

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Hulda - Hyttavanes

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

Hulda or Holda

(the *friendly*, or benignant), a German goddess, known in the old legends as “Frau Holle,” was originally the goddess of marriage and fecundity, worshipped and invoked by maids and wives; she sent bridegrooms to the former and children to the latter. She was represented as a beautiful white woman, surrounded by great numbers of children, in her favorite haunts in the depths of the sea or the hearts of hills. She was also the patroness of agriculture and domestic life, with its manifold employments. Later she appears in the fairy tales of Hesse and Thuringia probably written by Christian priests as an old and ugly woman, with a long nose, large teeth, coarse hair, and a companion of the wild and the roaming. But even in these last tales traces of kind and pleasant ways are left. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 480; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 453. (J. H.W.)

Hul'dah

(Hebrew *Chuldah'*, חַדְיָה *weasel*; Sept. Ὀλδαν, Josephus Ὀλδᾶ, *Ant.* 10, 4, 2), wife of Shallum, a prophetess, who, in the reign of Josiah, abode in that part of Jerusalem called the Mishneh, where the book of the law was discovered by the high-priest Hilkiah. B.C. 623. This prophetess was consulted respecting the denunciations which it contained. She then delivered an oracular response of mingled judgment and mercy; declaring the not remote destruction of Jerusalem, but promising Josiah that he should be taken from the world before these evil days came (¹²²⁴2 Kings 22:14-20; ¹²⁰⁴2 Chronicles 21:4, 22-28). Huldah is only known for this circumstance. She was probably at this time the widow of Shallum, a name too common to suggest any information; he is said to have been “keeper of the wardrobe,” but whether the priestly or the royal wardrobe is uncertain. If the former, he must have been a Levite, if not a priest. *SEE HARHAS*. As to her residence חַדְיָה in the Mishneh, which the A.V. renders “in the college,” there is no ground to conclude that any school or college of the prophets is to be understood. The name means *second* or *double*; and many of the Jews themselves (as Jarchi states) understood it as the name of the suburb lying between the inner and outer wall of Jerusalem; perhaps 1. q. “the lower city,” or *Acra* (q.v.). It is safest to regard it as a proper name denoting some quarter of Jerusalem about which we are not certain, and, accordingly, to translate *in the mishneh*, for which we have the precedent of the Septuagint, which has ἐν τῇ Μασεῖν⁵. The place of her residence is mentioned probably to show why she, being at hand, was resorted to on

this urgent occasion, and not Jeremiah, who was then probably away at his native town Anathoth, or at some more distant place. There were gates of the temple in the middle of the southern wall, called “the gates of Huldah” (Mishna, tit. *Middoth*, 1, 3), which, if they were so named from any connection with tile prophetess, may indicate her residence on Ophel. *SEE SHALLUM; SEE JOSIAH.*

Huldericus, Augustensis Episcopus

who flourished in 860, was a scholar of Adalbert, and descended from the counts of Kilbury and Döllinger. He is known by his letter addressed to pope Nicholas against the celibacy of the clergy (*Eistola de Cleri caelibatu*). It was translated into English, and published about the time of the Reformation (in 16mo), without date. — Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Literature*, 2:531.

Huldrich, Jean Jacques

a Swiss theologian, born at Zurich in 1683, belonged to a family of which several members have distinguished themselves as theologians and philologists. *SEE HULDERICUS.* He devoted much of his time to the acquisition of Hebrew, and went to the universities of Holland to pursue a course of study in the Oriental languages. On his return to his native place in 1706 he was made pastor of the House of Orphans. In 1710 he was appointed professor of moral science at the Gymnasium of Zurich. His scholarship was of a superior order, and he was frequently solicited to accept a professorship at the universities of Heidelberg and Groningen. He died at Zurich May 25, 1731. He published *Historia Jeschua Nazareni, a Judeis blaspheme corrupta, ex manuscripto hactenus inedito Heb. et Lat., cum tiotis* (Leyd. 1705, 8vo) — *Gentilis Obtrectator, sive de calumniis gentilium in Judaeos Commentarius* (Zurich, 1744, 4to), a collection of sermons, etc. — Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 25, 470 sq.

Hull Hope

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born March 13, 1763, in Worcester County, on the eastern shore of Maryland. His early education was rather neglected, and he was apprenticed to a carpenter at Baltimore. In this city he was converted, and entered the itinerancy in 1785. He was first appointed to Salisbury, North Carolina. With the exception of a brief period spent in New England, his time was given to the introduction of

Methodism in the Southern States. His last appointment was the Savannah Circuit, Georgia. In 1794 he traveled with bishop Asbury, and located in 1795. He died October 4, 1818, at Athens, Ga. Hull possessed wonderful power over those who came within his influence, and was one of the most eloquent ministers in the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day. His piety was deep, and many were converted under his labors. During his active work in the ministry, he secured for himself a pretty good education, and was at one time able even to assume the duties of teacher of Latin. He was also one of the first and strongest supports of the University of Georgia, which was founded during his residence at Athens. — Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, chap. 9; Boehm, *History Reminisc.* p. 366; Sprague, *Annals Azet. Pulpit*, 7, 112 sq. (J. H.W.)

Huln

(UILLAUME, a Roman cardinal, born at Étain. in the diocese of Verdun, in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time archdeacon of Verdun and later of Metz. He was an attendant at the Council of Basle in 1440, and was one of the supporters of the antipope (Amadeus of Savoy) Felix V, who gave him the cardinal's hat. Nicholas V confirmed the cardinal after the schism Dec. 19, 1449. He died at Rome Oct. 28, 1455. — Migne, *Dict. Theol.* 31, 1092.

Hulot, Henri Louis

a French theologian, was born at Avenay March 1, 1757. He was professor first at the seminary, then at the University of Rouen, where he was obliged to resign at the outbreak of the Revolution, and to flee from persecution which threatened him. He went to Gand, where he was made grand vicar, until the entrance of the French into the Netherlands in 1794 forced him again to flee. He went successively to Minster, Erfurt, Dresden, and Augsburg. When he was permitted to return to his native land, he was appointed curate of the parish of Avançon, and later of Antigny. After twenty years of assiduous labor at this parish, he was made canon, and finally grand vicar and official at Rheims. He died Sept. 1, 1829. His principal writings are *Lettre aux catholiques de Reims* (in Latin and French, Gand, 1793, 8vo) — *Lettre des pretres Français Al' eveque de Gand* — *Collect. des brefs du pape Pie VI* (Augsb. 1796) — *lettres à M. Schrofenberg, eveque de Freysingue et de Ratisbonne, en faveur des pretres Franf.* (1796, 8vo) — *Etat les Cathol. Angl.* (1798, 8vo) —

Salisburgensis cujusdetm religiosi delecta castigatio, seu vindicice cleri Gallicani exulis (1800, 8vo): *Gallicanorum Episcoporumn dissensus innocuus* (1801, 8vo) — *Sedis apostolicae Triumphus, seu sedes apostolica, protectore deo, semper invicta* (Laon, 1836, Svo). Several controversial works and sermons were left in MS. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Bio. Gen.* 25, 479.

Hulse, John

was born at Middlewich in 1708. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; obtained a small curacy in the country; and, upon the death of his father in 1753, withdrew to his paternal inheritance in Cheshire, where, owing to his delicate state of health, he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 14, 1790. He bequeathed estates in order to found two divinity scholarships in St. John's College, the Hulsean Prize Essay, and to endow the offices of "Christian Advocate" and "Christian Preacher" in the University of Cambridge. The duties of the "Christian Preacher," or Hulsean Lecturer according to this appointment, were to deliver and print twenty sermons every year, either upon the evidences of Christianity, or the difficulties of Holy Scripture. The funds being inadequate, the lectures were not commenced until 1820, and in 1830 the number of sermons to be delivered in a year was reduced to eight. In 1860 the office of "Christian Advocate" was changed to a professorship, called the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity. Bishop Ellicot was the first incumbent in the new chair. At present the office of the Hulsean Lecturer or Preacher is annual, and the duty of the lecturer to preach not less than four, nor more than six sermons in the course of the year. Among the most important of the Hulsean sermons are the following: Blunt (J.J.), *Principles for the proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings*, 1832 (London 1833, 8vo); Alford, *The Consistency of the Divine Conduct in revealing the Doctrines of Redemption*, 1841 (Cambridge, 1842, 8vo); Trench, *The Fitness of the Holy Scripture for unfolding the Spiritual Life of Man*, 1845 (Cambridge, 1845, 8vo); Trench, *Christ the Desire of all Nations*, 1846 (Cambridge, 1846, 8vo); Wordsworth, *On the Canon of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and on the Apocrypha*, 1847 (London 1848, 8vo); Wordsworth, *Lectures on the Apocalypse, critical, expository, and practical*, 1848 (London 1849, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1573; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 453; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 207.

Hulsean Lectures

SEE HULSE, JOHN.

Hülsemann, Johann

a German theologian, was born in Ostfriesland in 1602, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig. In 1629 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg; he was also a member of the “Leipziger Convent” of 1630, and of the “Colloquium” at Thorn in 1645, where he performed the office of *moderator theologorum Augustance confessionis*. In 1646 he was called as professor of systematic theology to the University of Leipzig. He died in 1661. In connection with his son-in-law, Calovius (q.v.), he carried on the controversy against Calvinism as a strictly orthodox Lutheran. An able polemic and a thoroughly educated theologian, who in many respects may be compared to the scholastics of the 16th century, Hülsemann distinguished in his attacks against Calvinism (in his work *Calvinismus irreconciliabilis*, Witt. 1644, Lpz. 1646), incited by bishop Joseph Hall’s *Roma irreconciliabilis*, the fundamental articles and the presuppositions from the possible inferences. His most celebrated work is *Breviarum theolog. exhibens praecipuas fidei controversias* (1640, and often), and in an enlarged form, *Extensio breviarii theologici* (1655, 1657). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4, 304 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 372; Gass, *Protest. Dogmat.* 1, 318 sq.; 2, 38 sq.; Tholuck, *Geist. d. luther. Theol. Wittenberg’s*, p. 164 sq.

Human Depravity

SEE DEPRAVITY.

Humanists

(from the Latin *litræ humanores*, polite letters) was the name assumed in the beginning of the 16th century by a party which, with Erasmus and Reuchlin at their head, was especially devoted to the cultivation of classical literature, and which, as not infrequently happens in the enthusiasm of a new pursuit, was arrayed in opposition to the received system of the schools, not alone in the study of the classical languages, but even in philosophy, and eventually in theology. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* vol. 5.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 406 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 35, 127.

Humanitarians

I. A name given to those several classes of anti-Trinitarians who believe that Christ was nothing more than a mere man, born according to the usual course of nature, and one who lived and died according to the ordinary circumstances of mankind. As such are generally regarded the early Judaizing sects of Ebion, Cerinthus, and Carpocrates; but this classification is by no means justified, especially as regards the Ebionites (q.v.), who taught that at the baptism in the Jordan the Messianic calling first arose in Jesus, and that at this time a higher spirit joined itself to him, investing him with miraculous powers, that left him only at the hour of his departure from this world. The earliest recorded author of the purely humanitarian theory is generally regarded as Theodotus (q.v.) of Byzantium (A.D. 196), surnamed the Tanner, who, having denied Christ in time of persecution, defended himself afterwards by declaring that, in so doing, “he had denied not God, but man.” A contemporary of Theodotus, Artemon (q.v.), in like manner believed in God the creator, but held that Christ was a mere man, born of a virgin, however, and superior to the prophets, and asserted that such had been the universal belief of Christians till the time of Zephyrinus. 202 (comp. Liddon, *Our Lord’s Divinity* [Bampton Lect. 1866], p. 425). These opinions must of course be distinguished from the doctrines of the Arian sects, even the lowest schools of which admit the pre-existence of Christ, and his pre-eminence among the creatures of God. **SEE ALOGI: SEE ARIANS; SEE ARTEMONITES; SEE SOCINIANS; SEE UNITARIANS.**

II. The name Humanitarian is also sometimes applied to the disciples of St. Simon (the successor of Baboeuf, who flourished under Napoleon I), and in general to those who look to the perfectibility of human nature as their great moral and social dogma, and ignore altogether the dependence of man upon supernatural aid, believing in the all-sufficiency of his own innate powers. A party of Communists who arose in France about 1839 also took the name from the newspaper *L’humanitaire*, their organ — Buck, *Theol. Dict.*; Pierer, *Univers. Lex.*; Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 259. **SEE COMMUNIST.**

Humanity

the exercise of the social and benevolent virtues; a fellow-feeling for the distresses of another. It is properly called humanity because there is little or

nothing of it in brutes. The social affections are conceived by all to be more refined than the selfish. Sympathy and humanity are universally esteemed the finest temper of mind, and for that reason the prevalence of the social affections in the progress of society is held to be a refinement of our nature,

Humanity and Christianity

SEE CHRISTIANITY.

Humanity of Christ

SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE CHRISTOLOGY; SEE INCARNATION.

Human Sacrifices

SEE SACRIFICE.

Human Soul

SEE SOUL.

Humbert

(by some improperly called HUBERT), a French cardinal, was born probably towards the close of the 10th century. He entered the order of the Benedictines at Moyon-le-Moutier in 1015. In 1049 pope Leo IX, who had been bishop of Toul, the diocese in which the monastery of Moyon-le-Moutier was situated, called Humbert to Rome, and he was first created archbishop of Sicily, and in 1051 cardinal bishop of Silva Candida. Humbert is believed to be the first Frenchman who received the cardinal's hat. He was intimately associated with the pope, was admitted to all his councils, and was the Roman ambassador to Constantinople to effect a union with the Eastern or Greek Church. Under pope Victor III he was made chancellor and librarian at the Vatican, which offices he continued to hold under the pontifical successors Etienne III, Nicolas II, and Alexander II. He was at the head of the party opposed to Berenger, and obliged him to make a confession of faith at the synod at Rome in 1059. He died about 1063. He wrote a number of works, among others a treatise against the Simonians (published by Martene in his *Anecdota*), and a narrative of his embassy to Constantinople. This narrative and two other polemical works against the Greek Church have been printed several times, especially in the

Annales Ecclesiastici of Baronius. All his writings have been collected and printed by Migne, vol. 143 (1853), p. 929-1278. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 483; Migne, *Encyclop. Theol.* 31, 1092 sq.

Humbert

general of the order of Dominican monks, was born at Romans, France, about 1200. He was early sent to Paris to be educated as a clergyman, and soon became prominent as an assistant preacher to the celebrated Jourdan. He entered the order in 1224, and was made priest at Lyons. In 1242 he was elected “provincial” of Tuscany, in 1244 “provincial” of France, and in 1254 general of his order. In 1263, however, he abdicated this high position, and retired as a simple monk, first to a monastery at Lyons, and later to a like institution at Valencia. The patriarchate of Jerusalem was offered him in 1264, but he declined it. He died July 14, 1277. He wrote *Officium Ecclesiasticum univetsum tam nocturnum quam diurnum, ad usum ordinis praedicatorum*: — *Expositio super regulam St. Augustini*: — *Expositio super Constitutiones ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, not quite complete: — *Liber de instructione oficialium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum* (printed several times; the best edition, Lyons, 1515): — *De Eruditione Praedicatorum*, also entitled *De Arte praedicandi*, has been inserted in the *Collection of the Church Fathers*, vol. 25: *Liber de Praedicatione Crucis*, an appeal to the Christians against *infidels*: — *Liber de eis quae tractanda videbantur in Concilio generali Lugduni celebrando*, of which extracts were published by Martene in his *Thesaurus Anecd.* — vol. 7, etc. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25, 483 sq.

Humbert

a French theologian, was born at Gendrex, near Paris, about the middle of the 13th century. In July 1296, he was elected abbé of Prulli, in the diocese of Sens, and he died there March 14, 1298. He wrote several theological and philosophical works, all of which remain unprinted. His most important work is *Sententice super libros Metaphysicae Aristotelis*, a commentary on Aristotle’s metaphysics. — Hoefer, *Nouveau Biog. Généralé*, 25, 485; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 21, 86.

Humble Access Prayer Of,

is a phrase in some churches for a divine supplication made by the priest kneeling at the altar before the consecration.

Hume, David

the most notable man of letters and speculation in Scotland during the last century. He was almost equally eminent as a metaphysician, a historian, and a political essayist. He was born at Edinburgh April 26 (O. S.), 1711. On his father's side he was related to the earls of Home or Hume, and through his mother he was the grandson of Sir David Falconer, lord president of the court of justice. His father was not rich, but he was an independent proprietor, owning the estate of Ninewells, in Berwickshire. But David was the younger son, and was entitled to only a small share of his father's substance. He was left an orphan in his infancy, and, with his brother and one sister, depended on the sole care of his excellent mother. He passed without special note through the University, and was designed for the Scotch bar, but he had no taste for the profession; and having spent seven years at home at Ninewells, after leaving college, ostensibly engaged in studying the sages of the law, he visited Bristol in 1733 with some mercantile aspirations. Thence, after a few months of disgust, he passed over into France, and took up his abode first at Rheims, and afterwards at La Flechi. Here he devoted himself to philosophy for life, and composed his *Treatise of Human Nature*. It was in a discussion with one of the Jesuit fathers of La Flechi that the celebrated argument against miracles flashed upon his mind. The *Treatise of Human Nature* was published in 1737, after his return to England. He says himself of it; "It fell dead-born from the press." The family home at Ninewells was again his shelter, and here he renewed his studies and extended his speculations. In 1742 he published the first part of his *Essays, Moral and Political*, which, in his opinion, met with considerable favor. Still, he had obtained no assured provision in life. He was disappointed in an application for a professorship in the University of Edinburgh, and in 1745 he accepted the charge of the marquis of Annandale. With him he resided twelve unpleasant months, but he derived some emolument from the association. In 1746 he became secretary to general St. Clair, whom in 1747 he attended on his military embassy to Vienna and Turin. The *Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding* a recast of the first part of his first treatise-was published while he was at Turin in 1749 he resought his old refuge at Ninewells, and occupied himself with the composition of his *Political Discourses*, and his *Inquiry into the principles of Morals*. The former constituted the second part of his essays; the latter was a revision and modification of the second part of his *Treatise of Human Nature*, which has always been better known in

Germany than in England. In 1751, on the marriage of his brother, he abandoned the family seat, and, in company with his sister, made a new home in Edinburgh. He applied for a chair in the University of Glasgow, but again failed. In 1752 he accepted the post of librarian to the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, but transferred nearly all his small salary to the blind poet, Blacklock. He now engaged in the composition of his *History of England*, which had attracted his regards some years before. The partisan temper in which it is designed is revealed by the period which he first took up. He plunged *in medias res*, or, rather, he commenced nearly at the end, and worked backwards. From its publication Hume experienced such hostility and disappointment that he would have changed his name and retired to the Continent if he had not been prevented by the occurrence of the Seven Years' War. The first volume of the *History of England* appeared in 1754; the second in 1756 or 1757. Between the two was published the *Natural History of Religion* (8vo), which was answered by bishop Hurd. *The History of the House of Tudor* came out in two volumes in 1759; and in 1761, two volumes, containing the early history of England, completed the work, which, before its conclusion, was recognized as an English classic, and still is justly so regarded. If the work encountered various and violent opposition, it gradually achieved eminent popularity, and rendered the author "not only independent, but opulent." Being now "turned of fifty," he resolved to spend the remainder of his life in philosophical dignity and comfortable retirement. The resolve was of no long duration. The marquis of Hertford invited Hume, with whom he was personally unacquainted, to become his secretary of legation at the French court. The distinguished philosopher and historian was received with marked attentions and flatteries by the eminent persons assembled at Paris. It was the period when the union of infidel sentiments with literary renown had become the rage in the most brilliant *salons*. After two years lord Hertford was recalled, but Hume remained as *charge d'affaires* till 1766 and received a pension of £400 for his diplomatic services. The "canny Scot" had become a rich old bachelor, and was able to extend his patronage and aid to Rousseau on his arrival in England, and even to procure for him the offer of a pension from the crown. These favors ended in a quarrel between the protected and the protector, of which an account was given by the latter in a pamphlet. About this time Hume became undersecretary of state, and held the office for two years, returning to Edinburgh in 1769. Here he passed the remaining years of his life, with the exception of a brief visit to Harrowgate and Bath, and it was shortly before

setting out on this journey, undertaken for the restoration of his declining health, that he wrote his *Autobiography*. He had been attacked with diarrhea in the spring of 1775, and succumbed to the disease on Sunday, Aug. 25, 1776. He was serene in life, he was equally serene in death. If Christianity had no consolations for an expiring foe, the grave presented no terrors to the man who had cavilled about all religion. Yet few persons will assent to the unmeasured eulogy of Adam Smith, who “considered him, both in his life, and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit.” But Smith, notwithstanding this testimony, refused to publish the *Dialogues or, Natural Religion*, though a special legacy of £200 was attached to such publication. They were not given to the world until 1779, and then by the agency of Hume’s nephew. His *Life, written by himself with a Letter from Adam Smith giving an Account of his Death*, appeared in 1777 (Lond. 8vo). A better view of the life and the character of Hume than this edition of his autobiography is given in the *Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle* (Edinb. and N. Y. 1860).

The philosophy of Hume underwent three revisions with, however, scarcely any essential change. It has been customary to enlarge upon the acumen and logical precision of Hume, but these qualifications resolve themselves, on close scrutiny, into mere dialectical subtlety. If his artifices imposed upon others, he was often the victim of them himself, and he was crushed to the earth beneath the ruins of the systems which he overthrew. Hume’s fundamental thesis is that all *human* knowledge (no pun is designed) consists of *impressions* and *ideas*. *Impressions* are the direct perceptions of sense: *ideas* are only the relics or signs of former impressions. *Impressions* are always particular, and incapable of variation: *ideas* are consequently the unalterable specters of former sensations. The theory of Locke is accepted and simplified by discarding the office of reflection. The theory of Berkeley is accepted and expanded by applying his argument against matter to mind, and denying all evidence of the existence of either. The result is a thoroughly Pyrrhonic doubt. The application of these postulates, for postulates they are, generated the whole philosophy of Hume. There are only two objects of knowledge—the relations of ideas, and the relations of impressions or facts. The former relations are concerned with unchanging signs, and are therefore simple, and readily discerned by the discussion of thought; but the latter always involve the principle of *cause* and *effect*, because due to some exciting

influence. The relation of cause and effect is nothing more than the habitual succession of events; because all our complex conceptions are linked together only by customary association, and it is impossible that particular objects should produce a general idea. General ideas are, indeed, in possibilities, for all abstractions are only vague images of particulars. Ideas may represent either realities or phenomena, but no investigations can reach beyond the phenomenon to the reality. This reality is a pure delusion—a figment; it is only the name arbitrarily given to a system of connected impressions and ideas. There is neither reality nor substance, neither matter nor mind; at least, there is nothing to authorize the assertion of their existence except as factitious phenomena. The connection of phenomena, or of the conceptions corresponding with them, is accepted as truth in consequence of a primordial tendency of the mind, called belief. This belief, however, imports nothing more than the tenacity of certain notions in consequence of the vivacity of the impressions by which they are produced. The credibility of facts is thus resolved into their apprehensibility, and becomes merely a question of probabilities. This constitution of belief, and this complexion of knowledge, result from the mode in which the materials of thought are obtained. They are gathered by observation and experience, and are distinguished into two, and only two classes, according to their relative *strength-impressions* and *ideas*; the former being the primary and more forcible perceptions; the latter being the derivative and weaker, and being only copies of impressions. Further than this it is impossible to carry speculation. The mind, the instrument of thought, lies beyond; but its nature is discernible only in its operations, and these constitute its whole nature so far as any attainable knowledge is concerned. Thus the human mind is the mold and measure of all knowledge, and yet that mind is itself only a problematical phenomenon. A good-humored skepticism is accordingly the sole result of philosophy.

From this brief and imperfect synopsis of Hume's doctrine—so well summed up by Mackintosh: "He aimed at proving, not that nothing was known, but that nothing could be known" it is easy to recognize the mode in which he reached its most startling applications. He might assert the moral sense, but the assertion was nugatory, for there could be no foundation for morals, nor anything more valid than expediencies growing out of particular impressions and their observed sequences. He might admit the possibility, even the probability, of divine intelligence, but could not tell whether it was "*ane or mair*," since revelation could not be substituted for sensible

perceptions. The scheme had no room for the admission of miracles, as they were unsupported by ordinary experience, and human testimony was fallacious. All this mischievous error is the appropriate fruit of the tree on which it hangs. Many refutations of these positions have been attempted, and a vigorous warfare has been waged on the principles supposed to form the foundation of this philosophy; but too little attention has been paid to the ambiguity of the terms employed, and to the vacillation with which they are used by the conjuror. A strict definition of “miracles” and “experience,” and a rigid adherence to such definition, will reduce the celebrated argument against miracles to a bald *petitio principii*, or to a manifest absurdity. Hume endeavored to prove that “no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle,” and the reasoning employed for this purpose is, that ‘a miracle being a violation of the laws of nature, which a firm and unalterable experience has established, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can be; whereas our experience of human veracity, which (according to him) is the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, is far from being uniform, and can, therefore, never preponderate against that experience which admits of no exception.’ This boasted and plausible argument has, with equal candor and acuteness, been examined by Dr. Campbell, in his *Dissertation on Miracles*, who justly observes that, so far is experience from being the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, that, on the contrary, testimony is the sole foundation of by far the greater part of what Mr. Hume calls firm and unalterable experience; and that if, in certain circumstances, we did not give an implicit faith to testimony, our knowledge of events would be confined to those which had fallen under the immediate observation of our own senses. Hume maintained that a miracle is contrary to experience; but, in reality, it is only different from ordinary experience. That diseases should *generally* be cured-by the application of medicine, and *sometimes* at the mere word of a prophet, are facts not inconsistent with each other in the nature of things themselves, nor irreconcilable according to our ideas. Each fact may arise from its own proper cause; each may exist independently of the other; and each is known by its own proper proof, whether of sense or testimony. To pronounce, therefore, a miracle to be false, because it is different from ordinary experience, is only to conclude against its existence from the very circumstance, which constitutes its specific character; for if it were not different from ordinary experience, where would be its singularity? or what

proof could be drawn from it in attestation of a divine message? *SEE MIRACLES.*

The importance and value of Hume's political essays have rarely been appreciated. They are the best of all his productions, but they have been almost disregarded in the estimation of his genius. They exercised a considerable but unacknowledged influence on the age nearest his own. It is impossible to ignore the obligations of the Constitution of the United States to the essay on the Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth. Lord Brougham does no more than justice to the author when he declares that "Mr. Hume is, beyond doubt, the author of the modern doctrines which now rule the world of science, which are to a great extent the guide of practical statesmen; for no one deserving the name of legislator pretends to doubt the soundness of the theory." Many of the intellectual vices, as all the excellences of Hume—his speculative audacity, his regard for material comfort and independence, his want of enthusiasm, the restriction of his view to observation and experience, his acceptance of expediency as a principle, his acquaintance with courts and with affairs of state, his knowledge of history, his philosophic habits, his slow progress from pinched to easy circumstances, all favored proficiency in this branch of inquiry. Many of these characteristics were, however, adverse to his career as an historian. True, in Hume's *History of England*, the vigorous, easy, and unaffected style, the vivacity of the delineations, the arrangement of the topics, the disposition of the personages, the variety and penetration of the reflections, are all admirable. The narrative is always fascinating, if the expression is rarely idiomatic, sometimes ungrammatical, and often provincial. But to the highest merits of history it possesses no claim. It is hastily, carelessly, and inaccurately composed; it is incurious of truth; it disregards authentic sources of information from indolence and indifference; it is equally partial and prejudiced. In form, it is a model of historical art, but not of the art in its highest conception; in substance and in spirit it displays easily every sin and corruption, which a historian should abhor. His writings called forth many antagonists, and, in fact, may be said to have given rise to the Scotch metaphysical school of *Common Sense*, so called, of which the best exposition, and, at the same time, the best answer to Hume's skepticism, is to be proved by Reid's *Complete Works, with Notes by Sir William Hamilton* (Edinburgh, 1846, 8vo). Beattie's *Essay on Truth*, and Oswald's *Appeal to Common Sense* (Edinb. 1772, 2 vols.), were also written in reply to Hume.

See *The Philosophical Works of David Hume, including all the Essays, and exhibiting the more important Alterations and Corrections in the successive Editions published by the Author* (Edinburgh and Boston, 1854, 4 vols. 8vo); Burton, *Life and Letters of David Hume* (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); *Letters of eminent Persons addressed to David Hume* (Edinb. and Lond. 1820, 4to); Brougham, *Lives of Men of Letters and of Science* (London, 1845, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual History of Philos.* § 376; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philosophy*, pt. 1, ch. 3; Sir Wm. Hamilton, *Lect. on Metaphysics*; Mackintosh, *Hist. of Ethical Philos.* p. 146 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 914 sq.; Lewes, *History of Philos.* 2, 305 sq.; Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* 11, 425 sq.; Ritter, *Christl. Philos.* 8. 6, 7, ch. 2; Cousin, *Hist. the la Philos. moderne*, Leçon 11; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 148 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* Jan. 1847; *Quart. Review*, 73, 292; 77, 40; 1844, p. 315 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine* (on the argument against miracles), 46, 91 sq.; June, 1869; *Brit. Review*, Aug. 1847, p. 288; 1868, p. 77 sq.; *New Englander*, i, 169, 172; 2, 212; 4, 405; 18, 168; *North American Review*, 79, 536 sq.; *Christ. Remembrancer*, Oct. 1868, p. 272; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Oct. 1865. p. 826 sq.; *Contemp. Review*, May, 1869, art. vi, reprinted in the *Amer. Presbyt. Rev.* July, 1869, art. 8. (G. F. H.)

Humerale

SEE AMICE.

Humiliati

a monastic order founded about 1134 by some Italian noblemen whom the emperor Henry II had sent as hostages to Germany. In 1151 they were transformed into canons of St. Benedict, and as such received the sanction of pope Innocent III in 1200. A corresponding order of nuns was afterwards organized in Milan by a lady name(d Blassoni (whence they were also called *Nuns of Blassoni*). Notwithstanding the numerous disorders they occasioned, these nuns did great good as nurses, etc.; their rule was adopted in some ninety-eight convents, but they were finally suppressed by Pius V in 1571. A few convents, without particular attention to dress and observances of the old order, still remain in Italy. The habit of the order consisted in a white dress and cloak, to which a white scapulary was afterwards added; also a small hood. The nuns' dress was white, with gray under-garments, or vice versa. — Pierer, *Univers. Lexikon*, 8, 609;

Fehr, *Allgem. Gesch. der Mönchsorden* (Tüb. 1845), p. 132 sq.; Helyot, *Geschichte d. Klöster u. Ritterorden*, 6; 179 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3, 347; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 396 sq. (J. H.W.)

Humiliation of Christ

(in the language of the older Reformed theologians, the *status humiliations sive exinanitionis*), the “humbling of himself” (Philippians ii, 8) to which the son of God submitted in accomplishing the redemption of mankind. As to the question whether the Logos, at the incarnation, voluntarily divested himself of his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in purely human form, *SEE KENOSIS*. On the question of his descent into Hades, *SEE HELL, DESCENT INTO*. For monographs on this subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 34; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 113.

The humiliation of Christ is generally set forth by theologians as shown in his birth, his circumstances, temptation, sufferings, and death.

1. *In his birth*: he was born of a woman — a sinful woman; though *he* was without sin (^{<404>}Galatians 4:4); of a *poor* woman (^{<407>}Luke 2:7, 24); in a poor country village (^{<404>}John 1:46); in a stable—an abject place; of a nature subject to infirmities (^{<800>}Hebrews 2:9), hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, etc.
2. *In his circumstances*: laid in a manger when he was born, lived in obscurity for a long time, probably worked at the trade of a carpenter, had not a place where to lay his head, and was oppressed with poverty while he went about preaching the Gospel.
3. It appeared in his *reputation*: he was loaded with the most abusive railing and calumny (Isaiah 53), the most false accusations (^{<405>}Matthew 26:59, 67), and the most ignominious ridicule (^{<4216>}Psalms 22:6; ^{<4216>}Matthew 22:68; ^{<405>}John 7:35).
4. *In his soul*: he was often tempted (^{<400>}Matthew 4:1, etc.; ^{<827>}Hebrews 2:17, 18; 4:15); grieved with the reproaches cast on himself, and with the sins and miseries of others (^{<823>}Hebrews 12:3; ^{<4119>}Matthew 11:19; ^{<415>}John 11:35); was burdened with the hidings of his Father’s face, and the fears and impressions of his wrath (^{<4201>}Psalms 21:1; ^{<424>}Luke 22:43; ^{<807>}Hebrews 5:7).
5. *In his death*: scourged, crowned with thorns, received gall and vinegar to drink, and was crucified between two thieves (Luke 23; John 19;

<41524>Mark 15:24, 25). 6. In his *burial*: not only was he born in another man's house, but he was buried in another man's tomb; for he had no tomb of his own, or family vault to be interred in (<25310>Isaiah 53:10, etc.; <41316>Matthew 13:46).

The humiliation of Christ was necessary,

1. To execute the purpose of God, and covenant engagements 'of Christ (<4423>Acts 2:23, 24; <9416>Psalm 40:6, 7, 8);
2. To fulfill the manifold types and predictions of the Old Testament;
3. To satisfy the broken law of God, and procure eternal redemption for us (Isaiah 53; <3912>Hebrews 9:12, 15);
4. To leave us an unspotted pattern of holiness and patience under suffering. *Buck, Theol. Dict.* s.v. For a summary of the views of the Reformed theologians on the humiliation of Christ, see Heppe, *Dogmatik deri Evang. — Reform. Kirche* (Elberfeld, 1861), Locus 19. See also Hase, *Evane. Prot. Dogmatik*, § 155, 156; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, vol. 2; Robert Hall, *Works*, vol. 3; Knapp, *Theology*, § 9597. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

Humility (Lat. *humilitas*; from *humus*, the ground), as a Christian grace, is the opposite of "highmindedness." It was unknown to the ancient heathen moralists; the word *humilis*, with them, indicated baseness of mind.

1. The believer is indeed "exalted" to a higher stage of manhood by his union with Christ, and becomes moreover, a "king and priest unto God." But he never "exalts" himself. Whatever he has, he owes (and feels that he owes) not to himself, but to the love of God, his creator; to the grace of Christ, his redeemer; and to the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. He perceives all his blessings only in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If he looks upon himself, he finds that- all he is or has is but what has been mercifully vouchsafed to him; if he looks upon his individual *ego*, apart from these privileges, he finds only a weak, impotent personality, corrupted by sin and error, and unworthy of such great privileges. If he rejoices in the possession of Christian graces, he rejoices in them as having been given him (<4047>1 Corinthians 4:7), and considers at the same time the merits of others (<5123>Romans 12:3: "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you not to think *of himself more* highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith"). Conscious of the gifts he has received, he yet

praises the grace which has given them to him (^{<4517>}Romans 15:17, 18: “I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ, in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me.” ^{<5041>}Philippians 4:11-13: “I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.” ^{<4705>}2 Corinthians 3:5: “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God.” ^{<4085>}1 Corinthians 3:5-7: “Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase”). The best Christians are but unprofitable servants, and unworthy instruments of the grace of God (^{<2710>}Luke 17:10: “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do”). The feeling of obligation for all one is or has, and of shortcoming in the use of those gifts, which we cannot even praise ourselves for having well employed, is a mark of *humility*.

2. “To consider this grace a little more particularly, it may be observed,
 1. That humility does not oblige a man to wrong the truth or himself by entertaining a meaner or worse opinion of himself than he deserves.
 2. Nor does it oblige a man, right or wrong, to give everybody else the preference to himself. A wise man cannot believe himself inferior to the ignorant multitude, nor the virtuous man that he is not so good as those whose lives are vicious.
 3. Nor does it oblige a man to treat himself with contempt in his words or actions: it looks more like affectation than humility when a man says such things *in* his own dispraise as others know, or he himself believes, to be false; and it is plain also that this is often done merely as a bait to catch the praises of others.

Humility consists,

1. In not attributing to ourselves any excellence or good which we have not.
2. In not overrating anything we do.
3. In not taking an immoderate delight in ourselves.
4. In not assuming more of the praise of a quality or action than belongs to us.
5. In an inward sense of our many imperfections and sins.
6. In ascribing all we have and are to the grace of God. True humility will express itself,
 1. By the modesty of our appearance; the humble man will consider his age, abilities, character, function, etc., and act accordingly;
 2. By the modesty of our pursuits: we shall not aim at anything above our strength, but prefer a good to a great name.
 3. It will express itself by the modesty of our conversation and behavior: we shall not be loquacious, obstinate, forward, envious, discontented, or ambitious.

The advantages of humility are numerous:

1. It is well pleasing to God (~~4001~~ 1 Peter 3:4).
2. It has great influence on us in the performance of all other duties, praying, hearing, converse, etc.
3. It indicates that more grace shall be given (~~5006~~ James 4:6; ~~4209~~ Psalm 25:9)
4. It preserves the soul in great tranquility and contentment (~~4802~~ Psalm 69:32, 33).
5. It makes us patient and resigned under afflictions (~~4022~~ Job 1:22).
6. It enables us to exercise moderation in everything.

To obtain this excellent spirit, we should remember,

1. The example of Christ (~~5006~~ Philippians 2:6, 7, 8);
2. That heaven is a place of humility (~~4008~~ Revelation 5:8);

3. That our sins are numerous, and deserve the greatest punishment (~~<2189>~~Lamentations 3:39);
4. That humility is the way to honor (~~<2168>~~Proverbs 16:18);
5. That the greatest promises of good are made to the humble (~~<2575>~~Isaiah 57:15; 56:2; ~~<4185>~~1 Peter 5:5; ~~<4176>~~Psalms 147:6; ~~<4185>~~Matthew 5:5)" (Buck, *Theo. Dict.* s.v.).

"It has been deemed a great paradox in Christianity that it makes humility the avenue to glory. Yet what other avenue is there to wisdom, or even to knowledge? Would you pick up precious truths, you must bend down and look for them. Everywhere the pearl of great price lies bedded in a shell, which has no form or comeliness. It is so in physical science. Bacon has declared it, *Natura non nisi parendo vincitfu*; and the triumphs of science since his days have proved how willing Nature is to be conquered by those who will obey her. It is so in moral speculation. Wordsworth has told us the law of his own mind, the fulfillment of which has enabled him to reveal a new world of poetry: *Wisdom is oftentimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar*. That it is so likewise in religion we are assured by those most comfortable words, *Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*. Moreover, the whole intercourse between man and man may be seen, if we look at it closely, to be guided and regulated by the same pervading principle; and that it ought to be so is generally recognized, instinctively, at least, if not consciously. As I have often heard said by him, who, among all the persons I have conversed with to the edification of my understanding, had the keenest practical insight into human nature, and best knew the art of controlling and governing men, and winning them over to their good the moment anybody is satisfied with himself, everybody else becomes dissatisfied with him; whenever a person thinks much of himself, all other people give over thinking about him. Thus it is not alone in the parable that he who takes the highest room is turned down with shame to the lowest, while he who sits down in the lowest room is bid to go up higher." See Hare, *Guesses at Truth*, 1, 242; Krehl, *Handwörterbuch des 7. Test.*, s.v. Demuth; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, 2, 286; Whately, *Dangers to Christian Faith*, p. 38; Conybeare, *Sermons*, p. 141.

Humphrey, Lawrence

an English Protestant divine and philologist, was born at Newport-Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, about 1527. He was educated at Cambridge, where he applied himself especially to the classics. After becoming fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and professor of Greek in the university, he entered the Church. In 1555 he left England in consequence of the persecutions to which Protestants were subject, and remained a while in Zurich. After the death of queen Mary he returned home and resumed his professorship. He became successively professor of theology at Queen's College in 1560, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1561, dean of Gloucester in 1570, and dean of Winchester in 1580. He died February 1, 1589. He was a man of conciliatory manners, and of great piety and learning; of great purity of character, moderate and conscientious, and to this he owed his last preferments he was a good linguist, and a very skilful controvertist. He wrote *Epistola de Graecis literis et Homeri lectione et imitatione* (printed in the first part of Junius's *Cornucopiae*, Basle, 1558, fol.): — *De religionis conservacione et reformatione, deque Primatu Regum* (Basle, 1559, 8vo): — *Obadias Propheta, Hebraice et Latine, et Philo "De Judice," Graece et Latine*, at the end of the preceding treatise: — *Optimates, sive de nobilitate ejusque antiqua origine, natura, officii, disciplina* (Basle, 1561, 8vo, with a Latin translation of Philo's treatise *De Nobilitate*): — *Joannis Juelli, episcopi Salisburiensis, Vita et Mors* (London, 1573, 4to): — *Jesuitismi pars prima, sive praxis Romane curiae contra respublicas et principes* (Lond. 1582, 8vo): — *Jesuitisnzi pars secunda, Puritano Papismlu seu doctriuce Jesuiticae aliquot rationibus ab Edni. Campiatno comprehensce et a Johanne Durceo defenses Confutatio* (London, 1584, 8vo), etc. See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (vol. 1); Chalmers, *Genesis Biog. Dictionary*; Chauffepid, *Dict. Hist.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 543; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 918; Neal, *History of the Puritans* (see Index); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 6:207 sq. (J. N. P.)

Hum'tah

(Heb. *Chuntcah'*, חֲמַתָּא) μ prob. from the Syr. *fortress*, otherwise *place of lizards*; Sept. Ἀμματά v.r. Εὐμά and Χαμματά; Vulg. *Athmatha*), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Aphekah and Hebron (¹⁰⁵⁵Joshua 15:54), apparently in the district lying immediately west of Hebron (Keil, *Comment. ad loc.*). It is not mentioned by any other ancient

writer (Reland, *Palcest.* p. 723) except Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast. s. v.*, *Ἀμαθία*, Ammatha). There is some resemblance between the name and that of *Kimath* (*Κιμάθ*), one of the places added in the Vat. text of the Sept. to the list in the Heb. text of ^{<ORIG>}1 Samuel 30:27-31. It possibly corresponds with the ruined site marked as *Sabzin* (or *Ramet el-Alineh*) on Van de Velde's *Map* at 11 miles north of Hebron, just west of the Jerusalem road.

Hundred

(as a division of the Heb. people). *SEE HOST.*

Huneric

SEE VANDALS.

Hungarian Confession

(*Confessio Hungaria*), the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in Hungary. It was drawn up in 1557 and 1558 by the Synod of Czenger (hence also called *Confessio Czengeriana*), and published in 1570 in Debreczin. It is strongly Calvinistic, especially in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and it was on that account not adopted by the Reformed churches of Poland. (A. J. S.)

Hungary,

a kingdom in Eastern Europe, which has for several centuries been united with the empire of Austria. It has 82,839 square miles, and its population was, according to the census of 1857, 9,900,785. Connected with it, as dependencies of the crown of Hungary, are Transylvania (q.v.), Croatia, and Slavonia. This whole division, which is sometimes called the Transleithanian division of the empire, sometimes simply Hungary, has 124,000 square miles, and, according to the official census of 1857, 13,768,813 inhabitants. According to the official census of Dec. 31, 1869, the total population of the countries subject to the Hungarian crown amounted to 15,429,238, of which Hungary proper had about 11,109,000; Transylvania, 2,109,000; Croatia and Slavonia, 1,015,000; the Military Frontier, 1,195,000.

I. History. — *The Hungarians*, a Scythian tribe, were, as it seems, akin to and allies of the Chazari, who in the first century of the Christian era had

left their original seats, the plateaus of Central Asia, and had founded in the course of time a powerful empire on the Tauric peninsula. At the close of the 9th century the Hungarians (Magyars) were living on the northeastern frontier of this empire, which they defended under their own chiefs against the powerful neighboring nations. After the destruction of this empire, the Magyars, who were unable to resist singly the onset of other tribes, crossed the Dnieper, and settled (884) near the mouth of the Danube, between the Rivers Bugh and Szereth. The imperial throne of Constantinople was at that time occupied by Leo the Wise, who called the bravery of his new neighbors to his aid against Simeon, the chief of the Bulgarians. The call was cheerfully accepted by Arpad, the son of the Magyar duke Almos. Simeon was conquered, and his country laid waste. The renown of the Magyars soon induced king Arnold, of Germany, to ask them for aid against Szvatoplugk, the grand prince of Moravia. Again they accepted the invitation, entered Upper Pannonia, which then belonged to the Moravian empire, and obtained a complete victory; after that they returned to their homes. These, however, had in the meanwhile been invaded and terribly devastated by the Bulgarians, and the Magyars therefore concluded to settle permanently in Pannonia, from which they had just returned as victors. The occupation of the country began in 894; it was completed in 900. The country, distributed among seven tribes and 108 families, was converted into a military state. Their bravery and their renown caused many people of the districts, which they had traversed, and many soldiers of foreign countries, to join them. Thus strengthened, they were able to undertake expeditions as far as the North Sea, the South of France into Italy, and to the Black Sea. But repeated defeats by the kings and emperors of Germany put a stop to their conquests and gave a different direction to their energies. The frontiers of their new country were more definitely marked and fortified, and many more foreign colonists drawn into the country.

The large number of Christian slaves, the connection with the emperors of Constantinople, but in particular the efforts of duke Geysa (972-997), and of his Christian wife Sarolta (Caroline), gradually prepared the introduction of Christianity. Geysa made peace with all his neighbors, and at the diet which he assembled recommended a hospitable reception of foreign visitors and the introduction of Christianity. Geysa himself was baptized by bishop Pilgrin of Passau, who, even during the reign of Tacsony, the father of Geysa, had begun to show a warm interest in the conversion of Hungary.

Besides him, the emperor Otto I and bishop Adalbert of Prague showed a great zeal for the Christianization of the Magyars. Thus the Roman Catholic Church obtained the ascendancy over the few missions which under former chiefs had been established by missionaries of the Greek Church. Adalbert, in 994, baptized, at Gran, Voik, the son of Geysa, who received the name of Stephen. Immediately after his accession to the throne, Stephen made it the first object of his rule to secure the complete victory of Christianity; nor did he hesitate for this end to employ force. He issued at once an order that all Magyars must receive baptism, and that all Christian slaves must be set free. This decree filled those Magyars who were opponents of Christianity with the utmost indignation against the young king and against the Germans who surrounded him. Kupa, a relative of Stephen and duke of the Sumegians, put himself at the head of the malcontents, but at Veszprim he was totally defeated and killed; and henceforth all serious opposition to the Christianization of Hungary ceased. Stephen himself traversed the country in every direction, encouraging the people to become Christians, and threatening with severe punishments all who would refuse to obey this order. He established schools in his residence, called many monks as teachers, established ten richly-endowed bishoprics, introduced the tithe, and made the prelates the first estate of the empire. For these labors Stephen received from pope Sylvester II a crown, which has since then constituted the upper part of the *sacra regni Hungariae corona*, while its lower part consists of a crown which the Greek emperor Manuel Dukas gave to Geysa. With this crown Stephen received from the pope a patriarchal cross and the title of apostolic king. Thus Hungary became a kingdom, the chief supports of which, according to the Constitution given by Stephen, were to be the clergy and the nobility. The following kings enlarged the privileges of the clergy, who thus, in the course of time, became richer than in any other European country. After the death of Stephen several more efforts were made by the native pagan party to displace both Christianity and the German party at the court, which was regarded as the chief support of Christianity. But all these attempts utterly failed, and paganism soon became extinct. The frontiers of the empire were enlarged by the conquest of Croatia and Slavonia in 1089, and that of Dalmatia in 1102; at home the clergy extorted from the weak Andrew I (1202-35) a favorable Concordat. In 1437 Hungary fell for the first time to the house of Hapsburg. In 1526 the line of independent kings of Hungary became extinct by the death of king Louis II. A large portion of Hungary was subjugated by the Turks, and remained

a Turkish province for more than a century; the remainder was long rent by civil wars, which ended in connecting the country permanently with the crown of Hapsburg.

When the first knowledge of the Reformation reached Hungary, the Diet of 1528 issued a cruel decree that the Lutherans and all favorers of Lutheranism should be captured and burned. But amidst the disorder which followed the death of Louis II the Reformation spread, and gained a firm footing in spite of the cruel prohibitory laws. Probably the first to preach in favor of the Reformation was Thomas Preussner, of Kaesmark, who is said to have publicly announced his concurrence in the views of Luther. A great impression was made by the Augsburg Confession, as the grandees who accompanied king Ferdinand to the Diet of Augsburg brought back a favorable account of the Lutheran Reformation. Several scholars went to Wittenberg to study under Luther, among whom were Devay, Quendel, Stockel, Andrew Fischer, Leutscher, Bogner, Transylvanus, Radan, Siklosy, and Kopaczy. The further progress of the Reformation was very quiet, only a few bishops and magnates trying to employ force. Prince Zapolya, who contested with king Ferdinand the possession of Hungary, issued a severe edict against the Protestants, and the parish priest of Libethen was in 1527 burned as a favorer of the Reformation; but as the majority of the towns, nearly the whole nobility, and many of the most powerful magnates were favorable to the Reformation, the persecution of Protestantism soon ceased. Many of the priests then joined the Reformation with their entire congregations; in other instances the congregations waited until the death of the Catholic pastor, and then called an evangelical successor. The evangelical pastors continued for a long time to pay tribute to the bishops, and were protected by the latter in their rights and privileges, provided they would remain faithful to the Augsburg Confession, and not join the detested Sacramentarians (Calvinists). In 1549 the royal free cities of Upper Hungary had their Confession of Faith drawn up by Leonhard Stockel in the sense of the Augsburg Confession, and presented it to king Ferdinand. This Confession was approved and confirmed not only by the king, but also by the primate Nicholas Olah and the bishop Verantius, with several Catholic prelates, as bishop Kechdry of Veszprim, bishop Thurzo of Neutra, and bishop Dudich, who had attended the Council of Trent as representatives of Ferdinand. King Ferdinand himself appeared to be favorable to the Protestants, for he permitted the election of the foremost patron of the Reformation, Thomas Nadasdy, as

palatine of Hungary. Still more auspicious was the reign of the mild Maximilian, who tried to gain the Protestants by wise concessions. Thus they found time to develop their Church Constitution, to hold synods, and to regulate their Church and school affairs under the protection of the evangelical magnates. A large majority of the inhabitants belonged to the evangelical faith; only three magnates continued to be Roman Catholic, and probably Protestantism would have forever established its ascendancy had not the Protestants themselves been split into Lutherans and Calvinists, who seemed to hate each other more than other religious denominations. Thus weakened by internal dissensions, the Protestants suffered greatly from the persecutions which began against them under the reign of Rudolphus. The Jesuits, who had come for a short time to Hungary in 1561, at the invitation of the primas Nicholas Olah, but had been unable to do any thing under the tolerant reign of Maximilian, returned, and began to display a great activity for the restoration of the old Church. Jacob Barbian of Belgioso took from the Protestants a number of churches, and the complaints of the people against these acts of violence remained without effect. Rudolphus, instead of redressing the grievances, made to the laws passed by the Hungarian Diet an addition, which declared the grievances of the Protestants to be unfounded and their conduct scandalous, and which confirmed all the former laws against them. Boczkai, the prince of Transylvania, rose against this law, and was joined everywhere by malcontents. Soon he was master of all Transylvania and of Northern Hungary. Basta, the imperial general, was defeated, and Rudolphus compelled to conclude, in 1606, the peace of Vienna, which assured the Protestants throughout the empire of religious liberty, and promised that the emperor would never allow any violation of this provision. To the provision was, however, added this clausula, "without any injury to the Catholic religion." When the articles of the Vienna treaty of peace were, in 1608, read to the Diet at Pressburg, the bishop of Veszprim protested in the name of the clergy against the religious liberty granted to the Protestants; but the firmness of archduke Matthias overcame the opposition of all the Catholics, and the treaty of peace was unanimously ratified by all save cardinal Forgaz. Nevertheless, Rudolphus declared the resolutions of the Diet invalid. This breach of faith cost him the throne; his brother Matthias was crowned king of Hungary on November 8, 1608, two days after the evangelical count Illeshazy had been elected palatine by a large majority. Through the liberality of Illeshazy, who was in possession of immense riches, the Protestants received a large number of churches and

schools. Illeshazy died the next year (May 6, 1609); but his successor, count George Thurzo, was an equally zealous Protestant. Under his presidency, a synod was held in March, 1610, at Sillein, in the comitat of Trentshin, at which the Protestant churches were organized into three superintendencies, the duties of superintendents, seniors, and inspectors defined, and many rules adopted for the regulation of Church government and Church discipline. The resolutions of the synod, which were printed by order of the palatine, and circulated among all the Protestant congregations of the country, aroused the Catholic clergy to extraordinary efforts against the further spreading of Protestantism. Unfortunately, palatine Thurzo died soon, and the Catholics found a leader of rare ability in the Jesuit Pazmany, who succeeded in causing within a short time more than fifty of the first noble families to return to the Catholic Church. They, in turn, compelled hundreds of thousands of their subjects to leave the Protestant churches. At the diets the Roman Catholics again obtained the ascendancy; the resolutions of 1608 were, it is true, several times confirmed, but the government did not respect the decrees of the diets, and the persecutions of Protestants continued. For a time the Reformed prince Bethlen, of Transylvania, extorted by his victories from king Ferdinand II promises of redress, but none of these promises were kept. At the Diet of 1637, the Protestants, under the name of the Evangelical Estates (*Status et Ordines Evangelici*), presented their grievances in writing; but the Diet contented itself with a new confirmation of former laws, and gave to the Jesuits the first landed property in the kingdom. The discontent of the Protestants was supported by Racoczy, prince of Transylvania, who invaded Hungary at the head of 10,000 men, and finally compelled Ferdinand III to conclude the peace of Linz, 1645, in which the Protestants again obtained the free exercise of their religion, the use of bells, and the permission to build towers and to keep their own cemeteries. But the Catholic clergy refused to recognize the provisions of this treaty, and soon the reign of Leopold I brought on the sorest trials for Protestantism. The complaints of the Protestants regarding the constant violations of their rights were not listened to; they were ordered not to bring their grievances before the Diet, but before the courts. Several Protestant noblemen entered, therefore, into a conspiracy for the separation of Hungary from Austria, but the plot was discovered, and all who had taken part in it sentenced to death. The Jesuits used this as a pretext for the most violent measures against Protestants. Archbishop Szelepczenyi summoned the evangelical ministers of the mountain towns before his court at Pressburg, where they were charged

with being accomplices of the Turks, with seditious sermons, revolutionary sympathies, abuse of the Catholic host, opening of the prisons, sale of Catholic priests to the Turks. The preachers were all sentenced to death; but the emperor pardoned them on the condition that they should renounce their titles of preachers and pastors, not discharge the duties connected with such a title, keep no schools, not preach either secretly or publicly, and sign a declaration acknowledging their guilt. Whosoever should refuse to sign this declaration must leave Hungary within thirty days. In the next year all the evangelical preachers, even those who lived under Turkish dominion, were summoned to Pressburg. The latter did not come; but those living under the scepter of Leopold made their appearance, 250 of the Confession of Augsburg and 57 of the Helvetic Confession. The majority signed the demanded declaration; those who refused were imprisoned; the most obstinate, about 29 in number, were sent to the galleys. The Swedish government, the dukes of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Luneburg, remonstrated with the emperor in favor of the prisoners, but not until about a year later did they recover their liberty. A great massacre of Protestants was soon after (1657) committed at Eperies by the imperial general Caraffa, who pretended to have discovered a wide-spread conspiracy, and caused the execution of a large number of prominent men, among whom were many of the leaders of the Protestants. The peace of Carlovics, in 1699, restored to Hungary all the districts, with the only exception of that of Temesvar, which for more than a hundred years had been under the rule of the Turks. At home, the continued discontent of the people led to a new insurrection headed by Francis Racozy, which was suppressed in 1711 by the peace of Szathmar. This peace again reaffirmed the rights, which had been granted to Protestants. New complaints of disturbances of Protestant worship induced Charles VI (as king of Hungary, Charles III) to appoint a royal commission, on the recommendation of which it was decreed that the evangelical preachers should be superintended by Catholic archdeacons; that the ministerial functions of the preachers of the two Protestant Confessions must be limited to those churches (at most two in each comitat) in which a resolution of the Diet of Oedenburg, held in 1681, expressly authorized the Protestants to hold divine service; that the Protestants, when elected to office, must take their oaths with an invocation of the blessed Virgin and all the saints; and that all Protestants must take part in the celebration of the Catholic festivals and in the public processions. The establishment of a royal chancellery and stadtholdership, which in the name of the sovereign

had to promulgate and execute the imperial laws, was unfavorable to the Protestants. as a majority of the councilors were taken from the ranks of the bishops, magnates, and noblemen. Thus the Protestants were annoyed by this board in every possible way. Conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism were strictly forbidden; Catholics were forbidden to attend a Protestant school, and the Protestant youth to study at foreign schools; members of one Protestant denomination were not allowed to visit the divine service of the other; Protestant books were submitted to Protestant censors, their trials of divorce to Catholic judges. Maria Theresa expressed personal sympathy with the oppressed condition of Protestants but pretended to be unable to do any thing for them on account of her coronation oath and the laws of the country. An essential amelioration in the condition of Protestants was effected under Joseph II, who, in 1781, by the edict of toleration, granted to all the Protestants of his dominions freedom of conscience and of religion, and the right of public worship. Now a new era in the history of Protestantism began. A large number of new churches and schools were established, hundreds of clergymen were called. Protestants became eligible to every office; the religious oath was abolished; the Protestant superintendents were allowed to visit the churches, and persons living in mixed marriages to bring up their children in the evangelical faith, as well as to select for them any school they chose; the press was to be free and unfettered. Leopold II also showed a firm disposition to be just toward the Protestants. The Diet of 1791 was petitioned by the Protestants to sanction the royal decree which had granted them religious freedom, Notwithstanding a violent opposition on the part of the bishops, the diet granted the request, chiefly moved by the eloquent plea of the Catholic count Aloysius Battlyani. Accordingly, the 26th article of religion of 1791 provides that the Protestants of both Confessions shall enjoy the free exercise of their religion; that they shall not be forced to attend processions, masses, or other ceremonies; that in ecclesiastical affairs they shall be subordinate only to their own ecclesiastical superiors; that they may build churches and schools, elect preachers and teachers; that they shall not have to contribute to the building of Catholic churches and schools. The Protestants at once hastened to perfect their ecclesiastical constitution. In the same year (1791), a synod of both the Protestant churches was held at Ofen and Pesth, at which long-pending controversies between the clergy and prominent laymen were settled, and the establishment of a general Consistory proposed. The protest of a few evangelical clergymen, as well

as that of the Catholic clergy and the early death of the sovereign, prevented the resolutions of this diet from receiving the royal sanction. During the reign of Francis I the rights of the Protestants were often encroached upon, especially in the case of mixed marriages. The Diet of 1843 to 1844 interfered, however, in favor of the Protestants, and enlarged, in its provisions concerning mixed marriages and the right of joining the Protestant Church, the law of 1791. The fullness of equal rights was finally secured to Protestants by a law of 1848. In consequence of the failure of the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848 and 1849, these rights were, however, for a time suspended. The imperial commander, baron Haynau, himself a Protestant, abolished the offices of general inspector and the district inspectors for the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and that of curators for the Church of the Helvetic Confession. The holding of conventions was forbidden, and only after a time the holding of "several conventions" allowed when attended by an imperial commissioner. After repeated petitions and representations, the minister of public worship and instruction, on August 21, 1856, laid the draft of a law on the reorganization of the Constitution of the Protestant churches before the superintendents. The latter declined this draft, and unanimously asked for the convocation of the General Synod. On September 1, 1859, an imperial patent was published, which undertook, on the ground of the law of 1791, to give to the Protestant churches a new Constitution. Nearly the entire evangelical Church of both Confessions protested against the legality of this imperial patent, claiming for the Church the right to make herself the necessary changes in her Constitution on the legal basis of the law of 1791. Only a few congregations of the Lutheran Slovaks, numbering together about 54 congregations, accepted the patent. All the efforts to break the opposition of the Protestants failed; and when, in 1867, the Austrian government concluded to make peace with Hungary, the patent of 1859, and all the decrees accompanying it, were repealed. The two Protestant churches were assured that they would be at liberty to rearrange their Church matters in a constitutional way. At the General Convention of the Confession of Augsburg, which was held in Pesth in September, the reunion of the Lutheran Slovaks who had accepted the patent with the remainder of the Church was consummated. In December, 1867; a General Convention of the 'two Protestant churches was held under the presidency of baron Nicholas Vay, in order to acquaint the Hungarian Diet with the wishes and opinion of the churches concerning religious and school questions. The Convention resolved,

- 1, that the affairs of the Protestants be regulated by general laws, and not by special laws for each of the two denominations;
- 2, that no privileges be granted to any on account of religion;
3. that the equality pronounced in the 20th article of the law of 1848 extend to all denominations;
- 4, that the Church with regard to the state be autonomous, and that to the state belong only the right of supreme inspection and of protection. Other liberal resolutions were adopted by this and by a later Convention respecting a change of religion, mixed marriages, divorces, schools, and endowment. The majority of the Diet showed itself just toward the Protestants, and their chief demands were fulfilled. The reconciliation which took place in 1867 between the people of Hungary and the emperor of Austria gave to Hungary a greater independence than it had ever enjoyed before. A special ministry was appointed for the countries of the Hungarian crown, which also had their own diet, and retained only a few points of administration in common with the remainder of the monarchy. One of the most important reforms, introduced into Hungary in consequence of the new Constitution, was the declaration of the autonomy of all the religions recognized in Hungary, and the transfer of the extensive rights in ecclesiastical affairs, which had formerly been connected with the Hungarian crown, to elective assemblies representing the several religious denominations. The first assemblies of those churches, which had thus far been without them, were convoked by the government; they fixed the mode of election for the subsequent assemblies. Thus, with the other denominations, the Roman Catholic Church received an autonomy congress, the only elective assembly of this kind in the Church, and regarded with great distrust by the ultramontane party. It consists of all the bishops, and of chosen delegates of the lower clergy and the laity. The preliminary congress was held on June 24, 1869, and consisted of 157 members.

II. Statistics. — *According* to the last official census of 1857, the religious statistics of the countries belonging to the Hungarian crown were as follows:

According to an official calculation, the Hungarian countries had, in 1880, 7,558,558 Latin Catholics, 1,559,628 Greek Catholics, 5133 Armenian Catholics, 2,589,319 Oriental or Non-United Greeks, 3,144,759

Evangelicals, 54,922 Unitarians, 553,641 Israelites, 3603 belonging to other sects.

The Roman Catholic Church has four archbishops, those of Gran (who is primate of all Hungary), Kalocza, Erlau, and Agram. The archbishopric of Gran, which was founded by St. Stephen, had in 1870 ten suffragan sees, namely, the Latin bishoprics of Veszprim, Neusohl, Waitzen, Neutra, Stahlweissenburg, Fiinfkirchen, Steinamanger, Raab, and the United Greek sees of Muncacz and Eperies. The archdiocese of Colocza (and Bacz) has the Latin suffragan sees of Czanad, Gran Wardein, and Transylvania. The suffragans of the archbishop of Erlau are the bishops of Zips, Rosenan, Kaschau, and Szathmar. Agram, which had formerly been a suffragan of Gran, and was constituted an archbishopric on Dec. 20, 1852, embraces Croatia and Slavonia, and has as suffragans the Latin bishoprics of Zengg-Modruss and Diacovar (Bosnia-Syrmium), and the Greek bishop of Creutz.

The Greek Catholic (United Greek) Church has, besides the bishops of Muncacz, Eperies, and Creutz, who have already been mentioned, an archbishop (since 1853) at Fogaras, who has as suffragans the bishops of Lugos, Gran Wardein, and Szamos-Ujvar.

The Oriental, or Non-United Greek Church, has for the Servian nationality a patriarch at Carlovicz, and suffragan sees at Alt-Ofen, Arad, Temesvar, Neusatz, Pakratz, and Carlstadt; for the Romanian nationality, a metropolitan of Transylvania.

The Church of the Augsburg Confession (evangelical Lutherans) has four superintendencies (Cis-Danubian Trans-Danubian, Montan District, and Theiss District); the superintendencies are subdivided into seniorats, the latter into congregations. The Church of the Helvetic Confession has likewise four superintendencies, which are also subdivided into seniorats and congregations. Transylvania has one Lutheran and one Reformed superintendent. Each congregation of the two Protestant churches chooses its own pastors and a presbytery, which is presided over in the Church of the Augsburg Confession by a local inspector, and in the Church of the Helvetic Confession by a curator, in common with the pastor. The congregations belonging to one seniorat choose a senior and a senioral inspector (Lutheran), or subcurator (Reformed). In the Reformed seniorats, the senior presides in the senioral conventions; in the Lutheran Church, the inspector. The superintendents and the superintendential inspectors (Lutheran) or curators (Reformed) are chosen for lifetime by all

the congregations. The superintendential conventions, which are held annually, and composed of all the seniors, and of one clerical and one lay deputy from each seniorat, are presided over by the superintendent in common with the superintendential inspector or curator. The Protestants of the Helvetic Confession are all Magyars, with the exception of eight German congregations; to the Church of the Augsburg Confession belong about 200,000 Germans, 200,000 Magyars, and 400,000 Slavs.

The Unitarians in Transylvania have a superintendent (bishop) and Supreme Consistory at Clausenburg, 104 parishes, and 120 ministers.

Hungary has a national university at Pesth, 48 Catholic and 39 Protestant gymnasia. The number of elementary schools amounted (1864) in Hungary to 11,452, in Transylvania to 1793, in Croatia and Slavonia to 490, in the Military Frontier to 907. A large number of communities were in 1869 still without a school. There are also five normal schools at Pesth, Sgezedin, Neuhausel, Miskolcz, and Grosskanizsa. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 16, 636 Mather, *Kirchl. Chronik*, 1867 and 1869; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, i, 216 sq.; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistic*, 2, 123. (A.J.S.)

Hunger

($h[\underline{r}]$; *raah'*; $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$) AND THIRST are the symbols of affliction. Thus in ^{<1808>}Deuteronomy 8:3, “He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger,” where the latter is the instrument of the former. So ^{<1824>}Deuteronomy 32:24, “They shall be burnt with hunger;” i.e. they shall be tormented or afflicted. So *tofaist* is often called to *afflict one’s soul*, as in ^{<1869>}Leviticus 16:29-31; ^{<2886>}Isaiah 58:5. In Aristophanes (*Aves*) hunger is proverbially used for great misery. See ^{<4041>}1 Corinthians 4:11; ^{<4112>}2 Corinthians 11:27; ^{<1042>}Philippians 4:12. In our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount, *to hunger and thirst* signifies to long for and relish the Gospel (^{<4186>}Matthew 5:6; ^{<4121>}Luke 6:21), but elsewhere to be in want of hearing God’s word; that is, to be hindered by persecution from worshipping God in peace (Psalm 23; Ecclesiastes 24:19; ^{<4043>}John 4:13, 1.; 6:35; ^{<1081>}Amos 8:11; ^{<3076>}Ezekiel 7:26). *SEE FAMINE.*

Hunnius, Aegidius

an eminent German Lutheran theologian, was born at Winenden, in Wurtemberg, Dec. 21, 1550, and studied theology at Tübingen, where he

afterwards became first tutor, and deacon in 1574. In 1576 he went to Marburg as professor and preacher, Here his strict adherence to the doctrine of ubiquity in the Eucharist, and his advocacy of the Formula of Concord, sowed the germ of the separation of the Hessian Church. In 1592 he became professor at the University of Wittenberg, where he opposed the moderate views of Melancthon. In 1594 he accompanied the duke Frederick William to the Imperial Diet at Regensburg, where his influence opposed the union of the different evangelical free cities. In 1595 he sustained a sharp controversy with Samuel Huber (q.v.) on the doctrines of election and predestination, and in 1602, at the Conference of Ratisbon, he was one of the principal opponents of the Jesuits Gretzer and Tanner. He died April 4, 1603. His principal works are, *Confession v. d. Person Christi* (1577, 1609); also in Latin, *De persona Christi* (1585): — *Calvinus Judaizans* (1593): — *Antiparaeus* (194 and 1599): — *Josephus*, a drama (1597). His works in Latin have been collected and published by Garthius (Wittenb. 1607-9, 5 vols. folio). See Hutter, *Lebensbeschreibung* (1603); Adami, *Vites Theologorum*; Ersch und Gruber, *Encyclopadie*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25; 554; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6:316 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 140; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* 3:534 sq.

Hunnius, Nikolaus

son of AEGidius Hunnius, was born at Marburg July 11, 1585. He studied philology, philosophy, and theology at Wittenberg, where he began lectures on theology and philosophy in 1609. In 1612 he went as superintendent to Eilenburg, and in 1617 returned to Wittenberg as professor, in the place of Hutter (q.v.). In 1623 he became head pastor of the Church of Mary at Lubeck, and superintendent of the Church in the same city the following year. He died April 12, 1643. He resembled his father as well in his attachment to the Lutheran orthodoxy as in his learning and controversial powers. He devised the plan of a *Collegium Irenicum*, which was called, after him, "Collegium Hunnianum," and which was to form a supreme tribunal in all theological disputes. He was also distinguished as an able opponent of Popery. His principal works are, *Ministerii Lutherani divini adeoque legitimi demonstratio* (Witteub. 1614): — *Examen errorum Photinianorum* (1618, 1620): — *Epitome credendorum* (Wittenberg, 1625; 18 eds., and translated into Dutch, Swedish, and Polish): — *Διάσχεσις theol. de fundamentali dissensu doctrinae evangel. Lutheranae et Calvinianae* (Wittenb. 1626): — *Bedenkent ob u. wie d. is d. Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche d.*

schwebende Religionstreitigkeit beilegen od fortstellen u. endigen misgen (Lub. 1632, 1638, 1666, 1667): — *Anweisung zum rechten Christenthum* (Lub. 1637 and 1643). See Heller, *Lebensbeschreibung* (1843); Pierer, *Universal Lex.* vol. 8; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 6, 321 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 201.

Hunolt, Franz

a distinguished Roman Catholic pulpit orator, was born in the duchy of Nassau towards the close of the 17th century. He was a member of the Jesuit order, and his *Sermons* (Cologne, 1737, 6 vols. fol., and often) gave him rank as one of the best preachers (of the 18th. century. He died at Trier in 1746. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12, 606.

Huns

(Latin *Hunni*), a nation of Asiatic origin, and in all likelihood of Mongolian or Tartar stock, therefore akin to. and perhaps to be identified with, the *Scythians* and the *Turks*, were, according to De Guignes (*Hist. des Huns*), whose theory was accepted by Gibbon, and is now entertained by all competent critics, lineal descendants from the *Hiong-nou* nation, “whose ancient seat was an extensive but barren tract of country immediately to the north of the great wall of China. About the year B.C. 200 these people overran the Chinese empire, defeated the Chinese armies in numerous engagements, and even drove the emperor Kao-ti himself to an ignominious capitulation and treaty. During the reign of Vou-ti (B.C. 141-87) their power was very much broken. Eventually they separated into two distinct camps, one of which, amounting to about 50,000 families, went southwards, while the other endeavored to maintain itself in its original seat. This, however, it was very difficult for them to do; and eventually the most warlike and enterprising went west and north-west in search of new homes. Of those that went northwest, a large number established themselves for a while on the banks of the Volga.” About the earlier part of the 4th century they crossed this river, and advanced into the territories of the Alani, a pastoral people dwelling between the Volga and the Don. The incursion was resisted with much bravery and some effect, until at length a bloody and decisive battle was fought on the banks of the Don, in which the Alan king was slain, and his army utterly routed, and the vast majority of the survivors agreed to join the invaders. They next encountered successfully the aged leader of the Goths, who claimed as his dominions

the land situated between the Baltic and the Euxine, and then his successor Withimir, whom they slew in battle. The Goths still remaining placed themselves under the protection of the emperor Valens, who in 376 gave permission to a great number of them to cross the Danube, and settle in the countries on the other side as auxiliaries to the Roman arms against further invasion. The Huns thus became the occupants of all the old territories of the Goths; and when these, not long afterwards, revolted against Valens, the Huns also crossed the Danube, and joined their arms to those of the Goths in hostilities against the Roman empire. In the wars that followed, the Huns were less conspicuous than the Goths, their former enemies. In the 5th century they were strengthened by fresh hordes of their brethren, and they determined to gain further conquests. In the reign of Theodosius, under their king Attila (q.v.), they were even strong enough to receive an annual tribute from the Romans to secure their empire against external injury. With Attila's death, however, in 454, their power was totally broken. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded him, but there was now strife everywhere among the several nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns never regained their power. Many of them took service in the armies of the Romans, and others again joined fresh hordes of invaders from the north and east; which were undoubtedly tribes related to them, especially the Avares, whom they joined in great numbers and hence perhaps the reason why, at this period of their history, they are frequently called *Hunnavares*. They now made themselves masters of the country known by us as Lower Austria. But the Slaves (Slavonians?) in Bohemia and Moravia regained their territory in the 8th century, and many of the Hunnavares were made slaves, and were thus brought to a knowledge of Christianity. Their inclinations, however, led them to oppose most fiercely all the inroads of Christianity, and they transformed Christian churches into heathen temples wherever they were successful in gaining territory. About 791 Charlemagne waged war against the Avares, as the Huns were then called, in which many of them were slain, and but few weak tribes remained. About the year 799 they were finally conquered, and their power broken. Charles himself regarded this war as a sort of crusade or holy war, and sent to the pope and the Church all the tribute paid him by the vanquished foe. The first great convert to Christianity was one of their princes, called Tudem, who sent a legation to Charlemagne in 795, with the declaration that he would become tributary to him and accept the Christian religion. He was baptized at Aix-la-Chapelle in 796, but shortly after his return to his tribe he abjured the newly-accepted faith. King Pepin paid

particular attention to the conversion of the Huns, in whose behalf Alcuin (q.v.) also was greatly interested. By peopling the territory assigned to them with 'Germans, especially Bavarians, and by founding several monasteries and cathedrals, the subsequent Christian princes furthered Christianity among them, until they became amalgamated with the Germans.

The Huns are said to have been of a dark complexion, almost black; deformed in their appearance, of uncouth gesture, and shrill voice. The ancient descriptions unmistakably ally them to the Tartars. "They were distinguished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes deeply buried in the head; and, as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the manly graces of youth or the venerable aspect of age. A fabulous origin was assigned worthy of their form and manners—that the witches of Scythia, who for their foul and deadly practices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits, and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjunction" (Gibbon). See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 5, 397 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 462; Appleton, *Am. Cyclop.* 9, 318; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Milman's ed.), vol. 6 (see Index). (J. H.W.)

Hunt, Aaron

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Episcopal parents at Eastchester, N. Y., March 28, 1768, and emigrated to New York City at seventeen. Here he was converted in 1789, and licensed to preach in 1790. He was first employed as assistant to Dr. Wm. Phoebus on the Long Island Circuit. In 1791 he entered the New York Conference, and was sent to Fairfield Circuit. In a few years his labors were extended all through the state of Connecticut, on the east as well as on the west side of the river by that name, and into adjoining states, exploring new ground, and contending with opposition and difficulties common to Methodist ministers of those times. After this we find him laboring on various circuits in the state and city of New York, having charge of the whole work in that great city. He was sixty-seven years in the ministry, thirty-seven of which he was an effective laborer in the regular itinerant work; and whether located, supernumerary, or superannuated, he continued to labor and preach as he had opportunity, and health would permit, until March, 1855. He died at

Sharon, Conn., April 25, 1858. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 7, 158; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*.

Hunt, Absalom

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia Dec. 4, 1773, and emigrated when a boy to East Tennessee, and later removed to Fleming Co., Kentucky. He was licensed as a local preacher about 1793. In 1815 he joined the Kentucky Conference on trial, and was sent to the Madison Circuit. He was next appointed to the Lexington Circuit, and two years afterwards successively to the Hinkstone, Limestone, Mt. Sterling, and Fleming Circuits. In 1823 he was superannuated, but returned at the next session of the Conference, and was sent to the Liberty Circuit. From 1825-28 he served as supernumerary at Paris, Lexington, and Hinkstone, and then returned to the superannuated list, finding his health inadequate to the active work of the ministry. He died February 21, 1841. Hunt was a "natural orator," and, "though comparatively illiterate and unpolished, such was his native good sense, his deep acquaintance with the human heart, his quick perception of the characters of men, and the unaffected kindness of his manners, that he was not only generally popular as a preacher, but was often the admired favorite with the learned and the *refined*." — *Methodist Monthly*, 1850; Redford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, 2, 346 sq. (J. H.W.)

Hunt, Christopher

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Tarrytown, N. Y., near the opening of our century; graduated at Rutgers College in 1827, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1830. He was settled at Clarkstown, N. Y., 1830-2; at Nassau, N.Y., 1832-7; and at Franklin St., N. York, 1837-9. Bereft of both parents when very young, he made his home an orphan asylum, where Christian kindness and spiritual training were blessed to him. He was an earnest, devoted preacher, a man of comprehensive views, and well qualified by natural endowments, as well as by divine grace, for the large and important charge in which he ended his ministry. His memory is ardently cherished among the churches, which he served. He fell in the prime of life, a victim of pulmonary disease. His last words were, "All is well."—Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Dutch Church*, p. 119. (W. J. R. T.) Hunt, Jeremiah, D.D., a learned English dissenter, was born in London June 11. 1678. He studied first in that city under Mr. Thomas Rowe, and afterwards at Edinburgh and Leyden. On his

return to England he preached at Tunsted, near Norwich. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1707, and died Sept. 5, 1744. Dr. Lardner preached his funeral sermon, which contained a biographical sketch. Dr. Benson edited Hunt's sermons, which are elaborate and exact compositions, but not interesting. His principal works are *An Essay towards explaining the History and Revelations of Scripture in their several Periods*, pt. i; to which is added a *Dissertation on the 'all of Man* (Lond. 1731, 8vo): — *Sermons and Tracts* (Lond. 1748, 4 vols. 8 5). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1580.

Hunt, John

a Congregational minister, was born at Northampton Nov. 20, 1744, and was educated at Harvard (class of 1764). From 1765-69 he taught a grammar School at his native place. While in this position he was converted, and having pursued a theological course in his last years of teaching, he was licensed to preach in 1769. Only two years later he was called to the old South Church, Boston, as associate of the Rev. John Bacon (q.v.). In 1775, while on a visit to his home, he died (Dec. 20). Though young even when he died, Hunt had already acquired a great reputation as a ready Speaker and a superior thinker. He published two of his *sermons* (1771). — Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 686 sq.

Hunt, John

a Wesleyan missionary to the Fiji Islands, and a model of Christian excellence, was born at Hykeham Moor, near Lincoln, England, June 13, 1812. His early education was very limited, and John was brought up to assist his father on a farm, over which he was bailiff or overseer. When seventeen years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan society, to whose service he resolved to devote all his powers. He began at once to preach, and by close application acquired considerable knowledge. In 1835 he received the recommendation from a Quarterly Meeting to join Conference, and in May, 1836, he was accepted by that body as a "preacher on trial." His intention was to preach a short time at home, and, after sufficient preparation, go to Africa as a missionary. Upon examination at London before the Missionary Committee, he was found to be so far beyond the average standard that it was decided that Hunt should be sent to the theological institution at Hoxton. In 1838, when it became the task of the Missionary Committee at London to determine the future course of

Hunt, the wants of Fiji seemed to press upon them, and they overruled the original design of sending him to Africa. He was ordained March 27, and sailed, with his lately wedded bride, April 29, 1839, and they entered on their work at Rewa Jan. 3, 1839. His only object was to do successfully the work for which he was sent. He labored earnestly to acquire a thorough mastery of the language of the natives, and soon met with such success as has rarely crowned the work of a Christian missionary. Indeed, he became a living example to all missionaries through those islands. "Neither distance nor danger delayed or daunted him. In one of his tours he preached the Gospel to five different nations and kingdoms, who had never before seen a missionary. He died in the midst of his labors, Oct. 4, 1848. Besides a translation of the New Testament for the Fijis, Hunt wrote a work on *Entire Sanctification*, "the matured thoughts of a Christian profoundly submissive to divine teachings; written amidst the most robust labors of untiring activity, prompted by the principle of holiness; and himself able, through grace, to illustrate the truths he taught by his spirit and life. The book will live; for it is a thorough discussion of the doctrine of Holy Scripture, untinged with mysticism, free from enthusiastic extravagance, and not burdened, like some recent writings, with extraneous matters interesting only to the writer." See Rowe, *Life of John Hunt* (Lond. 1860, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Robert

a very pious and devoted clergyman of the Church of England, and one of the petitioners for the charter granted by king James I to the "London Company" April 10, 1606, emigrated for this country as preacher of the first colony to Virginia Dec. 19, 1606. The history of Mr. Hunt's life previous to this time is not known, neither is it definitely known whether he spent the remainder of his life in Virginia, though this is generally supposed to have been the case, nor is the time of his death at all ascertained. During his connection with the colony their church was burned, and with it Mr. Hunt's library, but he lived to see at last the church rebuilt (1608). — Hawks, *Rise and Progress of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in Va.* p. 17 sq.

Hunt, Thomas, D.D.

a distinguished English Hebraist, was born in 1696. He studied at the University of Oxford, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1721. He was one of the first fellows of Hertford College, and applied himself especially

to philosophical researches in the O. Test. He greatly assisted Walton in publishing the London Polyglot. In 1738 he was called to the chair of Arabic founded by Laud. In 1747 he became professor of Hebrew at Oxford; in 1740 he was made fellow of the Royal Society of London, and received the degree of D.D. in 1744. He died at Oxford October 31, 1774. Hunt wrote *De Benedictione patriarchae Jacoli* (Oxford, 1724, 4to): — *De antiquitate, elegantia et utilitate Linguae Arabicae* (Oxford, 1739, 4to): — *De Usu Dialectorum Orientalium*, etc. (Oxford, 1748): — *Observations on several Passages of the Book of Proverbs, with two Sermons* (Oxford 1775, 4to), his best and a most valuable work, published after the author's death, under the care of Kennicott. (J. N. P.)

Hunter

SEE HUNTING.

Hunter, Henry, D.D.

a Scotch Presbyterian divine, born at Culross, Perthshire, in 1741, was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1766 he became minister of South Leith, and in 1771 minister of the Scotch Church, London Wall, London. He died at Bristol Hot Wells, October 27, 1802. Hunter was a man of learning, and an eloquent writer. His principal works are *Sermons, collected and republished in their respective order*, etc. (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Sacred Biography, or the History of the Patriarchs*; being a course of lectures delivered at the Scotch Church, London Wall (6th ed. Lond. 1807, 5 vols. 8vo). This work has often been reprinted both in England and America, and has had great popularity. It is, to a large extent, an unacknowledged translation from Saurin's *Discours Historiques*. Hunter edited several other French books, and excelled in this line of labor. After his death appeared a collection of his *Sermons and other Pieces, with a Sketch of his Life and Writings* (Lond. 1804, 2 vols. 8vo). See Jones, *Christian Biography*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1582; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 922.

Hunter, Humphrey

a Presbyterian minister and patriot, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, May 14, 1755. His widowed mother came to this country when Humphrey was only four years old. During the Revolution he served our nation in the struggle for independence, first as a private, and later, for a short time, as

lieutenant, against the Cherokee Indians. He finally decided to prepare himself for a literary career, and to this end pursued a course of study at the Queen's Museum, afterwards called Liberty Hall Academy, at Charlotte, N. C. After the surrender of Charlestown he re-enlisted, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Camden. He succeeded in making his escape from the enemy, and took a gallant part in the battle at Eutaw Springs. After this he resumed his studies at Mount Zion College, Minnsborough, S. C., and graduated in 1787. Two years later he was ordained for the ministry, and in 1805 was installed as pastor over the Steele Creek Church, N.C., where he remained until his death, Aug. 21, 1827. (J. H.W.)

Hunter, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the County of Tyrone, Ireland, May 10, 1710. When about twenty-four years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and shortly after his connection with the Church began to preach. He became personally acquainted with Mr. Wesley, and felt so drawn towards him that he decided to accompany him from place to place, to profit by the godly life of the founder of Methodism. In May 1790, he immigrated to this country, and settled in Delaware. He was admitted on trial in the traveling connection in 1793, was ordained deacon in 1794, and in 1796 an elder. He successively traveled Chester, Bristol, Dover, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, Strasburg, Dauphin, and Lancaster circuits. For two years he labored as a missionary in Pennsylvania, and during four years he presided on the Schuylkill District. In 1814 he was returned superannuated, but in 1816 he again resumed his labors. In 1819 he was returned supernumerary, and from 1822 to 1827 continued, and so remained, till his death at Coventry, Pa., Sept. 27, 1833. In the various appointments he filled in the Church "he was acceptable and useful as a preacher, and discharged the duties of his vocation with simplicity and fidelity." — *Minutes of Conf.*

Hunting

Picture for Hunting 1

(*dyæi* Gr. ἄγρα). The pursuit and capture of beasts of the field was one of the first means of sustenance to which the human race had recourse. In process of time, however, when civilization had made some progress, when cities were built and lands cultivated, hunting was carried on not so

much for the food which it brought as for the recreation it gave and its conduciveness to health. Hunting has always borne somewhat of a regal character, and in Persia immense parks (*παράδεισοι*) were enclosed for nurturing and preserving beasts of the chase. The monarch himself led the way to the sport, not only in these preserves, but also over the wide surface of the country, being attended by his nobles, especially by the younger aspirants to fame and warlike renown (Xenoph. *Cyr.* 8, 1, 38). Scenes of this character are abundantly portrayed on the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments recently discovered by Botta and Layard. The king is represented as pursuing not only smaller game on horseback, but also engaged in the chase of more formidable animals, such as lions and wild bulls, in the chariot (Layard's *Nineveh*, 1st ser. ii, 328). *SEE LION*. This was especially a favorite employment of princes, and Darius caused to be engraved on his tomb an epitaph recording his proficiency as an archer and hunter (Strabo, 15, 212).

Picture for Hunting 2

In the Bible we find hunting connected with royalty as early as in ~~Gen.~~ Genesis 10:9. The great founder of Babel was in general reputed as “a mighty hunter before the Lord.” *SEE NIMROD*. The patriarchs, however, are to be regarded rather as herdsmen than hunters, if respect is had to their habitual mode of life. The condition of the herdsman ensues next to that of the hunter in the early stages of civilization, and so we find that even Cain was a keeper of sheep. This, and the fact that Abel is designated “a tiller of the ground,” would seem to indicate a very rapid progress in the arts and pursuits of social life. The same contrast and similar hostility we find somewhat later in the case of Jacob and Esau; the first “a plain man dwelling in tents,” the second “a cunning hunter, a man of the field” (Genesis 25 sq.). The account given of Esau in connection with his father seems to show that hunting was, conjointly with tillage, pursued at that time as a means of subsistence, and that hunting had not then passed into its secondary state, and become an amusement.

Picture for Hunting 3

In Egypt the children of Israel doubtless were spectators of hunting carried on extensively and pursued in different methods, but chiefly, as appears probable, with a view rather to recreation than subsistence (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* vol. 3). Wild oxen are represented on the Egyptian sculptures

as captured by means of the lasso, but dogs appear to have been usually employed in the chase. *SEE DOG*. That the land of promise into which the Hebrews were conducted on leaving Egypt was plentifully supplied with beasts of the chase appears clear from ^{<0239>}Exodus 23:29, "I will not drive them out in one year, lest the land become desolate and the beast of the field multiply against thee" (comp. ^{<0822>}Deuteronomy 3:22). Also from the regulation given in ^{<0875>}Leviticus 17:15, it is manifest that hunting was practiced after the settlement in Canaan, and was pursued with the view of obtaining food. ^{<0127>}Proverbs 12:27 proves that hunting animals for their flesh was an established custom among the Hebrews, though the turn of the passage may serve to show that at the time it was penned sport was the chief aim. If hunting was not forbidden in the "year of rest," special provision was made that not only the cattle, but the beast of the field," should be allowed to enjoy and flourish on the uncropped spontaneous produce of the land (^{<0231>}Exodus 23:11; ^{<0820>}Leviticus 25:7). Harmer (iv, 357) says, "There are various sorts of creatures in the Holy Land proper for hunting; wild boars, antelopes, hares, etc., are in considerable numbers there, and one of the Christian kings of Jerusalem lost his life (*Gesta Dei*, p. 887) in pursuing a hare." That the lion and other ravenous beasts of prey were not wanting in Palestine many passages of the Bible make obvious (^{<0873>}1 Samuel 17:34; ^{<0230>}2 Samuel 23:20; ^{<1133>}1 Kings 13:24; Harris, *Natural History of the Bible; Kitto's Pictorial Palestine*). The lion was even made use of to catch other animals (^{<3593>}Ezekiel 19:3), and Harmer long ago remarked that as in the vicinity of Gaza, so also in Judaea, leopards were trained and used for the same purpose (Harmer, 4, 358; ^{<3008>}Habakkuk 1:8). That lions were taken by pitfalls as well as by nets appears from ^{<3594>}Ezekiel 19:4, 8 (Shaw, p. 172). In the latter verse the words of the prophet, "and spread their net over him" (comp. ^{<0126>}2 Samuel 22:6), allude to the custom of inclosing a wide extent of country with nets, into which the animals were driven by hunters (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 3:4). The spots thus enclosed were usually in a hilly country and in the vicinity of water-brooks; whence the propriety' and force of the language of ^{<0941>}Psalms 42:1, "As the (hunted) hart panteth after the water-brooks." These places were selected because they were those to which the animals were in the habit of repairing in the morning and evening. Scenes like the one now supposed are found portrayed in the Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson). Hounds were used for hunting in Egypt, and, if the passage in Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 8, 9) may be considered decisive, in Palestine as well. From ^{<0278>}Genesis 27:3, "Now take thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow,"

we learn what arms were employed at least in capturing game. Bulls, after being taken, were kept at least for a time in a net (^{251D}Isaiah 51:20). Various missiles, pitfalls, snares, and gins were made use of in hunting (^{191B}Psalms 91:3; ^{101B}Amos 3:5; ^{103D}2 Samuel 23:20). See the various animals and means of capture enumerated above in their alphabetical place. That hunting continued to be followed till towards the end of the Jewish state appears from Josephus (*War*, 1, 20, 13), where the historian speaks of Herod as “ever a most excellent hunter, for in one day he caught forty wild beasts.” The same passage makes it clear that horses were employed in the pursuits of the chase (compare Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 7, 7; 16:10, 3). **SEE CHASE.**

The prophets sometimes depict war under the idea of hunting: “I will send for many hunters,” says Jeremiah. “and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks” (16:16), referring to the Chaldaeans, who held the Jews under their dominion, or, according to others, to the Persians, who set the Hebrews at liberty. Ezekiel also (^{32D}Ezekiel 32:30) speaks of the kings, who were persecutors of the Jews, under the name of hunters. The psalmist thanks God for having delivered him from the snares of the hunters [Eng. trans. “fowler”] (^{191B}Psalms 91:3). Micah complains (^{310D}Micah 7:2) that every one lays ambuscades for his neighbor, and that one brother hunts after another to destroy him. Jeremiah (^{218D}Lamentations 3:52) represents Jerusalem as complaining of her enemies, who have taken her, like a bird, in their nets. **SEE NET.**

Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of

a lady distinguished in the religious history of the 18th century, was born Aug. 24, 1707, and was one of the three daughters and co-heirs of Washington Shirley, earl of Ferrers. Selina, the second daughter, married, in 1728, Theophilus Hastings, earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman of retired habits, with whom she appears to have had a very happy life till his sudden death, on the 13th of October, 1746, of a fit of apoplexy. She had many children, four of whom died in youth or early manhood. It was probably these domestic afflictions, which disposed this lady to take the course so opposite to that which is generally pursued by the noble and the great. She became deeply religious. It was at the time when the preachers and founders of Methodism, Wesley and Whitefield, were rousing in the country, by their exciting ministry, a spirit of more intense devotion than

was generally prevalent, and leading men to look more to what are called the distinguishing truths of the Gospel than to its moral teachings, to which the clergy had for some time chiefly attended in their public ministrations. She found in these doctrines matter of consolation and delight, and she sought to make others participate with her in the advantages they were believed by her to afford. The character of her religion, as well as of her mind, was too decided to allow it to shrink from prominence; on the contrary, her high soul compassionated the fearful condition of the wealthy and noble, and she boldly sought to spread the influences of Methodism, not only through the highest aristocracy of the realm, but to the royal family itself. She took Whitefield under her especial patronage, defied all ecclesiastical order, and even engaged him to hold services in her own residence, which she invited her friends of the nobility to attend. She persuaded the highest ladies of the court to listen to the preaching of the great evangelists, with an influence more or less powerful upon some, and a saving change in others. Among the former were the celebrated duchess of Marlborough and the duchess of Buckingham; among the latter the duchess of the celebrated Chesterfield, lady Ann Frankland, and lady Fanny Shirley, the theme of the admiring muse of Pope. She numbered among her friends some of the most venerated personages of English history: Watts, Doddridge, Romaine, Venn, and the sainted Fletcher. When Mr. Wesley and his conference of preachers came to the conclusion that they had “leaned too much to Calvinism,” lady Huntingdon, who had imbibed from Whitefield the Calvinism by him imported from New England, received the impression, erroneous but inveterate, that Mr. Wesley denied the doctrine of justification by faith, and insisted upon the saving merit of works. Her relative, Rev. Walter Shirley, with the small remnant of Calvinistic preachers, called for recantation. A controversy arose, in which the virulent Toplady was chief champion of Calvinism, and love and truth, on the Armenian side, found their model in Fletcher. Each party went on, in spite of the break, in spreading the essential truths of the Gospel maintained by both. Lady Huntingdon and Mr. Wesley never again met on earth; but when, near the close of her own career, she read the dying ascription made by Mr. Wesley of his salvation to the blood of the Lamb, and when she learned from Wesley’s fellow-traveler, Bradford, that such had ever been the tenor of his preaching, her soul melted, and, bursting into tears, she lamented that the unhappy separation had ever taken place. Whitefield made no attempt to found a separate sect, but the countess chose to assume a sort of leadership among his followers, and to act herself as the

founder of a sect, and those who might properly have been called Whitefieldian Methodists came to be known as “the countess of Huntingdon’s Connection.” On Whitefield’s death in 1777 she was appointed by will sole proprietrix of all his possessions in Georgia (U. S. A.), and a result of this was the organization of a mission to America. But the countess had also at her own command a considerable income during the forty-four years of her widowhood, and, as her own personal expenses were few, she established and supported, with the assistance of other opulent persons, members of her own family, or other persons who were wrought upon as she was. a college at Trevecca, in Wales, for the education of ministers; built numerous chapels, and assisted in the support of the ministers in them. He died June 17, 1791, and the number of her chapels at the time of her death is stated to have been sixty-four, the principal of which was that at Bath, where she herself frequently attended. She created a trust for the management of her college and chapels after her death. The college was soon after removed to Cheshunt, Herts, where it still flourishes; but her chapels have, for the most part, become in doctrine and practice almost identical with those of the Congregational or Independent body, the chief distinction being in the use of a portion” at least of the “Book of Common Prayer,” though, where not expressly directed in the trust-deed, that practice has in many instances been abandoned. In 1851 there were, according to the census, 109 chapels belonging to the countess of Huntingdon’s Connection in England and Wales. See *English Cyclopaedia; Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1858, p. 162; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 167; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon* (Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Mudge, *Lady Huntingdon portrayed* (New York, 1857, 12mo); Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 388 sq.

Huntingford, George Isaac, D.D.

an English prelate, was born in Winchester in 1748, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1772 he became master of Westminster School; in 1789, warden of Winchester School; in 1802, bishop of Gloucester; and in 1815 bishop of Hereford. He died in 1832. Besides several Greek and Latin class-books, he published *Thoughts on the Trinity, with Charges*, etc. (2nd edit. Lond. 1832, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons and charges. See *Gentleman’s Magazine*, June and Dec. 1832; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1, 1584 Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 924. Huntington, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister,

was born in 1735, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Coventry, Conn., June 29, 1763, where he died Dec. 25, 1794. In 1780 he was made a member of the board of overseers of Yale College. He published *A Plea before the Ecclesiastical Council at Stockbridge in the Case of Mrs. Fiske, excommunicated for marrying a profane Man (1779)*: — *An Address to his Anabaptist Brethren (1783)*: — *Thoughts on the Atonement of Christ (1791)*: — *Calvinism improved (post, 1796)*; and a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 602.

Huntington, Joshua

a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 31, 1786, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1804, entered the ministry in Sept. 1806, and was ordained co-pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, May 18, 1808, where he labored until his death, Sept. 11, 1819. He was one of the founders of the "American Educational Society," and President of the "Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor" from its formation in 1816. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2, 501.

Huntington, Robert, D.D.

a distinguished English theologian and Orientalist, was born in February, 1636, at Deorhyrst, in Gloucestershire, where his father, of the same names, was parish clergyman. He was educated at the free-school of Bristol, was admitted in 1652 a portionist of Merton College, Oxford, received his bachelor's degree in 1658, and was shortly after elected to a fellowship in that college. He took his degree of Master of Arts in 1663, and, having then applied himself with great success to the study of the Oriental languages, he was in 1670 appointed to the situation of chaplain at Aleppo. From 1677 to 1682 he traveled in the East, and a short time after his return, in 1683, was appointed provost or master of Trinity College, Dublin, receiving about this time the degree of D.D.; he resigned this position in 1691, and once more returned to England. In August, 1692, he was presented by Sir Edward Turner to the rectory of Great Hallingbury, in Essex; and while there he married a sister of Sir John Powell, one of the justices of the King's Bench. In 1701 he was elected bishop of Raphoe, but he died before consecration, Sept. 2, of this year. Dr. Huntington is principally distinguished for the numerous Oriental manuscripts which he procured while in the East and brought with him to England. Besides those

which he purchased for archbishop Marsh and bishop Fell, he obtained between six and seven hundred for himself, which are now in the Bodleian Library, to which he first presented thirty-five of them, and then sold the rest in 1691 for the small sum of £700. Huntington, however, missed the principal object of his search, the very important Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius, a large portion of which was recovered in 1843 by Mr. Tattam from one of the very monasteries in Nitria, which Huntington had visited in the course of his inquiries. Several of Huntington's letters, which are addressed to the archbishop of Mount Sinai, contain inquiries about the manuscript of St. Ignatius, and the same earnest inquiries are made in his letters to the patriarch of Antioch. See *Vita I. et epistolae*, edited by Thomas Smith (Lond. 1704, 8vo); *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 924; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:224; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1, 1585. (J. H. W.)

Huntington, William

a Calvinistic Methodist preacher, was born in 1744. He passed his early life in: menial service and dissipation, but after conversion he entered the ministry, and became a popular preacher in London. On his books he took the title of S. S., or *Sinner Saved*. He died in 1813. — A review of his works by Southey will be found in the *Quarterly Review*, 20, 462. His writings have been collected and published: *Works* (London, 1820, 20 vols. 8vo, and his select works, edited by his son, 6 vols. 8vo, 1838, and reprinted in 1856): *Contemplations on the God of Israel*, in a series of letters to a friend (Sleaford, 1830, 12mo): — *The Law established by the Faith of Christ*, a sermon on ^{<418B>}Romans 3:31 (Lond. 1786, 8vo): — *The Epistle of Faith* (Lond. 1789, 8vo): *The Kingdom of Heaven taken by Prayer*, with *Life of the author* (Andover, 1832, 32mo): — *The wise and foolish Virgins described*, the substance of two sermons on ^{<418B>}Matthew 25:3, 4 (Lond. 1803, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1586.

Hunyad, Johannes Corvinus

SEE HUNGARY.

Hupfeld, Hermann, D.D.

a German theologian, and one of the most distinguished Hebraists of Europe, son of the clergyman Bernhard Karl Hupfeld, who died at

Spangenburg, Hesse, in 1823, was born March 31, 1796, at Marburg, and educated at the university of his native place, under the especial protection of the great Orientalist Arnoldi (q.v.). After preaching a short time as assistant to the first Reformed preacher of Marburg, he accepted in 1819 the position as third teacher at the gymnasium at Hanau. He resigned in 1822 on account of impaired health, and, after a summer's journey through Switzerland, and the use of mineral waters at the springs of two watering-places in Wurtemberg, he went first to his father's house at Spangenburg to resume his theological studies and to prepare for the ministry, and later to the University of Halle, where he became acquainted with Gesenius, and was led to a more thorough study of the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament. In 1824 he began to lecture at the university, and prepared an elaborate essay on the Ethiopic language (*Exercitationes Aethiopiae*, Leipzig, 1825), which was favorably received and commented upon in *the Heidelberger Jahrbücher* and the *Hallische Literatur Zeitung*. In 1825 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at the University of Marburg, and in 1827, after Hartmann's death, professor *ordinarius* of the Oriental languages, retaining the chair of theology, which was made a regular professorship in 1830. During the Revolution of 1830 he was on the side of those who favored a reform of the ecclesiastical constitution of Hesse, and strongly opposed the conservative minister Hassenpflug. In 1843 he went to Halle as the successor of Gesenius, by whose influence Hupfeld had received the degree of D.D. in 1834. During the revolution of 1848 he was active in the interests of a popular form of government, and urged the establishment of a German empire on a historical basis. He died April 24, 1866. In theology, Hupfeld was called orthodox in Germany, but in America he would be much more likely to have been classed with "Liberals." On inspiration, for instance, he held that only certain portions of the sacred writings are of divine origin, and that the Spirit reveals to all sincere readers the real character of such passages. In criticism, he belonged to the school of his friend De Wette (q.v.). "His researches were extensive, but guarded in their deductions by his caution. In the Elaboration of his works he was extremely fastidious. A *connoisseur* in work, he could not go on if the machinery were not exact, if one slight element were lacking to harmony and completeness. This sensibility sometimes impeded the activities of a mind whose powers of acquisition and production were immense. In his department he was among the first scholars of his day. Few burial-grounds, indeed, enclose the ashes of two such *savans* as Hupfeld and his predecessor Gesenius. At the close of his

arduous life, when in his seventy-first year, his mental vigor, showed no decline, his diligence no slackening. As a religious man, Hupfeld belonged to the Pietists, who correspond in the religious scale with our strict evangelical Christians. He was a devout man, though not after our stamp of devotion. It is doubtful whether he knew anything by experience of our immediate conversion. Probably he was never in a prayer meeting; and he looked upon revivals as questionable, if not objectionable measures. Of devotional methods and exercises, then, he had limited knowledge; but he believed, nevertheless, ‘with the heart unto righteousness.’ He lived as all Christians must live, by faith” (*N. Y. Methodist*, 1866, No. 313). Hupfeld left mere monographs, the results of most careful inquiry on certain points bearing on the subjects to which he devoted his later years, and but few books proper. Thus, in 1841, he commenced a Hebrew grammar, in which he attempted to pursue the same course in the Shemitic as Grimm did in the Germanic language, viz. the development of the Hebrew *genetically* by a consideration of its sounds. Only a few sheets of the work were published, under the title *Kritisches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache und Schrift* (Cassel, 1841). His most important works are, *Ueber d. Begriff u. d. Methode d. bibl. Einleit.* (Marb. 1844): *De antiquioribus apud Judceos accentunim scriptoribus* (Halle, 1846 and 1847, 2 vols.): — *De primit. et vera festorum apud Hebreos ratione* (1851, 1852, 1858, 1865, 2 vols.): — *Quaest. in Jobeidos locos* (1853): — *Die Quellen d. Genesis* (Berl. 1835): — *Die Psalmen, übersetzt u. erldrt* (1855-62, 4 vols. 8vo; of a 2nd ed., begun in 1867 by Dr. Edward Riehm, 3 vols. are now [1870] published): — *Die heutige theosoph. u. mytholog. Theologie und Schrifterklärung* (Berlin, 1861). A biography of Hupfeld was published by Dr. Riehm (*Dr. Hermann Hupfeld*, Halle, 1867). See *Theol. Univ. Lex.* 1, 374; Pierer, *Universal Lex.* 8, 631; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, 1, 184 sq.; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theolog.* 1868, 4:758 sq.; *Bib. Sac.* 1866, p. 673 sq. (J.H.W.)

Hu’pham

(Heb. *Chiupham*’, $\mu\rho\psi j$, according to Gesenius perh. *coast-man*, according to Furst *screened*; Sept. omits, but some eds. have Ὠφάμ ; Vulg. *Hupham*), a person apparently mentioned as one of the sons of Benjamin (⁽⁻⁰²⁵⁾Numbers 26:39); elsewhere less correctly called HUPPIM (⁽⁻⁰⁴²⁾Genesis 46:24). His descendants are called HUPHIMITES (Hebrew *Chuphanzi*’, $\text{ym}\rho\psi j$, Sept. omits, but some eds. Ὠφάμί , Vulg. *Huphamitce*, ⁽⁻⁰²⁵⁾Numbers 26:39). B.C. 1856. The name *Huppim* being in the plural

(Heb. *Chuppim*’, **μϣϣ** coverings; Sept. omits in ^{<0462>}Genesis 46:21, but some copies have **Θφμίν** or **Όφμίμ**; as a son of Bela; Vulg. *Ophim.*), suggests the possibility that it is a contraction for *Huphamites*. **SEE SHUPPIM**. The only other passages where it occurs are ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:12 (Sept. **Άφείμ**, Vulg. *Hapham*) and 15 (Sept. **Άφφείμ**, Vulg. *Haphhim*), in both which it has the same fraternity with Shuppim, and in the latter mention is made of a sister Maachah as married to Machir, the son of Manasseh by a concubine, while in the former Huppim and Shuppim are expressly called the sons of Ir, apparently a son of Benjamin additional to the three mentioned in ver. 6, but probably not the Iri mentioned in ver. 7. Hence results the probability that Hupham, whose descendants are thus spoken of, was a grandson of Benjamin, and consequently a son of one of his five sons expressly named in order in ^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 8:1, 2, but whether of the fourth or fifth is uncertain. **SEE BENJAMIN**.

Hu’phamite

(^{<0559>}Numbers 26:39). **SEE HUPHAM**.

Hup’pah

(Heb. *Chuppah*’, **hPj υ** a covering or bridal canopy, as in ^{<0906>}Psalms 19:6; also *protected*, as in ^{<2305>}Isaiah 4:5; Sept. **Όφφά** v.r. **Όπφά**, and even **Όχχοφφά**), the head of the thirteenth of the twenty-four classes into which David divided the priests (^{<1343>}1 Chronicles 24:13). B.C. 1014.

Hup’pim

(^{<0462>}Genesis 46:21; ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:12). **SEE HUPHAM**.

Hur

(Heb. *Chûr*, **rWj**, a hole, as of a viper, ^{<2308>}Isaiah 11:8; also a narrow and filthy subterranean prison, ^{<2322>}Isaiah 42:22; comp. the “black hole” of Calcutta; otherwise *noble*; Sept. **”Ωρ, Ούρ**, but **Σούρ** in ^{<1403>}Nehemiah 3:9; Josephus **”Οροσ** and **Ούρησ**), the name of five men.

1. A son of Caleb (Judah’s great-grandson through elzron), the first one by his second wife Ephrath, and grandfather of Bezaleel (q.v.), the famous artificer, through Uri (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 2:19, 50; 4:1, 4; comp. 2:20; ^{<1405>}2 Chronicles 1:5; ^{<0230>}Exodus 31:2; 35:30; 38:22). B.C. between 1856 and

1658. By some (after Josephus, *Ant.* 3:6,1) he has been confounded with the following.

2. The husband of Miriam, the sister of Moses, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 3:2, 4). During the conflict with the Amalekites he assisted Aaron in sustaining the arms of Moses in that praying attitude upon which the success of the Israelites was found to depend (^{<0270>}Exodus 17:10-12); and when Moses was absent on Sinai to receive the law, he associated Hur with Aaron in charge of the people (^{<0244>}Exodus 24:14). B.C. 1658.

3. The fourth named of the five princes or petty kings of Midian (^{<0244>}יִנְדִּימָעֵי), who were defeated and slain shortly before the death of Moses by the Israelites, under the leadership of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (^{<0610>}Numbers 31:8; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:7, 1). B.C. 1618. In ^{<0632>}Joshua 13:21 these five Midianites are termed ^{<0632>}יְקִשָּׁאִי / ^{<0632>}הַיְסָאִי, the *vassals of Sihon*, and are also described as ^{<0632>}רְחַבְיָוִי, *dwellers in the land*, which Keil (ad loc.) explains as meaning that they had for a long time dwelt in the land of Canaan with the Moabites, whereas the Amorites had only recently effected an entrance. After the defeat of Sihon these chieftains appear to have made common cause with Balak, the king of Moab (^{<0624>}Numbers 22:4, 7), and to have joined with him in urging Balaam to curse the Israelites. The evil counsel of Balaam having been followed, and the Israelites in consequence seduced into transgression (^{<0616>}Numbers 31:16), Moses was directed to make war upon the Midianites. The latter were utterly defeated, and “Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword.” *SEE SIHON.*

4. A person whose son (Ben-Hur) was Solomon’s purveyor in Mount Ephraim (^{<1008>}1 Kings 4:8). Josephus calls him *Ures* (Οὔρης), and makes him to have been himself military governor of the Ephraimites (*Ant.* 8:2, 3). B.C. ante 995.

5. Father of Rephaiah, which latter is called “ruler of the half part of Jerusalem” after the exile, and repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (^{<1009>}Nehemiah 3:9). B.C. ante 446.

Hu’rai

(Heb. *Churay’*, ^{<1009>}חֲרַי , Chald. perhaps *linen worker*, otherwise *noble*; Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. *Hurai*), a native of the valleys (“brooks”) of Mount Gaash,

one of David's heroes (<31E>1 Chronicles 11:32); called less correctly in the parallel passage (<4E3>2 Samuel 23:30) HIDDAI. B.C. 1046.

Hu'ram

(a, <38E>1 Chronicles 8:5; b, <34E>1 Chronicles 14:1, marg.; <40E>2 Chronicles 2:3, 11, 12; 8:2, 18; 9:10, 21; c, <48E>2 Chronicles 3:13; 4:11, 16). *SEE HIRAM.*

Hurd, Richard, D.D.

an eminent English prelate, was born at Congreve, Staffordshire, in 1720. He was admitted at Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1733. In 1750, by recommendation of his friend, bishop Warburton (q.v.), he became one of the Whitehall preachers, and in 1757 rector of Thurcaston. He afterwards became successively rector of Folkton, Yorkshire, in 1762, preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1765, archdeacon of Gloucester in 1767, and finally bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1775, whence he was translated to Worcester in 1781. In 1783 he was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury, which he declined. He died in 1808. His *Sermons* (5 vols. 8vo), distinguished by elegant simplicity of style, perspicuity of method, and acuteness of elucidation, are to be found, with his other miscellaneous writings, in his *Works* (London, 1811, 8 vols. 8vo). His most important contribution to theology is his *Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies* (1772, 8vo; 1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1839, edited by Bickersteth, 12mo). This was the first of the "Warburtonian Lectures." Notwithstanding the polemical cast of some of these sermons, the clear exposition of the general principles of prophecy and of the claims which this portion of the sacred Scriptures has on the serious and unprejudiced attention of thoughtful readers, conveyed in perspicuous and even elegant language, has secured a large amount of popularity for the work even up to recent times (Kitto, *Bib. Cyclop.* ii, 343). — He also edited *The Works of Warburton* (1788. 7 vols.), and published a *Life of Warburton* (Lond. 1794, 4to). See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 925; *Quarterly Review* (London), 7:383; Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (4th edit., Lond. 1854), 3:475; *Life. and Writings of Hurd*, by Francis Kilvert (Lond. 1860); *Christ. Remembrancer*, 1860, p. 262; *North British Rev.* May 1861, art. 4; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6 225 sq.

Hurdis, James

an English divine, was born at Bishopstone, Sussex, in 1763, and was educated first at Chichester School and next at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. In 1782 he was chosen demy of St. Mary Magdalene College, and some time after was made a fellow. In 1785 he became curate of Burwash, in Sussex, and in 1791 was presented to the living of his native place. In 1793 he was elected to the professorship of poetry, having previously published some poems of great excellence. He took the degree of B.D. in 1794, and that of D.D. in 1797. He died Dec. 23, 1801. Besides poetical works, Hurdis published several works of interest to the Biblical student. They are: *Select Critical Remarks upon the English Version of the first ten Chapters of Genesis* (Lond. 1793, 8vo): — A short critical Disquisition upon the true Meaning of the Word קרוקודיל (^{<002>}Genesis 1:21) (ibid. 1790, 8vo), in which he contends that this word, wherever it occurs, signifies *crocodile*. "His remarks on the various passages in which it is found are, to say the least, very ingenious." He also wrote *Twelve Dissertations on the Nature and Occasion of Psalm and Prophecy* (ibid. 1800). — Kitto, *Bib. Cycl.* 2, 343; Hook, *Eccl. Biogr.* 6, 227 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 925.

Hurdwar

(more accurately HARDWAR, i.e. *Gate of Hari*), also called GANGADWARA (*Ganges Gate*), an Indian city, is celebrated on account of the pilgrimages which are made to it. More than two million people from all parts of India resort to this place to take the sacred bath in the Ganges (q.v.), that flows by the side of it. As in Mecca, the occasion is also improved for business purposes, and great fairs are held annually in April. — Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* 8, 167-8.

Hu'ri

(Heb. *Churi'*, חורי, according to Gesenius perhaps *linen-work-er*, like Arab. *Hariri*; so also Furst; Sept. *Opi*, Vulg. *Huri*), son of Jaroah and father of Abihail of the descendants of Gad in Bashan (^{<1354>}1 Chronicles 5:14). B.C. ante 781.

Huris

SEE HOURIS; SEE MOHAMEDANISM.

Hurrion, John

an English Independent minister, was born about 1675. He became pastor of a congregation at Denton, Norfolk, in 1696. In 1724 he removed to London as minister to a congregation in Hare Court, and died in 1731. He employed his time greatly in study, chiefly of the Church fathers. — His style is natural, unaffected, and manly. His writings include a *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* (1734, 8vo), and a large number of sermons and lectures, all of which have been collected and published under the title *The whole Works of John Hurrion, now first collected; to which is prefixed the Life of the Author* (Lond. 1823, 3 vols. 12mo). — Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1587; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 926; *Lond. Evang. Mag.* Jan. 1827.

Hurter, Friedrich Emanuel von

a Swiss theologian who became a convert to Romanism, was born at Schaffhausen March 19, 1787. He studied Protestant theology at the University of Göttingen, became pastor of a country congregation in his native canton, 1824, first pastor of the city of Schaffhausen, 1835, antistes (chief of the clergy of the canton) and dean of the synod. His intimate association with some of the ultramontane Roman Catholics, and the great attention paid him by communicants of the Church of Rome on a journey through Bavaria and Austria, brought on him the stigma of Cryptocatholicism, and he was requested by his colleagues at Schaffhausen to define his position to the Reformed Church in which he held orders. As the declaration which Hurter made gave dissatisfaction to his Protestant friends and brethren in the ministry, he resigned his position in 1841, and in June, 1844, made open declaration of his abjuration from the Reformed and adherence to the Romish Church. He now devoted his time mainly to the study of history, and in 1845 accepted a call to Vienna as imperial historiographer. Under the liberal ministry of Pillersdorf he had to resign this position, but recovered it in 1851, when he was also ennobled. He died at Gratz Aug. 27, 1865. His works of especial interest to the theologian are, *Geschichte des Papstes Innocenz III u. s. Zeitalter* (Hamb. 1834-42, 4 vols. 8vo): — *Befeindung d. Kathol. Kirche in d. Schweiz* (Schaffh. 1840): — *Geburt u. Wiedergeburt* (ibid. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. 1867, etc.): — *Geschichte Ferdinand II und seiner Eltern* (Schaffhaus. 1850-64, 11 vols.). The researches made for his history of Innocent III, the Roman

Catholics claim, led to Hurter's conversion to their Church. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 633; Werner, *Gesch. der Kathol. Theol.* p. 521 sq.

Hurter, Johann Georg

a German Pietist and philanthropist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. Of his early history we know but little. He was pastor of a church at Schaffhausen from 1704. He is often called "an Augustus Hermann Francke in miniature" on a account of the school and orphan-houses which he built without possessing the necessary means, relying solely, like Francke, on providential help. His first undertaking was the building of a school-house for the instruction of the children of his own scattered congregation, who were obliged to go a long way to the town school, and of whom many could not get there at all. "In December, 1709, seventy children, with their pastor, Hurter, at their head, celebrated, with prayer and thanksgiving, their entrance into their new house." The contributions which he had received for the undertaking had been so numerous and so ready that on the completion of the school-house he decided to build an orphan asylum. One benevolent man laid the cornerstone by a gift of 200 florins. To make a beginning, one of the rooms in the schoolhouse was set apart for the reception of orphans, and in July 1711, a widow with seven children was received. The contributions multiplied, and with them the children. Hurter contributed even much of his own means; and when in 1716 he, with other Pietists, was rewarded for his service by deposition from the ministry, he modestly secluded himself in a little room in his orphan asylum, and there spent the latter years of his life. He died in 1721. This article is based altogether on Hurst's' translation of Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries* (N. York, Scribner and Co., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo), 1, 181.

Hurwitz, Hyman

a distinguished Jewish scholar, of whose early life but little is known, was, up to the time of his death (about 1850), professor of Hebrew in the University College, London. He is best known as the author of *Vinsdiciae Hebraicae, or A Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Lond. 1820, 8vo), which, at the time of its appearance, was highly commented upon by the *London Quarterly Review*, and by Home in his *Bibl. Bib.* Hurwitz also published a volume of *Hebrew Tales*, collected chiefly from the Talmud, to which he pays a very high tribute, and of which, while endeavoring to free

it from the objection so frequently made to some of its indecent passages and many contradictions, he says, "I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information, than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew cases." In 1807 Hurwitz began the publication of text-books for the study of the Hebrew language, which are considered among the best extant in the English language. They were, *Elements of the Hebr. Lang.* pt. 1, Orthography (Lond. 1807, 8vo; 4th ed. 1848, 8vo): — *Etymology and Syntax of the Hebr. Lagn.* (4th ed. 1850, 8vo): — *Hebrew Grammar* (4th ed. 1850, 8vo). — Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 183 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 926.

Husband

(prop. *vyaar* or *v/nā*, a man, *ἀνὴρ*; also *l* [*Bj* master, *ˆtj*; spouse [in ^{<1024>}Exodus 4:24, the phrase "bloody husband" has an allusion to the matrimonial figure in the covenant of circumcision (q.v.)], etc.), a married man, the house-band, or band which connects the whole family, and keeps it together. Johnson (*Engl. Dict.* s.v.) refers the term to the Runic, *house-bonda*, master of the house; but several of his instances seem allied to the sense of binding together, or assembling into union. So we say, *to husband* small portions of things, meaning to collect and unite them, to manage them to the greatest advantage, etc., which is by associating them together; making the most of them, not by dispersion, but by union. A man who was betrothed, but not actually married, was esteemed a husband (^{<1016>}Matthew 1:16, 20; ^{<1015>}Luke 2:5). A man recently married was exempt from going out to war (^{<1017>}Deuteronomy 20:7; 24:5). The husband is described as the head of his wife, and as having control over her conduct, so as to supersede her vows, etc. (^{<1016>}Numbers 30:6-8). He is also the guide of her youth (^{<1017>}Proverbs 2:17). Sarah called her husband Abraham lord, a title which was continued long after (^{<1016>}Hosea 2:16) [*baali*, my lord]. The apostle Peter seems to recommend it as a title implying great respect, as well as affection (^{<1016>}1 Peter 3:6). Perhaps it was rather used as an appellation in public than in private. Our own word *master* [*Mr.*] (and so correlatively *mistress*) is sometimes used by married women when speaking of their husbands; but the ordinary use made of this word to all persons, and on all occasions, deprives it of any claim to the expression of particular affection or respect, though it was probably in former ages implied by it or connected with it, as it still is in the instances of proprietors, chiefs,

teachers, and superiors, whether in civil life, in polite arts, or in liberal studies. *SEE MARRIAGE.*

Husbandman

(properly *hmda}vyaan* *man of the ground*; *γεωργός*), one whose profession and labor is to cultivate the ground. It is among the most ancient and honorable occupations (~~OLD~~ Genesis 9:20; 26:12, 14; 37:7; Job 1, 2, ~~XXII~~ Isaiah 28:24-28; ~~XCIV~~ John 15:1). All the Hebrews who were not consecrated to religious offices were agriculturists. Husbandmen at work are depicted on the ancient monuments of Egypt. It was remarked by the members of the French Commission that there is a great similarity between the joyless looks of the husbandmen on the monuments and the somber countenances of the modern fellahs, whose toil is so miserably remunerated. In reference to the husbandmen of Syria, Dr. Bowring says, “The laboring classes, if left to themselves, and allowed unmolested to turn to the best account the natural fertility and richness of the country, would be in a highly favorable condition. But this cannot be considered as the case when their services may be and are called for as often as the government require them, and for which they are always inadequately paid; they are likewise frequently sent from one part of the country to another wholly without their consent. The fellah, or peasant, earns little more than a bare subsistence. In Syria a great proportion of the labor is done by females, and they are constantly seen carrying heavy burdens, and, as in Egypt, a large portion of their time is employed in fetching water from the wells for domestic use. They bring home the timber and brushwood from the forests, and assist much in the cultivation of the fields.” — Bastow.

SEE HIRELING.

God is compared to a husbandman (~~XCIV~~ John 15:1; Corinthians 3:9); and the simile of land carefully cultivated, or of a vineyard carefully dressed, is often used in the sacred writings. The art of husbandry is from God, says the prophet Isaiah (28:24-28), and the various operations of it are each in their season. The sowing of seed, the waiting for harvest, the ingathering when ready, the storing up in granaries, and the use of the products of the earth, afford many points of comparison, of apt figures, and similitudes in Scripture. *SEE HUSBANDRY.*

Husbandry

(in Heb. by circumlocution , **hmda**) the *ground*; Gr. prop. **γεωργία**, 2 Macc. 12:2; also **γεώργιον**, a *plot* of tilled ground, **1** Corinthians 3:9). The culture of the soil, although coeval with the history of the human race (**1** Genesis 2:15; 4:2; 9:20), was held of secondary account by the nomad Hebrews of the early period (**1** Genesis 26:12, 14; 37:7; see **1** Job 1:3; comp. Harmer, 1, 88 sq.; Volney, *Travels*, 1, 291; Burckhardt, *Beduin*. p. 17; see Michaelis, *De antiquitatibus aecon. patriarch. 1*, Halle, 1728, and in Ugolini *Thesaurus*, 24 etc.), but by the Jewish lawgiver it was elevated to the rank of a fundamental institution of national economy (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, i, 249 sq.), and hence became assiduously and skillfully practiced in Palestine (comp. **1** Samuel 11:5; **1** Kings 19:19; **2** Chronicles 26:10; **1** Proverbs 31:16; Ecclus. 7:15; also **1** Isaiah 27:27, and Gesenius, ad loc.), as it continues in a good degree to be at the present day in the East. Upon the fields, which were divided (if at all) according to a vague land-measure termed a yoke (**dmx**, **1** Samuel 14:14), and occasionally fenced in (see Knobel, *Zu Jesaias*, p. 207), were mostly raised wheat, barley, flax, lentils (**2** Samuel 23:11), garlic, and sometimes spelt, beans, a kind of *durra* or *holcus* (**j Dn**) cummin, fennel, cucumbers, etc. (**1** Isaiah 28:25). See these and other vegetables in their alphabetical place; for the later periods, compare the Mishna, *Chilaim*, 1. The fertility of Palestine (q.v.), especially in many parts, made the cultivation tolerably easy, and it was gradually increased by the clearing away of forests (**1** Jeremiah 4:3), thus enlarging the arable plains (**rynæovale**; comp. **1** Proverbs 13:23); the hills (**2** Chronicles 26:10; **1** Ezekiel 38:6, 9) being formed into terraces (compare Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* 156; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1, 64), upon which the earth was kept by a facing of stones, while the low grounds and flats along streams were intersected by ditches (**µyæi yGèPi**; **1** Proverbs 21:1; comp. Psalm 1, 13) for drainage (comp. Mishna, *Maoed Katon*, 1, 1; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* 156; *Trav.* 1, 356, 437; Harmer, 2, 331 sq.), or, more usually, irrigation by means of water wheels (Mishna, *Peah*, 5, 3). The soil was manured (**mD**) sometimes with dung (compare **1** Jeremiah 9:22; **2** Kings 9:37), sometimes by the ashes of burnt straw or stubble (**1** Isaiah 5:24; 47:14; **1** Joel 2:5). Moreover, the keeping of cattle on the fields (Pliny, 18:53), and the leaving of the chaff in threshing (Korte, *Reisen*, p. 433), contributed greatly to fertilization. For breaking up the surface of the ground (**vrj** ; also **bgj**), ploughs (**tvrhñi** ?),

probably of various construction, were used (“Syria tenui sulco arat:” Pliny, 18:47; comp. Theophrast. *Caussae plant.* 3, 25; on **מִטְּאֵבֶל** 4:10, see Credner, ad loc.). The latter, like the harrows, which were early used for covering the seed (Pliny, 18:19, 3; see Harduinm, ad loc.), were drawn by oxen (**אֲרָבָה** 1 Kings 19:19 sq.; **אֲרָבָה** Job 1:14; **אֲרָבָה** Amos 6:12) or cows (**אֲרָבָה** Judges 14:18; *Baba Mez.* 6, 4), seldom by asses (**אֲרָבָה** Isaiah 30:24; **אֲרָבָה** Isaiah 32:20; Varro, 2, 6, 8, “Ubi levis est terra”), but never with a yoke of the two kinds of animals together (**אֲרָבָה** Deuteronomy 22:10), as is now customary in the East (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 156): the beasts were driven with a cudgel (**דַּמְיָן** **הַגֵּבֶה** goad). (Delineations of Egyptian agriculture may be seen in Wilkinson, 2nd ser. 1, 48; Rosellini, *Mon. civ.* table 32, 33.) See each of the above agricultural implements in its alphabetical 1., ce. The furrows (**מִלְּפָנֶיךָ**, **חֲנִיכָה**), among the Hebrews, probably ran usually lengthwise and crosswise (Pliny. 18:19; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 155). The sowing occurred, for winter grain, in October and November; for summer fruit, in January or February; the harvest in April. The unexceptionable accounts of fifty-fold and hundred-fold crops (**אֲרָבָה** Genesis 26:12 [on the reading here, see Tuch, ad loc]; **אֲרָבָה** Matthew 13:8 sq.; compare Josephus, *War.* 4, 8, 3; Herod. 1, 193; Pliny, 18, 47; Strabo, 15, 731; 16, 742; Heliod. *Eth.* 10, 5, p. 395; Sonnini. *Trav.* 2, 306; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 123; Burckhardt, 1, 463; yet see *Ruppel.* — *Abyss.* 1, 92; Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 151 sq.) seem to show that the ancients sowed (planted, i.e. deposited the grain, **מִלְּפָנֶיךָ**, **אֲרָבָה** Isaiah 28:25) in drills, and with wide spaces between (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 157; Brown’s *Travels in Africa*, p. 457), as Strabo (15, 731) expressly says was the case among the Babylonians. (See further under the above terms respectively; and comp. generally Ugolini, *Comment. de re rustica yet. Hebr.*, in his *Thesaur.* 29; H. G. Paulsen, *Nachrichten vom Ackerbau der Morgenländer*, Helmstadt, 1748; id. *Ackerbau d. Morgenländer*, Helmstidt, 1748; Norbery, *De agricultura orient.*, in his *Opusc. Acad.* ii, 474 sqq.; P. G. Purmann, 5 *progr. de re rustica yet. Hebr.* Franckf. 1787; also the *Calendar. Palest. aconom.* by Buhle and Walch, Gotting. 1784; Reynier, *L’Economie rurale des Arabes*; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*; Layard’s *Nineveh*, 1849; his *Nineveh and Babylon*, 1853; Kitto’s *Physical Hist. of Palest.* 1843.) **SEE**
AGRICULTURE.

a. The legal regulations for the security and promotion of agriculture among the Israelites (compare Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 23 sq.) were the following: *a.* Every hereditary or family estate was inalienable

(^{<1253>}Leviticus 25:23); it could indeed be sold for debt, but the purchaser held only the usufruct of the ground; hence the land itself reverted without redemption at the year of jubilee to its appropriate owner (^{<1253>}Leviticus 25:28), whether the original possessor or his heirs-at-law; and at any time during the interval before that period it might be redeemed by such person on repayment of the purchase-money (^{<1253>}Leviticus 25:24). *SEE LAND; SEE JUBILEE.*

b. The removal of field-lines marked by boundary-stones (*‘termini’*) was strongly interdicted (^{<1214>}Deuteronomy 19:14; compare 27:17; ^{<1228>}Proverbs 22:28; ^{<2150>}Hosea 5:10), as in all ancient nations (comp. Plato, *Leg.* 8 p. 843 sq.; Dougtsei, *Annalect.* 1, 110; since these metes were established with religious ceremonies, see Pliny, 18:2; compare Ovid, *Fasti*, 2, 639 sq.); yet no special penalty is denounced in law against offenders. For any damage done to a field or its growth, whether by the overrunning of cattle or the spreading of fire (^{<12216>}Exodus 22:5 sq.), full satisfaction was exacted (Philo, *Opp.* 2, 339 sq.). But it was not accounted a trespass for a person to pluck ears of grain from a stranger’s field with the naked hand (^{<12312>}Deuteronomy 23:26; ^{<1212>}Matthew 12:1; ^{<1211>}Luke 6:1). This last prescription, which prevails likewise among the Arabs in Palestine (Robinson’s *Researches*, 2, 419, 430), was also extended to the gleanings (**fql** , comp. Robinson’s *Res.* 3:9) and to the corners, of the field (see Mishna, *Peak*, 1, 2, where these are computed at a sixtieth part of the field), which were left for the poor, who were in like manner to share in the remnants of the produce of vineyards and fruit trees. *SEE GLEANING.*

c. Every seventh year it was ordained that all the fields throughout the entire land should lie fallow, and whatever grew spontaneously belonged to the poor (^{<1254>}Leviticus 25:4 sq.). *SEE SABBATICAL YEAR.*

d. Various seeds were not allowed to be planted in the same field (^{<1219>}Leviticus 19:19; ^{<12219>}Deuteronomy 22:9). These beneficent statutes, however, were not uniformly observed by the Israelites (before the Exile). Covetous farmers not only suffered themselves to remove their neighbor’s land-mark (^{<2150>}Hosea 5:10; comp. ^{<12312>}Job 24:2) but even kings bought large tracts of land (*latifundia*) together (^{<2183>}Isaiah 5:8; ^{<3112>}Micah 2:2), so that the entailment and right of redemption of the original possessor appear to have fallen into disuse; neither was the Sabbatical year regularly observed (^{<2148>}Jeremiah 34:8 sq.). (For further agricultural details, see Jahn’s *Bibl. Archaeol.* chap. 4.) *SEE FARM.*

Hüsgen, Johann

a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Giesenkirchen, near Cologne, in 1769. In 1792 he became vicar and teacher at his native place, and after filling different vicarages, was appointed superintendent over the Roman Catholic schools at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1816, in 1825 general vicar to archbishop Spiegel of Desenberg and dean in Cologne, and in 1835, upon the death of the archbishop, presiding officer of the archiepiscopacy pro tem, in which offices he greatly distinguished himself by his kind and conciliatory spirit towards all sects. He died in 1841. — Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* 8, 635.

Hu'shah

(Hebrew *Chushah'*, חֻשָּׁה , *haste*; Sept. Ὠσάν, Vulg. *hosa*), son of Ezer and grandson of Hur, of the family of Judah (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 4:4); whence probably the patronymic HUSHATHITE (Heb. *Chushathi'*, חֻשָּׁתִּי , Sept. Ἄσωθί, Οὐσσαθί), ^{<1018>}2 Samuel 21:18; ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 11:29; 20:4. He seems to be the same person called SHAI in ^{<1341>}1 Chronicles 4:11. *SEE HUSHAN*. B.C. post 1612.

Hu'shai

(Heb. *Chushay'*, חֻשָּׁי , *quick*; Sept. and Josephus [*Ant.* 7, 9, 2] Χουσί), called “the Archite” (q.v.) (comp. ^{<1612>}Joshua 16:2) and “the king’s companion,” i.e. *vizier* or intimate adviser (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:33), a post which he doubtless attained by his eminent services to David in defeating (B.C. cir. 1023) the plots of Ahithophel, in league with the rebellious Absalom (^{<1052>}2 Samuel 15:32, 37; 16:16-18; 17:5-15). *SEE DAVID*. Baanah, Solomon’s vicegerent in Asher, was doubtless the son of the same (^{<1046>}1 Kings 4:16).

Hu'sham

(Heb. *Chusham'*, חֻשָּׁם , but defectively חֻשָּׁם חֻשָּׁם ^{<1064>}Genesis 36:34, 35, *hasty*; Sept. Ἀσώμ and Ἀσόμ), a Temanite, successor of Jobab and predecessor of Bedad among the native princes of Mount Seir before the usurpation of the Edomites (^{<1064>}Genesis 36:34, 35; ^{<1345>}1 Chronicles 1:45). B.C. long ante 1093, and probably ante 1618.

Hu'shathite

(^{<1018>}2 Samuel 21:18; 23:27; ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 11:29; 20:4; 26:11). **SEE HUSHAH.**

Hu'shim

(Heb. *Chushimz'*, **μυνθ**, or defect. **μυνθαι** in Genesis 46: 23: ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:12, *haste*; Sept. **Ωσίμ**, but **Ἀσόμ** in ^{<0452>}Genesis 46:23, and **Ἀσόβ** in ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:12), the name of two men and one woman.

1. A son of Dan (Genesis 46: 23); more properly called SHUHAM (^{<0252>}Numbers 26:42). “Hushim figures prominently in the Jewish traditions of the recognition of Joseph, and of Jacob’s burial at Hebron. See the quotations from the Midrash in Weil’s *Bib. Legends*, p. 88, note, and the Targum Pseudojon on Genesis 1, 13. In the latter he is the executioner of Esau”

2. A name given as that of “the *sons* of Aher” or Aharah, the third son of Benjamin (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:12; comp. 8:1), and therefore only a plural form for *Shuhanz* (see the foregoing name, and compare the fact that the following is a fem. appellation) as a representative of his brethren. **SEE HUPIHII**, and **SEE BENJAMIN**. B.C. post. 1856.

3. One of the wives of Shahraraim, of the tribe of Benjamin, in the country of Moab, by whom he had Ahitub and Elpaal (^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 8:8, 11). B.C. cir. 1618.

Husk

Picture for Husk

(*gz*; *zag*, the *skin* of a grape, so. called as being *transparent*, ^{<0004>}Numbers 6:4; **ἡ ἰσικλὼν**, a *sack* for grain, so called from being *tied* together at the mouth, ^{<1342>}2 Kings 4:42) occurs also in ^{<2516>}Luke 15:16 as a rendering of **κεράτιον**:(from its *horned* extremities), in the parable of the prodigal son, where it is said that “he would fain have filled his belly with the *husks* that the swine did eat; and no man gave [even this poor provender, so Meyer, ad loc.] unto him.” In the Arabic Version of the New Testament, the word *kharûb*, often written *kharnûb*, is given as a synonym of *keratia*. According to Celsius, the modern Greeks have converted the Arabic name into **χάρουβα**, and in a similar form it has passed into most European

languages. Though with us little more than its name is known, the carob-tree is extremely common in the south of Europe, in Syria, and in Egypt. (See Thomson, *Land and the Book*, i, 21.) The Arabs distinguish it by the name of *Kharnub shanmi* — that is, the Syrian Carob. The ancients, as Theophrastus and Pliny, likewise mention it as a native of Syria. Celsius states that no tree is more frequently mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, i, 40; 4:164; 6:494), where its fruit is stated to be given as food to cattle and swine: it is now given to horses, asses, and mules. During the Peninsular War the horses of the British cavalry were often fed on the beans of the carob-tree. Both Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 15, 23) and Columella (7, 9) mention that it was given as food to swine (comp. Mishna, *Shaab.* 24, 2), yet was sometimes eaten by men (Horace, *Epist.* 2, 1,123; Juv. 11, 58; Pers. 3, 55; Sonnini, *Travels in Greece*, p. 26). By some it has been thought, but apparently without reason, that it was upon the husks of this tree that John the Baptist fed in the wilderness: from this idea, however, it is often called St. John's Bread and Locust-tree.' *Ceratia* or *Ceratonia* is the name of a tree of the family of leguminous plants, of which the fruit used to be called *Siliqua edulis* and *Siliqua dulcis*. By the Greeks, as Galen and Paulus Aegineta, the tree is called **κερατία**, **κερατωνία**, from the resemblance of its fruit to **κέρας**, a horn; also **συκὴ αἰγυπτία**, or *Egyptian fig* (Theophr. *Plant.* i, 18). The carob-tree grows in the south of Europe and north of Africa, usually to a moderate size, but it sometimes becomes very large, with a trunk of great thickness, and affords an agreeable shade. It has been seen by travelers near Bethlem (Rauwolf, *Travels*, p. 458; Schubert, 3:115), and elsewhere (Robinson's *Researches*, 3, 54). Prof. Hackett saw it growing around Jerusalem, and the fruit exposed for sale in the market at Smyrna; and he describes its form and uses (*Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 129, Bost. 1855). Wilde, being in the plain near Mount Carmel, observed several splendid specimens of the carob-tree. On the 15th of March he noticed the fruit as having been perfected. The husks were scattered on the ground, where some cattle had been feeding on them. It is an evergreen, and puts forth a great many branches, covered with large pinnated leaves. The blossom is of a reddish or dark purple color, and is succeeded by large, slender pods or capsules, curved like a horn or sickle, containing a sweetish pulp, and several small, shining seeds. These pods are sometimes eight or ten inches long, and an inch and a half broad; the color is dark brown, and the seeds which they contain are about the size of an ordinary dry pea, not perfectly round, flattened, hard and bitter, and of a dark red color. The quantity of pods borne by each tree is

very considerable, being often as much as 800 or 900 pounds weight; they are of a subastringent taste when unripe, but when come to maturity they secrete within the husks and around the seeds a sweetish-tasted pulp. When on the tree the pods have an unpleasant odor, but when dried upon hirdles they become eatable, and are valued by poor people, and during famine in the countries where the tree is grown, especially in Spain and Egypt, and by the Arabs. They are given as food to cattle in modern, as we read they were in ancient times, but at the best can only be considered very poor fare. (See Celsius, 1, 227; Oedmann, 6, 137 sq.; Salmas. *Exercit. Plin.* p. 45 sq.; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 531; Arvieux, *Voyage*, p. 206 sq.; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. *Ceratonia*.)

Huss, John

(more properly *Hus*, the other mode of spelling his name being a mere usage which has established itself in the English language), was the illustrious Bohemian reformer before the Reformation, and the precursor of the Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.

I. *Sketch of his Life.* — He was born July 6, 1369, or, according to some authorities, 1373, at Husinec, a small market town of Bohemia, on the Planitz. His parents were common people, but in good circumstances for their station in life. Very little is known of his early years. He entered the University of Prague, and took his first degree in 1393. The development of his mind was slow but his behavior was distinguished by the strictest probity and the most genuine godliness. In his intercourse with others he was modest and kind. A spirit of melancholy gave a subdued tone to his bearing. He was a tall man, with a thin, pale, sad face. His public career began in 1398, when he was appointed a professor in the university. In 1401 he became dean of its theological faculty, and in 1402 its rector. At the same time he was pastor of the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, erected by John de Milheim (1391), in order to give the people ail opportunity of hearing the Gospel in their native tongue, and in this position he exerted great influence. Multitudes flocked to his chapel, among them Queen Sophia, who also chose him for her confessor. His sermons were not oratorical, but lucid, fervent, and simple, displaying a thorough knowledge of the Bible, and leaving an indelible impression upon the minds of the people. It was from the pulpit of this church that he set forth the truth with such force as to make Rome tremble. The Reformation, which Huss may be said to have inaugurated, may be dated from the 28th of May, 1403,

when the doctrines of John Wickliffe were publicly condemned in a meeting of the faculties and doctors of the university, in spite of the efforts of Huss and his friends to prevent such a decision. The formation of two parties was the result; the one in favor of reform, the other opposed to it. At the head of the first stood Huss, who labored with zeal and boldness, uncovering the putrid sores of the Church, and particularly the gross immoralities of the clergy. For a time Zybnek, the archbishop of Prague, recognized the honesty of Huss's intentions. But soon disagreements occurred between them; and when thousands of students left the university because of a new distribution of votes on academic occasions (1409), which Huss had been mainly instrumental in bringing about, the archbishop openly arrayed himself on the side of his enemies. An opportunity soon offered for showing Zybnek's ill will. The clergy of Prague laid before him formal accusations of heresy against Huss, which the latter met with common accusations against Zybnek. Both appealed to the pope. In response, Alexander V conferred extraordinary powers on the archbishop to root out heresies from his diocese. Accordingly, the latter prohibited preaching in private chapels; caused more than 200 volumes of Wickliffe's writings to be committed to the flames, amidst the chanting of the *Te Deum*; and excommunicated Huss (July 18, 1410). In this emergency king Wenzel came to the rescue, commanding Zybnek to reimburse the owners for the loss of their books, and annulling the ban against Huss. Nor was the prohibition touching chapels carried out. Meantime Alexander died, and was succeeded by John XXIII, an atrocious wretch, formerly a pirate, and now the embodiment of vice. To him, Wenzel, the queen, many nobles, and Huss himself appealed for redress. But the new pope adhered to the policy of his predecessor, confirmed the acts of Zybnek, and cited Huss before his tribunal in person. The king, however, sent two advocates to Bologna, where the papal court had its seat, to plead Huss's cause, and they were joined by three more delegated by Huss himself. But they effected only a transfer of the suit to other hands; while an attempt on the part of Zybnek, at Prague, to lay an interdict upon the city, caused an open rupture between him and the king, who coerced him by violent means. At last, in the summer of 1411, the archbishop yielded, and a pacification, including Huss, was brought about. But in September of the same year Zybnek died, and was succeeded by Albicus, a weak and miserly old man, who received, in the following spring (1412), a papal bull commanding a crusade against Ladislaus, king of Naples, an adherent of the anti-pope, and offering plenary indulgence to all who would take part in it, or contribute money

towards its prosecution. The publication of this bull put a sudden end to the peace which had been patched up in the Church of Bohemia. Huss regarded the bull as an infamous document, contrary to all the principles of the Holy Scriptures, and at once publicly took this stand. A number of his friends, on the contrary, maintained that the will of the pope must be obeyed under all circumstances; they accordingly broke with him, and went over to the anti-reform party. Several of them afterwards became his most embittered foes; and one of them, Stephen de Palec, was the chief instigator of his subsequent condemnation at Constance. In nothing terrified by his adversaries, however, Huss continued to preach against the bull, and held a public disputation upon it in the *aula* of the university; on which occasion his friend and coadjutor, Jerome of Prague, delivered an address of such fervid eloquence that the students formed a fantastical procession the next day, bearing as many copies of the document as they could find to the outskirts of the city, where they were heaped up and burned. Huss took no part in these proceedings. King Wenzel now became alarmed. He had a reputation-to support in Romish Christendom, and issued a decree making any further revilement of the pope or the papal bull punishable with death. In consequence, three young men were executed, who, on the following Sunday, publicly gave the lie to a priest while advocating the plenary indulgence offered by the pope. Huss buried them in the Bethlehem Chapel, with all the rites of the Church, and extolled them as martyrs. When John XXIII was informed of these events, he excommunicated the Reformer a second time, ordered his arrest, commanded his chapel to be razed to the ground, and laid an interdict upon the whole city of Prague. Wenzel again interfered, saved Huss from arrest, and prevented the chapel from being destroyed: but, as the ban was every where published, and the interdict rigidly enforced, he advised Huss to leave the city for a time. Huss obeyed, and, after having affixed a protest to the walls of his chapel, appealing from the corrupt Romish tribunal to the only incorruptible and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ, he retired to the Castle of Kozi Hradek (December, 1412). There, and subsequently at the Castle of Krakowec, he remained until August, 1414, engaged in literary labors, which resulted in some of the most important both of his Latin and Bohemian works, carrying on a voluminous correspondence, and preaching to the people of the neighboring villages.

Meanwhile a general council of the Church had been called to meet at Constance on the 1st of November 1414, under the auspices of Sigismund,

a brother of Wenzel, and designated emperor. This monarch invited Huss to attend, that his cause might be examined and peace given to the Bohemian Church. He pledged himself to grant him a safe-conduct, and to send him back unharmed, even in the event of his not submitting to the council. Modern Romish historians try to disprove the reality of such a promise. But it is incontrovertible. The instrument which Sigismund actually furnished says: “Ut ei transire, stare, morari, *redire* libere permittatis.” Huss joyfully obeyed the summons, for it was the great wish of his heart to defend his doctrines in the presence of the assembled representatives of Latin Christendom, and to unite with them in reforming the Church, for which purpose the Council had been specially convened. Leaving Prague on the 11th of October, with testimonials of orthodoxy from the papal inquisitor and the archbishop, and accompanied by an escort of nobles whom the king appointed to defend him, he traveled through Bohemia and Germany, held disputations upon his doctrines in all the towns where he passed a night, and arrived at Constance on the 3rd of November. The next three weeks he spent in strict seclusion. Sigismund had not yet come, and the pope had temporarily suspended the sentence of excommunication, besides giving him the most solemn pledges for his personal safety. But Stephen de Palec and others among his Bohemian enemies began so persistently to incite the ecclesiastics against him, that he was arrested on the 28th of November, and on the 6th of December he was cast into the dungeon of the Dominican monastery. When Sigismund reached the city, Huss’s escort vainly attempted to secure his release. The emperor was persuaded by the priests that it would be wrong to keep faith with a heretic. Huss not only remained a prisoner, but, after the lapse of three months, was conveyed to the Castle of Gottlieben, where a mere hole, so low that he could not stand upright in it, was assigned him as his cell, and where his feet were fastened to a block with heavy irons, and at night his right arm was chained to the wall. In this miserable plight he remained from the end of March to the beginning of June, in spite of the unceasing efforts of his friends, and the solemn protest of the whole Bohemian nation.

Huss had three hearings before the council; the first on the 5th of June (1415), the second on the 7th, and the third on the 8th. For the most part they were stormy debates, or irregular philippics against him. He was not permitted to explain and defend his doctrines. An immediate and explicit recantation was required of him, which he declined giving, unless convicted

of heresy by the testimony of Christ and his apostles. After the last hearing several weeks elapsed, in which every conceivable effort was made to induce him to recant. But he remained firm, and calmly prepared for death. On Saturday, July 6, he was once more cited before the council, condemned as a heretic, degraded from the priesthood, and delivered into the hands of the secular power for execution. The proper officers immediately conveyed him to the outskirts of the city, where, at about ten o'clock in the morning, he was burned alive at the stake, while the council continued in session. He suffered with the heroism of the early martyrs. His ashes were cast into the Rhine. A simple monument, erected by the present generation of his countrymen, marks the spot. Erasmus pithily said: "Joannes Hus exustus, non convictus." The tradition of a peasant woman bringing a fagot to the pile, and moving him to exclaim "O sancta simplicitas!" is very doubtful; the other tradition of a prophecy with regard to Luther, under the image of a swan, uttered by Huss on his way to execution, lacks all historic basis. Jerome of Prague (q.v.), who had stood faithfully by the side of Huss, and, on the death of his friend, himself led the followers of the lamented Huss, soon suffered the same fate. The disturbances which then followed we treat under HUSSITES *SEE HUSSITES* .

II. *Huss's Literary Labors.* — Besides the many letters which Huss wrote, and which clearly set forth his theological views, he was the author of fifteen Bohemian, and a large number of Latin works. Of the former, among which his *Postills* and *Treatise on Simony* are particularly important, several have, unfortunately, never been translated, and others remain in manuscript. Of the latter, his *Tractatus de Ecclesia* deserves to be particularly mentioned, together with the polemical treatises against Palec and Stanislaus, that form its supplements (*Historia et Monumenta Joannis Hus*, 1, 243-331, ed. of 1715). Other of his Latin works are of an exegetical character. He also composed numerous hymns and didactic hexameters. Many of his hymns were adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, and some of them are still in use in the Moravian Church. Moreover, he carefully revised the old Bohemian version of the Bible, which had been translated as early as the 13th century; and quite recently, Palacky, the great Bohemian antiquary and historian, has discovered a catechism in that language, which he supposes to be from the pen of Huss, and which, no doubt, formed the basis for the catechism of the Brethren, published in 1522. As a writer of his mother language the

merits of Huss cannot be overestimated. He purified it; fixed etymological and syntactical rules, and invented a new system of orthography, distinguished by its simplicity and precision. It was brought into general use by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren in the sixteenth century, since which time it has remained the acknowledged standard. Ulrich von Hutten was the first to publish the Latin works of Huss. The edition by O. Brunfels (Strasb. 1525, 4to, with woodcuts), is very scarce. A more complete edition appeared at Nuremberg in 1558, entitled *Historia et Monumenta Joannis Huss atque Hieronymi Pragensis*, in two fol. volumes. Still more complete is the edition of 1715, which came out at the same place with the same title. A small but very important volume of his sermons, translated from a copy of the Bohemian *Postills*, brought to Herrnhut by the Moravian refugees, appeared at Görlitz in 1855. Its title reads as follows: *Johannes Hus Predigten über die Sonn- und Festtags-Evangelien des Kirchenjachs. Aus der Bömischen in die Deutsche Sprache übersetzt von Dr. Johannes Nowotny*. They are pre-eminently sermons for the times, and abound in polemics. His letters have been translated into English (Edinb. 1859, 1 vol.) and other modern languages. A collection of his writings in Bohemian was begun by Erben (Prague, 1864, etc.).

III. *Huss's Theological Views, and the Principles of His Reformation* The views of Huss were molded by the writings of two men in particular; the one Matthias of Janow, a Bohemian, the other Wickliffe, the English Reformer. He was attracted by the latter, inasmuch as Wickliffe always traced the truth up to its source in the New Testament., and desired to renew Christianity in its apostolic sense. Hence he made him his guide in those principles which he had, first of all, learned from Janow, but which Wickliffe developed more fully and consistently. Not having passed through the same conflict which brought Luther into the inner sanctuary of divine grace, through Christ, and justification by faith, he did not turn his attention so much to doctrine as to practice, and set forth the Saviour of the world rather from the standpoint of that perfect law whereof he is the author, than from that of his redeeming work. As a necessary consequence, he insisted more upon the reformation of the Church in regard to life than in regard to its unsound and corrupt dogmatical views. This was the weak point of his Reformation, bringing it to a premature end, and him to the stake. In order to success, an absolute reform of the dogmas of the Church was essential. Huss did not see this, because he had formed no plan of operations antagonistic to Rome. He advanced, not in obedience to a.

systematic process inwardly developed, but under the influence of outward circumstances. While Christ was the center of his own faith, and he held to Christ's Word alone as the norm of the faith of all, he did not, on that account, reject Romish dogmas until he became conscious of a contradiction between them and the Scriptures. The more any theological question was made prominent by the circumstances of the times, the more clearly he apprehended the truth in its evangelical import. Upon some points, however, as, for instance, the seven sacraments, and transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, he never changed the views, which were his by education. No outward impulse was given him to investigate these points in a reformatory spirit. So also he allowed, with certain qualifications and great caution, prayers for the dead, although he did not deem them of any importance; also confession to a priest and absolution, though none, he said, could forgive sins but God only; and he was, at first, satisfied with the holy communion in one kind. When this latter usage, however, grew to be a subject of dispute between the national and the Romish party in Bohemia, he emphatically endorsed the position of Jacobellus of Mies, who was the great advocate of the cup. For an exposition of his views on the Church, as set forth in the work mentioned above, see Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, 6. 395, etc., or Torrey's *Translation*, 5, 299, as also Gillett's *Life and Times of Huss*, 1, 244, etc. In general, it may be said that it was not until his trial before the council that he recognized the necessity of breaking with the Church of Rome in order to effect a reformation. If he had been able, at that time, to escape from the hands of his enemies and return to Bohemia, he would have been the Luther of the world, and Protestantism would have begun its enlightening course a century earlier. **SEE REFORMATION.** While Huss failed to bring about a general reformation, his principles, developed and purified, found an ecclesiastical form forty-two years later in the Church of the Brethren, and have, through that channel, come down to the present day as a power in Christendom. **SEE MORAVIANS.**

IV. Literature. — For a study of the life of Huss, in addition to the histories of the Council of Constance, the most important works are: *Lebensbeschreibung des M. Johannes Hus von Hussinecz*, von Aug. Zitte, Weltpriester (Prague, 1790); an anonymous history, in German, "*Of the manner in which the Holy Gospel, together with John Huss, was condemned in the Council of Constance by the Pope and his faction,*" written by an eye-witness, and published in 1548; Becker's *Life of Huss*;

Koehler's *Huss und seine Zeit; Hist. of the Hussites*, by Cochleius; Hodgson, *Reformers*, p. 123 sq.; Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, vi; Gillett's *Life and Times of John Huss*; and especially Palacky, F., *Geschichte von Bohmen*, 3 pt. 1, c. 3-5; Palacky, F., *Documenta Mag. J. Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Cone. Constant. actam, etc., nunc ex ipsisfontibus hausta* (Prag. 1869); Bonnechose (Emile de), *Les Reformations avant la Reforme* (Paris, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo); *Good Words*, Jan. 6, 1866, p. 21 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 79 sq.; Zitte, *Lebenbeschreib. d. Mag. J. Huss* (Prag. 1789-95, 2 vols.); Wendt, *Gesch. v. Huss und d. Hussiten* (Magdeb. 1845); Helfert, *Huss u. Hieronymus* (Prag. 1853); Bohringer, *D. Kirche Christi v. ihre Zeugen* (ultrampntane) (Zur. 1858, vol. 2, pt. 4); Krummel, *J. HuIss* (Darmst. 1863); Hofler, *3 Mag. J. Huss* (Prague, 1864); *Contemp. Rev.* April and July, 1869; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, 4; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1864, p. 176. (E. DE S.)

Hussey, Robert, B.D.

an eminent minister of the Church of England, was born at Sunderland, Kent, Oct. 7, 1801. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford, and graduated in 1825 with great credit. He discharged for a while the office of proctor, and was afterwards appointed one of the public examiners in the classical school. In 1837 he took the degree of B.D. In 1842 he was appointed regius professor of ecclesiastical history, which position he held until his death, December 2, 1858. Hussey possessed an immense fund of information, to which his numerous works on all kinds of subjects bear full testimony. The principal of these are: *Sermons, mostly academic*, with a preface containing a refutation of the theory founded upon the Syriac fragment of the epistles of St. Ignatius (Oxford. 1849, 8vo): — *The Papal Supremacy, its Rise and Progress, traced in three Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 8vo). This little work demonstrates that "the papal system grew up and increased by means of usurpation and frequent acts of oppression, favored by the weakness of other parts of the Church, and the vices of ages." He had previously prepared for the University Press an edition of *Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 1827): — also the Latin text of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of England*, with short notes (Oxford 1846): — and the Greek text of Socrates's *Ecclesiastical History* (1844). In 1853 he edited, again for the University Press another edition of Socrates, and this time not a mere text-book for his lectures, but an elaborate edition, with a Latin, version, notes, and index, forming three volumes 8vo. In 1854 he published a sermon, by request, on *University Prospects and University Duties*, and in

1856 an ordination sermon on *The Atonement*. An edition of Sozomen was suspended by his death.

Hussites

a general name for the followers of JOHN HUSS *SEE JOHN HUSS* (q.v.). The Council of Constance, in its dealings with Huss, seems to have forgotten that the adherents to his cause were not the handful of men who had gathered around their friend and teacher in his last hours, but were scattered throughout Bohemia and Moravia. No sooner had the news of the execution of Huss reached them than disturbances became the order of the day. Everywhere in the two kingdoms named the life of the priests was in danger. The archbishop of Albicus (q.v.) himself was obliged to flee for his life. King Wenceslas, of Bohemia, was indignant at the action of the council, and the queen hesitated not to espouse openly the cause of the Hussites. September 3, 1415, the Diet of Bohemia addressed a manifesto to the council, full of reproaches and threats; and September 5 it voted that every landowner should be free to have the doctrines of Huss preached on his estate. Fearful of the danger threatened, the priesthood, and, indeed, all strict adherents of the Romish Church, formed (October 1) a league (Herrenbund), vowing obedience to the council and fidelity to the Romish Church. Encouraged by these associations, deemed strong enough not only to oppose successfully any further attacks on Romanists, but even any further inroads of the heretics among the people, the council assumed a more authoritative position. Not satisfied with the mischief it had already done, it now threatened all adherents of Huss with ecclesiastical punishments. Jerome of Prague (q.v.), the friend and disciple of Huss, was the first to suffer. He was summoned before the council, summarily tried and condemned and, like his master, burned at the stake (May 30, 1416). The 452 signers of a protest against the execution of Huss were the next summoned before the bar of the council to answer for their heretical conduct. Indeed, had not the emperor Sigismund interfered, the king and queen of the Bohemians would have been added to this number. But the execution of Jerome, following that of Huss, was too great an outrage in the eyes of the Bohemians not to destroy the last vestige of respect for the body by whose order these atrocious deeds were committed. The threats of the council became to them a mere *brutum fulmen*. They treated them with contempt.

Meanwhile, the adherents of Huss had divided into two parties, the moderate and the extreme. The moderate party, led by the University of Prague, took the name of *Calixtines* (q.v.), who derived their name from the chalice (*calix*), holding that communion in both kinds was essential to the sacrament; the extreme party were called the *Taborites*, from the mountain Tabor (now Austin), which was originally their headquarters. Here, where Huss himself had formerly preached, they assembled in the open air, sometimes to the number of over 40,000, and partook of communion under both kinds on tables erected for the occasion. The Calixtines preserved the belief in purgatory, praying for the dead, images of the saints, holy water, etc.; but in March 1417; they declared openly for the right of all to receive communion in both kinds. In consequence of this declaration, all the privileges of the university were suspended by the council, and the forcible abolition of the heresy demanded by pope Martin V. In the early part of 1419 king Wenceslas, unwilling to lose the favor of either party, and fearing the wrath of Rome, decreed the restoration of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. But no sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites, and began all manner of persecutions against them. February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found "to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;" all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which bigoted intolerance and persecution might copy and exhausts the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are schismatic, seditious, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, however scattered over the world, and thus leagued in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pestiferous heresiarchs." These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defense, and chose Nicholas of Hussinecz (q.v.) and John Zisca (q.v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was

entitled "*A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel,*" amid was signed by four of their leading captains. "It is honorable at once to their courage, their prudence, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God." Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom. July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of the city in which resided the reformers, and prepared for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state house was stormed. Seven of the councilors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows and impaled on the pikes of the soldiers below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the next general election, and then withdrew, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against these armed heretics, but even endeavored to influence the citizens-of Prague to admit Sigismund as the successor of Wenceslas. The people appealed to Zisca for aid against the probable invasion of the city by Sigismund. November 4, 1419, Zisca re-entered the city. The emperor, involved in a war with the Turks, neglected at first to attend to Bohemia. Finally, in 1420, he besieged Prague, but was driven from his positions.

Widely differing in their political and religious sentiments, the Hussites became daily more divided. Some favored the Calixtines, others the Taborites, and between these two parties strong jealousies were constantly springing up. In the old town of Prague the Calixtines prevailed, in the new the Taborites held sway, and, finding it thus difficult to satisfy and please all parties, and even fearing a union of the Calixtines with the Royalists, Zisca finally withdrew to the country. During the siege the Praguers had

presented to the emperor, as conditions of submission and adherence to him as subjects, four articles (*Articles of Prague*). These were stipulations for,

1, the free and untrammelled preaching of the Word of God, throughout the kingdom of Bavaria, by evangelical preachers;

2, the free use of communion in both kinds by all true Christians who had not committed mortal sin;

3, the keeping of all priests and monks out of any temporal power, and obliging them to live according to the example of Christ and the apostles;

4, the punishment of all mortal sins, and of all disorders contrary to the law of God committed by the priests. The Taborites, however, presented no less than twelve articles, namely, the suppression of all unnecessary churches, altars, images, etc.; the application of capital punishment for other sins, such as drinking in taverns, luxury in clothes or in the style of living, etc. But the continued persecutions of the Hussites, and the unqualified approval of them by Sigismund, ever united the two parties for common defense. March 1, 1420, Martin V invited a regular crusade against them, incited thereto in a great measure, no doubt, by Sigismund, who felt himself too weak to gain the kingdom with his army. The Hussites were now to be dealt with as “rebels against the Roman Church, and as heretics;” and the emperor exerted himself for the publication of this bull throughout his dominions. Even more than the previous documents of like character, it shows the blind zeal and persecuting bigotry of Rome. A Christian, not a heathen people, were now, however, to be the objects of its vengeance — a people whose great heresy was that they made the Word of God their supreme authority, and contended for the institutions of the Gospel in their primitive simplicity and integrity.” To animate his followers with greater fervor in the execution of the bull, the pope, “by the mercy of Almighty God, and the authority of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as by the power of binding and loosing bestowed by God upon himself, granted to those who should enter upon the crusade, or to such even as should die upon the *road plenary pardon of their sins, ... and eternal salvation;*” and to such as could not go in person, but contributed to it in any *wise, full remission of their sins*. Thus “all Christendom, with its generals and armies, was summoned to crush out the heresies of men whom the council chose to burn rather than refute.” “But the result disappointed all human expectations. The forces of the empire dashed and

shattered themselves against the invincible resolution and desperate courage of a band of men sustained by religious enthusiasm, and conducted by able generals.”

Measures for defense were at once taken by the Hussites. The citizens of Prague, who had frequently been divided, now united against the common foe. Calixtine and Taborite were ready to join hands in a league of mutual defense. Never was there a more signal defeat than the imperial forces now sustained, although their army was 140,000 to 150,000 strong. Prague was the first city freed from the beleaguering enemy; but the great battle which decided the fate of the Imperialists was fought at Galgenberg or Witkow, known thereafter as the Ziscaberg (Hill of Zisca). Yet the opposition of the Taborites to all hierarchical pomp, and the threatened ruin of some of the most splendid structures of Prague, inclined the Calixtines, as soon as the danger had passed, to accept the terms of peace which Sigismund seemed very anxious to grant, provided, however, they could induce the emperor at the same time to remove the stigma of heresy which rested on the four “Articles of Prague.” This they failed to accomplish, and peace was further delayed. A second and third attempt of Sigismund at pacification met with no better success. An effort was now made to compromise the differences between the Calixtines and Taborites. But the greatest obstacle to this was found to be their political rather than religious views. The question who should wear the crown of Bohemia was a matter of no little importance, and each party seemed anxious to secure it for one of their number. A convention of the states was held at Czaslau, July 1421, to determine the matter. A regency was appointed of twenty members, taken from the different orders of the nation. Zisca appeared in it in the first rank of the nobles. It was resolved, with remarkable unanimity, that the four Articles of Prague should be universally received. Sigismund was declared incapable of reigning over Bohemia, and the crown was offered to the king of Poland. He refused, however, to accept it. Withold, grand duke of Lithuania, was next chosen; he also declined, but recommended Sigismund Corybut, his brother, to the Bohemian barons, and accompanied him to Prague, where they both, by partaking of the communion of the cup, sealed their adherence to the faith of the Calixtines, who held now the supremacy at Prague, and who had revived their old hostility against the Taborites. The nation divided into two “fierce parties, embittered by prejudice and mutual aggressions,” so that the opposition to Corybut became irreconcilable, even although Zisca himself espoused his cause, as the

Taborites were unwilling to follow their leader blindly. A diet held at Prague in November, 1421, to determine the question, brought it no nearer to its solution, while it effected the estrangement of Zisca from the Calixtines, who now regarded him and his followers as their enemies. An army was gathered against them; but, as often before, the Taborites were victorious, and the Calixtines severely beaten. Another attempt proved even less favorable to them, and, thus driven to desperation, Zisca now attempted to crush the Calixtines, who were virtually leagued with the Imperialists. After various victories over his enemies, Zisca appeared before Prague September 11, 1423, and invested the city, suffering no one to issue forth from its gates. When everything was ready to storm the city, a deputation of the Calixtines appeared before him and offered terms of submission, which he readily accepted. Zisca entered Prague with great honors, and was entrusted with the exercise of paramount authority. The emperor's hopes of being king of Bohemia had of late been based upon the divisions of the nation, and, baffled by this new agreement between the Hussites, he now sought to win them over by liberal concessions. He offered to Zisca the government of the kingdom, and asked for himself only the wearing of the crown.

“But, at this culminating point of Zisca's fortunes, death overtook him (October 11, 1424). He lived to foil the purposes of Sigismund, and died at the moment when his death was, in some respects, another defeat to his hopes.” Zisca's death left the Taborites without any real leader. Their success they chiefly owed to him, and some of them, to indicate their deep sense of the loss they had suffered, took the name of *Orphanites* (q.v.). Others were absorbed by the Horebites (q.v.), while still others retained their old name, and chose St. Procopius “the Great” (q.v.) as their leader. The Orphanites, however, had relapsed to a belief in transubstantiation: they observed the fasts; honored the saints, and their priests performed worship in robes, all which the strict Taborites continued to reject. Among the Orphanite leaders, Procopius “the Lesser” was the most eminent. Vainly did the pope, assisted by the emperor, preach another crusade against the Hussites, who sallied out from Bohemia in troops to make invasions into neighboring countries, and, considering always Bohemia as their home, and other places as the land of the Philistines, treated the latter accordingly. Bands of robbers of all nations soon joined them. Frederick “the Valiant” made war against them, and entered Bohemia in 1425, and again in 1426, with 20,000 men, but was repulsed, on the second occasion

suffering a terrible defeat at the battle of Ausch, June 15. A panic now seized all Germany, which was increased by the storming of Miess and Tachow by the Hussites in 1427. Another crusade, instigated against them by the emperor Sigismund in the same year, met with no better success than before.

At the opening of 1428, a Convention was called at Beraun to bring about, if possible, a general pacification of the nation. But so varying were the views of the different sects, especially the doctrines of free will, justification, and predestination, that the Convention was broken up without accomplishing anything. In 1429, the Orphanites, assisted by a portion of the Taborites, made a great invasion into Saxony and Silesia. They took Dresden, marched along the Elbe to Magdeburg, then turned into the province of Brandenburg, and finally returned to Bohemia by way of Silesia, distributing themselves into different bands in various places, and adopting names according to their fancy. Some were known as *Collectors*, some as “Small Caps” (*Petit Chapeaus*, says L’Enfant), some as *Little Cousins*, others as *Wolf-bands*. In the spring of 1430 they were ready to undertake another invasion. With 20,000 cavalry, 30,000 infantry, and 3000 chariots, and with Procopius and other able generals at their head, they repeated the invasion of the countries that had been visited the previous year. Dividing into several bands, they desolated or reduced to ashes more than a hundred towns and villages, beat a Saxon army at Grimma, then wept to Franconia, and returned home through Lower Bavaria. Meanwhile the pope had been busy with his bigots crying a new crusade against the Hussites. November 1, 1429, a diet had been summoned to meet at Vienna, but the delay of Sigismund in reaching the place had caused its transfer to Presburg. Here the deliberations were protracted for eight months, and at length nearly all the prelates and princes of the empire were brought together, either in person or by ambassadors. “It was finally resolved to make still another invasion of Bohemia. The papal legate came provided for the emergency. He had brought with him a bull of Martin V, ordaining a crusade, which was now opportunely to be published. Indulgences were profusely promised to those who should engage in the enterprise, or contribute to its promotion. Those who should fast and pray for its success should have a remission of penance for sixty days. From other vows interfering with enlistments in the holy war, a dispensation should be freely bestowed.” Great efforts were made to insure the successful issue of this, the sixth invasion of Bohemia

by the Imperialists (or the third papal crusade urged by Martin V). June 24, 1431, was the time appointed for it. But, before it was undertaken, the emperor, to test the spirit of the Bohemians, made again propositions for the crown. The Orphanites were the only Hussites that opposed him. The Calixtines and Taborites returned a deputation of four to confer with Sigismund. But, even before this deputation had returned to Prague, the Hussites became distrustful, and the most cautious and moderate among them felt satisfied that the emperor only intended to mislead them into a state of security, and then surprise and conquer them. "The old leagues and confederations were revived. Old feuds were forgotten. The barons of Bohemia and Moravia, the Calixtines of Prague, and the indomitable Taborites and Orphanites, again united to repel the invader. In a few weeks 50,000 infantry, 7000 cavalry, and 3600 chariots were gathered." The crusading force also had been collecting, and now numbered 80,000 (some say 130,000) men, under the command of the elector of Brandenburg. This army, immense as it was, and powerful and invincible as it seemed, was, like its predecessors, completely routed at Tausch, August 14, 1431, and the hopes of the Imperialists of subjecting the Bohemians by force of arms effectually crushed. Sigismund now most earnestly endeavored to make peace, and entrusted the negotiations to the Council of Basle (which met December, 1431). The Bohemians were invited, promised a safe-conduct, and freedom to remain at Basle, to act, decide, treat, and enter into arrangements with the council; also "perfect liberty to celebrate in their houses their peculiar forms of worship; that in public and in private they should be allowed from Scripture and the holy doctors to advance proof of their *four Articles*, against which no preaching of the Catholics should be allowed while they remained within the city." But even with these proffered favorable conditions the Bohemians at first kept aloof, mistrusting the sincerity of the offers made them; yet in 1432 they consented to send envoys to the council. It was in the beginning of the next year (January 4, 1433) that the Bohemian deputation, numbering 300, was chosen from the most noble in the land, and with Procopius "the Great," the colleague of Zisca, the hero of many battles, the leader of many invasions, at its head. On the 16th of January the Bohemian deputation appeared before the council, and presented the four Articles of Prague as the basis of negotiations. After discussing them for fifty days, the parties had been brought no nearer together, and the Bohemians, growing impatient, prepared for their return to Prague. Towards the close of the same year, however, the council sent envoys to Prague, and finally the

Treaty of Prague was concluded, November 30, 1433, known in history as the *Compactata*, stipulating first for the restoration of peace and the abolition of ecclesiastical censorship, then for the admission of the four Articles of Prague, modified as follows: 1, the Eucharist to be administered equally under one or both kinds; 2, that preaching should be free, but only permitted to regularly ordained ministers; 3, that priests should have no possessions, but should be permitted to administer upon them.; 4, that sin should be punished, but only by the regularly constituted authorities. The Taborites disapproved the proceedings; a diet, held at Prague in 1434, in which the Calixtines acknowledged the authority of the pope, brought the difficulty to a crisis, and the Calixtines, joined by the Roman Catholics, defeated the Taborites near Böhmisschbrod, May 30, 1434. The two Procopiuses were killed. The Taborites were now driven to their strongholds, which they were obliged to surrender one by one. In another diet, held at Prague in 1435, all Bohemians acknowledged Sigismund for their king, he granting them, on his part, very advantageous conditions for their country and sect. The Romish Church, in accepting the four Articles, having conceded to them the use of the cup in the Eucharist, and many other privileges, they were finally absolved from ecclesiastical interdict, and the emperor came to Prague August 23, 1436. The Taborites submitted gradually, and the thus united Hussites took the name of *Utraquists* (q.v.).

Sigismund, however, did not keep the promises he had made on ascending the throne of Bohemia, but rather used every means to restore the Roman Catholic faith in that country. The chief of the Hussites, John Rokyzan, whom the emperor himself had at first confirmed in the office of archbishop, came to be in danger of his life. This created new disturbances, which continued until the death of Sigismund in 1437. The Roman Catholic party now elected Albrecht of Austria king, but the Hussites chose Casimir of Poland. The former finally prevailed; but at his death, in October, 1439, during the minority of his son Ladislaus, two governors were appointed (in 1441), the one a Roman Catholic, the other a Hussite, to govern the kingdom. In 1444, George de Podiebrad was the Hussite governor chosen, and in 1450 he assumed the sole control. This change created no disorder, as the Roman Catholics, who were busily engaged undermining the Hussite doctrine and gaining over its adherents, were anxious to avoid an open conflict with them. At the death of Ladislaus in 1457, George himself was elected king. In order to conciliate the pope, he caused himself to be crowned by Roman Catholic bishops, and swore obedience to the Church

and to the pope. During his reign the Calixtines enjoyed full religious liberty; and when Pope Pius II declared the treaty abolished in 1462, George sent the papal legates to prison without further forms. For this he was put under the ban, and finally deposed by the pope in 1463.

“Meanwhile the warlike Taborites had disappeared from the scene. They no longer formed a national party. But the feeble remnants of that multitude which had once followed the standards of Zisca and Procopius still clung to their cherished faith, and, with the Word of God as their only supreme authority, the *United Brethren* (q.v.) appear as their lineal representatives. How, from such an origin, should have sprung a people whose peaceful virtues and missionary zeal have been acknowledged by the world, is a problem only to be solved by admitting that, in the faith of the old Taborites, however they may have been guilty of fanatical excesses, there was to be found that fundamental principle of reverence for the authority of Scripture alone which they bequeathed as a cherished legacy to those who could apply and act upon it in more favorable circumstances and in more peaceful times.” The successor of George, Ladislaus of Poland, who came to the government in 1471, held fast to the conditions of the treaty though himself a Roman Catholic. In 1485 he concluded the peace of Kuttenberg, according to which the Utraquists and Subunists (Roman Catholics who communed but in one kind) were promised equal toleration; and in 1497 he gave the Utraquists the right to appoint an administrator of the archbishopric of Prague as their ecclesiastical chief. When the Reformation began in Germany, it was gladly hailed by both the Calixtines and the Bohemian Brethren, and in 1524 they decided to continue, under the guidance of Luther, the reform begun by Huss. A large part of them now divided themselves into Lutherans and Calvinists, and in 1575 both these united with the Bohemian Brethren in a joint confession, and became a strictly Protestant denomination. They were permitted to enjoy religious liberty until 1612, when they were subjected to many restrictions by the emperor Matthias, and to still more by the emperor Rudolph in 1617. This was the first cause of the Thirty-years’ War, and it was only under Joseph II that the Calixtines recovered their religious liberty. See Cochlaus, *Hist. Hussitarum* (Mayence, 1549, fol.); Theobald, *Hussitenkrieg* (Wittenberg, 1609; Nuremb. 1623; Bresl. 1750, 3 vols.); *Geschichte d. Hussiten* (Lpz. 1784); Schubert, *Geschichte d. Hussitenkriegs* (Neustadt, 1825); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 8:636; Koppen, *Der alt. Huss. Brüderkirche* (Lpz. 1845); *The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia* (London,

1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Palacky, *Geschichte v. Behmen* (1845, 3 vols.), vol. iii; *Beziehungen u. Verhältniss do Waldenser z. d. ehemaligen Sekten in Bohmen* (Prag. 1869); *Vorlaufer d. Hussitenthums in Bohmen* (new edit. 1869); Jean Gochlee and Theobaldus, *Hist. de la Guerre des Hussites*; Neander, *Church Hist.* 5, 172; Gindely, *Gesch. d. Bohnmisohen Brider* (Prague, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); and especially Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss* (Boston, 1863, 2 vols. 8vo), from which extracts have frequently been made in this article. Roman Catholic-Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:348 sq.; *Gesch. Kaiser Sigmunds* (Hamb. 1838-45, 4 vols. 8vo). See Huss. (J. H.W.)

Hutcheson, Francis

called by Mackintosh the “father of speculative philosophy in Scotland,” was the son of a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, and was born Aug. 8, 1694. He entered the University of Glasgow in 1710, and afterwards became minister of a Presbyterian church in the north of Ireland; but, preferring the study of philosophy to theology, he was induced to open a private academy at Dublin. The publication of some of his works soon procured him the friendship of many distinguished persons, and in 1729 he was called as professor of moral philosophy to the University of Glasgow. He died in 1747. His principal works are, *Philosophiae moralis institutio compendiaria, ethices et jurisprudentiae naturalis elementa continens* (Glasgow, 1742, 12mo): — *A short Introduction to Moral Philosophy, containing the Elements of Ethics and the Law of Nature*, translated (Glasgow, 1747, sm. 8vo): — *An Essay on the Vature and Conduct of Passions and Affections* (3rd ed. Glasgow 1769, sm. 8vo): — *Synopsis metaphysicae, Ontologicam et Pneumatologiams complectens* (editio sexta, Glasgow 1774, small 8vo): — *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, in two treatises (5th edit. corrected, London, 1753, 8vo): — *Letters between the late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and IM. Hutcheson concerning the true Foundation of Virtue or Moral Goodness*, etc. (London, 1735, 8vo). After his death, his *System of Moral Philosophy* was published by his son, Francis Hutcheson, M.D., with a sketch of his life and writings by Dr. William Leechman (Glasgow 1755, 2 vols. 4to). “In his *metaphysical* system Hutcheson rejected the theory of innate ideas and principles, but insisted upon the admission of certain universal propositions, or, as he terms them, metaphysical axioms, which are self-evident and immutable. These axioms are primary and original, and do not derive their authority from any simpler and antecedent principle.

Consequently, it is idle to seek a criterion of truth, for this is none other than reason itself, or, in the words of Hutcheson, ‘menti cogenita intelligendi vis.’ Of his ontological axioms two are important: Everything exists really; and no quality, affection, or action is real, except in so far as it exists in some object or thing. From the latter proposition, it follows that all abstract *affirmative* propositions are hypothetical, that is, they invariably suppose the existence of some object without which they cannot be true. Truth is divided into logical, moral, and metaphysical. Logical truth is the agreement of a proposition with the object it relates to; moral truth is the harmony of the outward act with the inward sentiments; lastly, metaphysical truth is that nature of a thing wherein it is known to God as that which actually it is, or it is its absolute reality. Perfect truth is in the infinite alone. The truth of finite things is imperfect, inasmuch as they are limited. It is, however, from the finite that the mind rises to the idea of absolute truth, and so forms to itself a belief that an absolute and perfect nature exists, which, in regard to duration and space, is infinite and eternal. The soul, as the thinking essence, is spiritual and incorporeal. Of its nature we have, it is true, but little knowledge; nevertheless, its specific difference from body is at once attested by the consciousness. It is simple and active; body is composite and passive. From the spiritual nature of the soul, however, Hutcheson does not derive its immortality, but makes this to rest upon the goodness and wisdom of God.” In *moral* philosophy he was the first to use the term “moral sense” to denote “the faculty which perceives the morality of actions,” and he held it to be an essential part of human nature. “He allows the appellation of good to those actions alone which are disinterested and flow from the principle of benevolence. The last has no reference to expediency nor personal advantages, nor even to the more refined enjoyments of moral sympathy, the obligations of reason and truth, or of the divine will. It is a distinct and peculiar principle, a moral sentiment or instinct of great dignity and authority, and its end is to regulate the passions, and to decide, in favor of virtue, the conflict between the interested and disinterested affections. On this foundation Hutcheson erected all the superstructure of the moral duties.” See *English Cyclopaedia*; Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy*, p. 126; Tennemann, [*Manual History of Philosophy*, § 350; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 406; Morell, *History of Mod. Philippians* p. 179 sq.; M’Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 92, 248, 411 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 926. Hutcheson, George, an English Biblical scholar, of whose early life but little is known, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a

minister first at Colomonell, and later at Edinburgh, but was ejected for nonconformity about 1660. In 1669 he preached at Irvine, though he continued steadfastly to oppose the use of the Episcopal liturgy. He died hi 1678. He wrote, *Exposition of the twelve Minor Prophets* (Lond. 1655, sm. 8vo): — *Exposit. of John* (1657, fol.): — *Exposition of Job* (1669, fol.): — *Forty-five Sermons on the 130th Psalm* (Edinb. 1691, 8vo). — Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 345; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 1, 927. (J. H. W.)

Hutchinson, Anne

an American religious enthusiast, and founder of a party of Antinomians (q.v.) in the New England colony, emigrated from Lincolnshire, England, to Boston in 1636. She claimed to be a medium of divine revelation, and, being “a woman of admirable understanding, and profitable and sober carriage, she won a powerful party in the country, and her enemies could never speak of her without acknowledging her eloquence and ability.” She held that the Holy Spirit dwells in every believer, and that the revelation of the Spirit is superior to the ministry of the word. As her doctrines affected not only the religious, but also the political professions of the people, great controversies ensued; a synod was finally called, in which her teachings were condemned, and she and her associate leaders were banished from the colony. Anne and her friends now obtained from the chief of the Narragansetts permission to reside in Rhode Island. Here “they set up a community on the highly commendable principle that no one was to be ‘accounted a delinquent for doctrine.’” “After the decease of her husband (who shared her opinions), she removed to a Dutch settlement in the colony of New York. In 1643, she and her whole family of fifteen persons were taken prisoners by the Indians, and all but one daughter barbarously murdered. See Bancroft, *Hist. of the United States*, 1, 388 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* 5, 472; *American Presb. Rev.* 1860, p. 225. (J. H. W.)

Hutchinson, John, 1

a Puritan colonel in the Parliamentary army during the time of the English Civil War, was born at Nottingham in 1617. He was a nonconformist (Baptist), and, being of a religious turn of mind, much of his time was given to the study of theology. At the outbreak of the Civil War he sided with the Parliament, and was appointed governor of Nottingham Castle. At the trial of the king (Charles I) he concurred in the sentence pronounced on him, having first “addressed himself to God by prayer.” Cromwell’s

conduct after this unfortunate affair Hutchinson disapproved; and while various sentiments are entertained on his political conduct, “none question his integrity or piety.” At the Restoration he suffered the general fate of the Republicans, and died in prison, Sept. 11, 1664. See Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harper’s edit.), 2, 378 sq.; Appleton’s *Amer. Cyclop.* 9, 396.

Hutchinson, John, 2

inventor of a theory of hermeneutics which gave rise to much discussion in the 17th century, and still has a few adherents, was born in 1674, at Spennithorne, in Yorkshire. After private education, he became, at the age of 19, steward to Mr. Bathurst, and afterwards to the duke of Somerset, who bestowed upon him many marks of confidence, and finally procured for Hutchinson a sinecure appointment of £200 per annum from the government. His time was now mainly devoted to religious study. He also made a large and valuable collection of fossils. In 1724 he published the first part of a curious work entitled *Moses’s Principia*, in which he attempted to refute the doctrine of gravitation as taught in the *Principia* of Newton. In the second part of this work, which appeared in 1727, he continued his attack upon the Newtonian philosophy, and maintained, on the authority of Scripture, the existence of a *plenum*. From this time to his death he published yearly one or two volumes in further elucidation of his views, which evince extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. He died August 28, 1737.

“According to Hutchinson, the Old Testament contains a complete system of natural history, theology, and religion. The Hebrew language was the medium of God’s communication with man; it is therefore perfect, and consequently, as a perfect language, it must be coextensive with all the objects of knowledge, and its several terms are truly significant of the objects which they indicate, and not so many arbitrary signs to represent them. Accordingly, Hutchinson, after Origen and others, laid great stress on the evidence of Hebrew etymology, and asserted that the Scriptures are not to be understood and interpreted in a literal, but in a typical sense, and according to the radical import of the Hebrew expressions. By this plan of interpretation, he maintained that the Old Testament would be found not only to testify fully to the nature and offices of Christ, but also to contain a perfect system of natural philosophy.” His editors give the following compendium of the Hutchinsonian theory: “The Hebrew Scriptures nowhere ascribe motion to the body of the sun, or fixedness to the earth;

they describe the created system to be a *plenum* without any *vacuum*, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning: the heavens, thus framed by Almighty wisdom, are an instituted emblem and visible substitute of Jehovah Elohim, the eternal three, the coequal and co-adorable Trinity in Unity: the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence, and the distinction of conditions the triune personality in Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance. From their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew *Shermim*, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by their names that they are emblems, and by their conditions or offices what it is they are emblems of.” As an instance of his etymological interpretation, the word *Berith*, which our translation renders *Covenant*, Hutchinson construes to signify “he or that which purifies,” and so the purifier or purification “for,” not “with,” man. From similar etymologies, he drew the conclusion “that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were so many delineations of Christ, in what he was to be, to do, and to suffer, and that the early Jews knew them to be types of his actions and sufferings, and that, by performing them as such, were in so far Christians both in faith and practice.” All his writings are collected in *The Philosophical and Theological Works of the late truly learned John Hutchinson, Esq.* (Lond. 1749, 3rd edit. 12 vols. 8vo).

“Hutchinson’s philological and exegetical views found numerous followers, who, without constituting a doctrinal sect, came to be distinguished as ‘Hutchinsonians.’ In their number they reckoned several distinguished divines in England and Scotland, both of the Established Church and of Dissenting communities. Among the most eminent of these were bishop Home, and his biographer, Mr. William Jones; Mr. Romaine, and Mr. Julius Bates, to whom the duke of Somerset, on the nomination of Mr. Hutchinson, presented the living of Sutton, in Sussex; Mr. Parkhurst, the lexicographer; Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel; and Dr. Wetherell, master of University College, Oxford; Mr. Holloway, author of *Letter and Spirit*; and Mr. Lee, author of *Sophron, or Nature’s Characteristics of Truth*. The principles of Mr. Hutchinson are still entertained by many divines without their professing to be followers of Mr. Hutchinson, but the number of professing Hutchinsonians is now very small.” See *English Cyclop.* s.v.;

Jones of Noyland, *Works*, vols. 3 and 13; Bishop Horne, *Works*, vol. vi (ed. 1809); Bate, *Defense of Hutchinson* (Lond. 1751, 8vo); Spearman, *Abstract of Hutchinson's Works* (Edinb. 1755, 12mo); Kitto., *Bibl. Cyclop.* 2, 345.

Hutchinsonianism

SEE HUTCHINSON, JOHN, 2.

Hutten, Ulrich von

a German knight and Reformer, was born April 20 (or 22), 1488, at Castle Steckelberg, in Hesse-Cassel, and entered the monastery of Fulda in 1498, intending to become a monk, but fled in 1504 to Erfurt, where he continued his theological studies for a while. In 1505 he went to Cologne, and the following year to Frankfort on the Oder, where the new university had recently been established. Here he applied himself to the study of philology and poetry. From Frankfort he went to Greifswald, and afterwards to Rostock, where he lectured on philosophy. In 1510 he went to Wittenberg, and thence to Vienna, where he remained until 1512. He afterwards visited Pavia and Bologna, studied law, and devoted himself particularly to the humanities and poetry. What he saw in Italy had the effect of making him an enlightened opponent of popery. Later he joined the army of the emperor Maximilian, and returned to Germany in 1517.. Taking part in Reuchlin's quarrel against the Dominicans of Cologne, he wrote against the state of the Romish Church, and particularly against the pontiff. Bolder, and more open in the expression of his opinions than most men of his age, he did much to prepare the way for the Reformation, though he sympathized with Luther only in his attack upon the pope, his great aim being not so much to change the Church as to free Germany from the tyranny of which popery was the basis. In 1522 he made an alliance with Franz von Sickingen, who was chosen chief of the nobility of the Upper Rhine at Landau. In that year, as the German princes did not approve of Sickingen's plan of freeing Germany from the Romish rule, he appealed to the States, and endeavored to make them side with the nobility against the princes. But Sickingen succumbed in 1523, and Hutten was obliged to flee from Germany. In Switzerland, his former friend Erasmus withdrew from him, and the Council of Zurich drove him out of their territory. He then retired to the island of Ufnau, on the lake of Zutrich, where he died, Aug. 29, 1523. Hutten has been very variously judged,

according to the different stand-points of his critics; yet it is certain that he was honest in his convictions, and, though not a partisan of the Reformation from any religious feeling, he did all he could to free his native land from the subjection to the papacy. For that end he gave Luther all the aid in his power. He was one of the authors of the greater part of the *Epistolce obscurorum virorum*, and most of his writings were satires against the pope, the monks, and the clergy. Several editions of his works have been published; the principal are Munch's (Berlin, 1821-23, 6 vols.) and Ed. Bocking's (Lpz. 1859 sq., 7 vols.). See *Epistolce U. ab Hutten ad R. Crocum* (Leipzig, 1801); Bocking, *Ein Verzeichniss der Schriften Hutten's*, *Index bibliographicus Huttenianus* (Leipz. 1858); Schubart, *Biographie* (Lpz. 1791); Tischer, *Biographie* (Lpz. 1803); Panzer, *Ulrich von Hutten, in literarischer Hinsicht* (Nirnburg, 1798); Giess, *H. u. sein Zeitalter* (1813); E. von Brunnow, *Ulrich von H.* (Lpz. 1842, 3 vols.); Burck, *Ulrich v. H.* (Dresden u. Lpz. 1846); David Friedrich Strauss, *Ulrich v. H.* (Lpz. 1857, 2 vols.); *Revite Germanique*, March, 1858; *Eclectic Review* (Lond.), July, 1858, p. 54 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, vol. 8; Hase, *Ch. History*, § 314. *Ulrich von Hutten*, transl. from Chauffour-Kestner's *Etudes sur les Réformateurs du 16^{me} siecle*, by A. Young (Lond. 1863); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, 2, 188; Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 32 sq.; *National Magazine*, 1858, p. 243 sq.; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1857 (April); 1867 (April).

Hutter, Elias

a German Hebraist, was born at Gorlitz in 1554, studied the Oriental languages in the universities of Jena and Leipzig, and became in 1579 Hebrew teacher of the elector August of Saxony. He next resided successively in different parts of Germany, set up a printing establishment in Nuremberg, and finally retired to Augsburg, where he died (others say he died at Frankfort) in 1605. His reputation as a linguist he established by editing several Polyglot Bibles. The first of them, *Opus quadripartitum Script. Sacra* (Hamb. 1596), contained the O.T. in Hebrew and three other versions. In 1599 he published at Nuremberg the New Test. in twelve different versions, and in 1602 his *Nov. Test. Harmon. Ebr. Gr. Lat. et Germ.* At present, however, Hutter's works are more curious than useful. Among them is a Hebrew Bible in remarkably bold and large letter, in which the *serviles* are distinguished by hollow type, and the defective radicals interlined in small characters, as in Bagster's edition of the Psalms. Pierer, *Unic. Lex.* 8, 646 sq.; Kitto, *Biblical Cyclop.* 2, 346.

Hutter, Leonhard

a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Nellingen, near Ulm, in January, 1563, studied philosophy, philology, and theology at Strasburg, Leipzig, Heidelberg, and Jena; became private tutor in the latter university in 1594, and in 1596 professor at Wittenberg, where he died, Oct. 23, 1616. He was a zealous upholder-of Lutheran orthodoxy. His *Conpendium locorum theologicorum* (Wittenb. 1610, etc.), prepared by order of the elector Christian, took the place of Melancthon's *Loci* as a text-book, and was translated into several languages (into German by Holstenius [Lib. 1611], and by Hutter himself [1613, etc.] into Swedish [Stock. 1618]), and commented on by Cundisius (Jena, 1648, etc.), Glassius (1656), Chemnitz (1670), Lachmann (1690), etc. It has lately been reproduced by Hase under the title *fitterus redivivus* (Berl. 1854), and translated into English, under the title of *Compend of Lutheran Theology*, by the Rev. H. E. Jacobs and the Rev. G. F. Spieker (Phila. 1868, 8vo). He carried out the *Conpendium* further in his *Loci communes theolog.* (Wittenb. 1619, fol., etc.). He also wrote against John Sigismund of Brandenburg, who had embraced Calvinism, his *Callvinista aulico-politicus* (Wittenb. 1609-14, 2 vols.),-and against Hospinian's *Concordia discors* another work, entitled *Concordia concors* (Wittenb. 1614). His other writings are *De Voluntate Dei circa ceterum praedestinationis salvandorum Decretum* (Wittenb. 1605, 4to): — *Explicatio libri Christiane concordantiae* (Wittenberg, 1608. 8vo; twice reprinted): — *Irenicum vere Christianum, sire tractatus de synodo et unione evangelicorum non fucata concilianda* (Rost. 1616, 4to; 1619, folio), against the plan of fusion between the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Pareus, and especially against the latter's *Irenicum*. See J.C.Erdmann, *Lebensbesch. u. Literarische Nachricht. v. d. Wittenberg Theologen seit 1502 bis 1802* (Wittenberg, 1804); Bayie, *Dict. Hist.*; J. G.Walch, *Bibl. Theologica Selecta*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25 655; *Univ. Lex.* i, 376; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:238.

Hutton, James

a preacher of the Moravian Brethren was born in London in 1715. He was the son of a clergyman, and served an apprenticeship to a printer and a bookseller; but, coming under the influence of Mr.Wesley's preaching, he was awakened, and was converted under the labors of the distinguished Moravian, Peter Bohler. Soon after his conversion he visited the brethren at Hernhut, and became a devoted disciple and servant of count

Zinzendorf, under whose direction he henceforth devoted all his time and energy to the unity of the Moravian brotherhood in England. “His counsel and aid were afforded it in all its complicated plans of government and projects of usefulness; he held, as years rolled on, every lay office in it, and preached and ministered as a deacon; he was the soul of its missionary labors as a ‘society for the furtherance of the Gospel;’ he defended it in its distresses; helped it by his energy and skill through all its heavy financial embarrassments; traveled for it over Europe; and, towards the close of his life, became, as it were, its representative to the court and people of England.” He died in 1795. Hutton was a man of great piety and indomitable energy. The history of the Moravian Brethren in the second half of the 18th century is eminently the history of his own life. See *Memoirs of James Hutton, comprising the annals of his life, and connexion with the United Brethren*, by Daniel Benham (Lond. 1856, 8vo); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 8, 239 sq.

Huyghens, Gummarus

a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at Liere or Lyre (Brabant) Feb. 1631. When only twenty-one years of age he was appointed professor of philosophy at Louvain, and here he distinguished himself greatly. In 1668 he was honored with the doctorate of theology, and in 1677 was made president of the college of pope Adrian VI. He died at Louvain Oct. 27, 1702. Huyghens wrote a number of works, of which the best are *Conferentias theologicas*, in 3 vols.; *Breves observat., or a course of divinity*, in 15 vols. 12mo. As he refused to favor the peculiar views of some of the French moralists, and opposed the celebrated four articles of the French clergy (1.682), he was involved in great controversies. — Jocher, *Algern. Gelehrten Lex.* 2, 1794; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6, 239. (J. H. W.)

Huz

(^{4022b}Genesis 22:21). *SEE UZ*. Huzoth. *SEE KIRJATH-HUZOTH*. Huz’ zab (Hebrew *Hutstsab*’, בִּחְזָב rendered as a proper name in the Auth. Version of ^{3417c}Nahum 2:7, is either Hoph. praet. of בִּחְזָב; to *place* firmly; and so the clause may be translated, “And *it is fixed!* she is led away captive,” i.e. the decree is confirmed for the overthrow of Nineveh (so the margin, and most interpreters; see Lud. de Dieu; the Sept. and Vulg. both confound with בִּחְזָב and ἡ ὑπόστασις [military station] ἀπεκαλύφθη, *et miles captivus*

abductus est; the Talmud and Hebrew interpreters, confounding with **bXhi** render “the queen sitting on her couch”); or, rather, of **bbx̄**; to *flow*, by Chaldaism, and the meaning will then be (with Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1147, who joins the word to the last of the preced. verse), “the palace shall be dissolved *and made to flow down*,” i.e. the palaces of Nineveh, inundated and undermined by the waters of the Tigris, shall dissolve and fall in ruins (comp. Diodorus, 2, 26). Mr. Rawlinson supposes (*Herod.* i, 570, note) that *Huzzab* may mean “the *Zab* country,” or the fertile tract east of the Tigris, watered by the Upper and Lower *Zab* rivers (*Zab Ala* and *Zab Asfal.*), the *A-diab-ene* of the geographers. This province—the most valuable part of Assyria—might well stand for Assyria itself, with which it is identified by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 12) and Ammianus (23:6). The name *Zab*, as applied to the rivers, is certainly very ancient, being found in the great inscription of Tiglath Pileser I, which belongs to the middle of the 12th century B.C.; but in that case the name would hardly be written in Heb. with **x̄**.

Hwiid, Andreas Christian

a Danish Orientalist, was born Oct. 20, 1749, at Copenhagen. He was highly educated, and enjoyed great advantages by travel in foreign countries. Thus from 1777 to 1780 he spent in Germany, especially at Gittingen, where he studied under the celebrated Michaelis and Heyne, and in Italy, where he enjoyed the society of several cardinals, although a Protestant in belief. On his return he was appointed professor at the Royal College. He died May 3, 1788. Hwiid wrote *Specimen medice Versionis Arabico-Samaritance Pentateuchi* (Romans 1780, 4to): — *Libellus criticus de indole codicis MSS. N.T. biblioth. Caeseo Vindobonensis* (Cop. 1785). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé* 25:688.

Hyacinth

SEE JACINTH.

Hyacinthus de Janua

a Capuchin monk of distinction, who flourished in the first half of the 17th century, was named after his native city, Genoa. He was general preacher of his order, and enjoyed the confidence of Maximilian to such an extent that in 1622 he was charged by Gregory XV with a special commission to the Spanish court to translate Castiglio’s history of the Dominican order

into Italian (Palermo, 1626, 2 vols. fol.). — Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrt. Lex.* 2, 1795; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, 2, 485.

Hyaena

SEE HYENYA

Hyatt, John

a Calvinistic Methodist preacher of considerable talent, was born at Sherborne, in Dorsetshire, in 1767. He became minister of a congregation at Mere, Wiltshire, in 1798, but removed in 1800 to one at Frome, Somersetshire, and soon afterwards to Tottenham Court Chapel and the Tabernacle, London. Here he was co-pastor with the Rev. Matthew Wilks until his death in 1826. His principal works are, *Christian Duty and Encouragement in Times of Distress* (2nd edit. Lond. 1810, 8vo): — *Sermons on select Subjects* (2nd ed. London, 1811, 8vo): — *Sermons on various Subjects*, edited by his son, Charles Hyatt, with memoir of the author by the Rev. John Morison, etc. (2nd ed. Lond. 1828, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1, 1597.

Hydas'pes

(Ὑδάσπης), a river noticed in Judith 1, 6, in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris, mentioned by Arrian (Ind. 4) and Strabo (15, 697), which flowed westwards into the Indus, and is now called *Jelam* (Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 558). The well-known Hydaspes of India is too remote to accord with the other localities noticed in the context. We may perhaps identify it with the *Choaspes* or *Euloeus* of Susiana, which was called *Hydaspes* by the Romans (Voss, *ad Justin.* ii, 14).

Hyde, Alvan, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 2, 1768, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1788, entered the ministry in June, 1790, and was ordained pastor in Lee June 6, 1792, where he remained until his death, Dec. 4, 1833. Hyde published *Sketches of the Life of the Rev. Stephen West, D.D.* (1818): — *An Essay on the State of Infants* (1830); and several occasional *Sermons*. — *Sprague, Annals*, 2, 300; *Theol. Rev.* 5, 544.

Hyde, Edward

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norwich, Conn., March 31, 1786. He was converted in 1803, entered the New England Conference in 1809, was presiding elder on Boston District in 1822-26, and again in 1830, and meantime four years on New London District, and in 1831 was appointed steward of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1832. His indefatigable and successful labors were very valuable to the *Church*. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1, 162; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, 2, 142; *Funeral Sermon*, by Dr. Fisk. (G. L. T.)

Hyde, Lavius

a Congregational minister, was born in Franklin, Conn., Jan. 29, 1789. He lost his father while quite young, and was prepared for college by his brother, the Rev. Alvan Hyde, D.D. He graduated at Williams College in 1813, and afterwards pursued a course of theological studies at Andover. In 1818 he was ordained minister over a church in Salisbury, Conn.; in 1823 he changed to Bolton, Conn., served subsequently at Ellington, Wayland, and Becket, Mass., and finally again at Bolton. At the age of seventy he retired from the active work of the ministry, and removed to Vernon, Conn., where he died, April 3, 1865. He wrote a biography of his brother, Alvan Hyde, and edited Nettleton's *Village Hymns*. — *Appleton, Am. Annual Cyclop.* 1865, p. 636.

Hyde, Thomas, D.D.

a learned English divine and Orientalist, was born in Shropshire in 1636. He was educated at King's College, Cambridge. In 1653 he went to London, and rendered essential service in the preparation of Walton's Polyglot Bible. He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1659, and afterwards became keeper of the Bodleian Library. In 1666 he became prebendary of Salisbury, in 1678 archdeacon of Gloucester, Arabic professor in 1691, and finally regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church in 1697. He died in 1703. His principal work is *Historia religionis veterum Persarum eorumque Magorum, ubi etiam nova Abrahami et Alithrce, et Vestae, et Manetis*, etc. (Oxonii, 1700, 4to; 2nd edit., revised and augmented by Hunt and Costar, under the title *Veterum Persarum, Parthorum et laedorum Religionis Historia*, Lond. 1760, 4to, illustrated). The work evinces great research and considerable acumen in

sifting the ancient Greek writers and some Persian works posterior to the Hegira, but, in consequence of the want of the most essential documents, such as the sacred books of the ancient Persians, which were then unknown in Europe, Hyde necessarily fell into some errors. Thus he maintains that Monotheism prevailed at first in Persia, was afterwards mixed with Sabaeism, was brought back to its original purity by Abraham, and was finally lost again by being connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies. The incorrectness of the opinion has since been shown by abbot Foucher (in *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1759), and especially by Anquetil Duperron, who brought to France the sacred books of the Persians. Hyde's other writings are collected in *Syntagma dissertationum, quas olim auctor doctissimus Thomas Hyde, S.T.P., separatim edidit, accesserunt nonnulla ejusdem opuscula hactenus inedita, etc., omnia diligenter recognita*, a Gregorio Sharpe, LL.D. (Oxonii, 1767, 2 vols. 4to). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, , 1598; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, 25:691; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:239; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, 1, 930.

Hydroparastatae

(ὕδροπαραστάται, *aquarii*, “offerers of water”), a name given to the Encratites (q.v.) because they avoided wine, and even in the Lord's Supper used nothing but water. See Theodoret, *Her. Fab.* 1, c. 20; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 15: ch. 2, § 7.

Hyemantes

(*winterers*, or *tossed by a winter blast*), an epithet given by the Latin fathers to demoniacs. Neale's *Introd. to the Hist. of the Eastern Ch.* 1, 209. **SEE ENERGUMENS; SEE EXORCIST.**

Hyena

(ὕαινα, Ecclesiasticus 13:18) does not occur in the A.V. of the canonical Scriptures, but is probably denoted by [Wbx]; (*tsabu'a*, *streaked* or *ravenous*, only ^{צִבְיָה} Jeremiah 12:9; so Sept. ὕαινα, but Vulg. *avis discolor*, and Auth. Vers. “speckled bird”), as the context and parallelism of the preceding verse require; an identification disputed by some, on the ground that the animal is not mentioned by ancient authors as occurring in Western Asia before the Macedonian conquest, and was scarcely known by name

even in the time of Pliny; it has since been ascertained, however, that in Romaic or modern Greek the word *krokalos* and *glanos* have been substituted for the ancient term *hyena*, and that the animal is still known in those regions by names cognate with the Hebrew (see Ruppel, *Abyss.* 1, 227; Shaw, *Tray.* 154; Kimpfer, *Anasen.* 411 sq.; Russell's *Alfppo*, 2, 65 sq.; comp. Pliny, 8, 44; 11, 67). The only other instance in which it occurs is as a proper name, Zeboim (^{Q1318}1 Samuel 13:18, "the valley of hyenas," Aquila; ^{Q1134}Nehemiah 11:34). **SEE ZEBOIM**. The Talmudical writers describe the hyena by no less than four names, of which *tsabua* is one (Lewysohn, *Zool.* § 119). Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2, 163 sq.) and Taylor (*continuation of Calmet*) have indicated what is probably the true meaning in the above passage in Jeremiah, of [**Wbx; fyæi** *ait tsabua, the striped rusher*, i.e. the hyena, turning round upon his lair-introduced after an allusion in the previous verse to the lion calling to the beasts of the field (other hyenas and jackals) to come and devour. This allusion, followed up as it is by a natural association of ideas with a description of the pastor, feeder, or rather consumer or devourer of the vineyard, treading down and destroying the vines, renders the natural and poetical picture complete; for the hyena seeks burrows and caverns for a lair; like the dog, it turns round to lie down; howls, and occasionally acts in concert; is loathsome, savage, insatiable in appetite, offensive in smell, and will, in the season, like canines, devour grapes. The hyena was common in ancient as in modern Egypt, and is constantly depicted on monuments (Wilkinson, 1, 213, 225); it must, therefore, have been well known to the Jews, as it is now very common in Palestine, where it is the last and most complete scavenger of carrion (Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 62 sq.). Though cowardly in his nature, the hyena is very savage when once he attacks, and the strength of his jaws is such that he can crunch the thigh-bone of an ox (Livingstone's *Travels*, p 600).

Picture for Hyena

"*Tsabua*, therefore, we consider proved to be, generically, the hyena; more specifically, the *Canis hyaena* of Linn., the *Hyena vulgaris* of more recent naturalists, the *food* of Barbary, the *dub, dubbah, dabah, zabah*, and *kaftaar* of modern Shemitic nations; and, if the ancients understood anything by the word, it was also their *trochus*. The striped species is one of three or four-all, it seems, originally African, and, by following armies and caravans, gradually spread over Southern Asia to beyond the Ganges,

though not as yet to the east of the Bramapootra. It is now not uncommon in Asia Minor, and has extended into Southern Tartar; but this progress is comparatively so recent that no other than Shemitic names are well known to belong to it. The head and jaws of all the species are broad and strong. the muzzle truncated; the tongue like a rasp; the teeth robust, large, and eminently formed for biting, lacerating, and reducing the very bone; the neck stiff; the body short and compact; the limbs tall, with only four toes on each foot; the fur coarse, forming a kind of semi-erectile mane along the back; the tail rather short, with an imperfect brush, and with a fetid pouch beneath it. In stature the species varies from that of a large wolf to much less. Hyenas are not bold in comparison with wolves, or in proportion to their powers. They do not in general, act collectively; they prowl chiefly in the night; attack asses, dogs, and weaker animals; feed most willingly on corrupt animal offal, dead camels, etc.; and dig into human graves that are not well protected with stakes and brambles. The striped species is of a dirty ashy buff, with some oblique black streaks across the shoulders and body, and numerous cross-bars on the legs; the muzzle and throat are black, and the tip of the tail white.” (See *Pliny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.) **SEE JACKAL; SEE WOLF; SEE BEAR.**

Hyginus

considered as the eighth or tenth bishop of Rome, appears to have held that station from A.D. 137 to 141. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, he was a native of Athens, and before his election to the see of Rome taught philosophy. Nothing is known of his life, and the *Liber pontif* merely says of him, “Clerum composuit et distribuit gradus.” The Pseudo Decretals **SEE DECRETALS** ascribe to him a number of rules on Church discipline, and he is said to have introduced the customs of godfathers and Church consecrations, but this is doubtful. The Martyrologies give some the 10th, others the 11th of January, 142, as the date of his death. Some critics deny his having been more than a simple confessor. A certain Hyginus, bishop of Cordova, is said to have been the first opponent of Priscillian (q.v.). See Papebroch, *Acta Sanctorum*; Tillemont, *Memoires Baillet, Vies des Saints*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 705; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. 2.

Hyksos

(**Ἰκσώς**, correctly explained [comp. Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 297] by Josephus [*Apion*, i, 14] as being compounded of the Egyptian *hyk*, “king,”

and *sos*, “shepherd” or “Arab,” i.e. *nomade*), a race who invaded Egypt, and constituted the 15th and one or two of the following dynasties, according to Manetho (see Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 2, 152 sq.), especially as preserved by Josephus (*ut supra*): “In the reign of king Timaus there came up from the east men of an ignoble race, who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it without a battle, burning the cities, demolishing the temples, slaying the men, and reducing the women and children to slavery.” They made Salatis, one of themselves, king: he reigned at Memphis, and made the upper and lower region tributary. Of the 17th dynasty also were forty-three shepherd kings, called Hyksos, who reigned, perhaps contemporaneously with the preceding, at Diospolis. In the 18th dynasty of Diospolis a rising took place, and the shepherd kings were expelled out of the other parts of Egypt into the district of Avaris, which they fortified. Amosis besieged and compelled them to capitulate; on which they left Egypt, in number 240,000, and “marched through the desert towards Syria, and built the city of Jerusalem.” The last few words seem to render it probable that Manetho confounded the Hyksos with the Israelites, which is the less surprising, since the Hyksos were, as he rightly calls them, *Phoenicians* of the ancient, if not original race which inhabited Phoenicia, or Palestine (taken in its widest sense), before the conquest of the country by the Hebrews. Chronological considerations seem to refer the time of the dominion of the Hyksos to the period of Abraham and Joseph (say from B.C. 2000 to 1500). When Joseph went into the land he found the name of shepherd odious — which agrees with the hypothesis that places the irruption of the shepherd kings anterior to his time; and possibly both the ease with which he rose to power and the fact that Jacob turned towards Egypt for a supply of food when urged by want may be readily accounted for on the supposition that a kindred race held dominion in the land, which, though hated by the people, as being foreign in its origin and oppressive in its character, would not be indisposed to show favor to members of the great Shemitic family to which they themselves belonged. The irruption into Egypt, and the conquest of the country on the part of the Phoenician shepherds, seems to have been a consequence of the general pressure of population from the north-east towards the south-west, which led the nomad Shemitic tribes first to overcome the original inhabitants of Palestine, and, continuing in the same line of advance, then to enter and subdue Egypt. The invasion of the Hyksos is indeed to be regarded as the result of the movement from the Euphrates westward of the most powerful

and (comparatively) most civilized people then found in Western Asia, who in their progress subdued or expelled in the countries through which they not improbably were urged by a pressure from other advancing tribes, nation and tribe one after another, driving them down towards the sea, and compelling those who dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean to seek shelter and safety in the islands of that sea and other distant parts. To conquerors and aggressors of the character of these shepherd hordes Egypt would offer special attractions. They continued sweeping onwards, and at last entered and conquered Egypt, establishing there a new dynasty, which was hateful because foreign, and because of a lower degree of culture than the Egyptians themselves had reached. Nor would these shepherds be less odious because, coming from the east and immediately from the deserts of Arabia, they were from the quarter whence the mild and cultivated Egyptians had long been wont to suffer from the predatory incursions of the wild nomad tribes (*Die Phonizier*, by Movers, Bonn, 1841; Bertheau, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, Gottingen, 1842), between whom and the agricultural natives of the country different pursuits, habits, and tastes would naturally engender animosities. This feeling of alienation exists at the present day. The Arab is still a depressed and despised being in Egypt. Bowring, in his *Report* on the country, remarks, "It is scarcely allowable even to send a message to a person in authority by an Arab servant" (p. 7). The expulsion of the shepherds seems to have been strangely confounded by Josephus, after Manetho, with the Exodus of the Israelites. The shepherds were conquerors, rulers, and oppressors; the Israelites guests and slaves. The shepherds were expelled, the Israelites were delivered. Josephus elsewhere (*Apion*, 1, 26) gives from Manetho a narrative of another event which wears a much nearer likeness to the Exodus (although Josephus expressly combats such an identification) in the case of a king Amenophis, who was ordered by the gods to cleanse Egypt of a multitude of lepers and other unclean persons; many of whom were drowned, and others sent in great numbers to work in the quarries which are on the east side of the Nile. After a time they were permitted to establish themselves in Avaris, which had been abandoned by the shepherds. They then elected a ruler, Osarsiph, whose name was afterwards changed to that of Moses. This chief made this law for them, that they should not worship the Egyptian gods, but should kill the animals held sacred by the Egyptians; nor were they to have intercourse with any but such as were members of their own body-in. all respects aiming to oppose the customs and influence of the nations. These, sending for aid to the shepherds who had settled in

Jerusalem, and having received troops to the number of 200,000 men, were met by Amenophis, the king, with a yet larger force, but not attacked. "On a subsequent occasion, however, they were assailed by the Egyptians, beaten, and driven to the confines of Syria." Lysimachus gives an account not dissimilar to this, adding that, under the leadership of Moses, these mixed hordes settled in Judaea. (Cory's *Ancient Fragments*). The account which Diodorus gives of the migration of the Israelites from Egypt to Palestine is of a similar tenor. The deviations from the sacred narrative may easily be accounted for by Egyptian ignorance, vanity, and pride. (See Akers's *Biblical Chronology*, chap. 5). It is also apparent that Josephus considerably travesties the original narrative of Manetho (Kenrick, *Egypt*, 2, 159). The expulsion of the Hyksos seems to have taken place about two centuries after the Exode (q.v.)

If, as we have some reason to believe, and as the reader may see satisfactorily established in Movers and Bertheau (*ut supra*), a race of the Shemitic family, coming down from the upper (Aram) country into the lower (Canaan), in course of time subjugated Egypt and established their dominion, maintaining it for some-five hundred years, such a historical event must have had a marked influence on the religion of the land. These invaders are described (Herod. 2, 128) as enemies to the religion of Egypt, who destroyed or closed the temples, broke in pieces the altars and images of the gods, and killed the sacred animals. Their influence on the Egyptian religion was probably not unlike that of the Persians on the Grecian, having for its aim and effect to discountenance and destroy a low and degrading system of idolatry; for the worship of the heavenly bodies, to which the Phoenician equally with the Persian invaders were given, was higher in its character and effects than the service of the ordinary gods of Greece, and still more so than the degrading homage paid by the Egyptians to the lowest animals. By this means the Shemitic religion exerted on the native Egyptian religion a decided and improving influence, which may be seen and traced in that element of the religion of Egypt which contains and presents the worship of the heavenly bodies. The two systems, that of the Egyptians before it received inoculation from the East, and that of the Eastern invaders, agreed in this, that they were both the worship of the powers of nature; but they differed in this, and an important difference it was, that the Egyptians adored the brute creation, the Phoenicians the host of heaven. — Kitto. (See *Stud. und Krit.* 1839, 2, 393, 408; Saalschütz, *Forschungen*, abth. 3:1849; Schulze, *De Jontibus historice Hyksorum*,

Berlin, 1848; Uhlemann *Issraeliten- und Hyksos in Aegypten*, Lpz. 1856.)
 SEE EGYPT; SEE SHEPHERD-KINGS.

Hylaret, Maurice

a French theologian, was born at Angoulême Sept. 5, 1539. In 1551 he entered the order of the C' Cordeliers." About 1552 he went to Paris to continue his studies, and returned to Angoulême in 1557 to be ordained for the priesthood. He now devoted his time exclusively to the study of theology, and in 1562 was made a professor of philosophy, and a short time later a professor of theology. In 1566 he made himself quite conspicuous by a public controversy with the Calvinist Godet. In 1568 he was called to the Sorbonne, and was honored with the doctorate two years later. Henceforward he preached much, and the celebrity he gained as a pulpit orator procured him a position as preacher at Orleans in 1572. He died in December, 1591. His works are, *Sacrae Decades quinquepartitce, concones quadragesimales, atque Paschales numero quinquaginta* (Lyons, 1591, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Concionum per adventum Enneades sacrae quatuor, homilics triginta sex complectentes, e quibus viginti septem priores Joelem prophet. explicant novera vero posteriores Evangelia adventus et festorum per id tempus occurrentium. explicant* (Paris, 1591, 8vo): — *Homilie in Evangelia dominicalia per totum annum* (Paris, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo). Dupin also ascribes to Hylaret *De non conveniendo cum haereticis et de non ineundo cum haeretica a viro catholico conjugio* (Orl. 1587). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 25, 707 sq.

Hyle

(ὕλη, *matter*) was, according to the doctrines of the Manicheans (q.v.), the Lord of darkness. They: held that the world is governed by *two* primary principles, viz. "a subtle and a gross sort of matter, or *light* and *darkness*, separated from each other by a narrow space," over each of which presides an *eternal* Lord. God they termed the Lord of the *world of Light*; Hyle the Lord of the *world of darkness*; and both of these worlds, "although different in their natures, have some things in common. Each is distributed into five opposing elements, and the same number of provinces; both are equally eternal, and, with their respective lords, self-existent, both are unchangeable, and exist forever; both are of vast extent, yet the *world of light* seems to fill more space than the *empire of darkness*. The condition of the two *lords* presiding over the two kinds of matter is equal, but they

are totally unlike in their natures and dispositions. The *Lord of Light*, being himself happy, is beneficent, a lover of peace and quietness, just and wise; the *Lord of darkness*, being himself very miserable, wishes to see others unhappy, is quarrelsome, unwise, unjust, irascible, and envious. Yet they are equal in the eternity of their existence, in their power to beget beings like themselves, in their unchangeableness and in their power and knowledge; and yet the King of light or God, excels the Prince of darkness, or the Daemon, in power and knowledge.” — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist. of the first three Centuries*, 2, § 41, p. 275; Meander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, 1, 118, 127, 181, etc.

Hylozoism

(ὕλη, *wood*, used by ancient philosophers to signify the abstract idea of *matter*; and ζωή, *life*) is a term for the atheistical doctrine which teaches that life and matter are inseparable. But the forms which have grown out of this doctrine have been rather variable. Thus, “Strato of Lampsacus held that the ultimate particles of matter were each and all of them possessed of-life,” approaching, of course, in this sense, to pantheism; but “the Stoics, on the other hand, while they did not accord activity or life to every distinct particle of matter, held that the universe, as a whole, was animated by a principle which gave to it motion, form, and life.” The followers of Plotinus, who held that the “soul of the universe” animated the least particle of matter; or, in other words, while they admitted a certain material or plastic life, essential and substantial, ingenerable and incorruptible, attributed all to matter, especially favored the Stoical doctrine, and “Spinoza asserted that all things were alive in different degrees (‘omnia quamvis diversis gradibus animata tamen sunt’).” All the various forms of this doctrine evidently mistake *force* for *life*. According to Leibnitz, Boscovich, and others, “Matter is always endowed with force. Even the *vis isertice* ascribed to it is a force. Attraction and repulsion, and chemical affinity, all indicate activity in matter; but life is a force always connected with organization, which much of matter wants. Spontaneous motion, growth, nutrition, separation of parts, generation, are phenomena which indicate the presence of life, which is obviously not coextensive with matter.” See Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philos.* (edited by Krauth), p. 219 sq.; Cudworth, *intellect. System*, 1, 106 sq., 144 sq., etc.; Hallam; *Hist. of Europe*, 4, 188.

Hymen

or Hymeneus, in Grecian mythology, is the god of marriage. Originally the word seems to have denoted only the bridal song of the companions of the bride sung by them as she went from her father's house to that of the bridegroom. The god Hymen is first mentioned by Sappho. "The legends concerning him are various; but he is generally said to be a son of Apollo and some one of the Muses. He is represented as a boy with wings and a garland, a bigger and graver Cupid, with a bridal-torch and a veil in his hands." — Chambers, *Encyclop.* 5, 494.

Hymenaeus

(Ὑμέναιος, *hymeneal*), a professor of Christianity at Ephesus, who, with Alexander (^{<5011>}1 Timothy 1:20) and Philetus (^{<5118>}2 Timothy 2:18), had departed from the truth both in principle, and practice, and led others into apostasy (Neander, *Pfianz.* 1, 475). The chief doctrinal error of these persons consisted in maintaining that "the resurrection was past already." The precise meaning of this expression is by no means clearly ascertained: the most general, and perhaps best-founded opinion is, that they understood the resurrection in a figurative sense of the great change produced by the Gospel dispensation. See below. Some have suggested that they attempted to support their views by the apostle's language in his Epistle to the Ephesians (νεκρῶς - συνέζωποίησεν - συνήγειρεν, etc., 2, 1-5); but this is very improbable; for, if such misconception of his language had arisen, it might easily have been corrected; not to say that one of them appears to have been personally inimical to Paul (^{<5014>}2 Timothy 4:14), and would scarcely have appealed to him as an authority. Most critics suppose that the same person is referred to in both the epistles to Timothy by the name of Hymenaeus (see Heidenreich, *Pastoralbr.* 1, 111). Mosheim, however, contends that there were two. He seems to lay great stress on the apostle's declaration in ^{<5011>}1 Timothy 1:20, "Whom *I have delivered unto Satan*, that they may learn not to blaspheme." But, whatever may be the meaning of this expression, the infliction was evidently designed for the benefit and restoration of the parties (comp. 1 Corinthians 5, 5), and was therefore far from indicating their hopeless and abandoned wickedness. See below. Nor do the terms employed in the second epistle import a less flagrant violation of the Christian profession than those in the first. If in the one the individuals alluded to are charged with having "discarded a good conscience" and "made shipwreck of faith,"

in the other they are described as indulging “in vain and profane babblings, which would increase to more ungodliness,” as “having erred concerning the truth,” and “overthrowing the faith” of others. These can hardly be said to be “two distinct characters, having nothing in common but the name” (Mosheim’s *Commentaries*, 1, 304-306). For other interpretations of ^{<4828>}2 Timothy 2:18, see Gill’s *Commentary*, ad loc., and Walchii *Miscellanea Sacra*, 1, 4; *De Hymenaeo Phileto*, Jen. 1735, and Amstel. 1744. Two points referred to above require fuller elucidation.

1. The Error of Hymenaeus. — This was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and has frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that “knowledge” (γνῶσις) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked forward to a complete restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις, see Heyne, ad Virg. ^{<2045>}*Ecclesiastes* 4:5; comp. *Gen.* 6, 745), so there was “a regeneration” (^{<4835>}Titus 3:5; ^{<4828>}Matthew 19:28), “a new creation” (^{<4857>}2 Corinthians 5:17; see Alford, ad loc.; ^{<4821>}Revelation 21:1), “a kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ” (Matthew 13; Revelation 7) —and herein popular belief among the Jews coincided unequivocally propounded in the N.T.; but *here* with this remarkable difference, viz., that in a great measure it was present as well as future—the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. “The kingdom of God is within you,” said our Lord (^{<4872>}Luke 17:21). “He that is spiritual judgeth all things,” said Paul (^{<4855>}1 Corinthians 2:15). “He that is born of God cannot sin,” said John (^{<4881>}1 John 3:9). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N.T.; the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (^{<4883>}John 3:3-8), “the hour which now is” (ibid. 5, 24,25, on which see Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 20, 6); the second, that of the body to and from corruption (^{<4856>}1 Corinthians 15:36-44; also ^{<4853>}John 5:28, 29), which last is prospective. Now, as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (^{<4873>}Acts 17:32; ^{<4855>}1 Corinthians 15:35: how keenly they were pressed may be seen in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 22:12 sq.), while, on the other hand, there was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which enlarge upon the

glories of the spiritual life that now is under Christ; and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may deride the first errors of the Gnostics, of whom Hymenaeus was one of the earliest. They were spreading when John wrote' and his grand-disciple, Irenaeus, compiled a voluminous work against them (*adv. Haer.*). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, *E. H.*, Per. 1, Div. 1, § 44 sq. **SEE RESURRECTION.**

2. The Sentence passed upon him. — It has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. a Lapide, ad ^{<4185>}1 Corinthians 5:5) that the “delivering to Satan” is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated. Even the title which they bore has been set apart to them ever since. The shaking off the dust of their feet against a city that would not receive them (^{<4004>}Matthew 10:14), although an injunction afterwards given to the Seventy (^{<4201>}Luke 10:11), and one which Paul found it necessary to act upon twice in the course of his ministry (^{<4435>}Acts 13:51, and 18:6), has never been a practice since with Christian ministers. “Anathema,” says Bingham, ‘is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canons’ (*Antiq.* 16, 2, 16), but the form “Anathema Maranatha” is one that none have ever ventured upon since Paul (^{<4162>}1 Corinthians 16:22). As the apostles healed all manner of bodily infirmities, so they seem to have possessed and exercised the same power in inflicting them—a power far too perilous to be continued when the manifold exigencies of the apostolical age had passed away. Ananias and Sapphira both fell down dead at the rebuke of Peter (^{<4185>}Acts 5:5,10); two words from the same lips, “Tabitha, arise,” sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (^{<4494>}Acts 9:40). Paul’s first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (^{<4497>}Acts 9:17. and ^{<4431>}Acts 13:11), while soon afterwards we read of his healing, the cripple of Lystra (^{<4448>}Acts 14:8). Even apart from actual intervention by the apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord’s Supper unworthily, when as yet no discipline had been established: “For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and a good number (ἰκανοί, in the former case it is πολλοί) sleep” (^{<4131>}1 Corinthians 11:30).

On the other hand, Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (^{<8006>}Job 1:6-12; 2:1-7). Similar agencies are described ^{<1229>}1 Kings 22:19-22, and ^{<1201>}1 Chronicles 21:1. In ^{<1789>}Psalms 78:49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned. Even our Lord submitted to be assailed by him more than once (^{<1905>}Matthew 4:1-10; ^{<2013>}Luke 4:13 says, “Departed from him *for a season*”); and “a messenger of Satan was sent to buffet” the very apostle whose act of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion. At the same time, large powers over the world of spirits were authoritatively conveyed by our Lord to his immediate followers (to the Twelve, ^{<2105>}Luke 9:1; to the Seventy, as the results showed, ^{<2107>}Luke 10:17-20). *SEE SATAN.*

It only remains to notice five particulars connected with its exercise, which the apostle himself supplies:

- 1.** That it was no mere prayer, but a solemn authoritative sentence pronounced in the name and power of Jesus Christ (^{<4185>}1 Corinthians 5:3-5);
- 2.** That it was never exercised upon any without the Church: “Them that are without (God judgeth” (ibid. 5, 13), he says in express terms;
- 3.** That it was “for the destruction of the flesh,” *i.e.* some bodily visitation;
- 4.** That it was for the improvement of the offender: that “his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (ibid. 5, 5) and that “he might learn not to blaspheme” while upon earth (^{<5021>}1 Timothy 1:20);
- 5.** That the apostle could in a given case empower others to pass such sentence in his absence (^{<4185>}1 Corinthians 5:3,4). *SEE ANATHEMIA.*

Thus, while the “delivering to Satan” may resemble ecclesiastical excommunication in some respects, it has its own characteristics likewise, which show plainly that one is not to be confounded or placed on the same level with the other. Nor again does Paul himself deliver to Satan all those in whose company he bids his converts “not even to eat” (1 Corinthians 5, 11). See an able review of the whole subject by Bingham, *Ant.* 6, 2, 15.

SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.

Hymn

(Ὕμνος). This term; as used by the Greeks, primarily signified simply a *song* (comp. Homer, *Od.* 8, 429; Hesiod, *Op. et Dies*, 659; Pindar, *Ol.* 1, 170; 11, 74; *Isthm.* 4, 74; *Pyth.* 10, 82; AEsch. *Eum.* 331; Soph. *Antig.* 809; Plato, *Republ.* 5, 459, E. etc.); we find instances even in which the cognate verb ὕμνεῖν is used in a bad sense (φαύλως ἐκλαμβάνεται, Eulstath. p. 634; comp. Soph. *Elect.* 382; (*Ed. Tyr.* 1275; Eurip. *Med.* 425); but usage ultimately appropriated the term to songs in praise of the gods. We know that among the Greeks, as among most of the nations of antiquity, the chanting of songs in praise of their gods was an approved part of their worship (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6, 633, ed. Sylburg., Porphyr. *de Abstin.* 4 sec. 8; Phurnutus, *De Nat. Deor.* c. 14; Alex. ab Alex. *Genesis Dies*, 4:c. 17, s.f.; Spanheim in *not. ad Callimachum*, p. 2; comp. Meiners, *Geschichte aller Religionen*, c. 13) and even at their festive entertainments such songs were sometimes sung (Athen. *Deipnos.* 14, 15, 14; Polyb. *Hist.* 4, 20, ed. Ernesti). Besides those hymns to different deities which have come down to us as the composition of Callimachus, Orpheus, Homer, Linus, Cleanthes, Sappho, and others, we may with confidence refer to the choral odes of the tragedians as affording specimens of these sacred songs, such of them, at least, as were of a lyric character (Snedorf, *De Hymnis Vet. Graec.* p.19). Such songs were properly called *hymns*. Hence Arrian says distinctly (*De Exped. Alex.* 4, 11, 2), ὕμνοι μὲν ἐς τοὺς θεοὺς ποιοῦνται, ἔπαινοι δὲ ἐς ἀνθρώπους. So also Phavorinus: ὕμνος, ἢ πρὸς θεὸν ᾄδῆAugustine (*in Psalm 72*) thus fully states the meaning of the term: “Hymni laudes sunt Dei cum cantico. Hymni cantus sunt, continentes laudes Dei. Si sit laus, et non sit Dei, non est hymnus. Si sit laus et Dei laus, et non cantatur, non est hymnus. Oportet ergo ut si sit hymnus, habeat haec tria, et *lauden et Dei et canticum.*” See CHANT.

“Hymn,” as such, is not used in the English version of the O.T., and the noun only occurs twice in the N.T. (⁴¹⁵⁹Ephesians 5:19; ⁵⁰⁸¹⁶Colossians 3:16), though in the original of the latter the derivative verb (ὕμνῶ) occurs in four places (“sing a hymn,” ⁴¹⁶⁵⁰Matthew 26:30; ⁴¹⁴⁰⁶Mark 14:26; “sing praises,” ⁴¹⁶²⁵Acts 16:25; ³⁸⁰¹²Hebrews 2:12). The Sept., however, employs it freely in translating the Hebrew names for almost every kind of poetical composition (Schleusn. *Lex.* ὕμνος). In fact, the word does not seem to have in the Sept. any very special meaning, and hence it calls the Heb. book of *Tehillim* the book of *Psalms*, not of *Hymns*; yet it frequently

uses the noun ὕμνος or the verb ὑμνέω as an equivalent of *psalm* (e.g. ^{<3376>}1 Chronicles 25:6; ^{<4076>}2 Chronicles 7:6; 23:13; 29:30; ^{<4622>}Nehemiah 12:24; ^{<3900>}Psalms 40:1, and the titles of many other psalms). The word *psalm*, however, generally had for the later Jews a definite meaning, while the word *hymn* was more or less vague in its application, and capable of being used as occasion should arise. If a new poetical form or idea should be produced, the name of *hymn*, not being embarrassed by a previous determination, was ready to associate itself with the fresh thought of another literature. This seems to have actually been the case. **SEE SONG.**

Among Christians the hymn has always been something different from the psalm; a different conception in thought, a different type in composition. **SEE HYMNOLOGY.** The “*hymn*” which our Lord sung with his disciples at the Last Supper is generally supposed to have been the latter part of the *Hallel*, or series of psalms which were sung by the Jews on the night of the Passover, comprehending Psalm 113-118; Psalm 113 and 114 being sung before, and the rest after the Passover (Buxtorf *Lex. Tam.* s.v. **l l h**, quoted by Kuinol on ^{<4351>}Matthew 26:30; Lightfoot’s *Heb. and Talm. Exercitations* on ^{<4146>}Mark 14:26; *Works*, 11, 435). **SEE HALLEL.** But it is obvious that the word *hymn* is in this case not applied to an individual psalm, but to a number of psalms chanted successively, and altogether forming a kind of devotional exercise, which is not inaptly called a hymn. The prayer in ^{<4021>}Acts 4:24-30 is not a hymn, unless we allow non-metrical as well as metrical hymns. It may have been a hymn as it was originally uttered; but we can only judge by the Greek translation, and this is without meter, and therefore not properly a hymn. In the jail at Philippi, Paul and Silas “sang hymns” (A.V. “praises”) unto God, and so loud was their song that their fellow-prisoners heard them. This must have been what we mean by singing, and not merely recitation. It was, in fact, a veritable singing of hymns. It is remarkable that the noun *hymn* is only used in reference to the services of the Greeks, and in the same passages is clearly distinguished from the psalm (^{<4059>}Ephesians 5:19; ^{<5186>}Colossians 3:16), “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs.” It has been conjectured that by “psalms and hymns” the poetical compositions of the Old Testament are chiefly to be understood, and that the epithet “spiritual,” here applied to “songs,” is intended to mark those devout effusions which resulted from the spiritual gifts granted to the primitive Church; yet in ^{<4146>}1 Corinthians 14:26, a production of the latter class is called “a psalm.” Josephus, it may be

remarked, used the terms ὕμνοι and ᾠδαί in reference to the Psalms of David (*Ant.* 7, 12, 3). *SEE PSALM.*

It is probable that no Greek version of the Psalms, even supposing it to be accommodated to the Greek meters, would take root in the affections of the Gentile converts. It was not only a question of meter, it was a question of *tune*; and Greek tunes required Greek hymns. So it was in Syria. Richer in tunes than Greece, for Greece had but eight, while Syria had 275 (*Benedict. Pref.* vol. 5, *Op.* — *Eph. Syr.*), the Syrian hymnographers reveled in the varied luxury of their native music; and the result was that splendid development of the Hymn, as molded by the genius of Bardesanes, Harmonins, and Ephraem Syrus. In Greece, the eight tunes which seem to have satisfied the exigencies of Church music were probably accommodated to fixed meters, each meter being wedded to a particular tune; an arrangement to which we can observe a tendency in the *Directions about tunes and measures* at the end of our English version of the Psalms. This is also the case in the German hymnology, where certain ancient tunes are recognized as models for the meters of later compositions, and their names are always prefixed to the hymns in common use. See Music.

It is worthwhile inquiring what profane models the Greek hymnographers chose to work after. In the old religion of Greece the word *hymn* had already acquired a sacred and liturgical meaning, which could not fail to suggest its application to the productions of the Christian muse. So much for the *name*. The special forms of the (Greek hymn were various. The Homeric and Orphic hymns were written in the epic style, and in hexameter verse. Their meter was not adapted for singing; and therefore, though they may have been recited, it is not likely that they were sung at the celebration of the mysteries. We turn to the Pindaric hymns; mid here we find a sufficient variety of meter, and a definite relation to music. These hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, and it is very likely that they engaged the attention of the early hymn-writers. The dithyramb, with its development into the dramatic chorus, was sufficiently- connected with musical traditions to make its form a fitting vehicle for Christian poetry; and there certainly is a dithyrambic savor about the earliest known Christian hymn, as it appears in Clem. Alex. p. 312, 313, ed. Potter.

The first impulse of Christian devotion was to run into the moulds ordinarily used by the worshippers of the old religion. This was more than an impulse — it was a necessity, and a twofold necessity. The new spirit

was strong; but it had two limitations: the difficulty of conceiving a new music-poetical literature; and the quality so peculiar to devotional music, of lingering in the heart after the head has been convinced and the belief changed. The old tunes would be a real necessity to the new life; and the exile from his ancient faith would delight to hear on the foreign soil of a new religion the familiar melodies of home. Dean Trench has indeed labored to show that the reverse was the case, and that the early Christian shrank with horror from the sweet but polluted enchantments of his unbelieving state. We can only assent to this in so far as we allow it to be the second phase in the history of hymns. When old traditions died away, and the Christian acquired not only a new belief, but a new social humanity, it was possible, and it was desirable too, to break forever the attenuated thread that bound him to the ancient world. Thus it was broken; and the trochaic and iambic meters, unassociated as they were with heathen worship, though largely associated with the heathen drama, obtained an ascendant in the Christian Church. In ~~4646~~ 1 Corinthians 14:26, illusion is made to *improvised* hymns, which, being the outburst of a passionate emotion, would probably assume the dithyrambic form. But attempts have been made to detect fragments of ancient hymns conformed to more obvious meters in ~~4064~~ Ephesians 5:14; ~~3017~~ James 1:17; ~~6008~~ Revelation 1:8 sq.; 15:3. These pretended fragments, however, may with much greater likelihood be referred to the swing of a prose composition unconsciously culminating into meter. It was in the Latin Church that the trochaic and iambic meters became most deeply rooted, and acquired the greatest depth of tone and grace of finish. As an exponent of Christian feeling they soon superseded the accentual hexameters; they were used mnemonically against the heathen and the heretics by Commodianus and Augustine. The introduction of hymns into the Latin Church is commonly referred to Ambrose. But it is impossible to conceive that the West should have been so far behind the East: similar necessities must have produced similar results; and it is more likely that the tradition is due to the very marked prominence of Ambrose as the greatest of all the Latin hymnographers.

The trochaic and iambic meters, thus impressed into the service of the Church, have continued to hold their ground, and are, in fact, the 7's, S.M., C.M., and L.M. of our modern hymns, many of which are translations, or, at any rate, imitations of Latin originals. These meters were peculiarly adapted to the grave and somber spirit of Latin Christianity. Less ecstatic than the varied chorus of the Greek Church, they

did not soar upon the pinion of a lofty praise so much as they drooped and sank into the depths of a great sorrow. They were subjective- rather than objection; they appealed to the heart more than to the understanding; and, if they contained less theology, they were fuller of a rich Christian humanity. (See Deyling, *Obss. Sacrc.* 3, 430; Hilliger, *De Psal. Hymn. atque odar. sac. discrimine.* Viteb. 1720; (Gerbert, *De cantu et ,musico,* Bamb. et Frib. 1774, 2 vols. 4to; Rheinwald, *Christl. Archaöl.* p. 262.) Our information respecting the hymnology of the first Christians is extremely scanty: the most distinct notice we possess of it is that contained in Pliny's celebrated epistle (*Ep. 10:97*): "*Carmen Christo quasi deo, dicere secum invicem.*" (See Augusti, *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*, 2, 1-160; Walchii, *Miscellanea Sacra*, i, 2; *De hymnis ecclesie Apostolicae*, Amstel. 1744; and other monographs cited in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 133).

Hymnar or Hymnal

is the name by which is designated a Church book containing hymns. Such a hymnar, according to Gennadius, was compiled by Paulinus of Nola (q.v.). — Walcott, *Sacred Archceöl.* p. 320: Augusti, *Christ. Archaöl.* 3, 710 sq.

Hymnarium

SEE HYMNAR.

Hymnology

"Poetry and its twin sister music are the most sublime and spiritual arts, and are much more akin to the genius of Christianity, and minister far more copiously to the purposes of devotion and edification than architecture, painting, and sculpture. They employ word and tone, and can speak thereby more directly to the spirit than the plastic arts by stone and color, and give more adequate expression to the whole wealth of the world of thought and feeling. In the Old Testament, as is well known, they were essential parts of divine worship; and so they have been in all ages, and almost all branches of the Christian Church. Of the various species of religious poetry, the hymn is the earliest and most important. It has a rich history, in which the deepest experiences of Christian life are stored. But it attained full bloom (as we will notice below) in the evangelical Church of the German and English tongue, where it, like the Bible, became for the

first time truly the possession of the people, instead of being restricted to priest or choir” (Schaff, *Ch. History*). “A hymn is a lyrical discourse to the feelings. It should either excite or express feeling. The recitation of historical facts, descriptions of scenery, narrations of events, meditations. may all tend to inspire feeling. Hymns are not to be excluded, therefore, because they are deficient in lyrical form or in feeling, if experience shows that they have power to excite pious emotions. Not many of. Newton’s hymns can be called poetical, yet few hymns in the English language are more useful” (Beecher, *Preface to the Plymouth Collection*). The hymn, as such, is not intended to be didactic, and yet it is one of the surest means of conveying “sound doctrine,” and of perpetuating it in the Church. The Greek and Latin fathers well understood this. Bardesanes (see below) “diffused his Gnostic errors in Syriac hymns; and till that language ceased to be the living organ of thought, the Syrian fathers adopted this mode of inculcating truth in metrical compositions. The hymns of Arius were great favorites, and contributed to spread his peculiar doctrines. Chrysostom found the hymns of Arian worship so attractive that he took care to counteract the effect of them as much as possible by providing the Catholic Church with metrical compositions. Augustine also composed a hymn in order to check the errors of the Donatists, whom he represents as making great use of newly composed hymns for the propagation of their opinions. The writings of Ephraem Syrus, of the 4th century, contain hymns on various topics, relating chiefly to the religious questions of the day which agitated the Church.” Yet a mere setting forth of Christian doctrine in verse does not constitute a hymn; the thoughts and the language of the Scriptures must be reproduced in a lyrical way in order to serve the needs of song. The most popular and lasting hymns are those which are most lyrical in form, and at the same time most deeply penetrated with Christian life and feeling. Nor can *hymns*, in the proper sense of the word, be other than popular. The Romish Church discourages congregational worship, and therefore she produces few hymns, notwithstanding the number of beautiful religious compositions, which are to be found in her offices, and the fine metrical productions of the Middle Ages, of which more in a later portion of this article. Hymns for Protestants, being “composed for congregational use, must express all the varieties of emotion common to the Christian. They must include in their wide range the trembling of the sinner, the hope and joy of the believer; they must sound the alarm to the impenitent, and cheer the afflicted; they must summon the Church to an earnest following of her Redeemer, go down with the dying to the vale of

death, and make it vocal with the notes of triumph; they must attend the Christian in every step of his life as a heavenly melody. There can be nothing *esoteric* in the hymn. Besides' this, the hymn, skillfully linked with music, becomes the companion of a Christian's solitary hours. It is the property of a good lyric to exist in the mind as a spiritual presence; and thus, as a 'hidden soul of harmony,' it dwells, a soul in the soul, and rises, often unsought, into distinct consciousness. The worldly Gothe advised, as a means of making life less commonplace, that one should 'every day, at least, hear a little song or read a good poem.' Happier he who, from his abundant acquaintance with Christian lyrics, has the song within him; who can follow the purer counsel of Paul, and 'speak to *himself* in hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody *in his heart* to the Lord' (Eph. 5:19)" (*Methodist Quarterly*, July, 1849). For the vocal execution of hymns as a part of Church service, *SEE SINGING*; and for their instrumental accompaniments, *SEE MUSIC*.

On the question of the use of hymns of *human composition*. in the Church, there were disputes at a very early period. The Council of Braga (Portugal), A.D. 563; forbade the use of any form of song except psalms and passages of Scripture (Canon 12). On this subject, Bingham remarks that it was in ancient times "no objection against the psalmody of the Church that she sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, besides those of the sacred and inspired writers. For though St. Austin reflects upon the Donatists for their psalms of human composition, yet it was not merely because they were human, but because they preferred them to the divine hymns of Scripture, and their indecent way of chanting them, to the grave and sober method of the Church. St. Austin himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th Psalm; and this he did for the use of his people, to preserve them from the errors of Donatus. It would be absurd to think that he who made a psalm himself for the people to sing should quarrel with other psalms merely because they were of human composition. It has been demonstrated that there always were such psalms, and hymns, and doxologies composed by pious men, and used in the Church from the first foundation of it; nor did any but Paulus Samosatensis take exception to the use of them; and he did so not because they were of human composition, but because they contained a doctrine contrary to his own private opinions. St. Hilary and St. Ambrose made many such hymns, which, when some muttered against in the Spanish churches because they were of human composition, the

fourth Council of Toledo made a decree to confirm the use of them. together with the doxologies ‘Glory be to the Father,’ etc., ‘Glory be to God on high,’ threatening excommunication to any that should reject them. The only thing of weight to be urged against all this is a canon of the Council of Laodicea, which forbids all *ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμούς*, all private psalms, and all uncanonical books to be read in the Church. For it might seem that by private psalms they mean all hymns of human composition. But it was intended rather to exclude apocryphal, hymns, such as went under the name of Solomon, as Balzamon and Zonaras understand it, or else such as were not approved by public authority in the Church. If it be extended further, it contradicts the current practice of the whole Church besides, and cannot, in reason, be construed as ally more than a private order for the churches of that province, made upon some particular reasons unknown to us at this day. Notwithstanding, therefore, any argument to be drawn from this canon, it is evident the ancients made no scruple of using psalms or hymns of human composition, provided they were pious and orthodox for the substance, and composed by men of eminence, and received by just authority, and not brought in clandestinely into the Church” (*Orig. Eccles.* bk. 14:ch. 1).

The Christian Church, in all periods, has been accustomed, as we have already stated, to use *psalms and hymns* in public worship. The psalms are portions of the Psalms of David; the hymns are human compositions. On the history of singing in worship generally, *SEE PSALMODY*, under which head will also be given an account of the standard hymnbooks in the several evangelical denominations.

I. *Ancient Hymns.* — A few hymns have come down to us from very remote antiquity. “Basil cites an evening hymn from an unknown author, which he describes as in his time (4th century) very ancient, handed down from the fathers, and in use among the people. Dr. J. Pye Smith considers it the oldest hymn extant. The following is his translation of it: “Jesus Christ, Joyful light of the holy! Glory of the Eternal, heavenly, holy, blessed Father! Having now come to the setting of the sun, beholding the evening light, we praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. Thou art worthy to be praised of sacred voices, at all seasons, (Son of God, who givest life. Wherefore the universe glorifieth thee!” (Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 16:§ 5). From the letter of the elder Pliny to Trajan we know that as early as the beginning of the 2nd century the Christians praised Christ as their God in songs; and from Eusebius (*Eccles.*

Hist. 5, 28) we learn that there existed a whole multitude of such songs. But the oldest hymn to Christ, remaining to us complete from the period of persecution, is that of Clemens Alexandrinus (q.v.). It is given in full Greek and Latin, in Coleman (*l. c.*): see also *Piper Cementis Hymnus is Salvatore* (Götting. 1835), and *Balt, Defensio fidei Nicceae*, § 111, ch. 2, cited by Coleman. “Though regarded as a poetical production, it has little claim to consideration; it shows the strain of the devotion of the early Christians: we see in it the heart of primitive piety laboring to give utterance to its emotions of wonder, love, and gratitude, in view of the offices and character of the Redeemer. It is not found in the later offices of the Church, because, as is supposed, it was thought to resemble, in its measure and antiphonal structure, the songs used in pagan worship” (Coleman, *Prim. Church*, p. 370). The oldest Christian hymn-writers, however, were mostly Gnostics in their doctrines, and they seem to have used their songs as “a popular means of commending and propagating their errors.” The first of these was Bardesanes, in the Syrian Church of the 2nd century, who wrote in imitation of the Psalms 150 hymns, *with Gnostic additions*. Valentinus of Alexandria belongs also to the oldest hymn-writers (comp. Muintier, *Odae Gnosticae*, Copenh. 1712). The *Gloria in Excelsis* (q.v.), which is still retained in use, is ascribed to the third century. **SEE ANGELICAL HYMN.**

1. Oriental and Greek. — The *Therapeutae* in Egypt sang in their assemblies old hymns transmitted by tradition. When, under Constantine the Great, Christianity became the religion of the state, the hymns acquired the importance of regular liturgical Church songs. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), in the 4th century, who may be considered as the representative of the whole Syrian hymnology, sought to bring the heretical hymns of the Gnostics into disuse. In the Eastern Church the hymns of Arius had, by their practical Christian spirit, acquired more popularity than the orthodox hymns, which consisted mostly of an assemblage of dogmatic formulas. To oppose this tendency, Gregory of Nazianzum and Synesius composed a number of new orthodox hymns but, not being adapted to the comprehension of the people generally, these did not become popular, and thus failed to answer the purpose of the writers. Sacred poetry in general began to decline among the Greeks; and as in the next century the strife concerning the adoration of Mary and the saints began, the orthodox hymns became mere songs of praise to these. Such are the hymns of Cosmas, bishop of Majumena (780); Andreas, bishop of Crete (660-732); Germanus, patriarch of

Constantinople (634-734); John Damascenus in the 8th century, and Theophanes, metropolitan of Nicea, and Josephus, deacon of Constantinople, in the 9th.

In the history of hymnology, Schaff distinguishes three periods, both in the Greek and Latin Church poetry:

- (1.) that of formation, while it was slowly throwing off classical meters and inventing its peculiar style, down to about 650;
- (2.) that of perfection, down to 820;
- (3.) that of decline and decay, to 1400, or to the fall of Constantinople.

“The first period, beautiful as are some of the odes of Gregory Nazianzen and Sophronius of Jerusalem has impressed scarcely any traces on the Greek office books. The flourishing period of Greek poetry coincides with the period of the image controversies, and the most eminent poets were at the same time advocates of images; pre-eminent among them being John of Damascus, who has the double honor of being the greatest theologian and the greatest poet of the Greek Church. The flower of Greek poetry belongs, therefore, to a later division of our history. Yet, since we find at least the rise of it in the 5th century, we shall give here a brief description of its peculiar character. The earliest poets of the Greek Church, especially Gregory Nazianzen in the 4th, and Sophronius of Jerusalem in the 7th century, employed the classical meters, which are entirely unsuitable to Christian ideas and Church song, and therefore gradually fell out of use. Rhyme found no entrance into the Greek Church. In its stead the metrical or harmonic prose was adopted from the Hebrew poetry and the earliest Christian hymns of Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, and the angelic host. Anatolius of Constantinople († 458) was the first to renounce the tyranny of the classic meter and strike out a new path. The essential points in the peculiar system of the Greek versification are the following: The first stanza, which forms the model of the succeeding ones, is called in technical language *Hirmos*, because it draws the others after it. The succeeding stanzas are called *Troparia* (stanzas), and are divided, for chanting, by commas, without regard to the sense. A number of troparia, from three to twenty or more, form an *Ode*, and this corresponds to the Latin *Sequence*, which was introduced about the same time by the monk Notker in St. Gall. Each ode is founded on a *hirmos*, and ends with a *troparion* in praise of the holy Virgin. The odes are commonly arranged (probably after the

example of such Psalms as the 25th, 112th, and 119th) in acrostic, sometimes in alphabetic order. Nine odes form a *Canon*. The older odes on the great events of the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension, are sometimes sublime; but the later long canons, in glorification of unknown martyrs, are extremely prosaic and tedious, and full of elements foreign to the Gospel. Even the best hymnological productions of the East lack the healthful simplicity, naturalness, fervor, and depth of the Latin and of the evangelical Protestant hymn.

“The Greek Church poetry is contained in the liturgical books, especially in the twelve volumes of the *Menmea*, which correspond to the Latin *Breviary*, and consist, for the most part, of poetic or half poetic odes in rhythmic prose. These treasures, on which nine centuries have wrought, have hitherto been almost exclusively confined to the Oriental Church, and, in fact, yield but few grains of gold for general use. Neale has latterly made a happy effort to reproduce and make accessible in modern English meters, with very considerable abridgments, the most valuable hymns of the Greek Church. We give a few specimens of Neale’s translations of hymns of ‘t. Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, who attended the Council of Chalcedon (451). The first is a Christmas hymn, commencing in Greek: Μέγα καὶ παράδοξον θαῦμα.

‘A great and mighty wonder,
The festal makes secure:
The Virgin bears the Infant
With Virgin-honor pure.

The Word is made incarnate,
And yet remains on high:
And cherubim sing anthems
To shepherds from the sky.

And we with them triumphant
Repeat the hymn again:
“To GOD on high be glory,
And peace on earth to men!”

While thus they sing your Monarch,
Those bright angelic bands,
Rejoice, ye vales and mountains I
Ye oceans, clap your hands!

Since all He comes to ransom,
 By all be He adored,
 The Infant born in Bethlehem,
 The Savior and the LORD!

Now idol forms shall perish,
 All error shall decay
 And CHIRST shall wield His scepter,
 Our LORD and GOD for aye.'

Another specimen of a Christmas hymn by the same, commencing **ἐν Βηθλεέμ:**

'In Bethlehem is He born!
 Maker of all things, everlasting God!
 He opens Eden's gate,
 Monarch of ages! Thence the fiery sword
 Gives glorious passage; thence,
 The severing mid-wall overthrown, the powers
 Of earth and Heaven are one;
 Angels and men renew their ancient league,
 The pure rejoin the pure,
 In happy union! Now the Virgin-womb
 Like some cherubic throne
 Containeth Him, the Uncontainable:
 Bears Him, whom while they bear
 The seraphs tremble! bears Him, as He comes
 To shower upon the world
 The fullness of His everlasting love!'

One more on Christ calming the storm, **ζοφερᾶς τρικμίας**, as reproduced by Neale:

'Fierce was the wild billow,
 Dark was the night;
 Oars labor'd heavily;
 Foam glimmer'd white;
 Mariners trembled;
 Peril was nigh;
 Then said the God of God,
 "Peace! It is."

Ridge of the mountain-wave,
 Lower thy crest!

Wail of Euroclydon,
 Be thou at rest!
 Peril can none be Sorrow must fly
 Where saith the Light of light,
 "Peace! It is I.

Jesu, Deliverer!
 Come Thou to me:
 Soothe Thou my voyaging
 Over life's sea!
 Thou, when the storm of death
 Roars sweeping by,
 Whisper, O Truth of truth!
 "Peace! 'tis I."

2. Latin Church. — Of far more importance to the Christian Church than the Greek are the Latin hymns produced in the earlier ages, or the period covering the 4th to the 16th centuries. Though smaller in compass, Latin hymnology far surpasses the Greek "in artless simplicity and truth, and in richness, vigor, and fullness of thought, and is much more akin to the Protestant spirit. With objective churchly character it combines deeper feeling and more subjective appropriation and experience of salvation, and hence more warmth and fervor than the Greek. It forms in these respects the transition to the evangelical hymn, which gives the most beautiful and profound expression to the personal enjoyment of the Savior and his redeeming grace. The best Latin hymns have come through the Roman Breviary into general use, and through translations and reproductions have become naturalized in Protestant churches. They treat, for the most part, of the great facts of salvation and the fundamental doctrines of Christianity" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 585). But many of them, like the later productions of the Greek Church, are devoted to the praises of Mary and the martyrs, and are vitiated with all manner of superstitions. One of the oldest writers of Latin hymns is Hilary of Poitiers (Pictaviensis), who died in 368. Banished to Phrygia, he was incited by hearing the singing of Arian hymns to compose some for the Orthodox Church, and among these productions his *Lucis largitor splendide* is the most celebrated. There is no doubt that the authorship of a great many hymns is spurious, especially in the case of Ambrose (q.v.), bishop of Milan, who died in 397, and who is generally considered the proper father of Latin Church song. Among his genuine productions we find the grand hymns *O lux beata trinitas; Veni redemptor omnium; Deus creator omnium*, etc. The so-called Ambrosian song of

praise, *Te deum laudamus*, “by far the most celebrated hymn,” formerly ascribed to Ambrose, “which alone would have made his name immortal,” and which, with the *Gloria in excelsis*, is “by far the most valuable legacy of the old Catholic Church poetry, and which will be prayed and sung with devotion in all parts of Christendom to the end of time,” he is said to have composed for the baptism of Augustine. But it is now agreed by our best critics that this hymn was written at a later date (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 592). Another distinguished hymn writer of the Middle Age was Augustine, “the greatest theologian among the Church fathers († 430), whose soul was filled with the genuine essence of poetry.” He is said to have composed the resurrection hymn, *Cum rex gloriae Christus*; the hymn on the glory of Paradise, *Ad perennis vitae fontem Mens sitivit arida*, and others. Damascus, bishop of Rome († 384), who is said to have been the author of the rhyme of which we spoke above, is perhaps not less celebrated than the preceding names. Very prominently rank also Prudentius, in Spain († 405), whom Neale calls “the prince of primitive Christian poets,” the author of *Jam moesta quiesce querela*, and others; Paulinus of Nola; Sedulius, who composed two Christmas hymns, *A solis ortus cardine* and *Hostis Herodes impie*; Enodius, bishop of Pavia († 521); and Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (about 600), who wrote the passion hymns, *Pange lingua gloriosi Praelium certaminis* and *Vexillca regis prodeunt*. These hymns (the text and translations of most of which are given by Schaff, *l. c.*) soon became popular, and though many of them, long in use in the Church, were not to be set aside, still the Council of Toledo (633) recommended the use only of such hymns as those of Hilary, Ambrose, etc., in public worship. Gregory the Great, who introduced a new system of singing into the Church **SEE GREGORIAN CHANT**, also composed hymns, among others the *Rex Christefactor omnium*; *Primo dierum omnium*, generally regarded as his best, etc. After him the most noteworthy hymn-writers are Isidorus, bishop of Sevilla; Eugenius, Ildefonsus, and Julianus, bishops of Toledo; and Beda Venerabilis. Charlemagne (8th century), who introduced the Gregorian chant into France and Germany, also attempted sacred poetry, and is said to be the author of the Pentecost hymn, *Veni creator spiritus*, though others ascribe it, and perhaps on better grounds, to Rhabanus Maurus. Alcuin and Paulus Diaconus also composed hymns. Although Christianity, during that century and the next, spread through France, Germany, and northwards, yet Latin hymns remained in exclusive use during the whole of the Middle Ages, as the clergy alone took an active part in divine worship. In the 9th century appeared some noteworthy hymn-writers. Theodulf,

bishop of Orleans, whose *Gloria laus et honor tibi* was always sung on Palm Sunday; Rhabanus Maurus; Walafrid Strabo, the first German hymn-writer; Notker († 912), who introduced the use of sequences and recitatives in the hymns, and composed the renowned alternate chant, *Media vita in morfe sumus*. During the 10th and 11th centuries sacred poetry was cultivated by the Benedictines of Constance, among whom Hermann of Veringen († 1054) was especially distinguished. King Robert of France wrote the Pentecost hymn, *Veni sancte ritus*; Petrus Damiani wrote also penitential hymns. To the 11th century belongs the alternate hymn to Mary entitled *Salve Reginae mater misericordiae*. In the 12th century hymnwriting flourished, particularly in France, where we notice Marbord (1123); Hillebert of Tours; Petrus Venerabilis; Adam of St. Victor; Bernard- of Clairvaux, author of the *Salve ad faciem Jesu*, and the hymn beginning *Salve caput cruentatum*; Abelard, writer of the Annunciation hymn, *Mttit ad virginem*; and Bernard of Cluny, author of "The Celestial Country," about A.D. 1145. It was, moreover, a practice of conventual discipline to connect hymns with all the various offices of daily life: thus there were hymns to be sung before and after the meals, on the lighting of lamps for the night, on fasts, etc. In the 13th century the sentimentalism of the Franciscans became a rich source of poetry, and the Latin hymns perhaps attained their highest perfection under writers of that order. Francis († Assisi himself wrote sacred poetry. Among the Franciscan hymn writers are especially to be noticed Thomas of Celano (after 1255), author of the grand Judgment hymn, *Dies irae dies illa* **SEE DIES IRAE**; Bonaventura; Jacoponus, who wrote the *Stabat mater dolorosa* and *Stabat mater speciosa*. **SEE STABAT MATER**. Among the Dominicans, Thomas Aquinas distinguished himself by his *Pange lingua gloriosi* and *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*. After attaining this eminence Latin hymns retrograded again during the 14th and 15th centuries, and became mere rhymed pieces. The mystics Henry Suso (q.v.) and Thomas a Kempis (q.v.) alone deserve mention among the writers of good hymns.

On hymns of the Ancient and Middle Ages, see Bingham, *Oriq. Eccles.* bk. 13 chap. 5, and bk. 14 chap. 1; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus, sive hymnorum, etc., collectio amplissima* (Leipz. 1841-56, 5 vols. 8vo); a good selection in Königsfeld, *Lat. Hymnen und Gesdng*, in which the Latin- and German versions are printed face to face, with an Introd. and notes by A.W. von Schlegel (Bonn, 1847, 12mo, and second collection 1865, 12mo); Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry, chiefly Lyrical, with Notes*,

etc. (2nd ed. Lond. 1864, 18mo); Coleman, *Apostolic and Primitive Church*, ch. 12; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 16; Walch, *De Hymnis Eccles. Apostolicae* (Jena, 1837); Rambach, *Anthologie Christl. Gesange* (Altona, 1817-33); Bjorn, *Hymni Vet. Patrum Christ. Eccles.* (Hafn. 1818); Kehrein, *Lateinische Anthologie* (Frankf. 1840); (Ultramontane) Mone, *Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters* (Freib. 18i53.sq., 3 vols 8vo.); Moll, *Hymnasarium* (Halle, 1861, 18mo); Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenleid* (Lpz. 1864-65, 2 vols.), part of vol. 1, p. 9-362; Chandler, *Hymns of the Primitive Church* (Lond. 1837); Neale, *Hymns' of the Eastern Church* (3rd edit. London, 1866); *Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences* (3rd ed. London, 1867); *The Voice of Christian Life in Song, or Hymns and Hymn writers of many Lands and Ages* (N.Y. 1864, 12mo); Miller, *Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin* (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Koch, *Gesch. d. Kirchenl.* (2nd edit. Stuttgart, 1852 sq., 4 vols., especially, 1, 10-30); Edilestand du Meril, *Poesies populaires Latines anterieures tau douzieme siecle* (Paris, 1843); Fortlage, *Gesange Christl. Vorzeit* (Berlin, 1844); Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 8:302 sq.; Hill, *English Monasticism*, p. 324-373 (on mediaeval books and hymns); Rheimvald, *Kirchl. Archaöl.* p. 262 sq.; Augusti, *tiandb. der christl. Archaöl.* 2, 106 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 384 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites*, p. 475 sq.; *Christ. Examiner*, 28 art. 1; *Christi(a Remembrancer*, 44, art. 4; *N. Amer. Rev.* 1857, art. 4; and on the first six centuries a very excellent article, first published in the *British and Foreign Ev. Rev.* (Oct. 1866), in Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:575 sq.

II. A Modern Hymnography. —

1. German. — The origin of German hymns, which are without question the richest of any in modern tongues, may be traced to the 9th century. But the history of German hymnology, strictly speaking, does not begin earlier than the Reformation. For “it was not until the people possessed the Word of God, and liberty to worship him in their own language, that such a body of songs could be created, though vernacular hymns and sacred lyrics had existed in Germany throughout the Middle Ages. It was then that a great outburst of national poetry and music took place, which reflected the spirit of those times; and on a somewhat smaller scale the same thing has happened both before and since that time. at every great crisis in the history of the German people.” The most marked of these periods are, besides the Reformation, the 12th and 13th centuries, or the Crusading period, and- the latter part of the 17th, and 18th centuries. The earliest

attempts at German hymns are traced to the 9th century. For some centuries preceding the Roman Church had abandoned congregational singing, and the hymns formed part of the liturgical service performed by the priests and the canonical singers. In some churches, however, the people still continued 'the old practice of uttering the response *Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison*, at certain intervals during the singing of the Latin hymns and psalms, which finally degenerated into a confused clamor of voices. The first attempt to remedy this was made by adding, soon after Notker, who originated the Latin Sequence or Prose, a few German rhymes to the *Kyrie Eleison*, "from the last syllables of which these earliest German hymns were called *Leisen*." But as they were never used in Mass service, but were confined to popular festivals, pilgrimages, and the like, they did not come into general use, and it may be said that the real employment of *Leisen* (or *Leiche*, as they were also called) did not begin before the 12th century. At that time they had become the common property of the German people, and hymns in the vernacular were freely produced, among them the oldest German Easter hymn, *Christus ist sifi rstandens*, attributed to Sperrvogel, which has descended to our own day as a verse of one of Luther's best hymns:

*Christ the Lord is risen
Out of death's dark prison;
Let us all rejoice today,
Christ shall be our hope and stay:
Kyrie eleison.
Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia!*

Several of the great Latin hymns were also translated into German, and although their use in the Church was more or less restricted, and was always regarded with suspicion by the more papal of the clergy, yet they continued to be favored by the people, as is fully evinced by the quantity of sacred verse written from this time onwards. Thus Wackernagel, in his work on religious poetry, prior to the Reformation (*Das deutsche Kirchenleid v. d. alttest. Zeit bis zu Anjfang d. 17th Jahrhundert*), exhibits nearly 1500 specimens, and the names of no less than 85 different poets, with many anonymous authors. Among the writers named we find not a few of the celebrated knightly mine-singers, as Hartmann von deer Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Walther von der Vogelweide, and others. But the German sacred songs of this time, like the old Latin hymns, were confined to addressing the saints, and, above all, the Virgin Mary. "The

former class is not very important, either as to number or to quality; but the *Mlicarien-Lieder* and, in a minor degree, *Annen-Lieder* (hymns to Mary and to Anne), constitute a very large anti well-known class among the poems of the ante-Reformation times in Germany. ... They form a sort of spiritual counterpart to the minne-songs or love-songs addressed to his earthly lady by the knight. It was easy to transfer the turn of expression and tone of thought from the earthly object to the heavenly one, and the degree to which this is done is to us very often startling. The honors and titles belonging to our Lord Jesus Christ are attributed to his mother; God is said to have created the world by her, and to have rested in her on the seventh day; she is said to have risen from the grave on the third day, and ascended into heaven; she is addressed not only as a persuasive mediator with her Son, but as herself the chief source of mercy and help, especially in the hour of death and at the day of judgment. By degrees, her mother is invested with some of her own attributes; for it is said, if Christ would obey his own mother, ought not she much more to obey hers? So a set of hymns to Anne sprang up, in which she is entreated to afford aid in death, and obtain pardon for the sinners from Christ and Mary, who will refuse her nothing” (Winkworth, *Christiana Singers of Germany*, p. 96, 97). **SEE HYPERDULIA**. It is no wonder that in the face of such extravagances Wackernagel is constrained to say that the existence of so many godless hymns addressed to the Virgin and the saints, or teaching the whole doctrine of indulgences, is an indisputable testimony to the degeneracy into which the nation had fallen, rendering the Reformation necessary; and that the existence of so many breathing an unstained Christianity is at the same time a witness to the preservation of so much true religion as made the Reformation at all possible. The use of German hymns was taken up by the heretical sects that began to spring up under the persecuting influence of Rome. The German Flagellants, the Bohemians, the Waldenses, and the Mystics, who all encouraged the study of the Scriptures, of course favored the singing of German hymns; and they contributed not a few sacred songs themselves to those already existing. Thus the Mystic Tauler (q.v.) (to whom was long attributed the *Theologia Germania*. in all probability the work of Nicholas of Basle) wrote several hymns, which became widely known. His best, perhaps, are the following:

WHAT I MUST DO.

*“From outward creatures I must flee,
And seek heart-oneness deep within
If I would draw my soul to Thee,
O God, and keep it pure from sin,” etc.*

ONLY JESUS.

*“O Jesu Christ, most good, most fair,
More fragrant than May’s flowery air
Who Thee within his soul doth bear,
True cause for joy hath won!*

*But would one have Thee in his heart,
From all self-will he must depart;
God’s bidding only where thou art
Must evermore be done.*

*Where Jesus thus doth truly dwell,
His presence doth all tumults quell,
And transient cares of earth dispel
Like mists before the sun,” etc.*

A marked improvement, however, took place in German hymnology during the 15th century, especially near its close. The chief hymn-writer of this period was Henry of Laufenberg, who was particularly active in transforming secular into religious songs, as was frequent at this time; he also translated for the Germans many of the old Latin hymns. One of the best specimens of a religious song transformed we cite here. The original was “Innsbruck, I must forsake thee.”

FAREWELL.

*O world, I must forsake thee,
And far away betake me,
To seek my native shore;
So long I’ve dwelt in sadness,
I wish not now for gladness,
Earth’s joys for me are o’er.*

*Sore is my grief and lonely,
And I can tell it only
To Thee, my Friend most sure!
God, let Thy hand uphold me,*

*Thy pitying heart enfold me,
For else I am most poor.
My refuge where I hide me,
From Thee shall naught divide me,*

*No pain, no poverty:
Naught is too bad to fear it,
If Thou art there to share it;
My heart asks only Thee.*

Many of these transformed hymns were preserved, like the one above cited, through the Reformation. Another very popular hymn, *Den liebsten puelen den ich Fan der ist in des Himels Trone*, was transformed from the song “Den liebsten puelen den ich han der liegt beim Wirt im Keller.” Of the transformation of ballads by the minnesingers into hymns to Mary and Anne we have already spoken. We return, therefore, to Laufenberg, and cite one of his hymns, which well deserves to be called not only one of the best of his age, but one of the loveliest sacred songs that has ever been written. We copy the first stanza of it from Mrs. Winkworth (p. 93):

CRADLE SONG.

*Ah Jesu Christ, my Lord most dear,
As Thou wast once an infant here,
So give this little child, I pray,
Thy grace and blessings day by day:
Ah Jesu, Lord divine,
Guard me this babe of mine!*

Laufenberg also wrote and widely introduced the use of many hymns in mixed Latin and German, a kind of verse which was the favorite amusement of the monks, and which had acquired considerable popularity at his time. The best known of these productions was a Christmas carol, dating from the 14th century, *In dulci jubilo, Nu signet und seid fro*. Peter Dresdensis was generally, but erroneously, regarded as the author of these perhaps properly termed “Mixed Hymns.” His real work, however, lay in the strenuous efforts he made to introduce hymns in the vernacular more freely into public worship, especially into the service

of the Mass," from which they had, as we have already had occasion to observe, been excluded. But these efforts met with violent opposition from the Church, and the use of hymns in the vernacular still continued to be almost exclusively confined to festivals and like occasions. Among these vernacular hymns are particularly celebrated "*Ein Kindelein so lobelich*," "*Christ fure zu Himmel*," "*Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeist*," "*Wir danken dir lieber lierre*," etc. After the invention of the art of printing, the followers of Huss, who had formed themselves into a separate and organized Church of their own in 1467 (Bohemian and Moravian Brethren), and who made it one of their distinctive peculiarities to use hymns in the vernacular, as their service was mainly conducted in their mother tongue, especially their prayers, gave new encouragement to the writing of German hymns. In 1504, Lucas, then chief of the Bohemians, collected 400 of the most popular of the German hymns and had them printed. This is "the first example of a *hymn-book* composed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome." Previous to this time, towards the close of the 15th century, there existed two or three collections of German versions of the *Latin* hymns and sequences, but they are of very inferior merit.

The Reformation in the 16th century marks the next era in the history of German hymnology. The introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy of the Church gave an impulse to the German language that was only eclipsed by Luther's translation of the Bible for the edification and education of the entire German people. But it was Luther's aim not only to furnish his followers the Book of books, but also to introduce everywhere the singing of such hymns as already existed in the vernacular, and by the creation of a taste among the people for German sacred 'song to promote its cultivation. Of this he set himself the best example. As in the cause of religion he knew how to enlist a large circle of eminent men and scholars to carry out his great designs, so also, with a true appreciation of sacred art, both in poetry and song, he soon gathered about him many friends, who became the compilers of several collections of hymns, that were issued from the press at remarkably short intervals. *SEE PSALMODY*. Luther himself, besides translating anew many of the Latin hymns, "which he counted among the good things that God's power and wonderful working had kept alive amid so much corruption," and, besides transforming or reproducing some four of the early German hymns, composed some twenty-one in the vernacular,

most of which are known in our own day by most of the Protestant nations of the globe, and some of which are particular favorites even with the English-speaking people. The special object of the composition of these hymns, into which Luther threw “all his own fervent faith and deep devotion;” was undoubtedly “to give the people a short, clear confession of faith, easy to be remembered. For the doctrines which Luther propagated were yet too new to be well understood by all as he desired them to be. He wished men to know what they professed. Protestantism meant the profession of a faith by *choice*, and not by compulsion; a belief that was cherished by the confessor, and not a blind following after the teacher. He required a comprehension of his great doctrines of justification by faith, of the one Mediator between God and man, which gave peace to the conscience by delivering it from the burden of the past sins, and a new spring of life to the soul by showing men that their dependence was not on anything in themselves, on no works of their own performance, but on the infinite love and mercy of God, which he had manifested to all mankind in his Son; of his doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which put a new spirit into the Church, by vindicating for every member of it his right and duty to offer for himself the sacrifice of praise and prayer, and to study for himself God’s word in the Scriptures” (comp. Winkworth, p. 105). One of Luther’s hymns best known to us is that founded on the 46th Psalm, the famous “Marseillaise of the Reformation,” as Heine called it. He is generally supposed to have written it on his way to the Diet of Worms. Some, however, think that it was composed at the close of the second Diet of Spire (1529). It has been again and again translated. Mrs. Winkworth gives us the following:

THE STRONGHOLD.

*A sure stronghold our God is he,
A trusty shield and weapon;
Our help he’ll be, and set us free,
Whatever ill may happen.*

*That old malicious foe
Intends us deadly woe;
Armed with the strength of hell,
And deepest craft as well*

*On earth is not his fellow.
Through our own force we nothing can,
Straight were we lost forever,
But for us fights the proper Man*

*By God sent to deliver.
Ask ye who this may be?
Christ Jesus named is he,
Of Sabaoth the Lord,*

*Sole God to be adored;
Tis he must win the battle.
And were the world with devils filled,
All eager to devour us,*

*Our souls to fear should little yield;
They cannot overpower us.
Their dreaded prince no more
Can harm us as of yore;*

*Look grim as e'er he may,
Doomed is his ancient sway,
A word can overthrow him.
Still shall they leave that world its might,*

*And yet no thanks shall merit;
Still is he with us in the fight
By his good gifts and Spirit.
E'en should they take our life,*

*Goods, honor, children, wife,
Though all of these were gone,
Yet nothing have they won God's kingdom ours abideth!*

Another hymn of Luther's which has gained a worldwide circulation is the one that was written by him on the burning of two martyrs for their faith at Brussels in 1523, and which was translated, or, rather, transformed by D'Aubigne in his *History of the Reformation*, beginning,

*"Flung to the heedless winds,
Or on the waters cast,
Their ashes shall be watched,
And gathered at the last," etc.*

As an example of the songs he transformed most successfully, we quote the old ditty,

*“O thou naughty Judas!
 What hast thou done,
 To betray our Master,
 God’s only Son!*

*Therefore must thou suffer
 Hell’s agony
 Lucifer’s companion
 Must forever be.
 Kyrie, Eleison!”*

This Luther changed to the following:

*“Twas our great transgression
 And our sore misdeed
 Made the Lord our Saviour
 On the cross to bleed.*

*Not then on thee, poor Judas,
 Nor on that Jewish crew,
 Our vengeance dare we visit-
 We are to blame, not you.
 Kyrie, Eleison!*

*“All hail to thee, Christ Jesus,
 Who hungest on the tree,
 And bor’st for our transgressions
 Both shame and agony.
 Now beside thy Father*

*Reignest thou on high;
 Bless us all our lifetime,
 Take us when we die!
 Kyrie, Eleison!”*

(*Christian Examiner*, 1860, p. 239 sq.)

Of the friends whom Luther was successful in enlisting as writers for his new hymnbooks we have space here to mention only the most prominent names. One of them, Justus Jonas, was a colleague of Luther and Melancthon at the University of Wittenberg. His special service was the transformation of the Psalms into metrical German versions, ““choosing, as one can well understand, those which speak of David’s sufferings from his enemies, and his trust in God’s deliverance.” One of his best is on the 124th Psalm, beginning thus:

*“If God were not upon our side,
When foes around us rage;
Were not Himself our Help and Guide,
When bitter war they wage
Were He not Israel’s mighty Shield,
To whom their utmost crafts must yield,
We surely must have perished.”*

Another of Luther’s co laborers was Paul Eber, whose hymns have “a tone of tenderness and pathos which is much less characteristic of this period than the grave, manly trustfulness of Luther and Jonas.” But they became very extensively known, and during the trying period of the Thirty-years’ War they were constantly heard both in public and around the family hearthstone. A special favorite at that time was the one, composed when the imperial armies were besieging Wittenberg (1547), beginning:

*“When, in the hour of utmost need,
We know not where to look for aid,
When days and nights of anxious thought
Nor help nor comfort yet have brought,
Then this our comfort is alone,
That we may meet before Thy throne,
And cry, O faithful God, to Thee,
For rescue from our misery.”*

Two of Eber’s hymns for the dying have been great favorites by the side of deathbeds and at funerals, not only among the German Protestants, but also among the Roman Catholics. The one is *Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott* (Lord Jesus Christ, true man and God); the other is the following childlike expression of perfect trust, beautifully rendered by Mr. Winkworth (p. 12):

DEATH IN THE LORD.

*“I fall asleep in Jesu’s arms,
Sin washed away, hushed all alarms,
For his dear blood, his righteousness,
My jewels are, my glorious dress,
Wherein before my God I stand
When I shall reach the heavenly land.
With peace and joy I now depart,
God’s child I am with all my heart:*

*I thank thee, Death; thou leadest me
To that true life where I would be.
So cleansed by Christ I fear not Death,
Lord Jesu, strengthen thou my faith!"*

But Luther and his associates were only the founders of the new German hymnology, which soon spread over a much more extended field. Hymn-writers became common all over the land, and their number is legion, so that it is almost impossible for us, in our limited space, to give more than a brief account of the most distinguished, and the names only of those of lesser note. Thus Nicholas Decius, a converted monk, produced a translation of the *Gloria in Excelsis* ("Allein Gott in der Hoh', sei Ehr.," *All glory be to God on high*), which, with its noble chorale, soon came into use all over Germany. Paul Speratus (von Spretten), the chaplain of the duke of Prussia, is perhaps the most noted of all the hymnologists of this period, and is best known as the author of the hymn on the doctrine of *Justification by faith*:

*"Salvation hath come down to us
Of freest grace and love,
Works cannot stand before God's law,
A broken reed they prove;
Faith looks to Jesus Christ alone,
He must for all our sins atone,
He is our one Redeemer."*

This, in Luther's day, was as popular among the Germans as one of his own hymns. Indeed, it is said that when Luther first heard it sung by a beggar on the roadside he gave him the last coin he had. Princes also became sacred poets, such as the margrave of Brandenburg and Hesse, known as the author of:

*"Grant me, eternal God, such grace
That no distress
May cause me e'er to flee from Thee," etc.*

The elector John of Saxony was also, at that time, courted among hymn-writers, but it now appears that he never wrote any hymns himself, although he was passionately fond of them. Hans Sachs (1494-1576), the celebrated and popular poet of this period, also wrote sacred verse, and figures not less prominently than the persons whose names we have already mentioned. The most famous of his hymns he wrote during the siege of

Nuremberg, his native city, in 1561: “Why art thou thus cast down, my heart?” (*Warum betrübst du dich mein Herz?*). He wrote also a very beautiful hymn on the explicit confidence in the saving merits of Christ, entitled “The Mediator,” which is translated by Mrs. Winkworth (*Christ. Sing.* p. 134). Among the Bohemian Brethren, who, as is well known, were on intimate terms with the Lutherans, Michael Weiss is distinguished both as the translator of Bohemian hymns into German, and as the author of a number of beautiful German hymns. Two of them, “Once he came in blessing,” and the well-known “Christ, the Lord, is risen again” (*Christus ist erstanden von des Todes Banden*), translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth, may be found in her *Lyra Germanica*, 2, 62, and in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 15, 259. Not less worthy of notice, though perhaps not quite so prominent in their day, are Johann Matthesius († 1561) and Nicholas Hermann († 1561). The former wrote, among others, the beautiful morning hymn, “My inmost heart now raises” (*Aaus meizes Herzen’s Grunde*), which was a favorite with king Gustavus Adolphus. Hermann’s hymns are to be found in nearly all German hymn-books. Among his best hymns are’ *Lobt Gott ihr Christen allzugleich*, and *Wenn mein Stündlein vorhanden ist*. Mrs. Winkworth gives Matthesius’s “Miner’s Song” (p. 144) and Hermann’s “Hymn for the Dying.”

In the latter half of the 16th, and even at the opening of the 17th century, a gradual decline is manifest in the quality of the hymns, though the quantity continued. They were now no longer the spontaneous production of men of all classes, moved to worship God in songs of praise, but the work of professional hymnologists. “Still this period, too, has some very good and fine hymns, but a marked change of tone is perceptible in most of them; they are no longer filled with the joyful welcome of a new day: they more often lament the wickedness of the age, and anticipate coming evil times, or the end of the world itself.” Most prominent among the hymn-writers of this period are the following:

(1.) Ambrose Lobwasser, who translated the French Psalter of Marot and Beza; but the literary merit of the work was rather mediocre. “It does not rise above the level of a sort of rhymed prose, and it furnished an unfortunate model for a flood of very prosaic rhymed paraphrases of doctrinal statements or passages of Scripture, which became wonderfully numerous at this time.”

(2.) Bartholomaeus Ringwaldt (1530-98) is the author of the hymn, in England erroneously attributed to Luther, "Great God, what do I see and hear," which was written in imitation of the "*Dies irae, dies illa.*" It really deserves to be placed first among the hymnologists of this period. It is incorporated in the *New Congregational Hymn-book* (London), No. 420. His hymns partake of the penitential style, by which, as above remarked, this period is characterized. One of his best on "Penitence" Mrs. Winkworth has clothed in English dress (p. 149).

(3.) Nicolaus Selnecker (1530-92), author of *Gleich wie sein Haus der Vogel baut*, based on the 84th Psalm.

(4.) Louis Helmboldt, the poet laureate of the emperor Maximilian, who wrote "The true Christian's Vade-Mecum" (*From God shall naught divide me*, Mrs. Winkworth, p. 154), which is contained in all German hymn-books, "and has rooted itself among the people." To this period belong also Martin Schalling (1532-1608), among whose hymns *Herzlich lieb hab' ich Dich o Herr* ("O Lord, I love thee," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 609) is best known; Kaspar Melissander ("Herr, wie du willst, so schick's mit mir"), Mart. Moller, Mart. Behemb. Mart. Rutilius ("Ach; Herr u. Gott, wie gross u. schwer!"), Job. Pappus ("Ich hab mein Sach' Gott heimgestellt"), and more especially Philip Nicolai (1556-1608), who was the first to reintroduce, after the Reformation, the mystical union of Christ with the soul in his hymns, whence they have often been called the 'Hymns of the Love of Jesus.' His two best hymns have gained a remarkable popularity, "and are indeed admirable for their fervor of emotion and mastery over difficult but musical rhythms." They are, *Wachet auf; ruft uns die Stimme* ("Wake, awake, for night is flying," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 382; in the *New Congregational Hymn-book*, No. 749), and *Wie schon leuchtet der Morgenstern* ("How lovely shines the Star," *Christ in Song*, p. 551), which latter especially "became so popular that its tunes were often chimed by city bells, lines and verses were printed from it by way of ornament on the common earthenware of the country, and it was invariably used at weddings and certain festivals." All German hymnbooks still contain it, though in a somewhat modified form.

The tempest of war which for thirty years swept over Germany, and caused a tale of disasters from which it would seem society could have never recovered, even promoted, or at least did not impede in any way, the literary and intellectual activity of the German mind; and this period is not

only recognized as having been signaled by “a great outburst of religious song,” but as having produced the most famous hymnologists of Germany. First among these stands the great Martin Opitz (1597-1639), of the Silesian school of German poets, who greatly improved all German poetry. He wrote many versions of some of the epistles, and of many of the Psalms, and of the Song of Solomon. But his original versions are by far the best; e.g. his morning hymn, “O Light, who out of Light wast born” (Winkworth, p. 173). Next to him we find Paul Fleming (q.v.) (1609-40), author of “In allen unseren Thaten.” But most famous at this time were undoubtedly Johann von Rist (q.v.) (1607-67), Johann Heermann (q.v.) (1685-1647), and, a little later, Paul Gerhard (q.v.) (1606-76), who was the greatest of them all, “the prince of German hymnists.” Rist wrote as many as 600 to 700 religious poems and hymns, “intended to supply every possible requirement of public worship or private experience.” His best are perhaps “Werde munter mein Gemuthe,” “Auf, auf ihr Reichsgenossen,” and “Werde Licht, du Volk der Heiden” (translation in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 118). Heermann’s best hymns are “Herzliebster Jesu, was hast du verbrochen” (*Christ in Song*, p. 171), “Jesu. deine tiefe Wunden,” “Zion Klage mit Angst u. Schmerzen” (Winkworth, p. 198), “Fruth Morgens da die Sonn’ aufgeht” (*Christ in Song*, p. 263), and “O Jesu Christe, wahres Licht” (*Christ in Song*, p. 116). Very beautiful is the following (transl. by Mrs. Winkworth):

IN TEMPTATION.

*“Jesu, victor over sin,
 Help me now the fight to win.
 Thou didst vanquish once, I know,
 Him who seeks my overthrow;
 So to Thee my faith will cleave,
 And her hold will never leave,

 Till the weary battle’s done,
 And the final triumph won;
 For I too through Thee may win,
 Victory over death and sin.”*

In Gerhard’s hands the German hymn reached its highest perfection, and his name is to the German justly dearer than that of any other save Luther. His hymns are “pervaded by a spirit of the most cheerful and healthy piety—a piety which shows itself not merely in direct devotion to God and to

Christ, but in a pure and childlike love of nature, and good will towards men. They exemplify Coleridge's lines:

*'He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.'*

They have the homely simplicity of Luther's, and a strength like his, if not quite equal to it, with a versatility, smoothness, and literary finish not to be found in Luther's, and unsurpassed in any period of German hymnology" (*Christian Examiner*, 1860, p. 247). Gerhardt has been aptly considered "the typical poet of the Lutheran Church, as Herbert is of the English;" but it must not be thought that he was by any means a voluminous writer. On the contrary, he only wrote altogether about 120 hymns. His life and writings have been dwelt upon so much in detail that we can do no better here than leave him with a few words of tribute so ably paid by Mrs. Winkworth: "His hymns seem to be the spontaneous outpouring of a heart that overflows with love, trust, and praise; his language is simple and pure; if it has sometimes a touch of homeliness, it has no vulgarism, and at times it rises to a beauty and grace which always gives the impression of being unstudied, yet could hardly have been improved by art.

His tenderness and fervor never degenerate into the sentimentality and petty conceits which were already becoming fashionable in his days, nor his penitence and sorrow into that morbid despondency for which the disappointments of his own life might have furnished some excuse." Other hymn-writers of this period are Andreas Gryphius (1616-64) of the same country as Opitz, and, like him, also a great writer of secular literature; Martin Rinkart (q.v.), the writer of *Nue danket alle Gott* ("Let all men praise the Lord"); Simor Dach (q.v.), author of *Ich bin ja Herr in Deiner Macht*; Heinrich Albertus (1604-68), whose best hymn is considered to be *Gott d. Himmels u. d. Erden*; Geors 'Weissel (first half of the 17th century), who wrote *Hach hoch die Thür. die Thor msacht weit* (in *Christ in Song*, p 17); the electoress Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg who composed in 1649, after the death of her first husband, the hymn *Jesus, meine Zuversicht*, well known in the English dress, "Jesus, my Redeemer, lives" (see *Chris; in Song*, p. 265); Ernst Chr. Homburg (1605-81), whose hymns were published together under the title *Geistliche Lieder* (Naumb. 1758). Perhaps his best hymn is *Jesu meines Lebens Leben*, or "Christ, the life of all the living" (*Christ in Song*, p. 183); another, hardly less beautiful,

is his well-known "Man of Sorrows." Johann Frank (1618-77), "who ranks only second to Gerhardt as a hymn writer, and, with him, marks the transition from the earlier to the later school of German religious poetry," published his sacred songs under the title of *Geistliches Zion* (Guben, 1764). One of his best is *Schmücke dich o liebe Seele*, "Deck thyself, my sold" (Winkworth, *Lyra Germanica*, ii, 133; Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 590). We add here only Georg Neumark (q.v.) (1621-81), for a time professor of poetry and poet laureate at the University of Königsberg, whose most famous hymn is *Wer nur den lieben Gott lasst walten*, "Leave God to order all thy ways" (*Lyra Germanica*, p. 152); J.M. Meyfarth (1590-1642), *Jerusalem du hochgebaute Stadt*, translated in the *Christian Examiner*, 69, 254 ("Jerusalem, thou high-built, fair abode"), and in *Lyra Germanica*, 2, 285); Friedrich V. Spee (1591 or 1595-1635), a Roman Catholic, who labored earnestly to introduce vernacular hymns into the divine service of his Church. wrote *Auf, auf, Gott will gelobet sein*; Johann Jacob Balde (1603-68), also a Roman Catholic, but he wrote mostly in Latin (his sacred poems being published under the title of *Carmina Lyrica*); Georg Philipp Harsdorfer (1607-58), of Southern Germany; A.H. Buchholz (1607-71); Johann Olearius (1611-84), belonging to a family who in this century were hymn-writers of some note.

Angelus Silesius (1624-77) (as a Lutheran, Johann Scheffer) wrote beautiful hymns, 205 of which were published under the title of *Heilige Seelenlust, oder Geistliche Hirtenlieder* (Bresl. 1657, and often). Particularly excellent are his *Ich will dich lieben meine Stairke* ("Thee will I love, my strength, my tower"), and *Liebe, die Du sich zum Bilde* ("O Love, who formedst me," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 414; *Christian Examiner*, 69, 245). Angelus was the founder of the so-called second Silesian School of poets, as Opitz is regarded as the leader of the first. They wrote both secular and religious poetry, but the latter far excels the former. To this school belonged Homburg, mentioned above; the two countesses of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt; Knorr V. Rosenroth (1636-89), who wrote the lovely little hymn, *Morgenglanz der Ewigkeit* ("Dayspring of eternity"); Christian Sriver, author of *Jesu mesier Seele Leben*, and others; Sigismund v. Birken (1626-81), who, with Harsdorfer, already noticed, belonged to the sentimental school; Gottfried Wilhelm Sacer (1635-99), G. Hoffmann, B. Pratorius, Johann Neunherz, Kaspar Neumann who wrote *Auf mein Herz des Herrn*, also Tug, *O Gott von dem wir Alles haben*, and many others.

In striking contrast with the formal and unspiritual hymns of the second Silesian school stand the poetical writings of the so-called Pictists, originating with Spener, "who for nearly a hundred years exerted a most powerful influence both on the religious and social life of Germany." The representatives of this school are Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705); his friend and associate, August Hermann Francke (1663-1727), the founder of the Halle Orphan Asylum; Anastasius Freylinghausen, a son-in-law of Francke, who wrote 44 hymns, and published (1704) a collection which remained for some generations the favorite collection for private reading among pious persons in Germany. To the same period belong J. C. Schade; Fr. von Canitz; Joachim Neander (1640-80), of the Reformed Church, who wrote *Lobe den Herrn den Machtigen*; Johann C. Schütz, author of *Sei Lob u. Ehr dent höchsten Gut*; Christian Tittius; Adolph Drese; Samuel Rodigast, who composed in 1675 the world-renowned *Was Gott that, das ist wohlgethan* ("Whate'er my God ordains is right"); J. Ad. Hasslocher; Christ. Pressovius; Laur. Laurenti, whose best hymn Dr. Schaff designates *Ermunzert euch ihr Frommen* ("Rejoice all ye believers," in *Christ in Song* p. e 383); J. B. Freistein; C. Ginther. *Halt im Gedachtniss e Jesum Christ*; Sal. Liskovius; J. T. Breithaupt; J. Lange; J. D. Herrnschmid; Christ. F. Richter; J. G. 'Wolf; Chr. A. Bernstein; Chr. J. Koitsch; J. Tribechovius; J. J. Winkler; J. H. Schrider; J. E. Schmidt; P. Lackmann; J. Chr. Lange; L. A. Gotter; B. Crasselius, *Heiligster Jesu Heiligungsquelle*; M. Müller; A. Hinkelman; H. G. Neuss; A. Creutzberg; J. Muthmann; Ernst Lange (1650-1727), *Im Abend blinkt der Morgenstern*, or "The wondering sages trace from far" (*Christ in Song*, p. 120); L. J. Schlicht; C. H. von Bogatzky, the celebrated author of the "Golden Treasury" (*Das goldene Schatzkstein*), also one of the compilers of the "Cothen Hymn-book;" J. J. Rambach; T. L. K. Allendorf L. F. F. Lehr; J. S. Kunth; E. G. Woltirsdorf, and many others. There were also the Wurtembergers, the best representatives of the pietism of South Germany, of whom Albert Bengel (1687-1732) may be looked upon as a prominent leader, though as a hymn-writer he was far excelled by another great light of this section of Germany, Philip Friedrich Hiller (1699-1769), who took Paul Gerhardt for his model. He published several volumes of hymns, of which the "Casket of Spiritual Songs" (*Geistliches Liederklstein*), containing only his own sacred songs, "obtained very wide popularity," and is "still the commonest book in Wirtemberg next to the Bible itself" (Winkworth, p. 283 sq.). Here deserve mention, also, J. R. Hedinger, S. Urlsperger, F. O. Hiller Ph. H. Weissensee, E. L. Fischer, J. Chr. Storr, —

Ph; D. Bark, Chr. Fr. Ottinger, Chr. K. L. von Pfeil; J. T. von Moser, and still others. The school of Spener developed the Mystics and Separatists, who also furnished a number of contributors to hymnology; but, although some of them were quite able, the influence of the new schools, as a whole, on hymnology “was, for the most part, simply mischievous, and their hymn-books contain about the worst specimens to be found—poor as poetry, fiercely intolerant towards their fellow-Christians, and full of a fantastic and irreverent adoration of the Redeemer” (Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 290). The only hymnologists who really deserve praise are Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) and Gerhard Tersteegen (1697-1769). The former, although an extensive writer on Church History, etc., is, indeed, best remembered in our day by his hymns, of which he wrote 130, and among them several of very great beauty. Perhaps the best of Arnold’s hymns is his deeply thoughtful “How bless’d to all thy followers, Lord, the road,” etc. Tersteegen (q.v.), who, although he never actually separated from the Reformed Church to which he belonged, was none the less “a Mystic of the purest type,” wrote more than 100 hymns; but he has become especially familiar to English-speaking Christians by the English dress which Wesley gave to two of his best hymns—“Lo! God is here; let us adore,” and “Thou hidden love of God, whose height,” etc. Lesser lights of these schools are J. Dippel, J. W. Petersen, G. Arnold, and others.

Here also, finally, deserve notice the hymn-writers of the Moravians, who have had no despicable influence on hymnology. Of especial credit are a few of count Zinzendorf’s hymns, who, unfortunately, cared more for their quantity than their quality; he wrote more than 2000, many of which, naturally enough, found a place in English hymn-books. His own sect has inserted 128. Charles Wesley also translated some of them. Among his best are “Jesus, still lead on” (*Jesu geh voran*), and “Jesus, thy blood and righteousness” (*Christi Blut u. Gerechtigkeit*). We might also mention in the same connection J. Nitschmann, Chr. David, L. J. Dober, F. von Watteville, A. G. Spangenberg, Louisa von Hayni, and others.

By the end of the century the influence of pietism had made itself felt even among the so-called “orthodox,” who imitated the Pietists in producing many hymns which may be counted among the best written at this time. Of the representatives of this school we name a few: Benjamin Schmolke, who wrote more than 1000 hymns, many of which have been translated into English. Among his best we count “Welcome victor in the strife”

(*Wilkommen Held im Streite*), and “Heavenward doth our journey tend” (*Himamelan geht unsre Bathn*). Wolfgang G. Dessler wrote *Wie wohl ist mir o Freund der Seelen* (*Christ in Song*, p. 491, 555, 342); and Salomon Frank; *Schnücke clich, o liebe Seele* (“Deck thyself, my soul,” in *Lyra Germanica*, 2, 133; *Christ in Song*, p. 590). Here deserve mention, also, Erdmann Neumeister, B. Marperger, J. G. Hermann, J. Chr. Wentzel, F. Fabricius, P. Busch, J. Lehmus, and others; of the Reformed Church: J. J. Spreug, C. Zollikofer, and, later. J. E. Lavater.

Modern German Hymnologists. — Towards the close of the 18th century Germany was waking to a new sera in literature. But the philosophic, or, as some acutely call it, “the critical doubting” religion of this period by no means affected hymnology favorably, “for really good hymns must have in them something of the nature of the popular song; they must spring from a cordial, unquestioning faith, which has no misgivings about the response it will evoke from other hearts.” The influence of the Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy, and of Gottsched’s school of poetry, caused the sacred songs to be of a dry, stiff, and artificial style. “Even the classical hymns, though consecrated by association, could no longer satisfy the more pedantic taste of the age, and there sprang up a perfect mania for altering them, and for making new collections of such modernized versions.... These alterations generally consisted in diluting the old vigor, substituting ‘virtue’ for ‘holiness’ or ‘faith,’ ‘the Supreme Being’ for ‘our faithful God,’ and so on,” so that these modified hymns may be said to have been changed from *religious* to *moral* songs. **SEE PSALMODY.** One, however, whose songs, on account of their “rational piety and quiet good taste,” deserve especial praise, is Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (q.v.). Other hymnologists of this time, for the mention of whose names *we* have only space here, are J. A. Schlegel, J. F. von Cronegk, J. P. Uz, J. F. Lowen, J. S. Diterich, J. S. Patzke, J. F. Feddersen, B. Münter, J. F. Mudre, H. C. Heeren, J. A. Hermes, F.W. Loder, J. Eschenburg, J. Chr. Frobing, S. G. Biiirde, Chr. F. Neander, B. Hang, Christ. G. Goz, and others. The pathological direction was taken by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (q.v.), in his *Aufersteh’n, ja aufersteh’n*. He was followed by J. A. Cramer, a very popular hymnologist, and a friend of Gellert and Klopstock, G. P. Funk, C.W. Ramler, Chr. Chr. Sturm, A. H. Niemeyer, Chr. F. Dan, Schubart, and others.

But the one really “great step” that was made in German hymnology at this time was the official sanction of the use of vernacular hymns in the Roman

Catholic churches of South Germany and Austria. Naturally enough, many of the Roman Catholic hymns of the period are translations from the Latin; many of the original compositions follow closely in style both Gellert and Klopstock; nay, the productions of several Protestant hymnologists, especially those of the two last-named poets, were even used in the Roman Catholic Church, of course often in a somewhat modified and even distorted form. Of their own hymn-writers, the following deserve especial mention: J. M. Sailer (bishop of Ratisbon), J. M. Fenneberg, J. H. C. von Wessenberg, J. Sperl, and J. Franz. Here deserve notice also the Moravians, Chr. Gregor, H. von Bruininigk, C. von Wobeser, G. H. Loskiel, J. J. Bossart, and others; the Würtembergers, C. F. Hartmann, W. L. Hosch, Chr. Ad. Daun, I. Hahn, Christ. G. Pregizer; in other German provinces, C. Liebich, Mat.th. Claudius, J. G. Schiner; and in the Reformed Church, H. Annoni, F. A. Krummacher, Jung-Stillilg, G. Menkein; the forerunner of the latest period is Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis).

Present German Hymnology. — *The* most modern period begins with the war of liberation (1813-15), and with the reawakening of a genuine religious life, which, after all, is slowly gaining the upper hand over that generally supposed dominating skepticism. Although in the modern productions the subjective greatly predominates, and they are still rather the work of art instead of popular songs, yet they do not quite attain to the force and condensed pregnancy of the classic hymns, so that there is very apparent in them a striving after objectivity, and “they have at least much sweetness, earnestness, and simplicity.” To the Romantic school of which Novalis was mentioned belong E. M. Arndt, M. von Schenkendorf, Fr. H. de la Motte Fouque, Louise Hensel, and Fr. Rückert. Of the other latest Lutheran hymnologists, whose most prominent representatives are Alb. Knapp, Vict. Strauss, J. C. Ph. Spitta, Chr. R. H. Puchta, C. A. Doring, deserve mention here: Chr. C. J. Asscelenfeld, J. F. Bahnmaier, Chr. G. Barth, J. Bentz, Ed. Eyth, F. A. Feldhoff, G.W. Fink, W. R. Freudenthal, C. von Grüneisen, W. Hey, Christ. G. Kern, J. Fr. Möller, Chr. F. H. Sachse, R. Stier, and Chr. H. Zeller; among the Reformed, J.P. Lange. Among the Moravians, the highest rank in this period belongs to J. B. von Albertini, one of their bishops, whose hymns, it is said, Schleiermacher asked to have read to him in his dying hours. C. B. Garve here deserves also high encomiums as a hymnologist. Among the Roman Catholics, whose prominent model is Spee, “with all the defects, no less than the beauties of style,” the Virgin serving as the most usual theme, M. von

Diepenbrock deserves especial mention. The extent of German hymnology may be inferred from the fact that the Evangelical Church alone has produced no less than 80,000 hymns. *SEE PSALMODY.* (J. H. W.)

2. English. — *The sacred poetry of England antedates by many generations its true hymnology. The author of *England's Antiphon* (George Macdonald) devotes an interesting chapter to the sacred lyrics of the 13th century, in which he gives specimens of genuine devotional song from the Percy Society publications, taken from MSS. in the British Museum, and ascribed to the reign of Edward I. "Mary at the Cross," "The Mourning Disciple," and the "Canonical Hours" of William of Shoreham furnish illustrations of most tender and scriptural verse, but are written in a dialect that needs frequent translation into modern English. The "Miracle Plays" were originally introduced by the Normans after the Conquest, and are written in Norman French, but in 1338 the pope permitted them to be translated into English. In this 14th century "the father of English poetry," Geoffrey Chaucer, gave a new voice to Christian song. It was full two hundred years from his advent before England produced another really great poet. But the age of Elizabeth, as if to make up for the barrenness of preceding centuries, is remarkable for the great number of its writers of sacred verse, as well as for its other literary prodigies. In a selection made and edited by Edward Farr, Esq., for the "Parker Society," consisting chiefly of devotional poems, he has given the names and brief biographical notices of no less than one hundred and thirty-seven different authors. Among the illustrious writers of sacred verses in this era we find queen Elizabeth, archbishop Parker, Edmund Spenser, George Gascoigne, Michael Drayton, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Philip Sidney, the Fletcher brothers Giles and Phineas, Dr. Donne, George Withers, Lord Bacon, the countess of Pembroke (sister of Sir Philip Sidney, and joint author with him of a version of the Psalms). Later still we find quaint old Philip Quarles, and Robert Southwell, the martyr monk, and their contemporary, sweet George Herbert. The great dramatists of that golden age have left here and there some outbursts of deep religious poetry and song, which at least show forth their obligations to the Bible and to the Christianity of the period. Haywood, Shirley, and Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Shakespeare, greatest of all, swell the hymnic chorus. But the dramatic gave way gradually to lyric poetry, and in the succeeding century we have an increasing number of devout poets, of whom the immortal Milton must always be the chief. Yet the singular fact remains that during all these ages*

there was “nothing like a People’s Hymn-book in England.” It is true that Christian worship was not without its temple songs. The Psalms of David, the *Te Deum*, the *Magnificat*, the *Glorias*, and the “Song of the Angels,” the “Ambrosian Hymn,” and some of the hymns of the Middle Ages, were chanted in the churches and cathedrals. But the so-called hymns of Spenser and Milton, and of minor writers, never entered into the Christian heart, life, and worship of British Christianity. Germany possessed a classic literature of this sort a century and a half before England had a hymnal. The rude version of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins, the smoother but’ insipid version of Brady and Tate which superseded it, and the more faithful Scottish version, which was the work of an English Puritan (Rouse), were sung by those whose stern revolt against Romanism led them to reject even what was really good and scriptural in her order of worship and liturgical books. The faults of the age are conspicuous in its poetry. It is intellectual, metaphysical, reflective, literary, full of “quips, and cranks, and wanton wiles;” cumbrous and overdone. With very few exceptions, there is nothing that people would care to sing, or could sing, for there is little of that emotional element which goes out in musical expression. The rhymes are rude and irregular, and the very art of the poetry seems to defy any attempts to set it to popular music. For “people cannot think and sing; they can only feel and sing.” Even Milton’s magnificent hymn, “On the Morning ‘of Christ’s Nativity,” is not adapted to common Sabbath worship; and there are few of George Herbert’s verses that survive in the songs of the sanctuary.

The period succeeding this revival of literature produced some Christian poets of note, and a few hymns, which survive their authors. Bunyan, and Baxter, and Jeremy Taylor all wrote verses, but their prose had more of poetry in it than their attempts at song. Among those whose good old hymns have stood the test of time, we must not forget the Rev. John Mason, of Water-Stratford, who died in 1694, author of “Come, dearest Lord, and feed thy sheep, on this sweet day of rest,” “*Now* from the altar of our hearts,” “What shall I render to my God?” etc. He published a volume of “*Spiritual Songs*” in 1686. Dr. Watts borrowed much from him. The good non-juror, bishop Ken (1637-1711), bequeathed to Christendom his famous “*Morning and Evening Hymns*,” and that matchless doxology, “Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.” Next comes Joseph Addison, whose elegant version of the nineteenth Psalm, commencing “The spacious firmament on high,” first appeared in the *Spectator* in 1712, at the close of

an article on “the right means to strengthen faith;” and about the same time was published his sweet paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm. Perhaps the most familiar of his hymns is that beginning “When all thy mercies, O my God.” *SEE ADDISON.*

The Reformation in England did not, as in Germany, grow by the spontaneous utterance of popular Christian song. That was left for the period of the great evangelical revival, which crowned the last century with its blessings. All that had been done before was as the broad and deep foundation-work, rude and unchiseled, but strong and essential to the majestic superstructure, which has risen upon it. The stream of Christian verse flowed on in its old channels until the publication of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts began a new era in English hymnology. The poet Montgomery says that “Dr. Watts may almost be called the inventor of hymns in our language, for he so far departed from all precedent that few of his compositions resemble those of his forerunners, while he so far established a precedent to all his successors that none have departed from it otherwise than according to the peculiar turn of mind of the writer, and the style of expressing Christian truth employed by the denomination to which he belonged.” Dissenter as he was, his Psalms and Hymns are so catholic in their spirit that many of them have been adopted by all denominations of Protestant Christians in their Sabbath worship. His *Divine Songs for Children*, and some of his Psalms, will live while the language endures. The defects of his style are obvious in many of his lyrics, which evince haste and negligence, faulty rhymes, and a prosing feebleness of expression. Yet he broke bravely through the mannerisms of preceding ages, and inaugurated a style of Christian hymnology which has alike enriched the evangelical poetry of the English tongue, and filled the temples and homes of the race that speaks that language with the most delightful praises of the Most High. His example was soon followed with success by others. But to him belongs the undisputed honor of being the great presenter of the immense chorus which he will forever lead in these glorious harmonies. His first hymn was given to the Church under circumstances of prophetic interest. He had complained to some official in the Independent church of Southampton, of which his father was a deacon. “that the hymnists of the day were sadly out of taste.” “Give us something better, young man,” was the reply. The young man did it, and the Church was invited to close its evening service with a new hymn, which commenced,

*“Behold the glories of the Lamb
Amidst His Father’s throne;
Prepare new honors for His name,
And songs before unknown.”*

From that time his ever-ready muse gave forth, in strains which are almost divine, “harmonies” for his Savior’s name! and “songs before unknown.” We need only indicate a few of the first lines: “When I survey the wondrous cross,” “My God, the spring of all my joys,” “When I can read my title clear,” “Come, ye that love the Lord,” “Come, let us join our cheerful songs,” “He dies, the friend of sinners dies.” His “Cradle Hymn” has taught countless mothers and children to sing of Jesus, and the angels and manger of Bethlehem: “Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber.” It was while looking out from his quiet chamber window at Southampton “upon the beautiful scenery of the harbor and river, and upon the green glades of the New Forest on its farther bank, that the idea suggested itself of the image of the heavenly Canaan,” which he soon embodied in those sweetest of all his verses, “There is a land of pure delight,” etc. *SEE WATTS.*

Only seven years before the first edition of Watts’s Hymns was given to the world, Philip Doddridge was born (1702); and before the death of his great predecessor, whose verses cheered his own dying hours in a distant land, he had published most of his sweetest hymns. Some of these are imperishable, for they have become part of the spiritual life of our Protestant Christianity. Many of them grew out of and were appended to his sermons, which he crystallized into such hymns as “Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love” (⁽³⁰⁰⁾Hebrews 4:9), “Jesus, I love thy charming name” (⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾1 Peter 5:7). His *Rise and Progress of Religions in the Soul*, which was written at the suggestion of Dr. Watts, and has been translated into the leading languages of Europe, and his *Family Expositor of the New Testament*, are monuments of his wonderful religious power and usefulness. But his hymns will be sung where his larger works are never heard of, and the world will never cease to echo the strains of such songs as “Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve!” “Hark, the glad sound, the Savior’s come!” “Grace, ‘tis a charming sound,” “Ye golden lamps of heaven, farewell!” *SEE DODDRIDGE.*

The most voluminous and successful of all English hymnists is the Rev. Charles Wesley. Over seven thousand psalms and hymns were written by his facile pen; and these were merely the by-play of a tireless itinerant evangelist, who, with his more celebrated brother John, himself also a

hymn-writer of no mean powers, preached the Gospel in the Old and New worlds, and gave a new style to Christian song. Their history, labors, persecutions, and triumphs are so well known that we need only mention their sainted names. John Wesley was the author or translator of several excellent hymns, and a capital-critic on hymnology. Of Charles Wesley's hymns a large number have taken a more than classic place in our poetic literature. The Christian Church will never cease to sing "Oh love divine, how sweet thou art!" "Jesus, lover of my soul," "Hark! the herald angels sing," "The earth with all its fullness owns," "Come, let us join our friends above." Dr. Watts said of Charles Wesley's inimitable rendering of the wrestling of Jacob at Peniel with the angel, "That single poem, 'Wrestling Jacob,' is worth all the verses which I have ever written." Doubtless much of the power of his hymns is attributable to the circumstances which gave rise to them, and to his facility in giving them the most fresh and vivid forms of expression. On the last projecting rock on Land's End, Cornwall, he stood and wrote that memorable hymn, "Lo! on a narrow neck of land," etc. His judgment hymn, commencing "Stand, the omnipotent decree," and two others, were written and published in 1756, just after the destruction of the city of Lisbon by an earthquake. "Glory to God, whose sovereign grace," was written for the Kingswood colliers, whose wonderful conversion, under the preaching of Whitefield and the Wesleys, was among the miracles of grace which attended their apostolic ministry. "Oh for a thousand tongues, to sing my great Redeemer's praise," commemorates his own spiritual birth, and was written in response to a German friend, the Moravian Peter Boehler, who said to him, when hesitating to confess publicly his conversion, "If you had a thousand tongues you should publish it with them all." Another powerful accessory of the Wesleyan hymns was the music with which many of them were accompanied. The great composer Handel set some of them to noble tunes, the MSS. of which are still preserved in the library of Cambridge University. But their greatest interest and success doubtless comes from their scriptural character, their immense range over all varieties of Christian experience, and their intimate relation to the great revival of religion of which these remarkable men and their compeers were the leading instruments. (A striking illustration of all these features is given in the hymn at once expository and experimental-of which we have space for only part of one stanza:

*“Tis mystery all-the Immortal dies!
Who can explore his strange design? * * *
Tis mercy all! let earth adore:
Let angel minds inquire no more.”*)

They were among the providential and gracious developments of a period whose influences, at the end of a hundred years, are yet only beginning to show forth the high praises of their Master. *SEE WESLEY, JOHN* and *SEE WESLEY, CHARLES*.

We have given more space to these celebrated hymn writers because of their historical relations to the new sera of devotional and sanctuary song which they introduced. From that period the number, variety, and excellence of the contributions to our Christian lyrics has increased, until the hymnology of the English ‘tongue is second only to that of Germany in volume and diversity. The literary’ character of these productions has been raised to a higher standard, and their scriptural and experimental value has been tested both by their denominational uses, and by that truly catholic spirit which has made them the property of the Church Universal. Inferior compositions have been gradually dropped, and replaced by others of undoubted merit, until the collections of the various Christian churches have overflowed with the very best hymns of all ages. The most remarkable evidence of these statements is found in the recent attention given to the history and literature of our sacred poetry by English and American writers, who have patiently explored the whole field, and have garnered its treasures in many admirable collections. Referring our readers to these accessible publications, we can devote the limited space left in this article only to brief notices of the principal contributors to the volume of divine praises since the Wesleys died.

Of their contemporaries, we can never forget Augustus Toplady (1741-1778), and his almost inspired hymn, “Rock of Ages, cleft for me,” and others of his excellent collection. *SEE TOPLADY*. Nor will the churches cease to sing the magnificent strains of his theological opponent, Thomas Olivers (1725-1799), in his judgment hymn, beginning “Come, immortal King of glory.” *SEE OLIVERS*. Along with them came William Williams (1717-1791), the Methodist “Watts of Wales,” singing “O’er the gloomy hills of darkness,” and “Guide me, oh thou great Jehovah;” and John Cennick, the devout Moravian, to whom we are indebted for two of the finest hymns ever written—“Rise, my soul, and stretch thy wings,” and “Lo! he comes with clouds descending.” The latter has been erroneously

attributed to Olivers, in whose judgment hymn are stanzas which it resembles in some respects, but a close inspection shows them to be entirely different productions. Cennick's hymn first appeared in a "Collection of Sacred Hymns" in 1752. *SEE CENNICK*. Next in order appeared the collection of hymns by the Rev. Benjamin Beddome (1717-1795), a Baptist clergyman, whom a London congregation could not tempt to leave his little flock at Bourton, where he labored fifty-two years, and preached and sang of Jesus. He was the author of "Did Christ o'er sinners weep?" "Faith, 'tis a precious grace," "Let party names no more," etc. Thomas Haweis, chaplain to the countess of Huntington, a theological author of note, and one of the founders of the London Missionary Society (1739-1820), was the author of over two hundred and fifty hymns, some of which are favorites still; but to the countess herself, the patron and friend of Whitefield, and Berridge, and Romaine, we are indebted for such undying-hymns as "Oh! when my righteous judge shall come," "We soon shall hear the midnight cry." She died in 1791, at the age of eighty-four, having devoted her fortune and life to the cause of Christ. Some of the sweetest hymns for the Church and the home which this age produced were written by the daughter of a Baptist clergyman at Broughton, Miss Anne Steele (1716-1778). She withheld her name from her poems, but the English-speaking Christian world still sings from its myriad hearts and tongues, "Father, whatever of earthly bliss," "Jesus, my Lord, in thy dear name unite All things my heart calls great, or good, or sweet," etc.; "Come, ye that love the Savior's name;" and some of her sacramental hymns are fine specimens of Christian song.

The next hymnbook of importance that appeared in Great Britain was the *Olney Hymns*, which is the joint production of those gifted and illustrious men, so different in their characters and lives, and yet so united in the love of Christ-the Rev. John Newton and William Cowper. To this book Newton furnished two hundred and eighty-six hymns, and Cowper sixty-two. It was published first in 1779, before Cowper's reputation as a poet was made. The hymns were written between 1767 and 1779, and doubtless would have contained more of Cowper's contributions but for a return of his insanity. The history of these noble coworkers for Christ is too well known to require more than this allusion. Their deep personal experiences are written in many of their delightful verses, and reflected in the Christian life of succeeding generations. Who that remembers Newton's marvelous conversion, and his subsequent life of piety and distinguished usefulness,

until his death at the age of eighty-two (1807), will not appreciate the fervor with which he sang,

*“Amazing grace! how sweet the sound
That saved a wretch like me;”*

or

*“How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer’s ear;”*

or

*“Sometimes a light surprises
The Christian while he sings;”*

or

*“Day of judgment, day of wonders,
Hark! the trumpet’s awful sound?”*

SEE NEWTON, JOHN. And the English language itself must die before Cowper’s plaintive music ceases to vibrate through believers’ souls in those almost perfect hymns in which he wrote out and yet veiled the strange, sweet, and attractive experiences of his own religious life: “To Jesus, the crown of my hope,” “Far from the world, O Lord, I flee,” “Oh! for a closer walk with God,” “There is a fountain filled with blood,” “God moves in a mysterious way.” It has been well said by Dr. Cheever that “if Cowper had never given to the Church on earth but a single score of those exquisite breathings of a pious heart and creations of his own genius, it had been a bequest worth a life of suffering to accomplish.” *SEE COWPER.* 5

It was long before another bard arose to take up the lyre, which this gentle singer laid down. A few strains come floating through the succeeding years, such as Robinson’s “Come, thou fount of every blessing,” and “Jesus, and can it ever be, a mortal man ashamed of thee!” written in 1774 by Thomas Green of Ware, then a precocious boy of only ten years! Of female hymnists we have at this period Mrs. Barbauld (1743-1825) and Jane Taylor, both of whom left some sweet hymns for the sanctuary. The former will be best remembered by her beautiful lines on the death of a believer “Sweet is the scene when Christians die;” the latter by her *Hymns for Infant Minds*. To them we must add Miss Hannah More (1744-1833), whose practical Christian prose writings possess a masculine vigor and Biblical earnestness, and whose poetry, although not of the highest order,

yet often overflows with melody and tender feeling. Her Christmas hymn, "Oh! how wondrous is the story of our Redeemer's birth," is a favorable specimen. Among the minor poets of this period we mention Dr. John Ryland, born in, 1753, author of "In all my Lord's appointed ways," "Lord, teach a little child to pray," "Sovereign Ruler of the skies," "O Lord, I would delight in thee;" and the Rev. John Logan, who died in 1788, at the age of forty, a Scottish preacher famed for his eloquence, who wrote such hymns as "Where high the heavenly temple stands," "Oh, city of the Lord, begin the universal song," "Oh God of Bethel! by whose hand thy people still are fed," "The hour of my departure's come," etc. To the poet of the poor, Rev. George Crabbe, we are indebted for those delightful lines, "Pilgrim, burdened with thy sin, come the way to Zion's gate;" and to Rev. Samuel Medley, a Baptist minister of Liverpool (1738-1799), for the stirring lyrics, "Mortals, awake! with angels join," and "Awake, my soul, in joyful lays." The name of Henry Kirke White (1785-1808) will ever live in the splendid hymn in which he sang the story of the birth of the Redeemer and of his own conversion, "When marshaled on the mighty plain." From his pen also flowed those characteristic hymns beginning "The Lord our God is full of might," "O Lord, another day is flown," "Through sorrow's night and danger's path." *SEE HENRY K. WHITE*. The coronation hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," was written by the Rev. Edward Perronet, an English dissenting clergyman, who died at Canterbury in 1792, exclaiming, "Glory to God in the height of his divinity, glory to God in the depth of his humanity, glory to God in his all-sufficiency, and into his hands I commend my spirit!" The grand tune which has always been associated with these lines was composed for them by a Mr. Shrubsole, a friend of the author, and organist at the chapel of Spa Fields, London, 1784-1806. We can only allude in a sentence to the well-known occasional hymns of the great poets, Pope and Dryden, Wordsworth, Campbell, Moore, Southey, and some of their associates.

But the Church Universal owes a greater debt to James Montgomery (1771-1854). No man since the days of Cowper has added so many admirable versions of the Psalms and noble hymns to the English language as this gifted Moravian, whose prolific muse never ceased to lavish its treasures until, at fourscore years, he went up higher. His paraphrase of the seventy-second Psalm, commencing "Hail to the Lord's anointed," is a classic full of the old Hebrew fire and of the best modern missionary spirit. His "Thrice holy" (^{238B} Isaiah 6:3), beginning "Holy, holy, holy Lord,"

seems to blend the voices of “saints and seraphim” in one glorious prophetic anthem. Of his other hymns we need only name the Hallelujah, “Hark! the song of Jubilee;” the Christmas choruses, “Angels from the realms of glory,” and “Hail to the Lord’s anointed;” the song of heaven, “Forever with the Lord;” the hymn on the death of an aged minister, “Servant of God, well done,” written in memory of his friend, Rev. Thomas Taylor; and that on the decease of the Rev. John Owen, secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, “Go to the grave in all thy glorious prime.” His verses, “Prayer is the soul’s sincere desire,” “Oh! where shall rest be found?” “What are these in bright array?” are only a few of the priceless gems which he has set in the crown of our Christian praises. *SEE MONTGOMERY, JAMES.*

In this later period of English hymnology many and very sweet have been the singers and their sacred songs. There is Henry F. Lyte, the rector of Brixham (1793-1847), author of “Jesus, I my cross have taken,” and of those delightful “hymns from beneath the cloud,” “My spirit on thy care, blest Savior, I recline.” and he last that he ever wrote, “Abide with me, fast falls the eventide.” It was of his *Tales in Verse* that professor Wilson, in the “Noctes Ambrosianae,” wrote, “Now that is the right kind of religious poetry. He ought to give us another volume.” That volume soon came, entitled *Poems, chiefly religious*. The female hymnists increase in number and in power in this period. Mrs. Felicia Iemrans, Caroline Bowles, and others of great repute, lead the way with their sweet music. We have learned to sing “Nearer, my God, to thee,” from Miss Sarah F. Adams, who died in 1849 in her old home, Dorsetshire; and Charlotte Elliott, of Torquay, struck a new chord for all the world when she wrote, in 1836, those inimitable verses, “Just as I am, without one plea.” She is the author of several volumes, and furnished one hundred and seventeen hymns to *The Invalid’s Hymnbook*, the last edition of which she supervised. Mrs. Barret Browning, Mrs. Charles, of “Schonberg Cotta” fame, Miss Adelaide Proctor, Mary Howitt, and the Bronte sisters — Charlotte, Emily, and Anne, Isabella Craig, and Mrs. Craik, formerly Miss Mulock, author of *John Halifax, Gentleman*, are among the later chief singers of their sex whose verses have enriched our hymnals. Sir John Bowring, born in 1792, author of “In the cross of Christ I glory,” “Watchman, tell us of the night;” the dean of St. Paul’s, Dr. Henry Hart Milman, archbishop Trench, John Keble, with his *Christian Year*, the poet leader of the Anglican Catholic movement in the English establishment, Alexander Knox, Allan

Cunningham, Robert Pollok, bishop Heber with his glorious advent, and judgment, and missionary hymns, Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet, canon Wordsworth, and the late dean Alford, of Westminster Abbey, Faber, the devout Romish hymnist, and Dr. John H. Newman, once of Oxford and now of Rome, Robert Murray M'Cheyne, and John R. M'Duff, the Scottish preachers, with Horatius Bonar, of Kelso, author of the delightful *Hymns of Faith and Hope*, many of which are already familiar as household words, and Edward H. Bickersteth, whose poem "Yesterday, to-day, and forever" is "one of the most remarkable of the age" all these, and more whom we cannot even name, swell the majestic volume of our most recent British sacred song. It is not any exaggeration to say that many of their hymns will compare favorably with the best that preceded them, and that some of them can never die while their mother tongue is the vehicle of Christian praise.

3. *American Poetry* was not cultivated in our heroic age for its own sake, and the singers were few and far between. The churches mostly used the psalms and hymns which they brought with them from the Old World until after the Revolutionary War. President Davies (1724-1761) left some poems, among which his lines on the birth of an infant, and the noble hymn commencing "Great God of wonders! all thy ways," are most familiar. The celebrated Dr. Timothy Dwight, at the request of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, revised the psalms of Dr. Watts, and added over twenty of his own versifications to the volume. Of all that he wrote, however, none have such beauty and vitality, as his rendering of Psalm 119, "How precious is the Book divine!" Psalm 137, "I love thy kingdom, Lord;" and of Psalm 150, "In Zion's sacred gates." These are universal favorites. In his preface to that admirable volume, *Christ in Song*, Dr. Philip Schaff says, "The Lyra Sacra of America is well represented. Although only about thirty years old, it is far richer than our British friends are aware of." Abundant proof of its richness is furnished in the *Hymns of Immanuel*, which the author has gathered into this remarkable collection of Christological poetry, a number of which were furnished by their authors for this work. It is scarcely necessary in these pages to quote at any length those hymns which have been adopted into nearly all of the recent books of praise for the various denominations. We shall therefore only refer to the most noted authors, and give parts of some of the hymns which seem destined to secure a permanent place in our American hymnals. The earlier poets — Percival, Pierpont, Henry Ware, Jr., Richard H. Dana,

Washington Alston, John Neal, N. P. Willis, Brainard, J.W. Eastburn, Carlos Wilcox, Hillhouse, with Bryant, Longfellow, Tuckerman, and Whittier, who are still living-have all made occasional contributions to the stock of popular hymns, chiefly of the Unitarian and 'Universalist bodies. The clergy of the American churches have probably been the most fertile contributors to this department of sanctuary worship during this period.

The late bishop Doane (q.v.), of New Jersey, wrote some very beautiful hymns, which long ago passed beyond the body of which he was a champion into the hymnals of other churches. His evening hymn is worthy of comparison even with that of good bishop Ken: 'Softly now the light of day.'" There is a trumpet-like music in his majestic lines on the Banner of the Cross, which reminds us of Heber and Milman: "Fling out the banner! let it float," etc. The same Church has also given us Dr. W. A. Muhlenbergh's well-known hymn, "I would not live alway," and other delightful verses from his now patriarchal muse. Another bishop, Dr. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, among his fine Christian ballads and poems, has rendered into verse, with more spirit and power than any other English writer, those words of Christ, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock."

To the late Dr. James W. Alexander (q.v.) we owe the best version in our language of Gerhardt's imperishable hymn, "Oh sacred head! now wounded." One of the most chaste and fervid of our hymn-writers was the late Dr. George W. Bethune (q.v.), author of "It is not death to die," "Oh Jesus, when I think of thee, thy manger, cross, and crown," and many other well-known lyrics. The Rev. Dr. Alexander R. Thompson, of the Reformed Church, New York, has published some admirable original hymns for Christmas and Easter, and very spirited, translations from ancient and mediaeval hymns. We specify only his version of the "Aurora coelum purpurit," which, with others from his pen, are given in full in Schaff's *Christ in Song*. Quite in another line, but not less happy, is a new hymn by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, a popular clergyman of the same Church in New York City. It is the story of Bartimaeus, so sweetly told that we regret we have not space for at least a part of it. There are no more delightful hymns in the language than those of the Rev. Ray Palmer, D.D., a Congregational clergyman, author of *Hymns of my holy Hours*, *Hymns and sacred Pieces*, and many sacred poems. That "selectest and most perfect of our modern hymns," "My faith looks up to thee," etc., was composed in 1830. It has been translated into Arabic, Tamil, Tahitian, the Mahratta, and other languages, and seems destined to follow the Cross

over the whole world. Among his other hymns are those beginning "Jesus, these eyes have never seen that radiant form of thine;" "Alone with thee! alone with thee! O friend divine," "O Jesus! sweet the tears I shed," "Jesus! thou joy of loving hearts," etc.

The Rev. Russell S. Cook (q.v.) wrote and sent to Miss Elliott, the author of "Just as I am, without one plea," a counterpart to her own sweet hymn, so beautiful and complete that it seems almost as if the same pen had given them both to the world: "Just as thou art! without one trace," etc. It has since been incorporated with Sir Roundell Palmer's *Book of Praise* and several American hymnbooks.

It would be inexcusable, in a summary like this, to omit a hearty tribute of acknowledgment to the female hymn-writers of our country. First among these, Mrs. Sigourney, who may be called the Hannah More of America, has an established place among these honored authors, although most of her poetry was written in blank verse, or in meter not adapted to Church music. Yet her anniversary hymns for Sunday-schools and missionary meetings have been very popular. Her verses are full of a tender, devotional spirit, and expressed in chaste and beautiful language. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in some of her *Religious Poems*, published in 1867, has caught the spirit of the inspired word, and rendered its utterances into verse with singular felicity. We may instance the fine hymns commencing "When winds are raging in the upper ocean," "Life's mystery deep, restless as the ocean," "That mystic word of thine. O sovereign Lord," and the one entitled "Still, still with thee." The Cary sisters, Phoebe and Alice, have added a few graceful and touching hymns to our *Lyra Americana*, and have been particularly successful in their writing for the young. That favorite and delightful hymn (which reminds us of Cowper's sensitive strains), "I love to steal a while away from every cumbering care," was written by Mrs. Phoebe H. Brown after being interrupted while at prayer. On giving up her only son to preach Christ to the heathen, she wrote that sweet missionary hymn beginning

*"Go messenger of love, and bear
Upon thy gentle wing
The song which seraphs love to hear,
And angels joy to sing."*

Many a revival of religion has been sought and promoted in the use of her familiar strains,

*“O Lord, Thy work revive
In Zion’s gloomy hour.”*

These are but specimens of a few of our best female hymnists. Many-others we cannot even mention, to whom the whole Church owes a debt of gratitude for “psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,” in which they have taught her to “make melody unto the Lord.” For additional literature, *SEE PSALMODY*. (W. J. R. T.)

Hypapante

SEE CANDLEMAS.

Hypatia of Alexandria

born in the latter half of the 4th century, was the daughter of Theon the younger, by whom she was instructed in mathematics and philosophy, and professed, like her father, the old heathen doctrines, of which she was one of the most eloquent advocates. So eminent did she become in the ancient philosophy that, in the early part of the 5th century, she publicly lectured on Aristotle and Plato, both at Athens and Alexandria, with immense success. Socrates (Wells’s translation, 1709, of the Latin of Valesius) thus narrates her history: “There was a woman at Alexandria by name Hypatia. She was daughter to Theon the philosopher. She had arrived to so eminent a degree of learning that she excelled all the philosophers of her own times, and succeeded in that Platonic school derived from Plotinus, and expounded all the precepts of philosophy to those who would hear her. Wherefore all persons who were studious about philosophy flocked to her from all parts. By reason of that eminent confidence and readiness of expression wherewith she had accomplished herself by her learning, she frequently addressed even the magistrates with a singular modesty. Nor was she ashamed of appearing in a public assembly of men, for all persons revered and admired her for her eximious modesty. Envy armed itself against this woman at that time; for because she had frequent conferences with Orestes [the prefect of Alexandria], for this reason a calumny was framed against her among the Christian populace, as if she hindered Orestes from coming to a reconciliation with the bishop. Certain persons therefore, of fierce and over hot minds, who were headed by one Peter, a reader, conspired against the woman, and observed her returning home from some place; and, having pulled her out of her chariot, they dragged her to the church named Caesareum, where they stripped her and murdered

her. And when they had torn her piecemeal, they carried all her members to a place called Cinaron, and consumed them with fire. This fact brought no small disgrace upon Cyrillus and the Alexandrian Church” (*Hist. Eccles.* bk. 7:c. 15). The death of Hypatia occurred in 415. Suidas (Ὑπατία), 3:533, puts the guilt of Hypatia’s death more directly upon Cyril; but his account is by the best authorities, Gibbon of course excepted, not thought to be trustworthy (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:943). There is a spurious epistle attributed to Hypatia, addressed to Cyril, in favor of Nestorius (Baluze, *Concilia*, 1, 216). Toland wrote a sketch of Hypatia (Lond. 1730, 8vo), and Kingsley has recently made her story the subject of a novel (“*Hypatia*”). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 415; Wernsdorf, *Diss. Acad. de Hypatia* (1747); *English Cyclopaedia; Monage, Hist. ul. Philosoph.* p. 52; Munich, *Hypatia*, in his *Vermischt. Schriften* (Ludwigsb. 1828), vol. 1; Schaff, *Ch. History*, 2, 67; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 4, 502 sq.

Hypatius of Gangra

a distinguished member of the Council of Nice, of whose life but little is known, was stoned to death March 31, 327, in a pass near Gangra, by a gang of Novatian ruffians, in all probability on account of the opposition which he had manifested towards the Novatians (q.v.) at the council. See Stanley, *History of the Eastern Church*, p. 266.

Hyperbole

Any one who carefully examines the Bible must be surprised at the very few hyperbolic expressions, which it contains, considering that it is an Oriental book. In Eastern Asia the tone of composition is pitched so high as to be scarcely intelligible to the sober intellect of Europe, while in Western Asia a medium seems, to have been struck between the ultra extravagance of the far East and the frigid exactness of the far West. But, even regarded as a book of Western Asia, the Bible is, as compared with almost any other Western Asiatic book, so singularly free from hyperbolic expressions as might well excite our surprise, did not our knowledge of its divine origin permit us to suppose that even the style and mode of expression of the writers were so far controlled as to exclude from their writings what, in other ages and countries, might excite pain and offence, and prove an obstacle to the reception of divine truth. **SEE INSPIRATION.** Nor is it to be said that the usage of hyperbole is of modern growth. We

find it in the oldest Eastern writings which now exist; and the earlier Rabbinical writings attest that in times approaching near to those in which the writers of the New Testament flourished, the Jewish imagination had run riot in this direction, and has left hyperboles as frequent and outrageous as any which Persia or India can produce. *SEE TALMUD.*

The strongest hyperbole in all Scripture is that with which the Gospel of John concludes: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain all the books that should be written." This has so much pained many commentators that they have been disposed to regard it as an unauthorized addition to the sacred text, and to reject it accordingly a process always dangerous, and not to be adopted but on such overwhelming authority of collated manuscripts as does not exist in the present case. Nor is it necessary, for as a hyperbole it may be illustrated by many examples in sacred and profane authors. In ^{<4153>}Numbers 13:33, the spies who had returned from searching the land of Canaan say that they saw giants there of such a prodigious size that they were in their own a sight but as grasshoppers. In ^{<4153>}Deuteronomy 1:28, cities with high walls about them are said to be "walled up to heaven." In ^{<2007>}Daniel 4:7, mention is made of a tree whereof "the height reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof unto the end of all the earth" and the author of Ecclesiasticus (47:15), speaking of Solomon's wisdom, says, "Thy soul covered the whole earth, and thou filledst it with parables." In Josephus (*Ant.* 14:22) God is mentioned as promising to Jacob that he would give the land of Canaan to him and his seed; and then it is added, "they shall fill the whole sea and land which the sun shines upon." Wetstein, in his note on the text in John, and Basnage, in his *Histoire des Juifs* (3, 1-9; 5, 7), have cited from the ancient Rabbinical writers such passages as the following: "If all the seas were ink, and every reed was a pen, and the whole heaven and earth were parchment, and all the sons of men were writers, they would not be sufficient to write all the lessons which Jochanan composed" and concerning one Eliezer, it is said that "if the heavens were parchment, and all the sons of men writers, and all the trees of the forest pens, they would not be sufficient for writing all the wisdom which he was possessed of." Homer, who, if not born in Asia Minor, had undoubtedly lived there, has sometimes followed the hyperbolic manner of speaking which prevailed so much in the East: thus, in the *Iliad* (20, 246,247), he makes Aeneas say to Achilles, "Let us Cave done with reproaching one another, for we may

throw out so many reproachful words on one another that a ship of a hundred oars would not be able to carry the load.” Few instances of this are to be found in Occidental writers; yet it is observed that Cicero (^{<small>5110</small>}*Philippians* 2:44) has “Praesertim quum illi eam gloriam consecuti sint, quae vix caelo capi posse videatur,” and that Livy (7, 25) says, “Hae vires populi Romani, quas vix terrarum capit orbis.” See bishop Pearce’s *Commentary on the four Evangelists*, 1777, etc. Modern examples of equal hyperbole may be found cited in almost any work on rhetoric.

Hypercalvinism

SEE CALVINISM; SEE ULTRA-CALVINISM.

Hyperdulia

(ὕπερ, *above*; δουλία, *sworship, service*), the worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Church. The Romanists speak of three kinds of adoration, namely, *latria*, *hyperdulia*, and *dulia*. “The adoration of *latria*,” they say, “is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his supremacy; *hyperdulia* is worship paid to the Virgin on account of what the Papists call the maternity of God, and other eminent gifts, and her super eminent sanctity; *dulia* is worship paid to saints on account of their sanctity.” These distinctions are too refined for the common people; and it is greatly to be feared that multitudes worship the Virgin *instead* of God, or take her as a mediator *instead* of Christ. The prayer books of the Roman Church are not free from the charge of encouraging a belief in the mediation of Mary. A book in, common use, called *The Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary*, which is published with an indult of pope Pins in favor of its use, contains the following passages: “Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great so ever your crimes may be, come and behold. Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. *Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the lost engagings invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost*, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate.” Again (p. 256): “Rejoice, O most glorious Virgin, such is thy favor with God, such the power of thy intercession, that the whole treasury of heaven is open to thee and at thy disposal. When thou art pleased to intercede in favor of a sinner his case is in sure hands; there is no danger of refusal on the part of Heaven when thy mediation appears in his behalf.” “Thou art the great mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand

of the blessed Trinity.” Another book in common use *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God*, prepared by Liguori (q.v.), is full of similar passages. We extract only the following prayer: “holy Virgin! deign to manifest your generosity towards me, a miserable sinner. If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? No, I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son, justly irritated, since one word from you will appease him. I shall only fear myself, and that, forgetting to invoke you, I may be lost. But this will not be the case. I promise you today to recur to you in all my wants, and that, curing life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul. Amen.” See Cumming and French, *Protestant Discussion* (London, 1856, 12mo), p. 288 sq.; Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca, Venerat. Sanct.* § 34-39; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanisms*, bk. 4. ch. 4. **SEE MARIOLATRY.**

Hyperius, Andrew Gerhard

an eminent Protestant theologian of the 16th century, was born at Ypres, Belgium, May 16, 1511. His family name was *Gerhard*, but he assumed the name *Hyperius* from his birthplace. His father directed his first studies, after which Hyperius attended the University of Paris during the years 1528-35. After completing his studies he made a short stay at Louvain, then traveled through the Netherlands and visited Germany. On his return he was deprived of a benefice which had been obtained for him, on the ground that he had embraced the doctrine of the Reformation. He went to England, where he remained four years with the son of William Mountjov, a friend of Erasmus, studying at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The persecutions directed against the Protestants after Cromwell's death compelled him, in 1541, to leave England, and he purposed going to Strasburg, attracted by the reputation of Bucer; but his friend Geldenhauer, professor of theology at Marburg, persuaded him to remain in the latter city, and he succeeded his friend in 1542 as professor. He died at Marburg Feb. 1, 1564. To profound and extensive learning Hyperius joined great intellectual powers, and a remarkably mild, yet straightforward disposition. Greatly in advance of his times as a scholar, he held deep and correct views on the system with which theological researches and studies should be conducted in striking contrast with the arbitrary proceedings of the exegetes of the 16th century, as well as the scholastic theories of contemporary theologians. His views have become the basis of modern scientific theology. He had also a clearer and more practical notion of

preaching than the other preachers of his time, who, instead of expounding Christian doctrines to their hearers in view of edifying them, brought abstract discussions or irritating controversies into the pulpit. Hyperius wrote *Def armandis Concionibus sacris, seu de interpretatione Scripturarum populari, Libri 2* (Dort, 1555, 8vo; latest ed., augmented, and containing a biography of the author, Halle, 1781, 8vo). It is the first complete work on Homiletics, and one of the best: — *De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, Lib. iv* (Basle, 1556, 8vo; often reprinted): this is a work of great merit, which may have had the most favorable effect on theological study, had not the largeness of views and the Zuinglian opinion of the author in regard to the Eucharist rendered it suspicious in the eyes of the orthodox Lutheran party. Laurentius Villavincencius, an Augustinian monk of Xeres, in Andalusia, made great use of this as well as of the preceding work, or, rather, caused them to be reprinted almost word for word, as his own production, with the exception of passages too favorable to Protestantism, in a work he published at Antwerp in 1565, and the plagiarism was not detected until half a century later: — *Elementa Christianae religionis* (Basle, 1563, 8vo): — *Topica theologica* (Wittemb. 1565, 8vo; Basle, 1573, 8vo): — *Methodi Theologice, sive praecipuorum Christianae religionis locorum communium, Libri 3* (Basle, 1566, 1568, 8vo). This work was to have had three more parts, but it was left incomplete: — *Opuuscula Theologica varsia* (Basle, 1570, 2 vols. 8vo). His exegetical works are among the most valuable productions in that department by the Reformers, and were frequently used by Bloomfield in his notes on the New Testament. His most important work in this department, a *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (*Comment. in Epistolas ad Timothy, Titus, et Philem.* 1582; *Comment. in Pauli Epistolas*, 1583; *Comment. in Epist. ad Hebraeos*, 1585), was published after his death by Mylius (Zurich, 1582-8, 4 vols. folio), and under the care of J. Andreas Schmidt (Helmstadt, 1704, 8vo). In it “Hyperius pursues the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, examining the meaning of the words, carefully tracing the connection of the passage, taking note of the analogy of Scripture, and so arriving at the true sense of the place. Not until he has thus done justice to the exegesis does he proceed to the dogmatical or practical use of the passage. He also frequently gives citations from the fathers to show the agreement of his conclusions with the understanding of the ancient Church” (Kitto). A collection of small pamphlets had been previously published separately; among them, *De Sacrae Scripturae Lectione et Meditatione* (Basle, 1581,

8vo). See Boissard, *Icones Virorum Illustrium*, pars 3; Melch. Adam, *Vifte Germanorum Theologorum*; Bayle, *Dict. flist.*; . M. Schrockh, *Lebensbesch. beriihnt. Gelelhrten*, vol. 1, and *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.*: vol. 5; Hoefler, *Novus. Eiog. Ges.* 25, 71; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1857, p. 271 sq.; *Ch. Monthly*, June, 1866; M'Crie, *Reform. in Spain*, p. 382; Haucl, *Jethro. d. Theol.* 2, 255. (J. H. W.)

Hypocrisy

(ὕπόκρισις; but in ⁵¹⁸²James 5:12, two words, ὑπὸ κρίσιν, as the A.V. justly) is the name for the successful or unsuccessful endeavor of a person to impart to others, by the expression of his features or, gestures, by his outward actions, and, in fine, by his whole appearance, a favorable opinion of his principles, his good intentions, love, unselfishness, truthfulness, and conscientiousness while in reality these qualities are wanting in him. It is, therefore, a peculiar kind of untruthfulness, which has its definite aims and means. It is precisely because these aims refer to the moral qualifications of the subject, because he speaks and acts as if an honest man, that hypocrisy has found room and opportunity in social life, in commerce and industry, in politics, and, above all, in the field of revealed religion. This may appear paradoxical, because this as well as the religion of the old covenant, places man before the face of an almighty Being who sees the heart, and who penetrates human thought even from its very beginning; who perceives clearly its development and ripening; so that the hypocrite, even if he should succeed in deceiving men, can certainly have no benefit from his acts in the end. On the other hand, because religion consists not entirely in the performance of outward actions, but makes the worth of the person dependent on the righteous state of his heart and mind, it creates the greater desire in him to acquire the reputation of really having these qualities; and because these qualities, though they are of a purely spiritual nature, yet can only be manifested by outward acts, which, since they are material, strike the eye of the world, and may be enacted without the possession of the genuine-mental and moral state, it results that there is here such a wide field for hypocritical actions. We infer, therefore, from what we have said, that there is less opportunity for hypocrisy in heathenism than in Judaism; in Catholicism than in Protestantism. For wherever the principal weight is laid on the outward action, on the *opus operatum*, there one experiences far less the inclination to cover the inconsistency of the inner world by the outer world; while, on the other hand, where every thing depends on the inward state, and where, with the

mere enactment of outward ceremony, God and conscience cannot be appeased, there originates in the unregenerate man the temptation to do what may give him at least the semblance of a quality which he really does not possess. When a frivolous, reckless fellow kneels at the Catholic altar to perform by feature and gesture his devotions, no one would think of accusing him of hypocrisy; while a Protestant, in a similar case, could not escape this judgment. Still, this does not fully solve the paradox how the hypocrite can hope to carry on his false game, while he knows very well that before the God of truth no one can pass for righteous who possesses simply the semblance of righteousness, but does not connect therewith the belief in its power. It must here be remembered that, in the one case, the person endeavors to acquire for himself, in the community to which he belongs, the epithet of a pious man; and, if he is satisfied herewith, then, in regard to his future state, in view of that day which will bring every thing to light, he is either thoughtless and careless, or else totally unbelieving. When his earthly scene has ended, the curtain drops for him, and all is over. But in another case the person is animated by the hope that, in virtue of those outward acts by which he thinks to do good, his praying, almsgiving, etc., he may prevail before God; this is the true Phariseism, which dims the faculty of knowing God, and not only deceives men, but counterfeits truth itself, and thereby cheats itself worst of all. A special means of detecting the real hypocrite is his unmerciful judgment over others. This has its ground in the fact that by such expressions he not only seeks to confirm his own standing, but it is also a self-deceit into which he falls; the more he finds to blame in others, the more confident he grows of his own worth, and the more easily he appeases his conscience in regard to the inconsistency of his moral state with his actions and the incongruity of his secret with his open ways. Ethics finds among the different gradations of sill a certain state of hypocrisy which is far worse than absolute subjection to sin, inasmuch as in the latter state there may exist at least the earnest desire in the individual to rid himself of his faults, although he no longer possesses the power to do so; the hypocrite, on the other hand, is quite contented with himself, and has no desire whatever to repent of the sin so deeply lodged in his heart, but merely endeavors to hide it from God and men, in order to be able to gratify his sinful inclinations the more securely under the cover of an assumed sanctity. In certain respects the frivolous sinner is far better than the hypocrite, inasmuch as the former has at least no desire to deceive any one about his condition, and does not present himself to the world otherwise than he really is. This formal truthfulness in

the open sinner, however, is counterbalanced by the fact that the hypocrite recognizes at least a divine law and judgment; he is still alive to the consciousness of the incongruity of his state of mind and heart with this divine law; but yet hypocrisy, as a permanent untruthfulness, as a systematic deceit, as a life in dissimulation, must gradually annihilate all sense of its own condition. Thus, in the issue, publicans and harlots are nearer to the kingdom of heaven than Pharisees. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:643 sq. *SEE HYPOCRITE.*

Hypocrite

(Greek ὑποκριτής) signifies one who *feigns* to be what he is not; who puts on a false person, like actors in tragedies and comedies. It is generally applied to those who assume appearances of a virtue without possessing it in reality. Our Savior accused the Pharisees of hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is vain and foolish, and, though intended to cheat others, is, in truth, deceiving ourselves. No man would flatter or dissemble if he thought that he was seen and discovered. All his hypocrisy, however, is open to the eye of God, from whom nothing can be hid. The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he seeth all his doings; there is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves. Whoever dissembles, and seems to be what he is not, thinks that he ought to possess such a quality as he pretends to; for to counterfeit and dissemble is to assume the appearance of some real excellence. But it is best for a man to be in reality what he would seem to be. It is difficult to personate and act a false part long, because, where truth does not exist, nature will endeavor to return, and make a discovery. Truth carries its own light and evidence with it, and not only commends us to every man's conscience, but to God, the searcher of our hearts. Hence sincerity is the truest wisdom, for integrity has many advantages over all the artful ways of dissimulation and deceit. On the contrary, a dissembler must be always upon his guard, lest he contradict his own pretences; he acts an unnatural part, and puts a continual force and restraint upon himself. Truth always lies uppermost, and will be apt to make its appearance; but he who acts sincerely has an easy task, and needs not invent pretences before, or excuses after, for what he says or does. Insincerity is difficult to manage; for a liar will be apt to contradict at one time what he said at another. Truth is always consistent with itself, needs nothing to assist it, and is always near at hand; but a lie is troublesome; it sets a man's invention upon the rack, and is frequently the occasion of many more. Truth and sincerity in our words and actions will carry us

through the world, when all the arts of cunning and deceit shall fail and deceive us. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, plainness and sincerity will appear the most perfect beauty; the craftiness of men, who lie in wait to deceive, will be stripped of all its colors; all specious pretences, all the methods of deceit, will then be disclosed before men and angels, and no artifice to conceal the deformity of iniquity can there take place. Then the ill-designing men of this world shall with shame be convinced that the upright simplicity, which they despised, was the truest wisdom, and that those dissembling and dishonest arts which they so highly esteemed were in reality the greatest folly.

Hypocrites have been divided into four sorts:

1. The *worldly* hypocrite, who makes a profession of religion, and pretends to be religious merely from worldly considerations (~~4125~~ Matthew 23:5);
2. The *legal* hypocrite, who relinquishes his vicious practices in order thereby to merit heaven, while at the same time he has no real love to God (~~4108~~ Romans 10:3);
3. The *evangelical* hypocrite, whose religion is nothing more than a bare conviction of sin; who rejoices under the idea that Christ died for him, and yet has no desire to live a holy life (~~4031~~ Matthew 13:20; ~~4022~~ 2 Peter 2:20);
4. The *enthusiastic* hypocrite, who has an imaginary sight of his sin and of Christ; talks of remarkable impulses and high feelings; and thinks himself very wise and good while he lives in the most scandalous practices (~~4139~~ Matthew 13:39; ~~4714~~ 2 Corinthians 11:14). — Robinson, *Theol. Dictionary*; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*; Warner, *System of Morality*, 3, 323; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, 2, 253; Gilfillan, *Essays on Hypocrisy* (1825); Ellis, *Self Deceiver discovered* (1731); Edwards, *Works* (see Index). **SEE HYPOCRISY.**

Hyponoia

(*ὑπόνοια*, *under sense*), a term applied to the *hidden meaning* supposed by some to underlie the language of Scripture. If by this is understood a signification totally different from the plain statements, the theory is to be condemned as savoring of mysticism (q.v.); but if it is only intended to designate the collateral and ulterior application of language which has likewise a more obvious or literal import, it may be received to a limited degree. **SEE DOUBLE SENSE.** The Scriptures themselves authorize such

a view of the deeper significance of Holy Writ, especially of prophecies which necessarily await their fulfillment in order to their complete elucidation (¹1 Peter 1:11); and the apostle John accordingly invites his readers to the close examination of his symbols, under which, for prudential considerations, was couched a somewhat enigmatical allusion (¹³Revelation 13:18). *SEE INTERPRETATION*. To infer from this, however, that the sacred writers were not themselves aware of the meaning of what they uttered or penned is to take an unworthy and false view of their intelligent instrumentality (Stier, *Words of Jesus*, 1, 432 sq., Am. ed.). *SEE INSPIRATION*.

Hypopsalma

SEE ACROSTIC.

Hypostasis

(from ὑπό, *under*, and ἵστημι, *to stand*; hence *subsistence*), a term used in the theology to signify *person*. Thus the orthodox hold that there is but one nature or essence in God, but three hypostases or persons. This term is of very ancient use in the Church. Cyril, in a letter to Nestormus, employs it instead of πρόσωπον, *person*, which did not appear to him sufficiently expressive. The term occasioned great dissensions, both among the Greeks and Latins. In the Council of Nicaea, *hypostasis* was defined to mean essence or substance, so that it was heresy to say that Christ was of a different hypostasis from his Father. Custom, however, altered its meaning. In the necessity they were under of expressing themselves strongly against the Sabellians, the Greeks used the word *hypostasis*, the Latins *personia*, which proved a source of great disagreement. The barrenness of the Latin language allowed them only one word by which to translate the two Greek ones οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, and thus prevented them' from distinguishing essence from hypostasis. An end was put to these disputes by a synod held in Alexandria about A.D. 362, at which Athanasius assisted, when it was determined to be synonymous with πρόσωπον. After this time the Latins made no great scruple in saying *tres hypostases*, or the Greeks three persons. — Farrar. *SEE TRINITY*; *SEE HOMOUSIAN*.

Hypostatical Union

the *subsistence* (ὑπόστασις) of two natures in *one* person, in Christ. While the reality of such a union is established by the Scriptures, and is on

that account maintained by our Church (see 2nd Article of Religion—"So that two whole and perfect natures," etc.), it is to be lamented that many intricate and fruitless metaphysical questions have been debated among different sects of Christians as to the divine nature of our Lord, and the *manner* of the union between the Deity and a man—the parties engaged in these questions being too often hurried into presumptuous as well as unprofitable speculations—on points as far beyond the reach of the human intellect as colors to a man born blind; and forgetting that the union of the soul and body of any one among us can neither be explained nor comprehended by himself or any other, and appears the more mysterious the more we reflect upon it (Eden). *SEE TRINITY; SEE CHRIST, PERSON OF; SEE MONOPHYSITES; SEE NESTORIANS.*

Hypothetical Baptism

is a phrase sometimes used to denote, in the Church of England, a baptism administered to a child of whom it is uncertain whether it has already been baptized or not.. The rubric states that "if they who bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," then the priest, on performing the baptism, is to use this form of words, viz.: "If thou art not already baptized, N____, I baptize thee in the name," etc,

Hypothetical Universalism

SEE HYPOTHETICI.

Hypothetici

a name given to the followers (French Protestants) of Amyraut, who, while they asserted *agratia univerasalis*, none the less ought not to be classed with modern Universalists, as they simply taught that God desires the happiness of all *men*, *provided they will receive his mercy in faith*, and that none can obtain salvation without faith in Christ. *SEE AMURAUT; SEE CAMERON; SEE UNIVERSALISM.*

Hypsistarians

(worshippers of the $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, or "Most High God," as such), a sect mentioned by Gregory of Nazianzum, whose father was a member of it before his conversion to Christianity. They are represented as combining. in

their doctrines the elements of Judaism and paganism. They assigned a place to fire and light in their worship, but rejected circumcision and the worship of images; they kept the Sabbath, and abstained from the eating of certain kinds of meats. Gregory of Nyssa also mentions the Hypsistarii, to whom he gives the surname Ὑψιστιανοί. He says that, like the Christians, they acknowledge only one God, whom they call ὕψιστον or παντοχρότορα, but are distinguished from them in not considering him as *Father*. All that subsequent writers have said of this sect is derived from the above statements. The Hypsistarii do not appear to have extended outside of Cappadocia, and they seem to have existed but a short time there, for no mention is made of them either before or after the 4th century. Contrary to the statement of the ancient writers, who described them as Monotheists, Bohmer concludes from the remark made by Gregory concerning his father, ὑπ' εἰδώλοις πάρος ἦεν ζώων, that, though the Hypsistarii worshipped but one God, they did not formally deny the existence of more. It is not to be wondered at, in view of the scanty information we possess concerning this sect, that very great differences of opinion should exist in regard to them. Mosheim considers them as belonging to the Gnostic school; J. J. Wetstein (in *Prolegom. I., N.T.* p. 31, 38) and D. Harenberg consider them as identical with the *Caelicol/e* (q.v.), regarding them as descendants from the worshippers of Thor; others trace a resemblance between their doctrines and those of Zoroaster. That they were not a Christian sect is proved by the fact of Gregory of Nazianzum's father having belonged to it before his becoming a Christian. Ullmann considers them as Eclectics, combining the elements of Judaism with the Persian religion, while Bohmer looks upon them as identical with the Euphemites, which Neander (*CG. Hist. 2, 507*) also thinks probable. Their morals are represented as having been very good. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop. s.v.*; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 380 sq.*; Walch, *Hist. d. Ketzereien, 2, 180 sq.*; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. 13, 278 sq.*; C. Ullmann, *De Hypsistariis* (Heidelb. 1833); G. Bohmer, *De Hypsistariis* (Berol. 1834).

Hyrchanus

(Ὑρκανός, *SEE HIRCANUS*), the name of two of the high priests and kings of the Maccabwnn line of the Jews. *SEE MACCABEES*.

1. JOHN HYRCANUS, the son of Simon Maccabaeus, who sent him with his brother Judas to repel Cendebmus, the general of Antiochus VII, B.C.

137. On the assassination of his father and two brothers, John ascended the throne, B.C. 135. During the first year of his reign Jerusalem was besieged by Antiochus Sidetes, and at length Hyrcanus was obliged to submit. The walls of Jerusalem were destroyed, and a tribute imposed upon the city. Hyrcanus afterwards accompanied Antiochus in his expedition against the Parthians, but returned to Jerusalem before the defeat of the Syrian army. After the defeat and death of Antiochus, B.C. 130, Hyrcanus took several cities belonging to the Syrian kingdom, and completely established his own independence. He strengthened his power by an alliance with the Romans, and extended his dominions by the conquest of the Idumaeans, whom he compelled to submit to circumcision and to observe the Mosaic law; and also by taking Samaria, which he leveled to the ground, and flooded the spot on which it had stood. The latter part of his reign was troubled by disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Hyrcanus had originally belonged to the Pharisees, but had quitted their party in consequence of an insult he received at an entertainment from Eleazar, a person of importance among the Pharisees. By uniting himself to the Sadducees, Hyrcanus, notwithstanding the benefits he had conferred upon his country by his wise and vigorous government, became very unpopular with the common people, who were mostly attached to the Pharisees. Hyrcanus died B.C. 106, and was succeeded by his son Aristobulus (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 7 sq.; *War*, 1, 2; 1 Macc. 15, 16; Justin, 26, 1; Diodorus, *Exc. Haesch.* 34, 1; Plut. *Apophth.* p. 184 sq.; Eusebius, *Chronicles Arm.* p. 94, 167). See Smith, *Dict. of Classical Biography*, s.v. **SEE ANTIOCHUS.**

2. HYRCANUS II, son of Alexander Janumeus, and grandson of the preceding. On the death of his father (B.C. 78) he was appointed high priest by his mother Alexandra, who ruled Judea herself for the next nine years. After her death (B.C. 69), his younger brother, Aristobulus, a braver and more energetic man, seized the government, and forced Hyrcanus to withdraw into private life. Induced by the Idlumsean Antipater, and aided by Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, he endeavored to win back his dominions, but was not successful until Pompey began to favor his cause. After some years of tumultuous fighting, Aristobulus was poisoned by the partisans of Ptolemy (B.C. 49), and Hyrcanus, who had for some time possessed, if he had not enjoyed, the dignity of high-priest and ethnarch, was now deprived of the latter of these offices, for which, in truth, he was wholly incompetent. Caesar (B.C. 47), on account of the services rendered to him by Antipater, made the latter procurator of Judaea, and thus left in

his hands all the real power, Hyrcanus busying himself only with the affairs of the priesthood and Temple. Troubles, however, were in store for him. Antipater was assassinated, and Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, with the help of the Parthian king, Orodes I, invaded the land, captured Hyrcanus by treachery, cut off his ears, and thus disqualified him for the office of high-priest, and carried him off to Seleucia, on the Tigris. Some years later, Herod, son of his old friend Antipater, obtained supreme power in Judea, and invited the aged Hyrcanus home to Jerusalem. He was allowed to depart, and for some time lived in ease and comfort, but, falling under suspicion of intriguing against Herod, he was put to death (B.C. 30) (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 16; 14, 1-13; *War*, 1, 511; Dio Cass. 37, 15, 16; 48, 26; Diod. 11, *Ex. Vet.* p. 128; Oros. 6:6; Euseb. *Chronicles Arm.* p. 94). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. **SEE HEROD.**

Hyssop

Picture for Hyssop

(b/zae&zb', of uncertain etymology; Gr. ὕσσωπος), a plant difficult to define, especially as the similarity 'of the above terms has early led to their confusion. As the ὕσσωπος of Greek authors is generally acknowledged to be the common hyssop (*Hyssopus officinalis* of botanists), it has been inferred that it must also be the plant of' the Old Testament, as well as that referred to in the New Testament. This inference has not, however, been universally acquiesced in; for Celsius enumerates no less than eighteen different plants which have been adduced by various authors as the hyssop of Scripture. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that in the Sept. the Greek ὕσσωπος is the uniform rendering of the Hebrew *ezob*, and that this rendering is indorsed by the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:19, 21), when speaking of the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law. Whether, therefore, the Sept. made use of the Greek ὕσσωπος as the word most nearly resembling the Hebrew in sound, as Stanley suggests (*S. and Pal.* p. 21, note), or as the true representative of the plant indicated by the latter, is a point which, in all probability, will never be decided. Botanists differ widely even with regard to the identification of the ὕσσωπος of Dioscorides. The name has been given to the *Satureia Graeca* and the *S. Juliana*, to neither of which it is appropriate, and the hyssop of Italy and South France is not met with in Greece, Syria, or Egypt. Daubeny (*Lect. on Romans Husbandry*, p. 313), following Sibthorpe, identifies the mountain hyssop with the *Thymnbra spicata*, but this conjecture is

disapproved of by Kihn (*Comm. in Diosc. 3 27*), who in the same passage gives it as his opinion that the Hebrews used the *Origanum Aegypticum* in Egypt, the *O. Syriacum* in Palestine, and that the hyssop of Dioscorides was the *O. Smyrnaeum*. The Greek botanist describes two kinds of hyssop, ὄρεινή and κηπευτή, and gives πεσαλέμ as the Egyptian equivalent. The Talmudists make the same distinction between the wild hyssop and the garden plant used for food. The hyssop is of three species, but only one of these is cultivated for use. The common hyssop is a shrub, with low, bushy stalks, growing a foot and a half high; small, pear-shaped, close-setting, opposite leaves, with several smaller ones rising from the same joint; and all the stalks and branches terminated by erect, whorled spikes of flowers, of different colors in the varieties. They are very hardy plants, and may be propagated either by slips or cuttings, or by seeds. The leaves have an aromatic smell, and a warm, pungent taste. It is a native of the South of Europe and the East.

The first notice of the scriptural plant occurs in ^{<0122>}Exodus 12:22, where a bunch of hyssop is directed to be dipped in blood and struck on the lintels and the two side-posts of the doors of the houses in which the Israelites resided. It is next mentioned in ^{<0140>}Leviticus 14:4, 6, 52, in the ceremony for declaring lepers to be cleansed; and again, in ^{<0496>}Numbers 19:6, 18, in preparing the water of separation. To these passages the apostle alludes in ^{<0399>}Hebrews 9:19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." From this text we find that the Greek name ὕσσωπος was considered synonymous with the Hebrew *ezob*; and from the preceding that the plant must have been leafy, and large enough to serve for the purposes of sprinkling, and that it must have been found in Lower Egypt, as well as in the country towards Mount Sinai, and onwards to Palestine. From the following passage we get some information respecting the habits and the supposed properties of the plant. Thus, in ^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33, it is said, "Solomon spoke of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;" and in the penitential psalm of David (^{<0107>}Psalm 2:7), "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." In this last passage, it is true, the word is thought by some commentators to be used in a figurative sense; but still it is possible that the plant may have possessed some general cleansing properties, and thus come to be employed in preference to other

plants in the ceremonies of purification. It ought, at all events, to be found growing upon walls, and in Palestine. In the account of the crucifixion of our Savior, the evangelist John says (~~<4192>~~ John 19:29), “Now there was set a vessel, full of vinegar, and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon *hyssop*, and put it to his mouth.” In the parallel passages of Matthew (~~<4178>~~ Matthew 27:18) and Mark (~~<4153>~~ Mark 15:36) it is stated that the sponge filled with vinegar was put upon a reed or stick. To reconcile these statements, some commentators have supposed that both the sponge and the *hyssop* were tied to a stick, and that one evangelist mentions only the *hyssop*, because he considered it as the most important; while, for the same reason, the other two mention only the stick; but the simplest mode of explaining the apparent discrepancy is to consider the *hyssop* and the stick to be the same thing—in other words, that the sponge was affixed to a stick of *hyssop*.

Of the different plants adduced by Celsius as having more or less claims to be regarded as the *hyssop* of Scripture, some belong to the class of ferns, as *Copcellus Veneris*, maiden-hair, and *Ruta mursaria*, or wall-rue, because they will grow upon walls; so also the *Polytrichum*, or hair-moss, the *Kloster hyssops*, or pearlwort, and *Saginal procumbens* are suggested by others, because, from their growing on rocks or walls, they will answer to the passage in ~~<1063>~~ 1 Kings 4:33, and from their smallness contrast well with the cedar of Lebanon, and are a proof of the minute knowledge of Solomon. Some again contend for species of wormwood, as being, from their bitterness, most likely to have been added to the vinegar in the sponge, that it might be more distasteful to our Savior. The majority, however, have selected different kinds of fragrant plants belonging to the natural family of *Labiatae*, several of which are found in dry and barren situations in Palestine, and also in some parts of the desert. (See Raunolf, *Trae*. p. 59, 456; Hasselquist, *Trav*. p. 554, 517; Burckhardt, *Trav*. 2, 913; Robinson, *Researches*, 1, 162, 157.) Of these may be mentioned the rosemary, various species of lavender, of mint, of marjoram, of thyme, of savory, of thymbra, and others of the same tribe, resembling each other much in character as well as in properties; but it does not appear that any of them grow on walls, or are possessed of cleansing properties; and, with the exception of the rosemary, they are not capable of yielding a stick, nor are they found in all the required situations. If we look to the most recent authors, we find some other plants adduced, though the generality adhere to the common *hyssop*. Sprengel (*Hist. Rei-Herb*. 1, 14). seems to

entertain no doubt that the *Thymbra spicata* found by Hasselquist on the ruins about Jerusalem is the hyssop of Solomon, though Hasselquist himself thought that the moss called *Gymnostoamum Truncatum* was the plant. Lady Calcott asks “whether the hyssop upon which St. John says the sponge steeped in vinegar was put, to be held to the lips of Christ upon the cross, might not be the hyssop attached to its staff of cedar-wood, for the purposes of sprinkling the people, lest they should contract defilement on the eve of the Sabbath, which was a high-day, by being in the field of execution” (*Scripture Herbal*, p. 208). Rosenmüller, again, thinks that the Hebrew word *ezob* does not denote our hyssop, but an aromatic plant resembling it, the wild marjoram, which the Germans call *Dosten*, or *Wohlgemuth*, the Arabs *Zatar*, and the Greeks *Origanum*. In the *Pictorial Bible* (1, 161), Mr. Kitto observes “that the hyssop of the sacred Scriptures has opened a wide field for conjecture, but in no instance has any plant been suggested that, at the same time, has a sufficient length of stem to answer the purpose of a wand or pole, and such detergent or cleansing properties as to render it a fit emblem for purification;” and he suggests it as probable that “the hyssop was a species of *Phytolacca*, as combining length of stem with cleansing properties, from the quantity of potash which is yielded by the ashes of the American species, *P. decandra*, of this genus.” *P. Abyssinica* grows to the size of a shrub in Abyssinia. Wier (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, s.v. Ysop) observes that the Talmudists distinguish the hyssop of the Greeks and Romans from that mentioned in the law. He then adduces the *Origanum*, mentioned in the quotation from Rosenmüller, as the *ezob* of the Hebrews; but concludes by observing that a more accurate examination is required of the hyssops and *Origana* of that part of Asia before the meaning of the Hebrew term can be considered as satisfactorily determined. Five kinds of hyssop are mentioned in the Talmud. One is called **bwza** simply, without any epithet: the others are distinguished as Greek, Roman, wild hyssop, and hyssop of Cochali (Mishna, *Negaim*, 14, 6). Of these, the four last mentioned were profane, that is, not to be employed in purifications (Mishna, *Parah*, 11, 7). Maimonides (*de Vacca Rufa*, 3, 2) says that the hyssop mentioned in the law is that which was used as a condiment. According to Porphyry (*De Abstin.* 4, 7), the Egyptian priests on certain occasions ate their bread mixed with hyssop; and the *zaatar*, or wild marjoram, with which it has been identified, is often an ingredient in a mixture called *Adukkah*, which is to this day used as food by the poorer classes in Egypt (Lane, *Mod. Eng.* 1, 200). It is not improbable, therefore, that this may have been the hyssop of

Maimonides, who wrote in Egypt; more especially as R. D. Kimchi (*Lex. s.v.*), who reckons seven different kinds, gives as the equivalent the Arabic *zaatar*, *origanum*, or *marjoram*, and the German *Dosten* or *Wohlgemuth* (*Rosenmüller Handb.*). With this agrees the Tanchum Hieros. MS, quoted by Gesenius. So in the Judaeo-Spanish version, ^{<1022>}Exodus 12:22 is translated “y tomaredes manojo de *origano*” This is doubtless the species of “hyssop” (*zaatar*) shown to Dr. Thomson, who describes it as “having the fragrance of thyme, with a hot, pungent taste, and long slender stems” (*Land and Book*, 1,161). But Dioscorides makes a distinction between *origanum* and *hyssop* when he describes the leaf of a species of the former as resembling the latter (comp. Plin. 20:67), though it is evident that he, as well as the Talmudists, regarded them as belonging to the same family. In the Syriac of ^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33, *hyssop* is rendered by *lufo*, “houseleek,” although in other passages it is represented by *zûfé*, which the Arabic translation follows in ^{<940>}Psalms 41:9, and ^{<809>}Hebrews 9:19, while in the Pentateuch it has *zaatar* for the same. Patrick (on ^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33) was of opinion that *ezob* is the same with the Ethiopic *azub*, which represents the *hyssop* of ^{<850>}Psalms 51:9, as well as ἡδύσμον, or *mint*, in ^{<1023>}Matthew 23:23. The monks on *Jebel Musa* give the name of *hyssop* to a fragrant plant called *ja’deh*, which grows in great quantities on that mountain (*Robinson. Bibl. Res.* 1, 157). It has been reserved for the ingenuity of a German to trace a connection between *AESop*, the Greek fabulist, and the *ezob* of ^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33 (*Hitzig, Die Sprüche Salmo’s*, Einl. § 2). (See *Celsius, Ierobot.* 1, 407 sq.; comp. *Bochart, Hieroz.* 1, 589; *Plenk, Plant. Med. tab.* 465; *Otho, Lex. Rabb. p.* 284 sq.; *Faber, in Keil’s Analect.* 1, 3 sq.; *Geiger, Pharmaceut. Bot.* 1, 491 *Gesenius, Thesaur.* 1. 57 sq.; *Sprengel, ad Dioscor.* 2, 506 sq.; *Prosp. Alpin. Planst. Aegypt.* c. 20; *Spencer, Leg. Rit.* 2, 15, 4; and the Talmudical, classical, and other authorities there cited.)

The latest result is that of Dr. J. F. Royle (communicated in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, and published in their journal for November, 1844), who infers, first, that any plant answering to all that was required should be found in Lower Egypt (^{<1022>}Exodus 12:22); in the desert of Sinai (^{<814>}Leviticus 14:4,6, and 52; ^{<1016>}Numbers 19:6,18); in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (^{<812>}John 19:29); secondly, that it should be a plant growing on walls or rocky situations (^{<1063>}1 Kings 4:33); and, finally, that it should be possessed of some cleansing properties (^{<850>}Psalms 51:7), though it is probable that in this passage it is used in a figurative sense. It

should also be large enough to yield a stick, and it ought, moreover, to have a name in the Arabic or cognate languages similar to the Hebrew name. After a careful and minute examination of all the ancient and modern testimony in the case, he finds all these circumstances united in the caper-plant, or *Capparis spinosa* of Linnaeus. **SEE CAPER-PLANT.** The Arabic name of this plant, *asuf*, by which it is sometimes, though not commonly described, bears considerable resemblance to the Hebrew. It is found in Lower Egypt (Forskal, *Flor. Eg.-Arab.*; Plin. 13:44). Burckhardt (*Trav. in Syr.* p. 536) mentions the *aszefas* a tree of frequent occurrence in the valleys of the peninsula of Sinai, “the bright green creeper which climbs out of the fissures of the rocks” (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 21, etc.), and produces a fruit of the size of a walnut, called by the Arabs *Felfel Jibbel*, or mountain-pepper (Shaw, *Spec. Phytogr. Afr.* p. 39). Dr. Royle thought this to be undoubtedly a species of *capparis*, and probably the caper plant. The *Calpparis spinosa* was found by M. Bove (*Rel. d’un Voy. Botan. en Eg.*, etc.) in the desert of Sinai, at Gaza, and at Jerusalem. Lynch saw it in a ravine near the convent of Mar Saba (*Exped.* p. 388). It is thus met with in all the localities where the *ezob* is mentioned in the Bible. With regard to its habitat, it grows in dry and rocky places, and on walls: “quippe quum capparis quoque seratur *siccis* maxime” (Plin. 19:48). De Candolle describes it as found “in muris et rupestribus.” The caper-plant was believed to be possessed of detergent qualities. According to Pliny (20, 59), the root was applied to the cure of a disease similar to the leprosy. Lamarck (*Eiç. Botan.* art. Caprier) says, “Les capriers . sont regardes comme antiscorbutiques.” Finally, the caper-plant is capable of producing a stick three or four feet in length. Pliny (13, 44) describes it in Egypt as “firmioris ligni frutex,” and to this property Dr. Royle attaches great importance, identifying, as he does, the ὕσσώπῳ of ~~John~~ John 19:29 with the κάλαμόφ of Matthew and Mark. To this identification, however, Dr. G. E. Post (in the Am. ed. of Smith’s *Bibl. Dict.*) justly objects that the caper-plant has a thorny stem, and is too straggling and otherwise unsuitable in form for the uses designated; and, moreover that its Arab name really has little affinity with the Heb. *ezob*. He therefore returns to Celsius’s idea of the *Labiatace*, or marjoram tribe, specially the *Origanum maru* (Arab. *Zupha*), which grows on the walls of terraces, has a long slender stem, or cluster of stems, with a bushy top, a fragrant odor, and a bitter but wholesome flavor. With this agrees one of the Arabic and Syriac renderings above noted.

Hystaspes

(Ὑστάσπης, also HYSTASPAS, i.e. *eydaspes*), a prophetic-apocalyptic work among the early Christians, thought to contain predictions of Christ and the future of his kingdom, so called from a Persian savant (Magus), Hystaspes, under whose name it was circulated. As in the case of the Sibyllines (q.v.), the work in question seems to have been an attempt made by the early Church fathers to find in the religion and philosophical systems of the heathen predictions of and relations to the Christian religion. The first mention of these *vaticinia Hystaspis* we find in two passages of Justin (*Apolog.* 1, 20, cap. 21, p. 66 c, ed. Otho, i, p. 180, and cap. 44, p. 82 c, ed. Otho, p. 226). According to the first passage, the destruction of the world is predicted by Hystaspes as it is foretold by the Sibylla (Καὶ Σίβυλλα καὶ Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφησαν). In the second passage Justin asserts that the bad daemons, in their efforts to prevent man's knowing the truth, succeeded in establishing a law which forbids the reading of the βίβλοι Ὑστάσπου ἢ Σιβύλλης ἢ τῶν προφητῶν under penalty of death; but the Christians, notwithstanding this law, not only read the books themselves, but even incited the heathen to study them. More particular information in regard to their contents is given us by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, 5, 6, § 43, ed. Potter, p. 761). But so varying have been the interpretations of this passage that it is difficult to determine definitely whether the book is of older origin than the first half of the 2nd century. To this opinion Wagenmann (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*) inclines. The information which Clement furnishes us is:

1. There existed in the 2nd century a βίβλος Ἑλληνική, a work written in Greek, and circulated in Christian and heathen circles, entitled ὁ Ὑστάσπης.
2. The Christians found in it, even more plainly than in the books of the Sibyllines, references to Christ and the future of his kingdom, and especially a reference to Christ's divine sonship, to the sufferings which awaited him and his followers, to the inexhaustible patience of the Christians, and the final return of Christ. The third and last of the Church fathers who make mention of the Hystaspes is Lactantius. He speaks of it in three different passages (*Instit.* div. 7:cap. 15, cap. 18; *Epitom.* ii, 69). In the first passage Lactantius speaks of the Hystaspes in connection with the Sibyl, and in the two other passages he speaks of it in connection with the

Sibyl and Hermes Trismegistus. According to the first passage, Hystaspes, like the Sibyl, predicts the extinction of the empire and name of Rome. According to the second passage (cap. 18), the troubles and warfares which shall precede the final day of the world have been prophesied of by the *prophetae ex Dei spiritu*; also by the *vates ex instinctu dceimonum*. For instance, Hystaspes is said to have predicted and described the *iniquitas sceculi hujus extremi*, how a separation of the just from the unjust shall take place, how the pious, amid cries and sobs, will stretch out their hands and implore the protection of Jupiter (*inamloratueros fidem Jovis*), and how Jupiter will look down upon the earth, hear the cry of men, and destroy the wicked.

With regard to the person of Hystaspes, who is said to be the author of the work containing these predictions, Justin and Clement of Alexandria have left us no information, and we depend, therefore, solely on Lactantius, according to whom he was an old king of the Medes, who flourished long before the Trojan war, and after whom was named the river Hystaspes. In all probability, Lactantius here thinks of the father of king Darius I, known to us from the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, and other Greek authors, but to whom the prophetic talents of Hystaspes were entirely foreign. Ammianus Marcellinus (23, 6), who flourished in the 4th century of our era, informs us that one Hystaspes had studied astronomy with the Brahmas of India, and had even informed the Magi of his ability to know the future. Agathias, the Byzantine historian of the 6th century, knows of a Hystaspes who was a contemporary with Zoroaster, but he does not dare to assert that this Hystaspes was the same as the one spoken of as the father of Darius I. **SEE PARSISM**. In view of the uncertainty of the authorship, it is well-nigh impossible to determine fully the origin, contents, form, and tendency of the *Vaticinia Hystaspis*. We know not even whether it emanated from Jewish, Christian, or heathen writers, although all our present knowledge points to the last as its probable origin. That the author was a Gnostic, as Huetius thinks (*Quaest. Alnet.* 1, 3, ep. 21, p. 230), is possible, but cannot be definitely stated, nor at all proved; beyond this, the only answer left us to all questions that might be put is a *non liquet*. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19, 660 sq.; Walch, *De Hystaspe ejusque vaticiniis*, in the *Comment. Societ. Gotting. hist. et phil.* (1779), 2, 1-18; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Grec.* 1, 93 sq.; Lucke, *Einleitung in d. Offenb. Joh.* (2nd ed. 1848), p. 237; Reuss, *Geschichte d. heil. Schrifft. d. N.T.* (4th edit. 1864), p. 270; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 176 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hyttavanes

in the mythology of the Finns, is the name of the god of the chase, especially of hares. *Pierer. Univ. Lex.* 8:693.