8. *SEE GOAT.*

### Picture for Horn 4

Out of either or both of these last two metaphors sprang the idea of representing gods with horns. Spanheim has discovered such figures on the Roman denarius, and on numerous Egyptian coins of the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines (*Diss.v.*, 353). The Bacchus **Ταυροκέρως**, or *cornutus*, is mentioned by Euripides (*Bacch.* 100), and among other pagan absurdities Arnobius enumerates "Dii cornuti" (*c. Gent.* 6). In like manner river gods are represented with horns ("tauriformis Aufidus," Hor. *Od.* 4, 14, 25; **ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ**, Eurip. *Ion.* 1261). For various opinions on the *ground thought* of this metaphor, see *Notes and Queries.*, 1, 419, 456. Manx legends speak of a *tarroo-ushtey*, i.e. water-bull (see Cregeen's *Manx Dict.*). (See Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2, 288; and, for an admirable compendium, with references, Zornius, *Bibliotheca Antiquaria*, 2, 106 sq.).

Some of these metaphorical applications of the word horn require more special elucidation.

**(1.) Symbolical.** — As horns are the chief source of attack and defense with the animals to which God has given them, they serve in Scripture as emblems of power, dominion, glory, and fierceness (<sup><2785></sup>Daniel 8:5, 9; 1 Samuel. 16:1, 13; 1 Kings 1, 39; <sup><6604></sup>Joshua 6:4,5; <sup><9101></sup>1 Samuel 2:1; <sup><4975></sup>Psalms 75:5, 10; 132:17; Luke 1, 69; <sup><4637></sup>Deuteronomy 33:17; <sup><2103></sup>Lamentations 2:3; <sup><3343></sup>Micah 4:13; <sup><2482></sup>Jeremiah 48:25; <sup><3321></sup>Ezekiel 29:21; <sup><3063></sup>Amos 6:13). In <sup><1221></sup>1 Kings 22:11, we find a striking display of symbolical action on the part of the false prophet Zedekiah. He made him horns of iron, and said, "Thus saith Jehovah, With these thou shalt push the

Syrians, until thou have consumed them.” Hence, to defile the horn in the dust (<sup><384D></sup>Job 16:2) is to lower and degrade one’s self, and, on the contrary, to lift up, to exalt the horn (<sup><497D></sup>Psalm 75:4; 79:17; 148:14), is poetically to raise one’s self to eminent honor or prosperity, to bear one’s self proudly (comp. also <sup><123D></sup>1 Chronicles 25:5). Something like this is found in the classic authors (see Horace, *Carm.* 3, 21,18). The expression “horn of salvation,” which Christ is called (Luke 1), is equivalent to a salvation of strength, or a Savior, who is possessed of the might requisite for the work (see Brünings, *Decornu salutis*, Heid. 1743).

Horns were also the symbol of royal dignity and power; and when they are distinguished by *number*, they signify so many monarchies. Thus horn signifies a monarchy in <sup><248D></sup>Jeremiah 48:25. In <sup><3018></sup>Zechariah 1:18, etc., the four horns are the four great monarchies, which had each of them subdued the Jews. The ten horns, says Daniel, 7:24, are ten *kings*. The ten horns, spoken of in <sup><663D></sup>Revelation 13:1 as having ten crowns upon them, no doubt signify the same thing, for so we have it interpreted in <sup><672D></sup>Revelation 17:12. The king of Persia is described by Ammianus Marcellinus as wearing golden rams’ horns by way of diadem (69, 1). The effigy of Ptolemy with a ram’s horn, as exhibited in ancient sculpture, is mentioned by Spanheim, *Dissert. de Numism.* Hence also the kings of Media and Persia are depicted by Daniel (<sup><278D></sup>Daniel 8:20) under the figure of a horned ram. **SEE RAM.**

When it is said, in <sup><278D></sup>Daniel 8:9, that out of one of the four notable horns came forth a little horn, we are to understand that out of one of the four kingdoms represented by the four horns arose another kingdom, “which became exceeding great.” This is doubtless Antiochus Epiphanes; others refer it to one of the first Czesars; and others refer it to the Turkish empire, and will have Egypt, Asia, and Greece to be the three horns torn up or reduced by the Turk. **SEE LITTLE HORN.**

## Picture for Horn 5

(2.) *Ornamental.* — In the East, at present, horns are used as an ornament for the head, and as a token of eminent rank (Rosenmüller, *Morg.* 4, 85). The women among the Druses on Mount Lebanon wear on their heads silver horns of native make, “which are the distinguishing badge of wifhood” (Bowring’s *Report on Syria*, p. 8). “These *tantours* have grown, like other horns, from small beginnings to their present enormous size by slow degrees, and pride is the soil that nourished them. At first they consisted merely of an apparatus designed to finish off the headdress so as

to raise the veil a little from the face. Specimens of this primitive kind are still found in remote and semi-civilized districts. I have seen them only a few inches long, made of pasteboard, and even of common pottery. By degrees the more fashionable ladies used tin, and lengthened them; then rivalry made them of silver, and still further prolonged and ornamented them; until finally the princesses of Lebanon and Hermon sported gold horns, decked with jewels, and so long that a servant had to spread the veil over them. But the day for these most preposterous appendages to the female head is about over. After the wars between the Maronites and Druses in 1841 and 1845, the Maronite clergy thundered their excommunications against them, and very few Christians now wear them. Many even of the Druse ladies have cast them off, and the probability is that in a few years travelers will seek in vain for a horned lady” (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 101). *SEE HEADDRESS.*

### Horn, John

Or, more properly, JOHN ROH (Cornu or Korn being a translation of the surname, which he assumed according to the usage of the times), was a distinguished bishop of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, or Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. He was born at Yauss, in Bohemia, near the close of the 15th century. In 1518 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1529 consecrated bishop by a synod assembled at Brandeis, on the Adler. Three years later, (1532) he became senior bishop and president of the Ecclesiastical Council, which position he held until his death, governing the Unitas Fratrum with great wisdom, and furthering its interests with ardent zeal. Supported by John Augusta (q.v.), he inaugurated a new policy, which brought the Church out of its partial obscurity, and made it thereafter an important element in the national history of Bohemia. His immediate predecessor, Martin Skoda, had strictly abstained from all intercourse with the Reformers, following the principles established by Luke of Prague (q.v.). Horn, who had twice been a delegate to Luther (1522 and 1524), and who entertained a high regard for him and his work, reopened a correspondence with him, and induced the publication of a new Confession of the Brethren’s faith at Wittenberg, with a commendatory preface of his own (1533). This led to a still closer fellowship, Horn sending two deputations to Luther in 1536, a third in the following year, and a fourth in 1542. In 1538 Luther published another and the principal Confession of the Church, again with a preface from Horn’s pen. This Confession had been drawn up in 1535, and formally presented

to the emperor Ferdinand at Vienna (November 14) by several barons and divines in the name of the *Unitas Fratrum*. Encouraged by his intercourse with Luther, Horn also sent an embassy to the Swiss Reformers in 1540, which resulted in a correspondence with Bucer, Calvin, and others. Thus the Brethren joined hands with the Reformers in carrying on the great work of evangelical truth, and gave the earliest tokens of those efforts to bring about a union among all Protestants, which afterwards resulted in the *Consensus Sandomiriensis* of the Polish churches. The most important literary production of bishop Horn was the authorized edition of the German Hymn book of the Brethren, published in 1540. He died in 1547. Bishop Blaloslav, the illustrious historian and grammarian of the Church, wrote his biography, which is, however, no longer extant. (E. de S.)

### Hornbeck

SEE HOORNBECK.

### Horne, George, D.D.

An English prelate, was born at Otham, near Maidstone, Nov. 1, 1730. He was educated at University College, Oxford, where he devoted himself especially to the study of Hebrew and of the fathers. He became fellow of Magdalen in 1749, and president in 1768. In 1776 he was made vice chancellor of the University of Oxford, dean of Canterbury in 1781 and, finally, bishop of Norwich in 1789 to died Jan. 17, 1792. In his early youth he imbibed the doctrines of John Hutchinson (q.v.), and defended them in an *Apology* (1756), which is given in vol. 6 of his collected *Works*. He was considered the best preacher of his time, a sincere and exemplary Christian, and a thorough scholar. Many of his writings were controversial tracts, arising out of the Hutchinsonian theory, and the quarrels, which it provoked. His more important and durable works are, *Commentary on the Psalms* (Oxford, 1766, 2 vols. 4to, often reprinted) — *Discourses on several Subjects and Occasions* (London, 4th ed. 1803, 4 vols. 8vo). These, with his other writings, are collected in *The Works of Bishop Horne, with his Life*, by William Jones, of Nayland (London, 1795, 6 vols. 8vo). See Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 6:160; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliograph.* 1, 1541; Alibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 887; Home (T. H.), *Bibliographical Appendix; Ch. Review*, 1, 59; Bickersteth, *Bib. Stud. Assist.* p. 306, 319; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* 2, 419; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 252, n. 1; 253, n. 3.



## Horne, John

A Nonconformist divine, born in 1615, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became successively vicar of Allhallows, Lynn, Regis, and finally Norfolk in 1647. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1676. "He was a learned man, of most exemplary and primitive piety, very ready in the Scriptures, skilled in the Oriental languages, and an Arminian in doctrine." Shortly before his ejection he published *The open Door for Alan's Approach to God, or A Vindication of the Record of God concerning the Extent of the Death of Christ*. His other principal works are, *The Brazen Serpent, or God's grand Design on* ~~John~~ John 3:14, 15 (London 1673, 4to) — *The best Exercise for Christians in the worst of Times, in Order to their Security against Profaneness and Apostasy — on Jude 20:21* (London 1671, sm. 8vo), etc. Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1, 1543; Stoughton (John), *Ecclesiastes Hist. of England* (London 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 407 sq.

## Horne, Melville

A Wesleyan minister, born in England in the latter part of the last century, was originally a lay preacher of the Wesleyan societies, but by the advice, of his brethren he took orders in the Church of England, and went as missionary to Sierra Leone. On his return he was made vicar of Olney, later at Macclesfield, and finally went to West Thurrock, Essex. He died in the early part of the present century. Horne is known especially by his *Letters on Missions, addressed to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches* (1794, 8vo; reprinted at Boston, 1835), which, it is generally believed, "prompted the first counsels that led to the formation of the London Missionary Society (comp. Ellis's *Hist. of London Miss. Soc.* 1, 13-15; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 2, 295 sq.). He published also several of his sermons (1791-1811), and an *Investigation of the Definition of Justifying Faith* (1809, 12mo).

## Horne, Thomas Hartwell, D.D.

An English Biblical scholar, born October 20, 1780, was educated at Christ's Hospital. At first he became clerk to a barrister. Devoting his leisure hours to the study of the Bible, in 1818 he published his *Introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures* (which has now reached the 11th edition, and is enlarged from 3 to 5 vols. 8vo; it has also been reprinted in this country in 2 vols. imp. 8vo, and 4

vols. 8vo), a work which procured for him admission into orders without the usual preliminaries. Subsequently St. John's College, Cambridge, conferred on him the degree of B.D., and two American colleges that of D.D. In 1824 he found employment in the library of the British Museum as assistant in the department of printed books. In 1833 archbishop Howley appointed him to the rectories of St. Edmund and St. Nicholas, London, which positions he held until his death, Jan. 27, 1862. Home was for some years actively engaged in the work of Methodism, numbering among his friends Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Bunting. He entered the ministry of the Church of England in deference to the earnest desire of his father with the hope of securing leisure for literary pursuits, but he always maintained a hearty interest in the Church of his early choice, and preserved to the end of his life that simple and earnest godliness which Methodism had taught him to cultivate in his youthful days. He was distinguished as a polemic of considerable ability; his controversial writings alone would have given him a high status among the men of his time; and his versatility is further attested by the variety of his publications, many of which are given to subjects not usually treated by scholars and divines. His researches in bibliography were conducted with amazing industry, and tabulated with great judgment and skill. But he will be best known to posterity by his *Introduction to the critical Study of the Scriptures* (referred to above), which, at the time of its first appearance, was a marvel of labor and scholarship. Hundreds of Biblical students owe their taste for critical pursuits to the reading of this work; and, though somewhat below the spirit and results of the more recent criticisms, it is yet invaluable to those whose resources will not permit the large outlay, which the collection of a critical library demands. The most important of his other works are, *Compend. Introduction to the Study of the Bible, or Analysis of the Introduction to the Holy Scriptures* (12mo, 1827) — *Deism Refuted, or plain Reasons for being a Christian* (12mo, 1819) — *Romanism contradictory to Scripture, or the peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome, as exhibited in her accredited Formularies, contrasted with the Holy Scriptures* (12mo, 1827) — *Mariolatry, or Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome* (2nd ed. 1841) — *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (12mo) — *Manual of Parochial Psalmody* (18mo, 1829) — *Manual for the Afflicted* (18mo, 1832), etc. A list of all the productions of Dr. Home is given by Allibone (*Dict. of Authors*, 1, 889-892). See *Reminiscences, personal and bibliographical, of Thomas Hartwell Horne*, with Notes by his daughter, Sarah Anne

Cheyne, and a short Introduction by the Rev. Joseph B. M’Caul (London 1862); Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 419; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 324; Keil, *Introduction to N.T.* p. 38; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1, 154 sq.; *Vorth 4 Am. Review*, 17, 130 sq.; *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 5, 29, 250. (J. H. W.)

### Horneck, Anthony, D.D.,

An English divine, was born at Baccharack, in the Lower Palatinate, in 1641. He studied at Heidelberg and at Leyden, and finally went to England, and entered Queen’s College, Oxford, at the age of nineteen. Two years after he became tutor to lord Torrington, who gave him the living of Doulton, in Devonshire, and procured him a prebend in the church of Exeter. In 1671 he was chosen preacher at the Savoy, upon which he resigned his living in Devonshire. Admiral Russel, afterwards earl of Orford, recommended him to the queen for preferment, and, by the advice of Dr. Tillotson, then archbishop, he was presented to the prebendary of Westminster in 1693. He died Jan. 31, 1697. He was a good linguist, a learned divine, an excellent preacher, and a faithful pastor. His church was so crowded that it was often difficult for him to reach the pulpit. In the reign of James II, when it became clear that there was danger of a revival of popery, he spared no pains in resisting the movement. His zeal for the promotion of practical religion was incessant; and, among other means, he made use of the so called *Religious Societies* of the time, of which, indeed, some suppose him to have been the original founder. The rules of these *societies* seem in some points to have suggested to Wesley his *class meetings* (q.v.). The following is a summary of them:

- “1. All that enter the society shall resolve upon a holy and serious life.
2. No person shall be admitted into the society until he has arrived at the age of sixteen, and has been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken upon himself his baptismal vows.
3. The members shall choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them.
4. They shall not be allowed in their meetings to discourse on any controverted point of divinity.
5. Neither shall they discourse on the government of Church or State.

- 6.** In their meetings they shall use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the litany and collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the absolution.
- 7.** The minister whom they choose shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings.
- 8.** They shall have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a psalm.
- 9.** After all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse to each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise which any shall be obliged to attend to.
- 10.** One day in the week shall be appointed for this meeting for such as cannot come on the Lord's day; and he that absents himself without cause shall pay three pence to the box.
- 11.** Every time they meet they shall give sixpence to the box.
- 12.** On a certain day in the year, viz. Whit Tuesday, two stewards shall be chosen, and a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached; and the money distributed (necessary charges deducted) to the poor.
- 13.** A book shall be bought in which these orders shall be written.
- 14.** None shall be admitted into this society without the consent of the minister who presides over it; and no apprentice shall be capable of being chosen.
- 15.** If any case of conscience shall arise, it shall be brought before the minister.
- 16.** If any members think fit to leave the society he shall pay five shillings to the stock.
- 17.** The major part of the society shall conclude the rest.
- 18.** The following rules are more especially recommended to the members of this society, viz.: To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual

and temporal.” Dr. Horneck’s writings include the following: *Sermons on the fifth of St. Matthew*, with *The Life of the Author*, by Richard (Kidder), lord bishop of Bath and Wells (London 2nd ed. 1706, 2 vols. 8vo) — *The crucified Jesus, or A Treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, etc. (London, 6th edit. 1716, 8vo) — *The great Law of Consideration* (London 11th ed. 1729, 8vo). — *The happy Ascetic, or the best Exercise* (on <sup><540></sup>1 Timothy 4:7), to which is added *A Letter concerning the holy Lives of the primitive Christians* (London 3rd ed. enlarged, 1693, 8vo) — *The Fire of the Altar, A Preparation for the Lord’s Supper* (London, 13th ed. 1718, 12mo) — *Sermon on* <sup><513></sup>Romans 8:20 (London 1677, 4to). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliograph.* 1, 1547; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, 6, 166; Birch, *Life of Tillotson*.

### Hornejus (Horney) Konrad

A German Lutheran divine, was born in Brunswick Nov. 25, 1590. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology at Helmstadt, where he settled in 1612. Here he became professor of logic and ethics in 1619, and of theology in 1628. He died Sept. 26, 1649. As a theologian, especially in the Synergistic controversy (q.v.), he was distinguished for his moderation. His principal works are, *Disputationes ethicae* (Helmst. 1618; 7th ed. 1666) — *Exercitationes et disputationes logicae* (1621) — *Disputationes metaphysicae* (1622) — *Institutiones logicae* (1623) — *Compendium dialecticæ succinctum* (1623; 12th ed. 1666) — *Compendium historie eccles.* (1649) — *Commentar z. Hebraer und den Katholischen Briefen* (1654) — *Compendium theologie* (Brunsw. 1655). Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 8, 542; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 265; Gass, *Dogmengesch.* 2, 147, 159, 210; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 201.

### Hornet or Wasp

(*h[r]kāsīrah*, <sup><123></sup>Exodus 23:28; <sup><172></sup>Deuteronomy 7:20; <sup><1342></sup>Joshua 24:12; Sept. *σφηκία*, Vulg. *crabro*). The Heb. term appears to be indicative of *stinging*; and the ancient versions with the Rabbins favor the interpretation of “hornet” rather than “wasp,” as appears from the application of the above Greek and Latin words (comp. Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* 5, 19, 617; 9, 65, 66; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 11, 24). The above passages in which the word occurs refer to some means of expulsion of the Canaanites before the Israelites. Not only were bees exceedingly numerous in Palestine, but from the name Zoreah (<sup><153></sup>Joshua 15:33) we may infer

that hornets in particular infested some parts of the country: the frequent notices of the animal in the Talmudical writers (Lewysohn, *Zool.* § 405) lead to the same conclusion. Gesenius, however, maintains that the term is not to be taken in a literal sense, but metaphorically, as the symbol of the panic with which God would inspire the inhabitants, adducing the expressions “terror of God” (<sup><0135></sup>Genesis 35:5), “mighty destruction” (<sup><0173></sup>Deuteronomy 7:23), and the antithesis of the angel to defend them (<sup><0231></sup>Exodus 23:20, etc.), in favor of this interpretation (see *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1186). Indeed, the following arguments seem to decide in favor of a metaphorical sense: (1) that the word “hornet” in <sup><0238></sup>Exodus 23:28 is parallel to “fear” in ver. 27; (2) that similar expressions are undoubtedly used metaphorically, e.g. “to chase as the bees do” (Deuteronomy 1, 44; <sup><0182></sup>Psalms 118:12); (3) that a similar transfer from the literal to the metaphorical sense may be instanced in the classical *aestrus*, originally a “gad-fly,” afterwards *terror* and *madness*; and, lastly (4), that no historical notice of such intervention as hornets occurs in the Bible. We may therefore regard it as expressing under a vivid image the consternation with which Jehovah would inspire the enemies of the Israelites, as declared in <sup><0125></sup>Deuteronomy 2:25; <sup><0121></sup>Joshua 2:11. Among the moderns, Michaelis has defended the figurative sense. In addition to other reasons for it, he doubts whether the expulsion of the Canaanites *could* be effected by swarms of σφηκία, and proposes to derive the Hebrew from a root signifying “scourges,” “plagues,” *scutica plagae*, etc. (*Supplem. ad Lexic. Hebr.* 6, 2154); but his reasons are ably refuted by Rosenmüller, apud Bochart (*Hieroz.* Lips. 1796, 3, ch. 13, p. 402, etc.). In favor of the possibility of such an event, it is observed that Aelian relates that the Phaselitae were actually driven from their locality by such means (Φασηλίτας δὲ σφήκες κ.τ.λ.. *Hist. Anim.* 9, 28), and Bochart has shown that these Phaselitae were a *Phoenician people* (*ut sup.* p. 412). For a parallel case of an army being seriously molested by hornets, see Ammian. Marcell. 24, 8. Even Rosenmüller himself adopts the figurative sense in his *Scholia* on <sup><0238></sup>Exodus 23:28; but on <sup><0112></sup>Joshua 24:12 he retracts that opinion, and amply refutes it. His reasonings and refutations have been adopted by numerous writers (among others, see Paxton’s *Illustrations of Scripture* 1, 303, etc., Edinb. 1819). Michaelis’s doubt of the abstract possibility seems very unreasonable when the irresistible power of bees and wasps, etc., attested by numerous modern occurrences, and the thin and partial clothing of the Canaanites, are considered. It is observable that the event is represented by the author of the apocryphal book of Wisdom (12, 8) as a

merciful dispensation, by which the Almighty, he says, “spared as men the old inhabitants of his holy land,” and “gave them place for repentance.” If the hornet, considered as a *fly*, was in any way connected with their idolatry, the visitation would convey a practical refutation of their error. Ewald (*Gesch. d. V. Israel*, 3rd ed. Getting. 1864-8, 2:116 sq.) connects the word (reading h[~~r~~k];i.q. t[arx]) with Manetho’s story (Josephus, *Apion*, 1, 26) of the expulsion of the Israelites from Egypt on account of a disease. See BAALZEBUB.

The hornet (*Vespa crabro*) is a hymenopterous insect with six legs and four wings. It bears a general resemblance to ‘the common wasp, but is of a darker color, and much larger. It is exceedingly fierce and voracious, especially in hot climates, but even in Western countries its sting is frequently dangerous. Roberts observes on <sup>(1872)</sup>Deuteronomy 7:20, “The sting of the hornet and wasp of the East is much more poisonous than in Europe, and the insect is larger in size. I have heard of several who died from having a single sting; and not many days ago, as a woman was going to a well ‘to draw water,’ a hornet stung her in the cheek, and she died the next day. The god Siva is described as having destroyed many giants by hornets.” It may be remarked, that the hornet, no less than the whole species of wasps, renders an essential service in checking the multiplication of flies and other insects, which would otherwise become intolerable to man; and that in regard to their architecture, and especially their *instincts* and *habits*, they do not yield to their more popular congener, the bee, but even, in several respects, greatly excel it. The hornet, in common with the other social wasps, displays great ingenuity in the manufacture of its nest. It is made of a coarse gray paper, much like the coarsest wrapping paper, but less firm. This is arranged in several globose leaves, one over the other, not unlike the outer leaves of a cabbage, the base of which is attached by a small footstalk to the upper part of the cavity in which it is enclosed. Within this protecting case the combs are built in parallel rows of cells, exactly like those of the bee, but made of paper, and ranged horizontally instead of vertically, and in single series, the entrances always being downwards. Each story is connected with that above it by a number of pillars of the common paper, thick and massive. These cells do not contain honey, but merely the eggs, and in due time, the young, being in fact nursing cradles. The paper with which the hornet builds is formed either from decayed wood or the bark of trees, the fibers of which it abrades by means of its jaws, and kneads into a paste with viscid saliva. When a

morsel as large as a pea is prepared, the insect flies to the nest and spreads out the mass in a thin layer at the spot where it is required, molding it into shape with the jaws and feet. It is soon dry, and forms real paper, coarser than that of the common wasp. (Kirby and Spence, *Introduct. to Entomology*, 8vo, London 1828, 1, 273, 274; Raumur, *Histoire des Insectes*, vol. 6, Mem. 6, 4to, Par. 1734-42; Wood, *Bible Animals*, London 1869, p. 614 sq.). **SEE WASP.**

## Horologion

(ὥρολόγιον, literally *Adial*) is the title of one of the “office-books” of the orthodox Eastern Church. It contains the daily hours of prayer, so far as respects their immovable portions, and answers in a measure to the *Officium Hebdomade* which is found at: the opening of each volume of the breviary of the Eastern Church. But it generally contains also other formularies of that Church. See Neale, *Introduction to the Hist. of the Eastern Church*, 2, 848. **SEE HOURS.**

## Horon

**SEE BETH-HORON; SEE HORONAIM.**

## Horona'im

(Heb. *Chorona'yim*, **חַרְוֹנַיִם** *two caverns*; Sept. **Ἀρωνιείμ** and **᾿Ωρωναΐμ**), a Moabitish city near Zoar, Luhith, Nimrim, etc., on a declivity along the route of the invading Assyrians (<sup>-2485B</sup>Isaiah 15:5; <sup>-2485B</sup>Jeremiah 48:3, 5, 34); probably the same called HOLON (חַלְוֹן) perhaps by an error for חַרְוֹן *Horon*, which would appear to be the original form of the word Horonaim; from **רְוֹן** *hole* in <sup>-2482</sup>Jeremiah 48:22 (Sept. **Χελών**, Vulg. *Helon*). The associated names only afford a conjectural locality east of the north end of the Dead Sea, probably on some one of the great roads (Ἐρδ) leading down from the plateau of Moab to the Jordan valley. It is doubtless the *Oronse* (᾿Ωρωνοῦσι) of Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 15, 4; 14, 1, 4). Sanballat “the Horonite” (**חַרְוֹנִי** <sup>-3620</sup>Nehemiah 2:10,19; 13:28) was probably a native of this place, and not (as stated by Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 147) of Beth-horon, which was entirely different.



## Ho'ronite

[many *Hor'onite*] (Heb. with the art. *ha-CIhoroni'*, **ϣαϣβ**; Sept. **οἱ Ἀρωνί, Οὐρανίτης**, *Vulg. Horonites*), the designation of Sanballat (q.v.), who was one of the principal opponents of Nehemiah's works of restoration (<sup><1420></sup>Nehemiah 2:10, 19; 13:28). It is derived by Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 459) from Horonaim, the Moabitish town, but by Furst (*Handw.*) from Horon, i.e. Bethhoron. The latter supposition agrees with the local relations of Sanballat towards the Samaritans, but the 'former suits better his heathenish affinities, as well as the simple form of the primitive.

## Horse

**sws**, *sias*, **ἵππος**, of frequent occurrence; other less usual or proper terms and epithets are **HSws**, *susah'*, a *mnare*, rendered "company of horses," i.e. cavalry, Song of Solomon 1, 9; **vrP**; *parash'*, Ahorse for riding, "horseman," of frequent occurrence; **bkr**, or **bkr**; *re'keb* or *Raakab'*, a beast of burden, also a chariot, charioteer, or chariot-horse, especially a *team*, variously rendered, and of frequent occurrence; **ryBæ** *abbir'*, "strong," as an epithet of the horse, only in Jeremiah, as <sup><2016></sup>Jeremiah 8:16; 47:3; 1, 11; **vkP**, *re'kesh*, a horse of a nobler breed, a courser, rendered "dromedary" in <sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:8; "mule," <sup><1780></sup>Esther 8:10, 14; "swift beast," <sup><3007></sup>Micah 1:13; **EMri** *ramm-ak'*, a *mare*, rendered "dromedary," <sup><1780></sup>Esther 8:10. The origin of the first two of these terms is not satisfactorily made out; Pott (*E'tym. Forsch.* 1, 60) connects them respectively with Susa and Pares, or Persia, as the countries whence the horse was derived; and it is worthy of remark that *sus* was also employed in Egypt for a — *marme*, showing that it was a foreign term there, if not also in Palestine. There is a marked distinction between the *sus* and the *parash*; the former were horses for driving in the war-chariot, of a heavy build, the latter were for riding, and particularly for cavalry. This distinction is not observed in the A.V. from the circumstance that *parash* also signifies horseman; the correct sense is essential in the following passages <sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:26, "forty-thousand *chariot-horses* and twelve thousand *cavalry-horses*;" <sup><2714></sup>Ezekiel 27:14, "driving-horses and riding-horses;" <sup><2014></sup>Joel 2:4, "as riding-horses, so shall they run;" and <sup><2917></sup>Isaiah 21:7, "a train of horses in couples."

The most striking feature in the Biblical notices of the horse is the exclusive application of it to warlike operations; in no instance is that

useful animal employed for the purposes of ordinary locomotion or agriculture, if we except <sup><2338></sup>Isaiah 28:28, where we learn that horses (A.V. “horsemen”) were employed in threshing, not, however, in that case put in the gears, but simply driven about wildly over the strewed grain. This remark will be found to be borne out by the historical passages hereafter quoted, but it is equally striking in the poetical parts of Scripture. The animated description of the horse in <sup><1839></sup>Job 39:19-25, applies solely to the war-horse; the mane streaming in the breeze (A.V. “thunder”) which “clothes his neck;” his lofty bounds as a grasshopper;” his hoofs “digging in the valley” with excitement; his terrible snorting are brought before us, and his ardor for the strife. The following is a close rendering of this fine description of the war-horse: Canst thou give to the horse prowess?

Canst thou clothe his neck [with] a shuddering [mane]?  
 Canst thou make him prance like the locust?  
 The grandeur of his snorting [is] formidable.  
 They will [eagerly] paw in the valley,  
 And [each] rejoice in vigor;  
 He will go forth to meet [the] weapon:  
 He will laugh at dread,  
 Nor will he cower,  
 Nor’ retreat from before [the] sword:  
 Against him may rattle quiver,  
 Flaming lance or dart [in vain].  
 With prancing and restlessness he will absorb [the earth [by fleetness];  
 Nor can he stand still when the sound of the trumpet [is heard]:  
 As oft [as the] trumpet [sounds], he will say, “Aha!”  
 For from afar he can scent [the battle],  
 The thunder of the captains and shouting.

So, again, the bride advances with her charms to an immediate conquest “as a company of horses in Pharaoh’s chariots” (<sup><2109></sup>Song of Solomon 1:9); and when the prophet Zechariah wishes to convey the idea of perfect peace, he represents the horse, no more mixing in the fray as before (Song of Solomon 9:10), but bearing on his bell (which was intended to strike terror into the foe) the peaceable inscription, “Holiness unto the Lord” (Song of Solomon 14:20). Lastly, the characteristic of the horse is not so much his speed or his utility, but his strength (<sup><49317></sup>Psalm 33:17; 147:10), as shown in the special application of the term *abbir* (**ryBā**), i.e. strong, as an equivalent for a horse (<sup><24186></sup>Jeremiah 8:16; 47:3; 1,11). Hence the horse becomes the symbol of war, or of a campaign (<sup><38108></sup>Zechariah 10:3; comp.

<9515> Psalm 45:5; <16213> Deuteronomy 32:13; <95612> Psalm 56:12; <23814> Isaiah 58:14, where horsemanship is made typical of conquest), especially of speedy conquest (<24413> Jeremiah 4:13), or rapid execution of any purpose (Revelation 6).

The Hebrews in the patriarchal age, as a pastoral race, did not stand in need of the services of the horse, and for a long period after their settlement in Canaan they dispensed with it, partly in consequence of the hilly nature of the country, which only admitted of the use of chariots in certain localities (<70119> Judges 1:19), and partly in consequence of the prohibition in <6716> Deuteronomy 17:16, which would be held to apply at all periods. Accordingly they hamstrung the horses of the Canaanites (<6106> Joshua 11:6, 9). David first established a force of cavalry and chariots after the defeat of Hadadezer (<3084> 2 Samuel 8:4), when he reserved a hundred chariots, and, as we may infer, all the horses; for the rendering “houghed all the chariot-horses” is manifestly incorrect. Shortly after this Absalom was possessed of some (<4051> 2 Samuel 15:1). But the great supply of horses was subsequently effected by Solomon through his connection with Egypt; he is reported to have had “40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots, and 12,000 cavalry-horses” (<1006> 1 Kings 4:26), and it is worthy of notice that these forces are mentioned parenthetically to account for the great security of life and property noticed in the preceding verse. There is probably an error in the former of these numbers; for the number of chariots is given in <1106> 1 Kings 10:26; <4014> 2 Chronicles 1:14, as 1400, and consequently, if we allow three horses for each chariot, two in use and one as a reserve, as was usual in some countries (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 6, 1, § 27), the number required would be 4200, or, in round numbers, 4000, which is probably the correct reading. Solomon also established a very active trade in horses, which were brought by dealers out of Egypt, and resold at a profit to the Hittites, who lived between Palestine and the Euphrates. The passage in which this commerce is described (<1108> 1 Kings 10:28, 29) is unfortunately obscure; the tenor of verse 28 seems to be that there was a regularly established traffic, the Egyptians bringing the horses to a mart in the south of Palestine, and handing them over to the Hebrew dealers at a fixed tariff. The price of a horse was fixed at 150 shekels of silver, and that of a chariot at 600; in the latter we must include the horses (for an Egyptian war-chariot was of no great value), and conceive, as before, that three horses accompanied each chariot, leaving the value of the chariot itself at 150 shekels. In addition to this source of supply, Solomon received

horses by way of tribute (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:25). He bought chariots and teams of horses in Egypt (<sup><1103></sup>1 Kings 10:28), and probably in Armenia, “in all lands” and had them brought into his dominions in strings, in the same manner as horses are still conducted to and from fairs for this interpretation, as offered by professor Paxton, appears to convey the natural and true meaning of the text; and not “strings of linen yam,” which here seem to be out of place (<sup><4116></sup>2 Chronicles 1:16, 17; 9:25, 28). The cavalry force was maintained by the succeeding kings, and frequent notices occur both of riding-horses and chariots (<sup><1292></sup>2 Kings 9:21, 33; 11:16), and particularly of war-chariots (<sup><1224></sup>1 Kings 22:4; <sup><1300></sup>2 Kings 3:7; <sup><2307></sup>Isaiah 2:7). The force seems to have failed in the time of Hezekiah (<sup><1283></sup>2 Kings 18:23) in Judah, as it had previously in Israel under Jehoahaz (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:7). Josiah took away the horses, which the kings of Judah, his predecessors, had consecrated to the sun (<sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 23:11). *SEE SUN*. The number of horses belonging to the Jews on their return, from Babylon is stated at 736 (<sup><1078></sup>Nehemiah 7:68).

### Picture for Horse 1

### Picture for Horse 2

### Picture for Horse 3

In the countries adjacent to Palestine the use of the horse was much more frequent. It was introduced into Egypt probably by the Hyksos, as it is not represented on the monuments before the 18th dynasty (Wilkinson, 1, 386, abridgm.). Yet these animals are not mentioned among the presents which Abraham received from Pharaoh (<sup><0126></sup>Genesis 12:16), and occur first in Scripture among the valuables paid by the Egyptians to Joseph in exchange for grain (<sup><1477></sup>Genesis 47:17). They were still sufficiently important to be expressly mentioned in the funeral procession, which accompanied the body of Jacob to his sepulcher in Canaan (<sup><0103></sup>Genesis 1:9). At the period of the Exodus horses were abundant in Egypt (<sup><0193></sup>Exodus 9:3; 14:9, 23; <sup><6177></sup>Deuteronomy 17:17), and subsequently, as we have already seen, they were able to supply the nations of Western Asia. The Tyrians purchased these animals from Solomon, and in the time of Ezekiel imported horses themselves from Togarmah or Armenia (<sup><3714></sup>Ezekiel 27:14). The Jewish kings sought the assistance of the Egyptians against the Assyrians in this respect (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 31:1; 36:8; <sup><3715></sup>Ezekiel 17:15). The Canaanites were possessed of them (Dent. 20:1; <sup><6104></sup>Joshua 11:4; <sup><0703></sup>Judges 4:3; 5:22, 28),

and likewise the Syrians (~~1080~~2 Samuel 8:4; ~~1170~~1 Kings 20:1; ~~1164~~2 Kings 6:14; 7:7, 10) notices, which are confirmed by the pictorial representations on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, 1, 393, 397, 401), and by the Assyrian inscriptions relating to Syrian expeditions. But the cavalry of the Assyrians themselves and other Eastern nations was regarded as most formidable; the horses themselves were highly bred, as the Assyrian sculptures still testify, and fully merited the praise bestowed on them by Habakkuk (~~3008~~Habakkuk 1:8),” swifter than leopards, and more fierce than the evening wolves;” their riders “clothed in blue, captains and rulers, all of them desirable young men” (~~2226~~Ezekiel 23:6), armed with “the bright sword and glittering spear” (~~3488~~Nahum 3:3), made a deep impression on the Jews, who, plainly clad, went on foot; as also did their regular array as they proceeded in couples, contrasting with the disorderly troops of asses and camels which followed with the baggage (~~2207~~Isaiah 21:7, *rekeb* in this passage signifying rather a *train* than a single chariot). The number employed by the Eastern potentates was very great, Holofernes possessing not less than 12,000 (Judith 2:15). At a later period we have frequent notices of the cavalry of the Graeco-Syrian monarchs (1 Macc. 1, 18; 3:39, etc.).

## Picture for Horse 4

## Picture for Horse 5

The above notices of the use of the horse by the ancient Egyptians derives abundant illustration from their monuments. In the sculptured battle-scenes, which are believed to represent victories of Sesostris, or of Thothmes II and III, over nations of Central Asia, it is evident that the enemy’s armies, as well as the foreign allies of Egypt, were abundantly supplied with horses, both for chariots and for riders; and in triumphal processions they are shown as presents or tribute-proving that they were portions of the national wealth of conquered states sufficiently valuable to be prized in Egypt. That the Assyrians and Babylonians were equally well supplied with this valuable animal is likewise attested by the martial scenes depicted on the sculptures discovered among the ruins of Nineveh and the vicinity. They are represented in almost every variety of position and employment, such as the chase, and for other purposes of pleasure; but chiefly in war, for which the Assyrians used them both with the saddle and in the chariot. According to Mr. Layard (*Nineveh*, 1st series, 1, 275 sq.), the horses of the Assyrians were well formed and of noble blood, as

appears from the figures no doubt faithfully copied on the sculptures. Cavalry formed an important part of the Assyrian army. The horsemen carried the bow and spear, and wore coats of mail, high greaves, and the pointed helmet. Their horses also were covered, and even, it would seem, with a kind of leather armor, from the head to the tail, to protect them from the arrows of the enemy. It consisted of several pieces fastened together by buttons or loops. Over it was thrown an ornamented saddlecloth, or a leopard's skin, upon which the rider sat. Under the head of the horse was hung a bell (comp. <sup><3140></sup>Zechariah 14:20) or a tassel. The reins appear to have been tightened round the neck of the horse by a sliding button, and then dropped as the war Tior was engaged in fight. Between the horse's ears was an arched crest, and the different parts of the harness were richly embroidered, and ornamented with rosettes (Layard's *Nin.* 2nd ser. p. 456). *SEE HORSEMAN.*

## Picture for Horse 6

With regard to the trappings and management of the horse among the Hebrews and adjoining nations, we (have little information; the bridle (*resen*) was placed over the horse's nose (<sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 30:28), and a bit or curb (*metheg*) is also noticed (<sup><1268></sup>2 Kings 19:28; <sup><1819></sup>Psalms 32:9; <sup><1018></sup>Proverbs 26:3; <sup><2372></sup>Isaiah 37:29; in the A.V. it is incorrectly given "bridle," with the exception of Psalm 32). The harness of the Assyrian horses was profusely decorated, the bits being gilt (1 Esdr. 3:6), and the bridles adorned with tassels; on the neck was a collar terminating in a bell, as described by Zechariah (<sup><3140></sup>Zechariah 14:20). Saddles were not used until a late period; only one is represented on the Assyrian sculptures (Layard, 2, 357). The horses were not shod, and therefore hoofs as hard "as flint" (<sup><2188></sup>Isaiah 5:28) were regarded as a great merit. The chariot-horses were covered with embroidered trappings-the "precious clothes" manufactured at Dedan (<sup><2771></sup>Ezekiel 27:20) these were fastened by straps and buckles, and to this perhaps reference is made in <sup><1781></sup>Proverbs 30:31, in the term *zarzir*, "one girded about the loins" (A.V. "greyhound"). Thus adorned, Mordecai rode in state through the streets of Shushan (<sup><1781></sup>Esther 6:9). White horses were more particularly appropriate to such occasions as being significant of victory (<sup><6612></sup>Revelation 6:2; 19:11, 14). Horses and chariots were used also in idolatrous processions, as noticed in regard to the sun (<sup><12311></sup>2 Kings 23:11). As to kinds of harness, etc., by means of which the services of the horse were anciently made available by other nations, it may be well to notice that the riding bridle was long a mere slip-knot,

passed round the under jaw into the mouth, thus furnishing only one rein; and that a rod was commonly added to guide the animal with more facility. The bridle, however, and the reins of chariot-horses were, at a very early age, exceedingly perfect, as the monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Greece amply prove. Saddles were not used, the rider sitting on the bare back, or using a cloth or mat girded on the animal. The Romans, no doubt copying the Persian Cataphractae, first used pad saddles, and from the northern nations adopted stimuli or spurs. Stirrups were unknown. Avicenna first mentions the *rikiab*, or Arabian stirrup, perhaps the most ancient; although in the tumuli of Central Asia, Tahtar horse skeletons, bridles, and stirrup saddles have been found along with idols, which proves the tombs to be more ancient than the introduction of Islam. With regard to horseshoeing, bishop Lowth and Bracy Clark were mistaken in believing that the Roman horse or mule shoe was fastened on without nails driven through the horny part of the hoof, as at present. A contrary conclusion may be inferred from several passages in the poets; and the figure of a horse in the Pompeii battle mosaic, shod in the same manner as is now the practice, leaves little doubt on the question. The principal use of horses anciently was for the chariot, especially in war; to this they were attached by means of a pole and yoke like oxen, a practice which continued down to the times of the Romans. (See *Bible Animals*, p. 248 sq.) **SEE CHARIOT; SEE BRIDLE.**

It appears that the horse was derived from High Asia, and was not indigenous in Arabia, Syria, or Egypt (Jardine's *Naturalist's Library*, vol. 12), where his congeners the zebra, quagga, and ass are still found in primitive freedom, although the horse is found in all parts of the world free, it is true, but only as a wild descendant of a once domesticated stock. (See Schlieben, *Die Pferde des Alterthums*, Neuwied. 1867; Abd el Kader, *Horses of the Desert*, trans. by Daumas, London, 1863.) All the great original varieties or races of horses were then known in Western Asia, and the Hebrew prophets themselves have not infrequently distinguished the nations they had in view by means of the predominant colors of their horses, and that more correctly than commentators have surmised. Taking Bochart's application (*Hieroz.* 1, 31 sq.) of the Hebrew names, the bay race, **μ/da**; *adom.*, emphatically belonged to Egypt and Arabia Felix; the white, **μynḥb**] *lebonim*, to the regions above the Euxine Sea, Asia Minor, and northern High Asia; the dun, or cream-colored, **μyQæa**] *serukkim*, to the Medes; the spotted *piebald*, or skewbald, **μyDæB**] *beruddim*, to the

Macedonians, the Parthians, and later Tahtars; and the *black*, *μυρῆς*; *shachorim*, to the Romans; but the *chestnut*, *//mai,am, otz*, does not belong to any known historical race (<sup><3008></sup>Zechariah 1:8; 6:2). *SEE ASS*; *SEE MULE*; *SEE DROMEDARY*. Bay or red horses occur most frequently on Egyptian painted monuments, this being the primitive color of the Arabian stock, but white horses are also common, and, in a few instances, black the last probably only to relieve the paler color of the one beside it in the picture. There is also, we understand, an instance of a spotted pair, tending to show that the valley of the Nile was originally supplied with horses from foreign sources and distinct regions, as, indeed, the tribute pictures further attest. The spotted, if not real, but painted horses, indicate the antiquity of a practice still in vogue; for staining the hair of riding animals with spots of various colors, and dyeing their limbs and tails crimson, is a practice of common occurrence in the East. These colors are typical, in some passages of Scripture, of various qualities, e.g. the white of victory, the black of defeat and calamity, the red of bloodshed, etc. (compare Rev. 6). *SEE COLOR*.

### Horse-Gate

(*mys* *Shirv*, *sha'ar has-susim*, *Gate of the horses*; Sept. *πύλη ἵππων* or *ἵππέων*, Vulg. *porta equorum*), a gate in the first or old wall of Jerusalem, at the west end of the bridge leading from Zion to the Temple (<sup><1033></sup>Nehemiah 3:28; <sup><3610></sup>Jeremiah 31:40), perhaps so called as being that by which the "horses of the sun" (<sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 23:11) were led by the idolaters into the sacred enclosure (<sup><1035></sup>2 Chronicles 23:15; comp. <sup><1216></sup>2 Kings 11:16). (See Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels*, Append. 1, p. 14.) Barclay, however, thinks of a position near the Hippodrome (which, on the contrary, was a later edifice), at the S.E. corner of the Temple wall (*City of the Great King*, p. 152). *SEE JERUSALEM*.

### Horse-leech

(*hq* *l* } *alukah*); Sept. *ἡ βδέλλα*, Vulg. *sanguisuga*, A.V. some eds. as two words, "horse leech") occurs once only, viz. <sup><1015></sup>Proverbs 30:15, "The horseleech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give." Although the Hebrew word is translated *leech* in nearly all the versions, there has been much dispute whether that is its proper meaning. *Against the received translation*, it has been urged that, upon an examination of the context in which it occurs, the introduction of the leech seems strange; that it is



impossible to understand what is meant by its “two daughters,” or *three*, as the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic versions assign to it; and that, instead of the incessant craving apparently attributed to it, the leech drops off when filled. In order to evade these difficulties, it has been attempted, but in vain, to connect the passage either with the preceding or subsequent verse. It has also been attempted to give a different sense to the Hebrew word. But as it occurs nowhere besides in Scripture, and as the root from which it would seem to be derived is never used as a verb, no assistance can be obtained from the Scriptures themselves in this investigation. Recourse is therefore had to the Arabic. The following is the line of criticism pursued by the learned Bochart (*Hieroicoicon*, ed. Rosenmüller, 3, 785, etc.). The Arabic word for leech is *alahkah*, which is derived from a verb signifying to hang or to adhere to. But the Hebrew word, *alukah*, he would derive from another Arabic root, *aluk*, which means “fate, heavy misfortune, or impending calamity;” and hence he infers that *allukah* properly means destiny, and particularly the *necessity of dying* which attaches to every man by the decree of God. He urges that it is not strange that *offspring* should be ascribed to this divine appointment, since, in Proverbs 27, offspring is attributed to time, a day” Thou knowest not what a day may *bring forth*.” Now the Hebrews call events “the children of time.” We also speak of “the womb of time.” He cites <sup>(177)</sup>Proverbs 27:20, as a parallel passage; “Hell (*sheol*) and the grave are never full.” Hence he supposes that *sheol* and the *grave* are the two daughters of *Alukah* or *Destiny*; each cries “give” at the same moment the former asks for the soul, and the latter for the body of man in death; both are insatiable, for both involve all mankind in one common ruin. He further thinks that both these are called daughters, because each of the words is of the feminine or, at most, of the common gender; and in the 16th verse, the grave (*sheol*) is specified as one of the “things that are never satisfied.” In further confirmation of this view, Bochart cites rabbinical writers, who state that by the word *alukah*, which occurs in the Chaldee paraphrase on the Psalms, they understand destiny to be signified; and also remark that it has two daughters — Eden and Gehenna, Paradise and Hell — the former of whom never has enough of the souls of the righteous, the latter of, the souls of the wicked. (See also Alb. Schultens, *Comment.* ad loc.).

*In behalf of the received translation*, it is urged that it is scarcely credible that all the ancient translators should have confounded *alukah* with *alahkah*; that it is peculiarly unlikely that this should have been the case with the

Septuagint translator of the book of Proverbs, because it is believed that “this ranks next to the translation of the Pentateuch for ability and fidelity of execution;” and that the author of it must have been well skilled in the two languages (Horne’s *Introduction*, 2, 43 ed. 1828). It is further pleaded that the application of Arabic analogies to Hebrew words is not decisive; and finally, that the theory proposed by Bochart is not essential to the elucidation of the passage. In the preceding verse the writer (not Solomon see ver. 1) speaks of “a generation, whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw-teeth as knives to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men;” and then, after the abrupt and picturesque style of the East, especially in their proverbs, which is nowhere more vividly exemplified than in this whole chapter, the leech is introduced as an illustration of the covetousness of such persons, and of the two distinguishing vices of which it is the parent, avarice and cruelty. May not also the “two daughters of the leech, crying, Give, give,” be a figurative description of the two lips of the creature (for these it has, and perfectly formed), which are a part of its very complicated mouth? It certainly is agreeable to the Hebrew style to call the offspring of inanimate things daughters, for so branches are called daughters of trees (<sup>41422</sup>Genesis 49:22, margin). A similar use of the word is found in <sup>21214</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:4, “All the daughters of music shall be brought low,” meaning the lips, front teeth, and other parts of the mouth. It is well remarked by Prof. Paxton that “this figurative application of the entire genus is sufficient to justify the interpretation. The leech, as a symbol in use among rulers of every class and in all ages, for avarice, rapine, plunder, rapacity, and even assiduity, is too well known to need illustration” (see Plautus, *Epidic.* art. 2; Cicero, *ad Attic.*; Horace, *Ars. Poet.* 476; Theocritus, *Pharmaceut.*; etc.). In confirmation of this view, Prof. Stuart remarks (*Comment.* ad loc.), “The Arabians have the same word, and in the *Camûs*, their standard dictionary, it is defined by another Arabic word, viz. *Ghoui*. This latter the *Camûs* again defines as meaning, (1) *Calamity*, (2) *Forestdevil*, (3) *Adaemon man-eating and insatiable*. The Arabians, down to the present hour, maintain that it is often met with in the forests of Arabia, and they stand in great terror of it when entering a thick woods. (See Lane’s *Modern Egyptians*, 1, 344.) The Syrians had a like superstition, but, like the Hebrews, they more generally named the sprite *lilith*. In <sup>23811</sup>Isaiah 35:14, this last word occurs (Auth. Version screech-owl), and it is amply and finely illustrated by Gesenius (*Comment.* ad loc.). In like manner, Western superstition is full of spokes, hobgoblins, elves, imps, and vampires; all.

especially the last of which, are essentially insatiable, blood sucking specters.” (See also Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb. p.* 1038.) **SEE SPECTER.**

There is, then, little doubt that *alukah* denotes some species of leech, or, rather, is the generic term for any blood-sucking annelid, such as *Hirudo* (the medicine leech), *Haemopis* (the horse-leech), *Limnatis*, *Trochetia* and *Aulastoma*, if all these genera are found in the marshes and pools of the Bible-lands. The leech of bloodsucker belongs to the genus *vermes*, order *intestinata*, Limn. It is viviparous, brings forth only *one* offspring at a time, and the genus contains many species “The *horse-leech*” is properly a *species* of leech discarded for medical purposes on account of the coarseness of its bite. There is no ground for the *distinction of species* made in the English Bible. The valuable use of the leech (*Hirudo*) in medicine, though undoubtedly known to Pliny and the later Roman writers, was in all probability unknown to the ancient Orientals; still they were doubtless acquainted with the fact that leeches of the above-named genus would attach themselves to the skin of persons going barefoot in ponds; and they also were probably cognizant of the propensity horse-leeches (*Haemopis*) have of entering the mouth and nostrils of cattle, as they drink from the waters frequented by these pests, which are common enough in Palestine and Syria. The use which, from its thirst for blood, we make of the leech, being unknown to the ancient Orientals, as it is unknown in the East at the present day, it is there spoken of with feelings of horror and aversion, particularly as it causes the destruction of valuable animals by fastening under their tongues when they come to drink. The lake called Birket er-Ram, the ancient Phiala, about three hours from Banias, is said to be so crowded with leeches that a man can gather 6000 or even 8000 in a day, while the fountain at Banias is not infested by a single leech.

### **Picture for Horse-leech**

The mechanism by which the leech is enabled to gratify its greedy thirst for blood is highly curious. The throat is spacious and capable of being everted to a great degree. The front border of the mouth is enlarged so as to form a sort of upper lip, and this combines with the wrinkled muscular margin of the lower and lateral portions to form the sucker. We may even slit down the ventral margin of the sucker, exposing the whole throat. Then the edges being folded back, we see implanted in the walls on the dorsal regions of the cavity three white eminences of a cartilaginous texture, which rise to a sharp crescentic edge; they form a triangular, or, rather, a

triradiate figure, and by a peculiar saw-like motion so abrade the surface as to cause a flow of blood, which is greatly assisted by the contraction of the edges forming a vacuum like a cupping-glass.

## Horseman

### Picture for Horseman

(properly and usually *vrP;I B. ba'al parash'*, *master of a horse*). Our translation would make it appear that a force of cavalry accompanied Pharaoh in his pursuit — “his horsemen” (<sup><0243></sup>Exodus 14:9 etc.). It is, however, a fact not a little remarkable, that in the copious delineations of battle-scenes which occur in the monuments, and which must have been coeval with these events, in which, moreover, everything that could tend to aggrandize the power or flatter the pride of Egypt would be introduced, there never occurs any representation of Egyptian cavalry. The armies are always composed of troops of infantry armed with the bow and spear, and of ranks of chariots drawn by two horses. Both Diodorus and Herodotus attribute cavalry to the early Pharaohs; and some eminent antiquarians, as Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, endeavor to account for the absence of such a force in the pictorial representations consistently with its existence. But professor Hengstenberg has maintained, and not without some degree of probability, that the word “horsemen” of the above passage should rather be rendered “chariot riders.” We quote his words: “It is accordingly certain that the cavalry, in the more ancient period of the Pharaohs, was but little relied on. The question now is, what relation the declarations of the passage before us bear to this result. Were the common view, according to which riding *on horses* is superadded with equal prominence to the chariot of war, in our passage, the right one, there might arise strong suspicion against the credibility of the narrative. But a more accurate examination shows that the author does not mention Egyptian cavalry at all; that, according to him, the Egyptian army is composed only of chariots of war, that he therefore agrees in a wonderful manner with the native Egyptian monuments. And this agreement is the more minute, since the second division of the army represented upon them, the infantry, could not, ill the circumstances of our narrative, take part in the pursuit. The first and principal passage concerning the constituent parts of the Egyptian army which pursued the Israelites is that in <sup><0246></sup>Exodus 14:6, 7 “And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him; and he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and *chariot-warriors* upon

all of them.” Here Pharaoh’s preparation for war is fully described. It consists, first, of chariots, and, secondly, of chariot warriors. Cavalry are no more mentioned than infantry. This passage, which is so plain, explains the second one (ver. 9), where the arrival of this same army in sight of the Israelites is plainly and graphically described, in order to place distinctly before the reader the impression which the view made upon the Israelites: “And the Egyptians followed them and overtook them, where they were encamped by the sea, all the *chariot-horses* of Pharaoh, and his *riders*, and his host” (*Egypt and Moses*, ch. 4). *SEE CHARIOT*.

## Picture for Horseman 2

## Picture for Horseman 3

In the same connection we may remark that, although the Egyptian warriors usually rode two in a chariot only, yet it appears, from the use of the peculiar term *vyl æ*, *shalish*’ (lit. *third*, A.V. “captain”), applied to the charioteers destroyed in the Red Sea (<sup><D154></sup>Exodus 15:4), and to other officers (<sup><D128></sup>2 Samuel 23:8, etc.), that occasionally at least *three* persons were accustomed to ride together in battle; and this is confirmed by the fact that in some of the delineations on the Egyptian monuments we find two persons represented as principals in a war-car, while a third manages the reins. *SEE CAPTAIN*.

Among the Assyrians, on the other hand, single riders on horseback were not uncommon, although with them, too, the cavalry arm of the military service consisted chiefly of chariots. *SEE ARMY*.

## Horsley, Samuel

One of the most distinguished divines ever produced by the Church of England, was born in London, October 1733. He was the son of the Reverend John Horsley (whose father was originally a Nonconformist), for many years the clerk in orders at St.Martin’s-in-the-Fields, and who held two rectories, Thorley in Hertfordshire, and Newington Butts in Surrey. Samuel Horsley was educated at Westminster School and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and had the rectory of Newington, which his father resigned to him soon after he had taken orders in 1759. His more public career may be said to have commenced in 1767 when he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, of which body he became secretary in 1773. His earliest publications were tracts on scientific subjects, but in 1776 he projected a

complete and uniform edition of the philosophical works of Sir Isaac Newton. This design was not accomplished till 1785, when the fifth and last of the five quarto volumes made its appearance. In the earlier years of his public life he found patrons in the earl of Aylesford, and in Lowth, bishop of London; but we pass over the presentations to his various livings, and the dispensations, which the number of his minor preferments rendered necessary. In 1781 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Albans. It was a little before the date last named that he first appeared in the field of theological controversy, in which, from the great extent of his knowledge and from the vigor of his intellect, he soon showed himself a very powerful combatant. His attacks were chiefly directed against Dr. Joseph Priestley, who in a series of publications defended with great subtlety and skill the doctrines of philosophical necessity, materialism, and Unitarianism. Dr. Horsley began his attack in 1778 on the question of *Man's Free Agency*; it was continued in a *Charge* delivered in 1783 to the clergy of his archdeaconry, in which he animadverted on many parts of Dr. Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. This charge produced a reply from Dr. Priestley, which led to a rejoinder from Dr. Horsley in *Seventeen Letters to Dr. Priestley*, a masterly defense of the orthodox faith, and the secure foundation of a lasting theological reputation. These writings are believed to have stopped the progress, for that age, of Socinianism in England. The tide of preferment now began to flow in upon him. Thurlow, who was then chancellor, presented him with a prebendal stall in the church of Gloucester, observing, as it is said that "those who defended the Church ought to be supported by the Church;" and in 1788 he was made bishop of St. David's. In Parliament he distinguished himself by the hearty support which he gave to the measures of Pitt's administration. His political conduct gained him the favor of the court: in 1793 he was translated to Rochester, and in 1802 to St. Asaph. He died October 4, 1806. Dr. Horsley has been, not inaptly, described as the last of the race of episcopal giants of the Warburtonian school. He was a man of an original and powerful mind, of very extensive learning, and profoundly versed in the subject of ecclesiastical history, of which he gave ample evidence in his controversy with Dr. Priestley, while archdeacon of St. Albans. Even Gibbon says, "His spear pierced the Socinian's shield." His sermons and critical disquisitions frequently display a rich fund of theological acumen, and of successful illustration of the sacred writings. Besides the works named above, his theological writings include *Critical Disquisitions on Isaiah 18* (London 1799, 4to) — *The Book of Psalms, translated, with Notes* (3rd edit.

London, 1833, 8vo) — *Hosea, translated, with Notes* (2nd edit. London 1804) — *Biblical Criticism on the O.Test.* (2nd edit. London 1844, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Sermons on the Resurrection* (3rd edit. London 1822, 8vo); all which, with his tracts in the Priestley controversy, are to be found in his *Collected Works* (London 1845, 6 vols. 8vo). See *English Cyclopædia; Quarterly Review* (London), vols. 3 and 9; *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 17; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 894; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1, 1548; Chalmers, *Biog. Dictionary*; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 6:171 sq.; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 513 sq.; Donaldson, *Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctrines*, 1, 72; *Ch. Hist. of the 13th Century*, p. 445; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 418, 421; Shedd, *History of Doctrines* 1, 57, 386; *General Repository*, 1, 22, 229; 2, 7, 257; 3, 13, 250; *Quarterly Review*, 3, 398; 9:30; *Edinburgh Review*, 17, 455; *Monthly Review*, 84, 82; *Analytical Magazine*, 4, 268.

### Horstius, Jacob Merlo

A Roman Catholic theologian, was born towards the close of the 16th century at Horst, Holland (whence his name). He was priest at the Lyskirchen in Cologne, where he died in 1644. Horstius is the author of several ascetical works. He wrote *Enchiridion officii divini; Paradisus animæ Christianæ* (translated into French by Nicolaus Fontane, under the title *Heures Chretiennes, tirnes de l'Ecriture et des saints Peres*) — *Septem tubæ orbis Christiani* (a compilation from the writings of the fathers, and intended for young Roman Catholic priests). He also edited a commentary of Estius on the *Pauline Letters*; the works of St. Bernard (2 vols.), and of Thomas a Kempis. — Wetzter and Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 12, 593; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* (Elberf. 1868), 2, 369.

### Hort, Josiah

An Anglican prelate, was born towards the close of the 17th century, and educated at a Dissenting school together with Dr. Isaac Watts. In 1695 he became chaplain to John Hampden, Esq., M.P., and afterwards settled as Dissenting minister at Marshfield. About 1708 he conformed, and became a minister of the Church of England. He now rose quickly to distinguished positions in the Church. In 1721 he was consecrated bishop of Ferns and Leighlin in Ireland, translated in 1727 to Kilmore and Ardagh, and was advanced to the archbishopric of Tuam in 1742, with the united bishopric of Enaghdoen, and with permission to hold also his former bishopric of

Ardagh. He died Dec. 14, 1751. Bishop Hort published, besides, several collections of *Sermons* (1708-9, 1738, 1757) — *Instructions to the Clergy of Tuam* (1742, 8vo; 1768, 8vo; also in *Clergyman's Instructor*). See Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 6, 184 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 895.

### Hortig, Karl Anton

A distinguished German Roman Catholic (also known by the name given him by his order, JOHANN NEPOMIUCK), was born at Pleistein, Bavaria, in 1774, and was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He entered the order of the Benedictines in 1794, and in 1799 became chaplain of a nunnery at Nürnberg. In 1802 he was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the school of the Andech Cloister, and promoted, after filling various minor positions, to a professorship of theology at Landshut in 1821. In 1826 he removed with the university to Munich, where he received many honors, and died Feb. 27, 1847. His theological works are, *Predigtenf. alle Festtage* (Landsh. 1821; 3rd edit. 1832) — *Predigten ü. d. sontaigigen Evangel.* (ibid. 1827; 2nd ed. 1832) — *Handb. d. christl. Kirchengesch.* (2 vols. 1826-28, of which the second part of vol. 2 was completed by the celebrated Dollinger). *Real-Encyklop. d. atho. Deutschl.* 12, 1031 sq.; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 550.

### Horton, Thomas, D.D.

An English divine, was born at London, and was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1637 he was university preacher, and in July of this year he was chosen master of Queen's College, Cambridge, and minister of St. Mary Colechurch, London. In 1641 he became professor of divinity at Gresham College, and in 1647 preacher of Gray's Inn, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1650. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, but he afterwards conformed, and was appointed vicar of Great St. Helen's, London, in 1666. He died in 1673. He was a pious and learned man, especially skilled in the Oriental languages. Of his works, which are very scarce, the principal are *Sermon* (<sup>1680</sup>Psalm 87:4-6), *Zion's Birth-register unfolded* (London 1656, 4to) — *Forty-six Sermons on the eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (London 1674, fol.) — *Choice and practical Expositions on four select Psalms* (4, 42, 59, 63) (London, 1675, fol.) — *One hundred select Sermons upon several Texts; fifty upon the Old Testament and fifty on the New*: left perfected in the press under his own hands (London 1679, fol.). — Stoughton (John),



*Ecclesiastes Hist. of England* (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 1, 156, 288; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1, 1531; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 6, 185 sq.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* 2 (see Index); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 895.

## Horus

### Picture for Horus

(Ὠρος), the Egyptian god of the sun, generally written in hieroglyphics by the sparrow hawk, and represented with a bird's beak. The old derivation from the Hebrew *aur*, light, is now recognized as incorrect. As an Egyptian divinity he is mentioned generally as the son of Isis and Osiris, and brother of Bubastis, the Egyptian Diana. Various esoteric explanations have been given of him, e.g. that "he represents the Nile, as Typhon the desert, the fruitful air or dew which revives the earth, the moon, the sun in relation to the changes of the year, or the god who presided over the course of the sun." He also represented three planets Jupiter (Harapshta), Saturn (Harka), and Mars (Harteshr). The sparrow hawk was sacred to him; so were lions, which were placed at the side of his throne. There was a festival to celebrate his eyes on the 30th Epiphi, when the sun and moon, which they represented, were on the same right line with the earth. A movable feast, that of his coronation, is supposed to have been selected for the coronations of the kings of Egypt, who are described as sitting upon his throne. When adult, he is generally represented hawk-headed; as a child, he is seen carried in his mother's arms, wearing the *pshent* or *atf*, and seated on a lotus-flower with his finger on his lips. He had an especial local worship at Edfou or Hut, the ancient Apollinopolis Magna, where he was identified with Ra, or the Sun. There were also books of Horus and Isis, probably referring to his legend (Lucian, *De Somn. sive Gall.* s. 183). The magnet was called his bone; he was of fair complexion (Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5 430 sq.). He was also worshipped very extensively in Greece, and later at Rome, in a somewhat modified form. In Grecian mythology he was compared with Apollo, and identified with Harpocrates, the last son of Osiris (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 19). **SEE HORAPOLLO**. They were both represented as youths, and with the same attributes and symbols (Artemid. *Oneiro* 2, 36; Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 23; Porphyry ap. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* 5, 10; Iamblichus, *DeMyster.* 7, 2). In the period of the worship of this god at Rome he seems to have been regarded as the god of quiet life and silence (Varro, *De L. L.* 4, 17, Bip. Ovid, *Met.* 9, 691; Ausonius, *Epist. ad Paul.*

25, 27), which was due no doubt, to the belief that he was born with his finger in his mouth, as indicative of secrecy and mystery. Horus acts also a prominent part in the mystic works attributed to Hermes Trismegistus (q.v.). See Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*,. 2, 526; Birch, *Gall. of Antig.* p. 35; Wilkinson, *Mann. and Cust.* 4, 395; Jablonski, *Panth.* 2, 4, p. 222; Champollion, *Panth. Eg.*; Hincks, *Dublin Univ. Mag.* 28, 187; Bockh, *Manetho*, p. 61; Buseen, *Aegyptens Stelle in d. Weltgesch.* 1, 505 sq. **SEE VALENTINIAN THEOLOGY.** (J. H.W.)

## Horwitz

A Jewish family, several members of which have become distinguished as writers. The most renowned are:

- 1. HORWITZ** (*Sabbatai-Scheftel*), HA-LEVI BEN-AKIBA, head of the synagogue of Prague at the beginning of the 16th century. He wrote *Mr̄aj l P* (Kerez., 1793, 4to), or Commentary on Samuel Galicho's *sys̄j ym̄r̄æ — yw̄ab̄iy TB̄j i t̄m̄ij̄a* (Prague, 1616, 4to), a dialogue expounding the Cabalistic doctrine of the soul: *l f̄; p̄v*, 1780, 4to), a Cabalistic work divided into two parts, making a key to the Jezirah, Zohar, and other Cabalistic books.
- 2. HORWITZ, ABRAHAM**, son of the preceding, and known also under the name of *Schefteles*, was born at Prague in the first half of the 16th century. He wrote the following Hebrew works: *phrb̄aj tyrb̄a* On *Repentance and Confession* (Cracow, 1602, and often): *phrb̄aj l dsj* , a complete commentary on Maimonides' s Introduction to the book Aboth of the Talmud (Cracow, 1577, and often) — — *yl j̄n̄ vye* (Prague, 1615, 4to), containing moral instructions, especially intended for his own children — *hkr̄B̄]qm̄]̄* (Amst. 1757, 4to), containing remarks on the blessings of the Jews and their origin.
- 3. HORWITZ, ISAIAH**, son of the foregoing, born at Prague about 1550, became the most distinguished of this family. He was Rabbi first at Frankfort, then at Posen, at Cracow, and at Prague. In 1622 he went to Jerusalem. 'Poverty induced him to leave that city, and he retired to Tiberias, where he died in 1629. He wrote *tyrb̄aj i t̄m̄ij̄a* (Amsterd. 1649, fol.; several times reprinted), a work which enjoys great reputation among the Jews. It is divided into two parts: the first treats of the existence

of God, the law, the privileges of the people of Israel, the attributes of God, the sanctuary, judgment, free agency, the Messiah, worship, ceremonies, and feasts. The second part contains ten treatises on six hundred and thirteen precepts, the oral law, etc. Three abridgments have been published, one by Epstein (Amst. 1683, 4to; several edit.); the second by Zoref Ha-Levi (Frankf. 1681, 4to); and the third by (Ettling Ben-Jechia (Ven. 1705, 8vo) — **iv,yDgBao** Commentary on “the book of Mordecai,” was at first published only in part with the *Seder Mohed*, then separately (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.), and oftener as an appendix to the book of Mordecai, or in some editions of the Talmud — **hkrB]qm[est] t/hGh]** reflections on the *Emek Berakah* of his father, and printed along with it (Crac. 1597, 4to); also in the two separate editions of the preceding work — **µyæVhiy[ivæ** (Amst. 1717, 4to; with a preface and glossaries by one of his descendants, Abraham Horwitz): it is a Cabalistic commentary on the Psalms and on prayers. The same work contains also his father’s *Sepher Berith Abraham*.

**4. HORWITZ** (*Sabbatai Scheftel*), son of the preceding, was Rabbi of Frankfort, then of Posen, and finally of Vienna, where he died about 1658. He is the author of three Hebrew works, the first entitled *A Treatise on Morals*, in six parts, serving as an introduction to his father’s work, **tyræ] t/j Wl yne]** and printed with it (Amst. 1649, fol.; several editions) — **haWx**, printed with his grandfather’s **yl bñn vyæ** (Amst. 1717 4to), a work on morals already referred to above — **t/krB]SmevWJ** printed with his grandfather’s *Emek Berakah*, on which it is a sort of commentary (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.).

**5. HORWITZ, ISAIAH BEN-JACOB**, nephew of the foregoing, and grandson of the former Isaiah Horwitz, wa, a native of Poland, and died there in 1695. He wrote **ywbai tyBe** (Venice, 1663, 4to), and some commentaries on the Talmud relating to Jewish jurisprudence. See J. Buxtorf, *Rabbinica Bibliotheca*; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*; Rossi, *Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei*; J. First, *Biblioth. Judaica*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*. 25, 207. (J. H.W.)

## Ho’sah

(Heb. *Chosah*’, **hsj q** *refuge*; Sept. **Ωσά**, **Ωσά**, and **Ωσηέ**), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. A place on the border of the tribe of Asher, at a point where the line turned from the direction of Tyre to its terminus on the Mediterranean, in the direction of Achzib (<sup><1623></sup>Joshua 19:29). It is possibly the same with the modern village *el-Ghazieh*, a little south of Zidon; notwithstanding the objection of Schwarz (who thinks this too far north, and prefers a village called *el-Bussah*, a little north of Eczib, *Palest.* p. 194), since it is uncertain which way the boundary is here described as running, and the account is a good deal involved. Van de Velde proposes to identify it with *el-Kauzah*, “a village with traces of antiquity near wady el-Ain” (*Memoir*, p. 322), the *Kauzih* of Robinson (new *Researches*, p. 61, 62); but to this Keil objects (*Comment. on Joshua* ad loc.) that “the situation does not suit in this connection,” although it lies very near Ramah, and in the direction from Tyre towards Achzib. *SEE ELKOSH.*

2. A Levite of the family of Merari, who, with thirteen of his relatives, was appointed by David porter of the gate Shallecheth, on the west side of the Temple (<sup><3168></sup>1 Chronicles 16:38; 26:10, 11, 16). B.C. 1014.

Hosai.

*SEE HOZAI.*

Hosan'na

(ὡσαννά, from the Heb. אֲנַח־יְבָא, as in <sup><4825></sup>Psalms 118:25; <sup><2801></sup>Isaiah 59:1; 45:20), a form of acclamatory blessing or wishing well, which signifies *Save now!* i.e. “succor now! be now propitious!” It occurs in <sup><420></sup>Matthew 21:9 (also <sup><4109></sup>Mark 11:9,10; <sup><4323></sup>John 12:13), “Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest.” This was on the occasion of our Savior’s public entry into Jerusalem, and, fairly construed, would mean, “*Lord*, preserve this Son of David; heap favors and blessings on him!” It is further to be observed that *Hosanna* was a customary form of acclamation at the Feast of Tabernacles. This feast was celebrated in September, just before the commencement of the civil year, on which occasion the people carried in their hands bundles of boughs of palms, myrtles, etc. (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 13, 6; 3:10, 4). They then repeated the 25th and 26th verses of Psalm 118, which commence with the word *Hosanna*; and from this circumstance they gave the boughs and the prayers, and the feast itself the name of *Hosanna*. They observed the same forms, also, at the Encaenia, or Festival of Dedication (1 Macc. 10:6,7; 2 Macc. 13:51; <sup><4109></sup>Revelation 7:9), and the Passover. — Kitto. The

psalm from which it was taken, the 118th, was one with which they were familiar, from being accustomed to recite the 25th and 26th verses at the Feast of Tabernacles. On that occasion the Great *Hallel*, consisting of Psalm 113-118, was chanted by one of the priests, and at certain intervals the multitudes joined in the responses, waving their branches of willow and palm, and shouting as they waved them Hallelujah, or Hosanna, or “O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity” (~~118:25~~ Psalm 118:25). This was done at the recitation of the first and last verses of Psalm 118, but, according to the school of Hillel, at the words “Save now, we beseech thee” (ver. 25). The school of Shammai, on the contrary, say it was at the words “Send now prosperity” of the same verse. Rabban Gamaliel and R. Joshua were observed by R. Akiba to wave their branches only at the words “Save now, we beseech thee” (Mishna, *Succah*, 3, 9). On each of the seven days during which the feast lasted the people thronged in the court of the Temple, and went in procession about the altar, setting their boughs bending towards it, the trumpets sounding as they shouted Hosanna. But on the seventh day they marched seven times round the altar, shouting meanwhile the great Hosanna to the sound of the trumpets of the Levites (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, 16, 2). The very children who could wave the palm branches were expected to take part in. the solemnity (Mishna, *Succah*, 3, 15; ~~4215~~ Matthew 21:15). From the custom of waving the boughs of myrtle and willow during the service the name Hosanna was ultimately transferred to the boughs themselves so that, according to Elias Levita (*Thisbi*, s.v.), “the bundles of the willows of the brook which they carry at the Feast of Tabernacles are called Hosannas.” The term is frequently applied by Jewish writers to denote the Feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day of the feast being distinguished as the great Hosanna (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.5. [vy]). Monographs on this ejaculation have been written in Latin by Bindrim (Ros. 1671), Nothdurfft (Bruitw. 1713), Pfaff (Tübingen, 1789), Winzer (Lips. 1677-78, 1703), Bucher (Zittav. 1728), Wernsdorf (Viteb. 1765), Zopf (Lips. 1703). *SEE HALLEL.*

## Hosanna

The early Christian Church adopted this word into its worship. It is found in the apostolical constitutions connected with the great doxology or exclamation of triumph, “Glory be to God on high,” and was frequently used in the communion service, during which the great doxology was also

sung. — Eadie, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 314; Bingham, *Christ. Antig.* 1, 41; 2, 690. (J. H.W.)

## Hose

(*vyfP*, *spattish*’, only in the plur., marg. *vyfP*, *pe’tesh.*, Chald., hosen,” Dan. 3:21). What article of apparel is here denoted is not certain. Theodotion (perhaps also the Sept.) and the Vulg. understand a *tiara*; compare Greek *πέτασος*, Venet. Gr. vers. *ἀναξυρίς*; but the Heb. interpreters more correctly render a *tunic* or undergarment (*תַּחֲטִיב* = *חִטּוֹן*), a signification that better agrees with an ample garment (from *vyfP*; to *expand*). The term does not elsewhere occur; but see Buxtorff, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1865. **SEE DRESS.**

## Hose’ä

(Heb. *Hoshe’d*, [*veh*, *deliverance*]), or “HOSHEA” (as it is more correctly Anglicized in Dent. 32 — 44; <sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 15:30; 17:1, 3, 4, 6; 18:1, 9, 10; <sup><1371></sup>1 Chronicles 27:20; <sup><16123></sup>Nehemiah 10:23; but “Oshea” in <sup><4138></sup>Numbers 13:8, 6), the name of several men.

**1.** HOSHEA or OSHEA (Sept. *Αὐσή* and *Ἰησοῦς*, Vulg. *Osee* and *Josue*), the original name of JOSHUA **SEE JOSHUA** (q.v.) Moses’s successor (<sup><4138></sup>Numbers 13:8, 16; Dent. 32:44).

**2.** HOSHEA, the son of Azariah, and viceroy of the Ephraimites under David (<sup><1371></sup>1 Chronicles 27:20).

**3.** HOSEA (Sept. *Ὅσηέ*, Vulg. *Osee*, N.T. *Ὡσεή*, “Osee,” <sup><5125></sup>Romans 9:25), the son of Beeri (<sup><300></sup>Hosea 1:1, 2), and author of the book of prophecies which bears his name. **SEE PROPHET.**

The personal history of the prophet Hosea is so closely interwoven with his book of prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider them together; indeed he principal recorded events of his life were a series of prophetic symbols themselves. The figments of Jewish writers regarding Hosea’s parentage need scarcely be mentioned (see J. Fredericus, *Exercit. de Hosea et vaticiniis ejus*, Lips. 1715). His father has been confounded with *Beerah*, a prince of the Reubenites (<sup><1186></sup>1 Chronicles 5:6). So, too, Beerah has been reckoned a prophet himself, according to the rabbinical notion that the mention of a prophet’s father in the introduction to his

prophecies is a proof that sire as well as son was endowed with the oracular spirit.

**1. Place.** — Whether Hosea was a citizen of Israel or Judah has been disputed. The pseudo-Epiphanius and Dorotheus of Tyre speak of him as being born at Belemoth, in the tribe of Issachar (Epiphan. *De Vitis Prophet.* cap. 11; Dorotheus. *De Proph.* cap. 1). Drusius (*Critici Sacri*, in loc., tom. 5) prefers the reading “Beth-semes,” and quotes Jerome, who says, “Osee de tribu Issachar fuit ortus in Beth-semes.” But Maurer contends strenuously that he belonged to the kingdom of Judah (*Comment. Theol.*, ed. Rosenmüller, 2, 391); while Jahn supposes that he exercised his office, not, as Amos did, in Israel, but in the principality of Judah. Maurer appeals to the superscription in Amos as a proof that prophets of Jewish origin were sometimes commissioned to labor in the kingdom of Israel (against the appeal to Amos see Credner, *Joel*, p. 66; Hitzig, *Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. zum A. T.* p. 72). But with the exception of the case recorded in <sup><1110></sup>1 Kings 13:1 (a case altogether too singular and mysterious to serve as an argument), the instance of Amos is a solitary one, and seems to have been regarded as anomalous by his contemporaries (<sup><3172></sup>Amos 7:12). Neither can we assent to the other hypothesis of Maurer, that the mention of the Jewish kings Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, by Hosea in his superscription is a proof that the seer regarded them as his rightful sovereigns, as monarchs of that territory which gave him birth. Hengstenberg has well replied, that Maurer forgets “the relation in which the pious in Israel generally, and the prophets in particular, stood to the kingdom of Judah. They considered the whole separation, not only the religious, but also the civil, as an apostasy from God. The dominion of the theocracy was promised to be the throne of David.” The lofty Elijah, on a memorable occasion, when a direct and solemn appeal was made to the head of the theocracy, took *twelve* stones, one for each tribe — a proof that he regarded the nation as one in religious confederation. It was also necessary, for correct chronology, that the kings of both nations should be noted. The other argument of Maurer for Hosea’s being a Jew, viz. because his own people are so severely threatened in his reproofs and denunciations, implies a predominance of national prepossession or antipathy in the inspired breast’ which is inconsistent with our notions of the piety and patriotism of the prophetic commission (Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebraer*, 1, 203). We therefore accede to the opinion of De Wette, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Eichhorn, Manger, Uhland, and

Kuinol, that Hosea was an Israelite, a native of that kingdom with whose sins and fates his book is specially and primarily occupied. The name Ephraim occurs in his prophecies about thirty-five times, and Israel with equal frequency, while Judah is not mentioned more than fourteen times. Samaria is frequently spoken of (<sup><2001></sup>Hosea 7:1; 8:5, 6; 10:5, 7; 14:1), Jerusalem never. All the other localities introduced are connected with the northern kingdom, either as forming part of it, or lying on its borders: Mizpah, Tabor (<sup><2001></sup>Hosea 5:1), Gilgal (<sup><2045></sup>Hosea 4:15; 9:15; 12:12 [11]), Bethel, called also Bethaven (<sup><2015></sup>Hosea 10:15; 12:5 [4]; <sup><2045></sup>Hosea 4:15; 5:8; 10:5, 8), Jezreel (1:4), Gibeah (<sup><2008></sup>Hosea 5:8; 9:9), Ramah (<sup><2008></sup>Hosea 5:8), Gilead (<sup><2048></sup>Hosea 4:8; 12:12 [11]), Shechem (<sup><2009></sup>Hosea 6:9), Lebanon (<sup><2046></sup>Hosea 14:6, 7), Arbela (<sup><2004></sup>Hosea 10:14 [?]).

**2. Time.** — There is no reason, with De Wette, Maurer, and Hitzig, to doubt the genuineness of the present superscription, or, with Rosenmüller and Jahn, to suppose that it may have been added by a later hand though the last two writers uphold its authenticity. These first and second verses of the prophecy are so closely connected in the structure of the language and style of the narration, that the second verse itself would become suspicious if the first were reckoned a spurious addition. This superscription states that Hosea prophesied during a long and eventful period, commencing in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, extending through the lives of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and concluding in the reign of Hezekiah. As Jeroboam died B.C. 782, and Hezekiah ascended the throne 726, we have the round term of about sixty years, B.C. cir. 784/724, as the probable space of time covered by the utterance of these predictions (Maurer, in the *Comment. Theol.* p. 284, and more lately in his *Comment. Gram. Hist. Crit. in Proph. Min.* Lips. 1840). The time when they were committed to writing may probably be fixed at about B.C. 725. This long duration of office is not improbable, and the book itself furnishes strong presumptive evidence in support of this chronology. The first prophecy of Hosea foretells the overthrow of Jehu's house; and the menace was fulfilled on the death of Jeroboam, his great-grandson. This prediction must have been uttered during Jeroboam's life. Again, in <sup><2014></sup>Hosea 10:14, allusion is made to an expedition of Shalmaneser against Israel; and if it was the first inroad against king Hoshea (<sup><2074></sup>2 Kings 17:4), who began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz, the event referred to by the prophet as past must have happened close upon the beginning of the government of Hezekiah. These



data corroborate the limits assigned in the superscription, and they are capable of verification by reference to the contents of the prophecy.

**(a.)** As to the beginning, Eichhorn has clearly shown that we cannot allow Hosea much ground in the reign of Jeroboam (823-782).

The book contains descriptions which are utterly inapplicable to the condition of the kingdom of Israel during this reign (<sup>245</sup>2 Kings 14:25 sq.). The pictures of social and political life which Hosea draws so forcibly are rather applicable to the interregnum which followed the death of Jeroboam (781-771), and to the reign of the succeeding kings. The calling in of Egypt and Assyria to the aid of rival factions (<sup>218</sup>Hosea 10:3; 13:10) has nothing to do with the strong and able government of Jeroboam. Nor is it conceivable that a prophet who had lived long under Jeroboam should have omitted the mention of that monarch's conquests in his enumeration of Jehovah's kindnesses to Israel (<sup>218</sup>Hosea 2:8). It seems, then, almost certain that very few at least of his prophecies were written until after the death of Jeroboam (781).

**(b.)** As regards the end of his career, the title leaves us in still greater doubt. It merely assures us that he did not prophesy beyond the reign of Hezekiah. But here, again, the contents of the book help us to reduce the vagueness of this indication. In the sixth year of Hezekiah the prophecy of Hosea was fulfilled, and it is very improbable that he should have permitted this triumphant proof of his divine mission to pass unnoticed. He could not, therefore, have lived long into the reign of Hezekiah; and as it does not seem necessary to allow more than a year of each reign to justify his being represented as a contemporary on the one hand of Jeroboam, on the other of Hezekiah, we may suppose that the life, or, rather, the prophetic career of Hosea, extended from 782 to 725, a period of fifty-seven years.

**3. Order in the Prophetic Series.** — *Hosea* is the first in order of the twelve minor prophets in the common editions of the Scriptures (Heb., Sept., and Vulg.), an arrangement, however, supposed to have arisen from a misinterpretation of chap. 1:2, which rather denotes that what follows were the first divine communications enjoyed by this particular prophet (see Jerome, *Prefat. in 12 Prophetas*; Hengstenberg, *Christol.* Keith's translated, 2:23; De Wette, *Einleitung*, § 225; Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Min. Proph.* p. 7; Newcome, *Pref. to Min. Prophets*, p. 45). The probable causes of this location of Hosea may be the thoroughly national character of his oracles, their length, their earnest tone, and vivid representations.

The contour of the book has a closer resemblance to the greater prophets than any of the eleven productions by which it is succeeded. (See below.) There is much doubt as to the relative order of the first four or five of the minor prophets: as far as titles go, Amos is Hosea's only rival; but <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 14:25 goes far to show that they must both yield in priority to Jonah. It is perhaps more important to know that Hosea must have been more or less contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, Jonah, Joel, and Nahum.

**4. Circumstance, Scope, and Contents of the Book.** — The years of Hosea's public life were dark and melancholy (see Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). The nation suffered under the evils of that schism which was effected by "Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin." The obligations of law had been relaxed, and the claims of religion disregarded; Baal became the rival of Jehovah, and in the dark recesses of the groves were practiced the impure and murderous rites of heathen deities; peace and prosperity fled the land, which was harassed by foreign invasion and domestic broils; might and murder became the twin sentinels of the throne; alliances were formed with other nations, which brought with them seductions to paganism; captivity and insult were heaped upon Israel by the uncircumcised; the nation was thoroughly debased, and but a fraction of its population maintained its spiritual allegiance (<sup><1298></sup>2 Kings 19:18). The death of Jeroboam II was followed by an interregnum of eleven years (B.C. 781-770), at the end of which his son Zachariah assumed the sovereignty, and was slain by Shallum, after the short space of six months (<sup><1250></sup>2 Kings 15:10). In four weeks Shallum was assassinated by Menahem. The assassin, during a disturbed reign of ten years (B.C. 769-759), became tributary to the Assyrian Pul. His successor, Pekahiah, wore the crown but two years, when he was murdered by Pekah. Pekah, after swaying his bloody scepter for twenty years (B.C. 757-737), met a similar fate in the conspiracy of Hoshea; Hoshea, the last of the usurpers, after another interregnum of eight years, ascended the throne (B.C. 729), and his administration of nine years ended in the overthrow of his kingdom and the expatriation of his people (<sup><1278></sup>2 Kings 17:18,23).

The prophecies of Hosea were directed especially against the country of Israel or Ephraim, whose sin had brought upon it such disasters — prolonged anarchy and final captivity. Their homicides and fornications, their perjury and theft, their idolatry and impiety, are censured and satirized with a faithful severity. Judah is sometimes, indeed, introduced, warned, and admonished. Bishop Horsley (*Works*, 3, 236) reckons it a mistake to

suppose, "that Hosea's prophecies are almost wholly directed against the kingdom of Israel." The bishop describes what he thinks the correct extent of Hosea's commission, but has adduced no proof of his assertion. Any one reading Hosea will at once discover that the oracles having relation to Israel are primary, while the references to Judah are only incidental. In ~~3007~~Hosea 1:7, Judah is mentioned in contrast with Israel, to whose condition the symbolic name of the prophet's son is especially applicable. In ver. 11 the future union of the two nations is predicted. The long oracle in chap. 2 has no relation to Judah, nor the symbolic representation in chap. 3. Chap. 4 is severe upon Ephraim, and ends with a very brief exhortation to Judah not to follow his example. In the succeeding chapters allusions to Judah do indeed occasionally occur, when similar sins can be predicated of both branches of the nation. The prophet's mind was intensely interested in the destinies of his own people. The nations around him are unheeded; his prophetic eye beholds the crisis approaching his country, and sees its cantons ravaged, its tribes murdered or enslaved. No wonder that his rebukes were so terrible, his menaces so alarming, that his soul poured forth its strength in an ecstasy of grief and affection. Invitations replete with tenderness and pathos are interspersed with his warnings and expostulations. Now we are startled with a vision of the throne, at first shrouded in darkness, and sending forth lightning, thunders, and voices; but while we gaze, it becomes encircled with a rainbow, which gradually expands till it is lost in that universal brilliancy which itself had originated (chaps. 11 and 14).

**5.** — *The Prophet's Family Relations.* — The peculiar mode of instruction which the prophet details in the first and third chapters of his oracles has given rise to many disputed theories. We refer to the command expressed in ~~3007~~Hosea 1:2 — "And the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms," etc.; ~~3008~~Hosea 3:1, "Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress," etc. Were these real events, the result of divine injunctions literally understood, and as literally fulfilled? Or were these intimations to the prophet only intended to be pictorial illustrations of the apostasy and spiritual folly and unfaithfulness of Israel? The former view, viz. that the prophet actually and literally entered into this impure connubial alliance, was advocated in ancient times by Cyril, Theodoret, Basil, and Augustine; and more recently has been maintained by Mercer, Grotius, Houbigant, Manger, Horsley, Eichhor, Stuck, and others. Fanciful

theories are also rife on this subject. Luther supposed the prophet to perform a kind of drama in view of the people, giving his lawful wife and children these mystical appellations. Newcome (*Minor Prophets*) thinks that a wife of fornication means merely an Israelite, a woman of apostate and adulterous Israel. So Jac. Capellus (*In loseam; Opera*, p. 683). Hengstenberg supposes the prophet to relate actions which happened, indeed, actually, but not outwardly. Some, with Maimonides (*Joreh Nevochim*, pt. 2), imagine it to be a nocturnal vision; while others make it wholly an allegory, as the Chaldee Paraphrast Jerome, Drusius, Bauer, Rosenmüller, Kuino; and Lowth. The view of Hengstenberg (*Christology*, 2, 11-22), and such as have held his theory (*Marki Diatribe de uxore fornicationum accipienda*, etc., Lugdun. Batav. 1696), is not materially different from the last to which we have referred (see Libkerk in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 647 sq.). Besides other arguments resting on the impurity and loathsomeness of the supposed nuptial contract, it may be argued against the external reality of the event that it must have required several years for its completion, and that the impressiveness of the symbol would therefore be weakened and obliterated. But this would almost equally apply to the repeated case of Isaiah (<sup><238B></sup>Isaiah 8:3; 20:3). Other prophetic transactions of a similar nature might be referred to. Jerome (*Comment. ad loc.*) has referred to <sup><200B></sup>Ezekiel 4:4. On the other hand, the total absence of any figurative or symbolical phraseology seems to require the command to be taken in a literal sense, and the immediate addition of the declaration that the order was obeyed serves to confirm this view. It is not to be supposed, as has sometimes been argued, that the prophet was commanded to commit fornication. The divine injunction was to *marry* — “Scortum aliquis ducere potest sine peccato, scortari non item” (Drusius, *Comm. ad loc. in Critici Sacri*, tom. 5.). Moreover, if, as the narrative implies, and as the analogy of the restored nation requires, the formerly unchaste woman became a faithful and reformed wife, the entire ground of the objection in a moral point of view vanishes (see Cowles, *Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). In fact, there were two marriages by the prophet: the first, in <sup><200B></sup>Hosea 1:2 of a woman (probably of lewd inclinations already) who became the mother of three children, and was afterwards repudiated for her adultery; and the second, in chap. 3 of a woman at least attached formerly to another, but evidently reformed to a virtuous wife. Both these women represented the Israelitish nation, especially the northern kingdom, which, although unfaithful to Jehovah, should first be punished and then reclaimed by him. Keil, after combating at length (*Minor Prophets*,

introduc. to Hosea) against Kurtz's arguments for the literal view, is obliged to assign the *moral* objection as the only tenable one. This, however, is a very unsatisfactory mode of disposing of the question, for we are not at liberty thus to explain away the reality of the occurrence simply to evade its difficulties. Moreover, if it be a *symbol*, what becomes of its force unless based upon a fact? Nor do the prophets receive *visions* respecting their own personal acts. Finally, the internal suggestion of a wrong act to the prophet's mind as one to be not merely tolerated, but committed, would be equivalent, in point of moral obliquity, to the actual deed itself; at least according to our Savior's rule of guilt in such a matter (<sup><4163></sup>Matthew 5:28). This last remark leads us to the true solution of the whole difficulty, which has simply arisen from judging O.T. morals by a Gospel standard, in neglect of the important principle enunciated by Christ himself on the very question of the relations of the sexes (<sup><4163></sup>Matthew 19:8). The Mosaic precept (<sup><41614></sup>Leviticus 21:14) has no pertinence here, for Hosea was not a priest.

But in whichever way this question may be solved whether these occurrences be regarded as a real and external transaction, or as a piece of spiritual scenery, or only (Witsi *Miscell. Sac.* p. 90) as an allegorical description it is agreed on all hands that the actions are typical; that they are, as Jerome calls them, *sacramenta futurorum*. One question which sprang out of the literal view was whether the connection between Hosea and Gomer was marriage or fornication. Another question which followed immediately upon the preceding was "an Dens possit dispensare ut fornicatio sit licita." This latter question was much discussed by the schoolmen, and by the Thomists it was avowed in the affirmative.

Expositors are not at all agreed as to the meaning of the phrase "wife of whoredoms," <sup><41623></sup> *ymwleztvæ* whether the phrase refers to harlotry before marriage, or unfaithfulness after it. It may afford an easy solution of the difficulty if we look at the antitype in its history and character. Adultery is the appellation of idolatrous apostasy. The Jewish nation were espoused to God. The contract was formed in Sinai; but the Jewish people had prior to this period gone a-whoring. <sup><41614></sup> Joshua 24:2-14, "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, and they served other gods." Comp. <sup><41617></sup> Leviticus 17:7, in which it is implied that idolatrous propensities had also developed themselves during the abode in Egypt so that the phrase here employed may signify one devoted to lasciviousness prior to her marriage. Yet this propensity of the Israelites to idolatry had been

measurably covert prior to the Exode. On the other hand, none but a female of previously lewd inclinations would be likely to violate her conjugal obligations; and Eichhorn shows that marrying an avowed harlot is not necessarily implied by *μυνθηζ]tvaew* which may very well imply a wife who after marriage becomes an adulteress, even though chaste before. In any case the marriage must be supposed to have been a real contract, or its significance would be lost. <sup><411></sup>Jeremiah 2:2, “I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown.” The facts in the case of the Israelitish nation correspond with this symbol of a woman who had been of bad repute before marriage, and who proved a notorious profligate afterwards. *μυνθηζ]ydeyi* *children of whoredoms*, refer most naturally to the two sons and daughter afterwards to be born. They were not the prophet’s own, but a spurious offspring palmed upon him by his faithless spouse, as is intimated in the allegory, and they followed the pernicious example of the mother. Spiritual adultery was the debasing sin of Israel. “Non dicitur,” observes Manger, “cognovit uxorem, sed simpliciter concepit et peperit.” The children are not his. It is said, indeed, in ver. 3, “She bare *him* a son.” The word /I is wanting in some MSS. and in some copies of the Sept. If genuine, it only shows the effrontery of the adulteress, and the patience of the husband in receiving and educating as his own a spurious brood. The Israelites who had been received into covenant very soon fell from their first love, and were characterized by insatiable spiritual wantonness yet their Maker, their husband, did not at once divorce them, but exhibited a marvelous long-suffering.

The names of the children being symbolical, the name of the mother has been thought to have a similar signification. *Gomer Bath-Diblair* may have the symbolic sense of one thoroughly abandoned to sensual delights; *rmfo* signifies *completion* (Ewald, *Grammat.* § 228); *AtBiμyηbDæ* “*daughter of grape-cakes*,” the dual form being expressive of the mode in which these dainties were baked in double layers. The names of the children are Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah, and Lo-ammi. The prophet explains the meaning of the appellations. It is generally supposed that the names refer to three successive generations of the Israelitish people. Hengstenberg, on the other hand, argues that “wife and children both are the people of Israel: the three names must not be considered separately, but taken together.” But as the marriage is first mentioned, and the births of the children are detailed in

order, some time elapsing between the events, we rather adhere to the ordinary exposition. Nor is it without reason that the second child is described as a female. The first child, Jezreel, may refer to the first dynasty of Jeroboam I and his successors, which was terminated in the blood of Ahab's house shed by Jehu at Jezreel. The name suggests also the cruel and fraudulent possession of the vineyard of Naboth, "which was in Jezreel," where, too, the woman Jezebel was slain so ignominiously (<sup>1160</sup>1 Kings 16:1; <sup>1192</sup>2 Kings 9:21). But since Jehu and his family had become as corrupt as their predecessors, the scenes of Jezreel were again to be enacted; and Jehu's race must perish. Jezreel, the spot referred to by the prophet, is also, according to Jerome, the place where the Assyrian army routed the Israelites. The name of this child associates the past and future, symbolizes past sins, intermediate punishments, and final overthrow. The name of the second child, Lo-ruhamah, "not-pitied," the appellation of a degraded *daughter*, may refer to the *feeble, effeminate* period which followed the overthrow of the first dynasty, when Israel became weak and helpless as well as sunk and abandoned. The favor of God was not exhibited to the nation: they were as abject as impious. But the reign of Jeroboam II was prosperous; new energy was infused into the kingdom; gleams of its former prosperity shone upon it. This revival of strength in that generation may be typified by the birth of a third child, a *son*, Lo-ammi, "not-my-people" (<sup>1245</sup>2 Kings 14:25). Yet prosperity did not bring with it a revival of piety; still, although their vigor was recruited, they were not God's people (*Lectures on the Jewish Antiquities and Scriptures*, by J. G. Palfrey, 2, 422, Boston, 1841). See each name in its place.

**6. Division of the Book.** — Recent writers, such as Bertholdt, Eichhorn, De Wette, Stuck, Maurer, and Hitzig, have labored much, but in vain, to divide the book of Hosea into separate portions, assigning to each the period at which it was written; but from the want of sufficient data the attempt must rest principally on taste and fancy. A sufficient proof of the correctness of this opinion may be found in the contradictory sections and allotments of the various writers who have engaged in the task. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 evidently form one division: it is next to impossible to separate and distinguish the other chapters. The form and style are very similar throughout all the second portion.

The subdivision of these several parts is a work of greater difficulty: that of Eichhorn will be found to be based upon a highly subtle, though by no means precarious criticism.

(1.) According to him, the first division should be subdivided into three separate poems, each originating in a distinct aim, and each after its own fashion attempting to express the idolatry of Israel by imagery borrowed from the matrimonial relation. The first, and therefore the least elaborate of these, is contained in chap. 3; the second in ~~XIII~~Hosea 1:2-11; the third in ~~XIII~~Hosea 1:2-9, and ~~XIII~~Hosea 2:1-23. These three are progressively elaborate developments of the same reiterated idea. ~~XIII~~Hosea 1:2-9 is common to the second and third poems, but not repeated with each severally (4, 273 sq.).

(2.) Attempts have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who *gets five*, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets *sixteen* poems out of this part of the book.

These prophecies — so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl — were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

**8. Style.** — The peculiarities of Hosea's style have often been remarked. Jerome says of him, "Commaticus est, et quasi per sententias loquens" (*Praef ad XII. Proph.*). Augustine thus criticises him: "Osea quanto profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur." His style, says De Wette, "is abrupt, unrounded, and ebullient; his rhythm hard, leaping, and violent. The language is peculiar and difficult" (*Einleitung*, § 228). Lowth (*Prelect.* 21) speaks of him as the most difficult and perplexed of the prophets. Bishop Horsley has remarked his peculiar idioms his change of person, anomalies of gender and number, and use of the nominative absolute (*Works*, vol. 3). Eichhorn's description of his style was probably at the same time meant as an imitation of it (*Einleitung*, § 555). His discourse is like a garland woven of a multiplicity of flowers: images are woven upon images, comparison wound upon comparison, metaphor strung upon metaphor. He plucks one flower and throws it down that he may directly break off another. Like a bee, he flies from one flowerbed to another, that he may suck his honey from the most varied pieces. It is a natural consequence that his figures sometimes form strings of pearls. Often he is prone to approach to allegory often he sinks down in obscurity" (compare 5:9; 6:3; 7:8; 13:3, 7, 8, 16). Obscure brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that, "of all the prophets, he



is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood" (Henderson, *Minor Prophets*, p. 2). Unusual words and forms of connection sometimes occur (De Wette, § 228; see also Davidson, in Horne, 2:945).

**9. Citation in the N.T.** — Hosea, as a prophet, is expressly quoted by Matthew (<sup><4025></sup>Matthew 2:15). The citation is from the first verse of chap. 11 <sup><2066></sup>Hosea 6:6 is quoted twice by the same evangelist (<sup><4093></sup>Matthew 9:13; 12:7). Other quotations and references are the following: <sup><4230></sup>Luke 23:30; <sup><4616></sup>Revelation 6:16; <sup><2808></sup>Hosea 10:8; <sup><41025></sup>Romans 9:25, 26; <sup><40120></sup>1 Peter 2:10; Hosea 1, 10; 2:23; <sup><46574></sup>1 Corinthians 15:4; <sup><28102></sup>Hosea 6:2; <sup><28135></sup>Hebrews 13:15; <sup><2842></sup>Hosea 14:2. Messianic references are not clearly and prominently developed (Gramberg, *Religionsid.* 2, 298). This book, however, is not without them, but they lie more in the spirit of its allusions than in the letter. Hosea's Christology appears written, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God, on the fleshly tables of his heart. The future conversion of his people to the Lord their God, and David their king, their glorious privilege in becoming sons of the living God, the faithfulness of the original promise to Abraham, that the number of his spiritual seed should be as the sand of the sea, are among the oracles whose fulfillment will take place only under the new dispensation.

**10. Commentaries.** — The following are the exegetical helps on the whole book of Hosea separately, and the most important are designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* 3, 438); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* 5, 234); Remigius Antissod., *Commentarius* [fragment] (in Mai, *Script. Fet.* VI, 2:103); Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, and Kimchi, *Scholia* (ed. with Notes, by Coddæus, L. B. 1623, 4to; by De Dieu, ib. 1631, 4to; also extracts, with additions, by Von der Hardt, Helmst. 1702, 4to [with a historical Introduction ib. eod.]; and by Mercer. Genesis 1574, 1578; L. B. 1621, 4to; and [including several other minor prophets] Genesis 15, fol.; Giess. 1595, 4to; Götting. 1755, 4to); Abrabanei, *Comment.* (in Lat. with notes, by F. al-Husen, L. B. 1687, 4to); Luther, *Enarratio* (Viteb. 1526, 1545; Frcft. 1546, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 4, 598; also *Senterntie*, ib. 684); Capito, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1528, 8vo); Quinquarboreus, *Notæ* [including Amos, Ruth, and Lam.] (Par. 1556, 4to); Brentz, *Commentarius* (Hag. 1560, 4to; Tub. 1580, fol.; also in *Opp.* 4); Box, *Commentaria* (Coesaraug. 1581, fol.; Ven. 1585, 4to; Lugd. 1587, 8vo; improved edition by Gyrel, Brix. 1604, 4to), De Castro, *Commentaria* (Samant. 1586, fol.); Vavassor, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.*

Vitemb. 4, 348; Jen. 4, 764); Mcatthoeus, *Praelectiones* (Basil. 1590, 4to); Polansdorf, *Analysis* (Basil. 1599, 4to; 1601, 8vo); Zanchius, *Commentarius* (Neost. 1600, 4to; also in *Opp.* 5); Gesner, *Illustratio* (Vitemb. 1601, 1614, 8vo); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Heidelberg, 1605, 1609, 4to); Downname, *Lectures* [on. ch. 1-4] (London 1608, 4to); Cocceius, *Illustratio* (in *Opp.* 11, 591); Krackewitz, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1619, 4to); Beisner, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1620, 8vo); Rivetus, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1625, 4to; also in *Opp.* 2:488); \*Burroughs, *Lectures* [chapter 14 by Sibbs and Reynolds] (London 1643 52, 4 vols. 4to; London 1843, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Expositio* (in *Works*, 2, 423); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1677, 8vo); \*Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxon. 1685, fol.; also in *Works*, 2, 1); \*Seb. Schmid, *Commentarius* (F. ad MI. 1687, 4to); Biermann, *Ontleding* (Utrecht, 1702, 4to); Wacke, *Expositio* (Ratisb. 1711, 8vo); Graff, *Predigten* (Dresd. 1716, 4to); Kromayer, *Specimen*, etc. [including Joel and Amos] (Amst. 1730, 8vo); Terne, *Erklärung* (part 1, Jen. 1740: 2, Eisenb. 1748, 8vo); Klemmuis, *Note* (Tübing. 1744, 4to) Dathe, *Dissertatio* [on Aquila's vers. of Ho] (Lips. 1757; also in *Opusc.* Lips. 1796); Happach, *Expositio* [on certain passages] (Cobl. 1766 sq., 8vo); Struensee, *Uebers.* (Frankf. and Lpz. 1769, 8vo); Neale, *Commentary* (London 1771, 8vo); Michaelis, *Chaldea* [Jonathan's Targum] (Gött. 1775, 4to); Staudlin, *Erlaut.* (in his *Beitr.* 1 sq.); Euren, *Exanen* [of var. readings] (1, Upsal. 1782; 2, ib. 1786; also in Aurivellii, *Dissert.* p. 594); Schrier, *Erlaut.* (Dessau, 1782, 8vo); Manger, *Commentarius* (Campis, 1782, 4to); Pfeiffer, *Uebers.* (Erlangen, 1785, 8vo); Uhland, *Annotationes* (in 12 pts. Tübing. 1785-97, 4to); Volborth, *Erklärung* (part 1, Gott. 1787, 8vo); Kuinol, *Erläuterung* (Leips. 1789, 8vo; also in Latin, *ibid.* 1792, 8vo); Roos, *Observationes* [on difficult passages] (Erlang. 1780, 4to); Vaupel, *Erklar.* (Dresden, 1793, 8vo); \*Horsley, *Notes* (London 1801, 1804, 4to; also in *Bib. Crit.* 2, 134); Philippon, *Commentirung* [includ. Joel] (Dessau, 1805, 8vo; also in his *Israelitische Bibel*); Bickel, *Erlaut.* (Konigsb. 1807, 8vo); Gaab, *Dijudicatio* [on the vers. of H. in the London Polyglot] (in 2 pts. Tüb. 1812, 4to); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (part 7, vol. 1, 1827, 8vo); Goldwitzer, *Anmerk.* (Landsh. 1828, 8vo); \*Stuck, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1828, 8vo); Schroder, *Erlaut.* [vol. 1 of min. proph.. includ. Hosea, Joel, and Amos] (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); De Wette, *Ueber d. geschl. Beziehung*, etc. (in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, p. 807); Mrs. Best, *Dialogues* (London 1831, 12mo); Redslob, *Die Integritat*, etc. [of 7, 4-10] (Hamb. 1842, 8vo); \*Simson, *Erklar.* (Hamb. 1851 8So); Drake, *Notes* [includ. Jonah]

(London 1853, 8vo; also *Sermons* [includ. also Amos], ib. ed. 8vo); Kurtz, *Ehe d. H.* (Dorpat. 1859, 8vo); Kara, ⲡⲓⲣⲉⲛⲓ (Breslau, 1861, 4to); Winsche, *Auslegung* [Rabbinical] (Lpz. 1868 sq. 8vo); Bassett, *Translation* (London, 1869, 8vo). **SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.** 4, 5. HOSHEA **SEE HOSHEA** (q.v.).

## Hosein

**SEE HOCEIN.**

## Hosen

**SEE HOSE.** Hoshai'ah (Heb. *Hoshayah'*, ⲏⲥⲏⲁⲓ, whom *Jehovah* delivers; Sept, Ὠσαΐα, but identifies those named in <sup><2401></sup>Jeremiah 42:1; 43, 2, yet changes in both passages to *Maaaaaian'*; Vulg. *Oscjas*), the name of two men.

**1.** The father of Jehazaniah, which latter besought Jeremiah to favor the flight of the remnant of the Jews into Egypt (<sup><2401></sup>Jeremiah 42:1). He is apparently the same with the father of Azariah, which latter is mentioned as rejecting the advice of Jeremiah after he had thus solicited it (<sup><2402></sup>Jeremiah 43:2). B.C. 587.

**2.** One who headed the procession of the chief men of Judah along the southern section of the newly rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (<sup><4622></sup>Nehemiah 12:32). B.C. 446.

## Hosha'ma

[many *Hosh'ama*] (Heb. *Hoshama'*, ⲏⲥⲏⲁⲙⲁ, whom *Jehovah* hears; Sept. Ὠσαμώ v.r. Ὠσαμάθ and Ἰωσαμώ), one of the sons of king Jehoiachin, born during his captivity (<sup><4318></sup>1 Chronicles 3:18). B.C. post 598. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17.) **SEE JEHOIACHIN.**

## Hoshe'ä

(Heb. the same name as "Hosea," q.v.), the name of several persons.

**1.** The original name (<sup><6244></sup>Deuteronomy 32:44, Sept. Ἰησοῦς, Vulg. *Josue*; A.V. in <sup><0438></sup>Numbers 13:8, 16, "Oshea," Sept. Ὠσηή, Vulg. *Osee*) of the son of Nun, afterwards called JOSHUA **SEE JOSHUA** (q.v.), by the more distinct recognition of the divine name *Jah*.

2. (Sept. **Ωσή**; Vulg. *Osee*). A son of Azariah in the time of David; also an Ephraimite and prince of his people (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 27:20). B.C. 1014.
3. The prophet Hosea (q.v.).
4. Hosea (Sept. **Ωσηέ**, Vulg. *Osee*), the son of Elah, and last king of Israel. In the twentieth (posthumous) year of Jotham (<sup><1250></sup>2 Kings 15:30), i.e. B.C. 737-6, he conspired against and slew his predecessor Pekah, thereby fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (<sup><2376></sup>Isaiah 7:16). Although Josephus calls Hoshea *a friend* of Pekah (**φίλου τινὸς ἐβουλευσάντος αὐτῷ**, *Ant.* 9, 13, 1), we have no ground for calling this “a treacherous murder” (Prideaux, 1, 16). But he did not become established on the throne he had thus usurped till after an interregnum of warfare for eight years, namely, in the twelfth year of Ahaz (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 17:1), i.e. B.C. 729-8. “He did evil in the sight of the Lord.” but not in the same degree as his predecessors (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 17:2). According to the Rabbis, this superiority consisted in his removing from the frontier cities the guards placed there by his predecessors to prevent their subjects from worshipping at Jerusalem (*Seder Olam Rabba*, cap. 22, quoted by Prideaux, 1, 16), and in his not hindering the Israelites from accepting the invitation of Hezekiah (<sup><1400></sup>2 Chronicles 30:10), nor checking their zeal against idolatry (<sup><1430></sup>2 Chronicles 31:1). The compulsory cessation of the calf-worship may have removed his greatest temptation, for Tiglath Pileser had carried off the golden calf from Dan some years before (*Sed. Ol. Rab.* 22), and that at Bethel was taken away by Shalmaneser in his first invasion (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 17:3; <sup><2804></sup>Hosea 10:14). Shortly after his accession (B.C. 728) he submitted to the supremacy of Shalmaneser, who appears to have entered his territory with the intention of subduing it by force if resisted (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 17:3), and, indeed, seems to have stormed the strong caves of Beth-arbel (<sup><2804></sup>Hosea 10:14), but who retired pacified with a present. This peaceable temper, however, appears not to have continued long. The intelligence that Hosea, encouraged perhaps by the revolt of Hezekiah, had entered into a confederacy with So, king of Egypt, with the view of shaking off the Assyrian yoke, caused Shalmaneser to return and punish the rebellious king of Israel by imprisonment for withholding the tribute for several years exacted from his country (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 17:4), B.C. cir. 725. He appears to have been again released, probably appeasing the conqueror by a large ransom; but a second relapse into revolt soon afterwards provoked the king of Assyria to march an army into the land of Israel, B.C. 723; and after a three-years’ siege Samaria was taken and destroyed, and the ten

tribes were sent into the countries beyond the Euphrates, B.C. 720 (<sup><1276></sup>2 Kings 17:5, 6; 18:9-12). The king no doubt perished in the sack of the city by the enraged victor, or was only spared for the torture of an Assyrian triumph. He was apparently treated with the utmost indignity (<sup><3301></sup>Micah 5:1). That he disappeared very suddenly, like “foam upon the water,” we may infer from (<sup><2831></sup>Hosea 13:11; 10:7. His name occurs on the Assyrian monuments. The length of the siege was owing to the fact that this “glorious and beautiful” city was strongly situated, like “a crown of pride” among her hills (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 28:1-5). During the course of the siege Shalmaneser must have died, for it is certain that Samaria was taken by his successor Sargon, who thus laconically describes the event in his annals: “Samaria I looked at, I captured; 27,280 men (families?) who dwelt in it I carried away, I constructed fifty chariots in their country ... I appointed a governor over them, and continued upon them the tribute of the former people” (Botta, p. 145, 11, quoted by Dr. Hincks, *Journ. of Sacr. Lit.* Oct. 1858; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 1, 148). For an account of the subsequent fortunes of the unhappy Ephraimites, the places to which they were transplanted by the policy of their conqueror and his officer, “the great and noble Asnapper” (<sup><3540></sup>Ezra 4:10), and the nations by which they were superseded, **SEE SAMARIA**. Hoshea came to the throne too late, and governed a kingdom torn to pieces by foreign invasion and intestine broils. Sovereign after sovereign had fallen by the dagger of the assassin; and we see from the dark and terrible delineations of the contemporary prophets, **SEE HOSEA; SEE MICAH; SEE ISAIAH**, that murder and idolatry, drunkenness and lust, had eaten like “an incurable wound” (<sup><3001></sup>Micah 1:9) into the inmost heart of the national morality. Ephraim was dogged to its ruin by the apostate policy of the renegade who had asserted its independence (2 Kings 17; Joseph. *Ant.* 9,14; Prideaux, 1, 15 sq.; Keil, *On Kings*, 2, 50 sq., English ed.; Jahn, *Hebr. Corn.* § 40; Ewald, *Gesch.* 3. 607-613; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* chap. 1, English translated; Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 149). **SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.**

**5. HOSHEA** (Sept. **Ωσηέ**, Vulg. *Osee*), one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant after the Captivity (<sup><1602></sup>Nehemiah 10:23). B.C. cir. 410.

### Hosius or Osius

(**Ὅσιος**, *the saint*), an early Christian bishop, was born probably about A.D. 256. It is doubtful whether he was a native of Spain, but he was

bishop of the see of Cordova, Spain, for some sixty years. He was a particular favorite of the emperor Constantine, who is said to have been converted to Christianity under the instrumentality of Hosius, by offering him, as an inducement, the remission of his sins, a satisfaction which the heathen priests were unable to grant. He was present at the Council held at Eliberi or Elvira (q.v.), near Granada (305 or 306), and suffered for his faith (*confessus sum*, as he says in his letter to Constantine) during the persecutions of Diocletian and Maximianus. In 324 Constantine sent him to Alexandria, to settle the dispute between Alexander and Arius, also the troubles which had arisen concerning the observance of the Easter festival. He failed in this mission, but still remained in favor with the emperor. He took part in the Council of Nice (325), where Baronius claims that Hosius attended as legate of the pope; but this is not generally conceded even by Roman Catholic historians. Hosius's signature is the first amongst the subscriptions to the acts of this council. He pronounced (ἔξέδετο) or *drew up* (according to Tillemont) the symbol or confession of faith of Nice. In 347 he presided at the Council of Sardica, called by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans at the request of Athanasius. In 355 Constantius desired him to take part in the condemnation of Athanasius, but Hosius replied by a letter, recalling all he had suffered on behalf of the faith, and closing with an earnest defense of Athanasius. A second attempt of Constantius, who called him to Milan, met with the same opposition, and likewise a third, Hosius, who was then nearly a hundred years old, still refusing to condemn Athanasius. This decided stand in favor of Athanasius finally caused Hosius's banishment in 355. At length, worn out by imprisonment, he consented to give countenance to Arianism in a formula which was presented to the Synod of Sirmium (357). He was permitted to return again to his see, where he died in 359. Athanasius and Augustine praise his virtues and excuse his weakness. See Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* c. 42, 44; Augustine, *Cont. Epistolam Perneniani*, 1, 7; Eusebius, *De Vit. Constantini*, 2:63; 3:7; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 7, 8; 2:20, 29, 31; Sozomen, 1, 10, 16, 17; 3. 11; Tillemont., *Memoires pour servir A l'Hist. Eccl.* 7, 300; Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.*; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. 5 Proleg. c. 8; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:209; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 275 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 245; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1, 33 sq.; Neander, *Church Hist.* 2:154, 371, 398, 404; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 627, 635 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 5, 343 sq., 349, 354 sq., 364; 6, 83, 140; Stanley, *Eastern Ch.* (see Index); Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 1, 99, 101; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* 1, 146; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 127 sq.,

135,140; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 336 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen Lex.* 3, 331 sq. (J. H.W.)

### Hosius, Stanislaus

A distinguished Romish theologian of Poland, of Germans origin, was born at Cracow May 5, 1504. He studied at Padua and Bologna, and obtained, on his return to Poland in 1538, a canonry. He was afterwards made secretary to the king, and, in 1549, bishop of Culm. He was entrusted by the king with important missions to the emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I; and as a reward for his services was made also bishop of Ermeland. Hosius was an ardent opponent of Luther, and having written the *Confessio catholicae fidei* (Mayence, 1551, etc.) in opposition to the Augsburg Confession, he was rewarded with a cardinal's hat. He attended the Council of Trent as legate, and afterwards returned to Poland, where he used his influence in favor of the Jesuits, and in 1564, to prevent the spread of Lutheranism, he established the College of Braunsberg, called after him *Collegium Hosianum*, and still existing with the two faculties of theology and philosophy. He afterwards made a journey to Rome for the purpose of settling some questions of importance to the Polish Church, but was detained by pope Gregory XIII, who received him with the highest honors. He died at Caprarola Aug. 15, 1579. 'A collection of his works has been published under the title *Opera omnia* (Col. 1584, 2 vols. folio). It contains *De Communionem sub utraque Specie; De Sacerdotum conjugio; De Alissa vulgari lingual celebranda*, etc. See Father Paul, *History of the Council. of Trent*; Krasinski, *Ref. in Poland* (London, 1840, 2 vols.); *Ch. Hist. 13th Cent.* p. 243; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 82; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* 3, 98; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* 3, 499 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 339 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirche. — Lex.* 3, 333 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. sd. Reform.* 2, 695; Palavicini, *Hist. Concilii Trident.* lib. 2 ch. 4; Ersch u. Gruber, *Alg. Encyklop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 210; Eichhorn, *Der Bischof Stan. rosius* (Mainz, 1844-55, 2 vols.).

### Hospice

The name by which are known the pious establishments kept up by monks on some of the Alpine passes, to afford assistance and shelter to travelers. The first of these established was that situated on the Great St. Bernard, of which the priests of the canton of Valais obtained possession in 1825. Another hospice existed on St. Gothard as early as the 13th century. This

establishment the monks have left, and it is now occupied by a “hospitaller,” who entertains travelers gratis. Hospices are also found on Mount Cenis, the Simplon, and the Little St. Bernard. — Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 432. *SEE HOSPITALS.*

### Hospinian, Rudolph

A Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Altdorf, near Zurich, Nov. 7, 1547, of a family several members of which had been martyrs of the Reformation. Rudolph was brought up by his uncle, and studied theology at the universities of Marburg and Heidelberg. After his return to Zurich in 1568 he began to preach, and became successively rector in 1576, archdeacon in 1588, and pastor of the church of the Abbey in 1594. He died March 11, 1626. Hospinian is especially distinguished as a writer, and most of his works are of a polemic character, against the Romish Church, inquiring into the cultus and constitution of that Church. The first of them was his *De origine et progressu Rituum et Ceremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum* (1585). Two years after he published *De Templis hoc est de origine, progressu, usu et abusu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium* (Zur. 1587, fol.; enlarged edition, 1602, fol.). His *De Monachis, seu de origine et progressu Monachatus ac Ordinum Monasticorum, Equitum militarium tam sacrorum quam seecularium omnium* was published at Zurich (1588), and reprinted, with additions, as an answer to Bellarmine’s *De Monachis* (Zurich, 1609, folio) — *De Festis Chris. tianorum, hoc est de origine, progressu, caerimoniis et ritibus festorum dierum Christianorum Liber unus*, etc. (Zur. 1592-3, 2 vols. fol.; augmented, ib. 1612, fol.); the additions to the second edition are in answer to the objections of cardinal Bellarmine and of the Jesuit Gretser: *De Festis Judeorum, et Ethnicorum, Libri tres* (Zurich, 1592, fol.; 2nd edit., augmented, Zurich, 1611, fol.) — *De Origine et Progressu Controversice Sacramentariae de Caena Domini inter Lutheranos, Ubiquistas et Orthodoxos quos Zuinglianos seu Calvinistas vacant* (Zur. 1602, fol.); the Lutherans are strongly attacked by Hospinian in the work — *Sacrae Scripturce, orthodoxis symbolis, toti antiquitati puriori, et ipsi etiam Augustance Confessioni repugnantia*, etc. (Zurich, 1609, folio). This work gave rise to great controversy. Frederick IV, elector of the Palatinate, blamed Hospinian strongly, and Leonard Hutter answered this and the preceding work in his *Concordia Concors* (Wittemb. 1614, folio). Hospinian intended to answer Hutter, but gave up the idea lest he should displease the Protestant princes and embitter the controversy, which was



very agreeable to the Roman Catholic party — *Historia Jesuitica* (Zurich, 1619, fol.), a very valuable work — *An Anima sit in toto corpore sinul? De Immortalitate ejus* (Zurich, 1586, 4to). A complete edition of Hospinian's works was published by J. H. Heidegger at Geneva (1669-81, 7 vols. fol.), containing a full memoir. See Fabricius, *Historia Bibl.* pt. 1, p. 349, 350; pt. 2, p. 510, 511; pt. 3, p. 87, 88; Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs separes de la communion Romaine*, etc. (Paris, 1718); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v. Herzog *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25 211; Bayle, *Historical Dict.* 3:502; Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliog.* vol. 1. **SEE HUTTER.** (J. N. P.)

## Hospital, Michael De L'

**SEE HOPITAL.**

## Hospitality

(φιλοξενία). The practice of receiving strangers into one's house and giving them suitable entertainment may be traced back to the early origin of human society. It was practiced, as it still is, among the least cultivated nations (Diod. Sic. 5:28, 34; Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 6, 23; Tacit. *Germ.* 21). It was not less observed, in the early periods of their history, among the (greeks and Romans. With the Greeks, hospitality (ξενία) was under the immediate protection of religion. Jupiter bore a name (ξένιος) signifying that its rights were under his guardianship. In the *Odyssey* (6, 206) we are told expressly that all guests and poor people are special objects of care to the gods. There were, both in Greece and Italy, two kinds of hospitality, the one private, the other public (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Hospitium). The first existed between individual, the second was cultivated by one state towards another. Hence arose a new kind of social relation: between those who had exercised and partaken of the rites of hospitality an intimate friendship ensued, which was called into play whenever the individuals might afterwards chance to meet, and the right, duties, and advantages of which passed from father to son, and were deservedly held in the highest estimation (Potter's. *Greek Antiquities*, 2, 722 sq.).

But, though not peculiarly Oriental, hospitality has nowhere been earlier or more fully practiced than in the East. It is still honorably observed among the Arabs, especially at the present day. (See Niebuhr, *Arabia*, p. 46; Burckhardt, 1, 331, 459; 2:651, 739; Jaubert, *Trav.* p. 43; Russel's *Aleppo*, 1, 328; Buckingham's *Mesopot.* p. 23; Robinson's *Researches*, 2, 331,

335, 603; Prokesch, *Ermin.* 2:245; Harmer, 2, 114; Schultens, *Excerpt.* p. 408, 424, 454, 462; Layard's *Nineveh*, 2nd ser. p. 317 sq.; Hackett's *Ill. of Script.* p. 64 sq.) An Arab, on arriving at a village, dismounts at the house of some one who is known to him, saying to the master, "I am your guest." On this the host receives the traveler, and performs his duties, that is, he sets before his guest his supper, consisting of bread, milk, and *borgul*, and if he is rich and generous, he also takes the necessary care of his horse or beast of burden. Should the traveler be unacquainted with any person, he alights at any house, as it may happen, fastens his horse to the same, and proceeds to smoke his pipe until the master bids him welcome, and offers him his evening meal. In the morning the traveler pursues his journey, making no other return than "God be with you" (good-by) (Niebuhr, *Reis.* 2:431,462; D'Arvieux, 3:152; Burckhardt 1, 69; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 6, 82, 257). The early existence and long continuance of this amiable practice in Oriental countries are owing to the fact of their presenting that condition of things which necessitates and calls forth hospitality. When population is thinly scattered over a great extent of country, and traveling is comparatively infrequent, inns or places of public accommodation are not found; yet the traveler needs shelter, perhaps succor and support. Pity prompts the dweller in a house or tent to open his door to the tired wayfarer, the rather because its master has had, and is likely again to have, need of similar kindness. The duty has its immediate pleasures and advantages, for the traveler comes full of news—false, true, wonderful; and it is by no means onerous, since visits from wayfarers are not very frequent, nor are the needful hospitalities costly. In later periods, when population had greatly increased, the establishment of inns (caravanserais) diminished, but did by no means abolish the practice (Josephus, *Ant.* 5:1, 2; ~~2034~~ Luke 10:34).

Accordingly, we find hospitality practiced and held in the highest estimation at the earliest periods in which the Bible speaks of human society (~~1003~~ Genesis 18:3; 19:2; 24:25; ~~1022~~ Exodus 2:20; ~~0796~~ Judges 19:16). Express provision for its exercise is made in the Mosaic law. (~~1063~~ Leviticus 19:33; Dent. 14:29). In the New Testament also its observance is enjoined, though in the period to which its books refer the nature and extent of hospitality would be changed with the change that society had undergone (~~1009~~ 1 Peter 4:9; ~~502~~ 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1, 8; ~~5150~~ 1 Timothy 5:10; ~~5123~~ Romans 12:13; Heb. 13:2). The reason assigned in this last passage (see Pfaff, *Diss. de Hospitalitate*, ad loc., Tübing. 1752), "for thereby some

have entertained angels unawares," is illustrated in the instances of Abraham and Lot (<sup><0180></sup>Genesis 18:1-16; 19:1-3); nor is it without a parallel in classical literature; for the religious feeling which in Greece was connected with the exercise of hospitality was strengthened by the belief that the traveler might be some god in disguise (Homer, *Odyss.* 17, 484). The disposition which generally prevailed in favor of the practice was enhanced by the fear lest those who neglected its rites should, after the example of impious men, be subjected by the divine wrath to frightful punishments (Lelian, *Animalia*, 11, 19). Even the Jews, in "the latter days," laid very great stress on the obligation: the rewards of Paradise, their doctors declared, were his who spontaneously exercised hospitality (Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* 1, 220; Kype, *Observ. Sacr.* 1, 129).

The guest, whoever he might be, was, on his appearing, invited into the house or tent (<sup><0192></sup>Genesis 19:2; <sup><0223></sup>Exodus 2:20; <sup><0735></sup>Judges 13:15; 19:21). Courtesy dictated that no improper questions should be put to him, and some days elapsed before the name of the stranger was asked, or what object he had in view in his journey (<sup><0233></sup>Genesis 24:33; *Odyss.* 1, 123; 3, 69; *Iliad*, 6, 175; 9, 222; Diod. Sic. 5, 28). As soon as he arrived he was furnished with water to wash his feet (<sup><0184></sup>Genesis 18:4; 19:2; <sup><5450></sup>1 Timothy 5:10; *Odyss.* 4, 49; 17, 88; 6, 215); received a supply of needful food for himself and his beast (<sup><0185></sup>Genesis 18:5; 19:3; 24:25; <sup><0223></sup>Exodus 2:20; <sup><0723></sup>Judges 19:20; *Odyss.* 3, 464), and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host (<sup><0195></sup>Genesis 19:5; <sup><0622></sup>Joshua 2:2; <sup><0723></sup>Judges 19:23). **SEE SALT, COVENANT OF.** The case of Sisera, decoyed and slain by Jael (<sup><0748></sup>Judges 4:18 sq.), was a gross infraction of the rights and duties of hospitality. On his departure the traveler was not allowed to go alone or empty-handed (<sup><0748></sup>Judges 19:5; Waginseil, *ad Sot.* p. 1020, 1030; Zorn, *ad Hecat. Abder.* 22; *Iliad*, 6, 217). This courtesy to guests even in some Arab tribes goes the length (comp. <sup><0208></sup>Genesis 21:8; <sup><0724></sup>Judges 19:24) of sacrificing the chastity of the females of the family for their gratification (Lane, *Modern Eg.* 1, 443; Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins*, 1, 179). As the free practice of hospitality was held right and honorable, so the neglect of it was considered discreditable (<sup><4812></sup>Job 31:32; *Odyss.* 14, 56); and any interference with the comfort and protection which the host afforded was treated as a wicked outrage (<sup><0184></sup>Genesis 19:4 sq.). Though the practice of hospitality was general, and its rites rarely violated, yet national or local enmities did not fail sometimes to interfere; and accordingly travelers avoided those places in which they had reason to expect an unfriendly

reception (compare Judges 19:12). The quarrel which arose between the Jews and Samaritans after the Babylonian captivity destroyed the relations of hospitality between them. Regarding each other as heretics, they sacrificed every better feeling (see John 4:9). It was only in the greatest extremity that the Jews would partake of Samaritan food (Lightfoot, p. 993); and they were accustomed, in consequence of their religious and political hatred, to avoid passing through Samaria in journeying from one extremity of the land to the other. The animosity of the Samaritans towards the Jews appears to have been somewhat less bitter; but they showed an adverse feeling towards those persons who, in going up to the annual feast at Jerusalem, had to pass through their country (Luke 9:53). At the great national festivals, hospitality was liberally practiced as long as the state retained its identity. On these festive occasions no inhabitant of Jerusalem considered his house his own; every home swarmed with strangers; yet this unbounded hospitality could not find accommodation in the houses for all who stood in need of it, and a large proportion of visitors had to be content with such shelter as tents could afford (Helon, *Pilgrim*. 1, 228 sq.). The primitive Christians considered one principal part of their duty to consist in showing hospitality to strangers (1 Peter 4:9; 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1, 8; compare Acts 2:44; 6:32, 35). They were, in fact, so ready in discharging this duty that the very heathen admired them for it. They were hospitable to all strangers, but especially to those of the household of faith (see Ambrose, *De Abrahamo*, 5; *De Offic.* 2, 21; 3:7; Augustine, *Epist.* 38, n. 2; Tertullian, *Apologet.* 39). Even Lucian praises them in this respect (*De morte peregrin.* 2, p. 766). Believers scarcely ever traveled without letters of communion, which testified the purity of their faith, and procured for them a favorable reception wherever the name of Jesus Christ was known. Calmet is of opinion that the two minor epistles of John may be such letters of communion and recommendation. (On the general subject, see Unger, *De ξενοδοκίᾳ ejusque ritu untiquo*, in his *Annal. de Cingulis*, p. 311 sq.; Stuck, *Antiq. Conviv.* 1, 27; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Archäologie*; Scholz, *Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie*; Deyling, *Observ.* 1, 118 sq.; Jahn, *Archäologie*, I, 2:227 sq.; Küster, *Erläuterung*, § 202 sq.; Laurent, in Gronov. *Thesaurus*, 9, 194 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* 283.) **SEE CARAVAN;**  
**SEE ENTERTAINMENT;** **SEE GUEST.**

## Hospitallers

Is the name generally given to charitable brotherhoods, consisting of laymen, monks, choristers, and knights of religious orders, who, while continuing under the rules and exercises of conventual life (chiefly after the rule of St. Augustine), devoted themselves to the care of the poor and the sick in the hospitals. These brotherhoods were founded at various times and in different countries. They added to the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the special vow that they would devote themselves to this work of mercy. The hospitals (q.v.), in the age when these were instituted, were mostly connected with monasteries, and were subject to the bishops. Oftentimes the care of them was so great that a special officer was appointed, with the appellation of general, and the officer under him as intendant, superior, or major. Some of the Hospitaller brotherhoods, however, were not subject to the bishops, but only to the pope, as the Hospitallers' of St. John of God, also called the Brethren of Love, etc. As an order of spiritual knights, they were divided into knights, priests, and serving brethren. Among them we find

- (1.) The *Hospitallers of St. Anthony*, **SEE ANTHONY, ORDERS OF**, founded by Gaston in consequence of an epidemic known as St. Anthony's fire.
- (2.) The *Brethren of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem*. **SEE MALTA, KNIGHTS OF**.
- (3.) The *Order of Teutonic Knights* (q.v.).
- (4.) The *Brethren of the Hospital of the Order of the Holy Ghost*, **SEE HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF**, founded by Guido at Montpellier.
- (5.) The *Hospitallers of Burgos*, founded in 1212.
- (6.) The *Hospitallers of our Lady of Christian Charity* were founded near Chalons in the end of the 13th century by Guy de Joinville; a like order was founded at Paris in 1294.
- (7.) The *Hospitallers of our Lady Della Scala*, which, according to some authorities, dates as far back as the 9th century, is said by others to have been founded about this time at Sienna, in Italy.
- (8.) The *Hospitallers of the Order of St. John of God (de Dieu)*, also called "Brothers of Charity," etc. **SEE CHARITY, BROTHERS OF**.

(9.) Of the *Congregation of penitent Brethren*, founded in Flanders in 1615; the *Hospitallers of the Order of Bethlehemites* (q.v.), in 1655; and a number of congregations of the third order of St. Francis, which arose in the 14th century, some are still in existence. The dress of the hospitallers was a black robe or cloak, on the breast of which was worn a white cross, with eight points, which, according to their statutes, is the true symbol of the virtues. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 6, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 345; Helyot, *Gesch. d. Klosteru. Ritterorden.* 2, 200 sq.; 3, 86 sq., 463 sq.; Vertot, *Hist. des Chevaliers de St. Jean de Jerusalem* (Amst. 1732, 5 vols. 8vo); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 25, 93 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 255 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2, 276; Milman's Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, 5, 598 sq.; Lea, *Histor. Sacerdot. Celib.* p. 365 sq., 475; *New Englander*, Aug. 1851, p. 388 sq. **SEE JERUSALEM; SEE KNIGHTHOOD; SEE TEMPLARS;** etc.

## Hospitals

So called from the mediaeval *hospitia*, are now generally understood to be establishments intended for the reception of the poor the sick, or the infirm, where their spiritual and temporal wants are gratuitously ministered to. Though various provisions were made for the poor among the Greeks and Romans, and public largesses were distributed in many ways, hospitals were unknown. The true spirit of Christian charity, however, considers the most useless and abandoned characters as most in need of assistance, and imitates Christ in bestowing it upon them. The early Christians fed, not only their own poor, but also those of the heathen. Even Julian the Apostate praised their example in this respect. As soon as the early Christians were free to practice their religion openly, they commenced building charitable institutions, to which they gave various names, according to the character of their inmates: thus they had the *Brephotrophium*, or infant asylum; the *Orpihanotrothium*, or orphan asylum; the *Nosocomium*, or sick hospital; the *Xenodochlium*, or retreat for strangers, more particularly pilgrims. The latter was properly the hospital, or house of hospitality and in monasteries, that part of them which was reserved for the accommodation of visitors, and was divided into sections according to the classes of society to which the visitors belonged, was also so called (Du Cange, *Gloss.* s.v. *Hospitale*). These hospitals were soon found in all the large cities. Epiphanius says (*Haeres.* 75, No. 1): "The bishops, in their charity towards strangers, are in the habit of establishing institutions wherein they receive the maimed and the sick, providing them

with such accommodations as their means will allow.” They ‘were generally in charge of the clergy (*Constit. Apostol.* I, 3:c. 19), though rich laymen would occasionally erect hospitals also, and wait on their inmates themselves, as did Pammachius of Porto, and Gallican of Ostia. The bishops were careful to have the poor properly buried, ransomed the prisoners of war, and often emancipated slaves. They often went so far as to sell the communion service, or the altar ornaments, to raise the means of accomplishing these charitable objects (*Mœurs des Chrétiens*, § 51). One of the most famous of these institutions was founded at Caesarea in the latter half of the 4th century. The next notable institution was that of St. Chrysostom, built at his own expense at Constantinople. There was also a very fine hospital at Rome, which was built by Fabiola, a Roman lady and friend of St. Jerome, who himself likewise built one at Bethlehem. The inmates of the hospitals in the early Church, very much like the practice of our own day, were divided according to sex. The male portion was placed under the charge of a deacon, and the women under the care of the deaconesses, who, according to Epiphanius (*Exposit. fid.* c. 17), rendered to persons of their sex whatever services their infirmity required. It was a rule for the deacons and deaconesses to seek for the unfortunate day by day, and to inform the bishops, who in turn, accompanied by a priest, visited the sick and needy of all classes (Augustine, *De civit. Dei*, I, 22 c. 8). The hospitals known as *Nosocomia* were really first instituted under Constantine. They were under the direct care of the bishop himself, and were, until the Middle Ages, oftentimes placed near or incorporated with their dwellings. But they must not be understood to have been, like the hospitals of our own day, one immense building. They consisted of a number of small cottages (dormunculke), each intended for a certain malady. Procopius (*De aedif. Justinian.* I, 1, c. 2; *Hist. Byzant.* 3), in speaking of an ancient valetudinarium which was re-established and enlarged by Justinian, says that the enlargement consisted in the addition of a certain number of small houses (“numero dormuncularum”), and of additional annual revenues (“annuo censu”). These numberless small houses, spread over a large area, gave to a hospital the appearance and extent of a village by itself. The nosocomia were also established in the West, but, unlike those of the East, they were confined to the houses of the bishops. Thus Augustine dined at the same table with the sick and poor to whom he afforded relief (Posidius, *In ejus Vita*, c. 23). After the downfall of the Roman Empire, we find no mention made of hospitals in Europe for several centuries. During that period the bishops generally took the whole

care of the poor and the sick. The bishops' house was the refuge of the poor, the widows, the orphans, the sick, and the strangers; the care of receiving and entertaining them was, as we have already stated, always considered one of the chief duties of the clergy. During the troubled times which followed the downfall of the Carolingian dynasty the poor were almost forsaken; gaunt famine stalked over Europe, and the clergy were hardly able to keep off starvation from their own doors. But in the 13th and 14th centuries, when contagious diseases were rife in Europe, hospitals were generally established in nearly all parts of the continent. Some were the fruit of private charity, others were established by the Church, and others by the state. They were usually under the direction of priests and monks, and in the course of time many abuses arose. In the progress of civilization both the condition and the management of such institutions were greatly improved. At the present day, no civilized country is without its hospitals, either endowed and supported by the government or by private charity. The Protestant Church of Germany has institutions of deaconesses, who especially devote themselves to the care of the sick in hospitals, and from Germany these institutions have spread to many other countries. There are also in many countries special schools for the training of nurses in hospitals. Among those who, in modern times, have exerted themselves for the improvement of the hospital service, Florence Nightingale is prominent. See Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Theologie*, s.v.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites Chret.* p. 289 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 336 sq.; Leckey, *History of Rationalism*, 2, 263 sq.; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope*, 1, 120,222; *Church of England Review*, July, 1855; Low, *The Charities of London* (London 1850, 12mo); Nightingale, *Notes on Nursi.*, 1 (London 1859); Dieffenbach, *Anleit. zur Krankenwartung* (Berl. 1832). **SEE ALMIONER; SEE ALMS; SEE DEACONESSES; SEE FOUNDLING HOSPITALS; SEE ORPHAN ASYLUMS.** (J. H. W.)

## Hospital Sisters

Also called "Daughters of God," are communities of nuns and lay sisters founded for the same purpose originally as the Hospitallers (q.v.). Their organization spread even more rapidly than the latter, but they soon abandoned their original purpose, and turned their attention to the education of young girls, especially orphans, and also to the redeeming of lost women. They are to be found to this day in France, the Netherlands, and in Italy, and are especially useful in taking care of the sick. Among their many branches we find the following:



(1.) *Hospital Sisters of Notre Dame of Refuge*, founded in 1624 by Elizabeth of the Cross at Nancy, confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. They received in their houses three classes of women: virtuous girls, who by vows bound themselves to works of charity; fallen women, who, after their reformation, were likewise admitted to taking the vows; finally, voluntary penitents, and women who were sent to these institutions against their will for correction.

(2.) *Hospital Sisters of Loches* (in Touraine), founded in 1630 by the priest Pasquier Bouray. They had a very strict rule.

(3.) *Hospital Sisters of the Mercy of Jesus*, established in 1630 according to the rule of St. Augustine; confirmed in 1638 by patent letters, and in 1664 and 1667 by papal bulls.

(4.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph or of Providence*; **SEE PROVIDENCE, ORDERS OF.**

(5.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Thomas of Villeneuve*, established in 1660 by Angelus le Proust and Louis Chaboisseau, according to the third rule of St. Augustine; received in 1661 the royal sanction, and still exist in France.

(6.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Augustine of Notre Danme of Christian Love*, who originated in 1679 at Grenoble.

(7.) *Hospital Sisters of Besangon*, established in 1685, revived in 1807, have (1870) about eighteen houses.

(8.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Martha of Pontarlier*, established in 1687.

(9.) *Hospital Sisters of the Holy Ghost*; **SEE HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF.** To the class of Hospital Sisters, in the wider sense of the word, may also be counted the Elizabethines, the Sisters of Charity, and many other congregations. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 6, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5:345 sq.; Helyot, *Geschichte d. Klöster- u. Ritterorden*, 2, 362; 4, 404, 437, 475, 482; 7, 342 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 2, 370 sq. (A. J. S.)

### **Hossbach, Peter Wilhelm, S.T.D.**

A distinguished German theologian, born in Wusterhausen, Prussia, Feb. 20, 1784, was educated at the universities of Halle and Frankfort on the Oder. He was a regular attendant at the lectures of Knapp and Niemeyer.

After his graduation he studied with great interest the works of Schleiermacher, with whom he was intimately associated the greater part of his life, and through whose influence he obtained the position of preacher to the Prussian military school for officers (Kadettenhaus) at Berlin. In 1819, while in this position, he published *Das Leben Joh. Val. Andreas*, which was highly commented upon by Tholuck (comp. the article Andre:1 in Herzog. *Real-Encyklop.* 1, and Supplem. 1), and which at once assigned him an eminent position in the ranks of the Church historians. In 1821 he became pastor of the New Jerusalem Church. His opening sermon, which he published, led to the publication of an entire volume of his sermons (1822), which he dedicated to his friend Schleiermacher. Other collections of his sermons were published in 1824, 1827, 1831, 1837, 1843, and after his death another collection, with an introduction by Pischon, in 1848. Hossbach published his most important work in 1828: *Spener u. s. Zeit* (2 vols. 8vo). The second edition, which was published in 1853, contains also, as an addendum, an introduction to the history of the Evangelical Church and theology of the 18th century, a portion of a work on which he was engaged the latter part of his life, and which was left uncompleted. He died April 7, 1846. Hossbach was a popular preacher, but his published sermons enjoyed even greater popularity, and established his reputation as an able divine. He held a midway position between the strictly orthodox and the liberal theologians of Germany, 'and his great endeavor was to effect a compromise between these two antagonistic elements. A very fine autobiography as a minister Hossbach has furnished in his last sermon of the sixth collection, delivered to his congregation February 5, 1843, after a successful treatment of his eyes, one of which the physician was obliged to remove. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19, 655 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 2, 371. (J. H. W.)

### Hossein Ben-Mansour, Abou'l Moghits

A Persian Mohammedan Mystic surnamed *Al-Hellaj*, was born at Khorassan or Beidah (Fars) in the second half of the 9th century. He was a descendant of a Guebre who had embraced Islamism. After studying under the most distinguished *sofis*, one of whom prescribed for him solitude and silence for two years, he traveled through the East as far as China, preaching on his way. Some believed in him, others considered him an impostor. He uttered new opinions in religion and morals, which did not very well harmonize with each other, nor with his mode of living: thus sometimes he was a strict observer of all the practices of Islamism, while

he taught that good works were more meritorious than devotional practices. His morals, however, were unimpeachable, and his life one of the utmost simplicity. He professed Pantheism, which he symbolized in these words: "I am God and all is God." The imams and sheiks of Baghdad condemned him to death, and handed him over to the secular power. After remaining one year and a half in prison, by order of the vizir, Ali ben-Assa, he was taken out to undergo torture. Instead of cursing his persecutors, he prayed for them, and died thus, the 23rd dzou'lcadeh, 309 (March, 922). His body was burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tigris. His theological and mystical works are some thirty in number. See Ibn Khallikan, *Biograph. Dict.* 1, 423; and Fragments translated by Tholuck, *Bliithensamml. aus d. morgenländischen Mystik* (Berlin, 1825, 8vo), p. 310, 327; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:215; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 392 (Hallage). (J. N. P.)

Host occurs in the A.V. of the Bible in two very different senses, the latter and most frequent now nearly obsolete.

**1. Socially** (**ξένος**, lit. a *stranger*, as usually; hence a *guest*, and by inference an *entertainer*, <sup><6163></sup>Romans 16:23; **πανδοχεύς**, one *who receives all comers*, i.e. a *tavern keeper*, e.g. the custodian of a caravanserai [q.v.], <sup><2035></sup>Luke 10:35). **SEE HOSPITALITY; SEE INN.**

**2. Military** (prop. and usually **abx**; *tsaba'*, *warfare*, hence an *army*, **στρατία**; also **רנח יחי** *machaneh'*, an *encampment, host*; sometimes **דלדגדג** *gedud'*, a *troop*; **ל יחי** *cha'yil*, or **ל יח** *echeyl*, *aforce*; **חברת**, *maarabah'*, *Amilitary station*; Gr. **στράτευμα** or **στρατόπεδον**), the usual designation of the standing army among the Israelites. This consisted originally of infantry (compare <sup><4112></sup>Numbers 11:21; <sup><9940></sup>1 Samuel 4:10; 15:4), not simply because the country of Palestine prevented the use of cavalry, since already the Canaanites and Philistines had iron (iron-armed) chariots, which they knew how to use to advantage in the plains and open land (<sup><6176></sup>Joshua 17:16 Judges 1, 19; 4:3,13; 5:22; <sup><9335></sup>1 Samuel 13:5; comp. Wichmausen, *De currib. bellic. in oriente usitatis*, Viteb. 1722; **SEE CHARIOT**), and the same was true of horsemen (2 Samuel 1, 6); moreover, the neighboring nations (Syrians and Egyptians) employed these military instruments in their campaigns against the Israelites (<sup><6110></sup>Joshua 11:9; <sup><9703></sup>Judges 4:3; <sup><10018></sup>2 Samuel 10:18, etc.). This last circumstance (which appears to have had no influence over David, <sup><10394></sup>2 Samuel 8:4), especially when the theatre of war was removed into foreign countries, may naturally have induced Solomon

(contrary to the command, <sup><5176></sup>Deuteronomy 17:16; comp. Gesenius, *Con2ment. zu Jesa.* 1, 186 sq.) to add cavalry to his army (<sup><1103></sup>1 Kings 4:26; 10:26), which he distributed among the cities (<sup><1109></sup>1 Kings 9:19; 10:26); also under the later kings we find this description of troops mentioned (<sup><1169></sup>1 Kings 16:9; <sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:7), although they were eager to avail themselves of the assistance of the Egyptian cavalry (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 31:1; 36, 9; <sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:24). The Mosaic laws obliged every male Israelite from 20 years of age (Numbers 1, 3; 26:2; <sup><1255></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5) to 50 (Joseph. *Ant.* 3, 12, 4; comp. Macrob. *Sat.* 1, 6; Seneca, *Vit. brev.* 20) to bear arms (see in Mishna, *Sofa*, 8:7), yet there were many causes of exemption (Deuteronomy 20 5; compare 1 Macc. 3:55). Whenever an occasion of hostilities occurred, the young men assembled, and the requisite enumeration of the soldiers (by means of a **rpso**sopher, “scribe” or registrar, <sup><2525></sup>Jeremiah 52:25; <sup><2338></sup>Isaiah 33:18) was made according to the several tribes (<sup><6812></sup>Numbers 31:2 sq.; <sup><6103></sup>Joshua 7:3; <sup><7210></sup>Judges 20:10). On sudden incursions of enemies, the able-bodied Israelites were summoned by special messengers (Judges 6,35), or by the sound of trumpets, or by beacons (**snenes**) placed upon the hilltops (<sup><1007></sup>Judges 3:27; 6:34; 7:24; <sup><1005></sup>Jeremiah 4:5 sq.; 6:1; <sup><1074></sup>Ezekiel 7:14; comp. <sup><2313></sup>Isaiah 13:2; 49, 22; <sup><1210></sup>2 Kings 3:21; Jeremiah 1, 2; 1 Macc. 7:45; Diod. Sic. 19:97). The entire army, thus raised by levy, was divided, according to the various kinds of weapons (<sup><1448></sup>2 Chronicles 14:8), into troops (officers and soldiers together being called **pydbajpyræ**, *captains and servants*) of 1000, 100, and 50 men (<sup><6814></sup>Numbers 31:14, 48; <sup><7210></sup>Judges 20:10; <sup><982></sup>1 Samuel 8:12; 2 Kings 1, 9; 11:15), each having its own leader (**pytban;rci**, *captain of the thousands*; **rcit/aMaj**, *captain of the hundreds*; **pyVaje;rci**, *captain of fifty*; 2 Kings 1, 9; 11:4; <sup><1425></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5; for later times, comp. 1 Macc. 3:55): larger divisions are also referred to (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1 sq.; <sup><1474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14 sq.). The commander-in-chief of the entire army (called **rcel yþhi**, *captain o’ the host*, or **abXhirci**, *captain of the army*, or **abXhil irci**, *captain over the army*, <sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 2:8; 24:2; 1 Kings 1, 19) formed a council of war (general’s staff) with the commanders of the chiliads and centuries (<sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 13:1 sq.), and in time of peace had the direction of the military enrolment (<sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 24:2 sq.). But the king generally led the army in person in battle. The national militia of the Hebrews wore no uniform. and at first each soldier was at his own expense, although commissaries of provisions are occasionally mentioned (<sup><7210></sup>Judges 20:10). On military

weapons, *SEE ARMOR*. The strength of the Israelitish armies is sometimes stated in very high figures (<sup><0918></sup>1 Samuel 11:8; 15:4; <sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1 sq.), which is not so surprising, as they were gathered in mass by messengers (at a later day, Josephus got together in Galilee alone 100,000 men of the Jewish soldiery, *War*, 2:20, 6); but the numbers are probably often corrupt (<sup><1049></sup>2 Samuel 24:9 sq.; <sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 21:5 sq.; <sup><1437></sup>2 Chronicles 13:3; 14:8; 17:14; 26:12 sq.) or (in the Chronicles, see Gramberg, p. 117) exaggerated. *SEE NUMBER*.

The organization of a standing army was begun by *Saul* (<sup><0913></sup>1 Samuel 13:2 sq.; 24:3) in the establishment (by voluntary enlistment) of a picked corps of 3000 strong from the whole mass of the people subject to military duty (<sup><0945></sup>1 Samuel 14:52). David followed his example, but, besides the bodyguard (*SEE CHERETHITET* and *SEE PELETHITE*), he likewise instituted a national army, to serve in turn in monthly divisions (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1 sq.). Solomon did the same (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 4:26); and even princes of the royal stock, before they came to the throne invested themselves with a lifeguard of troops (<sup><1051></sup>2 Samuel 15:1; 1 Kings 1, 5). Likewise under Jehoshaphat (<sup><1474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14 sq.), Athaliah (<sup><12104></sup>2 Kings 11:4), Amaziah (<sup><1426></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5), and Uzziah (<sup><1451></sup>2 Chronicles 26:11), as also under Ahaziah of Israel (2 Kings 1, 9 sq.), standing troops are mentioned in time of peace, but they were probably not in constant service. Their pay probably consisted in agricultural produce. Foreigners were not excluded from the honors of war (as may be seen in the case of Uriah the Hittite, and other warriors of David, q.v.); and Amaziah, king of Judah (although with the disapprobation of the prophet), even hired a whole troop of Ephraimitish soldiers (<sup><1426></sup>2 Chronicles 25:6 sq.). (See generally J. F. Zacharime, *De re militari yet. Hebr.* Kil. 1735, a work of no great merit.) In post-exilian times a fresh organization of Jewish military force was instituted under the Maccabees. Judas early established his military companies (1 Macc. 3:55) in divisions of 1000, 100, 50, and 10; and Simon, as prince, first paid a standing army out of his own resources (1 Macc. 14:32). His successors commanded a still larger number of troops, and John Hyrcanus was the first who enlisted also foreigners (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 8, 4), probably Arabians, who served in mercenary armies (1 Macc. 5:39). On the other hand, the Jews likewise engaged in foreign warfare, for instance, as auxiliaries of the Egyptians (1 Macc. 10:36; Joseph. *Ant.* 13:10, 4), and individuals even attained the rank of commanders (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:10, 4; 13, 1; *Apion*, 2:5), although they generally abstained from

serving in foreign armies. on account of being obliged to violate the Sabbath (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:10,11 sq., 14). The discontent and party jealousies of the Jews rendered necessary the employment of foreign mercenaries by king Alexander and queen Alexandra (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:13, 5; 14, 1; 16, 2), called heavy-armed (ἑκατοντάμαχοι, Joseph. *Ant.* 13:12, 5). Herod the Great had in his army, no doubt, many foreigners, even Germans (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:8, 3; *War.* 2:1, 2); Kandler (in *Act. Acad. Erfbrd. Mogunat.* 1, 415 sq.) understands also a special chosen corps as a body-guard (τοματοφύλακες, Joseph. *Ant.* 15:9, 3; comp. *War.* 2, 1, 3). He, as also his successor (Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 10, 3; *War.* 2, 20, 1), suffered his troops in certain cases to unite with the Roman legions (Josephus, *War.* 2, 18, 9; 3, 4, 2; *Ant.* 17, 10, ), and these Herodian soldiers, like the Roman, were employed to guard prisoners (<412> Acts 12:4 sq.). Respecting the discipline of these Herodian troops we know nothing positive, but they were certainly organized on Roman principles, as also Josephus himself armed and disciplined the Jewish militia who were under his command, after the Roman custom (*War.* 2, 20, 7). In the times of the direct Roman government of Judea, in order to maintain tranquility, there were Roman military bodies in the country, who were regularly stationed at the headquarters of the procurator at Caesarea (<400> Acts 10:1); but during the great festival, namely, the Passover, they were in part detailed to Jerusalem (<423> Acts 21:31; Joseph. *War.* 2, 12, 1). **SEE ROMAN EMPIRE.** (See generally Danz, *De breor. re milit.* Jense, 1690; J. Lydii *Syntagma de re milit. cum notis* S. van Til, Dordrac. 1698; both also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 27.) **SEE ARMY; SEE WAR.**

## Host of Heaven

(**[myvhiabx]** *tseba' hashssama'yim, army of the skies*), in <000> Genesis 2:1, refers to the sun, moon, and stars, as the host of heaven under the symbol of an army, in which the sun is considered as the king, the moon as his vicegerent, the stars and planets as their attendants, and the constellations as the battalions and squadrons of the army drawn up in order, that they may come with their leaders to execute the designs and commands of the sovereign. According to this notion, it is said in the song of Deborah, "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera" (<000> Judges 5:20). The worship of the host of heaven was one of the earliest forms of idolatry (q.v.), and, from finding it frequently reprobated in the Scriptures, we may conclude that it was very common among the Jews in the days of

their declension from the pure service of God (<sup><1549></sup>Deuteronomy 4:19; <sup><12716></sup>2 Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:5; <sup><24913></sup>Jeremiah 19:13; <sup><31005></sup>Zephaniah 1:5; <sup><44742></sup>Acts 7:42). *SEE HEAVEN.*

In the book of Daniel it is said, “And it (the little horn) waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them” (<sup><27810></sup>Daniel 8:10, 11). This doubtless points to the aspiring nature and usurping power of Antiochus Epiphanes, who in 2 Macc. 9:10 is described as the man who thought he could reach to the stars of heaven; which, from <sup><23413></sup>Isaiah 14:13; 24:21, may be understood to signify the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, among the Jews. The priests and Levites, like the angels, were continually waiting on the service of the King of heaven in the Temple, as of old in the tabernacle (<sup><49124></sup>Numbers 8:24), and these were that part of the host, or the holy people, that were thrown down and trampled upon; for Antiochus overthrew some of the most celebrated luminaries among the leaders of the Jewish people, and reduced them to the lowest degradation. Spencer, in his treatise *De Legibus Heb.* bk. 1, ch. 4 p. 202, takes notice that the Scripture often borrows expressions from military affairs to accommodate itself to the use of the tabernacle, and hence is the frequent use of the term “host.” The *host of heaven* and the *prince of the host* he thinks must refer to the body of the priests, who exercised the offices of their warfare under the standards of the Deity. *SEE LITTLE HORN.*

A very frequent epithet of Jehovah is “*Jehovah God of hosts*,” i.e. of the celestial armies; generally rendered “Lord God of hosts” (<sup><24514></sup>Jeremiah 5:14; 38, 17; 44, 7; <sup><28125></sup>Hosea 12:5; <sup><31013></sup>Amos 3:13; <sup><15015></sup>Psalms 59:5; 80:4, 7, 14). This is a very usual appellation of the Most High God in some of the prophetic and other books, especially in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi; but does not occur in the Pentateuch, in the books of Joshua and Judges, nor in Ezekiel, Job, and the writings of Solomon. The Hebrew word “*Sabaoth*,” i.e. *hosts*, is used by the apostles Paul and James (<sup><49129></sup>Romans 9:29; <sup><50914></sup>James 5:4), and is retained untranslated in the English Version. As to the grammatical construction of *Jehovah of hosts*, some suppose it to be by ellipsis for *Jehovah God of hosts*; Gesenius says this is not necessary, and the Arabs, too, *subjoin* in like manner a genitive of attribute to the proper names of persons, as *Antara, of the horse*, q. d. *Antara, chief of the horse*. So, too, in the construction *God of-hosts*, the word *hosts* may be taken as an attribute, which could be put in apposition with the names of God. The *hosts* thus signified in *Jehovah of hosts* can

hardly be doubtful if we compare the expressions *host* and *hosts of Jehovah* (<sup><R514></sup>Joshua 5:14, 15; <sup><R321></sup>Psalms 103:21; 148:2), which, again, do not differ from *host of heaven*, embracing both angels, and the sun, moon, and stars (Genesis 32. 1, 2; <sup><R419></sup>Deuteronomy 4:19). The phrase *Jehovah of hosts*, therefore, differs little from the latter form, *God of heaven*, and *Jehovah God of heaven* (<sup><D47></sup>Genesis 24:7; 2 Chronicles 36, 23; <sup><R515></sup>Job 15:15; Ezra 1, 2; 5:11, 12; 6:9, 10; Nehemiah 1, 4, 5; 2:4, 20; <sup><R56></sup>Psalms 136:26; John 1, 9; <sup><R28></sup>Daniel 2:18, 37; <sup><R113></sup>Revelation 11:13). *SEE SABAOTH.*

## Host

(oblation, from *hostia*, victim, sacrifice), the name given in the Romish Church to the bread or wafers used in the celebration of the Eucharist. It is unleavened, thin, flat, and of circular form, and has certain emblematic devices, as the crucifixion, the Lamb, or some words, or initials of words, having reference to the sacrifice, impressed on it. The Greek and other Oriental churches, as well as the various Protestant churches, celebrate the Eucharist by using leavened bread only differing from ordinary bread in being of a finer quality; and one of the grounds of separation from the West alleged by Michael Cerularius was the Western practice of using unleavened bread. "The Greek and Protestant controversialists allege that in the early Church ordinary or leavened bread was always used, and that our Lord himself, at the Last Supper, employed the same. Even the learned cardinal Bona and the Jesuit Sirmond are of the same opinion; but most Roman divines, with the great Mabillon at their head, contend for the antiquity of the use of the unleavened bread, and especially for its conformity with the institution of our Lord, inasmuch as at the paschal supper, at which 'he took bread, and blessed, and brake it,' none other than the unleavened was admissible (<sup><D28></sup>Exodus 12:8, 15; <sup><R25></sup>Leviticus 23:5). (See Klee, *Dogmatik*, 3, 190.)" — Chambers. At the Council of Florence it was left at the option of the churches to use leavened or unleavened bread. "Romanists worship the host under a false presumption that they are no longer bread and wine, but transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, who is, on each occasion of the celebration of that sacrament, *offered* up anew as a *victim* (hostia) by the so-called 'priests.' Against this error the 31st Article of Religion is expressly directed, and also these words in the consecration prayer of the Communion Service of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 'By his *one* oblation of himself *once* offered,' etc., that Church pointedly declaring in both those places that the minister,



‘so far from offering any sacrifice himself, refers’ the people ‘to the sacrifice already made by another’ (Eden). After the Council of Trent had determined that, upon consecration, the bread and wine in the sacrament are changed into the Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, and that though the Savior always sits at the right hand of God in heaven, he is, notwithstanding, in many other places sacramentally present, this decision follows: “There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *latría*, which is due to the true God, according to the constant usage of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored that it was instituted by Christ the Lord.” We learn that, in conformity with this instruction, as the Missal directs, the priest, in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees adores the sacrament. He worships what is before him on the paten and in the chalice, and gives to it the supreme worship, both of mind and body, that he would pay to’ Christ himself. With his head bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed on it and directed towards it, he prays to it as to Christ: “Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, give us peace.” The following is a translation from the rubric of the Missal: “Having uttered the words of consecration, the priest, immediately falling on his knees, adores the consecrated host; he rises, shows it to the people, places it on the corporale, and again adores it.” When the wine is consecrated, the priest, in like manner, ‘falling on his knees, adores it, rises, shows it to the people, puts the cup in its place, covers it over, and again adores it.” The priest, rising up after he has adored it himself, lifts it up as high as he can conveniently, and, with his eyes fixed upon it shows it, to be devoutly adored by the people; who, having notice also, by ringing the mass-bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adoration to it, as if it were God himself. If Christ were visibly present, they could not bestow on him more acts of homage than they do on the host. They pray to it, and use the same acts of invocation as they do to Christ himself. The host is also worshipped when it is carried through the street in solemn procession, either before the pope, or when taken to some sick person, or on the feast of Corpus Christi. The person who, in great churches, conveys the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called *bajulus Dei*, the porter or carrier of God. This idolatrous custom of the Church of Rome was not known till the year 1216; for it was in 1215 that transubstantiation, by the

Council of Lateran, under pope Innocent III, was made an article of faith; and we also find in the Roman canon' law that it was pope Honorius who ordered, in the following year, that the priests, at a certain part of the mass service, shout elevate the host, and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it. See Augulsti, *Denkwii-digkeiten aus der christl. Archaeol.* 8:275 sq.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. 2:ch. 4:5; Brown, *Expos. of the 39 Articles*, p. 606, 731, n.; Neale, *Introduction East. Church*, 2, 516; Siegel, *Christ. Alterth.* 1, 30; Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* 2:819; Farrar, s.v. Adoration; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch* 28, p. 73; and the articles *SEE AZYMITES; SEE LORD'S SUPPER; SEE MASS; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.* (J.H.W.)

### Hostage

(*ḥbwrīṭ*, *taarubah*, *suretyship*), a person delivered into the hands of another as a security for the performance of some engagement. *SEE PLEDGE.* Conquered kings or nations often gave hostages for the payment of their tribute, or for the continuance of their subjection; thus Jehosh, king of Israel, exacted hostages from Amaziah, king of Judah (<sup><1244></sup>2 Kings 14:14; <sup><1453></sup>2 Chronicles 25:24). *SEE WAR.*

### Hotchkin, Ebenezer

A Presbyterian missionary to the Indians, was born at Richmond, Mass., March 19, 1803. He was sent as an assistant missionary to the Choetaw nation in 1828, and spent the rest of his life laboring among them. He died at the residence of his brother, the late Rev. John Hotchkin, at Lenox, Mass., Oct. 28, 1867. Hotchkin was not only a minister, but also an instructor and was active in the management of boarding and other schools. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 334 sq.

### Hot Cross-Buns

A kind of muffin or biscuit, with the figure of the cross impressed upon them, quite generally used in England by the adherents of the Church of England for breakfast on Good Friday. These biscuits are said to be derived from the Ecclesiastical Eulogiae (q.v.), formerly given as a token of friendship, or sent to the houses of those who were hindered from receiving the host. — See Staunton, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, p. 377.

## Ho'tham

(Heb. *Chotham'*,  $\mu\tau/\text{j}$ , a *seal* or signet ring, as in <sup><1282></sup>Exodus 28:12, etc.; Sept.  $\chi\omega\theta\acute{\alpha}\mu$ , Vulg. *Hothanz*), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Heber, the grandson of Asher (<sup><1172></sup>1 Chronicles 7:32). B.C. cir. 1658. He is probably the same with HELEM, whose sons are enumerated in verse 35, and grandsons in verses 36, 37.
2. An Axoerite, and father of Shama and Jehiel, two of David's champions (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44, where the name is Anglicized "Hothan," after the Sept.  $\chi\omega\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ). B.C. 1046.

## Ho'than

(<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44). *SEE HOTIHAMI* 2. Ho'thir (Heb. *Hothir'*,  $\text{ryt}\theta$ , *preserver*; Sept.  $\text{Ἰωεθιρί, Ἰεθιρί}$ ), the thirteenth son of Heman (q.v.), who, with eleven of his kinsmen, had charge of the twenty-first division of Levitical singers (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 25:4, 28). B.C. 1014. *SEE GIDDALTI*.

## Hottentots

The aboriginal inhabitants of Cape Colony, in Southern Africa. They are divided into three large tribes: 1. the Nama, or Namaqua; 2. the Kora (Korana, Koraqua); and, 3. the Saab, or Bushmen (Bosjesmans). In modern times they have been pushed northwards, partly by European immigrants, partly by the Betchuanas and Kaffres. The Nama, or Namaqua, live as nomads along the Orange River, in Great Namaqualand, which is an independent country, with about 100,000 square miles, and only 40,000 inhabitants, and Little Namaqualand, which is a part of Cape Colony. The Kora, or Korana, were about fifty years ago very numerous in the vicinity of the Vaal and Hart rivers; now they dwell as nomads on both sides of the Upper Orange River, both in Cape Colony and in the Orange Free State (q.v.). The Saab, or Bushmen, live scattered, partly in the northern districts of Cape Colony, partly in the desert Kalahary. In Cape Colony there were, according to the census of 1865, 81,598 Hottentots, by the side of 181,592 Europeans, and 100,536 Kaffres, in a total population of 496,381. Little is known of the Hottentots' religion further than that they believe in a good and an evil spirit, hold festivals on the occasion of the new and full moon, and look upon certain spots as the abode of departed spirits. They have no

regular priest, nor anything like an established worship, although they render especial homage to a small, shining bug. They have magicians for whom they have great respect. The *Bastards*, or *Griquas*, resulting from the amalgamation of Hottentots and Europeans, appear much more susceptible of mental and intellectual culture; they also form a distinct race, and a colony of 6000 of them, established at the Cat River in 1826, has been quite successful and numbered in 1870 about 20,000, nearly all Christians. They are partly nomads, partly agriculturists. The Hottentots in Cape Colony and the Griquas no longer speak the Hottentot language, but a Dutch dialect, strongly mixed with Hottentot and Kaffre words. The Hottentot language is not related to any other, and is especially different from the large South African family of languages. The words are mostly monosyllabic, and usually end in a vowel or nasal sound. Among the consonants, *l*, *f*, and *v* are wanting. There are many diphthongs. Non-Africans find it impossible to imitate the gutturals which the Hottentots breathe with a hoarse voice from a hollow chest, as well as the four clicking sounds which are produced by a lashing of the tongue against the palate, and which in writing are represented by lines and points (I = dental; ! = palatal; ± = cerebral; ||, lateral). Modern linguists enumerate four dialects: 1. that of the Nama; 2. that of the Kora; 3. that of the eastern Hottentots, or Gonaquas; 4. the dead dialects of the colonial Hottentots. The substantives have three genders, masculine, feminine, and common; and three numbers, singular, dual, and plural. There are no cases; the adjective and verb are not inflected. The prepositions are usually placed after the words which they govern. The language of the Bushmen differs from that of the other Hottentots. By the Dutch conquerors of the country of the Hottentots the poor inhabitants were considered unworthy of Christianity, and even many members of the colonial churches discountenanced and prevented all missionary enterprises. The first missionary among the Hottentots began his operations in 1709, but he ceased them after a few weeks. In 1737, the Moravian missionary, G. Schmidt, gained an attentive hearing; but when, after a few years, the fruit of his labors appeared, he was compelled by the colonial government to leave. During the next fifty years no missionary was allowed to visit the Hottentots. In 1792 the Moravians succeeded in re-establishing their mission, but not until the country passed into the hands of the English did the missionaries find the necessary protection, under which their station at Baviaanskloof (at present called Genadendal) became very flourishing. The work grew steadily, and (since 1818) has extended from the Hottentots to

the Kaffres. The Moravians, even as early as 1798, were joined by the London Missionary Society. The missionary Von der Kemp established in the eastern part of the colony a mission among the Hottentots, and the latter labored among the Bushmen. In Little Namaqualand the mission was likewise begun by the London Society, and continued by the Rhenish Missionary Society, which, after the emancipation of the Hottentots, established a number of stations in the eastern districts. Several thousands of Griquas settled on the Cat River, where the station Philipton, with several out stations, arose. Among the Koras, missions have been established (since 1834) by the Berlin Missionary Society. More recently, a number of other missionary societies, of almost all the churches represented in Cape Colony, have taken part in the missions among the Hottentots. Beyond the limits of Cape Colony, the London Mission Society was the first to establish (1805) missions in Great Namaqualand. Subsequently the field was occupied by the Wesleyan Methodists and the Rhenish Missionary Society. Several stations established by the former in the northern parts of the country were again abandoned (Concordiaville and Wesleyvale, 1845-53), but in 1869 they still had three districts in the south-Nisbethbath, Hoole's Fountain, and Jerusalem—all of which were occupied by native helpers, and occasionally visited by a Wesleyan missionary from Little Namaqualand. More extensive is the work of the Rhenish Society, which in 1842 established its first out-station at Bethania, and gradually advanced northwards as far as the Zwachaub. Their labors, especially at Bethania, have been very successful, and Great Namaqualand may now be regarded as a Christianized country. See Tyndall (Wesleyan missionary), *Two Lectures on Great Namaqualand and its Inhabitants; Moo(lie, The Record, or a Series official Papers relative to the Condition and Treatment of the native Tribes in South Africa* (Capetown, 1838 sq., 5 vols.). A Grammar of the Hottentot language has been prepared by Tyndall (Capetown, 1857), and a work on etymology by Wallmann (Berlin, 1857). On the history of the missions among the Hottentots, see Grundemann, *Missionsatlas* (Gotha, 1867). (A. J. S.)

### Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 1

A celebrated Swiss theologian and scholar, born at Zurich March 10, 1620. He studied theology and the Oriental languages at Zurich, Geneva, Groningen, and Leyden. In 1642 he became professor of Church History at Zurich, and in 1643 added to it a professorship at the Carolinum. In 1655 he became professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg, but in 1661 he

returned to Zurich. In 1666, after the decease of Hoorneck (q.v.), the University of Leyden urged Hottinger to come as his successor. He finally consented, by advice of the Swiss government, to serve that university a few years. While making his arrangements preparatory to his journey, he was drowned in the Limmat, June 5, 1667. Hottinger occupies a distinguished place among the philologists of the 17th century, who labored to promote the knowledge of the Shemitic languages. He was one of the first to bring to public notice a number of Syriac and Arabic works by giving extracts from them and biographies of their authors. He also gave a powerful impulse to the study of Oriental languages by establishing at his own expense an Arabic printing office at Heidelberg while professor in that city. The great aim of his writings was to establish the interpretation of Scripture on a more thoroughly historical and grammatical foundation; yet he rather furnished the means for such a system than established it himself. His works consist chiefly of compilations, and were valuable from the fact that they were from sources previously not generally known. He seldom gives an exegesis, but when he does it is based on grammatical and historical considerations rather than on dogmatical. His principal works are, *Exercitationes Antinzorinicae de Pentateucho Sanarit.* (1644) — *Erotemata linguae sanetae* (1647; 2nd edition, 1667) — *Grammatica Chaldeo-Syriaca* (1658) — *Hist. orientalis de Muhammedismo, Saracenisimo, Chaldaismo* (Zur. 1650) — *Historia ecclesiast. Novi Test.* (1651-67, 9 vols.), of which Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1, 21) says that it is a counterpart of the Magdeburg Centuries. "It is less original and vigorous, but more sober and moderate:" *Jus Ilebrceorum* (1655) — *Smegma orientale oppositum sordibus barbarisimi* (1657) — *Bibliotheca orientalis* (Heidelb. 1658) — *Thesaurus philol.* (Zur. 1649) — *Wegweiser, dadurch man versichert werden moag, wo heut zu Tage der wahre katholische Glaube zufinden sei* (1647-49, 3 vols.) — *Cursus theologicus* (1660). Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, s.v.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 331; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 236 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 287 sq.; Hirzel, *J. It. Hottinger der Orientalist d. 17 Jahrhunderts*; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* 2, 525 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 7, 63.

### Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 2

A Swiss Protestant theologian, grandson of the preceding, was born at Zurich Dec. 5, 1681. He studied theology at the universities of Zurich, Geneva, and Amsterdam, and in 1704 was appointed professor of philosophy at Marburg. In 1705 he became professor of Hebrew

antiquities, and in 1710 professor of theology. To strictly Calvinistic views he added most of Cocceius's principles, and from this mixture resulted a system of his own, which he set forth in a treatise on dogmatics, entitled *Typus Doctrinæ Christianæ* (Francf. ad Main, 1714, 8vo). This work created great excitement; the author was accused of inculcating mystical doctrines, and was obliged to resign his position in 1717. Hottinger retired to Frankenthal, where he became pastor of the Reformed Church. In 1721 he was appointed professor of theology at Heidelberg, where he died April 7, 1750. The most important of his later writings are *Disquisitio de Revelationibus extraordinariis in genere et de quibusdam hodiernis vulgo dictis inspiratis in specie* (1717, 8vo), in which he treats of the prophets of the Cevenlnes, who were just then attracting great attention in Germany. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25:239; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1868, p. 31. (J. N. P.)

### Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 1

Son of Johann Heinrich, No. 1, was born at Zurich Dec. 1, 1652. He studied theology at Zurich and Basle, and became, in 1680, pastor of Stallikon, near Zurich. In 1686 he was appointed dean of the cathedral of Zurich, and in 1698 professor of theology in the university of that place. He died Dec. 18, 1735. Hottinger labored earnestly to establish a union of the Protestant churches, and with that view published his *Diss. irenica de veritatis et charitatis in ecclesie Protestantium connubio* (1721). He was an ardent opponent of the Roman Church, and wrote against it his *Dissertatio saecularis de necessaria majorum ab ecclesia Romana secessione* (1719). His principal other works are, *Helvetische Kirchengeschichte* (1698-1729, 4 vols. 4to) — *Ueber d. Zustand der Seele auch dem Tode* (1715) — *Die christlichen 'Lehre v.d. heilsamen Gnade Gottes* (1716) — *Historia formulae consensus* (1723): *Fata doctrina de predestinatione et gratia Dei* (1727), etc. — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 290 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25 238 sq.; Walch, *Biblioth. Theolog.* (see Index); Fuhrmann's *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* 2, 354; Gass, *Dogmen geschichte*, 3, 78 sq.

### Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 2

Nephew of a grandson of the foregoing, and also a distinguished theologian, was born at Zurich May 18, 1783. He was appointed professor

of history at the university of his native place in 1844, and died there May 18, 1859. His principal works are *Gesch. d. Schweizer. Kirchentrennung* (Zür. 1825-27, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Huldreich Zwingli u. s. Zeit* (ibid. 1841, 8vo). He also edited, in connection with Vigeli, Bullinger's *Reformationsgesch.* (vol. 1-3, Frauenf. 1840, 8vo). See Pierer. *Univ. Lexikon*, 8, 358; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 239; Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* 8, 108.

## Houames

Is the name of a Mohammedan sect of roving licentious Arabians, who dwell in tents, as is the custom of the Arabians. "They have a particular law, by which they are commanded to perform their ceremonies and prayers under a pavilion, without an light, after which they lie with the first woman they can meet." Some followers of this sect are living concealed at Alexandria and other places. They are not tolerated by their fellow-countrymen, and are burnt alive if discovered. The name given them signifies in Arabic *wicked, lascivious, or abominable persons*. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* 1, 495. (J. H. W.)

## Houbigant, Charles François

A French priest of the Oratory, and an eminent Biblical scholar, was born at Paris in 1686. He joined his order in 1704, and soon became distinguished for his great attainments. He lectured successively on belles-letters at Jeully, on rhetoric at Marseilles, and on philosophy at Soissons, and was called to Paris in 1722 to conduct the conferences of St. Magloire. His devotion to the duties required by these new offices produced a serious illness, which terminated in total deafness. Being thus incapacitated for public duty, he devoted all his time to study, applying himself especially to the Oriental languages. Towards the close of his long career, his intellectual faculties became impaired in consequence of a fall. He died at Paris October 31, 1783. In 1772 he founded a school for girls at Avilly, where he had a country residence, and at his death he left an annual income of 175 francs to that institution. His principal amusement was to set in type and print his works himself, and for that purpose he established a printing room in his country house. He wrote *Racines de la Langue Hebraïque* (Paris, 1732, 8vo) in verse, in imitation of the *Racines-Grecques* of Rort-Royal. In the preface Houbigant defends Masclefs system, and attempts to prove the uselessness and danger of vowel points in the study of Hebrew



— — *Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacrum* (Paris, 1746, 4to). In this work he follows Cappel, seeking to prove that the original text of the O.T. has undergone alterations which, without touching on points of dogma or of morals, tend to obscure the sense; and he gives rules by which these faults, due mostly to the carelessness of copyists, may be discovered and corrected — *Conferences de Metz*. In this work, published without name of place or date, he gives a popular *expose* of the principles of criticism developed in the preceding work — *Psalmi Hebraici mendis quam plurimis expurgati* (Leyden, 1748. 16mo), the text corrected according to the principles laid down by the author in his *Prolegomena* — *Biblia Hebraica cunz notis criticis et versione Latina ad notas criticasfacta; accedunt libri Graeci qui deuterocanonici vocantur, in fres classes distributi* (Paris, 1753 and 1754, 4 vols. fol.). This work, which cost its author twenty years' labor, was published by the Congregation of the Oratory at an expense of e 40,000 francs. It is very carefully executed, and is printed in two columns, one containing the text and the other the translation. The text, printed without vowel points, is but a reprint of Van der Hooght's edition of 1705. The corrections proposed by Houbigant (who makes no account of the *Keri* and *Kethlib* of the Masorites), are placed either in the margin or in the form of tables at the end of each volume. The corrections of the Pentateuch are taken from the Samaritan Codex, to which Houbigant, as well as Morin, attached undue importance; others are taken from various MSS. belonging to the Congregation of the Oratory, or to the Imperial Library of Paris, but are not fully indicated by him; a large number, finally, are merely conjectural, and derived from the application of his principles of criticism contained in the *Prolegomena*. These corrections have not received the approbation of competent judges. Houbigant appears not to have had a very clear idea of the relative value of his authorities, and he has been accused of want of thoroughness in his knowledge of Hebrew, as well as of arbitrariness in his corrections. The Latin translation was published separately, under the title *Veteris Testamenti versio nova* (Paris, 1753, 5 vols. 8vo); the critical notes and *Prolegomena* have also been printed separately, under the title *Notae Criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros, cum laebraiae tum Graeae scriptos, cum integris Prolegomenis, ad exemplar Parisiense denuo recensce* (Franf. ad Main, 1777, 2 vols. 4to). Houbigant translated bishop Sherlock's *Sermons* and Leslie's *Meeting with the Deist* into French. He left a large number of MSS. which were never published. See Cadry, *Notice sur la Vie et les Ouvrages du P. Houbigant* (in the *Magasin*

*Encyclopedique*, May, 1806) ( G. W. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Schrifterklar.* 4, 154-156, 264-270, 465, 466; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Geschl.* 25, 20, 241 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 2, 158; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 7, 168; 8, 50.

### Houdayer, Julien

A French theologian, was born at Noyen in 1562. In 1595 he was appointed rector of the Sorbonne, and later filled several positions of distinction in the Roman Catholic Church of France. He died Nov. 28, 1619. His only theological work is *Du Devoir des Cures* (Le Mans, 1612, 12mo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 247.

### Houdry, Vincent

A French Jesuit preacher and religious writer, was born at Tours January 22, 1631. He entered the order in 1644, preached some thirty years, and then devoted his time to writing only. He died March 29, 1729. His principal works are *Sermons sur tons les sujets de la. Morale Chretienne* (Paris. 1696, etc., 20 vols. 12mo) — *Traite de la maniere d'imlifer les bons predicatemurs* (Par. 1702, 12mo); and most especially *Bibliotheque des Predicateurs: contemat les principaux sujets de la morale Chret.* (Par. 1712, etc., 23 vols. 4to). Hoefer, *Nou. Biog. Généralé*, 10 15, 258; Chandon and Delandine, *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* 16, 313.

### Houel, Nicolas

A French philanthropist of the 16th century. He founded at Paris the *laaison de la Charite Chretienne* in 1578. Two years later he published his *Avertissement et declaration de l' institution de la Charift Chretienne* (Par. 1580, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 258 sq.

### Hough

(*rQē*akker', Piel of *rql*; to *extirpatee*), a method employed by the ancient Israelites to render useless the captured horses of an enemy (<sup><6105></sup>Joshua 11:6; comp. Genesis 49. 6), as they were not allowed or able to use that animal (so also <sup><1084></sup>2 Samuel 8:4; <sup><3304></sup>1 Chronicles 18:4). It consisted in *hamstringing*, i.e. severing "the tendon Achilles" of the hinder legs (Sept. *νευροκοπεῖν*; compare 'akar; Syr. the same, Barhebr. p. 220). The practice is still common in Arab warfare (Rosenmüller, *Instituturis Moham. circa bellum*, § 17). **SEE HORSE.**

## Hough, John, D.D., 1

A distinguished English divine, born in Middlesex in 1651, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, of which he was elected president in 1687, in spite of the mandamus of king James II, who endeavored to procure the election to the headship of the college first of Anthony Farmer, and then of Dr. Samuel Parker (q.v.), bishop of Oxford, both Roman Catholics in belief, and neither of them fellows of the college, as the statute required. Lord-commissioners having been sent to enforce the royal mandates on the students, Hough, together with twenty-six out of the twenty eight fellows of the college, courageously protested against their arbitrary proceedings, and refused to deliver the keys of the college. Finally, in Oct. 1687, Dr. Parker was by main force installed in Hough's place. "The nation, as well as the university, looked on all this proceeding with just indignation. It was thought an open piece of robbery and burglary, when men authorized by legal commission came forcibly and turned men out of their possession and freeholds" (bishop Burnet). "The protest of Hough was everywhere applauded; the forcing of his door was everywhere mentioned with abhorrence." Less than a year after, James II, under the pressure of political events, thought it prudent, however, to retrace his steps, and to conciliate Hough and his adherents. The former was restored to his position as president. After the Revolution, Hough became successively bishop of Oxford in 1690; of Lichfield and Coventry in 1699; and finally, after refusing the archbishopric of Canterbury, bishop of Worcester in 1717. He died in 1743. Hough wrote *Sermons and Charges*, published with a *Memoir of his Life*, by William Russell, B.D. etc. (Oxford 1821); and other occasional sermons. — Darling, *Encyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1554; Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. 2; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 897; McMasters, *Biog. Ind. to flume's History of England*, p. 363 sq.; Stoughton (John), *Eccl. Hist. of England* (London 1870), 2, 133 sq.

## Hough, John, D.D., 2

A Congregational minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., August 17, 1783. He graduated at Yale in 1802, then studied divinity, and was sent in 1806 as missionary to Vermont, where he was ordained pastor at Vergennes in 1807. This pastorate he resigned in 1812, and became professor of languages in Middlebury College, Vt. Here he remained twenty-seven years, occupying several chairs in turn. He left in 1839, and was some time

in the service of the Colonization Society. In 1841 he was installed pastor at Windham, Ohio. He obtained a dismissal in 1850 on account of failing eyesight, which finally became blindness. He died at Fort Wayne, Indiana, July 17, 1861. Hough was eminently successful and popular as an instructor. He published three sermons, preached at ordinations (1810, 1823, 1826), and was one of the editors of "The Adviser, or Vermont Evangelical Magazine." *Congreg. Quart.* 3, 378.; Wilson, *Presbyt. Historical Almanac*, 1862, p. 186.

### Houghtaling, J. B.

A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northeast, Dutchess Co., N.Y., Oct. 9, 1797; studied law for five years, from 1813; was converted about 1817, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1828. He was appointed agent of the Troy Conference Academy in 1835, and, on account of poor health, took a supernumerary relation in 1847, which he retained until his death in 1856 or 7. He was a very useful preacher and an excellent pastor. His business abilities were fine, and he was for many years secretary of the Troy Conference, and twice assistant secretary of the General Conference. *Minutes of Conferences*, 6, 353. (G. L. T.)

### Hour

(Chald. **h[*v*]**; *shal, saotr'*, a *moment*, prop. a *look*, 1. q. "the wink of an eye" [Germ. *Augenblick*]; Greek **πα**), a term first found in <sup><27816></sup>Daniel 3:6; 4:19, 33; 5:5; and occurring several times in the Apocrypha (Judith 19:8; 2 Esd. 9:44). It seems to be a vague expression for a short period, and the frequent phrase "in the same hour" means "immediately:" hence we find **h[*v*B]** substituted in the Targum for **krB]** "in a moment" (<sup><04621></sup>Numbers 16:21, etc.). The corresponding Gr. term is frequently used in the same way by the N.T. writers (<sup><11813></sup>Matthew 8:13; <sup><12129></sup>Luke 12:39, etc.). The word *hour* is sometimes used in Scripture to denote some determinate season, as "mine *hour* is not yet come," "this is your *hour*, and the power of darkness," "the *hour* is coming," etc. It occurs in the Sept. as a rendering for various words meaning time, just as it does in Greek writers long before it acquired the specific meaning of our word "hour." *Saah* is still used in Arabic both for an hour and a moment.

The ancient Hebrews were probably unacquainted with the division of the natural day into twenty-four parts. The general distinctions of "morning,

evening, and noonday” (Psalm Iv, 17; comp. <sup><MS2></sup>Genesis 15:12; 18:1; 19:1, 15, 23) were sufficient for them at first, as they were for the early Greeks (Homer, *II. 21:3*, 111); afterwards the Greeks adopted five marked periods of the day (Jul. Pollux, *Oom?* — 1, 68; Dio Chrysost. *Orat. in De Glor.*), and the Hebrews parceled out the period between sunrise and sunset into a series of minute divisions distinguished by the sun’s course, as is still done by the Arabs, who have stated forms of prayers for each period (Lane’s *Mood. Eg.* vol. 1, ch. 3). **SEE DAY.**

The early Jews appear to have divided the day into *four* parts (<sup><MS3></sup>Nehemiah 9:3), and even in the N.T. we find a trace of this division in <sup><MS1></sup>Matthew 20:1-5. There is, however, no proof of the assertion sometimes made, that **πρ** in the Gospels may occasionally mean a space of three hours. It has been thought by some interpreters (see Wolfii *Curae in N.T.* ad <sup><MS4></sup>John 19:14) that the evangelist John always computes the hours of the day after the Roman reckoning, i.e. from midnight to midnight (see Pliny, *Hist. Noct.* 2, 79; Aul Gell. *Noct. Att.* 3, 2); but this is without support from Hebrew analogy, and obliges the gratuitous supposition of a reckoning also from midday (against <sup><MS5></sup>John 11:9).

The Greeks adopted the division of the day into twelve hours from the Babylonians (Herodotus, 2:109; comp. Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2:334). At what period the Jews became first acquainted with this way of reckoning time is unknown, but it is generally supposed that they, too, learned it from the Babylonians during the Captivity (Wiahner, *Ant. Hebr.* § 5:1, 8, 9). They *may* have had some such division at a much earlier period, as has been inferred from the fact that Ahaz erected a sun-dial in Jerusalem, the use of which had probably been learned from Babylon. There is, however, the greatest uncertainty as to the meaning of the word **ט/ל** (A.V. “degrees,” Isaiah 38, 8). **SEE DIAL.** It is strange that the Jews were not acquainted with this method of reckoning even earlier, for, although a purely conventional one, it is naturally suggested by the months in a year. Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that it arose from a less obvious cause (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 334). In whatever way it originated, it was known to the Egyptians at a very early period. They had twelve hours of the day and of the night (called Nau=hour), each of which had its own genius, drawn with a star on its head. The word is said by Lepsius to be found as far back as the fifth dynasty (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 135). The night was divided into twelve equal portions or hours, in precisely the same manner as the day. The most ancient division, however, was into three watches (*Ant.* 63, 6,

90, 4) the first, or beginning of the watches, as it is called (<sup><2512B></sup>Lamentations 2:19); the middle watch (<sup><00719></sup>Judges 7:19); and the morning watch (<sup><014></sup>Exodus 14:24). *SEE WATCH*. When Judaea became a province of Rome, the Roman distribution of the night into four watches was introduced; to which division frequent allusions occur in the New Testament (<sup><01238></sup>Luke 12:38; <sup><01425></sup>Matthew 14:25; 13:35), as well as to that of hours (<sup><01513></sup>Matthew 25:13; 26:40; Mark 14. 37; <sup><01715></sup>Luke 17:59; <sup><01223></sup>Acts 23:23; <sup><01613></sup>Revelation 3:3). *SEE COCK-CROWING*.

There are two kinds of hours, viz.

- (1.) the astronomical or equinoctial hour, i.e. the twenty-fourth part of a civil day, which, although “known to astronomers, was not used in the affairs of common life till towards the end of the 4th century of the Christian sera” (Smith, *Dict. of Classical Antiq.* s.v. Hora); and
- (2.) the natural hour (such the Rabbis called *twynmz, καιρικαί*, or temporales), i.e. the twelfth part of the natural day, or of the time between sunrise and sunset. These are the hours meant in the New Test., Josephus, and the Rabbis (<sup><01109></sup>John 11:9; <sup><01417></sup>Acts 5:7; 19:31; Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 4, 3), and it must be remembered that they perpetually vary in length, so as to be very different at different times of the year. Besides this, an hour of the day would always mean a different length of time from an hour of the night, except at the equinox. From the consequent uncertainty of the term there arose the proverbial expression “not all hours are equal” (R. Joshua *up.* Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 345). At the equinoxes the third hour would correspond to nine o’clock; the sixth would *always* be at noon. To find the exact time meant at other seasons of the year, we must know when the sun rises in Palestine, and reduce \the hours to our reckoning accordingly (Jahn, *Biblio. Arch.* § 101). In ancient times the only way of reckoning the progress of the day was by the length of the shadow—a mode of reckoning which was both contingent on the sunshine, and served only for the guidance of individuals. *SEE SHADOW*. By what means the Jews calculated the length of their hours—whether by dialing, by the *clepsydra* or water-clock, or by some horological contrivance, like what was used anciently in Persia (Josephus, *Ant.* 11 6), and by the Romans (Martial, 8 *Epig.* 67; Juv. *Sat.* 10, 214), and which is still used in India (A *siat. Researches*, 5, 88), a servant notifying the intervals—it is now impossible to discover (see Buttinghausen, *Specimen horarum Ieb. et Arab.* Tr. ad Rh. 1758). Mention is also made of a curious invention called *h[y;r/rx]* by

which a figure was constructed so as to drop a stone into a brazen basin every hour, the sound of which was heard for a great distance, and announced the time (Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s.v. Hora).

For the purposes of prayer, the old division of the day into four portions was continued in the Temple service, as we see from <sup><425></sup>Acts 2:15; 3:1; 10:9. The stated periods of prayer were the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day (Psalm 45, 17; Josephus, *Anf.* 4, 4, 3). The Jews supposed that the third hour had been consecrated by Abraham, the sixth by Isaac, and the ninth by Jacob (Kimchi; Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* ad <sup><431></sup>Acts 3:1). It is probable that the canonical hours observed by the Romanists (of which there are eight in the twenty-four) are derived from these Temple hours (Goodwill *Moses and Aaron*, 3, 9). *SEE HOURS, CANONICAL.*

The Rabbis pretend that the hours were divided into 1080 ⲙⲩⲟⲗⲓⲛ (minutes), and 56,848 ⲙⲩⲟⲗⲓⲛⲁⲗⲗⲁⲛ (seconds), which numbers were chosen because they are so easily divisible (Gem. Hier. *Berachoth*, 2, 4; in Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* 4:1, § 19). *SEE TIME.*

## Hour-glass Stand

### Picture for Hour-glass Stand

A frame of iron for the hourglass, often placed near the pulpit after the Reformation in England. They were almost: universally introduced in churches during the 16th century and continued in use until about fifty years ago, to regulate the length of sermons. Some of them are yet to be seen, as at Wolvercot and Beckley, in Oxfordshire, and Leigh Church, in Kent. One was recently set up in the Savoy Chapel. — Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, p. 127; Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* D. 317.

## Houris

A designation by Europeans of those imaginary beings whose company in paradise, according to the Mohammedans' belief, is to form the principal felicity of the believers. The name, derived from *hour al oyun*, signifies black-eyed. They are represented in the Koran as most beautiful virgins, not created of clay, like mortal women, but of pure musk, and endowed with immortal youth, and immunity from all disease. See the Koran, chap. 55, 56 (Sale's translation); and the *Prel. Disc.* s. 4; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Liter. and Art*, 2:153.

## Hours, Canonical

signifies, in ecclesiastical usage, the daily round of prayers and praise in some churches, both ancient and modern. The ancient order of these “hours” is as follows:

1. *Nocturns* or [*Matins*, a service performed before daybreak (properly a night service), called *vigils* by the Council of Carthage (398), but afterwards the first hour after dawn; mentioned by Cyprian as midnight and matins, and by Athanasius as nocturns and midnight (~~398~~ Psalm 119:62-147; ~~416~~ Acts 16:25). Cassian and Isidore say this season was first observed in the 5th century, in the monastery of Bethlehem, in memory of the nativity.
2. *Lauds*, a service performed at daybreak, following the matin shortly, if not actually joined on to it, mentioned by Basil and the Apostolical Constitutions.
3. *Prime*, a service performed at about six o’clock A.M., “the first hour,” mentioned by Athanasius — (~~398~~ Psalm 92:2; 5:3; 59:16).
4. *Tierce* or *Terce*, a service performed at 9 A.M., “the third hour;” mentioned by Tertullian with Sexts and Nones (see below), as commemorating the time when the disciples were assembled at Pentecost (~~416~~ Acts 2:15).
5. *Sext*, a service performed at noonday, “the sixth hour,” commemorating Peter’s praying (~~409~~ Acts 10:19).
6. *Nones*, a service performed at 3 P.M., “the ninth hour,” commemorating the time when Peter and John went up to the Temple (~~401~~ Acts 3:1).
7. *Vespers*, a service performed in the early evening; mentioned by Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome, and by the Apostolical Constitutions (which we cite below), to commemorate the time when Christ instituted the Eucharist, showing it was the eventide of the world. “This hour is called from evening, according to St. Augustine, or the evening star, says St. Isidore.” It was also known as the office and the hour of lights as, until the 8th or 9th century, was usual in the East and at Milan; also when the lamps were lighted (~~384~~ Zechariah 14:7). “The Roman custom of saying Vesper after Nones then came into use in the West” (Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 316).



8. *Compline*, the last evening or “bedtime service” (~~<1118>~~ Psalm 132:3); first separated from Vespers by Benedict.

The office of Lauds was, however, very rarely separated from that of Matins, and these eight hours of prayer were therefore practically only seven, founded on David’s habit (~~<300>~~ Psalm 4:17; 119:62).

The Apostolical Constitutions (8, 34) mention the hours as follows: “Ye shall make prayer in the moranieg, giving thanks, because the Lord hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing the day; at the third hour, because the Lord then received sentence from Pilate; at the sixth, because he was crucified; at the ninth, because all things were shaken when the Lord was crucified, trembling at the audacity of the impious Jews, not enduring that the Lord should be insulted; at evening giving thanks, because he hath given the night for rest from labor; at cock-crowing, because that hour gives glad tidings that the day is dawning in which to work the works of light.” Cassian likewise mentions the observation of Tierce, Sext, and Nones in monasteries. Tertullian and Pliny speak of Christian services before daylight. Jerome names Tierce, Sext, Nones, Vespers, and Lauds; also Augustine—for the two latter hours, however, substituting “Early Vigil.” Archdeacon Freeman, of the Church of England, gives (*Principles of Div. Serv.* 1, 219 sq.) the following explanation, viz. that these offices, “though neither of apostolic nor *early* post-apostolic date as Church services, had, nevertheless, probably existed in a rudimentary form, as private or household devotions, from a very early period, and had been received into the number of recognized public formularies previous to the reorganization of the Western ritual after the Eastern model.” “Various reasons have been assigned for a deeper meaning in the hours; one is, that they are the thanksgiving for the completion of creation on the seventh day. Another theory beautifully connects them with the acts of our Lord in his passion: Evensong with his institution of the Eucharist, and washing the disciples’ feet, and the going out to Gethsemane; Compline with his agony and bloody sweat; Matins with his appearance before Caiaphas; Prime and Tierce with that in the presence of Pilate; Tierce also with his scourging, crown of thorns, and presentation to the people; Sext with his bearing the cross, the seven words, and crucifixion; Nones with his dismissal of his Spirit, descent into hell, and rout of tire devil; Vespers with his deposition from the cross ‘nd entombment; Compline with the setting of the watch; Matins with his resurrection” (Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* p. 317). Of the origin of these

“hours,” Bingham (*Antiquities of the Christ. Church*, bk. 13:ch. 9:p. 661 sq.) says that “they who have made the most exact inquiries can find no footsteps of them in the first three ages, but conclude that they came first into the Church with the monastic life” (compare also Pearson, *Praelect. in Act. Apost. mum.* 3, 4). It is observable further, that most of the “writers of the fourth age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observances of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. Thus Jerome, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cassian, Cassiodorus, and most other writers of the early Christian Church, speak but of three hours of prayers; thus, also, even Chrysostom himself, who, however, when “speaking of the monks and their institutions (Fomil. 14 in I Timothy p. 1599), gives about the same number of canonical hours as others do.” Yet it is very likely even that in some Eastern churches these hours of prayers might have been practiced in the 4th century, and quite certain that the different churches observing the hours varied greatly both as to the number of the hours and the service in their first original. “At the time of the Reformation, the canonical hours were reduced in the Lutheran Church to two, morning and evening; the Reformed Church never observed them” (Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Literat. and Art*, 2, 152). In the Church of England these services were, at the time of the English Reformation, used as distinct offices only by stricter religious persons and the clergy. At the revision of the liturgy of that Church under Edward VI, it was decided to have “only two solemn services of public worship in the day, viz. Matins, composed of matins, lauds, and prime; and *Evensong*, consisting of vespers and compline.” In the Greek Church, Neale (*Essays on Liturgiology and Church Hist.*, Essay 1, p. 6 sq.) says, “There are eight canonical hours; prayers are actually, for the most part, said three times daily—matins, lauds, and prime, by aggregation early in the morning; tierce, sexts, and the liturgy (communion) later; nones, vespers, and compline, by aggregation in the evening.” So, also, is it in the West. “Except in monastic bodies,” says the same writer (p. 46 sq.), “the breviary as a church office is scarcely ever used as a whole. You may go, we do not say from church to church, but from cathedral to cathedral of Central Europe, and never hear matins save at high festivals. In Spain and Portugal it is somewhat more frequent, but there, as everywhere, it is a clerical devotion exclusively. Then the lesser hours are not often publicly said except in cathedrals, and then principally by aggregation, and in connection with mass... In no national Church under the sun are so many matin services said as in our own.” It may not be out of place here to add that seven hours formed the

basis of the “Primers” (q.v.). “English editions of these, set forth by authority in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward V, and of queen Elizabeth, show that the English reformers did not wish to discourage the observance of the ancient hours of prayer. As late as 1627, by command of Charles I, bishop Cosin published a ‘Collection of Private Devotions in the practice of the ancient Church, called the Hours of Prayer, as they were after this manner published by authority of queen Elizabeth, 1560,’ etc.” See, besides the authorities already referred to, Procter, *Prayer Book*, chap. 1; Blunt (the Rev. J. H.), *Dict. of Doctrinal and Hist. Theol.* (London 1870), 1, 315; Siegel, *Christl. — Kirche. Alterthümer*, 1, 270 sq.; 4, 65 sq. **SEE CANONICAL; SEE BREVIARY.** (J. H. W.)

### Hours of our Lady

the title of a devotion instituted by pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095. — Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 318.

### House

(**ty**~~β~~*ba'yith*, which is used with much latitude, and in the “construct” form **ty**~~β~~*ebeyth*, Anglicized “Beth,” [q.v.] enters into the composition of many proper names; Gr. οἶκος, or some derivative of it), a dwelling in general, whether literally, as house, tent, palace, citadel, tomb, derivatively as tabernacle, temple, heaven, or metaphorically as family. **SEE PALACE.**

### Picture for House 1

**I.** *History and Sources of Comparison.* — Although, in Oriental language, every tent (see Gesen. *Thes.* p. 32) may be regarded as a house (Harmer, *Obs.* 1, 194), yet the distinction between the permanent dwelling-house and the tent must have taken rise from the moment of the division of mankind into dwellers in tents and builders of cities, *i.e.* of permanent habitations (<sup><0047></sup>Genesis 4:17, 20; <sup><2382></sup>Isaiah 38:2). The agricultural and pastoral forms of life are described in Scripture as of equally ancient origin. Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a keeper of sheep. The former is a settled, the latter an unsettled mode of life. Hence we find that Cain, when the murder of his brother constrained him to wander abroad, built a town in the land where he settled. At the same time, doubtless, those who followed the same mode of life as Abel, dwelt in tents, capable of being taken from one place to another, when the want of fresh pastures constrained those removals which are so frequent among people of pastoral

habits. We are not required to suppose that Cain's town was more than a collection of huts. *SEE CITY*. Our information respecting the abodes of men in the ages before the Deluge is however, too scanty to afford much ground for notice. The enterprise at Babel, to say nothing of Egypt, shows that the constructive arts had made considerable progress during that obscure but interesting period; for we are bound in reason to conclude that the arts possessed by man in the ages immediately following the Deluge existed before that great catastrophe. *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS*.

## Picture for House 2

The observations offered under ARCHITECTURE will preclude the expectation of finding among this Eastern people that accomplished style of building which Vitruvius requires, or that refined taste by which the Greeks and Romans excited the admiration of foreign nations. The tents in which the Arabs now dwell are in all probability the same as those in which the Hebrew patriarchs spent their lives. It is not likely that what the Hebrews observed in Egypt, during their long sojourn in that country, had in this respect any direct influence upon their own subsequent practice in Palestine. *SEE TENT*. Nevertheless, the information which may be derived from the figures of houses and parts of houses in the Egyptian tombs is not to be overlooked or slighted. We have in them the *only* representations of ancient houses in that part of the world which now exist; and however different may have been the state architecture of Egypt and Palestine, we have every reason to conclude that there was considerable resemblance in the private dwellings of these neighboring countries. The few representations of buildings on the Assyrian monuments may likewise be of some assistance in completing our ideas of Hebrew dwellings. The Hebrews did not become dwellers in cities till the sojourn in Egypt and after the conquest of Canaan (Genesis 47, 3; ~~<0127>~~Exodus 12:7; ~~<810>~~Hebrews 11:9), while the Canaanites, as well as the Assyrians, were from an earlier period builders and inhabitants of cities, and it was into the houses and cities built by the former that the Hebrews entered to take possession after the conquest (Genesis 10. 11,19; 19:1; 23:10; 34:20; ~~<0412>~~Numbers 11:27; ~~<860>~~Deuteronomy 6:10, 11). The private dwellings of the Assyrians and Babylonians have altogether perished, but the solid material of the houses of Syria, east of the Jordan, may perhaps have preserved entire specimens of the ancient dwellings, even of the original inhabitants of that region (Porter, *Damascus*, 2:195, 196; C. C. Graham in "Camb. Essays," 1859, p. 160, etc.; comp. Buckingham *Arab Tribes*, p. 171,172).

**II. Materials and general Character.** — There is no reason to suppose that many houses in' Palestine were constructed with wood. A great part of that country was always very poor in timber, and some parts of it had scarcely any wood at all. But of stone there was no want, and it was consequently much used in the building of houses. The law of Moses respecting leprosy in houses (<sup><1843></sup>Leviticus 14:33-40) seems to prove this, as the characteristics there enumerated could only occur in the case of stone walls. Still, when the Hebrews intended to build a house in the most splendid style and in accordance with the taste of the age, as much wood as possible was used. Houses in the East were frequently built of burnt or merely dried clay bricks, which were not very durable (<sup><1849></sup>Job 4:19; <sup><1076></sup>Matthew 7:26). Such were very liable to the attacks of burglars (<sup><1846></sup>Job 24:16; <sup><1059></sup>Matthew 6:19; 24:16. See Hackett's *Illust. of Script.* p. 94). The better class of houses were built of stone, the palaces of squared stone (<sup><1070></sup>1 Kings 7:9; <sup><2390></sup>Isaiah 9:10), and some were of marble (<sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 29:2). Lime or gypsum (probably with ashes or chopped straw) was used for mortar (<sup><2332></sup>Isaiah 33:12; <sup><2430></sup>Jeremiah 43:9); perhaps also asphaltum (<sup><0103></sup>Genesis 11:3). A plastering or whitewashing is often mentioned (<sup><0844></sup>Leviticus 14:41, 42; <sup><2530></sup>Ezekiel 13:10; <sup><1277></sup>Matthew 23:27); a wash of colored lime was chosen for palaces (<sup><2274></sup>Jeremiah 22:14). The beams consisted chiefly of the wood of the sycamore from its extreme durability (<sup><2390></sup>Isaiah 9:10); the acacia and the palm were employed for columns and transverse beams, and the cypress for flooring-planks (<sup><1065></sup>1 Kings 6:15; <sup><4475></sup>2 Chronicles 3:5). The fir, the olive-tree, and cedars were greatly esteemed (<sup><1070></sup>1 Kings 7:2; <sup><2274></sup>Jeremiah 22:14); but the most precious of all was the almug-tree: this wood seems to have been brought through Arabia from India (<sup><1001></sup>1 Kings 10:11, 12). Wood was used in the construction of doors and gates, of the folds and lattices of windows, of the flat roofs, and of the wainscoting with which the walls were ornamented. Beams were inlaid in the walls to which the wainscoting was fastened by nails to render it more secure (<sup><1504></sup>Ezra 6:4). Houses finished in this manner were called ceiled houses and ceiled chambers (<sup><2274></sup>Jeremiah 22:14; <sup><3700></sup>Haggai 1:4). The lower part of the walls was adorned with rich hangings of velvet or damask dyed of the liveliest colors, suspended on hooks, and taken down at pleasure (<sup><1706></sup>Esther 1:6). The upper part of the walls was adorned with figures in stucco, with gold, silver, gems, and ivory; the expressions "ivory houses," "ivory palaces," and "chambers ornamented with ivory" (<sup><1229></sup>1 Kings 22:39; <sup><4376></sup>2 Chronicles 3:6; <sup><9503></sup>Psalms 45:8; Amos, 3:15). Metals were also employed to some

extent, as lead, iron, and copper are mentioned among building materials; but especially gold and silver for various kinds of solid, plated, and inlaid work (<sup><1234></sup>Exodus 36:34,38). The ceiling, generally of wainscot, was-painted with great art. In the days of Jeremiah these chambers were ceiled with costly and fragrant wood, and painted with the richest colors (<sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 22:14). (See each of these parts and materials in their alphabetical place.) The splendor and magnificence of an edifice seems to have been estimated in a measure by the size of the square stones of which it was constructed (<sup><1009></sup>1 Kings 7:9-12). In some cases these were of brilliant and variegated hues (<sup><1301></sup>1 Chronicles 29:2). The foundation stone, which was probably placed at the corner, and thence called the corner stone, was an object of peculiar regard, and was selected with great care from among the others (<sup><4482></sup>Psalms 118:22; <sup><2386></sup>Isaiah 28:16; <sup><1212></sup>Matthew 21:42; <sup><4411></sup>Acts 4:11; <sup><1016></sup>1 Peter 2:6). The square stones in buildings, as far as we can ascertain from the ruins which yet remain, were held together, not by mortar or cement of any kind, except a very small quantity indeed might have been used, but by cramp ions. Walls in some cases appear to have been covered with a composition of chalk and gypsum (<sup><1672></sup>Deuteronomy 27:2; comp. Dan. 5:5; <sup><4218></sup>Acts 23:3. See Chardin's *Voyages*, ed. Langles, vol. 4). The tiles dried in the sun were at first united by mud placed between them, afterwards by lime mixed with sand to form mortar. The latter was used with burnt tiles (<sup><1844></sup>Leviticus 14:41, 42; Jeremiah 43, 9). For the external decoration of large buildings marble columns were employed (<sup><2151></sup>Song of Solomon 5:15). The Persians also took great delight in marble. To this not only the ruins of Persepolis testify, but the Book of Esther, where mention is made of white, red, and black marble, and likewise of veined marble. The Scriptural allusions to houses receive no illustration from the recently discovered monuments of the Mesopotamian mounds, as no private houses, either of Assyria or Babylonia, have been preserved; owing doubtless to their having been constructed of perishable mud walls, at most enclosed only with thin slabs of alabaster (Layard's *Nineveh*, 2, 214). **SEE TEMPLE.**

The Hebrews at a very ancient date, like the Orientals, had not only summer and winter rooms (Jeremiah 36, 22; see Chardin. 4:119), but palaces (<sup><1001></sup>Judges 3:20; <sup><1002></sup>1 Kings 7:2-6; <sup><1015></sup>Amos 3:15). The houses, or palaces so called, made for summer residence, were very spacious. The lower stories were frequently under ground. The front of these buildings faced the north, so as to secure the advantage of the breezes, which in

summer blow from that direction. They were supplied with a current of fresh air by means of ventilators, which consisted of perforations made through the upper part of the northern wall, of considerable diameter externally, but diminishing in size as they approached the inside of the wall. *SEE DWELLING.*

Houses for jewels and armor were built and furnished under the kings (<sup><2013></sup>2 Kings 20:13). The draught-house (t/arj תי; κοπρών *latrinae*) was doubtless a public latrine, such as exists in modern Eastern cities (<sup><2017></sup>2 Kings 10:27; Russell, 1, 34).

Leprosy in the house was probably a nitrous efflorescence on the walls, which was injurious to the salubrity of the house, and whose removal was therefore strictly enjoined by the law (<sup><0143></sup>Leviticus 14:34,55; Kitto, *Phys. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 112).

**III.** *Details of Hebrew Dwellings.* — In inferring the plan and arrangement of ancient Jewish or Oriental houses, as alluded to in Scripture, from existing dwellings in Syria, Egypt, and the East in general, allowance must be made for the difference in climate between Egypt, Persia, and Palestine, a cause from which would proceed differences in certain cases of material and construction, as well as of domestic arrangement.

### Picture for House 3

### Picture for House 4

### Picture for House 5

**1.** The houses of the rural poor in Egypt, as well as in most parts of Syria, Arabia, and Persia, are for the most part mere huts of mud, or sun burnt bricks. In some parts of Palestine and Arabia stone is used, and in certain districts caves in the rock are used as dwellings (<sup><3051></sup>Amos 5:11; Bartlett, *Walks*, p. 117). *SEE CAVE.* The houses are usually of one story only, viz. the ground floor, and sometimes contain only one apartment. Sometimes a small court for the cattle is attached; and in some cases the cattle are housed in the same building, or the people live on a raised platform, and the cattle round them on the ground (<sup><0284></sup>1 Samuel 28:24; Irby and Mangles, p. 70; Jolliffe, *Letters*, 1, 43; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 170; Burckhardt, *Travels*, 2, 119). In Lower Egypt the oxen occupy the width of the chamber farthest from the entrance: it is built of brick or mud, about

four feet high, and the top is often used as a sleeping place in winter. The windows are small apertures high up in the walls, sometimes grated with wood (Burckhardt, *Travels*, 1, 241; 2:101, 119, 301, 329; Lane, *Mod. Egyptians*, 1, 44). The roofs are commonly, but not always, flat, and are usually formed of a plaster of mud and straw laid upon boughs or rafters; and upon the flat roofs, tents or “booths” of boughs or rushes are often raised to be used as sleeping-places in summer (Irby and Mangles, p. 71; Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 49, 53; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 112; *Nineveh*, 1, 176; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 280; *Travels*, 1, 190; Van Egmont, 2:32; Malan, *Magdala and Bethany*, p. 15). To this description the houses of ancient Egypt, and also of Assyria, as represented in the monuments, in great measure correspond (Layard *Mon. of Nin.* p. 2, p. 49,50; Wilkinson, *Ancient Eg.I.* 13; Martineau, *East. Life*, 1, 19, 97). In the towns the houses of the inferior kind do not differ much from the above description, but they are sometimes of more than one story, and the roof terraces are more carefully constructed. In Palestine they are often of stone (Jolliffe, 1, 26). In the inferior kinds of Oriental dwellings, such as are met with in villages and very small towns, there is no central court, but there is generally a shaded platform in front. The village cabins and abodes of the peasantry are, of course, of a still inferior description; and, being the abodes of people who live much in the open air, will not bear comparison with the houses of the same class in Northern Europe, where the cottage is the *home* of the owner. (See Jahn, *Bibl. Archaeol.* translated by Prof. Upham, pt. 1, ch. 2.)

## Picture for House 6

## Picture for House 7

**2.** The difference between the poorest houses and those of the class next above them is greater than between these and the houses of the first rank. The prevailing plan of Eastern houses of this class presents, as was the case in ancient Egypt, a front of wall, whose blank and mean appearance is usually relieved only by the door and a few latticed and projecting windows (*Views in Syria*, 2, 25). The privacy of Oriental domestic habits would render our plan of throwing the front of the house towards the street most repulsive. The doorway or door bears an inscription from the Koran as the ancient Egyptian houses had inscriptions over their doors, and as the Israelites were directed to write sentences from the Law over their gates. **SEE MEZUZAH.** Over the door is usually the kiosk (sometimes projecting



like a bay-window), or screened balcony, probably the “summer parlor” in which Ehud smote the king of Moab (<sup><OR></sup>Judges 3:20), and the “chamber on the wall,” which the Shunammite prepared for the prophet (<sup><OR></sup>2 Kings 4:10). Besides this, there may be a small latticed window or two high up in the wall, giving light and air to upper chambers, which, except in times of public celebrations, is usually closed (<sup><OR></sup>2 Kings 9:30; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 207; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1, 27). The entrance is usually guarded within from sight by a wall or some arrangement of the passages. In the passage is a stone seat for the porter and other servants (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1 32; Chardin, *Voy.* 4, 111). *SEE DOOR.*

The buildings which form the house front towards an inner square or court. Small houses have one of these courts, but superior houses have two, and first-rate houses three, communicating with each other; for the Orientals dislike ascending stairs or steps. It is only when the building-ground is confined by nature or by fortifications that they build high houses, but, from the loftiness of the rooms, buildings of one story are often as high as houses of three stories among ourselves. If there are three or more courts, all except the outer one are much alike in size and appearance; but the outer one, being devoted to the more public life of the occupant, and to his intercourse with society, is materially different from all the others. If there are more than two, the second is devoted chiefly to the use of the master, who is there attended only by-his eunuchs, children, and females, and sees only such persons as he calls from the third or interior court, in which they reside. In the history of Esther, she incurs danger by going from her interior court to that of the king, to invite him to visit her part of the palace; but she would not, on any account have gone to the outermost court, in which the king held his public audiences. Some of the finest houses in the East are to be found at Damascus, where in some of them are seven such courts. When there are only two courts, the innermost is the *harem*, in which the women and children live, and which is the true domicile of the master, to which he withdraws when the claims of business, of society, and of friends have been satisfied, and where no man but himself ever enters, or could be induced to enter, even by strong persuasions (Burckhardt, *Travels*, 1, 188; Van Egmont, 2 246, 253; Shaw, p. 207; Porter, *Damascus*, 1, 34, 37, 60; Chardin, *Voyages*, 6, 6; Lane, *Modern Eg.* 1 179, 207). See below.

Entering at the street door, the above-named passage, usually sloping downwards, conducts to the outer court; the opening from the passage to

this, as before observed, is not opposite the gate of entrance, but by a side turn, to preclude any view from the street into the court when the gate is opened. This open court corresponds to the Romali *impluvium*, and is often paved with marble. Into this the principal apartments look, and are either open to it in front, or are entered from it by doors. An awning is sometimes drawn over the court and the floor strewn with carpets on festive occasions (Shaw, p. 208). Around part, if not the whole, of the court is a veranda, often nine or ten feet deep, over which, when there is more than one floor, runs a second gallery of like depth, with a balustrade (Shaw, p. 208). The stairs to the upper apartments or to the roof are often shaded by vines or creeping-plants, and the courts, especially the inner ones — planted with trees. The court has often a well or tank in it (<sup><4038></sup>Psalm 128:3; <sup><4078></sup>2 Samuel 17:18; Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 24, 32; Wilkinson, 1, 6, 8; Lane; *Mod. Eg.* 1, 32; *Views in Syria*, 1, 56). **SEE COURT.**

On entering the outer court through this passage we find opposite to us the public room, in which the master receives and gives audience to his friends and clients. This is entirely open in front, and, being richly fitted up, has a splendid appearance when the first view of it is obtained. A refreshing coolness is sometimes given to this apartment by a fountain throwing up a jet of water in front of it. This is the **κατάλυμα**, or *guest-chamber*, of <sup><2211></sup>Luke 22:11; not necessarily an **ἀνάγαιον**, or *upper chamber*, as in verse 12. A large portion of the other side of the court is occupied with a frontage of lattice-work filled with colored glass, belonging to a room as large as the guest-chamber, and which in winter is used for the same purpose or serves as the apartment of any visitor of distinction, who cannot, of course, be admitted into the interior parts of the house. The other apartments in this outer court are comparatively small, and are used for the accommodation of visitors, retainers, and servants. **SEE GUEST-CHAMBER.**

### Picture for House 8

In the better class of houses in modern Egypt, the above ground-floor room is generally the apartment for male visitors, called *mandarah*, having a portion of the floor sunk below the rest, called *durka'ah*. This is often paved with marble or colored tiles, and has in the center a fountain. The rest of the floor is a raised platform called *liwan*, with a mattress and cushions at the back on each of the three sides. This seat or sofa is called

*diwan*. Every person, on entrance, takes off his shoes on the *durka'ah* before stepping on the *liwan* (Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Exodus 3:5; Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Joshua 5:15; Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Luke 7:38). The ceilings over the *liwan* and *durka'ah* are often richly paneled and ornamented (Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Jeremiah 22:14). **SEE DIVAN.**

Bearing in mind that the reception-room is raised above the level of the court (Chardin, 4:118: *Views in Samaria*, 1, 56), we may, in explaining the circumstances of the miracle of the paralytic (Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Mark 2:3; Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Luke 5:18), suppose,

1. either that our Lord was standing under the veranda, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and, taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the veranda, or removing the awning over the impluvium, τὸ μέσον, in the former case let down the bed *through* the veranda roof, or in the latter, *down* by Unay of the roof, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, and deposited it before the Savior (Shaw, p. 212).
2. Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the ὑπερῶν, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Crench, *Miracles*, p. 199 Lane, *Modern Eg.* 1, 39). 3.

And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings now to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room “ten or twelve feet high, and as many or more square,” with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside, and the bearers of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and, having uncovered it (ἐξορούσαντες), let him down into the room where our Lord was (Malan, 1. c.). See below.

## Picture for House 9

Besides the *mandarah* some houses in Cairo have an apartment called *mak'ad*, open in front to the court, with two or more arches, and a railing; and a pillar to-support the wall above (Lane, 1, 38). It was in a chamber of this kind, probably one of the largest size to be found in a palace, that our Lord was arraigned before the high-priest at the time when the denial of him by Peter took place. He “turned and looked” on Peter as he stood by the fire in tile court (Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ Luke 22:56, 61; Ⲭⲓⲃⲃ John 18:24), while he himself

was in the “hall of judgment,” the *mak’ad*. Such was the “porch of judgment” built by Solomon (<sup><1007></sup>1 Kings 7:7), which finds a parallel in the golden alcove of Mohammed Uzbek (Ibn Batuta, *Travels*, p. 76, ed. Lee). **SEE PRAETORIUM**. The circumstance of Samson’s pulling down the house by means of the pillars, may be explained by the fact of the company being assembled on tiers of balconies above each other, supported by central pillars on the basement; when these were pulled down, the whole of the upper floors would fall also (<sup><0765></sup>Judges 16:26; see Shaw, p. 211). **SEE PILLAR**.

When there is no second floor, but more than one court, the women’s apartments (Arabic *harem* or *hamran*, *secluded* or *prohibited*, with which maybe compared the Hebrew Armon, <sup>~</sup>/mr̥ḥi Stanley, *S. and P.* App. § 82), are usually in the second court; otherwise they form a separate building within the general enclosure, or are above on the first floor (*Views in Syria*, 1, 56). The entrance to the harem, as observed above, is crossed by no one but the master of the house and the domestics belonging to the female establishment. Though this remark would not apply in the same degree to Jewish habits, the privacy of the women’s apartments may possibly be indicated by the “inner chamber” (rdj , ταμείον; *cubiculum*), resorted to as a hiding-place (<sup><1280></sup>1 Kings 20:30; 22:25; see <sup><0750></sup>Judges 15:1). Solomon, in his marriage with a foreigner, introduced also foreign usage in this respect, which was carried further in subsequent times (<sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 7:8; <sup><1245></sup>2 Kings 24:15). The harem, of the Persian monarch (μυναεtyβεῶ γυναικῶν; *domus feminarum*) is noticed in the book of Esther (2, 3) **SEE WOMAN**.

## Picture for House 10

Sometimes the *diwan* is raised sufficiently to allow of cellars underneath for stores of all kinds (ταμεία, <sup><1265></sup>Matthew 24:26; Russell, 1, 32). This basement is occupied by various offices, stores of corn and fuel, places for the water-jars to stand in, places for grinding corn, baths, kitchens, etc. In Turkish Arabia most of the houses have underground cellars or vaults, to which the inhabitants retreat during the midday heat of summer, and there enjoy a refreshing coolness. We do not discover any notice of this usage in Scripture. But at Acre the substructions of very ancient houses were some years ago discovered, having such cellars, which were very probably subservient to this use. In the rest of the year, these cellars, or *serdaubs*, as

they are called, are abandoned to the bats, which swarm in them in scarcely credible numbers (<sup><2122></sup>Isaiah 2:20).

The kitchens are always in this inner court, as the cooking is performed by women; and the ladies of the family superintend or actually assist in the process. The kitchen, open in front, is on the same side as the entrance from the outer court; and the top of it forms a terrace, which affords a communication between the first floor of both courts by a private door, seldom used but by the master of the house and attendant eunuchs. There are usually no fireplaces except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick, with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the “boiling-places” (τ/Ι Vβim] μαγειρεῖα; *culinae* of Ezekiel (<sup><2642></sup>Ezekiel 46:23; see Lane, 1, 41; Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 249). In these different compartments the various dishes of an Eastern feast may be at once prepared at charcoal fires. This place being wholly open in front, the half-tame doves, which have their nests in the trees of the court, often visit it, in the absence of the servants, in search of crumbs, etc. As they sometimes blacken themselves, this perhaps explains the obscure passage in <sup><2682></sup>Psalm 68:13, “Though ye have lien among *the pots* [but Gesenius renders “sheepfolds”], ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver,” etc.

## Picture for House 11

Besides the *mandarah*, there is sometimes a second room, either on the ground or the upper floor, called *ka'ah*, fitted with *diwans*, and at the corners of these rooms portions taken off and enclosed form retiring rooms (Lane, 1, 21; Russell, 1, 31, 33). While speaking of the interior of the house we may observe, that on the *diwan*, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, 1, 27; Malan, *Tyre and Sidon*, p. 38). When there is an upper story, the *ka'ah* forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the ὑπερῶον, which was often the “guest-chamber” (Luke 22:12; <sup><4113></sup>Acts 1:13; 9:37; 20:8; Burckhardt, *Travels*, 1, 154). The windows of the upper rooms often project one or two feet, and form a kiosk or latticed chamber, the ceilings of which are elaborately ornamented (Lane, 1, 27; Russell, 1, 102; Burckhardt, *Trat.* 1, 190). Such may have been the “chamber in the wall” (ἡΥ] βῆπερῶον, *conaculum*, Gesen. p. 1030) made, or rather set apart for Elisha by the Shunammite woman (<sup><2240></sup>2 Kings 4:10, 11). So, also, the “summer parlor” of Eglon (<sup><2022></sup>Judges 3:20,

23; but see Wilkinson, 1, 11), the “loft” of the widow of Zarephath (<sup><1179></sup>1 Kings 17:19). The “lattice” (ἡκβε] δίκτυωτός, *cancelli*) through which Ahaziah fell perhaps belonged to an upper chamber of this kind (2 Kings 1, 2), as also the “third loft” (τρίστεγον) from which Eutychus fell (<sup><419></sup>Acts 20:9; compare <sup><223></sup>Jeremiah 22:13). *SEE UPPER ROOM*. The inner court is entered by a passage and door similar to those on the street, and usually situated at one of the innermost corners of the outer court. The inner court is generally much larger than the former. It is for the most part paved, excepting a portion in the middle, which is planted with trees (usually two) and shrubs, with a basin of water in the midst. That the Jews had the like arrangement of trees in the courts of their houses, and that the birds nested in them, appears from <sup><1847></sup>Psalms 84:2, 3. They had also the basin of water in the inner court or *harem*, and among them it was used for bathing as is shown by David’s discovering Bathsheba bathing as he walked on the roof of his palace. The arrangement of the inner court is very similar to that of the outer, but the whole is more open and airy. The buildings usually occupy two sides of the square, of which the one opposite the entrance contains the principal apartments. They are upon what we should call the first floor, and open into a wide gallery or veranda which in good houses is nine or ten feet deep, and covered by a wooden penthouse supported by a row of wooden columns. This terrace or gallery is furnished with a strong wooden balustrade, and is usually paved with squared stones, or else floored with boards. In the center of the principal front is the usual open drawing room, on which the best art of the Eastern decorator is expended. Much of one of the sides of the court front- is usually occupied by the large sitting room, with the latticed front covered with colored glass, similar to that in the outer court. The other rooms, of smaller size, are the more private apartments of the mansion.

No ancient houses had chimneys. The word so translated in <sup><2833></sup>Hosea 13:3, means a hole through which the smoke escaped; and this existed only in the lower class of dwellings, where raw wood was employed for fuel or cooking, and where there was an opening immediately over the hearth to let out the smoke. In the better sort of houses the rooms were warmed in winter by charcoal in braziers (Jeremiah 36, 22; <sup><4154></sup>Mark 14:54; <sup><6188></sup>John 18:18), as is still the practice (Russell, 1, 21; Lane, 1, 41; Chardin, 4:120), or a fire of wood might be kindled in the open court of the house (<sup><4255></sup>Luke 22:55). *SEE FIRE*.

There are usually (no doors to the sitting or drawing rooms of Eastern houses: they are closed by curtains, at least in summer, the opening and shutting of doors being odious to most Orientals. The same seems to have been the case among the Hebrews, as far as we may judge from the curtains which served instead of doors to the tabernacle, and which separated the inner and outer chambers of the Temple. The outer doors are closed with a wooden lock (Lane, 1, 42; Chardin, 4:123; Russell, 1, 21). *SEE LOCK; SEE CURTAIN.*

## Picture for House 12

The windows had no glass; they were only latticed, and thus gave free passage to the air and admitted light, while birds and bats were excluded. In winter the cold air was kept out by veils over the windows, or by shutters with holes in them sufficient to admit light (1 Kings. 7:17; ~~200~~Song of Solomon 2:9). The apertures of the windows in Egyptian and Eastern houses generally are small, in order to exclude heat (Wilkinson, *Anc e.g.* 2, 124). They are closed with folding valves, secured with a bolt or bar. The windows often project considerably beyond the lower part of the building, so as to overhang the street. The windows of the courts within also project (Jowett, *Christian Res.* p. 66, 67). The lattice is generally kept closed, but can be opened at pleasure, and is opened on great public occasions (*Lane, Mod. Egypt.* 1, 27). Those within can look through the lattices, without opening them or being seen themselves; and in some rooms, especially the large upper room, there are several: windows. From the allusions in Scripture we gather, that while there was usually but one window in each room, in which invariably there was a lattice (Judges 5:28, where “a window” is in Heb. “the window;” ~~1025~~Joshua 2:15; ~~1026~~2 Samuel 6:16, in Hebrews *the window;*” ~~1027~~2 Kings 9:30, do.; ~~1028~~Acts 20:9, do.), there were sometimes several windows (~~1029~~2 Kings 13:17). The room here spoken of was probably such an upper room as Robinson describes above with many windows (*Res.* 3, 417). Daniel’s room had several windows, and his lattices were opened when *his* enemies found him in prayer (Dan. 6:10). The projecting nature of the window, and the fact that a divan, or raised seat, encircles the interior of each, so that usually persons sitting in the window are seated close to the aperture, easily explains how Ahaziah may have fallen through the lattice of his upper chamber, and Eutychus from his window-seat, especially if the lattices were open at the time (2 Kings 1, 2; ~~1030~~Acts 20:9). *SEE WINDOW.*

There are usually no special bedrooms in Eastern houses, and thus the room in which Ishbosheth was murdered was probably an ordinary room with a *diwan*, on which he was sleeping during the heat of the day (<sup><106></sup>2 Samuel 4:5, 6; Lane, 1, 41). *SEE BEDCHAMBER.*

The stairs to the upper apartments are in Syria usually in a corner of the court (Robinson, 3:302). When there is no upper story the lower rooms are usually loftier. In Persia they are open from top to bottom, and only divided from the court by a low partition (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1, 10; Chardin, 4:119; Burckhardt, *Travels*, 1, 18, 19; *Views in Syria*, 1, 6). This flight of stone steps conducts to the gallery, from which a plainer stair leads to the housetop. If the house be large, there are two or three sets of steps to the different sides of the quadrangle, but seldom more than one flight from the terrace to the house-top of any one court. There is, however, a separate stair from the outer court to the roof, and it is usually near the entrance. This will bring to mind the case of the paralytic, noticed above, whose friends, finding they could not get access to Jesus through the people who crowded the court of the house in which he was preaching, took him up to the roof, and let him down in his bed through the tiling to the place where Jesus stood (<sup><107></sup>Luke 5:17-26). If the house in which our Lord then was had more than one court, he and the auditors were certainly in the outer one; and it is reasonable to conclude that he stood in the veranda addressing the crowd below. The men bearing the paralytic, therefore, perhaps went up the steps near the door; and finding they could not even then get near the person of Jesus, the gallery being also crowded, continued their course to the roof of the house, and, removing the boards over the covering of the gallery, at the place where Jesus stood, lowered the sick man to his feet. But if they could not get access to the steps near the door, as is likely, from the door being much crowded, their alternative was to take him to the roof of the next house, and there hoist him over the parapet to the roof of the house which they desired to enter. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 64.) *SEE STAIRS.*

### Picture for House 13

The roof of the house is, of course, flat. It is formed by layers of branches, twigs, matting, and earth, laid over the rafters, and trodden down; after which it is covered with a compost that acquires considerable hardness when dry. Such roofs would not, however, endure the heavy and continuous rains of our climate; and in those parts of Asia where the



climate is more than usually moist, a stone roller is usually kept on every roof, and after a shower a great part of the population is engaged in drawing these rollers over the roofs. It is now very common, in countries where timber is scarce, to have domed roofs; but in that case the flat roof, which is indispensable to Eastern habits, is obtained by filling up the hollow intervals between the several domes, so as to form a flat surface at the top. These flat roofs are often alluded to in Scripture, and the allusions show that they were made to serve the same uses as at present. In fine weather the inhabitants resorted much to them to breathe the fresh air, to enjoy a fine prospect, or to witness any event that occurred in the neighborhood (<sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 11:2; <sup><2201></sup>Isaiah 22:1; <sup><0247></sup>Matthew 24:17; <sup><1135></sup>Mark 13:15). The dry air of the summer atmosphere enabled them, without injury to health, to enjoy the bracing coolness of the night-air by sleeping on the housetops; and in order to have the benefit of the air and prospect in the daytime, without inconvenience from the sun, sheds, booths, and tents were sometimes erected on the housetops (<sup><1062></sup>2 Samuel 16:22). *SEE HOUSETOP.*

### Picture for House 14

The roofs of the houses are well protected by walls and parapets. Towards the street and neighboring houses is a high wall, and towards the interior courtyard usually a parapet or wooden rail.; Battlements” of this kind, for the prevention of accidents, are strictly enjoined in the law (Dent. 22:8); and the form of the battlements of Egyptian houses suggest some interesting analogies, if we consider how recently the Israelites had quitted Egypt when that law was delivered. *SEE BATTLEMENT.*

In the East, where the climate allows the people to spend so much of their time out of doors, the articles of furniture and the domestic utensils have always been few and simple. *SEE BED; SEE LAMP; SEE POTTERY; SEE SEAT; SEE TABLE.* The rooms, however, although comparatively vacant of movables, are far from having a naked or unfurnished appearance. This is owing to the high degree of ornament given to the walls and ceilings. The walls are broken up into various recesses, and the ceiling into compartments. The ceiling, if of wood and flat, is of curious and complicated joinery; or, if vaulted, is wrought into numerous coves and enriched with fretwork in stucco; and the walls are adorned with arabesques, mosaics, mirrors, painting, and gold, which, as set off by the marble-like whiteness of the stucco, has a truly brilliant and rich effect.

There is much in this to remind one of such descriptions of splendid interiors as that in <sup><2541></sup>Isaiah 54:11, 12. Smith; Kitto; Fairbairn. *SEE CEILING.*

**IV. Metaphori: ally.** — The word house has some figurative applications in Scripture. Heaven- is considered as the house of God (<sup><614></sup>John 14:2): “In my Father’s house are many mansions.” Here is an evident allusion to the Temple (q.v.), with its many rooms, which is emphatically styled in the Old Testament “the House of the Lord.” The grave is the house appointed for all the living (<sup><832></sup>Job 30:23; <sup><2348></sup>Isaiah 14:18). House is taken for the body (<sup><61></sup>2 Corinthians 5:1): “If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved;” if our bodies were taken to pieces by death. The comparison of the body to a house is used by Mr. Harmer to explain the similes, Ecclesiastes 12:and is illustrated by a passage in Plautus (*Mostell.* 1, 2). The Church of God is his house (<sup><5415></sup>1 Timothy 3:15): “How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, that is, the Church of the living God.” In the same sense, Moses was faithful in all the house of God as a servant, but Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we (Christians). But this sense may include that of household, persons composing the attendants or retainers to a prince, etc. This intimate reference of house or dwelling to the adherents, intimates, or partisans of the householder, is probably the foundation of the simile used by the apostle Peter (<sup><1015></sup>1 Peter 2:5): “Ye (Christians), as living stones, are built up into a spiritual house.” <sup><4316></sup>Genesis 43:16: “Joseph said to the ruler of his house;” i.e. to the manager of his domestic concerns. Isaiah 36, 3: “Eliakim, who was over the house, or household;” i.e. his steward. <sup><133></sup>Genesis 30:30: “When shall I provide for mine own house also?” i.e. get wealth to provide for my family (see 1 Timothy 5:8). <sup><1001></sup>Genesis 7:1: “Enter thou and all thy *house* (family) into the ark.” Exodus 1. 21: “And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them *houses*,” i.e. he prospered their families. So also in <sup><1025></sup>1 Samuel 2:35; <sup><1072></sup>2 Samuel 7:27; <sup><1113></sup>1 Kings 11:38. Thus the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house (<sup><1127></sup>Genesis 12:17). “What is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?” (<sup><1078></sup>2 Samuel 7:18). So Joseph (Luke 1, 27; 2:4) was of the house of David, but more especially he was of his royal lineage, or family; and, as we conceive, in the direct line or eldest branch of the family, so that he was next of kin to the throne, if the government had still continued in possession of the descendants of David (see also 1 Timothy 5, 8). <sup><1071></sup>2 Samuel 7:11: “Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house;”

i.e. he will give thee offspring, who may receive and may preserve the royal dignity. Psalm 49, 12: “Their inward thought is that their *houses* shall continue forever;” i.e. that their posterity shall always flourish. — Calmet; Wemyss. *SEE HOUSEHOLD*.

### House of Bishops

*SEE CONVOCAATION.*

### House of Clerical and Lay Deputies

*SEE CONVOCAATION.*

### House of God

A name frequently given to the edifice in which Christians assemble for the worship of God, not because God *dwells there* by any visible or special presence, as of old he “dwelt between the cherubims,” but because it is *dedicated to God*, and set apart for his service. It is thus synonymous with the word “church” in that modern use of it by which it signifies a building (Eden). *SEE BETHEL; SEE HOUSE; SEE TEMPLE.*

### House of Prayer

Places where persons assemble to pray, and to receive religious instruction, but where the sacraments are not administered. It is the general name of the Protestant churches in Hungary, and was such in Silesia under the Austrian rule, to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic places of worship. It is also used in Germany to designate the churches of such sects as are not officially recognized, as the Moravians, etc. The synagogues are also called houses of prayer (<sup>23407</sup>Isaiah 46:7). — Pierer, *Unic. Lex.* s.v. *SEE PROSEUCHAE.*

### Household

(usually same in the orig. as “house”), the members of a family residing in the same abode, including servants and dependants, although in Job 1, 3 a distinction (not observed in the A.V.) is intimated by the term **hDbj** *abuddah*,’ lit. *service* (“servants,” <sup>0234</sup>Genesis 26:24), between the *domestics* and the **tyB** *bay’ith*, or proper family of the master of the house; and some have thought a like difference to be denoted between the Greek term **οἰκία** (lit. *residence*) and **οἶκος** of the N.T., which are both

indiscriminately rendered “house” and “household” in the English. Version. This latter view is confirmed by the improbability that any of the immediate imperial family (Nero’s) should have been included in the converts to Christianity expressed in the phrase *they of Caesar’s household* (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καισαρος οἰκίας, <sup><102></sup>Philippians 4:22). *SEE CAESAR*.

## Householder

(οἰκοδεσπότης, *master of the house*, as rendered <sup><102></sup>Matthew 10:25; <sup><125></sup>Luke 13:25; 14:21), the male head of a family (<sup><127></sup>Matthew 13:27, 52; 20:1; 21:23). There are monographs on the parable Matthew 20 by Feuerlein, *De scriba proferente e thesauro nova et vetera* (Alt. 1730); Bagewitz, *De scriba docto* (Rost. 1720). *SEE GOODMAN OF THE HOUSE*.

## Housel

“the old Saxon name for the Eucharist, supposed by some to be from the Gothic ‘hunsal,’ a victim.” — Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary*, p. 315.

## House-top

### Picture for House-top

(גג; *gag*, δῶμα), the flat roof of an Oriental house, for such is usually their form, though there are sometimes domes over some of the rooms. The flat portions are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, which in time becomes very hard, but when not laid on at the proper season is apt to crack in winter, and the rain is thus admitted. In order to prevent this, every roof is provided with a roller, which is set at work after rain. In many cases the terrace roof is little better than earth rolled hard. On ill-compacted roofs grass is often found springing into a short-lived existence (<sup><103></sup>Proverbs 19:13; 27:15; <sup><106></sup>Psalms 129:6, 7; <sup><127></sup>Isaiah 37:27; Shaw, p. 210; Lane, 1, 27, Robinson, 3, 39, 44, 60). *SEE GRASS*.

### Picture for House-top 2

In no point do Oriental domestic habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof (Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 71 sq.). Its flat surface is made useful for various household purposes (<sup><106></sup>Joshua 2:6), as drying corn, hanging up linen, and preparing figs and raisins (Shaw, p. 211; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1, 191; Bartlett, *Footsteps of our Lord*, p. 199). The

roofs are used almost universally as places of recreation in the evening, and often as sleeping-places at night (<sup><10112></sup>2 Samuel 11:2; 16:22; <sup><7043></sup>Daniel 4:29; <sup><4925></sup>1 Samuel 9:25, 26; <sup><4878></sup>Job 27:18; <sup><1100></sup>Proverbs 21:9; Shaw. p. 211; Russell, 1, 35; Chardin, 4:116; Layard, *Nineveh*, 1, 177). They were also used as places for devotion, and even idolatrous worship (<sup><3629></sup>Jeremiah 32:29; 19:13; <sup><12312></sup>2 Kings 23:12; <sup><3005></sup>Zephaniah 1:5; <sup><4100></sup>Acts 10:9). At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles booths were erected by the Jews on the tops of their houses, as in the present day huts of boughs are sometimes erected on the housetops as sleeping-places, or places of retirement from the heat in summer time (<sup><10816></sup>Nehemiah 8:16; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 280). As among the Jews the seclusion of women was not carried to the extent of Mohammedan usage, it is probable that the house-top was made, as it is among Christian inhabitants, more a place of public meeting both for men and women, than is the case among Mohammedans, who carefully seclude their roofs from inspection by partitions (Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1, 191, compare Wilkinson, 1, 23). The Christians at Aleppo, in Russell's time, lived contiguous, and made their house-tops a means of mutual communication to avoid passing through the streets in time of plague (Russell, 1, 35). In the same manner, the housetop might be made a means of escape by the stairs by which it was reached without entering any of the apartments of the house (<sup><10417></sup>Matthew 24:17; 10:27; <sup><10138></sup>Luke 12:3). Both Jews and heathens were in the habit of wailing publicly on the housetops (<sup><23138></sup>Isaiah 15:3; 22:1; <sup><4838></sup>Jeremiah 48:38). The expression used by Solomon, "dwelling upon the housetop" (<sup><1100></sup>Proverbs 21:9), is illustrated by the frequent custom of building chambers and rooms along the side and at the corners of the open space or terrace which often constitutes a kind of upper story (Hackett, *ut sup.* p. 74). Or it may refer to the fact that booths are sometimes constructed of branches and leaves upon the roof which, although of cramped dimensions, furnish a cool and quiet retreat, not unsuitable as a relief from a clamorous wife (Pococke, *Travels*, 2, 69). It is obvious that such a place would be convenient for observation (<sup><2211></sup>Isaiah 22:1), and for the proclamation of news (<sup><10138></sup>Luke 12:3; comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 51). **SEE ROOF.**

### Picture for House-top 3

Protection of the roof by parapets was enjoined by the law (Dent. 22:8). The parapets thus constructed, of which the types may be seen in ancient Egyptian houses, were sometimes of open work, and it is to a fall through or over one of these that the injury by which Ahaziah suffered is sometimes

ascribed (Shaw, p. 211). To pass over roofs for plundering purposes, as well as for safety, would be no difficult matter (Joel, 2:9). In ancient Egyptian, and also in Assyrian houses, a sort of raised story was sometimes built above the roof, and in the former an open chamber, roofed or covered with awning, was sometimes erected on the house-top (Wilkinson, 1, 9; Layard, *Mon. of Nin.* 2, pl. 49, 50). — Smith. *SEE HOUSE*.

### Houssay, Brother Jean Du

A distinguished member of an order of hermits who lived on Mount Valerian, near Paris, was born at Chaillot in 1539. These pious men formed a community of their own, distinct from the outer world, and took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Houssay died Aug. 3, 1609. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 271 *SEE VALERIAN MONKS*. (J. H. W.)

### Housta, Baudoin de

An Augustine monk, was born at Toubise in the early part of the 18th century, and distinguished himself greatly by his piety and erudition. He is especially celebrated as the would-be critic of Fleury's work on ecclesiastical history, which he attacked in a work entitled *Mauvaise foi de M. Fleury, prouvé par plusieurs passages des Saints Peres, des conciles et d'auteurs ecclesiastiques qu'il aomis, tronques ou infidèlement traduits dans son histoire* (Malines, 1733, 8vo). Of course the monk, from his narrow and biased standpoint, was unable to comprehend the greatness of Fleury and the liberality of his views, and he endeavored to ridicule Fleury, and stamp him as an infidel. Housta died at Enguien in 1760. — Chaudon and Delandine, *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* 6, 315 sq.; Fuller, *Dict. Hist.* 9, 45. (J. H.W.)

### Houteville, Alexandre Claude François

A French theologian, was born at Paris in 1688, became a member of the Congregation of the Oratory in 1704, and remained such for some eighteen years. He was then appointed secretary to cardinal Dubois. In 1722 he published *La Verite de la religion Chretienne prouvé par les faits* (Paris, 4to; new ed. Paris, 1749, 4 vols. 12mo), "which had a 'wonderful though scarcely deserved popularity at one time'" (Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 6:198), and provoked considerable controversy. In 1723 he was made abbé of St. Vincent du Bourg-sur-Mer, in the diocese of Bordeaux. In 1728 he

published *Essai philosophique sur la Providence*. In 1740 he published a second edition of his *Vérité de la religion Chretienne* (Paris, 3 vols. 4to). This edition, greatly enlarged, contains a *historical and critical discourse upon the method of the principal authors who wrote for and against Christianity from its beginning* (which was translated and published separately, with a *Dissertation on the Life of Apollonius Tyanceus, and some Observations on the Platonists of the latter School*, London 1739, 8vo). "It contains little information concerning the authors or the events, but a clearly and correctly, written analysis of their works and thoughts" (Farrar, *Crit. History of Free Thought*, p. 15). In 1742 he was honored with the appointment of "perpetual secretary" to the French Academy. He died Nov. 8, 1742. — *Biographie Univ.* 20:620 sq.; Chaudon and Delandine, *Nouv.* — *Dict. Hist.* 6, 316; *Dict. Hist.* 9:45 sq. (J. H.W.)

### Hovel or Housing

is a term applied to a canopy or niche. — Wallcot, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 318.

### Hovey, Jonathan Parsons, D.D.

A Presbyterian minister, was born in Waybridge, Vt., Oct. 10, 1810. He received a collegiate education at Jacksonville, Ill., and South Hanover, Ind. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was ordained for the ministry March 1837. He was settled four times: first at Gaines, N. Y.; then at Burdette, N. Y.; then at Richmond, Va.; and from September, 1850, for thirteen years, in New York City. "His church occupied a difficult field. It was surrounded by German Catholics, and by those who valued little, though they greatly needed, the institutions of the Gospel. Here he labored with signal fidelity and usefulness. Several revivals were enjoyed during his ministry, and many additions were made to the Church." During our late civil war Dr. Hovey served as chaplain of the 71st Regiment New York State Volunteers, and continued with them during their entire period of service, at the expiration of which he returned again to his charge in New York City. He died there Dec. 16, 1863. — *Wilson's Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1864, p. 305 sq.; Rev. Dr. Field, in the *Christian Intelligencer*, Dec. 24, 1863.

### How, Samuel B., D.D.

was born in 1788, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1810, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1813. He was settled successively in

Presbyterian churches at Salisbury, Pa., 1813-15; Trenton, N. J., 1815-21; and New Brunswick, N. J., 1821-23. From 1823 to 1827 he was pastor of the Independent Church at Savannah, Ga., then for a year in New York, whence he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, Pa., 1830-31. In 1832 he accepted the charge of the First Reformed Dutch Church in New Brunswick, N. J., but resigned on account of ill health in 1861. In all these positions his fine classical scholarship and solid and extensive theological learning were studiously maintained and conspicuously displayed. Devout, conscientious, a Christian gentleman in the best sense of the term, a most faithful preacher and pastor, fearless and independent, zealous and successful, as a minister he was remarkable for scriptural instruction and pious fervor. His ideal of the ministry was lofty, and his life was the best commentary upon it. In 1855 he published an elaborate pamphlet entitled *Slaveholding not sinful*, which grew out of the request of the North Carolina Classis of the German Reformed Church to be united with the Reformed Dutch Church. The important and excited discussion which followed in the General Synod of the latter body ended in a decided refusal to comply with the application. Dr. How's pamphlet was answered in the same form by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse and others, and it was long before the interest produced by it died away. Dr. How published also several occasional sermons of eminent ability. He was a frequent contributor to religious periodicals, especially in relation to the pending theological controversies of his time. The last seven years of his life were spent in retirement from public service. He preached when his health would permit. He dwelt among his own people, a model of Christian virtues and of ministerial excellence. He died in 1868. — Corwin's *Manual Ref. Church*, p. 118; *Christian Intelligencer*; Rev. R. H. Steele, D.D., *Hist. of Ref. D. Ch. New Brunswick* (1869). (WV. J. R. T.)

### Howard, Bezaleel, D.D.,

a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., Nov. 22, 1753. He entered Harvard College in 1777, and, after graduation in 1781, engaged in teaching, pursuing at the same time a course of theological study. In 1783 he was appointed tutor at Harvard. In November 1784, he was called as minister to the First Church and Society in Springfield, Mass., and was ordained April 27, 1785. He continued in this position until September 1803, when impaired health obliged him to discontinue his work; but his resignation was not accepted by the Church until Jan. 25, 1809, when his successor was ordained. In 1819 he



associated himself with a new Unitarian Church which had been formed from members of his old congregation, and he continued with them till his death, Jan. 20, 1837. In 1824 Harvard College conferred the degree of D.D. upon him. The Rev. Daniel Waldo, in a sketch of Dr. Howard (in Sprague's *Annals of the Am. Pulpit*, 8, 181 sq.), says that the theological views of Dr. Howard had been Armenian until his latest years, when he came to believe "the sole supremacy of the Father. He, however, held to the doctrine of the atonement, in the sense of propitiation or expiation, with the utmost tenacity; and he regarded the rejection of it as a rejection of Christianity. His views of the character of the Savior were not, perhaps, very accurately defined; he seemed to regard him as a sort of eternal emanation from Deity; not a creature in the strict sense, on the one hand, nor yet the supreme God on the other." He published a sermon delivered at the ordination of the Rev. Antipas Steward (1793). (J. H. W.)

### Howard, John

One of the most eminent of modern Christian philanthropists, was born at Hackney in 1726. His father apprenticed him to a wholesale grocer, but died when his son was about nineteen years of age, leaving him in possession of a handsome fortune, and young Howard, who was in weak health, determined to make a tour in France and Italy. On his return he took lodgings in Stoke Newington, where his landlady, a widow named Loidore, having nursed him carefully through a severe illness, he, out of gratitude, married her, though she was twenty-seven years his senior. She, however, died about three years after the marriage, and he now conceived a desire to visit Lisbon, with a view to alleviate the miseries caused by the great earthquake in 1756. On his voyage he was captured by a French privateer, carried a prisoner to Brest, and subsequently removed into the interior, but was finally permitted to return to England on the promise of inducing the government to make a suitable exchange for him. This was affected, and Howard retired to a small estate he possessed at Cardington, near Bedford, and there, in April 1758, he married Miss Henrietta Leeds. It is mentioned as a characteristic trait that he stipulated before marriage "that, in all matters in which there should be a difference of opinion between them, his voice should rule." For seven years he was chiefly engaged in the task of raising the physical and moral condition of the peasantry of Cardington and its neighborhood by erecting on his own estate better cottages, establishing schools, and visiting and relieving the sick and the destitute; in his benevolent exertions he was assisted by his

wife. She died March 1765, and Howard from that time lost his interest in his home and its occupations. He lived some years at Cardington in seclusion, then made another Continental tour, and in 1773 was nominated sheriff of Bedford. The sufferings, which he had endured and witnessed during his own brief confinement as a prisoner of war struck-deep into his mind, and, shocked by the misery and abuses, which prevailed in the prisons under his charge, he attempted to induce the magistrates to remedy the more obvious of them. The reply was a demand for a precedent, and Howard at once set out on a tour of inspection. But he soon found that the evil was general, and he set himself diligently to work to inquire into the extent and precise nature of the mischief, and, if possible, to discover the true remedy for the evil. He visited, in two journeys, most of the town and county jails of England, and accumulated a large mass of information, which, in March 1774, he laid before the House of Commons. This was the commencement of prison reform in England. Once actively engaged, he became more and more devoted to this benevolent pursuit. He traveled repeatedly over the United Kingdom, and at different periods to almost every part of Europe, visiting the most offensive places, relieving personally the wants of the most wretched objects, and noting all that seemed to him important either for warning or example. The first fruit of these labors was *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with an Account of some Foreign Prisons* (1777). "As soon as it appeared, the world was astonished at the mass of valuable materials accumulated by a private unaided individual, through a course of prodigious labor, and at the constant hazard of life, in consequence of the infectious diseases prevalent in the scenes of his inquiries. The cool good sense and moderation of his narrative, contrasted with that enthusiastic ardor which must have impelled him to his undertaking, were not less admired, and he was immediately regarded as one of the extraordinary characters of die age, and as the leader in all plans for ameliorating the condition of that wretched part of the community for whom he interested himself" (Aikin). In 1778 he undertook another tour, revisited the celebrated Rasp-houses of Holland, and continued his route through Belgium and Germany into Italy, whence he returned through Switzerland and France in 1779. In the same year he made another survey of Great Britain and Ireland. In these tours he extended his views to the investigation of hospitals. The results were published in 1780, in an *Appendix to "The State o' the Prisons in England and Wales,"* etc. Having traveled over nearly all the south of Europe, in 1781 he visited Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and Poland, and in 1783 he

went through Spain and Portugal, continuing at intervals his home inquiries, and published in 1784 a second appendix, together with a new edition of the original work, in which the additional matter was comprised. The importance, both in prisons and hospitals, of preventing the occurrence or spread of infectious diseases, produced in Mr. Howard a desire to witness the working and success of the Lazaretto system in the south of Europe, more especially as. a safeguard against the plague. Danger or disgust never turned him from his-path, but on this occasion he went without even a servant, not thinking it right, for convenience sake, to expose another person to such a risk. Quitting England in 1785, he traveled through the south of France and Italy to Malta, Zante, and Constantinople, whence he returned to Smyrna, while the plague was raging, for the purpose of sailing from an infected port to Venice, where he might undergo the utmost rigor of the quarantine system. He returned to England in 1787, resumed his home tours, and in 1789 published the result of his late inquiries in another important volume, entitled *An Account of the principal Lazarettos in Europe, etc., with additional Remarks on the present State of the Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland*. The same summer he renewed his course of foreign travels, meaning to go into Turkey and the East through Russia, He had, however, proceeded no farther than the Crimea when a rapid illness, which he himself believed to be an infectious fever, caught in prescribing for a lady-, put an end to his life on the 20th of January, 1790. He requested that no other inscription should be put upon his grave than simply this, "Christ is my hope." He was buried at Dauphiny, near Cherson, and the utmost respect was paid to his memory by the Russian government. The intelligence of his death caused a profound feeling of regret in his native country, and men of all classes and parties vied in paying their tribute of reverence to his memory. A marble statue by Bacon of "the philanthropist" was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral by a public subscription.

Mr. Howard's piety was deep and fervent, and his moral character most pure and simple. His-literary acquirements were small, neither were his talents brilliant; but he was fearless, single-minded, untiring, and did great things by devoting his whole energies to one good object. The influence of disinterestedness and integrity is remarkably displayed in the ready access granted to him even by the most absolute and most suspicious governments, in the respect invariably paid to his person, and the weight attached to his opinion and authority. He was strictly economical in his

personal expenses, abstemious in his habits, and capable of going through' great fatigue; both his fortune and his constitution were freely spent in the cause to which his life was devoted. The only blemish which has ever been suggested as resting upon his memory is in connection with his conduct to his son. Mr. Howard was a strict — and has not escaped the charge of being a severe — parent. The son, unhappily, in youth fell into dissolute habits, which being carefully concealed from the father, and consequently unchecked, brought on a disease which terminated in insanity. He survived his father nine years, dying on the 24th of April 1799; but he remained till his death a hopeless lunatic. The question of Howard's alleged harshness to his son has been thoroughly investigated and effectually disproved. (See Dixon's *Life of Howard*.) That his devotion to the great philanthropic object to which he gave up his life may not have interfered with his paternal duties, it is, of course, impossible to affirm; but that John Howard was an affectionate and kind-hearted father, as well as a single-minded benefactor to his species there can now be no reasonable doubt. See *English Cyclopaedia*; Aiken, *Character and Services of John Howard* (London, 1792, 8vo); Brown, *Memoirs of John Howard* (London 1818, 4to); Dixon, *Johns Howard and the Prison World of Europe* (London, 1850, 12mo; reprinted, with an introduction, by the Rev. R. W. Dickinson, D.D., N. Y. 1854, 18mo); Field, *Life of John Howard* (London 1850. 8vo); Skeats, *History of the Free Churches of England*, p. 479.

### Howard, John

A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Roman Catholic ancestry in Onslow County, North Carolina in 1792. His early education was limited, as his father died shortly after the birth of John, and he was placed in a store at the age of twelve. He was converted in 1808 and entered the ministry in 1818 at Georgetown. In 1819 he joined the South Carolina Conference, and was stationed at Sandy River Circuit. In 1820 he was appointed to Georgetown 1821 to Savannah, 1822 to Augusta, and 1823 and 1824 to Charleston. He located from 1825 till 1828, when he was appointed to the Washington and Greensborough Circuits. In 1829 and 1830 he labored on the Appalachee Circuit. In 1831 he joined the Georgia Conference, then forming, and for three years became presiding elder of the Milledgeville District. From 1834 to the time of his death in 1836, he was agent for the "Manual Labor School" of the Conference. "Mr. Howard's ministry, especially in Savannah, Augusta, and Charleston, was attended with marked success. He labored with great fidelity, not only in

the pulpit, but with penitents at the altar being alike fervent in his prayers and appropriate in his counsels. As a pastor, too, he was always on the alert to promote the best interests of his people. Whenever there was darkness to be dissipated, or grief to be assuaged, or sinking hope to be encouraged, or evil of any kind to be removed, there he was sure to be present as an angel of mercy.” — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 7, 614 sq.

### Howard, Simeon, D.D.

A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Maine, April 29, 1733, and educated at Harvard College, where he graduated with distinguished honor in 1758. After a course of theological study, pursued while himself engaged in teaching, he accepted a call to a church at Cumberland, Nova Scotia. In 1765 he returned to Cambridge as a resident graduate student, and was elected tutor the year following. In 1767 he accepted the pastorate of West Church, Boston, and was ordained May 6, 1768. During the Revolution his congregation suffered greatly, and having made many friends during his residence in Nova Scotia, he proposed that his congregation should emigrate with him thither, which they did. After about one year and a half he returned to Boston, and again served his congregation there, receiving only such compensation for his services, as he was fully satisfied they could afford to give in their destitute circumstances. He died in the midst of his labors among them, August 13! 1804. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Edinburgh University. He was an overseer and fellow of Harvard, and a member of most of the American societies for the promotion of literary, charitable, and religious objects, and an officer of several of them. Dr. Howard was “bland and gentle in his manner, calm and equable in his temper, cheerful without levity, and serious without gloom His parishioners loved him as a brother, and honored him as a father; his brethren in the ministry always met him with a grateful and cordial welcome; and the community at large revered him for his simplicity, integrity, and benevolence.” Dr. Howard published *Sermons* (1773, 1777, 1778, 1780) — *Christians have no Cause to be ashamed of their Religion* (sermon, 1779) — *Ordination Sermon* (1791). — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 8, 65.

## Howe, Bezaleel

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Tower Hill, Dutchess County, N. Y., July 14, 1781. In early life he was a student of Paine and Rousseau, and for several years a professed infidel; but the unhappy death of a notorious infidel of his acquaintance was the means of his conversion, and in 1823 he entered the New York Conference, in which he labored with great zeal and success until his death, June 25, 1854. He was fond of study, and his piety and abilities honored and edified the Church. — *Min. of Conferences*, 5, 533. (G. L. T.)

## Howe, Charles

a distinguished English diplomatist under Charles II, was born in Gloucestershire in 1661. Being of a strong religious turn, he finally forsook public life, and retired into the country, where he wrote his *Devout Meditations* (8vo: 2nd ed. Edinb. 1752 12mo; London 1824, 12mo, and often), of which the poet, Dr. Edward Young, says, "I shall never lay it far out of my reach, for a greater demonstration of a sound head and sincere heart I never saw." Howe died in 1745. *London Gentl. Mag.* vol. 64; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 902; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

## Howe, John

a Nonconformist divine, and one of the greatest of English theologians, who is often called the "Platonic Puritan," was born May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, in Leicestershire, where his father was the incumbent of the parish church; but, having become a Nonconformist, he was ejected from his living, and retired to Ireland. He soon, however, returned to England, and settled in the town of Lancaster, where John received his rudimentary instruction from his father. He was afterwards educated at Christ College, Cambridge, but removed to Brazenose College, Oxford; of which he became the bible-clerk in 1648, and where he for the second time took his degree of B.A. in 1649. He was made a demy of Magdalen College by the parliamentary visitors, and was afterwards chosen a fellow. In July, 1652, he took the degree of AM.A. After having been ordained by a Nonconformist divine, assisted by others, he became a minister at Great Torrington, in Devonshire. In 1654 Cromwell appointed him his domestic chaplain. He gave some offence to the protector by one of his sermons, in which he censured certain opinions about divine impulses and special impressions in answer to prayer, but retained his situation till Cromwell's

death, and afterwards till the deposition of Richard Cromwell. He then resumed and continued his ministry at Great Torrington till the Act of Uniformity, August 1662, obliged him to restrict his preaching to private houses. He went to Ireland in 1671, where he resided as chaplain to the family of lord Massarene, enjoying there the friendship of the bishop of that diocese. Howe was granted liberty to preach in all the churches under the jurisdiction of this bishop. He wrote at this time his *Vanity of Man as Mortal*, and began his greatest work, *The Living Temple*, below referred to. In 1675 he accepted an invitation to become the minister of a congregation in London. During the year 1680 he engaged in a controversy with Drs. Stillingfleet and Tillotson on the question of nonconformity, and it is said that Dr. Stillingfleet, who had provoked the controversy by a discourse which he preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of London on "The Mischief of Separation," was subdued when he read Howe's reply, and confessed that he discoursed "more like a gentleman than a divine, without any mixture of rancor, or any sharp reflections, and sometimes with a great degree of kindness towards him, for which, and his prayers for him, he heartily thanked him" (Rogers's *Life of Howe*, p. 183). In August 1685, he went to the Continent with lord Wharton, and in 1686 became one of the preachers to the English church at Utrecht. When James II published his "declaration for liberty of conscience," Howe returned to London, and at the Revolution, the year following, he headed the deputation of dissenting ministers who presented their petition to the throne. In 1689 he again pleaded the cause of the Nonconformists in an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Case of the Protestant Dissenters represented and argued*. In 1691 he became involved in the Antinomian controversy by a recommendation, which he gave to the works of Dr. Crisp. He soon, however, cleared his reputation by a strong recommendation of Flavel's *Blow at the Root*, a work against Antinomianism, then in the course of publication. In 1701 he became entangled in a controversy with the Puritan De Foe (q.v.) on account of one of Howe's members, who had been elected lord mayor, and who, in order to qualify himself for that office, had taken the Lord's Supper in an Established church. The manner in which Howe answered (*Some Considerations of a Preface to an Inquiry*, etc.) the objections of De Foe, who opposed communion in the Established Church by Nonconformists, is to be regretted by all who venerate the name of John Howe. He died April 2, 1705. Among the Puritans, John Howe ranks as one of the most eminent. He was also unquestionably a man of great general learning. "The

originality and compass of Howe's mind, and the calmness and moderation of his temper, must ever inspire sympathy and awaken admiration in reflective readers: his Platonic and Alexandrian culture commends him to the philosophical student, and the practical tendency of his religious thinking endears him to all Christians" (Stoughton [John], *Ecclesiastes Hist. of Engl.* 2, 422, 423). "Perhaps it may be considered as no unfair test of intellectual and spiritual excellence that a person can relish the writings of John Howe; if he does not, he may have reason to suspect that something in his head or heart is wrong. A young minister who wishes to attain eminence in his profession, if he has not the works of John Howe, and can procure them in no other way, should sell his coat and buy them; and, if that will not suffice, let him sell his bed and lie on the floor; and' if he spends his days in reading them, he will not complain that he lies hard at night" (Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, 1, 437). "Howe seems to have understood the Gospel as well as any uninspired writer, and to have imbibed as much of its spirit. There is the truest sublimity to be found in his writings, and some of the strongest pathos; yet, often obscure, generally harsh, he has imitated the worst' parts of Boyle's style. He has a vast number and variety of uncommon thoughts, and is, on the whole, one of the most valuable writers in our language, or, I believe, in the world" (Dr. Doddridge). "I have learned more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read. There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions" (Robert Hall). "This great man was one of the few who have been venerated as much by their contemporaries as by their successors. Time, which commonly adds increased luster to the memory of the good, has not been able to magnify any of the qualities: for which Howe was so conspicuous. His strong and capacious intellect, his sublime elevation of thought, his flowing eloquence, the holiness of his life, the dignity and courtesy of his manners, the humor of, his conversation, won for him from the men of his own time the title of 'the great Howe'" (Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 169). Howe's most important works are, *The Living Temple* (many editions; first in 1676), in which he proves the existence of God and his conversableness with men, and which occupies one of the highest places in Puritan theology — *The Redeemer's Tears over lost Souls* [<sup>1941</sup> Luke 19:41,42], with an Appendix on the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (London 1684; often reprinted), in which Howe does not, unlike many high Calvinistic theologians, enter at all into the predestination controversy, but confines himself to a solution of the question of God's omniscience and man's responsibility: — *Inquiry*



*concerning the Trinity, etc. — Office and Work of the Holy Spirit.* These, with his *Sermons* and other writings, are to be found in his *Collected Works, with Life by Dr. Calamy* (1724, 2 vols. folio); and in *The whole Works of the Rev. John Howe, . M.A.,* edited by Hunt (London, 1810-22, 7 vols. 8vo, with an eighth vol., containing a Memoir and additional works), and again in *The Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A., as published during his life, comprising the whole of the two folio volumes, ed. 1724, with A Life of the Author,* by the Rev. J. P. Hewlett (London, 1848, 3 vols. 8vo). There is also an edition of his Works in 1 vol. imp. 8vo (London, 1838), and an American edition (Philadelphia. 2 vols. imp. 8vo). See also Wilson, *Selections from Howe, with his Life* (London 1827, 2 vols. 12mo); Taylor, *Select Treatises of John Howe* (1835, 12mo); Rogers, *Life of John Howe, with an Analysis of his Writings* (London 1836, 12mo); Dunn, *Howe's Christian Theology* (London 1836, 12mo); *English Cyclopædia*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 902; *Quarterly Review* (London), 36, 167; *Literary and Theological Review*, 4, 538; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 676; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 6, 198 sq. (J.H.W.)

### Howe, Joseph

a Congregational minister, born at Killingly, Connecticut, January 14, 1747 was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1765, the first in his class. By recommendation of the president of his college he was appointed principal of a public school at Hartford, at that time the most important institution of that class in the colony. He was licensed to preach in 1769, and was appointed tutor at Yale in the same year. He held this position, preaching quite frequently, until called to the New South Church, Boston, in 1772, where he was ordained May 19, 1773. At the outbreak of the Revolution (1775) he fled to Norwich, where he remained only a short time, as his health had become enfeebled. He went to New Haven, and on his return stopped at Hartford, where he died, Aug. 25, 1775. — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1, 707 sq.

### Howe, Josiah

an English divine of the 17th century, born at Crendon, Bucks County, was educated at Oxford, and obtained a fellowship at Trinity College, of that University, in 1637. He found great favor with Charles I, at whose command he was admitted to the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1646. After the ruin of the royal house he was ejected from his fellowship, but

was restored to his preferment after the restoration of the monarchy. He died in 1701. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 3; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* 2, s.v.

### Howe, Nathaniel

a Congregational minister, was born in Ipswich, Mass., Oct. 6, 1764. He graduated at Harvard College in 1786, and was ordained pastor at Hopkinton Oct. 5, 1791, where he labored until his death, Feb. 15, 1837. He published *An Attempt to prove that John's Baptism was not Gospel Baptism, being A Reply to Dr. Baldwin's Essay on the same Subject* (1820) — *A Catechism with miscellaneous Questions, and A Chapter of Proverbs for the Children under his parochial Care*. See Sprague, *Annals*, 2, 307; *North American Review*, 4, 93-97.

### Howell, Horatio S.

a Presbyterian minister, born near Trenton, N. J., in 1820, was educated at Princeton College, and the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. In 1846 he was ordained pastor of East Whiteland Church, Pa. He subsequently became pastor of the Church at Elkton, Md., and at the Delaware Water Gap, Pa. While he was laboring at this latter place the Rebellion broke out. He at once entered the army as chaplain of the 90th Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers. His reputation as chaplain was pre-eminent for arduous, zealous, and judicious devotion. He was killed at the battle of Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 1863. — Wilson Pres. *Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

### Howell, Lawrence

a distinguished Nonjuror, was born soon after the Restoration, about 1660. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1684, and M.A. in 1688. Having entered the Church, he was ordained in 1712 by the nonjuring bishop, Dr. Hickee, who had taken the title of suffragan bishop of Thetford. He soon after published a pamphlet entitled *The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated*, for which he was committed to Newgate, convicted, and condemned to three years' imprisonment, besides whipping, a fine of £500, and degradation. This latter part was remitted him, however, by the king. He died in Newgate in 1720. Whatever his errors, the punishment appears to have been disproportionate to his offence. He was a man of extensive learning and great capacity. He wrote *Synopsis Canonum S.S. Apostolorum et Conciliorum Aecumenicorum et Provincialium ab Ecclesia Graeca*

*receptorum* (1708, fol.): — *Synops. Canon. Eccles. Lat.* (1710-1715, fol.) — *A View of the Pontificate from its supposed beginning to the end of the Council of Trent*, etc. (London 1716, 8vo) — *Desiderius, or the original Pilgrim; A divine Dialogue* (from the Spanish) (London 1717, 12mo) — *A complete History of the Holy Bible*, with additions by Rev. Geo. Burder (London 1806, 3 vols. 8vo) — *Certain Queries proposed by Roman Catholics*, etc. (London 1716); etc. — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1563; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 6, 199; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale* 25, 313 sq. (J. N. P.)

### Howell, Robert Boyte Crawford, D.D.

a prominent Baptist preacher in Tennessee, was born in Wayne County, North Carolina, March 10, 1801. He pursued his literary and theological studies in Columbian College, also the study of medicine, but without intending its practice. With this preparation, he entered upon the duties of the ministry in the Episcopal Church, of which his family were communicants; but, quite unexpectedly to his friends, he soon joined the Baptists, traveling fourteen miles to reach the nearest Baptist church for this purpose, Feb. 6, 1821. Five days afterwards he received license to preach the doctrines of the Baptist Church. At Washington he performed, in connection with his theological studies, the duties of a city missionary, and for a year after the completion of his course he was a missionary in Virginia. He then accepted a call to the pastorate of the Cumberland Street Baptist Church in Norfolk. He was ordained Jan. 27, 1827. A revival immediately followed, as the fruits of which he baptized about 200 within a few months. His labors continued here for eight years. In 1834 he removed to Nashville, Tenn. The First Baptist Church had been dispersed by the Rev. Alexander Campbell and his disciples, but under Mr. Howell's labors it was revived and built up. He established, and for some time edited a religious newspaper. He exerted more influence in the support of missions than any other minister of the denomination in Tennessee. After the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention, he was elected and re-elected its president. In 1850 he removed to Richmond, Va., where, in addition to the charge of a church, he was a trustee of Richmond College, and of the Richmond Female Institute, a member of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission, Publication, and Sunday-school Boards, and of the Virginia Baptist Mission and Educational Board. In 1857 he yielded to an urgent call to reoccupy his former field of labor in Nashville. There, besides efficiently promoting all the State Baptist organizations, he was, by

appointment of the Legislature, a trustee of the Institution for the Blind, and in other educational trusts. His labors were arduous; in addition to which, he performed a considerable amount of literary work, including some of his most useful books. He died April 5, 1868, greatly honored and lamented. Dr. Howell was a man of commanding presence and dignified address, warm and genial in his manners. His labors as a preacher of the Gospel were abundant and successful, and some of his published works had a wide circulation in this country, and were republished in England. He was the author of *Evils of Infant Baptism — The Cross: — The Covenants — The Early Baptists of Virginia On Communion — The Deaconship — The Way of Salvation*. He left several works in manuscript, among them, “The Christology of the Pentateuch,” an enlargement of “The Covenants,” and “The Family.” He was also a frequent contributor to the periodicals of his Church. (L. E. S.)

### Howgill, Francis

a noted preacher of “the Friends,” was born about 1638 in Westmoreland, England. He was brought up and educated in the Church of England, but withdrew from the national Church after graduation in the university, and joined the Independents, among whom he held an eminent position as minister. In 1652 he became an adherent to the doctrines of George Fox, the Quaker. Two years later, he set out with two others of the Society of Friends to preach their doctrines for the first time at London. He even went before the protector Cromwell, to seek his influence in aid of the Quakers, who were then greatly persecuted, both in the country and at London; but he does not seem to have been successful in his effort. He escaped, however, after this interview, all personal molestation as long as he continued preaching in London. He and his friends next went to Bristol, where they met with much better success. “Multitudes flocked to hear them, and many embraced their doctrine.” The clergy became alarmed, and Howgill and his co laborers were summoned before the magistrates, and commanded to leave the city immediately. Considering themselves entitled to remain, as “free-born Englishmen,” they tarried in the city, and continued to meet with success. In 1663 we find Howgill at Kendal, again summoned before the justices of the place, who tendered him the oath of allegiance, and on his conscientious refusal of it committed him to prison, in which he remained until his death, Jan. 20, 1688. Howgill wrote a copious treatise against oaths while in prison. He also published *The Dawnings of the Gospel Day, and its Light and Glory discovered* (London

1676, fol.). See Neale, *History of the Puritans* (Harper's edit.), 2, 413-420; Gough, *Hist. of the Quakers*, 1, 112, 126, 144, etc.; 2:31, 96 sq., 236 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Howie, John

a Scotch Presbyterian, was born at Lochgoin Nov. 14, 1735. His father died when John was only one year old, and he was removed to his grandparents' at Blackhill, where he received a limited education. In 1766 he returned to the farm of Lochgoin, to pursue the study of Church history and religious biography, to which he had devoted much of his time for several years. In 1767 his early religious impressions assumed the form of decided piety, and he determined to serve the Church by preparing the book for which he is celebrated, *The Scotch Worthies*. "It is a work of no inconsiderable labor; for, though the biographical information he had procured, and with which his powerful memory was richly stored, must have greatly facilitated the task, yet, living remote from cities, and almost shut out from the abodes of civilized life, the difficulty of correspondence and the want of books must have tended not a little to render his task both painful and irksome. Under all these disadvantages, however, did Mr. Howie, in the seclusion of Lochgoin, bring the work to a successful termination. The first edition appeared in 1774 and a second, greatly enlarged, in 1785 (new edition, revised, corrected, and enlarged, with a preface and notes by Wm. McGavin, Edinb. and N. Y., 1853, 8vo). Like the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' it has been long so extensively popular with all classes of the community, that it has secured for itself a position from which it will never be dislodged, as long as Presbyterianism, and a religious attachment to the covenanted work of Reformation, continue to engage the attention of the natives of Scotland." Besides this work, Mr. Howie published,

1. a collection of *Lectures and Sermons*, by some of the most eminent ministers, preached during the stormiest days of the Persecution: —
2. *An Alarm to a secure Generation* —
3. *Faithful Contendings displayed*; an account of the suffering remnant of the Church of Scotland from 1681-1691 —
4. *Faithful Witness-bearing exemplified*

- 5.** *Patronage Anatomized*, a work which, next to the “Scots’ Worthies,” must be regarded as superior to all his other writings —
- 6.** *Vindication of the Modes of handling the Elements in the Lord’s Supper before giving Thanks*; written during the controversy on this subject among the Antiburgher seceders —
- 7.** *Clarkson’s plain Reasons for Dissenting*, with a preface and notes, and an abstract of the principles of the Reformed presbytery regarding civil government —
- 8.** *Preface to Mr. Brown of Wamphray’s Looking glass of the Law and the Gospel*. Howie died in Sept. 1791. “He was, indeed, a marked character, whether at home, in the public market, or at church; and wherever he went, the fame of his piety and varied acquirements contributed greatly to his influence” (Biogr. Sketch prefixed to the Amer. edition of his “Scotch Worthies”). — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 905. (J.II. W.)

### Howley, William, D.D.

an English prelate, was born at Ropley, Hampshire, in 1765. He was educated at Winchester school, and in 1783 went to New College, Oxford. He was elected fellow in 1785, became canon of Christ Church in 1804, regius professor of divinity in 1809 bishop of London in 1813 and, finally, archbishop of Canterbury in 1828. He died in 1848. His principal works are *Sermon* [on <sup>254B</sup>Isaiah 54:13] (London, 1814, 8vo) — *Sermon* [on <sup>481D</sup>Psalm 20:7, 8] (Thanksgiving, when the eagles taken at Waterloo were deposited in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall) (London 1816, 4to) — *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London the Visitation of 1818* (London 1818, 8vo) — *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London in July, 1826* (London 1826, 4to). — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1. 1564.

### Howson, John

an English divine, born in London in 1556, was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Bampton, in Oxfordshire, the rectorate at Brightwell, in Berkshire, and then became fellow of Chelsea College, and canon of Hereford. In 1619 he was appointed bishop of Oxford, and was transferred to the bishopric of Durham in 1628. He was also at one time vice-chancellor of Oxford. While in this position “he exerted himself against those Puritans who opposed the discipline and

ceremonies, but was afterwards a more distinguished writer and preacher against popery.” He died in 1631. Howson was the author of a number of sermons (published 1597-1661); and four of his polemical discourses against the supremacy of St. Peter were published by order of king James I, “to clear the aspersions laid upon him (Howson) of favoring popery” (1622, 4to). See Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biogr.* 6, 202; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 908.

### Hoyer, Anna

a German enthusiast, was born at Goldenbüttel, near Eiderstadt (Schleswig), in 1584. Her maiden name was OWEN. In 1599 she married a nobleman called Hoyer, and when he died she retired to one of her estates, where she devoted herself to belles-lettres and poetry. Becoming acquainted with an alchemist named Teting, who attended her during a sickness, she was soon fascinated by the views of the mystic, whom she took into her house, and considered as a prophet. She afterwards joined the Anabaptists, and thought herself inspired. Her ardor in making proselytes caused her to lose nearly her whole fortune, and, leaving her country, she went to Sweden, where she found a protector in queen Eleonora Maria, who presented her with an estate on which she resided until her death in 1656. Her views, derived from Paracletus, David Joris, Schwenckfeld, Weigel, and other mystics, are expressed in indifferent verses in her *Works* (Amsterd. 1650). Some of her writings were directed against the Lutherans. See J. G. Feuclitking, *Gynecaemum haeret. fanat.* p. 356 sq.; Arnold, *Kirchen-u. Ketzerhist.* 3, 10, 14; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 319.

### Hozai

(Heb. *Chozay'*, *yz'ij*, *seer*; Sept. οἱ ὀρῶντες, Vulg. *Hozai*, Auth. Vers. the seers,” marg. “Hosai”), a prophet or seer, the historiographer of Manasseh, king of Judah (2 Chronicles 33, 19). B.C. p. 642. The Jews are of opinion that Hosai and Isaiah are the same person; the Sept. takes Hosai in a general sense for prophets and seers: the Syriac calls him *Hanan*, the Arabic *Sapcha*. — *Calmet*, s.v. Bertheau (*Chronik.* Einleit. p. 35) conjectures that *yzwj* is here a corrupt rendering for *μυζwj*, as in ver. 18; but for this there is only the authority of a single Codex and the Sept. (Davidson, *Revision of Heb. Text*, p. 221, b). **SEE CHRONICLES.**

## Hrabanus

SEE RABANUS.

## Hroswitha

SEE ROSWITHA.

## Hu

the most eminent god of the Celtic religion, originally the founder of the religion of the Druids. See vol. 2, p. 180.

## Huarte, Juan

the representative of Spanish philosophy in the Middle Ages, was a Frenchman by birth, and born about 1530. He was educated at the University of Huesca, and afterwards devoted himself to the study of medicine and philosophy. The work to which he owes his great reputation is entitled *Examen de Ingenios, para las ciencias donde de nuestra la diferencia de habilidades que hay en los hombres, y el genero de letras quecada uno responde en particular officina plantiniana* (1593; sm. 8vo, Pamplon. 1575, and often). This work aims to show, "by marvelous and useful secrets, drawn from true philosophy, both natural and divine, the gifts and different abilities found in man, and for what kind of study the genius of every man is adapted, in such a manner that whoever shall read this book attentively will discover the properties of his own genius, and be able to make choice of that science in which he will make the greatest improvement." It has been translated into English by Carew and Bellamy, under the title *Trial of the Wits*; into German by Lessing (*Priüfung der Köpfe*), and into many other languages. Huarte has been severely reproached for having published as genuine a spurious letter of Lentulus, the proconsul, from Jerusalem, in which a description of the Savior's person is given. He died near the close of the 16th century. See Antonio, *Biblioth. Hispana nova*, 1, 543; Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* 3, 528; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Lit.* 3, 189; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 333 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Hubald

SEE HUCBALD.



## Hubbard, Austin Osgood

a Congregational minister, was born in Sunderland, Mass., Aug. 9, 1800. He was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1824. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of the Presbytery of Baltimore, teaching at the same time in the academy at Franklin, Md. He was licensed to preach in 1826, and labored as a missionary some two years in Frederick County, Md. From 1831 to 1833 he was at Princeton Theological Seminary in further theological studies, and preaching to vacant churches in the vicinity. In 1833, during Dr. Alexander's absence in Europe, Mr. Hubbard was appointed assistant professor of Biblical Literature. In 1835 he went to Melbourne, C. E., and labored as a missionary. In 1840 he removed to Hardwick, Vt., and was installed pastor of the Congregational Church in that place July 7th, 1841. In 1845 he was called to Barnet, Vt., and preached there until 1851. In 1855 he accepted a call to Craftesbury, Vt., where he remained until the death of his wife in the fall of 1857, when he became mentally and physically prostrated, and he was removed to the Vermont Insane Asylum in March, 1858, where he died Aug. 24th, 1858. He published *Five Discourses on the moral Obligation and the particular Duties of the Sabbath* (Harm., N. H., 1843, 16mo). "Fervent piety and thorough scholarship combined to render him a faithful and able minister of the New Testament. His views of divine truth were clear and strong, his manner of presenting them forcible and impressive. His sermons were logical, and weighty with matter." — *Congregational Quarterly*, 1, 412 sq.

## Hubbard, John

an English divine and adherent of the "Independents," was born about 1692. He was at first assistant at a church in Stepney, and after the decease of Dr. Taylor succeeded him as pastor of a congregation at Deptford. This position he held for twenty-two years with distinguished skill, fidelity, and diligence. In 1740 he was appointed to the divinity chair of the academy of the Independents at London. "He applied himself to the duties of this office with exemplary diligence, and the most pleasing hopes were entertained of many years of usefulness; but they were extinguished by his decease in July, 1743." He published *Two Sermons at Coward's Lecture* (London, 1729, 8vo). Nine of his sermons are in the Berry Street (Coward's Lecture) *Sermons* (2nd ed. 2 vols. 8vo, 1739). Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (2nd edit.), 2, 219 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 909.

## Hubbard, William

a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1621, and came to this country with his parents in 1630. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1642, a member of the first class. He is said to have pursued a course of theological studies with the Rev. Mr. Cobbet, of Ipswich, whom he also assisted in the pulpit. He was ordained about 1656. In 1685 Mr. Cobbet died, and Hubbard became his successor. In 1686 he served as assistant to the Rev. John Dennison, grandson of Major General Dennison, who was also a graduate of Harvard (1684). In 1689 Dennison died, and, about three years after, the Rev. John Rogers, son of the president of Harvard, became Hubbard's colleague. In 1703, enfeebled by age, Hubbard was obliged to resign his charge, and the people voted him sixty pounds as a gratuity. He died Sept. 14, 1704. His writings were mainly on the history of New England, and he left a work in MS. which has been of service to American historians. He published a *Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians from 1607-1677, with a Discourse* (Boston 1677, 4to) — *Sermons* (1676, 1682, 1684) — and, in connection with the Rev. John Higginson, of Salem, *Testimony to the Order of the Gospel in the Churches* (1701). Hubbard is represented by his contemporaries to have been "for many years the most eminent minister in the county of Essex, equal to any in the province for learning and candor, and superior to all his contemporaries as a writer." — Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 148 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 909.

## Hubberthorn, Richard

a celebrated Quaker of the 17th century, was at first a preacher in the Parliament's army, but he afterwards joined the Quakers, and, in accordance with their principles of peace, quitted the army. After preaching some nine years, he was imprisoned on account of his religious belief, and died from the effects at Newgate, June 17. 1662. Hubberthorn was one of the Quakers liberated by king Charles upon his marriage with Catharine of Braganza, who ordered "the release of Quakers and others in jail in London and Middlesex for being present at unlawful assemblies, who yet profess all obedience and allegiance, provided they are not indicted for refusing the oath of allegiance, nor have been ringleaders nor preachers at their assemblies, hoping thereby to reduce them to a better conformity." Just before this event, Hubberthorn, together with George Fox, had addressed the king and demanded the liberation of their suffering brethren.

— Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 2, 418; Stoughton, *Ecclesiastes Hist. of England*, 1, 275.

### Huber, Johann Ludwig

a German author who at first studied theology, but afterwards devoted his time mainly to the study of jurisprudence deserves our notice on account of his *Versuche mit Gött zu reden* (sacred songs) (Reusl. 1775; Tübing. 1787). He died at Stuttgart in 1800.

### Huber, Kaspar

SEE HUBERINUS.

### Huber, Maria

a celebrated mystic, was born at Geneva in 1694. She retired into solitude in 1712, to indulge in contemplation and mysticism. She afterwards returned to live in Geneva, joined the Roman Church, and died at Lyons in 1759. She is generally named as a deist, yet her opinions partook rather of extreme mysticism than of infidelity her principal works are *Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme* (Amsterd. 1738; London 1739, 2 vols.) in which "she traces all religion to the moral necessities of the heart, and considers revelation a mere auxiliary to natural theology, a means of interpreting it to our own consciousness" (Hagenbach, *Germ. Rationalism*, p. 55 sq.) — *Recueil de diverse pieces servant de supplement aux Lettres sur la religion*, etc. (Berl. 1754, 2 evol.; London 1756) — *Le monde fou prefere au monde sage, divise en trois parties, faisant 24 promenades* (whence the work is sometimes styled *Promenades*) (Amst. 1731 and 1744) — *Le Systeme des theologiens anciens et modernes, sur l'etat des âmes separees des corps* (Amst. 1731, 1733.1739) — *Reduction du Spectateur Anglais a ce qu'il referme de meilleur*, etc. (Par. 1753 12mo). Senebier considers her as the author of the *Histoire d'Abassay* (1753, 8vo), which is generally attributed to Miss Fauque. See Senebier, *Hist. litter. de Geneve*, 3, 84; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Pierer; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 344.

### Huber, Samuel

a German theologian, was born at Berne in 1547. He studied theology in Germany, and became pastor at Burgdorf. He was much given to controversy, especially in behalf of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's

Supper. Censured for a speech he made on the 15th of April, 1588, he nevertheless continued to attack the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and was, in consequence, first imprisoned, and then exiled. In July 1588, he went to Tübingen, where he joined the Lutheran Church. He became pastor of Doredingen, and in 1592 professor at Wittenberg. His belief in free grace, and in the universality of the atonement, brought him into antagonism with Huminus, Leyser, and Gesner (1592); the breach between them was not healed by public discussions held at Wittenberg and Regensburg in 1594. Huber has been wrongly charged with teaching the doctrine of universal salvation. He was a determined opponent of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and held that the words "decree" and "election" were equivalent to "gracious invitation," which God extends to all men without distinction. "But, to make their calling and election, they must repent and believe." Driven out of Hesse-Cassel in 1594, he resided for some time at Jena, Helmstadt, and Goslar. He died March 25, 1624. The most important among his numerous works are *Christum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum* (Tübing. 1590) — *Beständiges Bekenntniss* (1597) — *Amnti-Bellarminus* (Gosl. 1607, 6 vols.). See *Acta Huberiana* (Tüb. 1597; Lüb. 1598); (Götze, *Acta Hub.* (Lüb. 1707); Schmid, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Helmst. 1708); Pfaff, *Introd. in Hist. Liter. Theol.* pt. 2, bk. 3, p. 431; Arnold, *Ketzerhistorie*, 1, 952; Moshelm, *Ch. History*, 3, 158.

### Huberinus (Huber), Kaspar

a Bavarian monk, afterwards a convert to Protestantism, was born near the close of the 15th century. He became a Protestant preacher in 1525 at Augsburg, and was appointed to a church at that place in 1527. He was a zealous opponent of the Anabaptists, who were quite numerous at Augsburg about that time, and he also engaged in the Berne disputations on the ministration of the sacrament. He was in favor of the Lutheran doctrine on this point, and in 1535 he went to Wittenberg, to consult with Luther personally, and to regain for Augsburg the celebrated Urbanus Rhegius (q.v.). Huberinus was also actively engaged in introducing the Reformation in the Pfalz, and in the territory of Hohenlohe. In 1551 he returned to Augsburg as preacher, but as he alone of the Protestant preachers at Augsburg had accepted the Interim (q.v.), he was obliged to leave the city in 1552, and died of grief at Oehringen Oct. 6, 1553. Huberinus wrote quite extensively; among other works, we have from his pen *Tröstlicher Sermon* — *v.d. Urstende Christi* (1525) — *Schlussreden*

*v.d. rechten Hand Gottes u. I. Gewalt Christi* (1529) etc. See Keim, *Schwseb. Ref. Gesch.*, p. 273,278; Döllinger, *Reformation*, 2, 576; Herzog, *Real Encyclopadie* 6, 296; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* p. 372; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 569. (J. H. W.)

### Hubert, Leonard

a Belgian theologian, flourished about the year 1490. He was at first a Carmelite monk, afterwards he became bishop of Darie, then suffragan of the bishop of Liege, and finally "inquisitor" of Liege. He wrote quite extensively. His most celebrated works are *De Immunitate Ecclesiastica Sermons*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25, 35-1.

### Hubert; Mathieu

a distinguished French Roman Catholic, born at Chatillon in 1640, was a priest of the Congregation of the Oratory, and one of the most brilliant preachers of his country and Church. He died at Paris in 1717. He published *Sermons* (Paris, 1725, 6 vols. 12mo). — Feller, *Dict. Hist.* 9, 49 sq.; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 6, 202; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 355. (J. H.W.)

### Hubert (Hubertus), St.

Son of Bertrand, duke of Guienne was high in office under Theoderic, king of the Franks having been a great sportsman, and, according to tradition, converted by a stag which bore a shining cross between his antlers, and which spoke, entreating him to turn from his gay life and serve the Church. He at once entered the Church, succeeded his religious instructor, Lambert (Lamprecht), as bishop of Lüttich in 708, and died in 727. His body was in 827 transferred to the Benedictine convent of Andain, in the Ardennes, which thence received the name of St. Hubertus, and it is here he is said to have had the abovementioned vision. Tradition also holds that his relics, by virtue of the *golden key of St. Hubert*, which he received from St. Peter, can cure hydrophobia, etc. The 3rd of November (*St. Hubert's day*) marks the end of the hunting season, and was celebrated by great hunts (St. Hubert's chase). — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 570; *Theolog. Univ. Lex.* 1, 372.

### Hubert, Order of St.

the oldest and highest order of Bavaria, was founded in 1444, and often reformed, the last time in 1808. The sign of the order is a golden cross on a

shield, in the middle of which is the picture of St. Hubertus (q.v.). It is borne on a golden chain.

### Hubertine Annalist

an anonymous writer of the chronicles of St. Hubert's monastery, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. In his *Chronicles St. Hub. Andaginensis* the style of Sallust is imitated. Bethmann (L. C.) and Wattenbach (W.) issued a new edition of it in Pertz, *Script.* 8, 565-630, and the following opinion of the author is expressed by them: "Satis habeamus nosse, auctorem operis fuisse virum inter medias res versatum, acrem judicio, veritatis studiosum: hoc enim totum ejus dicendi genus, hoc simplex et sincera rerum narratio suadent." — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 296 sq.

### Hübmayr or Hübmeier (Hübmör), Balthasar

one of the most learned of the Anabaptists, was born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, Bavaria, in 1480. He studied theology and philosophy at Freiburg with Eck, and in 1512 went with his teacher to Ingolstadt, where he became preacher and professor. In 1516 he went to Regensburg, where his ministrations led to the expulsion of the Jews; but, having openly expressed sentiments favorable to the Reformation, he was himself obliged to leave Regensburg, and taught school for some time in Schaffhausen. In 1522 he was appointed pastor to Waldshut, where he came under the influence of Münzer, and embraced the Anabaptist views. He wrote several works in support of his new views, more particularly upon baptism and the sacraments; but the ground which he took against his early coadjutor and intimate friend Zwingli provoked a violent reply from the latter, and caused the estrangement of the two friends. Driven to Zurich in 1525 by the Austrian persecution at Waldshut, he was branded as a heretic by Zwingli, and, after suffering imprisonment, finally fled from the Austrian territory (1526). He preached a short time at Constance, and then journeyed to Moravia. In 1528 he was arrested, probably at Brünn, by the Austrian authorities, and was burned at the stake in Vienna (March 10). His wife, who steadfastly adhered to Hübmayr's views, was imprisoned with him, and suffered martyrdom by drowning. Hübmayr is now conceded by all historians to have been a man of very exalted character, and, although a fanatic in religion, it is certain that he never favored the extreme views of some of the Anabaptists. See Brown, *Memorials of*

*Baptist Martyrs*, p. 106 sq.; *Baptist Quarterly Review*, 1869 (July), p. 333; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 203; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 298 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 372. (J. H. W.)

### Huby, Vincent

a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Hennebon, in the Bretagne, May 15. 1608. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1643, and contributed greatly to the growth of this order. He died March 24, 1693. He wrote a number of ascetic works, which have been edited by abbé Lenoir Duparc, and published under the title *AEuvres spirituelles* (Paris, 1753, 1761, 1769; Lyons and Paris, 1827, 12mo); also by the abbé Baudrand (Paris, 1767, 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 361.

### Huc, Evariste Régis

a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Toulouse Aug. 1, 1813. He was educated in his native city, and entered the order of St. Lazarus, and in 1839 was sent as missionary to China. After about three years of missionary labor in the northern districts of China, he started with father Gabet, in the fall of 1844, to explore the wilds of Tartary and Christianize Tibet, according to the directions of the apostolic vicar of Mongolia. Accompanied by a single Chinese convert, a young lama, they reached the lama convent of Kounboun, where they acquired the dialect of Tibet. Towards the end of September 1845, they joined a caravan from China, with which they went to Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. Here they were permitted to remain on their declaration that they had come only for the purpose of preaching the religion of Christ. But they had barely settled when the Chinese ambassador commanded them to leave the country. They were put in charge of a Chinese escort. and carried back a journey of nearly 2000 miles to the extreme south, and arrived in October, 1846, at Macao. Here they were subjected to a trial by the Chinese tribunals, and were finally permitted to return to the station from which they had originally started on this journey. Hue, whose health completely failed him, returned to Toulouse in 1849, and gave an account of this journey in his *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine, pendant les années 1844, 1845, et 1846* (Paris 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). This book met with great success, and was translated into various languages (English by Hazlitt, London 1851, 2 vols. and New York, 1853). It owed its great success partly to its description of a country heretofore unknown, and also

to its lively style. In this work the abbé also pointed out the similarities between the Buddhist and Roman Catholic ceremonials and for it was punished by seeing his book placed on the "Index" (comp. Miller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, 1, 187, note). By order of the emperor, he then published *L'Empire Chinois, faisant suite à l'ouvrage intitulé "Souvenir d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie et le Thibet"* (Par. 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). This work was crowned by the Academy. There are several editions of it and it was also translated into English (N. York, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo). His last work, *Le Christianisme en Chine. en Tartarie, et au Thibet* (Paris, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo, with map), contains a vast amount of historical information; but its chief topic is the propagation of Romanism in China. Hue thinks that "the Gospel will soon take in Asia the place now occupied by the philosophy of Confucius, the traditions of the Buddhists, and the endless legends of the Vedas; finally, that Brahma, Buddha, and Mohammed will disappear to make room for the true God," etc. Hue died in Paris March 31, 1860. See Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, 5, 445; Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Gen.* 25, 361; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1855; *Christian Examiner*, January to May, 1858. (J. H. W.)

### Hucarius

an English deacon who flourished in the 11th century. He wrote one hundred and eight homilies, "which were extant in Leland's time in Canterbury College (now Christ Church), Oxford, but which appear to be no longer in existence. In the prologue to this book, Hucarius stated his name and country, but nothing more is known of him." He is said to have made an extract from the penitential work of archbishop Egbert of York, of the 8th century, as an introduction to the homilies. See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (Anglo-Sax. Period), p. 426; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 21, 604; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 372. (J. H. W.)

### Hucbald

also called HUCBOLD, HUGBALD, UBALD, and HUBALD, a celebrated monk, was probably born about 850, and was educated by his learned relative Milo (q.v.) in the monastery of St. Amandus in Flandern. After Milo's death, Hucbald succeeded him as teacher and presiding officer of the school of this monastery. About 893, archbishop Fulco, of Rheims, called Hucbald to that city, to preside over the cathedral school there he died in 930. He distinguished himself greatly in music, and was the first to



establish the laws of harmony (diaphonia). His lives of some of the saints are considered valuable, especially *Vita S. Lebuini*, *Vita Aldegundis*, *Vita Rictrudis*. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3, 342; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 6, 297 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Hudson, John, D.D.

an English philologist and theologian, was born at Widehope in 1662, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He obtained the degree of Master of Arts in 1684, and shortly afterwards that of Doctor of Divinity. In 1701 he was appointed librarian of the Bodleian library at Oxford, and died Nov. 27, 1719. He is chiefly known on account of his *Geographie Veteris Scriptorum Graeci minores*. etc. (Oxford, 1698, 1703, 1712, 3 vols. 8vo), and his edition of Josephus, entitled *Flavii Josephi Opera* (Oxford 1720, 2 vols. fol.), which appeared shortly after his death. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 372 sq.

### Huel, Joseph Nicolas

a French philosopher, was born at Mattaincourt June 17, 1690. After the completion of his studies at Paris he took orders, and was made curate of Rameux. He is said (Barbier *Dict. des Anonymes*) to be the author of *Essai philosophique sur la crainte de la Mort*, and of *Moyen de rendre nos religions utiles et de nous exempter des dotes qu'elles exigent* (1750), in which important reforms of the religious houses of the Roman Catholic Church are advocated. His special aim was the employment of the inmates of convents in instructing the youth of the land, instead of spending a life of idleness, partly, if not wholly, at the expense of the state. The book was suppressed, but reprinted eleven years after, without, however, awakening any general interest in this reformatory movement. Huel died at Romeux Sept. 3, 1769. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Geneir.* 25, 377 sq.; Classe, *Remarques bibliographiques sur Huel*, in the *Memoires de l'Academie de Nancy* (1856): p. 251. (J. H. W.)

### Huesca, Council of (*Concilium Oscense*)

a council held at Huesca, in Spain, in 598, of which only two canons are extant. One orders that the diocesan synods, composed of the abbots, priests, and deacons of the diocese, be held annually, in which the bishop shall exhort his clergy upon the duties of frugality and continence: the other that the bishop shall inform himself whether the priests, deacons, and

subdeacons observe the law of continence (tom. 5:Cone. 1604). — Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 266.

### Huesca, Duando de

a celebrated member of the Albigenses (q.v.), flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He at length yielded to Romish influences, and returned to that Church, in which he founded a religious community under the name of ‘Poor Catholics.’ In 1207 he went to Rome, and obtained the remission of his heresy from Innocent III, and was by this pope declared the superior of his fraternity. The members of this community lived o(n alms, applied themselves to study and teaching, kept Lent twice a year, and wore a habit of white or gray, with shoes open at the top, but distinguished by some particular mark from those of the Poor Men of Lyons (Insabatati). “The new order spread so rapidly that in a few years it had numerous convents both south and north of the Pyrenees. But, although they professed to devote themselves to the conversion of heretics, and Huesca wrote some books with that view they soon incurred the suspicion of the bishops, who accused them of favoring the Vaudois (q.v.), and concealing their heretical tenets under the monastic garb. They had sufficient influence to maintain themselves for some time, and even to procure letters from his holiness, exhorting the bishops to endeavor to gain them by kindness instead of alienating their minds from the Church by severe treatment; but their enemies at last prevailed, and within a short time no trace of their establishments was to be found.” — McCrie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 36 sq.; *list. Gie. de Languedoc*, 3, 147 sq. (3. H, W.)

### Huet, François

a distinguished French philosopher, was born Dec. 26, 1814, at Villeau, France. He was for a time professor at the University of Ghent, and distinguished himself greatly by his efforts to reform modern philosophy upon the principles of Bordas-Dermoulin, who aimed to conciliate all the political and social influences of the Revolution with the religious traditions of ancient Gallicanism. His last years were spent in educating the young prince of Servia. He died suddenly, while on a visit at Paris, July 1, 1869. His principal works are *Recherches sur la vie, les outrages et les doctrines de Henri de Gand* (1838, 8vo) *Le Cartisianisme ou la veritable renovation des sciences* (1843, 2 vols. 8vo), crowned by the French Academy — *Le Regne social du Christianisme* (1853, 8vo):*Essais sur la Reformé*

*Catolique* (1856, 8vo), written in connection with Bordas-Demoulin — *La science de l'esprit, principes de philosophie pure et appliquée* (2 vols. 8vo, 1864). — Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, p. 907; Brockhaus, *Unsere Zeit*, 5th year, vol. 2 (1869), 237.

### Huet (Huetius), Pierre Daniel

a French scholar, and ecclesiastic, was born at Caen Feb. 8, 1630. He was educated at the Jesuit school of Caen, and was originally intended for the profession of the law; but the perusal of the "Principles" of Des Cartes and Bochart's "Sacred Geography" turned his attention to general literature, and he became a zealous pupil of these distinguished men. In 1652 he accompanied Bochart to Sweden. Here he discovered and transcribed the MS. of Origen, which subsequently became the basis of his celebrated edition of that Church father. He was solicited by the queen to settle in her dominions, but he refused the offer, and returned to France. In 166-11 he published an essay *De Interpretatione*, and in 1668 his edition of Origen's *Commentaria in Sac. Script.* (Rouen, 2 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1685, 3 vols. fol.), with a learned introduction, entitled *Origeniana*, since reprinted in the Benedictine edition of Origen. He thus acquired so great a reputation that he was honored with the degree of doctor of law, and shortly after was appointed subtutor to the dauphin. He also took a leading part in editing the Delphini edition of the Latin classics. In 1674 he was elected a member of the French Academy; and having taken orders in 1676, he was appointed in 1678 to the abbey of Aunay, near Caen. In 1685 he was made bishop of Soissons, but he never entered on this position and was transferred to the see of Avranches in 1692. Desirous of devoting his time to study, he resigned his bishopric in 1699, and obtained the abbey of Fontelnay near Caen. In 1701 he removed to Paris, and resided at the Jesuits' house. He died Jan. 26, 1721. His other principal works are *Demonstratio Evangelica* (Paris, 1679, often reprinted). "This work, which is the great monument of Huet's literary reputation, was the result of various conversations with the eminent Rabbi Manasseh ben-Israel at Amsterdam. It begins with a set. of definitions on the genuineness of books, history, prophecy, the Messiah, and the Christian religion. Then follow two postulates and four axioms. — The propositions occupy the rest of the book, and in the discussion of these the demonstration consists" (Kitto) — *De la situation du Pardlis Terrestre* (Par. 1691, 12mo) — *Commentarius de rebus ad auctorem pertinentibus* (Amst. 1718, 12mo), "his autobiographical memoirs—a model of pure Latinity, as well as the most interesting record of the history of his

time.” It was translated by John Aikin, M.D. (London, 1810, 2 vols. 8vo) — *Censura Philosophiae Cartesianae* (Par. 1689, 1694, 12mo) — *Questiones Alnetance de Concordia Rationis et Fidei* (Caen, 1690). The two last-named works are aimed at the Cartesian philosophy, to which Huet had adhered in his earlier days, and against which he appears in these works as one of the most formidable opponents — *Traite philosophique de la faiblesse de l’Eprit humain* (Amsterd. 1723, 8vo), “which, according to Voltaire, was regarded by many as a refutation of his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and has caused him to be classed among skeptics.” All the works of Huet were published in a collected form in 1712, and an additional volume, entitled *Huetiana*, in the year following his death (1722). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25:387 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; *Quarterly Rev.* (London), 4:103 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 449 sq.; Morell, *list. of Mod. Philosophy*, p. 195 sq., 523. (J.H.W.)

### Hüffel, Johann Jakob Ludwig

a German divine, was born May 6, 1784 at Gladenbach, in Hesse, and educated at the universities of Giessen and Marburg. In 1817 he was appointed minister at Friedberg, in 1825 senior professor in the theological seminary at Herborn, and in 1829 prelate of Baden and religious counselor of the duke of Baden. He died July 26, 1856. Besides a collection of sermons (Giessen, 1817-29), Hüffel published *Wesen u. Berzfd. evang. Geistlichen* (ibid. 1821, 4th edit. 1843) — *Studen christl. Andacht* (1844) — *Briefe ü. d. Unsterblichkeit* (2nd edit. Karlsruhe, 1832). The same subject is still further treated in a later work, entitled *Die Unsterblichkeit avf’s neue beleuchtet* (2nd edit. 1838): — *Der Pietismus geschichtlich beleuchtet* (Heidelb. 1849). — *Theol. Univers. Lex.* 1, 372; *Pireer, Univers. Lex.* 8, 581.

### Hufnagel, Wilhelm Friedrich

a German theologian, was born at Hall, Swabia, June 15, 1754, and educated at the universities of Altorf and Erlangen. In 1779 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Erlangen, and in 1782 he was transferred to the chair of theology as regular professor. In 1788 he received the pastorate of the university church, and was made overseer of the seminary for preachers. In 1791 he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main as preacher of one of the oldest churches of that city. He died Feb. 7 1830. Hufnagel was distinguished both as a preacher and as a theologian, but he

was especially at home in the Shemitic languages. His publications, aside from his *Sermons* (1791-96), are *Variarum lectionum e Bibliis a Nisselio curatis excerptarum specimen* (1777) — *Salmos hohes Lied geprüft, überset u. erläutert* (1784) — *Nov. Biblioth. theol.* (1, 1782-3) — *Bearbeit. d. Schriften d. A. T. nach ihrem Inhalt u. Zweck* (1784), in which he took a rationalistic position — *Iob neu übers. n. Annm.* (1781): — *Dissertatio de Psalinis prophetias Messian. continentibus* (2 pts. 1, 784). — *Biographie Universelle*, 27, 428; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 339 sq.; Doring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl.* 1, 767 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Hug, Johann Leonhard

an eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Constance June , 1765, and educated at Freiburg University. In 1789 he took priest's orders, and in 1791 was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis at his alma mater. In 1792 the New-Testament exegesis was added to the duties of his chair. To fit himself more thoroughly for his professional duties, he visited the great libraries and universities of Central Europe. Though a Roman Catholic, he was too well acquainted with sacred criticism, and, like the celebrated Dr. Jahn, too impartial to be very greatly influenced in his views as a Biblical scholar and critic by his ecclesiastical connections. He wrote *Erfindung d. Buchstabenschrift* (Ulm, 1801) — *Einleitung in d. Schriften d. Neuen Testaments* (Stuttg. 1808, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847). This work, in which he attempts to vindicate and sustain the genuineness of all the-books commonly regarded as canonical, has been translated into French and English (*Introduction to the New Testament*, by Wait, London 1827, 2 vols. 8vo; far better by Fosdick, Andover, Mass., 8vo), and is considered one of the ablest works of the kind.

*Untersuchungen über den Mythos d. berühmtesten Völker d. alten Welt* (Freib. 1812) — *Ueber d. Hohe Lied* (ibid. 1813-1818) — *De conjugii Christiani vinculo indissolubili comment. exeget.* (ib. 1816), in which he took ground against civil marriages — *Katechismus* (ib. 1836) — *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina comment.* (ib. 1818) — *Gutachten über d. Leben Jesu von D. F. Strauss* (ib. 1840-1844, 2 vols.). Hug was also one of the editors, with Hirscher (q.v.) and others, of the *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie* (Bonn, 1839-42). See Maier, *Gedächtnissrede auf Hug* (Freiburg, 1847); *Real Encyklop. d. Kathol. Deutschland*, 5:518 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 19, 658; Chambers, *Cyclopedia*, 5:449 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 340; Haag, *Hist. d. Dogmas Chret.* 1, § 112;

Werner, *Geschichte d. Katholischen Theol.* p. 527 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 400. (J. H. W.)

### Hugg, Isaac

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester, now Camden County, New Jersey, about 1814. But little is known of his early life. He was converted in 1841, licensed to preach about 1844, and joined the New Jersey Conference in 1845. Thenceforward he filled with zeal and efficiency the several positions assigned him, being in many places eminently useful. On Rome and Wantage Circuit, on Cedarville charge and elsewhere, he had extensive and powerful revivals of religion, and founded the first Methodist society at the village of Cranberry, N. J., consisting at first of seven members, which, before the year closed, increased to fifty. About 1855, while laboring on Vernon Circuit, he had his hip dislocated by a fall from his carriage, which caused him a great deal of suffering, and in the spring of 1864, being pressed by increasing affliction, he was obliged to take a superannuated relation, and settled at Pointville, in Burlington County. Here he labored as he had ability, being greatly beloved by the people. He died suddenly, while preparing to re-enter the active work of the ministry, April 5, 1866. "Hugg was emphatically a good man: the poor knew well how to prize him, and the children everywhere loved him. He was a good preacher, and, when health permitted, a faithful pastor." — *New Jersey Conf. Minutes*, 1867.

### Hugh

*SEE HUGO.*

### Hughes, George, B.D.

an English Nonconformist, was born in Southwark in 16)3, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He became fellow of Pembroke College, then lecturer at Allhallows, London, and afterwards minister of Tavistock. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Andrew's, Plymouth, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. — He died in 1667. Hughes was a divine of good natural capacity and learning, and an exact critic for his time. His principal works are: *An Analytical Exposition of the whole Book of Genesis, and of the first twenty-three Chapters of Exodus, wherein the various readings are observed*, etc. (1672, fol.) — *Aphorisms, or Select*

*Propositions of the Scriptures, shortly determining the Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1670, sm. 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1568.

### Hughes, Jabez

an English divine, born in 1685, was educated at Cambridge University, and afterwards became fellow of Jesus College. He is chiefly known as the editor of Chrysostom's treatise *περὶ ἱερωσύνης* or *On the Priesthood* (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2nd edit. in Greek and Latin, with notes and a preliminary dissertation against the pretended *Rights of the Church* etc., 1712, 8vo). He died in 1731. — *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* 7, 276; *London Gent. Mag.* 48, 583,673.

### Hughes, John

an English divine, was born in 1682, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became a fellow of the university. But little is known of his life. He died in 1710. Among his works we find *Dissertationes in quibus Auctoritas Ecclesiastica, quatenus civili sit distincta, defenditur contra Erastianos* (Cambridge, 1710, 8vo; and in English by Hilk. Bedford, London 1711, 8vo) — *St. Chrysostom's Treat. on the Priesthood* (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2nd edit., with notes, etc., 1712, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 911; Lowndes, *Brit. Liter.* p. 535 sq.

### Hughes, John

an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Ireland in 1798, and emigrated to this country in 1817, his father having preceded him about two years. At first he went to a florist to learn the art of gardening, but a few years later he entered the Theological Seminary of St. Mary's at Emmitsburgh, Md., teaching also at the same time. In 1825 he was ordained priest in Philadelphia, and settled over a parish of that city. In 1837 he was appointed coadjutor of bishop Dubois, of New York. and immediately after his consecration in 1838, he assumed the virtual administration of the diocese, but he was not made bishop until 1842. In 1850 New York was raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see, and archbishop Hughes went to Rome to receive the pallium at the hands of the pope. He died January 3, 1864. Even before his elevation to the episcopacy he had gained among his coreligionists some distinction as a champion of his Church by a controversy, in 1830 and 1834, with Dr. John

Breckinridge, on the question, "Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?" Some years later he had another celebrated controversy with Dr. Nicholas Murray, of Elizabeth, who, under the name of "Kinran," published a series of able and interesting articles against the Roman Catholic Church. "Both controversies increased his reputation among his coreligionists; but non-Catholics were not struck by his arguments in favor of Roman Catholicism, and he failed to attract anything like the attention, or produce anything like the impression, which writings of real ability, such as those of Mohler in Germany, and of Brownson and Hecker, are always sure to command." As archbishop, in the administration of the property of the Church, and the use, which he made of it for the spreading of his Church, he displayed a talent rarely found. An immense property gradually accumulated in his hands, which enabled him to increase largely the number of Roman Catholic churches, schools, and other denominational institutions. Thus, in 1841, he opened the Roman Catholic St. John's College, at Fordham, New York, to which he afterwards added the Theological Seminary of St. Joseph. The archbishop sustained a celebrated controversy on this subject with Erastus Brooks, editor of the *New York Express*, and at that time a state senator, who had stated in an address in the senate chamber that the archbishop owned property in New York to the amount of \$5,000,000. A long discussion took place, and this time the ability with which the archbishop defended his statements and his position, was acknowledged alike by Protestants and Romanists. But he opened a breach between the Romanists and Protestants by his unauthorized demands in the School Question, to the effect that the Common Council of New York City should designate seven of the public schools as Catholic schools, and when this was denied both by the Common Council and the Legislature, bishop Hughes advised the Catholics to run, at the next political campaign, an independent ticket. He defended his cause with great ability, but failed to convince Protestants generally of the fairness of the demand to grant to the Roman Catholic community an exceptional prerogative, which was neither possessed nor claimed by any Protestant, body. He also opposed the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in the common school, in which he was not quite so successful as in his other efforts in behalf of Romanism. Archbishop Hughes's political influence in the United States was very great, and he was honored by all sects in a manner unknown in any other Protestant country. Thus, in 1847, he was invited by both houses of Congress to deliver a lecture in the hall of the House of Representatives in Washington, and after the outbreak of the



Rebellion (1862) he was even entrusted with a semi-official mission to France. As a writer archbishop Hughes has done but little, except by the discussions above alluded to. These were all published in book form (Philadelphia 1836, 8vo). He also published a number of his sermons and addresses. Since his decease his "works" have been collected by Lawrence Kehoe (N. Y. 2 vols. 8vo; 2nd ed. 1865). — *N. Tablet*, Jan. 1864; *Methodist*, Jan. 9, 1864; *An Amer. Cyclop.* 1868, p. 429. (J. H..)

### Hughes, Joseph, D.D.

an eminent Baptist divine, was born in London Jan. 1, 1769. In 1784 he became a member of the Baptist Church, and entered the Baptist College at Bristol, where he remained as a student till 1787. He studied also three years at Aberdeen, where he passed M.A. in 1790. In 1791 he became classical tutor in the Baptist College; 1792 to 1796 he was assistant minister at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol; and in 1796 he became pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Battersea. When the "Religious Tract Society" was formed in 1799, he was chosen its first secretary, and he retained this office until his death, Oct. 12, 1833. His industry in official work was enormous, and a great part of the success of the Tract Society is due to his labors. He also took a large part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was its first secretary, retaining the office until his death. His personal history is largely that of this great organization. See Leifchild, *Memoirs of the Rev. J. Hughes* (London 1834, 12mo); *Jubilee Volume of the Religious Tract Society*; Owen, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*. Timpson *Bible Triumphs* (1853, 12mo).

### Hugo

a friar of the order of the *Minimi*, and a doctor of theology, was born at Prato, near Florence, in the latter half of the 13th century. He was a man of remarkable austerity, and imposed upon himself the most severe mortifications. He died in Tartary after the year 1312. Among his works, which remain in MS., are a *letter* to the Minimi of Prato, a treatise *De Vita Contemplativa*, and *De Perfectione Statuum*. — *Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 451.

### Hugo of Amiens, or of Rouen

a distinguished Roman Catholic divine, was born at Amiens, France, towards the close of the 11th century, and was educated at Laon under the

celebrated Anseim. He entered the Benedictine monastery of Clugny, and became prior of the monastery of Limoges in 1113. On account of his great learning and uncommon talent he was transferred as prior to the monastery at Lewes, in England, and in 1125 was appointed abbot of Reading Abbey by Henry I, the founder. In 1129 Hugo was elected archbishop of Rouen, over which see he presided until his death, Nov. 11, 1164. He was quite prominent in the history of celibacy during his day. While archbishop of Rouen, he sought to convert an obscure sect in Brittany, in all likelihood a branch of the Petrobrussians, whose doctrines were “a protest against the overwhelming sacerdotalism of the period, by an elaborate denunciation of their tenets, among which he enumerates promiscuous licentiousness and disregard of clerical celibacy.” Indeed, Hugo was distinguished among his contemporaries not only as a theologian, but also as a statesman. “It was he who, in 1139, at the Council of Winchester, saved king Stephen from excommunication by the English bishops.” He wrote *Dialogi de Summo Bono Libri 7* (published by Martene in his *Thesaur. Anecdorum*, 5, 895), a work of especial interest both to the theologian and the philosopher on account of the views which it sets forth on moral philosophy — *De Haeresibus*, printed by D’Achery as an appendix to the works of Guibert de Nogent, is a work leveled against the heretics of his day, and affording valuable materials on the history of the Church in the 12th century — *De Fide Catholicae*, containing an explication of the Apostles’ Creed and the Lord’s Prayer, published by Martene and Durand in their *Thesaurmus Anecdorum*, vol. 5, and in their *l’eterum Scriptorum Collectio*, vol. 9. See Schröckh *Kirchengesch.* 27, 409 sq.; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 372 sq.; Hoefer— *Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 439 sq.; Gorton, *Biog Dic.* s.v. — (J. H. W.)

### Hugo of Angoulême

flourished in the 10th century. As soon as he had become the incumbent of the see of Angoulême (March 21, 973) he sought also to assume the temporal government over his diocese, and became entangled in controversies with count Arnold, the prince of that country, against whom he even waged war. It is thought that Hugo finally withdrew from the bishopric, retired to the abbey of St. Cibard, and died in obscurity in 990. He is said to have left several works, but they have not yet come to light. — *Hist. Lift. de la France*, vol. 8; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 428.

## Hugo of Besançon

was born towards the close of the 10th century, and was appointed archbishop of Besançon, as successor of archbishop Gaucher of Salins, in 1031. Immediately on assuming the charge of the see he dismissed the canons of St. Anatole of Salins, and gave this church to the monks of St. Benigne of Dijon; but he afterwards repented of the change, and reinstated the chapter of St. Anatole in 1048. He is said to have been an industrious prelate, and to have enjoyed the confidence of his pope and of his emperor. Under the emperor Henry III he was arch-chancellor. He also assisted at the coronation of king Philip I of France. He died July 27, 1066. — Dunod de Carnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Besançon* 1, 29 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. biog. Gen.* 25, 429.

## Hugo of Breteuil

was born near the opening of the 11th century, and was educated as a theologian at the school in Chartres. He was made bishop of Langres by king Robert some time in the first months of 1031. Conducting himself in a manner unworthy of his high position in the Church, he was finally accused of adultery and homicide, and other even more atrocious crimes, and was brought to trial before a council at Rheims. At first he braved the accusations, and sought to defend himself; but, finding that the proof against him was impossible of contradiction, he finally fled, and was punished with excommunication. To *expiate* his crimes he went on foot to Rome, where he procured an audience with pope Leo IX, and obtained pardon. On his return home he died at Biterne, France, March 16, 1051. He is the author of an interesting letter *On the Errors of Berenger* (published as an appendix to the works of Lanfranc). — *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 7, 438; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 428 sq.

## Hugo of Castro-Novo (Newcastle)

an English theologian, flourished, according to Wadding (*Annall. Min.* 3), about 1310. He belonged to the order of the *Minimi*, and was an ardent defender of the philosophy of Duns Scotus. He is said to have been the author of *De Victoris Christi contra Antichristum* (printed in 1471). But his most important work is *De Laudibus B. Mariae* (published 1697, 1698, 1704). It comprises twelve books, the first of which is a simple paraphrase of the angelical salutation (Luke 1, 26 sq.). The third book treats of the carnal prerogatives of Mary, the fourth of her virtues, the sixth of the

names by which she is known, the seventh and eighth of the celestial and terrestrial objects to which she is ordinarily compared, etc. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 450 sq.

### Hugo of Champfleuri

a French prelate, was born in the early part of the 12th century. Of his early life but little is known. In 1151 he was appointed chancellor of France, and in 1159 he was elected bishop of Soissons, retaining, however, his position in the state, from both of which, for unknown reasons, he was deposed in 1171. He died Sept. 4, 1175. — *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 13 536; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25, 445. Hugo OF CITEAUX, a French Roman Catholic theologian who flourished in the 12th century, was a disciple of St. Bernard and abbé of Trois Fontaines. In 1150 he was made bishop of Ostie and cardinal by pope Eugene III. He died in 1158. Hugo wrote a narrative of the death of pope Eugene III, and several other works. He was a prelate of great merit and piety. See *Encyclop. Theologique* (Dict. des Cardinaux), 31, 1083.

### Hugo Of Clugny

SEE CLUGNY.

### Hugo of Falcandus

SEE FALCANDUS.

### Hugo of Farfa

SEE FARFA.

### Hugo de Fleury or de St. Marie

(oftentimes called *St. Benoit sur Loire*), a celebrated Benedictine monk of the abbey of Fleury, on the Loire, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. His *Chronicon*, a history of religion and of the Church, prepared after the manner of his day, viz. consisting of notices of popes, martyrs, and other saints, Church fathers, persecutions, heresies, etc., a work of great celebrity, was probably never brought down by him later than 855, and the continuation from that date to 1034 was in all likelihood prepared by other Benedictine monks (Minster, 1638, 4to). He wrote also *De la Puissance Royale, et de la Digniti Sacerdotale* (found in the Miscellanea

of Baluze). — Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 24, 501 sq.; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 1, 206. (J. H. W.)

### Hugo de Fouilloi

a distinguished French theologian, canon of St. Augustine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. In 1149 he was chosen abbé by the regular canons of St. Denis of Rheims, but he declined this high office. On the decease of the person selected in his stead in 1153, however, he consented to accept the honor. He abdicated in 1174, and his death is supposed to have occurred shortly after. He is said to be the author of a number of works, but as they were not written under his own name, and as some were even printed as the productions of others, it is difficult now to determine them. He is generally believed to be the author of *De Claustro Animce*, a work often attributed to Hugo St. Victor — *De Arca Noe mystica Descriptio* — *De Arca Noe moralis interpretatio* — *De vanitate rerum mundanarum*, etc. — Oudin, *Script. Eccl.*; *Histoire Litt. de la France*, 13, 492 sq.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 2, 442 sq.

### Hugo of Flavigny

a French Church historian, was born at Verdun about the year 1065. While yet a youth he entered the convent of St. Vitonius at Verdun, where he studied under the abbot Rodolph. In consequence of some persecutions, Hugo and the other members of his order removed to Flavigny. In 1097 he was elected abbot of his convent, and in 1111 he exchanged this abbey for that of St. Vannes. According to some, he died there as early as 1115, but according to others he left this convent for St. Dijon about 1115, and the time of his death is much later. Hugo wrote a chronicle extending from the birth of Christ to the year 1102 divided into two parts, under the title *Chronicon Viridumense, Aquibusdam dictum Flaviniacense* (in Ph. Labbei *Bibliotheca Nova*, tom. 1). The first part of this work, which closes with the 10th century, is trifling and erroneous, but the second part contains much important information on the ecclesiastical history of France in the 11th and 12th centuries. — Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25, 433; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 6, 308.

### Hugo of Frazan or Trasan

tenth abbé of Clugny (q.v.), who flourished in the 12th century, became abbé in 1157 or 1158. Taking sides with the anti-pope Victor IV, he was

excommunicated by pope Alexander III, and driven from the abbey. He died after the year 1166. Several works are attributed to him, but without good *reason*. — *Hist. litt. de la France*, 13, 571 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 442.

### Hugo (St.) of Grenoble

was born at Chateauneuf in the Dauphiny, and became a priest at Valence. In 1080 he was appointed bishop of Grenoble, but he only accepted the position after considerable hesitancy, and even left the bishopric some time after, and retired to the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, in Clermont, as a Benedictine monk. By order of pope Gregory VII, however, he returned again to Grenoble. He died there April 1, 1139. He was declared saint two years after by pope Innocent II. Hugo was a very pious man, and especially rigid in the enforcement of the vow of celibacy. During fifty three years, spent in the active duties of his bishopric, it is said he never saw the face of a woman except that of one aged mendicant. See *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* 5, 530 sq.; Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 238.

### Hugo of Langres

SEE BERENGARIUS.

### Hugo of Lincoln

was born in 1140 at Gratianopolis, Burgundy, and was first a regular canon, and later a Carthusian monk. When Henry II founded the Carthusian monastery at Witham, in Somersetshire, he invited Hugo to accept the priorship of this new foundation. After many entreaties by Reginald, bishop of Bath, Hugo consented. He was also made bishop of Lincoln by Henry II. He died in Nov. 1200, and was canonized at Rome in 1221. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 448; Wheatly, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 75; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdot. Celib.* p. 296. (J. H. W.)

### Hugo, archbishop of Lyons

was born about the middle of the 11th century, and was one of the most distinguished supporters of the Romish Church, in her efforts to exalt the papacy, during the last half of the 11th century, when Gregory VII and the emperor Henry were arrayed against each other. He was the papal legate (under pope Urban II) at the Council of Autun, A.D. 1094, who pronounced the ban on king Philip of France for the repudiation of his

lawful wife Bertha. Hugo died Oct. 7, 1106. His only works are his letters, which, according to the *Hist. Lit. de la France* (9, p. 303), are very valuable to the historian of the 12th century. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 123; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 429 sq.

### Hugo of Macon

a French ecclesiastic, was born about the close of the 11th century, and was educated by his cousin St. Bernard. He was appointed abbé of Pontigny, as the representative of which he appeared in 1128 at the Council of Troves. In August, 1136, he was elected bishop of Auxerre, and was consecrated the January following. He was an attendant at the Council of Sens, which condemned the doctrines of Abelard (q.v.); also in 1148 at the Council of Rheims, where he combated the opinions of Gilbert de la Porree. He stood high in the estimate of popes and princes. After his death, Oct. 10, 1151, the manner in which he disposed of the immense fortunes which he had amassed by great avariciousness, and which, instead of being bequeathed for distribution among the poor of his diocese, were given to his nephew, greatly annoyed his friends, and his cousin the pious St. Bernard, finally had the will annulled by pope Eugene III. He is said to have written several books, but there are no writings extant which can be definitely claimed as *his*. — *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 12, 408; Hoefler. — *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 438.

### Hugo of Monceaux

a distinguished French divine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. He was first monk at Vezelay, then abbé of St. Germain (1162). He was consecrated by pope Alexander III, April 21, 1163. The pretensions of bishop Maurice, of Paris, to assist in the ceremony were energetically opposed by Hugo, and this occasioned a controversy, of which a summary was published by Hugo. It forms a very interesting document of his time (printed in the collection of Andre Duchesne, vol. 4). In the same year (May 19) Hugo assisted at the Council of Tours, where he continued the controversy with Maurice, which was finally brought before the pope, who decided in favor of the monk. In 1165 (Aug. 22) Hugo was one of the abbés who presided at the baptism of the royal infant, later Philip Augustus. He was also about this time entrusted with various ecclesiastical offices, and in 1179 he attended the Council of Latran. He

died Mar. 27, 1182. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 446; *list. Litt. de la France*, 13, 615; *Gallia Christiana*, 7 col. 442. (J. H.W.)

### Hugo of Nonant

an English divine, was born at Nonant, in, Normandy, in the first half of the 12th century, and was educated at Oxford University. About 1173 he became archdeacon of Lisieux, and, towards 1185, bishop of Coventry. He was the Romish legate to England during the administration of the bishops of Durham and of Ely, in the absence of Richard to the East, and his influence caused the removal of these bishops in 1191. Only three years later he was himself driven from his see, but he was permitted in 1195 to return again, on paying a fine of 5000 marks silver to the royal treasury. He died in April 1198, during a voyage, or more probably, while in exile a second time. The recital of the disgrace of the bishop of Ely was written down by Hugo, and has been published by Roger of Hoveden (*Script. Rer. Ang.* p. 702). It is a very violent pamphlet. — *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 15; — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 447.

### Hugo de Paganis

*SEE KNIGHT TEMPLARS.*

### Hugo of Potters

a monk of Vézelay, of whose life but little is known, flourished in the 12th century. He wrote a history of the monastery of Vézelay, which has been published by D'Achery in his *Spicilegium*, 3. He is also supposed by some to be the author of the *Chronique des Colmtes de Nevers*, inserted by Labbe in his *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Manuscrits*. He died about 1161. — *list. Litt. de la France*, 7, 668 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Généralé*, 25, 439.

### Hugo of Porto

was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was archdeacon of Compostelle until the bishopric of Porto was established in 1114, when Hugo was elected to this see. He was a member of several Church councils in 1122-25. He died about 1125. Of his writings, the *History of the Church of Compostelle*, which has never been printed, is of especial value for the history of his diocese. — *Histoire Litt. de la France*, 11, 115; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 435. (J. H. W.)



## Hugo of Rheims

son of count Herbert of Vermandois, flourished in the 10th century. He was elected archbishop of Rheims when not quite five years old, and installed as head of the Church in that city by the power of his father; but only six years later Hugo was succeeded by the monk Artold or Artaud. Herbert, dissatisfied with this appointment, made Artold prisoner, and called a synod at Soissons, which confirmed his son Hugo in the archbishopric. After Herbert's death Artold was liberated, and great contentions arose between the two incumbents of the same see. In 947 a synod was held at Verdun; but this, as well as another held at Mousson in 948, proved of no avail, as Hugo had secured for himself the intercession of the pope, who decreed that Hugo should hold the archbishopric. The friends of Artold finally resolved to hold a national synod, when Hugo was deposed and Artold installed. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 22, 252 sq.

## Hugo of Riremont

a French theologian of the 12th century, of whose life but little is known, was the author of *Epistola de Natura et Origine Aniace* (in Martene, *Anecdota*, 1, 368), which is based on the real and supposed works of Augustine. Of Aristotle's treatise *On the Soul* he seems to have been unaware. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 447; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 11, 113.

## Hugo of Sancto Caro

(*Hugh of St. Cher*), sometimes also called HUGO DE S.THEODORICO, an eminent French theologian, was born at St. Cher (whence his surname), a suburb of Vienne, France, about 1200. He studied theology and canon law at Paris, and in 1224 joined the Dominicans in the convent of St. Jacques (whence he is also called HUGO DE ST. JACABO), and in 1227 was made "provincial" of this order in France. He also taught theology in Paris, and was connected with several scientific undertakings. He was one of the commissioners who examined and condemned the *Introductorius in Evang. aetern.* of the Franciscan Gerhard, which developed the fanatical doctrines of Alb. Joachim of Flore (q.v.), and was active in the controversy of William de St. Amour with the mendicant orders. In 1245 he was made cardinal by Innocent IV, and died at Orvieto in 1263. The reputation of Hugo, however, rests chiefly upon his *Biblical* studies and writings. In 1236 he executed a revision of the text of the Latin Vulgate, an immense

labor for that age. A copy of this work preserved in the Nuremberg Library has this title: “*Liber de correctionibus novis super Biblia, ad sciendum quae sit verior et communior litera*, Reverendisimi patris et domini D. Hugonis, sacrae Rom. eccl. presbyteri cardinalis, sacrae theologiae professoris et de ordine praedicatorum.” His principal published works are *Postillae in universa Biblia*, a sort of brief commentary, prepared, however, without sufficient acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible (Basil. 1487, etc.) *Speculum ecclesiae* (Lyons, 1554). But his most important service to Biblical literature was his conception of the plan of a *Concordance*, which he executed, with the aid of many monks of his order, in his *Sacroruma Bibl. Concordantiae* (latest ed. Avignon, 1786, 2 vols. 4to). It is an alphabetical index of all the words in the Vulgate, and has formed the model of all Concordances to the Bible. It had the effect also of bringing the division into chapters and verses into general use. See Quétif et Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, 1, 194 sq.; *Hist. Litter. de la France*, 19:38 sq.; Richard Simon, *Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du N. Test.* 2, 128; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 6; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 450; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 340.

### Hugo of St. Victor

said to have been count of Blankenburg, was born at Ein, near Ypres, about 1097, and educated in the convent of Hammersleben, near Halberstadt. When eighteen years of age he went to Paris, and joined the Augustines of St. Victor. He next became professor of theology, and his success as a teacher and writer was very brilliant. He died at Paris about 1141. Hugo was the most spiritual theologian of his time, and the precursor of the later Mystics. He recommended the use of the Bible for private devotion, and urged also its study on priests and teachers. He followed the theology of Augustine so strictly, and expounded it so successfully, that he was called *Augustine the Second*, and *the Mouth of Augustine*. “In Hugo we see the representative of a school distinguished in the 12th century for its hearty religious spirit, and its tendency to practical reform; a school which, though it united more or less the mystico contemplative with the speculative element, yet constantly kept up the contest with the predominant dialectic tendency of the times. If, in Abelard, we see those spiritual tendencies, which had been harmoniously united by Anselm, brought into conflict with each other, we see them once more reconciled in Hugo, but with this difference, that in him the dialectical element is not so strong as it was in Anselm. In his doctrinal investigations,

he often has reference to, and contends against Abelard, though without mentioning his name. The empirical department of knowledge generally, and in theology the study of the older Church teachers, and of the Bible, was made specially prominent by Hugo, in opposition to one-sided speculation and innovating influences. His principle was, 'Study everything; thou wilt afterwards see that nothing is superfluous.' Adopting the definition of faith in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he remarks, 'Faith is called the substance of things invisible, because that which, as yet, is not an object of open vision, is by faith, in a certain sense, made present to the soul actually dwells in it. Nor is there anything else whereby the things of God could be demonstrated, since they are higher than all others; nothing resembles them which could serve us as a bridge to that higher knowledge.' Hence he declared that, in regard to the essence of true faith, much more depends on the degree of devotion than on the extent of knowledge; for divine grace does not look at the amount of knowledge united with faith, but at the degree of devotion with which that which constitutes the object of faith is loved" (compare Trench, *Sac. Lat. Poetry*, p. 54). In the struggle then raging between scholasticism (Bernhard) and mysticism (Abelard), Hugo inclined rather to mysticism; but, instead of favoring exclusively the one, he aimed rather at combining the two antagonistic doctrines, and giving birth to a new system, containing the better elements of both. It is for this reason that we oftentimes find one or the other of these doctrines quite promiscuously advocated in his writings. A tolerably accurate idea of Hugo's own doctrines, and of the peculiarities of his system, may be obtained by a study of his *Summa sententiarum*. In man, says he, there is a threefold eye: the *bodily eye*, for visible things; the *eye of reason*, which enables man to see his own soul and its faculties; and the *eye of contemplation*, to view divine things. But by sin the eye of contemplation has become blinded, so that faith, which has the advantage of realizing without seeing, comes in its stead, and is the organ of the knowledge of the super terrestrial; while the eye of reason is not so greatly obscured as to excuse man's ignorance of divine things. Thus he acutely distinguishes between what is possible to be known *ex ratione*, the "necessaria" (natural laws), and what *secundum rationem*, the "probabilia," as well as what lies *supra rationem*, the "mirabilia" (divine things), and what must be acknowledged to be *contra rationem*, the "incredibilia." Subject to knowledge are the *necessaria*, subject to faith the *probabilia and mirabilia*. Faith, he continues, is supported by reason, reason is perfected by faith. The certainty of faith is-

superior to opinion, but not to knowledge; still *scire quod ipsum sit* must precede faith; after faith comes *intelligere quid ipsum sit*. Purity of heart and prayer lead upon the steps of *cogitatio*, *meditatio*, and *contemplatio*, gradually to this higher intuition, which affords a real foretaste of heaven itself (compare Ebrard, *Hdbuch. d. Kirch. u. Dogmen-Gesch.* 2, 220). In his *De sacramentis fidei*, treating of redemption, he regards man as the end of creation, and God as the end of Iman. In the doctrine of the attributes of God, he considers, like Abelard, power, wisdom, and goodness as primary, but contradicts Abelard in his view that what God does is the limit of his omnipotence. With Anselm, he seeks to exhibit the doctrine of the Trinity by analogy with the human spirit. Spirit, wisdom, and love, says he, correspond to the three divine persons; but, while human wisdom and affection are liable to changes, the divine are not. On the doctrine of the will, he modified Augustine slightly. He distinguishes, in order to harmonize the freedom of man with the omnipotence of God, between willing *per se*, and the fixing of the will upon something definite; making the former free, and the latter bound by the moral government of God. God is consequently not *auctor ruendi*, but only *ordinator incedendi*. Hugo was also the first to advance distinctly the idea of *gratia superadita*. Grace is both *creatrix* and *salvatrix*; of these, the *creatrix* involved the power to be free from sin, but positively to do good required *gratia apposita*. After the fall, *gratia operans* had to be added to *gratia co-operans*. The essence of original sin he holds to consist in ignorance and concupiscence. To the doctrine of the sacraments Hugo was the first of the scholastics to give definiteness. Unsatisfied with Augustine's definition of them as *sacrae rei signum*, he says, in his *Summa*, that the sacrament is *visibilis borma invisibilis gratiae, in eo collatae*. In his *De sacramentis fidei* he defines it still more distinctly as 'a corporeal, actually perceptible element, which, by virtue of the divine institution, exhibits, and really contains, symbolically, invisible grace.' He also distinguishes three classes of sacraments: the first, those on which salvation especially depends (Baptism and the Lord's Supper); the second, those which are not necessary to salvation, but yet useful for sanctification—the number of these is indefinite; and, thirdly, that which serves to qualify for the administration of the other sacraments priestly ordination. To the first class, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, he gave not only especial prominence, but he laid particular stress on their careful observance. Of course he believed in transubstantiation, calling the mode of the change *transitio*, but he considered it a means of communion with Christ. The best edition of his

collected works is the *first-Opera Omnia*, stud. Badii Ascensii et J. Parvi (Paris, 1526, 3 vols. fol.). The later editions are Venice, 1588; Cologne, 1617; Rouen, 1648: all in 3 vols. See Neander, *Ch. History* 4, 401 sq.; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, 12th century; Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccl.* t. 2 p. 1138; Schmid, *Mysticisimus di. Mittelalters* (Jena, 1824); Liebner, *Monographie über Hugo* (Leips. 1832). A number of the writings attributed to Hugo are probably not his, and others of his real writings remain unedited. The task of selecting what are and what are not his genuine works has been undertaken by M. Haureau, of Paris, who will doubtless do it full justice. See Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 436 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6, 308 sq.; Maurice, *Medieval Philos.* p. 144 sq.; Tiedemann, *Geist. der speculat. Philos.* 4, 289 sq.; Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 8, 206 sq.; Schröckh *Kirchengesch.* 24, p. 392 sq.; 29, 274 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, 2, 467 sq. (J. H. W.)

### Hugo Aicelin de Billom, or Hugo Séquin

was born at Billom, in Auvergne, about 1230, was educated at the college of the Church of St. Sirene, and afterwards entered the monastery at Clermont. He preached at various places with great success, and was awarded, on account of his superior scholarship, the doctorship of divinity by the University of Paris, where he was afterwards professor of theology. In 1285 Hugo went to Rome, and was appointed by pope Honorius IV master of his palace. Nicolas IV made him cardinal, May 15, 1288. He died at Rome Dec. 29, 1297. He is said to have written works on the *beatific vision*, an apologetical work against the corrupters of the doctrines of St. Thomas, On *Jeremiah*, a volume of *Sermons*, etc. See Echard, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum*, 1, 450 sq.; *Encyclop. Theolog.* 31, 1091 sq.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 450.

### Hugo, Ethérien

a Tuscan theologian of the 12th century, contemporary of pope Alexander III, to whom he dedicated the principal of his works, lived some time at the court of Constantinople, and was highly esteemed by the emperor Comnenus. On the occasion of his conference with the Greek theologians he wrote his treatise *De Haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt*, also known under the title of *le Immortali Deo*, libri 3. It is published in the Lyons edition of the *Library of the Fathers*, vol. 22:col. 1198. The

same collection contains also a treatise of Hugo on the *State of the Soul separated from the Body*. — *Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs eccles. du douzieme siecle*; *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 448.

## Hugo Grotius

*SEE GROTIUS.*

## Hugo, Herman

a distinguished Jesuit, born at Brussels in 1588, wrote several historical and theological works he is celebrated on account of his *Pia desideria emblematicis illustrata* (1624, 8vo; 1629, 12mo; translated into English as *Divine Addresses*, by Edmund Arkwater. 3rd edit. corrected, London 1702, 8vo). He died of the plague at Rheinberg Sept. 10, 1629. See *Darling, Cyclop. Bibl.* 2, 1572; *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* p. 336.

## Hugociano, François

a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, according to some was an Englishman by birth, but according to others was born at Pisa in the first half of the 14th century. By an acquaintance which he formed with pope Boniface IX he was able to procure the archbishopric of Bordeaux in 1389, and some time after he was also made Boniface's legate to Gascogne, the kingdoms of Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Aragon.. In 1405 he was made cardinal by pope Innocent VII, and was employed by the papal chair in several theological controversies. He was especially prominent at the Council of Pisa in 1409. He died at Florence Aug. 14, 1412. See *Encyclop. Theol.* 31, 1082 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Hugonet, Philibert,

a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the 15th century was educated at the universities of Dijon, Turin, and Padua. and succeeded his uncle in the bishopric of Macon. He was made cardinal in 1473 by pope Sixtus IV, and died at Rome in 1484. See *Encyclop. Theol.* 31, 1083; *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Généralé.* 25, 426.

## Huguceio of Pisa

*SEE GLOSSATORES.*

## Huguenots

originally a nickname applied to the partisans of the Reformation in France. The origin of this word is rather obscure. Some derive it from *Huguon*, a word applied in Touraine to persons who walk at night in the street—the early French Protestants, like the early Christians, having chosen that time for their religious assemblies. Others derive it from a faulty pronunciation of the German *Eidgenossen*, signifying *confederates*, on account of the connection between the French Protestants and the Swiss confederates, who maintained themselves against the tyrannical attempts of Charles III, duke of Savoy, and were called *Eignots*. Others derive it from the part which the French Protestants took in sustaining Henry IV, the descendant of *Hugues* Capet, to the throne of France against the Guises. Another derivation is from the subterraneous vaults in which they held their assemblies, outside the walls of Tours, near a gate called Fourgon, an alteration from *feu Hugon*. This last derivation is strengthened by the fact that they were originally called “Huguenots of Tours.” Still others derive it from the name of a very small coin of the time of Hugues, to denote the vile condition of the Protestants. Thus the distinguished German philologist, Prof. Mahn, of Berlin, in his *Etymologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Romanischen Sprachen*, gives no less than fifteen supposed derivations, but inclines himself to the opinion that the word Huguenot was originally applied as a nickname to the early French Protestants, and that it was derived from *Hughues*, the name of some heretic or conspirator, and was formed from it by the addition of the French diminutive ending *ot*, like *Jacot*, *Margot*, *Jeannot*, etc.

At the very commencement of the Reformation in Germany, adherents of the cause of the Reformers sprang up in France, then under the government of Francis I. Under the powerful support which these French Reformers found in Margaret of Navarre, sister of the king, as early as 1523 Melchior Wolmar, a Swiss, preached the Gospel in the south of France, and Lutheran societies, at this time calling themselves Gospellers (q.v.), were organized by Gerhard Roussel and Jacob Lefevre. **SEE FABER**. The circulation of Lefevre’s New Testament by the thousand throughout France by peddlers from Switzerland, where copies were printed by Farel (q.v.), still further increased the number of the Reformers, and finally led to the promulgation of an ordinance by the Sorbonne, obtained from the king, for the *suppression of printing* (Feb. 26, 1535). In 1533, Calvin (q.v.), who had been invited to Paris by the rector of the University, began to

preach the new doctrines in that and other cities, and by his efforts greatly furthered the success of the French Protestants, who now began to be known by the name of Huguenots. Indeed, so numerous had they become, that to exterminate, if possible, by force, their doctrine before it should spread further, the Church resorted, by consent of the king, in 1545, to a massacre in the Vaudois of Province, which was accompanied by horrors impossible to describe. The new-view religion, however, made rapid progress in spite of all persecutions and men of rank; of learning, and of arms ranged themselves in its defense. "The heads of the house of Bourbon, Antoine, duke of Vendome, and Louis, prince of Conde, declared themselves in its favor. The former became the husband of the celebrated Jeanne d'Albret, queen of Navarre, daughter of the Protestant Margaret of Valois, and the latter became the recognized leader of the Huguenots. The head of the Coligny family took the same side. The Montmorencies were divided; the Constable halting between the two opinions, waiting to see which should prove the stronger, while others of the family openly sided with the Reformed. Indeed, it seemed at one time as if France were on the point of turning Protestant." The Huguenots had become strong enough to hold a synod as early as 1559, and in 1561 cardinal De Sainte-Croix becoming alarmed, wrote the pope, "The kingdom is already half Huguenot," while the Venetian ambassador Micheli reported to his government that no province in France was free from Protestants. The Roman Catholic clergy, in influence at court, now decided to drive Henry II to a more determined opposition against the Huguenots by assuring him that his life was threatened. Cardinal de Lorraine, the head of the Church in France, declared to him that, "if the secular arm failed in its duty all the malcontents would throw themselves into this detestable sect. They would first destroy the ecclesiastical power, and the royal power would come next." The immediate consequence was a royal edict, in 1559, declaring the crime of heresy punishable by death, and forbidding the judges to remit or mitigate the penalty. The fires of persecution, which had for a time been smoldering, again burst forth. The provincial Parliaments, at the instigation of the Guises, established *Chambres ardentes* for the punishment of Protestants; and executions, confiscations, and banishments became the order of the day throughout France. The death of Henry II, and the accession of Francis II, did not modify in the least the existing state of affairs. More violent measures, even were taken, none of which succeeded in eradicating the great eyesore of the adherents of the prevalent Church, whose office had now become that of the executioner and hangman. The



Protestants could endure these persecutions no longer, and resolved on open revolt. Protected by Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, by the Condes, the Colignys, and also by such Romanists as were politically opposed to the Guises, the Huguenots formed a strong opposition. Having chosen Louis de Conde for their leader, they decided, Feb. 1, 1560, at Nantes, to address a petition to the king, and, in case it were rejected, to put down the Guises by force of arms, capture the king, and make the prince of Conde governor of the kingdom. The carrying out of this plan was entrusted to Georges de Barri de la Renaudie, a nobleman from Perigord. The conspiracy, however, was discovered through the treachery of count Louis de Sancerre, and the court was removed to Amboise. Some of the Huguenots followed it in arms, whence the whole affair became known as the conspiracy of Amboise. They were defeated, however, by the forces of the Guises, and 1200 of them, taken as prisoners, were executed. The Guises now aimed at the introduction of the Inquisition in France; but, at the instigation of the noble chancellor l'Hôpital [see Hôpital], the king gave to Parliament, by the edict of Romorantin, in May, 1560, the right of deciding in matters of faith, leaving, however, to the bishops the privilege of discovering and pointing out heretics.

During the minority of Charles IX, who ascended the throne Dec. 5, 1560, a boy only ten years old, the strife between the parties which divided the court became more violent, as the chancellor de l'Hôpital, on the assembling of Parliament in Dec. 1560, had exhorted men of all parties "to rally round the young king; and, while condemning the odious punishments which had recently been inflicted on persons of the Reformed faith, announced the intended holding of a national council, and expressed the desire that henceforward France should recognize neither Huguenots nor papists, but only Frenchmen." Catharine de Medicis, the regent, who regarded it to her interest to balance the power of the two parties so as to govern both more easily, seconded the views of the chancellor. The two princes of Conde, who had been prisoners at Lyons after the affair of Amboise, were liberated. Antoine de Navarre was made constable of France, and a new edict was published in July 1561, which granted full forgiveness to the Huguenots, who, it was stated, were no longer to be designated by such nicknames. Finally, a conference was appointed (Sept. 3) for both parties to meet with a view to conciliation. This conference is famous in history as the Conference of Poissy (q.v.). The Cardinal de Lorraine led the Roman Catholic theologians, but was signally defeated,

especially by the arguments of Theodore Beza. The Huguenots, emboldened by their success, now adopted the Calvinistic Confession, and, thus united themselves more strongly against Romanism, counting among their friends Catharine herself, who had been forced to their side by the machinations of the Guises. January 17, 1562, a royal edict was issued, guaranteeing to the Protestants liberty of worship. The Guises and their partisans now became exasperated. On Christmas day, 1562, about 3000 Protestants of Vassy, in Champagne, met for divine worship, and to celebrate the sacrament according to the practices of their Church. Vassy was one of the possessions of the Guises, and the bishop of Chalons complaining to Antoinette de Bourbon, an ardent Roman Catholic, she threatened the Huguenots, if they persisted in their proceedings, with the vengeance of her son, the duke of Guise. Undismayed by this threat, the Protestants of Vassy continued to meet publicly, and listen to their preachers, believing themselves to be under the protection of the law, according to the terms of the royal edict. On March 1, 1563, while the Huguenots of Vassy, to the number of about 1200, were again assembled for divine worship in a barn — as they had shortly before been deprived of their churches by Catharine who made this concession to Antoine de Navarre, in order to secure her support, still leaving them, however, free to assemble in the suburbs and in the country on the estates of noblemen — they were attacked by a band of armed men, led by the duke of Guise, and massacred. For an hour they fired, hacked, and stabbed amongst them, the duke coolly watching the carnage. Sixty persons of both sexes were left dead on the spot, more than two hundred were severely wounded, and the rest contrived to escape. After the massacre the duke sent for the local judge, and severely reprimanded him for having permitted the Huguenots of Vassy to meet. The judge entrenched himself behind the edict of the king. The duke's eye flashed with rage, and, striking the hilt of his sword with his hand, he said, "The sharp edge of this will soon cut your edict to pieces" (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 48; comp. Davila, *Histoire des Guerres civiles de France*, 2, 379). This massacre was the match applied to the charge ready to explode. It was the signal to Catholic France to rise in mass against the heretics, and to Protestant France a warning for their lives. An army of Roman Catholics gathered, at the head of which were the duke of Guise, the constable of Montmorency, and marshal St. Andre, who seized the king and the regent under pretence of providing for their safety, proclaimed the Huguenots, who had at the same time been gathering at Orleans under Conde, rebels, and sent an army against them. Thus began

*the first war of the Huguenots.* September 11, 1562, the royal troops, after much bloodshed, took Rouen, and December 19 a battle was fought at Dreux, in which, after a terrible struggle, the Protestants yielded. One of the leaders of the Romanists, marshal St. André, fell in battle; another, the constable of Montmorency, was made prisoner by the Huguenots, and the leader of the latter in turn fell into the hands of the Guises. An exchange of prisoners, however, was immediately effected. The duke of Guise now marched against Orleans, but was assassinated in his own camp, Feb. 18, 1563, before he had been able to attack this great stronghold of the Protestants. The queen mother, realizing the loss which the Romanists, to whose side she had been forced by policy, had sustained in the death of the duke of Guise, and informed of a threatened invasion of the English on the coast of Normandy, concluded the peace of Amboise, March 19, by which the Protestants were again granted the privileges of the edict of 1562, with several additions. The armies now united, and made common cause against the English. As soon, however, as Catharine thought herself able to dispense with the aid of the Huguenots, whom she both feared and hated, and on whose destruction she was resolved, she again restricted the privileges conceded them in the edict of Amboise, formed a close alliance with Spain for the extirpation of heresy, and made attempts to secure the imprisonment, and death if possible, of Conde and of the admiral Coligny (q.v.). The Huguenots now became alarmed, and their leaders adopted the resolution, Sept. 29, 1567, to secure, at the castle of Morceaux, the king's person, in whose name Catharine de Medicis was acting. The court, having received information of this decision, fled to Paris. Conde immediately followed, and, laying siege to the city, opened *the second war of the Huguenots.* After a siege of one month, Conde and the constable Montmorency met for battle, November 10, 1567, at St. Denis. Here 2700 Huguenots fought against no less than 20,000 royal troops. But so well did the Huguenots maintain their ground, that the victory was undecided. The superior force of the royal troops led Conde to fall back into Lorraine, where he was re-enforced by 10,000 German warriors, under prince John Casimir. Conde with these forces now threatened Paris (Feb. 1568), and Catharine, in her fright, at once offered a treaty of peace, which was contracted at Longjumeau March 27, 1568, re-establishing the terms of the treaty of Amboise generally known as the *petite paix* (little peace) of Longjumeau. Notwithstanding this treaty, which both parties seem to have signed only because they felt under compulsion, Catharine continued all manner of persecutions against the Protestants. "The pulpits, encouraged

by the court, resounded with the horrid maxim that faith need not be kept with heretics, and that to massacre them was just, pious, and useful for salvation” (De Thou, *Vie de Coligny*, p. 350). In less than three months more than 3000 Protestants were either assassinated or executed.

L’Hôpital, the friend of peace, and the upholder of the rights of all citizens without distinction of creed, who had become obnoxious to Rome and her adherents, was dismissed or forced to resign, and the seizure of Conde and Coligny resolved upon. Fortunately, however, for the Protestants, some of the royal officers were unwilling to be instruments in the massacre likely to ensue upon such an act, and Conde and Coligny received warning to flee for their lives. Rochelle, one of the strongholds of the Protestants, which had baffled all the attacks and plans of Catharine, was open to receive them, and thither they consequently directed their steps for safety, closely pursued by the royal blood-hunters. Measures had also been planned for entrapping the other leading Protestants, but they all failed in the execution. “The cardinal of Chatillon, an adherent to the Protestant cause, who was at his see (Beauvais), escaped into Normandy, took the disguise of a sailor, and crossed over to England in a small vessel, and there became of great service to the Protestant cause by his negotiations. The queen of Navarre, warned in time by Coligny, also hastened to Rochelle with her son and daughter, contributing some money and four thousand soldiers. The chiefs-in-general took the defensive, and immediately raised levies in their different provinces. The guerrillas maintained by these persons kept the Catholic army in full employment, and preserved Rochelle from a general attack till proper measures had been taken for its defense.” Catharine, outwitted in her diabolical attempts, now resolved to cajole the Huguenots into submission, and to this end published an edict declaring the willingness of the government to protect the Protestants in future, as well as to render them justice for the past. But so completely was this edict at variance with her conduct that it passed unnoticed. Enraged at this, she now promulgated several edicts against the Protestants, revoking every edict that had ever been published in their favor, and forbade, under the penalty of death, the exercise of any other religion than the Roman Catholic. This sudden revocation of all former edicts made her acts a public declaration that she was resolved on a war of religion, and the Huguenots, fortified in their strongholds, and with assistance, which they had obtained from Germany and England, now began the *third religious war*. On March 13, 1569, the two contending armies met in battle at Jarnac, near La Rochelle, in which the Catholics, headed by the duke of Anjou, later Henry III, defeated the

Protestants, making prince Conde a prisoner, whom they afterwards, on recognition in the camp, murdered in cold blood. The Protestants being thus left without a leader, the command was entrusted to Coligny. But the admiral, ever unselfish in his motives, finding that the army had become greatly dispirited by their recent reverses, urged Jeanne D' Albret, queen of Navarre, to give them her son as princely leader. She at once hastened to Cognac, where the army was encamped, and presented her son, prince Henry of Beam, afterwards Henry IV, then in his 16th year, and Henry, son of the lately fallen Conde, still younger, as the leaders of the cause, under the guidance of Coligny. Having obtained further re-enforcements from Germany, the Huguenots now laid siege to Poitiers, but on Oct. 3, 1569, were again defeated in a battle at Moncontour. Still sustained by means from England, Switzerland, and Germany, the Huguenots were enabled to take Nimes in 1569, to free prince Henry of Navarre and the eldest Henry of Conde in La Rochelle, to beat the royal army at Luçon and Arnay-le-Duc in 1570, to besiege Paris, and, finally, to dictate (Aug. 8, 1570) the terms of the peace of St. Germain-en-Laye, by which they were to hold La Rochelle, La Charitd, Montauban, and Cognac for two years, and were guaranteed liberty of worship outside of Paris, equality before the law, admission to the universities, and a general amnesty. "Under the terms of this treaty, France enjoyed a state of quiet for about two years, but it was only the quiet that preceded the outbreak of another storm."

Having failed to crush the Protestants in the open field Catharine, now sought to accomplish her object by treachery and by a general massacre. In her artful way she contrived a marriage between her own daughter Margaret of Valois, sister of the king, and Henry of Beam, king of Navarre, the proclaimed leader of the Huguenots. Jeanne d' Albret, the mother of Henry of Beam, and even the admiral Coligny, heartily concurred in the projected union, in the hope that it would be an important step towards a close of the old feud; but many of the Protestant leaders mistrusted Catharine's intentions, especially after her late attempt to assassinate Coligny, and they felt inclined to withdraw. None the less, as the preparations for the royal nuptials were in progress, the Reformers took courage, and resorted in large numbers to Paris to celebrate the great, and to them so promising, event. Catharine now felt that her favorable moment had come. On the day after the marriage, which had been celebrated with great pomp, and was followed by a succession of feasts and gayeties, in which the principal members of the nobility,

Protestant as well as Romanist, were participating, and while the fears of the Huguenots were completely disarmed, a private council was held by Catharine and the king, in which it was decided that on a given night all the Protestants should be murdered, with the exception of Henry of Beam and the young prince of Conde. For the head of Coligny the king offered a special price of 50,000 crowns; but the attempt made upon his life failed to prove fatal to Coligny, and the hypocritical Charles even professed sorrow for the injury he sustained. *SEE COLIGNY*. The night of August 24, 1572, was appointed for the massacre. About twilight in the morning of the 24th, as the great bell of the church of St. Germain was ringing for early prayers, to open the festival of St. Bartholomew's day, Charles, his mother, and the duke of Anjou sat in a chamber of the palace to give the signal for the massacre. A pistol-shot fired from one of the windows of the palace called out 300 of the royal guard, who, wearing, to distinguish themselves in the darkness, a white sash on the left arm and a white cross in their hats, rushed out into the streets, shouting "For God and the king!" and commenced the most perfidious butchery recorded in history. The houses of the Huguenots were broken in, and all who could be found murdered, the king himself firing from his windows on those who passed in the street. Some 5000 Huguenots, among them their great and noble leader, the admiral Coligny (q.v.), were thus killed in Paris; while many Roman Catholics met with the same fate at the hands of personal enemies, under the plea of their being inclined to Protestantism. The next day orders were sent to the governors of the provinces to follow the example of the capital. A few only had the manliness to resist this order, and in the space of sixty days some 70,000 persons were murdered in the provinces. *SEE BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY*. Those who escaped took refuge in the mountains and at La Rochelle. Henry of Navarre was compelled to sign a recantation. The prince of Conde became a Roman Catholic, and Charles IX declared in Parliament that Protestantism was extinct in France. "Catharine de Medicis wrote in triumph to Alva (the ignominious commander of Philip's troops in the Netherlands), to Philip II of Spain, and to the pope, of the results of the three days' dreadful work at Paris. When Philip heard of the massacre, he is said to have laughed for the first and only time in his life. Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannon were fired at St. Angelo; Gregory XIII and his cardinals went in procession from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck to celebrate the atrocious event, with the pope's head on one side, and on

the other an angel, with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, pursuing and slaying a band of flying heretics. The legend it bears, ‘*Ugonottorum Strages, 1572,*’ briefly epitomizes the terrible story.” The festival of St. Bartholomew was also ordered to be yearly celebrated in commemoration of the event. Not satisfied with these demonstrations at Rome, Gregory sent cardinal Orsini on a special mission to Paris to congratulate the king His passage was through Lyons, where 1800 persons had been killed, the bodies of many of whom had been thrown into the Rhone to horrify the dwellers near that river below the city (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 60).

Although deprived so suddenly of their leaders, and greatly weakened by the slaughter of great numbers of their best and bravest men, the Protestants gathered together in their strong places, and prepared to defend themselves by force against force. “In the Cevennes, Dauphiny, and other quarters, they betook themselves to the mountains for refuge. Ill the plains of the south fifty towns closed their gates against the royal troops. Wherever resistance was possible it showed itself.” Thus opened *the fourth war of the Huguenots*. The duke of Anjou, at the head of the Romanists, marched against the forts in the hands of the Huguenots. He attacked La Rochelle, but was repulsed, and obliged to retire from the siege, after losing nearly his whole army. The duke of Anjou becoming king of Poland, peace was concluded June 24, 1573, and the Protestants received as security the towns of Montauban, Nimes, and La Rochelle, besides enjoying freedom of conscience, though not of worship, throughout the kingdom. Charles IX falling ill, the so-called *Conspiration des politiques* was formed by the Huguenots, with a section of the Roman Catholic nobility, to depose the queen and the Guises, and to place on the throne the chief of the Romanists, the duke of Alençon, the youngest son of Catharine and of Francis II, who, from political motives, made common cause with the Huguenots. The leaders made arrangements with Henry of Navarre and the prince of Conde, Protestant princes, for the humiliation of Austria, and only a premature rising of the Protestants defeated the plan. Some of the conspirators were executed, D’Alençon and Henry of Navarre were arrested, and Conde fled to Germany, where he returned to Protestantism, saying that his abjuration had been obtained from him by violence.

The *fifth ‘war’ of the Huguenots* began under Henry II, the former duke of Alençon, who became king of France in 1574. In this war the Roman

Catholics lost several strong towns, and were repeatedly defeated by the Huguenots. The prince of Conde returned to France with a German army under the orders of John Casimir, and in March 1576, was joined by the duke of Alençon, who was at enmity with the king. In the south, Henry of Navarre was making rapid progress. The court became alarmed, and finally concluded the peace of Beaulieu, May 8, 1576, granting the Huguenots again a number of places of security, and freeing them from all restrictions in the exercise of their religion, also the promise to indemnify the German allies of the Huguenots for the war expenses. The Guises, thus frustrated in their political designs, instigated the inhabitants of Peronne, under the leadership of Humieres, to organize an association called the *Holy League* (q.v.), in 1576, for the defense of the interests of Romanism. The league rapidly increased, was supported by the king, by Spain, and the pope, and finally led to the *sixth war of the Huguenots*. The states, however, refusing to give the king money to carry it on, and the Roman Catholics being divided among themselves, the peace of Bergerac was signed in September, 1577. The conditions were the same as on the former occasions; but Catharine, in her anxiety to diminish the growing power of the Guises, entered into a private treaty with Henry of Navarre (at Nerac), and thus the Protestants were put in possession of a few more towns.

The *seventh war of the Huguenots*, called at court the *Guerre des amoureux*, was occasioned by the Guises, who instigated the king to demand back the towns given to the Protestants as securities, and to violate the treaty in various ways. Conde answered by taking Lafère in November 1579, and Henry by taking Cahors in April, 1580. The duke of Anjou intending to employ the royal forces in the Netherlands, and the Huguenots having met with several disastrous encounters with the Romanists, peace was concluded again at Flex, Sept. 12, 1580, and the Huguenots were permitted to retain their strongholds six years longer. A comparatively long interval of peace for France now followed.

But when the duke of Anjou (formerly of Alençon) died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the "Holy League" sprang again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of *Liguze des Seize*), took an active part in it. Henry, duke of Guise, finally concluded a treaty with Spain, signed at the castle of Joinville January 3,



1585, creating a strong opposition to the succession of Henry of Navarre to the throne, and aimed even against Henry III, who seemed inclined to favor his brother-in-law. At the same time the Guises sought, though not altogether successfully, the approbation of pope Gregory XIII to the declaration of cardinal of Bourbon as heir to the throne, under the pretense that, as a faithful Catholic, he would aid his Church in extirpating heresy. The real object of the duke of Guise, however, in proposing so old an incumbent for the throne, was to obtain for himself the crown of France, which seemed by no means a chimerical attempt, as he had received strong assurances of support from Spain. With the assistance of soldiers and funds sent him by his Spanish ally, the duke succeeded in taking several towns, not only from the Huguenots but also from the king. Henry III, hesitating to send an army against the duke of Guise promptly, was finally obliged to sign the edict of Nemours, July 7, 1585, by which all modes of worship except that of the Roman Catholic Church were forbidden throughout France. All Huguenot ministers were given one month, and the Huguenots six months, to leave the country, and all their privileges were declared forfeited. Though put under the ban as heretics by pope Sixtus V, Henry of Navarre and the prince of Conde prepared to resist the execution of the royal edict by force of arms. With the aid of money from England, and an army of 30,000 men sent from Germany, they took the field in 1587, and began the *eighth war of the Huguenots*, called also, from the names of the leaders, the *war of the three Henrys*. The Huguenots gained the battle of Contras, Oct. 8. 1587, but were subsequently defeated, and their German allies were obliged to leave the country. The duke of Guise was left master of the field. He was not slow to grasp the power of the state, and obliged the king to sign the edict of reunion of Rouen, July 19, 1588, for the forcible submission of the Huguenots, and the exclusion of Henry of Navarre from the succession to the throne. The king, to whom it now became evident that the duke of Guise's aim was to secure the throne for himself, feigned acquiescence in the demand, called a Parliament at Blois in order to gain time, and there caused both of the Guises to be murdered (Dec. 23, 1588). Both Protestants and Roman Catholics were indignant at this act of treachery; the Parliament denounced the king as an assassin, and Charles of Guise, duke of Mayenne, who had escaped the massacre, made himself master of several provinces, marched on Paris, and took the title of lieutenant general of the kingdom. Catharine having died in 1589, Henry III made a treaty with Henry of Navarre, but was himself assassinated in the camp of St. Cloud by the monk Jacques Clement,

August 1, 1588. Henry of Navarre, a Protestant in belief, now succeeded to the throne under the title of Henry IV. His first step was to conquer for himself the possessions which had been wrested from his kingdom by the league and the Spaniards. But finding that he could obtain security of life and permanent possession of his dominion only by becoming a Roman Catholic, he abjured the faith of his fathers in the church of St. Denis, July 25, 1593. The duke of Mayenne, supported by Spain still continued the war against the king, but the latter having obtained absolution from the pope in 1595, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits, who had sold their influence to Spain, many forsook the league to join the royal standard, and the duke of Mayenne was finally obliged to make peace with the king. On April 15, 1598, Henry IV granted to the Protestants, for whom he ever cherished great affection, the celebrated *Edict of Nantes* (q.v.), consisting of ninety-one articles, by which the Huguenots were allowed to worship in their own way throughout the kingdom, with the exception of a few towns; their ministers were to be supported by the state; inability to hold offices was removed; their poor and sick were to be admitted to the hospitals; and, finally, the towns given them as security were to remain in their hands eight years longer. Pope Clement VIII became enraged at the concessions, and wrote Henry that "a decree which gave liberty of conscience to all was the most accursed that had ever been made." His influence was also used to induce Parliament to refuse its approval to the edict, but it was finally registered in spite of Romish craftiness, Feb. 25, 1599.

After repeated attempts upon the life of the king, who had made himself especially obnoxious to the Jesuits, he was eventually assassinated by Ravallac May 14, 1610. Henry's second wife, Mary of Medicis, and her son Louis XIII, still a minor, now assumed the government. The edicts of toleration were by them also ratified; but, notwithstanding this public declaration on their part, they were practically disregarded and violated. When prince Henry II of Conde rose against the king in Nov. 1615, the Protestants sided with him. By the treaty of London, May 4, 1616, their privileges were confirmed; but, at the instigation of the Jesuits, a new edict of 1620 restored Roman Catholicism as the official religion of France, and decided that the Huguenots should be deprived of their churches. The latter resisted, headed by the princes of Rohan and Soubise, and the war commenced anew (in 1621), but this time proved unfavorable to the Protestants; yet at the peace of Montpellier, Oct. 21, 1622, the edict of Nantes was confirmed, and the Protestants only lost the right of holding

assemblies. In 1622, Louis XIII called Richelieu, whom the pope had lately created cardinal, to his councils. The power of the chancellor once firmly established, he determined to crush the Huguenots, whose destruction he considered essential to the unity and power of France, not so much on account of their religion, as on account of their political influence at home, and particularly abroad. He accordingly paid little attention to the stipulations of the treaty which the king had made with the Huguenots, and provoked them to rebellion by all possible means. In 1625, while the government was involved in difficulties in Italy, the Protestants improved the opportunity and rose in arms. Their naval force, under Soubise, beat the royal marine in several engagements, and cardinal Richelieu found himself under the necessity of offering conditions of peace, which this time the Protestants very unwisely refused to accept. The cardinal now resolved to reduce La Rochelle, their stronghold. A powerful army was assembled and marched on the doomed place, Richelieu combining in himself the functions of bishop, prime minister, and commander-in-chief. The Huguenots of Rochelle defended themselves with great bravery for more than a year, during which they endured the greatest privations. But their resistance was in vain; even a fleet which the English had induced Charles I to send, under the command of the duke of Buckingham, to their assistance, was defeated off the Island of Rhé, Nov. 8, 1627. On the 28th of Oct. 1628, Richelieu rode into Rochelle by the king's side, in velvet and cuirass, at the head of the royal army, after which he proceeded to perform high mass in the church of St. Margaret, in celebration of his victory (compare Smiles, *Hug.* p. 118). The loss of La Rochelle was the deathblow to the Huguenots as a political power. As it was followed by the loss of all their other strongholds, Nismes, Montauban, Castres, etc., they were now left defenseless, and entirely dependent on the will of their conqueror. Richelieu, however, acting in a wise and tolerant spirit, refrained from pushing the advantages which he had gained to extremes, and advised the publication of an edict which should grant the Protestants freedom of worship, no doubt actuated to this course by considerations of state policy, as he had just entered into a league with the Swedes and Germans, and needed the good-will of his Protestant subjects as much as that of the Romanists. June 27, 1629, peace was concluded at Alais, and in the same year an edict followed, called "the Edict of Pardon," granting to the Protestants the same privileges as the edict of Nantes, with exception of their strongholds, which were demolished, they ceasing to have political influence, and becoming distinguished as a party only by their religion. The

reign of Louis XIII closed in 1629, and his successor, Louis XIV, as well as cardinal Mazarin, the successor of Richelieu, who had died a short time before Louis, confirmed to the Protestants the rights and privileges granted them; and although they suffered from a gradual defection of nobles, who, finding them no longer available for purposes of faction, now rejoined the old Church, they nevertheless enjoyed comparative freedom from persecution.

The death of Mazarin in 1661 forms another epoch in the history of the Protestants. New edicts were published, intended to damage their financial interests, and to become impediments to the free exercise of their religion. Thus, in 1662, an edict forbade them to inter their dead except at daybreak or at nightfall. Another decree in 1663 excused new converts from payment of debts previously contracted with their fellow-religionists. In 1665 their children were allowed to declare themselves Roman Catholics—if boys, at fourteen; if girls, at twelve years of age; parents either to continue to provide for their apostate children, or to apportion to them a part of their possessions. In 1679 it was decreed that converts who had relapsed into Protestantism should be banished, and their property confiscated. In 1680 Huguenot clerks and notaries were deprived of their employments, intermarriages of Protestants and Roman Catholics' were forbidden, and the issue of such marriages declared illegitimate, and incapable of succession. In 1681, to strike terror to the hearts of the Protestants, a royal declaration granted the right to Huguenot children to become converts at the age of *seven* years. "The kidnapping of Protestant children was actively set on foot by the agents of the Roman Catholic priests, and their parents were subjected to heavy penalties if they ventured to complain. Orders were issued to pull down Protestant places of worship, and as many as eighty were shortly destroyed in one diocese. The Huguenots offered no resistance. All that they did was to meet together and pray that the king's heart might yet be softened towards them. Blow upon blow followed. Protestants were forbidden to print books without the authority of magistrates of the Romish communion. Protestant teachers were interdicted from teaching anything more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. Such pastors as held meetings amid the ruins of the churches which had been pulled down, were compelled to do penance with a rope round their necks, after which they were to be banished the kingdom. Protestants were prohibited from singing psalms on land or water, in workshop or in dwellings. If a priestly procession passed one of their

churches while the psalms were sung, they must stop instantly, on pain of fine or imprisonment to the officiating minister.” In short, from the pettiest annoyance to the most exasperating cruelty, nothing was wanting on the part of the “most Christian king” and his abettors. The intention apparently was to provoke the Huguenots into open resistance, so as to find a pretext for a second massacre of St. Bartholomew.

In 1683, Colbert, who had been Louis’s minister for several years, and who, convinced that the strength of states consisted in the number, the intelligence, and the industry of their citizens, had labored in all possible ways to prevent the hardships which Louis, led by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, and his Jesuit confessor, Pere la Chaise, was inflicting on the Protestants, was removed by death. Military executions and depredations against the Protestants now began throughout the kingdom. “Pity, terror, and anguish had by turns agitated their minds, until at length they were reduced to a state of despair. Life was made almost intolerable to them. All careers were closed against them, and Protestants of the working class were under the necessity of abjuring or starving. The mob, observing that the Protestants were no longer within the pale of the law, took the opportunity of wreaking all manner of outrages on them. They broke into their churches, tore up the benches, and, placing the Bible and hymn-books in a pile, set the whole on fire; the authorities usually lending their sanction on the proceedings of the rioters by banishing the burned-out ministers, and interdicting the further celebration of worship in the destroyed churches” (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 135-6). Bodies of troops which had been quartered upon the Protestants to harass them, now made it a business to convert the Protestants. Accompanied by Jesuits, they passed through the southern provinces, compelling the inhabitants to renounce their religion, demolishing the places of worship, and putting to death the preachers. Hundreds of thousands of Protestants, unwilling to renounce their religion, fled to Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, and Germany. In vain was it attempted to restrain this self-expatriation by cordons along the borders. Many Protestants also made an insincere profession of Roman Catholicism. These, on the slightest appearance of relapse, were put to death. On October 23, 1685, Louis at last revoked the edict of Nantes. This revocation enacted the demolition of all the remaining Protestant temples throughout France; the entire proscription of the Protestant religion; the prohibition of even private worship under penalty of confiscation of body and property; the banishment of all Protestant pastors from the kingdom

within fifteen days; the closing of all Protestant schools; the prohibition of parents from instructing their children in the Protestant faith; the obligation, under penalty of a heavy fine, of having their children baptized by the parish priest, and educating them in the Roman Catholic religion; the confiscation of the property and goods of all Protestant refugees who failed to return to France within four months; the penalty of the galleys for life to all men, and of imprisonment for life to all women detected in the act of attempting to escape from France. "Such were a few of the dastardly and inhuman provisions of the edict of Revocation. It was a proclamation of war by the armed against the unarmed — a war against peaceable men, women, and children—a war against property, against family, against society, against public morality, and, more than all, against the right of conscience." But when we take into consideration the private character of the king, how completely he was controlled by abandoned women and their friends, the Jesuits, who both feared and hated Protestantism, because, if successful, it would have been a death-blow to their own wicked association, we cannot wonder that great was the rejoicing of the Jesuits on the revocation of the edict of Nantes," and that "Rome sprang up with a shout of joy to celebrate the event," and that "Te Deums were sung, processions went from shrine to shrine, and the pope sent a brief to Louis, conveying to him the congratulations and praises of the Romish Church."

The edict of Revocation was carried out with rigor; and but one feeling now possessed the minds of the Reformed, to make their escape from that devoted land. Disguised in every form which ingenuity could suggest, by every outlet that could anywhere be made available, through every hardship to which the majority were most unaccustomed, the crowd of fugitives pressed forward eagerly from their once dearly-loved country. It is impossible to estimate with accuracy the number of the refugees. Sismondi (*Hist. de France*) computed that the-total number of those who emigrated ranged from 300,000 to 400,000, and he was further of opinion that a like number perished in prison, on the scaffold, at the galleys, and in their attempts to escape; and Weiss (in his *History of the French Protestant Refugees*) thinks the number no less than 300,000 of those who departed the French kingdom. Vauban wrote, only a year after the Revocation, that France had lost 60,000,000 of francs in specie, 9000 sailors, 12,000 veterans, 600 officers, and her most flourishing manufactures; and Fénelon thus described the last years of the reign of Louis XIV: "The cultivation of the soil is almost abandoned; the towns and

the country are becoming depopulated. All industries languish, and fail to support the laborers. France has become as but a huge hospital without provisions." The hospitable shores of England, which had long before this period furnished an asylum to the fugitive Huguenots, were now eagerly sought, and the Huguenots met with kindness and assistance from the English government. To Holland, also, and to Denmark, the best talent of the land, the most skilful artisans, directed their steps, and many great branches of industry of France, by the folly of a king who had taken his mistress as his first state counselor, received their deathblow. The industry of some places was for a time completely prostrated. Indeed, more than a century really passed before they were restored to their former prosperity, "and then only to suffer another equally staggering blow from the violence and outrage which accompanied the outbreak of the French Revolution." In fact, this last terrible event may justly be considered not only as a providential retribution, but likewise a natural penalty for the civil wrongs inflicted upon the Protestants, since these cruel measures exiled from the country a large part of its piety and intelligence, by which alone that catastrophe might have been averted.

From the vicinity of Nismes, where the Huguenots had always been very numerous, thousands, unwilling either to abjure their faith or to leave their native country, betook themselves to the mountains of the Cevennes, and continued the exercise of their religion in secret. These, and the mountaineers of the Cevennes, among whom sprang up a sect which displayed a remarkable fanatical enthusiasm, under the name of Camisards (q.v.), finally commenced to wage war against the royal forces, which was called the *War of the Cevennes*, or the *Camisard War*. It was successfully carried on until 1706, when, in consequence of the war of succession with Spain, they were allowed a respite, the royal troops being otherwise employed. Their number now rapidly augmented, especially in Province and Dauphiny, and thus, notwithstanding all the persecutions which the Protestants had suffered, about two millions continued to adhere to their religion (Charles Coquerel, *Hist. des Eylises du Desert*, Par. 1841, 2 vols.).

A partial repose which the Huguenots now enjoyed for more than ten years greatly increased their numbers, especially in Province and Dauphiny; but in 1724, Louis XV, who had ascended the throne in 1715, at the instigation of the ever-conspiring Jesuits, issued a very severe ordinance against them. The spirit of the age, however, was too much opposed to persecution to suffer the edict to work the mischief intended. The governors of several

provinces tolerated the Protestants, and as early as 1743 they resumed their assemblies in the mountains and woods, and celebrated their *Mariages du desert*. In 1744 new edicts were issued against them, requiring upon those who had been baptized or married in the *desert* (as it was called) a repetition of the rite by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. Even the Roman Catholics themselves soon became loud in opposition against these violent measures, and the persecution gradually ceased. Men like Montesquieu and Voltaire successfully advocated mild treatment, and it must be conceded that the Protestants owed much of the toleration they afterwards met with to Voltaire's treatise on the subject, written in 1763, and to his procuring the release of John Calas (q.v.). Their position was still further improved on the accession of Louis XVI to the throne (1774). In 1787 an edict was issued (which the Parliament, however, registered only in 1789) by which the validity of Protestant baptisms and marriages was recognized, though subject to some purely civil regulations; they were given cemeteries for the burial of their dead, were allowed to follow their religion privately, and granted the rights of citizenship, with the exception of the right of holding any official position.

After the breaking out of the French Revolution in 1789, a motion was made in the General Assembly to admit the Protestants to equal rights with the Roman Catholics: this motion was at first rejected, but finally carried. A decree of 1790 restored the Protestants to the possession of all the rights and property they had lost subsequently to the revocation of the edict of Nantes. The "Code Napoleon" placed the Protestants equal in their civil and political rights with the Roman Catholics, as, in fact, they had already been for more than fifteen years; and though, after the restoration of the Bourbons, especially in 1815 and 1816, the priests succeeded in exciting the populace of the department of the Gard to rise and murder the Protestants, the authorities conniving at the crime, still they remained equal to the Roman Catholics in the eye of the law. The spirit of persecution, however, continued, though in a somewhat weaker form, both among the people and the government of the Bourbons, even in that of the Orleans family, though, after the July Revolution of 1830, the reformed charter of France had proclaimed universal freedom of conscience and of worship, a principle which was reasserted in 1848. (For the present state of Protestantism in France, *SEE FRANCE.* )

The descendants of the Huguenots long kept themselves a distinct people in the countries to which their fathers had fled, and entertained hopes of a



return to their country; but as time passed on these hopes grew fainter, while by habit and interest they became more united to the nations among whom it fell to their lot to establish a new home. The great crash of the first Revolution finally severed all the ties that bound them to their native land. They either changed their names themselves by translating them, or they were changed by the people among whom they resided by mispronunciation. Thus, in England, “the Lemaltres called themselves Master; the Leroys, King; the Tonneliers, Cooper; the Lejeunes, Young; the Leblancs, White; the Lenoirs, Black; the Loiseaus, Bird.

Thenceforward the French colony in London no longer existed. At the present day, the only vestige of it that remains is in the Spitalfields district, where a few thousand artisans, for the most part poor, still betray their origin, less by their language than by their costume, which bears some resemblance to that of the corresponding class in Louis XIV’s time. The architecture of the houses they inhabit resembles that of the workmen of Lille, Amiens, and the other manufacturing towns of Picardy. The custom of working in cellars, or in glazed garrets, is also borrowed from their original country” (Weiss, p. 283, 284). In our own country also, where the Huguenots settled at an early day, their descendants may be found, particularly in New York, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas; and, as in England, they have become naturalized, and their names have been changed, until it has become difficult to recognize them. “Their sons and grandsons, little by little, have become mingled with the society which gave a home to their fathers, in the same way as in England, Holland, and Germany. As their Church disappeared in America, the members became attached to other evangelical denominations, especially the Episcopal, Reformed Dutch, Methodist, and Presbyterian. The French language, too, has long since disappeared with their Church service, which used to call to mind the country of their ancestors. French was preached in Boston until the close of the last century, and at New York the Huguenot services were celebrated both in French and English as late as 1772. Here, at the French Protestant church, which succeeded the Huguenot years since, the Gospel was preached in the same language in which the prince of French pulpit orators, Saurin, used to declare divine truth two centuries ago. The Huguenot church at Charleston, South Carolina, alone has retained in its primitive purity, in their public worship, the old Calvinistic liturgy of its forefathers. The greater part of the exiled French families have long since disappeared, and their scattered communities have been dissolved by amalgamation with the other races around them. These pious fugitives have

become public blessings throughout the world, aid have increased in Germany, Holland, and England the elements of power, prosperity, and Christian development. In our land, too, they helped to lay the firm cornerstones of the great republic whose glory they most justly share" (G. P. Disosway, *The Huguenots in America*, as Appendix to Harper's edition of Smiles's *Huguenots*, p. 442). See Beza, *Hist. des Eglises reform mees en France* (Antw. 1580, 3 vols.); Thuane, *Historia sui temporis* (Paris, 1620, and often, 7 vols.); Davila, *Storia delle guerre civili di Francia* (Venice, 1630); St. Aignon, *De el'tat des Protestants en France* (Paris, 1808; 2nd ed. 1818); Lacretelle, *Histoire de France pendant les guerres de la religion* (Paris, 1814, 1815, 4 vols.); Benoit, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes* (Delft, 1693, 2 vols.); Rulhiere, *Eclaircissements historiques sur les causes de la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes* (Par. 1788, 2 vols.); Court de Gebelin, *Hist. des troubles des Cevennes* (Villefranche, 1760, 2 vols.); Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots* (London 1828, 2 vols.) Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, 8. 129 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 8:583 sq.; Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees*; Coquerel, *Histoire des Eglises du desert* (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo) Felice, *Histoire des Protestants de France*; Peyrat, *Histoire des Pasteurs du Desert* (Paris, 2 vols. 8vo); Crowe, *History of France* (London, 1867, 1869, 5 vols.); Smiles, *The Huguenots* (3rd edit. London, 1869); *London Rev.* July, 1855 Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 450 sq. For special biographies, Haag, *La France Protestante* (Par. 8 vols. 8vo) } Michelet. *Louis XIV et la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes* (Paris, 1860, 8vo); Michelet, *Guerres de Religion* (Par. 1857, 8vo); Drion, *Histoire Chronol. de l'Eglise Protestante de France* (2 vols. 12mo); Smedley, *History of the Reformed Religion in France* (London, 1827, 3 vols.); Athanase Coquerel fits, *Les Forcats pour la obi* (Paris, 1868). (J. H. W.)

## Hugues

SEE HUGO.

## Huguet, Marc Antoine

a French prelate, was born at Moissac in 1757. He entered the sacred order in his youth, and became curate of a little village in Auvergne. In 1791 he was elected bishop of Creuse. During the French Revolution he was a member of the Legislature, and of the National Convention, and voted for the death of the king. Complicated in several popular disturbances, and

conspiring against the established government, he was arrested in 1795, and imprisoned at Ham for several months. Engaging in another conspiracy which failed to accomplish its object, he was again arrested, condemned to death, and executed Oct. 6, 1769. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 466.

### Huish, Alexander

a learned English divine, who flourished in the 17th century, was fellow of Magdalen College, rector of Beckington and Hornblotton, Somersetshire. He published *Lectures on the Lord's Prayer* (London 1626, 4to). He was also a very superior scholar of exegesis, and a prominent assistant on Walton's *Polyglot Bible*. His services were highly commented upon by bishop Walton himself. See Wrangham, *Proleg.* 2, 203; Todd, *Life of Walton*, p. 269 sq.; Stoughton (John) *Ecclesiastes Hist. of English*. (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 332; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 58.

### Husisseau, Jacques d' 1

a French theologian, was born in the latter half of the 16th century. He entered the monastery at Marmoutiers, and was made great prior of his order in 1594. Refusing in 1604 admission to Matthieu Renusson, visitor of the order of St. Benoit for the province of Tours, he was deposed from his position, deprived of all power, and excommunicated. He, however, succeeded in regaining his position. At the time of his death, Sept. 24, 1626, he was provincial of the Benedictine congregation of exempts in France. He published, for the use of his abbey, a collection of prayers, entitled *Enchiridion Precum* (Tours, 1607) — *Supplement a la Chronique des Abbés de Marmoutiers (1615)* — *Chronique des Prieurs (1625)*. This last-named work Husisseau translated himself into Latin. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25, 468 sq.

### Huisseau, Jacques d', 2,

another French minister and theologian, who flourished in the 17th century. But little is known of his early life. He was professor of theology at Saumur and rendered himself famous by his *La disciple des Eglises Reformees de France, avec uen recueil des observations et questions sur la plupart des articles tiré des actes des synodes nationaux* (1650, 4to, probably published at Saumur; Geneva, 1666, 4to; Bionne, near Orleans, 1675, 12mo). The great success which followed this work estranged from him many of his acquaintances and associates in the Church, who envied

his prospects, and who even presented complaints against him in 1656, meeting, however, with no encouragement from the superiors of Huisseau. In 1670 he published *La Reunion du Christianisme, ou la matiere de rejoindre les Chretiens dans une seule Confession de foi* (Saumur, 12mo). It favored the union of all who believed in Christ as the God or man Savior, and was attacked by L. Bastide in his *Remarques sur un livre intitule "La reunion,"* etc. (1670, 12mo), and it was condemned by the Synod of Anjou. Huisseau endeavored to explain his views, but the synod declined to give him a hearing, and finally deposed him from the priesthood. He immigrated to England, and was reinstated as minister without being obliged to retract. He died there before 1690, about 70 years of age. — *Biographie Universelle*, 57, 441.

### Huit, Ephraim

a dissenting English minister, of whose early life but little is known. He was minister for some time at Roxhall, Warwickshire, and finally immigrated to this country, and settled in New England. He became minister of a congregation at Windsor, Conn., and died in 1644. Huit published, in his mother country, *Prophecie of Daniel explained* (London 1643, 4to) Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 913.

### Huk'kok

(Hebrew *Chukkok'*, חֻקֹּק *incised*; Sept. Ἰκόκ 5. r. Ἰακανά, *Vulg. Hucusa*), a town on the border of Naphtali, near Zebulon, not far from Jordan, west of Aznoth-Tabor, and in the direction of Asher (<sup><1698></sup>Joshua 19:34); elsewhere written HUKOK (חֻקֹּק, *Chukok'*, <sup><1665></sup>1 Chronicles 6:75; Sept. Ἰακόκ, *Vulg. Hucac*); but probably, in this latter passage, erroneously for HELKATH (<sup><1625></sup>Joshua 21:35; comp. 19:25). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Icoc), as well as Benj. of Tudela (2, 421), allude to it. It is doubtless identical with the modern small village *Yakuk*, between the plain of Genesareth and Safed (Robinson's *Researches*, 3 App. p. 133; *Biblioth. Sac.* 1843, p. 80), said to contain the grave of Habakkuk (see new edit. of *Researches*, 3, 81; and comp. Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 182).

### Hu'kok

(<sup><1665></sup>1 Chronicles 6:75). *SEE HUKKOK.*

## Hul

(Heb. *Chul*, חול , a circle; Sept. Οὔλ), the name of the second son of Aram (B.C. cir. 2414), who appears to have given name to an Aramsean region settled by him (<sup>Ⓜ</sup>Genesis 10:23; 1 Chronicles 1, 17). Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 6, 4) places it (Ουλον, as Havercamp corrects- for "Οτρος) in Armenia, comparing it with the district *Cholobotene*, according to the conjecture of Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2:9). Michaelis, taking the word in the sense of a *hollow* or valley (*Spicileg.* 2:135) understands *Caele-Syris* (comp, Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 7, 1; 1 Macc. 3:13); and Schultens (*Parad.* p. 282) refers it to the southern part of Mesopotamia, from the signification *sand*. More probable seems the identification proposed by Rosenmüller (*Aterthum.* 1, 2, p. 253) with the district now called *Huleh*, around the lake Merom, at the upper sources of the Jordan (Burckhardt, *Tray.* 1, 87), which, although a small tract and no proper part of Aramaea, seems to be supported by the rendering of Saadias (compare Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 41, note), According to Dr. Robinson, the name el-Huleh, as used by the present inhabitants, belongs strictly to the northern part of the basin in which the lake lies, but is commonly extended to embrace the whole; its different quarters fall within various jurisdictions, and have special names (*Researches*, 3:342). A great portion of this northern tract near the lake is now an impassable marsh, probably in consequence of the choking up of the streams by rubbish (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, p. 200, 201). The remainder is a very fertile plain, forming a valley near Baniyas (Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. 3:396-398). Traces of the name Hul or Huleh appear in the district *Ulatha* Οὐλάθα around Paneas, mentioned by Josephus as originally belonging to Zenodorns, and bestowed by Augustus upon Herod (*Ant.* 15:10, 3, comp. *Wars*, 1, 20, 4) **SEE MEROM.**