

HEGESIPPUS

Early ecclesiastical writer; d. c. 180. According to Eusebius, Hegesippus flourished at the time of Irenaeus (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4.21). He was a master of Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek, and his wide familiarity with Jewish oral traditions made him an important figure. About the middle of the 2d century he set out from his native land (possibly Asia Minor) for Rome. En route he visited many bishops and heard the same doctrine from all of them. At Corinth, he “was refreshed by the true word” and learned that the letter of Pope CLEMENT I was still read in the Church (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.22). During the pontificate of Pope ANICETUS he reached Rome, and here too, he found the teaching of the Apostles handed down incorrupt.

As quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4.25), Hegesippus says that he made a *διαδοχή* to the time of Anicetus, and that Soter succeeded (*διαδέχεται*) Anicetus. The meaning of the Greek noun and verb is disputed. Some scholars take the noun to mean a list of bishops of the Church in Rome (possibly the source on which Irenaeus drew for his account in *Adversus haereses* 3.3.3) and would translate the passage: During my stay in Rome I made a list of the bishops down to the time of Anicetus whose deacon was Eleutherius; Soter succeeded Anicetus, and after him came Eleutherius.

More recent research, however, indicates that at the time of Hegesippus *διαδοχή* had the meaning of transmission of teaching or doctrine, and that the cognate verb did not mean to succeed, but to receive a teaching from another. Consequently, Hegesippus means that while in Rome he ascertained for himself that the genuine apostolic teaching was transmitted without interruption down to Anicetus. From Anicetus it was passed on to SOTER, who handed it on to Eleutherius.

After his return from Rome, Hegesippus wrote *Memoirs* in five books to refute the teachings of the Gnostics (see GNOSTICISM). This work today is known only through fragments quoted in Eusebius’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, although as late as the 17th century the complete work could be found in several Greek monasteries. The traditional account of the death of the Apostle James, “the brother of the Lord, the rampart of the people and righteousness,” and scattered bits of information on Simon, second bishop of Jerusalem, are taken from the fragments of Hegesippus.

Bibliography: J. QUASTEN, *Patrology*, 3 v. (Westminster, Md. 1950–) 1:284–287. B. ALTANER, *Patrology*, tr. H. GRAEF from 5th German ed. (New York 1960) 148–150. H. CAMPENHAUSEN, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht* (Tübingen 1953). L. KOEP, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. T. KLAUSER (Stuttgart 1941) 2:411. J. LENZENWEGER, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*,

ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER, 10 v. (2d, new ed. Freiburg 1957–65) 5:60. G. W. H. LAMPE, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961–).

[H. DRESSLER]

HEIDEGGER, MARTIN

Existentialist philosopher; b. Sept. 26, 1889, in Messkirch, Baden, Germany; d. May 26, 1976 and was buried in the place of his birth. Early in life he had intended to become a Catholic priest, but due to a heart condition he ended his theological studies in 1911 and switched to mathematics. He earned a doctorate in philosophy in 1913. From 1915 to 1923, with the exception of his military service, he taught at Freiburg, where he was associated with Edmund HUSSERL, who had a significant impact on Heidegger’s thought. He then was professor at Marburg until 1928, when he returned to Freiburg as Husserl’s successor. He was rector there from 1933 to 1934, where as a German nationalist and anti-communist he supported Hitler’s rise to power and joined the Nazi Party. After the war Heidegger was suspended from teaching until 1950 due to his Nazi sympathies. He retired from teaching in 1952, but continued to publish until his death.

The early influence of *The Many Senses of Being according to Aristotle*, by Franz BRENTANO, and his own habilitation thesis on pseudo-Scotus’s *Grammatica speculativa*, foreshadowed Heidegger’s lasting concern with the themes of being and speech. In treating these themes, however, Heidegger developed a characteristic style and terminology that resist translation into ordinary language. In fact, attempts to reduce his thought to usual philosophical expressions tend to distort its meaning, if only by conferring upon it a false clarity. For this reason, in what follows Heidegger’s thought is rendered in rather literal translation, in many instances accompanied by the German expression itself.

Das Sein. Heidegger develops his philosophy around the difference and interplay between being (*Seiendes*), the “to be” (*das Sein*), and *Dasein*, viz, man as the only being who questions the “to be” is its presence or there-ness (*da*) as differentiated from being. For Heidegger, the question concerning being as being, which characterized classical metaphysics and ontology, must be transcended toward the more radical question concerning the “to be” itself, the most questionable theme. The “dis-coveredness” of beings in their beingness (*Seiendheit*) presupposes unthematic openness and standing out (*ek-stasis*, “ex-sistence”) toward the “to be,” as opposed to beings; but the “to be,” obscured by the beings it illuminates and withdrawn into coveredness

by being, is forgotten. The history of the “to be” is that of the epochs or difference of ways the “to be” sends and withholds itself, goes forth and returns to itself, and promises and loses its name or saying (*Sage*), which is variously rendered as presence out of absence (*physis*), being insofar as it is (*das Sein des Seienden*), object for subject, position (*Setzung*), and construct (*Ge-stell*).

Since the “to be” is hidden, what manifest being can one question concerning it? The answer is man himself, the only available being concerned with the “to be.” The method of investigation is phenomenological: letting be seen whatever shows itself in the way, as self-manifesting, it uses itself to show itself (*Sein und Zeit*, 7th ed., n.7). Truth as “un-concealment” and “un-forgetting” (*a-letheia*) is the inseparability of “disclosedness” and “re-collection” from hiddenness and finitude. One can speak of the veiled “to be” only by manifesting oneself as *Dasein*. A neutral or absolute perspective is impossible. The difference between that “from which” man questions and the theme “concerning which” he questions is constitutive of philosophy.

Dasein. The phenomenological analytic of *Dasein* begins with man as he exists proximally and usually, or in his everydayness. It manifests—through such pretheoretical structures (“the existentials”) as instrumentality, thrownness, call, they (*das Man*), inauthenticity, and fallenness—that man cannot “catch up with” (*einholen*) his being as disengaged from being in the world with others. Calling the analysis of the passions in Book 2 of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* the first systematic hermeneutic of the everydayness of being with others (*Sein und Zeit*, 138), Heidegger shows that man’s fundamental way of being is disposed attunement (*Gestimmtheit*): man is in concern and dread. But the analytic of *Dasein* is neither of man as man (anthropology), nor of being as being (metaphysics), but of man in his ordinary way of “being toward” the “to be” as differentiated from beings. Thus concern and dread are neither ontic states nor abstract principles but ontological perspectives (*Sein und Zeit*, 57). Concern is the way in which man finds himself as “thrown forward toward . . .”; dread is the pathos of “being toward” the “not” of being as a whole, viz, toward the “to be” that makes beings be, but that is not a being. The naught is the “to be” differentiated from the perspective of worldliness. Temporality is the unity of being “already in and with,” anticipating what is not yet; being-toward-death is being already “thrown forward toward” the coming nihilation of being-in-the-world-with-others. The ontological constitution of historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*) is based on *Dasein*’s anticipatory openness to the source: what-is-as-having-been still coming to manifestation through “re-petition” (*Wiederholung*). *Dasein*-in-world is before, between, and beyond consciousness

of objects. Itself “ec-static” toward the “to be,” *Dasein* illuminates a purview in which beings can be obvious or show themselves. Projection (*Entwurf*) of and by the “to be” frees the ontological space in which beings are encountered—the world.

There being no adequate manifestation of, and speaking about, the “to be” in differentiation, the reversal (*Kehre*) that goes beyond the phenomenological analytic of *Dasein* to the limits of a nonphenomenological use of language breaks down before the impossibility of speaking clearly what is most hidden; but this reversal is anticipated in the analysis of *Dasein* as the phenomenon that manifests the “to be” by questioning it: *Sein und Zeit*, 38–39; *Ueber den Humanismus* (Klostermann), 17, 41–42; *Holzwege*, 3d ed., 286; *Nietzsche*, 2:353–359, 367–369, 389–390; *Unterkunft der Ankunft des Ausbleibens*. The *logos* of the “to be” in differentiation is silence, but to be silent is possible only for a being that can speak.

Heidegger speaks of the absence (*Fehl*) of God and is silent about the relation of God to the “to be,” although he does distinguish them. Atheism is the price of considering God the first and highest among beings (*Holzwege*, 240; *Identität und Differenz*, 71).

Heidegger’s influence has, for the most part, resulted from the misinterpretation of his earlier work as an anthropology (*Wesen des Grundes*, 4th ed., 43, n. 59; *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit*, 3d ed., 26–27).

Writings. Two-thirds of Heidegger’s writings remain unpublished; he made arrangements for the definitive edition, being published by Klostermann; see F.-W. von Herrmann, “Observations on the Definitive Collected Works of Martin Heidegger,” *Universitas* 17 n. 1 (1975) 29–37. The edition is divided into four parts: (1) already published works, 1914–76, with Heidegger’s marginalia (already available and of special interest are the marginalia to *Sein und Zeit*, also in the Niemeyer edition, 14 Aufl., 1977); (2) the lectures, Marburg, 1923–28, Freiburg, 1928–44, early Freiburg, 1919–23; (3) private monographs and lectures, 1919–67; (4) preparations and sketches, reconsiderations and indications.

Bibliography: M. HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, tr. J. MACQUARRIE and E. ROBINSON (New York 1962); *Nietzsche* (Pfullingen, Ger. 1961). A. CHAPPELLE, *L’Ontologie phénoménologique de Heidegger* (Paris 1962). O. PÖGGELER, *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers* (Pfullingen 1963). R. POLK, *Heidegger: An Introduction* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1999). J. MCCUMBER, *Metaphysics of Oppression: Heidegger’s Challenge to Western Philosophy* (Bloomington, Ind. 1999). E. OVERENGET, *Seeing the Self: Heidegger on Subjectivity* (Boston 1998). H. PHILIPSE, *Heidegger’s Philosophy of Being: A Critical Interpretation* (Princeton, N.J. 1998). J. O. PRUDHOMME, *God and Being: Heidegger’s Relation to Theology* (Atlantic High-

lands, N.J. 1997). D. A. WHITE, *Logic and Ontology in Heidegger* (Columbus 1985).

[T. PRUFER/EDS.]

HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

Next to the Westminster Confession (1646–48), the most important Reformed confession. The Heidelberg Catechism (*Catechesis Palatina*) takes its name from the capital of the Rhenish Palatinate, which became Lutheran in 1546 under Elector Frederick II (1483–1556). The growing influence of the Swiss Reformers toward the end of the reign of Elector Otto Henry (1502–59) precipitated violent controversies, especially about the Sacrament of the Altar. Otto Henry's irenically disposed successor, Frederick III ("the Pious"; 1515–76), while disclaiming any formal knowledge of Calvinism and adhering to the 1540 ("Variata") edition of the Augsburg Confession, availed himself more and more of Calvinistic theological leadership, staffed the theological faculty of the University of Heidelberg exclusively with Calvinistic professors, and reformed the worship of the church in his domains according to Reformed principles. In 1562 he commissioned his theologians to prepare what became the Heidelberg Catechism, formally adopted by a synod convened in Heidelberg in January 1563.

Since Heinrich Alting (1583–1644), tradition has ascribed the authorship of the catechism to Zacharias UR-SINUS and Caspar OLEVIANUS (1536–87). Although they are unquestionably the major contributors, available evidence points to the broad cooperation of a considerable number of others as well. The 16th-century rumor that the real authors were Heinrich BULLINGER, the successor of Huldrych ZWINGLI at Zurich, and his associates is unfounded. A second and third edition preceded the authoritative fourth edition, published in November 1563 as part of the Palatine Church Order. Prompted by Olevianus, Frederick ordered the inclusion, in the second edition, of the condemnation of the "papal mass" as a "denial of the once for all sacrifice and passion of Jesus Christ" (q. 80), presumably as a response to the Tridentine decree on the sacrifice of the Mass; the third edition added the characterization of the Mass as "an accursed idolatry."

The Catechism consists of 129 questions and answers, supported by Biblical proofs and divided, after a brief introduction (qq. 1–2), into three parts: man's misery, exposed by the divine law (qq. 3–11); man's redemption—Apostles' Creed, justification, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the office of the keys (qq. 12–85); and man's gratitude—Decalogue (with four commandments in the first table, six in the second) and Our Father (qq. 86–129). The questions are distributed over 52 parts for annual re-

view on successive Sundays. The tone is warmly devotional, the emphasis primarily ethical, the approach strongly practical; the theology is a mild Calvinism (there is no discussion of predestination), with elements traceable to Philipp MELANCHTHON and to Bullinger. Except in a few places—such as q. 80, the condemnation of excesses in the veneration of the saints and of the use of images, and the moderate but firm disavowal of certain characteristically Lutheran views—the Catechism avoids polemics. Widely adopted in Reformed circles almost from the start, it has been translated into some 40 languages. In 1619 the pan-Reformed Council of Dort gave the Heidelberg Catechism confessional status. In North America both major Reformed bodies, the Reformed Church in America and the Christian Reformed Church, include it among their doctrinal standards; and it is greatly cherished in the former Evangelical and Reformed sectors of the United Church of Christ. Because of difficulties that children had in understanding and learning it, Elector John Casimir (1543–92) of the Palatinate directed the preparation of a simple and popular extract, the "little Heidelberg Catechism" (1585).

See Also: CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, PROTESTANT.

Bibliography: W. NIESEL, ed., *Bekennnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche* (2d ed. Zurich 1938), 148–187, Ger. text. H. A. NIEMEYER, ed., *Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum* (Leipzig 1840) 428–461, Lat. text. A. O. MILLER and M. E. OSTERHAVEN, trs., *The Heidelberg Catechism* (Philadelphia 1962), 400th anniversary Eng. tr. A. PÉRY, *The Heidelberg Catechism with Commentary*, tr. A. O. MILLER and M. B. KOONS (Philadelphia 1963). K. BARTH, *The Heidelberg Catechism for Today*, tr. S. C. GUTHRIE, JR. (Richmond, Va. 1964). D. J. BRUGGINK, ed., *Guilt, Grace and Gratitude* (New York 1963), a comment on the Heidelberg Catechism.

[A. C. PIEPKORN]

HEILIGENKREUZ, ABBEY OF

Cistercian abbey in the Archdiocese of Vienna, Lower Austria; founded (1133) by Margrave LEOPOLD III at the request of his son, OTTO OF FREISING, and settled from MORIMOND. Its name derives from a relic of the Holy Cross received from Leopold VI. Heiligenkreuz founded ZWETTL, Baumgartenberg, Cikádor, MARIENBERG, LILIENFELD, Goldenkron, and Neuberg. Under the first abbot it had 300 monks and lay brothers. GUTOLF (d. c. 1300) and Nicholas Vischel (d. 1330) wrote important works. The abbey declined because of wars (1462, 1529, 1532) and the Reformation, but remained Catholic. In the 16th century it assumed the pastoral care of its villages. In the 17th- and 18th-century revival the buildings were partly restored in baroque. United with Heiligenkreuz were the Hungarian monastery of St. Gotthard (1734–