# S

## Sa, Manoel De[[@Headword:Sa, Manoel De]]

             a Portuguese theologian, was born in 1530 at Villa do Conde. At the age of fifteen he joined the Order of Jesuits, and became instructor in philosophy, first in the University of Coimbra, and afterwards at Gaudia. Being called to Rome in 1557, he spent his time in teaching, preaching, and editing a new version of the Bible, which appeared during the pontificate of Sixtus V. He also founded many religious houses in Upper Italy. After residing for a time at Genoa, he returned to the convent at Arona, where he died, Dec. 30, 1596. Of his works, we have Aphorismi Confessorum (1595): — Scholia in IV Evangeliis (1596): — Notationes in Totam S. Scripturam (1598).

## Saadhs[[@Headword:Saadhs]]

             a sect in Hindostan who have rejected Hindu idolatry, substituting for it a species of deism. They are found chiefly at Delhi, Agra, Jyepore, and Furruckhabad. Their name implies Pure, or Puritans. The sect originated in A.D. 1658, with a person named Birbhan. They have no temples, but assemble at stated periods, more especially every full moon, in private houses, or in adjoining courts set apart for this purpose. They wear white garments, use no pigments, nor sectarian marks upon their forehead, and have no chaplets or rosaries or jewels.

## Saadia(S), Hag-Gaon[[@Headword:Saadia(S), Hag-Gaon]]

             (הִגָּאוֹן, the majesty), ben-Joseph Ha-Pithomi, Ha-Mizri, called in Arabic Said Ibn-Jaakub al-Fayumi, a learned Jewish rabbin, was born at Fayum, in Upper Egypt, A.D. 892. His contemporary was the Arabian historian Masudi. Saadia enjoyed the tuition of an eminent Karaite teacher. Salomon ben-Jerucham, an advantage that gave him an enlargement of mind beyond many of his colleagues in the Babylonian schools, though he never embraced the Karaite doctrines, but contended for the necessity of oral tradition. Saadia was distinguished alike as philosopher, Talmudist, theologian, orator, grammarian, and commentator, and, when little more than twenty-two (915), he published his first production, written in Arabic,  entitled “A Refutation of Anan,” or Kitab ar-rud ila Anan. This work has not as yet been found, but from Jerucham's rejoinder to it we learn that the import of it was to refute Anan's doctrines, and to show the necessity of the traditional explanation of the Scriptures as contained in the Rabbinic writings. “He urged in support of tradition that the simple words of the Bible are insufficient for the understanding and the performance of the law, since many of the enactments in the Pentateuch are only stated in outline, and require explanation; as in the case of the general prohibition to work on the Sabbath, where the nature of the labor is not defined; that prayer was not at all ordered in the Mosaic law, while the necessity of it is referred to an oral communication; that the advent of the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead are based upon traditional exegesis; and that the history of the Jews is derived entirely from tradition” (comp. Jerucham against Saadia, Alphabet 3, MS.).

The rapid stride of Karaism, and the fact that the Karaites were now almost the sole possessors of the field of Biblical exegesis and grammatical research, while the orthodox Jews were satisfied with taking the Talmud as their rule of faith and practice, determined Saadia to undertake an Arabic translation of the Scriptures, accompanied by short annotations. His Biblical works are, תורה תפסיר אל, A Translation of the Pentateuch, which he completed A.D. 915- 920. The commentary accompanying this translation, and which Aben-Ezra and Saadia himself mention, has not as yet come to light, but the Arabic version has been published, first with the reputed Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, the Jewish Persian version of Jacob Taus, the Hebrew text, and Rashi's commentary (Constantinople, 1546); then in the Paris and London polyglots, with a Latin version:תפסיר ישעיה, A Translation of Isaiah, which H.E.S. Paulus published from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (Cod. Pococke, No. 32) of the year 1244, under the title Rabbi Saadioe Phiumensis Versio Jesaioe Arabica, etc. (Jena, 1790-91), and which called forth a number of dissertations and criticizms, as well as corrections, as may be seen in Eichhorn's Allem. Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur, 3, 9 sq., 455 sq.; Michaelis, Neue oriental, Bibliothek, 8, 75 sq.; Gesenius, Der Prophet Jesaia, 1, 1, 88 sq.; Rappaport, in Bikkure Ha-Ittim, 5, 32, etc.; Munk. Notice sur Saadia, etc., p. 29-62:-- תפסיר זבדר דאאּד(שרה), A Translation of the Psalms of David, with annotations; only parts of this commentary, which is still extant in two MSS. of the Bodleian Library (Cod. Pococke, No. 281 [Uri, No. 39], and Cod, Hunt, No. 416 [Uri, No. 49]), and in one Munich MS., were published by Schnurrer, Hanneberg,  and Ewald: — תפסיר איוב, A Translation of Job, with annotations, entitled כתאב אלתַעדיל, The Book of Justification, or Theodicoea; excerpts of this version, and annotations from the only MS. extant (Bodleian Library, Cod. Hunt. No. 511). were published by Ewald: — פירוש על שיר השירי ם, A Commentary on the Song of Songs, first published by Isaac Akrish (Constantinople, about 1579); then separately by Salomon ben-Moses David, under the title פרוש רסעדיה(Prague, 1608).

Excerpts of the Constantinople edition, with an English translation. were published by Ginsburg in his Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs (Lond. 1857), p. 36, etc. From quotations made by Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Salomon ben-Jermecham, and other Jewish expositors and lexicographers, we know that Saadia also wrote commentaries on other books, as on Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, as well as the Minor Prophets and the book of Daniel. Of his grammatical and lexical works, only that on the seventy ἃπαξ λεγόμενα, entitled אלסבעין לפטה אלפרדה תפסיר, was published by Dukes, and again, with important corrections, by Geiger in his Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (Leips. 1844), 5, 317-324.

All these works Saadia wrote before he was thirty-six years of age, i.e. between A.D. 915 and 928. So great was the reputation which these works secured for him that he was called to Sora, in Babylon, where he was appointed gaon of the academy, a dignity which had never before been conferred upon any but the sages of Babylon, who were selected from the learned teachers of their own academies. After occupying this high position a little more than two years (928-930), he was deposed through the jealousy of others and his own unflinching integrity. In the presence of an anti-gaon, he retained his office fir nearly three years more (930-933), when he had to relinquish his dignity altogether. In Baghdad, where he now resided as a private individual from 933 to 937, he wrote against the celebrated Masorite Aaron ben-Asher, as well as those two philosophical works, viz. the commentary on the Book Jezira, and the treatise commonly entitled אמונות ורעות, Faith and Doctrine, which were the foundation of the first system of ethical philosophy among the Jews. This latter work, which is intended to demonstrate the reasonableness of the articles of the Jewish faith, and the untenableness of the dogmas and philosophemes opposed to them, consists of ten sections, and discusses the following subjects:

section 1, the creation of the world and all things therein;

2, the unity of the creation;

3, law and revelation;

4, obedience to God and disobedience, divine justice and freedom;

5, merit and demerit;

6, the soul and immortality;

7, the resurrection;

8, the redemption;

9, reward and punishment;

10. the moral law.

The original of this work, entitled ואלאעתקאדאת כתאב אלאמאנאת, sand written in Arabic, has not as yet been published. It is in Ibn-Tibbon's Hebrew translation of it, made in 1186, under the title וְהֵדֵּעוֹת סֵ הָאמֵוּנוֹת, and published in Constantinople (1562), Amsterdam (1648), Berlin (1789), in Furst's German translation (Leipsic, 1845), and in Ph. Bloch's translation in the Judisches Literaturblatt (Magdeburg, 1878), which shows that this treatise is accessible to scholars. Saadia also wrote an Agenda, containing prayers and hymns, which are specified by Fürst. In the year 937 Saadia was reinstalled in his office as gaon of Sura, and died five years afterwards, in 942. See Rappaport, Biography of Saadia in Bikkure Ha-Ittim (Vienna, 1828), 9, 20-37; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1835), 1, 182; ibid. (Leipsic, 1844), 5, 261 sq.; Judische Zeitschrift. 1868, p. 309; 1872, p. 4 sq., 172 sq., 255; Munk, Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa Version Arabe, in Cahen's Bible (Paris, 1838), 9, 73 sq.; Ewald u. Dukes, Beitrage zur Geschichte der altesten Auslegung des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart, 1844), 1, 1-115; 2, 5-115; Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 266-271; id. Geschichte des Karaerthums von 900-1575 (Leips. 1865), p. 20 sq.; Introduction to the Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, p. 24 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, No. 2156-2224; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 5, 268 sq., 479 sq.; Bloch, in Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1870, p. 401 sq.; Turner. Biographical Notices of some of the most Distiguished Jewish Rabbis (N.Y. 1847), p. 63-65, 1851-90; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy (ibid. 1872), 1, 418, 423, 424; Ginsburg, in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v.; id. Commentary on the Song of Songs (Lond. 1857), p. 34 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 226 sq.; Dessauer, Geschichte der Israeliten, p. 278 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 84, 125, 131, 132, 135, 159, 160, 165, 166; Schmiedel, Saadia Alfajumi  und die negativen Vorzuge seiner Religionsphilosophie (Wien, 1870); Kalisch, Hebrew Grammar (Lond. 1863), 2, 5 sq.; Keil, Introduction to the Old Testament (Edinb. 1870), 2, 383; Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 1101 sq., 104 sq., 744; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 97 (Germ. transl.); id. Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana, p. 98 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 2, 274 sq., 279, 285, 345; Kaufmann, Die Attributenlehre des Saadjac Alfajjumi (Gotha, 1875); Eisler, Vorlesungen uber die judischen Philosophen des Mittelalters, I. Abtheilung (Wien, 1876), p. 1 sq.; Kaufmann, Geschichte der Attributenlehre in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters von Saadja bis Maimuni (Gotha, 1877), and review of this work in Z. d. d. M. G. (1878), 32, 213 sq.; Bäck, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes (Lissa, 1877), p. 255 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Saalschutz, Joseph Levin[[@Headword:Saalschutz, Joseph Levin]]

             a learned German rabbi, was born in Königsberg, March 15, 1801, and was educated in his native place, where he was also made doctor of philosophy in 1824, having presented for this purpose to the faculty an elaborate treatise on the Urim and Thummin. In the following year he published Von der Form der hebr. Poesie, nebst einer Abhandlung uber die Musik der Hebraer (Königsberg, 1825), which he republished with two additional treatises under the title Form und Geist der biblisch-hebr. Poesie (ibid. 1853). He then went to Berlin, where he was engaged in the Jewish public school (1825-29), at the same time prosecuting his archaeological researches. In 1829 he was called as rabbi to Vienna, where he remained until 1835, when he was called for the same position in his native place. Here he continued the remainder of his life, and published the following works: Forschungen im Gebiete der hebraisch-ägyptischen Archäologie (1838-49, 3 vols.): — Das mosaische Recht (1846-48; 2 vols.; Berlin, 1863, 2d ed.): — Archäologie der Hebräer (1856, 2 vols.) — Die Ehe nach biblischer Vorstellung (1858) — Die klassischen Studien und der Orient (1850). In 1849 he was appointed privat-docent in philosophy at the University of Königsberg — the first Jew who ever received such an appointment — and was afterwards made honorary professor. He died Aug. 23, 1863. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 182 sq.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theologica, 2, 1103; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 362; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Kayserling, Bibliothekjüdischer Kanzelredner, 2, 85 sq.; Jolowicz, Gesch. d. Juden in Königsberg (Posen, 1867), p. 130 sq.; Ben Chananya (1864), p. 749 sq. (B.P.)

## Saba (St.), Monastery Of[[@Headword:Saba (St.), Monastery Of]]

             now called Deir Mar Saba, still exists on the brink of Wady Nar, the extension of the valley of the Kidron, near the Dead Sea. The surrounding scenery is of the wildest and most romantic character. SEE KIDRON. The convent hangs on the precipitous side of the ravine, being partly excavated out of the rock, and surrounded by a strong wall, accessible only on one side. The edifices within are extensive and commodious, being occupied by about sixty monks of the Greek rite, who are said to be quite rich. The original cell of the founder is shown, said to have been a cave occupied by a lion, which voluntarily relinquished it to the saint. The convent was plundered by the Persians in 533, and forty-four of the monks were then massacred; but it has survived all the vicissitudes of the Holy Land, of which it is one of the earliest monastic relics. No women are ever admitted within its portals, although the monks are hospitable to male visitors, provided they are furnished with the proper credentials. For a full description, see Robinson, Researches, 1, 382, 521; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 435; Porter, Handbook for Pal. p. 229.

## Saba Or Sabas[[@Headword:Saba Or Sabas]]

             (Σάβας), the name of several saints of the Roman Catholic Church. SEE SABBAS.

1. A Gothic soldier who was martyred at Rome with 170 other persons under the emperor Aurelian (Martyr. Rom. April 24; Tillemont, Memoires, 4, 363).

2. Another Goth and martyr who suffered many cruel tortures in the persecution under Athanaric, king of the Goths, and was finally drowned in the river Mussaeus. His relics, together with a letter from the Gothic to the Cappadocian Church (which is preserved among the epistles of St. Basil), were sent to Cappadocia by the Roman governor on the Scythian border (Basil, Epp. 155, 164, 165; Martyr. Rom. and Acta SS. April 12; Stolberg, 12, 209).

3. A hermit of Mount Sinai who, according to a statement by the hermit Ammonius (Combefis, Acta SS.; Eust., etc. [Paris, 1660]), was mortally wounded in a surprise by the Saracens towards the close of the 4th century (Tillemont, Memoires, 7, 575).

4. The name Sabas or Sabbas (according to Theodoret, Vit. Patr. c. 2, equivalent to πρεσβύτης) was conferred upon the hermit Julian of Edessa by the Mesopotamians. Julian was accounted one of the leading hermits by Jerome and Chrysostom. He spent forty years of his life (about A.D. 330- 370) in a narrow and damp cave in the desert of Osroene, practicing the utmost austerity, performing miracles — chiefly works of healing and exorcisms, descriptions of which are given by Theodoret and instructing a band of nearly 100 pupils. The death of Julian the Apostate was revealed to tins saint at the moment when that emperor fell in battle (A.D. 363), though twenty days journey separated him from the scene of conflict (Theodoret, H.E. 3, 24). In the reign of Valens the Arians of Antioch claimed that this hermit, whose fame extended over the entire East, belonged to their party; but Sabas, in response to the request of the Catholics, forsook his solitude for the first time in forty years, and appeared at Antioch to contradict the Arian boast, his journey to that place and back being signalized by the performance of numerous miracles. The recollection of this visit was still fresh when Chrysostom preached at  Antioch. Sabas died in his cave, an old man. His festival is observed by the Greeks on Oct. 18 and 28, and by the Latins on Jan. 14 (Acta SS. Jan. 14; Tillemont, Memoires, 7, 581; Stolberg, 12, 198).

5. The most noted saint of this name appeared at the beginning of the 6th century in connection with the Monophysite controversy. He was born about A.D. 439 at Mutalasca, in Cappadocia, of good family. At first a monk under the rule of St. Basil, he became a hermit in Palestine before completing the eighteenth year of his age, and was received into favor as a pupil by the hermit Euthymius, to whose prayers he owed the preservation of his life at a subsequent day, when he was dying of thirst in the desert (Stolberg, 17, 168). He was made a priest in A.D. 484, and placed over all the hermits in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, eventually filling his station with great success, though at first the strictness of his rule gave much dissatisfaction and caused his withdrawal to a distant solitude. At the time of the Monophysite controversy, the patriarch Elias of Jerusalem sent him with other hermits to Constantinople with a view to dispose the emperor Anastasius more favorably towards the Catholic cause, but his mission failed to produce lasting results. Elias having been superseded in the patriarchate by John, who belonged to the party of Severus (q.v.), Sabas and others induced the new primate to renounce his views and acknowledge the Council of Chalcedon. The emperor endeavored to reclaim John, but was met with a spirit of defiant opposition, which found further expression in the pronouncing of a solemn anathema upon Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, and all other opponents of the Council of Chalcedon. The revolt of Vitalian in the meantime diverted attention from the insubordinate monks, and in 518 the emperor Anastasius died. Sabas afterwards performed a second journey to Constantinople, a year before he died, for the purpose of obtaining a reduction of the oppressive imposts exacted from the population of Palestine, and also to counteract the influence of Origenism, which began to make itself felt among the monks under his direction. He was received with great pomp, the emperor Justinian sending Epiphanius, the patriarch, and a number of bishops and courtiers in the imperial galleys to meet him, and on his arrival prostrating himself before the aged hermit to receive his blessing. The petition in behalf of Palestine was granted, and a large sum of money was offered to Sabas for the use of his convent; but this Sabas declined to receive, and asked that it be appropriated to other useful purposes in Palestine. Nothing, however, was done against Origenism while Sabas lived. SEE  ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY.

A joyful welcome awaited him on his return to Palestine, after which he retired to his laura, and died Dec. 5, A.D. 531 or 532. There is a Greek liturgy entitled Τυπικόν, etc. (printed at Venice, 1603, 1613, 1643, fol.), attributed to St. Saba, but of unknown authorship. See Cyrilli Vita S. Saboe in Cotelerii. Monum. Eccl. Gr. 3, and Latin in Surius, Dec. 5; Tillemont, Memoires, 16, 701 sq.

## Sabachthani[[@Headword:Sabachthani]]

             [many sabachtha'ni] (σαβαχθανί, a Graecized form of the Chaldee shebakta'ni, שְׁבִקְתִּנַי, thou hast left me), quoted by our Lord upon the cross (Matthew 17:46; Mar 15:34) from the Targum on Psa 22:2 (where the Heb. has azabta'ni, עֲזִבְתִּנַי, “thou hast forsaken me”). See Petersen, Erforschung des Wortes σαβαχθανί (s.l. 1701). SEE AGONY.

## Sabaean[[@Headword:Sabaean]]

             As much confusion has been introduced by the variety of meanings which the name Saboeans has been made to bear, it may be proper to specify in this place their distinctive derivations and use. In our Authorized Version of Scripture the term seems to be applied to three different tribes.

1. The Sebaim (סְבָאַי ם, with a samech), the descendants of Seba or Saba, son of Cush, who ultimately settled in Ethiopia. SEE SEBA.

2. The Shebaim (שְׁבָאַי ם, with a shin), the descendants of Sheba, son of Joktan, the Saboei of the Greeks and Romans, who settled in Arabia Felix. They are the “Sabaeans” of Joe 3:8, to whom the Jews were to sell the captives of Tyre. The unpublished Arabic Version, quoted by Pocock, has “the people of Yemen.” Hence they are called “a people afar off, “the very designation given in Jer 6:20 to Sheba, as the country of frankincense and the rich aromatic reed, and also by our Lord in Mat 12:42, who says the queen of Sheba, or “the south, “came ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς, “from the earth's extremes.” SEE SHEBA.

3. Another tribe of Shebans (Heb. sheba', שְׁבָא, also with a shin), a horde of Bedawin marauders in the days of Job (Job 1:15); for whether we place the land of Uz in Idumoea or in Ausitis, it is by no means likely that the Arabs of the south would extend their excursions so very far. We must therefore look for this tribe in Desert Arabia; and it is singular enough that, besides the Seba of Cush and the Shaba of Joktan, there is another Sheba, son of Jokshan, and grandson of Abraham, by Keturah (Gen 25:33); and his posterity appear to have been “men of the wilderness, “as were their kinsmen of Midian, Ephah, and Dedan. To them, however, the above- cited passage in the prophecy of Joel could not apply, because in respect neither to the lands of Judah nor of Uz could they be correctly described as a people “afar off.” As for the Sabaim of Eze 23:42 (which our version also renders by Sabaeans”), while the Keri has Sabaiyam', םסָבָאַיָ, the Kethib has Sobeim', סוֹבְאַי ם, i.e. “drunkards,” which better suits the context. SEE SHABA.

4. Yet, as if to increase the confusion in the use of this name of “Sabaeans,” it has also been applied to the ancient star worshippers of Western Asia, though they ought properly to be styled Tsabians, and their religion not Sabaism, but Tsabaism, the name being most probably derived from the object of their adoration, tseba', צְבָא, the host, i.e. of heaven (see an excursus by Gesenius in his translation of Isaiah, On the Astral Worship of the Chaldoeans, and SABAOTH).

5. The name of Sabaeans, or Sabians, has also been given to a modern sect in the East, the Mandaites, or, as they are commonly but incorrectly called, the “Christians” of St. John; for they deny the Messiahship of Christ, and  pay superior honor to John the Baptist. They are mentioned in the Koran under the name of Sabionna, and it is probable that the Arabs confounded them with the ancient Tsabians above mentioned. Norberg, however, says that they themselves derive their own name from that which they give to the Baptist, which is Abo Sabo Zakrio; from Abo, “father;” Sabo, “to grow old together;” and Zakrio, e.g. Zechariah. “The reason they assign for calling him Sabo is because his father, in his old age, had this son by his wife Aneshbat (Elizabeth), she being also in her old age” (see Norberg's Codex Nasaroeus, Liber Adami Appellatus, and Silvestre de Sacy, in the Journal des Savans for 1819). SEE SABIANISM.

## Sabai Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Sabai Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Sabai is spoken in several islands in Torres Strait, between Australia and Papua. The gospel of Mark was printed at Sydney in 1883 under the care of the Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The translation was made by a teacher, Elia, who had been fifteen years engaged on the work, and revised by the Reverend S. Macfarlane, of Murray Island. The gospel of Matthew has since then been added. (B.P.)

## Sabaism[[@Headword:Sabaism]]

             SEE SABAEAN.

## Sabanus[[@Headword:Sabanus]]

             (σἀβανος, classical σάβανον, a linen cloth), a white cloth with which the infant was covered in baptism. This was an ancient practice. From the 4th century we find frequent mention of clothing the newly baptized in white garments. These garments, as emblems of purity, were delivered to them with a solemn charge to keep their robes of innocence unspotted till the day of Christ. The neophytes wore this dress from Easter eve until the Sunday after Easter, which was hence called Dominica in albis, that is, “the Sunday in white.” This garment was usually made of white linen, but sometimes of more costly materials. SEE ALB; SEE CHRISOME.

## Sabaoth[[@Headword:Sabaoth]]

             [some Saba'oth] (σαβαώθ, a Graecized form of the Heb. tsebaoth',

צְבָאוֹת, armies), a word occurring in this form only in the A.V. in Rom 9:29; Jam 5:4; but in the Heb. of frequent occurrence in the phrase “Jehovah of hosts,” or “Jehovah, God of hosts.” “It is familiar through its occurrence in the Sanctus of the Te Deum, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth.' It is often considered to be a synonym of, or to have some connection with, Sabbath, and to express the idea of rest, and this not only popularly, but in some of our most classical writers. Thus Spenser, Faery Queene, canto 8, 2.

‘But thenceforth all shall rest eternally

With him that is the God of Sabaoth hight:

O that great Sabaoth God, grant ire that Sabaoth's sight;'

also Bacon, Advancement of Learning, 2, 24: ‘... sacred and inspired divinity, the Sabaoth and port of all men's labors and peregrinations;' Johnson, in the first edition of whose Dictionary (1755) Sabaoth and Sabbath are treated as the same word; Walter Scott, Ivanhoe, vol. 1, ch. 11 (1st ed.): ‘a week, aye the space between two Sabaoths.' But this connection is quite fictitious. The two words are not only entirely different, but have nothing in common.” The Heb. term tsaba, צִבָא, signifies an army (see Deu 24:5; Exo 6:26). The plural is used in the sense of armies (Exo 7:4, and often). The singular is sometimes applied to the company of angels which surround the throne of Jehovah, who are called צָבָא הִשָּׁמִיַ ם, tsaba hash-shamayim, “the host of heaven.” The same phrase is also applied to the stars, for the most part as objects of idolatrous worship; indeed, the expression appears to include everything in heaven, both angels and heavenly bodies. Isaiah uses the phrase צָבָאהִמָּרוֹ, tsaba ham-marom, “the Host on High, “in opposition to the kings of the earth. God is called אֶלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת יְהוָֹה, Jehovah elohey' tsebaoth, “Jehovah God of hosts,” which most commentators regard as synonymous with “God of heaven” (see Zenkei De Synonymis צְבָאוֹתet עֶלְיוֹן, Lips. 1763), though others assert that it should be taken in a military sense, as the God of armies or wars. “It designates him as the supreme head and commander of all the heavenly forces; so that the host of Jehovah is all one with the host of heaven (1Ki 22:19), and must be understood strictly of the angels, who are ever represented as the Lord's immediate and fitting agents, ready on all occasions to execute his will (Psa 103:21; Psa 148:2). It is never applied to God with reference to the army of Israel. Once, indeed, the companies composing this are called the hosts of the Lord' (Exo 12:41), because they were under his direction and guardianship; but when employed with the view of heightening the idea of God's greatness and majesty, as the term ‘hosts' is in the phrases in question, the hosts can only be those of the angelic or heavenly world” (see Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.)' SEE HOST.

## Sabat[[@Headword:Sabat]]

             (Σαβάτ, v.r. in Esdr. Σαφάτ and Σαφάγ), the Graecized form of three names in the Apocrypha.

1. The head of one of the families of “Solomon's servants” who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel, according to 1Es 5:34;  but the Heb. lists (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59) have no corresponding name.

2. The Jewish month SHEBAT SEE SHEBAT (q.v.) (1Ma 16:14).

## Sabataeas[[@Headword:Sabataeas]]

             (Σαβαταίας v.r. Σαββαταίας and Σαβαταῖος), a Graecized form (1Es 9:48) of the Heb. name (Neh 7:7) SHABBETHAI SEE SHABBETHAI (q.v.).

## Sabatniki[[@Headword:Sabatniki]]

             a sect of Russian Sabbatarians, or “Sabbath-honorers,” which arose in Novgorod (cir. A.D. 1470), where some clergy and laity were persuaded by a Jew of Kiev, named Zacharias, into a belief that the Mosaic dispensation alone was of divine origin. They accepted the Old Testament only, of which, being unacquainted with Hebrew, they used the Slavonic translation. Like the Jews, they were led to expect the advent of an earthly Messiah. Some of them denied the Resurrection; and, being accused of practicing several cabalistic arts, for which points of Jewish ceremonial may have been mistaken, were regarded by the common people as soothsayers and sorcerers. They were gradually becoming a powerful sect, one of their number, named Zosima, having even been elected archbishop of Moscow, when in A.D. 1490 they were condemned by a synod, and a fierce persecution nearly obliterated them. But here and there, in remote parts of Russia, travelers have within the last century discovered fragmentary communities holding Jewish views, which have been thought to be relics of the older sect of Sabatniki. In Irkutsk they continue to exist under the name of Selesnewschschini. See Platon, Present State of the Greek Church in Russia (Pinkerton's transl.), p. 273.

## Sabatus[[@Headword:Sabatus]]

             (Σάβατος, v. . r. Σάβαθος), a Graecized form (1Es 9:28) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:27) ZABAD SEE ZABAD (q.v.).

## Sabazius[[@Headword:Sabazius]]

             a deity worshipped by the ancient Phrygians, alleged to have sprung from Rhea or Cybele. In later times he was identified both with Dionysus and Zeus. The worship of Sabazius was introduced into Greece, and his  festivals, called Sabazia, were mingled with impurities. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v. See also Vollmer, Worterbuch der Mythol. s.v.

## Sabba[[@Headword:Sabba]]

             SEE SABA.

## Sabba, Abraham IBN-[[@Headword:Sabba, Abraham IBN-]]

             a Jewish writer of the 16th century, who was banished with thousands of Jews from Lisbon in 1499, is the author of a very extensive commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled The Bundle of Myrrh צרור המור, in which he largely avails himself of the zohar and other early cabalistic works. The commentary was first published at Constantinople in 1514; then at Venice in 1523, 1546, 1566, and at Cracow in 1595. Pellican has translated this commentary into Latin, and the MS. of this version is in the Zurich library. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. Ginsburg, Kabbalah, page 123; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, page 266; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sabbaeus[[@Headword:Sabbaeus]]

             (Σαββαῖος, v.r. Σαββαίας), a corruptly Graecized form (1Es 9:22) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:31) SHEMAIAH SEE SHEMAIAH (q.v.).

## Sabban[[@Headword:Sabban]]

             (Σάββανος; Vulg. Bauni), a corrupt form (1Es 8:63) of the Heb. name (Ezr 8:33) BINNUI SEE BINNUI (q.v.).

## Sabbas, St. (Primoe Rasteo)[[@Headword:Sabbas, St. (Primoe Rasteo)]]

             a mediaeval ecclesiastic, was born during the latter part of the 12th century. He was the son of Stephen Nemania, founder of the kingdom of Servia. Contrary to the wishes of his father, Rasteo embraced the monastic life, and, though young, was soon made abbot. He prevailed upon the patriarch of Constantinople to create a Servian archbishopric, and was himself the first to enjoy the position. He made an extended our through Egypt and the Holy Land, and, on his return, died at Truava, in Bulgaria, Jan. 14, 1237. His remains were placed in the monastery at Milechivo, but were burned in 1595 by the order of Sikan Pasha. The 14th of January is kept in memory of this saint.

## Sabbatarians[[@Headword:Sabbatarians]]

             those who keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. They are to be found principally, if not wholly, among the Baptists. They object to the reasons which are generally alleged for keeping the first day, and assert that the change from the seventh to the first was effected by Constantine on his conversion to Christianity. The three following propositions contain a summary of their principles as to this article of the Sabbath, by which they are distinguished: 1. That God has required that the seventh, or last, day of every week be observed by mankind universally for the weekly Sabbath. 2. That this command of God is perpetually binding on man till time shall be no more. 3. That this sacred rest of the seventh-day Sabbath is not (by  divine authority) changed from the seventh and last to the first day of the week, or that the Scripture nowhere requires the observance of any other day of the week for the weekly Sabbath but; the seventh day only. They hold, in common with other Christians, the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity. See Evans, Sketches of the Denominations of the Christian World. SEE BAPTISTS, SEVENTH-DAY.

## Sabbatati[[@Headword:Sabbatati]]

             a name applied sometimes to the Waldenses (q.v.), from the circumstance that their teachers wore mean or wooden shoes, which in French are called sabots.

## Sabbath days Journey[[@Headword:Sabbath days Journey]]

             (σαββάτου ὁδός, Act 1:12; in Talmudical Heb. תְּחוֹ ם הִשִּׁבָּת, techim hashshabbath) is a phrase for the prescribed distance which may lawfully be traversed on a Sabbath, and beyond which no Jew can go without violating the sanctity of the day, except he adopts the means appointed for exceeding the canonical boundary.

I. Distance of a Sabbath-way, and its Origin. — From the injunction in Exo 16:29, that every man is to “abide in his place, “and not “go out of his place” on the Sabbath, the ancient Hebrew legislators deduced that an Israelite must not go 2000 yards, or 12,000 hand breadths — as the ancient Hebrew yard consisted of six hand breadths — five Greek stadia, for the Greek stadium measured 2400 hand breadths — beyond the temporary or permanent place of his abode. Epiphanius's definition of the Sabbath day's journey at six stadia =14,400 hand breadths, or 750 Roman geographical paces (Hoer. p. 66, 82), is most probably based upon the larger yard, which the Jews adopted at a later period. SEE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

These 2000 yards are not to be measured from any and every spot, but according to definite and minute rules, the city having always to be reduced to a square. Thus if the Sabbath day's walk is to be fixed from a circular city, an imaginary square must be circumscribed about it, and the measurement is not to be taken from the corners a in a diagonal direction — i.e. from a to e — inasmuch as thereby the distance between will be less than 2000 yards, but from a to f, whereby the allowable distance is increased in the direction of a e, as will be seen from the annexed diagram.

The permitted distance seems to have been grounded on the space to be kept between the ark and the people (Jos 3:4) in the wilderness, which tradition said was that between the ark and the tents. To repair to the ark being, of course, a duty on the Sabbath, the walking to it was no  violation of the day; and it thus was taken as the measure of a lawful Sabbath day's journey. This prohibition is not repeated in the law, but the whole spirit of the Sabbath institution obviously forbade a Jew to make a proper journey on that day (Josephus, Ant. 13, 8, 4), especially as the beasts of burden and travel were to rest (comp. Mat 24:20). Whether the earlier Hebrews did or did not regard it thus, is not easy to say. Nevertheless, the natural inference from 2Ki 4:23 is against the supposition of such a prohibition being known to the spokesman, Elisha almost certainly living — as may be seen from the whole narrative — much more than a Sabbath day's journey from Shunem. Heylin infers from the incidents of David's flight from Saul, and Elijah's from Jezebel, that neither felt bound by such a limitation. Their situation, however, being one of extremity, cannot be safely argued from. Our Savior seems to refer to this law in warning the disciples to pray that their flight from Jerusalem in the time of its judgment should not be “on the Sabbath day” (Mat 24:20). The Christians of Jerusalem would not, as in the case of Gentiles, feel free from the restrictions on journeying on that day; nor would their situation enable them to comply with the forms whereby such journeying, when necessary, was sanctified; nor would assistance from those around be procurable. The Jewish scruple to go more than 2000 paces from his city on the Sabbath is referred to by Origen (περὶ ἀρχων, 4, 2), by Jerome (Ad Algasiam, qu. 10), and by Oecumenius — with some apparent difference between them as to the measurement. Jerome gives Akiba, Simeon, and Hillel as the authorities for the lawful distance.

Another reason for fixing the distance of a Sabbath day's walk or journey at 2000 yards is that the fields of the suburbs for the pasture of the flocks and herds belonging to the Levites measured 2000 cubits or yards, and that in Exo 21:13 it is said, “I will appoint thee a place (מקו ם) whither he shall flee” — i.e. the Levitical suburbs or cities. Now, it is argued, if one who committed murder accidentally was allowed to undertake this journey of 2000 yards on a Sabbath without violating the sanctity of the day, innocent people may do the same. Besides, the place of refuge is termed מקו ם, which is the same word employed in Exo 16:29. As the one מקו ם, place, was 2000 yards distant, it is inferred, according to the rule the analogy of ideas or words (גזרה שוה) that the command, “Let no man go out of his place (ממקמו) on the seventh day” (Exo 16:29) means not to exceed the distance of the place 2000 yards off (Hillel I, rule 2, in  Erubin, 51 a; Maccoth, 12 b; Zebachim, 117 a). Josephus (War, 5, 2, 3) makes the Mount of Olives to be about six stadia from Jerusalem; and it is the distance between these two places which in Acts 1, 12 is given as a Sabbath day's journey. Josephus elsewhere determines the same distance as five stadia (Ant. 20, 8, 6); but both were probably loose statements rather than measured distances; and both are below the ordinary estimate of 2000 cubits. Taking all circumstances into account, it seems likely that the ordinary Sabbath day's journey was a somewhat loosely determined distance, seldom more than the whole and seldom less than three quarters of a geographical mile. See Selden, De Jure Nat. et Gent. 3, 9; Frischmuth, Dissert. de Itin. Sabbat. (1670); Walther, Dissert. de Itin. Sabbat.; both in Thesaurus Theolog. Philog. (Amsterd. 1720).

II. Cases in which the Limits of a Sabbath day's Journey could be exceeded. — Though the laws about the Sabbath day's journey are very rigorous, and he who walked beyond the 2000 yards, or moved more than four yards farther than his temporary place of abode, when the Sabbath day's journey had not been determined beforehand, received forty stripes save one; yet in cases of public or private service, when life was in danger, people were allowed to overstep the prescribed boundary (Mishna, Erubin, 4; Rosh-hashanah, 2, 5). The Pharisees, or the orthodox Jews in the days of our Savior, also contrived other means whereby the fraternity of this order could exceed the Sabbath day's walk without transgressing the law. They ordained that all those who wished to join their social gatherings on the Sabbath were to deposit on Friday afternoon some article of food in a certain place at the end of the Sabbath day's journey, that it might thereby be constituted a domicile, and thus another Sabbath day's journey could be undertaken from the first terminus. SEE PHARISEE.

This mode of connecting or amalgamating the distances (עירוב תנחומין), as it is called, is observed by the orthodox Jews to the present day. Such importance have the Jews. since their return from the Babylonian captivity, attached to the Sabbath day's journey that a whole tractate in the Mishna (Erubin) is devoted to it. Hence the phrase is mentioned in the New Test. (Act 1:12) as expressive of a well known law, and the so called Jerusalem Targum translates Exo 16:29, “And let no man go walking from his place beyond 2000 yards on the seventh day, “while the Chaldee paraphrase of Rth 1:16 makes Naomi say to Ruth, “We are commanded to keep sabbaths and festivals, and not to walk beyond 2000 yards” (comp. Mishna, Erubin, c. 5; Rosh-hashanah, 2, 15; Babylon  Talmud, Erubin, 56 b, 57 a; Zuckermann, in Frankel's Monatsschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums [Breslau, 1863], 12, 467 sq.).

## Sabbath school[[@Headword:Sabbath school]]

             SEE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

## Sabbath, Christian[[@Headword:Sabbath, Christian]]

             Under this head, we propose to treat of the sabbatical institution as one of general and permanent obligation.

I. Concerning the time when the Sabbath was first instituted there have been different opinions. Some have maintained that the sanctification of the seventh day mentioned in Genesis 2 is only there spoken of διὰ προλήψεως, or by anticipation, and is to be understood of the Sabbath afterwards enjoined in the wilderness; and that the historian, writing after it was instituted, there gives the reason of its institution, and this is supposed to be the case, as it is never mentioned during the patriarchal age. But against this sentiment it is urged

(a) that it cannot be easily supposed that the inspired penman would have mentioned the sanctification of the seventh day among the primeval  transactions if such sanctification had not taken place until 2500 years afterwards;

(b) that, considering Adam was restored to favor through a Mediator, and a religious service instituted which man was required to observe, in testimony not only of his dependence on the Creator, but also of his faith and hope in the promise, it seems reasonable that an institution so grand and solemn, and so necessary to the observance of this service, should be then existent.

Some find the institution of it in the fourth commandment (Exo 20:8-11); but the language employed is not apparently that of origination. The command to remember the Sabbath seems to imply that the Israelites were already acquainted with its existence and sacredness. But such injunctions, we are told, have often prospective significance, e.g. “Remember this day in which ye came out from Egypt” (Exo 13:3); “Remember the word which Moses the servant of the Lord commanded you” (Jos 1:13); “Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth” (Ecc 12:1). In all these citations the meaning is remember from this time. To this stricture it may be replied that such injunctions have always relation to the future, but that they also suppose antecedent knowledge. Children, for example, would not be told to remember their Creator unless they had been previously informed about creation unless they had been instructed that one God has made us, and that we are all his offspring. That an ordinance should be ushered into existence by the requirement to remember it is a strange idea to which facts give no countenance. Besides, the fourth commandment assigns a reason for observing the Sabbath, which, if good for the future, must have been always valid. We do not here enter into any disquisition about the days of creation. It is enough that God, in a manner befitting him, worked six days and rested on the seventh, and has required that, in a manner befitting us, we shall imitate his example. But how was it to be expected that this consideration should weigh much with the Jews in time to come, if, in preceding ages, God himself had made no account of it in his regulation of human conduct?

Some, again, have contended that we do not require to go far back in order to find its commencement; they think they learn when and how it began in Exo 16:19-30, these verses have reference to the gathering and cooking of manna. That an institution so prominent as the Sabbath in the  religion of the Jews should have been initiated in a manner so incidental, and almost unobservable, is in contradiction to the whole genius of the economy. Nor does the passage countenance any such notion. “It came to pass, “we are told (Exo 16:22), “that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread.” In other words, they gathered on the sixth day enough for that day and for the day following. But why provide beforehand for the Sabbath in order to respect and keep its rest, if not in supposed obedience to the will of God, as previously notified? It is alleged, in reply, that the order complied with is presented to us afterwards, and occurs in Exo 16:23, “This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake today, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you, to be kept until the morning.” By this exegesis the practice (Exo 16:22) is first related, and then we come to the injunction (Exo 16:23), of which it was the fulfilment! In such inversion of natural order there is obvious unlikelihood. But the exposition in question is otherwise untenable. The verses alleged to exhibit first the obedience, and then the statute obeyed, have no such intimacy of connection. They refer, in fact, to different things. Exo 16:23 does not touch on the collection of the manna at all, but has regard to the baking of it — a new subject, and therefore the gathering of it on the sixth day in quantity sufficient also for the seventh day, not being here prescribed, remains without any explanation, except a previous appointment and prevalent knowledge of the sabbatical institution.

It is objected, however, that the Sabbath disappears from the record during the antediluvian and patriarchal periods. Why this protracted silence about it if it had then a place among religious articles and usages? This evidence of its absence is negative, and cannot outweigh express contrary proof of its initiation. Of these times, be it also remarked, we have not detailed accounts, and we must therefore make allowance for great brevity and many omissions. Succeeding annals are more ample, and yet we have no indication of the observance of the Sabbath during four hundred years after its sacredness had been confessedly proclaimed from Mount Sinai. Even if neglect of the day could be established, such negligence would not disprove obligation. The Passover, during protracted periods, fell into disuse, and there was general and continued departure from the marriage relation as originally constituted.

It is not the case, however, that allusion to the Sabbath is wholly wanting during the time alleged. Occasional mention is made of weeks; and we  know that the heathen world very extensively distributed days into sevens, with some notion of sacredness belonging to the seventh. This arrangement is traced by some to the lunar month, divided into quarters, each of seven days, by the phases of the moon. But this computation does not accord, except proximately, with fact, as the lunar month exceeds twenty-nine days in duration. It ascribes consequence also to the number four, as well as to the number seven--partitioning the month into four divisions--and four has no distinctive sacredness in any known country or language. The explanation, though ingenious, is simply a guess, without any support from Scripture or other writings, and has like validity with another conjecture, that the assignment of seven days to a week may have been derived from the supposed number of the planets.

II. That the Sabbath owes its maintenance to its morality we will endeavor more expressly to substantiate. Here a consideration of first consequence is that it forms the subject of the fourth commandment. Some deny the ethical character of the decalogue. They allege it to be of a mixed nature, and insist that though particular elements in it are of inherent and enduring worth, yet, as a whole, it belonged to an economy of shadows, and has vanished with them. Therefore the presence of any statute in such a compendium is no decisive evidence of moral force.

1. But the decalogue in its integrity has a very distinctive place and consequence in the Bible. It was proclaimed with extraordinary solemnity, peculiar to itself, from Mount Sinai (Exo 19:16-24). God caused it to be written on tables of stone, and he made these stones to be deposited in the ark, representative of himself. “These words,” says Moses, “the Lord spake to all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and he added no more.” The decalogue was frequently called the covenant, and the chest containing it the ark of the covenant. Would a fragmentary and heterogeneous compound create or warrant any such designation? Again, as often as Christ cited any of these commandments he enforced them emphatically. The Jews seem to have distributed them into greater and less, and to have treated the less as scarcely deserving consideration. But he impressively declared, “Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” The kingdom of heaven is the Gospel dispensation. Certain statutes our Lord declares to be congenial with that  economy, and their observance he characterizes as a sure constituent or guarantee of its greatness. But what statutes could he speak of which verify this description, and are recognizable from others, unless those composing the decalogue? When, also, he resolved the law into two great commandments, he made evident reference to the two tables of the covenant, for he instituted the same classification of devotional and social duties; and when he further resolved all duty into love. with God and man for its objects, he impressed on the whole code a moral interpretation. What can be more truly or purely moral than charity? — charity branching off into piety and benevolence? In a word, the decalogue is reproduced by the apostles. What it enjoins they enjoin in the identical terms, or with only verbal alterations; and how could they more decisively affix their seal to its indelible righteousness?

2. The decalogue, then, as a whole, is moral. SEE LAW OF MOSES. If the Sabbath be an exception, it is the only exception. But when we have found it in a code collectively moral — the morality of which is attested by the clearest and most cumulative proof — and when we find it sharing all the conspicuousness and honors of the allied enactments, it would require strong argument indeed to render credible its exceptional ritualism. Let us see whether good cause for so regarding it be discoverable in its own nature, or in prophecy, or min what Christ said of it expressly, or in the apostolic epistles.

(1.) The Sabbath provides for rest and worship. Our sensuous being requires the one, and our spiritual being the other. To deny the laboring population any intermission of toil, or the heir of immortality any time for religious observances, would be to offend against the fundamental conditions of our state of existence. Under these aspects the Sabbath is not arbitrary. It is founded on the essentials and necessities of the human constitution, and nothing here below can be more solid and stable than its groundwork. To speak of our spiritual responsibilities more especially — if it be a moral duty to worship God, it must also be a moral duty to observe that worship to the best advantage. For this the Sabbath provides. It is advantageous for worship that a certain day be set apart for it, and guarded from intrusive distractions. It is advantageous that the worshippers set apart the same day, both to the end that one may not draw another into temporal toil, and that religion may have the aids of social stimulus. It is advantageous that the day recur with suitable frequency. What frequency would be best it might be difficult or impossible for us to determine; but  that would not show the proportioning of the time to be a matter of indifference. We can easily perceive that there are extremes to be avoided. If every day were a Sabbath, our terrestrial occupations would be suppressed. If the Sabbath returned once a year, it would be inadequate for the maintenance of habitual devotion. One of these arrangements would have been evidently incompatible with what we owe to this world, and the other with dutiful regard for the world to come. If we can judge thus far of the too often and the too seldom, why may not God descry unerringly the mean, and perceive that one day in seven is the best possible adjustment? — the most conducive to moral good in our existing circumstances'? Experience has recommended no other division of time as preferable; on the contrary, every attempt to elongate or contract the week has utterly failed, and has owed the failure to a manifested impracticability or mischievousness. It follows that not only the duty, but the very timing of the duty, is of moral account, and that the Sabbath is entitled, by its nature, to the place it occupies in the decalogue — fitly and justly ranking with statutes which transcend casualties, and will maintain their jurisdiction while the world lasts. On the same principle, if the sacredness of the Sabbath has been enhanced by rendering it commemorative of some great event, such as the natural creation, there may be religious benefit, and therefore moral suitableness, in transferring it to another day of the seven, in order to commemorate another event of analogous but superior consequence — such as the accomplishment of a spiritual creation by the resurrection of Christ from the dead. SEE LORDS DAY. Even the old economy, notwithstanding its necessary regard to times, did not show any rigid adherence to particular days, when a sufficient reason existed for departing from them. Thus, while circumcision was by the law fixed to the eighth day, the great mass of the people who had grown up in the wilderness were circumcised on the same day (Jos 5:1-9); and when any obstacle prevented men from the eating the Passover on the 14th of the first month, they were allowed to postpone it to the next (Num 9:6).

(2.) The prophets, speaking in the name of God, always express themselves in reverential language of the Sabbath. (See, in particular, Isa 56:6-7; Isa 58:13-14; also 56:23.)

It is objected that in these and like instances the Sabbath is allied with acknowledged constituents of the Mosaic law, and that such passages would therefore equally prove their permanency. It is in plain accordance,  however, with the moral claims of the Sabbath that its continued observance should be foretold, and the absence of such prediction would have been urged in proof of its abrogation. Besides, these prophecies are in no part meaningless. They point to real and to improved worship in such diction as the Jews were familiar with and could alone comprehend. Shall we say, then, that the change in worship would be improvement, and the change as to the Sabbath abolition? We cannot see that this conclusion is called for “by parity of reasoning.” On the contrary, these passages, to have sense or truth in any of their clauses, require a perpetuated Sabbath; for the effect would be to sweep away worship altogether if a day for it were not preserved.

(3.) As regards Christ's express sayings on this subject, he discouraged, no doubt, such a traditional observance of the Sabbath as would have transformed it into a day of heartless neglects and sanctionless rigors. But he countenanced the keeping of it in its true spirit, as a day of personal privilege and beneficent usefulness avowing that “the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.” This seems to teach that the Sabbath was made for man not as a Jew or as a Christian, but as man, and therefore entitled to his regard in all conditions and through all ages. In reply, however, we are told that the expression in the original is the man. This must mean, it is said, “those for whom it was appointed, without specifying who they were, and not at all designating man in general.” We see no grounds for such a paraphrase, but very much to demand its rejection. The article in such expressions defines the individual or the species. No individual man could be thus singled out as having the Sabbath made for him unless it were Adam; and none will assert that it was made for him in any sense exclusive of his posterity. Again, the article may define the species, as we say the horse, the ass, the ostrich. Where the species is defined, all the individuals are comprehended, or such an allegation is made as would apply to any of them indifferently. For example, “If the salt have lost its savor, it is good for nothing but to be trodden under the feet of men” — literally “the men,” or the species, men without the distinction of Jew and Gentile. “Let your light so shine before men,” literally “the men,” in the sense of any or all men. “That which cometh out of the mouth this defileth a man” — literally “the man,” equivalent to man or any man. Practically the distinction here attempted to be made is visionary. Since man without the article is general, and the man, meaning the species man, is also general, the article may be dropped or retained without affecting the  sense. Accordingly, these modes of expression are often used interchangeably. When Christ, then, declares that the Sabbath was made for man, we can only understand him as teaching that it was intended and instituted for our common humanity, and that it is to be so employed as to conduce to man's highest or spiritual good. But he also said that he was “Lord of the Sabbath; which shows,” we are told, “that he had power to abrogate it partially or wholly.” It seems as if some cannot think of power in connection with the Sabbath unless as exercised in abrogation. If it be placed in Christ's charge, they take for granted that more or less extinction must be the consequence. They speak as if Christ's scepter were an axe, and the only question were how much it would hew down and devastate! We maintain, on the contrary, that Christ would not be the Lord of the Sabbath to be its destroyer. In the language of the New Testament, this title points to assured prosperity. But though he will not superintend in order to annihilate either worship or worshippers, the designation “Lord” does suppose a manifested supremacy, and leads us to expect ameliorating modification with essential preservation — in other words, a Christian Sabbath or Lord's day.

(4.) In the epistles, much stress has been laid by opponents of the Sabbath on some expressions of Paul. “One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind” (Rom 14:5). To us this language is vague and seems general; but it had relation to specific disputes, and we do not know, because we have not been told, what days are more particularly intended. They may have been festival days of human appointment, or cherished relics of Judaism unconnected with its Sabbath perfectly known, without danger of mistake, to the parties addressed. It is admitted that the apostles had stated religious services with assigned seasons for them; and if in the passage commented on we give his words the absolute and exceptionless sense claimed for them, it will follow that he courted contempt for his own ordering of worship. Assuredly he sanctioned no such sweeping indifference to days as would invalidate the injunction, “Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is.”

It is said (Col 2:16), “Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.” This passage perfectly accords with a superseding of the Sabbath day as distinguished from the Lord's day, embodying substantially all that  prior sabbatical observance had shadowed. In the same relation we would use the same language still. Independently of this answer to the objection, many have held, with bishop Horsley, that the word Sabbath is not here used in its strict acceptation, but with reference to other days observed by the Jewish Church with Sabbath like solemnity. Even if these passages had more difficulty than they present, two or three doubtful expressions, in relation to local circumstances and usages about which we have little information, are not to be balanced against the weighty and cumulative evidence which has been adduced for the morality of the Sabbath, and its consequent claims on the respect of all countries and ages.

It may appear to some an objection to these views that if the Sabbath were moral, and therefore immutable, it would remain in heaven, whereas first and seventh days equally lose in the heavenly state their distinctive characters. There all duration is Sabbath — all space sanctuary — all engagement worship. It is sufficient to reply that morality supposes facts in demanding conformity to them. Filial duty implies the existing relation of parent and child, and is ever binding while that relation subsists, but is otherwise non-existent. So the Sabbath supposes a sensible world, and in such a world it must ever be a duty to have time expressly for temporal and time expressly for spiritual occupations. But in the world of spirits, where even the natural body becomes a spiritual body, and which flesh and blood cannot inherit, this discrimination disappears. It is the glory of the Sabbath that it prepares us for this consummation — for inheriting blessings transcending its own privileges, and even induces approximations to celestial perfection under present adverse circumstances.

III. Under the Christian dispensation, the Sabbath is altered from the seventh to the first day of the week (see Stone, in the Theol. Eclectic, 4, 542 sq.). The arguments for the change are these:

1. As the seventh day was observed by the Jewish Church in memory of the rest of God after the works of the creation, and their deliverance from Pharaoh's tyranny, so the first day of the week has always been observed by the Christian Church in memory of Christ's resurrection.

2. Christ conferred particular honor upon it by not only rising from the dead, but also by repeated visits to his disciples on that day.

3. It is called the Lord's day, κυριακή, a term otherwise only used in the New Test. in reference to the sacred supper (1Co 11:20), and  as in the latter passage it denotes that which specially commemorates the death of our Lord, it seems indisputable that it is applied in the former to that which specially commemorates his resurrection (Rev 1:10).

4. On this day the apostles were assembled, when the Holy Ghost came down so visibly upon them, to qualify them for the conversion of the world.

5. On this day we find Paul preaching in Troas, when the disciples came to break bread.

6. The directions which the apostles give to the Christians plainly allude to their religious assemblies on the first day.

7. Pliny refers to a certain day of the week being kept as a festival in honor of the resurrection of Christ; and the primitive Christians kept it in the most solemn manner. SEE LORDS DAY,

These arguments, it is true, are not satisfactory to some, and it must be confessed that there is no law in the New Test. concerning the first day. However, it may be observed that it is not so much the precise time that is universally binding, as that one day out of seven is to be regarded. “As it is impossible,” says Dr. Doddridge, “certainly to determine which is the seventh day from the creation; and as, in consequence of the spherical form of the earth, and the absurdity of the scheme which supposes it one great plain, the change of place will necessarily occasion some alteration in the time of the beginning and ending of any day in question, it being always at the same time, somewhere or other, sun rising and sun setting, noon and midnight, it seems very unreasonable to lay such a stress upon the particular day as some do. It seems abundantly sufficient that there should be six days of labor and one of religious rest, which there will be upon the Christian and the Jewish scheme.” SEE SUNDAY.

As soon as Christianity was protected by the civil government, the Lord's day was ordered by law to be kept sacred. All proceedings in courts of law, excepting such as were deemed of absolute necessity, or of charity, as setting slaves at liberty, etc., were strictly forbidden; and all secular business, excepting such as was of necessity or mercy, was prohibited; and by a law of Theodosius senior, and another by Theodosius junior, no public games or shows, no amusements or recreations, were permitted to be practiced on that day (see Cod. Theod. lib. 2, tit. 8, “De feriis;” Cod. Justin. lib. 3; Cod. Theod. lib. 15, “De spectaculis,” lib. 5, leg. 2). The day  was consecrated by all the primitive Christians to a regular and devout attendance upon the solemnities of public worship, and other religious exercises; and, as Bingham says in his Christian Antiquities, “they spent it in such employments as were proper to set forth the glory of the Lord, in holding religious assemblies for the celebration of the several parts of divine service — psalmody, reading the Scriptures, preaching, praying, and receiving the Communion; and such was the flaming zeal of those pious votaries that nothing but sickness, or a great necessity, or imprisonment, or banishment, could detain them from it.” A further proof of the sanctity in which they held the Sabbath was their pious and zealous observance of the Saturday evening, or, rather, from midnight to break of day on the Lord's day. This time the early Christians spent in the exercises of devotion; and persons of all ranks employed it in preparation for the sacred day. It must also be further observed that, in many places, particularly in cities, they usually had sermons twice a day in the churches, and that the evening was as well attended as the morning service; but in such churches as had no evening sermon, there were still the evening prayers, and the Christians of those times thought themselves obliged to attend this service as a necessary part of the public worship and solemnity of the Lord's day. The better to enforce this observance upon such as were ungodly or careless, ecclesiastical censures were inflicted upon them, whether they frequented places of public amusement or spent the day in indolence at home. These observations chiefly refer to the period between the publication of the Gospel by the apostles and the latter end of the 4th century — a period when this day might be expected to be observed more in accordance with the command of Christ and the will of the Holy Ghost.

IV. As the Sabbath is of divine institution, so it is to be kept holy unto the Lord. Numerous have been the days appointed by men for religious services; but these are not binding, because of human institution. Not so the Sabbath. Hence the fourth commandment is ushered in with a peculiar emphasis — “Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.” This institution is wise as to its ends, that God may be worshipped, man instructed, nations benefited, and families devoted to the service of God. It is lasting as to its duration. The abolition of it would be unreasonable, unscriptural (Exo 31:13), and every way disadvantageous to the body, to society, to the soul, and even to the brute creation. It is, however, awfully violated by visiting, feasting, indolence, buying and selling, working, worldly amusements, and traveling. “Look into the streets,” says  bishop Porteus, “on the Lord's day, and see whether they convey the idea of a day of rest. Do not our servants and our cattle seem to be almost as fully occupied on that day as on any other? As if this were not a sufficient infringement of their rights, we contrive, by needless entertainments at home and needless journeys abroad, which are often by choice and inclination reserved for this very day, to take up all the little remaining part of their leisure time. A Sabbath day's journey was among the Jews a proverbial expression for a very short one; among us it can have no such meaning affixed to it. That day seems to be considered by too many as set apart, by divine and human authority, for the purpose, not of rest, but of its direct opposite, the labor of traveling, thus adding one day more of torment to those generous but wretched animals whose services they hire; and who, being generally strained beyond their strength the other six days of the week, have, of all creatures under heaven, the best and most equitable claim to suspension of labor on the seventh.”

The evils arising from Sabbath breaking are greatly to be lamented, they are an insult to God, an injury to ourselves, and an awful example to our servants, our children, and our friends. To sanctify this day, we should consider it —

(1) a day of rest; not, indeed, to exclude works of mercy and charity, but a cessation from all labor and care;

(2) as a day of remembrance; of creation, preservation, redemption;

(3) as a day of meditation and prayer, in which we should cultivate communion with God (Rev 1:10);

(4) as a day of public worship (Act 20:7; Joh 20:19);

(5) as a day of joy (Isa 56:2; Psa 118:24);

(6) as a day of praise (Psa 116:12-14);

(7) as a day of anticipation, looking forward to that holy, happy, and eternal Sabbath which remains for the people of God.

V. The literature of the subject is very copious. The following are the chief standard works: Brerewood, Treatise of the Sabbath; Prideaux, Doctrine of the Sabbath; Bramhall, Discourses on the Controversy about the Sabbath; White, Treatise of the Sabbath Day; Heylin, History of the Sabbath; Chandler, Two Sermons on the Sabbath; Watts, Perpetuity of the  Sabbath; Kennicott, Sermon and Dialogue on the Sabbath; Paley, Natural and Political Philosophy, bk. 5, ch. 7; Holden, Christian Sabbath; Burnside, On the Weekly Sabbath; Burder, Law of the Sabbath; Wardlaw, Wilson, and Agnew, severally, On the Sabbath; Modern Sabbath Examined (1832); James, On the Sacraments and Sabbath; Maurice, On the Sabbath; Kalisch, Commentary on Exodus (ad loc.); Proudhon, De la Celebration du Dimanche; Hessey, Bampton Lecture (Lond. 1866); Johnstone, Sunday and the Sabbath (ibid. 1853); Domville, Inquiry into the Nature of the Sabbath (ibid. 1855, 2 vols.); Ellicott, History and Obligation of the Sabbath (ibid. 1844; N.Y. 1862); Hill, The Sabbath Made for Man (Lond. 1857); Coleman, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 526 sq.; and the literature cited by Malcolm, Theol. Index, s.v.; and especially by Cox, Literature of the Sabbath Question (Edinb. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo). Articles on special points connected with the institution of the Sabbath may be found (in addition to those referred to in Poole's Index, s.v.) in the Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1849; April, 1857; Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851; July, 1857; Theol. and Lit. Journ. 1852; North Brit. Rev. Feb. 1853; Biblioth. Sacra, Oct. 1854; South. Quar. Rev. July 1857; New-Englander, Aug. 1858; United Presb. Rev. Jan. 1860; Amer. Theol. Rev. April, 1862; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. Jan. 1863; Princeton Rev. Oct. 1863. SEE SUNDAY.

## Sabbath, Court Of The[[@Headword:Sabbath, Court Of The]]

             (מוּסִךְ השִּׁבָּת, musak hash-shabbath; Sept. ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθέδρας τῶν σαββάτων; Vulg. Musach sabbati, 2Ki 16:18), is understood to mean a canopy under which Ahaz used to stand, at the entrance of the porch of the Temple, when he attended the service; but which he removed when he became an idolater, to show his contempt, and his intention of not resorting thither any more. SEE COURT. So we see in 2Ch 28:24 that “he shut up the doors of the house of God” that none might enter to worship. SEE AHAZ.

## Sabbath, Jewish[[@Headword:Sabbath, Jewish]]

             The word Sabbath is, in Hebrew, shabbath', שִׁבָּת (comp. Ewald, Ausfuhrl. Lehrb. p. 400; and see on the form shabbathon, שִׁבָּתוֹן, at the end of this art.); in the Graecized form σάββατον, or, in the plural form, τὰ σάββατα (comp. Horace, Sat. 1, 9, 69). The derivation and meaning of the word are well known. Josephus (Apion, 2, 2) explains it as a rest from all labor, ἀνάπαυοις ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔπγου (comp. Ant. 1, 1, 1). Mistaken etymologies, by those ignorant of Hebrew, are found in Josephus, Apion, loc. cit.; Plutarch, Symp. 4, 6, 2; Lactantius, Institut. 7, 14. On Sabbath (G. σάββατα) in the sense of week, SEE WEEK. It is clear that the word ἑβδομάς (2Ma 6:11) means the Sabbath (comp. Josephus, War, 2, 8, 9).

This was the seventh day of the Hebrew week, extending from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday (comp. Lev 23:32, and see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. p. 312 sq.). SEE DAY. The time during which the sun was going down was the eve of the Sabbath. SEE PREPARATION. Of course, the commencement and close of the Sabbath varied with the higher or lower position of the observer. Thus, Carpzov quotes from the book Musar this statement: “Tiberias lay in a valley, where the sun disappeared half an hour before setting; Zephore was on a mountain, where the sun shone longer than on the plains. The people in the former, therefore, began their Sabbath sooner, in the latter later, than the rest of the nation.” By a law of Augustus (Josephus, Ant. 16, 6, 2), the Sabbath began at the ninth hour. According to the disciples of the Gemara, the Sabbath began and ended in all Jewish cities at the sound of the trumpet (comp. Maimon.  Hilkoth Shab. c. 5). Josephus records this custom of Jerusalem (War, 4, 9, 12). In the Temple, the trumpet was to be blown from the “covert for the Sabbath,” or Sabbath roof, Heb. Mesak hash-shabbath, מֵיסִךְ הִשִּׁבָּת(2Ki 16:18). See Rhenferd, Opera Philol. p. 770 sq.

This day was celebrated by the Hebrews as a holy day (Deu 5:12). a day of rest and rejoicing (Isa 58:13; comp. Hos 2:11; 1Ma 1:41), by ceasing from all labor, with their servants and all strangers, as well as cattle (Exo 20:10; Exo 31:13 sq.; Exo 34:21; Exo 35:2; Deu 5:14, comp. Jer 17:21; Jer 17:24; Josephus, Apion, 2, 39; Dion Cass. 37, 17 [Philo, Opp. 2, 137, extends the Sabbath — rest even to plants — they were not to be eared or reaped on that day]), and by a special burned offering, presented in the Temple, in addition to the usual daily offering (q.v.) — which was doubled on this day — consisting of two yearling lambs, with the meat offerings and drink offerings belonging to it (Numbers 38:9; comp. 2Ch 31:3; Neh 10:33; Eze 46:4). In the holy place of the Temple, the shewbread was renewed (Lev 24:8; 1Ch 9:32), and the new division of priests appointed for that week took their places (2Ki 11:5; 2Ki 11:7; 2Ki 11:9; 2Ch 23:4). The services of the priests and Levites in and about the tabernacle and Temple were not accounted labor (comp. Mat 12:5), and continued through the Sabbath. Circumcision, too, as a religious ceremony, took place on the Sabbath, when that was the eighth day (Joh 7:22 sq.; comp. Mishna, Shab. c. 19; Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. 1, 121; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. p. 1028).

Deliberate profanation of this day was punished with death (Exo 31:14 sq.; Exo 35:2), which was inflicted by stoning (Num 15:32 sq.; Mishna, Sanhedr. 7, 8). But if the law of the Sabbath was broken through ignorance or mistake, a sin offering was required, and the offense pardoned (comp. Shab. 7, 1; 11, 6, Chrithuth, 3, 10). There were times, too, when the Jews dispensed with the extreme severity of their law (Isa 56:2; Isa 58:13; Eze 20:16; Eze 22:8; Lam 2:6; Neh 13:16); and the legal observance of the Sabbath seems never to have been rigorously enforced until after the Exile. At this time, too, the meaning of the work which profaned the Sabbath was first strictly defined, since the lawgiver had left this to be determined by experience, and, in certain doubtful cases, the individual conscience, definitely prohibiting but one act — the kindling of a fire in one's house (Exo 35:3; comp. Eichhorn, Repert. 9, 32; 13, 258) for cooking (Exo 16:23; Num 15:32;  comp. Mishna, Terum. 2, 3). This was interpreted by the Jews, however, to include the lighting of lamps, and they used to do this before the Sabbath began (Mishna, Shab. 2, 7; 16, 8; comp. Seneca, Ep. 95, p. 423, Bip.). This prohibition compelled the Jews to cook and bake their food for the Sabbath on the preceding day, and it was often kept warm in vessels set in dry hay or chips (Mishna, Shab. 4, 1 sq.; comp. also Josephus, War, 2, 8, 9, on the Essenes). The intermission of labor was required on feast days as well as on the Sabbath, except the preparation of food (comp. Exo 12:16; see Mishna, Yom Tobit , 5, 2; Megilla, 1, 5). A later age, which sought to observe painfully the letter of the law, and to confide as little as possible to the judgment and conscience of individuals, extended the meaning of this work much further, and strove to complete a formal code for Sabbath observance. Marketing and public trade ceased on the Sabbath, of course (Neh 10:31; Neh 13:15-16); and it was merely an auxiliary police regulation of Nehemiah to close the gates on that day (Neh 13:19). It was in the spirit of the law, too, that traveling on the Sabbath was forbidden, with reference to Exo 16:29 (comp. Josephus, Ant. 13, 8, 4). SEE SABBATH DAYS JOURNEY.

But the conduct of the Jewish armies in refusing to arm on the Sabbath, and suffering their enemies to cut them down, certainly savored of fanaticism (1 Macc. 2, 32 sq.; 2Ma 6:11, Josephus, Ant. 12, 6, 2, War, 2, 17, 10; Life, p. 32; comp. Plutarch, Superstit. p. 169). A parallel may be found in the Jewish steersman who left the helm at the moment of a squall because the Sabbath was beginning (Synes. Ephesians 4, p. 163, ed Petav.). Yet the apprehension of the great advantage which would thus accrue to the enemy led prudent commanders to observe this rest from fighting only so far as to abstain on the Sabbath from offensive operations (1Ma 11:34; 1Ma 11:43 sq.; Josephus, Ant. 13, 1, 3; 14, 4, 2 sq.). Marching armies halted on that day (Josephus, Ant. 13, 8, 4; comp. 14, 10, 12). The last passage seems to show that the Sabbath law was made a pretext by Jews to escape from foreign military service when they wished (see again Ant. 18, 9, 2; 10, 2; War, 4, 2, 3; Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 4, 133 sq.). Yet in the last Jewish war less caution was exercised, even in abstaining from offensive movement (Josephus, War, 2, 19, 2); and many an artifice was carried on by the aid of the Sabbath and its observances (ibid. 4, 2, 3. In this instance, it was less the fear of breaking the law than a shrewd calculation of advantage which prevented the Jews from engaging the enemy on the Sabbath).  The Pharisees gave very minute directions on the observance of the Sabbath; and although different teachers differed in many points, yet in the New Testament period we find great rigor prevailing. The plucking of single ears of grain in passing (Mat 12:2; Mar 2:23 sq.; Luk 6:1 sq.), the healing of the sick (Mat 12:10; Mar 3:2; Luk 6:7; Luk 13:14; Joh 9:14; Joh 9:16; Thilo, Apocr. p. 503), the walking of a cured patient with his bed (John 5, 10), all were considered as desecrations of the Sabbath by the Pharisees and their disciples; although when property was in danger, many acts which were certainly waork were freely performed in case of pressing need (Mat 12:11; Luk 14:5; comp. Gemara, Shab. 128, 1); yet even in the care of cattle (comp. Luk 13:15) all work was to be shunned which was not really necessary (Shab. 24, 2 sq).

The Essenes seem to have been yet stricter in observing this day. The Mishna (Shab. c. 17) has severe regulations against the removal of goods; yet certain exceptions were allowed (comp. Philo, Opp. 2, 569). On the severity of the Samaritans in this respect, see Gesen. De Theol. Samarit. p. 35 sq.; comp. Origen, Princip. 4, 17; tom. 1, p. 176). They refrained from sexual intercourse on the night of the Sabbath (Eichhorn, Repert. 13, 258). The Mishna, in the tract Shab. (2d part), which treats the whole subject of this article, names in particular (7, 2) thirty-nine forms of labor which are forbidden on the Sabbath, each of which has, again, its variations and species. In the two-fold Gemara to this tract (the Tosiphta to the tract Shab. is found in Hebrew and Latin in Ugolini Thesaur. 17; the tract itself has been separately edited by J.B. Carpzov, Leips. 1661), and in the Rabbinical writings the matter is spun out still further and finer (see Hulsius, Theol. Jud. 1, 240 sq.; Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. c. 16; Schottgen, Hior. Hebr. 1, 121 sq.). As to the healing of the sick, the rabbins generally allowed the use of all proper remedies if life was in danger (see Mishna, Yoma, 8, 6; Schottgen, op. cit. p. 122 sq.; Danz, Christi Curatio Sabbathica Vindic. [Jen. 1699]; also in Meuschen, N.T. p. 569 sq.); but those which were only designed to make the sick more comfortable were rigorously forbidden (see, e.g. Gemara, Berachoth, p. 11. According to the Mishna [Shab. 22, 6], even a broken bone was not to be set nor dislocations poulticed on the Sabbath; yet see Maimonides, ad loc.). On the other forms of labor permitted on the Sabbath (Mishna, Shab. 24, 5) the reader may consult V.H. Hasenmuller, Opera Sabbathum Depellantia (Jen. 1708).  The Sabbath was especially consecrated to devotion and to the law (Josephus, Ant. 16, 2, 4), and frivolous or unclean conversation was accounted a desecration of the day (Gesen. In Jesa. 2, 230). Hence in the synagogues everywhere on this day took place the great services of worship (Mar 1:21; Mar 6:2; Luk 4:16; Luk 4:31; Luk 6:6; Luk 13:10; Act 13:44; Act 16:13; Act 17:2; Act 18:4), with prayer and the public reading and expounding of the holy books (Luk 4:16 sq.; Act 13:27; Josephus, Apion, 1, 22). This, however, cannot be considered as a Mosaic regulation (see Vitringa, Synag. 1, 2, 2); but see LAW. Cheerful meals were held (Luk 14:1; Philo, Opp. 2, 477. The ariston [ἄριστον] was taken on the Sabbath about the sixth hour [Josephus, Life, p. 54]. On the three meals of the Sabbath, see Mishna, Shab. 16, 2, and Maimon. ad loc.); feast day clothing was put on (Sharbau, De Luxu Sabbatorio, in his Observ. Sacr. 3, 541 sq.); and it was never a fast day (Jdg 8:6. Justin's remark [36:2], which makes it a fast, is untrue. Comp. Sueton. Aug. 76, where Ernesti's explanation does not accord with the usage of speech; Petron. Fragm. 35, 6. See contra, Maimon. Hilkoth Shab. Extr. Comp. P.T. Carpzov, De Jejun. Sabb. ex Antiq. Hebr. [Rostoch. 1741]).

When the Jews were under foreign supremacy, except during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (1Ma 1:45; 1Ma 1:48; 2Ma 6:6), their legal Sabbath was confirmed (comp. 1Ma 10:34; Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 20, 21, 23, 25); and even in the composition of the civil law, a conciliatory respect was shown to it (Josephus, Ant. 16, 6, 2 and 4; Philo, Opera, 2, 569). It is still a question how far the Jewish legal administration itself regarded the Sabbath (see, among others, Tholuck, On John, p. 302 sq.; Bleek, Beiträge z. Evangelienkritik, p. 140 sq.). The Mishna (Yom Tobit , 5, 2) says expressly that no court was held on that day, nor even was a session begun the afternoon preceding, lest it might encroach upon the Sabbath (Mishna, Shab. 1, 2; comp. Gemara, Sanhed. fol. 35, 1; nor can the force of these passages be removed by Gemara, Sanhed. fol. 88, 1, even though it referred to this subject). SEE COUNCIL. It is remarkable that at one time the Jews themselves made an effort in Syria to do away with the observance of the Sabbath (Josephus, War, 7, 3, 3). This effort was aided, perhaps, by the view which the Romans took of this weekly rest, often mocking the Jews as slothful (Juvenal, 14, 105 sq.; Seneca, in Augustine, Civ. Dei, 6, 11).

The origin of the Sabbath is usually referred to Moses by the German critics (Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 2, 142 sq.) on the ground that Gen 2:1  cannot be accepted as a testimony to its earlier institution, since this whole account of the creation, whose date and author are unknown, is plainly designed for the very purpose of presenting the Sabbath to us as an immediate divine ordinance (see Gabler, Neuer Vers. uber die mos. Schopfungsgesch. p. 38 sq.; De Wette, Krit. p. 40 sq.), just as it is often set forth in later writings in connection with the exode and with the legislation of Sinai (Eze 20:10 sq.; Neh 9:13 sq.; comp. Deu 5:14 sq., with which Exo 16:23 agrees). Reggio, by a peculiar. explanation of Gen 2:1 sq., arrives at a distinction between the Sabbath appointed here for all mankind and that given to the Jews in their law (Zeitschrift fur d. Judenth. 1845, p. 102 sq., 121 sq.). The Sabbath is considered as a Mosaic institution also by Eusebius (H.E. 1, 4, 3; Proep. Ev. 7, 6) and most of the rabbins (Selden, Jus. Nat. et Gent. 3, 10). Among the more recent writers, this view is adopted by Spencer (Leg. Rit. 1, 4, 9 sq.); Eichhorn (Urgesch. 1, 249 sq.); Gabler (ibid. p. 58 sq.; Neuer Versuch, p. 38 sq.); Bauer (Gottesdienstl. Verfass. 2, 174 sq., in answer to Hebenstreit, De Sab. ante Leg. Mos. Existente [Lips. 1748]); Iken (Dissert. Theol. p. 26 sq.); Richter (in the Biblioth. Brem. Nova, 3, 310 sq.); Michaelis (Mos. Recht, 4, 110 sq.). SEE SABBATH, CHRISTIAN.

The question may be raised whether the Sabbath was not borrowed by Moses from some other ancient people, as the Egyptians. It is not necessary to discuss the unhistoric suppositions of Philo (2, 137) and Josephus (Apion, 2, 39) that this feast was very widely spread among ancient nations. Yet it appears from Seneca (Ep. 95. p. 423, Bip.) and Ovid (Remed. Amor. p. 219) that a reverence for the seventh day had found an entrance among the Romans (comp. Ideler, Chron. 2, 176). Various strange opinions as to the origin of the Sabbath have been suggested which answer themselves (Plutarch, Sympos. 4, 6, 2). (On the pretended Jewish worship of Saturn, see Buttmann, Mythol. 2, 44 sq.) It is certain that the Egyptians knew the reckoning by weeks, and even began each successive week with the day of Chronos (Dion Cass. 37, 18, 19). Baur, following Tacitus (Hist. 5, 5), has connected the Sabbath with the worship of Chronos-Saturn, to whom the Romans also dedicated particularly the seventh day of the week (Tubinger Zeitschr. fur Theol. 1832, 3, 145 sq.; comp. Movers, Phoniz. p. 315); hence the Roman historians compared the Jewish Sabbath with the day of Saturn (Dion Cass. 37, 17, 18; Tibul. 1, 3, 17). His view rests on the well known representation by the Greeks and  Romans of the golden age long gone by, the age of rest and equality, under Saturn, and the custom connected with it of giving the slaves a holiday at the Saturnalia (see Syrb, De Sabbatho Gentili in Temp. helvet. 2, 527 sq.; and in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 17; comp. also Wernsdorf, Diss. de Gentil. Sabbato [Viteb. 1722]). But this theory is so fine spun that it falls to pieces at the first touch, for the passage in Dion Cassius does not do anything towards proving a naming of the days of the week after the planets (see Ideler, Chronol. 1, 180). And the Western representations of Saturn can so much the less be transferred to the East in that, even among the Romans, the day of Saturn was counted an unlucky one. Astrologically, too, the day of Saturn is the first, not the seventh, of the week. But, apart from all this, it was more natural for an agricultural people to keep as a festival the last day of the week, after men and beasts had become wearied with toil, in rest, and with ceremonies in accordance with their religious character, particularly with sacrifices. Why should we seek a foreign model for all the Mosaic institutions? Why refer these simple observances to such far fetched and generally unsuitable explanations? (See especially Bahr, Symbol. 1, 584 sq. In answer to Von Bohlen, Genesis, p. 137, Introd. see Tuch, Genesis, p. 14 sq.)

The Sabbath, as the basis of the Israelitish cycle of feast days, was imitated and repeated, as it were, in several other festivals; e.g. the Sabbath Year, the Seventh New Moon, and the Year of Jubilee. On the subject of the whole article, see Carpzov, Appar. p. 382 sq.; Reland, Ant. Sacr. 4, 8; Bauer, op. cit. 2, 152 sq.; Jahn, 3, 388 sq.; Gisb. Voetii Dis. Sel. 3, 1227 sq.; Bahr, Symbol. 2, 566 sq., 577 sq.

A figurative use of the word “Sabbath” denotes a solemn festival on which servile work was proscribed; but this occurs only with respect to the great day of annual atonement (Lev 23:33). The word properly representing such an abstract idea of rest is שִׁבָּתוֹן, shabbaton, σαββατισμός, sabbatism (q.v.). The term “Sabbath,” however, is frequently applied to a longer hebdomadal cycle than that of the week, e.g. the sabbatic year (q.v.). The Rabbinic or orthodox Jews likewise claim that in Lev 23:11-16, שִׁבָּת, Sabbath, is synonymous with פֶּסִח, Passover, and accordingly they reckon Pentecost from the 16th of Nisan, the second day of unleavened bread, instead of the Sabbath following it. SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH. In this they are upheld by a majority of Christian archaeologists and interpreters. The Karaites, on the contrary,  contend that the word “Sabbath” in that ordinance has its regular and usual signification, namely, the seventh day of the week. The arguments advanced for the traditional view and reckoning, formidable as they at first appear, will be found, on a close examination, to be wholly inconclusive.

(1.) It is a pure assumption that the phrase מָחַרִת הִשִּׁבָּת, morrow of the Sabbath, is equivalent to מָחַרִת הִפֶּסִח, morrow of the Passover. The passage in Jos 5:11, often appealed to in proof, states that on the latter day the Israelites ate the produce of Canaan (עֲבוּר הָאָרֶוֹ, A.V. erroneously “old corn of the land”), consisting of unleavened cakes and parched ears. From this it has been inferred that, as the Passover had just been celebrated, the wave sheaf, which was a necessary preliminary to harvest (Lev 23:14), had already been offered. This, as all parties agree, could not be done before the 16th of Nisan, and hence Keil and others unwarrantably assume that this was the day in question. But we know, from its use elsewhere (Num 23:3), that the phrase “morrow after [Heb. of] the Passover” was the day immediately succeeding the Paschal meal, i.e. the 15th of Nisan. The wave sheaf had not therefore at that time been offered, and the Israelites could not have stood upon ceremony in eating the new grain, probably because they had not vet become settled in their possession to which the law in question was specially applicable (Lev 23:10; comp. Num 15:18).

(2.) The definite art. in הִשִּׁבָּתthe ordinance under consideration merely indicates it as the one Sabbath of the Paschal week, and cannot refer to any other of the Passover days in the context, which are not (either there or elsewhere) designated by this term. Nor is the word שִׁבָּת, Sabbath, ever used in Biblical Hebrew in the sense of a literal week, as the Rabbinical theory assumes. The seven Sabbaths are termed fall (תְּחַימוֹת, “complete”) because they are exclusive of the terminus a quo, contrary to the usual Jewish practice, which is to include both extremes.

(3.) The reckoning of Pentecost from the Sabbath proper would not disagree with the classification of the other Jewish feasts by terms of seven, nor tend to displace either that or the Passover in the calendar; for the other feasts were not dependent upon the Pentecost, and the fifty days would be equally regular and harmonious from whatever point reckoned.

(4.) The weight of Jewish authority is of little account, and the accession of Christian writers is of still less, since there is known to have been an early  difference of opinion and practice on this point. The two instances occurring in the New Test. history are decidedly adverse to the Rabbinical mode of computation, namely. the “second Sabbath after the first,” on which Jesus passed through the fields of standing corn (Luk 6:1), SEE SECOND FIRST SABBATH, and the first Pentecost of the Christian Church, which by the traditionary calendar would have fallen on the Sabbath (the seventh after that of the crucifixion), and not on Sunday, as generally admitted. SEE PENTECOST; SEE SABBATH, MORROW AFTER.

In Luk 6:1 we have the above-noted phrase, σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον, rendered in the A.V. “The second Sabbath after the first.” It is over hasty, after a few MSS., to blot out the second word as not genuine, though even Meyer does so. Who could have inserted it? And is not the omission of a word which nobody understood easily accounted for in the few instances in which it takes place? To strike out a word simply as strange is too uncritical to be borne. The various older interpretations are collected in Wolf, Cur. 1, 619 sq.; Rus, Harm. Evang. p. 639 sq.; Paulus, Comm. 2, 32 sq. It is usually regarded as the first Sabbath after the second Easter day (comp. Lev 23:15, and the Sept.), since from this day to the Passover seven Sabbaths were reckoned (Leviticus l.c.), and these may well have been distinguished by their numbers — the first, second, third, etc., after the second Easter day (Scaliger, De Emend. Temp. p. 557; Casaub. Exercit. Antibar. p. 272; Bauer, op. cit. 2, 154). Olshausen's objections to this view do not seem to be forcible. His own explanation (following Beza and Paulus), the first Sabbath of two during a feast, is not plausible. A peculiar name would hardly be given to this; and, even if given, would be of no importance to the evangelist. Moreover, in such a case the phrase would be inappropriate at best. Credner's view (Beitr. z. Einl. ins N.T. 1, 357) is rightly answered by De Wette, On Luke, l.c. The objections made by Paulus and others to our interpretation have been well answered by Lubkert (in the Studien u. Krit. 1835, 3, 664 sq.). Yet he takes no notice of P. Ewald's suggestion (in the Neu. krit. Journ. d. Theol. 2, 480) that the phrase may easily be an abridged Hebrew expression for the second Sabbath after the second Paschal day; in which, however, the proof that such a phrase was in use in the age of Jesus is wanting. Hitzig understands it to mean the 15th of Nisan, which, according to Lev 23:11, was considered as a Sabbath, following the 14th, which had always been a Sabbath. This, however, is unsupported. Wieseler gives (Chronol.  Synop. p. 231 sq.) an interpretation intimately connected with his whole system, that it is the first Sabbath in the second year of the seven years, reckoned from one sabbatical year to another; i.e. the first Sabbath of Nisan. Here it is assumed that a technical term was appropriated to the first Sabbath of every year in such a series of years; which is the less probable, as the civil year, with which the sabbatical year is connected (comp. Wieseler, p. 204 sq.), began in autumn. Add to this that no mode of reckoning in practical life by Sabbath years has been proved from Josephus (Ant. 14, 10, 5 and 6). nor from the Mishna. In fine, the effort of Redslob to refer this phrase to the second Sabbath after the second Easter day by the force of the word δευτερόπρωτον (Hall. Lif.-Z. 1847; Int. Bl. No. 70) seems to be a mistake. SEE SECOND FIRST SABBATH.

Of equal regard with the Sabbath, as a day of entire rest, was the first Paschal day and the last (Lev 23:39), while the great day of reconciliation was a Sabbath of Sabbaths (16:31; 23:32). Accordingly, some would understand the words in Joh 19:31 (ην μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου, rendered in the A.V. “for that Sabbath day was a high day”) of the first Paschal day. But a proper weekly Sabbath seems certainly to be meant, in harmony with the entire relation of John; e.g. with 21:1. It is called a great or high day because the first Paschal day fell upon it (see Carpzov, App. p. 384; Bleek, Beitr. z. Evangelien-Kritik, p. 31 sq.).

The Sabbath is kept by the modern Jews as a great festival with every demonstration of joy, taking the idea from Isa 58:13-14, “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable . . . then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, “etc. The Sabbath is held from evening to evening (Lev 23:32), but they begin it half an hour before sunset on Friday, and prolong it till half an hour after sunset on Saturday, for the benefit of the souls of the damned, who, they believe, are allowed on that day suspension of their sufferings. On Friday afternoon they prepare all the food, etc., that may be wanted, and lay out their best clothes to wear in honor of “Queen Sabbath.” Some opulent Jews keep magnificent dresses to be worn on the Sabbath alone. As soon as the Sabbath commences, the mistress of the house lights the Sabbath lamp, which is filled with pure olive oil, and has from four to seven wicks, and lays on the table the Sabbath bread, shaped like a twisted plait, made of the finest wheaten flour, and sprinkled with poppy seeds. They go to the synagogue, and after  their devotions wish each other “a good Sabbath.” At supper, the master of the house repeats the commemoration of the Sabbath out of Genesis 2, “Thus the heavens were finished,” etc.; thanks God for the Sabbath, blesses the wine, and passes it round. They rise later than usual on the Sabbath morning; and at the synagogue they use some additional devotions, with a commemoration of the dead. They think it right to eat at least three meals on the Sabbath, because the word “today” relating to the Sabbath is repeated three times in Exo 16:25. So convinced are they that one way of honoring the Sabbath is by great feasting that they sometimes fast the preceding day to enable them to eat the more at the Sabbath meals (Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. c. 15). There is a Jewish maxim, that he is greatly to be commended who honors the Sabbath exceedingly in his body, in his dress, and in eating and drinking. Such are the principal features of the carnal views of the Sabbath from which the early fathers wished to wean the Jewish converts. A full account of the sabbatical ceremonies observed at present by the Jews may be found in Buxtorf's Synagoga Judaica, and in Picard's Religious Ceremonies.

See, in general, Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 70 sq.; Ball, Horoe Sabbaticoe (Lond. 1853); and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 112; and by Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica (see Index). See also the literature referred to under the article following and SEE LORDS DAY.

## Sabbath, Morrow After The[[@Headword:Sabbath, Morrow After The]]

             There has been from early times some difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words מָחַרִת הִשִּׁבָּת, mochorath hashshabbath, thus rendered in the computation of the Passover (Lev 23:11; Lev 23:15). It has, however, been generally held, by both Jewish and Christian writers of all ages, that the Sabbath here spoken of is the first day of holy  convocation of the Passover, the 15th of Nisan, mentioned in Lev 23:7. In like manner the word שִׁבָּתis evidently used as a designation of the day of atonement (Lev 23:32); and שִׁבָּתוֹן(sabbati observatio) is applied to the first and eighth days of Tabernacles and to the Feast of Trumpets. That the Sept. so understood the passage in question can hardly be doubted from their calling it “the morrow after the first day” (i.e. of the festival): ἡ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης. The word in Lev 23:15-16 has also been understood as “week, “used in the same manner as σάββατα in the New Test. (Mat 28:1; Luk 18:12; Joh 20:1, etc.).

But some have insisted on taking the Sabbath to mean' nothing but the seventh day of the week, or “the Sabbath of creation, “as the Jewish writers have called it; and they see a difficulty in understanding the same word in the general sense of week as a period of seven days, contending that it can only mean a regular week, beginning with the first day, and ending with the Sabbath. Hence the Baithusian (or Sadducaean) party, and in later times the Karaites, supposed that the omer was offered on the day following that weekly Sabbath which might happen to fall within the seven days of the Passover. The day of Pentecost would thus always fall on the first day of the week. Hitzig (Ostern und Pfingsten [Heidelberg, 1837]) has put forth the notion that the Hebrews regularly began a new week at the commencement of the year, so that the 7th, 14th, and 21st of Nisan were always Sabbath days. He imagines that “the morrow after the Sabbath” from which Pentecost was reckoned was the 22d day of the month, the day after the proper termination of the Passover. He is well answered by Bahr (Symbolik, 2, 620), who refers especially to Jos 5:11, as proving, in connection with the law in Lev 23:14, that the omer was offered on the 16th of the month. It should be observed that the words in that passage, עֲבוּר הָאָרֶוֹ, mean merely corn of the land, not, as in the A.V., “the old corn of the land.” “The morrow after the Passover” (מָחַרִת הִפֶּסִח) might at first sight seem to express the 15th of Nisan; but the expression may, on the whole, with more probability, be taken as equivalent to “the morrow after the Sabbath,” that is, the 16th day. See Keil on Jos 5:11; Masius and Drusius, on the same text, in the Crit. Sac.; Bahr, Symb. 2, 621; Selden, De Anno Civili, c. 7; Bartenora, in Chagigah, 2, 4; Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. vol. 20, Fagius, in Lev 23:15; Drusius, Notoe Majores in Lev 23:16. It is worthy of remark that the Sept. omits τῇ ἐμαύριον τοῦ πάσχα, according to the texts of  Tischendorf and Theile. SEE PASSOVER; SEE PENTECOST. But there is strong ground for the Karaitic interpretation. SEE SABBATH (Supra).

## Sabbath, Second After The First[[@Headword:Sabbath, Second After The First]]

             (Luk 6:1). SEE SECOND FIRST SABBATH.

## Sabbathaeus[[@Headword:Sabbathaeus]]

             (Σαββαταῖος), a Graecized form (Esdr. 9:14) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:15) SHABBETHAI SEE SHABBETHAI (q.v.).

## Sabbathai Zebi[[@Headword:Sabbathai Zebi]]

             (i.e. צְבַי, the gazelle, or beauty, a family adjunct), a famous Jewish impostor, was born in Smyrna, July, 1641. When a child he was sent to a Rabbinic school and instructed in the whole cycle of Rabbinic lore. When fifteen years of age, he betook himself to the study of the Cabala, rapidly mastered its mysteries, and became peerless in his knowledge of “those things which were revealed and those things which were hidden;” and at the age of eighteen obtained the honorable appellation of sage (חכ ם), delivering public lectures, and expounding the divine law and the esoteric doctrine before crowded audiences. At the age of twenty-four, he revealed to his disciples that he was the Messiah, the son of David, the true Redeemer, and that he was to redeem and deliver Israel from their captivity among the Christians and Mohammedans. At the same time he publicly pronounced the Tetragrammaton as it is written, to do which, it is well known, was not permitted, save to the high priest during the existence of the Temple, when he performed service in the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement, thus braving the rule that “the penalty of death is pronounced on him who utters the Tetragrammaton publicly.” When the sad intelligence reached the sages of Smyrna, they sent to him two messengers of the Beth-din (ecclesiastical tribunal) to warn him, and to caution him that if he should so trespass again they would excommunicate him, and even consider it a meritorious action for any one to take his life. But Sabbathai replied that he was allowed to do so, being the anointed of God. Hearing this, the sages of Smyrna were much affrighted, and having deliberated together what to do, they decreed unanimously that he was guilty of death for two reasons: firstly, because he had uttered the name of the Lord according to its letters, and, secondly, because he pretended to be the Messiah. Therefore they excommunicated him, and proclaimed it a  meritorious action for any one to slay him, and the fine imposed on the slayer by the laws of the Mohammedans they promised to pay.

Now, when Sabbathai saw that evil was determined against him, he fled from Smyrna to Salonica, where he was received with great honor, his evil deeds having not yet been known there. Many disciples also gathered around him to learn the science of the Cabala, and all the inhabitants of Salonica revered him and loved him more than any other man. But after having been there for a considerable time, he fell again into his former error, and repeated his former transgression, uttering the name of the Lord according to its letters in the presence of his disciples; and when his pupils asked him wherefore he did so, he replied that he was the anointed, and that it was therefore lawful for him to do so. The sages of Salonica, having heard of this repeated offense, sent to him two messengers of the Beth-din, ordering him to quit Salonica, otherwise he would be put to death, because he had wrought folly in Israel. Knowing that the Jews had more power at Salonica than in any other country, he secretly fled to Athens, and thence into Morea. But he found no refuge there, for the inhabitants of Morea, being informed that he had been expelled from Salonica, also drove him away. He then went through Greece to Alexandria, from this city to Cairo, and thence to the Holy Land, as far as Jerusalem, where he remained for several years, teaching the Cabala, proclaiming himself as the Messiah, anointing prophets, and converting thousands upon thousands. So numerous were the believers in him that in many places trade was entirely stopped; the Jews wound up their affairs, disposed of their chattels, and made themselves ready to be redeemed from their captivity and led by Sabbathai Zebi back to Jerusalem. The consuls of Europe were ordered to inquire into this extraordinary movement, and the governors of the East reported to the sultan the cessation of commerce. Sabbathai Zebi was then arrested by order of the sultan Mohammed IV, and taken before him at Adrianople. The sultan spoke to him as follows: “I am going to test thy Messiahship. Three poisoned arrows shall be shot into thee, and if they do not kill thee, I too will believe that thou art the Messiah.” He saved himself by embracing Islamism in the presence of the sultan, who gave him the name Effendi, and appointed him Kapidji-Bashi. Sabbathai died Sept. 10, 1676, after having ruined thousands upon thousands of Jewish families. The literature on this pseudo-Messiah is very rich. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 184 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10, 205 sq.; note 3, p. 23 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 153 sq.; Ginsburg, Kabbalah, p. 139; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 701; Theologisches Universal-  Lexikon, s.v. Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 3, 369 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 475 sq.; Schmucker, Hist. of the Modern Jews, p. 226 sq. SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE. (B.P.)

## Sabbathaists[[@Headword:Sabbathaists]]

             SEE SABBATHAI.

## Sabbatians[[@Headword:Sabbatians]]

             a Judaizing section of the Novatians, who owed their origin to Sabbatius, a presbyter that had been ordained by Marcian (Socrat. Hist. Eccl. 5, 20; 7, 15). They assumed the name of Protopaschites, and refused to communicate with any but those who adopted with them the Quartodeciman rule in regard to the paschal festival. The Sabbatians were included among heretics who were condemned in A.D. 381 by the seventh canon of the Council of Constantinople (Mansi Concil. 3, 563).

## Sabbatic River[[@Headword:Sabbatic River]]

             a stream of Palestine, described by ancient writers as flowing only on the Sabbath day (Reland, Paloest. p. 291). Josephus locates it between Arce and Raphanaca (War, 7, 24). Thomson thinks that the intermittent fountain of Nebo el-Fuar, in the valley of Mar Jirius, west of Kulat Husn, near Tripoli, may have been the origin of the fountain, as it seems to contain a siphon for carrying off the overflow of the water (Land and Book, 1, 496 sq.).

## Sabbatical Year[[@Headword:Sabbatical Year]]

             the septennial rest for the land from all tillage and cultivation enjoined in the Mosaic law (Exo 23:10-11; Lev 25:2-7; Deu 15:1-11; Deu 31:10-13; comp. Josephus, Ant. 3, 12, 3). The regulation appears to have been greatly neglected during the Hebrew occupancy of Palestine (2Ch 36:21).

I. Names and their Signification. — In the Mosaic legislation this festival is called by four names, each of which expresses some feature connected with the observance thereof. Thus it is called —

(1) שְׁבִת שִׁבָּתוֹן, Rest of entire Rest, or Sabbath of Sabbatism (Lev 25:4; A.V. “Sabbath of rest”), because the land is to have a complete rest from all tillage and cultivation;

(2) שִׁבָּתוֹן שְׁנִת, the Year of Sabbatism or Rest (Lev 25:5, “year of rest'), because the rest is to extend through the year;

(3) שְׁמַטָּה, or more fully שְׁנִת הִשְּׁמַטָּה, “Release,” Remission, or “the Year of Release” (Deu 15:1-2; Deu 15:9), because on it all debts were remitted; and

(4) שְׁנִת הִשֵּׁבִע, “the Seventh Year” (Deu 15:9), because it is to be celebrated every seventh year, for which reason it is called in the Hebrew canons κατ᾿ ἐξοξήν, שַׁבַיעַית, the Seventh (i.e. שָׁנָה, Year), as is also the name of the tractate in the Mishna (Shebiith) treating on the sabbatical year. Josephus styles it the ἑβδοματικὸς or σαββατικὸς ἐνιαυτός (Ant. 14, 10, 6; 16, 2; 15, 1, 2); once ἀργὸν ἔτος (War, 1, 2, 4).

II. The Laws connected with this Festival. — Like the year of jubilee, the laws respecting the sabbatical year embrace three main enactments —

(1) Rest for the soil; (2) care for the poor and for animals; and (3) remission of debts.

The first enactment, which is comprised in Exo 23:10-11; Lev 25:2-5, enjoins that the soil, the vineyards, and the olive yards are to have perfect rest; there is to be no tillage or cultivation of any sort, at least in Palestine (comp. Tacit. Hist. 5, 4, 3). What constitutes tillage and cultivation, and how much of labor was regarded as transgressing the law, may be seen from the following definitions of the Hebrew canons: “The planting even of trees which bear no fruit is not allowed on the sabbatical year; nor may one cut off withered or dried up boughs of trees, nor break off the withered leaves and branches, nor cover the tops with (lust, nor smoke under them to kill the insects, nor besmear the plants with any kind of soil to protect them from being eaten by the birds when they are tender, nor besmear the unripe fruit, etc., etc. And whoso does one of these things in the sabbatical year is to receive the stripes of a transgressor” (Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka Hilkoth Shemita Ve-Jobel, 1, 5). Anything planted wittingly or unwittingly had to be plucked up by its roots (Mishna,  Terum. 2, 3). Thus it was a regulation requiring all the land periodically to lie fallow (Philo, Opp. 2, 207, 277, 631), and as a year of rest corresponded with the Sabbath or day of rest (ibid. 2, 631; Josephus, l.c.; War, 1, 2, 4; Tacit. l.c.); in fact, a Sabbath year, just as the Essenes, besides the seventh day, observed a sabbath of weeks each seventh week (Philo, Opp. 2, 481).

The second enactment, which is contained in Exo 23:11; Lev 25:5-7, enjoins that the spontaneous growth (סָפַיחִ) of the fields or of trees (comp. Isa 37:30) is to be for the free use of the poor, hirelings, strangers, servants, and cattle (Exo 23:11; Lev 25:5-7; comp. Mishna, Edayoth, 5, 1). This law is thus defined by the Jewish canons: “He who locks up his vineyard, or hedges in his field, or gathers all the fruit into his house in the sabbatical year, breaks this positive commandment. Everything is to be left common, and every man has a right to everything in every place, as it is written ‘that the poor of thy people may eat' (Exo 23:11). One may only bring into his house a little at a time, according to the manner of taking things that are in common” (Maimonides, ibid. 4, 24). “The fruit of the seventh year, however, may only be eaten by man as long as the same kind is found in the field; for it is written ‘and for the cattle and for the beast that are in thy land shall all the increase thereof be meat' (Lev 25:7). Therefore, as long as the animals eat the same kind in the field thou mayest eat of what there is of it in the house; and if the animal has consumed it all in the field, thou art bound to remove this kind from the house into the field” (Maimonides, ibid. 7, 1). The people, who are enjoined to live upon the harvest of the preceding year, and the spontaneous growth of the sabbatical year, are promised an especially fruitful harvest to precede the fallow year as a reward for obeying the injunction (Lev 25:20-22). That the fields yielded a crop in the sabbatical year, and even in the second fallow year — i.e. in the year of jubilee — has been shown in the art. JUBILEE YEAR.

The third enactment, which is contained in Deu 15:1-3, enjoins the remission of debts in the sabbatical year. The exceptions laid down are in the case of a foreigner, and that of there being no poor in the land. This latter, however, it is straightway said, is what will never happen. But though debts might not be claimed, it is not said that they might not be voluntarily paid; and it has been questioned whether the release of the seventh year was final or merely lasted through the year. This law is  defined by the ancient Hebrew canons as follows: The sabbatical year cancels every debt, whether lent on a bill or not. It does not cancel accounts for goods; daily wages for labor which may be performed in the sabbatical year, unless they have been converted into a loan; or the legal fines imposed upon one who committed a rape, or was guilty of seduction (Exo 22:15-16), or slander, or any judicial penalties; nor does it set aside a debt contracted on a pledge, or on a פְּרוֹסְבּוּל= πρὸς βουλῇ (or βουλήν) — i.e. declaration made before the court of justice at the time of lending not to remit the debt in the sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: “I, A B, deliver to you, the judges of the district C, the declaration that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me,” and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. If this Prosbul was antedated, it was legal, but it was invalid if postdated. If one borrowed money from five different persons, a Prosbul was necessary from each individual; but if, on the contrary, one lent money to five different persons, one Prosbul was sufficient for all. This Prosbul was first introduced by Hillel (q.v.) the Great (born about B.C. 75), because he found that the warning contained in Deu 15:9 was disregarded: the rich would not lend to the poor for fear of the sabbatical year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse (Mishna, Shebiith, 10, 1-5; Gittin, 4, 3). This shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the release of the seventh year did not simply last through the seventh year, as some will have it, but was final. The doctors before and in the time of Christ virtually did away with this law of remitting debts by regarding it as a meritorious act on the part of the debtor not to avail himself of the Mosaic enactment, and pay his debts irrespective of the sabbatical year. But not glaringly to counteract the law, these doctors enacted that the creditor should say, “In accordance with the sabbatical year, I remit thee the debt;” whereunto the debtor had to reply, “I nevertheless wish to pay it,” and the creditor then accepted the payment (Mishna, Shebiith, 10, 8). As the Mosaic law excludes the foreigner from the privilege of claiming the remission of his debts in the sabbatical year (Deu 15:3), the ancient Jewish canons enacted that even if any Israelite borrows money from a proselyte whose children were converted to Judaism with him, he need not legally repay the debt to his children in case the proselyte dies, because the proselyte, in consequence of his conversion, is regarded as having severed all his family ties, and this dissolution of the ties of nature sets aside mutual inheritance, even if the children professed Judaism with the father. Still the sages regarded it as a meritorious act if the debts were paid to the children  (Mishna, Shebiith, 10, 9). It is often said, too, that in the sabbatical year all slaves of Hebrew birth were freed; but the words in Exo 21:2 (comp. Jer 34:14 sq.) require only that they be freed in the seventh year of their servitude (Josephus, Ant. 16, 1, 1). Deu 15:12 no more relates to the law of the sabbatical year than Deu 15:19 sq. (comp. Ranke, Pentat. 2, 362), and where the sabbatical year is expressly treated of — as in Leviticus 25 nothing is said of such manumission. Nor does Josephus (Ant. 3, 12, 3) mention it. Leviticus 34:8 does not refer at all to this institution (yet see Hitzig, ad loc.), and Leviticus 34:14 refers only to the law in Exo 21:2. SEE RELEASE.

III. Time, Observance, and Limit of the Sabbatical Year. — The sabbatical year, like the year of jubilee, began on the first day of the civil new year =the first of the month Tisri (Maimonides, l.c. 4, 9). SEE NEW YEAR. But though this was the time fixed for the celebration of the sabbatical year during the period of the second Temple, yet the tillage and cultivation of certain fields and gardens had already to be left off in the sixth year. Thus it was ordained that fields upon which trees were planted were not to be cultivated after the feast of Pentecost of the sixth year (Mishna, Shebiith, 1, 1-8), while the cultivation of corn fields was to cease from the feast of Passover (ibid. 2, 1). Since the destruction of the Temple, however, the sabbatical year, or, more properly, cessation from tillage and cultivation of all kinds, does not begin till the feast of New Year. According to the Mosaic legislation, the laws of the sabbatical year were to come into operation when the children of Israel had possession of the promised land; and the Talmud, Maimonides, etc., tell us that the first sabbatical year was celebrated in the twenty-first year after they entered Canaan, as the conquest of it recorded in Jos 14:10 occupied seven years, and the division thereof between the different tribes mentioned in Joshua 18, etc., occupied seven years more, whereupon they had to cultivate it six years, and on the seventh year — the twenty-first after entering therein — the first sabbatical year was celebrated (Babylon Talmud, Erachan, 12 b; Maimonides, l.c. 10, 2). On the feast of Tabernacles of the sabbatical year, certain portions of the law were read in the Temple before the whole congregation (Deu 31:10-13). As the Pentateuchal enactment assigns the prelection of the law to the priests and college of presbyters (ibid.) — viz. the spiritual and civil heads of the congregation (hence the singular תַּקְרָא, “thou shalt read this law before all Israel”) the Hebrew canons ordained that the high priest, and  after the return from Babylon the king, should perform this duty. The manner in which it was read by the monarch is thus described in the Mishna: “At the close of the first day of the feast of Tabernacles in the eighth year — i.e. at the termination of the seventh fallow year a wooden platform was erected in the outer court, whereon he sat, as it is written, ‘at the end of the seventh year on the festival' (Deu 31:10). Thereupon the superintendent of the synagogue took the book of the law and gave it to the head of the synagogue; the head of the synagogue then gave it to the head of the priests, the head of the priests again gave it to the high priest, and the high priest finally handed it to the king; the king stood up to receive it, but read it sitting. He read —

(1) Deu 1:1-6; Deu 1:3 (אלה הדברי ם עד שמע);

(2) Deu 6:4-8 (שמע);

(3) Deu 11:13-22 (והיה אי ם שמוע);

(4) Deu 14:22; Deu 15:23 (עשד תעשר);

(5) Deu 26:12-19 (כי תכלה לעשר);

(6) Deu 17:14-20 (המלפִרשת); and

(7) Deu 27:23 (עד שגומר כל הפרשה כרכות וקללות).

The king then concluded with the same benediction which the high priest pronounced, except that he substituted the blessing of the festivals for the absolution of sins” (Mishna, Sota, 7, 8). This benediction forms to the present day a part of the blessing pronounced by the maphtir, or the one who is called to the reading of the lesson from the prophets after the reading of the lesson from the law, and is given in an English translation in the art. HAPHTAARH of this Cyclopoedia, beginning with the words “For the law, for the divine service,” etc. The sabbatical year, however, was only binding upon the inhabitants of Palestine (Kiddushin, 1, 9; Orlah, 3, 9), the limits of which were determined on the east by the desert of Arabia, on the west by the sea, on the north by Amana, while on the south the boundary was doubtful (comp. Geiger, Lehr-und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mishna, [Breslau, 1845], 2, 75, etc.).

As to the obedience to this law, ancient Jewish tradition tells us that it was never kept before the exile, and that it is for this reason that the Jews were seventy years in the Babylonian captivity, to give to the land the seventy years of which it was deprived during the seventy sabbatical years, or the  430 years between the entrance into Canaan and the captivity, as it is written (2Ch 36:20-21), “Until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths [i.e. sabbatical years], for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath to fulfill threescore and ten years [i.e. sabbatical years]” (comp. Shabbath, 13, a; Seder Odom, c. 26; Rashi on 2Ch 36:20). After the captivity, however, when all the neglected laws were more rigidly observed (see Neh 10:31), the sabbatical year was duly kept, as is evident from the declaration in 1Ma 6:49 that “they came out of the city, because they had no victuals there to endure the siege, it being a year of rest for the land,” from the fact that both Alexander the Great and Caius Caesar exempted the Jews from tribute on the seventh year, because it was unlawful for them to sow seed or reap the harvest (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 6), and from the sneers of Tacitus about the origin of this festival (Hist. 5, 2, 4), as well as from the undoubted records and the post-exilian minute regulations about the sabbatical year contained in the ancient Jewish writings. According to 1Ma 6:53, the one hundred and fiftieth year of the Seleucid eras was a sabbatical year (Josephus, Ant. 13, 8, 1, 16, 12; 15, 1, 2; War, 1, 2, 4; comp. Hitzig, Isaiah p. 433; Von Bohlen, Genesis p. 138 sq., Einleit.). The Samaritans observed it (Josephus, Ant. 11, 8, 6). St. Paul, in reproaching the Galatians with their Jewish tendencies, taxes them with observing years as well as days and months and times (Gal 4:10), from which we must infer that the teachers who communicated to them those tendencies did more or less the like themselves. Another allusion in the New Test. to the sabbatical year is perhaps to be found in the phrase ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτερομρώτῳ (Luk 6:1). Various explanations have been given of the term, one of them being that it denotes the first Sabbath of the second year in the cycle (Wieseler, quoted by Alford, vol. 1). SEE SECOND FIRST SABBATH

IV. Design of the Regulation. — The spirit of this law is the same as that of the weekly Sabbath. Both have a beneficent tendency, limiting the rights and checking the sense of property; the one puts in God's claims on time, the other on the land. The land shall “keep a Sabbath unto the Lord.” “The land is mine.” The sabbatical year opened in the sabbatical month. It was thus, like the weekly Sabbath, no mere negative rest, but was to be marked by high and holy occupation, and connected with sacred reflection and sentiment. At the completion of a week of sabbatical years, the sabbatical scale received its completion in the year of jubilee.  This singular institution has the aspect, at first sight, of total impracticability. This, however, wears off when we consider that in no year was the owner allowed to reap the whole harvest (Lev 19:9; Lev 23:22). Unless, therefore, the remainder was gleaned very carefully, there may easily have been enough left to insure such spontaneous deposit of seed as in the fertile soil of Syria would produce some amount of crop in the succeeding year, while the vines and olives would of course yield their fruit of themselves. Moreover, it is clear that the owners of land were to lay by corn in previous years for their own and their families' wants. This is the unavoidable inference from Lev 25:20-22. Though the right of property was in abeyance during the sabbatical year, it has been suggested that this only applied to the fields, and not to the gardens attached to houses. The great physical advantage aimed at in the sabbatical year was doubtless that the land lay fallow, thus increasing the fruitfulness of the six years of cultivation, especially in that ancient period when the artificial use of fertilizers was unknown. But this rest was experienced likewise by men and cattle. Other advantages of more or less importance have been suggested: the encouragement of the chase (comp. Lev 25:7); the securing of the land against famine (Michaelis in the Comment. Soc. Gotting. Oblat. [Brem. 1763], 5, 9; Mos. Recht, 2, 39 sq.); the prevention of exportation and foreign trade (Hug, Zeitschr. fur das Erzbisth. Freiburg, 1, 10 sq.). On the other hand, scarcity did sometimes occur during the sabbatical year (1Ma 6:49; 1Ma 6:53; Josephus, Ant. 14, 16, 2), and it is certain that the institution had various inconveniences incident to it (comp. Grever, Comment. Mis. Syntagma [Olden. 1794]. p. 27 sq.; Von Raumer, Vorles. uber alte Gesch. 1, 138 sq.), which, however, are certainly exaggerated by Von Raumer. Hullmann, too, has been carried too far by his zeal against this institution (Staatsveofass. der Israelit. p. 163 sq.).

V. Literature. — Mishna, Shebiith; the Talmud on this Mishna; Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka Hilkoth Shemita Ve-Jobel; Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, arts. 74-77 (English transl. [Lond. 1814], 1, 387-419); Baihr, Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus (Heidelb. 1839), 2, 569 sq., 601 sq.; Maimonides, Tr. de Jurib. Anni Sept. Vertit Notisque illustr. J. H. Maius (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1708); Carpzov, Appar. p. 442 sq.; Winer, Realworterb. 2, 349.

## Sabbatier, Pierre[[@Headword:Sabbatier, Pierre]]

             a French Benedictine, was born at Poitiers in 1682. In 1700 he took the habit of St. Benedict at the abbey of St. Faron de Meaux. He was employed by prince Bruinart to edit the fifth volume of the Annales Benedictines. At this time he also began to publish the ancient version of the Scriptures, commonly called the Italian Version. The first edition had not appeared when, on account of the part he had taken in the Jansenist quarrels, he was exiled to the abbey of St. Nicaise at Rheims. He did not live to see the work completed, his death occurring on March 24, 1742, but it was finally published by Ballard and Vincent de la Rue under the title of Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinoe Versiones Antiquoe, seu Vetus Italica (1743).

## Sabbatini, Andrea[[@Headword:Sabbatini, Andrea]]

             called Andrea da Salerno, an Italian painter, was born at Salerno about 1480. He studied at Rome under Raphael, and, though he remained there but a year, was one of the best imitators of Raphael's style. Among his numerous works at Naples are the frescos and scenes of Santa Maria della Grazia. His best works are at Gaeta and Salerno, and his Visitation may be seen at the Louvre, in Paris. He died in 1545. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Sabbatini, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Sabbatini, Lorenzo]]

             called Lorenzino da Bologna, another Italian painter, was born about 1533 at Bologna. Being called to Rome under the pontificate of Gregory XIII, he painted in the royal hall of the Vatican Faith Triumphing over Unbelief; and other frescos in the Pauline Chapel. These gained for him the position of superintendent of the works in the Vatican, which he held till his death. The principal pictures of Sabbatini are a Madonna, in the Louvre; the Marriage of St. Catharine, at Dresden; and the Virgin Enthtroned, at Berlin. He died in 1577.

## Sabbatini, Luigi Antonio[[@Headword:Sabbatini, Luigi Antonio]]

             an Italian composer of music, was born at Albano in 1739. While young he joined the Order of St. Francis, and received his musical education in the convents at Rome, Bologna, and Padua. His principal teacher was Villotti, whose system of harmony he adopted. He was made musical director of  the church of the Twelve Apostles at Rome, and retained the position till 1780, when he took the place of Villotti in the church of St. Antony at Padua. He composed much sacred music, and was the author of several musical works-Elementi Teorici della Musica (1789): — Vera Idea delle Musicali Numeriche Segnature (1795) — besides a Life of Villotti, and an edition of the Psalms of Marcello. He died at Padua Jan. 29, 1809.

## Sabbatism[[@Headword:Sabbatism]]

             (σαββατισμός, Heb 2:9, A.V.” rest”), a repose from labor, like that enjoyed by God at creation; a type of the eternal Sabbath of heaven. SEE REST.

## Sabbatum Magnum[[@Headword:Sabbatum Magnum]]

             (great Sabbath). The day before Easter was designated as the high Sabbath, partly in imitation of the primitive institution, and partly in token of respect for the time in which our Savior lay in the grave. This was the only Sabbath eventually continued in the Church and distinguished bI peculiar solemnities. It was set apart as a strict fast, probably with reference to the words of Christ, “When the Bridegroom is taken away from them, in those days shall they fast.” It was called the Easter vigil, and was among the earliest of those established by Christians. From Lactantius, Jerome, and other Christian writers we learn that the early Christians expected the second coming of our Lord on this night, and prepared themselves for it by fasting, prayer, and other spiritual exercises. The Easter vigil was distinguished by the lighting of a large taper (cerers paschalis), signifying the resurrection of our Lord, and the consequent rejoicing of the Church; by the baptism of catechumens, particularly in the Greek Church; and by the reading of proper lessons, which took place immediately before the celebration of the baptism. The fast was continued till cock-crowing the next morning, which was supposed to be the time of the resurrection. In the Latin Church the Easter vigil was suppressed, in consequence of the numerous abuses practiced and the injury to the morals of young people.

## Sabean; Sabeus[[@Headword:Sabean; Sabeus]]

             SEE SABEAAN; SEE SABAUS.

## Sabellianism[[@Headword:Sabellianism]]

             SEE SABELLIUS.

## Sabellians[[@Headword:Sabellians]]

             SEE SABELLIUS.

## Sabellius[[@Headword:Sabellius]]

             the author of a heretical doctrine concerning the nature of the Trinity, which disturbed the Church in the 3d century, and has occasionally reappeared, under modified forms, even down to modern times. Sabellius, according to Hippolytus (Philosophoumena), spent some time at Rome in the beginning of the 3d century, and was gained by Callistus to patripassianism. Subsequently he appears as a presbyter of Ptolemais, in Egypt. There his doctrine assumed a modified form, and made such progress in the Church that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, excommunicated him at a council in that city (A.D. 261), and opposed him so earnestly as to almost fall into the opposite error of a hypostatical independence of the Father and the Son. Thereupon the Sabellians complained of that bishop to Dionysius of Rome, who held a council on the subject in 262, and controverted Sabellianism in a special treatise, taking care also to refute subordinationism and tritheism. The bishop of Alexandria retracted his utterances on these last points. Thus this feature of the strife was largely allayed until the age of Arius, half a century later.

Sabellius is by far the most original and ingenious of the so called Monarchians. His system is known to us only from a few fragments imperfectly preserved in Athanasius and other fathers. It has been carefully discussed, and even partially revived, by Schleiermacher in modern times (see Schaff, Church History, p. 292-294). The beginnings of Sabellianism are found in Noetus, though there is no evidence of any historical connection between Noetus and Sabellius. The system seems rather to have sprung out of Judaizing and Gnostic tendencies which were indigenous to Egypt. Sabellius held the Jewish position of a strict monotheism, recognizing only a single divine substance and a single hypostasis, which are but two words for the same thing. In themselves they constitute the monad. As simple substance, the monad is “the silent God,” i.e. it is inoperative and unproductive. It becomes active only through revelation and development, which are sometimes conceived of as an unfolding,  sometimes as a speaking. The first form of Sabellianism seems to have held merely to a dyad, to wit, God simple and God speaking, that is, God and the Logos. But this earlier form soon disappears, and gives place to a triad. Thus the monad evolves itself as a triad, as three divine persons, but not in the Nicene sense. The one divine substance simply assumes three forms (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost) in its threefold relation to the world. This is not, however, simply three appellations, but it is three successive forms of manifestation of the one divine substance. In illustration of this, Sabellius compares the Father to the visible globe of the sun, the Son to its illuminating effects, and the Spirit to its warming influence, while the sun, per se, would correspond to the simple divine substance. To the first form of manifestation (the Father) is attributed the giving of the law, and in general the whole pre-Christian economy. Thereupon ensued the second form, the incarnation, in which God accomplished our objective redemption. Thereafter he appears under a third phase, the Spirit of sanctification, which exerts its efficiency in the hearts of believers. As the three manifestations are conceived of as successive, so, also, are they but temporary and transitory. The divine substance does not manifest itself simultaneously in three forms, but as each new manifestation is made the previous one ceases; and when, finally, all three stages have been passed, the triad will again return into the monad, and the divine substance will again be all and in all. Thus appears the pantheistic tendency of Sabellianism as a whole. God is the abstract substance which evolves itself into the world of reality, traverses the stage of finite life, and eventually retires within itself. The “silent” God speaks forth in the universe, and then returns back into silence. Some of the fathers traced the doctrine of Sabellius to the Stoic system. The only common element, however, is the pantheistic expansion and contraction of the divine nature immanent in the world. Kindred ideas are also found in Pythagoreanism, in the Gospel of the Egyptians, and in the Pseudo- Clementine Homilies. But this does not affect the vigorous originality of Sabellius. His theory broke the way for the Nicene Church doctrine by its full rejection of subordinationism, and by its complete coordination of the three persons. He differs from the orthodox view by his denial of the trinity of essence and the permanence of the threefold manifestation, thus making of the Father, Son, and Spirit simply a transient series of phenomena, which fulfil their mission, and then return into the abstract one divine substance.  See Athanasius, Contra Arianos Oratio, 3, 4; De Synodis, c. 7; Philastrius, De Hoeres.post Christi Passionem, lib. 26; Theodoret, Hoeret. Fab. Comnpend. 2, 9; Augustine, De Hoeres. lib. 41; Basil, Epist. 210, 214; Tillemont, Memoires, 4, 237; Mosheim, De Rebus Christian. saec. 3, § 38; Neander, Church Hist. (Rose's ed.), 2, 276; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 2, 429; Schleiermacher, Ueber den Gegensatz der Sabellianischen and athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinitdt; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 13, 214-216. (J.P.L.)

## Sabi[[@Headword:Sabi]]

             [or rather SABI'E, as in the earliest editions of the A.V.] (Σαβιή, v.r. Σαβείν), given in 1Es 5:34 as the head of one of the families of “Solomon's servants” who returned from Jerusalem; apparently a false Graecism for the ZEBAIM SEE ZEBAIM (q.v.) of the Heb. lists (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59).

## Sabians[[@Headword:Sabians]]

             (sometimes confounded with Saboeans), a very ancient sect, said to be named after Sabi, son of Enoch, reputed to have been the founder of their religion in its original and purest form. Their creed comprehended the worship of one God, the Governor and Creator of all things, who was to be addressed through a mediator, which office was to be performed by pure and invisible spirits. An admiration of the heavenly bodies, and an undue idea of their influence over earthly objects, soon produced an idolatrous worship of the heavenly luminaries, in which they conceived that the mediative intelligences resided. At first the Sabians worshipped towards the planets, as the residences of the mediating spirits between God and man; hence soon arose star worship. Then they made images to represent the stars, in which, after consecration, they imagined the intelligences came to reside; they named the images after the planets, and hence arose idolatry and its corruptions. They taught that the sun and moon were superior deities and the stars inferior ones; that the souls of the wicked were punished for nine thousand years, and then pardoned. They highly valued agriculture and cattle, and it was unlawful to kill the latter. The principal seats of Sabianism were Harran and “Ur of the Chaldees.” Maimonides says that Abraham was originally a Sabian, till he was converted and left Chaldaea. Maimonides also says that it was very prevalent in the time of Moses. It is to Sabianism that Job alludes (Job 31:26-27), “If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand” — i.e. in token of salutation. Also in different parts of the second book of Kings, and in Zep 1:5; Jer 19:13, the idolatrous worship of the host of heaven is mentioned. The Sabians of later times, when praying, turn towards the north pole; pray at sunrise, noon, and sunset; abstain from many kinds of vegetables; believe in the ultimate pardon of the wicked, after nine thousand years of suffering; keep three yearly fasts — one in February of seven days, one in March of thirty days, and one in December of nine days; offer many burned offerings, or holocausts; adore the stars; teach that mediators live in the seven planets, whom they call lords and gods, but the true God they call Lord of lords; each planet, they teach, has his distinct region, office, and objects of guardianship; they believe that an intercourse is kept up between the planetary intelligences and the earth, and that their influence is conveyed by talismanic mystic seals, made with spells and according to astrological rules. They go on pilgrimage to Harran, in Mesopotamia, respect the temple at Mecca, and venerate the pyramids in Egypt, which they believe to be the sepulchres of Seth, Enoch, and Sabi; and they offer there a cock and black calf, and burn incense (Sale, Koran). SEE TSABIANS.

The name of Sabians is often given by the Mohammedans and Eastern Christians to a sect in and about Bagdad and Bassorah, whose proper appellation is Mendaites, or “Disciples of John,” sometimes improperly called “Christians of St. John,” as they have in reality no pretensions to Christianity. The name of their founder is John, but it is not quite clear that he is John the Baptist, as has been supposed by their using a kind of baptism. Their sacred books are a ritual, the book of John, and the book of Adam; the latter has been published, and is extremely mystical and obscure. It sets out with the Gnostic tenet of two eternal, self-existent; independent principles. It teaches that Jesus is one of the seven planets — viz. Mercury; that he was baptized in Jordan by John, but corrupted the doctrines of John, wherefore the good genius Anush delivered him up to be crucified. These Sabians pray at the seventh hour and at sunset; assemble at the place of worship on the first day of the week, on which day they baptize their children; they use extreme unction, decry celibacy, forbid the worship of images, permit all kinds of meat, but abstain from meat dressed by infidels; sign their children with a particular sign, and contemn all reverence for the planets. The Rev. Joseph Wolf mentions in his Journal having met with  some of these Sabians, or rather Mendaites, about Bassorah; but they evidently wished to impose on him and give a favorable impression of their doctrines. They affected a great reverence for Christ, as the Messiah, and the Word of God; they professed to require the mediation of Christ and John, and to believe that Christians would be saved, and to expect the second advent, and taught that sin was washed away by rebaptizing. Their remaining tenets, such as sealing their children, abstaining from meats cooked by Mohammedans, etc., are the same as have been before quoted. SEE MENDEANS.

## Sabin (Or Sabine), Elijah Robinson[[@Headword:Sabin (Or Sabine), Elijah Robinson]]

             an early American Methodist minister, was descended from an old Puritan family, and was born in Tolland, Conn., Sept. 10, 1776. Although he never went to school after he was eight years of age, he acquired a tolerable education by night study on his father's farm. He was early converted under Calvinistic influence, but soon joined the Methodists, and began to preach in Vermont in 1798. The next year he was received into what was then the New York Conference, and sent to Needham, Mass. His labors on the Landaff Circuit, in New Hampshire, which was his next appointment, were so severe as to impair his health, and he retired as supernumerary for two years, during which he married. He resumed his ministry in 1805 as presiding elder of the Vermont district, and afterwards presiding elder on the New London district, enduring many hardships and persecutions in the work. He next served on the Needham Circuit, and finally in Boston. In 1811, his health failing, he located and afterwards removed to Penobscot, where he endured the horrors of the ensuing war, being in 1814 temporarily compelled to escape to Landaff. In 1817 he visited the South, and died at Augusta, Ga., May 4, 1818. He was a man of fine figure and commanding address, and at one time was chaplain of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts. He published several small works: The Road to Happiness: — Charles Observator: — several occasional Sermons and Tracts: — and began the collection of materials for a History of Maine. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 306 sq.

## Sabina[[@Headword:Sabina]]

             Saint and Martyr, was a pious and noble widow who had been converted to Christianity by Serapia, a virgin of Antioch who lived in her house (in what station is not known). Serapia was required to sacrifice to the gods, but refused; and when the presiding judge commanded her to offer to Christ instead, she replied, “I sacrifice to him continually, and pray to him day and night.” To the inquiry, “Where is the temple of your Christ, and what sacrifices do you offer?” she responded, “I offer myself in chastity and purity, and endeavor to persuade others to the same course; for it is written, ‘Ye are the temple of the living God.'” Thereupon the judge delivered her up to two Egyptians that they might violate her chastity; but they were smitten by divine power with blindness and terror, and were unable to accomplish their purpose. This result was attributed to the magical arts of Serapia, and she was subjected to various tortures, and finally beheaded. Sabina had the remains of her sainted teacher interred in her own tomb, and was soon called to suffer a similar fate. She endured  joyfully for Christ, and was laid by the side of her companion. The year of their martyrdom was about A.D. 125, as both Tillemont and the Bollandists assume; the place, according to Tillemont, some town in Umbria, but according to the Bollandists, the city of Rome. Roman Catholic scholars are not agreed respecting the character of such ancient “Acts” of this saint as still exist; some, like Baronius, regarding them as “sincerissima,” while others, like Tillemont (Monumenta, vol. 2), acknowledge them to be ancient, but doubt whether their antiquity reaches back to the time when these martyrs suffered, and also whether interpolations have not been added. The Bollandists. decide, “nobis non videntur fide indigna, etiamsi non careant omni naevo” (see the Bollandists, in Act. SS. MM. Secrapioe et Sabinoe ad 29 Augusti). The relics of the two confessors were transferred in A.D. 430 to a new church erected in their honor at Rome.

## Sabina, Poppaea[[@Headword:Sabina, Poppaea]]

             first the mistress and afterwards the wife of Nero. Her father was T. Ollius, who perished at the fall of his patron Sejanus, and her maternal grandfather  was Poppaeus Sabinus, whose name she assumed. Poppaea had been originally married to Rufius Crispinus, by whom she had a son; but she afterwards became the mistress of Otho, a boon companion of Nero, by whose means she hoped to attract the notice of the emperor. Obtaining a divorce from Rufius, she married Otho. Her husband's lavish praise of her charms made the emperor anxious to see her. Her conduct had the desired effect. Nero removed Otho out of the way by sending him to govern Lusitania, A.D. 58. Poppaea now became the acknowledged mistress of Nero, but was anxious to be his wife. As long, however, as Agrippina, the mother of Nero, was alive, she could scarcely hope to obtain this honor. Through her influence Nero was induced to put his mother to death, in A.D. 59, and in A.D. 62 he put away Octavia, on the plea of barrenness. and married Poppaea a few days afterwards. Not feeling secure as long as Octavia was alive, she worked upon the fears and passions of her husband until she prevailed upon him to put the unhappy girl to death in the course of the same year. Poppaea was killed by a kick from her husband in a fit of passion (A.D. 65). Her body was not burned, according to the Roman custom, but embalmed, and was deposited in the sepulchre of the Julii. She received the honor of a public funeral, and her funeral oration was pronounced by Nero himself. The only class in the empire who regretted her may have been the Jews, whose cause she had defended (Josephus, Life, § 3; Ant. 20, 8, 11).

## Sabinian[[@Headword:Sabinian]]

             SEE SABINIANUS.

## Sabinianus[[@Headword:Sabinianus]]

             Pope, was a native of Volterra, and was elected bishop of Rome after the death of Gregory I, or the Great, Sept. 13, A.D. 604. He had been employed on a mission to the court of Phocas, the usurper of the Eastern empire. He is said to have shown himself avaricious and fond of hoarding, and to have thereby incurred the popular hatred. Sabinianus died in about eighteen months after his election (Feb. 22, A.D. 606), and was succeeded, after a vacancy of nearly one year, by Boniface III, the first bishop of Rome who was acknowledged by the imperial court of Constantinople as primate of the whole Church.

## Sabotiers[[@Headword:Sabotiers]]

             a name given to the Waldenses, from the sabots (sandals) worn by the French peasantry. The sabots of the Waldenses were, however, distinguished by a painted cross—insabbatati — or else by sandals tied crosswise. They are described in an epistle of Innocent III as “calciamenta desuper aperta” (Innocent, Ep. 15, 137); and other writers speak of the Waldenses as wearing sandals, after the custom of the apostles, and as walking with naked feet. Ebrard speaks of them contemptuously as assuming this name themselves: “Xabatenses a xabata potius, quam  Christiani a Christo, se volunt appellari.” The custom was doubtless adopted in imitation of the voluntary poverty of the apostles, and in accordance with the names “Pauperes de Lugduno” and “De Lombardia,” which they assumed (Ebrard, Contr. Waldens. in Bibl. Lugd. [1572], 24).

## Sabta[[@Headword:Sabta]]

             (Heb. Subta', סִבְתָּא, of unknown etymology, Sept. Σαβαθά v.r. Σαβατά, 1Ch 1:9; in Gen 10:7 the Heb. [in most MSS.] is Sabtah', סִבְתָּה; Sept. Σαβαθά; Eng. Vers. “Sabtah”), the third named of the five sons of Cush, the son of Ham. B.C. cir. 2475. His descendants appear to have given name to a region of the Cushites (Gen 10:7; 1Ch 1:9). SEE CUSH.

In accordance with the identifications of the settlements of the Cushites in the art. ARABIA and elsewhere. Sabtah should be looked for along the southern coast of Arabia. There seem to be no traces in Arabic writers; but the statements of Pliny (6, 32, § 155; 12, 32), Ptolemy (6, 7, p. 411), and Anon. Peripl. (27), respecting Sabbatha, Sabota, or Sabotale, metropolis of the Atramitae (probably the Chatramotitae), seem to point to a trace of the tribe which descended from Sabta, always supposing that this city Sabbatha was not a corruption or dialectic variation of Saba, Seba, or Sheba. SEE SHEBA.

It is only necessary to remark here that the indications afforded by the Greek and Roman writers of Arabian geography require very cautious handling, presenting, as they do, a mass of contradictions and transparent travelers' tales respecting the unknown regions of Arabia the Happy, Arabia Thurifera, etc. Ptolemy places Sabbatha in long. 77°, lat. 16° 30'. It was an important city, containing no less than sixty temples (Pliny, N.H. 6, 23, 32); it was also situate in the territory of king Elisarus, or Eleazus (comp. Anon. Peripl. ap. Muller, Geog. Min. p. 278, 279), supposed by Fresnel to be identical with “Ascharides,” or “Alascharissoun” in Arabic (Journ. Asiat. Nouv. Serie, 10, 191). Winer thinks the identification of Sabta with Sabbatha, etc., to be probable; and it is accepted by Bunsen (Bibelwerk, Genesis 10, and Atlas). It certainly occupies a position in which we should expect to find traces of Sabta, where are traces of Cushitic tribes in very early times, on their way, as we hold, from their earlier colonies in Ethiopia to the Euphrates. Gesenius, who sees in Cush only Ethiopia, “has no doubt that Sabta should be compared with Σαβάτ, Σαβά, Σαβαί (see Strabo, 16, p. 770, ed. Casaub.; Ptolemy, 4, 10), on the shore of the Arabian Gulf, situated just where  Arkiko is now, in the neighborhood of which the Ptolemies hunted elephants. Among the ancient translators, Pseudo-Jonathan saw the true meaning, rendering it סמדאי, for which read סמראי, i.e. the Sembritpoe, whom Strabo (l.c. p. 786) places in the same region. Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 1) understands it to be the inhabitants of Astabora” (Gesenius, ed. Tregelles, s.v.). Here the etymology of Sabta is compared plausibly with Σαβάτ; but when probability is against his being found in Ethiopia, etymology is of small value, especially when it is remembered that Sabat and its variations (Sabax, Sabai) may be related to Seba, which certainly was in Ethiopia. On the Rabbinical authorities which he quotes we place no value. It only remains to add that Michaelis (Suppl. p. 1712) removes Sabta to Ceuta, opposite Gibraltar, called in Arabic Sebtah (comp. Marasid, s.v.); and that Bochart (Phaleg, 1, 114, 115, 252 sq.), while he mentions Sabbatha, prefers to place Sabta near the western shore of the Persian Gulf, with the Saphtha of Ptolemy, the name also of an island in that gulf.

## Sabtah[[@Headword:Sabtah]]

             (Gen 10:7). SEE SABTA.

## Sabtecha[[@Headword:Sabtecha]]

             (Heb. Sabteka', סִבְתְּכָא, etymology unknown; Sept. in Genesis Σαβαθακά v.r. Σαβακαθά; in Chronicles A.V. “Sabtechah;” Σεβεθαχά v.r. Σεκαθά), the last named of the five sons of Cush, the son of Ham. B.C. cir. 2475. His descendants seem to have given name to a people in Ethiopia (Gen 10:7; 1Ch 1:9). SEE CUSH. “Their settlements would probably be near the Persian Gulf, where are those of Raamah, the next before him in the order of the Cushites. SEE DEDAN; SEE RAAMAH; SEE SHEBA. He has not been identified with any Arabic place or district, nor satisfactorily with any name given by classical writers. Bochart (who is followed by Bunsen, Bibelwerk, Genesis 10, and Atlas) argues that he should be placed in Carmania, on the Persian shore of the gulf, comparing Sabtechah with the city of Samydace of Steph. Byz. (Σαμιδάκη or Σαμυκάδη of Ptolemy, 6, 8, 7). This etymology appears to be very far-fetched. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 936) merely says that Sabtechah is the proper name of a district of Ethiopia, and adds the reading of the Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan (זנגאי, Zingitani).” In confirmation of this latter  view the name Sabatok has been discovered on the Egyptian monuments (Rosellini, Monumenta, 2, 198).

## Sabtechah[[@Headword:Sabtechah]]

             (Gen 10:7). SEE SABTECHA.

## Sabureans[[@Headword:Sabureans]]

             a class of doctors among the modern Jews, who weakened the authority of the Talmud by their doubts and conjectures. They were sometimes termed Opinionists. It is said that rabbi Josi was the founder of the sect about twenty-four years before the Talmud was finished. He had some celebrated successors who became heads of the academies of Sora and Pumbaditha. But as these two famous academies were shut up by order of the king of Persia, the sect of the Sabureans became extinct about seventy-four years after its establishment.

## Sacaea[[@Headword:Sacaea]]

             a festival observed by the ancient Persians and Babvlonians in commemoration of a victory gained over the Sacae, a people of Scythia. It lasted five days, and resembled in its mode of observance the Roman saturnalia (q.v.).

## Sacar[[@Headword:Sacar]]

             (Heb. Sacar', שָׂכָר, hire, as often; Sept Σαχάρ v.r.]Αχάρ, and Σαχιάρ in 1Ch 26:4), the name of two Israelites.

1. The father of Abiam, one of David's mighty men; he is called a Hararite (1Ch 11:35), and is the same man called SHARAR (q.v.) in 2Sa 23:33. B.C. ante 1020. See DAVID.

2. The fourth named of the eight sons of Obed-Edom (1Ch 26:4). B.C. cir. 1012.

## Sacchi, Andrea[[@Headword:Sacchi, Andrea]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Rome in 1598. From his father, a mediocre artist, he received his first ideas of art, and by studying the works of Albani he became one of the best artists of the Roman school. His works show great care in execution, though they have been criticized by Raphael Mengs  as lacking in detail. In the Vatican are four of his paintings, which are reproduced in Mosaic in the crypt of St. Peter's. Among his best paintings are the Miracle of St. Gregory the Great, Noah and his Sons, and portraits of Albani and of the artist himself. He died in 1661. His tomb is in the church of St. John Lateran at Rome.

## Sacchini, Francesco[[@Headword:Sacchini, Francesco]]

             an Italian historian, was born in the year 1570 at Paciono, near Perugia. In 1688 he joined the Order of Jesuits, and taught in Rome. He was for seven years the secretary of Vitelleschi, general of his order. His writings were principally historical, as Historia Soc. Jesu (5 vols. fol.; the list three of these were published after his death). He also published a volume of sermons, and an Italian translation of the life of Paulin de Nole, by Rosweyde. He died at Rome Dec. 16, 1625.

## Saccophori[[@Headword:Saccophori]]

             (sack-carriers), a name of a small party of professing penitents in the 4th century, who went about always dressed in the coarse apparel which their name implies. They appear to have been a subdivision of the Encratites- those, namely, who thought fit to make an outward profession of their rule. St. Basil puts together the Encratites, Saccophori, and Apotactics as an offshoot of the Marcionites (Basil, Can. Epist. 2, can. 47). Theodosius made a decree, which was renewed by Honorius, that some of the Manichueans, who went by the name of Encratites, Saccophori, or Hydroparastatse, should be punished with death (Cod. Theod. lib. 16, tit. 5, “De Haeret.” leg. 9).

Both the Marcionites and the Manichaeans held the doctrine of Two Principles; and it is no wonder that the Encratites are referred now to one, now to the other of these sects. But their true origin appears to be from the former. St. Basil's Canon is one relating to the baptism of these sects. SEE ENCRATITES.

## Saccus[[@Headword:Saccus]]

             (σακκός), a tight sleeveless habit worn by Greek patriarchs and metropolitans.

## Sacellanus, The Grand[[@Headword:Sacellanus, The Grand]]

             an officer in the Greek Church, whose title denotes “headmaster of the chapel.” He exercises inspection over monasteries and nunneries, presents all candidates for ordination to the patriarch or his deputy, and assists the patriarch in th'e performance of several of the ceremonies of the Church, and in the administration of his judicial functions.

## Sacellius[[@Headword:Sacellius]]

             (Gr. σακελλάριος), a lay officer of the early Church, acting in the capacity of treasurer, as μέγας σακελλάριος, treasurer of the cloisters. See Coleman, Christian Antiquities, p. 129.

## Sacellum[[@Headword:Sacellum]]

             a sacred enclosure among the ancient Romans, which was dedicated to a god, and containing an altar and a statue of the deity.

## Sacer, Gottfried Wilhelm[[@Headword:Sacer, Gottfried Wilhelm]]

             a German hymnist, was born at Naumberg July 11, 1635, and died Sept. 8, 1699. He was an excellent lawyer, and in his official duties distinguished himself by a strict conscientiousness and the most unbounded benevolence. He is the author of a number of very fine hymns; the greater part he composed while a student at the University of Greifswalde. When these hymns were collected and published in 1714, they immediately procured him the reputation of a distinguished poet. Two of them were also translated into English by Miss E. Cox: Gott fdhrt auf gen' Himmel (Hymns from the German, p. 62), “Lo! God to heaven ascendeth,” and So hab' ich obgesieget (p. 86), “My race is now completed.” See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 3, 398 sq.; Gul. Saceri Memoria, auctore Joanne Arnold Ballenstedt (Helmst. 1745). (B.P.)

## Sacerdos[[@Headword:Sacerdos]]

             (priest), a name by which bishops and presbyters are frequently designated in early writings, bishops being occasionally called summi sacerdotes. From the deacons performing only the subordinate ministerial duties, they were early called sacerdotes secundi vel tertii ordinis. See Coleman, Chris. Antiq. p. 111.

## Sacerdotal Cities[[@Headword:Sacerdotal Cities]]

             the thirteen cities set apart by Joshua for the family of Aaron, which lay in the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (Jos 21:4), and in the vicinity of the holy city. Their names were Hebron (a free city), Libnah, Jattir, Eshtemoa, Holon, Debir, Ain, Juttah, Beth-shemesh, Gibeon, Geba, Anathoth, and Almon; the last four being in the tribe of Benjamin (Jos 21:10 sq.). After the exile, too, priests dwelt in these cities (Neh 7:73), though many were permanestly settled in Jerusalem itself (Neh 11:10 sq.). SEE CITY; SEE LEVI; SEE PRIEST.

## Sacerdotal City[[@Headword:Sacerdotal City]]

             SEE PRIEST.

## Sacerdotal Consecration Among The Israelites[[@Headword:Sacerdotal Consecration Among The Israelites]]

             Priests and high priests were consecrated to their offices with a variety of ceremonies, which are described at great length in the sacred books (Exo 29:1-37; Lev 8:1-30; Exo 40:12-15; comp. Bahr, Symbolik, 2, 166 sq.). The service consisted chiefly of two parts (comp. Exo 29:29).

1. The proper consecration consisted of washing the whole body, investment, and anointing with the sacred oil. SEE UNGUENT. The latter, indeed, in Exo 29:7; Lev 8:12, is mentioned only of the high priests; but that the common priests were also anointed is clear from Exo 40:15 (comp. Exo 28:41); and the peculiarity of the anointing of the high priest seems to have been simply that the ointment was poured upon his head (Exo 29:7; Lev 8:10), while the common priests were, perhaps, simply touched with the ointment on the hands, or, as the rabbins say, on the brow.

2. A sacrifice then followed. Three beasts were led to the altar, and the hands of the new made priest were laid upon them. First a young bull was presented as a sin offering, and essentially treated as a sin offering of the first class. SEE SIN-OFFIERING. A ram was slain as a burned offering, according to the usual ceremonial; and finally the Ram of Consecration. Blood from this ram was placed on the ear laps, on the right thumb, and on the great toe of the right foot, and was sprinkled about the altar. The parts of the body touched with blood point out the members chiefly used in sacerdotal service. (On the foot, comp. Exo 28:35. See Bahr, op. cit. p. 425. Comp. the five places touched by the Catholics in extreme unction. Their priests at consecration have only the hands anointed.) Now the bodies and the clothing of the candidates were again sprinkled, this  time with a mixture of the blood of the sacrifice and oil. The final ceremony was this: those parts of the ram of consecration which in the case of a thank-offering were raised and waved were placed, with some unleavened bread, upon the hands of the persons consecrated, and waved, and finally burned upon the altar, the “breast of the wave-offering” and the “shoulder of the heave-offering” alone excepted. On the symbolic meaning of this ceremony, SEE CONSECRATION OFFERING.

The ceremony of consecration, perhaps only the sacrifices of it, was to be repeated seven days (Exo 29:35), and the priests were forbidden during this time to leave the sanctuary. It is not very probable that this minute ceremonial was carried out at the ordination of all Jewish priests. According to the rabbins, it was only necessary at the first institution of the priesthood, and afterwards each common priest, on entering upon his office, was only required to present the meat-offering (Lev 6:12; Lev 6:14 sq.). SEE CONSECRATION; SEE PRIEST.

## Sacerdotal Order[[@Headword:Sacerdotal Order]]

             (designated in general by the Hebrew word priests, kohanim', כֹּהֲנַי ם, for the etymology, see various views in Gesenius, Thesaur. 2, 661 sq.). In the patriarchal age the head of a family was its priest (Gen 35:1 sq. SEE JETHRO; SEEMELCHIZEDEK. ); but when the children of Israel became a nation, a special tribe of priests was set apart by law for them. This arrangement was so far similar to that of the Egyptians that they too had a separate caste or body of priests, who indeed were their first and highest caste (Herod. 2, 164; Diod. Sic. 1, 73. On the Indian Brahmins, see Meiner, Gesch. d. Religion, 2, 541 sq.; yet comp. Bahr, Symbolik, 2, 32 sq.). By its hereditary nature, the priesthood acquired more firmness and security; the ritual and ceremonial law was more easily preserved and obeyed; and the higher culture which such a caste always secures obtained a more definite and fixed center.

These priests alone” drew near to God” (Num 16:5; Exo 19:22; Eze 42:13; comp. Num 18:3), and hence must alone attend to all the services of the central sanctuary, the penalty of death being denounced against all others who assumed such duties (Num 3:6-10; Num 3:38; Num 16:40). These priests, who exercised their office, after the division of the kingdom, in Judah alone (1Ki 13:33; 2Ch 11:13 sq.), were confined to the family of Aaron (Exo 28:1), who were  Kohathites (comp. Num 4:2). Hence they are called the children of Aaron (Lev 3:5; Lev 3:13; comp. Lev 1:5; Lev 2:2); although not all the descendants of Aaron who were legally qualified actually served as priests. Thus Benaiah, a priest's son (1Ch 27:5), held military office under David (2Sa 8:18; 2Sa 20:23; 1Ki 2:35). They were required to be without physical defect, as became men who must draw near to God, and mediate between him and his people (Lev 21:17 sq.; comp. Mishna, Bechoroth, c. 7; Josephus, War, 5, 5, 7; see Tholuck, Zwei Beil. z. Br. a. d. Hebr. p. 81 sq. On the examination for priesthood, see Mishna, Middoth, 5, 4). They must also be of blameless reputation (Josephus, Ant. 3, 12, 2; Philo, Opp. 2, 225; see Richter, Physiogn. Sacerd. [Jena, 1715] 2, 4; Kiesling, De Legib. Mos. circa Sacerdot. Vitio Corporis Laborantes [Lips. 1755]), which, indeed, was demanded among other nations (Potter, Greek Antiq. 1, 292 sq.; Adam, Rom. Antiq. 1, 529). On the vestals especially, see Aul. Gell. 1, 12. The requirements of the canon law as to physical defects in the clergy may be compared.

The law did not fix any definite year of the priest's age in which he should enter upon his office; yet the Gemarists assert that none was ever admitted before his twentieth year. Indeed, this age was required of the Levites (q.v.) before serving. But since, at a later day, even the high priest might be but a youth (Josephus, Ant. 15, 3, 3), it may be that with priests of lower grade no great strictness was ever exercised in this respect. Indeed the Mishna (Yoma, 1, 7; comp. Tamid, 1, 1) speaks of youths whose beard was just beginning to grow (if the gloss be right) as already entering the sanctuary in the priestly office. At a later day every one was required to prove his genealogy (comp. Mishna, Middoth, 5, 4; Kiddush. 4, 4 sq.), which led the priests to set great value on their family records (comp. Ezr 2:62; Neh 7:64; Josephus, Apion, 1, 7), and the Gemara refers to a special course of instruction for those entering on this office (Kethuboth, cvi, 1). The formal consecration to the priesthood consisted in sacrifices, with symbolic ceremonies, purifications, and investment (Exodus 29; Leviticus 8). SEE SACERDOTAL CONSECRATION.

The Israelitish priests, during active service (and, according to Jewish tradition, during their stay in the Temple; but see Josephus, War, 5, 5, 7; according to the Mishna, Tamid, 1, 1, they were merely prohibited from sleeping in their clothes; these were kept in the Temple under a special officer [Mishna, Shekal. 5, 1]), wore clothing of white linen (בִּדַ, bad), as did the Egyptian priests (Herod. 2, 37), whose white linen garments, the  simple expression of purity, were known through the ancient world (see Spencer, Leg. Rit. 3, 5; Celsius, Hierobot. 2, 290). Bahr supposes the Israelitish priestly garments to have been copied from the Egyptian (Symbol. 2, 89 sq.), but on insufficient grounds (comp. Hengstenberg, Mos. p. 149 sq.). These garments of the Jewish priests consisted of the following distinct parts, which, however, are not accurately described (Exo 28:40; Exo 28:42; Exo 39:27 sq.; Lev 6:3; Lev 8:13):

(1.) מַכְנָסַי ם, miknasim (Sept. περισκελῆ, A.V. “linen breeches”), which were simply drawers, a covering for the pudenda, extending from the hips to the thighs (so described by Josephus, Ant. 3, 7, 1; but comp. Philo, Opp. 2, 225).

(2.) כְּתנֶת, kethoneth (A.V. “coat”), a woven tunic for the body. It is described by Josephus (Ant. 3, 7, 1) as reaching to the feet and fitting the body, with sleeves tied fast to the arms, and girded to the breast a little above the elbows.

(3.) אִבְנֵט, abnet, the “girdle” used to bind the tunic. It passed round the body several times, beginning at the breast, and was then tied, and hung loosely down to the ankles, save when the priest was serving, when, for convenience, it was thrown over the shoulders. It was broad, loosely woven, and embroidered (Josephus, Ant. 3, 7, 2).

(4.) מַגְבָּעָה, migbaah (A.V. “bonnet, “Exo 28:40), properly a cap or turban, not made conical, but covering rather more than half the head, and so made as to resemble a crown. It was of heavy linen, in many folds, and sewed together, and had a cover of fine linen, which reached down to the forehead. It was fitted closely to the head (Josephus, Ant. 3, 7, 3). But Bihr has made some well grounded objections to this description of Josephus (Symbol. 2, 64 sq.), and the migbadh may, perhaps, have been a real cap, possibly in the form of a flower cup (comp. especially the extracts from Schilte Haggibbor, in Hebrew and German, in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 13, and Braun, De Vestitu Sacerdot. [Amst. 1701]). There is no sufficient reason for supposing the forms of these articles of clothing to have been imitated from Egyptian models. The Israelitish priests seem not to have worn shoes: no mention, at least, is made of them; and the belief prevailed that on a holy place one should tread only with bare feet (Exo 3:5; Jos 5:15). SEE SHOE. The Egyptian priests performed their service barefoot (Sil. Ital. 3, 28; for other similar examples, see Carpzov, Appar. p.  790 sq.; Walch, De Vet. Relig. ἀνυποδησίᾷ [Jena, 1756], p. 12 sq.; Baldwin, De Calceo Antiq. c. 23), though Herodotus ascribes to them sandals of papyrus (2, 37). The Rabbins assure us expressly that the priests wore no shoes (Bartenora, Ad Cod. Shekal. 5, 1 Maimonides, Chele Hammikd. 5, 14; comp. Theodoret, Ad Exodus 3, qu. 7; Mishna, Berachoth, 9, 5), and refer in part to this cause the frequency of diseases of the bowels among the priests, which rendered it necessary to keep a special physician at the Temple skilled in those diseases (comp. Braun, Vestit. Sacerd. 1, 3, 33 sq.; Kall, De Morbis Sacerdot. V.T. ex Ministerii eor. Condif. Oriundis [Hafn. 1745]).

The priests appear to have been divided by David into twenty-four classes for the daily service (1Ch 24:3 sq.; comp. 2Ch 8:14; 2Ch 35:4 sq.; Josephus, Ant. 7, 14, 7), each of which had its president or ruler (2Ch 36:14; Ezr 10:5; Neh 12:7 : he is called ἀρχιερεύς by Josephus, Ant. 20, 7, 8; Life, 5, 38, 39; and in the New Test., Mat 2:4; Mat 16:21; Luk 22:52), and performed the service for one week, from Sabbath to Sabbath (2Ki 11:9; 2Ch 23:4; comp. Luk 1:5; Josephus, Apion, 2, 7 sq.); dividing itself further into six sections, one for each day of the week, the whole number acting on the Sabbath. These twenty-four classes still existed in the period after the exile (Josephus, Life, p. 1; Apion, 2, 7; comp. 1 Maccabees 2, 1), and the Talmud asserts (Lightfoot, Hor. Reb. p. 708 sq.) that the four priestly families which returned with Ezra (Ezr 2:36 sq.) were immediately divided into twenty-four parts by the prophets (comp. Sonntag, De Sacerd. V.T. Ephem. [Altorf, 1691]; Maius, De Ephem. Sacerd. in his Exercit. 1, 20). Herzfeld, however. considers the account of the original division into classes as a fable of the chronicler, yet without reason (Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 1, 392 sq.). The several duties, as they returned in order, were distributed by lot (Luk 1:9; Mishna, Yoma, 2, 3 sq.; and Tanid; see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 714 sq.), and there was a special officer at the Temple to preside over this distribution (Mishna, Shekal. 5, 1). The office of priest, in distinction from that of Levite, consisted in “coming nigh” to the vessels of the sanctuary and to the altar (Num 18:3); and included the following special duties: (1.) In the Temple itself, the kindling of the incense (q.v.) morning and evening (Luk 1:10); the cleansing of the lamps in the “golden candlestick” and filling them with oil; the weekly renewal of the shew bread. (2.) In the court of the Temple, the feeding of the continual fire on the altar of burned offering (Lev 6:5), and  daily removal of the ashes from it (Yoma, 2, 8, 3, 1; Tamid, 1, 2, 4); all the exclusively priestly services in sacrificing, sprinkling the blood (Lev 1:5; Lev 1:11; Lev 3:2; Lev 3:13; Lev 4:25; 2Ch 30:17, etc.); waving the wave pieces (Lev 14:24; Lev 23:11; Lev 23:20); presenting the sacrifices and gifts upon the altar, and burning those which were to be burned (Lev 2:2; Lev 2:8; Lev 2:16; Lev 3:11; Lev 3:16; Lev 4:26, SEE SACRIFICE ); then the sacred ceremonies at the cleansing of the Nazarite, on the final release from his vow (Numbers 6), and at the ordeal of a woman suspected of adultery (Num 6:12 sq.), and the blowing of the metal trumpets at set times (Num 10:8 sq.; 2Ch 5:12; 2Ch 7:6; 2Ch 29:26; Neh 12:41; Mishna, Succa, 5, 5; Arach, 2, 3). To these were added the examination of the unclean, especially of lepers and their cleansing (Lev 13:14; comp. Deu 24:8; Mat 8:4; Luk 17:14, SEE PURIFICATION. ), the estimation of vows (Leviticus 27), and the nightly watch of the inner sanctuary (Mishna, Mliddoth, 1, 1). How these were related to the priests who kept the threshold (2Ki 12:9; 2Ki 25:8; Jer 52:23) is uncertain. SEE THRESHOLD. The overseer of the regular watch of the priests is mentioned (Middoth, 1, 2); perhaps the same with the captain of the Temple, στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Act 4:1; Act 5:24; comp. Deyling, Observ. 3, 302 sq.). But who, then, are the captains of the Temple, στρατηγοί, in the plural (Luk 22:52)? Perhaps under officers of the Levitical Temple watch (comp. Mishna, Shekal. 5, 1, 2). SEE TEMPLE.

The priests were also required to instruct the people in the law, and in certain cases to give judicial answers (Deu 17:8 sq.; Deu 19:17; Deu 21:5; comp. 2Ch 17:8. sq.). King Jehoshaphat even established a high tribunal, consisting of priests and Levites, in Jerusalem (2Ch 19:8; comp. Josephus, Apion, 2, 21; Diod. Sic. Ecl. 40, 1). On the services of priests in armies, SEE WAR.

The priests were required to perform all their offices in a state of ceremonial purity (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 6), which led to their oft repeated washings; especially before each performance of official duty (Exo 30:19 sq.; Tamid, 1, 2, 4; 2, 1), for which purpose vessels of water for bathing were kept in the court of the sanctuary. (On the duties of priests when rendered unclean, see the Mishna, Middoth, 2, 5.) They were not permitted, while engaged in official service, to take wine or any other intoxicating drink (Lev 10:9 sq.; Eze 44:21; Josephus, Ant. 3, 12, 5; War, 5, 5, 7). According to Rabbinical regulations, those who had  the daily ministration must entirely abstain, and the rest of the weekly division might drink wine only at night, because during the day they were liable to be called on for aid (Mishna, Taanith, 2, 7; comp. Josephus, Apion, 1, 22, p. 457 ed. Haverc.). All extravagant demonstrations of sorrow, as rending the clothes, wounding the body, shaving the head, etc., were forbidden them (Lev 10:6 sq.; Lev 21:5, SEE MOURNING ), and they were to avoid with care the touch of a corpse (Lev 21:1 sq.; Eze 44:25 sq.; Bahr, Symbol. 2, 182 sq.). With these restrictions may be compared those enjoined on the flamen dialis among the Romans (Aul. Gell. 10, 15). They were required in marrying, too, to have regard to priestly dignity; though not compelled to celibacy, as the Egyptian priests (Diod. Sic. 1, 80), they could only marry virgins or widows of character (never divorced women. Mishna, Sota, 8, 3), and of Israelitish descent (Lev 21:7; Eze 44:22; comp. Ezr 10:18), though no limit was enjoined as to the particular tribe; and in a later age even the Israelitish descent needed not to be direct (Mishna, Biccur. 1, 8). Yet intermarriage with the families of priests was especially sought (Luk 1:5; comp. Josephus, Apion, 1, 7; Muinch, De Matrim. Sacerd. V. T. c. Filiab. Sacerd. [Nuremb. 1747]). The law even extended its special care to the dignity and honor of the daughters of the priests (Lev 21:9; comp. 22:12; Mishna, Terumoth, 7, 2).

It is not difficult to understand how the priests enjoyed the peculiar reverence of the people (comp. Jer 18:18; Sir 7:31 sq.; Josephus, Apion, 2, 21), although their want of piety, and even their immorality, often called for severe rebukes from the prophets (Jer 5:31; Jer 6:13; Jer 23:11; Lam 4:13; Eze 22:26; Hos 6:9; Mic 3:11; Zep 3:4; Malachi 2). A number of cities (thirteen) were set apart for the residences of the priests, as also for the Levites (Jos 21:4; Jos 21:10 sq.), which lay near together in the vicinity of the sanctuary, in the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, SEE SACERDOTAL CITIES, and between which and Jerusalem they made their journeys on official duty (comp. Luk 10:31. (On the station or reserve body of priests in Jericho, see Lightfoot, flor. Heb. p. 89, 709.) In the Holy City, the priests inhabited chambers in the neighborhood of the Temple (Neh 11:10 sq.).

The priesthood was supported (comp. Numbers 18; Josephus, Ant. 4, 4, 4) by the assigned portions of the sacrifices (Lev 2:3; Lev 2:10; Lev 5:13; Lev 6:9; Lev 6:13; Lev 7:6; Lev 7:9; Lev 7:14; Lev 7:32; Lev 7:34; Lev 10:12 sq.; Num 6:20; Deu 18:3), as in Egypt (see Herod. 2, 37; and SEE SACRIFICE; comp. also Schol. ad Aristoph. Plut. 1186). This sacred portion was distributed also to those of priestly descent who were infirm, or for other reasons not called into service (Lev 21:22; Josephus, War, 5, 5, 7; see Hottinger, Apolog. pro Benigna Lege, Leviticus 22 [Frankf. 1738]; Cremer, in the Miscell. Groning. 2, 294 sq.; Deyling, Observ. 5, 70 sq.). First-fruits, heave offerings (Num 31:29), tithes (q.v.), the shew bread, when removed (Lev 24:9; Mat 12:4; comp. Succa, 5, 8), the fines for Levitical transgressions (Num 5:6 sq.), the redemption price of the first-born (18:15 sq.), and the subjects of vows, or the price of their redemption (Leviticus 27; Num 18:14; see in general Philo, De Proemiis Sacerd. in vol. 2 of Mangey's Ausg. p. 232 sq.), were also perquisites; some of which were only to be enjoyed by the priests themselves, and only then in the vicinity of the sanctuary, as the pieces of the trespass-offering (Lev 6:19 sq.) and the shew bread (24:9); others only within the Holy City; while the tithes, heave offerings, etc., were eaten in the sacerdotal cities, and by the entire families of the priests.

In addition to their receipts, the priests were free from taxes and from military service; and the freedom from taxation was granted them even in the period after the exile, and by the foreign rulers of Palestine (Ezr 7:24; Josephus, Ant. 12, 3, 3). In the last period of the Jewish state the rapacity of the high priests reduced the common priests even to want (Josephus, Ant. 20, 9, 2; comp. 8, 8). As the priests and Levites formed one thirteenth of the whole population, the support of this class was no small burden on the productive industry of the nation; yet the constant increase of the Levitical families caused such division of the revenues that the income of a Levite could never have been very great. In relation to this subject, it should be borne in mind,

(1) that the tithes and first-fruits, on a soil so fruitful, and with property secured by law, could never be very burdensome;

(2) that the other gifts, pieces from the sacrifices, vows, etc., depended in great part on the free choice of worshippers;

(3) that, apart from the priests and a few officers of government, the whole people were producers, and, during the early period at least, the body of consumers was not increased by a standing army or a learned class;

(4) that the increase in numbers of the Levites themselves did not increase the tithes, which were a fixed percentage of the produce. The true view is that one thirteenth of all the land rightfully belonged to the tribe of Levi; and, as this share was abandoned to the other tribes, their revenues were not payments for their sacerdotal services, but interest or rent for their land.

Thus, until the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem by the Romans, the priestly order continued as a hereditary and honored body (contrasted with the laity in the Talmud, Terum. 5, 4), directing and expressing the religious views of the people by symbolic usages, and when their relations to Jehovah were disturbed by sin, restoring them by expiatory sacrifices. It was a kind of nobility (Josephus, Life, sec. 1). It seems to have been in correspondence with their natural position; in the nation that at an early period the priests had an active share in the government as political counsellors (Num 27:2; Num 27:19; Num 31:12; Numbers cf., Num 31:26; Num 32:2; Deu 27:9; Jos 17:4). Under the kings, they sometimes mediated between the prince and the people (2Sa 19:11), or were prized as counselors at court (1Ki 1:7 sq., 1Ki 1:39; 1Ki 4:4; 2Sa 8:17); but later, when the corruption of the people and the State became obvious, they allied themselves with kings and princes for the suppression of the bold speaking of the prophets (Jer 20:1 sq., Jer 26:7 sq.), for their love of form and ritual would naturally endanger the spirit of faith within them, and place them in opposition to the prophets. SEE SEER.

The rule of the sacerdotal caste in Palestine does not seem to have begun with the settlement of the Israelites there. In the time of the Judges there were family priests appointed by the head of the household (Jdg 17:5 sq.; Jdg 18:3; Jdg 18:27; Jdg 18:30). Those who were not Levites, or at least not priests, offered on altars which they had themselves built (Jdg 6:26; Jdg 13:19; 1Sa 7:9; 1Sa 16:5; but Jdg 6:18 does not belong here; see Rosenmüller, ad loc.; so in 1Sa 6:14, as in 2Sa 6:17, though priests are not expressly named); and in Shiloh, near the sanctuary, where a family of priests performed service, the people visited high-places and altars long before consecrated. SEE SACRIFICE. Even under David, it would seem that the Levitical priests were not exclusively intrusted with the sanctuary, for David's sons were priests (2Sa 8:18). It is true that the word כֹּהַנַי ם, kohinim, is here often rendered privy-councillors, or, as in the A.V., “princes;” and so in other places where the priests are named with the people of the court, but without philological grounds  (Gesenius, Thesaur. 2, 663 sq.). An exclusive priesthood, as a distinct caste, was confirmed by the building of the Temple, and their influence may have been increased by being concentrated within the little kingdom of Judah. According to 2Ch 11:13 (comp. 1Ki 12:31; 1Ki 13:33) the priests and Levites left the kingdom of Israel under its first king, and gathered in the kingdom of Judah (but comp. 2Ki 17:27 sq.).

See, in general, Philo, in the first book, De Monarchia. p. 225 sq.; Saubert, De Sacerdot. Hebr. in his Op. Posth. p. 283 sq., and De Sacrif. Vet. p. 637 sq.; also in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 12; Krumbholz, Sacerdot. Hebr. and Ugolini Sacerdot. Hebr. in Thesaur. vol. 13; Carpzov, Appar. p. 89 sq.; Reland, Ant. Sac. 2, 4 sq. SEE PRIEST.

## Sacheverell, Henry, D.D.[[@Headword:Sacheverell, Henry, D.D.]]

             a celebrated English divine, son of Joshua, minister of St. Peter's Church, Marlborough, was born about 1672. He was educated at Magdalen College, of which he became a fellow, and appears to have been celebrated and successful as a college tutor. He took his degree of M.A. in 1696, of B.D. in 1707, and of D.D. in 1708. The first living he held was at Cannock, in Staffordshire, but in 1705 he was appointed preacher of St. Savior's, Southwark. It was while in this situation that he delivered his two famous sermons — the first at the assizes at Derby, Aug. 15, 1709; the other before the lord mayor at St. Paul's, Nov. 5, in the same year. In both sermons he vehemently attacked Low-Churchmen and Dissenters, and asserted that the Church was in imminent danger. In one he was supposed to allude, under the name of Volpone, to lord Godolphin. He was impeached by the House of Commons, and tried before the Lords, found guilty, and suspended for three years, his sermons to be burned by the public hangman. On the expiration of his sentence (1713), the queen presented him to the living of St. Andrew's, Holborn. He died June 5, 1724. He left a number of sermons, principally remarkable because of their connection with his trial. Some excellent Latin poems by him are in the Musoe Anglicanoe, vols. 2, 3. See Secret Memoirs of Sacheverell (Lond. 1710); History of Dr. Sacheverell (ibid. 1711).

## Sachs, Hans[[@Headword:Sachs, Hans]]

             an eminent people's poet of Germany, was born at Nuremberg, Nov. 5, 1494. In a Latin school, from 1501 to 1509, he learned the elements of the sciences of the day. Though apprenticed to the trade of a shoemaker in his  fifteenth year, and hindered from university training, the beginnings of general knowledge which he obtained in youth were fruitfully utilized in his after life. As a school boy he was trained to take part in the choral service of the Church; and he enjoyed also the special instruction of the Meistersinger Lienhard Nonnenbeck. Thus he joined to his profession of cobbler that of a Meistersinger. In 1511 he started upon a wandering tour, and in the course of five years became acquainted with most of the cities and eminent persons of Germany. In 1519 he returned to Nuremberg, married, and plied his two trades of cobbler and poet to the end of his life. He died Jan. 20, 1576, at the age of eighty-one.

The career of Sachs falls in the most prosperous period of Nuremberg's history, and covers the whole epoch of the Reformation. Among his townsmen were Durer, Vischer, Ebner, Spengler, and Osiander. When Luther began to preach, he warmly welcomed the new epoch, and called the reformer the “Wittenberg nightingale.” Throughout his fruitful life he labored, directly or indirectly, to promote the new doctrines, and to promote honor and purity among the people. His poetic productiveness began with his return to Nuremberg, in his twenty-fourth year. Thenceforth his fertility is almost marvelous, and comparable only to that of the Spanish poet Lope de Vega. His works embraced thirty-four folio volumes. In 1567 he estimated the number of his poems, short and long, at 6048, and nearly 600 were subsequently added. They were written upon all possible subjects — history, sacred and profane; fable, classic and Gothic; civic life and domestic; animals, birds, and fishes; and in every style — tragedy, comedy, farce, epic, didactic, lyric, elegiac, and descriptive. The greater part of these poems were designed not for the press, but to be used by players in MS., and to be sung on special occasions. The first complete collection of his approved poems appeared at Augsburg, in 3 vols. fol., from 1558 to 1561. A larger edition, at the same place, in 5 vols. fol., in 1570-79. A selection of his better pieces appeared at Nuremberg in 1781, also in 3 vols.; ibid. in 1816-24; still another, in 2 vols., in 1856; still another in the 4th, 5th, and 6th vols. of the Deutsche Dichter des 16. Jahrhunderts, by Goedeke and Tittmann (Leips. 1870-74). During the dry dogmatic period of the 17th century, Sachs was quite neglected, but Wieland and Goethe brought him again into good repute. A monument was erected to him at Nuremberg in 1874. See Ranisch, Lebensbeschreibunsg Hans Sachsens (Altenburg, 1765); Hoffmann, Hans Sachs (Nuremberg, 1847); Herzog, Real-Encykl. 20, 636, 653. (J.P.L.)

## Sachs, Marcus[[@Headword:Sachs, Marcus]]

             professor of Hebrew and exegetical theology, was born of Jewish parentage at Inovratzlav, in the duchy of Posen, June 13, 1812. He received his early education at Berlin, in the house of an uncle, who sent him to the gymnasium, where Homer became his delight. Having passed his examination, he entered the university, and gave himself to the study of French literature. Voltaire became his idol. The career of a rabbi was closed to him; and as for a position in any public office, the government of Prussia in those days iwas not liberal to men of his opinions. As trade also was not to his mind, he determined in 1842 to go to England. After a short sojourn in London he came to Edinburgh, and here it was that, through the instrumentality of the late Dr. John Brown, this Jewish freethlinker was brought to Christ. When he had made his public profession, he betook himself to the study for the ministry, and attended the lectures of Dr. Chalmers. Having obtained license as a preacher, he was appointed tutor in Hebrew to the Free Church Divinity Hall in Aberdeen. After having filled the office of tutor for some years, he was raised to the status and obtained the title of professor of Hebrew and exegetical theology. For nearly thirty years he held this honorable position, until he was called home, Sept. 29, 1869. See Marcus Sachs: In Memoriam (Aberdeen, 1872); Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffnung (1875), 12, 41 sq. (B.P.)

## Sachs, Michael[[@Headword:Sachs, Michael]]

             a German rabbi, was born at Great-Glogau, Sept. 3, 1808. Owing to his distinguished talents both as a Biblical scholar and a preacher, he was invited to become rabbi preacher of the new temple at Prague in 1836, which office he occupied till 1844, when he was appointed rabbinate assessor to the Jewish community at Berlin, where he remained till his death, Jan. 31, 1864. He published a German translation of the Psalms, with annotations (Berlin, 1835): — Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Joel, Amos, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, the Psalms, the Song of' Songs, and Lamentations, as well as part of Jeremiah, translated from the Hebrew into German, embodied in the Twenty-four Books of Holy Scripture according to the Massoretic Text, edited by Zunz, Arnheim, Furst, and Sachs (ibid. 1838): — Die religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien (ibid. 1845): — Stimmen vom Jordan und Euphrat (ibid. 1853): — Beitrage zur Sprach- und Alterthumsforschung (ibid. 1852-54, 2 vols.): — Festival Prayers of the Israelites, the Hebrew  text with a German translation and notes (ibid. 1856-57, 9 vols.): — Daily Prayer-book, the Hebrew text with a German translation (ibid. 1858): — and finally, Sermons (ibid. 1867-69, 2 vols., ed. by Dr. D. Rosin), besides a number of valuable essays, published in the Kerem-Chemed (ibid. 1856, new ser. vol. 9). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 190 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 1863, p. 263 sq.; Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1864, p. 115 sq.; 1866, p. 301 sq.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 11, 571 sq.; Cassel, Leitfaden derjudischen Literatur, p. 114 sq.; Jewish Messenger (N.Y.), Aug. 27, 1875. (B.P.)

## Sachse, Christian Friedrich Heinrich, D.D.[[@Headword:Sachse, Christian Friedrich Heinrich, D.D.]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born July 2, 1785, at Eisenberg, in Saxe-Altenburg. Having finished his studies at Jena, he was in 1812 appointed deacon in Meuselwitz, near Altenburg. In 1823 he was made court preacher at Altenburg, in 1831 member of consistory, and in 1841 his alma mater honored him with the theological doctorate. In February, 1860, he was obliged, through bodily infirmities, to retire from his important position, and on October 9 he was called to his home. Sachse wrote several very fine hymns, two of which are also translated into English — Wohlauf! wohlan! zum letzten Gang, sung at his own funeral (in Hymns from the Land of Luther [p. 108], “Come forth! come on with solemn song!”), and Lebwohl, die Erde wartet dein (ibid. p. 154, “Beloved and honored, fare thee well!”). See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 22, 76; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1342, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sack, August Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Sack, August Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             one of the most eminent German Reformed preachers of the reign of Frederick II of Prussia, was born at Harzgerode, Feb. 4, 1703. In 1722-24 he studied at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. The next two years he passed as tutor in the family of a French preacher at Stettin. Then he studied in Holland. Here he became acquainted with the chief theologians of Arminianism,  from which his own views took a permanent coloring. From 1728 to 1731 he was teacher to a young prince in the neighborhood of Magdeburg. In 1731 he began to preach in Magdeburg, and rapidly rose in esteem and in office. In the last year of the old king Frederick William I (1740) he was called to Berlin, where he entered upon his ministry of forty years. It was a noble and fruitful career. He stood independent between the two prevalent partiesthe slavishly orthodox and the rationalists — holding to the good in both parties, and esteemed by the best in both. At the outbreak of the Seven Years' War he accompanied the royal family to Magdeburg, and there, for three years, was charged with the education of the crown prince. At the close of the war, he resumed his labors as cathedral preacher in Berlin. He preached his last sermon in 1780. He died April 3, 1786. The chief theological work of Sack is Der vertheidigte Glaube der Christen (issued first in 1751, again in 1773), a popular statement and defense of Christian doctrine, which is worthy of attention even today. In this work the author ably and safely avoids the two fatal extremes of dynamic determinism as to the action of grace and of the self-regeneration of the Socinians. “The objective conditions of salvation are miraculously prepared in redemption; the subjective appropriation of these conditions is left to human freedom. God cannot convert man without man; man cannot convert himself without God.” Of Sack's sermons several volumes appeared (1735 to 1764). They passed through many editions. One volume of them was translated into French by Frederick II's queen, Elizabeth: Six Sermons de M. Sack (1775). In character Sack was worthy of his high position. He quailed not before tyrants, and was believing in an age of negation and infidelity. He stood by the side of Spalding, Jerusalem, and Zollikofer, a pillar of the Church, when obscurantist and neologist were laboring to bury it in ruins. His was noble blood; his son and his son's son have followed worthily in his footsteps. See Sack, Lebensbeschreibung (by his son [Berlin, 1789, 2 vols.]); Herzog, Real-Encykl. 20, 653-662. (J.P.L.)

## Sack, Brethren[[@Headword:Sack, Brethren]]

             of the, a religious order, which was established about the beginning of the 13th century, and had monasteries in France, Germany, Italy, and England. The brethren were very austere, for they neither ate flesh nor drank wine. Besides the sack which they wore, and from which they took the name, they went bare legged, and had only wooden sandals on their feet.

## Sack, Carl Heinrich, Dr.[[@Headword:Sack, Carl Heinrich, Dr.]]

             a German theologian, son of F.S.G. Sack, was born at Berlin, Oct. 17, 1790. He studied at Gottingen and Berlin, and commenced his lectures at the Berlin University in 1817. In 1818 he was made professor extraordinary, and in 1832 professor of theology in Bonn. He died at Pappelsdorf, near Bonn, Oct. 16, 1875. Of his many works we mention Christliche Apologetik (Hamb. 1841): — Christliche Polemik (ibid. 1838): — Geschichte der Predigt von Mosheim bis Schleiermacher und Menken  (Heidelberg, 1866): Theologische Aufsatze (Gotha, 1871, etc.). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1106 sq.; Theologisches Universal- Lexikon, s.v.; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 353; Literarischer Handweiser (1875), p. 433; Theologisches Jahrbuch (Bielefeld, 1877), p. 228. (B.P.)

## Sack, Friedrich Ferdinand Adolph[[@Headword:Sack, Friedrich Ferdinand Adolph]]

             brother of the preceding, was born at Berlin, July 16, 1788, and succeeded his father as court and cathedral preacher. He died Oct. 16, 1842. Together with his brother, he published Sermons (Bonn, 1835). He is also the author of the beautiful communion hymn Du ladest, Herr, zu deinem Tisch. See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 353; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1342, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sack, Friedrich Samuel Gottfried[[@Headword:Sack, Friedrich Samuel Gottfried]]

             a Prussian theologian, court preacher, and Church governor, was born Sept. 4, 1738. His mother was of a French refugee family, which explains a fondness which Sack had for the French language and literature. He studied at the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder from 1755 to 1757. The next two years he studied in England, coming into contact with Seeker, the archbishop of Canterbury, Kennicott, Lardner, and others. On his return to Germany he acted as tutor to a young nobleman, whom he accompanied to Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and where he again heard lectures. He now associated much with Tollner. After preaching at Magdeburg (1769-77), he was called by Frederick II as fifth court preacher to Berlin. Gradually he rose to the first place. In 1786 he became a member of the high consistory, The years 1804-13 were spent in arduous devotion to the oppressed and suffering people of the capital. In 1816 the king conferred upon him the title of bishop of the Evangelical Church. He died Oct. 2, 1817. In theology Sack was independent of the traditions of orthodoxy, but he stood firmly on evangelical ground. God as a person and Father; the Son as Redeemer and Offering; the Holy Spirit as comforter; love to God in Christ as the spring of the Christian life — such were the elements of his theology. Though leaning somewhat towards rationalism, he yet firmly opposed the inroads which Kant's and Fichte's speculations made upon evangelical doctrine. He was one of the chief movers towards the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Prussia, which was effected after his death. For some years he stood in the closest relations to the young  Schleiermacher, and rejoiced in the promise of good which the latter would bring to the Church. When this young divine first issued his celebrated Reden (1799), Sack openly expressed his paternal grief at what seemed to him a leaning towards pantheism in this work. In later editions many of the criticized passages were modified. Sack was not productive; he was chiefly a practical worker. His published works consist of translations from English (Blair's Sermons) and Latin (Cicero's De Amicitia and De Senectute), two collections of Sermons, an Autobiography, and some minor Essays. See Herzog, Real-Encykl. 20, 662-667. (J.P.L.)

## Sackbut[[@Headword:Sackbut]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the Chaldee sabbeka (written סִבְּכָאin Dan 3:5, but שִׂבְּכָא in Dan 3:7; Dan 3:10; Dan 3:15; thought by Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v., to be from סָבִךְ, to weave, from the entwined strings), which the Sept. and Vulg. render by the corresponding σαμβύκη, sambuca, which, in fact, are mere transcriptions of the Chaldee word. The English version has evidently imitated the word. The sackbut, however, is an old English name for a wind instrument (see the Bible Educator, 4, 150), but the Greek and Roman sambuca had strings (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v.). “Mr. Chappell says (Pop. Mus. 1, 35), ‘The sackbut was a bass trumpet with a slide, like the modern trombone.' It had a deep note, according to Drayton (Polyolbion, 4, 365):

The hoboy, sagbut deep, recorder, and the flute.'

The sambuca was a triangular instrument with four or more strings played with the fingers. According to Athenseus (14, 633), Masurius described it as having a shrill tone; and Euphorion, in his book on the Isthmian games, said that it was used by the Parthians and Troglodytes, and had four strings. Its invention is attributed to one Sambyx, and to Sibylla its first use (Athen. 14, 637). Juba, in the 4th book of his Theatrical History, says it was discovered in Syria, but Neanthes of Cyzicum, in the first book of the Hours, assigns it to the poet Ibycus of Rhegium (ibid. 4, 77). This last tradition is followed by Suidas, who describes the sambuca as a kind of triangular harp. That it was a foreign instrument is clear from the statement of Strabo (10, 471), who says its name is barbarous. Isidore of Seville (Origin. 3, 20) appears to regard it as a wind instrument, for he connects it  with the sambucus, or elder, a kind of light wood of which pipes were made. The sambuca was early known at Rome, for Plaitus (Stich. 2, 2, 57) mentions the women who played it (sambucoe, or sambucistrioe, as they are called in Livy, 39, 6). It was a favorite among the Greeks (Polybius, 5, 37), and the Rhodian women appear to have been celebrated for their skill on this instrument (Athen. 4, 129). There was an engine called sambuca used in siege operations, which derived its name from the musical instrument, because, according to Athenaeus (14, 634), when raised it had the form of a ship and a ladder combined in one.” Rawlinson (Ancient Monarchies, 3, 20) thinks that the Chaldee sabbeka was a large harp resting on the ground like that of the Egyptians. SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

## Sackcloth[[@Headword:Sackcloth]]

             (שִׂק, sak, from its net-like or sieve-like structure; a word which has descended pure in the Greek σάκκος and modern languages) is the name of a coarse material, apparently made of goat's or camel's hair (Rev 6:12), and resembling the cilicium of the Romans (Gen 37:34; 1Ki 20:31; 2Ki 19:1 sq.; Mat 11:21; Luk 10:13; comp. Josephus, Ant. 7, 1, 6; Porphyr. Abstin. 4, 15; Plutarch, Superst. c. 7). It was probably dark brown or black in color (Isa 1:3; Rev 6:12; comp. the black dresses of the Greeks: Eurip. Alc. 440; Orest. 458; Helen, 1088; and Romans, Ovid, Metam. 6, 568; Tacit. Annal. 3, 2; Becker, Gallus, 2, 289; see Josephus, Life, 28). It was used for the following purposes:

(1.) For making sacks for grain, the same word describing both the material and the article (Gen 42:25; Lev 11:32; Jos 9:4). Sacks are usually made of hair in the East; whence we may understand that where sackcloth is mentioned haircloth is intended.

(2.) This material was certainly employed for making the rough garments used by mourners (Esther 4:21), which were in extreme cases worn next the skin (1Ki 21:27; 2Ki 6:30; Job 16:15; Isa 32:11), and this even by females (Joe 1:8; 2Ma 3:19), but at other times were worn over the coat or kethoneth (Ton. 3, 6) in lieu of the outer garment. The robe probably resembled a sack in shape, thus fitting closer to the person than the usual flowing garments of the Orientals (Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 340), as we may infer from the application of the term חָגִר,  to bind, to the process of putting it on (2Sa 3:31; Ezr 7:18, etc.). It was confined by a girdle of similar material (Isa 3:24). Sometimes it was not laid aside even at night (1Ki 21:27). Prophets and ascetics wore it over the underclothing, to signify the sincerity of their calling (Isa 20:2; Mat 3:4; see Wetstein, N.T. 1, 384 sq.). The Apocrypha intimates that this habit of sackcloth was that in which good people clothed themselves when they went to prayers (Bar 4:20). The use of haircloth as a penitential dress was retained by the early Oriental monks, hermits, and pilgrims, and was adopted by the Roman Church, which still retains it for the same purposes. Haircloth was, indeed, called “sackcloth” by the early Greek and Latin fathers. It does not appear that sackcloth is now much used in token of grief in the East; but ornaments are relinquished, the usual dress is neglected, or it is laid aside, and one coarse or old assumed in its place (comp. Liske, De Sacco et Cinere [Vitemb. 1693]). SEE MOURNING.

## Saconay, Gabriel De[[@Headword:Saconay, Gabriel De]]

             a French theologian, was born near Lyons. While quite young, he was made canon of Lyons, and afterwards became dean of the chapter. He was one of the most zealous opponents of the Reformation. and was for some time censor of the city of Lyons. He died Aug. 3, 1580. His writings are principally controversial, and bitter in the extreme. They are, De la Providence de Dieu sur les Rois de France, with L'Histoire des Albigois (1568): — Traite de la Vraie Idoltrie de notre Temps (1568): — Discours des Premiers Troubles advenus a Lyons, written in answer to a Huguenot writing (La Genealogie et la Fin des Hugueneaux): — and Decouverte du Calvinisme. Saconay also published an edition of the treatise of Henry VIII against Luther, to which he wrote a preface full of the most violent expressions. Calvin answered it by a satirical work called Gratulatio (1560).

## Sacra[[@Headword:Sacra]]

             (sacred rites), a general term used by the ancient Romans to denote all that belonged to the worship of the gods. The sacra were either public or private, the former applying to the worship conducted at the expense of the State, and the latter at the expense of families or single individuals. In both cases the whole services were performed by the pontiffs, who, in the case of the sacra publica, had also the charge of the funds set apart for these  services. The sacra privata were generally nothing more than sacrifices to the Penates, or household gods.

## Sacra, Circa, Or In Sacris[[@Headword:Sacra, Circa, Or In Sacris]]

             The power of the magistrate is scarcely allowed by any party in sacris (in sacred things), but many allow his power circa sacra (about sacred things). The 23d chapter of the Westminster Confession says, however: “The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments for the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.” It is noteworthy that one of the proof texts in the Westminster Confession, under this head, is Mat 2:4-5, Herod's calling together the sanhedrim when startled by the news of the birth of Christ — a rival prince, as he thought, and whom he proposed to destroy. A large party object to this doctrine of the magistrate's power as Erastian and unscriptural, and maintain that the Church should be free of all control on the part of the State, and alike independent of its pay and its patronage. SEE ERASTIANISM. How the compromise is effected between the two powers in the Church of Scotland may be seen in the way in which the General Assembly is annually dismissed at the end of the statutory period beyond which it cannot prolong its sittings. Thus, in the year 1861, the moderator concluded his address by saying, “As this General Assembly was convened in the name and by authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, so in the same name and by the same authority I now dissolve it, and appoint the next meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to be held in this place on Thursday, the 22d day of May, 1862.” The lord high commissioner then said: “Right reverend and right honorable, it is now my duty, in my sovereign's name, to dissolve this assembly; and, accordingly, I hereby declare this assembly dissolved in her name, and by the same authority I appoint the next General Assembly to meet on Thursday, the 22d day of May, 1862.” SEE SECULAR POWER.

## Sacrament[[@Headword:Sacrament]]

             (from the Lat. sacramentum, a military oath of enlistment), a word adopted by the writers of the Latin Church to denote those ordinances of religion by which Christians come under an obligation of obedience to God, and which obligation, they supposed, was equally sacred with that of an oath. Considering the simplicity of the manner and the brevity of the terms in which the Lord Jesus Christ instituted certain general and perpetual observances for the Church which he founded, it is difficult to repress amazement at the extent of the discussions and the voluminousness of the controversies that have sprung up in reference to them. Many of those controversies are now obsolete, and all of them shrink to comparative unimportance when the Word of God is taken as the one only source of authoritative instruction on the subject. In order to make proper distinctions between the divine teachings and human theories, and also to see how doctrines have been promulgated in successive periods without the shadow of scriptural authority, it is well first to note both the letter and the spirit of the New Testament teaching in reference to what we now call sacraments. We may then the more intelligently follow the line of historical development and practice, however that may have been corrupted from the simplicity of the Gospel. A negative lesson of no little significance is taught in the fact that the term sacrament is not found in the N.T.; neither is the Greek word μυστήριον in any instance applied to either baptism or the Lord's supper, or any other outward observance. That word, however, came subsequently into ecclesiastical usage as the equivalent of the Latin sacramentum. The Greek Church still uses it in that sense, designating as the seven mysteries what the Roman Church calls the seven sacraments.

I. Scriptural Statement of the Subject. — The instructions given by the N.T. in reference to baptism and the Lord's supper are of two kinds:

1. Those found in the example and precepts of Christ himself;

2. Those found in the subsequent practice and teaching of the apostles. Introductory to both is the great fact with which the Gospel history opens, viz. John's baptism: that was distinctly declared to be a baptism of repentance, introductory to the kingdom of God about to be established by the promised Messiah. John's baptism, therefore, is to be regarded as a connecting link between the old and the new dispensation; and as it was prophetic of Christ's immediate advent, so it was sanctioned by the fact of  Christ's accepting, indeed demanding, baptism at the hands of John, in order to “fulfil all righteousness.” By this expression we may understand that Christ not only fulfilled, in his own person, the law of the Abrahamic covenant in circumcision, but also the spiritual law of Christianity which he was about to establish, and of which baptism was to be the appointed emblem. This view is corroborated in the fact that, in connection with this baptism, not only was the Messiahship of Christ attested by an approving voice from heaven, but by the descent upon him of the Holy Ghost (Mat 3:13-17; Mar 1:8-11; Luk 3:21-22). This great event occurred at the beginning of Christ's public ministry; and although, in the record of his ministrations, little is said of baptism, yet sufficient is recorded to indicate that the rite was practiced from the first as initiatory to Christian discipleship. It is summarily mentioned in Joh 4:1-2, “that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.” In the preceding chapter (Joh 4:22) it had been stated that “Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judaea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized.” Hence we may infer that baptism was fully established as a custom of the initial Church prior to the formal command by which, in the great Commission, its perpetual observance was enjoined (Mat 28:19). From the first exercise of their appointed office, the apostles preached baptism as a duty (Act 2:38), and administered it to those professing Christianity (see Act 2:41; Act 8:12-13; Act 8:16; Act 8:38; Act 9:18; Act 16:15; Act 16:33; Act 18:8, etc.). SEE BAPTISM.

The institution of the Lord's supper was, in some respects, similar. In his custom of fulfilling all righteousness, our Lord, on the night before his betrayal, assembled his disciples to eat the Passover (q.v.), in accordance with Jewish law and custom. In that connection he not only identified himself as the true Paschal Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world, but appointed bread and wine to be emblems of his body and blood, to be used by all his followers in perpetual commemoration of his impending sacrificial death (see Mat 26:26; Mar 14:22; Luk 22:19; 1Co 11:23-27). That this institution was observed by the apostles and the churches founded by them in the simplicity and sacredness of its original appointment is obvious from various statements and allusions in the Acts and Epistles; but we may search the whole New Testament record in vain for an account of any other appointments of a corresponding character. If, by analysis, we seek to determine what is peculiar and essential to baptism and the Lord's supper, when considered as ordinances  of the Christian Church, the following characteristics will be found to inhere in both:

1. They were illustrated by our Lord's own example, and enjoined by his specific command;

2. They were enjoined upon the whole Church, and as of perpetual obligation;

3. They were recognized by the apostles and the New Testament churches in the character stated, and by them observed in the form and spirit of their appointment;

4. Each of the institutions named had an important significance with reference to the whole scheme of salvation, and was adapted to serve as a means of grace to all Christians. SEE LORDS SUPPER.

If, now, the ordinances named are to be considered as sacraments of the Christian Church (which has never been questioned or denied), it is evident that nothing else should be considered a sacrament in which the same characteristics do not in like manner inhere. Let the several points named be applied as tests to the five additional observances of the Greek and Roman churches, called by them sacraments — viz. confirmation, matrimony, penance, orders, and extreme unction-and it will be seen how radically defective they all are.

Keeping in view the fact that the term sacrament has no sanction from scriptural usage, a question of some importance arises as to how it came to its present significance and general adoption, also whether and to what extent the term itself has become an agency of error. In considering this question, it is well to go back in thought to the post-apostolic age, and trace downward, by successive steps, the development of ideas and customs in the Christian Church.

1. Ideas of peculiar sacredness could not fail to be associated with duties enjoined in the last commands of the Lord Jesus — the recently crucified but now ascended Savior.

2. These ideas would be intensified in the participation of the Lord's supper, which, by its very design, addressed itself to the tenderest sympathies and highest moral purposes of the human soul.

3. As the act of communion demanded of each believer, not only self- examination as to his faith and spiritual life, but also an actual or implied pledge of future obedience and devotion to Christ, the Captain of our salvation, so that pledge might easily come to be regarded somewhat in the light of an oath.

4. More especially as Christians were taught to regard themselves as soldiers, called to fight the fight of faith and to war a good warfare, it would be natural to regard the act of devotion by which they pledged allegiance to Christ as very analogous to the sacramentum, or oath, by which Roman soldiers swore allegiance to their emperor. Hence the Lord's supper came to be called sacramentum eucharistoe.

5. In like manner, as baptism was regarded in the light of an enrolment to be a soldier of Jesus Christ, so it came to be called sacramentum aquac. Thus, or similarly, in point of historic fact, the term sacrament became generic and inclusive of the two and only observances enjoined by Christ as of universal and perpetual obligation upon the Church. Moreover, as both sacraments were designed to serve as outward signs of a promised invisible grace, they would naturally be reverenced as involving much that was incomprehensible to the natural mind, in fact, mysterious. Hence, in the Greek language, the term μυστήριον (mystery) came to be used as the equivalent of sacramentum in the Latin. This term “mystery,” however, became misleading by very natural processes. It had for a long time been applied to certain secret ceremonies, practiced specially among the Greeks, SEE ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES, and could hardly fail to suggest analogous and corrupting ideas to Christians at all inclined to a worldly policy The writers of the New Testament had, in fact, repeatedly used the words mystery and mysteries, but never in connection with either baptism, the Lord's supper, or any Christian ceremony. They had spoken of the mysteries of the kingdom of God, the mystery of faith, the mystery of godliness, and also of the Gospel as “the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest.”

II. Multiplication of the Sacraments such obviously appropriate uses the term mystery was, in ecclesiastical language, so far perverted as to be made almost exclusively to represent Christian ceremonies, a wide door was opened for the ingress of erroneous opinions and practice. The very term suggested secrecy where publicity was designed. It obviously prompted the artificial rules of the disciplina arcani (q.v.), and thus strongly encouraged  ceremonial instead of spiritual conversion. It also stimulated the inventiveness of ecclesiastics in the multiplication of so called sacraments. It gave countenance to priestly pretensions on the part of Christian ministers, and encouraged the imitation of Jewish and pagan rites. Combined with other influences of like nature, it contributed to that great perversion of the sacrament of the Lord's supper by which it came to be regarded as a propitiatory sacrifice — a parent error, from which the mystical ceremonies and the doctrine of transubstantiation were logical outgrowths. Errors also arose from a loose application of the word sacramentum. As that term involved the generic idea of sacredness, so it came to be applied to various other usages that sprang up in the Church, with the tendency to attribute to them an importance and sanctity corresponding to those of the sacraments proper. For successive centuries the number of observances called, in this loose sense, sacraments was more or less varied and indefinite; one writer (Damian) enumerated twelve. But by degrees, the sacred number seven came to be adopted as the limit, yet not always in application to the same ceremonies or in the same order. The present enumeration of the Roman Church is credited to the schoolman Peter Lombard (d. 1164), although for at least three centuries later more or less controversy was maintained among the schoolmen as to the number and order of the sacraments. It was the General Council of Florence in 1439 that, following Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, first assumed to define authoritatively the number as subsequently maintained by the Church of Rome. The definition or limitation then decreed was promulgated in a synodal epistle from pope Eugenius to the Armenians in 1442. The language of the decree is full and explicit, not only as to the number, but also as to the doctrine of the sacraments. It says:

“The sacraments of the new law are seven — namely, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony — which differ much from the sacraments of the old law: for those do not cause grace, but represent it as only to be given through the passion of Christ; but the sacraments of the new law contain grace, and confer it on those who worthily receive them. The first five are ordained for the spiritual perfection of each man in himself; the last two, for the government and multiplication of the whole Church.... All these sacraments are perfected in three ways — namely, by things as to the material, by words as to the form, and by the person of the administrator who confers the  sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does — of which, if any be wanting, the sacrament is not perfected. Among these sacraments there are three baptism, confirmation, and orders — which impress indelibly on the soul a character: that is, a certain spiritual sign, distinguishing him from others. Hence they are not repeated on the same person. But the other four do not impress a character, and admit of reiteration.”

The sacramental theory of the Roman Catholic Church has rarely, if ever, been better stated. As thus formulated, it was an ingenious and authoritative digest of views that had been developed during long centuries in which tradition and superstitious inventiveness had usurped the supreme control in matters of religion. During that period the living oracles were silent, and nearly all the prevailing influences united to enhance the prerogatives of the clergy by attaching magical or supernatural influence to their supposed priestly functions. Baptism, loaded down with accumulated ceremonies, became the essential agency of regeneration; absolution from sin was given or withheld at the option of a priest; while extreme unction was regarded as an important, if not an essential passport to usher a dying person into the presence of God. But it was the Lord's supper in which all that was most solemn and mysterious was concentrated. That rite had become the holy of holies in the Christianity then prevalent. In it the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ was believed to be secured as often as the priest performed the act of consecration; but the manner of that presence was for a long time undiscussed, being neither defined by canon, agitated before council, nor determined by pope. “During all those centuries no language was thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. The oratory of the pulpit and the hortatory treatise had indulged freely in the boldest images; the innate poetry of the faith had worked those images into realities.” A specimen of the oratorical hyperbole employed in reference to this subject may be taken from Chrysostom, written in his treatise on the priesthood, about A.D. 380: “The priestly office is discharged upon earth, but holds the rank of heavenly things, and very rightly so.... For when you behold the Lord sacrificed and prostrate, and the priest standing over the sacrifice, and praying, and all stained with that precious blood, do you then suppose you are among men and standing upon earth? Are you not immediately transported to heaven? . . . Oh, the marvel! Oh, the love of God to man! He who sits with the Father on high is at that moment held in the hands of  all, and gives himself to those who are willing to embrace and to receive him!”

For centuries following Chrysostom, the prevalent ideas of the real presence in the eucharist were not only vague, but widely dissimilar, ranging from the border of a just spiritualism to a gross materialism, but with growing tendencies to the latter, until, at length, the more material the conception came to be of an actual and repeated sacrifice, the more it seemed to impress minds wholly uninstructed in Scripture truth. For a long period inquiries into the nature of the sacred mysteries were regarded as presumptive; but when, at length, speculation arose, the most startling theorists excited the most attention. It was to Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corvey (A.D. 831), that the Roman Church was indebted for the first clear statement of what came afterwards to be known as the doctrine of transubstantiation. Although Paschasius did not employ that term, he fully set forth the idea which the term was afterwards invented to express. He taught that the substance of the bread and wine was actually annihilated, notwithstanding the corporeal form remained, in passing into and becoming the body and blood of the Redeemer — the actual body and blood of Jesus Christ, which had been resuscitated in the resurrection, and which was now multiplied in countless numbers of times and places. He did not shrink from following out this theory to its grossest consequences, sustaining it by the narration of various miracles, such as the host bleeding and assuming the human form. It is not to be supposed that Paschasius originated this theory; his task was that of formulating it from the still cruder notions of the average popular and priestly mind of his day. But, dark as were the times in which he lived, his theory, when reduced to a connected statement, was too gross to pass unchallenged. A protracted discussion arose, known in ecclesiastical history as the First Eucharistic Controversy.

Against the theory of Paschasius, Frudegard, a monk of another order, and Ratramnus, another monk of Corvey, urged sundry arguments, and quoted many passages from the fathers, especially from Augustine, showing that the body of Christ in the eucharist could not be the same body as that in which he was born, suffered, and rose again. Ratramnus, in fact, wrote a learned work entitled De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, in which he modestly but ably controverted the positions of his abbot, Paschasius. The latter had strongly urged those views of the sacrifice of the mass that had prevailed from the time of Gregory the Great. On the other hand, Ratramnus designated the eucharist as being only a commemorative  celebration of Christ's sacrifice, by remembrance of which Christians should make themselves capable of partaking of the divine grace of redemption. Rabanus Maurus, John Scotus Erigena, and others also wrote in opposition to the theory of Radbert. Thus the controversy was protracted into the 10th century, but with a constantly increasing tendency to reject and silence all opposition to the extremest views as heretical. SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Notwithstanding the popular drift in the line of transubstantiation, Berengar of Tours (q.v.), about the middle of the 11th century, opened, by his acute and able opposition to the theory of Paschasius Radbert, what has been denominated the Second Eucharistic Controversy. His position was that the substance of the bread and wine was not changed by the consecration, but only their efficacy, thus maintaining a dynamic, as against an actual change. His chief literary opponent was Lanfranc (q.v.), but his ecclesiastical opponents were legion. In the apparent consciousness that he could not be answered, he was summarily arraigned by popes and prelates, before councils and synods, and forced repeatedly to renounce his doctrines on pain of death. As often as he was able to escape from the power of his persecutors, he recanted his successive renunciations of his doctrines respecting the sacraments, until he at length found a refuge in France, where he was permitted, at the age of ninety, to die in peace. His views found many adherents, both in France and Germany, who came to be known and proscribed as Berengarians.

A synod of Rome in 1079 confirmed the doctrine of Paschasius Radbert; and, although for some years afterwards that doctrine was maintained by the use of other terms, it at length found definite expression in the term transubstantiation, which is said to have been first used by Hildebert of Tours (about 1134). Steps were now successively taken by which discussion was checked and opposition in the Church practically silenced. Pope Innocent III, at the Lateran Council of 1215, made transubstantiation (q.v.) an unchangeable article of the Roman Catholic faith; pope Urban IV, in 1264, instituted the annual festival of Corpus Christi; and pope Clement 5, in 1311, reduced the doctrine in question to a liturgical form. By these means, not only the theologians and the clergy of the Church, but also the masses of the people, were committed to the actual deification of the host, or consecrated wafer. The withholding of the cup from the laity was deemed a logical sequence of the doctrine of transubstantiation of more controlling influence than the express command  of Christ with reference to the cup — “Drink ye all of it.” The precept quoted was thenceforward conveniently limited to the clergy.

From the periods named above, scholasticism was busy in the vindication and explanation, by various ingenious methods, of the new dogma; while in practice, the sacrifice of the mass became more than ever the center of the Roman ritual. Nor is it easy for Protestants in the 19th century to understand how completely the combined influence of the decrees of the Church, the writings of the schoolmen, the ceremonies of the ritual, and the parade of festivals had blotted out of the public mind the simple scriptural idea of the eucharist, and substituted in its place a vague but blind superstition in reference to this now mutilated sacrament. The efforts made during successive centuries to give reality and impressiveness to the Roman doctrine of the sacraments, and especially that of the eucharist, had not been limited to traditional and preceptive influences; stupendous miracles in demonstration of it had been often and widely proclaimed. “Besides, the very nature of the doctrine itself adapted it singularly to retain its hold on an ignorant and superstitious generation. The notion once impressed upon the multitude that, when they celebrated one of the sacraments of their Church, they actually swallowed the real body and blood — the very person of their God — was too intensely exciting, too attractive to their imagination, too closely connected with their senses, to be abandoned without great reluctance. We might, indeed, wonder how it was found possible to obtain so general a credence for a dogma than which, in its popular sense, no more audacious paradox was ever obtruded on the credulity of man; but, once received, once impressed on the belief, once embraced as an essential truth, it became so entirely essential, so predominant, so engrossing, as to take almost exclusive possession of the soul, and to throw a shade of comparative insignificance over every other tenet. To be deprived of this conviction; to be assured that the consecrated elements hitherto reverenced and adored as the very body of the Divinity were no more than bread and wine, unchanged by the sacerdotal consecration, either in substance or in accident, was, in the vulgar mind, to part with the portion of religion most nearly touching both feelings and practice. ‘That they were robbed of their God' was the first impression produced upon ignorant devotees; and those who had nourished that ignorance, and found their profit in it — the chiefs and champions of the system to which that dogma was so essential — united in one great  confederacy to propagate the cry” (Waddington, History of the Reformation, ch. 31).

III. Roman Catholic View. — The full and authoritative statement of the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the sacraments is given in the Decree of the Council of Trent, as embraced in the following extract of the preface and in thirteen consecutive canons:

“In order to complete the exposition of the wholesome doctrine of justification, published in the last session by the unanimous consent of the fathers, it hath been deemed proper to treat of the holy sacraments of the Church, by which all true righteousness is at first imparted, then increased, and afterwards restored, if lost. For which cause the sacred, holy, ecumenical, and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled, etc., abiding by the doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures, the tradition of the apostles, and the uniform consent of other councils and of the fathers, hath resolved to frame and decree these following canons, in order to expel and extirpate the errors and heresies respecting the most holy sacraments which have appeared in these times--partly the revival of heresies long ago condemned by our ancestors, partly new inventions and have proved highly detrimental to the purity of the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls. The remaining canons, necessary to the completion of the work, will be published hereafter, by the help of God.

“Canon 1. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven--namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony--or that any of these, is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.

“2. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law only differ from those of the old law in that their ceremonies and external rites are different, let him be accursed.

“3. Whoever shall affirm that these seven sacraments are in such sense equal that no one of them is in any respect more honorable than another, let him be accursed.  “

4. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous, or that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these sacraments (although it is granted that they are all not necessary to every individual), let him be accursed.

“5. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments were instituted solely for the purpose of strengthening our faith, let him be accursed.

“6. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers, let him be accursed.

“7. Whosoever shall affirm that grace is not always given by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received, but that it is only bestowed sometimes and on some persons, let him be accursed.

“8. Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the new law, by their own power (ex opere operato), but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace, let him be accursed.

“9. Whoever shall affirm that a character (that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark) is not impressed upon the soul by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and orders (for which reason they cannot be repeated), let him be accursed.

“10. Whoever shall affirm that all Christians have power to preach the word and administer all the sacraments, let him be accursed.

“11. Whoever shall affirm that, when ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should, at least, have the intention to do what the Church does, let him be accursed.

“12. Whoever shall affirm that a minister who is in a state of mortal sin does not perform or confer a sacrament, although he observes everything that is essential to the performance and bestowment thereof, let him be accursed.  “

13. Whoever shall affirm that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, commonly used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be despised or omitted without sin by the minister, at his pleasure, or that any pastor of a church may change them for others, let him be accursed.”

Refutations of the Romanistic theory of the sacraments have been so numerous and detailed in the writings of the Reformers, from the days of Wycliffe down to the present time, that it seems only necessary to present here a brief resume of the standard objections to it:

1. The sacramental theory of the Church of Rome wholly ignores the great scriptural doctrine of salvation by faith.

2. It elevates ceremonies above Christian obedience and duty.

3. It is artificial in naming as sacraments several things which Christ did not appoint as such --e.g. confirmation, penance, orders, extreme unction, and matrimony; which last, instead of being instituted by Jesus Christ, was, in fact, appointed by God from the creation of man.

4. It is arbitrary in dividing the eucharist and denying the cup to the laity.

5. It unduly exalts the functions of the priesthood, making the gift of divine grace dependent on the intention of the administrator of a real or supposed sacrament.

6. It sanctions immorality in the highest offices and most sacred ceremonies of religion by maintaining that wickedness, even to the extent of mortal sin, does not disqualify the celebrant from truly administering the holy sacraments.

7. It gives incentives to bad living, and even to crime, by teaching men that the sacraments impress upon the soul an indelible character of grace and spirituality, irrespective of their personal faith or practice.

The doctrine of the Old Catholics (q.v.), as stated in Art. VIII of the Theses agreed upon in the Conference at Bonn in 1874, is thus expressed:

“1. We acknowledge that the number of the sacraments was fixed at seven first in the 12th century, and then was received into the general teaching of the Church, not as a tradition coming down from the  apostles or from the earliest times, but as the result of theological speculation.

“2. Catholic theologians (i.e. Bellarmine) acknowledge, and we acknowledge with them, that baptism and the eucharist are ‘principalia, proecipua, eximia salutis nostroe sacramenta.'”

IV. Tenets of the Oriental Churches.-- The Greek Church, including the Russian, teaches that there are seven sacraments (μυστήρια), the same as the Roman Catholic — namely, baptism, unction with chrism, the eurcharist, penitence, the priesthood, lawful marriage, and extreme unction (Orthodoxa Confessio [A.D. 1643], qu. 98; Dosithei Confessio [A.D. 1672], deer. 15; Longer Catechism [prepared by Philaret, and approved by the Synod of A.D. 1839], qu. 285). That Church holds, indeed, some peculiarities as to the mode of administering certain of these sacraments; but they nevertheless strenuously maintain the divine character and essential importance of them all. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

The Armenian and Coptic churches [see each] have substantially the same views upon the subject as the Greek Church. The orthodox Nestorians (q.v.), however, including the Christians of St. Thomas, believe, with Protestants, in two sacraments only, namely, baptism and the Lord's supper; but the “Chaldaean” branch, of course, coincides with the Roman view.

V. Views of the Lutheran Reformers and of later Protestants.-- Notwithstanding the formidable combination of influences to popularize and maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation, many minds revolted against the absurdities it involved. Some individuals and sects went to the extreme of rejecting the sacraraments altogether; others, including most of those known as Reformers before the Reformation, alike objected to the invented and redundant sacraments, and pointed out many errors and abuses connected with the administration of baptism and the eucharist. This opposition, however, was manifested under many restraints and embarrassments, not merely caused by the spirit of persecution that was everywhere so rife, but by those prejudices and habits of mind to which the reformers themselves were subject. Bold and uncompromising as was Luther on most subjects in which Roman errors were involved, he nevertheless on the one topic now in question exhibited weaknesses of character and an infirmity of judgment that can only be accounted for by  the influence of his education and early habits of thought. Even after that great man had fully accepted the doctrine of salvation by faith, and rejected the greater number of those errors and inventions by which the Roman system had made void the word and truth of God, he remained so tenacious of the doctrine of Christ's real and corporeal presence in the bread and wine of the eucharist as to make a violent and almost fatal issue with his fellow Reformers on that point. No argument was sufficient to move him from his fixed adherence to the literal interpretation of the phrase, “This is my body.” Hence, not only he, but Melancthon and all those German Reformers who acted with them, while rejecting transubstantiation, rigidly adhered to that slight variation from it known as consubstantiation (q.v.). The controversies between Luther and Zwingli and their several adherents unhappily put in jeopardy some of the most important interests of the Reformation, and gave great cause of rejoicing to the partisans of the papacy. But for that unfortunate issue, which, at a very critical period, divided the Reformers and weakened their strength, it cannot be doubted that much more rapid progress would have been made in restoring to the Church the true but long lost idea of the supper of the Lord as instituted by him and appointed for the confirmation of faith in his atoning sacrifice. But, notwithstanding all hindrances, it is from the period of the Reformation that improvements may be noted in those doctrinal views of the sacraments which found expression in the creeds of representative churches. To show the successive steps of progress made as the result of controversy on the subject, quotations will now be given from several of the more celebrated creeds put forth during the 16th century. The oldest of all the Protestant confessions of faith is that of Augsburg, of which several articles related to the sacraments. That celebrated document was prepared by Melancthon, and read, June 27, 1530, in the presence of the emperor Charles V and his court, including many prominent Roman Catholic theologians. Although its tone was apologetic, nevertheless its utterances were distinctly Protestant, except in some of the articles relating to the sacraments.

Part I, Art.VIII, allows the validity of the sacraments, although administered by evil men.

Art. IX declares that baptism is necessary to salvation.

Art. X is in these words: “Of the Lord's supper, they (the Lutherans) teach that the [true] body and blood of Christ are truly present [under  the form of bread and wine], and are [there] communicated to those that eat in the Lord's supper.”

Art. XIII,

 On the Use of the Sacraments, contains the following language: “They were ordained, not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather that they should be signs and testimonies of the will of God towards us, set forth unto us to stir up and confirm faith in such as use them. Therefore men must use sacraments so as to join faith with them which believes the promises that are offered and declared unto us by the sacraments. Wherefore they (the Lutherans) condemn those that teach that the sacraments do justify by the work done (ex opere operato), and do not teach that faith which believes the remission of sins is requisite in the sacraments.”

Part II, Art. I, enjoins communion in both kinds, and discountenances the carrying about the elements in procession.

Art. III says: “Our churches are wrongfully accused of having abolished the Mass; for the mass is still retained among us, and celebrated with great reverence.” Nevertheless, the article proceeds to condemn private masses as being celebrated only for lucre's sake.

The Augsburg Confession does not definitely assert, but clearly implies, that the sacraments are only two in number. The Helvetic Confession of 1536 was explicit on that point, stating, also, that both baptism and the eucharist are only outward signs of the hidden things, or inward graces, spiritually imparted to faith in the promises of God. That confession also denies that the body and blood of Christ are naturally united, locally included, or actually present in the material bread and wine; but it affirms that the bread and wine, by the institution of God, are symbols through which, as from Christ himself, by the ministry of the Church, a true spiritual communication of his body and blood is made, not in perishable food, but for the sustenance of the soul's life.

In the further development of Protestantism, the most noted ecclesiastical statement of the doctrine of the sacraments is found in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, originally adopted in 1563. The following extracts embrace the more important points:

“Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the  which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm, our faith in him.” “There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord.” “Those five commonly called sacraments--that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction--are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.” “The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them; and in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation.... Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthrows the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.”

In the three symbols above quoted may be seen the types of doctrine which have prevailed, with slight variations of expression, in all Protestant evangelical churches. The Lutheran churches of Europe and America have alone followed the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. The Calvinistic churches of all countries have followed, in the main, the Zwinglian doctrine as set forth in the first Helvetic Confession; while the formula of the Church of England has been adopted by the Methodist churches of Great Britain and America and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Notwithstanding the variations of views and statements that prevailed among the different branches of early Protestantism, yet so substantial was the unity among all classes of the reformers in rejecting the doctrine of the opus operatum, and also, as sacraments, all observances besides baptism and the Lord's supper, that the general drift of the Protestant doctrine became widely diffused and accepted during the first period of the Reformation. That the influence of counter discussion had come to be greatly dreaded by the Roman theologians is obvious from several  expressions made use of by the Council of Trent in 1547. Nevertheless, as we have seen, that council proceeded to reaffirm the mediaeval theories of the sacraments in their most objectionable forms.

In many points of view, it may be regarded as extremely unfortunate that among the active agents of the Reformation there arose serious differences of views as to the sacraments, and more especially that those differences resulted in actual divisions and oppositions between brethren agreed in general principles and striving for common results. On the other hand, it is not difficult to infer that much discussion was necessary at that period as a means of clearing away the misconceptions of preceding ages, and of bringing out scriptural truth into a prominent light. It is impracticable and quite unnecessary here to outline the successive and protracted controversies with reference to the sacraments which took place between Luther and Zwingli and their successive followers for several generations, or, indeed, the somewhat different controversies that prevailed in Great Britain, bearing upon the same subject. It is, however, only just to remark that the influence of John Calvin in the Protestant sacramental controversy was very opportune and very powerful. As a contemporary and friend both of Luther and Zwingli, he sought to mediate between the extreme views of both. His theory was, in fact, an ingenious compromise between the realism of Luther and the idealism of Zwingli. He adopted the figurative interpretation of Christ's words, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, and rejected all carnal and materialistic conceptions of the eucharistic mystery; but he at the same time strongly asserted a spiritual real presence and communion of Christ's body and blood for the nourishment of the soul. “He taught that believers, while they receive with their mouths the visible elements, receive also by faith the spiritual realities signified and sealed thereby--namely, the benefit of the atoning sacrifice on the cross and the life-giving virtue of Christ's glorified humanity in heaven, which the Holy Ghost conveys to the soul in a supernatural manner; while unbelieving or unworthy communicants, having no inward connection with Christ, receive only bread and wine to their own judgment.” Luther had always insisted upon the corporeal presence and the oral manducation of the body and blood of Christ by communicants.

Calvin substituted for that idea the virtual, or dynamic, presence of Christ's humanity, and a spiritual reception and assimilation of the same by the act of faith and through the mediation of the Holy Spirit. This view was substantially adopted by the writers and adherents of the Heidelberg Catechism, and, in fact, passed into all the  leading Reformed confessions of faith. In fact, Melancthon, during the latter period of his life, substantially approved of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper. That circumstance gave rise to a controversy in the bosom of the Lutheran Church, by which it was divided into Lutherans, or, more properly, ultra-Lutherans, and Melancthonians, or Philippists. Luther's doctrine, by a literal interpretation of the words of institution, not only involved the oral manducation, but the practical ubiquity, of the body of Christ. Under the influence of Bucer and Calvin, and a further study of Augustine and of the Holy Scriptures, Melancthon had rejected both these views; although, through modesty and strong personal attachment, he did not separate from Luther or define an opposite theory. Luther, though grieved at these changes of view, nevertheless did not withdraw his friendship from Melancthon; but when both were dead, direct issues were made between their respective followers. A long and bitter controversy ensued, which extended to several other topics of theology, as well as that relating to the ubiquity, or multipresence, of Christ's body. The high Lutherans insisted upon ubiquity as a necessary result of the real communication of the two natures in Christ; while the Philippists and Calvinists rejected it as inconsistent with the nature of a body, with the reality of Christ's ascension, and with the general principle that the infinite cannot be comprehended or shut up in the finite. At the end of the controversy, the views of the extreme Lutherans became limited to only a portion of the Protestants of Germany; while those of Melancthon and Calvin were adopted by the Reformed churches of Germany, Switzerland, France, and the Netherlands. Practically, the same views were embodied in the later Helvetic confessions, in the creeds and catechisms of the Scotch Kirk, and in the Westminster Confession.

During the last three hundred years a great degree of practical unity has prevailed throughout Protestant Christendom in reference to the theory of the sacraments. This fact may be attributed to the general use and recognized authority of the Word of God. There have, indeed, been some small sects which, following the views of Socinus, have, by their theories, reduced the sacraments to mere commemorative observances, having a certain emblematic significance, but void of any spiritual influence. The Friends, or Quakers, have even rejected the sacraments as not designed for continued observance, at least in an outward form. They claim that the one baptism appointed for perpetuity among Christ's followers is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the true Lord's supper is that alluded to in  Rev 3:20 : “Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.” Aside from such slight exceptions, the great body of Protestants, while rejecting the mass and all other superstitious ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church, have sought to practice the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper both in the form and spirit of their original appointment. It is true that somewhat extended controversies have arisen as to the subjects and the mode of baptism, prompted chiefly by the exclusive claims of those who would reject from the Lord's supper all who have not been baptized by immersion (q.v.; also INFANT BAPTISM). Another form of exception to the general Protestant sentiment has been exhibited by that class of Anglicans and others who have distinguished themselves by those Romanizing tendencies which have so frequently terminated in adhesion to the Church of Rome, with her full list of sacraments.

VI. Literature.--Taking into view all the phases of controversy that have been developed in reference to the sacraments, the literature of the subject is exceedingly voluminous; but by far the greater part of it is now obsolete and never likely to be reproduced. That the discussions of the past have, on the whole, had a favorable issue is indicated by the fact that the great majority of modern publications relating to baptism and the Lord's supper are of a practical character, aiming to set forth the design, the obligations to their observance, and the duties growing out of them. Publications of this character are so numerous and so common that an attempt to give a full or even a specimen list of their titles is deemed quite unnecessary. The following are chiefly books which discuss the broader aspects of the sacraments in general, or which furnish historical data respecting the development of sacramental theories: Chrysostom, On the Priesthood (Homilies); Augustine, On Catechising the Ignorant; On Baptism (Sermons 218, 272); On True Religion; Ambrose, On the Sacraments; Gregory Nazianzum, Oration 60; Gregory of Nyssa, Catechetical Orations; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Discourses; Gregory the Great, Liturgy; Book of Morals; the so called Apostolic Constitutions (bk. 8); Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines; Neander, Church History; Gieseler, Church History; Melancthon, Sententia de Coena Domini; Calvin, De Coena Domini; Albertin, De Eucharistia; Beza, Discourses; Cranmer, Definition of the True Doctrine of the Lord's Supper; Cudworth, True Notion of the Lord's  Supper; Halley, On Symbolic Institutions; Barrows, Sermons; South, Sermons; Owen, Sacramental Discourses; Brevant, Sacrament and Sacrifice; Willet, Synopsis Papismi; Elliott, Romanism; Bennett, History of the Eucharist; Whately, On the Sacraments; Adam Clarke, On the Eucharist; Luckey, On the Lord's Supper; Nevin, Mystical Presence; Harbaugh, Creed and Cultus; and Essays by other authors in Tercentenary Monument of the Heidelberg Catechism. The authors who have discussed the doctrine of the sacraments as a topic of theology are almost innumerable. See also all Church creeds, e.g. Schaff, Creeds of the Churches (N.Y. 1878, 3 vols. 8vo). (D.P.K.)

## Sacramental Seal[[@Headword:Sacramental Seal]]

             an expression used by Romish writers to denote the obligation which rests upon the priesthood to conceal those things the knowledge of which is derived from sacramental confession.

## Sacramentals[[@Headword:Sacramentals]]

             a name given to those rites which are of a sacramental character, but yet are not true sacraments-such as confirmation and matrimony.

## Sacramentarians[[@Headword:Sacramentarians]]

             a controversial name given by the Lutherans to the Zwinglians to designate their belief that the consecrated elements in the eucharist are merely sacramental symbols, and not in any way the means by which the body and blood of Christ are really and truly present to, and conveyed to, the faithful partaker of them. The third volume of Schlusselburg's Hoereticorum Catalogus contains 492 pages “De Secta Sacramentariorum qui Cingliani seu Calvinistae vocantur.” SEE ZWINGLIANS.

## Sacramentary[[@Headword:Sacramentary]]

             the name of a book in the Romish Church containing the collects, together with the canon, or that part of the sacramental service which is invariable.

## Sacraments; Sacramentum[[@Headword:Sacraments; Sacramentum]]

             SEE SACRAMENT.

## Sacrarium[[@Headword:Sacrarium]]

             a term employed by the ancient Romans to denote any place in which sacred things were deposited. A sacrarium was either public or private, the former being a part of a temple in which the idol stood, and the latter the part of a private house in which the Penates were kept. In the early Latin Church the name was given to the chancel or bema, and also to the side table (oblationarium) on which the offerings of the people were deposited.

## Sacred Heart (Of Jesus), Feast Of The[[@Headword:Sacred Heart (Of Jesus), Feast Of The]]

             a festival of comparatively modern institution in the Roman Catholic Church, and for a time the subject of much controversy among Roman Catholics themselves. Its origin is traced to a vision recorded of a French nun of the Order of the Visitation, named Mary Margaret Alacoque, who lived at Paray-le-Monial, in Burgundy, in the latter half of the 17th century, and whose enthusiasm led her to practice a special devotion to the heart of the Saviour. This devotion was gradually propagated in France, and at length was approved by pope Clement XII in 1732 and 1736, and by Clement XIII in 1765. The festival is held on the Friday after the octave of Corpus Christi.

This festival has for its principal object to excite in the hearts of those who celebrate it a feeling of love to Jesus. It has doubtless given origin to the societies of cognate title. The instructions to these for each day in the week are peculiar. Thus:

“ Sunday. — Yon will enter into the opened heart of Jesus as into a furnace of love, there to purify yourself from all stains contracted during the week, and to destroy the life of sin, that you may live the life of pure love, which will transform all into itself. This day will be dedicated to a special homage to the blessed Trinity.  “Monday. — You will look on yourself as a criminal, who desires to appease his judge by sorrow for his sins, and who is ready to make satisfaction to his justice. Yon will enter in spirit into the heart of Jesus, in order to enclose yourself in that prison of love.

“Tuesday. — You will enter into the heart of Jesus as into a school, in which you are one of his disciples, In this school is learned the science of the saints, the science of pure love, which makes us forget all worldly sciences.

“Wednesday. — You will enter into the heart of Jesus as a passenger into a ship.

“Thursday. — You will enter into the heart of Jesus Christ as a friend who is invited to the feast of his friend. On this day you will perform all your actions in the spirit of love.

“Friday. — You will contemplate Jesus on the cross as a tender mother, who has brought you forth in his heart, with inexpressible pailis; you will repose in his arms as a child in the arms of its mother.

“Saturday. — You will offer yourself to the heart of Jesus as a victim coming up to the temple to be immolated and led before the sacrificer.”

## Sacred Heart (Of Jesuts), Ladies Of The[[@Headword:Sacred Heart (Of Jesuts), Ladies Of The]]

             a religious congregation of the Roman Catholic Church, founded in Paris Nov. 21, 1800, and devoted to education. In that year Joseph Desird Varin, superior of the Fathers of the Faith, desirous of establishing a society of women who would devote themselves to the education of young ladies of the higher classes, selected Madeleine Sophie Louise Barat and Octavie Bailly. On Nov. 21 they consecrated themselves to the Heart of Jesus, and opened a school in Paris. They removed to Amiens in 1801, where both their community and pupils increased rapidly. Madame Barat was chosen superior in 1802, branch establishments were founded, and in 1806 a first chapter of the order was held, at which that lady was chosen superior-general, which post she retained till her death, in 1865. Pere Varin completed his draft of the proposed constitutions in 1825, and they were  approved by Leo XII Dec. 22, 1826. Being invited by the pope to Rome, they established themselves in the convent and church of Trinita de' Monti. They spread thence to the chief cities of Italy, and soon owned flourishing schools in Austria, Bavaria, Prussia, Belgium, England, and Ireland. They had come' to the United States in 1817 with bishop Dubourg, of New Orleans, and founded a house near St. Louis, Mo. Their increase in this country is chiefly owing to the late archbishop Hughes, to Madame Elizabeth Gallitzin, and especially to Madame Aloysia Hardey, who founded the majority of the American houses. They opened a school at the corner of Houston and Mulberry streets, New York, and now the order has spread to the principal states of the Union, to the Canadian provinces, Cuba, and Chili. The rules and constitutions are closely modelled on those of the Society of Jesus in all that regards the conditions for membership, training, degrees, elections, etc. The members employed in teaching and governing are styled “choir religious, “the others “lay sisters.” According to Appletons' Cyclopoedia, the order had (1875): “In France, 8 provinces and 42 establishments, including 1 in Algiers; the province of Belgium and Holland, with 4 establishments; that of England and Ireland, with 5; that of Italy, with 5; that of Spain, with 3; and that of Austria, with 5. In America, they had in the United States 3 provinces, with 21 houses; the province of Canada, with 5; and the province of Chili, with 5, besides an establishment at Havanna. The number of ‘choir religious' was 2325, and that of lay sisters 1947; total 4272. The central house of the whole order and the residence of the superior general is in the Boulevard des Invalides, Paris.”

## Sacred Heart (Of Mary), Order Of The[[@Headword:Sacred Heart (Of Mary), Order Of The]]

             a society of nuns established at Bange, in France, by the abbe Brault in 1755, and devoted to the care of the infirm and neglected, especially during the French Revolution.

## Sacred Heart, Brothers Of The[[@Headword:Sacred Heart, Brothers Of The]]

             a lay order in the Roman Catholic Church devoted to the instruction of youth, especially in France, where it was founded by the abbe Coindre in 1826, and whence it extended in 1847 to the United States. The Brothers have academies, orphan asylums, and schools, with more than 600 boys under their care, in Kentucky, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

## Sacred Hearts (Of Jesus And Mary), Congregation Of The[[@Headword:Sacred Hearts (Of Jesus And Mary), Congregation Of The]]

             a religious order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded at Poitiers in 1800 by M. Coudrin aln Madame Ayme de la Chevallerie, for the cultivation of personal piety (hence it is sometimes styled the Order of the Perpetual Adoration of the Holy Host), the education of youth, missionary labors, etc. The Congregation has houses in various parts of France. See Migne, Diet. des Ordres Religieux, 4, 1277 sq.

## Sacrificati[[@Headword:Sacrificati]]

             Christians who, to avoid condemnation before a heathen tribunal, had offered sacrifice to an idol. When such persons, after the persecution was over, returned to the Church, they were obliged to undergo a very rigid penance before they could be readmitted into its fellowship. Sacrificati is their denomination as penitents, after their return to the faith. Those who continued in idolatry were simply apostates. SEE LIBELLATICI.

## Sacrifice[[@Headword:Sacrifice]]

             properly so called, is the solemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to the Deity as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed mean of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government. Among the Hebrews it was an offering made to God on his altar by the hand of a lawful minister. Sacrifice differed from oblation: in a sacrifice there was a real change or destruction of the thing offered, whereas an oblation was but a simple offering or gift. In the Mosaic economy it was the main public form of worship. SEE SACRIFICIAL OFFERING.

I. Scripture Terms.-The following are the original words used in the Bible to express the sacrificial act:

1. מַנְחָה, minchah, from the obsolete root מָנִה, “to give;” used in Gen 32:13; Gen 32:20-21, of a gift from Jacob to Esau (Sept. δῶρον); in 2Sa 8:2; 2Sa 8:6 (ξένια), in 1Ki 4:21 (δῶρα), in 2Ki 17:4 (μαναά), of a tribute from a vassal king; in Gen 4:3; Gen 4:5, of a sacrifice generally (δῶρον and θυσία, indifferently); and in Lev 2:1; Lev 2:4-6, joined with the word korban, of an unbloody sacrifice, or “meat offering” (generally δῶρον θυσία). Its derivation and usage point to that idea of sacrifice which represents it as a eucharistic gift to God our King. SEE MINCHAH.

2. קָרְבָּן, korban (derived from the root קָרִב, “to approach,” or [in Hiphil] to “make to approach”); used with minchah in Lev 2:1; Lev 2:4-6 (Sept. δῶρον θυσία), generally rendered δῶρον (see Mar 7:11, κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστι δῶρον) or προσφορά. The idea of a gift hardly seems inherent in the root. which rather points to sacrifice, as a symbol of communion or covenant between God and man. SEE CORBAN.

3. זֶבִח, zebach (derived from the root זָבִח, to “slaughter animals,” especially to “slay in sacrifice”), refers emphatically to a bloody sacrifice, one in which the shedding of blood is the essential idea. Thus it is opposed to nminchah in Psa 40:6 (θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν), and to olah (the whole burned offering) in Exo 10:25; Exo 18:12, etc. With it the expiatory idea of sacrifice is naturally connected. SEE VICTIM.

4. In the New Test. the comprehensive term is θυσία (from θύω, which seems radically to express the fuming up of the sacrificial smoke), which is used both of the victim offered and of the act of immolation, whether literal or figurative. Distinct from these general terms, and often appended to them, are the words denoting special kinds of sacrifice. SEE OFFERING.

5. עוֹלָה, olah (Sept. generally ὁλοκαύτωμα), the “whole burned offering.” SEE BURNED OFFERING.

6. שֶׁלֶ ם, shelem (Sept. θυσία σωτηρίου), used frequently with זֶבִה, and sometimes called קָרְבָּן, the “peace-” or “thank offering.” See each of these words.

7. חִטָּאת, chattath (Sept. generally περὶ ἁμαρτίας), the “sin offering” (q.v.).

8. אָשָׁ ם, asham (Sept. generally πλημμελεία), the “trespass offering” (q.v.).

9. אַשֶּׁה, ishsheh (from אֵשׁ, fire), a “sacrifice made by fire;” spoken of every kind of sacrifice and offering, as commonly burned (Lev 2:3; Lev 2:10), and even of those not consumed by fire (Lev 14:7; Lev 14:9); but usually in the ritual formula, “a sacrifice of sweet odor to Jehovah” (Lev 1:9; Lev 1:13; Lev 1:17; Lev 2:2; Lev 2:9; Lev 3:5; comp. Exo 29:41; Lev 8:12; briefly, Exo 29:18; Exo 29:25; Lev 2:16). SEE FIRE.

10. תּוֹדָה, todah, is used in a figurative sense only, a “a sacrifice of praise.” SEE PRAISE.

11. חָג, chag (from הָגִג, to dance in religious joy), is s properly a festival only; but by metonymy is occasionally used for the sacrificial victims of such occasions (Exo 23:18; Psa 118:27; Mal 2:3). SEE FESTIVAL. The term “sacrifice” is sometimes used figuratively for deep repentance (Psa 51:17), for the good works of believers  (Php 4:18; Heb 13:16), and for the duties of prayer and praise (Rom 12:1; Heb 13:15; 1Pe 2:5).

II. Origin of Sacrifice. — Did it arise from a natural instinct of man, sanctioned and guided by God, or was it the subject of some distinct primeval revelation? This is a question the importance of which has probably been exaggerated. There can be no doubt that sacrifice was sanctioned by God's law, with a special typical reference to the atonement of Christ; its universal prevalence, independent of, and often opposed to, man's natural reasonings on his relation to God, shows it to have been primeval, and deeply rooted in the instincts of humanity. Whether it was first enjoined by an external command, or whether it was based on that sense of sin and lost communion with God which is stamped by his hand on the heart of man, is a historical question, perhaps insoluble, probably one which cannot be treated at all, except in connection with some general theory of the method of primeval revelation, but certainly one which does not affect the authority and the meaning of the rite itself. We need not discuss here the theory of the old English deists, such as Blount and Tyndale, that, as cruel men delighted in bloodshed, so they conceived God to be like themselves, and sought to please and appease him by the slaughter of innocent beasts; or the specious improvement of this theory which Spencer (De Leg. Hebr. Rit. 1. 3, diss. 2) framed, that men sacrificed originally because of the savage wildness of their nature, and that God accepted and ratified their grim worship to restrain them from what was worse. The question is now proposed in this form: Did sacrifice arise from the natural religious instinct of man, with or without (for both views are held) an unconscious inspiration of the Divine Spirit, or did it originate in a distinct divine revelation? Those who advocate the former view speak of sacrifice as the “free expression of the divinely determined nature of man” (Neumann). “Man sacrifices because of his inalienable divine likeness, according to which he cannot cease to seek that communion with God for which he was created, even through such an effectual self sacrifice as is exhibited in sacrifice. Sacrifices have thus been as little an arbitrary invention of man as prayer. Like prayer, they have originated in an inner necessity to which man freely surrenders himself” (Oehler, in Herzog's Real-Encykl. 10, 617).

1. One recent writer on the subject (Davison, Inquiry into the Origin and Intent of Primitive Sacrifice, 1825) adduces (on the authority of Spencer and Outram) the consent of the fathers in favor of the human origin of  primitive patriarchal sacrifice, and alleges that the notion of its divine origin is “a mere modern figment, excogitated in the presumptively speculative age of innovating Puritanism.” This assertion has, in part, been met by Faber (Treatise on the Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice, 1827), who shows that the only authorities adduced by Outram (De Sacrificiis) and Spencer (De Leg. Hebr.) are Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, the author of the work called Apostolical Constitutions, and the author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox, commonly printed with the works of Justin Martyr. Of the early theologians thus adduced, the last three are positive and explicit in their assertion, while the sentiments of Justin Martyr are gathered rather by implication than in consequence of any direct avowal. He says, “As circumcision commenced from Abraham, so the Sabbath, and sacrifices, and oblations, and festivals commenced from Moses;” which clearly intimates that he considered primitive sacrifice as a human invention until made by the law a matter of religious obligation. The great body of the fathers are silent as to the origin of sacrifice; but a considerable number of them, cited by Spencer (De Leg. Hebr. p. 646 sq.), held that sacrifice was admitted into the law through condescension to the weakness of the people, who had been familiarized with it in Egypt, and, if not allowed to sacrifice ta God, would have been tempted to sacrifice to the idols of their heathen neighbors. The ancient writers who held this opinion are Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, Irenaeus, Jerome, Procopias, Eucherius, Anastatius, and the author of the Apostolical Constitutions.

But out. of the entire number, only the four already mentioned allege incidentally the human origin of primitive sacrifice; the rest are silent on this point. Outram, indeed (De Sacrif. lib. 1, cap. 1, § 6, p. 8, 9), thinks that in giving this opinion they virtually deny the divine origin of sacrifice. But it is fairly answered that the assertion, be it right or be it wrong, that sacrifice was introduced into the law from condescension to the Egyptianizing weakness of the people, furnishes no legitimate proof that the persons entertaining this opinion held the mere human origin of primitive patriarchal sacrifice, and affords no ground for alleging the consent of Christian antiquity in favor of that opinion. Such persons could not but have known that the rite of sacrifice existed anterior to the rise of pagan idolatry; and hence the notion which they entertained leaves the question as to the primitive origin of sacrifice entirely open, so far as they are concerned. Paganism, whether in Egypt or elsewhere merely borrowed the rite from pure patriarchism, which already possessed it; and unless a writer expressly declares such to  be his opinion, we are not warranted in concluding that he held the human origin of primitive patriarchal sacrifice, simply because he conceives that a system of sacrificial service had been immediately adopted into the law from paganism out of condescension to the weakness of the people. Besides, some of these very fathers held language with respect to primitive sacrifice not much in favor of the interpretation which has, on this ground, been given to their sentiments. Thus, according to Cyril, “God accepted the sacrifice of Abel and rejected the sacrifice of Cain, because it was fitting that posterity should learn from thence how they might blamelessly offer unto God his meet and due honor.” If, then, these authorities be taken as neutral on the question, with the four exceptions already indicated, we shall find whatever authority we ascribe to these more than counterbalanced by the testimony of other ancient witnesses in favor of the divine origin of primitive sacrifice. Philo-Judoeus says, “Abel brought neither the same oblation as Cain, nor in the sane manner; but, instead of things inanimate, he brought things animate; and instead of later and secondary products, he brought the older and the first: for he offered in sacrifice from the firstlings of his flock, and from their fat, according to the most holy command” (De Sacrif. Abelis et Caini in Opp. p. 145). Augustine, after expressly referring the origin of sacrifice to the divine command, more distinctly evolves his meaning by saying, “The prophetic immolation of blood, testifying, from the very commencement of the human race, the future passion of the Mediator, is a matter of deep antiquity; inasmuch as Abel is found in Holy Scripture to have been the first who offered up this prophetic immolation” (Cont. Faust. Manich. in Opp. 6, 145). Next we come to Athanasius, who, speaking of the consent of the Old Testament to the fundamental doctrines of the New, says: “What Moses taught, these things his predecessor Abraham had preserved; and what Abraham had preserved, with those things Enoch and Noah were well acquainted; for they made a distinction between the clean and the unclean, and were acceptable to God. Thus, also, in like manner, Abel bore testimony; for he knew what he had learned from Adam, and Adam himself taught only what he had previously learned from the Lord” (Synod. Nicen. contra Hoer. Arian. decret. in Opp. 1, 403). Eusebius of Caesarea, in a passage too long for quotation, alleges that animal sacrifice was first of all practiced by the ancient lovers of God (the patriarchs), and that not by accident, but through a certain divine contrivance, under which, as taught by the Divine Spirit, it became their duty thus to shadow forth the great and venerable victim, really acceptable  to God, which was, in time then future, destined to be offered in behalf of the whole human race (Demonst. Evang. 1, 8, 24, 25).

Among the considerations urged in support of the opinion that sacrifice must have originated in a divine command, it has been suggested as exceedingly doubtful whether, independently of such a command, and as distinguished from vegetable oblations, animal sacrifice, which involves the practice of slaughtering and burning an innocent victim, could ever, under any aspect, have been adopted as a rite likely to gain the favor of God. Our own course of scriptural education prevents us, perhaps, from being competent judges on this point; but we have means of judging how so singular a rite must strike the minds of thinking men not in the same degree prepossessed by early associations. The ancient Greek masters of thought not unfrequently expressed their astonishment how and upon what rational principles so strange an institution as that of animal sacrifice could ever have originated; for as to the notion of its being pleasing to the Deity, such a thing struck them as a manifest impossibility (Iamblic. De Vit. Pythag. p. 106-118; Porphyr. De Abstin. p. 96; Theophrast. et Porphyr. ap. Euseb. Proep. Evang. p. 90, 91). Those who do not believe that sacrifices were of divine institution must dispose of this difficulty by alleging that, when men had come to slay animals for their own food, they might think it right to slay them to satisfy their gods; and, in fact, Grotius, who held the human origin of sacrifices, and yet believed that animal food was not used before the Deluge, is reduced to the expedient of contending that Abel's offering was not an animal sacrifice, but only the produce-the milk and wool-of his best sheep. This, however, shows that he believed animal sacrifice to have been impossible before the Deluge without the sanction of a divine command, the existence of which he discredited.

A strong moral argument in favor of the divine institution of sacrifice, somewhat feebly put by Hallet (Comment. on Heb 11:4, cited by Magee, On the Atonement), has been reproduced with increased force by Faber (Prim. Sacrifice, p. 183). It amounts to this:

(1.) Sacrifice, when uncommanded by God, is a mere act of gratuitous superstition; whence, on the principle of Paul's reprobation of what he denominates will-worship, it is neither acceptable nor pleasing to God.

(2.) But sacrifice during the patriarchal ages was accepted by God, and was plainly honored with his approbation.

(3.) Therefore, sacrifice during the patriarchal ages could not have been an act of superstition uncommanded by God.

(4.) If, then, such was the character of primitive sacrifice — that is to say, if primitive sacrifice was not a mere act of gratuitous superstition uncommanded by God — it must, in that case, indubitably have been a divine, and not a human, institution. If it be held that any of the ancient sacrifices were expiatory, or piacular, the argument for their divine origin is strengthened. as it is hard to conceive the combination of ideas under which the notion of expiatory sacrifice could be worked out by the human mind. This difficulty is so great that the ablest advocates of the human origin of primitive animal sacrifice feel bound also to deny that such sacrifices as then existed were piacular. It is strongly insisted that the doctrine of an atonement by animal sacrifice cannot be deduced from the light of nature or from the principles of reason. If, therefore, the idea existed, it must either have arisen in the fertile soil of a guessing superstition, or have been divinely appointed. Now, we know that God cannot approve of unwarranted and presumptuous superstition; if, therefore, he can be shown to have received with approbation a species of sacrifice undiscoverable by the light of nature, or from the principles of reason, it follows that it must have been of his own institution.

The question of the existence of expiatory sacrifice before the law, however, is more difficult, and is denied by Outram, Ernesti, Doderlin, Davison, and many others, who believe that it was revealed under the law, as well as by those who doubt its existence under the Mosaical dispensation. The arguments already stated in favor of the divine institution of primitive sacrifice go equally to support the existence of piacular sacrifice, the idea of which seems more urgently to have required a divine intimation. Besides, expiatory sacrifice is found to have existed among all nations in conjunction with eucharistic and impetratory sacrifices; and it lies at the root of the principle on which human sacrifices were offered among the ancient nations. The expiatory view of sacrifice is frequently produced by heathen writers: “Take heart for heart, fibre for fibre. This life we give you in the place of a better” (Ovid, Fasti, 6, 161). This being the case, it is difficult to believe but that the idea was derived, along with animal sacrifice itself, from the practice of Noah, and preserved among his various descendants. This argument, if valid, would show the primitive origin of piacular sacrifice. Now there can be no doubt that the idea of sacrifice which Noah transmitted to the postdiluvian world was the same  that he had derived from his pious ancestors, and the same that was evinced by the sacrifice of Abel, to which we are, by the course of the argument, again brought back. Now if that sacrifice was expiatory, we have reason to conclude that it was divinely commanded; and the supposition that it was both expiatory and divinely commanded makes the whole history far more clear and consistent than any other which has been or can be offered. It amounts, then, to this-that Cain, by bringing a eucharistic offering, when his brother brought one which was expiatory, denied virtually that his sins deserved death, or that he needed the blood of atonement. Some go further, and allege that in the text itself God actually commanded Cain to offer a piacular sacrifice. (See this question discussed below.)

2. On the other hand, the great difficulty in the theory which refers it to a distinct command of God is the total silence of Holy Scripture-a silence the more remarkable when contrasted with the distinct reference made in Genesis 2 to the origin of the Sabbath. Sacrifice when first mentioned, in the case of Cain and Abel, is referred to as a thing of course; it is said to have been brought by men; there is no hint of any command given by God. This consideration, the strength of which no ingenuity has been able to impair, although it does not actually disprove the formal revelation of sacrifice, yet at least forbids the assertion of it, as of a positive and important doctrine. See, for example (as in Faber's Origin of Sacrifice), the elaborate reasoning on the translation of חִטָּאת in Gen 4:7. Even supposing the version a “sin offering coucheth at the door” to be correct, on the ground of general usage of the word, of the curious version of the Sept., and of the remarkable grammatical construction of the masculine participle with the feminine noun (as referring to the fact that the sin offering was actually a male), still it does not settle the matter. The Lord even then speaks of sacrifice as existing, and as known to exist: he does not institute it. The supposition that the “skins of beasts” in Gen 3:21 were skins of animals sacrificed by God's command is a pure assumption. The argument on Heb 11:4, that faith can rest only on a distinct divine command as to the special occasion of its exercise, is contradicted by the general definition of it given in Heb 11:1. (See below.)

Nor is the fact of the mysterious and supernatural character of the doctrine of atonement, with which the sacrifices of the O.T. are expressly connected, any conclusive argument on this side of the question. All allow that the eucharistic and deprecatory ideas of sacrifice are perfectly natural  to man. The higher view of its expiatory character, dependent, as it is, entirely on its typical nature, appears but gradually in Scripture. It is veiled under other ideas in the case of the patriarchal sacrifices. It is first distinctly mentioned in the Law (Lev 17:11, etc.); but even then the theory of the sin offering, and of the classes of sins to which it referred, is allowed to be obscure and difficult; it is only in the N.T. (especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews) that its nature is clearly unfolded. It is as likely that it pleased God gradually to superadd the higher idea to an institution, derived by man from the lower ideas (which must eventually find their justification in the higher), as that he originally commanded the institution when the time for the revelation of its full meaning was not yet come. The rainbow was just as truly the symbol of God's new promise in Gen 9:13-17, whether it had or had not existed as a natural phenomenon before the flood. What God sets his seal to he makes a part of his revelation, whatever its origin may be. It is to be noticed (see Warburton, Div. Leg. 9, c. 2) that, except in Gen 15:9, the method of patriarchal sacrifice is left free, without any direction on the part of God, while in all the Mosaic ritual the limitation and regulation of sacrifice, as to time, place, and material, is a most prominent feature, on which much of its distinction from heathen sacrifice depended. The inference is at least probable that when God sanctioned formally a natural rite, then, and not till then, did he define its method.

See on the question, in addition to the above treatises, Sykes, Essay on the Nature, Origin, and Design of Sacrifices; Taylor, Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement (1758); Ritchie, Criticisms upon Modern Notions of Sacrifices (1761); Magee, Discourses on Atonement and Sacrifices. SEE ATONEMENT.

III. Biblical History of Sacrifice. —

1. Ante-Mosaic Instances. — In examining the various sacrifices recorded in Scripture before the establishment of the law, we find that the words specially denoting expiatory sacrifice ( חִטָּאת and אָשָׁ ם) are not applied to them. This fact does not at all show that they were not actually expiatory, nor even that the offerers had not that idea of expiation which must have been vaguely felt in all sacrifices; but it justifies the inference that this idea was not then the prominent one in the doctrine of sacrifice.

The sacrifice of Cain and Abel is called minchah. although in the case of the latter it was a bloody sacrifice. (So in Heb 11:4 the word  θυσία is explained by the τοῖς δώροις below.) In the case of both it would appear to have been eucharistic, and the distinction between the offerers to have lain in their “faith” (Heb 11:4). Whether that faith of Abel referred to the promise of the Redeemer and was connected with any idea of the typical meaning of sacrifice, or whether it was a simple and humble faith in the unseen God, as the giver and promiser of all good, we are not authorized by Scripture to decide. SEE CAIN.

The sacrifice of Noah after the flood (Gen 8:20) is called burned offering (olah). This sacrifice is expressly connected with the institution of the covenant which follows in Gen 9:8-17. The same ratification of a covenant is seen in the burned offering of Abraham, especially enjoined and defined by God in Gen 15:9; and is probably to be traced in the “building of altars” by Abraham on entering Canaan at Bethel (Gen 12:7-8) and Mamre (Gen 12:13; Gen 12:18), by Isaac at Beersheba (v. 26, 25), and by Jacob at Shechem (v. 33, 20), and in Jacob's setting-up and anointing of the pillar at Bethel (Gen 25:18; Gen 35:14). The sacrifice (zebach) of Jacob at Mizpah also marks a covenant with Laban, to which God is called to be a witness and a party. In all these, therefore, the prominent idea seems to have been what is called the federative, the recognition of a bond between the sacrificer and God, and the dedication of himself, as represented by the victim, to the service of the Lord. SEE NOAH. The sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:1-13) stands by itself as the sole instance in which the idea of human sacrifice was even for a moment, and as a trial, countenanced by God. Yet in its principle it appears to have been of the same nature as before: the voluntary surrender of an only son on Abraham's part, and the willing dedication of himself on Isaac's, are in the foreground; the expiatory idea, if recognised at all, holds certainly a secondary position. SEE ISAAC.

In the burned offerings of Job for his children (Job 1:5) and for his three friends (Job 42:8), we, for the first time, find the expression of the desire of expiation for sin accompanied by repentance and prayer, and brought prominently forward. The same is the case in the words of Moses to Pharaoh as to the necessity of sacrifice in the wilderness (Exo 10:25), where sacrifice (zebach) is distinguished from burned offering. Here the main idea is at least deprecatory; the object is to appease the wrath and avert the vengeance of God.

2. The Sacrifices of the Mosaic Period. — These are inaugurated by the offering of the Passover and the sacrifice of Exodus 24. The Passover,  indeed, is unique in its character, and seems to embrace the peculiarities of all the various divisions of sacrifice soon to be established. Its ceremonial, however, most nearly resembles that of the sin offering in the emphatic use of the blood, which (after the first celebration) was poured at the bottom of the altar (see Lev 4:7), and in the care taken that none of the flesh should remain till the morning (see Exo 12:10; Exo 34:25). It was unlike it in that the flesh was to be eaten by all (not burned, or eaten by the priests alone), in token of their entering into covenant with God, and eating “at his table,” as in the case of a peace offering. Its peculiar position as a historical memorial, and its special reference to the future, naturally mark it out as incapable of being referred to any formal class of sacrifice; but it is clear that the idea of salvation from death by means of sacrifice is brought out in it with a distinctness before unknown. SEE PASSOVER.

The sacrifice of Exodus 24, offered as a solemn inauguration of the covenant of Sinai, has a similarly comprehensive character. It is called a “burned offering” and “peace offering” in Exo 24:5; hut the solemn use of the blood (comp. Heb 9:18-22) distinctly marks the idea that expiatory sacrifice was needed for entering into covenant with God, the idea of which the sin and trespass offerings were afterwards the symbols.

The law of Leviticus now unfolds distinctly the various forms of sacrifice:

(a.) The burned offering. Self dedicatory.

(b.) The meat offering (unbloody). Eucharstic.

The peace offering (bloody).

(c.) The sin offering.

The trespass offering. Expiatory.

(d.) The incense offered after sacrifice in the Holy Place, and (on the Day of Atonement) in the Holy of Holies, the symbol of the intercession of the priest (as a type of the Great High priest), accompanying and making efficacious the prayer of the people.

In the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Leviticus 8) we find these offered in what became ever afterwards the appointed order: first came the sin offering, to prepare access to God; next the burned offering, to mark their dedication to his service; and, thirdly, the meat offering of thanksgiving. The same sacrifices, in the same order, with the addition of a  peace offering (eaten, no doubt, by all the people), were offered a week after for all the congregation, and accepted visibly by the descent of fire upon the burned offering. Henceforth the sacrificial system was fixed in all its parts, until He should come whom it typified. It is to be noticed that the law of Leviticus takes the rite of sacrifice for granted (see Lev 1:2; Lev 2:1, etc., “If a man bring an offering, ye shall,” etc.), and is directed chiefly to guide and limit its exercise. In every case but that of the peace offering the nature of the victim was carefully prescribed, so as to preserve the ideas symbolized, but so as to avoid the notion (so inherent in heathen systems, and finding its logical result in human sacrifice) that the more costly the offering, the more surely must it meet with acceptance. At the same time, probably in order to impress this truth on the mind, and also to guard against corruption by heathenish ceremonial, and against the notion that sacrifice in itself, without obedience, could avail (see 1Sa 15:22-23), the place of offering was expressly limited, first to the Tabernacle, afterwards to the Temple. (For instances of infringement of this rule uncensored, see Jdg 2:5; Jdg 6:26; Jdg 13:19; 1Sa 11:15; 1Sa 16:5; 2Sa 6:13; 1Ki 3:2-3. Most of these cases are special, some authorized by special command; but the law probably did not attain to its full strictness till the foundation of the Temple.) This ordinance also necessitated a periodical gathering as one nation before God, and so kept clearly before their minds their relation to him as their national King. Both limitations brought out the great truth that God himself provided the way by which man should approach him, and that the method of reconciliation was initiated by him, and not by them.

In consequence of the peculiarity of the law, it has been argued (as by Outram, Warburton, etc.) that the whole system of sacrifice was only a condescension to the weakness of the people, borrowed, more or less, from the heathen nations, especially from Egypt, in order to guard against worse superstition and positive idolatry. The argument is mainly based (see Warburton, Div. Leg. 4, § 6:2) on Eze 20:25, and similar references in the Old and New Test. to the nullity of all mere ceremonial. Taken as an explanation of the theory of sacrifice, it is weak and superficial; it labors under two fatal difficulties, the historical fact of the primeval existence of sacrifice, and its typical reference to the one atonement of Christ, which was foreordained from the very beginning, and had been already typified, as, for example, in the sacrifice of Isaac. But as giving a reason for the minuteness and elaboration of the Mosaic ceremonial so remarkably  contrasted with the freedom of patriarchal sacrifice, and as furnishing an explanation of certain special rites, it may probably have some value. It certainly contains this truth: that the craving for visible tokens of God's presence, and visible rites of worship, from which idolatry proceeds, was provided for and turned into a safe channel by the whole ritual and typical system, of which sacrifice was the centre. The contact with the gigantic system of idolatry which prevailed in Egypt, and which had so deeply tainted the spirit of the Israelites, would doubtless render such provision then especially necessary. It was one part of the prophetic office to guard against its degradation into formalism, and to bring out its spiritual meaning with an ever-increasing clearness.

3. Post-Mosaic Sacrifices. — It will not be necessary to pursue, il; detail, the history of Post-Mosaic sacrifice, for its main principles were now fixed forever. The most remarkable instances of sacrifice on a large scale are by Solomon at the consecration of the Temple (1Ki 8:63), by Jehoiada after the death of Athaliah (2Ch 23:18), and by Hezekiah at his great Passover and restoration of the Temple-worship (2Ch 30:21-24). In each case the lavish use of victims was chiefly in the peace offerings, which were a sacred national feast to the people at the table of their Great King.

The regular sacrifices in the Temple service were:

(a.) Burned offerings.

1. The daily burned offerings (Exo 29:38-42).

2. The double burned offerings on the Sabbath (Num 28:9-10).

3. The burned offerings at the great festivals (Num 28:11 to Num 29:39).

(b.) Meat offerings.

1. The daily meat offerings accompanying the daily burned offerings (flour, oil, and wine) (Exo 29:40-41).

2. The shew bread (twelve loaves with frankincense), renewed every Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9).

3. The special meat offerings at the Sabbath and the great festivals (Num 28:29).

4. The first fruits, at the Passover (Lev 23:10-14), at Pentecost (28:17-20), both “wave offerings;” the first fruits of the dough and threshing floor at the harvest time (Num 15:20-21; Deu 26:1-11), called “heave offerings.”

(c.) Sin offerings.

1. Sin offering (a kid) each new moon (Num 28:15).

2. Sin offerings at the Passover, Pentecost, Feast of Trumpets, and Tabernacles (Num 28:22; Num 28:30; Num 29:5; Num 29:16; Num 29:19; Num 29:22; Num 29:25; Num 29:28; Num 29:31; Num 29:34; Num 29:38).

3. The offering of the two goats (the goat sacrificed, and the scapegoat) for the people, and of the bullock for the priest himself on the Great Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16).

(d.) Incense.

1. The morning and evening incense (Exo 30:7-8).

2. The incense on the Great Day of Atonement (Lev 16:12). Besides these public sacrifices, there were offerings of the people for themselves individually: at the purification of women (Leviticus 12); the presentation of the firstborn, and circumcision of all male children; the cleansing of the leprosy (ch. 14) or any uncleanness (ch. 15); at the fulfilment of Nazaritic and other vows (Num 6:1-21); on occasions of marriage and of burial, etc., besides the frequent offering of private sinofferings. These must have kept up a constant succession of sacrifices every day, and brought the rite home to every man's thought and to every occasion of human life. SEE SACRIFICIAL OFFERINGS.

IV. Significance of the Levitical Sacrifices. — In examining the doctrine of sacrifice, it is necessary to remember that, in its development, the order of idea is not necessarily the same as the order of time. By the order of sacrifice in its perfect form (as in Leviticus 8) it is clear that the sin offering occupies the most important place, the burned offering comes next, and the meatoffering, or peace offering, last of all. The second could only be offered after the first had been accepted; the third was only a subsidiary part of the second. Yet, in actual order of time, it has been seen that the patriarchal sacrifices partook much more of the nature of the peace offering and burned offering; and that, under the law, by which was “the  knowledge of sin” (Rom 3:20), the sin offering was for the first time explicitly set forth. This is but natural, that the deepest ideas should be the last in order of development.

It is also obvious that those who believe in the unity of the Old and New Tests., and the typical nature of the Mosaic covenant, must view the type in constant reference to the antitype, and be prepared, therefore, to find in the former vague and recondite meanings which are fixed and manifested by the latter. The sacrifices must be considered, not merely as they stand in the law, or even as they might have appeared to a pious Israelite, but as they were illustrated by the prophets, and perfectly interpreted in the N.T. (e.g. in the Epistle to the Hebrews). It follows from this that, as belonging to a system which was to embrace all mankind in its influence, they should be also compared and contrasted with the sacrifices and worship of God in other nations, and the ideas which in them were dimly and confusedly expressed.

1. Contrast with Heathenism. — It is needless to dwell on the universality of heathen sacrifices (see Magee, Dis. on Sacrifice, vol. 1, dis. 5, and Ernst von Lasaulx, Treatise on Greek and Roman Sacrifice, quoted in notes 23, 26 to Thomson's Bampton Lectures, 1853), and it is difficult to reduce to any single theory the various ideas involved therein. It is clear that the sacrifice was often looked upon as a gift or tribute to the gods; an idea which, for example, runs through all Greek literature, from the simple conception in Homer to the caricatures of Aristophanes or Lucian, against the perversion of which Paul protested at Athens, when he declared that God needed nothing at human hands (Act 17:25). It is also clear that sacrifices were used as prayers to obtain benefits or to avert wrath, and that this idea was corrupted into the superstition, denounced by heathen satirists as well as by Hebrew prophets, that by them the gods' favor could be purchased for the wicked, or their “envy” be averted from the prosperous. (On the other hand, that they were regarded as thank offerings, and the feasting on their flesh as a partaking of the “table of the gods” (comp. 1Co 10:20-21), is equally certain. Nor was the higher idea of sacrifice as a representation of the self devotion of the offerer, body and soul, to the god, wholly lost, although generally obscured by the grosser and more obvious conceptions of the rite. But, besides all these, there seems always to have been latent the idea of propitiation; that is, the belief in a communion with the gods, natural to man, broken off in some way, and by sacrifice to be restored. The emphatic “shedding of the  blood” as the essential part of the sacrifice, while the flesh was often eaten by the priests or the sacrificer, is not capable of a full explanation by any of the ideas above referred to. Whether it represented the death of the sacrificer, or (as in cases of national offering of human victims, and of those self devoted for their country) an atoning death for him; still, in either case, it contained the idea that “without shedding of blood is no renission,” and so had a vague and distorted glimpse of the great central truth of revelation. Such an idea may be, as has been argued, “unnatural,” in that it could not be explained by natural reason; but it certainly was not unnatural if frequency of existence and accordance with a deep natural instinct be allowed to preclude that epithet.

Now, the essential difference between these heathen views of sacrifice and the scriptural doctrine of the O.T. is not to be found in its denial of any of these ideas. The very names used in it for sacrifice, as is seen above, involve the conception of the rite as a gift, a form of worship, a thank offering, a self devotion, and an atonement. In fact, it brings out, clearly and distinctly, the ideas which, in heathenism, were uncertain, vague, and perverted. But the essential points of distinction are two:

(1.) Whereas the heathen conceived of their gods as alienated in jealousy or anger, to be sought after, and to be appeased by the unaided action of man, Scripture represents God himself as approaching man, as pointing out and sanctioning the way by which the broken covenant should be restored. This was impressed on the Israelites at every step by the minute directions of the law as to time, place, victim, and ceremonial, and by its utterly discountenancing the “will worship” which in heathenism found full scope, and rioted in the invention of costly or monstrous sacrifices. It is especially to be noted that this particularity is increased as we approach nearer to the deep propitiatory idea; for whereas the patriarchal sacrifices generally seem to have been undefined by God, and, even under the law, the nature of the peace offerings, and, to some extent, the burned offerings, was determined by the sacrificer only, yet the solemn sacrifice of Abraham in the inauguration of his covenant was prescribed to him, and the sin offerings under the law were most accurately and minutely determined (see. for example, the whole ceremonial of Leviticus 16). It is needless to remark how this essential difference purifies all the ideas above noticed from the corruptions which made them odious or contemptible, and sets on its true basis the relation between God and fallen man.

(2.) The second mark of distinction is closely connected with this, inasmuch as it shows sacrifice to be a scheme proceeding from God, and, in his foreknowledge, connected with the one central fact of all human history. It is to be found in the typical character of all Jewish sacrifices, on which, as the Epistle to the Hebrews argues, all their efficacy depended. It must be remembered that, like other ordinances of the law, they had a twofold effect, depending on the special position of an Israelite as a member of the natural theocracy, and on his general position as a man in relation with God. On the one hand, for example, the sin offering was en atonement to the national law for moral offenses:of negligence, which in “presumptuous” — i.e. deliberate and wilful — crime was rejected (see Num 15:27-31; and comp. Heb 10:26-27). On the other hand, it had, as the prophetic writings show us, a distinct spiritual significance as a means of expressing repentance and receiving forgiveness, which could have belonged to it only as a type of the great atonement. How far that typical meaning was recognised at different periods and by different persons, it is useless to speculate; but it would be impossible to doubt, even if we had no testimony on the subject, that, in the face of the high spiritual watching of the law and the prophets, a pious Israelite must have felt the nullity of material sacrifice in itself, and so believed it to be availing only as an ordinance of God, shadowing out some great spiritual truth or action of his. Nor is it unlikely that, with more or less distinctness, he connected the evolution of this, as of other truths, with the coming of the promised Messiah. But, however this be, we know that, in God's purpose, the whole system was typical; that all its spiritual efficacy depended on the true sacrifice which it represented, and could be received only on condition of faith; and that, therefore, it passed away when the Antitype had come.

2. The nature and meaning of the various kinds of sacrifice are partly gathered from the form of their institution and ceremonial, partly from the teaching of the prophets, and partly from the N.T., especially the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(1.) Old-Testament Relations. — Here all had relation, under different aspects, to a covenant between God and man.

(a.) The sin offering represented that covenant as broken by man, and as knit together again, by God's appointment, through the “shedding of blood.” Its characteristic ceremony was the sprinkling of the blood before  the veil of the sanctuary, the putting some of it on the horns of the altar of incense, and the pouring out of all the rest at the foot of the altar of burned offering. The flesh was in no case touched by the offerer; either it was consumed by fire without the camp, or it was eaten by the priest alone in the holy place, and everything that touched it was holy (קָדוֹשׁ). This latter point marked the distinction from the peace offering, and showed that the sacrificer had been rendered unworthy of communion with God. The shedding of the blood, the symbol of life, signified that the death of the offender was deserved for sin, but that the death of the victim was accepted for his death by the ordinance of God's mercy. This is seen most clearly in the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, when, after the sacrifice of the one goat, the high priest's hand was laid on the head of the scapegoat — which was the other part of the sin offering — with confession of the sins of the people, that it might visibly bear them away, and so bring out explicitly what in other sin offerings was but implied. Accordingly, we find (see quotation from the Mishna in Outram, De Sacr. 1, ch. 15:§ 10) that in all cases it was the custom for the offerer to lay his hand on the head of the sin offering, to confess, generally or specially, his sins, and to say, “Let this be my expiation.” Beyond all doubt, the sin offering distinctly witnessed that sin existed in man, that the “wages of that sin was death,” and that God had provided an atonement by the vicarious suffering of an appointed victim. The reference of the Baptist to a “Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world” was one understood and hailed at once by a “true Israelite.” SEE SIN OFFERING.

(b.) The ceremonial and meaning of the burned offering were very different. The idea of expiation seems not to have been absent from it, for the blood was sprinkled round about the altar of sacrifice; and, before the Levitical ordinance of the sin offering to precede it, this idea may have been even prominent. But in the system of Leviticus, it is evidently only secondary. The main idea is the offering of the whole victim (to God, representing (as the laying of the hand on its head shows) the devotion of the sacrificer, body and soul, to him. The death of the victim was (so to speak), an incidental feature, to signify the completeness of the devotion; and it is to be noticed that, in all solemn sacrifices. no burned offering could be made until a previous sin offering had brought the sacrificer again into covenant with God. The main idea of this sacrifice must have been representative, not vicarious; and the best comment upon it is the  exhortation, in Rom 12:1, “to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God.”

(c.) The meat offerings — the peace or thank offering, the first fruits, etc. — were simply offerings to God of his own best gifts, as a sign of thankful homage, and as a means of maintaining his service and his servants. Whether they were regular or voluntary, individual or national, independent or subsidiary to other offerings, this was still the leading idea. The meat offering, of flour, oil, and wine, seasoned with salt and hallowed by frankincense, was usually an appendage to the devotion implied in the burned offering; and the peace offerings for the people held the same place in Aaron's first sacrifice (Lev 9:22), and in all others of special solemnity. The characteristic ceremony in the peace offering was the eating of the flesh by the sacrificer (after the fat had been burned before the Lord, and the breast and shoulder given to the priests). It betokened the enjoyment of communion with God at “the table of the Lord,” in the gifts which his mercy had bestowed, of which a choice portion was offered to him, to his servants, and to his poor (see Deu 14:28-29). To this view of sacrifice allusion is made by Paul in Php 4:18; Heb 13:15-16). It follows naturally from the other two. SEE MEAT OFFERING.

It is clear, from this, that the idea of sacrifice is a complex idea, involving the propitiatory, the dedicatory, and the eucharistic elements. Any one of these, taken by itself, would lead to error and superstition. The propitiatory alone would tend to the idea of atonement by sacrifice for sin, as being effectual without any condition of repentance and faith; the self-dedicatory, taken alone, ignores the barrier of sin between man and God, and undermines the whole idea of atonement; the eucharistic, alone, leads to the notion that mere gifts can satisfy God's service, and is easily perverted into the heathenish attempt to “bribe” God by vows and offerings. All three, probably, were more or less implied in each sacrifice, each element predominating in its turn: all must be kept in mind in considering the historical influence, the spiritual meaning, and the typical value of sacrifice.

Now, the Israelites, while they seem always to have retained the ideas of propitiation and of eucharistic offering, even when they perverted these by half-heathenish superstition, constantly ignored the self dedication which is the link between the two, and which the regular burned offering should have impressed upon them as their daily thought and duty. It is, therefore,  to this point that the teaching of the prophets is mainly directed; its key- note is contained in the words of Samuel — “Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams” (1Sa 15:22). So Isaiah declares (as in Isa 50:10-11) that “the Lord delights not in the blood of bullocks, or lambs, or goats;” that to those who “cease to do evil and learn to do well…. though their sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow.” Jeremiah reminds them (Jer 7:22-23) that the Lord did not “command burned offerings or sacrifices” under Moses, but said, “Obey my voice, and I will be your God.” Ezekiel is full of indignant protests (see Eze 20:39-44) against the pollution of God's name by offerings of those whose hearts were with their idols. Hosea sets forth God's requirements (Hos 6:6) in words which our Lord himself sanctioned: “I desired mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burned offerings.” Amos (Amo 5:21-27) puts it even more strongly, that God “hates” their sacrifices, unless “judgment run down like water, and righteousness like a mighty stream.” And Micah (Mic 6:6-8) answers the question which lies at the root of sacrifice — “Wherewith shall I come before the Lord?” by the words, “What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?” All these passages, and many others, are directed to one object — not to discourage sacrifice, but to purify and spiritualize the feelings of the offerers.

The same truth, here enunciated from without, is recognised from within by the Psalmist. Thus he says, in Psa 40:8-11, “Sacrifice and meat offering, burned offering and sin offering, thou hast not required;” and contrasts with them the homage of the heart — “Mine ears hast thou bored,” and the active service of life — “Lo! I come to do thy will, O God.” In Psalm 1:13, 14, sacrifice is contrasted with prayer and adoration (comp. Psa 141:2): “Thinkest thou that I will eat bulls' flesh, and drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows to the Most High: and call upon me in the day of trouble.” In Psa 51:16-17, it is similarly contrasted with true repentance of the heart: “The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit, a broken and a contrite heart.” Yet here also the next verse shows that sacrifice was not superseded, but purified: “Then shalt thou be pleased with burned offerings and oblations; then shall they offer young bullocks upon thine altar.” These passages are correlative to the others, expressing the feelings, which those others in God's name require. It is not to be argued from them that this  idea of selfdedication is the main one of sacrifice. The idea of propitiation lies below it, taken for granted by the prophets as by the whole people, but still enveloped in mystery until the Antitype should come to make all clear. For the evolution of this doctrine we must look to the N.T.; the preparation for it by the prophets was (so to speak) negative, the pointing out the nullity of all other propitiations in themselves, and then leaving the warnings of the conscience and the cravings of the heart to fix men's hearts on the better atonement to come.

(2.) New-Testament Explanation. — Without entering directly on the great subject of the atonement (which would be foreign to the scope of this article), it will be sufficient to refer to the connection established in the N.T. between it and the sacrifices of the Mosaic system. To do this, we need do little more than analyze the Epistle to the Hebrews, which contains the key of the whole sacrificial doctrine.

(a.) In the first place, it follows the prophetic books by stating, in the most emphatic terms, the intrinsic nullity of all mere material sacrifices. The “gifts and sacrifices” of the first tabernacle could “never make the sacrificers perfect in conscience” (κατὰ συνείδησιν); they were but “carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation” (διορθώσεως) (Heb 9:9-10). The very fact of their constant repetition is said to prove this imperfection, which depends on the fundamental principle “that it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin” (Heb 10:4). But it does not lead us to infer that they actually had no spiritual efficacy if offered in repentance and faith. On the contrary, the object of the whole epistle is to show their typical and probationary character, and to assert that in virtue of it alone they had a spiritual meaning. Our Lord is declared (see 1Pe 1:20) “to have been foreordained” as a sacrifice “before the foundation of the world;” or (as it is more strikingly expressed in Rev 13:8) “slain from the foundation of the world.” The material sacrifices represented this great atonement as already made and accepted in God's foreknowledge; and to those who grasped the ideas of sin, pardon, and self dedication symbolized in them they were means of entering into the blessings which the one true sacrifice alone procured. Otherwise the whole sacrificial system could have been only a superstition and a snare. The sins provided for by the sin offering were certainly in some cases moral. The whole of the Mosaic description of sacrifices clearly implies some real spiritual benefit to be derived from them, besides the temporal privileges belonging to the  national theocracy. Just as Paul argues (Gal 3:15-29) that the promise and covenant to Abraham were of primary, the law only of secondary importance — so that men had under the law more than they had by the law — so it must be said of the Levitical sacrifices. They could convey nothing in themselves; yet, as types, they might, if accepted by a true, though necessarily imperfect faith, be means of conveying in some degree the blessings of the Antitype. SEE TYPE.

(b.) This typical character of all sacrifice being thus set forth, the next point dwelt upon is the union in our Lord's person of the priest, the offerer, and the sacrifice. SEE PRIEST. The imperfection of all sacrifices, which made them, in themselves, liable to superstition and even inexplicable, lies in this: that, on the one hand, the victim seems arbitrarily chosen to be the substitute for, or the representative of, the sacrificer; and that, on the other, if there be a barrier of sin between man and God, he has no right of approach, or security that his sacrifice will be accepted; that there needs, therefore, to be a mediator, i.e. (according to the definition of Heb 5:1-4), a true priest, who shall, as being one with man, offer the sacrifice, and accept it, as being one with God. It is shown that this imperfection, which necessarily existed in all types, without which indeed they would have been substitutes, not preparations for the antitype, was altogether done away in him: that in the first place he, as the representative of the whole human race, offered no arbitrarily chosen victim, but the willing sacrifice of his own blood; that in the second place he was ordained by God, by a solemn oath, to be a highpriest forever, “after the order of Melchisedek,” one “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,” united to our human nature, susceptible to its infirmities and trials, yet, at the same time, the true Son of God, exalted far above all created things, and ever living to make intercession in heaven, now that his sacrifice is over; and that, in the last place, the barrier between man and God is by his mediation done away forever, and the most holy place once for all opened to man. All the points in the doctrine of sacrifice which had before been unintelligible were thus made clear.

(c.) This being the case, it next follows that all the various kinds of sacrifices were, each in its measure, representatives and types of the various aspects of the atonement. It is clear that the atonement in this epistle, as in the N.T. generally, is viewed in a twofold light.

(1.) On the one hand, it is set forth distinctly as a vicarious sacrifice which was rendered necessary by the sin of man, and in which the Lord “bare the sins of many.” It is its essential characteristic that in it he stands absolutely alone, offering his sacrifice without any reference to the faith or the conversion of menoffering it, indeed, for those who “were still sinners” and at enmity with God. Moreover, it is called a “propitiatiols” (ἱλασμός or ἱλαστήριον), Rom 3:24; 1Jn 2:2; a “ransom” (ἀπολύτρωσις), Rom 3:25; 1Co 1:30, etc.; which, if words mean anything, must imply that it makes a change in the relation between God and man, from separation to union, from wrath to love, and a change in man's state from bondage to freedom. In it, then, he stands out alone as the mediator between God and man; and his sacrifice is offered once for all, never to be imitated or repeated.

Now, this view of the atonement is set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews as typified by the sin offering, especially by that particular sin offering with which the high priest entered the most holy place on the great day of atonement (Heb 9:7-12), and by that which hallowed the inauguration of the Mosaic covenant and cleansed the vessels of its ministration (Heb 9:13-23). In the same way Christ is called “our Passover, sacrificed for us” (1Co 5:7); and is said, in even more startling language, to have been “made sin for us,” though he “knew no sin” (2Co 5:21). This typical relation is pursued even into details, and our Lord's suffering without the city is compared to the burning of the public or priestly sin offerings without the camp (Heb 13:10-13). The altar of sacrifice (θυσιαστήριον) is said to have its antitype in his passion (13:10). All the expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices of the law are now for the first time brought into full light. Although the principle of vicarious sacrifice still remains, and must remain, a mystery, yet the fact of its existence in him is illustrated by a thousand types. As the sin offering, though not the earliest, is the most fundamental of all sacrifices, so the aspect of the atonement which it symbolizes is the one on which all others rest.

(2.) On the other hand, the sacrifice of Christ is set forth to us as the completion of that perfect obedience to the will of the Father which is the natural duty of sinless man, in which he is the representative of all men, and in which he calls upon us, when reconciled to God, to “take up the cross and follow him.” “In the days of his flesh he offered up prayers and supplications... and was heard, in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet  learned he obedience by the things which he suffered: and being made perfect” (by that suffering; see 2:10), “he became the author of salvation to all them that obey him” (5:7, 8, 9). In this view his death is not the principal object; we dwell rather on his lowly incarnation, and his life of humility, temptation, and suffering, to which that death was but a fitting close. In the passage above referred to the allusion is not to the cross of Calvary, but to the agony in Gethsemane, which bowed his human will to the will of his Father. The main idea of this view of the atonement is representative rather than vicarious. In the first view the “second Adam” undid by his atoning blood the work of evil which the first Adam did; in the second he, by his perfect obedience, did that which the first Adam left undone, and, by his grace making us like himself, calls upon us to follow him in the same path. This latter view is typified by the burned offering; in respect of which the N.T. merely quotes and enforces the language already cited from the O.T., and especially (see Heb 10:6-9) the words of Psa 40:6, etc., which contrast with material sacrifice the “doing the will of God.” It is one which cannot be dwelt upon at all without a previous implication of the other: as both were embraced in one act, so are they inseparably connected in idea. Thus it is put forth in Rom 12:1, where the “mercies of God” (i.e. the free salvation, through the sin offering of Christ's blood, dwelt upon in all the preceding part of the epistle) are made the ground for calling on us “to present our bodies, a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, “inasmuch as we are all (see Rom 5:5) one with Christ, and members of his body. In this sense it is that we are said to be “crucified with Christ” (Gal 2:20; Rom 6:6); to lave “the sufferings of Christ abound in us” (2Co 1:5); even to “fill up that which is behind” (τὰ ὑστερήματα) thereof (Col 1:24); and to “be offered” (σπένδεσθαι) “upon the sacrifice of the faith” of others (Php 2:17; comp. 2Ti 4:6; 1Jn 3:16). As without the sin offering of the cross this, our burned offering, would be impossible, so also without the burned offering the sin offering will to us be unavailing.

(d.) With these views of our Lord's sacrifice on earth, as typified in the Levitical sacrifices on the outer altar, is also to be connected the offering of his intercession for us in heaven, which was represented by the incense. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, this part of his priestly office is dwelt upon with particular reference to the offering of incense in the most holy place by the highpriest on the great day of atonement (Heb 9:24-28,  comp. Heb 4:14-16; Heb 6:19-20; Heb 7:25). It implies that the sin offering has been made once for all to rend asunder the veil (of sin) between man and God, and that the continual burned offering is now accepted by him for the sake of the great interceding High priest. That intercession is the strength of our prayers, and “with the smoke of its incense” they rise up to heaven (Rev 8:4). SEE INCENSE.

(e.) The typical sense of the meat offering or peaceoffering is less connected with the sacrifice of Christ himself than with those sacrifices of praise, thanksgiving, charity, and devotion which we, as Christians, offer to God, and “with which he is well pleased” (Heb 13:15-16) as with “an odor of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable to God” (Php 4:18). They betoken that through the peace won by the sin offering we have already been enabled to dedicate ourselves to God, and they are, as it were, the ornaments and accessories of that self dedication. SEE PEACE OFFERING.

Such is a brief sketch of the doctrine of sacrifice. It is seen to have been deeply rooted in men's hearts, and to have been, from the beginning, accepted and sanctioned by God, and made by him one channel of his revelation. In virtue of that sanction it had a value, partly symbolical, partly actual, but in all respects derived from the one true sacrifice, of which it was the type. It involved the expiatory, the self dedicatory, and the eucharistic ideas, each gradually developed and explained, but all capable of full explanation only by the light reflected back from the antitype.

Literature. — This is very copious, as may be seen from the lists of works cited by Danz (Worterb. s.v. “Opfer”), Darling (Cyclop. Bibliog. [see Index]), and Malcolm (Theol. Index, s.v.), as also from the references in the following articles. See especially Kurtz, Der alttestam. Oefercultus (Mitau, 1862); transl. Sacrificial Worship of the Old Test. (Edinb. 1863).

## Sacrifice, Human[[@Headword:Sacrifice, Human]]

             The offering of human life, as the most precious thing on earth, came in process of time to be practiced in most countries of the world. All histories and traditions darken our idea of the earlier ages with human sacrifices. But the period when such prevailed was not the earliest in time, though probably the earliest in civilization. The practice was both a result and a token of barbarism more or less gross. In this, too, the dearest object was primitively selected. Human life is the most valuable thing known, and of  this most precious possession the most precious portion is the life of a child. Children, therefore, were offered in fire to the false divinities, and in no part of the world with less regard to the claims of natural affection than in the land where, at a later period, the only true God had his peculiar worship and highest honors.

Under these circumstances, it is a striking fact that the Hebrew religion, even in its most rudimental condition, should be free from the contamination of human sacrifices. The case of Isaac and that of Jephthah's daughter cannot impair the general truth that the offering of human beings is neither enjoined, allowed, nor practiced in the Biblical records. On the contrary, such an offering is strictly prohibited by Moses as adverse to the will of God and an abomination of the heathen. “Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Moloch: defile not yourselves with any of these things” (Lev 18:21; see also 20:2; Deu 12:31; Psa 106:37; Isa 66:3; Jer 23:37). Yet in an age in which, like the present, all manner of novelties are broached, and, in some cases, the greater the paradox advanced with the more promptitude and maintained with the greater earnestness, these very clear positions have been withstood, and human sacrifices have been confidently charged on the Hebrew race. In the year 1842, Ghillany, professor at Nuremberg, published a book (Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebraer), the object of which was to prove that as the religion of the ancient Hebrews did not differ essentially from that of the Canaanites — so that Moloch, who had been originally a god common to both, merely in the process of time was softened down and passed into Jehovah, thus becoming the national deity of the people of Israel — so did their altars smoke with human blood, from the time of Abraham down to the fall of both kingdoms of Judah and Israel. In the same year appeared in Germany another work, by Daumer (Der Feuer- und Molochdienst der alten Hebraer), intended to prove that the worship of Moloch, involving his bloody rites, was the original, legal, and orthodox worship of the nation of Abraham, Moses, Samuel, and David. To these works a reply was put forth in 1843, by Lowengard (Jehovah, nicht Moloch, war der Gott der alten Hebraer), in which he defends the worship of Jehovah from the recent imputations, and strives, by distinguishing between the essential and the unessential, the durable and the temporary, to prepare the way for a reformation of modern Judaism.

We do not think that it requires any deep research or profound learning to ascertain from the Biblical records themselves that the religion of the Bible  is wholly free from the shocking abominations of human sacrifices, and we do not therefore hesitate to urge the fact on the attention of the ordinary reader as not least considerable among many proofs not only of the superior character, but of the divine origin, of the Hebrew worship. It was in Egypt where the mind of Moses, and of the generation with whom he had primarily to do, was chiefly formed, so far as heathen influences were concerned. Here offerings were very numerous. Sacrifices of meat offerings, libations, and incense were of very early date in the Egyptian temples. Oxen, wild goats, pigs, and particularly geese, were among the animal offerings; besides these, there were presented to the gods wine, oil, beer, milk, cakes, grain, ointment, flowers, fruits, vegetables. In these, and in the case of meat, peace, and sin offerings (as well as others), there exists a striking resemblance with similar Hebrew observances, which may be found indicated in detail in Wilkinson (Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 5, 358 sq.; see also 2, 378), who, in agreement with Herodotus, maintains, in opposition to Diodorus, that the Egyptians were never accustomed to sacrifice human beings — a decision which has a favorable aspect on our last position, namely, that the religion of the Israelites, even in its earliest days, was unprofaned by human blood. A remarkable instance of disagreement between the observances of the Egyptians and the Jews in regard to sacrifices is that while the Egyptians received the blood of the slaughtered animal into a vase or basin, to be applied in cookery, the eating of blood was most strictly forbidden to the Israelites (Deu 15:23).

## Sacrificial Festival[[@Headword:Sacrificial Festival]]

             This was held with the pieces of the victims laid aside from sacrifices of a joyful nature (epuloe sacroe, dapes), not only in all ancient heathen nations (Saubert, De Sacrific. c. 26; Feith, Antiq. Hom. 1, 10, 7; Stuck, Antiq. Conviv. 1, 33; Lakemacher, Antiq. Groecor. Sacre, p. 384 sq.; Dougtai Annal. 1, 235; on the Romans, see, among others, Josephus, War, 7, 1, 3; comp. also Plato, Leg. 5, p. 738; Herod. 6:67), but also among the Israelites (Deu 12:6 sq.; 1Sa 9:19; 1Sa 16:3; 1Sa 16:5; 2Sa 6:19). Only the thank offerings of individuals, however, among that people gave opportunity for these festivals, since of these alone certain rich portions were consumed on the altar (Lev 3:3 sq., Lev 3:9 sq.; Lev 14:15); the breast and the right shoulder belonged to the officiating priests (Lev 7:31 sq.), and all the rest of the flesh was restored to the offerer (Deu 27:7). This was to be eaten on the same or the following  day (Lev 7:16), and in the company of all members of the household and of bidden guests (the Levites especially were often invited) (Deu 12:12). Other sacred meals were held at the times of festivals (Deu 16:11 sq.). Upon the tithe meal, SEE TITHE.

Heathen sacrificial meals, which were held sometimes in the temples (1Co 8:10), sometimes in private houses, are mentioned (Num 25:2). The participation of an Israelite in these was accounted idolatry (Num 25:3 sq.; Psa 106:28; Tob 1:12; 1Co 10:20 sq.; Rev 2:14); hence, too, the apostles forbade Christians to join them (Act 15:29; Act 21:25), or at least warned against them on account of those who were weak in faith (1Co 8:1 sq.; 1Co 10:28 sq.). Such “meat offered to idols,” however, was set forth on the table not only at the sacrificial meals (1Co 8:10; 1Co 10:27), but the poor or the avaricious used to preserve it for future use (Theophr. Char. 10) or sell it to traders (ibid. 23); hence it might easily happen that one who bought at the meat market received it (1Co 10:25). SEE FESTIVAL.

## Sacrificial Instruments In The Israelitish Sanctuary[[@Headword:Sacrificial Instruments In The Israelitish Sanctuary]]

             For the use of the priests in offering sacrifices, especially those with blood, there were kept in the tabernacle (Exo 27:3; Exo 38:3; Num 4:14) and in the Temple (1Ki 7:40; 1Ki 7:45; 2Ki 25:14 sq.; Jer 52:18 sq.) the following implements of brass:

1. יָעַי ם, yaim', shovels, perhaps to free the altar of burned offering from its ashes; to which the סַירוֹת, siroth', or pots, belonged, into which they were thrown.

2. מַזְרָקוֹת, mizrakoth', basins, to take up the blood of the victims for sprinkling.

3. מַזְלָגוֹת, mizlagoth', forks, flesh-forks.

4. מִחְתּוֹת, machtoth', firepans, in which coals were taken up.

The brazen מְזִמְּרוֹת, mezammeroth' (Jer 52:18), may be considered as belonging here, and will then doubtless mean sacrificial knives, elsewhere called מִחְלָפַי, machlaphim'. SEE KNIFE. The golden vases or vessels mentioned in 1Ki 7:50 are certainly different from those just mentioned (No. 2), and were intended for use in the holy place. SEE SACRIFICE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Sacrificial Offering[[@Headword:Sacrificial Offering]]

             There is no doubt that the origin of sacrifices is to be referred to the very earliest ages of humanity, where also the Mosaic history places it (Gen 4:3 sq.; Gen 8:20; Gen 22:2; Gen 31:54; Gen 46:1; comp. Hottinger, De Origine Sacrific. Patriarch. [Marb. 1706]). While men as yet made little distinction between the sensible and the supernatural, they sought to acquire or fix the favor of their gods, or to express their gratitude for their gifts, by thank offerings, usually of some kind of food, since they attributed to their gods the wants of men (Lev 21:6; Lev 22:25; Num 28:2; comp. Pliny, 2, 5, p. 73 [ed. Hard.]; Homer, Iliad, 4, 48; Aristoph. Aves, 1516 sq.; comp. Pauly's Real-Encyklop. 4, 839 sq.). (On the meaning and kinds of offerings, see Melancthon, in the Apol. A. C. p. 253 sq. A contracted view is taken by Sykes, Ueber d. Natur, Absicht u. Urspr. d. Opfer [Halle, 1778]. There is a vain attempt to philosophize, by Rosenkranz, in the Hall. Encykl.vol. 3, § 4, p. 74; comp. Baader, Ueber eine kunft. Theorie d. Opfers und Cultus [Munich, 1836]; Bahr, Symbol. 2, 288 sq.) The sensualism of an early age expressed itself, too, in supposing a god to be pleased with the odor of sacrifices (Lev 1:9; Lev 1:13; Num 15:7 sq.; Lucian, Icaromen. 27). The sacrifices were usually of such food as men themselves most enjoyed, and of the greatest excellence in their kind (1Sa 15:15; Psa 66:15), and were either raw or prepared in such a way as to be most palatable. Hence doubtless the use of salt (q.v.). Perhaps the first offerings were productions of the vegetable kingdom (Plato, Leg. 6, 782), and then honey, milk, etc., animals not being offered until later (Theophr. in Porphyr. Abstinent. 2, 5, and 28:33; comp. Plato, Leg. 6, 782; Ovid, Fasti, 1, 337; Pausan. 8, 2, 1). For the history informs us that man began with vegetable food, and afterwards to eat flesh (comp. Gen 1:29; Gen 9:3; see Schickedanz, De Natura Sacrif V.T. ex Seculi Morib. repetend. [Francf. 1784], and in the Symbol. Duisb. 2, 2, 493 sq.), and perhaps the sacrifice of animals may have led to the burning of the sacrifices on altars. (See iin general Gedicke, Verm. Schriff. p. 229 sq.; Wolf, Verm. Schrift. u. Aufs. [Halle, 1802], p. 243 sq.; Saubert, De Sacrfic. Vet. Collectanea [Jen. 1659]; Meiner, Krit. Gesch. der Religion, 2, 1 sq.; Baur, Symbol. u. Mythol. 2, 2, 284 sq.) It is commonly supposed that the first offerings were of immediate divine appointment (Deyling, Observat. 2, 53 sq.), but this is not affirmed in the Mosaic history (comp.  Wolf, Hominies Mose Vetustiores Sponte Sacrafecisse, etc. [Lips. 1782]), and is rejected by some as anthropopathism. The views of those who seek definite dogmatic relations in the first sacrifices, as Tholuck (2te Beil. zum Br. a.d. Hebr. p. 69), do not belong to historical criticism, but to dogmatic”theology (see also the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1863, 3).

On the ritual of sacrifice among the Hebrews in general, see Lightfoot, De Ministerio Templi, in his Works, and in Ugolino, vol. 9, ch. 8; Carpzov, App. p. 699 sq.; Outram, De Sacrif: Lib. (Lond. 1677), vol. 2 (only the first book relates to the Jewish sacrifices); Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 3, 1; Bauer, Gottesdienst-Verfass. 1, 80 sq.; Rosenmulller, Excursus 1, ad Leviticus; Gramberg, Relig. Ideen, 1, 94 sq.; Scholl, in the Wurtemberg. Stud. 1, 2, 152 sq.; 4, 1, 3 sq.; 5, 1, 108 sq.; Bahr, Symbol. 2, 189 sq.; Kurtz, Das mos. Opfer (Mitau, 1842). The Jewish views of the ritual of sacrifice are especially set forth in the tracts Sebachim, Menachoth, and Temura, in the fifth part of the Mishna. From these and the rabbins extracts are given by Otho, Lex. Talm. p. 621 sq. The entire Babylonish Gemara to the tract Sebachim, and the Tosiphta to the same tract, are found in Hebrew and Latin in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 19. Many parallels and explanations are found in the Phoenician table of offerings discovered some years since in Marseilles, and published, with a commentary, by Movers (Breslau, 1847). (On the offerings of other Eastern and Western nations, see Flugel, Volkel, and Wachter, in the Hall. Encykl. 3, § 4:p. 77 sq.)

The law adopted as a model the sacrifices already long in use, and gives exact directions as to the kinds of sacrifices and the ceremonies of offering. (We cannot here discuss the question of how much of this law was Mosaic. In answer to the view of De Wette, Von Bohlen, George, and others that the greater part had a still later origin, see Bleek, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1831, 3, 491 sq.; Bahr, Symbol. 2, 192 sq.) This law of offerings may be summed up thus:

1. The subjects to be sacrificed, in the proper sense of the word, which were laid, that is, on the burning altar of Jehovah, must be borrowed as well out of the vegetable as the animal kingdom. (In the wider sense of offering, even tithes, first fruits, and incense are included. Comp. the offering of wood, Neh 10:35.) Hence there is a distinction between offerings without blood (מְנָחוֹת, menachoth, προσφοραί, δῶρα) and offerings with blood (זַבָחַי ם, zebachim, θυσίαι). See 1Sa 2:29; 1Sa 3:14, Psa 40:7; Heb 8:3. The latter were  considered the more important. But salt, a mineral, was added to every distinct sacrifice of either kind. The vegetable products offered were both solid and fluid; of the former, roasted grain, flour, cakes with olive oil (the cakes always without leaven or honey), and incense as an accompaniment, formed the meat offerings (the מַנְחָה, minchah, in the proper sense); of the latter, wine formed the drink offerings (נֶסֶךְ, nesek). The animals offered must be clean, and such as were fit for food (Josephus, Ant. 12, 5, 4; comp. Gen 8:20), and must be tame beasts, as cattle (Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 326 sq.), goats, sheep, and sometimes turtle doves and young pigeons, but never fishes. They must be altogether free from deformity (spotless, perfect, ἄνουμος, τέλειος, Lev 22:20 sq.; comp. Mal 1:8; Mal 1:14; Herod. 2:38; Plutarch, Orac. Def. p. 49; Ovid, Met. 15, 130; Virgil, Aen. 4, 57; Pliny, 8, 70; Athen. 15, 674; Tertull. Apol.c. 14; with the passage in Plutarch may be compared Polluc. Onom. 1, 1, 1 29; Schol. ad Aristoph. Acarn. p. 785; on the expressions in Lev 22:20 sq., see Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 594 sq.; 4 comp. Baldinger, praes. Hottinger, De Victim. Integritate 1 et Mysterio [Heidelb. 1731]). Except the doves, they must be at least eight days old, because younger flesh is unfit for food (Exo 22:30; Lev 22:27), the smaller cattle being usually yearlings (sheep, goats, 4 calves, Exo 29:38; Lev 9:3; Lev 12:6; Lev 14:10; Lev 23:12; Lev 23:18 sq.; Num 15:27; Num 28:9 sq.), while the larger were young, perhaps usually three years old (yet Jdg 6:25 mentions a bull of seven years as a sacrifice; comp. Pliny, 8, 77; Herod. ii, 38). The sex of four-footed beasts for sacrifice was sometimes indifferent (as in thank and sin offerings; comp. Lev 3:1; Lev 3:6; yet in all public offerings the Mishna requires males, Temzura, 2, 1), and sometimes males were required, as in burned offerings; for the male sex was considered the superior. The choice of the kind of beast was free in the burned offerings and thank offerings (Lev 1:2; Lev 3:1; Lev 3:6), but was determined by law in the trespass and sin offerings (Lev 4:3). Human sacrifices, as heathenish (Lev 18:21; Lev 20:2 sq.; Deu 12:31), were avoided by the pious Israelites (Psa 106:37), although their sacred history contained an example of the purposed sacrifice of a son by his father (Genesis 22), and in the unsettled days of the judges a daughter fell under the sacrificial knife of her superstitious father (Judges 11). On the human sacrifices of other nations, see Baur, Mythology, 2, 2, 293 sq.; Wachsmuth, Hellen. AIterth. 2, 549 sq.; and on those of the apostate Israelites, SEE MOLOCH.

The slanderous statement that the Jews slaughtered strangers and drank their blood arose about the time of  Antiochus Epiphanes (see Josephus, Apion, 2, 8; Ghillany, Die Menschenopfer der alten Heb. [Nuremberg, 1842]; Hall. Lit. Zeit. 1844, No. 220-223). The legal and regular circle of sacrificial beasts is explicable from the agricultural pursuits of the Israelites: oxen, goats, and sheep were the usual stock of farmers, and corn, oil, and wine were the chief productions of the soil for the commonest wants of life. The addition of doves springs from the fact that scarcely any creatures with life suitable for sacrifice could be found save among birds, and doves were the most common domestic birds. But why not chickens; and why, according to the rabbins, could not chickens be kept in the holy city? (comp. Eskuche, De Gallis et Gallinis ad Aram Jovoe non Factis [Rint. 1741]). SEE FATTED FOWL. Each person was required to furnish his own sacrifices, and those who lived near enough drove them from their own herds. But later there arose in Jerusalem traders in beasts for sacrifice (victimarii ngotiatores; Pliny, H.N. 7, 10; Mishna, Shekal. 7, 2), and at the time of Jesus a regular market for this purpose stood in the vicinity of the Temple (q.v.).

2. The place where alone sacrifices might be presented was the court of the national sanctuary — the tabernacle first and afterwards the Temple (Deu 12:5; Deuteronomy cf., 11), and every offering elsewhere was to be punished with death (Lev 17:4 sq.; Deu 12:13; comp. 1Ki 12:27). The place is more exactly called “the door of the tabernacle of the congregation” (Lev 1:3; Lev 4:4; Lev 4:14); and, according to the Mishna (Sebach. c. 5), the offerings were slain, part on the north side of the altar, part, the less holy, at any place in the court indifferently (comp. Plato, Leges, 10, 910). These regulations were designed to prevent the idolatrous worship which might have been concealed under the mask of the legal ritual.. Besides, the common place of worship must have had a beneficial influence on the spirit of a nation so torn into factions (comp. 1Ki 12:27). This common place of sacrifice was not always observed in the time of the judges, nor even of David (1Ki 3:2-3). Sacrifices were made away from the tabernacle (Jdg 2:5; 1Sa 7:17; 1Ki 1:9), especially on high places (Jdg 6:26; Jdg 13:19; Hos 4:13). Even the law-abiding Samuel did this (1 Samuel l.c.), and David tolerated it (1Ki 3:2 sq.). These sacrifices on high places lasted after Solomon's time, even under theocratic kings. In the kingdom of Israel the common place of sacrifice was abandoned. In the time of the judges the irregularity sprang from the confusion of jurisdiction and the unsettled condition of the people,  everywhere pressed by their enemies; yet it is, on the whole, probable that such entire exclusiveness of locality was not so severely demanded by the Mosaic law as later, after the unfortunate consequences of private and voluntary sacrifices were seen.

3. The purpose of the sacrifices was special — either to thank God for benefits received, or to propitiate him because of sins and errors. Hence the distinction of thank offerings and sin and trespass offerings. The burned offerings had a more general tendency (comp. the division of sacrifices in Philo, Opp. 2, 240; see Scholl, in Klaiber's Studien, 4, 1, 36 sq.). The Hebrew sacrifices are enumerated, though not defined with exactness, in Num 15:3 sq.; Deu 12:6; Jer 17:26. On the classes of Carthaginian sacrifices, see Movers (Phoniz. p. 19, 41). These various offerings produced great variety of ceremonies, as now in the masses of the Roman Catholics. On great public festivals, great collective offerings like hecatombs are mentioned (1Ki 8:5; 1Ki 8:63 sq.; 2Ch 29:32 sq.; 2Ch 30:24; 2Ch 35:7 sq.; comp. Herod. 7:43; Xenoph. Hell. 6, 4, 29; Sueton. Calig. 14; Capitol. in Maxim. et Balbin. c. 11).

Offerings were sometimes public (comp. Herod. 6:57; Xenoph. Athen. 2, 9), sometimes private, sometimes prescribed, sometimes voluntary; the latter were sometimes family sacrifices (1Sa 1:21; 1Sa 20:6). One person had sacrifices offered for another, as the Catholics with masses (Job 1:5; 2Ma 3:32). Not only the Israelites, but the heathen, were permitted to sacrifice to Jehovah (Num 15:14; 2Ma 3:35; 2Ma 13:23; Philo, Opp. 2, 569; Josephus, Apion, 2, 5; Mishna, Shekal. 7, 6), and the Jews even made sacrifices for heathen princes on the altars of Jehovah (1Ma 7:33; Josephus, Ant. 12, 2, 5). Originally they were offered only for the living, sometimes when death was near (Sir 38:11); but after the resurrection became a general belief sacrifices for the dead arose (2Ma 12:43). There is, indeed, no other instance, and perhaps they never were customary, especially as they are not in harmony with the law (see Grotius, ad loc.). The polemic writers against the Catholic masses for the dead repudiate them indignantly (Chemnitz, Exam. Concil. Trid. p. 736 sq. [ed. Francf.]; Pfaff, Num ex 2Ma 12:39 sq. adstrui possint Missce et Preces pro Defunctis [Tubing. 1749]), or suppose that the narrator forged the account (Hyper. in the Miscell. Duisburg. 1, 453).

4. In the sacrifice of offerings with blood the owner himself (see Hottinger, De Function. Laic. circa Victim. [Marburg, 1706]), after being cleansed  and sanctified (1Sa 16:5; Job 1:5; comp. Josephus, Apion, 2, 23; Hesiod, Opp. p. 724 sq.; Ovid, Metam. 10, 434 sq.; Tibul. 2, 1, 11; Herod. 2, 37), led the beast to the altar (Lev 3:1; Lev 3:12; Lev 4:14; Lev 17:4). Among the Greeks and Romans the horns of the beast were gilded (Homer, Iliad, 10, 294; Odys. 3, 384, 426; Plato, Alcib. 2, c. 20; Virgil, Aen. 9, 927; Macrob. Sat. 1, 17, p. 29, ed. Bip.) and crowned (comp. Act 14:13; see Ovid, Metam. 15, 131; Lucian, Sacrif. vol. 12; Lycophron. Alex. p. 327; Statius, Theb. 4, 449; Pliny, 16, 4; Strabo, 15, 732; Athen. 15, 674; see Wetstein, 2, 543; Walch, Dissert. ad Acta Apost. 3, 200). That this custom prevailed among the Jews, at least with the thank offerings, is less clear from Josephus (Ant. 13, 8, 2) than from the Mishna (Bikkurim, 3, 2 sq.; comp. in general Lakemacher, Observ. 1, 79 sq.). The owner laid his hand upon the head of the beast (Lev 1:4; Lev 3:2; Lev 4:4; Lev 4:15; Lev 4:24; Lev 8:18; comp. the Egyptian custom, Herod. 2, 40). If the sacrifice was that of a community, the elders performed this duty (Lev 4:15); but when the offering was public, i.e. in the name of the whole people, the ritual mentions this imposition of the hand but in one case (Lev 16:21; comp. the Mishna, Menach. 9, 7; yet see 2Ch 29:23), this ceremony being the formal consecration of the beast to Jehovah; not the laying of the penalty due to sin upon the sacrifice, as Bochart thinks (Hieroz. 1, 330), for the ceremony occurs in the case of the thank offering. According to the rabbins, a regular form of words was used in laying the hands on the victim (Maimon. Hilch. Korban, 3, 9); then it was slain (Lev 3:2; Lev 4:4; Lev 4:15; Lev 4:24; Lev 8:15; Lev 8:19), but this might be, and in later times actually was, done by the priests (2Ch 29:24); perhaps even by the Levites, but 2Ch 30:17 does not prove this.

Among the Romans, officers called popae or victimarii slew the victim (Bochart, Ilieroz. 1, 330). The blood was then taken up, and in different sacrifices variously sprinkled or poured out by the priest (Hottinger, De Function. Sacer. circa Victim. [Marb. 1706]). According to the varying character of the offering, the blood was sprinkled, or brought into the Temple and there sprinkled upon the ark of the covenant, and put on the horns of the altar of burned offering, and the remainder thrown out at the foot of the altar of burned offering. The sacrificer (yet comp. 2Ch 29:34) then took off the skin of the victim (Lev 1:6), which belonged, when not burned (Lev 4:1), either to the priests (Lev 7:8; only said of the burned offering) or to the offerer (comp. the directions in the Talmud-Mishna, Sebach. 12, 2 sq.). So, too, among the Carthaginians (see the lists of offerings found in Marseilles, 3, 4, 8, 10). In Sparta the skins of public sacrifices belonged to  the kings (Herod. 6:57). The victim was cut to pieces (Lev 1:6; Lev 8:20), which were, in various sacrifices, either all (as the burned offerings), or certain specially valued pieces (in all other offerings; comp. Isa 1:11; Strabo, 15, 732; Catull. 40, 5), burned by the priest upon the altar. In the latter case the flesh belonged to the priests or to the sacrificer, or must be burned outside of the city. (On the ceremony of offering the doves, see Lev 1:14 sq.; Lev 5:8; comp. Hottinger, De Sacr. Avium [Marb. 1706].) The ceremonies of heaving and waving took place in some sacrifices either before or after the victim was killed. SEE HEAVE OFFERING; SEE WAVE OFFERING.

5. The yearly expense of sacrifices, both by individuals and the whole people, was not trifling; yet householders had at hand most of the necessary offerings, and wood was brought from the forests. (On the limits within which wood was obtained for Temple use in the later age, see the Mishna, Taanith, 4:5. For the trees used as sacrificial wood, see the tract Tamid, 2, 3.) Later, foreign princes who desired the favor of the Jews applied from their revenues a portion to public sacrifices (Ezr 6:9; 1Ma 10:39; 2Ma 3:3; 2Ma 9:16; Josephus, Ant. 12, 3, 3). (On a peculiar festival of carrying wood, see Josephus, War, 2, 17, 6. It was held in the beginning of the month Elul).

6. As an expression of pious gratitude and of reverence towards Jehovah (Psa 66:15; Psa 110:3; Sir 38:4; comp. Mat 8:4; Act 21:26), sacrifices were presented in abundance by the Hebrews through all antiquity, and he who offered none was accounted irreligious (Ecc 9:2; comp. Isa 43:23 sq.). Oaths were made by the offerings (Mat 23:18), and in descriptions of golden antiquity the ideally magnified splendor of the sacrificial ritual appears (Isa 19:21; Isa 56:7; Isa 60:7; Zec 14:21; Jer 17:26; Jer 33:18), while the want of sacrifice is among the terrors of threatened exile (Hos 3:4). Yet the Israelites often forgot in the symbol the higher affection of the heart, and their offerings became an opus operatum. Accordingly the prophets occasionally give warning against overvaluing sacrifices, and strive to call forth a pious disposition, as more pleasing to God than they are, since in them the heart feels nothing (Isa 1:11; Jer 6:20; Jer 7:21 sq.; Hos 6:6; Amo 5:22; Mic 6:6 sq.; comp. Psalm 40:7; 1:9 sq.; Psa 51:18 sq.; Pro 21:3; Mat 5:23 sq.; Sir 35:1; comp. Plato, Alcib. 2, 150; Diod. Sic. 12, 20; Ovid, Heroid. 20, 181 sq.; Seneca Benef. 1, 6; comp. Siebelis Disput. p. 121 sq.).

Such representations do not  justify us in denying to the older Israelites the anthropopathic view of sacrifices, and forcing upon ancient simplicity an artificial doctrine. Yet this is done by Bahr (Symbol. 2, 198 sq.; comp. Hoff, Die mos. Opfer nach ihrer sinn- u. vorbildl. Bedeut. [Warsaw, 1845]), who, starting with the statement that offerings with blood were the germ of all (in reference to Lev 17:11), finds in the Mosaic sacrifices the doctrine of symbolic substitution. “The offering and bringing near of the nephesh, or life, in the sacrificial blood upon the altar, as the place of the presence and revelation of God, is a symbol of the offering of the nephesh, or life, of the sacrificer to Jehovah. As this presentation of the blood is a giving up to death of the animal life, so must also the spiritual life of self, as opposed to God, be given up and die. But since the giving up is to Jehovah, the Holy One, it is not merely a ceasing, something negative, but a dying, which in the very act is a becoming alive,” etc. Apart from all the assumption in this theory, it is entirely too artificial, one might say too Christian, for Israelitish antiquity. It is necessary, too, to assume that the sacrifices with blood were the original ones, which is not proven; and the doctrine cannot be extended without violence to any but sin offerings (see Kurtz, Mos. Opfr, p. 7 sq.), in which it cannot be denied that the idea of substitution is found. In the period after the exile arose the Essenes, who went further than the prophets, and retained of the outward ritual only the lustrations, not offering sacrifices at all (Josephus, Ant. 18, 1, 5). It is well known that all the ceremonial of sacrifice has been given up by the Jews, since they no longer possess the Temple mountain; yet the Samaritans still yearly offer seven lambs on Mount Gerizim at the Passover (Robinson, 3, 98 sq.). SEE OFFERING.

The fact that every individual who brought a sacrifice had to be present in the Temple when it was offered gave rise to the opinion that the daily morning and evening sacrifices which were brought for the whole congregation of Israel required that the congregation should be represented in the Temple at the offering of these national sacrifices. Hence the whole people was divided into twenty-four divisions or orders, corresponding to the divisions of the priests and Levites. Every division chose a number of representatives (מעמד אנשי), one of whom was appointed chief (המעמד), and in turn sent up some of them as a deputation to Jerusalem to represent the nation at the daily sacrifices in the Temple, and pronounce the prayers and blessings in behalf of the people while the sacrifices were offered. They had also to fast four days (i.e. the second, third, fourth, and  fifth day) during the week of their representation. Those of the representatives who remained at home assembled in a synagogue to pray during the time of sacrifice. SEE TEMPLE.

It will be observed from the above notices that there was one grand point of difference between the Jews and the heathens: the sacrificial rites of the former were never stained with human blood, than which nothing could be conceived more abhorrent to all the attributes of Jehovah (Jephthah's daughter is no exception, for it cannot be proved with certainty that she was sacrificed; on the contrary, many interpreters think that she was solemnly dedicated to the service of God). But the testimony of innumerable writers proves that no heathen nation has been free from human sacrifices; such having occurred, even among civilized people, at some period of their history, especially on some great occasion, to expiate a great sin or avert some dreadful calamity. Even to this day among the Hinduls, whose tenets forbid blood shedding, human self-immolations, or sacrificial suicides, are common. Another point of difference is found in the animal sacrifices, which, among the heathens, were frequently of such as were particularly forbidden in the Mosaic law — unclean animals and beasts of prey; such as dogs offered to Hecate, swine to Mars (in the Suovetaurilia), and wolves to Apollo. Heathens in their sacrifices poured oil over the beast, which the Jews did not; they (the former) burned only a portion of the frankincense presented; the Jews burned all. The Greeks offered honey to the sun; in Jewish sacrifices it was forbidden; and the Sabian idolaters ate the blood of their sacrifices, which Maimonides thinks was one of the reasons why it was so particularly prohibited to the Jews. Their bread offerings also were leavened. Some points of similarity are to be found between the Jewish and heathen sacrifices. The heathens brought their victims to the temples, chose them without blemish, poured out libations of wine, cut the animal's throat, flayed and dissected it, caught the blood in a vessel, and poured it on and round the altar; and they used salt by mixing some with meal, and sprinkling it on the head of the animal, on which they also laid their hands. In the early times the sacrifice was burned whole, the skin being given to the priest; but later, part only was consumed and the rest given to the sacrificers (if it was an eatable animal) to feast upon. The thighs and fat were the share of the gods. The victims among the Greeks and Romans were crowned with garlands and adorned with fillets and ribbons, and the horns of large animals were gilded. None of these decorations are enjoined in the Jewish sacrifices. SEE SACRIFICE.

## Sacrilege[[@Headword:Sacrilege]]

             (ἱεροσολέω, to rob a temple, Rom 2:22; so the noun ἱερόσυλος, “robber of churches, “Act 19:37), the violation or profanation of holy places, persons, or things. Though the word sacrilege is not used elsewhere than as above in our version of the canonical Scriptures, yet we find the crime itself often alluded to; e.g. “profaning the sanctuary” (Lev 21:22), “profaning hallowed things” (Lev 19:8), “profaning the covenant” (Mal 2:10). The first sacrilegious act we read of is that of Esau selling his birthright (Gen 25:33), for which he is called “profane” by Paul (Heb 12:16). Instances of this under the Mosaic economy (which sternly forbade it [Exo 25:14]) were the cases of Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10), the men of Bethshemesh (1 Samuel 5), Uzzah (2 Samuel 6:67), Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26). The Jews at a later period of their history were eminently guilty in this particular, inasmuch as they withheld the tithes and offerings which God required of them (Mal 3:8-10), and converted his holy temple into a market (Mat 21:12-13). This profanation is forbidden in the Talmud (Lightfoot, ad loc.). SEE TEMPLE.

Yet they pretended to be punctiliously scrupulous in their reverence for the interior building (Mat 26:61). So the grand accusation against Stephen was that he spoke disrespectfully of the Temple (Act 6:13). An uproar was excited against Paul in Jerusalem on the charge that he brought Greeks into the Temple and polluted the holy place (Act 21:28-29), though daily profanations were committed by the affected zealots with impunity. At length, in the closing scenes of Jerusalem, such were the multitude and the magnitude of the sacrileges that Josephus says if the Romans had not taken the city of Jerusalem he would have expected it to have been swallowed up like Sodom, or have had some other dreadful judgment. The jealousy of the Almighty respecting things dedicated to him, and his punishment of the profanation of them, are alluded to by Paul (1Co 3:17): “If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” We read but little else in the N.T. pertaining to sacrilege except Paul's rebuke of the Corinthians for their profane conduct at the celebration of the Lord's supper (1Co 11:29). In that early period of the Christian Church, it had not been able as yet regularly to establish sacred places and things; but as soon as circumstances permitted, we shall find in the Church history of every nation a due respect for consecrated things, and laws for their preservation. Even  the heathens, particularly the Greeks and Romans, were not without their rules concerning sacrilege, the penalty of which was usually death. Thus it was held sacrilege for the polluted to pass beyond the porch of the temple, to spit or wipe the nose in a temple, to cut down consecrated trees, to build upon or till any spot of ground where a thunderbolt had fallen, to suffer a man to witness the ceremonies of the Bona Dea, or Good Goddess, or to suffer a woman to enter the temple of Diana in the Vicus Patricius in Rome, to suffer a birth or death to occur in the holy isle of Delos, to steal anything belonging to a temple, to approach a sacrifice without being sprinkled by the priest with the lustral water, to consecrate a blemished man to the priesthood (compare with the Jewish law, Lev 21:21), and many other instances which will occur to the classical reader.

## Sacrilege, Christian View Of[[@Headword:Sacrilege, Christian View Of]]

             The ancient Church distinguished several sorts of sacrilege:

1st, the diverting things appropriated to sacred purposes to other uses; to break or burn the furniture of the Church, or deliver it to be broken or burned;

2d, robbing the graves or defacing and spoiling the monuments of the dead;

3d, those were considered as sacrilegious persons who delivered up their Bibles and the sacred utensils of the Church to the pagans in the time of the Diocletian persecution;

4th, profaning the sacraments, churches, altars, etc.;

5th, molesting or hindering a clergyman in the performance of his office;

6th, depriving men of the use of the Scriptures or the sacraments, particularly the cup in the eucharist, the last being condemned by Gelasius and pope Leo, and yet not recognised as sacrilege by the Romish casuists. SEE SACRILEGIUM. In England sacrilege is not now a legal, but a popular term, used to denote the breaking into a place of worship and stealing therefrom. The legal offense comes generally under the head of burglary or housebreaking. A less punishment applies to the offense when committed in dissenting chapels. In Scotland there is no increase of severity in the punishment by reason of the sacred character of the things stolen.

## Sacrilegium[[@Headword:Sacrilegium]]

             in Roman Catholic theology, is a term denoting contempt of God or of divine and holy things when expressed in act, the utterance of such feeling in speech being characterized by the word blasphemy (q.v.) This crime may be committed either directly against the holiest objects by unworthy partaking of the consecrated bread and wine or otherwise desecrating their character (sacrilegium immediatum); or indirectly against consecrated persons, things, or places (sacrilegium mediatum). The latter form is consequently either personale, incurred through violation of the privilegium canonis, or assault on the persons of individuals belonging to the clerical and monastic orders, SEE PRIVILEGIUM CANONIS, with intent to do bodily harm, or through violations of the law of chastity by persons of rank in such orders (sacrilegium carnale); or it is sacrilegium reale, consisting in the employment of sacred edifices and their decorations, vessels, utensils, etc., for common or even wicked purposes; the purloining of things which have been set apart for the use of a church by consecration or benediction (q.v.), or which have been placed in a church for protection and safe keeping; the alienating from or denying to the Church of legal and customary revenues; the voluntary transfer of objects used in the worship and other services of the Church to the enemies of Christianity, particularly in times of persecution, etc.; and the receiving of any “sacrament of the living” (q.v.) while in a state of mortal sin, and without having previously been absolved: or, lastly, the sacrilegium is locale, and may be committed by consciously violating an ecclesiastical asylum, SEE ASYLUM, by breaking a local interdict (q.v.) with armed force, by desecrating holy places with murder, the guilty spilling of human blood or human sperm, the interment of unbelievers and excommunicated persons in churches and burial grounds belonging to the Church, etc.

The punishments denounced against this crime have been severe under every code. According to the canon law, sacrilege committed against the venerabile itself was visited with the anathema; against other sacred things, with the ban; and in case of obstinate contumacy, with the denial of Christian burial (c. 2, 10, “De Rapt.” 5, 17; c. 22, 10,” De Sent. Excomm.” 5, 39). The Roman law punished robbery of churches, unless mitigating circumstances intervened, with death (Inst. § 9, “De Publ. Jud.” 4, 18). The criminal code of Charles V decreed the punishment of death by fire against the theft of a monstrance or a ciborium (q.v.) containing the host, and death in a milder form against the theft of other sacred objects belonging to  the altar and used in worship. Plundering an alms chest might be punished by either corporal inflictions or death, and the abstraction of unconsecrated objects from churches and sacristies (unless accompanied with violence or committed at night) by the infliction of penalties denounced upon ordinary burglaries (CC. C. of 1532, art. 172-175). The more recent administration of criminal law in Germany likewise invariably imposes severe penalties upon crimes committed against the Church. Licentiousness on the part of clergymen belonging to the higher orders is punished by suspension and penances; if committed by monks, by confinement and severe penances. The violator of a nun, if a clergyman, is deposed, SEE DEPOSITION; if a layman, is excommunicated; and the nun herself is subjected to close confinement and mortifications of the body (c. 6, 21; c. 27, qu. 1). Under the Roman law the violator of a consecrated female was beheaded (lib. 2, cod. “De Episc. et Cler.” 1, 3, Nov. 123, c. 43), and this penalty was retained under the code of the German empire.

## Sacring bell[[@Headword:Sacring bell]]

             (campanella, timbele) was rung at the elevation inside the church, in England, by the Constitutions of Cantelupe in 1240, as a warning of devotion. Becon says while the elements were blessed the serving boy or parish clerk rang the little sacring bell, at which the people knelt down while the host was elevated. The second sacring was the crossing of the chalice with the host. The custom has been attributed to cardinal Grey when legate in Germany, cir. 1203; it was confirmed by Gregory IX in 1259. At the beginning of the 13th century, at Paris, the bells were rung at this time. The Armenians use a cymbal, with little bells, called the quechouez. A sacring bell was found in the wall of Deddington church, and that of Hawstead still hangs above the roodscreen, The use of this bell has been traced back to the 11th century; and before 1114, Ivo, bishop of Chartres, thanked queen Maud of England for the bells which she had given to Chartres, and says they were rung at the elevation. The custom is confined to Western Christendom, and is unknown at Rome. In Spain they use a melodious peal of bells, which chime a silvery music, instead of the ordinary tinkling of a single bell, at the moment of consecration, when the divine words of institution are recited by the celebrant; and, at the elevation of the host, Aubrey mentions that at Brokenborough, Wilts, there were eighteen little bells rung by pulling one wheel. Such wheels, it is believed, are still preserved at Yaxley and Long Stratton. In the Roman Church it is rung thrice at the Sanctus, once before and three times at the elevation of  the host, three times at the elevation of the chalice, and at the Domine non sum dignus, and once before the Pater (the latter dating from the 16th century), and also at benediction with the sacrament.

## Sacris Solemniis Juncta Sint Gaudia[[@Headword:Sacris Solemniis Juncta Sint Gaudia]]

             is the beginning of a festival hymn composed by Thomas Aquinas, of which the first stanza runs thus:

“Sacris solemniis juncta sint gaudia,

 Et ex praecordiis soneut praeconia;

 Recedant vetera, nova sint omnia,

 Corda, voces, et opera.”

There is an English translation by Chambers in the Lyra Eucharistica, p. 70:

“Let this our solemn feast W

ith holy joys be crowned,” etc.;

and another by Caswall in Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated, p. 54:

“Let old things pass away, L

et all be fresh and bright,” etc.

There is also a German translation of this hymn in Bassler's Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder (Berlin, 1858), p. 116, and a second one in Rambach, Anthologie christlicher Gesange, 1, 311. (B.P.)

## Sacristan[[@Headword:Sacristan]]

             (1.) The monastic treasurer and church warden. He provided all the necessaries for divine service; was keeper of the church keys, relics, fabric, plate, furniture, and ornaments; secretary, and chancellor. He arranged the way of processions for the prsecentor, superintended the bell-ringers, and received the rents, oblations, and burial fees. At Canterbury he delivered the crosier to the new archbishop. At Ely he received the candle corn (one sheaf of corn in every acre), to supply the lights, and, as the bishop's vicar, exercised archidiaconal jurisdiction over the city chaplains. At Peterborough his fee were the horses of a knight buried in the minster, if under four marks in value, otherwise they accrued to the abbot; and at Worcester. the abbots of Gloucester, Tewkesbury, Pershore, and Evesham gave him a cope of profession at their benediction.

(2.) Vice-custos, the vicar of the treasurer, or sub-treasurer at York in 1230. He opened the doors of the sacristy in the morning, admitted the rectors of choir and sick members who desired to say the Hours privately. He warned canons of chapter, kept the doors shut during its session, rang the bells, and led the procession. Bishop Storey mentions the use of the word sacrist in an inferior sense as recent in the 15th century. Where there was no permanent sacristan in a cathedral, a canon was appointed, called praefect of sacristy. In the Decretals of Gregory IX and at Lyons (1269) the sacrist was the inferior of the sacristan. In the new foundations he furnished the sacred elements, administered sacraments, officiated at marriages and burials, was the curate of the chapter, like the foreign parochus, and had charge of the bells, church goods, furniture, and lights. At Girgenti there are four sacrists; at Mayence he was a vicar, and at Angers a cubicular, or chamberlain, who administered the sacraments to sick canons and the choir clergy.

(3.) The sacristan at mass has charge of the vessels, and attends in a surplice at the credence table, which is placed on the south side of the altar, and arranges on it the chalice, covered with the linen cloth called the purifier; and also the paten, which is covered with a stiff cloth and a rich veil of silk; the cruets for wine and water; the Gospel and Epistle books; the ewer, basin, and water for washing the celebrant's fingers; the corporal, or cloth on which the chalice and host are placed, and contained in a burse, or embroidered case; a crucifix, and two tapers.

(4.) A church servant, now called sexton.

## Sacristy[[@Headword:Sacristy]]

             an apartment in a church or convent in which are kept the sacred objects used in the public worship, and in which the clergy and other public functionaries who take part in the service assemble and prepare for the ceremonies on which they are about to enter. In many churches the sacristy is a spacious and costly building.

## Sacrobosco (Or Holywood), John De[[@Headword:Sacrobosco (Or Holywood), John De]]

             an English ecclesiastic of the 13th century, is supposed to have been born at Halifax, in Yorkshire, but is claimed also as a native of Ireland and Scotland. He became a canon regular of the Order of St. Augustine in the monastery of Holywood, in Nithsdale. He afterwards went to Paris, and became professor of mathematics. His death occurred in 1256. His principal work was Sphaera Mundi (1648, 8vo). Other works were, De Anni Ratione, seu de Computo Ecclesiastico: — De AIgorismo.

## Sacrobosco, Christopher[[@Headword:Sacrobosco, Christopher]]

             a native of Dublin, Ireland, in the early part of the 17th century, is chiefly known as the author of the work Defensio Decreti Tridentini et Sententioe Rob. Bellarmini et Authoritate Yutgatoe Editionis Latinoa contra Whitakerum, etc. (1604, 8vo).

## Sacy, Antoine Isaac Silvestre De, Baron[[@Headword:Sacy, Antoine Isaac Silvestre De, Baron]]

             a celebrated French Orientalist, was born at Paris Sept. 21, 1758. At an early age he showed great aptitude for the study of languages; but it was mainly from self instruction, with the help of irregular private lessons, that his immense learning was acquired. In Hebrew he was helped by a Jew; in Arabic, by a Benedictine monk, Berthereau. Having entered upon the practice of the law at the age of twenty-three, he retired in 1789, at the age of thirty, and devoted several years to private study. During the Reign of Terror, he lived very humbly among peasants, and could make but furtive visits to the libraries of Paris. Early in his learned career he, had opened correspondence with the chief Orientalists of Europe — with J.D. Michaelis, Sir Wm. Jones, Eichhorn, and others. To Eichhorn's Repertorium he contributed frequent essays. In France he published in 1785 an essay on the origin of Arabic literature, and in 1787 an abridgment of the Natural History of Demiri. Still more valuable and erudite was his work Memoires sur Diverses Antiquites de la Perse (1793). In 1792 he was made a member of the Academie des Inscriptions; and when, in 1795, the Convention founded a school for the study of modern Oriental languages, De Sacy was made professor of Arabic, a post which he held till his death. In 1806 he became also professor of Persian at the College de France. From this time he was very productive in all the branches of Oriental learning. Many of his works have had a very fruitful influence upon Biblical criticism. We mention particularly a translation of Makrisi's treatise On Mohammedan M.edals (1797): — The Outlines of Universal Grammar (1799): his Chrestomathie Arabe (1806, 3 vols.): — his large Arabic Grammar (1810): — Calila-ve-Dimna, the Arabic text of the Fables of Pilpay (1816): — the Pend-Nameh (Book of Counsels), a Persian didactic poem (1819): — The Sessions of Hariri, a romance in Arabic (1821): — and his work On the Religion of the Druids (1838, 2  vols.). The amount of learning which these works contain and imply can only be appreciated by Oriental specialists. Besides the works mentioned, he contributed scores of essays to learned journals in Germany and elsewhere. His style is simple and direct. The chief defect is a lack of poetic delicacy and of rhetorical polish. De Sacy, though beginning his career in obscurity, was finally abundantly honored. In 1808 he was given the honorary position of membership in the Corps Legislatif: In 1813 he was made a baron. In 1814 he became rector of the University of Paris. After the Revolution of 1830 he was made a peer of France and a grand officer of the Legion of Honor. Honors from abroad also came upon him in abundance. He founded chairs for the Sanscrit and the Chinese language at the College de France; and he continued his public lectures, six per week (an unusual number for a Parisian savant) down to the day of his sickness. In politics he was conservative, in character upright, in religion Catholic. On Feb. 19, 1838, he was stricken with apoplexy on the street, and died three days after. See two biographical sketches in the Journal Asiatique, 1838; Encycl. Brit. vol. 19; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 287-289. (J.P.L.)

## Sacy, Louis Isaac le Maistre de[[@Headword:Sacy, Louis Isaac le Maistre de]]

             an eminently pious and learned Port-Royalist divine and Biblical critic, was born at Paris in 1613. He was shut up in the Bastille on account of his Jansenist doctrines, and died in 1684. The New Test. translated by De Sacy, and known as the Testament de Mons, was condemned by pope Clement IX in 1668. De Sacy's version of Thomas a Kempis's De Imitatione has had 150 editions. His commentary on the Scriptures has continued to maintain a high character. It is essentially valuable for unfolding the spiritual meaning of the sacred text. De Sacy was assisted in the work by Du Fosse, Charles Hure, and Le Tourneaux. Many editions have been printed, both of the original work and of abridgments. The edition of 1692 is the best; that of 1705-30, bound variously in 40, 45, or 54 vols. 12mo, is esteemed for its convenient form; that of 1781, printed at Nismes, in 25 vols. 8vo, has the advantage of being edited, with additions, by Rondet. De Sacy also wrote Lettres Chretiennes et Spirituelles (Paris, 1690, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Sadamias[[@Headword:Sadamias]]

             (Vulg. Sadamias, the Greek original being lost), given in the Apocrypha (2 Esdras 1, 1) instead of SHALLUM SEE SHALLUM (q.v.) in the ancestry of Ezra (Ezr 7:2).

## Sadanana[[@Headword:Sadanana]]

             (the god with six faces), in Hindu mythology, is a surname of the twelve- handed Skanda, who was born to Shiva the Destroyer by the two sisters Ganga and Ulma. Sadanana slew the giant Torake by cutting him through the middle, and then transformed half of the body into a peacock, upon which he rides. He is greatly revered in India, and has many pagodas.

## Sadas[[@Headword:Sadas]]

             (Σαδάς v.r. Α᾿σταί, Α᾿ργαί), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 5:13) of the name AZGAD SEE AZGAD (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 2:12).

## Saddaeus[[@Headword:Saddaeus]]

             (or rather Daddoe'us [as in 1Es 8:46], Δαδδαῖος, v.r. Δολδαῖος, Λοδδαῖος, and Λοδαῖος), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 8:45) of the name IDDO (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 8:17).

## Saddle[[@Headword:Saddle]]

             (מֶרְכָב, merkaib, a “chariot” [1Ki 4:26; Heb 5:6]; also a seat in a chariot or other vehicle, “saddle” [Lev 15:9]; “covering” of a palanquin [Son 3:10]). SEE CHARIOT.

The word which our translators elsewhere (Gen 22:3; Num 22:21; Jdg 19:10; 2Sa 16:1; 2Sa 17:23; 1Ki 2:40; 1Ki 13:13; 1Ki 13:23; 1Ki 13:27; 2Ki 4:24) render by “to saddle” literally signifies “to bind about” (as Exo 29:9; Joh 2:6, and often) — namely, with the bags or panniers used for riding or carrying burdens. It is certain that saddles were unknown for many ages after the custom of riding had been introduced. Those who did not ride bareback were contented with placing a piece of leather or cloth between them and their steed. As luxury advanced, a soft cushion was introduced, to which were added various ornamental trappings, and these were soon carried to a ridiculous excess of  ostentation. Saddles, properly so called, were in all probability invented by the Persians, perhaps for the sake of giving a steady seat to their mounted archers, a part of their military force to which they always paid the greatest attention. Pack saddles must have been s much earlier invention, for something was obviously necessary to prevent the backs of animals bearing heavy burdens from being chafed by the loads (see Kitto, Pict. Bible, at Jdg 19:10). SEE ASS; SEE CAMEL; SEE HORSE.

The ordinary pack saddles of the camels were high, and made of wood; carpets, cloths, etc., were heaped upon it, to form a comfortable seat for ladies who do not use the cradle, or hamper, while travelling. The cloths, etc., were removed at the end of the day's journey, and, being laid on the ground, served as a sort of mattress in the tent, on which a person might sit or lie down, while he reclined against the pack saddle itself (Gen 31:34).

## Saddler, Isaac P., D.D[[@Headword:Saddler, Isaac P., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, October 5, 1807. He was converted in 1839, licensed to preach in 1840, entered the Pittsburgh Conference in 1853, was superannuated in 1872, and assigned to the East Ohio Conference at its organization in 1876. He died suddenly, March 2, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1882, page 329.

## Sadduc[[@Headword:Sadduc]]

             (or rather Saddu'cus, Σάδδουκος, s.v. Σαδδούλουκος), the Grsecized form (1Es 8:2) of the name of ZADOK SEE ZADOK (q.v.), the high priest, one of Ezra's ancestors (Ezr 7:2).

## Sadducee[[@Headword:Sadducee]]

             (strictly Sadducce'an, Σαδδουκαῖος [Mat 3:7; Mat 16:1; Mat 16:6; Mat 16:11-12; Mat 22:23; Mat 22:34; Mar 12:18; Luk 20:27; Act 4:1; Acts 5, 17; Act 23:6-8]), the usual designation of one of the three sects or orders of Judaism in the time of Christ, the other two being the Essenes and the Pharisees. They were originally a religious party, if such free thinkers could fairly be so designated. SEE SECTS, JEWISH.

I. Name of the Sect and its Signification. — According to the current tradition of the Jews, the appellation צִדּוּקַי, Tsaddukim, of which Σαδδουκαῖοι = Sadduccei is the Greek form (used by Josephus and the New Test. as above), is derived from Zadok, the name of the founder of this sect, who was a disciple of Antigonus of Soho, B.C. 200-170. SEE SCHOOL. This is not onlv declared in the Aboth di Rabbi ANathan (cap. 5), but by Saadia Gaon, 892-942 A.D.; by R. Nathan (cir. 1030-1106 A.D.), in his lexicon called Aruch, s.v. ביתוסין; by Maimonides (1135- 1204 A.D.), in his commentary on Aboth (1, 3), but by the greatest Jewish authorities since the 9th century of the Christian era. Dr. Geiger, who, in his Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (p. 105), argues in a most  elaborate manner that there are not sufficient historical data for deriving the name Sadducee from Zadok, a disciple of Antigonus of Soho, derives it, nevertheless, from this proper name, which he assigns to another person of an earlier date, as will be seen in the sequel. Epiphanius, however, seems to derive it from a double source — viz. from a proper name Zadok, and from the Hebrew noun צֶדֶק, righteousness. He says that they call themselves Sadducees because this name is derived from righteousness, as Zedek denotes righteousness (Ε᾿πονομάζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὁρμωμένης· σεδὲκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη), and that there was also anciently a priest named Zadok, but they did not continue in the doctrines of their (ἐπιστάτης) chief (Adiersus Hoereses, 1, 14). Dr. Low rejects altogether the derivation of Sadducee from the proper name Zadok, for the following reasons:

(1.) Because there is no precedent in the whole ancient Jewish history for the followers of a sect to be called by the name of the chief of the sect, and that it is as contrary to the genius of the Hebrew if צדוקיis taken as the proper name צרוק, with יappended, to translate it a follower of Zadok, as it would be to render ירבעמי, a follower of Jeroboam.

(2.) The older Talmudic literature knows nothing of Zadok and Boethus, the supposed originators of the Sadducees.

(3.) The Sadducees, as is evident from ancient sources, called themselves צִדַּיקַי ם, the righteous (Epiphanius, Adversus Hoereses, 1, 1, 4). Hence Dr. Low concludes that, in harmony with his Hebrew name צִדַּיק, the Sadducee called himself in Greek εὐθύς, the straightforwarid, open, honest, righteous, and that the opponents of this sect changed both the honorable Hebrew appellation צריקי ם; into צרוקי ם(hence the singular צדוקי= Sadducee), and the Greek name εὐθύς, which is written in Hebrew אבתוס(according to the analogy of אבגינוס= εὐγενής), into ביתוס, from which originated ביתוסי ם, Boethusians. He moreover maintains that it is for this reason that the Talmud makes no distinction between the Sadducees and the Boethusians (Ben-Chananja, 1, 346 sq.). This definition of the appellation Sadducee is entirely speculative, and its soundness must be determined by an examination of the rise, progress, and doctrines of the Sadducees. Besides, the first objection against the  derivation of צדוקיfrom the proper name צדוקis set aside by the fact that the first Karaites called themselves ענניי ם, followers of Anan, Ananites; so that ענני, an Asnanite, is an exact parallel to צדוקי, a Zadokite. Still more speculative, and altogether unique, is the opinion of Koster that “Sadducee is simply a different form of Stoic” (Studien und Kritiken, 1837, p. 164). According to some readings the Sadducees also called themselves קראי ם, Scripturalists, Bible-followers, Karaites (Megilla, 24 b; Jerusalem Megilla, 4:9), because they adhered to the written law. This is in perfect accordance with the ancient custom of calling a Biblical student by the honorable Hebrew appellation קָרִא(formed according to the analogy of דִּיָּן); or by the Aramaic form קָרוֹי(defective of קיויא), or קָרִי, formed according to the analogy of זִכִּי. Thus Chanina, Abba Chalifa, Eliezer ben-Simon, and Levi ben-Sisi, were designated by this title (Taanith, 27 b; Baba Bathra, 123; Midrash Rabba on Levit. cap. 30; Jalkut, On the Song of Songs, § 533); and the Talmud tells us that those were deemed worthy of this name “who understood how to read accurately the law, the prophets, and the Hagiographa” (comp. Kiddushin, 42; Furst, Karaerothum, p. 129).

II. Scripture Notices. — Although frequently mentioned in the New Test. in conjunction with the Pharisees, they do not throw such vivid light as their great antagonists on the real significance of Christianity. Except on one occasion, when they united with the Pharisees in insidiously asking for a sign from heaven (Mat 16:1; Mat 16:4; Mat 16:6), Christ never assailed the Sadducees with the same bitter denunciations which he uttered against the Pharisees; and they do not, like the Pharisees, seem to have taken active measures for causing him to be put to death. In this respect, and in many others, they have not been so influential as the Pharisees in the world's history; but still they deserve attention, as representing Jewish ideas before the Pharisees became triumphant, and as illustrating one phase of Jewish thought at the time when the new religion of Christianity, destined to produce such a momentous revolution in the opinions of mankind, issued from Judaea.

The Sadducees are not spoken of at all in the fourth Gospel, where the Pharisees are frequently mentioned (Joh 7:32; Joh 7:45; Joh 11:47; Joh 11:57; Joh 18:3; Joh 8:3; Joh 8:13-19; Joh 9:13); an omission which, as Geiger suggests, is not unimportant in reference to the criticism of the Gospels (ut sup. p. 107). Moreover, while  Paul had been a Pharisee and was the soil of a Pharisee, while Josephus was a Pharisee, and the Mishna was a Pharisaical digest of Pharisaical opinions and practices, not a single undoubted writing of an acknowledged Sadducee has come down to us, so that for an acquaintance with their opinions we are mainly dependent on their antagonists. This point should always be borne in mind in judging their opinions and forming an estimate of their character, and its full bearing will be duly appreciated by those who reflect that even at the present day, with all the checks against misrepresentation arising from publicity and the invention of printing, probably no religious or political party in any country would be content to accept the statements of an opponent as giving a correct view of its opinions.

III. The Tenets and Practices of the Sadducees. — To apprehend duly the doctrines and usages of this sect, it must be borne in mind that the Sadducees were the aristocratic and conservative priestly party, who clung to their ancient prerogatives and resisted every innovation which the ever- shifting circumstances of the commonwealth demanded; while their opponents, the Pharisees, were the liberals, the representatives of the people their principle being so to develop and modify the Mosaic law as to adapt it to the requirements of the time, and to make the people at large realize that they were “a people of priests, a holy nation.” Thus, standing immovably upon the ancient basis, the Sadducees, whose differences were at first chiefly political, afterwards extended these differences to doctrinal, legal, and ritual questions.

A. Political Opinions. — The primary political difference between the two sects was that the Sadducees maintained that a man's destiny is in his own hands, and that human ingenuity and statecraft are therefore to be resorted to in political matters; while the Pharisees clung to the conviction that the political relations with foreign nations, like the theocracy at home, are under the immediate control of the holy one of Israel (Josephus, Ant. 13, 5, 9; 18, 1, 4, with War, 2, 8, 14; Mishna, Berachoth, 33 b; Nidah, 16, 72). That the Sadducees, who were the real aristocracy (Josephus, Ant. 18:1, 4) and the successful warriors in the Maccabaean struggles (ibid. 13:16, 2; War, 1, 5, 3), should have espoused such political views was the natural result of their political success. Moreover, the doctrine that what a man possesses is what he deserves was peculiarly gratifying to the successful and aristocratic caste. Besides, in this respect, as in all other matters, the Sadducees showed their conservatism in abiding by the Pentateuchal views  that a man is rewarded in this world according to his deeds, and that prosperity and adversity are a test of piety and wickedness (Deu 28:1-68, with Psa 37:25).

B. Doctrinal Views. —

1. Rejection of the Oral Law. Foremost among the doctrines of the Sadducees is the tenet that the Hebrew Scriptures, with the authoritative explanations and glosses which developed themselves in the course of time, are the sole rule of faith and practice, thus denying that there existed any orally transmitted law to supplement the written law, to which their opponents the Pharisees laid claim; or, as Josephus states it, “the Pharisees have given to the people many statutes from the traditions of the fathers which are not written in the law of Moses; and it is for this reason that the Sadducees reject them, saying that it is only the written observances which are binding, but those which are transmitted by the fathers are not to be observed” (Ant. 13:10, 6). For the better understanding of this important question, it must be remarked that the Pharisees and the orthodox Jews to the present day have an oral law in addition to the written law. This oral law consists of sundry religious, ceremonial, and social practices which obtained in the course of time, and which were called forth either through the obscurity, conciseness, and apparent contradiction of some of the written enactments, or through the inapplicability of some of the Mosaic statutes to the ever changing circumstances of the commonwealth.

Some of the enactments contained in this oral code are undoubtedly as old as the original laws which they supplement and explain, so as to adapt them to exceptional cases not specified in the Mosaic law; others, again, were introduced by the spiritual heads of the nation after the return from the Babylonian captivity, because the altered state of the nation absolutely required these regulations, although there was no basis in the Mosaic law for them; while others originated in party feeling, to shield the pious against even approaching the limits of transgression. Now the Sopherim (i.e. scribes and the lawyers), after the Babylonian captivity, who found this accumulated traditional code, tried to classify and arrange it. Those practices which could be deduced from or introduced into the text of Holy Writ by analogy, combination, or otherwise, were regarded as the legitimate and authoritative traditional exposition of the law, SEE MIDDASH; while those practices which obtained in the course of time, which were venerated and esteemed by the people aoth for their antiquity and utility, but for which neither author nor apparent reason could be  found in the written law, were denominated A traditional law of Moses from Sinai (הלכה למשה מסני), because from their antiquity and importance it was thought that they must have come down orally from the lawgiver himself. It is this oral law which the Sadducees rejected; and in their conservatism they adhered to the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, as well as to those time-honored explanations and practices (הלכות) which were not at variance with the text of the Bible.

It must be distinctly borne in mind that by their rejecting traditions is not meant that the Sadducees rejected all the traditional comments upon the law and the ancestral practices not found in the Bible. Even the Talmud itself only charges them with rejecting some things (Sanhedrin, 33 b; Horajoth, 4 a), and there is but little doubt that those practices which they rejected were originated by the Pharisees, the liberal party whose innovations the conservative Sadducees disliked, and regarded as an encroachment upon their priestly and aristocratic rights. In the Mishna specific points of difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees are mentioned, which are unimportant — such, e.g., as whether touching the Holy Scriptures made the hands technically “unclean,“ in the Levitical sense, and whether the stream which flows when water is poured from a clean vessel into an unclean one is itself technically “clean” or “unclean” (Yadaim, 4:6, 7). If the Pharisees and Sadducees had differed on all matters not directly contained in the Pentateuch, it would scarcely have been necessary to particularize points of difference such as these, which to Christians imbued with the genuine spirit of Christ's teaching (Mat 15:11 : Luk 11:37-40) must appear so trifling as almost to resemble the products of a diseased imagination. Indeed, it will be seen in the course of this article, from the enumeration of their distinctive tenets, that the theological views of the two sects were not so much at variance as might have been supposed, and that the Sadducees in many cases actually adhered to ancient traditions, while the Pharisees abandoned these traditions and introduced new statutes in order to raise the people, whose true representatives they were, to a nation of kings and priests. SEE TRADITION.

That the Sadducees also rejected the prophets and Hagiographa, and only believed in the Pentateuch, as is asserted by Epiphanius (Adversus Hoereses, 14), Origen (Cels. 1, 49), Jerome (Comment. on Mat 22:31-33), and followed by some modern writers, is utterly at variance with the Jewish records of this sect, and has evidently arisen from a confusion of the Sadducees with the Samaritans.

2. Denial of the Resurrection, etc. — Next in importance in point of doctrine is their eschatology. The Sadducees denied that the dead will rise to receive their reward and punishment. Josephus, who specifies this second cardinal difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, describes their respective doctrines of a future reward and punishment in such a manner as to infer that the former, believing in a future judgment, also believed in the immortality of the soul; while the latter, by denying a future judgment, also denied the survival of the soul after the death of the body (Ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ᾿ ¯δου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦαι [War, 2, 8, 14]). In another place, again, where this historian mentions the distinctive eschatological views of the Sadducees, he plainly says, “Their doctrine is that souls perish with the bodies” (Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι [Ant. 18:1, 4]). But in the Talmud and in the New Test. we are told that they simply denied the resurrection (comp. Sanhedrin, 90 b with Luk 20:27; Mar 12:18; see also Mat 22:23), which by no means involves the immortality of the soul; and it cannot be supposed that if the Sadducees had actually denied the immortality of the soul, so vital a point would be passed over in silence by the Talmudic doctors, when unimportant differences are minutely specified. There can, therefore, be no doubt that Josephus, in his vanity to depict to the Greeks the Jewish sects in such colors as to make them correspond to the different philosophical schools I among the Greeks, did injustice to the Sadducees by assigning to them the doctrines of the Stoics. The misrepresentation of the Sadducees will appear all the more evident when it is born in mind how defectively Josephus describes the Pharisaic eschatology in the very same section. He there represents the Pharisees, who were his own party, as believing that the resurrection is to be confined to the righteous, while the wicked are to be detained in everlasting punishment in Hades under the earth (Ant. 18:1, 3); whereas it is well known that this opinion was only entertained by some of the later doctors, while the Pharisees generally believed in the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked (Dan 12:2), and this was the common doctrine as late as the second book of Maccabees (comp. 2Ma 12:40-45). The reason which the Sadducees assigned for not believing in the resurrection of the dead to receive their reward and punishment is that it is not taught in the law of Moses (Sanhedrin, 90 b), which simply promises temporal rewards and punishments for obedience and disobedience (Exo 20:12; Exo 23:25-26; Deu 7:12-15; Deu 28:1-68). The very quotation made by our Savior (Mat 22:31-32;  Mar 12:26-27; Luk 20:37) of Exo 3:6; Exo 3:15, which it is only natural to suppose is the most cogent text in the law, nevertheless does no more than suggest an inference on this doctrine. The Sadducees, however, did not admit the inference, and they simply regarded this mode of proving the resurrection from the law as Pharisaic, as they were in the habit of hearing similar inferences deduced by the Pharisees from other passages. Thus the Talmud relates: “The Sadducees asked Rabbi Gamaliel, Whence do you know that the holy one, blessed be he, will raise the dead? To which he replied, From the law, the prophets, and the Hagiographa: from the law because it is written, ‘And the Lord said to Moses, Behold, thou shalt lie down with thy fathers (וק ם), and this people shall rise again' (Deu 31:16): from the prophets because it is written, ‘Thy dead men shall live,‘ etc. (Isa 26:19); and from the Hagiographa because it is written, ‘And the roof of thy mouth,‘ etc. (Son 7:9). The Sadducees, however, would slot accept these passages till he quoted the passage, ‘The land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give it to them' (Deu 11:21). He promised it to them (לה ם) — i.e. to the living, and not to the dead; but as they were now dead, it is evident that there will be a resurrection if the promise is to be fulfilled” (Sanhedrin, 90 b).

We are also told in the New Test. that the Sadducees say that there is “neither angel nor spirit” (Act 23:8); but this can by no means imply that they altogether denied the existence of angelic and spiritual beings, since the Sadducees were firm believers in the divinity of the Mosaic law, where the appearance of angels is again and again recorded (Gen 16:7; Gen 19:1; Gen 22:11; Gen 28:12; Exo 23:20; Num 22:23 et al.), and neither Josephus nor the Talmudic writings charge them with this unbelief. What they denied is the incarnation and manifestation of demoniac powers and angelic beings in later days, as believed and described in the Jewish writings and in the New Test.

3. The opinions of the Sadducees respecting the freedom of the will, and the way in which those opinions are treated by Josephus (Ant. 13:5, 9), have been noticed elsewhere. SEE PHARISEES. It may here be added that possibly the great stress laid by the Sadducees on the freedom of the will may have had some connection with their forming such a large portion of that class from which criminal judges were selected. Jewish philosophers, in their study, although they knew that punishments as an instrument of  good were unavoidable, might indulge in reflections that man seemed to be the creature of circumstances, and might regard with compassion the punishments inflicted on individuals whom a wiser moral training and a more happily balanced nature might have made useful members of society. Those Jews who were almost exclusively religious teachers would naturally insist on the inability of man to do anything good if God's Holy Spirit were taken away from him (Psa 51:11-12), and would enlarge on the perils which surrounded man from the temptations of Satan and evil angels or spirits (1Ch 21:1; Tob. 3, 17). But it is likely that the tendencies of the judicial class would be more practical and direct, and more strictly in accordance with the ideas of the Levitical prophet Ezekiel (Eze 33:11-19) in a well known passage in which he gives the responsibilitv of bad actions, and seems to attribute the power of performing good actions exclusively to the individual agent. Hence the sentiment of the lines,

“Our acts our angels are,

 or good or ill,

 Our fatal shadows that walk by us still,“

would express that portion of truth on which the Sadducees, in inflicting punishments, would dwell with most emphasis; and as, in some sense, they disbelieved in angels, these lines have a peculiar claim to be regarded as a correct exponent of Sadducaean thought. Yet perhaps, if writings were extant in which the Sadducees explained their own ideas, we might find that they reconciled these principles, as we may be certain that Ezekiel did, with other passages apparently of a different import in the Old Test., and that the line of demarcation between them and the Pharisees was not, in theory, so very sharply marked as the account of Josephus would lead us to suppose.

C. Legal Matters. —

1. The Sadducees restricted the Levirate law to cases of betrothal (ארוסה), but denied its obligation when the marriage was consummated (נשואה). Thus, for instance, though they regarded a betrothed woman (ארוסה) as a wife, and treated her as a married woman in accordance with the Mosaic legislation, SEE MARRIAGE, yet, when her betrothed husband died without cohabiting with her, his surviving brother could perform the duty of Levir without committing incest, as she was still a virgin. In this respect, too, the Sadducees, as the erudite Geiger has shown, followed the  ancient Levirate law, which is based upon Gen 38:7-10, and which — inferring from the similarity of expression used in Gen 38:7; Gen 38:10, that Er too had acted wickedly and not properly consummated the marriage with Tamar — enacted that the Levir is only then to perform the duty towards his deceased brother when the marriage has not been consummated (Yebamoth, 34 b; Bereshith Rabba, 85; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift [Breslau, 1862], 1, 30, etc.). It is to be remarked that the Samaritans of old restricted the Levirate law (Deu 25:5, etc.) in the same manner, and that the Talmud which records it tells us that in support of this restriction the Samaritans appealed to the expression החוצה, which they translated outer, and regarded as the adjective of אשת המת, construing it with the preceding לא תחיה, while they took לאיש זרas explicative of the preceding by way of repetition, translating the whole passage “The wife of the deceased who is outside (i.e. the consummation of the marriage) is not to be for another man” (Jerusalem Yebamoth. 1, 6; Kirchheim, Karme Shomron, p. 36).

The Karaites, who may be regarded as modern Sadducees, explain the Levirate law in the same manner. This restriction of the Levirate law on the part of the Sadducees imparts additional force to the incident recorded in the Gospels (Mat 22:23, etc.; Mar 12:18, etc.; Luk 20:27, etc.). Here we are told that the Sadducees, not believing in a resurrection, put the following question to our Savior: The first of seven brothers married a wife and died childless, whereupon the second brother performed the duty of Levir, and he too died without issue; then the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh brother successively performed the duty of Levir, so that she alternately became the wife of seven husbands now, whose wife is she to be at the resurrection? With the restricted application of the Levirate law before us, it will be seen that though this ironical question was chiefly directed against the doctrine of the resurrection, yet it at the same time also attacks the orthodox Pharisaic view of the Levirate law which was undoubtedly shared by our Savior. What the Sadducees thereby say is, as Geiger rightly remarks, that according to their application of the Levirate law, which restricts it to the betrothed woman (ארוסה), apart from the extremely rare occurrence of death between the betrothal and connubial intercourse (נשואה), especially several times under similar circumstances, the relation of the woman to her last husband who consummated the marriage is far more intimate than to any of the other husbands to whom she was simply betrothed. Supposing, therefore, for argument's sake, that there will be a resurrection, and that  the woman will rise with all the seven brothers, no difficulty will be experienced according to the restricted application of this law, inasmuch as she will be the wife of the last husband who alone consummated the marriage. According to the Pharisaic practice, however, the Levirs have to marry the widow after the marriage has been consummated, so that she is the real wife of all the seven brothers; hence the ironical question put to our Savior, “According to the Pharisaic doctrine of the Levirate law, in which you believe, the difficulty will be to decide whose wife she is to be.”

2. The ceremony of taking of the shoe (חליצה), in case the surviving brother refuses to perform the duty of Levir towards the widow of his deceased brother, is explained most rigidly by the Sadducees insisting upon the letter of the law, that the rejected widow is to spit into the man's face (בפניו, Deu 25:9); while the Pharisees, adapting the law to the requirements of the time, regarded the spitting before his face as satisfying the demands of the injunction, and hence explained the passage accordingly (Taanith, 4).

3. The same conservatism and rigor the Sadducees manifested in the right of retaliation, insisting upon the literal carrying out of the law, “eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,“ etc. (Exo 21:23; etc.); while the Pharisees, with a due regard for the interests of the people, maintained that pecuniary compensation is sufficient (Baba Kama, 53 b; 34 a, b; Taanith, 4:2).

4. For the same reason the Sadducees also insisted upon the literal explanation of the law in Deu 19:21, maintaining that false witnesses are only then to be executed when the sentence of the falsely accused had actually been carried out, in which case alone the words “life for life” receive their literal fulfilment; whereas the Pharisees concluded, from Deu 19:19, that if they are found out, even before the sentence has been carried out, they are to be executed; for it is there said, “Ye shall do unto him as he intended to do unto his brother.” Hence the intention is to be visited with capital punishment (Mishna, Maccoth, 1, 6; Tosiphta Sanhedrin, 6).

5. The law of inheritance formed another distinctive feature of the Sadducees. According to the Mosaic law, the son alone is the rightful heir; and in case there is no son, the daughter inherits the father's property (Num 27:1-11). Now, the Sadducees maintained that in case the  son, who is the heir presumptive, has sisters, and he dies, leaving a daughter, the property is not to go entirely to his female issue, but that the deceased's sisters are to have an equal share with his issue, urging that the deceased son's daughter is only the second degree, while his sisters are the first degree. The Pharisees, on the contrary, maintained that the deceased brother's daughter is the rightful and sole heir, inasmuch as she is the descendant of the male heir, whose simple existence disinherited his sisters (Mishna, Baba Bathra, 8:1; Babylonian Baba Bathra, 115 b; 116; Taanith, 5, 2.

6. From the law that the owner of cattle is responsible for damages done by his animals (Exo 21:28-29), the Sadducees maintained that a master is responsible for damages done by his slave, submitting that he is far more answerable for him than his cattle, inasmuch as he is to watch over his moral conduct. The Pharisees, on the other hand, denied this, submitting that the slave is a rational, and hence a responsible, creature; and that if the master be held answerable for his conduct, the dissatisfied slave might, out of spite, commit ravages in order to make his master pay (Mishna, Yadaim, 4:7).

D. Ritual Questions. —

1. The first important distinction in this department to be mentioned is the great stress which the Sadducees laid on the ritual purity of the person of the officiating priest. He had to keep aloof from the very appearance of uncleanness. Hence they required that the burning of the red heifer, from the ashes of which the water of absolution was prepared, should not be performed by any priest who had been defiled, although he had immersed, because he does not become undefiled before sunset (מעורבי שמש). The Pharisees, on the other hand, disregarding the person and regarding the thing, opposed this great ado about the aristocratic priest. “They prepared a baptistry on the Mount of Olives, where the burning of the red heifer took place, and designedly defiled the priest who was to burn it, so that the Sadducees should not be able to say that the heifer is not to be prepared by such as had not become pure by the sun-setting” (Mishna, Para, 3, 7).

2. The Sadducees, again, did not believe that the sacred vessels in the Temple are to be subjected to the strict laws of Levitical purity, which the Pharisees stoutly maintained. So strict were their views on this subject that the Pharisees had all the sacred vessels immersed at the conclusion of every  festival, because some unclean priest might have touched them. Hence, when the Pharisees, on one occasion, immersed s even the golden candlestick after a festivity, the Sadducees tauntingly exclaimed, “Behold, the Pharisees will at last also purify the sun!” (Jerusalem Chagiga, 79 d). That the Pharisees should have thus guarded the sanctity of the vessels against the possible touch of a defiled priest must have been all the more annoying to the priestly Sadducees, since in other things which did not affect this aristocratic fraternity, but conduced to the comfort of the people at large, the Pharisees were less rigorous with regard to the laws of Levitical purity than the Sadducees, as may be seen from the following instance.

3. The Sadducees interpreted the injunction in Lev 11:39-40 most rigidly, maintaining that it is not only the carcass of an animal which died a natural death that defiles by touching it, but also its sundry parts, such as the skin, bones, sinews, etc.; while the Pharisees restricted this defilement by contact simply to the flesh, except the parts of a dead human body, and of a few reptiles, in which the skin and the flesh are, to a certain extent, identical.

4. As a necessary and vital consequence of the foregoing view, the Sadducees maintained that the skin and the other parts of an animal not legally slaughtered — i.e. both of all those animals which the law permits to be eaten when legally slaughtered, but which have died a natural death, and of those which the law does not permit to be eaten — are not allowed to be made into different articles of use; and that leather, parchment, or any other of the numerous articles made from the skin, bones, veins, etc., is defiling. This rigid view obliged the Sadducees to explain Lev 7:24 in an unnatural manner, by taking the expression נבלהto denote an animal approaching the condition of becoming a carcass — i.e. being so weak that it must soon expire — and to urge that an animal in such a condition may be slaughtered before it breathes its last. In such a case, though its flesh is a defiling carcass, and must not be eaten, the fat, skin, bones, etc., may be used for divers purposes (Jerusalem Megilla, 1, 9; Babylon Sabbath, 108 a). The Pharisees, on the other hand, as the representatives of the people, whose interests they had at heart, allowed the sundry parts of such animals to be used as materials for different utensils. They even allowed the Sacred Scriptures, the phylacteries, and the mezuzah (q.v.) to be written on parchment prepared from the skin of an animal which either died a natural death or was torn by wild beasts, but not  on parchment prepared from the skin of an unclean animal (ibid. and Torah ad init.; Sopherim ad init.).

Bearing in mind this difference of opinion, we shall understand the import of the two discussions, recorded in the Mishna, between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, based thereupon. The Sadducees, we are told, said, “We complain of you Pharisees because you say the Sacred Scriptures, when touched, defile the hands, but the books of Homer do not defile the hands.” Jochanan ben-Zakkai said, “And have we nothing else to object to the Pharisees but this? Do they not also assert that the bones of an ass are clean, but that the bones of Jochanan the highpriest are unclean?” (Yadaim, 4:6). Now, according to the Sadducees, contact with sacred things, so far from defiling, actually sanctified; while the Pharisees, in order to guard the sacred things against contact, ordained that contact with such holy things defiles. On the other hand, the Sadducees regarded the touching of foreign books as defiling, because they are written upon parchment made from skins of unclean animals, or of clean animals not legally slaughtered, which, with them, were like carcasses, and which, as we have seen, the Pharisees did not admit. Hence the charge of the Sadducees that the Pharisees assign a superiority to profane books over the Sacred Scriptures, which Jochanan ben-Zakkai rebuts by ironically enhancing this charge, and saying that this is not the only accusation against the Pharisees, inasmuch as he shows thereby a similar consequence arising from Pharisaic views.

The bones of a dead man, he submits, are unclean, according to the express declaration of the Bible, even if they happen to be the bones of such a man as John Hyrcanus, the patron of the Sadducees; whereas the bones of an animal, even if it be unclean, and such a contemptible one as an ass, are clean; tlulls showing that the defiling power of an object does not always betoken a degradation in its nature, but, on the contrary, because it is of an elevating nature, therefore it defiles more easily. The other discussion, also arising from this difference of opinion is recorded in the Talmud, where the law of the Pharisaic sages is recorded, that the Sacred Scriptures, the phylacteries, and the mezuzah may be written upon parchment prepared from the skin of an animal which died a natural death, but not from an unclean beast. Whereupon a Boethusian [=Sadducee] asked Rabbi Joshua Ha-Garsi, “Where can you show that the phylacteries are not to be written on the skin of an unclean animal?” R. Joshua. “Because it is written [Exo 13:9, where the phylacteries are enjoined] that the law of the Lord be in thy mouth; that is to say, prepared from animals allowed to be put into the mouth.” The Sadducee. “But, according to this, they ought not to be written on the skin  of an animal which died or was torn [because these, too, must be put into the mouth, or be eaten].” To which he replied, “I will tell thee a parable, to show the distinction between the two: Two men are guilty of death; one is killed by the king himself, and the other by the executioner. Whose lot is preferable?” Reply. “That one's whom the king executed.” [So is the carcass of a clean animal killed by the hand of the King of kings to be preferred to the unclean animal which is already stamped with defilement while alive.] “But, according to this,“ said the Sadducee, “the carcass ought also to be eaten.” To this he replied, “The law says ye shall not eat of anything that died [Deu 14:21]; and sayest thou that it should be eaten?” To this the Sadducee replied, “Bravo!” ( קאלוס= καλῶς [Sabbath, 108 a]).

5. The Sadducees, who stood upon their priestly dignity and ancient prerogatives, rejected the artificial mode of amalgamating the distances (עירוב תנהומיו): introduced by the Pharisees to enable the members of their order to walk beyond the Sabbath day's journey without infringing on the sanctity of the day, so as to join the social meal which was instituted in imitation of the priestly social repast. SEE PHARISEE; SEE SABBATH DAYS JOURNEY.

6. As priests, the Sadducees were not subject to the stringent Sabbatical laws, and could therefore enjoy their meals comfortably, inasmuch as they regarded the work requisite for their preparation as part of their sacerdotal duties, which set aside the Sabbatic regulations; whereas upon the people they imposed the most rigorous observance. Thus, in accordance with Exo 25:3, they insisted that lights must not be kindled on Sabbath eve. and that the supper should be eaten in the dark (Sabbath, 55 b; Rashi, on Tosiphta in Sabbath, ibid.; Maimonides, Yad Hachezaka, Hilchoth Sabbath, 6:1; Tanchuma, 58); they prohibited the eating of any food which was either kept warm since the preparation day (ערב שבת), or was warmed on the Sabbath (Responses of the Gaonim, called Shaare Teshuba, No. 34); and forbade connubial intercourse because, of the exertion connected therewith, and of its not being holy work, according to Exo 19:10; Exo 19:15 (comp. Baba Kama, 82 a).

7. The Sadducees, who, as the priestly party, regarded the Temple treasury as their own, demanded that the daily morning and evening sacrifices should be procured from the private and voluntary gifts of each individual, basing their opinion upon the expression of the law (Num 28:4);  while the Pharisees, on the other hand, also basing their opinion upon the letter of the law (ibid. 28:2), and wishing to protect the interests of the people, maintained that the sacrifices were national, and that they ought to be procured with the money of the Temple treasury. Accordingly, the Pharisees ordered a special Temple tax, which was collected every spring, and deposited in three distinct boxes in, the Temple treasury, on which was indicated that the money therein contained was destined for the sacrifices for all Israel. The required money was taken out of the boxes three times a year — on the three great festivals, i.e. on the feast of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. From the first box it was taken with the announcement that it was “in the name of the whole land of Israel;” from the second, with the express declaration, “in the name of its surrounding cities;” and from the third, “in the name of Babylon, in the name of Media, and in the name of the distant countries generally;” so that all the Israelites, including even those who did not contribute to this tax, were represented in this daily sacrifice (Shekalim, 3, 1-3; Maimonides, Shekalim). So hotly was this point contested between them that it lasted eight days (Nisan, 1-8, year not mentioned), and that the Pharisees, to mark their victory over the Sadducees, appointed these eight days half festivals, during which no mourning should take place (Menachoth, p. 65 a).

8. Regarding the sacrifices as their own, or as belonging to their priestly party, the Sadducees maintained that the priests might eat of the meat- offerings which were connected with the free will animal sacrifices (Num 15:2, etc.); while the Pharisees maintained that they must be burned on the altar, and carried their opinion into a law, for which reason they again instituted a half festival in commemoration of their victory.

9. Taking the expression ממהרת השבת(Lev 23:11; Lev 23:15-16) literally, the Sadducees maintained that the Omer ought to be offered on the first day following the weekly Sabbath; so that the feast of Pentecost is always to be on the first day of the week (Mishna, Menachoth, 10:3; Gemara on the same, 65 a; Taanith, 1, 1). SEE PENTECOST.

10. The Sadducees rejected the old custom of pouring water on the altar every day at the morning sacrifice during the feast of Tabernacles (ניסוהִמי ם); and so opposed were they to this ceremony that it became the cause of separation between the Sadducaean king Alexander Jannseus and the Pharisees (Succa, 48 b, with Josephus, Ant. 13:13, 5; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 3, 473, 2d ed.).

11. They also objected to the procession of the people round the altar holding willow branches in their hands on the feast of Tabernacles (Yoma, 43 b). SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

12. They maintained that the incense which the high priest was to carry into the holy of holies on the great day of atonement ought to be kindled outside, and thus to be carried into the sanctuary; because they deemed it improper to do work in the presence of the Lord, and because it was more in accordance with the words כי בענן אראה על הכפרת(Lev 16:2), which they interpreted to mean “only in the cloud” (i.e. rising from the burning incense) “will I be seen on the cover.” The cloud thus arising from the burning incense was to conceal the manifested Deity, whereas if the high priest were to enter before this cloud began to ascend, he would see God and die. The Pharisees considered this as violating the express command of the text, which plainly requires that the frankincense should be put on the burning coals in the holy of holies. So particular were they about it that they exacted an oath from the high priest, before the Day of Atonement, to perform everything in strict accordance with their enactments (Siphra, Pericope אחרי מות, 3; Jerusalem Yonma, 1, 5; Babylon Yoma, 19 b, 53 a).

13. Though admitting that Exo 13:6 enjoins phylacteries, the Sadducees rejected the Pharisaic regulations about the making and weaving of them (Sanhedrin, 88 b; Maimonides, Yad Hachezaka, Hilchoth Tephillin, 4:3). SEE PHYLACTERY.

14. Based upon the law that a lying in woman is not to touch holy things nor to go into the Temple during the thirty-three days following the first seven days after the birth of a boy, and during the sixty-six days following the first fourteen days after the birth of a girl (Lev 12:2-8), the Sadducees maintained that this law excludes the woman from the enjoyment of her connubial rights all these days; while the Pharisees, who always endeavored to relieve the people as much as possible from the burden of the law, did not transfer the holiness of the things and of the Temple to the persons, thus granting to the wife and to the husband the enjoyment of their rights. Hence, while they held every other appearance of blood in the woman as defiling, they regarded it, in this instance, as the effects of the birth, and as pure blood (דמי טהרה). It is for this reason that the הin טהרה(Lev 12:4-5) has not the Mappik, thus  denoting pure blood, as the present Masoretic text is the Pharisaic text; and that the rendering of it in the A.V. by “the blood of her purifying, “ though agreeing with the Sadduceean text, which is undoubtedly the original one, is at variance with the textus receptus (comp. Geiger, He- Chaluz, 5, 29; 6, 28 sq.; Judische Zeitschrift, 1, 51; 2, 27, etc.).

It must not, however, be concluded that these are the only distinctive features of the Sadducees, although not many more are mentioned by their opponents, the Pharisees.

IV. History of the Sadducees. —

1. Their Origin. — The oldest record pretending to describe the source of this sect (אבות דרבי נתן.) is the commentary of Rabbi Nathan Ha-Babli (q.v.) on the tractate of the Mishna entitled Aboth (אבות) = the Moral Sayings of the Ancient Fathers. In this commentary on the saying of Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200-170) — “Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving wages, but be like servants who serve their master without expecting to receive wages, and let the fear of the Lord be upon you” (Mishna, Aboth, 1, 3) — Rabbi Nathan remarks as follows: “Antigonus of Soho had two disciples who propounded his maxim; they taught it to their disciples, and their disciples, again, taught it to their disciples. Thereupon they began to examine it after them, and said, ‘What did our fathers purport to teach by this maxim? Is the laborer to work all day, and not receive his wages in the evening? Surely, if our fathers had known that there is another world, and believed in a resurrection of the dead, they would not have spoken thus.' They then separated themselves from the law, and two sects arose from them — the Zadokites [= Sadducees] and the Boethusians. The Zadokites are called after Zadok, and the Boethusians after Boethus. They used vessels of silver and vessels of gold all their days, not because they were proud, but because the Sadducees said that the Pharisees had a tradition that they are to afflict themselves in this world, and yet they have nothing in the world to come” (Aboth di Rabbi Nathan, cap. 5).

That Zadok and Boethus were contemporaries of Antigonus of Soho, that they opposed the doctrines of the sages, and that the sages ordained laws to obviate the cavils of their opponents, is also declared by Saadia Gaon (q.v.) (A.D. 892-942). Thus Isaac Israeli tells us: “Saadia says, the contemporaries and the tribunal of Antigonus of Soho ordained it as a law that the beginning of the month is to be determined by the appearance of the new moon, to do away with the  cavils of Zadok and Boethus, who disputed against the sages about the fixing of the new moon” (Yesod Olam, 4:6, p. 9 [ed. Berlin, 1848]). Similar in import to Rabbi Nathan's statement on Aboth, 1, 3 is the remark of Maimonides (A.D. 1135-1204) on the same passage. “Antigoams,“ says this great authority, “had two disciples, one named Zadok and the other Boethus, who, when they heard this sage propound this maxim, left him, saying one to the other, the Rabbi distinctly declares that there is neither a future state of reward and punishment, nor any hope for man — because they misunderstood his maxim. Thereupon they strengthened each other's hands, separated themselves from the congregation, and left the observance of the law, when one sect followed the one, and another sect followed the other, whom the sages respectively called the Zadokites and the Boethusians” (Commenet. on Aboth, 1, 3). It must be added that the greatest Jewish authorities since the 9th century of the Christian era have regarded Zadok and Boethus as the heretical leaders who originated two sects. Modern critics, however, reject this current account of the origin of the Sadducees from Zadok and Boethus, the disciples of Antigonus of Soho, as unhistorical, because (a) it is not mentioned either in Josephus, the Mishna, or the Gemara; (b) the original account of Rabbi Nathan neither says that Zadok and Boethus themselves misunderstood Antigonus's maxim, nor that they were the chiefs of these sects, but that their disciples misinterpreted the import of the maxim, and separated themselves from the congregation; and (c) it is illogical to suppose that the disciples of Zadok, who, according to Rabbi Nathan's account, did not misunderstand Antigonus, but simply continued to propound his master maxim, would call themselves, or be called, Zadokites=Sadducees, and not Antigonites, seeing that the maxim belongs to Antigonus and not to Zadok. The second and third reasons, however, are of little value, since the present text of Rabbi Nathan's Aboth is obscure, and since Saadia Gaon, the Aruch, Maimonides, and all the ancient Jewish authorities who lived centuries ago, and who had better means of procuring correct codices, understood the passage to mean, and also derived it from independent sources, that Zadok and Boethus themselves misunderstood their master Antigonus, and that they were the originators of the sects. It is the first reason which, coupled with the fact that the oldest records are perfectly silent about Zadok and Boethus as disciples of Antigonus, goes far to show that the passage in the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan, like many other pieces in the same work, is by a later hand; and that its author, who most probably flourished towards the end of the 7th century, though possessing the right  information that the Zadokites and Boethusians were the followers of Zadok and Boethus, misstated the fact by making these two chiefs, who lived at different times, contemporaries, and by describing them as disciples of Antigonus. This mistake is all the more natural since the real and essential differences between the Sadducees and the Pharisees actually began to develop themselves in the time of Antigonus; and it is not at all improbable that, though the Sadducees, as we shall presently see, derived their early sentiments and distinctive name from a much older leader named Zadok, a distinguished descendant of that leader, bearing the same name, may have lived in the time of Antigonus, and may have contributed greatly to the final separation of the Sadducees from the Pharisees.

2. Development of the Sect. — We have seen from their tenets and practices that the Sadducees were the ancient priestly aristocracy, and that they persisted in maintaining their conservative notions, as well as in retaining their pristine prerogatives, against the voice of the people. It is therefore natural, in tracing their origin, to look for a leader among the priests themselves, as their strong conservative sentiments would, as a matter of course, make them center around a representative and a name of their own caste celebrated in the records of the Sacred Scriptures. Such a chief, answering all the conditions required, we find, as Geiger has elaborately shown, in the eminent priest Zadok, the tenth in descent from the high priest Aaron, who declared for the succession of Solomon to the throne when Abiathar took the part of Adonijah (1Ki 1:32-45), and whose line of descendants, or “house” as it is termed in the Bible, henceforth retained a pre-eminence in the future history of the Jewish people. Thus when Hezekiah put a question to the priests and Levites generally, the answer was given by Azariah, “the chief-priest of the house of Zadok” (2Ch 31:10); and Ezekiel, in his prophetic vision of the future temple, pre-eminently distinguishes “the sons of Zadok,“ and “the priests and the Levites of the seed of Zadok,“ as the faithful guardians of the Lord's sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray (Eze 40:46; Eze 43:19; Eze 44:15; Eze 48:11). When the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, this sacerdotal aristocracy, and especially the “priests of the seed of Zadok,“ the “sons of Zadok,“ or, which comes to the same thing, “the Zadokites” = Sadducees, naturally continued to form the center of the newly formed state, and to be the time-honored guardians both of God's sacred heritage and their holy religion. The high priests were also the chief functionaries of state. Their maxim, however, that statecraft and ingenuity  are to be employed in political transactions with foreign nations, as well as the conduct of the chiefs among this sacerdotal aristocracy based upon this maxim, threatened to destroy both the nationality and the religion of the Jews. Hellenism — which gradually found its way into Judaea after its occupation by Alexander the Great — Grecian sports, and political alliances with the heathen, were advocated by the highest of the land, and openly espoused by multitudes (1Ma 1:11-15).

The very high priest, who hitherto was the center of religion, did all he could to denationalize the people of his charge (2Ma 4:1-19). The people, who saw their sanctuary ravished by the Syrians while their aristocracy were engaged in their ruinous statecraft, became embittered against both the foreigners abroad and the rulers at home. We cannot do better than continue the description of the Sadducees in the powerful words of Geiger: “It was then that a pliable priestly family made itself the hand and the mouthpiece of this discontent; it conquered and crushed the foreign sway, overthrew the governing families at home, and assumed the pre-eminence. But the aristocracy soon surrounded the new sun of the Maccabees, and the Zadokites, who themselves had hitherto been the sun, now became its satellites, as Sadducees. The party struggle increased with continued success to the Pharisees. The internal struggles, however, made the interference of the Romans easy, and paved the way of the keenly ambitious Herod to the throne. He was neither a priest nor a born Israelite; but, like all upstarts, he was anxious to ally himself with the ancient aristocracy. His connection with Mariamne supported a Maccabaean family in the court itself, which, in opposition thereunto, had popular sympathies because it had its root among the people in consequence of its celebrated past; hence the eternal court intrigues and the consequent brutalities. It was for this reason that Herod sought for another alliance with the sacerdotal aristocracy which should both legitimatize him and be his faithful followers, and which he, on his part, would raise by being connected with the sovereign. For this purpose he selected the family of Boethus, a sacerdotal family to whom the functions of the high priesthood did not belong. He married the daughter of Simon Boethus, whom he made high priest. Thus was a new high aristocracy created, which, being of ancient aristocratic blood, was blended with the high aristocracy, but which, nevertheless, owed its elevation to the sovereign, and was allied to his house.

These were the Boethusians. Their double character, being both upstarts and yet claiming to be ancient aristocracy, enhanced their arrogance” (uidische Zeitschrift, 2, 34 sq.). They are the Herodians, and for this reason are  alternately called Herodians and Sadducees in the New Test. (comp. Mat 16:6 with Mar 8:15). Thus we are told that the Pharisees took counsel with the Herodians, i.e. with the Boethusian branch of the Sadducees — how they might destroy Jesus (Mar 3:6), as these Herodians, from their alliance with the reigning dynasty, had the temporal power for their aid. Again, in Mar 11:1; Mar 11:27; Mar 12:13, it is stated that the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, sent unto Jesus certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians to catch him in his words; and after they had conjointly put to him the question about the tribute — money (Mar 12:14-17), each of the representatives of the two sects — i.e. of the Sadducees and the Pharisees — tried to entrap him with questions in harmony with their sectarian tenets. Accordingly, the Sadducean portion of the deputation, which are called in Mar 12:13 Herodians and in Mar 12:19 Sadducees, came forward first and asked him the question about the seven brothers, which bore upon the Sadducean doctrine of the resurrection and the Levirate law (Mar 12:19-27). When they were silenced, one of the scribesi.e. of the Pharisaic portion of the deputation — who was pleased with the manner in which Jesus put down the cavils of the Herodians, came forward and tried to entangle our Savior with a question from a Pharisaic point of view (Marks 12:28-37). The reason why our Savior, who so frequently rebuked the extravagances of some of the Pharisees, did not expose the doctrines of the Sadducees is that at his advent their tenets had been thoroughly refuted by their opponents the Pharisees; and that although, through their alliance with the court, they wielded the temporal arm (Act 5:17), they exercised no religious influence whatever upon the mass of the Jewish people, with whom the Pharisees were all in all (Joseph. Ant. 13, 10, 5). But even their political influence soon ceased, for with the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans the Sadducees lost their temporal significance; and though their doctrines continued to be held by a small fraction of the dispersed Jews, yet they were deemed of so little influence that Jehudah the Holy (163-193), in his redaction of the Mishna, only rarely and sparingly takes notice of the different opinions upon the various Jewish enactments held by the Sadducees and the Boethusians. It is for this reason that the Sadducees are also mentioned so little in the Talmud and the Midrashim, and that their origin was forgotten in the 7th century, when the above-quoted passage relating to their rise was introduced into the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan.

3. Their Eventual Fate. — The fact of the rapid disappearance of the Sadducees from history after the 1st century, and the subsequent predominance among the Jews of the opinions of the Pharisees, remains to be considered. Two circumstances indirectly but powerfully contributed to produce this result: 1st, the state of the Jews after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus , , 2 d, the growth of the Christian religion. As to the first point it is difficult to overestimate the consternation and dismay which the destruction of Jerusalem occasioned in the minds of sincerely religious Jews. Their holy city was in ruins; their holy and beautiful Temple, the center of their worship and their love, had been ruthlessly burned to the ground, and not one stone of it was left upon another; their magnificent hopes, either of an ideal king who was to restore the empire of David, or of a Son of Man who was to appear to them in the clouds of heaven, seemed to them for a while like empty dreams; and the whole visible world was, to their imagination, black with desolation and despair. In this their hour of darkness and anguish, they naturally turned to the consolations and hopes of a future state; and the doctrine of the Sadducees that there was nothing beyond the present life would have appeared to them cold, heartless, and hateful. Again, while they were sunk in the lowest depths of depression, a new religion which they despised as a heresy and a superstition, of which one of their own nation was the object, and another the unrivalled missionary to the heathen, was gradually making its way among the subjects of their detested conquerors, the Romans. One of the causes of its success was undoubtedly the vivid belief in the resurrection of Jesus, and a consequent resurrection of all mankind, which was accepted by its heathen converts with a passionate earnestness, of which those who at the present day are familiar from infancy with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead can form only a faint idea. To attempt to check the progress of this new religion among the Jews by an appeal to the temporary rewards and punishments of the Pentateuch would have been as idle as an endeavor to check an explosive power by ordinary mechanical restraints. Consciously, therefore, or unconsciously, many circumstances combined to induce the Jews, who were not Pharisees, but who resisted the new heresy, to rally round the standard of the oral law, and to assert that their holy legislator, Moses, had transmitted to his faithful people by word of mouth, although not in writing, the revelation of a future state of rewards and punishments. A great belief was thus built up on a great fiction; early teaching and custom supplied the place of evidence; faith in an imaginary fact produced results as striking as could have flowed from the fact itself; and the  doctrine of a Mosaic oral law, enshrining convictions and hopes deeply rooted in the human heart, has triumphed for nearly eighteen centuries in the ideas of the Jewish people. SEE RABBINISM.

4. Their Modern Representatives. — Many leading Jewish writers (Pinsker, Geiger, Furst, etc.) claim the Karaites as lineal descendants of the Sadducees; and this identity is quietly assumed by Ginsburg in the art. in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, which we have thus far mainly followed. It is true the modern Karaite Jews hold, in common with the Sadducees, the decided rejection of the oral law. Less important coincidences are also pointed out, such as their views of worldly policy, their notions respecting the Levirate law, retaliation, inheritance, defilement, the Sabbath, phylacteries, etc.; but these particulars, if indeed not merely accidental, are certainly not conclusive, in the absence of any link of historical connection between the two sects. On the other hand, the failure of agreement in the marked tenet respecting the resurrection is a sufficient offset to these other marks of identity. SEE KARAITES.

V. The literature is nearly the same as that for the Pharisees (q.v.). The following monographs, however, may be specified: Cellarius, De Causis cur Sadducoei Angelos negarint (Ziz. 1637); Reiske, De Sadducoeis (Jen. 1666); Mieg, De Argumento Christ. adversus Sadducoeos (Heidelb. 1677); Willemer, De Sadducceis (Viteb. 1680); Barthel, De Sadducceis (Lips. 1680); Lund, De Phariscis, Sadduceis et Essenis (Abose, 1689); Salden, De Sadducoeis et Pharisceis (in his Otia Theol. p. 554); Buding, De Sadducoeismo Annoe et Caiaphoe (Buding. 1719); Cobius, Argum. Jes. Chr. contra Sadducoeos (Viteb. 1727); Walther, De Immortalitate Animarum a Sadducoeis negata (Neubrand. 1776); Schultze, Conjecturoe Hist.-criticoe de Sadducoeis (Hal. 1779); Schaffer, Oratio ἀρχιερεῦσι in Ecclesia Hebroea Sadducea (Jen. s. a.); Harenberg, Nervus Demonstrationis a Christo in Sadduccos susceptce (in Iken's Thesaur. 2, 242); Gade, De Sadducaeorum in Gente Judaica Auctoritate (in the Miscell. Lips. Nov. 2, 13; 5, 440); Guldenapfel, Josephi de Sadducaorum Canone Sententia (Jen. 1804); Grossman, De Philosophia Sadducoeorum (Lips. 1836-39, 4 vols.); Hanne, Die Pharisaer u. Sadducaer als polit. Parteien (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift, 1867). SEE PHILOSOPHY.

## Sade, Jean Baptiste de[[@Headword:Sade, Jean Baptiste de]]

             a French prelate, nephew of Richard, was born at Avignon in 1632. After the death of his uncle he became bishop of Cavaillon, and died Dec. 21, 1707. He left several religious works: Instructions Chretiennes et Morales (1696): Reflexions Chretiennes sur les Psaumes Penitentiaux Trouvees dans la Cassette d'Antoine I, Roi de Portugal (1698).

## Sade, Pons de[[@Headword:Sade, Pons de]]

             a French prelate. He was first professor in the University of Avignon, and in 1445 was made bishop of Vaison. He died at Vaison in 1469.

## Sade, Richard de[[@Headword:Sade, Richard de]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was successively chamberlain of pope Urban VIII, vice-governor of Tivoli and Ravenna. and after 1660 bishop of Cavaillon. He died at Rome, June 27, 1663.

## Sadeel (Prop. Chandieu), Antoine[[@Headword:Sadeel (Prop. Chandieu), Antoine]]

             one of the promoters of the Reformation, was born, 1534, at the castle of Chabot, in the Maconnais. At the age of twenty he was invited to preach to a congregation of the Reformed at Paris. Attacked by the priests, he was employed by the Protestants to draw up a vindication, was imprisoned the next year, 1558, but was released by the king of Navarre. He went to Orleans, where, in 1562, he presided at a national synod. He then went to Berne, and finally to Geneva, where, from 1589, he labored as preacher and professor of Hebrew until his death, Feb. 23, 1591. He wrote against the Jesuits, Sophismata F. Turriani, etc. (1577): — Index Repetitionum Turriani (1583, 8vo): — De Legitima Vocatione Pastorum Ecclesioe Reformatoe (1583, 8vo): — Response a la Profession de Foy (1593, 8vo): — Opera Theologica (1592, fol.).

## Sadhyas[[@Headword:Sadhyas]]

             in Hindu mythology, are demi-gods, all of whom are descended from the first Menu.

## Sadir Jug[[@Headword:Sadir Jug]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a period in Hindu chronology which embraces four world periods, or twelve thousand divine years of three hundred and sixty solar years each.

## Sadleir, Francis, D.D.[[@Headword:Sadleir, Francis, D.D.]]

             provost of Trinity College, Dublin, from 1837 until his death in 1851, was a lineal descendant of Sir Ralph Sadleir. His Sermons and Lectures (Donellan Lectures) were published in Dublin (1821-22, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Sadler, Anthony, D.D.[[@Headword:Sadler, Anthony, D.D.]]

             chaplain to Charles II, died about 1680. His published works are, Inquisitio Anglicana (Lond. 1654, 4to): — The Loyal Mourner (1660, 4to): — The Subject's Joy for the King's Restoration: a Masque (1660, 4to): — Strange News Indeed (1664, 4to): — Schema Sacrum, etc. (1683). Also single Sermons. See Bliss's Wood, Athen. Oxon. 3, 1267.

## Sadler, John[[@Headword:Sadler, John]]

             an English divine and author, who died 1595, is known principally by his work, Sacred Records of the History of Christ (Lond. 8vo).

## Sadler, Michael Thomas[[@Headword:Sadler, Michael Thomas]]

             an English statesman and philanthropist, was a native of Snelston, Derbyshire, and was born in 1780. He was for some time a merchant of Leeds, was member of Parliament for Newark-upon-Trent, 1829-30, and in 1831 for Aldborough, Yorkshire. He was noted for his philanthropic interest on behalf of the agricultural poor and children in factories, and his opposition to Roman Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform. He died in 1835. The following are some of his principal works: Ireland: its Evils and Remedies (Lond. 1828, 8vo): — Speech in the House of Commons on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, March 17, 1829; Second Speech, March 30, 1829 (Lond. 1829).

## Sadoc[[@Headword:Sadoc]]

             the Greek form of the name ZADOK SEE ZADOK (q.v.) in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. (Vulg. Sadoch, the Greek original being lost). The high priest Zadok (2 Esdras 1, 1); one of Ezra's ancestors (Ezr 7:2).

2. (Σαδώκ, Vulg. Sadoc). The son (great-grandson) of Azor and father of Achim (Mat 1:14) in Christ's ancestry. B.C. cir. 220. SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

## Sadoleto, Jacopo[[@Headword:Sadoleto, Jacopo]]

             a Roman cardinal and bishop, noted for his learning, ability, purity, and liberality, born at Modena in 1477. His father, a professor at Pisa, then at Ferrara, gave him an excellent education. While yet a mere youth he heard lectures on Aristotle, and was introduced to the riches of classical literature. Philosophy and eloquence were his favorite studies; and Aristotle and Cicero his masters. His first publication was Philosophicoe Consolationes et Meditationes in Adversiis (1502). He also made a promising start in poetry, as his De Cajo Curtio and De Laocoontis Statua testify. On leaving the university he went to Rome, and soon won the esteem of all scholars and of several eminent prelates. Cardinal Caraffa had him made a canon of San Lorenzo, a place which he held until 1517. Leo X, on his accession, chose Sadoleto and Peter Bembo as his secretaries. In this position Sadoleto rendered his Church faithful services and won great reputation. In 1517, while on a pilgrimage to Loretto, he was appointed bishop of Carpentras, near Avignon. After vainly declining this honor, he accepted it, and fulfilled its duties with exemplary diligence. Leo's successor, Adrian VI, did not esteem him so highly as Leo. But Clement VII recalled him to Rome — a call which he accepted on condition of being permitted to return to his see after three years. He now became one of Clement's most trusted counselors, and exerted a very beneficent influence. But he endeavored in vain to dissuade the pope from his league against Charles V (1526).

Foreseeing the calamities which would result, he begged to be permitted to retire to his diocese. Scarcely twenty days after his departure, Rome was sacked and the pope a prisoner. He now gave his earnest attention to the management of his diocese, removing unworthy pastors, appointing faithful ones, establishing schools, and endeavoring to make the Reformation unnecessary by removing abuses. Here he came into correspondence with some of the most eminent Protestants — Martin Bucer, John Sturm, and Melancthon. He appreciated the motives of the Reformers; but he regarded their doctrine of justification by faith alone as an excessive statement of a good Catholic doctrine, and as liable to  Antinomian abuse. His position was that of a mediator; and to all persecution of the Protestants he was utterly opposed. During his stay at Carpentras he entered afresh upon literary labors. Here he wrote a work on education: De Liberis recte Instituendis (Ven. 1533; new ed. Paris, 1855) and a commentary, In Pauli Epistolam ad Romanos (Ven. 1535). This commentary is his most important doctrinal utterance. His purpose was to present the general Catholic doctrine on faith, good work, justification, predestination, and free will. He mainly followed Chrysostom and Theophylact, and opposed the determinism of Augustine. Man is not passive in the process of regeneration, but must personally cooperate with the grace of God. Faith and good works are inseparable; but works without faith are of no worth. In so far as he opposed justification by faith alone, he opposed only its abuse. He also opposed the excessive fasts and asceticism of the Roman Church. The book was severely censured at Rome. Sadoleto modified some of its utterances, and issued a new edition in 1536. At this period he wrote also an Interpretatio of some of the Psalms.

On the accession of Paul III, Sadoleto was called to Rome to give counsel as to measures of Church reform. The pope now raised him to the cardinalate (1536), retained him at Rome, and charged him with preparations for the contemplated Council of Trent. In 1538 he attended the pope when he met Charles V at Nice. Here he labored to bring about a peace between the emperor and Francis I. An armistice having been effected, he obtained permission to retire to his bishopric. Here he wrote his elegant work De Philosophia. In 1539 he wrote his celebrated Epistolam ad Senatum Populumque Genevensem, an eloquent and affectionate appeal to the Genevese Protestants, whom he styles “his beloved brethren in Christ,“ to return into the unity of the Church. Here he also began his irenical work, De Exstructione Cath. Eccl. At this period he gave a signal proof of his Christian liberality. Francis I had issued an order of persecution against all dissenters in Provence; thereupon some of them drew up a statement of their belief, sent it to Sadoleto, and asked his intercession. He candidly made the examination, suggested a few changes, and promised to use his utmost endeavors to rescue them from persecution. War breaking out afresh between Francis I and Charles V, Sadoleto was called to Rome (1542) to act as peace commissioner. This work done, he retired for a few months to Carpentras; but in the summer of 1543 he returned to Rome to aid the pope further in his preparations for the Council of Trent. The next year he was called on to meet the emperor and the pope at Busseto in an endeavor to effect a peace with France. This was among the last of  Sadoleto's labors. He was now far advanced in years; his health gave way in the summer of 1547, and on Oct. 18 he entered into rest. Sadoleto was one of the noblest characters of the age; he belonged to that select circle of high Roman prelates who sincerely desired to do away with the corruptions of their Church, but whose influence was largely counteracted by the worldly minded majority. His works, which are very elegantly written, were printed in 1607: Sadoleti Opera quoe extant Omnia (Mogunt.). His collected works, except his Letters, were again issued at Verona in 1737- 38, in 4 vols. 4to; his Epistolarum Libri XVII, at Lyons in 1550; a better edition of these Letters, at Rome, 1759, in 5 vols. 8vo; his work on philosophy, at Paris in 1853. See his Life by Florebellus; Joly, Etude sur Sadolet (Caen, 1857): Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 297-301; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (J.P.L.)

## Sadoleto, Paolo[[@Headword:Sadoleto, Paolo]]

             an Italian prelate, nephew of the preceding, was born at Modena, 1508. He studied literature and ancient languages at Ferrara, and was in 1533 made assistant of his uncle at the siege of Carpentras, and in 1541 governor of Venaissin. In 1544 he succeeded his uncle as bishop, and went to Rome as secretary of pope Julius III. At the death of that pontiff, in 1555, he returned to his diocese, and twice again was charged with the governorship of Venaissin, 1560, 1567. He died Feb. 26, 1572, deplored by his people for his excellent qualities and erudition. His Letters and Later Poems were published by abbe Costanzi at the end of his uncle's Letters. See Tiraboschi, Storia della Letteratura Italianza, 7; Barjavel, Diet. Hist. du Vaucluse.

## Sadr[[@Headword:Sadr]]

             in Scandinavian mythology, is a surname of Odin, the principal deity.

## Saewulf[[@Headword:Saewulf]]

             supposed to have been a merchant of Gloucester, flourished in 1102, and is noticed by William of Malmesbury. He left in manuscript an account of his travels in the Holy Land, A.D. 1102-3, under the title, Relatio de Peregrinatione Saewulfi ad Hierosolymam et Terram Sanctam, etc. A French translation was published in Paris, 1839, under the title, Relation des Voyages de Saewulf a Jerusalem et en Terre-Sainte; and an English  translation is included in Thomas Wright's Early Travels in Palestine (Lond. 1848).

## Safed[[@Headword:Safed]]

             is an important, but comparatively modern town of Palestine, eight miles north-west of the sea of Galilee, famous especially as a mediaeval seat of Jewish learning. The following account of it is taken from Murray's Hand--  book for Syria (page 418). Further details may be found in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (1:199, 248).

"Safed lies on an isolated peak, which crowns the southern brow of the mountain range. A deep glen sweeps round its northern and a western sides, and a shallower one, after skirtinng the easternside, falls into the former a few miles to the south. Beyond these, on the north-east, north, and west, are higher hills, but on the south the view is open. The old castle crowns the peak; the Jewish quarter of the town clings to tile western side, considerably below the summit, the rows of houses arranged like stairs. There are, besides, two Moslem quarters — one occupying the ridge to the south, and the other nestlng in in the valley to the east. The population may be estimated at about four thousand, of whom one third are Jews and a very few families Christians.

"The only attraction of Safed is the splendid view it commands. This is best seen from the summit of the castle. The latter is surrounded by a deep, dry ditch, within which was a wall. All is now a mass of ruins. Only a shattered fragment of one of the great round towers has survived the earthquake of 1837. Before that catastrophe it was not in the best repair, still, it afforded accommodation to the governor and his train; but then, in a few minutes, it was utterly ruined, and many of its inmates buried beneath the fallen towers.

"Safed is first mentioned in the Vulgate version of the book of Tobit [rather as Safat in the Jerusalem Talmud; perhaps also the Seph of Josephus (War, 2:25)]. Tradition has made it the site of Bethulia of the book of Judith, but without evidence. The castle seems to have been founded by the crusaders to guard their territory against the inroads of the Saracens. It was garrisoned by the Knights-Templars. Its defenses, both natural and artificial, were so strong that Saladin besieged it for five weeks before he was able to capture it. After lying in ruins for many years it was rebuilt by Benedict, bishop of Manseilles, in the year 1240. But it only remained twenty years in the hands of the Christians, for, being hard pressed by Sultan Bibars, the garrison capitulated and here murdered to a man, the chief being flayed alive by the barbarous Mohammedans. From that period till the past century it continued to be one of the bulwarks of Palestine.

"We know not when the Jews first settled in Satfed, or at what period they raised the town to the rank of a 'holy city.' There were no Jews in the place  in then middle of the 12th century; when Benjamin of Tudela visited the country; and it was not, in fact, until four centuries later that the schools of Safed became celebrated. Then a printing-press was set up, synagogues were built, and the rabbis of Safed were acknowledged to be among the chief ornaments of Hebrew literature. The 16th century was their golden age in the 17th both learning and funds began to decline, and the earthquake of 1837 gave a deathblow to the Jewish cause. Printing-press, synagogues, schools, houses, and people were all involved in one common ruin."

## Safford, Jefferson Price, D.D[[@Headword:Safford, Jefferson Price, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Zanesville, Ohio, September 22, 1823. He graduated from the University of Ohio, at Athens, in 1843; taught at Dry Creek Academy, Covington, Kentucky, and at Indianapolis Academy, Ind., for two years each; was professor of mathematics at Covington, in 1847 and 1848; next entered Princeton Seminary, N.J., where he graduated in 1852; was licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, April 5, 1851; taught mathematics at Richmond Academy, Richmond, Virginia, three years, supplying also, part of the time, the Church at Bethlehem, and was ordained by the Presbytery of West Lexington, at Frankfort, Kentucky, February 9, 1855. His fields of labor were the Church at Frankfort, from 1855 to 1857; pastor of First Church, Piqua, Ohio, from 1857 to 1862.; First Church, New Albany, Indiana, from 1862 to 1867, and district secretary of the Board of Missions for Ohio and Indiana from 1867 to 1870. He served as stated supply to Brownsville (Ohio) Church from 1870 to 1876, at the same time supplying also Fairmount Church from 1870 to 1877, Rosville Church from 1871 to 1873, acting as president of Zanesville University in 1871 and 1872, supplying Uniontown (Ohio) Church from 1871 to 1873, Hanover Church in 1873 and 1874, Kirkersville Church from 1874 to 1879, and Claysville and West Carlisle churches until his death, which occurred at Zanesville, July 10, 1881. Dr. Safford was also the accurate and efficient stated clerk of the Presbytery of Zanesville from 1873, and of the synod of Colisumbus from 1876. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 48.

## Saffron[[@Headword:Saffron]]

             (כִּרְכֹּ ם, karkom', Sept. κρόκος) occurs only once in the O.T., viz. in Son 4:14, where it is mentioned along with several fragrant and stimulant substances, such as spikenard, calamus, and cinnamon, trees of frankincense, myrrh, and aloes (ahalim): we may therefore suppose that it was some substance possessed of similar properties. The name, however, is so similar to the Persian karkam (see Castelli, Lex. Hept. Col. 1808) and the Greek κρόκος that we have no difficulty in tracing the Hebrew karkon to the modern crocus or saffron. It is also probable that all three names had one common origin, saffron having from the earliest times been cultivated in Asiatic countries, as it still is in Persia and Cashmere (comp. Theophr. Plant. 6, 6; Pliny, 21, 17), and especially in ancient Cilicia (Strabo, 14, 6, 71; Dioscor. 1, 25). Crocus is mentioned by Hippocrates and Theophrastus. Dioscorides describes the different kinds of it, and Pliny states that the benches of the public theatres were strewn with saffron; indeed, “the ancients frequently made use of this flower in perfumes. Not only saloons, theatres, and places which were to be filled with a pleasant fragrance were strewn with this substance, but all sorts of vinous tinctures retaining the scent were made of it, and this costly perfume was poured into small fountains, which diffused the odor which was so highly esteemed. Even fruit and confitures placed before guests, and the ornaments of the rooms, were spread over with it. It was used for the same purposes as the modern potpourri” (Rosenmiller, Bibl. Bot. p. 138). In the present day a very high price is given in India for saffron imported from Cashmere; native dishes are often colored and flavored with it, and it is in high esteem as a stimulant medicine. The common name, saffron, is no doubt derived from the Arabic zafran. as are the corresponding terms in most of the languages of Europe. To this it may be added that it was a favorite pigment or dye. “Saffron-vested” (κρόκοπεπλος) is a Homeric epithet for aurora or morning, and the crocota was a robe of delicate texture and bright-yellow color, occasionally worn by actors and Roman ladies. Its beauty in the landscape is referred to by Homer (Iliad, 14, 399), Virgil (Georg. 4, 182), and Milton (Par. Lost, 4, 700). Nothing, therefore, was more likely than that saffron should be  associated with the foregoing fragrant substances in the passage of Canticles, as it still continues to be esteemed by Asiatic nations, and, as we have seen, to be cultivated by them. Hasselquist also (Trav. p. 36), in reference to this Biblical plant, describes the ground between Smyrna and Magnesia as in some places covered with saffron; and Rauwolf mentions gardens and fields of crocus in the neighborhood of Aleppo, and particularizes a fragrant variety in Syria. Kitto (Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 321) says that the safflower (Carthamus tinctorius), a very different plant from the crocus, is cultivated in Syria for the sake of the flowers which are used in dyeing; but the karkam, no doubt, denotes the Crocus sativus.

Saffron belongs to the flag or iris order (Iridaceoe). The different members of the crocus family are great favorites: the purple and golden varieties (Crocus vernus, Willd., and C. aureus, Sin.), which, on English flower borders, are the first to follow the snowdrop, and often fill with a flush of coming spring the earliest days of March; and the lonely, fragile sort (C. nudiforus, Sm.), which, with its own leaves still underground, comes up amid the drifting foliage of autumn, making a mournful effort to cheer the last days of October. These, and other species now naturalized in various localities, are regarded by some as only varieties of the C. sativus of Linnaeus, the true or saffron-yielding crocus — a plant of plentiful occurrence in Greece and Asia Minor. The name saffron, as usually applied, does not denote the whole plant, nor even the whole flower, of Crocus sativus, but only the stigmas, with part of the style, which, being plucked out, are carefully dried. (Comp. Halle Encykl. 1, § 20, 165 sq., and plates in Plenck, Icones Plantar. Med. 1, plate 32.) These, when prepared, are dry, narrow, thread-like, and twisted together, of an orangeyellow color, having a peculiar aromatic and penetrating odor, with a bitterish and somewhat aromatic taste, tinging the mouth and saliva of a yellow color. Sometimes the stigmas are prepared by being submitted to pressure, and thus made into what is called cake saffron, a form in which it is still imported from Persia into India. Hay saffron is obtained chiefly from France and Spain, though it is also sometimes prepared from the native crocus cultivated for this purpose. Saffron was formerly highly esteemed as a stimulant medicine, and still enjoys high repute in Eastern countries both as a medicine and as a condiment. See, further, Beckmann; Geschichte der Erfind. 2, 79 sq.; Celsius, Hierobot. 2, 11 sq.; Bod. a Stapel. Comment. in Theophr. p. 663 sq.; Hertodt, Crocologia (Jen. 1670); Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 496.

## Saga[[@Headword:Saga]]

             in Scandinavian mythology, possibly identical with Laga, is a deity who at least shares the dwelling place of Laga in the cooling waters of Soquabekr, and participate in the love of Odin, who pays her daily visits. Saga is one of the Asins, whose songs commemorate the deeds of the heroes. SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.

## Sagan[[@Headword:Sagan]]

             (סֶגֶן, a proefect), the second priest of the Jews, who acted as deputy of the high priest, often officiating for him in the sacred service of the Temple. He was sometimes called high priest, and was identical with the ruler of the Temple. SEE PRIEST.

## Sagaren, Or Sangaren[[@Headword:Sagaren, Or Sangaren]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a famous king, belonging to the race of Children of the Sun, whose sixty thousand sons were turned to ashes by an angry glance of the white penitent Kabiler.

## Sagaris[[@Headword:Sagaris]]

             in Greek mythology, was a Trojan who accompanied AEneas to Italy, where he was slain by Turnus.

## Sagaritis[[@Headword:Sagaritis]]

             in Phoenician mythology, was a dryad who induced Atys to violate his faith with Cybele, to punish which the latter cut down the tree of Sagaritis, and thus caused her death.

## Sagatrakawaxen[[@Headword:Sagatrakawaxen]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a monstrous giant who sprang from the blood of Brahma, when that god was decapitated by the angry Siva, and who was provided with five hundred heads and a thousand arms.

## Sage, John[[@Headword:Sage, John]]

             a bishop of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, was born (1652) in the parish of Creich, Fife. He was educated at the University of St. Andrews (M.A. 1672), and was ordained in 1684. He officiated at Glasgow until the  Revolution in 1688, and was consecrated a bishop for Scotland, 1705. He died in 1711. The following are his principal works: The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery (Lond. 1695, 8vo); The Principles of the Cyprianic Age with regard to Episcopal Power, etc. (1695. 4to; 1717, 8vo); A Vindication of the same (1701, 4to). These, together with his Life, were republished, in three octavo volumes, by the Spottiswoode Society (Edin. 1844-46). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Sagittarius, Caspar[[@Headword:Sagittarius, Caspar]]

             historiographer of the duchy of Saxony, professor of history at the University of Jena, and, according to his biographer, J.A. Schmidt, one of the most excellent, erudite, and industrious men of his time, was born Sept. 23, 1643. His father, a pastor, taught him with care, and sent him, when fifteen, to the gymnasium at Lubeck. At this early age he published an essay, De Ritibus Veterum Romanorum Nuptialibus, and began his annotations on Justin. Here also he wrote an erudite history of the Passion of Jesus. After three years at the gymnasium, he entered the University of Helmstadt, and heard lectures on the whole field of human knowledge — exegesis, church history, metaphysics, logic, ethics, politics, physics, history, geography, and anatomy — thus laying a foundation for the character of polyhistor which he subsequently bore. He also preached and traveled in various parts of Germany, and formed relations with many learned men. He next prepared his work, De Calceis et Nudipedalibus Veterum. At the age of twenty-five he became rector of the school at Saalfeld (1668), where he not only distinguished himself as an educator, but also continued his literary productiveness. In 1671 he was called to a professorship at Jena. After writing various philological treatises and theological disputations — one of them De Martyrum Cruciatibus in Primitiva Ecclesia — he succeeded (1674) to the chair of J.A. Bose as professor of history. The next year he published a very learned work on the history and customs of Thuringia. In 1676 he visited the libraries of Germany and Copenhagen; in 1678 he issued his Compendium Historioe Saxonicoe, and was made a doctor of theology; in the following years he appeared as a polemic, defending Lutheranism against the Jesuit Schonmann. Thereupon followed various works on Pietism, which he boldly defended, and for which he was bitterly assailed by the staid orthodox party. Among the best of his works in this strife is his Christlicher Neujahrswunsch an alle evangelische Theologos, die die  Beforderung des thatigen Christenthums sich angelegen seyn lassen (Jena, 1692). Among his later writings were his Historia Vitae Georgii Spalatini (Jena, 1693), and an Introductio in Historiam Ecclesiasticam, which he did not live to finish. He died March 9, 1694. For a complete list of the works of Sagittarius, see Joan. Andr. Schmidii Commentarius de Vita et Scriptis Caspari Sagittarii (Jena, 1713). See Herzog, Real-Encykl. 13, 301-304. (J.P.L.)

## Sagui[[@Headword:Sagui]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the second stage of blessedness in the paradise of Vishnu. SEE HINDUISM.

## Sahadutha[[@Headword:Sahadutha]]

             SEE JEGAR-SAHADUTHA.

## Sahidic (Or Thebaic) Version[[@Headword:Sahidic (Or Thebaic) Version]]

             SEE EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

## Sahm, Peter, D.D[[@Headword:Sahm, Peter, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, graduated from Gettysburg Theological Seminary in 1831, and entered the ministry in 1832, the period of his service comprising  forty-four years. He preached in both German and English as occasion required. A considerable time he was pastor at Green Castle. At the time of his death he was serving the Church at New Berlin, Pennsylvania. He died at Laurelton, March 14, 1876, aged sixty-six years. See Lutheran Observer, March 24, 1876.

## Sahuguet, Marc Rene[[@Headword:Sahuguet, Marc Rene]]

             abbe d'Espagnac, was born at Brives, in 1753. Being destined for the Church, he received orders, and was soon appointed canon of Paris. He gave himself principally to literary pursuits, and his earlier essays have received just praise. In 1782 he became advisory clerk of Parliament, and soon developed a great love of riches. The agent and friend of Calonne, he only engaged in those enterprises which would increase his wealth. Among his operations was a speculation in shares of the East India Company, which was so scandalous as to oblige the government to cancel the whole bargain. After the disgrace of Calonne, the abbe d'Espagnac was exiled, though he was still canon of Notre Dame. In 1789 he returned to Paris and associated himself with the so called Club of 1789. At the same time he was a friend of the Jacobins, whose influence procured for him the office of purveyor to the army of the Alps. He was very soon denounced by Cambon and put under sentence of arrest for engaging in fraudulent business transactions, but succeeded in clearing himself. Having gained his liberty, he attached himself to the army of Dumouriez, and by various means acquired an immense fortune. But at the revolt of Dumouriez, Sahuguet was arrested, and tried as an accomplice in a conspiracy to corrupt the government. He was found guilty, and executed at Paris, April  5, 1794. Of his literary works there are a few remaining which show considerable ability. The most noticeable are L'Eloge de Catinat, who was crowned by the French Academy in 1775, and Reflexions sur l'Abbe Suger et sur son Siecle (1780). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Sail[[@Headword:Sail]]

             is the incorrect rendering in the passages Isa 33:23; Eze 27:7, of the Hebrew נֵס, nes, usually a standard or flag-staff, and in the passages in question a flag of a ship. In Act 27:17 it stands vaguely for σκεῦος (a vessel or implement of any kind), which there designates the tackling, or sailing apparatus in general of a ship. SEE MAINSAIL.

## Sail, Andrew, D.D[[@Headword:Sail, Andrew, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born near Cashel, Ireland, about 1612, and after having studied for some time at St. Omer's, was transferred to Valladolid, in Spain, that he might become conversant with the rules and institutions of the Jesuits. Having acquired distinction as a theologian, he was appointed successively reader of divinity at Pampeluna, professor at Tudela and Valencia, rector of the Irish College, and lecturer of controversial divinity at the University of Salamanca. It was at this time that many of the  influential Roman Catholics in Ireland expressed their willingness to adhere to king Charles XI, and renounce the interference of all foreign power, even though the pope should excommunicate them. Under these circumstances it was deemed expedient by the Romish court to send Jesuits to Ireland, and among them was Sail. Some years later, however, a change took place in his religious views, and he joined the Church of England, in connection with which he labored with exemplary diligence till his death, April 6, 1682. His works are, Recantation, and a Sermon on Mat 24:15-18, in Confutation of the Errors of the Church of Rome (Lond. 1674, 8vo): — The Catholick and Apostolick Faith Maintained in the Church of England (Oxford, 1676, 8vo): — Votum pro Pace Christiana (1678, 4to): — Ethica seu Moralis Philosophia (1680, 8vo). See (Lond.). Church of England Magazine, July 1841, page 3; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sailer, Johann Michael[[@Headword:Sailer, Johann Michael]]

             a Roman Catholic bishop of Ratisbon, the originator of a tendency in German Catholicism, and one of the purest and noblest theologians of the Church universal. His life lies between Nov. 17, 1751, and May 20, 1832. He was born near Schrobenhausen, in the bishopric of Augsburg, of upright, devout parents. His mother left upon his young heart an impression for which he expressed public thanks to the end of his days. His readiness in learning induced his father to send him in his tenth year to school at Munich. For five or six years he earned his way as attendant on a young nobleman. Having finished his gymnasium studies at the age of nineteen, he entered as Novitiate into the Jesuit Society at Landsberg, and passed three very studious years. On the dissolution of the order (1773), he went to Ingolstadt, and pursued philosophy and theology until 1777, when he was consecrated to the priesthood.

Up to his sixteenth year, Sailer suffered under a tender and often upbraiding conscience. But, finding a wise spiritual guide, he was now led to a clear, evangelical conversion. At his eighteenth year he was troubled with historical doubts. An aged missionary from India helped him, happily, over these. But other, even severer, temptations beset him subsequently. In 1777 he became repetitor publicus of philosophy and theology at Ingolstadt. Here he formed intimate bonds with the zealous and devout pastor Feneberg, and with Winkelhofer, the German Fenelon. In 1780 he was promoted to the chair of dogmatics. He now began his public literary activity, and published notes to the Imitatio Christi, also a prayer book, which has enjoyed great popularity, and a discussion of the province of reason. From 1784 to 1794 he served as professor of pastoral theology at  the University of Dillingen — a very fruitful period. He planted evangelical principles in the hearts of thousands of students, who in turn spread them throughout German Catholicism. He formed religious friendships with many eminent Protestants, especially Lavater, and with all who were earnestly upholding religion against the inflooding of rationalism. This finally brought persecution upon Sailer, and in 1794 he was abruptly dismissed from his chair. For a while he shared the hospitality of Winkelhofer in Munich, but then retired into greater privacy at Ebersberg. The next six years brought to Sailer great spiritual temptations. He was brought into the stream of earnest evangelical mysticism which centerd in Martin Boos; but he was not entirely carried captive by it. Partially convinced that he still retained something of the Pharisee and formalist, yet unable to break entirely away from Catholic tradition, he finally sought refuge and consolation in fervent prayer and active labor upon the souls of men. Not fully rising to the subjective self assertion of Luther, he yet clung with his whole heart to Christ, and followed the examples of Fenelon and Francis de Sales. His piety resembled that of Charles Wesley, while his adhesion to Catholicism, though less passionate, was yet of the same type as Charles Wesley's devotion to the Establishment.

In 1799, Sailer was again favored with a chair in Ingolstadt. The next year the university was removed to Landshut. Here he labored with great fruitfulness until 1821. He lectured on ethics, pastoral theology, homiletics, pedagogics, liturgies, and served as university preacher. His pen was also very busy. He attracted students from every part of Germany, and received many tempting calls to other fields, one of them to the archbishopric of Cologne; but he declined them all. Even yet he did not entirely escape persecution and abuse; but he bore it all with the greatest patience, holding as his motto the words of the prophet (Jer 30:15), “In spe et silentio erit fortitudo vestra.” While Napoleon accused him of being a bigoted papist, the pope distrusted him and refused to confirm him as bishop of Augsburg. Accused of mysticism and of fraternization with Protestants, he published, in 1820, a detailed defense of all that he had done or taught, and submitted the whole to the judgment of the pope, “following the example of the great Fenelon.” This document did not fully satisfy Rome, and it was only after considerable negotiation that the king of Bavaria obtained papal consent to his ecclesiastical preferment. In 1821 he was made prebendary of Ratisbon, and in 1822 vicar-general and coadjutor of the aged bishop Von Wolf; at the same time he was made bishop in partibus of Germanicopolis. With great conscientiousness he now entered upon the weighty duties of this  great diocese of Ratisbon. Everywhere he endeavored to look into matters with his own eyes, and to correct all abuses to the extent of his ability. He held regular meetings with all his clergy, and endeavored to improve the popular education. In 1829 he became in name what he had long been in reality, bishop of Ratisbon. Three years later he died at the age of eighty- one. A complete edition of his works was published by J. Widmer (Sulzb. 1830-42) in forty volumes. Among them the following deserve special mention: Briefe aus allen Jahrhunderten (1800-4): — Grundlehren der Religion: — Moralphilosophie: — Erziehung fur Erzieher: — Die Weisheit auf der Gasse: — Pastoraltheologie: — and many sermons and addresses. Though lacking in profound speculative power, Sailer's writings have yet had a very wide and very stimulating influence. He has been compared to Herder, but he had far more respect than Herder for the objective fruit of ecclesiastical thought. He endeavored in all things to practice the maxim In necessarsiis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas. Of a school of theology as springing from Sailer, we cannot properly speak. He did not leave a school, but only a spiritual impulse. He was of decidedly irenical tendency. Full of Christian love, his ideal was a “mild orthodoxy,“ equally opposed to rationalism, on the one hand, and to a stiff, arid, Roman orthodoxy, on the other. Among the most eminent followers of Sailer was Melchior Diepenbrock (1798-1851), his companion at Ratisbon, and subsequently princebishop of Breslau and cardinal-priest. See Hagenbach, Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries; but especially Herzog, Real-Encykl. 13, 305-313. (J.P.L.)

## Sailly, Thomas[[@Headword:Sailly, Thomas]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born at Brussels in 1553, where he died in 1623. At the age of seventeen, having been already ordained priest, he went to Rome to enter the Society of Jesus. When hardly out of his novitiate, he was sent by Gregory XIII on an embassy to the czar Ivan. On account of his health he was recalled, and became confessor to prince Alexander of Parma. In 1597 he was made superior of a military mission, and in 1606 he went to Rome as procurator-general of the Belgian provinces. In 1620 he took part as missionary in the campaign of Spinola. He was the author of works in Latin, Flemish, and French: Guidon et Pratique Spirituelle du Soldat Chretien (1590): — Narratio Itineris Fr. de Mendoza, Almirantii Aragonioe, in Leqatione sua (1598): — Thesaurus Litanarum ac Orationum Sacer (1598): — Den niewen Morghenwekker (1612). He also translated several religious treatises into his native language.

## Saint[[@Headword:Saint]]

             an epithet applied to (1) a person eminent for piety and virtue; (2) a consecrated or sanctified person. There are two words in the Hebrew Scripture used to express the above, both of which are rendered in our translation by the single expression Saint. חָסַיד, chasid (like the Gr. ὅσιος), denotes a mental quality; its most certain acceptation being pious, just, godly, etc. It is spoken of pious Hebrews (Psa 4:3; Psa 30:4; Psa 31:23; Psa 37:28; Psa 79:2; Psa 97:10; Psa 116:15). On the other hand, קָדוֹש, kadosh, and also the Greek word ἃγιος, signifies pure, clean, in reference to physical purity and cleanliness; they are also used of moral purity, holy, hallowed, sacred — applied to persons consecrated to the service of God: the priests (Exo 28:41; Exo 29:1; Lev 21:6; 1Sa 7:1; 1 Peter 2, 5); the first-born (Exo 13:2; Luk 2:23; Rom 11:16); and the people of Israel (Exo 19:10; Exo 19:14; Isa 13:3); prophets and apostles (Luk 1:70; Act 3:21; 2Pe 1:21; Eph 3:5); the pious Israelites, the saints (Deu 33:3; Psa 16:3; Psa 34:9; Psa 89:5; Psa 89:7; Zec 14:5; Dan 7:18; Dan 7:21; Dan 7:25; Dan 7:27; Mat 27:52); and the angels (Job 5:1; Job 15:15; Dan 8:13; Mat 25:31; 1Th 3:13). The latter Greek word is also used of those who are purified and sanctified by the Holy Spirit; and as this is assumed of all who profess the Christian name, Christians are called saints (Act 9:13-14; Act 9:32; Act 9:41; Act 26:10; Rom 1:7; Rom 8:27). It may here be observed that the Hebrew word for a consecrated prostitute is קְדֵשָׁה, kedeshah, derived from קָדשׁ, kadosh, in its signification of separated, dedicated, because such women among idolaters were devoted to the service of the temples of their false deities, particularly those of Venus, and to the ancient priests of Bel, or Belus. Of such female devotees, instances are to be found in the present day attached to the Hindu temples.

The later Jews have their saints as well as the Christian Church; the word they use is קדשׁ, kadosh. Their most celebrated saint is rabbi Judah Hak- kadosh (rabbi Judah the Holy). He lived about one hundred and twenty years after the destruction of the second Temple, and was the author of the Mishna (or text) of the Babylonian Talmud. They have also their devout men (חסדי ם, chasidim), who devote themselves to a religious life and to the study of their law, visit the dying, perform the rites for the dead, etc. Of such kind were the “devout persons” with whom Paul disputed (Act 17:17). In the New Test. the word ἃγιος, as above, is used throughout wherever our version has “saint,“ and with the same signification as in the Sept. — viz. separated, dedicated, sanctified by consecration — because the Christians were then especially dedicated to God's service, in separation from the Jews and pagans, as the Jews had been before the “holy people” separated from the Gentiles. SEE HOLINESS.

After the Christian era, the martyrs were considered as dignified saints in the same rank as the apostles — i.e. saints by profession and office, as distinguished from the saints, or holy and pious by character and conduct, such as have been eminent for religion and virtue, but not canonized. After some time canonization was extended also to confessors — that is, persons who during the persecutions against the Christians had made a resolute avowal and defense of their faith, and had suffered torture, banishment, or confiscation in consequence, but not actual martyrdom (see the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 169). For some centuries there was no regular canonization in the Christian Church. By a tacit consent of the clergy the names of martyrs, etc., were inserted as saints in a kind of ecclesiastical register, called a diptych. It was not till about the 9th century that solemn and formal canonization, with its particular ceremonies, began to be regularly practiced. At present, in the Church of Rome, the ceremony of beatification, or being pronounced blessed by the pope, must precede canonization, and cannot take place till fifty years after death. SEE CANONIZATION. The word is generally applied by us to the apostles and other holy persons mentioned in the Scriptures; but the Romanists make its application much more extensive, as, according to them, all who are canonized are made saints of a high degree. Protestants, in applying this term to the sacred writers, are very inconsistent; for though they say St. John, St. Peter, St. David, they never use St. Isaiah, St. Habakkuk, etc. The practice has even extended to naming churches after certain saints. SEE PATRON SAINTS.

Concerning the bodies of the saints which arose and came out of their graves after the resurrection of Christ (Mat 27:50), it is believed that they were persons who believed in him and waited for him in hope, as old Simeon had done (Luk 2:25), but who had died before his resurrection, and who were thus favored to be an example of the general resurrection, and to whom Christ alluded (Joh 5:25), “The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live;” and of whom Paul speaks, “Now is Christ  risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept,“ because his resurrection was the signal for theirs. It appears that these persons must have been deceased during the then present generation; for they went into Jerusalem, and appeared unto many, who could not have recognized them had they been much longer dead. We may here observe that when the word saint or saints (ἃγιος, ἃγιοι) is used in the New Test. relative to persons deceased, it is to be understood of the spirits of the just (without any distinction of office or character) made perfect. SEE RESURRECTION.

## Saint Aldegonde[[@Headword:Saint Aldegonde]]

             SEE MARNIX, PHILIPPE.

## Saint Andrews[[@Headword:Saint Andrews]]

             SEE ANDREWS, ST.

## Saint Brieuc[[@Headword:Saint Brieuc]]

             SEE BIANEUC, ST.

## Saint Claude[[@Headword:Saint Claude]]

             SEE CLAUDE, ST.

## Saint Cyran[[@Headword:Saint Cyran]]

             SEE DUVERGIER.

## Saint Denis[[@Headword:Saint Denis]]

             SEE DENIS, ST.

## Saint Edmunds, Alan[[@Headword:Saint Edmunds, Alan]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Caithness in 1290, and in 1291 was made lord-chancellor. He died in 1292. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 211.

## Saint Gall[[@Headword:Saint Gall]]

             SEE GALL, ST.

## Saint John, Knights Hospitallers Of[[@Headword:Saint John, Knights Hospitallers Of]]

             (also called Knights of Rhodes, and Knights of Malta), a religious and military order, originating in the middle of the 11th century. Some citizens of Amalfi, while trading with Palestine, had (1048) founded two hospitals for the reception of pilgrims to Jerusalem — one for men, and the other for women. The hospital for men bore the name of St. John the Almoner, a native of Cyprus and patriarch of Alexandria, who sent aid to Jerusalem in 614, after it had been sacked by Chosroes II. The confraternity who did  service in the hospital was under the direction of Gerard. They displayed such heroic charity when Jerusalem was captured by the Crusaders, July 15, 1099, that several knights — among them Raymond du Puy — joined them as hospitallers. The lordship of Montboire, in Brabant, was bestowed upon them by Godfrey de Bouillon. When peace was restored to the city, Gerard and his associates pledged themselves to labor forever in the hospitals “as the servants of the poor and of Christ,“ the members of both sexes assuming as their habit the black robe of the Augustinians, with a white linen cross of eight points on the left breast. The order received the papal approbation from pope Paschal II, Feb. 15, 1113, under the appellation of “Brothers Hospitallers of St. John in Jerusalem.”

A magnificent church was erected to St. John the Baptist on the traditional site: of his parents' abode. Gerard took the title of Guardian and Provost of the order, and built, for the accommodation of pilgrims, hospitals in the chief maritime towns of Western Europe; these afterwards became commanderies of the order. Gerard died in 1118, and was succeeded by Raymond du Puy, who to their former duty of hospitality and attendance upon the sick added that of knighthood, in opposition to infidels; and this soon became the principal object of the order. Raymond divided the order into knights, priests, and brother servants; and there grew up, also, a numerous intermediate class of sergeants (old Fr. serfgents, serving men), who rendered valuable service in field and hospital, and were, in course of time, assigned separate commanderies. The order, under its new organization, was called after St. John the Baptist; and Raymond exchanged the title of guardian for that of master. The title of grandmaster was first assumed by Hugues de Revel, 1267. The constitutions, based on the Augustinian rule, were drawn up by Raymond, and approved by pope Calixtus II, 1120. The great influx of members caused the order to be divided according to nationalities, or “languages” — those of Provence, Auvergne, France, Italy, Aragon, Germany, and England — to which were added the languages of Castile and Portugal. The order became famous by its delivering Antioch from the Moslems, raising the siege of Jaffa, assisting powerfully in the fall of Tyre, driving the enemy from Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, and contributing to the fall of Ascalon, in 1153. Amaury, king of Jerusalem, bribed them, in 1168, to promise to violate a solemn treaty and engage in an expedition against Egypt. The order was nearly annihilated in 1187 by Saladin in the battle of Tiberias. After the fall of Jerusalem, it was established at the castle of Margat (Markat), the female branch of the order retiring to Europe. The Kharesmians nearly  exterminated the order in 1244 at the battle of Gaza.

When the Saracens took Acre (1291), the hospitallers removed to Limisso, in Cyprus, where originated their naval character, as their vessels conveyed pilgrims to the Holy Land. Having conquered Rhodes in 1309 (or 1310), they afterwards made it the principal seat of their order, and were hence called Knights of Rhodes. They sustained there two sieges, the first, in 1480, under the grandmaster D'Aubusson, proving disastrous to the besiegers; and the second, under L'Isle-Adam, in 1522, ending (after a heroic defense of six months) in the defeat of the knights and evacuation of the island. After taking refuge successively in Candia, Messina, and the mainland of Italy, they were put in possession of the islands of Gozo and Malta and the city of Tripoli by emperor Charles V. They made Malta one of the strongest places in the world, and it gave its name to the order. They repelled attacks from the Turks in 1551 and 1565, and held the island until June, 1798, when it was taken by Bonaparte, the grandmaster Hompesch having abdicated and been sent to Trieste. Since that event the order has existed only in name. It was for a time under the protection of Paul I of Russia, whose reported conversion to Romanism led to his being elected grandmaster. The seat of the order was removed to Catana in 1801. to Ferrara in 1826, and to Rome in 1834. SEE HOSPITALLERS.

## Saint Martin[[@Headword:Saint Martin]]

             SEE MARTIN

(SAINT

), LOUIS CLAUDE DE.

## Saint Omer[[@Headword:Saint Omer]]

             SEE OMER, ST.

## Saint worship[[@Headword:Saint worship]]

             SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

## Saint- Simon, Claude (The Younger)[[@Headword:Saint- Simon, Claude (The Younger)]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1695. In 1716 he became superior of the abbey of Jumieges. Being made bishop of Noyon, he was afterwards (in 1733) transferred to Metz: he there founded a seminary which bears his name, and in which he died, Feb. 29, 1760.

## Saint-Amour, Louis Gorin De[[@Headword:Saint-Amour, Louis Gorin De]]

             a French theologian, was born at Paris, Oct. 27, 1619. He was educated at the University of Paris, and afterwards became its rector, and in 1644 was made professor at the Sorbonne. His profound learning and the vigor of his argumentative powers soon made him conspicuous in the assemblies of the faculty. When the Jesuits obtained the condemnation of the five propositions of the book of Jansenius, Saint-Amour became one of the most powerful adversaries of the decision. He was one of the doctors who went to Rome to obtain its reversal, but was obliged to return without having succeeded. By his defense of Arulauld he was excluded from the assemblies of the Sorbonne, and, being arrested by the order of the Council of State, he was in 1684 burned at the stake. He published a Journal de ce quei c'est passea a Rome touchant les cinq Propositions depuis 1646 jusqu'en 1653 (1662), edited by Arnauld and De Sacy from the notes of Saint-Amour and the abbe Salaine.

## Saint-George, Arthur, D.D.[[@Headword:Saint-George, Arthur, D.D.]]

             dean of Rosse, died 1772. His only published work is The Archdeacon's Examination of Candidates for Holy Orders, etc., edited by W. Wotton, D.D. (Lond. 1751, 12mo).

## Saint-John, Pawlett, D.D.[[@Headword:Saint-John, Pawlett, D.D.]]

             rector of Yelden, Beds, prebendary of Hereford, and chaplain in ordinary. He received the degree of M.A. in 1706, and D.D. in 1716, and died 1732. “His sermons were written in a forcible yet simple style.” Fourteen of them, on practical subjects, were published (Lond. 1737, 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Saint-John, Theophilus, D.D.[[@Headword:Saint-John, Theophilus, D.D.]]

             a pseudonym. The real author was the Rev. Samuel Clapham, A.M. His Sermons were of a highly popular and useful character, two volumes of which were published (Lond. 1812, 8vo).

## Saint-Jure, Jean Baptiste De[[@Headword:Saint-Jure, Jean Baptiste De]]

             an ascetic author, was born, in 1588, at Metz. At the age of sixteen he joined the Jesuits, and was superior successively of the monasteries at Amiens, Alencon, Orleans, and Paris. He was one of the Jesuits who went into England during the reign of Charles I; but the condition of the country  was so unsettled that he returned to his native land. He died at Paris, April 30, 1657. He wrote several works which have been reprinted, even at the present day. We mention De la Connaissance et de I'Amour de Jesus- Christ (1634): — Methode pour bien mourir (1640): L'Homme Spirituel (1646): — L'Idee d'un Parfait Chretien, ou la Vie de M. de Renty (1651): — L'Homme Religieux (1657);

## Saint-Maur[[@Headword:Saint-Maur]]

             SEE MAUR (ST.), CONGREGATION OF.

## Saint-Pard (Pierre Nicholas Van Blotaque)[[@Headword:Saint-Pard (Pierre Nicholas Van Blotaque)]]

             Abbe de, a Belgian ascetic writer, was born, Feb. 9, 1734, at Givet-Saint- Hilaire. He studied with the Jesuits at Diman, joined their order, and was sent to teach in various colleges. At the time of the suppression of the society he was at Vennes, but went to Paris; and, learning of the interdict of Parliament, he changed his name to that of Saint-Pard, which he retained till his death, which occurred at Paris, Dec. 1, 1824. During the Revolution he remained in Paris, and, though obliged to conceal himself; he still exercised his ministerial functions. Under the Directory he became bolder, and was twice imprisoned for preaching in public. In 1801 he became honorary canon of Notre Dame, and had charge of the parish of St. Jacques de Haut-Pas, which he held during the remainder of his life. Of his writings we have Retraite de dix Jours (1773): — L'Ame Chretienne formee sur les Maximes de l'Evangile (1774): — Exercises de l'Amou du Penitent (1799). He abridged and re-edited Le Livre des Elus (1759), and La Connaissance de Jesus-Christ (1772),

## Saint-Pierre, Charles Irenee Castel[[@Headword:Saint-Pierre, Charles Irenee Castel]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born near Barfleur, Normandy, Feb. 18, 1658. He was educated by the Jesuits at Caen, and joined the priesthood. He went to Paris in 1686, and succeeded Bergeret in the Academy, 1695. He became chaplain of the bishop of Orleans in 1702, and received, through him, the abbey of Tiron. He, attended the Congress of Utrecht with cardinal Polignac in 1712. In some of his writings (Discours sur la Polysynodie) he severely judged Louis XIV, and advocated a constitutional government. For this he was expelled from the Academy; but an association known as the Club de l'Etresol gave him opportunities to expound his humanitarian schemes. It was closed seven years after (1731)  by cardinal Fleury. He died April 29, 1743. Most of his writings are included in his Ouvrages de Politique et de Morale (Rotterdam, 1738-41, 18 vols.).

## Saint-Simon, Claude Henri[[@Headword:Saint-Simon, Claude Henri]]

             Count of, one of the most eminent so called socialistic or communistic philosophers of modern times. He was born at Paris of an ancient and noble family, April 17, 1760. Grownc up in the midst of religious and social agitation, he entered the army and was made a captain at the age of seventeen. In 1779 he went to America, fought under Bouille and Washington, was captured with the count de Grasse in 1782, and, at the conclusion of the war, returned to France and was promoted to a colonelcy. In 1785 he visited Holland and endeavored to induce the government to join with France in an expedition against the English in the East Indies. He then went to Spain with an eccentric project of uniting Madrid by a canal with the sea. Failing in both schemes, he returned to Paris, and, finding the Revolution in full blaze, laid aside his aristocratic name, and fell in with the popular current. By speculating in confiscated property he found himself, in 1797, in possession of 144,000 francs in specie. With this capital he led, the next ten years, a life of travel, study, experiment, and pleasure, and, in the intervals, brooded over a fanciful scheme of regenerating human society. Locating himself in the Latin Quarter, Paris, he studied the whole circle of physical and social sciences. This was his theoretical education; but he wanted also an experimental education. In order to this, he endeavored to realize in his own person the whole circle of human experiences, joys, and sorrows. He entered society; he gave banquets and balls; he gambled, drank, and debauched himself; he courted contagious diseases; he tried to keep off old age by medicaments and paint; he set all moral law aside, justifying it by the maxim that the end sanctified the means. It was right for him, the reformer, to do this. How could he apply the remedy if he had not himself felt the pain! He married in 1801, but, soon dissatisfied, he put away his young wife and sought out  another. From this state of dissipation and theorizing he awoke just in time to find that his money was all gone, and that poverty was staring him in the face. The germs of Saint-Simon's system are given in his first publication, Lettres d'un Habitant a Geneve (1802). All men of thought were to form the spiritual order, all men of action the temporal order — an adaptation to modern society of the mediaeval distinction of the Romish Church. This work was followed in 1807 by his Introduction aux Travaux Scientifiques du 19ieme Siecle (Paris, 1807, 2 vols.). The novelty of these views attracted to Saint-Simon a circle of admiring youth, among whom were Olinde Rodrigues, Augustin Thierry, and Auguste Comte. This was the beginning of organized Saint-Simonism. In cooperation with these disciples, he now produced in rapid succession a Prospectus d'une Nouvelle Encyclopedie (1810): — De la Reorganisation de la Societe Europeenne (1814): — L'Industrie (1817): — L'Organisateur (1819): — Systeme Industriel (1821-22): — Catchisme des Industriels (1823): Opinions Litteraires, Philosophiques et Industrielles (1825). But these ambitious works did not produce the revolution in society which Saint- Simon looked for. They fell still born from the press, or were left unread. The pretended savior of mankind was oppressed with poverty and discouragement. Reaching the lowest depths in March, 1823, he made a fruitless attempt at suicide, but succeeded only in blowing out one of his eyes. Recovering from his wounds and despondency, he now summoned up his last powers in an endeavor to give the world a new religion. The result was his Nouveau Clhristianisme (Paris, 1825). In this he used many thoughts from the Bible. God is the infinite, universal being; he is the all; everything is in him and by him; his central essence is love; he reveals himself as reason, understanding, wisdom, strength, beauty. Man is his highest revelation. Man's ideal essence is also love. The ideal condition of humanity is not the enslaving of the one by the other, but the improvement of each by the other, and the transformation of earth into a paradise. By this process all evil is to be overcome and all bliss to be attained; men are to yield obedience to the authority of wisdom; all are to labor for the happiness of all. But the God of Saint-Simon was a vague abstraction; the system was simply materialism with a slight tincture of naturalistic pantheism. Material well being was the ideal paradise; Saint-Simonism was hedonism; Christianity was but a transient form of man's endeavor to find happiness. Catholicism did a good work in its day, so also did Protestantism; but Saint-Simonism was now to supersede all previous systems. The new era was to be brought about by two principles — an end  and a means. The end was, the most rapid possible amelioration, physical and moral, of the condition of the class the most numerous and poor. The means was, to each man a vocation according to his capacity, and to each capacity a reward according to its works. The result aimed at was a sort of democratic epicureanism. It was an outbirth of a one-sided brooding over the conflict between capital and labor, noble and peasant, priest and devotee. It sprang of fanatical enthusiasm lor a vaguely comprehended good; it was devoid of high ethical thoughts; it had no just appreciation of the philosophy of history: hence it was of a highly artificial and sentimental character, and its speedy collapse was a matter of logical necessity. So soon, therefore, as Saint-Simon died (May 19, 1825), and the enthusiasm of his first disciples had occasion to come into contact with the practical facts of society, the system as a whole vanished into thin air. Dissensions arose. Rodrigues, Enfantin, Leroux, Bazard, Comte, each interpreted the master for himself, and each went his own way. The last remnant of organized Saint-Simonism was dispersed by decree of a civil court in August, 1832. After this date most of the members returned to the ranks of ordinary life, and the system became simply a matter of social history. See Carove, Der Saint-Simonismus (Leipzig, 1831); Veit, Saint-Simon (ibid. 1834); Matter, in Stud. u. Krit. (1832); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 317- 320; Encycl. Brit. (8th ed.), vol. 19. (J.P.L.)

## Sainte-Aulaire, Martial Louis De Beaupoil De[[@Headword:Sainte-Aulaire, Martial Louis De Beaupoil De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1720, and in 1759 he was called to the bishopric of Poitiers, and made deputy to the state assembly of 1789. He was averse to all innovations, and strongly opposed to the requirements of the law in obliging ecclesiastics to take the civil oath. In 1791, he went to England, and afterwards to Switzerland, where he died in 1798.

## Sainte-Beuve, Jacques De[[@Headword:Sainte-Beuve, Jacques De]]

             a French theologian, was born at Paris, April 26, 1613. He received his degree in 1638 at the Sorbonne, and became royal professor of theology in that institution, where his learning gained for him so wide a reputation that he was considered one of the most ready casuists of his time. His refusal to subscribe to the censure passed upon two propositions of Arnauld caused  him to lose his professorship in 1656. He was also deprived of his authority as preacher; but as he afterwards showed more submission to the dictates of the Church by signing the new formula prescribed Feb. 15, 1665, by Alexander VII, he was chosen theologian of the French clergy. This position brought him a pension, and also obliged him to write a Theologie Morale for the assembly at Mantes. Sainte-Beuve lived in Paris in retirement, but was sought for consultation by all the dignitaries of his time. It was said that he not only ruled all of one city, but a whole kingdom. He died Dec. 15, 1677. His writings are, De Confirmatione (1686): — De Extrema Unctione (1686): — Decisions de Cas de Conscience (1686). These words were edited after his death by his brother Jerome.

## Sainte-Marthe, Claude De[[@Headword:Sainte-Marthe, Claude De]]

             a French ascetic author, was born at Paris, June 8, 1620. He entered the priesthood in early life, and lived for a time in solitude. After being for some years cure of Mondeville, in the diocese of Sens, he entered the order of Port-Royal des Champs. Twice he was obliged to leave on account of persecution, and finally, in 1679, went to live at his chateau at Courbeville, where he died Oct. 11, 1690. His writings are, Defense des Religeuses de Port-Royal et de leur Directeurs (1667): — Traites de Piete (1702): — Lettres de Piete et de Morale (1709). He wrote part of the Morale Pratique des Jesuites, and was engaged in the translation of the New Testament by Mons. Besides these, he left many petty works, sermons, and letters.

## Sainte-Valier, Jean Baptiste De Lacroix De[[@Headword:Sainte-Valier, Jean Baptiste De Lacroix De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Grenoble, Nov. 14, 1653. He became chaplain to Louis XIV, and in 1684 was appointed vicar-general of Quebec by bishop Laval. He arrived in Canada July 30, 1685, returned to France Nov. 1687; was consecrated bishop of Quebec, Jan. 25, 1688, and went back to Canada in August of the same year; founded the general hospital at Quebec, was captured by the English at sea while returning from a visit to France, July, 1704, and remained a prisoner until 1709. He died at Quebec, Dec. 26, 1727. He was the author of Etat Present de l'Eglise et de la Colonie Francaise dans la Nouvelle France (1688).

## Saints[[@Headword:Saints]]

             SEE SAINT.

## Saints Days[[@Headword:Saints Days]]

             SEE CALENDAR; SEE FEASTS.

## Saints Relics[[@Headword:Saints Relics]]

             SEE RELICS.

## Saints, Invocation Of[[@Headword:Saints, Invocation Of]]

             SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

## Sair[[@Headword:Sair]]

             SEE SATYR.

## Saitis[[@Headword:Saitis]]

             in Greek mythology, is a surname of Minerva, under which she possessed a temple on the mountain Pontinus, near Lerna, in Argolis. This Saitic worship was doubtless derived from Sais, in Egypt, where the goddess Neith was adored, the latter service being incorporated with that of Minerva by the Greeks.

## Saitons[[@Headword:Saitons]]

             in Prussian mythology, were persons who inflicted wounds on themselves, and spilled their blood in the sacred groves, in order to make atonement to the gods for the sins of other people.

## Saivas[[@Headword:Saivas]]

             the general name given to those among the Hindus who worship Siva the Destroyer, one of the members of the Trimurti. The only form under which this deity is worshipped is that of the Linga, which they adore either in temples, in their houses, or on the side of a sacred stream. “The worship of Siva seems to have been, from a remote period, rather that of the learned and speculative classes than that of the masses of the people. In a renowned work called the Sankaradig-vijaya, or the victory of Sankara over the world, composed by Anandagiri, one of the disciples of Sankara,  several subdivisions of the Saivas are named- — viz. the Saivas, properly so called, who wore the impression of the Linga on both arms; the Raudras, who had a trident stamped on the forehead; the Ugras, who had the drum of Siva on their arms; the Bhaktas, with an impression of the Linga on their foreheads; the Jangamas, who carried a figure of the Linga on their heads; and the Pasupatas, who imprinted the same symbol on the forehead, breast, navel, and arms. The present divisions of the Saivas, however, are the following: the Dandins and Dasnami-Dandins; the Yogins; the Jangamas; the Paramahansas; the Aghorins; the Urdhabahus; the Akasmukhins and Nakhins; the Gudaras; the Rukharas, Sukharas, and Ukharas; the Karalingins; the Bramacharins; and the Nagas.” Each division is characterized by some peculiarities of dress, self-torture, tenets, etc. (see Wilson, Religious Sects of the Hindus [Lond. 1862], 1, 188 sq.).

## Saivo Oiniak[[@Headword:Saivo Oiniak]]

             in Lapp mythology, was a mountain deity worshipped under the symbols of peculiarly shaped stones or mountains.

## Sajotkatta[[@Headword:Sajotkatta]]

             a term given by the North American Indians to those persons who enjoy the special favor of their patron spirits, and are through such aid enabled to discover things that are hidden, to foretell future events, to bewitch other persons, to perform extended journeys in the soul while absent from the body, etc. — in short, the most cunning impostors in the tribes. The Iroquois equivalent for this title is Agottsinnachs, i.e. seers.

## Sakar[[@Headword:Sakar]]

             in Mohammedan writers, is one of the seven hells, which serves as the place in which Parsees are punished for being what they are.

## Saker, Alfred[[@Headword:Saker, Alfred]]

             a missionary to the "Dark Continent," was born in England, July 21, 1814. At the age of twenty-nine he was accepted by the Baptist Missionary Society for the mission on the west coast of Africa. In 1845 Saker settled at King Aqua's Town, the seat of a large tribe, on the left bank of the Cameroons River, and about twenty miles from its mouth. With great difficulty he mastered the Dualla language, spoken by the people among whom he lived. Early in November 1849, he baptized the first convert, and in the afternoon of the day a church was formed, consisting of the missionary and his wife, the native helpers, and the Dualla convert. Mr. Saker translated the Bible into the Dualla language, and died at Victoria, March 13, 1880, having spent thirty-four years in Africa. (B.P.)

## Sakhi Bhavas[[@Headword:Sakhi Bhavas]]

             a Hindu sect who worship Radha as the personification of the Sakti or Krishna. They assume the female garb, and adopt not only the dress and ornaments, but the manners and occupations of women. The sect are held in little estimation, and are very few in number They occasionally lead a mendicant life, but are rarely met with. It is said that the only place where they are to be found in any number is Jaypur. There are a few at Benares, and a few scattered throughout several parts of Bengal.

## Sakhtar[[@Headword:Sakhtar]]

             is the Parsee name for the heaven which encloses the heaven of the fixed stars, and which is immovable and inhabited by Ormuzd alone.

## Sakia[[@Headword:Sakia]]

             in Arabian mythology, is a Mohammedan name for the god of a primeval race of giants and daemons who dwelt in Arabia Petraea, and who drew down rain to the earth.

## Sakin[[@Headword:Sakin]]

             in Scandinavian mythology, is one of the thirty-seven rivers of hell.

## Sakkuto, Abraham Ben-Samuel[[@Headword:Sakkuto, Abraham Ben-Samuel]]

             a learned Jewish writer, was born at Salamanca about A.D. 1450. He was a celebrated astronomer, mathematician, historian, and lexicographer, and his distinguished talents secured for him the professional chair of astronomy at Saragossa. When he had to quit Spain, in 1492, he repaired to Portugal, where king Emmanuel appointed him chronographer and astronomer royal. On the banishment of the Jews from Portugal, he retired to Tunis. It was here that he completed, in 1504, the famous chronicle entitled יוּחֲסַין סֵפֶר(The Book of Genealogies), which comprises a chronological history of the Jews from the creation to A.M. 5260=A.D. 1500. In this elaborate work Sakkuto gives an account of the oral law as transmitted from Moses through the elders, prophets, sages, etc.; the acts and monuments of the kings of Israel, as well as of the surrounding nations, in chronological order; the Babylonian colleges at Sora and Pumbadita; the events which occurred during the period of the second Temple; the different sects of that period — viz. the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Nazarites; the princes of the captivity, and the rectors of the colleges after the close of the Talmud; and the period down to the end of the 15th century. Sakkuto's work, which is an encyclopedia of Jewish literature, was first published at Constantinople (1566): then, with many additions and glosses, at Cracow (1581), Amsterdam (1717), Konigsberg (1857), and from a MS. in the Bodleian Library, with many corrections, additions, etc., by Filipowski (Lond. 1857). Sakkuto also wrote a Rabbinic Aramaic lexicon to the Chaldee paraphrases, the Midrashim, and Talmud, entitled הוֹסָפוֹת לְסֵפֶר הָעָרוּךְ(i.e. Supplements to the Book Aruch), of which an account is  given by Geiger in the Zeitschrift der D. M. G. 12, 144 sq. (Leips. 1858): — מָתוֹה לִנֶּפֶשׁ(Sweet to the Soul), on the future state, the separation of spirit from body, etc. (Constantinople, 1516). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 200 sq.; Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 334; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. p. 706 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews, p. 267; Finn, Sephardim, p. 452; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 284; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literature, p. 451 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9, 18 sq., 418, 458, 474; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 113. (B.P.)

## Saktas[[@Headword:Saktas]]

             the worshippers of the Sakti (q.v.), the female principle, or the divine nature in action, which is personified under different forms, according as the worshippers incline towards the adoration of Vishnu or Siva-Saraswati being the Sakti, or wife, of Brahma; Lakshmi the Sakti, or wife, of Vishnu; and Devi or Durga the Sakti, or wife, of Siva. Since Siva is the type of destruction, his energy, or wife, becomes still more the type of all that is terrific. As a consequence, her worship is based on the assumption that she can be propitiated only by practices which involve the destruction of life, and in which she herself delights. Such a worship leads to brutalism and licentiousness, and it became the worst of all forms which the various aberrations of the Hindu mind assumed. Appealing to the superstitions of the vulgar mind, it has its professors chiefly among the lowest classes. The works from which the tenets and rites of this religion are derived are known by the collective name of Tantras; but as in some of these works the ritual enjoined does not comprehend all the impure practices which are recommended in others, the sect became divided into two leading branches — the Dakshinacharins and Vamacharins, or the followers of the right- hand and left-hand ritual. The Dakshinacharins are the more respectable of the two, although they indulge in practices contrary to the Vedic ritual. The Vamacharins adopt a ritual of the grossest impurities. Their object is, by reverencing Devi, who is one with Siva, to obtain supernatural powers in this life, and to be identified after death with Siva and his consort. The worship of Sakti requires the presence of a female as the living representative and type of the goddess, and is mostly celebrated in a mixed society — the men representing Bhairava (or Siva as the Terrific), and the women Bhairavi (or Sakti as the Terrific). The ceremony generally terminated with the most scandalous orgies among the votaries. The  members of the sect are very numerous, especially among the Brahminical caste. All classes are, however, admissible and equal at these ceremonies. The particular insignia of the Saktas are a semicircular line or lines on the forehead of red sanders or vermilion, or a red streak up the middle of the forehead, with a circular spot of red at the root of the nose. They use a rosary made of the seeds of the el ocarpus or of coral beads, but of no greater length than may be concealed in the hand. In worshipping they wear a piece of red silk round the loins and decorate themselves with garlands of crimson flowers. Two other sects are likewise mentioned as belonging to the Saktas, but it is doubtful whether they are still in existence. See Wilson, Sketch of Religious Sects of the Hindus, 1, 240 sq.

## Sakti[[@Headword:Sakti]]

             the active volition or omnipotent energy of any one of the members of the Hindu Trimurti. It may exist separately from the essence of Deity, and in such a case it is conceived to be invested with a species of personality, and to be capable of exerting an independent agency. When viewed as the cause of phenomena, or sensible appearances, it is called MAYA SEE MAYA (q.v.). The Sakti is worshipped by many Hindus, being personated by a naked female, to whom meat and wine are offered.

## Sakti Sodhana[[@Headword:Sakti Sodhana]]

             a religious ceremony in connection with the Sakti, or personified energy of Deity among the Hindus. The object of worship in this case should be a dancing girl, a harlot, a washer woman, or barber's wife, a female of the Brahminical or Sudra tribe, a flower girl, or a milkmaid. The ceremony is performed at midnight with a party of eight, nine, or eleven couples. Appropriate mantras are to be used, according to the description of the person selected for the Sakti, who is then to be worshipped according to the prescribed form. She is placed disrobed, but richly ornamented, on the left of a circle described for the purpose, with various mantras and gesticulations, and is to be rendered pure by the repetition of different formulas. Being finally sprinkled over with wine, the act being sanctified by the peculiar mantra, the Sakti is now purified; but if not previously initiated, she is further to be made an adept by the communication of the radical mantra whispered thrice in her ear, when the object of the ceremony is complete.

## Sakuntala[[@Headword:Sakuntala]]

             one of the most pleasing female characters of Hindu mythology. She is mentioned as a water nymph in the Yajurveda, is the subject of a beautiful episode of the Mahabharata, and is spoken of in the Puranas. Her name has become specially familiar in Europe through the celebrated drama of Kalidasa, which, introduced to us by Sir William Jones in 1789, became the starting point of Sanscrit philology in Europe.

## Sakyamuni, Or Saint Sakya[[@Headword:Sakyamuni, Or Saint Sakya]]

             a name of Buddha (q.v.), the founder of the Buddhist religion.

## Sala[[@Headword:Sala]]

             (Σαλά), the Greek form (Luk 3:35) of the name of the patriarch SALAH SEE SALAH (q.v.), the father of Eber (Gen 10:24).

## Salaam[[@Headword:Salaam]]

             SEE SALUTATION.

## Salacia[[@Headword:Salacia]]

             in Roman mythology, was a goddess of the salt waters, the wife of Neptune, and mother of Triton.

## Saladin[[@Headword:Saladin]]

             the name given by Western writers to SALAH ED-DIN YUSSEF IBN-AYUB, the sultan of Egypt and Syria, and the founder of the Ayubite dynasty in those countries. As the great Moslem hero of the third crusade, and the beau-ideal of Moslem chivalry, he is one of the most interesting characters presented to us by the history of that period. He belonged to the Kurdish tribe of Ravad, and was born at Tekrit (a town on the Tigris, of which his father, Ayub, was kutwal, or governor, under the Seljuks) in 1137. Following the example of his father and uncle, he entered the service of Noureddin (q.v.), prince of Syria, and accompanied his uncle in his various expeditions to Egypt in command of Noureddin's army. Saladin was at this time much addicted to wine and gambling, and it was not till, at the head of a small detachment of the Syrian army, he was beleaguered in Alexandria by the combined Christians of Palestine and the Egyptians, that he gave indications of possessing the qualities requisite for a great captain. On the  death of his uncle, Shirkoh, Saladin became grand-vizier of the Fatimite caliph, and received the title of El-melek el-nasr, “the Victorious Prince.” But the Christians of Syria and Palestine, alarmed at the elevation of a Syrian emir to supreme power in Egypt, made a combined and vigorous attack on the new vizier. Saladin foiled them at Danietta, and transferred the contest to Palestine, taking several fortresses, and defeating his assailants near Gaza; but about the same time his new-born power was exposed to a still more formidable danger from his master, Noureddin, whose jealousy of the talents and ambition of his able young lieutenant required all the skill and wariness at Saladin's command to allay.

On Noureddin's death in 1174, Saladin began a struggle with his successor, which ended in his establishing himself as the sultan of Egypt and Syria, a title which was confirmed to him by the caliph of Bagdad. The next ten years were occupied in petty wars with the Christians, and in the arrangement and consolidation of his now extensive dominion. The plundering by the Christians of a rich pilgrim caravan on its way to Mecca, an infringement of the treaty with Saladin, brought down upon them the latter's vengeance. Their army suffered a dreadful defeat at Tuberias (July 4, 1187). The king of Jerusalem, the two grand-masters, and many other warriors of high rank were taken captive; Jerusalem was stormed (Oct. 2), and almost every other fortified place in Palestine was taken. The news of this great success of the infidels being brought to Western Europe, aroused the enthusiasm of the Christians to its highest pitch, and a powerful army of crusaders, headed by the kings of France and England, speedily made their appearance on the scene of strife. They captured Acre in 1191, and Richard Coeur-de-Lion, at the head of that portion of the crusading army which adhered to him, continued the war with success, twice defeated Saladin, took Caesarea and Jaffa, and finally obtained a treaty for three years (Aug. 1192), by which the coast from Jaffa to Tyre was yielded to the Christians. In the following year, Saladin died at Damascus of a disease under which he had long suffered. Saladin was not a mere soldier; his wise administration left behind it traces which endured for centuries; and the citadel of Cairo and sundry canals, dikes, and roads are existing evidences of his careful attention to the wants of his subjects. In him the warrior instinct of the Kurd was united to a high intelligence; and even his opponents frankly attribute to him the noblest qualities of mediaeval chivalry, invincible courage, inviolable fidelity to treaties, greatness of soul, piety, justice, and moderation.

## Salagramma[[@Headword:Salagramma]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a stone into which Vishnu was transformed by the curse of a virtuous woman after he had violated her chastity in the guise of her husband.

## Salah[[@Headword:Salah]]

             (Heb. She'lach, שֶׁלִח, something sent forth, as a javelin or a sprout; Sept. and New Test. Σαλά, but Σάλα in 1Ch 1:24; A.V. “Shelah” in 1Ch 1:18; 1Ch 1:24), the only named son of the patriarch Arphaxad, and the father of Eber (Gen 10:24; Gen 11:12-15; 1Ch 1:18; 1Ch 1:24), B.C. cir. 2478. See SALA. “The name is significant of extension, the cognate verb (שָׁלִה) being applied to the spreading out of the roots and branches of trees (Jer 17:8; Eze 17:6). It thus seems to imply the historical fact of the gradual extension of a branch of the Shemitic race from its original seat in Northern Assyria towards the river Euphrates. A place with a similar name in Northern Mesopotamia is noticed by Syrian writers (Knobel, in Genesis 11); but we can hardly assume its identity with the Salah of the Bible. Ewald (Gesch. 1, 354) and Von Bohlen (Introd. to Gels. 2, 205) regard the name as purely fictitious, the former explaining it as a son or offspring, the latter as the father of a race. That the name is significant does not prove it fictitious, and the conclusions drawn by these writers are unwarranted.”

## Salai, Or Salaino, Andrea[[@Headword:Salai, Or Salaino, Andrea]]

             an Italian painter, was born about the year 1500, but the time of his death is not known. From an humble position in the studio of Leonardo da Vinci, he finally became the favorite pupil of his master, and his pictures show the same softness which characterizes those of the great artist. In Milan may be seen his Holy Family and St. John in the Desert, and at Paris an Adoration of the Magi, besides many others scattered through Europe.

## Salamander[[@Headword:Salamander]]

             a kind of imaginary beings belonging rather to the physico-philosophical systems of the Cabalists than to the mythology of any particular people. They were supposed to inhabit fire as their proper element, as the Undines made their home in water; and this idea probably gave rise to the notion that the amphibious, lizard-like reptiles of the species which are dotted  with black, yellow, or red spots are likewise able to resist the destructive power of fire.

## Salaminius[[@Headword:Salaminius]]

             in Greek mythology, is a surname of Jupiter, derived from Salamis, in Cyprus, where a temple was erected to him by Teucer.

## Salamis[[@Headword:Salamis]]

             (Σαλαμίς, perhaps from ἃλς, salt, as being on the sea), a city at the east end of the island of Cyprus, and the first place visited by Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey after leaving the mainland at Seleucia. SEE PAUL. Two reasons why they took this course obviously suggest themselves, viz. the fact that Cyprus (and probably Salamis) was the native place of Barnabas, and the geographical proximity of this end of the island to Antioch. But a further reason is indicated by a circumstance in the narrative (Act 13:5). Here alone, among all the Greek cities visited by Paul, we read expressly of “synagogues” in the plural. Hence we conclude that there were many Jews in Cyprus. This is in harmony with what we read elsewhere. To say nothing of possible mercantile relations in very early times SEE CHITTIM, Jewish residents in the island are mentioned during the period when the Seleucidse reigned at Antioch (1Ma 15:23). In the reign of Augustus, the Cyprian copper mines were farmed to Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant. 1, 4, 5), and this would probably attract many Hebrew families: to which we may add evidence to the same effect from Philo (Legat. ad Caium) at the very time of Paul's journey. Again, at a later period, in the reign of Trajan, we are informed of dreadful tumults here, caused by a vast multitude of Jews, in the course of which “the whole populous city of Salamis became a desert” (Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 3, 111, 112). Hadrian, afterwards emperor, came to the aid of the Cypriots. He overcame the Jews, and expelled them from the island, forbidding any of that nation to approach its coasts; and so strictly was this carried out  that if a Jew were ever cast by shipwreck on the island, he was put to death. We may well believe that from the Jews of Salamis came some of those early Cypriot Christians who are so prominently mentioned in the account of the first spreading of the Gospel beyond Palestine (Act 11:19-20) even before the first missionary expedition. Mnason (Act 21:16) might be one of them. Nor ought Mark to be forgotten here. He was at Salamis with Paul and his own kinsman Barnabas; and again he was there with the same kinsman after the misunderstanding with Paul and the separation (Act 15:39). SEE MARK.

Salamis was not far from the modern Famagosta. Legend ascribed its origin to the Aeacid Teucer. After various fortunes in the connections of the Greek states, it finally fell under the power of the Ptolemies. It was situated on a bight of the coast, a little to the north of a river called the Pediaeus, on low ground, which is, in fact, a continuation of the plain (anciently called Salaminia) running up into the interior towards the place where Nicosia, the present capital of Cyprus, stands. We must notice in regard to Salamis that its harbor is spoken of by Greek writers as very good; and that one of the ancient tables lays down a road between this city and Paphos (q.v.), the next place which Paul and Barnabas visited on their journey. Salamis again has rather an eminent position in subsequent Christian history. Constantine or his successor rebuilt it and called it Constantia, and, while it had this name, Epiphanius was one of its bishops. In the reign of Heraclius the new town was destroyed by the Saracens. SEE CYPRUS.

Very little of the ancient city is now standing; but on the outside of the city recent travelers have seen the remains of a building two hundred feet in length, and six or eight feet high; also a stone church and portions of an aqueduct by which water was brought to the city from a distance of thirty miles. Of the travelers who have visited and described Salamis we must particularly mention Pococke (Descr. of the East, 2, 214) and Ross (Reisen nach Kos, Halikarnassos, Rhodos, und Cypern, p. 118-125). These travelers notice, in the neighborhood of Salamis, a village named St. Sergius, which is doubtless a reminiscence of Sergius Paulus, and a large Byzantine church bearing the name of St. Barnabas, and associated with a legend concerning the discovery of his relics. The legend will be found in Cedrenus (1, 618, ed. Bonn). SEE BARNABAS; SEE SERGIUS PAULUS.  See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. 2, 876 sq; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1, 169; Lewin, St. Paul, 1, 120 sq. On the coins of Salamis, see Eckhel, 3, 87.

## Salamis (2)[[@Headword:Salamis (2)]]

             in Greek mythology, was a daughter of the river god Asopus, whose name was transferred to the island of Salamis, and who became by Neptune the mother of Cychreus.

## Salary[[@Headword:Salary]]

             (Lat. salarium, salt-money, salt being part of the pay of the Roman soldier), an annual or periodical payment for services. Nothing like the provisions of the Levitical law, for the maintenance of the clergy, was known in the primitive Church. The duty, however, of the Church to maintain her religious teachers is implied in the New Test. “The workman is worthy of his meat,” says Christ (Mat 10:10), to which the apostle appeals,”Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel” (1Co 9:14). In the apostolic age the maintenance of the clergy consisted merely in the supply of their personal wants (2Co 11:7-8; Php 4:16-18). There were probably in early times no fixed stipends for the ministers because the Church did not possess property; and when at length specific provision was made for the support of the clergy, it was not by any ordinance of the Church, but by the law of the State. Fees paid to the clergy for services rendered were called sportoe, sportella, and sportule; probably in allusion to the bringing of the first fruits in a basket, sportula. They were not the same as the jura stole, surplice fees (q.v.), which were unknown in the primitive Church. It was an established rule that no fees should be received for religions services. The first departure from it began with the celebration of religious ordinances in a private manner, in which the individual, at whose request this private celebration was performed, was required to pay something as an equivalent for the public and voluntary oblations that would otherwise have been made. So far as the clergy of the primitive Church can be said to have had any salary, it was paid, either according to their necessities or according to some general rule, from the treasury of the Church, which was supplied chiefly from voluntary contributions. Various rules were, from time to time, given for the distribution of funds. One required that they should be divided into three equal parts, one of which was to be paid to the bishops, another to the clergy, and the third was to be expended in making repairs, etc.

In the 4th century the Church and clergy came into the possession of real property. By a law of Constantine in the year 321, the clergy were permitted to receive donations and bequests. Liberal grants were also made  by Constantine and by Gratian, Theodosius the Great, and other emperors. By other means also the revenues of the Church were enriched: 1. On the demolition of heathen temples by Theodosius the Great and his sons, the proceeds were applied to the benefit of the clergy, or appropriated to religious uses. 2. On the same principle, the property belonging to heretics was sequestrated. 3. The property of such clergy as died without heirs, and of all who relinquished their duties without sufficient cause, became the property of the Church. 4. The Church was made heir-at-law of all martyrs and confessors who died without near relations. 5. By tithes and first fruits, which, however, were unknown until the 4th or 5th century. Chlarlemagne first required the payment of tithes by statute law, and enforced the duty by severe penalties. His successors confirmed and completed the system of tithe by law which was subsequently introduced into England and Sweden. In the Eastern Church the support of religion was never legally enforced, but was urged as a religious duty, and tithes were paid as a voluntary offering. See Coleman, Christ. Antiquities, p. 148 sq.

## Salasadai[[@Headword:Salasadai]]

             (Σαλασαδαϊv, v.r. Σαρασαδαϊv, etc., a corruption from the Sept. Σουρισαδαϊv, for Zurishaddai, in Num 1:6), a name given (Jdg 8:1) as that of an Israelite, father of Samael, in the ancestry of Judith (q.v.).

## Salat, Jacob[[@Headword:Salat, Jacob]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher of Germany, was born August 24, 1766. In 1801 he was professor of ethics and pastoral theology at Munich, in 1807 professor of moral philosophy at Landshut, and died in 1851. He published, Die Religionsphilosophie darngestellt (Landshut, 1811): — Grundlinien der Religionsphilosophie (Sulzbach, 1819): — Grundlinien der Moralphilosophie (Munich, 1827): — Versuche uber Supranaturalismus und Mysticismus (Sulzbach, 1823): — Sokrates, oder uber den neuesten Gegensatz zwischen Christenthum und Philosophie (1820): — 1st der Priestercolibat ein Ideal? (Stuttgart, 1833): — Die literarische Stellung der Protestanten zu den Katholiken (1831): — Aufschluss uber den Ultrakatholicismus (1833): — Schelling und Hegel (Heidelberg, 1842). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:285, 288, 370, 375, 466, 723. (B.P.)

## Salathiel[[@Headword:Salathiel]]

             (Heb. Shealtiel', שְּׁאִלְתַּיאֵל, asked of God; Sept. and New Test. Σαλαθιήλ; more correctly, “Shealtiel,” in the A.V. in Ezr 3:2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14; Hag 2:2). It is customary to distinguish two of this name, from the apparent difference of parentage in Matthew 1, 12 and Luke 3, 27, but probably they were one, and the manner of keeping the Jewish records will readily suggest methods of reconciling the passages (comp. Strong, Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16). SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST. Salathiel was the son of Jeconiah, perhaps grandson of Neri (Luk 3:27), and father of Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3, 17; Ezra 3, 2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14; Hag 2:2; Mat 1:12; Luk 3:27. SEE SHEALTIEL.

## Salcah[[@Headword:Salcah]]

             (Heb. Salkah', סִלְכָה, from an Arabic root, signifying migration; Sept. Σελχά, v.r. Σελά, Σεκξαί, Ε᾿λχά, etc.; A.V. “Salchah,” in Deuteronomy 3, 10 [Targum Pseudo-Jon. gives it סלווקיא, i.e. Seleucia; though which Seleucia they can have supposed was here intended it is difficult to imagine]), a city named in the early records of Israel as the extreme limit of Bashan (Deu 3:10; Jos 13:11). This city appears to have been one of the old capitals of Og's kingdom (Jos 12:5). A statement in 1Ch 5:11 seems to show that Salcah was upon the eastern confines of both Manasseh and Gad, although it was really beyond the bounds of Palestine as occupied by the Hebrews. On another occasion the name seems to denote a district rather than a town (Jos 12:5). In later Jewish history the name is never mentioned, and the probability is that the city soon fell into the hands of the original inhabitants. By Eusebius and Jerome it is merely mentioned, apparently without their having had any real knowledge of it.

Salcah is, doubtless, identical with the present town of Sulkhad, which stands at the southern extremity of the Jebel Hauran, twenty miles south of Kunawat (the ancient Kenath), which was the southern outpost of the Leja, the Argob of the Bible. Sulkhad is named by both the Christian and Mohammedan historians of the Middle Ages (Will. of Tyre, 16, 8, “Selcath;” Abulfeda [Tab. Syr. p. 106; also in Schultens's Index Geogr.] “Sarchad”). It was visited by Burckhardt (Syria, Nov. 22, 1810), Seetzen, and others, and more recently by Porter, who describes it at some length (Five Years in Damascus, 2, 176-216). Its identification with Salcah seems to be due to Gesenius (Burckhardt, Reisen, p. 507). Immediately below Sulkhad commences the plain of the great Euphrates desert, which appears to stretch, with hardly an undulation, from here to Busra, on the Persian Gulf. The town is of considerable size, from two to three miles in circumference; it occupies a strong and commanding position on a conical hill. On the summit stands the castle, a circular building of great size and strength, surrounded by a deep moat. The external walls are still tolerably perfect, and were evidently founded not later than the Roman age, though the upper portions are Saracenic. The sides of the cone immediately beneath the walls are steep and smooth, and are covered with light cinders and blocks of lava, showing that it was originally a volcano. The city occupies the lower slopes on the south, extending to the plain. A large  number of the houses are still perfect, with their stone roofs and stone doors, though they have been long deserted. On the walls of the castle, and among the ruins, there are Greek inscriptions, bearing dates equivalent to A.D. 246 and 370; while an Arabic record on the walls of a large mosque shows that it was built in the year A.D. 1224, and a minaret near it about four centuries later. The latter appears to be the newest building in the place. The country round Salcah is now without inhabitants; but traces of former industry and wealth, and of a dense population, are visible. The roads, the fields, the terraces, the vineyards, and the fig-orchards are there, but man is gone. The view from the summit of the castle of Salcah is one of the most remarkable for desolation in all Palestine. See Porter, Handbook for Syria, p. 488; Schwarz, Palestine, p. 222. SEE BASHAN.

## Salchah[[@Headword:Salchah]]

             (Deu 2:10). SEE SALCAH.

## Sale, John[[@Headword:Sale, John]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, and “one of the most heroic evangelists and founders of Western Methodism,” was born in Virginia in 1769. In 1796 he joined the itinerancy, and was sent to Swanino Circuit, “in the wilds of Virginia, where he had his courage and fidelity tested in breasting the dangers and hardships of a pioneer preacher.” His next circuit was the Mattamuskeet, Va.; in 1799 he went to Holston Circuit; in 1803, to the northwestern territory of Virginia, where, for nearly a quarter of a century, he alternated between Ohio and Kentucky, a successful circuit preacher and a commanding presiding elder. He died Jan. 15, 1827, exclaiming, “My last battle is fought, and the victory sure! hallelujah!” Mr. Sale was an eminently useful man, and he adorned every relation that he sustained to the Church. See Minutes of Conferences, 1, 572; Stevens, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 4, 106, 148, 149, 338, 431; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7; Finley, Sketches, p. 185, 186; Bangs, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 2, 111. (J.L.S.)

## Salem[[@Headword:Salem]]

             (Heb. Shalem', שָׁלֵ ם, peaceful, i.e. uninjured, or whole, as often) occurs in a few passages of Scripture, and in several other notices, as the name of one or more places, although some writers doubt whether it should not in  all cases be translated as a simple appellative. It has likewise been usually regarded as commemorated in the name Jerusalen. SEE SHALEM.

1. (Sept. Σαλήμ, and so N.T.) The place of which Melchizedek was king (Gen 14:18; Heb 7:1-2). Some have inferred, from the circumstances of the narrative (e.g. Bochart, Phaleg, 2, 4; Ewald, Gesch. 1, 410), that it lay between Damascus and Sodom; but although it is said that the king of Sodom — who had probably regained his own city after the retreat of the Assyrians went out to meet (לַקְרָאת) Abraham, yet it is also distinctly stated that this was after Abraham had returned (אִחֲרֵי שׁוּבו) from the slaughter of the kings. The only clue is that afforded by the mention of the valley of Shaveh (q.v.), which seems to have been the “King's Dale” near Jerusalem. SEE ABSALOMS PILLAR.

Dr. Wolff, in a striking passage, implies that Salem was — what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews understood it to be — a title, not the name of a place. “Melchizedek of old... had a royal title: he was ‘King of Righteousness' (in Hebrew, Melchi-zedek); he was also ‘King of Peace' (Melek-Salem). When Abraham came to his tent, he came forth with bread and wine, and was called ‘the Priest of the Highest,' and Abraham gave him a portion of his spoil. Just so Wolffs friend, in the desert of Meru, in the kingdom of Khiva ... whose name is Abd-er-Rahman, which means ‘Slave of the merciful God,' ... has also a royal title. He is called Shahe-Adaalat, ‘King of Righteousness' — the same as Melchizedek in Hebrew. When he makes peace between kings, he bears the title Shahe Sulkh, ‘King of Peace' (in Hebrew, Melek-Salem).”

The main opinion, however, current from the earliest ages of interpretation, is that of the Jewish commentators, who, from Onkelos (Targum) and Josephus (War, 6, 10; Ant. 1, 10, 2; 7, 3, 2) to Kalisch (Comm. on Genesis p. 360), with one voice affirm that Salem is Jerusalem, on the ground that Jerusalem is so called in Psa 76:2, the Psalmist, after the manner of poets, or from some exigency of his poem, making use of the archaic name in preference to that in common use (see Reland, Paloestina, p. 833). The Christians of the 4th century held the same belief with the Jews, as is evident from an expression of Jerome (“nostri omnes,” Ep. ad Evangelum, § 7), and Eusebius (in the Onomast. s.v.). Here it is sufficient to say

(1) that Jerusalem suits the circumstances of the narrative rather better than any place farther north, or more in the heart of the country. It would be quite as much in Abraham's road, going from the sources of Jordan to his home under the oaks of Hebron, and it would be more suitable for the visit of the king of Sodom. In fact, we know that, in later times at least, the usual route from Damascus avoided the central highlands of the country and the neighborhood of Shechem, where Salim is now shown (see Pompey's route in Josephus, Ant. 14:3, 4; 4, 1).

(2) It is, perhaps, some confirmation of the identity — at any rate, it is a remarkable coincidence — that the king of Jerusalem in the time of Joshua should bear the title Adoni-zedek — almost precisely the same as that of Melchizedek.

2. Jerome himself, however, is not of the same opinion. He states (Ep. ad Evang. § 7) without hesitation, though apparently (as just observed) alone in his belief, that the Salem of Melchizedek was not Jerusalem, but a town near Scythopolis, which in his day was still called Salem, and where the vast ruins of the palace of Melchizedek were still to be seen. Elsewhere (Onomast. s.v. Salem) he locates it more precisely at eight Roman miles from Scythopolis, and gives its then name as Salumias. Further, he identifies this Salem with the Salim (q.v.) (Σαλείμ) of John the Baptist. That a Salem existed where Jerome thus places it there need be no doubt; indeed, the name has been recovered at the identical distance below Beisan by Van de Velde, at a spot otherwise suitable for Aenon. But that this Salem, Salim, or Salumias was the Salem of Melchizedek is even more uncertain than that Jerusalem was so. The ruins were probably as much the ruins of Melchizedek's palace as the remains at Ramet el-Khalil, three miles north of Hebron, are those of “Abraham's house.” Nor is the decision assisted by a consideration of Abraham's homeward route. He probably brought back his party by the road along the Ghor as far as Jericho, and then, turning to the right, ascended to the upper level of the country in the direction of Mamre; but whether he crossed the Jordan at the Jisr Benat Yakub, above the Lake of Gennesaret, or at the Jisr Mejamia, below it, he would equally pass by both Scythopolis and Jerusalem. At the same time, it must be confessed that the distance of Salem (at least eighty miles from the probable position of Sodom) makes it difficult to suppose that the king of Sodom can have advanced so far to meet Abraham, adds its weight to the statement that the meeting took place after Abraham had returned — not  during his return, and is thus so far in favor of Salem being Jerusalem. SEE MELCHIZEDEK.

3. Professor Ewald (Geschichte, 1, 410, note) pronounces that Salem is a town on the further side of Jordan, on the road from Damascus to Sodom, quoting at the same time Joh 3:23; but there seems to be no authority for this, nor any notice of the existence of the name in that direction either in former or recent times.

4. A tradition given by Eupolemus, a writer known only through fragments preserved in the Proeparatio Evangelica of Eusebius (9, 17), differs in some important points from the Biblical account. According to this, the meeting took place in the sanctuary of the city Argarizin, which is interpreted by Eupolemus to mean “the Mountain of the Most High.” “Argarizin” (Pliny uses nearly the same form — Argaris, H.N. 5, 14) is, of course, har-Gerizzim, Mount Gerizim. The source of the tradition is, therefore, probably Samaritan, since the encounter of Abraham and Melchizedek is one of the events to which the Samaritans lay claim for Mount Gerizim. But it may also proceed from the identification of Salem with Shechem, which, lying at the foot of Gerizim, would easily be confounded with the mountain itself. SEE SHALEM.

5. A Salem is mentioned in Jdg 4:4 among the places which were seized and fortified by the Jews on the approach of Holofernes. “The valley of Salem,” as it appears in the A.V. (τὸν αὐλῶνα Σαλήμ), is possibly, as Reland has ingeniously suggested (Paloest. p. 977), a corruption of εἰς αὐλῶνα εἰς Σαλήμ — “into the plain to Salem.” If Αύλών is here, according to frequent usage, the Jordan valley, then the Salem referred to must surely be that mentioned by Jerome and already noticed. But in this passage it may be with equal probability the broad plain of the Mukhna which stretches from Ebal and Gerizim, on the one hand, to the hills on which Salim stands, on the other, which is said to be still called the “plain of Salim” (Porter, Handbook, p. 340 a), and through which runs the central north road of the country. Or, as is perhaps still more likely, it refers to another Salim near Zerin (Jezreel), and to the plain which runs up between those two places as far as Jenin, and which lay directly in the route of the Assyrian army. There is nothing to show that the invaders reached as far into the interior of the country as the plain of the Mukhna. The other places enumerated in the verse seem, as far as they can be recognized, to be points which guarded the main approaches to the interior (one of the  chief of which was by Jezreel and Engannin), not towns in the interior itself, like Shechem or the Salem near it. SEE JUDITH, BOOK OF.

6. (Sept. ἐν εἰρήνῃ; Vulg. in pace), Psa 76:2. It seems to be agreed on all hands that Salem is here employed for Jerusalem, but whether as a mere abbreviation to suit some exigency of the poetry and point the allusion to the peace (shalom) which the city enjoyed through the protection of God, or whether, after a well known habit of poets, it is an antique name preferred to the more modern and familiar one, is a question not yet decided. The latter is the opinion of the Jewish commentators, but it is grounded on their belief that the Salem of Melchizedek was the city which afterwards became Jerusalem. (See above.) See a remarkable passage in Geiger's Urschrift, etc. p. 74-76. The antithesis in Psa 76:1 between “Judah” and “Israel” might seem to some to imply that some sacred place in the northern kingdom is here contrasted with Zion, the sanctuary of the south. If there were in the Bible any sanction to the identification of Salem with Shechem (noticed above), the passage might be taken as referring to the continued relation of God to the kingdom of Israel. But the parallelism is rather one of agreement than contrast. Hence, Zion the sanctuary being named in the one member of the verse, it is tolerably certain that Salem, in the other, must denote the same city SEE JERUSALEM.

## Salema[[@Headword:Salema]]

             in Arabic mythology, is the god of health worshipped by a race of giants who are said to have inhabited Arabia.

## Sales, Francis De[[@Headword:Sales, Francis De]]

             SEE FRANCIS OF SALES.

## Salesians[[@Headword:Salesians]]

             an order of recluse nuns, otherwise known as Visitants. Its founder was count Francis of Sales (q.v.), who conceived the idea of providing an asylum for widows and other females in distress, and of devoting them to the service of the sick and to a religious life. A vision encouraged him to carry forward his purpose, and the active cooperation of a noble widow (saint), Francisca du Chantal, enabled him to succeed. The order of the Visitation of Mary, or Salesians, was the result. The first house for their  use was secured in 1610, at Annecy, and the second in 1615, at Lyons. Their rules (given by St. Francis) were mild, and intended rather to promote spiritual dispositions and works of mercy than to encourage outward asceticism. The sisters were required to take only the simple vows; strict retirement was imposed only during the period of the novitiate; their apparel was not required to be different from that of ordinary females, except that it should be of black color and modest appearance. In 1618 pope Paul V raised the congregation into an order De Visitatione B.V.M. under the rule of St. Augustine, and conferred on it all the privileges accorded to other religious orders, making its special mission the training of female children. The convents were placed under the supervision of the diocesan bishops by the will of their founder. Their number increased rapidly, the first being established at Paris, in 1619; thirteen before Francis died in 1622, and eighty-seven during the life of mother du Chantal (died 1641). The order gradually spread also over Italy, Germany, Poland, Austria, Switzerland, Syria, and North America. It is now one of the most important in the Roman Catholic Church, having one hundred convents with at least three thousand inmates.

The members of the order are classed as choristers, associates, and house companions, the first of which classes performs the duties of the choir, while the last takes charge of the domestic administration of the house. The modern rule is not especially strict, but few special fasts being prescribed. The habit of the order is black, with a black band crossing the forehead, and a small white breast-cloth pendent from the neck, under which a silver cross is suspended from a black band.

## Salganeus[[@Headword:Salganeus]]

             in Greek mythology, is an appellative of Apollo, derived from the Boeotian town of the same name.

## Salian, Jacques[[@Headword:Salian, Jacques]]

             a learned French Jesuit, was born at Avignon in 1557. He was admitted in 1578 into the Institute of St. Ignatius, where he taught theology, and also in the province of Lyons. He was rector of the College of Besaneon, and while on a visit to Paris died of apoplexy, Jan. 23, 1640. His principal work is entitled Annales Ecclesiastici V.T. (1619).

## Salians[[@Headword:Salians]]

             SEE SALESIANS.

## Salier, Jacques[[@Headword:Salier, Jacques]]

             a French theologian, was born at Saulien in the year 1615. He belonged to the order of the Minimes. After having taught theology, he became provincial, and finally assistant of the general of his order. He died at Dijon, Aug. 20, 1707. He wrote, De Eucharisticis (1687): — Cacocephalus (1694): — Pensees sur le Paradis et sur l'Ame Raisonnable, in which there is very little about paradise.

## Salig, Christian August[[@Headword:Salig, Christian August]]

             a German theologian of great learning and mystical tendency, was born near Magdeburg, April 6, 1692. His father, a pastor, instructed him in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In 1707 he bealan to study at Halle, and heard lectures from A.H. Franke, P. Anton, Christian Wolf, and others, also taking frequent part in public disputations against Socinianism and Romanism. From 1710 to 1712 he studied at Jena, under J.F. Buddaeus, J.A. Danz, and others, and took his master's degree. In 1714 he delivered lectures, philosophical, theological, and historical, at Halle. The same year he published Philosophumena Veterum et Recentiorum de Anima et ejus Immortalitate, at Halle, a work which drew to him the attention of Thomasius. In 1717 he became conrector of the school at Wolfenbuttel, and entered upon his duties with a dissertation, De Nexu Corruptionis ac Instaurationis Ecclesioe ac Scholarum. Here the excellent library furnished him welcome means of productive study. In 1723 he issued his work De Eutychianismo ante Eutychem, in which he treated also of the history of Nestorianism. For this work he was fiercely accused of Nestorianism himself. The second centenary of the Augsburg Confession occasioned the preparation of Salig's masterwork, a complete history of the Augsburg Confession and Apology (Halle, 1730). In 1733 he issued an additional work on the history of Protestantism outside of Lutheranism. In 1735 he published an account of the inner growth and strifes of Lutheranism, which was bitterly assailed because of its frank presentation of men and things as they actually were. As a continuation of his labors in the same field, he undertook a complete history of the Council of Trent, but did not live to finish it. He died at Wolfenbuittel in 1735. He wrote, also, Nodus  Proedestinationis Solutus. See Ballenstedt, De Vita et Obitu C.A. Saligii (Helmst. 1738); Herzog, Real-Encylk. 13, 323-325. (J.P.L.)

## Salii[[@Headword:Salii]]

             were priests of Mars Gradivus, and are said to have been instituted by Numa. They were twelve in number, chosen from the patriarchs, and had charge of the sacred shields (ancilia). which were kept in the Temple of Mars on the Palatine Hill. The distinguishing dress of the salii was an embroidered tunic bound with a brazen belt, the trabea, and the apex, also worn by the flamines. Each had a sword by his side, and in his right hand a spear or staff. The festival of Mars was celebrated by the salii on the 1st of March, and for several successive days, on which occasion they were accustomed to go through the city in their official dress, carrying the ancilia, singing and dancing. The members of the collegium were elected by co-optation. Tullus Hostilius established another collegium of salii. These were twelve in number, were chosen from the patricians, and appear to have been dedicated to the service of Quirinus. They were called the Salii Collini, Agonales, or Agonenses.

## Salim[[@Headword:Salim]]

             (Σαλείμ v.r. Σαλλειμ; Vulg. Salim), a place named (Joh 3:23) to denote the situation of Aenon, the scene of John's last baptisms — Salim being the well known town or spot, and Aenon a place of fountains, or other water, near it. Christ was in Judaea (Joh 3:22), and the whole scope of the passage certainly conveys the impression that John was near him, and consequently Salim was either in Judaea or close to its borders. The only direct testimony we possess is that of Eusebius and Jerome, who both affirm unhesitatingly (Onom. “Aenon”) that it existed in their day near the Jordan, eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis. Jerome adds (under “Salem”) that its name was then Salumias. Elsewhere (Ep. ad Evangelum, § 7, 8) he states that it was identical with the Salem of Melchizedek. A tradition is mentioned by Reland (Paloestina, p. 978) that Salim was the native place of Simon Zelotes. This in itself seems to imply that its position was, at the date of the tradition, believed to be nearer to Galilee than to Judsea. Various attempts have been more recently made to determine the locality of this interesting spot, but the question can hardly yet be regarded as definitely settled.

1. Some (as Alford, Greek Test. ad loc.) propose Shilhim and Ain, in the arid country far in the south of Judaea, entirely out of the circle of associations of John or our Lord. Others identify it with the Shalim of 1Sa 9:4; but this latter place is itself unknown, and the name in Hebrew contains ע, to correspond with which the name in John should be Σεγαλείμ or Σααλείμ.

2. Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Researches, 3, 333) suggests the modern village of Salim, three miles east of Nablufs; but this is no less out of the circle of John's ministrations, and is too near the Samaritans; and although there is some reason to believe that the village contains “two sources of living water” (ibid. p. 298), yet this is hardly sufficient for the abundance of deep water implied in the narrative. A writer in the Colonial Ch. Chronicles No. 126, 464, who concurs in this opinion of Dr. Robinson, was told of a village an hour east (?) of Salim “named Ain-un, with a copious stream of water.” Lieut. Conder says (Tent Work in Palestine, 1, 92) that Wady Farah, in the locality in question, contains a succession of little but perennial springs, from which the water gushes out in a fine stream over a stony bed, and that the village of Ain-un lies five miles north of the stream.

3. Dr. Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 564) is filled with an “assured conviction” that Salim is to be found in Wady Seleim, and Aenon in the copious springs of Ain Farah (ibid. p. 559), among the deep and intricate ravines some five miles northeast of Jerusalem. This certainly has the name in its favor, and, if the glowing description and pictorial wood-cut of Dr. Barclay may be trusted, has water enough (ὕδατα πολλά) and of sufficient depth for the purpose. But the proximity to Jerusalem is a decided objection. SEE ENON.

4. There is said to be a village called Salim in the plain of Mukhna, east of Nablis, which is probably the Shalem of Gen 33:18 (Porter, Handbook, p. 340; Robinson, Bibl. Researches, 2, 279); but it is too far north to suit the Gospel narrative; and, besides, it cannot be said of it “there is much water there.” SEE SHALEM.

5. The name of Salim has been lately discovered by Van de Velde (Syr. and Pal. 2, 345) in a position exactly in accordance with the notice of Eusebius, viz. six English miles south of Beisan and two miles west of the Jordan. On the northern base of Tell Redghah is a site of ruins, and near it a Mussulman tomb, which is called by the Arabs Sheik Salim (see also  Memoir, p. 345). Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Researches, 3, 333) complains that the name is attached only to a Mussulman sanctuary, and also that no ruins of any extent are to be found on the spot; but with regard to the first objection, even Dr. Robinson does not dispute that the name is there, and that the locality is in the closest agreement with the notice of Eusebius. As to the second, it is only necessary to point to Kefr-Saba, where a town (Antipatris), which so late as the time of the destruction of Jerusalem was of great size and extensively fortified, has absolutely disappeared. The career of the Baptist has been examined in a former part of this work, and it has been shown with great probability that his progress was from south to north, and that the scene of his last baptisms was not far distant from the spot indicated by Eusebius, and now recovered by Van de Velde. SEE JOHN; SEE JORDAN. Salim fulfils also the conditions implied in the name of Aenon (springs), and the direct statement of the text that the place contained abundance of water. “The brook of Wady Chusneh runs close to it, a splendid fountain gushes out beside the Wely, and rivulets wind about in all directions.... Of few places in Palestine could it so truly be said, ‘Here is much water'” (Syr. and Pal. 2, 346). Drake, however, avers that “inquiries of the Arabs and fellahin of the district resulted in not a man of them even having heard of either of these places,” i.e. Bir Salim and Sheik Salim (Quar. Report of the Pal. Explor. Fund, Jan. 1875, p. 82). SEE SALEM.

## Salim (2)[[@Headword:Salim (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 1:92) advocates the position of this place at Salim, four miles east of Nablufs, urging the abundance of water there, and the presence of a village, Ainun (AEnon), seven and a half miles to the north-east; and Tristram (Bible Places, page 192) likewise accepts this situation for similar reasons, adding that "it is close to one of the old main  lines of road from Jerusalem to Galilee." "The head-springs are found in an open valley surrounded by desolate and shapeless hills. The water gushes out over a stony bed, and flows rapidly down in a fine stream surrounded by bushes of oleander. The supply is perennial, and a continual succession of little springs occurs along the bed of the valley, so that the current becomes the principal western affluent of Jordan south of the Vale of Jezreel. The valley is open in most parts of its course, and we find the the wo requisites for the scene of baptism of a multitude — an open space and abundance of water" (Conder). Salim itself is described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:230) as "a small village, resembling the rest, but evidently ancient, having rock-cut tombs, cisterns, and a tank. Olive-trees surround it; on the north are two springs, three quarters of a mile from the village."

## Salimbeni, Arcangelo[[@Headword:Salimbeni, Arcangelo]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Sienna, and flourished from the year 1557 to 1579. He was a pupil of Sozzi, and enriched his native town with a great number of pictures. His best are a Holy Family and a Martyrdom of St. Peter.

## Salimbeni, Simondio[[@Headword:Salimbeni, Simondio]]

             son of the following, was born in 1597, and died in 1643. In one of the churches in Sienna are four frescos by this artist.

## Salimbeni, Ventura[[@Headword:Salimbeni, Ventura]]

             called the Cavaliere Bevilacqua, son of Arcangelo, was born at Sienna in 1567. He studied with his father, and at last went to Rome, where he executed many of his best frescos. The number of these is very large, and in the church of St. Catharine at Sienna are some of the finest. At Florence  may be seen his Apparition of St. Michael, and in Vienna a Holy Family. He died in 1613.

## Salisbury, John[[@Headword:Salisbury, John]]

             SEE JOHN OF SALISBURY.

## Salisbury, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Salisbury, Nathaniel]]

             a Methodist minister, was born in Vermont in 1794, and converted in Scipio, Tompkins County, N.Y., at the age of twenty-five years. He was admitted into the Genesee Conference on trial in 1822, ordained deacon in 1824, and elder in 1826. He was employed on circuits eleven years, on stations seventeen years, and on districts, as presiding elder, fifteen years, and was on the superannuated list eleven years. He was in 1832 a member of the General Conference from the Oneida Conference. He was a man of fine preaching abilities, a safe counsellor, and was greatly beloved by the people. He died in Rome, N.Y., Feb. 18, 1876. See Minutes of Conferences, 1876, p. 63.

## Salius[[@Headword:Salius]]

             in Greek mythology, was one of the companions of Eneas, who secured a prize, consisting of the skin of a lion, in the races.

## Salkeld, John[[@Headword:Salkeld, John]]

             who flourished from 1575 to 1659, was educated partly at Oxford, and, after being for many years a Jesuit in Spain and Portugal, was converted by the eloquence of James I, and by him made vicar of Wellington, Somersetshire. From 1635 to 1645 he was minister of the church at Taunton, Devonshire, from which he was ejected in the civil wars. He published, A Treatise of Angels (Lond. 1613, 8vo): — Treatise of Paradise, of the Serpent, Cherubim, etc. (1617, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Salkinson, Isaac E[[@Headword:Salkinson, Isaac E]]

             a missionary among the Jews, and an excellent Hebrew scholar, who died June 15, 1883, at Presburg, in the employ of the British Society for Jewish Missions, is the author of a Hebrew translation of Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation (Altona, 1858). Besides translating into Hebrew Milton's Paradise Lost, Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, he published The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, translated from the original Greek (Edinburgh, 1855). At the time of his death lie had finished a Hebrew translation of the New Test., which was edited by Dr. Ch. D. Ginsburg of England, and published at the expense of the English Trinitarian Bible Society at the imperial press of K. Fromme, in Vienna. The translation has been made in "classical Hebrew idiom," but "in seeking for elegance of language, exegetical and historical correctness, which are always closely connected with correctness of language, has been lost." See Theologisches Literaturblatt (Leipsic, 1885, Nos. 45, 46, 47). (B.P.)

## Sallai[[@Headword:Sallai]]

             (Heb. סִלִּי, Sallay', perhaps lifted up, from סָלִל, salal; or basket-maker; Sept. Σηλεί, Σαλαϊv, v.r. Σηλί), the name of two Hebrews.

1. One of the leaders of the sons of Benjamin, who settled at Jerusalem with 928 tribesmen on the return from captivity (Neh 11:8), B.C. cir. 459.

2. One of the chiefs of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:20), B.C. cir. 459. He is elsewhere (Neh 12:7) called SALLU (q.v.).

## Salle, John Baptist De La[[@Headword:Salle, John Baptist De La]]

             founder of the order of Christian Brothers, was born at Rheims, France, April 30, 1651. At the age of seventeen he was made canon of the Cathedral of his native city, and after studying some time at the Sulpician Seminary in Paris, he took the degree of doctor of divinity, and was ordained priest in 1678. He died in Rouen, April 9, 1719. The order which he established is devoted to teaching, especially among the poorer classes. He introduced the mutual simultaneous method of instruction, and also composed a treatise on school government. The order was approved by Benedict XIII, and has thousands of schools, and first-class colleges at Passy, near Paris, at Marseilles, Manhattanville, N.Y., St. Louis, Baltimore, etc. Baptist de la Salle was declared venerable by Gregory XVI, May 8, 1840, and beatified by Pius IX in 1873. See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1873, page 88.

## Sallu[[@Headword:Sallu]]

             the name of two Hebrews, differently spelled in the original.

1. (Heb. סִלּוּא, Sallu' [ סִלֻּאin Neh 11:7], weighed; Sept. Σαλώ, v.r. Σηλώ, Σαλώμ.) A Benjaminite, son of Meshullam, dwelling in Jerusalem after the return from exile (Neh 11:7; 1Ch 9:7), B.C. cir. 459.

2. (Heb. סִלּוּ, Sallu', weighed; Sept. Σαλού v.r. Σαλλουαϊv.) Another name (Neh 12:7) for SALLAI (Neh 12:20), No. 2 (q.v.).

## Sallumus[[@Headword:Sallumus]]

             (Σαλλοῦμος v.r. Σαλοῦμος), a Graecized form (1Es 9:25) of the name SHALLUM SEE SHALLUM (q.v.) of the Heb. (Ezr 10:24).

## Salma[[@Headword:Salma]]

             (Heb. שִׂלְמָא, Salma', a garment; Sept. Σαλμάν, Σαλωμών, v.r. Σαλμών), the name of two men.

1. An ancestor of David and Christ (1 Chronicles 2, 11); elsewhere SALMON SEE SALMON (q.v.).

2. The second-named of three sons of Caleb the son of Hur, called the “father” (i.e. founder) of Bethlehem and of the Netophathites (1Ch 2:51; 1Ch 2:54), B.C. ante 1500. Lord Hervey (Genealogy of Our Lord, ch. 4, 9) confounds this person with the preceding (see Keil, ad loc.).

## Salmacis[[@Headword:Salmacis]]

             in Greek mythology, was the nymph of a fountain of the same name in Caria. She loved Hermaphroditus, the son of Mercury and Venus, who was possessed of extraordinary beauty; but he avoided her and despised her  prayers. She therefore seized him in her embraces at a time when he was bathing in her fountain, and besought the gods to join her inseparably with him in case he should not listen to her plea. The prayer was heard, and Hermaphroditus, previously a man, thereafter united both the sexes in his person.

## Salmanasar[[@Headword:Salmanasar]]

             (Vulg. Salmanasar, for the Gr. text is lost), a less correct form (2Es 13:40) of the name of the Assyrian king SHALMANESER SEE SHALMANESER (q.v.).

## Salmanticani[[@Headword:Salmanticani]]

             (sc. theologi), a collection of theological “Summae” emanating from the college of Discalceate Carmelites at Salamanca, and highly esteemed in the Roman Catholic Church. The work, inl arrangement and execution, is wholly in the style of Thomas Aquinas, and its teaching is emphatic in defending the views of the Angelical Doctor to the utmost, particularly with reference to the doctrine of grace. Its authors directed their argument especially against the system of Molina, SEE MOLINA, LUIS, which was then a subject of controversy. In this course they were supported by the whole weight of the University of Salamanca, which not only clung to the Thomist doctrines in their utmost strictness, but whose faculty bound itself with a unanimous oath to present only the doctrines of Augustine and Aquinas in their public lectures. A work containing the philosophical system of Aquinas had previously been issued by the Barefooted Carmelites of the College of Alcala, under the title Complutensis Artium Cursus, which served as a preliminary to the Salmantican theology. The authors of the above works are not definitely known, though Antonius, in Bibl. Hispan., mentions a Carmelite father Antonius as the principal author of both a statement which is disproved by the preface to the Theology. The first volume of the Salmantican theologians appeared in 1631, and nine volumes are now known to exist (Pfaff, Introd. in Hist. Theol. Literar. p. 203, mentions ten), the last of which contains the tract De Incarnatione.

A smaller work on moral theology, Cursus Theol. Moralis (Venet. 1728, complete in 6 vols.), was published by the same order and school, whose authors were, without exception, Probabilists. SEE PROBABILISM. Their names are given in the book. The work has been highly commended by Roman Catholic theologians in the department of morals, e.g. by Gury.

## Salmasius, Claudius[[@Headword:Salmasius, Claudius]]

             (Claude de Saumaise), one of the greatest French scholars of the 17th century, was born at Semur-en-Auxois, in Burgundy, April 15, 1588. His father, a jurist, gave him the first elements of his classic knowledge; his mother, a Calvinist, impressed upon him her practical religion. At the age of ten he wrote Latin and Greek. At sixteen he went to the University of Paris, and was greatly stimulated by intercourse with those great classic scholars, Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon. To his Greek and Latin he now added Hebrew, Arabic, and Coptic, which he learned without a teacher. In 1606 he resorted to the University of Heidelberg to study jurisprudence under Gothofredus, but he found the most attraction in the rich library, and especially in its rare manuscripts. He now gave up jurisprudence as a specialty, and devoted himself to universal erudition. At the age of twenty-one he brought out his richly annotated edition of Florus, a work which gave him a name among the scholars of the age. In 1611 he printed at Paris his Scriptores Historioe Augustoe. In 1623 he married, and lived for some years near Paris, working upon his essays on Pliny I and Solinus. They appeared in Paris in 1629 in two folio volumes, under the title Plinianioe Dissertationes in Caii Julii Solini Polyhistora, and obtained for their author wide fame and calls to many foreign universities. In 1632 he accepted an honorary professorship at Leyden, with a comfortable pension, devoting himself to erudite labor, and declining many tempting invitations to return to France. Even the offer by Riclelieu of six times as great a salary if he would come to Paris and become the great statesman's biographer was respectfully declined, with the remark that he could not consent to devote his pen to the work of flattery. His work on the primacy of the pope (1645) involved him in trouble with the Roman clergy; but the consequences of his Defensio Regia pro Carolo Psrimo (Leyden, 1649), which he had written at the request of the banished king Charles It, were much more serious, for it not only called forth the able and passionate rejoinder of Milton, Defensio pro Populo Anglicano (1650), but it brought upon its author the disapproval of his republican patrons in Holland. Wounded at this, Salmasius hastily accepted an invitation of Christina of Sweden to enter her service; but, his expectations not being met, he returned to Holland in 1651. But his health was now completely broken. Salmasius became a Protestant at Heidelberg while still a youth, and held fast to his faith at no little self-sacrifice throughout life. He died at Spa Sept. 6, 1653, and was buried at Maestricht. Among his writings  which bear upon religion, we may mention De Episcopis et Presbyteris: — De Coesarie Virorum et Muliesrum Coma: — Super Herodis Infanticida: — De Transubstantione: — De Cruce et Hyssopo. See Papillon, Bibliotheque des Auteurs de Bourgogne; Paquot, Memoires; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 328-331. (J.P.L.)

## Salmeggia, Enea[[@Headword:Salmeggia, Enea]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Bergamo. He was a pupil of Campi at Cremona, afterwards went to Rome, and for fourteen years gave himself to the study of the works of Raffaelle. His works show the effect of this study. Many of his pictures are at Bergamo, but the best may be seen in Milan, as St. Victor, Christ in the Garden, and others. He died in 1626.

## Salmeron, Alphonso[[@Headword:Salmeron, Alphonso]]

             one of the original six who associated themselves with Loyola in founding the Society of Jesus. He was born at Toledo in 1515. Having learned the ancient languages at Alcala. he repaired to the University of Paris to study philosophy and theology. There he became attached to Loyola, and was soon one of his most zealous and efficient disciples. Subsequently he visited Italy, and promoted the cause of the new order by enthusiastic public labors of every kind. His talent for controversy was of a high order. The pope rewarded his zeal by conferring on him the title of Apostolic Nuncio of Ireland. He was charged by the popes Paul III, Julius IlI, and Pins IV with the function of papal theologian and orator at the Council of Trent. In cooperation with Lainez, he prepared a statement of the so called erroneous teachings of the Reformers, accompanying each one with citations from the fathers, popes, and councils which refuted and condemned them. After the Council of Trent he returned to Italy, and retired into the college which he had founded at Naples. There, as president of the provincial section of his order in Naples, he closed his days, in 1585, combating all forms of heresy, and preparing his extensive commentary on the Bible. His works were published, in sixteen volumes folio, at Madrid, Mantua, Brixen, and Cologne (1597-1612). Some of the titles of the separate volumes are, Prolegomenon in Universam Scripturama: — De Incarnatione Verbi: — De Sermone Domini in Monte: — De Christi Miraculis: — De Passione et Morte Domini: — De Resurrectione et Ascensione Domini. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 331. (J.P.L.)

## Salmon[[@Headword:Salmon]]

             the name of a man and of a hill.

1. (Heb. Salmon', שִׂלְמוֹן, clothing, Rth 4:21, Sept. Σαλμών v.r. Σαλμάν; but Salima', שִׂלְמָא, id. 1Ch 2:11, Sept. Σαλμάν v.r. Σαλωμών, A.V. “Salma;” and Salmah', שִׂלְמָה, id. Rth 4:20, Sept. Σαλμών v.r. Σαλμάν, A.V. “Salmon;” N.T. Σαλμών). The son of Nahshon and the ancestor of Boaz, of the family of Judah and David (Rth 4:20-21; 1Ch 2:11; Mat 1:4-5; Luk 3:32). B.C. cir. 1660. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

2. (Heb. Tsalmon, (צִלְמוֹן, shady.) A place named (Psa 68:14) as a battlefield, apparently during the Israelites' conquest of Canaan; probably the Mount ZALMON SEE ZALMON (q.v.) elsewhere (Jdg 9:48) referred to.

## Salmon, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Salmon, Nathaniel]]

             an English clergyman and physician, son of the Rev. Thomas Salmon, was educated at Cambridge. He entered holy orders, but after a while abandoned the clerical profession for that of medicine, in the practice of which, and in the study of antiquities, he passed the remainder of his life. He died April 2, 1742. His principal works were, Lives of the English Bishops (Lond. 1733, 8vo): — History of Hertfordshire (ibid. 1728); and others on history and antiquities.

## Salmone[[@Headword:Salmone]]

             (Σαλμώνη, of unknown etymology), a promontory in Crete, apparently forming the northeast point of the island, mentioned thus in the narrative of Paul's voyage and shipwreck: “When we had scarce come over against Cnidus, the wind not suffering us, we sailed under Crete, over against Salmone” (Act 27:7). Capt. Smith (of Jordanhill) has shown the naturalness and accuracy of this notice in his own peculiar way. The direct course of the ship, he states, from Myra to Italy, after reaching Cnidus, lay by the north side of Crete; but the wind at the time did not suffer that, blowing, as he shows, from a point somewhat to the west of northwest — a wind very prevalent. in the Archipelago in late summer. Then he says,  “With northwest winds the ship could work up from Myra to Cnidus; because, until she reached that point, she had the advantage of a weather shore, under the lee of which she would have smooth water and a westerly current; but it would be slowly and with difficulty. At Cnidus that advantage ceased; and unless she had put into that harbor and waited for a fair wind, ler only course was to run under the lee of Crete, κατὰ Σαλμώνην, in the direction of Salmone, which is the eastern extremity of that island” (Paul's Voyage and Shipwreck, ch. 2). They passed the point, the evangelist says, with some difficulty; and the same modern writer mentions the case of a squadron (a portion of the British fleet from Abukir) which tried to take the same course, but had the wind too westerly to admit of their doing so (see Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 191). SEE SHIPWRECK (of St. Paul).

The classical name for the headland is Salmonium, Sammoninum, or Samonium (Σαλμώνιον, Σαμμώνιον, Σαμώνιον, Ptolem. 3, 15, § 5; Strabo, 2, 106; 10:474, 475, 478, 489; comp. Pomp. Mela, 2, 7, § 12; Pliny, 4, 20, § 21). The name Point Salomon is now usually applied to the end of Cape Sidero, the easternmost extreme of Crete (Hock, Creta, 1, 427); but Spratt (Researches in Crete [Lond. 1865]) thinks it is rather a southern extension of that headland called Cape Plaka. SEE CRETE.

## Salmoneus[[@Headword:Salmoneus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a son of Aeolus and Enarete, and brother of Sisyphus. He was king in Elis (where he built Salmone), and husband, first of Alcidice, the mother of Tyro, and afterwards of Sidero. Such was his vanity that he demanded to be recognized and worshipped as Jupiter, and that, to deceive the populace, he attempted to imitate the lightnings of Jove by causing flaming torches to be thrown about him, and the thunders of the god by driving over sounding bridges of brass with heavy war chariots. or by dragging vessels filled with air behind his chariot. He was even charged with having murdered people, that he might pretend that they had fallen beneath his thunderbolts. Jupiter at length became wearied of his madness, and smote him with his bolt, besides destroying the entire city of Salmone.

## Salom[[@Headword:Salom]]

             (Σαλώμ), a Greek form in the Apocrypha,  (a) incorrectly (1Ma 2:26), for SALU SEE SALU (q.v.), the father of Zimri (Num 25:14);

(b) less correctly (Bar 1:7), for SHALLUM SEE SHALLUM (q.v.), the father of Hilkiah (1Ch 6:13).

## Salome[[@Headword:Salome]]

             (Σαλώμη, from the Heb. שָׁלוֹ ם, i.e. peaceful), the name of several women mentioned or alluded to in the N.T. and by Josephus.

1. Called also Alexandra, the wife of Aristobulus I, king of the Jews, on whose death (B.C. 106) she released her brothers, who had been thrown by him into prison, and advanced the eldest of them (Alexander Jannaeus) to the throne (Josephus, Ant. 13:12, 1; War, 1, 4, 1). By some she has been identified with Alexandra, the wife of Alexander Jannseus. SEE ALEXANDRA.

2. A daughter of Antipater by his wife Cypros, and sister of Herod the Great, one of the most wicked of women. She first married Joseph, whom she accused of familiarities with Mariamne, wife of Herod, and thus procured his death (B.C. 34). She afterwards married Costobarus; but, being disgusted with him, she put him away — a license till then unheard of among the Jews, whose law (says Josephus) allows men to put away their wives, but does not allow women equal liberty (B.C. 26). After this she accused him of treason against Herod, who put him to death. She caused much division and trouble in Herod's family by her calumnies and mischievous informations; and she may be considered as the chief author of the death of the princes Alexander and Aristobulus, and of their mother Mariamne. SEE ARISTOBULUS. She afterwards conceived a violent passion for an Arabian prince, called Sillaeus, whom she would have married against her brother Herod's consent; and even after she was married to Alexas, her inclination for Sillaeus was notorious. Salome survived Herod, who left her, by will, the cities of Jamnia, Azoth, and Phasaelis, with fifty thousand pieces of money. She favored Antipas against Archelaus, and died A.D. 9, a little after Archelaus had been banished to Vienne, in Dauphiny. Salome had five children by Alexas — Berenice, Antipater, Calleas, and a son and a daughter whose names are not mentioned (Josephus, Ant. 15:4; 17:8) SEE HEROD.

3. A daughter of Herod the Great by Elpis. In addition to what her father bequeathed to her, Augustus gave her a considerable dowry, and married her to one of the sons of Pheroras, Herod's brother (Josephus, A nf. 17:1; War, 1, 28, etc.). SEE HEROD.

4. The wife of Zebedee, as appears from comparing Mat 27:56 with Mar 15:40. It is further the opinion of many modern critics that she was that sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, to whom reference is made in Joh 19:25. The words admit, however, of another and hitherto generally received explanation, according to which they refer to the “Mary the wife of Cleophas” immediately afterwards mentioned. In behalf of the former view, it may be urged that it gets rid of the difficulty arising out of two sisters having the same name; that it harmonizes John's narrative with those of Matthew and Mark; that this circuitous manner of describing his own mother is in character with John's manner of describing himself; that the absence of any connecting link between the second and third designations may be accounted for on the ground that the four are arranged in two distinct couplets; and, lastly, that the Peshito, the Persian, and the Aethiopic versions mark the distinction between the second and third by interpolating a conjunction. On the other hand, it may be urged that the difficulty arising out of the name may be disposed of by assumig a double marriage on the part of the father; that there is no necessity to harmonize John with Matthew and Mark, for that the time and the place in which the groups are noticed differ materially; that the language addressed to John — “Behold thy mother!” — favors the idea of the absence rather than of the presence of his natural mother; and that the varying traditions current in the early Church as to Salome's parents, worthless as they are in themselves, yet bear a negative testimony against the idea of her being related to the mother of Jesus. (According to one account, she was the daughter of Joseph by a former marriage [Epiphan. Hoer. 78, 8]; according to another, the wife of Joseph [Niceph. H.E. 2, 3].) Altogether, we can hardly regard the point as settled, though the weight of modern criticism is decidedly in favor of the former view (see Wieseler, in the Stud. u. Kit. [1840] p. 648). The only events recorded of Salome are that she preferred a request, on behalf of her two sons, for seats of honor in the kingdom, of heaven (Mat 20:20); that she attended at the crucifixion of Jesus (Mar 15:40); and that she visited his sepulchre (Mar 16:1) (A.D. 26-28). She is mentioned by name only on the two latter occasions. SEE ZEBEDEE.

5. The daughter of Herodias by her first husband, Herod Philip (Josephus, Ant. 18:5, 4). She is the “daughter of Herodias” noticed in Mat 14:6 as dancing before Herod Antipas, and as procuring, at her mother's instigation, the death of John the Baptist. SEE HERODIAS. She was married, in the first place, to Philip, the tetrarch of Trachonitis, her paternal uncle, who died childless; and, secondly, to her cousin Aristobulus, son of Herod, the king of Chalcis, by whom she had three sons. The legendary account of her death (Niceph. H.E. 1, 20) is a clumsy invention to the effect that Salome accompanied her mother Herodias, and her father-in-law Herod, in their banishment to Vienne, in Dauphiny; and that, the emperor having obliged them to go into Spain, as she passed over a river that was frozen, the ice broke under her feet, and she sank in up to her neck, when, the ice uniting again, she remained thus suspended by it, and suffered the same punishment she had made John the Baptist undergo. SEE HEROD.

## Salomo Ben-Abraham Laniado[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Abraham Laniado]]

             SEE LANIADO.

## Salomo Ben-Abraham Parchon[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Abraham Parchon]]

             SEE PARCHON.

## Salomo Ben-Abraham Urbino[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Abraham Urbino]]

             SEE URBINO.

## Salomo Ben-David De Oliveyra[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-David De Oliveyra]]

             SEE OLIVEYRA.

## Salomo Ben-Elijakim Panzi[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Elijakim Panzi]]

             SEE PANZI

## Salomo Ben-Isaak[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Isaak]]

             SEE RASHI.

## Salomo Ben-Jechiel Loria[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Jechiel Loria]]

             SEE LORIA.

## Salomo Ben-Jehuda Ibn-Gebirol[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Jehuda Ibn-Gebirol]]

             SEE IBNGEBIROL.

## Salomo Ben-Jehuda Verga[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Jehuda Verga]]

             SEE VERGA,

## Salomo Ben-Joel Dubno[[@Headword:Salomo Ben-Joel Dubno]]

             SEE DUBNO.

## Salomo Levi[[@Headword:Salomo Levi]]

             SEE PAULUS BURGENSIS,.

## Salomo Molcho[[@Headword:Salomo Molcho]]

             SEE MOLCHO.

## Salomon Di Norzi[[@Headword:Salomon Di Norzi]]

             SEE NORZI.

## Salomon, Gotthold[[@Headword:Salomon, Gotthold]]

             a German rabbi, was born at Sandersleben, in the duchy of Anhalt-Dessau, Nov. 1, 1784. Up to his sixteenth year he was educated in Talmudic lore and literature, according to the custom of that time. After this he acquired the rudiments of the German language, especially through the efforts of the chaplain Bobbe, who not only allowed him to come to his school, but also gave him private lessons. He then went to Dessau, to attend the lectures at the Jewish college, employing, however, all his spare time in acquainting himself with German literature. In 1802 he became tutor of German and Hebrew at the Franz school, and afterwards he was intrusted with the religious instruction. In 1806 he delivered his maiden speech, which was very highly spoken of by Christians who heard him. Salomon never lost sight of his intention to become a preacher; and in this he was encouraged by his Christian friends, who not only supplied him with the sermons of Zollikofer and Reinhardt, but even corrected his compositions in accordance with the rules of homiletics. In 1815 he went to Berlin, where he delivered his first discourse in Jacobsohn's Temple. He now became known to his coreligionists; and when, in 1818, the Temple of the  Reformed party at Hamburg was dedicated, Salomon was elected assistant preacher. In the year 1844 he dedicated the “New Temple,” and attended the assemblies of the rabbins at Brunswick, Frankfort, and Breslau. In the year 1857 he retired from his duties, and died Nov. 17, 1862. Of his numerous publications we mention: Auswahl von Predigten (Dessau. 1818): — Predigten (Hamburg, 1819-29): — Moses, in 21 sermons (ibid. 1835): — David, as Man, Israelite, and King, 26 sermons (ibid. 1837): — Elias, the Champion of Light and Truth, in 19 sermons (ibid. 1840): — Der Berg des Herrnn, 17 sermons on the Decalogue (ibid. 1846): — באוֹרי ם, comments upon Haggai and Zechariah (Dessau, 1805): — The Pentateuch, according to the Masoretic text, with a German translation and short glosses (Krotoschin, 1848-49, 5 vols.). Some of his sermons were also translated into English by Miss A.M. Goldsmid (London, 1839). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 226 sq.; Kayserling, Bibliothek judischer Kanzelredner, 1, 142-277; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 365, 371; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11, 416 sq.; Ph. Philippson, Biographische Skizzen (Leips. 1866, 3 pts.); Geiger, in the Zeitschrift fur judische Theologie, 2, 127 sq.; 3, 91-102; Unsere Zeit, 7, 396; Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliographie, 6, 17; L. Philippson, Predigt- und Schul-Magazin, 2, 253- 269. (B.P.)

## Salomon, John[[@Headword:Salomon, John]]

             professor of Hebrew, was a native of Posen, where he was born in 1623. He embraced Christianity at Dantzic, Jan. 22, 1657. Two years later he was appointed professor of the Oriental languages at the gymnasium there, and died July 1, 1683. He wrote Demonstrationes XXXVIII contra Judoeos (Frankfort, 1660): — Programma Hebr. ad A udiendam Orationem Hebr. de Proestantia et Utilitate Lingua Hebr. (Dantzic, 1666): — Programma de Jubiloeis Hebroeorum (ibid. 1658, etc.). See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 2, 97; 3, 229; Steinschneider, Bibliograph. Handbuch, p. 123; id. Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. p. 2397; Wolf, Bibl. Hebri, 480; Delitzsch, Wissenschaft, Kunst und Judenthum, p. 139, 301; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 735. (B.P.)

## Salonius, St.[[@Headword:Salonius, St.]]

             bishop of Geneva in the middle of the 5th century, was the son of Eucher, afterwards bishop of Lyons. At the early age of ten, he entered the monastery of Lerins, and there studied under Hilary, Honorat, and Vincent.  It is not positively known whether Salonius had charge of the church at Vienna or Geneva, but it was probably the latter. He is supposed to have assisted, with his father, at the Council of Orange in 441. He died about 470. There remains a writing of Salonius, called Expositio Mystica in Parabolas Salomonis et Ecclesiasten. The style is simple, and the most of the exposition relates to ethics.

## Salpinx[[@Headword:Salpinx]]

             (a trumpet), in Greek mythology, was a surname of Minerva. Hegeleos, the son of Tyraenus, dedicated to her a temple with the above name after his father had invented the trumpet.

## Salt[[@Headword:Salt]]

             (מֶלִח, melach; ἃλς), the chloride of sodium of modern chemistry. Indispensable as salt is to ourselves, it was even more so to the Hebrews, being to them not only an appetizing condiment in the food both of man (Job 6:6) and beast (Isa 30:24; see margin), and a most valuable antidote to the effects of the heat of the climate on animal food, but also entering largely into their religious services as an accompaniment to the various offerings presented on the altar (Lev 2:13). They possessed an inexhaustible and ready supply of it on the southern shores of the Dead Sea. In the same manner the Arabs of the present day procure their supply of salt from the deposits of the Dead Sea, and carry on a considerable trade in that article throughout Syria. Here may have been situated the Valley of Salt (2Sa 8:13), in proximity to the mountain of fossil salt which Robinson (Researches, 2, 108) describes as five miles in length, and as the chief source of the salt in the sea itself. SEE SALT, VALLEY OF. Here were the salt pits (Zep 2:9), probably formed in the marshes at the southern end of the lake, which are completely coated with salt, deposited periodically by the rising of the waters; and here also were the successive pillars of salt which tradition has from time to time identified with Lot's wife (Wis 10:7; Josephus, Ant. 1, 11, 4). SEE DEAD SEA.

Salt might also be procured from the Mediterranean Sea, and from this source the Phoenicians would naturally obtain the supply necessary for salting fish (Neh 13:16) and for other purposes. The Jews appear to have distinguished between rock-salt and that which was gained by evaporation, as the Talmudists particularize one species (probably the latter) as the “salt of Sodom” (Carpzov, Appar.  p. 718). The notion that this expression means bitumen rests on no foundation. The salt pits formed an important source of revenue to the rulers of the country (Josephus, Ant. 13:4, 9), and Antiochus conferred a valuable boon on Jerusalem by presenting the city with 375 bushels of salt for the Temple service (ibid. 12:3, 3). In addition to the uses of salt already specified, the inferior sorts were applied as a manure to the soil, or to hasten the decomposition of dung (Mat 5:13; Luk 14:35). Too large an admixture, however, was held to produce sterility, as exemplified on the shores of the Dead Sea (Deu 29:23; Zep 2:9); hence a “salt” land was synonymous with barrenness (Job 39:6; see margin; Jer 17:6; comp. Josephus, War, 4:8, 2, ἁλμυρωοης καὶ ἃγονος); and hence also arose the custom of sowing with salt the foundations of a destroyed city (Jdg 9:45), as a token of its irretrievable ruin. It was the belief of the Jews that salt would, by exposure to the air, lose its virtue (μωρανθῇ, Mat 5:13), and become saltless (ἄναλον, Mar 9:50). The same fact is implied in the expressions of Pliny, sal iners (31, 39), sal tabescere (31, 44); and Maundrell (Early Travels [ed. Bohn], p. 512) asserts that he found the surface of a salt rock in this condition (see Hackett, Illustrat. of Script. p. 48 sq.).

The associations connected with salt in Eastern countries are important. As one of the most essential articles of diet, it symbolized hospitality; as an antiseptic, durability, fidelity, and purity. Hence the expression, “covenant of salt” (Lev 2:13; Num 18:19; 2Ch 13:5), as betokening an indissoluble alliance between friends (see Gettysb. Evang. Rev. Oct. 1867); and again the expression, “salted with the salt of the palace” (Ezr 4:14), not necessarily meaning that they had “maintenance from the palace,” as the A.V. has it, but that they were bound by sacred obligations of fidelity to the king. So in the present day, “to eat bread and salt together” is an expression for a league of mutual amity (Russell, Aleppo, 1, 232); and, on the other hand, the Persian term for traitor is nemekharam, “faithless to salt” (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 790). The same force would be given by the preservative quality of salt (Bahrdt, De Federe Salis [Lips. 1761]; Hallervordt, id. [ibid. 1701]; Zeibich, id. [Ger. 1760]; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 42 sq.). SEE COVENANT. It was possibly with a view to keep this idea prominently before the minds of the Jews that the use of salt was enjoined on the Israelites in their offerings to God; for in the first instance it was specifically ordered for the meat  offering (Lev 2:13), which consisted mainly of flour, and therefore was not liable to corruption (see Pontanus, De Sale Sacrific. [Traj. 1703]; Spencer, De Legis Rit. 1, 5, 1). The extension of its use to burned- sacrifices was a later addition (Ezra 43, 24; Josephus, Ant. 3, 9, 1), in the spirit of the general injunction at the close of Leviticus 2, 13. Similarly the heathens accompanied their sacrifices with salted barley meal, the Greeks with their οὐλοχύται (Homer, Il. 1, 449), the Romans with their mola salsa (Horace, Sat. 2, 3, 200) or their salsoe fruges (Virgil, Aen. 2, 133). Salt, therefore, became of great importance to Hebrew worshippers: it was sold accordingly in the Temple market, and a large quantity was kept in the Temple itself, in a chamber appropriated to the purpose (Maii Diss. de Usu Salis Symbol. in Rebus Sacris [Giess. 1692]; Wokenius, De Salitura Oblationum Deo Factar. [Lips. 1747]; Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 3; Middoth, 5, 3; Othon. Lex. Rabb. p. 668). It may, of course, be assumed that in all of these cases salt was added as a condiment; but the strictness with which the rule was adhered to — no sacrifice being offered without salt (Pliny, 31, 41), and still more the probable, though perhaps doubtful, admixture of it in incense (Exo 30:35, where the word rendered “tempered together” is by some understood as “salted” — leads to the conclusion that there was a symbolical force attached to its use (Josephus, Ant. 3, 9, 1; Philo, 2, 255; Hottinger, Jur. Heb. Legg. p. 168); as was certainly the case with the Greeks and Romans (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 31, 44; Ovid, Fast. 1, 337; Spencer, De Leg. Rit. 3, 2, 2; Lukemacher, Antiq. Groec. Sacr. p. 350; Hottinger, De Usu Salis. etc. [Marburg, 1708]; Schickedanz, id. [Servest. 1758]; Maius, id. [Giess. 1692]; Mill, id. (Ult. 1734]). Our Lord refers to the sacrificial use of salt in Mar 9:49-50, though some of the other associations may also be implied. The purifying property of salt, as opposed to corruption, led to its selection as the outward sign in Elisha's miracle (2Ki 2:20-21), and is also developed in the New Test. (Mat 5:13; Col 4:6). The custom of rubbing infants with salt (Ezra 16:4) originated in sanitary considerations, but received also a symbolical meaning (Richter, De Usu Salis apud Priscos Profano et Sacro [Zittas, 1766]).

## Salt Sea[[@Headword:Salt Sea]]

             usually known as “the Dead Sea.” This is the largest lake in Palestine, and in many respects the most remarkable in the world. Well known as it has always been, its peculiarities have scarcely yet been adequately explored.

I. Names. — This body of water has received a variety of designations from writers both ancient and modern; and, as they are characteristic, they demand a brief examination here.

1. “The Salt Sea” is the most common Scripture appellation (יָ ם הִמֶּלִה, Yam ham-Melach; Sept. ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ἁλῶν, or ἁλός; also ἡ θάλασσα ἡ ἁλυκής; Vulg. Mare Salis). It is evidently a descriptive name, probably intended to indicate both the saltness of its water and the character of the plain and hills along its southern margin (Reland, Paloest. p. 240). It occurs in the earliest books of the Bible, but is not found later than the time of Joshua (Gen 14:3; Num 34:3; Deu 3:17; Jos 3:16; Jos 15:2; Jos 15:5; Jos 18:19). In the Talmudical books it is likewise called “the Sea of Salt” (ימא דמלחא). See quotations from the Talmud and, the Midrash Tehillim by Reland (Paloest. p. 237).

2. “The Sea of the Plain,” or, more properly, of the Arabah (יָ ם הָעֲרָבָה, Yam ha-Arabah; Sept. [ἡ]θάλασσα [τῆς] ῎Αραβα; Vulg. Mare solitudinis), is also a descriptive title, showing its geographical position in the center of the great valley of the Arabah. It is first employed in combination with the preceding, as if Moses had heard it on his approach to Palestine (Deu 3:17); and possibly it may have afterwards supplanted the older name (4:49; 2Ki 14:25), with which it is sometimes associated (Jos 3:16; Jos 12:3; Deu 3:17). SEE ARABAH.

3. “The East Sea” is the only other name employed in Scripture (הִקִּדְמוֹנַיהִיָּ ם, ha-Yam hak-Kadmoni; Sept. ἡ θάλασσα ἡ πρὸς ἀνατολάς; Vulg. Mare Orientale). It is used by Ezekiel (Eze 47:18), Joel (Joe 2:20), and Zechariah (Zec 14:8, where the A.V. has “the former sea,” although the Hebrew is the same), to distinguish it from the Mediterranean, which was called “the western” (האחרון, literally “latter,” though when opposed to קדמוןit means “western”).  In one passage (Eze 47:8) it is styled, without previous reference, “the Sea” (הִיָּ ם, ha-Yanm, ), and distinguished from “the great sea” — the Mediterranean — (Eze 47:10).

4. The Sea of Sodom (ימא של סדו ם) is found in the Talmud (Reland, p. 237, 243), no doubt because common tradition represented the city of Sodom as having been engulfed by it. Its connection with Sodom is first suggested in the Bible in the book of 2 Esdras (5:7) by the name “Sodomitish sea” (mare Sodomiticum).

5. Josephus, and before him Diodorus Siculus (2, 48; 19, 98), names it the Asphaltic Lake — ηΑ῾᾿σφαλτίτις λίμνη (Ant. 1:9; 4:5, 1; 9:10, 1; War, 1, 33, 5; 3:10, 7; 4:8, 2, 4), and once λ. ἡ ἀσφαλτοφόρος (Ant. 17:6, 5). Also (ibid. 5, 1, 22) ἡ Σοδομίτις λίμνη. This name was adopted by Galen and other ancient writers, apparently because bitumen or asphaltum was often found floating on its surface or lying along its shores (Reland, p. 241).

6. The name Dead Sea appears to have been first used in Greek (θάλασσα νεκρά) by Pausanias (5, 7) and Galen (4, 9), and in Latin (mare mortuum) by Justin (36, 3, 6), or, rather, by the older historian, Trogus Pompeiius (B.C. cir. 10), whose work he epitomized. It is employed also by Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Σόδομα). The expressions of Pausanias and Galen imply that the name was in use in the country; and this is corroborated by the expression of Jerome (Comm. on Dan 11:45), “Mare . . . quod nunc appellatur mortuum.” The origin of this name is given by Jerome (ad Ezekiel 47), “In quo nihil poterat esse vitale;” and in this respect modern research has to a large extent confirmed ancient tradition, proving that the name is appropriate. The Jewish writers appear never to have used it, but it has become established in modern literature from the belief in the very exaggerated stories of its deadly character and gloomy aspect, which themselves probably arose out of the name, and were due to the preconceived notions of the travelers who visited its shores, or to the implicit faith with which they received the statements of their guides. Thus Maundeville (ch. 9) says it is called the Dead Sea because it moveth not, but is ever still — the fact being that it is frequently agitated, and that when in motion its waves have great force. Hence also the fable that no birds could fly across it and live, a notion which the experience of almost every modern traveler to Palestine would contradict.

7. The Arabic name is Bahr Lut, “the Sea of Lot.” The name of Lot is also specially connected with a small piece of land, sometimes island, sometimes peninsula, at the north end of the lake. Another frequent designation among the modern inhabitants is El-Baheiret el-Myetah, “Dead Sea,” suggested by its character.

II. Physical Features. —

1. General Position. — The Dead Sea is situated in the lowest part of that great valley which stretches in a direct line due south from the base of Hermon to the head of the gulf of Akabah. The valley is a chasm or fissure in the earth's crust, being for nearly 200 miles below the level of the ocean. The Dead Sea is the reservoir into which all its waters flow, and from which there is, and can be, no escape except by evaporation. It is the lowest and largest of the three lakes which interrupt the rush of the Jordan's downward course. It is, in fact, a pool left by the ocean in its retreat from what there is reason to believe was at a very remote period a channel connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. As the most enduring result of the great geological operation which determined the present form of the country, it may be called, without exaggeration, the key to the physical geography of the Holy Land. It is therefore in every way an object of extreme interest.

The valley is shut in on the east and west by parallel ranges of mountains, having steep, rugged, and bare sides, furrowed by wild ravines. The eastern range is somewhat higher than the western. In the parallel of Jericho the ranges expand slightly, and the valley there attains its greatest breadth — about twelve miles; but they contract again at the northern end of the Dead Sea, and continue in parallel lines throughout its entire length. The cliffs which hem in the valley are here steeper, higher, and wilder than elsewhere, and the scenery is more bleak and desolate. The sea occupies the whole width of the valley, in many places washing the sides of the cliffs.

2. Terrace Banks. — It is deserving of special note that the mountainsides and low plains on both the eastern and western shores of the Dead Sea are marked by a series of terraces, manifestly waterlines of some remote ages. The highest is very distinctly seen on the mountain chain of Moab, extending along the tops of the cliffs like a huge shelf. Its elevation appears to be about 1300 feet; and on the western range, at various places, there is a corresponding terrace. This terrace has been frequently noticed by  travelers, but special attention was recently given to it by Tristram who remarks: “These terraces in the old Secondary limestone must be about the present level of the Mediterranean, and they seem to tell of a period long antecedent to the Tertiary terraces and deposits below, when the old Indian Ocean wore the rocks and scooped out the caverns, as its unbroken tide swept up from the coasts of Africa; or when the Salt Sea formed one in a chain of African lakes” (Land of Israel, p. 247).

About 230 feet above the present level of the Dead Sea are traces of another ancient shoreline, marked by a strip of alluvial marl adhering to the rocks and cliffs, particularly at the northwest angle, and down as farnas Ras el-Feshkhah (ibid. p. 256). It is also seen at Wady Derejah and Ain- Jidy. The deposit is mixed with shells of existing species, layers of gypsum, and gravel. Where there are ravines running down to the sea between high cliffs, the deposit reaches up their sides in places to a height of 400 feet, and then slopes away in a series of terraces to the present level of the sea, as if the water had gradually and slowly evaporated. At one point Tristram counted on the shore “no less than eight low gravel terraces, the ledges of comparatively recent beaches, distinctly marked. The highest of these was forty-four feet above the present sea level” (p. 278). At Jebel Shukif, a short distance north of Engedi, Tristram, in addition to the lower terraces noted elsewhere, measured the elevations of three high terraces. The first at a height of 322 feet, marked by a deposit of marl on limestone; the second 665 feet, formed of hard limestone; and the third 1654 feet, of crystalline limestone (ibid. p. 295).

3. Circuit of the Shore. — The Contour of the Dead Sea, as delineated in most maps, is regular, the shorelines having few indentations, and the curves at the north and south being uniform. Recent researches especially those of Lynch, Robinson, and Tristram have shown that this regularity of outline is incorrect, The western shore especially has long promontories and deep bays, and the curves at the north and south are very far from being so gracefully rounded as most chartographers have delineated them.

On the north, at the embouchure of the Jordan, a low promontory is in process of gradual formation by the muddy deposits brought down by the river. It is mostly bare, destitute of all vegetation, and, like the adjoining plain, covered with a nitrous crust. At present it projects into the lake more than a mile. When the water is very high, a portion is overflowed. To the westward lies a deep bay, and beyond it a long, low isthmus, covered with  cairns of loose: rounded stones. De Saulcy has given to this isthmus the name Rejum Lut, “Lot's ruin;” but this name is not heard on the spot. The ruins are shapeless and desolate. They are of the highest antiquity, and may perhaps be of the era of the “cities of the plain.”

The shoreline now trends, with an easy curve, to the southwest, and then to the south, until it reaches the bold headland of Ras el-Feshkhah. So far it is flat and sandy, and the adjoining plain dreary and naked, save where, at long intervals, a little brackish spring rises, or a tiny streamlet flows, and there cane brakes and shrubberies of tamarisk are seen. Ridges of drift mark the waterline, and are composed of broken canes and willow branches, with trunks of palms, poplars, and other trees, half imbedded in slimy mud, and all covered with incrustations of salt.

A few miles north of Ras el-Feshkhah are some confused heaps and long ridges of loose unhewn stones and mounds of earth, to which De Saulcy has given the name Gumran. Other travelers, however, have been unsuccessful in discovering here any traces of a ruined city, or of the name which the French savant has given to it (Tristram, p. 249; Porter, Handbook, p. 203).

Ras el-Feshkhah is a bold headland of crystalline limestone, descending from a height of some 1500 feet in broken cliffs into the deep sea. It bars all passage along the shore; but Tristram by great exertions climbed round its face. It is cleft asunder by Wady en-Nar, the continuation of the Kidron. At the base of the cliff is a vein of bituminous limestone, largely used in the manufacture of little ornaments which are sold to the pilgrims at Jerusalem. “The substance seemed to have been partially ejected in a liquid form, and to have streamed down the cliffs. It was generally mixed with flints and pebbles, sometimes covering the boulders in large splashes, and then, in the sea itself; formed the matrix of a very hard conglomerate of gravel and flints. When thrown into the fire, it burned with a sulphurous smell, but would not ignite at the flame of a lamp” (Tristram, p. 254).

South of Ras el-Feshkhah the cliffs retreat, leaving a plain along the shore, varying from (nete to two miles in breadth, and extending to Ain-Terabeh, about six miles distant. The plain is an alluvial deposit with layers of gravel, and having spits of pure sand projecting at intervals into the sea. It is partially covered with shrubberies of tamarisk, acacia, and retem (a species of broom; the Genista roetam of Forskal, abounding in the peninsula of Sinai), and towards the south with dense cane brakes. The coating of  alluvial marl which once covered it is now in many places worn away; and deep gullies rend it in all directions. Enough remains to show that its top, like that of the plains at the northern and southern ends of the lake, formed the old Tertiary level of the waters (ibid. p. 256).

In the plain is a copious brackish spring, with a temperature of 96° Fahr. Farther south is Ain-Terabeh, a small fountain, slightly brackish, oozing up from the sand a few feet from the shore. Between it and the cliffs is a dense thicket abounding with birds and beasts: ducks, teal, pochard, thrush, bulbul; with swine, leopard, jackal, fox, hare, and porcupine (ibid. p. 273).

From Ain-Terabeh to Ras Mersed (six miles) the coast plain is a mere strip, frequently interrupted by rocky headlands which dip into the waves. Bitumen is here abundant with pebbles imbedded. “In a little bay, just before reaching NW Nady Shlukif, we were struck by a powerful sulphurous odor, and after some search found hot water bubbling through the gravel, at a temperature of 95° Fahr., only six inches from the sea. The smell of sulphur and rotten eggs was very strong, and while scooping in the gravel my hands became quite black, and my boots were covered with a yellow incrustation. Pebbles thrown in became incrusted with sulphur in a few minutes, and all the rocks in the sea, which were here quite hot — of the temperature of 800 Fahr. — were covered with it. There must be an enormous discharge of this mineral water under the sea, as the heat of the water extends for two hundred yards, and the odor to a much greater distance. The ordinary temperature of the sea elsewhere was 62°” (ibid. p. 279). On the south side of this spring is Jebel Shukif, a high, bold peak projecting into the sea. Two miles beyond it is the oasis of Engedi, a plain some two miles square, forming a delta to two glens which empty into it perennial streamlets of fresh water. These, with the “fountain of the kid” itself, make this spot a paradise in the midst of a dreary desert. SEE ENGEDI.

South of Engedi the plain becomes wider, but it is bare and desolate. The cliffs rise over it in broken masses of pale-brown limestone, divided by yawning chasms, while the alluvial deposits along their base are as white as snow. Two miles southward a spring of fetid water (Birket el-Khulil) oozes up on the margin of the sea, having a temperature of 88° Fahr. Other springs must exist beneath the waves, for the water near the shore is much hotter than elsewhere, and the whole surrounding air is filled with fumes of sulphureted hydrogen. No traces of trap rock are anywhere seen; but near  Wady Khuderah are veins of crystalline limestone, and great quantities of flint, coated with oxide of iron. These De Saulcy and others mistook for lava torrents. The coast has the same general features as far as the hill and fortress of Sebbeh, the ancient Masada (q.v.). There, at the base of the hill, are the remains of a Roman camp; and beyond it the aspect of the plain is that of utter and even painful sterility. “Elsewhere the desolation is comparatively partial; here it reigns supreme. The two miles of rugged slope that lay between our path and the sea are difficult to describe. They are formed of a soft, white, and very salt deposit, torn and furrowed by winter torrents in every direction, which have left fantastic ruins and castles of olden shape, flat-topped mamelons, cairns, and every imaginable form into which a wild fancy could have moulded matter, standing in a labyrinth, north and south, before and behind us” (ibid. p. 315). The Birket el-Khulil just alluded to is a shallow depression on the shore, which is filled by the water of the lake when at its greatest height, and forms a natural saltpan. After the lake retires the water evaporates from the hollow, and the salt remains for the use of the Arabs. They also collect it from similar though smaller spots farther south, and on the peninsula (Irby, June 2). One feature of the beach is too characteristic to escape mention — the line of driftwood which encircles the lake, and marks the highest, or the ordinary high, level of the water. It consists of branches of brushwood, and of the limbs of trees, some of considerable size, brought down by the Jordan and other streams, and in course of time cast up on the beach. They stand up out of the sand and shingle in curiously fantastic shapes, all signs of life gone from them, and with a charred though blanched look very desolate to behold. Among them are said to be great numbers of palm trunks (Poole, p. 69); some doubtless floated over from the palm groves on the eastern shore already spoken of, and others brought down by the Jordan in the distant days when the palm flourished along its banks. The driftwood is saturated with salt, and much of it is probably of a very great age.

Farther south the shore recedes, forming a bay some eight miles in length, the water in places almost washing the base of the cliffs. One wild glen, called UmBaghek, breaks through the mountains, and sends out a tiny stream with a dense fringe of evergreens. Not far from it is another hot sulphur spring, which spreads its suffocating odors around. On the south the bay is bounded by the oasis of the Wady Zuweireh — a plain of some extent, sprinkled with tamarisks and acacias, and torn in all directions with torrent beds, through which the winter rains and the streamlets from  numerous sulphurous and brackish springs find their way to the sea. The cliffs and peaks which rise over the oasis appear from a distance to exhibit traces of volcanic action, but closer inspection proves that there are no igneous rocks here or elsewhere along the western shore. Veins of ruddy limestone, blocks of ironstone, and multitudes of nodules of black flint look like trapdikes and craters in the distance. There are, however, a few cinders and scoriae observable here and there along the shore.

A short distance south of the Wady Zuweireh is Jebel Usdum, a range of hills running from north to south a distance of seven miles, with an average elevation of three hundred feet, composed of a solid mass of rock salt. The top and sides are covered with a thick coating of marl, gypsum. and gravel, probably the remains of the Post-tertiary deposit uplifted upon the salt. The declivities of the range are steep and rugged, pierced with huge caverns, and the summit shows a serried line of sharp peaks. The salt is of a greenish-white color, with lines of cleavage as if stratified, and its base reaches far beneath the present surface. The name of the range, Khashm Usdum, appears to preserve a memorial of the ancient guilty “city of the plain.” SEE SODOM.

At the mouth of the Wady Zuweireh are some heaps of rough stones and the shattered walls of a small tower, marked by De Saulcy as the remains of Sodom. That city may have stood in this region, but it requires some power of imagination to identify it with these insignificant ruins.

At the northern end of Jebel Usdum is the mouth of Wady Muhawat, which exhibits some very remarkable geological features. Its sides are cliffs of old limestone, showing here and there on their surface traces of Post-tertiary marl; “but since the marl has been washed out there has been a second filling-in of an extraordinary character, which is only now in course of denudation. There are exposed on the sides of the wady, and chiefly on the south, large masses of bitumen mingled with gravel. These overlie a thick stratum of sulphur, which again overlies a thicker stratum of sand so strongly impregnated with sulphur that it yields powerful fumes on being sprinkled over a hot coal. Many blocks of the bitumen have been washed down the gorge, and lie scattered over the plain below along with huge boulders and other traces of tremendous floods.... The layer of sulphurous sand is generally evenly distributed on the old limestone base, the sulphur evenly above it, and the bitumen in variable masses. In every way it differs from the ordinary mode of deposit of these substances as we have seen  them elsewhere. Again, the bitumen, unlike that which we pick up on the shore, is strongly impregnated with sulphur, and yields an overpowering sulphurous odor; above all, it is calcined, and bears the marks of having been subjected to extreme heat.” This discovery is exceedingly important; and the remarks of Tristram upon it will be read with the deepest interest by all students of the Bible. “Here, so far as I can judge, we have the only trace of anything approaching to volcanic action which we have met with in our careful examination of the northern, western, and southern shores. The only other solution of the problem — the existence of a bituminous spring when the supply of water was more abundant — would scarcely account for the regular deposition of sulphurous sand, and then of the sand with the bitumen superimposed. I have a great dread of seeking forced corroborations of scriptural statements from questionable physical evidence, for the sceptic is apt to imagine that when he has refuted the wrong argument adduced in support of a scriptural statement, he has refuted the scriptural statement itself; but, so far as I can understand this deposit, if there be any physical evidence left of the catastrophe which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, or of similar occurrences, we have it here. The whole appearance points to a shower of hot sulphur, and an irruption of bitumen upon it, which would naturally be calcined and impregnated by its fumes; and this at a geological period quite subsequent to all the diluvial and alluvial action of which we have such abundant evidence. The catastrophe must have been since the formation of the wady, since the deposition of the marl, and while the water was at its present level; therefore, probably during the historic period” (p. 355-357).

The shoreline runs for nearly three miles southward along the base of Jebel Usdum, and then sweeps sharply round to the east, leaving on the south a naked, miry plain called Sabkah, ten miles long from north to south by about six wide. It is in summer coated with a saline crust, but is so low that when the water is high a large section of it is flooded. Numerous torrent beds from the salt range on the west, and from the higher ground of the Arabah on the south, run across it, converting large portions into impassable swamps. On its southern border the old diluvium terrace rises like a white wall to a height of more than two hundred feet. It is only on getting close to it that the sides are seen to be rent and torn into a thousand fantastic forms by winter torrents and the wearing away of the softer deposits. The Sabkah is bounded on the east by Wady Tufeileh, one of the principal drains of the Arabah, and containing a brackish, perennial stream.  Beyond it the character of the surface completely changes. The ground rises in an easy slope to the foot of the Moab Mountains, and is covered with dense thickets of reeds, tamarisk, acacia, retem, zyziphus, and other shrubs, intermixed with fertile fields, cultivated by the Ghawarineh Arabs (as the inhabitants of the Ghor are called, here the worst representatives of their race), and producing abundant crops of wheat, maize, indigo, melons, and cucumbers. Tristram says: “The place positively swarmed with birds in countless myriads. There were doves by the score on every bush, large and small (Turtur risorius and T. Aegyptius), bulbuls, the hopping-thrush, shrikes, the gorgeous little sun-bird resplendent in the light, and, once more, our new sparrow. The Abyssinian lark, pipits, and wagtails luxuriated in the moist rills at our feet, which were fringed by drooping tufts of caper (Capparis Aegyptiaca) in full flower. All teemed with a prodigality of life” (p. 336).

This fertile tract touches the southeastern shore of the sea, and continues along it as it trends northeast for some five miles to the mouth of the Wady Nimeireh, becoming gradually narrower as the shoreline approaches the rocky sides of the mountains. The geological formation of this eastern range is different from the western. The front cliffs are red sandstone, apparently overlying hard, crystalline limestone, and topped by more recent calcareous rock. Trap boulders and fragments of greenstone and sienite are strewn along the base.

Such are the great southern shores of the Dead Sea. The great valley is here narrower than at the northern shore, not because of any contraction in the mountain ranges, but arising from the ridge of Usdum, which was evidently thrown up from the bottom of the valley at some period subsequent to the formation of the Arabah. The projecting base of Jebel Usdum on the west, and the high fertile region of Es-Safieh on the east, contract the southern end of the lake into the form of a semicircular bay about six miles in diameter. A few miles farther north the shores on each side expand so much that the breadth of the sea is almost doubled. The general aspect of the shores is dreary and desolate in the extreme. The salt- incrusted plain, the white downs of the Arabah, the naked line of salt hills, the bare and scathed mountain ranges on each side, all blazing under the rays of a vertical sun, form a picture of utter and stern desolation such as the mind can scarcely conceive.  On the northern side of Wady Nimeireh — a narrow strip of saline plain, very low and very barren, intervenes between the shore and the mountains. Here and there, at a little fountain or at the mouth of a ravine, a clump of bushes or a cane brake may be seen.

The Peninsula of el-Lisan, “the Tongue” SEE BAY, is the most remarkable feature on the eastern shore. It juts out opposite the great ravine of Kerak. The neck connecting it with the mainland is a strip of low, bare sand, measuring five miles across. In outline the peninsula bears some resemblance to the human foot, the toe projecting northward and forming a sharp promontory. Its length is about nine miles, and from the heel or southwestern point to the southern shoreline is seven miles. The main body is a Post-tertiary deposit composed of layers of marl, gypsum, and sandy conglomerate, manifestly coeval with the great diluvial terrace, and corresponding with it in elevation. The top is a table land, broad towards the south, but gradually narrowing to a serried ridge at the northern end. It is white and almost entirely destitute of vegetation. The surface is all rent and torn by torrent beds; and the sides are worn away into pyramidal masses resembling lines and groups of white tents. It is worthy of special note that in the wadys and along the shores pieces of sulphur, bitumen, rock salt, and pumice stone are found in great profusion. Probably, if examined with care, geological phenomena similar to those in Wady Mahawat might be found on this peninsula, and some additional light thus thrown upon the destruction of the cities of the plain. Poole says “the soil appeared sulphurous” (Journal R.G.S. 26, 62-64).

The little plain at the mouth of Wady Draa, or Kerak, affords a striking contrast, in its thickets of evergreens and luxuriant cornfields, to the arid desolation of the adjoining peninsula. It is here that the few inhabitants of the peninsula reside, in a wretched village called Mezra'ah.

The shore of the Dead Sea between the peninsula and the northeastern angle has never been thoroughly explored. Seetzen, Irby and Mangles, De Saulcy, and more recently the party of the Duc de Luynes, visited a few places; and Lieut. Lynch and his officers touched at several points. A few miles north of el-Lisan the fertile plain called Ghor el-Mezra'ah terminates, and the mountains descend in sublime cliffs of red sandstone almost to the water's edge. Higher up, white, calcareous limestone appears, and forms at this place the main body of the range. Basalt also appears in places,  sometimes overlying the limestone as on the plain of Bashan, at others bursting through the sandstone strata in dikes and veins. The ravines of Mojib (Arnon) and Zerka Ma'in appear like huge rents in the mountains. Near the mouth of the latter veins of gray and black trap cut through the sandstone, and a copious fountain of hot, sulphurous water sends a steaming river into the sea amid thickets of palms and tamarisks. This is Callirrhoe, so celebrated in olden time for its baths. Between this point and the plain of the Jordan volcanic eruptions have produced immense flows of basaltic rock, portions of which had been overflowed into the valley of the Jordan. Among other smaller basaltic streams three were found bordering on the eastern edge of the Dead Sea to the south of the little plain of Zarah (M. Lartet's paper to French Academy of Sciences; see in Journal of Sac. Lit. July, 1865, p. 496).

The plain between the mountains and the mouth of the Jordan is in general well watered, and covered with luxuriant vegetation and occasional thickets of tamarisk, retem, and acacia. At the ruins of Suweimeh, De Saulcy found a copious hot spring with a ruinous aqueduct (Voyage en Terre-Sainte, 1, 317). Along the shore pieces of pumice stone, lava, and bitumen are found imbedded in the sand and mud as if washed up by the waves; and at this point are more distinct traces of volcanic action than elsewhere around the sea.

One remarkable feature of the northern portion of the eastern heights is a plateau which divides the mountains halfway up, apparently forming a gigantic landing place in the slope, and stretching northward from the Wady Zerka Ma'in. It is very plainly to be seen from Jerusalem, especially at sunset, when many of the points of these fascinating mountains come out into unexpected relief. This plateau appears to be on the same general level with a similar plateau on the western side opposite to it, with the top of the rock of Sebbeh, and perhaps with the Mediterranean.

4. The dimensions of the Dead Sea have never yet been taken with sufficient accuracy. Its longest axis is situated nearly north and south. It lies between 31° 6' 20” and 31° 46' N. lat., nearly; and thus its water surface is from N. to S. as nearly as possible 40 geographical, or 46 English miles long. On the other hand, it lies between 35” 24' and 35° 37' E. long., nearly; and its greatest width (some three miles south of Ain-Jidy) is about 9 geographical miles, or 10 1/3 English miles. The ordinary area of  the upper portion is about 174 square geographical miles; of the channel, 29; and of the lower portion, hereafter styled the lagoon, 46 — in all, about 250 square geographical miles. It must be remembered that this varies considerably at different seasons of the year, and in different years. When the sea is filled up by winter rains, the flat plain on the south is submerged for several miles. The annual rainfall, too, is not uniform in Palestine. Some years it is more than double what it is in others, and this produces a corresponding effect on the volume of water in the sea, and consequently on its area. At its northern end the lake receives the stream of the Jordan; on its eastern side the Zerka Ma'in (the ancient Callirrhoe, and possibly the more ancient en-Eglaim), the Mojib (the Arnon of the Bible), and the Beni-Hemad. On the south the Kurahy or el-Ahsy, and on the west that of Ain-Jidy. These are probably all perennial, though variable, streams; but, in addition, the beds of the torrents which lead through the mountains east and west, and over the flat, shelving plains on both north and south of the lake, show that in the winter a very large quantity of water must be poured into it. There are also all along the western side a considerable number of springs, some fresh, some warm, some salt and fetid, which appear to run continually, and all find their way, more or less absorbed by the sand and shingle of the beach, into its waters.

The peninsula of Lisan divides the sea into two sections: that on the north is an elongated oval in form, while that on the south is almost circular. The narrowest part of the channel between the peninsula and the mainland is not much more than two miles across. The northern section is a deep, regularly formed basin, the sides descending steeply and uniformly all round, as well on the north and south as on the east and west. This is one of the most remarkable features of the sea. Lynch ran seven lines of soundings across it from shore to shore, and found it deepest between Ain- Terabeh and Wady Mojib, that is, about the center of the northern section. From this point the depth decreased gradually towards the Lisan on the south and the mouth of the Jordan on the north. The greatest depth found by Lynch was 1308 feet, but Lieut. Molyneux records one sounding taken by him as 1350 feet. The deep part of the lake terminates at the peninsula. The greatest depth of the channel between the Lisan and the western shore is only thirteen feet, and no part of the southern section was more than twelve feet in depth (Lynch, Oficial Report, p. 43).

It appears that when the water is very low there are two practicable fords from the peninsula to the mainland — one across the narrow channel, and  the other running from the isthmus to the northern point of Jebel Usdum (Seetzen, Reisen, 2, 358; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 140).

5. The depression of the Dead Sea is without a parallel in the world. From experiments made by boiling water in 1837, Messrs. Moore and Beke supposed the depression to be about 500 feet. In the following year, Russegger with his barometer made it about 1400 feet. Symonds by trigonometrical survey, in 1841, calculated the depression at 1312 feet; and the level run by Dale, an officer of Lynch's expedition, gave a result of 1316 feet. A still more careful measurement has been recently made by the corps of English engineers under Capt. Wilson, with the following result: “The levelling from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea has been performed with the greatest possible accuracy, and by two independent observers, using different instruments, and the result may be relied upon as being absolutely true to within three or four inches. The depression of the surface on March 12, 1865, was found to be 1292 feet; but from the line of driftwood observed along the border of the Dead Sea, it was found that the level of the water at some period of the year — probably during the winter freshets — stands two feet six inches higher, which would make the least depression 1289.5 feet. Capt. Wilson also learned, from inquiry among the Bedouin, and from European residents in Palestine, that during the early summer the level of the Dead Sea is lower by at least six feet. This would make the greatest depression to be as near as possible 1298 feet... The most recent observation before that now given, by the Due de Luynes and Lieut. Vignes, of the French navy, agrees with our result in a very remarkable manner, considering that the result was obtained by barometric observation, the depression given by them being 1286 feet on June 7, 1864, which at most differs only twelve feet from the truth, if we suppose the Dead Sea was then at its lowest” (Sir Henry James, in the Atheneum).

The exact amount of the depression will, of course, vary with the rise and fall of the waters at different seasons. Traces along the shore prove that the level has varied as much as fifteen feet within the past half century (Robinson, Physical Geography, p. 190). It is a singular coincidence that the depth and depression of the Dead Sea are very nearly equal, each about 1300 feet; the elevation of Jerusalem above the Mediterranean is about twice, and above the Dead Sea about three times that number (ibid. p. 190).

6. The water of the Dead Sea is more intensely salt than that of any other sea known. It has also a bitter, nauseous taste, and leaves upon the skin a slightly greasy feeling. Yet it is transparent as the water of the Mediterranean, and its color is the same — a delicate green. Its specific gravity, and consequent buoyancy, is very great. Bathers float easily in an upright position with head and shoulders above the surface. Lynch says that eggs, which would have sunk in the ocean, floated here with only two thirds immersed. This peculiarity was well known to the ancients (Josephus, War, 4:8, 4; Aristot. Meteor. 2, 3; see also in Reland, p. 241, 249). Of its weight and inertia the American expedition had also practical experience. In the gale in which the party were caught on their first day on the lake, between the mouth of the Jordan and Ain-Feshkhah, “it seemed as if the bows of the boats were encountering the sledge-hammers of the Titans.” When, however, “the wind abated, the sea rapidly fell; the water, from its ponderous quality, settling as soon as the agitating cause had ceased to act” (Lynch, Narrative, p. 268). At ordinary times there is nothing remarkable in the action of the surface of the lake. Its waves rise and fall, and surf beats on the shore, just like the ocean. Nor is its color dissimilar to that of the sea.

The water has an oily feel, owing possibly to the saponification of the lime and other earthy salts with the perspiration of the skin, and this seems to have led some observers to attribute to it a greasy look; but such a look exists in imagination only. It is quite transparent, of an opalescent green tint, and is compared by Lynch (ibid. p. 337) to diluted absinthe. Lynch (p. 296) distinctly contradicts the assertion that it has any smell, noxious or not. So do the chemists who have analyzed it. One or two phenomena of the surface may be mentioned. Many of the old travelers, and some modern ones (as Osburn, Pal. Past and Present, p. 443, and Churton, Land of the Morning, p. 149), mention that the turbid, yellow stream of the Jordan is distinguishable for a long distance in the lake. Molyneux (p. 129) speaks of a “curious broad strip of white foam which appeared to lie in a straight line nearly north and south throughout the whole length of the sea... some miles west of the mouth of the Jordan” (comp. Lynch, Narrative, p. 279, 295). “It seemed to be constantly bubbling and in motion, like a stream that runs rapidly through still water; while nearly over this track during both nights we observed in the sky a white streak like a cloud extending also north and south, and as far as the eye could reach.” Lines of foam on the surface are mentioned by others, as Robinson (Physical Geography, 1, 503), Borrer (Journey, etc., p. 479), Lynch (Narrative, p. 288). From Ain-Jidy a current was observed by Mr.  Clowes's party running steadily to the north not far from the shore (comp. Lynch, ibid. p. 291). It is possibly an eddy caused by the influx of the Jordan. Both De Saulcy (Narrative, Jan. 8) and Robinson (Physical Geography, 1, 504) speak of spots and belts of water remaining smooth and calm while the rest of the surface was rippled, and presenting a strong resemblance to islands (comp. Lynch, Narrative, p. 288; Irby, Travels, June 5). The haze or mist which perpetually broods over the water has already been mentioned. It is the result of the prodigious evaporation. Lynch continually mentions it. Irby (June 1) saw it in broad transparent columns, like waterspouts, only very much larger. Extraordinary effects of mirage, due to the unequal refraction produced by the heat and moisture, are occasionally seen (Lynch, Narrative, p. 320). The remarkable weight of this water is due to the very large quantity of mineral salts which it holds in solution. The details of the various analyses are given in the following table, accompanied by that of seawater for comparison.

From that of the United States expedition it appears that each gallon of the water, weighing 12 1/4 lbs., contains nearly 3½ lbs. (3.319) of matter in solution — an immense quantity when we recollect that seawater, weighing 10 1/4 lbs. per gallon, contains less than 1/2 lb. Of this 3 1/3 lbs. nearly 1 lb. is common salt (chloride of sodium), about 2 lbs. chloride of magnesium, and less than 1/2 lb. chloride of calcium (or muriate of lime). The most unusual ingredient is bromide of magnesium, which exists in a truly extraordinary quantity. To its presence is due the therapeutic reputation enjoyed by the lake when its water was sent to Rome for wealthy invalids (Galen, in Reland, Paloest. p. 242) or lepers flocked to its shores (Ant. Mart. § 10). Boussingault (Ann. de Chimie, 1856, 48, 168) remarks that if ever bromide should become an article of commerce, the Dead Sea will be the natural source for it. It is the magnesian compounds which impart so nauseous and bitter a flavor to the water. The quantity of common salt in solution is very large. Lynch found (Narraative, p. 377) that while distilled water would dissolve 5/17 of its weight of salt, and the water of the Atlantic 1/6, the water of the Dead Sea was so nearly saturated as only to be able to take up 1/11. The above differences in the analysis of the water of the Dead Sea must be expected. When the sea is flooded by freshets, the amount of salts in solution will be less; when low, after the evaporation of the summer, the amount will be more. The presence of these foreign ingredients in such quantities is easily accounted for. The washings of the salt range of Usdum, and numerous brackish springs along the shores, supply the salt; the great sulphur fountain at Callirrhoe, and many others on the north and west, with  the sulphur, bitumen, iron, etc., found so abundantly in the later deposits, supply the other ingredients. It is known also that large masses of bitumen are occasionally forced up from the bed of the sea; and it may be that beneath its waves are fountains and deposits more numerous and more remarkable than those in the surrounding rocks and plains. Then, too, the constant evaporation takes away the pure water, but leaves behind all the salts, which are thus gradually increasing in quantity.

Of the temperature of the water more observations are necessary before any inferences can be drawn. Lynch (Report, May 5) states that a stratum at 59° Fahr. is almost invariably found at ten fathoms below the surface. Between Wady Zerka and Ain-Terabeh the temperature at surface was 76°, gradually decreasing to 62° at 1044 feet deep, with the exception just named (Narrative, p. 374). At other times, and in the lagoon, the temperature ranged from 82° to 90°, and from 5° to 10° below that of the air (ibid. p. 310-320; comp. Poole, Nov. 2). Dr. Stewart (Tent and Khan, p. 381), on March 11, 1854, found the Jordan 60° Fahr. and the Dead Sea (north end) 73°; the temperature of the air being 83° in the former case and 78° in the latter.

The water is fatal to animal life; and this fact, according to Jerome, originated the name Dead Sea (Ad Ezech. 48, 8; comp. Galen, De Simpl. 4, 19). Shells and small fish, in a dead or dying state, have been picked up along the northern shore, and are found in some of the little fountains along the western coast; but they are all of foreign importation. Recent investigations have led some to suppose that the Dead Sea does contain and support a few inferior organizations, but the fact has not as yet been established on conclusive evidence. Lying in this deep caldron, encompassed by naked white cliffs and white plains, exposed during a great part of the year to the unclouded beams of a Syrian sun, it is not strange that the shores of the Dead Sea should exhibit an almost unexampled sterility and a death-like solitude; nor is it strange that in a rude and unscientific age the sea should have become the subject of wild and wondrous superstitions. “Seneca relates that bricks would not sink in it. Early travelers describe the lake as an infernal region; its black and fetid waters always emitting a noisome smoke or vapor, which, being driven over the land, destroys allegetation like a frost. Hence, too, the popular report that birds cannot fly over its deadly waters” (Robinson, Physical  Geography, p. 199). Such stories are fabulous. It is true that the tropical heat causes immense evaporation, the exhalations from the sulphurous springs and marshes taint the air for miles, and the miasma of the swamps on the north and south gives rise to fevers, and renders the ordinary inhabitants feeble and sickly; but this has no necessary connection with the Dead Sea, or the character of its waters. The marshes of Iskanderfin are much more unhealthy than any part of the Ghor. Wherever a copious fountain bubbles up along the shores, or a mountain streamlet affords water for irrigation, tangled thickets of tropical trees, shrubs, and flowers spread out their foliage. There birds sing as sweetly as in more genial climes, and the Arab pitches his tent like his brethren on the Eastern plateau, and an abundant harvest rewards the labors of the husbandman. Tristram exclaims with something of enthusiasm, “What a sanitarium Engedi might be made, if it were only accessible, and some enterprising speculator were to establish a hydropathic establishment! Hot water, cold water, and decidedly salt water baths, all supplied by nature on the spot, the hot sulphur springs only three miles off, and some of the grandest scenery man ever enjoyed, in an atmosphere where half a lung is sufficient for respiration” (The Land of Israel, p. 295).

III. Origin and History. — It is a question of the highest importance, and one which has created much controversy among scientific and Biblical students, whether the present physical aspect of the Jordan valley and shores of the Dead Sea tends to throw any light upon its origin and changes, or upon the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Our knowledge of the physical structure of the Jordan valley, and of the various strata and deposits along the shores of the Dead Sea, is not yet sufficiently extensive or minute to enable us to construct a satisfactory theory on the points at issue; but it may be well to state here in a few simple propositions what are the actual statements made in Scripture about the Dead Sea, and what are the facts which scientific investigation, so far as hitherto prosecuted, has established.

1. The references to the Dead Sea in Scripture are few, and mostly incidental. Three passages deserve special attention.

(1.) In Gen 13:10, where the sacred writer relates the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot, he represents the two as standing on the mountain-top east of Bethel. He then says, “Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain (or circuit) of Jordan, that it was well watered  everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar.” It has been inferred from this that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the whole plain around them, must have been in sight at the time referred to, and must therefore have been situated at the northern end of the Dead Sea, which alone is visible from the height at Bethel. But a careful examination of the passage shows that this does not follow. The patriarchs looked towards “the circuit of the Jordan.” It is not implied that they saw it all, nor is it said that Sodom and Gomorrah were in sight. They saw enough to give them a general idea of the whole region. One thing is evident from the statement: a remarkable change was effected in the plain at the time of the destruction of Sodom. It was fertile and well watered before that event, but manifestly not so, or not so much so, after it. This is corroborated by the narrative in Gen 19:24-25.

(2.) The second passage is Gen 14:2-10, which contains the story of Lot's capture. Gen 14:3 is important: “All these (kings) were joined together in the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea.” There cannot be a doubt that the idea here expressed is that the district called in the time of Lot “the vale of Siddim” had become, in the time of the writer, “the Salt Sea,” or at least constituted a part of that sea. The Hebrew phrase establishes the identity of the two just as certainly as the similar phrase in Gen 14:2 establishes the identity of Bela and Zoar. The clause is found in all the ancient MSS. and versions, and in the Targum of Onkelos. Its genuineness rests on the very same basis as the other portions of the narrative. It was manifestly the opinion of Moses that the vale of Siddim was submerged. Another point in the narrative demands attention. The route of the invading host is traced. They attacked the Rephaim in Bashan, then marched southward through Moab and Edom to Paran, on the west side of the Arabah, opposite Edom. There they turned, and after resting at the fountain of Kadesh, they swept the territory of the Amalekites on the south of Judah, and of the Amorites “who dwelt in Engedi.” Having thus ravaged all the countries surrounding the cities of the plain, they descended upon their territory from the west. The inhabitants now came out against them, and were marshalled in the vale of Siddim. The exact locality of the vale is not described. It may have been north or it may have been south of Engedi. One thing, however, is certain: if the western shores of the sea were then as they are now, no army could have marched along them from Engedi to Jericho. On the other hand, from Engedi there is a good path southward. It is said, moreover, that “the  vale of Siddim was full of bitumen pits” (Gen 14:10). There is no part of the valley north of the sea to which this would apply; nor, indeed, is there any plain or vale along its shores “full of bitumen pits” at the present day. These facts render it impossible that the vale of Siddim could have been on the plain of Jericho, and they seem to confirm the previous statement that Siddim was submerged. SEE SIDDIM.

(3.) The third passage is Gen 19:24-25 : “Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground.” Abraham, when, on the succeeding morning, he reached the mountain brow, “looked towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and towards all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace” (Gen 19:28). As Abraham was at this time residing at Hebron, the view towards the south end of the Dead Sea would have been much more distinct than to the northern end, although the lake itself is visible from Beni-Naim (the traditionary site of Abraham's interview with Jehovah) through gaps in the western mountains (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 189). SEE SODOM.

2. The physical facts ascertained by scientific research are as follows: The formation of the great valley of the Jordan must have been long antecedent to historic times, and coeval with the existing mountain ranges; the valley was, at some remote period, filled with water to the level of the ocean; the water has gradually decreased, apparently by evaporation, and has left a number of shorelines, traced by terraces along the mountain sides, all antecedent to historic times; the portion of the Dead Sea north of el-Lisan forms a distinct basin, and appears to have done so from a time long anterior to Abraham. The southern section is different: it is very shallow; its bottom is slimy. “Sulphur springs stud its shores; sulphur is strewn, whether in layers or in fragments, over the desolate plains; and bitumen is ejected, in great, floating masses, from the bottom of the sea, oozes through the fissures of the rocks, is deposited with gravel on the beach, or, as in the Wady Mahawat, appears, with sulphur, to have been precipitated during some convulsion” (Tristram, p. 358), and that at a period long subsequent to the latest diluvial formation, and apparently within the historic period.  There can be no doubt that the destruction of the cities was miraculous. A shower of ignited sulphur was rained upon them. May we not connect this historic fact with the observed fact just stated? Again, it is said that “the plain of Siddim was filled with bitumen pits.” Bitumen is inflammable, and, when ignited by the fiery shower, would burn fiercely. May we not also connect this with the phenomena of Wady Mahawat, of which Tristram says, “The whole appearance points to a shower of hot sulphur, and an irruption of bitumen upon it, which would naturally be calcined and impregnated with its fumes?” (p. 356). The sacred writer further says that the vale of Siddim became the Salt Sea, or was submerged. The southern part of the lake is now a muddy flat, covered with a few feet of water. Suppose the vale to have sunk a few feet, or the water to have risen a few feet, after the miraculous destruction of the cities: either supposition would accord with the Biblical narrative, would not be without a parallel in the history of countries exposed to earthquakes and would not be opposed to any results of modern observation; it would accord, besides, with the views of ancient writers and with uniform Jewish tradition (Josephus, Ant. 1, 9; War, 4:8, 4; Reland, p. 254 sq.). This was the view suggested by Dr. Robinson, and sanctioned by the distinguished geologist, Leopold von Buch. In his latest work, published since his death, Robinson says: “It seems to be a necessary conclusion that the Dead Sea extended no farther south than the peninsula, and that the cities destroyed lay on the south of the lake as it then existed. Lot fled from Sodom to Zoar, which was near (Gen 19:20); and Zoar, as we know, was in the mouth of Wady Kerak as it opens upon the neck of the peninsula. The fertile plain, therefore, which Lot chose for himself, where Sodom was situated, and which was well watered, like the land of Egypt, lay also south of the lake ‘as thou comest to Zoar' (Gen 13:10-11). Even to the present day, more living streams flow into the Ghor at the south end of the sea, from wadys of the eastern mountains, than are found so near together in all Palestine besides. Tracts of exuberant fertility are still seen along the streams, though elsewhere the district around the southern bay is almost desert” (Physical Geogr. of the Holy Land, p. 213). Notwithstanding the arguments and almost contemptuous insinuations of some recent writers, not a single fact has been adduced calculated to overthrow this view; but, on the contrary, each new discovery seems as if a new evidence in its favor.

3. Later and Modern Notices. — It does not appear probable that, with the above exception, the condition or aspect of the lake in ancient times was  materially different from what it is at present. Other parts of Syria may have deteriorated in climate and appearance, owing to the destruction of the wood which once covered them; but there are no traces either of the ancient existence of wood in the neighborhood of the lake, or of anything which would account for its destruction, supposing it to have existed. A few spots-such as Ain-Jidy, the mouth of the Wady Zuweireh, and that of the Wady ed-Draa — were more cultivated, and, consequently, more populous, than they are under the discouraging influences of Mohammedanism. But such attempts must always have been partial, confined to the immediate neighborhood of the fresh springs and to a certain degree of elevation, and ceasing directly irrigation was neglected. In fact, the climate of the shores of the lake is too sultry and trying to allow of any considerable amount of civilized occupation being conducted there. Nothing will grow without irrigation, and artificial irrigation is too laborious for such a situation. The plain of Jericho, we know, was cultivated like a garden; but the plain of Jericho is very nearly on a level with the spring of Ain-Jidy, some 600 feet above the Ghor el-Lisan, the Ghor es-Safieh, or other cultivable portions of the beach of the Dead Sea. Of course, so far as the capabilities of the ground are concerned (provided there is plenty of water), the hotter the climate, the better; and it is not too much to say that if some system of irrigation could be carried out and maintained, the plain of Jericho, and still more the shores of the lake (such as the peninsula and the southern plain), might be the most productive spots in the world. But this is not possible, and the difficulty of communication with the external world would alone be (as it must always have been) a serious bar to any great agricultural efforts in this district.

When Machaerus and Callirrhoe were inhabited (if, indeed, the former was ever more than a fortress, or the latter a bathing establishment occasionally resorted to), and when the plain of Jericho was occupied with the crowded population necessary for the cultivation of its balsam gardens, vineyards, sugar plantations, and palm groves, there may have been a little more life on the shores. But this can never have materially affected the lake. The track along the western shore and over Ain-Jidy was then, as now, used for secret marauding expeditions, not for peaceable or commercial traffic. What transport there may have been between Idumaea and Jericho came by some other channel. Josephus appears to state that the Moabites crossed the sea to invade Judah (Ant. 9, 1, 2); and he informs us that the Romans used boats against the fugitive Jews (War, 4:7, 6; comp. 4:8, 4). A  doubtful passage in Josephus (see Reland, Paloest. p. 252), and a reference by Edrisi (ed. Jaubert, in Ritter, Jordan, p. 700) to an occasional venture by the people of “Zara and Dara” in the 12th century, are all the remaining allusions to the navigation of the lake known to exist, until Englishmen and Americans launched their boats on it for purposes of scientific investigation. The temptation to the dwellers in the environs must always have been to ascend to the fresher air of the heights, rather than descend to the sultry climate of the shores. It is not strange that the Dead Sea was never navigated to any extent: fish do not exist in it, and the sterile character of the shores made water transit of little importance.

Costigan, an Irish traveler, was the first, in modern times, to navigate this Sea of Death. Having descended the Jordan in a little boat, he crossed to the peninsula of Lisan. For three days he had no fresh water, and he was carried to Jerusalem to die. No record of his journey has been found. In 1837 Moore and Beek had a light boat conveyed from Jaffa. They succeeded in visiting some points, and making a few experiments with boiling-water, which were the first to prove that the lake was below the level of the ocean. Ten years later, Lieutenant Molyneux, of the British navy, took a boat down the Jordan, visited the peninsula, and took some soundings. He was able to return to his ship, but died shortly afterwards. A brief record of his voyage is given in the Journal of the R.G.S. vol. 18. The expedition of Lynch, in 1848, was the only one crowned with success. This was in part owing to the superior organization and strength of the party, and in part to the fact that it was undertaken at a comparatively cool season — April and May. Even this, however, was too late; several of the party took fever, and one — Lieutenant Dale — died. The unfortunate expeditions of Costigan and Molyneux were made in July and August respectively. Winter is the proper season for any such undertaking. Rain seldom falls on the shores; the air, during the depth of winter, is fresh and balmy, and cold is almost unknown.

Josephus gives a brief description of the Dead Sea (War, 4:8, 4); and several Greek and Roman authors, scientific as — well as geographical, speak of its wonders. Extracts from the principal of these may be seen in Reland's Paloestina (p. 238-258). Among modern writers, the following may be consulted with advantage: Seetzen, in Zach's Monatliche Correspondenz, vols. 17, 18, 26, 27; Burckhardt, Travels in Syria; Irby and Mangles, Travels; Wilson, Lands of the Bible; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 2, 557-780; Poole, in Journal of R.G.S. vol. 26. The books containing the  fullest and latest accounts are: Robinson, Bib. Res. 1, 501-523; 2, 187-192; andPhysical Geogr. of Pal. p. 187-216; De Saulcy, Voyage autour de la Mer Morte, and Voyage en Terre-Sainte; Tristram, The Land of Israel, p. 242-366; Land of Moab (1873); Lynch, Official Report, which contains Anderson's Geological Reconnaissance (published at the National Observatory, Washington, 1852); Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 344-464. There is an old monograph on the Dead Sea by Wahner, De יִ ם הִמֶּלִח(Helmst. 1712); and a recent one by Fraas, Das todte Meer (Stuttg. 1867). SEE DEAD SEA.

## Salt, City Of[[@Headword:Salt, City Of]]

             (Heb. Ir ham-Me'lach, עיראּהִמֶּלִח; Sept. αἱ πόλεις Σαδῶν, v.r. ἡ πόλις τῶν ἁλῶν; Vulg. civitas Salis), the fifth of the six cities of Judah which lay in the “wilderness” (Jos 15:62). Its proximity to Engedi, and the name itself, seem to point to its being situated close to. or at any rate in the neighborhood of the Salt Sea. Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 2, 109) expresses his belief that it lay somewhere near the plain at the south end of that lake, which he would identify with the Valley of Salt (q.v.). This, though possibly supported by the reading of the Vatican Sept., “the cities of Sodom,” is at present a mere conjecture, since no trace of the name or the city has yet been discovered in that position. On the other hand, Van de Velde (Syr. and Pal. 2, 99; Memoir, p. 111, and Map) mentions a Nahr Maleh which he passed in his route from Wady el-Rmail to Sebbeh, the name of which (though the orthography is not certain) may be found to contain a trace of the Hebrew. It is one of four ravines which unite to form the Wady el-Bedun. Another of the four, Wady ‘Amreh (ibid.), recalls the name of Gomorrah, to the Hebrew of which it is very similar. It seems most probable that it took its name from salt works or mines. At the southwestern extremity of the Dead Sea stands a remarkable range of hills of pure salt, and near them “the City of Salt” was perhaps situated. There are ancient ruins at the mouth of Wady Zuweireh, at the northern end of the range; and others at Um-Baghek, five miles farther north. One or other of these places may mark the site of “the City of Salt” (Van de Velde, Meemoir, p. 345; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 318 sq.). SEE JUDAH.

## Salt, Covenant Of[[@Headword:Salt, Covenant Of]]

             SEE COVENANT; SEE SALT.

## Salt, Ecclesiastical Use Of[[@Headword:Salt, Ecclesiastical Use Of]]

             It would appear from a sentence of Augustine that in the 4th century was customary to use salt in baptism, at least in Milan. Salt was placed in some churches on the tongues of the catechumens, as an emblem of wisdom and an admonition to attain it. With salt, milk and honey were given. In the  Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, after a form for the benediction and consecration of salt, it is said, “Hac oratione expleta, accipiat sacerdos de eodem sale, et ponat in ore infantis, dicendo, Accipe sal sapientiae in vitam aeternam” (“This benediction being finished, let the priest take a portion of the same salt and put it into the mouth of the infant, saying, Take the salt of wisdom to eternal life “).

## Salt, Valley Of[[@Headword:Salt, Valley Of]]

             (Heb. גֵּיא מֵלִח, Gey Melach, but twice with the article, גֵּ הִמֶּלִח; Sept. Γεβελέμ, Γεμελέδ, κοιλὰς [or φάραγξ] τῶν ἁλῶν; v.r. Γημαλά, Γαιμελά; Vulg. Vallis Salinarum), a certain valley — or perhaps more accurately a “ravine,” the Hebrew word gey appearing to bear that signification — in which occurred two memorable victories of the Israelitish arms.

1. That of David over the Edomites (2Sa 8:13; 1Ch 18:12). It appears to have immediately followed his Syrian campaign, and was itself one of the incidents of the great Edomitish war of extermination. The battle in the Valley of Salt appears to have been conducted by Abishai (1Ch 18:12), but David and Joab were both present in person at the battle and in the pursuit and campaign which followed; and Joab was left behind for six months to consummate the: doom of the conquered country (1Ki 11:15-16; Psalms 60, title). The number of Edomites slain in the battle is uncertain: the narratives of Samuel and Chronicles both give it at 18,000, but this figure is lowered in the title of Psalm 55 to 12,000. SEE DAVID.

2. That of Amaziah (2Ki 14:7; 2Ch 25:11), who is related to have slain 10,000 Edomites in this valley, and then to have proceeded with 10,000 prisoners to the stronghold of the nation at has- Sela, the Cliff, i.e. Petra, and, after taking it, to have massacred them by hurling them down the precipice which gave its ancient name to the city. See EDOM.

Neither of these notices affords any clue to the situation of the Valley of Salt, nor does the cursory mention of the name (“Gemela” and “Mela”) in the Onomasticon. By Josephus it is not named on either occasion. Seetzen  (Reisen, 2, 356) was probably the first to suggest that it was the broad, open plain which lies at the lower end of the Dead Sea, and intervenes between the lake itself and the range of heights which crosses the valley at six or eight miles to the south. The same view is taken (more decisively) by Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 2, 109). The plain is in fact the termination of the Gh8r or valley through which the Jordan flows from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea. Its northwest corner is occupied by the Khashm Usdum, a mountain of rock salt, between which and the lake is an extensive salt marsh, while salt streams and brackish springs pervade, more or less, the entire western half of the plain. Without presuming to contradict this suggestion, which yet can hardly be affirmed with safety in the very imperfect condition of our knowledge of the inaccessible regions south and southeast of the Dead Sea, it may be well to call attention to some considerations which seem to stand in the way of the implicit reception which most writers have given it since the publication of Dr. Robinson's Researches. (So Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 346; also Keil on 2Ki 14:7.) SEE SODOM.

(a.) The word Gey (גֵּיא), employed for the place in question, is not elsewhere applied to a broad valley or sunk plain of the nature of the lower Ghor. Such tracts are denoted in the Scripture by the word Emek or Bika'ah, while Gey appears to be reserved for clefts or ravines of a deeper and narrower character. SEE VALLEY.

(b.) A priori, one would expect the tract in question to be called in. Scripture by the peculiar name uniformly applied to the more northern parts of the same valley, ha-Arabah, in the same manner that the Arabs now call it el-Ghor, “Ghor” being their equivalent for the Hebrew “Arabah.” SEE ARABAH.

(c.) The name “Salt,” though at first sight conclusive, becomes less so on reflection. It does not follow, because the Hebrew word melach signifies salt, that therefore the valley was salt. A case exactly parallel exists at el- Milh, the representative of the ancient Moladah, some sixteen miles south of Hebron. Like melach, milh signifies salt; but there is no reason to believe that there is any salt present there, and Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 2, 201, note) himself justly adduces it as “an instance of the usual tendency of popular pronunciation to reduce foreign proper names to a significant form.” Just as el-Milh is the Arabic representative of the Hebrew Moladah,  so possibly was Gey Melach the Hebrew representative of some archaic Edomitish name.

(d.) What little can be inferred from the narrative as to the situation of the Gey Melach is in favor of its being nearer to Petra. Assuming Selah to be Petra (the chain of evidence for which is tolerably connected), it seems difficult to believe that a large body of prisoners should have been dragged for upwards of fifty miles through the heart of a hostile and most difficult country merely for massacre. SEE PETRA.

It would seem probable from the above considerations that the sacred writers do not refer to the Arabah, or great plain south of the Dead Sea, but rather to one or other of the passes leading from it, either up into Judah, on the one side, or Edom, on the other. Wady Zuweireh, a well known pass at the northern end of the salt range of Usdum, might be the one meant, though the scope of the narrative would rather seem to locate it nearer Edom. Schwarz (Palest. p. 21, 22) fixes the valley at the same point, the southwest extremity of the Dead Sea, and thinks that Zoar is called the “City of Salt” in Jos 15:62, because of the salt mountain near it. SEE SALT, CITY OF.

## Salter, Richard, D.D.[[@Headword:Salter, Richard, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister of New England, was born in Boston, Mass., in 1723. In due time he entered Harvard College, from which he graduated with honor, 1739. He studied and practiced medicine, but afterwards chose the ministry for his life work. Ile was settled in Mansfield, Conn., and ordained. June 27, 1744. Not long after Salter's settlement, a serious difficulty commenced in his church, in consequence of some of the members declaring in favor of the “Separatists” (q.v.), and the difficulty was protracted through several years. Peace was restored only after twenty-four of the members were expelled. He continued actively engaged until 1787, when his strength began perceptibly to decline. In 1771 he was elected a fellow of Yale College, and was presented, 1782, by the same college with the degree of D.D. In 1781 he gave, by deed, a farm to Yale College “for encouraging and promoting the study of the Hebrew language, and other Oriental languages.” He was twice married, but had no children. He preached the Connecticut Election Sermon (1768), which was published. He died in 1793. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 421 sq.

## Salter, Samuel, D.D.[[@Headword:Salter, Samuel, D.D.]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Norwich, and educated at the free school of that city, at the Charter House, and at Benedict College, Cambridge, of which he was elected a fellow. He became rector of Burton College, Lincolnshire, and prebendary of Norwich; minister of Great Yarmouth, 1750; preacher at Charter House, 1754; rector of St. Bartholomew the Less, London, 1756; and master of the Charter House, 1761. He died 1772. Several sermons of his were published (Lond. 1755, 1762). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Salthen, Daniel Lorenz[[@Headword:Salthen, Daniel Lorenz]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born March 16, 1701, at Markin, near Upsala, and died at Konigsberg, January 29, 1750, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Articulis Smalcaldicis (Konigsberg, 1729): — Introductio in Omnes Libros Sacros (1736): — De Auctore Libri Sapientiae (1739). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:329; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Saltmarsh, John[[@Headword:Saltmarsh, John]]

             an Antinomian divine, was born in Yorkshire, England. He was educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge, became minister of Brasted, Kent, and chaplain in the army under Essex. He subsequently settled at Ilford, Essex, where he died in 1647. He published a number of works: The Smoke in the Temple (Lond. 1646, 4to): — Free Grace (ibid. 1645, 4to): — Sparkles of Glory (ibid. 1647, 12mo), and others. See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Saltzmann, Friedrich Rudolf[[@Headword:Saltzmann, Friedrich Rudolf]]

             an eminent, and once very popular, Protestant author, was born at Strasburg, March 9, 1749. He studied in the gymnasium, and then in the University of Strasburg. After his graduation in 1773, he journeyed through Italy and Germany, and then took charge of the education of the young Baron (afterwards Prussian minister) von Stein. Subsequently he lectured on history in Strasburg, but without great success. He next edited a political paper, and thereby came into suspicion of aristocratic tendencies among the radicals and terrorists of the French Revolution. He was forced to flee and to live in disguise until the downfall of Robespierre, meantime suffering the seizure and appropriation of his large property in Strasburg. During this period of trials his religious life came to rapid maturity. Raised in strict Protestant principles, he now came into contact with French mystics and theosophists. At the close of the Revolution he returned to Strasburg, and began the publication of a series of religious and mystical works, which made him many friends, and which enjoyed a very wide circulation. Among these publications were, Das christliche Erbauungsblatt, which was issued for many years, from 1805 and on: — Es wird Alles neu werden (1802-10), a work in seven instalments, consisting of essays upon, and extracts from, the chief mystics and  theosophists — Rusbroeck, Terstegen, Catherine of Sienna, Mesdames Bourignon, Guyon, Leade, and Browne, also Swedenborg, and Bromley: — On the Last Things (1806): — Glances at God's Dealings with Man from the Creation to the End of the World (1810), in which the author gives a survey of human history during the first six thousand years, and then, with the help of geology and astronomy, forecasts the consummat;in of all things, which will be preceded by the millennium and terminated by the restoration of Paradise: — Religion der Bibel (1811), relating largely to the millennium: — Geist und Wahrheit (1816), a work much esteemed by Schubert, and treating of the so called double sense of Scripture. In all of these writings Saltzmann manifests the highest reverence for the Bible and the most childlike faith in God. And yet, with all his Bible study, he seems to find confirmation only for the views of the writers of the mystical school. But he is a mystic of the milder type; and he was entirely free from the “occult science” of a Bohme and a Schonherr. During his whole active career, Saltzmann continued his political editorship, and it was but his leisure moments that he gave to his theological studies. In his last years, when Schubert visited him in 1820, he had ceased all outward activity, and was patiently awaiting his call into the spirit world. See La Revue d'Alsace, 1860; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 13, 337-341. (J.P.L.)

## Salu[[@Headword:Salu]]

             (Heb. Salu', סָלוּא, weighed; Sept. Σαλώ v.r. Σαλμών), a prince and head of a house among the children of Simeon; father of the Zimri who was slain by Phinehas for bringing the Midianitish woman into the camp of Israel (Num 25:14; see Num 25:7 sq.). B.C. ante 1618.

## Salum[[@Headword:Salum]]

             a Greek form found in the Apocrypha of the Hebrew name SHALLUM SEE SHALLUM (q.v.): a. (Σαλοῦμος v.r. Σαλῆμος; 1Es 8:1) the father of Hilkiah (Ezr 7:2); b. (Σαλούμ; 1Es 5:28) a temple “porter” (Ezr 2:42).

## Salus[[@Headword:Salus]]

             (health, prosperity, well being), in some degree synonymous with the Greek Hygeia, in Roman mythology, was primarily the goddess of physical health, but afterwards also of the public weal or prosperity of the state. A  temple was built in her honor after the conclusion of the Samnite war by C. Junius Bubulcus.

## Salut[[@Headword:Salut]]

             an evening office, which took its origin in Southern Europe (Spain and Italy), consisting of an exposition of the Sacrament, accompanied with chanting and a brilliant display of tapers. It varies in different churches; at Lyons it is not followed by benediction, and in France generally is only used in a solemn form on the eves of great festivals. The Roman rite requires the sign of the cross to be made with the monstrance in silence; but in some parts of France the priest uses a form of benediction.

## Salutation[[@Headword:Salutation]]

             (from the Lat. salus, health, i.e. a wishing well; in the A.V. “salute” is the rendering of בָּרִךְ, barak, to bless; שָׁאִל, shaal, to inquire; but more properly of שָׁלוֹ ם, shalom, peace [q.v.]; in the N.T. of ἀσπαζομαι, to embrace), a term which, in the Bible, includes two classes or modes of address. These, however, were of course often continued under various circumstances. SEE COURTESY.

I. Conversation. — The frequent allusion in Scripture to the customary salutations of the Jews invests the subject with a higher degree of interest than it might otherwise claim; and it, is therefore fortunate that there are few scriptural topics which can be better understood by the help of the illustrations derivable from the existing usages of the East.

1. The forms of salutation that prevailed among the Hebrews, so far as can be collected from Scripture, are the following:

(1.) The salutation at meeting consisted, in early times, of various expressions of blessing, such as “God be gracious unto thee” (Gen 43:29); “Blessed be thou of the Lord” (Rth 3:10; 1Sa 15:13); “The Lord be with you,” “The Lord bless thee” (Rth 2:4); “The blessing of the Lord be upon you; we bless you in the name of the Lord” (Psa 129:8). Hence the term “bless” received the secondary sense of “salute,” and is occasionally so rendered in the A.V. (1Sa 13:10; 1Sa 25:14; 2Ki 4:29; 2Ki 10:15), though not so frequently as it might have been (e.g. Gen 27:23; Gen 47:7; Gen 47:10; 1Ki 8:66). Most of the expressions used in meeting, and also those which were used in parting,  implied that the person who employed them interceded for the other. Hence the word בָּרִךְ, barak, which originally signified “to bless,” meant also “to salute” or “to welcome,” and “to bid adieu” (Gen 47:8-11; 2Ki 4:29; 2Ki 10:13; 1Ch 18:10).

(2.) The blessing was sometimes accompanied with inquiries as to the health either of the person addressed or his relations. In countries often ravaged, and among people often ruined, by war, “peace” implied every blessing of life; and this phrase had, therefore, the force of “Prosperous be thou.” This was the commonest of all salutations (Jdg 19:20; Rth 2:4; 1Sa 25:6; 2Sa 20:9; Psa 129:8). Hence the Hebrew term used in these instances (שָׁלֹ ם, shalom) has reference to general well being, and strictly answers to our “welfare, “ as given in the text (Gen 43:27; Exo 18:7). It is used, not only in the case of salutation (in which sense it is frequently rendered “to salute, “ e.g. Jdg 18:15; 1Sa 10:4; 2Ki 10:13), but also in other cases, where it is designed to soothe or to encourage a person (Gen 43:23; Jdg 6:23; Jdg 19:20; 1Ch 12:18; Dan 10:19; comp. 1Sa 20:21, where it is opposed to “hurt;” 2Sa 18:28, “all is well;” and 2Sa 11:7, where it is applied to the progress of the war). The salutation at parting consisted originally of a simple blessing (Gen 24:60; Gen 28:1; Gen 47:10; Jos 22:6); but in later times the term shalom was introduced here also in the form “Go in peace,” or, rather, “Farewell” (1Sa 1:17; 1Sa 20:42; 2Sa 15:9). This was current at the time of our Savior's ministry (Mar 5:34; Luk 7:50; Act 16:36), and is adopted by him in his parting address to his disciples (Joh 14:27). It had even passed into a salutation on meeting, in such forms as “Peace be to this house” (Luk 10:5), “Peace be unto you” (Luk 24:36; Joh 20:19).

The more common salutation, however, at this period was borrowed from the Greeks, their word χαίρειν (to be joyful or in good health) being used both at meeting (Mat 26:49; Mat 28:9; Luk 1:28) and probably also at departure. In modern times, the ordinary mode of address current in the East resembles the Hebrew: Es-selam aleykum, “Peace be on you” (Lane, Mod. Egypt. 2, 7); and the term “salam” has been introduced into our own language to describe the Oriental salutation. Accordingly, we have the exclamation χαῖρε, χαίρετε; Joy to thee! Joy to you! rendered by  Hail! an equivalent of the Latin Ave! Salve! (Mat 27:29; Mat 28:9; Mar 15:18; Lnlke 1:28; Joh 19:3).

A still stronger form of this wish for the health of the person addressed was the expression “Live, my lord” (חוה אדני), as a common salutation among the Phoenicians, and also in use among the Hebrews, but by them only addressed to their kings in the extended form of “Let the king live forever!” (1Ki 1:31), which was also employed in the Babylonian and Persian courts (Dan 2:4; Dan 3:9; Dan 5:10; Dan 6:6; Dan 6:21; Neh 2:3). This, which in fact is no more than a wish for a prolonged and prosperous life, has a parallel in the customs of most nations, and does not differ from the “Vivat!” of the Latin, the “Vive le roi!” of the French, or our own “forever!”

2. Use of these Expressions. — The forms of greeting that we have noticed were freely exchanged among persons of different ranks on the occasion of a casual meeting, and this even when they were strangers. Thus Boaz exchanged greeting with his reapers (Rth 2:4), the traveler on the road saluted the worker in the field (Psa 129:8), and members of the same family interchanged greetings on rising in the morning (Pro 27:14). The only restriction appears to have been in regard to religion, the Jew of old, as the Mohammedan of the present day, paying the compliment only to those whom he considered “brethren,” i.e. members of the same religious community (Mat 5:47; Lane, Mod. Egypt. 2, 8; Niebuhr, Descript. p. 43). Even the apostle John forbids an interchange of greeting where it implied a wish for the success of a bad cause (2Jn 1:11). In modern times the Orientals are famed for the elaborate formality of their greetings, which occupy a very considerable time; the instances given in the Bible do not bear such a character, and therefore the prohibition addressed to persons engaged in urgent business, “Salute no man by the way” (2Ki 4:29; Luk 10:4), may best be referred to the delay likely to ensue from subsequent conversation. This, perhaps, must not be understood literally, as it would be churlish and offensive. But there is so much insincerity, flattery, and falsehood in the terms of salutation prescribed by custom that our Lord rebuked them by requiring his followers, as far as possible, to avoid them (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 533 sq.).

3. Modern Parallels. — As already intimated, the usages involved in these oral salutations seem not only similar to, but identical with, those still  existing among the Arabians. These, indeed, as now observed, go upon the authority of religious precepts. But it is known that such enactments of the Koran and its commentaries merely embody such of the previously and immemorially existing usages as the legislature wished to be retained.

(1.) Oral Forms. — Their most common greeting, as among the Jews, is, “Peace be on you!” to this the reply is, “On you be peace!” to which is commonly added, “and the mercy of God and his blessings!” This salutation is never addressed by a Moslem to one whom he knows to be of another religion; and if he find that he has by mistake thus saluted a person not of the same faith, he generally revokes his salutation: so also he sometimes does if a Moslem refuses to return his salutations, usually saying, “Peace be on us and on (all) the right worshippers of God!” This seems to us a striking illustration of Luk 10:5-6; 2Jn 1:11. Various set compliments usually follow this salam; which, when people intend to be polite, are very much extended and occupy considerable time. Hence they are evaded in crowded streets, and by persons in haste, as was the case, for the same reason doubtless, among the Jews (2Ki 4:29; Luk 10:4). Specimens of this conventional intercourse are given by Lane (Mod. Egypt. 1, 253), who says that to give the whole would occupy a dozen of his pages. There are set answers, or a choice of two or three answers, to every question; and it is accounted rude to give any other answer than that which custom prescribes. They are such as those by which the Israelites probably prolonged their intercourse. If one is asked, “How is your health?” he replies, “Praise be to God!” and it is only from the tone of his voice that the inquirer can tell whether he is well or ill. When one greets another with the common inquiry, “Is it well with thee?” (see 2Ki 4:26) the answer is, “God bless thee!” or “God preserve thee!” An acquaintance on meeting another whom he has not seen for several days, or for a longer period, generally says, after the salam, “Thou hast made us desolate by thy absence from us;” and is usually answered, “May God not make us desolate by thy absence!”

(2.) The gestures and inflections used in salutation varied with the dignity and station of the person saluted, as is the case with the Orientals at this day. SEE ATTITUDE. The obeisance with which this is accompanied varies according to the degree of respect designed to be shown to the person addressed, and this rises nearly according to the following scale:

1. Placing the right hand upon the breast;

2. Touching the lips and the forehead or turban (or the forehead and turban only) with the right hand;

3. Doing the same, but slightly inclining the head during the action;

4. The same as the preceding, but inclining the body also;

5. Still the same, with the addition of previously touch, ing the ground with the right hand;

6. Kissing the hand of the person to whom obeisance is paid;

7. Kissing his sleeve;

8. Kissing the skirt of his clothing;

9. Kissing his feet; and

10. Kissing the carpet or ground before him.

Persons distinguished by rank, wealth, or learning are saluted by many of the shopkeepers and passengers as they pass through the streets and market-places of Eastern cities, and are, besides, often greeted with a short ejaculatory prayer for the continuance of their life and happiness. Such were “the salutations and greetings in the market place” of which the scribes were so extravagantly fond (see Mar 12:28). When a very great man rides through the streets, most of the shopmen rise to him and pay their respects to him by inclining the head and touching the lips and forehead or turban with the right hand. It is usual for the person who returns the salutation to place at the same time his right hand upon his breast, or to touch his lips, and then his forehead or turban with the same hand. This latter mode, which is the most respectful, is often performed to a person of superior rank, not only at first with the salam, but also frequently during a conversation. In some cases the body is gently inclined, while the right hand is laid upon the left breast. A person of the lower orders in addressing a superior does not always give the salam, but shows his respect to high rank by bending down his hand to the ground, and then putting it to his lips and forehead. SEE BOWING.

It is a common custom for a man to kiss the hand of his superior instead of his own (generally on the back only, but sometimes on both back and front), and then to put it to his forehead in order to pay more particular respect. Servants thus evince their respect towards their masters. Those residing in the East find their own servants always doing this on such little occasions as arise beyond the usage of their ordinary service; as on receiving a present, or on returning fresh from the public baths. The son also thus kisses the hand of his father, and the wife that of her husband. Very often, however, the superior does not allow this, but only touches the hand extended to take his, whereupon the other puts the hand that has been touched to his own lips and forehead. The custom of kissing the beard is still preserved, and follows the first and preliminary gesture; it usually takes place on meeting after an absence of some duration, and not as an everyday compliment. In this case the person who gives the kiss lays the right hand under the beard, and raises it to his lips, or rather supports it while it receives his kiss. This custom strikingly illustrates 2Sa 20:9. In Arabia Petraea and some other parts it is more usual for persons to lay the right sides of their cheeks together. These acts involved the necessity of dismounting in case a person were riding or driving (Gen 24:64; 1Sa 25:23; 2Ki 5:21). The same custom still prevails in the East (Niebuhr, Descript. p. 39). Among the Persians, persons in saluting often kiss each other on the lips; but if one of the individuals is of high rank, the kiss is given on the cheek instead of the lips. This seems to illustrate 2Sa 20:9; Gen 29:11; Gen 29:13; Gen 33:4; Gen 48:10-12; Exo 4:27; Exo 18:7. SEE KISS.

Another mode of salutation is usual among friends on meeting after a journey. Joining their right hands together, each of them compliments the other upon his safety, and expresses his wishes for his welfare by repeating, alternately, many times the words selamat (meaning, “I congratulate you on your safety”) and taiyibin (“I hope you are well”). In commencing this ceremony, which is often continued for nearly a minute before they proceed to make any particular inquiries, they join their hands in the same manner as is usually practiced by us; and at each alternation of the two expressions change the position of the hands. These circumstances further illustrate such passages as 2Ki 4:19; Luk 10:4. SEE HAND.

II. The epistolary salutations in the period subsequent to the Old Test. were framed on the model of the Latin style: the addition of the term “peace” may, however, be regarded as a vestige of the old Hebrew form (2Ma 1:1). The writer placed his own name first, and then that of the person whom he saluted; it was only in special cases that this order was reversed (2Ma 1:1; 2Ma 9:19; 1Es 6:7). A combination of the first and third persons in the terms of the salutation was not unfrequent (Gal 1:1-2; Phm 1:1; 2Pe 1:1). The term used (either expressed or understood) in the introductory salutation was the Greek χαίρειν in an elliptical construction (1Ma 10:18; 2Ma 9:19; 1Es 8:9; Act 23:26); this, however, was more frequently omitted, and the only apostolic passages in which it occurs are Act 15:23 and Jam 1:1, a coincidence which renders it probable that James composed the letter in the former passage. A form of prayer for spiritual mercies was also used, consisting generally of the terms “grace and peace,” but in the three pastoral epistles and in 2 John “grace, mercy, and peace,” and in Jude “mercy, peace, and love.” The concluding salutation consisted occasionally of a translation of the Latin valete (Act 15:29; Act 23:30), but more generally of the term ἀσπάζομαι, “I salute,” or the cognate substantive, accompanied by a prayer for peace or grace. Paul, who availed himself of an amanuensis (Rom 16:22), added the salutation with his own hand (1Co 16:21; Col 4:18; 2Th 3:17). The omission of the introductory salutation in the Epistle to the Hebrews is very noticeable. There are Latin monographs on the subject in general by Mayer (Gryph. 1703), Allgower (Ulm, 1728), Schmerschl (Jena, 1739), Heyrenbach (Vien. 1773), and Purmann (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1749). SEE EPISTLE.

## Salutation, Ritual[[@Headword:Salutation, Ritual]]

             In the Romish Church, the words of the angel to Mary are called the Angelic Salutation. The latter clause, “Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus,” was added, they tell us, in the fifth century; but the last words, “Nunc et in hora mortis nostrae,” were inserted by order of pope Pius V. It is sometimes repeated at the beginning of a sermon, ending with a prayer or a pro nobis, and bells are tolled to put people in mind of it. SEE SALVE REGINA.

In the Church-of-England service a species of salutation occurs. “Having all repeated our Creed, ... we now prepare ourselves to pray. And since  salutations have ever been the expressions and badges of that mutual charity without which we are not fit to pray, therefore we begin with an ancient form of salutation, taken out of the Holy Scripture; the minister commencing, salutes the people with ‘The Lord be with you,' and they return it with a like prayer, ‘And with thy Spirit.'”

## Salutatorium[[@Headword:Salutatorium]]

             (place of salutation), a room connected with an ancient church, where the bishop and clergy sat to receive the salutations of the people as they came to solicit prayers on their behalf or to consult them about important business.

## Salvador, Joseph[[@Headword:Salvador, Joseph]]

             a Jewish physician, was born at Montpelier, France, in 1796, and died at Versailles, March 17, 1873. He is the author of Loi de Moyse, ou Systeme Relig. et Polit. des Hebreux (Paris, 1822); republished under the title Histoire des Institutions de Moise et du Peuple Hebreu (Paris, 1828, 3 vols.); German transl. Geschichte der mosaischen institutionen, etc., by Essena, with a preface by G. Riesser (Hamburg, 1836, 3 vols.): — Jesus- Christ et sa Doctrine, etc. (Paris, 1838, 2 vols.); German transl. by Jacobson, Das Leben Jesu und seine Lehre (Dresden, 1841, 2 vols.): — Histoire de la Domination Romaine en Judee et de la Ruiae de Jerusalem (Paris, 1847, 2 vols.); German transl. by Eichler, Geschichte der Ronnerherrschaft in Judda, etc. (Bremen, 1847, 2 vols.): — Paris, Rome, Jerusalem, ou la Question Religieuse au XIXe Siecle (Paris, 1860, 2 vols.). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 230; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 746; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1109 sq.; Zeitung des Judenthums. 1873. (B.P.)

## Salvation[[@Headword:Salvation]]

             (properly יְשׁוּעָה, σωτηρία, both meaning originally deliverance or safety). No idea was more ingrained in the Jewish mind than the truth that God was a Savior, a Helper, a Deliverer, a Rescuer, a Defender, and a Preserver to his people. Their whole history was a history of salvation, and an unfolding of the nature and purposes of the Divine Being. Israel was a saved people (Deu 33:29); saved from Egypt (Exo 14:30), delivered from enemies on every side, preserved in prosperity, and restored from adversity — all by that One Person whom they had been taught to call Jehovah. Though human instruments were constantly used as  saviors — as, for instance, the judges — the people were always taught that it was God who saved by their hand (2Sa 3:18; 2Ki 13:5; 2Ki 14:27; Neh 9:27), and that there was not power in man to be his own savior (Job 40:14; Psa 33:16; Psa 44:3; Psa 44:7), so that he must look to God alone for help (Isa 43:11; Isa 45:22; Hos 13:4; Hos 13:10). This the Scriptures express in varied forms, usually in phrases, in which the Hebrews rarely use concrete terms, as they are called, but often abstract terms. Thus, instead of saying, God saves them and protects them, they say, God is their salvation. So, a voice of salvation, tidings of salvation, a word of salvation, etc., is equivalent to a voice declaring deliverance, etc. Similarly, to work great salvation in Israel signifies to deliver Israel from some imminent danger, to obtain a great victory over enemies. Most of these phrases explain themselves, while others are of nearly equal facility of apprehension, e.g. the application of “the cup of salvation” to gratitude and joy for deliverance (Psa 106:13); the “rock of salvation” to a rock where any one takes refuge, and is in safety (2Sa 22:47); “the shield of salvation” and “helmet of salvation” to protection from the attack of an enemy (Psa 18:35; Isa 59:17); the “horn of salvation” to the power by which deliverance is effected (Psa 18:2); “the garments of salvation” to the beauty and protection of holiness (Isa 61:10); the “wells of salvation” to the abundant sources of the mercies of salvation, free, overflowing, and refreshing (Isa 12:3). See each of these associated terms in its alphabetical place.

“When we come to inquire into the nature of this salvation thus drawn from God, and the conditions on which it was granted during the Old Test. dispensation, we learn that it implied every kind of assistance for body and soul, and that it was freely offered to God's people (Psa 28:9; Psa 69:35); to the needy (Psa 72:4; Psa 72:13), to the meek (Psa 76:9), to the contrite (Psa 34:18), but not to the wicked (Psa 18:41) unless they repented and turned to him. Salvation consisted not only of deliverance from enemies, and from the snares of the wicked (Psa 37:40; Psa 59:2; Psa 106:20), but also of forgiveness (Psa 79:9), of answers to prayer (Psa 69:13), of spiritual gifts (Psa 68:19), of joy (Psa 51:12), of truth (Psa 25:5), and of righteousness (Psa 24:5; Isa 45:8; Isa 46:13; Isa 53:5). Many of the beautiful promises in Isaiah refer to an everlasting and spiritual salvation, and God described himself as coming to earth to bring salvation to his people (Isa 62:11; Zec 9:9). Thus was the way prepared for the  coming of him who was to be called Jesus, because he should save his people from their sins. SEE MESSIAH.

“In the New Testament the spiritual idea of salvation strongly predominates, though the idea of temporal deliverance occasionally appears. Perhaps the word restoration most clearly represents the great truth of the Gospel. The Son of God came to a lost world to restore those who would commit themselves unto him to that harmony with God which they had lost by sin. He appeared among men as the Restorer. Disease, hunger, mourning, and spiritual depression fled from before him. All the sufferings to which the human race is subject were overcome by him. Death itself, the last enemy, was vanquished; and in his own resurrection Christ proclaimed to all believers the glad tidings that God's purpose of bringing many sons unto glory was yet to be carried out. During his lifetime Jesus Christ was especially a healer and restorer of the body, and his ministrations were confined to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but by his death for the sins of the whole world, and by his subsequent resurrection and exaltation, he was enabled to fulfil the mission for which he had taken our nature. He became generally the Savior of the lost. All who come to him are brought by him to God; they have spiritual life, forgiveness, and peace, and they are adopted into the family of God. Their bodies are made temples of the Holy Ghost, by whose inworking power Christ is formed within them. Their heart being purified by faith in him as the Son of God, they receive from him the gifts and graces of God, and thus they have an earnest of the final inheritance, the complete restoration, which is the object of every Christian's hope. If it be asked when a man is saved, the answer is that the new life which is implanted by faith in Christ is salvation in the germ, so that every believer is a saved man. But during the whole Christian life salvation is worked out, in proportion to our faith, which is the connecting link between the Savior and the saved — the vine and the branches. Salvation in its completion is ready to be revealed' in the day of Christ's appearing, when he who is now justified by Christ's blood shall be saved from wrath through him, and when there shall be that complete restoration of body and soul which shall make us fit to dwell with God as his children for evermore.” SEE SAVIOR.

## Salvation Army, The[[@Headword:Salvation Army, The]]

             This new religious organization is, in some of its agencies and operations, suggestive of the reformation under Luther, and of the religious awakening under the Wesleys. Each of these great movements was so startling in its character that it commanded wide-spread attention, and excited opposition and envy on every hand. Their enemies declared that the work would soon come to naught, and that such inflammable material would soon burn itself out. But these disparaging predictions have not been fulfilled with regard to the former two efforts, nor are they likely to be realized in the case of the Salvation Army. Not designed for any merely human aggrandizement, not antagonistic to any other religious organization, it began with a burning desire in the heart of one Christian minister to "rescue the perishing "'in London. It was the privilege of the writer to hear William Booth, the general and founder of the Salvation Army, preach the gospel in a prison when he was only twenty years old, and to be an intimate personal acquaintance of his from that time to the present.

I. Origin of the Movements. —

1. William Booth was born in the town of Nottingham in the year 1829. His parents belonged to the Church of England, but at the age of fourteen he began to attend the services of the Wesleyan Methodists, then and now a large and influential body in the town. Their services had in them more life and energy than he found in the Established Church, and, having experienced a change of heart in these exercises, his affections were naturally centred where he had derived so much good; hence, though young in years, he began to attend mission and open-air services and cottage-meetings among the poor in the neglected parts of the town. He soon became all exhorter, and related at the meetings his own happy experience, persuading others to seek salvation. During the daytime he was employed at the miscellaneous store of a pawnbroker, and, there he became practically acquainted with the wants, privations, and sufferings of the poor. His natural quickness of observation and his retentive memory were used by him to advantage. In the evenings and on Sundays, while a mere youth, he began to preach short, earnest sermons, in the open air, in all weathers, inviting sinners to Christ. In 1846 when only seventeen, he was accepted as a local preacher, became zealous and useful, and his labors were much owned of God. He was then a mere stripling, tall, with long, flowing black hair, a piercing eye, and a tongue of fire. Before he was  twenty he was urged to enter the Methodist ministry, but in addition to his want of theological training, the doctors told him that one year of the earnest ministerial work, to which he was occasionally called, would probably exhaust the little strength he had; and as he was not physically strong, he waited for a time to see if his health improved. In the meanwhile he was wholly engaged, partly in London and partly in Lincolnshire, as an evangelist, a work in which he took special delight.

At the age of twenty-four he was accepted as a minister on trial in the Methodist New Connection, and placed for a time under the care of the Reverend William Cooke, D.D., for theological training. Shortly afterwards, in 1854, their society at Giernsey invited him to raise their cause, then in a low condition, and at the same time improve his own health in their mild and genial atmosphere. At the first Sunday service he held there thirty persons were converted, and within a month three hundred were added to the church membership. He had to return to London, but the news of his success quickly spread through the. Connection, and he soon afterwards had invitations to ten circuits, to hold special services for a week or two in each. The conference that year sent him out as an evangelist, the results of which may be judged by the returns from a few places: at Hanley, Staffordshire, 400 conversions; at Newcastle, in one week, 290; at Sheffield, in four weeks, over 400; at Chester, several hundred. Fifteen of these converts are known to have become ordained ministers of the gospel.

2. Jealousy among a few senior preachers, who could not command such success, obliged him to settle down in a circuit, and he spent three years (1857-59) at Gateshead-on-Tyne, where, by his labors, the membership was trebled. He was next sent to Newcastle, with the same result, having in the meantime married Catharine Mumford, daughter of Mr. J. Mumford, a good London Methodist; and his young wife worked earnestly and lovingly with him. Her piety, zeal, discretion, and ability entitle her to take rank with the late Mrs. Phoebe Palmer, of New York, as one of the specially called and gifted of God to do a great work for him in the world and in the church. Seeing how God was working by Mr. Booth among a class of people seldom reached by the ordinary minister, and feeling the burden of souls pressing upon him, he made a most earnest appeal to the Liverpool Conference of 1861 to again appoint him as an evangelist; and his appeal. worthy of Dr. Coke or George Whitefield, was supported for a while by an equally earnest appeal made by Mrs. Booth from the gallery of the chapel.  Some of the older preachers were shocked by a woman addressing the conference, and she was silenced. The conference made a great mistake in not accepting Mr. Booth's services as an evangelist: had they done so, their membership might have been doubled in ten years; instead of which, after the lapse of a quarter of a century, their membership is less today than it was then, and does not number thirty thousand after the lapse of nearly ninety years. Mr. Booth resigned his connection with the body, and resolved to await the openings of Providence; without employment, home, or income, he and his devoted wife looked alone to God for guidance, and it soon came.

Visiting Cornwall, he found many earnest Methodists in hearty sympathy with the yearnings of his heart. Mrs. Booth now fully shared his labors, herself preaching and holding revival services both on the Sabbath and on week days. In this way they spent two years as missionaries, in various localities, for three or four weeks each. Fishermen and tin miners came to their services by thousands, whole neighborhoods were stirred all round, the claims of religion became paramount, and men by scores left their work to seek divine mercy. The knowledge of these gracious outpourings of the Holy Spirit spread throughout the country. One chapel was kept open from daylight in the morning till midnight for a whole week. The result of such manifestations awakened general interest in the work, and invitations for the services of Mr. and Mrs. Booth reached them from all parts of England and Wales. These occupied them both for two years more, and in June 1865, they came to London.

Providentially they were directed to the East End, a locality where, within the limits of half a mile, eighteen thousand persons, men and women, were counted entering drinking-saloons on one Sunday. There, on a heap of refuse, Mr. Booth commenced the work which has developed into the great Christian army known the world over. A small pocket Bible and hymn-book were his only weapons. In 1883 Mrs. Booth, in writing of herself and Mr. Booth in 1865, remarks: "He left a happy and prosperous, ministerial career, gave up all that is commonly regarded as valuable in life, came but without any human encouragement or guarantees, and devoted himself to labor among the neglected masses, with no thought beyond that of a local work in the east of London. We surrendered home, income, every friend we had in the world, save my parents [whom they nourished in old age], with four little children under five years old, to trust only in God. During the ten years following, we were groping our way out of the  conventionalism in which we had been trained, and often reluctantly following the pillar of cloud by which God was leading us. We tried committees, conferences, and all sorts of governments, showing how far we were wrong till the grand military idea was revealed to us."

Not much consideration was required to convince Mr. Booth that in East London there was labor for a man's life, however earnest and long-lived he might be and having his sympathies strongly drawn towards the dense mass of godless people in the streets day and night, he gave up invitations to labor in the provinces to devote himself fully to the teeming population of Whitechapel and its surroundings. In ten or fifteen minutes he would gather a congregation of a thousand people, to whom he preached daily the plain gospel in the old-fashioned manner. He was a Methodist to the backbone, and in all his addresses he taught and enforced the necessity of repentance, faith, and holiness. God wonderfully owned the word preached; its effects had been witnessed in Cornwall and other parts, and it was soon found that conversions followed the preaching in London. As there was no place in which to gather the people, Mr. John Eason, an old Methodist, lent Mr. Booth a preaching tent which he had long used on London Fields. Crowds gathered there, many were saved, and these soon began to be useful in their own localities, each one asking himself, after he had found Jesus,

"What shall I do to make it known What Thou for all mankind hast done?" Mr. Booth prepared a cheap hymn-book, which was sold freely at all the meetings, and thousands were bought and read by the new converts. These. one after another, began to speak of the blessings they had received, and their testimony deepened and intensified the general interest in the services; so that the companions of these poor men, now made rich by faith, began to think there was something in the preaching which had completely changed very bad persons, and made them lovers of home, of God, and of their fellow-creatures. The storms of autumn scattered the tent in which they found shelter, but the work went on in the open air. As winter approached, shelter was required, and one of the lowest of the many drinking-saloons, a very den of infamy, was secured, and converted into a mission hall and book-store, for the sale of hymns, tracts, and such literature as would be suitable to young converts brought up in utter ignorance of religion. Next a large dancing-saloon was taken and used in the same way. Both these places were soon filled by eager listeners, services being held on the ground-floor and the first-floor simultaneously, the stairs and passages crowded at nearly, every service by the neglected  poor, who saw in these agencies and ministrations the means of rescuing themselves-from sin, misery, and poverty. Believing in the advantages of labor, and in the truth of Mr. Wesley's adage, "All at work and always at work," Mr. Booth found employment for many of the converts in extending the mission, and it was soon manifest that they were gradually rising in the moral and social scale. Converts increased, people by thousands attended the exercises, and in less than a year Mr. Booth hired a large theatre for services on Sunday, which proved attractive to the outcast. Crowds gathered there, young and old, most of whom had lived like heathen, with no knowledge of God or regard for his laws. Drunlkards became sober, swearers began to pray, those who had lived by stealing stole no more, scores of old and forgotten debts were paid, multitudes of women ere rescued from ruin, and appeals now came to Mr. Booth to open new missions at Bethnal Green, Limehouse, Poplar, Canning Town, Croydon, Norwood, and other places; in these localities the applicants were directed to procure a room, and speakers were sent to hold services. It is amusing to survey, at this time, the variety of spots used for the new efforts, many of which the writer personally visited at the time — a club- room, a cellar, a shed, a railway arch, behind a pigeon-shop, an old factory, a schoolroom, a cottage — so eager were the poor people to get the gospel preached to them. They had not been accustomed to churches or chapels; they knew little about the Bible, and parsons they thought their greatest enemies. They belonged to the refuse of mankind — navvies, sailors, gypsies, infidels, scoffers, drunkards, thieves, dog-fanciers, pigeonkeepers; men, women, and children, the roughest, wildest, most ignorant and degraded met together, and on them the full power of the gospel was manifested in their conversion and after-life. Persons from all these classes stood forth and openly declared what the grace of God had done for them, then appealing to their old companions in sin as to the truth of their testimony.

While Mr. Booth was thus evangelizing the masses, his wife was engaged in holding meetings in many of the largest halls and most aristocratic centres in the kingdom. At Hastings, Margate, Brighton, and many other places, crowds of the middle and upper classes attended her services, and numbers, whose interest and sympathy were enlisted, became friends and helpers in the establishment of missions for the working classes on the plans already described. The motto of Mrs. Booth's life seemed to be, "I must be about my Father's business." While thus occupied in public work,  her family was not neglected; for she tells us that every hour which was not spent in public work was sacredly devoted to her children, who were mainly educated at home, and trained on the principles laid down in a book entitled The Training of Children, recently written by her husband. How completely this task was accomplished is manifest from the fact that all their children were converted early in life and all who are old enough are doing useful and important labor in the Salvation Army. The work spread faster than Mr. Booth's family could keep pace with it, and their converts carried the holy fire with them into their homes; and thus began fresh missions at Old Ford, Stoke Newington, Shoreditch, Tottenham, Mill Wall, and other parts in and around London, progress being reported monthly in a new periodical which bore the title of Christian Mission Magazine.

3. In 1870 a great impulse was given to the movement, when Mr. Booth purchased a pile of rough, strong buildings in Whitechapel, London, which had been used as "a people's market," but having been a commercial failure, was now obtained at a reasonable cost, and fitted up as a hall to hold two thousand people, with numerous separate rooms, soon occupied as offices, class-rooms, a book-room, and a kitchen. All these were put too active use, and there the new converts found a hearty welcome at the daily services, always fresh and cheery; and in that building many have been saved from every kind of misery, and even from self-destruction, as despair seized upon them. The daily services were well attended, and on Sunday three or four services were regularly held, at which both Mr. and Mrs. Booth labored continuously and earnestly. At length his health gave way, and a long rest was needed; but God raised up ready helpers, much prayer was offered up, and, on his recovery, a fresh campaign was started, in 1873, large additions being made to the membership, and officers sent into new localities to rescue the perishing. In 1874 a new mission was opened at Hammersmith, and others were begun in towns far away from London; operating with the same results as those in the metropolis. In the provinces some remarkable conversions took place of persons who had been notorious sinners, and they soon became as noted in spreading the news of salvation.

These converts were chiefly uneducated people, but were easily led by those who had been helpful to them, and it became necessary to issue  suggestions for their guidance. The following five points were accordingly distributed:

1. To hold meetings out of doors, and to march singing through the streets in harmony with law and order;

2. To visit public-houses, gin-palaces, prisons, private houses, and to pray with any who can be got at;

3. To hold meetings in theatres, music halls, saloons, and other common resorts of those who prefer pleasure to God, and services in any place where hearers can be gathered, especially such as would not enter ordinary places of worship;

4. To use the most popular song-tunes, and the language of every-day life, to convey a knowledge of God to every one in novel and striking forms;

5. To make every convert a witness for Christ, both in public and private. The Whitechapel headquarters soon became a center of great influence, which reached far beyond London, and the deaths of two of the officers there proved to be a blessing to many, as they verified the truth of the well-known words of the Reverend Charles Wesley, "God buries his workmen, but carries on his work." In six months nine valiant officers came forth to supply the places of those who had died. Quietly, but like a deep and mighty river, the work was spreading through the provinces, and a new departure became necessary, with more efficient organization.

4. After mature consideration, in the spring of 1878, the entire mission was remodelled as a military organization, with the title "The Salvation Army," and the writer was present, by invitation of Mr. Booth, at the first meeting held under the new designation, when the originator was called "General Booth." The reason given by him for the change was that his adherents' were really an army of salvation. "The name," said he, "is preferable, because the only reason for which the organization exists being war against sin, commonsense requires that it shall be framed after that pattern which mankind, in all ages, has found to be the most. effective, and the only one possible for an army.” The novelty of the new designation at once attracted the notice of the press, some to approve, others to oppose; but the object was gained. The mission at once rose from comparative obscurity and  Weekness to one of strength, and in a few months thirty new stations were opened, most of which have had prosperity. By the end of a year the new openings were increased to eighty, and the number of officers (evangelists) increased from thirty to one hundred and twenty-seven. Thus the leisure- loving Christians saw a spectacle which takes its rank among the marvels of the age, an army "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." When the army was formed, in 1878, it numbered 29 corps and 31 officers, or evangelists; in 1882 they had increased to 331 corps and 760 officers; in 1885, 1001 corps and 2560 officers, with a total registered membership in June 1885, of 90,000 in Great Britain and Ireland.

II. Organization, Characteristics etc. —

1. As the plan adopted in London is the one in use in all the places where the army has a field of operation, it will be best described by the words of general Booth himself, who says, "Our organization makes every soldier in some degree an officer, charged with the responsibility of so many of his townsfolk, and expected to carry on the war against the locality where he resides. Every corps is mapped to a portion of the country, and every village is placed under the care of a sergeant until a corps be established in it under commissioned officers. England is divided into thirteen districts, each under the command of a major, whose duty it is to direct and inspect the operations of every corps therein; he has to see to the extension of the war, and the calling out of new officers, and to the removal of others unfit for their position. Each corps is under the command of a captain, assisted by one or two lieutenants, who are entirely employed in and supported by the army, their duty being to conduct services out-doors and in-doors, to visit those enlisted, and to plan and work for the salvation of the whole population around. Captains and lieutenants are removed about every six months, to avoid settling into old ruts, and to prevent their forming too strong attachments to either persons or places. We have tens of thousands of soldiers who are ready at a word to leave all and go out to rescue the souls of others, and who glory in submitting to the leadership of either men or women placed over them, for Christ's sake. Experience has taught us that real soldiers care little who leads or how they march, so that there is victory. We have never enjoyed such unbroken peace and harmony as we have had since it was thoroughly understood that the corps is under its captain, the division under its major, and the whole army under its general, with no hope of successful agitation against superior authority. It is a great object with us to avoid using our system of government so as to limit  spiritual liberty, or hamper any officer with awkward restrictions, who is seeking the accomplishment of his great mission." In 1883 the army had 509 centres of operation in England, 35 in Scotland, 17 in Ireland, and, at the last account, one each in France, Switzerland, Sweden, United States, Canada, India, South Africa, South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and New Zealand — a remarkable development as the result of five years' work.

2. Shortly before the army was organized, it was found that property, valued at many thousand pounds, was owned by Mr. Booth's mission, and in order to leave no doubt of its security for the objects for which it had been acquired or built, a deed was drawn up, and enrolled in chancery, August 7, 1875, which declares that the property belongs, first, to William Booth, second, to his son, William Bramwell Booth, and at the death of both these persons the whole is to be vested in trustees for the use of the army so long as it may exist; and the solicitors to the army hold in their possession the deeds, and a complete schedule of all property standing in the name of William Booth, which is increasing rapidly every year.

The finances of the army are derived from various sources. From the first, all who attended the services were taught the duty and privilege of giving in support of the work, and the majority of the corps have long been self- supporting. In 1884 the members of the army contributed among themselves more than $500,000 to carry on the work, and this in addition to subscriptions and donations from the general public, and the sales of their various newspapers and publications. The total revenue for 1884 was $1,350,000, made up as follows: Central, or office funds, $373,325; local funds, $675,00; foreign funds, $315,000. Persons of all religious denominations contribute to this result, and the accounts are under the supervision and yearly audit of regular chartered accountants in London. The net profits on the sale of books, newspapers, medals, and other insignia were, in 1883, $25,000, and in 1884 over $40,000. Out of these results the salaries of the officers were paid, including also general Booth and his family. During the time (about twelve years) previous to the formation of the army, and for several years afterwards, a benevolent Christian gentleman, member of parliament for Nottingham (Mr. Booth's birthplace), afterwards for Bristol, generously provided for the wants of Mr. Booth and his family, and this was continued until the book profits were sufficient for the purpose, without trenching on the general funds. These profits are Mr. Booth's legitimate creation, and as general editor he  might claim them, but, instead, he maintains the official staff from that source of revenue.

3. Having to organize mostly by means of uneducated persons, the work has been slow and up-hill. The officers are drawn from the ranks; those who prove the best soldiers are recommended by their captains to headquarters, inspected and reported on by the major, and if then able to answer (to the satisfaction of the general himself) a lengthy series of questions, they are placed in the training-barracks at Clapton. There a few weeks of East-end London work test their qualities and qualifications severely; meanwhile they are trained in conducting every branch of the service, carefully drilled, and taught the simplest way of conveying the truths of the Bible to the people. Some have to be taught the elements of knowledge, reading, writing, and arithmetic; but the training is not so much scholastic as spiritual, the great necessity pressed upon every one being that of holiness of heart and life. Those who prove unfit for officers are sent back to the ranks: the care in selecting cadets is such that this necessity does not often arise. Few persons are received as officers who do not give up homes or positions more comfortable, from a worldly point of view, than the one they come to, so that self-seeking persons are seldom found in the army. The training lasts from six to twelve weeks; then the catlet is sent as a lieutenant to some captain in the field. Neither captain nor lieutenant has often many shillings in pocket when commencing the work in a new place, whether city or village. Constant dependence on God for the supply of all needs is a lesson often learned amidst hard surroundings. So rapid and complete is success generally that their lot is not often one of much privation. For a few years mob violence was their chief hardship, but as the army becomes better known and understood by the authorities, and their non-resistant disposition discovered by all classes, the officers are able to give their whole strength to the service. Each officer is expected to conduct from twenty to twenty-five meetings weekly, extending over thirty to thirty-five hours; to spend eighteen hours in visiting from house to house, and to spare no possible effort in seeking the good of souls. The amount of salary to be drawn by a single man-captain is twenty-one shillings weekly, by a woman-captain fifteen shillings, and by a married captain twenty-seven shillings, with one shilling per week per child, so that drones are seldom found in the Salvation Army. A negligent or unsuccessful officer, after sufficient trial, is usually left without an appointment. The frequent removals check all selfish sentiment, amid thus  the officers by experience, become examples of self-sacrifice for the salvation of the world.

The uniform worn by the army consists of a plain simple dark-blue dress, trimmed with a neat red braid, and marked with the letter S on the collar: the S on the general's garments is marked in gold. It is found to be useful, attracts attention, gives opportunity for conversation, gathers people at the open-air demonstrations, excites respect in the rougher class of the people, indicates a person's position in the army, and is a safeguard against the fashions of the age. The military form of government, affirms Mr. Booth, in his Book of Instructions, contradicts no form of government laid down or practised in the New Test., and is in perfect harmony with the only system described in the Old Test., and cannot therefore be said to be unscriptural.

4. The doctrines taught, in the army are Arminian, such as Mr. Booth learned to love and preach when he was a Methodist minister. In describing this matter, he says, "We have not a particle of sympathy with those who desire to let down or adapt the gospel of Christ to the fancy of the 19th century. The gospel which tells a man that he is thoroughly bad, and under the power of the devil; which drags out the hidden things of iniquity to the light of the judgment throne; which denounces sin without mercy, and warns men of eternal wrath to come unless they repent and believe in the only Saviour; the gospel of a crucified Saviour, who shed real blood to save men from real guilt, real danger, a real hell, and who lives again to give a real pardon to the really penitent — a real deliverance from the guilt, power, pollution, and fact of sin to all who really give up to him a whole heart, and trust him with a perfect faith — such is the gospel of the Salvation Army. We heartily believe the three creeds of the Church, we believe every word of the commination service, and we denounce the wrath of God against sinners as those who believe that all these things are true. We teach men to expect salvation from the guilt of sin the moment they turn from sin to God, and trust him to receive and pardon them. We teach that God is able and willing perfectly to purge the heart from all its evil tendencies a id desires, the moment the soul trusts him for it all: we urge the people not to rest until God has thus cleansed the thoughts of their hearts by his Holy Spirit; and we assure them that God will preserve them blameless, and cause them everywhere to triumph, so long as they fully trust and obey him. We teach that sin is sin, whoever commits it, and that there cannot be sin without the divine displeasure that there is a real, constant, and perfect deliverance from sin provided by Jesus Christ, which  all men are responsible either for accepting or rejecting. We teach that all saved men and women ought to lay down their lives for the salvation of others, if required; that being followers of Christ means sacrificing all our own interests, enjoyments, and possessions to save a rebel world, and that whosoever does not so bear the cross has no right to expect the crown."

5. Printing has been a great factor in the progress and success of the army. From the commencement of the mission in East London Mr. Booth has had strong faith in the power of the press. A cheap and good hymn-book was one of his first requisites, and his first collection, sold at one penny, was often enlarged and added to, until it has become one of the best penny hymn-books in use, and hundreds of thousands have been sold of it. He then began a penny monthly magazine, called The East London Evangelist, which was followed by another, with the title Christian Mission Magazine. Both these were too slow in their operation to satisfy the general of an army. During a few weeks of enforced confinement to his room through an injured foot, Mr. Booth conceived the idea of a weekly newspaper, of four large pages, to sell at one cent; in three days his plans were completed, and within a month appeared No. 1 of The War-cry, a startling title for timid people, but it exactly met the wants of the army, and in a few days 7000 of that issue were sold, and of No. 2 fully 20,000 were wanted. In a few months it had a weekly circulation of 100,000, then it became necessary to issue it twice in the week, and it was filled with stirring news of the doings of the army everywhere, illustrated by engravings which strongly appealed to the emotional sensibilities, every column in each issue being filled with intelligence, short, sharp, and fresh. The sales soon ran up to 250,000, and in each issue was printed an account of the number of copies of the paper sold by each corps throughout the country, as a spur to ambition. The War-cry is now a valuable property to Mr. Booth, and since January 1886, it has been enlarged, and issued once a week, at one penny. There are now twenty different papers with that title, four English and sixteen foreign, issued in as many localities, to report the work of the army in those places, anti all after the English original. For the children in the army another paper is issued, called The Little Soldier in which are reported the sayings and doings of the juvenile members of the army. People outside the army have frequently complained of articles which have appeared in both papers, but  the reply of the officials is, that the soldiers in the army are satisfied, and they are the chief patrons of both papers. Every soldier is expected to take part in selling these papers weekly, and they are sold as freely on Sunday as on any other day, as are also other publications of theirs. Quite a number of books are issued now from the book-room, for which a large publishing- house has been opened in London. One of these is entitled The Salvation Soldier's Guide, which contains a Bible chapter for every morning and evening throughout the year, to help the unlearned to a daily increased knowledge of God's word. The army has now a considerable catalogue of its own publications. About twenty tons' weight of printed books is sent out every week from the publishing, home.

6. It has been found that strong prejudice exists among the poor against churches and chapels; to avoid arousing those prejudices in the minds of the outcast class and the ignorant, the terms "Salvation Army," and "barracks," and "stores," and "headquarters" have been adopted as less objectionable than such names as "Christ Church" or "Jesus College." The carrying of colors, using bands of music, processions, and other sensational methods are justified because other methods have failed to influence the masses. Striking handbills are used as the only means likely to influence drunkards, gamblers, thieves, and neglecters of salvation generally. The terms "Blood and Fire," used ion the banners and in their literature, refer to the blood of the Atonement by which men are saved, and fire means the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies, energizes, and comforts all true soldiers of God.

All new converts are taught and encouraged to speak immediately after their conversion, just to tell what the Lord has done for them; it commits them to a life of usefulness in his service before all their old companions, kindred, and friends God blesses them in so doing, it makes them happy and useful, and has been the means of saving scores from becoming backsliders, by returning to their old ways.

The employment, of women to speak and preach has been objected to by some, but it is justified by various passages in the New Test. Beyond these, the fact that they have the gift to preach — and this both Mrs. and Miss Booth have in a very high degree — and preach most effectively, is evidence that the gift should be exercised. Philip the Evangelist had four daughters who were preachers. For ten years and more Mrs. and Miss Booth, and scores of other females in the army, have preached continually  to all classes of people, without any evil consequences following; on the contrary, hundreds of people, rich and poor, have been saved under their ministrations. The army does not recruit its ranks by drawing members from any churches, it openly avows its objection to accept members belonging to any existing Church; but churches of most denominations have voluntarily contributed to its funds, especially the Church of England and the Methodists, who best understand its operations and designs. Many of the army converts go to join other churches, and it is known that more than four hundred persons, converted and trained in its ranks, were, in 1885, employed by different religions organizations as ministers, evangelists, missionaries, colporteurs, Bible women, and in other like agencies. Great care is taken of the health of the soldiers in the army, and when unable to attend to the duties of their station they are sent to a House of Rest, which was many years the home of general Booth and his family, and there they remain till recovered strength justifies their return to duty.

III. Statistics. — The success of the army, especially in Great Britain and the colonies, has commanded the attention and consideration of persons in all classes of society. On June 30, 1882, queen Victoria intimated her personal disposition towards the army in a letter to Mrs. Booth, from which the following is an extract: "Madam, I am commanded by the queen to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th inst., and to assure you that her majesty learns with much satisfaction that you have, with other members of your society, been successful in your efforts in winning many thousands to the ways of temperance, virtue, and religion." About the same time the bishops in convocation spoke most favorably of the army, and they unanimously passed a resolution "for a committee of their lordships to inquire into the workings of the army, to see what advice they could give to their presbyters in dealing with them." The archbishop of York and the bishop of Bedford, among others, have gathered large companies of the army and administered the Lord's Supper to them in their churches.\*

\* In 1883 the Salvation Army was prohibited by the authorities of the cantons of Geneva, Berne, and Neufchatel, in Switzerland, on an old law, as disturbers of the public peace, and there have been occasional interferences with their Sunday processions in some towns in America by the municipal authorities on similar grounds — ED.  The great Congress Hall in London is the school for the army. There about one hundred and fifty soldiers are constantly under training in various departments some have to learn the mere elements of knowledge, and the elements of theology are not forgotten. To many of the cadets the interior of a church or chapel was a place of mystery before their conversion. The army is now so thoroughly before the public, and has met with almost universal endorsement in the minds-of unprejudiced persons, that it has become a most important factor in raising fallen and degraded humanity in nearly all lands. As described by general Booth himself, "The end and design of the Salvation Army is to spread throughout the entire world, and to last as long as God has enemies to be fought with and overcome!"
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## Salvation, Infant[[@Headword:Salvation, Infant]]

             SEE INFANT SALVATION.

## Salve[[@Headword:Salve]]

             SEE MEDICINE; SEE UNGUENT.

## Salve Jesu, Summe Bonus[[@Headword:Salve Jesu, Summe Bonus]]

             is the beginning of one of St. Bernard's passion hymns, and is addressed to the side of Christ. It has been translated into English by Thompson in Lyra Messianica, p. 293:

## Salve Regina  [[@Headword:Salve Regina  ]]

             “Jesu, hail! supremely Good, On the branches of the Rood, How thy limbs, all anguish-worn, Bitterly were scorched and torn, Thou that but too gracious art!” (B.P.)  (Hail, O Queen, i.e. Virgin Mary) is the name of an antiphony long in use in the Roman Catholic Church. Composer and date are unknown, though it is attributed to either Peter, bishop of Compostella in the 10th century, or to Hermannus Contractus, a Benedictine, in the 11th. The Chronicles of Spires state that St. Bernard, when at Spires in the capacity of apostolical delegate, added the closing words, “O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria!” by which it received its present form (Chronic. de Urbe Spirensi, lib. 12). Pope Gregory directed, in 1239, that it be recited in the daily offices after the completorium (q.v.). In modern usage, it is employed during the interval between Trinity and Advent Sundays; and it also forms a part of the usual private devotions of believers, especially on Saturdays. In many dioceses the ritual in use directs the recitation of the Salve Regina at funerals, after the burial service, with a view to supplicate the maternal intercession of the Blessed Virgin for the souls in purgatory. St. Bernard discusses the subject matter of this antiphony in his works, laying special emphasis on the mercy and power of Mary as here set forth (Opera [Antw. 1616], p. 1756, s.v.).

## Salve, Festa Dies, Toto Venerabilis Aevo[[@Headword:Salve, Festa Dies, Toto Venerabilis Aevo]]

             is the beginning of a resurrection hymn by Venantius Fortunatus. “In this sweet poem, the whole nature, born anew in the spring, and arrayed in the bridal garment of hope and promise, welcomes the risen Savior, the Prince of spiritual and eternal life.” The original, as given by Daniel (Daniel 1:170), has fourteen stanzas, of three lines each. Trench gives only ten lines, and so likewise Biassler, Rambach, and Simrock in their collections. Daniel remarks, “Ex hoc suavissimo poimate ecclesia decem versus sibi vindicavit, qui efficerent canticum triumphale Paschatis.” We give the first stanza:

“Salve, festa dies, toto venerabilis aevo,

Qua Deus infernum vicit et astra tenet.

Salve, festa dies, toto venerabilis aevo.”

There are different English renderings, as by Mrs. Charles, Christian Life in Song, p. 135: “Hail, festal day! ever exalted high;” in Lyra Eucharistica, p. 16: “Hail, festal day! for evermore adored;” in Schaffa Christ in Song, p. 235: “Hail, Day of Days! in peals of praise.” German translations are given by Rambach, Bassler, Simrock, and Fortlage. (B.P.)

## Salve, caput cruentatum[[@Headword:Salve, caput cruentatum]]

             is the beginning of one of Bernard's seven passion hymns. The original, in fifty lines, in five stanzas, addressed to the face of Christ (“Ad faciem Christi in cruce pendentis”), is the best of the seven passion hymns, and runs thus in the first stanza:

“Salve, caput cruentatum,

Totum spinis coronatum,

 Conquassatum, vulneratum,

 Arundine sic verberatum.

Facie sputis illita.

Salve, cujus dulcis vultus Immutatus et incultus

 Immutavit suum florem, Totus versus in pallorem,

Quem coeli tremit cura.”

There are different English renderings of this hymn, as by Mrs. Charles, Christian Life in Song, p. 159: “Hail, thou Head! so bruised and wounded,” which is also found in Schaffs Christ in Song; by Alford in the Year of Praise, No. 102: “Hail! that Head with sorrows bowing;” by Baker, in Hymns, Ancient and Modern, No. 97: “O Sacred Head, surrounded.” There are a number of German translations, but the best is that by Gerhardt: “O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden,” which again has been translated into English by Alexander and others. (B.P.)

## Salvete, flores martyrum[[@Headword:Salvete, flores martyrum]]

             is the beginning of the famous hymn written by Prudentius of Spain (q.v.), and which is used in the Latin Church on Innocents' Day, the second day after Christmas. This hymn, of which the first stanza runs thus,

“Salvete, flores martyrum,

Quos lucis ipso in limine Christi insecutor sustulit,

Ceu turbo nascentes rosas,”

has been translated into English by Chandler, Hymns of the Primitive Church, “Hail, infant martyrs! newborn victims, hail!” by Caswall, Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated, “Flowers of martyrdom, all hail!” and Neale, “All hail, ye infant martyr-flowers!” German translations are given in Bassler, Konigsfeld, Rambach, and Simrock; while the original is found in Trench (p. 121), Daniel (1, 124), Simrock, Rambach, Bassler, and Konigsfeld. (B.P.)

## Salvi Mundi Salutare[[@Headword:Salvi Mundi Salutare]]

             another of these passion hymns, is addressed to the pierced feet of Christ, the original of which is given in Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 137, while Mrs. Charles, in Christian Life in Song, p. 161, has given an English rendering, “All the world's Salvation, hail!” to which we may add another translation by Kynaston in Lyra Messianica, p. 194, “Jesus, hail! the world's Salvation.” A German rendering is found in Rambach, Anthologie, 1, 275, and in Konigsfeld, Hymnen und Gesange, 2, 191. That part of the hymn which is addressed to the knees of the Savior and commences, “Salve, salve, rex sanctorum,” Thompson has rendered in Lyra Messianica, p. 288, “Hail, O hail! high King of Saints;” who also rendered that part addressed to the hands, and commencing, “Salve, salve, Jesu bone,” in Lyra Messianica, p. 301, “Hail! O Jesu, kind and good.” (B.P.)

## Salvi, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Salvi, Giovanni Battista]]

             an Italian painter of the Roman school, was born July 11, 1605. He studied at first with his father, at his home in Sassoferrato, and afterwards went to Rome and Naples. In the latter city he became a pupil of Domenichino, whom he resembled in many respects. Salvi died Aug. 8, 1685. He left a great number of copies after Guido, Baraccia, and Raphael. Of his original  compositions, there are, in the museum at Naples, a Holy Family, and Thi Workshop of St. Joseph.

## Salvi, Niccolo[[@Headword:Salvi, Niccolo]]

             an Italian architect, was born, in 1699, at Rome. He was of wealthy parent, age; and, having received a brilliant education, he applied himself in turn to poetry, mathematics, philosophy, and even medicine, but finally decided upon architecture, which had always been his favorite study. His master, Canevarius, leaving Rome, Salvi was left in charge of many important works. He designed several beautiful altars and constructed villas; but his great work is the Fountain of Trevi, which was commenced by order of Clement XII and finished under Benedict XIV. He died at Rome in 1751.

## Salvianus[[@Headword:Salvianus]]

             an elegant ecclesiastical writer of the 5th century, was born in the neighborhood of Treves. Whether reared as a Christian is uncertain; but shortly after his marriage with Palladia, a pagan lady of Cologne, they both appear as earnest Christians. After the birth of a daughter, he joined his wife in making a vow of monkish chastity. He now removed to the south of France, and acted as presbyter of the Church at Marseilles. Here he stood in close relations with bishop Eucherius of Lyons, to whose sons he gave instruction. The period of his death is uncertain, but he lived at least until 490, for Gennadius wrote of him in 490-495, “Vivit usque hodie senectute bona.” Salvianus was a prolific author. Besides various treatises which have perished, the following are still extant: Adversus Avaritiam Libri IV ad Ecclesiam Catholicam (about 440 [it was printed by Sichardus, at Basle, in 1528; its object was to induce the laity to greater luberality to the Church]): De gubernatione Dei et de Justo Proesentique Judicio (451- 455 [it was printed by Frobenius, Basle, 1530; it was written at the time of the ravages of the Northern barbarians, and was designed, like the Civitas Dei of Augustine, to remove the doubts against the providence of God to which those calamities had given rise]): — Epistoce IX, which had been addressed to friends on various familiar topics. These letters were first printed, with the author's collective works, in 1580. The collective works of Salvianus were printed by P. Pithoeus (Paris, 1580, 8vo), by Rittershusius (Altdorf, 1611), and by Balusius (ibid. 1663-69-84). See Heyne, Opuscula Academica, vol. 6; Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Myth. 3, 700, 701; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 13, 342, 343. (J.P.L.)

## Salviati, Alamanno[[@Headword:Salviati, Alamanno]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Florence, April 20, 1668. He was prothonotary of the Holy See, afterwards vice-legate of Avignon, and in 1717 was made legate of Urbino, which charge he held till he was created cardinal in 1730. He died at Rome, Feb. 24, 1733. This prelate was the author of a dedicatory epistle addressed to the grand-duke Jean Gaston, and which is at the beginning of the Vocabolario of the Academy of Crusca.

## Salviati, Antonio Maria[[@Headword:Salviati, Antonio Maria]]

             an Italian cardinal, nephew of Bernardo and Giovanni, was born in 1507. In 1561 he became bishop of Saint-Papoul, a diocese which had been held by his two uncles; but he relinquished it in 1563, and was sent by Pius IV as ambassador to the court of France. Gregory XIII also employed him in various capacities, and in 1583 invested him with the purple. Salviati was afterwards legate at Bologna, and, on account of his virtues, was called the “great cardinal Salviati.” He died at Rome, April 28, 1602.

## Salviati, Bernardo[[@Headword:Salviati, Bernardo]]

             an Italian cardinal of the same family as the preceding, was born at Florence in 1492. As a knight of St. John of Jerusalem he took part in several expeditions against the barbaric corsairs, and reached the rank of general of the galleys He undertook a campaign in the Peloponnesus when the island of Rhodes was in the hands of Soliman: he laid Tripoli in ruins, destroyed the forts along the canal of Fagiera, besieged and took Cordon, in the Morea, and ravaged the island of Scio. Thus in a short time his name became a terror to the Turks. Being sent to Barcelona, to Charles V, he pleaded in vain for the liberty of his country, then torn by revolutions. Having gone to the court of France, he followed the advice of his relative, Catherine de' Medici, entered in ecclesiastical life, and was made almoner of the queen. In 1549 Salviati became bishop of Saint-Papoul, and, at the request of Catherine de' Medici, received from Pius IV the cardinal's hat, together with the bishopric of Clermont. He died at Rome, May 6, 1568.

## Salviati, Francesco Rossi de[[@Headword:Salviati, Francesco Rossi de]]

             (called Cecchino de' Salviati), an Italian painter, was born at Florence in 1510. He was taught by his father, Filippo Rossi, but afterwards became a  pupil of Bugiardini, and frequented the studios of the artists Raffaello da Brescia and Andrea del Sarto. After he had gained some reputation, he was called to Rome by cardinal Giovanni Salviati, who became his patron, and whose name he took. He died at Rome in 1563. In his frescos, Salviati shows a richness of invention and purity of design which have made him justly celebrated. His paintings are to be found in many of the principal cities of Europe. In the Louvre are a Holy Family, a Visitation, and The Unbelief of Thomas.

## Salviati, Giovanni[[@Headword:Salviati, Giovanni]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Florence, March 24, 1490. He became cardinal in 1517, then administrator of the Church at Fermo, and, in 1520, bishop of Ferrara. His cousin, Clement VII, sent him to quiet the troubles in Parma, and also, in 1526, on a mission to Charles V at Madrid, to solicit the release of Francis I and the recall of the imperial troops which had invaded the Papal States. Not being able to prevent the sack of Rome by the soldiers of the constable de Bourbon, Salviati went to implore the aid of the king of France in favor of the Holy See. By his mediation the treaty of the Holy League was signed, May 29, 1527, between Clement VII, Francis I, and Henry VII; and, in spite of many obstacles, he also brought about a peace between Charles V and the Holy See. From Francis I he received, in 1520, the diocese of Oleron, and, in addition, that of Saint- Papoul, besides several rich abbeys. In 1543 he became bishop of Albano, and in 1546 of Porto. The home of Salviati at Rome was the resort of men of genius, who always found in him a generous patron. He died at Ravenna, Oct. 28, 1553.

## Salvini, Salvino[[@Headword:Salvini, Salvino]]

             an Italian scholar, was born, in 1667, at Florence. He was educated at Pisa, and gave himself to the study of belles-lettres and the antiquities of his country. He was canon of the cathedral of Florence, and member of several literary associations. He died at Florence, Nov. 29, 1751. His works were numerous, but not of a religious character, as Fasti Consolari dell' Accademia Fiorentina.

## Salzburgers, The[[@Headword:Salzburgers, The]]

             is a term applied in Protestant history to the evangelical inhabitants of the duchy of Salzburg, who, after ages of persecution, finally, in 1731-32, gave  up their property and homes, and found refuge in Eastern Prussia. Salzburg, in the Middle Ages, was a powerful archbishopric, and its archbishop the most important prelate of Germany. It lay in the mountains in the southwest of Austria. Its population was Christianized by St. Rupert in the 6th century. The doctrines of Huss early obtained a footing, but the severe measures of archbishop Eberhard III in 1420 suppressed them, though it is probable that the good leaven still worked secretly in many hearts; for at the first dawn of the Reformation Salzburg warmly welcomed it, and many of its priests began to teach as Luther. Eminent among these was the venerable friend of Luther, Dr. Staupitz, who, in 1518, became the court preacher of the ducal archbishop of Salzburg. In 1520, however, he was silenced by the archbishop. Anothet eminent evangelical priest was Paul Speratus, who was driven into banishment. A third was Stephen Agricola, also a court preacher; after three years of imprisonment he escaped (1524), and became a pastor at Augsburg. A fourth was George Scharer, who was actually put to death for his earnest preaching of the Gospel. In 1588 archbishop Dietrich issued a decree that all non-Catholic Salzburgers should within one month either become Catholics or leave the duchy. As the most of them chose the latter, another decree was issued confiscating their lands. Under his successor a similar measure was executed in 1614. During the whole period of the Thirty-years' War (1618- 48), Salzburg was relatively quiet, and actually increased in material prosperity, while disorder and ruin prevailed elsewhere. But a tolerant archbishop was a rare exception. Accordingly the harsh measures broke out afresh under Gandolph in 1685. This was occasioned by the discovery of a rural parish which was wholly Lutheran, save that occasionally it held a public mass. All the evangelical books of this society were at once gathered up and burned, and the single choice offered of submission to Rome or exile, with loss of property and children. More than a thousand persons saw themselves forced in midwinter to leave their homes and children. Earnest remonstrances were made by Prussia and other Protestant powers against this direct violation of the provisions of the Peace of Westphalia. While this diplomatic correspondence was taking place, the archbishop died (1686). Under his two successors there was less persecution, and the Lutheran-minded among the inhabitants practiced more caution, concealing their Bibles and other books in the mountains, and resorting to secret places in the night and celebrating their simple worship, armed with axes, and with outstanding guards. But the final storm came at last, when the miserly and ambitious Leopold Anton became  archbishop (1728).

This man was anxious for two things to stand in high favor at Rome, and to fill his treasury. Both objects he thought would be reached by a severe course against all open or secret heresy. Accordingly he flooded his land with Jesuit spies. All heretics were at once arrested and cast into prison, and tormented with hunger and tortures. Meantime a few of the chief non-Catholics fled secretly to Ratisbon and to Prussia, in hope of effecting forcible intervention on their behalf. They were warmly welcomed by Frederick William I of Prussia, and were promised homes and protection for all who should be forced to abandon their country. But before their return the archbishop had resorted to a more extreme measure. The nonconformity of the non-Catholics was represented to Austria as rebellion, and from 4000 to 6000 troops were obtained, and then quartered on the persecuted Lutherans; and then, in order to terrify the rest into submission, some 800 of the most prominent members were violently arrested, and required within eight days to leave the country. But the effect was the contrary of what had been expected: they behaved so heroically and resolutely as to inspire the whole body of non-Catholics with a like enthusiasm. In December, 1731, they crossed the Bavarian frontier. A few days later another company of 500 followed them. By April, 1732, the number of the exiles had reached more than 14,000; and some of the best districts were almost desolated. The sole substantial help was given to the exiles by Prussia. The king issued a decree in February, 1732, requiring his officers to furnish them with money to make their journey, acknowledging them as Prussian subjects, pledging his government to see that recompense should be made for their lands, and threatening to confiscate Catholic property in his own dominions in case the archbishop did not proceed with more moderation. Denmark, Sweden, and Holland made similar remonstrances and threats in their behalf At the suggestion of George II of England a collection was taken up for the sufferers throughout Protestantdom. It amounted to some 900,000 florins.

The place of refuge assigned to them was in the wilds of Lithuania. The course of their march through Nuremberg, Erlangen, Leipsic, Halle, Wittenberg, Magdeburg, Potsdam, and Berlin was almost like a triumphal procession, so great was the sympathy which their long-endured sufferings had everywhere excited. At Potsdam the old king, Frederick William, received them into the palace gardens; and, with his queen, mingled among them very familiarly, asking them questions in regard to their faith, and giving them advice for the future. He was highly gratified with them, gave them money, and, assuring them that he would treat them in the best possible manner, bade them a  hearty godspeed. From Berlin the exiles took their way to Stettin, where they took ship and sailed to Konigsberg. Thence they marched by land to Lithuania, where wild lands awaited them, and which their industry speedily transformed into a flourishing colony of towns and farm houses. The number who positively settled there was over 20,000. They cordially welcomed the Lutheran pastors who were furnished to them at Berlin. The several millions of thalers which the king spent upon them proved no less a wise commercial investment than had been the case with the help given to the banished Huguenots by his grandfather, the great elector.

While Prussia profited so richly from the persecutions of these Salzburgers, the persecuting archbishop was foiled in his real, sole purpose. Instead of filling his treasury, he actually emptied it. It was only imperfectly that he could supply his deserted fields and mines with new laborers; and those whom he did obtain were, many of them, indolent and mendicant. In addition, there came upon him a debt of 11,000,000 florins for the Austrian troops which he had employed to oppress and expel his subjects. The results were an impoverished land and a heavier taxation upon the remaining Catholics, while the emigrants were entirely freed from all imposts and taxes for full ten years. Also other lands profited from this persecution. Wurtemberg, Holland, Sweden, Russia, England, and America (Georgia) received large numbers of the exiles; so that the number actually lost to Salzburg by the folly of archbishop Anton was over 30, 000. Since this asra of persecution Salzburg has held a much less prominent place in European history. The territory was secularized in 1802. In 1815 the most of it was given to Austria. In 1849 it became a separate crown land of Austria. See Gockling, Emigrationsgeschichte von Salzburg (Leips. 1734); Panse, Geschichte der Auswanderung der evangelischen Salzburger (ibid. 1827); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 346-359. (J.P.L.)

## Sam, Conrad[[@Headword:Sam, Conrad]]

             known in German history as “the Reformer of Ulm,” was born at Rothenacker in 1483. He studied Latin at Ulm, and in 1498 matriculated at Tubingen. In 1520 he was preacher at Brackenheim, near Heilbronn, and thoroughly devoted to the Reformation. Luther corresponded with him, and sent to him regularly his publications. Copies still exist with Luther's autograph: “An den Sam, Pf. zu Brackenheim, M. Luther, Dr.” In 1524 he was driven away from Brackenheim, but found protection in Ulm, and an open door to preach the new doctrines. Here his labors resulted in the  complete victory of Protestantism. His stentorian voice, his popular style and wit, filled the great cathedral with the eager populace. But soon great trials began. The eucharistic strife broke out. Sam gradually turned from Luther's views to the simpler and more radical doctrine of Zwingli, with whom, as also with Blarer, Bucer, and Oecolampadilus, he entered into close correspondence. After many struggles, the local authorities of Ulm were brought to consent to a formal reformation of Church rites and doctrine. The mass was abolished, images removed, cloisters closed, and the Zwinglian doctrines accepted. But victory, after seven years of valiant contest, was in its results for Sam fully as serious and full of danger as had been the open contest. So soon as the crown of victory was gained, the interest of the masses in religion cooled off; attendance on the sermons declined; vice reigned among high and low; the duties of Sam taxed his powers to the utmost; and, worse than all, the zeal of the oppressed party burst forth with new life. Romanists flocked out to every neighboring village to Join in their old rites; and High Lutherans labored in the same direction. In 1533 the health of the laborious preacher began to break down. Twice he rose from his sick bed to proclaim the Gospel afresh. It was too much. On June 20 he rested from his labors. See Keim, Reform. der Reichsstadt Ulm (1851); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20, 670-682. (J.P.L.)

## Sam-Beid, Or Saman Veda[[@Headword:Sam-Beid, Or Saman Veda]]

             Is the Hindu title of the third section of the Vedas (q.v.).

## Samael[[@Headword:Samael]]

             (Σαμαήλ v.r. Σαλαμιήλ), a corrupt form (Jdt 8:1) of the Heb. name (Num 1:6) SHELUMIEL SEE SHELUMIEL (q.v.).

## Samaias[[@Headword:Samaias]]

             (Σαμαίς, but v.r. in Tobit Σεμέας, Σεμελίας, etc.), a Graecized form for the name SHEMAIAH SEE SHEMAIAH (q.v.): a. a Levite (1Es 1:9), in the reign of Josiah (2Ch 25:9); b. an Israelite (1Es 8:39) of the “sons” of Adonikam (Ezr 8:13); c. a “great” personage, father of Ananias and Jonathas (Tob 5:13).

## Samanaeans[[@Headword:Samanaeans]]

             in Chinese mythology, are an order of saints who are given to self- contemplation. Fo, or Fohi, teaches that the essence of all things consists in the nothing and the vacuum, and that men return into the nothing, there first to attain to blessedness. The Samanaeans occupy the last stage in the progress towards this nihilistic blessedness. He who has advanced to this  stage need no longer worship the gods; he is delivered from his passions, lives in a state of constant self-contemplation, and dies only that he may be incorporated with the great soul of the world.

## Samanera[[@Headword:Samanera]]

             is the name given to a novice among the Buddhists. It is derived from sramama, an ascetic. He must be at least eight years of age, and must have received the consent of his parents to his abandonment of the world. He cannot receive ordination until he is twenty years of age, nor before he has reached that age can he perform any religious rite, nor is he allowed to interfere in matters of discipline or government. The vow of a Samanera is in no case revocable.

## Samaria[[@Headword:Samaria]]

             [strictly Samari'a], CITY OF (Heb. Shomeron', שֹׁמְרוֹן, watch, so called probably from its commanding site, as well as by alliteration with its original owner's name; Chald. Shomra'yin, שָׁמְרָיַן, Ezr 4:10; Ezr 4:17; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, usually Σαμάρεια, as Ptolemy; but some copies of the Sept. often have Σαμαρία, and occasionally Σεμηρών or Σομορών; and Josephus once [Ant. 8:12, 1] Σεμαρεων), an important place in Central Palestine, famous as the capital of the Northern Kingdom, and later as giving name to a region of the country and to a schismatic sect. Its boundaries, however, seem never to have been very definitely fixed. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

I. History. — The hill of the same name, which the city occupied, was purchased for two talents of silver from the owner, Shemer (q.v.), after whom the city was named (1Ki 16:23-24), by Omri (q.v.), king of Israel, for the foundation of his new metropolis, B.C. cir. 925. The first capital after the secession of the ten tribes had been Shechem itself, whither all Israel had come to make Rehoboam king. On the separation being fully accomplished, Jeroboam rebuilt that city (1Ki 12:25), which had been razed to the ground by Abimelech (Jdg 9:45). But he soon moved to Tirzah, a place, as Dr. Stanley observes, of great and proverbial beauty (Son 6:4), which continued to be the royal residence until Zimri burned the palace and perished in its ruins (1Ki 14:17; 1Ki 15:21; 1Ki 15:33; 1Ki 16:6-18). Omri, who prevailed in the contest for the kingdom that ensued, after “reigning six years” there, transferred his court and government to a new site, being under the necessity of reconstructing somewhere, and doubtless influenced by the natural advantages of the position, and desirous of commemorating his dynasty by a change of capital. Samaria continued to be the metropolis of Israel for the remaining two centuries of that kingdom's existence. During all this time it was the seat of idolatry, and is often as such denounced by the prophets (Isa 9:8; Jer 23:13-14; Eze 16:46-55; Amo 6:1; Mic 1:1), sometimes in connection with Jerusalem (especially by Hosea). Ahab built a temple to Baal there (1Ki 16:32-33); and from this circumstance a portion of the city, possibly fortified by a separate wall, was called “the city of the house of Baal” (2Ki 10:25). It was the scene of many of the acts of the prophets Elijah and Elisha (q.v.), connected with the various famines of the land, the unexpected plenty of Samaria, and the several deliverances of the city from the Syrians. Jehu broke down the temple of Baal, but does not appear to have otherwise injured the city (2Ki 10:18-28). Samaria must have been a place of great strength. It was twice besieged by the Syrians, in B.C. 901 (1Ki 20:1) and in B.C. 892 (2Ki 6:24; 2Ki 6:20); but on both occasions the siege was ineffectual. On the latter, indeed, it was relieved miraculously, belt not until the inhabitants had suffered almost incredible horrors from famine during their protracted resistance.

The possessor of Samaria was considered to be de facto king of Israel (2Ki 15:13-14); and woes denounced against the nation were directed against it by name (Isa 7:9, etc.). Although characterized by gross voluptuousness, as well as other sins incidental to idolatry, its inhabitants did not entirely lose that generosity which had early characterized Ephraim, in evidence of which note the event that happened during the reign of the last but one of its kings (2Ch 28:6-15). In B.C. 720 Samaria was taken, after a siege ser (or, rather, by his successor Sargon), king of Assyria (2Ki 18:9-10), and the kingdom of the ten tribes was was demolished by the condestroyed. The city doubtless queror. Col. Rawlinson, indeed, has lately endeavored to show that Samaria was not at once depopulated (Athenoeum Lond.], Aug. 22, 1863, p. 246); and this was doubtless true as regards the country around; but his application of the argument to the city itself (evidently in order to square with the hypothesis of a twofold invasion of Judah also during the reign of Hezekiah [q.v.]) is based upon reasons so obviously inconclusive that they need not be here examined in  detail. SEE SAMARITAN. Samaria is only called Beth-Khumri in the earlier cuneatic inscriptions (q.v.), but from the time of Tiglath-Pileser II the term used is Tsamirin (Rawlinson, Hist. Evidences, p. 321). The people are figured on the Egyptian monuments among the captives with the hieroglyph Asmori attached (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1, 403). SEE CAPTIVITY, ASSYRIAN.

After this capture Samaria appears to have continued, for a time at least, the chief city of the foreigners brought to occupy the places of the departed natives, although Shechem soon became the capital of the Samaritans as a religious sect. From this it would seem that the city of Samaria had meanwhile been but partially rebuilt. We do not, however, hear especially of the place until the days of Alexander the Great, B.C. 333. That conqueror took the city, which seems to have somewhat recovered itself (Euseb. Chronicles ad ann. Abr. 1684), killed a large portion of the inhabitants, and suffered the remainder to settle among their compatriots at Shechem (q.v.). He replaced them by a colony of Syro-Macedonians, and gave the adjacent territory (Σαμαρεῖτις χώρα) to the Jews to inhabit (Josephus, c. Revelation 2, 4). These SyroMacedonians occupied the city until the time of John Hyrcanus. It was then a place of considerable importance, for Josephus describes it (Ant. 13:10, 2) as a very strong city (πόλις ὀχυρωτάτη). John Hyrcanus took it after a year's siege, and did his best to demolish it entirely. He intersected the hill on which it lay with trenches; into these he conducted the natural brooks, and thus undermined its foundation. “In fact,” says the Jewish historian, “he took away all evidence of the very existence of the city.” This story at first sight seems rather exaggerated, and inconsistent with the hilly site of Samaria. It may have referred only to the suburbs lying at its foot. “But,” says Prideaux (Connection, B.C. 109, note), “Benjamin of Tudela, who was in the place, tells us in his Itinerary (no such passage, however, exists in that work) that there were upon the top of this hill many fountains of water, and from these water enough may have been derived to fill these trenches.” It should also be recollected that the hill of Samaria was lower than the hills in its neighborhood. This may account for the existence of these springs. Josephus describes the extremities to which the inhabitants were reduced during this siege, much in the same way that the author of the book of Kings does during that of Benhadad (comp. War, 1, 2, 7 with 2Ki 6:25). John Hyrcanus's reasons for attacking Samaria were the injuries which its inhabitants had done to the people of Marissa, colonists and allies  of the Jews. This confirms what was said above of the cession of the Samaritan neighborhood to the Jews by Alexander the Great. The mention of Marissa in this connection serves to explain a notice in the earlier history of the Maccabees. The Samaria named in the present text of 1Ma 5:66 (ἡ Σαμάρεια; Vulg. Sanaria) is evidently an error. At any rate, the well known Samaria of the Old and New Testaments cannot be intended, for it is obvious that Judas, in passing from Hebron to the land of the Philistines (Azotus), could not make so immense a detour. The true correction is doubtless supplied by Josephus (Ant. 12:8, 6), who has Marissa (i.e. Mareshah [q.v.]) a place which lay in the road from Hebron to the Philistine plain. One of the ancient Latin versions exhibits the same reading, which is accepted by Ewald (Gesch. 4, 361) and a host of commentators (see Grimm, Kurzg. exeg. Handb. on the passage). Drusius proposed Shaaraim; but this is hardly so feasible as Mareshah, and has no external support.

After this demolition (which occurred in B.C. 129), the Jews inhabited what remained of the city; at least, we find it in their possession in the time of Alexander Janneeus (Josephus, Ant. 13:15, 4), and until Pompey gave it back to the descendants of its original inhabitants (τοῖς οἰκήτορσιν). These οἰκήτορες may possibly have been the Syro-Macedonians, but it is more probable that they were Samaritans proper, whose ancestors had been dispossessed by the colonists of Alexander the Great. By directions of Gabinius, Samaria and other demolished cities were rebuilt (ibid. 14:5, 3). But its more effectual rebuilding was undertaken by Herod the Great, to whom it had been granted by Augustus, on the death of Antony and Cleopatra (ibid. 13:10, 3; 15:8, 5; War, 1, 20, 3). He called it Sebaste, Σεβαστή = Augusta, after the name of his patron (Josephus, Ant. 15:7, 7). Josephus gives an elaborate description of Herod's improvements. The wall surrounding it was twenty stadia in length. In the middle of it was a close, of a stadium and a half square, containing a magnificent temple dedicated to the Caesar. It was colonized by 6000 veterans and others, for whose support a most beautiful and rich district surrounding the city was appropriated. Herod's motives in these arrangements were probably, first, the occupation of a commanding position, and then the desire of distinguishing himself for taste by the embellishment of a spot already so adorned by nature (ibid. 15:8, 5, War, 1, 20, 3; 21, 2).

How long Samaria maintained its splendor after Herod's improvements, we are not informed. In the New Test. the city itself does not appear to be mentioned, but rather a portion of the district to which, even in older times, it had extended its name. Our version, indeed, of Act 8:5 says that Philip the deacon “went down to the city of Samaria;” but the Greek of the passage is simply εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας. It is hardly safe to argue, however, either from the absence of the definite article, or from the probability that, had the city Samaria been intended, the term employed would have been Sebaste, that some one city of the district, the name of which is not specified, was in the mind of the writer (as Olshausen, Neander, De Wette, Meyer, etc.); for the genitive is one of apposition (Winer), πόλις being sufficiently defined by it (Hackett), and the city was well known in that day by this name (see Josephus, Ant. 20:6, 2). The evangelist would naturally have resorted first to the chief city, where also Simon Magus probably was. In Act 8:9 of the same chapter “the people of Samaria” represents τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας; and the phrase in Act 8:25, “many villages of the Samaritans,” shows that the operations of evangelizing were not confined to the city of Samaria itself (comp. Mat 10:5, “Into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not;” and Joh 4:4-5, where, after it has been said, “And he must needs go through Samaria,” obviously the district, it is subjoined, “Then cometh he to a city of Samaria called Sychar”). Henceforth its history is very unconnected, although it is occasionally noticed in the reigns of the Roman emperors (Ulpian, Leg. I. de Censibus, quoted by Dr. Robinson). Various specimens of coins struck on the spot have been preserved, extending from Nero to Geta, the brother of Caracalla (Vaillant, in Numism. Imper., and Noris, quoted by Reland; Eckhel, 3, 440; Mionnet, Med. Antiq. 5, 513). Septimius Severus appears to have established there a Roman colony in the beginning of the 3d century (Cellarius, Not. Orb. 2, 432). Eusebius scarcely mentions the city as extant; but it is often named by Jerome and other writers of the same and a later age (adduced in Reland's Palest. p. 979- 981). But it could not have been a place of much political importance. We find in the Codex of Theodosius that by A.D. 409 the Holy Land had been divided into Palestina Prima, Secunda, and Tertia. Palsestina Prima included the country of the Philistines, Samaria (the district), and the northern part of Judaea; but its capital was not Sebaste, but Caesarea. In an ecclesiastical point of view it stood rather higher. It was an episcopal see  probably as early as the 3d century. At any rate, its bishop was present among those of Palestine at the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, and subscribed its acts as “Maximus (al. Marinus) Sebastenus.” The names of some of his successors have been preserved; the latest of them mentioned is Pelagius, who attended the synod at Jerusalem, A.D. 536. The title of the see occurs in the earlier Greek Notitioe and in the later Latin ones (Reland, Paloest. p. 214-229).

Jerome, whose acquaintance with Palestine imparts a sort of probability to the tradition which prevailed so strongly in later days, asserts that Sebaste, which he invariably identifies with Samaria, was the place in which John the Baptist was imprisoned and suffered death. (See below.) He also makes it the burial place of the prophets Elisha and Obadiah (see various passages cited by Reland, Paloest. p. 980, 981). Epiphanius is at great pains, in his work Adv. Hoereses (lib. 1), in which he treats of the heresies of the Samaritans with singular minuteness, to account for the origin of their name. He interprets it as שֹׁמְרַי ם, φύλακες, or “keepers.” The hill on which the city was built was, he says, designated Somer, or Somoron (Σωμήρ, Σωμόρων), from a certain Somoron the son of Somer, whom he considers to have been of the stock of the ancient Perizzites or Girgashites, themselves descendants of Canaan and Ham. But, he adds, the inhabitants may have been called Samaritans from their guarding the land, or (coming down much later in their history) from their guarding the law, as distinguished from the later writings of the Jewish canon, which they refused to allow. SEE SAMARITAN.

The city, along with Nablus, fell into the power of the Moslems during the siege of Jerusalem, A.D. 614; and we hear but little more of it till the time of the Crusades. At what time the city of Herod became desolate no existing accounts state, but all the notices of the 4th century and later lead to the inference that its destruction had already taken place. The Crusaders established a Latin bishopric at Sebaste, and the title was continued in the Romish Church till the 14th century (Le Quien, Oriens Christ. 3, 1290). Saladin marched through it in A.D. 1184, after his repulse from Kerak (Abulfeda, Annal. A.H. 580). Benjamin of Tudela describes it as having been “formerly a very strong city, and situated on the mount, in a fine country, richly watered, and surrounded by gardens, vineyards, orchards, and olive-groves.” He adds that no Jews were living there (Itiner. [ed. Asher] p. 66). Phocas and Brocardus speak only of the church and tomb of John the Baptist, and of the Greek church and monastery on the summit of  the hill. Notices of the place occur in the travelers of the 14th, 16th, and 17th centuries; nor are they all so meager as Dr. Robinson conceives. That of Morison, for instance, is full and exact (Voyage du Mont Sinai, p. 230- 233). The description of Sandys, likewise, is quite circumstantial (see Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 117 sq.). Scarcely any traces of the earlier or later Samaria could then be perceived, the materials having been used by the inhabitants for the construction of their own mean dwellings. The residents were an extremely poor and miserable set of people. In the 18th century the place appears to have been left unexplored, but in the present century it has often been visited and described.

II. Description. — In the territory originally belonging to the tribe of Joseph, about six miles to the northwest of Shechem, there is a wide basin- shaped valley, encircled with high hills, almost on the edge of the great plain which borders upon the Mediterranean. In the center of this basin, which is on a lower level than the valley of Shechem, rises a less elevated oblong hill, with steep yet accessible sides, and a long flat top. The singular beauty of the spot may have struck Omri, as it afterwards struck the tasteful Idumaean (Josephus, War, 1, 21, 2; Ant. 15:8, 5). All travelers agree that it would be difficult to find in the whole land a situation of equal strength, fertility, and beauty combined. “In all these particulars,” says Dr. Robinson, “it has greatly the advantage over Jerusalem” (Bibl. Researches, 3, 146). In the valley there is an abundance of excellent water all the year round, but on the hill itself there is not so much as a single fountain. This is its only and great disadvantage as a site for a city, and a most serious one it must have been, especially in the time of siege. This was a want which Samaria shared in common with the capital of Judah; but the deficiency in both cases was so amply supplied by cisterns under the houses and elsewhere that in the severe sieges we never read of either city suffering from a scarcity of water. SEE JERUSALEM.

The hill of Samaria itself is of considerable elevation and very regular in form, and the broad deep valley in the midst of which it lies is a continuation of that of Nablas (Shechem), which here expands into a breadth of five or six miles. Beyond this valley, which completely isolates the hill, the mountains rise again on every side, forming a complete wall around the city (as referred to in 2Ki 6:17). They are terraced to the tops, sown in grain, and planted with olives and figs, in the midst of which a number of handsome villages appear to great advantage, their white stone cottages contrasting strikingly with the verdure of the trees. The hill of Samaria itself is cultivated from its base,  the terraced sides and summit being covered with corn and with olive- trees. About midway up the ascent the hill is surrounded by a narrow terrace of level land, like a belt, below which the roots of the hill spread off more gradually into the valleys. Higher up, too, are the marks of slight terraces, once occupied, perhaps, by the streets of the ancient city. The ascent of the hill is very steep, and the narrow footpath winds among the mountains through substantial cottages of the modern Sebustiyeh (the Arabic form of Sebaste), which appear to have been constructed to a great extent of ancient materials, very superior in size and quality to anything which could at this day be wrought into an Arab habitation. The houses are all of stone, though erected with little or no regard to order and regularity. These, with their inmates, present the same unclean appearance that is met with among all the Felahin of the country; and the inhabitants are remarkably rude, but more industrious than most of their race. The view from the summit is most interesting. Beneath, to the north and east, lie its own immediate fertile valleys; and, turning westwardly, the eye wanders over rich plains to Sharon and the blue Mediterranean; and even in the present impoverished state of the country the scene fills the mind of the beholder with delight.

On the summit, the first object which attracts the notice of the traveler, and, at the same time, the most conspicuous ruin of the place, is the church dedicated to John the Baptist, erected on the spot which an old tradition (noticed above) fixed as the place of his burial, if not of his martyrdom. It is said to have been built by the empress Helena; but the architecture limits its antiquity to the period of the Crusades, although a portion of the eastern end seems to have been of earlier date. There is a blending of Greek and Saracenic styles, which is particularly observable in the interior, where there are several pointed arches; others are round. The columns follow no regular order, while the capitals and ornaments present a motley combination not to be found in any church erected in or near the age of Constantine. The length of the edifice is 153 feet inside, besides a porch of 10 feet; and the breadth is 75 feet. The eastern end is rounded, in the common Greek style; and, resting. as it does, upon a precipitous elevation of nearly 100 feet immediately above the valley, it is a noble and striking monument. Within the enclosure is a common Turkish tomb; and beneath it at a depth reached by twenty-one stone steps, is a sepulchre, three or four paces square, where, according to the tradition, John the Baptist was interred after he had been slain by Herod. There is no trace of this tradition  earlier than the time of Jerome; and if Josephus is correct in stating that John was beheaded in the castle of Machaerus, on the east of the Dead Sea (Ant. 18:5, 2), his burial in Samaria is very improbable. SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

On approaching the summit of the hill, the traveler comes suddenly upon an area once surrounded by limestone columns, of which fifteen are still standing and two prostrate. These columns form two rows, thirty-two paces apart, while less than two paces intervene between the columns. They measure seven feet nine inches in circumference; but there is no trace of the order of their architecture, nor are there any foundations to indicate the nature of the edifice to which they belonged. Some refer them to Herod's temple to Augustus, others to a Greek church which seems to have once occupied the summit of the hill. The descent of the hill on the W.S.W. side brings the traveler to a very remarkable colonnade, which is easily traceable by a great number of columns, erect or prostrate, along the side of the hill for at least one third of a mile, where it terminates at a heap of ruins, near the eastern extremity of the ancient site. The columns are sixteen feet high, two feet in diameter at the base, and one foot eight inches at the top. The capitals have disappeared; but the shafts retain their polish, and, when not broken, are in good preservation. Eighty-two of these columns are still erect, and the number of those fallen and broken must be much greater. Most of them are of the limestone common to the region; but some are of white marble, and some of granite. The mass of ruins in which this colonnade terminates towards the west is composed of blocks of hewn stone, covering no great area, on the slope of the hill, many feet lower than the summit. Neither the situation nor extent of this pile favors the notion of its having been a palace, nor is it easy to conjecture the design of the edifice.

The colonnade, the remains of which now stand solitary and mournful in the midst of ploughed fields, may, however, with little hesitation, be referred to the time of Herod the Great, and must be regarded as belonging to some one of the splendid structures with which he adorned the city. In the deep ravine which bounds the city on the north there is another colonnade, not visited by Dr. Robinson, but fully described by Dr. Olin (Travsels, 2, 371-373). The area in which these columns stand is completely shut in by hills, with the exception of an opening on the northeast; and so peculiarly sequestered is the situation that it is only visible from a few points of the heights of the ancient site, by which it is overshadowed. The columns, of which a large number are entire and  several in fragments, are erect, and arranged in a quadrangle 196 paces in length and 64 in breadth. They are three paces asunder, which would give 170 columns as the whole number when the colonnade was complete. The columns resemble, in size and material, those of the colonnade last noticed, and appear to belong to the same age. These also probably formed part of Herod's city, though it is difficult to determine the use to which the colonnade was appropriated. Dr. Olin is possibly right in his conjecture that this was one of the places of public assembly and amusement which Herod introduced into his dominions. “A long avenue of broken pillars” (says dean Stanley), “apparently the main street of Herod's city, here, as at Palmyra and Damascus, adorned by a colonnade on each side, still lines the topmost terrace of the hill.” But the fragmentary aspect of the whole place exhibits a present fulfilment of the prophecy of Micah (Mic 1:6), though it may have been fulfilled more than once previously by the ravages of Shalmaneser or of John Hyrcanus: “I will make Samaria as a heap of the field, and as plantings of a vineyard: and I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will discover the foundations thereof” (Mic 1:6; comp. Hos 13:16).

See Robinson, Researches, 3, 136-149; Olin, Travels, 2, 366-374; Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p. 512517; Richardson, Travels, 2, 409- 413; Schubert, Morgenltnd. 3, 156-162; Raumer, Palastina, p. 144-148 (notes), 158; Maundrell, Journey, p. 78, 79; Reland, Paloestina, p, 344, 979-982; Vanl de Velde, Syria and Palestine, 1, 363-388; 2, 295, 296; Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 242-246; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 2, 272 sq.; Hackett, Illust. p. 183 sq.; Schwarz, Palest. p. 149; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 197 sq.; Porter, Handbook, p. 337 sq.; Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 541 sq.; Conder, Tent Work in Palestine, 1, 88 sq. SEE SAMARIA, REGION OF.

## Samaria (2)[[@Headword:Samaria (2)]]

             The archaeology of Sebustieh is given in detail in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:211 sq.), and the topography somewhat (page 160). See also Conder, Tent Work, 1:88 sq.

## Samaria, Region Of[[@Headword:Samaria, Region Of]]

             (usually Σαμάρεια, the same as the city; but when distinguishing it from the latter, the Sept. and Josephus write Σαμαρεῖτις or Χώρα Σαμαρέων; sometimes Σαμαρί, as Ptolemy). This term at first included all the tribes over which Jeroboam made himself king, whether east or west of the river Jordan. Hence, even before the city of Samaria existed, we find the “old prophet who dwelt at Bethel” describing the predictions of “the man of God who came from Judah,” in reference to the altar at Bethel, as directed not merely against that altar, but “against all the houses of the high places  which are in the cities of Samaria” (1Ki 13:32), i.e., of course, the cities of which Samaria was, or was to be, the head or capital. In other places in the historical books of the Old Test. (with the exception of 2Ki 17:24; 2Ki 17:26; 2Ki 17:28-29) Samaria seems to denote the city exclusively. But the prophets use the word, much as did the old prophet of Bethel, in a greatly extended sense. Thus the “calf of Bethel” is called by Hosea (Hos 8:5-6) the “calf of Samaria;” in Amos (Amo 3:9) the “mountains of Samaria” are spoken of; and the “captivity of Samaria and her daughters” is a phrase found in Ezekiel (Eze 16:53).

But, whatever extent the word might have acquired, it necessarily became contracted as the limits of the kingdom of Israel became contracted. In all probability the territory of Simeon and that of Dan were very early absorbed in the kingdom of Judah. This would be one limitation. Next, in B.C. 771 and 740 respectively, “Pul, king of Assyria, and Tilgath-pilneser, king of Assyria, carried away the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half- tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan” (1Ch 5:26). This would be a second limitation. But the latter of these kings went further: “He took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria” (2Ki 15:29). This would be a third limitation. Nearly a century before, B.C. 860, “the Lord had begun to cut Israel short,” for “Hazael, king of Syria, smote them in all the coasts of Israel; from Jordan eastward, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the river Arnork even Gilead and Bashan” (2Ki 10:32-33). This, however, as we may conjecture from the diversity of expression, had been merely a passing inroad, and had involved no permanent subjection of the country, or deportation of its inhabitants. The invasions of Pul and of Tilgath-pilneser were utter clearances of the population. The territory thus desolated by them was probably occupied by degrees by the pushing forward of the neighboring heathen, or by straggling families of the Israelites themselves. In reference to the northern part of Galilee, we know that a heathen population prevailed. Hence the phrase “Galilee of the nations” or “Gentiles” (Isa 9:1; 1Ma 5:15). No doubt this was the case also beyond Jordan. But we have yet to arrive at a fourth limitation of the kingdom of Samaria. It is evident from an occurrence in Hezekiah's reign that just before the deposition of Hoshea, the last king of Israel, the authority of the king of Judah, or, at least, his  influence, was recognized by portions of Asher, Issachar, and Zebulun, and even of Ephraim and Manasseh (2Ch 30:1-26). Men came from all those tribes to the Passover at Jerusalem. This was about B.C. 726. In fact, to such miserable limits had the kingdom of Samaria been reduced, that when, two or three years afterwards, we are told that “Shalmaneser came up throughout the land,” and after a siege of three years “took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes” (2Ki 17:5-6), and when again we are told that “Israel was carried away out of their own land into Assyria” (2Ki 17:23), we must suppose a very small field of operations. Samaria (the city), and a few adjacent cities or villages only, represented that dominion which had once extended from Bethel to Dan northwards, and from the Mediterranean to the borders of Syria and Ammon eastwards. This is further confirmed by what we read of Josiah's progress, in B.C. 628, through “the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon, even unto Naphtali” (2Ch 34:6). Such a progress would have been impracticable bad the number of cities and villages been at all large. On the capture of the city of Samaria, and the final overthrow of the kingdom of Israel by Shalmaneser or Sargon (B.C. 720), the Jews were removed, and strangers were brought from Assyria “and placed in the cities of Samaria” (2Ki 17:24; comp. Ezr 4:10). These colonists took the name of their new country. SEE SAMARITANS.

Instead of a kingdom, Samaria now became a province. Its extent cannot be exactly ascertained. The political.geography of Palestine was undergoing changes every year, in consequence of incessant wars and conquests; and it was not until the period of Roman dominion that the boundaries of provinces began to be accurately defined. Josephus describes the province as follows: “The district of Samaria lies between Judea and Galilee. Commencing at a village called Ginaea, situated in the Great Plain, it terminates at the territory of the Acrabatenes” (War, 3, 3, 4). Ginaea is identical with the modern Jenin, on the southern side of the plain of Esdraelon. It is evident, therefore, that the northern border of Samaria ran along the foot of the mountain range, beginning at the promontory of Carmel on the west, and terminating at the Jordan, near the site of Succoth. Its southern border would probably correspond pretty nearly to a line drawn from Joppa eastward through Bethel to the Jordan (see Reland, Paloest.p. 192). Thus it comprehended the ancient territory of Ephraim, and of those Manassites who were west of Jordan. “Its character,” Josephus continues, “is in no respect different from that of Judaea. Both  abound in mountains and plains, and are suited for agriculture, and productive, wooded, and full of fruits both wild and cultivated. They are not abundantly watered; but much rain falls there. The springs are of an exceedingly sweet taste; and, on account of the quantity of good grass, the cattle there produce more milk than elsewhere. But the best proof of their richness and fertility is that both are thickly populated.” The accounts of modern travelers confirm this description by the Jewish historian of the “good land” which was allotted to that powerful portion of the house of Joseph which crossed the Jordan, on the first division of the territory. The geographical position of the province is several times incidentally mentioned in the New Test. Thus in Luk 17:11 it is stated that our Lord, in proceeding to Jerusalem from northern Palestine, “passed through the midst of Samaria;” and again, when he left Judaea and went to Galilee, St. John says, “He must needs go through Samaria” (4:4). So also, when Paul and Barnabas were sent on a special mission from Antioch to Jerusalem, “they passed through Phenice and Samaria” (Act 15:3). They followed the road along the sea coast, doubtless calling at the great cities of Sidon, Tyre, and Csesarea.

After the time of Roman rule in Syria, the name of Samaria as a province appears to have passed away. It is used by Pliny and Ptolemy, and is mentioned by Jerome. It is not found, however, in the Notitioe Ecclesiasticoe, nor in any later work; and it is now wholly unknown to the natives of the country. The name of the ancient city has even given place to the Arabo-Greek Sebustiyeh.

On the history and natural features of the region in question, SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF; SEE PALESTINE; SEE SAMARIA, CITY OF.

## Samaritan[[@Headword:Samaritan]]

             (Heb. Shomeroni', שֹׁמַרֹנַי, from Shomeron, the Heb. name of Samaria; Sept., New Test., Josephus, and other Greek writers, Σαμαρείτης, fem. laΣαμαρεῖτις; by the later Jews, כּוּתַיַּי ם, i e. Cuthites [q.v.]; by themselves, שֹׁמַרַי ם, Shomerim, watchers [by a play upon their original name], i.e. keepers of the law, as interpreted by Epiphanius, Hoeres. 1, 9), a term which in its strictest sense would denote an inhabitant of the city of Samaria. But it is not found at all in this sense, exclusively at any rate, in the Old Test., nor perhaps elsewhere. In fact, it only occurs there once, and then in a wider signification, in 2Ki 17:29. There it is employed to  designate those whom the king of Assyria had “placed in (what are called) the cities of Samaria (whatever these may be) instead of the children of Israel.” Were the word Samaritan found elsewhere in the Old Test., it would have designated those who belonged to the kingdom of the ten tribes, which in a large sense was called Samaria. As the extent of that kingdom varied, which it did very much, gradually diminishing to the time of Shalmaneser, so the extent of the word Samaritan would have varied. In the New Test. it is applied, strictly speaking, to the people or sect who had established an independent worship of their own in a temple or synagogue at Nablfs. Although a comparatively small and isolated community, their history and literature are so closely connected with those of the Hebrew people as to give them great importance in a Biblical point of view. SEE SECTS OF THE JEWS.

I. Origin of this Peeople. — As we have seen in the preceding articles, Shalmaneser, or Sargon, his successor (2Ki 17:5-6; 2Ki 17:26), carried Israel, i.e. the remnant of the ten tribes which still acknowledged Hosea's authority, into Assyria. This remnant consisted, as has been shown, of Samaria (the city) and a few adjacent cities and villages. Now (a), did he carry away all their inhabitants, or not? (b) Whether they were wholly or only partially desolated, who replaced the deported population? On the answer to these inquiries will depend our determination of the questions, Were the Samaritans a mixed race, composed partly of Jews, partly of new settlers, or were they purely of foreign extraction? Upon few Biblical questions have scholars arrived at conclusions more opposite.

1. Argunents in Favor of an Exclusively Heathen Origin of the Samaritans. — The great advocate of this view is Hengstenberg, who states not only the Biblical reasons, but continues the examination through Sirach, the Maccabees, and the New Test. (Authentie des Pentateuch, 1, 3- 28). In favor of the purely Assyrian origin of the people, Hengstenberg quotes Mill, Schultz, R. Simon, Reland, and Elhnacin. To this list others add Suicer, Hammond, Drusius, Maldonatus, Havernick, Robinson, and Trench (Parables, p. 310 sq.). In ancient times, Josephus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theodoret are quoted on the same side. The following is an outline of this position:

It has been asserted that the language of Scripture admits of scarcely a doubt. “Israel was carried away” (2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 17:23), and other nations were placed “in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel”  (2Ki 17:24). There is no mention whatever, as in the case of the somewhat parallel destruction of the kingdom of Judah, of “the poor of the land being left to be vine dressers and husbandmen” (2Ki 25:12). It is added that, had any been left, it would have been impossible for the new inhabitants to have been so utterly unable to acquaint themselves with “the manner of the God of the land” as to require to be taught by some priest of the captivity sent from the king of Assyria. Besides, it was not an unusual thing with Oriental conquerors actually to exhaust a land of its inhabitants. Comp. Herod. 3, 149: “The Persians dragged (σαγηνεύσαντες) Samos, and delivered it up to Syloson, stripped of all its men;” and, again, Herod. 6:31, for the application of the same treatment to other islands, where the process called σαγηνεύειν is described, and is compared to a hunting out of the population (ἐκθηρεύειν). Such a capture is presently contrasted with the capture of other territories to which σαγηνεύειν was not applied. Josephus's phrase in reference to the cities of Samaria is that Shalmaneser “transplanted all the people” (Ant. 9:14, 1). A threat against Jerusalem, which was, indeed, only partially carried out, shows how complete and summary the desolation of the last relics of the sister kingdom must have been: “I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab: and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish: he wipeth and turneth it upon the face thereof” (2Ki 21:13). This was uttered within forty years after B.C. 721, during the reign of Manasseh. It must have derived much strength from the recentness and proximity of the calamity. Hence it is concluded by the advocates of this view that the cities of Samaria were not partially, but wholly, evacuated of their inhabitants in B.C. 720, and that they remained in this desolated state until, in the words of 2Ki 17:24, “the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava (Ivah, 2Ki 18:34), and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof.” Thus the new Samaritans — for such we would now call them were Assyrians by birth or subjugation, were utterly strangers in the cities of Samaria, and were exclusively the inhabitants of those cities. An incidental question, however, arises: Who was the king of Assyria that effected this colonization? At first sight, one would suppose Shallnaneser; for the narrative is scarcely broken, and the repeopling seems to be a natural sequence of the depopulation. Such would appear to have been Josephus's view; for he says of Shalmaneser, “When he had removed the people out of their land, he brought other nations out of Cuthah, a place so  called (for there is still in Persia a river of that name), into Samaria and the country of the Israelites” (Ant. 9:14, 1 and 3; 10:9, 7); but he must have been led to this interpretation simply by the juxtaposition of the two transactions in the Hebrew text. The Samaritans themselves (in Ezr 4:2; Ezr 4:10) attributed their colonization, not to Shalmaneser, but to “Esar- haddon. king of Assur,” or to “the great and noble Asnapper,” either the king himself or one of his generals. It was probably on his invasion of Judah, in the reign of Manasseh, about B.C. 677, that Esar-haddon discovered the impolicy of leaving a tract upon the very frontiers of that kingdom thus desolate, and determined to garrison it with foreigners. The fact, too, that some of these foreigners came from Babylon would seem to direct us to Esar-haddon, rather than to his grandfather Shalmaneser: it was only recently that Babylon had come into the hands of the Assyrian king. There is another reason why this date should be preferred: it coincides with the termination of the sixty-five years of Isaiah's prophecy, delivered B.C. 742, within which “Ephraim should be broken that it should not be a people” (Isa 7:8). This was not effectually accomplished until the very land itself was occupied by strangers. So long as this had not taken place, there might be hope of return; after it had taken place, no hope. Josephus (Ant. 10:9, 7) expressly notices this difference in the cases of the ten and of the two tribes. The land of the former became the possession of foreigners, the land of the latter not so.

These strangers, who are thus assumed to have been placed in “the cities of Samaria” by Esar-haddon, were, of course, idolaters, and worshipped a strange medley of divinities. Each of the five nations, says Josephus, who is confirmed by the words of Scripture, had its own god. No place was found for the worship of Him who had once called the land his own, and whose it was still. God's displeasure was kindled, and they were infested by beasts of prey, which had probably increased to a great extent before their entrance upon it. “The Lord sent lions among them, which slew some of them.” On their explaining their miserable condition to the king of Assyria, he despatched one of the captive priests to teach them “how they should fear the Lord.” The priest came accordingly; and henceforth, in the language of the sacred historian, they “feared the Lord, and served their graven images, both their children and their children's children: as did their fathers, so do they unto this day” (2Ki 17:41). This last sentence was probably inserted by Ezra. It serves two purposes: 1st, to qualify the pretensions of the Samaritans of Ezra's time to be pure worshippers of  God — they were no more exclusively his servants than was the Roman emperor, who desired to place a statue of Christ in the Pantheon, entitled to be called a Christian; and, 2ndy, to show how entirely the Samaritans of later days differed from their ancestors in respect to idolatry. Josephus's account of the distress of the Samaritans, and of the remedy for it, is very similar, with the exception that, with him, they are afflicted with pestilence.

Such, according to one view of the history, was the origin of the post- captivity, or new Samaritans — men not of Jewish extraction, but from the farther East. “The Cuthaeans had formerly belonged to the inner parts of Persia and Media, but were then called ‘Samaritans,' taking the name of the country to which they were removed,” says Josephus (Ant. 10:9, 7). Again, he says (Ant. 9:14, 3) they are called, “in Hebrew, ‘Cuthseans,' but in Greek, ‘Samaritans.'” Our Lord expressly terms them ἀλλογενεῖς (Luk 17:18); and Josephus's whole account of them shows that he believed them to have been μέτοικοι ἀλλοεθνεῖς though, as he tells us in two places (Ant. 9:14, 3; 11:8, 6), they sometimes gave a different account of their origin.

2. Arguments in Favor of a Mixed Origin of the Samaritans. — The above views have been strongly combated by Kalkar (in the Theologische Mitarbeiten, 1840, 3, 24 sq.); and weighty names are on this side, e.g. De Sacy, Gesenius, Winer, Dollinger (Heidenthum u. Judenthum, p. 739), Davidson, Stanley, Rawlinson, etc. The arguments for their views are substantially as follows:

(1.) It is evident that a considerable portion of the original Israelitish population must still have remained in the cities of Samaria; for we find (2Ch 30:1-20) that Hezekiah invited the remnant of the ten tribes who were in the land of Israel to come to the great Passover which he celebrated, and the different tribes are mentioned (2Ch 30:10-11) who did or did not respond to the invitation. Later, Esar-haddon adopted the policy of Shalmaneser, and a still further deportation took place (Ezr 4:2); but even after this, though the heathen element, in all probability, preponderated, the land was not swept clean of its original inhabitants. Josiah, it is true, did not, like Hezekiah, invite the Samaritans to take part in the worship at Jerusalem; but, finding himself strong enough to disregard the power of Assyria, now on the decline, he virtually claimed the land of Israel as the rightful appanage of David's throne, adopted energetic measures for the suppression of idolatry, and even exterminated the  Samaritan priests. But what is of more importance as showing that some portion of the ten tribes was still left in the land is the fact that, when the collection was made fior the repairs of the Temple, we are told that the Levites gathered the money “of the hand of Manasseh and Ephraism, and of all the remnant of Israel,” as well as “of Judah and Benjamin” (2Ch 34:9). So, also, after the discovery of the book of the law, Josiah bound not only “all who were present in Judah and Benjamin” to stand to the covenant contained in it; but he “took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel, and made all that were present in Israel to serve, even to serve Jehovah their God. All his days they departed not from serving Jehovah the God of their fathers” (2Ch 34:32-33).

Later yet, during the vice-royalty of Gedaliah, we find still the same feeling manifested on the part of the ten tribes which had shown itself under Hezekiah and Josiah. Eighty devotees from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria, came with all the signs of mourning, and bearing offerings in their hand, to the Temple at Jerusalem. They thus testified both their sorrow for the desolation that had come upon it, and their readiness to take part in the worship there, now that order was restored. This, it may be reasonably presumed, was only one party out of many who came on a like errand. All these facts prove that, so far was the intercourse between Judah and the remnant of Israel from being imbittered by religious animosities, that it was the religious bond which bound them together. Hence it would have been quite possible during any portion of this period for the mixed Samaritan population to have received the law from the Jews.

This is far more probable than that copies of the Pentateuch should have been preserved among those families of the ten tribes who had either escaped when the land was shaven by the razor of the king of Assyria, or who had straggled back thither from their exile. If even in Jerusalem itself the book of the law was so scarce, and had been so forgotten, that the pious king Josiah knew nothing of its contents till it was accidentally discovered, still less probable is it that in Israel, given up to idolatry and wasted by invasions, any copies of it should have survived.

On the whole, we should be led to infer that there had been a gradual fusion of the heathen settlers with the original inhabitants. At first the former, who regarded Jehovah as only a local and national deity like one of their own false gods, endeavored to appease him by adopting in part the  religious worship of the nation whose land they occupied. They did this in the first instance, not by mixing with the resident population, but by sending to the king of Assyria for one of the Israelitish priests who had been carried captive. But in process of time the amalgamation of races became complete, and the worship of Jehovah superseded the worship of idols, as is evident both from the wish of the Samaritans to join in the Temple worship after the captivity, and from the absence of all idolatrous symbols on Gerizim. So far, then, the history leaves us altogether in doubt as to the time at which the Pentateuch was received by the Samaritans. Copies of it might have been left in the northern kingdom after Shalmaneser's invasion, though this is hardly probable; or they might have been introduced thither during the religious reforms of Hezekiah or Josiah. Till the return from Babylon there is no evidence that the Samaritans regarded the Jews with any extraordinary dislike or hostility. But the manifest distrust and suspicion with which Nehemiah met their advances when he was rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem provoked their wrath. From this time forward they were declared and open enemies. The quarrel between the two nations was further aggravated by the determination of Nehemiah to break off all marriages which had been contracted between Jews and Samaritans. Manasseh, the brother of the high priest (so Josephus calls him, Ant. 11:7, 2), and himself acting high priest, was one of the offenders. He refused to divorce his wife, and took refuge with his father- in-law, Sanballat, who consoled him for the loss of his priestly privilege in Jerusalem by making him high priest of the new Samaritan temple on Gerizim. With Manasseh many other apostate Jews who refused to divorce their wives fled to Samaria. It seems highly probable that these men took the Pentateuch with them. and adopted it as the basis of the new religious system which they inaugurated. SEE PENTATEUCH.

(2.) That the country should be swept clean of its inhabitants on the downfall of Samaria seems most improbable. It is true Eastern conquerors did sometimes utterly destroy cities, and occasionally extirpate whole islands (Herod. 3, 149). And some have thought that such was the general treatment of the conquered by the Assyrians (Layard, Nineveh and its Remains, 2, 374); but, as Rawlinson justly remarks, “it appears by the inscriptions that towns were frequently spared, and that the bulk of the inhabitants were generally left in the place” (Five Great Monarchies, 1, 304, note). Should it be argued that the conduct of the residents of the city of Samaria was of a character to draw upon them the severest chastisement  of their conquerors — an indiscriminate slaughter, with impalement or slavery awaiting the prisoners — there is no reason to suppose that the cities and towns of the provinces met with the same fate. According to the Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon, this removal consisted of only 27,280 families — amounting, let us say, to 200,000 individuals — which certainly would not exhaust the land.

It is popularly said and credited that those Assyrians were placed in Samaria by Shalmaneser soon after the fall of the kingdom; but this is a mistake. It arose probably from Josephus's statement, who, it seems, was led into this error from the juxtaposition in which the two events are related in the Hebrew text. It is doubtful whether Shalmaneser conducted the siege to its end, for there is a supposition that he was treacherously slain by the emissaries of Sargon, who had usurped the throne during his master's absence, and that the siege was terminated under the command of one of his leaders. The following expression is remarkable, and would tend to confirm this opinion: “Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, came up against Samaria and besieged it. And at the end of three years they took it” (2Ki 18:9-10). Sargon, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, claims the victory to himself, as well as the removal of the Samaritans to Assyria (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 472; comp. Isa 20:1). It is a curious and interesting fact, for the knowledge of which we are indebted to Sir H. Rawlinson, that Sargon penetrated far into the interior of Arabia, and, carrying off several Arabian tribes, settled them in Samaria. This explains how Geshem the Arabian came to be associated with Sanballat in the government of Judaea, as well as the mention of Arabians in the army of Samaria (Illustrations of Egyptian History, etc., in the Trans. of the Roy. Soc. Lit. 1860, 1, 148, 149). SEE SARGON.

Be this as it may, it is quite certain that some time elapsed from the fall of Samaria to the removal of the Assvrians into its cities. In the Assyrian inscriptions we have a list- probably a complete one — of the monarchs of the latter half of the 8th and the first half of the 7th century B.C., namely, Tiglath-pileser II, Shalmaneser II, Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esar-haddon. Now the Samaritans themselves attribute their removal to this last-named monarch, “Esar-haddon, king of Assur,” “the great and noble Asnapper” (Ezr 4:2; Ezr 4:10); and of this there call be no reasonable doubt. He invaded Judah in the reign of Manasseh, about B.C. 677, and probably it was this expedition that moved him to place these his subjects in Samaria. As he is conjectured to have died in B.C. 660, the transmigration must have taken place some  time between these dates. Let us suppose that it occurred B.C. 670, and that king Josiah began his reformation B.C. 628. This would have given the strangers a residence of forty-two years. The question now arises, Were these colonists so numerous as to repeople the cities of Israel, from Bethel even to Naphtali? and was it over these that Josiah exercised his authority? Now, we have no means of arriving at any estimate of the number of these aliens; but, whatever it may have been, it is highly improbable that king Josiah would have had the imprudence to interfere with any subjects of the king of Assyria, especially as that government had already laid a heavy hand upon Judah (2Ki 18:13-15). Neither had he any religious jurisdiction over them. It seems far more likely that Josiah carried out his reform ostensibly among the remaining Israelites, the majority of whom not unlikely placed themselves under his rule. Israel was not at any time all given to idolatry. In one of its unholiest periods (under Ahab) there were 7000 faithful men who had not bowed their knees unto Baal (1Ki 19:18). Again, when Hezekiah sent his delegates to visit the nation, although the majority of the people “mocked them, nevertheless divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulon humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem” (2Ch 30:11). The residue of the ten tribes would be still more attached to the government of Judah after the destruction of their own.

(3.) On the whole, therefore, notwithstanding the force of the counter- arguments, we conclude that, although the city of Samaria itself was probably razed to the ground, and its population wholly carried away, yet a considerable remnant of the inhabitants of the adjoining country was left. Consequently in later times the people, in their origin, were a mixed race. Doubtless the heathen element prevailed, because the colonists were greatly superior in numbers. When they came, they found none but the dregs of the populace, whom the victors had left. All power was in the hands of the colonists. All that the words in 2Ki 17:24 prove is that the colonists who had been transplanted thither took the place of the deported Israelites as owners of the soil. The Israelites were no longer the chief inhabitants. The petition of the heathen colonists does not show that the last remnant had been removed by the Assyrians. From the removal of all the priests, it does not follow that all the inhabitants had been carried away; and the petition of the inhabitants merely speaks of sending a priest, of whom it was thought that he alone could offer worship acceptable to a local deity. The people wanted priests to teach them the right worship of  the God of the land; nor is aught said of giving the inhabitants the rudest idea of the manner of worshipping such a deity.

According to the analogy of similar deportations, such as that of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, we must suppose that the principal inhabitants of Israel — those fit for war, the priests, and others were carried away; leaving the poor, weak, and aged, in the country districts, who had little or nothing to do with war. The prophetic expressions in Jeremiah and Zechariah speak only of the Israelites as a whole, of their rejection and banishment. The fact that the Samaritans in Ezr 4:1, etc., do not mention their Israelitish origin is easily explained, because heathen blood had overpowered the Israelitish element. Had the latter retained its distinctive existence, they would probably have referred to their origin; but as it had become almost extinct, the wiser policy was to make no allusion to descent. The very fact, however, of their application for admission to the national worship of the Jews, and all their subsequent history in connection with this people, imply an Israelitish element in their origin. Had they been of pure heathen descent, what propriety was there in the application? What had they to do with Jewish worship, on the supposition that they were mere heathens? How is it that the Samaritans always claimed descent from Ephraim and Manasseh? Have they been continuous liars in making this pretension? If so, their history proves an unaccountable imposture. Was there ever before a heathen people so desirous to unite with the worshippers of the true Jehovah as to become implacable enemies to their recusants? Moreover, the writers of the New Test., with the Jews of that period, looked upon them in the light of a schismatical community from themselves, rather than a distinct nation. Though the Savior calls the Samaritan leper whom he healed a stranger, ἀλλόγενης, he used the expression more for the purpose of contrasting the unthankfulness of the nine Jews with the gratitude of the Samaritan, than of ethnological distinction (Luk 17:11-19). For it is certain that he did not class the Samaritans with the Gentiles, but made a marked distinction between them (Mat 10:5). Notwithstanding the animosity of the two peoples, there are some few circumstances on record which indicate that they felt themselves to be in truth brethren and coreligionists. Thus, during the feasts they were admitted like the Jews to the Temple (Josephus, Ant. 18:2, 2). Their food also was by the Jew deemed cosher, or lawful (Joh 4:8-40). Circumcision performed by a Samaritan was held to be valid. Down to the time of the Mishnic authors a Samaritan was regarded as a brother; nor did  the Talmudists all agree in his condemnation, for while some looked upon him as a heathen, others treated him in every respect as an Israelite.

II. History. — As already seen, the new inhabitants of Samaria carried along with them their idolatrous worship. In the early period of their settlement they were attacked by lions, which they regarded as a judgment inflicted by the deity of the land, whom they did not worship. Accordingly, they applied to the Assyrian king Esar-haddon for an Israelitish priest to teach them the proper worship of the local god. The request was granted. One of the transported priests was despatched to them, who came and dwelt at Bethel, and instructed them in the worship of Jehovah. He was not a Levitical priest, but an Israelitish priest of the calves; because there had been no Levitical ones in the kingdom when the inhabitants were carried away, and because Bethel, where he settled, was the chief seat of the calf worship.

On the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, the Samaritans wished to join them in rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem, saying, “Let us build with you: for we seek your God as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur, which brought us up hither” (Ezr 4:2). It is curious, and perhaps indicative of the treacherous character of their designs, to find them even then called, by anticipation, “the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin” (Ezr 4:1), a title which they afterwards fully justified. But, so far as professions go, they are not enemies; they are most anxious to be friends. Their religion, they assert, is the same as that of the two tribes; therefore they have a right to share in that great religious undertaking. But they do not call it a national undertaking. They advance no pretensions to Jewish blood. They confess their Assyrian descent, and even put it forward ostentatiously, perhaps to enhance the merit of their partial conversion to God. That it was but partial they give no hint. It may have become purer already, but we have no information that it had. But the proffered assistance was declined. Thenceforward they threw all obstacles in the way of the returned exiles. Nor were their efforts to frustrate the operations of the Jews entirely unsuccessful. Two Persian kings were induced to hinder the Jews in their rebuilding; and their opposition was not finally overcome till the reign of Darius Hystaspis, B.C. 519.

The enmity which began at the time when the cooperation of the Samaritans in rebuilding the Temple was refused continued to increase till  it reached such a height as to become proverbial in after times. It is probable, too, that the more the Samaritans detached themselves from idols and became devoted exclusively to a sort of worship of Jehovah, the more they resented the contempt with which the Jews treated their offers of fraternization. Matters at length came to a climax. About B.C. 409, in the reign of Darius Nothus, one Manasseh, of priestly descent, was expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah for an illegal marriage, and took refuge with the Samaritans. Whether the temple on Mount Gerizim was actually built in the days of Manasseh is doubtful. Probably he labored to unite the people in a common worship. The temple is not said to have been erected till the time of Alexander the Great, who gave permission to build it. If so, it did not exist till about one hundred years after Manasseh. It is difficult to make a consistent and clear account of the matter out of Josephus, who has evidently fallen into error, since he is inconsistent with Neh 13:28, etc. The establishment of a separate worship made the breach existing between the Jews and Samaritans irreparable. From this time malcontent Jews resorted to Samaria; and the very name of either people became odious to the other. About the year B.C. 129, John Hyrcanus, high priest of the Jews, destroyed the city of the Samaritans. The Cuthaean Samaritans had possessed only a few towns and villages of the large area generally known as Samaria, and these lay almost together in the center of the district. Shechem, or Sychar (as it was contemptuously designated), was their chief settlement, even before Alexander the Great destroyed the city of Samaria, probably because it lay almost close to Mount Gerizim. Afterwards it became more prominently so, and there on the destruction of the city of Samaria by Alexander they had built themselves a temple, which remained till the capture of Gerizim by John Hyrcanus (Joseph. Ant. 13:9, 1). SEE SHECHEM.

The only thing wanted to crystallize the opposition between the two races — viz. a rallying point for schismatical worship — being now obtained, their animosity became more intense than ever. The Samaritans are said to have done everything in their power to annoy the Jews. They would refuse hospitality to pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem, as in our Lord's case. They would even waylay them in their journey (Joseph. Ant. 20:6, 1); and many were compelled through fear to take the longer route by the east of Jordan. Certain Samaritans were said to have once penetrated into the Temple of Jerusalem, and to have defiled it by scattering dead men's bones on the sacred pavement (ibid. 18:2, 2). We are told, too, of a strange piece  of mockery which must have been especially resented. It was the custom of the Jews to communicate to their brethren still in Babylon the exact day and hour of the rising of the paschal moon by beacon fires commencing from Mount Olivet, and flashing forward from hill to hill until they were mirrored in the Euphrates. So the Greek poet represents Agamemnon as conveying the news of Troy's capture to the anxious watchers at Mycenee. Those who “sat by the waters of Babylon” looked for this signal with much interest. It enabled them to share in the devotions of those who were in their fatherland, and it proved to them that they were not forgotten. The Samaritans thought scorn of these feelings, and would not unfrequently deceive and disappoint them by kindling a rival flame and perplexing the watchers on the mountains. “This fact,” says Dr. Trench, “is mentioned by Makrizi (see De Sacy, Chrest. Arabe, 2, 159), who affirms that it was this which put the Jews on making accurate calculations to determine the moment of the new moon's appearance (comp. Schottgen, Hor. Heb. 1, 344).”

Their own temple on Gerizim the Samaritans considered to be much superior to that at Jerusalem. There they sacrificed a passover. Towards the mountain, even after the temple on it had fallen, wherever they were, they directed their worship. To their copy of the law they arrogated an antiquity and authority greater than attached to any copy in the possession of the Jews. The law (i.e. the five books of Moses) was their sole code; for they rejected every other book in the Jewish canon. They professed to observe it better than did the Jews themselves, employing the expression not unfrequently, “The Jews indeed do so and so; but we, observing the letter of the law, do otherwise.” The Jews, on the other hand, were not more conciliatory in their treatment of the Samaritans. The copy of the law possessed by that people they declared to be the legacy of an apostate (Manasseh), and cast grave suspicions upon its genuineness. Certain other Jewish renegades, as already observed, had, from time to time, taken refuge with the Samaritans. Hence, by degrees, the Samaritans claimed to partake of Jewish blood, especially if doing so happened to suit their interest (Joseph. Ant. 11:8, 6; 9:14, 3). A remarkable instance of this is exhibited in a request which they made to Alexander the Great, about B.C. 332. They desired to be excused payment of tribute in the sabbatical year, on the plea that as true Israelites, descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh, sons of Joseph, they refrained from cultivating their land in that year. Alexander, on cross-questioning them, discovered the hollowness of their pretensions. (They were greatly disconcerted at their failure, and their dissatisfaction probably led to the conduct which induced Alexander to  besiege and destroy the city of Samaria. Shechem was, indeed, their metropolis, but the destruction of Samaria seems to have satisfied Alexander.) Another instance of claim to Jewish descent appears in the words of the woman of Samaria to our Lord, Joh 4:12 : “Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well?” a question which she puts without recollecting that she had just before strongly contrasted the Jews and the Samaritans. Very far were the Jews from admitting this claim to consanguinity on the part of these people. They were ever reminding them that they were, after all, mere Cuthaeans, mere strangers from Assyria. They accused them of worshipping the idol gods buried long ago under the oak of Shechem (Gen 35:4).

They would have no dealings with them that they could possibly avoid. This prejudice had, of course, sometimes to give way to necessity, for the disciples had gone to Sychar to buy food while our Lord was talking with the woman of Samaria by the well in its suburb (Joh 4:8). From Luk 9:52 we learn that the disciples went before our Lord at his command into a certain village of the Samaritans “to make ready” for him. Perhaps, indeed (though, as we see on both occasions, our Lord's influence over them was not yet complete), we are to attribute this partial abandonment of their ordinary scruples to the change which his example had already wrought in them, “Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil” was the mode in which the Jews expressed themselves when at a loss for a bitter reproach. Everything that a Samaritan had touched was as swine's flesh to them. The Samaritan was publicly cursed in their synagogues; could not be adduced as a witness in the Jewish courts; could not be admitted to any sort of proselytism; and was thus, so far as the Jew could affect his position, excluded from hope of eternal life. The traditional hatred in which the Jew held him is expressed in Sir 1:25-26, “There be two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation: they that sit on the mountain of Samaria; and they that dwell among the Philistines; and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem.” So long was it before such a temoer could be banished from the Jewish mind that we find even the apostles believing that an inhospitable slight shown by a Samaritan village to Christ would be not unduly avenged by calling down fire from heaven. “Ye know not what spirit ye are of,” said the large-hearted Son of Man; and we find him on no one occasion uttering anything to the disparagement of the Samaritans. His words, however, and the records of his ministrations confirm most thoroughly the view which has been taken above that the Samaritans were not Jews. At the first sending forth of the twelve (Mat 10:5-6), he  charges them, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles; and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” So, again, in his final address to them on Mount Olivet, “Ye shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1, 8). So the nine unthankful lepers, Jews, were contrasted by him with the tenth leper, the thankful stranger (ἀλλογενής), who was a Samaritan. So, in his well known parable, a merciful Samaritan is contrasted with the unmerciful priest and Levite. And the very worship of the two races is described by him as different in character. “Ye worship ye know not what,” this is said of the Samaritans: “We know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews” (Joh 4:22).

Such were the Samaritans of our Lord's day: a people distinct from the Jews, though lying in the very midst of the Jews; a people preserving their identity, though seven centuries had rolled away since they had been brought from Assyria by Esar-haddon, and though they had abandoned their polytheism for a sort of ultra-Mosaicism; a people who — though their limits had been gradually contracted, and the rallying-place of their religion on Mount Gerizim had been destroyed one hundred and sixty years before, and though Samaria (the city) had been again and again destroyed, and though their territory had been the battlefield of Syria and Egypt — still preserved their nationality, still worshipped from Shechem and their other impoverished settlements towards their sacred hill, still could not coalesce with the Jews.

Under Vespasian, the city of Sichem received the new name of Neapolis, which still remains in the Arabic form Nablus. At the time of Pilate a tumult was excited among the Samaritans by an adventurer who persuaded the common people to follow him to the summit of Gerizim, where he pretended that Moses had buried the golden vessels. But Pilate dispersed the multitude with troops, and put the heads of the sedition to death. In consequence of the Samaritans complaining of his conduct to Vitellius, Pilate was deposed and sent to Rome (Joseph. Ant. 18:4, 1). Josephus relates (War, 3, 7, 32) pliat while Vespasian was endeavoring to subjugate the neighboring districts, the Samaritans collected in large numbers and took up their position on Mount Gerizim. The Roman general attacked and slew 11,600. Under Septimius Severus they joined the Jews against him; and therefore Neapolis was deprived of its rights. In the 3d and 4th centuries, notwithstanding their former calamities, they seem to have greatly increased and extended, not only in the East, but in the West. They  appear to have grown into importance under Dositheus, who was probably an apostate Jew. Epiphanius (Adv. Hoereses, lib. 1), in the 4th century, considers them to be the chief and most dangerous adversaries of Christianity, and he enumerates the several sects into which they had by that time divided themselves. They were popularly, and even by some of the fathers, confounded with the Jews, insomuch that a legal interpretation of the Gospel was described as a tendency to Σαμαρειτισμός or Ι᾿ουδαϊσμός. This confusion, however, did not extend to an identification of the two races. It was simply an assertion that their extreme opinions were identical. But the distinction between them and the Jews was sufficiently known, and even recognizer: in the Theodosian Code. In the 5th century a tumult was excited at Neapolis, during which the Samaritans ran into the Christian church, which was thronged with worshippers, killing, maiming, and mutilating many. The bishop, Terebinthus, having repaired to Constantinople and complained to the emperor, the latter punished the guilty by driving them from Mount Gerizim and giving it to the Christians, where a church was erected in honor of the Virgin. Under Anastasius an insurrection headed by a woman broke out, and was soon suppressed. Under Justinian there was a more formidable and extensive outbreak. It is related that all the Samaritans in Palestine rose up against the Christians and committed many atrocities, killing, plundering, burning, and torturing. In Neapolis they crowned their leader, Julian, king. But the imperial troops were sent against them, and great numbers, with Julian himself, were slain. In the time of the Crusaders, Neapolis suffered, along with other places in Palestine. In 1184 it was plundered by Saladin.

After the battle of Hattin, in 1187, it was devastated, and the sacred places in the neighborhood were polluted by Saladin's troops. Having been several times in the hands of the Christians, it was taken by Abu ‘Aly in 1244, since which it has remained in the power of the Mohammedans. No Christian historian of the Crusades mentions the Samaritans; but they are noticed by Benjamin of Tudela in the 12th century, who calls them Cuthites, or Cuthaeans. In the 17th century Della Valle gives an account of them; subsequently, Maundrell and Morison. After an interest in the people had been awakened by the reception of copies of their Pentateuch, their answers to the letters which Joseph Scaliger had sent to their communities in Nablus and Cairo came into the hands of John Morin, who made a Latin translation of them. The originals and a better version were published by De Sacy in Eichhorn's Repertoriam, vol. 13. In 1671 a letter was sent by the Samaritans at Nablus to Robert Huntington, which was answered by  Thomas Marshall of Oxford. The correspondence thus begun continued till 1688. De Sacy published it entire in Correspondance des Samaritains, contained in Notices et Extraits des MSS. de la Bibliotheque du Roi, vol. 12. The correspondence between Ludolf and the Samaritans was published by Cellarius and Bruns, and is also in Eichhorn's Repertorium, vol. 13. These letters are of great archaeological interest, and enter very minutely into the observances of the Samaritan ritual. Among other points worthy of notice in them is the inconsistency displayed by the writers in valuing themselves on not being Jews, and yet claiming to be descendants of Joseph. In 1807 a letter from the Samaritans to Gregoire, the French bishop, came into De Sacy's hands, who answered it. This was followed by four others, which were all published by the eminent French Orientalist.

At Nablus the Samaritans have still a settlement, consisting of about two hundred persons. Yet they observe the law, and celebrate the Passover on a sacred spot on Mount Gerizim, with an exactness of minute ceremonial which the Jews themselves have long intermitted. The people are very poor now, and to all appearance their total extinction is not far distant. In recent times many travelers have visited and given an account of the Samaritan remnant, such as Pliny, Fisk, Robinson, and Wilson. See also Shelaby, Notices of the Modern Samaritans (Lond. 1855). One of the late notices is that of M.E. Rogers, in Domestic Life in Palestine (1863, 2d ed.), ch. 10. Another and fuller account is given in Mill, Three Months' Residence in Nasblus, and an Account of the Modern Samaritans (1864, 12mo); see also Barges, Les Samaritains de Naplouse (Paris, 1855, 8vo). Mr. Grove has given an account of the ceremonial of their atonement, in Vacation Tourists for 1861; and Stanley, of their Passover, in Lectures on the Jewish Church, Append. 3, and still more minutely in Sermons in the East, Append. 2. For older monographs on the Samaritans, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 44. SEE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND LITURGY; SEE SAMARITANS, MODERN.

## Samaritan Language[[@Headword:Samaritan Language]]

             The Samaritan is chiefly a compound of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac. Among the words derived from these sources are to be recognized a great number of Cuthaean words, imported, doubtlessly, by the new colonists. We must therefore not be surprised that Greek, Latin, Persian, Arabic, and possibly other languages as well, have each contributed something to enrich the vocabulary. The grammar bears all the signs of irregularity which  would characterize that of an illiterate people; the orthography is uncertain; there is a profusion of quiescents, and a complete confusion between the several gutturals and cognate letters respectively; the vowels are uncertain, the A sound being most prominent. Such is the dialect which was spoken in Samaria till the Arabian conquest of the country in the seventh century A.D., when the language of the victors was introduced, and by its superior vigor gradually overpowered its rival, till, probably by about the 8th or 9th century, it had entirely taken its place. The old language, however, still continued to be understood and written by the priests, so that, like the Jews, they had two sacred languages, which, however, they had not the skill completely to distinguish from each other. The “Hebrew,” consequently, which appears in the correspondence of Samaritans with Europeans is largely impregnated with Aramaisms; Arabisms also are not by any means unfrequent.

Orthographic Elements. — The Samaritan language, or, as the Samaritans call it, the “Hebrew,” like all Shemitic languages, is read from right to left. The alphabet consists only of consonants (twenty-two in number), as in the adjoining table.

Save some points and scanty orthographical signs, there are in Samaritan no accents or other diacritical marks, as in Hebrew. There are no vowel- points, as in other Shemitic languages; but in order to supply this want and to indicate somewhat the pronunciation, some consonants are used as vowels, viz.:

a ה א e י א i י u (oo) ו

Of two consonants beginning a word, the first is pronounced as if it were a slight and indistinct vowel, similar to the Hebrew Sheva.

The only diacritical sign is a stroke over the consonant (e.g. א) serving to distinguish two different words written in the same manner, or two different forms derived from one and the same root, or to indicate some letter added or omitted. When placed over יor 5, the stroke indicates that these letters are real consonants, not representing vowels. Words cannot be separated at the end of the lines, hence the two letters ending the last word  are separated from the others and placed at the end of the line; but in printing this is generally avoided by diminishing or enlarging the spaces between the words.

As to punctuation, a point is put by the side of the final letter of a word. Besides this, the following signs have been introduced by the transcribers:

:or ῥ or .: at the end of a sentence.

- - (also .) at the end of part of a sentence, like our colon.

=.: or -<: more seldom — .: etc., or compound <:=.: etc., at the end of a longer sentence or section.

< .:. = = .:. > or similar signs, sometimes again and again repeated, between the end of one section, paragraph, or chapter, and the beginning of the other.

The numbers are written as in Hebrew.

Grammars. — Chr. Crinesius, Lingua Samaritica ex Scriptura Sacra fideliter eruta (Altdorphi, s. a.); Chr. Ravis, A Discourse of the Oriental Tongues, viz. Ebrew, Samaritane, etc., together with a Grammar ofthe said Tongues (Lond. 1649); Morini, Opuscula Hebroeo-Samaritana (Paris, 1657); Hilligerius, Summarium Linguoe Aramoeoe, i.e. Chaldeo- Syro-Samaritanoe (Witteb. 1679); Cellarius, Horoe Samaritanoe (Cizse, 1682; Francof. et Jenae, 1705); Otho, Synopsis Institutionum Samaritanarum, Rabb, etc. (Francof. 3d ed. 1735); Mascleff, Grammatica Hebraica: access. tres Granmaticoe, Chaldaica, Syriaca, et Samaritana (Paris, 2d ed. 1743, 2 vols. 12mo); Stohr, Theoria et Praxis Linguarun Sacrarum, sc. Samaritanoe, Hebr., et Syr. earumque Harmonia (Aug. Vind. 1796); Uhlemann, Institutiones Linguoe Samaritane: accedit Chrestomathia Samaritana Glossario Locupletata (Lips. 1837); Nicholls, A Grammar of the Samaritan Language, with Extracts and Vocabulary (Lond. 1858); Petermann, Brevis Linguoe Samaritanoe Grammatica, etc. (Berolini, 1873).

Lexicons.-Castelli, Lexicon Heptaglotton (Lond. 1669 fol.); Young, Samaritan Root-book (Edinburgh, s. a.). See also Kohn, Samaritanische Studien, and Zur Sprache der Sanmaritaner, p. 206 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritan Literature[[@Headword:Samaritan Literature]]

             Under this head propose to enumerate the works known to European scholars, somewhat in distinction from those current with the Samaritans themselves, which will be found under SAMARITANS, MODERN.

1. Grammar and Lexicography. — In this department we have to mention three grammatical treatises, which were published from a MS. at Amsterdam, by Noldeke, in the Gottinger Nachricheten, 1862, p. 337, 385. They are built entirely on the philological views of Arabic grammarians, some sections (such as those on transitive and intransitive verbs) being copied word for word from their works. From the transcriptions of Hebrew words into Arabic, we may judge of the Samaritan pronunciation of the eleventh century. As to the present system of pronunciation, Prof. Petermann, of Berlin, has transcribed the whole book of Genesis after the manner in which it is now read in the synagogue of Nablus, and from this transcription the present system of pronunciation may be known, although it is difficult to decide whether the present system is due to genuine tradition, or whether it has become influenced by the Syriac and Arabic. According to Petermann's transcription, the first verse in Genesis would read thus: “Baraset bara eluwem it assamem wit aares.” (Comp. Abhandlungen fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes d. D.M.G. 1868, vol. 5, No. 1.)

In the matter of lexicography there is little information to give; of dictionaries proper none has as yet come to light. At Paris (Bibl. Nat. Anciens Fonds, 6, Peiresc) there is a concordance of forms occurring in the Scriptures with the corresponding Arabic and Samaritan words in parallel columns, and a similar one is preserved at Cambridge (Christ's College Library), in which, however, the Samaritan equivalent is omitted. Of late the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg has obtained fragments of grammatical works and of Hebrew-Arabic dictionaries, or “Tardeschemans” (interpreters), as they are termed by Samaritans and Arabs, which will be described in the catalogue to be issued by Mr. Harkavy.

2. Calendars. — In this branch there are some astronomical tables, two of which were published by Scaliger, and one was edited with a translation by De Sacy (iot. et Extr. 12:135, 153). Several more MSS. have found their  way to Europe — one written A.D. 1750, another written 1689, a third dated 1724 (see Journ. Asiatique, 1869, p. 467, 468). The Imperial Library of St. Petersburg also possesses several specimens.

3. Legends. — The British Museum possesses a MS. (Add. MS. 19, 657), a commentary on the “legends ascribed to Moses.” It has been translated by Dr. Leitner in Heidenheim's Vierteljahrsschrift, 4:184 sq. It borrows largely from Jewish sources. Of a similar type is the Jewelled Necklace in Praise of the Lord of the Hutman Race, composed in 1537 by Ismail Ibn- Badr Ibn-Abu-l-'Izz Ibn-Rumaih (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 19, 021) in honor of Moses. It sets forth his divine nature, and extols the glories of his birth and miracles. With this may be classed a tract in which is contained a “complete explanation of the chapters on Balak” by Ghazal Ibn-ad- 'Duwaik (MS. 27, Bibl. Acad. Reg. Scient. Amst. p. 265-289); and another small tract (ibid. p. 292, 293), by the famous Abu Said, explaining the cause of the fear felt by Jacob on his way to Egypt (Gen 46:1; Gen 46:3), and by Abraham after the conquest of the five kings (ibid. 15:1), with a third (p. 294-296), by an unknown author, in which the fifteen occasions are quoted from Exodus and Numbers when the Israelites, by their complaints and abuse of Moses and Aaron, tempted God, and the times are mentioned at which the divine glory appeared.

4. Commentaries. — Of great importance, especially for ascertaining the doctrinal views of the Samaritans, are their commentaries on the Pentateuch. The oldest extant is perhaps the one in the Bodleian Library (Add. MS. 4to, 99, and described by Neubauer in the Journ. Asiatique, 1873, p. 341 sq.), composed A.D. 1053 by an unknown Samaritan for the benefit of a certain Abul Said Levi. In this commentary we find quotations from the Pentateuch, the former and later prophets, Nehemiah, the Mishna, etc., but not from the Samaritan Targum. All anthropomorphisms are avoided.

Another interesting and important commentary is one preserved at Berlin, from which large extracts were given by Geiger in the Zeitschrift d. 1). M. G. 17, 723 sq.; 20, 147 sq.; 22, 532 sq. In it the national feeling as exhibited in opposition to the Rabbinic school of thought among the Jews is thoroughly represented.

An anonymous commentary on Genesis, brought frorn the East by bishop Huntington, and preserved in the Bodleian Library (Hunt. MS. 301), is of  the same type as the preceding. The forty-ninth chapter was published by Schnurrer in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 16, 151-199.

To this class we must also reckon a hagadic commentary on the Pentateuch containing Genesis and Exodus, termed the Dissipater of Darkness from the Secrets of Revelation, written in 1753-54 by Ghazal Ibn-Abu-s-Surur al-Ghazzi (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 19, 657), and another containing fragments of a commentary on Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus, often quoted by Castellus in his notes on the Samaritan Pentateuch (Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 5495).

A number of fragments of such commentaries are also preserved at St. Petersburg. Other writers seem to have devoted their energies to the same subject, but nothing now remains to us but their names and the titles of their books (Amst. MS. 27, p. 309, 314 sq.).

5. Chronicles. — Here we mention:

(a.) The Samaritan Chronicle or Book of Joshua, sent to Scaliger by the Samaritans of Cairo in 1584. It was edited by Juynboll (Leyden, 1848), and his acute investigations have shown that it was redacted into its present form about A.D. 1300, out of four special documents, three of which were Arabic and one Hebrew (i.e. Samaritan). The Leyden MS. in 2 pts., which Gesenius (De Samuel Theol. p. 8, n. 18) thinks unique, is dated A.H. 764- 919 (A.D. 1362-1513); the Cod. in the Brit. Museum, lately acquired, dates A.H. 908 (A.D. 1502). The chronicle embraces the time from Joshua to about A.D. 350, and was originally written in, or subsequently translated into, Arabic. After eight chapters of introductory matter begins the early history of “Israel” under “King Joshua, “who, among other deeds of arms, wages war, with 300.000 mounted men — ”half Israel” — against two kings of Persia. The last of his five “royal” successors is Shimshon (Samson), the handsomest and most powerful of them all. These reigned for the space of 250 years, and were followed by five high priests, the last of whom was Usi (? =Uzzi, Ezr 7:4). With the history of Eli, “the seducer,” which then follows, and Samuel, “a sorcerer,” the account by a sudden transition runs off to Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 45), Alexander (ch. 46), and Hadrian (ch. 47), and closes suddenly at the time of Julian the Apostate. The Hebrew of this chronicle is given by Kirchheim in his Karme Shomron.

(b.) The El-Tholidoth, or “The (book of) Generations.” It professes to have been written by Eleazar ben-Amram in A.H. 544 (A.D. 1149), copied and continued by Jacob ben-Ismael 200 years later, and carried down by other hands to 1859, when the present MS. was written by Jacob ben- Aaron, the high priest. It was published by Neubauer in the Journal Asiatique for 1869, p. 385 sq. He gives the Samaritan, or rather Hebrew, text with notes and translation, citing the Arabic translation when the sense is not clear. His text is that of the Bodleian MS. numbered Bodl. Or. p. 651. collated in some passages with one belonging to a private owner. A German translation with explanations has been given by Heidenheim in his Vierteljahrsschrift fur deutsch- und englisch-theolog. Forschung u. Kritik, 4, 347 sq. The chronicle is of interest to geographers, as, while mentioning the various Samaritan families settled in Damascus, Palestine, and Egpt, it incidentally introduces the names of a considerable number of places inhabited by them. As to the importance of this chronicle for comparison with the “Book of Jubilees,” comp. Ronsch, Das Buch der Jubilaen (1874), p. 361.

(c.) The Chronicle of Abulfath is a compilation from the Samaritan chronicle, as well as from various sources, Jewish or Rabbinical. It is full of fables, and contains little useful matter. The history in it extends from Adam to Mohammed, and was composed in the 14th century — i.e. in 1355, or 756 A.H. — at Nablus. Five MSS. of it are known — one at Paris, another at Oxford, procured by Huntington, and three in Berlin; but one of the last three consists of nothing but a few fragments. Schnurrer gave a long extract from the Oxford copy, with a German translation, in Paulus, Neues Repertoriumfur biblische und morgenlandische Literatur (1790, Theil 1, 120 sq.); and in Paulus, Memorabilia (1791, 2 vols.); so, too, De Sacy, in his Arabic Chrestomathy, and Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque du Roi, tom. 12. With an English translation by R. Payne Smith, it was printed in Heidenheim's Journal, 2, 304 sq.; 432 sq. Recently it has been published by Vilmar, with the title, Abulfathi Annales Samaritani, quos Arabioe edidit, cum Proll. Latine vertit et Commentasrio illustravit (Gothae, 1865), after a collation of the various MSS., and with learned prolegomena.

6. Miscellaneous. — To this belongs a work of Abu-l-Hasan of Tyre, relating to lawful and forbidden meats, or “of force” (Bodl. MS. Hunt. 24; comp. also Journal Asiat. 1869, p. 468). In it the peculiar dogmas of the Samaritans as differing from those of the Jews are set forth and supported  by arguments drawn from the Pentateuch. Closely resembling this is a work entitled “a book sufficing to those who desire the knowledge of the book of God,” by Muhaddib Eddin Jussuf Ibn-Salamah Ibn-Jussuf al-Askari, commenced in A.D. 1041. It is an exposition of the Mosaic laws, and preserved in the Brit. Museum (Add. MS. 19, 656 [2]).

Another work by Abu-l-Hasan relates to the future life, with arguments drawn from the Pentateuch (Bodl. MS. Hunt. 350 [1]).

An Abridgment of the Mosaic Law according to the Samaritans, by Abul Farag Ibn-Ishag Ibn-Kathar, is preserved at Paris (Bibl. Nat. Anciens Fonds, 5, Peiresc); a work on penance. in Amst. (MS. 27, p. 304), which MS. also contains a treatise on the nature of God and man, etc. (ibid. p. 223), and questions and answers, with interpretations from the Pentateuch (ibid. p. 297).

The St. Petersburg collection also contains fragments of Samaritan law books (F. 4, 18); twenty-two documents in Arabic, relating to civil matters, and ranging from the 17th to the 19th century; about seventy contracts of marriage; and six amulets.

See Petermann, Versuch einer hebr. Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner (Leips. 1868), introduction; Juynboll, Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samaritanae (Lugd. Bat. 1846), p. 58 sq.; Noldeke, Ueber einige samaritanisch-arab. Schriften, die hebr. Sprache betreffend (Gottingen, 1862); Geiger, Die hebraische Grammatik bei den Samaritanern, in Zeitschr. d. D. M. G. (1863), 17, 748; Heidenheim, Vierteljahrsschriff, in loc. cit.; Petermann, in Herzog, Real- Encykl. 13, 376 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. “Samaritanische Literatur;” Nutt, A Sketch of Samaritan History, p. 134 sq.; Relandi Dissertt. Miscell. 2, 14; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, 4, 2814 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. 3, 751; Kirchheim, Karme Shomron (Frankfort, 1851), p. 28 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritan Liturgy[[@Headword:Samaritan Liturgy]]

             Under this head we propose to treat of the formal ritual of the Samaritans, including their most important doctrines, usages, etc., as gathered from documentary sources; reserving some additional details as to their present practice for the art. SEE SAMARITANS, MODERN.

I. Ritual. — The liturgical literature of the Samaritans is very extensive, and not without a certain poetical value. It consists chiefly of hymns and prayers for Sabbath and feast days, and of occasional prayers at nuptials, circumcisions, burials, and the like. The British Museum possesses nineteen volumes of prayers and hymns, which are described by Heidenheim in his Vierteljahrsschrift, 1, 279 sq.; 408 sq. Several have also been published by Heidenheim, e.g. A Hymn for the Day of Atonement (ibid. 1, 290 sq.); A Petition of Vanah ben-Marka (ibid. p. 432); A Petition of Meshalma of Daphne (ibid. p. 438 sq.); The Prayer of Ab. Gelugah, from a Vatican MS. (ibid. 2, 213 sq.); The Litany of Marka, the end of which runs thus:

“Lord, for the sake of the three perfect ones! For the sake of Joseph, the interpreter of dreams! For the sake of Moses, chief of the prophets! For the sake of the priests, the masters of the priests! For the sake of the Torah, most sacred of books! For the sake of Mount Gerizim, the everlasting hill! For the sake of the hosts of angels! Destroy the enemies and foes! Receive our prayers! O Everlasting! Deliver us from these troubles! Open to us the treasure of heaven;”

A Prayer of the High priest Pinchas for the Celebration of the New Moon (contained in Cod. 19, 020 Add. MSS.); Two Hymn for the Day of Atonement, one by the priest Abraham, the other by the priest Tobias (ibid. 4, 110 sq.; contained in Cod. 19, 009 Add. MSS.); The Prayer of Marka and that of Amram, both contained in the Vatic. MS. (ibid. 4, 237 sq.; 390 sq.). Of the hymns for the Passover we will speak farther on. In Gesenius, Carmina Samaritana, fragments of liturgies from Damascus were published, which Kirchheim has published with emendations in his Karme Shomron. One hymn on the Unity of God, and headed לית אלה אלא אחד, i.e. “there is no God but one,” runs thus:

1.אלהי ם קעימהThe everlasting God, דקעי ם עד לעל ם Who liveth forever;  אלה על כל חילין God above all powers, וממן כן לעל ם And who thus remaineth forever.

2.בחילרִבה נתרחוֹIn thy great power shall we trust, דאת הו מיןFor thou art our Lord; באלהותדִאנדית In thy Godhead; for thou hast created עלמה מן רישה The world from beginning.

3.גבורתכִסיהThy power was hidden,! וטהרוִרחמיAnd thy glory and mercy. גלין גליאתה וכסיאתה Revealed are both the things that are revealed, and those that are unrevealed, בשלטן אלהותוִכו Before the reign of thy God head, etc.

Petermann has published three “prayers of Moses and Joshua” and five “prayers of the angels” in his Grammatica Samaritana, p. 418 sq. A volume of prayers is also in the Paris Bibl. Nat. Anciens Fonds, 4, Peiresc. The present Samaritans have two collections, which they call Dunrran (“string of pearls”) and Defter (“book”), the latter comprising the former, the arrangement of which they ascribe to Amran-ez-Zeman or Amram- Dari. The language in which they are written varies; some are in almost classical Hebrew, others in a dialect resembling that of the Targums, containing an admixture of Arabisms and Hebraisms. The meter also differs considerably.

II. Doctrines. — From the various hymns and documents extant, it appears that the Samaritans had five principal articles of faith, viz.:

1. God is one, without partner or associate, without body and passions, the cause of all things, filling all things, etc.

2. Moses is the one messenger and prophet of God for all time, the end of revelation, the friend and familiar servant of God; none will arise like him.

3. The law is perfect and complete, destined for all time, never to be supplemented or abrogated by later revelation.

4. Gerizim is the one abode of God on earth, the home of eternal life; over it is Paradise, thence comes all rain.

5. There will be a day of retribution, when the pious will rise again; false prophets and their followers will then be cast into the fire and burned.

Other points in their creed may be noticed. From the prayer of Tobiah 5, 24, it seems that the Samaritans believed in original sin. “For the sake of Adam and because of the end of all flesh, forgive and pardon the whole congregation.” From a prayer for the Day of Atonement we see that the doctrine concerning the Logos was known among them, for which see Heidenhelm, Vierteljahrsschrift, 4, 126 sq. They believe in angels and astrology, which may be seen from a prayer given by Heidenheim, l.c. p. 545 sq.

The belief in a coming Messiah, or “Restorer,” who should be the son of Joseph, was current among the Samaritans at a very early age, and this belief is based upon such Messianic prophecies as Gen 15:17; Gen 49:10; Num 24:17; and Deu 18:15. All that they had to say concerning this point is contained in the letter of Marchib Ibn-Jakub addressed to Thomas Marshall, where we read: “You have spoken of the arrival of the great Prophet. This is he who was announced to our father Abraham, as it is said there appeared ‘a smoking furnace and a burning lamp' (Gen 15:17); ‘to him shall the people submit themselves' (ibid. 49:10); of him also it is said (Num 24:17), ‘he shall destroy all the children of Sheth, and Israel shall do valiantly;' of him, ‘the Lord thy God shall raise thee up from amidst thy brethren a prophet like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken' (Deu 18:15). Our teachers have said on this point that this prophet shall arise, that all people shall submit to him and believe in him and in the law and Mount Gerizim; that the religion of Moses, son of Amram, will then appear in glory; that the beginning of the name of the prophet who will arise will be M; that he will die and be interred near Joseph, ‘the fruitful bough;' that the Tabernacle will appear by his ministry and be established on Gerizim. Thus it is said in our books and in the book of Joshua, the son of Nun” (Eichhorn, Repertorium, 9, 11 sq.). What has been said in this and other letters and works is merely an extract from a hymn composed by the high priest Abisha ben-Pinchas for the Day of Atonement, and contained in Cod. 19, 651 Add. MSS. of the British Museum (comp. Heidenheim, 5, 170 sq.). As to the time of his appearance the Samaritans were formerly uncertain. “No one knows his  coming but Jehovah,” says Ab Zehuta in 1589 (comp. Eichhorn, 13, 266); “it is a great mystery with regard to Messiah who is to come and who will manifest his spirit; happy shall we be when he arrives,” writes Salameh, in 1811 (see De Sacy, Not. et Extr. 12, 122). “The appearance of Messiah,” writes Petermann, in 1860, “is to take place 6000 years after the creation, and these have just elapsed; consequently he now, though all unconsciously, is going about upon earth. In 1853 the Samaritans expected a great political revolution; but in 1863 the kings of the earth will, according to them, assemble the wisest out of all nations in order by mutual counsel to discover the true faith. From the Israelites, i.e. Samaritans, will one be sent, and he will be the Taeb. He will gain the day, lead them to Gerizim, where under the twelve stones they will find the ten commandments (or the whole Torah), and under the stone of Bethel the Temple utensils and manna. Then will all believe in the law, and acknowledge him as their King and Lord of all the earth. He will convert and equalize all men, live 110 years upon earth, then die and be buried near Gerizim; for upon that pure and holy mountain, which is fifteen yards higher than Ebal, no burial can take place. Afterwards will the earth remain some hundreds of years more till the 7000 are completed, and then the last judgment will come in” (Herzog, R.-Encykl. 13, 373 sq.).

III. Usages. — At the present day the Samaritans celebrate seven feasts in the year, although only one, the Passover, is observed with its former solemnities. A minute and interesting account of the ceremonies of this feast, as celebrated in 1853, is given by Petermann, in Herzog, R.-Encykl. 13, 378; also by Stanley, Hist. of the Jewish Church, 1, 513 sq. The liturgy for this feast is very rich; thus every evening during the feast the “dream of the priest Abisha” is read, to hear which only the elders are permitted. This dream is contained in Cod. 19, 007 Add. MSS. Brit. Museum. There are Passover hymns composed by the high priests Marka, Pinchas, and Abisha (q.v.), given by Heidenheim, 3, 94 sq., 357 sq., 475 sq. There exists also a History of the Exodus, a so called Pesach-Hagqgadah, which Dr. S. Kohn published with a German translation in Abhandlungen der D. M. G. 5, No. 4 (Leips. 1876).

The second feast, celebrated on the 21st of Nisan, or last day of Unleavened Bread, is marked by a pilgrimage to Gerizim. The third feast is Pentecost; the fourth that of Trumpets; the fifth is the Day of Atonement. The first and eighth days of Tabernacles count for the remaining feast days.  The Sabbath, moreover, is kept with great strictness; the years of jubilee and release are also still observed.

The Samaritans have two more days of assembly, though they do not count them as holidays, termed צמות. Summoth, on which the number of the congregation is taken, and in return every male over twenty years of age presents the priest with half a shekel (three piasters), in accordance with Exo 30:12-14, receiving from him a calendar for the coming six months prepared from a table in his possession — originally, it is said, composed by Adam and committed to writing in the time of Phinehas. From these offerings, the tenth of the incomes of the congregation, and other small gifts, the priest gains his living. He may consecrate any of his family that he pleases to the priesthood, provided the candidate be twenty- five years of age and never have suffered his hair to be cut. Like other Orientals, he never removes his turban, and thus is not easily to be distinguished from the rest of the congregation; but, in accordance with Lev 10:6, he does not “rend his clothes” by wearing a slit on his sleeve as other Samaritans; and when the roll of the law is taken from the ark, he, like his assistants, places a cloth, which they call טלית, tallith, around his head. They wear white turbans; ordinarily they are compelled, by way of distinction from Mohammedans, to wear them of a pale-red color. They may cut their hair or not, as they please, but not their beards, this being forbidden in Lev 19:27; Lev 21:5. Women must let their hair grow, and wear no earrings, because of them the golden calf was made. For fear of scandalizing the Mohammedans, none but the old ones venture to attend the synagogue. When a boy is born, great rejoicing is held; his circumcision always takes place on the eighth day after birth, even though it be a Sabbath. Boys marry as early as fifteen or sixteen, girls at twelve. The Samaritans may marry Christian or Jewish girls, provided they become Samaritans. When a man has a childless wife he may take a second; but if she also be barren, not a third. Divorces, though permitted, are uncommon. The dead are prepared for burial by their own friends; the whole body is washed, but especially the hands (thrice), mouth, nose, face, ears, both inside and out (all this in Mohammedan fashion), and lastly the feet. The burial takes place, if possible, before sunset the same day, accompanied with the recitation of the law and hymns. The following is a part of a litany for the dead  אברה ם ויצחק ויעקב אדני יהוה אלהי ם ברחמיוִבוִבשמ ִיאדונינו משה ובו ובכבודוִבאדונינן

Lord Jehovah, Elohim, for thy mercy, and for thine own sake, and for thy name, and for thy glory, and for the sake of our Lords Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and our Lords Moses and Aaron, and Eleazar, and Ithamar, and Phinehas, and Joshua, and Caleb, and the Holy Angels, and the seventy Elders, and the holy mountain of Gerizim, Beth El. If thou acceptest [תשי ם] this prayer [ מקרא= reading], may there go forth from before thy holy countenance a gift sent to protect the spirit of thy servant, iS i. i.)j [N. the son of N.], of the sons of [ — ], daughter [ — ] from the sons of [ — ]. O Lord Jehovah, in thy mercy have compassion on him (, [or] have compassion on her), and rest his (her) soul in the garden of Eden; and forgive him (, | [or] her), and all the congregation of Israel who flock to Mount Gerizim, Beth El. Amen. Through Moses the trusty. Amen, Amen, Amen.

These readings are continued every day to the next Sabbath, the women of the family watching near the grave. On the Sabbath it is visited by the whole congregation (except the near relations), who eat there together, reciting part of the law and singing hymns, finishing the recitation later in the day with the relations.

From the usages among the Samaritans we see that, on the whole, they strictly adhere to Jewish customs, and yet we find numerous enactments against them in the Talmud. There is especially one whole treatise which bears upon this subject, entitled Massecheth Kuthim, which Kirchheim published with six others (Frankfort, 1851). From this treatise we see “that Jews are not allowed to suffer them to acquire immovable property, nor to sell them sheep for shearing, nor crops to cut, nor timber still standing. They are also forbidden to sell them weapons or anything which could damage persons, or to give or to take wives from them. A daughter of Israel may not deliver a Samaritan woman nor suckle her son, but a Samaritan woman may perform these offices for a daughter of Israel in her (the Israelite's) house.” These are some of the main points contained in that treatise, which concludes in the following words:

“And why are the Cathim not permitted to come into the midst of the Jews? Because they have mixed with the priests of the heights (idolaters). R. Ismael says: They were at first pious converts (צדק  גירי= real Israelites), and why is the intercourse with them prohibited? Because of their illegally begotten children, and because they do not fulfil the duties of יב ם (marrying the deceased brother's wife);' a law which they understand to apply to the betrothed only.

“‘At what period are they to be received (into the community)?' ‘When they abjure the Mount Gerizilm, recognize Jerusale!m (viz. its superior claims), and believe in the Resurrection.'”

See Gesenius, Samarit. Theolog. (Hale, 1822); Anecdota Exon. (Lipsise, 1824); Kirchheim, Karme Shomron, p. 16 sq.; Petermann, in Herzog, 13:376 sq.; Nutt, Sketch of Samaritan History, p. 65 sq., 142 sq; Friedrich, De Christologia Samar. (Lipsice, 1821); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 1, 50 sq.; Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 172; Adams, History of the Jews, 2, 257 sq.; Langen, Das Judenthum in Paldstina (Freiburg, 1866), p. 90 sq., 185 sq., 232 sq., 299 sq., 407 sq.; Appel, Qucestiones de rebus Samaritanorum (Gotting. 1874), and Ueber Samaritaner, in Jud. Literaturblatt, 1878, No. 14 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. 3, 751 sq.; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, p. 2816 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritan Pentateuch[[@Headword:Samaritan Pentateuch]]

             This is one of the:most important relics of the Samaritan literature that have come down to our times. We therefore give it a large critical treatment, following the results of Gesenius's investigations, as they have been presented by Lee in his Prolegomena; Davidson, in Kitto's Cyclop.; and Deutsch, in Smith's Dict. of the Bible. The latter two, also giving the results of Kirchheim, we have especially used in this abstract, making such corrections and additions as appeared necessary. SEE PENTATEUCH.

I. History — It had been well known to early Jewish and Christian writers that a recension of the Pentateuch, differing in important respects from that in use among the Jews, was in possession of the Samaritan community. But these writers regarded it in a different light respectively. Thus the Jews treated it with contempt as a forgery. “You have falsified your law” — תורתכ ם זייפת ם— says R. Eliezer ben-Simeon (Jeremiah Sotah, 7, 3; Sotah, p. 33 b), “and you have not profited aught by it,” referring to the insertion of the words “opposite Shechem” in Deu 11:30. On another occasion they are ridiculed on account of their ignorance of one of  the simplest rules of Hebrew grammar, displayed in their Pentateuch, viz. the use of the ה locale (unknown, however, according to Jeremiah Meg. 6, 2, also to the people of Jerusalem). “Who has caused you to blunder?” said R. Simeon ben-Eliezer to them; referring to their abolition of the Mosaic ordinance of marrying the deceased brother's wife (Deu 25:5 sq.) — through a misinterpretation of the passage in question, which enjoins that the wife of the dead man shall not be “without” to a stranger, but that the brother should marry her: they however, taking החוצה(=לחווֹ) to be an epithet of אשת, “wife,” translated “the outer wife,” i.e. the betrothed only (Jeremiah Jebam. 1, 6; comp. Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 197 sq.).

Early Christian writers, on the other hand, speak of it with respect, in some cases even preferring its authority to that of the Mosaic text. Origen quotes it under the name of τὸ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν ῾Εβραικόν, giving its various readings in the margin of his Hexapla (e.g. on Num 13:1; comp. 21:13, and Montfaucon, Hexapl. Prelim. p. 18 sq.). Eusebius of Caesarea, noticing the agreement in the chronology of the Sept. and Samaritan text as against the Hebrew, remarks that it was written in a character confessedly more ancient than that of the latter (1Ch 16:1-11). Jerome (in Preface to Kings) also mentions this fact, and in his comment on Gal 3:10 he upholds the genuineness of its text over that of the Masoretic one, but in his Quoest. in Gen 4:8 he speaks more favorably of the Hebrew; while Georgius Syncellus, the chronologist of the 8th century, is most outspoken in his praise of it, terming it “the earliest and best even by the testimony of the Jews themselves” (τὸ τῶν Σαμαρείτῶν ἀρχαιότατον καὶ χαρακτῆρσι διάλλαττον ὅ καὶ ἀληθὲς ειναι καὶ πρῶτον ῾Εβραῖοι καθομολογοῦσιν [Chronogr. p. 851]).

Down to within the last two hundred and fifty years, however, no copy of this divergent code of laws had reached Europe, and it began to be pronounced a fiction, and the plain words of the Church fathers — the better known authorities — who quoted it were subjected to subtle interpretations. Suddenly, in 1616, Pietro della Valle, one of the first discoverers also of the cuneiform inscriptions, acquired a complete codex from the Samaritans in Damascus. In 1623 it was presented by Achille Harley de Sancy to the Library of the Oratory in Paris, and in 1628 there appeared a brief description of it by J. Morinus in his preface to the Roman  text of the Sept. Three years later, shortly before it was published in the Paris Polyglot — whence it was copied, with a few emendations from other codices, by Walton-Morinus, the first editor, wrote his Exercitationes Ecclesiasticoe in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum, in which he pronounced the newly found codex, with all its innumerable variants from the Masoretic text, to be infinitely superior to the latter; in fact, the unconditional and speedy emendation of the received text thereby was urged most authoritatively. And now the impulse was given to one of the fiercest and most barren literary and theological controversies, of which more anon. Between 1620 and 1630 six additional copies, partly complete, partly incomplete, were acquired by Usher; five of which he deposited in English libraries, while one was sent to De Dieu, and has disappeared mysteriously. Another codex, now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, was brought to Italy in 1621. Peiresc procured two more, one of which was placed in the Royal Library of Paris, and one in the Barberini at Rome. Thus the number of MSS. in Europe gradually grew to sixteen. During the present century another, but very fragmentary, copy was acquired by the Gotha Library. A copy of the entire (?) Pentateuch, with Targum (? Samaritan version), in parallel columns (4to), on parchment, was brought from Nablus by Mr. Grove in 1861, for the count of Paris, in whose library it is. Single portions of the Samaritan Pentateuch, in a more or less defective state, are now of no rare occurrence in Europe. Of late the St. Petersburg Library has secured fragments of about three hundred Pentateuch MSS.

II. Description. — Respecting the external condition of these MSS., it may be observed that their sizes vary from 12mo to folio, and that no scroll, such as the Jews and the Samaritans use in their synagogues, is to be found among them. The letters, which are of a size corresponding to that of the book, exhibit none of those varieties of shape so frequent in the Masoretic text; such as majuscules, minuscules, suspended, inverted letters, etc. Their material is vellum or cotton paper; the ink used is black in all cases save in the oldest scroll of the Samaritans at Nablits, the letters of which are in purple. There are neither vowels, accents, nor diacritical points. The individual words are separated from each other by a dot. Greater or smaller divisions of the text are marked by two dots placed one above the other, and by an asterisk. A small line above a consonant indicates a peculiar meaning of the word, an unusual form, a passive, and the like; it is, in fact, a contrivance to bespeak attention. For example, הֵנָה and הַנֵּה, עִר and עֵד, דֶבֶרand דָבָר, אִל and אֵל, יֵאָכֵל and יאֹכִל, יַקָרֵא and יַקְיָא, ש ׁand שׂ, the suffixes at the end of a word, the ה without a dagesh, etc., are thus pointed out to the reader (comp. Kirchheim, p. 34).

The whole Pentateuch is divided into nine hundred and sixty-four paragraphs, or Kazzin, the termination of which is indicated by these figures, =, .., or <. At the end of each book the number of its divisions is stated thus:

(250) nv , vtam ]yjq . ]v>arh rpc hzh

(200) , ytam “ yn>h “ “

(130) , y>vl>v ham “ y>yl>h “ “

(218) xyv1 y “ yiybrh “ “

(166) ycv1 q “ y>ymxh “ “

The Samaritan Pentateuch is halved in Lev 7:15 (8:8, in Hebrew text), \* where the words “Middle of the Torah” (פלגא דארהותא) are found. At the end of each MS. the year of the copying, the name of the scribe, and also that of the proprietor are usually stated. Yet their dates are not always trustworthy when given, and very difficult to be conjectured when entirely omitted, since the Samaritan letters afford no internal evidence of the period in which they were written. To none of the MSS., however, which have as yet reached Europe can be assigned a higher date than the 10th Christian century. The scroll used in Nabls bears — so the Samaritans pretend — the following inscription:

“I, Abisha, son of Phinchas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest — upon them be the grace of Jehovah — in his honor have I written this Holy Law at the entrance of the Tabernacle of Testimony on the Mount Gerizim, even Beth El, in the thirteenth year of the taking possession of the land of Canaan, and all its boundaries around it, by the children of Israel. I praise Jehovah.”

\* Mr. Deutsch, who copied here Kirchheim (p. 36), has overlooked the latter's note, viz. that Lev 8:8 contains the two words which, according to the Masorites, constitute the middle of all the words in the Pentateuch. As it stands now it would lead to the supposition that Lev 7:15 of the Samaritan Pentateuch corresponds to 8:8 in the Hebrew text.  (Letter of Meshalmah ben-Ab Sechuah, Cod. 19, 791, Add. MSS. Brit. Mus. in Heidenheim, 1, 88. Comp. Epist. Samuel Sichemitarum ad Jobusn Ludolphum [Cize, 1688]; Antiq. Eccl. Orient. p. 123; Huntingtoni Epist. p. 49, 56; Eichhorn, Repertorium f. bibl. und morg. Lit. vol. 9, etc.) But no European has fully succeeded in finding it in this scroll, however great the pains bestowed upon the search (comp. Eichhorn, Einleit. 2, 599); and even if it had been found, it would not have deserved the slightest credence. It would appear, however (see archdeacon Tattam's notice in the Parthenon, No. 4, May 24, 1862), that Mr. Levysohn, who was attached to the Russian staff in Jerusalem, has found the inscription in question “going through the middle of the body of the text of the Decalogue, and extending through three columns.” Considering that the Samaritans themselves told Huntington “that this inscription had beeon in their scroll once, but must have been erased by some wicked hand” (comp. Eichhorn, ibid.), this startling piece of information must be received with extreme caution. Nevertheless, Lieut. Conder speaks as if he had actually seen the inscription on the venerable MS. (Tent Work in Palestine, 1, 50).

This venerable roll is written on parchment, in columns thirteen inches deep and seven and a half inches wide. The writing is in a good hand, but not nearly so large or beautiful as in many book copies which they possess. Each column contains from seventy to seventy-two lines, and the whole roll contains a hundred and ten columns. The skins of which the roll is made are of equal size, and each measures twenty-five inches in length by fifteen inches in width. In many places it is worn out and patched with rewritten parchment, and in many other places where not torn the writing is illegible. About two thirds of the original writing is still readable. The name of the scribe, we are told, is written in a kind of acrostic, and forms part of the text running through three columns of the book of Deuteronomy. In whatever light this statement may be regarded, the roll has the appearance of very great antiquity.

III. Critical Character. — We have briefly stated above that the Exercitationes of J. Morin, which placed the Samaritan Pentateuch far above the received text in point of genuineness — partly on account of its agreeing in many places with the Sept., and partly on account of its superior “lucidity and harmony” — excited and kept up for nearly two hundred years one of the most extraordinary controversies on record. Characteristically enough, however, this was set at rest once for all by the very first systematic investigation of the point at issue. It would now  appear as if the unquestioning rapture with which every new literary discovery was formerly hailed, the innate animosity against the Masoretic (Jewish) text, the general preference for the Sept., the defective state of Shemitic studies — as if, we say, all these put together were not sufficient to account for the phenomenon that men of any critical acumen could for one moment not only place the Samaritan Pentateuch on a par with the Masoretic text, but even raise it, unconditionally, far above it. There was, indeed, another cause at work, especially in the first period of the dispute; it was a controversial spirit which prompted J. Morin and his followers, Cappellus and others, to prove to the Reformers what kind of value was to be attached to their authority — the received form of the Bible, upon which, and which alone, they professed to take their stand. It was now evident that nothing short of the Divine Spirit, under the influence and inspiration of which the Scriptures were interpreted and expounded by the Roman Church, could be relied upon. On the other hand, most of the “Antimorinians” — De Muis, Hottinger, Stephen Morin, Buxtorf, Fuller, Leusden, Pfeiffer, etc. — instead of patiently and critically examining the subject and refuting their adversaries by arguments which were within their reach, as they are within ours, directed their attacks against the persons of the Morinians, and thus their misguided zeal left the question of the superiority of the new document over the old where they found it. Of higher value were. it is true, the labors of Simon, Le Clerc, Walton, etc., at a later period, who proceeded eclectically, rejecting many readings, and adopting others which seemed preferable to those of the old text. Houbigant, however, with unexampled ignorance and obstinacy, returned to Morinus's first notion — already generally abandoned — of the unquestionable and thorough superiority. He, again, was followed more or less closely by Kennicott, Alex. a St. Aquilino, Lobstein, Geddes, Bertholdt, and others. The discussion was taken up once more on the other side, chiefly by Ravius, who succeeded in finally disposing of this point of the superiority (Exercitatt. Phil. in Houbig. Prol. [Lugd. Bat. 1755]). It was from his day forward allowed, almost on all hands, that the Masoretic text was the genuine one; but that in doubtful cases, when the Samaritan had an “unquestionably clearer” reading, this was to be adopted, since a certain amount of value, however limited, did attach to it. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Jahn, and the majority of modern critics adhered to this opinion, Here the matter rested until 1815, when Gesenius (De Pent. Samuel Origine, Indole, et Auctoritate) abolished the remnant of the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch. So masterly, lucid, and full are his arguments  and his proofs that there has been, and will be, no further question as to the absence of all value in this recension, and in its pretended emendations. In fact, a glance at the systematic arrangement of the variations, of which he first of all bethought himself, is quite sufficient to convince the reader at once that they are for the most part mere blunders, arising from an imperfect knowledge of the first elements of grammar and exegesis. That others owe their existence to a studied design of conforming certain passages to the Samaritan mode of thought, speech, and faith — more especially to show that the Mount Gerizim, upon which their temple stood, was the spot chosen and indicated by God to Moses as the one upon which he desired to be worshipped. Finally, that others are due to a tendency towards removing, as well as linguistic shortcomings would allow, all that seemed obscure or in any way doubtful, and towards filling up all apparent imperfections either by repetitions or by means of newly invented and badly fitting words and phrases. It must, however, be premised that, except two alterations (Exo 13:6, where the Samaritan reads “Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread,” instead of the received “Seven days,” and the change of the word תהיה“There shall not be,” into תחיה, “live,” Deu 23:18), the Mosaic laws and ordinances themselves are nowhere tampered with.

We will now proceed to lay specimens of these once so highly prized variants before the reader, in order that he may judge for himself. We shall follow in this the commonly received arrangement of Gesenius, who divides all these readings into eight classes:

1. The first class, then, consists of readings by which emendations of a grammatical nature have been attempted.

(a.) The quiescent letters, or so called matres lectionis, are supplied. Thus יַ ם is found in the Samar for אַּ ם of the Masoretic text; ות for אֹּת; יָו for אָּו; אליה ם for אֲלֵהֶ ם; מאורות for מאֹרֹת, etc.; sometimes a וis put even where the Heb. text has, in accordance with the grammatical rules, only a short vowel or a sheva: חופניוis found for חָפְניו (Lev 16:12); אוניות for אַניות (Deu 28:68).

(b.) The more poetical forms of the pronouns, probably less known to the Samuel, are altered into the more common ones. Thus נחנו, ה ם, הָאֵל, become אנחנו, המה, האלה.

(c.) The same propensity for completing apparently incomplete forms is noticeable in the flexion of the verbs. The apocopated or short future is altered into the regular future. In this manner וִתִּגֵּד becomes ותגיד (Gen 24:22); וִיָּמָת is emendated into וימות(Gen 35:18); יֵרֶא (verb ל ה) into יראה (Gen 41:33); the final ן, of the 3d pers. fem. plur. fut., into נָה.

(d.) On the other hand, the paragogical letters ו and י at the end of nouns are almost universally struck out by the Samuel corrector; e.g. שוכני(Deu 33:16) is shortened into שוכן, חיתו into הית (Gen 1:24); and, in the ignorance of the existence of nouns of a common gender, he has given them genders according to his fancy. Thus masculine are made the words לח ם (Gen 49:20), שער (Deu 15:7, etc.), מהנה (Gen 32:9); feminine the words אר וֹ(Gen 13:6),! דר (Deu 28:25), נפש (Gen 46:25. etc.); wherever the word נער. occurs in the sense of “girl,” a הis added at the end (24:14, etc.).

(e.) The infin. absol. is, in the quaintest manner possible, reduced to the form of the finite verb; so הלווִשוב וישובו, “the waters returned continually,” is transformed into וישובו הלכו ושבו, “they returned, they went and they returned” (Gen 8:3). Where the infin. is used as an adverb, e.g. הרחק (Gen 21:16), “far off,” it is altered into הרחיקה, “she went far away,” which renders the passage almost unintelligible; or it is changed into a participle, as היודוע נדע (Gen 43:7) into the meaningless הידע נ8.

For obsolete or rare forms, the modern and more common ones have been substituted in a great number of places. Thus ערי םfor עיר ם(Gen 3:10-11); ילדfor ולד(Gen 11:30); צפורי םfor the collective צפור (Gen 15:10); אמות, “female servants,” for אמהות (Gen 20:18); וירא מנוחה כי טובהfor the adverbial טוב (Gen 49:15); בריחי for בריחי ם (Exo 26:26, making it depend from עצי); מַשָּׁ ם, in the unusual sense of “from it” (comp. 1Ki 17:13), is altered into מַמֶּנָּה (Lev 2:2); חיהis wrongly put for חי (3d pers. sing. masc. of חיי =-is>); עי, the obsolete form, is  replaced by the more recent עַיר (Num 21:15); the unusual fem. termination אַּי (comp. אביטל, אביגיל) is elongated into אּית; שהו is the emendation for שֵׂיו. (Deu 22:1); הרי for הִרְרֵי (Deu 33:15), etc.

2. The second class of variations consists of glosses or interpretations received into the text glosses, moreover, in which the Samuel not unfrequently coincides with the Sept., the various versions, and Jewish commentaries, most of them therefore the result of exegetical tradition. Thus איש ואשה, “man and woman,” used by Gen 7:2 of animals, is changed into זכר ונקבה, “male and female;” שנאיו (Gen 24:60), “his haters,” becomes אויביו, “his enemies;” for מה (indefin.) is substituted מאומה; ירא, “he will see, choose,” is amplified by לוֹ, “for himself;” הִגָּר, הִגֵּרis transformed into הגר אשר יגור (Lev 17:10); בלע ם וִיקָּר אלה8 אל (Num 23:4), “And God met Bileam,” becomes with the Samuel וימצִא מלאאִל את ב, ‘“and an angel of the Lord found Bileam; על האשה (Gen 20:3) for the woman,” is amplified into האשה על אודת, “for the sake of the woman;” for ולנכדי, from נכד (obsol., comp. < >), is put לנגדי, “those that are before me,”in contradistinction to “ those who will come after me;” וִתְּעִר,”and she emptied” (her pitcher into the trough, Gen 24:20), has made room for ותוריד, “and she took down;” נועדתי שמה, “I will meet there” (A.V. Exo 29:43), is made נדרשתי ש ם, “I shall be [searched] found there;” Num 31:15, before the words ההיית ם כל נקכה, “Have you spared the life of every female?” a לָמָּה, “Why,” is inserted (Sept.); for כי ש ם יהוה אקרא (Deu 32:3), “If I call the name of Jehovah,” the Samuel has בש ם, “In the name,” etc.

3. The third class consists of conjectural emendations of difficulties; e.g. the elliptic use of ילד, frequent both in Hebrew and Arabic, being evidently unknown to the emendator, he alters the הלבן מאה שנה יַוָּלֵד (Gen 17:17), “shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old?” into אוליד, “shall I beget?” Gen 24:62, בא מבוא, “he came from going” (A.V. “from the way”) to the well of Lahai-roi, the Samuel alters into בא במדבר, “in or through the desert” (Sept. διὰτῆς ἐρήμου).  In Gen 30:34,!הֵן לו יהי כדברי, “Behold, may it be according to thy word,” the לו (Arab. J) is transformed into לא, “and if not — let it be like thy word.” Gen 41:32, ועל הַשָּׁנות החלו ם, “And for that the dream was doubled,” becomes שנית ה ועלה, “The dream rose a second time,” which is beth un-Hebrew and diametrically opposed to the sense and construction of the passage. Better is the emendation, Gen 49:10, מַבֵּין רִגְלָיו, “from between his feet,” into “from among his banners.” מבין דגליו. Exo 15:18, all but five of the Sam. codd. read ם ועוד לעול, “forever and longer,” instead of ועד, the common form, “evermore.” Exo 34:7, יְנִקֶּה וְנִקֵּה לֹא, “that will by no means clear the sin,” becomes וְנֹקֶה לוֹ יַנָּקֶה, “and the innocent to him shall be innocent,” against both the parallel passages and the obvious sense. The somewhat difficult ולא יָסָפוּ, “and they did not cease” (A.V. Num 11:25), reappears as a still more obscure conjectural יֵאָסְפוּ, which we would venture to translate, “they were not gathered in,” in the sense of “killed:” instead of either the אכנשו, “congregated,” of the Samuel Vers., or Castell's “continuerunt,” or Houbigant's and Dathe's “convenant.” Num 21:28, the עָר, “Ar” (Moab), is emendated into עִד, “as far as,” a perfectly meaningless reading; except that the עָר, “city,” it seems, was a word unknown to the Samaritan. The somewhat uncommon words (Num 11:32) וישטחו לה ם שטוח, “and they (the people) spread them all abroad,” are transposed into וישחטו לה ם שחוטה, “and they slaughtered for themselves a slaughter.” Deu 28:37, the word לְשִׁמָּה, “an astonishment” (A.V.), very rarely used in this sense (Jer 19:8; Jer 25:9), becomes לְשֵׁ ם. “to a name,” i.e. a bad name. Deu 33:6, מְתָיו מספר ויהי, “May his men be a multitude,” the Samuel, with its characteristic aversion to, or, rather, ignorance of, the use of poetical diction, reads ויהי מֵאַתּו מספר, “May there be from him a multitude,” thereby trying perhaps to encounter also the apparent difficulty of the word מספר, standing for “a great number.” Anything more absurd than the מאתוin this place could hardly be imagined. A few verses farther on, the uncommon use of מַן. in the phrase מַן יְקוּמוּן (Deu 33:11), as “lest,” “not,” caused the no less unfortunate alteration מַי יְקַימֶנוּ, so that the latter part of the passage, “smite through  the loins of them that rise against him, and of them that hate him, that they rise not again,” becomes “who will raise them?” — barren alike of meaning and of poetry. For the unusual and poetical דָּבְאֶךָ (Deu 33:25; A.V. “thy strength”),! רביis suggested; a word about the significance of which the commentators are at a greater loss even than about that of the original.

4. The fourth class consists of those readings where the Samuel is corrected or supplied from parallel passages. Thus לא אעשה (Gen 18:29) becomes אשחית לא, according to Gen 18:28. Proper names, which are variously written in Hebrew, are all conformed to one orthography, as יתרו, Moses's father-in-law. In Gen 11:8, “and the tower” is added to the Hebrew text, taken from the fourth verse.

5. The fifth class consists of larger interpolations taken from parallels, in which whatever was said or done by Moses as recorded in a preceding passage is repeated; and whatever is said to have been commanded by God is repeated in as many words where it is recorded to have been carried into effect. In this way Exodus is much enlarged by interpolations from itself, or from Deuteronomy. Gesenius thinks that these insertions were made between the date of the Sept. and Origen, because the Alexandrian father mentions a passage of the kind (Pick, Horoe Samarit.).

6. The sixth class consists of corrections made in order to remove what was offensive in sentiment to the Samaritans, or what conveyed an improbable meaning in their view. Thus in the antediluvian times none begets his first son after he is 150 years of age. Hence, from Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, 100 years are subtracted at the time they are said to have their first son. In the postdiluvian times none is allowed to beget a son till after he is fifty years old. Accordingly some years are subtracted from several patriarchs and added to others. To make this intelligible, we subjoin from our Horoe Samaritanoe the following table of the Hebrew and Samaritan chronology, and where the first column, marked A, gives the years before birth of son; the second, B, the rest of life; the third, C, the extent of whole life:  ANTEDILUVIANS.

Heb./Sam.ABCABCJared16280096262785847Enoch6530036565300365Methuselah1878296967653720Lamech18259577753600653 POSTDILUVIANS.

Heb./Sam.ABCABCArphaxad35403438135303438Eber34430464134270404Peleg30209239130109239Reu32207239132107239Serung30200230130100230Nahor291191487969148Under this head falls the passage in Exo 12:40 : “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was 430 years.” The Samuel has “The sojourning of the children of Israel and their fathers who dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt was 430 years.” The same reading is in the Sept. (cod. Alex. and Josephus; comp. also Gal 3:17). In Gen 2:2 השׁביעיis altered into השׁשׁי, the sixth.

7. The seventh class comprises what we might briefly call Samaritanisms. i.e. certain Hebrew forms translated into the idiomatic Samaritan; and here the Samuel codices vary considerably among themselves — as far as the very imperfect collation of them has hitherto shown some having retained the Hebrew in many places where the others have adopted the new equivalents. Thus the gutturals and ahevi letters are frequently changed: הררטbecomes אררט (Gen 8:4); באי is altered into בעי (Gen 23:18); שבה into שבע (Gen 27:19); זהלי stands for זחלי (Deu 32:24); the ה is changed into ח in words like נהג, גבהי ם, which become נחג, גבחי ם; חis altered into ע— חמרbecomes עמר. The יis frequently doubled (? as a mater lectionis): הייטיב; is substituted for היטיב; איירא for אירא; פיי for פי. Many words are joined together: מרדרורstands for מר דרור(Exo 30:23); כהנאן  for כהן אן (Gen 41:45); הר גריזי ם is always הרגריזי ם. The pronouns אִת ְּand אתֵּן, 2d pers. fem. sing. and plur., are changed into אתיand אתין(the obsolete Heb. forms) respectively; the suff. ךָinto! א ִinto! י; the termination of the 2d pers. sing. fem. pret., אּתְּ, becomes תַּי, like the 1st pers.; the verbal form Aphel is used for the Hiphil; אזכרתיfor הזכרתי; the medial letter of the verb ע ו is sometimes retained as א or י, instead of being dropped as in the Hebrew. Again, verbs of the form לה have the יfrequently at the end of the infin. fut. and part., instead of the ה. Nouns of the schema קָטֵל(אָבֵל, etc.) are often spelled קָטֵיל, into which the form קָטוֹל is likewise occasionally transformed. Of distinctly Samaritan words may be mentioned:! הִ(Gen 34:31) =!אֵי,! הֵי(Chald.), “like;” חתי ם, for the Heb. חות ם, “seal;” כּפֹרחת, “as though it budded,” becomes כאפרחת= the Targ. כד אפרחת, etc.

8. Passages which have been conformed to the theology, hermeneutics, and worship of the Samaritans. Thus, to avoid the appearance of polytheism, the four passages where Elohim is construed with a plural are altered so as to present the singular (Gen 20:13; Gen 31:53; Gen 35:7; Exo 22:9). Again, whatever savors of anthropomorphism, or is unsuitable to the divine majesty, is either removed or softened. Wherever the Almighty himself is brought immediately into view as speaking to and dealing with men, “the angel of God” is substituted. Reverence for the patriarchs and Moses led to the alteration of Gen 49:7 and Deu 33:12; for example, for “cursed is their anger,” ארור אפִ ם, the Samuel reads, “excellent is their anger,” אדיר אפ ם; and instead of “the beloved of the Lord shall dwell,” ידיד יהוה, it has “the hand, the hand of the Lord makes him to dwell,” which yields no sense. In like manner, voces honestiores are sometimes put when there is fancied immodesty; as in Deu 25:11, במבשׁיוis changed into בבשרו.

Here Gesenius puts the notable passage Deu 27:4, where the Samaritans changed Ebal into Gerizim to favor their own temple. Some, as Whiston and Kennicott, have attempted to show that the Jews changed Gerizim into Ebal, but unsuccessfully (comp. on this point Lee's Prolegomena, p. 29).  From the immense number of these worse than worthless variations Gesenius has singled out four which he thinks preferable, on the whole, to those of the Masoretic text, viz. Gen 4:8, where the Samuel adds, “Let us go into the field;” Gen 22:13, אחד, a, instead of אִחִר, behind (also found in five fragments of old Jewish MSS. at St. Petersburg; see Journ. Asiat. 1866, 1, 542); Gen 49:14, where גֶרֶ ם, a bone, is

גָּרַי ם, bony; and Gen 14:14, וידק, instead of וִיָּרֶק, i.e. he numbered, for he led forth. Even these have been thought emendations, and rejected by the majority of critics (comp. Frankel, Einfluss, p. 242).

Frankel has treated of the subject more by way of supplement to Gesenius than from an independent point of view. His additions to the classes of the latter are small and unimportant, besides being pervaded by erroneous conceptions of the age when the Samaritan Pentateuch originated. He adduces —

1. The use of the imperative for the third person, as הקרבfor יקרב (Exo 12:48); and to ignorance of the use of the infinitive absolute, as זכרוfor זכור (Exo 13:3), אמר for אמור(Num 6:23), etc.

2. The characteristics of the Galilaeo-Palestinian dialect, such as the interchange of the ahevi letters, and of ב for פ, of ז for צ, etc. But this peculiarity is simply owing to carelessness of transcription in the copyists, who wrote as they pronounced, and softened the hard gutturals which were difficult to their organs.

3. The Aramenan coloring and orthography, as קָטֵלand קטיל. This is likewise owing to transcription, and can hardly be called a characteristic of the Samaritan (Frankel, Einfluss, p. 238 sq.).

Another classification of the Samaritan characteristic readings is given by Kirchheim. He makes thirteen classes, י ג שערי ם, as follows:

1. למעלת הר גריזי ם ש

8 ההוספות והשנוי ם, additions and alterations in favor of Mount Gerizim, e.g. Deu 5:21.

2. למלאות ש

8ההוספות, additions to fill up.

3. הבאור, explications or glosses.

4. חלו הפעלי ם והבניני ם, change of verbs and conjugations.

5. חלו תשמות, change of nouns.

6. ההשואה, assimilation, or bringing irregular forms into the same uniform type.

7. האותיות תמורת, permutation of letters.

8. כנויי ם, pronouns.

9. המין, gender.

10. אויתיות הנוספות. letters added.

11. אותיות היחס והחבור, addition of qualifying letters, as articles, conjunctions, and prepositions.

12. הקבווֹ והפרוד, junction and separation.

13. ימות עול ם, chronological alterations (Kane Shomron, p. 32 sq.). Comp. for No. 13, Pick, Horoe Samaritanoe (Genesis 5, 11, where the differences of the chronology in the Heb., Sept., Samuel, and Josephus are exhibited).

A third division is that adopted by Kohn (De Pent. Samuel p. 9). He makes three divisions, viz.

1, Samaritan forms of words;

2, corrections and emendations;

3, glosses and corruptions for religious purposes; and perhaps,

4, blunders in orthography.

IV. Origin and Age. — In regard to these questions, opinions have been much divided. We shall enumerate the principal ones.

1. That the Samaritan Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes, whom they succeeded — so the popular notion runs. Of this opinion are J. Morinus, Walton, Cappellus, Kennicott, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bauer, Jahn, Bertholdt, Steudel, Mazade, Stuart, Davidson, and others. Their reasons for it may be thus briefly summed up:

(1.) It seems improbable that the Samaritans should have accepted their code at the hands of the Jews after the Exile, as supposed by some critics, since there existed an intense hatred between the two nationalities.

(2.) The Samaritan canon has only the Pentateuch in common with the Hebrew canon: had that book been received at a period when the Hagiographa and the Prophets were in the Jews' hands, it would be surprising if they had not also received those.

(3.) The Samaritan letters, avowedly the more ancient, are found in the Samaritan code; therefore it was written before the alteration of the character into the square Hebrew — which dates from the end of the Exile — took place.

Since the above opinion — that the Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans from the ten tribes — is the most popular one, we will now adduce some of the chief reasons brought against it; and the reader will see, by the somewhat feeble nature of the arguments on either side, that the last word has not yet been spoken in the matter.

(a.) There existed no religions animosity whatsoever between Judah and Israel when they separated; the ten tribes could not, therefore, have bequeathed such an animosity to those who succeeded them, and who, we may add, probably cared as little, originally, for the disputes between Judah and Israel as colonists from far-off countries, belonging to utterly different races, are likely to care for the quarrels of the aborigines who formerly inhabited the country. On the contrary, the contest between the slowly Judaized Samaritans and the Jews only dates from the moment when the latter refused to recognize the claims of the former of belonging to the people of God, and rejected their aid in building the temple. Why, then, it is said, should they not first have received the one book which would bring them into still closer conformity with the returned exiles at their hands? That the Jews should yet have refused to receive them as equals is no more surprising than that the Samaritans from that time forward took their stand upon this very law — altered according to their circumstances — and proved from it that they and they alone were the Jews κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν.

(b.) Their not possessing any other book of the Hebrew canon is not to be accounted for by the circumstance that there was no other book in existence at the time of the schism, because many psalms of David, writings of Solomon, etc., must have been circulating among the. people.  But the jealousy with which the Samaritans regarded Jerusalem. and the intense hatred which they naturally conceived against the post-Mosaic writers of national Jewish history, would sufficiently account for their rejecting the other books, in all of which, save Joshua, Judges, and Job, either Jerusalem, as the center of worship, or David and his house, are extolled. If, however, Lowe has really found with them (as he reports in the Allgem. Zeitung d. Judenth. April 18, 1839) our book of Kings and Solomon's Song of Songs-which they certainly would not have received subsequently all these arguments are perfectly gratuitous.

(c.) The present Hebrew character was not introduced by Ezra after the return from the Exile, but came into use at a much later period. The Samaritans might, therefore, have received the Pentateuch at the hands of the returned exiles, who, according to the Talmud, afterwards changed their writing, and in the Pentateuch only, so as to distinguish it from the Samaritan. “Originally,” says Mar Sutra (Sanhedr. 21 b), “the law was given to Israel in Ibri writing and the holy (Hebrew) language; it was again given to them, in the days of Ezra, in the Ashurith writing and Aramaic language. Israel then selected the Ashurith writing and the holy language, and left to the ignorant (Ι᾿διῶται) the Ibri writing and the Aramaic language. Who are the ignorant? The Cuthim (Samaritans). What is Ibri writing? The Libonai (Samaritan).” (See also Luzzatto, in Kirchheim, op. cit. p. 111.) It is well known, also, that the Maccabaean coins bear Samaritan inscriptions; so that “ ἰδιῶται “would point to the common use of the Samaritan character for ordinary purposes down to a very late period.

2. The second leading opinion on the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is that it was introduced by Manasseh (comp. Josephus, Ant. 11:8, 2, 4) at the time of the foundation of the Samaritan sanctuary on Mount Gerizim (Ant. van Dale, R. Simon, Prideaux, Fulda, Hasse, De Wette, Gesenius, Hupfeld, Hengstenberg, Keil, etc.). In support of this opinion are alleged the idolatry of the Samaritans before they received a Jewish priest through Esar-haddon (2Ki 17:24-33); and the immense number of readings common to the Sept. and this code against the. Masoretic text.

3. Other, but very isolated, notions are those of Morin, Le Clerc, Poncet, etc., that the Israelitish priest sent by the king of Assyria to instruct the new inhabitants in the religion of the country brought the Pentateuch with  him; further, that the Samaritan Pentateuch was the production of an impostor. Dositheus ( דוסכאיin the Talmud), who lived during the time of the apostles, and who falsified the sacred records in order to prove that he was the Messiah (Usher) — against which there is only this to be observed, that there is not the slightest alteration of such a nature to be found; finally, that it is a very late and faulty recension, made after the Masoretic text (6th century after Christ), into which glosses from the Sept. had been received (Frankel), or transcribed from a Hebrew copy into their own character, in the 10th, 11th, or 12th century (Tychsen). Both these conjectures are clearly refuted by the testimonies of Origen and Jerome, who affirm that the Samaritans had the Pentateuch in peculiar characters before their time.

V. Relation of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the Septuagint. — From the time of the discovery of the Samaritan Pentateuch, its striking resemblance in numerous passages to the Alexandrine version had been noticed by all. Hassencamp calculated some 1900 places in which the Samaritan Pentateuch agreed with the Sept. Gesenius thinks that there are more than 1000 such places. The most important places are given by Pick in his Horoe Samaritanoe.

It must, on the other hand, be stated also that the Samaritan and Sept. quite as often disagree with each other, and follow each the Masoretic text; also, that the quotations in the N.T. from the Sept., where they coincide with the Samaritan against the Hebrew text, are so small in number, and of so unimportant a nature, that they cannot be adduced as any argument whatsoever. SEE PENTATEUCH.

The chief opinions with respect to the agreement of the numerous readings of the Sept. (of which no critical edition exists as yet) and the Samaritan Pentateuch are:

(1.) That the Sept. was translated from the Samaritan (De Dieu, Selden, Hottinger, Hassencamp, Eichhorn, Kohn).

(2.) That mutual interpolations have taken place (Grotius, Usher, Ravius, etc.).

(3.) That both versions were formed from Hebrew codices, which differed among themselves as well as from the one which afterwards obtained public authority in Palestine; that, however, very many wilful corruptions and interpolations have crept in in later times (Gesenius).

(4.) That the Samaritan has, in the main, been altered from the Sept. (Frankel).

(a.) As to the first of these opinions — that the Sept. was translated from the Samaritan — it has been alleged on the evidence of Origen and supported by Jerome that in certain MSS. of the Sept. existing in their day the word יהוהwas retained in the ancient Hebrew (i.e. Samaritan) character, not in those used at their time, Ezra, according to tradition, having introduced other letters after the captivity (Origen, Hexapla [ed. Montfaucon], 1, 86; Jerome, Epistola 136 ad Marcellume). It is clear, however, from the statement made by Jerome on this point, that the remark of Origen can apply only to the Aramaic or square characters, not to those in use among the Samaritans. These are his words: “Nomen (viz. nomen Dei) est tetragrammum, quod ἀνεκφώνητον, i e. ineffabile putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur: Yod, E, Vav, E. Quod quidam non intelligentes Pi Pi legere consueverunt;” and they explain how it came that some Greek copyists could make πιπι out of the Hebrew יהוה.

That the argument based upon Origen's words must fall to the ground is evident. Another reason alleged in support of the Sept. having been derived from the Samaritan original has been given on the supposition that the variations from the Hebrew text arose from a confusion between letters resembling each other in the Samaritan and not in the square alphabet. But this argument is untenable; for while we admit that such errors may have arisen from a confusion between similar letters in the Samaritan, yet it is equally true that the same could have occurred as well in the square letters; thus, e.g., ה and 10: י and 5, ו and ז, ב and נ, ב and כ, ר and נ, פ and ר, ד and ר, could have been mistaken. A third argument has been used: The Samaritans had already brought out for their own use a Greek translation, known under the name of τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν; the Sept. finding this convenient for their purpose, took it for their basis, altering here and there after the Hebrew original to suit their own ideas (so Kohn, p. 38 sq.). But there is this objection to that theory: the Samaritan-Greek version was c not translated before the 3d or 4th century A.D. Besides, it is hardly possible that a people like the Samaritans, who on all other occasions showed themselves powerless to invent, only capable of feeble imitation, should in this one instance have distanced their rivals ill producing so great a literary work as a Greek translation of the Pentateuch. For this reason we must give up this explanation of the similarity of the two texts.

(b.) As to the second opinion, that mutual interpolations have taken place, or that the Samaritan Pentateuch was corrected from the Septuagint, it is true to a certain extent: many passages occur in the former which bear all the marks of being interpolations from the Alexandrine version, e.g. Gen 23:2, הארבע אל עמק בקרית= ἐν πόλει Α᾿ρβὸκ, ἣ ἐστιν ἐν τῶ κοιλώματι; Gen 27:27, כריח השדה מלא= ώς ὀσμή ἀγρου πλήρους; Gen 43:28, לאלהי ם ברוהִאישההוא =εὐλογημένος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ Θεῷ; Exo 5:13, לכ ם התבן נתן= τὸ ἄχυρον ἐδίδοτο ὑμῖν, etc. But how, moreover, on this supposition, are the equally numerous passages to be accounted for in which the Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the Sept., sometimes in these cases agreeing with the Hebrew, at others departing from it?

(c.) The third opinion, advocated by Gesenius, that both the Samaritan and the Sept. were formed from Hebrew MSS., has the most probability.

(d.) The fourth opinion, which claims that the Samaritan has, in the main, been altered from the Sept., will leave few, if any, supporters, since, according to Frankel, this should have been accomplished through a Greek translation of a Targum and the Greek version of the Samaritan Pentateuch. SEE SEPTUAGINT.

VI. Copies. —

1. The following is a list of the MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch now in European libraries (Kennicott):

No. 1. Oxford (Usher), Bodl., fol., No. 3127. Perfect, except the first 20 and last 9 verses.

No. 2. Oxford (Usher), Bodl., 4to, No. 3128, with an Arabic version in Samaritan characters. Imperfect. Wanting the whole of Leviticus and many portions of the other books. SEE NUMBERS and SEE DEUTERONOMY.

No. 3. Oxford (Uisher), Bodl., 4to, No. 3129. Wanting many portions in each book, especially in Numbers and Deuteronomy.

No. 4. Oxford (Usher, Laud), Bodl., 4to, No. 624. Defective in parts of Deuteronomy.

No. 5. Oxford (Marsh), Bodl., 12mo, No. 15. Wanting some verses in the beginning; 21 chapters obliterated.

No. 6. Oxford (Pocock), Bodl., 24mo, No. 5328. Parts of leaves lost; otherwise perfect.

No. 7. London (Usher), Br. Mus. Claud. B. 8vo. Vellum. Complete. 254 leaves. Of great value.

No. 8. Paris (Peiresc), Imp. Libr., Samuel No. 1. Recent MS. containing the Hebrew and Samaritan texts, with all Arabic version in the Samaritan character. Wanting the first 34 chapters, and very defective in many places.

No. 9. Paris (Peiresc), Imp. Libr., Samuel No. 2. Ancient MS., wanting first 17 chapters of Genesis, and all Deuteronomy from the 7th chapter. Houbigant, however, quotes from Gen 10:11 of this codex — a rather puzzling circumstance.

No. 10. Paris (Harl. de Sancy), Oratory, No. 1. The famous MS. of P. della Valle.

No. 11. Paris (Dom. Nolin), Oratory, No. 2. Made-up copy.

No. 12. Paris (Libr. St. Genev.). Of little value.

No. 13. Rome (Peiresc and Barber.), Vatican, No. 106. Hebrew and Samaritan texts, with Arabic version in Samaritan character. Very defective and recent. Dated the 7th century (?).

No. 14. Rome (Card. Cobellertius), Vatican. Also supposed to be of the 7th century, but very doubtful.

No. 15. Milan (Ambrosian Libr.). Said to be very ancient; not collated.

No. 16. Leyden (Golius MS.), fol., No. 1. Said to be complete.

No. 17. Gotha (Ducal Libr.). A fragment only.

No. 18. London (Count of Paris's library). With version.

No. 19. St. Petersburg (Imp. Libr.).  A description of No. 19 is expected from Mr. Harkavy, while the others are described by Kennicott in his Dissertatio Generalis, reprinted by Blayney in his edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

All these are written on separate leaves; none are in the shape of rolls. At Nablus, however, as is well known, there is still preserved in the synagogue, and only brought out with much solemnity on certain festivals, an ancient parchment roll, purporting, by its inscription, to have been written by the hand of the great-grandson of Aaron himself, thirteen years after the original settlement of the Israelites in Canaan. It is written on the hair side of the skins of some twenty rams that served as thank offerings (so says the priest). They are of unequal size, some containing five, some six, columns of writing. Other old MSS. are also mentioned as existing there and elsewhere in Palestine; one has the date of A.H. 35 (=A.D. 655) inscribed on it.

2. Printed editions are contained in the Paris and Walton Polyglots; and a separate reprint from the latter was made by Blayney (Oxford, 1790). A facsimile of the 20th chapter of Exodus, from one of the Nablus MSS., has been edited, with portions of the corresponding Masoretic text, and a Russian translation and introduction, by Levysohn (Jerusalem, 1860); but the specimen is badly executed.

VII. Literature. — Besides the Introductions of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Jahn, De Wette, Havernick, Keil, and Bleek, and the articles in the dictionaries of Kitto and Smith (which we have freely used here), the reader is referred to Gesenius, De Pent. Samarit. Origine, Indole, et Aucforitate (Halse, 1815, 4to); Journ. Sacr. Lit. July, 1853, p. 298 sq.; Morini (J.) Exercitationes in utrumque Samarit. Pentateuchum (Paris, 1631, 4to); Usher, Syntagma de Sept. Interpretibus, Epistola ad L. Cappellum (London, 1655, 4to); Poncet, Nouveaux Eclaircissements sur l'Origine et le Pentateuque des Samaritains (Paris, 1760, 8vo); Le Clerc, Sentinens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande sur I'Histoire Critique du R. Simon (Amsterdam, 1686, 8vo); Tychsen, Disputatio Historicophilologico-critica de Pentateucho Ebroeo-Samaritano, ab Ebroeo eoque Masoretico Descripto Exemplari (Butzovii, 1765, 4to); Prideaux, Old and New Testament connected in the History of the Jews and Neighboring Nations (London, 1719, 8vo); Walton, Prolegomena (ed. Dathe, Leipzig, 1777, 8vo), 11:9, 11; Cappelli Critica Sacra (ed.Vogel and Scharfenberg, Hale, 1775-86, 8vo); Hassencamp, Der entdeckte wahre  Ursprung der alten Bibelubersetzungen und der gerettete samar. Text (Minden, 1775); Kennicott, Second Dissertation (Oxford, 1759); Rutherford, Letter to the Rev. Mr. Kennicott, in which his Defense of the Sanaritan Pentateuch is examinsed, and his Second Dissertation on the State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the O.T. is shown to be, in many instances, Injudicious and Inaccurate (Cambridge, 1761, 8vo); Kennicott, Answer to a Letter from the Rev. T. Rutherford, D.D. (1761, 8vo); Rutherford, Second Letter to the Rev. Dr. Kennicott, in which his Defense of the Second Dissertation is examined (1763, 8vo): Bauer, Critica Sacra (Lipsise, 1795); Steudel, in Bengel's Archiv. 3, 626, etc.; R. Simon, Histoire Critique du V.T. (Paris, 1685, 4to); Fulda, in Paulus's Memorabilia, 7; Hasse, Aussichten zu kunftiger Aufklarung uber das A. T. (Jena, 1785, 8vo); Paulus, Commentar uber das N.T. (Lubeck, 1804, 8vo), pt. 4; Hupfeld, Beleuchtung einiger dunklen und missverstandenens Stellen der alttestamentlichen Textgeschichte, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1830, pt. 2; Mazade, Sur l'Origine Ag, Ae, et ‘Etat Critique du Pent. Sanar. (Geneva, 1830, 8vo); Hug, in the Freiburg Zeifschrift, vol. 7; Hengstenberg, Die A uthentie des Pentateuches (Berlin, 1836, 8vo), vol. 1; Stuart, in the North American Review for 1826, and American Biblical Repository for 1832; Frankel, Vorstudieni (Leipsic, 1841), and Ueber den Einuss der palastiniischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (ibid. 1851, 8vo); Lee, I Prolegomena, in Biblia Sacra, etc. (London, s. a.); Da-ividson, Treatise on Biblical Criticism (Edinburgh, 1852, 8vo); כרמי שומרון, Introductio in Librum Talmudicum “De Samaritanis,” scripsit Raphael Kirchheim, (Frankfbrt, 1851, 8vo); Walker, in the Christ. Examiner, May and September, 1840; Zeitschrift d, D. M. G. 13:275; 14:622; 18:582 sq.; 19:611 sq.; Nutt, Samaritans History, p. 83 sq.; Kohn, De Pentateucho Samaritano (Lipsiae, 1865; reviewed in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1865, p. 356 sq.); Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften (Berlin, 1877), 4, 54 sq.; Pick, Horoe Samaritance, or, A Collection of Various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other A ncient Versions, in Biblioth. Sacra, 1876-77-78. SEE SAMARITANS, MODERN. (B.P.)

## Samaritan Sects[[@Headword:Samaritan Sects]]

             The most important information on the subject is given by Epiphanius (Hoeres. [1, 28], followed by John Damascus [ibid. p. 79], and Nicetas [Thesaur. 1, 35]). Epiphanius mentions four different sects — the Essenes,  Sebuaeans, Gorthenians, and Dositheans. With regard to the first of these bodies nothing is known, nor is the information with regard to the Sebuaeans (Σεβουαῖοι, שבועאי) more satisfactory. They are said to have distinguished themselves by commencing the year in the early autumn; soon after this they held the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost later, and that of Tabernacles in the spring, when the Jews were celebrating their Easter. Of the Gorthenians, termed by Nicetas Sorothenians, nothing whatever is known. With regard to the last of the four sects and their leader Dositheus, it is impossible to reconcile the discordant testimony of Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, and Samaritan writers. Epiphanius relates of them that they were believers in the resurrection and austere in their manner of life, avoiding animal food, some marrying but once, others not at all. As to the observance of circumcision, the Sabbath, avoiding contact with others, fasting and penance, they were not distinguished from the other Samaritans. Their founder was, he continues, a Jew who, for his learning, aspired to be chief among his party, but being disappointed in. his ambitious schemes, went over to the Samaritans and founded a sect: later he retired to a cave, and there starved himself to death out of affected piety.

What Epiphanius relates here concerning Dositheus fully accords with the account of Abfil-Fath concerning Dusis; but the austere life of his adherents can only refer to those of Dostan, of whom we shall have to speak further on. It seems that Epiphanius has confounded the two together, which has also been done by later writers. The statement of Abfil- Fath is that a sect appeared calling themselves Dostan, or “the Friends,” who varied in many respects the hitherto received feasts and traditions of their fathers. Thus they held for impure a fountain into which a dead insect (שרוֹ) had fallen; altered the time for reckoning the purification of women and commencement of feasts; forbade the eating of eggs which had been laid, allowing those only to be eaten which were found inside a slain bird; considered dead snakes and cemeteries as unclean; and held any one whose shadow fell upon a grave as impure for seven days. They rejected the words “Blessed be our God forever” (ברואִלהינו לעול ם), and substituted Elolim for Jehovah; denied that Gerizim had been the first sanctuary of God; upset the Samaritan reckoning for the feasts, giving thirty days to each month, rejecting the feasts and order of fasts, and the portions (due to the Levites). They counted the fifty days to Pentecost from the Sabbath the day after the first day of the Passover, like the Jews;  not from the Sunday, like the other Samaritans. Their priests, without becoming impure, could enter a house suspected of infection as long as he did not speak. When a pure and an impure house stood side by side, and it was doubtful whether the impurity extended to the former as well, it was decided by watching whether a clean or unclean bird first settled upon it. On the Sabbath they might only eat and drink from earthen vessels, which, if defiled, could not be purified; they might give no food or water to their cattle: this was done on the day previous. Their high priest was a certain Zarf, who had been turned out of his own community for immorality.

At a later period lived Dusis. Being condemned to death for adultery, he was respited on the promise of sowing dissension among the Samaritans by founding a new sect. He went to Asker, near Nablus, and formed a friendship with a Samaritan, distinguished for his learning and piety, by the name of יחדו. Compelled, however, to fly for his life on account of a false accusation which he had brought against his friend, he took shelter at Shueike with a widow woman named Amentu, in whose house he composed many writings; but, finding that a hot pursuit after him was still maintained, he retired to a cave, where he perished of hunger, and his body was eaten by dogs. Before his departure, however, he left his books with his hostess, enjoining her to let no one read them unless he first bathed in the tank hard by. Accordingly, when Levi, the high priest's nephew — a pious, able man — arrived with seven others in search of him, they all bathed, one after the other, in the tank, and each, as he emerged from the water, exclaimed, “I believe in thee, Jehovah, and in Dfsis, thy servant, and his sons and daughters;” Levi adding, when his turn came, “Woe to us if we deny Dusis, the prophet of God.” They then took the writings of DAsis, and found that he had made many alterations in the law — more, even, than Ezra. They concealed them, and on their return to Nablus reported that Duisis had disappeared before they arrived, they knew not whither. At the next Passover, Levi had to read out Exo 12:22 in the synagogue, but for “hyssop” (אזוב) he substituted “thyme” (צעתר).

Corrected by the congregation. he still persevered, crying, “This is right, as God hath said by his prophet Ddsis, on whom be peace! Ye are all worthy of death for denying the prophetic office of his servant Ddfsis, altering the feasts, falsifying the great name of Jehovah, and persecuting the second prophet of God, whom he hath revealed from Sinai! Woe unto you that you have rejected and do not follow him!” Levi was stoned. His friends dipped a palm leaf in his blood, and ordained that whoever would read Dusis's  writings and see the leaf must first fast seven days and nights. They cut off their hair, shaved their beards, and at their funerals performed many strange ceremonies. On the Sabbath they would not move from their place, and kept their feasts only on this day, during which they would not remove their hands from their sleeves. When one of their friends died, they would gird him with a girdle, put a stick in his hand and shoes on his feet, saying, “If we rise, he will at once get up,” believing that the dead man, as soon as he was laid in the grave, would rise and go to Paradise. As to the age in which Dusis lived, it must have been long before Origen, for this father, in his Commentary on John 13, 27 (ed. Lommatzsch, 2, 49), tells us that a “certain Dositheus arose and claimed to be the Messiah; his followers are called Dositheans, who have his books and tell wonderful stories of him, as if he had not died and is still alive somewhere.” This agrees with the statement of Abul-Fath concerning Dusis. According to Origen, Dositheus must have lived long before himprobably in the 1st, or at least in the 2d century of the Christian era. That he was the teacher or pupil of Simon Magus, as some have asserted, is an untenable conjecture. See Petermann in Herzog, 13, 387 sq.; Nutt, Samaritan History, p. 46 sq.; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 94 sq.; Jost, Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Secten, 1, 62 sq.; De Sacy, Chrestom. Aroabe, 1, 334 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritan Versions[[@Headword:Samaritan Versions]]

             There exist three different translations of the Pentateuch in Samaritan, two of which have been translated into Greek and Arabic respectively.

1. Samaritan. — The origin, author, and age of the Samaritan version of the five books of Moses has hitherto — so Eichhorn quaintly observes — “always been a golden apple to the investigators, and will very probably remain so, until people leave off venturing decisive judgments upon historical subjects which no one has recorded in antiquity” (Einleitung, 2, 320). Indeed, modern investigators, keen as they have been, have done little towards the elucidation of the subject. According to the Samaritans themselves (De Sacy [Mem. 3], Paulus, Winer), their high priest Nathaniel, who died about B.C. 20, is its author. Gesenius puts its date a few years after Christ. Juynboll thinks that it had long been in use in the second post- Christian century. Frankel places it in the post-Mohammedan time, on account of the many Arabisms. Other investigators date it from the time of Esar-haddon's priest (Schwarz), or either shortly before or after the foundation of the temple on Mount Gerizim. Kohn thinks that it was made by different authors. It seems certain, however, that it was composed before the destruction of the second Temple; and being intended, like the Targums, for the use of the people exclusively, it was written in the popular Samaritan idiom, a mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic.

As a whole, the version cannot be called a good one, since the translator seems to have been guided by no proper rules of exegesis. Hence he falls into many mistakes. “Elohim” or “Jehovah” is commonly avoided, and “angel” put instead, to suit the supposed dignity of the divine being. The names of peoples, countries, cities, mountains, and rivers are changed from the old into more modern names, as the following list of geographical names will prove. Thus we read in

The same is the case with proper nouns. Thus, “land of the tower” (Babylonia); Potipherah (Gen 46:20) is Cohenan; Gad, “a troop will depopulate,” as it is in the Samaritan, is here rendered “a despiser will despise.” In Gen 10:31, for “these are the sons of Shem,” this version has הדה חלוקת ילידי שם, “these are the portions of the sons of Shem.” Mistakes are numerous and glaring: thus for “the two of them”  (שניהם, Gen 3:7), the version has רדפי עלהיון, “pursuing them,” apparently because the translator read שנאהים. In Exo 20:26, “thou shalt not go up by steps” is rendered בשקרין לא תסק, “thou shalt not ascend with prevarications.” In Num 12:14, אביה, “her father,” seems to have been taken from בוֹא, for it is rendered “in bringing her.” In Gen 49:11, עירה, “his colt,” is mistaken for “city,” and is therefore translated קרתה. In Gen 24:63, for “Isaac went out to take a walk” (לשוח), the Samaritan has “Isaac went out to pray” (למצלאה), taking שוח as equivalent to שיח; but in this it agrees with Onkelos, the Arabic, and Persian. Another characteristic of this version is the great number of glosses found in it. Thus, Gen 1:15, ברקיע השמים is rendered בפליפִלוק שמיה, to which Morinus remarks, “his duabus dictionibus utitur ut firmamentum explicet;” Gen 5:27, ויבראis rendered קדו פישין; Gen 2:3, שבת by בטל פסק; Gen 5:11, פשין by קדו פישין; Gen 3:9, ויקרא by ויקרא וזעק; Gen 5:12, נתתה עמד י by דאתנחת לי עמי= the one which has been brought to me; Gen 5:22, וחי לעלם by וח לעלם וחי(comp. Kohn, Samaritanische Studien, p. 32 sq. The great similarity it has with Onkelos occasionally amounts to complete identity; for instance, the following example, taken from a facsimile by Blanchini (Evangeliarum Quadruplex, 2, 2, after 604). On account of this similarity, many critics, such as Hottinger, Eichhorn, and Kirchheim, have held it to have been copied from Onkelos. This, however, seems to be rather an overstating of the case. It is true that ἃπαξ λεγόμενα and words of uncertain meaning are often rendered by identical or similar expressions in both. Moreover, when Onkelos borrows from Jewish tradition, the Samaritan Targum often follows him. Yet the two are independent. The latter falls into serious blunders from which the version of Onkelos should have protected it; it often retains difficulties of the Hebrew text where the other gives a translation. For instance, the word דֶבֶר, “pestilence” (Exo 9:15), the Samaritan renders by ממלל, “word,” as if it had read דָבָר, “a word.” If it had followed Onkelos it could not have fallen into such a blunder, where the true reading is! במות, i.e. “with death.”  In Deu 1:44, we read דבֹרים, “bees,” where the Samaritan renders מליה, “words,” as if it read דבָרים, which could not have been the case had it followed Onkelos, who renders it correctly by דבריתא, “bees.” That the Samaritan Targum has not followed the version of Onkelos may be also seen from the number of difficult Hebrew words, which, although intelligible to the Samaritan translator, he would not have retained had he followed Onkelos, who explained the same. Of such difficult words Winer mentions: Gen 2:12, שהם; Gen 48:22, שכם; Gen 49:10, שלה; 51:29, יש לאל ידי; Exo 1:16, על אצנים; Exo 8:21, ערב; Exo 13:18, חמשים; Exo 23:28, צרעה; Exo 26:6, קרסי; Exo 27:4, מכבר; Exo 26:19, אדנים; Exo 28:8, חשב; 33:35, פרע; Lev 1:15, מלק; Lev 2:2, אזכרתה; Lev 2:14, ערש; 5:21, תשוטת, etc. (comp. p. 39 sq.). Under these circumstances, we cannot but conclude that the Samaritan translator has not known the version of Onkelos, or that he has not perused it; and we can only suppose that single passages have been interpolated from Onkelos; for, as Eichhorn has justly remarked, “the Samaritan Paraphrase went through different hands, and was afterwards edited by one or more Samaritans” (Introduction, vol. 1, § 305).

For purposes of exegesis the version is entirely useless. It is simply interesting as faithfully representing the religious ideas and literary progress of the Samaritans; it is valuable also for philological purposes, as being the most trustworthy monument of an important Shemitic dialect. The oldest MSS. hitherto known to exist are both at Rome the Barberini Triglot and the Vatican. The former was bought by Peiresc at Damascus, in 1631, and bequeathed by him to cardinal Barberini, in whose library it still remains. It is imperfect; the oldest parts were written in A.D. 1226, and the end of Deuteronomy was supplied by a later hand in 1482.

The Vatican MS. was bought by Pietro della Valle at Damascus, in 1616. It is much later than the one just described; it is on paper, dated A.D. 1514, with considerable lacunae of words, and even verses (comp. Assemani, Bibl. Vat. Catal. 1, 1, 464). This is the only text that has ever been published: it appeared in the Paris Polyglot of 1645, and was thence copied, without, however, a fresh collation of the MS., into the London Polyglot of 1657, from which A. Brüll reprinted it in Hebrew characters, and published it under the title שמרני על התורה תרגום(Frankfort-on- the-Main, 1875). Petermann, of Berlin, intended to publish an edition from  MSS. collated by him at Nablis, but the first part only was published: Pentateuchus Samaritanus, ad fidem Librorum Manuscriptorum apud Nablusianos Repertorum, edidit et varias Lectiones adscripsit H. Petermann. Fasciculus 1, Genesis (Berolini, 1872). Fragments of a Samaritan Targum (Lev 25:26, to the end of that book, and parts of Numbers), from a Bodleian MS., were edited and published by Nutt (Lond. 1874). The Imperial Library of St. Petersburg contains also many fragments of the Samaritan-Arabic translation, as well as of the Samaritan Targum.

2. “The Samaritan” in Greek (τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν). In the fathers, of the 3d and 4th centuries, as well as in MSS. containing the Sept., with fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, we find scholia, or pieces of a Greek translation of the Pentateuch so designated. These fragments have been collected by Morin, Hottinger, and Montfaucon, and are in Walton's Prolegomena. Castell, Vossius, and Herbst think that they are merely translated extracts from the Samaritan Version; while Gesenius, Winer, and Juynboll suppose them to be remains of a continuous Greek version of the Samaritan Pentateuch. On the other hand, Hengstenberg and Hävernick see in it only a corrected edition of certain passages of the Sept. The most probable of these opinions seems to be that which looks upon the notes or scholia as the Samaritan corrections of certain places in the Sept.

3. In 1070 an Arabic version of the Samaritan Pentateuch was made by Abu Said in Egypt, on the basis of the Arabic translation of Saadias Haggaon (q.v.). Like the original Samaritan, it avoids anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms, replacing the latter by euphemisms, besides occasionally making some slight alterations, more especially in proper nouns. It appears to have been drawn up from the Samaritan text, not from the Samaritan Version, the Hebrew words occasionally remaining unaltered in the translation. Often, also, it renders the original differently from the Samaritan Version. Principally noticeable is its excessive dread of assigning to God anything like human attributes, physical or mental. For יהוה אלהים, “God,” we find (as in Saadias sometimes) Malak Allah, “the Angel of God;” for “the eyes of God” we have (Deu 9:12) “the beholding of God.” For “bread of God,” “the necessary,” etc. Great reverence is shown for Moses and the tribe of Levi; but envy of the tribe of Judah (Gen 49:10). It is written in the common language of the Arabs, and abounds in Samaritanisms. An edition of this version was  commenced by Kuenen at Leyden. Genesis was published in 1851; Exodus and Leviticus in 1854. In Syria it would appear, at the Samaritans still used Saadias's even after Abu Said's had been made, for which reason Abul Baracat (about 1208) wrote scholia upon the latter in order to recommend it to the people. This must not be considered a new version, but a Syriac recension of the Arabic-Samaritan. The two recensions — the Syriac of Abul Baracat and the Egyptian of Abu Said — were mixed together in the MSS., and cannot now be properly separated. For further particulars we must refer to Juynboll and Eichhorn: the former in his Orientalia, 2, 115 sq.; the latter in the second volume of his Einleitung to the Old Test. Van Vloten described a MS. of Abu Said's in the University of Leyden in 1803; and Juynboll notices the MSS. at Paris, especially Nos. 2 and 4, in the Orientalia, 2, 115 sq.

Literature. — Cellarius, Hore Samaritanoe (Frankfort and Jena, 1705, 4to, 2d ed.), p. 1-58; Uhlemann, Samaritan Chrestomathy (Lipsiae, 1837); Walton, Prolegomena, ed. Dathe; Castell, Observations on the Sixth Volume of the London Polyglot; Eichhorn, Einleitung ins A.T. vol. 2; Gesenius, De Pentateuchi Samarit. Origine, etc.; Winer, De Versionis Pentat. Samar. Indole (ibid. 1817, 8vo); De Wette, Einleitung in das A.T.; Hävernick, Einleitung, 1, 1 — Juynboll, Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samaritance (Leyden, 1846, 4to); Davidson, Treatise on Biblical Criticism, vol. 1; Lee, Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora, prolegomenon 2, § 1, 3; Kohn, De Pentateucho Samaritano, p. 66 sq.; id. Samaritanische Studien (Breslau, 1868); also Zur Sprache, Literatur u. Dogmatik der Samaritaner (Leipsic, 1876); Brill, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur der Samariter (Frankfort, 1876); Keil, Introduction, 2, 278 sq.; Kaulen, Einleitung (Freiburg, 1876), 1, 91 sq.; Noldeke, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, 6, 204 sq.; Barges, Notice sur deux Fragments d'un Pentateuque Hebreu-Samaritain, 1865, p. 15; Simon, Histoire Critique du V.T. p. 261; Davidson, in Kitto's Cyclop. 21, 750 sq.; Deutsch, in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, 4, 2812 sq.; Nutt, Sketch of Samaritan History, p. 106 sq.; Petermann, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 13, 375 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritans[[@Headword:Samaritans]]

             Modern. As already stated (under SAMARITAN), a small remnant of the old nation still dwell in their ancient capital, Shechem. There existed a tradition among them, which has yet hardly died out, that large numbers of their  brethren were dwelling in various parts of the world — in England, France, India, and elsewhere — and they have instituted inquiries from time to time in the hope of becoming acquainted with these their brethren. In past ages we do find them not only inhabiting various cities in Palestine, but even in Egypt and Constantinople (El-Masudi, Hist. Encycl. 1, 114; Rabbi Benjamin, Itinerary). They are now, however, confined to Nablus, the ancient Shechem, and their sacred city through all ages. Here they live together, Ghetto-like, on the southwestern side of the town, at the very foot of Gerizim, their sacred mount. They have dwindled down to a very small number, consisting only of some forty families; and before many generations more have passed away, the ancient Samaritan nation will have become extinct. In 1872 they numbered 135 souls, 80 of whom were males; by the defection of Jacob Shellaby and his family, they have been reduced to a total of 130 souls. Perhaps no people have been persecuted and oppressed from age to age more than they have, yet it has served to knit them the more closely together. In appearance they are superior to their circumstances, as also to all others around them — a straight and high forehead, full brow, large and rather almond-shaped eyes, aquiline nose, somewhat large mouth, and well-formed chin are their chief physiological characteristics; and, with few exceptions, they are tall and of lofty bearing. If the present small community is a fair specimen of what their nation was in ancient times, they must have been a fine race.

A deep interest is attached to this people, not only because they are the oldest and smallest sect in the world, but principally because they retain the opinions, ceremonies, and habits of their forefathers, and are, like their Jewish brethren, a living evidence of the truth of Bible history, especially that of the Pentateuch. Our object will be, therefore, to give a summary account of all the principal features of their life and manners, as exhibited by these remaining votaries; and for this purpose we chiefly follow Mills's abridgment (in Fairbairn's Dictionary) of his larger account (Three Months in Nablus, Lond. 1864).

I. Domestic Life and Duties. —

1. Circumcision. — The first and most important is to admit the male child into the Abrahamic covenant by circumcision. This ceremony must be performed on the eighth day, even should that be the Sabbath, as it was undoubtedly the practice of the Jews of old (Joh 7:22); and not in the synagogue, but always in the house of the parents. The performance of the  rite devolves upon the priest; but should he happen to be absent, any one acquainted with the mode of operating may do it. During the celebration of the ceremony the name of the child is announced, as of old (Luk 1:59), and, when over, they celebrate it (as the Jews do) by a feast, enlivened by Arab music and singing. If the child be female, the only observance is that of naming, which takes place on the third day at the parents' house, without any particular rite or gathering of friends, the priest simply announcing it in the hearing of those who may happen to be present. Formerly, they used to redeem the first-born child, as the Jews still do, according to the commandment (Exo 13:13), but now the ceremony is discontinued on account of the poverty of their people.

2. Marriage. — Like most Easterns, the Samaritans have a strong desire for offspring, a feeling which is probably intensified by the paucity of their number. This, together with an early development in such a climate, leads them, like all their neighbors, to marry at a very early age, the males being eligible at fourteen and the females at ten years of age. But they never intermarry with persons of another creed, whether circumcised or uncircumcised; and never marry but on a Thursday, this in their estimation being a peculiarly propitious day. They have no betrothing, and the marriage rite is very simple. Upon the appointed day, two men who are witnesses of the agreement conduct the bride and her friends at midday to the bridegroom's house, where the ceremony is performed by the priest. The service is in Hebrew — an unknown tongue to those most concerned — and consists of portions of the law interspersed with certain prayers; and the marriage agreement is read, by which the young bridegroom has to pay a fixed dowry to the father of the bride. In the evening a feast is made, followed by music, singing, and dancing, performed, however, not by themselves, but by hired Mussulmans. Here we may observe that they are not given to polygamy. There is nothing in their theology prohibiting it, but this virtue has grown upon them from necessity, on account of the unequal distribution of the sexes. Their present rule, and one which has existed for some ages past, is that any one may take an additional wife if the first wife be willing, but on that condition only.

3. Divorce. — The Samaritans are not given to divorcement, and in this matter they stand in singular contrast to their Jewish and Mohammedan neighbors. Their modern theology at least forbids it, except only for the cause of fornication, but their strict conformity to this dogma under all circumstances is very doubtful.

4. Purifications. — There are seven things that particularly defile a person, four of which relate to both sexes, the remaining three pertaining to the female: (1) the conjugal act; (2) nocturnal pollution; (3) touching any dead body; (4) touching unclean birds, quadrupeds, or reptiles; (5) a female from hemorrhage; (6) a female's menstrual discharge, when she remains unclean for seven days; (7) childbirth, when the mother is accounted unclean for forty-one days if the child be male, but if female for eighty days. On account of these defilements they purify themselves most scrupulously. Formerly, when sacrifices used to be offered, the ashes of a burned heifer were kept to be mixed with running water and sprinkled on the unclean person by one that was clean according to the law (Num 19:17-19). Now running water only is used. The washing of hands as a rite of purification at rising and before eating, etc., as the Jews do, is never observed by the Samaritans; they simply do it for the purpose of cleansing, and not as a religious ceremony (comp. Mar 7:3-4).

5. Morning and Evening Prayer. — The first duty on rising is to repeat the morning prayer, which is long and tedious. It is generally offered by each individual in private, although there is no law against its being performed in the presence of the family. Any one is at liberty to repeat this or any other prayer as often as he pleases during the day, but the morning and evening orisons must on no account be neglected, and must be said in the early morning and at sunset. This, like all their other prayers, is a set one in the Hebrew tongue, and consequently not understood except by some one or two besides the priest. Still, the sacredness of the language, combined with the antiquity of the formula, imparts to it a kind of hallowedness, which has a strange hold upon the conscience of the people. During the prayer they always turn towards Mount Gerizim.

6. Food. — When they sit to eat, a blessing is pronounced before the food is served. This duty devolves upon the head of the family. They make the broadest distinction in articles of diet; adhering faithfully to the law of Moses, and attaching the greatest importance to its observance. They never eat the flesh of any beast that does not chew the cud and divide the hoof (Lev 11:3-8; Deu 14:6-8), and swine are held in the greatest detestation. All kinds of poultry, except those notified as unclean (Lev 11:13-25), are considered lawful, as well as all fish that have fins and scales (Lev 11:9-12). Like the Jews, they never partake of flesh and butter (or milk) at the same meal, nor do they even place them on the table at the same time. Six hours must elapse after partaking of meat  before milk or butter can be taken. The Jews found this custom on the passage, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk” (Exo 23:19), but the Samaritans refuse it the importance of a law of Moses, and only observe it as a sanatory rule laid down by their sages. They hold it unlawful to eat anything prepared by either Jews or Gentiles, therefore they make their own bread, cheese, butter, etc. Cattle and poultry too must be slaughtered by their own shochet, or killer, who has to pass through a course of study and training before he is qualified to kill according to the numerous rules prescribed by their sages.

7. Duties towards the Dead. — The Samaritans, like the Jews, teach the dying person to say as his last words, “The Lord our God is one Lord.” This last utterance must be in the Hebrew, therefore all their people, women and children, are most carefully taught this phrase. The relations of the dead never rend their clothes, as they consider it to be contrary to the will of God. Nor have they any fixed time to mourn, or formula to repeat over the departed. With them it is simply a matter of feeling; some mourn for a long and some for a shorter time. But to indulge in grief is discouraged, forasmuch as the high priest was forbidden to mourn for the dead (Lev 21:10); so they consider the refrainment from it to be a proof of a more thorough obedience to the will of God and a higher religious state of mind. As anciently, the house wherein the dead body lies is rendered unclean (Num 19:14), and the priest carefully avoids crossing its threshold (Lev 21:11).

As soon as the dying person has expired, they perform the ceremony of טִהֲרָה (taharah), purification, by washing the body carefully with clean running water. This is done by individuals appointed to that duty from among themselves, after which it is wrapped in a cotton shroud (Joh 11:44), and then placed in a wooden coffin. It is curious to observe that no other natives of any creed use coffins; the Samaritans, however, scrupulously follow the example set them by their father Joseph (Genesis 1, 26). When a death is expected, the law is read in the chamber of the sick, not by the priest, but by one appointed for that purpose. As soon as all hope of recovery is given up, the reading begins, is continued to the patient's death, and again resumed after the taharah, and continued to Num 30:1. After arranging the funeral procession, the reading is once more proceeded with until the whole law be read.

II. Religion. — The Samaritan idea of religion is a national one. To them their faith and people are synonymous. In this sense they are, according to their own belief, the only peculiar people of God, with whom the Almighty has entered into covenants, and which covenants they faithfully keep. These are seven in number, and are as follows:

a, the covenant of Noah (Gen 9:14);

b, the covenant of Abraham concerning circumcision (Gen 17:9-14);

c, the covenant of the Sabbath (Exo 31:12-17);

d, the covenant of the two tables of the ten commandments (Exo 20:2-17);

e, the covenant of salt (Num 18:19);

f, the covenant of the Passover (Exo 12:2);

g, the covenant of the priesthood (Num 25:12-13). By virtue of these they are separated, on the one hand, from all the Gentiles, and, on the other hand, from the Jews, who, they assert, are cursed since the time of Eli.

1. Constitution. — Their people, according to the above idea, constitute a national religious community, over which two officers preside. The chief is the priest (כֹּהֵן). Upon him devolves the performance of all the duties prescribed in the law of Moses as pertaining to the priestly office. These are now but nominal, as they have no sacrifice because they have no temple; but certain prayers are offered instead of sacrifices. These, together with the priestly blessings, are given on all occasions by the priest himself, who is in reality but a Levite, for the last of the descendants of Aaron, according to their own chronicle, died in A.D. 1631. The second officer is the minister, חֲזִן (chazan), who is a member of a younger branch of the same family. It is his duty to read the public service generally, both in the synagogue and out of it. Upon him also falls the work of educating the children and instructing them in the law. These two officers sitting in assembly constitute their בֵּית יּיַן, or house of judgment. The priest sits supreme and the minister second, and before this tribunal all Samaritan matters, whether social or religious, are settled. Should a question of any difficulty arise, the priest calls other members of the priestly family to assist  in deciding the case; otherwise all kinds of questions are determined by the two officers alone.

2. Creed. — The Samaritans have no formula of belief or set articles of faith, excepting four great tenets: (1) to believe in Jehovah as the only God; (2) to believe in Moses as the only lawgiver; (3) to believe in the תּוֹרָה (Torah), Pentateuch, as the only divine book; (4) to believe in Mount Gerizim as the only house of God. These are the cardinal points of the Samaritan faith; but so far as a more detailed theological creed is concerned, the thirteen articles drawn up by Maimonides would as well express the Samaritan as the Jewish faith. These consist of a belief, in God as Creator and Governor; in one God only; in his not being corporeal; in God being first and last of all things; in God as the only object of prayer; in the truth of prophecy; in the truthfulness and superiority of Moses; in the law as the enactment of Moses; in the unchangeableness of the law; in the omniscience of God; in rewards and punishments; in the coming of the Messiah; and in a general resurrection (British Jews, p. 68). Here it is important to observe that their only authority in theology is the Pentateuch — nothing is divine and binding but the Torah; all their dogmas are believed, whether rightly or wrongly, to be founded upon that sacred volume; and they are, in fact, strictly and wholly the disciples of Moses. It becomes, therefore, a subject of no little interest to the Biblical student to observe how many of the principal doctrines of revealed truth are held by the Samaritans to be the teaching of the law. For instance, they found the doctrine of a future state upon Exo 21:6 — “I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, ed the God of Jacob;” being the very passage quoted by the Savior, and drawing from it the same conclusion that “he is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living” (Mar 12:26-27); and that of a resurrection they hold to be clearly revealed in Gen 9:5. “And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man.” But we cannot help thinking that the influence of Christianity is discernible in several points of modem Samaritanism, as well as of modern Judaism; and that some doctrines may be regarded as affiliated to the Torah rather than inducted therefrom. Their doctrine concerning the Messiah, although infinitely below the conception of the New Test., is yet far superior to that of the Jews. They never call him Messiah — that name not being in the law — but Tahebah, תהבה, or the Arabic equivalent, Al-Mudy, the Restorer.  They believe him to be a man, a son of Joseph, of the tribe of Ephraim, according to the words of Moses (Deu 33:16). The promise of his coming was made by Moses” The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken” (Deu 18:15). He is to be not a king and conqueror, but a great teacher. His mission is not to shed blood, but to heal the nations; not to make war, but to bring peace. He will restore the law to its purity, preach it to the world, and bring all the nations over to its practice. In fact, he will be a great reformer, expressly sent by the Almighty, and endowed with the necessary qualifications to perform so great and glorious a work. Following his direction, they believe that the congregation will repair to Gerizim, where, under the “twelve stones,” they will find the Ten Commandments, and under the stone of Bethel the golden vessels of the temple and the manna. After one hundred and ten years the Prophet is to die and be buried beside Joseph in the valley. Soon afterwards, on the conclusion of seven thousand years from its foundation, the world is to come to an end.

3. Synagogue. — They themselves never call it synagogue. Sometimes they use the Arabic term bit Allah, house of God, but the common appellation is kinshah, קנשה, place of assembly; equivalent to the Greek συναγωγή, and the Hebrew בֵּית הִכְּנֶסֶת. At present they have but one, a small and unsightly building, but large enough for their community. Its extreme length measures thirty-seven feet five inches, with a breadth of eighteen feet. A part of the floor — namely, that of the right — hand division in the accompanying plan is raised a foot higher than the remaining portion. On the left-hand side is a recess some four feet square. The ceiling is vaulted, and from it hang two very primitive chandeliers and a small oil lamp. In the roof is a circular, dome-like window to admit light and air, the only opening besides the door. The small, square recess is the musbah, or altar, which is considered to be the most sacred spot in the building. It is here the Torah, or Law of Moses, is kept, in the form of a roll, and in this respect the musbah answers to the Jewish chel. But it has a further sacredness attached to it. During the existence of the temple on Gerizim sacrifices were slain on the altar, but since its demolition they are considered unlawful; therefore the musbale takes the place of the altar, and prayer that of sacrifice. Its place in the synagogue, therefore, fronts the spot whereon the temple formerly stood, so that when the worshippers, during service, look towards the sacred recess their faces may be turned to Mount  Gerizim. A large, square veil hangs continually in front of the musbah, in order to screen it from the gaze of the people, as no one is permitted to enter it but the two officials. The congregation consists of males only; but in this particular the Samaritans do not stand alone, as it is common to the natives of all creeds, with the exception of the few Christian Protestants in the country. Should the females wish to be present, they are at liberty to gather outside the building in the court and listen to the service, but no more. On this point Jews and Samaritans agree, but not with regard to the number necessary to constitute a congregation. With the first there must be a minyan — i.e. ten males of full age — present before the congregation is legal and the service can be read; but with the Samaritans there is no rule, but, like the Christian practice, it may be formed of any number met together to worship. They never assemble in the synagogue during week days except on the feasts and fasts. On the Sabbath they have three services. The first is a short one at sunset on Friday, at which time their Sabbath commences. The second is early on the following morning, and is much the longest and most important, for during this service the law is shown. The minister takes it out of the musbah, removes its covering, opens the silver-gilt case in which it is kept, and exhibits to the congregation that column of the text which contains Aaron's blessing (Num 6:24-27), when they step forward to kiss the sacred scroll. The last service is on Saturday afternoon a little before sunset, and consists of prayers interspersed with portions of the law, and arranged in one liturgy. The language being all Hebrew, the people understand the service but very imperfectly, the officials with one or two others excepted. It is performed in a kind of chant or cantillation most peculiar in its character. It differs nearly as much from the native Arab music as from that of Europeans, and seems to have an origin both ancient and peculiar. They have seventy different melodies, composed, according to their tradition, by the seventy elders of Israel in the time of Moses, which they have preserved and still use on various occasions.

4. Sacred Seasons. — An important part of the Samaritan religion consists of the observance of certain sacred seasons. These are as follows:

(1.) The Sabbath. — Like the Jews, they reckon their days from sunset to sunset, according to the expression in Genesis — “And the evening and the morning were the first day.” The Sabbath, therefore, as already said,  commences at sunset on Friday and ends at sunset on Saturday. This day they keep most strictly as a day of rest, upon which no manner of work is to be done, according to the words of the law in Exo 20:8-10. To this command they adhere most faithfully, accepting it in its literal fullness. Unlike the Jews, they employ no gobim, or Gentiles, to light their fires or snuff their candles, but all within the gates keep the Sabbath alike. Consequently they never have any fire on that day, but scrupulously keep the command, “Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day” (Exo 35:3). Not a lamp or a candle ever burns in their houses or in the synagogue on that day. When darkness comes on during the reading of the opening service on Friday evening, they never introduce lights, but finish the service in the dark, and remain so in their houses until they retire to rest. Their first and great idea of keeping the Sabbath holy is to remain quiet — never to go out of their dwellings except to the synagogue; and the second is, to live more generously than on ordinary days, but the cooking is all prepared on Friday. Although they carefully abstain from all kind of work, even the most trifling actions, they keep no such guard on their language nor check on their thoughts, but feel at liberty to talk about anything and everything; and of a higher and purer mode of sanctifying the day they have no idea.

(2.) The New Moon. — Next in frequency, but not in importance, to the observance of the Sabbath is that of the new moon, the reosh hadesh, equivalent to the Jewish rosh chodesh. The new moon is sacredly watched for, and the afternoon immediately following its appearance, about half past four, the Samaritans assemble in the synagogue to perform the appointed service. It consists of prescribed prayers composed for the occasion, intermixed with portions of the law, especially those referring to the beginning of months (Num 10:10; Num 28:11-14). During the recital of the service, the whole of which lasts about two hours, the minister exhibits one of the roll copies of the Pentateuch to the congregation.

(3.) The Feasts and Fasts. — The Samaritans are not given to festivals. In this they greatly differ from their Jewish brethren, as well as from some Christian communities. In the Jewish calendar there are above thirty such seasons of greater or less importance; but in the Samaritan only eight, six of which are commanded in the law, the other two being less important. These are the following:

(a.) Karaban Aphsah, or Jewish חִג הִפֶּסִח, Passover. This is the memorial of their great national deliverance from Egypt (Exodus 12). The time of its celebration is the fifteenth day of their month Nisan, in the evening of the day; but should that happen to be a Sabbath, the feast is held on the previous day. Its place of celebration is Mount Gerizim, which they found upon Exo 21:18. Therefore, early on the morning of the fourteenth day the whole community, with few exceptions, close their dwellings in the city, and clamber up the Mount, on the top of which, and in front of the ruins of their ancient temple, they pitch their tents in a circle. The lambs, five or six in number, and “without blemish,” are brought on the tenth day, and during the intervening days are carefully kept, and cleanly washed as a sort of purification to fit them for the paschal service (comp. Joh 5:2). On the sacred spot, near the tents, a fire is kindled, over which two caldrons full of water are placed. Another fire is kindled close by in a kind of circular pit sunk into the ground, where the lambs are to be roasted. At sunset the lambs are slaughtered by five or six young men dressed in blue robes of unbleached calico, having their loins girded, who dip their fingers in the streaming blood and with it mark the foreheads and noses of the children. The boiling water is carefully poured over the dead lambs, and, when fleeced, the right forelegs, which belong to the priest, are removed and placed on wood already laid for the purpose, together with the entrails; salt is added, and they are then burned. The lambs are now spitted and lowered into the oven. The spit is a long pole thrust through from head to tail, near the end of which is placed a transverse peg to prevent the carcass from slipping off. At midnight the lambs are taken up, when the paschal feast commences. A large copper dish filled with unleavened cakes and bitter herbs rolled up together is brought in and distributed among the congregation, all the adults wearing a kind of girdle around their waist, with staves in their hands, according to the command (Exo 12:11). The lambs are then laid upon carpets and strewn over with bitter herbs, all the congregation, i.e. the men, standing in two rows, one on each side of the lambs. During all this time, a long and tedious service peculiar to the day is recited by the two officials in turn, and when the reading has arrived at a certain point, all the expectant auditors stoop at once, and, as if in haste and hunger, tear away the flesh piecemeal with their fingers, and carry portions to the females and little ones in the tents. In a few minutes the whole disappears except some fragments, which are carefully gathered up, not a particle being left, which, with the bones, are all burned in a fire kindled for that purpose (Exo 12:10). On the  following day rejoicings continue; fish, rice, and eggs are eaten, wine and spirits are drunk, and hymns, generally impromptu, are sung. Here we may observe that those who are unable to keep the Passover on this day may do so on the same day of the following month; but this second celebration is not kept on the hill, but in their own quarter in the city.

(b.) Moed Aphsah, answering to the Jewish הִמִּצּוֹת חִג', or Feast of Unleavened Cakes. Although this feast is intimately connected with the former, still, strictly speaking, they are two distinct solemnities, the Feast of the Passover commemorating the protection given them when the first born of the Egyptians were slain, and that of the Unleavened Bread commemorating the beginning of their march out of Egypt. The distinction of the two feasts is more marked in the Samaritan than in the Jewish mode of their celebration. On the preceding day of the feast, every family removes all leavened bread out of its dwelling, and a most careful search is made, so that the least fragment may not remain. Thus by the evening of the fourteenth day, all leavened bread and fermented drink are laid aside, and unleavened bread alone must be used during the seven following days, according to the law (Exo 12:18-20). This bread they call masat, equivalent to the Hebrew matstsoth; and the cake is made in the same form as the Jewish matstsoth, except that it is a little larger, but of the same thickness. The Samaritans, like some of the strict Jews, hang up some of the cakes in their houses till the next Passover, believing them to have the power of charms in warding off evils and drawing many blessings upon the family. The first and seventh days of the feast are kept holy, according to Exo 12:16, but the seventh is considered the most sacred of the two. At early morn they form themselves into a procession and clamber up Gerizir, “in honor of God.” There, on the sacred spot, the priest repeats the service for the day, which consists of lengthy portions of the law interspersed with prayers and songs.

(c.) Chamsin, the “fiftieth,” equivalent to the Πεντηκοστή‘, Pentecost, of the New Test. It is thus called because it falls upon the fiftieth day after the morrow of the Sabbath of the Unleavened Bread. The Samaritans differ from the Jews in reckoning these days. The latter begin to count them from the second day of the Unleavened Bread, on whatever day of the week it may happen; but the Samaritans commence on the morrow of the Sabbath which falls within the days of that feast, and cite as their authority  Lev 23:15-16. It is kept as a day to “rejoice before the Lord their God,” on account of the bounties of his providence and the liberty to enjoy them in their own promised land (Deu 16:9-12). This day likewise they go up Gerizim in procession, and on the same place as before the service for the day is gone through, which contains all the references made in the law to the harvest, as well as prayers and songs.

(d.) Arish-sheni similar to the Jewish Rosh-hashanah, and always falls on the 1st of Tishri, that month being the commencement of the civil year with the Samaritans as with the Jews. They keep this day as a holy convocation, in which no servile work is done (Lev 23:24). They attend synagogue, and the service lasts about six hours; but they neither have “blowing of trumpets,” as in the Jewish synagogue, nor is the day regarded with the importance attached to it by the Jews.

(e.) Kibburim, equivalent to the Jewish Yom Kippur, יוֹם הִכַּפּוּרַים, Day of Atonement of the Jews, which is held on the tenth day of Tishri, according to the command (Lev 23:27-32). In a strict point of view, this is the most important day in the Samaritan calendar. On the ninth day of the month, just two hours before sunset, all the community, both male and female, purify themselves by the free application of clean running water, after which they partake of the last meal before the great fast. The meal must be finished at least half an hour before sunset, when a rigid fast is observed until half an hour after sunset on the following day, making altogether a fast of twenty-five hours. During this time neither man, nor woman, nor child — not even the sick or suckling — is permitted to taste a morsel of bread or a drop of water. No indulgence, however trifling it may be, is permitted, and the whole fast is kept with such rigor that even medicine to the sick would on no account be administered. The day is therefore looked forward to with no little anxiety. They assemble at the synagogue a little before sunset, when the service commences and is kept up in solemn darkness through the night. It consists of the reading of the law, together with special prayers and supplications, portions of which are sung to their ancient melodies. The following morning they form a procession and visit the tombs of some of their prophets, where they repeat a portion of the service, and on their return at noon it is resumed in the synagogue. As it draws to a conclusion the principal ceremony takes place — namely, the exhibition of the ancient roll of the law, believed by them to be written by Abishua, the great-grandson of Aaron. Before the roll is covered and replaced, all step forward with eagerness to kiss it, as the  opportunity only occurs annually. The service is undertaken by the priest and minister alternately, with the occasional help of one of the congregation. A little after sunset the anxious and tedious duties of the solemn day are over.

(f.) Sekuth, the Jewish סֻכּוֹת, Tabernacles. They begin this festival on the fifteenth day of the same month, and keep it for seven days, conforming literally to the injunctions in Lev 23:34-36; Lev 23:40-43. On the eleventh day they begin the erection of the booths, which must be finished by the morning of the fourteenth. These are raised in the courts of their houses, in the open air. On each day of this feast service is held in the synagogue both morning and evening, and they make in procession a daily ascent of Gerizim, “in honor of God.” No servile work is done, nor is any business transacted during these days, of which the eighth and last is held the most sacred.

Besides the sacred seasons already mentioned, they have two others of less important character. The first is Reosh-ashena, Rosh-hashanah of the Jews, the beginning of the year. It is held, not on the first day of Tishri, the beginning of the civil year, but on the first day of Nisan, the commencement of their ecclesiastical year. The day is not kept sacred, for they all follow their usual vocations; they simply attend a short service in the synagogue both morning and evening. The next is Purim, not, like that of the Jews, held in the month Adar to commemorate the national deliverance through queen Esther, but held in the preceding month, Shebat, in commemoration of the mission of Moses to deliver the Israelites out of Egypt.

4. Sacred Places. — The religious rites of Palestine, whether performed in honor of the true God or that of idols, were celebrated from the earliest ages on the top of the highest mountains. The Hebrew lawgiver felt it necessary to enjoin on the Israelites the duty of destroying all these sacred high places on their coming into possession of the land (Deu 12:2-5); but so deeply rooted was this form of worship in the religious feelings of Israel, as of the surrounding nations, that it proved a snare to them for many ages. It was these early sympathies that made Mount Gerizim so sacred to the children of Ephraim ever since the conquest, and in the same spirit have the Samaritans regarded it through all ages even to this day. Their great holy place is Gerizim. This mountain they hold to be the earth's center, the house of God, the highest mountain on earth, the  only one not covered by the flood, the site of altars raised by Adam, Seth, and Noah, the Mount Moriah of Abraham's sacrifice, the Bethel or Luz of Jacob's vision, and the place where Joshua erected first an altar, next the tabernacle, and finally a temple. On its slope the cave of Makkedah is also shown, though now closed up. Just as the Jew in all parts of the world turns his face in prayer towards the Temple mount at Jerusalem, so does the Samaritan to Gerizim, his temp mount. To him it is “the house of God,” “the house of Jehovah,” “the mountain of the world,” “God's mountain,” “the Sanctuary,” “the mountain of the Divine Presence,” and other such like titles — all flowing from their extravagant notions of its sacredness. They rarely write its name without the addition “the house of God.” It was this same spirit that moved the woman of Samaria to answer the Savior with such an air of pride — “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain” (Joh 4:20). SEE GERIZIM.

But Samaritanism has other holy places. These are the tombs of their early prophets and holy men — viz. Joseph, Eleazar, Ithamar, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, the seventy elders, and Eldad and Medad. All these, according to their tradition, are buried in the neighborhood of Shechem, and on certain occasions the congregation visit them, when portions of the law and prayers are repeated. This is especially the case with the tombs of Phinehas and Eleazar, but even more so with that of Joseph, which they visit frequently.

III. Local Literature. — Before giving a summary of the books of the modern Samaritans, it is necessary to remark that they are, to a certain extent, a trilingual people. Of these languages the first is Hebrew. The fact of its being the language of the Law of Moses makes it to them, as to the Jews, the leshon hak-kodesh, or holy tongue. All their sacred books and their religious services are therefore in Hebrew, although it is to them, with few exceptions, a dead language. The second is the Samaritan. Its basis was the Hebrew, and it was thoroughly Shemitic in framework; but its superstructure contained many anomalies, some of which were harsh and foreign. SEE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE. From what now remains of it, its general construction seems very simple, and not unfrequently lucid and forcible; and, as pronounced by the Samaritans, it is much more euphonious than the Arabic. Soon after the Mohammedan conquest of Palestine, it gradually lapsed into a dead language. The only literature now remaining in it consists of the forms of the Pentateuch and a few other works, above noticed. The third tongue is the Arabic, the language of their  conquerors. This soon supplanted the Samaritan, and has ever since remained their vernacular, and most of their works have been translated into Arabic for the sake of such of their people as understand no other.

It is difficult, at this time, to determine to what extent the ancient Samaritan literature was developed, though there is enough evidence to show that much mental activity existed among the people in former ages. Of their literary productions but little remains, owing in part to the destructive hand of time, but much more to the ravages they suffered during the first centuries of the Christian era, and again under the Mohammedan rule. The works now known as extant may be classified under four heads, and we arrange the lists according to the Samaritan dates, including some already enumerated under SAMARITAN LITERATURE.

1. Theological. — It is to this class most belong, and the first on the list is the Torah, or Law of Moses. SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

Risalat Achbor Israel, a work explaining the feasts, their object, and manner of keeping them, by Eleazaer, a priest who is said to have lived in the 5th century after the conquest of Palestine by the tribes. (Composed in Hebrew, of which there is an Arabic translation.)

Sharich, an exposition of the book of Exodus by various authors. (Written in Hebrew, with an Arabic translation. No date, but ancient.)

El-Amir, a commentary on portions of the law by Maraka, who flourished about fifty years before Christ. (Hebrew, with an Arabic translation.)

Sharich, an exposition of Genesis from the beginning to ch. 28; the author not known, but dates from the 2d century of our era. (Written in Hebrew, but, like the former, has an Arabic translation.)

El-Kaffi. This is a work discussing the doctrines contained in the law, written by Juseph el-Askari, A.D. 700. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

Masail Chilafi, a work discussing the differences between the Jews and Samaritans, by Munaji Naphes ed-Din, who lived in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

El-Mulhalal fi en-Nikahi, an explanation of the laws of marriage, by Abul- Barakat, who lived in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)  Kitab el-Mirath, a work on the laws and regulations of wills and testaments. (Written by the same author, in Hebrew, with an Arabic translation.)

Sharich, a historical exposition of the law, showing how the ancients observed it; written by El-Hhabr Jacub in the 12th century. (In Hebrew only.)

Sharich, an exposition of the book of Exodus, by Ghazal ed-Duik, of the 13th century. (In Hebrew and Arabic.)

Sharich, a book explaining the blessings and cursings of the law, by Ihbrahim el-Kaisi, of the 16th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

Risalat el-Arshad, a book on the days of the month upon which the feasts were to be held, written by Ibrahim il-Ahi, an author of the 18th century. (Hebrew and Arabic)

Sharich, an exposition of the whole book of Genesis, written by Musalem el-Murjam, of the last century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

Sharich, an exposition of the books of Leviticus and Numbers, by Ghazal el-Matari who lived in the last century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

Sharich, a work concerning the Eternal, together with certain social points, principally marriage and the Sabbath, by Ghazal ibn Ramiyahh. (Hebrew and Arabic, but without date.)

2. Liturgical. — This class comprises all the books relating to their public and private services, such as the feasts and fasts, circumcision, marriage, and burial. They consist of passages from the Torah, interspersed with prayers and poetic compositions, the reading of which is principally performed with a kind of cantillation; hence the term Tartil generally applied to these books. This class is nearly as extensive as the theological, and contains much interesting matter and many beautiful passages, but the works have not yet received the attention they deserve. The most important are the services for the annual feasts and fasts, eleven in number- namely, one for the ordinary Sabbaths throughout the year; one for the two Sabbaths preceding Passover; one for the Passover; one for the days of Unleavened Bread; one for the fifty days following Passover; one for Pentecost: one for the 1st of Tishri; one for the Day of Atonement; one for  the Tabernacles; one for the first day of the year, and one for the last day of the year.

All these liturgies exist only in Hebrew, as it would be unlawful to translate them into the vulgar tongue. They are all of ancient date, but the authors and compilers are unknown. SEE SAMARITAN LITURGY.

3. Historical. — In this class there are but few works; these are:

Tarik. This is the Samaritan book of Joshua, as it is generally called, and is pretty well known to European scholars since the time of Scaliger, who, in A.D. 1584, received a copy from the Samaritans of Cairo, an edition of which was brought out by Juynboll (Leyden, 1848), with a Latin version and valuable annotations. It contains a brief history of themselves from the close of the Pentateuch down to modern times, and comprising some amount of valuable information mixed up with much that is fictitious and exaggerated.

Another historical work is extant, partly compiled from the above, by Abul-Fatah, an author of the 14th century, but is not held in esteem by the Samaritans themselves.

El-Tabak, a history of the Jews, principally relating the judgments that had befallen them; written by Abu Hassan es-Suri in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

Kitab es-Satir, a compendium of history from Adam to Moses. No author is named; but it is stated to have been written at the command of Moses. (Hebrew only.)

Ihlm Attawarik. This is simply a chronological table according to the Samaritan dates, extending from the creation of man to the present time. It is well known that the Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch differs in its dates from both the Jewish Hebrew text and the Sept. version, thus causing a difference in the date of all subsequent historical events. Independently of this, there is a further difference between this table and all other accepted data down to the commencement of the Christian era. For example, the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan took place, according to common chronology, in A.M. 2553; but, according to the Samaritan, it was in 2794, making a difference of 241 years. The same chronology gives the age of the world at the commencement of the Christian era as 4438 A.M., while  the accepted date is 4004, thus making a difference of 434 years. But from this period the table generally agrees with our ordinary chronology.

4. Scientific. — Under this head may be comprised the following:

El- Chubs, an astronomical work treating of the rules regulating the first month of the year, and the conjunctions of the sun and moon. It was written, we are told, under the direction of Adam. (Hebrew.)

Risalat. This is a sort of exposition of the former work, written by several authors, but whose names and times are unknown. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

To the foregoing list may be added the following works extant and known in Europe, but not now in the possession of the Samaritans themselves — viz. Ghazal and Zadaka on parts of the law, Abul-Hassan and Zadaka el- Israili on religion and ceremonies; and Abu Said and Abu Itshak Ibrahim on language and grammar.

## Samatus[[@Headword:Samatus]]

             (Σαματός; Vulg. Semedius), given in the Apocrypha (1Es 9:34) as the name of the fourth of the six sons of Osora (i.e. Abiah or Mochnadebai) among those Israelites who had married foreign wives after the captivity; but the Heb. list (Ezr 10:41-42) contains the names Shelemiah, Shemariah, and Shallum in the corresponding place.

## Samavarti[[@Headword:Samavarti]]

             In Hindu mythology, is an appellation of Dhama, the god of the underworld, who judges the dead and separates the good from the wicked.

## Samba[[@Headword:Samba]]

             In Hindu mythology, was a son of Vishnu in the avatar of Krishna, born of Dshamty, the beautiful daughter of the king of the bears. Samba, guided by the counsel of his father, and in order to avert the infliction of a threatening curse to which he had imprudently exposed himself, built a city, to which he gave his own name, and introduced in it the worship of the sun, to which he gathered the priests by conveying them on the saddle horse Garudha, which was sacred to Vishnu.

## Sambation[[@Headword:Sambation]]

             A river mentioned in the Talmud as flowing during the first six days of every week and drying up on the Sabbath. The rabbins are not agreed as to the situation of the river, some placing it on the borders of Ethiopia and some in India. SEE SABBATICAL RIVER,

## Samber[[@Headword:Samber]]

             In Hindu mythology, is an evil demon and king of giants, who brought under his power the beautiful Reti, consort of the god of love, and sought to win her for himself, but was defeated by Kamadewa, the son of Krishna.

## Sambhara[[@Headword:Sambhara]]

             Synonymous with SAMBER SEE SAMBER (q.v.). Sambhava, in Hindu mythology, is the third of the twenty-eight Buddhas who have hitherto appeared to save the world. His symbol is a horse, which therefore constantly appears with him in the representations.

## Sambiasi, Francesco[[@Headword:Sambiasi, Francesco]]

             An Italian missionary to China, was born at Cosenza in 1582, and died in 1649.

## Samech[[@Headword:Samech]]

             (prop. Sa'mek, ס; fully סָמֶךְ, a prop), the fifteenth letter of the Heb. alphabet (Psa 119:113). SEE ACROSTIC.

## Sameius[[@Headword:Sameius]]

             (Σαμεῖος, v.r. Σαμαῖος and Θαμαῖος), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:21) of the name SHEMAIAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:21).

## Samerius, Henry[[@Headword:Samerius, Henry]]

             A Jesuit, was born in France in 1540. For some time he was confessor to Mary queen of Scots. He died about 1610. He was the author of a work entitled Chronologia Sacra.

## Samgar-nebo[[@Headword:Samgar-nebo]]

             (Heb. Samgar' Nebu', סִמְגִּראּנְבוּ, sword of Nebo, or perhaps conqueror of Nebo; Sept. Σαμαγάδ, v.r. Σαμαγαώθ, Σαμαγάρ), one of the princes or commanders of Nebuchadnezzar's army against Jerusalem at its downfall (Jer 39:3). B.C. 589. The Nebo (q.v.) is the Chaldean Mercury; about the Samgar, opinions are divided. Von Bohlen suggested that from the Sanskrit sangara, “war,” might be formed sangara, “warrior,” and that this was the original of Samgar. Fürst suggests that nebo should perhaps be joined to the following word Sarsechim (q.v.), as in the Sept., since it is contrary to analogy for this to stand at the end of a name. SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR, etc. As in Jer 39:13 the chief of the eunuchs is called NEBU-SHASBAN, it has been supposed that Nebu- Sarsechim is only another name of the same person, and that Samgar is but a name of his office. It may be compounded of the Persic cham, a “cup,” and kar, a derivative particle, and so be equivalent to cup bearer, or Rabsbakeh (q.v.).

## Sami[[@Headword:Sami]]

             (Σαμί, v.r. Σαβεί, Τωβίς; Vulg. Tobi), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 5:28) of the name SHOBAI SEE SHOBAI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 2:42).

## Sami (2)[[@Headword:Sami (2)]]

             A species of hardwood which the Hindus employ in kindling the sacrificial fire. They believe that it contains a mysterious internal heat which must be called forth by rubbing, and the fire for sacrificial uses is accordingly never produced by any other method.

## Samia[[@Headword:Samia]]

             In Greek mythology, is (1) a daughter of the river god Maeander, who was married to Ancaeus, the son of Neptune and Astypalea, and king of the Leleges, to whom she bore Perilaus, Enudus, Samus, and Alitherses — ancestral heroes of the Samians — and also Parthenope; (2) a surname of Juno, derived from Samos, where a primitive statue in the Egyptian style, the work of Smilis, was erected in her honor.

## Samis[[@Headword:Samis]]

             (Σαμίς, v.r. Σομεϊvς), a Greek form (1Es 9:34) of the name SHIMEI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:38).

## Samius[[@Headword:Samius]]

             In Greek mythology, is an appellative of Neptune, from his temple on Samos.

## Samlah[[@Headword:Samlah]]

             (Heb. Samlah', שִׂמְלָה, a garment; Sept Σαλαμά, Σαμαά, v.r. Σαμαδά, Σεβλά), a king who reigned in Edom before the Israelites had a king (Gen 36:36-37; 1Ch 1:47-48). B.C. post 1618. He was the successor of Hadad or Hadar, and was of Masrrekah, that being probably the chief city during his reign. This mention of a separate city as belonging to each (almost without exception) of the “kings” of Edom suggests that the Edomitish kingdom consisted of a confederacy of tribes, and that the chief city of the reigning tribe was the metropolis of the whole.

## Sammael[[@Headword:Sammael]]

             A demon among the modern Jews, most commonly styled the Angel of Death. The rabbins allege that the removal from the present life of those who die in the land of Israel is assigned to Gabriel, whom they call an Angel of Mercy, while those who die in other countries are dispatched by the hand of Sammael, the prince of daemons. Several of the rabbins confidently assert that the latter has no power over the Jews, and God himself is represented as saying to him, “The world is in thy power except this people. I have given thee authority to root out the idolaters; but over this people I have given thee no power.”

## Sammans[[@Headword:Sammans]]

             (SCHAMANS). SEE SHAMANS.

## Sammim[[@Headword:Sammim]]

             SEE SPICE.

## Sammus[[@Headword:Sammus]]

             (Σαμμούς v.r. Σαμμού), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:43) of the name SHEMA SEE SHEMA (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Neh 8:4).

## Samoan (Or Navigators) Islands[[@Headword:Samoan (Or Navigators) Islands]]

             A group of nine inhabited islands, with some islets, in the Pacific Ocean, lying north of the Friendly Islands; population in 1869, 35,107. The soil, formed chiefly by the decomposition of volcanic rock, is rich, and the climate is moist. Among the Polynesian Islands, the inhabitants of the Samoan group rank, in personal appearance, second only to the Tongese. They are well formed, and easy and graceful in their movements. Polygamy is customary, but two wives seldom live in the same house. Women are considered the equals of men, and both sexes join in the family labor. The ancient religion of the islanders acknowledged one great God, but less worship was paid to him than to some of their war gods. They had, besides, a god of earthquakes, a god who upheld the earth, and gods of hurricanes, rain, and lightning, and also many inferior gods, who guarded certain localities. They also worshipped certain chiefs, to whose memory they erected carved blocks of wood and stone. The first missionaries landed in Savaii in 1830 from the Society Islands, and, in 1836, were joined by others from England. The first Roman Catholic missionaries arrived in 1846. The inhabitants are all now nominally Christians. There are schools and a church in every village. The children can generally read in their own language at the age of seven years, and most of the adult population can read and write. The Bible has been translated and printed, as have hymn books and other works, at the missionary printing office. In 1869, the population was divided, denominationally, as follows: Independents and Presbyterians, 27,021; Wesleyans, 5082; Roman Catholics, 3004.

## Samoan Version[[@Headword:Samoan Version]]

             The Samoan belongs to the Polynesian or Malayan languages, and is spoken in Samoa, or Navigator's Islands. The translation of the Scriptures into that language appears to have been undertaken, in the first place, by the Rev. John Williams, assisted by other missionaries of the London Missionary Society, who, after the death of Williams, continued and completed it. In 1842 the Gospel of John was published, followed, in 1845, by the Gospel of Luke, translated by Macdonald, and the Epistle to the Romans, translated by Heath. In 1846, the entire New Test., including a  revised translation of the Gospel of Matthew, was completed at press. In 1848, the missionaries sent a revised copy of the New Test. to London, and an edition of 15,000 copies was printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In the year 1855, the translation of the Old Test. was completed and printed; and as to the particulars concerning this great work, we will quote the words of the Report (1856, p. 164):

“Previous to the completion of the New Test. some progress had been made in the translation of the Old; and, in 1848, an edition of 10,000 copies of the book of Psalms was put through the press, bound, and circulated.

“In 1849, editions of 10,000 each of the books of Genesis and Exodus were printed; and in 1850 Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy were also printed, in editions of 7000 copies each. The Pentateuch was then bound in one volume.

“In 1853, editions of 5000 each of the books from Joshua to 2 Samuel inclusive were printed, and in 1854 the remaining historical books; and the whole were bound up in one volume, forming the second volume of the historical books.

“In the same year, editions of 3500 each of the books of Solomon, the Lamentations, and the minor prophets were put through the press; and in March of the present year Ezekiel and Daniel were in circulation, Isaiah in the press, and Job ready for it. The only remaining book to be revised was Jeremiah; so that before this time the whole of the Old and New Tests. will have been completed and printed. The book of Job, with those of Solomon and the Prophets, will, besides the book of Psalms, form the third volume of the Old Test.

“The plan adopted in translation has been to assign to individuals separate books or portions for most careful translation. These portions have been further submitted to the criticisms of the other members of our Mission, and finally revised for the press by a committee of not less than five, including the translators, and then printed in every respect according to the decision of the committee.

“ In the Old Test., our translations have been made from the Hebrew text sent out to us by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and executed agreeably to the rules of the Society. Our  English Authorized Version has been constantly before us, and adhered to as nearly as possible. Constant reference has been made to the Septuagint and Vulgate, and the best use made of the various Polynesian translations. With regard to the lexicography, criticism, and renderings of the sacred text, we have availed ourselves of the labors of Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Lee, Ainsworth, Blayney, Henderson, Lowth, Dathe, Patrick, Good, etc.

“These translations and revisions have cost the members of our Mission many years of patient thought and labor; and it is a cause of great and most devout thankfulness to God that some of us who commenced the work on the Samoan group, and have from the beginning taken a part in the translating of the Sacred Word into its language, have lived to be engaged in it to its completion. To the great Head of the Church, who has enabled us to put this invaluable boon into the hands of the Samoan people, be all the praise.”

Since that time new revised editions have been published. The last edition of the entire Bible left the press at London in 1873, under the editorship of the Rev. Dr. Turner. (B.P.)

## Samogitian Version[[@Headword:Samogitian Version]]

             The Samogitian is a dialect of the Lithuanian language, spoken in three districts of Lithuania — namely, Telcha, Schaul, and Rosina. The Samogitians number about 112,000 individuals, and are, with few exceptions, of the Roman Catholic persuasion, whence it is also called the “Catholic dialect.” In 1814, the New Test. had been for the first time translated into this dialect by prince Gedroitz, bishop of Samogitia, who designed to print one thousand copies at Wilna at his own expense. In 1816, a second edition left the press, and in 1831 a third one, printed by the monks in the monastery of St. Cazemir at Wilna. Of the Old Test. nothing has as yet been translated into this dialect. Comp. Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands, p. 41, 79; The Bible of Every Land, p. 313. (B.P.)

## Samoiede (Or Samoyed) Mythology[[@Headword:Samoiede (Or Samoyed) Mythology]]

             The religious system of three Arctic tribes which persist in heathenism, despite repeated efforts to convert them to Christianity. Their supreme being, who is regarded as the creator and director of the universe, is called  Num. Innumerable subordinate spirits or gods, called Tatebi, are acknowledged, who combine both good and evil qualities in their natures. The priests govern the elements and control the health of human beings. They perform ceremonies in connection with births, marriages, and deaths. The Samoieds build temples, but do not set up representations of Num in them, as he is held to be invisible. The only images are those of subordinate deities.

## Samokrestschentsi[[@Headword:Samokrestschentsi]]

             SEE SAMOKRISCHTCHINA.

## Samokrischtchina[[@Headword:Samokrischtchina]]

             A sect of Russian dissenters, whose name signifies “self-baptizers,” and expresses the peculiarity by which they are distinguished from other Raskolniks.

## Samonas[[@Headword:Samonas]]

             Archbishop of Gaza, flourished about 1056. His known work is Discussion with Achmed concerning the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, found in Bibl. Max. Patr. 18, 577; Gr. and Lat. in Bibl. Patr. Gallandi, 14, 225.

## Samos[[@Headword:Samos]]

             (Σάμος, distinguished), a noted island in the Aegean Sea, near the coast of Lydia, in Asia Minor, and separated only by a narrow strait from the promontory which terminates in Cape Trogyllium. This strait, in the narrowest part, is not quite a mile in width (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 34; Strabo, 14, 634; comp. Leake, Map of Asia Minor). For its history, from the time when it was a powerful member of the Ionic confederacy to its recent struggles against Turkey during the war of independence, and since, we must refer to Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog. s.v. Samos is a very lofty and commanding island; the word, in fact, denotes a height, especially by the seashore: hence, also, the name of Samothracia, or “the Thracian Samos,” for another similar island. Samos was illustrious at a period of remote antiquity, and was at one time mistress of the sea, but its greatness was of no long duration. Tradition ascribes the birth of Pythagoras to this island, and Creophilus, said to be the son-in-law of Homer, and himself a poet of no mean pretensions, was also a Samian. The period during which  Samos enjoyed the greatest prosperity was that occupied by the government of Polycrates, who made himself master of many among the surrounding islands. The island fell subsequently under the Athenian dominion, and was considered as one of the most valuable dependencies of Athens. The people of Samos were especially worshippers of Juno or Hera, and her temple, called the Hermeon, was enriched by some of the finest works of art known in Greece, particularly statues by Myron, Polycletus, and Praxiteles. The chief manufacture carried on by the inhabitants was that of pottery, the Samian ware being celebrated all over the civilized world. It was made of a fine smooth clay of a deep red color, and many specimens of it remain to adorn the cabinets of archaeologists. It must be borne in mind, however, that the term Samian ware was soon applied to all of a similar character, wherever fabricated, just as at the present time all porcelain is called by the general name of china. The island is sometimes stated to have been famous for its wines, but, in fact, the wine of Samos was in ill repute. Strabo says expressly that the island was οὐκ εὔοινος. It now, however, ranks high for its Levantine wine, which is largely exported, as are also grapes and raisins. Samos, which is still called Samo, contained, some years ago, about 60,000 people, inhabiting eighteen large villages and about twenty small ones. Vathi is the chief town of the island in every respect, except that it is not the residence of the governor, who lives at Colonna, which takes its name from a solitary column (about fifty feet high and six in diameter), a remnant of the ancient Temple of Juno, of which some insignificant remains are lying near. Various travelers (Clarke, Tournefort, Pococke, Dallaway, Ross) have described this island. See also Georgirenes, Description of Samos, etc. (Lond. 1678); Panofka, Res Samiorum (Berlin, 1822); and especially Guerin, Description de l'Ile de Patmos et de l'Ile de Samos (Paris, 1856).

Samos is briefly referred to in two places in Scripture. The Romans wrote to the governor in favor of the Jews, in the time of Simon Maccabaeus (1Ma 15:23), and Paul touched there when going to Jerusalem, on his return from his third missionary journey (Act 20:15). He had been at Chios, and was about to proceed to Miletus, having passed by Ephesus without touching there. The topographical notices given incidentally by Luke are most exact. The night was spent at the anchorage of Trogyllium,  in the narrow strait between Samos and the extremity of the mainland ridge of Mycale. This spot is famous both for the great battle of the old Greeks against the Persians in B.C. 479, and also for a gallant action of the modern Greeks against the Turks in 1824. Here, however, it is more natural (especially since we know, as above from 1Ma 15:23, that Jews resided here) to allude to the meeting of Herod the Great with Marcus Agrippa in Samos, whence resulted many privileges to the Jews (Josephus, Ant. 16, 2, 2, 4). At that time and when Paul was there it was politically a “free city” in the province of Asia (q.v.). See Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 2, 18; Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 87 sq. SEE PAUL.

## Samosatenes, Or Samosatenians[[@Headword:Samosatenes, Or Samosatenians]]

             The followers of Paul of Samosata (q.v.).

## Samostrigolschtschina[[@Headword:Samostrigolschtschina]]

             A sect of Russian dissenters, whose name signifies “self-ordainers,” and expresses the peculiarity by which they are distinguished from other Raskolniks.

## Samothracia, Or Samothrace[[@Headword:Samothracia, Or Samothrace]]

             (Σαμοθράκη), a famous island in the northeastern part of the Aegean Sea, above the Hellespont, with a city of the same name. It was anciently called Dardana, Leucania, and also Samos; and, to distinguish it from the other Samos (q.v.), the name of Thrace was added, from its vicinity to that country. Hence, Samos of Thrace, Σάμος Θράκης, and by contraction Σαμοθράκη, Samothrace. Samothrace is about twenty miles in circumference, and about twenty miles from the coast of Thrace. The island was celebrated for the mysteries of Ceres and Proserpine, and was a sacred asylum (Diod. Sic. 3, 55; 5, 47; Ptolemy, Geog. 5, 11; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 4, 23). In ancient times it was the resort of numerous pilgrims, who regarded it as invested with peculiar sanctity. It was the seat of the worship and mysteries of the Cabiri — mysteries in which persons of the highest rank and consideration deemed it an especial honor to be initiated, and which have been a favorite subject for investigation among modern students. Samothrace is mountainous, and the central peak is the highest point in the northern part of the Aegean, and inferior only to Mount Athos  on the mainland. Homer places upon it the throne of Neptune; it towers high over Imbros, and the plains of Troy are distinctly visible from its summit. Homer describes Jupiter as watching from hence the progress of the Trojan war. The traditions of Samothrace extend to the remotest antiquity; they refer to a period when the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Bosphorus were but a series of inland lakes, and the Euxine was entirely shut away from the Aegean. It is the opinion of Niebuhr (Ancient Ethnography and Geography, 1, 182) that Samothrace was the center of the Pelasgic religion. Perseus took refuge here after his defeat by the Romans at Pydna. In later times Samothrace had, according to Pliny, the privileges of a small free state, though it was doubtless considered a dependency of the province of Macedonia. The island is now called Samothraki, frequently corrupted into Samandrichi (ἐς τὸ μανδίκι). It is but thinly peopled, principally by fishermen, and in many parts is covered with forests. It contains only a single village. The mountain is described in the Missionary Herald for 1836, p. 246; comp. Richter, Wallfahrt, p. 438 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Conze, Reise auf d. Inseln d. Thrakischen Meers (Berl. 1859).

The mention of this island in the account of Paul's first voyage to Europe (Act 16:11) is, for two reasons, worthy of careful notice. In the first place, being a very lofty and conspicuous island, it is an excellent landmark for sailors, and must have been full in view, if the weather was clear, throughout that voyage from Troas to Neapolis. From the shore at Troas, Samothrace is seen towering over Imbros (Homer, 2, 13, 12, 13; Kinglake, Eöthen, p. 64), and it is similarly a marked object in the view from the hills between Neapolis and Philippi (Clarke, Travels, ch. 13). These allusions tend to give vividness to one of the most important voyages that ever took place. Secondly, this voyage was made with a fair wind. Not only are we told that it occupied only parts of two days, whereas on a subsequent return voyage (Act 20:6) the time spent at sea was five: but the technical word here used (εὐθυδρομήσαμεν) implies that they ran before the wind. Now the position of Samothrace is exactly such as to correspond with these notices, and thus incidentally to confirm the accuracy of a most artless narrative. Paul and his companions anchored for the night off Samothrace. The ancient city, and therefore probably the usual anchorage, was on the north side, which would be sufficiently sheltered from a southeast wind. It may be added, as a further practical consideration not to  be overlooked, that such a wind would be favorable for overcoming the opposing current, which sets southerly after leaving the Dardanelles, and easterly between Samothrace and the mainland. See Conybeare and Howson, Life and Ep. of St. Paul, 1, 282 sq., Lewin, St. Paul, 1, 200.

## Sampsames[[@Headword:Sampsames]]

             (Σαμψάμης v.r. Σαμψάκης; Vulg. Lampsacus, Samsames), a name which occurs in the list of those to whom the Romans are said to have sent letters in favor of the Jews (1Ma 15:23). The name is probably not that of a sovereign (as it appears to be taken in the A.V.), but of a place, which Grimm identifies with Samsun, on the coast of the Black Sea, between Sinope and Trebizond.

## Sampson, Ezra[[@Headword:Sampson, Ezra]]

             A Congregational minister, was born at Middleborough, Mass., Feb. 12, 1749. He graduated at Yale College, 1773, and became pastor of the Congregational Church at Plympton, Mass., Feb., 1775. He also officiated as chaplain in the Revolutionary army, and was settled at Hudson, N.Y., 1796. While there he became associated with Rev. Harry Crosswell in the editorship of The Balance, one of the first literary journals in the United States (1801-4). He edited for a year (1804-5) the Connecticut Courant, and became judge of Columbia County in 1814. He died in New York City, Dec. 12, 1823. He was the author of Beauties of the Bible (1802): — Sham Patriot Unmasked (1803): — The Historical Dictionary (1804): — The Brief Remarker on the Ways of Men (1817, 1855). See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 2, 122.

## Sampson, Francis S., D.D.[[@Headword:Sampson, Francis S., D.D.]]

             An eminent Presbyterian divine, was born near Dover Mills, Goochland Co, Va., in Nov., 1814. At the age of sixteen he was placed in the family of his uncle, the Rev. Thornton Rogers, of Albemarle. Finding himself now in a religious atmosphere, he was induced to seek earnestly the salvation of his soul, made a profession of religion, and became a member of the Church in Charlottesville, Aug. 13, 1831. He graduated at the University of Virginia in 1836; subsequently studied theology at the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia; and, on the resignation of Prof. Ballantine, in the spring of 1838, was appointed teacher of Hebrew, and from that time continued to perform other duties of the Oriental department; was licensed  by the East Hanover Presbytery in Oct., 1839, and ordained as an evangelist by the same presbytery in Oct. 1841. In the summer of 1848 he visited Europe, spending his time chiefly at the universities of Halle and Berlin in the prosecution of his Oriental studies, and returned in August, 1849. In Oct. 1848, he was elected professor of Oriental literature and languages in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and in 1849 received the degree of D.D. from Hampden Sidney College. He died April 9, 1854. In 1851 Dr. Sampson delivered, at the University of Virginia, a lecture on The Authority of the Sacred Canon, and the Integrity of the Sacred Text, which was afterwards published, in connection with the series of which it formed a part; and in 1856 there was published, under the editorial supervision of his successor, Dr. Dabney, A Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. One of Dr. Sampson's most striking and valuable traits was his methodical industry. “That whatever is worth doing is worth doing well; that each task must be done with one's might in just so much time as is needed to do it perfectly, and no more; that no task is to be left till all is perfected which can be done to advantage — these were the rules of working which he carried with him from the time of his boyhood to the school, the university, the study, and the lecture room.” He was eminently conscientious in everything. Family prayers were, in his house, no hurried, unmeaning form. The whole air and tone of the exercise showed deep, conscientious sincerity and earnestness. As an instructor, Dr. Robert L. Dabney says of him, “I hesitate not to say that, as a master of the art of communicating knowledge, he was, in my view, unrivalled;” and again, “One of the foundation stones of his success was his indisputable scholarship. No man ever passed through one of his classes without a profound and admiring conviction of this.” See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 4, 795; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Sampson, Henry[[@Headword:Sampson, Henry]]

             A Nonconformist divine, was born in Nottinghamshire, and studied at Leyden and Padua. He was ejected at the Reformation, and subsequently became an eminent London physician. He died in 1705. He published an edition of Porter on Divine Grace, and prepared materials for a history of Nonconformists.

## Sampson, Richard, Ll.D.[[@Headword:Sampson, Richard, Ll.D.]]

             Bishop of Chichester in 1536. He was transferred to Coventry and Lichfield, 1542-43, and died at Eccleshall, 1554. He is the author of Commentary on Romans, etc. (Lond. 1546, 8vo): Regii Sacelli (4to).

## Sampson, Thomas[[@Headword:Sampson, Thomas]]

             a Puritan divine, was born (according to Strype) at Playford, in Suffolk, 1517, and educated at Oxford. He was ordained by archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley; was chaplain in the army of Lord Russell. In 1551 he was preferred to the rectory of All-hallows, London, and, in 1554, to the deanery of Chichester. During the reign of Mary he resided in Strasburg. Returning home on the accession of Elizabeth, he refused the bishopric of Norwich, because dissatisfied with the nature of the office. In Sept. 1560; he was made prebendary of Durham, and in Michaelmas term, 1561, he was installed dean of Christ Church, Oxford. So open and zealous was he against clerical habits that in 1564 he was deprived of his deanery, and for some time imprisoned. Notwithstanding his nonconformity, he was presented, in 1568, with the mastership of Wigston Hospital at Leicester, and had, according to Wood, a prebend in St. Paul's. He resided at Leicester until his death, April 9, 1589. He married bishop Latimer's niece, by whom he had two sons, John and Nathaniel. Besides editing two Sermons of John Bradford (1574, 8vo), a translation into English of a Sermon of St. Chrysostom (1550, 8vo), he published several Letters, and a Brief Collection of the Church and Ceremonies thereof (1592, 16mo).

## Samson[[@Headword:Samson]]

             (Heb. Shimshon', שַׁמְשׁוֹן, sunlike, shining; Sept. and N.T. Σαμψών, and so Josephus, Ant. 5, 8, 4, according to whom, however, the word means “strong:” if the root shemesh has the signification of “awe,” which Gesenius ascribes to it, the name Samson would seem naturally to allude to the “awe” and “astonishment” with which the father and mother looked upon the angel who announced Samson's birth [see Jdg 13:6; Jdg 13:18-20]), the name of the celebrated champion, deliverer, and judge of Israel, equally remarkable for his supernatural bodily prowess, his moral infirmities, and his tragical end (B.C. 1185-65). His career is one of romantic interest, and affords valuable lessons in the relations and condition of the Hebrew people.

1. History. — Samson was the son of Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, and was born, B.C. cir. 1200, of a mother whose name is nowhere given in the Scriptures. The circumstances under which his birth was announced by a heavenly messenger gave distinct presage of an extraordinary character, whose endowments were to be of a nature suited to the providential exigencies in which he was raised up. The burden of the oracle to his mother, who had long been barren, was that the child with which she was pregnant was to be a son, who should be a Nazarite from his birth, upon whose head no razor was to come, and who was to prove a signal deliverer to his people. She was directed, accordingly, to conform her own regimen to the tenor of the Nazaritish law, and strictly abstain from wine and all intoxicating liquor, and from every species of impure food. According to the “prophecy going before upon him,” Samson was born in the following year; and his destination to great achievements began to evince itself at a very early age by the illapses of superhuman strength which came, from time to time, upon him.

As the position of the tribe of Dan — bordering upon the territory of the Philistines — exposed them especially to the predatory incursions of this people, it was plainly the design of Heaven to raise up a deliverer in that region where he was most needed. The Philistines, therefore, became very naturally the objects of that retributive course of proceedings in which Samson was to be the principal actor, and upon which he could only enter by seeking some occasion of exciting hostilities that would bring the two peoples into direct collision. Such an occasion was afforded by his meeting with one of the daughters of the Philistines at Timnath, whom he besought his parents to procure for him in marriage, assigning as a reason that she “pleased him well” — Heb. ישרה בעיני הוא, She is right in mine eyes; not beautiful, engaging, attractive, but right relative to an end, purpose, or object (see Gousset, Lexicon, s.v. ישר, and comp. 2Sa 17:4; 1Ki 9:12; 2 Chronicles 12:30; Num 28:27). That he entertained a genuine affection for the woman, notwithstanding the policy by which he was prompted, we may, doubtless, admit; but that he intended, at the same time, to make this alliance subservient to the great purpose of delivering his country from oppression, and that in this he was acting under the secret control of Providence, would seem to be clear from the words immediately following, when, in reference to the objection of his parents to such a union. it is said that they “knew not that it was of the Lord that he sought an occasion against the Philistines.” It is here worthy of note that  the Hebrew, instead of “against the Philistines,” has “of or from the Philistines,” apparently implying that the occasion sought should be one that originated on the side of the Philistines. This occasion he sought under the immediate prompting of the Most High, who saw fit, in this indirect manner, to bring about the accomplishment of his designs of retribution on his enemies. His leading purpose in this seems to have been to baffle the power of the whole Philistine nation by the prowess of a single individual. The champion of Israel, therefore, was not appointed so much to be the leader of an army, like the other judges, as to be an army in himself. In order, then, that the contest might be carried on in this way, it was necessary that the entire opposition of the Philistines should be concentrated, as far as possible, against the person of Samson. This would array the contending parties in precisely such an attitude as to illustrate most signally the power of God in the overthrow of his enemies. But how could this result be brought about except by means of some private quarrel between Samson and the enemy with whom he was to contend? And who shall say that the scheme now projected was not the very best that could have been devised for accomplishing the end which God had in view? To what extent Samson himself foresaw the issue of this transaction, or how far he had a plan distinctly laid, corresponding with the results that ensued, it is difficult to say. The probability, we think, is that he had rather a general strong impression, wrought by the Spirit of God, than a definite conception of the train of events that were to transpire. It was, however, a conviction as to the issue sufficiently powerful to warrant both him and his parents in going forward with the measure. They were in some way assured that they were engaged in a proceeding which God would overrule to the furtherance of his designs of mercy to his people and of judgment to their oppressors. From this point commences that career of achievements and prodigies on the part of this Israelitish Hercules which, passing gradually from the wonderful to the miraculous, rendered him the terror of his enemies and the wonder of all ages.

(1.) On his first visit to his future bride, he slew a lion without weapons; and on his second visit, to espouse her, he found the skeleton, denuded of the flesh by the birds and jackals, occupied by a swarm of bees (Jdg 14:1-8). The strange incident of a Nazarite eating honey out of the carcass of a dead lion has been examined by Theodoret (Quest. in Jud 1:22). We must not attribute too scrupulous views to the times of the Judges. It is  worthy of remark, however, that Josephus (Ant. 5, 8, 6) says nothing of the eating of this honey by Samson and his parents.

(2.) At his wedding feast, the attendance of a large company of paranymphs, or friends of the bridegroom, convened ostensibly for the purpose of honoring his nuptials, but in reality to keep an insidious watch upon his movements, furnished the occasion of a common Oriental device for enlivening entertainments of this nature. He propounded a riddle, the solution of which referred to his obtaining a quantity of honey from the carcass of a slain lion; and the clandestine manner in which his guests got possession of the clue to the enigma cost thirty Philistines their lives (Jdg 14:10-20).

(3.) The next instance of his vindictive cunning was prompted by the ill treatment which he had received at the hands of his father-in-law, who, upon a frivolous pretext, had given away his daughter in marriage to another man, and was executed by securing a multitude of foxes, or rather jackals (שועלים, shualim), and, by tying firebrands to their tails, setting fire to the cornfields of his enemies. (See the Latin monographs on this subject by Hilliger [Viteb. 1674], Gasser [Halle, 1751], and Vriemoet [Franc. 1738.) The indignation of the Philistines, on discovering the author of the outrage, vented itself upon the family of his father-in-law, who had been the remote occasion of it, in the burning of their house, in which both father and daughter perished. This was a fresh provocation, for which Samson threatened to be revenged; and, thereupon falling upon them without ceremony, he smote them, as it is said, “hip and thigh, with a great slaughter” (Jdg 15:18). The original, strictly rendered, runs, “he smote them leg upon thigh” — apparently a proverbial expression, and implying, according to Gesenius, that he cut them to pieces so that their limbs — their legs and thighs — were scattered and heaped promiscuously together; equivalent to saying that he smote and destroyed them wholly, entirely. Mr. Taylor, in his edition of Calmet, recognizes in these words an allusion to some kind of wrestling combat, in which, perhaps, the slaughter on this occasion may have commenced.

(4.) Having subsequently taken up his residence in the rock Etam, he was thence dislodged by consenting to a pusillanimous arrangement on the part of his own countrymen, by which he agreed to surrender himself in bonds, provided they would not themselves fall upon him and kill him. He probably gave in to this measure from a strong inward assurance that the  issue of it would be to afford him a new occasion of taking vengeance upon his foes. Being brought, in this apparently helpless condition, to a place called, from the event, Lehi, a jaw, his preternatural potency suddenly put itself forth; and, snapping the cords asunder, and snatching up the jawbone of an ass, he dealt so effectually about him that a thousand men were slain on the spot. That this was altogether the work, not of man, but of God, was soon demonstrated. Wearied with his exertions, the illustrious Danite became faint from thirst; and, as there was no water in the place, he prayed that a fountain might be opened. His prayer was heard: God caused a stream to gush from a hollow rock hard by; and Samson, in gratitude, gave it the name of Enhakker, a word that signifies “the well of him that prayed,” and which continued to be the designation of the fountain ever after. The place received its name from the circumstance of his having then so effectually wielded the jawbone (לחי, Lehi) (Jdg 15:15 sq.; see Bauer, Heb. Myth. 2, 65; Ausführl. Erklär. des W. 2, 57; comp. Jdg 3:31; 2Sa 23:8; 2Sa 23:18). The springing up of a fountain in the jawbone (2Sa 23:19) has given great trouble to the interpreters; and some would remove the passage from the text, or give it a very different meaning. The most common is to render lechi, לְחַי, not jawbone, but Lehi, the name of a place in which the fountain sprang up; and maktesh, מִכְתֵּשׁ, not the socket of the tooth, but the rift of the rock from which the water came. So the Targum, and Josephus (Ant. 5, 8, 9; comp. Clericus in loc.; Ortlob, De Fonte Simsonis prope Maxillam [Leips. 1703]; Deyling, Observat. Sacr. 1, 113 sq.; Busing, in the Biblioth. Hagana, 2, 505 sq.; Herder, Geist der ebr. Poesie, 2, 235, 255; Rosenmüller, Schol. in loc.). It would seem that Lehi refers back to 2Sa 23:15, and the rendering of maktesh is assumed. It would be easier, with Studer, to take Lehi for the name of a wall of rock, an opening in which was called maktesh, tooth cavity. Yet it seems to be doubtful whether maktesh alone could have this meaning. (See in general Gesenius, Thesaur. 2, 752.) Heine (Dissertat. Sacr. p. 241 sq.) opposes another exegetical attempt on this passage, and clings to the entire miracle. Comp. Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 171 sq.). SEE LEHI.

(5.) The Philistines were from this time held in such contempt by their victor that he went openly into the city of Gaza, where he seems to have suffered himself weakly to be drawn into the company of a woman of loose character, the yielding to whose enticements exposed him to the most imminent peril (Jdg 16:1-3). His presence being soon noised abroad, an attempt was made during the night forcibly to detain him by closing the  gates of the city, and making them fast; but Samson, apprised of it, rose at midnight, and, breaking away bolts, bars, and hinges, departed, carrying the gates upon his shoulders to the top of a neighboring hill that looks towards Hebron (על פני חַברון; Sept. ἐπὶ προσώπου τοῦ Χεβρών, facing Hebron). The common rendering, “before Hebron,” is less appropriate, as the distance between the two cities is at least twenty miles. The hill lay, doubtless, somewhere between the cities, and in full view of both. SEE GAZA.

(6.) After this his enemies strove to entrap him by guile rather than by violence, and they were too successful in the end. Falling in love with a woman of Sorek, named Delilah, he became so infatuated by his passion that nothing but his bodily strength could equal his mental weakness. (But see Oeder, De Simsone Casto [Onold. 1718].) The princes of the Philistines, aware of Samson's infirmity, determined by means of it to get possession, if possible, of his person. For this purpose they propose a tempting bribe to Delilah, and she enters at once into the treacherous compact. She employs all her art and blandishments to worm from him the secret of his prodigious strength. Having for some time amused her with fictions, he at last, in a moment of weakness, disclosed to her the fact that it lay in his hair, which, if it were shaved, would leave him a mere common man. Not that his strength really lay in his hair; for this, in fact, had no natural influence upon it one way or the other. His strength arose from his relation to God as a Nazarite; and the preservation of his hair unshorn was the mark, or sign, of his Nazariteship, and a pledge, on the part of God, of the continuance of his miraculous physical powers. If he lost this sign, the badge of his consecration, he broke his vow, and consequently forfeited the thing signified. God abandoned him; and he was thenceforward no more, in this respect, than an ordinary man. His treacherous paramour seized the first opportunity of putting his declaration to the test. She shaved his head while he lay sleeping in her lap; and, at a concerted signal, he was instantly arrested by his enemies lying in wait. Bereft of his grand endowment, and forsaken of God, the champion of Israel could now well adopt the words of Solomon: “I find more bitter than death the woman whose heart is snares and nets, and her hands are bands; whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her; but the sinner shall be taken by her.” Having so long presumptuously played with his ruin, Heaven leaves him to himself, as a punishment for his former guilty indulgence. He is made to reap as he had sown, and is consigned to the hands of his relentless foes. His punishment  was indeed severe, though he amply revenged it, as well as redeemed, in a measure, his own honor, by the manner in which he met his death. The Philistines, having deprived him of sight, at first immured him in a prison, and made him grind at the mill like a slave (Jdg 16:4-21). As this was an employment which, in the East, usually devolves on women, to assign it to such a man as Samson was virtually to reduce him to the lowest state of degradation and shame. To grind corn for others was, even for a woman, a proverbial term expressive of the most menial and oppressed condition. How much more for the hero of Israel, who seems to have been made grinder general for the prison house! (See Lehmann, De Simsone Molitore (Viteb. 1711].)

(7.) In process of time, while remaining in this confinement, his hair recovered its growth, and with it such a profound repentance seems to have wrought in his heart as virtually reinvested him with the character and the powers he had so culpably lost. Of this fact his enemies were not aware. Still exulting in their possession of the great scourge of their nation, they kept him, like a wild beast, for mockery and insult. On one of these occasions, when an immense multitude, including the princes and nobility of the Philistines, were convened in a large amphitheater to celebrate a feast in honor of their god Dagon, who had delivered their adversary into their hands, Samson was ordered to be brought out to be made a laughing stock to his enemies, a butt for their scoffs, insults, mockeries, and merriment. Secretly determined to use his recovered strength to tremendous effect, he persuaded the boy who guided his steps to conduct him to a spot where he could reach the two pillars upon which the roof of the building rested (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 343). Here, after pausing for a short time while he prefers a brief prayer to Heaven, he grasps the massy pillars, and, bowing with resistless force, the whole building rocks and totters, and the roof, encumbered with the weight of the spectators, rushes down, and the whole assembly, including Samson himself, are crushed to pieces in the ruin (Jdg 16:22 sq.).

Thus terminated the career of one of the most remarkable personages of all history, whether sacred or profane. The enrolment of his name by an apostolic pen (Heb 11:32) in the list of the ancient worthies, “who had by faith obtained an excellent repute,” warrants us, undoubtedly, in a favorable estimate of his character on the whole, while at the same time the fidelity of the inspired narrative has perpetuated the record of infirmities which must forever mar the luster of his noble deeds. It is not improbable  that the lapses with which he was chargeable arose, in a measure, from the very peculiarities of that physical temperament to which his prodigies of strength were owing; but while this consideration may palliate, it cannot excuse the moral delinquencies into which he was betrayed, and of which a just Providence exacted so tremendous a penalty in the circumstances of his degradation and death. (See Weissenborn, De Morte Simsonis [Jena, 1705]; Maichel, Simson ab Crimine Vindicat. [Tübing. 1739].)

His relatives, we are told (Jdg 16:31), went and recovered his body, and interred it in the burying place of his father Manoah. The consternation produced at Gaza by the catastrophe connected with his death, we can easily conceive, would render this easier of accomplishment. SEE PHILISTINE.

2. Representative Relations. — Some of these have been in part touched upon in the foregoing narrative, but Samson was so striking a character that they need to be more specifically dwelt upon.

(1.) As a judge his authority seems to have been limited to the district bordering upon the country of the Philistines, and his action as a deliverer does not seem to have extended beyond desultory attacks upon the dominant Philistines, by which their hold upon Israel was weakened, and the way prepared for the future emancipation of the Israelites from their yoke. It is evident from Jdg 13:1; Jdg 13:5; Jdg 15:9-11; Jdg 15:20, and the whole history, that the Israelites, or at least Judah and Dan, which are the only tribes mentioned, were subject to the Philistines through the whole of Samson's judgeship; so that, of course, Samson's twenty years of office would be included in the entire period of the Philistine dominion, which Usher and some others have hastily concluded was limited to the forty years of Eli's administration. From the angel's speech to Samson's mother (Jdg 13:5) it appears further that the Israelites were already subject to the Philistines at his birth; and, as Samson cannot have begun to be judge before he was twenty years of age, it has erroneously been supposed that his judgeship must about have coincided with the last twenty years of Philistine dominion. But when we turn to the first book of Samuel, and especially to 7:1-14, we find that the Philistine dominion continued till the judgeship of Samuel. Hence it appears that Samson and Samuel were separated by the whole interval of Eli's judgeship and of Samuel's minority. SEE CHRONOLOGY. There are, however, several points in the respective narratives of the times of Samson and Samuel which indicate  great similarity of circumstances. First, there is the general prominence of the Philistines in their relation to Israel. Secondly, there is the remarkable coincidence of both Samson and Samuel being Nazarites (Jdg 13:5; Jdg 16:17; comp. 1Sa 1:1). It looks as if the great exploits of the young Danite Nazarite had suggested to Hannah the consecration of her son in like manner, or, at all events, as if for some reason the Nazaritish vow was at that time prevalent. No other mention of Nazarites occurs in the Scripture history till Amo 2:11-12; and even there the allusion seems to be to Samuel and Samson. Thirdly, there is a similar notice of the house of Dagon in Jdg 16:23 and 1Sa 5:2. Fourthly, the lords of the Philistines are mentioned in a similar way in Jdg 16:8; Jdg 16:18; Jdg 16:27, and in 1Sa 7:7. The effect of Samson's prowess must have been more of a preparatory kind, by arousing the cowed spirit of his people, and shaking the insolent security of the Philistines, than in the way of decisive victory or deliverance. There is no allusion whatever to other parts of Israel during Samson's judgeship, except the single fact of the men of the border tribe of Judah, three thousand in number, fetching him from the rock Etam to deliver him up to the Philistines (Jdg 15:9-13). The whole narrative is entirely local, and, like the following story concerning Micah (Judges 17:18) seems to be taken from the annals of the tribe of Dan. Still it does not follow that there were contemporary judges in other parts of the land. SEE JUDGE.

(2.) As a Nazarite, Samson exhibits the law in Numbers 6 in full practice. The eminence of such Nazarites as Samson and Samuel would tend to give that dignity to the profession which is alluded to in Lam 4:7-8. SEE NAZARITE.

(3.) As an inspired person, Samson is one of those who are distinctly spoken of in Scripture as endowed with supernatural power by the Spirit of the Lord. Those specimens of extraordinary prowess, of which even the slaying of the lion at Timnath without weapons was one, were doubtless the result of that special influence of the Most High which is referred to in Jdg 13:25”; And the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol.” The import of the original word (לפעם) for moved is peculiar. As פָּעִם, the radical form, signifies an anvil, the metaphor is probably drawn from the repeated and somewhat violent strokes of a workman with his hammer. It implies, therefore, a peculiar urgency, an impelling influence, which he could not well resist in himself, nor others in him. But we do not know that this  attribute, in its utmost degree, constantly dwelt in him. So, in later exploits, it is said, “The Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and the cords that were upon his arms became as flax burned with fire;” “The Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he went down to Ashkelon, and slew thirty men of them.” But, on the other hand, after his locks were cut, and his strength was gone from him, it is said “He wist not that the Lord was departed from him” (Jdg 13:25; Jdg 14:6; Jdg 14:19; Jdg 15:14; Jdg 16:20). The phrase “the Spirit of the Lord came upon him” is common to him with Othniel and Gideon (Jdg 3:10; Jdg 6:34); but the connection of supernatural power with the integrity of the Nazaritish vow, and the particular gift of great strength of body, as seen in tearing in pieces a lion, breaking his bonds asunder, carrying the gates of the city upon his back, and throwing down the pillars which supported the house of Dagon, are quite peculiar to Samson. Indeed, his whole character and history have no exact parallel in Scripture. It is easy, however, to see how forcibly the Israelites would be taught by such an example that their national strength lay in their complete separation from idolatry and consecration to the true God; and that he could give them power to subdue their mightiest enemies, if only they were true to his service (comp. 1Sa 2:10). (See the Eclectic Review, Nov. 1861.)

(4.) As to Mythological Coincidences. — The narrative of Samson's deeds has often been compared with the mythical story of the Greek Hercules. (See especially Vogel, in the Hall. Encyclop. 2, § 6, 8 sq.; Riskoff, Die Simsonsage u. d. Herakles-Mythus [ Leips. 1861].) Thus his combat with the lion is compared with the conquest of the Nemean lion (Diod. Sic. 4, 11; Apollod. 2, 5, 1), and another fearful lion on Mt. Cithaeron (Apollod. 2, 4, 9); his capture of the jackals with the capture of the stag of Diana (Diod. Sic. 4, 13; Apollod. 2, 5, 3), and of the Cretan bull (Apollod. 2, 5, 7; Diod. Sic. 4, 13); his slaughter of his paranymphs' friends with the overthrow of the king of the Minyae, Erginus, and his host, by Hercules, in a narrow pass (Apollod. 2, 4, 11; mentioned, too, by Herod. 2, 45); his carrying off the gates of Gaza with the carrying away of the Cretan bull (Diod. Sic. 4, 13); but, above all, the destruction of Samson by his beloved Delilah has been compared with the overcoming of Hercules through Omphale (Diod. Sic. 4:31; Apollod. 2, 6, 3; comp. Senec. Hippol. p. 318 sq.); in fine, Samson's wonderful birth (Judges 13) with that of Hercules (see Bauer, Hebr. Myth. 2, 86 sq.). Those, however, have far less ground who identify Samson with the Phoenician Hercules, the sun god.  Basing the view on the etymology of the name (see Vatke, Bibl. Theol. 1, 368 sq.), they labor, viewing the whole story of Samson as a myth, to explain the details by the course and operation of the sun (Borkhausen, in the Coburg. Annal. d. Theol. 1833, 3, 2, 3; 4, 1; comp. Jerome, Ep. ad Philem. 7, 752). There are many other striking parallels in the Greek mythology — e.g. in the Croton Milo and other strong men (Pliny, 7, 19); in the deeds of Theseus, especially the destruction of the wild boar at Crommyon (Diod. Sic. 4, 59), and the carrying away of a living bull to Athens (Bauer, 1. c. p. 91 sq.); of king Nisus in Megara, who lost his kingdom at the same time with his hair (Ovid, Met. 8, 8 sq., 84 sq.; Virgil, Cir. 120 sq.; Hygar. Fab. 198); of the fountain Aganippe, which sprang from the footstep of Pegasus, etc. But there is no reason for rejecting the historical existence of Samson; and his character and deeds accord well with the state of the Israelites in the time of the Judges. Yet the opinion is widely held that the traditions out of which the book of Judges is compiled have exaggerated his exploits (Bauer, Hebr. Myth. 2, 69 sq.; Hebr. Gesch. 2, 88 sq.). Hence some have undertaken to explain the account from natural causes and commonplace events most fruitlessly (Harenberg, in the Brem. u. Verd. Biblioth. 2, 302 sq.; Bern, in Semler's Hall. Samml. 1, 4, 1 sq.; Hezel, Schriftforsch. 1, 653 sq.; Justi, in Eichhorn's Repert. 7, 78 sq.; also in his Vermn. Abhandl. 1, 146 sq.; Diederich, Zur Gesch. Sims. [Gött. 1778]; Herder, Geist. d. ebr. Poes. 2, 235 sq., 252 sq.). Yet more trifling is the hypothesis of Kaiser (Commentar. in Priora Genes. Cap. p. 188 sq.) that Samson was striving to mimic and mock the Philistine Hercules. Once more: “Hercules once went to Egypt, and there the inhabitants took him, and, putting a chaplet on his head, led him out in solemn procession, intending to offer him in sacrifice to Jupiter. For a while he submitted quietly; but when they led him up to the altar and began the ceremonies, he put forth his strength and slew them all” (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 45).

The passage from Lycophron, with the scholion, quoted by Bochart (Hieroz. pars 2, lib. 5, cap. 12), where Hercules is said to have been three nights in the belly of the sea monster, and to have come out with the loss of all his hair, is also curious, and seems to be a compound of the stories of Samson and Jonah. To this may be added the connection between Samson, considered as, derived from Shemesh, “the sun,” and the designation of Moui, the Egyptian Hercules, as “Son of the Sun,” worshipped also under the name Sem, which Sir G. Wilkinson compares with Samson. The Tyrian Hercules (whose temple at Tyre is described by Herod. 2, 44), he also tells  us, “was originally the sun, and the same as Baal” (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 44, note 7). The connection between the Phoenician Baal (called Baal Shemen, Baal Shemesh, and Baal Hamman) and Hercules is well known. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. בעל) tells us that in certain Phoenician inscriptions, which are accompanied by a Greek translation, Baal is rendered Herakles, and that “the Tyrian Hercules” is the constant Greek designation of the Baal of Tyre. He also gives many Carthaginian inscriptions to Baal Hamman, which he renders Baal Solaris; and also a sculpture in which Baal Hamman's head is surrounded with rays, and which has an image of the sun on the upper part of the monument (Mon. Phoen. 1, 171; 2, tab. 21). Another evidence of the identity of the Phoenician Baal and Hercules may be found in Bauli, near Baiae, a place sacred to Hercules (“locus Herculis,” Serv.), but evidently so called from Baal. Thirlwall (Hist. of Greece) ascribes to the numerous temples built by the Phoenicians in honor of Baal in their different settlements the Greek fables of the labors and journeys of Hercules. Bochart thinks the custom described by Ovid (Fast. 54) of tying a lighted torch between two foxes in the circus, in memory of the damage once done to the harvest by a fox with burning hay and straw tied to it, was derived from the Phoenicians, and is clearly to be traced to the history of Samson (Hieroz. pars 1, lib. 3, cap. 8). From all this, however, arises little probability that the Greek and Latin conception of Hercules in regard to his strength was derived from Phoenician stories and reminiscences of the great Hebrew hero Samson. Some learned men connect the name Hercules with Samson etymologically (see Wilkinson's note in Rawlinson's Herod. 2, 43; Patrick, On Judges 16, 30; Cornel. a Lapide, etc.); but none of these etymologies are very convincing. Nevertheless, the following description of Hercules, given by C.O. Müller (Dorians, bk. 2, ch. 12), might almost have been written for Samson: “The highest degree of human suffering and courage is attributed to Hercules: his character is as noble as could be conceived in those rude and early times; but he is by no means represented as free from the blemishes of human nature; on the contrary, he is frequently subject to wild, ungovernable passions, when the noble indignation and anger of the suffering hero degenerate into frenzy. Every crime, however, is atoned for by some new suffering; but nothing breaks his invincible courage until, purified from earthly corruption, he ascends Mount Olympus.” Again: “Hercules was a jovial guest, and not backward in enjoying himself.... It was Hercules, above all other heroes, whom mythology placed in ludicrous situations, and sometimes made the butt of the buffoonery of others. The  Cercopes are represented as alternately amusing and annoying the hero. In works of art they are often represented as satyrs who rob the hero of his quiver, bow, and club. Hercules, annoyed at their insults, binds two of them to a pole, and marches off with his prize.... It also seems that mirth and buffoonery were often combined with the festivals of Hercules: thus at Athens there was a society of sixty men, who, on the festival of the Diomean Hercules, attacked and amused themselves and others with sallies of wit.” The commentary of Adam Clarke presents us with the results of De Lavour, an ingenious French writer, on this subject, from which it will be seen that the coincidences are extremely striking, and such as would, perhaps, afford to most minds, an additional proof of how much the ancient mythologies were a distorted reflection of the Scripture narrative. Phoenician traders, it is imagined, might easily have carried stories concerning the Hebrew hero to the different countries where they traded, especially Greece and Italy; and such stories would have been molded according to the taste or imagination of those who heard them. Whatever is thought, however, of such coincidences, it is certain that the history of Samson is a historical, and not an allegorical, narrative. It has also a distinctly supernatural element which cannot be explained away. The history, as we now have it, must have been written several centuries after Samson's death (Jdg 15:19-20; Jdg 18:1; Jdg 18:30; Jdg 19:1), though probably taken from the annals of the tribe of Dan. Josephus has given it pretty fully, but with alterations and embellishments of his own, after his manner. The older writers on Samson contribute nothing to the interpretation of the history (e.g. Marck, in his Dissert. Philol. Exeget. p. 173 sq.). The effort to rid the story of its miraculous air appears already in Stackhouse (Bibl. Hist. 3, 776 sq.). The Wolfenbüttel Fragments (according to the specimens in Bayle and others) would simply degrade Samson; and Niemeyer (Charak. 3, 524 sq.) accomplishes nothing beyond showing that this willful and rough hero of the olden time, judged by the moral law, is unworthy of comparison with Christ (see Hauke, De Simsone Typo Christi [Alt. 1740]). Samson was earnest and patriotic; to him his Nazaritish consecration was not a mere religious veil, but a living impulse, and no one can properly deny him the dignity of a shophet, or judge (Bertheau, Buch der Richter, p. 14, Einleit.), unless he understands the word in a narrow and too modern sense. The moral significance of Samson's life has been first set forth by Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 2, 401 sq.), but he seems to have idealized his hero too much (comp. the excellent remarks of Bertheau, op. cit. p. 168 sq.). The only mention of Samson in the New Test. confirms his historical character,  being that in Heb 11:32, where he is coupled with Gideon, Barak, and Jephthah, and spoken of as one of those who “through faith waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens.” For other monographs on Samson, see Darling, Cyclopoedia Bibliographica, col. 285.

## Samson, Bernhardin[[@Headword:Samson, Bernhardin]]

             A Franciscan monk, who plied the traffic in indulgences in Switzerland at the time of Tetzel's exploits in Saxony, was a native of Milan, but the dates of his birth and death are not known. He is described by his contemporaries as an eloquent, insolent monk. He was employed in the indulgence traffic by cardinal Forli, to whom Leo X had farmed out the territory of Switzerland. He entered Switzerland in August, 1518, and passed from canton to canton with great success, assuming great state, and giving great offense to the local clergy. Meantime Zwingli was called as priest to Zurich. He had already raised his voice against the traffic, but now he was summoned by bishop Hugo to make a direct attack upon Samson. Others also were likewise summoned. As Samson had not duly presented his credentials to the bishop, the latter ordered his whole diocese to exclude him from their churches. Samson retired into Baden, and met with great success. In his zeal in urging the indulgences upon the people, he represented the souls thereby rescued from purgatory as flying to heaven by swarms: “Ecce volant! Ecce volant!” In Feb., 1519, he went to Bremgarten, but Henry Bullinger, the priest of the place, refused to admit him into his church. Thereupon Samson pronounced the ban against him, and threatened to complain against him to the government at Zurich. On reaching Zurich, however, he was peremptorily ordered to absolve Bullinger, and to quit the country. In answer to a complaint of the Swiss authorities, pope Leo X announced (April 30, 1519) that he had already recalled Samson, and that in case their complaints were found corroborated, he should punish him. After Samson's retiring to Italy, all trace of him is lost. See the authorities cited in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13:392-394. (J.P.L.)

## Samson, Hermann[[@Headword:Samson, Hermann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Riga, December 16, 1642, is the author of, De Basi Fidei seu de Scriptura Sacra: — De Auctoritate Scripturae Sacrae: — De Imagine Dei in Primo Homine Statuque Innocentiae: — De Autore et Causa Peccati: — De Baptismo: — De Sacra Coena: — De Ecclesia: — Num Sancti sint Invocandi: — De Anti- Christo. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Samuel[[@Headword:Samuel]]

             (Heb. Shemuel', שַׁמוּאֵל [on the signification, see below]; Sept. and New Test. Σαμουήλ), the last of those extraordinary regents that presided over the Hebrew commonwealth under the title of judges (q.v.), and the first of  the line of the prophets (q.v.) specially so called (Act 13:20). As such he possesses peculiar interest in the history of the chosen people. SEE SAMUEL.

I. Name. — Of this different derivations have been given:

(1) שֵׁם אֵל, “name of God;” so apparently Origen (Euseb. H. E. 6, 25), i.q. Θεοκλητός.

(2) אֵל שׁוּם, “placed by God.”

(3) שָׁאוּל אֵל, “asked of God” (1Sa 1:20). Josephus (who gives this interpretation, Σαμούηλος, Ant. 5, 10, 3) ingeniously makes it correspond to the well-known Greek name Θεαίτητος.

(4) שְׁמוּעִ אֵל, “heard of God.” This, which is the most obvious, may have the same meaning as the previous derivation, which is supported by the sacred text (1Sa 1:20).

II. History. —

1. Private Life. — The circumstances of his birth were ominous of his future career. He was the son of Elkanah, an Ephrathite or Ephraimite, and Hannah or Anna. His father is one of the few private citizens in whose household we find polygamy. It may possibly have arisen from the irregularity of the period, but more probably from the sterility of his wife Hannah, whom, as she is always named first, and is known to have been the favorite, he probably married first. The usual effect of polygamy was felt in Elkanah's household. The sterility of Hannah brought upon her the taunts and ridicule of her conjugal rival, who “provoked her sore, to make her fret, because the Lord had shut up her womb” (1Sa 1:6). The jealousy of Peninnah was excited also by the superior affection which was shown to Hannah by her husband. “To Hannah he gave a worthy portion; for he loved Hannah” (1Sa 1:5). More especially at the period of the sacred festivals did the childless solitude of Hannah create within her the most poignant regrets, when she saw her husband give portions to all the sons and daughters of Peninnah, who, exulting in maternal pride and fondness, took advantage of these seasons to subject the favorite wife to a natural feminine retaliation. Hannah's life was embittered, “she wept and did not eat” (1Sa 1:7). SEE HANNAH.

The descent of Samuel's father, Elkanah, is involved in great obscurity. In 1Sa 1:1 he is described as an Ephraimite. In 1Ch 6:22-23 he is made a descendant of Korah the Levite (see the table below). Hengstenberg (on Psa 78:1) and Ewald (2, 433) explain this by supposing that the Levites were occasionally incorporated into the tribes among whom they dwelt. The question, however, is of no practical importance, because, even if Samuel were a Levite, he certainly was not a regular priest by descent. In virtue of his semi-sacerdotal lineage as a Levite, and especially by the authority of his office as a prophet, he hesitated not to perform priestly functions, like Elijah and others. The opinion was, nevertheless, in former times very current that Samuel was a priest — nay, some imagine that he succeeded Eli in the pontificate. Many of the fathers inclined to this notion, but Jerome affirms (Advers. Jovin.), “Samuel propheta fuit, Judex fuit, Levita fuit, non pontifex, ne sacerdos quidem” (Ortlob, “Samuel Judex et Propheta, non Pont. aut Sacerd. Sacrificans,” in the Thesaurus Novus Theol. Philol. Hasaei et Ikenii, 1, 587; Selden, De Success. ad Pontiff. lib. 1, c, 4). The American translator of De Wette's Introduction to the Old Testament (2, 21) say's he was a priest, though not of Levitical descent, slighting the information of Chronicles, and pronouncing Samuel at the same time to be only a mythical character.

Samuel's birthplace is one of the vexed questions of sacred geography, as his descent is of sacred genealogy. SEE RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM. All that appears with certainty from the accounts is that it was in the hills of Ephraim, and (as may be inferred from its name) a double height, used for the purpose of beacons or outlookers (1Sa 1:1). At the foot of the hill was a well (1Sa 19:22). On the brow of its two summits was the city. It never lost its hold on Samuel, who in later life made it his fixed abode.

The combined family must have been large. Peninnah had several children, and Hannah had, besides Samuel, three sons and two daughters. But of these nothing is known, unless the names of the sons are those enumerated in 1Ch 6:26-27. It is on the mother of Samuel that our chief attention is fixed in the account of his birth. She is described as a woman of a high religious mission. Almost a Nazarite by practice (1Sa 1:15), and a prophetess in her gifts (2:1), she sought from God the gift of the  child for which she longed with a passionate devotion of silent prayer, of which there is no other example in the Old Test.; and when the son was granted, the name which he bore, and thus first introduced into the world, expressed her sense of the urgency of her entreaty — Samuel, “the asked, or heard, of God.” Living in the great age of vows, she had before his birth dedicated him to the office of a Nazarite. As soon as he was weaned, she herself, with her husband, brought him to the tabernacle at Shiloh, where she had received the first intimation of his birth, and there solemnly consecrated him. The form of consecration was similar to that with which the irregular priesthood of Jeroboam was set apart in later times (2Ch 13:9) — a bullock of three years old (Sept.), loaves (Sept.), an ephah of flour, and a skin of wine (1Sa 1:24). First took place the usual sacrifices (Sept.) by Elkanah himself; then, after the introduction of the child, the special sacrifice of the bullock. Then his mother made him over to Eli (1Sa 1:25; 1Sa 1:28), and (according to the Heb. text. but not the Sept.) the child himself performed an act of worship. The hymn which followed on this consecration is the first of the kind in the sacred volume. It is possible that, like many of the psalms, it may have been enlarged in later times to suit great occasions of victory and the like. But 1Sa 1:5 specially applies to this event, and 1Sa 1:7-8 may well express the sense entertained by the prophetess of the coming revolution in the fortunes of her son and of her country.

From this time the child is shut up in the tabernacle. The priests furnished him with a sacred garment, an ephod, made, like their own, of white linen, though of inferior quality, and his mother every year, apparently at the only time of their meeting, gave him a little mantle reaching down to his feet, such as was worn only by high personages, or women, over the other dress, and such as he retained, as his badge, till the latest times of his life. He seems to have slept near the holy place (1Sa 3:3), and his special duty was to put out, as it would seem, the sacred candlestick, and to open the doors at sunrise.

2. Samuel's Call. — In this way his childhood was passed. It was while thus sleeping in the tabernacle that he received his first prophetic call. The stillness of the night, the sudden voice, the childlike misconception, the venerable Eli, the contrast between the terrible doom and the gentle creature who has to announce it, give to this portion of the narrative a universal interest. It is this side of Samuel's career that has been so well caught in the well known picture of Sir Joshua Reynolds. The degeneracy  of the people at this time was extreme. The tribes seem to have administered their affairs as independent republics; the national confederacy was weak and disunited; and the spirit of public patriotic enterprise had been worn out by constant turmoil and invasion. The theocratic influence was also scarcely felt, its peculiar ministers being withdrawn, and its ordinary manifestations, except in the routine of the Levitical ritual, having ceased. The “word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision” (1Sa 3:1). The young devotee, “the child Samuel,” was selected by Jehovah to renew the deliverance of his oracles. According to Josephus (Ant. 5, 10, 4), he was at this time twelve years old. As he reclined in his chamber adjoining the sacred edifice, the Lord, by means adapted to his juvenile capacity, made known to him his first and fearful communication — the doom of Eli's apostate house. Other revelations speedily followed this. The frequency of God's messages to the young prophet established his fame, and the exact fulfilment of them secured his reputation. The oracle of Shiloh became vocal again through the youthful hierophant (1 Samuel 3, 19-21). From this moment the prophetic character of Samuel was established. His words were treasured up, and Shiloh became the resort of those who came to hear him (1Sa 3:19-21). The fearful fate pronounced on the head and family of the pontificate was soon executed. Eli had indulgently tolerated, or leniently palliated, the rapacity and profligacy of his sons. Through their extortions and impiety “men abhorred the offering of the Lord,” and Jehovah's wrath was kindled against the sacerdotal transgressors. They became the victims of their own folly, for when the Philistines invaded the land an unworthy superstition among the Hebrew host clamored for the ark to be brought into the camp and into the field of battle. Hophni and Phinehas, Eli's sons, indulging this vain and puerile fancy, accompanied the ark as its legal guardians, and fell in the terrible slaughter which ensued. Their father, whose sin seems to have been his easiness of disposition, his passive and quiescent temper, sat on a sacerdotal throne by the wayside, to gather the earliest news of the battle, for his “heart trembled for the ark of God;” and as a fugitive from the scene of conflict reported to him the sad disaster, dwelling with natural climax on its melancholy particulars — Israel routed and fleeing in panic, Hophni and Phinehas both slain, and the ark of God taken this last and overpowering intelligence so shocked him that he fainted and fell from his seat, and in his fall, from the imbecile corpulence of age, “brake his neck and died” (1Sa 4:18). In the overthrow of the sanctuary we hear  not what became of Samuel. According to the Mussulman tradition, Samuel's birth was granted in answer to the prayers of the nation on the overthrow of the sanctuary and loss of the ark (D'Herbelot, s.v. Aschmouyl). This, though false in the letter, is true to the spirit of Samuel's life.

3. Samuel's Civil Administration. — When the feeble administration of Eli, who had judged Israel forty years, was concluded by his death, Samuel was too young to succeed to the regency; and the actions of this earlier portion of his life are left unrecorded. The ark, which had been captured by the Philistines, soon vindicated its majesty, and, after being detained among them seven months, was sent back to Israel. It did not, however, reach Shiloh, in consequence of the fearful judgment upon Beth-shemesh (1Sa 6:19), but rested in Kirjath-jearim for no fewer than twenty years (1Sa 7:2). It is not till the expiration of this period that Samuel appears again in the history. Perhaps, during the twenty years succeeding Eli's death, his authority was gradually gathering strength; while the office of supreme magistrate may have been vacant, each tribe being governed by its own hereditary phylarch. This long season of national humiliation was, to some extent, improved. “All the house of Israel lamented after the Lord;” and Samuel, seizing upon the crisis, issued a public manifesto, exposing the sin of idolatry, urging on the people religious amendment, and promising political deliverance on their reformation. The people obeyed, the oracular mandate was effectual, and the principles of the theocracy again triumphed (1Sa 7:4). The tribes were summoned by the prophet to assemble in Mizpeh; and at this assembly of the Hebrew comitia, Samuel seems to have been elected regent (1Sa 7:6). Some of the judges were raised to political power as the reward of their military courage and talents; but Samuel was raised to the lofty station of judge, from his prophetic fame, his sagacious dispensation of justice, his real intrepidity, and his success as a restorer of the true religion. His government, founded not on feats of chivalry or actions of dazzling enterprise, which great emergencies only call forth, but resting on more solid qualities, essential to the growth and development of a nation's resources in times of peace, laid the foundation of that prosperity which gradually elevated Israel to the position it occupied in the days of David and his successors. This mustering of the Hebrews at Mizpeh on the inauguration of Samuel alarmed the Philistines, and their “lords went up against Israel.” Samuel offered a solemn oblation, and implored the  immediate protection of Jehovah. With a symbolical rite, expressive, partly of deep humiliation, partly of the libations of a treaty, the people poured water on the ground; they fasted; and they entreated Samuel to raise the piercing cry for which he was known in supplication to God for them. It was at the moment that he was offering up a sacrifice, and sustaining this loud cry (compare the situation of Pausanias before the battle of Plataea, Herod. 9:61), that the Philistine host suddenly burst upon them. He was answered by propitious thunder, an unprecedented phenomenon in that climate at that season of the year (comp. 1Sa 12:18 : Josephus says [Ant. 6, 2, 2] that there was also an earthquake). A fearful storm burst upon the Philistines; the elements warred against them. “The Highest gave his voice in the heaven, hailstones and coals of fire.” The old enemies of Israel were signally defeated, and did not recruit their strength again during the administration of the prophet judge. Exactly at the spot where, twenty years before, they had obtained their great victory, a stone was set up, which long remained as a memorial of Samuel's triumph, and gave to the place its name of Ebenezer, “the Stone of Help,” which has thence passed into Christian phraseology, and become a common name of Nonconformist chapels (1Sa 7:12). The old Canaanites, whom the Philistines had dispossessed in the outskirts of the Judean hills, seem to have helped in the battle; and a large portion of territory was recovered (1Sa 7:14). This was Samuel's first, and, as far as we know, his only, military achievement. But, as in the case of the earlier chiefs who bore that name, it was apparently this which confirmed him in the office of “judge” (comp. 1Sa 12:11, where he is thus reckoned with Jerubbaal, Bedan, and Jephthah, and Ecclesiastes 46:15-18). From an incidental allusion (1Sa 7:14), we learn, too, that about this time the Amorites, the Eastern foes of Israel, were also at peace with them another triumph of a government “the weapons of whose warfare were not carnal.”

The presidency of Samuel appears to have been eminently successful. Its length is nowhere given in the Scriptures; but, from a statement of Josephus (Ant. 6, 13, 5), it appears to have lasted twelve years (B.C. 1105 -1093), up to the time of Saul's inauguration. SEE CHRONOLOGY. From the very brief sketch given us of his public life, we infer that the administration of justice occupied no little share of his time and attention. He visited, in discharge of his duties as ruler, the three chief sanctuaries (Sept. ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις τούτοις) on the west of the Jordan- Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh (1Sa 7:16). His own residence was still  his native city, Ramah, or Ramathaim, which he further consecrated by an altar (1Sa 7:17), after the patriarchal model, like Abraham. Such a procedure was contrary to the letter of the Mosaic statute; but the prophets had power to dispense with ordinary usage (De Wette, Bib. Dogmat. § 70; Knobel, Der Prophetism. der Heb. 1, 39; Kister, Der Prophetism. d. A. und N.T. etc. p. 52). In this case, the reason of Samuel's conduct may be found in the state of the religious economy. The ark yet remained at Kirjath-jearim, where it had been left in terror, and where it lay till David fetched it to Zion. There seems to have been no place of resort for the tribes, the present station of the ark not having been chosen for its convenience as a scene of religious assembly. The shrine at Shiloh, which had been hallowed ever since the settlement in Canaan, had been desolate from the date of the death of Eli and his sons — so desolate as to become, in future years, a prophetic symbol of divine judgment (Jer 7:12-14; Jer 26:6). In such a period of religious anarchy and confusion, Samuel, a theocratic guardian, might, without any violation of the spirit of the law, superintend the public worship of Jehovah in the vicinity of his habitation (Knobel, Der Prophetism. der Heb. 2, 32).

At Ramah Samuel married; and two sons grew up to repeat, under his eyes, the same perversion of high office that he had himself witnessed in his childhood in the case of the two sons of Eli. One was Abiah, the other, Joel, sometimes called simply “the second” (vashni, 1Ch 6:28). In his old age, according to the quasi-hereditary principle already adopted by previous judges, he shared his power with them; and they exercised their functions at the southern frontier in Beersheba (1Sa 8:1-4). These young men possessed not their father's integrity of spirit, but “turned aside after lucre, took bribes, and perverted judgment” (1Sa 8:3). The advanced years of the venerable ruler himself, and his approaching dissolution; the certainty that none of his family could fill his office with advantage to the country; the horror of a period of anarchy which his death might occasion; the necessity of having some one to put an end to tribal jealousies, and concentrate the energies of the nation, especially as there appeared to be symptoms of renewed warlike preparations on the part of the Ammonites (12:12) these considerations seem to have led the elders of Israel to adopt the bold step of assembling at Ramah with the avowed purpose of effecting a revolution in the form of the government.

4. Retirement from Public Office. — Down to this point in Samuel's life there is but little to distinguish his career from that of his predecessors.  Like many characters in later days, had he died in youth, his fame would hardly have been greater than that of Gideon or Samson. He was a judge, a Nazarite, a warrior, and (to a certain point), a prophet. But his peculiar position in the sacred narrative turns on the events which follow. He is the inaugurator of the transition from what is commonly called the theocracy to the monarchy. The misdemeanor of his own sons precipitated the catastrophe which had been long preparing. The people demanded a king. Josephus (Ant. 6, 3, 3) describes the shock to Samuel's mind “because of his inborn sense of justice, because of his hatred of kings as so far inferior to the aristocratic form of government, which conferred a godlike character on those who lived under it.” For the whole night he lay fasting and sleepless, in the perplexity of doubt and difficulty. In the vision of that night, as recorded by the sacred historian, is given the dark side of the new institution, on which Samuel dwells on the following day (1Sa 8:9-18). The proposed change from a republican to a regal form of government displeased Samuel for various reasons. Besides its being a departure from the first political institute, and so far an infringement on the rights of the divine head of the theocracy, it was regarded by the regent as a virtual charge against himself, and might appear to him as one of those examples of popular fickleness and ingratitude which the history of every realm exhibits in pro. fusion. Jehovah comforts Samuel in this respect by saying, “They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me.” Being warned of God to accede to their request for a king, and yet to remonstrate with the people, and set before the nation the perils and tyranny of a monarchical government (8:10), Samuel proceeded to the election of a sovereign. Saul, son of Kish, “a choice young man and a goodly,” whom he had met unexpectedly, was pointed out to him by Jehovah as the king of Israel, and by the prophet was anointed and saluted as monarch. Samuel again convened the nation at Mizpeh, again with honest zeal condemned their project, but caused the sacred lot to be taken. The lot fell on Saul. The prophet now formally introduced him to the people, who shouted, in joyous acclamation, “God save the king!” Not content with oral explanations, this last of the republican chiefs not only told the people the manner of the kingdom, “but wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord.” What is here asserted of Samuel may mean that he extracted from the Pentateuch the recorded provision of Moses for a future monarchy, and added to it such warnings and counsels and safeguards as his inspired sagacity might suggest. Saul's first battle being so successful, and the preparations for it displaying no ordinary energy and promptitude of  character, his popularity was suddenly advanced and his throne secured. Taking advantage of the general sensation in favor of Saul, Samuel cited the people to meet again in Gilgal, to renew the kingdom, to ratify the new constitution, and solemnly install the sovereign (1Sa 11:14). The assembly was held at Gilgal, immediately after the victory over the Ammonites. The monarchy was a second time solemnly inaugurated, and (according to the Sept.) “Samuel” (in the Hebrew text, “Saul”) “and all the men of Israel rejoiced greatly.” Then takes place his farewell address. By this time the long, flowing locks, on which no razor had ever passed, were white with age (1Sa 12:2).He appeals to their knowledge of his integrity. Whatever might be the lawless habits of the chiefs of those times — Hophni, Phinehas, or his own sons — he had kept aloof from all. No ox or ass had he taken from their stalls — no bribe to obtain his judgment (Sept. ἐξίλασμα) — not even a sandal (ὑπόδημα, Sept. and Ecclesiastes 46:19,. It is this appeal, and the response of the people, that have made Grotius call him the Jewish Aristides. He then sums up the new situation in which they have placed themselves; and, although “the wickedness of asking a king” is still strongly insisted on, and the unusual portent of a thunderstorm in May or June, in answer to Samuel's prayer, is urged as a sign of divine displeasure (1Sa 12:16-19), the general tone of the condemnation is much softened from that which was pronounced on the first intimation of the change. The first king is repeatedly acknowledged as “the Messiah,” or anointed of the Lord (1Sa 12:3; 1Sa 12:5); the future prosperity of the nation is declared to depend on their use or misuse of the new constitution; and Samuel retires with expressions of goodwill and hope: “I will teach you the good and the right way... only fear the Lord...” (1Sa 12:23-24). It is the most signal example afforded in the Old Test. of a great character reconciling himself to a changed order of things, and of the divine sanctions resting on his acquiescence. For this reason it is that Athanasius is by Basil called the Samuel of the Church (Basil, Ep. 82). SEE MONARCHY.

5. Residue of Samuel's Life. — His subsequent relations with Saul are of the same mixed kind. The two institutions which they respectively represented ran on side by side. Samuel was still, by courtesy at least, judge. He judged Israel “all the days of his life” (1Sa 7:1-15), and from time to time came across the king's path. (But these interventions are chiefly in another capacity, which are unfolded below. The assertion may mean that even after Saul's coronation Samuel's power, though (formally  abdicated, was yet actually felt and exercised in the direction of state affairs (Hävernick. Einleit. in das A.T. § 166). No enterprise could be undertaken without Samuel's concurrence. His was an authority higher than the king's. We find Saul, having mustered his forces, about to march against the Philistines, yet delaying to do so till Samuel consecrated the undertaking. He came not at the time appointed, as Saul thought, and the impatient monarch proceeded to offer sacrifice — a fearful violation of the national law. The prophet arrived as the religious service was concluded, and, rebuking Saul for his presumption, distinctly hinted at the short continuance of his kingdom. Again, we find Samuel charging Saul with the extirpation of the Amalekites. The royal warrior proceeded on the expedition, but obeyed not the mandate of Jehovah. His apologies, somewhat craftily framed for his inconsistencies, availed him not with the prophet, and he was by the indignant seer virtually dethroned. He had forfeited his crown by disobedience to God. Yet Samuel mourned for him. His heart seems to have been set on the bold athletic soldier. But the breach was irreconcilable, and they must separate. The parting was not one of rivals, but of dear though divided friends. The king throws himself on the prophet with all his force; not without a vehement effort (Josephus, Ant. 6, 7, 5) the prophet tears himself away. The long mantle by which he was always known is rent in the struggle; and, like Ahijah after him, Samuel saw in this the omen of the coming rent in the monarchy. They parted, each to his house, to meet no more. But a long shadow of grief fell over the prophet. “Samuel mourned for Saul.” (It grieved Samuel for Saul.” “How long wilt thou mourn for Saul?” (1Sa 15:11; 1Sa 15:35; 1Sa 16:1). SEE PROPHET. But now the Lord directed him to make provision for the future government of the country (1Sa 16:1). To prevent strife and confusion, it was necessary, in the circumstances, that the second king should be appointed ere the first sovereign's demise. Samuel went to Bethlehem and set apart the youngest of the sons of Jesse, “and came to see Saul no more till the day of his death.” Yet Saul and he came near meeting once again at Naioth, in Ramah (19, 24), when the king was pursuing David. As on a former occasion, the spirit of God came upon him as he approached the company of the prophets with Samuel presiding over them, and “he prophesied and lay down naked all that day and all that night.” A religious excitement seized him; the contagious influence of the music and rhapsody fell upon his nervous, susceptible temperament and overpowered him. SEE SAUL.  The remaining scriptural notices of Samuel are in connection with David's history. SEE DAVID.

6. Decease and Traditions. — The death of Samuel is described as taking place in the year of the close of David's wanderings. It is said with peculiar emphasis, as if to mark the loss, that “all the Israelites” — all, with a universality never specified before — “were gathered together” from all parts of this hitherto divided country, and “lamented him,” and “buried him,” not in any consecrated place, nor outside the walls of his city, but within his own house, thus in a manner consecrated by being turned into his tomb (1Sa 25:1). His relics were translated “from Judaea” (the place is not specified), A.D. 406, to Constantinople, and received there with much pomp by the emperor Arcadius. They were landed at the pier of Chalcedon, and thence conveyed to a church near the palace of Hebdomon (see 4 Acta Sanctorum, Aug. 20).

The situation of Ramathaim, as has been observed, uncertain. But the place long pointed out as his tomb is the height, most conspicuous of all in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, immediately above the town of Gibeon, known to the Crusaders as “Montjoye,” as the spot from whence they first saw Jerusalem, now called Neby Samwil, “the Prophet Samuel.” The tradition can be traced back as far as the 7th century, when it is spoken of as the monastery of St. Samuel (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 142). SEE ZOPHIM. A cave is still shown underneath the floor of the mosque. “He built the tomb in his lifetime,” is the account of the Mussulman guardian of the mosque, “but was not buried here till after the expulsion of the Greeks.” It is the only spot in Palestine which claims any direct connection with the first great prophet who was born within its limits; and its commanding situation well agrees with the importance assigned to him in the sacred history. SEE MIZPEH.

His descendants were subsisting at the same place till the time of David. Heman, his grandson, was one of the chief singers in the Levitical choir (1Ch 6:33; 1Ch 15:17; 1Ch 25:5).

The apparition of Samuel at Endor (1Sa 28:14; Ecclesiastes 46:20) belongs to the history of Saul. We here follow the inspired narrative, and merely say that Saul strangely wished to see Samuel recalled from the dead, that Samuel himself made his appearance suddenly, and, to the great terror of the necromancer, heard the mournful complaint of Saul, and pronounced his speedy death on an ignoble field of loss and massacre  (Henderson, On Divine Inspiration, p. 165; Hales, Chronology, 2, 323; Scott, On the Existence of Evil Spirits, etc. p. 232).

It has been supposed that Samuel wrote a life of David (of course of his earlier years) which was still accessible to one of the authors of the book of Chronicles (1Ch 29:29); but this appears doubtful. Various other books of the Old Test. have been ascribed to him by the Jewish tradition — the Judges, Ruth, the two books of Samuel (the latter, it is alleged, being written in the spirit of prophecy). He is regarded by the Samaritans as a magician and an infidel (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 52).

The Persian traditions fix his life in the time of Kai-i-Kobad, second king of Persia, with whom he is said to have conversed (D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. s.v. “Kai-Kobad”).

III. Samuel's Character — So important a position did he hold in Jewish history as to have given his name to the sacred book, now divided into two, which covers the whole period of the first establishment of the kingdom, corresponding to the manner in which the name of Moses has been assigned to the sacred book, now divided into five, which covers the period of the foundation of the Jewish Church itself. In fact, no character of equal magnitude had arisen since the death of the great lawgiver.

1. Samuel's character presents itself to us as one of uncommon dignity and patriotism. His chief concern was his country's weal. Grotius compares him to Aristides, and Saul to Alcibiades (Opera Theol. 1, 119). To preserve the worship of the one Jehovah, the God of Israel, to guard the liberties and rights of the people, to secure them from hostile invasion and internal disunion, was the grand motive of his life. His patriotism was not a Roman love of conquest or empire. The subjugation of other people was only sought when they disturbed the peace of his country. He was loath, indeed, to change the form of government, yet he did it with consummate policy. First of all, he resorted to the divine mode of appeal to the Omniscient Ruler — a solemn sortilege — and brought Saul so chosen before the people, and pointed him out to them as peerless in his form and aspect. Then, waiting till Saul should distinguish himself by some victorious enterprise, and receiving him fresh from the slaughter of the Ammonites, he again confirmed him in his kingdom, while the national enthusiasm, kindled by his triumph, made him the popular idol. Samuel thus, for the sake of future peace, took means to show that Saul was both chosen of God and yet virtually elected by the people. This procedure, so  cautious and so generous, proves how little foundation there is for the remarks which have been made against Samuel by some writers, such as Schiller (Neue Thalia, 4, 94), Vatke (Bibl. Theol. p. 360), and the infamous Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist (p. 200, ed. Schmidt).

But there are two other points which more especially placed him at the head of the prophetic order as it afterwards appeared. The first is brought out in his relation with Saul, the second in his relation with David.

2. He represents the independence of the moral law, of the Divine Will, as distinct from regal or sacerdotal enactments, which is so remarkable a characteristic of all the later prophets. As we have seen, he was, if a Levite, yet certainly not a priest; and all the attempts to identify his opposition to Saul with a hierarchical interest are founded on a complete misconception of the facts of the case. From the time of the overthrow of Shiloh, he never appears in the remotest connection with the priestly order. Among all the places included in his personal or administrative visits, neither Shiloh, nor Nob, nor Gibeon (the seats of the sacerdotal caste) is ever mentioned. When he counsels Saul, it is not as the priest, but as the prophet; when he sacrifices or blesses the sacrifice, it is not as the priest, but either as an individual Israelite of eminence, or as a ruler, like Saul himself. Saul's sin in both cases where he came into collision with Samuel was not simply that of intruding into sacerdotal functions, but of disobedience to the prophetic voice. The first was that of not waiting for Samuel's arrival, according to the sign given by Samuel at his original meeting at Ramah (1Sa 10:8; 1Sa 13:8); the second was that of not carrying out the stern prophetic injunction for the destruction of the Amalekites. When, on that occasion, the aged prophet called the captive prince before him, and with his own hands hacked him limb from limb in retribution for the desolation he had brought into the homes of Israel, and thus offered up his mangled remains almost as a human sacrifice (“before the Lord in Gilgal”), we see the representative of the older part of the Jewish history. But it is the true prophetic utterance such as breathes through the psalmists and prophets when he says to Saul in words which, from their poetical form, must have become fixed in the national memory, “To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.”

3. Samuel is the first of the regular succession of prophets: “All the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after” (Act 3:24); “Ex quo sanctus Samuel propheta coepit, et deinceps donec populus Israel in  Babyloniam captivus veheretur,... totum est tempus prophetarum” (Augustine, Civ. Dei, 17, 1). Moses, Miriam, and Deborah, perhaps Ehud, had been prophets. But it was only from Samuel that the continuous succession was unbroken. This may have been merely from the coincidence of his appearance with the beginning of the new order of things, of which the prophetical office was the chief expression. Some predisposing causes there may have been in his own family and birthplace. His mother, as we have seen, though not expressly so called, was, in fact, a prophetess; the word Zophim, as the affix of Ramathaim, has been explained, not unreasonably, to mean “seers;” and Elkanah, his father, is, by the Chaldee paraphrast on 1Sa 1:1, said to be “a disciple of the prophets.” But the connection of the continuity of the office with Samuel appears to be still more direct. It is in his lifetime, long after he had been “established as a prophet” (1Sa 3:20), that we hear of the companies of disciples, called in the Old Test. “the sons of the prophets,” by modern writers “the schools of the prophets.” All the peculiarities of their education are implied or expressed — the sacred dance, the sacred music, the solemn procession (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 10:10; 1Ch 25:1; 1Ch 25:6). At the head of this congregation, or “church, as it were, within a church” (Sept. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, 1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 10:10). Samuel is expressly described as “standing appointed over them” (1Sa 19:20). Their chief residence at this time (though afterwards, as the institution spread, it struck root in other places) was at Samuel's own abode, Ramah, where they lived in habitations (Naioth, 19, 19, etc.) apparently of a rustic kind, like the leafy huts which Elisha's disciples afterwards occupied by the Jordan (Naioth = “habitations,” but more specifically used for “pastures”). SEE NAIOTH.

In those schools, and learning to cultivate the prophetic gifts, were some whom we know for certain, others whom we may almost certainly conjecture, to have been so trained or influenced. Two eminent individuals had a casual or remote connection with them. One was Saul. Twice at least he is described as having been in the company of Samuel's disciples, and as having caught from them the prophetic fervor to such a degree as to have “prophesied among them” (1Sa 10:10-11) and on one occasion to have thrown off his clothes, and to have passed the night in a state of prophetic trance (1Sa 19:24); and even in his palace the prophesying mingled with his madness on ordinary occasions (1Sa 18:9). Another was David. The first acquaintance of Samuel with David was when he privately anointed him at the house of Jesse. SEE DAVID.

But the connection thus begun with the shepherd boy must have been continued afterwards. David, at first, fled to “Naioth in Ramah,” as to his second home (1Sa 19:19), and the gifts of music, of song, and of prophecy, here developed on so large a scale, were exactly such as we find in the notices of those who looked up to Samuel as their father. It is, further, hardly possible to escape the conclusion that David there first met his fast friends and companions in afterlife, prophets like himself — Gad and Nathan. In the prospect of a regal form of government he seems to have made the prophetic office a formal institute in the Jewish nation. These academies were famous for the cultivation of poetry and music, and from among their members God might select his special servants (Gramberg, Religions-Id. 2, 264; Vitringa, Synag. Vet. 1, 2, 7; Werenfels, Diss. de Scholis Prophetar.; De Wette, Comm. fib. d. Psalm. p. 9). For a different view of the schools, see Tholuck, Literar. Anzeiger, 1831, 1, 38. We are informed (1Ch 9:22) that the allocation of the Levites for the Temple service was made by David and Samuel the seer; i.e. that David followed some plan or suggestion of the deceased prophet. It is stated also (26:28) that the prophet had made some munificent donations to the tabernacle, which seems to have been erected at Nob, and afterwards at Gibeon, though the ark was in Kirjath-jearim. Lastly (29:29), the acts of David the king are said to be written in the book of Samuel the seer. SEE PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.

It is needless to enlarge on the importance with which these incidents invest the appearance of Samuel. He there becomes the spiritual father of the Psalmist king. He is also the founder of the first regular institutions of religious instruction, and communities for the purposes of education. The schools of Greece were not yet in existence. From these Jewish institutions were developed, by a natural order, the universities of Christendom. It may be added that with this view the whole life of Samuel is in accordance. He is the prophet the only prophet till the time of Isaiah — of whom we know that he was such from his earliest years. It is this continuity of his own life and character that makes him so fit an instrument for conducting his nation through so great a change.

Accordingly, Samuel is called emphatically “the Prophet” (Acts 3, 24; Act 13:20). To a certain extent this was in consequence of the gift which he shared in common with others of his time. He was especially known in his own age as “Samuel the Seer” (1Ch 9:22; 1Ch 26:28; 1Ch 29:29). “I am the seer,” was his answer to those who asked “Where is the seer?” “Where  is the seer's house?” (1Sa 9:11; 1Sa 9:18-19). “Seer,” the ancient name, was not yet superseded by “Prophet” (ch. 9). By this name, Samuel Videns and Samuel ὁ βλέπων, he is called in the Acta Sanctorum. Of the three modes by which divine communications were then made, “by dreams, Urim and Thummim, and prophets,” the first was that by which the divine will was made known to Samuel (1Sa 3:1-2; Josephus, Ant. 5, 10, 4). “The Lord uncovered his ear” to whisper into it in the stillness of the night the messages that were to be delivered. It is the first distinct intimation of the idea of “Revelation” to a human being (see Gesenius, in voc. גָּלָה). He was consulted far and near on the small affairs of life; loaves of “bread,” or “the fourth part of a shekel of silver,” were gratuities offered for the answers (1Sa 9:7-8). SEE PRESENT.

From this faculty, combined with his office of ruler, an awful reverence grew up round him. No sacrificial feast was thought complete without his blessing (1Sa 9:13). When he appeared suddenly elsewhere for the same purpose, the villagers “trembled” at his approach (1Sa 16:4-5). A peculiar virtue was believed to reside in his intercession. He was conspicuous in later times among those that “call upon the name of the Lord” (Psa 99:6; 1Sa 12:18), and was placed with Moses as “standing” for prayer, in a special sense, “before the Lord” (Jer 15:1). It was the last consolation he left in his parting address that he would “pray to the Lord” for the people (1Sa 12:19; 1Sa 12:23). There was something peculiar in the long-sustained cry or shout of supplication, which seemed to draw down as by force the divine answer (1Sa 7:8-9). All night long, in agitated moments, “he cried unto the Lord” (1Sa 15:11). The power of Samuel with God, as an intercessor for the people, is compared to that of Moses (Jer 15:1; Psa 99:6). See Plumtre, Life of Samuel (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Anon. Life and Times of Samuel (ibid. 1863, 12mo).

## Samuel Ben-David Otolengo[[@Headword:Samuel Ben-David Otolengo]]

             SEE OTOLENGO.

## Samuel Ben-Isaac Oceda[[@Headword:Samuel Ben-Isaac Oceda]]

             SEE OCEDA.

## Samuel Ben-Meir[[@Headword:Samuel Ben-Meir]]

             SEE RASHBAM.

## Samuel Maroccanus[[@Headword:Samuel Maroccanus]]

             SEE MOROCCO, SAMUEL OF.

## Samuel The Little[[@Headword:Samuel The Little]]

             (שמואל הקטן), a contemporary of Gamaliel 2, is known in Jewish history as the author of the prayer against the Minim, or Jewish Christians. In the Talmud treatise Berakoth, fol. 28b, we read: הסדיר שמונה עשרה ברכות לפני רבן גמליאל על הסדר ביבנה אמר שמעון פקולי לתקן ברכת הצדוקים עמד שמואל הקטן ותקנה להם רבו גמליאל לחכמים כלום יש אדם שיודע; i.e. “Simon Pakuli arranged the eighteen benedictions before rabban Gamaliel, in Jabne, in their present order. Rabban Gamaliel said to the sages, ‘Is there none who knows to prepare a benediction against the Zaddukim or Sadducees?' Then arose Samuel the Little and prepared it.” This ברכת הצדוקים, or, as it is generally called, ברכת המינים, “the benediction against the Minim, or Jewish Christians,” is the twelfth of the so-called Sh'mone Esre, or Eighteen Benedictions [ comp. the art. SYNAGOGUE], and originally read ולמלשינים אל תהי תקוה ולמינים, i.e. “let there be no hope for the Minim and calumniators.” That this prayer was directed against Jewish Christians is testified by Epiphanius (Ep. adversus Hoeres. 29, 9; ed. Petav. p. 124), who states: οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ι᾿ουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους ῾τοὺς Ναζεραίους] κέκτηναι μῖσος, ἀλλὰ ἀνιστάμενοι,  ἕωθεν καὶ μἐσης ἡμἐρας καὶ μερί τὴν ἑσπέραν, τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας ὅτε εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ἑπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας φάσκοντες ὃτι Ε᾿πικαταράσι ὸ θεὸς τοὺς Ναζεραίους. With regard to these words of Epiphanius, Grätz remarks that Epiphanius, being by birth a Jew, is a competent witness that this formula was directed against the Jewish Christians. It will be seen that the remark of Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v. “Synagogue” (p. 906, note), is not justified either by the statement of Epiphanius or that of the Jewish historian Grätz. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4, 434; Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, p. 344-346; Schürer, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte, p. 502. (B.P.)

## Samuel Yeretz[[@Headword:Samuel Yeretz]]

             An Armenian historian, was born at Ani (Armenia Major), and lived in the 12th century. He was a disciple of George Melrig, and was requested by Gregory IV, patriarch of Armenia, to prepare a chronicle or universal history, which work he published under the title Samuelis, Presb. Aniensis, temporum usque ad suam Ratio. It is divided into two parts, commencing with the creation of the world and ending with the year 1179. It is really a mere abridgment of the chronicles of Eusebius increased by matter found in the History of Armenia by Moses of Choren, and in earlier writings now lost. The Latin translation was prepared by Dr. Zorab and Angelo May.

## Samuel, First And Second Books Of[[@Headword:Samuel, First And Second Books Of]]

             These two historical portions of Scripture, in all the editions of the original and versions, immediately precede the books of Kings, and are intimately connected with them. There is less critical dispute concerning them than respecting those books that precede them.

I. Name and Division. — The books so called received this name (which is now customarily attached to them in Hebrew printed texts) subsequently to  the completion of the Sept., in which their present name is Βασι λείων Πρώτη, Βασιλείν Δευτέρα (First and Second of Kings); and similarly in the Vulg. Hence they are entitled in the English version “The First [or Second] Book of Samuel, otherwise called the First [or Second] Book of the Kings.” The name may in some measure be explained and justified on the ground that the early part of the first book is chiefly concerned about Samuel, and that the two kings Saul and David, whose reigns occupy all the rest of the books, were both anointed by Samuel to their office.

In Hebrew MSS. the work is one and not two. The present division was first made in the Sept., and was thence adopted into the Vulg. But Origen, as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 6, 25), expressly states that they formed only one book among the Hebrews. Jerome (Proefatio in Libros Samuel et Malachim) implies the same statement; and in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 14, c. 2), wherein the authorship is attributed to Samuel, they are designated by the name of his book, in the singular number (ספרו שמואל כּתב). After the invention of printing they were published as one book in the first edition of the whole Bible printed at Soncino in A.D. 1488, and likewise in the Complutensian Polyglot printed at Alcala, A.D. 1502-1517; and it was not till the year 1518 that the division of the Sept. was adopted in Hebrew, in the edition of the Bible printed by the Bombergs at Venice. The work constitutes a separate and independent whole, and is not to be joined either with the book of Judges or with that of Kings, from which it differs by many important characteristics.

II. Contents. — The statements of the books of Samuel belong to an interesting period of Jewish history. The preceding book of Judges refers to the affairs of the republic as they were administered after the conquest, when the nation was a congeries of independent cantons, sometimes partially united for a season under an extraordinary dictator. As, however, the mode of government was changed, and remained monarchical till the overthrow of the kingdom, it was of national importance to note the time, method, and means of the alteration. This change happening under the regency of the wisest and best of their sages, his life became a topic of interest. The first book of Samuel gives an account of his birth and early call to the duties of a seer, under Eli's pontificate; describes the low and degraded condition of the people, oppressed by foreign enemies; proceeds to narrate the election of Samuel as judge; his prosperous regency; the degeneracy of his sons; the clamor for a change in the civil constitution; the  installation of Saul; his rash and reckless character; his neglect of, or opposition to, the theocratic elements of the government. Then the historian goes on to relate God's choice of David as king; his endurance of long and harassing persecution from the reigning sovereign; the melancholy defeat and death of Saul on the field of Gilboa; the gradual elevation of the man “according to God's own heart” to universal dominion; his earnest efforts to obey and follow out the principles of the theocracy; his formal establishment of religious worship at Jerusalem, now the capital of the nation; and his series of victories over all the enemies of Judea that were wont to molest its frontiers. The annalist records David's aberrations from the path of duty; the unnatural rebellion of his son Absalom, and its suppression; his carrying into effect a census of his dominions, and the divine punishment which this act incurred; and concludes with a few characteristic sketches of his military staff. The second book of Samuel, while it relates the last words of David, yet stops short of his death. As David was the real founder of the monarchy and arranger of the religious economy; the great hero, legislator, and poet of his country; as his dynasty maintained itself on the throne of Judah till the Babylonian invasion, it is not a matter of wonder that the description of his life and government occupies so large a portion of early Jewish history. The books of Samuel thus consist of three interlaced biographies — those of Samuel, Saul, and David. The following are the details:

1. Israel under Samuel (1 Samuel 1-12; B.C. 1120-1093). — The parentage, birth, and consecration of Samuel (ch. 1); Hannah's prayer (1Sa 2:1-10); the evil practices of the sons of Eli; a man of God predicts the troubles which shall befall Eli (1Sa 2:10-33); God calls Samuel in the night, and reveals to him the judgment of the house of Eli, to whom Samuel declares it (1Sa 3:1-18); Samuel is established to be a prophet in Shiloh (1Sa 3:19 to 1Sa 4:1); a battle of the Philistines with the; Israelites between Aphek and Eben-ezer; the Israelites, being defeated, send for the ark from Shiloh; another battle ensues, in which Israel is again smitten, the ark is taken, and the two sons of Eli slain; the news is carried to Eli, who dies; Ichabod is born (ch. 4); penalties inflicted on the Philistines on account of the ark of God; it is sent back with presents to Israel, first to Beth-she-mesh, and then to Kirjath- jearim (1 Samuel 5-7); the reformation under Samuel and the national assembly at Mizpeh (1Sa 7:2-6); the Philistines again invade Israel, but at the cry of Samuel the Lord discomfits them with thunder, and  they are smitten before Israel; their conquests restored to Israel from Ekron to Gath, and peace established (1Sa 7:7-14); Samuel judges Israel in a circuit of four cities yearly (1Sa 7:15-17); becoming old, he makes his sons judges over Israel, but their conduct is bad (1Sa 8:1-3); the elders of Israel come to Samuel at Ramah and demand a king; Samuel protests, but by divine direction yields at length (1Sa 8:4-22); Saul, son of Kish, seeking the lost asses of his father, visits Samuel, who, forewarned by God of his coming, entertains him with honor, and on parting anoints him to be king, and gives him signs in confirmation, which come to pass; Samuel then calls an assembly at Mizpeh, and there Saul is publicly designated by lot to be king over Israel, but not acknowledged by all the people (1 Samuel 9, 10); the men of Jabesh-gilead, sending to Gibeah in their distress, Saul is roused to aid them, and gains a great victory over the Ammonites; then Saul is joyfully recognized as king by all the people at Gilgal, where Samuel renews the kingdom (1 Samuel 11); there Samuel addresses the people, vindicates his own conduct, and exhorts them to fidelity to God and their king; the miracle of thunder and rain at wheat harvest (1 Samuel 12).

2. Israel under King Saul (1 Samuel 13-31; B.C. 1093-1053). — Saul forms an army of two thousand men under his own command at Michmash, and one thousand under Jonathan at Gibeah; Jonathan smites the Philistine garrison at Geba, and the Philistines gather a great army; Israel is greatly distressed; Saul awaits Samuel at Gilgal, but begins to offer sacrifice before his arrival, for which act of disobedience he is rejected of God (1Sa 13:1-14); in the extremity of the times Jonathan and his armor bearer discomfit the Philistines at Michmash; in the general pursuit Jonathan tastes honey contrary to the command of Saul; his life is spared at the demand of the people (1 Samuel 8:15-14, 45); Saul's successes in war against the neighboring tribes; his children and relatives named (1Sa 14:46-52); Saul, commanded to exterminate Amalek, only partially obeys, and Samuel declares to him his rejection from the kingdom; Samuel and Saul finally part (1 Samuel 15); Samuel is sent to Bethlehem to anoint David, son of Jesse, to be king (1Sa 16:1-13); in consequence of Saul's malady, David is sent for to cheer him with music (1Sa 16:14-23); the Philistines and the Israelites arrayed for battle in the valley of Elah; Goliath challenges Israel, and is killed by David (1 Samuel 17); Jonathan and David make a covenant of friendship; Saul retains David near him, and sets him over his men of war; the women-  singers give greater honor to David than to Saul, who is displeased, and seeks to destroy David (1 Samuel 18); Jonathan takes David's part and Michal also; David flees to Samuel at Ramah; they go together to Naioth; Saul sends messengers, and then goes himself to fetch David; they all prophesy (ch. 19); David visits Jonathan; they renew their covenant; Jonathan makes known to David by the device of the arrows Saul's determination to kill him; their parting (ch. 20); David flees to Nob, where he obtains the shewbread, and proceeds to Achish, king of Gath, and feigns madness; then to the cave of Adullam, to Mizpeh of Moab, and to Hareth; Saul kills Ahimelech and the priests by the hand of Doeg the Edomite (ch. 21, 22); David saves Keilah from the Philistines, but leaves it on the approach of Saul, and abides in the wilderness of Ziph, where Jonathan visits him; Saul is recalled from the pursuit of David by an invasion of the Philistines (1 Samuel 23); David in the wilderness of Engedi spares Saul's life (ch. 24); Samuel's death and burial; the narrative of Nabal and his wife Abigail (ch. 25); David again spares the life of Saul at Hachilab; he goes with six hundred men to Achish, king of Gath, who gives him Ziklag to dwell in the Philistines encamp against Israel; Saul in vain seeks counsel from God, and then has recourse to the witch of Endor; the princes of the Philistines refuse David's aid in battle (1 Samuel 26-29); David returns to Ziklag and finds it desolated; he pursues the Amalekites and recovers the spoil (ch. 30); the battle of Gilboa; Saul and his three sons die (ch. 31); the news of Saul's death reaches David at Ziklag, and calls forth his touching dirge or lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Samuel 1).

3. The Unsettled Succession, — Ishbosheth king of Israel, David of Judah (2Sa 2:1 to 2Sa 5:3; B.C. 1053-1046). — David is anointed king of Judah at Hebron; Ishbosheth is made king of Israel; the fight between the followers of David and of Ishbosheth by the pool of Gibeon (ch. 2); David's power increases in Hebron; six sons born to him there; Abner forsakes Ishbosheth, and makes terms with David to transfer the kingdom of Israel to him; is slain by Joab; David's lamentation over him (ch. 3); the head of Ishbosheth is brought by Rechab and Baanah to David, who punishes them for the deed (ch. 4); the tribes of Israel make David their king (2Sa 5:1-3).

4. Israel under King David (2Sa 5:4-24; B.C. 1046-1013). — David, after being king of Judah for seven vears and a half, reigns thirty- three years in Jerusalem over all Israel; he captures the fortress of Zion from the Jebusite, forms a friendship with Hiram king of Tyre, defeats the  Philistines at Baal-perazim, and again from Geba unto Gazer (ch. 5); David brings up the ark of the Lord; the breach of Uzzah; the house of Obed- edom is blessed; the ark brought to Jerusalem; Michal derides David for dancing before the ark (ch. 6); David is forbidden to build a house for the Lord in a message brought to him by Nathan the prophet, who announces the establishment of his dynasty; David's prayer (ch. 7); his victories over the Philistines, Moabites, Edomites, etc., recited (ch. 8); his kindness to Mephibosheth (ch. 9); his victory over Bene-ammon (ch. 10); his sin with Bathsheba and Uriah; Nathan's parable; punishment denounced; David's penitence; the child dies; Solomon is born; David captures Rabbah of Bene-ammon (ch. 11, 12); the affair of Amnon and Tamar; Absalom's revenge and flight to Geshur; Joab artfully procures his return after three years' absence (ch. 13, 14); the rebellion of Absalom and the flight of David; the ark, the priests, and Hushai sent back to Jerusalem; the treachery of Ziba; the reviling of Shimei; conflicting advice given by Hushai and Ahitophel to Absalom, and Ahitophel's suicide (ch. 15-17); the battle in the forest of Ephraim; Absalom's death; David's great grief (ch. 18); David's return to Jerusalem; the conduct of Shimei, Mephibosheth, and Barzillai; the rivalry between Judah and Israel in bringing back the king (ch. 19); the rebellion of Sheba; Joab slays Amasa; Sheba's head given to Joab at Abel (ch. 20); the three years' famine, and the appeasement of the Gibeonites; the burial of the bones of Saul and his sons; the giants of the Philistines slain by David's servants (ch. 21); David's song (Psalms 18) (ch. 22); the last words of David; the names and exploits of his heroes (ch. 23); the numbering of the people and the pestilence (ch. 24).

III. Origin and Structure. — It is evident that Samuel could not be the author of the whole of these books, since his death is recorded in the 25th chapter of the first book, and the history continues after his death down to nearly the end of the reign of David, a period of perhaps forty-five years. There is a somewhat common opinion that the first twenty-four chapters were written by Samuel and the rest by Gad and Nathanan opinion founded on 1Ch 29:29 : “Now the acts of David the king, first and last, are they not written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer?” There is much in the general structure of the books, (and in the relation of the several parts to each other, to render it probable that different writers, living at different times, were concerned in their production, notwithstanding the degree of uniformity which the style and language exhibit. The most reasonable  supposition is: that they were the work of one compiler, who used historical records of various sources. This opinion, though held by nearly all modern critics, as Thenius, and even by Hävernick and Keil, is not new, as Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodoret, St. Athanasius, and St. Gregory observed that the four books of Kings were historical abridgments of several books or memoirs of the prophets which are cited in them. The grounds on which this view of the origin of these books is based have, however, only in very recent times been fully expounded. Warning the reader against attaching undue importance to the evidence which has been adduced in proof of this position, his attention may nevertheless be directed to the following points:

1. There is considerable difference in the manner of the writers; some portions contrasting in their brief, fragmentary, chronological character with others which are more full and copious, and (in one part at least) minutely biographical (comp. 1Sa 5:1-12; 1 Samuel 8; 1Sa 20:15-22; 1Sa 23:8-29, with 2 Samuel 11-20).

2. In several places there may be perceived the conclusion of the original documents, to which additional matter has been attached, yet without being so joined as to appear like a natural continuation. In some places the compiler has placed together what he found narrated by different writers respecting the persons whose histories they wrote, without having so worked them up into one narrative as to harmonize all their parts (1Sa 7:15-17; 1Sa 14:47-52; 2Sa 8:15-18; 2Sa 20:23-26).

3. Of some events there appear to be double accounts recorded, and occasionally these accounts are different, and sometimes, apparently at least, inconsistent; as, for instance, how Saul became king (1 Samuel 9-10; 1 Samuel 16, and 1Sa 10:17-27); how and why Saul was rejected (1Sa 13:8-14; 1Sa 15:10-26); how David became known to Saul (1Sa 16:14-21, and 1Sa 17:55 to 1Sa 18:2); how David spared Saul's life (1 Samuel 24, 26); how David went over to the Philistines (1Sa 21:10-15; 1Sa 27:1-4); how the proverb “Is Saul also among the prophets?” arose (1Sa 10:9-13; 1Sa 19:22-24). It should here be remarked that these alleged discrepant passages, as well as many more which skeptical critics have adduced, need to be explained, whatever opinion may be held respecting the authorship of these books. As, for instance, the statement that Samuel (1Sa 7:15-17) was all his life long judge over Israel, but according to 1Sa 8:1-3 had surrendered the office to his sons  (but see 1Sa 12:2); the occasion and the motives for demanding a king, as differently stated in 1Sa 8:5 and 1Sa 12:12; the two accounts of Goliath (1Sa 17:1-10, and 2Sa 21:19); the double record of Samuel's death (1Sa 25:1; 1Sa 28:3); the two descriptions of the manner of Saul's death (1Sa 31:1-6 and 2Sa 1:1-10); the twofold account of the battle with the Syrians (2 Samuel 8, 10), etc. Such different, though not therefore discordant, portions of the work may probably be best explained on the assumption that the books consist of materials brought together from various sources. This origin may be granted, however, without admitting that there is any inconsistency or contradiction among the materials so joined together; just as in the case of the Gospel history, which is constituted by the separate narratives of four different, but not therefore discordant, writers. It is not the object of this article to explain the alleged inconsistencies, however completely that might be done. They are here mentioned only as they bear upon the question of authorship, and as they seem to indicate the use of a variety of materials by the author or compiler of these books.

4. The relation between the books of Chronicles and the books of Samuel is thought to point to the same conclusion. It can scarcely be maintained that the author of the Chronicles has derived from the books of Samuel all the materials for the narratives which are common to both works. There are so many variations between the history as related by the chronicler and as related in Samuel as to render it probable, not that the chronicler derived everything from Samuel, but that he had access to the sources used also by the compiler of Samuel. This may be explained by a comparison of 2Sa 5:1-10; 2Sa 23:8-39 with 1Ch 11:12. The chronicler has placed in continuous narrative David's anointing as king of Israel at Hebron, the capture of Jerusalem, the building of the city of David, and the list of David's heroes, with their deeds, probably as he found them connected in the documents which he used; while in Samuel they are detached, the list of heroes being placed separately in the history of the latest period of the life of David. So in 1 Chronicles 3, the list of David's children is given in a form probably drawn from some official register to which the writer of Samuel had access, as he gives the list in two portions to suit the course of his narrative (2 Samuel 3, 2-5; 2 Samuel 5, 14-16).

5. The hand of a compiler is thought to be perceptible in certain detached observations here and there occurring in the course of the history, in the  way of explanation of some portion drawn from the documents; as for example, in 1Sa 9:9, the expression הָרֹאֶה. is explained: For “the prophet” of today was called formerly “the seer.” 1Sa 17:14-15, is regarded as an interposed remark, to connect this history with the account given in the previous chapter of the family of Jesse.

IV. The Sources. — Should these books then appear to be a compilation from several original documents, the interesting question arises, How far may it be possible to resolve the whole work into its constituent parts, so as to obtain some idea of the nature of the sources whence the parts were derived? Thenius has attempted to solve this difficult problem in the following way. On internal grounds he distinguishes five principal sources:

(a.) A History of Samuel, contained in 1 Samuel 1-7, which seems to conclude naturally as a separate and independent narrative, in which Samuel is altogether the principal person.

(b.) A History of Saul, comprised in the following portions: 1 Samuel 8; 1Sa 10:17-27; 1 Samuel 11; 1 Samuel 12; 1 Samuel 15; 1 Samuel 16; 1Sa 18:6-14; 1 Samuel 26; 1Sa 28:3-25; 1 Samuel 31. The materials derived from this source are interwoven with others derived from a third source, viz.:

(c.) A History of David, from which have been derived the following portions: 1Sa 14:52; 1 Samuel 17; 1 Samuel 18, in part; 19; 20; 21, in part; 22; 23; 24; 25; 27; 1Sa 28:1-2; 1 Samuel 29; 1 Samuel 30; 2 Samuel 1-5; 2 Samuel 7; 2 Samuel 8.

(d.) Another History of Saul, from which 1 Samuel 9; 1Sa 10:1-16; 1 Samuel 8; 1 Samuel , 14 have been drawn. This is regarded as an older and more strictly historical document than b, that being considered as of much later origin, and as founded on tradition.

(e.) Lastly, a Biography of David, embracing full details of the second half of his life, and recounting his family history (2 Samuel 11; 2Sa 12:1-25; 2 Samuel 13-20).

The relation of 2 Samuel 21-24 to the preceding portions seems to be that of a supplement or appendix of matters not related in chronological order, nor having any close connection with each other.

There is doubtless very much hypercriticism in this account of Thenius. So far as authorities or sources are quoted in the books themselves, the matter is much more simple. To only one work is direct reference made, viz. to the book of the upright (Jasher), הִיָּשָׁר סֵפֶר(2Sa 1:18),  elsewhere also quoted only once (Jos 10:13), and, as both the quotations are in verse, the work is thought to have been a book of poems. SEE JASHER, BOOK OF.

There are, however, certain parts of the books of Samuel which must have been derived either from verbal tradition or from some written documents, such, for instance, as the following poetical pieces: the song of Hannah (1Sa 2:1-10); David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:19-27); David's lament over Abner (2Sa 3:33-34); Nathan's parable (2Sa 7:1-4); a song or psalm of David (2Sa 22:2-51 [Psalms 18]); the last words of David (Psa 23:1-6). To these must be added the lists of names and genealogies, etc.

It is said in 1Ch 29:29, “Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer.” The old opinion as to the authorship of Samuel, to which we have already alluded, was founded on this quotation. The prophets were wont to write a history of their own times. That Samuel did so in reference to the great events of his life is evident from the statement that he “wrote the manner of the kingdom in a book, and laid it up before the Lord” (1Sa 10:25). The phrase דַּבְרֵי שְׁמוּאֵל, “words of Samuel,” may not refer to our present Samuel, which is not so comprehensive as this collection seems to have been. It does not, like the treatise to which the author of Chronicles refers, include “the acts of David, first and last.” The annals which these three seers compiled were those of their own times in succession (Kleinert, Aechtheit d. Jes. pt. 1, p. 83); so that there existed a history of contemporary events written by three inspired men. The portion written by Samuel might include his own life, and the greater part of Saul's history, as well as the earlier portion of David's career. Gad was a contemporary of David, and is termed his seer. Probably also he was one of his associates in his various wanderings (1Sa 22:5). In the latter part of David's reign Nathan was a prominent counsellor, and assisted at the coronation of Solomon. We have, therefore, prophetic materials for the books of Samuel. Hävernick (§ 161) supposes there was another source of information to which the author of Samuel might resort, namely, the annals of David's reign — a conjecture not altogether unlikely, as may be seen by his reference to 2Sa 8:17, compared with 1Ch 27:24. The accounts of David's heroes and their mighty feats, with the estimate of their respective bravery, have the appearance of a contribution by Seruiah,  the scribe, or principal secretary of state. Out of such materials ample and authoritative, some of them written and some of them oral — the books of Samuel appear to be made up (Bunsen, Bibelwerk, pt. 2. p. 496; Karo, De Fontibus Librorum quoe feruntur Samuelis [1862]).

V. Antiquity. — The external evidence carries the book only to the age of the Ptolemies, when the Sept. version was made, or possibly to the age of Nehemiah, if we may trust the apocryphal account of the foundation of a library by the latter (2Ma 2:13). But the internal evidence is much stronger. The high antiquity of the books of Samuel, or of the sources whence they were principally derived, in comparison with that of the Kings and Chronicles, appears from the absence of reference to older sources or authorities in the former, such as is frequently made in the latter. It hence appears that the compiler did not live at any great distance from the events which he relates, and therefore does not deem it needful to refer his readers to sources already known to them; while the original sources have for the most part all the marks of having been written by persons contemporaneous with the events described. Against this opinion as to the early age of the books of Samuel, various objections have been brought. The phrase “unto this day” is often employed in them to denote the continued existence of customs, monuments, and names whose origin has been described by the annalist (1Sa 5:5; 1Sa 6:18; 1Sa 30:25). This phrase, however, does not always indicate that a long interval of time elapsed between the incident and such a record of its duration. It was a common idiom. Joshua (1Sa 22:3) uses it of the short time that Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh had fought in concert with the other tribes in the subjugation of Canaan. So, again, he (1Sa 23:9) employs it to specify the time that intervened between the entrance into Canaan and his resignation of the command on account of his approaching decease. Matthew, in his Gospel (1Sa 27:8, and 1Sa 28:15), uses it of the period between the death of Christ and the composition of his book. Reference is made in Samuel to the currency of a certain proverb (1Sa 10:12), and to the disuse of the term seer (1Sa 9:9), but in a manner which by no means implies an authorship long posterior to the time of the actual circumstances. The proverb, “Is Saul also among the prophets?” was one which for many reasons would obtain rapid and universal circulation; and, if no other hypothesis be considered satisfactory, we may suppose that the remark about the term “seer” becoming obsolete may be the parenthetical insertion of a later hand; or, it may be that in Samuel's days the term nabi came to be technically used in  his school of the prophets. SEE PROPHET.

There is little reason for supposing that any part of the work was composed even so late as subsequently to the division of the kingdom. For the expression “Israel and Judah” (occurring 1Sa 11:8; 1Sa 17:52; 1Sa 18:16; 2Sa 3:10; 2Sa 5:5; 2Sa 24:1), which is claimed as proof of an origin after the division of the kingdom under Rehoboam, has no such force (as must be obvious from 2Sa 2:4; 2Sa 2:9-10; 2Sa 2:17; 2Sa 2:28; 2Sa 18:6-7; 2Sa 18:16; 2Sa 19:9, compared with 12, 15, 16), from which it is clear that the phrase, if not already in use, originated in the circumstances that at first only the tribe of Judah adhered to David, while the remaining tribes under the common name of Israel formed a separate kingdom for seven years and a half, under Ishbosheth, and afterwards for a short time under Absalom. There is, however, one passage, 1Sa 27:6, “Therefore hath Ziklag been to the kings of Judah till this day,” which is not so clearly reconcilable with this view, unless it should prove to be a note added by a later hand.

With this claim to high antiquity the other internal evidence, so far as it goes, entirely agrees. In the unsettled times of the judges the observance of the ritual enjoined in the books of Moses had fallen greatly into disuse. Sacrifices which were lawful only before the door of the tabernacle were offered at many places, as at Mizpeh and Gilgal. No disapprobation of this practice is expressed in Samuel, though it very often is so in Kings. The Pentateuch seems to exert little influence on the habits of the people as described in Samuel, or on the ideas and language of the writers. There are, in; deed, fewer allusions to Moses and his writings in Samuel than in any other of the early books of Scripture. But this may doubtless be in part accounted for by the disorganized and somewhat anomalous state into which matters fell in consequence of the capture of the ark by the Philistines, and the essentially new era which was shortly afterwards introduced by the institution of the kingdom, with the stirring events that followed in the personal histories of Saul and David. The name of Moses occurs fifty-six times in Joshua, in Judges three, in Samuel two, in Kings ten, in Chronicles thirty-one. The law of Moses is never once named in Samuel.

The language is distinguished by its purity, and this also is an argument for the early origin of these books. A considerable number of words and forms of words are peculiar to them, and several occur which are found only in one other book besides. But it is unnecessary here to give lists of them.

VI. The Author or Compiler. — With the exception of a brief expression in the Talmud (Egyptian Gemara, A.D. 500, Baba Bathra, fol. 14), שמואל כהב ספרו(“ Samuel wrote his book”), there is no opinion expressed by antiquity respecting the name of the author. No mention is made of it in the books of Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles, or in any part of the Bible. Nor is it named in the Apocrypha or in Josephus. The work is generally attributed to some competent historian, who availed himself of authentic documents in preparing it. Some writers, as Abarbanel and Grotius, ascribe it to Jeremiah, some to Ezra, and some to Isaiah. There is not nearly so much probability that Jeremiah compiled the books of Samuel (as is argued at some length by Hitzig, Die Psalmen, p. 48-85) as there is that he was the writer of the books of Kings. There is much greater dissimilarity of language, style, and spirit between Samuel and Jeremiah than between Kings and Jeremiah. The great number of words and forms of words peculiar to this work point out a distinct author and age, and it would seem most likely that it was compiled in an early period after the death of David, and previously to the rending of the kingdom under Rehoboam; unless the opinion which has widely prevailed in the Christian Church should be finally adopted, that the work begun by Samuel was carried on and finished before the death of David by Nathan and Gad, or that it was the work of some member of the school of the prophets who had personal knowledge of the events which he narrates. If, however, this theory cannot be maintained, and there should be grounds for supposing that the compiler lived not earlier than the times of Rehoboam (see Thenius on 2Sa 8:7; 2Sa 14:27), still it must be acknowledged that the materials which he used were of earlier date, and must for the most part have been written by persons who were contemporaneous with the events. It appears certain that memoirs were written by Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (see 2Ch 29:29), and perhaps also by other members of the schools of the prophets, although it may not be equally certain that those memoirs are identical with the present books of Samuel. The fact that a recorder or remembrancer (מִזְכַּיר), whose office it was to prepare memoirs or annals of passing events, is mentioned early among the household of David, is not without an important bearing on this question. It is clear that the authors of the original documents, if not of the work itself, must have occupied such positions of honor and influence as gave them ample opportunity of knowing the events of the times in which they wrote. Such minute details as we find, for instance, in the history of David, belonging rather to his  private than to his public life — the story of Bathsheba, of David's behavior on the death of her child, of Amnon and Tamar, of the secret sending to the priests from Mahanaim, etc. — bespeak perfectly well instructed writers, who had access to the best sources of information.

Stähelin (Einleit. § 25, etc.) conjectures that a large portion of Samuel was written by the author of the Pentateuch and of the books of Joshua and Judges. But continuity of history in the same form does not prove identity of authorship, nor are the similar phrases found in these books sufficient in number or characteristic idiom to support the theory. Nay, Samuel is free from the so called Chaldaisms of Judges and the archaisms of the Pentateuch. The peculiar theory of Jahn, on the other hand, is that the four books of Samuel and Kings were written by the same person, and at a date so recent as the 30th year of the Babylonian captivity. His arguments, however, as well as those of Eichhorn (Einleit. § 468), and Herbst (Einleit. 2, 1-139), who hold a similar view, are more ingenious than solid (introduction, § 46). The fact of all the four treatises being named “Books of Kings” is insisted on as a proof that they were originally undivided and formed a single work — a mere hypothesis, since the similarity of their contents might easily give rise to this general title, while the more ancient appellation for the first two was The Books of Samuel. Great stress is laid on the uniformity of method in all the books. But this uniformity by no means amounts to any proof of identity of authorship. It is nothing more than the same Hebrew historical style. The more minute and distinctive features, so far from being similar, are very different. Nay, the books of Samuel and Kings may be contrasted in many of those peculiarities which mark a different writer:

(a.) In Kings there occur not a few references to the laws of Moses; in Samuel not one of these is to be found.

(b.) The books of Kings repeatedly cite authorities, to which appeal is made, and the reader is directed to the “Acts of Solomon,” “the book of the Chronicles of Kings of Israel,” or “Judah.” But in the books of Samuel there is no formal allusion to any such sources of information.

(c.) The nature of the history in the two works is very different. The plan of the books of Samuel is not that of the books of Kings. The books of Samuel are more of a biographical character, and are more limited and personal in their view.

(d.) There are in the books of Kings many later forms of language. For a collection of some of these the reader is referred to De Wette (Einleit. in das A.T. § 185, note e). Scarcely any of those more recent or Chaldaic forms occur in Samuel. Besides, some peculiarities of form are noted by De Wette (§ 180), but they are not so numerous or distinctive as to give a general character to the treatise (Hirzel, De Chaldaismi Bibl. Origine, 1830). Many modes of expression common in Kings are absent from Samuel (Keil, Einleit. § 53). SEE KINGS, BOOKS OF.

(e.) The concluding chapters of the second book of Samuel are in the form of an appendix to the work — a proof of its completeness. The connection between Samuel and Kings is thus interrupted. It appears, then, that Samuel claims a distinct authorship from the books of Kings. Stähelin, indeed, supposes that the present division between the two treatises has not been correctly made, and that the two commencing chapters of 1 Kings really belong to 2 Samuel. This he argues on philological grounds, because the terms והפלתי והכרתי(1Ki 1:38), מלט נפש (1Ki 1:12), and נפש פדה (1Ki 1:29) are found nowhere in Kings but in the first two chapters, while they occur once and again in Samuel. There is certainly something peculiar in this affinity, though it may be accounted for on the principle that the author of the pieces or sketches which form the basis of the initial portions of 1 Kings not only composed those which form the conclusion of Samuel, but also supervised or published the whole work which is now called by the prophet's name.

Thus the books of Samuel have an authorship of their own — an authorship belonging to a very early period. While their tone and style are very different from the later records of Chronicles, they are also dissimilar to the books of Kings. They bear the impress of a hoary age in their language, allusions. and mode of composition. The insertion of odes and snatches of poetry, to enliven and verify the narrative, is common to them with the Pentateuch. They abound in minute sketches and vivid touches. As if the chapters had been extracted from a diary, some portions are more fully detailed and warmly colored than others, according as the original observer was himself impressed. Many of the incidents, in their artless and striking delineation, would form a fine study for a painter.

VII. The Object. — So far as the compiler of these books might be conscious of a direct aim in his work, producing it, as doubtless he did, under the impulse and guidance of the Holy Spirit, it might be his endeavor  to continue the history of the chosen people, and especially to record the remarkable change which was effected in the method of the divine government, when the God of Israel ceased to rule the people by judges, and permitted them to be governed by kings, as were the other nations of the earth. In pursuing this object the writer took care to point out the important distinction which was to be maintained between the kings of Israel and those of other nations, in the separation of the civil from the ecclesiastical, or the secular from the religious authority; and also to describe the origin and influence of the prophetical order in relation both to the monarchy and to the people. The books of Kings are a history of the nation as a theocracy; those of Chronicles have special reference to the form and ministry of the religious worship, as bearing upon its reestablishment after the return from Babylon. Samuel is more biographical, yet the theocratic element of the government is not overlooked. It is distinctly brought to view in the early chapters concerning Eli and his house, and the fortunes of the ark; in the passages which describe the change of the constitution; in the blessing which rested on the house of Obed-Edom; in the curse which fell on the Bethshemites and Uzzah and Saul for intrusive interference with holy things.

VIII. Particular Relation to the Books of Chronicles. — That portion of the history which is common to the books of Samuel and of Chronicles is found in 2 Samuel 1-24, and 1 Chronicles 10-21, beginning with the account of the death of Saul and ending with the story of the pestilence. Between these two narrations of the same period of history the following differences may be pointed out.

1. The book of Samuel contains, but that of Chronicles omits:

1. The story of David's kindness to Mephibosheth, 2 Samuel 9.

2. Of Bathsheba and Uriah, 2Sa 11:2-12; 2Sa 11:25.

3. The rebellion of Absalom, 2 Samuel 13, etc.

4. The surrender of seven of the sons of Saul to the Gibeonites, 2Sa 21:1-14.

5. A war with the Philistines, 2Sa 21:15-17.

6. David's song (Psalms 18), 2 Samuel 22.

7. The last words of David, 2 Samuel 23.

2. The book of Samuel omits, but that of Chronicles contains:

1. A list of David's adherents.

2. A list of those who chose David to be king at Hebron.

3. David's preparation for building the Temple.

4. The arrangement of the Levites and priests for Temple service.

5. David's officers and heroes, etc.

3. The two works present several portions of the history in a different order, such as the following:

2Sa 5:11-25 .............. 1 Chronicles 14

2Sa 6:1-10..............1Ch 11:1-9.

2Sa 6:3-11..............1 Chronicles 13.

2Sa 6:12-23 .............1 Chronicles 15.

2Sa 23:8-10 ........... 1Ch 11:10-47.

4. The differences of verbal and grammatical forms in the narration of the same events in these two works are of such a nature as to indicate the greater antiquity of the books of Samuel. Nearly all the points in which Chronicles differ from Samuel may be distinctly explained by the more recent origin of the former. They are too numerous and minute to be here mentioned.

5. Many of the numbers in Samuel and Chronicles differ, as 2Sa 10:13; 2Sa 18:24, and 1Ch 19:12. 2Sa 23:8, and 1Ch 11:11. 2Sa 24:9; 2Sa 24:13, and 1Ch 21:5; 1Ch 21:12.

These discrepancies are doubtless to be accounted for on the ground of errors of transcription. Whether the numbers in Samuel are generally right, and those in Chronicles generally wrong, which is the common (but perhaps usually incorrect) opinion, or whether errors exist in both, cannot be determined until more careful attention shall have been given to the subject, and a more critical edition of the Hebrew text shall have been prepared. SEE CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF.

IX. Chronology. — One of the most striking points of difference between the books of Samuel and of Kings is the more sparing use of dates in the former. The means of determining the periods of time in which the various events recorded in them happened are exceedingly scanty. The most helpful are found in other parts of Scripture. Thus, in Acts 13 we find that Saul was king “by the space of forty years.” We know already that David  reigned over Judah and all Israel forty years, and we have also calculated that Samuel must have lived about 110 years. If, then, Samuel died about five years before Saul, we find that the history covers a period of 155 years, except that brief portion of the life of David not contained in Samuel. These numbers agree with the usual dates assigned to the commencement and termination of the books of Samuel. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

X. Canonicity, etc. — The historical credibility and canonicity of these books need not be fully discussed in this place. The internal evidence of their truthfulness and the external evidence of their canonical authority are both complete. The style in which they are written is simple, natural, and bold. Places, times, and other minute details are freely and artlessly given. The course and connection of the history carry with them the proof of their truthfulness. The characters and events are in accordance with the times in which they are placed. Attempts to establish contradiction and discrepancy have not succeeded. The history contained in these books fits in and accords with the preceding and subsequent portions of the history of the Israelitish people, although the several portions were composed at long intervals and by different authors. Portions of them are quoted in the New Test. (2Sa 7:14, in Heb 1:5; 1Sa 13:14, in Act 13:22). References to them occur in other sections of Scripture, especially in the Psalms, to which they often afford historic illustration. The old objections of Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, and Le Clerc are well disposed of by Carpzov (Introductio, p. 215). Some of these supposed contradictions we have already referred to, and for a solution of others we refer to Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 544, etc. Some of the objections of Vatke, in his Bibl. Theol. — “cujus mentio est refutatio” — are summarily disposed of by Hengstenberg (Die Authentie des Pentat. 2, 115). See, in addition to the ordinary Introductions to the Old Test. — such as those of Horne, Hävernick, Keil, De Wette — the following later works: Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Berl. 1860), p. 355-368; Stähelin, Specielle Einleitung in die kanonischen Bucher des Alten Testaments (Elberfeld, 1862), p. 83-105; Davidson, Introduction to the Old Testament (Lond. and Edinb. 1862), p. 491-536.

XI. Commentaries. — The exegetical helps on the entire books of Samuel alone have not been numerous: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. 2, 479; also in Gallandii Bibl. Patrum, 14); Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 4, 331);  Theodoret, Quoestiones (in Opp. 1, 1); Gregory, Expositiones (in Opp. 3, 2, 1); Jerome, Quoestiones (in Opp. [ Spur.], 3, 755); Eucherius, Commentaria (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 6); Procopius, Scholia [includ. other hist. books] (in Meursii Opp. 8, 1); Isidore, Commentaria (in Opp.); Babe, Expositio, etc. (in various forms, in Opp.); Angelomus, Enarrationes (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 15); Hildebert, Versio Metrica (in Opp. p. 1191); Raban, Commentarii (in Opp.); Rupert, Commentarii (in Opp. 1, 345); Hugo Victor, Annotationes (in Opp. 1); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּשׁ [includ. other hist. books] (s.1. et a. [Pesaro, 1522]; Naples, 1543, fol.; Leips. 1686, fol.); Bafiolas, פֵּרוּש ׁ (Leiria, 1494, fol.; also in the Rabbinic Bibles); Bugenhagen, Adnotationes [includ. Deuteronomy] (Basil. 1524; Argent. 1525, 8vo); Menius, Commentarius [on 1 Samuel] (Vitemb. 1532, 8vo); Brentius, Commentaria (in Opp. 2); Lambert, Commentarius (Argent. 1526; Francof. 1539, fol.); Caussin [R.C.], Dissertationes (Par. 1550, fol.; Colon. 1552, 4to); Weller, Commentaria [includ. 1 Kings] (Francof. 1555, 2 vols. 8vo); Peter Martyr, Commentarii (Tigur. 1567, fol.); Strigel, Commentarius [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Lips. 1569, 1583, fol.; Neost. 1591, 8vo); Borrhäus, Commentarius [includ. other hist. books] (Basil. 1577, fol.); Allschul, שַׁמוּאֵל(Cracow, 1595, fol., and later); Ascheich, מִרְאוֹת הִצּיֹבְאוֹה [includ. other hist. books] (Venice, ] 1601, 1620, fol., and later); Pflacker, Predigten (Tüb. 1602, fol.); Lafado, יָקָר כְּלַי [includ. other hist. books] (Venice, 1603, fol.); Bidemach, Auslegung (Tüb. 1605, fol.); Willet, Harmony (Cambr. 1606; Lond. 1607, 4to; ibid. 1614, fol.); Leonhart, Hypomnete [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Erf. 1608, 1614, 8vo); Serarius [R.C.], Commentaria [includ. other books] (Lugd. 1613; Mogunt. 1617, fol.); Laurent, Auslegung (Leips. 1615, 1616, fol.); Drusius, Adnotationes [on parts, includ. other books] (Franec. 1618, 4to); Rangolius [R.C.], Commentarii (Par. 1621-24, 2 vols. fol.); De Mendoza [R.C.], Commentaria [on 1 Samuel 1-15] (Lugd. 1622-31, 3 vols. fol.); Sanchez [R.C.], Commentarius (Antw. 1624; Lugd. 1625, fol.); Crommius [R.C.], Theses (includ. other hist. books] (Lovan. 1631, 4to); De Vera [R.C.], Commentaria (Limae, 1635, fol.); Bonfrere [R.C.], Commentarius [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Tornaci, 1643, 2 vols. fol., and later); Wulffer, Predigten (Nüremb. 1670, 4to); De Naxera [R.C.], Excursus (Lugd. 1672, 3 vols. fol.); Osiander, Commentarius (Stuttg. 1687, fol.); Schmid, Commentarius (Argent. 1687-89, 2 vols. 4to); Moldenhauer, Erläuterung [includ. other hist. books] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik, בְּאֹר [on 1 Samuel] (Vienna, 1793, 8vo); Detmold,  שְׁמוּאֵל (ibid. 1793, 8vo, and later); Hensler, Erläuterung [on 1 Samuel] (Hamb. and Kiel, 1795, 8vo); Horsley, Notes (in Bibl. Criticism, 1); Mulder, נְבַיאַים רַאשׁוֹנַים[includ. other hist. books] (Amst. 1827, 8vo); Lindsay, Lectures (Lond. 1828, 2 vols. 12mo); Kalkar, Quoestiones [on the authenticity of 1 Samuel] (Othin. 1835); Königsfeldt, Annotationes [on 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles] (Havn. 1839, 8vo); Wellhausen, Der Text d. B. S. (Gött. 1841, 8vo); Thenius, Erklärung (in the Kurzgef. exeg. Handb., Leips. 1842, 1864, 8vo); Keil and Delitzsch, Commentar (ibid. 1864; transl. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1866, 8vo); Erdmann, Erklärung (in Lange's Bibelwerk, Bielefeld, 1873, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Samus[[@Headword:Samus]]

             In Greek mythology, is an ancestral hero of the Samians, from whom both that people and the island Samos derived their names. He was the son of Ancaeus, king of the Leleges, and Samia, daughter of Maeander. His brothers were Perilaus, Enudus, and Alitherses, and Parthenope was his sister.

## San Benito[[@Headword:San Benito]]

             The garment worn by the victims of the Inquisition on the occasion of the auto-da-fé. It was a yellow frock, with a cross on the breast and on the back, devils and flames also being painted upon it. Those who were to be burned alive had the flames pointing upward, while those who had escaped this horrible fate had them pointing downward.

## San Erdeni[[@Headword:San Erdeni]]

             in Lamaism, is one of the seven sacred objects which are placed before the idols in the temples of the Mongols, Kalmucks, and Tibetans. It represents  a white elephant, an animal regarded with the utmost veneration by those peoples, insomuch that the loftiest title of the sovereigns of Burma, China, and India (the former “Great Mogul”) is “lord of the white elephant,” and bloody wars have been waged to secure it as an exclusive right.

## San-Gimignano, Vincenzo Da[[@Headword:San-Gimignano, Vincenzo Da]]

             An Italian painter, was born in Tuscany, and flourished during the earlier part of the 16th century. He was one of the pupils of Raphael, who esteemed him very highly for the softness of his coloring and the beautiful paintings in wax with which he ornamented the facades of several palaces. During the sack of Rome in 1527, Vincenzo fled to San-Gimignano, having lost almost all his works and designs. He lived only a short time after this misfortune. His works are very rare, one being in the Museum at Dresden — a Madonna with the Infant Jesus and St. John.

## San-Giorgio, Gianantonio Dr[[@Headword:San-Giorgio, Gianantonio Dr]]

             An Italian prelate, was born at Milan in 1439. Having completed his studies at the University of Pavia, he opened a school of canonical law in that city, but at the end of six years returned to Milan. He there became a member of the College of Jurists, afterwards provost of the basilica of St. Ambrose, and in 1479 was made bishop of Alexandria. In 1493 Alexander VI bestowed upon him the cardinal's hat, and transferred him in turn to Parma, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina. This prelate was employed by the popes in various negotiations, and was a man of prudence and great learning. He died at Rome, March 14, 1509. He published several works, as Commentaria super quorto Decretalium: — De Appellationibus: — De Usibus Feudorum: — Lecturoe super Decretales.

## San-Jasiis[[@Headword:San-Jasiis]]

             One of the three classes of Jagins, which latter are Brahmanic anchorets. They affect great abstinence, and refrain from marriage, betel, and, indeed, pleasure in general. They are allowed to make but one meal a day, and to live on alms, carrying with them a cup of earthenware only. Their clothes  are dyed with red earth, and they have a long bamboo cane in their hands. They are forbidden to touch either gold or silver, much less to carry any about them. They are not allowed to have any fixed residence, nor to lie two nights together in the same place, once a year excepted, when they are suffered to continue two months in the same place: they then select such a spot as is thought to be holy, and there they may remain for life if they wish. They are bound to be always ready to oppose six enemies, viz. Cama, lust; Croota, anger; Lopa, avarice; Madda, pride; the love of things of this world; and Matsara, thirst for revenge.

## Sanabassar[[@Headword:Sanabassar]]

             (Sanab£Ssaroj V.R. Saman£Ssaroj, 1Es 2:12; 1Es 2:15), Or Sanabas'sarus (Sanab£Ssaroj, V.R. Saban£Ssaroj, 1Es 6:18; 1Es 6:20), The Greek form of the Heb. name SHESHBAZZAR in the corresponding passages (Ezr 1:8; Ezr 1:11; Ezr 5:14; Ezr 5:16).

## Sanadon, Noel-Etienne[[@Headword:Sanadon, Noel-Etienne]]

             A celebrated Jesuit, was born at Rouen, Feb. 16, 1676. At the early age of twelve he was admitted to the Order of Jesuits, and carried on his studies at Caen, where he afterwards taught rhetoric. His first literary attempt was a Latin poem entitled Nicanor Moriens. He subsequently wrote and translated many Latin poems, one of which, a translation of Horace, is considered his best work. In 1712 Sanadon was elected professor of rhetoric in the College of Louis the Great, and in 1728 he became librarian of the same institution. He died at Paris, Sept. 21, 1733.

## Sanagen[[@Headword:Sanagen]]

             In Hindu mythology, is a rajah of the children of the moon, the father of Darmatuwassa and grandfather of Kandikaiya.

## Sanakadi Sampradayis[[@Headword:Sanakadi Sampradayis]]

             One of the Vaishnava sects among the Hindus. They worship Krishna and Radha conjointly, and are distinguished from other sects by a circular black mark in the center of the ordinary double streak of white earth, and also by the use of the necklace and rosary on the stem of the tulasai. The members of this sect are scattered throughout the whole of Upper India. They are very numerous about Mathura, and they are also among the most numerous of the Vaishnava sects in Bengal.

## Sanarkumaren[[@Headword:Sanarkumaren]]

             In Hindu mythology, is one of the four perfect beings created by Brahma in order to recreate the destroyed human race; but as the pious offspring did not achieve that object, the evil spirit became the prevailing power in coition.

## Sanasib[[@Headword:Sanasib]]

             (Σανασίβ, v.r. Σαναβίς, Α᾿νασείβ), A head of the priests, “the sons of Jeddu, the son of Jesus,” who are said to have returned, to the number of 972, with Zerubbabel from the captivity (1Es 5:24); evidently the 973 “children of Jedaiah, of the house of Jeshua,” in the Heb. texts (Ezr 2:36; Neh 7:39), the name Sanasib having been repeated for the “Senaah” (Esdras, “Annaas”) of the preceding verse.

## Sanat[[@Headword:Sanat]]

             In Finnish mythology, means songs of magical power which are chanted by the priests of the heathen Finns for the purpose of producing storms, curing the sick, causing favorable weather, bewitching cattle, etc.

## Sanballat[[@Headword:Sanballat]]

             (Heb. Sanballat', סִנְבִּלִּט), A name of which the latter part is of uncertain etymology, but the first syllable is probably the Sanskrit san [Greek σύν], indicative of strength; Sept. Σανβαλλάτ, Josephus, Σαναβαλλέτης), a Horonite (q.v.), i.e. probably a native of Horonaim in Moab (Neh 2:10; Neh 2:19; Neh 13:28). There are two very different accounts of him.

All that we know of him from Scripture is that he had apparently some civil or military command in Samaria, in the service of Artaxerxes (Neh 4:2), and that, from the moment of Nehemiah's arrival in Judea, he set himself to oppose every measure for the welfare of Jerusalem, and was a constant adversary to the Tirshatha. B.C. 445. His companions in this hostility were Tobiah the Ammonite and Geshem the Arabian (Neh 2:19; Neh 4:7). For the details of their opposition, see Nehemiah 6, where the enmity between Sanballat and the Jews is brought out in the strongest colors. The only other incident in his life is his alliance with the high priest's family by the marriage of his daughter with one of the grandsons of Eliashib, which, from the similar connection formed by Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh 13:4), appears to have been part of a settled policy concerted between Eliashib and the Samaritan faction. The expulsion from the priesthood of the guilty son of Joiada by Nehemiah must have still further widened the breach between him and Sanballat, and between the two parties in the Jewish state. Here, however, the scriptural narrative ends — owing, probably, to Nehemiah's return to  Persia — and with it likewise our knowledge of Sanballat. SEE NEHEMIAH.

But on turning to the pages of Josephus a wholly new set of actions, in a totally different time, is brought before us in connection with Sanballat, while his name is entirely omitted in the account there given of the government of Nehemiah, which is placed in the reign of Xerxes. Josephus, after interposing the whole reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus between the death of Nehemiah and the transactions in which Sanballat took part, and utterly ignoring the very existence of Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Ochus, etc., jumps at once to the reign of “Darius the last king,” and tells us (Ant. 11, 7, 2) that Sanballat was his officer in Samaria, that he was a Cuthaean (i.e. a Samaritan) by birth, and that he gave his daughter Nicaso in marriage to Manasseh, the brother of the high priest Jaddua, and consequently the fourth in descent from Eliashib, who was high priest in the time of Nehemiah. He then relates that on the threat of his brother Jaddua and the other Jews to expel him from the priesthood unless he divorced his wife, Manasseh stated the case to Sanballat, who thereupon promised to use his influence with king Darius, not only to give him Sanballat's government, but to sanction the building of a rival temple on Mount Gerizim of which Manasseh should be the high priest. Manasseh, on this, agreed to retain his wife and join Sanballat's faction, which was further strengthened by the accession of all those priests and Levites (and they were many) who had taken strange wives. But just at this time happened the invasion of Alexander the Great; and Sanballat, with seven thousand men, joined him and renounced his allegiance to Darius (Ant. 11, 8, 4).

Being favorably received by the conqueror, he took the opportunity of speaking to him in behalf of Manasseh. He represented to him how much it was for his interest to divide the strength of the Jewish nation, and how many there were who wished for a temple in Samaria; and so obtained Alexander's permission to build the temple on Mount Gerizim, and make Manasseh the hereditary high priest. Shortly after this, Sanballat died; but the temple on Mount Gerizim remained, and the Shechemites, as they were called, continued also as a permanent schism, which was continually fed by all the lawless and disaffected Jews. Such is Josephus's account. If there is any truth in it, of course the Sanballat of whom he speaks is a different person from the Sanballat of Nehemiah, who flourished fully one hundred years earlier; but when we put together Josephus's silence concerning a Sanballat in Nehemiah's time, and the many coincidences in the lives of the  Sanballat of Nehemiah and that of Josephus, together with the inconsistencies in Josephus's narrative (pointed out by Prideaux, Connect. 1, 288, 290, 395, 466), and its disagreement with what Eusebius tells of the relations of Alexander with Samaria (who says that Alexander appointed Andromachus governor of Judaea and the neighboring districts; that the Samaritans murdered him; and that Alexander, on his return, took Samaria in revenge, and settled a colony of Macedonians in it, and the inhabitants of Samaria retired to Sichem [Chronicles Can. p. 346]), and remember how apt Josephus is to follow any narrative, no matter how anachronistic and inconsistent with Scripture, we shall have no difficulty in concluding that his account of Sanballat is not historical. It is doubtless taken from some apocryphal romance, now lost, in which the writer, living under the empire of the Greeks, and at a time when the enmity of the Jews and Samaritans was at its height, chose the downfall of the Persian empire for the epoch, and Sanballat for the ideal instrument, of the consolidation of the Samaritan Church and the erection of the temple on Gerizim. To borrow events from some Scripture narrative and introduce some scriptural personage, without any regard to chronology or other propriety, was the regular method of such apocryphal books. (See 1 Esdras, apocryphal Esther, apocryphal additions to the book of Daniel, and the articles on them, and the story inserted by the Sept. after 2 Kings 12:24, etc.). To receive as historical Josephus's narrative of the building of the Samaritan temple by Sanballat, circumstantial as it is in its account of Manasseh's relationship to Jaddua, and Sanballat's intercourse with both Darius Codomanus and Alexander the Great, and yet to transplant it, as Prideaux does, to the time of Darius Nothus (B.C. 409), seems scarcely compatible with sound criticism. SEE SAMARITAN.

## Sanborn, E.C.[[@Headword:Sanborn, E.C.]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bath, N.H., June 12, 1794. Early impressed that it was his duty to preach, he hesitated  for some time. At length a portion of one of his hands became maimed for life; that hand, while yet bleeding, he held towards heaven, and promised God that he would no longer resist his convictions of duty. In 1833 he joined the Genesee Conference, and continued in effective work until 1844, when, through failing health, he was obliged to desist entirely from ministerial labor. He died at the residence of his son, Hon. L.R. Sanborn, Niagara County, N.Y., April 20, 1867. He entertained a high appreciation of the varied duties of the ministry, was a firm believer in the doctrines of his Church, and an ardent admirer of her polity. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1867, p. 244.

## Sanborn, Jacob[[@Headword:Sanborn, Jacob]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Unity, N.H., May 16, 1788. His pious parents deeply impressed the mind of their son by their religious instructions, prayers, and holy life. At the age of seventeen years (1805), he was awakened, and found peace. Although of Baptist parentage, he united (Jan. 18, 1806) with the Methodist Episcopal Church. About five years after, he became impressed that it was his duty to preach, and on Aug. 14, 1811, he went to preach as a licentiate on the Landaff Circuit, N.H. In June, 1812, he united on trial with the New England Conference, and from this time onward until 1850, with the exception of one year's location (1839-40), he performed effective labor. In 1850 he took a superannuated relation, which he retained until his death. He nevertheless continued to preach until May 10, 1863, when he delivered his last sermons in Pembroke. He died March 16, 1867. Mr. Sanborn was a more than ordinary man. He was a sound divine, good logician, able preacher, an eminently good pastor, a man of prayer, and of strict integrity of purpose and honesty of heart. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1867, p. 59.

## Sanbuki Codex[[@Headword:Sanbuki Codex]]

             Is a Hebrew manuscript, now no more extant. Nothing is known of its author, the place where, and the time when it was written. According to Richard Simon (Biblioth. Critic. 1, 367), the name Sanbuki (זנבוקי) is derived from the owner of the MS., a Hungarian family. According to Hottinger (in Bibliothecario Quadripartito, p. 158, ed. Turic.), the name ought to be זנדוקיinstead of זנבוקי, which is equivalent to Zadduki, or Sadducee. For other conjectures, see Wolf (Bibl. Hebr. 2, 292, 293; 4, 79) and Tychsen (Tentamen, p. 249, 250). As to the codex itself, some of its  readings are given in the margin of some MSS., as in Cod. Kennic. 415; Cod. Kennic. 8 (Bibl. Bodl. Hunting. 69; comp. Brunsius, Ad Kenn. Diss. Genesis p. 345). Besides, this codex is quoted three times by Menachem di Lonzano in his commentary Or Thora, as on Gen 9:14, בְּעֲנֲנַי(fol. 2 b, fin. ed. Amstel): אן בשוא לבד ובזנבוקי בשוא בפתה בהללי הנו, i.e. in the Codex Hillel, the nun has only the sh'va (:), but in the Codex Sanbuki the sh'va with the patach; Lev 13:20, שָׁפָל(fol. 14 b), שפל בזנבוקי הפ א בפתח, i.e. in the Codex Sanbuki the פin שפלis written with the patach; Lev 26:36, וְהֵבֵאתַי (fol. 15 b), געיא בתי ו אבִהללי ובירושלמיים ובזנבוקי בס תס ואשכנז לאיש, i.e. in Spanish and German MSS. there is a gaya (i.e. a metheg) under ת, but not so in the Codd. Hillel, Jerusalem, and Sanbuki. See Strack, Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Test. Hebr. (Lips. 1873), p. 22. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL. (B.P.)

## Sanchez De Arevalo, Roderigo[[@Headword:Sanchez De Arevalo, Roderigo]]

             Generally known as Rodericus Sanctus, a Spanish prelate, was born at Santa Maria de Nieva, in the diocese of Segovia, in 1404. After receiving his classical education at the University of Salamanca, and obtaining the degree of doctor, he entered the Church, and was made successively archdeacon of Trevino (in the diocese of Burgos), dean of Leon, and dean of Seville. About 1440 John II of Castile sent him as ambassador to Frederick III, and he was afterwards sent by Henry IV of Castile to congratulate pope Calixtus III upon his accession. On the accession of Paul II, Sanchez, who had been prevailed upon by his predecessor to settle at Rome, was appointed by that pope governor of the Castle of St. Angelo and keeper of the jewels and treasures of the Roman Church, and in course of time promoted to the bishoprics of Zamora, Calahorra, and Palencia. He died at Rome Oct. 10, 1470, and was interred in the Church of Santiago dei Spagnuoli. He wrote the following works: Speculum Vitoe Humanoe (Rome, 1468, fol.): — Epistola de Expugnatione, etc. (fol.): — Compendiosa Historia Hispanica (Rome, 1470, 4to; Frankfort, 1603): —  Liber de Origine ac Differentia Principatus (Rome, 1521). Many other works in MS. are in the Vatican Library. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sanchez, Gaspar[[@Headword:Sanchez, Gaspar]]

             A learned Jesuit, was born at Cifuentes, in New Castile, about 1553. He was appointed to teach the learned languages and belles lettres in the Jesuit colleges at Oropesa, Madrid, and other places, and was at last chosen professor of divinity at Alcala. Here he spent thirteen years in commenting on the Scriptures, the result of which he published in various volumes in folio. He died in 1628.

## Sanchez, Pedro Antonio[[@Headword:Sanchez, Pedro Antonio]]

             A learned Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Vigo, in Gallicia, in 1740. He entered the Church, obtained a canonry in the Cathedral of St. James, and was likewise appointed professor of divinity in that city. His fame procured for him admission into many learned societies. He was celebrated as a preacher and admired for his benevolence, spending his income to aid the poor, so that, at his death in 1806, he left no more than was barely sufficient to defray the expenses of his funeral. Among his works are Summa Theologioe Sacroe (Madrid, 1789, 4 vols. 4to): — Annales Sacra (ibid. 1784, 2 vols. 8vo): — Hist. of the Church of Africa (ibid. 1784, 8vo): — A Treatise on Toleration, etc. (ibid. 1785, 3 vols. 4to), and others.

## Sanchez, Thomas[[@Headword:Sanchez, Thomas]]

             A celebrated Roman casuist, was born at Cordova in 1550. Raised in Romish piety, he joined the Jesuits in his sixteenth year. He studied philosophy, law, and theology with great success; was punctual in the fulfilment of all Church duties; and, at an early age, enjoyed a high reputation throughout Spain and Italy. His fame as a casuist was so great that he was often personally applied to for the solution of specific cases. He died at Granada in 1610. His work De Sacramento Matrimonii (Genuae, 1592, 3 vols.) occupies a high place in Jesuitical casuistry. It treats of every variety of obscene and immoral questions, and is justly regarded as indirectly contributive to the very immorality which it formally condemns. Pope Clement VIII used the work in preparing a solution of a specific case, and pronounced upon it the highest praise. But others have vigorously assailed it, even in the Roman Church. Arnauld of St. Cyr attacked it in his Vindicioe Censuroe Facultatis Parisiensis (see Bayle, Dictionnaire [art. “Sanchez”], 4, 134). After Sanchez's death appeared Operis Moralis in Proeceptis Dei Tomus I (Venet. 1614): — Consilia seu Opuscula Moralia (Lugd. 1634). His complete works appeared at Venice in 1740, in 7 vols. See Wuttke, Christian Ethics (N.Y. 1873), 1, 255-272; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 413. (J.P.L.)

## Sanchoniatho[[@Headword:Sanchoniatho]]

             (Σαγχουνιάθων), The supposed author of a Phoenician history of Phoenicia and Egypt, called Φοινικκιά. He has been the subject of much discussion involving his place of birth, his works, and, indeed, his very existence. Our principal information respecting him is derived from Philo Byblius, a Greek writer at the beginning of the 2d century A.D. According to him, Sanchoniatho lived during the reign of Semiramis, and dedicated his book to Avibalus, king of Berytus. The general nature of the work is in itself sufficient to prove it to be a forgery, and yet the question remains whether the name Sanchoniatho was a pure invention of Philo or not. Movers supposes that it was the name of the sacred books of the Phoenicians and that its original form was San-Chon-iath, which might be represented in the Hebrew characters by כּוֹן יִהִת סִן, that is, “the entire law of Chon.” On this etymology we offer no opinion. According to Suidas, he also wrote a book on the theology of the Egyptians.

## Sancroft, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Sancroft, William, D.D.]]

             An English prelate, was born at Fresingfield, Suffolk, Jan. 13, 1616, and educated at the grammar school of Bury St. Edmunds, and at Emanuel College, Cambridge. In 1642 Sancroft was elected a fellow of his college, but in the following year was deprived of his fellowship by the Puritans for refusing to subscribe to the famous “Engagement;” after which he went abroad. On the restoration of Charles 2, 1660, he was appointed chaplain to Cosin, bishop of Durham. After several preferments he was (1668) made archdeacon of Canterbury, and in 1677 archbishop of Canterbury. When James II issued his declaration for liberty of conscience and required the clergy to sign it, Sancroft refused. With six other bishops who joined him in his refusal, he was sent to the Tower (1688). He refused to take the oath to William and Mary, and was deposed by an act of Parliament, Aug. 1, 1689; but his actual departure from Lambeth did not take place until June 23, 1691. He then retired to his native village, where he died, Nov. 24, 1693. He published some Sermons, and Letters to Mr. North. His Modern Policies and Practices, from Machiavelli and others, was published in 1757.

## Sancta Sanctis[[@Headword:Sancta Sanctis]]

             SEE TRISAGION.

## Sancte-Bell, Sanctus-Bell, Saints-Bell, Massbell[[@Headword:Sancte-Bell, Sanctus-Bell, Saints-Bell, Massbell]]

             (old English forms, Sacring-bell, Saunce-bell), a small bell used in the Roman Catholic Church to call attention to the more solemn parts of the service of the Mass, as at the conclusion of the ordinary, when the words “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Deus Sabaoth” are pronounced by the priest, and on the elevation of the host and chalice after consecration. It is now usually, if not always, a small handbell carried by an attendant, and was generally of this kind in England previous to the Reformation, made sometimes of silver; but in some instances a larger bell was used, and was suspended on the outside of the church in a small turret, made to receive it, over the archway leading from the nave into the chancel, and rung by a rope from within. Many of these turrets still exist, as at Isham, Rothwell, and Desborough, Northamptonshire; Boston, Lincolnshire; Bloxham, Brize-norton, Swalcliffe, and Coombe, Oxfordshire, etc.; a few still retain the bell, as at Long Compton, Warwickshire. Occasionally, also, a number of “little bells were hung in the middle of the church, which the pulling of one wheel made all to ring, which was done at the elevation of the hoste.”

## Sancti, Sanctissimi[[@Headword:Sancti, Sanctissimi]]

             Usual epithets of the bishops, signifying holy, most holy. Other epithets were “beati, beatissimi,” blessed, most blessed; “Deo carissimi,” dearly beloved by God.

## Sanctification[[@Headword:Sanctification]]

             Separation from ordinary use to a sacred purpose. The Hebrew word קָדֵשׁand the Greek word ἃγιος, rendered “holy,” “hallowed,” and “sanctified,” are applied to certain times which were hallowed — as the Sabbath and the Hebrew festivals (Gen 2:3; Exo 20:8; Exo 20:11; Lev 23:37; 2Ki 10:20); to the things said to be hallowed, as the sacred incense or perfume (Exo 30:36; Mat 7:6), the sacred vestments (Exo 28:2; Exo 28:4), the sacred utensils (Exo 30:29; 1Ch 22:10; 2Ti 2:21), the holy bread (Lev 21:22; 1Sa 21:5), the altar (Exo 29:37; Exo 30:1; Exo 30:10; Mat 23:19), and portions of the sacrifices (Lev 2:3; Lev 2:10). So, also, of places said  to be hallowed (Exo 3:5; Act 7:33), as the holy city, i.e. Jerusalem (Neh 11:1; Isa 48:2; Mat 4:5; Mat 24:15; Mat 27:53; Act 6:13; Act 22:28), the holy mountain, i.e. Zion (Psa 2:6), the Tabernacle (Num 18:10); the Temple (Psa 138:2), the most holy place, the oracle (Exo 26:33; Exo 28:43; Heb 9:2-3; Heb 9:12; 1Ki 6:16; 1Ki 8:6; Eze 41:23). So, also, men are said to be hallowed, as Aaron and his sons (1Ch 23:13; 1Ch 24:5; Isa 43:28), the firstborn (Exo 13:2), and the Hebrew people (Exo 19:10; Exo 19:14; Daniel 12), also the pious Hebrews, the “saints” (Deu 33:3; Psa 16:3; Dan 7:18), like the word חָסַיד, rendered “saint” (Psa 30:4; Psa 31:23; Psa 37:28; Psa 1:5; Psa 52:9; Psa 79:2; Psa 97:10), and “godly” (Psa 4:3).

The terms are also used of those who were ceremonially purified under the Mosaic law (Num 6:11; Lev 22:16; Lev 22:32; Heb 9:13). But, though the external purifications of the Hebrews, when any one had transgressed, had to do with restoration to civil and national privileges, they did not necessarily induce moral and spiritual holiness. They, however, reminded the sincere Hebrew that he was unclean in the sight of God; and that the ceremonial cleansings, by which he had been restored to his civil and political rights, were symbols of those “good things that were to come” — spiritual and eternal salvation — which should accrue through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit. He was thus assured that “without holiness no man shall see the Lord” (Heb 9:14; Heb 12:14). Hence, sanctification is used to designate that state of mind induced by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, thus producing internal and external holiness (Joh 3:5; 1Co 6:11; Eph 5:26; 1Th 4:3-4; 1Th 4:7). It is true, sanctification is sometimes spoken of as the work of man himself (Exo 19:22; Lev 11:44; Lev 20:7-8; 1Pe 3:15). When a person solemnly and unreservedly gives himself to God, he then may be said to sanctify himself. He is then enabled to believe in Christ with his heart unto righteousness, and God instantly, by the communication of his Holy Spirit, sanctifies the believer. Thus the believer gives himself to God, and God, in return, gives himself to the believer (Eze 36:25-29; 1Co 3:16-17; 1Co 6:19; 2Co 6:16-18; Eph 2:22). This sanctification, which is received by faith, is the work of God within us.

In a general sense, “sanctification” comprehends the whole Christian life (Gal 5:22-23; 1Pe 1:15-16; 1Pe 1:22; Heb 12:10;  Jam 4:8). In 1Th 5:23, the apostle prays for the sanctification of the entire Church in all its various departments. In 1Co 7:14, it is said, the unbelieving husband, or wife, is “sanctified” — that is, to be regarded not as unclean, but as specially claiming the attention of the Christian community. The term “sanctified” is also used in the sense of expiation (Heb 10:10; Heb 10:14; Heb 10:29). See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 281, 288, 503; Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics. SEE HOLINESS.

## Sanctification, Entire[[@Headword:Sanctification, Entire]]

             One of the most interesting, and practically one of the most important, questions connected with the divine plan of salvation is, What degree of deliverance from sin is it scriptural for the believer to expect in this life?

I. Preliminary Concessions and Distinctions. — There are several points upon which all schools of theology agree.

1. One is that the complete sanctification of believers. their perfect deliverance from sin in every sense of the term, is an integral part of the great plan of redemption. Differ as they may in regard to the time when it shall be accomplished, they unite in pronouncing sin a thing to be abhorred, a defilement from the last touch or taint of which God's people are at some period to be delivered.

2. Again, all Christians agree that the true followers of Christ hate sin, loathe it, and struggle, and are bound ever to struggle, for complete deliverance from it. Whether continuous victory or daily defeat attend the contest, that war must go on.

3. All writers agree, also, in the conviction that no Christian in this life attains absolute perfection. Some, indeed, hold that through the grace of God the believer may attain what the Scriptures call perfection: consequently, the word itself is not to be condemned, seeing that it is employed by those who “speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” Nevertheless, the term perfection is applicable only in a restricted sense to any part of the Church militant. The holy law demands the absolute right, in word and deed, in thought and intention, in all obedience, love, and devotion. It requires payment of the debt, not only to “the uttermost farthing,” but in coin in which there is no trace of alloy.  But such service as this can be rendered only where there is perfect knowledge, not simply of the letter of the law, but of its practical application to the endlessly diversified and complicated events and circumstances of daily life. No mere man since the fall ever possessed such knowledge. The holiest of men are conscious that they are often at a loss to know what God and duty require at their hands, and that there are times when their uncertainty in matters of importance burdens and distresses them. Right and wrong sometimes seem to shade into each other, like the prismatic colors; and the sharpest eye cannot tell where the one ends or the other begins. The tenderest conscience takes alarm the soonest, and the better taught is the less liable to err; but the wisest and the most conscientious have occasion to pause now and then, waiting for clearer light, and, perhaps, wait in vain. When Paul and Barnabas at Antioch were planning a tour among the churches, Barnabas had a very positive desire that “John whose surname was Mark” should accompany them. Paul had an equally decided conviction that Mark ought not to go, seeing that he had “departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work.” Neither Paul nor Barnabas would yield; and “the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder, one from the other.” Here one or both of them failed of the absolute right. Either Paul, without being conscious of it, was unjust to a fellow disciple, or Barnabas, in his ignorance, was ready to imperil the work of the Lord by calling Mark to a position which he was not qualified to fill. Perhaps, in the sharp contention, παροξυσμός, they were unjust to each other, and thus another feature of wrong was introduced. If errors of judgment may thus lead to errors of action, when the holiest of men are counseling in regard to the holiest of causes, what may we expect of those who are immersed in the interests, prejudices, and collisions of common life?

Service may also be defective in degree. Justice, truth, and love are due to our fellow men; but a still higher and nobler duty is required at our hands. We are invited to the fellowship of our Lord Jesus Christ, and God the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost; and called to love and serve “in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life.” And who that ever by faith caught a glimpse of the glory of God, the great, the holy, and the good, “the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth,” did not bow down in lowliest self-abasement, in view of the poor service which he renders? The Christian never feels in this world that his service is all that he would have  it. Though faith may never utterly fail, nor obedience be forgotten, nor love grow cold, nor devotion die, yet the most obedient, faithful, and devoted child of God will humble himself in the very dust at the remembrance of his infinite obligations to his Creator and Redeemer and the poor returns which he is daily making. Thus, if we assume that the intent is wholly right and the purpose all controlling, the service rendered will be imperfect in character, marred by lack of knowledge and errors of judgment, and deficient in degree; and sinless obedience, in the absolute sense of the term, is utterly impossible.

4. Still another point needs recognition. As long as we remain in this world, however deep, fervent, and thorough our religious life, there are sources of danger within. There inhere in our nature as essential elements of it, at least in this present life, appetites, passions, and affections, without which man would be unfit for this present state of existence and would cease to be man. These, although innocent in themselves. are simply unreasoning impulses over which we need to keep constant watch and ward, ruling them by reason, conscience, and divine grace, else they lead to sin and death. By these “sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” When Eve, in Eden, “saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise,” the temptation was a skilful appeal to elements in her nature which were pure from the hand of the Creator. The desire for pleasant food is not sin; nor is the higher taste which finds enjoyment in contemplating beautiful forms and colors. Nor can we condemn the still more elevated instinct of the soul which delights in mental activity and the acquisition of knowledge. If these aptitudes and instincts had not existed in original human nature, the temptation of Satan would have had no power. “The deaf adder hears not the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.”

Consequently, in the work of sanctification, the various instincts and passions of original human nature do not need to be rooted out, but to be restrained, chastened, disciplined, made to obey reason and the voice of God. The due enjoyment of pleasant food is not the gluttony which the wise man condemns. A father may provide for his children by a wise foresight which is by no means the “covetousness which is idolatry.” When foul outrage is done to the innocent and the defenseless, we may feel our souls flame with fiery indignation, and “be angry and sin not.” God “setteth the solitary in families” by the affections with which he endowed man at the beginning; and nothing is more beautiful than the relations which grow out  of them, where the divine intent rules, and nothing more debasing and destructive than their abuse.

These elements of our nature survive the deepest work of grace. When the wondrous change has come to the penitent believer and he has “put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness,” he is still human, still nothing less than man. The world appeals to him, Satan assails him, and in himself is the tinder which the glancing sparks of temptation tend to kindle. “There is no discharge in that war.” Till life itself is done, some form of peril will remain. Youth may be tempted by fleshly lusts, manhood may become ambitious and proud, age misanthropic and avaricious. The innocent appetite to which, in Eden, the forbidden fruit appealed may be perverted into the despotic thirst of the inebriate; Eve's delight in beauty may be the germ from which shall spring a life given up to frivolity and empty show; and the nobler hunger for knowledge may break away from all authority and madly labor to reason God out of his own creation. Nevertheless, these possibilities of evil do not prove that God's children cannot in this world be saved from moral depravity, nor that the continuous commission of willful sin must stain the lives of the holiest of them till the very hour of death. They are proof, rather, that conversion does not end probation; and that it behooves every man, whatever progress he may have made in divine things, to “keep his body under, lest that by any means he should be a castaway.”

5. One more point needs to be stated. Discussion on this subject has often been rendered inconclusive and unsatisfactory by the misuse of terms. The Westminster Confession, as explained by the Exposition published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, makes “original sin” include three wholly different things: (1) the guilt of Adam's sin; (2) the inherited depravity of soul; (3) the damage done the body. Wesley also uses the term sin in three different senses: (1) the depravity inherited from Adam; (2) “voluntary transgression of known law;” (3) involuntary infractions of the divine law. Owing to this confusion of terms, there have been hot controversies where there was little real difference of opinion; whole octavos have been wasted in refuting what nobody holds, and proving what nobody doubts; and theological champions fight imaginary foes, and are happy in imaginary victories. If matters not really belonging to the question of entire sanctification are ruled out, we shall find that just two points need investigation: (a) What scriptural ground is there for the belief that the Christian may in this life be delivered from the moral depravity which he  inherited as a member of a fallen race? (b) How far and in what sense may the believer be kept in this life, through grace, from the commission of sin?

II. Different Ecclesiastical Views on the Subject. —

1. The Romish Theory. — The Council of Trent teaches that the sacrament of baptism, rightly administered, washes away guilt and depravity of every kind. It pronounces anathema against those who presume to think or dare to assert “that, although sin is forgiven in baptism, it is not entirely removed or totally eradicated, but is cut away in such a manner as to leave its roots still firmly fixed in the soul.” The Council, however, declares that concupiscence, or the fuel of sin, remains. “Concupiscence is the effect of sin, and is nothing more than an appetite of the soul, in itself repugnant to reason. If unaccompanied with the consent of the will or unattended with neglect on our part, it differs essentially from the nature of sin.”

The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches also that “the commandments of God are not difficult of observance.” “As God is ever ready by his divine assistance to sustain our weakness, especially since the death of Christ the Lord, by which the prince of this world was cast out, there is no reason why we should be disheartened by the difficulty of the undertaking. to him who loves nothing is difficult.”

2. The Calvinistic Theory. — The Westminster Confession of Faith has the following chapter on sanctification:

“They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by his word and spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified; and they are more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

“This sanctification is throughout the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abide still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.

“In this war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from the  sanctifying spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome; and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.”

In respect to the possibility of keeping the law, the following declarations of the Confession and the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church are sufficiently explicit:

“No man is able, either by himself or by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word, and deed.” — Catechism.

“This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin.” — Confession, ch. 6.

Thus the Calvinistic standards answer the two questions by saying, in reply to the first, that as long as a man lives on the earth “there abide still some remnants of corruption in every part” of his nature; and, in reply to the second, that every man, notwithstanding all the grace received, “doth daily break” the law of God “in thought, word, and deed;” and that this residue of corruption, “and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.” Consequently there is no such thing as entire sanctification in this life, but the holiest of God's children must of necessity remain corrupt, at least in part, and go on in the constant commission of actual sin as long as they live. Indeed, it is not entirely clear how “the saints,” as the Confession asserts, “grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord,” seeing that the highest attainments possible in this life still leave them with corruption within, and an outward life marred by the constant commission of sin, “in thought, word, and deed.”

3. Arminian Theories. —

(1.) Arminius himself seems to have taken no very decided position on the subject, his chief fields of battle lying in other directions. Nevertheless, among “certain articles to be Diligently examined and weighed, because some controversy has arisen concerning them, even among those who profess the Reformed religion,” he makes a statement to the effect that “regeneration is not perfected in a moment, but by certain steps and intervals,” and that the regenerate man “still has within him the flesh lusting against the Spirit;” nor does he speak of any complete deliverance in this for the regenerate, through the grace of Christ, perfectly to fulfill the law in the present life, is neither a Pelagian, nor inflicts any injury on the grace of God, nor establishes justification through works.” He cites Augustine himself as declaring the abstract possibility of a man's living in this world without sin, and as saying, “Let Pelagius confess that it is possible for man to be without sin in no other way than by the grace of Christ, and we will be at peace with him.” Arminius can hardly be said to have held any well- defined theory on the subject.

(2.) Wesley's Theory. — Wesley's views on the subject of entire sanctification were long in the process of formation, and it is no difficult task to find early statements which contradict others made at a later period. As enunciated in the latter part of his life, his views may be defined thus. He taught in regard to the work wrought in us —

1. That man by nature is depraved, so that, aside from grace, he is unfitted for all good, and prone to all evil.

2. That, through the grace of God, this moral depravity may be removed in this life, and man live freed from it.

3. That regeneration begins the process of cleansing, but, except in some exempt cases possibly, does not complete it, a degree of depravity still remaining in the regenerate.

4. That the process of cleansing is in some cases gradual, the remains of the evil nature wearing away by degrees; in others instantaneous, the believer receiving the blessing of “a clean heart” a few days, or even hours only, after his regeneration.

5. That this great gift is to be sought for specifically, and is to be obtained by a special act of faith directed towards this very object.

6. That this second attainment is attested by the Holy Spirit, which witnesses to the completion of the cleansing, as it did to the regeneration which began it.

7. That this gracious attainment, thus attested by the Holy Spirit, should be confessed, on suitable occasions, to the glory of God. partially corrupt, or even fall wholly away from God, and be lost forever.

9. That it is the high privilege of every one who is born of God to live from that moment free from the sins which bring the soul into condemnation: that is, from “voluntary transgressions of known law;” but that involuntary errors and mistakes, needing the atonement of Christ, remain to the end.

This last item in the statement of Wesley's views, as well as those numbered 1 and 2, is accepted by all classes of Methodist thinkers, and therefore need not be referred to again.

(3.) The Theory of the English Wesleyans. — It is presumable that the Compendium of Theology, recently published by the Rev. Dr. Pope, theological tutor in the Didsbury College, a school established by the Wesleyans for the training of the young men who are to enter their traveling ministry, may be taken as a standard of the general sentiment of the Wesleyan body at the present time. In several important points he differs from Wesley. He pronounces sanctification always a gradual work. “It must be remembered that this final and decisive act of the Spirit is the seal set upon a previous and continuous work. The processes may be, hastened, or condensed into a small space; they must be passed through.” Instead of lying within the reach of any novice, to be attained at any moment, “Christian perfection is the exceeding great reward of perseverance in the renunciation of all things for God; in the exercise of love to God, as shown in the passive submission to his will, and in the strenuous obedience of all his commandments.” He intimates that the time when the work is completed is “known only to God;” or, “if revealed in the trembling consciousness of the believer, a secret that he knows not how to utter;” consequently there is no place for the confession of it. Dr. Pope teaches also that after the highest point is attained there still remains “something of the peculiar concupiscence, or liability to temptation, or affinity with evil, which besets man in this world.” His views are almost identical with those set forth by Wesley and the Conference of 1745, but are widely different from the doctrine which Wesley began to preach in 1760.

(4.) There is still another view, which expresses the convictions of not a few of the clearest thinkers in the Methodist Episcopal churches, and is  accepted by many of the clergymen and people of other denominations. It is set forth in the following propositions:

1. Moral depravity is a real and positive quality of the unregenerate human spirit.

2. In the renewal of the soul at conversion, whereby man becomes a new creature, a new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, the inborn moral depravity is removed from the immortal nature, which, so far as the work of cleansing is concerned, is in that moment fitted for heaven itself.\*

\* The great majority of Methodists, however, hold that this depravity is not wholly removed at conversion, but that its last remains are (usually at least) taken away by a subsequent act of grace. — ED.

3. From the very hour of justification the renewed soul is summoned to live a holy life, a life of continuous victory over sin, and of freedom from condemnation, and is, through grace, equipped for such a life, so that he who fails thus to live falls below both his high privilege and his bounden duty.

4. Such a life — holy, freed from sin, cleansed from all unrighteousness — is the Christian life, to which every child of God is summoned.

5. The believer, thus renewed, is still human, nothing less than man, possessing all the innocent appetites, passions, and affections which belong to human nature; and that these, though in themselves innocent, need to be controlled by reason and conscience, else they lead to sin.

6. It is the privilege of the believer, thus renewed, to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God, gaining day by day more of spiritual strength and beauty, until he becomes a perfect man, and reaches the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; and that this is what is properly called maturity, or Christian perfection.

3. Arguments on the Subject. — The evangelical churches, therefore, divide on this line; the Calvinists holding that believers must of necessity remain in some degree depraved, and go on daily committing sin, “in thought, word, and deed,” to the end of their lives; the Arminians, with some differences among themselves in regard to the time and the conditions, holding that entire sanctification, including the cleansing of the  human spirit from moral depravity, and freedom from actual sin, in the sense of “voluntary transgression of known law,” is attainable in this life.

In support of the Arminian doctrine of entire sanctification, the following arguments are brought forward:

1. To affirm that it is by the will of God that the Christian lives in sin, and sin lives in the Christian, and that God so orders it for his own glory and the good of men, is monstrous, being neither scriptural, nor good morals, nor good sense.

2. The Word of God nowhere represents death as the hour, or the agent, that shall cleanse the heart, or relieve believers from the necessity of sinning against God.

3. Scripture, reason, and the daily experience of God's children show that holiness is the great need of the Church and of the individual Christian.

4. The mission of Christ is to save his people from their sins, and to save them to the uttermost; and this salvation is set forth as attainable in this life.

5. God commands his children to be holy, and promises to help them to be holy, declaring that his grace is sufficient for their spiritual needs, and that he “will not suffer them to be tempted above that they are able” to bear.

6. Believers in general are everywhere in the Scriptures said to be holy, sanctified, purified, saints, new men, new creatures, created anew in righteousness and true holiness; and whenever any conduct inconsistent with this gracious state is charged upon any of them, it is to warn them of their lapsing from the grace of God, and endangering their souls.

7. Not a few of God's faithful servants are named and described in the Scripture: Abel as righteous, Enoch as walking with God, Job as perfect, Zacharias and Elizabeth as righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless; and there is not a word in the history to compel us to take this description of them in any other than the exact, literal sense of the language employed.

IV. Literature. — Many books have been published on the subject of entire sanctification and Christian perfection, but most of them are devotional and practical manuals, rather than theological treatises. The following discuss the doctrine: Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection; Pope, Compendium of Theology; Peck (G.), Christian  Perfection; Foster, Christian Purity; Peck (J.T.), The Central Idea of Christianity; Boardman (H.A.), The “Higher-Life” Doctrine of Sanctification; Steele, Love Enthroned; Franklin, A Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection; Huntington, What is it to be Holy? or the Theory of Entire Sanctification; Endsley and others, Our Holy Christianity, a series of essays; Crane, Holiness the Birthright of all God's Children; also, article in the Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1878, on Christian Perfection and the Higher Life; Boardman (W.E.), The Higher Christian Life; See, The Rest of Faith; Atwater, The Higher Life and Christian Perfection (article in the Presb. Quar. and Princeton Rev. July, 1877); Simpson, Encyclop. of Methodism, s.v. “Perfection, Christian,” p. 704. (J.T.C.)

## Sanctimoniales[[@Headword:Sanctimoniales]]

             A name given in early times to nuns on account of their profession of sacredness. They are also called Virgines Dei, Virgines Christi, Ancilloe Dei, Sorores Ecclesioe, etc. They must not be confounded with the ancient deaconesses.

## Sanction[[@Headword:Sanction]]

             SEE PRAGMATIC SANCTION.

## Sanctius, Caspar[[@Headword:Sanctius, Caspar]]

             a Jesuit, was born in 1954, and died November 16, 1628, professor of theology at Madrid. He is the author of, In Quatuor Libros Regums et in Dulos Paralipomenorum Commentarii (Antwerp, 1624; Lyons, 1625): — Commentarii in Libros Ruth, Esdrae, Nehem., Tob., Judith, Estherae et Machabaeorum (Lyons, 1628): — Comnentarii in Acta Apostolorum. Accessit Disputatio de Jacobi et Pauli in Hispaliniam Adventu (1616; Cologne, 1617). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:203, 204, 250; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sanctuary[[@Headword:Sanctuary]]

             Is the occasional rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. and one Greek term. A general term is קֹדֶשׁ, kodesh (“ sanctuary,” Exo 30:13; Exo 30:24; Exo 36:1; Exo 36:3-4; Exo 36:6; Exo 38:25-27; Lev 4:6; Lev 5:15; Lev 10:4; Lev 27:3; Lev 27:25; Num 3:28; Num 3:31-32; Num 3:47; Num 3:50; Num 4:12; Num 4:15; Num 7:9; Num 7:13; Num 7:19; Num 7:25; Num 7:31; Num 7:37; Num 7:43; Num 7:49; Num 7:55; Num 7:61; Num 7:67; Num 7:73; Num 7:79; Num 7:85-86; Num 8:19; Num 18:3; Num 18:5; Num 18:10; 1Ch 9:29; Psa 20:2; Psa 58:2; Psa 68:24; Psa 74:3; Psa 77:13; Psa 114:2; Psa 150:1; Isa 43:28; Lam 4:1; Eze 41:21; Eze 41:23; Eze 42:20; Eze 44:27; Eze 45:2; Dan 8:13-14; Dan 9:26; Zep 3:4), which properly means holiness (often so rendered, frequently as an attribute, and perhaps to be regarded as a concrete of the sacred edifice), and especially the “holy place” (as very often rendered). The more specific term is מַקְדָּשׁ, mikdash (invariably rendered “sanctuary,” except Amo 7:13, “chapel,” and twice in the plur. “holy place” [Psa 68:35; Eze 21:2]), which is from the same root, and signifies the local shrine. In the New Test. we have the corresponding ἃγιον (“ sanctuary,” Heb 8:2; Heb 9:1-2; Heb 13:11; elsewhere “holy  place” or “holiest”), which is simply the neut. of ἃγιος , a general term for anything holy. SEE HOLY PLACE; SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Sanctuary (2)[[@Headword:Sanctuary (2)]]

             In popish times the privilege of sanctuary was common in Scotland. Innes says: “In several English churches there was a stone seat beside the altar, where those fleeing to the peace of the Church were held guarded by all its sanctity. One of these still remains at Beverley, another at Hexham. To violate the protection of the frithstol (the seat of peace), or of the fertre (the shrine of relics behind the altar), was not, like other offenses, to be compensated by a pecuniary penalty: it was bot-leas, beyond compensation. That the Church thus protected fugitives among ourselves we learn from the ancient canons of the Scotican councils, where, among the list of misdeeds against which the Church enjoined excommunication. after the laying of violent hands upon parents and priests, is denounced ‘the open taking of thieves out of the protection of the Church. The most celebrated, and probably the most ancient, of these sanctuaries was that of the church of Wedale, a parish which is now called by the name of its village, ‘the Stow.' There is a very ancient tradition that king Arthur brought with him from Jerusalem an image of the Virgin, ‘fragments of which,' says a writer in the 11th century, ‘are still preserved at Wedale in great veneration.' About the beginning of his reign, king William issued a precept to the ministers of the church of Wedale, and to the guardians of its ‘peace,' enjoining them ‘not to detain the men of the abbot of Kelso, who had taken refuge there, nor their goods, inasmuch as the abbot was willing to do to them, and for them, all reason and justice.'” SEE ASYLUM; SEE CHURCH.

Sanctuary,

A name for the presbytery, or eastern part of the choir of a church, in which the altar is placed.

## Sanctus, St.[[@Headword:Sanctus, St.]]

             Is said to have been a physician, and a native of Otriculum (or Ocriculum), a city of Central Italy. He was put to death with great cruelty in the reign of M. Aurelius Antoninus, A.D. about 150, and his memory is celebrated on June 26.

## Sancus[[@Headword:Sancus]]

             In Old Italian mythology (in its complete form Semo Sancus, commensurable with Fidius), was an immigrant god who came from the Sabines to Rome and obtained a sanctuary on the Quirinal Hill. He was subsequently compared with Hercules, and called Hercules Sabinus.

## Sancy, Achille Harley De[[@Headword:Sancy, Achille Harley De]]

             A French diplomat and prelate, was born in 1581. In early life he gave himself to study, and, having taken orders, was in a short time made bishop of Lavaur. But in 1601 he gave up his ecclesiastical life and entered the army. After taking part in several campaigns, he was made ambassador to Turkey. Here his conduct was such as to bring upon him the displeasure of the Turkish government, and he was bastinadoed. This closed his diplomatic career, and, returning to France, he devoted himself and his fortune to the cardinal Richelieu. Subsequently he went to England and was in favor with queen Henrietta. He died Nov. 20, 1646. He was a man of great learning, is said to be the author of several unimportant works in his native language, and collected many Oriental manuscripts which are now in the Richelieu Library.

## Sand[[@Headword:Sand]]

             (חוֹל, chol, from its tendency to slide or roll; ἄμμος). A similitude taken from the aggregate sand of the sea is often used to express a very great multitude or a very great weight; or from a single sand, something very mean and trifling. God promises Abraham and Jacob to multiply their posterity as the stars of heaven and as the sand of the sea (Gen 22:17; Gen 32:12). Job (6:3) compares the weight of his misfortunes to that of the sand of the sea. Solomon says (Pro 27:3) that though sand and gravel are very heavy things, yet the anger of a fool is much heavier. Ecclesiasticus says that a fool is more insupportable than the weight of sand, lead, or iron (Sir 22:15). The prophets magnify the omnipotence of God, who has fixed the sand of the shore for the boundaries of the sea, and has said to it, “Hitherto shalt thou come; but here thou shalt break thy foaming waves, and shalt pass no farther” (Jer 5:22). Our Savior tells us (Mat 7:26) that a fool lays the foundation of his house on the sand; whereas a wise man founds his house on a rock. Ecclesiasticus says (18:8) that the years of the longest life of man are but as a drop of  water or as a grain of sand. Wisdom says (7:9) that all the gold in the world, compared to wisdom, is but as the smallest grain of sand. SEE DUST.

## Sand, Christoph Von Den (Lat. Sandius)[[@Headword:Sand, Christoph Von Den (Lat. Sandius)]]

             A German theologian, was born at Königsberg Oct. 12, 1644. On account of his Socinian sentiments, and unwillingness to participate in the Lutheran services, he was exiled, and went to Holland, where he spent the greater part of his life. In later years his religious views seem to have changed, as he became a firm Arminian. He died at Amsterdam Nov. 30, 1680. His principal works are: Nucleus Historioe Ecclesiasticoe, etc.: — Interpretationes Paradoxoe IV Evangeliorum: — Confession de Foy conformement a l'Escriture: — Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix: — Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum. Sand also left a manuscript work, Auctuariun Operis Vossiani de Historicis Latinis, and two shorter ones which prove his Arminian sentiments.

## Sandacus[[@Headword:Sandacus]]

             In Greek mythology, was a son of Astynous and grandson of Phaethon, who came from Syria to Cilicia, and there founded the town of Celenderis. He married Pharnace, the daughter of Megessares, and by her had a son whom he named Cinyras.

## Sandal[[@Headword:Sandal]]

             Occurs in the A.V. only, for the same Greek word σανδάλιον, Mar 6:9; Act 12:8; but it more properly represents the Heb. נִעִל, ndal; Sept. and New Test. ὑπόδημα; rendered “shoe” in the English Bible. There is, however, little reason to think that the Jews really wore shoes, and the expressions which Carpzov (Apparat. p. 781, 782) quotes to prove that they did (viz. “put the blood of war in his shoes,” 1Ki 2:5; “make men go over in shoes,” Isa 11:15), are equally adapted to the sandal — the first signifying that the blood was sprinkled on the thong of the sandal, the second that men should cross the river on foot instead of in  boats. The shoes found in Egypt probably belonged to Greeks (Wilkinson, 2, 333). The sandal appears to have been the article ordinarily used by the Hebrews for protecting the feet. It was usually a sole of hide, leather, or wood, bound to the foot by thongs; but it may sometimes denote such shoes and buskins as eventually came into use. The above Hebrew term naal implies a simple sandal, its proper sense being that of confining or shutting in the foot with thongs; we have also express notice of the thong (שְׂרוֹךְ; ἱμάς; A.V. “shoe latchet”) in several passages (Gen 14:23; Isa 5:27; Mar 1:7). The Greek term ὑπόδημα properly applies to the sandal exclusively, as it means what is bound under the foot; but no stress can be laid on the use of the term by the Alexandrine writers, as it was applied to any covering of the foot, even to the Roman calceus, or shoe, covering the whole foot. Josephus (War, 6, 1-8) so uses it of the caliga, the thick nailed shoe of the Roman soldiers.

This word occurs in the New Test. (Mat 3:11; Mat 10:10; Mar 1:7; Luk 3:16; Luk 10:4; Joh 1:27; Act 7:33; Act 13:25), and is also frequently used by the Sept. as a translation of the Hebrew term; but it appears in most places to denote a sandal. Similar observations apply to σανδάλιον, which is used in a general, and not in its strictly classical sense, and was adopted in a Hebraized term by the Talmudists. We have no description of the sandal in the Bible itself, but the deficiency, can be supplied from collateral sources. Thus we learn from the Talmudists that the materials employed in the construction of the sole were either leather, felt, cloth, or wood (Mishna, Jebam. 12, 1, 2), and that it was occasionally shod with iron (Sabb. 6, 2). In Egypt various fibrous substances, such as palm leaves and papyrus stalks, were used in addition to leather (Herod. 2, 37; Wilkinson, 2, 332, 333), while in Assyria wood or leather was employed (Layard, Nin. 2, 323, 324). In Egypt the sandals were usually turned up at the toe like our skates, though other forms, rounded and pointed, are also exhibited. In Assyria the heel and the side of the foot were encased, and sometimes the sandal consisted of little else than this. This does not appear to have been the case in Palestine, for a heel strap was essential to a proper sandal (Jebam. 12, 1). Ladies' sandals were made of the skin of an animal named tachash (Eze 16:10), whether a hyena or a seal (A.V. “badger”) is doubtful; the skins of a fish (a species of Halicore) are used for this purpose in the peninsula of Sinai (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 116). Ladies of rank especially appear to have paid great attention to the beauty of their sandals (Son 7:1); though if the bride in that book was an Egyptian princess, as most think, the exclamation, “How beautiful are thy  feet with sandals, O prince's daughter!” may imply admiration of a luxury properly Egyptian, as the ladies of that country were noted for their sumptuous sandals (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3, 364). But this taste was probably general; for at the present day the dress slippers of ladies of rank are among the richest articles of their attire, being elaborately embroidered with flowers and other figures wrought in silk, silver, and gold. SEE DRESS.

The thongs, those at least in Hebrew times, were handsomely embroidered (Jdt 10:4; Jdt 16:9), as were those of the Greek ladies (Smith, Dict. of Antiq. s.v. “Sandalium”). Sandals were worn by all classes of society in Palestine, even by the very poor (Amo 8:6), and both the sandal and the thong or shoe latchet were so cheap and common that they passed into a proverb for the most insignificant thing (Gen 14:23; Ecclesiastes 46:19). They were not, however, worn at all periods; they were dispensed with indoors, and were only put on by persons about to undertake some business away from their homes, such as a military expedition (Isaiah 5, 27; Eph 6:15), or a journey (Exo 12:11; Jos 9:5; Jos 9:13; Act 12:8); on such occasions persons carried an extra pair, a practice which our Lord objected to as far as the apostles were concerned (Mat 10:10; comp. Mar 6:9, and the expression in Luk 10:4, “do not carry,” which harmonizes the passages). An extra pair might in certain cases be needed, as the soles were liable to be soon worn out (Jos 9:5), or the thongs to be broken (Isa 5:27). During meal times the feet were undoubtedly uncovered, as implied in Luk 7:38; Joh 13:5-6, and in the exceptions specially made in reference to the paschal feast (Exo 12:11); the same custom must have prevailed wherever reclining at meals was practiced (comp. Plato, Sympos. p. 213). It was a mark of reverence to cast off the shoes in approaching a place or person of eminent sanctity: hence the command to Moses at the bush (Exo 3:5) and to Joshua in the presence of the angel (Jos 5:15). In deference to these injunctions the priests are said to have conducted their ministrations in the Temple barefoot (Theodoret, ad Exodus 3, quaest. 7), and the Talmudists even forbade any person to pass through the Temple with shoes on (Mishna, Berach. 9, § 5). This reverential act was not peculiar to the Jews; in ancient times we have instances of it in the worship of Cybele at Rome (Prudent. Peris. 154), in the worship of Isis as represented in a picture at Herculaneum (Ant. d'Ercol. 2, 320), and in the practice of the Egyptian priests, according to Sil. Ital. (3, 28).

In modern times we may compare the similar practice of the Mohammedans of Palestine before entering a mosque (Robinson, Bibl.  Res. 2, 36), and particularly before entering the Kaaba at Mecca (Burckhardt, Arabia, 1, 270); of the Yezidis of Mesopotamia before entering the tomb of their patron saint (Layard, Nin. 1, 282); and of the Samaritans as they tread the summit of Mount Gerizim (Robinson, 2, 278). The practice of the modern Egyptians, who take off their shoes before stepping on the carpeted lewan, appears to be dictated by a feeling of reverence rather than cleanliness, that spot being devoted to prayer (Lane, 1, 35). It was also an indication of violent emotion, or of mourning, if a person appeared barefoot in public (2Sa 15:30; Isa 20:2; Eze 24:17; Eze 24:23). This, again, was held in common with other nations, as instanced at the funeral of Augustus (Sueton. Aug. 100), and on the occasion of the solemn processions which derived their name of Nudipedalia from this feature (Tertull. Apol. 40). To carry or to unloose a person's sandal was a menial office, betokening great inferiority on the part of the person performing it; it was hence selected by John the Baptist to express his relation to the Messiah (Mat 3:11; Mar 1:7; Joh 1:27; Act 13:25). The expression in Psa 9:8; Psa 107:9, “over Edom will I cast out my shoe,” evidently signifies the subjection of that country; but the exact point of the comparison is obscure, for it may refer either to the custom of handing the sandal to a slave, or to that of claiming possession of a property by planting the foot on it, or of acquiring it by the symbolical action of casting the shoe; or, again, Edom may be regarded in the still more subordinate position of a shelf on which the sandals were rested while their owner bathed his feet. The use of the shoe in the transfer of property is noticed in Rth 4:7-8, and a similar significance was attached to the act in connection with the repudiation of a Levirate marriage (Deu 25:9). Shoemaking, or rather strap making (i.e. making the straps for the sandals), was a recognized trade among the Jews (Mishna, Pesach. 4, § 6). SEE SHOE.

## Sandal tree[[@Headword:Sandal tree]]

             (Santalum album), A tree which yields an aromatic wood, much used in the pagodas for purposes of fumigation, and which is, therefore, an important article of commerce. The Hindus also grind it to a fine powder, which they dilute with water taken from the Ganges until it becomes a thin paste, with which they mark the forehead and breast each day, after bathing, in accordance with the particular worship they profess.

## Sandals[[@Headword:Sandals]]

             As insignia of office. They consisted of a sole so attached to the foot as to leave the upper part bare. Without these no priest was permitted to celebrate mass; but after the 7th and 8th centuries we find them expressly mentioned as an episcopal badge, distinct from that of the priests. They were supposed to indicate firmness in God's law and the duty of lifting up the weak.

## Sandalwood[[@Headword:Sandalwood]]

             SEE ALMUG.

## Sandanam[[@Headword:Sandanam]]

             In Hindu mythology, is one of the five trees which sprang from the bosom of the milk sea when the mountain Mandu was turned in order to the preparing of the Amrita, and which bore the fruits of prosperity and abundance.

## Sandanen[[@Headword:Sandanen]]

             In Hindu mythology, was a celebrated king of the Middle Kingdom, friend to Siva, and ancestor of the Kurus and Pandus. He fell in love with Ganga, the wife of Siva, and was punished by being turned into an ape.

## Sandanigen[[@Headword:Sandanigen]]

             In Hindu mythology, was one of the five sons borne by Drowadei, the wife of the five Pandus, to her husbands.

## Sandbuchler, Aloys[[@Headword:Sandbuchler, Aloys]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born February 20, 1751. In 1770 he joined the Augustinians at Salzburg, was in 1810 professor of Oriental languages and biblical exegesis at the Lyceum there, and died February 3, 1820, doctor of theology. He published, Darstellungs der Regeln einer allgemeinen Auslegungskunst von den Buchern des Alten und Neuen Testaments nach Jahn (Salzburg, 1813): — Kurze Darstellung einer Einleitung in die Bucher des Alten Testaments, nach Jahn (eod.): — Abhandlung uber die zweckmassigen Mittel, den hebraischen und giechischen Grundtext dem Wortsinne nach richtig zu verstehen (1791): — Vertheidigung der Gottlichkeit des mosaischen Gesetzes und des Alten Bundes (1787-88, 4 parts): — Ueber die Zuverlassigkeit des Grundtextes (1788). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst,  Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:377, 398, 400, 409. (B.P.)

## Sandby, George, D.D[[@Headword:Sandby, George, D.D]]

             a Church of England divine, was born about 1717, and was educated at Merton College, Oxford, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1740, and afterwards was master of Magdalen College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of D.D. in 1760. He was collated to the rectorship of Denton, Norfolk, in 1750, and to the chancellorship of Norwich in 1768. He died at Denton, April 29, 1807. See (Lond.) Annual Registe,1807, page 571.

## Sandeman, Robert[[@Headword:Sandeman, Robert]]

             The founder of the Sandemanians (q.v.), was born at Perth, Scotland, in 1718. He studied two years at the University of Edinburgh, and then entered into business. He adopted Mr. Glas's views in opposition to all National Church establishments; and, taking up his residence in Edinburgh, he married one of Mr. Glas's daughters, joined the Glasites, and became an elder in the church that was formed in that city. In 1760 he removed to London, where he preached in various places, attracting much notice. He formed a congregation there in 1762, and in 1764 removed to the American colonies, where he continued till his death. His sympathy with the mother country rendered him obnoxious to the colonists, and his  prospects for usefulness were in a great measure blighted. After collecting a few small societies, he died at Danbury, Conn., 1771. He wrote, Letters on Theron and Aspasio (Edinb. 1757, 1803, 2 vols. 12mo): — Correspondence with Mr. Pike: — Thoughts on Christianity: — Sign of the Prophet Jonah: — Honor of Marriage, etc.: — On Solomon's Song.

## Sandemanians[[@Headword:Sandemanians]]

             The followers of Robert Sandeman (q.v.). The leading doctrine of this sect is thus expressed in the epitaph on Mr. Sandeman's tomb in Danbury: “Here lies until the resurrection the body of Robert Sandeman, who, in the face of continual opposition from all sorts of men, long and boldly contended for the ancient faith that the bare death of Jesus Christ, without a deed or thought on the part of man, is sufficient to present the chief of sinners spotless before God.” He describes justifying faith as nothing more nor less than “the bare belief of the bare truth” witnessed concerning the person and work of Christ. This, however, could only be entertained through divine teaching or illumination (see 1Co 2:14). The chief opinions and practices in which this sect differs from other Christians are their weekly administration of the Lord's supper; their love feasts, of which every member is not only allowed, but required, to partake, and which consists in their dining together at each other's houses in the interval between the morning and afternoon services; their kiss of charity, used on the occasion of the admission of a new member, and at other times when they deem it necessary and proper; their weekly collection before the Lord's supper for the support of the poor, and paying their expenses; mutual exhortations; abstinence from blood and things strangled; washing each other's feet, when, as a deed of mercy, it might be an expression of love (the precept concerning which, as well as other precepts, they understand literally); community of goods, so far that every one is to consider all that he has in his possession and power liable to the calls of the poor and the Church; and the unlawfulness of laying up treasures upon earth, by setting them apart for any distant, future, and uncertain use. They allow of public and private diversions, so far as they are unconnected with circumstances really sinful; but, apprehending a lot to be sacred, disapprove of lotteries, playing at cards, dice, etc.

They maintain a plurality of elders, pastors, or bishops in each church, and the necessity of the presence of two elders in every act of discipline and at the administration of the Lord's supper. In the choice of these elders, want of learning and engagement in trade are no sufficient objection, if qualified according to  the instructions given to Timothy and Titus; but second marriages disqualify for the office, and they are ordained by prayer and fasting, imposition of hands, and giving the right hand of fellowship. In their discipline they are strict and severe, and think themselves obliged to separate from the communion and worship of all such religious societies as appear to them not to profess the simple truth for their only ground of hope, and who do not walk in obedience to it. We shall only add that in every transaction they esteem unanimity to be absolutely necessary. This sect in England has considerably diminished, so that in 1851 only six congregations were reported as belonging to the body, each having a very small attendance. They probably number less than 2000 throughout the world. See Glas, Testimony of the King of Mertyrs; Sandeman, Letters on Theron and Aspasio (letter 11); Backus, Discourse on Faith and its Influence, p. 7-30; Adams, View of Religions; Bellamy, Nature and Glory of the Gospel (Lond. ed. notes), 1, 65-125; Fuller, Letters on Sandemanianism; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 430, 431.

## Sanden, Bernhard von (1)[[@Headword:Sanden, Bernhard von (1)]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 4, 1636, at Insterburg. He studied at different universities, was in 1664 preacher at Koinigsberg, in 1674 professor, and in 1675 doctor of theology. In 1690 Sanden was made general superintendent, and died April 19, 1703. He published, Theologia Symbolica Lutherana: — Dissertatio ad Genesis 49, de Propheta Promisso: — De Verbis Dei ad Petrum Mat 16:19 : —Pentas illustrium Quaestionum Theologicarum. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sanden, Bernhard von (2)[[@Headword:Sanden, Bernhard von (2)]]

             son of the preceding, was born at Koinigsberg, May 4, 1666. He studied at different universities, was in 1695 professor of theology at the university of his native place, in 1709 first court-preacher, and died January 22, 1721, doctor of theology. He wrote, De Cive in Republica Hebraeorum: — De Modis Obtinendi Civitatem Hebraeorum: — De Proselytismo: — In Mat 16:19 : — In Joh 21:15 : — In Luk 22:31; Luk 22:38 : — In Iesa. 54:6: — De Duobis Hircis Festo Expiaitionis Deo Oblatis: — An Concilium Tridentinum sit OEcumenicum: — De Prophetis et Prophetiis Veteris Testamenti: — De Conjugio Petri et Pauli Apostolorum: — De Apparitione Spiritus Sancti in Specie Columbae: — De Sinu Abrahami: — De Salute Gentium Infidelium, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sander, Antony[[@Headword:Sander, Antony]]

             A Flemish ecclesiastic, was born at Antwerp in 1586, and died in 1664. He was the author of several religious and historical works in Latin.

## Sander, Immanuel Friedrich Emil, Ph.D.[[@Headword:Sander, Immanuel Friedrich Emil, Ph.D.]]

             A German divine, was born in 1797 at Schafstädt. For a time he preached in the University Church at Leipsic; then at Wichlinghausen, in Westphalia; and finally he was pastor at Elberfeld, where he died in 1861. Besides a great many Sermons, he published, Der Kampf der evangelischen Kirche mit dem Rationalismus (Barmen, 1830): — Theologisches Gutachten über die Predigerbibel des Ed. Hülsmann (ibid. 1836): — Der Romanismus, seine Tendenzen u. seine Methodik (Essen, 1843): — Das Papstthum in seiner heutigen Gestalt, etc. (Elberfeld, 1846): — Die Abendmahlsgemeinschaft zwischen Lutherischen u. Reformisten (ibid. 1859). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 2, 1113 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, p. 747; Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 243. (B.P.)

## Sandercock, Edward[[@Headword:Sandercock, Edward]]

             An English dissenting minister, was born in 1703. He was pastor of an independent congregation in Spittal Square, London, in 1727, at Bartholomew Close in 1730, and at Rotherhithe in 1738. He retired to  York about 1762, where he died in 1770. He published, Sermons (Lond. 8vo).

## Sanders, Billington McCarter[[@Headword:Sanders, Billington McCarter]]

             A Baptist minister, was born in Columbia County, Ga., Dec. 2, 1789; graduated at the South Carolina College Dec. 4, 1809; and about 1811 or 1812 was rector of the Columbia County Academy. He was for one year a member of the State Legislature, and afterwards for several years one of the judges of the Superior Court. Finally he turned his attention to the ministry, and was ordained Jan. 5, 1825. After preaching for a time at Williams Creek and at Pine Grove, he became in 1826 pastor of the Union Church in Warren County. In Dec., 1832, he commenced, by the desire of the Georgia Baptist Convention, to lay the foundation of the Mercer Institute, afterwards the Mercer University, of which he was appointed the first president. He resigned this office in 1839, after having conducted the institution successfully through the six years of its academic minority and the first year of its collegiate career. He occupied highly honorable positions in divers societies. He was for several years clerk of the Georgia Association, and for nine years its moderator. For six years he was president of the Georgia Baptist Convention, and for a much longer time a member of its executive board. He was often a delegate to the General Triennial Convention, and, after the separation, was several times a delegate to the Southern Baptist Convention. He also edited for a year the Christian Index, and was an ardent supporter of temperance, foreign and domestic missions, Bible societies, and all kindred forms of Christian beneficence. He died March 12, 1854. See Sprague. Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 740.

## Sanders, Daniel Clarke, D.D.[[@Headword:Sanders, Daniel Clarke, D.D.]]

             A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born in Sturbridge, Mass., May 3, 1768. He was prepared for college by Rev. Samuel West, admitted at Harvard in 1784, and graduated in 1788. After his graduation he engaged in teaching. He was licensed to preach by the Denham Association, and was ordained and installed pastor of the Congregational Church in Vergennes, Vt., June 12, 1794. He continued in this charge about six years, when he became president of the University of Vermont, which position he held fourteen years. He was installed as pastor at Medfield, Mass., May 24, 1815. He was a member of the convention that revised the constitution of  Massachusetts in 1820-21. He retired from his pastoral charge in 1829. He died at Medfield, Oct. 18, 1850. His published works consist of a History of the Indian Wars, etc. (Montpelier, Vt., 1812, 8vo), besides more than thirty Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 226 sq.

## Sanders, Edward[[@Headword:Sanders, Edward]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of Maryland, and grew up to manhood without religious influences. In early manhood, however, he was brought to see his condition, and found peace in believing. He entered the itinerant ministry as a member of the Philadelphia Conference in 1834, and continued in that Conference until the New Jersey Conference was set off. The remainder of his effective ministry was passed in the latter Conference. While in charge of the River Church, his health failed, and, taking a supernumerary relation, he settled in Pennington, N.J., where he died, Dec. 31, 1859. His life was a rebuke to infidelity and a comfort to Christians. — Minutes of Annual Conf. 1860, p. 39.

## Sanders, Nicholas[[@Headword:Sanders, Nicholas]]

             A prominent Roman Catholic writer of the 16th century. He was born at Charlewood, in Surrey, about 1527, and educated at Winchester school, whence he removed to New College, Oxford. He was made fellow of his college in 1548, and in 1550 or 1551 took the degree of bachelor of laws. He declined the office of Latin secretary to queen Mary for the sake of study. In 1557 he was one of the professors of canon law, and delivered the Straggling Lectures (lectures not endowed) until the accession of queen Elizabeth, when his principles induced him to leave England. He arrived at Rome in 1560, studied theology, became doctor of divinity, and was ordained priest by Dr. Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph. Soon after cardinal Hosius made him a member of his family, using him as assistant in the Council of Trent. Returning to Flanders, he was settled at Louvain for twelve years, and in 1579 he arrived in Ireland as papal nuncio. He died in 1580 or 1581. Among his works are, Supper of Our Lord (Louvain, 1566-67, 4to ): — Treatise on the Images of Christ, etc. (ibid. 1567, 8vo): — The Rock of the Church (ibid. 1566-67, 8vo): — Treatise on Usury (1566): — and others.

## Sanderson, Robert, D.D.[[@Headword:Sanderson, Robert, D.D.]]

             An English prelate, was born at Rotherham, Yorkshire, Sept. 19, 1587. Studied at Lincoln College, Oxford, became a fellow in 1606, and reader in logic in 1608; ordained deacon and priest in 1611. He was subrector in Lincoln College in 1613, 1614, and 1616; proctor of Oxford in 1616; bachelor of divinity in 1617; rector of Wilberton, Lincolnshire, in 1618, and of Boothby Pannel for more than forty years from 1619; prebendary of Lincoln in 1629; chaplain to Charles I in 1631; rector of Muston, Leicestershire, eight years from 1633; doctor of divinity in 1636. In 1642 he was prebendary of Southwell and of Oxford, and regius professor of divinity, with the canonry of Christ Church. He was unable to enter the professorship until 1646; was ejected from the last two appointments in 1648, but restored in 1660, and consecrated bishop of Lincoln the same year. He died Jan. 29, 1662. The following are his principal works: Logicoe Artis Compendium (1615, 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1841, 12mo): — Judicium Universitatis Oxoniensis (ibid. 1648):, — De Obligatione Conscientioe Proelectiones (1647, 1660, 8vo; it has passed through several later editions — the last at Cambridge [1856, 8vo]). Besides other dissertations, he printed numbers of his Sermons, which were collected and published, together with his Life by Izaac Walton (Lond. 1689, fol.). See Cattermole, Lit. of the Ch. of England, 2, 10-34.

## Sandes[[@Headword:Sandes]]

             In Persian mythology, was a fabled Persian hero, supposed to be identical with Jemshid, and by his deeds a counterpart of Hercules.

## Sandford, Daniel, D.D.[[@Headword:Sandford, Daniel, D.D.]]

             A Scotch prelate, was born at Delville, near Dublin, in 1766, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he won the prize for Latin composition in 1787. At Edinburgh, in 1792, he became minister of an Episcopal congregation for whom Charlotte Chapel was built in 1797. He joined the Episcopal Church of Scotland in 1803, and was ordained bishop of Edinburgh in 1806. He consecrated for his own congregation the newly erected Chapel of St. John in 1818. Bishop Sandford died in 1830. He published, Lectures on Passion Week (Edinb. 1797, 8vo; 1821, 12mo; 1826, 12mo): — Sermons preached in St. John's Chapel (ibid. 1819, 8vo): — Remains and Sermons, etc. (ibid. 1830, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Sandford, David[[@Headword:Sandford, David]]

             An American Congregational minister, was born in New Milford, Conn., Dec. 11, 1737, and graduated at Yale College in 1755. Influenced by the wish of his father, he began the study of theology, but realizing that he had not the spiritual qualifications for the ministry, he relinquished his purpose in that direction. He settled upon a farm, where he remained a number of years, when, experiencing a change of life, he resumed the study of theology, and was ordained pastor of the church at Medway, Mass., April 14, 1773. Mr. Sandford served a short time as chaplain in the army. In 1807 he suffered severely from a stroke of paralysis, and never resumed his public labors. He died April 7, 1810. His only printed production is Two Dissertations (1810); one on The Nature and Constitution of the Law given to Adam, etc., the other on The Scene of Christ in the Garden, etc. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 48.

## Sandford, Peter P., D.D.[[@Headword:Sandford, Peter P., D.D.]]

             A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of respectable parents in Lodi, N.J., Feb. 28, 1781. At eighteen years of age he was converted, and still earlier had begun to hold religious services among his neighbors. In 1807 he entered the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1810 he was transferred to the New York Conference, in which he held some of the most important appointments till his death, Jan. 14, 1857. He “was a thorough divine, an able preacher, a judicious administrator of discipline, and an eminently honest Christian.” See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1857, p. 320.

## Sandiadevi[[@Headword:Sandiadevi]]

             In Hindu mythology, was a daughter of Brahma, to whom he gave birth from his own person, after having assumed a human form of extraordinary attractiveness, in order that he might people the world with gods.

## Sandini, Anthony[[@Headword:Sandini, Anthony]]

             An Italian ecclesiastical historian, was born June 31, 1692, and became, by the interest of his bishop, cardinal Rezzonico (who was afterwards pope Clement XIII), librarian and professor of ecclesiastical history at Padua, where he died, Feb. 23, 1751. He is known principally by his Vitoe Pontificum Romanorum (Ferrara, 1748; reprinted under the title of Basis Historioe Ecclesiasticoe). He also wrote Historioe Familioe Sacroe: —  Hist. SS. Apostolorum: — Disputationes XX ex. Hist. Eccles., etc.: — and Dissertations in Defence of his Hist. Fam. Sac., which father Serry had attacked.

## Sandomir (Also Sendomir) Agreement[[@Headword:Sandomir (Also Sendomir) Agreement]]

             (Consensus Sendomiriensis), An accommodation reached by the Protestant churches of Poland in 1570, at a synod held at Sandomir, now the capital of the government of Radom, by which existing differences were composed and a fraternal union was established.

The Protestantism of Poland was of three types: 1, the Lutheran, introduced from Germany, and taking root chiefly in what is now Prussian Poland; 2, the Swiss, or Reformed, dating its introduction nearly to the same period as the Lutheran, and prevailing chiefly in Cracow and the surrounding country; and, 3. the Bohemian, brought in by refugees from the persecutions which raged in their native land. The language and customs of these refugees resembled those of the country in which they sought a home, and their Church possessed further advantages in its compact organization, thorough government, and rich hymnology, by which it was enabled to make rapid advances. These successes gave rise to the first disagreements with which the Polish Reformation was troubled, and furnished evidence of a wide division between the Lutherans and the Bohemian churches, the former charging the Bohemian Brethren with erroneous teaching, particularly in respect to the doctrines of justification and the Lord's supper, and with intentional neglect of scientific culture; and the latter retorting with reflections upon the absence of Church discipline and of moral restraints among their opponents. The progress of the Reformation in Strasburg in the meantime furnished the Brethren with an opportunity to enter into relations with other Protestant churches; and a delegation from Bohemia, appointed in 1540 for that purpose, having been favorably received by Bucer, Hedio, Capito, Calvin, and other Reformers, served to establish an intimacy of friendship between the respective leaders which was carefully cherished by the Bohemian Church.

The necessity of conciliating the opposing parties was apparent. The machinations of Romanism threatened them with a common danger; and it became important, after 1551, to check the progress of the antitrinitarian movement headed by Laelius Socinus; and the efficient organization of the Bohemian congregations, together with the fact that many of the foremost personages in the state were at least their friends and patrons, indicated  that a closer relation with them was essential to the stability and required for the defense of the Reformation. The earliest attempt of which we have authentic information was made by Felix Cruciger, a supporter of the Swiss Confession and evangelical superintendent in Little Poland, through the medium of discussions on the state of the Church with representative Bohemians. A compromise was ultimately effected at the general Synod of Kozminek in 1555, by which the Bohemian Confession was adopted, the liturgy of the Bohemians to be introduced, and their consent to be obtained to any undertaking. This agreement secured the approval of many theologians of the Reformed confessions in other lands, and of such men as Paul Vergerius and Brenz among the Lutherans.

But the provisions of Kozminek were not executed with energy. John à Lasko, the eminent Reformer, whose high birth and former services gave him an assured influence, returned from exile (December 1556) and discouraged further effort; and when, towards the close of the year 1557, opinions adverse to the proposed union were received from Calvin, Bullinger, Viret, and others of the Swiss Reformers, the compromise fell to the ground, having effected nothing that was expected from it, and leaving behind it the additional complication of excited feelings between the Reformed and the Bohemian parties. To remedy this failure, Lasko now proposed that a colloquy be held in Moravia for the purpose of discussing the objections raised against the Bohemian Confession, and the Brethren readily agreed. Leipnik was chosen as the place of meeting. Fifteen points were presented for discussion, bearing chiefly against the view of the Lord's supper taught by the Bohemian Church, and against the constitution of the Church itself, the latter presenting the more difficult problem to be solved. The constitution of the Bohemian Brotherhood had adopted the Romish principle of a clerocracy. The government of the churches was placed wholly in the hands of a regularly ordained and graded officiary; and if the lay element was recognized in the fact that the clergy were required to depend for their support, in part, on secular occupations, this was counterbalanced by the imposition of celibacy on the priesthood, thus securing to persons of that class not only a distinctive character, but also an appearance of superior sanctity. To change the constitution of the Church in this respect was impossible without giving up the principle of an organization to which the Brotherhood owed its preservation in the most trying times of persecution. The requirement of celibacy from their priests was explained as a prudential measure dictated by the greater liability of that class to persecution; but the exclusion of the, laity from the government of the  Church admitted of no explanation satisfactory to a people whose nobles had been leaders in the Reformation and guides in the subsequent progress of the Church. The Conference of Leipnik closed without having effected any material result; and when a renewed effort to secure the approval of the Bohemian Confession by the Swiss theologians, Calvin and Musculus in particular, had failed, it was evident that all but hope was lost. The Synod of Xions (September, 1560), at which the Evangelical Church of Poland was constituted, did something, however, to keep that hope alive by admitting delegates from the Bohemian fraternity to its deliberations, and by adopting ecclesiastical terms peculiar to that Church, such as senior and consenior, into the new constitution.

In Great Poland, where Lutheranism predominated, the Melancthonian party, headed by the brothers Erasmus and Nicholas Gliczner, put forth earnest efforts in behalf of Protestant fraternity. A synod at Posen (1560), composed of representatives from the Evangelical and Bohemian churches, as well as of Lutherans, developed a plan of union which subsequently became the basis of the Sandomir Agreement. In the following year a discussion of doctrinal differences took place at Buzenin, the Lutherans being scantily represented, which led to the translation into Polish of the revised Bohemian Confession, and its submission for the approval of the Evangelical party; and it was resolved that delegates from either section should attend all synods without a formal invitation. The progress of the Antitrinitarian movement, headed by Laelius Socinus, together with the incursion of Anabaptist refugees from Bohemia and Moravia, likewise promoted the interests of fraternity among the Evangelicals by threatening to sweep away entire congregations from the orthodox faith. The Cracow congregation, acting under the advice of Calvin and Bullinger, met the emergency by adopting the Swiss Confession and form of government (1560), and was followed in this measure by most of the congregations in Little Poland, so that from this time the Poles must be regarded as Calvinists; and even the Lutherans of Great Poland and Lithuania took similar action by the substantial adoption of the resolutions of Xions, at a synod at Gostyn, in June 1565, reserving only the teaching of the Augsburg Confession on the Lord's supper, and certain ecclesiastical usages.

The rigid Lutherans, whose leading representative was Benedict Morgenstern, resisted the union movement at every step, and profited by the organization of the Polish Lutheran Church by the synod of Gostyn to give the opposition a more definite and vigorous form; but the matter  having — apparently by an oversight on their part — been referred to the University of Wittenberg. a reply adverse to their purposes was received 4to. 1568), which rendered futile further opposition. The nobles of the land, alarmed by the successes of Romanism, now urged the cessation of strife between the factions of Protestantism. Edicts from the throne, then occupied by the vacillating Sigismund Augustus, had pointed out the real unity of belief held by the conflicting parties by exempting them from a proscription decreed against sectaries; and when the diet of Lublin (1569), at which the union of Poland and Lithuania came to pass, convened, the evangelical nobles present decided that a synod should be called to prepare the way for establishing a national Evangelical Church. After a number of preliminary conferences had been held, the synod assembled at Sandomir, April 9, 1570, and continued its session until April 15. Various attempts to establish the confession of one party as the common faith were made and set aside, until a compromise was effected by which each party was pledged to maintain fraternal relations with the others, while guarding its own confession and independent Church life.

The Sandomir Agreement was not a measure designed to secure identity of doctrinal teaching, but a provision to effect a practical comity of intercourse between separate churches. It recognizes the independence of the several churches, but removes the principal source of trouble — the doctrine of the Lord's supper — from the central position given to it by Lutheran polemics by emphasizing the agreement of the different confessions with respect to the leading doctrines of the faith. It provides that the ministry of either Church might conduct the worship and administer the sacraments in congregations of the other churches, though under restrictions intended to guard the usages and discipline of such congregations. It binds the contracting parties to avoid controversy and strife, and to make common cause against Romanism, sectarianism, and all other forces hostile to the Gospel; and it provides, in conclusion, that all important matters affecting the churches in Poland, Lithuania, and Samogitia should be regulated in common, and that deputies from all the churches should attend the general synods held by any one of them. A synod subsequently held (May 20, 1570), at Posen, and largely attended, took further measures to secure the practical operation of the Consensus Sendomiriensis; and the course of events from that time has proved that agreement as constituting the most important fact in the history of the evangelical churches in Poland. Some opposition to the compromise was  manifested, and more or less uneasiness was betrayed from time to time; but the action of the general synod at Thorn, in 1595, in reenacting the Sandomir resolutions, brought the dispute to a final settlement.

See Friese, Beiträge zur Ref. — Gesch. in Polen u. Lithauen; Fischer, Vers. einer Gesch. der Ref. in Polen (Grätz, 1855); id. Kirchengesch. des Königreichs Polen; Gindely, Fontes Rerum Austriacarum; id. Fontes Rerum Historiacarum; Löscher, Historia Motuum; Hartknoch, Preuss. Kirchen-Historie; Jablonski, Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis; Cosack, Paul Speratus' Leben u. Lieder (1861); Schnaase, Gesch. der evang. Kirche Danzigs (Dantzic, 1863); Eichhorn, Der ermländische Bischof u. Cardinal Hosius (Mayence, 1854); Wengerscius, Slavonia Reformata. Also J.W. Walch, Hist. u. theol. Einl. in die Rel.- Streitigkeiten; Zorn, Hist. der zwischen den luth. u. ref. Theologis gehaltenen Colloquiorum; Beck, Symbol. Bücher der evangel. ref. Kirche; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, etc., pref. p. 70; Nitzsch, Urkundenbuch der evang. Union, etc.

## Sandoval, Fray Prudencio De[[@Headword:Sandoval, Fray Prudencio De]]

             A Spanish prelate and historian, was born at Valladolid about 1560. He was a Benedictine monk, and was appointed historiographer to Philip III, who employed him to continue the general history of Ambrosio Morales, which appeared under the title of Historia de los Reyes de Castilla y de Leon. Among his other works are a Historia de la Vida y Hechos del Emperador Carlos V, which is esteemed a standard work and has been translated into English, and a Cronica del Emperador de Espana, Don Alonzo VII. Sandoval was made bishop of Tuy in 1608, and of Pampeluna in 1612. He died at Pampeluna, March 17, 1621. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sands, Elisha[[@Headword:Sands, Elisha]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York, 1830, and was converted under the ministry of R.S. Foster. He entered the New York East Conference, and labored in Orient, Greenport, Brooklyn (York and Warren streets), Jamaica, and Patchogue. By diligent study and natural gifts, he became an eloquent, impressive, and useful minister. He died in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1868. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 93.

## Sandusky, John[[@Headword:Sandusky, John]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson (now Marion) County, Ky., Jan. 11, 1798. His connection with the ministry extended over a period of nearly, if not quite, fifty years, and embraced a time of arduous labor and little compensation. His death took place Oct. 15, 1874, at the house of his daughter, Catharine Logan, at which time Mr. Sandusky was a member of the Kentucky Conference. He was a man of marked character — brave, unselfish, just, and generous. He was master of the system of theology of the Church to which he belonged, clear and forcible in preaching, and greatly gifted in prayer. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, M.E. Ch., South, 1875, p. 223.

## Sandwich Islands, Or Hawaiian Islands[[@Headword:Sandwich Islands, Or Hawaiian Islands]]

             The most northerly cluster of the Polynesian Archipelago, containing twelve islands. The chain extends about 360 miles from southeast to northwest, and lies in the Pacific Ocean between lat. 18° 55' and 22° 20' N., and long. 154° 55' and 160° 15' W. The largest island is Hawaii, containing 4040 square miles; but Oahu, more central and having a good harbor, is the seat of government and the commercial center. The population of the islands was estimated by Cook at 400,000 — doubtless an exaggeration. In 1832 the official census gave 130,313, in 1850, 84,165; in 1860, 69,800; and in 1872, 56,899. This decrease is due to many causes, of which those now principally active may be traced to their contact with the whites. “Before missionary operations commenced, the people were, if not in the lowest state of barbarism in which men are ever found, yet certainly in a very low state of intellectual, social, and moral debasement. With no written language; with no comfortable dwellings; with very little clothing; with the family constitution in ruins, unmitigated licentiousness universal, and every wild passion indulged without restraint; the people were ‘a nation of drunkards,' with no laws or courts of justice. The people of all ranks were much under the influence of superstitious fears, and their religion, in connection with the cruel rites of idol worship, was in a great measure a tabu system — i.e. a system of religious prohibitions and consecrations, which had extended itself very widely, and had become exceedingly burdensome under the direction of kings and priests who use the system to accomplish their own purposes” (Newcomb). Vancouver, who arrived with Cook in 1778, and returned in 1792, and again in 1794, made sincere attempts to enlighten the natives. His instructions were not  forgotten, and, by a spontaneous movement, the whole nation rose up to destroy their idols and temples (1819-1820).

The first missionaries to these islands were from America — Hiram Bingham and Asa Thurston, of Andover Theological Seminary. They arrived at Kailua, April 4, 1820, only a short time after the decisive battle had been fought which had subdued the party supporting idolatry. In 1822 the language was reduced to writing, since which time more than 200 works, mostly educational and religious, have been published in Hawaiian. The total number of Protestant missionaries sent to the islands, clerical and lay, including their wives, is 156 — at an expense, up to 1869, of $1,220,000. The whole number of persons admitted to the Hawaiian Protestant churches up to 1873, inclusive, was 67,792; and the total membership of the same churches in 1873 was 12,283. In 1826, John Alexius Aug. Bachelot was appointed apostolic prefect of the islands, and arrived at Honolulu, July 7, 1827, with two other priests and four laymen. They landed without permission from the authorities, and countenanced and encouraged those who became their adherents in various violations of the laws. The government at last (Dec., 1831) sent them away to California; but in 1839 the French government sent a frigate to Honolulu, and compelled Kamehameha III to declare the Catholic religion free to all. The whole number of the Catholic population of the islands in 1872 was stated to be 23,000 — probably an exaggeration. An English Reformed Catholic mission was sent out in 1862, and met with favor from Kamehameha V. An Anglican bishop of Hawaii was appointed, who remained until 1870. Since his return in that year the interest in the mission has decreased and its success is small. See Appleton's New Amer. Cyclop. s.v.; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, s.v.

## Sandys (Or Sandes), Edwin, D.D.[[@Headword:Sandys (Or Sandes), Edwin, D.D.]]

             An English prelate. He was born at Hawkshead, Lancashire, England, in 1519, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became influenced in favor of the Reformation. He was junior proctor of the university in 1542, was elected master of Catharine Hall in 1547, and was about the same time vicar of Haversham, Bucks; made doctor of divinity and prebend of the Cathedral of Peterborough in 1548, and of Carlisle in 1552; vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1553. Having espoused the cause of Lady Jane Grey, he was thrown into the Tower in 1553, and remained there twenty-nine weeks. He escaped and fled to the Continent in 1554. On the death of Mary, he returned to England, and was appointed by Elizabeth one of the nine Protestant divines who were to hold a disputation before  both houses of Parliament with the same number of the Romish persuasion. He was made bishop of Worcester in 1559, of London in 1570, and archbishop of York in 1576. He died July 10, 1588. He wrote Sermons on Various Occasions (Lond. 1585, 4to; 1616, 4to; Cambridge, 1841, 8vo). He assisted in the translation of the Scriptures known as the “Bishop's Bible,” and was one of the commissioners appointed to revise the Liturgy. See Whitaker, Life of Edwin Sandys; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sandys, Edwin, Sir[[@Headword:Sandys, Edwin, Sir]]

             Son of archbishop Sandys, was born at Worcestershire about 1561. He was educated, under Hooker, at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; made probationer fellow in 1579, and prebendary of York in 1581. Having supported the succession of James I, he was knighted by that monarch in 1603. He was an influential member of the second London Company for Virginia, and was its treasurer in 1619; but Spanish influence was exerted against him, and in 1620 king James forbade his reelection. He was the author of a work entitled Europes Speculum, or a View on Survey of the State of Religion in the Western Part of the World, etc. (1605, 4to, with numerous later editions): — The Sacred Hymns, consisting of Fifty Select Psalms of David, etc. (1615, 4to). It is uncertain whether this version was performed by Sir Edwin or by some other of the same name (Wood, Athen. Oxon. [Bliss's ed.], 2, 474). See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Appleton's Cyclop. s.v.

## Sandys, George[[@Headword:Sandys, George]]

             An Oriental traveler, was the seventh and youngest son of archbishop Sandys, and was born at Bishopsthorpe in 1577. He entered St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and traveled in the East from 1610 till 1612. In 1621 he succeeded his brother as colonial treasurer of Virginia, and while in that colony completed his translation of the Metamosphoses of Ovid. Returning to England in 1624, he was appointed a gentleman of the king's privy chamber. He died at Bexley Abbey, Kent, the residence of his niece, lady Margaret Wyatt, in 1644.

## Sanford, David[[@Headword:Sanford, David]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at New Milford, Conn., Dec. 11, 1737, and graduated at Yale College in 1755. He was ordained pastor of the Church at Medway, Mass., in 1773, which connection he retained until his death in 1810. He published, On the Nature and Constitution of the Law given to Adam in Paradise: — On the Scene of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane (Boston, 1810, 8vo).

## Sanford, David Platt, D.D[[@Headword:Sanford, David Platt, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Redding, Connecticut, January 29, 1819. He graduated from Trinity College, Hartford, in 1844; became minister at Woodbury in 1846, at Oxford and Quaker's Farms in 1847; Walcottville in 1849; St. Louis, Missouri, in 1850; New Milford, Connecticut, in 1851; Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1853; Faribault, Minnesota, in 1858; Long Hill, Connecticut, in 1859; chaplain in the army in 1862; rector at Wolcottville in 1864; Rochester, Minn., in 1869; Winsted, Conn., in 1870; Hazardville in 1874, and died at Thompsonville, April 3, 1883.

## Sanford, Hiram[[@Headword:Sanford, Hiram]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Cheshire, Conn., Feb. 27, 1805. His parents removed to Homer, N.Y., while he was a child. While quite young, he professed conversion and united with the Church. After about eight years spent in teaching and studying in Buffalo, he joined the Genesee Conference Oct. 14, 1835. He became supernumerary in 1851, and remained in this relation until 1854, when he was superannuated, and so continued until his death, which occurred in Phelps, May 16, 1865. Mr. Sanford was modest, very industrious, and faithful in every place he occupied. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1865, p. 240.

## Sanford, Joseph[[@Headword:Sanford, Joseph]]

             A Presbyterian minister, was born in Vernon, Vt., Feb. 6, 1797. He became a communicant in the Church at the age of thirteen; pursued part of his preparatory course at Granville, Washington County, N.Y., and part at Ballston, Saratoga County, N.Y.; graduated at Union College in 1820, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., in 1823; was licensed by the Presbytery of New York in April, 1823; was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, L.I., from 1823 till 1828, and of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, from 1828 until his death, Dec. 25, 1831. Mr. Sanford's only publication was a Farewell Sermon, delivered at Brooklyn in 1829 (8vo). He was a model pastor and a most effective preacher. See Memoirs of Joseph Sanford, by the Rev. Robert  Baird (Phila. 1836, 12mo); Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 655; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Sanford, Miles, D.D[[@Headword:Sanford, Miles, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, a native of Connecticut, was for a time a Methodist, then became a Baptist, and was pastor of the First Baptist Church in  Chicago, Illinois; subsequently an editor in Detroit, Michigan, from which place he removed to East Boston, Massachusetts, then to Gloucester, and at length to North Adams, whence he went as chaplain of a Western Massachusetts regiment to active service in the late war. Next he was for a short period financial secretary of the American Bible Union, and then became pastor of the First Church in Salem, N.J., where he remained about two years. He died at Salem, October 31, 1874. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1028. (J.C.S.)

## Sanford, Peter P., D.D[[@Headword:Sanford, Peter P., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lodi, N.J., February 28, 1781. He was religiously inclined from childhood, converted at the age of eighteen, and in 1807 entered the Philadelphia Conference. In 1810 he was transferred to the New York Conference, and in it continued laborious till his death, January 14, 1857. Dr. Sanford was a thorough divine, an able scholar, and an eminent, honest, and devout man. From 1816 to 1852 he was elected a delegate to every general conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1857, page 321; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Sanga[[@Headword:Sanga]]

             A name given to the sacred pilgrimage of Isje, a central province of Japan. In Isje is the grand Mia, or temple of Tensio-Dai-Dsin, which is the model after which all the other temples are built. To this place the religious sect of the Sintoists requires each of its adherents to make a pilgrimage once a year, or at least once in their life.

## Sangallensis, Codex[[@Headword:Sangallensis, Codex]]

             SEE GALL (ST.) MS.

## Sangarius[[@Headword:Sangarius]]

             (ΣαγγάΡιος), A river god, is described as the son of Oceanus and Tethys, and as the father of Hecube. The river Sangarius (in Phrygia) itself is said to have derived its name from one Sangas, who had offended Rhea, and was punished by her by being changed into water.

## Sanger, Ralph, D.D[[@Headword:Sanger, Ralph, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, son of Reverend Zedekiah Sanger, D.D., was born in Duxbury, Massachusetts, June 22, 1786. He graduated from Harvard College in 1808; then, after spending three years in the study of theology under his father, he was appointed tutor at Cambridge; was ordained pastor of the Church at Dover, Massachusetts, September 16, 1812, and continued there until his death, May 6, 1860. See Necrology of Harvard College, page 305. (J.C.S.)

## Sanger, Zedekiah. D.D.[[@Headword:Sanger, Zedekiah. D.D.]]

             A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Sherburne, Mass., Oct. 4, 1748 , entered Cambridge July, 1767, and graduated with high honors in 1771. His theological studies were pursued under the direction of Rev. Jason Haven, of Dedham. On July 3, 1776, he was ordained and installed pastor of the church in Duxbury. He resigned his charge in April, 1786, on account of impaired eyesight, and engaged in secular pursuits for two or three years. On Dec. 17, 1788, he was installed as the colleague of Rev. John Shaw, South Bridgewater, where he spent the rest of his days. He received the degree of D.D. from Brown University in 1807. He died, after a short illness, Nov. 17, 1820. His published works are five Ordination Sermons (1792-1812). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 99.

## Sangha[[@Headword:Sangha]]

             An assembly or chapter of Buddhist priests.

## Sangra[[@Headword:Sangra]]

             In Hindu mythology, was a daughter of Wiswakarma and wife of the Sun god, who caused his long and shining hair to be clipped from his head in order that Sangra, who could not endure their brilliant light, might remain with him.

## Sangrid[[@Headword:Sangrid]]

             In Norse mythology, was one of the Walkures, or messengers of Odin, who elect the warriors to be slain in battle.

## Sanguirese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Sanguirese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This language is used in the Sangir Islands, the inhabitants of which, numbering about 80,000 souls, 10,000 of whom have been baptized, have but recently been blessed with a translation of the New Test. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1879 we learn that the Reverend Mr. Kelling, who has been laboring twenty years on the island of Tagulandang, where he has formed a church has completed the. New Test., and is giving it a final revision. This translation was published at London, in the Siamo dialect, in 1882, the Reverend E.W. King, of Tilbury, having read the proofs. Encouraged by the good reception which the New Test.  had received at the hands of the natives, the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society agreed, in 1884, to print an edition of the Psalms, the translation having also been made by the Reverend Mr. Kelling. (B.P.)

## Sanhedrim[[@Headword:Sanhedrim]]

             (Hebraized [see Buxtorf, Lex. Chal. Talm. s.v.] Sanhedrin, סִנְהֶדְרַין, from the Greek Synedrium, συνέδριον, as in the New Test. [Mat 5:22; Mat 26:59; Mar 14:55; Mar 15:1; Luk 22:66; Joh 11:47; Act 4:15; Act 5:21; Act 5:27; Act 5:34; Act 6:12; Act 6:15; Act 22:30; Act 23:1; Act 23:6; Act 23:15; Act 23:20; Act 23:28; Act 24:20], and Josephus [Life, 12; Ant. 14, 9, 3]; apocopated סִנְהֶדְרַי, plural סִנְהֶדְרַיּוֹת), the supreme council of the Jewish nation in and before the time of Christ. In the Mishna it is also styled בֵּית דַּין, Beth-Din, “house of judgment;” and in the Apocrypha and New Test. the appellations γερουσία, senate, and πρεσβυτέριον, presbytery, seem also to be applied to it (comp. 2Ma 1:10; Act 5:21; Act 22:5; 1Ma 7:33; 1Ma 12:35, etc.). As there were two kinds of Synedria, viz. the supreme or metropolitan Sanhedrim, called סִנְהֶרַין גַּדוֹלָה, the Great Sanhedrim (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 5), and provincial councils called סִנְהֶדְרַין קְטֹנָה, the Small Sanhedrims (ibid.) — differing in constitution and jurisdiction from each other — we shall describe their respective organizations and functions separately, and close with an account of their history, largely as contained in the treatise of the Talmud which is devoted to this subject.

I. The Great Sanhedrim, or Supreme Council. —

1. Number of Members and their Classification. — The Great Sanhedrim, or the supreme court of justice (דַּין הִגָּדוֹל בֵּית) as it is called (Mishna, Homrajoth, 1, 5; Sanhedrin, 11, 4), or κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν, בֵּית דַּין, the court of justice, the judgment hall, because it was the highest ecclesiastical and civil tribunal, consisted of seventy-one members (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 2, 4; Shebuoth, 2, 2). This is the nearly unanimous opinion of the Jews as given in the Mishna (Sanhedrin, 1, 6): “The Great Sanhedrim consisted of seventy-one judges. How is this proved? From Num 11:16, where it is said, ‘Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel.' To these add Moses, and we have seventy-one. Nevertheless, R. Judah says there were seventy.” The same difference made by the addition or exclusion of Moses appears in the works of Christian writers, which accounts for the variation in the books between seventy and seventy-one. Baronius, however (Ad Ann. 31, § 10), and many other Roman Catholic writers, together with not a few Protestants, as Drusius, Grotius, Prideaux, Jahn, Bretschneider, etc., hold that the true number was seventy-two, on the ground that Eldad and Medad, on whom it is expressly said the Spirit rested (Num 11:26), remained in the camp, and should be added to the seventy (see Hartmann, Verbindung des A.T. p. 182; Selden, De Synedr. lib. 2, cap. 4).

These members represented three classes of the nation, viz.

(a) The priests, who were represented by their chiefs, called in the Bible the chief priests ( הָאָבוֹת לְכֹהֲנַים ראֹשֵׁי=πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς), of whom there were most probably four-and-twenty (1Ch 24:4; 1Ch 24:6; with Mat 27:1; Joh 7:32; Joh 11:47; Joh 12:10).

(b) The elders, זְקֵנַים. = πρεσβύτεροι (Mat 16:21; Mat 21:23; Mat 26:3; Mat 26:47; Mat 26:57; Mat 26:59; Mat 27:1; Mat 27:3; Mat 27:12; Mat 27:20; Mat 27:41; Mat 28:12; Mar 8:31; Mar 11:27; Mar 14:43; Mar 14:53; Luk 9:22; Luk 20:1; Luk 22:52; Joh 8:9; Act 4:5; Act 4:23; Act 6:12; Act 23:14; Act 25:15); also called the elders of the people (ἄρξοντες τοῦ λαοῦ Act 4:8, with Act 4:5), because they were the heads of the families and tribes of the people, for which reason πρεσβύτεροι and ἄρχοντες are also synecdochically used for βουλή and συνέδριον (Luk 23:13; Luk 24:20; Act 3:7, etc.); these elders, who most probably were also twenty-four in number (Rev 4:4), were the representatives of the laity, or the people generally.

(c) The scribes (q.v.) or lawyers ( סוֹקְרַים=γραμματεῖς), who, as the interpreters of the law in ecclesiastical and civil matters, represented that particular portion of the community which consisted of the literary laity, and most probably were twenty-two in number. As the chief priests, elders, and scribes constituted the supreme court, these three classes are frequently employed in the New Test. as a periphrasis for the word Sanhedrim (Mat 26:3; Mat 26:57; Mat 26:59; Mat 27:41; Mar 8:31; Mar 11:27; Mar 14:43; Mar 14:53; Mar 15:1; Luk 9:22; Luk 20:1; Luk 22:66; Act 5:1; Act 6:12; Act 22:30; Act 25:15); while John, who does not at all mention the Sadducees, uses the term Pharisees to denote the Sanhedrim (Joh 1:24; Joh 4:1; Joh 8:3; Joh 11:46, etc.).

2. Qualification and Recognition of Members. — The qualifications for membership were both very minute and very numerous. The applicant had to be morally and physically blameless. He had to be middle aged, tall, good looking, wealthy, learned (both in the divine law and diverse branches of profane science, such as medicine, mathematics, astronomy, magic, idolatry, etc.), in order that he might be able to judge in these matters. He was required to know several languages, so that the Sanhedrim might not be dependent upon an interpreter in case any foreigner or foreign question came before them (Menachoth, 65 a; Sanhedrin, 17 a; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 2, 1-8). Very old persons, proselytes, eunuchs, and Nethinim were ineligible because of their idiosyncrasies; nor could such candidates be elected as had no children, because they could not sympathize with domestic affairs (Mishna, Horajoth, 1, 4; Sanhedrin,  36 b); nor those who could not prove that they were the legitimate offspring of a priest, Levite, or Israelite, who played dice, lent money on usury, flew pigeons to entice others, or dealt in produce of the Sabbatical year (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 3, 3).

In addition to all these qualifications, a candidate for the Great Sanhedrim was required, first of all, to have been a judge in his native town; to have been transferred from there to the Small Sanhedrim, which sat at the Temple mount or at its entrance ( הִר הִבֵּיתַor פְּתִח הִר הִבֵּית), thence again to have been advanced to the second Small Sanhedrim, which sat at the entrance of the Temple hall ( פְּתִח הִר הִבֵּיתorחֵיל), before he could be received as member of the seventy-one (Sanhedrin, 32 a, 88 b; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 2, 8).

The ordination took place when the candidate was first appointed judge in his native place. In olden days every ordained teacher could ordain his disciples; afterwards, however, the sages conferred this honor upon Hillel I, B.C. 30; it was then decreed that no one should be ordained without the permission of the president of the Sanhedrim (נָשַׂיא); that the president and the vice-president should not ordain in the absence of each other, but that both should be present; and that any other member may ordain with the permission of the president and the assistance of two non-ordained persons, as no ordination was valid if it was effected by less than three persons (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 3). The ordination was effected, not by the laying on of hands on the head of the elder, but by their calling him rabbi, and saying to him, “Behold, thou art ordained, and hast authority to judge even cases which involve pecuniary fines” (Maimonides, ibid. 4, 1-4).

The Sanhedrim was presided over by a president called Nasi (נָשַׂיא) = prince, patriarch, and a vice-president styled אָב בֵּית דַּין, the father of the house of judgment. The power of electing these high officials was vested in the corporate assembly of members, who conferred these honors upon those of their number who were most distinguished for wisdom and piety. The king was the only one disqualified for the presidential throne, because according to the Jewish law it is forbidden to differ from him or to contradict his statement; but the high priest might be elected patriarch provided he had the necessary qualifications (Sanhedrin, 18 b; Maimonides, Had Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 2, 3). After the death of Hillel I, however, the presidency became hereditary in his family for  thirteen generations. SEE HILLEL I. The functions of the Nasi or the patriarch were more especially external. Being second to the king, the Nasi represented the civil and religious interests of the Jewish nation before the Roman government abroad, and before the different Jewish congregations at home; while in the Sanhedrim itself he was simply the reciting and first teacher. The vice-president, on the other hand, had his sphere of labor more especially within the Sanhedrim. It was his office to lead and control their discussions on disputed points; hence his appellation, “father of the house of judgment.” Next to the vice-president, or the third in rank in the Sanhedrim, was the חָכָם, sage, referee, whose office it was to hear and examine the pending subject in all its bearings, and then to bring it before the court for discussion. This dignitary we first meet with under the presidency of Gamaliel II the teacher of the apostle Paul, SEE GAMALIEL, and his son Simon 2 (Horajoth, 13; Tosephta Sanhedrin, cap. 7; Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1, 348). Besides these high functionaries, there were sundry servants not members of the seventy-one, such as two judges' scribes (הִדַּינְין סוֹפְרֵי), or notaries, one of whom registered the reasons for acquittal, and the other the reasons for condemnation (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 4:3); and other menial officials, denominated בֵּין שֹׁטְרַים שַׂמְשֵׁי= ὑπηρέτης, πράκτωρ (Mat 5:25; Mat 26:58 : Mar 14:54; Mar 14:65; Luk 12:58; Joh 7:32; Joh 7:45; Joh 18:3; Joh 18:12; Joh 18:18; Joh 18:22; Joh 19:6; Act 5:22; Act 5:26; Act 23:2, etc.).

3. Place, Time, and Order in which the Sessions were held. — There seems not to have been any prescribed place for holding the sessions in the early part of the Sanhedrim's existence. In all probability they were held in some place adjoining the Temple, as the neighborhood of the sanctuary was deemed specially appropriate for the solemn assemblies which had to decide upon the most momentous questions affecting life and death, time and eternity. It was Simon ben-Shetach (B.C. 110-65) who built the Hall of Squares (הִגָּזַית לַשְׁכִּת), or, more briefly, the Gazith (גָּזַית), where both the Sanhedrim and the priests permanently held their meetings. This basilica, the floor of which was made of hewn square stones — whence its name (Yoma, 25 a) — was situated in the center of the south side of the Temple court, the northern part extending to the court of the priests (קדש), and the southern part to the court of the Israelites (חול); it was thus lying between these two courts, and had doors into both of them (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 11, 2; Pea, 3, 6; Middoth, 5, 3, 4; Herzfeld.  Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1, 394 sq.; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums, 1, 145, 275). SEE TEMPLE.

This hall henceforth became the prescribed court for the sessions of the Sanhedrim. The assembling of the Sanhedrim in the high priest's house was illegal. Equally illegal was the assumption of the presidency by this sacerdotal functionary over this supreme court recorded in the New Test. (Mat 26:3; Act 5:21; Act 5:27; Act 23:2), as Gamaliel I was then the legitimate president (Pesachim, 88 b). When it is remembered that this sacred office was at that time venial, and that the high priest was the creature of the Romans, this priestly arrogance will not be matter of surprise. “Forty years before the destruction of the Temple [i.e. while the Savior was teaching in Palestine], the sessions of the Sanhedrim were removed from the Hall of Squares to the Halls of Purchase” (Sabbath, 15 a; Aboda Sara, 8 b), on the east side of the Temple mount.

The Sanhedrim sat every day from the termination of the daily morning sacrifice till the daily evening sacrifice, with the exception of the Sabbath and festivals, when they retired to the synagogue on the Temple mount and delivered lectures (Sanhedrin, 88 b; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 3, 1). The order in which they sat was as follows: the president (נָשַׂיא) sat in an elevated seat; on his right hand sat the vice- president (אָב בֵּית דַּין), and at his left the chakamn (חָכָם), or referee; while the members, seated on low cushions, with their knees bent and crossed in the Oriental fashion, were arranged, according to their age and learning, in a semicircle, so that they could see each other, and all of them be seen by the president and vice-president. The two notaries stood before them, one to the right and the other to the left. Before them sat three rows of disciples (חֲכָמַים תִּלְמַידֵי), in places appropriate to their respective attainments. From the first of these rows the ranks of the judges were always filled up. When those of the second row took their seat in the first, those of the third took the seats of the second, while members of the congregation generally were selected to fill the lowest places vacated in the third row (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 3, 3, 4; Maimonides, ibid. 1, 3). Under ordinary circumstances all the seventy-one members were not required to be present in their seats, so that most of them could attend to their business, since twenty-three members formed a quorum. Less than this number during any part of the session was illegal; hence before one could go out he was obliged to look round in order to ascertain that there was the legal quorum without him (Sanhedrin, 88 b; Tosephta Shekalim, at the end; Maimonides, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 3, 2).

4. Jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim. — Being both legislative and administrative, the functions of the Sanhedrim in the theocracy extended to the institution of ordinances and the definition of disputed points in ecclesiastical matters, as well as to the adjudication of ecclesiastical and secular questions, including even political matters. The tribunal had, in the first place, to interpret the divine law, and to determine the extension or limitation of its sundry enactments, inasmuch as the members of the Sanhedrim were not only the most skilled in the written word of God, but were the bearers of the oral law which was transmitted to them by their predecessors, and which they again in succession handed down to the other members of this body. Thus the Sanhedrim had

(a) to watch over the purity and legality of the priests who ministered in holy things. For this purpose they appointed trustworthy persons to keep family registers ( סֵפֶר יוּחָסַיןgenealogies) of the priests in Egypt, Babylon, and in all places where the Jews resided, stating the names, and giving all the particulars both of the head of the family and all his male descendants, and to supply every priest with such a document attested by the Sanhedrim, inasmuch as those priests who could not prove that they were not the issue of proscribed marriages were disqualified for ministering in holy things, and were ordered to divest themselves of their sacerdotal robes and put on mourning (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 5; Middoth, 5, 4; Bechoroth, 45 a; Tosephta Chagiga, cap. 2; Josephus, Cont. Apion. 1, 7).

(b) To try cases of unchastity on the part of priests' daughters, and married women who were accused by their husbands of infidelity, which were questions of life and death (Mishna, Sota, 1, 4; Sanhedrin, 52 a).

(c) To watch over the religious life of the nation, and to try any tribe which was accused of having departed from the living God to serve idols (ibid. 1, 5).

(d) To bring to trial false prophets or any heretic who promulgated doctrines contrary to the tenets of the scribes or the Sanhedrim (דַּבַרֵי סוֹפְרַים): “Such a one is not to be executed by the tribunal of his native place, nor by the tribunal at Jabne, but by the supreme court of Jerusalem; he is to be kept till the forthcoming festival, and to be executed on the festival,” as it is written (Deu 17:13), “and all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously” (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 11, 3, 4; comp. also Mat 26:65; Mat 27:63; Joh 19:7; Act 4:2; Acts 5, 28; Act 6:13). In accordance with this is the remark of our Savior, “It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem” (Luk 13:33, with Josephus, Ant. 14, 9, 3).

(e) To see that neither the king nor the high priest should act contrary to the law of God. Thus the Talmud tells us that Alexander Jannseus was summoned before the Sanhedrim to witness the trial of his servant, who had committed murder (B.C. 80), under the presidency of Simon ben- Shetach (Sanhedrin, 19 a), and we know that Herod had to appear before this tribunal to answer for his conduct (Josephus, Ant. 14, 9, 4).

(f) To determine whether a war with any nation contemplated by the king is to be waged, and to give the sovereign permission to do so (Sanhedrin, 1, 5; 2, 4).

(g) To decide whether the boundaries of the holy city or the precincts of the Temple are to be enlarged, inasmuch as it was only by the decision of the Sanhedrim that these additions could be included in the consecrated ground (ibid. 1, 5; Shebuoth, 14 a).

(h) To appoint the provincial Sanhedrim, or courts of justice (Sanhedrin, 1, 5; Gemara, ibid. 63 b; Tosephta Sanhedrin, cap. 7; ibid. Chagiga, cap. 2; Jerusalem Sanhedrin, 1, 19 b).

(i) To regulate the calendar and harmonize the solar with the lunar year by appointing intercalary days (Sanhedrin, 10 b). This jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was recognized by all the Jews both in Palestine and in foreign lands (Act 9:2; Act 26:10; with Mishna, Manoth, 6, 10; Tosephta Sanhedrin, cap. 7; Chagiga, cap. 2). Thereby this supreme court secured unity of faith and uniformity of practice.

5. Mode of Conducting Trials, Punishments, etc. — The humane and benevolent feelings of the rulers towards the people whom they represented were especially seen in their administration of the law. They always acted upon the principle that the accused was innocent till he could be proved guilty. Hence they always manifested an anxiety, in their mode of conducting the trial, to clear the arraigned rather than secure his condemnation, especially in matters of life and death. Their axiom was that “the Sanhedrim is to save, not to destroy life” (Sanhedrin, 42 b). Hence no man could be tried and condemned in his absence (Joh 7:51); and  when the accused was brought before the tribunal, the president of the Sanhedrim at the very outset of the trial solemnly admonished the witnesses, pointing out to them the preciousness of human life, and earnestly beseeching them carefully and calmly to reflect whether they had not overlooked some circumstances which might favor the innocence of the accused (Sanhedrin, 37 a). Even the attendants were allowed to take part in the discussion, if a mild sentence could thereby be procured; while those members of the Sanhedrim who, during the debate, once expressed themselves in favor of acquitting the accused, could not any more give their votes for his condemnation at the end of the trial. The taking of the votes always began from the junior member and gradually went on to the senior, in order that the lowest members might not be influenced by the opinion of the highest (ibid. 32 a). In capital offenses, it required a majority of at least two to condemn the accused; and when the trial was before a quorum of twenty-three, or before the Small Sanhedrim, which consisted of this number, thirteen members had to declare for the guilt (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 4, 1; Gemara, ibid. 2 a, 40 a). In trials of capital offenses, the verdict of acquittal could be given on the same day, but that of guilty had to be reserved for the following day, for which reason such trials could not commence on the day preceding the Sabbath or a festival. No criminal trial could be carried through in the night (Mishna, ibid. 4, 1; Gemara, ibid. 32).

The judges who condemned a criminal to death had to fast all day (Sanhedrin, 63 a). The condemned was not executed the same day on which the sentence was passed; but the votes pro and con having been taken by the two notaries, the members of the Sanhedrim assembled together on the following day to examine the discussion, and to see whether there was any contradiction on the part of the judges (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 4, 1; Gemara, ibid. 39 a). If on the way to execution the criminal remembered that he had something fresh to adduce in his favor, he was led back to the tribunal, and the validity of his statement was examined. If he himself could say nothing more, a herald preceded him as he was led to the place of execution, and exclaimed, “A, son of B, has been found guilty of death, because he committed such and such a crime according to the testimony of C and D; if any one knows anything to clear him, let him come forward and declare it” (Mishna, ibid. 6, 1). Clemency and humanity, however, were manifested towards him even when his criminality was beyond the shadow of a doubt, and when the law had to take its final course. Before his execution, a stupefying beverage was administered to the condemned by pious women to deprive him of  consciousness and lessen the pain (Sanhedrin, 43 a, with Mat 27:48; Mar 15:23; Mar 15:36; Luk 23:36; Joh 19:29-30). The property of the executed was not confiscated, but passed over to his heirs (Sanhedrin, 48 b). The only exception to this leniency was one who gave himself out as the Messiah, or who led the people astray from the doctrines of their fathers ( מסית ומדיה=πλάνους; Mat 27:63; Luk 13:33; Act 4:2; Acts 5, 28). Such a one had to endure all the rigors of the law without any mitigation (Sanhedrin, 36 b, 67 a). He could even be tried and condemned the same day or in the night (Tosephta Sanhedrin, 10; Mat 27:1-2).

As to the different punishments which the Sanhedrim had the power to inflict, though they were commensurate with the gravity of the offenses which fell within their jurisdiction to try, and embraced both corporal (Acts 5, 40; Mishna, Manoth, 3, 1-5) and capital punishments, yet even this supreme court was restricted to four modes of taking life — viz. by stoning, burning, beheading, and strangling (הרג וחנק סקילה שריפה). These four modes of execution were the only legal ones among the Jews from time immemorial (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 7, 1), and could be inflicted either by the Great Sanhedrim or by the Small Sanhedrim. According to the Gospel of John, however, the Jews declare (ἡμυῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα), “It is not lawful for us to put any man to death” (Joh 18:31), which agrees with the remark in the Jerusalem Talmud that “forty years before the destruction of the Temple the power of inflicting capital punishment was taken away from Israel” (Sanhedrin, 1, beginning; 7, 2, p. 24). But this simply means that without the confirmation of the sentence on the part of the Roman procurator, the Jews had not the power to carry the sentence of the Sanhedrim into execution. This is not only confirmed by Josephus, who tells us that the Pharisees complained to the procurator Albinus about the assumption to execute capital punishment on the part of the Sadducaean high priest (Ant. 20, 9, 1), but by the appeal of Paul to the chief captain (Act 22:25-30), and especially by the whole manner in which the trial of Jesus was conducted. The stoning of Stephen (Act 7:54, etc.) was the illegal act of an enraged multitude, as Josephus (Ant. 20, 9, 1) expressly declares the execution of the apostle James during the absence of the procurator to have been.

II. The Small Sanhedrim. —

1. Members, Constitution, etc. — This judicial court consisted of twenty- three members, who were appointed by the Great Sanhedrim (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 5, 6), and a president (מופלא, excellency) as their head (ibid. 1, 6; Horajoth, 4 b). They had the power not only to judge civil cases, but also such capital offenses as did not come within the jurisdiction of the supreme court (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 4; 4, 1). Such provincial courts were appointed in every town or village which had no less than 120 representative men (מעמידין) — i.e. twenty-three judges, three ranks of disciples of twenty-three persons each (=sixty-nine), ten constant attendants in the synagogue (עשרה בטלנין של בית הכנסת), two judges' notaries, the one to write down the arguments for and the other the arguments against the accused's innocence; two court servants to administer the forty stripes save one, and to wait upon the judges; two judges, two witnesses, two counter-witnesses, two witnesses to gainsay the counter-witnesses, two almoners, and one additional to distribute the alms, one physician, one scribe (לבלי), and one schoolmaster for children — in all 120 (Sanhedrin, 17 b; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 1, 10).

2. Place, Time, and Order in which the Sessions were Held. — In the provinces these courts of justice were at first held in the market place, but afterwards in a room adjoining the synagogue (Jerusalem Sanhedrin, 1, 1 Baba Metsia, 51, 8), for the same reason which made the Great Sanhedrim hold their sittings in the Hall of Squares, in the inner court of the Temple. They sat every Monday and Thursday, being market days (Baba Rema, 82 a; Kathuboth, 3 a), from the termination of morning prayer till the sixth hour (Maimonides, Hilchoth Sanhedrin, 3, 1). The order in which they were ranged was the same as that of the Great Sanhedrim. There were two of these lesser courts of justice in Jerusalem itself; one sat at the entrance to the Temple mount, and the other at the entrance to the Temple hall (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 9, 2), which on special occasions met together with the Great Sanhedrim (Sanhedrin, 88 b). There was no appeal to the Great Sanhedrim against the decision of this lesser Sanhedrim. Only when the opinion of the judges was divided did they themselves consult with the supreme court. The stripes to which offenders were sentenced were given in the synagogue by the officer already mentioned (Mar 13:9, with Mat 10:17; Mat 23:34), and it is evidently to such a local Sanhedrim that reference is made in Mat 5:22; Mat 10:17; Mar 13:9.  Besides these two courts, there was also one consisting of three judges. Within the jurisdiction of this court came suits for debts, robbery, bodily injuries, compensation for damages; thefts which involved a twofold, fourfold, or fivefold value to the proprietor (Exo 22:1-9); rapes, seduction, slander, and all minor offenses (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 1-3; 3, 1). There were in Jerusalem alone 390 such Sanhedrims.

3. Origin, Development, and Extinction of the Sanhedrim. — According to the most ancient Jewish tradition, the Sanhedrim was instituted by Moses, when he appointed, according to the command of God, seventy elders, who, together with him as their president, were to act as magistrates and judges (Num 11:16-24), thus constituting the first Sanhedrim with its seventy-one members (Mishna, Sanhedrin, 1, 6; Gemara, ibid. 2). Hence the so-called Jerusalem Targum paraphrases Exo 15:27, “And they came to Elim, and there were there twelve fountains of water, answering to the twelve tribes of Israel; and seventy palm trees, answering to the seventy elders of the Sanhedrim of Israel,” while the other Chaldee versions express the judicial courts and colleges of the remotest antiquity by the name Sanhedrim (comp. Targum, Isa 28:6; Rth 3:11; Rth 4:1; Psa 140:10; Ecc 12:12). Hence, too, the offices of president and vice-president are traced to Moses (Jerusalem Sota, 9, 10). In the time of the kings, we are assured, Saul was president of the Sanhedrim in his reign, and his son Jonathan was vice- president (Moed Katon, 26 a); and these two functions continued during the time of the later prophets (Pea, 2 b; Nasir, 56 b; Tosephta Yadayim, cap. 11). The Chaldee paraphrase on the Song of Songs tells us that the Sanhedrim existed even in the Babylonian captivity, and that it was reorganized by Ezra immediately after the return from the exile (comp. Son 6:1). But though this view has also been entertained by some of the most learned Christian scholars (e.g. Selden, Leusden, Grotius, Reland), and though allusion is made in Jeremiah (Jer 26:8; Jer 26:16) to the several distinct classes which we afterwards find constituting the Sanhedrim, while Ezekiel (Eze 8:11, etc.) actually mentions the existence of seventy elders in his time, yet there seems to be little doubt that this supreme court, as it existed during the second Temple, developed itself in the Greek rule over Palestine. Livy expressly states (14, 32), “Pronuntiatum quod ad statum Macedoniae pertinebat, senatores, quos synedros vocant, legendos esse, quorum consilio respublica administraretur.” If the γερουσία τῶν Ι᾿ουδαίων in 2Ma 1:10; 2Ma 4:44; 2Ma 11:27, designates the Sanhedrim — as it probably does — this is the earliest historical trace of its existence. The Macedonian origin of the Sanhedrim is corroborated by the following reasons:

(a) The historical books of the Bible are perfectly silent about the existence of such a tribunal.

(b) The prophets, who again and again manifest such zeal for justice and righteous judgment, never mention this court of justice, but always refer the administration of the law to the ruling monarch and the magnates of the land, thus showing that this central administration belongs to the period of the second Temple.

(c) The name συνέδριον, συνεδρεύειν, by which it has come down to us, points to the fact that this synod originated during the Macedonian supremacy in Palestine. It is true that Josephus does not mention the Sanhedrim before the conquest of Judea by Pompey (B.C. 63); but the very fact that it had such power in the time of Hyrcanus II as to summon Herod to answer for his unjust conduct (Josephus, Ant. 14, 9, 4) shows that it must then have been a very old institution to have acquired such development and authority. Hence Frankel rightly remarks, “Upon more minute examination, we find that the chronicler gives a pretty plain sketch of the Great Sanhedrim, as he mentions the existence in Jerusalem of a supreme court consisting of priests, Levites, and heads of families, with the high priest as president (2Ch 19:8; 2Ch 19:11).... Now the chronicler, as Zunz has shown (Gottesdienstliche Vorträge, p. 32), lived as early as the beginning of the 2d century of the Seleucidean era, so that at that time the Sanhedrim did already exist, and its beginning is to be placed at the period in which Asia was convulsed by Alexander and his successors of the Ptolemean and Seleucidean dynasties. Palestine, too, felt deeply the consequences of these recent convulsions, and to preserve its internal religious independence it required a thoroughly organized body to watch over both its doctrines and rights. This body manifested itself in the Sanhedrim, at the head of which was the high priest, as is seen from Ecc 4:4-5, and 2Ch 19:8; 2Ch 19:11. The Sanhedrim seems to have been dissolved in the time of the Maccabaean revolt in consequence of the unworthy high priests (comp. 2 Macc.), but it was reconstructed after the overthrow of the Syrian yoke. As the people, however, were unwilling to leave the whole power in the hands of the Maccabees, who were already princes and high priests, they henceforth  placed at the head of the Sanhedrim a president and a vice-president” (Der gerichtliche Beweis, p. 68, note). This is, moreover, corroborated by the traditional chain of presidents and vice-presidents which is uninterruptedly traced from Jose ben-Joeser (B.C. 170), as well as by the statement that with Simon the Just terminated the Great Synagogue (Aboth, 1, 2), from which the Sanhedrim developed itself. The transition from the Great Synagogue to the Great Sanhedrim is perfectly natural. “The Macedonian conqueror,” as Frankel justly states (Programm. p. 6, 1834), “with all his clemency towards Palestine, which resisted him so long and so obstinately, effected changes in the internal government of the people, and dissolved the Great Synagogue, which to a certain extent conferred independence and a republican constitution upon the land. The people, however, valued highly their old institutions, and would not relinquish them. Hence most probably in the confusions which broke out after Alexander's death, when the attention of the fighting chiefs could not be directed towards Palestine, the supreme court was formed anew, assuming the name Synhedrion, which was a common appellation among the Greeks for a senate.” It was this development of the Great Sanhedrim from the Great Synagogue which accounts for the similarity of the two names (הגדולה סנהדרין גדולה כנסת).

After the destruction of Jerusalem, when the holy city was no longer adapted to be the center of religious administration, R. Jochanan ben- Zakkai transferred the seat of the Sanhedrim to Jabne or Jamnia (A.D. 68- 80); it was thence transferred to Usha (Kethuboth, 49; Sabbath, 15; Rosh Ha-Shana, 15 b), under the presidency of Gamaliel II, ben-Simon II (A.D. 80-116); conveyed back to Jabne and again to Usha; to Shafran, under the presidency of Simon III, ben-Gamaliel II (A.D. 140-163); to Beth-Shearim and Sepphoris, under the presidency of Jehudah I the Holy, ben-Simon III (A.D. 163-193; comp. Kethuboth, 103 b; Nida, 27 a); and finally to Tiberias, under the presidency of Gamaliel III, ben-Jehudah I (A.D. 193- 220), where it became more of a consistory, but still retaining, under the presidency of Jehudah II, ben-Simon III (A.D. 220-270), the power of excommunication in case any Israelite refused to abide by its decisions; while under the presidency of Gamaliel IV, ben-Jehudah II (A.D. 270-300), it dropped the appellation Sanhedrim, and the authoritative decisions were issued under the name Beth Ham-Midrash (בֵּית הִמְּדְרָשׁ). Gamaliel VI (A.D. 400-425) was the last president. With the death of this patriarch, who was executed by Theodosius II for erecting new synagogues contrary  to the imperial inhibition, the title of Nasi, the last remains of the ancient Sanhedrim, became wholly extinct in the year 425.

It was with reference to this Supreme Court that Christ chose seventy disciples (Luk 10:1), answering to the seventy senators composing the Sanhedrim, just as he chose twelve apostles with reference to the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28; Luk 22:30), to indicate thereby to the Jews that the authority of their supreme religious court was now taken away and was vested in the seventy of his own choice, and over which he himself was the president and supreme Lord.

4. Literature. — Mishna, Sanhedrin, and the Gemara on this tractate; excerpts of the Gemara tractate Sanhedrin have been translated into Latin with elaborate notes by John Coch (Amst. 1629); the monographs of Vorstius and Witsius, in Ugolino's Thesaurus, vol. 25; Maimonides, De Sanhedriis et Poenis (ed. Houting. Amst. 1695); Selden, De Synedriis et Proeficturis Juridicis Veterum Eboreorum (Lond. 1650); Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 37 sq. (Berlin, 1832); Israelitische Annaelen, 1, 108, 131 sq. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839); Frankel, Der gerichtliche Beweis nach mosaisch-talmudischem Rechte, p. 68 sq. (Berlin, 1846); Rapaport, Erech Millin, p. 2 (Prague, 1852); Frankel, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1, 344 sq.; Levy, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 4, 266 sq., 301 sq. (Leips. 1855); Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2, 380 sq. (Nordhausen, 1855); Krochmal, in the Hebrew essays and reviews entitled He-Chaluz, 3, 118 sq. (Lemberg, 1856); Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, 1, 123 sq., 270 sq. (Leips. 1857); Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, p. 88 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1863); Hartmann, Die Verbindung des Alten Testaments init dem Neuen (Hamb. 1831). SEE SCHOOL, where all the presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim will be given in chronological order; and SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT, where the development of the Sanhedrim from this institution will be traced. For monographs on the civil powers of the Sanhedrim in our Lord's time, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 58. SEE COUNCIL.

## Sankara, Or Sankaracharya[[@Headword:Sankara, Or Sankaracharya]]

             The name of one of the most renowned theologians of India. The time in which he flourished is unknown, tradition placing him at about B.C. 200, but H.H. Wilson assigns him to the 8th or 9th century after Christ. Most accounts agree in making him a native of Kerala or Malabar, and a member of the caste of the Namburi Brahmans. In Malabar he is said to have divided the four original castes into seventy-two, or eighteen subdivisions each. Towards the close of his life he repaired to Cashmere, and finally to Kedarnath, in the Himalaya, where he died at the early age of thirty-two years. In the course of his career he founded the sects of the Dasnami- Dandins. His principal works, which are of considerable merit, and exercised a great influence on the religious history of India, are his commentary on the Vedanta Sutras, on the Bhaga-vadgita, and the principal Upanishads. A number of works are current in the south of India relating to his life, among them the Sankara-dig-vijaya, or the conquest of the world by Sankara. See Wilson, Sketch of Religious Sects of the Hindus.

## Sanke, Christopher[[@Headword:Sanke, Christopher]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 12, 1700, at Guben, Lower Lusatia. He studied at Leipsic, and died there, May 4, 1752. He wrote, Diss. Philol. de Anathemate Pauli Votivo Rom 9:3 (Leipsic, 1729): — Vollstandige Anweisung zu den Accenten der Hebraer (1740): — De Differentia Inter Vocationentm ac Tentationem circa Munus Ecclesiasticum (1749). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sankhar[[@Headword:Sankhar]]

             An evil spirit mentioned in the Jewish Talmud as having taken possession of the throne of Solomon.

## Sankhya[[@Headword:Sankhya]]

             (Sanscrit, synthetic reasoning), The name of one of the three great systems of orthodox Hindu philosophy. Like the other systems, it professes to teach the means by which eternal beatitude, or the complete and perpetual exemption from every sort of ill, may be attained. This means is the discriminative acquaintance with tatwa, or the true principles of all existence. Such principles are, according to the Sankhya system, twenty-  five in number, as follows: (1) Prakriti or Pradhana, substance or nature; it is the universal and material cause, eternal, productive but unproduced. Its first production is (2) Mahat (literally the great), or Buddhi (literally intellect). From it devolves (3) Ahankara (literally the assertion of “I”), the function of which consists in referring the objects of the world to one's self. It produces (4-8) five tanmatra, or subtle elements, which produce the five gross elements [see (20-24)]. Ahankara further produces (9-13) five instruments of sensation, viz. the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin; (14-18) five instruments of action, viz. the organ of speech, the hands, the feet, the excretory termination of the intestines, and the organ of generation; lastly (19), manas, or the organ of volition and imagination. The five subtle elements (4-8) produce (20-24) the five gross elements, viz. akasa, space or ether, derived from the sonorous tanmatra; air, derived from the aerial tanmatra; fire, from the igneous tanmatra; water, from the aqueous tanmatra; lastly, earth, derived from the terrene tanmatra. The 25th principle is Purusha, or soul, which is neither produced nor productive; it is multitudinous, individual, sensitive, eternal, unalterable, and immaterial.

Creation results from the union of Prakriti (1) and Purusha (25), and is either material or intellectual. Besides the twenty-five principles, the Sankhya also teaches that nature has three essential gunas, or qualities, viz. satwa, the quality of goodness or purity; rajas (literally coloredness), the quality of passion; and, tamas, the quality of sin or darkness; and it classifies accordingly material and intellectual creation. From the foregoing summary it will be seen that the Sankhya proper does not teach the existence of a Supreme Being, by whom nature and soul were created, and by whom the world is ruled. Its opponents have therefore accused it of being atheistical; and it is the special object of the Yoga system to remove this reproach by asserting his existence and defining his essence. Its final object is not absorption in God, whether personal or impersonal, but “Moksha,” deliverance of the soul from all pain and illusion, and recovery by the soul of its true nature. The Sankhya system underwent a mythological development in the Puranas (q.v.); thus Prakriti, or nature, is identified with Maya, or the energy of Brahma; and the Matsya-Purana affirms that Buddhi, or Mahat, the intellectual principle, through the three qualities goodness, passion, and sin, becomes the three gods — Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The most important development, however, of the Sankhya is that by the Buddhistic doctrine, which is mainly based on it.

The Sankhya philosophy is supposed to date from a period anterior to the 8th century B.C., and its reaction against Brahmanism became a popular movement in the 6th century in the Buddhistic reformation of Sankhyamuni, who taught the Yoga system with little change, and named its “deliverance of the soul from pain and illusion” the Nirvana. The reputed author of the actual Sankhya is Kapila (literally tawny), who is asserted to have been a son of Brahma; by others an incarnation of Vishnu. He taught his system in Sutras (q.v.), which, distributed in six lectures, bear the name of Sankhya-Prarachana. The oldest commentary on this work is that by Aniruddha; another is that by Vijnanabhikshu. They owe their preservation to Ishwara Krishna, who reduced them to writing, edited by H.H. Wilson. See Fitzedward Hall, Preface to his ed. of Sankhya- Prarachana; H.T. Colebrooke, Miscell. Essays (Lond. 1837), 1, 227 sq.; Max Müller, Chips from a German Workshop.

## Sankrandanna[[@Headword:Sankrandanna]]

             In Hindu mythology, is “the variable one,” a surname of Indra, the god of the heavens and of the air.

## Sanks, James[[@Headword:Sanks, James]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Anne Arundel County, Md., June 12, 1806, and early removed to Virginia. In 1828 he was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference, where he labored until 1858. when he was transferred to the East Baltimore Conference and placed in charge of the Bellefonte district. In 1862 he was appointed to York, Pa., but soon sank under the influence of disease, and died in the borough of York, Pa., June 4, 1862. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1863, p. 11.

## Sankuman[[@Headword:Sankuman]]

             In Hindu mythology, is a wise and pious king, who secured the welfare of his realm and then became a penitent. He received from Vishnu the promise that the god would become incarnate in his family, which was fulfilled in his being born as Rama.

## Sannan[[@Headword:Sannan]]

             SEE KIRJATH-SANNAH.

## Sanngetal[[@Headword:Sanngetal]]

             In Norse mythology, is a surname of Odin.

## Sannuwadi[[@Headword:Sannuwadi]]

             In Hindu mythology, is one of the eight playmates of Ganga.

## Sanquhar Declaration[[@Headword:Sanquhar Declaration]]

             After Hall of Haughhead had been killed at Queensferry, June 3, 1680, an unsigned paper was found in his possession, which was never recognized by the members of the Covenant. But on June 22, 1680, a party of twenty- one armed men boldly entered the little burgh of Sanquhar, and marched to the market cross, where they read and posted up a paper, throwing off all allegiance to the government, and proclaiming themselves in defiant rebellion. The Sanquhar paper was as follows: “It is not among the smallest of the Lord's mercies to this poor land that there have been always some who have given their testimony against every course of defection (that many are guilty of), which is a token for good that he doth not as yet intend to cast us off altogether, but that he will leave a remnant in whom he will be glorious, if they, through his grace, keep themselves clean still, and walk in his way and method, as it has been walked in and owned by him in our predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of reformation in the several steps thereof, from popery, prelacy, and likewise Erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him who (it is true, so far as we know) is descended from the race of our kings; yet he hath so far departed from what he ought to have been, by his perjury and usurpation in Church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land, that we have just reason to account it one of the Lord's great controversies against us that we have not disowned him and the men of his practices (whether inferior magistrates or any other) as enemies to our Lord and his crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in these lands, our Lord's espoused bride and Church.

Therefore, although we be for government and governors, such as the Word of God and our covenant allow, yet we for ourselves, and all that will adhere to us, as the representatives of the true Presbyterian kirk and covenanted nation of Scotland, considering the great hazard of lying under such a sin any longer, do by these presents disown Charles Stuart, that has been reigning (or rather tyrannizing, as we may say) on the throne of Britain these years by gone, as having any right, title to, or interest in the said crown of Scotland  for government, as forfeited several years since by his perjury and breach of covenant both to God and his kirk, and usurpation of his crown and royal prerogatives therein, and many other breaches in matters ecclesiastic, and by his tyranny and breach of the very leges regnandi in matters civil. For which reason, we declare that several years since he should have been denuded of being king, ruler, or magistrate, or of having any power to act or to be obeyed as such. As also, we being under the standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of salvation, do declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ and his cause and covenants; and against all such as have strengthened him, sided with, or anywise acknowledge him in his tyranny, civil or ecclesiastic — yea, against all such as shall strengthen, side with, or anywise acknowledge any other in the like usurpation and tyranny — far more against such as would betray or deliver up our free reformed mother — kirk unto the bondage of antichrist, the pope of Rome. And by this we homologate that testimony given at Rutherglen, May 29, 1679, and all the faithful testimonies of those who have gone before, as also of those who have suffered of late. And we do disclaim that declaration published at Hamilton, June 1697, chiefly because it takes in the king's interest, which we are several years since loosed from, because of the foresaid reasons, and others which may after this (if the Lord will) be published. As also we disown, and by this resent, the reception of the duke of York, that professed papist, as repugnant to our principles and vows to the most high God, and as that which is the great, though not alone, just reproach of our kirk and nation. We also by this protest against his succeeding to the crown; and whatever has been done, or any are essaying to do in this land (given to the Lord) in prejudice to our work of reformation. And, to conclude, we hope after this none will blame us for, or offend at our rewarding these that are against us, as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity. This is not to exclude any that have declined, if they be willing to give satisfaction according to the degree of their offense. Given at Sanquhar, June 22, 1680.” SEE QUEENSFERRY DECLARATION.

## Sansannah[[@Headword:Sansannah]]

             (Heb. Sansannah', סִנְסִנָּה, palmbranch; Sept. Σανσαννά v.r. Σεθεννάκ), A town in the southern part of the territory of Judah (Jos 15:31). The corresponding lists of Simeon (Jos 19:5; 1Ch 4:31) seem to call it HAZAR-SUSAH SEE HAZAR-  SUSAH (q.v.). It is identified by Schwarz with the village of Simsum, on a river of the same name, northeast of Gaza — a position which he acknowledges, however, to be rather in the lowlands than in the south of Judah (Palest. p. 101, 123); but the boundary line can easily be accommodated to this location. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF. Wilton would identify it with the Wady es-Suny mentioned by Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1, 299, 300), not far south of Gaza, which he supposes to have been the first resting place for horses after leaving Gaza on the way to Egypt; and he thinks a confirmation is found for this in the circumstance that various travelers, in passing north from Egypt, have noticed that they first met with horses about that locality (Negeb, p. 210). Lieut. Conder thinks (Tent- Work in Palest. 2, 339) that it was at Beit-susin, east of the valley of Sorek; but this could not possibly have been within the territory of Simeon.

## Sansbury (Sandsbury, Or Sansbry), John[[@Headword:Sansbury (Sandsbury, Or Sansbry), John]]

             A native of London, entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1593, aged seventeen; vicar of the Church of St. Giles, Oxford, in 1607; bachelor of divinity in 1608: buried in Jan., 1609. He wrote, Ilium in Italiam: — Oxonia ad Protectionem Regis sui Omnium Optimi Filia, etc. (Oxon. 1608, 16mo).

## Sanscara, Or Sanskara[[@Headword:Sanscara, Or Sanskara]]

             (Sanscrit, completing),The name of one of the ten essential rites or ceremonies of the Hindus of the first three castes. They are the ceremonies to be performed before and at the birth of a child; of naming the child on the tenth, eleventh, or one hundred first day; of carrying the child out to see the moon on the third lunar day of the third light fortnight, or to see the sun in the third or fourth month; of feeding him in the sixth or eighth month (or at other stated periods); the ceremony of the tonsure in the second or third year; of investiture with the string in the fifth, eighth, or sixteenth year, when he is handed to a guru to become a religious student; and the ceremony of marriage, after he has completed his studies and is fit to perform the sacrifices ordained by the sacred writings.

## Sanscrit Versions[[@Headword:Sanscrit Versions]]

             A translation of the New Test. into the Sanscrit, the ancient and classical language of India, was commenced in the year 1803 and finished at the press in 1808. The man who had immortalized his name by this translation  was the well-known Dr. Carey (q.v.). He had also commenced a translation of the Old Test., when the disastrous fire at Serampore in 1812 interrupted his labors, destroying not only a dictionary of the Sanscrit and various Indian dialects, but also his MSS. of the second book of Samuel and the first book of Kings. In 1815 Dr. Carey received an associate in Dr. Yates, and both carried on the work of translating the Old Test., which was finally completed in 1822. In 1820 a second edition of the New Test. was undertaken at Serampore, the former edition, consisting of only 600 copies, having been completely exhausted. In 1827 a second edition of the Old Test. was in press, but various circumstances retarded its completion, and in 1834 the impression had been struck off only as far as the first book of Kings. As the first attempt of translating could only be defective, especially when undertaken at a period when the language had been little studied by Europeans, and no printed copies of the standard works were in existence, a statement as to the desirableness of a new and a more polished translation was laid before the committee of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in 1835.

The committee entered into communication on the subject with the bishop of Calcutta, and the new translation was undertaken by Dr. Yates, formerly the associate of Dr. Carey, upon whom the mantle of the venerable translator seemed to have fallen. Dr. Yates began the work in 1840 by the publication of the Psalms; in 1844 the Gospels were completed; and in 1846 the Proverbs and the New Test. were in the press. While prosecuting his work, Dr. Yates was overtaken by death in 1845. On examining the state of the version, it was found that the books of Genesis, Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah had all passed through the press, and that the rest of the Pentateuch, and the books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Daniel, had been prepared in MS. The work was now committed to the Rev. Mr. Wenger, the translator into the Bengalee, and in 1852 the second volume of the Old Test., containing the historical books from Judges to Esther inclusive, was completed. In 1858 a third volume, bringing the translation up to the Song of Solomon, was finished; in 1863 the translation was continued as far as the end of Isaiah; and in 1873 the translation of the whole Bible was announced as completed. Besides the translation into Sanscrit proper, there exist versions into

(a.) Sanscrit-Bengalee, i.e. reprints from the Sanscrit in Bengalee character — viz. Genesis (first published in 1855; 2d. ed. 1860), Psalms (1857), Proverbs (1855), St. Luke (1855).

(b.) Sanscrit-Deva Nagari. With regard to the Deva Nagari character, the Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1877 states that “the Calcutta University has largely of late years so popularized this language and character that it has been thought desirable to print not only the book of Psalms, but also the book of Proverbs and the New Test.” Only the Psalms have as yet been printed.

(c.) Sanscrit-Oriya. In this character the same parts as under (a) have been published.

See the Bible of Every Land, p. 86, and the Annual Reports of the Brit. and For. Bible Society. (B.P.)

## Sansom, James Green[[@Headword:Sansom, James Green]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Bedford, Bedford Co., Pa., May 13, 1794. So destitute was the place of educational and religious advantages, that Mr. Sansom did not hear a sermon nor enter a school house until his thirteenth year. His early religious training was received from his mother, a member of the Presbyterian Church. In his seventeenth year he was brought into association with the Methodists, in 1818 was licensed to preach, and in 1819 was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference. In 1824 he went to Uniontown, Pa., which was soon after included in the Pittsburgh Conference, and he became one of its members. From 1819 till his death he was an earnest and effective minister, eighteen years serving as presiding elder. He died in Brownsville, Pa., May 4, 1861. He was of a genial spirit, interesting as a preacher, wise as a counsellor. — Minutes of Annual Conf. 1862, p. 44.

## Sanson, Jacques[[@Headword:Sanson, Jacques]]

             A French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Abbeville, Feb. 10, 1596. He took orders as a Carmelite in 1619, under the name of Ignace-Joseph de Jesus-Marie. He was prior of the monastery at Paris, and afterwards had charge of the novices at Charenton and at Toulouse. While in the latter city he became confessor to the duchess of Savoy, and held the position until her death, in 1663. Returning to France, he assisted in founding two monasteries — one at Abbeville, the other at Amiens. He died at Charenton, Aug. 19, 1665. His writings are of very little account except those which give some history of the province of Ponthieu. These are, Histoire Genealogique des Comtes de Ponthieu et des Maires d'Abbeville,  and Histoire Ecclesiastique de la Ville d'Abbeville. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sansovino, Andrea Contucci[[@Headword:Sansovino, Andrea Contucci]]

             An Italian sculptor and architect, was born in 1460 at Monte-Sansovino, in Tuscany. He was the son of a poor peasant, but was sent to Florence through the liberality of a fellow townsman, and studied under Antonio del Pollajuolo. At the age of thirty he was called to Portugal, where he remained nine years, and constructed various edifices for John II and Emmanuel I. In Rome are the tombs of cardinals Sforza and Basso, executed by Sansovino, and in the Church of St. Anna the group The Madonna and St. Ann, one of his best works. He also executed some beautiful bas reliefs at Loretto. He died in 1529.

## Santa Casa[[@Headword:Santa Casa]]

             (holy cottage). SEE LORETTO, HOLY HOUSE AT.

## Santa Croce, Prospero Di[[@Headword:Santa Croce, Prospero Di]]

             An Italian prelate and diplomatist, was born at Rome in 1513. He studied law at Padua, and afterwards entered the Church. Paul III gave him the bishopric of Castel-Chisamo, on the island of Candia. He was employed as papal nuncio in Germany, Portugal, Spain, and France. While in the last named country, he received, at the request of Catherine de' Medici, the bishopric of Aries, and in 1565 the cardinal's hat. In 1573 he gave up his see in favor of his nephew, Silvio di Santa Croce, and returned to Rome. Sixtus V made him bishop of Albano, but he lived only a few months after receiving the see. This cardinal introduced tobacco into Italy, and the name “Santa Croce” was given to the plant. He died at Rome, Oct. 2, 1589. He wrote the Memoirs of his life, and of the civil wars in France, in Latin. These have been published in the Collectio Veterum Scriptorum of Martenne and Durand, under the title De Civilibus Gallioe Dissensionibus Comm. Besides this, there are Decisiones Rotoe Romanoe, Constitutiones laneoe Artis in Urbe erectoe, and many Letters in French and Italian concerning the affairs of France, which are published in the Synodes des Eglises Reformees.

## Santa Sophia[[@Headword:Santa Sophia]]

             SEE SOPHIA

(SAINT

), CHURCH OF.

## Santali Version[[@Headword:Santali Version]]

             Santali is the language spoken by the Santhals of Northwestern Bengal. In this language the Gospel according to St. Matthew was for the first time printed in 1868, which was followed in 1873 by the Psalms, printed under the superintendence of the Calcutta Auxiliary Bible Society. In 1876 the Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society stated that the translation of St. Matthew had been revised, while the other Gospels and Acts were in the course of revision. In 1877 the Report stated that the Gospel of St. Mark had been printed, while St. Luke was in the press, and St. John and the Acts were ready for the press. All these portions were translated from the original by the missionaries of the Church Missionary Society. (B.P.)

## Santarelli, Antonio[[@Headword:Santarelli, Antonio]]

             An Italian Jesuit, was born in 1569, at Atri, kingdom of Naples. At the age of sixteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and later taught belles lettres and theology at Rome. He died there Dec. 5, 1649. He was the author of a work which at the time attracted much attention — De Hoeresi, Schismate, Apostasia, et Sollicitatione in Sacramento Poenitentioe, et de Potestate Summi Pontificis in his Delictis Puniendis. In 1626 it was censured by the Sorbonne, and the Parliament of Paris condemned it to the flames. Santarelli held that the power of the pope extended even above that of the sovereign, and the doctrine was even opposed by the Jesuits themselves when they saw their confrere denounced by the faculties of all the principal universities. Santarelli wrote some smaller works in Italian.

## Santer, John[[@Headword:Santer, John]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of Tettnang, kingdom of Würtemberg, Germany, May 18, 1812. He came to this country about 1835. Having been converted, he was licensed to preach, and in 1844 was sent to Rahway, N.J., and after three months to Newark, N.J., where he labored with success for three years. In 1845 he was received into the New Jersey Conference, and until 1868 was in active service, filling appointments successfully in the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. From 1868 to 1874 he sustained a supernumerary and superannuated relation. On March 17 he received injuries on the railroad that proved fatal, death taking place March 24, 1874. Mr. Santer was a good man, a diligent worker, a faithful pastor, and a safe adviser. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1875, p. 44.

## Santes, Pagninus[[@Headword:Santes, Pagninus]]

             SEE PAGNINUS.

## Santi (Or Sanzio), Giovanni[[@Headword:Santi (Or Sanzio), Giovanni]]

             An Italian poet and painter, was born at Colbordolo, duchy of Urbino. He was the father of the immortal Raphael, and his first master. It is supposed that the elder Sanzio studied under Mantegna. His designs, without being extremely delicate, are carefully studied. Many of his works have disappeared, but there may be seen in the Museum of Berlin his Virgin Holding Jesus, and a Madonna with St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Catherine. He also composed a Chronicle in rhyme, in honor of one of the dukes of Urbino. This is still preserved in the Library of the Vatican. He died Aug. 1, 1494.

## Santo Volto[[@Headword:Santo Volto]]

             (hol countenance). SEE HOLY HANDKERCHIEF.

## Santos, Joao Dos[[@Headword:Santos, Joao Dos]]

             A Portuguese missionary, was born at Evora, in the latter part of the 16th century. Belonging to the Order of St. Dominic, he obtained permission in 1596 to carry the Gospel to Eastern Africa. He traveled through Caffraria, the coast of Natal, Sofala, Mozambique, and penetrated some distance into the interior. After spending eleven years in spreading the Christian faith and founding new colonies, he returned to Europe, and published Ethiopia Oriental e Varia Historia de Cousas Notaveis do Oriente. Notwithstanding the credulity which Santos shows, his work was for a long time an authority upon geographical points, and he was the first to describe the manners of those countries of which he wrote. In 1617 he was sent to India and attached to the mission at Goa. He died there in 1622. His Commentarios da Regiao dos Rios de Cuama have never been published. See Hoefer Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sanuto, Mirino[[@Headword:Sanuto, Mirino]]

             Called Torsello, an Italian chronicler, was born at Venice in the latter part of the 13th century. He was of an ancient family, which, under the name of Candiani, had for years occupied an important position in the republic. In early life he traveled extensively in the East, explored Cyprus, Rhodes, Armenia and other countries, and on his return wrote his Liber Secretorum Fidelium super Terroe Sanctoe Recuperatione, in which he described the countries he had visited, and the various wars with the infidels. The book  contained also four maps of the Mediterranean, the Holy Land, and Egypt. Having finished his task, Sanuto went through Europe preaching a new crusade. All his efforts were useless, and he abandoned the project. He died about 1330. The book and letters of Sanuto were published in 1611 by Bongars, in Gesta Dei per Francos.

## Sanyasi[[@Headword:Sanyasi]]

             A Hindu ascetic of the most extreme kind, who assumes a state of silence, and gives up the use of fire, eats little, and asks but once in the day for food. “At the time,” says the Code of Manu, “when the smoke of the kitchen fires has ceased, when the pestle lies motionless, when the burning charcoal is extinguished, when people have eaten, and when dishes are removed, let the Sanyasi bid for food.” He feeds upon roots and fruits. In order to fit him for immortality, he endeavors to reach a state of indifference and entire freedom from passion and emotion of every kind. He must never walk without keeping his eyes upon the ground for the sake of preserving minute animals; and, for fear of destroying insects, he must not drink water until it has been strained. The only occupation suitable to his situation is meditation.

## Saon[[@Headword:Saon]]

             In Greek mythology, was the son of Jupiter and a nymph, or of Mercury and Rhene, who is credited with having gathered the inhabitants of Samothrace into towns and villages, and with having divided them into five tribes named after his sons, besides giving them laws.

## Saotes[[@Headword:Saotes]]

             In Greek mythology, was the preserver.

1. A surname of Jupiter, applied to him in Thespiae. A monstrous dragon devastated that territory, and the oracle had directed that a youth be given the monster each year. When the lot fell on Cleostratus, his friend Menestratus caused a brazen coat of mail to be studded with barbed hooks and points, in which the victim went out to meet his fate. He lost his life, but so did the dragon, and Thespiae erected a bronze statue to its deliverer Jupiter.

2. A surname of Bacchus, under which he was worshipped at Troezene and about Lerna.

## Sapandomad[[@Headword:Sapandomad]]

             In Persian mythology, was the genius of the earth, a female angel of the highest perfection, who, as one of the Amshaspands created by Ormuzd, is engaged in an incessant warfare with Astushad, one of the daemons of Ahriman.

## Saph[[@Headword:Saph]]

             (Heb. id. סִפ, a threshold, or dish, as often; Sept. Σέφ v.r. Σεφέ), A Philistine giant of the race of Rapha, slain by Sibbechai the Hushathite (2Sa 21:18). B.C. cir. 1050. In 1Ch 20:4 he is called SIPPAI.

## Saphat (Saf?t)[[@Headword:Saphat (Saf?t)]]

             Saphati'as (Σαφατίας v.r. Σοφοτίας), and Sa'pheth (Σαφέθ v.r. Σαφυθί, Σαφυϊv), Greek forms (respectively 1Es 5:9; 1Es 8:34; 1Es 5:33) of the name SHEPHATIAH SEE SHEPHATIAH (q.v.) in the corresponding Heb. lists (respectively Ezr 2:4; Ezr 8:8; and Ezr 2:57).

## Saphir[[@Headword:Saphir]]

             (Heb. Shaphir', שָׁפַיר,fair; Sept. translates as adverb, καλῶς), A place in the kingdom of Judah, named only in Mic 1:11. By Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. “Saphir”) it is described as “in the mountain district between Eleutheropolis and Ascalon.” But in this description Dr. Robinson thinks that the Onomasticon incorrectly takes it for one of the Hazors of Jos 15:25, in the south of Judah (Bibl. Res. 2, 370). On the way from Jerusalem to Gaza, at Kuratiyeh, Robinson saw a place called by the Arabs es-Sawafir, N. 32° W., which seems to be a plural form for Saphir (comp. Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. שָׁפַיר). Es-Sawafir lies seven or eight miles to the northeast of Ascalon, and about twelve west of Beit-Jibrin, to the right of the coast road from Gaza (Van de Velde, Syr. and Pal. p. 159). Tobler prefers a village called Saber, close to Sawafir. containing a copious and apparently very ancient well (Dritte Wanderung, p. 47). “In one important respect, however, the position of neither of these agrees with the notice of the Onomasticon, since it is not near the mountains, but on the open plain of the Shefelah. But as Beit-Jibrin, the ancient Eleutheropolis, stands on the western slopes of the mountains of Judah, it is difficult to understand how any place could be westward of it (i.e. between it and  Ascalon), and yet be itself in the mountain district, unless that expression may refer to places which, though situated in the plain, were for some reason considered as belonging to the towns of the mountains. SEE KEILAH; SEE NEZIB, etc. Schwarz, though aware of the existence of Sawafir (p. 116), suggests as a more feasible identification the village of Safiriyeh, a couple of miles northwest of Lydda (Palest. p. 136). The drawback to this is, that the places mentioned by Micah appear, as far as we can trace them to be mostly near Beit-Jibrin, and, in addition, that Safiriyeh is in clear contradiction to the notice of Eusebius and Jerome” (Smith). Van de Velde inclines to identify Saphir with one of the two other villages named es-Sawafir south by east of Esdfud, and nearer to it (Memoir, p. 346).

## Saphir (2)[[@Headword:Saphir (2)]]

             The probable representative of this place is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:413):

"Three mud villages of the name es-Suafir exist close together. It is probably the Zeoplir in the territory of Ascalon, given as properly to the bishop of Bethlehem, A.D. 1100 (William of Tyre). The most ancient of the sites would appear to be Suafir esh-Shemaliyeh (the most northerly of the three), where there are ruined cisterns of rubble masonry. There are small gardens and wells at each village."

## Saphir, Jacob[[@Headword:Saphir, Jacob]]

             a Jewish traveller, was born in 1830, and died at Jerusalem, June 23,1885. He visited Egypt, Arabia, India, and Australia; the results of his researches he published in אבן ספיר(1868, 1874, 2 volumes). This work is of great historical and ethnographical value. For the Hebrew codex which Saphir brought from Arabia and sold to. the public library at Paris in 1868, SEE SHAPIRA MANUSCRIPT. (B.P.)

## Saponarias)[[@Headword:Saponarias)]]

             were held at Tousi, a place in the diocese of Toul.

I. This council was held in June, 859. Charles the Bald and the sons of the emperor Lothaire were present. Thirteen canons were published, of which the first treats of the reconciliation of Charles and his brother Louis. The sixth relates to a charge of treason brought by Chlarles the Bald against Venilon, bishop of Sens. Canon 8 relates to the case of the Breton bishops who had been guilty of schism in: separating from their metropolitan. The tenth contains certain dogmas relating to grace (originally put forth in the first six canons of Valence, in the Synod of Quiercy), concerning which there arose a great contention among the bishops present. Synodal letters were addressed to Venilon, the Breton prelates, and to those factious and seditious persons whose unbridled licentiousness had caused extreme disorder. See Mansi, Concil. 8:974.

II. The second Council of Tousi (also called Concilium Tullense, or Tussiacense) was held in 860. Forty bishops from fourteen provinces attended. Five canons were published, directed against robbery, perjury, and other crimes, then very prevalent. Although only forty bishops were present, these canons are signed by fifty-seven, the decrees of councils being often sent to the bishops who were absent for their signature.

1. Is directed against invaders of sacred things.

2. Concerning the incontinence of virgins or widows consecrated to God.

3. On perjury and false witnesses.

4. Against robbers and others guilty of various crimes.

5. Concerning vagabond clerks and monks. A synodal letter was also drawn up, addressed to the invaders of ecclesiastical rights and property, and the plunderers of the poor. See Mansi, 8:702.

## Sapp, Resin[[@Headword:Sapp, Resin]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mt. Vernon, O., Feb. 9, 1816. He was licensed to preach in 1837; and in 1838 he was admitted to the Michigan Conference, then embracing a part of Ohio. For more than thirty-four years Sapp served the Church, twenty-three of which were spent in the regular pastorate, and ten in the presiding eldership. His last sermon was preached at Alaska, Mich., Jan. 12, 1873, and on May 5 he died, in holy triumph, at Grand Rapids. He was a laborious and able member of the General Conferences held at Boston, Indianapolis, Buffalo, and Brooklyn. He was also a valuable contributor to the periodical literature of his church. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1873, p. 96.

## Sapphira[[@Headword:Sapphira]]

             (Σαπφείρη, a sapphire stone, or beautiful), The wife of Ananias, and his accomplice in the sin for which he died (Acts 5, 1-10). A.D. 30. Unaware of the judgment which had befallen her husband, she entered the place about three hours after, probably to look for him; and, being there interrogated by Peter, repeated and persisted in the “lie unto the Holy Ghost” which had destroyed her husband; on which the grieved apostle made known to her his doom, and pronounced her own” Behold, the feet of them who have buried thy husband are at the door and shall carry thee out.” On hearing these awful words, she fell dead at his feet. The cool obstinacy of Sapphira in answering as she did the questions which were probably designed to awaken her conscience deepens the shade of the foul crime common to her and her husband, and has suggested to many the  probability that the plot was of her devising, and that, like another Eve, she drew her husband into it. The interval of three hours that elapsed between the two deaths, Sapphira's ignorance of what had happened to her husband, and the predictive language of Peter towards her are decisive evidences as to the supernatural character of the whole transaction. The history of Sapphira's death thus supplements that of Ananias, which might otherwise have been attributed to natural causes. SEE ANANIAS.

## Sapphire[[@Headword:Sapphire]]

             (סִפַּיר, sapper [according to Gesenius, from its capacity for engraving; but according to Fürst, from its brilliancy]; Sept. and N.T. σάπφειρος; Vulg. sapphirus), a precious stone, apparently of a bright blue color; see Exo 24:10, where the God of Israel is represented as being seen in vision by Moses and the elders with “a paved work of a sappir stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness” (comp. Eze 1:26). The sappir was the second stone in the second row of the high priest's breastplate (Exo 28:18); it was extremely precious (Job 28:16); it was one of the precious stones that ornamented the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13). In the Apocalyptic vision it formed the second foundation wall of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:19). Notwithstanding the identity of name between our sapphire and the σάπφειρος and sapphirus of the Greeks and Romans, it is generally agreed that the sapphire of the ancients was not our gem of that name, viz. the azure or indigo blue crystalline variety of corundum, but our lapis lazuli (ultramarine); for Pliny (N.H. 37, 9) thus speaks of the sapphirus: “It is refulgent with spots of gold, of an azure color sometimes, but not often purple. The best kind comes from Media; it is never transparent, and is not well suited for engraving upon when intersected with hard, crystalline particles.” The account of Theophrastus is similar (De Lapid. 23). This description answers exactly to the character of the lapis lazuli; the “crystalline particles” of Pliny are crystals of iron pyrites, which often occur with this mineral. It is, however, not so certain that the sappir of the Hebrew Bible is identical with the lapis lazuli; for the scriptural requirements demand transparency, great value, and good material for the engraver's art, all of which combined characters the lapis lazuli does not possess in any great degree. Pliny calls it “inutilis sculpturae.” King (Antique Gems, p. 44) says that intagli and camel of Roman times are frequent in the material, but rarely any works of much merit. Again, the  sappir was certainly pellucid: “sane apud Judaeos,” says Braun (De Vest. Sac. p. 680, ed. 1680), “saphiros pellucidas notas fuisse manifestissimum est, adeo etiam ut pellucidum illorum philosophis dicatur ספיר, saphir.” Beckmann (Hist. of Invent. 1, 472) is of opinion that the sappir of the Hebrews is the same as the lapis lazuli; Rosenmüller and Braun argue in favor of its being our sapphire or precious corundum.

The Oriental sapphire is a pellucid gem, little inferior in hardness to the diamond. The best are found in Pegu, and in the sand of the rivers of Ceylon. They are very seldom found of a large size. Their color is blue, varying through all the intermediate shades down to colorless. The deep blue are called male sapphires; the lighter, water sapphires, or female sapphires. The sapphire has been sometimes found red, and has then been mistaken for ruby. There is a gem called sapphirorubinus, which is a sapphire part blue, part ruby colored: it is called by the Indians niloecundi. Precious stones were considered by the ancients to be emblematical of some faculty or virtue. Pope Innocent III sent to king John a present of four rings: the sapphire, denoting hope; the emerald, faith; the garnet, charity; the topaz, good works. The sapphire is the stone which, in the high priest's breastplate, bore the name of Issachar. According to the Cabalists, the sapphire was fatal to serpents. The rabbins also have an absurd story about the engraving of the gem on the high priest's breastplate by means of a singular worm (see the Talmudical treatises Sopha and Gittin). The ancients as well as moderns had many other superstitions and speculations concerning this stone. (See Jungendres, De Sapphiro [Alt. 1705].) SEE GEM.

## Sappir Codex[[@Headword:Sappir Codex]]

             SEE SHAPIRA MANUSCRIPT.

## Sara[[@Headword:Sara]]

             (Σάῤῥα), a Graecized form of the Heb. name Sarah (q.v.), applied to two women in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. The wife of Abraham (Heb 11:11; 1Pe 3:6).,

2. The daughter of Raguel and Edna, betrothed to her cousin Tobias, a native of Ecbatana in Media, in the apocryphal history of Tobit. As the story goes, she had been married to seven husbands, who were all slain on  the wedding night by Asmodaeus, the evil spirit, who loved her (Tobit 3, 7). This spirit the rabbins call Ashmedai, and say he was the incestuous offspring of Tubal-Cain by his sister Naama, who became the mother of many devils; and that he was enamored of the beauty of Sara as the angels were of the daughters of men (Genesis 5). SEE ASMODAEUS. The breaking of the spell and the chasing away of the evil spirit by the “fishy fume,” when Sara was married to Tobias, with whom she afterwards lived in peace, are told in ch. 8. SEE TOBIT.

## Sarab[[@Headword:Sarab]]

             SEE BRIER.

## Sarabaites[[@Headword:Sarabaites]]

             A vagrant class of monks among the Egyptians in the 4th century, designated Remboth. They lived together in very small communities, chiefly in cities where everything they did might attract attention. They turned religion into an art, and made a gain by the exhibition of pretended miracles. Their dress was most disgusting and their conduct immoral (Jerome, Ep. 22 ad Eustoch).

## Sarabias[[@Headword:Sarabias]]

             (Σαραβίας), a Greek form (1Es 9:48) of the name SHEREBIAH SEE SHEREBIAH (q.v.) in the Heb. text (Neh 8:7).

## Saracens[[@Headword:Saracens]]

             Originally the name of an Arab tribe, then applied to the Bedouin, and later to all the Moorish or Mohammedan people who invaded Europe, and against whom the Crusaders fought. The true derivation of the word was long a puzzle to philologers: Du Cange deduced it from Sarah, the wife of Abraham; Hottinger (Biblioth. Orient.) from the Arab saraca, to steal; Forster (Journey) from sahra, a desert; others from the Hebrew sarak, poor. The opinion most generally prevalent is that the word was originally Sharkeyn (Arab. Eastern people), corrupted by the Greeks into Σαρακηνοί, from which the Romans derived their word Saraceni. SEE CRUSADES; SEE MOORS; SEE SPAIN.

## Sarah[[@Headword:Sarah]]

             The name of two women in the Old Test., whose Hebrew names, however, are different.

I. The wife of Abraham and mother of Isaac.

1. Her Name. — The Hebrew form of Sarah is שָׂרָה, Sarah, which is the regular feminine of שִׂר, sar, a prince, often so used and rendered (Sept., Josephus, and New Test. Σάῤῥα, “Sara” in the A.V. of the N.T.). Her original name, however, was SARAI SEE SARAI (q.v.), which is usually regarded as of kindred etymology. The change of her name from “Sarai” to “Sarah” was made at the same time that Abram's name was changed to Abraham, on the establishment of the covenant of circumcision between him and God. That the name “Sarah” signifies “princess” is universally acknowledged. But the meaning of “Sarai” is still a subject of controversy. The older interpreters (as, for example, Jerome, in Quoest. Hebr., and those who follow him) suppose it to mean “my princess;” and explain the change from Sarai to Sarah as signifying that she was no longer the queen of one family, but the royal ancestress of “all families of the earth.” They also suppose that the addition of the letter ה, as taken from the sacred tetragrammaton Jehovah, to the names of Abram and Sarai, mystically signified their being received into covenant with the Lord. Among modern Hebraists there is great diversity of interpretation. One opinion, keeping to the same general derivation as that referred to above, explains “Sarai” as “noble,” “nobility,” etc., an explanation which, even more than the other, labors under the objection of giving little force to the change. Another opinion supposes Sarai to be a contracted form of שְׂרָיָה (Seraydh), and to signify “Jehovah is ruler.” SEE SERAIAH. But this gives no force whatever to the change, and, besides, introduces the element Jah into a proper name too early in the history. A third (following Ewald, Heb. Gram. § 324) derives it from שָׂרָה, a root which is found in Gen 32:28; Hos 12:4, in the sense of “to fight,” and explains it as “contentious” (streitsüchtig). This last seems to be, etymologically, the most probable, and differs from the others in giving great force and dignity to the change of name (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1338 b; Pfeiffer, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1871, 1, 145 sq.). SEE PROPER NAME.

2. Her Parentage. — She is first introduced in Gen 11:29 as follows: “Abram and Nahor took them wives: the name of Abram's wife was Sarai; and the name of Nahor's wife was Milcah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milcah, and the father of Iscah.” In Gen 20:12 Abraham speaks of her as his sister, the daughter of the same father, but not the daughter of the same mother. The common Jewish tradition, taken for granted by Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 6) and by Jerome (Quoest. Hebr. ad Genesin, 3, 323 [ed. Ben. 1735) is that Sarai is the same as Iscah, the daughter of Haran and the sister of Lot, who is called Abraham's “brother” in Gen 14:14; Gen 14:16. Judging from the fact that Rebekah, the granddaughter of Nahor, was the wife of Isaac, the son of Abraham, there is reason to conjecture that Abraham was the youngest brother, so that his wife might not improbably be younger than the wife of Nahor. It is certainly strange, if the tradition be true, that no direct mention of it is found in Gen 11:29. But it is not improbable in itself; it supplies the account of the descent of the mother of the chosen race, the omission of which in such a passage is most unlikely; and there is no other to set against it, except the assertion of Abraham himself that Sarai was his half- sister, “the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother” (Gen 20:12); but this is held by many to mean no more than that Haran her father was his half-brother; for the colloquial usage of the Hebrews in this matter makes it easy to understand that he might call a niece a sister, and a granddaughter a daughter. In general discourse “daughter” comprised any and every female descendant, and “sister” any and every consanguineous relationship. (See Stempel, De Abrahamo Matrimonium Dissimulante [Vitemb. 1714].) In that case Abraham was really her uncle as well as husband. SEE BROTHER.

3. Her History. — This is substantially, of course, that of Abraham. She came with him from Ur to Haran, from Haran to Canaan, and accompanied him in all the wanderings of his life. Her only independent action is the demand that Hagar and Ishmael should be cast out, far from all rivalry with her and Isaac; a demand symbolically applied in Gal 4:22-31 to the displacement of the Old Covenant by the New. The times in which she plays the most important part in the history are the times when Abraham was sojourning, first in Egypt, then in Gerar, in both which cases Sarah shared his deceit towards Pharaoh and towards Abimelech. On the first occasion, about the middle of her life, her personal beauty is dwelt upon as its cause (Gen 12:11-15); on the second, just before the birth of  Isaac, at a time when she was old (thirty-seven years before her death), but when her vigor had been miraculously restored, the same cause is alluded to as supposed by Abraham, but not actually stated (Gen 20:9-11). In the former case the commendations which the princes of Pharaoh bestowed upon the charms of the lovely stranger have been supposed by some to have been owing to the contrast which her fresh, Mesopotamian complexion offered to the dusky hue of their own beauties. But, so far as climate is concerned, the nearer Syria could offer complexions as fair as hers; and, moreover, a people trained by their habits to admire “dusky” beauties were not likely to be inordinately attracted by a fresh complexion. In both cases, especially the last, the truthfulness of the history is seen in the unfavorable contrast in which the conduct both of Abraham and Sarah stands to that of Pharaoh and Abimelech. She died at Hebron at the age of one hundred and twenty-seven years, twenty-eight years before her husband, and was buried by him in the cave of Machpelah, B.C. 2027. Her burial place, purchased of Ephron the Hittite, was the only possession of Abraham in the Land of Promise. It has remained, hallowed in the eyes of Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans alike, to the present day; and in it the “shrine of Sarah” is pointed out opposite to that of Abraham, with those of Isaac and Rebekah on the one side, and those of Jacob and Leah on the other (see Stanley's Lect. on Jewish Church, app. 2, p. 484-509). SEE ABRAHAM.

4. Her Character. — This is no ideal type of excellence, like that of Abraham, but one thoroughly natural and truly feminine, both in its excellences and its defects. Her natural motherly affection is seen in her touching desire for children, even from her bondmaid, and in her unforgiving jealousy of that bondmaid when she became a mother; in her rejoicing over her son Isaac, and in the spirit which resented the slightest insult to him and forbade Ishmael to share his sonship. It makes her cruel to others as well as tender to her own, and is remarkably contrasted with the sacrifice of natural feeling on the part of Abraham to God's command in the last case (Gen 21:12). To the same character belong her ironical laughter at the promise of a child, long desired, but now beyond all hope; her trembling denial of that laughter, and her change of it to the laughter of thankful joy, which she commemorated in the name of Isaac. It is a character deeply and truly affectionate, but impulsive, jealous, and imperious in its affection.  Sarah, however, is so rarely introduced directly to our notice that it is difficult to estimate her character justly for want of adequate materials. She is seen only when her presence is indispensable; and then she appears with more of submission and of simplicity than of dignity, and manifests an unwise but not unusual promptitude in following her first thoughts, and in proceeding upon the impulse of her first emotions. Upon the whole, Sarah scarcely meets the idea the imagination would like to form of the life companion of so eminent a person as Abraham. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to observe that she was a most attached and devoted wife. Her husband was the central object of all her thoughts; and he was not forgotten even in her first transports of joy at becoming a mother (Gen 21:7). This is her highest eulogium.

It is asked whether Sarah was aware of the intended sacrifice of Isaac, the son of her long-deferred hopes. The chronology is uncertain and does not decide whether this transaction occurred before or after her death. She was probably alive; and if so, we may understand from the precautions employed by Abraham that she was not acquainted with the purpose of the journey to the land of Moriah, and, indeed, that it was the object of these precautions to keep from her knowledge a matter which must so deeply wound her heart. He could have the less difficulty in this if his faith was such as to enable him to believe that he should bring back in safety the son he was commanded to sacrifice (Heb 11:19). As, however, the account of her death immediately follows that of this sacrifice, some of the Jewish writers imagine that the intelligence killed her, and that Abraham found her dead on his return (Targ Jonath., and Jarchi on Gen 23:2; Pirke Eliezer, c. 52). But there seems to be no authority for such an inference.

Isaiah is the only prophet who names Sarah (Isa 51:2) Paul alludes to her hope of becoming a mother (Rom 4:19); and afterwards cites the promise which she received (Rom 9:9); and Peter eulogizes her submission to her husband (1Pe 3:6).

II. (Heb. Se'rach, שֵׂרִה; Sept. Σάρα, “Sarah,” Num 26:46; being there “in pause” Sarach, שָׂרִה) the daughter of the patriarch Asher, elsewhere (Gen 46:17; 1Ch 7:30) more properly Anglicized SERAE SEE SERAE (q.v.).

## Sarai[[@Headword:Sarai]]

             (Heb. Saray', שָׂרִי; Sept. Σάρα; Vulg. Sarai), the original name of Sarah, the wife of Abraham. It is always used in the history from Gen 11:29 to Gen 17:15, when it was changed to Sarah at the same time that her husband's name from Abram became Abraham, and the birth of Isaac was more distinctly foretold. The meaning of the name appears to be, as Ewald has suggested, “contentious.” SEE SARAH.

## Saraias[[@Headword:Saraias]]

             (Σαραίας v.r. [in No. 2] Α᾿ζαραίας), the Greek form of SERAIAH SEE SERAIAH (q.v.), namely:

(a) the high priest (1Es 5:5); (b) the father of Ezra (1Es 8:1; 2Es 1:1).

## Saramel[[@Headword:Saramel]]

             (Σαραμέλ v.r. Α᾿σαραμέλ), the place where the assembly of the Jews was held at which the high priesthood was conferred upon Simon Maccabaeus (1Ma 14:28). The fact that the name is found only in this passage has led to the conjecture that it is an imperfect version of a word in the original Hebrew or Syriac from which the present Greek text of the Maccabees is a translation. Some (as Castellio) have treated it as a corruption of Jerusalem; but this is inadmissible, since it is inconceivable that so well known a name should be corrupted. Other conjectures are enumerated by Grimm in the Kurzgef. exegetisches Handb. on the passage. A few only need be named here, but none seem perfectly satisfactory. All appear to adopt the reading Asaramel.

(1.) Ha-hatsar Millo, “the court of Millo,” Millo being not improbably the citadel of Jerusalem. SEE MILLO. This is the conjecture of Grotius, and has at least the merit of ingenuity.

(2.) Ha-hatsar Am-El, “the court of the people of God, that is, the great court of the Temple.” This is due to Ewald (Gesch. 4, 387), who compares with it the well-known Sarbeth Sabanai-El, given by Eusebius as the title of the Maccabean history. SEE MACCABEE.

(3.) Has-shaar Am-El, “the gate of the people of God,” adopted by Winer (Realwb.).

(4.) Has-shaar Am-El, “prince of the people of God,” as if not the name of a place, but the title of Simon, the “in” having been inserted by puzzled copyists. This is adopted by Grimm himself. It has in its favor the fact that without it Simon is here styled high priest only, and his second title, “captain and governor of the Jews and priests” (1Ma 14:47), is then omitted in the solemn official record the very place where it ought to be found. It also seems to be countenanced by the Peshito-Syriac version, which certainly omits the title of “high priest,': but inserts Rabba de-Israel, “leader of Israel.” None of these explanations, however, can be regarded as entirely satisfactory.

## Saran[[@Headword:Saran]]

             In Hindu mythology, is a superlative bow belonging to Vishnu, whose arrows never fail to reach their mark and return of themselves to Vishnu.

## Sarantari[[@Headword:Sarantari]]

             in the Greek Church, are masses for the dead during forty days.

## Saraph[[@Headword:Saraph]]

             (Heb. Saraph'. שָׂרָ, burning; Sept. Σαράφ v.r. Σαἰα), named as one of the sons or descendants of Shelah the son of Judah (1Ch 4:22), and he seems to have lived about the time of the Eisode, as he is said to have had the dominion in Moab. B.C. cir. 1618. “Burrington (Geneal. 1, 179) makes Saraph a descendant of Jokim, whom he regards as the third son of Shelah. In the Targum of R. Joseph, Joash and Saraph are identified with Mahlon and Chilion, who married (בָּעֲלוּ) in Moab.'”

## Saraph (2)[[@Headword:Saraph (2)]]

             SEE SERAPHIM; SEE SERPENT.

## Sarasa, Alphonse Antoine De[[@Headword:Sarasa, Alphonse Antoine De]]

             A Flemish Jesuit of the last century, was born at Nieuwpoort of Spanish parents. At the age of fifteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught in the College of Gaud. Later he gave himself to the study of mathematics, which he had studied under the famous Gregory de St. Vincent, and passed the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Anvers, July 5, 1667. He wrote Ars Semper Gaudendi, etc., which has  been translated into French under the title L'Art de se Tranquilliser dans les Evenements de la Vie. This work was held in high regard by Leibnitz, Wolf, and others of their school.

## Sarasvati[[@Headword:Sarasvati]]

             Is also the name of a stream which flows into the Ganges at Hoogly. According to the myth, the goddess, being pursued, hid herself under the earth, and in the character of a stream forced her way until she reached the Ganges, her lover, with whom she was united. Another tradition makes Sarasvati the daughter of Brahma, whose beauty captivated the god himself. As she concealed herself behind him, he assumed five heads in order to look for her; but Siva, becoming angry, cut off one of them. She is usually represented as seated by the side of Brahma.

## Saraswati (Or Sarasvati)[[@Headword:Saraswati (Or Sarasvati)]]

             Is, in Hindu mythology, the name of the wife, or the female energy, of the god Brahman, the first of the Hindu Trimurti, or triad. She is also the goddess of speech and eloquence, the patroness of music and the arts, and the inventress of the Sanscrit language and the Devanagari letters. She was induced to bestow these benefits on the human race by the sage Bharata, who, through his penance, caused her to descend from heaven, and to divulge her inventions. Hence she is called Bharati. She is also very white, hence another of her names, Mahasweta, or Mahasukla (from mahat, great, and sweta, white).Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.

## Saravia, Hadrian A.[[@Headword:Saravia, Hadrian A.]]

             Classed among the English divines, although of Spanish extraction, was born at Hisdin, in Artois, France, in 1531. In 1582 he became professor of divinity and preacher to the French Church at Leyden. Influenced, doubtless, by his preference for episcopal government, he went to England in 1587, where he was well received by the prelates and divines. He first settled in Jersey, where he taught school and preached to his exiled countrymen there; afterwards he was master of the free grammar school at Southampton. He was successively promoted to a prebend in the churches of Gloucester (1591), Canterbury (1595), and Westminster (1601). He showed great learning in defending the episcopacy against Beza, when the latter recommended its abolition in Scotland. He died in 1613, and was interred in Canterbury Cathedral. A collective edition of all his works,  which were in Latin, was published in 1611 (Lond. 1 vol. 4to), under the title of Diversi Tractatus Theologioe: De Diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 168, 186.

## Sarcerius, Erasmus[[@Headword:Sarcerius, Erasmus]]

             An able practical theologian of the 16th century, was born at Annaberg, in Saxony, in 1501. He studied first at Leipsic, then at the feet of Luther and Melancthon in Wittenberg. In 1530 he left the university and became co- rector of a Latin school at Lubeck. Laboring here with some interruption until 1536, he then took charge of a similar school in Nassau. From 1538 he gave his attention exclusively to the work of reforming the Church of Nassau, presiding at synods, instructing the clergy, and furnishing them with written works on practice and doctrine. But, unwilling to sanction the Interim (1548), he resigned his position, retired to Annaberg, and in 1549 became a pastor in Leipsic. In 1553 he was called to be Church superintendent in Eisleben. In 1559 he accepted a call as preacher at St. John's in Magdeburg; but the high Lutheran clergy scented heresy in his mild and genial sermons, and assailed him in pamphlets. Worn out with labor, he speedily succumbed. He died in 1559 at the age of fifty-eight. In character, Sarcerius was firm, conscientious, blameless. A stranger to flattery, he walked among princes as an equal, and never quailed before a foe. His works were highly esteemed and much studied. We mention only, Anweisung die heilige Schrift zu interpretiren (Basle, 1528): — Tractatus de Ratione Discendoe Theologioe (1539): — Conciones Annuoe (1541, 4 vols.): — De Consensu Veroe Ecclesioe et S. Patrum: — also Loci Communes Theologioe (1542?): — Pastorale (1559). (J.P.L.)

## Sarcerius, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Sarcerius, Wilhelm]]

             The only son of the preceding, was pastor at Eisleben, but lost his position because of holding the opinions of Flacius (q.v.). He went, thereupon, to Mansfeld, where he died as court preacher. He published, Leichen-, Lauf-, und WasserPredigten: — Geistliches Herbarium: — Fechtschule Jesu Christi: — Höllischer Trauergesang. See Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 20, 682-686.

## Sarchedonus[[@Headword:Sarchedonus]]

             (Σαρχέδονος, v.r. Σαχερδονός, Σαχερδάν), a Graecized form (Tob. 1, 21) for the name of the Assyrian king ESAR-HADDON SEE ESAR- HADDON (q.v.).

## Sarchi, Philip[[@Headword:Sarchi, Philip]]

             a Jewish writer, who died at Paris in 1830, is the author of, Grammzaire Hebraique Raisonnee et Comparee (Paris, 1828): — An Essay on Hebrew  Poetry, Ancient and Modern (Lond. 1824). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:116. (B.P.)

## Sardeeus[[@Headword:Sardeeus]]

             (Σαρδαῖος, v.r. Ζαρδαῖος, Ζεραλίας), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:28) of the name AZIZA SEE AZIZA (q.v.) of the Heb. list (Ezr 10:27).

## Sardessius[[@Headword:Sardessius]]

             In Greek mythology, is an appellative of Jupiter, derived from the city of Sardessus, in Lycia.

## Sardica[[@Headword:Sardica]]

             In Illyria. A council was held at this place in 347, by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans, whom Athanasius, persecuted by the Eusebians, had petitioned to convoke a council. Twenty canons were drawn up, and regulations made concerning Easter.

## Sardine[[@Headword:Sardine]]

             (σάρδινος, apparently an adjective from σάρδιον, which has the same signification), the name of a gem (Rev 4:3). SEE SARDIUS.

## Sardis[[@Headword:Sardis]]

             (Σάρδεις, of uncertain etymology), a city of Asia Minor, the capital of the ancient kingdom of Lydia. It was situated about two miles to the south of the river Hermus, just below the range of Tmolus (Bos Dagh), on a spur of which its acropolis was built, in a fine plain watered by the river Pactolus (Herod. 7, 31; Xenophon, Cyrop. 7, 2-11: Pliny, Hist. Nat.; Strabo, 13, 625). It is in lat. 38° 30' N., long. 27° 57' E. Sardis was a great and ancient city, and, from its wealth and importance, was the object of much cupidity and of many sieges.

1. Ancient History. — The Lydians, or Ludim, whose metropolis Sardis was, were the descendants of Lud the son of Shem, and must not be confounded with the Ludim, the children of Lud the son of Misraim the son  of Ham, who dwelt and settled in Egypt. These latter were the nation alluded to by Jeremiah (Jer 46:9) when he speaks of “the Lydians that handle the bow:” the distinction will appear the more clearly from the fact that the Lydians and the Libyans are mentioned together as embracing the same cause. The Shemitic Ludim were a warlike, active, and energetic people, and established an empire extending as far east as the river Halys. The city of Sardis, although of more recent origin than the Trojan war (Strabo, 13, 625), was very ancient, being mentioned by Aeschylus (Pers. 45); and Herodotus relates (1, 84) that it was fortified by a king Meles, who (according to the Chronicles of Eusebius) preceded Candaules. The city itself was, at least at first, built in a rude manner, and the houses were covered with dry reeds, in consequence of which it was repeatedly destroyed by fire; but the acropolis, which some of the ancient geographers identified with the Homeric Hyde (Strabo, 13, 626; comp. Pliny, 5, 30; Eustath. ad Dion. Per. 830), was built upon an almost inaccessible rock. In the reign of Ardys, Sardis was taken by the Cimmerians, but they were unable to gain possession of the citadel. Over this realm a series of able princes ruled, the last of whom, Croesus, obtained a world wide fame for his wealth, his misfortunes, and his philosophy. The earlier part of his reign was one of unusual glory; he extended his dominion over the whole of Asia Minor with the exception of Lycia and Cilicia, and displayed as much ability as an administrator as he had done as a conqueror. But the rising power of Cyrus soon came into collision with his own, and, by the capture of Sardis, the Persian prince brought the Lydian rule to a close. Croesus is said to have advised the victor to discourage the martial spirit of the Lydians by restraining them from all warlike occupations, and employing them in those arts only which minister to luxury and sensuality. Cyrus is reported to have taken the disgraceful advice, and the result was that, from ranking among the bravest and hardiest nations of antiquity, the Lydians became the most helpless and effeminate.

After its conquest, the Persians always kept a garrison in the citadel, on account of its natural strength, which induced Alexander the Great, when it was surrendered to him in the sequel of the battle of the Granicus, similarly to occupy it. Sardis recovered the privilege of municipal government (and, as was alleged several centuries afterwards, the right of a sanctuary) upon its surrender to Alexander the Great, but its fortunes for the next three hundred years are very obscure. It changed hands more than once in the contests between the dynasties which arose after the death of Alexander. In  the year B.C. 214 it was taken and sacked by the army of Antiochus the Great, who besieged his cousin Achaeus in it for two years before succeeding, as he at last did through treachery, in obtaining possession of the person of the latter. After the ruin of Antiochus's fortunes, it passed, with the rest of Asia on that side of Taurus, under the dominion of the kings of Pergamus, whose interests led them to divert the course of traffic between Asia and Europe away from Sardis. Its productive soil must always have continued a source of wealth; but its importance as a central mart appears to have diminished from the time of the invasion of Asia by Alexander. After their victory over Antiochus it passed to the Romans, under whom it still more rapidly declined in rank and prosperity.

In the time of the emperor Tiberius, Sardis was desolated by an earthquake (Strabo, 12, p. 579), together with eleven, or, as Eusebius says, twelve other important cities of Asia. The whole face of the country is said to have been changed by this convulsion. In the case of Sardis the calamity was increased by a pestilential fever which followed; and so much compassion was in consequence excited for the city at Rome that its tribute was remitted for five years, and it received a benefaction from the privy purse of the emperor (Tacitus, Ann 2, 47). This was in the year A.D. 17. Nine years afterwards the Sardians are found among the competitors for the honor of erecting, as representatives of the Asiatic cities, a temple to their benefactor. SEE SMYRNA. On this occasion they plead, not only their ancient services to Rome in the time of the Macedonian war, but their well- watered country, their climate, and the richness of the neighboring soil; there is no allusion, however, to the important manufactures and the commerce of the early times. In the time of Pliny it was included in the same conventus jursidicus with Philadelphia, with the Cadueni, a Macedonian colony in the neighborhood, with some settlements of the old Maeonian population, and a few other towns of less note. These Maeonians still continued to call Sardis by its ancient name, Hyde, which it bore in the time of Omphale.

2. Biblical Notice. — The inhabitants of Sardis bore an ill repute among the ancients for their voluptuous habits of life. Hence, perhaps, the point of the phrase in the Apocalyptic message to the city, “Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments” (Rev 3:4). The place that Sardis holds in this message, as one of the “Seven Churches  of Asia,” is the source of the peculiar interest with which the Christian reader regards it. From what is said, it appears that it had already declined much in real religion, although it still maintained the name and external aspect of a Christian Church, “having a name to live, while it was dead” (Rev 3:1).

3. Description and Modern Remains. — Sardis was in very early times, both from the extremely fertile character of the neighboring region and from its convenient position, a commercial mart of importance. Chestnuts were first produced in the neighborhood, which procured them the name of βάλανοι Σαρδιανοί. The art of dyeing wool is said by Pliny to have been invented there; and, at any rate, Sardis was the entrepot of the dyed woolen manufactures, of which Phrygia, with its vast flocks (πολυπροβατωτάη, Herod. 5, 49), furnished the raw material. Hence we hear of the φοινικίδες Σαρδιαναί; and Sappho speaks of the ποικίλος μάσθλης Λύδιον καλὸν ἔργον, which was perhaps something like the modern Turkish carpets. Some of the woolen manufactures, of a peculiarly fine texture, were called ψιλοτάπιδες. The hall through which the king of Persia passed from his state apartments to the gate where he mounted on his horse was laid with these, and no foot but that of the monarch was allowed to tread on them. In the description given of the habits of a young Cyprian exquisite of great wealth, he is represented as reposing upon a bed of which the feet were silver, and upon which these ψιλοτάπιδες Σαρδιαναί were laid as a mattress. Sardis, too, was the place where the metal electrum was procured (Sophocles, Antig. 1037); and it was thither that the Spartans sent in the 6th century B.C. to purchase gold for the purpose of gilding the face of the Apollo at Amyclae. This was probably furnished by the auriferous sand of the Pactolus, a brook which came from Tmolus and ran through the agora of Sardis by the side of the great temple of Cybele. But, though its gold washings may have been celebrated in early times, the greatness of Sardis in its best days was much more due to its general commercial importance and its convenience as an entrepot. This seems to follow from the statement that not only silver and gold coins were there first minted, but there also the class of κάπηλοι (stationary traders, as contradistinguished from the ἔμποροι, or traveling merchants) first arose. It was also, at any rate between the fall of the Lydian and that of the Persian dynasty, a slave mart.

Successive earthquakes and the ravages of the Saracens and Turks have reduced this once flourishing city to a heap of ruins, presenting many remains of its former splendor. The habitations of the living are confined to a few miserable cottages, still found on the true site of Sardis, at the foot of Mount Tmolus, or Buz-dag, as the Turks call it. Two or three shepherds inhabited a hut, and a Turk with two servants a mill, at the time of Arundel's visit in 1826. In 1850 no human being found a dwelling in the once mighty and populous Sardis. The modern name of the ruins at Sardis is Sert-Kalessi. Travelers describe the appearance of the locality on approaching it from the northwest as that of complete solitude. The Pactolus is a mere thread of water, all but evanescent in summer time. The Wadis-tchai (Hermus), in the neighborhood of the town, is between fifty and sixty yards wide and nearly three feet deep; but its waters are turbid and disagreeable, and are not only avoided as unfit for drinking, but have the local reputation of generating the fever which is the scourge of the neighboring plains. A countless number of sepulchral hillocks, beyond the Hermus, heighten the desolateness of a spot which the multitudes lying there once made busy by their living presence and pursuits. The acropolis seems well to define the site of the city. It is a marked object, being a tall distorted rock of soft sandstone, rent as if by an earthquake. The acropolis is very difficult of ascent; it has a few fragments of ruinous walls on the summit, but no remains are visible of the temple which Alexander built there in honor of the Olympian Jove. The almost perpendicular wall towards the south was considered impregnable, and Croesus therefore, in defending his capital against Cyrus, omitted to guard it; but a Persian soldier, seeing a Lydian descend by a path of steps cut in the rock in order to regain his helmet, which had fallen down, watched his proceedings, and led a body of Persian troops into the acropolis itself.

The remains of the ancient city are few and inconsiderable. The gerusia — called also the house of Croesus — lies westward of the acropolis. Arundel measured one of its halls, and found it one hundred and fifty-six feet in length by forty-three in breadth, and having walls ten feet in thickness. There are some portions of a theater and of two churches, one of which, said to be dedicated to the Virgin, was carefully examined by Col. Leake, and found to consist almost wholly of fragments of earlier edifices; and from more recent investigations it appears that these were chiefly taken from the Temple of Cybele, and if so they are among the oldest monuments now existing in the world, the temple having been built only three hundred  years after that of Solomon. Of the few inscriptions which have been discovered, all, or nearly all, belong to the time of the Roman empire. Yet there still exist considerable remains of the earlier days. The massive Temple of Cybele still bears witness in its fragmentary remains to the wealth and architectural skill of the people that raised it. Mr. Cockerell, who visited it in 1812, found two columns standing with their architrave, the stone of which stretched in a single block from the center of one to that of the other. This stone, although it was not the largest of the architrave, he calculates must have weighed twenty-five tons. The diameters of the columns supporting it are six feet four and a half inches at about thirty-five feet below the capital. The present soil (apparently formed by the crumbling away of the hill which backs the temple on its eastern side) is more than twenty-five feet above the pavement. Such proportions are not inferior to those of the columns in the Heraeum at Samos, which divides, in the estimation of Herodotus, with the Artemisium at Ephesus the palm of preeminence among all the works of Greek art. And as regards the details, “the capitals appeared,” to Cockerell, “to surpass any specimen of the Ionic he had seen in perfection of design and execution.” On the north side of the acropolis, overlooking the valley of the Hermus, is a theater near four hundred feet in diameter, attached to a stadium of about one thousand. This probably was erected after the restoration of Sardis by Alexander. In the attack of Sardis by Antiochus, described by Polybius (7, 15-18), it constituted one of the chief points on which, after entering the city, the assaulting force was directed. The temple belongs to the era of the Lydian dynasty, and is nearly contemporaneous with the Temple of Zeus Panhellenius in Egina, and that of here in Samos. To the same date may be assigned the “Valley of Sweets” (γλυκὺς ἀγκών), a pleasure ground, the fame of which Polycrates endeavored to rival by the so-called Laura at Samos.

4. Authorities. — Ancient: Athenseus, 2, 48; 6, 231; 12, 514, 540; Arrian, 1, 17; Pliny, H.N. 5, 29; 15, 23; Stephanus Byz. s.v. Υδη; Pausanias, 3, 9, 5; Diodorus Sic. 20, 107; Scholiast, Aristoph. Pac. 1174; Herodotus, 1, 69, 94; 3, 48; 8, 105; Strabo, 13, § 5; Tacitus, Annal. 2, 47; 3, 63; 4, 55. Modern: Böckh, Inscriptiones Groecoe, Nos. 3451-3472; Cockerell, in Leake's Asia Minor, p. 343; Arundel, Discoveries in Asia Minor. 1, 26-28; Tchibatcheff, Asie Mineure, p. 232-242; Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor, p. 316 sq. See also Smith, Hartley, Macfarlane, Arundel, and Svoboda, severally, On the Seven Churches of Asia; Storch, Dissert. de Sept. Urb.  Asioe in Apocal.; Richter, Wallfahrten, p. 511 sq.; Prokesch, Denkwürdigk. 2, 31 sq.

## Sardite[[@Headword:Sardite]]

             (Heb. Sardi', סִרְדַּי, used as a plur. with the art. prefixed; Sept. Σαρεδί), the patronymic title (Num 26:26) of the descendants of Sered (q.v.), the son of Zebulon.

## Sardius[[@Headword:Sardius]]

             (Heb. אֹרֵם, o'dem; Sept. and New Test., σάρδιον), one of the precious stones in the breastplate of the high priest (Exo 28:17; Exo 39:10). So also Josephus (War, 5, 5, 7), who, however, in Ant. 3, 7, 6, makes it the sardonyx (σαρδόνυξ). Still, as this latter named mineral is merely another variety of agate, to which also the sard or sardius belongs, there is no very great discrepancy in the statements of the Jewish historian. SEE SARDONYX.

The odem is mentioned by Ezekiel (28:13) as one of the ornaments of the king of Tyre. In Rev 4:3, John declares that he whom he saw sitting on the heavenly throne “was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone.” The sixth foundation of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem was a sardius (Rev 21:20). There can scarcely be a doubt that either the sard or the sardonyx is the stone denoted by odem. The authority of Josephus in all that relates to the high priest's breastplate is of the greatest value; for, as Braun (De Vest. Sac. Heb. p. 635) has remarked, Josephus was not only a Jew, but a priest, who might have seen the breastplate with the whole sacerdotal vestments a hundred times, since in his time the Temple was standing. The Vulgate agrees with his nomenclature. In Jerome's time the breastplate was still to be inspected in the Temple of Concord; hence it will readily be acknowledged that this agreement of the two is of great weight. The sard, which is a superior variety of agate, has long been a favorite stone for the engraver's art. “On this stone,” says King (Ant. Gems, p. 5), “all the finest works of the most celebrated artists are to be found; and this not without good cause, such is its toughness, facility of working, beauty of color, and the high polish of which it is susceptible, and which Pliny states that it retains longer than any other gem.” Sards differ in color. There is a bright red variety which, in Pliny's time, was the most esteemed; and perhaps the Hebrew odem, from a root which means “to be red,” points to this kind. There is also a paler or honey-colored variety; but in sards there is always a shade of yellow  mingling with the red (see King, Ant. Gems, p. 6). The sardius is the stone now called the carnelian, from its color (a carne), which resembles that of raw flesh. The Hebrew name is derived from a root (אָדִם) which signifies redness. The sardius or carnelian is of the flint family, and is a kind of chalcedony. The more vivid the red in this stone, the higher is the estimation in which it is held. It was anciently, as now, more frequently engraved on than any other stone. The ancients called it sardius, because Sardis in Lydia was the place where they first became acquainted with it; but the sardius of Babylon was considered of greater value (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 37, 7). The Hebrews probably obtained the carnelian from Arabia. In Yemen there is found a very fine dark red carnelian, which is called el-Akik (Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 142). The Arabs wear it on the finger, on the arm above the elbow, and in the belt before the abdomen. It is supposed to stop hemorrhage when laid on a fresh wound. See Theophr. De Lapid. c. 43; Cleaveland, Mineral. p. 250; Moore, Anc. Mineral. p. 153.

## Sardo[[@Headword:Sardo]]

             In Greek mythology, was the daughter of Sthenelus, whose name was given to the city of Sardis.

## Sardonyx[[@Headword:Sardonyx]]

             (σαρδόνυξ, from σάρδιον, the sardius, and ὄνυξ, the onyx) is mentioned in the New Test. once only — viz. in Rev 21:20 — as the stone which garnished the fifth foundation of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem. “By sardonyx,” says Pliny (N.H. 37, 6), who describes several varieties, “was formerly understood, as its name implies, a sard with a white ground beneath it, like the flesh under the fingernail.” The sardonyx consists of “a white opaque layer, superimposed upon a red transparent stratum of the true red sard” (King, Ant. Gems, p. 9). It is, like the sard, merely a variety of agate, and is frequently employed by engravers for the purposes of a signet ring. It is a species of onyx, distinguished from the common stone of that name by having its different colors, red and white, disposed in alternate bands. But there is another stone so called, whose tint is reddish yellow or orange, with sometimes a tinge of brown (Moore, Anc. Mineral. p. 153).

## Sardus[[@Headword:Sardus]]

             In Greek mythology, was the son of Maceris, who was known as Hercules among the Libyans and Egyptians. He led a colony of Libyans to the island of Ichnusa, who settled there without driving away the original inhabitants. The Libyans subsequently sent a statue of Sardus as a votive offering to Delphos, and gave his name to the island, which thereafter was known as Sardinia.

## Sarea[[@Headword:Sarea]]

             (Vulg. id., for the Greek text is not extant), one of the five scribes “ready to write swiftly” whom Esdras was commanded to take (2Es 14:24).

## Sarepta[[@Headword:Sarepta]]

             (Σάρεπτα; Vulg. Sarepta; Syriac, Tsarpath), the Greek form of the name which in the Hebrew text of the Old Test. appears as ZAREPHATH SEE ZAREPHATH (q.v.). The place is designated by the same formula on its single occurrence in the New Test. (Luk 4:26) that it is when first mentioned in the Sept. version of 1Ki 17:9, “Sarepta of Sidonia.”

## Sareseok[[@Headword:Sareseok]]

             In Persian mythology, is a bullock formed by Ormuzd out of the generative powers of the primitive ox which was slain by Ahriman. Sareseok supplied the world with animals, and became one of the greatest benefactors of mankind.

## Sargado[[@Headword:Sargado]]

             SEE IBN-SARGADO.

## Sargon[[@Headword:Sargon]]

             (Heb. Sargon', סִרְגּוֹן, either prince of the sun [Gesenius] or firm king [Rawlinson]; Sept. Α᾿ρνᾶ v.r. Ναρνά,), a king of Assyria, whose general, Tartan, in the time of Hezekiah, besieged Ashdod, the key of Egypt, with the view of then invading that country (Isa 20:1; Isa 20:4 sq.). B.C. 715.

Sargon was one of the greatest of the Assyrian kings. His name is read in the native cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) as Sargina (see Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 148), while a town which he built and called after himself (now Khorsabad) was known as Sarghun to the Arabian geographers. He is mentioned by name only once in Scripture (as above), and then not in a  historical book, which formerly led historians and critics to suspect that he was not really a king distinct from those mentioned in Kings and Chronicles, but rather one of those kings under another name. Vitringa, Offerhaus (Spicileg. p. 125 sq.), Eichhorn, and Hupfeld (De Rebus Assyrior. p. 51) identified him with Shalmaneser; Grotius, Lowth, and Keil (comp. also Schröer, Imper. Babyl. p. 152) with Sennacherib; Perizonius, Kalinsky, and Michaelis with Esar-haddon. All these conjectures are now shown to be wrong by the Assyrian inscriptions, which prove Sargon to have been distinct and different from the several monarchs named, and fix his place in the list — where it had been already assigned by Paulus, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald, and Winer — between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. He was certainly Sennacherib's father, and there is no reason to doubt that he was his immediate predecessor (see Jour. of Sac. Lit. July, 1854, p. 398 sq.). He ascended the throne of Assyria, as we gather from his annals, in the same year that Merodach- Baladan ascended the throne of Babylon, which, according to Ptolemy's canon, was B.C. 721. This is Col. Rawlinson's date (Lond. Athenoeum, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 245). But the synchronism with the Hebrew annals, SEE HEZEKIAH; SEE SAMARIA, would locate Sargon's accession in B.C. 720. G. Smith puts it in B.C. 722 (Hist. of Assyria, ch. 9), and so Prof. Rawlinson (Ancient Monarchies, 2, 141). He seems to have been a usurper, and not of royal birth, for in his inscriptions he carefully avoids all mention of his father. It has been conjectured that he took advantage of Shalmaneser's absence at the protracted siege of Samaria (2Ki 17:5) to effect a revolution at the seat of government, by which that king was deposed and he himself substituted in his room. SEE SHALMANESER.

It is remarkable that Sargon claims the conquest of Samaria, which the narrative in Kings appears to assign to his predecessor. He places the event in his first year, before any of his other expeditions. Perhaps, therefore, he is the “king of Assyria” intended in 2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11, who is not said to be Shalmaneser, though we might naturally suppose so from no other name being mentioned. Or perhaps he claimed the conquest as his own, though Shalmaneser really accomplished it, because the capture of the city occurred after he had been acknowledged king in the Assyrian capital. At any rate, to him belongs the settlement of the Samaritans (27,280 families, according to his own statement) in Halah and on the Habor (Khabur), the river of Gozan, and (at a later period, probably) in the cities of the Medes.  Sargon was undoubtedly a great and successful warrior. In his annals, which cover a space of fifteen years, he gives an account of his warlike expeditions against Babylonia and Susiana, on the south; Media, on the east; Armenia and Cappadocia, towards the north; Syria, Palestine, Arabia, and Egypt, towards the west and southwest (see Records of the Past, 7, 25 sq.). In Babylonia he deposed Merodach-Baladan and established a viceroy; in Media he built a number of cities which he peopled with captives from other quarters; in Armenia and the neighboring countries he gained many victories; while in the far west he reduced Philistia, penetrated deep into the Arabian peninsula, and forced Egypt to submit to his arms and consent to the payment of a tribute. In this last direction he seems to have waged three wars — one in his second year, for the possession of Gaza; another in his sixth year, when Egypt itself was the object of attack; and a third in his ninth, when the special subject of contention was Ashdod, which Sargon took by one of his generals. This is the event which causes the mention of Sargon's name in Scripture. Isaiah was instructed at the time of this expedition to “put off his shoe, and go naked and barefoot,” for a sign that “the king of Assyria should lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, to the shame of Egypt” (Isa 20:2-4). We may gather from this either that Ethiopians and Egyptians formed part of the garrison of Ashdod, and were captured with the city, or that the attack on the Philistine town was accompanied by an invasion of Egypt itself, which was disastrous to the Egyptians. The year of the attack, it is thought, would fall into the reign of the first Ethiopian king, Sabaco I (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 386, note 7, 2d ed.), and it is in agreement with this Sargon speaks of Egypt as being at this time subject to Meron. Besides these expeditions of Sargon, his monuments mention that he took Tyre, and received tribute from the Greeks of Cyprus, against whom there is some reason to think that he conducted an attack in person. The statue of Sargon, now in the Berlin Museum, was found at Idalium in Cyprus. It is not very likely that the king's statue would have been set up unless he had made the expedition in person.

It is not as a warrior only that Sargon deserves special mention among the Assyrian kings. He was also the builder of useful works and of one of the most magnificent of the Assyrian palaces. He relates that he thoroughly repaired the walls of Nineveh, which he seems to have elevated from a provincial city of some importance to the first position in the empire; and  adds, further, that in its neighborhood he constructed the palace and town which he made his principal residence. This was the city now known as “the French Nineveh,” or “Khorsabad,” from which the valuable series of Assyrian monuments at present in the Louvre was derived almost entirely. Traces of Sargon's buildings have been found also at Nimrud and Koyunjik; and his time is marked by a considerable advance in the useful and ornamental arts, which seem to have profited by the connection that he established between Assyria and Egypt. He left the throne to his son, the celebrated Sennacherib (q.v.). The length of Sargon's reign is variously reckoned by Assyriologists as from fifteen to nineteen years. SEE CHRONOLOGY. Comp., in addition to the above, the following monographs by Oppert: Les Fautes de Sargon (Paris, 1863); Les Inscriptions des Sargonides (ibid. eod.); also Strachey, Time of Sargon and Sennacherib (Lond. 1856). SEE ASSYRIA.

## Sarid[[@Headword:Sarid]]

             (Heb. Surid' שָׂרַיד. survivor, as often [Fürst, place of refuge]; Sept. Σαρίδ v.r. Σαρδίδ, Σεδδούχ, etc.), the point of departure on the southern boundary of Zebulon, lying west of Chisloth Tabor, and south of Daberath and Japhia (Jos 19:10; Jos 19:12). It was unknown to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. “Sarith”), and the name has not been discovered by modern research. Knobel, holding the word to mean an “incision,” thinks it designates merely the southern opening of the deep and narrow wady which comes down from the basin of Nazareth (q.v.), between two steep mountains (Seetzen, 2, 151 sq.; Robinson, 3, 183). Keil more definitely suggests that it may be found in one of the two heaps of ruins on the south side of the modern “Mount of Precipitation,” namely those near el-Mezrach, on the northwest. SEE TRIBE; SEE ZEBULON.

## Sarid (2)[[@Headword:Sarid (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:49) that the original name may have been Sadid רfor ד), as in the Sept., and in that case the place may be represented by the modern Tell Shadud, three and a half miles south-west of Nazareth, consisting of "a good-sized artificial mound, with fine springs beneath on the south" (ibid. page 70).

## Sarigani[[@Headword:Sarigani]]

             An Arabian sect of this name is mentioned by Assemann. He considers them to have been a branch of the Mendaeans (q.v.). They held the opinions of Paul of Samosata and of Arius, but were converted and admitted to Catholic communion by Maranames, metropolitan of Adjabenus, in the year 760. Some, however, were found a hundred years later in Babylon.

## Sarmentitii[[@Headword:Sarmentitii]]

             One of the numerous opprobrious epithets with which the enemies of the early Christians accosted them. It is derived from the word sarmenta, sarmina, the piles of fagots around the stake to which the martyr was fastened.

## Saron[[@Headword:Saron]]

             (ὁ Σαρών v.r. ἀσσαρῶνα, i.e. הִשָּׁרוֹן, the Sharon), the district in which Lydda stood (Act 9:35); the Greek form of the name SHARON SEE SHARON (q.v.) of the Old Test. “The absence of the article from Lydda, and its presence before Saron, is noticeable, and shows that the name denotes a district — as in ‘The Shefelah,' and in our own ‘The Weald,' ‘The Downs.'”

## Saron (2)[[@Headword:Saron (2)]]

             In Greek mythology, was a king of Troezene, who was fond of the chase, and, built a temple to Diana. While pursuing a deer he fell into the gulf which was from that time known as the Saronian Gulf. He was buried in the grove of Diana.

## Saronis[[@Headword:Saronis]]

             (Σαρωνίς), a surname of Artemis at Troezene, where an annual festival was celebrated in her honor under the name of Saronia. SEE SARON.

## Sarothie[[@Headword:Sarothie]]

             (Σαρωθιέ v.r. Σαρωθί; Vulg. Caroneth), a person named (1 Esdr. 5, 84) as one of the heads of the families of “Solomon's servants” who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel; but see the Hebrew lists (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59).

## Sarpedon[[@Headword:Sarpedon]]

             In Greek mythology, was

(1.) a son of Jupiter and Europa, who quarrelled with his brother. Minos and was compelled to leave Crete. He took possession of Lycia, and was permitted by Jupiter to live the period of time allotted to three generations of men.

(2.) A son of Jupiter and Laodamia, the daughter of Bellerophon. His uncles were engaged in a protracted dispute for the possession of the crown of Lycia, which was decided by the agreement that the realm should be awarded to him who should shoot a ring from the breast of a child without injuring the child. Laodamia presented her son for this trial, and the generosity of the mother led to his being appointed king. When the Trojan war broke out, both parties sought his aid. He decided in favor of Priam, and inflicted great injury on the Greeks when they landed and afterwards. He slew Tlepolemus (being at the same time severely wounded himself), led the fifth part of the army in the storming of the fortifications, mounted the wall, slew Alcmaeon and opened the way for the advance of the Trojans, and covered Hector when stricken down by Ajax, but ultimately fell by the hand of Patroclus. His horses and armor became the spoil of the Greeks, but his body was, by Jupiter's command, borne to Lycia for honorable interment by the hands of Sleep and Death.

(3.) A son of Neptune and brother of Poltys, who lived in Thrace and was given to deeds of violence. He was slain by Hercules.

## Sarpedonia[[@Headword:Sarpedonia]]

             (Σαρπηδόνια). a surname of Artemis, derived from Cape Sarpedon, in Cilicia, where she had a temple with all oracle (Strabo, 14, p. 676).

## Sarpedonius[[@Headword:Sarpedonius]]

             A surname of Apollo in Cilicia.

## Sarpi[[@Headword:Sarpi]]

             SEE PAUL (Father).

## Sarritor[[@Headword:Sarritor]]

             In Roman mythology, was a god of husbandry whose province was the hoeing and cultivating of the growing crops.

## Sarsechim[[@Headword:Sarsechim]]

             (Heb. Sarsekim', שִׂרְסְכַים, probably prince of the eunuchs; Sept. [with great confusion] Ναβουάχαρ v.r. Ναβουσαρσαχίμ, etc.; Vulg. Sarsachien), one of the generals of Nebuchadnezzar's army at the taking of Jerusalem (Jer 39:3), B.C. 588. He appears to have held the office  of chief eunuch, for Rabsaris (q.v.) is probably a title and not a proper name. In Jer 39:13, Nebushasban is called Rab-saris, “chief eunuch,” and the question arises whether Nebushasban and Sarsechim may not be names of the same person. Gesenius conjectures (Thesaur. s.v.) that Sarsechim and Rab-saris may be identical, and both titles of the same office. SEE SAMGAR-NEBO.

## Sartaba[[@Headword:Sartaba]]

             (סִרְטָבָא), the name of a mountain on which the Jews anciently lighted the beacon fire (the one next to the Mount of Olives) to herald the new moon (Reland, Paloest. p. 346). In one passage it is erroneously written Sartan, סרטן(Schwarz, Palest. p. 162). It is undoubtedly the present Kurn Surtabah (Horn of Sartaba), on the edge of the Ghor, or Jordan valley, not far north of Jericho (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 242, new ed.). The summit still retains traces of the platform erected for building the beacon fires, which Lieut. Conder of the English Engineers has mistaken for the remains of the memorial altar of Jos 22:10 (Quar. Report of “Pal. Explor. Fund,” Oct. 1874, p. 241 sq.).

## Sarto, Andri Vannucchi[[@Headword:Sarto, Andri Vannucchi]]

             Called Del Sarto, an Italian painter, was born at Florence about 1488. Having shown a taste for drawing, he was placed with a goldsmith to learn engraving on plate. Giovanni Barile, a painter, persuaded his father to entrust him to his care, and he remained with Barile three years; he was then placed by him with Pietro Cosimo. Leaving the school of Cosimo, he formed an intimacy with Francisco Bigio, with whom he executed some works in the public buildings of Florence, which gained him considerable reputation. We are told by Vasari that Sarto passed some time in Rome. After his return, he painted for the Monastery of the Salvi his admired pictures of the Descent of the Holy Ghost, the Birth of the Virgin, and the Last Supper. Francis I, king of France, desirous of procuring specimens of Italian art, Sarto was commissioned to paint a picture for his majesty, and sent in a Dead Christ, with the Virgin, St.

IMAGE ERRORJohn, and other figures, which are now among the chief ornaments of the Gallery of the Louvre. The king invited him to Paris, where he obtained employment from Francis and the nobility. His wife urging his return to Florence, he obtained leave of absence, and was intrusted with a considerable sum of money for the purchase of statues, pictures, etc. Having spent the king's money, as well  as his own, he sank into poverty, and died of the plague in 1530. The churches, convents, and palaces of Florence contain many of his best works. In the National Gallery are two pictures by him, the Holy Family and his own portrait.

## Sartorius, Christoph Friedrich[[@Headword:Sartorius, Christoph Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 22, 1701. He studied at Tubingen, was vicar at Ludwigsburg in 1727, in 1730 at Stuttgart, in 1733 preacher and professor at: Bebenhausen. In 1747 he went again to Ludwigsburg, was called to Tubingen in 1755, and took the degree of doctor of theology in 1756. He died December 2, 1785. Sartorius published, Meditationes ad Psalms 53 de Salute ex Zione (Tubingen, 1735): — Positiones Generaliores de Libro Geneseos (1756): — De Messiae Filii Dei Generatione AEterna ex Psa 2:7 Adverta (1758): — De Sacramentis in Genere (1760): — De Baptismo (1761): — De Sacra Coena (eod.): — De Lege Ceremoniali (1762): — Vindiciae Cantici Canticorum (1765): — Diss. Exegetica Super Psalms 19 (1766): — Theologumena Symbolica (1769-71): — De Utilitate Vet. Test. etc. (1772): — Diss. ad Dictum Christi Mat 5:1-19 (1773). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.).

## Sartorius, Ernst Wilhelm Christian[[@Headword:Sartorius, Ernst Wilhelm Christian]]

             One of the ablest, most fruitful, and genial theologians of modern orthodox Lutheranism, was born at Darmstadt, May 10, 1797, and died at Königsberg June 13,1859. While studying at Göttingen (1815-18), he fell under the earnest religious influence of Planck. In 1819 he began to lecture in the University, and to produce the first of those numerous genial writings which have induced some to call him the St. John of Lutheranism. The first that appeared was three essays — one on the Purpose of Jesus in Founding the Church; the second on the Origin of the Gospels (afterwards disavowed); and the third on the Doctrine of Grace and Faith. Next followed (1821) the Lutheran Doctrine of Human Inability, in which he opposed Schleiermacher. In 1821 he became professor of theology at Marburg. Here he issued two works, The Doctrine of Protestants as to the Respect due to the Civil Magistracy, and Religion Outside of the Limits of Mere Reason. In 1824 he received the doctorate and accepted a call to Dorpat. Here appeared successively his Contributions to Evangelical Orthodoxy, in which he opposed Röhr, Bretschneider, and Rationalism in general. In 1831 he issued his Discussion of the Person and Work of Christ, which speedily passed through seven editions, and was translated into other languages. These two works attracted to him very general attention, as did also his contributions to Hengstenberg's Church Journal, in which appeared from 1834 to 1836 his vigorous assaults upon Möhler's Symbolik. After eleven years of academic labor at Dorpat, he was called to Prussia in 1835, and appointed to the position of superintendent-general of the province of Prussia and director of the royal consistory. He entered upon his duties with a sermon in the royal court-church at Königsberg in December. In 1840 he began his work on moral theology, Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe, which, with its modifications and its revisions for new editions, occupied him until 1856, and which he justly regarded as his chief title to a place in the world of theology. The movements of the fanatical ‘Friends of Light' induced Sartorius to issue, in 1845, a work on the Necessity and Obligatoriness of the Creeds. In 1852 appeared his work on Primitive Worship, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments; in 1853 his Defence of the Augsburg Confession; and in 1855 his Meditations on the  Glorious Manifestations of God in his Church and on the Presence of the Glorified Body of Christ in the Eucharist. After a ministry of twenty-four years, he died in the midst of his labors. The day before his decease he had labored upon a large polemical work against Romanism, published afterwards (1860) by his son, under the title Soli Deo Gloria! A Comparison of Lutheranism and Romanism in the Light of the Augsburg and the Tridentine Confessions, with Special Reference to Möhler's Symbolik. Up to the end of his life he was a zealous contributor to Hengstenberg's Church Journal. Some of his later papers were of a very severe polemical character. Only a few of his sermons have been printed. See Kurtz, Church History (Eng. transl.), 2, 372; Wuttke, Christian Ethics, 2, 374; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 426-428; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 414, 406, 494. (J.P.L.)

## Sartorius, Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Sartorius, Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Dantzic, February 7, 1715, and died at Lubben in 1784, doctor of theology and general superintendent. He wrote, De Metempsychosi Pythagorica, etc. (Lubben, 1760): — De Scriptura Sacra (1735): — De Bello Domini in Amalek (1736). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:468; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Saruch[[@Headword:Saruch]]

             (Σαρούχ), the Greek form (Luk 3:35) of the name of the patriarch SERUG SEE SERUG (q.v.), son of Reu.

## Saruk, Menachem, Ibn-[[@Headword:Saruk, Menachem, Ibn-]]

             An early Jewish scholar, was born about 910 at Tortosa, in Spain, and died about 970 at Cordova. He is the author of a Biblical dictionary called ס8אגרוןor ס8 הפתרון; also מחברת מנחם, including the Aramenan of Daniel and Ezra, with explanations in Hebrew. A grammatical introduction precedes each letter (מחברת), and introductions relating to the preliminary grammatical studies, divided into ten chapters, supply in it the place of a grammar. Against this work Dunash ben-Labrat (q.v.) wrote a critique, which elicited a rejoinder from Saruk. Saruk's Lexicon has been edited by Philipowski (Lond. 1854). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 248 sq.; Introd. to his Hebrew and Chaldee Dict. p. 26; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 336 sq.; Braunschweiger, Geschichte, p. 25 sq.; Kimchi, Liber Radicum, p. 31 sq. (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht); De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 287 (Germ. transl.); Kämpf, Nichtandalusische Poesie, p. 155 sq.; Pick, Menachem Ibn-Saruk (in Heb. Chr. Witness, Lond. 1877), p. 324 sq.; Gross, Menachem ben-Saruk (Breslau, 1872); and Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift, 1872, p. 81 sq. (B.P.)

## Sarum, Use Of[[@Headword:Sarum, Use Of]]

             In former times each bishop had the power of making some improvements in the liturgy of his Church. In process of time different customs arose, and several became so established as to receive the names of their respective churches. The ‘use' or custom of Sarum derives its origin from Osmund, bishop of that see in A.D. 1078, and chancellor of England. Influenced by difficulties arising from an attempt to do away with the ancient Gregorian chanting, Osmund collected together the clergy, and composed a book for the regulation of ecclesiastical offices, which was entitled the Custom- Book. The substance of this was probably incorporated into the missal and other ritual books of Sarum, and ere long almost the whole of England, Wales, and Ireland adopted it. When the archbishop of Canterbury celebrated the liturgy in the presence of the bishops of his province, the bishop of Salisbury (probably in consequence of the general adoption of the ‘use' of Sarum) acted as precentor of the College of Bishops, a title which he still retains. SEE USE.

## Sarvagna[[@Headword:Sarvagna]]

             In Hindu mythology, is the all-seeing one, a surname of Siva.

## Sarvastivadas, Or Sarvastivadins[[@Headword:Sarvastivadas, Or Sarvastivadins]]

             (literally, those who maintain the reality of all existence), is the name of one of the four divisions of the Vaibhashika system of Buddhism. Its reputed father was Rahula, the son of the Buddha Sakyamuni. See Köppen, Die Religion des Buddha (Berlin, 1857); Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus und seine Dogmen (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Sas[[@Headword:Sas]]

             SEE WORM.

## Sasnett, William Jeremiah[[@Headword:Sasnett, William Jeremiah]]

             A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Hancock County, Ga., April 29, 1820, and graduated at Oglethorpe University in 1839. After graduation he studied law, but very early entered the ministry. His active work was soon interfered with by rheumatism. He then engaged in the work of education, and accepted, in 1849, the chair of English Literature in Emory College, which he filled until 1858, when he  became president of La Grange Female College. In Sept., 1859, he opened the East Alabama Male College, as its president. At a very early day its halls were filled with young men, but the war coming on, so many of them entered the army that college exercises were necessarily suspended. Dr. Sasnett retired to his farm in Georgia, where he remained until his death, Nov. 3, 1865. As a scholar, the attainments of Dr. Sasnett were varied and extensive. As a preacher, his gifts were far from ordinary. Besides a large number of contributions to the periodical press, he published, Progress (1855): — Discussions in Literature (1860). See Minutes of Annual Conf. of Meth. Epis. Church, South, 1865, p. 574.

## Sason, Aaron[[@Headword:Sason, Aaron]]

             SEE AARON BEN-JOSEPH SASON.

## Sason, Aaron Ben-Joseph[[@Headword:Sason, Aaron Ben-Joseph]]

             SEE AARON BEN-JOSEPH SASON.

## Sasportas, Jacob Ben-Aaron[[@Headword:Sasportas, Jacob Ben-Aaron]]

             A Jewish writer, was born in 1610 at Oran, North Africa. Very little is known about his early youth. In 1634 he became chief rabbi of six African communities, which position he held for two decades, when he was obliged to leave the country. In 1654 he arrived at Amsterdam, and a year later he was recalled by the emperor of Morocco, and charged with the ambassadorship to Spain. In 1664 he appeared as chief rabbi of London, which he left in 1672 for Hamburg. In the same year he was called to Amsterdam, and so likewise in 1680, where he went in 1693, to be gathered to his fathers in 1698. He is best known as the author of יעקב תולדות, or index of Biblical passages which are explained in hagadistic manner in the Jerusalem Talmud, being a supplement to the תולדות אהרןof Ah. Pesaro (q.v.). He also wrote against the Pseudo-Messiah, Sabbatai Zebi (q.v.), in his ציצת נובל צבי(Amst. 1737). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 251; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 168; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10, p. 110 sq. (B.P.)

## Sassanidae[[@Headword:Sassanidae]]

             The dynasty which succeeded that of the Arsacidae on the throne of Persia (q.v.). See Müller, Chips from a German Workshop.

## Sassi, Francisco Girolamo[[@Headword:Sassi, Francisco Girolamo]]

             A noted monk, was born at Milan in 1673. He took orders in the brotherhood of the Oblates, and was made general of the order in 1700. He died at Milan, Nov. 2, 1731. He gave his life to religious instruction, and published several devotional works, among them Christi Laudes and Marioe Laudes.

## Satan[[@Headword:Satan]]

             The Scripture term for the chief of fallen spirits, and the arch-principle of evil. The doctrine of Satan and of satanic agency is to be made out from revelation, and from reflection in agreement with revelation. The obscurity of the subject need not deter us from a candid investigation of it.

I. Scripture Names or Titles of Satan. — Besides Satan, he is called the Devil, the Dragon, the Evil One, the Angel of the Bottomless Pit, the Prince of this World, the Prince of the Power of the Air, the God of this World, Apollyon, Abaddon, Belial, Beelzebub. “Satan” and “devil” are the names by which he is oftener distinguished than by any other, the former being applied to him about forty times and the latter about fifty times. See each term.

Satan is the Hebrew word שָׂטָן, satan', transferred to the English. It is derived from the verb שָׂטִן, which means “to lie in wait,” “to oppose,” “to be an adversary;” hence, the noun denotes an adversary, or opposer. The word in its generic sense occurs in 1Ki 11:14 : “The Lord raised up an adversary (satan; Sept. σατάν) against Solomon,” i.e. Hadad the Edomite. In the 23d verse the word occurs again, applied to Rezan. It is used in the same sense in 1Sa 29:4, where David is termed an adversary, and in Num 22:22, where the angel “stood in the way for an adversary (satan) to Balaam,” i.e. to oppose him when he went with the princes of Moab. See also 2Sa 19:22, 1Ki 5:4; 1Ki 11:25 Psa 109:6, where the Sept. has ἐπίβουλος, ἀντικαίμενος, διάβολος, etc. In Zec 3:1-2, the word occurs in its specific sense as a proper name. “And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.” Here it is manifest, both from the context and the use of the article, that some particular adversary is denoted. In Job 1:2, the same use of the word  with the article occurs several times. The events in which Satan is represented as the agent confirm this view. He was a distinguished adversary and tempter. See also 1Ch 21:1. In all these latter passages the Sept. has σατάν, and the Vulg. Satan. When we pass from the Old to the New Test., this doctrine of an invisible evil agent becomes more clear. With the advent of Christ and the opening of the Christian dispensation, the great opposer of that kingdom, the particular adversary and antagonist of the Savior, would naturally become more active and more known. The antagonism of Satan and his kingdom to Christ and his kingdom runs through the whole of the New Test., as will appear from the following passages and their contexts: Mat 4:10; Mat 12:26; Mar 4:15; Luk 10:18; Luk 22:3; Luk 22:31; Act 26:18; Rom 16:20; 2Co 11:14; Rev 2:13; Rev 12:9. Peter is once called Satan, because his spirit and conduct, at a certain time, were so much in opposition to the spirit and intent of Christ, and so much in the same line of direction with the workings of Satan. This is the only application of the word in the New Test. to any but the prince of the apostate angels. In the New Test. the word is σατανᾶς, followed by the Vulg. Satanas, except in 2Co 12:7, where σατᾶν is used. It is found in twenty-five places (exclusive of parallel passages), and the corresponding word ὁ διάβολος in about the same number. The title ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου is used three times; ὁ πονηρός is used certainly six times, probably more frequently, and ὁ πειράζων twice.

Devil (Διάβολος) is the more frequent term of designation given to Satan in the New Test. Both “Satan” and “devil” are in several instances applied to the same being (Rev 12:9), “That old serpent, the devil and Satan.” Christ, in the temptation (Matthew 4), in his repulse of the tempter, calls him Satan; while the evangelists distinguish him by the term “devil.” Devil is the word διάβολος transferred from the verb διαβάλλω, “to thrust through,” “to carry over,” and, tropically, “to inform against,” “to accuse.” He is also called the accuser of the brethren (Rev 12:10). The Hebrew term Satan is more generic than the word devil, at least by its etymology. The former expresses his character as an opposer of all good; the latter denotes more particularly the relation which he bears to the saints, as their traducer and accuser. Διάβολος is the uniform translation which the Sept. gives of the Hebrew Satan when used with the article. Farmer says that the term Satan is not appropriated to one particular person or spirit, but signifies an adversary, or opponent in  general. This is to no purpose, since it is also applied to the “devil” as an adversary in particular. There are four instances in the New Test. in which the word “devil,” diabolos, is applied to human beings. In three out of the four it is in the plural number, expressive of quality and not personality (1Ti 3:11; 2Ti 3:3; Tit 2:3). In the fourth instance (Joh 6:70), Jesus says to his disciples, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?” This is the only instance in the New Test. of its application to a human being in the singular number; and here Dr. Campbell thinks it should not be translated “devil.” The translation is, however, of no consequence, since it is with the use of the original word that this article is concerned. The obvious reasons for this application of διάβολος to Judas, as an exception to the general rule, go to confirm the rule. The rule is that, in the New Test. usage, the word in the singular number denotes individuality, and is applied to Satan as a proper name. By the exception, it is applied to Judas, from his resemblance to the devil, as an accuser and betrayer of Christ, and from his contributing to aid him in his designs against Christ. With these exceptions, the usus loquendi of the New Test. shows ὁ Διάβολος to be a proper name, applied to an extraordinary being, whose influence upon the human race is great and mischievous (Mat 4:1-11; Luk 8:12; Joh 8:44; Act 13:10; Eph 6:11; 1Pe 5:8; 1Jn 3:8; Rev 12:9). SEE DEVIL.

The term “devil,” which is in the New Test. the uniform translation of διάβολος, is also frequently the translation of daemon, δαίμων, and daemonion, δαιμόνιον. Between these words and διάβολος the English translators have made no distinction. The former are almost always used in connection with demoniacal possessions, and are applied to the possessing spirits, but never to the prince of those spirits. On the other hand, διάβολος is never applied to the daemons, but only to their prince, thus showing that the one is used definitely as a proper name, while the others are used indefinitely as generic terms. The sacred writers made a distinction, which in the English and most modern versions is lost. SEE DEMON.

II. Personality of Satan. — We determine this point by the same criteria that we use in determining whether Caesar and Napoleon were real, personal beings, or the personifications of abstract ideas, viz. by the tenor of history concerning them, and the ascription of personal attributes to them. All the forms of personal agency are made use of by the sacred  writers in setting forth the character and conduct of Satan. They describe him as having power and dominion, messengers and followers. He tempts and resists; he is held accountable, charged with guilt; is to be judged, and to receive final punishment. On the supposition that it was the object of the sacred writers to teach the proper personality of Satan, they could have found no more express terms than those which they have actually used. To suppose that all this semblance of a real, veritable, conscious moral agent is only a trope, a prosopopoeia, is to make the inspired penmen guilty of employing a figure in such a way that, by no ascertained laws of language, it could be known that it was a figure — in such a way that it could not be taken to be a figure, without violence to all the rhetorical rules by which they on other occasions are known to have been guided. A personification protracted through such a book as the Bible. even should we suppose it to have been written by one person, is altogether anomalous and inadmissible. But to suppose that the several writers of the different books of the Bible, diverse in their style and intellectual habits, writing under widely differing circumstances, through a period of nearly two thousand years, should each, from Moses to John, fall into the use of the same personification, is to require men to believe that the inspired writers, who ought to have done the least violence to the common laws of language, have really done the most.

But there are other difficulties than these general ones by which the theory of personification is encumbered. This theory supposes the devil to be the principle of evil. Let it be applied in the interpretation of two or three passages of Scripture. “Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil” (Mat 4:1-11). Was Jesus tempted by a real, personal being? or was it by the principle of evil? If by the latter, in whom or what did this principle reside? Was it in Jesus? Then it could not be true that in him was no sin. The very principle of sin was in him, which would have made him the tempter of himself. This is bad hermeneutics, producing worse theology. Let it also be remembered that this principle of evil, in order to be moral evil, must inhere in some conscious moral being. Sin is evil only as it implies the state or action of some personal and accountable agent. Again: “He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth: he is a liar and the father of it” (Joh 8:44). With what propriety could these specific acts of guilt be charged upon an abstraction? An abstraction a murderer! a liar! Seriously to affirm such things of the mere abstraction of evil is a solemn fiction;  while to assert them of a fallen angel, who beguiled Eve by falsehood, and brought death upon all the race of man, is an intelligible and affecting truth.

It would be a waste of time to prove that, in various degrees of clearness, the personal existence of a Spirit of Evil is revealed again and again in Scripture. Every quality, every action, which can indicate personality, is attributed to him in language which cannot be explained away. It is not difficult to see why it should be thus revealed. It is obvious that the fact of his existence is of spiritual importance, and it is also clear, from the nature of the case, that it could not be discovered, although it might be suspected, by human reason. It is in the power of that reason to test any supposed manifestations of supernatural power, and any asserted principles of divine action which fall within its sphere of experience (“ the earthly things” of Joh 3:12). It may by such examination satisfy itself of the truth and divinity of a Person or a book; but, having done this, it must then accept and understand, without being able to test, or to explain, the disclosures of this divine authority upon subjects beyond this world (the “heavenly things,” of which it is said that none can see or disclose them, save the “Son of Man who is in heaven”).

It is true that human thought can assert an a priori probability or improbability in such statements made, based on the perception of a greater or less degree of accordance in principle between the things seen and the things unseen, between the effects, which are visible, and the causes, which are revealed from the regions of mystery. But even this power of weighing probability is applicable rather to the fact and tendency than to the method of supernatural action. This is true even of natural action beyond the sphere of human observation. In the discussion of the plurality of worlds, for example, it may be asserted without doubt that in all the orbs of the universe the divine power, wisdom, and goodness must be exercised; but the inference that the method of their exercise is found there, as here, in the creation of sentient and rational beings is one at best of but moderate probability. Still more is this the case in the spiritual world. Whatever supernatural orders of beings may exist, we can conclude that in their case, as in ours, the divine government must be carried on by the union of individual freedom of action with the overruling power of God, and must tend finally to that good which is his central attribute. But beyond this we can assert nothing to be certain, and can scarcely even say of any part of the method of this government whether it is antecedently probable or improbable.  Thus, on our present subject, man can ascertain by observation the existence of evil — that is, of facts and thoughts contrary to the standard which conscience asserts to be the true one, bringing with them suffering and misery as their inevitable results. If he attempts to trace them to their causes, he finds them to arise, for each individual, partly from the power of certain internal impulses which act upon the will, partly from the influence of external circumstances. These circumstances themselves arise, either from the laws of nature and society, or by the deliberate action of other men. lie can conclude with certainty that both series of causes must exist by the permission of God, and must finally be overruled to his will. But whether there exist any superhuman but subordinate cause of the circumstances, and whether there be any similar influence acting in the origination of the impulses which move the will, this is a question which he cannot answer with certainty. Analogy, from the observation of the only ultimate cause which he can discover in the visible world — viz. the free action of a personal will — may lead him, and generally has led him, to conjecture the affirmative; but still the inquiry remains unanswered by authority start.

The tendency of the mind in its inquiry is generally towards one or other of two extremes. The first is to consider evil as a negative imperfection arising, in some unknown and inexplicable way, from the nature of matter, or from some disturbing influences which limit the action of goodness on earth; in fact, to ignore as much of evil as possible, and to decline to refer the residuum to any positive cause at all. The other is the old Persian or Manichaean hypothesis, which traces the existence of evil to a rival creator, not subordinate to the Creator of good, though perhaps inferior to him in power, and destined to be overcome by him at last. Between these two extremes the mind varied through many gradations of thought and countless forms of superstition. Each hypothesis had its arguments of probability against the other. The first labored under the difficulty of being insufficient as an account of the anomalous facts, and indeterminate in its account of the disturbing cause; the second sinned against that belief in the unity of God and the natural supremacy of goodness, which is supported by the deepest instincts of the heart. But both were laid in a sphere beyond human cognizance; neither could be proved or disproved with certainty.

The revelation of Scripture, speaking with authority, meets the truth and removes the error inherent in both these hypotheses. It asserts in the strongest terms the perfect supremacy of God, so that under his permission  alone, and for his inscrutable purposes, evil is allowed to exist (see, for example, Pro 16:4; Isa 45:7; Amo 3:6; comp. Rom 9:22-23). It regards this evil as an anomaly and corruption, to be taken away by a new manifestation of divine love in the incarnation and atonement. The conquest of it began virtually in God's ordinance after the fall itself, was effected actually on the cross, and shall be perfected in its results at the judgment day. Still Scripture recognizes the existence of evil in the world, not only as felt in outward circumstances (“ the world”), and as inborn in the soul of man (“ the flesh”), but also as proceeding from the influence of an evil spirit, exercising that mysterious power of free will, which God”s rational creatures possess, to rebel against him, and to draw others into the same rebellion (“ the devil”).

In accordance with the “economy” and progressiveness of God”s revelation, the existence of Satan is but gradually revealed. In the first entrance of evil into the world, the temptation is referred only to the serpent. It is true that the whole narrative, and especially the spiritual nature of the temptation (“ to be as gods”), which was united to the sensual motive, would force on any thoughtful reader the conclusion that something more than a mere animal agency was at work; but the time had not then come to reveal, what afterwards was revealed, that “he who sinneth is of the devil” (1Jn 3:8), and that “the old serpent” of Genesis was “called the devil and Satan, who deceiveth the whole world” (Revelation 12:9; 20:23).

Throughout the whole period of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, this vague and imperfect revelation of the source of evil alone was given. The Source of all Good is set forth in all his supreme and unapproachable majesty; evil is known negatively as the falling away from him; and the “vanity” of idols, rather than any positive evil influence, is represented as the opposite to his reality and goodness. The law gives the “knowledge of sin” in the soul, without referring to any external influence of evil to foster it; it denounces idolatry, without even hinting, what the New Test. declares plainly, that such evil implied a “power of Satan.”

The book of Job stands, in any case, alone (whether we refer it to an early or a later period) on the basis of “natural religion,” apart from the gradual and orderly evolutions of the Mosaic revelation. In it, for the first time, we find a distinct mention of Satan, the adversary of Job. But it is important to remark the emphatic stress laid on his subordinate position, on the absence  of all but delegated power, of all terror, and all grandeur in his character. He comes among the “sons of God” to present himself before the Lord; his malice and envy are permitted to have scope, in accusation or in action, only for God's own purposes; and its is especially remarkable that no power of spiritual influence, but only a power over outward circumstances, is attributed to him. All this is widely different from the clear and terrible revelations of the New Test.

The captivity brought the Israelites face to face with the great dualism of the Persian mythology, the conflict of Ormuzd with Ahriman, the coordinate spirit of evil. In the books written after the captivity we have again the name of Satan twice mentioned; but it is confessed by all that the Satan of Scripture bears no resemblance to the Persian Ahriman. His subordination and inferiority are as strongly marked as ever. In 1Ch 21:1, where the name occurs without the article (“ an adversary,” not “the adversary”), the comparison with 2Sa 24:1 shows distinctly that, in the temptation of David, Satan”s malice was overruled to work out the “anger of the Lord” against Israel. In Zec 3:1-2, Satan is ὁ ἀντίδικος (as in 1Pe 5:8), the accuser of Joshua before the throne of God, rebuked and put to silence by him (comp. Psa 109:6). In the case, as of the good angels, so also of the evil one, the presence of fable and idolatry gave cause to the manifestation of the truth. SEE ANGEL. It would have been impossible to guard the Israelites more distinctly from the fascination of the great dualistic theory of their conquerors.

It is perhaps not difficult to conjecture that the reason of this reserve as to the disclosure of the existence and nature of Satan is to be found in the inveterate tendency of the Israelites to idolatry — an idolatry based, as usual, in great degree, on the supposed power of their false gods to inflict evil. The existence of evil spirits is suggested to them in the stern prohibition and punishment of witchcraft (Exo 22:18; Deu 18:10), and in the narrative of the possession of men by an “evil” or “lying spirit from the Lord” (1Sa 16:14; 1Ki 22:22); the tendency to seek their aid is shown by the rebukes of the prophets (Isa 8:19, etc.). But this tendency would have been increased tenfold by the revelation of the existence of the great enemy concentrating round himself all the powers of evil and enmity against God. Therefore, it would seem, the revelation of the “strong man armed” was withheld until “the stronger than he” should be made manifest.  In the New Test. this reserve suddenly vanishes. In the interval between the Old and New Test. the Jewish mind had pondered on the scanty revelations already given of evil spiritual influence. But the Apocryphal books (as, for example, Tobit and Judith), while dwelling on “daemons” (δαιμόνια), have no notice of Satan. The same may be observed of Josephus. The only instance to the contrary is the reference already made to Wisd. 2, 24. It is to be noticed also that the Targums often introduce the name of Satan into the descriptions of sin and temptation found in the Old Test., as, for example, in Exo 32:19, in connection with the worship of the golden calf (comp. the tradition as to the body of Moses, Deu 34:5-6; Jud 1:9). SEE MICHAEL. But, while a mass of fable and superstition grew up on the general subject of evil spiritual influence, still the existence and nature of Satan remained in the background, felt, but not understood.

The New Test. first brings it plainly forward. From the beginning of the Gospel, when he appears as the personal tempter of our Lord, through all the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse, it is asserted or implied, again and again, as a familiar and important truth. To refer this to mere “accommodation” of the language of the Lord and his apostles to the ordinary Jewish belief is to contradict facts and evade the meaning of words. The subject is not one on which error could be tolerated as unimportant, but one important, practical, and even awful. The language used respecting it is either truth or falsehood; and unless we impute error or deceit to the writers of the New Test., we must receive the doctrine of the existence of Satan as a certain doctrine of revelation. Without dwelling on other passages, the plain, solemn, and unmetaphorical words of Joh 8:44, must be sufficient: “Ye are of your father the devil. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abides (ἕστηκεν) not in the truth.... When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it.” SEE DEMONIAC.

III. Natural History. —

1. Of the original nature and state of Satan, little is revealed in Scripture. Most of the common notions on the subject are drawn from mere tradition, popularized in England by Milton, but without even a vestige of Scriptural authority. He is spoken of as a “spirit” in Eph 2:2; as the prince or ruler of the “daemons” (δαιμόνια) in Mat 12:24-26; and as having “angels” subject to him in Mat 25:41; Rev 12:7; Rev 12:9. The whole description of his power implies spiritual nature and spiritual influence. We conclude, therefore, that he was of angelic nature, a rational and spiritual creature, superhuman in power, wisdom, and energy; and not only so, but an archangel, one of the “princes” of heaven. SEE ARCHANGEL.

The class of beings to which Satan originally belonged, and which constituted a celestial hierarchy, is very numerous: “Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him” (Dan 7:10). They were created and dependent (Joh 1:3). Analogy leads to the conclusion that there are different grades among the angels as among other races of beings. The Scriptures warrant the same. Michael is described as one of the chief princes (Dan 10:13); as chief captain of the host of Jehovah (Jos 5:14). Similar distinctions exist among the fallen angels (Col 2:15; Eph 6:12). It is also reasonable to suppose that they were created susceptible of improvement in all respects except moral purity, as they certainly were capable of apostasy.

2. As to the time when they were brought into being, the Bible is silent; and where it is silent, we should be silent, or speak with modesty. Some suppose that they were called into existence after the creation of the world; among whom is Dr. John Dick. Others have supposed that they were created just anterior to the creation of man, and for purposes of a merciful ministration to him. It is more probable, however, that as they were the highest in rank among the creatures of God, so they were the first in the order of time; and that they may have continued for ages in obedience to their Maker, before the creation of man, or the fall of the apostate angels.

We cannot, of course, conceive that anything essentially and originally evil was created by God. We find by experience that the will of a free and rational creature can, by his permission, oppose his will; that the very conception of freedom implies capacity of temptation; and that every sin, unless arrested by God”s fresh gift of grace, strengthens the hold of evil on the spirit till it may fall into the hopeless state of reprobation. We can only conjecture, therefore, that Satan is a fallen angel, who once had a time of probation, but whose condemnation is now irrevocably fixed.

3. The Scriptures are explicit as to the apostasy of some, of whom Satan was the chief and leader. But of the time, cause, and manner of his fall, Scripture tells us scarcely anything. It limits its disclosures, as always, to that which we need to know. The passage on which all the fabric of  tradition and poetry has been raised is Rev 12:7; Rev 12:9, which speaks of “Michael and his angels” as “fighting against the dragon and his angels,” till the “great dragon, called the devil and Satan,” was “cast out into the earth, and his angels cast out with him.” Whatever be the meaning of this passage, it is certain that it cannot refer to the original fall of Satan. The only other passage which refers to the fall of the angels is 2Pe 2:4, “God spared not the angels, when they had sinned, but having cast them into hell, delivered them to chains of darkness (σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν), reserved unto judgment,” with the parallel passage in Jud 1:6, “Angels, who kept not their first estate (τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν), but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” In these mysterious passages, however, there is some difficulty in considering Satan as one of the rest, for they are in chains and guarded (τετηρημένους) till the great day; he is permitted still to go about as the tempter and the adversary, until his appointed time be come. This distinction, nevertheless, may be due to Satan”s eminence among his fellows. Those who adhered to Satan in his apostasy are described as belonging to him. The company is called “the devil and his angels” (Mat 25:41). The relation marked here denotes the instrumentality which the devil may have exerted in inducing those called his angels to rebel against Jehovah and join themselves to his interests. Aside from these passages. we have still to consider the declaration of our Lord in Luk 10:18, “I beheld (ἐθεώρουν) Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven.” This may refer to the fact of his original fall (although the use of the imperfect tense and the force of the context rather refer it figuratively to the triumph of the disciples over the evil spirits); but, in any case, it tells nothing of its cause or method. There is also the passage already quoted (Joh 8:44), in which our Lord declares of him, that “he was a murderer from the beginning,” that “he stands not (ἕστηκε) in the truth, because there is no truth in him,” that “he is a liar, and the father of it.” But here it seems likely the words ἀπ᾿ ἀρχῆς refer to the beginning of his action upon man; perhaps the allusion is to his temptation of Cain to be the first murderer — an allusion explicitly made in a similar passage in 1Jn 3:9-12. The word ἕστηκε (wrongly rendered ‘abode' in the A.V.) and the rest of the verse refer to present time. The passage therefore throws little or no light on the cause and method of his fall. Perhaps the only one which has any value is 1Ti 3:6, “lest being lifted up by pride he fall into the condemnation (κρίμα) of the devil.” It is concluded from this that pride was the cause of the devil”s condemnation.  The inference is a probable one; it is strengthened by the only analogy within our reach, that of the fall of man, in which the spiritual temptation of pride, the desire”; to be as gods,” was the subtlest and most deadly temptation. Still it is but an inference; it cannot be regarded as a matter of certain revelation.

How Satan and his followers, being created so high in excellence and holiness, became sinful and fell is a question upon which theologians have differed, but which they have not settled. The difficulty has seemed so great to Schleiermacher and others that they have denied the fact of such an apostasy. They have untied the knot by cutting it. Still the difficulty remains. The denial of mystery is not the removal of it. Even philosophy teaches us to believe sometimes where we cannot understand. It is here that the grave question of the introduction of evil first meets us. If we admit the fact of apostasy among the angels, as by a fair interpretation of Scripture we are constrained to do, the admission of such a fact in the case of human beings will follow more easily, they being the lower order of creatures, in whom defection would be less surprising.

4. In his physical nature, Satan is among those that are termed spiritual beings; not as excluding necessarily all idea of matter, but as opposed rather to the animal nature. The good angels are all ministering spirits, πνευματα (Heb 1:14). Satan is one of the angels that kept not their first principality. The fall produced no change in his physical or metaphysical nature. Paul, in warning the Ephesians against the wiles of the devil, tells them (Eph 6:12) that they contended not against flesh and blood, mere human enemies, but against principalities and powers; against the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places, in which the contrast is between human and superhuman foes, the latter being spiritual natures, or spirits, in opposition to flesh and blood (Rosenmüller, ad loc.). Satan is immortal, but not eternal; neither omniscient nor omnipresent, but raised high above the human race in knowledge and power. The Persian mythology in its early stage, and subsequently the Gnostics and Manichaeans, ranked the evil principle as coeval and coordinate, or nearly so, with God, or the good principle. The doctrine of the Jewish Church always made him a dependent creature, subject to the control of the Almighty. By the modifications which Zoroaster subsequently introduced, the Persian angelology came more nearly to resemble that of the Jews. Some have ascribed to Satan the power of working miracles, contending that there are two series of  antagonistical miracles running through the Bible. To the miracles of Moses were opposed those of the Egyptian magicians; and to those of Christ and his apostles, the signs and wonders of false prophets and Antichrists the divine and the satanic. Olshausen maintains this view, as do some of the older commentators (Biblischen Commentar. 1, 242). The evidence in support of such a belief has not been sufficient to procure for it general acceptance (see Rosenmüller and Calvin on Mat 24:24; 2Th 2:9; Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses, ch. 3; also Rosenmüller and Bush on Exodus 7). With a substantial presence in only one place at one time, yet, as the head of a spiritual kingdom, he is virtually present wherever his angels or servants are executing his will.

5. Scripture describes to us distinctly the moral character of the Evil One. This is no matter of barren speculation to those who, by yielding to evil, may become the “children of Satan” instead of “children of God.” The ideal of goodness is made up of the three great moral attributes of God — love, truth, and purity, or holiness — combined with that spirit which is the natural temper of a finite and dependent creature, the spirit of faith. We find, accordingly, that the opposites to these qualities are dwelt upon as the characteristics of the devil. In Joh 8:44, compared with 1Jn 3:10-15, we have hatred and falsehood; in the constant mention of the “unclean” spirits, of which he is the chief, we find impurity; from 1Ti 3:6, and the narrative of the temptation, we trace the spirit of pride. These are especially the “sins of the devil;” in them we trace the essence of moral evil and the features of, the reprobate mind. Add to this a spirit of restless activity, a power of craft, and an intense desire to spread corruption, and with it eternal death, and we have the portraiture of the spirit of evil as Scripture has drawn it plainly before our eyes.

More particularly, Satan's character is denoted by his titles, Satan, Adversary, Diabolos, False Accuser, Tempter, etc. All the representations of him in Scripture show him to have unmixed and confirmed evil as the basis of his character, exhibiting itself in respect to God in assuming to be his equal, and in wishing to transfer the homage and service which belong only to God to himself; and, in respect to men, in efforts to draw them away from God and attach them to his kingdom. The evil develops itself in all possible ways and by all possible means of opposition to God, and to those who are striving to establish and extend his dominion. The immutability of his evil character precludes the idea of repentance, and,  therefore, the possibility of recovering grace. “He possesses an understanding which misapprehends exactly that which is most worthy to be known, to which the key fails without which nothing can be understood in its true relations — an understanding darkened, however deep it may penetrate, however wide it may reach. He is thereby necessarily unblessed; torn away from the center of life, yet without ever finding it in himself; from the sense of inward emptiness, continually driven to the exterior world, and yet with it, as with himself, in eternal contradiction; forever fleeing from God, yet never escaping him; constantly laboring to frustrate his designs, yet always conscious of being obliged to promote them; instead of enjoyment in the contemplation of his excellence, the never satisfied desire after an object which it cannot attain; instead of hope, a perpetual wavering between doubt and despair; instead of love, a powerless hatred against God, against his fellow beings, against himself” (Twesten).

IV. Satan's Power and Action. — Both these points, being intimately connected with our own life and salvation, are treated with a distinctness and fullness remarkably contrasted with the obscurity of the previous subjects.

The agency of Satan extends to all that he does or causes to be done. To this agency the following restrictions have generally been supposed to exist: It is limited, first, by the direct power of God; he cannot transcend the power on which he is dependent for existence; secondly, by the finiteness of his own created faculties; thirdly, by the established connection of cause and effect, or the laws of nature. The miracles, which he has been supposed to have the power of working, are denominated lying signs and wonders (2Th 2:9). With these restrictions, the devil goes about like a roaring lion.

His agency is moral and physical. First, moral. He beguiled our first parents, and thus brought sin and death upon them and their posterity (Genesis 3). He moved David to number the people (1Ch 21:1). He resisted Joshua the high priest (Zec 3:1). He tempted Jesus (Matthew 4); entered into Judas, to induce him to betray his master (Luk 22:3); instigated Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Ghost (Act 5:3); and hindered Paul and Barnabas on their way to the Thessalonians (1Th 2:18). He is the spirit that now worketh  in the children of disobedience (Eph 2:2); and he deceiveth the whole world (Rev 12:9).

The means which he uses are variously called wiles, darts, depths, snares, all deceivableness of unrighteousness. He darkens the understandings of men, to keep them in ignorance. He perverts their judgments, that he may lead them into error. He insinuates evil thoughts, and thereby awakens in them unholy desires. He excites them to pride, anger, and revenge; to discontent, repinings, and rebellion. He labors to prop up false systems of religion, and to corrupt and overturn the true one. He came into most direct and determined conflict with the Savior in the temptation, hoping to draw him from his allegiance to God, and procure homage for himself; but he failed in his purpose. Next, he instigated the Jews to put him to death, thinking thus to thwart his designs and frustrate his plans. Here, too, he failed, and was made to subserve the very ends which he most wished to prevent. Into a similar conflict does he come with all the saints, and with like ultimate ill success. God uses his temptations as the means of trial to his people, and of strength by trial; and points them out as a motive to watchfulness and prayer. Such are the nature and mode of his moral influence and agency.

But his efforts are directed against the bodies of men, as well as against their souls. That the agency of Satan was concerned in producing physical diseases the Scriptures plainly teach (Job 2:7; Luk 13:16). Peter says of Christ that he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil (Act 10:38). Hymenaeus and Alexander were delivered to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme (1Ti 1:20), where physical suffering by the agency of Satan, as a divine chastisement, is manifestly intended.

The power of Satan over the soul is represented as exercised either directly or by his instruments. His direct influence over the soul is simply that of a powerful and evil nature on those in whom lurks the germ of the same evil, differing from the influence exercised by a wicked man in degree rather than in kind; but it has the power of acting by suggestion of thoughts, without the medium of actions or words — a power which is only in a very slight degree exercised by men upon each other. This influence is spoken of in Scripture in the strongest terms as a real external influence, correlative to, but not to be confounded with, the existence of evil within. In the parable of the sower (Mat 13:19), it is represented as a negative  influence, taking away the action of the Word of God for good; in that of the wheat and the tares (Mat 13:39), as a positive influence for evil, introducing wickedness into the world. Paul does not hesitate to represent it as a power permitted to dispute the world with the power of God; for he declares to Agrippa that his mission was ‘to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power (ἐξουσίας) of Satan unto God,' and represents the excommunication, which cuts men off from the grace of Christ in his Church, as a “deliverance of them unto Satan” (1Co 5:5; 1Ti 1:20). The same truth is conveyed, though in a bolder and more startling form, in the epistles to the churches of the Apocalypse, where the body of the unbelieving Jews is called a “synagogue of Satan” (Rev 2:9; Rev 3:9), where the secrets of false doctrine are called “the depths of Satan” (Rev 2:24), and the “throne” and “habitation” of Satan are said to be set up in opposition to the Church of Christ. Another and even more remarkable expression of the same idea is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the death of Christ is spoken of as intended to baffle (καταργεῖν) ‘him that hath the power (τὸ κράτος) of death, that is, the devil;' for death is evidently regarded as the ‘wages of sin,' and the power of death as inseparable from the power of corruption. Nor is this truth only expressed directly and formally; it meets us again and again in passages simply practical, taken for granted as already familiar (see Rom 16:20; 2Co 2:11; 1Th 2:18; 2Th 2:9; 1Ti 5:15). The Bible does not shrink from putting the fact of satanic influence over the soul before us in plain and terrible certainty.

Yet, at the same time, it is to be observed that its language is very far from countenancing, even for a moment, the horrors of the Manichean theory. The influence of Satan is always spoken of as temporary and limited, subordinated to the divine counsel, and broken by the incarnate Son of God. It is brought out visibly, in the form of possession, in the earthly life of our Lord, only in order that it may give the opportunity of his triumph. As for himself, so for his redeemed ones, it is true that “God shall bruise Satan under their feet shortly” (Rom 16:20; comp. Gen 3:15). Nor is this all, for the history of the book of Job shows plainly, what is elsewhere constantly implied, that satanic influence is permitted in order to be overruled to good, to teach humility, and therefore faith. The mystery of the existence of evil is left unexplained; but its present subordination and future extinction are familiar truths. So accordingly, on the other hand, his  power is spoken of as capable of being resisted by the will of man, when aided by the grace of God. “Resist the devil and he will flee from you” is the constant language of Scripture (Jam 4:7). It is indeed a power to which “place” or opportunity “is given” only by the consent of man's will (Eph 4:27). It is probably to be traced most distinctly in the power of evil habit — a power real, but not irresistible, created by previous sin, and by every successive act of sin riveted more closely upon the soul. It is a power which cannot act directly and openly, but needs craft and dissimulation in order to get advantage over man by entangling the will. The “wiles” (Eph 6:11), the “devices” (2Co 2:11), the “snare” (1Ti 3:7; 1Ti 6:9; 2Ti 2:26) “of the devil” are expressions which indicate the indirect and unnatural character of the power of evil. It is therefore urged as a reason for “soberness and vigilance” (1Pe 5:8), for the careful use of the “whole armor of God” (Eph 6:10-17); but it is never allowed to obscure the supremacy of God's grace, or to disturb the inner peace of the Christian. “He that is born of God keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not” (1 John 5).

Besides his own direct influence, the Scriptures disclose to us the fact that Satan is the leader of a host of evil spirits, or angels, who share his evil work, and for whom the “everlasting fire is prepared” (Mat 25:41). Of their origin and fall we know no more than of his, for they cannot be the same as the fallen and imprisoned angels of 2 Peter 2 and Jud 1:6; but one passage (Mat 12:24-26) identifies them distinctly with the δαιμὀνια (A.V. “devils”) who had power to possess the souls of men. The Jews there speak of a Beelzebub (Βεελζεβούλ), “a prince of the daemons,” whom they identify with, or symbolize by, the idol of Ekron, the “god of flies”, SEE BEELZEBUB, and by whose power they accuse our Lord of casting out daemons. His answer is, “How can Satan cast out Satan?” The inference is clear that Satan is Beelzebub, and therefore the demons are “the angels of the devil;” and this inference is strengthened by Act 10:38, in which Peter describes, the possessed as καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου; and by Luk 10:18, in which the mastery over the daemons is connected by our Lord with the “fall of Satan from heaven,” and their power included by him in the “power of the enemy” (τοῦ ἐχθροῦ; comp. Mat 13:39). For their nature, SEE DAMON.

They are mostly spoken of in Scripture in reference to possession; but in Eph 6:12 they are described in various lights, as  “principalities” (ἀρχαί), “powers” (ἐξουσίαι), “rulers of the darkness of this world,” and “spiritual powers of wickedness in heavenly places” (or things”) (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις); and in all as “wrestling” against the soul of man. The same reference is made less explicitly in Rom 8:38 and Col 2:15. In Rev 12:7-9 they are spoken of as fighting with “the dragon, the old serpent called the devil and Satan,” against “Michael and his angels,” and as cast out of heaven with their chiefs. Taking all these passages together, we find them sharing the enmity to God and man implied in the name and nature of Satan; but their power and action are but little dwelt upon in comparison with his. That there is against us a power of spiritual wickedness is a truth which we need to know, and a mystery which only revelation can disclose; but whether it is exercised by few or by many is a matter of comparative indifference.

But the evil one is not only the “prince of the daemons,” but also he is called the “prince of this world” (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) in Joh 12:31; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11, and even the “god of this world” (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) in 2Co 4:4; the two expressions being united in the words τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, used in Eph 6:12. (The word κόσμος, properly referring to the system of the universe, and so used in John 1, is generally applied in Scripture to human society as alienated from God, with a reference to the “pomp and vanity” which make it an idol [see, e.g., 1 John 2]; αἰών refers to its transitory character, and is evidently used above to qualify the startling application of the word θεός, a “god of an age” being of course no true God at all. It is used with κόσμος in Eph 2:2.) This power he claimed for himself as a delegated authority in the temptation of our Lord (Luk 4:6), and the temptation would have been unreal had he spoken altogether falsely. It implies another kind of indirect influence exercised through earthly instruments. There are some indications in Scripture of the exercise of this power through inanimate instruments, of an influence over the powers of nature, and what men call the “chances” of life. Such a power is distinctly asserted in the case of Job, and probably implied in the case of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (in Luk 13:16), and of Paul's “thorn in the flesh” (2Co 12:7). It is only consistent with the attribution of such action to the angels of God (as in Exo 12:23; 2Sa 24:16; 2Ki 19:35; Act 12:23), and, in our ignorance of the method of connection of the second causes of  nature with the supreme will of God, we cannot even say whether it has in it any antecedent improbability; but it is little dwelt upon in Scripture in comparison with the other exercise of this power through the hands of wicked men, who become “children of the devil,” and accordingly “do the lusts of their father.” (See Joh 8:44; Act 13:10; 1Jn 3:8-10; — and comp. Joh 6:70.) In this sense the Scripture regards all sins as the “works of the devil,” and traces to him, through his ministers, all spiritual evil and error (2Co 11:14-15), and all the persecution and hindrances which oppose the Gospel (Rev 2:10; 1Th 2:18). Most of all is this indirect action of Satan manifested in those who deliberately mislead and tempt men, and who at last, independent of any interest of their own, come to take an unnatural pleasure in the sight of evil doing in others (Rom 1:32).

The method of his action is best discerned by an examination of the title by which he is designated in Scripture. He is called emphatically ὁ διάβολος, “the devil.” The derivation of the word in itself implies only the endeavor to break the bonds between others and “set them at variance” (see, e.g., Plato, Symp. p. 222 c, διαβάλλειν ἐμὲ καὶ Α᾿γάθωνα); but common usage adds to this general sense the special idea of “setting at variance by slander.” In the New Test. the word διάβολοι is used three times as an epithet (1Ti 3:11; 2Ti 3:3; Tit 2:3), and in each case with something like the special meaning. In the application of the title to Satan both the general and special senses should be kept in view. His general object is to break the bonds of communion between God and man, and the bonds of truth and love which bind men to each other to “set” each soul “at variance” both with men and God, and so reduce it to that state of self will and selfishness which is the seed plot of sin. One special means by which he seeks to do this is slander of God to man and of man to God.

The slander of God to man is seen best in the words of Gen 3:4-5 : “Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day that ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” These words contain the germ of the false notions which keep men from God, or reduce their service to him to a hard and compulsory slavery, and which the heathen so often adopted in all their hideousness, when they represented their gods as either careless of human weal and woe or “envious” of human excellence and happiness. They attribute selfishness and jealousy to the giver of all good. This is enough (even without the imputation of falsehood which is added) to pervert man's natural love of  freedom till it rebels against that which is made to appear as a hard and arbitrary tyranny, and seeks to set up, as it thinks, a freer and nobler standard of its own. Such is the slander of God to man, by which Satan and his agents still strive against his reuniting grace.

The slander of man to God is illustrated by the book of Job (Job 1:9-11; Job 2:4-5). In reference to it. Satan is called the “adversary” (ἀντίδικος) of man in 1Pe 5:8, and represented in that character in Zec 3:1-2; and more plainly still designated in Rev 12:10 as “the accuser of our brethren, who accused them before our God day and night.” It is difficult for us to understand what can be the need of accusation, or the power of slander, under the all-searching eye of God. The mention of it is clearly an “accommodation” of God's judgment to the analog of our human experience; but we understand by it a practical and awful truth, that every sin of life, and even the admixture of lower and evil motives which taints the best actions of man, will rise up against us at the judgment to claim the soul as their own, and fix forever that separation from God to which, through them, we have yielded ourselves. In that accusation Satan shall in some way bear a leading part, pleading against man, with that worst of slander which is based on perverted or isolated facts; and shall be overcome, not by any counterclaim of human merit, but “by the blood of the lamb” received in true and steadfast faith.

But these points, important as they are, are of less moment than the disclosure of the method of Satanic action upon the heart itself. It may be summed up in two words — temptation and possession.

The subject of temptation is illustrated, not only by abstract statements, but also by the record of the temptations of Adam and of our Lord. It is expressly laid down (as in Jam 1:2-4) that “temptation,” properly so called, i.e. “trial” (πειρασμός), is essential to man, and is accordingly ordained for him and sent to him by God (as in Gen 22:1). Man's nature is progressive; his faculties, which exist at first only in capacity (δυνάμει), must be brought out to exist in actual efficiency (ἐνεργείᾷ) by free exercise. His appetites and passions tend to their objects, simply and unreservedly, without respect to the rightness or wrongness of their obtaining them; they need to be checked by the reason and conscience, and this need constitutes a trial in which, if the conscience prevail, the spirit receives strength and growth; if it be overcome, the lower nature tends to predominate, and the man has fallen away. Besides this, the will itself  delights in independence of action. Such independence of physical compulsion is its high privilege; but there is over it the moral power of God's law, which, by the very fact of its truth and goodness, acknowledged as they are by the reason and the conscience, should regulate the human will. The need of giving up the individual will, freely and by conviction, so as to be in harmony with the will of God, is a still severer trial, with the reward of still greater spiritual progress if we sustain it, with the punishment of a subtler and more dangerous fall if we succumb. In its struggle the spirit of man can only gain and sustain its authority by that constant grace of God, given through communion of the Holy Spirit, which is the breath of spiritual life.

It is this tentability of man, even in his original nature, which is represented in Scripture as giving scope to the evil action of Satan. He is called the “tempter” (as in Mat 4:3; 1Th 3:5). He has power (as the record of Genesis 3 shows clearly), first, to present to the appetites or passions their objects in vivid and captivating forms, so as to induce man to seek these objects against the law of God “written in the heart;” and next, to act upon the false desire of the will for independence, the desire “to be as gods, knowing” (that is, practically, judging and determining) “good and evil.” It is a power which can be resisted, because it is under the control and overruling power of God, as is emphatically laid down in 1Co 10:13; Jam 4:7, etc.; but it can be so resisted only by yielding to the grace of God, and by a struggle (sometimes an “agony”) in reliance on its strength.

It is exercised both negatively and positively. Its negative exercise is referred to in the parable of the sower, as taking away the word, the “engrafted word” (Jam 1:21) of grace, i.e. as interposing itself, by consent of man, between him and the channels of God's grace. Its positive exercise is set forth in the parable of the wheat and the tares, represented as sowing actual seed of evil in the individual heart or the world generally; and it is to be noticed that the consideration of the true nature of the tares (ζιζάνια) leads to the conclusion, which is declared plainly in 2Co 11:14, viz. that evil is introduced into the heart mostly as the counterfeit of good.

This exercise of the tempter's power is possible, even against a sinless nature. We see this in the temptation of our Lord. The temptations presented to him appeal, first, to the natural desire and need of food; next,  to the desire of power, to be used for good, which is inherent in the noblest minds; and, lastly, to the desire of testing and realizing God's special protection, which is the inevitable tendency of human weakness, under a real but imperfect faith. The objects contemplated involved in no case positive sinfulness; the temptation was to seek them by presumptuous or by unholy means; the answer to them (given by the Lord as the Son of Man, and therefore as one like ourselves in all the weakness and finiteness of our nature) lay in simple faith, resting upon God, and on his word, keeping to his way, and refusing to contemplate the issues of action, which belong to him alone. Such faith is a renunciation of all self confidence, and a simple dependence on the will and on the grace of God.

But in the temptation of a fallen nature Satan has a greater power. Every sin committed makes a man the “servant of sin” for the future (Joh 8:34; Rom 6:16); it therefore creates in the spirit of man a positive tendency to evil, which sympathizes with, and aids the temptation of the evil one. This is a fact recognized by experience; the doctrine of Scripture, inscrutably mysterious, but unmistakably declared, is that, since the fall, this evil tendency is born in man in capacity, prior to all actual sins, and capable of being brought out into active existence by such actual sins committed. It is this which Paul calls “a law,” i.e. (according to his universal use of the word) an external power “of sin” over man, bringing the inner man (the νοῦς) into captivity (Rom 7:14-24). Its power is broken by the atonement and the gift of the Spirit, but yet not completely cast out; it still “lusts against the spirit” so that men “cannot do the things which they would” (Gal 5:17). It is to this spiritual power of evil, the tendency to falsehood, cruelty, pride, and unbelief, independently of any benefits to be derived from them, that Satan is said to appeal in tempting us. If his temptations be yielded to without repentance, it becomes the reprobate (ἀδόκιμος) mind, which delights in evil for its own sake (Rom 1:28; Rom 1:32), and makes men emphatically “children of the devil” (Joh 8:44; Act 13:10; 1Jn 3:8; 1Jn 3:10) and “accursed” (Mat 25:41), fit for “the fire prepared for the devil and his angels.” If they be resisted, as by God's grace they may be resisted, then the evil power (the “flesh” or the “old man”) is gradually “crucified” or “mortified” until the soul is prepared for that heaven where no evil can enter.

This twofold power of temptation is frequently referred to in Scripture as exercised chiefly by the suggestion of evil thoughts, but occasionally by the delegated power of Satan over outward circumstances. To this latter  power is to be traced (as has been said) the trial of Job by temporal loss and bodily suffering (Job 1, 2), the remarkable expression used by our Lord as to the woman with a “spirit of infirmity” (Luk 13:16), the “thorn in the flesh.” which Paul calls the “messenger of Satan” to buffet him (2Co 12:7). Its language is plain, incapable of being explained as metaphor or poetical personification of an abstract principle. Its general statements are illustrated by examples of temptation. (See, besides those already mentioned, Luk 22:5, John 23:27 [Judas]; Luk 22:31 [Peter]; Act 5:3 [Ananias and Sapphira]; 1Co 7:5; 2Co 2:11; 1Th 3:5.) The subject itself is the most startling form of the mystery of evil; it is one on which, from our ignorance of the connection of the first cause with second causes in nature, and of the process of origination of human thought, experience can hardly be held to be competent either to confirm or to oppose the testimony of Scripture.

It is of no avail that there are difficulties connected with the agency ascribed to Satan. Objections are of little weight when brought against well-authenticated facts. Any objections raised against the agency of Satan are equally valid against his existence. If he exists, he must act; and if he is evil, his agency must be evil. The fact of such an agency being revealed as it is, is every way as consonant with reason and religious consciousness as are the existence and agency of good angels. Neither reason nor consciousness could by itself establish such a fact; but all the testimony they are capable of adducing is in agreement with the Scripture representation on the subject.

On the subject of demonical possession (q.v.) it is sufficient here to remark that although widely different in form, yet it is of the same intrinsic character as the other power of Satan, including both that external and internal influence to which reference has been made above. It is disclosed to us only in connection with the revelation of that redemption from sin which destroys it — a revelation begun in the first promise in Eden, and manifested in itself at the atonement in its effects at the great day. Its end is seen in the Apocalypse, where Satan is first “bound — for a thousand years,” then set free for a time for the last conflict, and finally “cast into the lake of fire and brimstone ... for ever and ever” (20:2, 7-10).

V. Traditions. — According to the Mohammedans, who have derived their account from Jewish traditions, Satan, or, as they sometimes call him,  Eblis, was an archangel whom God employed to destroy the Jinns or Genii, a race intermediate between men and angels, who tenanted the earth before the creation of Adam. In riches, power, and magnificence, the pre-Adamite sultans of the Jinns far surpassed any height to which monarchs of the human race have attained; but the pride with which such glories inspired them filled them with impiety, and their monstrous crimes at length provoked the wrath of the Omnipotent. Satan was then commissioned to destroy them; he exterminated the greater part of the perfidious race, and compelled the rest to seek refuge in the caves beneath the mighty Kaf, or mountain framework which supports the universe. This victory filled Satan with pride; and when God, after the creation of Adam, required all the celestial intelligences to worship the new being, Satan and his adherents peremptorily refused, upon which he was driven from heaven, and the faithful angels threw great stones at him to accelerate his flight. Hence the common Mohammedan saving, “God preserve us from Satan who was stoned!” In revenge for this misfortune, Satan resolved to procure the expulsion of our first parents from paradise; but when he presented himself at the gate of the garden, he was refused admittance by the guard. On this he begged each of the animals, one after another, to carry him in, that he might speak to Adam and his wife; but they all refused him except the serpent, who took him between two of his teeth and thus carried him in. See D'Herlelot, Biblioth. Orientate, s.v. SEE SUPERSTITION.

VI. Literature. — Lists of works on this subject are given by Danz, Theol. Wörterbuch, s. vv. “Satan,” “Teufel;” Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. Colossians 1384. 1680 sq.; and Malcom, Theolog. Index, s.v. See also Tweedie, Satan as revealed in Scripture (Edinb. 1862); Snope, Satanic Influence (Lond. 1854); Cowan, idem (ibid. 1861); and the monographs referred to under SEE DAEMON; SEE DEVIL; SEE POSSESSED.

## Satan, Depths Of[[@Headword:Satan, Depths Of]]

             (Rev 2:24), probably were the mysteries of the Nicolaitans, the Simonians, and other early Gnostics, who concealed their errors under deep abstruseness derived from wild speculations of Oriental philosophy, spoke of certain intelligences which created the world, but were in opposition to the Creator. They taught a profound knowledge of the nature of angels and their different degrees. They seem to have had secret books, written in an abstruse and mysterious style. SEE GNOSTICS.

## Satan, Synagogue Of[[@Headword:Satan, Synagogue Of]]

             (Rev 2:9; Rev 2:13), probably denotes the unbelieving Jews at Smyrna, the false zealots for the law of Moses, who at the beginning were the most eager persecutors of the Christians. They were very numerous at Smyrna, where Polycarp was bishop, to whom John writes. SEE SMYRNA.

## Satanael[[@Headword:Satanael]]

             a being whom the Bogomiles (q.v.) of the 12th century regarded as the first-born son of the supreme God, who sat at the right hand of God, holding the second place after him. To each of the higher spirits they believed that God had committed a particular administration, while Satanael was placed over all his universal vicegerents; but, having apostatized, he persuaded his companions in apostasy to create a new heaven and a new earth, which should be an empire independent of the supreme God. He ruled in the world which he had created, bringing many thousands to ruin by his seductive wiles. But the good God resolved to rescue men from the dominion of Satanael and to deprive him of power. This was accomplished by the Logos, who became incarnate, or, rather, took an ethereal body, which resembled an earthly body only in its outward appearance. Satanael was deprived by Christ of his divine power, and obliged to give up the name of El and retain only that of Satan. This doctrine has a marked resemblance to that of the Euchites.

## Satanamis[[@Headword:Satanamis]]

             a Hindu sect who profess to adore the true name alone, the one God, the cause and creator of all things. They borrow their notions of creation from the Vedantic philosophy. Worldly existence is with them illusion, or the work of Maya. They acknowledge the whole of the Hindu gods, and, although they profess to worship but one God, they pay reverence to what they consider manifestations of his nature visible in the Avatars, particularly Rama and Krishna. They use distinctive marks, and wear a double string of silk bound around the right wrist. They do not uniformly employ frontal lines, but some make a perpendicular streak with ashes of a burned offering to Hanuman. Their moral system approaches that of the Hindu Quietists or the Greek Stoics, consisting chiefly of a spirit of rigid indifference to the world, its pleasures and its pains, advantages and disadvantages; and a strict adherence to all ordinary social and religious  duties, combined with the calm hope of final absorption into the one spirit which pervades all things.

## Satanians[[@Headword:Satanians]]

             a branch of the Messalians, who appeared about A.D. 390. They derived their name from the theory which they are alleged to have held, that the power of Satan over men makes it right for them to pray that he will not exercise it to their harm. This opinion seems to be the same as that on which the worship of the Yezedees (q.v.) is grounded.

## Satanniani[[@Headword:Satanniani]]

             Heretics of this name are mentioned by the author of Predestinatus as having derived their name from Satanius, and as maintaining the opinion that the resurrection of the dead will be a restoration of bodies and souls to exactly the same condition in which they exist during the present life. This seems to be the same heresy which is numbered the eightieth by Philaster and the sixty-seventh by Augustine, and to whose adherents the name Æternales is given by Danreus in his tract on Augustine's treatise on heresies.

## Satanow, Isaac Ha-Levi[[@Headword:Satanow, Isaac Ha-Levi]]

             a Jewish writer, was a native of Satanow, in Russian Poland, where he was born in the year 1732. In 1772 he came to Berlin, where he began to issue those works for which he had prepared himself in his native place, and which have secured him a lasting memorial in Hebrew literature and Biblical exegesis. His works are, a short Hebrew grammar, entitled ס8 שפתי רננות, The Joyful Lips (Berl. 1773): שפת אמת, a Hebrew dictionary in the manner of Kimchi's: ס השרשים (ibid. 1787; Prague, 1804): אחדי דברים; on the synonyms and homonyms of the Hebrew language (Berl. 1787; Prague, 1804): — אחת שפה, a Hebrew dictionary, also called ס8השרשים(Berl. 1787): — A Hebrew commentary on and German translation of Job (ibid. 1799). Besides these, Satanow has also written several works of gnomes and apothegms in imitation of the Psalms and Proverbs, as well as grammatical notes on all the difficult passages of the Old Test. which have not as yet been published. Satanow died in 1802. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 251 sq.; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte d. jüdische Poesie, p. 115 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 398, etc.; Kitto, Cyclop.  s.v.; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Lit. p. 395; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11, 132 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliograph. Handb. p. 124; Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl. p. 2502. (B.P.)

## Satervis[[@Headword:Satervis]]

             in Persian mythology, is a prince of the stars and good genius who protects the region of the west, and is a leader in the contest with Ahriman. He raises the water from the sea and spreads it over the land in the form of rain.

## Sathrabuzanes[[@Headword:Sathrabuzanes]]

             (Σαθραβουζάνης), a Graecized form (1Es 6:3; 1Es 6:7; 1Es 6:27 [7:1]) of the Chaldee name (Ezr 5:3; Ezr 5:6; Ezr 6:6; Ezr 6:13) SHETHAR-BOZNAI SEE SHETHAR-BOZNAI (q.v.).

## Satisfaction[[@Headword:Satisfaction]]

             (expressed in Hebrew by מָלֵא, to fill; שָׂבִע, to satiate; and רָוָה, to glut; in Greek [according to the A.V.] by less distinctive terms, χορτάζω, to fodder; once [Col 2:23] πλησμονή, satiety), in general, signifies the act of giving complete or perfect pleasure. In the Christian system it denotes that which Christ did and suffered in order to satisfy divine justice, to secure the honors of the divine government, and thereby make an atonement for the sins of his people (Heb, כפר, to atone for). This use of the word satisfaction is taken from the sense of the word in the Roman law, viz. contenting an aggrieved person by some consideration consistent with a remission of the debt or offence for which the satisfaction is offered. The death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice was the satisfaction for the sins of the world (1Jn 2:2; Rom 5:11). Satisfaction is, in fact, propitiation and atonement. Christ's satisfaction is vicarious and expiatory, being made for us and instead of us or our act, we having ourselves no power of offering satisfaction to the offended majesty of heaven. Satisfaction is distinguished from merit thus: The satisfaction of Christ consists in his answering the demands of the law on man, which were consequent on the breach of it. These were answered by suffering its penalty. The merit of Christ consists in what he did to fulfill what the law demanded before man sinned, which was obedience. The satisfaction of Christ is to free us from misery, and the merit of Christ is to procure happiness for us. See Owen, On the Satisfaction of Christ; Gill, Body of  Div. s.v.; Stillingfleet, On Satisfaction; Watts, Redeemer and Sanctifier, p. 28, 32; Hervey, Theron and Aspasio. SEE ATONEMENT; SEE PROPITIATION.

## Satisfaction, Romish[[@Headword:Satisfaction, Romish]]

             The catechism of the Council of Trent defines “satisfaction” as “the compensation made by man to God by doing something in atonement for the sins which he has committed.” The satisfaction which Christ makes on the cross, it is declared, ‘gives to man's actions merit before God.” “Canonical satisfaction” is something — prayer, fasting, or alms — deeds — “which is imposed by the priest, and must be accompanied with a deliberate and firm purpose carefully to avoid sin for the future.” This satisfaction is directed by the Council of Trent to be proportioned to the nature of the offence and the capability of the offender. It directly opposes the doctrine of justification by faith only, and is closely connected with the Romish notion of the merits of good works. SEE PENANCE.

## Satisfactional View Of The Atonement[[@Headword:Satisfactional View Of The Atonement]]

             The vicarious sufferings of Jesus Christ upon the cross are often represented by theologians as mainly intended to appease the divine wrath by offering a satisfaction for human guilt. That this, however, is incorrect is evident, not only from the character of God himself, who is no Shylock demanding his "pound of flesh," and is infinitely anxious to be reconciled to the sinner, but it is clear likewise from the fact that no adequate quid pro quo was either attempted or achieved in this regard. The virtue and obedience and holiness of Jesus did not in the slightest degree lessen, palliate, or modify the crimes, the sins, and the transgressions of man, nor are they ever represented as any apology or excuse for these. To accept the merit of the pure as a counterpoise of the dereliction of the impure is no reasonable equivalent, much less to condone the fault of the offending by the suffering of the innocent. Such a satisfaction is opposed to the plain teaching of the parable of the prodigal son, in which no reparation, but merely a penitent return, is attempted or spoken of on the part of the wanderer. Nor does this conflict with Paul's doctrine of the release from the claims of the law (Rom 5:11), for he everywhere represents this from a Judaic or human point of view, and especially insists that these obligations are cancelled for the past and fulfilled for the future simply by a subjective conformity to the will of God (Romans 10:4; 13:10). It is, in fact, the sinner himself who is ultimately and practically called upon to be satisfied with this arrangement, and upon his acceptance of the substitute the whole efficacy of the scheme is finally made to depend. God needs no such inducement, but man does, and this not so much outside parties as the offending individual himself. It is the sinner's conscience that demands a satisfaction, and this he can find only in Christ. SEE VICARIOUS SUFFERING.

## Satnius[[@Headword:Satnius]]

             in Greek mythology, was a son of Enops and the naiad or nymph of the stream Satniois. He was slain by Ajax, the son of Oileus.

## Satrap[[@Headword:Satrap]]

             (Heb. achashdarpen', אֲחִשְׁדִּרְפֵּן; Sept. σατρᾶπης and στρατηγός; Vulg. satrapes; A.V. ‘ruler of provinces;' Est 3:12; Est 8:9; Est 9:3; and with the Chaldee termination, Dan 3:2-3; Dan 3:27; Dan 6:2-3). The genuine form of this name has been found in Indian inscriptions to be ksatrapa, i.e. warrior of the host (see Benfey, in Gött. Gel. Anz. 1839, p. 805 sq.; Lassen, Zeitschriftf. d. Morgenl. 3, 161), to which the Greek ἐξατράπης or ἐξαιθράπης corresponds (Böckh, Corp. Inscr. No. 2691 c), from which the softer form satrapes gradually arose and passed into modern languages (Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.). “These satraps are known in ancient history as the governors or viceroys of the provinces into which the Persian empire was divided. Strictly speaking, they had an extended civil jurisdiction over several smaller provinces, each of which had its own פחה, or governor. Thus Zerubbabel and Nehemiah were ‘governors' of Judea under the Persian satraps of Syria (Ezr 4:3; Ezr 4:6; Neh 2:9). The power and functions of the Persian satraps were not materially different from those of the modern Persian governors and Turkish pashas; and, indeed, the idea of  provincial government by means of viceroys intrusted with almost regal powers in their several jurisdictions, and responsible only to the king, by whom they are appointed, has always been prevalent in the East. The important peculiarity and distinction in the ancient Persian government, as admirably shown by Heeren (Researches, 1, 489 sq.), was that the civil and military powers were carefully separated — the satrap being a very powerful civil and political chief, but having no immediate control over the troops and garrisons, the commanders of which were responsible only to the king. The satraps, in their several provinces, employed themselves in the maintenance of order and the regulation of affairs; and they also collected and remitted to the court the stipulated tribute, clear of all charges for local government and for the maintenance of the troops (Xenoph. Cyrop. 8, 6, § 1-3). In later times this prudent separation of powers became neglected in favor of royal princes and other great persons (Xenoph. Anab. 1, 1, § 2), who were intrusted with the military as well as civil power in their governments to which cause may be attributed the revolt of the younger Cyrus, and the other rebellions and civil wars, which, by weakening the empire, facilitated its ultimate subjugation by Alexander.” SEE PERSIA.

## Satrapes[[@Headword:Satrapes]]

             in Greek mythology, was a name under which a bronze statue was erected to Neptune, first at Samicum, and afterwards in Elis, which was constantly covered with a robe of woolen, another of linen, and a third of byssus.

## Satshi[[@Headword:Satshi]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the wife of the sun god Indra.

## Satterlee, Alfred Brown[[@Headword:Satterlee, Alfred Brown]]

             a Baptist missionary, was born at Sheldon, N.Y., Oct. 26, 1823, and was a graduate of Brown University, in the class of 1852. He pursued his theological studies at the Rochester Theological Seminary, and received his appointment as a missionary of the American Baptist Missionary Union in 1853, and was set apart for the Arracan mission. He reached the field of his labors, Akyab, in Sept., 1855. He was not permitted to perform much service for his Master. At the early age of thirty-two he died of the cholera, July 1, 1856. (J.C.S.)

## Satterpai[[@Headword:Satterpai]]

             in Persian mythology, is the heaven of the fixed stars supposed to be situated below the heaven of the moon, and presided over by twelve genii of the twelve signs of the zodiac.

## Sattiawodi[[@Headword:Sattiawodi]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a daughter of the king Dassarayen, who was first married to Parassen and afterwards to Sandanen.

## Saturday[[@Headword:Saturday]]

             (Saturn's day) was, next to the Lord's day, held by the ancient Christians in great veneration, and, especially in the Eastern parts, honored with all the public solemnities of religion. This observance of the day was, doubtless, out of respect to the feelings of the Jews, who were generally the first converts to the Christian faith, and who still retained great reverence for the Sabbath. The Western Church regarded it as a fast, but the Greek Church observed it as a festival, one Sabbath (Saturday) only excepted. This was called the Great Sabbath, between Good Friday and Easter day, when our Savior lay buried, upon which account it was kept as a fast throughout the whole Church. Athanasius (Hom. de Semente, tom. 1, p. 1060) tells us that they assembled on Saturdays — not that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath. So far as concerns public worship, Saturday was made in all things conformable to that of the Lord's day. The Scriptures were read, as on the Lord's day, sermons preached, and the communion administered. A preference, however, was given to the Lord's day, for there were no laws forbidding lawsuits, pleadings, public shows, and games on that day. Nor were men obliged to abstain wholly from bodily labor, but, on the contrary, the Council of Laodicea (August. Ep. 118) has a canon forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the Sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship. The reason for the Latin Church keeping Saturday as a fast is given by pope Innocent in his epistle to the bishop of Eugubium: “If we commemorate Christ”s resurrection not only at Easter, but every Lord”s day, and fast upon Friday because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy.” He therefore concludes that Saturday ought to be kept as a fast (Innocent. Ep. ad Decium Eugubin. c. 4). This was the general practice, and yet in Italy itself it was otherwise at Milan,  where Saturday was a festival. The Saturdays in Ember weeks are called “in XII Lections,” from the six Gospels read both in Latin and Greek. See Bingham, Antiq. of the Christ. Church, p. 1137 sq.; Riddle, Christ. Antiq. p. 652 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.

## Saturn, Or Kronos[[@Headword:Saturn, Or Kronos]]

             Was a principal deity in Greek and Roman mythology. The old Italic Saturn, whose name indicates that he was a god of harvests, and the old Grecian Kronos, a thoroughly symbolic being, which, like his brothers, the Titans, is suggestive of the primeval and uniform forces of nature, and has a probable though partial connection with the Phoenician Moloch (q.v.), are deities of two religions which often diverge from each other; and a modern learned mythology, which everywhere intermixes Greek and Roman elements, has met with but indifferent success in the endeavor to combine the two gods into one. Kronos, the son of Uranus and Gæa, was the most cunning of the Titans. His mother had given birth to the Centimani and the Cyclops, and Uranus had confined them in the underworld on account of their monstrous shapes and strength. Enraged by this action, Gæa proposed to her younger children to avenge their brothers; but they all shrank from laying violent hands on their father, with the exception of Kronos, who hid himself, and at night emasculated Uranus and threw the generative organs down upon the earth, thereby fructifying it. Kronos then married the Titaness Rhea, from whom sprang the entire race of the gods who ruled the world. To avoid a prophecy by his parents which foretold that one of his children should dethrone him, he swallowed all his children immediately after their birth, excepting Jupiter, whom Rhea saved by giving Kronos a stone wrapped in cloths instead. The child grew rapidly, and attained in a single year to extraordinary size and strength. Metis (cunning) now gave him an emetic, which he administered to Kronos, with the result that he cast up all the children he had swallowed, together with the stone. The latter was placed for a memorial at the foot of Mount Parnassus, and Jupiter conspired with his brothers and sisters to dethrone their father, whom he mutilated as Uranus had been; but when he sought to secure the throne for himself the Titans resisted, with the result that after ten years' war Jupiter released the Centimani and the Cyclops, and with their aid overcame the Titans, whom he imprisoned in the dungeon where the Cyclops had lain. The division of authority was then  determined among the Kronidae by lot, Pluto receiving the earth, Neptune the sea, and Jupiter the heavens and supreme authority over all. The dethroned Kronos or Saturn, it is said, now fled to Italy and inaugurated the golden age. Men lived, like the gods, without care, in uninterrupted happiness, health, and strength; they did not grow old; and to them death was a slumber which relieved them of their present nature and transformed them into daemons. The earth yielded every kind of fruit, and gave up all its treasures without cultivation and labor. Under the reign of Saturn men lived the life of paradise. To keep alive the recollection of this primitive life o( innocence, freedom, and equality, the festival (of the Saturnalia was instituted at Rome, which began on Dec. 17, and continued, first a single day, but afterwards for longer periods, until in the time of the emperors it extended over an entire week. During its continuance all business was interrupted; all distinctions between masters and slaves were laid aside, so that slaves sat at the sumptuous table and masters waited on them, and every form of recreation was allowed. In Greece Kronos or Saturn possessed temples of extremely ancient date. His temple at Rome stood at the foot of the Capitol, and served as an archive of the State and also as its treasury. The god is usually represented as bearing a sickle. The scythe, wings, and hourglass, which are likewise often introduced in such representations, are added notions of more recent date, and resulted from a change in the mode of conceiving of the god. The Persians gave this deity an almost wholly animal representation: the lower parts of the body resemble those of swine, a human body with arms is added, and an animal head with crown completes the figure.

## Saturn, The Planet[[@Headword:Saturn, The Planet]]

             seems to be named as an object of worship in Amo 5:26, under the title Kiyun', כַּיּוּן, where it is said of the Israelites in the wilderness, “Ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun, your images,” etc.; for a similar word is the name of this star in both Syriac and Arabic (comp. Aben-Ezra, ad loc.), and it is known that the ancient Arabians strove to propitiate Saturn as a star of evil influence (see Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 103, 120, ed. nov.; comp. Norberg, Onomast. Cod. Nas. p. 78 sq.; Ephrem Syr. Opp. 2, 458; Propert. 4, 1, 104; Lucan, 1, 652; Juvenal, 6, 569). On account of its distance from the sun it was considered by the ancient astronomers as having a cold nature (Pliny, 2, 6, p. 75 ed. Hard.), and they ascribed to it heavy storms of rain (ibid. 2, 39; see Harduin, ad  loc.; see also, on its evil influence, Macrobius, Saturn, 1, 19, p. 95, 97 Bip.; SEE MOLOCH ). The Sept. has ῾Ραιφάν; comp. Act 7:43, where the MSS. vary much (see Griesb. ad loc.; comp. O. Müller, in the Bibl. Lubec. 7:469 sq.), but the best read ῾Ρηφάν. This is a Coptic word, as Kircher has shown from an Arabico-Coptic inscription (Ling. Aeg. Restit p. 49; Oedip. Aeg. p. 1, 386 sq.). Seyffarth would derive it from PE, to make or be, and ουοειν, light, i.e. shining (comp. Tatius Isag. in Arati Phoen. c. 17). Jablonski, however (Remph. .Egypt. Deus [Frankfort and Leips. 1731], also in his Opusc. 2, 1 sq., and in Ugolini Thesaur. 23), would deny that this and the other names of planets associated with it in the inscription are Egyptian, and renders the word as Ethiopic, king of heaven, i.e. sun (comp. Opusc. 1, 230 sq.), from ro, “king,” and pheh, “heaven.” [Hence the true reading would be ῾Ρομφά Then we must understand the passage in Amos to refer to the worship of Osiris. But there is little evidence for the reading with μ. Ign. Rossi (Etymol. Egypt. [Rome, 1808] p. 176) explains ῾Ρεμφά as meaning inhabitant of heaven, from pheh, “heaven,” and rene, “inhabitant” (comp. Coptic version of 1Co 15:48 sq.). But this is not striking. More recently, Hengstenberg agrees with Jablonski in rejecting all glosses, and has returned to the old view t that ῾Ρηφάν is the mistake of a scribe for Kiyun, or Riyun (Authent. des Pentat. 1, 110 sq.); yet this seems too hasty; and Kircher's view is supported by some well 1 acquainted with the Coptic, and is defended by Baur (Comment. ad loc.) and Winer, who considers the rendering of Hengstenberg (Gestell eurer Bilder, i.e. the frame or support of your images) as without force, though Hitzig and Ewald adopt it. Gesenius (Thesaur. 2, 669 sq.) renders statuam idolorum vestrorum, i.e. statue of your idols, which is without good reason. (Comp., in gen., Braun, Selecta Sacra, p. 477 sq.; Maius and Schwab, in Ugolini Thesaur. 23 [but these are unimportant]; Schröder, De Tabernac. Mol. et Stella Dei Rempha [Marb. 1745].) Rosenmüller denies that the Sept. renders Kiyun by ῾Ραιφάν, but refers it as a word of explanation to elohekem אַלֹהֵיכֶם, your gods. But this is with little reason. An attempt has been made to connect Saturn with the Jewish Sabbath, as the day of Saturn. See, contra, Bähr, Symbol. 2, 584. Wolff's Diss. 1. de Chiun et Remph. (Leips. 1741) is unimportant. SEE CHIUN.

## Saturnalia[[@Headword:Saturnalia]]

             the festival of Saturnus, to whom the people of Latium attributed the introduction of agriculture and the arts of civilized life. It was kept towards the end of December, as a sort of harvest home, during which business was suspended; courts and schools were closed; no war was commenced or malefactor punished; slaves were relieved from ordinary labor, and, dressed in their masters' clothes, were waited upon by them at the table. Saturnus being an ancient national god of Latium, the institution of the Saturnalia is lost in the most remote antiquity. One legend ascribes it to Janus, another (by Varro) to the Pelasgi, while a third tradition represented certain followers of Hercules, whom he had left behind on his return to Greece, as the authors of the festival. At first only one day was set apart for the sacred rites of Saturnus, but additions were gradually made until it occupied seven days. In reality, during the empire, three different festivals were celebrated. First came the Saturnalia proper, commencing on XVI Kal. Dec., followed by the Opalia, anciently coincident with the Sigillaria, so called from little earthenware figures (sigilla oscilla) exposed for sale at this season.

## Saturnia And Saturnius[[@Headword:Saturnia And Saturnius]]

             in Greek mythology, were appellatives of Juno and Jupiter, derived from their father Saturn.

## Saturninians, Saturnians, Or Saturnines[[@Headword:Saturninians, Saturnians, Or Saturnines]]

             an early sect of Syrian Gnostics, followers of Saturninus (q.v.) or Saturnilus. The theories of Saturninus are only known through the work of Irenaeus Against Heresies. In this he states that Saturninus, like Menander, taught that there is one supreme Unknown, the Father (Πατὴρ ἄγνωστος) The Father, he taught, was without origin, bodiless and formless, and never had in reality appeared to men; the God of the Jews was only an angel. A number of spiritual beings were created by him in successive gradations, in the lowest of which came the spirits of the seven planets. These seven, of whom the God of the Jews was chief, created the world, man, and all things. They had not power to make man an erect being, and so he continued to crawl upon the earth like a worm until the Supreme sent forth a spark of life, which gave him an erect posture, compacted his joints, and made him to live. Man now for the first time becomes possessed of a soul, and the godlike germ is destined to unfold itself in those human natures where it has been implanted, to distinct personality, and to return after a  determinate period to the original Fountain of Life. Saturninus taught that the Savior, whom he calls Aeon, νοῦς came to destroy the Demiurge, who was the God of the Jews; that he was without birth, without body, without figure, and only in appearance a man. He accounted for the existence of good and evil men by affirming that they were originally created of two kinds, the one good, whom Christ came to save, the other wicked, whom the devils succor, and whom Christ will destroy. The Saturninians considered marriage to be of Satan; they abstained from animal food, and taught that some prophecies came from the spirits who made the world, and some from Satan. Their doctrines led to a strict asceticism, and also to the celibacy of. following times; they were based on dualism, and resembled those of the Docetae. As these heretics are not mentioned by St. Clement of Alexandria, it is probable — that they were not much known out of Syria, and that they were few in number. See Blunt, Hist. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1, 280 sq.

## Saturninus[[@Headword:Saturninus]]

             a native of Antioch, in Syria, and a disciple of Menander. He was founder of a sect of Gnostics, called after him Saturninians (q.v.). He flourished A.D. 117-138.

## Saturninus (2)[[@Headword:Saturninus (2)]]

             a Christian martyr under Diocletian, was a priest of Albitina, in Africa, who, having been informed against for officiating in his clerical capacity, was apprehended and sent to Carthage to be examined before Amelinus. On his examination, Saturninus vindicated the Christian religion with great eloquence. By command of the proconsul he was tortured and remanded to prison, where he died of starvation, about A.D. 305. See Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 48.

## Satyr[[@Headword:Satyr]]

             The rendering in Isa 13:21; Isa 34:14, of the Hebrews word ‘שָׂעַיר, sair', which properly means hairy; hence a goat, especially a he-goat (comp. Lat. hircus, from hirsutus, hirtus), and is so rendered in Lev 4:24; 2Ch 29:23, and often. The Sept. has, in the  passages in Isaiah, δαιμόνιον, demon; and so the Eng. A.V., in 2Ch 11:15, ‘devil.' These beings are mentioned in Isaiah as the inhabitants of desert places, but particularly the ruins of Babylon and Petra, where they dance and call to each other. The Greeks probably derived their belief in the existence of beings half men and half goats from the Eastern nations, whose mythology abounds with such fabulous animals, but there is no reason to believe that they formed any part of the Jewish superstitions. Yet it has been supposed by some that Isaiah alludes to the spectral beings which the ancient Persians, the Jews, and the Mohammedans believe to haunt the ruins of Babylon. SEE SUPERSTITION.

But in those passages where the prophet predicts the desolation of Babylon, there is probably no allusion to any species of goat, whether wild or tame. According to the old versions, and nearly all the commentators, our own translation is correct, and satyrs — that is, daemons of woods and desert places, half men and half goats — are intended. Comp. Jerome (Comment. ad Isaiah xiii): ‘Seirim vel incubones vel satyros vel sylvestres quosdam homines quos nonnulli fatuos ficarios vocant, aut daemonum genera intelligunt.' This explanation receives confirmation from a passage in Lev 17:7, ‘They shall no more offer their sacrifices unto seirim,' and from a similar one in 2Ch 11:15. The Israelites, it is probable, had become acquainted with a form of goat worship from the Egyptians (see Bochart, Hieroz. 3, 825; Jablonski, Pant. Egypt. 1, 273 sq.). The opinion held by Michaelis (Supp. p. 23-42) and Lichtenstein (Commentat. de Simiarum, etc. § 4, p. 50 sq.), that the seirim probably denote some species of ape, has been sanctioned by some modern scientists from a few passages in Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 8; 7, 2; 8, 54). SEE APE. That some species of cynocephalus (dog-faced baboon) was an animal that entered into the theology of the ancient Egyptians is evident from the monuments and from what Horapollo (1, 14-16) has told us. The other explanation, however, has the sanction of Gesenius, Bochart, Rosenmüller, Parkhurst, Maurer, Fürst, and others. As to the ‘dancing' satyrs, comp. Virgil, Ecl. 5, 73. SEE GOAT.

## Satyrs[[@Headword:Satyrs]]

             in Greek mythology, were daemonic companions of Bacchus. who represented the unrestrained and luxurious life in the Bacchic circle. They are not mentioned in Homer, and Hesiod does not describe their form, though he speaks of them as a useless race having no adaptability to labor. Later writers furnish a description about as follows: Bristly hair, a short,  thick, and turned-up nose, pointed ears, the neck often marked with small lumps resembling horns, a horse tail, sometimes a goat tail over the coccyx. The endowment of these beings with horns and goats' feet was a misconception of later days by which they were identified with pans, paniscs, and fauns. The satyrs were said to be sons of Mercury and Iphthime, or of the naiads. The oldest and most prominent of them was named Silenus, and the older satyrs are called Sileni collectively. Marsyas, too, was a satyr. In substance, the satyrs were companions of Bacchus; they were excessively fond of wine, and are accordingly represented as drinking, as reeling with the thyrsus, as overcome with sleep, as wine pressers, or as playing on the flute or cymbal. Their attributes were the flute, the thyrsus staff, pandean pipes, the shepherd's staff, drinking vessels, and bottles. They were clothed in skins of beasts and crowned with vine branches, ivy, and pine twigs. They have frequently been the subject of artistic representation, and always in company with Bacchus. The Latin word satira (a satire), originally satura, has not the remotest connection with the Greek Satyri, and should not be in any way referred to them.

## Saubert, Johann[[@Headword:Saubert, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Nuremberg, February 1, 1638. In 1660 he was professor of Oriental languages, in 1665 professor of theology at Helmstadt, in 1673 professor and pastor at Altdorf, and he died April 29, 1688, doctor of theology. He wrote, Varies Lectiones Text. Graeci Evangelii Matth. (Helmstadt, 1672): — De Templo Hierosolymi  (1665): — Die heil. Schrift Alten Test (part 1, eod.): — De Sacrificiis Veterum Collectanea (ed. Crenius, Leyden, 1699): — De Studii Hebraicae Linguae Multiplici Utilitate et Necessitate (Helmstadt, 1661, 1678). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:28, 103, 139, 169, 515, Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v., Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sauces[[@Headword:Sauces]]

             a Coptic name, according to Jerome, given to the Coenobites, as distinct from the Anchorets. The name is sometimes Anglicized Sauches. See Bingham, Antig. of the Christ. Church, 1, 243.

## Sauches[[@Headword:Sauches]]

             SEE SAUCES.

## Saukwimir[[@Headword:Saukwimir]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the strongest jots, or giants. Odin slew his son, and at a subsequent visit to the jots narrated that he had killed the son of a giant and afterwards enjoyed the hospitality of the father, without having discovered his true character, or even having excited the suspicions of his host. — Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. s.v.

## Saul[[@Headword:Saul]]

             (Heb. Shaill', שָׁאוּל, desired; Sept. and New Test. Σαούλ; Josephus, Σάουλος), the name of several men, the following three of whom are thus known in the A.V. For the others SEE SHAUL.

1. An early king of the Edomites, successor of Samlah at Rehoboth (Gen 36:37-38), elsewhere called “Shaul” (1Ch 1:4 p. 49). B.C. post 1618.

2. The first king of Israel (B.C. 1093-1053). As such his career possesses a peculiar interest in the history and relations of the chosen people.

I. The Name. — This first becomes prominent here in the history of Israel, though found before in the Edomitish prince already mentioned, and in a son of Simeon (Gen 46:10; A.V. “Shaul”). It also occurs among the Kohathites in the genealogy of Samuel (1Ch 6:24, “Shaul”), and in Saul, like the king, of the tribe of Benjamin, better known as the apostle Paul (see below). Josephus (War, 2, 18, 4) mentions a Saul, father of one Simon who distinguished himself at Scythopolis in the early part of the Jewish war. The name in its application to the present character seems almost like a mockery of his history.

II. His Family. — On the following page is a general view of Saul's pedigree.

In this genealogy may be observed —

1. The repetition in two generations of the names of Kish and Ner, of Nadab and Abi-nadab, and of Mephibosheth.

2. The occurrence of the name of Baal in three successive generations; possibly in four, as there were two Mephibosheths.

3. The constant shiftings of the names of God, as incorporated in the proper names: (a) Ab-iel=Jehiel; (b) Malchi-shua=Je-shua; (c) Esh- baal=Ishbosheth; (d) Mephi- (or Meri-) baal=Mephi-bosheth.

4. The long continuance of the family down to the times of Ezra.

5. Is it possible that Zimri (1Ch 9:42) can be the usurper of 1 Kings 16 --if so, the last attempt of the house of Saul to regain its ascendency? The time would agree.

There is a disagreement between the pedigree in 1Sa 9:1; 1Sa 14:51, which represents Saul and Abner as the grandsons of Abiel. and 1Ch 8:33; 1Ch 9:39, which represents them as his great- grandsons. If we adopt the more elaborate pedigree in the Chronicles, we must suppose either that a link has been dropped between Abiel and Kish, in 1Sa 9:1, or that the elder Kish, the son of Abiel (1Ch 9:36), has been confounded with the younger Kish, the son of Ner (1Ch 9:39). The pedigree in 1 Chronicles 8 is not free from confusion, as it omits among the sons of Abiel, Ner, who in 1Ch 9:36 is the fifth son, and who in both is made the father of Kish. SEE ABIEL.

Saul's more particular genealogy and lineage (so far as given) is as follows:

III. Saul's History. —

1. Up to his Coronation. — The birthplace of Saul is not expressly mentioned; but as Zelah was the place of Kish's sepulchre (2 Samuel 21), it was probably his native village. There is no warrant for saying that it was Gibeah, though, from its subsequent connection with him, it is called often “Gibeah of Saul.” SEE GIBEAH. (When Abiel, or Jehiel [1Ch 8:29; 1Ch 9:35], is called the father of “Gibeon,” it probably means founder of Gibeah.)

His father, Kish, was a powerful and wealthy chief, though the family to which he belonged was of little importance (1Sa 9:1; 1Sa 9:21). A portion of his property consisted of a drove of asses. In search of these asses, gone astray on the mountains, he sent his son Saul, accompanied by a servant (נִעִר) who acted also as a guide and assistant of the young man (1Sa 9:3-10). After a three days' journey (1Sa 9:20), which it has hitherto proved impossible to track with certainty, SEE RAMAH, through Ephraim and Benjamin, SEE SHALIM; SEE SHALISHA; SEE ZUPH, they arrived at the foot of a hill surrounded by a town, when Saul proposed to return  home, but was deterred by the advice of the servant, who suggested that before doing so they should consult “a man of God,” “a seer,” as to the fate of the asses, securing his oracle by a present (backshish) of a quarter of a silver shekel. They were instructed by the maidens at the well outside the city to catch the seer as he came out of the city to ascend to a sacred eminence, where a sacrificial feast was waiting for his benediction (1Sa 9:11-13). At the gate they met the seer for the first time — it was Samuel.

A divine intimation had indicated to him the approach and the future destiny of the youthful Benjamite. Surprised at his language, but still obeying his call, they ascended to the high place, and in the inn or caravansary at the top (Sept. τὸ κατάλυμα, 1Sa 9:27) found thirty or (Sept. and Josephus, Ant. 6, 4, 1) seventy guests assembled, among whom they took the chief place. In anticipation of some distinguished stranger, Samuel had bidden the cook reserve a boiled shoulder, from which Saul, as the chief guest, was bidden to tear off the first morsel (Sept. 1Sa 9:22-24). They then descended to the city, and a bed was prepared for Saul on the housetop. At daybreak Samuel roused him. They descended again to the skirts of the town, and there (the servant having left them) Samuel poured over Saul's head the consecrated oil, and with a kiss of salutation announced to him that he was to be the ruler and (Sept.) deliverer of the nation (1Sa 9:25 to 1Sa 10:1). From that moment, as he turned on Samuel the huge shoulder which towered above all the rest (Sept. 10:9), a new life dawned upon him. He returned by a route which, like that of his search, it is impossible to make out distinctly; and at every step homeward it was confirmed by the incidents which, according to Samuel's prediction awaited him (10:9, 10). At Rachel's sepulchre he met two men, who announced to him the recovery of the asses — his lower cares were to cease. At the oak of Tabor, SEE PLAIN, TABOR, he met three men carrying gifts of kids and bread and a skin of wine, as an offering to Bethel. Two of the loaves were offered to him as if to indicate his new dignity. At “the hill of God” (whatever may be meant thereby, possibly his own city, Gibeah) he met a band of prophets descending with musical instruments, and he caught the inspiration from them as a sign of his new life (Ewald, 3, 28-30).

This is what may be called the private, inner view of his call. The outer call, which is related independently of the other, was as follows. An assembly was convened by Samuel at Mizpeh, and lots (so often practiced at that time, see Aristot. Polit. 6, 11; Virgil, En. 2) were cast to find the tribe and  the family which was to produce the king. Saul was named, and, by a divine intimation, found hidden in the circle of baggage which surrounded the encampment (1Sa 10:17-24). His stature at once conciliated the public feeling, and for the first time the shout was raised, afterwards so often repeated in modern times, “Long live the king!” (1Sa 10:23-24) and he returned to his own Gibeah, accompanied by the fighting part (הִחִיַל) of the people, of whom he was now to be the especial head. The murmurs of the worthless part of the community who refused to salute him with the accustomed presents were soon dispelled by an occasion arising to justify the selection of Saul. The words which close 1Sa 10:27 are, in the Hebrew text, “he was as though he were deaf;” in Josephus, Ant. 6, 5,1, and the Sept. (followed by Ewald), “and it came to pass after a month that.”

The corrupt administration of justice by Samuel's sons furnished an occasion to the Hebrews for rejecting that theocracy of which they neither appreciated the value, nor, through their unfaithfulness, to it, enjoyed the full advantages (1 Samuel 8). The prospect of the event related below seems also to have conspired with the cause just mentioned and with a love of novelty in prompting the demand for a king (1Sa 12:12) — an officer evidently alien to the genius of the theocracy, though contemplated as a historical certainty, and provided for by the Jewish lawgiver (1Sa 12:17-20; Deu 17:14-20; on which see Grotius's note; also De Jure Belli, etc. 1, 4, 6, with the remarks of Gronovius, who [as Puffendorf also does] controverts the views of Grotius). An explanation of the nature of this request, as not only an instance of ingratitude to Samuel, but of rebellion against Jehovah, and the delineation of the manner in which their kings — notwithstanding the restrictions prescribed in the law — might be expected to conduct themselves (מַשְׁסִּט הִמֶּלֶ,ִ Sept. δικαίωμα τοῦ βασιλέως; 1Sa 8:11; 1Sa 10:25), failed to move the people from their resolution. SEE SAMUEL.

Both previously to that election (1Sa 10:16), and subsequently, when insulted by the worthless portion of the Israelites, he showed that modesty, humility, and forbearance which seem to have characterized him till corrupted by the possession of power. The person thus set apart to discharge the royal function possessed, at least, those corporal advantages which most ancient nations desiderated in their sovereigns — what Euripides calls the worthy form of royalty. His person was tall and commanding, and he soon showed that his courage was not inferior to his strength (1Sa 9:1; 1Sa 10:23). His belonging to  Benjamin also, the smallest of the tribes, though of distinguished bravery, prevented the mutual jealousy with which either of the two great tribes, Judah and Ephraim, would have regarded a king chosen from the other.

2. Confirmation of Saul's Appointment. — He was (having, apparently, returned to his private life) on his way home, driving his herd of oxen, when he heard one of those wild lamentations in the city of Gibeah, such as mark in Eastern towns the arrival of a great calamity. It was the tidings of the threat issued by Nahash, king of Ammon, against Jabesh-gilead. SEE AMMON. For, in the meantime, the Ammonites, whose invasion had hastened the appointment of a king, having besieged Jabesh in Gilead, and Nahash their king having proposed insulting conditions to them, the elders of that town, apparently not aware of Saul's election (1Sa 11:3), sent messengers through the land imploring help. The inhabitants of Jabesh were connected with Benjamin by the old adventure recorded in Judges 21. It was as if this one spark was needed to awaken the dormant spirit of the king. ‘The Spirit of the Lord came upon him,' as on the ancient judges. The shy, retiring nature which we have observed vanished never to return. In this emergency, he had recourse to the expedient of the earlier days by the message of the flesh of two of the oxen from the herd which he was driving. Saul thus acted with wisdom and promptitude, summoning the people, en masse, to meet him at Bezek; and having, at the head of a vast multitude, totally routed the Ammonites (Jdg 21:11) and obtained a higher glory by exhibiting a new instance of clemency, whether dictated by principle or policy — “Novum imperium inchoantibus utilis clementiae fama” (Tacitus, Hist. 4, 63), “For lowliness is young ambition's ladder” — he and the people betook themselves, under the direction of Samuel, to Gilgal, there with solemn sacrifices to reinstall the victorious leader in his kingdom (1 Samuel 11). If the number set down in the Hebrew text of those who followed Saul (1Sa 11:8) can be depended on (the Sept. more than doubles them, and Josephus outgoes even the Sept.), it would appear that the tribe of Judah was dissatisfied with Saul's election, for the soldiers furnished by the other tribes were 300,000, while Judah sent only 30,000; whereas the population of the former, compared with that of Judah, appears, from other passages, to have been as about five to three (2Ki 24:9). Yet it is strange that this remissness is neither punished (1Sa 11:7) nor noticed. At Gilgal Saul was publicly anointed and solemnly installed in the kingdom by Samuel, who took occasion to vindicate the purity of his own administration — which he  virtually transferred to Saul — to censure the people for their ingratitude and impiety, and to warn both them and Saul of the danger of disobedience to the commands of Jehovah (1 Samuel 12). The effect of this military success was instantaneous on the people; the punishment of the murmurers was demanded, but refused by Saul, and the monarchy was inaugurated anew (1Sa 11:1-15). It should be observed, however, that, according to 1Sa 12:12. the affair of Nahash preceded and occasioned the election of Saul. He became king of Israel. But he still so far resembles the earlier judges as to be virtually king only of his own tribe, Benjamin, or of the immediate neighborhood. Almost all his exploits are confined to this circle of territory or associations.

These were the principal transactions that occurred during the first decade of Saul's reign (which we venture to assign as the meaning of the first clause of ch. 13 — “the son of a year was Saul in his reigning;” the emendation of Origen, “Saul was thirty years old,” being required by the chronology, for he seems, at the next event, to have been forty years old); and the subsequent events happened in the second decade, which may be the meaning of the latter clause.

3. Saul's First Trial and Transgression. — Samuel, who had up to this time been still named as ruler with Saul (1Sa 11:7; 1Sa 11:12; 1Sa 11:14), now withdrew, and Saul became the acknowledged chief. The restrictions on which he held the sovereignty had (1Sa 10:25) been fully explained as well to Saul as to the people, so that he was not ignorant of his true position as merely the lieutenant of Jehovah, king of Israel, who not only gave all the laws, but whose will, in the execution of them, was constantly to be consulted and complied with. The first occasion on which his obedience to this constitution was put to the test brought out those defects in his character which showed his unfitness for his high office, and incurred a threat of that rejection which his subsequent conduct confirmed (1Sa 13:13). Saul could not understand his proper position, as only the servant of Jehovah speaking through his ministers, or confine himself to it; and in this respect he was not, what David with many individual and private faults and crimes was a man after God's own heart, a king faithful to the principles of the theocracy.

In the twentieth year of his reign (as the age of Jonathan evidently requires; the text being corrupt; see Keil, ad loc.) Saul began to organize an attempt to shake off the Philistine yoke which pressed on his country; not least on  his own tribe, where a Philistine officer had long been stationed even in his own field (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 13:3). Having collected a small standing army, part of which, under Jonathan, had taken a fort (or slain the officer) of the Philistines, Saul summoned the people to withstand the forces which their oppressors, now alarmed for their dominion, would, upon this signal, naturally assemble. But so numerous a host came against Saul that the people, panic stricken, fled to rocks and caverns for safety — years of servitude having extinguished their courage, which the want of arms, of which the policy of the Philistines had deprived them, still further diminished. The number of chariots, 30,000, seems a mistake; unless we suppose, with Le Clerc, that they were not war chariots, but baggage wagons (an improbable supposition), so that 3000 may be the true number. ‘Apparently reduced to extremity, and the seventh day having come, but not being ended, the expiration of which Samuel had enjoined him to wait, Saul at least ordered sacrifices to be offered — for the expression (1Sa 13:9) does not necessarily imply that he intruded into the priest's office (2Sa 6:13; 1Ki 3:2-4), though that is the most obvious meaning of the text. Whether that which Saul now disregarded was the injunction referred to (1Sa 10:8) or one subsequently addressed to him, this is evident, that Saul acted in the full knowledge that he sinned (1Sa 13:12); and his guilt, in that act of conscious disobedience, was probably increased by its clearly involving an assumption of authority to conduct the war according to his own judgment and will. But just after the sacrifice was completed Samuel arrived and pronounced the first curse on his impetuous zeal (1Sa 13:5-14). Samuel, having denounced the displeasure of Jehovah and its consequences, left him, and Saul returned to Gibeah (the addition made to the text of the Sept. 1Sa 13:15, where, after “from Gilgal,” the clause, “and the rest of the people went up after Saul to meet the enemy from Gilgal to Gibeah,” etc., being required apparently by the sense, which, probably, has been the only authority for its insertion). Left to himself, Saul's errors multiplied apace. SEE SAMUEL.

Meanwhile the adventurous exploit of his son brought on the crisis which ultimately drove the Philistines back to their own territory. Jonathan, having assaulted a garrison of the Philistines (apparently at Michmash [1Sa 14:31], which therefore must have been situated near Migron in Gibeah [1Sa 14:1], and within sight of it [1Sa 14:15]), Saul, aided by a panic of the enemy, an earthquake, and the cooperation of his fugitive soldiers, effected a great slaughter; but by a rash and foolish  denunciation, he (1) impeded his success (1Sa 14:30), (2) involved the people in a violation of the law (1Sa 14:33), and (3), unless prevented by the more enlightened conscience of the people, would have ended with putting Jonathan to death for an act which, being done in total ignorance, could involve no guilt. SEE JONATHAN.

This campaign was signalized by two remarkable incidents in the life of Saul. One was the first appearance of his madness in the above rash vow which all but cost the life of his son (1Sa 14:24; 1Sa 14:44). The other was the erection of his first altar, built either to celebrate the victory, or to expiate the savage feast of the famished people (1Sa 14:35). This success against the Philistines was followed, not only by their retirement for a time within their own territory, but by other considerable successes against the other enemies of his country. Moab, Ammon, Edom, the kings of Zobah, the Amalekites, and the Philistines — all of whom he harassed. but did not subdue. These wars may have occupied two or three years, about the middle of Saul's reign (B.C. 1073-71).

4. Saul's Second Transgression. — The expulsion of the Philistines (although not entirely completed [1Sa 14:52]) at once placed Saul in a position higher than that of any previous ruler of Israel. Probably from this time was formed the organization of royal state, which contained in germ some of the future institutions of the monarchy. The host of 3000 has been already mentioned (1 Samuel 13; 1Sa 24:2; 1Sa 26:2; comp. 1Ch 12:29). Of this Abner became captain (1Sa 14:50). A bodyguard of young, tall, and handsome Benjamites (Josephus, Ant. 6, 6, 6; 7, 14) was also formed of runners and messengers (see 1Sa 16:15; 1Sa 16:17; 1Sa 22:14; 1Sa 22:17; 1Sa 26:22). Of this David was afterwards made the chief. These two were the principal officers of the court, and sat with Jonathan at the king's table (20:25). Another officer is incidentally mentioned the keeper of the royal mules — the comes stabuli, the “constable” of the king — such as appears in the later monarchy (1Ch 27:30). He is the first instance of a foreigner employed about the court — being an Edomite or (Sept.) Syrian, of the name of Doeg (1Sa 21:7; 1Sa 22:9). According to Jewish tradition (Jerome, Qu. Hoeb. ad loc.) he was the servant who accompanied Saul in his pursuit of his father's asses — who counseled him to send for David (1Sa 9:16), and whose son ultimately killed him (2Sa 1:10). The high priest of the house of Ithamar (Ahimelech or Ahijah) was in attendance upon him with the ephod, when he desired it (1Sa 14:3), and felt himself bound to assist his  secret commissioners (21:1-9; 22:14). The king himself was distinguished by a state not before marked in the rulers. He had a tall spear of the same kind as that described in the hand of Goliath, and the same that now marks the Bedouin sheik. This never left him — in repose (18:10; 19:9), at his meals (20:33), at rest (26:11), in battle (2Sa 1:6). In battle he wore a diadem on his head and a bracelet on his arm (1:10). He sat at meals on a seat of his own facing his son (1Sa 20:25; Sept.). He was received on his return from battle by the songs of the Israelitish women (18:6), among whom he was on such occasions specially known as bringing back from the enemy scarlet robes, and golden ornaments for their apparel (2Sa 1:24).

The warlike character of his reign naturally still predominated, and he was now able not merely, like his temporary predecessors, to act on the defensive, but to attack the neighboring tribes of Moab, Ammon, Edom, Zobah, and finally Amalek (1Sa 14:47). The war with Amalek is twice related, first briefly (1Sa 14:48), and then at length (15:1-9). Its chief connection with Saul's history lies in the disobedience to the prophetical command of Samuel, shown in the sparing of the king, and the retention of the spoil (B.C. 1070). In this event another trial was afforded Saul before his final rejection namely, by the command to extirpate the Amalekites, whose hostility to the people of God was inveterate (Deu 25:18; Exo 17:8-16; Num 14:42-45; Jdg 3:13; Jdg 6:3), and who had not by repentance averted that doom which had been delayed 550 years (1Sa 14:48). The extermination of Amalek and the subsequent execution of Agag belong to the general question of the moral code of the Old Test. SEE AGAG.

There is no reason to suppose that Saul spared the king for any other reason than that for which he retained the spoil — namely, to make a more splendid show at the sacrificial thanksgiving (1Sa 15:21). Such was the Jewish tradition preserved by Josephus (Ant. 6, 7, 2), who expressly says that Agag was spared for his stature and beauty, and such is the general impression left by the description of the celebration of the victory. Saul rides to the southern Carmel in a chariot (Sept.), never mentioned elsewhere, and sets up a monument there (Heb. “a hand” [2Sa 18:18]), which in the Jewish traditions (Jerome, Qu. Hoeb. ad loc.) was a triumphal arch of olives, myrtles, and palms. In allusion to his crowning triumph, Samuel applies to God the phrase, “The victory (Vulg. trumphator) of Israel will neither lie nor repent” (1Sa 15:29; and comp. 1Ch 29:11). The apparent cruelty of  this commission was not the reason why it was not fully executed, as Saul himself confessed when Samuel upbraided him, “I feared the people and obeyed their voice” (1Sa 15:24). This stubbornness in persisting to rebel against the directions of Jehovah was now visited by that final rejection of his family from succeeding him on the throne which had before been threatened (1Sa 13:13-14; 1Sa 15:23), and which was now significantly represented, or mystically predicted, by the rending of the prophet's mantle. The struggle between Samuel and Saul in their final parting is also indicated, as he tears himself away from Saul's grasp (for the gesture, see Josephus, Ant. 6, 7, 5), and by the long mourning of Samuel for the separation “Samuel mourned for Saul.” “How long wilt thou mourn for Saul?” (1Sa 14:35; 1Sa 16:1). After this second and flagrant disobedience, accordingly, Saul received no more public countenance from the venerable prophet, who now left him to his sins and his punishment; “nevertheless the Lord repented that he had made Saul king” (15:35). SEE SAMUEL.

5. Saul's Conduct towards David. — The rest of Saul's life is one long tragedy. The frenzy which had given indications of itself before now at times took almost entire possession of him. It is described in mixed phrases as “an evil spirit of God” (much as we might speak of “religious madness”), which, when it came upon him, almost choked or strangled him from its violence (1Sa 16:14; Sept.; Josephus, Ant. 6:8, 2). The denunciations of Samuel sank into the heart of Saul, and produced a deep melancholy, which either really was, or which his physicians (1Sa 16:14-15; comp. Genesis 1, 2) told him was, occasioned by a supernatural influence; unless we understand the phrase רוּחִ רָעָה, an evil spirit, subjectively, as denoting the condition itself of Saul's mind, instead of the cause of that condition (Isa 29:10; Num 5:14; Rom 11:8). We can conceive that music might affect Saul's feelings, might cheer his despondency, or divert his melancholy; but how it should have the power to chase away a spiritual messenger whom the Lord had sent to chasten the monarch for his transgressions is not so easily understood. Saul's case must probably be judged of by the same principles as that of the daemoniacs mentioned in the New Test. SEE DAEMONIAC. In this crisis David was recommended to him by one of the young men of his guard (in the Jewish tradition groundlessly supposed to be Doeg [Jerome, Qu. Hoeb. ad loc.]) on account of his skill as a musician (1Sa 16:16-23). But the narrative of his introduction to Saul, his subsequently killing Goliath,  Saul's ignorance of David's person after he had been his attendant and armor bearer, with various other circumstances in the narrative (1Sa 16:14-23; 1 Samuel 17; 1Sa 18:1-4), present difficulties which neither the arbitrary omissions in the Sept. nor the ingenuity of subsequent critics has fully succeeded in removing, and which have led many eminent scholars to suppose the existence of extensive dislocations in this part of the Old Test. The change proposed by Hales and others seems to be the most ready, which would place the passage 1Sa 16:14-23 after 18:9; yet why should Saul's attendants need to describe so minutely a person whom he and all Israel knew so well already? Also, how can we conceive that Saul should love so much (1Sa 16:21) a person against whom his jealousy and hatred had been so powerfully excited as his probable successor in the kingdom? (1Sa 18:9). Besides, David had occupied already a much higher position (1Sa 18:5); and, therefore, his being made Saul's armor bearer must have been the very opposite of promotion, which the text (16:21) supposes it was. The most rational solution of the difficulty appears to be the supposition that David had in the interim grown so much that the monarch did not now recognize him. SEE DAVID.

Though not acquainted with the unction of David, yet having received intimation that the kingdom should be given to another, Saul soon suspected, from his accomplishments, heroism, wisdom, and popularity, that David was his destined successor; and, instead of concluding that his resistance to the divine purpose would only accelerate his own ruin, Saul, in the spirit of jealousy and rage, commenced a series of murderous attempts on the life of his rival that must have lost him the respect and sympathy of his people, which they secured for the object of his malice and envy, whose noble qualities also they both exercised and rendered more conspicuous. He attempted twice to assassinate him with his own hand (1Sa 18:10-11; 1Sa 19:10); he sent him on dangerous military expeditions (1Sa 18:5; 1Sa 18:13; 1Sa 18:17); he proposed that David should marry first his elder daughter, whom yet he gave to another, and then his younger, that the procuring of the dowry might prove fatal to David; and then he sought to make his daughter an instrument of her husband's destruction; and it seems probable that unless miraculously prevented he would have imbrued his hands in the blood of the venerable Samuel himself (1Sa 19:18), while the text seems to intimate (1Sa 20:33) that even the life of Jonathan was not safe from his fury, though the subsequent context may warrant a doubt whether Jonathan was the party  aimed at by Saul. The slaughter of Ahimelech the priest (ch. 22), under pretence of his being a partisan of David, and of eighty-five other priests of the house of Eli, to whom nothing could be imputed, as well as the whole inhabitants of Nob, was an atrocity perhaps never exceeded; and yet the wickedness of the act was not greater than its infatuation, for it must have inspired his subjects not only with abhorrence of their king as an inhuman tyrant, but with horror of him as an impious and sacrilegious monster. This crime of Saul put David in possession of the sacred lot, which Abiathar, the only surviving member of Eli's priestly family, brought with him, and by which he was enabled to obtain oracles directing him in his critical affairs (1Sa 22:21-23; 1Sa 23:1-2).

Having compelled David to assume the position of an outlaw, around whom gathered a number of turbulent and desperate characters, Saul might persuade himself that he was justified in bestowing the hand of David's wife on another, and in making expeditions to apprehend and destroy him. A portion of the people were base enough to minister to the evil passions of Saul (1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 26:1), and others, perhaps, might color their fear by the pretence of conscience (1Sa 23:12). But his sparing Saul's life twice, when he was completely in his power, must have destroyed all color of right in Saul's conduct in the minds of the people, as it also did in his own conscience (1Sa 24:3-7; 1 Samuel 26), which two passages, though presenting many points of similarity, cannot be referred to the same occasion without denying to the narrative all historic accuracy and trustworthiness. Though thus degraded and paralyzed by the indulgence of malevolent passions, Saul still acted with vigor in repelling the enemies of his country, and in other affairs wherein his jealousy of David was not concerned (1Sa 23:27-28). In Saul”s better moments, also, he never lost the strong affection which he had contracted for David. “He loved him greatly” (1Sa 16:21). “Saul would let him go no more home to his father”s house” (1Sa 18:2). “Wherefore cometh not the son of Jesse to meat?” (1Sa 20:27). “Is this thy voice, my son David? ... Return, my son David; blessed be thou, my son David” (1Sa 24:16; 1Sa 26:17; 1Sa 26:25). Occasionally, too, his prophetical gift returned, blended with his madness. He “prophesied” or “raved” in the midst of his house — “he prophesied and lay down naked all day and all night” at Ramah (1Sa 19:24). But his acts of fierce, wild zeal increased. The massacre of the priests, with all their families — the massacre, perhaps at the same time, of the Gibeonites (2Sa 21:1), and the violent extirpation of the necromancers (1Sa 28:3; 1Sa 28:9), are all of the same kind.

6. Saul”s Last Offense and Death. — At length the monarchy itself, which he had raised up, broke down under the weakness of its head. The Philistines reentered the country, and with their chariots and horses occupied the plain of Esdraelon. Their camp was I pitched on the southern slope of the range now called Little Hermon, by Shunem. On the opposite side, on Mount Gilboa, was the Israelitish army, clinging, as usual, to the heights which were their safety. It was near the spring of Gideon”s encampment, hence called the spring of Harod, or “trembling;” and now the name assumed an evil omen, and the heart of the king as he pitched his camp there “trembled exceedingly” (1Sa 28:5). The measure of Saul's iniquity, now almost full, was completed by an act of direct treason against Jehovah the God of Israel (Exo 22:18; Lev 19:31; Lev 20:27; Deu 18:10-11). Saul, probably in a fit of zeal and perhaps as some atonement for his disobedience in other respects, had executed the penalty of the law on those who practiced necromancy and divination (1Sa 28:3). Now, however, in the loss of all the usual means of consulting the divine will, he determined, with that wayward mixture of superstition and religion which marked his whole career, to apply to one of the necromancers who had escaped his persecution. Forsaken of God, who gave him no oracles, and rendered, by a course of wickedness, both desperate and infatuated, he requested his attendants to seek him a woman who had a familiar spirit (which is the loose rendering in the English Bible of the expression occurring twice in 1Sa 28:7, אֶשֶׁת בִּעֲלִת אוֹב, a woman a mistress of Ob; Sept. ἐγγαστρίμυθος, i.e. a ventriloquist; Vulg. habens Pythonem, i.e. a Pythoness, SEE NECROMANCY ), that he might obtain from her that direction which Jehovah refused to afford him. She was a woman living at Endor, on the other side of Little Hermon.. According to the Hebrew tradition mentioned by Jerome, she was the mother of Abner, and hence her escape from the general massacre of the necromancers (see Leo Allatius, De Engastrimutho, cap. 6 in Critici Sacri, vol. 2). Volumes have been written on the question whether in the scene that follows we are to understand an imposture or a real apparition of Samuel. Eustathius and most of the fathers take the former view (representing it, however, as a figment of the devil); Origen, the latter view. Augustine wavers (ibid. ut supra, p. 1062- 1114). The Sept. of 1Sa 27:7 (by the above translation) and the  A.V. (by its omission of “himself” in 28:14, and insertion of “when” in 1Sa 27:12) lean to the former. Josephus (who pronounces a glowing eulogy on the woman, Ant. 6, 14, 2, 3) and the Sept. of 1Ch 10:13, to the latter. At this distance of time it is impossible to determine the relative amount of fraud or of reality, though the obvious meaning of the narrative itself tends to the hypothesis of some kind of apparition. She recognizes the disguised king first by the appearance of Samuel, seemingly from his threatening aspect or tone as towards his enemy. Saul apparently saw nothing, but listened to her description of a godlike figure of an aged man wrapped round with the royal or sacred robe. On hearing the denunciation which the apparition conveyed, Saul fell the whole length of his gigantic stature (see 1Sa 28:20, margin) on the ground, and remained motionless till the woman and his servants forced him to eat.

Assured of his own death in the coming engagement, and that of his sons, of the ruin of his army and the triumph of his most formidable enemies, whose invasion had tempted him to try this unhallowed expedient all announced to him by that same authority which had foretold his possession of the kingdom, and whose words had never been falsified — Saul, in a state of dejection which could not promise success to his followers (comp. Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 168), prepared as best he could to meet the enemy in Gilboa, on the extremity of the great plain of Esdraelon (on the localities of this battle, etc., see Hackett, Illustrations of Script. p. 178 sq.).

The next day the battle came on, and, according to Josephus (Ant. 6, 14,7), perhaps according to the spirit of the sacred narrative, his courage and self devotion returned. The Israelites were driven up the side of Gilboa. The three sons of Saul were slain (1Sa 31:2). Saul himself with his armor bearer was pursued by the archers and the charioteers of the enemy (1Sa 31:3; 2Sa 1:6). He was wounded in the stomach (Sept. 1Sa 31:3). His shield was cast away (2Sa 1:21). In his extremity, having in vain solicited death from the hand of his armor bearer (Doeg the Edomite — the Jews say, “a partner before of his master's crimes and now of his punishment”), Saul perished at last by his own sword (1Sa 31:4). According to another account (less trustworthy, or, perhaps, to be reconciled with the former by supposing that it describes a later incident), an Amalekite came up at the moment of his death wound (whether from himself or the enemy) and found him “fallen” but leaning on his spear (2Sa 1:6; 2Sa 1:10). The dizziness of  death was gathered over him (2Sa 1:9), but he was still alive; and he was, at his own request, put out of his pain by the Amalekite, who took off his royal diadem and bracelet and carried the news to David (2Sa 1:7-10). Not till then, according to Josephus (Ant. 6, 14, 7), did the faithful armor bearer fall on his sword and die with him (1Sa 31:5). The body, on being found by the Philistines on the morrow, was stripped and decapitated. The armor was sent into the Philistine cities, as if in retribution for the spoliation of Goliath, and finally deposited in the temple of Astarte, apparently in the neighboring Canaanitish city of Bethshan; and over the walls of the same city was hung the naked, headless corpse with those of his three sons (1Sa 31:9-10). The head was deposited (probably at Ashdod) in the temple of Dagon (1Ch 10:10). The corpse was removed from Bethshan by the gratitude of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who came over the Jordan by night, carried off the bodies, burned them, and buried them under the tamarisk at Jabesh (1Sa 31:13). It is pleasing to think that even the worst men have left behind them those in whom gratitude and affection are duties. Saul had those who mourned him, as some hand was found to have strewn flowers on the newly made grave of Nero. After the lapse of several years, his ashes and those of Jonathan were removed by David to their ancestral sepulchre at Zelah in Benjamin (2Sa 21:14).

IV. Saul's Character. — There is not in the sacred history, or in any other, a character more melancholy to contemplate than that of Saul. Naturally humble and modest, though of strong passions, he might have adorned a private station. In circumstances which did not expose him to strong temptation, he would probably have acted virtuously. But his natural rashness was controlled neither by a powerful understanding nor a scrupulous conscience; and the obligations of duty and the ties of gratitude, always felt by him too slightly, were totally disregarded when ambition, envy, and jealousy had taken possession of his mind. The diabolical nature of these passions is seen, with frightful distinctness, in Saul, whom their indulgence transformed into an unnatural and bloodthirsty monster, who constantly exhibited the moral infatuation, so common among those who have abandoned themselves to sin, of thinking that the punishment of one crime may be escaped by the perpetration of another. In him, also, is seen that moral anomaly or contradiction, which would be incredible did we not so often witness it, of an individual pursuing habitually a course which his better nature pronounces not only flagitious, but insane (1Sa 24:16; 1Sa 24:22). Saul knew that that person should be king whom yet he persisted in seeking to destroy, and so accelerated his own ruin. For it can hardly be doubted that the distractions and disaffection occasioned by Saul's persecution of David produced that weakness in his government which encouraged the Philistines to make the invasion in which himself and his sons perished. “I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath” (Hos 12:11). In the prolonged troubles and disastrous termination of this first reign, the Hebrews were vividly shown how vain was their favorite remedy for the mischiefs of foreign invasion and intestine discord.

Saul's character is in part illustrated by the fierce, wayward, fitful nature of the tribe, SEE BENJAMIN, and in part accounted for by the struggle between the old and new systems in which he found himself involved. To this we must add a taint of madness, which broke out in violent frenzy at times, leaving him with long lucid intervals. His affections were strong, as appears in his love both for David and his son Jonathan, but they were unequal to the wild accesses of religious zeal or insanity which ultimately led to his ruin. He was, like the earlier Judges, of whom in one sense he may be counted as the successor, remarkable for his strength and activity (2Sa 1:23); and he was, like the Homeric heroes, of gigantic stature, taller by head and shoulders than the rest of the people, and of that kind of beauty denoted by the Hebrew word “good” (1Sa 9:2), and which caused him to be compared to the gazelle — “the gazelle of Israel.” It was probably these external qualities which led to the epithet which is frequently attached to his name, “chosen” — “whom the Lord did choose” — “See ye (i.e. Look at) him whom the Lord hath chosen” (1Sa 9:17; 1Sa 10:24; 2Sa 21:6).

V. Literature. — See the treatises referred to in Darling, Cyclop. Bibliograph. Colossians 290-302; Stanley, Jewish Ch. 2, lect. 21; Ewald, Hist. of Israel, 2, 15 sq.; Niemeyer, Charak. 5, 75 sq.; Hasse, König Saul (Gries. 1854); Richardson, Saul, King of Israel (Edinb. 1858); Miller, Saul, First King of Israel (2d ed., Lond. 1866); Brooks, King Saul ([a tragedy], N.Y. 1871); and the monographs on his interview with the witch cited by Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 236. SEE KING.

3. The Jewish name of Paul (q.v.). This was the most distinguished name in the genealogies of the tribe of Benjamin, to which the apostle felt some pride in belonging (Rom 11:1; Php 3:5). He himself leads  us to associate his name with that of the Jewish king by the marked way in which he mentions Saul in his address at the Pisidian Antioch: “God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin” (Act 13:21). These indications are in harmony with the intensely Jewish spirit of which the life of the apostle exhibits so many signs. The early ecclesiastical writers did not fail to notice the prominence thus given by Paul to his tribe. Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 5, 1) applies to him the dying words of Jacob on Benjamin. And Jerome, in his Epitaphium Pauloe (§ 8), alluding to the preservation of the six hundred men of Benjamin after the affair of Gibeah (Judges 20:49), speaks of them as “trecentos [sic] viros propter Apostolum reservatos.” SEE BENJAMIN.

Nothing certain is known about the change of the apostle's name from Saul to Paul (Act 13:9). Two chief conjectures prevail concerning the change. (1) That of Jerome and Augustine, that the name was derived from Sergius Paulus, the first of his Gentile converts. (2) That which appears due to Lightfoot, that Paulus was the apostle's Roman name as a citizen of Tarsus, naturally adopted into common use by his biographer when his labors among the heathen commenced. The former of these is adopted by Olshausen and Meyer. It is also the view of Ewald (Gesch. 6, 419, 420), who seems to consider it self evident, and looks on the absence of any explanation of the change as a proof that it was so understood by all the readers of the Acts. However this may be, after Saul has taken his place definitively as the apostle to the Gentile world, his Jewish name is entirely dropped. Two divisions of his life are well marked by the use of the two names.

## Saul, John, D.D[[@Headword:Saul, John, D.D]]

             an Irish Methodist preacher, was born at Dromore, County Down, in July 1795. He was brought up in the Established Church, converted in his youth, and joined the Methodists to exercise his gift for preaching. He entered the ministry of the Irish Conference in 1826, and for forty-two years employed his talents to the glory of God and the good of man. He was some years treasurer of the Children's Fund, became a supernumerary in 1868, and removed to England. He was for fifty years a diligent student of the Bible in the original languages. He was a happy, pious, and useful minister, and died near Manchester, October 11, 1878. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1879, page 43.

## Sauli, Alessandro[[@Headword:Sauli, Alessandro]]

             an Italian Barnabite, was born at Milan in 1535. He studied at Pavia and Milan with such success that he knew the "Summa" of Aquinas almost by heart. In 1567 Sauli was made superior of his order, in 1570 bishop of Aleria, in 1591 bishop of Pavia, after having refused the archbishopric of Genoa. He died in 1592. Benedict XIV beatified him in 1741. See Argelati, Bibliotheca Script Mediol. (Milan, 1745), volume 2; Collezione di Vite dei Piu Distinti Religiosi della Congregazione dei Chierici RR. di S. Paole detti Barnabiti (ibid. 1861), volume 13; Lettere Inedite del Beat. Alessandro Sauli (Turin, 1868); Raccolta di Orazioni in Lode del Beat. Alessandro Sauli (Lucca, 1743); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Saumur[[@Headword:Saumur]]

             a Protestant theological seminary, located in a town of the same name, in the department of the Maine-et-Loire. It was suppressed in 1685, but during its continuance exerted considerable influence upon Protestant  thought in France. Its tendency was towards Arminianism. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 222, n. 15, 225, 225 a, 247.

## Saunders, Ephraim Dod, D.D[[@Headword:Saunders, Ephraim Dod, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Mendham, N.J., September 30, 1809. After graduating at Yale College in 1831, he remained in New Haven for several months for the purpose of theological study. In the autumn of 1832 he went to Virginia, where he spent a year in teaching and study, He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of East Hanover, in session at Nottoway, October 18, 1833. After four years of pastoral work,  during which time he collected money to build two churches, he opened a school for boys in Cumberland County, which he removed to Goochland County. In 1843 he became principal of the Classical Institute at Petersburg, Virginia, and held this position for four years. In 1848 he visited Europe, and on his return established a Church in Pottsville, Pennsylvania. In 1851 he removed to West Philadelphia, and founded a school for boys, which was afterwards chartered as a college. During the late war a military department was established, the pupils being styled the "Courtland Saunders Cadets," in honor of the founder's only child, who was killed in battle, in September 1862. Dr. Saunders was made chairman of the Bounty Fund Commission of Philadelphia. In 1871 he offered to give his real estate in West Philadelphia to the Presbyterian Alliance for the purpose of founding a hospital. He also obtained subscriptions to the amount of one hundred thousand dollars towards the endowment of the hospital. He died in West Philadelphia, September 13, 1872. See Obituary Record of Yale College, 1873.

## Saunders, William T[[@Headword:Saunders, William T]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Roman Catholic parents, in Dublin, Aug. 16, 1836. In his sixteenth year he emigrated to America, landing at New Orleans, April 13, 1852. In Sept., 1853, he was converted at a camp meeting, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He spent one term at Meadville College, but for five vears after led an unsettled life. In 1859 he was admitted on trial in the Southeastern Indiana Conference and appointed to Vernon Circuit. He also served at New Washington; Patriot Circuit; Belleview; as chaplain of the Eighty-third Indiana Volunteers; Roberts and Trinity churches, Madison; Vevay; and Rising Sun. He continued to fill his pulpit until within four weeks of his death, which took place July 29, 1871. Mr. Saunders was a  man of diligent study, careful preparation for the pulpit, faithful as a pastor, while his piety was of the healthy, fruit bearing kind. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 184.

## Sauqua Behkr[[@Headword:Sauqua Behkr]]

             (Socquabekr), in Norse mythology, was the stream of death, a place where Saga dwelt, and which Odin visited each day in order to become drunk on the precious mead which she possessed, and to enjoy her love.

## Sauras[[@Headword:Sauras]]

             a Hindu sect who worship only Suryapati, or the sun god. They are few in number, and scarcely differ from the rest of the Hindus in their general observances. Their mark on the forehead is made in a particular manner, with red sandalwood, and their necklace is of crystal. They eat one meal without salt every Sunday, and on every occasion of the sun's entrance into a sign of the zodiac; and they cannot eat till they have noticed the sun.

## Saure, Conrad[[@Headword:Saure, Conrad]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Germany, and emigrated to this country in 1845. He studied theology privately, and commenced preaching in Cincinnati in 1856; two years later he was regularly ordained, and installed as pastor of the Salem church. His first sermon, it is said, was preached to six hearers. At the time of his death, in 1873, his congregation numbered between seven and eight hundred members. He was an acceptable and earnest preacher, and a faithful, laborious, and successful pastor. See the Ref. Ch. Mess. June 4, 1873. (D.Y.H.)

## Saurin, Elie[[@Headword:Saurin, Elie]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born Aug. 28, 1639, at Usseau, Dauphiny. He was the son of a village pastor, who conducted his education, and at last sent him to study theology at Geneva. Admitted to the ministry in 1661, he preached first at Venterot, and was called to the church at Embrun in the succeeding year. Having refused to uncover his head before a priest who was carrying the sacrament to a sick person, Saurin was banished from the country. He retired to Holland, where he took charge of a church at Delft, in 1665. He was employed to examine the religious opinions of the mystic Labadie, and offered to refute them  publicly. So well did Saurin succeed that he procured the deposition of his opponent, and, in order that he should not be suspected of any personal interest in the affair, obtained for Labadie the church at Middleburg. In 1671 Saurin accepted the place of Wolzogen at Utrecht. Here he lived for two years, during the French occupation, in continual agitation caused by his disputes with Jurieu. He began the contest by stating that some of the doctrines of Jurieu were heterodox and very dangerous. Efforts were made to reconcile the two pastors, and the synod of Leeuwarden forbade their writing against each other on pain of excommunication, but all to no effect. The last years of Saurin were devoted to the publication of theological works. He died at Utrecht, on Easter Sunday, 1703. We have from his pen, Examen de la Theologie de Jurieu: — Defense de la Doctrine e d l'Eglise Reformee, etc.: — Traite de l'Amour de Dieu: — Reflexions sur les Droits de la Conscience: — and a posthumous work, Traite de l'Amour du Prochain.

## Saurin, Jacques[[@Headword:Saurin, Jacques]]

             the most eloquent preacher of French Protestantism, was born at Nimes Jan. 6, 1677. In his eighth year his family, fleeing from the persecutions of Louis XIV, settled in Geneva. Quitting school at the age of sixteen, he joined a regiment of Savoyards in the general war against the French tyrant, and served nearly four years, till the Peace of Ryswick, in 1697. On his return, he took tip the study of theology under Tronchin, Pictet, and Turretin. It was only after many inner struggles that he conquered his frivolity and skepticism, and passed through the throes of the new birth. Once clearly converted, his life and influence were radically changed. His subsequent renown for eloquence began to take form even before his graduation. His mere schoolboy exercises in sermonizing attracted great attention. Entering the ministry in 1700, he took charge of a society of French Walloons in London, and preached with great success for four years. In 1705, while on a journey of recreation in Holland, he preached a few sermons and made such an impression as to occasion a call to labor at the Hague. This call he accepted; and here, for the remainder of his life twenty-five years — he labored with equal fame and usefulness. He soon became known as “the great Saurin,” the “Chrysostom of Protestantism.” The large church in which he preached was constantly overcrowded. It was not merely his eloquence, his fine manner, his melodious voice, which thus held and charmed for a quarter of a century all classes of society, but it was chiefly the weighty substance of what he said and the holy earnestness with  which he said it. Learned men (Clericus) and cold critics often went to hear him with deep prejudice, but uniformly they came away glad and captivated. The celebrated Abbadie exclaimed, after first hearing him,” Is it a man, or is it an angel!” Saurin was not a mere preacher, but also an organizer. He founded schools and asylums, and planned a grand scheme of missionary work throughout the Dutch colonies. He was also a systematic writer. In 1722 he issued an educational work, Abrege de la Theologie et de la Morale Chretienne. In 1724 he issued his Catechisme, which enjoyed a long popularity in Holland and at Geneva. In 1725 appeared at the Hague L'Etat du Christianisme en France, a collection of letters in favor of his fellow Protestants of France. A work which appeared between 1720 and 1728, Discours Historiques, Critiques, Theologiques et Morceaux sur les Evenements les plus Memorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament, though an able work in itself, had the unfortunate result of calling upon Saurin such a series of envious criticisms from his brother pastors as to embitter his last years and even to hasten his death. It is a memorable instance of the well known odium theologicum. It had no other basis or pretext than a few unguarded expressions in regard to the so-called falsehood of necessity.

But the posthumous fame of Saurin rests upon his Sermons. Of these he himself published (1707-25) five volumes. After his death, his son edited, from his papers, seven additional volumes. The whole twelve volumes have been several times reissued. The best edition is that of the Hague, in 1749; the most recent is that of Paris, in 1835. A good selection was published by Weiss, at Paris, in 1854, Sermons Choisis de Saurin, avec une Notice sur sa Vie. Most of these sermons have enjoyed great popularity in other languages. Five volumes of the Sermons were published in English by R. Robinson, in 1775. As to the form of Saurin's sermons, they are too systematic and scholastic for the taste of the present; they are encumbered with too much of learned citation. Much that they contain would be more appropriate in the professor's chair than in the pulpit. As compared with the great Catholic sermonizers, Saurin lacks the exquisite polish of Bossuet; nor does he search the secret recesses of the heart with as sharp an eye as Bourdaloue; nor are his appeals as pathetic as those of Massillon; but he surpasses them all in this, that he preaches the whole Gospel of Christ, and that he is unconscious of dependence on any other external authority than the simple Word of God. In manner, Saurin was impetuous in the extreme; greater self control would have given him greater power.  He sometimes spent so much force of voice in his opening prayer and exordium as to be very much exhausted before the close. Sometimes his voice would almost fail. The chief defect in his manner was a certain lack of unction. The understanding was convinced, the conscience was awakened, the will was aroused, but the heart was not fully subdued. After Saurin's death, his great work, Disccurs (2 vols. fol.), was continued by Roques and Beausobre, so that the whole consisted of six volumes. See Van Oosterzee, Jacques Saurin (Brus. 1856); Sayous, Hist. de la Litter. Franc. a l'Etr.; Weiss, Hist. des Ref. Prot. de France; Herzog, Real- Encykl. 13, 437-444. (J.P.L.)

## Saurus[[@Headword:Saurus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a noted highway robber on the borders of Elis, who was killed by Hercules.

## Saussay, Andre De[[@Headword:Saussay, Andre De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1589, and died Sept. 9, 1675, at Toul. His parents being poor, he was educated at the Hospital of the Holy Spirit, and on completing his studies took orders. He employed himself in preaching and controversy; was in favor at the court; and became cure of Saint-Leu, apostolic prothonotary, almoner of the king, and grand vicar of the Church of Paris. Elected bishop of Toul in 1649, he did not take possession of his see until 1657, on account of ecclesiastical troubles with its chapter. He held this office till his death. Saussay was the author of several religious works in Latin, which show great learning, but little judgment or critical acumen — as Genealogie des Heretiques Sacrementaires, etc.: — De Sacro Ritu Proeferendi Crucem, etc.

## Sautrantika[[@Headword:Sautrantika]]

             is the name of the second of the four great schools or systems of Buddhism, the three others being called Vaibhashika, Madhyamika, and Yogachara. They recognize the authority of the Sutras (q.v.), but reject that of the Abhidharma. See Köppen, Die Religion des Buddha (Berlin, 1857); Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Savagarad[[@Headword:Savagarad]]

             is the cap of an Armenian priest, made of cloth of gold, with an orb and cross on the top.

## Savage Island Version[[@Headword:Savage Island Version]]

             SEE NIUEAN VERSION.

## Savage, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Savage, Henry, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Eldsfield, Worcestershire, in 1604. He entered Baliol College, Oxford, as a commoner in 1621; took the degree of B.A. in Nov., 1625; in 1628 was made probationer fellow; and in 1630 completed his master's degree. On the commencement of the Rebellion, he traveled into France with William (lord) Sandys, whose sister, lady Mary, he afterwards married. He obtained the mastership of his college Feb. 20, 1650, and took his degree of D.D. the next year. He was made prebendary of Gloucester in 1665, and rector of Bladen, in Oxfordshire. He died, master of Baliol College, June 2, 1672, and was buried in the chapel. He published some pamphlets on infant baptism against John Tombes, and on Church reformations against Cornelius Burgess; but is best known by his Baliofergus; or, A Commentary upon the Foundation, Founders, and Affairs of Baliol College (Oxon. 1668, 4to).

## Savage, Isaac Aylsworth[[@Headword:Savage, Isaac Aylsworth]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Edinburgh, Saratoga County, N.Y., Dec. 28, 1814. He embraced religion at the age of sixteen, graduated at the Wesleyan University in Aug., 1841, and, having been already received on trial in the New England Conference, went immediately to South Boston. He was ordained deacon in 1843 and elder in 1845. He occupied appointments in Lowell, Springfield, Boston, and Holliston until 1854, when, after a protracted illness, he fell asleep on Feb. 16. Mr. Savage was an excellent scholar, an able and faithful minister, a devoted friend. See Minutes of Annual Con: 1854, p. 359.

## Savage, John Adams, D.D[[@Headword:Savage, John Adams, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Salem, Washington County, N.Y., Oct. 9, 1800. He received his preparatory training in Salem Academy; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1822; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach by Washington Associate Reformed Presbytery in 1825, and ordained by the same presbytery in 1827. His first charge was at Fort Covington, Franklin County, N.Y., where he remained until 1832, when he was called to the church in Ogdensburg, N.Y. Here his labors were abundant and successful. He remained at Ogdensburg nearly twenty years, and probably no man ever exerted so wide and powerful an influence for religion and for Presbyterianism in Northern New York as he. In 1850, at the earnest solicitation of Dr. Van Rensselaer, then corresponding secretary of the Board of Education, he went to Wisconsin, and took charge of Carroll College, at Wauketa, then in its infancy. Here he labored arduously in founding and building up a college in a new country. The charter had been obtained, and some little progress made in the enterprise before his arrival, but properly Dr. Savage is to be regarded as the founder of Carroll College. He died Dec. 13, 1864. Dr. Savage was a man of great sagacity, deep piety, and excellence of character; as a preacher, able and instructive; as a theologian, clear, sound, and scriptural, well meriting the honorary degree of D.D. conferred on him by his alma mater after his assumption of the presidency of the college. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 167. (J.L.S.)

## Savage, John, D.D[[@Headword:Savage, John, D.D]]

             an English divine of the last century, was a member of Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees, and was D.D. of both universities. He was rector, first of Bygrave, then of Clothall, Herts, and lecturer of St. George's, Hanover Square, London. He was at one time president of the famous club at Royston. He died March 24, 1747, from a fall. Besides a visitation and an assize sermon, there are attributed to him the following:  The Turkish History (abridged from Knolles and Rycaut [1701, 2 vols. 8vo]): Collection of Letters of the Ancients, etc. (1703, 8vo).

## Savage, Samuel Morton, D.D[[@Headword:Savage, Samuel Morton, D.D]]

             a learned Independent minister, was born in London in 1721, and educated under Dr. Jennings. He became professor of divinity at Hoxton; assistant minister of St. Mary Axe, London, in 1747; and sole pastor in 1756. He died in 1791. He published Sermons on several evangelical and practical subjects (Taunton, 1796, 8vo).

## Savage, Thomas[[@Headword:Savage, Thomas]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Boston, Mass., Sept. 2, 1794. He pursued his preparatory studies at Phillips Academy, in Andover; graduated with honor at Harvard University, Cambridge; and studied  theology at the divinity school connected with that institution. In 1815 he accepted an invitation to become a private tutor in Louisiana, in the vicinity of Baton Rouge, where he continued to teach and preach for nearly seven years. In 1824 he returned to Boston. and on July 5, 1826, was installed pastor of the church in Bedford, N.H., which pastorate lasted forty years. He died May 8, 1866. Mr. Savage possessed a truly symmetrical character. His ministry was in conformity with such a character. He was a practical and impressive preacher, and an accurate scholar — excelling perhaps in the classics, but familiar with the best models of his native tongue. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 196. (J.L.S.)

## Savaran[[@Headword:Savaran]]

             (Σαυαράν v.r. Αὐαράν), an erroneous form (1Ma 6:43) for AVARAN SEE AVARAN (q.v.), an epithet of the Maccabee Eleazar (q.v.).

## Savary, N[[@Headword:Savary, N]]

             a French writer and traveler. In 1776 he visited Egypt, and studied the antiquities and manners of the country. On his return he visited the Archipelago, and in 1780 published his translation of the Koran, which was succeeded by his Travels in Egypt, Letters on Greece, and a Grammar of the Modern Arabic. He died in 1788.

## Savastano, Francesco Eulalia[[@Headword:Savastano, Francesco Eulalia]]

             an Italian poet, was born in 1657 at Naples, where he died Oct. 23, 1717. He was a Jesuit, preached successfully, and taught rhetoric, philosophy, and theology in the College of Naples. He is the author of a Latin poem entitled Bo. tanicorum Liber.

## Savias[[@Headword:Savias]]

             Garbled Greek

(Tavici), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 8:2) of the Hebrews name UZZI SEE UZZI (q.v.), the ancestor of Ezra (Ezr 7:4).

## Savigni, Order Of[[@Headword:Savigni, Order Of]]

             a religious body connected with the Romish Church, founded in the 12th century by Vitalis de Mortain, a disciple of the famous Robert of  Arbiscelle, who instituted the Order of Fontevraud. The Order of Savigni, after continuing for a time, became merged in that of the Cistercians (q.v.).

## Savior[[@Headword:Savior]]

             a title applied in Scripture, in its highest sense, to Jesus Christ, but in a subordinate way to earthly deliverers. We present a comparatively brief abstract of this very extensive subject. SEE SOTERIOLOGY.

I. The Word itself. — The term “Savior,” as applied to our Lord Jesus Christ, represents the Greek soter (σωτήρ), which in turn represents certain derivatives from the Hebrew root yasha ( יָשִׁע), particularly the participle of the Hiphil form moshia (מוֹשַׁיעִ), which is usually rendered “Savior” in the A.V. (e.g. Isaiah 46:15; 49:26). In considering the true import of “Savior,” it is essential for us to examine the original terms answering to it, including in our view the use of soter in the Sept., whence it was more immediately derived by the writers of the New Test., and further noticing the cognate terms “to save” and “salvation,” which express respectively the action and the results of the Savior”s office. SEE JESUS.

1. The term soter is of more frequent occurrence in the Sept. than the term “Savior” in the A.V. of the Old Test. It represents not only the word moshia above mentioned, but also very frequently the nouns yesha (יֶשִׁע) and yeshuah ( יַשׁוּעָה), which, though properly expressive of the abstract notion “salvation,” are yet sometimes used in a concrete sense for “Savior.” We may cite as an example Isa 52:11, “Behold, thy salvation cometh, his reward is with him,” where evidently “salvation” = Savior. So again in passages where these terms are connected immediately with the person of the Godhead, as in Psalm 58:20, “the God our Savior” (A.V. “God of our salvation”). Not only in such cases as these, but in many others where the sense does not require it, the Sept. has soter where the A.V. has “salvation;” and thus the word “Savior” was more familiar to the ear of the reader of the Old Test. in our Lord”s age than it is to us.

2. The same observation holds good with regard to the verb σώζειν, and the substantive σωτηρία, as used in the Sept. An examination of the passages in which they occur shows that they stand as equivalents for words conveying the notions of well being, succor, peace, and the like. We have further to notice σωτηρία in the sense of recovery of the bodily  health (2Ma 3:32), together with the etymological connection supposed to exist between the terms σωτήρ and σῶμα, to which Paul evidently alludes in Eph 5:23; Php 3:20-21.

3. If we turn to the Hebrew terms, we cannot fail to be struck with their comprehensiveness. Our verb “to save” implies, in its ordinary sense, the rescue of a person from actual or impending danger. This is undoubtedly included in the Hebrew root yasha, and may be said to be its ordinary sense, as testified by the frequent accompaniment of the preposition min ( מַןcomp. the σώσει ἀπό which the angel gives in explanation of the name Jesus, Mat 1:21). But yasha, beyond this, expresses assistance and protection of every kind — assistance in aggressive measures, protection against attack; and, in a secondary sense, the results of such assistance victory, safety, prosperity, and happiness. We may, cite as an instance of the aggressive sense, Deu 20:4, “To fight for you against your enemies, to save you;” of protection against attack, Isa 26:1,” Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks;” of victory, 2Sa 8:6, “The Lord preserved David,” i.e. gave him victory; of prosperity and happiness, Isa 60:18, “Thou shalt call thy walls Salvation;” Isa 56:10, “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation.” No better instance of this last sense can be adduced than the exclamation “Hosanna,” meaning,”( Save, I beseech thee,” which was uttered as a prayer for God's blessing on any joyous occasion (Psa 118:25), as at our Lord's entry into Jerusalem, when the etymological connection of the terms Hosanna and Jesus could not have been lost on the ear of the Hebrew (Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15). It thus appears that the Hebrew and Greek terms had their positive as well as their negative side; in other words, that they expressed the presence of blessing as well as the absence of danger, actual security as well as the removal of insecurity. The Latin language possessed in the classical period no proper equivalent for the Greek σωτήρ. This appears from the introduction of the Greek word itself in a Latinized form, and from Cicero”s remark (in Verr. Acts 2:2, 63) that there was no one word which expressed the notion qui salutem dedit. Tacitus (Ann. 15, 71) uses conservator, and Pliny (22, 5) servator. The term salvator appears appended as a title of Jupiter in an inscription of the age of Trajan (Gruter, p. 19, No. 5). This was adopted by Christian writers as the most adequate equivalent for σωτήρ, though objections were evidently raised against it (Augustine, Serm. 299, § 6). Another term,  salutificator, was occasionally used by Tertullian (De Resurr. Carn. 47; De Carn. Chr. 14).

4. The historical personages to whom the terms are applied further illustrate this view. The judges are styled “saviors,” as having rescued their country from a state of bondage (Jdg 3:9; Jdg 3:15, A.V. “deliverer;” Neh 9:27); a “savior” was subsequently raised up in the person of Jeroboam II to deliver Israel from the Syrians (2Ki 13:5); and in the same sense Josephus styles the deliverance from Egypt a “salvation” (Ant. 3, 1, 1). Joshua, on the other hand, verified the promise contained in his name by his conquests over the Canaanites: the Lord was his helper in an aggressive sense. Similarly, the office of the “saviors” promised in Oba 1:21 was to execute vengeance on Edom. The names Isaiah, Jeshua, Ishi, Hosea, Hoshea, and, lastly, Jesus, are all expressive of the general idea of assistance from the Lord. The Greek soter was in a similar manner applied in the double sense of a deliverer from foreign foes, as in the case of Ptolemy Soter, and a general protector, as in the numerous instances where it was appended as the title of heathen deities.

5. There are many indications in the Old Test. that the idea of a spiritual salvation, to be effected by God alone, was by no means foreign to the mind of the pious Hebrew. In the Psalms there are numerous petitions to God to save from the effects of sin (e.g. Psa 39:8; Psa 79:9). Isaiah, in particular, appropriates the term “savior” to Jehovah (Isa 43:11), and connects it with the notions of justice and righteousness (Isa 45:21; Isa 55:16, 17): he adduces it as the special manner in which Jehovah reveals himself to man (Isa 45:15): he hints at the means to be adopted for effecting salvation in passages where he connects the term “savior” with “redeemer” (goal), as in Isa 41:14; Isa 49:26; Isaiah 55:16, and again with “ransom,” as in 43:3. Similar notices are scattered over the prophetical books (e.g. Zec 9:9; Hos 1:7), and though in many instances these notices admitted of a reference to proximate events of a temporal nature, they evidently looked to higher things, and thus fostered in the mind of the Hebrew the idea of a “Savior” who should far surpass in his achievements the “saviors” that had as yet appeared. The mere sound of the word would conjure up before his imagination visions of deliverance, security, peace, and prosperity.

II. The Work of the Savior. — This we propose to trace as developed in the several portions of the New Testament. .

1. The first three evangelists, as we know, agree in showing that Jesus unfolded his message to the disciples by degrees. He wrought the miracles that were to be the credentials of the Messiah; he laid down the great principles of the Gospel morality, until he had established in the minds of the Twelve the conviction that he was the Christ of God. Then, as the clouds of doom grew darker, and the malice of the Jews became more intense, he turned a new page in his teaching. Drawing from his disciples the confession of their faith in him as Christ, he then passed abruptly, so to speak, to the truth that remained to be learned in the last few months of his ministry, that his work included suffering as well as teaching (Mat 16:20-21). He was instant in pressing this unpalatable doctrine home to his disciples from this time to the end. Four occasions when he prophesied his bitter death are on record, and they are probably only examples out of many more (Mat 16:21). We grant that in none of these places does the word “sacrifice” occur; and that the mode of speaking is somewhat obscure, as addressed to minds unprepared, even then, to bear the full weight of a doctrine so repugnant to their hopes. But that he must (δεῖ) go and meet death; that the powers of sin and of this world are let loose against him for a time, so that he shall be betrayed to the Jews, rejected, delivered by them to the Gentiles, and by them be mocked and scourged, crucified, and slain; and that all this shall be done to achieve a foreseen work, and accomplish all things written of him by the prophets — these we do certainly find. They invest the death of Jesus with a peculiar significance; they set the mind inquiring what the meaning can be of this hard necessity that is laid on him. For the answer we look to other places; but at least there is here no contradiction to the doctrine of sacrifice, though the Lord does not yet say, “I bear the wrath of God against your sins in your stead; I become a curse for you.” Of the two sides of this mysterious doctrine — that Jesus dies for us willingly, and that” he dies to bear a doom laid on him as of necessity, because some one must bear it — it is the latter side that is made prominent. In all the passages it pleases Jesus to speak, not of his desire to die, but of the burden laid on him, and the power given to others against him.

2. Had the doctrine been explained no further, there would have been much to wait for. But the series of announcements in these passages leads up to one more definite and complete. It cannot he denied that the words of the institution of the Lord”s supper speak most distinctly of a sacrifice: “Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new covenant;” or, to follow Luke,  “the new covenant in my blood.” We are carried back by these words to the first covenant, to the altar with twelve pillars, and the burned offerings and peace offerings of oxen, and the blood of the victims sprinkled on the altar and on the people, and the words of Moses as he sprinkled it: “Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words” (Exodus 24). No interpreter has ever failed to draw from these passages the true meaning: “When my sacrifice is accomplished, my blood shall be the sanction of the new covenant.” The word “sacrifice” is wanting; but sacrifice, and nothing else, is described. And the words are no mere figure used for illustration, and laid aside when they have served that turn. “Do this in remembrance of me.” They are the words in which the Church is to interpret the act of Jesus to the end of time. They are reproduced exactly by Paul (1Co 11:25). Then, as now, Christians met together, and by a solemn act declared that they counted the blood of Jesus as a sacrifice wherein a new covenant was sealed; and of the blood of that sacrifice they partook by faith, professing themselves thereby willing to enter the covenant and be sprinkled with the blood.

3. So far we have examined the three “synoptic” Gospels. They follow a historical order. In the early chapters of all three the doctrine of our Lord”s sacrifice is not found, because he will first answer the question about himself, “Who is this?” before he shows them “What is his work.” But at length the announcement is made, enforced, repeated; until, when the feet of the betrayer are ready for their wicked errand, a command is given which secures that the death of Jesus shall be described forever as a sacrifice and nothing else, sealing a new covenant and carrying good to many. Lest the doctrine of atonement should seem to be an after thought, as, indeed, De Wette has tried to represent it, John preserves the conversation with Nicodemus, which took place early in the ministry; and there, under the figure of the brazen serpent lifted up, the atoning virtue of the Lord”s death is fully set forth. “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life” (Joh 3:14-15). As in this intercessory act the image pf the deadly, hateful, and accursed (Gen 3:14-15) reptile became by God”s decree the means of health to all who looked on it earnestly, so does Jesus in the form of sinful man, of a deceiver of the people (Mat 27:63), of Antichrist (12:24; Joh 18:33), of one accursed (Gal 3:13), become the means of our salvation; so that whoever fastens the earnest gaze of faith on him shall  not perish, but have eternal life. There is even a significance in the words “lifted up;” the Lord used, probably, the word דק, which, in older Hebrew, meant to “lift up” in the widest sense, but began in the Aramaic to have the restricted meaning of “lifting up for punishment.” With Christ the lifting up was a seeming disgrace, a true triumph and elevation. But the context in which these verses occur is as important as the verses themselves. Nicodemus comes as an inquirer; he is told that a man must be born again, and then he is directed to the death of Jesus as the means of that regeneration. The earnest gaze of the wounded soul is to be the condition of its cure; and that gaze is to be turned, not to Jesus on the mountain or in the temple, but on the cross. This, then, is no passing allusion, but it is the substance of the Christian teaching addressed to an earnest seeker after truth.

Another passage claims a reverent attention — “If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world” (Joh 6:51). He is the bread; and he will give the bread. If his presence on earth were the expected food, it was given already; but would he speak of “drinking his blood” (Joh 6:53), which can only refer to the dead? It is on the cross that he will afford this food to his disciples. We grant that this whole passage has occasioned as much disputing among Christian commentators as it did among the Jews who heard it; and for the same reason — for the hardness of the saying. But there stands the saying; and no candid person can refuse to see a reference in it to the death of him that speaks.

In that discourse, which has well been called the prayer of consecration offered by our High priest, there is another passage which cannot be alleged as evidence to one who thinks that any word applied by Jesus to his disciples and himself must bear in both cases precisely the same sense, but which is really pertinent to this inquiry — “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself that they also might be sanctified through the truth” (Joh 17:17-19). The word ἁγιάζειν, “sanctify,” “consecrate,” is used in the Sept. for the offering of sacrifice (Lev 22:2) and for the dedication of a man to the divine service (Num 3:15). Here the present tense, “I consecrate,” used in a discourse in which our Lord says he is “no more in the world,” is conclusive against the interpretation “I dedicate my life to thee;” for life is over. No self dedication, except that by death, can now be spoken of as  present. “I dedicate myself to thee, in my death, that these may be a people consecrated to thee;” such is the great thought in this sublime passage, which suits well with his other declaration that the blood of his sacrifice sprinkles them for a new covenant with God. To the great majority of expositors from Chrysostom and Cyril the doctrine of reconciliation through the death of Jesus is asserted in these verses.

The Redeemer has already described himself as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:17-18), taking care to distinguish his death from that of one who dies against his will in striving to compass some other aim — “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.”

Other passages that relate to his death will occur to the memory of any Bible reader. The corn of wheat that dies in the ground to bear much fruit (Joh 10:24) is explained by his own words elsewhere, where he says that he came “to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many” (Mat 20:28).

4. Thus, then, speaks Jesus of himself. What say his witnesses of him? “Behold the Lamb of God,” says the Baptist, “which taketh away the sin of the world” (Joh 1:29). Commentators differ about the allusion implied in that name. But take any one of their opinions, and a sacrifice is implied. Is it the paschal lamb that is referred to? Is it the lamb of the daily sacrifice? Either way the death of the victim is brought before us. But the allusion, in all probability, is to the well known prophecy of Isaiah (ch. 54), to the Lamb brought to the slaughter, who bore our griefs and carried our sorrows. See this passage discussed fully in the notes of Meyer, Lange (Bibelwerke), and Alford. — The reference to the paschal lamb finds favor with Grotius and others; the reference to Isaiah is approved by Chrysostom and many others. The taking away of sin (αἴρειν) of the Baptist, and the bearing it (φέρειν, Sept.) of Isaiah, have one meaning and answer to the Hebrew word נָשָׂא. To take the sins on himself is to remove them from the sinners; and how can this be through his death except in the way of expiation by that death itself?

5. The apostles, after the resurrection, preach no moral system, but a belief in and love of Christ, the crucified and risen Lord, through whom, if they  repent, men shall obtain salvation. This was Peter”s preaching on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2); and he appealed boldly to the prophets on the ground of an expectation of a suffering Messiah (3:18). Philip traced out for the eunuch, in that picture of suffering holiness in the well known chapter of Isaiah, the lineaments of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 8; Isaiah 53). The first sermon to a Gentile household proclaimed Christ slain and risen, and added “that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins” (Acts 10). Paul at Antioch preaches “a Savior Jesus” (Act 13:23); “through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Act 13:38-39). At Thessalonica all that we learn of this apostle”s preaching is “that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ” (Act 17:3). Before Agrippa he declared that he had preached always “that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead” (Act 26:23); and it was this declaration that convinced his royal hearer that he was a crazed fanatic. The account of the first founding of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles is concise and fragmentary; and sometimes we have hardly any means of judging what place the sufferings of Jesus held in the teaching of the apostles; but when we read that they “preached Jesus,” or the like, it is only fair to infer from other passages that the cross of Christ was never concealed, whether Jews or Greeks or barbarians were the listeners. And this very pertinacity shows how much weight they attached to the facts of the life of our Lord. They did not merely repeat in each new place the pure morality of Jesus as he uttered it in the Sermon on the Mount: of such lessons we have no record. They took in their hands, as the strongest weapon, the fact that a certain Jew crucified afar off in Jerusalem was the Son of God, who had died to save men from their sins; and they offered to all alike an interest, through faith, in the resurrection from the dead of this outcast of his own people. No wonder that Jews and Greeks, judging in their worldly way, thought this strain of preaching came of folly or madness, and turned from what they thought unmeaning jargon.

6. We are able to complete from the epistles our account of the teaching of the apostles on the doctrine of atonement. “The Man Christ Jesus” is the mediator between God and man, for in him the human nature, in its sinless purity, is lifted up to the divine, so that he, exempt from guilt, can plead for the guilty (1Ti 2:5; 1Jn 2:1-2; Hebrew 7:25). Thus he is  the second Adam that shall redeem the sin of the first; the interests of men are bound up in him, since he has power to take them all into himself (Eph 5:29-30; Rom 5:12; Rom 5:17; Rom 12:5; 1Co 15:22). This salvation was provided by the Father, to “reconcile us to himself” (2Co 5:18), to whom the name of “Savior” thus belongs (Luk 1:47); and our redemption is a signal proof of the love of God to us (1Jn 4:10). Not less is it a proof of the love of Jesus, since he freely lays down his life for us — offers it as a precious gift, capable of purchasing all the lost (1Ti 2:6; Tit 2:14; Eph 1:7; comp. Mat 20:28). But there is another side of the truth more painful to our natural reason. How came this exhibition of divine love to be needed? Because wrath had already gone out against man. The clouds of God's anger gathered thick over the whole human race; they discharged themselves on Jesus only. God has made him to be sin for us who knew no sin (2Co 5:21); he is made “a curse” (a thing accursed) for us that the curse that hangs over us may be removed (Gal 3:13); he bore our sins in his own body on the tree (1Pe 2:24). There are those who would see on the page of the Bible only the sunshine of the divine love; but the muttering thunders of divine wrath against sin are heard there also; and he who alone was no child of wrath meets the shock of the thunderstorm, becomes a curse for us and a vessel of wrath; and the rays of love break out of that thunder gloom and shine on the bowed head of him who hangs on the cross, dead for our sins.

7. We have spoken, and advisedly, as if the New Test. were, as to this doctrine, one book in harmony with itself. That there are in the New Test. different types of the one true doctrine may be admitted without peril to the doctrine. The principal types are four in number.

(1.) In the Epistle of James there is a remarkable absence of all explanations of the doctrine of the atonement; but this admission does not amount to so much as may at first appear. True, the keynote of the epistle is that the Gospel is the law made perfect, and that it is a practical moral system in which man finds himself free to keep the divine law. But with him Christ is no mere lawgiver appointed to impart the Jewish system. He knows that Elias is a man like himself, but of the person of Christ he speaks in a different spirit. He calls himself “a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.” who is “the Lord of glory.” He speaks of the Word of Truth of which Jesus has been the utterer. He knows that faith in the Lord of glory is inconsistent with time serving and “respect of persons” (Jam 1:1; Jam 1:18; Jam 2:1). “There is one lawgiver,” he says,” who is able to save and to destroy” (4:12); and this refers, no doubt, to Jesus, whose second coming he holds up as a motive to obedience (5:7-9). These and like expressions remove this epistle far out of the sphere of Ebionitish teaching. The inspired writer sees the Savior, in the Father”s glory, preparing to return to judge the quick and dead. He puts forth Christ as prophet and king, for he makes him teacher and judge of the world; but the office of the priest he does not dwell on. Far be it from us to say that he knows it not. Something must have taken place before he could treat his hearers with confidence, as free creatures able to resist temptations, and even to meet temptations with joy. He treats “your faith” as something founded already, not to be prepared by this epistle (1:2, 3, 21). His purpose is a purely practical one. There is no intention to unfold a Christology such as that which makes the Epistle to the Romans so valuable. Assuming that Jesus has manifested himself and begotten anew the human race, he seeks to make them pray with undivided hearts, and be considerate to the poor, and strive with lusts, for which they, and not God, are responsible; and bridle their tongues, and show their fruits by their works (see Neander, Pflanzung, b. 6, c. 3; Schmid, Theologie des N.T. pt. 2; and Dorner, Christologie, 1, 95).

(2.) In the teaching of Peter the doctrine of the person of our Lord is connected strictly with that of his work as Savior and Messiah. The frequent mention of his sufferings shows the prominent place he would give them; and he puts forward as the ground of his own right to teach that he was “a witness of the sufferings of Christ” (1Pe 5:1). The atoning virtue of those sufferings he dwells on with peculiar emphasis, and not less so on the purifying influence of the atonement on the hearts of believers. He repeats again and again that Christ died for us (1Pe 2:21; 1Pe 3:18; 1Pe 4:1); that he bare our sins in his own body on the tree (1Pe 2:24). He bare them; and what does this phrase suggest but the goat that “shall bear” the iniquities of the people off into the land that was not inhabited? (Lev 16:22), or else the feeling the consequences of sin, as the word is used elsewhere (Lev 20:17; Lev 20:19)? We have to choose between the cognate ideas of sacrifice and substitution. Closely allied with these statements are those which connect moral reformation with the death of Jesus. He bare our sins that we might live unto righteousness. His death is our life. We are not to be content with a self-satisfied contemplation of our redeemed state, but to live a life worthy of it (1Pe 2:21-25; 1Pe 3:15-18). In these passages the whole Gospel is contained; we are justified by the death of Jesus, who bore our  sins that we might be sanctified and renewed to a life of godliness. And from this apostle we hear again the name of “the lamb,” as well as from John the Baptist; and the passage of Isaiah comes back upon us with unmistakable clearness. We are redeemed “with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1Pe 1:18-19, with Isa 53:7). Every word carries us back to the Old Test. and its sacrificial system: the spotless victim, the release from sin by its blood (elsewhere [1Pe 1:2] by the sprinkling of its blood), are here; not the type and shadow, but the truth of them; not a ceremonial purgation, but an effectual reconcilement of man and God.

(3.) In the inspired writings of John we are struck at once with the emphatic statements as to the divine and human natures of Christ. A right belief in the incarnation is the test of a Christian man (1Jn 4:2; Joh 1:14; 2Jn 1:7); we must believe that Jesus' Christ is come in the flesh, and that he is manifested to destroy the works of the devil (1Jn 3:8). And, on the other hand, he who has come in the flesh is the one who alone has been in the bosom of the Father, seen the things that human eyes have never seen, and has come to de dare them unto us (1:2; 4:14; Joh 1:14-18). This person, at once divine and human, is “the propitiation for our sins,” our advocate with the Father,” sent into the world “that we might live through him;” and the means was his laying down his life for us, which should make us ready to lay down our lives for the brethren (1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:1-2; 1Jn 3:16; 1Jn 4:9-10; 1Jn 5:6; 1Jn 5:11-13; Joh 11:51). And the moral effect of his redemption is that “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin” (1Jn 1:7). The intimate connection between his work and our holiness is the main subject of his first epistle, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin (1Jn 3:9). As with Peter, so with John; every point of the doctrine of the atonement comes out with abundant clearness. The substitution of another, who can bear our sins, for us who cannot; the sufferings and death as the means of our redemption, our justification thereby and our progress in holiness as the result of our justification.

(4.) To follow out as fully, in the more voluminous writings of Paul, the passages that speak of our salvation would far transgress the limits of our paper. Man, according to this apostle, is a transgressor of the law. His conscience tells him that he cannot act up to that law, which, the same conscience admits, is divine, and binding upon him. Through the old dispensations man remained in this condition. Even the law of Moses could not justify him it only by its strict behests held up a mirror to conscience  that its frailness might be seen. Christ came, sent by the mercy of our Father who had never forgotten us; given to, not deserved by us. He came to reconcile men and God by dying on the cross for them, and bearing their punishment in their stead (2Co 5:14-21; Rom 5:6-8). He is “a propitiation through faith in his blood” (Rom 3:25-26; comp. Lev 16:15) (ἱλαστήρειον means “victim for expiation”) — words which most people will find unintelligible, except in reference to the Old Test. and its sacrifices. He is the ransom, or price paid, for the redemption of man from all iniquity (Tit 2:14). Still stronger in 1Ti 2:6, “ransom instead of (ἀντίλυτρον); also Eph 1:7 (ἀπολύτρωσις); 1Co 6:20; 1Co 7:23. The wrath of God was against man, but it did not fall on man. God made his Son “to be sin for us,” though he knew no sin; and Jesus suffered, though men had sinned. By this act God and man were reconciled (Rom 5:10; 2Co 5:18-20; Eph 2:16; Col 1:21). On the side of man, trust and love and hope take the place of fear and of an evil conscience; on the side of God, that terrible wrath of his, which is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, is turned away (Rom 1:18; Rom 5:9; 1Th 1:10). The question whether we are reconciled to God only, or God is also reconciled to us, might be discussed on deep metaphysical grounds; but we purposely leave that on one side, content to show that at all events the intention of God to punish man is averted by this “propitiation” and “reconcilement.” SEE RECONCILIATION.

Different views are held about the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews by modern critics, but its numerous points of contact with the other epistles of Paul must be recognized. In both the incompleteness of Judaism is dwelt on; redemption from sin and guilt is what religion has to do for men, and this the law failed to secure. In both, reconciliation and forgiveness and a new moral power in the believers are the fruits of the work of Jesus. In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul shows that the law failed to justify, and that faith in the blood of Jesus must be the ground of justification. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same result follows from an argument rather different: all that the Jewish system aimed to do is accomplished in Christ in a far more perfect manner. The Gospel has a better priest, more effectual sacrifices, a more profound peace. In the one epistle the law seems set aside wholly for the system of faith; in the other the law is exalted and  glorified in its Gospel shape; but the aim is precisely the same — to show the weakness of the law and the effectual fruit of the Gospel.

8. We are now in a position to see how far the teaching of the New Test. on the effects of the death of Jesus is continuous and uniform. Are the declarations of our Lord about himself the same as those of James and Peter, John and Paul? and are those of the apostles consistent with each other? The several points of this mysterious transaction may be thus roughly described:

(1.) God sent his Son into the world to redeem lost and ruined men from sin and death, and the Son willingly took upon him the form of a servant for this purpose; and thus the Father and the Son manifested their love for us.

(2.) God the Father laid upon his Son the weight of the sins of the whole world, so that he bare in his own body the wrath which men must else have borne, because there was no other way of escape for them; and thus the atonement was a manifestation of divine justice.

(3.) The effect of the atonement thus wrought is that man is placed in a new position, freed from the dominion of sin, and able to follow holiness; and thus the doctrine of the atonement ought to work in all the hearers a sense of love, of obedience, and of self sacrifice.

In shorter words, the sacrifice of the death of Christ is a proof of divine love and of divine justice, and is for us a document of obedience.

Of the four great writers of the New Test., Peter, Paul, and John set forth every one of these points. Peter, the “witness of the sufferings of Christ,” tells us that we are redeemed with the blood of Jesus, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot; says that Christ bare our sins in his own body on the tree. If we “have tasted that the Lord is gracious” (1Pe 2:3), we must not rest satisfied with a contemplation of our redeemed state, but must live a life worthy of it. No one can well doubt, who reads the two epistles, that the love of God and Christ, and the justice of God, and the duties thereby laid on us, all have their value in them; but the love is less dwelt on than the justice, while the most prominent idea of all is the moral and practical working of the cross of Christ upon the lives of men.

With John, again, all three points find place. That Jesus willingly laid down his life for us, and is an advocate with the Father; that he is also the  propitiation, the suffering sacrifice, for our sins; and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, for that whoever is born of God doth not commit sin — all are put forward. The death of Christ is both justice and love, both a propitiation and an act of loving self surrender; but the moral effect upon us is more prominent even than these.

In the epistles of Paul the three elements are all present. In such expressions as a ransom, a propitiation, who was “made sin for us,” the wrath of God against sin, and the mode in which it was turned away, are presented to us. Yet not wrath alone. “The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again” (2Co 5:14-15). Love in him begets love in us, and in our reconciled state the holiness which we could not practice before becomes easy.

The reasons for not finding in James similar evidence we have spoken of already.

Now, in which of these points is there the semblance of contradiction between the apostles and their Master? In none of them. In the gospels, as in the epistles, Jesus is held up as the sacrifice and victim, draining a cup from which his human nature shrank, feeling in himself a sense of desolation such as we fail utterly to comprehend on a theory of human motives. Yet no one takes from him his precious redeeming life; he lays it down of himself, out of his great love for men. But men are to deny themselves, and take up their cross and tread in his steps. They are his friends only if they keep his commands and follow his footsteps.

We must consider it proved that these three points or elements are the doctrine of the whole New Test. What is there about this teaching that has provoked in times past and present so much disputation? Not the hardness of the doctrine — for none of the theories put in its place are any easier — but its want of logical completeness. Sketched out for us in a few broad lines, it tempts the fancy to fill it in and lend it color; and we do not always remember that the hands that attempt this are trying to make a mystery into a theory, an infinite truth into a finite one, and to reduce the great things of God into the narrower limits of our little field of view. To whom was the ransom paid? What was Satan's share of the transaction? How can one suffer for another? How could the Redeemer be miserable when he was conscious that his work was one which could bring happiness to the whole  human race? Yet this condition of indefiniteness is one which is imposed on us in the reception of every mystery. Prayer, the incarnation, the immortality of the soul, are all subjects that pass far beyond our range of thought. Here we see the wisdom of God in connecting so closely our redemption with our reformation. If the object were to give us a complete theory of salvation, no doubt there would be in the Bible much to seek. The theory is gathered by fragments out of many an exhortation and warning; nowhere does it stand out entire, and without logical flaw. But if we assume that the New Test. is written for the guidance of sinful hearts, we find a wonderful aptness for that particular end. Jesus is proclaimed as the solace of our fears, as the founder of our moral life, as the restorer of our lost relation with our Father. If he had a cross, there is a cross for us; if he pleased not himself, let us deny ourselves; if he suffered for sin, let us hate sin. And the question ought not to be. What do all these mysteries mean? but Are these thoughts really such as will serve to guide our life and to assuage our terrors in the hour of death? The answer is twofold one from history and one from experience. The preaching of the cross of the Lord even in this simple fashion converted the world. The same doctrine is now the ground of any definite hope that we find in ourselves of forgiveness of sins and of everlasting life. See Thomson, essay on the “Death of Christ,” in Aids to Faith.

## Savior, St., Order Of[[@Headword:Savior, St., Order Of]]

             a name applied to the Order of St. Bridget (q.v.), because it was pretended that our Savior personally dictated to the founders the rules and constitution of the order. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Savonarola, Girolamo[[@Headword:Savonarola, Girolamo]]

             an Italian monk, reformer, and martyr, the leader of an incipient reformation of the Church in the latter half of the 15th century, a man whose eventful life and tragic death have called forth the most contradictory judgments, and whose real character is even to this day a matter of dispute with certain historians. Savonarola was born of an honorable family at Ferrara, Sept. 21, 1452. His education was carefully conducted. It was intended that he should devote himself to natural and medical science, but his early religious development turned him into another course. He was fond of solitude, and avoided the public walks of the ducal palace. Impressed with terror at the wickedness which he saw  about him, he finally, in his twenty-third year, fled from his home and friends and took refuge in a Dominican cloister at Bologna. Two days after his arrival in Bologna he wrote to his parents, begging their forgiveness and blessing, and averring as his excuse that he was utterly unable to endure the spectacle of the wickedness of Italian society. He also declared that he had simply followed out a divine impulse given him in prayer, and that he felt that he should be ready to suffer anything, even death, rather than disobey the voice of duty.

At first Savonarola desired to be simply a lay brother, and to perform the commonest menial services; but his superior saw his gifts, and charged him from the start with the teaching of what was then called philosophy and physics. His chief authorities in this teaching were the great Dominican theologian Thomas Aquinas, the Church father St. Augustine, and, above all, the Holy Scriptures. The latter he knew almost by heart. He was particularly fond of the Old Test. prophets and of the Apocalypse. It was in the study of these that his spiritual imagination nurtured itself, and attained such an intense vividness as to make it easy for him to assume to himself too much of the prophetic character. His first attempts at preaching were without special results. His voice was harsh, his gestures awkward, his language clumsy and scholastic. His audience was not attracted. But, while on a visit to Brescia, his power broke forth suddenly, as waters from a pent-up fountain. The people flocked to him in great crowds to hear his imaginative exposition of the Apocalypse; and the impression was not lessened when he made definite inferences (“non per rivelazione, ma per ragione delle Scritture”) as to calamities which were soon to fall upon Italy. But his politico-reformatory labors began only in his thirty-eighth year (1490), when he was appointed as lector in the Dominican cloister of San Marco, Florence. His two leading thoughts now were, reformation of the Church and emancipation of Italy. In carrying out these, he shook to its foundations the Florentine government, raised against himself the anathemas of the hierarchy, and finally fell himself a victim to the task. See Rule, Dawn of the Reformation (Lond. 1855).

The family of the Medici had raised Florence to a high degree of prosperity, and were enjoying princely power under the forms of a republic. Cosmo de' Medici (died 1464) was the Rothschild of the age. His gifted nephew Lorenzo (died 1492) followed in his footsteps, promoted commerce, letters, and philosophy, and made Florence the temporary center of a golden age. But beneath the outward polish of refined culture,  the moral corruption of high and low festered as an ulcer. In 1492 Lorenzo's son Pietro II followed him as master of Florence, while his younger son, Giovanni — who was made a cardinal at the age of twelve, four years before his father's death — aimed at the papal chair. Such was the condition of Florence at the time when Savonarola began his efforts at political and ecclesiastical reform. He began his lectures in the cloister; then transferred them to the cloister garden; and, when the multitude overflowed this, he repaired to a spacious church. Here, on Aug. 1, 1491, he commenced his elucidation of the Apocalypse before an immense multitude. “The Church must be renewed,” said he; “but previously God will send severe judgments upon Italy, and that, too, speedily.” He tore off the thin disguise of glory from the much boasted Medicine age, and exposed the great gulf of moral rottenness beneath. He spared neither rank nor sex nor age; neither pope nor monk nor layman. “Your sins,” exclaimed he, “make me a prophet! Hitherto I have been but as Jonah warning Nineveh. But, if you heed not my words, I shall be as Jeremiah, predicting your destruction, and weeping over the ruins: for God will renew his Church, and that will not take place without blood.”

It was not a doctrinal, but a moral reformation, which he more immediately contemplated; and closely with this he connected the restoration of the former liberties of the republic. In the main he was in accord with Catholic orthodoxy, and he carried the monkish principles of abstinence and self denial to an intense extreme. But he laid great emphasis on certain doctrines which the clergy of the age had greatly neglected, viz. that the Scriptures lead us chiefly to Christ, and not to the saints; that without the forgiveness of God no priestly absolution is of any avail; and that salvation comes of faith and submission to the Redeemer, and not from outward works or educational polish. Still there was felt throughout his sermons rather more of the earnestness of the law than of the gentleness of the Gospel. One year after his arrival in Florence he was made prior of San Marco. Contrary to all precedent, Savonarola omitted to call and pay his respects to the civil ruler of the city, Lorenzo. This was all the more singular as Lorenzo had made large gifts to San Marco, and had always shown all respect to the priesthood. But Savonarola saw in him simply the incarnation of worldliness, and the robber of his country's liberties. He feared his friendship more than his hatred. Lorenzo resorted to all the arts of cunning and flattery, but in vain; he did not win the smiles of the stern preacher of righteousness. Lorenzo died April 8, 1492. On his death bed he  sent for Savonarola and desired absolution. Savonarola exacted three things: faith in Christ; the restoration of all ill gotten property; and the reestablishment of the city's liberties. To the first two he cheerfully assented; to the latter he demurred. Thereupon the stern prior of San Marco departed. This third demand is not mentioned by Politian; it may be apocryphal.

The death of Lorenzo was the signal for the outbreak of the storm. He was succeeded by his rash and arbitrary son, Pietro II. The same year the notorious cardinal Borgia ascended the papal throne as Alexander VI. Savonarola continued his exhortations to repentance and his predictions of speedy judgments. “A storm will break in,” said he, “a storm that will shake the mountains; over the Alps there will come against Italy one like Cyrus of whom Isaiah wrote.” Soon thereafter Charles VIII of France actually came with a great army, not to reform the Church, however, but to take the vacant throne of Naples. Pietro Medici capitulated without resistance. Thereupon the wrath of the people broke out, and the Medici were forced to fly to Bologna. The senate pronounced them traitors, and set a price on their heads. But, as the aristocratic faction still desired to retain all political offices, Savonarola summoned a great popular assembly in the cathedral, and assumed the role of a theocratic tribune. By general consent he became the legislator of Florence. As the foundation of the new order of things, he proposed four principles: (1) fear God; (2) prefer the weal of the republic to thine own; (3) a general amnesty; (4) a council after the pattern of Venice, but without a doge. His political maxims he borrowed mostly from Aquinas. He was not opposed to monarchy, but he believed that circumstances called for a democracy in Florence. “God alone will be thy king, O Florence!” exclaimed he; “even as he was king in Israel under the old covenant.” The ruling element in this “city of God” was to be, not self seeking, but love — love to God and love to the neighbor. “How can we have peace with God if we have it not with each other?” Viva Cristo, viva Firenze! responded the people to the proposition of the enthusiastic monk, and, in the beginning of 1495, committed to him the remodeling of the state. With the details of the new order of things he did not, however, concern himself. His attitude was rather that of a judge in Israel, or of a Roman censor with dictatorial power. He regarded himself as the organ of Christ for the Christocratic republic. He guided it with his counsels, and breathed into it from his throne, the pulpit, a deep moral and religious earnestness. His influence over the people lasted for three years,  and was of unprecedented power. This is the testimony not only of the prudent historian Guicciardini, but of the deep seeing Machiavelli. The latter ascribes his downfall to the envy of the people, who can never long endure the spectacle of one great character towering above all the others.

With the new constitution, a new spirit took possession of the people. Unrighteous gains were given up; deadly enemies embraced each other in love; secular sports came to an end; vows of continence were made by husbands and wives; profane love songs gave place to hymns of love for Christ; artists cast their nude paintings into the fire; fasting became a delight; the communion was partaken of daily; never wearying crowds thronged to the great cathedral, over whose pulpit were inscribed the words: “Jesus Christ, the King of Florence;” committees traversed the city gathering up and destroying bad books, cards, and instruments of music; the carnival gave place to a Palm Sunday procession in which thousands of children and of adults, dressed in white, indulged in sacred dances and sang very odd Christian songs, of which the following verse is a fair sample:

“Non fu mai piu bel solazzo,

 Piu giocondo ne maggiore,

 Che per zelo e per amore

Di Gesu divenir pazzo.

Ognun grida com' io grido,

Semper pazzo, pazzo, pazzo.”

This popular excess Savonarola justified on the Monday after Holy Week, 1496, by citing the example of David dancing before the ark, and by the phenomena of Pentecost after the ascension.

But all this was but a transient enthusiasm of an excitable populace. The general character of levity had been too deeply implanted by ages of prosperity and submission to demagogues to be able now to assume suddenly the self control and steadfastness which are so essential to a religious and free government, and a reaction was inevitable. It came only too soon. The worldly spirit reasserted itself in the form of opposition to the monk's regime at home and of alliance with the pope from without. No more violent contrast could be imagined than the austere Savonarola and the profligate and infamous pope Alexander VI. It was impossible that these two could live in peace at the head of neighboring states. Savonarola hesitated not to attack the character of the papal court as it deserved; and he openly proclaimed his hope that the reform begun in Florence would  eventually embrace the whole of Italy. The papal court saw the necessity of putting down so bold a foe. Strategy was at first resorted to. Savonarola was invited to come to Rome; and a cardinal's hat and the archbishopric of Florence were offered to him. He answered the pope in strangely prophetic words: “I desire none of your gifts; I will have no other red hat than that which you have given to other servants of Christ — the red hat of martyrdom.” Then Alexander commanded him to come to Rome. Savonarola excused himself on the ground of his feeble health; and he continued to preach against Rome. Thereupon the pope (in the autumn of 1496) forbade him further preaching on pain of excommunication, until the termination of his trial for heresy, which was now to be commenced. At the same time, the jealousy of the Franciscan order, at the prominence of this Dominican, fell upon him. Savonarola ceased preaching for a time; but then, unable to restrain the spirit within him, recommenced. “The pope,” said he, “is ill informed and misguided. It is not the ideal pope who has forbidden me to preach; the true pope is the incarnation of the spirit of Christ; and Christ cannot be against the spirit of love, otherwise he would be against himself. This wicked order is, therefore, not from the pope. I must preach, because God has called me thereto.” So reasoned Savonarola; so endeavored he to reconcile disobedience to the visible pope with obedience to the Catholic Church. Meantime political affairs took an unfavorable turn for Savonarola. Charles VIII was forced to retire from Italy in inglorious failure. Combined Italy was hostile to Florence because of its alliance with the French. Also a pestilence and famine broke out in Florence (June 1497), against which Savonarola could furnish no miraculous remedy. The party of the Medici made an attempt to seize the government; this failed, and ended with the execution (Aug. 21, 1497) of five prominent men. The avengers of their blood now watched for Savonarola's life. His followers now surrounded him with an armed guard; it was only thus that he could reach his pulpit.

The pope, learning of the decline of Savonarola's popularity, excommunicated him, first in May, 1497, and then more emphatically in October, forbidding all Christians to have any intercourse with him, and threatening the city with the interdict. Savonarola, encouraged by a favorable council which was elected Jan. 1, 1498, ascended the cathedral pulpit, denied the charge of heresy, declared null and void the excommunication, and appealed from the human pope to the heavenly head of the Church. He also boldly summoned the crowned heads of all  Christendom to unite in calling a general council, to depose this pretended pope, and to heal the wounds of the Church. And yet Savonarola plainly foresaw the fatal result to himself of the present contest. “To the cause there can be no other outcome than victory; but to me it will be death.” An incautious step which Savonarola now took precipitated the end. From the balcony of San Marco he asked God to consume him with fire if he had acted from unchristian motives. A Franciscan monk offered to stand the ordeal of fire against him. Savonarola hesitated. An enthusiastic monk of San Marco offered to undergo the test in Savonarola's place; then the whole body of Dominicans declared themselves also ready. Savonarola consented. The issue in controversy was the righteousness of Savonarola and the invalidity of his excommunication. A monk was selected from each order. Two great ranges of fire, close beside each other, were prepared on the great square. The two orders of monks marched in with song and banners through the innumerable multitude; but, just as the moment arrived for the test, a violent disagreement arose as to whether the parties standing the ordeal should bear the crucifix and host. The contest lasted until evening, when a violent rain put out the remnant of the fire. The people dispersed amid loud murmurs, and the whole weight of their displeasure fell upon Savonarola. The fickle people now charged him with being an impostor and a coward, and it was due to his armed guards that he left the spot alive. On the next day — Palm Sunday, 1498 his enemies besieged him in San Marco; he disdained earthly weapons, and fell upon his face in prayer. As he was taken and conducted to judgment he was greeted with all manner of abuse. His adherents were expelled from the council, and a hasty trial was entered upon. On six successive days he was dragged forth and examined under the severest tortures. During the few days of his imprisonment he wrote a beautiful exposition of the 51st Psalm, which Luther afterwards published as a tract. He was then examined again, by torture, before a clerical tribunal; it was but a mere form. He was sentenced to be hanged and burned. He was thus executed with and between two of his friends, May 23, 1498. At the foot of the scaffold he had administered the eucharist to himself and his two friends. “My Lord was pleased to die for my sins; why should not I be glad to give up my poor life out of love to him?” With such words he closed his eyes upon the world and yielded to the gibbet and the flames.

The Dominican order endeavored in later years to effect his canonization. Luther said that God had already canonized him. Though not a dogmatic  reformer in the sense of Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin, Savonarola yet holds a most honorable place by the side of Wycliffe, Huss, and Wessel, as a forerunner of the great Reformation. Monuments were erected to Savonarola in San Marco, Florence, in 1873, and in Ferrara, May 23, 1875. Savonarola left numerous writings. In his Triumphus Crucis (Trionfo della Croce [1597]), he tries to turn the Church away from its modern corruptions to Christ as the center of all moral power. In his De Divisione Omnium Scientiarum he opposes pagan writers and praises the riches of the fathers. Recently (1845) his sermons (Prediche) were printed at Florence; also his poems (Poesie) in 1862. A portion of his works was published at Lyons, in six volumes, in 1633-40. His Life has been written by Carle (Paris, 1842); by Madden (Lond. 1853); by Perrens (Paris, 1853, 2 vols.; 3d ed. 1859); by Villari (Florence, 1859-61, 2 vols.); of the latter, a French translation by G. Gruyer (1874, 2 vols). His earlier biographers were: Burlamacchi (died 1519), G.F. Picodella Mirandola, and Bartoli. Excellent modern German biographers are: Rudelbach [A.G.], Savonarola (Hamb. 1835); Meier [F.K.], Savonarola (Berl. 1836); Hase, Neue Propheten (Leips. 1851). See the historical works of Guicciardini, Nardi, Roscoe, Machiavelli, Sismondi, and especially Villari, History of Savonarola (from the Italian, by Horner [Lond. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo]); Madden, Life of Savonarola (Lond. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo); also the Brit. Quarterly, Oct. 1849; Eclectic Review, Dec. 1853; Christian Remembrancer, Oct. 1858; Prot. Episc. Review, Oct. 1860; Baptist Quarterly, Oct. 1873; London Quar. Rev. July 1856; Methodist Quar. Rev. Oct. 1867; Schaff in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 444, 455. (J.P.L.)

## Savor[[@Headword:Savor]]

             (usually רֵיחִ, rich, a smell or scent, as elsewhere rendered; ὁσμή, elsewhere “odor;” but a perfume is Chald. נַיחוֹת., nichoth, incense; εὐωδία; and a stink is Hebrews בַּאִשׁ). Besides its literal sense, this word is used metaphorically to imply character or reputation, and also the degree of acceptance with which any person or thing is received (2Co 2:14, etc.). In Mat 16:23; Mar 8:33, φρονέω, to think, is rendered “savor.” in the sense of being flavored with (or, as the old Saxon use of the verb seems to warrant, in the entirely different signification of being mended; see Bible Educator, 4, 208). So in Mat 5:13, μωραίνω, to become foolish, is applied to the loss of that sharp quality in salt by which it renders other bodies agreeable to the taste. SEE SALT.

## Savory Meat[[@Headword:Savory Meat]]

             (מִטְעִמַּים, matammim, from טָצִם, to taste, Gen 27:4 sq.; and so מִטְעִמּוֹת, matammoth, “dainties,” Pro 23:3; Pro 23:6). The patriarchal cookery, like that of the modern Arabs, appears to have been generally very simple, but in dressing a favorite joint the latter frequently use every variety of fruits and vegetables which they can procure. “Among the more common dishes,” says Mr. Lane, “are the following: lamb or mutton, cut into small pieces, and stewed with various vegetables, and sometimes with peaches, apricots, or jujubes and sugar; cucumbers, etc.; small gourds, or the fruit of the black or white eggplant stuffed with rice and mince meat, etc.; vine leaves, or pieces of lettuce leaf and cabbage leaf, enclosing a similar composition; small morsels of lamb, or lamb and mutton, roasted on skewers, and called keebab; fowls simply roasted or boned and stuffed with raisins, pistachio nuts, crumbled bread, and parsley; and various kinds of pastry and other sweets. The repast is frequently commenced with soup, and is generally ended with boiled rice mixed with a little butter and seasoned with salt and pepper; or after this is served a watermelon or other fruit, or a bowl of sweet drink composed of water with raisins, and sometimes other kinds of fruit, boiled in it, and then sugar, and with a little rosewater added to it when cool. The meat, having generally little fat, is cooked with clarified butter, and is so thoroughly done that it is easily divided with the fingers” (Mod. Egyptians, 1, 214). SEE FOOD.

## Savoy, Conference Of[[@Headword:Savoy, Conference Of]]

             SEE CONFERENCE, SAVOY.

## Savoy, Confession Of[[@Headword:Savoy, Confession Of]]

             a declaration of faith and order on the part of the Independents, agreed upon at a meeting in the Savoy in 1658. Chapters 1 to 19 of the Savoy Confession correspond verbally to the Westminster Confession; but chapter 20 “Of the Gospel and the Extent of the Grace thereof,” is additional: “in which chapter, what is dispersed and inserted by intimation in the Assembly's confession is here brought together, and more fully, under one head.” Chapters 21 to 27 correspond to chapters 20 to 26 of the Westminster, with the following exceptions: Clause four of chapter 20 clauses five and six of chapter 24 and the third clause of chapter 26 are omitted; the third clause of chapter 23 is modified; and chapter 25 is  materially altered, a clause being added relating to the expectations of the Church. Chapters 30 and 31 are omitted; but the remaining chapters correspond. The Westminster has thirty-three chapters; the Savoy thirty- two. SEE INDEPENDENCY.

## Saw[[@Headword:Saw]]

             (מַגֵרָה, megerah, 2Sa 13:31; 1Ki 7:9; 1Ch 20:3; מִשּׂוֹר, massor, Isa 10:15; elsewhere גָּרִר, garar, in the Pual; πρίων and πρίζω). The Hebrews knew and used not only wood saws, but stone saws also (1Ki 7:9; comp. Pliny, 36, 29; 44, 48), both being of great antiquity (Rosellini, Monum. 2, 35). Prisoners of war, especially leaders and princes, were sometimes executed with iron saws (2Sa 12:31; 1Ch 20:3; comp. Heb 11:37; and Sept. in Amo 1:3), and according to a tradition in the Anabaticon Jes. (ed. Lawrence, 5, 11-14), and in the Church fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Epiphanius, Lactantius), this fate befell the prophet Isaiah also, under King Manasseh (comp. Gesen. Jesa. 1, 12 sq.). This terrible punishment was also known in other ancient nations, e.g. the Egyptians (Herod. 2, 139), the Persians (Ctesias, Pers. 54; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 5, 96), the Thracians (Val. Max. 9:2, extr. 4). There were even some instances of it under the Roman emperors (Sueton. Calig. 27), inflicted on Jews (Dio Cass. 68, 32). SEE CARPENTER.

Ancient Egyptian saws, so far as has yet been discovered, were single handed, though Jerome has been thought to allude to circular saws. As is the case in modern Oriental saws, the teeth usually incline towards the handle instead of away from it, like ours. They have, in most cases, bronze blades apparently attached to the handles by leathern thongs, but some of those in the British Museum have their blades let into them like our knives. A double-handed iron saw has been found at Nimrûd; and double saws strained with a cord, such as modern carpenters use, were in use among the Romans. In sawing wood, the Egyptians placed the wood perpendicularly in a sort of frame and cut it downwards. No evidence exists of the use of the saw applied to stone in Egypt, nor without the double-handed saw does it seem likely that this should be the case; but we read of sawn stones used  in the Temple (1Ki 7:9; Gesen. Thesaur. p. 305; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyp. 2, 114, 119; Brit. Mus. Egyp. Room, No. 6046; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 195; Jerome, Comm. in Is. 28, 27). The saws “under” or “in” which David is said to have placed his captives were of iron. The expression in 2Sa 12:31 does not necessarily imply torture, but the word “cut” in 1Ch 20:3 can hardly be understood otherwise (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 1326; Thenius on 2 Sans. xii and 1 Chronicles xx). A case of sawing asunder, by placing the criminal between boards and then beginning at the head, is mentioned by Shaw, Trav. p. 254. SEE HANDICRAFT.

However simple the idea of such an instrument, it was not among the most ancient of inventions, doubtless because it was one of the few which required from the very first to be constructed with iron. For this reason it is not known among savages; nor were even the comparatively cultivated nations of South America, being without iron, acquainted with its use. Beckmann states that, “In early periods, the trunks of trees were split with wedges into as many and as thin pieces as possible; and if it was found necessary to have them still thinner, they were hewn on both sides to the proper size.” This simple but wasteful process has continued in use down to a rather recent period, even where the saw has been known, in countries (Norway and Northern Russia, for instance) where wood is abundant, under the correct impression that boards thus hewn are much more durable, from having greater cohesion and solidity, than those which have had their fibers separated by the saw. Probably the jawbone of a fish suggested the first idea of a saw. So the Grecian fable states, in which the process of this invention is described. This fable, in its various versions, assigns the invention to the famous artist Daedalus, or rather to his nephew (called Talus by some, by others Perdix, while others leave him unnamed), who, having found the jawbone of a fish (or of a serpent according to others), was led to imitate it by filing teeth in iron, and thus forming a saw.

The process is very probable; but there is nothing to say for the claim which the Greeks make to the honor of this invention. It does not appear to have been known to them in the time of Homer; for in the minute account  of the proceedings of Ulysses in building his boat, there is not the least mention of a saw, although, if such an instrument had been then known, Calypso could as easily have supplied it as she did the axe, the adze, the augers, and whatever else he required. The Greeks, probably, in common with other neighboring nations, borrowed the saw from the Egyptians, to whom it was known at a very early period, as is proved by its appearance on their ancient sculptures. The ultimate improvement which the saw received in ancient times approximates it very nearly to the state in which we continue to use it. In the Antiquites d'Herculanum, 1, pl. 100, there is an engraving, after an ancient painting, which shows this in a very interesting manner. Beckmann (Inventions, 1, 366) has very accurately described it (see the cut): “Two genii (or winged Cupids) are represented at the end of a bench, which consists of a long table that rests upon two legs, like a stool.” Montfaucon gives, from Gruter, representations of two kinds of saws: one of them is without a frame, but has a handle of a round form; and the other has that high frame of wood which we see in the saws of our stone sawyers. This reminds us to observe that Beckmann, following Pliny, cannot find an instance of cutting stone with saws earlier than the 4th century B.C.; overlooking the text 1Ki 7:9, where it is said that some parts of Solomon's palace were constructed with “costly stones, according to the measure of hewed stones, sawed with a saw.” SEE MECHANIC.

## Sawa[[@Headword:Sawa]]

             in Arabic mythology, is a female deity, said to have been worshipped by the Arabs prior to the deluge — a statement not to be reconciled with the fact that those people are descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar. — Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. s.v.

## Sawaku[[@Headword:Sawaku]]

             in Caribbean mythology, is the man who first caused fire and lightnings. He was very powerful; but, in order to prevent pursuit, he transformed himself first into a bird, and then into a star. The lightnings are still occasioned by his blowing the celestial fire through a reed, so that it darts about to great distances.

## Sawamangala[[@Headword:Sawamangala]]

             in Hindu mythology (the highest blessedness), is a surname of Parvati, the consort of Siva.

## Sawtell, Eli Newton, D.D[[@Headword:Sawtell, Eli Newton, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Milford, N.H., September 8, 1799. He graduated from Greeneville College, Tennessee, in 1823, from Marysville Theological Seminary in 1825, and studied at Andover in 1826; was Presbyterian minister at several places in Tennessee and Kentucky until 1836; then went as chaplain to Havre, and filled other ecclesiastical offices until 1864; Congregational minister at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., from. 1865 to 1867; thereafter served in ecclesiastical commissions until 1878, and died on Staten Island, April 6, 1885. See Cong. Year-book, 1886, page 32.

## Sawtelle, Henry Allen, D.D[[@Headword:Sawtelle, Henry Allen, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Sidney, Maine, December 11, 1832. He graduated from Colby University in 1854, and from the Newton Theological Institution in 1858; was pastor at Limerick, Maine, one year; missionary to China from 1859 to 1861, pastor at San Francisco, California, in 1862; at Chelsea from 1877 until his death, November 22, 1885. He wrote frequently for the religious journals, also a volume entitled Things to Think of. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Sawyer, Cyrus[[@Headword:Sawyer, Cyrus]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lower Canada Dec. 22, 1811, but the next year his parents removed to Western New York. He was converted in 1822, licensed to preach in 1837, and received into the Michigan Conference, which then embraced Knox County, O., where he resided. The range of his itinerant labors was within the limits of the North Ohio Conference. He died at Delaware, O., in January, 1848. Mr. Sawyer's life was one of great excellence and moral beauty, and his ministry was eminently useful. See Minutes of Conferences, 4, 266. (J.L.S.)

## Sawyer, Isaac[[@Headword:Sawyer, Isaac]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Hoosick, N.Y., Nov. 22, 1770. He was left an orphan at the age of fourteen, and two years after bound himself out to a man who soon after removed to Monkton, Vt., where there was little or no religious influence. He was converted in 1793, and became a Baptist, serving in the capacity of deacon until he began to preach. In 1797 the Church called upon him to “exercise his gift,” but he delayed a long time, because of a sense of his own unfitness. On June 29, 1799, a council was called, and Mr. Sawyer was ordained. He filled the following churches: Monkton, Vt., 1799-1812; Fairfield, Vt., March, 181-213; Orwell, Vt., 1813-17; Brandon, Vt., 1818-25; Bethel, Vt., 1825-28; Westport, N.Y., 1828-34; Knowlesville, N.Y., 1834; and was for a short time at Stockton, N.Y., and Lewiston, N.Y. He died Sept. 30, 1847. He baptized during his ministry upwards of 1100 persons. He was the first president of the Vermont Baptist Convention, and a friend of education and temperance. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 369.

## Sawyer, James W[[@Headword:Sawyer, James W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Palmyra, Me., Sept. 16, 1838. He removed when a child to Portland, where he was converted at the age of fifteen years. He was licensed to preach April 19, 1862, and was received on trial in the Maine Conference in April 1864. His ministerial life was short, terminating with death, Dec. 23, 1869, Mr.  Sawyer was a deeply pious man, and a good preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 147.

## Sawyer, John, D.D[[@Headword:Sawyer, John, D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Hebron, Conn., Oct. 9, 1755. In 1777 he entered the Revolutionary army, and, after serving for some years, entered Dartmouth College in 1781. He graduated in 1786, then devoted himself to theology, and commenced preaching within one year after leaving college. In October, 1787, he accepted a call to become pastor of the Church at Oxford, Coos County, N.H., on the condition of that Church relinquishing the practice of baptizing children on what was termed the halfway covenant (q.v.). He afterwards became successively pastor of a Church in Boothbay, Me., in 1796; of New Castle in 1806, in which latter place he commenced traveling in all directions as a home missionary; of Bangor in 1812, where he acted both as preacher and as schoolmaster; and finally of Garland, where he remained until his death, Oct. 14, 1858. Religion was the supreme governing principle of his life, and for nearly eighty years he labored faithfully in bringing souls to God. See Amer. Cong. Yearbook, 1859, p. 131.

## Sawyer, Seymour B[[@Headword:Sawyer, Seymour B]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina, Dec. 8, 1808. He was converted Oct. 1, 1821, under the ministry of the Cumberland Presbyterians, to which body he attached himself. In 1827 he was licensed to preach among them; but, dissenting from some of their doctrines, he returned his license, and removed to Mississippi, where he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1830 was licensed as a local preacher. In 1832 he was admitted on trial in the traveling connection, and stationed in Montgomery. He filled with great acceptability and usefulness many of the most important charges, until his death, which occurred Sept. 23, 1843. Mr. Sawyer was a man of mild and gentle disposition. As a pastor, he was specially diligent and affectionate. His sermons were remarkable for their simplicity and spirituality. See Minutes of Conferences, 3, 593.

## Saxe, Alfred[[@Headword:Saxe, Alfred]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born Sept. 5, 1814. He was converted in 1830, licensed to preach in 1832, and graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1838. The succeeding eighteen months he was principal of  the Middletown Preparatory School, after which he became principal of the high school in that city, where he remained until 1843, when he was received on trial by the New York Conference, transferred to the Troy Conference, and appointed to Ferry Street Station, Albany. In 1845 he was appointed to North White Creek, and in 1846, on account of declining health, was placed on the superannuated list. He died Oct. 8, 1846. Mr. Saxe was a sound and practical preacher, a diligent and laborious pastor, and a most affable man. In his last illness he enjoyed the consolations of religion, and appeared cheerful and happy even while passing through the vale of death. See Minutes of Conferences, 4, 131. (J.L.S.)

## Saxnot[[@Headword:Saxnot]]

             in German mythology, was a god whose name occurs in the oath taken by the Saxons after their violent conversion to Christianity by Charlemagne, by which they renounced the worship of Thunar (Thor), Woden, and Saxnot. He is supposed to have been the god of war, since the word Sax (Sachs), from which the Saxons took their name, denoted a sword. Anglo- Saxon genealogies point — to a Saxneat, who was Woden's son.

## Saxon Architecture[[@Headword:Saxon Architecture]]

             The buildings of the Anglo-Saxons were usually of wood, rarely of stone until the 11th century, and consequently we must not expect to find any great number of remains. The only dated examples of this style are about the middle of the 11th century, as at Deerhurst, Gloucestershire; with the exception of some slight remains at the mouth of the Tyne, which are of an earlier and distinct character, and Brixworth, which is possibly Roman work restored. The style agrees in many respects with that of the 11th century on the Continent, where the work has not been ornamented with sculpture in the 12th, as has been very frequently the case. There are, however, some peculiarities about the buildings of this class which entitle them to the name of the Anglo-Saxon style, or, more correctly, perhaps, the primitive English style; for it has been observed that they are far more numerous in the Danes' land, or the eastern counties, than in other parts of England. In the neighborhood of Lincoln and Gainsborough almost all the old country churches partake of this character. It has also been observed that the earlier examples are more like the work of carpenters than of masons. Such a tower as that of Earl's Barton, for instance, has all the  appearance of being copied from a wooden tower, and this may very probably have been the case. Ordericus Vitalis, who lived in the 11th century, mentions that Siward, the cousin of Edward the Confessor, built a wooden church at Shrewsbury, which was used as the parish church. This is material evidence, considering that it was built by a royal prince in a town of so much importance. This church was existing in 1082, when a stone church was commenced by the father of Ordericus Vitalis, who records these facts. It is not improbable that these primitive English churches may be among the earliest stone churches of Western Europe after the time of the Romans. The Roman art of building had become extinct in all this part of Europe, and almost extinct in Rome itself, by the 10th century, and the most ready models which the English had to copy in the 1lth century were their own wooden churches. It was just at that time that Canute ordered churches to be built of stone and lime in all the places where his father or himself had burned the wooden churches of the Anglo- Saxons.

The class of buildings referred to as being considered to belong to this style contain some rather unusual features. The execution is rude and coarse: the walls are built either of rag or rubble, sometimes partly of herringbone work, without buttresses, and in many cases, if not always, have been plastered on the outside. The quoins are usually of hewn stones placed alternately flat and on end — a kind of construction to which the name “long and short” has been given; the walls are often ornamented externally with flat vertical strips of stone projecting slightly from the surface, resembling wooden framing, generally of the same “long and short” construction as the quoins. On towers there are sometimes several tiers of these, divided from each other by plain strings or bands. Semicircular arches and triangles formed of similar strips of stone are also sometimes used as ornaments; and plain projecting blocks are frequently associated with these, either as imposts, or as bases for the vertical strips which often stand above them. The jambs of doorways and other openings are very commonly of “long and short” work; and when imposts are used, as they generally are, they are usually rude, and often extremely massive, sometimes consisting of plain blocks and sometimes molded. Round the arch there is very often a projecting course occupying the situation of a  hood molding, which sometimes stops upon the imposts, but more frequently runs down the jambs to the ground, forming a kind of pilaster on each side of the opening.

It is usually flat, but is sometimes rounded and occasionally notched on the edges, as at Dunham Magna, Norfolk; in some instances the impost is arranged so as to form a capital to each of these projections on the jambs, and they are sometimes provided with bases either formed of plain blocks or rudely molded. The arches are generally plain, but are occasionally worked with rude and massive moldings, as the chancel arch at Wittering Church, Northamptonshire; some arches are constructed with bricks (probably all of them taken from some Roman building, as at Brixworth) or thin stones, and these usually have a course of stones or bricks laid upon the top of the arch, as at Britford Church, Wiltshire: the arches are always semicircular, but some small openings, such as doors and windows, have pointed or triangular heads formed of two straight stones placed on end upon the imposts, and resting against each other at the top, as at Barnack. The windows are not large, and, when splayed, have often nearly or quite as much splay externally as internally. In belfries and other situations where they do not require to be glazed, they are frequently of two or more lights, divided by small shafts or pillars, which are very usually made like balusters, and encircled with bands of rude moldings. In the old portion of St. Alban's Abbey, erected in the latter half of the 11th century, specimens are seen. These generally have capitals, or imposts, formed of long stones reaching entirely through the wall; in some instances the balusters are oblong in plan, as in the tower of St. Michael's Church, Oxford, and in others two are placed together, one behind the other, in order to give better support to these long capitals.

The whole of these peculiarities are not to be met with in any one building; and in some churches in which several of them are to be found they are associated with other features, evidently original, which so clearly belong to the Norman style as to prove that these buildings are not of Saxon date, as at the churches of Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, and Syston, Lincolnshire. In other instances the lower parts of buildings consist exclusively of this peculiar kind of construction, and are surmounted by pure Norman work which has been raised upon it subsequently to the first erection, as at the tower of Clapham Church, Bedfordshire, and Woodstone, near Peterborough. This last class of buildings appears to preponderate in favor of the Saxon theory; for, although the Norman  additions have been observed not to be remarkably early in that style, it is not very probable that so material a change would have been made in the architecture unless a considerable interval had elapsed between the erection of the different parts. Some of the churches in which the peculiarities under consideration are found are clearly Norman (and not early in the style), but it may reasonably be supposed that in many parts of the country the Saxon style would have lingered for a considerable time after the Norman invasion, and would have continued to be employed (with an increasing admixture of Norman features) in buildings erected by native workmen.

The following is a tolerably complete list of examples of the Saxon style:

Bedfordshire — Knotting; Clapham, tower.

Berkshire — Wickham, tower: Cholsey, tower.

Buckinghamshire — Caversfield, tower; Iver; Lavendon, tower, nave, and chancel.

Cambridgeshire — St. Benet's and St. Giles', Cambridge.

Cornwall — Tintagel.

Derbyshire — Repton, east end, and crypt.

Durham — Monks' Wearmouth, tower; Jarrow, walls of church and chancel, and ruins near it.

Essex — Boreham, church; Colchester, Trinity Church, part of the tower, etc.; Felstead, church; Great Maplestead, north door.

Gloucestershire — Daglingworth Church, except the tower; Deerhnrst, tower; Miserden, church; Stretton, north doorway; Upleaden, chancel- arch.

Hampshire — Boarhunt; Corhampton; Headbourne Worthy; Hinton Ampner; Little Sombourn; Kilmeston; Tichborne.

Hertfordshire — St. Michael's, at St. Alban's.

Kent — Dover, part of the ruined church in the Castle; Swanscombe, tower; Knotting.  Leicestershire—Barrow on Soar; Barrow on Tugby.

Lincolnshire — Aukloroneh; Barton on the Humber, St. Peter's, tower; Branston; Caburn; Clee, tower; Holton-le-Clay, tower and chancel-arch; Heapham; Lincoln, St. Peter's at Gowt's; St. Mary-le-Wigford; Nettleton; Ropsley, part of the west end; Rothwell; Scartho; Skellingthorpe; Skillington, part of the church; Springthorpe; Stow, transepts; Swallow; Syston, tower; Waith, tower and chancel-arch: Winterton.

Middlesex — Kingsbury, part of chleurch (now hidden by plastering).

Norfolk — Norwich, St. Julien's; Beeston St. Lawrence; Dunham Magna, church; Elmham, ruins of bishop's palace; Howe; Newton, tower.

Northamptonshire — Barnack, tower; Brigstock, church; Brixworth, church: Earl's Barton, tower; Green's Norton, west end: Pattishall; Stow- nine-churches; Witterington, chancel.

Northumberland — Bolam, tower: Bywell, St. Andrew; Bywell; Corbridge; Hexham, crypt; Ovingham; Whittingham.

Oxfordshire — St. Michael's, Oxford, tower; Northleigh, tower.

Shropshire — Barrow, chancel-arch; Church Stretton; Clee; Stanton Lacey, nave and transept; Stottesdon.

Somersetshire — Cranmore, door-head; Milbourne Port.

Suffolk — Barhaim, part of church; Debenham; Claydon, part of church; Flixton; Gosbeck, part of church; Hemingstone; Ilketshall; Leiston.

Surrey — Albury; Stoke d'Abernon, some portions.

Sussex — Bishopstone, church; Bosham, tower; St. Botolph, chancel-arch; Burwash; Sompting, tower; Worth; Yapton.

Warwickshire — Wooten Wawen, substructure of tower.

Wiltshire — North Burcombe, east end; Brytford, north and south doors; Bremhill, west end; Somerford Keynes.

Worcestershire — Wyre Piddle, chancel-arch.

Yorkshire — Bardsey; Kirkdale, west end and chancel-arch; Kirk Homerton Laughton-en-le-Morthen, north doorway; Maltby; Ripon  minster, crypt, called Wilfred's Needle; York Cathedral, portion of crypt (Bloxham); York, church of St. Mary, Bishop-hill Junior.

## Say, Samuel H[[@Headword:Say, Samuel H]]

             an English dissenting divine, was born in the year 1675. He entered as a pupil in the academy of Rev. Thomas Rowe, London, about 1692. Finishing his studies, he became chaplain to Thomas Scott, Lyminge, in Kent, in whose family he remained three years. Thence he removed to Andover, in Hampshire; then to Yarmouth, in Norfolk; and soon after to Lowestoff, in Suffolk, where he labored for eighteen years. He was co- pastor with Rev. Samuel Baxter at Ipswich nine years, and succeeded Dr. Edmund Calamy in Westminster in 1734. He died in 1743. He wrote, Sermon (Lond. 1736, 8vo): — Poems and Essays (ibid. 1745, 4to; 1749, 4to).

## Saybrook Platform[[@Headword:Saybrook Platform]]

             a confession of faith and a compendium of rules for the government of the churches, adopted by an assembly of Congregational ministers and lay delegates convened by order of the Legislature of Connecticut, at Saybrook, Sept. 9, 1708. The synod consisted of sixteen members — twelve clerical and four lay — who represented the councils of Hartford, Fairfield, New London, and New Haven counties. As to doctrine, they adopted for recommendation to the General Assembly of the colony the confession assented to by the elders and messengers assembled at Boston, May 12, 1680, which was the Savoy Confession with some small alterations, adding also the doctrinal parts of the Westminster Confession. In regard to Church government and discipline, they adopted fifteen articles, the substance of which was to provide (1) for one or more consociations in each county, with appellate and final jurisdiction, to which particular churches might refer in difficult cases; (2) for one or more associations in each county, consisting of the ministers, who should meet at least twice a year to consult on the common interest of the churches, and to perform certain other offices, such as the examination and recommendation of candidates for the ministry; (3) for a general association, to be composed of one or more delegates from each of the district associations, to meet once a year. The proceedings of the synod were approved by the Assembly of the colony, Oct. 1708, and it ordained “that all the churches within this government that are or shall be thus  united in doctrine, worship, and discipline be, and for the future shall be owned and acknowledged, established by law; provided always that nothing herein shall be intended or construed to hinder or prevent any society that is or shall be allowed by the laws of this government, who soberly differ or dissent from the united churches hereby established, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way, according to their consciences.” The decrees of the Saybrook Platform, both as regards doctrine and government, are not binding on the churches, but are only advisory in their character. See Trumbull, Hist. of Connecticut, vol. 1, ch. 19; Congregational Order; Bacon, Discourse at Norwich, Conn., June, 1859.

## Sayei[[@Headword:Sayei]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the daughter of Wiswakarma, and probably identical with Sangia. She was married to the sun god, and bore him Jama, the god of the underworld.

## Sayer, Ezra[[@Headword:Sayer, Ezra]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was originally a member of the Troy Conference, and was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1850. He preached at Shelbyville, Edina, Memphis, and Kirksville, but, in 1860, he took a superannuated relation. He took up his residence near Shelbyville, preaching as his health would permit until the summer of 1864, when he died. Mr. Sayer was a preacher of no common abilities, fulfilling the duties of his station so as to win the confidence and respect of all with whom he came in contact. See Min. of Annual Conf. 1865, p. 7.

## Saying[[@Headword:Saying]]

             a distinct or sustained monotone in sacred music analogous to the old “saying without note,” neither singing nor reading.

## Sayings, Traditional, Of Christ[[@Headword:Sayings, Traditional, Of Christ]]

             There can be no doubt that, besides the words of Christ which are mentioned in the gospels, others of more or less significance were spoken by him, and what John (Joh 20:30; Joh 21:25) says of the works of Christ, we may equally apply to his words. Paul mentions (Act 20:35) a saying of Christ, μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι ἤ λαμβάνειν (i.e. “It is more blessed to give than to receive”), which we look for in vain in the canonical  gospels. The following examples contain those sayings of Christ which the ancient Church has designated as such; and we put them together, not because we ascribe them altogether to apocryphal authors, but because they have no canonical authority in their favor:

1. “On the same day, having seen one working on the Sabbath, he said to him, O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the law.” This very remarkable saying occurs in Cod. D and in Cod. Graec. Rob. Stephani after Luk 6:4. Whether or not these words were originally in Luke's Gospel, we cannot decide, but that they convey an evangelical meaning is certain (comp. Loisell. Opusc. p. 20; Paulus Colomesius, Observation. Sacr. p. 143).

2. “But ye seek to increase from little, and from greater to less. When ye go and are bidden to dinner (δειπνῆσαι), sit not down in the highest seats, lest a more honorable man than thou come, and he that bade thee come and say to thee, Take a lower seat, and you be ashamed. But when thou sit down in a lower seat, and a less honorable man than thou come, then he that bade thee will say unto thee, Go up higher, and this will be profitable to thee.” This saying is also found in Cod. D or Cantabrig. and in some other codd. after Mat 20:28 (comp. Griesbach, N.T. ad loc.; Tischendorf, N.T. ad loc.). That this addition was well known may be seen from the fact that Juvencus (q.v.), in his Hist. Evang. 3, 613 sq., has given it in the following verses:

“At vos ex minimis opibus transscendere vultis, Et sic e summis lapsi comprenditis imos. Si vos quisque vocat coenae convivia ponens Cornibus in summis devitet ponere membra Quisque sapit, veniet forsan si nobilis alter, Turpiter eximio cogetur cedere cornu Quem tumor inflati cordis per summa locarat. Sin contentus erit mediocria prendere coena Inferiora dehinc si mox conviva subibit, Ad potiora pudens transibit strata tororum.”

3. “The Lord says in the Gospel, If ye keep not that which is small, who will give you that which is great? For I say unto you that he who is faithful in very little is faithful also in much.” This is found by Clem. Rom. (Epist. II ad Corinth. 8; comp. Iren. Adv. Hoeres. 2, 64).

4. “And Jesus says, For those that are sick, I was sick; and for those that hunger, I suffered hunger; and for those that thirst, I suffered thirst.” It is difficult to say whether this citation, which is found by Origen (Comment. in Matt. tom. 13 [tom. 3, 563, ed. De la Rue]), can claim any originality or not (comp. Mat 25:35; 1Co 9:20-22).

5. “Ask great things, and the small shall be added unto you; ask heavenly things, and the earthly shall be added unto you.” This saying, which is found in Clem. Alex. (Strom. 1, 1, 416 [ed. Pott, 2, 488]; Orig. De Orat. 2, 43; Opp. 1, 197, 219), seems not to be taken from an apocryphal gospel (comp. Grabe, Spicileg. 1, 14), or from an interpolated codex (Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N.T. 1, 329), but has been freely cited from Mat 6:33. Such license is often used in common life, when quoting the sentence of another, which is not done verbatim, but with such words as the circumstances and the connection of speech require.

6. “Show yourselves tried money changers” (γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι). This saying of Christ, which is found in Clement. Homil. 2, 51; 3, 50; 18, 20; Epiphan. Hoeres. 44, 2; Orig. Ad. Joh. tom. 19, 8, 20, p. 268; Jerome, Epist. 119 (ed. Vallars. 1, 815); Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 3, 16, is first cited without any authority (in the Apostol. Constit. 2, 36), then as a passage of Scripture by Clem. Alex. (Strom. 1, 1, 425), and also as an apostolic, but more especially Pauline, commandment (comp. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. Hist. Ecclesiastes 7, 7; Cyrill. Alex. Ad Jes. 2, 56). Under these circumstances, it will be difficult to decide who the author of this saying is.

7. “Let us resist all iniquity, and hold it in hatred,” quoted as the words of Christ by Barnabas (Epist. Catholica, 4); and ibid. 7 we read, “They who wish to see me and lay hold of my kingdom must receive me by affliction and suffering.”

8. “If only one of Israel will repent, and believe in God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven. After twelve years go ye into the world, lest one should say, We have not heard.” In Clem. Alex. (Strom. [ed. Pott], 6, 762), Peter quotes these words as those of the Lord, and Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 5, 18) mentions this command of Christ, ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωρισφῆναι τῆς ῾Ιερουσαλήμ.

9. “The Lord said, Should you be with me gathered in my bosom, and not do my commandments, I will cast you off, and say to you, Go from me, I  know you not whence you are, workers of iniquity.” This we read in Clem. Rom. (Epist. ad Corinth. 2, 4). In the same epistle (5), we read,

10. “The Lord saith, Ye shall be lambs in the midst of wolves. But Peter answered him, What, then, should the wolves tear in pieces the lambs? Jesus said to Peter, Let not the lambs fear the wolves after they are dead; and do you fear not those who kill you and can do nothing to you; but fear him who after you are dead hath power over soul and body to cast them into hellfire.” While there is some resemblance in this narrative with Mat 10:16; Mat 10:28; Luk 12:4-5, yet the whole manner of this conversation betrays too much its apocryphal origin.

11. “Keep the flesh pure and the soul unspotted, that ye may receive (ἀπολάβητε; not as some read, ἀπολάβωμεν, “that we may receive”) eternal life” (Epist. 8).

12. “Our Lord Jesus Christ said, In whatsoever I may find you, in this will I also judge you.” This saying, which is found in Justin. Mart. (Dial. c. Tryph. [ed. Marani, p. 143), is ascribed by Clem. Alex. (Quis Dives Salvetur, § 40) to God; by Johannes Climacus (in Scala Paradisi, 7, p. 159, and in the Vita B. Antonii, c. 15, in Vita Patrum, p. 41) to the prophet Ezekiel (comp. Eze 7:3; Eze 7:8; Eze 18:30; Eze 24:14; Eze 33:20, with Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. 1, 333). A comparison of the passages in Ezekiel will, however, prove that these parallels are insufficient, and some apocryphal gospel is probably the authority for this saving.

13. “The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stocks, and on each stock ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any saint shall have seized one bunch, another shall cry, I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord. Likewise also he said that a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand ears of corn, and each grain of wheat shall produce ten pounds of fine pure flour; and so all other fruits and seeds and each herb according to its proper nature. And that all animals, using for food what is received from the earth, shall live in peace and concord with one another, subject to men with all subjection. And when Judas the traitor believed not, and asked. How, then, shall such productions proceed from the Lord? the Lord said, They shall see who shall come to these times.” This narrative of the millennium Irenaeus (Adv. Hoeres. 5, 33) describes as  delivered by John to Papias. Since, however, this tradition belongs to Papias, whom Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3, 39) describes as an ἄνδρα σμικρὸν τὸν νοῦν, we must deny from the very beginning the authority of Christ as having uttered these words. Besides, the whole tenor of this narrative so conflicts with the dignity contained in all the words of Christ, that, without the least shadow of a doubt, we can ascribe to it an apocryphal origin. The description of the millennium reminds us of the Rabbinic representations of the same, especially as we find it in the Jalkut Shimoni (fol. 7, Colossians 1, No. 20), and which is too trivial to be translated. A German translation is given by Eisenmenger (Entdecktes Judenthum, 2, 309 sq.). An examination of the Koran (sur. 18, 32; 37, 49; 38, 53; 56, 38, etc.) will also show that the Mohammedan representation of Paradise is less sensual than that given above from a Christian source.

14. Pseudo-Linus (De Passione Petri; comp. Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N.T. 1, 335, 775) quotes a mystical saying of the Lord: “Unless ye turn your right into the left and the left into the right, and that which is above into that which is below, and that which is before you into that which is behind, ye will not know the kingdom of God.”

15. “The Lord being asked by Salome when his kingdom will come, said, When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.” This quotation, which is found by Clem. Rom. (Epist. ad Corinth. 12), is, according to Clem. Alex. (Strom. [ed. Pott], 3, 553), taken from the Gospel of the Egyptians. From the same gospel, Clem. (ibid. p. 532) has preserved the following conversation of Christ with Salome:

16. “When Salome asked the Lord, How long shall men die? he said, As long as women bear children. Then Salome answered, I have done well that I did not bear (καλῶς ουν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα); but the Lord replied, Thou mayest eat of every herb, but of that which has bitterness do not eat.” And further on (p. 540) he states, “I am come to make an end to the works of the woman — of the woman, viz. the lust; to the works, viz. to the birth and death.”

17. “He that wanders shall reign, and he that reigns shall rest” (Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, 453), from the Hebrew Gospel.

18. “I came to put an end to sacrifices; and unless ye cease from sacrificing, God's anger will not cease from you” (Evang. Ebion. ap. Epiph. Hoeres. 30, 16).

19. “My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house” (Clem. Alex. Strom. 5, 684).

20. “In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Savior himself says, Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor.” This very singular saying is quoted by Origen, in Joann. tom. 2 (ed. De la Rue, 4, 64); Jerome, Comment. in Jes. 11, 2, lib. 2; in Micham, 7, 6. That the Holy Ghost should be presented here as a genus femininum must not be looked for in the Gnostic idea of the Holy Ghost as female principle (comp. Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. 1, 362 sq.), but finds its explanation in the words of Jerome (Comment. in Jes. 40, 11), “Nemo autem in hac parte scandalizari debet, quod dicatur apud Hebraeos spiritus genere feminino, cum nostra lingua appellatur genere masculino, et Graeco sermone neutro; in divinitate enim nullus est sexus.”

21. “Never be joyful except when ye shall look on your brother in love” — so from the Hebrew Gospel by Jerome (Comment. ad Ephesians 5, 4).

See Grabe, Spicilegium, 1, 12 sq.; Fabricius, Codex Apocr. N.T. 1, 321 sq., Körner, De Sermonibus Christi ἀγράφοις (Lips. 1776); Hoffmann, Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen, (ibid. 1851), p. 317 sq.; Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (Boston, 1867), p. 445 sq. (B.P.)

## Sayres, Gilbert H., D.D[[@Headword:Sayres, Gilbert H., D.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a native of New Jersey, died at Jamaica, L.I. (where he had formerly been for many years rector), April 27, 1867, aged eighty years. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. July 1867, page 335.

## Sayutshiam[[@Headword:Sayutshiam]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a degree of blessedness or godliness which relieves man from the necessity of being born again on earth. It may be attained by solitude, virtue, and self examination, and is at all tines assured to such Brahmins as become Yogis, their state being so exalted as to make them more than equal to the gods and to exempt them from every form of trial.

## Sazoma[[@Headword:Sazoma]]

             in Lamaism, is one of the two legal wives of Cio Conciva or Xaka, the second person in the trinity of Lamaism.

## Scab[[@Headword:Scab]]

             (גָּרָב, garab, Deu 28:27; elsewhere “scurvy,” a diseased scurf on the skin; מַסְפִחִת, mispachath, Lev 13:6-8; a harmless cutaneous eruption; סִפִּחִת, sappachath, Lev 13:2; 14, 56, the mange in the hair causing it to fall out; kindred with these last two is שָׂפִחfor סָפִח, saphach, to “smite with a scab,” Isa 3:17, i.e. premature baldness; יִלֶּפֶת, yallepheth, Lev 21:20; Lev 22:22, an itching or tetter in the skin). SEE DISEASE; SEE LEPROSY.

## Scabbard[[@Headword:Scabbard]]

             (תִּעִר, taar, Jer 47:6; elsewhere “sheath”). SEE SWORD.

## Scaeus[[@Headword:Scaeus]]

             in Greek mythology, was one of the twelve sons of Hippocoön, who expelled Icarius and Tyndareus from Lacedaemon, but were afterwards themselves overcome and slain by Hercules.

## Scaffold[[@Headword:Scaffold]]

             (כַּיּוֹר, kiyor, 2Ch 6:13; elsewhere used of the “laver” and “pans” for the sacred service), a platform or pulpit (q.v.) for public speaking; probably raised from the floor, but whether round (as the name would seem to denote) or square (as the dimensions would imply) is uncertain.

## Scala Santa[[@Headword:Scala Santa]]

             (Ital. for holy stair), a celebrated staircase, consisting of twenty-eight white marble steps, in a little chapel of the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome. Romanists assert that this is the staircase which Christ several times ascended and descended when he appeared before Pilate, and that it was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Rome. Multitudes of pilgrims creep up the steps of the Scala Santa on their knees with roses in their hands, kissing each step as they ascend. On reaching the top, they repeat a prayer. The performance of this ceremony is regarded as being particularly meritorious, entitling the devout pilgrim to plenary indulgence. It was while thus ascending these holy stairs that Luther thought he heard the words “The  just shall live by faith,” and, mortified at the degradation to which his superstition had brought him, fled from the spot.

Certain churches in England had similar staircases, which enjoyed the privilege of affording composition for a visit to Rome — at Westminster Abbey, in 1504; St. Mary's Chapel, at Boston; St. Mary's Chapel in the Austin Canons' Church, Norwich; and at Windsor, with a college of ten priests, until 1504.

## Scale[[@Headword:Scale]]

             1, of fishes (קִשְׂקֶשֶׂת, kaskeseth, Lev 11:9-10; Lev 11:12; Deu 14:10; Eze 29:4; so of the laninoe of a coat of “mail,” 1Sa 17:5); similarly λεπίς (a flake) of incrustations from the eyes (Act 9:18); but in Job 41:15 (Hebrews 7) the scaly armor of the crocodile is figuratively denoted (אִפַּיקֵי מָגַנַּים, strong ones of shields, A.V. “scales”);

2, of balances (פֶּלֶס, peles, in the sing. only, “weight,” Pro 16:11; “scales,” Isa 40:12; always associated with מאֹזְיַם, the balance proper);

3, as a verb, to scale the walls of a city ( עָלָהolah, Pro 21:22, to go up, as elsewhere often). SEE LADDER.

Before the introduction of coins, balances were of the utmost importance for the weighing of gold and silver in every commercial transaction (Gen 23:16; Gen 43:21; Isa 46:6; Jer 32:9), so that a balance was required to be of exquisite delicacy. Allusions to this are found in Isa 40:15; Ecclesiastes 28:29, “small dust of the balance,” “a little grain of the balance;” and all dishonesty in the treatment of the scales is sternly forbidden and denounced (Lev 19:35; Hos 12:7; Amo 8:5; Mic 6:11; Pro 11:1; Pro 16:11). Hence arose the Rabbinic rule that the scales should be made of marble which could not wear away. The above term פֶּלֶס, peles (rendered “weight” Pro 16:11 [Sept. ῥοπη], and “scales” Isa 40:12 [Sept. σταθμός), is said by Kimchi (on Isa 26:7) to be properly the beam of the balance. In his Lexicon he says it is the part in which the tongue moves, and which the weigher holds in his hand. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.) supposed it was a  steelyard. That the steelyard was an invention known to the ancients is certain, for specimens of them, elaborately adorned, have been found at Pompeii and Herculaneum (Mus. Borbon. 1, 55). Still it was probably not known until the Roman era, and indeed is said to have been called Trutina Campana, from its invention in Campania (Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v. “Trutina”). No traces of its use have been found either in the tombs or temples of Egypt or Assyria, and this is a sufficient proof that the instrument was unknown in those countries. Hence there is no evidence that this instrument was known to the Hebrews. Of the material of which the balance was made we have no information. SEE BALANCE.

It is thought that the Jews knew the constellation Libra as one of the signs of the zodiac (2Ki 23:5; Job 38:32). SEE ASTRONOMY.

## Scaliger, Joseph Justus[[@Headword:Scaliger, Joseph Justus]]

             son of Julius Caesar Scaliger, a learned critic, and his rival in learning and arrogance, was born, in 1540, at Agen, and was educated at the college of Bordeaux, and, finally, by his father and Turnebus. Languages he acquired with wonderful ease, and is said to have been master of no less than thirteen. His friends denominated him “an ocean of science,” and “the masterpiece of nature.” He died in 1609, professor of belles lettres at Leyden. His works, most of which are commentaries on the classics, are numerous. Of his other productions, one of the most valuable is the treatise De Emendatione Temporum.

## Scall[[@Headword:Scall]]

             (invariably נֶתֶק, nethek, the mange, or diseased falling out of the hair of the head or beard, Lev 13:30 sq.). SEE LEPROSY.

## Scalp[[@Headword:Scalp]]

             (קָרְקֹד, kodkcd, Psalm 48:21; “pate,” Psa 7:16; the crown of the head [as elsewhere rendered], so called from the parting of the hair at that spot).

## Scamander[[@Headword:Scamander]]

             in Greek mythology, was (1) a son of Oceanus and Tethys, a river god in Troas, originally named Xanthus. He married the nymph Idaea, and became the father of Teucer and Glaucia. Hector's son, ordinarily called Astyanax, bore the appellative Scamandrius, derived from the name of this deity. (2) A nephew of the above, the son of Glaucia and Deimachus.

## Scamandrodice[[@Headword:Scamandrodice]]

             in Greek mythology, was the name occasionally given to Calyce, the mother of Cycnus.

## Scambler, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Scambler, Edward, D.D]]

             an English Protestant Dissenter and bishop, was born in 1512, and educated at the University of Cambridge. In the reign of queen Mary he was pastor of the first Protestant congregation; in London, but went abroad during the Marian persecution returned in the early days of Elizabeth's reign, and was chaplain to archbishop Parker; consecrated bishop of Peterborough in 1560, translated to Norwich in 1584. He conducted himself with wisdom and moderation, was a learned man, but zealous against the papists. He encouraged religious meetings among the clergy, but the queen suppressed them because Puritans were admitted. He died May 7, 1597 and was interred in Norwich Cathedral. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 1:4.

## Scamilli[[@Headword:Scamilli]]

             plain blocks or subplinths, placed under columns, statues, etc., to elevate them. They differ from ordinary pedestals in having no moldings about them, and in being usually of smaller size.

## Scandinavia[[@Headword:Scandinavia]]

             a large peninsula in the north of Europe, bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean; on the west by the Atlantic, North Sea, Scager Rack, Cattegat, and Sound; on the south and east by the Baltic Sea, Gulf of Bothnia, and Finland, with which it is connected by an isthmus 325 miles wide. This peninsula includes the two kingdoms Norway (q.v.) and Sweden (q.v.). The ancient Scandinavia, or Scandia, included Northern Denmark as well as the peninsula that still retains the name. It is first mentioned by Pliny, who, unaware that the peninsula was attached to Finland on the north, considered Scandinavia as an island.

## Scandinavian Architecture[[@Headword:Scandinavian Architecture]]

             Many of the earlier Norwegian and Swedish cathedrals were built by English or French workmen. There were six basilicas in Norway, with towers at the end of the choir aisles. In Denmark there are eight round churches and one octagonal. Roeskilde, Ribe, and Thorsager are apsidal; but the general characteristics of the Danish churches are a square east end, and an immense south porch and parvise. The wooden churches of Norway are probably of Byzantine origin, the plans having been brought back by the Varangians.

## Scandinavian Mythology[[@Headword:Scandinavian Mythology]]

             SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.

## Scandinavian Versions[[@Headword:Scandinavian Versions]]

             1. The Norse or Icelandic. — The first version into this language was made by Oddur Gotshalkson, son of a bishop of Holum, in Iceland. He attended the lectures of Luther and Melancthon, and on his return to Iceland entered upon a translation of the Scriptures. To avoid persecution, he commenced his work in a small cell in a cow house, and completed the New Test. in 1539. Finding it difficult, from the state of public opinion, to print it in Iceland, he sailed for Denmark, and published it at Copenhagen, under the patronage of Christian III. The translation, made from the Vulgate, corrected in some cases according to Luther's translation, was published in 1540. From this time on, parts of the Old Test. were published, until at length, in 1584, the entire Bible was printed in Icelandic at Holum. The work was conducted by Gudbrand Thorlakson, bishop of Holum, and has been called “a faithful mirror of Luther's German version;” and, on account of the purity of its diction, it is still held in high esteem. In 1609 a revised edition of the New Test. was published by bishop Gudbrand at Holum, with the title Thad Nyia Testamentum, a Islendsku yfersied og lesid epter theim riettustu Utleggingum, sem til hafa feingist (prentad a Holum i Hialltadal, anno 1609). In 1644 a revised edition of the entire Bible was published by Thorlak Skuleson, the grandson of Gudbrand, and his successor in the episcopate. In 1728 another edition was published, under the inspection of Stein Jonson, bishop of Holum. Following the Danish Bible too closely, this edition, on account of Danicisms, was found to be scarcely intelligible to the Icelanders, and hence never obtained much circulation. In 1747 a fourth edition, according to the text of 1644, was published at Copenhagen; a fifth in 1750; a sixth in 1807, chiefly at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society; and a seventh in 1813 by the same society, and often since. Since the year 1863 a revised edition of the New Test. and Psalms has been circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in 1867 the entire revised Bible, which is now in circulation, left the press at the expense of the same society.

2. Danish. — The earliest translation of any portion of the Scriptures into Danish is contained in a MS. preserved in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, supposed to have been written in the 13th or beginning of the  14th century. It proceeds no firther than the second book of Kings. In 1515, Pedersen, who is said to have been the first Lutheran clergyman in Zealand, published at Paris a Danish version of the Gospels and Epistles appointed to be read in churches. It was reprinted at Leipsic in 1518. The whole New Test., Det Nye Testamente, was translated by Hans Mikkelsen, sometimes called John Michaelis, and published at Leipsic in 1524, and reprinted at Antwerp in 1529. This version was executed by the command and under the patronage of Christian II. An improved edition of Mikkelsen's New Test. was published by Pedersen in 1529 at Antwerp, and republished, with the Psalms, in 1531. In 1550 the whole Bible was published in Danish at Copenhagen. This translation was undertaken at the suggestion of Bugenhagen, the celebrated Reformer, who had been invited to the court of Copenhagen to assist in the correction of ecclesiastical abuses.

A revision of the entire version was undertaken in 1586 by the command of Frederick II, which was published in 1589, with Luther's notes, under the title Biblia det er den gantske hellige Scrift, paa Danske igen offverseet oc prentet efter salige oc Hoglofflige Ikukomelse, Kong Frederichs den II Befalning. Met Register, alle D. Lutheri Fortaler, hans Udlegning i Broedden, oc Viti Theodori Summarier (prentet i Kjöbenhavn aft Matz Vingaardt, anno 1589, fol.). In 1604 king Christian IV appointed Dr. Resen, bishop of Zealand, to superintend a fresh revision of the Scriptures, which was published in 1607, with the title Biblia paa Danske, etc. In 1633 an edition from the revised text of 1589 was published at Copenhagen — Biblia det er den gantske hellige Scrift, etc. — and in 1647 a revised edition from Resen's Bible, designated “Swaning's Bible,” so called after the corrector Hans Swaning, archbishop of Zealand, was published, which was again edited in 1670. In 1714 a College of Missions was established at Copenhagen, which issued several editions of the Scriptures according to Swaning's text: one in 1717, a second in 1718, followed in 1722 by a third, and in 1728 by a fourth issue. In 1728 the mission press was destroyed by fire, and the Orphan House then obtained the exclusive privilege of printing the Danish Bible; and several editions were published by that institution between the years 1732 and 1745. In the meantime efforts were made to obtain a more correct and faithful edition of the Scriptures, and in 1748 the committee appointed by royal authority published a revised New Test.; and since that time numerous other editions were printed before the formation of the Danish Bible Society in 1814. In the year 1810 the British and Foreign Bible Society printed all edition of the Danish New Test. from the Copenhagen edition of 1799, the press  being superintended by the Rev. W.F. Rosing, minister of the Danish church in London. A second edition was published in 1814. In the following year another revision of the Bible was commenced at Copenhagen by royal authority. Bishop Muenter, together with five learned professors, constituted the commission of revisal; and in 1819 all edition of the New Test., as corrected and revised by them, was published, followed by a fourth edition of the entire Bible in 1824.

The committee of the Danish Bible Society has been engaged for several years past in the task of revising the Danish Old Test., and in 1871 a thoroughly revised text of the Danish Bible was published, which has also been adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The facilities for the circulation of the Protestant Bible in the kingdom of Denmark have within recent years been greatly increased by an arrangement happily come to between the British and Foreign Bible Society of London and the Orphan Institution at Copenhagen, which latter body possesses by law the exclusive right to print the Scriptures within the Danish realm. Prior to 1855 all editions of the Scriptures produced at Copenhagen were accompanied by the Apocrypha and explanatory notes, and hence the Bible Society was by its rules precluded from taking any part in their circulation. In that year, however, at the instance of the London society, the directors of the Orphan House agreed to produce the New Test. free from all notes and Apocryphal references. The concession thus happily obtained was at once acted on, and an edition of 10,000 Danish New Testaments was produced for the London society under the auspices of the Copenhagen Orphan Institution, and passed into rapid circulation. In 1859 a subsequent edition of 5000 was found necessary to meet the demands made upon the society's agency, which increase from year to year. As to the circulation of the entire Bible, without Apocrypha and explanatory notes, the society was prevented from doing so until 1872, when, after nmany negotiations, permission was obtained to circulate Bibles according to the rules laid down by the society, but with the conditions:

1. That the summaries and the references to parallel passages (with the exception of those which relate to the Apocryphal books) which are found in the editions of the Orphan House be also inserted in the editions published by the society in Denmark.

2. That the title page of these editions be as follows: Bibelen eller den Hellige Skrift, indeholdende det Gamle og det Nye Testamentes  Kanoniske Böger (“The Bible, or the Holy Scriptures, containing the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments”).

3. The fee to be paid to the Orphan House is provisionally fixed at one mark for each copy. We have stated above that the revised Danish text which was published in 1871 has also been adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. This was done after those marginal renderings which savor of “note or comment” had been stricken out. The annual report of 1874 stated the fact that “the first edition of the revised Danish Bible has left the press, the proofs having been read by the Rev. J. Plenge. This is the first edition of the complete Bible printed by the Orphan House at Copenhagen directly for the society.”

3. Norwegian. — Although the Norwegian and Danish Bibles were originally the same, yet the revisions of later times have made them different. Since about 1860 the Norwegian Bible, with slightly revised text, was published both by the Norwegian and the British Bible Society. A revision of the New Test. was begun about the year 1871, at the expense and by the authority of the Norwegian Bible Society, with the sanction of the chief of the Royal Church and Education departments. The changes introduced rarely touch the interpretation of the text, but are chiefly intended to express the same sense as before, only in language more conformed to the requirements of modern usage. Of the Old. Test., the Pentateuch, in a revised form, was published in 1876.

4. Swedish. — A version of the Scriptures into Swedish is said to have been made in the 14th century by order of St. Brigit, or Bridget, who, about the year 1344, founded the religious order called, from her, the Brigittines. A translation of the New Test., according to Luther's German version (the first Swedish version of which we have any definite account), was undertaken, by command of Gustavus Vasa, in 1523, by Laurentius Andreas, and printed in 1526, in folio, at Stockholm, with the title Thet Nyia Testamentit pa Swensko. The first Swedish version of the entire Bible was published at Upsala in 1541, with the Apocrypha, the Old Test. being translated by Laurentius and Olaus Petri from Luther's German version of 1534, and the New Test. was that of Laurentius Andreas, printed in 1526. Another version of the New Test., prepared by Amund Laurent, was published at Stockholm in 1550, and again in 1601 and 1621; and in the course of subsequent years several editions of the Psalms were printed. At the commencement of the 17th century, Charles IX ordered Jonas Petri,  bishop of Stregnaes, and other learned men, to collate Luther's editions of 1534 and 1545, noting such discrepancies as appeared to them of any importance, with the view of producing an improved edition of the Swedish translation. These notes, when completed, were called Observationes Stregnenses; and it was decreed in the Synod of Stockholm, in 1602, that they should be incorporated with the old version in a new edition of the Bible. From various causes, this new edition was not published until 1618, when it was printed in folio at Stockholm, with the following title: Biblia thet aer all then Helgha Scrifft pa Swensko. Effter förre Bibliens Text, oförandrat medh Forsprak pa the Boeker ther förr inge woro, medh Sumsarier för Capitelen, Marginalier, flere Concordantier, samt nytlighe Förklaringar och Register, etc., förmerat och efter then stormächtigeste högborne Förstes och Herres, Herr Gustaff Adolfs, Swerikes Göthes och Wendes Konungs, Befalning (tryckt i Stockholm, anno 1618). In 1622 not a copy of this edition remained on sale, and a reprint was therefore issued at Lubeck, followed by several successive editions at Leyden, and by two editions (in 1636 and 1646) at Stockholm. In 1650 the Stregnaes Bible was printed under the care of bishop Matthia, which was executed very negligently. The edition of 1618 was also reprinted several times, but with many deviations from the text. A revised edition of the entire Bible was undertaken under the reign of Charles XII, which was published in 1703, with the title Biblia thet är all then Heliga Scrifft pa Swensko, effter Konung Carl then Tolftes Befalning (Stockholm, 1703). Another revised edition appeared in 1709 at the same place. The preparation for this edition was begun by John Gezel, bishop of Abo, who died in 1690, but the work was completed and published by his son. In the course of the 18th century so many editions of the Danish Scriptures appeared that the country was generally considered well supplied with Bibles. When, however, in 1808, Dr. Paterson visited the country, the fact was ascertained that the poorer inhabitants, on account of the high price of Bibles, were almost destitute of the Word of God. The consequence was the formation of the Evangelical Society, which issued several editions for the poor, aided by grants from the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1815 the Swedish Bible Society was formed, which, with its numerous auxiliary societies, continues the important work of printing and disseminating the Scriptures. Till 1826 it received much assistance from the British and Foreign Bible Society, when the decision of the Apocryphal question in London severed the connection between the two societies. In order to maintain the circulation of Bibles in Sweden without  the Apocrypha, several editions of the Old and New Testaments have been issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Their first edition, which was stereotyped, was published in 1828. The text adopted was that of the last edition of the Swedish Bible Society. Several editions from the same text have since been printed by the same society in London, and likewise at Stockholm, through the medium of their agency maintained there. A revision of the old text is now under preparation. The total number of copies of Swedish Scriptures issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society up to March 31, 1877, amounted to 2,599,261, of which 452,879 were Bibles, 1,912,782 New Testaments and New Testaments with the Psalms, 218,650 portions of the Old Test., and 14,950 portions of the New Test.

5. Faroese. — Into this dialect only the Gospel of St. Matthew has been translated, about the year 1817, by the Rev. Mr. Schroeter, rector of one of the churches in the Faroe Isles. It was corrected by Mr. Lyngbye, of Jutland, who also superintended the printing of St. Matthew's Gospel, of which 1500 copies were issued. This is the only book of the New Test. that has ever been printed or translated into Faroese.

See Lorck, Bibelgeschichte, 1, 203 sq., 208 sq., 399 sq.; Göze, Sammlung merkwürdiger Bibeln, p. 277 sq.; Index Bibliorum, in Christiano- Ernestina Bibliotheca, p. 13, 42, 66; Bibliotheca Biblica, oder Verzeichniss der Bibel-Sammlung der Herzogin von Braunschweig, etc., p. 182 sq.; The Bible of Every Land, p. 214 sq.; Schinmeyer, Versuch einer Geschichte der schwedischen Bibel-Uebersetzungen und Ausgaben (Flensburg, 1777). (B.P.)

## Scape-goat[[@Headword:Scape-goat]]

             (Hebrews עֲזָאזֵל Azazel) is the name given in the A.V. to one of the two goats used in the sin offering for the entire community of Israel on the great day of atonement, the goat which was to be sent away into the wilderness. To determine which of the two goats was to be slain, and which sent alive into the wilderness, it was ordered that the priest should “cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord [Jehovah], and the other lot for the scapegoat” (Lev 16:8), but literally for Azazel (לִעֲזָאזֵל), a word nowhere else used. There can be no doubt that this has the appearance of being some sort of personage, or interest personified,  standing over against Jehovah, or somehow contradistinguished from him. But opinions have from early times been divided on the subject.

1. The one followed by our translators, which regards it as a name for the goat itself, is of great antiquity, and has numbers on its side — Symmachus (τράγος ἀπερχόμενος), Aquila (τράγος ἀπολελυμμένος), the Vulgate (hircus emissarius), Luther, and many moderns, also recently Hoffmann. The term so understood is viewed as a compound of עֵז,goat and אָזִל, to go away. The chief objections to it are that עֵזis never used precisely of a goat; in the plural it bears the sense of goats generally, but in the singular it designates only she goat; and in Lev 16:10; Lev 16:26, the goat and Azazel are expressly distinguished from each other, “the goat. (הִשָּׂעַיר) for Azazel.” These are fatal objections, and have led to the general abandonment of the view.

2. By others it has been taken as the name of a place, either some mountain in the desert (Pseudo-Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Jarchi), or a lonely and desolate region (Bochart, Deyling, Carpzov, Jahn). But this, also, is at variance with the natural import of the statements, especially with the expression in Lev 16:10, “to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness,” which would then mean, for the wilderness into the wilderness. Nor could Jehovah on the one side, and a place on the other, form a proper antithesis.

3. Others, again, have taken the word as a pealpal form of the Arabic verb עזל, to remove, formed by modification from עֲזִלְזִל, so that the meaning comes to be for a complete removing or dismissal (Tholuck, Steudel, Winer, Bähr). Grammatically, no objection can be urged against this view; and it undoubtedly accords well with the general import of this part of the rite. “The true expiation,” to use the words of Bähr, “was effected by the blood of the first goat, which was set apart for Jehovah; on the other hand, the ceremony with the other goat appears as a mere addition made for special reasons, a kind of complement to the wiping away of the sins which had already been effected by means of the sacrifice... After the expiation had been accomplished by the sprinkling of the blood, the sin was still further to be carried away into the desert. What the first goat, which died as a sin offering, was no longer in a condition to set forth was supplied by the second, which was, as it were, one with the first, inasmuch as it carried the sin which had been covered entirely away, and that into the desert or desolate place, where it was quite forgotten; so that the idea of expiation,  or the extermination of sin, was rendered thereby absolutely perfect” (Mic 7:19). In this view of the matter, the casting of the lots had for its object the assigning of one goat to Jehovah, namely, for an atonement to his justice, and the other to complete removal or bearing away into the oblivion of the desert — namely, of the sin which had been atoned; an explanation which accords well with the general idea of the transaction, and does no violence to the language. The objection of Hengstenberg, that it gives a cold and empty appearance to the peculiar word Azazel, a word coined for the occasion, to suppose it to have expressed only the comparatively common idea of complete removal, may perhaps be obviated by conceiving this idea to have been for the occasion invested with a kind of personified existence — much as Sheol, the region of departed spirits, became personified — the one the coverer or dark receptacle of people's lives, the other of their (forgiven) sins. Hence also, probably, the reason of the word being confined to this one occasion, there being no other in respect to which such utter personified oblivion could be predicated.

4. But there is still another class of writers who are disposed to claim for the word a more distinctly personal existence, and who would refer it directly to Satan. This view is certainly of high antiquity, and is expressed in the reading of the Sept. ἀποπομπαῖος, which means, not scape goat, or sent away, but the turner away, the averter. The expression of Josephus is somewhat dubious (Ant. 3, 10, 3), but it seems also to favor the same view; and it was very common with the rabbins, as in later times it has the support of many authorities Spenser, Ammon, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, etc., who hold it to be equivalent to the Roman averruncus, or evil daemon, which was supposed to inhabit desert places, and who needed to be propitiated; but adopted also, though purged of this idolatrous connection, by Witsius, Meyer, Alting, Hengstenberg (in his Bücher Moses, transl. by Robbins, N.Y. 1843); also quite recently by Vaihinger (in Herzog) and Kurtz (Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament). These writers hold that the view in question best preserves the contrast between the two goats — one for Jehovah, and one for the great adversary Azazel — the latter a being as well as the former, and a being who (as daemons generally) was supposed to have his peculiar dwelling in the desert. The goat, however, that was sent to this evil spirit — emphatically the removed or separate one — was no sacrifice, but rather a witness that the accepted sacrifice had been made. It proclaimed, as it were, “that the horrible wilderness, the abode of impure spirits, is alone the place to which the sins of the people,  as originally foreign to human: nature and society, properly belong; that Azazel, the abominable, the sinner from the beginning (Joh 8:44), is the one from whom they have proceeded, and to whom they must again with abhorrence be sent back, after the solemn atonement and absolution of the congregation have been accomplished” (Vaihinger). No doubt, as thus explained, the leading import of the transaction with this goat is in proper accordance with the service of the day; but it cannot appear otherwise than strange that, in the most sacred rite of the old covenant, Satan should be so formally recognized as, according to this view, he must have been; that he should there be recognized under a name which suggests a quite different idea concerning him than that under which he is elsewhere presented; and that, notwithstanding he was so publicly and so regularly associated with this name, it should never again be employed as a personal designation. Such peculiarities are rather startling, and dispose us, on the whole, to concur in the view which ranks third in the list of opinions now exhibited. SEE AZAZEL.

## Scapular, Or Scapulary[[@Headword:Scapular, Or Scapulary]]

             (Lat. scapula, the shoulder blade), originally a small garment without sleeves, a part of the habit of several religious orders in the Church of Rome. The several fraternities are distinguished by the color, shape, and material of these holy badges. It was first introduced by St. Benedict in lieu of a heavy cowl for the shoulders. Beirut informs us that “the badge which is called the holy scapulary is made of two small pieces of woolen stuff, about the extent of a hand, hanging by two little laces down from the neck upon both the breast and back of the devout person who wears it.” The scapular usually has on it a picture of the Virgin Mary or the initials “I.H.S.” on one piece, and “J.M.J.” (for Jesus, Mary, and Joseph) or two hearts on the other. It appears to have been invented by an English Carmelite friar named Simon Stock, in 1251. According to the Romish legend, he received the original scapular from the Virgin as a distinguishing badge of the Carmelite order. It is much worn by strict Romanists, in the belief that the devil dreads this terrible weapon. It is supposed to effectually preserve against death by drowning or by fire, and, indeed, against all that might injure either the soul or the body. Besides this “Scapular of Mount Carmel,” there are three others, likewise made of two pieces of woolen cloth. The four scapulars may all be worn at once. In this  case, each of the two parts is composed of four pieces, which are sewed together like the leaves of a book; and the two parts are joined together by two tape strings about eighteen inches long. Of these four leaves or pieces in each part, the “Scapular of Mount Carmel” is brown and about four inches square; the “Scapular of our Lady of the Seven Dolors” is black and somewhat smaller, the “Scapular of the Immaculate Conception” is blue and still smaller; the “Scapular of the Most Holy Trinity” is white and the smallest, with a cross of red and blue wool in the middle of it (Barnum, Romanism as it Is, p. 538). Many graces and indulgences are attached to the wearing of the scapularies by many papal bulls; one of these, the bull Sabbatina, secures to the wearer, by direct promise from the Virgin to pope John XXI, deliverance from purgatorial fire on the first Saturday after death.

## Scarf[[@Headword:Scarf]]

             a piece of silk or other material, hanging from the neck, worn over the rochet or surplice. It is not mentioned in the rubric of the English ritual, but is worn by our bishops and dignitaries of the Church. It has been used from the primitive ages by the clergy, when the presbyters and bishops wore a scarf in the administration of the sacraments, and on some other occasions. According to Walcott (Sacred Archoeology), it properly belonged to the doctors of divinity and dignitaries, is called talaga in Italy and Malta, and is worn by the doctors of theology.

## Scarlatti, Alessandro[[@Headword:Scarlatti, Alessandro]]

             an Italian musical composer, was born at Naples in 1659. He received a good musical education, and, at the age of twenty-one, wrote his first opera. Little is known of his life except that he was master of the royal chapel under Christina of Sweden in 1680. and after her death filled the same office in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. He also taught in various musical conservatories. He died Oct. 24, 1725. His principal works are about thirty in number, chiefly upon secular subjects, but among them are several oratorios, one called The Sacrifice of Abraham: — two renderings of the Stabat Mater: — and six Masses. See Fetis, Biog. Univ. des Musiciens.

## Scarlet[[@Headword:Scarlet]]

             Often occurs in Scripture associated with purple and blue. The words so translated occur in the following forms;

1. שָׁנַי, shani', and שָׁנַים, shanim', alone, Gen 38:28-30; Jos 2:18-21; 2Sa 1:24; Pro 31:21; Son 4:3; Jer 4:30; Sept. κόκκινον, Vulg. coccinutm; Isa 1:18, φοινικοῦν, coccinum,.

2. תּוֹלִעִת שָׁנַי, tolaath shani', Exo 25:4; Exo 26:1; Exo 26:31; Exo 26:36; Exo 27:16; Exo 28:5-6; Exo 28:8; Exo 28:15; Exo 35:6; Exo 35:23; Exo 35:25; Exo 38:18; Exo 38:23; Exo 39:3; Num 4:8, κόκκινον, and κόκκινον with διπλοῦν, κεκλωσμένον, κλώτον, διανενησμένον, Vulg. bis tinctus, coccus bis tinctus, and vermiculus.

3. שְׁנַי תוֹלִעִת, sheni' tolaath, Lev 14:4; Lev 14:6; Lev 14:49; Lev 14:51-52; Num 19:6; Sept. κοκκίνον, with κεκλωσμένον , and κλωστόν; vermiculus, coccus, and with bis tinctus.

4. תּוֹלִע, told, alone, Isa 1:18, κόκκινον, vermiculus; Lam 4:5, Vulg. croceis; Nah 2:3, coccineis. In the New Test., Mat 27:28; Heb 9:19; Rev 17:3-4; Rev 18:12; Rev 18:16; κόκκινος, coccineus. The first of these words, shani', is by some derived from shanah', שָנָה, “to repeat,” and is thus interpreted to mean “double dyed,” but which, Gesenius observes, is applicable only to the Tyrian purple (see Braunius, De Vest. 1, 15, § 214, p. 237; Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 3, p. 525-527). Gesenius prefers an Arabic root meaning to shine, because scarlet garments were admired for their brightness: but Jerome asserts that the word means coccinum (Epist. ad Fabiolam). It is certain that tola denotes a worm, grub, or insect, and the Sept. and Vulg. plainly understood by it the coccus, from which the ancients procured a blood red crimson dye, the Coccus ilicis of Linnaeus, class 4, Tetragyma, the kermez of the Arabians, whence used to be derived the French word cramoisi, and our crimson; but Kilian gives carmensinum, because made from a worm, which, in the Phoenician tongue, is called carmen. Hesychius defines coccus as that from which the Phoenician dye is obtained. It was the female of this remarkable insect that was employed; and though supplanted by the cochineal (Coccus cacti), it is still used for the purpose  in India and Persia. It attains the size and form of a pea, is of a violet black color, covered with a whitish powder, adhering to plants, chiefly various species of oak, and so closely resembling grains that its insect nature was not generally known for many centuries. According to Beckman, the epithet vermiculatus was applied to it during the Middle Ages, when this fact became generally understood, and that hence is derived the word vermilion. Hence the Hebrew words mean both the coccus itself, and the deep red or bright rich crimson which was derived from it (as in Son 4:3, “thy lips are like a thread of scarlet”); and so the word “scarlet” signified in the time of our translators, rather than the color now called by that name, and which was unknown in the time of James I. This insect is widely distributed over many of the southeastern countries of the ancient world. It occurs abundantly in Spain (Kirby and Spence, Introduction to Entomology [1828], 1, 319, 320). It is found on the Quercus coccifera, or kermes oak, in Palestine (Kitto, Physical History, p. 219). Pliny speaks of the coccus as a red color much esteemed, which he distinguishes from purple (Hist. Nat. 9, 65), and describes as a gay, red, lively bright, approaching the color of fire (ibid. and 21:22). All the ancients concur in saying that this dye was made from a sort of little grains which were gathered from the holm oak (Theophrast. Hist. Plant. 3, 16; Pliny, 16, 12; Dioscorides, 4, 48; Pausan. 10, 36). They not only call them grains, but speak of them as the vegetable productions of the oak itself (Plutarch, Thesaur. p. 7); and Pliny (Hist. Nat. 16, 12) calls them cusculia, from the Greek κοσκύλλειν, which signifies “to cut little excrescences,” because they cut or scrape off these small grains of the oak. Yet he was not entirely ignorant of their insect character, for he speaks of it becoming a worm (24, 4). It seems, however, that the color thus obtained was not durable (22, 3). It was known at a very early period in Canaan (Gen 38:28); it was one of the colors of the high priest's ephod (Exo 28:6), and of its girdle (Exo 28:8), of the breastplate (Exo 28:15), and of cloths for sacred uses (Num 4:8); it was used in cleansing the leper (Lev 14:4), to indicate, as Abarbanel thinks, that a healthy complexion was restored to him. It was the dress of females in the time of Saul (2Sa 1:24); of opulent persons in later times (Lam 4:5); of the Babylonian and Median soldiers, who also wore red shields (Nah 2:4; comp. “Scuta lectissimis coloribus distinguunt,” Tacitus, De Mor. Germ. c. 6, and Philostratus, Epist. de Lacedoemoniis). Three mistranslations of the word occur in our version, “She is not afraid of the snow for her household: for all her household are  clothed with scarlet” (Pro 31:21). Since there is no connection between the color and a defense from the cold, it would be better rendered, as in the margin, “double garments.” (Comp. Sept. ἐνδεδυμένοι; Vulg. vestiti duplicibus.)

The next verse of the Sept. begins Δισσὰς χλαίνας ἐποίησε τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς, She hath made double garments for her husband. In Isa 1:18 and Jer 4:30 the word should be rendered “scarlet,” and not “crimson.” The final reference to scarlet is in regard to pagan Rome, which, like all cities, is represented as a female; and since everybody wore scarlet in Rome, and especially during war, she is described as being arrayed in that color. In Exo 39:3, it is said, “They did beat gold into their plates, and cut into wires, to work in the blue, and in the purple, and in the scarlet, and in the fine linen,” which is explained to mean that these five kinds — blue, purple, scarlet, fine linen, and gold — were twisted into one thread; thus a thread of gold with six threads of blue, and so with the rest, after which they twisted all these threads into one (Braunius, 1, 17, 26). It seems plain, from Exo 35:25, that the blue and purple and scarlet were spun by hand from wool already dyed of these colors. The white ground was invariably designated by the term “fine linen.” The cloth was thus in stripes or checks of different materials. Wilkinson remarks that the color was in like manner imparted by the Egyptians to the thread, etc. — that is, cloth was not dyed after being woven (Manners and Customs, 3, 125). It will have been perceived that great difficulty attends the attempt to determine the precise distinctions of colors known to the ancients by the various preceding names. The only possible method whereby they could have conveyed them to our minds would have been by comparing them to the colors of natural objects, whose appearance was immutable and whose identity was beyond question. Such an attempt has been made by bishop Wilkins in his Real Character. We may illustrate the utility of these requisites by the color blue, which is defined to mean “the color produced or exposed to the view by the blowing away, or clearing away, or dispersing of the clouds” (Encyclop. Metropol.) But, as is well known, the shades of ethereal blue vary in different countries, and even in different altitudes of the same country; hence the word blue, if illustrated by this standard, would convey a different idea to the inhabitants of different regions. It is most likely that all our ideas of sensible impressions are liable to errors of association. It is, however, satisfactory to know that, like all other dubious matters, these are of minor importance. We add a further reference to Goguet, Origin of Laws, Arts, and Sciences, 2, 95, etc. (Edinb. 1764) SEE COLOR.

The natural history of the κόκκος may be thus summed up. It is a genus of insects belonging to the order Homoptera, of which the males have a single pair of wings and an obsolete mouth; while the females have no wings, but a perfect mouth (rostrum) formed for piercing plants and sucking their juices. They live on trees and plants of various kinds. Upwards of thirty species are included in the catalogue of British insects; but of these many have probably been introduced on exotic plants. There are numerous species, many of which are known to yield rich dyes, and several have been employed in the arts. Up to the time of the discovery of America none could compete with the species which infests the evergreen oaks (Coccus ilicis); but that has been thrown into the shade by the superior productiveness, if not the superior color, of a Mexican species (C. cacti), whence we obtain cochineal. The insect called kermes by the Arabs is abundant wherever the tree on which it lives is common. All over the south of Europe and throughout Western Asia this occurs in extensive forests. The hills of the south of Judah about Hebron, the sides of Carmel and of Tabor, the slopes of Gilead and Bashan, besides many other localities in Palestine, are sheeted with forests and groves of the evergreen oaks, from which a copious harvest of coccus may be annually gathered. It is no wonder, then, that the dye was so early familiar to the people of Canaan. It is in that stage of the insect when the larva is about fully grown that it contains the coloring matter in greatest abundance. The little scales are picked from the tree and simply dried, when they yield their dye by infusion in water. To make this permanent, what is called a mordant is added — a substance which, having no coloring faculty in itself, acts chemically as a bond of union between the dye and the textile material, and often modifies the tint. The ancients used an impure alum for this purpose. Pliny tells us that thus was obtained from the κόκκος a color of the most brilliant character (Hist. Nat. 9, 65; 21, 22). The hue now produced by the Kermes coccus with alum is a rich blood red; but if the same mordant be used as with cochineal — solution of tin — it yields a scarlet fully as brilliant as that rich American dye, and perhaps more permanent (Bancroft, Perm. Col. 1, 404). The far greater proportion of coloring matter to the bulk in the latter will always, however, prevent the kermes from regaining its commercial importance. SEE CRIMSON.

## Scattergood, Samuel[[@Headword:Scattergood, Samuel]]

             an English clergyman of the latter part of the 17th century, was a fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, vicar of Blockly, Worcestershire (1678), and died  in 1696. A volume of his Sermons was published (Lond. 1723, 2 vols. 8vo; reprinted 1810).

## Scaurus, M. Aemilius[[@Headword:Scaurus, M. Aemilius]]

             A Roman governor of Syria in New Test. times, was the eldest son of his father of the same name, and stepson of the dictator Sulla, whom his mother, Caecilia, married after the death of his father. In the third Mithridatic war, he served under Pompey as quaestor. The latter sent him to Damascus with an army, and from thence he marched into Judea to settle the disputes between the brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. Both of them offered him large sums of money; but he decided for Aristobulus, probably because he bid the highest, B.C. 64. After driving Hyrcanus out of Judaea, Scaurus returned to Damascus. Upon Pompey's arrival at this city in the following year, an accusation was brought against Scaurus of having been bribed by Aristobulus; but, though Pompey reversed his decision and placed Hyrcanus upon the throne, he took no notice of the charges, and left Scaurus in the command of Syria with two legions. Scaurus remained in Syria till B.C. 59, when he was succeeded by L. Marcius Philippus. During his government of Syria he made a predatory incursion into Arabia Petraea, but withdrew on the payment of three hundred talents by Aretas, the king of the country.

On his return to Rome he became a candidate for the curule aedileship, which he held in B.C. 58, the year in which P. Clodius was tribune. The extraordinary splendor with which he celebrated the public games surpassed everything of the kind that had been previously witnessed in Rome, and it is by them that his name has been chiefly handed down to posterity. The temporary theater which he built accommodated 80,000 spectators, and was adorned in the most magnificent manner. Three hundred and sixty pillars decorated the stage, arranged in three stories, of which the lowest was made of white marble, the middle one of glass, and the highest of gilt wood. Between the pillars there were three thousand statues, besides paintings and other ornaments. The combats of wild beasts were equally astonishing. A hundred and fifty panthers were exhibited in the circus, and five crocodiles and a hippopotamus were seen for the first time at Rome. But Scaurus purchased the favor of the people in these shows rather too dearly. So costly were they that they not only absorbed  all the property which his father had left him and the treasures which he had accumulated in the East, but compelled him to borrow money of the usurers in order to defray the expenses.

In B.C. 56 Scaurus was praetor, during which year he presided in the court in which P. Sestius was accused, who was defended by Cicero. In the following year he governed the province of Sardinia, which he plundered without mercy, as he wanted money both to pay his debts and to purchase the consulship. On his return to Rome in B.C. 54, he became a candidate for the consulship; but before the consular elections took place his competitors, at the beginning of July, got P. Valerius Triarius and three others to accuse him of repetundae in Sardinia, thus hoping to get rid of a formidable opponent. His guilt was certain; there were numerous witnesses against him; and M. Cato, who presided as praetor, was not to be corrupted, and was favorable to Triarius. Still, Scaurus did not despair. He was defended by Cicero and Hortensius, as well as by four other orators. Many of the most distinguished men at Rome, and among them nine persons of consular rank, pleaded on his behalf; while the tears of Scaurus himself, and his appeals to the splendor of his aedileship, produced a powerful effect upon the judices. Thus, notwithstanding his guilt, he was acquitted on the 2d of September, almost unanimously. Soon afterwards, and in the course of the same year, he was again accused by Triarius on a charge of ambitus (Cicero, Ad Att. 4, 16, 7, 8; 4, 17, 2; Ad Q. Fr. 3, 2, 3). Drumann says that he was condemned in this year and went into exile. But this appears to be a mistake; for although it is evident from the preceding passages in Cicero's letters that Scaurus was accused of ambitus in B.C. 54, it is equally clear from the testimony of Appian (B.C. 2, 24) that he was condemned in the third consulship of Pompey, B.C. 52. Hence it is probable that Scaurus was acquitted in B.C. 54, and accused again in B.C. 52 under Pompey's new law against ambitus. From this time the name of Scaurus does not occur again. He married Mucia, who had been previously the wife of Pompey, and by her he had one son (Josephus, Ant. 14, 3-5; War, 1, 7; Appian. Syr. 51; Cicero, Pro Sest. 54; De Off. 2, 16; Pliny, H.N. 36, 2; 36, 15, s. 24, et alibi; Val. Max. 2, 4, 6; Cicero, Ad Q. Fr. 2, 15, 4; 2, 16, 3; 3, 1, 4, 5; 3, 2, 3; Ad Att. 4, 15, 7, 9; 4, 16, 7, 8; 4, 17, 2; De Off. 1, 39; Ascon. Argum. in Scaur; and the fragments of Cicero's oration for Scaurus).

The following coin was struck in the curule aedileship of Scaurus and his colleague, P. Plautius Hypsaeus. The subject of the obverse relates to  Hypsaeus, and that of the reverse to Scaurus. The former represents Jupiter in a quadriga, with P. HYPSAEVS. AED. CVR. C. HVPSAE. COS. PREIVER. CAPTV.; the latter part of the legend referring to the conquest of Privernum by C. Plautius Hypsaeus, in B.C. 341. On the obverse side is a camel, with Aretas kneeling by the side of the animal, and holding an olive branch in his hand. The subject refers to the conquest of Aretas by Scaurus mentioned above. The legend is M. SCAVR. AED. CVR. EX. S. C., and below REX ARETAS (Eckhel, 5, 131, 275). SEE ARETAS.

## Scenophylaces[[@Headword:Scenophylaces]]

             SEE CEIMELIARCHAE.

## Scenophylacium[[@Headword:Scenophylacium]]

             the innermost part of the diaconicum, or vestry of the church, and the repository of the sacred vessels and such anathemata or presents as were reputed among the chiefest treasures of the church. It was otherwise called Secretarium, because, as Du Fresne conjectures, the consistory or tribunal of the church was kept here. See Bingham, Antiq. of the Christian Church, 1, 311.

## Scephrus[[@Headword:Scephrus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a son of Tegeates, king of Tegea. He had an interview with Apollo in the temple at Tegea, and his brother Limon, believing that its object was to lodge a complaint against himself, slew him. Limon was himself slain by an arrow from Diana's quiver; but a great dearth came to pass, nevertheless, and the oracle advised that mourning ceremonies be observed in memory of Scephrus. Games were accordingly instituted in honor of Apollo and Diana, in which a priestess of the latter, armed with bow and arrow, was expected to pursue any individual, in imitation of the pursuit of Limon by Diana.

## Scepticism[[@Headword:Scepticism]]

             (from Gr. σκέπτομαι, I consider) strictly denotes that condition in which the mind is before it has arrived at conclusive opinions — when it is still in the act of investigating or reflecting. Scepticism is therefore the opposite of dogmatism. Disbelief is quite a secondary meaning of the term. The Sceptics (disciples of Pyrrho of Elis) aimed at an undisturbed tranquillity of mind, to be attained by a constant balancing of opposing arguments, thus  reducing everything to a state of uncertainty and doubt. Popularly, the word is employed to signify the rejection of all religion — infidelity.

Scepticism has assumed several forms, of which the following are among the most common.

(1) Pantheism, or antisupernaturalism. Spinoza, the leader of this class, talks of nothing less than demonstration, and of being infallibly led to each conclusion by arguments which admit of no reply; a geometrical method of demonstration, the use of which, he said, made it unnecessary to attend to the arguments of opponents.

(2) The academic form, which originated with the Sophists, and which Bayle revived, the essence of which consists in opposing all the systems of speculative belief to each other. Academic doubt is ever seeking, for the avowed purpose of never finding; and perpetually reasoning, in order that it may never come to any conclusion.

(3) The absolute form, which strikes at the root of all opinions, and appears to found a system of universal doubt in the human understanding itself. Of this kind of scepticism the writings of Hume furnish the great and unrivalled example in modern times.

(4) Ridicule. This contains no philosophy, but is a mere series of doubting and jesting. Such was the scepticism of Voltaire.

(5) The historical form: this is contained in a narrative relating to the times and circumstances with which religion is chiefly concerned; and while preserving an outward regard to morals, misrepresents with irony the miraculous history of the Bible, and takes care, without absolutely falsifying facts, to place it in an absurd and improbable point of view. The history of Gibbon, dealing much in insinuation and very little in argument, is, perhaps, the most dangerous production in this class which has yet appeared, because it least admits of a reply. For who, as Paley observes, “can refute a sneer?”

(6) Sentimental infidelity. Such was the unbelief of Rousseau. Other infidels would destroy Christianity without having fixed on any other system to substitute in its place; but, if Rousseau has no system, he has abundance of “sentiments” and imaginations, and has a dim poetical deity of his own to worship, though he can assign no definite attributes to it, nor form any positive conception of his shadowy god.  The most modern form of scepticism is rationalism (q.v.), which strictly signifies that method of thought which, in matters of religion, not only allows the use of reason, but considers it indispensable. The term has now, however, acquired a wider meaning, and stands in opposition to supernaturalism (q.v.), or the belief in that which transcends, or, as others view it, contradicts both nature and reason — as, for example, miracles.

## Scepticism, Recent Phase OF[[@Headword:Scepticism, Recent Phase OF]]

             Scepticism is primarily nothing more than an inquiring state of mind, with provisional suspension of positive conclusions. It soon comes to mean denial, or repudiation of what transcends human observation and inference therefrom, in matters necessarily of faith. SEE SCEPTICISM in volume 9. It is in the latter signification that it will now be noticed, and only in its chief recent forms.

Every age has its own philosophical tendencies, recurring under modified fashions, with the change of antecedents and surroundings. Thus, old scepticism reappears with altered face, moving always in a vicious circle. Every philosophy is the imperfect expression of the faintly perceived and feebly understood manifestations of the universe, and of their supposed significance. Each has its own scheme for the interpretation As the mysteries with which "we are girt about," either recognising or excluding the supernatural. Scepticism, therefore varies with the ages, in degree, in method, and ill form. In no period of history has unbelief in revealed or natural religion, which is unbelief in all the foundations of knowledge, assumed so many varying forms and shadows of form as in the present day. Much, very much, of recent thought and speculation is corroded by the burrowing virus of this diseased and morbific tendency. It is difficult to employ familiar phrases and current modes of argument without being involved and entangled, unawares, in some of the ramifications of the pervading infection. All men are creatures of their age and of the intellectual atmosphere encompassing them. The mind is moulded, and its developments and products are shaped or colored, by the influences which it habitually endures. Hence it becomes a difficult task, but urgent in proportion to its difficulty, to examine the modes of aberration, and to detect the fallacies in widely accepted systems of error. Of course it would be impracticable, within any moderate limits, to distinguish the manifold varieties of recent scepticism, to trace the melting hues by which they blend almost insensibly into each other, and to discriminate the multitudinous variations and degrees of diseased perception in the diversities of philosophical sects. No more can be safely or profitably attempted than to note the most accepted types of skeptical speculation in this declining century. All might be included under the single head of RATIONALISM SEE RATIONALISM (q.v.), but this term has a more restricted meaning in theological terminology. All proceed from the negation or exclusion of  everything in the intelligible universe beyond the grasp of the observing and reasoning faculties.

The species of scepticism which will be estimated here are those which assail, extrude, or undermine religious truth — which reject knowledge or authority, superior to such as may be compressed into the narrow domain of scientific or demonstrative processes. Of these there appear to be six leading classes, the appreciation of which will afford guidance for the criticism of the intermediate or affiliated varieties of incredulity. They are, 1. Materialism; 2. Naturalism; 3. Agnosticism; 4. Phenomenalism;. 5. Pessimism 6. Nihilism, which last approximates to Neo-Buddhism. These several schemes have been exhibited in more or less developed proportions since human inquiry gained strength and audacity to propose a systematic answer to the torturing questions, Whence come man and the universe? How are they sustained? What are their meaning, their purpose, and their destiny? What are their relations to the source of their being, of their maintenance, and of their order? The manner in which these enigmas have been answered has continually suffered change with the extension of human knowledge and the consciousness of previous failure. The latest transmutations now attract our regard. Of the six classes, into which the chief recent theories of a sceptical character have been divided, two have been sufficiently considered in the, articles specially devoted to them. These are, Materialisn and Pessimism (q.v. severally). They require no further notice than may be incident to their relations to other theories.

Before proceeding to the examination, of the remaining forms, it may be judicious to indicate the fundamental delusion which underlies and vitiates all schemes of scepticism, using the designation in the restricted sense of unbelief in the transnatural. All knowledge of things included within the observation of physical perception is obviously and necessarily limited by the range of the several senses. The calorific, the actinic, and the chemical rays of light are invisible; yet they are probably more important and more operative in the economy of nature than the color-rays, with their endless service and infinite variety of beauty. There are sounds too loud for the human ear to distinguish, too slight for human hearing; notes that are discord to some races and musical to others; odors too faint or evanescent for man's olfactories to detect; tastes too delicate or too oppressive for the tongue of man to discriminate; things too distant or too small for human discernment. Assuredly there are stars beyond the reach of the telescope, organisms too minute for microscopic vision. These facts are recognised by  observation and reflection, aided by artificial contrivances. They prove that the senses cannot attain to the apprehension of a vast variety of unquestionable facts. Intellectual comprehension is limited by its constitution, in like manner, in regard to things intelligible. This is in consonance with the physical or material creation. The conclusion is the same in the one case as in the other. It is only transferred from the senses to the mind, and adapted to a new sphere. It is identical, also, with the irrefragable axiom or postulate that the finite can neither intellectually grasp nor logically deny what lies beyond its comprehension. But it may and must recognise it, or else renounce all validity of thought. Every form of dogmatic scepticism starts out, therefore, with a fatal and utterly irrational assumption.

On any scheme of philosophy the office of the human race on earth is to improve its habitation, its conditions, and itself, through the instrumentalities acquired by the enlargement of its knowledge and the expansion of its capacities. The fulfilment of this destiny or the achievement of this result would be impossible, and, indeed, inconceivable, if the limits of the unknown did not always spread around, and if humanity were not always led on and guided by an imperfect apprehension, a confident intuition, a persistent assurance of further enlargement of its acquisitions. It is the very law of its existence, of the possible sustenance of its increasing numbers, that, as Roger Bacon said, the recognition of the unknown and still unknowable advances more rapidly than the increase of the known. "Quae scit, pauca sunt et vilia respectu eorum quae non intelligit sed credit, et longe pauciora respectu eoruom quae ignorat." This is only an illustration of the law which renders fallacious all knowledge dwarfed to the compass of the reasoning faculties of man.

There is another line of procedure — a purely logical argument — which arrives at the same result. Every conclusion must rest on accepted premises. These premises, whether as previous conclusions, or as interpretations of facts, which are also conclusions, must, in their turn, depend upon more remote premises. Ultimately a point must be reached beyond which it is impossible for analysis to go. Yet the first principles repose on surer conviction than any inferences that may be deduced from them. The sphere beyond the utmost range of systematic ratiocination is not the darkness of the unapprehensible, but the realm of the partially unknown, yet inevitably believed. Throughout, the invisible, the incomprehensible, the unattainable, must be received as existent and  operative, or all knowledge and all fact must rest upon nothing but pure imagination. This is only the development of the profound and sagacious observation of Aristotle, that whoever demands a reason for ultimate principles takes away all possibility of reasoning. The necessary inference from these truths, which are only diverse aspects of the same truth, is that the whole order of existence, physical and intellectual — the whole procedure of valid reasoning on any subject — requires the constant admission of influences, causes, powers, purposes, and governance beyond the possible limits of formal and systematized knowledge, beyond the grasp of finite intelligence. Hence, any scheme of philosophy which pretends to include all being, and all appreciation of being, within the brief tentacles of human apprehension, is not merely incomplete and fallacious, but absurd.

With this preliminary exposition of the fundamental conditions of thought, the artful sophistry involved in all forms of dogmatic scepticism, and cunningly disguised or ignored in the recent phases of philosophical unbelief, becomes manifest. The countless forms of scepticism lie between the antagonistic extremes of materialism and idealism. These extremes are not necessarily sceptical, but in their development they tend to sceptical issues. Milton and Berkeley were fervent in their religious convictions. Of course, as materialism and idealism are the opposing poles of speculation, every scheme for the exposition of being and its interpretation must approximate more closely to the one or to the other. All may be included in the two. But such absorption of divergent currents of thought tends only to confusion. It will explain, however, the impossibility of separating discordant systems by sharp lines of discrimination. They are variously compounded, and coalesce with each other in various modes and in varying proportions. The failure, then, to maintain sharp distinctions will be due to the nature of the subject divided, not to the error of the division.

I. Naturalism. — Materialism, as has been remarked, has already been amply discussed. Naturalism is an extensive species of it, which requires special notice. There is, indeed, one subdivision of naturalism which is the purest idealism, when all nature, concrete and operative, is resolved into the divinity, and this again is dissolved into nature. This occurs in Spinozism, and in all varieties of pantheism. In its current philosophical acceptation, however, naturalism signifies the interpretation of the facts, functions, and developments of existence by the forces and changes of physical realities. It sees nothing beyond. It denies higher causation. It imprisons itself within the domain of the sensible, and affirms that this is  the sole and adequate exposition of all things. The voluntary captive, in his self-constructed dungeon, affirms that there is neither sun nor sunlight without. The unreasonableness of the conclusions and of the philosophy erected upon them is shown by the preliminary considerations which have been presented.

It should be remarked that, in these fashions of scepticism, the supposed conclusion is always the startingpoint of the doctrine. That which is to be proved is assumed. The philosophy is invented and manipulated for the support of the thesis. Great acuteness and ingenuity, greater self-delusion, and the confidence of wilfull ignorance, are shown in the elaborate artifices of the frail but often imposing structure. Every fact of nature, if analyzed- every part of such fact, if further analyzed, and if the analysis be conducted to its utmost limit inevitably leads "from nature up to nature's God." The same thing is true of every intellectual or emotional experience, which gives facts of another order.

Unquestionably the spontaneous revelation of the transnatural through the forms of the natural does not rest upon the same kind of evidence, or generate the same, species of conviction as are characteristic of scientific conclusions. But they come clothed with a firmer and more impressive certainty. This is no novel doctrine, for it is a reply to antiquated error. Thomas Aquinas said, "The dubitation which occurs in regard to articles of faith arises from no uncertainty of the thing, but from the weakness of the human mind. Nevertheless, a minimum of knowledge of the highest things is more to be desired than the most certain knowledge of things little in comparison." Such testimony may be rejected with scorn, as the utterance of a schoolman, a metaphysician, and a theologian. But the Angelic Doctor makes his avowal on the authority of Aristotle, who should be safe from the petty censure of current science. His remark is (De Part. Animal. 1:5), "If it be but little of these things that we apprehend, that little, on account of the preciousness of such knowledge, is more acceptable than all within our grasp." Old error should not, on account of its attempted rehabilitation, object to cogent refutation because it, too, is ancient,

II. Evolutionism is the most prominent and the most controlling type of naturalism in our age, the credit and the parentage of which are usually assigned to Darwin, though its most elaborate and systematic development is to be sought in the unfinished and interminable treatises of Spencer. The foundations and the main walls of the building are distinctively Darwin's.  To him is due the patient, persistent industry by which the materials have been quarried, chiselled into shape, and adapted to their places in the bewildering edifice. But the plan and the purpose of the philosophy may be found in the notes to the prosaic poems and in the prose romances of his grandfather. Nor is the elder Darwin to be considered as the original inventor of the system. Many critics have shown that the whole essence of the speculation and its line of argument were the teachings of, Lucretius. The Roman poet proved, in his own case, his maxim, "Ex nihilo nihil fit," and borrowed his dogmas, but not their radiant setting, from Epicurus. In this recurrence to the resuscitated phantasms of longburied delusion, Darwinism corresponds with all current schemes of sceptical speculation. They return with the revolving cycle. But never before, not even under the Roman republic or the empire, did Epicureanism display so bold a front or arrogate so absolute dominion as Darwinism has presented and received. It claims to be accepted by all scientific and intelligent minds. It has been extensively admitted into nearly all departments of knowledge. These have been remoulded in consonance with it. Now it looks forward to an early sovereignty over the whole realm of thought and action. The eminent naturalist maintained, during his life, that his doctrine was not inconsistent with the Christian faith. His letter to a German student, published after his death, revealed his suppressed conviction that it was so, and that it had proved so in: his own case. His declaration may, nevertheless, be so interpreted as to be true. There is no inevitable inconsistency between the creed of Christendom and the hypothesis of a progressive development. Everything depends upon the exposition and the application of the cardinal dogma. To human apprehension there is a more marvellous exhibition of creative intelligence and power in so ordering the world from the beginning, that every force and every creature in the universe should, like the fruit tree, have "its seed within itself," and exert its characteristic peculiarities in the perpetuation and progressive modification of all developments through endless generations. In this there is a more wondrous exhibition of intelligence and power than in the supposition of constant divine action in maintaining, regulating, combining, and modifying all the successive agencies and results of existence. The immanent operation of divine energy, which Thomas Aquinas considers the most cogent demonstration of the being of God, is imperative in the one case as in the other. The former explanation will not, indeed, satisfy the requirements of either true religious belief or genuine religious appetency;  but it is the more difficult of conception. It is not, however, under either aspect that evolution has been promulgated, applauded, and accepted.

One reason of the wide diffusion of evolutionism has, unquestionably, been the plausibility of the doctrine, and the ambiguity of the term. Evolution is true — "sub modo et terminis suis" — as the statement of a fact. Evolutionism is erroneous as a theory. That things change is a commonplace, that organic beings grow is another; that the chicken comes from the egg is undisputed; that plants and animals, including man, will, under suitable circumstances, be modified, improving or retrograding, has never been controverted. But that these mutations can take place only within wider or narrower limits — still, within restricted limits — has never been disproved. It is the baldest assumption and the wildest reverie, to presume that the possible changes are illimitable and uncontrolled, and that one genus can be transmuted into another, even in, the imaginary aeons of time. This is worse hallucination than alchemy. Evolution is an unfortunate and misleading term. It is wholly arbitrary to employ it as the designation of a philosophical system. Evolution cannot appropriately signify a force, a process, a mode, or a determining rule. It is merely descriptive of a phenomenon — unexplained. Smoke is evolved out of a gun-barrel. Something more than smoke is required to reveal the force, the nature, and the action of the gunpowder. This criticism may appear trivial, but it indicates the frailty and delusiveness of the theory of evolutionism. Certain modes succeed each other, and are noted. This affords no evidence of the fact or character of any philosophical relation between the forms. Nor is there much more to be ascertained from the cabalistic symbols of the school — the differentiation of the homogeneous, and the integration of. the heterogeneous. These phrases have meanings, but what their precise meaning may be depends upon the presumptions of the interpreter. Of themselves they are as obscure as "Greek invocations to call fools into a circle."

Abandoning, however, this skirmishing about the outposts, evolutionism, as a heresy, is sufficiently distinct and well understood. It signifies the progressive growth of all existence by successive stages, and through the influence of the surroundings, from primitive and unintelligent germs. There is a recent exposition, elaborated with great skill and acumen, which builds up society in its actual and prospective excellence, from protoplasm; and protoplasm from the diffused, undistinguished, and undistinguishable  antecedents of cosmical dust. Where did the dust come from? The elephant may stand on the tortoise, but on what does the tortoise stand?

Into the details and assumptions of evolutionism it is impossible to enter here. A hasty notice of a few salient characteristics is all that should be attempted, notwithstanding the hazard of such brevity. It may be said, however, that there is not a single principle relied upon by the evolutionists that is proved, or that admits of proof, in the latitude required for the theory; that the ingenious multiplication of assimilated details is not argument, and does not authorize the inductions drawn; that the accuracy and propriety of the details is questionable, and has been questioned; and that "the survival of the fittest" is contrary to all known fact, except through such casuistry and quibbling, such limitation and explanation, as constrain the evidence to fit the hypothesis. Throughout the theory there is a latent and unperceived "petitio principii," which conducts, by long, bewtildering achannels, the original assumption to the conclusion into which it is converted. It is scarcely necessary to repeat the preliminary proposition — that the world of observation reveals and necessitates, at all times, the admission of a higher force, guidance, and wisdom; initititing, sustaining, and directing all that is or can be observed.

The aim of evolutionism is to exclude from the theory of being and of truth everything transcending the manifestations of physical existence. Of course, the virtual effect on the spirit of speculation is the same, whether the supernatural is denied or rigidly ignored. The practical outcome of epicureanism, which relegated the gods to uninterrupted repose, was identical with that of the most absolute atheism. There is a logical and a metaphysical distinction, but little diversity of consequences. Hence Darwinism and evolutionism are on the same plane with positive unbelief, and merge into, even when they are not embodied in, the general procedure of agnosticism. SEE EVOLUTION.

III. Agnosticisism is the current designation of the most prevailing type of sceptical philosophism. It rejects all outside of the material and phenomenal. It deems it unnecessary to deny the divine, which it banishes. Indeed, Tyndall, Huxley, Spencer, and other hierophants of the fashionable delusion, have admitted the reality of what they exclude from consideration and from rational inquiry. They do not deny divinity; they do not reject creative energy as a possibility. They are content to say that they. know nothing, and can know nothing, about it and that no one does or can know  anything on the subject. They, therefore, refuse to admit it into their contemplation, or to accord it any rational authority over the thoughts and conduct of men. They pass it by with the flippant sneer, "Nihil ad nos." Agnosticism is simply shameless profession of ignorance — know- nothingism in all that is essential to philosophy. It is the substitution of human science, or nescience, for human knowledge. It may, accordingly, be extended to all forms of negation, or rejection of what lies beyond the domain of matter, or of physical science. But can physical science, or human reason, in its finite systematizations, fill the whole globe of human thought, feeling, and conduct? of human aspiration and of human duty?

As has already been pointed out, science, observation, experience, reasoning, imperatively require the constant recognition and support of what the agnostics reject as being unknowable. What they repudiate, but what, nevertheless, remains indispensable, is unknowable, in the sense of being irreducible to the forms and precision of scientific knowledge. But there is much knowledge of the highest practical value which is unreduced to such demonstrable form, much which is incapable of being reduced to that form. Scientific knowledge would be vain, a mere phantasm in the clouds, a castle in the air, if it had nothing but propositions reached by induction or deduction to rest upon. In the brilliant developments of modern science the necessary philosophic basis of science is forgotten, and in the pretensions of scientific system-builders it is ignored. The sun shines calmly on, if invisible to the blind, or denied by them. True wisdom is distrustful of itself. It eschews pretension, and avoids the confidence which would restrict the world to the limits of human comprehension. What cannot be scientifically arranged, coordinated, and syllogistically or inductively proved, is not absolutely unknown. Were it so, a child could possess no knowledge, and could never learn. In things transcending " the beggarly elements of man," we are and must "be as little children." Here humility is the condition and means of knowledge. The assurance thus gained is accepted in a different form from scientific conclusions; but it is confirmed by a more potent authority, and exercises a more constant and controlling influence over human life. The peaks of the Himalayas are not less lofty or less firmly rooted because they are inaccessible to the foot of man. It is their elevation that renders them inaccessible. Their snow-clad summits, disguised by their white robe, shine in a clearer, purer, more translucent atmosphere than the low hills on which men dwell, which may be measured and traversed amid fogs and exhalations. The extension of  precise knowledge widens, or should widen, the vision of an infinitely larger knowledge, which is unprecise. It is equally foolish and unphilosophical to deny the reality of all that cannot be impounded in our own petty preserves. To exclude such knowledge from consideration is the same, in effect, as to deny it, and is even more irrational. But this is what is done by the recent school of agnosticism, which refuses to acknowledge everything which science does not include or hope to embrace.

The attempt of Buckle to affirm, and of Arnold, his Dutch compeers, and many other schemers, in France, Germany, and England, to construct, a system of unspiritual. morality, or of immoral morals, is only the adaptation of current agnosticism to ethical doctrine. As in the physical, as in the intellectual, so in the ethical sphere, the characteristic defect is that the building demands a firm foundation, but is deprived of anything to rest upon. Historical and ethical agnosticism are more pernicious than evolutionism. It is possible to investigate physical phenomena apart from their origin or cause, but the essence of morals consists in the acceptance of right, as a rule, extraneously presented, and obligatory in obedience to an authority above mind beyond those bound to obey, though they have the power of disobeying. These traditions transcend the reach of rationalistic science.

A more dogmatic, but not more satisfactory, attitude is assumed by that growing sect of physiological psychologists who discern in mind only an exudation from matter, and resolve thought into a cerebral process, stimulated or stimulating, through the telegraphic lines of the nervous cords. Thought is thus, according to Spencer, a complex series of nervous "shocks," like those of an electric battery. If the nature and action of the human intellect are degraded to the level of the electric fluid, or of the currents of sap in vegetative growth, there is neither room nor occupation for any agency higher than organic motions. But how did these motions originate? Whence were their capabilities primarily derived? In all the play of nervous excitation, direct or reflex, where is the intelligence that notes and employs the communications transmitted? In ordinary telegraphing, an operator at each end of the line, or at the completion of the circuit, is indispensable. The apparatus is useless without something diverse from the apparatus, to interpret the messages. The gray matter of the brain, however wonderful its constitution and action, cannot discharge this function. At best, it is only a central office. The mind must be something entirely different from its complicated network of agencies. The spider's web is not  the spider. But mind, intangible in its essence and modes, is inconceivable and unmeaning, without a creative mind to form and to inform it, after a fashion far different from any physical changes. Physiology has rendered, and may continue to render, most important services in the interpretation of the physical accompaniments and instrumentalities of mental processes. But Maudsley, and Bain, and Spencer, and the other advocates of human automatism, cannot detect mind or thought under the scalpel, with the aid of any microscope. Their theories are wholly superficial. They deal only with the manifestations on the surface, produced by the underlying forces. They exclude the idea of forces, except as the sequence of changes, and as a substitute for cause. They would exclude the term if they could dispense with it. They fail, however, to see that its indispensability attests the reality of what they would expel. As these speculations confine their attention to the show of things, they might be embraced under the head of phenomenalism.

IV. Phenomenalism, however, in its technical signification, is sufficiently distinct to claim separate consideration. It assumes two very divergent positions. It may restrict itself to material semblances. This form has been noticed under Positivism (q.v.). It may make matter merely a mental conception. In this case transcendental idealism is the result. The universe is one incessant flux of modifications and convolutions of a single entity, which is all in all, in each, and in everything. This idealistic phenomenalism inevitably runs into pantheism. It has been examined in the article on SPINOZA SEE SPINOZA (q.v.). Notwithstanding the bitter, enduring, and often ill-considered censure bestowed upon Spinozism, it is returning in the speculation of the age, with such alterations of garb as the fashions of the times require. It is a recoil from the innutritious diet proffered by the materialists arid naturalists of current science. A noteworthy example of this violent reaction is furnished by the philosophy of Lotze, now rising into favor. Lotze endeavors to unite the results of science with those of transcendental metaphysics, combining, reconciling, and harmonizing them in a more comprehensive scheme. He sees in all things the continuous interaction and reciprocal determination of their mutual relations. These relations constitute all existence and all change — they bear to reality the same analogy that Boscovich's points of force bear to the gravitation and cohiesion of matter. These shifting, reciprocally moulding relations constitute at once the circulation and the substance of all being. The universe is one and single; its whole life, and the life of all its parts, are  contained in the constant throb and vital activity of these relations. The wheels move incessantly, because there is life in the wheels; but the vitality of each part is the appropriate play in that part of the common, undivided energy which is concentrated in the totality of all the parts combined into one whole. The universe is a web of one piece, weaving itself into changing patterns by interchange of relations through all the phantasmagoria of existence in time and in eternity. This is not Spinozism, but patient discrimination is needed to discriminate them. Lotze would regard his scheme as the negation of pantheism; and the last words of his metaphysics imply his recognition of God as a distinct essence. But the desire to distinguish is not always attended by the ability to do so. If Lotze's philosophy is conceived in opposition to pantheism, its tendency is towards it. The adoption, development, and application of his principles and conclusions could scarcely be prevented from reaching that goal. Pantheism destroys the conception of divine intelligence and government by identifying them with all the phenomena of being, as naturalism repudiates the conception altogether by substituting for the creative energy the blind and unintelligent forces exhibited by matter, and ascribed to matter as their origin.

To this brief notice of the vapory idealism of Lotze may be appended the commemoration of the equally impalpable metaphysics of sir William Hamilton and his acolytes. The inadequacy and baselessness of the Philosophy of the Conditioned have been indicated already. SEE HAMILTON, SIR WILLIAM. The legitimate deduction from it Was drawn by Dean Mansel (q.v.), in his Limits of Religious Thought, which may be considered as a prelude to Arnold's Religion without Faith, and Morality without Morals. The tendency of the metaphysical system of Hamilton is decidedly in the direction of pantheistic idealism, and antagonistic to the safe, but narrow, "common-sense" speculation of the Scotch school. If the admission of a constantly operating first cause must be excluded from the sphere of philosophy, because a first cause cannot be conceived; if the relativity of human knowledge is so interpreted as to render all knowledge a dream or a delusion; if nothing can be accepted as known, except what is precisely known, and known only so far as it is "conditioned," then all the powers, aspirations, and emotions of mall are paralyzed, or rendered unsubstantial shadows. All things, so far as man is concerned, would be resolved into the spectral shapes cast on the clouds of the human mind. Even these phantasms must be cast by something, or evoked by something.  This primary something is a cause, and a first cause, but its essence is beyond human grasp. There are, therefore, but two existences in the universe, conjoined to each other the mirror of the mind, and the entity which starts the images from the reflecting surface. Obviously; this reduces the actual, the intelligible, and the active to a single essence, some of whose pulsations manifest themselves as the phantasms of the human mind. This, too, is pantheism.

The fatal defect of the Hamiltonian philosophy, and of its developments, is, apparently, not in the assertion of the relativity and conditionalism of human knowledge, but in the exclusion of all knowledge of the "unconditioned." Knowledge is a very elastic term: "conditioned " is a very ambiguous one. It may be doubted whether incomprehensible technicalities — "absolute," “unconditioned," "infinite," etc. — afford such definite ideas as permit strict reasoning, logical or philosophical, in regard to them. They are shifting phantoms of the mist. Controversies in regard to them are as effective as would be battles of children, fighting with iridescent soap- bubbles. Waiving the discussion of the question, which would be endless, and presumably inconclusive, it must be felt that many paralogisms in philosophy are due to the unperceived diversity of latitude in the meaning of the terms conjured with. Knowledge is of various degrees, kinds, and characters. Some is scientific, some philosophical, some intuitive, some revealed in mode and form apt for human acceptance. If all knowledge be denied, or excluded, but that which is established by logical or scientific reasoning, the human mind must wander "in endless mazes lost." It will stagger helplessly along, led only by the marsh-fires of the night, through forest and bog; mistaking every ignis fatuus for eternal sunlight. Science should confine itself to scientific knowledge. The range is wide enough for any ambition. But science must beg its first principles. It must rest on postulates which have a metaphysical basis. Logic observes the processes and sequences of thought, but the mind is, in itself, beyond human observation. All that it receives or produces is derived from impulses within and impulses without, whose existence must be accepted without other testimony than themselves. Thus, in all the grades and species of knowledge, the fundamental and indispensable assurance which renders anly knowledge possible is the immutable conviction and the unwavering reception of knowledge, outside of systems of philosophy and provinces of science. Reason demands this. Conscious experience confirms it. Common- sense proceeds at all times from its influence, without a thought of its  requirement. The relativity of human knowledge, and its character as "conditioned,” should be admitted, but accompanied with the further admission that such knowledge is built upon the "absolute" and the "unconditioned."

Such limited idealism as has shown itself in late years may easily have been provoked by the insufficiency of scientific systems to furnish support or satisfaction to yearning and inquiring spirits. Perplexity, induced by the enigmas presented to the intellect, and despair of their solution, may have suggested another recent phase of scepticism, which differs widely from the forms commented upon. It is the least excusable of all forms, because it runs away from the battle-field, and seeks selfish relief in wilful misrepresentation and morose discontent. This scheme, if it is entitled to be called a scheme, is

V. Pessimism. — It might be supposed to be a natural resilience from the optimism of Leibnitz; but the schemes are separated by too wide an interval of time, and exhibit no links of actual connection. It rather grew out of the despair of the disappointed age which witnessed the dissipation of the dreams of the French revolution, and found utterance in the gloomy strains of Byron. Every age presents the results of the preceding philosophy, and moulds the philosophy of the age succeeding. That strange, poetic genius, Leopardi, sang the prelude of pessimism; Schopenhauer gave it form, expansion, and coherence; and Hartmann has endeavored to give it systematic exposition. Pessimism is not so much a negation of creative power and authority as a denigration of creative wisdom and benevolence. It maintains that the order of the universe is so constituted and regulated as to produce only wretchedness and increasing distress. In a period of brilliant industrial and intellectual achievement, but of augmenting disquietude, discontent, and misery, it presents a doctrine disparaging an order of things so often embittering life, and multiplying the myriads of the suffering, the sorrowing, and of those who find no rest. In one respect, pessimism is to be reprobated more severely than agnosticism. It does not merely hide the supernatural behind an impenetrable veil; it calumniates the creator and the creation. It degrades man, and unfits him for the discharge of the duties of humanity. Man's function on earth is not enjoyment; that may be an incident of his life, a result, or a recompense of his conduct. It is not to exult in the possession of pleasures and ease and vanities and gratifications. His office is, through constant trials, recurring sorrows, and "much tribulation," to strengthen and fit himself for the work set before  him, and to do it — to make his contemporaries, and posterity, and the world, better and better provided, in consequence of his action — and to serve earnestly and loyally, as private or captain, in promoting the unseen purpose of Providence, and the destinies of humanity. What may be the fortunes or the fate of an individual is of passing moment. Countless bubbles burst every second on the ocean of life; but the movement of the ocean is uninterrupted. Each individual is but one in the army of laborers. When he falls, his place will be taken, usually by one better fitted for the growing task. There would be an impropriety in dwelling on this type of scepticism, as it has been already noticed in this work. SEE PESSIMISM.

It must suffice to add that the blackening of the unseen, and of its cause, the substitution of a malignant author, or order of creation, for the wise and the beneficent, are as distinctly sceptical procedures as any other mode of repudiating a transcendent authority. These remarks on pessimism have been introduced chiefly for the purpose of noticing an outgrowth, conscious or unconscious. This excrescence has not yet coagulated into a distinct theory, but has an immediate practical effect, and tends to diffuse itself, like a spreading ulcer, through intelligent classes of existing society. Its evangel was Malloch's inquiry: "Is life worth living?" The obvious reply is, "Certainly not, if life is 'propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.'"

VI. Nihilism is a convenient designation for the incipient doctrine. Its purpose is to escape from the perplexity of conflicting arguments and the bewilderment of insoluble problems: to make the best, for selfish comfort, of what is presumed to be inevitably bad, as well as uncertain; to seek tranquillity, as far as practicable, in the renunciation of all annoying duties, and of all unselfish aims.

"How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable Seem to me all the uses of this world!" Nihilism, and the pessimism from which it descends, display analogies to the rehabilitated Buddhism, which has been recently compared to Christianity, and which is preached as a substitute for it in the midst of the chief centres of modern civilization. There is no folly or delusion, says Cicero, which has not been advocated by some of the schools of the philosophers. If such extravagant reveries meet with acceptance in a cultivated and thoughtful generation, it is a consolation to know that like errors have been welcomed and applauded before and have been  forgotten. They are dreams which vanish with the morning, and belong to "those fashions of the world which soon pass away."

If man be regarded — and the individual perhaps may properly be so regarded — as one ant in the busy ant-hill of humanity, the problem of life and of the universe in respect to him becomes as simple and clear as it is grand. What is needed for earthly necessities he learns by transmission, by observation, by experience, by the advance of science, and the growth of his faculties. Of all that is above him, and that is so strongly felt as to regulate his conduct and his understanding, he knows nothing, of his own knowledge, except imperfectly, for it is "wisdom unsearchable, and past finding out." Can he reject the knowledge, and the author of all his knowledge, because both remain incomprehensible? Whether affirming or denying, he is compelled to accept both. Shall the ant deny the existence of superior beings, which he can neither measure nor comprehend? Shall the clay ignore the hand of the potter? Shall man, walking in obscurity, and seeing only "as through a glass, darkly," reject or exclude all that he cannot fathom with his short plummet line? He has his office upon earth. What that office demands he knows, or may know, so far as is required for its discharge. He works for his family, that others may take his place when his time of labor is over. He works for his countrymen, and for his age; he scarcely knows why, or how. He knows imperfectly what has gone before, made him what he is, and elevated and facilitated his tasks. He thinks he knows the present, in which he lives. He knows nothing certainly of what may come after him. He "struts his hour upon the stage," unconsciously ministering to purposes of which he can hardly dream. When generations have succeeded generations, the retrospect may show a grand result flowing from the purblind activity of himself and his contemporaries. The prospect may reveal a still more glorious advancement to be accomplished. A new earth, if not a new heaven, will proceed from the successive swarms of mankind.

Can it be rationally questioned that there are controlling influences and purposes from the beginning, pressing forward to a determinate end? They necessitate the admission and the governance of a wisdom which man cannot conceive, of a beneficence which man cannot understand, of a plan which man cannot penetrate, and a guidance which man- cannot rationally or logically, ignore or deny.  Inferences. — It is a natural result of the self-confidence of men — an inevitable exorbitancy of that daring thought and speculation which are the handmaids of progress, that, in the hour of intellectual triumph and of material splendor, the bold leaders should undertake the erection, on earthly foundations, of "towers reaching to heaven." In their exultation, they are unmindful that these edifices must totter over, like other Babels, and note their existence by their ruins. The shattered monuments will furnish the quarries for humbler but securer dwellings. The churches and fortalices of mediaeval Rome were mainly built with the broken capitals and architraves, columns, statues, and other carvings, of fallen palaces and pagan temples. The strong places of later progress are similarly constructed. We mount on ruins, and on the corpses of those that have preceded us. It would be weak fanaticism to disparage the services to human knowledge and performance rendered by the theories of scepticism which have been surveyed. It would be imbecile ingratitude to refuse admiration to the learning, ingenuity, and perseverance of the high priests of recent aberrations. Their devices may produce a dreary impression —

"W

e start,

 for soul is wanting there”

 —

but there is no reason for consternation or despondency. They have opened new paths through the haunted forest of life. They have made clearings for the daylight, and for cultivation. They have extended our journeyings, noted the dangerous routes, and proved by their failures the limits of human capacity in many directions. They have wrought for ends unseen by themselves. They have erected magnificent abodes for other occupants.

Literature. — The materials for the full appreciation of the recent phases of scepticism must necessarily be sought in the writings of the founders and leaders of the several sects and divisions of sects, and in the criticisms which those writings have provoked. The literature of the subject, accordingly, embraces the works of the prominent philosophers of the last and current generations who have propounded theories of sceptical design or tendency. It equally includes the multitudinous controversies which they have excited, embodied in volumes, pamphlets, and periodicals. The biographies of the authors, as illustrative of their doctrines, constitute a desirable appendage. This literature would form a goodly library, and is too extensive for specification. So vast and so various have been the several schemes, their expositions, their refutations, and their rejoinders, that, instead of multiplying the titles of the embattled hosts of books, it might be  appropriate to empioy the epitaph of Sir Christopher Wren, in St. Paul's: "Circumspice." Some valuable and accessible treatises may, however, be designated, for the purpose of fuller, but still summary elucidation of the prevalent forms of philosophical incredulity. Such are, Temple, Bampton Lectures; Tulloch, Theism; Modern Theoriesin Philosophy and Religion; Flint, Anti-Theistic Theories; Martineau, Types of Ethical Theory. (G.F.H.)

## Sceptics[[@Headword:Sceptics]]

             SEE SCEPTICISM.

## Sceptre[[@Headword:Sceptre]]

             (Hebrews שֵׁבֶט, she'bet), in its primary signification, like the equivalent σκῆπτρον (for the root of the Hebrew and Greek words seems identical; comp. also English shaft), denotes a staff of wood (Eze 19:11), about the height of a man, which the ancient kings and chiefs bore as insignia of honor (Homer, Iliad, 1, 234, 245; 2, 185 sq.; Amo 1:5; Zec 10:11; Wis 10:14; comp. Gen 49:10; Num 24:17; Isa 14:5; wand, Lev 27:32). As such it is thought by some to have originated in the shepherd's staff, since the first kings were mostly nomad princes (Strabo, 16, 783; comp. Psalms 29). There were, however, some nations among whom the agricultural life must have been the earliest known; and we should not among them expect to find the shepherd's staff advanced to symbolical honor. Accordingly, Diodorus Siculus (3, 3) informs us that the scepter of the Egyptian kings bore the shape of a plow. The symbols of dominion, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, are various. That of Osiris was a flail and crook (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, 1, 257); that of the queens, besides the crown (q.v.), was two loose feathers on their head (ibid. 1, 276). A carved ivory staff discovered at Nimrûd is supposed to have been a scepter (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 195). A golden scepter — that is, perhaps, one washed or plated with gold — is mentioned in Eze 4:11 (comp. Xenophon, Cyrop. 8, 7, 13; Homer, Iliad, 1, 15; 2, 268; Odyss. 11, 91). Other decorations of Oriental scepters are noticed by Strabo (16, 746). Inclining the scepter was a mark  of kingly favor (Est 4:11), and the kissing it a token of submission (5:2). Saul appears to have carried his javelin as a mark of superiority (2Sa 8:14; comp. 1Sa 15:10; 1Sa 22:6). The use of the staff as a symbol of authority was not confined to kings, it might be used by any leader, as instanced in Jdg 5:14, where for “pen of the writer,” as in the A.V., we should read “scepter of the leader.” Indeed, no instance of the scepter being actually handled by a Jewish king occurs in the Bible; the allusions to it are all of a metaphorical character, and describe it simply as one of the insignia of supreme power (Psa 45:6; Bar 6:14). The term shebet is rendered in the A.V. “rod” in two passages where scepter is substantially meant, viz. in Psa 2:9, where “scepter of iron” is an expression for strong authority, and in Psa 125:3; a use derived from the employment of the same word as an ordinary “rod” of correction (Exo 21:10, and often), and even for beating out grain (Isa 28:27). SEE ROD.

## Sceva[[@Headword:Sceva]]

             (properly Skeuas, Σεκευᾶς), a Jew residing at Ephesus at the time of Paul's second visit to that city (Act 19:14-16), A.D. 52. He is described as a “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς.), either as having exercised the office at Jerusalem, or as being chief of one of the twenty-four classes. His seven sons attempted to exorcise spirits by using the name of Jesus, and on one occasion severe injury was inflicted by the demoniac on two of them (as implied in the term ἀμφοτέρων, the true reading in Act 19:16 instead of αὐτῶν).

## Schaaf, Charles[[@Headword:Schaaf, Charles]]

             a German Orientalist, was born at Huys, electorate of Cologne, in 1646. He was educated at Duisburg, and became professor of Oriental languages in that university in 1677. In 1679 he took the same position in the university at Leyden, where he continued until 1729, when he died of apoplexy. His works are, Opus Armoean. (1686, 8vo): — Novum Testamentum Syriacum, cum Versione Latina (1708, 4to): — Epitome Grammatioe Hebraicoe (1716, 8vo): — Sermo Academicus de Linguarum Orientalium Scientia. In 1711 he prepared a catalogue of all the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan books and MSS. of the Leyden University Library.

## Schaats, Gideon[[@Headword:Schaats, Gideon]]

             the second pastor of the Reformed Church in Albany, N.Y., was born in Holland in 1597, and at first was a schoolmaster at Beest. Having been ordained by the Classis of Amsterdam, he was sent to this country with the Rev. Samuel Drisius, a man of great learning, who preached in Dutch, English, and French, and was one of the ministers of the Dutch Church in New York from 1652 to 1671, being colleague with Dr. John Megapolensis. Drisius had previously been pastor of a Reformed Dutch Church in London. In addition to preaching in New York, he used to go once a month to Staten Island to preach to the French Vaudois or Waldenses, who had fled to Holland from persecutions in Piedmont, and were by the liberality of the city of Amsterdam enabled to emigrate to the New Netherlands. Mr. Schaats was forty-five years old when he came to this country, and his ministry here extended over thirty years. One of his three children — his eldest son — was killed in the massacre and burning of Schenectady, Feb. 10, 1690. During his pastorate in Albany, the governor (Sir Edmund Andross) compelled dominie Schaats to receive as a colleague the Rev. Nicholas Van Ranslaer, a Church of England man, who was recommended to Andross by the duke of York, and who attempted to obtain a living by laying claim to the pulpit and also to the manor of Rensselaerwyck. Van Ranslaer officiated for about a year, when he died. The people refused to acknowledge him, as also did the Classis of Amsterdam. He was strongly suspected of being a papist in disguise. Mr. Schaats was aided in the controversy with Andross by Rev. William Van Niewenhuysen of New York, who was sent to Albany for the purpose, and incurred the governor's bitterest enmity on this account. The latter part of Mr. Schaats's ministry was marked by congregational and domestic troubles. He died in 1674. See Rogers, Historical Discourse (1858); Corwin, Manual of Reformed Ch.; Murphy, Anthology of New Netherlands. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schade, Georg[[@Headword:Schade, Georg]]

             a Danish jurist in Altona, afterwards in Kiel, was born in 1711. He was the author (of a deistical work, Die unwandelbare und ewige Religion der ältesten Naturforscher, etc. (Leips. 1760), in which he attempts an absolute demonstration of the chief doctrines of faith and practice, independently of all revelation. He even constructs a complete theory of the resurrection of the body and of the future life. Soon after this book  appeared, a pretended refutation of it was published at Altona by a so- named professor R. Goisee, with the evident design of simply calling attention to the first work. The magistracy of Hamburg honored Schade's book with a public burning, and the king of Denmark deposed him from his office and banished him. It was only on the accession of Christian VII (1766) that he was recalled and restored to office. Thenceforth he devoted himself exclusively to his judicial duties, until his death in 1795. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20, 686-688. (J.P.L.)

## Schade, Johann Caspar[[@Headword:Schade, Johann Caspar]]

             an eminent pietist, was born in 1666. He studied at Leipsic (1685-89), came into intimacy with Francke, and shared in the religious awakening of which Francke was subsequently a leader. In 1690 Schade was called to the Church of St. Nicolas, in Berlin. Spener had just previously begun his fruitful ministry in this church. The two other colleagues were also pietistically minded. Here now began for Schade a very laborious and fruitful ministry. His zeal was seraphic, his temperament ascetic. He abstained from marriage that he might be more wholly devoted to Christ. Soon there arose differences between him and Spener. Schade knew no moderation in the pursuit of what he regarded as duty. He raised his voice against the abuses of private confession, and Spener refuted him. After much agitation, a governmental decision of 1698 removed the exaction of private confession and absolution, and permitted a merely general public confession in its place. But Schade did not live to enjoy this release from what had been to him an oppressive duty. He died in July of the same year. See Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1860, No. 489 sq.; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. (J.P.L.)

## Schadow, Friedrich Wilhelm Von[[@Headword:Schadow, Friedrich Wilhelm Von]]

             a German painter, was born at Berlin, Sept. 6, 1789. His early studies in art were directed by his father, but in 1806 he abandoned them for the military service, in which he remained for four years. In Rome he afterwards studied under Cornelius and Overbeck, became a convert to Catholicism, and assisted his masters in the decoration of several villas and churches. In 1819 he became a member of the Academy of Fine Arts at Berlin, and in 1827 he was made director of the Academy at Düsseldorf. Here his peculiar religious views and mystical tendencies led to a break with his pupils, and his school was divided, the seceding party being led by Lessing.  Schadow was made a nobleman in 1843. He published a pamphlet entitled Sur l'Influence du Christianisme sur les Arts (Düsseldorfer, 1842): — and Der Moderne Vasari (Berlin, 1854). He died in 1862. Of his paintings in Rome, the most remarkable are A Holy Family, The Virgin Mary, and The Union of Poetry and Sculpture. In Berlin is his Four Evangelists, and at Frankfort The Wise Virgins and The Foolish Virgins. See Uechtriz, Blicke in das Düsseldorfer Künstlerleben.; Pütmann, Die Düsseldorfer Malerschule.

## Schaeffer, Charles Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Schaeffer, Charles Frederick, D.D]]

             an eminent Lutheran divine, was born at Germantown, Pennsylvania, September 3, 1807. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1827, and studied theology with his father and with his father's assistant, the Reverend Charles R. Demme. He was licensed by the Synod of Maryland and Virginia June 17, 1829, and spent some months assisting his brother in New York. His first charge was at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and his ordination took place October 12, 1831. He left Carlisle December 1, 1834, to enter upon the pastorate at Hagerstown, Maryland, where he remained until 1840, when he received a call to become professor in the Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio. His relation to the Ohio synod became unpleasant, and he removed to Lancaster, November 21, 1843. He next removed to Red Hook, Dutchess County, N.Y., December 23, 1845, where he was much-esteemed. In 1851 he became pastor of St. John's Church, Easton, Pennsylvania, where he had a prosperous ministry of four years. It was during this period that he translated Klurtz's Sacred History, and made a careful revision of the translation of Luther's Smaller Catechism. In June 1855, he was unanimously chosen as German professor in Pennsylvania College and in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. The ministerium of Pennsylvania having decided to establish a theological seminary at Philadelphia, in July 1864; called Dr. Schaeffer to become professor of dogmatic theology, his instruction to be given in German and English equally. In this field he labored until his death, November 23, 1879. Besides the above-named works, he published several single sermons, translated Lange's Commentary on the Acts (1866), and contributed numerous articles to the Evangelical Review and the Bibliotheca Sacra. See a Memorial of his life, funeral addresses, etc., in German and English (Phila. 1880).

## Schaeffer, David Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Schaeffer, David Frederick, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, July 22, 1787. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1807, and, having finished his theological course, took charge of the evangelical Lutheran congregation at Frederick City, Maryland, in July 1808. He was ordained at Philadelphia in 1812, and in 1829 was unanimously elected principal of the Frederick Academy, He died at Frederick City, May 5, 1837. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:123.

## Schaeffer, Frederick David, D.D[[@Headword:Schaeffer, Frederick David, D.D]]

             a Lutheran. minister, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main, November 15, 1760, and received his education at the gymnasium in Hanau. In 1774 he began a private course in theology. He was licensed in 1786 by the Synod of Pennsylvania, ordained October 1, 1788, and took charge of the Lutheran Church at Carlisle, preaching at different places in other counties. In 1790 he assumed the pastoral charge of Germantown District, and in 1812 removed to Philadelphia, as pastor of St. Michael's and Zion's churches. In 1834, in consequence of declining health, he removed to Maryland, where he died, January 27, 1836. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 1:79; Evangelical Review, 6:275.

## Schaeffer, Prederick Christian, D.D[[@Headword:Schaeffer, Prederick Christian, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Germantown, Pennsylvania, November 12, 1792. He pursued his classical and also his theological studies under his father, was licensed in 1812, and soon after accepted a call from the Harrisburg congregation. He preached two years in New York city. In 1830 he was appointed professor of the German language and literature at Columbia College, but died March 29, 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 1:145; Evangelical Review, 8:200.

## Schaff, Phillip, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Schaff, Phillip, D.D., LL.D]]

             a prominent Presbyterian minister, author, and professor, was born at Coire, Switzerland, January 1, 1819. He received his education in his native place, and at Stuttgart, Tuibingen, Halle, and Berlin. Lecturing in Berlin University, 1842-44, on exegesis and Church history he next received and accepted a call to a professorship in Mercersbuirg Theological Seminary, where he remained until 1863; from 1864-69 was secretary of  the New York Sabbath Committee; 1870-72 professor of theological encyclopaedia and methodology in Union Theological Seminary; 1872-74 of Hebrew; and thereafter of sacred literature until his death, October 20, 1893. Dr. Schaff was a most genial Christian gentleman, and a scholar of wide and accurate attainments. He was a very voluminous writer and editor, principally in the line of Church history, especially The Creeds of Christendom (3 volumes): — and History of the Christian Church (7 volumes), upon which his reputation will most permanently rest. He also edited several commentaries, such as that of Lange; also The Popular Commentary, and The International Revision Commentary, besides many works of reference, most important of which is the Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopaedia. In 1886 he became the editor of A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers; he was also the editor of The Philosophical and Theological Library. He was chairman of the American Committee of Revisers of the English Bible, and labored ardently on the N.T. portion of that work.

## Schall, Johann Adam Von[[@Headword:Schall, Johann Adam Von]]

             a Jesuit missionary to China, was born at Cologne in 1591. He entered the Jesuit order in 1611, and was selected, partly because of his knowledge of mathematics and astronomy, to form one of the mission to China in 1620. He not only formed a successful mission, but, on account of his learning, was invited to the imperial court at Pekin. Through his influence with the emperor, he obtained an edict authorizing the building of Catholic churches and liberty of preaching throughout the empire. In the space of fourteen years the Jesuit missionaries are said to have received 100,000 proselytes. Upon the death of the emperor the edict was revoked. Schall was thrown into prison and sentenced to death, was released, again imprisoned, and died Aug. 15, 1669. A large MS. collection of his remains in Chinese, amounting to fourteen volumes in 4to, is preserved in the Vatican Library. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Schaller, Jacob[[@Headword:Schaller, Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Heilgenstein, near Strasburg, February 25, 1604. He studied at different universities, was in 1633 professor of moral philosophy at Strasburg, in 1634 doctor of theology, and died June 24, 1676. Of his many writings we mention, De Testamentis Christiansis: — De Plantatione Noe ad Libros Philonis Judaei: — De Vanitate Vanitatum ex Ecc 1:2 : — De Christo  Ofgensionis Lapide: — De Regno Davidico ad 1Sa 16:1 sq., etc. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schalling, Martin[[@Headword:Schalling, Martin]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born at Strasburg, April 21, 1532. He studied at Wittemberg, and was pastor at Regensburg, Vilseck (in Upper Palatine), and Amberg. In the latter place he was deposed because he would not subscribe to the Formula Concordioe. He died at Nuremberg, being pastor of St. Mary's, Dec. 29, 1608. He was a pious man, of whose hymn, Herzlich lieb' hab' ich dich, O Herr (Eng. transl. in Schaff's Christ in Song, p. 609, “Lord! I love thee from my heart”), Gellert said that it was “worth more than many volumes of new hymns, which have no other merit than that of a smoother language.” The hymn which we have mentioned, and which is based on Psalms 18, 73, was a favorite of Spener, Gellert, the duchess of Orleans (daughter of Louis Philippe), and others. See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 2, 282 sq.; 8, 265; Knapp, Evangel.  Liederschatz, p. 1342, s.v.; Rittelmeyer, Die evangelischen Kirchenliederdichter des Elsasses (Jena, 1856), p. 52 sq. (B.P.)

## Schamelius, Martin[[@Headword:Schamelius, Martin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Meuselwitz, Altenburg, June 5, 1668. He studied at Leipsic and Halle, was in 1703 deacon, and in 1708 first pastor at Naumburg. He died in 1742. He is the author of, Naumburgisches glossirtes Gesangbuch nebst einer kurzgefassten Geschichte der Hymnopolorum (4th ed. Nuremberg, 1720): — Evangelischer Liedercommentarius, etc. (Leipsic, 1724; 2d ed. 1737): — Vindiciae Cantionum Sanctae Ecclesiae Evangelicae (1712-19, 3 parts). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:526 sq. (B.P.)

## Schamyl[[@Headword:Schamyl]]

             SEE SHAMYL.

## Schappeler, Christoph[[@Headword:Schappeler, Christoph]]

             a famous theologian and jurist of the reformation period, was born at St. Gall in 1472. In 1513 he was preacher at Memmingen, and in 1520 he joined the reformation by attacking the Church of Rome, not so much in the sense of Luther, but of Zwingli, who wished his countryman to come back to Switzerland. Schappeler, however, remained at Memmingen, where he commenced the work of reformation. He showed to his congregation that the Bible is the centre and source of the Christian belief and of all ecclesiastical institutions. He denounced the mass as of no avail and the priests as unfit persons, who pray without devotion and read mass for the sake of money. The papal power he denounced as a carnal right, and the commandments of the Church as the false papal commandment. Such language had its effect, and the majority of the citizens were brought over to Schappeler's side. The writings of the reformers were circulated and read, especially the New Test. In 1523 Schappeler spent a short time in his natives country, where he. preached against the abuses of the Church of Rome, and in November of the same year, after his return from Switzerland, he was joined by Christoph Gertung, another preacher of Memmingen, and both now worked together in the interests of reformation. In vain did the bishop ask the town-council to stop Schappeler. When, however, the bishop, on February 27, 1524, pronounced the ban and excommunication over Schappeler, it had only the contrary effect. The citizens, openly declared themselves for their preacher,  and the council was powerless. In order to bring about a modus vivendi, the opponents of Schappeler had to appear at the Council hall, on January 2, 1525, for a public disputation. The confession of Schappeler, consisting of seven articles, was read. Five days the deputation lasted, which resulted in favor of the reformation, to introduce which the council now lent its hand. The ministers were allowed to marry, and the monks and nuns to leave the monasteries. Schappeler died at his native place, August 25, 1551. See Bobel, Memmingen im Reformationszeitalter (1877); Vogt, in Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encylop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Scharbau, Heinrich[[@Headword:Scharbau, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Lubeck, May 25, 1689. He studied at Jena, Wittenberg, and Leipsic, was in 1715 preacher at his nlative place, and died February 2, 1759. He wrote, De Creophagia Ante Diluvium Licita (Jena, 1709): — De Fatis Studii Moralis apud Ebraeos (Leipsic, 1712): — Exercitatio Philol. de Serpentis AEnei Significatione Mystica (Lubeck, 1713): — De Caipha ejusque Vaticinio ex Joh 11:49-51 (1715): — Judaismus Detectus (1722): — Parerya Philologico- theologica (1719-26, 5 parts): — Observationes Sacrae etc. (1731-37, 3 parts): — besides contributing to the Bibliotheca Lubecensis. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Scharer, Johann Rudolf[[@Headword:Scharer, Johann Rudolf]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Berne in 1756. In 1793 he was professor of Hebrew, in 1805 professor of Biblical study at the Berne Academy, and he died July 3, 1829, preacher at Bumpflingen. He is the author of, Das Buch Hiob aus dem Grundtext metrisch ubersetzt und erlautert (Berne, 1818, 2 parts): — Die Psalmlen metrisch ubersetzt mit kurzen Anmerkungen (1812): — Religioses Erbauungsbuch fur Gefangene (1817, 1820). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:206, 209; 2:320; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Scharfenberg, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Scharfenberg, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian. of Germany, was born at Leipsic, October 16, 1743, and died there, March 18, 1786, doctor and professor of philosophy. He is the author of, Prolusio de Josephi et Versionis Alexandrinae Consensu (Leipsic, 1780): — Fragmenta Versionum Graecarum Veteris  Testamenti in Monte-Falconio Collecta (part 1, 1776; 2, 1781): — Loci Nonnulli Danzielis, etc. (1774). Together with Vogel he edited Lud. Capelli Critica Sacra (1778-86, 3 volumes). See Furst, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:51, 93, 222. (B.P.)

## Scharff, Johann[[@Headword:Scharff, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kroppenstadt, near Halberstadt, June 18, 1595. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1627 professor of philosophy, in 1649 professor of theology, and died January 6, 1660, doctor of theology. He wrote, De Messia et Jesu Salvatore Mundi: —Collegium Anti-Calvinianum: — Collegium Theologicum Decem Disputationes de Praecipuis Fidei Articulis Continens: — Angelologia Sacra ex Mat 18:10 : — De Justificatione ex Rom 3:24-25 : — De Internau Confirmatione Fidelium ex 2Co 1:21-22 : — De Divinitate Christi ex Veteri et Novo Testamento Asserta, etc. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Scharling, Karl Emil[[@Headword:Scharling, Karl Emil]]

             a Danish theologian, was born at Copenhagen in 1803, and died in 1877, doctor and professor of theology. In 1828 he published De Stedingis Commentatio, and in 1833 Hvad er Hensigten, Betydningen og Resultaterne af Theologernes videnskabelige Undersogelser om det Nye Testamentes Skrifter? Upon publishing this treatise he was made professor. For a great many years he edited the Theologisk Tidsskrift (1837-55), and published, besides his writings already mentioned, De Paulo Apostolo ejusque Adersariis Commentatio (1836): — Epistola Pauli ad Coorinthios Posterior Annotationibus in Usum Studiosorum Illustrata (1840): — Jacobi et Judae Epistola Catholicae Commentariis Illustratae (1841): — and some other works which have been translated into German, Die neuesten Untersuchungen uber die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Neuen Testaments (Jena, 1846): — Michael de Molinos (Gotha, 1855). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schartau, Henrik[[@Headword:Schartau, Henrik]]

             a Swedish theologian, was born September 27, 1757, at Malmno. He studied at Lund, and at the age of twenty-three was ordained. In 1786 he  was called to Lund, where he spent the remainder of his life. Schartau, who died February 2, 1825, was a very eminent preacher and a faithful witness of Jesus. He lifted up his voice, calling to repentance all who were permeated by the leaven of unbelief, which characterized the age. After his death a number of homiletical and ascetical works were published . His followers are known as Schartauans. See Lindeblad, Schartau's Life and Teaching (Lund, 1837; Germ. transl. by A. Michelsen, Schartau's Leben und Lehsre, Leipsic, 1842); Melin, Henrik Schartau (Stockholm, 1838); Biographisk Lexicon ofver namnkundige Svenska Mann, 13:347-367 (Upsala, 1847); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schartauans[[@Headword:Schartauans]]

             a recent sect in Sweden, named after Schartau, a clergyman, whom they profess to follow. When Schartau died, he left some skeletons of sermons and a large number of devoted followers. An idolatry of the man and his skeleton sermons commenced, and with it a new era of Christian development, especially in Southern Sweden. It is neither High-Church nor Low-Church nor Broad-Church, but a hard, stony stereotype form — a certain way of preaching, talking, looking, and moving. The Schartauans dislike all lay activity — will join in no missionary work, in no Bible society because that is to yoke with unbelievers; nor will they speak with anyone on religious subjects unless he is an exclusive Schartauan. Another distinguishing feature is a great horror of the Moravians, founded on some unpleasant experience of Schartau's own. Schartauism crept into Gothenburg about twenty years ago.

## Schaubach, Konrad Friedrich[[@Headword:Schaubach, Konrad Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 9, 1827, at Meinlingen. He studied at Gottingen and Jena, was in 1851 rector at his native place, in 1865 deacon, in 1870 first pastor, in 1882 member of the superior ecclesiastical council, and died December 25, 1884. He published, Das Leben Philipp Melanchthon's (2d ed. Meiningen, 1860): — Ausgewahlte Psalmen im Anschlusse an die Evangelien des Kirchenjahres ausgelegt (Halle, 1863): — Zur Charakteristik der deutschen Volksliteratur (a prize essay). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schauffer, William Gotlieb, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Schauffer, William Gotlieb, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Stuttgart, the capital of Wurtemberg, August 22, 1798. When he was six years old his father removed to Odessa, Russia, where he hell the office of mayor over the German colony. The son early gave much attention to the study of French and Italian. He was converted at the age of twenty-two. With a view of preparing himself for a missionary, under the direction of Joseph Wolf, the Jewish missionary, he went to Constantinople and engaged in the study of the Latin, Turkish, and English languages. To perfect himself in the work of preparation he came to the United States, entered Andover Theological Seminary, and completed the full course in 1830. He was more or less familiar with a score of languages. In 1831 he was ordained, and, after spending five years in America, returned to Constantinople. One of the great works of Dr. Schauffler's life was the translation of the entire Bible into Osmanli Turkish, under the direction of the British and American Bible Societies. This work occupied eighteen years of unremitting labor. His labors for the conversion of the Jews were characterized by zeal and  devotion. He translated the Old Test. into Spanish. He was obliged to leave Constantinople on account of the plague in 1836, and travelled in southern Russia preaching the gospel to German residents. He spent three years in Vienna superintending the printing of the Bible. In 1877, in consequence of the infirmities of age, he was obliged to lay aside his active work, and came to the United States to end his days. He died in New York, January 26, 1883. The Tract Society published his Meditations on the Last Days of Christ. See N.Y. Observer, February 1, 1883. (W.P.S.)

## Schaw, Robert[[@Headword:Schaw, Robert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected abbot of Paisley, March 1, 1498, and was advanced to the see of Moray in 1524. He died in 1527. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 148.

## Schedius[[@Headword:Schedius]]

             in Greek mythology, was (1) the son of Iphitus and grandson of Naubolus, who led the Phocians, in connection with his brother Epistrophus, to Troy. He fell by Hector's hand in the stead of Ajax. (2) A son of Perimides, likewise leader of the Phocians, and killed by Hector.

## Scheelstrate, Emmanuel De[[@Headword:Scheelstrate, Emmanuel De]]

             a Belgian antiquarian and theologian, was born at Antwerp in 1649. In his youth he became much interested in ecclesiastical history, and traveled in France and Italy for the purpose of meeting with the learned men of his day. His first work — on the pontifical prerogative — gained for him a canonry and the position of chorister in the cathedral at Antwerp. Innocent XI called him to Rome, and made him librarian of the Vatican and canon of St. John Lateran. He died in Rome April 6, 1692. Scheelstrate was a great scholar and a most prolific writer, in most of his works maintaining the great dignity of the pope and endeavoring to extend his jurisdiction. Of his works we mention, Antiquitas Illustrata circa Concilia Generalica, etc.  (Antwerp, 1678, 4to) — Ecclesia Africana sub Primate Carthanginiensi (ibid. 1679, 4to), in which he endeavored to prove that this Church recognized the pope as patriarch: — Acta Constantiensis Concilii (ibid. 1683): — De Auctoritate Patriarchali et Metropolitica (ibid. 1687, 4to). See Dupin, Auteurs Ecclesiast.; Niceron, Memoirs.

## Scheffer, Ary[[@Headword:Scheffer, Ary]]

             a French painter, was born at Dort, in Holland, Feb. 18, 1795. His studies were carried on in Paris under baron Guerin, and in 1812 his first picture appeared. His earlier pieces were in the line of historical and genre painting, and have become well known through engravings as The Death of St. Louis, The Sister of Charity, and The Soldier's Widow. In the romantic style which was so prevalent at the time, Scheffer did not succeed so well, and felt that his power lay in a different direction. The inspiration given to his pencil by the works of Goethe and Byron is shown by his pictures Giaour, Faust, and a series of others. In religious painting, his Christ the Comforter and Christ the Remunerator, The Shepherds Led by the Angel, Christ in the Garden, show a deep religious feeling, and are works of power and great beauty. One of his finest sentimental pieces is Francesca di Rimini and her Lover Meeting Dante and Virgil in Hell. As a portrait painter he achieved great success, and the portraits of Lafayette, Lamartine, and others show his power. Scheffer worked incessantly, and his drawing is truthful and full of grace, his touch firm and well adapted to his style, and his color, though often wanting in mellowness, is still very beautiful. He was undoubtedly a great artist, and received the honor due to his talent. He was made commandant of the Legion of Honor in 1848, and died June 15, 1858.

## Scheffer, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Scheffer, Wilhelm]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born April 15, 1803, at Schrecksbach, Kurhessen, commenced his theological career at Marburg in 1827, was professor of theology there in 1831, member of consistory in 1838, member of superior consistory and superintendent in 1857, and died February 26, 1883, doctor of theology. He published, Quaestionum Philoniarum Particula I (Marburg, 1829): — De Usu Philonis in Interpretatione Novi Testamenti (1831), besides several sermons. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:522. (B.P.)

## Scheffler, Johann[[@Headword:Scheffler, Johann]]

             (Angelus Silesius), a Catholic mystic of Germany of great speculative power and poetic fervor, was born at Breslau in 1624, of Polish Protestant parents, and received his early schooling at the Elisabethanum of that city. In 1643 he went to Strasburg to study medicine, but soon afterwards retired to Holland, where he spent several years, partly at Leyden. Here he became interested in the writings of Jacob Bohme, which exerted a decided influence on his subsequent life. His religious studies did not, however, interrupt his professional preparation, and in 1647 he went to the University of Padua, where he graduated July 9, 1648. Returning to Silesia,  he served three years as family physician to a duke. Here it soon became evident that he could not content himself with the stiff Lutheranism of the day, and he soon became suspected by the local clergy. The court preacher, Freitag, forbade the publication of his poems because of their mystical tone. He found a patron, however, in Franckenberg, a Silesian nobleman, who was also attracted by Bohme. A poem which lie published in memory of Franckenberg in 1652 seems to have brought him into trouble. Soon afterwards he left the service of the duke, and on June 12, 1653, entered the Catholic Church at Breslau, at the age of twenty-nine. His conversion raised no little outcry against him. His motives were assailed. This led him to publish at Olmütz, in 1653, his Fundamental Reasons for Quitting Lutheranism, in which he gave fifty-five reasons for regarding Lutheran doctrine as erroneous and eighty-three for accepting Catholicism. “In the whole matter,” said he, “I have acted simply as an honest, conscientious Christian.” After his conversion he remained in Breslau, occupied with religious meditation and writing. In 1657 appeared simultaneously his two chief works, Der cherubinische Wandersmann and Geistliche Hirtenlieder. In 1661 he was consecrated to the priesthood, and thenceforth acted as an almost bigoted champion of Romanism.

In 1664 he was made the intimate counsellor of the bishop of Breslau. For seven or eight years he was now engaged in embittered controversies with the Protestant Church. Among his assailants were Chemnitz of Jena and Alberti of Leipsic. Abuse, caricature, and violence characterized both sides of the controversy. Many of these later writings he collected and published under the title Ecclesiologia. (Neisse and Glatz, 1677, fol.). His controversial activity seems to have rapidly consumed his strength, as he died at the early age of fifty-three. Of permanent results of his attacks upon Protestantism there is no trace. His writings soon fell into neglect, and it is only in quite recent times that they have met with full appreciation. They bear the stamp of deep conviction, and give evidence of wide acquaintance with the writings of the fathers and the mystics (see Grupp, Die römische Kirche [Dresden, 1840], and, on the Catholic side, Wittmann, Angelus Silesius [Augsburg, 1842]). But it is more as a poet than as a polemic that Scheffler holds a place in literature. His work Der cherubinische Wandersmann consists of a collection of 1675 brief utterances, mostly in Alexandrine verses of two to four lines each, unconnected and without systematic sequence. The title explains itself from the fact that the book aims at pointing out the way whereby man, estranged from God by sin and buried in the love of the world, is to find his way back to communion with God. The undertone of  these brief verses is of a strongly mystical character, and is entirely free from confessional distinctions. That we can return to God only by profound contemplation of God; and that the more we gaze upon God with open face and submit ourselves to him in perfect resignation and patience, so much the more are we essentially united to God and made possessors of all that is God's — such is the thought that constantly recurs under a thousand images, and spreads a fragrance over every page. The Christian element in this thought is found in the fact that Scheffler presents the incarnation and redemption as the effective means of our return to God; but he also insists, mystic-like, that the process of incarnation must in some degree repeat itself in us, so that we also may become sons of God like Christ.

That some of Scheffler's utterances have a leaning towards pantheism (e.g., “I am as great as God, and he is as small as I;” “When I love God more than myself, then I give to him as much as he gives to me”) is not to be denied. But this may be explained partly from the intensely aphoristic form of expression at which the author aims, and partly from actual inconsistency of thought. In his second edition he earnestly repudiates all pantheism, and asserts that he never intends to imply the cessation of the creatural character of man, but only that our regenerated nature may become so filled with grace as that God shall be, to us, all and in all. Besides, he constantly emphasizes the distinctness of the world from God and the moral freedom of man. With all their defects, these aphorisms are unquestionably among the richest fruits in the whole literature of Christian mysticism. They were highly esteemed by Arnold of Giessen, and by Leibnitz. In recent times the Wandersmann has received the warmest praises from Friedrich Schlegel, and has been reissued in whole (Sulzbach, 1829) or in extracts (F. Horn, Varnhagen von Euse, W. Müller, and others). But the poetic fame of Scheffler rests still more upon his volume of hymns, Seelenlust (1657-68; latest ed. Stuttgart, 1846), many of which have found a permanent place in the whole Protestant German Church. The latest of Scheffler's poetic works consists of a very realistic presentation of the Last Things (Schweidnitz, 1675), but it adds nothing to his fame. As to personal character, Scheffler is not without great inconsistencies. It is hard to believe that the profound sweetness of the poet and the fanatical zealotry of the controversialist could dwell in the same heart. Evidently the two natures of the man dwelt side by side, neither entirely mastering the other. The sources for the life of Scheffler are given in A. Kahlert's Angelus Silesius (Breslau, 1853). See Herzog, Real-Ecyklop. 13, 478-485;  Gervinus, Lit. Gesch.; Westminster Rev. Oct. 1853; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 204. (J.P.L.)

## Schegg, Peter[[@Headword:Schegg, Peter]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born June 6, 1815, at Kaufbeurn. In 1838 he received holy orders, commenced his academical career at the lyceum in Freising in 1843, was professor of exegesis there in 1847, in 1848 at Wurzburg, in 1872 at Munich, and died July 9, 1855, doctor of theology. He wrote, Geschichte der letzten Propheten (Ratisbon, 1853, 2 parts): — Uebersetzung und Erklarung der kleinen Propheten (1854, 2 volumes): — Uebersetzung und Erklarung der Psalmen (2d ed. 1857, 3 volumes): — Die heiligen Evangelien ubersetzt und erklart (Munich, 1856-70, 7 volumes): — Sechs Bucher des Lebens Jesu (Freiburg, 1874-75, 2 vols.): — Jacobus und sein Brief (1881): — Das Todesjahr des Konigs Herodes und das Todesjahr Jesu Christi (Munich, 1882). (B.P.)

## Scheibel, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Scheibel, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Breslau, September 16, 1783. In 1811 he was professor of theology at the university of his native place, but was deposed from his office in 1832 on account of his connection with the Separated Lutherans (q.v.), of whom he became a leader. Scheibel retired to Nuremberg, and died in 1842. He wrote, Observationes Criticae et Exegeticae ad Vaticinia Haggaei (Breslau, 1822): — Das Abendmahl des Herrn (1823): — Actenmassige Geschichte der neuesten Unternehmungen einer Union zwischen der reformirten und lutherischen Kirche (Leipsic, 1834, 2 volumes): — Communionbuch (1827). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:230, 454, 530, 756; 2:105, 275, 367; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Scheid, Balthasar[[@Headword:Scheid, Balthasar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Strasburg in 1614, and died there November 26, 1670, doctor of theology and professor of Oriental languages. He wrote, Jonas Propheta Philol. Commentar. Expositus (Strasburg, 1665): — Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et Antiquitatibus Hebraeorum Illustratum (ed. by J. Chr. Meuschen, Leipsicj 1736):— Epistola Pauli ad Titum et Philemon. Syr. Adjuncto Versione (1668). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:55, 227, 239; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Scheid, Everard[[@Headword:Scheid, Everard]]

             an eminent Dutch philologist, was born at Arnheim in 1742. and became professor of Orientalliterature at Leyden. He died in 1795. Among his works are, An Arabic Grammar: — Dissertation on the Song of Hezekiah in Isaiah (Leyden, 1759): — Book of Genesis Revised: — Minerva, seu de Causis Latinoe Linguoe.

## Schein, Johann Hermann[[@Headword:Schein, Johann Hermann]]

             was born Jan. 20, 1587, at Gruenhahn, near Zwickau. He studied philosophy and theology at Leipsic. Being, however, besides, an excellent musician, he was called in 1615 as precentor to the famous Thomas School at Leipsic, where he died Nov. 19, 1630. He is the author of the beautiful hymn Mach‘s mit mir, Gott, nach deiner Guet' (Engl. transl. “Deal with me, God, in mercy now,” in the Choral Book, No. 191). See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 3, 83 sq.; 8, 624; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1342, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schelhorn[[@Headword:Schelhorn]]

             father and son, two prominent theologians of the 18th century, whose works are still very valuable to the Church historian.

1. JOHANN GEORG, Sr., was born December 8, 1694, at Memmingen. He studied at Jena, was in 1718 conrector in his native city, in 1734 pastor, in 1753 doctor of theology, in 1754 superintendent, and died March 31, 1773. Of his works, we mention, De Religionis Evangelicae in Provincia Salisburgemisi Ortu et Fatis (Leipsic, 1732; also in German and Dutch): — Amenstates Historiae Ecclesiasticae et Litterariae (1737-46, 4 volumes: Germ. translation, Ulm, 1762-64, 3 volumes): — Acta Historica Ecclesiastica Seculi XV et XVI (1738): — De Vita, Fatis Meritis Ph. Camerarii Commentarius (Nuremberg, 1740): — Diatribe de Antiquissimum Latinorum Bibliorum Editione (1760). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Meusel, Lexikon verstorbener deutscher Schriffsteller, 12:124 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Reliqieuses, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:783, 787; Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v.

2. JOHANN GEORG, Jr., was born at Memmingen, December 4, 1733; studied at Gottingen and Tubingen, was in 1756 preacher at Buxach, near Memmingen, in 1762 at Memmingen, in 1793 superintendent there, and died November 22, 1802. He wrote, Beitrage zur Erlauterung der Geschichte, etc. (1772-77, 4 parts): — Anleitug fur Bibliothekare und Archivare (1788-1791, 2 volumes), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:190; 6:224; Meusel, Lexikon verstorbener deutscher Schriftsteller, s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schell, Levi[[@Headword:Schell, Levi]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born Sept. 9, 1823, at Berne, Schoharie County, N.Y. Having prepared himself for the ministry at Hartwick Seminary, he was licensed in 1853, and accepted a call as pastor of St. Thomas's Lutheran Church at Churchtown, N.Y., where he spent twelve years and a half, laboring with all the enthusiasm and intensity of his ardent nature. In 1866 he followed a call to the Clay and Cicero pastorate in Onondaga County, which he soon exchanged in 1867 with West Sandlake, in Rensselaer County. Having spent six years at West Sandlake, he accepted in 1873 a call to West Camp, where, however, his valuable and successful labors were interrupted in 1876 by sickness of so serious a character that he was compelled to discontinue preaching. In 1877 he again entered upon his duties, but in May, 1878, he was obliged to close his pastoral labors. He entertained the hope that he would again be enabled to resume his loved work of proclaiming the tidings of salvation, but his impaired constitution had finally to succumb, and he died Dec. 27, 1878, at the age of fifty-five years, and after twenty-five years of arduous and successful labor in the ministry of Jesus Christ. (B.P.)

## Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Von[[@Headword:Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Von]]

             one of the four (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) great speculative philosophers of modern Germany, was born at Leonberg, near Stuttgart, in 1775. His father, though but a rural clergyman, was an eminent scholar in Oriental and Rabbinical literature. Young Schelling showed early indications of his great powers. At fifteen he entered the University of Tübingen, intending to make theology his profession. Here he formed an intimate friendship with the student (afterwards rival) Hegel who was five years his senior, as also with the unfortunate poet Hölderin. Lessing, Herder, and Kant were the admired heroes of these young geniuses. Also they were enthusiastically stirred by the new political ideas of the outbreaking French Revolution.

Writings. — Schelling's first attempt at authorship was his essay for his master's degree in his eighteenth year, Antiquissimi de Prima Malorum Origine Philosophematis explicandi Gen. iii Tentamen Criticum (1792). A year later he published a paper, Ueber Mythen (on the myths and sagas of antiquity), which shows how deeply the religious ideas of the ancients were already occupying the young scholar. The year 1794, in which Fichte began his philosophical fame at Jena, was a turning point in the history of Schelling. Fichte's Wissenschaftslehre at once set into ferment the kindred speculative powers of Schelling, who, from thenceforth for two decades, sent forth a rapid succession of works which have assured him a place among the great speculatists of the race. Adopting Fichte's idealism, he spiritedly defended it in the following papers: Ueber die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie (1794): — Vom Ich als Princip der Philosophie (1795): — Philosophische Briefe über Dogmatismus und Kriticismus (1795): — Neue Deduktion des Naturrechts (1795): — Allgemeine Uebersicht der neuesten philosophischen Literatur (1795). These papers show a gradual advance towards independence of thought and towards the chief features of the author's subsequent peculiar positions. In 1796 Schelling went to Leipsic and gave special attention to the study of physics. Here he began to meditate that peculiar Philosophy of Nature which took so striking a form when he began to lecture at Jena in 1798. At first he taught side by side with Fichte; and when Fichte went to Berlin, in 1799, he remained the chief philosophical star at Jena. Hardly could there be conceived a more favorable place for the young philosopher than Jena at this time was. It was the philosophical focus of Germany. Reinhold had there expounded Kant; Goethe's spirit hovered over the place; Schiller,  Humboldt, and the Schlegels were closely related to the university. Circumstances combined to invest philosophy here with an atmosphere of poetry. Schelling's Philosophy of Nature, which was partly a creature and partly a creator of this atmosphere, was therefore very enthusiastically received. It was presented in a variety of writings: Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur (1797): — Von der Weltseele (1798): — System der Naturphilosophie (1799). While elaborating these works, Schelling also subjected the Fichtean philosophy of the Ego to a further development, positing the Ego as an antithesis to Nature (see his Systen des transcendentalen Idealismus [1800]). But, unable to rest in this dualism, he attempted to conciliate the antithesis in a higher unity in his Identitätssystem (1801). This thought is the inspiration of a fresh series of works: Bruno, oder über das göttliche und das weltliche Princip der )Dige (1802): — Vorlesungen fiber die Methode des akademischen Studiums (1803) — Philosophie und Religion (1804): — Darlegung des wahren Verhältnisses der Naturphilosophie zur verbesserten Fichte'-schen Lehre (1806). How great was the influence of Schelling in this period is vividly depicted in the pages of such men as Steffens, Schubert, and Schlosser. In 1803 Schelling was called by the Bavarian government to the University of Würzburg; here he wrought in the same spirit as at Jena. On account of political changes he left this post after two years, and retired to Munich, where, in 1807, he was made secretary of the Academy of Sciences.

This is a transition period in the philosophy of Schelling. His greater originality and independence lie in his Jena period. He now begins to drift towards syncretism and a mystical theosophy. It is an effort to escape from pantheism towards Christianity, or rather to find a system which shall express the truth of both. The works which give expression to this tendency — they appear less frequently than previously — are: Das Verhältniss der bildenden Künste zur Natur (1807): — Das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit (1809): the harsh work against Jacobi, Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen (1812); and essays in the Allgem. Zeitschrift (Munich, 1813).

After the year 1815 there begins an almost uninterrupted silence of nearly forty years in Schelling's life. In 1820 he lectured for a brief period at Erlangen. In 1826 he was made professor of philosophy at the new University of Munich. His lectures here formed an epoch in the life of many rising young men. In 1841 he accepted a call to Berlin. The lectures here delivered formed a strong antithesis to the dominant Hegelianism, and are  the best expression of his later system. His last years were devoted to editing his later form of doctrine for the press. Death overtook him in Aug. 1854, while seeking relief at the baths of Ragaz, in Switzerland, at the age of seventy-nine. Soon after his death (1856) the publication of his collective works was begun by his son (a clergyman), K.F.A. Schelling. They embrace a first division of ten volumes and a second of four volumes (Stuttgart and Augsburg, 1856 sq.).

Philosophy. — The philosophy of Schelling does not present a definite, self-consistent unity. It was in an almost constant state of self-modification. But it presents two pretty definite, crystallizing climax points his early pantheistic idealism and his later Christian theosophy. Between these climax points lies his long period of almost total retirement from public life. As a whole, however, the growth of his thoughts may be distributed under the following five phases:

(1.) Schelling as a disciple of Fichte.

(2.) His philosophy of nature and his transcendental idealism.

(3.) His system of identity.

(4.) His transition period.

(5.) His theosophic approach to Christianity.

(1.) Schelling began his thought system by absorbing and championing the reigning philosophy of the day — to wit, the system of Kant as modified by Fichte. By Fichte the idealism of Kant was emphasized into exclusive validity. According to Fichte, there is no other reality than the absolute activity of the Ego. It is true, this activity of the Ego is conditioned by an object — the Not-me. But this Not-me cannot be derived from any reality exterior to the Ego; that is, from any thing per se. On the contrary, the Not-me, the external world of thought and observation, is really an unconscious creation of the Ego, which the Ego then subsequently raises to an object of conscious contemplation. But which is the absolute reality with Fichte, the Ego as unconscious or as conscious? If as unconscious, then God, the All, is unconscious; and the empirical consciousness of man is delusive and unreal, and is destined to vanish into unconsciousness. If as conscious, then God, the supreme reality, has no existence save in the transitional flux of vanishing, finite Egos: he is in eternal process of becoming and of passing away. Between these two consequences Fichte's system constantly oscillated, tending at the one pole to self-annihilation, and at the other to self-deification. The latter tendency prevailed more in  his earlier, and the former in his later, life. It was as an enthusiast for this rigid idealism of Fichte that Schelling made his philosophical debut. With Fichte he denied self-consciousness and personality to the absolute being; and he insisted that for the idea of a divine revelation there can be no place, save in the mythological phraseology of the populace. The history of religions he regarded as only a “progressive, symbolical manifestation of the ideas of the absolute reason.” The philosophies and religions of the ancient world present in an imperfect and, as it were, unconscious form that which modern thought has developed in full consciousness of its own processes. Perhaps the chief feature in which Schelling differed from Fichte from the very outset was that he found a deeper significance in the different forms of religion than Fichte had done.

(2.) Schelling's second phase (1796-1800) sprang from his growing conviction that a mere subjective idealism could not do justice to the empirical objective world by which we are net on every hand. He did not mean by this to give up the results of his idealism; he only meant to reach the same results upon another path — to rediscover the reason of the subject in the objective reason of the world of nature. Thereby he introduced a new stadium into his philosophy: constructive or creative knowledge was put into the place of the previous critical knowledge. As previously the Ego had concentrated itself absolutely upon itself, so now this Ego, the subject, was to expand itself over the universe and find the laws of its own intuitions there reflected. Out of subjective idealism sprang, thus, an objective idealism. From the standpoint of this idealism the moral element loses its importance, and speculative knowledge is the one thing important. The intention of Schelling in his Philosophy of Nature was simply to complement the idealism of Fichte; but in reality it grew into a direct antithesis to it. With Fichte, nature was merely a means for the development of the subject. With Schelling, it was a manifestation — form of the absolute Ego, and had essence and significance in itself. Nature was spirit visible; spirit was nature invisible. This conception seemed strikingly new and important. It was hailed with very great enthusiasm. Nature was to Schelling a perpetual movement of self-balancing force. By the varied interaction of attraction and repulsion are produced the infinitely varied forms of organic life. Matter is balanced force. Nature, when rising above the antithesis of attraction and repulsion, becomes light. Light is, as it were, the soul, the thought of nature. Under the influence of light, matter evolves itself dynamically in the phenomena of magnetism, electricity,  chemistry. The antithesis of crude matter and light is harmonized in the higher stage of organic life. Here light inheres in the objects; it is their vitality, their light. Matter becomes here a mere incident of the vitalizing principle. The stages of the dynamic process constitute the great divisions of organic life. The preponderance of objectivity or of subjectivity determines the characteristics of the three great kingdoms of organic nature — the vegetable, the animal, and the human or moral. Matter is the background upon which these three kingdoms stand out as higher stages of evolved being. Through it they stand related and are united into a unitary cosmos.

In his Philosophy of Nature Schelling thus traces the objective world in its ascent from the crudest objective stage to the highest subjective; that is, from matter to moral freedom (so far as the latter exists). But, not content with this, he now reverses the process. He starts from the highest point reached by natural philosophy — to wit, self-conscious man — and reconstructs the whole system of philosophy from a subjective standpoint. In this — his Transcendental Idealism — he traces, accordingly, the objective as rising from the subjective. He divides his subject matter here into the theoretical, the practical, and (that which unites the two) the artistic. In the theoretical part Schelling considers the various stadia of knowledge in their relation to the various stadia of matter. Matter is extinct mind. The acts and phases of self-consciousness are rediscoverable in the forces of nature and in the stages of their development. All the forces of the world are ultimately reducible to powers of ideal representation. Organization is necessary; for intelligence must view itself in its productive, successive transition from cause to effect. This it cannot do without making that succession permanent or representing it as at rest; and succession represented as at rest is organization. Intelligence is a never- ending effort at self-organization. Among the successive stages of organization there must be one which the subject is forced to regard as identical with himself. It is only through the fact that there are other intelligences than myself that the world is made objective to me. It is only through commerce with other individuals that I can come to the consciousness of my freedom. The intercommunication of rational individuals through the medium of the objective world is the condition of freedom. But whether all free beings shall, or shall not, confine their action within such limits as leave free play to the freedom of each other is not left to chance. but is safeguarded by the higher law of justice. Justice rules in  the interests of freedom with all the inviolability of a law of nature. All attempts to supplant the reign of absolute justice by an arbitrary, artificial statute code have ever proved futile and abortive. The guarantee of a good constitution in each state must lie, in the last resort, in the subordination of all states to the common law of absolute righteousness. The gradual approach towards a realization of righteousness is the substance of history. History, as a whole, is a progressive realization and manifestation of the Absolute. It is only through history as a whole that the full proof of God's existence can become manifest. All single intelligences may be regarded as integrant parts of (God or the moral order of the world. This divine order will fully exist as soon as individual intelligences establish it. Towards this consummation history is constantly advancing in consequence of a preestablished harmony between the objective necessary and the subjective free. This harmony is conceivable only on the supposition of the existence of a higher element, superior to both, as being the ground of the identity of the absolutely subjective and the absolutely objective, the conscious and the unconscious, whose original separation took place simply in order to the phenomenal manifestation of free action. If the phenomenal manifestation of freedom is necessarily unending, then history itself is a never completed revelation of the Absolute, which disrupts itself, in view of this manifestation, into the conscious and the unconscious; but which is, in the inaccessible light in which it dwells, the eternal identity of both and the eternal ground of their harmony. To this higher element of identity no predicates can be given. Hence it cannot be an object of knowledge, but only of practical postulation — that is, of faith or religion. If we turn our attention exclusively to the orderliness of the objective world, we fall into a system of fatalism. If, on the contrary, we regard only the subjective, we land in irreligion or anarchy. But if we rise to the thought of that higher identity of both we attain to a system of providence — that is, of religion in the true sense of the word. It is true, Schelling leaves here untouched the very pertinent question how this higher Absolute to which no predicates can be assigned can be described as provident. How he would have met the question we leave undecided.

The transcendental idealism of Schelling had grown under his hands into a complete system of philosophy. It was therefore not only coordinate with his philosophy of nature, but also superordinate. But with this twofold presentation of his system from the two poles of the finite (Nature and the Ego) Schelling was not satisfied. He now felt that what he had found as the  goal of his highest previous effort — to wit, the principle of absolute identity — should be laid as the beginning at the foundation. This brings us to the third stage of his philosophizing.

(3.) The epoch of his System of Identity. In this system everything is derived from the absolute reason, taken in the sense of the absolute identity of subject and object. The highest law of this principle is its identity with itself (A = A). It is absolutely infinite and one. Whatever is, is this absolute itself. Single finite things exist only in reflection. As this absolute identity is everything, it is at the same time the totality of everything. It is not the source or the cause of everything, but it is itself everything. In his conception of this absolute identity, Schelling seems to involve himself in a shadow of self contradiction. He makes it, on the one hand, an absolute indifference; as such it is purely negative, and hence cannot be made the basis of a positive universe. On the other hand, he makes it the identify of everything — that is, he makes it the most positive of all things. In this absolute identity, Schelling distinguishes essence and form. In respect to form. it is an infinite self knowing; it can know itself, however, only as subject and object. But as this subject and object spring from identity, their only difference must be quantitative, not qualitative; that is, the absolute identity can differentiate and posit itself under a preponderance of the subjective or of the objective, but not under a form from which one of the elements is entirely absent. Any equation that can be contrasted with A = A must be simply equivalent to A = B. The whole conception may therefore be expressed under the form of an unending magnetic line with one indifference point and two poles, at the one of which A preponderates, and at the other B, thus:

A=B

A=B A=A

At every point in this line all three elements are present. Every single object is therefore one of the forms of the essence of the absolute, and in each of these forms the absolute identity is entire, seeing that it is per se indivisible. The preponderance of the objective or real is nature. The first relative totality in nature is matter; and the ideal antithesis of matter is light; and from the combination of matter and light springs organic life. But it is only in an infinite self knowing that the absolute identity is actu real, and hence only in the sphere of the subjective and ideal. This sphere Schelling identifies with the true, the good (religion), and the beautiful (art). The  absolute identity is therefore the essence of nature simply in that it is the ground of its actual existence. Everything is nature which falls outside of absolute being. This differentiation of essence as, on the one hand, the actuality of things, and as, on the other, simply the ground of their actuality, was justly regarded by Schelling as one of the most important connecting links between his earlier and his later system.

The filling up of the outlines of his system of identity Schelling left incomplete; he gave chiefly the objective phase. Of the subjective or spiritual phase we have only fragmentary sketches. As filled out in his oral lectures, this phase contained the germs of his later and more theistic system. Religion is presented, not as a product of development from a state of barbarism, but as a product of instruction from higher beings. But Christianity is regarded as inferior to the great religions of the Orient; and yet Schelling insists, as against illuminism and the subjective moralism of Kant, on the necessity of the chief theological ideas of the Bible. His thoughts are these: As the universe differentiates itself, as real and ideal, into nature and history, so history itself is likewise divided. The Oriental and pagan world is the nature side of history; Christianity, on the contrary, is the ideal or moral side. The pagan religions are religions of nature; the gods are but forces of nature; the infinite is subordinated to the finite; hence the multitudinousness of deities. But in Christianity the finite is subordinated to the one infinite; hence the unity of the divine nature; In Christianity mythology can only rise from deterioration and popular ignorance. In paganism mythology is primitive, and religion can rise only from an intellectual advance beyond the primitive elements. The stream of history rises through three stages. The stage of nature came to its climax in the religion and poesy of the Greeks: it was a time of unconscious identity with nature, and nature was regarded as a manifestation of eternal necessity. The period of catastrophe, or of conflict between natural necessity and moral freedom was the tragic age of the decline of ancient civilization. The period of harmonization, or of providence, was inaugurated by Christianity. (This division corresponds in part with the one made in the author's Transcendental Idealism.) It is only in Christ that God becomes truly objective. But this is an eternal process, and the incarnation is not a merely temporal, empirical act; Christ offers up in his own person the finite, and thereby renders possible the coming of the Spirit as the light of the new world; this spirit brings, conducts, the finite back to God. From philosophic speculation Schelling looked for the new birth of  essential, or esoteric, Christianity, and the proclamation of the absolute Gospel.

Connected with these views is Schelling's next speculative work, Philosophy and Religion (1804). It is a self defense against Eschenmayer. In it religion is presented as the “conciliation of the finite with God;” but the finite is regarded as per se fallen. “God is not the positively creative cause of the finite; the finite cannot directly spring of the absolute, and it sustains to the absolute no direct relation.” The finite is regarded simply as not real, as delusive. The general background of this work is an idealistic mysticism, derived in part from Plato and Plotinus, but also much resembling the transmigration systems of the Orient; it fails to do justice to the ideas of morality and freedom.

(4.) With this work on Philosophy and Religion Schelling begins his transition to a more positive Christianity. All of his works subsequent to his System of Identity bear a more or less mystical coloring and become less and less rigidly systematic in form; at first the mysticism resembles that of the Eleusinian mysteries and of Neo-Platonism; subsequently it approaches Christianity on the footsteps of Böhrae. But this appropriation of mystical views was entirely independent on the part of Schelling; he seems to have been forced into them by a growing feeling of incomplete satisfaction with his previous views. And it is to be regretted that he did not openly concede the erroneousness of his earlier system or systems, but constantly represented his later system as simply complementive of his previous ones.

But his change of view is very radical. It came to definite expression for the first time in 1809, in his discussion of the nature of human freedom. Here is to be found in embryo the very essence of his final system. Schelling gives up monism. Monism cannot solve the riddle of good and evil, and gives no play to creatural freedom. Idealism must be complemented by realism. Idealism is the soul of philosophy; realism is its vital body; it is only from the union of the two that a vital whole can result. A few of Schelling's positions here are these: As nothing exists before or outside of God, so he has the ground of his existence within himself. This ground of his existence is not God per se, but it is a nature in God; this nature is inseparable from God, but yet it is distinguishable; it is not actually, but only logically, antecedent to God. It is only from this nature in God that the diversity and multiplicity of finite things is explicable. In order that these things be other than God, it must be that they have the ground of  their existence in something which is not God; that is, in that in God which is not God himself. The further development of these thoughts brings us to

(5.) Schelling's Later System. The thoughts here met with are unquestionably among the most brilliant and suggestive that are anywhere to be found in the field of the philosophy of religion. At the threshold of this system we meet with an examination of the implications of creatural freedom. Among the fruitful conclusions here reached is this, that purely rational, logical thought is incapable of leading us to a knowledge of reality. This conclusion leads to a distribution of philosophy into negative and positive. By this distinction, Schelling comes into sharp antithesis to Hegel, who endeavored to comprehend the real by the processes of mere abstract thought. In the view of Schelling, this is impossible. Pure thought, pure reason, cannot a priori comprehend the existence of the objective world of reality. What a thing is and that it is (quid sit et quod sit) are clearly to be distinguished. The what, the essence of a thing, may be expressed in thought, in ideas. But the knowledge that it exists is / given by something outside of thought — to wit, its existence itself. This knowledge comes to us from experience, and not from reason. Existence cannot, therefore, be demonstrated; it can only be experienced. It is only through this knowledge from experience that thought reaches to true knowledge. A negative or ideal philosophy has to do only with the possible. It is only a positive philosophy that can rise to contact with the real and with that which springs from the real — to wit, freedom and free action. But as the whole of the results of freedom is not yet complete, a positive philosophy cannot be presented in as rounded a systematic form as is possible with the negative. The highest attainment of negative philosophy is to show how the highest principle is in idea. The connecting link which leads over from the negative to the positive form of philosophy is the conviction, forced upon us by experience, that God must be more than mere idea — that is, that he is real. As negative philosophy is the a priorism of the empirical, so positive philosophy is the empiricism of the a prioristic — that is, it is philosophical empiricism.

Positive philosophy can assume a starting-point almost anywhere — thus: “I will that which is higher than substance, to wit, the Lord of all being.” From this initial assumption it then proceeds deductively, and the experience which results reacts as verification of the assumed starting point. The world is here the posterius; the unconditioned prius is God. And the whole drama of human history is an accumulative proof that this  posterius is from this prius. It is only in the sphere of positive philosophy that we reach the field of religion — that is, of a real (not merely ideal) relation of man to God. The transition from a negative to a positive philosophy is like that from the law to the Gospel. For a purely rational science, the idea of an objective religion does not exist. Religion originates practically through a longing and desire of the spirit, which cannot be satisfied with the merely ideal God of speculation. This longing is not an expression of the practical reason, as Kant would have it, but rather of the individual personality. It is not the generic, but the specific, that leads to God; for it is not the generic element of man (the reason), but the specific (the personality), that calls for happiness. The individual, as personality, calls for a person who is outside of and above the world — a Heart with which it may commune. The object and content of positive philosophy are furnished by revelation. But revelation is not philosophy, even as a ledge of rocks is not geology; it becomes philosophy only when thought digests and constructs it. Revelation is as essential to religious knowledge as the crust of the earth is to geological knowledge; hence the absolute defect of rationalism; reason is not competent to judge as to what revelation should be, but only to construct the revelation which is.

Having speculatively reached the ideal of the Absolute Being, and being forced by the heart to assume that this Being is objectively real, the philosopher is now ready for the predicate of this highest reality. This Being would not be perfect if he had not the liberty of positing himself outside of himself; but this is a liberty, and not a necessity. God is, before the world, master of the world; that is, he is able to posit it or not to posit it. The world is therefore a consequence, not of the divine nature, but of the divine will. But God does not posit himself into the world. God does not become real in consequence of creation; and yet he would not be real without the power of creation. Monotheism is true, but not in the sense of theism. Theism admits God as a personality, but this personality is an empty undifferentiated infinity, and has within itself no potentiality, no basis for a world outside of God. God is per se a plurality of potencies, and he is the totality of these potencies. And the great error of pantheism is not that it holds that there is no being outside of God, and that all existence is God's existence, “for all hearts cheerfully and joyously concede this;” but it consists in assigning to God a necessary and involuntary identity with whatsoever is. It is only from this idea of monotheism as distinguished from theism and pantheism that a transition to the truth of the trinity is  possible. The entire God — that is, God as the totality of the divine potencies — is the Creator, the Father; and he is Father only in that he confronts the possibility of what is to be; and his fatherhood is fully realized only with the full actualization of creation. In the act of creation the absolute personality evolves its own self existing essence out of itself. This act of creation is a generating, and the divine essence so evolved is the Son. A second evolution constitutes the Spirit. The fatherly potency furnishes the material of creatural objects; the Son their form; the Spirit their perfection.

Revelation in the Old Test. lingers under the forms of mythology. In the New Test. these forms are entirely dispensed with. The focus of the new religion is the person of Christ, not as teacher or legislator, but as content. The person of Christ is both historical and prehistorical; as prehistorical he presided over pre-Christian history; as historical he laid aside his glory and identified himself with man in order to raise human nature into communion with God. Christ resumed the glory which he had laid aside only gradually and by moral process. This process began at his baptism. It is only on the complete victory of Christ over death that he could send the Spirit as comforter.

Schelling closes his philosophy of revelation with a glance at the history of the Church. He distinguishes here a prehistorical, a historical, and a post- historical Church. The latter will not appear in the present eon. The condition of the prehistorical is that of a merely subjective (negative) unity; that of the historical is a state of division as preparatory to its transition to a state of free, positive unity. The historical stage of the Church begins at the point where Christianity attains to domination in the Roman empire. Here it had to face, under a new form, all the might of the once defeated Evil Spirit. In giving itself an outer constitution, the Church appeared at first as a mere realistic, material, formal unity; as such it was of a merely authoritative legal character, and the more rigidly this legal character developed itself, so much the more was the ideal (spiritual) character driven into the background. But at the Reformation the ideal element came to open revolt with the realistic, and it then inaugurated a new phase of Church history. Both Christ and the apostles place the advance of the Church in a growth in knowledge; and the character of this new phase is, and will be, that mankind recognize more and more the supreme fact that Christianity is the highest stadium of human science. The three conditions of the Church are typified in the three apostles — Peter, Paul, and John.  Peter has the violent, aggressive nature that characterizes every beginning; Paul is steady and constructive; John has the gentle repose of maturity. The true Church is neither of the three, but the synthesis of all; its foundation was laid by Peter; its body was edified by Paul; its content was breathed into it by John. Even as God consists not simply of one person, so the Church is not embodied simply in one apostle. Peter is rather the apostle of the Father: he sees most deeply into the past. Paul is really the apostle of the Son: he is full of light. John is the mouth piece of the Spirit: he has the deep “words” of spiritual truth and warmth.

As a whole, no system of modern philosophy has more fully allied itself with Christianity than that of Schelling; he, of all the great speculatists, has alone treated this religion as “real history.” To Schelling Christianity is a higher, a supernatural stream of history flowing upon the bosom of the ocean of cosmic history. He treats this history, not atomistically, but genetically. This genetic method of theologizing has become the prevalent characteristic of modern theology. Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Rothe, Lange, Martensen, have all practiced it. Its general trait is an earnest endeavor to coordinate the parts into the whole, and to grasp the whole as a vital unity; and its stimulative relation to contemporary theological thought is an evident result of this its chief trait; and that in its details it may frequently be erroneous, or that many of its speculations are over presumptuous, does not destroy its value as a whole.

Few thinkers have had more enthusiastic disciples than Schelling. G.M. Klein espoused his system of identity. J.J. Wagner defended the earlier Schelling against the so-called later. G.A.F. Ast applied his method to the study of Plato. T.A. Rixner became a fruitful student of the history of philosophy. L. Oken applied Schelling's thoughts to an elaborate philosophy of nature; Nees von Esenbeck applied them to the physiology of plants; B.H. Blasche, to pedagogics and religious philosophy; J.P.V. Troxler, to the science of cognition. A.K.A. Eschenmayer received here his fundamental inspiration. J. Görres adapted Schelling to Roman Catholic tendencies. G.H. Von Schubert reflected him in a popular Christian mysticism. K.F. Burdach made large use of his philosophy of nature. K.G. Carus represented him in psychology and craniology; H.C. Oersted, in physics; K.W.F. Solger, in aesthetics; H. Steffens, in general religious philosophy; J.E. Von Berger, in the philosophy of law. F. Von Baader developed and remolded Schelling's later views into a very rich and elaborate system of Christian theosophy. K.C.F. Krause applied Schelling's  views to general literature and freemasonry. F.G. Stahl was largely influenced by the later Schelling in his philosophy of law and in his discussion of the relations of Church and State. Coleridge received much inspiration from the early Schelling, and through Coleridge this influence went over into the pantheistic traits of Wordsworth. Agassiz was inspired by Schelling's views of nature. And many of the brilliant hypotheses which have played so large a role in modern physics — such as the metamorphosis of plants, the homologies of the skeleton, the origin of species — are really found in germ in the early works of Schelling.

On Schelling, consult Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 503-551; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, vol. 2; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrine; Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism; Bowen, Modern Philosophy; and all works on modern German speculation. (J.P.L.)

## Schelling, Joseph F[[@Headword:Schelling, Joseph F]]

             general superintendent at Maulbrunn in Würtemberg, was born in 1737, and died in 1812. Among his contributions to Biblical literature are the writings of Solomon translated into Latin, with notes (Stuttgart, 1806), and a Dissertation on the Use of the Arabic to a Thorough Knowledge of Hebrew (Stuttgart, 1771).

## Schelwig, Samuel[[@Headword:Schelwig, Samuel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 8, 1643. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1673 professor of philosophy at Dantzic, in 1675 professor of theology, in 1685 doctor of theology. In 1693 Schelwig inaugurated a controversy with his colleague Constantine Schutze, whom he accused of having spoken in the pulpit in favor of pietism (q.v.) and Spener. The outcome of this controversy was a number of controversial writings published by both parties. In 1694 the town council interfered. But Schelwig would not stop. He now wrote against Spener, who replied. In 1701 Schelwig was joined by Chr. F. Bucher in his polemics against  Spener, and he died January 18, 1715. See Praetorins, Athenae Gedanenses (Leipsic, 1713), where a complete list of Schelwig's writings is given; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Walch, Religions streitugkeiten der evangel-lutherischen Kirche, 1:602 sq., 739 sq.; 4:159.; Schmid, Geschichte des Pietismus, page 225 sq., 343; Schnaase, Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Danzig's (Dantzic, 1863); Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schem, Alexander Jacob[[@Headword:Schem, Alexander Jacob]]

             a religious journalist and statistician, was born at Wiedenbrick, Germany, March 16, 1826. After a course of instruction at the gymnasium of Paderborn, he studied theology at Bonn (1843), and Tubingen (1845); became a Roman Catholic priest (1846), but embraced Protestantism, and edited a newspaper in Westphalia (1849). In 1851 he came to America. was professor of languages in Dickinson College (1854-60), and afterwards devoted himself to literary labors, especially in connection with several religious and political newspapers. He died at Hoboken, N.J., May 21, 1881, being at the time assistant superintendent of the public schools in New York city. He was a contributor to Appleton's Cyclopaedia, M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, editor of the Deutsch- Amerikanische Conversations-Lexicon (1869-74), of a Latin English Lexicon (in connection with Dr. Crooks), of a Cyclopaediae of Education (in connection with Henry Kullle), and author of several Year-books, besides other volumes.

## Schenck, George[[@Headword:Schenck, George]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Mattewan, N.Y., Jan. 27, 1816, and graduated at Yale College, August, 1837. During his boyhood he was crippled for life by a severe fall while skating. Hip disease ensued in its most painful form. He was helpless for three or four years, and was never after able to walk without crutch or cane and a high boot. But this affliction was sanctified to his conversion during his collegiate life. He studied theology in the New Brunswick Seminary, and after graduation, in 1840, settled as pastor of the Reformed Church of Bedminster, N. J. This was his only charge — a very large, intelligent, well-trained country congregation, which has enjoyed a long succession of able ministers. Mr. Schenck was distinguished as a preacher of unusual power in the exposition of Scripture and in the application of it to the consciences of his hearers. He was at times brilliant, always earnest, and “never feared the face of clay.” His fine social qualities, deep piety, and skill as a physician of souls, endeared him to his people. His energy was marvelous. “What he began, he expected to do. His body was like a little craft driven by a  tremendous engine; and for just that reason, no doubt, the timbers so soon fell apart. He preached, as he wrote to a friend, ‘with all his might.' He was no less zealous as a pastor.” His tastes were refined, literary, scholarly. But everything was bent to his life work as a minister. In the general affairs of the Church, in the temperance cause and educational movements, he was conspicuous for “zeal with knowledge.” His ministry was greatly blessed in conversions and revivals, and in the edification of the Church. He died in 1852, of palsy, which struck him down just after he came from a Sabbath afternoon lecture and a visit to a sick man. With characteristic modesty, he never but twice consented to frequent requests to appear in print. A Sermon on the Second Coming of Christ (1843) and an Address on Music (in which he was a proficient) (1849) are all of his publications. See Memorial Sermon, by Dr. T.W. Chambers; Letter of Rev. H.D. Ganse; Sprague's Annals of the Amer. Pulpit. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schenck, Noah Hunt, D.D[[@Headword:Schenck, Noah Hunt, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born near Trenton, N.J., June 30, 1825. He graduated from Princeton College in 1844, studied law, and practiced it for a year in Trenton and three years in Cincinnati, Ohio; but having decided to enter the ministry, studied theology at the Seminary in Gambier, where he graduated in 1853. His first parish was at Hillsboro'. In 1856-57 he preached at Gambier, and from 1857 to 1859 in Trinity Church, Chicago, Illinois. While in that city he founded and edited The Western Churchman. In 1859 he accepted a call to Emanuel Church, at Baltimore, where he remained until he went to Brooklyn, in 1867, as rector of St. Ann's Church, where he continued until his death, January 4, 1885. Dr. Schenck travelled several times in Europe, and was the author of several works, mostly letters of travel and sermons. At one time he edited  The Protestant Churchman of New York, and he was talked of for bishop on several occasions. He was regarded as a preacher of great ability, and always was listened to by large congregations.

## Schenk, Hartmann[[@Headword:Schenk, Hartmann]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born April 7, 1634, at Ruhla, near Eisenach. He studied at Helmstadt and Jena, and was pastor at Bibra and Vilkershausen. His motto was, “Mea Haereditas Servator,” and he died May 2, 1681. He was a man of prayer, who not only prayed himself, but also taught others how to pray. He wrote some hymns, which are still in use in the German churches. See G. Ludovici, De Hymnis et Hymnopoeis Hennebergicis (Schleusingen, 1703), p. 27; Wezel, Hymno-poeographia (Herrnstadt, 1724), 3, 49; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 3, 427; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1343. (B.P.)

## Schenk, Heinrich Theobald[[@Headword:Schenk, Heinrich Theobald]]

             a Lutheran hymn writer, was born at Alsfeld, and became headmaster of the school at Giessen, and afterwards chief pastor there, where he died in 1727. He is the author of Wer sind die vor Gottes Throne (based on Rev 7:13-17), transl. into English by E. Cox, in Hymns from the German, p. 91, “Who are these, like stars appearing.” See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4, 535; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1343. (B.P.)

## Schenkel, Daniel[[@Headword:Schenkel, Daniel]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born December 21, 1813, at Digerlen, Canton Zurich. He studied at Basle and Gottingen, was in 1837 privat-docent at Basle, in 1841 chief pastor at Schaffhausen. In 1846 he began his great work, Das Wesendes Protestantismus (1846-51, 3 volumes; 2d ed. 1861), in which he took his stand upon the so-called "Vermittelungstheologie," the via media between the old evangelicalism and the new criticism. Upon the death of De Wette, Schenkel was called in 1849 to Basle as professor of theology. In 1851 he was called to Heidelberg. At first evangelical in spirit, in 1857 he sided with the liberal direction in the General Synod, and worked for the reconstruction of the Hessian Church upon the basis of the Congregational principle ("Gemeindeprinzip"). As editor of the Allgemeine kirchliche Zeitschrift, he used the press to support the Liberal direction in theology and ecclesiastical constitution. The beginning of his liberalism he showed in the Christliche Dogmatik von Standpunkt des Gewissens (1858-59); but when he published in 1864 Das Charakterbild Jesu, one hundred and eighteen parochial clergymen in Baden issued a protest against the book. Schenkel replied in Die protestantische Freiheit in ihrem gepenwartigen Kampfe mit der kirchlichen Reaktion (1865). From 1863 he had labored hard for the foundation of the German "Protestanten Verein." In 1883 he retired from the direction of the homiletical seminary, and in 1884 from academical .activity, and died May 19, 1885. Besides the works already mentioned, he published, Die Grundlehren des Christenthums aus dem Bewusstsein des Glaubens dargestellt (1877): — Luther in Worms und Wittenberg (1870): — Christenthum und Kirche im Einklang mit der Kulturentwicklung (1867-72, 2 volumes): — Das Christusbild der Apostel und der nachapostolischen Zeit (1879): — in connection with eminent scholars he published Bibel-lexikon (1867-72, 5 volumes): — and for Lange's Bibelwerk he wrote the commentaries on Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, and his volume passed into a second edition; but in place in the series was afterwards occupied by a commentary on the same epistles by Dr. Karl Braune (q.v.). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schenkl, Maurus[[@Headword:Schenkl, Maurus]]

             a Benedictine of Germany, was born at Auerbach, January 4, 1749. In 1768 he joined his order, received holy orders in 1772, was in 1778 professor of theology at Weltenburg, in 1790 at Amberg, and died June 14, 1816. He wrote, Positiones Theologiae Dogmaticae (Regensburg, 1779- 80): — Positiones ex Theologian Universa (1781): — Positiones ex juare Ecclesiastico Universo et Bavarico (1783): — Ethica Christiana (1800- 1801, 3 volumes): — Institutiones Theologiae Pastoralis (1802; 2d ed. 1803): — Compendium sive Institutiones Ethicae Christiana (1807). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theoloygen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:316; 2:9, 35. (B.P.)

## Scherer, Johann Ludwig Wilhelm[[@Headword:Scherer, Johann Ludwig Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was.born at Nidda, February 27, 1777, and died in 1825. He is the author of, Ausfuhrliche Erklarung der sammtlichein messianischen Weissagungen, etc. (Altenburg, 1801): — Archiv zur Vervollkommnung des Bibelstudiums (Hamburg, eod.): — Geschichte der Israeliten vor Jesus (Zerbst, 1803-1804): — Der Schriftforscher zur Bildung eines grundlichen Bibelstudiums (Weimar, 1803-1805, 2 volumes): — Ausfuhrliche Erklarung der sammtlichen Weissargungen des Neuen Testaments (Leipsic, 1803): — Historische Einleitung zum richtigen Verstehen der Bibel (Halle, 1802). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:277, 390, 391; 2:37, 162, 249, 252, 280, 293; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schermerhorn, John F[[@Headword:Schermerhorn, John F]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born about 1785, graduated at Union College 1809, and entered the ministry of the Congregational Church,  which he left in 1813 for the Dutch Reformed Church. He was first settled at Middleburgh, N.Y., 1817-27. In 1817 he visited Upper Canada with Rev. Jacob Van Vechten, and labored three months among the Dutch churches there. He was appointed Secretary of Domestic Missions, 1828 or 1829, by the Northern Board of the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church to call forth the resources of the Church and determine the proper missionary fields. Subsequently he was appointed general agent for the whole Church. His energy and zeal gave a new impetus to the benevolence of the Church. Among the substantial fruits of his labors was the organization of the Reformed churches in Utica, Ithaca, and Geneva, besides others in less prominent places. But serious difficulties embarrassed his administration, and he resigned the office in 1832. He never afterwards held a pastoral charge, but was frequently a leading member of the ecclesiastical assemblies, and continued to interest himself in the benevolent movements of the Church. In 1832 president Jackson, of whom he was a warm personal and political friend, appointed him one of a commission to remove the Cherokee and Chickasaw Indians beyond the Mississippi. This work also brought with it some unhappy complications, which hindered his subsequent usefulness. He was a powerful preacher, a public debater of unusual mental vigor, acuteness, tact, and argumentative ability. His restless brain was always teeming with great schemes, which often were Utopian in their results. In conversation he was entertaining and suggestive beyond most men. His sympathies were tender; and, when preaching or conversing on the great themes of the Gospel, he not only felt deeply, but possessed great power over the hearts and consciences of his hearers. He labored much and successfully in revivals of religion as a helper to his brethren. In person he was very large, robust, and commanding. He died in 1850 after a short illness. See Memoir of Peter Labagh, D.D., by G. A. Todd, D.D., p. 52, 120, 161-163. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schermerhorn, Richard E[[@Headword:Schermerhorn, Richard E]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Nassau, Rensselaer County, N.Y., experienced religion at the age of nineteen, was received on trial by the New York Conference in 1826, transferred in the same year to the Maine Conference, admitted into full connection in 1828, and successively appointed to the Scarborough and Gotham circuits, and Belfast, Hallowell, Bangor, Buxport, and Gardiner stations. In 1834-35 he was appointed to Augusta district, and also elected as delegate to the General Conference. He died April 18, 1836. He was a man well read, of uniform and deep  piety, good preaching talents, and successful in the great object of the ministry. See Minutes of Conferences, 2, 409.

## Scherzer, Johann Adam[[@Headword:Scherzer, Johann Adam]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, born at Eger, August 1, 1628, was in 1657 professor of theology at Leipsic, in 1658 professor of Hebrew, and died December 23, 1683, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Collegium Anti-Calvinianum (edited by J. Schmid, Leipsic, 1704): — Collegiumi Anti-Socinianum (1672): — Trifolium Orientale (containing Manductio ad Lectionem Talmudico-rabbinicam, Specimen Theologiae Judaorum Mystice, Abarbanelis Comm. in Haggaeum): — Nucleus Grammaticorum Ebraicorumn (1660). See Furst, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:353, 354; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Scheuchzer, John James[[@Headword:Scheuchzer, John James]]

             a Swiss naturalist and physician, was born in 1672, at Zurich, where he was professor of mathematics and natural philosophy. He died in 1733. He was the author of several scientific works: Natural History of the Bible, in Latin and German (1732-37, 8 vols. fol.): — Natural History of Switzerland (1708, 3 vols.).

## Schian, Johann Robert[[@Headword:Schian, Johann Robert]]

             a German Protestant divine, was born Oct. 31, 1828, in Loewen. In 1852 he completed his theological studies at Breslau, was appointed deacon at Liegnitz in 1858, and afterwards first deacon in the same place, where he died, Jan. 16, 1876. He was one of the most prominent ministers in Silesia; and, besides a number of sermons, he wrote, Ratio quoe intercesserit inter Melanchthonem et Lutherum explicatur et quid attribuerit ad Ecclesiam Evangelicam constituendam exponitur (Gottingae, 1855). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 2, 1137; Theologisches Jahrbuch, 1877, p. 228. (B.P.)

## Schiavone, Andrea Medula (Or Medola)[[@Headword:Schiavone, Andrea Medula (Or Medola)]]

             an Italian painter and engraver, was born at Sebenico, in Dalmatia, in 1522. He was of obscure parentage, and went to Venice at an early age, where he gained a livelihood as a house painter. In his leisure hours he studied the works of Giorgione and Titian. The latter artist, hearing of his poverty and seeing his ability, employed him, with Tintoretto and others, in ornamenting the grand hall of the library of San Marco. His designs were good, but the drawing so defective as to render him unable to compete successfully with his rival Tintoretto. It was only after his death that his works were appreciated. His life was miserable. He died in Venice in 1582. His principal works are, The Eternal Father among the Angels: — John the Baptist in the Desert: — The Visit of the Virgin to Elizabeth: — The Death of Abel: — and The Assumption of the Virgin. Etchings by him are found after his own compositions, and copies of Raphael and others.

## Schickard, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Schickard, Wilhelm]]

             a learned German Orientalist and distinguished astronomer, was born at Herrenberg, near Tübingen, April 22, 1592. When he had finished his  theological course, he was for a while vicar in his native town, but in 1613 returned to Tübingen, and there gave lessons in Hebrew. In 1616 he was pastor at Nürtingen, continuing his studies in various languages. An acquaintance which sprang up between him and Kepler led to his turning his attention to mathematics, to which he afterwards gave much of his time. To occupy his spare moments, he learned the art of engraving upon wood, and made use of this acquirement in constructing a celestial globe and astronomical charts. In 1618 he became professor of Hebrew at Tübingen, and added to his knowledge of languages by studying Syriac, Arabic, Chaldee, Turkish, and Persian, all without any teacher or instruction save what he gained himself. In 1628 he was made member of the College of Arts, and in 1629 was elected inspector of the schools at Stuttgart. He occupied in 1631 the chair of astronomy at Tübingen, without giving up his Hebrew professorship. After the battle of Tübingen he retired to Austria, but returned later only to meet the plague, which bereft him of nearly his entire family, and finally terminated his own life, Oct. 23, 1635. His writings are numerous, all relating either to Oriental languages or astronomy. His most valuable work is Jus Regium Hebroeorum, or משפט המל, especially in the edition of Carpzov (Leips. 1674). See Vita Schickardi; Balth. Viassus, Apotheosis Schickardi; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 270 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 125 sq.; Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, p. 2565; R. Simon, Hist. Critique, p. 474; Diestel, Gesch. des alten Testaments, p. 322 sq., 334, 449, 501, 521; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Schickedanz, Abraham Philipp Gottfried[[@Headword:Schickedanz, Abraham Philipp Gottfried]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Dessau, May 22, 1747. In 1772 he was rector at Frankfort, in 1776 third preacher of the Reformed Church and professor of theology, in 1784 doctor of theology, and died at Zerbst, November 28, 1808. He wrote, De Caipha Prophetam Simulante ad Joh 11:49-52 (Frankfort, 1773): — Vestigia Messiae in Scriptis Josephi atque Philonis (1774): — Diss. super Quaedam Loca Sabbatarioum Scriptorum Exterorum (1775-76): — De Natura Sacrificiorum Veteris Testamenti (1784), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:136, 536. (B.P.)

## Schieck, Benjamin S., D.D[[@Headword:Schieck, Benjamin S., D.D]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born near Reading, Pennsylvania, March 14, 1806. He studied theology under Reverend Dr. F.S. Herman, was licensed in 1825, and ordained in 1826. His first charge  consisted of seven congregations in Celitre County, where he labored until 1833. In 1834 he became pastor in Gettysburg and vicinity, but, his health failing, he resigned in 1835. Shortly after he took charge of the Weekly Messenger; continuing as editor until 1844. He resumed the editorial management of the Messenger from 1847 to 1852. He was also editor of the Reforimirte Kirchenzeitung from its beginning until 1864, as well as minister at different intervals to congregations in the vicinity of Chambersburg. In 1855 he took charge of St. John's Reformed Church at Chambersburg, of which he continued pastor until his death, April 19, 1874. In 1839 he was president of the synod which met at Philadelphia. For some time before his death he was professor of German in the Wilson Female College, near Chambersburg. He was a man of much general information; a genial, pleasing, and instructive writer. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 5:120.

## Schiede, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Schiede, Johann Georg]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Cassel, May 15, 1714. He studied at Marburg, was ordained in 1739, and appointed pastor at Carlshafen in 1741. In 1745 he was called to Hanau, was in 1755 member of consistory, and died May 13, 1792. He wrote, De Velo Tabernaculi, etc. (Marburg, 1736): — Biga Observationum Sacrarum de Codice Bibliorum Ebraico MS. Bibliothecae Casselanae (Bremeni 1748). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schincke, Johann Christian Gotthilf[[@Headword:Schincke, Johann Christian Gotthilf]]

             a German theologian, was born in 1782 at Querfurt, and died in 1839 as pastor of Wispitz, in Anhalt-Köthen. He wrote, Metakritische Beobachtungen über die preuss. Agende (Halle, 1824): — Jesus Christus, ein Erbauungsbuch (ibid. 1826): — Evangelische Geschichten und Reden in frommen Dichtergaben (ibid. 1826): — Biblische Alterthumskunde in alphabetischer Folge (Neustadt, 1837-40): — Sammlung von auserlesenen Gebeten (Halle, 1843). See Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. 2, 1140. (B.P.)

## Schindler, Valentin[[@Headword:Schindler, Valentin]]

             who died in 1604, is the author of the first polyglot lexicon, containing the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Talmudico-Rabbinic, and Arabic. It was first published at Hanau in 1612, and in a fourth edition in 1695. Besides, he also wrote, Tractatus de Accentibus Hebr. etc. (Wittenberg, 1596): — Compendium Grammaticioe Hebraicoe (ibid. 1602; 2d ed. 1613), and other linguistic treatises. See Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 274; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 127; Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, p. 2566 sq.; Gesenius, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache, § 34; Diestel, Gesch. des alten Testaments, p. 447, 452. (B.P.)

## Schinmeyer, Johann Adolf[[@Headword:Schinmeyer, Johann Adolf]]

             a Lutheran divine and doctor of divinity, was born in 1733 at Stettin. leaving completed his studies, he was appointed in 1757 deacon at Itzehoe; in 1764 he was made archdeacon and professor of Oriental languages at Stettin; in 1774 he became pastor of the German congregation at Stockholm; and in 1778 he was appointed general superintendent at Greifswalde. In 1779 he was called for the same office to Lubeck, where he died May 3, 1796. Besides his Lebensbeschreibungen der drei schwedischen Reformatoren, des Kanzlers Lor. Andersen, Olaf Petersen und Lor. Petersen (Lubeck, 1783), he published Versuch einer vollständigen Geschichte der schwedischen Bibelübersetzungen und Ausgaben, mit Anzeige und Beurtheilung ihres Werthes (Flensburg, 1777), the best work on the earlier Swedish Bible versions. (B.P.)

## Schinner, Matthew[[@Headword:Schinner, Matthew]]

             a Romish bishop in Switzerland, and a cardinal just before the outbreak of the Reformation, was born in 1470. He studied at Zurich and Como, and became early noted for shrewdness and scholarship. In 1509 he was made bishop of Sion, and soon thereafter was called into diplomatic service by Leo X. In 1511 he received the cardinal's hat. He intrigued against the French in Italy, and was the agent for procuring an army of 20,000 Swiss by which, in 1512, the French were expelled from Lombardy. For this service the pope heaped titles and wealth upon Schinner, and gave to the Swiss for all time to come the appellation Defensores Ecclesiasticoe Libertatis. Zwingli took part in the campaign, and depicted in bright colors the glory of the occasion. Schinner now made his headquarters as papal legate at Milan. Fresh dangers from France arising again, he hastened to  England (1514), and endeavored, by his Oratio Philippica ad excitandos contra Galliam Britannos, to entangle Henry VIII in war with Francis I. On his return, he inspired the Swiss to resist the French at Marignano. When the Reformation began in Switzerland, this cardinal statesman gave it at first a warm greeting. Zwingli met him at Einsiedeln and Zurich, and showed him from the Scriptures his reasons for rejecting the errors of popery, and the cardinal expressed himself as very desirous of cooperating in the work of renovation. When Luther's life was in danger in Germany, the cardinal joined with those who offered him safety and refuge. On reading Luther's works, he exclaimed, “Disputet Eccius quantum velit, Lutherus veritatem scribit!” But temporal interests held him fast to the old Church. He was even induced actively to oppose the new doctrines. His last few years were spent in Rome. He died soon after assisting in the election of Adrian VI, Oct. 2, 1522. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20, 691- 694; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v. (J.P.L.)

## Schinos[[@Headword:Schinos]]

             SEE MASTIC.

## Schirmer, August Gottlieb Ferdinand[[@Headword:Schirmer, August Gottlieb Ferdinand]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in Silesia, May 14, 1791, and died in 1863 at Greifiswalde, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Observationes Exeg.-Criticae in Librum Esdrae (Breslau, 1820): — Die biblische Dogmatik, etc. (eod.): — Versuch einer wissenschaftlichen Wirdigung des Supernaturalismus und Rationalismus (1818): — Die Anbetung Gottes im Geist und in der Wahrheit (Greifswalde, 1830), etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:204, 292, 369; 2:104, 177; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schirmer, Michael[[@Headword:Schirmer, Michael]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Leipsic in 1606. In 1636 he was called as master of the Grayfriars' Grammar school at Berlin, where he died May 4, 1673. On account of his many troubles, he was called “the German Job.” He is the author of some hymns, the most popular of which is his O heil'ger Geist kehr'bei uns ein (Engl. transl. in Choral Book for England, No. 70, “O Holy Spirit, enter in”). See Dieterich, Berlinische Kloster- und Schul-Historie (Berlin, 1752); Bachmann, M. Schirmer nach seinem Leben u. Dichten (ibid. 1859); Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 3, 333 sq.: 8, 8, 92; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1343. (B.P.)

## Schism[[@Headword:Schism]]

             SEE HERESY.

## Schism Bill[[@Headword:Schism Bill]]

             an act passed in the reign of queen Anne rendering Nonconformist teachers of schools liable to three months' imprisonment. It was also laid down as imperative upon every schoolmaster that he should receive the sacrament of the Church of England, take the oaths, and teach only the Church  catechism. If he should attend a conventicle, he was incapacitated and imprisoned. The queen, however, died on the very day that the act was to have received her signature, and consequently, though it had passed both houses, it fell to the ground.

## Schism Overture[[@Headword:Schism Overture]]

             an overture which came before the Scottish General Assembly of 1766, and was produced by alarm at the rapid spread of secession. The overture affirms that a hundred and twenty meeting houses had been erected, and raised the question, What shall be done to remedy so great an evil? also, whether a committee might not be appointed to correspond with presbyteries and gentlemen of property and influence, and report? The overture was rejected by a vote of 19 to 85. The argument turned chiefly on the law of patronage.

## Schisms[[@Headword:Schisms]]

             Various great schisms are found in the history of the Church. There was the great schism which divided the Eastern and Western churches. In the Western Church there were early schisms —

(1) the schism of Hippolytus at Rome, A.D. 220-235, SEE CALIXTUS; SEE HIPPOLYTUS;

(2) the schism of Felicissimus at Carthage, about A.D. 250, which was in reality an opposition to the episcopal authority of Cyprian under the lead of Novatus, SEE NOVATIANS;

(3) the schism of Novatian, a presbyter at Rome, A.D. 251. There was also the schism of Meletius. The Popish Church was rent by a great schism in the 14th century. Seventy years did the popes reside at Avignon, and after this one party chose Urban VI and another party Clement VII. France held by the last and England by the first, and for the next half century the rival popes claimed each to be the infallible head of the Church.

## Schizler, Constantin Von[[@Headword:Schizler, Constantin Von]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born of Protestant parentage at Augsburg, in 1827. He studied jurisprudence, and was promoted as doctor of law at Erlangen in 1850. In the same year he joined the Church of Rome at Brussels, studied theology, and was made a priest in 1857 at Liege. In 1859 he was promoted at Munich as doctor of theology, was in 1863 lecturer at Freiburg, in 1866 archieplscopal counsellor, went to Rome in 1873, and was made chaplain by Pius IX. In 1878 he joined the Jesuits, and died at Interlaken, September 20, 1880. He published, Die Lehre von der Wirksamkeit der Sacramente (Munich, 1860): — Natur und Uebernatur (1865): — Gnade und Glaube (1867): — Das Dogma von der Mlenschwerdung Christi (1870): — Ueber papstliche Unfehlbarkeit (eod.): — Der heilige Thomas von Aquin als Besieger des Liberalisomus (1874). (B.P.)

## Schlatter, Michael[[@Headword:Schlatter, Michael]]

             a Swiss missionary, was born at St. Gall, July 14, 1716. Educated at St. Gall, he became a clergyman, and in 1746 offered himself to the synods of North and South Holland as a missionary to the German Reformed emigrants in Pennsylvania. He was pastor of the Reformed churches of  Philadelphia and Germantown from 1746 to 1751, and organized churches in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. He effected the organization of the Synod of the German Reformed Church in America in Sept. 1747. He revisited Europe in 1751, and secured six other ministers for the United States. In 1757 he acted as chaplain to an expedition to Nova Scotia against the French, and, espousing the cause of the colonists when the Revolution broke out, was imprisoned in 1777. He died near Philadelphia in October, 1790.

## Schlegel, Gottlieb[[@Headword:Schlegel, Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kinigsberg, February 16, 1739, and died at Greifswalde, May 27, 1810, doctor and professor of theology. He published, De Parallelismo Sermonum Jesu et Scriptorum Apostolicorum (Greifswalde, 1791): — Erneuerte Erwagung von der gottl.  Dreieinigkeit (Riga, 1791-92, 2 parts): — Briefe der Apostel Petrus, Johannes, Jacobus und Judas ubersetzt mit- einigen Anmerkungen (Halle, 1783): — De Principiis Expectationiis de Messia im Gente Judaica (1793), etc.; See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:110, 334, 421, 484, 497, 867; 2:31, 46, 221, 273. (B.P.)

## Schlegel, Johann Adolf[[@Headword:Schlegel, Johann Adolf]]

             a German preacher and poet, was born at Meissen Sept. 18, 1721. His early studies were carried on at Pforte, and in 1741 he entered the University of Leipsic, where he became acquainted with Gellert, Rabener, Gaestner, and many other writers of talent. In 1744 he edited, in concert with several friends, Bremische Beiträge and Vermischte Schriften (1744 and 1757), which aided in purifying the German literary taste. In 1751 he was professor in the school at Pforte, but in 1754 left to teach theology at Zerbst. There his sermons gained for him a fine reputation for eloquence. He became pastor at Hanover in 1759, and in 1780 was promoted to the office of ecclesiastical superintendent. He died at Hanover Sept. 16, 1793. His poems have not been very highly esteemed, though some of his chants are yet sung in the Protestant churches of Germany. Besides these, he wrote, Sammlung einiger Predigten (Leips. 1754-64): — Predigten über die Leidensgeschichte Jesu Christi (ibid. 1773-74, 3 vols. 8vo). His two sons, August Wilhelm and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich (q.v.), acquired great celebrity. See Schlichtegroll, Nekrolog.

## Schlegel, Johann Carl Furchtegott[[@Headword:Schlegel, Johann Carl Furchtegott]]

             a German theologian, son of Johann Adolf, was born in Hanover, January 2, 1753, and died November 13, 1831, member of consistory. He wrote, Ueber den Geist der Religiositat aller Zeiten und Volker (Hanover, 1819, 2 volumes): — Kirchen- und Reformnationsgeschichte von Norddeutschland und den hannover'schen Staaten (1828-32, 3 volumes): — Kurhannover'sches Kirchenrecht (1801-1806, 5 volumes). See Zuchold. Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:510, 797; 2:16, 23. (B.P.)

## Schlegel, Karl August Moritz[[@Headword:Schlegel, Karl August Moritz]]

             a German divine, son of Johann Adolf, was born in Hanover, September 26, 1756. He studied at Gottingen, was in 1790 preacher at Harburg, in 1796 at Gottingen, and died January 29, 1826. He published some ascetical works. See Doring, Die deuischen Kanzelredner, page 409-413. (B.P.)

## Schlegel, Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von[[@Headword:Schlegel, Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von]]

             a German author, was born in Hanover, March 10, 1772. He studied at Göttingen and Leipsic. In 1808 he, together with his wife, embraced the Roman Catholic religion, and went to Vienna, where he was appointed imperial secretary at the headquarters of the archduke Charles. He accompanied the duke to the battlefield, issuing patriotic proclamations against Napoleon. He was afterwards secretary of the Austrian embassy till 1818. The rest of his life he spent in lecturing in Vienna and Dresden. He was especially remarkable as a critic and thinker of great originality, and his principal works are, Griechen und Römer (1797): — Geschichte der Poesie der Griechez und Römer (1798): — Ueber die Sprache und  Weisheit der Inder (1808): — Vorlesungen über die neuere Geschichte (1811): — Philosophie des Lebens (1828): — Philosophie der Geschichte (1829, 2 vols.): — and Philosophie der Sprache (1830).

## Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst[[@Headword:Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst]]

             was a theologian of the Reformed Church of Germany, who, standing on the borderline between the decline of rationalism and the birth of the new evangelical school of Germany, exerted an influence for good in all the higher fields of thought which has rarely been equaled by any mind in any age (“the greatest divine of the 19th century,” says P. Schaff, Creeds, 1, 451). He was born at Breslau, Nov. 21, 1768. His father was an humble army chaplain of Calvinistic faith, upright life, and rather cold and harsh temper. His mother (nee Stubenrauch), a pastor's daughter, was sprightly, prudent, and pious. Young Schleiermacher's health was delicate. His education up to his fifteenth year was derived chiefly from his parents. In 1783 he was sent To the school of the Moravian Brethren at Niesky. Here he made rapid strides in knowledge; but he also began to be troubled with religious doubts. At the age of seventeen he entered the higher school of the same brethren at Barby. Here he was brought face to face with a body of doctrine which, not being able to command his full assent, had the effect of forcing him to begin the construction of a system of his own. His first chief doubts related to the substitutional atonement of Christ and the eternity of future punishment. The attempts of his teachers to remove these doubts had no other effect than to sadden him, and to convince him that his religious life would have to be nurtured outside of Moravian circles. He was frank enough to open his heart and explain his doubts to his dry, traditional father. The father rudely answered him, “O foolish son, who has bewitched thee that thou obeyest not the truth and crucifiest the Savior afresh?” Subsequent correspondence, however, brought the father into a more Christian frame of mind, and finally led each to esteem and respect the other in a far higher degree than before.

With great difficulty having obtained his father's consent, he entered the University of Halle in the spring of 1787. While thus breaking his outward connection with the Moravians, he yet bore away with him from them a spirit of tender, subjective religiousness which ever after lingered like a heavenly aroma over everything which he printed or spoke. In Halle he lived with an uncle, and studied and heard lectures just as he pleased. He was not very methodical. He heard the aged rationalist Semler, devoured the works of Wolf, Kant, and Jacobi, became familiar with modern languages, and  pursued mathematics. At this time he wrote: “I am not sure that I can construct the whole field of knowledge into such a system that I can readily assign to every question its place and its solution; but I am sure that the nearest approach to it will be made by a candid hearing of the reasons on both sides, and by not settling upon anything with positiveness until this has previously been done.” These words of the youth truly express the spirit that led him throughout life. While not in every case attaining to definitive results, he yet incessantly worked towards that goal; and his one life aim was to ascertain as nearly as practicable the limits of attainable human knowledge. Leaving Halle in 1790, he passed his theological examination in Berlin, and, on the recommendation of F.S.G. Sack, became private instructor in the pious family of the count Dohna-Schlobitten in East Prussia. Differing, ultimately, with the count on certain pedagogic principles, he returned to Berlin and taught, for a while, an orphan school (1793), then preached as vicar to pastor Schumann at Landsberg, on the Wartha (1794), and finally was made one of the two pastors at the Charité, the chief hospital in Berlin, a position which he filled until 1802. From 1796 onwards, his intellectual life took on a marvelous richness of flow and depth. Surrounded with such persons as Brinkmann, Scharnhorst, Alexander Dohna, Henrietta Herz, Dorothea Veit, he breathed the most stimulating atmosphere of the Prussian capital.

In his scientific and philosophical studies he made vast acquisitions. By his intimacy with the younger Schlegel he was partially imbued with the spirit of the romantic school in art. From this influence the clearness of his moral consciousness was momentarily disturbed. Hence arose his Letters upon Schlegel's romance, Lucinde (Vertraute Briefe, 1801), which, though well meant and full of moral earnestness, brought upon him no little odium. They can, at best, be called only a beautiful commentary to a bad text. Hence, also, sprang his romantic friendship with Leonore Grunow, the childless wife of a Berlin pastor, which was absolutely broken off only in 1805. Much satisfactory light is thrown upon this single shadow in his life by his letters to his sister Charlotte and to Henrietta Herz. These incidental matters did not interfere with the steady maturing of his intellectual and theological systems. It was, perhaps, the richest development period (from his twenty- eighth to his thirty-second year) in his life. Hence it is to be explained that with so little previous literary experience (he had only helped Sack translate Blair's Sermons, and himself translated Fawcett's Sermons and contributed a few essays to periodicals) he was able at once to electrify the nation by such a masterwork as his Reden (discourses on religion [1799])  and his Monologen (1800). Leaving behind him these earnest protests against the prevalent spirit of irreligion, he now repaired (1802) to the post of court preacher at Stolpe, in East Pomerania. Here he passed two laborious years, and wrought upon his German translation of Plato. Here appeared his first strictly philosophical work, Kritik aller bisherigen Sittenlehren (1803). In 1801 he was transferred to Halle and made professor extraordinary of theology. It was a trying change; his own system of theology was not yet matured in his mind; and nothing but the great practical wisdom and originality of a Schleiermacher would have succeeded under the circumstances. He began at once to lecture in a very original manner on New Test. exegesis, dogmatics, and ethics. He also preached frequently, reestablishing the academic worship which had fallen into neglect. He was soon made professor in ordinary. Although he attracted general attention, yet he was not congenial to the members of the theological faculty. Only Niemeyer and Vater drew near to him; Knapp and Nosselt did not appreciate him. His lectures and sermons made strange and contradictory impressions. Was he an atheist, a Spinozist, or a superorthodox pietist? Some thought the one; some the other. At this period he produced his Weihnachtsfeier (1806) and his commentary on Timothy (1807).

The ravages of the French invasion interrupting now his labors at Halle, he returned to Berlin (autumn of 1807) and became pastor of Trinity Church (Dreifaltigkeitskirche). In 1808 he married the widow of his young friend, Von Willich. In 1810 he was made professor in ordinary of the new University of Berlin and a member of two scientific associations. Here the most influential half of his life begins. He was of the small circle of great men who called the new university into being and gave to it fame. Here he passed from a rhapsodical to a dogmatic theologian; from a proclaimer of religious philosophy to an expounder of the Word of God. It is not a revolution, however, but only a growth. Besides his scholastic labors, Schleiermacher took a lively part in the troubled politics of his country. In the darkest hours of Napoleonic oppression, he was unwearied in pulpit labors, counseling patience and inspiring with hope. He gave also much thought to the Church agitation which afterwards culminated in the “Union” of the Lutherans and the Reformed. The most important production of his first ten years in Berlin was his Glaubenslehre. From 1818 to 1822 he labored with De Wette and Lücke in editing the Theologische Zeitschrift, which, ignoring the vulgar difference between rationalism and supernaturalism, represented a more general and a higher form of religious and philosophical science. Though not one of the  founders of the Studien und Kritiken (1828), yet his contributions to its earlier numbers helped to give it its high character. But it was to his actual work of teaching that the strength of his life was given. He lectured from two to three hours per day, except Saturdays. His intercourse with the other members of the university — with Fichte, Savigny, and Hegel, with Buttmann, Böckh, and Lachmann, with De Wette, Marheineke, and Neander — was deeply beneficial on both sides. The subjects which he taught were hermeneutics, ethics, dogmatics, dialectics, psychology, and philosophy, besides other incidental subjects. To his sermons he gave but a few moments on Saturdays, rarely throwing upon paper more than a few outlines. The majority of his published sermons arose from notes taken down by his auditors and then revised by himself. In society Schleiermacher took great delight, though not always himself the greatest talker. Society did not weary, but recreate him. To the students he was by far not so familiar as Neander, but the time he gave to them left indelible impressions. In his domestic life he was peculiarly happy. Only the death of his sole son (1829) cast a shadow into his life from which he seemed never fully to recover. Still he fulfilled all his offices and was busy with his pen to the very last. His oft expressed wish that he might die in the full possession of his consciousness was graciously granted to him. Early in February, 1834, he was attacked with inflammation of the lungs, which closed his life on the 12th. His dying hours were those of a resigned, joyous follower of Christ. His very last act and words were the administering of the eucharist to himself and his friends.

From these outlines of Schleiermacher's outward life we pass to a brief notice of his chief literary and theological productions, following in the main the article (forty-four pages) by Gass in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 13. He stood, as we have said, between the death and the birth of two ages. Combining the tendencies of the two — the rationalistic and the evangelical — in his own person, he helped to bury the one and to inaugurate the other. Yet he himself belonged to neither. He gave the death blow to rationalism, cast away the rubbish, and laid the foundations of the new evangelical edifice; but he did not fully build it. His intellectual history is the history of the Christian consciousness of his epoch. It is a growth. It has a dawn, a crystallizing period, and a philosophic maturity. It can be traced distinctly in the thirty-one volumes of his collective works as edited by his friend Jonas and others, from 1834 to 1864.  His career was opened by his Reden, addresses to cultivated unbelievers (1800). This work made an epoch in the German nation. It called the cultivated circles away from their pride in a high sounding philosophy and from their contempt of what they called religion. There is no incongruity, said the young prophet, between culture and religion. The culture that despises religion is but shallow presumption; the religion that despises culture is but a caricature.

The foundations of religion are as deep as intuition and as broad as humanity. Each individual of the race is a vital member of the universe. By the universe he is sustained and furthered. In every life there come moments when this dependence on the universe is thrust upon the consciousness and made the very life of the soul. Such moments are as a conception, a birth, of the Eternal and Absolute within the limits of the finite and dependent. Religion is art, taste, a consciousness of the All. In becoming conscious of the Infinite we have the sentiment of our immortality. Religion is not mere dogmas and systems. It is the deepest and truest life of humanity itself. Men may sneer at religion, but they cannot get away from religion. Scorners turn from dry dogmatics to living nature. But what do they revere in nature? Not dead matter, not prosy, chemical elements, but rather nature's orderly march, its adaptation of means to ends. But this is, after all, the very essence of religion; it is a sympathy with the eternal basis of all being. Religion is thus universal. We can escape it only by putting out our reason. It is not from wholeness, but only from partialness, of vision that the cultivated turn aside from religion. The first three of the discourses treat, thus, of the nature of religion in general.

The last two give a survey of religion in its historical reality. As the essence of religion is communion of feeling with the Absolute, the One, so its tendency is to organize man into communities and to express itself in organized worship. As there are infinite varieties of manifestation in nature, so the apprehension of the Infinite in the soul of man takes place under endless varieties. Hence the multiplicity of historical religions. But there are here points of greater and of less approximation. Ancient Israel stood exceptionally close to the Infinite. In Jesus of Nazareth, the One, the Infinite reached its (or his) intensest manifestation. Such is the general drift of these celebrated Reden. They were accused of a tendency to pantheism, though Schleiermacher resented the imputation. They were certainly not positively Christian. But they tended towards Christianity, and they unquestionably produced a more fruitful effect on the specific audience which they addressed than if they had been of more confessionally orthodox form. This effect was sudden and immense. In his preface to the  third edition (1821) Schleiermacher had occasion playfully to remark that there was then really a greater call for discourses to the over righteous and the creed worshippers among the cultivated than to unbelievers. The Monologen, with which Schleiermacher greeted the dawn of the 19th century, stand, as an ethical work, by the side of the religious tendency of the Reden. They are a self scrutinizing and self-exhorting journey through the religious consciousness. Man should not be simply one of the monotonous members of the universe; but he should, by self concentration and self virtualization, develop himself into a rich and relatively independent individual. Means to this are reflection, meditation, retirement from too great absorption in dissipation, business, and external routine — in other words, the due consecrating of our secular life with the devotional element. As in the Reden an influence of Spinoza has been noticed, so in the Monologen some have found a trace of Fichte. These two works present their author in the first stadium of his development The Christmas Celebration (Weihnachtsfeier [1806]) is a transition step towards positive theology. It is a charming dialogue, in the fashion of Plato, on the significance of the birth of Christ. The three speakers defend, each his peculiar view. Neither of them represents the author's exclusive views, but rather all of them in turn.

When we pass to Schleiermacher's critical treatment of the Bible, we meet with his least satisfactory works. And yet there was combined with his rather negative tendency very much which has enriched the results of exegetics. Ignoring the dogma of inspiration, he laid free hand upon the sacred book, just as upon the dialogues of Plato, or any other ancient documents. But he did not doubt the substantial genuineness of the Bible, and he was confident that critical science is capable of drawing the line between the essential and the non essential. His posthumously edited lectures on introduction to the New Test. hermeneutics and criticism have not fully answered all expectations.

In his outlines of theology (Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums), which appeared first in 1810, and then, enriched with notes, in 1830, Schleiermacher assumes very positive dogmatic ground. He bases himself upon the objective fact of the Protestant Christian consciousness. Theology is a positive science, the elements of which are evolved from the Christian consciousness and from the exigencies of Church government. It is not a branch of philosophical science in general. With philosophy it must neither interfere nor by philosophy be dominated. Its truth is ascertained by  historical criticism and by the comparative study of other religions. This forms the philosophical part. Its product is the historical, and out of the philosophical and historical parts results directly the practical part. This little work is of great originality, and has exerted wide influence. Its classification, however, has not been extensively followed.

The richest product of Schleiermacher's life is his dogmatics (Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche), which was first published in 1821 (2 vols.), then, in a much enriched and revised edition, in 1831. It is a monument of genius, and has been called the greatest theological product of the 19th century. Dogmatics is here presented, not as a speculative science, but as the systematized contents of the Protestant Christian consciousness. The essence of this consciousness is defined, not as knowledge or action, but as feeling, and as a feeling differing from all others in being a direct consciousness of the absolute. More specifically, it is a feeling of absolute dependence. This feeling is for the first time clearly realized in Christian monotheism. The principal defect of this definition is that it makes no adequate room for creatural freedom. A second definition is given of the specifically Christian consciousness.

Thus, qualitatively it is a transition from the moral condition of unhappiness into that of happiness; historically, it is an effect of the life of Christ. The two elements must stand in perfect union. This union gives the limits within which the healthy Christian life must move, and beyond which lie the shoals of all error and heresy. Redemption is infringed upon by any view of human ability which overlooks the absolute necessity of redemption. Christ is infringed upon by any view which makes him either too near to or too remote from the ordinary conditions of human life. Accordingly, we find, in fact, two opposite christological and two anthropological heresies — the Ebionite and the Docetic, the Pelagian and the Manichaean. From this starting point, and within these limits, the dogmatic theologian has free movement. It is his privilege to seize the historical results of the past, to shape them into self consistency, and to impress upon them in turn the historical coloring of the present. Thus the body of Christian doctrines is at no point definitively complete, but is in constant process of maturing. The dogmatics of Schleiermacher made an epoch in theology. It superseded old modes of defending Christianity, and inaugurated new and better ones. It did not begin with dry proofs of the existence of God; it found God already given in the Christian consciousness. It did not make Christ simply a part of the Christian system;  it made him its beginning, its middle, and its end. In the distribution of the subject matter of his work, Schleiermacher studies (1) man as conscious of God prior to the experience of the antithesis of sin and grace; next, after becoming conscious of such an antithesis, as (2) the subject of sin, and (3) as the subject of grace: or the states of innocence, sin, and grace.

Each of these divisions is subdivided in a threefold manner, describing respectively the condition of man, the attributes of God, and the constitution of the world, as they relate to the three above-named states. Thus Schleiermacher's method departs from all previous methods. While the schoolmen begin with God and his attributes, and then pass to man; while the reformers usually begin with the rule of faith, the Bible, and then, passing to the Deity, proceed in the scholastic manner, Schleiermacher, on the contrary, begins and ends with the human consciousness and its contents. The development of this scheme showed clearly that the old form of rationalism was shallow and worthless. It emancipated religion from its entanglement with philosophical systems and placed it in the realm of feeling. It showed that spiritual insight — an awakened heart — is just as necessary to the appreciation of Christian theology as asthetic insight is to the enjoyment of art. But with these healthful principles Schleiermacher associated consequences which were of damaging tendency. As he made the human intuitions the criterion of absolute appeal in art and morals, so he made the collective Christian consciousness the ultimate test of religious truth. The value of the apostolic testimony in Scripture arises, therefore, not from its being an absolute objective standard, but from its being the clearest existing expression of the Christian consciousness in the earliest and purest age. The Church existed before the New Testament. The New Testament appeals to the religious consciousness, but does not dictate to it. Inspiration is not mere genius: it is the outgoing of the religious consciousness; it is but a higher degree of what is common to the pious intuitions of saintly men in all ages. The Bible is a record of religious truth, not its formal organ.

It is a reflection of the Christian consciousness of the apostolic age, but not a mechanical criterion for all ages. By such views as these Schleiermacher made himself absolutely dependent upon the utterances of the religious consciousness. Hence he is unable fully to appreciate such points of doctrine as are not clearly given in this consciousness. Thus sin is understood rather as unholiness than as guilt before God; redemption rather as sanctification than as justification; Christ's death as a simple incident in his life of self sacrifice; atonement as the setting forth of the union of God with man; the mode of attaining to  salvation as a spiritual realization of this union through the embracing of Christ in love (see Farrar, Fee Thought, p. 245-247). The Holy Ghost is presented as simply the collective Spirit of the Church, as resulting from the union of human nature with the divine. With the exception of the doctrines of immortality, eternal life, and retribution, all the other opinions in regard to man's future are questions of mere hope and speculation. The doctrine of the Trinity is not a direct utterance of the religious consciousness, nor was it a separate article of the early Christian faith; hence it does not really possess the character of an independent dogma, which the Church afterwards gave to it. The Trinity is, in fact, not a designation of Deity, but rather of the revelation of Deity. Schleiermacher inclines to an improved Sabellianism. The scholastic idea of a tripersonal God is, in his view, an undogmatic philosopheme, while the simpler old Protestant conception is a logical self contradiction (see Theol. Zeitschrift, pt. 3 [transl. in Bible Repos. Andover, vol. 5]). The reception which the public gave to Schleiermacher's dogmatics was very varying. Rationalism was displeased: the first volume was too speculative, the second too pietistic. Wegscheider regarded it as a pious representation of essential orthodoxy. The orthodox party warmly welcomed it, though without full approval. Braniss and Delbrück criticized it sharply. The latter declared it inconsistent with the foundations of Protestantism. But it speedily recovered from these shocks; and within a few years it numbered among its disciples such men as Twesten, Lücke, Nitzsch, Ullmann, Baumgarten- Crusius, Schwarz, and Gass. These men studied it, elucidated it, wrote upon it. It came to honor in nearly all the German universities. In some of them it was made the basis of special courses of lectures. But it speedily became evident that the body of disciples might be divided into three chief groups. Some held more to the negative, critical elements; others to the evangelically positive; others to the middle course of the master. Among the more positively evangelical of his disciples were Twesten, Nitzsch, Julius Muller, Hagenbach, Tholuck, Sack, Bleek, Usteri, Olshausen, Dorner, Erbkam, Martensen, Liebner, Lange, Eberard. Auberlen, Rothe, Schöberlein, Palmer, and a host of others.

In the field of ethics the influence of Schleiermacher was only less than in that of dogmatics; but he was not privileged to bring his thoughts to satisfactory completion and consistency. He began with a revolutionary and unhistorical criticism of previous systems in his Kritik aller bisherigen Sittenlehren in 1803. His personal views he began to elaborate in a series  of essays in 1819. The substance of his lectures on ethics was edited by Schweizer (Entwurf der Sittenlehre) in 1835, also more briefly by Twesten (Grundriss der philosophischen Ethik) in 1841. His positively Christian ethics (Die christliche Sitte) was edited by Jonas in 1843. From these varied presentations it is difficult, if not impossible, to derive a single consistent view. The classification is artificial and unsatisfactory (see a severe criticism upon it in Wuttke's Christian Ethics [Engl. transl.], 1, 361-371). The fruitfulness of Schleiermacher in this field was rather in furnishing impulses to other authors than as the creator of a finished system.

Next in importance stand his works on pedagogics (Erziehungslehre), edited by C. Platz in 1849, and his Practical Theology (Praktische Theologie), edited by Frerichs. Of less worth are his lectures on Church history (Kirchengeschichte), edited by Bonnel in 1840. For the light thrown upon his inner religious life, none of Schleiermacher's writings are more interesting than his sermons. There are thus far published ten volumes. Of these four were revised by the author, and six have been prepared by others, mostly by Dr. Sydow. These sermons are from every period of his life, and of every class. The larger number, however, are not textual or exegetical, but synthetic, the regular development of a theme. In contents they stand midway between the instructive and the hortatory. The great preacher placed himself on the same level as his audience, and, while enriching their conception of Christianity, endeavored to inspire them to a fuller realization of it in their lives. The uniform central point of his utterance was Christ, the Redeemer. Dr. Schaff (see Creeds of Christendom, 1, 880) ascribes this intense love of Christ in Schleiermacher to his early Moravian education. He says, “It is a remarkable fact that the great German theologian Schleiermacher was cradled in the Moravian community, and conceived there his love for Christian union and personal devotion to Christ, which guided him through the labyrinth of speculation and scepticism, and triumphed on his death bed. He shook almost every dogma of orthodoxy, and was willing, if necessary, to sacrifice all if he could only retain a perfect and sinless Savior.” He is inexhaustible in the variety and novelty of ways in which he impresses this vital point. This singleness of aim, however, does not imply monotony, but is consistent with very wide variety of matter. There is scarcely a single point in the circle of Christian doctrine which is not the theme of some of these  sermons; hence they are often read from a merely dogmatic interest. They will long be esteemed among the richest fruits of the German pulpit.

Among the latest volumes edited from Schleiermacher's remains are his lectures on psychology (Psychologie), by George (1864) and his Life of Jesus (Leben Jesu), by Ritenik (1864). His correspondence with J.C. Gass was edited by W. Gass in 1852, and that with other friends appeared under the title Aus Schleiermacher's Leben (1858-62, 4 vols.). A brief autobiography, reaching only to 1794, was issued in Niedner's Zeitschrift in 1851.

For sources for Schleiermacher's life (besides his own writings and letters), see G. Bauer, Karakteristik, in Stud. u. Krit. 1859; Auberlen, Ein Karakterbild (Basle, 1859); Kosack, Jugendleben (Elberf. 1861); K. Schwarz (Gotha, 1861); E. Maier (1863); Baxmann (Bonn, 1864); Dilthey (1867); Schenkel (1868). On his doctrines, see Braniss, Ueber Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre (Berl. 1822); F. Delbrück, Erorterungen (Bonn, 1827); C. Baur, Primoe Rationalismi et Supranaturalismi Historioe Capita Potiora (1827); Baumgarten-Crusius, Schleiermacher's Denkart u. Verdienst (1834); Lücke, Erinnerungen, in Stud. u. Krit. 1834; H. Schmid, Ueber Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre (Leips. 1835); Rosenkranz, Kritik (1836); Baur, Die christliche Gnosis (Tübingen, 1835); Weissenborn, Darstellung u. Kritik der Glaubenslehre (1849); Schaller, Vorlesungen über Schleiermacher (Halle, 1844). On his ethics, see Twesten's preface to his edition of Schleiermacher's Phil. Ethik; Vorlander, Schleiermacher's Sittenlehre (1851); Herzog, in Stud. u. Krit. 1848; Reuter, in Stud. u. Krit. 1844. On his sermons, see Stud. u. Krit. 1831, 1848. See also Schürer, Religionsbegriff (Leips. 1848); P. Schmidt, Spinoza u. Schleiermacher (Berl. 1868); also Opuscules, by Carl Beck (Reutlingen, 1869); F. Zachler (Breslau, 1869); W. Bender (Worms, 1868); P. Leo (Jena, 1868); Hossbach (Berl. 1868); also article in Christ. Exam. vol. 53; Westm. Rev. July, 1861; Meth. Quar. Rev. April, 1869; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. April, 1862; July, 1866; Oct. 1876; Princeton Rev. April, 1866; Universalist Rev. April, 1869; Mercersb. Rev. April, 1871; Presb. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1868. (J.P.L.)

## Schleusner, John Frederic, D.D[[@Headword:Schleusner, John Frederic, D.D]]

             professor of theology in Wittenberg, was born in Leipsic Jan. 16, 1756, and studied theology and philology in the university (of that city. He was appointed professor of theology in Göttingen in 1784, and in 1795  professor of theology and provost of the college church in Wittenberg. He devoted himself principally to the lexicography of the Greek Scriptures. After the removal of the University of Wittenberg, he was associate director of the theological seminary. He died Feb. 21, 1831. Among his principal works are, Lexicon Graeco-Lat. in Novum Testamentum (Leips. 1792; last ed. 1819, 2 vols.): — Thesaurus, sive Lexicon in LXX (Leips. 1821, 5 vols.), reprinted in Glasgow (2 vols.) and London (3 vols.). The lexicon on the New Test. has been superseded by later works, but that on the Sept. has yet found no substitute.

## Schleyer, Peter[[@Headword:Schleyer, Peter]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, who died at Ettenheim, February 28, 1862, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, Orakel des Iesaia uber den Untergang Babels (Freiburg, 1839): — Ueber die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Unaufloslichkeit der Ehe (1844): — Der Puseyismus nach seinemn Ursprunge und als Lehrsystem dargestellt (1845). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schlichter, Christian Ludwig[[@Headword:Schlichter, Christian Ludwig]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Cothen, December 7, 1705, and died there, April 23, 1765, doctor of theology. He wrote, De Baptismo ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, etc. (Bremen, 1725): — De Quatuor Rebus Salomonaeis Intellectu Dificillimis ad Pro 30:18-19 (Halle, 1730): — Exercitatio Epistolica, etc., ad האדםGen 8:21 sq. (1732): — Decimae Sacrae seu Observationum in Utriusque Frederis  Libros Quinque Decades (eod.): — Exeracitatio Historico antiquaria de Cruae apud Judaeos, Christianos et Gentes (1733): — De Panibus Facierum eorumque Mysterio (1737): — Libellus Singularis de Sufitu Sacro Hebraeorum ejusque Mysterio, etc. (1754), and other works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v., Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schliemann, Adolf[[@Headword:Schliemann, Adolf]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Schwerin, July 30, 1879, doctor of theology, is the author of, Die clementinischen: Recognitionen (Kiel, 1843): — Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften, und der Ebionitismus (Hamburg, 1844). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schlochow, Emmanuel Moritz[[@Headword:Schlochow, Emmanuel Moritz]]

             a minister of the Episcopal Church, was born of Jewish parentage in 1826, at Winzig, Silesia. In 1848 he joined the Christian Church at Breslau, and in 1851 acted as lay missionary among the Jews in Upper Silesia. Ina order to make himself more fit for missionary work, Schlochow entered the Hebrew College of the London Society, and in 1853 was appointed to Jassy, where he remained for nearly ten years. In 1863 he was appointed to Mtihlhausen, and at the end of the Franco-Prussian war settled at Strasburg, as the most important place in Alsace and Lorraine. At the beginning of the year 1876 he was compelled to retire from the mission- field on account of broken health, and settled at Worthing, England, where he died, December 30, 1876. (B.P.)

## Schlurick, Friedrich Julius Hermann[[@Headword:Schlurick, Friedrich Julius Hermann]]

             doctor of theology and member of the Evangelical Lutheran Consistory in Dresden, was born at Dresden in 1815. From 1838 to 1841 he was professor at the Kreuzschule of his native place; from 1841 to 1851 he labored in Meissen; and from 1851 he was superintendent in Pirna, where he died, June 3, 1875. See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 2, 1148; Theolog. Jahrbuch, 1876, p. 365. (B.P.)

## Schmalkald, League Of[[@Headword:Schmalkald, League Of]]

             the name given to the defensive alliance concluded provisionally for nine years at Schmalkalden, Feb. 27, 1531, between nine Protestant princes and eleven imperial cities, with whom five other princes and ten imperial cities subsequently made common cause; and the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were appointed chiefs of the league and empowered to manage its affairs. The object of this formidable alliance — which included the whole of Northern Germany, Denmark, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, and portions of Bavaria and Switzerland — was for the common defense of the religion and political freedom of the Protestants against the emperor Charles V and the Catholic states. The league was not rendered superfluous by the religious peace of Nuremberg in 1532; and on the rumor that the emperor was meditating new hostile measures against the Protestants, another meeting of the confederates was held Dec. 24, 1535, which resolved to raise a permanent army of 10,000 foot and 2000 cavalry, and to prolong the league for ten years. The confederation was further consolidated by articles of guarantee which were drawn up by Luther at Wittenberg in 1536, and, being subscribed by the theologians present at the meeting of the league at Schmalkalden in February, 1537, were called the Articles of Schmalkald. Against the league the emperor, engaged as he was  at the time in contests with the Turks and French, found himself unable to contend, though supported by the Holy League, a Catholic confederation formed (in 1538) in opposition to the Protestant one. But impoltic management, mutual jealousies, and conflicting petty interests dissipated their energies and prevented united action. The “War of Schmalkald” commenced by the advance of the army of the league, under Sebastian Schartlin, into Swabia, to bar the approach of the imperial army from Italy. Schartlin forced his way to the banks of the Danube. but the miserable jealousy of the Saxon princes paralyzed his action.

The emperor, by a proclamation bearing date July 20, 1546, put the two chiefs of the league under the ban of the empire; Maurice, duke of Saxony, took possession of the electorate by virtue of an imperial decree; and the Protestant army was forced to retreat. The elector of Saxony reconquered his electorate in the autumn of 1546; but meantime the imperial army subdued the northern members of the League of Schmalkald, and advanced into Franconia to meet the combined armies of Saxony and Hesse. The latter were totally routed at Mühlberg (April 24, 1547), and both chiefs fell into the emperor's hands. This defeat, which has been ascribed to treason, and was, perhaps, as much owing to this cause as to weakness, finished the war. The object of the league — the guarantee of the liberty of religion to the Protestants — was subsequently effected by Maurice, now elector of Saxony who, by a brilliant feat of diplomacy and generalship, compelled the emperor to grant the treaty of Passau (July 31, 1552), by which this freedom was secured.

## Schmaltz, Moritz Ferdinand[[@Headword:Schmaltz, Moritz Ferdinand]]

             doctor of theology, born in 1785 at Stolpen, near Dresden, was first pastor in Wehlen. In 1816 he was called as evangelical minister and member of consistory to Vienna, where he remained till 1819, when he was called to the pastorate in Neustadt, Dresden, which position he occupied until 1833, when he was called to become the head pastor of St. Jacobi in Hamburg, where he died, Feb. 15, 1860. Schmaltz published a great many sermons, which make a library in themselves. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. 2, 1149 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 75; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 210, 212. (B.P.)

## Schmalzgruber, Franz[[@Headword:Schmalzgruber, Franz]]

             a Jesuit, was born in 1663 at Griesbach. He first lectured on logic and moral theology at Ingolstadt, then on canon law, and died in 1735. He wrote Index Ecclesiasticus (Ingolst. 1712): Judicium Ecclesiasticum (ibid. 1712): — Clerus Scecutlaris et Regularis (ibid. 1714, 2 vols.): — Sponsalia et Alatrimonium (ibid. 1716): — Crimen Faori Ecclesiastici (ibid. 1718, 2 vols.): — Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum (ibid. 1719, 6 vols.; Rome, 1833-45, 12 vols.): — Consilia sen Responsa Juris (Ingolst. 1722, 2 vols.). See Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schmeidler, Johann C. Hermann[[@Headword:Schmeidler, Johann C. Hermann]]

             a Protestant divine, was born at Breslau, Aug. 28, 1807, where he also died Aug. 16, 1867, after having occupied some of the most important ecclesiastical positions in his native place. He wrote, Der Untergang des Reiches Juda (Breslau, 1831): — Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Haupt-Pfarrkirche St. Maria Magdalena zu Breslau vor der Reformation (ibid. 1838 ): — Urkundliche Geschichte der evang. Haupt- u. Pfarrkirche zu St. Bernhardin in Breslau, etc. (ibid. 1853). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. 2, 1152; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 75. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Christian Ernst[[@Headword:Schmid, Christian Ernst]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 14, 1715, at Rabenau, Saxony, studied at Leipsic, and entered upon his pastoral duties in 1739. He died at Eilenburg, November 27, 1786, superintendent, leaving, Expositio Ritus Cantandi per Noctes Dierum Festorum apud Hebraeos (Leipsic, 1738): — De Lege per Peccatum Infirmata (1739): — De Veritatis Divinae Doctoribus Tamquam στύλοις ἐκκλησίας (ed.): — De Sacrificio a Perjuris Offerendo (eod.): — De Corpore Christi Omnis in Sepulcro Experte Corruptionis contra Anonymi Dubia (1740). See Doring, Die gelehrten, Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v., (B.P.)

## Schmid, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Schmid, Christian Friedrich]]

             a professor of theology at Tübingen, was born at Bickelsberg, 1794. Educated at Maulbronn and Tübingen, he began to lecture at the latter place in 1819. In 1826 he became professor in ordinary, and labored as such till his death, in 1852. Not prolific as an author, he has yet exerted a very great and evangelical influence on the clergy of Würtemberg. A supernaturalist from the start, he worked fruitfully by the side of the more negative Baur, defending vigorously the fundamentals of Christianity, and utilizing the better results of modern Christian speculation. Men like Dorner and Oehler have given public expression to their indebtedness to Schmid. His labors embraced practical, exegetical, and moral theology. His lectures were models of systematic Christian thought. He was not, however, simply a scientific theologian, but his influence was also deeply and positively Christian. His Biblische Theologie des neuen Test. appeared in 1853 (4th ed. by Dr. A. Heller, Gotha, 1868); it has enjoyed a wide popularity. His Christliche Moral, by the same editor, was published in 1861. See Erinnerung an C.F. Schmid, by Palmer and others (Tübingen,  1852); Stud. u. Krit. 1856; Wuttke, Christian Ethics. 1, 374; Hauck, Jahresbericht, 1869; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 604-606. (J.P.L.)

## Schmid, Christian Friedrich (2)[[@Headword:Schmid, Christian Friedrich (2)]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 20, 1741, at Roglitz, near Merseburg. He studied at Leipsic, and commenced his academical career there in 1764. He was professor in 1767, went to Wittenberg in 1772, took the degree of doctor of theology in the same year, and died May 19, 1778. He wrote, Versio Alexandrina Optimum Interpretationem Librorum Sacrorum Praesidium (Leipsic, 1763-64): — De Herodianis (1764): — Super Origine Epistolae ad Hebraeos (1765): — Observationes super Epistola ad Hebraeos (1766): — Observationes super Epistola Judae (1768): — Divina Origo Librorum Canonicorum Veteris Testamenti (Wittenberg, 1772): — De Antiqua Forma, Collectione et Conservatione Codicis Sacri Hebraioi (eod.), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer. Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:76, 77, 91, 109, 256, 267, 272, 486. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Heinrich[[@Headword:Schmid, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born July 31, 1811, at Harburg, near Nordlingen. He studied at Halle and Berlin, commenced his academical career at Erlangen in 1837, was in 1848 professor of theology, and died November 17, 1885. He wrote, Ueber Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre (Leipsic, 1835): — Die Dogmatik der evangelisch- lutherischen Kirche dargestellt (6th ed. 1876): — Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt (Erlangen, 1846): — Lehrbuch der Kirchen geschichte (2d ed. 1856): — Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte (1880-81, 2 volumes): — Die Theologie Semler's (1858): — Lehrbuch der Dogmen geschichte (1859): — Geschichte des Pietismus (1863): — Kampf der lutherischen Kirche um Luther's Lehre vom Abendmahl (2d ed. 1873): — Geschichte der kathol. Kirche Deutschlands, etc. (1872-74). (B.P.)

## Schmid, Johann Andreas[[@Headword:Schmid, Johann Andreas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Worms, August 28, 1652, was in 1683 professor at Jena, in 1699 at Helmstaidt, and died June 12, 1726, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Compendium Historie Ecclesiasticae (Helmstadt, 1701; new ed. 1708): — De Apostolis Uxoratis (1704): — Historia Saeculi Quarti Fabulis Variorum Maculata (1712): — De Fatis Calicis Eucharistiae in Ecclesia Romana (1708): — Lexicon Ecclesiasticum Minus (1712): — De Cantoribus Ecclesiae Veteris  et Novi Testamenti (1703): — De Re Monetali Ebraeorum (1699). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:529, 532, 534, 554, 564, 573, 603, 608, 613, 614, 616, 618, 620, 627, 629, 630-32, 634, 635, 637, 654, 663, 759, 761; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Schmid, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Jena, August 29, 1744, and died there April 1, 1798, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Immortalitatis Animorum Doctrina (Jena, 1770): — De Nexu inter Fidem et Virtutem Christianam (1784): — Historia Resurrectionis Christi (eod.): Commentationis, in qua μεσίτου Notio Indagatur, Particulae Tres (1785- 87): — De Consensu Principii Morals Kantiani cum Ethica Christiana (1788): — Verae Nestorii de Unione Naturarum in Christo Sententiae Explicatio (1793): — De Joanne a Jesu Dilecto (1795), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:310, 424, 428, 437, 447, 566, 599; 2:59, 68. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Joseph Anton[[@Headword:Schmid, Joseph Anton]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1827 at Heideck, Upper Palatinate. He received holy orders in 1851, was in 1853 professor of Hebrew and exegesis at the episcopal lyceum in Eichstatt, in 1868 professor of Church history and dogmatics at Bamberg, and died March 9, 1881, at Munich, doctor of theology. He published, Comnmentar zum Buch der Weisheit (Vienna, 1858): Kirche und Bibel (1862). (B.P.)

## Schmid, Karl Christian Erhard[[@Headword:Schmid, Karl Christian Erhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Heilsberg, Weimar, April 14, 1761, and died at Jena, April 10, 1812, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Philosophische Dogmatik im Grundrisse (Jena, 1796): — Versuch einer Moralphilosophie (1790-98, 2 volumes; 4th ed. 1802-3): — De Theologia Biblica (1788): — Adiaphora philosophisch, theologisch und historisch untersucht (1809). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:284, 288, 292, 294, 486, 761; 2:94. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Konrad[[@Headword:Schmid, Konrad]]

             a coadjutor of Zwingli in the reformation of Switzerland, born in 1476; died (with Zwingli, on the battlefield of Cappel) October, 1531. After studying at Basle, he entered a monastery at Kussnacht, and in 1519 became its commander. This same year Zwingli came as preacher to Zurich, and with him Schmid entered at once into close intimacy. In 1522 he threw aside Latin and preached at Zurich a stirring sermon in “good German,” in which he opposed the excessive claims of the pope and the abuses of image worship. In a religious conference at Zurich, October, 1523, he acted as mediator between the violent iconoclasts and the conservatives. “Let the weak have the images,” said he, “as a sort of staff to lean upon until they have taken hold upon Christ; when they once have done this, they will let go the staff as being no longer needful.” Also he blamed the coarse manner in which some spoke of the mass, as if it were a mere invention of the devil. At the close of his discourse on this occasion, he recommended to the civil authorities great moderation, and urged them to provide a thorough religious education of the masses. When Zwingli attended the conference with Luther at Marburg (Oct. 1529), Schmid filled his place as preacher in the cathedral of Zurich. He was an able and holy priest of God. See Bullinger, Reformationsgeschichte; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (J.P.L.)

## Schmid, Leopold[[@Headword:Schmid, Leopold]]

             a professor of philosophy, who died at Giessen, December 20, 1869, was originally a Roman Catholic divine, and occupied the theological chair at Giessen from 1839 to 1849. In the latter year he was elected bishop by the  Mayence chapter, but the papal see did not acknowledge the election. Schmid resigned his position as theological professor, accepted a position in the philosophical faculty, and in 1867 publicly left the Church of Rome, and published Ultramontan, etc. Of his writings we also mention, Erkllrung der Genesis (Giessen, 1835): — Grundzuge der Einleitung in die Philosophie (1860). (B.P.)

## Schmid, Sebastian, D.D[[@Headword:Schmid, Sebastian, D.D]]

             a native of Alsatia, was born Jan. 6, 1617, at Lamperheim, and died Jan. 9, 1696, at Strasburg, where he was professor of theology and canonicus. He was a voluminous writer. His principal Biblical works were his translation of the Bible: Biblia Sacra V. T. et N. ex Linguis Original. in Ling. Lat. translata (Strasb. 1696, 1708; New Test. 1715): — and his commentaries: On Genesis (Strasb. 1697): — Judges (ibid. 1684, 1691, 1706): — Ruth (ibid. 1696): — Kings (ibid. 1687): — Job (ibid. 1670, and often): — Coheleth (ibid. 1704 ): — Isaiah ( Hamb. 1702 ): — Jeremiah ( Strasb. 1685; Frankf. 1697, 1706): — Minor Prophets (Leips. 1685, 1687, 1698): — Hosea (Frankf. 1687): — Romans, Galatians, and Colossians, etc. (Hamb. 1704): — Ephesians (Strasb. 1684, 1699): — Hebrews (ibid. 1680; Leips. 1693, 1722): — l John (Frankf. and Leips. 1687, 1707,  1726). Some of these were posthumous publications; they are all much valued for sound and learned exegesis.

## Schmidt Erasmus[[@Headword:Schmidt Erasmus]]

             a German scholar, was born in Delitzsch, April 27,1560. He became professor of Greek and mathematics at Wittenberg, and died in that city Sept. 22, 1637. His chief work is Concordantioe Novi Test. (Vitemb. 1638, fol.). It was republished in Glasgow (2 vols. 8vo) and in London (1830, 48mo). He also published a highly improved edition of Beza's version of the New Test.

## Schmidt, Johann Ernst Christian[[@Headword:Schmidt, Johann Ernst Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 6, 1772, at Btisenborn, Hesse. He studied at Giessen, commenced his academical career there in 1793, and died June 4, 1831, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Genesis 49 neu ubersetzt, mit Anmerkungen (Giessen, 1793): — Salomo's Prediger neu ubersetzt und erklart (1794): — Philologisch-exegetischer Clavis uber das Neue Testament (1795- 1805): — Bibliotlek fur Kritik und Exegese des Neuen Testaments (1796- 1802, 2 volumes): — Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik (1800): — Handbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte (1801-20, 6 volumes): — Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament (1804-5, 2 volumes), Theologische Encyclopadie (1811). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologeni Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:10, 15, 75, 201, 213, 236, 299, 474, 537, 577, 604. (B.P.)

## Schmidt, Johann Eusebius[[@Headword:Schmidt, Johann Eusebius]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in 1669 at Hohenfeld, in Thuringia. A friend and pupil of A.H. Franke, he lived from 1697 as pastor in Siebleben, near Gotha, until his death, in 1745. Schmidt was a fine hymn writer, and some of his hymns belong to the best of German hymnology, as Es ist vollbracht, so ruft am Kreuze (transl. into Engl. by Mills in his Horoe Germanicoe, No. 161, “‘Tis finished! thus in tortures dying”): — Fahre fort, fahre fort (Engl. transl. in Monthly Rel. Mag. 1866, 35, 363, “Onward go, onward go”). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4, 402 sq.; 8, 141; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1343. (B.P.)

## Schmidt, Oswald Gottlob[[@Headword:Schmidt, Oswald Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kaditz, Saxony, January 2, 1821. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1845 pastor at Schontfeld, in 1856 at Greifenhain, and in 1866 at Werdau. Schmidt died December 26, 1882, doctor of theology. He published, Pericula Conjungendorum Ecclesiarum etc. (Grimma, 1844): — Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben (Leipsic, 1859): — Nicolaus Hausmann, der Freund Luther's (1860): — Caspar Cruciger und Georg der Gottselige (in Leben der- Altvater der lutherischen Kirche, 1861): — Petrus Mosellanus (1866): – — Blicke in die Kirchengeschichte der Stadt Meissen (1879). He also contributed to the Plitt-Herzog, Real Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schmitt, Leonhard Clemens[[@Headword:Schmitt, Leonhard Clemens]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1810 at Hochstadton-the-Aich. He received holy orders in 1884, was doctor of theology at Munich in 1835, and died at Bamberg, December 14, 1869,  professor of theology and vicar-general. He published, Grundriss einer Christologie des Alten Testaments (1841): — Praktische Erklarung des ersten Psalms (1843): — Die Construction des theolog. Beweises (1836). (B.P.).

## Schmolck, Benjamin[[@Headword:Schmolck, Benjamin]]

             a gifted German hymnologist, was born in Lieglitz, 1672. He studied theology at Leipsic from 1693 to 1697, became assistant pastor to his father at Liegnitz in 1701, but the next year accepted a tall to Schweidnitz as dean. Here he spent the rest of his life as a laborious pastor, exerting himself manfully to counteract the intrigues of the Jesuits and to preserve his people in their evangelical faith. In 1708 he was made archdean, in 1712 senior, and in 1714 pastor primarius. After a pastorate of thirty-five years, he entered into rest, 1737. By his hymns and songs, which appeared in various editions from 1704 and on, he has obtained an honorable place among the poets of his Church and nation. Their general tone is that of gentleness and simplicity, and of ardent love to Christ. Many of them, however, betray marks of carelessness in rhetoric and of lack of polish. A complete edition of his poems appeared at Tübingen in 1740. A selection was published by L. Grote at Leipsic in 1860. For his life, see this work of Grote and Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 608, 609. (J.P.L.)

## Schmolders, August[[@Headword:Schmolders, August]]

             a German Orientalist, was born in 1809 at Bochold, Westphalia, and died at Breslau, February 21, 1880, professor at the university. In 1869 he joined the Old Catholics. Schmilders published, Documenta Philosophiae Arabum ex Codice Manuscripto (Bonn, 1836): — De Studiis Arabum Grammaticis (Breslau, 1862). (B.P.)

## Schmucker, John George, D.D[[@Headword:Schmucker, John George, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Michaelstadt, in the Duchy of Darmstadt, Germany, August 18, 1771. He came to America in 1785, finished his course of study in Philadelphia in 1792, and was admitted as a member of the Synod of Pennsylvania, then at Reading. His first charge consisted of several congregations in York County. In 1809 he became pastor, of the congregation at York, where he labored twenty-six years. He died October 7, 1854. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 1:95; Evangelical Review, 6:412.

## Schmucker, Peter[[@Headword:Schmucker, Peter]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Michelstadt, grand duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, Aug. 24, 1784. His parents removed to this country while he was yet an infant, and settled in Virginia. He was converted in his eighteenth year, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church in 1814. We cannot specify the congregation he served, but his name is found in 1817 in the printed list of the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina; and in 1820 he was one of the delegates who met at Hagerstown, Md., to form the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the United States. Still later we find him recorded as a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Western Pennsylvania. In 1832 he joined the Methodist Church, and in 1838 entered the Ohio Conference to take charge of the German Mission in Cincinnati. In 1840 he was appointed to Louisville, Ky., and in 1842 sent to New Orleans to begin work among the Germans there. He continued to labor in different parts of the United States until 1848, when ill health disabled him. From that time he suffered greatly, until relieved by death, Dec. 9, 1860. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1861, p. 165.

## Schmucker, Samuel Simon, D.D[[@Headword:Schmucker, Samuel Simon, D.D]]

             an eminent Lutheran minister, son of John George, was born at Hagerstown, Maryland, February 28, 1799. His preparatory studies were pursued at York (Pennsylvania) Academy. In 1814 he entered the University of Pennsylvania, where he remained until the close of the sophomore year, when he returned to York, and in August 1816, took charge of the classical department of the York Academy, and held this position until November 1817. Having studied theology for a time with his father, he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1820. That year he was licensed to preach; for several months assisted his father; then went to Virginia to take charge of congregations in Shenandoah County, which had been under the care of his uncle, Reverend Nicholas Schmucker. He was ordained September 5, 1821, at Frederick, Maryland. The Shenandoah congregations which he served were, New Market, Solomon's, Reder's, and Armentrout's, and he remained in this charge until 1836. While here he set himself to work to translate,  rearrange, and enlarge Storr and Flatt's Biblical Theology. In 1822 he began to prepare students for the ministry. In March of the same year he submitted to a committee, appointed for the purpose, a plan which he had drawn up, entitled The Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Maryland and Virginia. It was adopted- by the synod in 1822, and approved by the General Synod in 1823. Subsequently it was revised and enlarged in 1827, under his direction, by the Synod of West Pennsylvania; was printed in the English Hymn-book in 1829; became the ground-plan of the organization of the congregations within the General Synod, and it has endured until the present time. In 1827 he was directed to prepare the constitution for synods, which was adopted in 1829. When, in 1823, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania withdrew, and the existence of the General Synod was imperilled, he was very active in the measures taken to prolong its life. He edited the English Catechism, and, in company with Reverend C.P. Krauth, prepared the English Hymn-book. The work to which he believed himself to be called was the preparation of candidates for the ministry. When the General Synod decided, in 1825, to establish a theological seminary, he was at once elected the first professor. The institution was opened September 5, 1826, at Gettysburg, to which place he removed. For four years he was the sole professor. During his connection with the seminary over foiur hundred ministers went out from it. After nearly forty years of labor in, this office he resigned it in 1864. He was largely instrumental in the establishment of Pennsylvania College, and was one of its trustees from its incorporation until the close of his life, July 26, 1873. In 1838 he published an appeal to the American churches, with a plan for Christian union, and was present, in 1846, when the Evangelical Alliance was organized. His Popular Theology passed through eight editions; his Psychology reached a third edition.. He published forty-four works, most of which were synodical and occasional discourses. It. is said that his attempts to produce liturgies were the most unsuccessful of his literary endeavors. As a preacher he was very careful in his preparation, and was always gladly heard. See Penn. College Year- book, 1882, page 154, Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry (1878), page 121; (Gettysburg) Evangelical Review, January 1874.

## Schnappinger, Bonifacius M[[@Headword:Schnappinger, Bonifacius M]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Neuburg, in Bavaria, Oct. 5, 1762, was first lecturer of theology at Würzburg, then professor of exegesis at Heidelberg, and from 1807 professor of dogmatics at Freiburg. He died Dec. 6, 1832. He published the New Test. with annotations (Mannheim, 1807): — Doctrina Dogmatum Eccles. Christ. Cath. ad usum Acad. (Augsburg, 1818): — Entwurf einer kathol.-christl. Religions-u. Dogmeneschichte zu akad. Vorlesungen (Carlsruhe, 1807). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 175, 306, 593; 2, 761. (B.P.)

## Schneckenburger, Matthias[[@Headword:Schneckenburger, Matthias]]

             an eminent modern theologian, born Jan. 17, 1804; died June 13, 1848. He studied Latin at Tuttlingen, Wirtemberg. In 1819 he began the study of theology at Urach. In 1824 he entered upon more thorough studies at Tübingen. Here his teachers were Steudel, Schmidt, Baur, Haug, and others. Philosophical theology was his favorite study; and the book which delighted him most was Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre. He reached his master's degree in his twentieth year, and held the highest place in a group of thirty-eight competitors. In 1826 he went to Berlin to continue his  studies under Schleiermacher, Neander, Marheinecke, and Hegel. With Neander and Marheinecke he formed very close relations, as also with other eminent literary men, e.g. Chamisso and Gans. In 1827 he returned to Würtemberg and began to lecture at Tübingen. Among his pupils were Strauss, Vischer, and Märklin. In 1831 he entered into the ministry as preacher at Herrenberg. Although a gifted speaker, he soon felt that not the pulpit, but the professor's chair was his place. In 1834 he accordingly entered the new theological faculty at Berne. By his side stood Hundeshagen, Lutz, and others. His field here was Church history, dogmatics, and exegesis; but it was especially in dogmatics that his greatest interest lay. Here his position was that healthy union of practice and theory which was so characteristic of Zwingli. When the Strauss commotion broke out in Germany (1839), Schneckenburger faced the whole series of questions which it called forth, and began a course of lectures on the influence of philosophy upon theology and on the collisions between modern speculation and Christianity. His position was that of a positive theist and an opponent of Hegel. Very fruitful among his labors in the following years were his studies in comparative dogmatics. His general tendency was unionistic. He did not confine himself to academic labors, but took also an active part in the Church affairs of the canton of Berne.

In character Schneckenburger was as simple and unassuming as a child. His great defect was a deficiency of self assertion. In his wedded life he was very unfortunate. His relation to his childless wife was very similar to that of Salmasius to his domineering “Juno.” Seeking relief from his domestic unhappiness in a still greater devotion to study, his health soon broke down. He died at the early age of forty-four. It was characteristic of his wife that his valuable papers were for a number of years kept under lock and key. It was only after she had fled from justice to America that they came into the hands of his colleague, Hundeshagen. Among Schneckenburger's writings are the following: Ueber Glauben, Tradition und Kirche (Stuttg. 1827): — Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe (Berlin, 1828): — Annotatio ad Epistolam Jacobi (Stuttg. 1832): — Einleitung ins Neue Test. (ibid. 1832): — Ueber das Evangelium der Aegypter (Berne, 1834): — Ueber den Begrif der Bildung (ibid. 1838): — Stapeferi, Theologi Bernensis, Christologia (ibid. 1842): — De Falsi Neronis Fama (ibid. 1846): — Zur kirchlichen Christologie (Pforzheim, 1848): Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformirten Lehrbegriffs (edited by Güder, Stuttg. 1855, 2 pts.). Also  numerous contributions to the Tübinger Zeitschrift, the Studien und Kritiken, the Theologische Jahrbücher, and others. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop.; Gedächtnissrede von Dr. Gelpke (Berne, 1848). (J.P.L.)

## Schneemann, Gerhard[[@Headword:Schneemann, Gerhard]]

             a Jesuit, who died November 20, 1885, at Kirchrath, Holland, is the author of, Die Irrthumer uber die Ehe; Die Freiheit und Unabhangigkeit der Kirche; Die kirchliche Gewalt und ihre Trager; Die kirchliche Lehrgewalt (published as essays in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Freiburg, 1866-69): — Sancti Irenaei de Ecclesiae Romanae Principatu Testimonium (1870): — Die Kanones und Beschlusse des vaticanischen Concils (in German and Latin, 1871): — Die Entstehung derthomistisch-molinistischen Controverse (1879): — Controversiarum de Divinae Gratiae Liberique Arbitrii Concordia Initia et Progressus (1881): — Weitere Entwickellng der thomistisch-molinistischen Controverse (1880). (B.P.)

## Schneider, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Schneider, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a missionary of the American Board of the Congregational Church, was born in New Hanover, Pa., Jan. 18, 1807. He joined the Church in Norristown in 1826, and soon after entered Hamilton College, in N.Y. Having remained awhile here, he went to Amherst, where he graduated in 1830. From Amherst he went directly to Andover, and entered the seminary, where the question of becoming a foreign missionary soon took possession of his mind. In June, 1832, he says, “Blessed be God for the prospect I have of consecrating myself to the good work of missions.” With this thought uppermost, he pursued his studies. After graduating in 1833, he was married to Miss Abbott. He was ordained in 1833, and Dec. 12 of the same year he sailed from Boston for Smyrna. From 1834 to 1849 he was stationed at Broosa, the ancient capital of the Turkish empire, about ninety miles south of Constantinople. Though a region rich and grand in natural scenery, it was hard to cultivate. The principle of toleration had not been established in the empire, and the missionary was subjected to endless annoyances and persecutions.

His chief labors were with the Greek population, and they were far less susceptible to Gospel influences than the Armenian. In 1849 he was called to take up his abode at Aintab, where he had labored for a time previously, and where a wonderful work had begun among the Armenians. Here Dr. Schneider labored until 1868, a period of nineteen years, and his labors were crowned with abundant success. He instructed the candidates for the ministry, and many of the native preachers in Central Turkey received their theological training at his hands. Though he had many things to occupy his attention in laying the foundations, his chief delight was in telling the simple story of the cross to the listening multitudes. Gentle and winning in his manners as he was scholarly, he attracted thousands by his fluency and fervor. Dr. Schauffler, another veteran missionary, in speaking of him, said, “Always when I can, I go to hear Dr. Schneider.” The pulpit was his throne, the place of his power. In 1868 it was thought advisable that he should return to Broosa and resume his labors there; and a few years later he seemed to be pointed out by Providence, on account of his scholarly attainments and fitness, as the person to be put in charge of the theological seminary at Marsovan. While laboring here, such was his incessant toil that his health gave way. He was  a man of eminent gifts and qualifications, an exact scholar, especially as a linguist. He mastered with ease all the foreign tongues he was called to use, and spoke with remarkable ease and fluency. His whole heart was in his work, because he loved it. Thus he lived and died. “His record is in heaven, and his testimony on high.” He died in Boston Sept. 14, 1877. (W.P.S.)

## Schneider, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Schneider, Johann Jacob]]

             was born Feb. 8, 1797, at Basle, where he also pursued his theological studies. In 1819 he was called to Grenzach, in Baden, and since that time he supplied the pulpit in different places until, in 1859, he was called to Betberg, where he intended to remain. Bodily infirmities came over him and ended his life March 24, 1859. Besides a number of hymns which he composed, he published Die christlichen Sänger des 19. Jahrhunderts (Basle, 1847). See Zum Andenken an J.J. Schneider, Pfarrer zu Betberg (Basle, 1859); Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 367 sq.; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1344; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theolog. 2, 1167. (B.P.)

## Schneider, Leonhard[[@Headword:Schneider, Leonhard]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, who died April 25, 1874, at Moorenweis, diocese of Augsburg, is the author of Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, des Aristoteles (Passau, 1867): — Studie uber Roger Bacosn (Augsburg, 1873): — Die Unsterblichkeitsidee im Glauben und in der Philosophie der Volker (Ratisbon, 1870). (B.P.)

## Schnepf, Erhard[[@Headword:Schnepf, Erhard]]

             an assistant in the Lutheran Reformation, born of a noble family at Heilbronn, November, 1498. He studied first at Erfurt, then at Heidelberg. As soon as Luther appeared, Schnepf welcomed his teachings. He preached first at Weinsberg, then (1523) at Wimpen, where he married. In 1525 he was called by Philip III of Nassau to introduce the reformation at Weilburg. Here his familiarity with Scripture enabled him to triumph in a disputation over Dr. Tervich of Treves. In 1528 Philip made him a professor in his new university of Marburg, whence he exerted a reformatory influence into Westphalia. He accompanied his patron to the diet of Spire in 1529, and to Augsburg in 1530. In 1534, at the request of duke Ulrich of Würtemberg, he united with Blaurer in the reformation of this country. His seat of operation was Stuttgart, while that of Blaurer was Tübingen. In 1544 he accepted a professorship in Tübingen, and represented the more rigid views of Luther in a Zwinglian community. Schnepf refused to accept the interim, and in 1548 gave up his position and fled to Heilbronn. At the suggestion of Johann Friedrich of Weimar, he became professor of Hebrew at Jena in 1549, and soon had more than sixty students. Here he became, alongside of Amsdorf and Strigel, one of the most eminent theologians in that region. Up to 1555 he had lived in peace with the synergistic Melancthonians at  Wittenberg; but now he became involved in the rigid Lutheran party of Flacius, and he assumed a milder position only at the instance of the duke Johann Friedrich. In the midst of labors abundant, he died at Jena, November, 1558. See Jo. Rosae, De Vita Schnepfii (Leips. 1562); Heyd, Blaurer, and Schnepf, in the Tüb. Zeitschrift, 1838; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 12, 618-620; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 314. (J.P.L.)

## Schnorr (von Carolsfeld), Julius[[@Headword:Schnorr (von Carolsfeld), Julius]]

             a famous painter, and, besides Cornelius, Overbeck, and Veit, one of the oldest and most distinguished representatives of Christian painting of modern times, was born in 1794 at Leipsic, and educated at Dresden. In  1817 Schnorr went to Italy, was in 1846 appointed director of the picture gallery at Dresden, and died May 24, 1872. He published, Die Bibel in Bildern (Leipsic, 1860): — Biblia Sacra Tabulis Illustrata, etc. (1855-60). (B.P.)

## Schnurrer, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Schnurrer, Christian Friedrich]]

             an eminent Orientalist, professor and preacher at Tübingen, was born at Cannstadt Oct. 28,1742. He studied at Tübingen, Göttingen, Jena, and Leipsic. Among his teachers were Michaelis, Ernesti, Dathe, Semler, Teller, and Gellert. He visited England and France to extend his familiarity with Oriental MSS. On his return in 1770 he became professor at Tübingen, and began the exegesis of the Old Test. But when, in 1772, he was placed at the head of the theological training school, he was in the place for which his talents and learning best fitted him. Here he labored with great success for thirty-two years. In 1806 he was made a prelate and brought into close connection with the government. He died at Stuttgart Nov. 10, 1822. Among the many writings of Schnurrer are, Bibliotheca Arabica (1799-1806, 7 parts): — Academic Addresses (in Latin [Tüb. 1828]): — Erläuterung (historical [Tüb. 1798]). See Weber, Schnurrer's Leben (1823); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20, 714-718. (J.P.L.)

## Schoberlein, Ludwig, Friedrich[[@Headword:Schoberlein, Ludwig, Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kolmberg, near Anspach, September 6, 1813. He studied at Munich and Erlangen, and commenced his academical career at the latter place in 1841. In 1850 he was professor at Heidelberg, in 1855 at Gottingen, in 1862 member of consistory, and died July 8, 1881. Schoberlein published, Die Grundlehren des Heils, entwickelt aus dem Prinzip der Liebe (Stutgard, 1848): — Der evangelische Gottesdienst nach den Grundsatzen der Reformation (Heidelberg, 1854): — Der evangelische Hauptgottesdienst in Formularen fur das ganze Kirchenjahr (1855; new ed. 1874 ): — Das Wesen des christlichen Gottesdienstes (1860): — Schatz des liturgischen Chor- und Gemeindegesangs, etc. (Gottingen, 1863-72, 3 volumes): —Geheimnisse des Glaubens (1872): — Princip und System der Dogmatik (1881). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Piinjer, Theol. Jahresbericht (1881), 1:374 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encylop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schock, Charles[[@Headword:Schock, Charles]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stuttgart, Germany, July 1, 1812, and emigrated to Philadelphia, Pa., 1829. Removing to Wilmington, Del., he there united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. He joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1838. He became supernumerary in 1855, and so remained until his death, which occurred in Philadelphia, March 24, 1872. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, p. 18.

## Schock, James L., D.D[[@Headword:Schock, James L., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Berks County, Pennsylvania, March 16, 1816. He graduated from Pennsylvania College in 1839, after which he was a tutor there, and for a short time studied at the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. In 1841 he was licensed to preach, and that year was pastor in Reading, Pennsylvania. For a time he preached in Chambersburg, and in 1852 became pastor of St. James's Church, New York city. He disappeared mysteriously during a mental disturbance, as a result of impaired physical health, October 29, 1865. See Pennsylvania College Yearbook, 1882, page 208.

## Scholastic Philosophy[[@Headword:Scholastic Philosophy]]

             SEE SCHOLASTICISM.

## Scholastic Theology[[@Headword:Scholastic Theology]]

             a term used to designate that peculiar phase of theological development which lies between the patristic age and the age of the Reformation. The  apostolic age had founded Christianity as a regenerative principle in human society; the patristic age had crystallized the teachings of Christianity as ecclesiastically sanctioned dogmas. The scholastic age now developed and defended and harmonized the dogmas which already were authoritatively accepted and taught by the Church.

The patristic age died away at about the close of the 6th century. The age from the 6th to the 11th century is a period of transition from the patristic to the scholastic age. The scholastic age proper extends from the age of Anselm (died 1109) to the outbreak of the Reformation. In the scholastic age we may readily distinguish three phases — the period of inception and youth; the period of greatest strength and glory; and the period of decline and dissolution.

On the threshold of scholastic theology stands unquestionably the celebrated archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm. He was the first to recognize distinctly the central principle of scholastic theology and to reduce it to masterly application. This principle is the unquestioning acceptance of the traditionally and officially sanctioned body of orthodox doctrine, and the earnest defense of the same by all the resources of logic and reason. The scholastic theologians were therefore not patres, generators, of dogmas, but only doctores, teachers and defenders; and they were not doctores in general, but only doctores ecclesioe. They taught not merely in the Church, but for the Church and in defense of the Church. Their central task was to conciliate, or at least to cast a bridge over the gulf which lies between, faith and knowledge. The instrument which they chiefly used was formal logic- syllogistic argumentation. Anselm plainly sets before himself a twofold task to safeguard theology from the charge of inculcating an absolutely blind and irrational faith, and to reprove the presumption of a too haughty and self-confiding reason. The first error — the too servilely traditionalistic tendency — had characterized the period since the decline of the patristic age. The second error was represented by some of the early scholastic philosophers, such as Roscelin. But in his attempt to find a system midway between these extremes, Anselm does not himself escape unconsciously vibrating, at times, into one and then into the other. At one time he makes knowledge positively dependent upon faith; at another he goes so far as to assume that reason can of itself demonstrate the absolute necessity of each and every dogma of the whole faith of the Church. In this he unconsciously accepts the very essence of rationalism; and yet nothing is further from his main tendency than an excessive reliance upon mere reason. On the  contrary, he is so thoroughly in bondage to the merely formal dogmas of orthodoxy that he is unable to reach any independent appreciation of either the simple word of Scripture or the direct intuitions of the moral consciousness. As a general result his writings are characterized largely by an unsatisfactory logical formalism. Philosophically, Anselm is a Platonic realist.

The same antithesis between faith and knowledge which occupied Anselm's attention reappears after his time. But while with Anselm the traditional, philosophical, and ethical elements were held in comparative equipoise, with some of his successors the center of gravity was seriously lost. This is particularly the case with Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. Of the two, Bernard (died 1153) was by far the more churchly minded. He looked upon the speculations of Abelard as daring innovations; he was a man of faith rather than of science; he bowed with awe before the body of Christian dogmas as held by the historical Church; and yet he was not a mere unthinking traditionalist. But he endeavored to appropriate the traditional system with a vital and intelligent faith. His spirit, however, is of a mystical rather than of a philosophical cast. The intellect cannot take by storm the mysteries of salvation; it is only by means of ecstatic contemplation that distant glimpses of their meaning can be obtained. What the soul sees in its mystic soarings are true foresights of what will lie open before us in our state of eternal bliss. This position of Bernard led him into violent personal opposition to his great contemporary Abelard.

Abelard (died 1142) had devoted himself at first to dialectics, i.e. philosophy, and had adhered primarily to the nominalists and subsequently to the realists; and those opposite standpoints are frequently clearly recognizable in his writings. Indeed, it is probable that Abelard himself never came to a clear decision between the two systems. His general position, however, seems to have been that which held the universalia in re, and which is best designated by the term conceptualism. On devoting himself to theology, Abelard subjected the whole series of dogmas to a vigorous philosophical treatment, endeavoring to commend them to the understanding by a clear presentation of their harmony with reason. He seriously complains of a failure to do this on the part of his predecessors, and insists that the exacting of faith in doctrines before the reasonableness of the doctrines has been explained can only lead to credulity and superstition. Such a course also deprives the Christian subject of the means of convincing the doubter and of refuting the opponent. Moreover, it rests  upon an unwise rejecting of the benefits of worldly science growing out of an ungrounded fear of its misuse. But Abelard is not a thorough rationalist; he does not make intellectual processes the generator of faith. He holds simply that philosophical arguments may facilitate the acceptance of Christian doctrine, while the final producer of converting faith is the influence of the Holy Spirit. He further holds that no true and full knowledge can arise without the help of personal faith. Nevertheless, it is the plain duty of the believer to strive after a scientific comprehension of that which the Church presents as a system of formal doctrine. But Abelard differs from Anselm in this — that while Anselm assumes at once the absolute truth of the official system of orthodox doctrines, and tests all philosophy by the touchstone of formal dogmas, Abelard, on the contrary, regards the official doctrines as simply a human development of what exists in germ in the Holy Scriptures, while these Scriptures themselves, together with the primitive creeds, are the real source and norm of all Christian truth. In his work Sic et Non, Abelard presents a series of contradictory authorities on the several dogmas with this express purpose — to show that the Church fathers are to be read, not cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate. He even gave much offense by insisting that the Bible itself is not to be fully appreciated without a discriminating exercise of the understanding. His general tendency was to embrace the natural and the supernatural in a single view, and to establish a bond of unity between all systems of religious faith. His standpoint was that of a formal supernaturalism with a noticeable tendency to material rationalism. The polemical conflicts in which his life was involved prevented him from coming to any very clear self consistency of system. They also led him, in some cases, to aim rather at a momentary dialectical triumph than at a solid development of Christian truth.

The sharp antitheses of tendency between the mysticism of Bernard and the dialectics of Abelard led to mediatory efforts. Prominent here is the school of the St. Victors. Hugo St. Victor (died cir. 1140) held to the Anselmic position that Scripture and tradition are the objective, and faith the subjective, norm of theological science; but he deviates from Anselm in making a broad distinction between alia ex ratione, alia secundum rationemn, alia supra rationem, and alia contra rationem, i.e. between necessaria, probabilia, mirabilia, and incredibilia. What falls under the first and the fourth head is not an object of faith, but only what falls under the second and third. Under the second head fall the so called doctrines of  natural religion. Here faith is helped by reason (ratione adjuvatur), as also reason is perfected by faith (ratio fide perficitur). Under the third head fall the specifically Christian doctrines of Scripture and tradition. Here ratio does not help faith, because the object is beyond its range, though it may offer grounds for revering the faith which grasps that which is above it. Thus Hugo St. Victor rejects the endeavor of Anselm to demonstrate the rationabilis necessitas of the orthodox dogmas, and concedes only our philosophical ability to strengthen the probabilitas of the dicta of natural religion. And this is essentially the role which reason plays in all subsequent mediaeval theology. The motive of Hugo in thus restricting the role of reason was (1) to put a check to the subtle and fruitless freaks of dialectics, and (2) to assure room for full play for his own mystical system. His real position was this: inasmuch as scholastic dialectics is unable to attain to absolute truth, therefore there must be a process of immediate intuition whereby the absolute truth is directly laid hold upon with the certainty of actual vision. He further held that there are progressive degrees in which this truth is grasped, depending upon the progress of our subjective sanctification through personal communion with God. In carrying out his system Hugo is guilty of unconsciously transgressing the bounds he had set up for reason, for he subjects the official form of doctrine to no little free criticism; and he endeavors to make clear to reason the grounds of the revealed system of truth. This is simply what was to be expected; for Hugo was to some considerable degree a genius of really productive power. His mystical system as a whole had, however, more indirect than direct influence on his age; it served as a powerful check to the mad freaks of uncurbed dialectics. He has greater significance as the first systematizer of the whole body of Christian doctrine. In his Summa Sententiarum he treats successively of all the dogmas of the Church, sustaining them by citations from Scripture and from the fathers, adducing, then, the various objections of opponents, and finally deciding each case according to Scripture and tradition. His work De Sacramentis, though of more speculative power than the Summa, has been much less read. And though his Summa was subsequently largely displaced by the Summa of Peter Lombard, yet the work of Hugo exerted a very important influence upon later scholastics, particularly upon Lombard himself and upon Thomas Aquinas, but very especially upon theologians of a mystical tendency, such as Bonaventura and Gerson.  The contemplative or mystical element of Hugo is carried much further by his pupil Richard St. Victor (died 1173). According to Richard there are six kinds of contemplation. “We know,

1, by the imagination (the sensible impressions made by creation);

2, by reason (perception of law and order in creation);

3, in reason according to imagination (symbolical knowledge of nature as a mirror of the spiritual);

4, in reason and according to reason (the internal referred to the internal without a sensible image);

5, above and not against reason (rational knowledge carried to a higher stage by revelation);

6, above and (apparently) against reason (as, e.g., the mystery of the Trinity).

In discussing the Trinity, Richard makes large use of the trias of power, wisdom, and love; but he lays greatest stress upon the latter, to which he ascribes the generation of the Son. There is nothing more perfect than love. But love (amor), in order to be charity (caritas), must have for its object not itself, but something else. Hence in order to charity there must be a plurality of persons. But love towards creatures is not sufficient, for God can fully love only that which is worthy of the highest love. Hence the divine love must have a divine object (the Son). But even this is not the highest love, for love is essentially social. The two who love each other must desire that a third party be as fully loved by each as each loves the other; hence the Father and Son agree in loving a third (the Spirit). And since this love to the third party, in order to be perfect, must have a perfect object, hence this third party is equal to the other two. Each is equally divine, and there is no superiority of the one to the other (see Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. 1, 420, 467). Richard agreed with Hugo in regarding theology as the central science, and as the mother of all other sciences.

But the drift of the age was averse to the deep and rich speculations of the St. Victors; it tended rather to concentrate all intellectual acumen upon the logical defense of the formal orthodoxy of the official Church. Hence it led mainly to the production of collections of dogmatic authorities (summoe sententiarum). The first real collector of such “sentences,” sententiarius,  was Hugo St. Victor, though the germs and forerunners of them are found as far back as in Vincent of Lerinum (died cir. 450), Gennadius of Marseilles (died cir. 493), and in Isidore of Seville; but it is only with Hugo that the process becomes of a really scientific character. The one motive of these real sententiarii is to bring dialectics into close service to orthodoxy. Thus they are not mere slavish compilers of the dicta of the fathers, on the one hand, nor rash speculators, on the other; but they hold the midway between them.

Among the earliest successors of Hugo was Robert Pulleyn, in his Sententiarum Libri Octo. He was archdeacon of Rochester, teacher in Paris and Oxford, and finally cardinal (died 1150). His chief polemical endeavor was to counteract the too daring speculations of Abelard; but Robert was far surpassed by the great magister sententiarum, Peter Lombard (died 1164). Of his Sententiarum Libri Quattuor, Hase says, “It was not so much on account of the ingenuity and depth displayed in the work as because of the position of the author in the Church, and his success in harmonizing antagonisms, as also because of the remarkable perspicuity of his work, that it became the manual of the 12th century and the model of the 13th.” The chief themes of his work are the Trinity, creation, the incarnation, and the sacraments. As a whole, it is a synopsis of the whole movement of scholastic theology. “With it,” says Baur, “really commences the systematization of scholasticism, the endless commenting upon the sentences of the masters.” It initiated the movement of tiresome questioning and answering; of laying down theses and antitheses, arguments and counter arguments; of dividing and splitting up the matter of doctrines ad infinitum. Lombard was very successful in keeping the mean way between the blind copyists of tradition (scrutatores) and the rash reasoners (garruli ratiocinatores). He uses reason in the modest role of removing the seeming contradictions in Scripture and tradition. These differences he states very frankly, somewhat in the manner of Abelard's Sic et Nons but with a much more intent endeavor to reconcile them. He purposely avoids all ambitious philosophizing, as this seemed to him to jeopardize the dignity and independence of theology. On the whole, therefore, the tendency of Lombard was towards the enslaving of speculation in the ruts of formal tradition. This influence was felt even by writers of much greater originality, and such as had entirely broken with the whole method of the sententiarii, as e.g. Thomas Aquinas.  Close upon the steps of Lombard followed the gifted Peter of Poitiers; and from him on there follow a whole series of commentators upon Lombard, prominent among whom are Alexander Hales, Duns Scotus, and Occam.

But the way opened by Lombard was not docilely followed in by all. Alanus of Ryssel (died 1202), in his Ars Cath. Fidei, presents the successive doctrines of the Church as a series of logical steps, endeavoring to develop the one directly from the other. “Heretics and skeptics,” says he, “cannot be won over by citations of authorities, therefore we must urge upon them rational arguments.” But he wisely adds: “Hae vero rationes si homines ad credendum inducant, non tamen ad fidem capessendam plene sufficiunt.” In this his position is related to that of Anselm. Lombard was also opposed for his use of Aristotelian logic. Walter St. Victor accuses him of drawing his whole inspiration from this secular fountain (uno spiritu Aristotelico afflatus). So also Joachim of Floris. A still more prominent voice against the great current of scholastic theology was that of John of Salisbury. He accused it of fruitlessness, absurdity, and presumption. It sacrificed the essence for the form, the truth for logic; but his critical ability was not supplemented by an adequate productive power. Hence he was unable materially to check the general drift towards scholastic subtleties.

Scholastic theology reached its highest development in the 13th century. Many circumstances contributed to this, especially the more full access to the writings of Aristotle, which was occasioned by the fall of Constantinople (1204). These writings, falling into the hands of a number of well-trained men, served to give theology a much wider and richer scope than it had as yet taken. The whole series of fundamental questions was now elaborately examined afresh. Among the problems discussed were, the sources of our knowledge of theology; the nature and necessity of revelation in contrast with reason and philosophy; the relation of faith to knowledge; whether theology is a science proper; whether it is a theoretical or a practical science; what is its proper object (materia de qua) in its contrast with philosophy; wherein Christianity per se differs from other religions, etc. The form which theology now assumed was partly that of commentaries upon the sentences of Lombard, and partly that of more original production. It is distinguished, on the one hand, for the immense increase of matter treated of (ethical and dogmatical, metaphysical and physical), and, on the other, by the perfection of the scholastic method, according to which, on every successive point, the authorities and reasons are cited pro et contra and a resolutio or conclusio duly drawn. The whole  is followed by a refutation in detail of all contrary views. Yet upon the basis of this uniformity there is manifested a large range of individual peculiarity. This sprang in part from the individual genius of the theologians, but also largely from their personal rivalry; and particularly from the rivalry and hostility that existed between the great monastic orders of Dominicans and Franciscans. and between the schools of the realists and the nominalists. Another characteristic of this climax period of scholasticism consists in the fact that it for the first time brought the whole body of specifically Catholic doctrine to its complete formal expression.

First in time, of the scholastic theologians of this period, is Alexander Hales (died 1245). He won the title of Doctor Irrefragabilis. His Summa Universoe Theologioe shows great breadth of thought; it makes large use of Aristotle, is very methodical in form, and treats of all the fundamental questions; but it introduces a vast amount of irrelevant matter, and, in its attempt to meet every possible point, raises many trivial and even foolish questions. As a whole it lacks real speculative power. It also favors some of the extreme inferences of Roman doctrine, such as the thesaurus gratioe and the immaculata conceptio passiva Virginis Marioe, and it betrays an occasional Pelagianizing tendency.

Hales is, in many respects, surpassed by the noted Dominican Albertus Magnus (died 1280). He made a much larger use of Aristotle. His commentaries on Aristotle and on Lombard and his Summa Theologioe exhibit an astounding universality of knowledge. His familiarity with mathematics and with the whole body of the natural science of the age won for him the repute of a magician. It is with injustice that some have styled him the Simia Aristotelis. He does not simply ape Aristotle, he merely makes free use of his materials; but he also combines therewith not a few of the conceptions of Plato and of the Neo-Platonists. It is true, he does not control his physical facts by an adequate criticism, and he fails to give full development to his speculations. But speculative power he really has, and from the midst of the mass of his chaotic materials there frequently dart forth surprising anticipations of great laws which subsequent scientists have fully developed — a fact which Alexander Humboldt has cheerfully conceded. As to Albert's specifically theological standpoint, he holds that theology is a practical science (scientia de his quoe ad salutem pertinent), treating of God and of his works. It is a science, however, not in the interest of science, but in the interest of eternal bliss. It has for its subject matter the objective fides catholica, which faith rests originally upon a  supermundana illuminatio. This illuminatio he attributes not only to prophets and apostles, but also to the fathers. He recognizes the two forms of faith — faith as the objective matter to be believed, and faith as a subjective activity of the individual; and upon this latter he bases the capability of attaining to real Christian knowledge. He regards revelation and reason, theology and philosophy, as absolutely in harmony, notwithstanding any seeming conflicts, for they both rest upon experience — theology upon our experience of the supernatural, and philosophy upon our experience of the natural; and the supernatural and the natural, though essentially different, rest both upon the harmonious plan and will of the one God. The supernaturalism of Albertus Magnus stands in close connection with his Platonizing derivation of all creatures, by a descending emanation, from the absolute God. Supernatural grace is needed by the creature per se, and irrespective of sin. Without this grace man, even had he not sinned, could not have lifted himself up out of his finiteness into likeness to the infinite God.

But Albertus Magnus did not fully develop his supernaturalism in all its bearings; this was done by his distinguished scholar, the greatest and most influential of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas (died 1274). Thomas Aquinas was very successful in vindicating to theology the character of a true science. He set before man as his highest good, as the goal of his blessedness, the vision of God (visio Dei). But this supermundane goal lies beyond the scope of creatural ability, for the natural cannot reach up to the divine. The highest that reason can attain to is a mere mediate knowledge of God through and from his works; and this is the furthest limit to which any of the old philosophers reached. These general religious notions form a sort of proeambula fidei. They can be reached, thought Aquinas, by way of logical demonstration; e.g. that there is a God, that God is one, etc. But to the supernatural end of man, as presented in Christianity, we can attain only through supernatural revelation. The seal, the witness, of this revelation are the miracles which attend it. Theology is the science which is based on revelation and guided by the light of faith; whereas the other sciences are based on nature and guided by the light of reason. The fact that theology has for its object a something that is to be accepted on authority — viz. faith — does not hinder it from being a science. All other sciences do the same thing; they accept their subject matter as an objective reality without proof, and then develop themselves therefrom as from an axiom. The axioms of theology  are the dogmas of the Church. From these it evolves and proves additional truths and consequences. This gives Aquinas's view of the relation of reason to faith. Reason cannot prove the articles of faith, for the latter spring from revelation, which is above reason. But rational and theological truths cannot possibly be in conflict, for they both come from God — the one indirectly and the other directly. Yet they do not overlap each other; they stand in different spheres. The rational truths do not reach up to the theological (deficiunt ab eis); they are only a proeambula to them. Natural reason serves, therefore, as a preparation for faith; but Thomas Aquinas elsewhere in his system robs reason of even this conceded service, for he really attributes the so called truths of natural reason to former half- remembered revelations, and regards them as implicitly containing the whole series of Christian dogmas. Another service (so teaches Aquinas) which reason renders to faith is to elucidate the doctrines of faith by means of natural analogies. The possibility of this rests on the fact that all natural objects retain a certain faint resemblance to their Author. Still another use of reason lies in convincing our adversaries. The singularis modus convincendi adversarios is really ex auctoritate Scripturoe divinitus confirmata miraculis. If the adversary concedes a part of the Christian system, his remaining errors may be removed by developing the implications of the partial truths which he does accept. If he rejects the whole, there remains no other resource than an indirect procedure, viz. by evolving the absurdities which are implied in his errors.

The form which Aquinas thus impressed upon theology was of the greatest influence upon all subsequent theological thought. It retained its sway in German orthodoxy down to the time of Schleiermacher. In the rest of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, it largely prevails even to the present. Its essential feature is the sharp distinction made between that religious knowledge which is attainable by reason and that which we owe to revelation, as also the designating of revealed truth as supra sed non contra rationem. It is within the range of this narrow field that Aquinas usually confines his thoughts. At times, however, he breaks forth in what might have proved very fertile speculations but for the hampering effects of his self-imposed yoke. Occasionally, however, he makes a real sophist's use of this yoke, calling in abruptly the help of mere ecclesiastical authority to veil the absurd consequences to which some of the official definitions of doctrine seemed to lead. In philosophical respects Thomas Aquinas was equally attracted by the opposed systems of Aristotle and Plato. He seems  to have oscillated not a little between the central differences of these systems — the realistic ideas of Plato and the universalia in re of Aristotle. Under this influence he sometimes assigns too high a role to natural reason (e.g. to demonstrate the existence of God), and at others he almost robs it of any power whatever (e.g. when he attributes the truths of natural religion to forgotten revelations). In his ontology Aquinas leans somewhat to the emanation of his master, Albertus Magnus. He does not clearly distinguish between will and nature in God; and his system, as a whole, is deterministic in its implications. In form it is an ideal of artistic construction. It is, however, not merely its form, but also and chiefly the rich fullness of its matter, which secured to it its long ascendency over the theological activity of the Church.

Contemporary with Aquinas was the gifted and eloquent Bonaventura (died 1274). He is peculiar for the completeness with which he combined the scholastical element with the mystical. His masters were Aristotle and the St. Victors. Less speculatively original than Aquinas, he is distinguished by a moderation which preserves him from dogmatic extremes, and by a warm religious element which lends to his pages an enduring attraction. This latter element saves him from the trivial subtleties into which his contemporaries so generally fell, and induces him to give great prominence to the simple practical elements of scriptural piety. Well did he merit the encomium of Gerson: “Recedit a curiositate quantum potest, non immiscens positiones extraneas, vel doctrinas terminis philosophicis obumbratas more multorum, sed dum studet illuminationi intellectus, totum refert ad pietatem et ad religiositatem affectus.” Hence to Bonaventura theology, though speculative as to its object, is yet predominantly a merely practical science. As to his mysticism, it does not materially affect the form of his theology; rather is it simply an attending complement serving to supplement the inadequacy of the formally logical element. As a whole, his influence, though permanent, was not so immediately effective as that of Raymund Lull (died 1315). Lull's Ars Generalis was a laudable endeavor to simplify and to render more practically effective the whole arsenal of scholastic resources. The enthusiasm with which he undertook to frame a system which would absolutely annihilate the scepticism of the Averrhoists, and demonstrate Christianity with the evidence of a simple syllogistic inference, is only to be compared with the kindred ambition of Wolf in the 18th century. But the results did not justify his hopes. And though he had a  long series of enthusiastic disciples, his logical rationalism failed to produce any long-lasting benefits.

But the figure which stands as a worthy rival of Thomas Aquinas, and whose subtleties brought scholastic theology not only to its meridian of glory, but also to that stage of excessive development which broke the way for its decline, is the Franciscan monk Duns Scotus (died 1308). Scotus was unquestionably an original, creative genius. He impressed upon the course of theological development a specifically new character. He was not merely a personal rival of Aquinas, but he was an independent master. He shared, with the other scholastics, the conviction of the absolute truth of the official orthodoxy of the Church. He differed from Aquinas in making a less impassable gulf between faith and knowledge. He reduced the claims of philosophy, and in the same measure enlarged the scope of theology. With him theology is the science of man in his relations to God, and of God in his relations to the universe. He comes to a clearer conception and a larger use of man as an image of God than is previously met with. From the fact that man is in the likeness of God follows the consequence that man is able to know God, and that the intuitions of essential truth lie in germ in the very nature of the soul. Upon the path of man's likeness to God, Duns Scotus was led to a more clear distinguishing of will from nature in God than had previously been done, as also to the assigning to God's freedom a very large role. The creation of the universe was not a matter of pantheistic necessity, but was the result of a special divine volition.

God might even have made the world other than as it is, and he might have given to man a different moral law. He might also have adopted a different plan of salvation. Thus, while teaching the great truth of the divine freedom and combating the determinism of Aquinas, Scotus did not guard the divine freedom against irrational arbitrariness by representing it as finding its norm of action in the divine wisdom. This great defect in Scotus's system led directly to the defeat of the most earnest endeavor of his life — viz. to settle Christian science upon an absolutely solid foundation; for it sapped the rational ground of the universe, and thus planted in theology a germ of universal scepticism. The reason of this failure lay not in a lack of ability in Scotus, but in the fundamental mistake of the whole body of scholastic theologians, viz. in the uncritical assumption of the absolute correctness of the formal dogmas of the official Church. This assumption shut them off at once from any adequate appreciation of the two true sources of all theology and philosophy, viz. Scripture and experience.  It was by developing the consequences of the scholastic method to their dangerous extremes that Duns Scotus has the merit of having at the same time raised scholastic theology to its fullest glory and also given an impulse towards its dissolution. Earliest among those who became conscious of the radical defectiveness of the whole scholastic method was Roger Bacon (died 1294). Bacon declaimed, in an almost Protestant spirit, against the enslavement of theology to human authorities, and pointed towards the Scriptures and experience as the real fountains of truth. But his influence towards the decline of scholasticism had a less potent effect to that end than the further development of scholasticism itself.

Of this third stage in the scholastic movement we can mention but the most prominent features. First of note stands the acute and independent minded Durand of St. Pourcain (died 1333). Durand held an eclectic relation to the opposed systems of Aquinas and Scotus. He was a nominalist like Scotus, but his nominalism had a realistic background. With Aquinas, he held that man is by nature incapable of knowing the laws of God. The intuitions and generalizations of the human mind have only subjective validity. The true knowledge of God can be derived only from the Scriptures, as officially interpreted by Rome. Theology aims not at the knowledge of the nature of God, but only at such a practical knowledge of God as leads to salvation. Theology relates to the will, and is hence a purely practical science. Faith cannot be begotten by arguments, but is a simple virtue; and its meritoriousness is in proportion to its difficulty. Durand denies even that the light of the Spirit shows us the evidence of Gospel truth. This also would destroy the merit of faith. He agrees with Aquinas in exalting the transcendental position of God in regard to man, and with Scotus in giving arbitrary play to the divine will and grace. The outcome of his whole system was to discourage the activity of human reason, and to promote a spirit of unquestioning submissiveness to the official Church. It denied all worth to philosophy, and reduced theology to a mere method of practice.

This attitude of theology was now more fully developed by Occam (died 1347). A disciple of Scotus, he yet varies from him in many points. He boldly opposed some of the claims of the popes, and substituted nominalism for the prevalent scholastic realism. This was a necessary logical outcome. Scholastic realism had utterly failed to resolve the truths of philosophy and theology into any unitary substratum of general knowledge. Hence its sole resource in order to attain to unity of thought was to give up all effort at knowing things per se, and to reduce our  highest intuitions and ideas to mere creations of our own subjectivity, destitute of objective value. Our highest ideas are mere fictiones, abstractiones. This nominalism was so strong with Occam that it gave to his whole system a positively skeptical tendency. Thenceforth nominalism reigns almost without rival in the waning life of scholastic theology.

After the time of Occam the development of theology becomes fitful and sporadic. The influence of Scotus led to a constantly more pronounced Pelagianism. The influence of Aquinas occasioned various attempts at a revival of Augustinian determinism. In a few cases, e.g. Wycliffe and Huss, it became a herald of the Reformation. The last scholastic proper, Gabriel Biel (died 1495), made earnest but fruitless endeavors to prop up the tottering superstructure of the old system. Further attempts in the same direction — by Raimund of Sabunde, Nicolas de Cusa, Gerson, and others of a less scholastic character — were equally unsuccessful, and served only to show the need of a thorough reformation of the whole body of theology.

The latest phenomena in theological science immediately before the Reformation were these three: An effort to revive an earnest Christian mysticism (Gerson and others); a revival of an Aristotelianism of a skeptical tendency (Pomponatius); and a syncretistic and fanciful Neo- Platonism (Ficinus, Picus Mirandula). Of these three, the first was necessarily impotent in its main endeavor, as it still held fast to the old scholastic foundation, while the second and third served only, by their skeptical and pagan tendencies, to give a final thrust at the entire effete system.

The so called ante-Reformers — Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Savonarola, Wessel — still linger under the dominion of scholastic forms and traditions. It was only the radically revolutionary spirit of the Reformers themselves that gave to scholastic theology its definitive death blow. But even subsequently to this point there have appeared not a few (though unimportant) scholastics, scholastici post scholasticismum. Luther himself confesses his indebtedness to scholasticism: “Ego scholasticos non clausis oculis lego, non rejicio omnia eorum, sed non probo omnia.” So also Melancthon. And it is only the shallowness of rationalism or the bigotry of ignorance that can declaim (as is often done) against the worthlessness of scholastic theology as a whole. Philosophers like Leibnitz, Hegel, Ritter, Cousin, Remusat, and Haureau, and theologians like Engelhardt, Rettberg, Liebner, Hasse, Gass, Neander, and Baur, have spoken in a very different  tone; and have contributed, in some degree, to acquaint modern times with a part of the rich treasures of thought and speculation which it contains. The dry, superficial 18th century mocked at the scholastics from the simple reason of its ignorance and its incapacity to appreciate them. The revival of theological originality since the time of Schleiermacher and the contemporary new birth of art in the romantic schools of Germany and France have awakened a very different state of mind. Even Semler has frankly declared that many a modern theologian who has abused the scholastics would not have been able to serve them as a mere amanuensis.

Faint reproductions of the scholastic period of Catholic theology have appeared in Protestantism. The 17th century was for the Lutheran and Reformed churches a really scholastic age. The systematic theologians of that century stood in the same relation to the fathers of Protestantism as the mediaeval scholastics to the patres of Catholicism. So is it with each of the most insignificant sects of Protestantism. Whenever any Church begins to let the writings of any of its eminent ministers stand between it and a free and direct interpretation of the Scriptures in the light of intuition and experience, that moment it enters into its scholastic stage. See Neander, Church Hist. vol. 4; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; and especially Herzog, Real-Encyklop. (J.P.L.)

## Scholasticism[[@Headword:Scholasticism]]

             (SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY — PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOLMEN), a notable phase of speculation which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages whenever any activity of thought was displayed, and which gave a distinctive character to the reasonings, to the controversies, and to the whole intellectual habit of those centuries. Scholasticism especially denotes the peculiar mode of argumentation then practiced, and the spirit by which it was guided. The Scholastic Philosophy designates the whole body of diverse and often conflicting doctrine which was generated under the scholastic procedure. The Philosophy of the Schoolmen signifies the same thing, but directs attention particularly to the very remarkable succession of acute and profound inquirers who applied and developed the scholastic method. The schoolmen were the theologians, the metaphysicians, the dialecticians, the encyclopaedists, the thinkers, and the teachers of the mediaeval period. The scholastic philosophy represented the ample and often bewildering, but always systematic, results of their labors, especially after their method had attained its curious but consummate perfection.  Scholasticism was the peculiar process of investigation and demonstration pursued by the schoolmen, with various thoroughness but unvarying uniformity, for much more than half a millennium. The schoolmen have long fallen into disrepute; little more than their names are remembered by the majority even of educated persons. Their works are unread and lie moldering and undisturbed on the dusty shelves of ancient libraries. Their system has been for nearly three centuries the constant butt of ignorant censure and stolid pretension. Yet a system which endured so long, which engrossed so many minds of wide culture and of marvelous penetration, which attracted so much of contemporaneous regard, which enlisted such intense and general enthusiasm, which filled the intellectual atmosphere for long generations, which almost “ruled the court, the camp, the grove,” in the persons of Anselm and Occam and Abelard, cannot be dismissed with a sneer or safely repudiated with indifference.

Hallam, following in the wake of Brucker, with whom he was probably unacquainted, has repeated the stale reproaches against the scholastics, though acknowledging that he had read neither the works of the schoolmen themselves nor the historians of their philosophy (Middle Ages, ch. 9, pt. 2). But the second-hand censures of Hallam are rendered ridiculous by the measured commendations of Leibnitz, to which he inadequately refers, and by the candid admiration of Sir William Hamilton and other competent judges. Sir William, speaking of Reid's repetition of the current abuse, observes: “This is the vulgar opinion in regard to the scholastic philosophy. The few are, however, now aware that the human mind, though partially, was never more powerfully developed than during the Middle Ages” (Reid, Works [ed. Hamilton], p. 268, note; comp. Hamilton, Discuss. p. 54, note; 2d ed. St. Hilaire, De la Logique d'Aristote, pref. vol. 1, p. 5; Remusat, Abelard, 2, 282, 548). St. Hilaire justly designates “La scolastique-berceau de l'intelligence moderne.” The world cannot afford to disown any of the laborious services by which knowledge and civilization have been advanced, no matter how strange they may now appear. Nor can it wisely forget those who have labored long and earnestly in its behalf. It may always be presumed that whatever occupied the ardent endeavors of many generations had some serious meaning, whether this meaning does or does not lie open to hasty apprehension; and that it solved some serious difficulties of the time and ministered to their removal from the onward path of humanity. It is certainly blindness and arrogance to reject, without careful examination, what we do not understand, because we do not understand it; and not to understand it, because unwilling to make an effort to understand it. There  is much which is unsuited to modern habitudes of thought, much which is strange and bewildering under modern associations, and which is futile, perverse, or erroneous in the writings of the schoolmen; much that may be judiciously abandoned as having served its turn and prepared and disciplined modern intelligence. But, as Richard Baxter and Leibnitz — very dissimilar minds — both recognized, there will still remain much that is valuable and deserving of sedulous appreciation. Indeed, to those who have sipped from the original fountains, who have pondered over the divisions of Aquinas or grappled with the distinctions of Duns Scotus, there will appear no extravagance in the question of a recent writer: “What doubts have since been mooted — what difficulties suggested in morals, religion, or politics during three centuries of unfettered religious inquiry which they, the schoolmen, have not anticipated and dissected with the calmness of scientific anatomists?” (Brewer, Letters and Papers in the Reign of Henry VIII, vol. 3, p. 413. Comp. Proudhon, Creation de l'Ordre dans l'Humanite, 3, 3, § 203).

1. Origin of the Term Scholasticism. — The word “scholastic” (σχολαστικός) does not occur in classic Greek in the sense so familiar from its customary application to the philosophers of the Middle Ages. Bayle (s.v. “Aristotle”) says that it was not used in Aristotle's time to “signify a scholar, a student, or a schoolman.” It occurs four times in Aristotle himself, always with the meaning of idle or disengaged — once in distinct opposition to practical. No distinct instance of its mediaeval usage is discoverable in Stephens' Thesaurus. The earliest approximation to it presents itself in Posidonius (Athen. Deipnos. 5, 48); but it still clings to its primary meaning of unemployed, leisurely. It must be remembered that “school” had originally the same import, and that its Latin name was ludus (play). Gradually “scholastic” came to mean “characteristic of the school,” particularly a school of rhetoric — the master of such a school, a teacher of rhetoric, an advocate in the courts of law. It is employed in this last sense in a rescript of the emperor Constantius II (Cod. Theod. 8, 10, 11). It is sometimes with reference to a forensic vocation, sometimes with reference to elegant culture (which the word afterwards denoted), sometimes with reference to rhetorical instruction, that the Eastern Greeks spoke of Eulogius scholasticus, Leontius scholasticus, Sozomen scholasticus, Evagrius scholasticus, etc. The term, however, gradually lapsed into new significations, so that in the amusing account which Anna Comnena in the 12th century gives of John Italus (Alexiad, 5, 8), it is put in contrast with  polite, rhetorical accomplishment, and signifies a dialectician. The word is translated “umbratilis,” by Possinus, in his version of Anna, in accordance with its classical sense; and this rendering is not changed in the revision of this version by Schopen in the Bonn edition. It is impossible, however, to ignore its indication of logical pursuits. It probably received this significance by importation from the contemporaneous usage in the schools of the West.

The fortune of the word in the Latin language was similar to its experiences in the Greek; but there is greater facility in tracing the mutations of its meaning. It does not occur in Cicero. The younger Pliny gives umbraticus as its equivalent (9, Ephesians 2). In Quintilian, in the Dialogue on Orators, and in Aulus Gellius, it denotes “appertaining to rhetorical schools.” In Petronius it designates the pupils of such a school. In the 4th century it was used for elegant, cultivated, refined (“scholasticus, ad Graecas munditias eruditus” [Capitolin. Maximin. Jr. c. 3]). In the 5th century it meant eloquent (“scholastici ac diserti” [Salvian, De Gub. Dei, praef.]). Several of the meanings were, no doubt, concurrent. The predominant meaning, under the empire of Rome in the West, was a person accomplished in the studies of a school of rhetoric, whether as disciple, teacher, or graduate. Rhetorical education, as the preparation of Cicero and the Institutes of Quintilian abundantly attest, had early become universal or encyclopaedical instruction. As rhetorical pursuits declined and as other studies waned, while logic gradually acquired a notable preponderance in the Church and in the ecclesiastical schools, as afterwards in the rising universities of Western Europe, scholasticism became identified with logic. Logic, however, embraced, or assumed to embrace, all subjects in its rigid grasp, as is shown by the commentaries of the greater schoolmen on all the works of Aristotle, and by their violent application of the logic of the schools to all departments of knowledge and action. But the universal range claimed by rhetoric in the Roman schools of rhetoric was never renounced by those who retained the name of scholastics while substituting logic for rhetoric. The process of the transmigration of meanings is easily discernible. School study is the pursuit of those who have leisure and therefore opportunity for learning. Rhetoric became the predominant and exclusive object of school instruction, but comprehended all knowledge. Logic supplanted rhetoric. Analysis and demonstration took the place of rhetorical elegance of expression, and aspired to the dominion of all knowledge. The new teachers and pupils retained the established name; and thus the scholastic of the Middle Ages emerged out of the idler of classical antiquity. The name is early applied to the masters of the cathedral schools.

2. Nature of Scholasticism. — The inquiry into the changing import of the name scholastic is equally necessary for the due apprehension of the ordinary employment of the term and for understanding its appropriation by the scholastic philosophers. There is a large class of words which denote shifting conditions, social fluctuations, expanding or altering forms, that can be duly appreciated only by attention to their historical modifications. Civilization is a word of this kind, scholasticism is another. The definitions of scholasticism given in the dictionaries are for the most part tautological — idem per idem — and habitually partial. They convey little information to those not already acquainted with the subject; they generally proceed by cross reference. The inquirer is baffled by a game of verbal battledore and shuttlecock between the reciprocally implicated terms scholasticism, scholastic philosophy, and schoolmen. The distinctions of the historians of philosophy are of course more satisfactory, but they are seldom adequate. Brucker enters into the history of the term; but Ueberweg is almost dumb on this point. He says (Hist. Phil. 1, 355), “Scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine, with an accommodation, in cases of discrepancy between them, of the former to the latter.” Then Abelard, who did not touch theology till an advanced period of his career, was not a scholastic during his brilliant course at Paris. Others, who never touched theology at all, were never scholastics. Occam, and those who rejected ecclesiastical authority in whole or in part, were not scholastics. Then Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus ceased to be scholastics when composing their vast commentaries on Aristotle; but became so, suddenly, when commenting on Peter Lombard and submitting their speculations to the discipline of the Church. Then Roger Bacon would not be a schoolman. Evidently there is no such compendious definition of scholasticism as Ueberweg and many of his fellow historians suppose. The application of the Aristotelian logic to the exposition of Christian doctrine, and the subordination of the logical deductions to the orthodox dogmas of the Church, characterized the most brilliant period of scholasticism, and constituted scholastic theology. SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

But these characteristics did not belong to the whole period, nor to all the schoolmen, nor to all the labors of theological scholastics in any period. John Scotus Erigena with his Platonism, and Pico di Mirandola with his Cabalism were schoolmen as much as Bonaventura or Bradwardine. So also were essentially the Jew Maimonides and the Saracen Avicenna. It is necessary to regard the wavering import of the term scholasticism, to note  its various use, and to trace the progress of the scholastic procedure, in order to obtain a full knowledge of its meaning, and to detect the grounds of its diverse, and particularly of its most familiar, application.

Scholasticism, so contemplated, will be found to have meant, under the emperors of Rome, the functions of a teacher of rhetoric, embracing all knowledge in his course, then the possession of such knowledge with the refinement which it was supposed to bestow. As universal learning shrank up, even in the times of Cassiodorus, to the Trivium and Quadrivium, scholasticism suffered eclipse, but still claimed dominion over all the learning of the time. When rhetoric was supplanted by logic, scholasticism became the application of deductive reasoning to all departments of inquiry; and, at a later time, in accordance with the temper, associations, and necessities of what is regarded as distinctively the scholastic period, preeminently, though never exclusively, to theology.

Scholasticism will thus be the employment of logic, not the Peripatetic philosophy as such, in all departments of learning, whether suited to them or not — the substitution of dialectics for investigation, of authority for facts. Lord Bacon did much, but very much less than his followers, to confirm the delusion that Aristotle handled everything in subservience to the logical science which he had created. Such an error can never be entertained by any one who has read his Natural History, his Parts of Animals, his Politics, or even his Rhetoric or his Ethics. This exclusive application of logic to all subjects and on all occasions was alike the defect and the characteristic of the schoolmen, practiced, even when condemned and opposed, by Roger Bacon.

3. Origin of the Scholastic Mode of Philosophizing. — The notices of the origin of the name and of the nature of scholasticism furnish indications of the genetic development of that notable method of speculation. They do not supply the historical explanation of its growth, nor reveal its relation to the changing circumstances in the social and intellectual condition of the darkening ages which determined its appearance and progressive ascendency. Several writers, among whom may be named Brucker, St. Hilaire, Remusat, have recognized in John of Damascus the progenitor of the scholastic system. He flourished in the earlier half of the 8th century. Long before him, germs of scholasticism and scholastic tendencies may be detected in both Christian and pagan writers. There are many evidences in Aulus Gellius that eristic dialectics constituted an habitual occupation of  scholars before the middle of the 2d century (see especially Noct. Att. 1, 2). There is a manifest disposition in Tertullian and other fathers of the early Church to treat religious topics in a manner analogous to that pursued a thousand years later by the most illustrious among the schoolmen. Scholasticism was a natural growth, not an arbitrary invention. It may be deemed to have been inevitable that this mode of intellectual procedure should be pursued when a revealed religion, appealing exclusively to faith in the revelation, and whose fundamental tenets “came not by observation,” was disseminated amid a highly cultivated but skeptical society, in antagonism to previously existing systems of religious belief, and to all the conclusions of its past thought and experience.

Authority, divine authority, was the basis of the new truth, and furnished the premises for controversy and for apologetics alike. The inspired Scriptures were the expression of this divine authority, and were neither to be established by observation nor tested by experiment. In exegetics as well as in polemics there was thus a necessity of proceeding from the maxims of faith to the consequences of such maxims, which could be reached only by deduction. The need of accommodating the arguments adduced to the hostile temperaments and adverse habitudes of a pagan age would naturally soften and obscure the sharp precision and harsh angularities of dialectical demonstration. But the scholastic method, and even the scholastic subtleties and quodlibets, very soon appeared, and may be discerned in early patristic literature. When Christianity became prevalent and was established as the religion of the State, especially as there was a coincident decay of general culture and secular letters, the logical spirit, with its texts, its abstractions, its distinctions, its divisions, and its refinements, became predominant.

This tendency is very pronounced in the Confessions of St. Augustine, in his other writings, and in the productions of his contemporaries and immediate successors. It is not without reason that Augustine has been signalized as one of the chief promoters of the scholastic method. As letters continued to shrivel up, and as cultivation of intellectual graces and refinements became impossible or mistimed in the midst of social anarchy, barbarian incursion, and general wretchedness, the deductive method of argumentation and exposition would unavoidably prevail. The extension of the practice and the exclusiveness of such pursuits would also be greatly favored by the restriction of study to the ecclesiastical circle, and by the mighty task imposed upon the whole medieval period of converting the pagan barbarians who had occupied the Western empire, and of civilizing them through the instrumentality of the Christian faith to which they were to be  converted. Of course, as logic was the chief method of theological persuasion, the influence of Aristotle and of the Aristotelian spirit grew with the progress of time and with the progress of theological disputation, for there neither is nor ever can be any logic but that of Aristotle. There does not seem to be any sufficient evidence of the total oblivion of Aristotle and of Aristotle's dialectics at any period of the Middle Ages. The testimony of Ingulph may be spurious, but there are other indications of a meager acquaintance with Aristotelian logic through secondary channels; and it is admitted that the version of Porphyry's Introduction, by Boethius, was known at all times.

After the conversion of the pagans in the new kingdoms, and the definite establishment of the ecclesiastical ascendency of the Roman Church throughout the Western empire, a fresh demand and a constant provocation for the intervention of scholastic procedure arose in the ever multiplying and often pernicious heresies which occupied provincial councils, and engaged the most zealous and astute minds in their promulgation, their refutation, and their defense. A very cursory perusal of the impugned opinions, whose statement opens the several articles in the Summa of Aquinas, or of any similar summa, will show what a countless number and endless variety of dogmas required to be examined and settled for the establishment of the religious and ethical doctrine of the times. It was an inestimable service which was rendered in the long and agonizing period of the Middle Ages, in a society without other intellectual discipline or moral control, by the proposition, the ventilation, the discussion, the establishment, or the reprobation of the multitudinous perplexed problems in theology — often affecting government, society, and private conduct. It is not a question here whether the reasoning adopted, the arguments adduced, the conclusions drawn, or the decisions affirmed were correct or pernicious. The process was necessary, the task indispensable, for the effective development of European intelligence. The system does not accord with modern requirements, nor approve itself to modern modes of thought; but it inaugurated those requirements and bred those modes. Feudalism had to be swept away to make room for the growth of society and its larger expansion; but feudalism was a blessing at a time when the imperative demand of society was for confirmed authority and graduated subordination. Any “good custom will corrupt the world;” and no human custom is absolutely good or free from the taint of wrong and prospective mischief. The errors and the defects of scholasticism are nowadays manifest to all, and are habitually exaggerated. The good, “that was buried with it,” is not equally apparent or as willingly sought. It requires some knowledge  of the schoolmen, of their works, and of their times — a transference of thought from our circumstances and points of view to theirs, and dispassionate reflection — to estimate their difficulties, their aims, and their achievements. One inestimable result of their labors — it is only one — was the definite establishment of the terms of reasoning, metaphysics, and theology, and, as a consequence of their procedure, the enforcement of logical coherence of thought and of precision of language. These things were indispensable preliminaries for the development of modern tongues, modern knowledge, modern enterprise, modern society, and modern government.

That this explanation of the rise and progress of scholasticism is correct is in some measure confirmed by the exhibition of the same tendencies, under analogous circumstances, in the contemporaneous speculation of the Jews and Arabs; for it is a mistake to regard scholasticism as either an ethnical or a theological idiosyncrasy.

In the manner stated, and by steps which can be only obscurely traced, scholasticism gradually assumed that form in which it is usually contemplated by the historians of philosophy; and acquired the fullness, abundance, energy, precision, and predominance which characterized the scholastic philosophy in its most vigorous manifestation.

4. Systematic Development of Scholasticism. — John Scotus Erigena, towards the close of the 9th century, is generally regarded as the first of those distinctively entitled schoolmen, though, as has been shown above, he should not be considered the earliest scholastic. The historians of philosophy have variously distributed the course of scholastic philosophy into periods. Ueberweg, who may be taken to represent the latest prevalent view, divides the scholastic age into two parts only: 1. From Scotus Erigena to Amalric, or from the 9th to the 13th century; 2. From the 13th century to the Renaissance. He thus omits both the preliminary tendencies and the expiring efforts, important as the origin and the decadence of the system must be. Sir William Hamilton (Reid, Works, Appendix, note B, p. 815) notes John Major, of St. Andrew's (1469-1547), as “the last of the regular schoolmen;” but the spirit survived far into the next century. Brucker does not neglect the early manifestations of scholasticism, but observes that it was conceived during the centuries extending from the 5th to the 8th; that the 9th and 10th were the time of its gestation and formation; that it was born in the 11th; that it passed its boyhood and youth  in the 12th; and that it attained full manhood in the 13th. He commences the treatment of what he holds to be the scholastic philosophy proper with the beginning of the 12th century, and divides the history into three periods: 1. From Lanfranc, or Abelard and his disciple Peter Lombard, to the middle of the 13th century, and to Albertus Magnus; 2. From 1220 to Durand of St. Pourcain; 3. From 1330 to Gabriel Biel and the close of the 15th century.

That a great change took place in the scholastic philosophy at the opening of the second period, through the rivalry and energy of the recently instituted orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, is proved by the character and career of the great schoolmen, and by Roger Bacon's curious vituperation of the “youngsters” who were teaching at Paris. These youngsters — “pueri duorum ordinum studentium” (Compend. Studii, 5) were Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and their colleagues. The third period is rendered memorable by the names of Duns Scotus and William of Occam, and was marked by an excess of ingenuity, an extravagance of distinctions, and a perverse subtlety which degenerated into vain and puerile captiousness in their successors. It is from the diseased state of scholasticism in its moribund age that the general estimate of the system has been formed. But there is little justice in applying to the whole philosophy the reproaches merited by it in the years of its impotent decline.

For an acquaintance with the character and consequences of the application of scholasticism to theology, for the peculiarities of the sects of the scholastics and of the leading schoolmen, for their rivalries and their antagonisms, reference should be made to the names of the schoolmen in this Cyclopoedia; to SEE NOMINALISM, SEE REALISM, and SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

5. Literature. — The literature of scholasticism is so extensive that it would be equally impracticable and vain to undertake to give here any adequate enumeration of the principal works that have illustrated it. Among the chief sources of information are obviously the opera omnia of all the more notable schoolmen and their predecessors, from Joannes Damascenus to Gerson and Petrus Alliacus, or even down to Philip Melancthon. Next in order would come all the chief historians of philosophy. Among works of more special and immediate interest on the subject may be named — Cousin, Fragmens Philosophiques; Phil. Scolastique (Paris, 1840); Rousselot, Etudes sur la Phil. dans le Moyen  Age (ibid. 1840-42); Jourdain, Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote (ibid. 1843); Caraman, Hist. des Rev. de la Phil. en France (ibid. 1845-48); Kaulich, Gesch. der scholast. Philosophie (Prague, 1853); Haureau, La Philosophie Scolastique (Paris, 1858); Hampden, The Scholastic Philosophy, etc. (Oxford, 1862); Erdmann, Der Entwickelungsgang der Scholastik, in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie (Halle, 1865), vol. 8; Michaud, Guillaume de Champeaux et les Ecoles de Paris (Paris, 1867); De Cupely, Esprit de la Philosophie Scolastique (ibid. 1868). (G.F.H.)

## Scholastics[[@Headword:Scholastics]]

             SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

## Scholefield, Arnold[[@Headword:Scholefield, Arnold]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Nova Scotia; united himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church while quite a youth; was admitted on trial in May, 1810, from which time he traveled and labored in the work of the ministry with great acceptance and usefulness until his health failed in 1828. In 1832 he was again reported effective, and appointed to travel on Troy district, but had not traveled long before he was again rendered ineffective by paralysis, and died in 1837. He was an able and laborious minister of the Gospel, and very ardent in his religious feelings. His sermons were characterized by a peculiar richness and pleasing variety, and were usually delivered with much pathos. See Minutes of Conferences, 2, 495; Bangs, Hist. of the M. E. Church, 3, 252.

## Scholia[[@Headword:Scholia]]

             short notes of a grammatical or exegetical nature. Many scholia are found on the margin of manuscripts, or interlined, or placed at the end of a book. They have also been extracted and brought together, forming what is called Catena Patrum. SEE COMMENTARY.

## Scholiasts[[@Headword:Scholiasts]]

             writers of such brief notes on passages of Scripture. Many of the ancient Christian fathers wrote scholia (q.v.), which have come down to us, and show the views entertained of various portions of the sacred volume. Their value, of course, depends on the learning and critical acumen of the  authors. Theodoret, Theophylact, and OEcumenius are among the best of them.

## Scholten, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Scholten, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Dutch theologian and leader of the critical theological school in Holland, who died in April 1885, was in 1840 professor at Franeker, and in 1843 at Leyden. He is the author of, Disquisitio de Dei Erga Hominem Amore Principe Religionis Christianae Loco (Leyden, 1836): — De Vitando in Jesu Christi Historia Interpretanda Docetismo (1840): — De Religione  Christiana suer Ipsa Dirinitatis in Animo Humano Vindiae (1844): — De Pugna inter Theologiam atque Philosophiam Recto Utriusque Studio Tollenda (1847): — Dogmatices Christianae Initia (2d ed. 1858): — De Sacris Liferis Theologiae Nostra AEtate Libere Exculte Fointe (1857): — Geschiedenis der godsdienst en wijsbegeerte ten gebruike bij het akademische lessen (1860): — Die altesten Zeugsnisse betreffend die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, from the Dutch, by Manchot (Bremen, 1867): — Das Evangelium nach Johannes (transl. by H. Lang, Berlin, 1867): — Das alteste Evangelium, etc. (transl. by Redepenning, Elberfeld, 1869): — Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie (transl. from the 3d ed. by Redepenning, ibid. 1868; also transl. into French by A. Reville, Manuel d'Histoire Comparee de la Philosophie et de la Religion, Paris, 1861): — Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinasien (transl. by Spiegel, Berlin, 1872): — Das Paulinische Evangelium, etc. (transl. by Redepenning, Elberfeld, 1881): — Historisch-critische bijetragen naar aanleiding van de nieuwste hypothese aangaande Jezus en den Paulus der vier hoofdrieven (Leyden, k882). (B.P.).

## Scholz, Johann Martin Augustin[[@Headword:Scholz, Johann Martin Augustin]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born February 8, 1794, at Kapsdorf, Silesia, and died at Bonn in 1853, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Novum Testamentum Graece (Leipsic, 1830-35, 2 volumes): — Biblisch kritische Reise in den Jahren 1818-21 (1823): — Curae Criticae in Histor. Textus Evangeliorum, etc. (Heidelberg, 1820): — Handbuch der bibl. Archiologie (Bonn, 1834): — Reise in die Gegend zwischen Alexandriesn, etc. (Leipsic, 1822): — Die kleinen Propheten ubersetzt und erklaurt (1833): — Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments (1845-48, 3 volumes): — De Virtutibus et Vitiis Utriusque Codicum Novi Testamenti Familiae (1845). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:14, 46, 92, 102, 137, 155, 174, 175, 560, 677. (B.P.)

## Schonemann, Karl Traugott Gottlieb[[@Headword:Schonemann, Karl Traugott Gottlieb]]

             from 1799 doctor of law and professor of philosophy at Göttingen, was born in 1766 at Eisleben, and died May 2, 1802. He is known as the editor of Epistoloe Romanorum Pontificum et quoe ad eos Scriptoe sunt, a S. Clemente I usque ad Innocent. III, etc. (Göttingen, 1796). He also published Bibliotheca Hist.-liter. Patrum Latinorum a Tertulliano principe usque ad Gregorium Magnum et Isidor. Hispal. (Lips. 1792-94, 2 vols.). See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, 1, 694, 854; 2, 763. (B.P.)

## Schoner, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Schoner, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born April 15, 1749, at Rügheim, near Schweinfurt, where his father was the pastor of the place. He studied at Leipsic and Erlangen, and was deacon of St. Lawrence's at Nuremberg. In 1799 he was taken sick, and died June 18, 1818. He was an excellent, pious man and pastor; and besides other hymns, he wrote the beautiful German hymn Hinmelan, nur himmelan, which has been translated by Mills, in his Horoe Germanicoe, No. 130, “Heavenward, still heavenward.” See Sonntagsbibliothek (Bielefeld), 6, 4; Koch, Geschichte d. deutschen Kirchenliedes, 6, 399 sq.; 8, 570; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1344. (B.P.)

## Schongauer, Martin[[@Headword:Schongauer, Martin]]

             called Martin Schön, a German painter and engraver, was born about 1420, and died at Colmar Feb. 2, 1488. The paintings attributed to this artist are very numerous, but there are only a few which can be proved to be his work; among them is a panel in the church of St. Martin at Colmar. As an engraver his reputation was very high. His style is much more elevated than that of the other early German artists, and many of his heads are full of refined sentiment. His Carrying the Cross is a masterpiece; and the Temptation of St. Anthony is held in high esteem.

## Schonherr, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Schonherr, Johann Heinrich]]

             a very remarkable and influential German theosophist, was born at Memel November 30, 1770. At the age of fifteen he was sent to Königsberg to engage in trade. After a year of trial he concluded that he had not found his  calling. By great self denial he succeeded in entering and passing through a gymnasium course, so that at the age of twenty-two he was ready for the university. Even in his gymnasial course he became interested in those deep problems to which his subsequent life was given. But as yet it was a period of inner commotion. His early reverence for the Bible and orthodoxy was shaken by contact with the Kantian philosophy. At first intent on studying theology, he now wavered and began with jurisprudence. Soon he broke off from Kantian principles and endeavored, in his own way, to solve the problem of destiny and immortality. After a year at Königsberg he made an extensive journey, stopping a while at Greifswald and Rostock, and finally studying a whole year at the University of Rinteln. Here at Rinteln his system of theosophy began to take shape. It was rooted in a reaction against Kant's abstract idealism, and was a fervent grasping after realism.

He imagined that in the simple words of revelation he had found a complete philosophy of being. “I even saw into the mystery of the Trinity,” says he; “and I discovered that the world is a structure that leads to perfection.” Leaving Rinteln in 1793, he passed through Göttingen, Erfurt, and Jena, and finally stopped at Leipsic to continue the study of philosophy. Here he led a quiet, studious life until February, 1794, and showed no signs of eccentricity. But of a sudden one morning he came into the room of a friend and inquired the way to the highest mountain of Thuringia, affirming that he must repair thither at once. His manner awakened a belief of his insanity, and he was at once taken to an asylum. Here he at first refused all food. After a month he was released. He returned to Königsberg in the full conviction that he had discovered a new system of religious truth, and with the full determination to devote his life to its propagation. To university studies he gave no further attention, but, gaining his daily bread by private instruction, he explained his thoughts in private, and gradually gathered to himself a little circle of admirers. His earnest assaults upon the prevalent rationalism, and his absolute enthusiasm for the literal written word of God, made a happy impression upon many a youthful heart. Two regular weekly meetings were held, Wednesday and Sunday evenings, at which were had animated discussions on the profoundest problems of philosophy and religion.

They extended far into the night, sometimes until daybreak. Ladies also attended. Usually they closed with a hymn and a simple meal. These meetings were held not so much simply to impart a fully developed system as in order to develop and mature on all sides a number of fundamental principles which were regarded as already settled and certain. Hence Schönherr was also himself a  seeker of light as well as a giver. As to his outward manner, he was as unpretentious as a child, showing no trace of a desire to rule or to be held in extraordinary esteem. He was simply a thoroughly convinced believer. He believed that he had found the key to a fuller understanding of revelation and a deeper insight into nature, and he felt that a great regeneration of Christendom would go out from his teachings. But he had not the least intention of forming a sect; on the contrary, he was very constant in his attendance upon the regular Church services, and he joined in them with fervent devotion. Although the private meetings at Schönherr's house were never very large, still their very regularity and the striking appearance of Schönherr himself attracted the attention of the police to them. Measures were about to be taken for their suppression, when a casual meeting of Schönherr with the minister of public worship made such a favorable impression as to cause the matter to be dropped. Thenceforth he was left to labor unmolested until his death.

Among the young friends of Schönherr none contributed more than J. W. Ebel (q.v.) to bring his teachings into public notice. Ebel had studied at Königsberg and received the degree of Ph.D. at Leipsic. In 1810 he obtained a place as preacher in Königsberg, where his intimacy with Schönherr was renewed. His preaching soon invited general attention. His manner was attractive, his language imaginative, and his chief themes (conversion and personal holiness) almost novel. Twice the clerical authorities were impelled to call him to give account of his doctrines and of his relations to Schönherr. But no good reason could yet be seen for interfering with him. These failures to find aught against him, especially the last one, in 1814, contributed to give even greater prominence to his ministry and his theosophic views. In 1816 he attained to the most prominent place in the Church of the city. This prominence soon opened the way for the conversion of not a few eminent persons. Even professors of the university and noble dukes and ladies were brought into close intimacy with Schönherr. In the year 1819, however, a violent disagreement arose between Ebel and his master.

Ebel had ripened into spiritual independence, and could no longer concede the infallibility to Schönherr which the whole circle had hitherto passively admitted. Besides, he could not admit the scripturalness of some of the later developments of his master's system. And when Schönherr actually proposed physical castigation as a means of hastening on the kingdom of God, and endeavored to sanction it by Scripture texts, Ebel took direct issue with  him, and ventured to intimate to him that, while starting well. he had stopped short and was yet entangled in the flesh. Thenceforth there were two parties, the larger one following Ebel. Schönherr continued with his diminished circle just as before. In 1823 he made a journey to St. Petersburg, and the next year another to Berlin; but he made no permanent impression. In 1825 he fell upon the insane notion of constructing a ship which was to move without sail against wind and stream, and to serve as a place of refuge for his followers amid the terrible judgments that were soon to fall upon the world. He actually constructed it. On being launched, it went to pieces amid the derision of the witnessing multitude. This came near entirely breaking up his little band of followers; yet it did not in the least shake his faith in the truth of his system or in his divine call. But his career was now about run. Broken down in health by his self mortifications and labors, he retired to Spittelhof, in the environs of Königsberg, and there died of consumption, Oct. 15, 1826, attended only by a single maid servant, who was faithful to him to the last.

What are the outlines of Schönherr's system? He never fully reduced them to writing. Only two small tractates are all he ever published: Der Sieg der göttlichen Offenbarung, and Vom Sieg der göttlichen Offenbarung (both Königsberg, 1804). But these essays contain only the embryo of his system. In addition there were found among his posthumous papers some brief notes, mostly aphoristic in form. De la Chevalerie, a disciple, also published abstracts of some of his lectures (Königsberg, 1835). All these data were used in preparing the book Grundzüge (Leipsic, 1852). From these sources, and from the works of Ebel and Diestel, Schönherr's most prominent disciples, the following not very clear outlines of a system may be gathered. The actual universe consists of a dualism; but the dualism can and should rise to unity. At the basis of the universe there are two primitive principles or beings. They are equally primitive and are personal and free. These beings exist in space, have a globular form, and are of the colors white and black. There is but one difference between them: the one is strong, the other weak. This difference, rightly taken, is a difference of activity and passivity. The cooperation of the two generates the world of reality. As the system grew towards self consistency, the two principles assumed the forms of spirit and nature. But in Schönherr's thought they were rather of the nature of water (the weaker) and fire (the stronger). Fire and water lie at the basis of all reality. From their union and interaction arise the universe and God. The fire poured its light upon the water, and  thus became self conscious. By the mutual action of the two a mutual effect was wrought — namely, the Word.

he outer form of the Word is Day. The two first principles are the Mosaic Elohim. The stronger one is Jehovah; the weaker one is matter. From the absolute submissiveness of the latter to the former results the absolute harmony and order of the universe. To preserve and virtualize this harmony is the object of creation and providence. Creation is but another word for the plastic operation of the stronger upon the feebler principle. The Trinity is thus explained: the primitive essence of God is fire or light; this is the Spirit. The immanent power of God is the Father. The product of the essence and the power is consciousness, or the Word — that is, the Son of God. The contact of the Spirit with matter produced not only the Son of God, but also the whole series of spiritual beings. The kingdom of evil was produced by one of these highest beings turning away from light and allying himself with matter. The origin of sin in man is explained in the most realistic manner. Man, tempted by Lucifer, took into his blood the destructive substance of the tree of good and evil. Through the blood the evil is propagated as depravity in all after generations. The theory of redemption is also very realistically conceived. By the fall man disturbed the harmony of the two principles of being. By redemption this harmony is reestablished. But how? By a realistic implantation into nature of a healthful, harmonious leaven. Yet how? Thus: man's life lies in his blood. By the corruption of man's blood the whole life of nature is poisoned and depraved. Inside of humanity there is, therefore, no healthful starting point. The healthful leaven must then be furnished from on high. It is furnished in the ideal human person of Jesus Christ, in whom the absolute mastery of the active over the passive principle is realized. The healthful, undepraved blood of Jesus is the redeeming principle. When he permitted the spirit of disorder to shed his precious blood on the cross, this blood flowed out and over into the realm of nature, or passivity and sin; and there it became the potent leaven which will ultimately transfigure, and glorify, and introduce order into the whole field of darkness.

As the spilling of the actual blood of Jesus upon the lap of nature is the means of regenerating the cosmos, so the right partaking of the blood of Christ in the eucharist is the means of regenerating the depravity of human nature. As with redemption, so with the resurrection, the ascension, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. All are explained in a realistic and physical manner.  As to the proximate coming of the kingdom of God on earth, Schönherr had peculiar and very detailed views. How soon the state of perfection should break in depended largely on the use of human freedom. To freedom a very high role is attributed. By freedom man, in some sense, takes the place of God. By freedom he interferes with omnipotence and omniscience. How he will help to shape the future history of the universe is not absolutely foreknown even by God. It lies within the discretion of man, by fidelity to his own possibilities, to inaugurate a new phase in the history of humanity. But there are two absolutely differing classes of men. There are central natures and subservient natures. The latter revolve about the former as planets about the sun. Let a central nature only be faithful, and he carries a whole galaxy with him into the realm of light. As such a central nature Schönherr unquestionably regarded himself. Faith in himself was the very essence of his character. Nor did he ever waver in this. Hence his oft expressed anticipation of a speedy transformation of humanity. He would be faithful, and would carry his brethren with him over into the realm of light.

After the death of Schönherr, the pastor Ebel took up the work of his master. It was a principle of the whole system that the essential thing is not knowledge, but faithfulness. Upon this maxim Ebel proceeded. In the pulpit and before the multitude he preached only the common doctrines of the catechism; but in private he gathered about his own person an elect circle of the initiated. Among them were great lords and ladies, professors and students. Best known among them are pastor Diestel and the commentator Olshausen. These were mostly “central natures;” while the uninitiated masses were but subordinate natures. The two corresponded to the two primitive principles of being, the active and the passive. But the main leader of the circle was Ebel. As the circle drew closer around him, the personal confession of every secret sin was introduced as a special means of rapid advancement in holiness. This gave Ebel an almost papal power over the consciences of the circle. It proved the means of a violent outburst which took place in 1826. Many of the chiefs of the circle left it and at once began an assault upon Ebel. For a while Ebel was prostrated by sickness, and dropped from the public attention. In 1834 he came again before the public. But a fresh storm broke out, and very soon involved Ebel and Diestel in one of the most notorious lawsuits of modern times. The two preachers were charged with unchurchly doctrines, immoral practices, and heresy. The trial lasted from 1835 to 1841, and resulted in deposing the accused  from office, but in acquitting them of intentional immorality. The result was to entirely discredit the theosophy of Schönherr. Thenceforth it has had no organic existence, though isolated theologians have, here and there, studied it with more or less admiration. See, besides the works already mentioned, Die Schutzwehr (Königsberg, 1834); Geyenseitige Liebe (ibid. 1834); Verstand u. Vernunft im Bunde (Leipsic, 1837); Diestel, Ein Zeugenverhör (ibid. 1838); Grundzüge (ibid. 1852) from Schönherr's papers; Compas de Route (Königsberg and Mohrungen, 1857), vol. 1; Life of Rudolf Stier (N.Y. 1874), p. 141, 142; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 620-647; Hahnenfeld, Die religiöse Bewegung zu Königsberg (Leipsic, 1858). (J.P.L.)

## School[[@Headword:School]]

             occurs in the A.V. but once (Act 19:9) as the rendering of the Greek σχολή (from which the English word is derived), meaning originally leisure; hence, a place of tuition. SEE TYRANNUS.

## School Brothers and Sisters[[@Headword:School Brothers and Sisters]]

             collective names of numerous associations in the Roman Catholic Church, devoted to the education of the young. The first (the Ursulines) were established at Brescia, 1537. SEE IGNORANTINES.

I. School Brothers. — In the present article only those congregations are mentioned whose members are not priests. The most important school brotherhoods are:

1. The “Brethren of the Christian Schools,” founded by Jean Baptiste de la Salle.

2. The “Christian Brothers,” founded by Rev. E. Rice, at Waterford, Ireland. These have their central house and superior general in Dublin, and numerous establishments in Great Britain, Ireland, and the British colonies.

3. The “Brothers Marists,” or “Christian Brothers of the Society of Mary,” founded at Bordeaux, France, in 1817, by abbe Guillaume Joseph Cheminade; approved by pope Gregory XVI in 1839. The society was introduced into the United States by archbishop Purcell in 1849, and had in  1874, 23 establishments in Ohio, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Louisiana, and Texas.

4. The “Lamennaisian Brothers,” or “Congregation of Christian Instruction,” founded in Brittany, in 1820, by abbe Jean de la Mennais. They reckoned in 1875 about 800 members and 150 establishments in France.

5. The “Brothers of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary,” founded in 1821 at Le Puy, France, by abbe Coindrin. They started in the United States at Mobile in 1847, and in 1874 had establishments in Mississippi, New Orleans, Kentucky, and Indiana.

6. The “Xaverian Brothers,” founded at Bruges, Belgium, in 1839, by Theodore Jacques Ryken. They were especially intended to labor in the United States, and were introduced by archbishop Spaulding into Louisville in 1854. In 1875 they had six schools there, one in Baltimore, and the St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys near the city.

7. The “Brothers of Charity,” founded in Belgium in 1809, by canon P. Triest, for the education of blind and deaf mutes and training of orphans. In January, 1874, they took charge of the Industrial School of the Angel Guardian in Boston, Mass.

II. School Sisters. — The following are the most important of these congregations:

1. The “Ursulines” (q.v.).

2. The “Sisters of the Visitation of Our Lady,” founded at Annecy, Savoy, in 1610, by St. Francis of Sales and St. Jeanne Frangoise de Chantal. In 1641, at the death of the latter, the order numbered 87 establishments, and in 1700, 160 establishments, with 6600 members. It had one establishment in the United States in Washington, in 1808; and in 1890 others in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. It was first approved by pope Urban VIII in 1626.

3. The “Sisters of Notre Dame.” SEE NOTRE DAME, CONGREGATION OF.

4. “Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur,” founded at Amiens, France, in 1804, by pere Joseph Desire Varin, Julie Billiart, and Marie Louise Francoise Blin de Bourdon, and transferred to Namur, Belgium, in 1809. Its object was to educate girls of the middle class; and it was approved by pope Gregory XVI June 28, 1844. It spread rapidly through Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Ireland; and the English government intrusted to the order the direction of normal schools for Roman pupil teachers. They were called to Cincinnati in 1840 by archbishop Purcell, to Oregon by archbishop Blanchet in 1843, to California in 1851, and to Guatemala in 1859. In 1871 they had 82 establishments (20 in the United States) and 26,000 pupils.

5. “Ladies of the Sacred Heart.” SEE SACRED HEART, LADIES OF THE. These have as their primary object the teaching of young girls; others add the care of orphans, visitation of sick and poor, and the direction of hospitals. Such are

(1) the “Ladies of the Incarnate Word,” founded in 1625 by Jeanne Marie Chezard de Matel, and approved by Urban VIII in 1633. They have many establishments in France, and eight in Texas.

(2) The ‘“Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ,” founded Aug. 15, 1849, at Dernbach, Nassau, by Katharine Kaspar; approved by Pius IX in 1860, and confirmed in 1870. They first established themselves in this country at Fort Wayne, Ind., August, 1868. In 1875 they numbered 45 sisters and five houses.

(3) The “Sisters of Our Lady of Charity,” or “Eudist Sisters,” founded at Caen, Normandy, by abbe Jean Eudes in 1641. In 1835 they became known as the “House of the Good Shepherd.” SEE SHEPHERD, HOUSE OF THE GOOD.

(4) The “Presentation Nuns,” founded at Cork, Ireland, in 1777, by Miss Nano Nagle, for visiting and teaching, but have since become strictly cloistered. Their first establishment in America was at St. John's, Newfoundland; and in the United States, in New York city, Sept. 8, 1874.

(5) “Sisters of Mercy” (q.v.).

(6) “Sisters of Charity.” SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF.

(7) The “Gray Nuns,” or” Sisters of Charity of Montreal.” SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF.

(8) “Sisters of St. Joseph” (q.v.). See Appletons' Cyclop. s.v.; Barnum, Romanism as it Is.

## School, Sunday[[@Headword:School, Sunday]]

             SEE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

## Schoolmaster[[@Headword:Schoolmaster]]

             is the inexact rendering in Gal 3:24-25 of παιδαγωγός (“ instructor,” 1Co 4:15), which does not signify a poedagogue in the modern sense, but a person, usually a slave or freedman, to whose care the boys of a family were anciently committed at the age of six or seven years, who watched over their physical and moral training and accompanied them to the public schools and elsewhere, or provided them with teachers (παιδομαθεῖς, Quintilian, 1, 11), but did not himself instruct them. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antig. s.v. “Paedagogue.”

## Schoolmen[[@Headword:Schoolmen]]

             See SCHOLASTICISM.

## Schools, Alexandrian[[@Headword:Schools, Alexandrian]]

             SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS.

## Schools, Christian[[@Headword:Schools, Christian]]

             At a very early period, schools were established in connection with the churches; and if no building was provided for this purpose, the schools were taught in the baptistry and the vestry. This is evident from the observation which Socrates makes upon the education of Julian the Apostate — “that in his youth he frequented the church, where, in those days, the schools were kept.” He speaks of the schools of grammar and rhetoric, which, it seems, were then taught at Constantinople in some apartment belonging to the church. Catechetical and charity schools were also established, especially for instruction in scriptural knowledge. The second Council of Chalons, in 813, enacted that bishops should set up schools to teach ordinary literature and a knowledge of the Scriptures. The sixth General Council of Constantinople recommended the setting up of charity schools in all the country churches. One of its canons is to this purpose: “that presbyters in country towns and villages should have  schools to teach all such children as were sent to them, for which they should exact no reward nor take anything, except the parents of the children thought fit to make them any charitable present by way of voluntary oblation. Another of those canons speaks of schools in churches and monasteries, subject to the bishop's care and direction; from which we may conclude that schools were anciently very common appendants, both of cathedral and country churches” (Bingham, Antiq. of the Christ. Church, 1, 314). SEE PAEDAGOGICS.

## Schools, Hebrew[[@Headword:Schools, Hebrew]]

             As this subject is intimately connected with the question of education and mode of instruction, which cannot be well dealt with separately, we propose to discuss historically these three topics in the present article, which is grounded upon the Biblical notices and the later Talmudical references. SEE EDUCATION.

I. In the Patriarchal Period. — We have nothing indicative of any place of public instruction in Scripture earlier than the Book of Samuel. But it is reasonable to suppose that, as the world became peopled, some measures were taken for the instruction of the young in all those parts of learning that were then known; and particularly among those persons who had the knowledge of the true God, who would naturally be anxious that the seeds of religious learning should be timely sown in their children's minds, and that they should be instructed in everything appertaining to divine rites and worship, of which we have reason to believe that singing and sacred poetry formed a large part. The Jewish doctors, indeed, have given us decided assertions on the subject of primitive teaching. They say that Adam instructed his posterity, and that Enoch succeeded him in the office. Enoch, we know, was a prophet (Jud 1:14); and in the later parts of the Old Test. we shall see that prophets were public instructors. The Arabians have traditions of Enoch under the name of Edris; that he wrote thirty volumes of revelations; that he was the first who knew astronomy and arithmetic, and wrote with the pen. Eusebius says he was the first who taught the knowledge of the stars, in which he was instructed by the angels of God, SEE ENOCH; that on his translation to heaven he was succeeded by Noah, a preacher, or teacher, of righteousness (2Pe 2:5). The next great public instructor, according to the rabbins, was Abraham, concerning whom Josephus relates (Ant. 1, 8) that he taught the Egyptians astronomy and arithmetic. The ancient historians Berosus and Hecatous commend his  learning; and Eupolimus writes “that he was superior to all men in wisdom, and taught astronomy to the Phoenicians.” The Targum also countenances the idea that Abraham taught in Haran. Jacob, according to the Jewish doctors, devoted himself to teaching instead of living the life of a hunter, like Esau; for (Gen 25:27) “he was a plain man, dwelling in tents,” is expressed by the Targums “he was a perfect man, a minister of the house of doctrine” (i.e. a school of instruction); but all this is mere fancy.

II. From the Exode to the Captivity. — Being under a theocracy, and engaged almost exclusively in pastoral; and agricultural pursuits, it was most important that the Hebrews, in the early stages of their existence, should educate their youth in a preeminently religious, practical, and simple manner. The parents, upon whom the education of the children at first devolved, were therefore strictly enjoined to instruct their offspring in the precepts of the law, in the fear of God (Deu 4:9-10; Deu 31:13; Deu 32:46), and in the symbols which represented the dealings of Providence with their nation in past days, and which were evidently designed to excite the curiosity of the children and to elicit inquiry, thus furnishing the parents with pictorial illustrations to facilitate the education of those committed to their care (Exo 12:26-27; Exo 13:8; Exo 13:14-15; Deu 6:8-9; Deu 6:20, etc.). This work of education was not to be put off for certain occasions, but was to be prosecuted at all times; no opportunity was to be lost. The father was enjoined, in sitting down with his family at the table, at home, abroad, before retiring in the evening, and after getting up in the morning, to train his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Deu 6:7). The law of God powerfully supported the authority of parents in this task by the injunction of filial obedience contained in the decalogue, as well as by the heavy punishment inflicted upon refractory children (Exo 20:12; Exo 21:15; Lev 20:9; Deu 21:18-21). Still the rigor of parental authority was not to be the sole operative power in the education of children. Parents are reminded that their example may lead their children to happiness or misery (Exo 20:5-6; Deu 4:10; Deu 5:9; Deu 30:19; Deu 32:46-47). The force of example in the education of children is most beautifully described in the praise of a royal mother who, with “the law of love upon her tongue,” Instilled noble sentiments into the heart of her children (Pro 31:1-9; Pro 31:25); and such loving words are represented as producing an indelible impression in the picture of a son who, with pious gratitude, dwells upon the wholesome lessons which his father imparted to him in early youth (4:3, etc.). Parents are, moreover,  advised not to adopt the same indiscriminate process of teaching with all children, but to adapt their instruction to every youth (על פי דרכו) according to his age and inclination, so that he may abide thereby (12:6).

That reading and writing must have formed part of education from the very settlement in Palestine is evident from the fact that the Israelites were commanded to write the precepts of the law upon the door posts and gates of their respective houses, SEE MEZUZAH, in order to be continually reminded of their obligations to their Creator (Deu 6:9; Deu 20:20). They were, moreover, enjoined to write the injunctions upon great stones (באר הטב) very plainly, immediately upon their crossing the Jordan (27:2-8), so that they might easily be read by every Israelite. Now these admonitions unquestionably presuppose that the people at large could read plain writing; that the deciphering of these memorials was a religious duty; and that it must, therefore, have formed an essential part in the strictly religious education of children. Besides, the manner in which some parts of the sacred oracles were written clearly indicates that the inspired writers reckoned upon the ability of the people to read. Thus the frequent play upon words, as, for instance, in Gen 6:8, where “Noah found favor,” is obtained by a transposition of the letters in the name נה into חן; Gen 38:7, where “Er... was wicked” is obtained by a transposition of the letters in the name ערinto רע; the alphabetical portions of the Old Test. (Psalms 9, 10, 25, 34, 38, 111, 112, 119, 145; Pro 31:10, etc.; the Lamentations), which were intended to assist the memory and mark the gradation of ideas; the substitution of ששfor בבל(Jer 25:26; Jer 51:4), לב קמיfor כשדים(51:1), by taking the letters of the alphabet in their reverse order, would have been utterly useless and most unintelligible had not the people for whom they were intended been able to read. If we bear in mind that the understanding of the sacred oracles was not the peculiar prerogative of the priestly caste, but was enjoined upon every Israelite, it becomes self evident that the knowledge of reading and writing, which, as we have seen, is so inseparable from the understanding of the Scriptures, must have formed a prominent part in the education of children whose sole training was the understanding of the Scriptures. For the same reason arithmetic must have been taught; as the days of the week, the months, the festivals, etc., were not designated by proper names, but by numerals. The numbers occurring in the Old Test. reach to hundreds of thousands; and we have, moreover, instances of addition (Num 1:22, etc.; Num 26:7, etc.), subtraction (Lev 25:27; Num 3:19; Num 3:43; Num 3:46), multiplication (Lev 5:8; Lev 27:16-18; Num 3:46-50), and division (Lev 25:27-50). In fact, every art or science which occurs or is alluded to in the Old Test., and upon the understanding of which depended the understanding of the Scriptures, must to some extent have formed a part of the strictly religious Jewish education.

We have already seen that the education of the children devolved upon the parents. They were the teachers in ordinary cases. This natural duty must have been a pleasant task, a welcome occupation, and a pastime to a people who led a rural life, and whose Sabbaths and festivals freed them from labor a sixth part of the year. SEE FESTIVAL. In these leisure hours the parents, who were strictly forbidden to engage in any secular work, were in constant contact with their children; and the many symbols, rites, and ceremonies on those occasions were used by them as so many illustrated narratives of the dealings of God. We need, therefore, not wonder that the name school does not occur in the Bible previous to the Babylonian captivity; before the Jews were entangled in foreign affairs; before commercial transactions with other nations and other matters had taken so many of the people away from their homes and deprived their children of their natural teachers. The traditional opinion that by שבת תחכמני (2 Samuel 33:8) is meant a sort of academy (the Midrash, the Chaldee Paraphrase, Kimchi, etc.), or that דלתתי (Pro 8:34) denotes בית המדרש(see Rashi, ad loc.), is purely gratuitous.

But though there were no national or elementary schools before the exile, there were cases in which professional teachers had to be resorted to, e.g. when the high position or official duties of the parents rendered parental teaching impossible, or when the parents were in any way incapacitated, when the child's abilities to learn surpassed the father's capabilities to teach, or where the son was preparing himself for a vocation different from that of his father. For such exceptional cases teachers existed from a very early period, as we have seen above. We find that Bezaleel and Aholiab were qualified by God as teachers (ולהורת נתן בלבו) in certain departments. The Psalmist speaks of his having had many teachers ( מכל מלמדי השכלתי [Psa 119:99]). Both teachers and pupils are mentioned in connection with the temple choir (1Ch 15:22; 1Ch 25:8); and the prophets, who, by virtue of their superior piety, high attainments, large acquaintance with the political affairs of the world, delivered public  lectures on the festivals (2Ki 4:22-23), instructed young men who aspired to a better education in order to fit themselves for public service (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 10:10, etc.; 2Ki 2:3, etc.; 4:38, etc.; 6:1, etc.).

As for the so-called school of prophets, no such term occurs in the Old Test. The institution, however, is substantially referred to in several passages which speak of the “sons of the prophets” (1Ki 20:35; 2Ki 2:5, etc.), showing some kind of a college for the instruction of the prophetical order from the time of Samuel onward. The intimations on the subject are, indeed, obscure, yet sufficiently clear to warrant the general belief in their existence. In later times they were doubtless merged in the regular synagogical schools referred to below. SEE PROPHETS, SONS OF.

III. From the Babylonian Captivity to the Close of the Talmud. — A new epoch in the education of the Jews began with their return from Babylon. In the captivity, the exiled Jews had to a great extent forgotten their vernacular Hebrew, and they became incompetent to understand their sacred oracles. Ezra, the restorer of the law, as he is called, found it therefore necessary, immediately on their return to Jerusalem, to gather around him those who were skilled in the law, and with their assistance trained a number of public teachers. The less distinguished of these teachers went into the provincial towns of Judaea, gathered disciples, and formed synagogues; while the more accomplished of them remained in Jerusalem, became members of the Great Synagogue, and collected large numbers of young men, whom they instructed in all things appertaining to the law, in the prophets, and in the sayings of the sages of old (Sirach 2, 9-11; Mishna, Aboth, 1, 1). Scrolls were given to children upon which were written passages of Scripture, such as Shema (i.e. Deu 6:4), or the Hallel (i.e. Psalms 114-118, 136), the history of the creation to the deluge (Gen 1:1 to Gen 8:1), or Leviticus 1:18 (comp. Jerusalem Talmud, Megilla, 3, 1; Gittin, 60 a; Sopherim, 5, 9). The course of study pursued in the metropolis was more extensive (Prolog. to Ecclus. and Sir 38:24, etc.; Sir 39:1, etc.), that of provincial towns more limited, while the education of the small and more remote places or villages almost exclusively depended upon what the inhabitants learned when they went up to Jerusalem to celebrate the festivals, and was therefore very insignificant. Hence the phrase ם הארוֹ, country people, came to denote the uneducated, the illiterate; just as paganus, or pagan, a countryman or  villager, is for a similar reason used for heathen; while urbanus, urbane, or an inhabitant of a city, denotes an educated man.

The schools now began to increase in importance; and the intercourse of the Jews with the Babylonians, the Persians, and the Greeks widened their notions of education, and made them study foreign languages and literature and Hebraize their philosophy. The Essenes, who found it necessary to separate themselves from the nation because of their foreign innovations, also devoted themselves to the education of the children; but their instruction was confined to the divine law and to morals (Josephus, War, 11, 8, 12). SEE ESSENES.

Simon ben-Shetach (B.C. 80) has the merit of having introduced superior schools into every large provincial town, and ordained that all the youths from the age of sixteen should visit them (Jerusalem Kethuboth, 8, 11), introducing government education. So popular did these schools become that while in the pre-exilian period the very name of schools did not exist, we now find in a very short time no less than eleven different expressions for school, e.g. אליסוס = ἄλσος, or אליסס = ἰλεός (Midrash Coh. 91); אסבולא, or אסכול י= σχολή (Midrash Shir Hashir, 15 a); בי מדרשא, or more frequently בית המדרש (Yebam. 24 b; Aboth, 5, 14); בית אולפן, house of learning (Jonath. on Exo 33:7); בית הספר', the house of books (Midrash Echa, 70 b); בית סופר, the house of the teacher (ibid. 77 b); בית רבן, the house of the master (Baba Bathra, 21 a); בית תלמוד, the house of instruction (Gittin, 58 a); ישיבה, or מתיבתא, the seat, i.e. where the disciples sat at the feet of their master; כרם, the vineyard (Rashi on Yebam. 42 b); and סדרא, an array, where the disciples were arrayed according to their seniority and acquirements (Cholin, 173 b). The etymologies of some of these words, and the signification of the others, give us in a very striking manner the progressive history of Jewish education, and tell us what foreign elements were introduced into Jewish paedagogy. Some idea may be formed of the deep root juvenile education had struck in the hearts of the Jews from the following declaration in the Talmud: “The world is preserved by the breath of the children in the schools;” “A town in which there is no school must perish;” “Jerusalem was destroyed because the education of children was neglected” (Sabbath, 119, b).

As the national education of this period is that which the apostles and the first disciples of Christ received, and as this must be of the utmost  importance and interest to Christians of the present day, we shall now briefly state what the Talmud and the Midrashim consider to constitute the proper education of a respectable Jew, and give their notions of schools and the mode of instruction. We must begin with the schools. A school or teacher was required for every twenty-five children; when a community had only forty children, they might have one master and an assistant (Baba Bathra, 21 a). Schools must neither be established in the most densely crowded parts of the town (Pesachim, 112 a), nor near a river which has to be crossed by an insecure bridge (Baba Bathra, 21), so as not to endanger the health or lives of the children. The proper age for a boy to go to school is six years (Kethuboth, 50 a); before that time the father must instruct his son.

Thus it is related that R. Chija ben-Abba would never eat his breakfast before he had repeated with his son the lesson which he gave him on the previous day, and taught him at least one new verse (Kiddush. 30 a). At the age of five a boy had to study the Bible, at ten the Mishna, and at fifteen the Talmud (Aboth, 5, 21). Great care was taken that the books from which instruction was imparted should be correctly written (Pesachim, 112 a), and that the lessons taught, especially from the Bible, should be in harmony with the capacities and inclinations of the children (Aboda Zara, 19 a; Berach. 63 a), practical (Kiddush. 40 b), few at a time, but weighty (Vayikra Rabba, 103). The parents never ceased to watch that their children should be in the class at the proper time. We are told that Rabba ben-Huna never partook of his breakfast till he had taken his son to school (Kiddush. 30 a). Josephus, therefore, did not at all exaggerate when, writing against Apion, he said, “Our principal care of all is to educate our children” (Apion, 1, 12). “If any of us is asked about our laws, he will more readily tell them all than he will tell his own name, and this in consequence of our having learned them as soon as ever we became sensible of anything, and of our having them, as it were, engraven on our souls. Our transgressors of them are but few, and it is impossible, when any do offend, to escape punishment” (ibid. 2, 19). In a similar manner Philo expresses himself: “The Jews looking upon their laws as oracles directly given to them by God himself, and having been instructed in this doctrine from their very earliest infancy, they bear in their souls the images of the commandments contained in these laws as sacred” (Legat. ad Cajum, § 31, Mang. 2, 577). “They are taught, in a manner, from their very swaddling clothes, by their parents and teachers and instructors, and even before that by their holy laws, and also by the unwritten maxims and customs, to believe that there is but one God their Father and the Creator of the world”  (ibid. § 16, Mang. 2, 562). Of Timothy we are told that from a child he knew the Holy Scriptures (ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οιδας [2Ti 3:15]); and a similar statement we find in the Apocryphal book Susannah, 2Ti 3:3.

From all this we can presume that the education and instruction of the children at first devolved upon the parents, who were the teachers, and who in their leisure hours, especially on Sabbaths and festivals, illustrated the many symbols, rites, and ceremonies which were used on different occasions. The importance of education having now become more and more realized, the foundation of schools became more and more a matter of necessity; and the man who immortalized his name by establishing elementary schools was Jesus of Gimlo, who fell by the hands of the zealots during the siege of Jerusalem. After that time children were not allowed to go to school from one city into another; the inhabitants of each city could be obliged to have a school and a teacher (Baba Bathra, 21 a), and it was even forbidden to live in a city where there was no school (Sanhedrin, 17 a). The number of schools now increased, and flourished throughout the length and breadth of the land; and though it seems exaggerated when the Talmud states that there were 400 elementary schools in Bechar, each having 400 teachers with 400 children each (Gittin, 58 b), and that there were 1000 pupils in the house of the father of Rabban Simeon ben-Gamaliel who were instructed in the Thora, or law, and in the Greek (Baba Kama, 83 a), it is certain that the number of schools, teachers, and pupils must have been large in every great place. Maimonides thus describes the school: “The teacher sat at the head, and the pupils surrounded him, as the crown the head, so that every one could see the teacher and hear his words. The teacher did not sit on a chair while the pupils sat on the ground, but all either sat on chairs or on the ground. Formerly it was customary for the teacher to sit and the pupil to stand; but shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem it was so arranged that both the teacher and scholar sat” (Jad Hachazaka H.T.T. 3, 2). No unmarried person could teach (Kiddush. 82 b). and no choleric person could be a teacher (Aboth, 2, 7).

The teacher was to be respected by the pupil; yea, the latter was expected to show him greater respect than his own father, and to entertain for him a warmer attachment (Aboth, 4, 15; Pesachim, 22 b; Sabbath, 119 b; Horayoth, 13 a; Baba Metsia, 33 a). But, on the other hand, the teacher was, both by word and example, to incite his pupils to everything good and noble; he was to endeavor to secure the confidence, the respect, and the affection, both of parents and children; the latter he was to treat rather with kindness than with rigor. As to the objects the  teacher had to teach, the national literature of the people was the main object. As soon as the child could read, the teacher commenced reading Leviticus or Torath Cohanim, and the reason why this book was to be read first was because the little ones are innocent and pure, and the sacrifices symbolize purity, therefore “let the pure ones come and study the law of restoring purity by the sacrifice” (Vayikra Rabba, § 7). The curriculum in the study of the law being finished, that of the Mishna began, to be followed by that of the Gemara; the latter, however, belonged to the higher schools. Besides the national literature, languages were also taught, especially the Greek. Thus we read of Rabbi, who said, “What is the use of the Syriac language in Palestine?

Let any one study either the Hebrew or the Greek” (Gittin, 28 b; Sotah, 49 a; Baba Kama, 82 b). Besides the linguistic studies, they also studied astronomy, mathematics, and natural sciences. It seems that gymnastic exercises also originally belonged to the curriculum, but were afterwards interdicted as leading to dangerous contact and assimilation with heathens (Aboda Zara, 18 b). Beating, if necessary, with a strap, never with a rod, was to be the principal means of correction; and an instance is mentioned where a teacher was deposed for too great severity. The alphabet was taught by drawing the letters on a board till the children remembered them. In reading, well corrected books were to be used, and the child was to point to the words as he spelled them. The teacher was to make the lesson as plain as possible, and not to lose patience if it was not immediately understood. It was one of the principal duties of an instructor of youth to impress upon their minds and hearts the lessons of morality and chastity. To acquire fluency, pupils were to read aloud, and certain mnemonic rules were devised to facilitate the committing to memory. The number of hours during which junior classes were to be kept in school was limited. As the close air of the schoolroom might prove detrimental during the heat of the day, schools were closed between ten o'clock A.M. and three P.M. For similar reasons school hours were limited to four hours a day during the period from the 17th Thamus to the 9th Ab, and the teacher forbidden to chastise his pupils during these months. The paramount importance which public instruction had assumed in the life of the nation, we can see from sayings like those above cited: “Jerusalem was destroyed because the instruction of the young was neglected” (Sabbath, 119 b); “The world is only saved by the breath of the school children” (ibid.); “A town in which there is no school must perish” (ibid.). The higher schools, or “kallahs,” met during certain months in the year only.

Three weeks before the term, the dean prepared the students for  the lectures to be delivered by the rector: and so arduous became the task, as the number of the disciples increased, that in time no less than seven deans had to be appointed. Yet the mode of teaching was not that of our modern universities. The professors did not deliver lectures which the disciples, like the student in Faust, could “comfortably take home in black and white.” Here all was life, movement, debate. Question was met by counter question; answers were given wrapped up in allegories or parables; the inquirer was led to deduce the questionable point for himself by analogy — the nearest approach to the Socratic method. The New Test. furnishes many specimens of this method of instruction. The extent of instruction imparted in these schools embraced almost all sciences preserved in the Talmud. An important part of education, as we shall more particularly see below, was the learning of a trade. Thus we find among the most celebrated “doctors” tentmakers, sandal makers, weavers, carpenters, tanners, bakers, cooks. Besides the elementary schools, which were chiefly intended for popular education, there were, as already intimated, also superior colleges, at first confined to Jerusalem, under the management of the presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim, the Sopherim, or “scribes” and “doctors,” as they are called in the New Test., and members of the Sanhedrim, who made it one of their principal objects to train young men destined to become the teachers and judges of Israel, and the bearers of “the traditions of the fathers” (Aboth, 1, 1). Gradually these academies were multiplied in the metropolis, and spread over all the countries where the Jews resided. Akbara, Lydda, Ushach, Sepphoris, Tiberias, Jabne, Nares, Nahardea, Machuza, Selki, Shakan-Zib (El-Sib), Pumbaditha, Sora, and Alexandria, in the process of time, became distinguished for their seats of learning. The following are the presidents and vice-presidents of the colleges which were the depositories of the traditions of the fathers and the supreme arbiters in the sphere of morals and education, together with the most distinguished masters and disciples under each presidency, both in Palestine and Babylon, to the close of the Talmud, in their chronological order (more briefly summarized in part under PUMBADITHA; SORA; etc.):

THE TANAIM EPOCH. B.C.

Simon the Just or Pious — 300 Antigonus of Soho — 200-170

a Jose ben-Joeser of Zereda, and Jose ben-Jochanan of Jerusalem, the first pair, 170-140

b Jehoshnah ben-Perachja, and Natai of Arabela — 140-110

c Simon ben-Shetach, their pupil, and Jehudah ben-Tabai — 110-65

d Shemaja, and Abtalion — 65-30

Hillel I, the Great, the Babylonian, in whose family the presidency became hereditary for fifteen generations (A.). 10-415). He was first with Menachem and then with Shammai, who founded a separate school — B.C. 30-A.D. 10

The former was designated the school of Hillel, which had eighty disciples, called the elders of the house of Hillel, among whom were Jonathan ben- Uziel the Targumist, Dossa ben-Harchinas, Jonathan his brother, and Jochanan ben-Zakkai; while the latter was denominated the school of Shammai, the immediate disciples or elders of which were Baba ben-Buta, Dotai of Stome, and Zadok, the originator of the Zealots. Simon ben-Hillel I — A.D. 10-30

Gamaliel I, ben-Simon I, called Ha-Zaken the elder, the teacher of the apostle Paul — 30-50

Simon II, ben-Gamaliel I — 50-70

Jochanan ben-Zakkai, founder of the school of Jabne or Jamnia — 68-80

PALESTINE

Gamaliel II, of Jabue, ben-Simon II, and Eleazar ben-Azariah, who was for a little time president in the place of Gamaliel. Here are to be mentioned Eliezer ben-Hyrkanus, brother-in-law of Gamaliel, and founder of the school at Lydda, which continued the only seat of learning in Southern Judaea for several centuries; Joshua ben-Chanaja, who established a school at Bekin, in the valley between Jabne and Lydda: Ismael ben-Eliesa, the founder of the school known by the name Be-R. Ismael; Aquila the translator of the Bible: R. Ilai, R. Chaliphita, Bar- Cochba, the false Messiah — 80-116

Simon II, ben-Gamaliel II, and R. Nathan, vice-president, author of the Mishna or Tosiphta which goes by his name, and of a commentary on Aboth. The distinguished men of this presidency are, R. Judah ben-Ilai, of Ushah: R. Jose ben-Chaliphta, of Sepphoris, author of the history called Seder Olam; R. Jochanan, of Alexandria; R. Simon ben-Jochai, of Galilee,  the reputed originator of the Cabala and author of the far-famed Zohar — 140-163

Jehudah I, the Holy, Ha-Nasi, ben-Simon III, editor of the Mishna, and called Rabbi. His celebrated disciples, who also became heads of schools, were called semi-Tanaim, and perfected their master's work, the Mishna. These were R. Janai, whose school was a Akbara; R. Chija=Achija; Ushaja the elder surnamed “the father of the Mishna;” and Abba Areka, surnamed Rab, the founder of the school at Pumbaditha—163-193

Gamaliel III, ben-Jehuda I, in whose presidency the college was transferred from Jabne to Tiberias—193-220

BABYLON

Nahardea, the center of learning since the Babylonian exile, and the seat of the rector-general of all the Babylonian colleges. It was destroyed through the adventurer Papa ben-Nazar, in the year A.D. 259.

R. Chanina, nephew of R. Josuah, formed a college in Nachor-Pacor, in the neighborhood of Nahardea, of which he became president; and R. Nechanja or Achiha was vice-president —138-140

R. Shila was the rector-general a Nahardea; R. Nathan, the last Tana, and R. Chija were both educated here. Abba Areka, who also a student here and afterwards went to Palestine to finish his studies under Jehudah I, brought with him on his first return to Babylon (A.D. 189) the complete Mishna of his master — cir. 140-190

Samuel the astronomer, also called Mar-Samuel, Arioch, and Jarchini, succeeded R. Shila as rector of the college at Nahardea — 190-247

THE AMORAIM EPOCH.

Jehudah II, ben-Simon III, also called Rabbi, the teacher of Origen. The teachers of this period were, R. Chaninah, the most distinguished disciple of Jehudah I, who founded a school at Sephoris; R. Simlai, the celebrated Haggadist, who reduced the law of Moses to 613 commandments; R. Jose of Maon; R. Chaggai, R. Jehudah ben-Nachmani, etc — 220-270

Abba Areka, surnamed Rab, having returned to his native place a second time, founded a school at Sora, which maintained its celebrity for nearly  800 years, and which attracted about 1200 students in the lifetime of its founder. He was the president of it twenty-eight years — 219-247

Samuel Jarchini, rector of the college at Nahardea, is elected rector-general of all the schools in Babylon — 247-257

R. Hana became rector-general. He had only 800 students, as, during his rectorate, R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel founded a school at Pumbaditha, and R. Chasda founded another school at Sora, which attracted many of his disciples. Nahardea is destroyed (259); the students emigrate into the neighborhood of the Tigris and found a school — 257-297

TIBERIAS.

Gamaliel IV, ben-Jehudah II — 270-300

Jehudah III, ben-Gamaliel IV — 300-309

Hillel II, ben-Jehudah III, introduced the new calendar, and is said by Epiphanius to have embraced Christianity. The distinguished teachers of this period were R. Jona, R. Jose, and Tanchuma ben-Abba, the renowned Haggadist and reputed author of the Midrash Tanchuma — 330-365

Gamaliel V, ben-Hillel II. The teachers of this period were R. Jeremiah, R. Jacob ben-Abnu, etc — 365-385

Jehudah IV, ben-Gamaliel V — 385-400

Gamaliel the last (בתראה), ben-Jehudah IV — 400-425

SORA.

Chasda of Kaphri, founder of this school, is rector — 293-309

Rabba ben-Huna, succeeded Chasda to the rectory, and when he died the college was without a rector for nearly fifty years — 309-320

Ashi ben-Simai, surnamed Rabban (our teacher), resuscitated the college of Sora, and was its rector fifty-two years, during which time seven rectors died in Pumbaditha. Ashi immortalized his name by collecting the Babylonian Talmud — 352-427

R. Jemar or Mar-Jemar (contracted Maremar), succeeded R. Ashi as rector of the college, and officiated about five years — 427-432  R. Idi ben-Abin, a disciple of R. Ashi, officiated as rector for twenty years — 432-452

R. Nachman ben-Huna — 452-455

Mar bar-R. Ashi, who continued collecting the Talmud, which his father began — 455-468

Rabba Tusphan. Sora, where one of the oldest Jewish universities stood, was now destroyed by the Persian king Firuz — 468-474

Ribina II, who, with R. Jose and his colleagues, completed the Talmud — 468-540

PUMBADITHA.

R. Jehuda ben-Jesheskel, founder of the school at Pumbaditha, is elected rector-general of all the colleges, and officiates two years — 297-299

Chasda of Kaphri, founder and rector of the school at Sora, is elected rector-general — 299-309

Rabba ben-Nachmani, who succeeded Chasda, revived the college to such a degree that he obtained 1200 students — 309-330

Joseph ben-Chija the blind. He translated the prophets of the Old Test. into Chaldee — 330-333

Abaji ben-Cajlil, surnamed Nachmani, the nephew of Rabba, succeeded R. Joseph the blind — 333-338

Rabba ben-Joseph, ben-Chama, who founded the school at Machuza, was elected rector after Abaji — 338-352

Nachman ben-Isaac held the rectorate four years — 352-356

R. Chama of Nahardea, Nachmani's successor, held the rectorate nineteen years — 356-377

R. Zebid ben-Ushaja — 377-385

R. Dimi ben-Chinena of Nahardea — 385-388

Raphrem ben-Papa — 388-400  R. Kahana. The celebrated men of this period were Mar-Sutra, Pheluna ben-Nathon, etc. — 400-411

Mar-Sutra — 411-414

R. Ahsa ben-Raba — 414-419

R. Gebiha of Be-Katil — 419-433

Rephrem II — 433-443

R. Rachamai — 443-456

R. Sama ben-Raba — 456-471

R. Jose — 471-520

R. Samuel ben-Abahu.

At first the organization of these schools or colleges was very simple. Besides the president or rector, who was the chief teacher, and an assistant, there were no offices or ranks. Gradually, however, superior and subordinate ranks involuntarily developed themselves, and ultimately assumed the following form: The college, which met during certain months of the year, and was generally called Methiba ((מתיבא), seat of learning, was presided over by the chief rabbi, who was called Resh-methiba (ראש מתיבא), and was elected by the school. Next to this Resh-methiba or rector came the Resh-kalla (ראש כלה), the chief of the assembly, whose office it was to expound or simplify to the students, during the first three weeks of the session, the theme upon which the rector had determined to lecture. In later times there were seven Rashe-kalloth (כלות ראשר), such interpreters, composed of the associates (חברים) and members of the Sanhedrim, varying in rank. The president or teacher occupied a raised seat, the interpreters sat next to the rector on lower seats, while the disciples sat below them at the feet of their teachers (Act 12:3).

The mode in which instruction was communicated was chiefly catechetical. After the master had delivered his dictum or theme, the disciples in turn asked different questions (Luk 2:46), which he frequently answered by parables or counter questions, a line of conduct also pursued by Christ in accordance with the custom of the time (comp. Mat 22:17-22;  Luk 20:2-4, etc.). Sometimes the teacher introduced the subject by simply asking a question connected with the theme he proposed to propound; the replies given by the different disciples constituted the discussion, which the master at last terminated by declaring which of the answers was the most appropriate. Thus R. Jochanan ben-Zakkai (B.C. 30), on one occasion, wanted to inform his disciples what was the most desirable thing for man to get. He then asked them, “What is the best thing for man to possess?” One replied, “a kind nature;” another, “a good companion;” another, “a good neighbor;” another, “the power to foresee consequences;” while R. Eleazer said “a good heart.” Whereupon R. Jochanan remarked, “I prefer R. Eleazer's answer to yours, for in it all your answers are comprehended” (Aboth, 2, 9). Who is not reminded thereby of the questions put by the Savior to his disciples in Mar 8:27-30?

Allegories, riddles, stories, etc., formed another channel whereby instruction was communicated in these schools. The oppressive heat of the Eastern climate, which was especially felt in the crowded college, where, as we have seen, twelve hundred disciples were sometimes present, tended to make the students drowsy when a hard subject was discussed. The wise teacher, therefore, when he perceived that the attention began to flag, at once introduced a merry anecdote or a monstrous story, or propounded a ludicrous riddle, which immediately aroused the disciples and enabled the master to go on with his theme. Hence the abundance of both sublime and ridiculous parables and stories dispersed throughout the Talmud and Midrashim which record these lectures; and hence, also, the parabolic mode of teaching adopted by our Savior.

The extent of instruction, or what constituted education in these schools, can hardly be defined. An unbiased reader will see from a most cursory glance at any of the discussions recorded in the Talmud that all manner of subjects were brought forward in these colleges. Theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, astronomy, astrology, medicine, botany, geography, arithmetic, architecture, were all themes which alternately occupied the attention of masters and disciples. In fact, the Talmud, which has preserved the topics discussed in the colleges, is an encyclopedia of all the sciences of that time, and shows that in many departments of science these Jewish teachers have anticipated modern discoveries. It would require far more space than the limits of this article allow to quote instances in confirmation of this; we can therefore only refer the reader to the treatises quoted below.  Besides the abstruse theological and scientific subjects, etiquette occupied a prominent part in the lectures of the college, and was regarded as forming an essential part of education. The most minute directions are given as to the behavior of students towards their parents, their teachers, their superiors in age or rank. Every one met in the street must be saluted (Aboth, 4, 10). Not to respond to a salutation is characterized as committing a robbery (Berach. 6 b). An ordinary man is to be saluted with the words, “Peace be with thee!” a teacher, “Peace be with thee, my teacher and my master!” (Rashi on Berach. 27 b); and a king, “Peace be with thee, my king! peace!” (Gittin, 62 a). Salutations in the house of prayer are not allowed (Derech Eretz, 10). One must rise before a learned man (Kethuboth, 103 b), and before the hoary head, even if he be a non- Israelite (Kiddush. 33 b). When three persons walk together, the superior is to walk in the middle (Erub. 54 b); the teacher must always be on the right of the pupil in walking (Yoma, 37 a). One must not leave a friend without asking his permission (Derech Eretz, 2); when leaving one's teacher the disciple must say, “I am dismissed;” whereupon the response is, “Depart in peace” (Berach. 64 a). Never enter a house suddenly and without notice (Kethuboth, 62 b); nor sit down before the superior has seated himself (Jerus. Kethuboth, 25); nor lean in the company of superiors (Derech Eretz, § 6). “Seven things are seen in the conduct of an educated man, and seven in the behavior of an uneducated person:

1. An educated man will be quiet in the presence of one more educated than himself;

2. Will not interrupt any one speaking;

3. Will not give a hasty reply;

4. Will ask appropriate questions;

5. Will give suitable answers;

6. Will answer the first thing first, and the last thing last; and

7. Will candidly say when he does not know anything. The reverse of these things will be seen in the uneducated” (Aboth, 5, 10).

Another most essential part of education was the learning of a trade. Thus R. Gamaliel declares, “learning, no matter of what kind, if unaccompanied by a trade, ends in nothing and leads to sin” (Aboth, 2, 2). R. Judah ben-  Ilai, called “the wise,” “the first orator,” had a trade, and used to say, “labor honors the laborer” (Nedarim, 49 b). R. Ismael, the great astronomer and powerful opponent of Gamaliel II, was a needle maker (Jerus. Berach. 4, 1); R. Jose ben-Chalaphta, of Sepphoris, was a tanner (Sabbath, 49 b). These rabbins, like the apostle Paul, gloried in the fact that they could maintain themselves and teach independently of payment, and hence took a pride in their respective trades, which were attached to their names, viz., rabbi Jochanan, the shoemaker; rabbi Simon, the weaver; rabbi Joseph, the carpenter. This will account for the apparent anomaly that the apostle Paul, a thorough student, should have been a tent maker.

Though female education was necessarily limited, owing to the position which women occupied in the East, yet it must not be supposed that it was altogether neglected. The fact that mothers had to take part in the education of their children would of itself show that their own education must have been attended to. We are, however, not confined to this inference. The 31st chapter of Proverbs gives us a description of what was the education of a woman and a housewife in the Old Test. In the Talmud we find the daughters of R. Samuel were even first rate students of the Halacha (Kethuboth, 23 a; Jerus. ibid. 2, 6). R. Jochanan ben-Napucha not only urges the study of Greek as a necessary part of a man's education, but recommends it also for women as a desirable accomplishment (Jerus. Sota, s.f.). To show the desirableness of uniting with Hebrew the study of Greek, this celebrated rabbi, in accordance with the ancient practice, illustrates it by a passage of Scripture (Gen 9:23): “Because the two sons of Noah, Shem and Japheth, unitedly covered the nakedness of their father with one garment; Shem (representing the Jews) obtained the fringed garment, the Talith; Japheth (representing the Greeks) got the philosopher's garment, i.e. Pallium,” which ought to be united again (Midrash Rabba [Genesis 36]). Hence R. Abbahu was not only himself a consummate Greek scholar, but had his daughter instructed in this classical language, since he regarded it as necessary to a good female education, and quoted R. Jochanan as an authority upon this subject (Jerus. Sabbath, 3, 1; Sota, s.f.).

V. Literature. — The best works upon this subject are the Talmud and Midrashim; but as these are not generally accessible, we mention the masterly works of Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (Berlin, 1832); Frankel, Der gerichtliche Beweis (ibid. 1846); Monatsschrift, 1, 509, etc.; Wunderbar, Biblisch-talmudische Medicin  (Riga and Leips. 1850-60); Lewysohn, Die Zoologie des Talmuds (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, vols. 3 and 4; Ben-Chananja, 1, 417, 460, 512; 2, 66, 167, 210, 258; 3, 539; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 297 sq.; Schürer, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte, p. 466 sq.; Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des A.T. mit dent Neuen, p. 377-384; Gfrörer, Jahrhundert des Heils, 1, 156-192; Van Gelder, Die Volksschule des jüdischen Altherthums nach talmudischen und rabbinischen Quellen (Berl. 1872); Marcus, Zur Schul-Pädagogik des Talmud (ibid. 1866).

There are numerous monographs on the subject: Held, De Jud. Scholis (Norimb. 1664); Heubner, De Academiis Hebroeor. (Vitemb. 1703); Lund, De Scholis et Academiis Heb. (Upsal. 1707); Reineccius, De Scholis Hebr. (Weissenb. 1722); Sennert, De Scholis et Academiis Hebr. in his Heptas Exercit. (Vitemb. 1657); Sgambalo, De Acad. Jud. (Neap. 1703); Weisner, De Scholis et Academiis Hebr. (Heidelb. 1782); Zorn, De Scholis Jud. (Sedin. 1716); and others cited by Volbeding, Index Program. p. 138. On the Schools of the Prophets: Hernig, Von den Schulen d. Proph. (Bresl. 1777); Winckler, Vindicatio Scholoe Samuelis (Hildesh. 1754); Silberrod, De Prophetarum Filiis (Jen. 1710). SEE PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.

## Schools, Parish[[@Headword:Schools, Parish]]

             SEE PARISH SCHOOLS.

## Schools, Singing[[@Headword:Schools, Singing]]

             The high estimation in which singers were held in the ancient Church appears from the institution of schools for their instruction and training, and the great attention which was paid to these schools and their presidents. Such schools were established as early as the 6th century, and became common in various parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany. The most celebrated was that founded at Rome by Gregory the Great, which was the model of many others afterwards established. From these schools originated the famous Gregorian chant, a plain system of church music, which the choir and people sang in unison. The prior or principal of these schools was a man of considerable dignity and influence in the Church. The name of this officer at Rome was archicantor ecclesioe Romanoe, and elsewhere primicerius (or prior) scholoe cantorum. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq. p. 124; Riddle, Christ. Antiq. p. 307. SEE SINGING.

## Schoonmaker, Henricus[[@Headword:Schoonmaker, Henricus]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Rochester, Ulster Co., N.Y., in 1739. He was converted early in life under the ministry of the Rev. Henricus Frelinghuysen, and studied theology with the Rev; John H. Goetschius, who became his father-in-law. Dr. Schoonmaker was one of the first ministers of the Reformed Church who were licensed by the coetus, independently of the Church in Holland. He was called immediately (1763) to the churches of Poughkeepsie and Fishkill. When the ministers arrived to ordain him, they found the church doors barred against them by the Conferentie party, and the service was conducted under the shade of a large tree in a wagon, in which upon his knees the candidate took his vows in presence of a large congregation. A ministry thus begun was not likely to be fruitless. His labors were greatly blessed, notwithstanding the opposition to which he was constantly exposed. In 1774 he removed to Acquackanonck (now Passaic), N.J., and subsequently gave a portion of his services to the neighboring church of Toteroo (now Paterson). In 1816 he resigned his charge, and died in 1820, having survived nearly all of his contemporaries. His grateful people continued his salary for life. He was the last but one of the old Dutch clergy who preached only in the language of Holland. Dr. Livingston pronounced him the most eloquent preacher in that tongue whom he had ever heard in this country. He was always popular in the pulpit, and his style was nervous, eloquent, and powerful. His life was blameless, and his ministry of over half a century was full of good fruits. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit; Kip, Historical Discourse. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schoonmaker, Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Schoonmaker, Jacob, D.D]]

             a son of the foregoing, was born May 11, 1777, at Acquackanonck (now Passaic), N.J. He graduated at Columbia College in 1799, and pursued his theological studies under Drs. Solomon Froeligh and John H. Livingston. He was licensed in 1801, and the next year became the pastor of the united churches of Jamaica and Newtown, L.I. This associate relation lasted until 1849, when the Newtown church became independent. He remained pastor at Jamaica one year longer, when on Aug. 6, 1850, he preached his farewell sermon, and then retired from the active ministry on account of age and infirmities. He died April 10, 1852, finishing his course with joy. Dr. Schoonmaker was a large, portly man, with a very benevolent countenance and a sweet savor of cheerful piety in his whole aspect and demeanor. He  was dignified, courteous, discreet — a faithful preacher, a devoted pastor, a sound evangelical theologian of the Calvinistic school — an active supporter of the educational institutions and benevolent agencies of the Church, and a workman who needed not to be ashamed. He was a father among his people, and, while cherishing the most profound attachment to his own Church, was truly catholic in feeling towards all who love Christ. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. 9. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schoonmaker, Martinus[[@Headword:Schoonmaker, Martinus]]

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born at Rochester, Ulster Co., N.Y., in 1737. He studied under Goetschius and Marinus, and was licensed to preach in 1765. His ministry was spent on Long Island, embracing the churches of Brooklyn, Flatbush, New Utrecht, Flatlands, Bushwick, and Gravesend. From 1765 to 1783 Harlem was also included in his extensive bishopric. All of these have long been separate and important churches. His labors were necessarily very arduous, but he bore them with untiring zeal and energy down to his old age, which was so vigorous that at fourscore his sight, hearing, and other faculties were as perfect as in former years. He was universally beloved and revered, without an enemy, and yet living in troublous times. He resided at Flatbush, while the care of all the churches of Kings County came upon him daily. During the Revolutionary war he was an ardent patriot, and it is related that on his personal word and statement he secured from the Congress in session at Harlem the release of a person who was suspected and imprisoned as a Tory. He preached only in the Holland language. His memory is held in high esteem as one of the fathers of the Church and a relic of the old race of venerable Dutch dominies. He died in 1824. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schopf, Joseph W[[@Headword:Schopf, Joseph W]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Chemnitz, April 12, 1793, and died July 15, 1831, at Dresden. He published, Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, deutsch mit Anmerkungen und Erklärungen, etc. (Leips. 1828, 2 vols.): — Die Widerlegung der augsburgischen Confession, etc. (ibid. 1830): — Der Geistliche und unsere Zeit (Dresden, 1831). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 2, 1173; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Schorch, Franz Eduard[[@Headword:Schorch, Franz Eduard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hermannsgriin in 1802, and died at Schleiz, November 17, 1881, superintendent and doctor of theology. He published Das Leben Jesu, etc. (Leipsic, 1841), and several volumes of Sermons, for which see Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schotanus, Christian[[@Headword:Schotanus, Christian]]

             a Dutch savant and historian, was born at Scheng, near Franeker, Aug. 16, 1603. He entered the Church, and in 1627 was pastor in his native village. He remained there till 1629, when he removed to Cornjum, where he spent ten years. At the end of that time he became professor of Greek in the Academy of Franeker, and subsequently added ecclesiastical history to his other labors. His death, which occurred Nov. 12, 1671, was caused by extreme cold and exposure. His principal works are, Notoe ad Evangelia et Epistolas (Leeuwarden, 1647, 12mo): — Catechesis (Franeker, 1653): — Collegium Miscellaneorum Theologicorum (ibid. 1654, 12mo): — Beschryving van Friesland (Leeuwarden, 1656-64, with plates and maps): — Bibliotheca Historioe Sacroe V.T. (Franeker, 1662-64, 2 vols. fol.): — Hectas Disputationum Theologicarum (ibid. 1664, 4to): — and an Ecclesiastical and Civil History of Friesland (down to 1558). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Schott, Christian Heinrich[[@Headword:Schott, Christian Heinrich]]

             a German doctor of philosophy, was born at Schneeberg in 1803, and died May 1, 1840, at Boritz, near Meissen, where he had been pastor since 1830. He published, Biblische Handconcordanz (Leips. 1827): — Züge aus dem Leben der Christen der drei ersten Jahrhunderte (ibid. 1829): — Das Leben unseres Herrn u. Heilandes Jesu Christi (ibid. 1830): — Geschichte der deutschen Bibelübersetzung Martin Luthers (ibid. 1835). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 2, 1174 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 764. (B.P.)

## Schott, Heinrich August[[@Headword:Schott, Heinrich August]]

             an eminent German theologian of the so called supernaturalist school, was born at Leipsic, Dec. 5, 1780, and died Dec. 29, 1835. He began his university studies at the age of sixteen, and was soon distinguished for his fine Latin style and for his progress in theology. Among his teachers at Leipsic were Beck, Platner, Cams, and Keil. In 1801 he began to give lectures, and in 1803 he became one of the university preachers. His edition of the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1804) gave him a place in the world of learning; still more so his edition of the New Testament with Latin translation (Leips. 1805). In 1809 he became professor of theology at Wittenberg, and lectured with great success on dogmatics, hermeneutics, and sacred eloquence. His Epitome Theologioe Christianoe (1811) was an  able work, but its usefulness was diminished by its complicated style. In 1812 he went to Jena, and there spent the rest of his fruitful life. The nucleus of a preachers' seminary which he there formed was richly endowed in 1817. His lectures were delivered in Latin. His work on eloquence, Die Theorie der Beredtsamkeit (Leips. 1815; 2d ed. 1828), is his best title to lasting fame; but his Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Foederis Sacros (Jen. 1830) is abundant in erudition, and still deserves study. In character Schott was upright, simple, and deeply pious. His motto expressed his life — “proving, believing, diligent.” He was a scholar and a theologian of the noblest type. He died in 1835. See his Life by Danz (Leips. 1836); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 13, 698-701. (J.P.L.)

## Schott, Leopold[[@Headword:Schott, Leopold]]

             a German rabbi, was born at Randegg, Baden, June 27, 1807. Having finished his rabbinical studies at Hechingen and Carlsruhe, in 1829 he went to Heidelberg to attend the lectures at the university, at the same time pursuing his rabbinical studies with Salomon Fürst. In 1831, after having passed his examination, he was appointed religious instructor in his native place. In 1833 he was appointed for the rabbinate of his native city. He died Jan. 20, 1869, at Buhl, Baden. He contributed a number of essays to the Zeitung des Judenthums and the Orient, and published a number of Sermons. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 286; Kayserling, Bibliothek jüd. Kanzelredner, 2, 293 sq. (B.P.)

## Schottgen, Christian[[@Headword:Schottgen, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian and philologist of Germany, was born at Wurzen, Saxony, March 14, 1687. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1716 rector at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1719 at Stargard, Pomerania, in 1728 at Dresden, and died December 15, 1751. He is best known as the author of, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in Universum Novum Testamentum (Dresden, 1733): — Horae Hebraice et Talmudicae in Theologiam Judaeorum Dogmaticam Antiquam et Orthodoxam de Messia Impensae (1742): — Novum Lexicon Greico-Latinum in Novum Testamentum (Leipsic, 1746; new ed. by Krebs, 1765, and Spohr, 1790). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Meusel, Lexicon der von 1750-1800 verstorbenen deutschen Schriftsteller, 12:382 sq.; Plitt- Herzogi Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.).

## Schottin, Johann D. Fr., Dr[[@Headword:Schottin, Johann D. Fr., Dr]]

             a German preacher, was born Jan. 4, 1789, at Heigendorf, in Weimar. He belonged to a Huguenot family, whose name was originally Chaudien, which the father of Johann D. Fr. changed into Schottin. Having completed his studies at Jena, he was in 1814 appointed pastor at Köstritz, in Reuss, where he remained till his end, May 16, 1866. He was an excellent pulpit orator, but the many calls which he received from Hamburg, Bremen, and Jena he refused. He is best known as one of the most recent German hymn writers. Besides, he published a number of devotional works. See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 3, 1176; Literarischer Handweiser, 1866, p. 309; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 75. (B.P.)

## Schrader, Clemens[[@Headword:Schrader, Clemens]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1820 at Itzum, in Hanover. He studied philosophy and theology at the Collegium Germanicum in Rome. In 1843 he was made doctor of philosophy, in 1846 he received holy orders, and in 1848 he was made doctor of theology. In 1850 he was appointed professor of dogmatics in Louvain; in 1851 he was called to Rome as professor of introduction to the New Test., where he afterwards also lectured on dogmatics; and in 1857 he was called to the Vienna University. This office he was obliged to resign, as he would not subscribe in 1868 to the new laws of the state. Since then he lived mostly in France, and died at Poitiers Feb. 23, 1875. He wrote Theses Theologicoe and De Unitate Ecclesioe. In popular writings he explained the Syllabus, etc. See Literarischer Handweiser, 1875, p. 158. (B.P.)

## Schrader, Johann Heinrich Ludolf[[@Headword:Schrader, Johann Heinrich Ludolf]]

             a Reformed minister of Germany, was born July 12, 1800, at Gifhorn, in Luneburg, and died at Frankfort-on-the-Main Jan. 11, 1875, where he had been pastor since 1830. He published a number of Sermons. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1177 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, p.765; Theologisches Jahrbuch, 1876, p. 365. (B.P.)

## Schramm, Johann Conrad[[@Headword:Schramm, Johann Conrad]]

             doctor and professor of theology at Helmstädt, where he died Feb. 25, 1739, is the author of, De Usu et Abusu Originum Linguoe Sanctoe (Helmstädt, 1707): — Programma, quo Proeliminaria Disputationum cum Judoeis Traduntur (ibid. 1718): — Disputatio de Mysteriis Veterum Judoeorum Philosophicis (ibid. 1708): — Prolusio de Poesi Hebroeorum in Codice Sacro (ibid. 1723): — Introductio in Dialecticam Cabbaleorum, etc. (Brunswick, 1703): — Disputatio de Symboli Apostolici in Talmude Ruderibus (Helmstadt, 1706): — Program. de Lectione, Proecipuo Ling. Hebr. Adjumento (ibid. 1708). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 287; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 128; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, p. 765; supplement, p. 300. (B.P.)

## Schramm, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Schramm, Johann Heinrich]]

             doctor and professor of theology, was born March 20, 1676, at Gerkhausen. In 1701 he was appointed professor of elocution, history, and  Greek at Herborn; in 1707 he was made member of consistory and preacher at Dillenburg; in 1709 he was appointed professor of theology at Herborn; in 1721 he was called to Marburg, and in 1723 to Herborn, where he died, Jan. 20, 1753. He wrote, Dissertatio Inaug. de Manipulo Hordeaceo, cujus Oblatione Messem suam Auspicabantur Judoei ejusque Mysterio (Frankf. a. O. 1706): — Dissertatio de Holocaustis Judoeorum et Gentilium Κακοζηλία (Herborn): — Dissertatio de Mysterio Holocaustorum (ibid.): — Dissertatio de Bestia Arundineti ad Psalms 48, 31 (ibid. 1713): — Dissertatio de Vigilibus Veterum (ibid.); etc. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 287 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, p. 765. (B.P.)

## Schreck, William[[@Headword:Schreck, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Osnabruck, Lower Prussia, about 1816. Emigrating to this country, he united with the Church, and was received into the Indiana Conference. He was afterwards a member of the Southwest German Conference. He labored as an itinerant minister for thirty-two years, and died on Herman Circuit, Ill., March 30, 1874. He was a pious, liberal, energetic man, serving the Church with holy consecration. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 88.

## Schreiber, Heinrich[[@Headword:Schreiber, Heinrich]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born July 14, 1793, at Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he also completed his studies. In 1816 he received holy orders, in 1822 he was made president of the gymnasium, and in 1826 he was appointed professor of moral theology at the university there. In 1831- 34 he published his Manual of Moral Theology (2 vols.), in which he protested a life-long vow and celibacy. The archbishop was ordered to make him promise to keep such views in future to himself, but against such a promise Schreiber publicly protested. He was obliged to resign his theological chair, but was given a chair in the philosophical faculty, until, in 1845, he had to resign this position also on account of his joining the German Catholic movement, and died Nov. 20, 1873. His most important work is his Ausführliche Geschichte der Stadt und Universität Freiburg (1857-60, 7 vols.). He also wrote Der deutsche Bauernkrieg (Freiburg, 1863-66, 3 vols.); etc. See Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Literarischer Handweiser, 1873, p. 17; Winer, Handbuch der theologischen Literatur, 1, 286, 484; 2, 765; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theol. 3, 1179. (B.P.)

## Schrockh, Johann Matthias[[@Headword:Schrockh, Johann Matthias]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany of eminent culture and extended usefulness in the department of historical learning, was born at Vienna July 26, 1733, and was early destined for the pulpit. His education was obtained chiefly at the Lutheran Gymnasium of Presburg, the Steinmetz School at Klosterbergen, near Magdeburg, and the University of Göttingen. Mosheim and J. D. Michaelis were then in the faculty of the latter institution, and their influence over Schröckh was such that his attention became predominantly fixed on history and the Oriental languages, and he was led to form habits of independent research, and to cultivate an attractive historical style qualities which adhered to him through life. After his graduation, he was associated with an uncle, Prof. Karl A. Bell, of Leipsic, in editing several learned periodicals; but he also found time to perfect his knowledge of Greek and Roman antiquities under the tuition of professors Christ and Ernesti. In 1756 he received the master's degree, and became a tutor in the university, and subsequently custodian of the library, and in 1761 he was made professor extraordinary. The uncertainty of further preferment in the University of Leipsic, and the unsatisfactory income which he derived from literary labors, now decided him to accept a call to the chair of poetry in the University of Wittenberg, which he held until 1775, when he was transferred to the chair of history, in the duties of which station he spent the remainder of his life. He projected a three years' course, in which he was accustomed to traverse not only the history of literature, the Church, the Reformation, theology, and Christian antiquities, but also that of European states, Germany and Saxony in particular, and also of diplomacy; and, in addition to these labors, he issued numerous reviews, editions of works written by his friends, and independent works of more or less importance. His fidelity to his work was acknowledged by the government at Dresden, who transmitted to him a testimonial in writing and an honorary donation, together with the offer of a titular patent as councilor of state, which latter he declined. He was married to Frederica Pitzschig, by whom he had four children, all of whom died in early childhood; and he died Aug. 2, 1808. in consequence of a fall experienced in his library, on the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth.

As a writer of history, Schröckh was thoroughly qualified by his learning, impartial love of truth and devotion to morality, untiring industry in the work of collection and research, and the clearness, simplicity, and logic of his style. He was deficient in the critical apprehension and philosophical  penetration needed to discover the internal connection of events; and his style, as a whole, lacks the picturesque coloring and pregnancy of meaning which characterize a classical writer. He was not a master in the art of descriptive writing, but, nevertheless, a meritorious and successful author. His works were numerous, but have been superseded by more complete and thorough books of later origin. They include biographies of learned men, and of other persons eminent in the history of the world; textbooks and manuals of history, and other similar works, none of which possess permanent value. The Historia Religionis et Ecclesioe Christianoe in Usum Lectionum, published in a seventh edition by Marheinecke in 1828, is noticeable chiefly because of its wealth of material, its judicious references to sources and helps, the systematic arrangement of its contents, and its excellent Latin. The great work of his life, beyond question, is the Ausführliche Geschichte der christlichen Kirche, in 45 vols., the last two of which were completed by Prof. Tzschirner after the author's death. The work covers eighteen centuries of the Christian Church, and is characterized by impartiality and completeness to a remarkable degree. No work has yet appeared which combines so great magnitude with so many advantages as does that of Schröckh , though the earlier volumes, being intended simply to furnish a comprehensive course of reading in Church history, leave much to be desired on the part of cultured readers.

See an article by Schröckh in R.G. Bayer's Allgem. Magazin für Prediger, etc., vol. 5, No. 2, p. 209-222; Politz, J.M. Schröckh's Nekrolog (Wittenberg, 1808); and notices respecting the life of Schröckh contributed to the Allgens. Zeitung, 1808, Nos. 247 and 248, p. 985-989. A faithful and instructive delineation is given by his friend K.L. Nitzsch in J.M. Schröckh's Studienweise u. Maximen (Weimar, 1809). H.G. Tzschirner's J.M. Schröckh's Leben, Karakter, u. Schriften was prefixed to pt. 10 of Schröckh's Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation, and has also been published separately since 1812, with portrait. A complete list of Schröckh's works is given in Mensel's Gelehrtes Deutschland, 8, 314 sq.; 10, 627, and 15, 381. See also Wähler, Gesch. d. hist. Forschung u. Kunst, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 813 sq.; Stäudlin, Gesch. u. Lit. d. Kirchengesch. (Hanover, 1827); Baur, Epochen d. christl. Kirchengesch.-Schreibung (Tüb. 1852).

## Schroder, Friedrich Wilhelm Julius[[@Headword:Schroder, Friedrich Wilhelm Julius]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, who died Feb. 27,1876, at Elberfeld, where he had succeeded the celebrated Krummacher as pastor of the First Reformed Church, is the author of a Commentary on Genesis (Berlin, 1844): Vesperklänge (ibid. 1846, 2 vols.): — a Commentary on Deuteronomy (prepared for Lange's Bible-work [Elberfeld, 1866]): — a Commentary on Ezekiel (also prepared for Lange's work). Besides, he published a number of Essays, Sermons, etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1182 sq.; Theol. Jahrbuch, 1877, p. 228. (B.P.)

## Schroder, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Schroder, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born in 1666 at Hallerspringe, in the principality of Calenberg, in Hanover. He was a pupil of the celebrated philanthropist A. H. Francke, and studied under him at Leipsic. In 1696 he became pastor at Merseburg, near Magdeburg. He wrote a few hymns which are still in use in the German Church, and died June 30, 1699. Of his hymns we mention, Eins ist Noth, ach Herr dies Eine (transl. by E. Cox, “One thing needful, then, Lord Jesus,” in Hymns from the German, p. 216): — Jesu, hilf siegen, du Fürst des Lebens (transl. by Mills, “Jesus, help conquer! thou Prince everliving,” in Horoe Germanicoe, p. 126). See Harnisch, in Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1857, No. 89; Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes, 4, 381 sq.; 8, 426 sq.; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1344. (B.P.)

## Schroder, Johann Joachim[[@Headword:Schroder, Johann Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Neukirchen, Hesse, July 6, 1680, and died at Marburg, July 19, 1756, professor of theology. He published, De Historia et Conditione Versionis Armenicae Sacri Codicis (Amsterdam, 1711): — Disputationes de Natura Linguae Hebraicae (Marburg, 1716): — De Rubo Ardente et non Comburente ad Exodus 3 :i sq. (1714): — De Annis Achasiae, Judaeorum Regis ad Conciliani Loca 2 Reg. 7:26 et 2Ch 22:2 (1715): — De Primeva Lingua Ebraica (1716): — De Precibus Ebraeorum (1717): — De Methinceis (1719): — De Voce אִבְרֵךְad Gen 41:43 (eod.), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schroder, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Schroder, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Marburg, June 15, 1726, and studied at the university in his native place. In 1755 he succeeded his father as professor of Oriental languages and Hebrew antiquities, and died March 8, 1793. He published, De Sanctitate in Genere et Quibusdam ejus Speciebus, Praecipue de Sanctitate Dei (Marburg, 1750): — Commentarius Philologicus in Psalmum 10 (Groningen, 1754): — In Causas Quare Dictio Pure Graeca in Novo Testamento Plerumque Praetermissa sit (1768): — In Difficiliora Quaedam Psalmorum Loca Fasciculus (1781). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schroder, Nicolaus Wilhelm[[@Headword:Schroder, Nicolaus Wilhelm]]

             professor of Oriental languages and antiquities at Groningen, was born at Marburg, Aug. 22, 1721, and died May 30, 1798. He is known as the author of Comment. Philologicocriticus de Vestitu Mulierum Ebroearum ad Jes. iii. 10-24 (Leyden, 1745). He also published a number of treatises bearing on Oriental languages and certain sections of the Bible, as De Confusione Sermonis Babelica: — De Voto Jephtoe: — De Tabernaculo. Molochi et Stella Dei Remphan, etc. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 291; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, p. 128; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Schroeder, John Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Schroeder, John Frederick, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in Baltimore, Maryland, April 8, 1800. He graduated from Princeton College in 1819; studied in the Episcopal Seminary at New Haven, Connecticut; was ordained in 1823; had charge of a parish on the eastern shore of Maryland for a few months; was assistant minister of Trinity Church, New York city, from 1824 to 1838; and in the latter year rector of the Church of the Crucifixion, and of St. Thomas's Church, Brooklyn. In 1839 he established a seminary for young ladies, called St. Ann's Hall, at Flushing, L.I. He died in Brooklyn, February 26, 1857. Dr. Schroeder was a fine scholar, a popular preacher, and the author of several volumes; one contains essays on Biblical subjects, and three are on General Washington.

## Schroter, Robert Gustav Theodor[[@Headword:Schroter, Robert Gustav Theodor]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Breslau, March 20, 1880, is the author of, Gregorii Bar-Hebraei Scholia in Psalmum 8:40, 41, 1, etc. (Breslau, 1857): — Kritik des Dunasch ben-Labrat uber einzelne Stellen aus Saadia, etc. (1866): — Diedem Saadia beigelegte arabische Uebersetzung der kleinena Propheten (in Merx' Archiv fur Erforschung des Alten Testaments); besides, he contributed to the Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft. (B.P.)

## Schubart, Christian Friedrich Daniel[[@Headword:Schubart, Christian Friedrich Daniel]]

             a Lutheran divine of Germany, was born at Obersontheim, in the county of Limburg, March 26, 1736, and died as court and theater poet at Stuttgart, Oct. 10, 1791. He is the author of the beautiful hymn Alles ist euer! O Worte des ewigen Lebens (transl. into English in Hymns from the Land of Luther, p. 61, “All things are yours, O sweet message of mercy divine”), and of Kommt heut' an eurem Stab (based on Luk 2:22-32, which Mills translated in his Horoe Germanicoe, p. 275, “Ye who with years are sinking”). See Schubart, Gesammelte Schriften (Stuttgart, 1839-40), vol. 1-8; Strauss, Schubarts Leben in seinen Briefen (Berlin, 1849, 2 vols.); Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes, 6, 376 sq.; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, p. 1344. (B.P.)

## Schubert, Gottlieb Heinrich Von[[@Headword:Schubert, Gottlieb Heinrich Von]]

             a German philosopher and mystic, who for more than half a century exerted a very extended and beneficent popular influence in almost every field of thought, was born in Saxony, April 26, 1780. His parents were pious and peculiar. In his fifth year he learned from his mother such a lesson on the death of Christ as remained a benediction to him to his latest hour. He studied at Greiz and Weimar, and at the latter place was taken into the house of Herder. He also came into contact with Goethe and Jean Paul. In 1799 he began to study theology at Leipsic, but in 1801 he changed theology for medicine, and went to Jena. Here he came under the personal and scientific influence of Schelling — an influence that lasted during life — as also under that of the naturalist William Ritter. In 1803 he married, and began the practice of medicine at Altenburg, supplementing his scanty fees by private lessons and other makeshifts. Here he wrote a romance, Die Kirche und die Götter. In 1805 he removed to Freiburg, where he began his great work Ahndungen einer allgemeinen Geschichte des Lebens, in which he endeavored to reduce to uniform laws the whole field of nature and humanity. Schelling applauded, but many shook their heads in doubt. In 1807 he went to Dresden and gave some public lectures, from which arose his strange and able work Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft. In 1809, by the help of Schelling, he was made rector of a scientific school at Nuremberg. Here he wrote his Symbolik des Traumes, also Altes und Neues aus dem Gebiet der inneren Seelenkunde (1815). This last work made a great sensation, and occasioned congratulations from Harms and Neander. Works in the same warmly  religious vein are, Erzahlungen (4 vols.): — Biographien und Erzahlungen (3 vols.): — and Der Erwerb (an autobiography, 3 vols.). His last work was Erinnerungen an die Herzogin Helene von Orleans. Schubert left Nuremberg in 1816; in 1819 he became professor at Erlangen; in 1827 he went to the new University of Munich. His latter years were passed in peace and affluence. He died July 1, 1860. See Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1860, No. 62; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. (J.P.L.)

## Schubert, Johann Ernst[[@Headword:Schubert, Johann Ernst]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Elbing, June 22, 1717, and died at Greifswalde, August 19, 1774, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Introductio in Theologiam Revelatam (Jena, 1749): — Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae (1756-58, 4 volumes): — Vermunftige und schriftgemasse Gedanken von der gottlichen Dreieinigkeit (1751): — Gedanken von der Gnadenwahl (1754): — Schriftgemasse Gedanken von der Rechtfertigung eeines Sunders vor Gott (1744): — Vernunfrige und schriftgemasse Gedanken vom Tode (1743): — Gedanken vom ewigen Leben und von Zustande der Seelen nach dem Tode (1747). See Winer, Iuandbuch der theol. Lit. 1:292, 343, 421, 443, 447, 448, 467, 470; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands s.v. (B.P.)

## Schuderoff, Johann Georg Jonathan[[@Headword:Schuderoff, Johann Georg Jonathan]]

             a German Protestant minister, was born in 1766 at Gotha. In 1790 he was appointed minister at Drakendorf, near Jena; in 1797 subdeacon at Altenburg; in 1805 archdeacon; in 1806 first pastor and superintendent at Ronneburg, and in 1824 member of consistory. In 1836 he retired from the ministry, and died in 1843. He wrote: Ueber allgemeine Union der christl. Bekenntnisse (Neustadt, 1829): — Symboloklasmus oder Symbolatrie? (ibid. 1831): — Ueber Consistorialverfassung in der deutsch- protestantischen Kirche (ibid. 1831): — Glaube u. Vernunft in ihren Verzweigungen (ibid. 1843), etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1188; Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schudt, Johann Jakob[[@Headword:Schudt, Johann Jakob]]

             a German Jewish writer, was born Jan. 14, 1664, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he also died, Feb. 14, 1722, as the rector of the gymnasium. Schudt is well known as the author of the Memorabilia Judaica, or Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten (Frankf. 1714-17, 4 pts.). This may be regarded as the most important of his works, which are enumerated by Fürst in his Bibl. Jud. 3, 292 sq. See also Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Schultens, Albert[[@Headword:Schultens, Albert]]

             an eminent Dutch Orientalist, the father of modern Hebrew grammar, was born at Groningen, 1686, and early destined to a theological career. He studied the original languages of the Bible — Chaldee, Syriac, and Rabbinic — and after a time Arabic. The earliest fruit of these studies was a public disputation with Gussetius, at the age of eighteen, in which he maintained that the study of Arabic is indispensably necessary to a knowledge of Hebrew. After completing his studies, he visited Leyden and Utrecht, and became acquainted with Reland, through whom he published  his first book, Animadv. Philolog. in Jobum (Utrecht, 1708, 8vo). Having returned to his home, he became candidate in theology, and in the following year (July 4, 1709) received the degree of doctor in that science. He then returned to Leyden to make use of its library. In 1711 he assumed the pastorate of the Church at Wassenaer, but exchanged that post after two years for the chair of Oriental languages in the Academy of Franeker. In 1729 he was placed in charge of the Leyden Theological Seminary and made custodian of the Warner MSS. He served three years, doing the work of a professor without enjoying the title or receiving any remuneration, after which period a chair of Arabic was specially created for him, with which the additional professorship of Hebrew antiquities was connected in 1740. He held these positions without interruption to the time of his death, Jan. 26, 1750.

The services which Schultens rendered to philological science are of great value. He was the first to overturn the notion that Hebrew is the original language given to man by God, by showing that that tongue is simply a branch of the Shemitic family, and finds an essential and indispensable aid in the comparison of the Arabic. Besides defending this position in his early disputation with Gussetius, he enforced its claims in the work Origines Hebroeoe. This opened a new path to Hebrew grammar and Biblical exegesis, and also contributed materially to the advancement of the study of Oriental languages and the attainment of its subsequent independent position. Numerous pupils helped to spread the knowledge of his views and methods, and founded the Dutch school of grammar and exegesis. The faults of Schultens are too great readiness in the tracing of analogies and the forming of combinations, and a lack of thorough criticism in the application of the Arabic.

Of the writings of Schultens, aside from the purely Arabic — such as editions of the Rudimenta (1733) and the Grammatica (1748) of Erpenius: — Vita Saladini (Lugd. Bat. 1733, fol.): — Monum. Vetustiora Arab. (Leyd. 1740, 4to): — Historia Joctinidarum (Harderov. 1786, 4to) — we mention those which have reference to Hebrew grammar and Biblical literature: Origines Hebroeoe, etc. (Franeker, 1734-38, 2 vols. 4to), and a preliminary work, De Defectibus Hodiernoe Linguoe Hebr. (ibid. 1731, 4to; new ed. of both works, Leyd. 1761, 2 vols. 4to): — Institutiones ad Fundam. Linguoe Hebr., etc. (Leyd. 1737, 1756, 4to): — Vetus et Regia Via Hebraizandi, etc. (Lugd. 1738), a rejoinder to his opponents, which he carries further in Excursus Primus ad Caput Primum Vice Veteris et  Reqioe Hebraizandi, etc., and Excursus Secundus and Tertius (Leyd. 1739, 4to): — Institutiones Aramoeoe (Lugd. Bat. 1745-49), a work containing a Chaldee and Syriac grammar, without preface or other guide to inquiry, and probably interrupted by the author's death, as it is broken off in the middle. Of his exegetical works the chief are, Liber Jobi, Nova Versione ad Hebr. Fontem et Comment., etc. (Lugd. Bat. 1737, 2 vols. 4to): — Proverbia Salomonis, etc. (ibid. 1748, 4to), an abridgment of which was published by G.J.L. Vogel (Halle, 1769, 8vo). Ten separately printed dissertations and addresses were published by his son in Opera Minora, etc. (Ludg. 1769, 4to), and also a number of dissertations read before him by his pupils, in Sylloge Diss. Philolog.-exeget. (Leidas et Leovard. pars 1, 1772; pars 2, 1775, 4to). Schultens left also several commentaries and a Hebrew lexicon in MS. See Vriemoet, Elogium Schultensii, in Athenoe Frisiacoe, p. 762-771; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Schultens, Heinrich Albert[[@Headword:Schultens, Heinrich Albert]]

             an Orientalist, the son of Johann Jacob, and grandson of Albert Schultens (q.v.), was born at Herborn, Central Germany, Feb. 15, 1749. He began the study of Greek and Latin, under the direction of the most celebrated instructors of Leyden, at the age of seven years, and followed it with that of Oriental languages and antiquities. He also became acquainted with the English, French, and German among modern tongues. In 1772 he visited England to make use of the Bodleian Library; and on his return, though not yet twenty-four years of age, was made professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Amsterdam, and in 1782 he was inducted into the chair previously occupied by his father and grandfather. His literary labors were expended chiefly on Arabic authors, and the continued effort required to prepare the Proverbs of Meidani undermined his health. He died of a slow fever, Aug. 12, 1793. Everard Scheid, his friend and successor, delivered his eulogium. For his life, comp. Series Continuata Histor. Batav. per Wagenaer, pars 1, p. 364-380; also the unimportant sketch by Rink, H.A. Schultens, etc. (Riga, 1794, 8vo).

## Schultens, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Schultens, Johann Jacob]]

             a theologian and Orientalist, the son of Albert Schultens (q.v.), was born at Franeker, in the Netherlands, in 1716, educated under the eye of his father, and appointed professor of theology and Oriental languages in the Academy of Herborn in 1742. He held that post during seven years, was  then transferred to the Academy of Leyden, and five months afterwards became the successor of his father in the theological seminary. He died in 1778. The only writings published by him were his inaugurals, Dissert. de Utilitate Dialect. ad tuendam Integritatem Codicis Hebr. (Leyd. 1742) (also in the Syllog. Dissertat. p. 231-439; see lit. art. “Albert Schultenus”): — De Fruct. in Theol. Reduntantibus ex Peritiore Linguarum Orient. Cognitione (ibid. 1749): — Dissert. Theol. Inaug. ad Locum Apostoli Philipp. cap. 2, 5, 5-11 (Syllog. Dissertat. p. 443-518), and some new editions of single works written by his father.

## Schultetus[[@Headword:Schultetus]]

             SEE SCULTETUS.

## Schulthess, Johannes, Dr[[@Headword:Schulthess, Johannes, Dr]]

             the Swiss compeer of Paulus and Rohr in the advocacy of the older rationalism, was born Sept. 28, 1763, and received a predominantly philological training. His earliest labors were expended in behalf of reforms in the public schools (see Schweizer Schulfreund, 1812, etc.). His Kinderbibel des alten Testaments and his Schweizer Kinderfreund were highly esteemed as textbooks. He became a professor of the Zurich gymnasium, and prebendary in 1816, and from that time devoted himself to the department of New Test. exegesis. He endeavored to ground his rationalism on the Bible itself, even at the cost of violence to the text. In 1824 he published a commentary on the Epistle of St. James, and in 1822 he gave to the world his dogmatical views, in a pamphlet entitled Rationalism. u. Supranaturalism. Kanon, Tradition u. Scription, a work in which Orelli participated. His Revision d. kirchl. Lehrbegriffs (1823-26) served a similar purpose. From 1826 to 1830 he edited the Annalen founded by Wachler, Schwarz at Heidelberg at the same time publishing a periodical in the interests of his peculiar theological views. In the revived conflict (1820 sq.) respecting the Lord's supper between the Lutheran and Reformed churches, he gave himself out as the defender of true Zwinglianism (comp. his Evangel. Lehre vom heil. Abendmahl [Leips. 1824]). He likewise felt himself called to resist the movements of his time towards ultramontanism, but no less all tendencies towards “mysticism and pietism.” He had, in short, a thoroughly polemical nature, which involved him in controversies with all who would not adopt his frequently venturesome hypotheses, rationalists no less than orthodox theologians; but in the privacy of social intercourse he displayed, especially in his later years, a friendly, genial spirit, in which nothing of the controversialist was apparent. He also combined with his rationalism a simple piety whose center was a firm faith in the all-controlling goodness of God. After the University of Zurich had been founded, in 1833, Schulthess became ordinary professor in that institution. He had received the degree of doctor in theology from Jena, Nov., 1817. He died Nov. 10, 1836, leaving, as his most important legacy to theological science, an edition of the works of Zwingli which he had published m connection with Schuler. The clergymen trained by him generally entered into different paths from those in which he walked — the older ones through the influence of Schleiermacher, and the younger under the guidance of Nitzsch, Tholuck, Jul. Muller, etc. The most trustworthy source for his biography is the Denkschrift zur hundertjahr.  Jubelfier d. Schulthess. Familienfonds, etc., by his son Johann (Zurich, 1859).

## Schulting, Cornelius[[@Headword:Schulting, Cornelius]]

             a learned Dutch ecclesiastic, was born at Steenwyk, Overyssel, about 1540. His family was distinguished and honorable. After studying at Cologne, he took the ecclesiastical habit, taught philosophy in the college at Laurentianum, and afterwards became its principal., He had charge of the faculty of arts at Cologne, and was canon of the cathedral. He died April 23, 1604. His writings show erudition and a great range of reading. We mention, Bibliotheca Ecclesiastics. etc (Cologne, 1599, 4 vols. fol.): — Ecelesiasticoe Disciplinoe, etc. (ibid. 1599, 8vo): — Bibliotheca Catholia (ibid. 1602, 2 vols. 4to): — Hierarchica Anacrisis (ibid. 1604, fol.). See Sweert Athenoe Belgicoe; Hartzheim, Bibl. Colon.

## Schultze, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Schultze, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 7, 1810, and died November 21, 1884. He is the author of, Weihnachtsglocke oder liturgische Vorfeier zum heil. Christtage (5th ed. Magdeburg, 1858): — Vesperglocke oder liturgische Andachten zum Sonntag-Nachmittag (1856): — Texigemasse Predigt-Entwurfe uber die evangelischen und epistolischen Perikopen (2d ed. Gottingen, 1884, 3 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schulz, David[[@Headword:Schulz, David]]

             a German rationalist, was born in Lower Silesia, Nov. 29, 1779, and after protracted preliminary studies was admitted to the University of Halle in 1803, where he devoted himself largely to philological studies and became strongly interested in the lectures of Fr. A. Wolf. In 1806 he received the degree of Ph.D. and the position of docent in the philosophical faculty of his alma mater. Soon afterwards the university was suspended, and Schulz followed a call to Leipsic in 1807; but on the restoration of the University of Halle he returned and taught successful courses on the classical writers, the books of the New Test., and Roman antiquities. The government of Westphalia recognized his services in 1809 by conferring on him the position of extraordinary professor in theology and philosophy; but having obtained, through the influence of Wolf and W. von Humboldt, an Ordinary professorship of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he left Halle for that place. In 1810 he received the theological doctorate. In 1811 the university was transferred to Breslau, and from that period Schulz concentrated his energies wholly on the science of theology. His lectures extended over the greater portion of its field, and discussed encyclopaedia, New Test. introduction, criticism, and hermeneutics, exegesis of nearly the entire New Test. Church history, introduction to systematic theology, dogmatics, and repeatedly, for students of the entire university, the nature of Christianity. He delivered the academical address in connection with the tercentenary of the Reformation in 1817, and that of June 25, 1830, in commemoration of  the submission of the Augsburg Confession. In 1819 he was made consistorial councillor, and soon afterwards director of the commission of examiners in science, as also director of the pedagogical seminary for learned schools. In 1845 he imprudently signed a declaration against the efforts of a small party in the evangelical Church, which yet was powerful by reason of support from without, and in consequence was deprived of the position of royal consistorial councillor, though permitted to retain the title and emoluments of that office. His influence declined after 1848, as did also his physical energies. The loss of sight compelled his withdrawal from academical occupations during the last years of his life, and, after protracted sufferings, he died Feb. 17, 1854.

Schulz's theological attitude was that of ordinary rationalism. He considered his mission to be the unifying of Christianity and humanity by more clearly apprehending and presenting the fundamental truths of the former, etc. He was not a pioneer, but a Conservative rationalist, and contributed greatly to protract the rule of the rationalist tendency. His exegetical writings are not without scientific value, but those of a polemical character are immoderately violent. All of his writings suffer from diffuseness and repetition. A certain force of individuality must be conceded to him, since he was able to attract large numbers of students to his lectures, which were entirely without arrangement, and was able to exercise an almost intolerable dominion over the entire Church of Silesia during a protracted period, so that the Lutheran separation in that province is often charged to his overbearing influence. His passionate nature could not brook opposition, and rendered it difficult for him to submit to the decrease of his party, which was apparent in his later years.

The works of Schulz mostly belong to the departments of exegesis and New Test. text criticism, but are occasionally polemical writings. We mention, Brief an die Hebraer, etc. (Bresl. 1818): — Parabel vom Verwalter, Luke 16, 1 sq. (ibid. 1821): — Christl. Lehre vom heil. Abendmahl (Leips. 1824; 2d ed., with sketch of doctrine of Lord's supper, ibid. 1831): — Was heisst Glauben, u. wer sind die Unglaubigen? etc., with supplement discussing original sin (ibid. 1830, 1834): — Geistesgaben d. ersten Christen, etc. (Bresl. 1836): — Prog. de Codice 4 Evangel. Biblioth. Rhedigerianoe, etc. (Vratisl. 1814): — Novum Test. Groece, Textum ad Fidem Codd., Verss. et Patrum rec. et Lect. Var. Adjecit J.J. Griesbach, vol. 1, Evangelia complectens; ed. tertiam emend. et auct. cur. D.S. (Berol. 1827): — Disputatio de Codice D.  Cantabrigiensi (Vratisl. 1833): — De Doctorum Academ. Officiis (ibid. 1827): — Theol. Lehrfreiheit auf den evangel. Universitaten u. deren Beschrankung durch symbol. Bucher (Bresl. 1830) (Von Colln being joined with Schulz in the authorship of this work).

## Schulz, Johann Christoph Fr.[[@Headword:Schulz, Johann Christoph Fr.]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, was born May 8, 1747, at Wertheim. From 1783 he was professor at Giessen; in 1786 he was made first preacher and superintendent of the Alsfeld diocese, and died Jan. 26, 1806. He wrote, Scholia in Vet. Test. (Norimb. 1797): — Psalmus 49 Varietatibus Lectionis Observationibusque Philologicis Illustratus (Gottingen, 1769, 1771, 2 pts.): —De Ellpsibus Hebraicis, etc. (Lips. 1782-93): — Der 2te Brief Pauli an die Korinther (Halle, 1785, tc.). See Winer, Hand-buch der theol. Literatur. 2, 769; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 295 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliograph. Handbuch, p. 130. (B.P.)

## Schulze, Benjamin Wilhelm Dan.[[@Headword:Schulze, Benjamin Wilhelm Dan.]]

             a German theologian, was born at Berlin, Jan. 17, 1715, where he also died, March 17, 1790. He wrote, Commentatio et Dissertatio Apologetica, qua Inquiritur, num Puncta Vocalia τῶ Kethib אא Subjecta ad Keri sint Referenda: — Vollstandigere Kritik uber die gewohnlichen Ausgaben der hebr. Bibel, etc. (Berlin, 1764): —Conjecturoe Historico-criticoe Sadducoeorum inter Judaeos Sectae Novam Lucem Accendentes (Halle, 1799): — Additamenta Variantium Lectionum e Gersoniana Sacri Codicis Editione Collectarum (ibid. 1768): — Conjecturoe Crit. ad lllustrotionem Psa 22:13 (ibid. 1769). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 770; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 296. (B.P.)

## Schulze, Ernst August[[@Headword:Schulze, Ernst August]]

             a German professor of theology, was born Aug. 8, 1721, at Berlin, and died May 3, 1786, as pastor of the German Reformed Church at Frankfort- on-the-Oder. He wrote, Commentatio de Fictis Hierosolymorum Privilegiis (Francof. 1756): — Dissertatio de Variis Judaeorum Erroribus in Descriptione Templi (ibid. 1758): — Commentatio de Hebraeorum Antiquitatum Vestigiis in Horatii Eclogis (Hague, 1774): — Dissertatio de Juda Galilaeo et ejus Secta (Francof. 1761): —Dissertatio de Herodiana Puerorum Bethlehemiticorum Coede (ibid. 1765): — Compendium  Archoeologioe Hebraicoe (Dresden, 1793). See Wiser, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 770; Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 296. (B.P.)

## Schulze, Johann Ludwig[[@Headword:Schulze, Johann Ludwig]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, was born at Halle, Dec. 17, 1734, and died there, May 1, 1799. He wrote, Dissertatio qua Mutationes in Textu Cod. Alexandrini a Grabio Factoe ex Conjectura, ad Examen Revocantur (Halle, 1768): — Chaldaicorum Danielis et Esrae Capitum Interpretatio Hebraica (ibid. 1782): — Dissertatio ad Cohel. 1-8 (ibid. 1768). He also edited Simonis Lexicon Manuale and Altingii Synopsis Institutionum Chaldoearum. See Wiser, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 770; Furst, Bibl Judaica, 3, 297. (B.P.)

## Schumann, Christian Heinrich[[@Headword:Schumann, Christian Heinrich]]

             a German doctor of theology, was born at Neukirchen Dec. 25, 1787. His first appointment was that of collaborator at Meissen. In 1815 he was made co-rector at Annaberg, in 1825 deacon, and in 1827 pastor there, until in 1835 he became superintendent. He died at Dresden Dec. 11, 1858. He wrote, De Cultu Jesu (Annaberg, 1841): — Stimmen aus dem Hause des Herrn uber Zeitereignisse und Zeitbedurfnisse (ibid. 1849). See Wiser, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, Supplement, p. 301; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1199. (B.P.)

## Schumann, Gustav Adolph[[@Headword:Schumann, Gustav Adolph]]

             a German theologian, was born at Weickelsdorf, near Zeitz, in 1803. In 1826 he became academical private teacher; in 1829 he was made professor extraordinary at Leipsic; and died at Meissen April 11, 1841. He wrote, Vita Mosis: Pars I, De Infantia Mosis (Lips. 1826): — De Libertate Interpretis Dissertatio (Meissen, 1840): — Melancthon Redivivus, oder der ideale Geist des Christenthums (Leips. 1837). See Wiser, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 770; Supplement, p. 801; Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 297; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1199. (B.P.)

## Schumman, Johannes[[@Headword:Schumman, Johannes]]

             a distinguished clergyman of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, a medical practitioner of considerable skill, and a Revolutionary patriot whose services to his country were most vigorous and fearless, was born Aug. 18, 1712, of German parents, at West Camp, N.Y., studied theology under  Frelinghuysen and Goetschius, and received and accepted a call to the united churches of Catskill and Coxsackie, N.Y., upon condition that, at their expense, he should go to Holland to complete his education. This he did in 1752; and in 1753, after a rigid examination, he was licensed and ordained by the Classis of Amsterdam, and returned to take charge of the churches, in which he spent his entire ministry of forty-one years. His powerful voice, earnest manner, and burning fervor of piety, with uncompromising attachment to the principles of theology, his honest zeal and indefatigable perseverance and industry, were the secrets of his success. He was a warm coetus man in the great controversy of his Church respecting independence of the mother Church in Holland. In the same spirit, his patriotism made him a famous leader of the people of the whole region of which Catskill is the center against British rule. Indians and Tories abounded in that country and around his own residence. Emissaries of George III were frequently passing through those river counties carrying messages between New York and Canada and stirring up the savages and the Tortes to treacherous plots and deeds of cruelty. Of course he was the chief object of their hatred. But he prayed and thundered from his pulpit. He rode undaunted to discharge his official duties in his church at Coxsackie, fifteen miles distant from Catskill and through a wilderness that exposed him to constant dangers from his country's foes. He aided in organizing committees of safety and in the military defenses. He went armed, but his chief trust was in God. Nothing daunted or depressed his lofty daring for liberty and his native land. To this day Ulster, Greene, and Albany counties are full of traditions of his fame. He is the hero of a historical novel entitled The Dutch Dominie of the Catskills, by the late Rev. David Murdock, D.D., who was his successor at Catskill, 1842-51. His medical services were gratuitously rendered for the benefit of his people, “and without respect of persons.” A few days before he died he preached at Coxsackie his last sermon, on the Savior's words “It is finished;” and then he went home to finish his own work in the full assurance of faith, May 6, 1794. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. 9. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schupp, Johann Balthasar[[@Headword:Schupp, Johann Balthasar]]

             a German pastor and critic, was born at Giessen in 1610. In his fifteenth year he entered the University of Giessen. At first he studied law, then theology. After a long journey among the German universities, he tarried at  Rostock (1629-31) and took his master's degree. Then he visited Holland and heard Salmasius and Voss. On his return he acted as professor of history and oratory for ten years at Marburg. In 1643 he added to his duties that of a pastor. Desiring to give himself entirely to the ministry, he accepted the place of court preacher at Braubach in 1646. The landgrave of Hesse-Braubach commissioned him to take part in the negotiation of the Peace of Westphalia (1648). At Munster he had the honor of preaching the first sermon in commemoration of the peace. Here a call came to him to the place of chief pastor of St. James's, Hamburg. Entering upon his duties in 1649, he labored the remaining twelve years of his life with great zeal and popularity. He was thoroughly evangelical, preaching not exclusively Christ for us, but Christ in us, and insisting upon thorough heart conversion. His manner was free and popular, a great contrast to the prevalent scholastic method. His success turned his colleagues into spies and enemies. Bitter calumnies were invented against him. Satirical pamphlets flew on every hand. The magistracy interfered, and imposed silence on both sides. But the violence of the assaults broke down the health of the faithful man. He died in great joy, a truly candida anima, in 1661. Schupp published, Volumen Orationum Solemnium et Panegyricarum (1642): — Traktaten uber Staat, Kirche und Schule; — Morgen- und Abend-Lieder. His collective works were edited by his son (Hanau, 1663), and have had several editions. See In Schuppii Obitum (Francof. 1685); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20, 749-755. (J.P.L.)

## Schureman, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Schureman, John, D.D.]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, son of Hon. James Schureman, United States Senator from New Jersey, was born near New Brunswick, N.J., Oct. 19, 1778. Of pious lineage, he devoted himself to Christ in early youth. At seventeen he graduated from Queen's College (1795), and then studied theology with Dr. Livingston. He was licensed in 1800, settled at Bedminster, N.J., from 1801 to 1807, when he removed to the Church at Millstone, and in 1809 accepted a call to the Collegiate Dutch Reformed Church in New York at the same time with Dr. Jacob Brodhead. Here he sustained himself with satisfaction to his people, but, on account of feeble health, in 1811 he accepted the vice-presidency and chair of moral philosophy and belles lettres in Queen's College at New Brunswick. For a short time, 1813, he was pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in that city, but disease soon obliged him to desist. In 1815 the General Synod  appointed him professor of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology in the theological seminary under their care in New Brunswick. Here for five years he fulfilled his duties with profit to the institution and honor to himself. He died in 1818 of typhus fever. Dr. Schureman was blessed with a clear, vigorous, accurate, and well-disciplined mind, and with an uncommonly amiable temper which made him, like Daniel, “a man greatly beloved.” His piety was tender, devout, and universally acknowledged by all who knew him. His preaching partook of these characteristics, and was always popular, but not strong or brilliant. He was judicious, solid, calm, and full of unction. His short career gave promise of usefulness and of power, but was blighted by early death, and yet makes his memory very precious among the departed worthies of the Reformed Church. See Ludlow, Memorial; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit; De Witt, Historical Discourse. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schurmann, ANNA Maria Von[[@Headword:Schurmann, ANNA Maria Von]]

             a prominent disciple and supporter of Labadie (q.v.), was born at Cologne, Nov. 5, 1607, of Reformed parents. Persecution drove her parents in 1610 to the district of Juliers, whence the family removed to Franeker, and, after the death of her father, to Utrecht. Anna Maria was possessed of extraordinary intellectual qualities, which were further developed by careful training and instruction, so that she became familiarly acquainted with many ancient and modern languages — the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Spanish, Arabic, Syriac, and Coptic — and was able to write letters in them all; was a proficient in mathematics and history; and was no less celebrated for her skill in the more ornamental branches of music, drawing, painting, carving, waxwork, and embroidery. Her attainments won for her the title of the Tenth Muse, the Celebrated Maid of Utrecht. The serious, pious temper, and the love for the word of God which she had manifested from her childhood, now gave way to vanity; but the influence of Labadie, whom she encountered when more than fifty years of age, led to a thorough conversion. She recalled all her writings, associated herself with Labadie in his home and life, defended him and his followers with her pen and supported them with her purse. A peculiar mystical relationship subsisted between her and Labadie, but no charge of improper conduct has ever been raised against her. After Labadie's death she retired to Wievert, in Friesland, where she died in 1678, after a protracted and painful illness. Her last work, entitled Eukleria, and containing a review of her life, its  tendencies and results, was completed just before her end. See Gobel, Gesch. d. christl. Lebens, etc., p. 272-280, 783.

## Schut, Cornelius[[@Headword:Schut, Cornelius]]

             a Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp in 1597. He was a pupil of Rubens; and when he had finished his studies in 1619, he worked with great success in churches and convents. His best painting is in the cupola of the Cathedral at Antwerp, and represents the Assumption of the Virgin; and the Martyrdom of St. George in the museum of the same city shows his skill. Schut possessed a brilliant imagination and great facility of execution, which, in a large measure, compensated for his feebleness of design. He is considered one of the best of Rubens' pupils.

## Schutz, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Schutz, Johann Jacob]]

             a German hymnist, was born Sept. 7, 1640, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he also died, May 22, 1690. He was very intimate with Spener and Joachim Neander. The only hymn which he wrote was ascribed to Hugo Grotius. It is an ornament of German hymnology, the well known Sei Lob und Ehr' dem hochsten Gut (Engl. transl, in Lyra Germanica, 2, 196, “All praise and thanks to God most high”) See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4, 218 sq. Rambach, Anthologie christl. Gesange, 3, 229; Wangemann, Kirchelied, p. 298; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwab, Johann Baptist[[@Headword:Schwab, Johann Baptist]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, born in 1811 at Hassfurt, was made priest in 1834 and doctor of theology in 1839. In 184 he was appointed professor of Church history and canon law at Wurzburg. In 1851 he was deposed on account of his heterodox views, and died Dec. 28, 1875, at Wurzburg. He published, Paul von Samosata (Wurzburg 1839): — Ueber das Verhaltniss der christlichen Beredtsamkeit zur antiker (1849): — Johannes Gerson, Professor der Theologie und Kanzler der Universitat Paris (1858). See Literarischer Handweiser, 1873, p. 18; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 3, 1202. (B.P.)

## Schwabe, Franz[[@Headword:Schwabe, Franz]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died August 12, 1884, at Friedberg, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, Evangelisches Brerier in Lied und Gebet (2d ed. Friedberg, 1873): — Geistliches Liederbuch (4th ed. 1878), and of some homiletical works. (B.P.)

## Schwabe, Johann Friedrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Schwabe, Johann Friedrich Heinrich]]

             a Protestant divine of Germany, was born in 1779 at Eichelborn, near Weimar. He studied theology at Jena, and entered upon his first ministerial  duties in 1802 at Wormstedt. From that time on till his death, which took place in 1834, he occupied the most important ecclesiastical positions in the grand duchy of Hesse. He wrote, Specimen Theologioe Comparativoe exhibens Κλεάνθους ὕμνον εἰς Δία, cum Disciplina Christiana Comparatum, etc. (Jena, 1819): — Verhaltniss der stoischen Moral zum Christenthum (ibid. 1820): — Examen aus der Reformationsgeschichte (Neustadt, 1839). He also published several volumes of Sermons. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1202 sq.; Regensburger Real-Encyklop, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwartz, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Schwartz, Christian Friedrich]]

             a German missionary to India. He was born at Sonnenburg, in Brandenburg, Oct. 26, 1726, and educated at Halle. While there he studied the Tamil, in order to aid the missionary Schultz in translating the Bible. He was ordained at Copenhagen in 1749, and on Jan. 29, 1750, embarked from England for India as missionary. He reached Tranquebar July 30. He remained there until, in 1767, he was transferred to the English society and stationed at Trichinopoly. In 1779 he went to Tanjore, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was greatly esteemed by both Europeans and natives. The rajah of Tanjore committed to him the education of his son and successor, and Hyder Ali received him as ambassador after refusing all others. He died in 1798. After his death the rajah of Tanjore and the East India Company each erected a monument to his memory.

## Schwartz, Peter (In Latin Niger)[[@Headword:Schwartz, Peter (In Latin Niger)]]

             a German theologian, was born early in the 15th century. His early history is unknown, except that he received a good education and entered the Order of St. Dominic. He traveled widely, and in every way endeavored to add to his knowledge of the laws and customs of the Jews. His knowledge of Hebrew was so great that in 1474 he carried on a discussion with several rabbis in that language at Ratisbon. At that time he was teaching at Wurzburg, but left to take charge of the College of Buda, in Hungary. He died in 1481. Many of the works of Niger are lost — indeed, but two important ones remain: Tractatus ad Judoeorum Perfidiam Extirpandam Confectus (Essling, 1477, fol.; transl, into German under the title Stella Messioe [ibid. 1477, 4to]): — Clypeus Thomistarum (Venice, 1482, fol.).

## Schwartze, Moritz Gotthilf[[@Headword:Schwartze, Moritz Gotthilf]]

             a German theologian, was born in 1802 at Weissenfels. He studied the Oriental languages, and was appointed professor of the Coptic language and literature at the University of Berlin. His death occurred in 1848. He published, Prolegomena in Religionem Veterum Aegyptorum (Berl. 1832): — Das alte Aegypten (Leips. 1843): — Psalterium in Dialetum Copticoe Linguoe Memphiticam, etc. (ibid. 1843): — Quatuor Evangelia in Dialecto Linguoe Copticoe Memphiticam Perscripta, etc. (pars 1, vol. 1, Evangelia Matthoei et Marci continens [ibid. 1846]): — Koptische Grammatik (ed. by H. Steinthal [Berl. 1850]): — Pistis Sophia (Coptic, with a Latin transl., ed. by Petermann [ibid. 1851]). See the Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarz William[[@Headword:Schwarz William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Oberachern, grand duchy of Baden, Germany, Feb. 14, 1826. He was brought up a  Roman Catholic, and attended the high schools of Rastadt and Freiburg, intending to prepare for the priesthood. He came to America in 1845, and united with the Church in New York the next year. In December, 1846, he was licensed to preach, and in May, 1848, was received into the New York Conference. He was sent as missionary to Germany in 1858, and labored also in Switzerland and Paris. He was transferred to the East German Conference, and arrived in the United States in May, 1874. His appointment was Melrose, N.Y., where he died March 13, 1875. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 45.

## Schwarz, Charles, Dr.[[@Headword:Schwarz, Charles, Dr.]]

             a German preacher, was born at Wreschen, in the duchy of Posen, in the year 1817, of Jewish parentage. Having passed the gymnasium, he entered the university at Berlin; and here it was that when twenty years of age, he openly professed his faith in Christ. He now betook himself to the study of theology; went to Halle, where he attended the lectures of Gesenius, Tholuck, Erdmann, and Julius Muller, and afterwards to Berlin, where Neander, Hengstenberg, and Twesten were his teachers. Having completed his studies, he offered himself to the London Jews' Society, was ordained by the bishop of London, and appointed for Constantinople. On his way to the latter city, he went to Pesth, in Hungary, where he stayed for about a year, in the meantime becoming acquainted with Dr. Duncan of Scotland. In Constantinople he only stayed one year, severed his connection with the London society, and entered the services of the Free Church of Scotland, which appointed him as a missionary to Berlin, where he labored from 1844 till 1848. From Berlin he went to Amsterdam, where he soon attracted the attention of Jews and Christians. The church which he built there soon became the nucleus of Christian life for the Whole city, and the weekly, which he issued under the title De Heraut, soon spread all over the Netherlands. His labors in Amsterdam were greatly blessed a circumstance which excited the hatred of the Jews, who boasted themselves of being the descendants of those exiles who came from Spain and Portugal, and who, in their fanatical ignorance, could not endure that some of their brethren should leave Judaism and become Christians. With incredible fanaticism they persecuted all converts. It was on Sunday morning, Aug. 1, 1858,  when Schwarz had entered the pulpit to preach to about 1200 people, that while in silent prayer he was stabbed in the side by a young Jew, who had followed the preacher without being seen. For a long time his life was endangered, but he finally recovered. He continued for six years longer in his work at Amsterdam, when, in 1864, he exchanged the scene of his long labors for London. Here a large field was opened to him, in which he also labored till Aug. 24, 1870, when he was called to his rest. To Jews and Gentiles, Schwarz preached in English, Dutch, and German, and many of those whom he led to Christ are now ambassadors of the cross. See Friedensbote fur Israel, 1871, p. 33 sq.; Saat auf Hoffnung, 7, 383; 8, 80; Missionsblatt fur Israel, 1874, p. 83 sq., 92 sq. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Franz Joseph[[@Headword:Schwarz, Franz Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, who died at Ellwangen, July 1, 1885, doctor of theology, is the author of, Neue Untersuchungen uber das Verwandtschafts-Verhaltniss der synoptischen Evangelien, etc. (Tubingen, 1841): — Die katholische Kirche und der Protestantismus auf dem Gebiete der inlandischen Mission (1851): — Die gittliche Offenbarung von Jesus Christus nach der sognannten Armenbibel (2d ed. Freiburg, 1883). (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Friedrich Heinrich Christian[[@Headword:Schwarz, Friedrich Heinrich Christian]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany; was born May 30, 1766, at Giessen, and studied there. In 1790 he was preacher at Dexbach, near Biedenkopf, Hesse, in 1796 at Echzell, and finally, in 1804, professor of theology at Heidelberg, where he died, April 3, 1837. Schwarz took a great interest in pedagogy, founded prosperous educational institutions, and published Lehrbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre (1835, 3 volumes). Of his theological works we mention, Sciagraphia Dogmatices Christianae in Usum Praelectorum (1808): — Grundriss der kirchlichen protestantischen Dogmatik (1816): — Das Christenthum in seiner Wahrheit und Gottlichkeit betrachtet (1808): — Handbuch der  evangelisch-christlichen Ethik fur Theologen und gebildete Christen (1821; 2d ed. 1830). See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Friedrich Immanuel[[@Headword:Schwarz, Friedrich Immanuel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 5, 1728, and died at Leipsic, October 25, 1786, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Exercitationes Historico-criticca in Utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum (Wittenberg, 1756): — Jesus Talgumicus (Torgau, 1758- 59, 2 parts): — De Disputatione Vinariensi et Restitutione Cantabrigiensi (1760): — De Unctione Pontificis Magni Hebraeorum per Crucem (1756): — De Scalinzis Hebraeorum (1755): — Martyrium Stephani e Pandectis Hebraeorum Illustratum (1756): — De Resurrectione Jobi (1759): — Vaticinium Iesaiae de Tumulo Jesu Commentatio Super Ies. 21:11, 12 (1760): — Observationes Criticae de Masora Scripturae Sacrae Veteris Testamenti Polyglotta (1754). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:98, 435, 760; Furst. Bibl. Jud. s.v. Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Gottfried[[@Headword:Schwarz, Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Iglau, Hungary, November 19, 1707. He studied at Jena, was in 1730 conrector at Leutschau, Hungary, in 1742 rector at Osnabruck, in 1749 professor at Rinteln, and died November 13, 1786, doctor of theology. He published, Trias Observationum Grammaticarum (Osnabruck, 1744): — Prolegomena de Praecipuis Nominibus Dei (1771): — Annorum Vitae Tharahhi et Abrahami (1773),etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschland, s.v. (B. P.)

## Schwarz, J.C.E.[[@Headword:Schwarz, J.C.E.]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, was born at Halle, June 20, 1802. After 1829 he labored at Jena, holding the highest ecclesiastical positions, and died there May 18, 1870. He published a number of Sermons, which are all enumerated in Zuchoht, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1205. See also Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 772; Literarischer Handweiser, 1870, p. 491. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Johann Conrad[[@Headword:Schwarz, Johann Conrad]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Coburg in 1676. He studlied at Jena and Halle, was in 1706 professor at the acaldemical gymnasium in Coburg, in 1715 doctor of theology, and died June 3, 1747. He published, De Mohammedis Furto Scriptura Sacrae Liber Unus (Leipsic, 1711): — Commentarii Critici et Philologici Linguae Graece Novi Foederis Divini (1736), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:125, 128, 530; Furst, Bibl. Jrud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Johann Peter[[@Headword:Schwarz, Johann Peter]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Rudolstadt, July 6, 1721. He studied at Jena and Gittingen, and commenced his academical career in 1739 at the former university. In 1749 he was deacon at his native place, in 1761 courtpreacler, and died in 1781. He wrote, De Paniculamentis Judaeorum (Gottingen, 1737): — De Perfectione Linguae Hebraicae Quod Syllabas (1738): — De Voto, quo se Invicem Judaei Ineunte Anno Prosequntur (Jena, 1736): — Diss. ad Versionem Jonathanis ben-Usiel Gen 2:1 (1739): — De Nominibus Veteris Testamenti Propriis, Religionis Ebr corum Monumentis (1743): — Paradoxa Theologica, de Efficacia Sacrae Scripturae (1757), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Josef[[@Headword:Schwarz, Josef]]

             a German Jew, was born Oct. 22, 1804, at Floss, in Bavaria. When seventeen years of age he entered the University of Wurzburg. In 1833 he arrived in Palestine, and died at Jerusalem Feb. 5, 1865. Schwarz is best known by his works on Palestine. Thus he published, Hebraiische Karte uber Palestina (Wurzburg, 1829, and often): — תּבּוּאות השׁמשׁ, or Astronomical and Physical Explanations of the Holy Land (Jerusalem, 1843): — תּבּוּאּתּ הּאּרּצּ, or Geography of Palestine (ibid. 1845): — תּוּצּאּוּתּ ץאּרּצּ, or Natural History of the Holy Land (ibid. 1845): — מּעשּׁהּ הּאּרּצּ, or History of Palestine till 1845 (ibid. 1845). Some of his works were translated into German. His Geography was translated into English by Is. Leeser: A Descriptive Geography and Brief Historical Sketch of Palestine (Phila. 1850). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 300 sq. (B.P.)

## Schwarz, Karl Heinrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Schwarz, Karl Heinrich Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born November 19, 1812. He commenced his academical career at Halle in 1842, was professor there in 1849, in 1856 court-preacher and member of consistory at Gotha, and died March 25, 1885, doctor of theology. According to his own request, Schwarz's body was cremated. He published, De Sancta Trinitate, etc. (Halle, 1842): — Das Wesen der Religion (1847): — Lessing als Theolog. (1854): — Zur Geschichte der neueren Theologie (4th ed. 1869): — Predigten aus der Gegenvwart (1859-79, 7 volumes). Schwarz was the leader of the so-called liberal theologians of Germany. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt[[@Headword:Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt]]

             the name of two German hymnists.

1. AEMILIA JULIANA, Countess of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, daughter of the count Adalbert Friedrich von Barby, was born Aug. 19, 1637, at Rudolstadt, where she died Dec. 3, 1706. She wrote over four hundred hymns, among others the well known Wer weiss wie nahe mir mein Ende? (“Who knows how near my end may be?” Lyra Germanica, 2, 267), which is said to have been written on the occasion of the sudden death of duke George of Saxe-Eisenach while hunting. Her Hymns have been published by Dr. Pasig (Halle, 1855). Comp. also Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes, 4, 56 sq.

2. LUDAMILIA ELISABETH. One of her hymns, Zeuch uns nach dir, so eilen wir, is found in an Engl. transl, in the Monthly Relig. Mag. 37, 1867. p. 338. SEE LUDAMILIA. (B.P.)

## Schwarzenberg, Friedrich Johann Nepomuk[[@Headword:Schwarzenberg, Friedrich Johann Nepomuk]]

             prince-archbishop of Prague, was born April 6, 1809. In 1836 prince Schwarzenberg was made archbishop of Salzburg, in 1842 cardinal-priest, in 1849 archbishop of Prague, and died at Vienna, March 27, 1885, cardinal archbishop. At the Vatican council he made an address, May 18, 1870; against the dogma of papal infallibility, which caused a great sensation in all Europe. But the resistance of Schwarzenberg was soon broken; he did not sign the protest of the opposition party, and retired to a monastery to avoid being further pressed by his former adherents. In Rome the papal faction soon proclaimed "Laudabiliter se subjecit." And such was the case, for Schwarzenberg was one of the first who proclaimed the dogma of infallibility in his archdiocese. Otherwise he was one of the most peaceful and tolerant prelates in Austria. (B.P.)

## Schwarzenberg, Johann Von[[@Headword:Schwarzenberg, Johann Von]]

             a prominent German statesman, warrior, and author of works for the people in the days of the Reformation, was born Dec. 25, 1463, received a knightly training, and was not less distinguished by herculean stature and physical strength than by courage and skill in the use of arms. A rebuke from his father determined him to avoid all frivolity and immorality of life, and with iron will he persisted through life in attaining to a high moral character. He participated in the expedition to the Holy Land undertaken by the elector Frederick the Wise in 1493 (concerning which see Spalatin, Hist. Nachl., published by Neudecker and Preller, 1, 76), and after his return accompanied the emperor Maximilian in his German and Italian campaigns. But though he acquired the reputation of a brave and skilful  soldier, he soon turned aside to the work of aiding to fit the State for the accomplishment of its great mission to promote peace and justice, and also the morality and prosperity of its subjects. His first field was in the episcopal principality of Bamberg, where he occupied the post of prime minister (Hofmeister) at the beginning of the 16th century, under the bishops Henry III and George of Limburg; and his first notable work was the introduction of a reform in the execution of capital punishments, which subsequently became the law of the empire (the so called Carolina of 1532).

While recognizing the need of reform in the State, Schwarzenberg was also convinced of the need of reform in the Church; and as he found opportunity to make himself felt for good in statesmanship, so he readily admitted the claims of duty on him from the side of religion and morality, He was thoroughly prepared for the beginning of the Reformation through zealous study of the Bible, which had, even before Luther appeared, revealed to him the vast difference between genuine Christianity and the actual life of the Church. He was profoundly impressed with the conviction that the creature owes the most perfect obedience to the will of God as revealed in Scripture, and this conviction was the leading motive of his life; but he had likewise learned to know the weakness of human nature, and therefore laid hold on the doctrines of grace in the Bible with all his heart. He naturally threw the weight of his official station, the convincing power of his speech, the iron energies of his will, and the combining and constructive powers of his statesmanship into the scale in favor of the Reformation, and thus became a most powerful instrument for promoting its success. As its progress was rather promoted than hindered by the bishop George, Bamberg soon became a stronghold for the defense and also a center from which to carry forward the extension of the evangelical cause. Schwarzenberg's influence was powerfully felt even in the administration of the empire. He had been the representative or companion of his prince in several diets, and had won a high reputation for ability. In 1522-23 he was not only a member of the regency of the empire, but its soul (see Ranke, Ref. Gesch. 2, 48 sq.); and it was that body which replied to the brief of pope Hadrian VI with a refusal to stamp out Lutheranism as he had demanded, and urged instead that the estates be convoked in some German city to institute reforms of evils conceded by the pope to exist a measure which, with some slight modifications, became an edict of the  empire early in 1523, and secured a period of quiet during which the Reformation might gather strength.

While Schwarzenberg was thus laboring for the cause of religion in the political field, he was also busy in the domain of literature, and published a number of works designed for the elevation of morals among the people. The earliest of his popular writings was a poem entitled Kummertrost, which was called forth by the death of his wife in 1502. He afterwards edited a collection of minor didactic poems under the title Memorial der Tugend, and published a poem in condemnation of the practices of the robber knights, who sought occasion for quarrel that they might have opportunity for plunder, as also one denouncing the drinking usages of his countrymen. Another method adopted by him to promote virtue among the people was the publication of suitable classical works, freely rendered, and accompanied with pertinent remarks from his own pen. Among such works were Cicero's De Officiis and the first book of Tusculan Questions, the De Senectute, and the De Amicitia. Himself unacquainted with the ancient languages, he would employ scholars to translate such works into German, and afterwards would popularize them, always using the language of a master, and adding rhymes and illustrations to give more force to the book. The Teutsche Cicero was frequently republished during the 16th century.

Bishop George died in 1522 and was succeeded by bishop Wigand, who was at first undecided, then controlled by the Romish clergy, and finally (June, 1524) joined a league organized to enforce the Edict of Worms. Schwarzenberg at once took his daughter out of a convent in Bamberg, and frankly justified his conduct in a letter to the bishop by advancing his evangelical motives (published, with a preface by Andr. Osiander, Nuremb. 1524; comp. Luther's Letter to Schwarzenberg, dated Dec. 21, 1524, in De Wette, 2, 581), and at the age of more than sixty years resigned his position in the principality. The controversy which had arisen broke out in his own family. His son Christoph issued an anonymous book aimed against the Reformed teaching, and designed to counteract the determinative influence of Schwarzenberg with the whole of the numerous family, to which the latter replied in 1524 with the frequently republished Beschworung der alten teuflischen Schlanqe mit dem gottlichen Wort, a dogmatical work, intended to demolish the false authorities on which his son had built, and to set forth the teachings of the Scriptures in their purity. Some further discussion took place in this dispute, but without eliciting any additional work of importance.  After leaving Bamberg, Schwarzenberg was employed in the Franconian principalities of Brandenburg in a capacity similar to that he had just vacated. The two margraves, Casimir and George, were in sympathy with his ideas — the former through his purpose of securing a strong government, the latter through his unconditional devotion to the cause of the Reformation. Margrave George was absent from his territories, however; and when the emperor took measures to counteract the decrees of the Diet of Nuremberg, the administration of the principality became less decidedly partial to the Reformation. The Peasants' War, too, seemed to effect a change in Casimir's attitude towards the new religion. In 1526, while the Diet of Spires was in session, Schwarzenberg was at the court of duke Albert of Prussia to represent his government on the occasion of the duke's marriage (see Spies, Brandenburg Munzbelustigungen, 2, 29), and availed himself of the opportunity to plead the cause of the Reformation with king Sigismund of Poland and the bishop of Cracow. (Comp. Strobel, Job. von Schwarzenberg, zween sehr merkw Briefe [Nuremb. 1775]). Duke Albert asked permission to retain Schwarzenberg at his court, at least for a single year, but without success.

After returning to his home, Schwarzenberg demanded in the Territorial Diet, Oct. 1526, that organizations on the evangelical plan be formed, and offered suggestions towards that end. Casimir attempted to temporize, but in vain, and accordingly joined the army of king Ferdinand in Hungary, where he died, Sept. 21, 1527. Margrave George now assumed the government, and at once took decided ground in favor of the Reformation. In March, 1528, the first visitation of the churches was undertaken in connection with Nuremberg. The objections of neighboring bishops, and the warnings of king Ferdinand were disregarded, and a papal brief intended to change the margrave's attitude was returned unopened. A delegated assembly from Franconia and Nuremberg met at Schwabach June 15, and agreed on articles to govern the exclusion of unevangelical persons from the Church. A meeting between the margrave and the elector of Saxony, having relation to ecclesiastical matters, took place in October, 1528, but Schwarzenberg was unable to be present because of sickness, and on the 21st of that month he died at Nuremberg.

See Rossbach, Verfasser d. Bamb., Brandenb. u. d. heil. Reichs peinl. Gerichts, Joh. Freih. v. Schwarzenberg, in Schott's Jurist. Vochenbl. 3d year, p. 273 sq., and Longolius, Nachr. von Brandenburg-Culmbach, 4, 53 sq., who among older writers furnish isolated particulars only; Christ, De  Joh. Schwartzenbergico (Halle, 1726), has reference only to the literary activity of its subject. A very inadequate sketch of the life of Schwarzenberg, which scarcely mentions his relation to the Reformation, appeared in Jagemann and Nollner's Zeitsehr. f. deutseh. Strafverfahren, 1, 133 sq. See also Stromer, Zween sehr merkw. Briefe, already cited; Lith, Erlaut. d. Ref.-Hist. a. d. Brandenb., in Onolzbach Archiv, 1733; Ranke, Ref. Gesch. ut sup.; and especially E. Herrmann, Joh. Freih. zu Schwarzenberg, etc. (Leips. 1841). The editions of Schwarzenberg's writings are given in Godeke's Grundriss zur Gesch. d. deutschen Dichtung, 1, 214.

## Schwarzhuber, Simpertus[[@Headword:Schwarzhuber, Simpertus]]

             a Benedictine, was born at Augsburg, December 4, 1727, and died at Salzburg, April 30, 1795, doctor of theology. He published, System der christlichen Sittenlehre (Salzburg, 1793-94, 2 volumes): — Gedanken uber die bedenklichsten Einwendungen gegen die Untruglichkeit der Kirche, etc. (1794): — Prsaktisch-katholisches Religionshandbuch fur nachdenkende Christen (1784-86, 4 volumes). See Winer. Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:316, 404; 2:323; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwarzl, Karl[[@Headword:Schwarzl, Karl]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in Austria, February 19, 1746, and died at Freiburg, March 4, 1809. He wrote, Elenchus Sanctorum Patrum Ordine Alphabetico (Innsbruck, 1780): — Praelectiones Theologiae Polemicae (Vienna, 1781): — Die Psalmen David's, frei aus dem Hebraischen ubersetzt (Augsburg, 1798): — Anleitung zu einer vollsundigen Pastoraltheologie (1799, 3 volumes): — Uebersetzung und Auslegung des Neuen Testaments (Ulm, 1802-1805, 6 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologens Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:342, 670; 2:35, 70. (B.P.)

## Schwebel, Johann (1)[[@Headword:Schwebel, Johann (1)]]

             an evangelical theologian and Reformer in the palatinate Zweibrucken, Rhenish Bavaria, was born in 1490 at Pforzheim, in Baden, and received his early education in the famous Latin school of that town, from which men like Capito Hedio, Grynaeus, Haller, etc., came forth. It is not known that Schwebel studied at any higher school. He entered the Order of the Holy Ghost while yet very young, and transferred to it the whole of his property, some part being afterwards returned to him through the intervention of the margrave Philip. In 1514 he was consecrated priest. He spent his time in studying the Scriptures and the writings of the fathers, and thus learned to know the perversions of doctrine and corruption of practice in the creed and worship of the Church; and his surroundings, as also the events of the time, aided to confirm the purpose he had formed of publicly antagonizing the evils be had found. The dispute of the Dominicans of Cologne with Reuchlin (q.v.) had united all the friends of classical and Biblical learning in an endeavor to combat scholasticism, monkish obscurantism, and the exaggerated demands of the Roman curia. Many reformatory spirits were then in Pforzheim or that vicinity; e.g. Gerbel, Capito, Pellican and Sebastian Mynster, Bucer, Oecolampadius, and Irenicus. Luther's Theses became known in 1517, and in the following year, April 25, Luther himself was at Heidelberg engaged in the famous disputation. Melancthon, too, wrote frequently to Schwebel from Wittenberg and sent him extracts from his lectures on Matthew and Romans (Cent. Epist. p. 3), etc.

Such influences served to prepare Schwebel for his reformatory career. He laid aside the garb of his order, and in 1519 became an evangelical preacher in his native town, but was speedily expelled by the margrave Philip. He  fled to Franz von Sickingen, and sought, from the asylum furnished by that stanch defender of the Reformation, to influence his countrymen by means of letters. Towards the close of 1522 he published a work entitled Ermahnung zu dem Questionieren, abzustellen uberflussige Kosten, in which he censured the abuses connected with the collection of alms in the Romish Church, all intended to secure money to the clergy, from the pope to the lowest monk. He was permitted to return to Pforzheim, and on April 10, 1524, preached there on the theme of the “Good Shepherd.” A small evangelical congregation was thus gathered, and was at this time placed under the pastoral care of Johann Unger, who had been tutor in the family of Melancthon and who remained its pastor until his death, in 1553 (Vierordt, De Johanne Ungero, Carolsr. 1844).

While Schwebel was present in the Castle of Sickingen that nobleman introduced the celebration of the mass in the German tongue, and Schwebel heartily approved of the innovation (Cent. Epist. p. 337). In 1524 he married, and, like other Reformers, was censured for that step, but defended himself in two treatises on marriage, and particularly the marriage of priests. Sickingen's unfortunate campaign against the elector of Treves and his allies (begun in September, 1522) necessitated the dismissal of his theological guests, and Schwebel went to Zweibrucken, where he became court preacher and superintendent of the churches of the duchy. He secured the confidence of his patron, the count palatine Louis 2, and found powerful co-laborers in the persons of Jacob Schorr and Jerome Bock, who belonged to the train of that prince. In 1524 Schwebel expounded Matthew, John, and Romans, though he afterwards preached usually on the pericope assigned to the day. His discourses were founded on the Epistle to the Romans. He taught that the chief elements of Christian doctrine are, (1) repentance (poententia); (2) justification by faith; (3) love to God and our neighbor; (4) the doctrine of sufferings (crux) as conservers of faith; (5) believing prayer in behalf of ourselves and others (ibid. p. 16). Elsewhere he says that works grow out of faith; man has free will, but only to evil naturally, and only by grace to good (Teutsche Schriften, 1, 81). He regards the sacraments as signs of the grace or the will of God towards us, and as symbols of love among Christians. The bread and wine in the supper become a spiritual food when received by faith.

Besides the German sermon, Schwebel introduced catechetical instruction covering the Decalogue, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the words of institution in the sacramental service; and he substituted the  singing of German for Latin hymns. In 1529 he prepared a form of Church government, which was approved by Bucer (Cent. Epist. p. 133), and continued, in connection with the evangelical clergy of that region, to give attention to this subject for many years (Teutsche Schriften, p. 317, 379, etc.). For ten years Schwebel guided the Reformation in Zweibrucken alone. His health began to fail and his strength to decline, and in 1533 he attempted to resign his office, in which purpose he was strengthened by the troubles caused by an assistant named Georgius, who denied original sin and infant baptism, and disturbed the peace of the Church. He was, however, prevailed on to remain, and in that year Caspar Glaser and Michael Hilspach were called to his aid (comp. Croll, Hist. Scholae Hornb. p. 18, 19). Schwebel was prohibited by his official position from attending any of the larger conferences in which religious and ecclesiastical matters were discussed, but he maintained a steady correspondence with most of the Reformers, particularly Melancthon, Bucer, and Capito. His advice was sought with reference to the desired settlement of the sacramental difficulty, which was attempted in the Concord of Stuttgart in 1534, and sought to be confirmed by the Wittenberg Concord. The latter document was signed by Schwebel and his colleagues, but with the reservation implied in the words “Vidimus et legimus exemplar concordiae.” He was essentially a man of peace, and not disposed to let usages and ceremonies cause divisions in the Church (see Cent. Epist. p. 297, 351). In few words, Schwebel occupied a position in dogmatics largely identical with that of Melanc-thon as represented in the Loci Communes and the Latin edition of his Articles of Visitation; and in Church organization he held to the Reformed system of a presbyterial and synodal constitution emanating from the congregation. If such organization was left uncompleted in his day, he had at least prepared the way for its ultimate consummation. He fell a victim to the plague when scarce fifty years of age, May 19, 1540, and his wife died two days later.

Schwebel's printed works are, Opera Theologicorum (pt. 1, Biponti, 1595, 8vo): — Centuria Epistolarum (ibid. 1597, 8vo): — Scripta Theologica, etc., a mere reprint of the two previous works, with preface omitted (ibid. 1605, 8vo): — Teutsche Schriften (Zweibruck. 1598): — Ermahnung zu d. Quest. abzustellen uberfluss Kosten (1522): — Sermon on the Good Shepherd (1524).

## Schwedler, Johann Christoph[[@Headword:Schwedler, Johann Christoph]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born at Krobsdorf, Silesia, Dec. 21, 1672. He studied at Leipsic, and in 1697 was appointed assistant deacon in Niederwiese, in Upper Lusatia. In 1701 he was appointed to the pastorate of that place, and died Jan. 12, 1730. He is the author of about 500 hymns, the most beautiful of which is his “Wollt ihr wissen, was mein Preis, “ translated into English in Hymnologia Christiana, No. 620, “Ask ye what great thing I know.” See Wezel, Hymnop, 4, 463 sq.; Otto, Lexikon oberlausitzischer Schriftsteller, 3, 1, 248 sq.; Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes, 5, 225 sq.; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwegler, Albert[[@Headword:Schwegler, Albert]]

             a German rationalist, perhaps, after Baur, the leading representative of the modern Tubingen school. His father was pastor in the village of Michelbach, Wurtemberg, and there Albert was born, Feb. 10, 1819. His early instruction was directed by his father, and was supplemented by the schools of Schwabisch-Hall and Schonthal, so that he entered the evangelical seminary at Tubingen in 1836 with rare preparatory acquirements. He immediately entered on the study of the Hegelian philosophy, and was so fascinated that he could find no pleasure in the study of Schleiermacher, which he had also undertaken, and considered the relation of that theologian to Christianity as evidence of his intellectual narrowness. Philosophical speculation was less suited to his mind, however, than historical inquiry. He was consequently mightily impressed on its appearance with Strauss's Leben Jesu, which he regarded as the culmination of the entire tendency in which the relation of theology to philosophy had been developed. The measures taken by the authorities against Strauss served only to heighten Schwegler's enthusiasm for that author. The longer he studied that work, however, the more reason did he  find for doubt He believed that the text Of the Gospels would afford a more solid historical basis than Strauss had found. His philosophical opinions, too, were becoming uncertain; he came to believe that the Hegelian system did not concede sufficient importance to the factor of personality, and questioned whether philosophy might not become more largely Christian than it then was; and in the end he acknowledged that he could not be certain that he should not become a pietist at last.

While in this state of uncertainty he became a disciple of F. Chr. Baur, in whom he imagined that he had found what he desired. He thoroughly mastered that theologian's theory of the conditions of early Christianity, and subsequently elaborated it in various essays and treatises. While a student, he solved two problems set by the theological faculty tone of which concerned the relation of the ideal to the historical Christ, and the other the Montanist heresy — and obtained both prizes. A brilliant examination, supplemented by the reception of a first prize in homiletics and another in catechetics, brought his student life to a close in 1840. He remained at Tübingen, employed in literary labors, during nine months longer. In 1841 he published his prize essay on Montanism in an enlarged form, under the title Der Montanismus u. d. christl. Kirche d. 2ten Jahrhunderts, and afterwards traveled through Germany to Holland and Belgium, with the result that he was confirmed in the tendency he had begun to cultivate. On his return to Tubingen in 1842, he was obliged to assume charge of the affairs of the Church at the neighboring village of Bebenhausen; but he had determined on a literary and academical career, and continued in that relation less than a year. In the autumn of 1843 he qualified himself for a tutorship in the theological seminary by reading before the philosophical faculty an essay on the Symposium of Plato, but without obtaining the desired place. In 1844 he, with a number of friends, founded the Jahrbiicher der Gegenwart, and became the actual editor. His rejection from the theological seminary had the effect to intensify his devotion to the system of Baur, as appears from the work entitled Das nachapostol. Zeitalter (Tub. 1846). This work was finished in six months, and is far inferior to the earlier work on Montanism. Its fundamental proposition is, that primitive Christianity was simple Ebionitism. In 1847 Schwegler published the Clementine Homilies, and in 1852 the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. All his subsequent works are outside the field of theology — Aristot. Metaphysik (1847): — Gesch. d. Philosophic (1848): — Romische Gesch., of which vol. 3 appeared in  1858, carrying the description forward to the Licinian laws. This volume is preceded by a life of the author, from which the data for this article are obtained. Schwegler had in 1848 been made extraordinary professor for Roman literature and antiquities, and afterwards obtained also the chair of ancient history. He died suddenly, Jan. 5, 1857.

## Schweinitz, Lewis David von, Ph.D.[[@Headword:Schweinitz, Lewis David von, Ph.D.]]

             an American clergyman and botanist, was born in Bethlehem, Pa., Feb. 13, 1780. He went to Germany in 1793, where he finished his education and remained till 1812, when he returned to America, and settled at Salem, N.C., as clergyman and superintendent of the financial affairs of the Moravian Church, South. He returned in 1821 to his native place — Bethlehem — and resided there until his death, Feb. 8, 1834. He was an enthusiastic scientist, making botany his special study. By his own researches he added more than 1400 new species to the catalogues of the American flora, the greater part being fungi, which had been previously but little studied. His principal botanical works are the following: Conspectus Fungorum Lusatioe (Leips. 1805): — Synopsis Fungorum Carolinoe Superioris (edited by Dr. Schwergichen, 1818): — Specimen Floroe Americoe Septentrionalis Cryptogamicoe (1821): — Monograph of the Genus Viola (1821): — Catalogue of Plants Collected in the Northwest Territory by Say (1824): — Monograph upon the American Species of the Genus Carex (1825): — and Synopsis Fungorum in America Boreali Media Degentium (1832).

## Schweinitz, Plans Christoph von[[@Headword:Schweinitz, Plans Christoph von]]

             a German hymnist, was born in 1645 at Rudelsdorf, in the Silesian principality of Schweidnitz, and died in 1722. His hymn Wird das nicht Freude sein, which he wrote at the death of his first wife, Theodora, has become one of the gems the German hymns. It has also been translated into English, “Will that not joyful be!” (Hymns from the Land of Luther, p. 9). See Otto, Lexikon oberlausitzischer Schriftsteller (Gorlitz, 1803); Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4, 34 sq.; Knapp, Evangel. Liederschatz, s.v. (B.P.)

## Schwenkfeld, Kaspar Von[[@Headword:Schwenkfeld, Kaspar Von]]

             founder of the religious sect named after him, Schwenkfeldians (q.v.). tie was born in Ossig, Silesia, in 1490; was a nobleman of ancient lineage,  councillor to the duke of Liegnitz, and an earnest advocate of the Reformation. While holding the chief Reformers in the highest esteem, he differed from them on the following points:

1. Schwenkfeld inverted the words of Christ, “this is my body,” and read “my body is this” — i.e. such as this bread, which is broken and consumed; a true and real food, which nourisheth, satisfieth, and delighteth the soul.

2. He denied that the external Word had any power to enlighten and renew the mind, but ascribed this power to the internal Word, which, according to his notion, was Christ himself. 3. He would not allow Christ's human nature, in its exalted state, to be called a creature or a created substance, as such a denomination appeared to him infinitely below its majestic dignity, united as it is in that glorious state with the divine essence. He died in Ulm about 1561. His character was never impugned by any of his opponents, and his numerous writings (including Bekenntniss und Rechenschaft von den Hauptpunkten des christlichen Glaubens [1547], and nearly 100 treatises) are among the most valuable sources of the history of the Reformation.

## Schwenkfeldians, Or Sehwenkfelders[[@Headword:Schwenkfeldians, Or Sehwenkfelders]]

             a religious sect in the 16th century deriving its name from Kaspar Schwenkfeld (q.v.). He often declared his unwillingness to form a separate sect, but after his death numbers who had embraced his views were subjected to severe persecution, especially from the Lutheran clergy. In 1719 the Jesuits endeavored to effect the conversion of this people, but, failing, they reduced them to slavery. They fled into Lusatia and other parts of Saxony; but protection being withdrawn there after eight years (1734), a number of them emigrated to Altona, Denmark. Many others, by the permission of the English govenment, came to Pennsylvania; and though in 1742 they were all invited back to Silesia, with the promise of the return of their estates and the full enjoyment of toleration, none could ever be induced to return. They celebrated their arrival in Pennsylvania by a “festival in grateful memory of all mercies and divine favors manifested to them by the Father of mercies.” They still continue to celebrate the anniversary. Reference to the peculiarities of doctrine is made in the article SCHWENKFELD SEE SCHWENKFELD (q.v.). This sect has a service in reference to infants unknown among other religious bodies. As soon as a child is born, a preacher is called in to pray for its happiness and prosperity,  exhorting the parents to bring it up in the fear of the Lord. A similar service is held in the church as soon as the mother is able to attend with the child. In their government they are Congregational, electing annually the minister, trustees, and other officers of their Church. They choose their pastors by lot, instructing them in their duties if uneducated when chosen. They number about 300 families, from 800 to 1000 communicants, 5 ministers, and as many churches. The language for social intercourse and private worship is German.

## Schwestriones[[@Headword:Schwestriones]]

             a name of reproach, “Sisterers,” given to the Lollards and Beghards (q.v.).

## Schyn, Hermann[[@Headword:Schyn, Hermann]]

             author of the Historia Mennonitarum, SEE MENNO; SEE MENNONITES, was born at Amsterdam in 1662, and studied at Leyden and Utrecht, being made M.D. in 1682. After settling at Rotterdam as a physician, he began the study of theology, and in 1686 was chosen preacher by the congregation of Mennonites in that city. In 1690 he removed to Amsterdam, and entered on a career in which he administered the duties of the sacred office during thirty-seven years with fidelity and success. He died in 1727. As a preacher he had a leaning towards the Cocceian tendency (q.v.), and followed the farfetched analytical-exegetical method of the time, but was none the less practical and fervent — somewhat given to the use of mystical phrases, as may be seen in the collection of his sermons, Heilige Keurstoffen (1733).

Schyn became known as a writer on practical themes through his Mensch in Christus (1721-25) and Beletselen d. Geestelyken Levens (1727), and also as an advocate of Union among his coreligionists through the Ontwerp toe Vereeniging der Doopsgezinden (1723). His principal fame was obtained, however, in the publication of the Historia Mennonitarum (Amst. 1723, 1729, 2 vols. [first in Dutch, Korte Hist.]). See Blaupot ten Cate, Gesehied. der Doopsgezinden, etc., 2, 136, and the literature there given; Krohn, Gesch. der Wiedertaufer, p. 136 sq.

## Sciaditis[[@Headword:Sciaditis]]

             in Greek mythology, was an appellative of Diana; who possessed a temple at Scia, in Arcadia, which had been built by Aristodemus.

## Sciallius[[@Headword:Sciallius]]

             in Greek mythology, was an appellative of Apollo.

## Sciamancy, Or Sciomancy[[@Headword:Sciamancy, Or Sciomancy]]

             (Gr. σκιά, a shadow, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination, by which it was pretended the dead were brought from the shades below. SEE DIVINATION; SEE NECROMANCY.

## Sciapodes[[@Headword:Sciapodes]]

             was a name in Greek mythology. A fable of the ancient Greeks recites that a people lived in India whose feet were so large as to be capable of serving as umbrellas. The Sciapodes (shadow-footed people) were accordingly in the habit of seating themselves and interposing a foot between the sun and their persons.

## Scias[[@Headword:Scias]]

             in Greek mythology, was a nymph from the forests of Tanagra, the wife of Cephissus and mother of Elinus. Eunostos, a son of the latter, became notorious through his indifference towards Ochne, the daughter of Colonus.

## Science[[@Headword:Science]]

             (מַדַּע, madda; Dan 1:4, knowledge, as elsewhere rendered). In one passage only (1Ti 6:20) this word has also been given by our translators as the equivalent of the Greek term γνῶσις, a word which is used about thirty times in the New Test., but which in all other passages is properly rendered knowledge. It doubtless here refers to the so called gnosis, or that affectation of spiritual knowledge which set itself in array against the Gospel of Christ, and which boasted of its superior insight into the nature of things. It was from this sort of pretentious knowing that the Gnostics derived their name and they were among the earliest corrupters of the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ. SEE GNOSTICS. Many readers have erroneously supposed that Paul is speaking of something else than the “knowledge” of which both the Judaizing and the mystic sects of the apostolic age continually boasted, against which he so urgently warns men (1Co 8:1; 1Co 8:7), the counterfeit of the true knowledge which he prizes so highly (1Co 12:8; 1Co 13:2; Php 1:9; Col 3:10).  It was not until after the accession of David that the Jews became remarkable for their intellectual culture; but the patriarchs probably possessed a considerable knowledge of practical astronomy SEE ASTRONOMY, such as is still popular among pastoral tribes, probably corrupting it by an admixture of judicial astrology. SEE ASTROLOGY.

The literature of the Hebrews was chiefly limited to ethics, religion, the history of their nation, and to natural history, on which Solomon wrote several treatises no longer extant. If the phenomena mentioned in Scripture had been described with the accuracy of modern physical science, they would have been unintelligible to the persons for whose use the sacred writings were originally designed. The most numerous references to Oriental science occur in the book of Job (see Schmidt, Biblischer Physikus [Zullichau, 1731, 1748]).

In modern times the appeal of rationalists and semi-infidels has especially been to the discoveries of science, especially geology (q.v.), as militating against the Bible; but in every instance a careful and candid comparison has shown their compatibility. SEE INTERPRETATION, BIBLICAL SCIENCE AND REVELATION. It is an undeniable fact that there is a Controversy between scientists and theologians, but we propose to answer in this article the question, Is there any antagonism between science and revelation? It may be well to define the position which some of the most distinguished scientists take, and which they claim to be alone tenable. Prof. Huxley says, “There is but one kind of knowledge, and but one method of acquiring it;” that that kind of knowledge makes “scepticism the highest of duties, blind faith the one unpardonable sin.” He describes all faith as “blind” which accepts anything on any kind of authority but that of scientific experience. He describes true religion as “worship ‘for the most part of the silent sort,' at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable,” and proclaims “justification, not by faith, but by verification,” as the gospel of modern science (Lay Sermon, read at St. Martin's Hall, London, and published in the Fortnightly Review, Jan, 15, 1866). He further says that “the improver of natural knowledge absolutely refuses to acknowledge authority as such,” and maintains that the method of the inductive sciences is the only method by which any human creature can arrive at any sort of truth. The natural consequence is that such men find themselves opposed to revelation, which assumes that man by searching cannot find all truth, and therefore teaches what is, otherwise, unknown and unknowable. Many scientists assert that their investigations prove the falsity of the statements and teachings of  Scripture. That the conclusions of scientists may not harmonize with what they believe to be the teachings of Scripture we readily admit; but that the real facts taught in the one contradict, antagonize, those revealed by the other we as unhesitatingly deny. In fact, revelation, as we hope to show, really has no controversy with science. Let us glance at some of the alleged contradictions.

1. Genesis. — The first chapters of this book have been the great bone of contention, theologians having been wont to assume that Moses asserts the formation of the entire universe, or at least of our own globe, with all its internal and superficial furniture, in six literal days; while scientists at present in the main contend for an immense period of astronomical and geological eras, which they claim that they read in the nebular reductions, the rocky strata, and the vital evolutions. But a close inspection of the phraseology of Moses shows that he has not committed himself to either of these opposite opinions. He Simply states in Col 3:1 the fact of God's creation of our own planet and its solar system, substantially as they now exist, without specifying any particulars as to the time, mode, or order of the process; and in the following verses he narrates successive stages of a subsequent special creation of the present vegetable and animal tribes, either over the earth generally or possibly in a particular locality only. The Bible and modern science thus appear to be discoursing upon two entirely different subjects, and cannot possibly contradict each other.

2. The Antiquity of Man. — The questions of the antiquity and unity of the human race upon the earth are indeed more explicitly touched upon in the Bible, but modern science has hitherto adduced nothing adequate to overthrow the Biblical testimony. Presumptions to the contrary, it is true, have been raised in some quarters by certain phenomena; but these admit of so ready an explanation on other grounds, and are rebutted by so many other facts, that scientists at large still hold fast to the opinion that man is of comparatively recent origin, and must have sprung from a single family.

3. The Flood. — The universality of Noah's flood as to the surface of the globe, although we admit the first inference from the Biblical account, is found on a closer examination not to be necessarily intended by its language; and a consideration of its uselessness and impracticability for the mere purpose of drowning a few thousands in a particular locality induced expositors to limit its prevalence long before the modern scientific objections were thought of.

4. The Resurrection, etc. — The doctrine of the survival of the soul after death, and of the resurrection of the body, are coming more and more to be seen to be not only not incompatible with physiological science, but to be almost necessary deductions from psychological and metaphysical reasoning, even apart from revelation. If the miraculous element be admitted into nature, and hard facts demand its occasional intervention, as well as its primal impulse, all difficulty on physical grounds vanishes from these problems of the future world. The imperceptible but frequent renewal of the material organism actually furnishes a striking illustration of the continuity of identity in the midst of apparent dissolution and atomic change.

5. Alleged Unscientific Statements. — But it is said that certain specific statements of Scripture are shown by science to be false. For instance, in natural history the coney and the hare are classed with the ruminants (Lev 11:5-6; Deu 14:7), whereas in fact they have no cud; and the ant with non-hybernating insects (Pro 6:6-8; Pro 30:25), whereas in truth it lies torpid all winter. The answer to this is that the Scripture writers give a correct account of an actual phenomenon, although their descriptions are not couched in scientific terms. Their language is always optical, i.e. in accordance with the exterior or apparent phenomena. As, in the case of the hare, they undoubtedly refer to the constant motions of the lips, which seems like chewing the cud. They were not mistaken as to the fact which they meant to state, nor do they use language which when properly interpreted conveys a false impression. If their hearers or readers already had an impression scientifically erroneous in some respects, they were not bound to correct that impression, provided it did not interfere with the purpose or truth which they had in view. Popular language always uses this liberty, but it is not therefore chargeable with untruth. Science is simply systematized knowledge, and therein it differs from popular or general information. The facts remain the same both to the scientific and unscientific man; they are only viewed in a different light and with different associations.

The Biblical writers, of course, having no scientific notions or standpoint after the Baconian school, ignore its nomenclature, and express themselves in the plain language of fact or sensible phenomena. They broach no theories, they employ no technical terms; they confine themselves to actual things in their phenomenal forms. This is a universal rule with them. Hence they seem to disagree with science whenever its rigid canon of verbal precision is applied to them, for of course their  vocabulary is different; but the dispute is about words only, while the things meant are identically the same. The sacred writers, in scholastic phrase, if you please, use solecisms in grammar inelegancies in rhetoric, the argumentum ad hominem in logic, an unscientific terminology throughout — for such was their vernacular; but they never fall into error as to matter of fact. The conflict between science and revelation, when carefully scrutinized, is seen to be only a disagreement between particular theories of particular scientists and particular interpretations of particular passages of Scripture. And, furthermore, when the scientific principle of thought is compared with the theological, or the unveiling of the Holy Ghost to men, they are found to be on two absolutely different planes, and unable, properly compared, to clash with each other. The fundamental error of the scientists of our day is in their method. It is mechanical, external, superficial, false. They exalt the senses, which are the mere servitors of mind, into the mind's masters, and terrible is the bondage to which they thus doom the spirit of man. Admit that mind is a force, and that there is an infinite mind, and then that in Scripture which to many scientists is most objectionable, viz. the miraculous, becomes natural and easy of belief. The main body of scientists of the present day are firm believers in Christianity, and science has no warmer advocates than are to be found among Christian believers. SEE REASON AND RELIGION.

## Scillus[[@Headword:Scillus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the father of Alesius, one of the suitors of the beautiful Hippodamia. The town of Alesia, in Ells, is said to have derived its name from his son.

## Sciomancy[[@Headword:Sciomancy]]

             SEE SCIAMANCY.

## Scioppius, Kaspar[[@Headword:Scioppius, Kaspar]]

             a noted German controversialist, was born at Neumark, in the Palatinate, May 27, 1576. He studied at Heidelberg, Altdorf, and Ingolstadt, and in 1597 visited Italy, Bohemia, Poland, and Holland. He had already become favorably known by his Latin verse and his notes upon different Latin authors. In 1598 he abjured Protestantism and became a Roman Catholic, in consequence of which the pope gave him the title of a knight of St. Peter, and soon afterwards made him Comes Apostolic us de Claravalle.  He also settled upon him a pension of 600 florins. Scioppiusi after becoming Roman Catholic, studied theology, and published some smaller works, partly to extenuate his own conduct, and partly to sustain the pope against the Protestants. Henceforth his career is a series of fierce onslaughts, chiefly against the Protestants, but also directed against all whom accident or malice led him to hate. The first person whom he selected was Joseph Scaliger, who had left the Romish Church and espoused Protestantism. In 1607 he launched against him his Scaliger Hypobolimoeus, in which he also attacks Henry IV of France. Sent in 1608 by the court of Rome to the Diet of Ratisbon for the purpose of observing the religious condition of Germany, he published in the same year more than twenty pamphlets against the Protestants, recommending the Catholic powers to exterminate them. At Venice, in the following year, he was imprisoned for a short time (three or four days) because of his endeavor to persuade Paolo Sarpi to come over to the pope's party, lie next visited Vienna, and the emperor, a devoted Catholic, gave him a favorable reception, made him councillor to his court, and raised him to the rank of count palatine. In 1611 he published two works, one called Ecclesiasticus Autoritati Ser. D. Jacobi, Magnoe Britannioe Regis, Oppositus,” and the other, Collyrium Regium, Ser. D. Jacobo, Magnoe Britannioe Regi, etc., both being directed against James I of England, but the first also containing fresh attacks on Henry IV of France. Scioppius returned to Italy, but shortly (in 1613) went to Madrid, where he was dreadfully beaten by the servants of lord Digby, the English ambassador, in retaliation for the abuse of his sovereign. He fled to Ingolstadt, where he published his Legatus Latro against the ambassador. In 1617 he settled in Milan, Italy, where he resided for the next twelve years. Returning to Germany in 1630, he requested from the Diet of Regensburg a pension, which being refused through the influence of the Jesuits, he became a bitter enemy to the order. He first attacked them anonymously, but in 1634 openly, in a work called Astrologia Ecclesiastics. His life being endangered by these attacks, he retired to Padua, where he began to occupy himself with writing a commentary on the Apocalypse; but before he had completed this work he died, Nov. 19, 1649. Of Scoppius's works, the principal are, Poemata Varia (Heidelb. 1593): — Verisimilium Libri Quatuor, etc. (Norimb. 1596): Suspectoe Lectiones (ibid. 1597): —De Arte Critica (ibid. 1597): —Symbols Critica in Apuleii Opera (Augsb. 1605): —Observationes Linguoe Latinoe (Frankf. 1609): —De Rhetoricarura Exercitationum Generibus (Milan, 1628); and others.

## Sciras[[@Headword:Sciras]]

             in Greek mythology, was an appellative of Minerva, a temple being dedicated to her under this name in Phalerum, the harbor of Athens, and another on Salamis.

## Sciron[[@Headword:Sciron]]

             in Greek mythology, was

(1) a notorious robber who established himself on the rocks between Athens and Megara, where he compelled the passers by to wash his feet, and afterwards kicked them into the sea, upon which a large turtle seized and devoured them. Theseus served him as he had formerly served others.

(2) The son of Pylas. He married a daughter of Pandion, and disputed with Nisus, a son of Pandion, the supremacy over Megara. Aeaeus, being appointed to arbitrate between them, gave the government to Nisus. and the conduct of the army in time of war to Sciran. Others designate him as the husband of Chariclo, the father of Endeis, the son-in-law of Cychreus, and the father-in-law of Aeacus.

## Sclavina[[@Headword:Sclavina]]

             a long gown worn by Romish pilgrims.

## Sclavonic Versions[[@Headword:Sclavonic Versions]]

             SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

## Scofield, Alanson[[@Headword:Scofield, Alanson]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Albany County, N.Y., Sept. 3, 1800, and worked at his trade as a tanner until he was of age. He then commenced a course of study, and graduated at Union College, N.Y., in 1830. After studying theology about one year at Andover, Mass., he entered Princeton Seminary in the fall of 1831, and remained two years. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Albany Oct. 8, 1833, and dismissed Feb. 6, 1838, to the Presbytery of Geneva as a licentiate. He was in the service of the American Education Society for six years, and resided at Auburn, N.Y., until 1839. He was ordained Oct. 3 of the same year, and was pastor of the Church of West Fayette, Seneca Co., N.Y., from 1839 to 1845, and three years stated supply of the Church at Red Hook, N.Y. In 1848 he  removed to Michigan, and was stated supply for two years at Augusta. Afterwards he served the Church at Stony Creek, in the Presbytery of Wastenaw, as pastor from 1849 to 1856. Then he was stated supply at Corunna and Newburg, in the Presbytery of Saginaw, Mich., for a period of four years, first at Fremont, and afterwards at Quincy. In 1864 or 1865 he was transferred from the Presbytery of Saginaw to that of Coldwater. About the year 1868 he removed to California, Mich., where he resided during the remainder of his life, serving the Church in that place, the whole or part of his time, as its stated supply. He became in 1871, by a change in the presbyteries necessitated by the reunion, a member of the Monroe Presbytery. During the last four years of his life he was in the service of the Presbyterian Board of Publication as a missionary. He died suddenly of apoplexy on Sabbath morning, June 18, 1876. Mr. Scofield was a man of immense physical vigor, of untiring energy, wonderful tenacity of purpose, skilled as a debater, genial and warm hearted, earnest and sound in doctrine, and thoroughly devoted to the interests of the Church. (W.P.S.)

## Scolitas[[@Headword:Scolitas]]

             in Greek mythology, Was a surname of Pan, whose brazen effigy stood at Megalopolis.

## Sconce[[@Headword:Sconce]]

             a movable candlestick of brass, latten, or other metal, sometimes affixed to a wall, placed against a pillar, or let into the rail-moulding of a pew. Sconces were likewise arranged along the top both of the roodscreen and of the side-screens of choirs and lateral chapels, in which, on great festivals, such as Christmas and Candlemas, lighted tapers were placed. — Lee, Gloss. of Liturg. and Eccles. Terms.

## Scoptzy[[@Headword:Scoptzy]]

             SEE SKOPTZY.

## Scopus[[@Headword:Scopus]]

             (Σκοπός, a watchman or mark), the popular epithet given by Josephus to an eminence at seven furlongs' distance, on the north, from Jerusalem, whence Cestius approached the city from Gabaon (el-Jib), and Titus from Gophna (Jifna), the latter obtaining a fine view of the Temple (War, 2, 19, 4; 5, 2, 3). Dr. Robinson locates it on the high level tract and brow upon the Nablus road, being the extension of the Olivet range (Bib. Res. 1, 407), a position in which Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 74) and Porter (Handb. for Syria, p. 118) coincide. According to Lieut. Conder, this spot is still called by the equivalent Arabic name El-Mesharif, and answers to all the requirements of the military notices (Quar. Statement of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” April, 1874, p. 111; camp. p. 94). SEE JERUSALEM

## Scoresby, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Scoresby, William, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman and Arctic explorer, was born at Cropton, Yorkshire, Oct. 5, 1789. He commenced a seafaring life at the age of ten, and in his twenty-first year succeeded his father as commander of the Resolution, and carried on the business of whale fishing. In 1822 he explored the east coast of Greenland, and upon his return devoted himself to study, entering Queen's College, Cambridge, from which he graduated as B.D. in 1834. In 1839 he received the degree of D.D., and labored faithfully as chaplain of the Mariners' Church in Liverpool, and afterwards at Bradford, Yorkshire, till failing health compelled him to retire to Torquay. He here engaged ia scientific and philanthropic labors. For the better prosecution of his researches he made a voyage to the United States in 1847, and to Australia in 1853, returning from the last named country in 1856, enfeebled by the arduous labors which he had undergone. He died at Tarquay March 21, 1857. His principal works are, An Account of the Arctic Regions (1820, 2 vols.): Journal of a Voyage to the Northern Whale Fishery (1823): — Discourses to Seamen (1831): — Zoistic. Magnetism (1849): — Sabbaths in the Arctic Regions (1850); and others. His Life has been written by his nephew, R.E. Scores-by-Jackson (Land. 1861).

## Scorpion[[@Headword:Scorpion]]

             ( עַקְרָב akrab, Deu 8:15; Eze 2:6; σκορπίος, Luk 10:19; Luk 11:12; Rev 9:3; Rev 9:5; Rev 9:10), a well known injurious insect of hot climates, belonging to the class Arachnida and order Pulmonaria, which is shaped very much like a lobster. It lives in damp places under stones, in clefts of walls, cellars, etc.; and in summer nights even creeps about in streets and on steps (Russell, Aleppo, 2, 119). The head and breast are closely joined, and there are two large feelers in front. The eyes are arranged much as in the spiders — one pair in the center of the thorax, the rest symmetrically on each side of the front. In the genus Scorpio proper there are six of these organs, in Buthus eight, and in Androctonus twelve. All these, however, may be quite correctly considered as scorpions. There are eight feet, covered with hair. There is a very active tail, of six joints, which ends in a crooked point (Pliny, 11, 62) like a fowl's claw (Schulz, Leitung, 4, 351). They are carnivorous in their habits, and move along in a threatening attitude with the tail elevated. The sting, which is situated at  the extremity of the tail, has at its base a gland that secretes a poisonous fluid, which is discharged into the wound by two minute orifices at its extremity. The scorpion makes a painful wound in men and beasts (Pliny, 11, 62; Host, Marokko, p. 302; camp. Minutoli, Tray. p. 205) which produces fatal results (Pliny, 11, 30; Sonnini, Tray. 2, 312; Prosp. Alpin. Rer. Aegyp. p. 206; camp. Latorde, Voyage, p. 50), Unless speedy remedies be provided (such are scarifying the wound, sucking out the poison, etc. [Russegger, Reis. 2, 2, 223]). This is true, however, only of the Oriental scorpion (though Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 379, says its bite is never fatal in Syria), that mentioned in the Bible (see description and plates in Rosel, Insecten-Belustig, 3, 370 sq., Tab. 65; camp. Sirach 26, 10; Eze 2:6); for the wound of the European, or Italian, scorpion is less dangerous. The former is distinguished by its shining black breastplate, which has given it the name Scorpio afer. (Many plates are given in Ehrenberg's Icon. et Descript. Animal. Icon. 1, Der Animal Evertebr.; but without descriptions. Three kinds of scorpions are named in the Descript. de Egypte, 22, 409 sq.)

The wilderness of Sinai is especially alluded to as being inhabited by scorpions at the time of the Exodus (Deu 8:15), and to this day these animals are common in the same district as well as in some parts of Palestine. Ehrenberg (Symb. Phys.) enumerates five species as occurring near Mt. Sinai, some of which are found also in the Lebanon. Ezekiel (Eze 2:6) is told to be in no fear of the rebellious Israelites — here compared to scorpions. There are many scorpions in Palestine — in the plains of Jordan, on the mountains of Judah, etc. (Troilo, Trav. p. 433; Schulz, Leitung, 4. 352, Thomson, Land and.Book, 1, 378 sq.), and they are proverbially common in Banias (Caesarea Philippi). A part of the mountains bordering on Palestine in the south was named from them Acrabbim. See Bochart, Hieroz. 3, 538 sq.; Shaw, Tray. p. 168. On the scorpion of Asia Minor, see Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 309 sq.; and on those of Egypt, Olivier, Voyage, 5, 171. Those found in Europe seldom exceed two or three inches in length, but in the tropical climates they are occasionally found six inches long. Those of Palestine are from one to three inches in length. There are few animals more formidable, and none more irascible, than the scorpion; but, happily for mankind, they are equally destructive to their own species as to other animals. Maupertius put about a hundred of them together in the same glass and they scarcely came into contact when they began to exert all their rage in mutual destruction, so that in a few days there remained but fourteen, which had killed and devoured all the rest. But their malignity is still more apparent in  their cruelty to their offspring. He enclosed a female scorpion, big with young, in a glass vessel, and she was seen to devour them as fast as they were extruded. There was only one of the number that escaped the general destruction by taking refuge on the back of its parent; and this soon after avenged the cause of its brethren by killing the old one in its turn. Such is the terrible nature of this insect; and it is even asserted that when placed in circumstances of danger, from which it perceives no way of escape, it will sting itself to death. Ordinarily, however, it is said to be extremely fond of its young, which it carries about on its back.

A scorpion for an egg (Luk 11:12) was probably a proverbial expression. According to Erasmus, the Greeks had a similar proverb (ἀντὶ περκῆς σκορπίον). But the creature has, of course, no likeness to an egg, as some have supposed that this passage implies (comp. Thomson, Land and.Book, 1, 379 sq.). The apostles were endued with power to resist the stings of serpents and scorpions (Luk 10:19). In the vision of St. John (Rev 9:3; Rev 9:10) the locusts that came out of the smoke of the bottomless pit are said to have had “tails like unto scorpions,” while the pain resulting from this Creature's sting is alluded to in Rev 9:5. The prophecy here has received many fanciful interpretations. SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF. The “scorpions” of 1Ki 12:11; 1Ki 12:14; 2Ch 10:11; 2Ch 10:14, have clearly no allusion whatever to the animal, but to some instrument of scourging, unless, indeed, the expression is a mere figure. Celsius (Hierob. 2, 45) thinks the “scorpion” scourge was the spiny stem of what the Arabs call Hedek, the Solanum melongena, var. esculentum, eggplant, because, according to Abul-Fadli, this plant, from the resemblance of its spines to the sting of a scorpion, was sometimes called the “scorpion thorn;” but, in all probability, this instrument of punishment was in the form of a whip armed with iron points, “Virga — si nodosa vel aculeata, scorpio rectissimo nomine vocatur, qui arcuato vulnere in corpus infigitur” (Isidore, Orig. Lot. 5, 27; and see Jahn, Bibl. Ant. p. 287). In the Greek of 1Ma 6:51, some kind of war missile is mentioned under the name σκορπίδιον but we want information both as to its form and the reason of its name. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiquities, art. “Tormentum.” Another tropical use of the word is given in the Mishna (Chelim, 12:3).

## Scorpios[[@Headword:Scorpios]]

             in mythological astronomy, was the scorpion in the Circle of the zodiac, a monster which Diana sent to encounter Orion when pursued by the latter.

## Scot, John[[@Headword:Scot, John]]

             a Scotch prelate, was archdeacon of St. Andrews, and soon after, in 1200, was made bishop of Dunkeld. He died in 1203. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 76.

## Scot, Matthew[[@Headword:Scot, Matthew]]

             a Scotch prelate, was archdeacon of St. Andrews and chancellor of the kingdom. He was postulate bishop of the see of Aberdeen in 1228, and  about the same time postulate bishop of the see of Dunkeld. He died before he had been consecrated to either see. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 79, 106.

## Scot, Reginald[[@Headword:Scot, Reginald]]

             was the younger son of John Scot of Scotshall, near Smeethe, Kent, England, and was born in the first half of the 16th century. He studied at Oxford, and upon his return home devoted himself exclusively to learned pursuits. His famous work, The Discoverie of Witchcraft, was published in 1584. and is designed to combat the prevalent belief on the subject. It called forth the Daemonology of James I, who informs us that he wrote it “chiefly against the damnable opinions of Wierus and Scot, the latter of whom is not ashamed in public print to deny there can be such a thing as witchcraft.” Scot's work passed through three editions and was translated into French and German. It was ordered to be burned by the common hangman, and copies of it are now extremely rare. He published A Perfect Platform of a Hop Garden (1576). His death occurred in 1599.

## Scotch Baptists[[@Headword:Scotch Baptists]]

             In Scotland a particular class of Baptists has long existed under this name. With the exception of baptism, they are nearly allied in sentiment to the old Scotch Independents — followers of Robert Dale (q.v.). Mr. Carmichael, pastor of an Antiburgher congregation at Cupar, in Angus, having changed his views, was baptized in 1765 by Dr. Gill in London. Returning to Edinburgh, he administered that ordinance to five others. In 1769 he was joined in the pastorate by a Mr. M'Lean, who bore an important part during the various internal dissensions which arose. Churches founded in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dundee, after great depression, gathered strength and influence, and in 1795 several societies were formed in the north of England. At the census of 1851 they were returned as having fifteen meeting houses in England with 2037 sittings. The Scotch Baptists are Calvinists; are strictly congregational; they observe the love feast, and upon certain occasions the kiss of charity, and also wash one another's feet when it is really serviceable as an act of hospitality; they abstain from eating blood and things strangled; advocate plain attire; they hold, with respect to marriage, that, while one of the parties being an unbeliever does not dissolve that relation when once entered into; it is the duty of Christians to  marry only in the Lord. For further information consult the works of M'Lean, Inglis, Braidwood, and Jones, and that of their great opponent, Andrew Fuller, Treatise on Sandemanianism. See Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Religions of the World (Lond. 1877).

## Scotch Philosophy[[@Headword:Scotch Philosophy]]

             SEE SCOTTISH PHILOSOPHY.

## Scotia[[@Headword:Scotia]]

             (σκοτία, dark),or Trochilus, a hollow moulding constantly used in the bases of columns, etc., in classical architecture. The old English name for a corresponding moulding very frequently employed in Gothic architecture is casement. SEE COLUMN.

## Scotists[[@Headword:Scotists]]

             a philosophico-religious school which arose at the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century. It derived its origin from John Duns Scotus (q.v.), and was especially opposed to the Thornists (q.v.). Scotus supposed that rational knowledge arose indirectly from divine illumination, in so far as the human mind discovers divine ideas in the objects of which they have been the types. Hence all science belongs to theologians. The struggle between the Scot-ists and the Thomists turned principally upon theological questions relative to liberty, grace, and predestination. One great question in particular was keenly discussed by the two rival sects for a long period, and indeed still divides the doctors of the Church of Rome at the present day — viz, whether the sacraments confer grace morally or physically? The physical efficacy of the sacraments was maintained by the Thomists, while their moral efficacy was inculcated by the Scotists. The followers of Duns Scotus alleged both original sin and grace to be the invariable attributes of all men, and thus they held them to be developments of the spiritual world in the ordinary course of providence. At the Reformation in the 16th century, when the Protestant party had succeeded in directing the attention of the Church to these delicate points, the Jesuits adopted the views of the Scotists. The Scotists defend the pretended immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.

## Scotitas[[@Headword:Scotitas]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of Jupiter in Laconia.

## Scotland[[@Headword:Scotland]]

             one of the three kingdoms of the British empire in Europe, and part of the island of Great Britain. In addition to the mainland, there are several groups of islands on the north and west coast. The extreme north point of the islands is Unst, in the Shetland group, lat. 60' 50', and their most westerly point St. Kilda, in the Hebrides, long. 8° 35' W. The greatest length of the mainland, from Dunnet Head, in the north, to the Mull of Galloway, in the south, is about 280 miles; and its greatest breadth, from Buchan Ness, in the east, to Ardnamurchan Point, in the west, about 170 miles. Scotland is geographically divided into two distinct regions — the Highlands, north of the Grampian Mountains, and the Lowlands, south of that range. Geologically, Scotland is divided into three distinct regions:

1. The southern, or Older Palaeozoic, which includes the region between the southern boundary and a line running east-northeast from Girvan, on the Frith of Clyde, to the Siccar Point, on the east coast.

2. The central, or Newer Palaeozoic, consisting of the Devonian or Old Red Sandstone and the Carboniferous formations, embraces the basins of the friths of Clyde, Forth, and Tay, with an area of about 5060 square miles.

3. The northern division, of crystalline and metamorphic rocks, comprises the whole of the remainder of Scotland, and has an area of 19,000 square miles. The climate is so tempered by the influence of the ocean that, notwithstanding the high northern latitude of the country, the thermometer rarely falls to zero, nor does it often rise above 80° in summer; the mean temperature is 47?.

Politically, the kingdom is divided into thirty-three counties, grouped in eight geographical divisions, with a total area of 30,463 square miles, of which the islands comprise about 5000. The population in 1871 was 3,360,018, of whom 1,603,143 were males and 1,756,875 females. The people are divided into the Highlanders and the Lowlanders, two distinct stocks, differing in language, manners, and dress. The language of the Highlanders is the Erse, or Gaelic, a Celtic dialect bearing no analogy to  the English. The peculiarities of language, costume, etc., are gradually falling into disuse. Their chief vices are intemperance and unchastity; so that in 1872 nine per cent. of the births were illegitimate, the proportion rising to sixteen and four tenths per cent. in Banff. In general government Scotland forms an integral part of the United Kingdom, standing on the same footing with England, except in regard to law and law-courts and the form of Church govern-merit, upon which points express stipulations exist in the articles of union between the two kingdoms. The nobles elect of their own sixteen peers to represent them in the House of Lords, and in 1874 the country was represented in the House of Commons by sixty members.

History. — The original Scotland (or Scotia) was Ireland, and the Scots (or Scoff), at their first appearance in authentic history, were the people of Ireland. Scotland was known to the Romans by the name of Caledonia, and was inhabited by savage tribes of Celtic race. They were polygamists and idolaters, their religion being druidical. They were hardy and brave, and offered to their Roman invaders a fierce and obstinate resistance. In the reign of Titus (A.D. 79-81), Julius Agricola led a Roman army beyond the friths of Forth and Clyde, and in 84 defeated the Caledonians under Galgacus. He and his Roman successors failed to thoroughly subdue the country, and withdrew in the early part of the 5th century. Between the two walls in the province Valentia (Northumberland, Dumfries-shire, etc.) dwelt five tribes who had become practically Romanized and civilized, and who, after the withdrawal of the Romans, formed a union called "Regnum Cumbrense." The Saxons arrived in Scotland in 449, conquered and settled the Lowlands, and one of their leaders, Edwin, founded the present capital, Edinburgh (Edwinsburgh). About 503 the Scots, from Ireland, crossed over to Scotland and settled on the west coast, establishing a kingdom under Fergus, son of Erc. His nation had been converted to Christianity by St. Patrick. Under Conal, his grandson, Columba began the conversion of the northern Picts. In the middle of the 9th century the Scots acquired a predominance in the country, the Piers disappearing as a people (probably amalgamated and absorbed by the Scots) during the reign of Kenneth, who became king in 836. In 866 the Danes, under the vikings, began to invade Scotland, and continued their incursions, until, in 1014, after a series of defeats by Malcolm II, they gave up the contest. During the reign of Constantine (904-953), the seat of the ecclesiastical primacy was transferred from Dunkeld to St. Andrew's, and the regal residence fixed at Scone. At the latter place, in the sixth year of his reign, Kellach, the bishop,  and the Scots swore to observe the laws and discipline of the faith and the rights of the churches and the gospels.

This seems to indicate the meeting of some sort of council, civil or ecclesiastical, or, more probably, a combination of both, according to the form prevalent at this period both among the Celtic and Teutonic nations. During the reign of Malcolm III (1057-1093), a great social and political revolution occurred in Scotland. In 1072 William the Conqueror invaded Scotland and secured hem. age from Malcolm as his feudal superior, which homage became a source of much dispute between the two countries. Malcolm's residence in England, and his marriage with the English princess Margaret, led to the introduction of English customs, language, and population into the northern and western districts. King Kenneth transferred his residence to Forteviot, in Strathearn, which had been the Pictish capital, fixing, soon after, the ecclesiastical metropolis of the United Kingdom at Dunkeld, where he built a church dedicated to St. Columba. The condition of the country was greatly improved under David (1124-1153), the youngest son of Malcolm, who was all to Scotland that Alfred was to England. Conforming to the rules of the Church and the principles of religion, he never forgot that he, not the clergy, was to rule. He introduced a system of written law superseding the old Celtic traditionary usages. David was as great a reformer in the Church as in the State. He established dioceses, encouraged the erection and endowment of parishes, provided for the maintenance of the clergy by means of tithes, and, displacing the old Celtic monastic bodies, introduced the Benedictine and Augustinian orders. There followed several centuries of internal strife and war with England, resulting in much distress and great disorder. During the reign of James V there were much religious agitation and discord. The practical corruptions of the Church were greater than in almost any other country of Europe, and, as a consequence, the principles of the Reformation were pushed further than elsewhere. The Roman Catholic system being overthrown, a contest began between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, James VI struggling hard to establish an absolute supremacy both in Church and State. The opponents of the crown bound themselves together, first by the National Covenant, and afterwards, in alliance with the English Puritans, by the Solemn League and Covenant. The Act of Union (with England) was formally ratified by the Parliament of Scotland Jan. 16,1707; it continued unpopular for many years, but the discontent has gradually ceased. For further discussion of the mental and religious life of Scotland consult Church in Scotland, in the  Westminster Rev. Jan. 1868; Religious Life in Scotland, ibid. July, 1871; Rudloff, Hist. of Reformation.

## Scotland, Churches Of[[@Headword:Scotland, Churches Of]]

             See the following articles.

## Scotland, Episcopal Church Of[[@Headword:Scotland, Episcopal Church Of]]

             In the latter part of the 16th century, the Scottish nation, disgusted with the lasciviousness, inconsistency, and oppression of the Romish clergy, became unanimous for reform. The papal party soon dwindled to nothing — their bishops forsook their sees and went abroad; but the ancient churches of St. Andrew's, Glasgow, etc., still continued and were presided over by archbishops and bishops, some of whom had been constituted before the Reformation. Of this old episcopate, James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, was the last survivor, dying April 24, 1603. James I revived the order (October, 1610), when John Spottiswood, Andrew Lamb, and Gavin Hamilton were consecrated respectively bishops of Glasgow, Brechin, and Galloway by the bishops of London, Ely, and Bath. But the Solemn League and Covenant .followed soon after, and this succession came to an end :in the person of Thomas Sydserf, bishop of Orkney, who died in 1663. Charles II was scarcely seated upon the throne when he was advised to restore episcopacy, and to suppress, if not all at once, yet by gradual encroachments, the Presbyterian government in the Scotch Church. By the advice of James Sharp, lord Clarendon, high in favor with the king, discouraged the recall of the old Episcopalians who had been long absent from Scotland. The management of the whole affair -was left to Sharp, who was placed at the head of the establishment as archbishop of St. Andrew's. On Dec. 15 (or 16), 1661, James Sharp, Andrew Fairfull (Fair- foul), Robert Leighton, and James Hamilton were consecrated to the sees of St. Andrew's, Glasgow, Dunblane, and Galloway by the bishops of London, Worcester, Carlisle, and Llandaff.

The selection was unfortunate. Sharp was chiefly known, through the whole period of his episcopate, as the unrelenting foe of the Presbyterians; Hamilton was good-natured and weak, and both he and Fairfull had been zealous in past times to enforce the Covenant; Leighton was a man of primitive holiness and an accomplished scholar, but in other respects not qualified for his office. The conduct of Sharp, especially in forbidding the clergy to meet in their presbyteries "till such time as the bishops should appoint," greatly irritated  the people. The first act of the new Parliament vested the whole government and jurisdiction of the Church in the several dioceses in the bishops, whereas previously the presbyteries had possessed a voice in the administration of the diocese. A proclamation was issued that all who had not obeyed the late act — that is, who held their livings only by virtue of a call from the people and an appointment by the presbytery — should desist from preaching and other ministerial functions. Above two hundred churches were closed in one day, often men of weight and ability being displaced by men unfit, by lack of education and morals, for the pulpit. The Conventicle Act (q.v.), passed by the English Parliament in 1663, was immediately adopted by the Scotch Legislature. Another act followed, substituting a national synod in the place of the General Assembly. The business of the synod was to be laid before it by the crown, and if agreed to by the president, the archbishop of St. Andrew's, and sanctioned by the king, it then became one of the ecclesiastical laws of the land.

In 1666 the Covenanters rose in arms, but were entirely subdued, many of them being hanged for rebellion. The course of Sharp in securing hostile legislation and in persecuting the Covenanters was disapproved of by many of the clergy and bishops of the Church. A compromise was proposed by Leighton and approved of by Charles (1667). It was substantially to the effect that the Church should be governed jointly by the bishops and clergy assembled in ecclesiastical court, the bishop acting only as )resident; that the Presbyterian ministers, in taking their seats, might declare that their recognition of a bishop was made only for the sake of peace. Other concessions were made, so that the episcopacy was reduced to the lowest point of authority compatible with its bare existence. But neither the Covenanters nor Episcopalians would accept the compromise, and matters grew worse until, in 1679, Sharp was assassinated; then a rebellion, and fresh severities on the part of the government. In 1688 the Scotch Convention; in their claim of rights, stated the conditions upon which they admitted William, prince of Orange, to the vacant throne. They affirmed in this state paper that "all prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance,s The bishops retired from the convention, the Presbyterians were left to carry, matters as they pleased, and episcopacy was once more abolished. At this date the Episcopal Church of Scotland stood thus: there were two archiepiscopal provinces — St. Andrew's and Glasgow — with twelve bishoprics. The clergymen were about 900, some of whom transferred their allegiance to William and Mary, but the greater part declined to do so, and formed a union with the Nonjurors of England, with whom their history is  closely entwined for ninety years, until the latter disappeared.

In 1702 queen Anne wrote to the privy council, expressing her desire that the Episcopal clergy should be permitted the free exercise of public worship — an act of generosity, as they still declined the oath of allegiance to the reigning family. The next year the Episcopalians presented her an address, in which they mention the suffering of the clergy in 1688 and 1689, and to which the queen returned a kind and gracious answer. Such toleration gave great offence, and the General Assembly addressed their remonstrances to the lord high commissioner. The Act of Union, by which England and Scotland were united, took place May 1,1707, but did not immediately benefit the Episcopalians, even the English regiments stationed in Scotland not being allowed the use of the English Prayer-book. Queen Anne died in 1714, and the next year the rebellion broke out in behalf of the Pretender The Episcopalians were supposed to be favorable to his cause, and were regarded with distrust, and met with very harsh usage. On taking the oath of allegiance, the Episcopal clergy were again permitted, by an act passed in 1719, to officiate in public and to use the English liturgy. They were undisturbed by the authorities until the second rebellion, in 1745, the principal cause of distraction being the controversy among themselves between the Nonjurors (q.v.) and their opponents. The second rebellion of 1745 nearly completed the destruction of Scotch Episcopalianism. The house of Hanover naturally regarded a Church whose bishops were up- pointed by the Pretender with suspicion. An act was passed forbidding every Episcopal clergyman to officiate without taking the oaths to the government, and in 1746 making more than four persons besides the clergyman's family an illegal meeting. In 1748 it was enacted that none but English or Irish letters of orders should be deemed sufficient to qualify any minister for the exercise of his office in Scotland, and the clergy were only permitted to officiate in their own houses. This state of things continued till the accession of George III in 1760. In 1765 the communion office was revised by the bishops, and brought to its present state. From this period the Church has used the English liturgy, with the exception of the communion office. From the time when the bishops met at Aberdeen and acknowledged George III as their rightful sovereign, the Church ceased to be a Nonjuring Church. In 1792 an act was passed which relieved them from the penalties imposed by the various acts of queen Anne, George I, and George II, but forbade the clergy from officiating in England "except in the case of such as shall have been ordained by some bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland."

This prohibition was so far removed in  1840 as to allow them to thus officiate "only with the special permission of the bishop in writing, such permission extending only to two Sundays at a time." The Scottish bishops early in the present century resumed the titles which they had been compelled to lay aside, but these titles are not allowed by law. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were made the standard of faith, and in 1863 the Prayer-book was adopted as the authorized service-book of the Episcopal Church, permission being given in certain cases to use the Scottish communion office. Several flourishing congregations of English Episcopalians still (1854) declined to recognise the authority of the Scotch bishops or hold communion with their Church, regarding its usages and doctrines on the subject of the eucharist as unscriptural. In 1864 all restrictions on the clergy were removed, save that an English or Irish bishop might refuse institution to a Scottish clergyman on his first presentation to a benefice in England or Ireland. The dioceses of the Scottish Episcopal Church are seven, viz. Moray, Aberdeen, Brechin, Argyle, St. Andrew's, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. The bishops are chosen by the clergy of the diocese and by representatives of the lay communicants, a majority of both orders being necessary' to a valid election. One of the bishops, under the name of "primus," chosen by the other bishops, presides at all meetings of the bishops, and has certain other privileges, but possesses no metropolitan authority. The highest judicial body is the Episcopal College, composed of all the bishops. The highest legislative body is a General Synod, composed of two houses — the one of the bishops, and the other of the deans and the representatives of the clergy. Since 1834 the Church has increased quite rapidly. The livings are generally very small, the minimum fixed income being £100 a year, and very few rating higher, unless the ministers have private incomes. Few of the middling class are connected with the Episcopal Church, its members being made up principally of the wealthy nobles and the poor peasantry. In 1841 Trinity College was founded at Glenalmond, in Perthshire, and St. Ninian's Cathedral at Perth was consecrated by the bishop of Brechin in 1851. See Burnet, Hist. of his Own Times; Spottiswood, Hist. of the Church of Scotland (1625; new ed. Edinb. 1847-51, 3 vols. 8vo): Collier, Eccles. Hist.; Bishop Skinner, Eccles. Hist. of Scotland. etc. (Lond. 1788, 2 vols. 8vo); Russell, Hist. of the Church in Scotland (ibid. 1834, 2 vols. 8vo); Lathbury, Hist. of the Nonjurors ; Cunningham, Church Hist. of Scotland; Grub, Eccles. Hist. of Scotland; also Marsden, Dict. of Christian Churches, s.v.; Religions of the World (ibid. 1877).

## Scotland, Presbyterian Churches Of[[@Headword:Scotland, Presbyterian Churches Of]]

             For information respecting the Established Church of Scotland, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, United Presbyterian Church, Free Church of Scotland, SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

## Scotland, Relief Church Or Synod[[@Headword:Scotland, Relief Church Or Synod]]

             or, one of the seceding bodies in Scotland which arose out of opposition to the system of Patronage (q.v.). A majority of the Presbytery- of Dunfermline having refused to take part in the induction of a minister to the parish of Inverkeithing who was unacceptable to the people, they were cited in 1752 before the General Assembly and ordered to proceed with the settlement of Mr. Richardson, the minister mentioned. Although three formed a legal quorum, and it was well known that three members of the presbytery were willing to comply with the command of the assembly, yet the quorum was raised to five. Three ministers were present on the day appointed for the settlement; but as they were not a quorum, nothing was done. Of the six who refused to comply with the appointment of the Supreme Court, it was resolved that one should be deposed. On Saturday, the day after their report was presented to the assembly, each of the six was singly placed before the bar of the house. Three seemed to yield, two remained firm. Thomas Gillespie, minister of Carnock. came forward with a protestation defending his conduct, and as a result was deposed from the ministry; the vote standing 56 for deposition and 102 declining to vote. Rightly judging that he was illegally and unrighteously deposed, Mr. Gillespie preached next Lord's day in the open air at Carnock. He went to Dunfermline a few months after, and the General Assembly refusing, the next year, to remove his sentence of deposition, he laid the foundation of a new secession. He labored alone until 1757, when a similar congregation was formed by Thomas Boston (son of Boston of Ettrick) at Jedburgh, in consequence of the forcible intrusion of a minister into that parish where the people desired that Boston should be appointed. A third congregation was formed from a similar cause in 1760. The first Relief Presbytery was formed Oct. 22,1761, and consisted of Gillespie, Boston, and Thomas Colier, according to the words of the original minute, "for the relief of Christians oppressed in their Christian privileges." Its first synod was formed in Edinburgh in 1773, and in 1794 a hymn-book was sanctioned by the synod. In 1807 it numbered about 60 congregations with 36,000 members, and in 1847, 7 presbyteries, 114 congregations, and about  45,000 members. In 1834 proposals were made for a union between the Secession and Relief synods, which was consummated, at Edinburgh, May 13, 1847, under the name of the United Presbyterian Church (q.v.). See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v. SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

## Scotopites[[@Headword:Scotopites]]

             one of the many names of the Circumcellions (q.v.). It is found in Isidore Hispalensis, and in Gratian's Decretals, II, 24:3.

## Scott, Andrew J.[[@Headword:Scott, Andrew J.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia, PA., about 1846. His conversion occurred when he was sixteen, and he was received on trial by the New Jersey Conference in 1866, but was soon disabled by disease which resulted in his death, Jan. 2, 1871. Mr. Scott was affable, kind, and sincere, and as a minister beyond reproach. See Minutes of Ann. Conferences, 1871, p. 63.

## Scott, Archibald[[@Headword:Scott, Archibald]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was a native of Scotland, and migrated in his boyhood and alone to the colony of Pennsylvania, about 1760. He is said to have been originally a laboring man, and to have pored over his books while his horses were feeding.

Dr. Cooper, a worthy physician of the colony, being impressed with Scott's remarkable aptitude for learning, was instrumental in introducing him into the family and school of a Mr. Finley, where he enjoyed the advantages of a thorough academical education, which he compensated for in some measure by working on the farm. Daring the period of his connection with this school he joined the Presbyterian Church, and, for the time, began to entertain some thoughts of entering the ministry. He was for several years a student of theology under the supervision of principal Graham, of Liberty Hall Academy, and during this period supported himself by conducting an academy of high reputation in Augusta County, VA, at which Dr. Campbell laid the foundation of his accurate scholarship, He was licensed to preach by the Hanover Presbytery, Oct. 31, 1777, and was ordained and installed pastor of the united churches of Hebron and Bethel, in Augusta County, in December 1778, which relation continued for more than twenty  years, and was at last dissolved by his death, March 4 1799. Mr. Scott's charge was a very scattered one, comprehending a district some twenty miles square. Like most of his brethren, he also had a very inadequate salary during the Revolution; but he never suffered anything to divert him from his great work as a minister of the Gospel. "He entered warmly into the American cause, and exhorted his people to fight for freedom. It was his practice to assemble all the children and youth of his charge in different neighborhoods on week-days, to attend to catechetical instruction. It. was in this employment that he was engaged on that memorable Saturday of June when the alarm of the approach of colonel Tarleton and his British dragoons spread consternation from Staunton throughout the surrounding valley of Virginia. It is said that Mr. Scott, like his two neighboring brethren, Graham and Brown, exhorted the stripling youths of his congregation to arm themselves and go with their neighbors, to stand with their arms at Rock Fish Gap, on the Blue Ridge Mountains, to dispute the pass with the invader and his legion." It was the recollection of that stand that gave occasion to those memorable words of general Washington — " If I should be beaten by the British forces, I will retreat with my broken army to the Blue Ridge and call the boys of West Augusta around me, and there I will plant the flag of my country." Mr. Scott was greatly beloved and esteemed in his day. He possessed a logical and discriminating mind, and was a strong, vigorous thinker; his preaching is said to have been in a high degree instructive, and often eloquent and powerful. He attached much importance and devoted much time to the religious instruction of the young. Besides the Shorter Catechism which he used, he introduced what was known as The Mother's Catechism, a work extending to 32 pp. 8vo, the appendix of which he wrote himself. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:387; Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Davidson, Hist. of the Presb. Church in Kentucky, p. 29; Foote, Sketches of Virginia (2d series). (J. L. S.)

## Scott, Charles W.[[@Headword:Scott, Charles W.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Morgan County, O., May 10, 1845, and joined the Church in his eighteenth year. He was admitted into the Pittsburgh Conference in 1866; was superannuated in 1874, and died of consumption, Jan. 28, 1875. He was studious, careful, amiable, devout, and conscientious. See Minutes era Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 36.

## Scott, Daniel[[@Headword:Scott, Daniel]]

             a Dissenting minister, the son of a merchant in London, was educated with Butler and Seeker under a Mr. Jones, at Tewkesbury, Gloucester. shire, from whose seminary he removed to Utrecht, in Holland, where he took the degree of LL.D. While there he changed his views concerning the mode of baptism, and became a Baptist. Returning to England, he settled in London, or Colchester, and devoted his time to writing. He was never married, and died suddenly in retirement near London, March 29, 1759. His works are, Essay towards a Demonstration of the Scripture Trinity (Anon. 1725, 1738): — A New Version of St. Matthew's Gospel, etc. (1741) : — Appendix to H Stephens's Greek Lexicon (1745, 2 vols. 4to).

## Scott, David[[@Headword:Scott, David]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 13, 1849. When a mere lad, his parents removed to New York city, and there he received his early lessons in the public schools. At the age fifteen he entered the employ of the Manhattan Gas Company as a book-keeper, and until he was graduated spent his vacations in earning the money needed for his education. He was prepared for college at the Lawrenceville (N. J.) High-school, under the Rev. Samuel M. Hamill, D.D. He united on profession of his faith with the Fifteenth Street Church (now the Phillips Memorial Church), New York city, at the age of fifteen. He was graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1873, taking a fellowship in the classics, one of the conditions of which is that the recipient shall spend one year abroad in some European university. Immediately after leaving college, Mr. Scott entered Princeton Theological Seminary and studied one year, at the end of which time he went to Leipsic, Germany, where he pursued the study of theology and philology for one year; then returning, he entered the middle class in the seminary, and, having finished the remaining two years, was graduated in 1877. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New York, April 4, 1876, and was ordained by the same presbytery as an evangelist, in the Fourteenth Street Presbyterian Church, June ,54, 1877. For nearly a year (from September, 1876, to June 1877) Mr. Scott was tutor of Latin and Greek in Princeton College, N. J., while pursuing his studies in the seminary. Having been accepted as a missionary by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, he embarked with his wife, Sept. 1, 1877, for Teheran, Persia. There he remained about sixteen months, during which time he had well mastered the Persian language, when, on account of the  continued illness of his wife, by the advice of physicians and of the mission, he returned to the United States, intending again to resume his work at Teheran as soon as possible. He arrived in New York near the end of March, almost immediately afterwards grew ill, and died in that. city, April 1, 1879. He was a young man of excellent abilities and of fine scholarship, and his death is regarded as a sad loss to the cause of foreign missions. (W. P. S.)

## Scott, Elisha J.[[@Headword:Scott, Elisha J.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Greensborough, Vt., Aug. 11, 1803, and joined the Baptist Church at the age of twelve. He continued in that Church about seven years, when he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1828 entered the New England Conference. He was ordained deacon June 27, 1830, and elder Aug. 11, 1832. After fifteen years he was made supernumerary, and was then superannuated for nine years, when he became again effective. He travelled the Montpelier District, Vermont Conference, for four years, and took once more a superannuated relation, which he held until his death, at Montpelier, Jan. 24, 1866. He was for several years the Conference secretary, delegate to the General Conference in 1836, and editor of the Vermont Christian Messenger. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1866, p. 129.

## Scott, George, D.D[[@Headword:Scott, George, D.D]]

             a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born at Clogher, County Tyrone, Ireland, July 26, 1805, of parents who came of the Covenanter stock, and was well educated. In 1822 he came to America, and, after a short engagement in mercantile pursuits, joined the church of Dr. Samuel B. Wylie, in Philadelphia, by whom he was encouraged to prepare for the ministry. By teaching school, and the most severe economy, he completed his studies privately, and after licensure travelled as an evangelist for some time, but at length was ordained pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian congregations at Little Beaver, Pennsylvania, and Austintown, Ohio, April 19, 1831. He afterwards confined his care to the former, until his resignation, October 1, 1880. He died December 16, 1881. Dr. Scott was a most honored, faithful, and successful pastor. See (Pittsburgh) Presbyterian Banner, August 9, 1882.

## Scott, Jacob[[@Headword:Scott, Jacob]]

             a minister of the Baptist denomination, was born in Boston, March 1,1815, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1836, and of the Newton Theological Institution in the class of 1842, His ordination occurred at Petersburg, VA, September; 1842. He was pastor at Petersburg and Hampton, VA, and for two years chaplain at the University of Virginia. Subsequently he had charge of important churches in Portland, Me.; Fall River, Mass.; and Yonkers, N. Y. He was obliged, on account of his health, to retire from the ministry. For some time he was superintendent of schools in Malden, Mass. where he died, Dec. 10, 1871.

## Scott, James (1), D.D.[[@Headword:Scott, James (1), D.D.]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born Sept. 27,1809, at Glasgow, Scotland, in the house in which Mary Queen of Scots took refuge after the battle of Laugside. His father, who was educated for the ministry, but never preached on account of ill-health, died when James was four years  old. At fifteen he united with the Church of Lochwinnoch, and, although struggling with very limited means, he prosecuted his studies at the University of Glasgow for three years, and afterwards at the college in Belfast, Ireland, for two years. Having married in Ireland, he removed to the United States in 1832, studied theology under care of the New York Presbyter), and was licensed by them in 1834. His first settlement was in the Presbyterian Church, German Valley, N. J., for eight years. In 1843 he accepted the call of the First Reformed Church, Newark, N. J., with which his remaining ministry was spent. Few men have achieved such thorough pastoral success as he did in this Church, which was greatly reduced and broken down when he took it, and grew during his fifteen years of service to be next to the largest Church in its entire denomination, numbering over six hundred communicants, and flourishing outwardly and spiritually. A large debt was removed, and three new and healthy churches grew out of it within this period. Dr. Scott's mind was synthetic rather than analytical. He was highly imaginative, a great lover of nature and art, literary in his tastes, and excelled in descriptive writing and in illustrative and pictorial address. His style teemed with figures. Rhetorical in manner and vivid in coloring, with a large, robust frame, a clear, strong voice, a full, canny Scotch face lighted up with benevolent smiles, and an attractive delivery, his preaching always drew large, popular audiences. But he was not content merely with this; his sermons were instructive, expository, free of theological technicalities, earnest, full of cheering Gospel truth, pathetic, faithful, and finely adapted to times, seasons, and occasions. His range of topics was unusually wide, embracing, among ordinary themes, full courses of pulpit lectures on Church history, prophecy, the religious condition of Europe, the Pentateuch, Ruth, Psalms, Canticles, harmony of the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Revelation, and an unfinished course on Esther. As a pastor he was almost unrivalled. He knew everybody among his people and all about them. Young people and children were his particular delight and care. Among the sick and poor and wretched his attentions were untiring. Beyond his own congregation he was so thoroughly well known and identified with every good public interest in Newark that he was justly called at his funeral the curate of the city. He devoted himself with zeal to the organization of the admirable Newark Library Association, to various educational movements, such as the public schools of Newark, the endowment of Rutgers College, and the preparation of a series of school- books. In all evangelical mission work, like that among the Germans, Sunday-schools, and the poor, he was a leading spirit. His disposition was  remarkably cheerful, storey, unsuspecting, frank, generous, self-conscious, and pleasantly egotistical at times, upright, bold, and faithful. He wrote much for newspapers, conducted a constant foreign correspondence with eminent men, and delivered literary lectures and addresses, and was always eminent for public spirit. The poet Robert Pollok was his bosom friend. He prepared an excellent life of this favorite author of The Course of Time, which was published by the Carters, New York, and has had a large circulation. He also wrote much in verse, and left a posthumous manuscript poem, with directions for its publication. But his crowning distinction was his thoroughly devoted Christian ministerial life. It was radiant with the results of faithful service. His death was sudden. He rose from his bed and was going to his bath on a Saturday morning, when he was seized with the fatal disease of which he had entertained frequent apprehensions. Immediately he said, "This is paralysis — -this is death. I am not afraid to die; I am ready." His last message, just before he became unconscious, was, "Give my love to all my people. Tell them they were in my dying thoughts, and that when dying I sent my blessing to my young people." In his own words respecting his friend Pol-Ink, "There was no death-struggle, no agony, no convulsion. His soul went out of the body all noiseless and fast, like Peter from the prison when the angel took off the fetters, opened the gate, and delivered him." He died May 10, 1858. In addition to the above notice, see Life, Letters, and Literary Remains of Robert Pollok (N.Y. 12mo). Dr. Scott published An Essay on the Course of Time : — The Guardian Angel (N. Y. 12m o), a poem in three books: — he also had a share in the series of school-books produced by a literary association and entitled The American System of Education: — the article Malachi in the annual known as The Saviour, Prophets, and Apostles; and wrote many papers in British and American periodicals. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 204; Lond. Critic, 1859; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (W. J. R. T.)

## Scott, James (2)[[@Headword:Scott, James (2)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, Aug. 1, 1825. He made a profession of religion in his sixteenth year, immediately began his preparatory studies for the ministry, and graduated with honor at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, in 1848. Soon after, he emigrated to America; graduated at Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J., in 1852; was licensed by Luzerne Presbytery in 1851; taught in the academy at  Attleborough, Bucks Co., PA, until 1853; was ordained pastor of the Church at Holmes-burgh, PA, June 6, 1854, which relation lasted for seven years, during which time he was zealous and faithful. In 1859 he was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which met at Indianapolis, Ind. He died Aug. 28, 1861. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 117. (J. L. S.)

## Scott, John (1), D.D.[[@Headword:Scott, John (1), D.D.]]

             a learned English divine, son of Thomas Scott (grazier), was born in the parish of Chippenham, Wiltshire, in 1638. Not being intended for a profession, he served an apprenticeship in London, much against his will, for about three years. He quitted his trade and went to Oxford, entering as a commoner of New Inn in 1657. He left the university without taking a degree, and being ordained, came to London, where he officiated in the perpetual curacy of Trinity in the Minories, and as minister of St. Thomas's in Southwark. In 1677 he was presented to the rectory of St. Peter le Poor in London, and was collated to a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1684. In 1685 he was made both B.D. and D.D. In 1691 he succeeded Sharp, afterwards archbishop of York, in the rectory of St. Giles in the Fields; and in the same year was made canon of Windsor. He died in 1694, and was buried in St. Giles's Church. He wrote, The Christian Life (pt. i, 1681, 8vo; pt. 2, 1685; pt. 3, 1686): — two pieces against the Romanists (1688): — Sermons, etc. His whole Works, including Sermons, etc., were published in 2 vols. fol. in 1704.

## Scott, John (2)[[@Headword:Scott, John (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Emmeso, Ireland. At the age of seventeen he was converted, and joined the Church. Coming to America, he united with the Methodist Church in St. John's. N. 13. He was licensed to preach in 1822, and in 1825 was received on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference. He was ordained deacon in 1827, and elder in 1829. The Erie Conference was formed in 1836, and he became one of its members. He was made a superannuate in 1847, but became effective the next year. In 1853 he was again superannuated, and held this relation until his death, Sept. 2, 1861. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1862, p. 124.

## Scott, John Work, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Scott, John Work, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in York County, Pennsylvania, November 27, 1807. He attended the Lower West Nottingham Academy and Slate Ridge Academy, and graduated from Jefferson College in 1827. He then taught three years at Butler (Pennsylvania), Churchville (Maryland), and Chanceford (Pennsylvania). In 1830 he entered the middle class at Princeton Theological Seminary, where he remained two years, at the same time teaching, as an assistant to Prof. Robert B. Pallon, at the Edgehill Seminary at Princeton. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New Castle, October 3, 1832; preached as stated supply at Poland, Ohio, during the winter following, and was also tutor at Jefferson College. In 1836 he became stated supply to the Church at Three Springs, also of the Free Church of Steubenville, Ohio. After this he preached frequently, but had no stated place. Dr. Scott's chief work was as an educator. He was founder and principal of the Grove Academy, at Steubenville, and with this was connected from 1836 to 1847. He was principal of the Lindsley Institute, at Wheeling, Virginia, until 1853; president of Washington College, Pennsylvania, from 1853 to 1865; principal of Woodburn Female Seminary and of the Academy, at Morgantown, West Virginia, until 1867; then vice-  president of the State University at the same place, and for two years was acting president. This he wasp obliged to resign in 1877, because of failing eyesight. His eyes being treated with success, he went, in 11879, to Biddle University, N.C., to fill a vacancy. He died July 25, 1879. Dr. Scott was a man of excellent mental powers, of great vigor of mind. As a teacher he was admirable and rarely surpassed. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Serm. 1880, page 18.

## Scott, Levi, D.D[[@Headword:Scott, Levi, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Cantwell's Bridge (now Odessa), Delaware, October 11, 1802. He was trained to labor, and began his thorough intellectual discipline after reaching manhood. He grew up in a Christian home, his father being an itinerant minister. Levi was converted in 1822, and entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1825. He served a number of the most important charges in his conference, and soon gained a high reputation as a clear, logical, incisive preacher. In 1840 he became principal of the grammar-school of Dickinson College, where he remained until 1843. The next two years he was pastor of Union Church, Philadelphia; and from 1845 to 1848 presiding elder of the South Philadelphia District. At the General Conference of 1848 he was made assistant book-agent at New York. In 1852 he was elected bishop, and from that time until the close of his active career was most earnest in labors for the Master. Shortly after his election to the episcopal office he visited our mission in Liberia, and for many years suffered from the effects of the climate. In 880, after twenty-eight years as bishop, and fifty-five in the active ministry, he retired to his childhood's home, where he gradually declined until his death, July 13, 1882. "In his most vigorous days the hearer was first arrested by the searching expression of the preacher's eye; then by the condensed energy of his diction; then by the conciseness and clearness with which point after point of the argument was made out. No time was lost in amplification; the paragraphs of logic were sent home to the conscience with the force of shocks from an electric battery. A torrent of appeal, brief, but intense, followed, and the preacher's work was done." See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1882, page 301; Life and Times, by Dr. Mitchell (N.Y. 1884).

## Scott, Mile[[@Headword:Scott, Mile]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Berlin, Chenango Co., N. Y., in 1818, and jointed the Church in 1836. He was licensed to preach in 1842, and joined the Genesee Conference in 1843. After a brief illness of four days, he died Oct. 1,1864. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1864, p. 210.

## Scott, Orange[[@Headword:Scott, Orange]]

             a noted Methodist preacher, was born in Brookfield, VT, Feb. 13, 1800, and up to his twentieth year had attended school but thirteen months. He was converted at a camp-meeting, in September, 1820, and immediately joined the Methodist Church. Next year he commenced preaching on Bernard Circuit, and in 1822 he was received into the New England Conference. His labors were crowned with abundant conversions, and he studied hard to make up the defects of his early education. In 1830 he was made presiding elder of Springfield district, and in 1834 of the Providence district. In 1832 he declined an offer to serve one of the wealthiest congregational churches in Rhode Island. The same year he was elected a delegate to the General Conference. About this time he became a controversial antislavery advocate, and in the General Conference of 1836 he carried through stringent resolutions on the subject. He subsequently labored with great success as pastor in Lowell and elsewhere. Being dissatisfied with the action of the General Conference of 1840 on the subject of slavery, he retired from the Church, and was largely influential in the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Church (q.v.), of which he was the book-agent till his death, which occurred in great peace at Newark, N. J, July 31,1847.

## Scott, Robert[[@Headword:Scott, Robert]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born about 1805. He was received into the Virginia Conference on trial in 1829, and was graduated to deacon's and elder's orders in 1831 and 1833. For twenty-eight years he labored in the itinerant ministry, and in 1857 took a supernumerary relation. He died in 1866. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1866, p. 7.

## Scott, Robinson, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Scott, Robinson, D.D., LL.D]]

             an English Methodist minister, was born at Bainbridge, Sept. 17, 1814. In 1835 he entered the Wesleyan ministry, in 1845 was appointed governor of the correctional school at Dublin, and subsequently of that at Belfast. He was foremost in the work of Methodist education in Ireland. He died December 22, 1883. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1884, page 33.

## Scott, Thomas Fielding, D.D[[@Headword:Scott, Thomas Fielding, D.D]]

             a missionary bishop, was for many years a Presbyterian minister in Georgia, but was ordained deacon in 1843 in the Protestant Episcopal Church. His first parish was at Marietta, which was a new field, and where, within six years, a fine church property and a female institute were purchased. In 1851 he became rector of Trinity Church, Columbus, from which he was promoted to missionary bishop in 1853. His jurisdiction extended over Oregon and Washington territories. He died in New York city, July 14, 1867, aged sixty-two years. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1867, page 499.

## Scott, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Scott, Thomas, D.D.]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of Lincolnshire. He was born Feb. 16, 1747, at Braytoft, a small farm-house five miles from Spilsby. He was educated at Bennington from his eighth to his tenth year, and the following five years he studied at Scorton. At the age of sixteen he was bound apprentice to a medical practitioner at Alford, but at the end of two months the master was dissatisfied with his behavior, and sent him home. He was now employed about the farm for some time, and compelled W labor in the most servile occupations — some-times tending the sheep, and at others following the plough. In this menial situation he continued for more than nine years, yet continually cherishing the wish of becoming a clergyman. Thoughts of the university, of learning, and of study often presented themselves to his mind; and he at length consulted a clergyman at Boston, who encouraged his attempt at qualifying himself for the ministry.; and having acquired a competent knowledge of Greek as well as Latin, he eventually obtained ordination from Dr. Green, bishop of Lincoln, Sept. 20,1772.

His first curacy was that of Stoke Gold-ington and Gayhurst, Buckinghamshire, from which he removed in 1775 to Ravenstone. In the spring of 1777 he settled in Weston Underwood, succeeding Mr. John Newton to the curacy of Olney in 1781. In 1785 he was removed from Olney to the chaplainship of the Lock Hospital, near Hyde Park Corner, and held, besides two lectureships in the city. In 1803 he obtained the living of Aston-Sandford, in Buckinghamshire, which he held to the period of his death, April 16,1821. It was an exceedingly small parish, but he could not be prevailed on to seek a larger, on account of the paucity of baptisms and burials which took place — a circumstance which, in some measure, relieved his scruples respecting the service as prescribed in the ritual. He first appeared as an author in a small volume entitled The Force of Truth (1779), in which he details the singular events which issued in his change of mind and character. This little piece has gone through not less than twenty editions. But his most important work, and that which has rendered him one of the most influential divines of the present day, is A Family Bible, with Original Notes, Practical Observations, and Marginal References (1796, 4 vols. 4to; 9th ed., with the author's last corrections and improvements, 1825, 6 vols. 4to). He was also the author of a great number of pieces, which have recently been collected and published uniformly (10 vols. 8vo), including Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Refutation of Calvinism : — Essays on Important Subjects : — Sermons,  Tracts, etc. He left in MS, at the period of his decease, a copious account of his own life, replete with interest, which has been published by his son, and very extensively read. See Memoirs of Thomas Scott, by his son.

## Scott, Uriah, D.D[[@Headword:Scott, Uriah, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Lincoln, England, in 1820. He was first employed as a minister in New Milford, Pennsylvania; but in 1859 was chosen rector of Grace Church, Honesdale, where lie remained until 1861. He then went to New York city, where e officiated occasionally, and in 1867 ministered to the Church of the Redemption. In 1870 he was chosen rector of that church, and died in the same city, December 25, 1878. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1880, page 172.

## Scott, William Anderson, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Scott, William Anderson, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Rock Creek, Bedford County, Tennessee, January 31, 1813. He was converted at fifteen, licensed to preach at seventeen, and immediately began his itinerant ministry. He graduated from Cumberland College, Kentucky, in 1833, studied one year at Princeton Theological Seminary, was ordained in 1835, labored several years as missionary and teacher in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee; pastor at Nashville in 1838; at Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in 1840; New Orleans, Louisiana, in 1843; San Francisco, California, from 1855 to 1861; travelled in Europe, and served as pastor at Birmingham, England; at New York city in 1863; and at San Francisco from 1870 until his death, January 14, 1885. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 30.

## Scott, William C.[[@Headword:Scott, William C.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Martinsburg, Berkeley Co., VA, Jan. 13, 1817. He was conducted through his academical course principally by his father, the Rev. William N. Scott, who, to support his family and educate his own children, had opened a school, which he continued for twenty years. He was converted in October, 1831, in a revival commenced in connection with the meeting of the Synod of Virginia, and united with his father's Church in the spring of 1832. It was about this time that he first felt his call to preach the Gospel. He graduated at South Hanover College, Ind., in 1837, and at the Union Theological Seminary, Va., in 1840. Here the depth of his piety, the high literary merit of his performances, and the vigor and originality of his intellect marked him as a candidate for the ministry of no ordinary promise. In April, 1840, he was licensed by the presbytery of Winchester, and during the ensuing autumn became a stated supply to three churches on Staunton River — namely, Providence, in Halifax Co., and Cub Creek and Bethesda, in Charlotte Co. In 1842 he was ordained pastor of the churches of Providence and Bethesda, where he continued to labor till the spring of 1846, when he became pastor of the church in Farmville, Va.

Before he had been three years in this charge, a bronchial trouble had so far developed itself that he was compelled to resign his pastorate, and retired to a small farm which he owned among his first congregation. Alter two years' abstinence from all public service, he was able again to preach, and was called with perfect unanimity to become a second time the pastor of the Bethesda church. Here he labored until his death, which occurred Oct. 23, 1854. Mr. Scott was the author Genius and Faith, or Poetry and Religion in their Mutual Relations (N. Y. 1853). This work is highly commended as "a treasury of invaluable thought, and in respect to which it is difficult to say whether the poetical, the philosophical, or the Christian element has the predominance." His intellect was of a high character, and his preaching always marked by careful preparation, by uncommon elegance of composition, and by clearness and accuracy of statement. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:802: Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J. L. S.)

## Scott, William D.[[@Headword:Scott, William D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Mecklenburg County, Va., Feb. 1808. He graduated at the Medical University, Philadelphia, March 2,1830, moved to Trenton, and engaged in the practice of his profession. He was licensed to preach Aug. 15, 1840; admitted into the travelling ministry in 1841; ordained deacon Nov. 6, 1842, and elder Nov. 25,1844. In 1845, because of failing health, he was superannuated, and in 1850 became effective again; but in 1851 he was once more superannuated, and held that relation until his death, Oct. 3, 1874. We record here as a part of his history that he bequeathed a hundred acres of ]and each to the Vanderbilt University and the Indian Mission Conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 63.

## Scott, William Mkendree, D.D.[[@Headword:Scott, William Mkendree, D.D.]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine and educator, was born in Jefferson County, O., in 1817. He graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., and at Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J., in 1846. He was licensed by the West Lexington Presbytery, and in 1847 was elected professor of languages in Centre College, Danville, Ky.; and, accepting a call of the First Presbyterian Church in that place, he was ordained by the Transylvania Presbytery in 1848. In January, 1856, he became pastor the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati, O., which relation existed for two years, when, in 1859, the General Assembly elected him professor of Biblical literature and exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the North-west at Chicago, Ill. His health had been gradually declining for some time, and in the autumn of 1861 he visited Princeton, N. J., where he hoped, among his kindred and friends, to recuperate his wasted energies; but his hopes were vain, and he died Dec. 22, 1861, at the residence of his father-in-law. Roy. Dr. Charles Hodge. The death of Dr. Scott produced a deep impression upon the Church.

The board of directors of the Theological Seminary of the North-west adopted a series of resolutions, and the presbytery of Chicago the following minute: "As a teacher, he was thorough and accurate. Much of his time was given to the work of instruction, and he had fully prepared himself for it. As an expounder of God's Word, he was at all times, whether in the lecture-room or the pulpit, lucid, impressive, and evangelical, attracting all by the originality and freshness of his views. As a presbyter, he loved the courts of the Church; and being thoroughly conversant with the theory and practice of our system, he was an  invaluable member in all complex and difficult cases." See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 204. (J. L. S.) Scottish Philosophy is an appellation currently applied to the method and principles of philosophizing and also to certain positive doctrines which were taught by several professors in the universities of Scotland. Prominent among these were Thomas Reid (1710-96), professor of philosophy in King's College, Aberdeen (1752-63), professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow (1763-96); Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), professor of moral philosophy in the University of Edinburgh (1785-1810); Dr. Thomas Brown (1778-!820), colleague with Stewart as professor of moral philosophy (1810-20); and Sir William Hamilton (1788-1856), professor of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh (1836-56). Besides these coryphaei of the Scottish school, others should be named who were more or less conspicuous in the various metaphysical discussions which preceded or accompanied the lectures and writings of these leaders, whether favorable or adverse — viz.: Francis Hutcheson (1694-1747), professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow (1729-46); George Turnbull (1698-1748); regent of Marischal College, Aberdeen (1721-27); David Hume (1711-76); Adam Smith (1723-90), professor of logic in the University of Glasgow (1751), professor of moral philosophy in the same (1752-63); James Beattie (1735-1803), professor of moral philosophy in Marischal College (1760-1802); Thomas Chalmers (1780- 1847), professor of moral philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's (182327), professor of theology in the University of Edinburgh (1827-43); John Wilson (1785-1854), professor of moral philosophy in the University of Edinburgh (1820-54); and James Frederick Ferrier (1808-64), professor of moral philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's (1845-64).

Of all these, Dr. Thomas Reid, by common consent, is the central, if not the most eminent, person in what is known distinctively as the Scottish school. He was the first to give a definite statement and a positive form to the principles which have given it a character and a name. He was aroused to this by the conclusions which were derived by Berkeley and Hume from certain fundamental doctrines of Locke's Essay which had been generally accepted as beyond question. Prominent among these were his doctrines of representative ideas in sense-perception and his definition &knowledge, as also the assertion that sensation and reflection are the only sources of knowledge. These principles had been used by Berkeley, with certain additions of his own, to demonstrate that the material world is known to us  only as a system of ideas which are made steadfast and trustworthy so far as they are held in being by the act and in the mind of God. Hume pushed Berkeley's argument one step further, and proved that we have no more direct and certain knowledge of spirit than we have of matter; and, moreover, that the relation of causation cannot be derived from either sensation or reflection, and is resolvable into custom, or the habitual association of ideas. Hume had also astonished and offended the community by his views of morality, miracles, and the usually accepted argument for the existence of God. Against these views, Reid asserted the doctrine of the direct perception of material qualities, and the positive suggestion or belief of material objects. He also insisted that there are certain original principles of belief which cannot be derived from either sensation or reflection. These he called First Truths, First Principles, Principles of Common-sense, etc. Hence the Scottish philosophy was very generally styled the "Common-sense Philosophy." Under this designation it was expounded in a popular treatise by James Oswald (oh. 1793) and James Beattie (1735-1803). The principal works of Reid were, Inquiry into the Human Mind, or Principles of Common-sense (Land. 1763); Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man (1785); Essays on the Active Powers of Man (1788).

Next to Reid in significance is Dugald Stewart for his undeviating and almost literal adherence to the doctrines of his teacher. He was more learned than Reid, more elegant, and more imaginative; but he did little else than illustrate and enforce the doctrines of Reid by examples and confirmations from his copious reading in a style which was ornate and carefully wrought. His influence was not confined to Great Britain. His lectures were attended by pupils from France, who subsequently were active in the reform of philosophy in their own country. His treatises were more numerous than those of Reid. In 1792 he published vol. i of The Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind; in 1814 vol. 2; in 1827 vol. 3; in 1793 The Outline of Moral Philosophy; in 1810 his Philosophical Essays, which are more severely and purely metaphysical than any of his other writings; in 1815 and 1821 parts 1 and 2 of his General View of the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Science since the Revival of Letters, in which his critical taste and erudition are abundantly displayed; in 1828 The Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers.  Dr. Thomas Brown should be named next to Dugald Stewart, not only because he was his immediate successor, nor because his combination of subtle analysis with rhetorical exuberance made him immensely popular for a time, but because he introduced new elements into the field of discussion, and gave an important impulse to a direction of thought which is now striving to displace the fundamental principles taught by Reid. We refer to the prominence given to the so-called association of ideas, to which Brown, following Stewart somewhat, assigned a very great significance in the explanation of psychological phenomena and philosophical beliefs. James Mill, John Stuart Mill, and Alexander Bain were all influenced by the philosophizing of Brown. The modern doctrine of inseparable associations was received through Brown frown Hume till it arrayed itself in direct Opposition to the so-called introspective theory of Hamilton in the criticism of his philosophy by John Stuart Mill. But although Brown in this and some other particulars deviated from the traditions of Reid and Stewart, he still held fast to the doctrine of irresistible beliefs as the foundation of philosophic truth. Though he accepted Hume's conception of the causal relation, he did not, with Hume, resolve our belief in its constancy into custom or experience. His analysis of the sense perceptions opened the way for the physiological psychology which has since been so earnestly prosecuted. For these and other reasons Brown is a considerable figure among the Scottish philosophers.

Still more considerable is Sir William Hamilton, whose astonishing erudition, subtle logic, and massive strength revived the interest in the old questions which had begun to wane, and gave a new direction to the old inquiries and discussions. His first published contributions were several articles in the Edinburgh Review; viz. the first on Cousin and the Philosophy of the Conditioned (1827), others on the Philosophy of Per- caption (1830), and Recent Publications in Logical Science (1833). In 1836 he was elected professor of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. In 1856 he published the first instalment of the works of Thomas Reid, with notes and illustrations, which remained unfinished till after his death. This work, in short foot-notes and long, learned appendices, contains some of his most valuable contributions to philosophy. His Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic were published after his death under the direction of Rev. H. L. Man-sel and Prof. John Veitch (1859, 1860, 4 vols.). Prof. Veitch also published his Memoirs (1869). Hamilton's philosophical teachings may be classed as follows. He was true  to Reid's doctrine that common-sense is the foundation and the criterion of all true and trustworthy philosophy. He expended immense research in the effort to show that this view was sanctioned by the most eminent of ancient rind modern philosophers. At the same time, he endeavored to formulate more accurate conceptions and more satisfactory definitions of common- sense and its relations to the criteria of truth. His doctrine of the intuitions, or first principles, is a great advance Upon that of Reid in philosophical exactness. Hamilton followed Reid in rejecting the doctrine of representative perception, tracing out with laborious erudition the several theories held by the advocates of this doctrine, and refuting them at every point. His classification of these theories is a masterpiece of ingenuity, acuteness, and learning. His own theory is an attempt to reconcile the latest results of physiological research with the doctrine of natural realism as taught by Reid. While he held, with Reid, to the necessity of a priori or intuitive truths, he sought to reconcile or modify this position by his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge. His philosophy of the conditioned was the result of an effort to adjust the Scottish with the Kantian theory of the a priori element in knowledge. In doing this, he coincided more nearly with Jacobi than with any other German philosopher, although he differed from Jacobi in his fondness for scholastic distinctions and learned erudition. In formal logic he was eminently at home, both in its subtle refinements and its special literature. He elaborated a new and original scheme of logical symbolization on the basis of the doctrine of the quantification of the predicate, to which he attached great importance. Whatever may be the fate of his peculiar teachings, his influence will long be felt and acknowledged in reawakening an interest in philosophical speculation and a respect for profound metaphysical studies in Great Britain and every English-speaking country. SEE HAMILTON, SIR WILLIAM.

Besides these four leaders of the Scottish school, Hutcheson deserves especial honor for anticipating in fact, though not with effect upon the course of speculation, some of the most important positions that were taken by Reid in dissent from Locke. It would seem as if Hutcheson had himself been influenced by a small but able school of Irish critics of Locke, whose home was in Trinity College, Dublin. George Turnbull should not be overlooked, who was the instructor of Reid, and, in some sense, anticipated many of his doctrines. The subtle and consequent David Hume should not be forgotten, for without Hume the Scottish metaphysics would never have had existence. Hume not only waked Kant from his dogmatic  slumber, but compelled Reid into the position of an earnest and patient inquirer into the Correctness of the current philosophy received from Locke. To Hume's acuteness and subtlety does the world owe the birth, beginnings, and character of the two most significant schools of philosophy in modern times, viz. the German and the Scottish. Adam Smith did not fall into the ranks with Reid; but he wrote the ingenious Theory of Moral Sentiments, the ethical principles of which have been enforced in the present generation with a new accession of energy and zeal. Thomas Chalmers was not an originator of special philosophical opinions, but he expounded and enforced profound ethical and metaphysical principles with contagious energy and inspiring enthusiasm. John Wilson was more of a poet than a philosopher, but he brought rare gifts and rarer eloquence to the illustration of ethical themes.

The acute and brilliant Ferrier may never have made a single convert to his theory of consciousness, but he could not fail to kindle a genuine interest in philosophical studies by his subtle analysis and his lucid statements. It does not fall within our task to characterize living teachers and writers; otherwise we might speak of Prof. Henry Calderwood, the daring critic of Hamilton when Hamilton was in his prime; Prof. A. D. Frazer, the subtle and sympathizing biographer and editor of Berkeley; Prof. Veitch, the genial histographer of Hamilton and Stewart; and the indomitable and tenacious Alexander Bain, whose zeal and lean, lug must sooner or later arouse antagonists and critics who shall effectively protest against the extremes to which he carries his associational theories. Two other writers should not be overlooked. James Hutchison Stirling, M.D., the author of the Secret of Hegel, the critic of Hamilton, and the able antagonist of Huxley in his A s Regards Protoplasm; and Prof. Simon S. Laurie, the ingenious author of Philosophy of Ethics and Notes Expository and Critical on Certain British Theories of Morals, give ample proof that the interest in philosophical studies is not likely to die out, and that, in some form or Other, a Scottish philosophy will continue to be taught and defended which will not be unworthy of Reid and Hamilton. Nor should we fail to give just honor to Dr. James M'Cosh, who was trained in the Scottish philosophy, and has done so much to expound and defend, in an independent and critical spirit, its most important and distinctive principles in his well-known works, and has also written the history of the Scottish school with an enthusiastic interest and faithful research.  The Scottish philosophy has had no inconsiderable influence on the Continent, especially in France. Dugald Stewart attracted many pupils from that country, and among them the distinguished Royer Collard, who lectured in the Sorbonne in the years 1811-14, which lectures were the first significant indications of a reaction against the traditional system of Condillac. The fragments of these lectures were subsequently published in connection with a translation of the works of Reid made by Theodore Jouffroy who, with Victor Cousin, was a pupil of Collard. The Eclectic and the more modern Historical French schools show abundant traces of indebtedness to the Scottish philosophy and the impulses which it received from the Scottish teachers with whom it began. This influence has been gratefully acknowledged by Royer Collard, Theodore Jouffroy, Victor Cousin, and many of Cousin's pupils. See M'Cosh, The Scottish Philosophy, Biographical, Expository, Critical, from Hutcheson to Hamilton (N. Y. 1875); Cousin, Philosophic Ecossaise (Paris, 1863, 4th ed.); Ucberweg, History of' Philosophy, etc., translated by Prof. George S. Morris (N. Y. 1872-74), app. i, § 27-46. (N. P.)

## Scotus (Erigena), John[[@Headword:Scotus (Erigena), John]]

             a very notable philosopher of the Carloylngian period, who reanimated in his own person the long-slighted speculations of the Neo-Platonists, and communicated the impulse which, after two centuries, eventuated in the earnest and brilliant labors of the schoolmen. The age in which Scotus Erigena lived is so distant; it is so obscure and confused, or, at least, presents so little to attract interest in modern times; his works are so unfamiliar and so rare, that his name is little regarded, and his career is seldom deemed worthy of consideration. Indeed, so slight is the general acquaintance with himself and his productions that he is at times confounded with the much later philosopher of somewhat similar name, Duns Scotus (q.v.). Yet John Scotus Erigena was a very remarkable phenomenon for the age in which he appeared. He bisects the long interval between Boethius and William of Champeaux, and is the sole luminary — obscured and soon swallowed up by the gloom which irradiates the darkness of speculation in Western Christendom — during those centuries. There may be little of permanent value in his doctrines; there may have  been scarcely any direct influence exercised by them on his own age and on the ages that ensued; there may be a very imperfect appreciation of the philosophy which he revived, remodelled, and transmitted; there may be little profundity when he is compared with his eminent predecessors and his more illustrious successors; but there was great intellectual boldness in his career. There were vigor and originality in his profession and exposition of the elder and almost forgotten doctrines in a dull and declining day. A profound impression was communicated by him to his own and to subsequent times, though it was conveyed by devious and unnoted channels, and through long and strangely disguised modes of transmission. A full and penetrating appreciation of this lonely and memorable dreamer in relation to the creeds, the thoughts, the interests, and the fortunes of his times might throw unexpected light on the history of philosophy and of theology, and even upon the confused struggles — social, political, and intellectual — of the 9th and 10th centuries, the dreariest because the least comprehended period of Christian history.

I. Life. — The origin, and the place and date of birth of John Scotus Erigena are all involved in obscurity and are wholly uncertain. According to one account, he was born on the western borders of England and was of royal Saxon blood. According to another tradition, he came from the western highlands of Scotland, and from the monastic establishments of St. Columba. The generally received opinion, however, is that he was Irish, and acquired his learning in the religious houses of Ireland, which then preserved a higher culture and education than were to be found elsewhere in Western Europe outside of the Saracenic schools in Spain. We may safely acquiesce in M. Guizot's positive declaration that he was of Irish extraction and of Irish training; but this is a conviction, not an established fact. There is conjecture in the conclusion, as well as in M. Guizot's other assumption, that he was called Scorns from his race, and Erigena from his country. Scotus, in the 9th century, meant distinctly an Irishman. Erigena was its Greek equivalent, and may have been adopted by John of Ireland as an Hellenic affectation in consequence of his Greek studies, Greek tastes, and translations from the Greek. It may have been assumed in order to distinguish him from the multitude of other Irish Johns, or Scotch Johns; it may have been conferred in the same spirit in which Alcuin bestowed classical or Scripture names upon Charlemagne and his studious contemporaries.

These are only conjectures. Certain knowledge have we none on this subject, or on the place of his birth, or the time of his birth. He  is supposed to have been born between 810 and 815; and no grave error will be committed by provisionally accepting the earlier as the correct date. Current rumors in his own day and generation represented him as having acquired his singular and varied knowledge, like the elder Greek sages, by travels in Greece, Asia, Egypt, Italy, and France. Such traditions are unquestionable delusions; but that he did travel extensively is rendered probable by a citation from his works, adduced by M. Guizot, which seems to make distinct reference to such wanderings. The peculiar direction of his studies, the character of his learning, the scheme of his philosophy, his addiction to the Greek and to the Neo-Platonic speculations, might all suggest personal acquaintance with the Greeks and the countries of the Greeks. It has scarcely been noticed that the Pythagorean sect, or, at any rate, the Pythagorean doctrine, in connection with its Neo-Platonic developments, continued to maintain itself, even beyond the 9th century, in Constantinople and in other parts of the Byzantine empire. This is clearly established by the declarations of Anna Comnena; but it escaped the regard of M. Guizot while he was awkwardly endeavoring to trace the dissemination of Neo-Platonic influences from the 5th to the 9th century. Wherever Scotus may have strayed, wherever he may have been educated, nothing is heard of him till he appears at the court of Charles the Bald of France. Whether an exile from his own country, or a pilgrim in search of knowledge or of sustenance, or invited by the king to aid in promoting liberal pursuits, he was cordially welcomed by the monarch, who made a zealous effort in a distracted time to renew the plans of his grandfather Charlemagne for the advancement of learning. Erigena went to Paris, and was placed at the head of the School of the Palace. There is no agreement of opinion in regard to the date of this migration. It is variously assigned to the years 840, 843, 847, 850, and 870. It could not well have been before 843, when Charles ascended the throne. It could not have been later than 850, when the controversy in regard to Gottschalk was raging. Scotus Erigena would be between thirty and forty, probably, at the time. We have little information in regard to his personal appearance.

He was small in stature and slender in frame; but the physical deficiencies which would invite only contempt in that muscular age were compensated by the brilliancy of his mind, the amiability of his temperament, and the quickness of his wit in social intercourse. The French king became warmly attached to him, and made him his constant companion and intimate friend. Charles was himself devoted to letters. He invited teachers from other countries, and is said to have attracted many Greeks to his schools. Employment was  found for Erigena beyond the Cathedra Palatina. He was requested by the king to translate a treatise On the Celestial Hierarchy, falsely ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, who was just as erroneously identified with St,. Denys, the supposed apostle of Christianity at Paris. The works of the alleged Areopagite had been sent in 824, by the Greek emperor Michael the Stutterer, as a present to the Frank emperor Louis le Debonnaire. They were held in high regard in France — not the less high because they were Greek and unintelligible. John Scotus complied with the king's request and translated the book into Latin, adhering, however, so closely to the words of his foreign text as to indicate that the knowledge which he had of the Greek, as of the Hebrew and Arabic, was neither elegant nor profound. His reputation, or his position in the king's favor, drew the regards of Hinemar, archbishop of Rheims, who was involved in the controversy respecting predestination between Ra-banns Maurus, of Mentz, and Gottschalk. The archbishop requested John to refute the polemic of Gott-schalk. This task was executed with zeal, but it laid him open to the charge of heresy and provoked fresh logomachy. His polemic was denounced by Prudentius of Troyes and Florus of Lyons, who invited the censures of the Church on nineteen propositions corresponding to the nineteen chapters of the essay De Praedestinatione. We shall not enter into the nice distinctions of the different species of predestination, which lead, by so many slightly divergent routes, to heresy. The controversialists, like "the infernal peers,"

"Reason'd high

Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate;

Fix'd fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute;

And found no end, in wandering mazes lost."

The master of the Palatine School added to his version of The Celestial Hierarchy translations of the other works credited to Dionysius the Areopagite. At some subsequent time he completed his own system of philosophy under the title De Divisione Naturae, or, rather, with the Greek designation Περὶ φυσικῆς μερισμοῦ. The controversial tracts of John had raised up antagonists and enemies; his philosophical tenets occasioned perplexity and alarm. Pope Nicholas, in 867, complained to Charles the Bald that works of doubtful tendency — the versions of Dionysius Areopagita — had been promulgated by John Scotus without having been first submitted to the approval of the apostolic see. He required the king, therefore, to send Scotus to Rome to explain and justify his procedure, or, at least, to dismiss him from the superintendence of the Palatine School.  The king's action is unknown: silentium tegit altum. That he did anything is improbable; but Scotus Erigena drops almost entirely out of view after 867. He is sometimes said to have withdrawn into seclusion in France. He is otherwise said to have returned to England after the death of Charles, and to have been placed by king Alfred at the head of his new school at Oxford, whence he was driven by the commotions of the students. According to Matthew of Westminster and Roger de Hoveden, he was intrusted with the school at the monastery of Meldun, where, having enraged his pupils by his severity, he was murdered by them with their styles (stilettos). This last story has, however, been transferred to the philosopher from another and somewhat later Joannes Scotus, who taught at Athelney. John Erigena seems to have ended his days in France, and to have died before 876. A letter written in that year to Charles the Bald by Anastasius Bibliothecarius speaks of him as if he were dead. He passed away like a bright meteor flashing through the midnight darkness, visible only in a brief transit, undiscoverable in its earlier and in its later course.

II. Works. — The principal works of Scotus Erigena — the works which gave him reputation and provoked censure — have been already mentioned, and will have to be noticed again in examining his doctrine. Several other tractates were written by him, or have been assigned to him. We cannot determine the dates or the sequence of his intellectual labors. His translations were probably communicated, in their progress, to the circle of curious inquirers with whom he was associated in the royal court, and might thus become partially known long before their completion. There was no such definite chronology in respect to literary productions in the days of manuscript as has been usual since the introduction of printing. We cannot, therefore, arrange the works of Erigena according to any chronological scheme. He translated all the works of the alleged Areopagite: The Celestial Hierarchy : — The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy : — The Book of the Divine Names: — The Mystical Theology : — and his Ten Letters. Some of these may have been previously rendered into Latin. He translated the Scholia of Maximus on the writings of Dionysius. He composed a tractate On the Eucharist, in which he denied the dogma of the real presence, and anticipated the position of Ralph Cudworth, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper is only a commemoration of his sacrifice: tantum memorla veri corporis et sanguinis ejus. It is not obvious how this opinion is consistent with the realistic or the pantheistic character of the philosophy of Scotus, but its coherence may be detected. Erigena is said to  have left behind him a work On the Vision of God, and other disputations, which have been lost. The reveries of Plotinus, and the revery upon reveries of Marcilius Ficinus, might enable us to recompose some image of the theory of the Vision of God if we could imitate the German fashion of reconstructing the unknown out of our inner consciousness. A treatise On the Duties of Man was ascribed to him by the abbot Trithemius, and several other productions have been attributed to him with little reason.

III. Philosophy. — It is not proposed to enter further into the theological positions of Erigena than may be necessary to show their relations to his speculative doctrine and to interpret it, or to be interpreted by it. There is a close correspondence between his theology and his philosophy, as must always be the case when different lines of thought are pursued by the same person with earnestness and sincerity. Moreover, the distinctive character of any philosophical doctrine is easily and briefly determined, notwithstanding variety of manifestations and multiplicity of details, by detecting the fundamental or cardinal principle, which must control those manifestations and details if there be honesty of purpose and consecution of thought. Such a principle may be readily discerned in the tenets of Scotus Edgena and in their developments. The essential unity of the divine nature is his central dogma, whence everything proceeds, and whence arises his heterodoxy in regard to the Trinity. Whether he reached this position by independent reflection, or deduced it from logical postulates, or derived it from Nee-Platonic suggestions, or from all sources unconsciously combined, this seems to be the prolific germ of his whole system. He distinctly acknowledges his obligation to Dionysius; yet the obligation was not one of servile acceptance, but of original development. However the spirit may be disguised under hard dialectical forms and under derivative arguments and phrases, there is a genuine and vigorous originality in John Scotus which is evinced in many ways. The unity of the divine nature is his point of departure. Hence, all things proceed from God; all things subsist in God; all things terminate in God. The procedure of Erigena is this, and it gives the title to his work On the Division of Nature. The generic division of nature is fourfold:

(1) the nature that creates and is not created;

(2) the nature that is created and creates;

(3) the nature that is created, but does not create;

(4) the nature which is neither created nor creates.

It will be observed that there is a gradual and delusive sliding of meanings in the application of the slippery, and perplexing word "nature," and that the term cannot be strictly applied to that which is not created; therefore neither to the first nor to the fourth genus. It is necessary to note this, as the errors and heresies charged upon Erigena are in part due to the insufficiency and indistinctness of all language — defects which he strenuously asserts himself. Turning to his four divisions, it is obvious that the nature which creates and is not created is the divinity; but the divinity as an abstract conception, a metaphysical entity, the Nee-Platonic Unum or Unitas, not a personal God: that the nature which is created but creates is also a vague abstraction, but must mean the forces, or laws, or ideas regulating all secondary creation — operating, therefore, simply by the impulse and constraint of their Creator: that the nature which is created but does not create is the only one which corresponds with the ordinary conception of the term, and signifies the concrete result of the action of the laws imposed and of the forces communicated by the Supreme Nature — sustained, therefore, by him, and subsisting in him because supported by his laws and by his continuous action; and that the nature which neither creates nor is created is a nonentity, an unknown and indefinable potentiality, possible hut unimaginable — the impalpable and inapprehensible which lies beyond the present sphere of the existent or of the conceivable. This fourth nature might be altogether rejected, but it would make a fatal breach in this rarefied scheme Of philosophy. Erigena justifies and pro-rides for it in his first and most general division of things — -into those which are and those which are not. There is a very marked Erigenism, or Hibernicism, in the second category. It is necessary, however, to the doctrine; for he declares that even God is, in a certain sense, non-existent. He is, and he is not. Absurd and blasphemous as such a proposition appears, it finds a parallel, as M. Caraman points out, in a similar utterance by Fenelon. What is meant is simply, as the context in both cases reveals, that all language is inadequate — all known qualities, perfections, characteristics, terms, im- proper-for the definition of the Divinity; that beyond all utterance, beyond all imagination, is everything appertaining to the Divine Essence. So far as this perfect nature lies without the apprehensible realm of the created and of the uncreated, it is for us non-existent, since ease and scire are one and correlative. There may be extravagance of conception and exaggeration of expression in such a thesis, but it is not necessarily either irreverent or absurd in its import. The fourth nature, then, as it is only in posse, belongs  to the Divine Nature, or to the yet unmanifested operations of its reserved will and power.

The tendency of this quadrifid nature is evidently to pantheism, if it is not already pantheistic. The tendency is apparently pressed to its consummation in the development of the scheme, which is controlled in form and in statement by the text of Dionysius and the spirit of Neo- Platonism. Hence flow these tenets: "God, who alone truly exists, is the essence of all things; as Dionysius the Areopagite says, ' God is the beginning, the middle, and the end: the beginning, because all things come from him and participate in his essence; the middle, because all things subsist in him and by him; the end, because all things move towards him to attain repose, the limit of their motion, and the stability of his perfection,'" etc. "Nothing subsists outside of the Divine Nature; it alone properly and truly exists in all things, and nothing properly and truly exists which it is not .... Creation is the procession of God through primordial causes to the invisible and visible effects of such causation .... Matter is only apparent; there is no real substance but the Divine Essence." It is not surprising that Scotus Erigena has been frequently regarded as the precursor of Spinoza, though Brucker distinguishes between the pantheism of the former and the atheism which he erroneously attributes to the latter.

If the language which Scorns employed is received literally; if the phraseology which he borrows from Neo-Platonic sources or from the shaping influences of Neo-Platonic mysticism is alone considered, it is impossible to regard his philosophy as anything else but pantheism. His writings were, of course, accepted literally by his contemporaries so far as they were understood. The hazardous consequences of his doctrine were the more readily apprehended, as certain explicit dogmas were obviously at variance with the teachings of the Church, such as the denial of transubstantiation and the subordination of authority to reason. That such should be the censure of the 9th century is much more pardonable than that metaphysicians of the 19th should rarely see in The Division of Nature anything but crude and unmitigated pantheism.

Crude it is not, for it is characterized throughout by acute penetration and vigorous thought. Unmitigated it is not, for there is a cautious asseveration of the restrictions and impotency of the human mind and of language. The Divine Nature, in regard to which he boldly speculates, is declared by him to be unutterable, ineffable, incomprehensible, superessential, supersubstantial, superdivine. In his struggles to grasp the inapprehensible, he invents terms transcending  all human appreciation, like a Byzantine emperor devising titles of hypersuperlative dignity. Some palliation may be offered even for the apparent pantheism, which is, perhaps, more in the framework and phraseology of the doctrine — in the inevitable vagueness of the expression — than in the actual contemplation of the author. It must, indeed, be acknowledged that all inaccuracies or imbecilities of language react upon those from whom they proceed, modify all subsequent deductions, and infect the mind of the propounder without his cognizance and contrary to his design. But, while the immediate and derivative consequences of such aberrations should be fully recognised, they should be treated as aberrations, and, therefore, as undesigned. Such tenderness of consideration is merited by Scotus Erige-ha, an earnest thinker, and the first original thinker in philosophy in mediaeval Christendom, when the materials of thought and the materials: Of expression were as yet loose and indeterminate.

Examining the De Divisione Naturae with the caution and reservations which such tenderness prescribes, it may be conjectured that, when Erigena speaks of God being all things and of all things being God, he really means little more than is implied in the Scripture phrase:" in whom we live, and move, and have our being ;" that when he speaks of all things proceeding from God, and of all things returning to him, he does not intend to assert the mere evolution of Deity into shifting phenomenal forms, or the reabsorption into his essence of the emanations which have streamed out from his nature, but only that the divine power of creation, in its eternal operation, accompanies all the developments of creation and attends the latest modes of change. Erigena asseverates creation throughout; he does not identify the Divinity with created forms, nor does he deny the separable character of such forms in any of their stages. These views are inconsistent with intentional pantheism. These considerations can, however, only be suggested, not explained or developed.

The absolute and transcendental perfection of the Divine Nature, which was regarded as indwelling in all derivative existence, led Erigena to deny the eternity of punishments. In the same manner maybe explained his anticipation of the doctrine of Leibnitz, that evil is not a positive entity, but only the privation of good. To the same principle may alto be referred his position in regard to predestination, which repudiated predestination to damnation.

Much of the questionable doctrine of Scotus Erlgena sprang from his dialectical procedure. Following Aristotle, but imperfectly understanding  him, he regarded division as the highest function of philosophy. Hence came the title-and the treatment of his principal work. Haureau pointed out his identification of the degrees of abstraction with the grades of existence, and Ueberweg charges him with "hypostatizing the Tabula Logics.' There is some truth in these charges, but they must not be pressed too far. It is, however, to this predominance of the dialectical procedure; to the conjunction of reason with authority; to the co-ordination of philosophy and theology; to the formal statement and refutation of objections; and to the array Of scriptural, patristic, and other testimonies in support of his conclusions, that Scotus Erigena owes his title to be considered the precursor of the schoolmen. He also furnishes the prelude to the great controversy between the Realists and Nominalists by his doctrine of ideas and his qualified realism.

IV. Influence. — M. Gnizot conceives that the influence of Scotus Erigena died with him. This is true in respect to his direct and ostensible influence, which was scarcely noticeable even in the maturity of his career. He was outside of his age. Deep night and the obscuration of all philosophical inquiry followed his disappearance from the scene. But he had awakened reflection, though soon diverted into other currents. He had scattered seeds which lay dormant, not dead, in the soil. The impulse communicated by him must have been obscurely transmitted to other times, since pope Honorius III, in 1225 — nearly four hundred years later — deemed it expedient to fulminate a pontifical censure against the Division of Nature. This was during the Albigensian crusades, when the pope ordered diligent search to be made for the work, and the burning of such copies as might be found. To this cause its extreme rarity may be referred.

V. Authorities. — There has been no collected edition of the works of John Scotus Erigena. His several works have been published separately, at different times. The first edition of the De Divisione Naturae was edited by (gale (Oxon. 1681, fol.). It has since been edited by Schluter (Munster, 1838), and by Floss (Paris, 1853), in Migne's Bibliotheca. M. Guizot stated that he had been unable to find the De Divisione Naturae in any of the libraries of Paris. He acknowledges the kindness shown him in searching for it. His inquiries in England had been attended with like disappointment, He remarks that, "many foreign writers who have spoken of this work have not had it before them any more than myself in its entire state. Of this they  ought to have made their readers aware," as we now do, ex parte nostra, in regard to the complete texts of Erigena.

Notices, more or less comprehensive and satisfactory, are to be found in Pagi, Crit. ad Annul. Baronii, Ann. 850-51; Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosophiae, 3, 614-625; Hjort, Johann Scotus Erigena, etc. (Copenhagen, 1823); Staudenmaier, Johannes Scotus Erigena (Frankf. 1834); Saint-Rend Taillandier, Scot Erigene, etc. (Paris, 1843); id. Erigene et la Philos. Schol. (Strasb. 1843); Moller, Job. Scotus Erigena (Mayence, 1844); Caraman, Hist. des Rev. Deuteronomy 1 a PhiIosophie, etc. (Paris); Christlieb, Leben u. Lehre des Jail. Scot. Erigena (Gotha, 1860); Hermens, Das Leben des Scotus Erigena (Jena, 1868); Schmid, Der Mysticismus des Mittelalters (ibid. 1824); Ampere, Hist. Litt. de France, tome 3, s.v.; Guizot, Hist. de la Civ. en France, leg. 39. (G. F. H.)

## Scotus, Duns[[@Headword:Scotus, Duns]]

             SEE DUNS SCOTUS.

## Scougal, Henry[[@Headword:Scougal, Henry]]

             an eminent Scottish divine, the second son of Patrick Scougal, bishop of Aberdeen, was born in June, 1650, at Sultan, in East Lothian. At the age of fifteen he entered the University of Aberdeen, and had no sooner finished his studies than he was promoted to a professorship (1669). At the age of twenty-three he was admitted into holy orders, and settled at Auchterless, near Aberdeen. In 1674 he was appointed professor of divinity in King's College, Aberdeen. He died at the early age Of twenty-eight, June 20,1678, and was buried in King's College Church, Old Aberdeen. His principal work is entitled The Life of God in the Soul of Man (Anon. 1671, ed. by bishop Burnet).

## Scourge[[@Headword:Scourge]]

             (usually some form of שׁוּט, shut, to lash; שׁוֹט, shot, Job 5:21; Job 9:23; Isa 10:26; Isa 28:18, a whip, as elsewhere rendered; שׁיִט, shayit, Isa 28:15; שֹׁטֵט, shorert, Jos 23:13; but in Leveticius 19:20, בִּקֹּרֶת, bikkoreth, chastisement in general; φραγέλλιον, the Lat. flagellum, or whip, Joh 2:15; so the verb φραγελλόω, Matthew 28:26; Mar 15:15; μαστίξ, a severe kind of whip, Act 22:24; Heb 11:36; tropically, "plague," Mar 3:10, etc.; so in a literal sense the verb μαστιγόω, Mat 10:17; Mat 20:19; Mat 23:34; Mar 10:34; Luk 18:33; Joh 19:1; Heb 12:6; or μαστίζω, Act 22:25). The punishment of scourging was very common among  the Jews. Moses ordains (Deu 25:1-3) that if there be a controversy between :men, and they come to judgment, then the judges may judge them; mad if the wicked man were found worthy to be beaten, the judge was to cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number of, but not exceeding forty, stripes. There were two ways of giving the lash — one with thongs or whips made of rope-ends or straps of leather, the other with rods or twigs. In later times the of- fender was stripped from his shoulders to his middle and tied by his arms to a low pillar, that he might lean forward and the executioner the more easily strike his back. Some maintain that they never gave more nor less than thirty-nine strokes, but that in greater faults they struck with proportionate violence. Others think that when the fault and circumstances required it, they might increase the number of blows. Paul informs us (2Co 11:24) that at five different times he received thirty-nine stripes from the Jews; which seems to imply that this was a fixed number, not to be exceeded. The apostle also clearly shows that correction with rods was different from that with a whip, for he says, "Thrice was I beaten with rods." The rabbins affirm that punishment by the scourge was not ignominious, and that it could not be objected as a disgrace to those who had suffered it. They maintain, too, that no Israelite. not even the king or the high-priest, was exempt from this law. This must be understood, however, of the whipping inflicted in their synagogues, which was rather a legal and particular penalty than a public and shameful correction. Philo, speaking of the manner in Which Flaccus treated the Jews of Alexandria, says he made them suffer the punishment of the whip, which, he remarks, is not less insupportable to a free man than death itself. Our Saviour, speaking of the pains and ignominy of his passion, commonly puts his scourging in the second place (Mat 20:19; Mar 10:34; Luke 28:32). The punishment of scourging was specially prescribed by the law in the case of a betrothed bondwoman guilty of unchastity, and perhaps in the case of both the guilty persons (Lev 19:20). Women were subject to scourging in Egypt, as they still are by the law of the Koran for incontinence (Sale, Koran, ch. 4, note, and 24; Lane, Modern Egypt, 1, 147; Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt. abridg, 2:211). The instrument of punishment in ancient Egypt, as it is also in modern times generally in the East, was usually the stick, applied to the soles of the feet — bastinado (id. loc. cit.; Chardin, 6:114; Lane, Modern Egypt, 1:146). SEE BASTINADO.

A more severe scourge is possibly implied in the term "scorpions," whips armed with pointed halls of lead, the "horribile flagellum" of Horace,  though it is more probably merely a vivid figure. Under the Roman method the culprit was stripped, stretched with cords or thongs on a frame (divaricatio), and beaten with rods. After the Porcian law (B.C. 300), Roman citizens were exempted from scourging, but slaves and foreigners were liable to be beaten, even to death. This infliction, as a method of extorting a confession, was not unusual among the Romans, and was sometimes practiced by the Jews themselves. The same punishment was also occasionally inflicted for ecclesiastical offences (Mat 10:17; Act 26:11), and sometimes as an instant mode of chastisement (Joh 2:15). See Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1062; Isidore, Orig. 5:27; Horace, 1 Sat. 2:41; 3:119; Pro 26:3; Act 16:22, and Grotius, ad loc. 22:24, 25; 1Ki 12:11; Cicero, 1Ki 12:3; 1Ki 12:28-29; Pro Rub. 4; Liv. 10:9; Sallust, Cat. 51; and the monographs of Krumb-holz, De Serratore Fustibus Caeso (in the Bibl. Brem. 8:35 sq.); Sagittarius, De Flagellatione Christi (Jen. 1674); Strauch, De Ritu apud Judaeos (Vi-teb. 1668); Hilpert, id. (Helmst. 1652); Seypel, De Ritu Flagellandi apud Romanos (Viteb. 1668); Schoff, De Flagellatione Apostolorum (Viteb. 1683). SEE PUNISHMENT; SEE WHIP.

## Scourging[[@Headword:Scourging]]

             a practice sanctioned by the Romish Church, whereby an individual, for the mortifying of the flesh, voluntarily scourges himself. This is resorted to in many monasteries at regular intervals, frequently as often as three times a week. and in many cases much oftener. The act is also performed at Rome on particular days during Lent. SEE FLAGELLANTES.

## Scovel, Sylvester, D.D[[@Headword:Scovel, Sylvester, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Peru, Massachusetts, March 3, 1796. He graduated from Williams College in 1822, and studied two years at Princeton Theological Seminary; labored as a missionary on the Delaware River; was pastor at Woodbury, N.J., in 1825; supply at Norristown, Pennsylvania, in 1828; in Ohio from 1833 to 1836; agent of domestic missions until 1846; and president of Hanover College, Indiana, until his death, July 4, 1849. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Screech-Owl[[@Headword:Screech-Owl]]

             (לילית, lilith, prob. from ליִל, sight, and so designating some nocturnal creature; Sept. ὀνοκένταυροι ; Aquila, ), λιλίθ; Symmachus: λαμία; Vulg. lamia; marg. "night-monster"), a creature mentioned in connection with the desolation that was to mark Edom. According to the rabbins, the lilith was a nocturnal spectre in the form of a beautiful woman that carried off children at night and destroyed them (see Bochart, Hieroz. 3:829; Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.; Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. et Talm. p. 1140). With the lilith may be compared the ghule of the Arabian fables. The old versions support the opinion of Bochart that a spectre is intended. As to the  ὀνοκένταυροι of the Sept. and the lamia of the Vulg. translations of Isaiah, see the Hieroz. 3:832, and Gesenius (Jesaia, 1:915-920). Michaelis (Suppl. p. 1443) observes on this word, "In the poetical description of desolation, we borrow images even from fables." Among Oriental nocturnal birds we have Strix ulula, S. brachyotus, or short-eared owl, likewise found in Egypt and Arabia, as well as to the north of Syria, a bold, pugnacious bird, residing in ruined buildings, mistaken by commentators for the screech-owl, S. stridula, and supposed by some to be the lilith of the Bible. The spectral species, again, confounded with the goat-sucker, is, we believe, S. coromanda [see Night-Hawk], and the same as S. orientalis of Hassel-quist, who makes it synonymous with massasa and with the Syrian bano, but apparently only upon the evidence of the vulgar, who believe in the "spectral lady" appearance of the lilith and bana, and in its propensity to lacerate infants, of which this bird, together with the S. ulula and bubo of antiquity, is accused. The original version of the story, however, refers, not to an owl or goat-sucker, but to the poetical Strix of the ancients, a lamia with breasts, that is, a harpy or a vampire, being a blood-sucking species of the bat family .(Ovid, Fast. 6:139, and the fables of C. Titinius, quoted by Gesner, De Strige, p. 738). SEE BAT. If, however, some animal be denoted by the Hebrew term, the screech-owl (S. flammea) may well be supposed to represent it, for this bird is found in the Bible lands (see Tristram, Ibis, 1:26, 46), and is, as is well known, a frequent inhabiter of ruined places. The statement of Irby and Mangles relative to Petra illustrates the passage in Isaiah under consideration: "The screaming of eagles, hawks, and owls, which were soaring above our heads in considerable numbers, seemingly annoyed at any one approaching their lonely habitation, added much to the singularity of the scene" (see also Stephens, Incid. of Trav. 2:, 76). Kitto (Pier. Bible, note ad loc.) might perhaps refer the lilith to the eagle-owl, or Bubo maximus, which is found in many parts of the world, and haunts old ruins and other places where it is not liable to interruption. Like others of its tribe, it remains silent in its solitude during the day, but comes forth at night from its retreat, adding, by its strange appearance and dismal tones, to the gloom of the scenes which it delights to frequent, The ground color of its plumage is brown mingled with yellow, diversified with wavy curves, bars, and dashes of black. Its length is about two feet; the legs are feathered to the toes, and the iris of the eye exhibits a bright orange color. SEE OWL.

## Screen[[@Headword:Screen]]

             a partition, enclosure, or parclose separating a portion of a room or of a church from the rest In the domestic halls of the Middle Ages a screen was almost invariably fixed across the lower end, so as to part off a small space, which became a lobby (with a gallery above it) within the main entrance doors, the approach to the body of the hall being by one or more doorways through the screen. These were of wood, with the lower part, to the height of a few feet, formed of close panelling, and the upper part of open-work. The passage behind the screen for the use of the servants was called "the Screens." In churches, screens were used in various situations, to enclose the choir, to separate subordinate chapels, to protect tombs, etc. That at the west end of the choir or chancel was often called the rood-screen, from the rood having been placed over it previous to the Reformation. Screens were formed either of wood or stone, and were enriched not only with mouldings and carvings, but also with most brilliant coloring and gilding. The screens at the west end and sides of the choir in cathedrals and large churches were usually close throughout their whole height, as they also occasionally were in other situations; but in general the lower part only, to the height of about four feet from the ground, was close, and the remainder was of open-work. The oldest piece of screen-work that has been noticed is at Compton Church, Surrey; it is of wood, of transition character from Norman to Early English, consisting of a series of small octagonal shafts with carved capitals supporting plain semicircular arches, and forms the front of an upper chapel over the eastern part of the channel.

Of the Early English style the existing examples are almost invariably of stone. Some are close walls, more or less ornamented with panelling, arcades, and other decorations; and some are close only at the bottom, and have the upper part formed of a series of open arches. Specimens of wooden screens of very early Decorated date remain at Stanton Harcourt, Oxfordshire, and at Sparsholt, Berkshire, and in the north aisle of the choir of Chester Cathedral: these have the lower part of plain boarding, and the upper of small feathered arches supported on circular banded shafts. Stone screens of this date are variously, and often very highly, enriched. Some have the upper part of open-work, similar to those of wood; and others are  entirely close, and are enriched with arcades, panels, niches, pinnacles, diapering, and other decorations characteristic of the style: specimens remain at Lincoln and several other cathedrals and large churches. Perpendicular screens exist in great variety in very many churches, both of wood and stone. Some of them are profusely ornamented with panelings, niches, statues, pinnacles, tabernacle-work, carvings, and other enrichments. The lower part usually consists of close panels, and the upper part of open-work divided by mullions supporting tracer, but sometimes the whole is close, with the same general arrangement of panelling. The illustration given from Fyfield Church, Berkshire, is an example of a parclose.

## Screven, Charles Odingsell, D.D[[@Headword:Screven, Charles Odingsell, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Charleston, S.C., in 1774. He graduated from Brown University in 1795, and was licensed to preach in 1801. His ministerial labors were confined to Liberty and the immediate counties. In 1806 he was elected -president of Mt. Enon College, where he remained- and taught probably two years. His only publications are two sermons. In 1802 a painful disease began to develop itself in one of his eyes. He continued to prosecute his labors until 1821. The last six years of his life were years of intense and almost uninterrupted pain. He died in New York, July 2, 1830. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:4391.

## Scribe[[@Headword:Scribe]]

             (סֹפֵר, sopher, a writer; γραμματεύς), a word the early appearance of which in Heb. literature shows the antiquity of the art of writing. The name of Kirjath - Sepher ( "city of the book," Jos 15:15; Jdg 1:12) may possibly connect itself with some early use of the title. In the song of Deborah (v, 14) the word appears to point to military functions of some kind. The "pen of the writer" of the A.V. has been thought to be the rod or sceptre of the commander numbering or marshalling his troops; but it may naturally signify only that those unused to warfare in the emergency exchanged the pen for the sword. The title appears with more distinctness in the early history of the monarchy. They must not be confounded, however, with the שֹׁטְרִים, shoterim (likewise literally recorders) from whom they are expressly distinguished (2Ch 26:11), as the latter were rather inspectors than writers. SEE OFFICER.

Three men are mentioned as successively filling the office of scribe under David and Solomon (2Sa 8:17; 2Sa 20:25; 1Ki 4:3, in this instance two simultaneously). Their functions are not specified, the high place assigned to them, side by side with the high priest and the captain of the host, implies power and honor. We may think of them as the king's secretaries, writing his letters, drawing up his decrees, managing his finances (comp. the work of the scribe under Joash, 2Ki 12:10). At a later period the word again connects itself with the act of numbering the military forces of the country (Jer 52:25, and probably Isa 33:18). Other  associations, however, began to gather round it about the same period. The zeal of Hezekiah led him to foster the growth of a body of men whose work it was to transcribe old records, or to put in writing what had been handed down orally Pro 25:1). To this period accordingly belongs the new significance of the title. It no longer designates only an officer of the king's court, but a class, students and interpreters of but the law, boasting of their wisdom (Jer 8:8). SEE SCRIBES.

As in ancient times comparatively few could write, this was, ill fact, a learned profession. Such persons, evidently official characters, are frequently depicted on the Egyptian monuments, as that nation was proverbial for recording everything relating both to public and private life. On the Assyrian monuments they likewise appear, but less prominently, and only in the later sculptures (Layard, Nineveh, 2:146). In the East to- day professional letter-writers may be found in the streets plying their vocation in behalf of the uneducated. See Writing.

## Scribes, Jewish[[@Headword:Scribes, Jewish]]

             These persons (called in Heb. סוֹפְרִים, sopherim; Gr. γραμματεῖς) were originally merely writers or copyists of the law, who followed this business as a mode of livelihood; but eventually they rose to the rank of a learned profession — becoming the doctors of the law and interpreters of the Scriptures. As such they frequently appear in the New Test., and occasionally in the later books of the Old; and their office gradually became of still more importance after the dissolution of the Jewish commonwealth. (The following article embraces both the Scripture allusions and the Talmudical references to the subject.)

The prominent position occupied by the scribes in the Gospel history would of itself make a knowledge of their life and teaching essential to any clear conception of our Lord's work. It was by their influence that the later form of Judaism had been determined. Such as it was when the "new doctrine" was first proclaimed, it had become through them. Far more than priests or Levites, they represented the religious life of the people. On the one hand, we must know what they were in order to understand the innumerable points of contrast presented by our Lord's acts and words. On the other, we must not forget that there were also, inevitably, points of  resemblance. Opposed as his teaching was, in its deepest principles, to theirs, he was yet, in the eyes of men, as one of their order — a scribe among scribes, a rabbi among rabbins (Joh 1:49; Joh 3:2; Joh 6:25, etc. Comp. Schottgen, Hor. Hebrews 2," Christus Rabbino-rum Summus").

The rise, progress, and influence of the Jewish doctors and interpreters of the law are properly divided into five distinct periods, which are indicated by the special appellations under which they were designated in successive times.

I. The sopherim, or "Scribes," properly so called. —

1. The Name and its Signification. — In the earlier records of the Old Test. the name Sopher (סֹפֵר, participle of סָפֵר, to write, to count) is given to officers of state whose functions were to write the king's letters, draw up his decrees (2Ki 12:10; 2Ch 24:11), and to number and write down the military forces as well as the prisoners (Jdg 5:14; 2Ki 25:19; Isa 33:18; Jer 52:25). As learning was intimately connected with the art of writing, and as these two accomplishments were always associated together in ancient days, these scribes occupied a distinguished position. Hence they are mentioned side by side with the high-priest and the captain of the host (2Ki 12:10; 2Ch 24:11); and hence, too, the term Sopher (ספר) became in the post-exile period the honorable appellation of one who copied the law for himself or others, one skilIed in the divine law, an interpreter of the Scriptures (Jer 8:8; Ezr 8:6; Ezr 8:12; Neh 8:1, etc.). The authority of most Hebrew scholars is with this etymology of the word (Gesen. s.v.). Ewald, however (Poet. Buch. 1:126), takes סֹפֵרas equivalent to שֹׁפֵט, "a judge."

In their anxiety to preserve the text of Holy Writ as well as to point out the import of its injunctions, these scribes counted every letter and classified every precept of the law. To indicate this, the Talmud, in accordance with Its general practice always to deduce from the name the various actions of the man, derives the appellation sopher from ספר, to count, maintaining that this name was given to those who counted the letters of the law (Kiddush. 30 a), as well as from ספר, to number, to arrange, to classify, submitting that the name was also given to them because they classified the precepts of Scripture (Jerus. Shekalim, 5:1). They had ascertained that the  central letter of the whole law was the ray of גָּחוֹן in Lev 11:42, and wrote it accordingly in a larger character (Lightfoot, On Luke x). They counted up, in like manner, the precepts of the law that answered to the number of Abraham's servants or Jacob's descendants.

The Greek equivalent answers to the derived, rather than the original, meaning of the word. The γραμματεύς of a Greek state was not the mere writer, but the keeper and registrar, of public documents (Thucyd. 4: 118; 7:10; so in Act 19:35). The scribes of Jerusalem were, in like manner, the custodians and interpreters of the γράματτα upon which the polity of the nation rested. Other words applied to the same class are found in the New Test. Νομικοί appears in Mat 22:35; Luk 7:30; Luk 10:25; Luk 14:3; νομοδιδάσκαλοι in Luk 5:17; Act 5:34. Attempts have been made, but not very successfully, to reduce the several terms to a classification. All that can be said is that γραμματεύς appears the most generic term; that in Luk 11:45 it is contrasted with νομικός; that νομοδιδάσκαλος, as in Act 5:34, seems the highest of the three. Josephus (Ant. 17:6, 2) paraphrases the technical word by ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων. Lightfoot's arrangement, though conjectural, is worth giving (Harm. § 77). The "scribes," as such, were those who occupied themselves with the Mikra. Next above them were the "lawyers," students of the Mishna, acting as assessors, though not voting in the Sanhedrim. The "doctors of the law" were expounders of the Gemara, and actual members of the Sanhedrim. (Comp. Carpzov, App. Crit. 1:7; Leusden, Phil. Hebr. c. 23; Leyrer, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. "Schriftgelehrte.")

2. Date and Institution. — The period of the Sopherim begins with the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, and ends with the death of Simon the Just (B.C. cir. 458-300), embracing nearly a hundred and sixty years. Though there were popular teachers of the law in the Babylonian captivity, as is evident from Ezr 8:16, where these official instructors are denominated skilled in the law (מבינים), and from the fact that Ezra himself was at the head of such a class (Ezr 7:12; Ezr 7:21; comp. Neh 13:13); yet the language in which the sacred oracles were written was gradually dying out, and Hebrew ceased, in many instances, to be the language of the people (Neh 13:24). This rendered the understanding of the Scriptures by the people at large a difficult matter. Besides, the newly altered state after the return from the Babylonian captivity, which called for new enactments as well as for the expansion and modification of some  Pentateuchal laws, imperatively demanded that an authoritative body of teachers should so explain the law, which was regarded as the only rule of practice, as to adapt it to present circumstances. Hence Ezra, who reorganized the new state, also organized such a body of interpreters, of which he was the chief. It is for this reason that he is called Sopher =one occupied with books, interpreter of the Book (vii, 6, 11, 12, 21; Neh 8:1; Neh 8:4; Neh 8:9; Neh 8:13; Neh 12:26; Neh 12:36), that he is denominated the second Moses (Sanhedrin, 21 b; Tosiphta, ibid. cap. iv; Jerus. Megilla, i, 9); and that it is said "when the Thora was forgotten by Israel, Ezra came from Babylon and restored it again" (Succa, 20 a; comp. 2Es 14:21-47). The skilled in the law, both from among the tribe of Aaron and the laity, who, with Ezra, and after his death to the time of the Tanaim, thus interpreted and fixed the divine law, are denominated Sopherim — "scribes," in the strict sense of the word. Many of these Sopherim were members Of the Great Synagogue which was formed by Nehemiah after the death of Ezra; hence the terms Sopherim and the men of the Great Synagogue (אנשׁי כנסת הגדולה) are frequently interchanged; and hence, too, the canons which were enacted during this period are sometimes recorded in the name of the former and sometimes in the name of the latter, though they proceed from one and the same body. Reserving those enactments which are recorded in the name of the Great Synagogue for that article, SEE SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT], we shall here specify the most important acts and monuments which have come down to us as proceeding from the Sopherim.

3. The Work of the Sopherim. — At the outset, the words of Ezr 7:10 describe the high ideal of the new office. The scribe is "to seek (דָּרשׁ) the law of the Lord and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." This, far more than his priesthood, was the true glory of Ezra. In the eyes even of the Persian king he was "a scribe of the law of the God of heaven" (Ezr 7:12). He was assisted in his work by others, chiefly Levites. Publicly they read and expounded the law, perhaps, also, translated it from the already obsolescent Hebrew into the Aramaic of the people (Neh 8:8-13). In the succeeding age they appear as a distinct class'' the families of the scribes," with a local habitation (1Ch 2:55). They compile, as in the two books of Chronicles, excerpta and epitomes of larger histories (1Ch 29:29; 1Ch 11:29). The occurrence of the word midrash (" the story" [margin, "the commentary''] "of the prophet Iddo"), afterwards so memorable, in 2Ch 13:22, shows that the work of commenting and expounding had already begun.

In the later period, it is not too much to say that the work of these Sopherim embraces the whole field of civil and religious law, both as it is contained in the written Word of God and as it obtained in the course of time; and that it is most essential to the criticism and interpretation of the Old Test. to understand these enactments, inasmuch as they materially affect the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. This will be evident from the following brief description of some of the Sopheric work.

(1.) In accordance with the primary meaning of their name, the scribes, or Sopherim, copied the Pentateuch, the phylacteries, and Mezuzoth for the people (Pesachim, 50 b), since it was only the codices which proceeded from these authoritative teachers that could be relied upon.

(2.) They guarded the Bible against any interpolations or corruptions, and for this purpose counted the letters of the Scriptures. Thus the scribes tell us that in five instances (Gen 18:5; Num 31:2; Psa 36:7), a vav crept into the text through a vitiated provincial pronunciation, for which reason these Sopheric corrections are called the emendations of the scribes ( עטור סופרים Nedarimi 37 b, SEE KERI AND KETHIB; SEE MASORAH; Ginsburg's translation of Jacob ben- Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 12).

(3.) They read the law before the people in the synagogues on stated occasions, for which reason Ezra, the chief scribe, is denominated (ἀναγνώστης) the praelector of the law (1Es 8:8). Hence the usage of the word scribe, or Sopher (ספר), in post-Biblical Hebrew to denote a public reader of the law (Sabbath, 31 a). Moreover, they indicated to the people when words were in pause or when they were in the plural or simply had dual forms, as is the ease with ארצ. מצרים, etc. These indications are called the reading of the scribes (מקרא סופרים).

(4.) They propounded the duties inculcated in the Scriptures to the people at large on Sabbath and festivals, and delivered lectures to their disciples in the weekdays in the colleges, on the profounder import Of Holy Writ. These expositions are called Sopheric comments (פירושׁי סופרים).

(5.) They defined the limits of each precept, and determined the manner in which the sundry commands of the divine law are to be performed — e, g. they fixed the passages of Scripture meant by "the words of command'' which the Lord enjoined the Israelites "to bind for a sign upon their hands, and to be as frontlets between their eyes" (Exo 23:9; Exo 23:16; Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18, with Menachoth, 34 b SEE PHYLACTERY); the portions of the Bible to be recited at morning and evening prayer as indicated in the words "thou shalt talk about them when thou liest down and when thou risest up" (Deu 7:7), etc. These definitions of the injunctions are denominated the measures of the scribes (שׁיעורי סופרים), which, though in theory they are distinguished from the letter of the Bible (דברי תורה), yet in authority are equal to it, and are regarded as divinely legal מדאוריתא

(6.) They fixed the traditional law, which was in the mouth and memory of the people,

(7.) They enacted prohibitory laws, called fences (גדר סיג גזרה), to guard the Biblical precepts from being violated, and these enactments are styled the precepts of the scribes or the Sopherim, the injunctions of the elders; and in the New Test,. the traditions of the elders (Mat 15:2; Mar 7:3), the traditions of the fathers (Gal 1:14). Hence, as the phrase דברי סופרים is not only used to express the Sopheric expositions of the Pentateuch, but more especially to denote the definitions and hedges of the scribes superadded to the divine law, it is frequently identical with the phrase oral law (שׁבעל פה תורה) Hence, too, the remark which often occurs in the Talmndic writings, "a subject the basis of which is in the words of the Pentateuch, but the definition or superstructure of which is from the words of the scribes" (Sanhedrin, 87 a; Jerus. ibid. 11:4 ; Kiddush. 77 a); when the simple letter of the inspired code is spoken of in contradistinction to the definitions and hedges of the scribes.

(8.) They removed anthropomorphisms and other indelicate expressions from the Scriptures by introducing alterations into the text, of which the following seventeen instances are especially recorded:

1. For the original reading, ויהיה עודני עמד לפני אברהם, and Jehovah still stood before Abraham" (Gen 18:22), they  substituted ואברהם עודנו עמד לפני יהוה, "and Abraham still stood before Jehovah," because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before the patriarch,

2. For the remark of Moses in his prayer, "Kill me, I pray thee,.., that I may not see (ברעתד) thy evil" (Num 11:15) — i.e. the punishment wherewith thou visitest Israel — they substituted "that I may not see (ברעתי) my evil," because it might seem as if Moses ascribed evil to the Deity.

3. They altered "Let her not be as one dead, who proceeded from the womb of (אמו) our mother, and half of (בשׁרנו) our flesh be consumed" (Num 12:12) into "Let her not be as one dead-born, which, when it proceeds from the womb of (אמנו) its mother, has half (בשׁרו) its flesh consumed."

4. They changed "For his sons cursed (אלתים) God" (1Sa 3:13), which is still retained in the Sept., into "for his sons cursed (להם) themselves," because it was too Offensive to say that the sons of Eli cursed God, and that Eli knew it and did not reprove them for it.

5. "Will God see (בעינו) with My eye ?" (2Sa 16:12) they altered into "Will God look (בעוני) at my affliction?" because it was too anthropomorphitic,

6. "To his God (לאלהיו), O Israel,... and Israel went (לאלהיו) to their God" (1Ki 12:16), they altered into "To your tents (לאהליד, O Israel,... and Israel departed (לאהליו) to their tents;" because the separation of Israel from the house of David was regarded as a necessary transition to idolatry, ,it was looked upon as leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idols in tents,

7. For the same reason they altered 2Ch 10:16, which is a parallel passage.

8. "My people have changed (כבודי) my glory for an idol" (Jer 2:11) they altered into "have changed (כבודם) their glory into an idol," because it is too offensive to say such a thing,

9. "They have put the rod to (אפי) my nose" (Eze 8:17) they changed into "They have put the rod to (אפם) their nose."

10. "They have changed (כבודי) my glory into shame" ( Hos 4:7) they altered into "I will change their glory into shame" (בקלון אמיר כבודם), for the same reason which dictated the eighth alteration,

11. "Thou diest not" (תמות), addressed by the prophet to God (Hab 1:12), they altered into" We shall not die" (נמות), because it was deemed improper,

12. "The apple of (עיני) mine eye" (Zec 2:12) they altered into "The apple of (עינו) his eye," for the reason which called forth the ninth emendation,

13. "Ye make (אותי) me expire" (Mal 1:13) they altered into "Ye weary (אותו) it," because of its being too gross an anthropomorphism,

14. "They have changed (כבודי) my glory into the similitude of an ox" (Psa 106:20) they altered into "They have changed (כבודי) their glory into the similitude of an ox," for the same reason which called forth the alterations in Jer 2:11 and Hos 4:7, or emendations eighth and ninth,

15. "Am I a burden (עליד) to thee?" (Job 7:20), which Job addresses to God, they altered into "So that I am a burden (אלי) to myself," to remove its offensiveness,

16. "They condemned (את אלתים, or את הדין) God, or the divine justice" (Job 32:3), they altered into "They condemned (איוב) Job," for the same reason which called forth the fifteenth emendation,

17. "Thou wilt remember, and thy soul will mourn over me" ( נפְשֶׁךְ וְתָשִׁיח עָלי[Lam 3:20]), they altered into "and my soul is humbled within me" (וְתשׁוּח עָלי נפְשִׁי), because of the seeming impropriety on the part of the sacred writer to say that God will mourn.  These alterations are denominated the seventeen emendations of the scribes (תקון סופרים חֹ מלין), or simply Tikun Sopherim (תקין סופרים) — the emendations of the scribes, and are given in the Massora Magna on Num 1:1; Num 11:15, Psa 106:20; Eze 8:17; Hab 1:12; and in the Massora Finalis (ספ), 13. (Camp. Pinsker in the Kerem Chemed [Berlin, 1856], 9:52 sq.; Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetz-ungen der Bibel, p. 308 sq.; Frensdorff, Ochlah W'ochlah' [ Hanover, 1864], p. 37 sq.; Ginsburg, The Introduction of Jacob ben- Chajim to the Rabbinic Bible, Hebrew and English [Land. 1865], p. 28, etc.; Wedell, De Emenda-tionibus a Sopherim in Libris V. T. Propositis [Vratis-laviae, 1869].)

4. The Manner in which the Sopherim Transmitted their Work. Their great reverence for the divine law, their extraordinary modesty and humility, as well as their fear lest any of their writings should be raised to the dignity of Holy Writ, prevented the scribes, or Sopherim, from embodying their expositions and enactments in separate treatises. This is the reason why there are no books of the scribes extant, and why they most scrupulously abstained from dogmatizing, so much so that the phrase the laws of the scribes (הלכות סופרים) does not occur. It was the later doctors of the law (תנאים=νομοδιδάσκαλοι) who canonized the opinions of the scribes (דברי סופרים), which, it was claimed, had been transmitted orally and through diverse signs.

These signs (סמנים) or indications (רמזים) the scribes are said to have put down in the margins of the copies of the Hebrew Scriptures to indicate to them the interpretations and definitions which their predecessors, contemporaries, and they themselves put on certain passages, and these signs are held to have formed the foundation of the Keri and Kethib, pkne and defective, etc., of later times. Thus, for instance, from Exo 21:8 they deduce that it is the bounden duty of the master to marry his maiden who was sold to him for this purpose, though the law tolerates an alternative, and to indicate this opinion the scribes put in the margin against אשׁר לא יעדה, "whom he will not betroth," the word לוwith וinstead of א, i.e. whom he ought to betroth (camp. Bekoroth, 13 a; Rashi on Exo 21:8). Again, in Lev 25:29-30, it is enacted that if a house in a walled city has been sold and is not redeemed within a year, it becomes the absolute property of the purchaser. Now, the scribes defined  the phrase walled city to mean a city which had walls in the time of the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, though these walls were afterwards removed; and to indicate this they put in the margin against אשׁר לא חומה, “which had a wall," the word לוwith וinstead of א, i.e. which has no wall now (camp. Erachi,, 32 a; Shebuoth, 16 a; Rashi on Lev 25:30-31; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel, 21:15).

They concluded from Lev 23:4 that the proclamation or fixing of the new moon devolved upon the supreme court at Jerusalem (Mishna, Roshhashanah, i, 8, 9; 2:5, 7), and to indicate this the scribes wrote the defective אַתֶּם"ye shall pronounce," i.e. מקודשׁ, "it is sanctified" SEE NEW MOON, instead of the plene אותם. The scribes also indicated that certain commandments are not to be restricted to Jerusalem, but are to be kept wherever the Jews reside, by writing in such instances the defective

מִשְׁבַּתֵּיכֶם, i.e. in your desolations, instead of the plene מושׁבתיכם, your dwellings (Lev 23:14; Lev 23:31). These signs are the basis of the Masorah, and account for many of the various readings which obtained in the course of time. For further information on this most important branch of the Sopheric work, we must refer to the elaborate treatise of Krochmal, entitled More Neboche Ha-Zeman, sec. 13:p. 161, etc.

5. The Authority of the Sopherim. — Though the scribes of this period themselves did not issue their expositions of what they believed to be the doctrines of Holy Writ with the declaration that "except every one do keep them whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly," or "except a man believe them faithfully, he cannot be saved," but simply stated them as their opinions about the teachings of the divine law, yet the doctors of the law who succeeded the Sopherim accepted these expositions as final, and decreed that whosoever gainsays their authority commits a capital offence. As the penalty attached to the violation of some of the Mosaic injunctions and prohibitions was not very serious, inasmuch as the law distinguished between the diverse kinds of transgression, while there is no distinction made in the Sopheric enactments, since the same amount of guilt and the same kind of punishment were incurred in case any one of their precepts was violated, the sages of the Mishna remark, "To be against the words of the scribes is more punishable than to be against the words of the Bible; he who, in order to transgress the Scriptures, says phylacteries are not enjoined in Holy Writ, is acquitted, but he who says that there  ought to be five compartments in the phylacteries, thus adding to the decisions of the scribes, is guilty" (Sanhedrim, 11:3). Hence also the Talmudic exposition of Ecc 12:9, which is as follows: "Above these, my son, beware; of making many books there is no end ;" i.e. my son, take care of the decisions of the scribes above the words of the Bible, for in the words of Scripture there are both (עשׁה) injunctions and (תעשׁה לא) prohibitions [the transgression of some of these involves only a slight punishment], while the transgression of any one of the precepts of the scribes is a capital offence. And if thou shouldest say, seeing that they are so weighty, Why are they not written down? [reply] "To make many books there is no end" (Erubin, 21 b). It is probable, however, that these bold statements, which appear to exalt the expositions of men above the Word of God, are really due to the succeeding period, which we will characterize in its place, and to which we relegate much that relates to the office and its influence.

II. The Tanaim or Teachers of the Law of New-Test. Times. —

1. Name and Date of the Tanaim. — The appellation Tanaim is Aramaic (תָּנָאִים, sing. תנאי, frequentative of the Chaldee תנה=Hebrew שׁנה, to repeat), and literally denotes repeaters of the law, or teachers of the law. The Hebrew equivalent for this title is הלכות שׁוני, while in the New Test. this class of teachers are denominated νομοδιδάσκαλοι (Luk 5:17; Act 5:34). These teachers of the law are also called the sages, the wise (חכמים, σοφοί, elders (זקנים, πρεσβύτεροι, Succa, 46; Sabbath, 64), and in later times rabbanan (רבנן) =our teacher, rabbani (=Ραββουνί, Mar 10:51; Joh 20:16), rabbon, and rabbi. SEE RABBI.

It is only rarely that the great doctors of this period are called צּצּצּ, scribes (comp. Kelim, 13 b). The period of the Tanaim begins with the famous Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200), and terminates with Gamaliel III ben-Jehudah I (A.D. 220), in whose presidency the Sanhedrim, and with it the college, was transferred from Jabneh to Tiberias, thus extending over 420 years.

2. The Work of the Tanaim. — The labors and tenets of these doctors of the law are of the greatest interest to the Christian student of the New Test., inasmuch as it was in their midst that our Saviour appeared; and as both Christ and his apostles frequently refer to the teaching and often  employ the very language of the Tanaim. The chief aim of the doctors of the law during this period Was —

(1.) To fix and formularize the views and expositions of their predecessors, the Sopherim, and to pass them as laws. Thus fixed and established, these views were termed Halachoth (הלכות) = laws: they are composed in Hebrew and expressed in laconic and often enigmatical formulae. The formularizing of these Halaehoth was especially needed, since the successive ascendency of the Persians, Egyptians, Syrians, and Romans over Palestine greatly influenced the habits and conduct of the Jewish people, and since the scribes themselves, as we have seen, did not set forth their opinions as final. The relation which the work of the Tanaim, or the νομοδιδάσκαλοι in this department bears to that of the scribes will be better understood by an example. The scribes deduced from the words "When thou liest down and when thou risest up" (בשׁכבךְ ובקומךְ, Deu 6:7), that it is the duty of every Israelite to repeat both morning and evening the sections of the law (i.e. Deu 6:-9; Deu 11:13-21) which proclaim the unity of God, without specifying the hours during which the passages are to be recited; while the νομοδιδάσκαλοι, accepting this deduction of the scribes as law (הלכה), fixed the time when this declaration about the unity of God is to be made by every Israelite, without mentioning the length of the section to be recited, or that it is a duty to do so, because they founded it upon the interpretation of the Sopherim (Mishna, Berakoth, i, 1-5).

(2.) The Tanaim compiled exegetical rules (מדות) to show how these opinions of the scribes, as well as the expansion of these views by doctors of the law, are to be deduced from the Scriptures. SEE ISHMAEL BEN- ELISA; SEE SCRIPTURE, INTERPRETATION AMONG THE JEWS. The study of the connection between the opinions of the scribes formularized into Halachoth and the Bible was called the Midrash, or exposition of the Scriptures (מדרשׁ הכתובים).

(3.) They developed the ritual and judicial questions hinted at in the Pentateuch in accordance with the requirements of the time and the ever- changing circumstances of the nation. As the period over which the work of these teachers of the law extended was very long, and as the older doctors of this period expressed their definitions of the Halachoth in extremely concise and Sometimes obscure formulae, many of these Hala-  choth, like the Scriptures, needed further elucidation, and became the object of study and discussion among the later Tanaim. These discussions, as well as the different modes of exposition whereby the sundry Hala-choth were connected with the Bible, which reflect the mental characteristics and idiosyncrasies of the particular teachers and schools, were gradually collected and rubricated, and now constitute the contents of the Mishna and the commentaries on the Pentateuch entitled Mechilta, Siphra, and Siphri, a description of which is given in the article SEE MIDRASH. For the other work of the most distinguished among these doctors of the law, we must refer to the article SEE SANHEDRIM. It must be remembered that this supreme court and chief seat of learning dates from the commencement of the Tannic period.

3. Development of Doctrine under the Tanaim. —

(1.) It is characteristic of the scribes of the earlier period that, with the exception of Ezra and Zadok (Neh 13:13), we have no record of their names. A later age honored them collectively as the men of the Great Synagogue, the true successors of the prophets (Pirke Aboth, i, 1); but the men themselves by whose agency the Scriptures of the Old. Test. were written in their present character, compiled in their present form, limited to their present number, remain unknown to us. Never, perhaps, was so important a work done so silently. It has been well argued (Jost, Judenthum, i, 42) that it was so of set purpose. The one aim of those early scribes was to promote reverence for the law, to make it the groundwork of the people's life. They would write nothing of their own, lest less worthy words should be raised to a level with those of the oracles of God. If interpretation were heeded, their teaching should be oral only. No precepts should be perpetuated as resting on their authority. In the words of later Judaism, they devoted themselves to the Mikra (i.e. recitation, reading, as in Neh 8:8), the careful study of the text, and laid down rules for transcribing it with the most scrupulous precision (comp. the tract Sopherim in the Jerusalem Gemara).

(2.) A saying is ascribed to Simon the Just (q.v.) (B.C. 300-290), the last of the succession of the men of The Great Synagogue, which embodies the principle on which they had acted, and enables us to trace the next stage of the growth of their system. "Our fathers have taught us," he said, "three things: to be cautious in judging, to train many scholars, and to set a fence about the law" (Pirke .4 both, i, 1; comp. Jost, i, 95). They wished to make  the law of Moses the rule of life for the whole nation and for individual men. But it lies in the nature of every such law, of every informal, half- systematic code, that it raises questions which it does not solve. Circumstances change, while the law remains the same. The infinite variety of life presents cases which it has not contemplated. A Roman or Greek jurist would have dealt with these on general principles of equity or polity. The Jewish teacher could recognise no principles beyond the precepts of the law. To him they all stood on the same footing, were all equally divine. All possible cases must be brought within their range, decided by their authority.

(3.) The result showed that in this, as in other instances, the idolatry of the letter was destructive of the very reverence in which it had originated. Step by step the scribes were led to conclusions at which we may believe the earlier representatives of the order would have started back with horror. Decisions on fresh questions were accumulated into a complex system of casuistry. The new precepts, still transmitted orally, more precisely fitting into the circumstances of men's lives than the old, came practically to take their place. The "Words of the Scribes" (דִּבְרֵי סוֹפְרִים, now used as a technical phrase for these decisions) were honored above the law (Lightfoot, Harm. vol. i, § 77; Jost, Jualeph, i, 93). It was a greater crime to offend against them than against the law. They were as wine, while the precepts of the law were as water. The first step was taken towards annulling the commandments of God for the sake of their own traditions. The casuistry became at once subtle and prurient, evading the plainest duties, tampering with conscience (Mat 15:1-6; Mat 23:16-23). The right relation of moral and ceremonial laws was not only forgotten, but absolutely inverted. This was the result of the profound reverence for the letter which gave no heed to the "word abiding in them" (Joh 5:38).

(4.) The history of the full development of these tendencies will be found elsewhere. SEE TALMUD. Here it will be enough to notice in what way the teaching of the scribes in our Lord's time was making to that result. Their first work was to report the decisions of previous rabbins. These, as we have just seen, were the Halackoth (that which goes, the current precepts of the schools) — precepts binding on the conscience. As they accumulated, they had to be compiled and classified. A new code, a second corpus, juris, the Mishna (δευτερώσεις), grew out of them, to become in its turn the subject of fresh questions and commentaries. Here ultimately  the spirit of the commentators took a wider range. The anecdotes of the schools or courts of law, the obiter dicta of rabbins, the wildest fables of Jewish superstition (Tit 1:14), were brought in, with or without any relation to the context, and the Gemara (completeness) filled up the measure of the institutes of Rabbinic law. The Mishna and the Gemara together were known as the Talmud (instruction), the "necessary doctrine and erudition" of every learned Jew (Jost, Judenth. it, 202-222).

(5.) Side by side with this was a development in another direction. The sacred books were not studied as a code of laws only. To search into their meaning had from the first belonged to the ideal office of the scribe. He who so searched was:secure, in the language of the scribes themselves, of everlasting life (Joh 5:39; see Pirke Aboth, it, 8). But here also the book suggested thoughts which could not logically be deduced from it. Men came to it with new beliefs, new in form, if not in essence, and, not finding any ground for them in a literal interpretation, were compelled to have recourse to an interpretation which was the reverse of literal. The fruit of this effort to find what was not there appears in the Midrashim (searchings, investigations) on the several books of the Old Test. The process by which the meaning, moral or mystical, was elicited was known as Hagadah (saying, opinion). There was obviously no assignable limit to such a process. It became a proverb that no one ought to spend a day in the Beth-ham-Midrash (" the house of the interpreter") without lighting on something new. But there lay a stage higher even than the Hagadah. The mystical school of interpretation culminated in the Cabala (reception, the received doctrine). Every letter, every number, became pregnant with mysteries. With the strangest possible distortion of its original meaning, the Greek word which had been the representative of the most exact of all sciences was chosen for the wildest of all interpretations. The Gematria (= γεωμετρία) showed to what depths the wrong path could lead men. The mind of the interpreter, obstinately shutting out the light of day, moved

in its self-chosen darkness amid a world of fantastic images (comp. Carpzov, App. Crit. i, 7; Schottgen, Hor. Heb. de Mess. i, 4; Zunz, Gottesdienstl. VortrSge, p. 42-61; Jost, Judenth. iii, 65-81).

4. Some of the Distinguished Doctors of the Law of this Period and their Tenets. — As the presidents and vice-presidents of the chief seat of learning during the whole of this period are given in chronological order in the article SCHOOLS (HEBREW), we shall here only mention such of the  doctors of the law as have influenced the Jewish mind and the religious opinions of the nation, and by their teaching prepared the way for Christianity. Foremost among these doctors of the law are to be mentioned:

a. Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200-170), whose famous maxim, according to tradition, gave rise to Sadduceeism and Boethusianism, SEE SADDUCEE, and who received the traditions of the fathers from Simon the Just, and transmitted them to his successors (Aboth, i, 3). The tenet of the Sadducees, however, never commanded the adhesion of more than a small minority. It tended, by maintaining the sufficiency of the letter of the law, to destroy the very occupation of a scribe, and the class, as such, belonged to the party of its opponents. The words "scribes" and "Pharisees" were bound together by the closest possible alliance (Matthew 23, passim; Luk 5:30). SEE PHARISEE. Within that party there were shades and subdivisions, and to understand their relation to each other in our Lord's time, or their connection with his life and teaching, we must look back to what is known of the five pairs (זוּגוֹת) of teachers who represented the scribal succession. Why two, and two only, are named in each case we can only conjecture, but the Rabbinic tradition that one was always the hast, or president, of the Sanhedrim as a council, the other the ab-beth-din (father of the House of Judgment), presiding in the supreme court, or in the Sanhedrim when it sat as such, is not improbable (Jost, Judenth, i, 160).

b. Jose ben-Joeser of Zereda and his companion, Jose ben-Jochanan of Jerusalem, who were the first of the four pairs (זוגות) that headed the Sanhedrim and the doctors of the law as president and vice-president (B.C. 170-140). Jose ben-Joeser was a priest, and played AN important part in the Maccabaean struggles. He was the spiritual head of the Chasidim (Mishna, Chagigah, ii, 7), also called scribes (γραμματε¡ις, 1Ma 7:12-13; 2Ma 6:18), who afterwards developed themselves into the Essenes, SEE CHASIDIM; SEE ESSENES; was among the "company of Assidseans who were mighty men of Israel, even all such as were voluntarily devoted unto the law," and the high-priest of the sixty who were slain by Bacchides through the treachery of Alci-mus (1Ma 2:42; 1Ma 7:12-16, with Chagigah, 18 b; Bereshith Rabba, תולדות, § lxv). The grand maxim of Jose ben- Joeser was, "Let thy house be the place of assembly for the sages, sit in the dust of their feet, and eagerly drink in their words" (Aboth, i, 4). Bearing in mind the distracted state of the Jewish people at that time, and the fearful  strides which Hellenism made among the highest sacerdotal functionaries, and which threatened to overthrow the ancestral doctrines, thia solemn admonition of the martyr that every household should form itself into a band of defenders of the faith, headed by sages — i, e. scribes, or doctors of the law — and that every Israelite should strive to be instructed in the religion of his forefathers (the phrase "to be enveloped in the dust of their feet" has its origin in the ancient custom of disciples sitting on the ground and sometimes in the dust at the feet of their teachers), will be appreciated. This will also explain the maxim of his colleague Jose ben-Jochanan: "Let thy house be wide open, let the poor be thy guests, and do not talk too much with women" (Aboh, i, 5).

To erect a wall of partition between the apostate Hellenists, who desecrated the sanctuary, and the faithful, as well as to prevent the residence of Jews among the Syrians, and check Hellenistic luxuries, these two doctors of the law enacted that contact with the soil of any foreign country, and the use of glass utensils, impart Levitical defilement (Sabbath, 14 b). These rigorous laws of Levitical purity laid the foundation of the withdrawal of the Essenes from the community at large, and of the ritual and doctrinal difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees, as hitherto the differences of these two parties were chiefly political. Hence the remark in the Mishna: "Since the death of Jose ben-Joeser of Zere-da and Jose ben-Jochanan of Jerusalem, the unity in the schools has ceased" (Sotah, 9:9). The precepts ascribed to them indicate a tendency to a greater elaboration of all rules connected with ceremonial defilement. Their desire to separate themselves and their disciples from all occasions of defilement may have furnished the starting- point for the name of Pharisee. The brave struggle with the Syrian kings had turned chiefly on questions of this nature, and it was the wish of the two teachers to prepare the people for any future conflict by founding a fraternity (the Chaberim. or associates) bound to the strictest observance of the law. Every member of the order, on his admission, pledged himself to this in the presence of three Chaberim. They looked on each other as brothers. The rest of the nation they looked on as "the people of the earth." The spirit of scribedom was growing. The above precept associated with the name of Jose ben-Joeser pointed to a further growth (Jost, i, 233). It was hardly checked by the taunt of the Sadducees that "these Pharisees would purify the sun itself" (ibid. i, 217). SEE PHARISEE.

c. Jochanan, the high-priest and governor of Jerusalem, ben-Simon, beu- Mattathias, commonly called John Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-106), was a  distinguished Pharisaic scribe or doctor of the law. The enactments which he passed, as recorded in the Mishua, show his endeavors to render the Temple service uniform, his humane feelings, and his desire to alleviate the unnecessary burdens of the law. Though Ezra, to punish the Levites for their backwardness in returning from Babylon, deprived them of their tithes or transferred them to the priests (Ezr 2:36-42; Ezr 8:15; Neh 7:43-45; comp. with Mishna, Maaser Shell, v, 15; Sotah, 9:10; Babylon Talmud, Yebamoth, 86 b; Kethuboth, 26 a), yet the formula consisting of Deu 26:13-15, and called confession (ורוי), in which the Israelite had to declare in the Temple before God that he had paid the tithes to the Levite, continued to be recited at the time of the evening sacrifice on the last day of Passover. There was also a custom of singing every morning in the Temple Psa 44:23-26 as part of the hymnal service, and of wounding the sacrifices on their head for the blood to run into their eyes, so as momentarily to blind them in order that they might be bound easily. Moreover, up to the time of Jochanan the high-priest=John Hyrcanus, the people worked during the middle days of the festivals. SEE PASSOVER; SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

"NOW Jochanan the high-priest did away- with the confession about the Levitical tithes (because it was now inapplicable); he also ordered the discontinuance of chanting 'Awake !' (Psa 44:23, etc., because the singing of it every morning made it appear as if God were asleep) and the wounding of the sacrifices (because it was cruel); interdicted working on the middle days of the festivals, since up to his days the hammer was busily at work in Jerusalem, and ordered buyers of questionable produce, whether it had been tithed or not, to tithe it" (Mishna, Maaser Sheni, v, 16; Sotah, 9:10).

d. Jehoshuah ben-Peraehja and his colleague, Natal of Arabela, who were the second of the four pairs (זוגות) that headed the Sanhedrim and the doctors of the law as president and vice-president (B.C. 140-110). Though their surviving maxims are very few, yet they are indicative of the irreparable breach which was then made between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. In harmony with the wisdom, humanity, consistency, and leniency of John Hyrcanus, under whose pontificate and rule these two distinguished doctors of the law taught, Je-hoshuah ben-Perachja propounded the maxim," Procure for thyself a teacher, gain to thyself a friend, and judge every man by the rule of innocence" (Aboth, i, 6). If,  however, we render this saying thus: "Take to thyself a teacher (Rub), get to thyself an associate (Chaber), judge every man on his better side," we shall see that, while its last clause attracts us by its candor, it nevertheless shows how easily even a fair-minded man might come to recognise no bonds of fellowship outside the limits of his sect or order (Jost, i, 227- 233). His colleague, Natal of Arabela, at all events, who regarded the foreign policy of the Sadducees as desecration of God's holy heritage, SEE SADDUCEE, and as working into the hands of those very enemies whom they had only just driven from the holy city (1 Maccabees 13, etc.), taught: "Keep aloof from wicked neighbors, have no fellowship with sinners, and reject not the belief in retribution'' (Aboth, i, 7).

It was this maxim which brought about the final separation between the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the time of Hvrcanus. The gulf thus created was deepened by an unhappy circumstance which made John Hyrcanus desert the ranks of the Pharisees and go over to the Sadducees, and which gave the first impulse to the bloody sufferings and the ultimate destruction of his country and people, for whose independence and religion he and his family fought so bravely. The circumstance is as follows: Having returned from a glorious victory, and being pleased with the condition of the people at home, Hyrcanus gave a banquet, to which he invited both Pharisees and Sadducees. As he was enjoying himself in the midst of his guests, he, instigated by the Sadducees, asked the pharisees to tell him whether there was any command which he had transgressed, that he might make amends, since it was his great desire to make the law of God his rule of life. To this one of the Pharisees replied: "Let Hyrcanus be satisfied with the regal crown and give the priestly diadem to some one more worthy of it; because before his birth his mother was taken captive from the Maccabrcan home, in a raid of the Syrians upon Modin, and it is illegal for the son of a captive to officiate as a priest, much more as high-priest." The Sadducees, who had thus far succeeded, tried to persuade Hyrcanus that the Pharisees did this designedly in order to lower him in the eyes of the people. To ascertain it, Hyrcanus demanded of the Sanhedrim to sentence the offender to capital punishment. But the Pharisaic doctors of the law, who had no special enactment against indignities heaped upon a sovereign, who believed and taught that all men are alike in the sight of God, and whose very president at this time propounded the maxim of leniency, said that according to the law they could only give him forty stripes save one, which was the regular punishment for slanderers. It was this which made Hyrcanus go over to the Sad-ducees, massacre many of the Scribes, and fill the Sanhedrim with  Sadducees (comp. Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 5, 6, with Kiddushin, 66 a; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden (2d ed.), iii, 453.

e. This deplorable condition, however, soon passed by, and the Scribes were again in the ascendency in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, son of John Hyrcanus, when Simon ben-Shetach (q.v.), brother of queen Salome (Berakoth, 48 a), was the president of the Sanhedrim, and Jebudah ben- Tabai vice-president (B.C. 110-65). Though Simon ben-Shetach had for a time to quit the court and hide himself, because he was accused of treason against the sovereign, yet Alexander Jannaeus reinstated him upon the solicitation of the Parthian ambassadors, who missed at the royal table the wisdom of this scribe, which they had so much enjoyed on a former occasion. He allowed himself to be elected member of the Sanhedrim, which was then filled with the Saddu-cees whom John Hyrcanus had put there, and by his wisdom repeatedly in the presence of the queen and king confounded these Sadducees by puzzling questions about the treatment, without tradition, of such legal cases as are not mentioned in the Mosaic law, so much so that they gradually quitted the supreme court, and Simon filled the vacancies with the scribes. The calamitous event which happened at the Feast of Tabernacles while Alexander Jannaeus was officiating in the Temple, SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF checked for a time the progress of the scribes, but it was more than made up by the fact that this sovereign, on his deathbed, committed his wife to the care of the Pharisees (Josephus, Ant. 13:16, 1, 2). Under Simon ben-She-tach and Jehudah ben-Tabai the Sanhedrim was entirely cleared of the Sadducees, and a festival day was instituted (March 17, B.C. 78) to commemorate the return of the residue of the scribes (פליטת סיפריא) who went into exile in the days of John Hyrcanus. The reconstruction of the Sanhedrim, however, was not the only important work effected by these two doctors of the law. To render divorce difficult, Simon ben-Shetach decreed that the money of marriage- settlement, which was at first deposited with the wife's father, and afterwards laid out in household furniture — thus being no loss to the husband in case he divorced his wife — should amount at least to two silver mince (about 710s.) if the bride Were a maiden, and half that sum to a widow; that the husband should invest it in his business, so as to render it a matter of great inconvenience and difficulty to draw it out, and that the whole of his property should be pledged for the payment of this settlement (כתובה, συγγραφή), thus precluding the possibility of her being defrauded of it by unprincipled heirs (Babylon Kethuboth, 82 b; Jerusalem  Kethuboth, cap. 8:end; Sabbath, 14:6; 16:6). SEE MARRIAGE.

Simon ben-Shetach, moreover, introduced superior schools into every provincial town, and ordained that all the youths from the age of sixteen should visit them (Jerusalem Kethuboth, 8:11), which created a new epoch in the education of the nation. SEE SCHOOLS.

Their zeal, however, to uphold the law in opposition to the Sadducees led them to commit rigorous acts towards their antagonists (Josephus, Ant. 13:16, 1); and on one occasion Jehudah ben-Tabai, to eradicate the Sadducean notions from the people, SEE SADUCEE, condemned to death a false witness in a capital trial (Maccoth, v, b). But when Simon ben-Shetach reprimanded his colleague for this unlawful act, Jehudah ben-Tabai, .who was then president of the Sanhedrim, was so truly penitent that he at once gave up the presidency, threw himself on the grave of the man he had condemned, .crying most bitterly, and beseeching God to take his own life as an atonement for the one he had judicially taken away (ibid.). This rash act taught him greater leniency for the future, and accounts for his precept to judges: "Only as long as the accused stand before thee regard them as transgressors of the law; but regard them as innocent immediately after they are released, and have suffered the penalty of the law" (Aboth, i, 8). The following may be mentioned as an instance of Simon ben-Shetaeh's extraordinary conscientiousness, which must have greatly impressed itself upon the minds of the people, and prepared the way for the reception of the truth as it is in Jesus. The Sadducees, out of revenge for his rigorous measures against them, suborned two witnesses, who testified that his son committed a capital crime. He was accordingly sentenced to death. As he was led to the place of execution, the witnesses, being filled with horror that they had condemned innocent blood, confessed that they had borne false witness, But as the law from time immemorial bad enacted that "the evidence once given and accepted cannot be revoked" (Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Eduth, iii, 5), and though Simon's fatherly feelings for a moment made him hesitate about the propriety of the execution, yet his son, to uphold the dignity of the law, exclaimed to him, "Father, if thou wishest that salvation should come to Israel through thee, pay no regard to my life," and accordingly the son died a martyr to the honor of the law (Jerusalem Chagigah, ii, 2; Sanhedrin, i, 5; 7:3). This noble sacrifice on the part of Simon ben-Shetach evidently made him lay down the maxim, "Test witnesses most carefully, and be cautious in questioning them, lest they learn therefrom how to impart to their falsehood the garb of truth" (Aboth,  i, 9). No wonder that tradition celebrates Simon ben-Shetach as "the restorer of the divine law to its pristine glory" (Kiddushin).

f. Shemaja (=Σαμέας, Josephus, Ant. 14:9, 4) and Abtalion (=Πολλίων, ibid. 15:1, 1, 10, 4) are the two great doctors of the law who now succeeded to the presidency and vice-presidency (B.C. 65-30) as the fourth pair (זוגות). They are generally considered as having been proselytes; but this is precluded by the fact that they were at the head of the Sanhedrim, and that according to the Jewish law no proselyte could even be an ordinary member of the seventy-one. Indeed, Gratz (iii, 481) has shown that they were Alexandrian Jews, and that the notion of their having been proselytes rests upon the misinterpretation of a passage in the Talmud. Though very few of their enactments have come down to us, yet the influence which their great learning and unflinching integrity gave them among the people at large, and especially among the succeeding doctors of the law, was such as to Secure for any question an authoritative reception if it could be traced to have been propounded by Shemaja and Ab-talion (Mishna, Edayoth, i, 3; Pesachim, 66 a), who were styled the two masmates of their day (גדולי הדור). The two maxims of these distinguished scribes which have survived reflect the deplorable condition of the Jews under the Roman yoke. Thus Shemaja urged on his disciples, "Love a handicraft, hate the rabbinate, and befriend not thyself with the worldly powers" (Aboth, i, 10); while Abtalion said, , Sages, be careful in your utterances, lest ye draw upon yourselves the punishment of exile, and ye be banished to a place where the water is poisonous [i.e. of seductive influence], and the disciples who go with you drink thereof and die, and thus bring reproach upon the sacred name of God" (ibid. i, 11). Some idea may be formed of Shemaja's unflinching integrity from his conduct at the trial of Herod before the Sanhedrim.

When this magnate was summoned before the supreme tribunal to answer the accusation of the mothers whose, children he had slain, and when his armed appearance and his retinue of soldiers frightened the other members of the court into silence, Shemaja, the president, had the courage to pronounce the sentence of death against him (Josephus, Ant. 14:9, 4). When he showed himself to be irresistible, they had the wisdom to submit, and were suffered to continue their work in peace. Their glory was, however, in great measure gone. The doors of their school were no longer thrown open to all comers so that crowds might listen to the teacher. A fixed fee had to be paid on entrance. The regulation was probably intended to discourage the attendance of the  young men of Jerusalem at the scribes' classes; and apparently it had that effect (Jest, i, 248-253). On the death of Shemaja and Abtalion, there were no qualified successors to take their place. Two sons of Bethera, otherwise unknown, for a time occupied it, but they were themselves conscious of their incompetence. A question was brought before them which neither they nor any of the other scribes could answer. At last they asked, in their perplexity, "Was there none present who had been a disciple of the two who had been so honored?" The question was answered by Hitlel the Babylonian, known also, then or afterwards, as the son of David. He solved the difficulty, appealed to principles, and, when they demanded authority as well as argument, ended by saying, "So have I heard from my masters Shemaja and Abtalion." This was decisive.

The sons of Bethera withdrew. Hillel was invited by acclamation to enter on his high office. His alleged descent from the house of David may have added to his popularity.

g. The name of Hillel (born cir. B.C. 112) has hardly received the notice due to it from students of the Gospel history. The noblest and most genial representative of his order, we may see in him the best fruit which the system of the scribes was capable of producing. It is instructive to mark at once how far he prepared the way for the higher teaching which was to follow, how far he inevitably fell short of it. The starting-point of his career is given in a tale which, though deformed by Rabbinic exaggerations, is yet fresh and genial enough. The young student had come from Golah, in Babylonia, to study under Shemaja and Abtalion. He was poor and had no money. The new rule requiring payment was in force. For the most part, he worked for his livelihood, kept himself with half his earnings, arid paid the rest as the fee to the college porter. On one day, however, he had failed to find employment. The doorkeeper refused him entrance; but his zeal for knowledge was not to be baffled. He stationed himself outside, under a window, to catch what he could of the words of the scribes within. It was winter, and the snow began to fall, but he remained there still. It fell till it lay upon him six cubits high (!) and the window was darkened and blocked up. At last the two teachers noticed it, sent out to see what caused it, and, when they found out, received the eager scholar without payment. "For such a man," said Shemaja, "one might even break the Sabbath" (Geiger, in Ugolini Thesaur. xxi; Jost, i, 254). In the earlier days of his activity, Hillel had as his colleague Menaehem, probably the same as the Essene Ma-naen of Josephus (Ant. 15:10, 5). He, however, was tempted by the growing  power of Herod, and, with a large number (eighty in the Rabbinic tradition) of his followers, entered the king's service and abandoned at once his calling as scribe and his habits of devotion. They appeared publicly in the gorgeous apparel, glittering with gold, which was inconsistent with both (Jost, i, 259).

The place thus vacant was soon filled by Shammai. The two were held in nearly equal honor. One, in Jewish language, was the Nasi, the other the Ab-beth-din, of the Sanhedrim. They did not teach, however, as their predecessors had done, in entire harmony with each other. Within the party of the Pharisees, within the order of the scribes, there came for the first time to be two schools with distinctly opposed tendencies — one vehemently, rigidly orthodox, the other orthodox also, but with an orthodoxy which, in the language of modern politics, might be classed as liberal-conservative. The points on which they differed were almost innumerable (comp. Geiger, ut sttf.). In most of them — questions as to the causes and degrees of uncleanness, as to the law of contracts or of wills — we can find little or no interest. On the former class of subjects the school of Shammai represented the extremest development of the Pharisaic spirit. Everything that could possibly have been touched by a heathen or an unclean Israelite became itself unclean. "Defilement" was as a contagious disease which it was hardly possible to avoid even with the careful scrupulosity described in Mar 7:1-4. They were, in like manner, rigidly sabbatarian. It was unlawful to do anything before the Sabbath which would in any sense be in operation during it, e.g. to put cloth into a dye- vat, or nets into the sea. It was unlawful on the Sabbath itself to give money to the poor, or to teach children, or to visit the sick. They maintained the marriage law in its strictness, and held that nothing but the adultery of the wife could justify repudiation (Jost, i, 257-269). We must not think of them, however, as rigid and austere in their lives. The religious world of Judaism presented the inconsistencies which it has often presented since. The "straitest sect" was also the most secular. Sham-mai himself was said to be rich, luxurious, self-indulgent.

Hillel remained to the day of his death as poor as in his youth (Geiger, loc. cir.). The teaching of Hillel showed some capacity for wider thoughts. His personal character was more lovable and attractive. While on the one side he taught from a mind well stored with the traditions of the elders, he was, on the other, anything but a slavish follower of those traditions. He was the first to lay down principles for an equitable construction of the law with a dialectic precision which seems almost to imply a Greek culture (Jost, i,  257). When the letter of a law, as e.g. that of the year of release, was no longer suited to the times, and was working, so far as it was kept at all, only for evil, he suggested an interpretation which met the difficulty or practically set it aside. His teaching as to divorce was in like manner an adaptation to the temper of the age. It was lawful for a man to put away his wife for any cause of disfavor, even for so slight an offence as that of spoiling his dinner by her bad cooking (Geiger loc. ct.).

The genial character of the man comes out in some of his sayings, which remind us of the tone of Jesus the son of Sirach, and present some faint approximations to a higher teaching: "Trust not thyself to the day of thy death." "Judge not thy neighbor till thou art in his place." "Leave nothing dark and obscure, saying to thyself, I will explain it when I have time; for how knowest thou whether the time will come ?" (comp. Jam 4:13-15). "He who gains a good name, gains it for himself; but he who gains a knowledge of the law, gains everlasting life" (comp. Joh 5:39; Aboth, ii, 5-8). In one memorable rule we find the nearest approach that had as yet been made to the great commandment of the Gospel: "Do nothing to thy neighbor that thou wouldest not that he should do to thee." The contrast showed itself in the conduct of the followers not less than in the teachers. The disciples of Shammai were conspicuous for their fierceness, appealed to popular passions, used the sword to decide their controversies. Out of that school grew the party of the Zealots, fierce, fanatical, vindictive, the political bigots of Pharisaism (Jost, i, 267-269). Those of Hillel were, like their master (comp. e.g. the advice of Gamaliel, Act 5:34-42), cautious, gentle, tolerant, unwilling to make enemies, content to let things take their course. One school resisted, the other was disposed to foster, the study of Greek literature. One sought to impose upon the proselyte from heathenism the full burden of the law, the other that he should be treated with some sympathy and indulgence. SEE PROSELYTE.

One subject of debate between the schools exhibits the contrast as going deeper than these questions, touching upon the great problems of the universe. "Was the state of man so full of misery that it would have been better for him never to have been? Or was this life, with all its suffering, still the gift of God, to be valued and used as a training for something higher than itself?" The school of Shammai took, as might be expected, the darker, that of Hillel the brighter and the wiser, view (Jost, i, 264).

Outwardly the teaching of our Lord must have appeared to men different in many ways from both. While they repeated the traditions of the elders, he  "spake as one having authority," "not as the scribes" (Mat 7:29; comp. the constantly recurring "I say unto you"). While they confined their teaching to the class of scholars, he "had compassion on the multitudes (Mat 9:36). While they were to be found only in the council or in their schools, he journeyed through the cities and villages (Mat 4:23; Mat 9:35; etc.). While they spoke of the kingdom of God vaguely, as a thing far off, he proclaimed that it had already come nigh to men (Mat 4:17). But, in most of the points at issue between the two parties, he must have appeared in direct antagonism to the school of Shammai, in sympathy with that of Hillel. In the questions that gathered round the law of the Sabbath (Mat 12:1-14; 1Jn 5:1-16; etc.) and the idea of purity (Mat 15:1-11, and its parallels), this was obviously the case. Even in the controversy about divorce, while his chief work was to assert the truth, which the disputants on both sides were losing sight of, he recognised, it must be remembered, the rule of Hillel as being a true interpretation of the law (Mat 19:8). When he summed up the great commandment in which the law and the prophets were fulfilled, he reproduced and ennobled the precept which had been given by that teacher to his disciples (Mat 7:12; Mat 22:34-40). So far, on the other hand, as the temper of the Hillel school was one of mere adaptation to the feeling of the people, cleaving to tradition, wanting in the intuition of a higher life, the teaching of Christ must have been felt as unsparingly condemning it.

h. It adds to the interest of this inquiry to remember that Hillel himself lived, according to the tradition of the rabbins, to the great age of 120, and may therefore have been present among the doctors of Luk 2:46, and that Gamaliel, his grandson and substantially his successor, was at the head of this school during the whole of the ministry of Christ, as well as in the early portion of the history of the Acts. We are thus able to explain the fact which so many passages in the gospels lead us to infer the existence all along of a party among the scribes themselves more or less disposed to recognise Jesus of Nazareth as a teacher (Joh 3:1; Mar 10:17), not far from the kingdom of God (Mar 12:34), advocates of a policy of toleration (Joh 7:5 l), but, on the other hand, timid and time-serving, unable to confess even their half-belief (Joh 12:42), afraid to take their stand against the strange alliance of extremes which brought together the Sadduccean section of the priesthood and the ultra-Pharisaic followers of Shammai. When the last great crisis came, they apparently contented  themselves with a policy of absence (Luk 23:50-51), possibly were not even summoned, and thus the council which condemned our Lord was a packed meeting of the confederate parties, not a formally constituted Sanhedrim. All its proceedings, the hasty investigation, the immediate sentence, were vitiated by irregularity (Jost, i, 407-409). Afterwards, when the fear of violence was once over, and popular feeling had turned, we find Gamaliel summoning courage to maintain openly the policy of a tolerant expectation (Act 5:34).

5. Education and Life. —

(1.) The special training for a scribe's office began, probably, about the age of thirteen. According to the Pirke A both (v, 24), the child began to read the Mikra at five and the Mishna at ten. Three years later every Israelite became a child of the law (Bar-Mitsvah), and was bound to study and obey it. The great mass of men rested in the scanty teaching of their synagogues, in knowing and repeating their Tephillim, the texts inscribed on their phylacteries. For the boy who was destined by his parents, or who devoted himself, to the calling of a scribe, something more was required. He made his way to Jerusalem, and applied for admission to the school of some famous rabbi. If he were poor, it was the duty of the synagogue of his town or village to provide for the payment of his fees, and in part also for his maintenance, His power to learn was tested by an examination on entrance. If he passed it, he became a "chosen one" (בחוֹר, comp. Joh 15:16), and entered on his work as a disciple (Carpzov, App. Crit. i, 7). The master and his scholars met, the former Sitting on a high chair, the elder pupils (תלמידים) on a lower bench, the younger (קטנים) on the ground, both literally "at his feet." The class-room might be the chamber of the Temple set apart for this purpose, or the private school of the rabbi. In addition to the rabbi, or head master, there were assistant teachers, and one interpreter, or crier, whose function it was to proclaim aloud to the whole school what the rabbi had spoken in a whisper (comp. Mat 10:27). The education was chiefly catechetical, the pupil submitting cases and asking questions, the teacher examining the pupil (Luke 2). The questions might be ethical, "What was the great commandment of all? What must a man do to inherit eternal life?" or casuistic, "What might a man do or leave undone on the Sabbath?" or ceremonial, "What did or did not render him unclean?" We are left to wonder what were the questions and answers of the schoolroom of Luk 2:46; but those proposed to our Lord by his  own disciples, or by the scribes, as tests of his proficiency, may fairly be taken as types of what was commonly discussed. The Apocryphal gospels, as usual, mock our curiosity with the most irritating puerilities. (Comp. Evangel. Infant. c. 45, in Tischendorf, Codex Apoc. N.T.). In due time the pupil passed on to the laws of property, of contracts, and of evidence. So far he was within the circle of the Halachah, the simple exposition of the traditional "words of the scribes." He might remain content with this, or might pass on to the higher knowledge of the Beth-ham-Mid-rash, with its inexhaustible stores of mystical interpretation. In both cases, pre-eminently in the latter, parables entered largely into the method of instruction. The teacher uttered the similitude, and left it to his hearers to interpret for themselves. SEE PARABLE. That the relation between the two was often one of genial and kindly feeling we may infer from the saying of one famous scribe, "I have learned much from the rabbins my teachers, I have learned more from the rab-bins my colleagues, I have learned most of all from my disciples" (Carpzov, App. Crit. i, 7).

(2.) After a sufficient period of training, probably at the age of thirty, the probationer was solemnly admitted to his office. The presiding rabbi pronounced the formula, "I admit thee, and thou art admitted to the chair of the scribe," solemnly ordained him by the imposition of hands (the סמיכה=χειροθεσία), and gave to him, as the symbol of his work, tablets on which he was to note down the sayings of the wise, and the "key of knowledge" (comp. Luk 11:52), with which he was to open or to shut the treasures of divine wisdom. So admitted, he took his place as a Chaber, or member of the fraternity, was no longer ἀγράμματος καὶ ἰδιώτης (Act 4:13), was separated entirely from the multitude, the brute herd that knew not the law, the "cursed" "people of the earth" (Joh 7:15; Joh 7:49). (For all the details in the above section, and many others, comp. the elaborate treatises by Ursinus, Antiq. Heb., and Heubner, De A ca-demiis Hebraeorum, in Ugolini Thesaur. ch. 21.)

(3.) There still remained for the disciple after his admission the choice of a variety of functions, the chances of failure and success. He might give himself to any one of the branches of study, or combine two or more of them. He might rise to high places, become a doctor of the law, an arbitrator in family litigations (Luk 12:14), the head of a school, a member of the Sanhedrim. He might have to content himself with the humbler work of a transcriber, copying the law and the prophets for the  use of synagogues, or Tephillim for that of the devout (Otho, Lex. Rabbin. s.v. "Phylacteria"), or a notary writing out contracts of sale, covenants of espousals, bills of repudiation. The position of the more fortunate was, of course, attractive enough. Theoretically, indeed, the office of the scribe was not to be a source of wealth. It is doubtful how far the fees paid by the pupils were appropriated by the teacher (Buxtorf, Synag. Judaic. c. 46). The great Hillel worked as a day-laborer. Paul's work as a tentmaker, our Lord's work as a carpenter, were quite compatible with the popular conception of the most honored rabbi. The indirect payments were, however, considerable enough. Scholars brought gifts. Rich and devout widows maintained a rabbi as an act of piety, often to the injury of their own kindred (Mat 23:14). Each act of the notary's office, or the arbitration of the jurist, would be attended by an honorarium.

(4.) In regard to social position, there was a like contradiction between theory and practice. The older scribes had had no titles, SEE RABBI; Shemaja, as we have seen, warned his disciples against them. In our Lord's time the passion for distinction was insatiable. The ascending scale of Rab, Rabbi, Rabban (we are reminded of our own Reverend, Very Reverend, Right Reverend), presented so many steps on the ladder of ambition (Serupius, De Tit. Rabbi, in Ugolino, ch. xxii). Other forms of worldliness were not far off. The later Rabbinic saying that "the disciples of the wise have a right to a goodly house, a fair wife, and a soft couch" reflected probably the luxury- of an earlier time (Ursini Antiiq. Heb. c. 5, ut sup.). The salutations in the market-place (Mat 23:7), the reverential kiss offered by the scholars to their master, or by rabbins to each other, the greeting of Abba, father (vet. 9, and Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad loc.), the long στολαί, as contrasted with the simple χίτων and ἰμάτιον of our Lord and his disciples, with the broad blue zizith or fringe (the κράσπεδον of Mat 23:5), the Tephillim of ostentatious size — all these go to make up the picture of a scribe's life. Drawing to themselves, as they did, nearly all the energy and thought of Judaism, the close hereditary caste of the priesthood was powerless to compete with them. Unless the priest became a scribe also, he remained in obscurity. The order, as such, became contemptible and base. For the scribes there were the best places at feasts, the chief seats in synagogues (Mat 23:6; Luk 14:7).

(5.) The character of the order in this period was marked, under these influences, by a deep, incurable hypocrisy, all the more perilous because, in most cases, it was unconscious. We must not infer from this that all were  alike tainted, or that the work which they had done, and the worth of their office, were not recognised by Him who rebuked them for their evil. Some there were not far from the kingdom of God, taking their place side by side with prophets and wise men among the instruments by which the wisdom of God was teaching men (Mat 23:34). The name was still honorable. The apostles themselves were to be scribes in the kingdom of God (Mat 13:52). The Lord himself did not refuse the salutations which hailed him as a rabbi. In "Zenas the lawyer" (νομικός, Tit 3:13) and Apollos mighty in the Scriptures," sent apparently for the special purpose of dealing with the μάχαι νομικαί which prevailed at Crete (Tit 3:9), we may recognise the work which members of the order were capable of doing for the edifying of the Church of Christ.

III. The AMORAIM, or Later Doctors of the Law. —

1. Name and Date. — The name Amoraim (אָמוֹרָאִים, sing. אמורא, from אמר, to say, to hold forth, to expound), like the appellation Tanaim, is Aramaic; it literally denotes recorders, expositors, and was given, after the redaction of the Mishna, to those "wise men" and "doctors of the law" who alone constituted the authorized recorders and expositors of the received Halachah. The period of the Amoraim begins with the immediate disciples of R. Jehudah the Holy (A.D. 220), and terminates with the completion of the Babylonian Talmud (cir. A.D. 500), embracing nearly 270 years.

2. The Work of the Amoraim. — As the title implies, these Amoraim had to examine, decide, and expound the import of the Mishna for general practice. After the redaction of the Mishna by Jehudah the Holy (A.D. 163- 193), this corpus juris became the canonical code, and constituted the source of study and the rule of practice, both in Babylon, whither it was imported immediately after its appearance by the celebrated Rab (q.v.), and in Palestine. These commentaries and discussions on the Mishna in the two countries are embodied in the two Talmuds, or more properly Gemaras, which are named after them — viz. Jerusalem and Babylon. The Jerusalem Talmud was made up in Tiberias about A.D. 400, because the Christian government took away from the doctors of the law the right of ordination, thus causing the extinction of the patriarchate and the declension of the Palestinian school; while the Babylonian Talmud was not closed finally till the period of the Saboraim, as the schools were still greatly flourishing in Babylon under the presidency of Resh Methibta (רישׁ מתיבתא), or heads  of schools, and the Resh Galutha (רישׁ גלותא), or the princes of the exiks, as they were called. SEE MIDRASH; SEE TALMUD. For the distinguished doctors of the law who occupied the patriarchate, and were the presidents and vice-presidents of colleges during this period, we must refer to the article SEE SCHOOLS, JEWISH, where they are enumerated in chronological order.

IV. The SABORAIM, Or the Teachers of the Law after the Conclusion of the Talmud. —

1. Name and Date.-

The appellation Saboraim ( סָבוֹרָאִיםfrom the Aramaic סבר, to think, to discern, to judge) properly signifies decisores, and was given to those doctors of the law who determined the law (הלכה) from a careful examination Of all the pros and cons (סברא) urged by the Amoraim in their controversies on divine, legal, and ritual questions contained in the Talmud. Hence the remark of Sherira Gaon (A.D. 968-998), "Though no independent legislation existed after the cessation of the Amoraim, yet there continued exposition and weighing of the transmitted and prevalent opinions; and it is from this weighing of opinions that the doctors derive their name, Saboraim" (Gratz, v, 426). The period of the Saboraim extends from about A.D. 500 to A.D. 657. This period, however, is divisible into two parts, and it is only the first part — i, e. from the death of Rabina, A.D. 500, to the death of R. Giza and R. Simuna, A.D. 550 — which can properly be denominated the real Saboraim epoch; while the second part, which consists of the interval between the real Saboraim and the rise of the Gaonim, from A.D. 550 to 657, has no proper designation, because the doctors who lived at this time and the work which they did are alike unimportant and desultory.

2. The Work of the Saboraim. — Unlike their predecessors the Tanaim and Amoraim, and their successors the Gaonim, these doctors of the law neither formed a succession of teachers nor were they engaged in any new work. They were a circle of literati and teachers, who supplemented and completed the work of the Amoraim. They explained all doubtful questions in the Talmud, made new additions to it both from oral traditions and MS. notes, inserted into it all the anecdotes which were current in the different schools, closed it, and wrote it down in the form in which we now have it. Hence their work had nothing to do with theories, but was pre-eminently  practical. The chief men among these Saboraim which have come down to us by name are R. Giza, the president of the college at Sofa, and R. Simuna, the president of the college at Pumbaditha and Rabai of Rob. Their disciples and successors who belong to this period are unknown (Gratz, v, 15 sq.; 422 sq.).

V. The GAONIM, Or the Last Doctors of the Law in the Chain of Rabbinic Succession. —

1. Name and Date. — It is now difficult to ascertain the etymology of Gaon (גָּאוֹן), the title of the chief doctors of the law who succeeded the Saboraim. One thing, however, is certain — namely, that it is not Hebrew, since both in the Bible and in the Talmud this word signifies pride, haughtiness, while here it is an honorable appellation given exclusively to the presidents of the two distinguished colleges at Sora and Pumbaditha. Now, the period in which it originated may throw some light on the etymology of this title. Griitz (v, 139, 477) has shown that this title obtained A.D. cir. 658. When All, the son-in-law and vizier of Mohammed, was elected caliph (655), and the Islamites were divided into two parties, one for and the other against him, both the Babylonian Jews and the Nestorian Christians decided in his favor and rendered him great assistance. Maremes, who supported Ali's commander-in-chief in the siege of Mosul, was nominated Cathollcos, while 11. Isaac, the president of the college at Sora, who at the head of several thousand Jews aided All in the capture of Firuz-Shabur (May, 657), was rewarded with the title Gaon (excellence). Accordingly the title גאון is either of Arabic or Persian origin, and properly belonged to the presidents of the Sofa college, who alone bore the appellation at the beginning. The president of the subordinate sister college at Pumbaditha was called the head of the college (Heb. ראשׁ ישׁיבה, Aramaic רישׁ מתיבתא) by the Babylonians; and the appellation Gaon, whereby they were sometimes styled, obtained at first among the non- Babylonian Jews, who were not thoroughly acquainted with the dignities of the respective colleges in Babylon. It was only after 917, when Pumbaditha became of equal importance with Sofa, and especially after 942-1038, when Sora, after the death of Saadia, began to decay altogether, and Pumbaditha continued alone to be the college of the doctors of the law, that the presidents of its college, like those of Sora, were described by the title Gaon. The period of the Gaonim extends from A.D. 657 to 1034 in Sots, and from 657 to 1038 in Pum-baditha, during which time the former  college had no less than thirty-five presidents and the latter forty-three. SEE PUMBADITHA; SEE SORA.

2. As to the organization of these colleges, the president of each school sat in front; next to him in rank was the superior judge (Heb. אב בית דין; Aramaic דבבא דיינא), who discharged the judicial functions, and was presumptive successor to the Gaonate. Then came the ten who constituted the more limited synod, seven of whom were at the head of the assembled students (ראשׁי כלות), and three associates (חברים); these sat with their faces towards the president. Then came the college of one hundred members, subdivided into two uneven bodies — the one consisting of seventy members and representing the Great Sanhedrim (q.v.), the other consisting of thirty members and representing the Smaller Sanhedrim. Of these hundred, the seventy only were ordained; they bore the title of teachers (אלופים, magistri), or the ordained sages (חכמי הסמוכים), and were capable of advancing to the highest office, while the other thirty were simply candidates (בני קיומי), and do not seem to have been legally entitled to a seat or voice. The seventy sat in seven rows, each consisting of ten, and being under one of the seven heads of the college. They transmitted their membership to their sons.

3. The Work and Authority of these Colleges. — In later times these colleges assembled together for two months in the year — viz, in Adar (=March) and Elul (=September). In these sittings the members explained difficult points in the Talmud, discussed and answered all the legal and ritual questions which were sent in during the vacation from the different Jewish communities abroad, and enacted new laws for the guidance and regulation of the dispersed congregations, in accordance with the requirements of the ever-shifting circumstances of the nation and the sundry localities. Each member of the college took part in the discussions; the president summed up the various opinions, decided the question, and ordered the secretary to write down the decision. All the decisions which were passed through the session were read over again by the president before the assembly was dissolved, were signed in the name of the college, sealed with the college seal, and forwarded by special messengers to the respective communities, who, in return, sent gifts to the college, which constituted the extraordinary revenue of these schools for training the doctors of the law. Their ordinary income was derived from regular taxes which the college fixed for those communities which were under their  jurisdiction. Thus the jurisdiction of Sofa extended over the south of Irak, with the two important cities Wasit and Basra, to Ophir (= India), and its annual income, even when it began to decline, amounted to 1500 ducats; while that of Pumbaditha extended over the north of Irak up to Khorassan. The president, with the superior judge and the seven heads of the college, appointed judges for each district, and gave them regular diplomas. As these judges, or dayanim (דינים), had not only to decide civil questions, but also to settle religious matters; they were also the rabbins of the respective communities, and selected for themselves, in each place, two learned members of the congregation, who were styled elders (זקנים), and with them constituted the judicial and rabbinate college. This local college had to issue all the legal instruments — such as marriage contracts, letters of divorce, bills of exchange, business contracts, receipts, etc.. Though each of the two imperial colleges had the power of governing itself and of managing its own affairs and dependencies, yet the College of Sora was, at first, over that of Pumbaditha, as may be seen from the following facts:

(1.) In the absence of the prince of the exiles, the gaon of Sora was regent, and called in the taxes from all the Jewish communities.

(2.) The College of Sofa got two shares of the taxes, while Pumbaditha only got one share.

(3.) The president of Sora took precedence of the president of Pumbaditha, even though the former happened to be a young man and the latter an old man. In later times, however, the College of Pumbaditha rose to the dignity of Sora, and eventually eclipsed it. These seats of learning, in which were trained the doctors of the law — the successors of the ancient scribes — and which represented the unbroken chain of tradition and ordination, were extinguished in the middle of the 11th century.

VI. Literature. — Krochmal, More Neboche Ha-Seman (Lemberg, 1851), p. 161, etc.; Frankel, Monatsschrifit fur Geschichte und Wissensehaft des Judenthums (Dessau, 1852), i, 203 sq., 403 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature (Lond. 1857), p. 9, etc.; Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, p. 2615, etc.; Gratz, in Frankel's Monatsschrift (Leips. 1857), 7:336 sq., 381 sq.; Ge-schichte der Juan, vols. iv and v; Frankel, Hodegetica in Mischnam (Lips. 1859); and the Latin monographs of Svrbius (Vitemb. 1670), Georgius (ibid. !734), and Hect (Francof. 1737);  also Pick, The Scribes in the Time of Christ (in the Lutheran Quarterly, 1878, p. 249 sq.).

## Scrip[[@Headword:Scrip]]

             an old Saxon name for satchel (Bible Educator, 4:209). is used in the A.V. as a rendering of the Heb. יַלְקוּט, yalkut (from לָקַט, to collect; Sept. συλλογή), in 1Sa 17:40, where it appears as a synonym for כְּלִי חָרֹעִים(τὸ κάδιον τὸ ποιμενικόν), the bag in which the shepherds of Palestine carried their food or other necessaries. In Symmachus and the Vulg. pera, and in the marginal reading of A.V. "scrip," appear in 2Ki 4:42 for the צִקְלוֹן, tsiklon, which in the text of the A. 57. is translated husk (comp. Gesen. s.v.). The ππήρα of the New Test. appears in our Lord's command to his disciples as distinguished from the ζώνη (Mat 10:10; Mar 6:8) and the βαλλάντιον (Luk 10:4; Luk 22:35-36), and its nature and use are sufficiently defined by the lexicographers. The English word has a meaning precisely equivalent to that of the Greek. Connected, as it probably is, with scrape, scrap, the scrip was used for articles of food. It belonged especially to shepherds (A s You Like It, act iii, sc. 2). It was made of leather (Milton, Comus, 626). The later sense of scrip as a written certificate is, it need hardly be said, of different origin or meaning; the word, on its first use in English, was written script (Chaucer). The scrip of the ancient peasants was of leather, used especially to carry their food on a journey (ἡ θηκὴ τῶν ἄρτων, Suid.; δέρμα τι ἀρτόφορον, Ammon.), and slung over their shoulders. In the Talmudic writers the word תרמילis used as denoting the same thing, and is named as part of the equipment both of shepherds in their common life and of proselytes coming on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Lightfoot, Hot. Heb. on Mat 10:10). The ζώνη, on the other hand, was the loose girdle, in the folds of which money was often kept for the sake of safety, SEE GIRDLE; the βαλλάντιον (sacculus, Vulg.), was the smaller bag used exclusively for money (Luk 12:33). SEE BAG.

Lightfoot, on the authority of rabbi Nathan, describes the scrip as "a kind of vesture, which was a little upper garment in which were many places sewed, where they put anything they met with that they had occasion to use; so that this was a kind of apron with divers purses or pockets made in it, in which the Jews put their necessaries as we do in our pockets, Which  apron they could readily put off or on, wear or lay aside, as they saw occasion. As in such an apron they had their pockets, so in the scarf or girdle wherewithal they girded their undercoats they had their purses. Their girdles were ordinarily of linen, and in them they kept their money when they travelled or went from home on their business" (Temple Service, 9:121). SEE PURSE.

Notwithstanding the great hospitality of the Orientals, travellers cannot always calculate upon obtaining a supply of food in their cottages, for most of the peasants are so poor that they can rarely afford to keep more provisions than will meet the immediate wants of their families. Pedestrian travellers and shepherds are therefore accustomed to take with them a satchel, or wallet, in which they carry some dry food and other little articles likely to be useful on a journey. It was in such a bag that David carried the pebble with which he smote the boasting champion of the Philistines (1Sa 17:40). When Christ sent forth his apostles, he forbade them to provide themselves with these satchels; and nothing can more forcibly show the completeness of their dependence on Divine Providence, while executing their mission, than their neglecting to supply themselves with what all other travellers would have regarded as an indispensable requisite (Mat 10:10; Mar 6:8; Luk 9:3; comp. Luk 22:35-36). They were to appear in ever), town or village as men unlike all other travellers, freely doing without that which others looked on as essential. The fresh rule given in Luk 22:35-36, perhaps, also, the facts that Judas was the bearer of the bag (γλωσσόκομον, Joh 12:6), and that when the disciples were without bread they were ashamed of their forgetfulness (Mar 8:14-16), show that the command was not intended to be permanent. The scrip is often made of haircloth, and is of various forms. In Palestine, however, it is usually made of leather (Porter, Damascus, 2:109). In the south of Spain, where many of the usages introduced by the Mohammedan conquerors are still retained, the scrip is usually of goat-skin, and is generally carried over the shoulder. The purse, which some inaccurate commentators have confounded with the scrip, was always Suspended from the girdle. A kind of sanctity is attributed to the scrip by some of the Eastern Jews, as it preserves their food from being polluted by being brought into con tact with those whom they are taught to regard as unclean or profane (see Hackett, Illustrations of Scripture, p. 91). Thomson found the farmers, in the vicinity of the Lake of Gennesaret, carrying wallets made of the skins of kids stripped off whole and roughly tanned; and he supposes these to be the scrip of the Bible (Land and Book, i, 532 sq.).

## Scriptoria[[@Headword:Scriptoria]]

             the desks of religious houses at which the monks wrote in the scriptorium.

## Scriptorium[[@Headword:Scriptorium]]

             In the Middle Ages, when learning was neglected elsewhere, such literature as there was found a refuge in monasteries. In every great abbey there was an apartment called scriptorium, or domus antiquarii, where writers were constantly employed in copying psalters, missals, Church music, and such other works as they could obtain. The monks in these writing-rooms were enjoined to pursue their occupations in silence, and cautiously to avoid mistakes in grammar, spelling, or pointing. In some cases authors prefixed to their works a solemn adjuration to the transcribers to copy them correctly. When a number of copies of the same work was to be made, it was usual to employ several persons at the same time in writing; each person, except the writer of the first skin, began where his fellow was to leave off. Sometimes they wrote after another person, called the dictator, who held the original and dictated; hence the errors in orthography in many ancient MSS. These scriptoria were ordinarily so arranged that benches were placed one behind another for the copyists, so that, a master or person standing at one end and naming a word or musical note, it could be quickly copied by all, each naming it in succession. These writing monks were sometimes distinguished by the name of librarii, a term applied to the common scriptores who gained a living by writing, but their more usual designation was antiquarii. Isidore of Seville says, "The librarii transcribed both old and new works, the antiquarii only those that were ancient; from hence they derived their name." It was the duty of the librarian, or precentor of the monastery, to provide the writing-monks with the books they were to copy, and with the materials necessary, for their occupation; they were also forbidden to write anything without his permission. The junior monks were usually employed in the transcription of ordinary books, but it was ordained that "the gospels, psalters, and missals should be carefully written by monks of mature age." Nuns were occasionally employed in a similar way.

## Scripturalists[[@Headword:Scripturalists]]

             a term sometimes applied to Protestants on account of their fundamental doctrine that the Scriptures are the only sufficient rule of faith and  obedience. The Jews also occasionally use the same word to denote those who reject the Mishna and adhere solely to the Old-Test. Scriptures.

## Scripture[[@Headword:Scripture]]

             (כְּתָב, kethtab, Dan 10:21, writing, as elsewhere rendered; in the New Test. γραφή, of the same signification, but always rendered "Scripture"). The chief facts relating to the books to which, individually and collectively, this title has been applied, will be found under SEE BIBLE; SEE CANON; and SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY. It will fall within the scope of this article to trace the history of the word, and to determine its exact meaning in the language of the Old and New Tests., with whatever elucidation modern researches and speculations have thrown upon the subject.

1. It is not till the return from the Captivity that the word meets us with any distinctive force. In the earlier books we read of the law, the book of the law. In Exo 32:16, the commandments written on the tables of testimony are said to be “the writing of God" (γραφὴ Θεοῦ), but there is no special sense in the word taken by itself. In the passage from Dan 10:21 (בִּכְתַּב אֶמֶת, Sept. ἐν γραφῆ ἀληθείας), where the A.V. has "the Scripture of truth," the words do not probably mean more than "a true writing." The thought of the Scripture as a whole is hardly to be found there: the statement there given was certainly not a quotation from any Biblical book. The allusion doubtless is to the divine purposes, which are figuratively represented as a book of destiny (comp. Psa 139:16; Rev 5:1). SEE BOOK.

This first appears in 2Ch 30:5; 2Ch 30:18 (כַּכָּתוּב, Sept. κατὰ τὴν γραφήν, — A. V. "as it was written"), and is probably connected with the profound reverence for the sacred books which led the earlier scribes to confine their own teaching to oral tradition, and gave therefore to "the writing" a distinctive pre-eminence. See attunes. The same feeling showed itself in the constant formula of quotation, "It is written," often without the addition of any words defining the passage quoted (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:6; Mat 21:13; Mat 26:24). The Greek word, as will be seen, kept its ground in this sense. A slight change passed over that of the Hebrew, and led to the substitution of another. The כְּתוּבִים (kethublm =writings), in the Jewish arrangement of the Old Test., was used for a part, and not the whole, of the Old Test. (the Hagiographa [q.v.]), while another form of the same root (kethib) came to have a technical  significance as applied to the text, which, though written in the MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures, might or might not be recognised as keri, the right intelligible reading to be read in the congregation. Another word was therefore wanted, and it was found in the Mikra ( מִקְרָאNeh 8:8). or "reading," the thing read or recited, recitation. (The same root, it may be noticed, is found in the title of the sacred book of Islam [Koran=recitation].) This, accordingly, we find as the equivalent for the collective γραφαί. The boy at the age of five begins the study of the Mikra, at ten passes on to the Mishna (Pirke Aboth, v, 24). The old word has not, however, disappeared, and הַכָּתוּב, '" the writing,'' is used with the same connotation (ibid. iii, 10).

2. With this meaning the word γραφή passed into the language of the New Test. Used in the singular, it is applied chiefly to this or that passage quoted from the Old Test. (Mar 12:10; Joh 7:38; Joh 13:18; Joh 19:37; Luk 4:21; Rom 9:17; Gal 3:8, et al.). In Act 8:32 (ἡ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς) it takes a somewhat larger extension, as denoting the writing of Isaiah; but in Act 8:35 the more limited meaning reappears. In two passages of some difficulty, some have seen the wider, some the narrower, sense.

(1.) Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (2Ti 3:16) has been translated in the A. V. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," as if γραφή, though without the article, were taken as equivalent to the Old Test. as a whole (comp. πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, Eph 2:21; πᾶσα Ιεροσόλυμα, Mat 2:3), and θεόπνευστος, the predicate asserted of it. This is doubtless the correct construction. Even if we should retain the narrower meaning, however, we might still take θεόπνευστος as the predicate. "Every Scripture — sc. every separate portion — is divinely inspired." It has been urged, however, that this assertion of a truth, which both Paul and Timothy held in common, would be less suitable to the context than the assigning of that truth as a ground for the further inference drawn from it; and so there is a large amount of authority in favor of the rendering, "Every γραφή, being inspired, is also profitable..." (comp. Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, Wiesinger, ad loc.). But this renders the latter clause unbalanced, and the rag is evidently intended as a copulative, and not as :a mere expletive adverb. There does not seem any ground for making the meaning of γραφή dependent on the adjective θεόπνευστος (" every inspired writing"), as if we recognised a γραφή not inspired. The usus  loquendi of the New Test. is uniform in this respect, and the word γραφή is never used of any common or secular writing.

(2.) The meaning of the genitive in πᾶσα προφητεὶα γραφῆς (2Pe 1:20) seems at first sight, anarthrous though it be, distinctly collective. "Every prophecy of (i.e. contained in) the Old-Test. Scripture." A closer examination of the passage will perhaps lead to a different conclusion. The apostle, after speaking of the vision on the holy mount, goes on, "We have as something yet firmer, the prophetic word" (here, probably, including the utterances of New Test. προφῆται, as well as the writings of the Old Test.). So ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος is used by Philo of the words of Moses (Leg. Al-leg. iii, 14; i, 95, ed, Mango. He, of course, could recognise no prophets but those of the Old Test. Clement of Rome (2:11) uses it of a prophecy not included in the canons. Men did well to give heed to that word, They needed one caution in dealing with it. They were to remember that no προφητεία γραφῆς, no such prophetic utterance starting from, resting on, a γραφή, came from the ἱδία ἐπίλυσις, the individual power of interpretation of the speaker, but was, like the γραφή itself, inspired. It was the law of προφητεία, of the later as well as the earlier, that men of God spake "borne along by the Holy Spirit." So in the only other instance in which the genitive is found (Rom 15:4), ἡ παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν is the counsel, admonition, drawn from the Scriptures. Λόγος παρακλήσεως appears in Act 13:15 as the received term for such an address, the sermon of the Synagogue. Παράκλησις itself was so closely allied with προφητεία (comp. Barnabas = υἱὸς προφητείας = υἱὸς παρακλήσεως) that the expressions of the two apostles may, be regarded as substantially identical.

3. In the plural, as might be expected, the collective meaning is prominent. Sometimes we have simply γραφαί (Mat 21:42; Mat 22:29; Joh 5:39; Act 17:11; 1Co 15:3). Sometimes πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί (Luk 24:27). The epithets gigtat (Rom 1:2), προφητικαί (Rom 16:26), are sometimes joined with it. In 2Pe 3:16 we find an extension of the term to the epistles of Paul; but it remains uncertain whether at αἱ λοιπαὶ γραφαί are the Scriptures of the Old. Test. exclusively, or include other writings then extant dealing with the same topics. There seems little doubt that such writings did exist. A comparison of Rom 16:26 with Eph 3:5 might even suggest the conclusion that in both there is the same assertion that what  had not been revealed before was now manifested by the Spirit to the apostles and prophets of the Church, and so that the "prophetic writings" to which Paul refers are, like the spoken words of New-Test. prophets, those that reveal things not made known before, the knowledge of the mystery of Christ.

It is noticeable that in the 2d Epistle of Clement of Rome (ch. 11) we have a long citation of this nature, not from the Old Test., quoted as ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος (comp. 2Pe 1:19),and that in the 1st Epistle (ch. 23) the same is quoted as ἡ γραφή. Looking to the special fulness of the prophetic gifts in the Church of Corinth (1Co 1:5; 1Co 14:1), it is obviously probable that some of the spoken prophecies would be committed to writing; and it is a striking coincidence that both the apostolic and the post-apostolic references are connected, first with that Church, and next with that of Rome, which was so largely influenced by it.

4. In one passage, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (2Ti 3:15) answers to "The Holy Scriptures" of the A.V. Taken by itself, the word might, as in Joh 7:15; Act 26:24, have a wider range, including the whole circle of Rabbinic education. As determined, however, by the use of other Hellenistic writers, Philo (Leg. ad Caium, ii, 574, ed. Mang.), Josephus (Ant. Proem. 3, 10:10, § 4; Cont. Apion. i, 26), there can be no doubt that it is accurately translated with this special meaning.

## Scripture, Apocryphal[[@Headword:Scripture, Apocryphal]]

             The books which we now call Apocryphal were read in some of the early churches, but not in all. They were utterly forbidden in the Church of Jerusalem, as appears from Cyril (Catech. 4, n. 22, p. 66, 67), where he directs the catechumens to read no Apocryphal books, but only the canonical, which he names as they are now found in the Bible, with the exception of Revelation. The like determination was made for some other churches by the Council of Laodicea (Conc. Laodic. can. 59). In some churches they were allowed to be read with a mark of distinction, as books of piety and moral instruction, to edify the people; but they were never named as inspired books, nor made use of to confirm articles of faith. They were sometimes spoken of as canonical, taking that word in a large sense for such books as were in the rule, or canon, or catalogue of books authorized to be read in the Church. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. 14:ch. iii, § 15. SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Scripture, Interpretation Or, Jewish[[@Headword:Scripture, Interpretation Or, Jewish]]

             We here present some details supplementary to the art. SEE INTERPRETATION (q.v.).

I. Among the Rabbinic Jews. — Immediately after the close of the canon, the study of the Old Test. became an object of scientific treatment. A number of God-fearing men arose, who, by their instruction, encouragement, and solemn admonitions, rooted and builded up the people in their most holy faith. The first among these was Ezra, who read and explained the law to the people (Neh 8:8). As the Bible formed the central point around which their legends, sermons, lectures, discussions, investigations, etc., clustered, a homiletico-exegetical literature was, in the course of time, developed, which was called Midrash (מדרשׁ). This Mid-rash again developed itself in the Halachah (הלכה), i.e. current law, fixed rule of life; also called שׁמעתא, what was heard or accepted, and Hagadah (הגדה), i.e. what was said, without having the authority of a law, i.e. free exposition, homilies, moral sayings, and legends.

Starting from the principle that Scripture, especially the Pentateuch, contained an answer to every question, the text was explained in a fourfold manner, viz.:

1, פשׁט, in a simple, primary, or literal;

2, דרשׁ, secondary, homiletic, or spiritual;

3, רמז, allegorical;

4, סוד, recondite or mysterious sense, which was afterwards designated by the acrostic Parries (q.v.).

These four modes of interpretation were also espoused by the celebrated Nicholas de Lyra (q.v.), which he describes in the well-known couplet —

Littern gesta docet, quid credas Allegoria, Moralis quid agas, qua tendas anagogia."

Long before De Lyra, we also find a threefold mode of interpretation by Origen, viz.: σωματικός ψυχικός, and πνευματικός (comp. περὶ ἀρχῶν, lib. 4:c. 2). As the Midrashic literature has already been treated in the art. SEE MIDRASH (q.v.), we can only refer to it. The fourfold mode  of interpretation, however, was not sufficient for the explanation, and, according to the old saying that "the law can be interpreted in forty-nine different modes" (התורה נדרשׁת במט פנימ, Midrash Rabb. Lee. § 26:p. 149 b), all impossibilities could be made possible. Hence the necessity arose for laying down and fixing certain laws for the interpretation of the Scripture. ,This was done by Hillel the Great. (q.v.) by his ז מדות, or seven rules, according to which the law was to be explained, viz.:

1. Inference from minor to major (קל וחומר). Thus, e.g., in Exo 22:13 it is not said whether the borrower of a thing is responsible for theft. In Exo 22:9-11, however, it is declared that the depositary who can free himself from making restitution in eases of death or accident must make restitution when the animal is stolen: while in Exo 22:13 the borrower is even obliged to make restitution in eases of death or accident. Hence the inference made from the minor (i.e. the depositary:) to the major (i.e. the borrower) that he (in 22:13) !S all the more responsible for theft (Bobs Metsia, 95 a; camp. also for other examples, Berakoth, 9:5 reed.; Beza, v, 2; Sanhedrin, 6:5; Eduyoth, 6:2).

2. The analogy of ideas or analogous inferences (גזתרה). This rule was employed by Hillel himself against the sons of Batheira, who pretended not to know Whether or not the Paschal lamb might be slain on the Sabbath, when the evening of the Passover happened to fall on that day. Hillel affirmed this question on the ground of the analogous inference. In Num 28:2 it is said concerning the daily sacrifice, "to offer it in its time" (במועדו); and it is also said respecting the Paschal lamb, "let the children of Israel keep it in its time" (במועדו, Num 9:2). He thus concluded since the daily sacrifice can be offered on the Sabbath, so likewise can the Paschal lamb (Pesachim, 6:2; Jerus, Pesachim, 66 a; Tosephta Pesachim, c. 4).

3. Analogy of two objects in one verse (מכתוב אחד בנין אב). Thus in Lev 15:4 two objects are mentioned, the bed and the chair (משׁכב ומושׁב), which, though belonging to two different classes, have the common quality of serving for repose. And as these are declared to be unclean when touched by him who has an issue, and to have .the power of defiling both men and garments through contact, it is inferred that all things  which serve for resting may be rendered unclean by him who has an issue, and then defile both men and garments.

4. Analogy of two objects in two verses (משׁני כתובים בנין אב), e.g., though the command to light the lamps in the sanctuary (נרות, Lev 24:4) is different from the command "to put out of the camp every leper" (Num 5:2), inasmuch as the former is enjoined for all times (Num 5:3), while the latter enjoins only the speedy carrying-out of the injunction (Num 5:4); yet, because they both have in common the word צוcommand, the conclusion is that every law with regard to which the expression צוis used must at once and forever be carried out.

5. General and special (כלל ופרט). Hereby is meant that wherever a special statement follows a general one, the definition of the special is to be applied to the general use. Thus in Lev 1:2 we read, "If any man of you bring an offering to the Lord, from cattle, from oxen, and from sheep." Here cattle is a general expression, and may denote different kinds of animals. Oxen and sheep is the special whereby the general is defined, and therewith it is rendered coextensive. Hence it is inferred that only oxen and small cattle may be brought as sacrifices, but not beasts.

6. Analogy of another passage (אחר כיוצא בן ממקום), being an extension of 3 and 4.

7. The connection (דבר הלמד מענינו). Thus the prohibition in Lev 20:11, "Ye shall not steal," only refers to stealing money, because the whole connection treats upon money matters.

To these exegetical principles Nahum of Gimso (q.v.) not only added another canon, but he also maintained that certain defined particles employed in the text were to be looked upon as so many indications of a hidden meaning in the words. In this he was opposed by Ne-chunjah ben- Ha-Kanah (q.v.), on the one hand, and seconded by Akiba (q.v.), on the other, who not only adopted this principle, but went much beyond it. Starting with an erroneous notion of the character of inspiration, he refused to submit the sacred text to the same critical rules as other writings. He maintained that every sentence, word, and particle in the Bible must have its use and meaning. He denied that mere rhetorical figures, repetitions, or accumulations occurred in the Bible. Every word, Syllable, and letter which was not absolutely requisite to express the meaning which it was desired to to indicate a special meaning. Akiba reduced his views to a system. The seven exegetical principles of Hillel were enlarged into forty-nine, and were strictly applied to every possible case, irrespective of the consequences of such conclusions. Great as the authority of Akiba was, yet as formerly Nechunjah ben-Ha-Kanah had opposed the exegetical principles of Nahum of Gimso, so now rabbi Ismael ben-Elisa (q.v.) rejected those of rabbi Akiba, and kept by the rules of Hillel, which he somewhat altered by rejecting one, adding another, and subdividing a third into five parts. These principles of rabbi Ismael are known as his thirteen exegetical canons, the מדות שׁלשׁעשׁרה, by which alone the Scriptures are to be interpreted (שׁהתורח נדרשׁת בהם), and which are:

1. Inference from minor to major (קל וחמר).

2. The comparison of words or ideas (גזירה שׁוה).

3. Building of the father, or the chief, law from one verse, and the chief law from two verses (בנין אב מכתוב אחד ובנין אב משׁני כתובים).

4. General and special (כלל ופרט).

5. Special and general (פרט וכלל).

6. General, special, and general (כלל ופרט וכלל).

7. A general subject which requires a special one, and a special which requires a general subject (כלל הצריךְ לפרט ופרט הצריד לכלל)

8. When a special law is enacted for something which has already been comprised in a general law, it shows that it is also to be applied to the whole class (אלא ללמד על הכלל כולן יצא ויצא מן הכלל ללמד לא ללמד על עצמו יצא דבר שׁהיה בכלל)

9. When a subject in a general description is excepted from it for another enactment, while it restrains in all other respects like it, it is excepted to be alleviated, but not aggravated אחי שׁחוא כעניני דבר יצא לחקל ולא להחמיר שׁהיה בכלל ויצא לטעון טעון). it for another enactment, while it is also not like it in other respects, it is excepted both to be alleviated and aggravated, i.e. its connection with the general law entirely ceases (ולהחמיר ויצא לטעון טעון טון אחר שׁלא כענינו ויצא להקל דבר שׁהיה בכלל).

11. If a subject included in a general description has been excepted from it for the enactment of a new and opposite law, it cannot be restored again to the general class unless the Bible itself expressly restores it (להחזירו לכללו עד שׁיחזירנו הכתוב בפירושׁ בכלל ויצא לודון בדבר החדשׁ אי אתח יכול דבר שׁחיה).

12. The sense of an indefinite statement must either be determined from its connection, or from the form and tendency of the statement itself (מסופו דבר הלמד מענינו ודבר הלמד).

13. When two statements seem to contradict each other, a third statement will reconcile them (ויכריע ביניהים המכחישׁים זה את זה עד שׁיבוא הכתוב השׁלישׁי שׁני כתובים).

This canon of Ishmael was soon followed by a more extended one Of Elieser ben-Jose the Galilean, of the 2d century, who laid down thirty-two rules, which are given in the art. MIDRASH (q.v.), § iv.

Besides these rules, the Scripture was explained according to the Notaricon (q.v.), or according to the Gematria (גימטריא), a word borrowed from the Greek, either corresponding to γεωμετρία or γραμματεία The idea of this rule was, since every letter is a numeral, to reduce the word to the number it contains, and to explain the word by another of the same quantity. Thus from the words "Lo! three men stood by him" (Gen 18:2), it is deduced that these three angels were Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, because והנה שׁלשׁה, and lo! three men, and אלו מיכאל גבריאל ורפאל, these are Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, are of the same numerical value, as will be seen from the following reduction to their numerical value of both these phrases:

ה+שׁ+ל+שׁ+ה+נ+ה+י

5+300+30+300+5+50+5+6=701.

 ל+  א+  י+  ר+  ב+  ג+  ל+  א+  כ+  י+  מ+  ו+  ל+ א

30+1+10+200+2+3+30+1+20+10+40+6+30+1

+ ל+ א+ פ+ ר+ ו

+30+1+80+200+6=701.

From the passage, And all the inhabitants of the earth were of one language (Gen 11:1), is deduced that all spoke Hebrew, שׁפה being changed for its synonym לשׁון, and חקדשׁ=5+100+4+300=409, is substituted for its equivalent אהת= 1 +8 +400 =409.

Another mode of interpretation was according to the אל תקרי, i.e. read not so, but so — a very important rule, which exhibits the beginnings of the Masorab (q.v.) In the 3d and 4th centuries nothing new was added to the exegetical canons, and the rabbins of this period did not go beyond their predecessors. The main study was devoted to that branch of literature which found its climax in the Mishna and Gemara, now constituting what is termed the Talmud (q.v.). In the 7th century, however, "we find ourselves with Jewish scholars who had begun to be awake to the importance of serious inquiry into the true meaning of the written Word of God, and men who brought to the task of such investigations minds not only teeming with the traditions of their forefathers, but educated in the severer science of their own age. Of this class the representative is Saadias (q.v.) Gaon, who was beyond compare, both as a philologist and theologian, the most competent expositor of Holy Scripture that had hitherto appeared in the schools of Judaism; and who was followed by men yet more powerful, in Aben-Ezra, Rashi, Kimchi, Abarbanel, and others, who have been, or will vet be, treated in this Cyclopedia. These commentators do not all adopt the same principle of interpretation. They teach the same doctrines substantially, they write under the influence Of similar prejudices more or less strong, and they aim at like objects; but they go to work in different ways. One class address themselves to unfold what they consider to be the simple or literal meaning of the words of Scripture; and of this class, some not only attend to the idioms of the language and the lexicographic import of words, but descend to the niceties of the Masorah, and profess to show how different shades of meaning may be brought out of words by the diacritical use of the vowel-points and accents. Another class bring to their aid the mythical apparatus of the Midrashim, and crowd their pages with  the legends and sagas of the Hagadoth. Others, again, advance from the literal into the allegorical mode of exposition, and consider the letter of the document as the signature or indication of a higher and more spiritual teaching; while a fourth school, disdaining all these lower modes of exegesis, seek the transcendental regions of the Cabala."

II. Among the Hellenistic and Alexandrian Jews.-While the Talmudic and Rabbinic Judaism, with all its dogmas and pharisaic decisions, stood upon the firm ground of the Old-Test. revelation, it was entirely different with Hellenistic Judaism. Separated from their brethren of Palestine, the Jews of Egypt constituted an almost independent sect. Left to themselves, and set free from those elements which led to the development of Rabbinism in the mother country, the Alexandrian Jews pursued a different direction. They had to defend their faith from the attacks of a philosophical system apparently related to it, but claiming for those initiated into its mysteries a higher spirituality and a loftier elevation. To retain the truths of Platonism in Judaism, to vindicate them for, and to elicit them from, the Phi Test., such was the first task of the Alexandrian Jewish apologist. The medium of allegorical exposition served for this purpose, as it necessarily comes into existence everywhere, when the religious faith has taken up an attitude of contradiction to the contents of those documents which yet are received as divine, and are firmly retained (see Gfrorer, Philo, i, 69).

The beginnings of this interpretation can be pointed out so early- as B.C. 180, in the Εξηγήσεις τῆς Μωυσέως Γραφῆς, by Aristobulus, an adherent of the Aristotelian philosophy; Homage was done to it by the Therapeutce (q.v.), who, according to Philo (De Vita Contem-plativa led. Mang.], ii, 483), regarded the entire νομοθεσία (that is, the Holy Scriptures) as a living being (ζῶον), and held "the words to be the body, and the deeper sense, which is veiled under the words, to be the soul: into this the rational soul gazes, looking into very bidden thoughts by means of the words, as it were by a mirror" (see Gfrorer, Philo, ii, 292 sq.). Josephus, it seems, also fancied this mode, as can be seen from his words in the preface to his Antiquities, that Moses, in his works, had only indicated some things, and others he had communicated in allegories worthy of the topics (τὰ μὲν αἰνιττομένου τοῦ νομοθέτου τὰ δὲ ἀλληγοροῦντος μετὰ σεμνότητος). But it reached its zenith in the writings of Philo (q.v.) of Alexandria, the whole of which are occupied with explanations or allegorical interpretations of the books of Moses.  Like most Jewish theologians, Philo places the authority of Moses above that of the other inspired writers, who are considered rather as his interpreters and followers than as his equals. But even in Moses we have to distinguish what he attained by philosophical acquirement from that which he received from God, either in ecstasy (a state more or less attainable by all initiated), in answer to his inquiries, or by direct communications. The results of all these are laid down in the Scriptures. But all deeper spiritual truths appear there veiled; the letter conveying comparatively low and carnal views in order to condescend to the gross and carnal notions of the vulgar, so as to bring at least some truth to them, and perhaps gradually to attract[ them to higher and more spiritual views. It were impossible, it is ridiculous, to interpret literally many scriptural statements, which, so understood, are contrary to reason, and would degrade Judaism below the level of heathen philosophy. In explaining the supposed allegories of Scripture, the Greek text of the Sept. is rigidly adhered to by Philo, though traces of an imperfect acquaintance with the Hebrew occur. A good deal was, of course, to be left to the exegetical tact of each interpreter, but the following seem to have been some of the principles of Alexandrian exegesis:

1. The terms in the text may be expanded, and its statements applied to any or all topics to which the same expressions might figuratively be applied. Thus the word "place" might, besides its proper meaning, apply to the Logos, and even to God, who contains and fills all.

2. The idea conveyed in the text may be educed from the words by showing a similar etymological derivation, and hence an affinity between the words and the idea.

3. Everything not absolutely requisite in the text was supposed to point to some special and hidden meaning.

4. Attention was to be given to the exegetical traditions of the fathers, which especially showed itself in the explanation of proper nouns.

5. Above all, the commentator may, by reaching the ecstatic state of the inspired writer, sympathize with and gain an immediate view of the same truth.

6. Several differing interpretations may all convey portions of truth. Such being the procedure of Philo, the natural consequence was "that he  completely altered the peculiar subject-matter and spirit of the religion of the old covenant, whose essential character is constituted by the revelation of God in facts and history; and that he volatilized the truth of God into abstract ideas." SEE PHILO (JUDAEUS).

III. Among the Cabalists. — An entirely different attitude towards the Old Test. was assumed by the Cabalists, the Jewish theosophists of the Middle Ages; for they endeavored to lay a foundation for their theosophic doctrine and theories formed by fusing Greek and Oriental speculations, together with the Old-Test. revelation, in allegorical and mystical interpretations of the Old Test., especially the history of creation in Genesis, and Ezekiel's vision of the chariot of God. For this purpose they availed themselves of the artificial hermeneutical methods of the Talmudical Hagadah. They not only made use of the four modes of interpretation comprised in the mnemotechnic Pardes, of the Notaricon and Guimatria mentioned above, but also of the Tsiruph (צירו), an anagram which consists in the change of any word into others by the transposition of the component letters, which form various words.

Thus בראשׁית, "in the beginning," has been anagramatized ברית אשׁ, "a covenant of fire," to accord with Deu 33:2; the Temurah (תמורה), or permutation, or a change of the letters of the alphabet, by first reducing its twenty-two letters to eleven couples, coupling the first with the last, the second with the one next to the last, etc., as את בשׁ גר דק חצ ופ זע חס טנ ימ כל, and then forming mysterious words from the substituted letters. They assert that Jeremiah, in order that he might not provoke the king of Babylon against him by making use of the word .Babylon, artfully substituted שׁשׁךְ (Jer 51:41), and that it is the same as בבל. Without going into details, we will quote the Jewish writer Zunz, who (in his Gottesdienstliche Vortridge, p. 403) characterizes the Cabalistic treatment of Scripture in the following manner: "The contents and signification of the Biblical and Talmudical doctrines were linked on to traditional or self-imagined laws for the regulation of the world in the mysteries of the Divine Majesty. The secrets of the law became now the deeper sense of the old precepts and opinions when this had been unriddled. It was believed that these secrets had been deposited in the letter of Scripture, but were legible only to the initiated or inspired, who knew how to set free the spirits confined in the words.

Thus, then, in all that was given by the Scripture and the Hagadah, men saw a sum of letters and signs, whose arbitrary combination led to the  unveiling of mysteries, and as the use of similar means occurred already in the Hagadah, such a spiritualizing of the letter, by means of which the connection of Judaism with the eternal order regulating the heavens became known, was held to be the glory of the law, the highest attainment of all exposition, and the final aim of all wisdom. The contents of the Holy Scriptures, the Halachah as well as the Hagadah, the secret doctrine and the results of philosophy — the whole was the bearer of an order which regulated the world in which God and law were the foundation, the written Word was the symbol, but the alleged body of tradition was the truth. Into that domain of the 'Mercabah' and the ' Bereshith' 'the Chariot' and ‘the Creation', at one time kept at such a distance from the public, everything of expositor?, material which antiquity had bequeathed was gradually drawn in, and was extended into philosophico-mystical systems of Judaism, in writings of the most manifold description." SEE CABALA.

IV. Among the Karaites. — Their opposition to Rabbinism would also lead them to a rejection of their mode of interpretation. They expounded the Old Test. simply and naturally, and their expositions manifest an obvious effort to reach the true spiritual understanding. In general they have penetrated deeper into the spirit of the Old Test. than their opponents. See Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen, p. 384-731; Hirschfeld, Der Gelst der talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel — Erster Theil, Halachische Exegese (Berlin, 1840); id. Die hagadische Exegese (ibid. 1847); Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septua-ginta, p. 163-203; id. Ueber den Einfluss der palastinensischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik and Programm zur Eroffhung des judisch- theolog. Seminars zu Breslau (1854); Welte, in the Tub. theol. Quartal- schrift, 1842, p. 19-58; Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. s.v. “Exegese;" Schurer, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, p. 446 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, iii, 175 sq.; 4:55 sq., 427 sq.; id. in Frankers Monatsschrift, 1851- 52, p. 156-162; Pinner, Einleltung zur Uebersetzung des Tractates Berachoth, p. 17 b-20 a; Pressel, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop, 15:65l sq.; Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortrage, p. 58 sq., 86 sq.; Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 182 sq., 570 sq.; Eisenmenger, Neuentdecktes Judenthum, i, 453 sq.; Wahlner, Antiquitates Ebraeorum, i, 376-532; Hottinger, Thesaur. Philolog. p. 560-562; Bodensehatz, Kirchi. Verfassung der heutigen Juden, iii, 237-246; D'Aquine [Ph.], Veterum Rabbinorum in Exponendo Pen-tateucho (Paris, 1622); Maimonides, More Nebuchim (see Rosenmuller's Handbuch, 4:124 sq.); Keil, Introduction to  the Old Test. ii, 380 sq.; Ginsburg, Kabbalah, p. 48 sq.; id. Ecclesiastes, p. 30 sq.; Margoliouth, Modern Judiaism Investigated, p. 13 sq. (B.P.)

## Scriptures[[@Headword:Scriptures]]

             This dialect is vernacular to the Uzbek and Turkish tribes of Turkestan and Central Asia, and a version of any part of the Scriptures into it is of a very recent date. In 1879 the Reverend James Bassett had completed a translation of the gospel of Matthew, with the assistance of a mirza from Meshed. After a careful revision made at Teheran, the translator carried his version through the press in London. A new and revised edition of this gospel was again printed at Tiflis, and most of the vowel points, which were so numerous in the first edition, were omitted. (B.P.)

## Scriptures, Holy[[@Headword:Scriptures, Holy]]

             the term generally applied in the Christian Church, since the 2d century, to denote the collective writings of the Old mid New Testaments. SEE BIBLE. The names Scripture, or "writing" ἡ γραφή, 2Pe 1:20), Scriptures (αἱ γραφαί, Mat 22:29; Act 8:24), Holy Scriptures (ἱερὰ γράμματα, 2Ti 3:15), are those employed in the New Test. to denote exclusively the writings of the Old. SEE TESTAMENT. About A.D. 180, the term The Holy Scriptures (ἱερὰ γράμματα) is used by Theophilus (Ad Autolyc, iii, 12) to include the Gospels. Irenaeus (ii, 27) calls the whole collection of the books of the Old and New Testaments The Divine Scriptures (αἰ ασ῾γίαι γραφαί), and The Lord's Scriptures (Dominicae Scripturae, v, 20, 2). By Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii) they are called the Scriptures (θεῖαι γραφαι), and the inspired Scriptures (αἱ θεοπνεύστοι γραφαί). From the end of the 2d and beginning of the 3d century, at which time a collection of the New- Test. writings was generally received, the term came into constant use, and was so applied as to include all the books contained in the version of the Sept., as well as those of the Hebrew canon. SEE SCRIPTURE.

I. Contents of the Scriptures. The Scriptures are divided into the books held sacred by the Jews, and those held sacred both by Jews and Christians. The former are familiarly known by the name of the Old Test., and the latter by that of the New. SEE BIBLE. The Old Test., according to the oldest catalogue extant in the Christian Church, that of Mellto, bishop of Sardis in the 2d century, consists of the five books of Moses, or the Pentateuch (viz. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy), Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; four books of Kings and two of Paralipomena (Chronicles); the Psalms of David; the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Job; the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah; the twelve Prophets; the books of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Ezra, under which head Nehemiah and Esther seem to be included (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 4:26). Origen, in the next century, reckons twenty-two books, calling them by their Hebrew names, which consisted generally of the initial word of the book, viz. Bresith, or Genesis; Walmoth, or Exodus; Waikra, or Leviticus; Ammesphekodeim, or Numbers; Ellahade-barim, or Deuteronomy; Joshua ben-Nun; Sophetim, or Judges and Ruth: Samuel; Wahammelech Dabid, or  3 and 4 Kings; Dibre Hajammin, or Chronicles; Ezra, which included Nehemiah; Sepher Tehillim, or Psalms; Misloth, or Proverbs; Koheleth, or Ecclesiastes; Sir Hasirim, or Canticles; Isaiah; Jeremiah, Lamentations, and the Epistle; Daniel; Ezekiel; Job; and Esther; "besides which," he adds, "is Sarbath Sarbane El, or Maccabees." He omits, perhaps by an oversight, the book of the twelve minor prophets. To the books enumerated in the preceding catalogue, Origen applies the term canonical Scriptures, in contradistinction to secret (apocryphal) and heretical books. He does not, however, include in these latter the deutero-canonical ἐν δεύτερῳ, see Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 4:36) or ecclesiastical books; to which he also applies the terms Scripture, the Divine Word, and the Sacred Books (De Princip. ii, 1; in Opp. i, 16, 79, etc.; Cont. Cola. 8, in Opp. i, 778). Jerome enumerates twenty-two books, viz.:

1. The Pentateuch, which he terms Thorn, or the Law.

2. The eight prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges and Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve prophets.

3. Nine Hagiographa, viz. Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Daniel, Chronicles, Ezra, and Esther.

Some, he adds, enumerate twenty-four books, placing Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa. The other books, read in the churches, but not fouln in the canon, as Wisdom, Sirach, Judith, Tobit., and the Shepherd, he terms Apocrypha. With this catalogue agrees his contemporary Rufinus, who accuses Jerome of compiling, or rather plundering (com-pilands), the Scriptures, in consequence of the rejection by that father of Susanna and the Benedicite. Cyril of Alexandria divided the canonical books into five of Moses, seven other historical, five metrical, and five prophetical.

With these catalogues the Jews also agree. Josephus enumerates twenty- two books — five of Moses, thirteen prophets, and four books of morality. The prophets were divided by the ancient Jews into the early prophets (viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) and the later prophets, which 'were again subdivided into the greater (viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel) and the twelve lesser prophets. The Talmud and the modern Jews agree with Jerome's division into eight prophets and nine Hagiographa (Kethubim).  The canon of the Alexandrian version includes the other books, called ecclesiastical, which we have already given in their order, SEE DEUTERO- CANONICAL.

As the early Christians (who were not acquainted with Hebrew) received this version, for which they had the sanction of its employment by the New-Test. writers, and as from it flowed the old Latin and several other ancient versions, we must not be surprised at finding that all these books, being thus placed in the Bible Without any mark of distinction, were received indiscriminately by the primitive Christians, and were, equally with the canonical, read in the churches. Jerome, in his Latin translation of the Bible from the Hebrew in the 4th century., introduced a distinction by means of his prefaces, prefixed to each book, which continued to be placed, in all the MSS. and in the early printed editions of Jerome's version, in the body of the text, from which they were for the first time removed to the beginning or end of the Bible after the decree of the Council of Trent in A.D. 1546 (see Rev. G. C. Gorham's Letter to Van Ess [Lond. 1826]). Luther was the first who separated these books from the others, and removed them to a place by themselves in his translation. Lonicer, in his edition of the Sept., 1526, followed his example, but gave so much offence by so doing that they were restored to their places by Cephalaeus in 1529. They were, however, published in a separate form by Plantin in 1575, and have been, since that period, omitted in many editions of the Sept. Although they were never received into the canon either by the Palestinian or Alexandrian Jews, yet they seem to have been, by the latter, considered as an appendix to the canon (De Wette, Einleitung). There are, besides these, many books cited which have long since perished, as the book of Jasher (Jos 10:13; 2Sa 1:18), and the book of the Wars of Jehovah (Num 21:14). Some books bearing these names have been printed, but they are forgeries. The book of Jasher, however, published at New York in 1840, is not, as would appear from the appendix to Parker's translation of De Wette's Introduction, a reprint of the Bristol forgery, but a translation of the much more respectable (though also spurious) book of Josher which we have already referred to as published at Naples in 1625, and written in excellent Hebrew before the close of the 15th century. See the American Christian Examiner for May, 1840. SEE JASHER.

In regard to the order of the books, the Talmndists and the Masoretes, and even some MSS. of the latter, differ from each other. The Alexandrian translators differ from both, and Luther's arrangement, which is generally  followed by Protestants, is made entirely according to his own judgment. The modern Hebrew Bibles are thus arranged, viz. five books of Moses; Joshua, Judges, two books of Samuel, two books of Kings; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets; Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah , , 1 and 2 Chronicles. The New Test. consists of the four Gospels, the Acts, Epistles of Paul, Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse; these are differently arranged in the Greek and Latin MSS. All these writings have been considered in the Christian Church from the earliest period as divinely inspired (θεόπνευστοι, 2Ti 3:14-16), as no doubt the books of the Old Test. were by the Jews (see Talmud, passim: Philo, De Vit. Mosis, vol. ii; Josephus, Cont. Apion. i, 3; and the manner of their citation in the New Test.). The early Christian writers also constantly maintain their inspiration (Justin Martyr, Second Apology; Irenaeus, i, 4; Origen. Περι Αρχῶν, Praef.), the only difference of opinion being as to its limits. Some of the fathers maintain their verbal inspiration, others only that of the thoughts or sentiments, or that the sacred writers were merely preserved from error (Dupin, On the Canon). But the first controversy raised on this subject was in the 16th century, when the theses Of the Jesuits, SEE MACCABEES, who had maintained the lower notion of inspiration, were condemned by the faculties of Louvain and Douai. Jahn observes (Introd.) that on this subject the entire Christian world was divided, and that the condemnation of the theses was not sanctioned by the Church or the Roman primate, and that the Council of Trent has pronounced no judgment on the subject. Henry Holden, doctor of the Sorbonne, published his Analysis Fidei in 1652, in which he defended that notion of the fathers which maintained only an exemption from errors appertaining to doctrine. Jahu further observes (loc. cit.) that most Protestants, until the middle of the 18th century, defended the most rigid notions of verbal inspiration; but that, from the time of Tollner and Semler, the idea of inspiration was frittered away and eventually discarded. The high notion of inspiration has been recently revived among Protestants, especially in the eloquent work of M. Gaussen, of Geneva, Theopneustia (1842). The moderate view has been that generally adopted by English divines (Henderson, On Inspiration, Horne's Introd.; appendix to vol. i), while m America the extreme view of verbal inspiration has, until very recently, prevailed. SEE INSPIRATION.

II. History and Authenticity of the Holy Scriptures. —

1. The Old Testament. — The first Scripture, the Pentateuch, was kept in a sacred place, the tabernacle, both in the wilderness and in the land of Canaan; and the successive sacred writings that were produced before the building of the Temple of Jerusalem were committed to the same safe custody; but when the Temple was built, Solomon removed into it these writings, and commanded that all succeeding Scriptures should be there preserved also. Though the Temple was burned by Nebuchadnezzar, it does not appear that the MSS. were destroyed, for none of the succeeding sacred writers allude to anything of the kind, which they certainly would have done as a matter of deep lamentation. During the captivity, Dan 9:11; Dan 9:13 alludes to the written law as in existence; and Ezra (Neh 8:5; Neh 8:8) read the book of the law to the people On their return from Babylon. About the time of Ezra, inspiration closed; the Spirit departed from Israel with Malachi, the last of the prophets, or, as the Jews call him, the seal of the prophets. Then the canon was formed by Ezra, and the Jews never dared to add, Or allow anything to be added, to it. The canon of the Scriptures, as collected by Ezra, is attested by Josephus in his book Contra Apio,. wherein he mentions the number of the hooks, the arrangement, and the contents; and adds that after a long lapse of time no one has dared to add, diminish, or alter; and that it is implanted in all Jews from their birth to consider these books the oracles of God, and, if need require, cheerfully to die for them. Five hundred years after Ezra, a complete copy of the canon of Hebrew scripture was preserved in the Temple, with which all others might be collated. Although Christ often reproached the scribes and Pharisees for their erroneous glosses on Scripture, he never said that they had in any way falsified the Scriptures.' Paul (Rom 3:2) reckons among their privileges that "to them were committed the oracles of God," without implying that they ever abused their privilege by corrupting them.

The Jewish canonical division of Scripture into three great parts — the law, the prophets, and the holy writings (which commence with the Psalms) is authorized by our Saviour (Luk 24:44) when he alludes to this threefold division: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me."

The authenticity of the Old Test. is abundantly proved —

(1) by the unintentional testimonies of profane authors, who speak in a corroborative manner of the persons and facts mentioned in it; such profane authors being unquestionably proved to have lived at a later period  than the sacred writers whom they corroborate, such as Diodorus Siculus, Longinus, Porphyry, etc., who corroborate Moses;

(2) by the fact testified by Grotius that there do not appear in any genuine ancient record any testimonies that contradict those produced in the Old Test.;

(3) by the corroboration of many traditions preserved among different and remote nations;

(4) by the collation of many hundreds of MSS. of the Old Scriptures written at different periods and by various persons: in all of which MSS. the most wonderful similarity is to be observed, the only variations being some trifling ones easily accounted for and explained, and not of the slightest consequence as to doctrine or fact (Dr. Kennicott collated seven hundred Hebrew MSS. without finding one various reading of any actual importance);

(5) by the agreement of ancient writings, such as the Samaritan Pentateuch, with the Hebrew, which, from the violent enmity between the Jews and Samaritans, could never have been by collusion (the old Chaldee Targums, or paraphrases, agree so remarkably with the Hebrew as to be more properly translations than paraphrases);

(6) by the extraordinary candor of the Hebrew writers, who detail simply the frailties of their great men and their own national crimes, instead of seeking to exalt themselves and their nation like other historians.

2. The New Testament. From the time the canon of the Old Test. was completed till the publication of the last of the books of the New Test., about four hundred and sixty years elapsed. During the life of Jesus Christ, and for some time after his ascension, nothing on the subject of his mission seems to have been committed to writing, for the purpose of publication, by his followers. During the period between his resurrection and the publication of the last of the books of the New Test.. the churches possessed miraculous gifts, and the apostles and disciples were enabled to explain the predictions of the Old Test., and to show their fulfilment. After the Gospel had attracted attention, and Christianity was planted, not only in Judaea, but in the cities of Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor, the Scriptures of the New Test. were written by the apostles and other inspired men, and intrusted to the keeping of the churches. Already had others written  narratives on the rise of the new religion, but they were not authenticated (Luk 1:1). When authentic documents were required for the information of the churches, and for the promotion of life and godliness in every region, six of the apostles and two disciples, all of whom were contemporary with the Master, were divinely inspired to write them. The evangelists may, under divine guidance, have made use of the earlier narratives of others, also of public records, and even of private memoranda; but the fact must not be lost sight of that all the sacred writers were divinely guided as to what they should write.

These several pieces which compose the Scriptures of the New Test. were written in the Greek language, which was then almost universally understood. They were not only received by the churches with the highest veneration, but were immediately copied and handed about from one Church to another till each was in possession of the whole. From the manner in which they were at first circulated, some portions were necessarily longer in reaching certain places than others. While copies of each book would be extensively multiplied, it is, at the same time, a certain fact that no other books besides those which at present compose the volume of the New Test. were admitted by the early churches. The original collection of the several books for the formation of the canon of the New Test. evidently took place in, or immediately after, the apostolic age; but it was not any Council convened by any bishop or Church that first, ascertained and determined their canonical authority. Indeed, the books admitted into the canon were never supposed to derive their authority and validity from any council, inasmuch as the authority of the books existed before any council, and consequently prior to any official or ecclesiastical declarations concerning them. As the several books were assumed to be of complete authority as soon as they were published by their inspired authors, the churches were eager for their possession, and had them transcribed and freely circulated everywhere. Thus, even in the apostolic age, several churches would be in possession of all the writings of the New Test., for the genuineness and authenticity of which they had all the requisite evidence from the highest sources. Though the books of the New Test. were written in the Greek language, the writers were Jews, hence, as might be expected, their compositions evidence Jewish thought, which everywhere gives a Hebrew coloring to the style of their several writings. We have no evidence that the books of the New Test. were ever corrupted; indeed, as these books were the foundation of the Christian faith,  alterations were both impossible and impracticable without detection. These books are quoted or alluded to by a series of Christian writers, as well as by the adversaries of the Christian faith, who may be traced back in regular succession from the present time to the apostolic age. Some of the ancient versions, as the Syriac, and several Latin versions, were made at the close of the first, or at the commencement of the second, century. Now the New Test. must necessarily have existed previously to the making of those versions; and a book which was so early and so universally read throughout the East in the Greek and in the Syriac languages, and throughout Europe and Africa in the Latin, must be able to lay claim to a high antiquity; while the correspondence of those versions with our copies of the original Greek attests their genuineness and authenticity.

But though the ancient MSS. of the Scriptures which have descended to our times have not been wilfully altered, they have, nevertheless, been subject to the vicissitudes incident to copying in the course of transmission. Still, the uniformity of the MSS. which are dis-versed in so many countries and in so great variety of languages is truly astonishing. The various readings Consist almost wholly in palpable errors in transcription, grammatical and verbal differences, such as the insertion or omission of a letter or article, the substitution of a word for its equivalent, or the transposition of a word or two in a sentence. Taken altogether, they neither change nor affect a single doctrine or duty announced or enjoined in the Word of God. From the recent herculean labors in examining the MSS. and collecting the variations, we have for the New Test. the investigations of Mill, Bengel, Wettstein, Griesbaeh, Mattheir, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Mai, Tregelles, and Scrivener, who have examined several hundreds of MSS. and compared their differences. The old versions also, such as the several Syriac copies, the Latin, Gothic, etc., have been compared and their supposed variations added to the lists. Even the quotations found in the fathers have been subjected to the same ordeal, and all their discrepancies and peculiarities seized on and subjoined to the formidable catalogue. -The various readings of Greek New-Test. Scriptures, thus multiplied by the fidelity of collators, may now amount to more than a hundred thousand. This immense combination of labor has established so convincingly the astonishing preservation of the sacred text, copied, nevertheless, so many thousands of times — in Hebrew during thirty-three' centuries, and in Greek during eighteen hundred years that the hopes of the enemies of religion in this channel have been overwhelmed;  while the faithful can rejoice in the fact that they possess in all their purity those writings which are able to make them wise unto salvation.

## Scriptures, Use Of, In The Early Church[[@Headword:Scriptures, Use Of, In The Early Church]]

             We have seen above that great care was taken by the fathers of the Christian Church to secure a speedy translation of the Scriptures into the languages of the several nations as they were converted to Christianity. Eu- sebius (De Praep. Evang. lib. 12:e. 1) says, "They were translated into all languages throughout the world:" while Theodoret (De Curdled. Graecor. Affect. Serm. 5, t. 4, p. 555) declares "that every nation under heaven had the Scripture in its own tongue." This translation was done to encourage its reading by the people, and, still further to secure this end, it was an ancient custom to have Bibles in the vulgar tongues laid in a convenient part of the church for the people at their leisure to employ themselves in reading. Not only men and women were allowed to read, but children also were encouraged and trained from their infancy to the reading of the Holy Scriptures. Catechumens were obliged w learn the Scriptures as part of their discipline and instruction, and they formed the chief part of the studies of the clergy. Both the clergy and monks were accustomed to have them read to them at their meals, and many became so well versed in the Scriptures that they could repeat them by. heart. Nor were the people denied the privilege of reading the Scriptures in their homes, but were rather encouraged to thus prepare themselves for the public services. In these latter the Scripture lessons, which were always two at least, and sometimes three or four, were taken from both the Old and the New Test., except in the Church of Rome, where only epistle and gospel were read. Those who withheld the Scriptures from the people were considered to be guilty of sacrilege; but such an offence was unknown to the ancients. It was considered a crime to yield up the Scriptures to persecutors demanding them, and those thus guilty were styled traditores, or betrayers. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. (see Index)?

## Scriver, Christian[[@Headword:Scriver, Christian]]

             a Lutheran clergyman and writer of devotional works in the 17th century, the contemporary and friend of Spener, was born at Rendsburg, in Holstein, Jan. 2, 1629. His childhood was spent under the care of a widowed mother in the trying period of the Thirty Years' War; but a wealthy merchant the brother of Scriver's grandmother — finally made  provision for his needs. After suitable preparatory studies, Scriver became a private tutor, and in 1647 entered the University of Rostock. In 1653 he was archdeacon at Stendal, and in 1667 pastor at Magdeburg, with which position he combined other offices, e.g. that of a schol-arch, and finally a senior in the government of the Church. lie refused to leave Magdeburg in answer to repeated calls to Halberstadt, to Berlin, and to the court of Stockholm, but was in advanced age induced to accept the post of court preacher at Quedliuburg. In 1692 he suffered an apoplectic stroke, and on April 5, 1693, he died. He had been married four times, and had had fourteen children born to him, but he outlived all his wives and children except one son and one daughter.

The name of Scriver has lived among the common people through the publication of his Seelenschatz (Magdeburg and Leips. 1737; Schaffhausen, 1738 sq., 5 parts in 2 vols. fol.), a manual of devotion which he dedicated to "the Triune God," and which deserves high commendation. Another work deserving of mention is his Gotthold's Zufallige Andachten (lsted. 1671, and often), a sort of Christian parables, 400 in number, • which are based on objects in nature and ordinary, occurrences in life. The Siech- u. Siegesbette describes a sickness through which he passed, and the aids and comforts derived from God's goodness in that time. Pritius has published a work of consolation, entitled Wittwentrost, from Scriver's literary remains.

For Scriver's life, see Pritius's preface to the Seelen. schatz; Christmann, Biographic (Nuremb. 1829); Ha-genbach, Wesen u. Gesch. d. Reformat. iv; Evang. Protestantismus, ii, 177 sq.

## Scrobiculi[[@Headword:Scrobiculi]]

             a name given among the ancient Romans to altars dedicated to the worship of the infernal deities. They consisted of cavities dug in the earth, into which libations were poured.

## Scrogie, William[[@Headword:Scrogie, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was minister of Raphan, in Aberdeenshire, and was elected and consecrated bishop of Argyle in 1666, where he continued until his death in 1675. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 291.

## Scroll[[@Headword:Scroll]]

             (סֵפֶר, sepher, Isa 34:4, a book, as elsewhere so also βίβλιον, Rev 6:14), the form of an ancient book (q.v.).

## Scroll (2)[[@Headword:Scroll (2)]]

             (1.) A numb given to a numerous class of ornaments which in general character resemble a band arranged in undulations or convolutions.

(2.) It is also applied to a particular kind of moulding shown in the example from Dorchester church, called the scroll or roll moulding, a marked feature of the Decorated style.

## Scrutiny[[@Headword:Scrutiny]]

             is the name, also, of one of the three canonical modes of electing a pope in the Romish Church. It is the method almost invariably followed, and is thus managed: Blank schedules are supplied to each of the cardinals, who fills them up with his own name and that of the individual for whom he votes. If two thirds of the votes are not in favor of any one person, the cardinals proceed to a second vote by accessus (q.v.). See Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archaeol, s.v.

## Scrutiny (2)[[@Headword:Scrutiny (2)]]

             the inquiry into the faith and manners of candidates for baptism. It was made in the presence of the congregation on seven days the last being Wednesday before Passion-Sunday. The name of each candidate was called; then the deacon bade him prostrate himself five times and rise, in memory of the five wounds of Christ. The sign of the cross was made on his forehead by the sponsor and acolyte; lastly, he was sprinkled with ashes. The custom died out in 860.

## Scudder, Catharine Hastings[[@Headword:Scudder, Catharine Hastings]]

             a missionary to India of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Utica, N.Y., Aug. 22, 1825. She was the daughter of Prof. Thomas Hastings, known and honored throughout the churches of the United States for his successful efforts in raising the standard of church music. In her tenth year, she joined the Presbyterian Church under the pastorate of Dr. Erskine Mason. The development of her piety gave early indications of her destiny as a missionary. When eleven years old, her heart was deeply affected by the fact that the missionaries who had charge of the Ceylon mission schools were obliged to disband some of them for want of funds, and to send back  to the darkness of heathenism many of the native children, and her sympathy led to corresponding action. She prepared a constitution, and formed a family association to sew for the heathen, and this association continued in existence until she left home for India, and exchanged manual for mental and moral labor in behalf of those for whom she felt a life-long solicitude. From the time she determined to devote herself to the missionary work, her character matured rapidly and with remarkable power, and the beauty of the Lord shone in and around her. In September, 1846, she was married to the Rev. William W. Scudder, son of the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., who was about to return to his native India as a missionary in that field, so long the home of his honored father. Soon after, they embarked for India, on the ship Flavio. In mid-ocean there was a revival on board, in which several of the roughest sailors were converted. When 280 miles from Madras, a meeting was held, at which there were eight of the seamen hopefully trusting in Christ for salvation. She united with the Church on the first Sabbath after her arrival on the shores of India, and enjoyed a delightful communion season with the Indian Church, full of gratitude to God for having permitted her to arrive on the field of her labors. Her allotted station was the island of Ceylon, and there, as soon as she could master a few words of the language, she commenced her work. She was permitted to prosecute her labors during the short period of two years only. While on a journey with her husband, returning from Madura, she was attacked with cholera, and died March 11, 1849, declaring in her last words that she was happy in Jesus. (W. P. S.)

## Scudder, John B.[[@Headword:Scudder, John B.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Princeton, N.J., June 8,1810. He was the oldest son of Jacob Scudder, M.D. He was graduated at Princeton College in 1830, after which he spent one year in teaching in Virgnia, and then returned to Princeton and entered the Theological Seminary. A failure of health prevented him from completing his theological course, and he went to Holmesville Mass., for its recovery. While there he entered actively in the Sabbath-school and prayer and other religious meetings, making himself generally useful as a Christian. After the restoration of his health he had charge of several Classical schools in Louisiana and at Memphis, Tenn., and also ha Georgia and Florida. The last years of his life were spent in Georgia. Although he was not ordained, he sustained the relation of a lay preacher, and, while engaged as principal of a large school, was much occupied in conducting religious exercises, in distributing religious tracts, and in other earnest and successful efforts to advance the kingdom of Christ in the world. As a colaborer, he was as useful as any in the ministry, and his labors of love were highly appreciated and much blessed. Like Harlan page, his personal efforts brought many into the kingdom who might have been beyond the reach of ministerial influence. On the morning of July 19, 1876, he was suddenly struck down by apoplexy, and, after exclaiming "How blessed a thing it is to be prepared to die !" he breathed his last. (W.P. S,

## Scudder, John, M.D.[[@Headword:Scudder, John, M.D.]]

             a celebrated missionary in Ceylon and India, was born at Freehold, N. J., Sept. 3, 1793, graduated at Princeton College in 1811, and at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York, in 1815. He established himself at once in medical practice in that city with success and lucrative prospects. In 1816 he married Miss Harriet Waterbury, the estimable and efficient companion of hit missionary life. In 1819, while waiting to see a patient, be picked up in the anteroom a tract called The Conversion of the World, or the Claims of Six Hundred Millions, and the Ability and Duty of the Churches respecting them. Deeply impressed by its appeals, he consulted with his wife prayerfully, and with fasting and great deliberation. They gave themselves up to the foreign missionary, service, offered themselves to the American Board, and prepared for their .work. His friends were astounded  that he should sacrifice his medical prospects of tame and fortune for such a venture. But the vow was made, never to be recalled, and joyously to be fulfilled. He was licensed by the Classis of New York of the Reformed Dutch Church in June, 1819, and they .sailed on the 8th of that month for their destination, with Messrs. Winslow, Spalding, and Woodward, to reinforce the Ceylon mission at Tilligally.

Here he immediately began his career as a missionary, physician, and minister, although he was not ordained until May 15,1821, in the Wesleyan chapel at Jaffnapatam, by clergymen of the Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist denominations. In the large hospital which he established, cholera and jungle fever were treated with eminent success, as well as ordinary diseases of the climate. In 1822 a college was organized' In 1824 the mission enjoyed a wonderful revival of religion, which wrought with power at Dr. Scudder's schools. His influence added much to the great prosperity of the Ceylon mission, hi 1836 he and Mr. Winslow were transferred to India to establish a printing- press at Madras for publishing the Scriptures and tracts in the Tared language, The large printing establishment of the Church Missionary Society fell into their hands in 1838. Six millions of pages were printed by these brethren the first year. and more in later years. These were scattered through every open door far and wide among the natives. Dr. Scudder resided at Chin-tadrepettah, near Madras, and out of these beginnings grew up the Arcot Mission, which was received under the American Boara of Christian Foreign Mission in 1852, and subsequently passed into the care of the Reformed Church in America in 1853 as the Arcot Mission on the Reformed Church.

After a residence of twenty-three years abroad, his health having suffered from the climate, Dr. Scudder returned to America in 1842, and remained until 1846. During these four years his time was employed in constant missionary service among the churches of this country. His labors among children and youth were memorable for the crowds that attended his public meetings, and his marvellous success in addressing them and direct influence for their conversion and consecration to the mission work. Upon his return to India, he resumed his work with characteristic zeal and energy. For a short time (1849), he was temporarily connected with the Madura mission. In November of the same year Mrs. Scudder died, and but a few days previously his son Samuel also deceased at New Brunswick, N. J., where he was pursuing his theological stuidies preparatory to joining his father and brothers in India. The death of this promising young man, in his twenty-second year, called forth one of the most touching appeals for men for his field, and in their absence he  resolved to make up for Samuel's loss by personally rendering extra Service. This excessive labor brought on serious illness. In 1854, by medical advice, he went to the Cape of Good Hope.

The voyage reinvigorated him, and after a brief sojourn at Wynberg, where he was very useful in Christian labors among the English-speaking people, he arranged to return again to his field. But only two days before the ship arrived, he died suddenly' of apoplexy, Jan. 13, 1855. Of his fourteen children, nine survive. His seven sons and two daughters became missionaries in the same field with their parents, and in the Afoot Mission of the Reformed Church. Two of the sons have since been obliged to leave India on account of ill- health, and have done good service to the Church at home. One of the daughters was, and the other still is, in missionary work (1870). Besides his numerous communications to the Missionary Herald and other serials for thirty-five years, Dr. Scudder issued several publications, which have all had a wide and useful circulation. Among these are, The Redeemer's Last Command : — The Harvest Perishing : — An Appeal to Mothers : — Knocking at the Door: — Passing over Jordan : — Letters to Children, etc. Dr. Scudder's distinguishing traits were decision of character, martyr- like attachment to the truth, and steadfastness in prosecuting his plans. He had in him many of the highest elements of moral heroism, a sublime daring to do right irrespective of opposition, a supreme regard for first principles, a scorn of all that was mean and small, a "zeal according to knowledge," and a practical wisdom in accomplishing his purposes which easily overrode mere conventionalities of routine.

His intellect was robust, intensely active, and independent. His will was most positive and all- controlling when once he believed himself to be fight. Nothing daunted his brave soul In early life he had for months been the victim of a most terrible spiritual conflict, which ended in a peace that nothing afterwards seriously disturbed. It was the grand victory of his life, which dwarfed all other contests and made self-sacrifice the easy law of his new being. When one told him that he should consult conscience lest he should overwork himself, he said that he had "quashed conscience of that sort long ago." When asked in America, "What are the discourage-merits of the missionary work?" he replied, "I do not know the word. I long ago erased it from my vocabulary.'' He fought the battles of temperance among the missions and people, and for the extirpation of caste in the churches of India, with heroic power and triumph. His piety wan sweetly expressed in saying to one of his sons "that his ambition was to be one of the inner circle around Jesus in heaven." For years before his death he enjoyed unbroken "assurance of  faith." His power and tact in personal religious conversation with almost everyone that tie met were wonderful. He preached the Gospel in almost every large town in Southern India. He made frequent and extensive tours for this purpose, preaching generally twice a day, and once "he stood at his post eleven consecutive hours. He did not even stop to eat, but had coffee brought to him." His biography is full of stirring incidents illustrating these and other characteristics of this remarkable man. A Memoir of him has been published by his brother-in-law, Rev. J. B. Waterbury, D.D. (N. Y. 1870, 12mo); also a previous volume called The Missionary Doctor and his Family, by M. E. Wilmer (Board of Publication of the Reformed Dutch Church). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. ix Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church in America, p. 204-210. (W, J. 11. T.)

## Scull[[@Headword:Scull]]

             SEE SKULL

## Sculpture, Christian[[@Headword:Sculpture, Christian]]

             The art Of sculpture has an antagonistic principle to overcome in the Christian conception of the world, and its progress has been much impeded by that fact; for, while this art must deal primarily with physical forms, and, at the most, can only regard the spirit as, with the body, a coordinate part Of a common whole, the Christian idea exalts the spirit, making of the body a mere instrument and medium of development, which is laid aside when the stage of a higher spiritual existence is reached; and in the measure m which Christianity confines all ideality to the realm of spirit, so does it render impossible the attainment of its ideal to an art which aims to achieve  in its representations a unity of spirit and body, of idea and phenomenon. The history of Christian sculpture down to the 16th century accordingly shows that the constant effort of artists was to discover a mode of conception and treatment, i.e. a style, which would enable them to be true to the Christian idea, and: at the same time, to the laws of the plastic art; and the several periods, as well as the sculptors and their productions, differ among themselves chiefly as the consciousness of this task has become apparent and the problem been more or less successfully solved.

Sculpture was neglected, however, during the first period in the history of Christian art (1st to 10th century) to a degree that permitted but a slight recognition of this task. The dislike of heathenism and its idolatries, in which service the noblest efforts of ancient art had been expended, was at first so great that a cultivation of the formative arts was out of the question; and when this aversion lost its controlling power, the energies of Christian art were employed in painting rather than sculpture, the only object being to bring before the faithful representations of scenes and incidents recorded in the Scriptures; and for this purpose paintings and mosaics were more suitable than sculptures. But four statues of a religious character may with certainty be attributed to this period:

(1) a marble statue of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus and martyr, in the former half of the 3d century. the figure seated and wearing a toga, the execution thoroughly ancient in the lower part of the sculpture, while the upper part is a modern renovation;

(2) the celebrated bronze statue of St. Peter whose feet the faithful are expected to kiss on festival occasions at Rome, resembling the Hippolytus in style and character, and probably executed at Constantinople in the 5th century; and

(3) two statues of the Good Shepherd, one belonging to the 5th or 6th century, and the other to a later period, when ancient Christian art was already in its decline. We have historical information respecting sculptures of a non-religious character also, e.g. equestrian statues of Justinian and Theodoric the Great, but none have been preserved to this time. Such other relics of this period as are still extant belong to the class of sculptures in relief — -e.g. the designs found on sarcophagi and tombs, of which a considerable number belonging to the 3d and 6th centuries are known, among them the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, the praefect of Rome, who  died in 359 soon after his conversion to Christianity — one of the most important remains of early Christian sculpture. The carvings in ivory, some of which may date back to the 4th century, also deserve mention. They were employed in the ornamentation of the diptychs (q.v.), and of chairs, book-covers, and other articles. Similar work was done in silver and gold, which metals were largely employed in the ornamenting of doors in churches, pulpits, etc.; but too little has been preserved to enable us to judge of its value in the light of art, and the fact of its having been used so largely as it was serves only to illustrate the craving of the Church for external pomp and show, and the coarse taste of a period which could delight in an excess of glittering tinsel.

The different works in relief which have been preserved to us from the early Christian period all resemble each other in character in the fact that they ignore the peculiar demands of the plastic art as completely as do the representations in color in the art of painting. Both arts were treated in the same spirit and style — a style that was neither picturesque nor plastic, that did not aim at an organic blending of the diverse elements, nor yet at a modification of the antagonizing principles, but simply at a mechanical combination of the two by seizing on certain elements from either side and disregarding others — specifically the early Christian style. The two arts went hand in hand in the further development of this method; but sculpture appears to have fallen into a decline earlier than painting, since it would seem that only sculptures in stone were executed in Italy as early as the 7th century, and that all work in bronze was obtained from Constantinople. In Byzantium, too, the compromise of the council of 787, by which the Iconoclast controversy was brought to a close, hastened the decline of the art of sculpture by providing that only paintings and reliefs should be allowed in the churches, and that all statuary should be rigidly excluded.

The Middle-age style differs from that of the preceding period in that it no longer aims at a mechanical combination of the plastic and the picturesque, but executes all sculptures directly in the spirit and method peculiar to the painter's art. It therefore becomes as picturesque as the architecture of that age, and, like painting, dependent on it. But the further development of this style led sculptors involuntarily to a mode of apprehension and execution more in harmony with the special laws of their art, and thus gave rise to the Romanesque in sculpture, which starts out with the traditional old Christian types, but endeavors to impart to them more soul and feeling, and also a more natural form. The aim was not realized at once, but the effort  to achieve it gave to the work accomplished something of that plastic character which early Christian art had so persistently perverted and ultimately wiped out. There are in Germany (on the so-called golden gate of the cathedral at Freiberg, in Saxony, and on the pulpit and altar of the church at Wechselburg) magnificent sculptures of this period, whose plastic beauty recalls to mind the masterpieces of antiquity. It is significant that Nicolo Pisano (about 1230), called the father of Italian sculpture, and, at all events, the leading sculptor of the Romanesque school in Italy, suddenly turned away from the old Christian (Byzantine) types and devoted himself to the study of the monuments of antiquity, at least with reference to form and apparel. The Romanesque style, however, was too much an exotic, and did not sufficiently reflect the ideas and tendencies of the Middle Ages to endure. The Gothic took its place, and with it came in a new era, inasmuch as both painting and sculpture turned directly to nature and to the actual world for their ideals. Figures in relief or in statues obtained greater individuality thereby, though beauty of form was entirely disregarded, and all emphasis was laid on adequate expression of the inner life. The plastic character of the sculptor's works was, of course, sacrificed by this method, and it was only natural that the aid of colors should be called in to transform all figures into statuary paint-lugs; but as the Gothic style aimed primarily to express the fundamental truths of the Christian philosophy of the world and of the Christian moral life, and employed natural forms only as the vehicle of such expression, it was readily led to attach importance, in the end, to such beauty of physical form as would adequately represent the beauty of soul m which the ideal of its aspirations had been unified. The picturesque was, in consequence, so greatly modified in many of the later productions of this style that the aesthetical impression does not suffer in any way.

The third and most flourishing period in the history of Christian art is characterized by the conscious effort to bring works of art into thorough harmony with the forms and principles of growth in nature, and with the conditions and requirements of art in general, and of every branch of art in particular, so that, independently of tradition and the Church. it may represent the Christian ideal with artistic freedom and with adequate beauty of form. Sculptors now sought to reconcile the Christian idea with the requirements of their art, special attention being given to works in relief anti to a combination of high with low reliefs in their representations, as  being most likely to secure the end in view. We can do little more in this place than mention a few of the more successful artists.

In Italy, the celebrated Lorenzo Ghiberti (born at Florence about 1380, died after 1455), one of the greatest masters of Christian sculpture, deserves special mention, as does also his talented rival, Donate di Betto Bardi (1383-1466), called Donatello, and Luca della Rob-bia (1440- 81),and several other Venetian artists. At the beginning of the 16th century a number of masters appeared by the side of Leonardo da Vinci — the Florentines Giovanni Francesco Rustici and Andrea Contucci, and the Venetian Alonzo Lombardi — who succeeded in honoring the idealism of Christianity, and also in doing justice to the claims of realism to natural and living representation in sculpture. Their works fall below the greatest masterpieces in painting by Raphael only as they are unable to represent the transcendental side of Christianity, the transformation of the human into the divine, with equal clearness. Michael Angelo Buona-rotti, however, soon displaced these masters in sculpture by the success he secured in his strivings after the grand, overpowering, and extraordinary, in which he paid but little attention to ideal beauty of form or to the requirements of plastic art. The result was that in the middle of the 16th century Italian sculptors had adopted a style which aimed chiefly at effect, and which was marred by ostentation and mannerisms, and often governed by a coarse naturalism.

German sculptors were not favored with the advantages secured to their Italian compeers by the possession of the models of antiquity; but their works nevertheless attained to a degree of perfection during this period which renders them not unworthy to be placed by the side of the products of Italian art. Various monuments of stone erected to the dead in the cathedral at Mayence and other Rhenish churches exhibit a depth and ingenuity of conception and a beauty of form in the sculptures executed by unknown hands in the 15th and 16th centuries which are worthy of special note. The principal work of German sculptors, however, was done in bronze. The Nuremberg artist family, of which Peter Vischer (died 1529) was the most celebrated member, is especially prominent. The best works of the latter artist (especially those in St. Sebald's Church at Nuremberg) will bear comparison with those of the Italian masters, and they even indicate a higher stage in the development of art in Germany than is apparent in the paintings of such masters as Durer and Holbein, since the works of these artists fail to show that ideality of physical shape and formal  beauty which art imperatively requires. But Vischer and a few colleagues stand almost alone, and the height upon which they Stood was not maintained by their successors. A rapid decline took place, and by the middle of the 16th century German art, both sculpture and painting, had degenerated into a bare imitation of the Italian masters.

This point marks the transition to the fourth period in the history of Christian art. Great convulsions in the political and religious world gave rise to new impulses, but they affected sculpture less than painting. The products of the early part of this period display warmth of feeling and passion combined with a decidedly naturalistic treatment, in both of which qualities they violate not only the Christian ideal, but the spirit and nature of plastic art itself; and as these qualities show that sculpture and architecture (q.v.) were similarly affected by causes then at work, so the progress of events involved them in a similar degradation. In Italy, Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680), celebrated both as a sculptor and an architect, an imitator of the style of Michael Angelo, introduced the same forced style into sculpture which he had given to his buildings, and it became the fashion to affect the imposing and ostentatious, and by the use of all manner of curves and crooks to secure the idea of movement. France at once adopted the new style and added to it the feature of theatrical display. Spain, the Netherlands, and Germany clung to purer methods for a time, hut in the 18th century likewise gave way to French taste and the Rococo style, which, from that point, increased in affected adornment, coquettish elegancies, and frivolous licentiousness.

A better spirit was aroused by Winckelmann's writings and a growing familiarity with the relics of antiquity. The painter Asmus Jacob Carstens (1754-98) was the first to gain a true conception of the beautiful, and left a number of drawings which are thoroughly penetrated by the spirit of antiquity. With his younger contemporary, Antonio Canova (1757-1822), that spirit entered again into the domain of sculpture, though as yet impure and showing traces of the French style. It is purer in the German Johann Heinrich von Dannccker (1758-1841), and best of all in the gifted Bertel Thorwaldsen (1770-1844). All that has been done, however, though much of it is excellent, serves only to afford further proof that the Christian ideal and the Greek style are irreconcilable with each other; and for this reason some sculptors (of Munich) have gone back to the position occupied by the great masters at the beginning of the 16th century. Nothing definite has been accomplished, and it remains for the future to determine whether  Christian sculpture can be carried forward from that point to a higher perfection.

The only modern work dealing specially with the history of Christian sculpture that need be mentioned is Cicognara, Storia della Scultura, dal sue Risorgimento in Italia sine al Secolo di Napoleone (Venice, 1813, 3 vols.), much of whose matter is however, already antiquated.

## Sculpture, Hebrew[[@Headword:Sculpture, Hebrew]]

             By the well-known law (in Exo 20:4 sq.; Deu 4:16 sq.; Deu 27:15; comp. Diod. Sic. Eclog. xl, 1; Strabo, 16:761; Josephus, Cont. Apion. ii, 6; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. ii, 110 sq.; Tacit. Hist, v, 5, 4.

But see Bertheau, Isr. Gesch. p. 248) the Israelites were not forbidden to make any image in stone, wood, or metal (Michaelis, Mos. Recht, p. 150 sq.), for even in the sanctuary of Jehovah, on the ark of the covenant, there were two cherubs of gold; and flower-work as ornament was placed on the golden candlestick; and the large brazen bathing-vessel in the court (the so- called brazen sea [q.v.]) was supported on twelve brazen oxen (1Ki 7:25), though Josephus blames this arrangement as illegal (Ant. 1Ki 8:7; 1Ki 8:5). In the wilderness, too, even Moses set up a brazen serpent (Num 21:8), and the Philistines offered golden figures as an offering to Jehovah (1Sa 6:17 sq.). But the design was to forbid all worship of images, and also all images of Jehovah (comp. Exo 20:5; Josephus, Ant. iii, 5, 5; Philo; Opp. ii, 591), for a sensual people would easily be led into idolatry by them, or at least would lose much of the spirituality of their ideas of Jehovah (temp. Philo, Opp. i, 496); and thus the golden calf of Aaron (Exo 32:4), the graven image of the children of Dan (Jdg 18:31; comp. Jdg 17:4), and the two golden calves of Jeroboam (1Ki 12:28 sq.) were antitheocratic. Yet this Mosaic law prevented the great progress of sculpture, which in all nations has received its greatest impulse from religious faith and worship. (Schnaase, Gesch. d. bild. Kiinste, i, 257, thinks that the imagination of the Hebrews, as shown in their poetry, was too quick and mercurial for the patient work of sculpture.) Most of their works of brass of this kind were by Phoenician artists (1Ki 7:14).

An example of sculpture not of a religious character occurs in the audience throne of Solomon, which was supported and surrounded by fourteen finely wrought lions, the symbol of strength (1Ki 10:19 sq.; 2Ch 9:19 sq.). After the exile, stricter views prevailed; and the orthodox Jews, or followers of the Pharisees, interpreted the Mosaic prohibition of sculpture in general (Josephus, Ant. 15:8, 1; 17:5, 2; 18:8, 1; War, ii, 9, 2; comp, also Mai- monides in Hottinger, Jus. Hebr. 39), even of architectural ornament (Josephus, War, ii, 10, 4; comp. Ant. 17:6, 2; Tacit. Hist. v, 5, 5. Yet according to Josephus, Ant. iii, 6, 2, only the image of living creatures were prohibited). Accordingly; a palace of the tetrarch Herod in Tiberias, which was adorned  with the figures of • beasts, was burned by order of the Sanhedrim, simply because it was thought to violate their law (Josephus, Life, 12). Still less were images tolerated in the Temple (id. Wari i, 33, 2; Ant. 17:6, 2). Even the image of the emperor, carried on the eagles of the soldiers, could not be admitted into Jerusalem (ibid. 18:3, 1, and 5, 3; comp. War, ii, 9, 2, Ant. 15:8, I sq.). Yet such rigid views were not universal; at least, at an earlier period, John Hyrcanus adorned his castle beyond the Jordan with colossal animal figures (ibid. 12:4,11 ); queen Alexandra had portraits of her children made (ibid. 15:2, 6); and Herod Agrippa possessed statues of his daughters (ibid. xix: 9, 1).

Hebrew sculpture, such as it Was, no doubt was based upon, and sustained by, the art as practiced in Egypt. It was there governed by very strict rules, fixed proportions being established for every figure, which the statuary was not permitted to violate; and hence arises the great sameness in the Egyptian statues, and the stiffness for which they are all remarkable. Isaiah describes the process of idol-making very minutely. "The carpenter stretcheth out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in his house" (Isa 44:13). The mode of proceeding will easily be understood by a reference to the accompanying engravings. When a proper block of marble or granite had been procured by the sculptor, the surface was first smoothed, and parallel lines drawn from top to bottom; other lines were then drawn, at equal distances, from side to side, So as to divide the whole into a series of squares. The size of these squares was proportioned to the' size of the figure, but the number of them was invariable, whatever might be the dimensions of the figure: nineteen of these squares, according to some authorities, and twenty-one and one fourth according to others, were allowed for the height of the human body; when smaller figures or ornaments were introduced, the squares were subdivided into smaller squares, proportioned to the less figure.

The outline was then traced, and its proportions were invariable. This, which to moderns would seem the most important part of the process, required no great exertion of skill in the Egyptian artist. It was then inspected by the master-sculptor, who wrote on various parts of it, in hieratic characters, such directions as he  thought it necessary to give to the inferior artists who actually cut the figure. The colossal statue on which the workmen in the accompanying engraving are engaged appears so far advanced towards completion that the instructions of the master-sculptor have been chiselled away. We are informed by Diodorus Siculus that the most eminent statuaries always went to reside for a time in Egypt, as modern artists do in Italy, to study the principles of their art. He particularly mentions Telecles and Theodorus, the sons of Rhaecus, who made the celebrated statue of the Pythian Apollo at Samos, after what he calls "the Egyptian fashion." He explains this fashion to be the separate execution of the parts, for the statue was divided into two parts, at the groin: one half was cut by Telecles at Samos, and the other by Theodorus at Ephesus; yet, when they were joined together, they fitted so exactly that the whole seemed the work of one hand. And this seemed the more admirable when the attitude of the statue was considered, for it had its hands extended, and its legs at a distance from each other, in a moving posture. We thus see that Egyptian sculpture was almost wholly a mechanical process; the laws of the country prohibited the intervention of novelty in subjects considered sacred; and the more effectually to prevent the violation of prescribed rules, it was ordained that the profession Of an artist should not be exercised by any Common or illiterate person. Wilkinson, indeed, has shown the great probability of the higher artists having been included in the ranks of the priesthood. In some instances, however, we find reason to believe that the Egyptian artists broke through these trammels. In the two granite statues of lions presented by lord Prudhoe to the British Museum, we perceive a boldness and freedom of execution scarcely compatible with a strict adherence to mechanical rule (see Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt. ii, 342 sq.).

## Scultet(us), (Schultz), Abraham[[@Headword:Scultet(us), (Schultz), Abraham]]

             was born at Grumberg, in Silesia, Aug. 24,1556, and went to Breslau in 1582. Obliged to leave on account of his father's loss of fortune, he took a situation as tutor in Freistadt, where he enjoyed the opportunity of hearing the sermons of Melancthon and of Abraham Bucholtzer. In 1584 he made a journey to Poland, and the year following to Gorlitz, in Lusatia, where he remained two years, attending public lectures and reading private lectures to others. In the same manner he employed himself in the University of Wittenberg and Heidelberg, till he was-admitted into the Church in 1594. Officiating in a village church for a few months, he was sent for by the elector to be one of his preachers. In 1598 he was appointed pastor of the Church of St. Francis, Heidelberg, and two years after became a member of the Ecclesiastical Senate. He was appointed court preacher about 1615, which position he retained until he accepted the professorship of divinity in 1618. After the bat-tie of Prague he resolved to return to Heidelberg; but the fury of war had dispersed the students, and he retired to Emden in August, 1622, where he died, Oct. 24,1625. His principal works are, Confutatio Disputa-tionis Baronii de Baptismo Consantini (Neost. 1607, 4to): Annales Evagelii per Europam 15. Saeculi Renovati (Heidelb. 1618, 8vo) : — Axiomata Concionandi (Han 1619, 8vo) : — Observationes in Pauli Epistolas ad Time-rheum, Titum, et Philemon Medulla Patrum (1634, 4to).

## Scum[[@Headword:Scum]]

             (חֶלְאָה, chelah, strictly an overlaying), rather, rust of a pot (Eze 24:6; Eze 24:11-12).

## Scuophylacium[[@Headword:Scuophylacium]]

             (σκευοφυλάκιον), a recess near the altar corresponding with the mediaeval "aumbrye," in which the chalice, paten, and every utensil  employed in offering the eucharistic sacrifice were anciently placed immediately after mass. Reference is made to such a receptacle by the councils of Laodicea and Agatha.

## Scurvy[[@Headword:Scurvy]]

             (גָּדָב, garab, from גָּרַב, to scratch), scurf on the akin (Lev 21:20; Lev 22:22), perhaps of a malignant kind ("Scab," Deu 28:27). So also the word יַלֶּפֶת, yallepheth, rendered "scabbed" (Lev 21:20; Lev 22:22), signifies a sort of itching scab, scurf, tetter, so called as sticking fast. SEE LEPROSY. The disease known by the name of scurvy in modern times is usually caused by long confinement in cold and damp climates, without fresh provisions, and a due quantity of acescent food. In the progress of the disease the skin becomes dry and scaly, livid spots appear, and the sufferer experiences great debility.

## Scutcheon[[@Headword:Scutcheon]]

             (old form, scouchon; Latin, scutum = a shield), besides signifying an escutcheon, is also an old name for the angles of buildings or parts of buildings, such as window-jambs, etc., but apparently for those only which are greater than right angles.

## Scutum[[@Headword:Scutum]]

             SEE POME.

## Scutum Fidei[[@Headword:Scutum Fidei]]

             (shield of faith), a sacred device frequently represented in stone and wood carving, on monumental brasses, in stained glass, and ancient paintings, in which the doctrines' of the Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity were set forth for the instruction of the faithful The example in the accompanying wood-cut is from the south window of the south transept of Thame Church, Oxfordshire (1829). It has since disappeared.

## Scylla[[@Headword:Scylla]]

             in Greek mythology, was the daughter of Typhon and Echidna, or of Neptune and the nymph Cratais. The descriptions of this marine monster  are sufficiently striking, though they were never followed in the formative arts. Homer makes her to dwell by a rock which reached to the skies, and whose brow was constantly crowned with clouds. The mountain could not be scaled because of its smooth surfaces, and the monster was accordingly able to dwell undisturbed in the cavern which the waves had washed at its foot, and thence to inflict destruction on all who might approach. The giantess had twelve feet, which, however, were less dangerous than might be supposed, because they were all fastened to the rock; but the horrible body had six long necks, surmounted by six terrible heads, which roared unceasingly under the impulse of hunger and ferocity. The mouth was armed with a triple row of teeth, and every form of creature afforded them a welcome prey. In the absence of other food, they seized on dolphins and seals, but if a ship drew near, it was obliged to sacrifice a portion of its crew. Ulysses came prepared for a conflict, and sought in every way to drive off the monster with spear-thrusts and poles, but was at length obliged to pay for the temerity which led him to navigate the Sicilian straits with the loss of six of his most faithful companions. These waters (between Italy and Sicily) were at that time regarded as impassable because of Scylla and Charybdis (incidit in Scyllain cupiens vitare Charybdin), one of which was certain to destroy the navigator. Their terrors are now altogether dissipated, and no fishing-boat dreads these monsters. Scylla is usually represented as a gigantic female figure with an oar raised as if to strike, the body ending in two dolphin tails.

## Scyllis[[@Headword:Scyllis]]

             in Greek mythology, was a celebrated architect, who was supposed to be the son of Daedalus by a paramour of unknown name. whose father lived at Gortys, in Crete. Many of the buildings in Sicily were attributed to him and his brother Dipoenus.

## Scyllius[[@Headword:Scyllius]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of Jupiter in Crete.

## Scythes[[@Headword:Scythes]]

             in Greek mvthology, was a son of Hercules and Echidna.

## Scythian[[@Headword:Scythian]]

             (Σκύθης) occurs in Col 3:11 as a generalized term for a rude, ignorant, degraded person. In the Gospel, says Paul, "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all." It was anciently applied sometimes to a particular people, and sometimes to all the nomad tribes which had their seat to the north of the Black and Caspian seas, stretching indefinitely eastward into the unknown regions of Asia. It had thus much the same latitude as "Tartars," and was in like manner synonymous with Barbarian (Βάρβαρος). The same view of Scythian barbarism appears in 2Ma 4:47 and 3Ma 7:5, also in Josephus (Cont. Apion. ii, 37) and Parmenio (ap. Athen. v, 221). For other similar testimonies, see Wettstein, Nov. Test. ii, 292.

The Scythians were, in fact, the ancient representatives of the modern Tartars, and, like them, moved from place to place in carts drawn by oxen. It is from this circumstance that they, or a tribe nearly allied to them, may be recognised on the monuments of Egypt. In the latter part of the 7th century B.C., they had become well known as a formidable power through the whole of Western Asia. Forced from their original quarters north of the Caucasian range by the inroads of the Massagetee, they descended into Asia Minor, where they took Sardis (B.C. 629), and maintained a long war with the Lydian monarchs; thence they spread into Media (B.C. 624), where they defeated Cyaxares. They then directed their course to Egypt, and were bribed off by Psammetichus; on their return they attacked the Temple of Venus Urania at Ascalon. They were finally ejected B.C. 596, after having made their name a terror to the whole Eastern world (Herod. i, 103 sq.). The name of Seythopolis, by which Beth-shean was known in our Saviour's time, was regarded as a trace of the Scythian occupation (Pliny, v, 16). This, however, is doubtful. SEE SCYTHOPOLIS. The Hebrew records are silent respecting this Seythian invasion, though some scholars suppose it to be referred to by the prophets Joel and Zephaniah. The Seythians are described by classical writers as skilful in the use of the bow (Herod. i, 73; 4:132; Xenoph. Anab. iii, 4,15), and even as the inventors of the bow and arrow (Pliuy, 7:57); they were specially famous as mounted bowmen (ἱπποτοξόται, Herod, 4:46; Thucyd. ii, 96); they also enjoyed an ill-fame for their cruel and rapacious habits (Herod. i, 106).

With the memory of these events yet fresh on the minds of his countrymen, Ezekiel seems to select the Scythians, under the name of Gog (q.v.), as the symbol of earthly violence, arrayed against the people of God, but meeting with a signal and utter overthrow. He depicts their avarice and violence (Eze 38:7-13), and the fearful vengeance executed upon them (Eze 38:14-23) — a massacre so tremendous that seven months would hardly suffice for the burial of the corpses in the valley which should thenceforth be named Hamon-gog (Eze 39:11-16). The imagery, of Ezekiel has been transferred in the Apocalypse to describe the final struggle between Christ and Antichrist (Rev 20:8).

As a question of ethnology, the origin of the Scythians presents great difficulties. Many eminent writers, with Niebuhr and Neumann at their head, regard them as a Mongolian, and therefore a non-Japhetic, race. It is unnecessary for us to enter into the general question, which is complicated by the undefined and varying applications of the name Scythia and Scythians among ancient writers. So far as the Biblical notices are concerned, it is sufficient to state that the Scythians of Ezekiers age — the Scythiaus of Herodotus — were in all probability a Japhetic race. They are distinguished, on the one hand, from the Argippoei, a clearly Mongolian race (Herod. 4:23), and they are connected, on the other hand, with the Agathyrsi, a clearly Indo-European race (ibid. 4:10). The mere silence of so observant a writer as Herodotus as to any striking features in the physical conformation of the Scythians must further be regarded as a strong argument in favor of their Japhetic origin. For the geographical and ethnographical relations of the term, see Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. ii, 936-945. Perhaps it may be inferred from Col. iii, 11 that there were Scythians also among the early converts to Christianity. Many of this people lived in Greek and Roman lands, and could have heard the Gospel there, even if some of the first preachers had not already penetrated into Scythia itself. See Nat. Quar. Rev. Dec. 1876; Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1853.

## Scython[[@Headword:Scython]]

             in Greek mythology, was a man whom the poets represent as possessed of the ability to change his sex at will.

## Scythopolis[[@Headword:Scythopolis]]

             (Σκυθῶν πόλις; Peshito- Syriac, Beisan; Vulg. ciritas Scytharum), that is, "the city of the Seythians," occurs in the A. V. of Jdt 3:10 and 2Ma 12:29 only. In the Sept. of Jdg 1:27, however, it is inserted (in both the great MSS.) as the synonym of Beth-shean (q.v.), and this identification is confirmed by the narrative of 1Ma 5:52, a parallel account to that of 2Ma 12:29, as well as by the repeated statements of Josephus (Ant. v, 1, 22; 6:14, 8; 12:8, 5). He uniformly gives the name in the contracted shape (Σκυθόπολις), in which it is also given by Eusebius (Onomast. passim), Pliny (H.N, v, 18), Strabo (xvi), etc., and which is inaccurately followed in the A.V. Polybius (v, 70, 4) employs the fuller form of the Sept. Beth-shean has now, like so many other places in the Holy Land, regained its ancient name, and is known as Beisan only. A mound close to it on the west is called Tell Shuk, in which it is perhaps just possible that a trace of Scythopolis may linger. But although there is no doubt whatever of the identity of the place there is considerable difference of opinion as to the origin of the name. The Sept. (as is evident from the form in which they present it) and Pliny (H. N. v, 16) attribute it to the Scythians, who, in the words of the Byzantine historian George Syncellus, "overran Palestine and took possession of Baisan, which from them is called Scythopolis." This has been in modern times generally referred to the invasion recorded by Herodotus (i, 104-106), when the Scythians, after their occupation of Media, passed through Palestine on their road to Egypt (about B.C. 600 a few years before the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar), a statement now recognised as a real fact, though some of the details may be open to question (Rawlinson's Herod. i, 246). It is not at all improbable that either on their passage through, or on their return after being repulsed by Psammetichus (Herod. i, 105), some Scythians may have settled in the country (Ewald, Gesch. iii, 694, note); and no place would be more likely to attract them than Beisan — fertile, most abundantly watered, and in an excellent military position. In the then state of the Holy Land they would hardly meet with much resistance. SEE SCYTHIAN.

Reland, however (apparently incited thereto by his doubts of the truth of Herodotus's account), discarded this explanation, and suggested that Scythopolis was a corruption of Succothopolis the chief town of the district of Succoth. In this he is supported by Gesenius (,Votes to  Burckhardt, p. 1058) and by Grimm (Exeg. Handbuch on 1Ma 5:52). Sinee, however, the objection of Reland to the historical truth of Herodotus is now removed, the necessity for this suggestion (certainly most ingenious) seems not to exist. The distance of Succoth from Beisan, if we identify the former with Sakut, is ten miles; while if the arguments of Mr. Beke are valid, it would be nearly double as far. It is surely gratuitous to suppose that so large, independent, and important a town as Beth-shean was in the earlier history, and as the remains show it to have been in the Greek period, should have taken its name from a comparatively insignificant place at a long distance from it. Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. iii, 330) remarks with justice that had the Greeks derived the name from Succoth, they would have employed that name in its translated form as Σκηναί, and the compound would have been Scenopolis. Reland's derivation is also dismissed without hesitation by Ewald, on the ground that the two names Succoth and Skythes have nothing in common (Gesch. iii, 694, note). Dr. Robinson suggests that, after all, City of the Scythians may be right, the word Scythia being used, as in the New Test., as equivalent to a barbarian or savage. In this sense he thinks it may have been applied to the wild Arabs, who then, as now, inhabited the Ghor, and at times may have had possession of Beth-shean.

The Canaanites were never expelled from Beth-shean, and the heathen appear to have always maintained a footing there. It is named in the Mishna as the seat of idolatry (Aboda Zara, i, 4), and as containing a double population Jews and heathens. At the beginning of the Roman war (A.D. 65), the heathen rose against the Jews and massacred a large number, according to Josephus (War, ii, 18, 3) no less than 13,000, in a wood or grove close to the town. Scythopolis was the largest city of the Decapolis, and the only one of the ten which lay west of Jordan. By Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v." Bethsau") it is characterized as πόλις ἐπίδημος and urbs nobilis. It was surrounded by a district of its own of the most abundant fertility. It became the seat of a Christian bishop, and its name is found in the lists of signatures as late as the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536. The latest mention of it under the title of Scythopolis is probably that of William of Tyre (22:16, 26). He mentions it as if it was then actually so called, carefully explaining that it was formerly Bethshan. SEE BETH- SHEAN.

## Se Ton Aphthiton Monarchen[[@Headword:Se Ton Aphthiton Monarchen]]

             (Σὲ τὸν ἄφθιτον μονάρχην, Thee the Everlasting King) is the beginning of a hymn written εἰς Χριστόν (to Christ) by Gregory of Nazianzum (q.v.). The first few lines of this hymn run thus in Mrs. Charles's version:

“Hear us now, Eternal Monarch, Grant us now to hymn and praise thee — Thee the King, and thee the Master! By whom are our hymns and praises, By whom are the choirs of angels, By whom flow the ceaseless ages, By whom only shines the sun, By whom walks the moon in brightness, By whom smile the stars in beauty, By whom all the race of mortals Have received their godlike reason And thine other works outshone.”

For the original Greek, together with a German translation, comp. Bässler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder, p. 10, 156, Rambach, Anthologie christlicher Gesänge, 1, 48 sq.; Fortlage, Gesange christlicher Vorzeit, p. 23, 361; Mrs. Charles, The Voice of Christian Life in Song, p. 62 sq. (B.P.)

## Se-Baptists[[@Headword:Se-Baptists]]

             a small and obscure sect which struck off from the Brownists (Independents) early in the 17th century. They received their name from the act of their leader, John Smith, of Amsterdam, in baptizing himself. After entertaining several views, he at last declared for the principles of the Baptists. Upon this he left Amsterdam and settled with his disciples at Ley, where, being at a loss for a proper administrator of the ordinance of baptism, he plunged himself and then performed the ceremony upon others. The Se-Baptists maintain that it is lawful for every one to baptize himself; and the Samokrestschentsi (a small Russian sect of self-baptizers) give as a reason that there is no one on earth sufficiently holy w administer the ordinance aright. See Blunt, Dict, of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Sea[[@Headword:Sea]]

             (Heb. יָם, yam; Chahl. יַמָּא, yamma; θάλασσα), as opposed to land or earth (אֶרֶצ, erets, Gen 1:10), in which all the waters of the earth are included, originated by the separation of its waters from those of the air, or the clouds (vet. 6 sq.). The sea is represented as deep (Psa 68:23; Mic 7:19; Amo 9:3; Job 38:16), wide (11:9), and mighty (Psa 104:25; Job 7:12; Lam 2:13); surrounding the earth at its utmost bounds (Deu 30:13; Psa 139:9; comp. the ancient Greek view of oceanus, ὠκέανος, Fubiger, Handb. d. alt. Geogr. i, 4); the earth, indeed, resting on the ocean (Psa 24:2). The surface (comp. βυθός, the deep, 2Co 11:25) is roused by winds (Dan 7:2; comp. Jon 1:11; Jon 1:13) into waves (גַּלִּים, Psa 65:8; Psa 107:25; Isa 66:18; κύματα, Jud 1:13; κλύδων, Jam 1:6), so that it roars and rages (Jer 6:23; Jeremiah 1, 42; Isa 5:30; Isa 57:20; Psa 96:11; 1Ch 16:32), and is only subject to God (Job 38:11; Psa 89:10). The countless inhabitants of the sea (Jam 3:7, Rev 8:8 sq.) are given to men for food (Gen 9:2 sq.),but the people of God may only eat those which are legally clean (Lev 11:9 sq.). On the coasts of the sea (Heb. samah', שָׂמָה) lie great lands; and the sand of the sea (חוֹל; Gr. ἄμμος) is proverbial for multitude (Gen 22:17; Jos 11:4; 2Sa 17:11; Job 29:18; Hos 1:10; 1Ma 11:1; Rev 20:8, etc.; Homer, Iliad, 9:885; Callim. Dish. p. 252; Ovid, Trist. 4:1, 55; Ars Am. i, 254. Comp. Pindar, Olymp. ii, 178; Calpurn. ii, 72. See also Gesen. Thesaur. p. 598 sq.).

It may be remarked that almost all the figures of speech taken from the sea in Scripture refer either to its power or its danger, and among the woes threatened in punishment of disobedience, one may be remarked as significant of the dread of the sea entertained by a non-seafaring people, the being brought back into Egypt "in ships" (Deu 28:68). The national feeling on this subject may be contrasted with that of the Greeks in reference to the sea. No mention of the tide is found in Scripture.

The above Heb. word, יָם, yam, is sometimes connected with תְּהוֹן, tehom (ἄβυσσος, abyssus, "the deep," Gen 1:2; Jon 2:5). It also means the west (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 360, 598). When used for the sea, it very often, but not always, takes the article. Other words for the sea (in the  A.V. "deep") are: מְצוּלָה, metsulah, or מְצוֹלָה, metsolah (only in the plural), or צוּלָה, tsulah simply (ἄβυσσος, βάθος, abyssus, profundum); מַבּוּל, mabbul (κατακλυσμός, diluvium, "water-flood," Psa 29:10).. Smaller pools were distinguished into אֲגָם, Ogdm, a natural pool or pond (evil, 35; Psa 114:8; Isa 35:7; Isa 41:18, etc.), and בְּרֵכָה, berekah, the same as the Arabic birkeh; an artificial pool or reservoir (2Sa 2:13; 2Sa 4:12; Nah 2:9).

The following are the applications Of the term yam in Scripture:

1. The "gathering of the waters" (yammin), encore-passing the land, or what we call in a more or less deft-nite sense "the Ocean." In this sense the term is used in Gen 1:2; Gen 1:10, and elsewhere, as Deu 30:13; 1Ki 10:22; Psa 24:2; Job 26:8; Job 26:12; Job 38:8; see Homer, Iliad, 14:301, 302; Hesiod, Theog. 107, 109; and 2Pe 3:5.

2. The word is used, with the article, of some definite part of the great circumambient water, viz.:

(a.) Of the Mediterranean Sea, called the "hinder" (אַחֲרוֹן), the "western," and the "utmost" sea (Deu 11:24; Deu 34:2; Joe 2:20); "sea of the Philistines" (Exo 23:31); "the great sea" (Num 34:6-7; Jos 15:47); "the sea" (Gen 49:13; Psa 80:11; evil, 23; 1Ki 4:20, etc.). SEE MEDITERRANEAN.

(b.) Also frequently of the Red Sea (Exo 15:4; Jos 24:6), or one of its gulfs (Num 11:31; Isa 11:15), and perhaps (1Ki 10:22) the sea traversed by Solomon's fleet. SEE RED SEA.

The place "where two seas met" (τόπος διθάλασσος, Act 27:41) is explained by Conybeare and Howson as a place where the island Salmonetta, off the coast of Malta, in St. Paurs Bay, so intercepts the passage from the sea without to the bay within as to give the appearance of two seas, just as Strabo represents the appearance of the entrance from the Bosphorus into the Euxine; but it seems quite as likely that by the "place of the double sea" is meant one where two currents, caused by the intervention of the island, met and produced an eddy, which made it desirable at once to ground the ship (Conybeare and Howson, 5, 423; Strabo, ii, 124).

3. The term is also applied to the great internal lakes of Palestine, whether fresh or salt; e.g.

(a.) The Sea of Chinnereth, יַם כִּנֶּרֶת(Num 34:11), called in the New Test. "the Sea of Galilee" (Mat 4:18), the "Sea of Tiberias" (Joh 21:1), and "the sea (or lake) of Gennesareth" (Mat 14:34; Mar 6:53; Luk 5:17), which last is but a variation of the Hebrew name. SEE GALILEE, SEA OF.

(b.) The Dead Sea, called in Scripture the Salt Sea, יָם הָמֶּלַח(Gen 14:3), the Sea of the Plain, or the Arabah, יָם חָעֲרָבָה(Deu 4:40), and the Eastern Sea, הַיָּם חַקַּדְמֹנִי(Joe 2:20; Eze 47:18; Zec 14:8). It is not named or alluded to in the New Test. It is called by Josephus (War, iii, 10, 7) λίμνη Ασφαλτίτης, by which name, or in the Latin form of Lacus Asphaltites, it was known to the classical writers. SEE SALT SEA.

(c.) The Lake Merom is named once only in Scripture, where it is called

מֵי מְרוֹם, waters of Merom (Jos 11:5; Jos 11:7). By Josephus it is called Semechonitis (Σεμεχωνίτις, Ant. v, 5, 1), and at present bears the name of Huleh: this is the uppermost and smallest of the three lakes on the Jordan. SEE MEROM.

4. The term yam, like the Arabic bahr, is also applied to great rivers, as the Nile (Isa 19:5; Amo 8:8, A.V. "flood ;" Nah 3:8; Eze 32:2) and the Euphrates (Jer 51:36). See Stanley, Syr. and Pal. App. p. 533; Hackett, Illust. of Script, p. 119.

5. Finally, the great copper (נְחשֶׁת) or molten (מוּצָק) laver, which stood in the court of Solomon's Temple, is called a yam (1Ki 7:23-44; 2Ki 16:17, etc.). SEE BRAZEN SEA; SEE LAVER

## Sea Of Chinnereth[[@Headword:Sea Of Chinnereth]]

             (יָםאּכַּנֶּרֶת; Sept. [ἡ]θάλασσα Χενέρεθ, Num 24:11; Jos 13:27) or CHINNEROTH (כַּנְּרוֹה, Χενέρεθ, Jos 12:3), the inland sea, which is most familiarly known to us by its New- Test. name as the "Lake of Gennesareth," or the "Sea of Tiberias" or "of Galilee." This is evident from the mode in which it is mentioned in various passages in the Pentateuch and Joshua as being at the end of Jordan, opposite to the " Sea of the Arabah," i.e. the Dead Sea, as having the Arabah or Ghor below it, etc. (Deuteronomy in, 17; Jos 11:2; Jos 13:3. In the two former of these passages the word "sea" is perhaps omitted). The word is by some derived from the Hebrews כַּנּוּר, Kinnur' (κιννύρα, cithara), a "harp," as if in allusion to the oval shape of the lake. But it is possible that Cinnereth was an ancient Canaanite name existing long prior to the Israelite conquest, and, like other names, adopted by the Israelites into their language. The subsequent name "Gennesar" was derived from "Cinnereth" by a change of letters of a kind frequent in the East. SEE GENNESARETH

## Sea, Molten[[@Headword:Sea, Molten]]

             SEE LAVER.

## Sea-Monster[[@Headword:Sea-Monster]]

             is the rendering in Lam 4:3 of the Heb. תַּן, tan, where the margin has "sea-calves." The root of the word is תָּנַן, tandin, "to stretch out," hence it seems to apply to a slim creature that extends itself, and some think it to mean a kind of serpent. Others would render it "jackal" It is variously rendered in the A. V. ("whale," "serpent,' etc.), nor is it probable that it was very definite ha its application. SEE DRAGON.

## Seabury, Samuel, D.D.[[@Headword:Seabury, Samuel, D.D.]]

             an efficient Episcopal minister, and afterwards bishop of Connecticut, was born at Ledyard, Groton, Conn., Nov. 30, 1729, and received his degree of A.B. at Yale College in 1748. In 1751 he went to Scotland, and was  ordained in London in 1753. On his return to America, he was successively rector of Christ's Church, New Brunswick, N. J.; Grace Church, Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; and St. Peter's Church, Westchester; and in 1764 was made A.M. by Columbia College, and D.D. by Oxford University, England. During the Revolutionary war he acted for a time as chaplain to the British army, and in 1783 was chosen bishop and went to England for consecration. Not being successful, he went to Scotland, where his application was granted, in 1784 at Aberdeen, which was thus the cradle of the American Episcopal Church. On his return he was made rector of St. James's Church, New London, Conn., where he published A Communion Office, and aided in a general organization of the Episcopal Church of the United States. He died Feb. 25, 1796. His publications comprise Charges, Sermons, and Addresses: — The Communion Office, etc.: — The Duty of Considering our Ways: — Discourses on Several Subjects (1791, 2 vols.) : — An Earnest Persuasive to the Frequent Receiving of the Holy Communion (republished, 1816). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 149.

## Seager, Micah[[@Headword:Seager, Micah]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Simsbury, Conn., in July, 1800, and was converted in 1816. In 1818 he was received on trial by the Genesee Conference, in which he performed more than thirty years of active service. He was superannuated in 1854, and held that relation until his death, May 26, 1872. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, p. 115.

## Seager, Schuyler, D.D.[[@Headword:Seager, Schuyler, D.D.]]

             a minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Simsbury, Conn., July 26, 1807. He graduated from the Wesleyan University, Middletown, in 1836, and took his degree of M.A. in 1839. After his graduation he became principal of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, N. Y., and held that position until 1844. He was employed in the pastorate from 1844 to 1853, and spent the next six years as principal of Genesee Wesleyan Seminary and Dansville Academy. He then returned to the pastoral work, in which he continued until his death. Among the churches he served were the First Church and Asbury, Rochester; Pearl Street and Grace, Buffalo; Lockport, and Batavia. He was a delegate to the general conferences of 1844 and 1848. At the time of his death he was a  member of the Western New York Conference. See Minutes of Ann. Conferences, 1875, p. 158.

## Seah[[@Headword:Seah]]

             (סֵאה, seah, from the obsolete סְאָה, saah, to 'expand), a Hebrew measure, properly for grain (A.V. always "measure;" Gen 18:6; 1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 18:32; 2Ki 7:1; 2Ki 7:16; 2Ki 7:18); containing, according to the rabbins, the third of an ephab, i.e. nearly one and a half pecks English; according to Jerome (On Mat 13:33), a modius and a half. From the Aramaean form has sprung the σάτον of the Sept., New Test., and Josephus. SEE METROLOGY,

## Seal[[@Headword:Seal]]

             (חוֹתָם, chotham, σφραγίς). The seal, together with the staff, has been in tile East from the earliest times (Gen 38:18) the favorite trinket of the men (see Son 8:6; Hag 2:23; Jer 22:24; Sir 17:22; comp. Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 6:252). Both are included in the attire of the Babylonians (Herod. i, 195; Strabo, 16:746). It was attached, as still in Persia, by a cord, and worn upon the bosom or in a finger-ring on the right hand (Gen 41:42; Est 3:10; Est 3:8; Est 8:2; Jer 22:24; comp. Chardin, 4:23; v, 454 sq.; Robinson, i, 58, and see especially Longus, De AnnuL Sign. [Mail. 1615; Lips. 1709]). The art of graving seals is an ancient one (Exo 28:11). The seal usually contains no figures (yet see the drawing of one found at Cusa, in Ker Porter, Tray. i, 425, pl. lxxx, 2), but simply the name of the wearer, sometimes with a sentence from the Koran, and it is customary to give an impression of it instead of a signature (Chardin, i, 289, 355; iii, 112, 362, 366, with plates; Olearins, Trav. p. 633; Rosenmuller, Morgenl. iii, 205 sq. Comp. Curtius, iii, 6, 7; Herod. iii, 128). For this purpose the seal is moistened with a kind of black ink (Harmer, Obs. ii, 468, 470; iii, 478); but in sealing letters (1Ki 21:8; comp. Josephus, Life, p. 44), bags (Job 14:17), and sacks (Mishna, Shabb. 8:5), as well as doors, clay or sealing-earth was used (ibid.). Among the Jews the women also carried seal-rings (ibid. 6:3). Eastern princes confer the dignity of minister or regent by tbe deliver)-of the state-sea], or a seal-ring (Gen 41:42; Est 3:10; Est 8:2; Esther 1 Mace. 6:15; comp. Curtius, 10:5, 4; Aristoph. Eq.  947; see Schulz, Leitung, 4:218 sq.; Tournefort, Voyage, ii, 383), and sometimes they invested successors in the same manner (Josephus, Ant. 20:2, 3), In the later language of the Jews the word chotam meant a counter or token, perhaps with a seal. Such were Used in the second Temple (Mishna, Shekal. v, 3 sq.), and a special officer of the seals was stationed there (ibid. v, 1). SEE RING

The seal, with the owner's name or some other device engraven upon it, was usually employed to authenticate public or private documents. Seals for this purpose, made of burned clay, or of copper, silver, gold, or precious stones set in metal, were anciently used in the East. Sometimes the signet-ring was used for this purpose (Gen 38:18; Jer 32:10). If a door had to be sealed, it was first fastened with some ligament, over which was placed some well-compacted clay, and then impressed with the seal, so that any violation of it would be discovered at once (Job 38:14; Son 4:12; Mat 27:66). Important documents were sometimes put in sealed bags and enclosed in earthenware vessels for greater security (Deu 32:34; Jer 32:14; Job 14:17). The seal, if a cylinder, was rolled on the moist clay, hence Job says, "it is turned as clay to the seal" (Job 38:14); and sometimes the tablet or impression was placed in the furnace and baked. The term "sealed" is sometimes used figuratively for that which is permanent (Isa 8:16) and confirmed (Joh 6:29; Rom 4:11), also for that which is to be kept secret until the appointed time (Dan 8:26; Dan 12:4; Dan 12:9). So also the "book or roll sealed with seven seals" symbolized the plan of the divine government, which is impenetrable to every creature, but fully comprehended by the Saviour, who is exalted to the throne of the universe (Rev 5:2-8). The "seal of the living God," on Which is supposed to be engraven the name of "Jehovah," which was impressed upon the foreheads of the faithful, symbolizes the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Rev 7:2-17; Eph 1:13-14; Eph 6:30; 2Co 1:22; Eze 9:4; Eze 9:6; 2Ti 2:19). SEE SIGNET.

## Seal (Ecclesiastical Use Of)[[@Headword:Seal (Ecclesiastical Use Of)]]

             a piece of metal or other hard substance, e.g. bone or ivory, usually round or elliptical, on which is engraved some device, used for making impressions on wax. The wax set or affixed to an ecclesiastical or legal instrument, duly impressed or stamped with a seal, is likewise designated by the same term. The use of seals as a mark of authenticity to letters and other instruments in writing is very ancient, and was allowed to be sufficient without signing the name, which few could do of old. In 1237, owing to the prevalence of forgeries and the absence of public notaries in England, abbots, priors, deans archdeacons, their Officials and rural deans, capitular bodies, colleges, and convents, were required to have seals. If the office was perpetual, then the name of the man who bore it was engraved on the seal; but rural deans and officials whose office was temporary, had only the name of their office engraved upon it. They resigned their seals at the expiration of their tenure to him by whom they had been commissioned. The name seal is also given to the little stone which covers the sepulchre of relics in an altar.

## Seal Of Baptism[[@Headword:Seal Of Baptism]]

             Baptism was often called, in the early Church, "the seal of the Lord," "the seal of Christ," with allusion, perhaps, to Eph 1:13; Eph 4:30; Joh 3:33, and other similar passages, especially 2Co 1:21-22. This use of the word is taken from the circumstance that the stamp or  impression of a seal upon anything was regarded as a mark of property, or a token that it belonged to a certain owner, namely, the person whose seal it bore. Thus Gregory. of Nazianzum (Orat. 40) calls baptism the seal and sign of sovereignty, or the token that the baptized person was subject to the dominion and government of God, and lived to obey his will. See Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 484.

## Seal Or Confession[[@Headword:Seal Or Confession]]

             a name for the obligation on a priest never to reveal the secrets of the confessional. See Lee, Gloss. of Liturgical Terms, s.v.; Wal-cott, Sac. Archceol, s.v.

## Seal, Abbatial[[@Headword:Seal, Abbatial]]

             is the official formal seal of an abbott.

## Seal, Consecration Of An Episcopal[[@Headword:Seal, Consecration Of An Episcopal]]

             It was customary in many parts of the Church during the Middle Ages to consecrate the seal of a newly made bishop with his vestments and other  episcopal insignia. The form of consecration was simple, the seal being blessed with holy-water. At the death of the bishop, his seal or seals (for he had usually more than one) were carefully destroyed.

## Seal, Decanal[[@Headword:Seal, Decanal]]

             is the official formal seal of the dean of a cathedral or collegiate church.

## Seal, Episcopal[[@Headword:Seal, Episcopal]]

             is the official formal seal of a bishop, attached to letters of orders, licenses, deeds of institution, induction, degradation, and other documents. They represent the arms of the diocese, impaled with the personal arms of the bishop. Bishops commonly have two official seals — a large and a small one. These, in England, on their death, are sent to Lambeth Palace to be defaced and destroyed under the direction of the archbishop's official.

## Seal-Skin[[@Headword:Seal-Skin]]

             SEE BADGER.

## Sealed Books[[@Headword:Sealed Books]]

             certain printed copies of the revised Anglican Prayer-book, as settled at the Savoy Conference, issued A.D. 1662, which, having been examined by the commissioners appointed for that purpose, were certified by them to be correct. They were ordered by Parliament to be preserved in certain cathedral and collegiate churches. A folio reprint of the Sealed Book was issued by Piekering (1844), and again by Masters ](1848, 8vo). See Leei Gloss. of Liturgical Terms, s.v.

## Seam[[@Headword:Seam]]

             occurs in Scripture only in the epithet ἄρραφος, "Without seam," applied to our Saviour's inner garment ("coat"), which the soldiers at his crucifixion accordingly cast lots for (Joh 19:23). Monographs on this fact are cited by Volbeding, index Programme-tam, p. 60.

## Seaman, Lazarus, D.D[[@Headword:Seaman, Lazarus, D.D]]

             an English Presbyterian clergyman, was born at Leicester, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1631. By diligence and hard study he attained great eminence in literature and in the learned languages. He went to London as. chaplain to the earl of Northumberland, and was lecturer at St. Martin's, Ludgate. His ability secured for him the valuable living of Allhallow's, Bread Street, given by archbishop Laud in 1642. The next year he was chosen a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. He was an able disputant, and defeated two Romish priests in a set controversy. In 1644 he was made master of Peterhouse, Cambridge. He had interviews with king Charles I before his impeachment. Cromwell appointed Dr. Seaman visitor to the University of Cambridge, and vice-chancellor thereof. After the Restoration he lost all his preferments, was ejected from All hallows in 1662, and gathered a congregation of his former hearers, who formed a new and important church, which met in Silver Street, continued about a century, and had a fine body of ministers. He died in Warwick Court, Newgate Street, September 9, 1695. For more than thirty years his skill as a casuist procured him great fame; as an interpreter of Scripture he was one of a thousand; he was also a model pastor. He published several sermons, and a translation into Turkish, in 1660, of John Ball's Catechisn. He had a very choice and valuable library, the catalogue of which is preserved in the museum at the Baptist Academy, Bristol. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 3:6-12.

## Seaman, Richard[[@Headword:Seaman, Richard]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born April 28,1785. He studied medicine, and was admitted to practice in New York when about nineteen. He became a Christian in 1812, and in 1823 was received into the New York Conference, and was regularly appointed until 1845, when he was obliged to take a superannuated relation. He continued to labor as his strength would permit, but for the last thirteen years of his life was a great  sufferer from rheumatism. He died Nov. 6, 1864. He was a man of superior judgment, stern integrity, untiring energy, modest, generous, and evangelical. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1865, p. 100.

## Sear[[@Headword:Sear]]

             occurs in Scripture only in the rendering of the word καυτηριάζω to brand ("sear with a hot iron"), in a tropical sense of the conscience (1Ti 4:2). To sear the flesh is to cauterize or burn it, and thus deprive it of the power of sensation. In 1Ti 4:2 the term denotes the effect of habitual sin, by which the conscience becomes so stupefied as to be insensible to the most enormous guilt and the most fearful threatenings of punishment. See burning.

## Searle, Jeremiah[[@Headword:Searle, Jeremiah]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Atkinson, N. H., in 1795. He was educated in part at Bowdoin College, Me., and graduated at Union College, N. Y, in 1820. He studied theology with Dr. Andrew Yates, and was licensed by the Congregational Association of Vermont in 1823. His ministerial life was spent in the following Reformed churches: Rotterdam, N. Y., 1823-25; Coxsackie, 1825-51; Keyport, N. J, 1851-53; Fallsburgh, N. Y., 1853-61. He was a man of great sweetness of spirit, amiable and beloved; a minister and a workman who needed not to be ashamed; studious, careful in preparation, practical and experimental in preaching; solemn, and yet cheerful, in manner; catholic in his sentiments, yet firm in the faith. He was president of the General Synod in 1850. He died in 1861. His ministry was marked by truly missionary labors, and crowned with two notable revivals of religion. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref.. Church. (W.J.R.T.),

## Searle, Moses C;[[@Headword:Searle, Moses C;]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Byfield, Mass., Sept. 17,1797. He graduated at the College of New Jersey, Princeton, in 1821, and at the Theological Seminary in that place in 1824; was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and, going East, began his labors in Grafton, Mass., being ordained by Newburyport Presbytery in 1826 as pastor of the Congregational Church, Grafton. He subsequently labored in New Hartford, N.Y.; Dorset,'Vt.; Haverhill, N. H.; Bradford, and Byfield, Mass., where he died, Dec. 10, 1865. Mr. Searle was a mail of deep piety and affectionate disposition, an excellent pastor and good preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 226. (J. L. S.)

## Searles, Isaac[[@Headword:Searles, Isaac]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Hartford, Conn., Oct. 30, 1816, removed to Ohio at an early age, and professed conversion in his seventeenth year. He was received on trial into the Rock River Conference, Aug. 25, 1841; ordained deacon in 1843, and elder in 1845. In 1848 the Wisconsin Conference was formed, and Mr. Searles became One of its members. He was superannuated for a short time, but became effective in 1852; superannuated in 1866, and active in 1867. His last appointment was Brandon, Wis., Where he died, Dec. 8, 1870. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 273.

## Sears, Baarnas, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Sears, Baarnas, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Baptist minister, was born at Sandisfield. Massachusetts, November 19, 1802. In 1825 he graduated from Brown University, and four years later from Newton Theological Seminary. From 1827 to 1829 he was pastor of the First Baptist Church at Hartford, Connecticut. From 1830 to 1832 he was a professor in the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution (now Madison University), and from 1833 to 1836 he studied theology at the German universities. During this period he inaugurated the German Baptist Church by immersing Reverend J.G. Oncken and six others in the Elbe, at Hamburg. He was a professor in the Newton Theological Seminary from 1835 to 1847, acting part of the time as president of the institution. He succeeded Horace Mann as secretary and executive agent of the Massachusetts Board of Education in 1848, and  served in that position until 1855, when he became. president of Brown University. In March, 1867, Dr. Sears was selected as the general agent of the Peabody Educational Fund, and at once went to Virginia to live. In this position he did much towards promoting education in the South. When the fund was established not a single Southern state had a modern system of public schools, but within eight years no state was without such a system. He died at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., July 6, 1880. Dr. Sears succeeded professor James D. Knowles as editor of the Christian Review in 1838, and held the position for a number of years. He was also a contributor to the American Cyclopaedia, and the Bibliotheca Sacra. Among the works published by him were the following: Nohden's German Grammar with Additions (1842): — Classical Studies (1843): — The Ciceronian. (1844) — Select Treatises of Luther (1846): — Life of Martin Luther (1850): — Roget's Thesaurus (1854). Dr. Sears also published many addresses, educational reports, and miscellaneous essays, including his discourse at the centennial celebration of Brown University in 1864.

## Sears, Clinton W.[[@Headword:Sears, Clinton W.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Chautauqua County, N. Y. April 27, 1819. He was educated at Yale College and Middletown Wesleyan University. He was a member of the Cincinnati  Conference, and had occupied Several responsible stations, when, in 1862, he was appointed chaplain of the Ninety-fifth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers. He was seized while in service With the camp dysentery, and returned to his home, July 15, 1863, and died Aug. 25,1863. Mr. Sears was a good scholar, an able preacher, and a faithful pastor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1863, p. 148.

## Sears. Allen[[@Headword:Sears. Allen]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New York State in 1806, received on trial in the Kentucky Conference in 1838, appointed to Taylorsville Circuit as junior preacher, and continued to travel within the bounds of that conference for seven years successively. In 1845 he was transferred to the Indiana Conference, and appointed to Vincennes Station; in 1846, to Spencer Circuit. He died Dec. 4,1846. He was a man of very strong faith, deep piety, a truly evangelical preacher, and a good pastor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4:185.

## Season[[@Headword:Season]]

             (properly עֵת, a fixed time,' καιρός, often rendered "time" in general, and not specific of a portion of the year). The general division of the year by the Hebrews was into two seasons, "Summer and Winter" (Psalm 64:17; Zec 14:8); but they appear also to have conveniently divided the year into six special seasons: "seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter" (Gen 1:14; Gen 8:22). The same division obtains among many Oriental nations, as the Hindus :and Arabians, at this day. According to this division of the seasons in Palestine, they would seem to have been distributed in the following order: Summer, from the ,middle of August to the middle of October; Seed-time(from the middle of October to the middle of December; Winter, from the middle of December to the middle of February; Cold, from the middle of February. to the middle of April; Heat, from the middle of April to the middle of August. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Seasons, Canonical[[@Headword:Seasons, Canonical]]

             SEE FESTIVALS.

## Seat[[@Headword:Seat]]

             (usually some form of יָשַׁב, yashab, to sit; κάθεδρα). There is no mention made of chairs in the Old Test., but seats of various kinds are named.

(1.) כִּסֵּא, kissah (from כָּסָהkasah, to cover, also occurring twice, Job 26:9; 1Ki 10:19, in the form כִּסֵּה), is a throne, a royal throne, as in Deu 17:18 : 2Sa 8:13, or the elevated seat of the high-priest, 1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 4:13, but is sometimes applied to a seat in general, though usually with some honorary distinction, as 1Sa 2:8; Isa 22:23. SEE THRONE

(2.) מוֹשָׁב, moshab (from יָשַׁב, yashab, to sit), means any seat, as 1Sa 20:18; 1Sa 20:25; Job 29:7, hence the site of a city, 2Ki 2:19; an assembly or session, as Psa 1:1, and the dwelling of men, Genesis 25:49, and often.

(3.) The word ,תְּכוּנָה, tekunah (from תָּכַן, takan, to weigh), is rendered "seat" in the A. V., Job 23:3, but means rather dwelling, abode.

(4.) Finally, shebeth, שֶׁבֶת, is the infinitive of the verb yashab, יָשַׁב(see No. 2, above), used substantively, as in Amo 6:8.

Orientals usually seat themselves upon mats or carpets on the floor. In the houses of the wealthy there are spread pillows, or cushions, stuffed with cotton; and sometimes broad low sofas, or divans, are used, with arms, stuffed cushions, and costly ornaments. Upon these divans, as well as upon the floor, they sit with the legs bent under, and crossed in a half-kneeling posture. Among some of them Europeans have even introduced chairs. The Ancient Egyptians had chairs and ottomans in great variety and of the most elegant forms, much in the modern fashion (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. i, 58 sq.); and no doubt the wealthy Hebrews imitated them. SEE HANDICRAFT. In later times the Hebrews adopted the custom of reclining upon couches at table (1Sa 9:22; Amo 6:4; Est 7:8; Mat 23:6; Luk 7:37-38). Among the Romans a chair of a particular form was used by the magistrates when administering justice, and this is called "the judgment-seat" (Mat 27:19; Act 18:12; Act 18:16; Rom 14:10). SEE JUDGMENT-SEAT.

The place in which a person is seated regulates, in Eastern nations, the degree of rank or precedence which he claims for himself or receives from others. In Persia the distance from the throne within which the dignitaries of the (court and nobles may sit is regulated by the strictest etiquette. The same particularity is observed in every department of public and private life, in the formal divan, in the social feast, and even in the retire-merit of the domestic chamber. To this peculiarity there are many allusions in Scripture: thus "the seat of Moses," in which the scribes and Pharisees sat, expresses metaphorically the dignity which belonged to their office as teachers or expounders of the law; "the seat of honor," to which allusion is made in the Apocrypha, was the highest seat in the synagogue so much coveted by the Pharisees. Thrones are mentioned only in reference to deity or sovereignty; every other kind of dignity is determined by the seat. It was  usual for persons who were greatly respected to be employed as judges or arbitrators; and for such seats were provided in some public place, round which the people respectfully stood, paying the most respectful reverence to the person deemed worthy of occupying the seat. SEE ATTITUDE.

## Seba[[@Headword:Seba]]

             (Heb. Seba', סְבָא; Sept. Σαβά, occasionally Σοήνη, v. r. in Chronicles Σαβάτ), the oldest son of Cush (B.C. cir. 2500), and hence a country and people among the Cushites (Gen 10:7; 1Ch 1:9), named in connection with Egyptians, Cushites, and Arabians (Sabaeans) (Isa 43:3; Isa 45:14 : Psa 72:10) and in Isa 45:14; Eze 23:42, as a rich and proud race. Much confusion has arisen between it and other similar names.

1. Name. Besides the singular form above, there is given the plural סְבָאִים(Sept.. Σαβαέιμ Ζαβαείυμ; Vulg. Sabaim), incorrectly rendered "Sabeans" a name given in the A. V. with more probability to the שְׁבָאִים(Joe 3:8 [Heb. text, 4:8]); and to Sheba, used for the people (Job 1:15); but it would have been better had the original orthography been followed in both cases by such renderings as "people of Seba," "people of Sheba," where the gentile nouns occur. SEE SABAEAN; SEE SHEBA.

If Seba be of Hebrew or cognate origin, it may be connected with the root סָבָא, saba, "he drank to excess," which would not be inappropriate to a nation seated, as we shall see was that of Seba, in a well-watered country; but the comparison of two other similar names of Cushites, Sabtah (סַבְתְּכָא) and Sabtechah (סַבְתְּכָא), does not favor this supposition, as they were probably seated in Arabia, like the Cushite Sheba (שְׁבָא), which is not remote from Seba (סְבָא.), the two letters being not unfrequently interchanged. Gesenius has suggested the Ethiopic sabeay, "a man," as the origin of both Seba and Sheba, but this seems unlikely. The ancient Egyptian names of nations or tribes, possibly countries, of Ethiopia, probably mainly, if not wholly, of Nigritian race, Sahaba, Sabara (Brugsch, Geogr Inschr. ii, 9, tav,. 12:1), are more to the point; and it is needless to cite later geographical names of cities, though that of one of the upper confluents of the Nile, Astasobas, compared with Astaboras, and Astapus, seems worthy of notice as perhaps indicating the name of a nation. The proper names of the first and second kings of the Ethiopian  25th dynasty of Egypt, Shebek (סוֹא) and Shebetek, may also be compared. Gesenius was led by an error of the Egyptologists, to connect Sevechus a Greek transcription of Shebetek, with Sabk or Sbak the crocodile-headed divinity of Ombos (Lex. s.v. סוא).

2. Biblical Notices. — Besides the mention of Seba as the first in the list of the sons of Cush (Gen 10:7; 1Ch 1:9), there are but three, or, as some hold, four, notices of the nation. In Psalms 72, which has evidently a first reference to the reign of Solomon, Seba is thus spoken of among the distant nations which should do honor to the king: "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts" (Psa 72:10). This mention of Sheba and Seba together is to be compared with the occurrence of a Sheba among the descendants of Cush (Gen 10:7), and its fulfilment is found in the queen of Sheba's coming to Solomon. There can be little doubt that the Arabian kingdom of Sheba was Cushite as well as Joktanite; and this occurrence of Sheba and Seba together certainly lends some support to this view. On the other hand, the connection of Seba with an Asiatic kingdom is important in reference to the race of its people, which, or at least the ruling class, was, no doubt, not Nigritian. In Isaiah 43, Seba is spoken of with Egypt, and more particularly with Cush, apparently with some reference to the Exodus, where we read, "I gave Egypt [for] thy ransom, Cush and Seba for thee" (Isa 43:3). Here, to render Cush by Ethiopia, as in the A. V., is perhaps to miss the sense of the passage, which does not allow Us to infer, though it is by no means impossible, that Cush, as a geographical designation, includes Seba, as it would do if here meaning Ethiopia. Later in the book there is a passage parallel in its indications: "The labor of Egypt and merchandise of Cush, and of the people of Seba, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine" (Isa 45:14). Here there is the same mention together of the three nations, and the same special association of Gush and Seba. The great stature and beauty of the Ethiopians are mentioned by Herodotus, who speaks of them as by report the tallest and handsomest men in the world (3:20; comp. 114); and in the present day some of the tribes of the dark races of a type intermediate between the Nigritians and the Egyptians, as well as the Caucasian Abyssinians, are remarkable for their fine form, and certain of the former for their height. The doubtful notice is in Ezekiel, in a difficult passage: "and with men of the multitude of Adam [were] brought drunkards [סוֹבָאִים; but the Keri reads סְבָאִים, 'people of Seba'] from the  wilderness, which put bracelets upon their hands, and beautiful crowns upon their heads" (Eze 23:42). The reading of the A.V. in the text is, "with the men of the common sort," and in the margin, "with the men of the multitude of men." The first clause would seem to favor the idea that a nation is meant, but the reading of the text is rather supported by what, follows the mention of the "drunkards." Nor is it clear why people of Seba should come from the wilderness.

3. Identification. — The list of the sons of Cush seems to indicate the position of the Cushite nation or country Seba. Nimrod, who is mentioned at the close of the list, ruled at first in Babylonia, and apparently afterwards in Assyria: of the names enumerated between Seba and Nimrod, it is highly probable that some belong to Arabia. We may thus conjecture a curve of Cushite settlements; one extremity which is to be placed in Babylonia; the other, if prolonged far enough in accordance with the mention of the African Gush, in Ethiopia.

The other passages we have examined seem to show (if we omit the last) that Seba was a nation of Africa, bordering on or included in Cush, and in Solomon's time independent and of political importance. We are thus able to conjecture the position of Seba. No ancient Ethiopian kingdom of importance could have excluded the island of Meroe, and therefore this one of Solomon's time may be identified with that which must have arisen in the period of weakness and division of Egypt that followed the empire, and have laid the basis of that power that made Shebek, or Sabaco, able to conquer Egypt and found the Ethiopian dynasty which ruled that country s well as Ethiopia.

Josephus says that Saba (Σαβά) was the ancient name of the Ethiopian island and city of Meroe (Ant. ii, 10, 2), but he writes Seba, in the notice of the Noachian settle-nents, Sabas (ibid. i, 6, 2). So, too, Strabo and Diodous Siculus (see Mannert, Geogr. p. 199). But the name Meroe is more probably Ethiopic, meaning the watered land (see Tuch, Genesis p. 222; comp. Knobel, lsa. p. 122, who gives Seba a similar meaning). This view of Seba, is identical with Meroe, has been adopted by all the moderns as suited to every passage where it is mentioned (comp. Miehaelis, Spicil. i, 180 sq.). Certainly the kingdom of Meroe succeeded that of Seba; and the ancient city of the same name may have been the capital, or one of the capitals, of Seba, though we do not find any of its monuments to be even as early as the 25th dynasty. There can be no connection between he two  names. According to Josephus and others, Meroe was named after a sister of Cambyses; but this is extremely unlikely, and we prefer taking it from the an-lent Egyptian Meru, an island, which occurs in the name of apart Of Ethiopia that can only be this or r similar tract, Meru-pet, "the island of pet (Phut ?) =the now," where the bow may have a geographical refer-nee to a bend of the river, and the word island to the country enclosed by that bend and a tributary. SEE PHUT. It may be remarked that it seems certain that, from a remote time, Ethiopia below Meroe could never have formed a separate powerful kingdom, and was probably always dependent upon either Meroe or Egypt.

4. Description. — Meroe was a large island in Ethiopia, formed by the Astaboras, on the east (Atbara, Takazze), and Astapus (Bahr el-Asrak), on the west (alluded to in Zep 3:10; Isa 18:1), the two arms that unite to form the Blue Nile (Strabo, 17:821). SEE NILE. It is mountainous, but fruitful (Heliod. AEthiop. 10:5), and its chief city is also called Meroe. This has been from antiquity the seat of a priesthood with an oracle of Jupiter Ammon (Herod. it, 29), and a trading-place for the caravans of Africa and Arabia (Strabo, 16:771; 17:786 sq.; Pithy, it, 75; v, 10; 6:35; 37:15; Diod. Sic. i, 33; iii, 5 sq.; Ptolem. 4:8). It is noted by the ancients as remarkable for the fact that here the sun casts shadows part of the year southward and part northward (comp. Strabo, it, 135 sq.; Pliny, it, 75; Lucan, 10:300, 305, etc.: some think this is referred to in Isa 18:1; Zep 3:10). The city lay in the northern extremity of the island (seventy thousand paces from the entrance, i.e. the southern extremity — Pliny, 6:35), five thousand stadia from Syene (Strabo, it, 114; comp. Pliny, it, 75), and ten thousand from Alexandria (Strabo, i, 62; it, 114). The city of Meroe had gained control Of the whole island, and sent colonies of priests to Upper Egypt to settle Thebes and Ammonium. In its flourishing period this kingdom was exceedingly powerful (Pliny, 6:35), and was inhabited by farmers, shepherds, and hunters (Strabe, 17:821). Deserts of sand surrounded it (ibid.). The priesthood retained power until the third century before Christ, when it was overthrown by a king Ergamenes (under Ptolemy Philadelphus). Thenceforward the power of the city seems to have declined; it disappears from the view of Western writers, and not until the time of Augustus do we begin to hear sparse, and on some points contradictory, accounts of a city somewhere in that region, under queens who bear the common name of Candace (comp. Pliny, 6:35;  Dion Cos. liv, 5; Eusb. H.E. it, 1). But Meroe was deserted, a few houses only remaining.

Modern travellers have striven to find its site, and it is identified with some probability as the ruins almost twenty miles north-east of the Nubian city Skendy, in the Dar el-Atbara, a district near Assur forming a peninsula, between the river Atbara, the Nile (Bahr As-rak), and the river Rahad. (See Russegger's Charte von Nubien, in his Reis., and it, 1,476, 480 sq.; Bruce, Tray-els, 4:542 sq.; Burckhardt, Travels in Nubia, p. 273 sq.; Ruppell, Arab. p. 114, 383, with plate v; Calliaud, Voyage a Meroe au Fleuve Blanc [Paris, 1826], 4 vols. with plates; Hoskins, Travels in Ethiopia, Exhibiting the State of the Country under the Dominion of Meroe [Lond, 1835], with plates.) This supposition is confirmed by the records of distances left by the ancients, for from Syene to Assur the caravan road is 534 English miles by Russegger's account, 560 by Hoskins's, while the ancient reckoning is equivalent to 568 or 590 English miles — an unimportant difference. So the distance from the beginning of the island to the city was 60 miles (see above), and Russegger found the distance from Assur to the mouth of the Atbara 55, Hoskins 60 miles. See Lnudolf, Comment. Hist. AEthiop. p. 88 sq.; Delisle, in the Histoire de l'Academie des Sciences in 1708, p. 365 sq.; Tzsehucke, Ad Mel. III, i, 256 sq.; Mannert, X, i, 182 sq.; Heeren, Ideen II, i, 352; For-biger, Handb, it, 814 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. "Meroe," SEE ETHIOPA.

## Sebak[[@Headword:Sebak]]

             SEE THICKET.

Sebald, ST,, a legendary wonder-worker of the Romish Church, said to have been the son of a Danish king, or, by another tradition, of a peasant. He began his studies at Paris before he was fifteen years of age, and after a few years married a daughter of the king Dagobert, from whom, however, he separated with her consent after the lapse of a single day, in order to become a hermit and practice a rigid asceticism. After ten years he made a pilgrimage to Rome, and received authority to preach from pope Gregory II. While on the way to Germany he miraculously delivered St. Willibald from death by starvation, and after reaching Bavaria he wrought numerous conversions, gathered churches, and settled near Nuremberg as a hermit. The date of his death is uncertain, being given as A.D. 801, 901, or 1070. He had directed that his body should be laid on a wagon drawn by four  bullocks, and buried where the cattle should come to a stop. The place so indicated was before St. Peter's Chapel at Nuremberg, which, accordingly, after having been transformed into a church, took his name. Many wonders were wrought by his lifeless body, in consequence of which he was beatified by pope Gregory X, and canonized by Martin V (1425), while the town of Nuremberg chose him for its patron saint. The 19th of August is set apart for his commemoration. A rich and artistic monument by Peter Vischer, erected to his memory, may be seen in the Church of St. Sebaldus, at Nuremberg.

## Sebaste[[@Headword:Sebaste]]

             SEE SAMARIA.

## Sebastian, ST.[[@Headword:Sebastian, ST.]]

             a Christian martyr under Diocletian, was born at Narbonne, in Gaul, and educated at Milan. Although a Christian, he entered the Roman army, concealing his religion, with the view of being enabled by his position to assist and protect the Christians. He rose to high favor under Diocletian, and became a member of the emperor's guard. At length he was informed against, and Diocletian used every, effort to induce him to renounce the Christian belief, but in vain. He was condemned to be put to death by a troop of Mauritanian archers, who transfixed him with arrows and left him for dead. Some Christians coming to the place of execution to bury him found signs of life remaining, and he was removed to the house of a  Christian lady, Irene, and recovered. He would not yield to the persuasions of his friends to remain in seclusion, but intentionally placed himself in the emperor's way. Diocletian condemned him to be beaten to death with clubs in the amphitheatre, and his body was flung into one of the sewers of the city. According to the Acts of Martyrdom, it was discovered by means of an apparition, and carried by a Christian lady, Lucina, to the catacomb which is still called by his name. The day of his martyrdom was Jan. 20, 288, but by the Greeks the feast is held Dec. 20.

There is another saint of the same name, who is said to have suffered martyrdom in Armenia.

## Sebat[[@Headword:Sebat]]

             or rather SHEBAT (Heb. Shebat, שְׁבָט, a rod or tribe; Sept. Σαβάτ), the fifth month of the Jewish civil year, and the eleventh of the ecclesiastical year, from the new moon of February to that of March; or, according to others, corresponding to our January. SEE MONTH. The name is substantially the same in the Syriac and Arabic. The Jews began in this month to number the years of the trees they planted, the fruits of which were esteemed impure till the fourth year (Zec 1:7). SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.

## Sebbun[[@Headword:Sebbun]]

             in Japanese mythology, is a feast of purification and of expelling the evil spirit, which is done shortly before the advent of the new year. This festival also serves as the date for the settlement of semiannual payments.

## Sebirin[[@Headword:Sebirin]]

             (סבירין), or imaginary readings, is a technical term of the Masorites to denote that words in the Bible ought to be read so and so, but they are not. This expression is derived from sabar, סבר, "to believe, think;" thus we read in Dan 7:25 ויסבר, and he thought, and in the Chaldee paraphrase on Pro 14:12, "there is a way which is right in the view of man," we read "there is a way which man imagines" (דסברין), etc. Now there are a number of such imaginary or supposed readings to be found in the Hebrew text of the Old Test. as the following examples will prove. Thus we read:  האל, these, is said to stand eight times for האלה, as in Gen 19:25; Gen 26:3; Lev 18:29, etc.

אלפי, thousand, is said to stand four times for אלפיםas in Exo 32:28; Jdg 4:10, etc.

וימר, and he said, is said to stand twelve times for ויאמרו, "and they said," as in Exo 14:25; Num 32:25, etc.

ארצ, into the land, is said to stand five times for

ארצה, as in Gen 45:25, etc.

אשׁח, a wife, stands three times for לאשׁח, "for a wife," as in 2Ch 21:6; Ezr 2:61; Neh 7:63.

אשׁר, which, stands four times for אשׁר, "as which," Exo 14:13; Lev 7:36; Lev 7:38; Num 4:49.

אתה, as which, stands ten times for עתה, "which," Deu 16:10; Deu 24:8, Jos 2:7; Jos 13:8; Jos 14:2; Jer 23:27 : Isa 51:13; Hos 7:12; Jon 1:14; Hag 1:12.

אתה, thou, stands three times for עתה, "now," as 1Ki 1:18; 1Ki 1:20.

ממנו, from it, stands six times for ממנה, "from her," as Lev 6:8; Lev 26:9; Jos 1:7; Jdg 11:34; 2Ki 4:39; 1Ki 22:43.

על, upon, stands nine times for עד, "until," as Gen 49:13; Jos 2:7; Jos 13:16; Judges 7:29,

על, upon, stands twice for עם, "with," as Gen 30:40; 1Sa 20:8.

Without enlarging Upon this list, we will remark for those interested in that subject that these סבירין are given in alphabetical order by Frensdorff in his Massora Magna; the first part is entitled Massoretisches Whr-terbuch, p. 369 sq. See Buxtorf, Tiberias, p. 257 sq.; Levita, Massoreth Ha- Massoreth (ed. Ginsburg), p. 225 sq. (B. P.)

## Sebonde (Or De Sabunde), Raimond[[@Headword:Sebonde (Or De Sabunde), Raimond]]

             a Spanish philosopher, was born at Barcelona during the 14th century; but his life is little known. He practiced medicine at Toulouse in 1430, and his death is placed in 1432. He wrote, besides several MS. works, Theologia Natura. As (Deventer, 1487, fol. and later), in which he sets forth the doctrine of Aquinas after the manner of Raimond Lully. The work was translated by Montaigne (Paris, 1569, 8vo). Of Sebonde's other essays, the principal is entitled De Natura Hominis (Cologne, 1501, 4to), an abridgment of the Theolohtia Naturalis. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Sebrasse, Gottlieb[[@Headword:Sebrasse, Gottlieb]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prussia, Nov. 8,1833, and came to the United States in 1852. He soon after was converted, and began to preach in 1856; but his health failing, after filling three or four appointments, he retired from the active ministry and settled near Red Wing. He died, from the effects of a fall from his wagon, June 3, 1876. He was a member of the Northwest German Conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p. 134.

## Sebuaet [[@Headword:Sebuaet ]]

             SEE SEBUANS.

## Sebuans[[@Headword:Sebuans]]

             the name given to the second of the four Samaritan sects named by Epiphanius, the other three being the Essenes, Gorttaeans, and Dositheans. It was originated by Sebua, or Sebuiah; and, partly to suit their own convenience, and partly through hostility to the Jews, kept the sacred festivals at different periods from them viz. the Passover and Pentecost in autumn, and the Feast of Tabernacles in the time usually allotted for the Passover. This sect was not permitted to worship along with the other Samaritans in the temple on Mount Gerizim. Lightfoot, in his Horae Talmudicae considers them to be identical with the Sabaeans.

## Secacah[[@Headword:Secacah]]

             [many Sec' acoh ] (Heb. Sekakah', סְכָכָה, thicket; Sept. Σοχοχά v.r. Αἰοχιόζα; Vulg. Sechacha, or Sachacha), one of the six cities of Judah  situated in the Midbar (" wilderness"), that is, the tract bordering ou the Dead Sea (Jos 15:61). It occurs in the list between Middin and han- Nibshan. It was not known to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast.). From Sinjii, among the highlands of Ephraim, near Seilfin, Dr. Robinson saw a place called Sekakeh (Bib. Res. ii, 8l, note); but this locality is, of course, out of the question. The place possibly corresponds to the site of Kusr Altar, one of two ruined towers on Wady Khureitun (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii: 182).

## Secacah (2)[[@Headword:Secacah (2)]]

             For this site Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:339) the modern Sikkeh, but he does not indicate the locality. It is thus referred to in the Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 55: "In the Judeean desert; possibly the ruin Sikkeh, east of Bethany (sheet 17)." But no such name appears on the Map nor in the accompanying Memoirs.

## Secachi, Giovannni Battista[[@Headword:Secachi, Giovannni Battista]]

             called il Caravaggino, an Italian painter, born at Caravaggio in 1619. He left several important works at Milan; among them are, Adoration of the Magi, and a Pier.

## Seceders[[@Headword:Seceders]]

             is a term applied in Scotland to those bodies of Christians who have separated from the National Church on grounds not implying a disagreement with its constitution and standards, in which latter case they are termed Dissenters (q.v.).

## Secession Kirk Of Scotland[[@Headword:Secession Kirk Of Scotland]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES; SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS.

## Sechenias[[@Headword:Sechenias]]

             (Σεχενίας Εἰεχονίας), Apocryphal forms of the Heb. name SHECHANIAH (q.v.); namely,

(a) the father of Lettus (1Es 8:29), or rather of one whose name has dropped out of the text (Ezr 8:3);

(b) the "son" of Jezeluo (1Es 8:32) or Jaha-ziel (Ezr 8:5).

## Sechu[[@Headword:Sechu]]

             (Heb. with the art. has-Seku', .חַשְּׂכוּ, the watch-tower, implying that the place was on or near an elevation; Sept. Σεχί v. r. Σεφεί), a region in Ramah, containing a famous well (or rather cistern, בּוֹר), which Saul passed while in pursuit of David (1Sa 19:22). "Assuming that Saul started from Gibeah (Tuleil el-Ful), and that Neby Samwil is Ramah [?], then Bir Neballa (the well of Neballa), alleged by a modern traveller (Schwarz, Palest. p. 127) to contain a large pit, would be in a suitable position for the great well of Sechu. Schwarz himself (p. 157) would identify it with Askar, on the south-east end of Mount Eba], and the well with Jacob's Well in the plain below; and Van de Velde (S. and P. ii, 53 sq.) hesitatingly places it at Shuk, in the mountains of Judah north-east of  Hebron; but this they are forced into by their respective theories as to the position of Ramathaim-Zophim" (Smith). Sechu is perhaps represented by the present Khuraib er-Ram, which still contains a cistern (Robinson, Later Res. p. 287), and lies near er-Ram (Ramah) directly on the road from Tuleil el-Ful (Gibcah of Saul).

## Sechu (2)[[@Headword:Sechu (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:116) that this may be represented by Khurbet Suweikeh, three and a half miles north-west of er-Rlam consisting of “walls, foundations, and heaps of stones; pieces of tessellated pavement" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:126).

## Seckendorf, Vitus Louis Von[[@Headword:Seckendorf, Vitus Louis Von]]

             a noted German statesman of the Reformation period, was born at Aurach, a town of Franconia, Dec. 20, 1626. The great progress in his studies made in his youth coming to the ears of Ernest the Pious, duke of Saxe-Ootha, this prince brought him to Gotha to be educated with his children. After remaining two years, he went in 1642 to Strasburg; and, returning to Gotha in 1646, was made honorary librarian to the duke. In 1651 he was made aulic and ecclesiastical councillor; and in 1663 council-lot of state, first minister and sovereign director of the consistory. The year after, he went into the service of Maurice, duke of Saxe-Zeist, as councillor of state and chancellor. He remained with him until his death, in 1681, and led a life of retirement, writing many works. Frederick III, elector of Brandenburg, made him councillor of state and chancellor of the University of Halle, dignities which he did not long enjoy. He died at Halle Dec. 18,1692. The work of his held in the highest estimation for its utility is Commentarius Historicus et Apo-logeticus de Lutheranismo (Lips. 1688-92), written in  refutation of Maimbourg's Histoire du Lutheranisme. See the literature referred to in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Second Adventists[[@Headword:Second Adventists]]

             SEE ADVENTISTS.

## Second Coming Of Christ[[@Headword:Second Coming Of Christ]]

             SEE ADVENT, SECOND, SEE MILLENNIUM

## Second Marriage[[@Headword:Second Marriage]]

             In the early Church, not only did the more strict Novatians and Montanists esteem a second marriage unlawful, but that error was upheld by several councils (Cone. Nic. c. 8; Ancyran, c. 19; Laodic. c. 1; Neocaesar. c. 3; Constit. Apost. lib. iii, c. 2; Athenag. Legat.; Theophil. Ant. Ad Autol. lib. iii; Iren. Adv. Haer. lib. iii, c. 19). When the severity of this principle was relaxed with regard to lay members of the Church, it was still retained with reference to the clergy (Tertull. De Monog. c. 11; Ad Uxor. lib. i, c. 7; De Pus,it. c. 9). At length this law was rendered nugatory by the enforcement of celibacy among the clergy. SEE DIVORCE; SEE MARRIAGE.

## Second-First Sabbath[[@Headword:Second-First Sabbath]]

             Σάββατον δευτερόπρω τον; Vulg. Sabbatum secundum primum ; A. V. "second Sabbath after the first") is an expression occurring only in Luk 6:1, and apparently coined for the occasion, as the compound adj. δευτερὀ πρωτος is found nowhere else in all the range of Greek literature. The learned have therefore been greatly divided, or, rather, in doubt, as to its meaning, since it is in itself quite vague and ambiguous. The earliest opinion is that of Epiphanius (Haeres. i, 30, 51), followed by Isidore of Pelusium (iii, 110), Suidas (s.v. Σάββατον,) Theophylact (ad loc.), and cited among later writers by Petavius (i, 61) and Scal-iger (Emend. Temp. 6:551), viz. that the Sabbath thus indicated was that which immediately succeeded the Paschal festival; for (argue they) the "morrow after the Sabbath" [i.e. Passover] (מִמָּחַרַת חַשַׁבָּת, i.e. ἀπὸ δευτέρας τοῦ δράγματος) is the point from which the law orders the seven weeks to be reckoned till Pentecost.

Hence all the weeks and Sabbaths of that interval are designated from this name (ספירת העומר, ἀριθμὸς τοῦ δράγματος numerus manipuli, i.e. the number of the omer, or first-fruits presented as a wave-offering). This is the view embraced by most moderns, quoted in detail by Wolf (Curae in N.T. i, 619 sq., where several arbitrary opinions by various authors are likewise enumerated); see also Kocher (Analect, ad lot.), Russ (Harmon. Evangel. p. 639 sq.), Marsh (Notes to Michaelis's Introd. ii, 61 ). The circumstances of Luke's narrative indicate that the day in question was not (as usually reckoned) the first Sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread, for that usually fell within the Passover week; whereas our Lord, on the occasion referred to, had evidently left Jerusalem at the close of the entire festival, and was on his way back to Galilee. Nor would this have been a natural and appropriate term for such a day, since that would rather have been a "first after the second" (πρωτο δεύτερος), if, indeed, it could have been called second at all, seeing it  either was simply, or else preceded, the first Sabbath Of the series of seven between Passover and Pentecost. It seems rather to have been the first of that series, but the second after the beginning of the Paschal week; which circumstance affords a simple and apposite explanation of the compound name. That the incident in our Lord's history occurred at that season is evident from the fact that the grain stood ripe, but unreaped, in the fields; and a comparison of the evangelical narratives makes it apparent likewise that the "feast" which John states (v, 1) that Jesus attended that year at Jerusalem was the Passover. If this collocation is correct, the Sabbath in question could not well have been the one occurring during the Paschal week, as that is preoccupied by John's account (in the same chapter) of the cure at the pool of Bethesda. The only mode of escaping this conclusion is by the unnatural supposition that the former "Sabbath" was merely the Passover-day itself, which, as some claim, is metaphorically thus named in a few cases (Lev 23:11; Lev 23:15; comp. Jos 5:11). See Mayer, Commetar, ad loc., Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 142; Methodist Quarterly Review, 1850, p. 492; also the monographs De Sabbato Deuteroproto, by Muller (Rust. 1665), Goloner (Viteb. s. a.), Van Til (L. B. 1708). SEE PASSOVER; SEE PENTECOST; SEE SABBATH.

## Secondary[[@Headword:Secondary]]

             a clerk who, if learned and expert in music, was eligible for promotion, by the dean, to the place of vicar. He was the carton's personal attendant, and sat in the secondary row of stalls: hence his name. At Chichester the secondary sang the daily mass of requiem in the Lady-chapel. It was also a technical term for a cathedral dignitary of second rank and posi-tion — a minor canon, precentor.

## Secret[[@Headword:Secret]]

             SEE MYSTERY.

Secret Discipline (Lat. arcani disciplina), a term used to signify a practice of the early Christian Church of performing the rites of religion with secrecy. It was founded upon the words of Christ, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs," etc. (Mat 7:6), and began to be common shortly after the middle of the 2d century. The first reason for its adoption was to guard the more sacred and mysterious doctrines from popular misconception and blasphemy among the pagans. The discipline of the secret appears in several forms:

(1.) Both unbelievers and catechumens were dismissed from the church, when the ordinary service was closed, by one of the deacons, who said, "Ire, missa est" — " Go, the assembly is dismissed." After this the sacrament was administered.

(2.) The lectures addressed by the presiding teacher to the body of catechumens in general were confined to the general doctrines of Christianity. The more mysterious doctrines, those which regarded the  sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, called "Mystagogie," were only communicated at the close, and to those only who had undergone the preliminary probation.

(3.) The eucharist, if referred to at all in the presence of the uninitiated, was spoken of in words so conceived as to conceal its nature. Some very curious examples of this concealment might be cited — e, g. Epiphanius, referring to the formula "this is my. body," writes, "This is my that thing" (Τοῦτό μου ἐστι τόδε). The mysteries thus specially guarded were baptism, the unction, or chrism ordination of priests, the Lord's supper, liturgy, the knowledge of the Holy Trinity, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq. p. 85. SEE ARCANI DISCIPLINIA.

## Secret Of The Mass[[@Headword:Secret Of The Mass]]

             a prayer in the canon of the mass before the preface, and having much the same tenor as the collect. Since the 10th century it is said in a low voice by the celebrant after the Orate fred. tres. In France it was marked with the mystic letters V.D. St. Gregory calls it the Canon of the Secret. According to some writers, it represents that the working of God in the holy communion passes man's understanding; but, as Cranmer explains it, Christ's secret conversation which he had with his disciples before his passion. The bells in England were forbidden to be rung during this service in 1701. The secrets were formerly called super oblata and may have taken their name from the secretion of gifts and oblations.

## Secretae[[@Headword:Secretae]]

             any prayers said secretly and not aloud. Anciently, at the commencement of the divine office, the Lord's Prayer and Hail Mary were said silently, as also other portions of the same office. But this rule was abolished in the English Church during the changes which took place three centuries ago, though it still obtains in the Latin communion. See, Glossary of Liturgical Terms, s.v.

## Secretaria[[@Headword:Secretaria]]

             a name given to the sessions of the councils in the early Christian Church because they Were held in the secretarium (q.v.).

## Secretarium (Or Secretum)[[@Headword:Secretarium (Or Secretum)]]

             a part of early Christian churches, which was also called diaconicum (q.v.). It was called secretarium, as Ducange conjectures, because the consistory or tribunal of the Church was here kept, the secretum or seeretariura being a known name for the courts of the civil magistrate. Others suppose it derived its name from its being a place of safety, or the robing-room of the officiating clergy.

## Secretarius[[@Headword:Secretarius]]

             (1) the confidential correspondent of a bishop, abbot, head of a college, or other ecclesiastical dignitary.

(2) A sacristan or sexton.

## Sect [In Biblical Usage][[@Headword:Sect [In Biblical Usage]]]

             (αἵρεσις, i.e. division; hence "heresy," Act 24:14; 1Co 11:19; Gal 5:20; 2Pe 2:1), a religious party (Act 5:17, etc.); hence discord (1Co 11:19, etc.). Among the Jews there were several sects mentioned in the New Test., distinguished by their practices and opinions, yet united in communion with each other and with the body of their tuition. SEE SECTS, JEWISH. Christianity was originally considered as a new sect of Judaism; hence Ter-tullus, accusing Paul before Felix, says that he was chief of the seditious sect of the Nazarenes (Act 24:5); and the Jews of Rome said to the apostle when he arrived in that city that, "as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Act 28:22). Peter (2Pe 2:1-10) foretells that false teachers should arise among them "who privily shall bring in damnable heresies [or sects], even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." He adds that these people, being great lovers of themselves, are not afraid to introduce new sects, where the word sect is taken in the same sense as heresy. SEE HERESY.

Among the Greeks the philosophers were divided into different sects; as the Academics, the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Cynics, the Epicureans, etc. The Jews, in imitation of the Greeks, began to divide themselves into sects about the time of the Maccabees; and it seems as if the Corinthians had a mind to introduce something like this into Christianity when they boasted, I  am a disciple of Peter, I of Paul, I of Apollos (1Co 1:12; 1Co 3:22, etc.). SEE DIVISION.

## Sect [In Ecclesiastical Usage][[@Headword:Sect [In Ecclesiastical Usage]]]

             (Lat. secta, cut off), a collective term comprehending all such as follow the doctrines and Opinions of some divine, philosopher, etc. By the Roman Catholic Church it is applied to all those religious bodies which separated from her communion. By Protestants, generally, it is employed in no opprobrious sense to signify the various organizations into which the Protestant churches are divided. Separate organization rather than difference of opinion is the meaning conveyed by the term; for great and known differences in opinion, when followed by no external breach in the society, are not considered as constituting distinct sects. Thus High and Low Church are only called parties, because they have not formed separate communions. Among the Jews the term was differently understood, for among them there were no separate communities erected, if we except the Samaritans. The same Temple and the same synagogues were attended alike by Pharisees and Sadducees. They were often of both denominations in the Sanhedrim and even in the priesthood. Another difference was, also, that the name of the sect was not applied to all the people who adopted the same opinions, but solely to the men of eminence among them, who were considered as the leaders of the party. There have been, from time to time, a great number of sects, separating, often on points of no importance, from some other Church organization. These are treated of in separate articles, and it will only be necessary to add here that with respect to certain sects, especially those belonging to the first centuries, we have no other information than such as is afforded by their foes, who were not always scrupulous in their theological warfare. Their statements should, the}e- fore, often be taken with considerable allowance. SEE SECTS, CHRISTIAN.

## Sectarianism[[@Headword:Sectarianism]]

             devotion or adhesion to a sect, generally signifies that spirit which makes more of the sect or organization than of the cause of Christ.

## Sectaries[[@Headword:Sectaries]]

             a term used to denote those who adhere to the same sect and maintain the same doctrines.

## Section[[@Headword:Section]]

             the representation of a building cut asunder vertically so as to show the interior; also of a moulding or other member in architecture cut asunder so as to show its profile.

## Sects, Christian[[@Headword:Sects, Christian]]

             The various sects which have arisen in the Church from time to time are, treated of under their several appropriate captions in this Cyclopaedia. This article has to do simply with the idea of sectarianism, and with the ethical and legal aspects which the question assumes in certain lands.

The word sect occurs in classical literature (in Cicero, Tacitus, etc.) in the sense of sequor as involving the idea of separation to some leader rather than that of separation from some body. It consequently might be applied to Christianity itself at the beginning, when devotion to Jesus of Nazareth seemed to be the prominent trait of the new tendency. In a later period the word came to signify separation from, as if derived from secure, to cut off. This has continued to be its principal meaning to our day. Protestantism is evidently prohibited from employing the word in this sense by the fundamental principle which concedes the right to personal convictions and the free expression of beliefs; • and it is a somewhat unusual term in the vocabulary of American ecclesiasticism, whose occurrence in almost every instance is explained by an implication of heresy as charged upon the ecclesiastical body to which the term is applied.

In European countries where State churches have been established the case is different. Separation has there often been regarded an odious offence, and has sometimes been construed into a crime against the State. The Pietism of the 17th century did something to break down this prejudice by revealing to the world an orthodoxy and piety superior to those of the churches, and the pseudo-enlightenment of later days likewise contributed to this end by advocating an absolute freedom of thought; but in both continental and insular Europe the term sect still carries with it a stigma, and to many minds involves the notion of heinous guilt.

In the Romish Church this term is not in general use, and is employed only as the synonym of heresy or schism. This meaning was adopted by the  Reformers and developed, so that Luther regards the sect as a mob and a fanatical clique. Both Lutherans and Reformed refused to tolerate any deviation from scriptural standards as understood by themselves, an apparent inconsequence whose explanation lies in the fact that these men had attained to positive convictions of truth; they saw but a single and exclusive object on which faith might lay hold, and could not conceive of diversities of view respecting that object. The unhappy Peasants' War confirmed Luther in his aversion to the idea of absolute toleration, and his influence contributed towards Raking sectarianism an offence against both Church and State.

The efforts of men to prevent the development of sects were, however, always counteracted by principles which underlay the ecclesiastical systems held by themselves. Not only does this apply to the principle of Protestantism, that freedom of religious belief is the right of every person, but it is shown in the results of territorialism and collegialism in the churches of Germany. The former of these systems had for its leading principle the notion that the ruling prince of any territory should possess absolute power over the exercise of religion within his dominions, but that he should regard all religious as equal so long as none of them should endanger the welfare of the State. The latter system practically located all ecclesiastical power in the particular congregation. It is evident that neither of these systems was calculated to repress a tendency towards sectarianism. Another factor in the problem was furnished by the extensive changes made in the map of Europe at the close of the 18th century, the breaking-up of states and dividing of their populations insuring a more cosmopolitan character to the inhabitants of countries, and thus reacting on their relations to the Church. When, finally, it came to be understood that the only claim of an evangelical Church to recognition by the State is that its roots strike down into the faith of the people, the last barrier in the way of complete toleration was practically overthrown. The logic of the situation is clear, and a hearty acceptance of the conclusion to which it leads is delayed only by prejudice and political considerations. In most of' the countries of Protestant Europe, however, grave difficulties still prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical functions by dissenting ministers, and the established churches are favored by existing laws.

The relation of private conscience to the question of sectarianism regarded as a separation from an existing Church evidently demands consideration under every ecclesiastical system. Frequently the motive which lends to the  separation of an individual from his Church not a good one: he is devoted to some specialty which he general Church disregards in her teachings, e.g. Millenarianism, etc., or he finds too much of worldliness, fashion, regard for wealth, etc., in the Church, and too many unworthy members. Clearly, separation from Church of Christ in which the pure Word of God is reached and the sacraments are duly administered is allowable only in answer to the clear call of duty; and,' s a general rule, separation should take place only by compulsion, as in the case of the separation of Luther corn the Romish and of Wesley from the Anglican Church. On the whole subject, see Herzog, Real-Encyklop, s.v., and the literature there mentioned.

## Sects, Jewish (Ancient)[[@Headword:Sects, Jewish (Ancient)]]

             These were of two kinds, arising from the fact that the differences of opinion, sentiment, and conduct were sometimes of a theosophical and sometimes of a practical character; but, among the ancient Jews, so close was the connection of Church and State that all theological or philosophical views necessarily affected the civil and social relations.

I. Religious. —

1. The Pharisees. — These were the orthodox party, and our Lord testifies to the general correctness of their creed (Mat 22:3). It was chiefly in liturgical and ceremonial particulars that their excessive regard for traditional observances was betrayed. In this regard the Rabbinical Jews of modern times are their acknowledged successors. SEE RABBINISM. In external deportment they were scrupulously exact; but, their motive being a love of popularity and a pride of self righteousness, they were sternly rebuked by our Lord as arch hypocrites and ecclesiastical tyrants. SEE PHARISEE.

2. The Sadducees. — These were next in importance, and of even more aristocratic influence, but they were the rationalists of their day (Act 23:8). They are represented by inimical writers as the originals of the modern Karaites (q.v.). SEE SADDUCEE.

3. The Essenes. — These were rather a class of ascetics or Jewish hermits, who are not mentioned in the New Test., and are chiefly known from the description of Josephus, who at one time belonged to their fraternity. SEE ESSENES.

II. Political. —

1. The Zealots. — These are mentioned in the New Test. and by Josephus as the violent party who contended for native rights and independence from all foreign influence. They had their type in the Chasidim of earlier and later times. SEE ASSIDAEAN. They largely contributed to the final collision of the Jews with the Romans. SEE ZELOTES.

2. The Herodians. — These appear, from the slight notices of them (Mat 2:16, etc.), to have been the temporizing party, who favored Graeco-Roman innovations. They had their originals in the apostates under Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan 11:35). SEE HERODIAN.  On the subject generally, see, in addition to the works cited under the articles on each of the above, Serarii, Drusii et Scaligeri Opusc. de Trib. Judoeorum Sectis (Delph. 1703); separately, Drusius, De Hassidoeis (Franek. 1603); De Sectis Judaicis (Arnh. 1619); Serarius, De Tribus Sectis, etc. (Franek. 1603; Mainz, 1604); Scaliger, De Tribus Jud. Hoeresibus (Franek. 1605; Arnh. 1619); Lund, De Sectis Judoerum (Upsal. 1700); Geiger, Sadducäer und Pharisäer (Bresl. 1863); Die Ebioniter des Alten Testaments, in the Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wiss. des Judenthums, Jan. 1869; Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1868, p. 128.

## Sects, Jewish (Modern)[[@Headword:Sects, Jewish (Modern)]]

             In the 17th century existed the sect of the Sabbathaites, so called after Sabbathai-Zebi (q.v.), whose apostasy to Islamism, and death in 1676, did not diminish the number of his followers, but rather increased it; and as there is no calculating the obstinacy of human credulity, his followers gave out that he had been transported to heaven, like Enoch and Elijah. Notwithstanding the constant and active opposition of the Jewish priesthood, the sect spread in all quarters, and numbered among its members men like Mose Chayim Luzzatto (q.v.). “Sabbathaism,” says Milman, “still exists as a sect of Judaism, though, probably, among most of its believers, rather supported by that corporate spirit which holds the followers of a political or religious faction together than by any distinct and definite articles of belief.”

But, in the middle of the last century, an extraordinary adventurer named Jacob Frank (q.v.) organized a sect out of the wrecks of the Sabbathaic party, of which we will speak now, although in the order of time an earlier sect, that of the Chasidim, ought to be mentioned. The sect which Frank organized assumed the name of Soharites or Cabalists, also of Frankists. As to the creed of this sect, it leaned towards Christianity rather than Islamism. It rejected the Talmud, but insisted on a hidden sense in the Scriptures. It admitted the Trinity and the incarnation of the Deity, but preserved an artful ambiguity as to the person in whom the Deity was incarnate, whether Jesus Christ or Sabbathai-Zebi. With the death of Frank the whole movement seems to have abated. Of greater significance is the sect of the Hassidim, or Chasidim (q.v.), or New Saints, or Pietists. The founder of this sect was Rabbi Israel ben-Eliezer Baal-Shem, also called Besht, בעשט, from the initials of בעל שם טיב As the tenets of these.  Saints, who still exist. in Poland, Galicia, etc., are given in the article CHASIDIM, we can only refer to it. (B.P.)

## Secular Clergy[[@Headword:Secular Clergy]]

             Parish priests and all who were charged with the cure of souls were named clerici seculares, so called as living according to the manners of the time (seculum). They were so called in contradistinction to regular clergy (q.v.), who belonged to the monastic orders or religious congregations.

## Secular Court, Delivering Up To The[[@Headword:Secular Court, Delivering Up To The]]

             a punishment peculiar to delinquent clergymen. The ancient law comprises it under the name of curioe tradi, and gave to it a different meaning from that which modern use and practice has put upon it. Among the modern canonists it signifies delivering a clergyman up to the secular judge after degradation, to be punished for some great crime with death, or such capital punishment as the Church had no power to inflict. In the old law the curia has a larger sense, not only to denote the judge's court, but the corporation of any city. In this there were some servile offices; and when a clergyman was degraded for any offense and reduced to the quality of layman, he was obliged to serve the curia, or secular corporation of the city, and that, many times, only in some mean office and servile condition. This was looked upon as being a slave to an earthly power, and precluded him from ever regaining his clerical dignity again, for no curiale was allowed to enter the ecclesiastical state. Besides this, there was another way of delivering over delinquent clergymen to the secular courts, which was when they had committed crimes such as were properly of civil cognizance; for clergymen were considered in a double capacity — as ministers of the Church and as members of the commonwealth. See Bingham, Antiq. of the Christ. Church, p. 1033.

## Secular Power[[@Headword:Secular Power]]

             SEE SECULAR COURT.

## Secular Sermons[[@Headword:Secular Sermons]]

             in Roman Catholic terminology, are discourses preached at the centennial jubilee of any religious or benevolent institution, association, etc. Their purpose is to review the history and work of the agency in question, or to rehearse the displays of divine grace manifested in and through its life. The  scope of such sermons will consequently be determined in each case by the character of the solemnities of which they form a part. An appropriate treatment of the theme selected will include the presentation of noteworthy features belonging to the subject, or the discussion of some religious topic which may be deduced from or illustrated by the occasion in which the celebration takes its rise, followed by direct application of the theme, and concluding with a prayer or doxology or a suitable exhortation. The style and mode of delivery should be solemn. When the celebration is on account of a nonreligious subject, the nature of religious discourse requires that it be discussed in its religious or moral bearings.

## Secularism[[@Headword:Secularism]]

             an atheistical movement which prevailed in England during the sixth decade of the present century to an extent that gained it many followers and excited much attention. Its leading apostle was George J. Holyoake, a friend to Robert Owen and his socialistic views. Holyoake and several like minded associates founded a journal named The Reasoner, in 1846, which speedily became the recognized organ of the modern school of English freethinkers. Its governing principle was atheism, though Holyoake and his friends preferred to designate the tendency they represented as non-theism, inasmuch as they simply refrained from inquiring whether a Deity exist or not. The term Secularism was subsequently applied to the entire movement, whose professed aim was proclaimed to be “to live and die for, the world, and to work for the welfare of men in this world.” The ethics of the party — was comprehended in the phrase “present human improvement by present human means,” its law had regard simply to the natural, utilitarian, and artistic aspects of life; its object was merely scientific culture and a suitable provision for the things of this life. The leading, and, indeed, the only principle of the morality of this movement is utility and the movement itself may be characterized as a thoroughly consistent utilitarianism, and also as an “atheistical ethics built upon the ruins of religion,” since no supernatural element is permitted to exercise any influence whatever over the actions of these worldly moralists.

The dogmatics of Secularism, if the term may be applied to a systematic negation of all positive doctrines, is analogous to its ethics in character. It denies that any competent knowledge concerning the existence of God is possessed by the world: matter, though self existent and eternal, is not God, since it lacks the constituent factors of personality — self  consciousness and freewill. Experience teaches that there is no Providence, no Father in heaven. The teleological argument for God's existence is valueless, yielding only a “confused reflection of man's own image:” on the one hand, it leads only to uncertain analogies; on the other, it proves too much, as it becomes necessary, after postulating a most wise Creator of the most wisely arranged creation, to assume a still wiser originator, and so on without end. In this line of argument Holyoake connects himself with the atheistical poet Shelley and the naturalist Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, and directs his criticism chiefly against Paley's Natural Theology. The secularists assert that nothing is known respecting the world beyond the grave, and that we are therefore not to concern ourselves about its conditions; our moral efforts should be wholly expended upon the present world. “If other worlds exist to which we are removed after this life is over, precisely they who have made it their one business to promote the common welfare of mankind in this world will be best able to enjoy them; if there be no hereafter, men evidently stand in their own light if they omit to enjoy this world.” (Comp. Holyoake, The Logic of Death [Lond. 1849]).

It is to be remarked that the relation between Secularism and the Positivism of Comte (q.v.) is such as to warrant the statement that Secularism is merely the French Positivism translated into English.

See Positivismus u. Secularismus, etc., in Neue Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1863, Nos. 19 and 20; Buchanan, Faith in God and Modern Atheism Compared (Lond. 1857, 2 vols.; The Theory of Secularism in 2, 223-291, also published separately); Christian Examiner for Nov. 1859. SEE SECULARISTS.

## Secularists[[@Headword:Secularists]]

             the name assumed by a sect of modern unbelievers to express their fundamental tenet that the duties and interests connected with the world which we see around us are those with which alone we have any concern. The Secularists are atheists, so far as they consider the existence of a personal God an open question, for belief in which no sufficient proofs are adduced. They are pantheists, so far as they consider nature to be the only God whose existence can be at all demonstrated. Another essential article of their creed is that “science is the providence of men, and that absolute spiritual dependence may involve material destruction.” Science they define to be “those methodized agencies which are at our command; that systematized knowledge which enables us to use the powers of nature for  human benefit.” The doctrine, then, of the Secularists is that if men properly use the powers of nature which are within their reach, they have no need to resort to prayer, with the view of seeking assistance from heaven. On the subject of morality they maintain that “there exist, independently of Scripture authority, guarantees of morals in human nature, intelligence, and utility.” The facts and doctrines ‘of Christianity are, of course, denied by them. Although the Secularists profess to be independent thinkers, their principles are in reality nothing more or less than the echo of rationalism and positivism among the less educated classes of thoughtful men. See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Secularization[[@Headword:Secularization]]

             of persons belonging to religious orders in the Roman Catholic Church, is a term which denotes the severing of the vows which bind to poverty and monastic obedience. Permission to this end can proceed only from the papal chair, and is but rarely granted. The persons affected thereby are clergymen in the higher orders of the ministry, who are thus transferred to the secular clergy, and permitted to live outside of their monasteries (clerici seculares); and nuns, and the lay brothers and sisters of suppressed convents, who have taken the vows of their orders upon them, and are by this act restored to the world, though salvo voto castitatis. Secularization differs from laicizing, or entire dissolution of the rule imposed by the order, in that the latter absolves from the vow of chastity and makes marriage valid.

## Seculars[[@Headword:Seculars]]

             In the early Christian Church there existed a distinction between the clergy and laity, the latter being called not only laymen, but also βιωτικοί, “seculars” (Chrysostom, Homr. 3, in Laz.; Hom. 23 in Romans; Hom. 35 in 1 Corinthians 14; Theodoret, Com. in 1Co 14:16). See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 191.

## Secundians[[@Headword:Secundians]]

             a Gnostic sect of the 2d century, owning for their leader Secundus, “who was born,” says Hippolytus, “about the same time as Ptolemaeus,” and thus was contemporary with the immediate followers of Valentinus. Irenaeus represents the Secundians as a branch of the Valentinian school (Hoeres. 1,  11, 2); but, although they emanated from that school (Hippolytus, Refut. 6, 32, 33), they introduced a principle so distinct as to render Secundus more properly a rival than the disciple of Valentinus. Secundus placed at the head of his AEons, whom he appears to have considered as real substances or persons, two principles, Light and Darkness. “He divides the Ogdoad into a pair of Tetrads, a right hand and a left Tetrad, one Light and the other Darkness” (Tertullian Adv. Valent. 38). This admission of the principle of dualism constitutes an essential difference between the Secundians and the Valentinians. It is evidently borrowed from the Oriental philosophy, and brings the Secundians so far nearer the Manichaeans. Accordingly, Dorner classes as adherents of the dualism whose character was predominantly physical, the Ophites, Saturnilus, Secundus, and subsequently the Manichaeans; as adherents of pantheistic Monism; Valentinus and his widespread school, especially Heracleon his contemporary, Ptolemaeus, and Marcus (Person of Christ, 1, append. p. 448). There is also mentioned as a distinction between the Valentinians and Secundus that the latter did not derive the power Acharnoth from any one of the thirty AEons, but from the fruits which issued out of their substance (Tertullian, ut sup.). He invented first four more AEons, and then four in addition (Pseudo-Tertullian, 13). The Secundians were Docetae. Augustine (Hoeres. 12) and Auctor Praedestinati (12) charge them with gross immorality. The latter adds that they were condemned by Diodorus, bishop of Crete.

## Secundinus[[@Headword:Secundinus]]

             the name of two persons in the early Christian Church.

1. A Manichaean of Africa, who wrote against Augustine because of his departure from that heresy. Augustine replied to him, under date of about A.D. 405, in the tract Contra Secundinum Manichoeum, lib. 1, showing why he had embraced orthodox views, and confuting the Manichaeans from the letter of his opponent (Migne, Patrologie, 43, Op. August. p. 578).

2. A son of the Lombard Restitutus and Dareca, a sister of St. Patrick. He lived in Ireland from A.D. 439, and died at the age of seventy-five, in 459. Secundinus was bishop of Domnach, and composed an ode on St. Patrick during the life of the latter, which was long on the lips of the Irish. It is given in Migne (Patrologie, 53, 838). Immediately after having composed  the above, ode, he died, thus verifying a prediction of St. Patrick. He was buried at Domnach (Acta Sanctorum, March 17, p. 523 sq., in the life of St. Patrick.

## Secundus[[@Headword:Secundus]]

             (the Lat. word Graecized, Σεκοῦνδος), a Christian of Thessalonica, and one of the party who went with the apostle Paul from Corinth as far as Asia (ἄχρι τῆς Α᾿σίας), probably to Troas or Miletus (all of them so far, some farther), on his return to Jerusalem from his third missionary tour (Act 20:4). A.D. 55.

## Secundus (2)[[@Headword:Secundus (2)]]

             (heretic). SEE SECUNDIANS.

## Securitas[[@Headword:Securitas]]

             in Roman mythology, was a personification of security, represented on coins as a quietly gazing matron, with the nether limbs crossed, the left elbow braced against a column, and the right hand placed over the head. She is furnished with a spear, a cornucopia, and an olive or palm branch.

## Sedecias[[@Headword:Sedecias]]

             (Σεδεκίας), the Graecized form of the Hebrew name Zedekiah (q.v.), applied in the Apocrypha to two men 1. A person mentioned (Baruch 1, 1) as the father of Maaseiah, himself the grandfather of Baruch, and apparently identical with the false prophet Zedekiah in Jer 29:21-22; Jeremiah 2. The “son of Josiah, king of Judah” (Bar. 1, 8), the Zedekiah under whom Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians.

## Seder Kodashim[[@Headword:Seder Kodashim]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder Moed[[@Headword:Seder Moed]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder Nashim[[@Headword:Seder Nashim]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder Nezikin[[@Headword:Seder Nezikin]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder Olam[[@Headword:Seder Olam]]

             (סֵדֶר עוֹלָם), or the Succession of the World's History, is an ancient Jewish chronicle, written by R. Jose ben-Chalafta, of Sepphoris, who flourished about A.D. 100-150. In thirty chapters it professes to give the history of Israel up to the time of the author, or rather to the termination of the last Jewish war under Bar-cocheba. At the close of the work there are some omissions, which, in part, are compensated by another historical work which bears the same title, but, in contradistinction to the Seder Olam, or the Seder Olam Rabba (סדר עולם רבא)=the Major Chronicle, it is designated the Seder Olam Zutta (סדר עולם זוטא)= the Minor Chronicle. The best edition of the Seder Olam is that by Meyer (Amsterdam, 1699), which appeared together with the Seder Olam Zutta, a Latin translation, and very elaborate annotations; See Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 2, 107 sq.; Zunz, Gottesdienstl. Vorträge, p. 85, 138; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden. 4:536 sq.; Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 263 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 32. (B.P.)

## Seder Tohoroth[[@Headword:Seder Tohoroth]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder Zeraim[[@Headword:Seder Zeraim]]

             SEE MISHNA.

## Seder ha-Doroth[[@Headword:Seder ha-Doroth]]

             SEE HEILPRIN, JECHIEL.

## Sedes[[@Headword:Sedes]]

             (Lat. a seat), a term used by the Latin ecclesiastical writers to denote a bishop's throne, which, with the thrones of his presbyters on each side of it, were arranged in a semicircle above the altar. Some suppose this to have been so arranged in imitation of the Jewish synagogues, in which, according to Maimonides, at the upper end the law was placed in the wall in an arch, and on each side the elders were seated in a semicircle. The  bishop's seat was usually covered with some decent material, suitable to the dignity of his office and person. See Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, 1, 299.

## Sedes Apostolica[[@Headword:Sedes Apostolica]]

             SEE APOSTOLICAL.

## Sedes Impedita[[@Headword:Sedes Impedita]]

             (a hindered see). An expression by which the canons designate the state of the papal or an episcopal office when its functions are seriously hindered or altogether interrupted by the force of difficulties from without.

1. The interruption of episcopal functions (sedes episcopalis impedita) may be occasioned (1) when outward foes (pagans or heretics) have seized the occupant of the chair and hold him prisoner. In this case the chapter administers the diocese, either directly or through a vicar, until the will of the pope can be ascertained (Sext. c. 3; De Suppl. Negl. Proel. 1, 8). (2) When a bishop is removed from his diocese and imprisoned by the government of his own country. The chapter must then immediately report the circumstance to the papal chair, and until the case is decided the administration will rest in the hands of the vicar-general on the spot (comp. Phillips and Görres, Hist.-polit. Blätter, vol. 2, No. 3, p. 158 sq.). (3) When the bishop has been suspended or excommunicated, or when physical weakness or mental imbecility unfits him for the further exercise of his office. Since in the former case the action emanated directly from the papal chair, and that action operates to destroy the official authority of the vicar- general at the same time (Sext. c. 1; De Off. Vicar. 1, 13), the pope at once makes provision for the temporary government of the diocese. In the latter case an episcopal coadjutor must be appointed.

2. Papal functions are interrupted (sedes apostolica impedita) when the pope is imprisoned and prevented from administering his office, in which case as many cardinals as may be available perform its functions so far as strict necessity requires, or as the provisional directions of the pope himself may allow; or when hostile powers prevent access to the papal chair or render it extremely difficult. In this case the authority of bishops within their dioceses is extended to take such provisional action as may become necessary, but in harmony with the current practice of the apostolical chair.

## Sedes Vacans[[@Headword:Sedes Vacans]]

             (a vacant see), strictly a vacancy of the papal or an episcopal chair, since the term sedes (θρόνος) is applied only to apostolica, i.e. Roman and other episcopal sees; but it is in use extended to abbeys, prelatures, and all dignities to which the right of collating to benefices belongs. For the rules which govern in the event of the vacation of the papal chair, SEE CARDINAL; SEE CONCLAVE; SEE POPE. This article will be devoted to the subject with reference to bishoprics only.

A sedes vacans occurs by death, resignation, translation, deprivation, etc., and continues until a successor has been regularly installed. The current business of a bishopric during such interim was formerly administered by its presbytery, but subsequently, after the 4th century, by an officer termed intercessor, interventor, visitator, or commendator. A provision was made that the see should be filled within a year, in order, to prevent the seizure of the office by the temporary administrators, and also to hinder secular lords from appropriating the income of a vacant see. Still later the temporary administration was intrusted to the chapters, at first in spiritualia, and afterwards in temporalities as well. The modern usage is based on the decisions of the Council of Trent and of the Congregatio Concilii. The episcopal jurisdiction during a vacancy inheres in the chapter, but is administered by one or more “oeconomists” and a capitular vicar, who may be the general vicar of the late bishop, and all of whom must be appointed within eight days after knowledge of the vacancy has been obtained. The capitular vicar must be a doctor or licentiate of canon law, or else possess abilities in that direction, and, must be taken from the chapter if a suitable person can be found. When there is no chapter, or when the chapter neglects to appoint administrators, the metropolitan is empowered to act in its stead if the church be a suffragan church, the oldest suffragan bishop if it be a metropolitan church, and the nearest bishop if it be an exempt church. The capitular vicar is not the agent of the chapter in this instance, but administers independently; and he is not liable to be deprived of his office without sufficient reason, the determining of which does not rest with the chapter, but with the Congregatio super Negotiis Episcoporum. Certain general limitations, however, restrict his action. All episcopal rights which inhere in the ordo episcopalis, or are delegated by the pope, are in abeyance during the vacancy, except as provision for their exercise is otherwise made by the curia, or circumstances compel the employment of a neighboring bishop. A year of mourning (annus luctus) is  appointed, during which no orders may be conferred within the bishopric, except they become necessary to administer a benefice which has been, or is about to be, received. Nor may the capitular vicar dispose of benefices which are subject to the bishop's collation, or the income of the diocese be in any way employed, except perhaps to pay the salary of the administrator. No real estate may be transferred to other hands, and, in general, no change which might result in disadvantage to the future bishop may be introduced. The sedes vacans ends with the installation of the new bishop, who is authorized to exact a complete account of the bishopric and its administration during the interim. A quasi vacans is distinguished from the sedes vacans, for which SEE SEDES IMPEDITA.

On the general subject, comp. the literature given in Pütter, Lit. des deutsch. Staatsrechts, vol. 3, § 1461; in Klüber's Fortsetzung, vol. 4:§ 1461, p. 528, 529; Ferraris, Bibliotheca: Canonica, s.v.; Ritter, Der Capitular-Vikar (Münster, 1842); Rau, Rechte der Domcapitel, etc., in the Tüb. theol. Quartalschrift, 1842, 3, 365-412; Huller, Die jurist. Persönlichkeit d. kath. Domcapitel in Deutschland (Bamberg, 1860).

## Sedgwick, Obadiah[[@Headword:Sedgwick, Obadiah]]

             a Nonconformist divine, was born at Marlborough, in Wiltshire, England, in 1600, and educated at Queen's College and at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He became chaplain to lord Horatio Vere, whom he accompanied to the Netherlands. Returning to Oxford, he was admitted to the reading of sentences in 1629. He preached at St. Mildred's, London, until interrupted by the bishop, and in 1639 became vicar of Coggeshall, Essex. In the rebellion he took part against the Church and State. In 1646 he was preacher at St. Paul's, Covent Garden; and, retiring to Marlborough, he died there in January, 1658. The principal of his works are, The Fountain Opened (1657): — An Exposition of Psalms 23 (1658, 4to): — The Anatomy of Secret Sins (1660): — Parable of the Prodigal (1660): Synopsis of Christianity.

## Sedile[[@Headword:Sedile]]

             (plur. sedilia), the Latin name for a seat, a term which in modern times has come to be pretty generally applied by way of distinction to the seats on the south side of the choir near the altar in churches, used in the Roman Catholic service by the priest and his attendants, the deacon and subdeacon, during certain parts of the mass; or in the Episcopal Church for the priests and deacons during the eucharistic service. Sedilia were sometimes movable, but more usually in England were formed of masonry and recessed in the wall like niches. Sedilia are comparatively rare on the Continent, but very numerous examples remain in Great Britain, a few of which are of as early date as the latter part of the 12th century; but the majority are later, extending to the end of the Perpendicular style. The earliest form in the catacombs, and repeated at St. David's, was a bishop's throne flanked by collateral seats. In general they contain three separate. seats, but occasionally two, or only one, and in a few rare instances four, as at Rothwell Church, Northamptonshire, and Furness Abbey; or five, as at Southwell Minster; sometimes a single seat under one arch, or formed on the back of a window, is found, long enough for two or three persons. They are very commonly placed at different levels, the eastern seat being a step the highest and the western the lowest; but sometimes, when three are used, the two western seats are on the same level, a step below the other, and sometimes the two eastern are level and the western a step below them. The decorations used about them are various, and in enriched buildings they are occasionally highly ornamented, and sometimes sur mounted with tabernacle work, pinnacles, etc. Some ancient sedilia consist of plain benches formed of masses of masonry projecting from the wall, and it is not improbable that such may have once existed in some of the churches in which no traces of these seats are now to be found. At Lenham Church, Kent, is a single seat projecting considerably from the wall (though the back is slightly recessed), with stone elbows resembling an armchair: this is popularly called the confessional. At Beckley Church, Oxfordshire, is also a single stone seat with one elbow.

## Sedition[[@Headword:Sedition]]

             In the early Church, kings and emperors were looked upon as political parents, whose authority and majesty were reputed sacred and supreme under God. All disloyalty or disrespect shown them, either in word or action, was always severely chastised by the laws of the Church. For the first three hundred years, Christians gloried over the heathens in this, that though the emperors were heathen, and some of them furious persecutors of the Christians, yet there were never any seditious or disloyal persons to be found among them. The fourth Council of Carthage forbids the ordination of any seditious person. The fourth Council of Toledo orders all clergymen that took up arms in any sedition to be degraded from their order, and to be confined to a monastery to do penance all their lives. See Bingham Antiq. of the Christ. Church, p. 985 sq.

## Sedlnitzky, Leopold Von[[@Headword:Sedlnitzky, Leopold Von]]

             formerly prince-bishop of Breslau, was born July 29, 1787, at Geppersdorf, in Austro-Silesia. Appointed for the Church, he was educated accordingly, and in 1798 the cathedral chapter of Breslau already nominated him as dean. In 1804 he commenced his studies at the Breslau University, where ex-Jesuits or their pupils were his teachers. In 1830, Sedlnitzky (not Seldnitzky, as Dr. Kurtz has it) was made provost of the chapter, and in 1835 prince-bishop. In the different positions which Sedlnitzky occupied, he had the best opportunity of seeing the doings of the hierarchy. A rupture with the see of Rome became finally a mere question of time, and on May 10, 1840, he resigned his bishopric. Frederick William IV, then king of Prussia, appointed him as member of the council of state, and thus he was obliged to take up his abode at Berlin. He now studied Church history and symbolics. The authority of the councils lost its power with him, as not founded upon the Holy Scriptures. He saw that the faith in the free grace of God in Christ, and not the episcopal government, was the uniting link of the Church. At first he attended the divine service of his Church, but this he soon abandoned, and listened to the preaching in different evangelical churches. He had a great desire for the Lord's supper, and it was a great pain to him to be deprived of this communion with the Lord and the brethren. After many hard inward struggles, he resolved in 1863 to join the evangelical Church, and in the church of Friedrich Werder he partook of the Lord's supper. From his own means he founded two institutions at Berlin — the Paulinum in 1862 and Johanneum in 1864 — both for the  education of teachers for the school and Church. In Breslau, also, he founded an institution for evangelical students of theology. Sedlnitzky died May 25, 1871, being the first Roman Catholic bishop who after the time of the Reformation became a convert to the evangelical Church. See Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (1874), 2, 262, especially the autobiography of Sedlnitzky, which was published in 1872, and which is an important contribution to modern Church history. For a review of this biography, see Hauck, Theologischer Jahresbericht, 1871, 7, 700 sq. (B.P.)

## Sedulius[[@Headword:Sedulius]]

             an Irish prelate, was called bishop of Dublin in 785 in the martyrologies of Mariani Gorman, and those of Tullagh. He died February 12, 785. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 24.

## Sedulius, Caius Coelius (Or Caecilius)[[@Headword:Sedulius, Caius Coelius (Or Caecilius)]]

             a priest and Christian poet in the reigns of Theodosius II and Valentinian III. Little is known respecting his parentage and life. He is said to have taught philosophy and rhetoric in Italy, and to have subsequently become a priest in Achaia, and ultimately a bishop. The year of his death is not known. He obtains recognition chiefly as the author of a number of religious writings, among them the hexameter poem Carmen Paschale, etc., in which Old Test. miracles, the miracles of Christ's life, and finally his death, resurrection, and ascension, are treated — the whole in opposition to the heretical views of Arius and Sabellius. Various editions of this poem have been published — by Cellarius (1704), Gallandi (1773), and others, the latest edition being by Arevalo, or Aurival (Rome, 1794). In response to the request of the priest Macedonius, Sedulius translated the work into prose, and called it Opus Paschale. Two other hymns are also attributed to him — namely, Elegia, or Collatio eteris et Novi Testamenti, and A Solis Ortus Ordine, an acrostic on the life of Christ which is sometimes called the Abecedarius.

## Sedulius, Scotus (Or Junior)[[@Headword:Sedulius, Scotus (Or Junior)]]

             a Christian writer of the 8th century, of whose works we possess, Collectanea in Omnes Epistolas S. Pauli (first published at Basle [1528], and afterwards in the Bibliotheca Max. [Lugd. 1677] tom. 6): — some exegetical labors on the first three Gospels published by cardinal A. Mai in the Scriptorum Veterum Collectio Nova, tom. 9: — and a political and religious work entitled De Rectoribus Christianis et Convenientibus Regulis, quibus Res Publica rite Gubernanda est (first published at Leipsic in 1619). The MS. belonged to the library of the Heidelberg University, with which it was taken to Rome in 1622, and has been admitted into the  Spicilegium Romanum Vaticanum (Rom. 1339-1844), tom. 10, of cardinal Mai. In tom. 8 of the latter work may also be found Explanationes in Proefationes S. Hieronymi ad Evangelia by Sedulius. Comp. Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, par Pierre Bayle (Rotterdam, 1720), tom. 30, pl. 2562 sq. Biog. Universelle (Paris, 1825), tom. 41, p. 436 sq.

## See[[@Headword:See]]

             (properly רָאָה, raah; ειδον), a term used in Scripture not only of the sense of vision by which we perceive external objects, but also of inward perception, of the knowledge of spiritual things, and even of the supernatural sight of hidden things — of prophecy, visions, ecstasies. Hence it is that those persons were formerly called seers who afterwards were called Nabi, or prophets, and that prophecies were called visions. SEE SEER.

The verb to see is Hebraistically used to express all kinds of sensations. It is said (Exo 20:18) that the Israelites saw voices, thunder, lightnings. the sound of the trumpet, and the whole mountain of Sinai covered with clouds or smoke. To see good, or goods, is to enjoy them. “I believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living” (Psa 27:13), i.e. I hope that God will bring me back into my own country, into the land of Judea, where I shall live in peace and prosperity. Job says (Job 7:7), “I shall die, and see no more; I shall no longer enjoy the good things of this world.” The psalmist says (Psa 4:6), “There be many that say, Who will show us any good?” that is, to enjoy any happiness in this life.

By an easy metaphor from this, to see the face of the king is to be of his council, his household, or to approach him. The kings of Persia, to maintain their respect and majesty, seldom permitted their subjects to see them, and hardly ever showed themselves in public. None but their most intimate friends or their familiar domestics had the honor of beholding their faces (Est 1:10; Est 1:14). Frequent allusion is made to this custom in Scripture, which mentions the seven principal angels that see the face of the Lord and appear in his presence (Rev 1:4).

## See (2)[[@Headword:See (2)]]

             (Lat. sedes, a seat), the seat of the bishop's throne, and used also to denote the whole extent of his episcopal jurisdiction.

## See, Andrew J[[@Headword:See, Andrew J]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Dec. 6, 1832, and joined the Church when about fifteen. He was licensed to preach in 1854, in the fall of which year he was admitted on trial into the Memphis Conference. He labored without intermission until his death, in 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 577.

## See, Apostolical[[@Headword:See, Apostolical]]

             This term, under the full form of “holy apostolical see,” is now used to designate the jurisdiction and power of the pope as bishop of Rome. But anciently every bishop's see was dignified with the title of sedes apostolica, SEE APOSTOLICAL, as deriving its authority through its succession from the apostles SEE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. Pope Siricius himself (Siric. Ephesians 4, c. 1) gives all primates the appellation apostolici. St. Augustine, Sidonius Apollinaris, and others make no distinction in favor of the bishop of Rome. See Bingham, Antiq. of the Christ. Church, p. 22, 67.

## Seed[[@Headword:Seed]]

             (זֶרִע, zera; σπέρμα). The seed time of Palestine (Lev 26:5) for grain came regularly in November and December (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. p. 340, 1003; Korte, Reis. p. 432). Since the harvest began in the middle of Nisan, the time of growth and culture was about four months (Joh 4:35; see Lücke, ad loc.). But this was certainly a very general reckoning, and perhaps had become proverbial. (In this passage the word ἔτι, yet, does not seem to accord with this explanation; see also Anger, De Temp. Act. Ap. p. 24 sq.; Wieseler, Chronol. Synops. p. 216 sq.; Jacobi, in Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 858 sq.). SEE AGRICULTURE.

Sowing was done by the hand, as often with us, though according to the Gemara (Baba Metsia, fol. 105) the Jews used machines also for this purpose (Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 685). The seed when sown and the young plants have more enemies in the East than even here: not only drought, hail, mice (1Sa 6:5), fire, but also grasshoppers and locusts (see these words), often destroy promising harvests. The following legal regulations are found in the Pentateuch:

1. Two kinds of seed, as wheat and barley, must not be sown on the same land (Lev 19:19; comp. Josephus, Ant. 4, 8, 20). The Talmudists  (Mishna, Chilaim, 2, 8) say that between two fields sown with different seeds must intervene either fallow ground or a ditch, path, or wall; but the law does not include garden beds (ibid. 3, 1; Shab. 9, 2). Michaelis (Mos. R. 4, 320 sq.) strives to show that the lawgiver meant simply to require a careful sorting of the seed, which is recommended by the ancients as very advantageous (Virgil, Georg. 1, 193 sq.; Varro, R. R. 1, 52, 1), and which would render impossible the springing up of weeds (especially the Lolium temulentum). But this cannot be supported, and a custom so advantageous to the agriculturist did not need the authority of law. Lappenberg (in the Brem. u. Verdensch. Biblioth., 5, 937 sq.) gives a purely theological exposition of it; and perhaps other parts of the law furnish an easier explanation of this class of regulations than this one. SEE DIVERSE.

The more exact requirements of the rabbins will be found in the Mishna (Chilaiz, ch. 1-3). They are very trifling, and sometimes show a disposition to evade the law; but even anciently it was not so strictly enforced as to prevent giving a field of barley a border of spelt (Isa 28:25; see marg. A.V.). In general the rule is confined to Palestine, and the Jews do not refuse elsewhere to enjoy the fruit of mixed harvests (comp. Hottinger, Hebr. Leges, p. 376 sq.; Darsov, De Mirodis Seminandi Diversa Semina Hebr. Vet. [Viteb. 1695]).

2. Lev 11:37 sq. provides that seed set apart for sowing should remain clean if the carcass of a creeping beast fell upon it; but if it had been wet, it should be made unclean, perhaps because wet seed takes up impurities far easier than dry (comp. the analogy, Lev 11:34). Similar is the law of purification in the Zendavesta (2, 335, Kleuker), and a similar distinction of wet and dry is observed among the Arabs still (Niebuhr, Beschs p. 40).

By an easy metaphor, seed, as the prolific principle of future life, is taken in Scripture for posterity, whether of man, beasts, trees, etc., all of which are said to be sown and to fructify as the means of producing a succeeding generation (Jer 31:27). Hence seed denotes an individual, as Seth in the stead of Abel (Gen 4:25 etc.). and the whole line of descent; as the seed of Abraham, of Jacob, etc., the seed royal, etc., much in the same acceptation as children. The seed of Abraham denotes not only those who descend from him by natural issue, but those who imitate his character (Rom 4:16), for if he be “the father of the faithful,” then the faithful are his seed by character, independent of natural descent; and hence the Messiah is said to see his seed, though, in fact, Jesus left no children by  descent, but by grace or conversion only (Isa 53:10). This is occasionally restricted to one chief or principal seed, one who by excellence is the seed, as the seed of the woman (Gen 3:15; Gal 3:16), the seed of Abraham, the seed of David — meaning the most excellent descendant of the woman, of Abraham, of David. Or understand by the “seed of the woman” the offspring of the female sex only, as verified in the supernatural conception of Jesus (Mat 1:18, etc.; Luk 1:26, etc.), and of which the birth of Abraham's seed (Isaac) was a figure. See below.

Seed is likewise taken figuratively for the Word of God (Luk 8:5; 1Pe 1:23), for a disposition becoming a divine origin (1Jn 3:9), and for truly pious persons (Mat 13:38).

## Seed, The One[[@Headword:Seed, The One]]

             (Gal 3:16). The logic of this passage has eluded the search of our best critics, and yet it is worth pursuing, even against hope. The question involved is one purely of grammar, and particularly of Hebrew grammar — namely, How may we determine the number of זֶרִע, when it is plural and when singular? This word, when representing the seed of plants, forms a regular plural like other masculine nouns; but when used for posterity, it never changes its form: in this use it resembles our English word sheep. We must, then, have recourse to the construction, and this is found to be very peculiar. The adjective is always singular, like itself, although the subject be numerous as the stars (Ezr 9:2; Job 5:25; Job 21:8; Psa 37:25; Psa 112:2). With verbs it is construed as a collective noun, the verb varying according to the circumstances, with no marked peculiarity. In connection with pronouns, the construction is entirely different from both the preceding. A singular pronoun marks an individual, an only one, or one out of many; while a plural pronoun represents all the descendants. This rule is followed invariably by the Sept., which always puts the pronouns of σπέρμα in the constructio ad sensum, just as the apostle does in the text, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου· ῞ΟΣ ἐστι Χριστός. Peter understood this construction, for we find him inferring a singular seed from Gen 22:17-18, when speaking to native Jews in the city of Jerusalem before Paul's conversion (Act 3:26), as David had set the example a thousand years before (Psa 72:17). Read this in the Sept.

זֶרִע, in the singular form, takes the pronouns plural in the following places: Gen 15:13; Gen 17:7; Exo 30:21; Lev 21:17; 2Ki 17:20; 2Ch 20:7, etc.; Neh 9:2, etc.; Psa 106:27; Isa 61:9; Jer 23:8; Jer 33:26; Jer 46:27; Eze 20:5-11. זֶרִע, in the same singular form, has pronouns singular in the following: Gen 3:15; Gen 22:17; Gen 24:60; 1Sa 1:11; 2Sa 7:12; 1Ch 17:11. These passages embrace seventy-one pronouns in all — twenty-three singular and forty-eight plural. They are all the places where the pronoun represents זֶרִע. Pronouns merely in apposition do not come under the rule. This presents a syntax different from the word, showing that seed has a double construction. The distinction made by Paul is not between one seed and another, but between the one seed and the many; and if we consider him quoting the same passage with Peter (loc. cit.), his argument is fairly sustained by the pronoun “his enemies.” Seed with a pronoun singular is exactly equivalent to son. It is worth noting that the Aramaean relatives of Rebekah have retained the peculiar syntax of the covenant, where our translators missed the mark, in Gen 24:60, “Those who hate him.” Whether these Syrians understood the Messianic aspect of the promise, or whether, like the Sept., who did not see the ὁ ἐρχόμενος, they merely followed the grammar, their language conveys the idea of One among the thousands of millions who will subdue all His haters.

Isa 48:19, as it stands in our Hebrew Bibles, furnishes an exception to the principle laid down above. If we should attach importance to one exception, occurring in a composition highly poetical, against threescore plain examples, it is to be observed that the Sept. has a different reading, and Lowth prefers it — thus removing all difficulty in the case.

With this clue to the Abrahamic covenant, and through it to the protevangel, we arrive with precision at the unity of the seed promised there — the He that shall bruise Satan on the head. The masculine singular copied by the Sept. is twice used in that promise. He is the God of peace who bruises Satan (Rom 16:20). (R.H.)

## Seeded[[@Headword:Seeded]]

             a phrase indicating that tapestry, hangings, or church vestments were, for their greater ornamentation, sprinkled over at regular intervals with pearls, anciently called “seeds.”

## Seehuana Version[[@Headword:Seehuana Version]]

             The Sechuana occupies a prominent place in the great Caffre family of languages, and is the most important of all languages of Southern Africa. The first portion of the Seehuana version- committed to the press was the Gospel of St. Luke, printed at Cape Town in 1831, under the personal superintendence of Mr. Moffat. In 1841 the whole New Test. was printed in London at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society, under the eye of the translator. From thai time on Mr. Moffat devoted himself to the translation of the Old Test., which was completed in 1859. A revision of the entire Bible was commenced in 1870 and completed in 1877. Up to March 30, 1878, 7066 Bibles and 10,094 New Testaments with Psalms have been distributed. Comp. The Bible of Every Land, but more especially the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which are the only sources for the more recent versions published since the preparation of The Bible of Every Land. (B.P.)

## Seeker, Thomas[[@Headword:Seeker, Thomas]]

             an eminent English prelate, was born in 1693 at Sibthorpe, Nottinghamshire. He belonged to a family of Dissenters, but was influenced (by his own views and by the divisions and disturbances at that period prevailing among the Dissenters) to conform. He therefore never practiced medicine, for which he had studied at London, Paris, and Leyden, but entered Exeter College, Oxford, in 1721. In December, 1722, bishop Talbot ordained him deacon, and not long after, priest. He was presented by the bishop with the rectory of Houghton le Spring in 1724, where he remained until 1727, when he removed to Durham. In July, 1732, Grafton, lord chamberlain, appointed him chaplain to the king. He was instituted to the rectory of St. James's, May 18,1733, and was consecrated bishop of Bristol Jan. 19, 1735. In May, 1737, Dr. Seeker was translated to the bishopric of Oxford; in December, 1750, was promoted to the deanery of St. Paul's; and confirmed archbishop of Canterbury April 21, 1758. He died in London, Aug. 3,1768. His works comprise Sermon, s, Lectures, and Charges (Loud. 1811, 6 vols.), last edition with a memoir by bishop Porteous.

## Seekers[[@Headword:Seekers]]

             a small sect of Puritans which arose in England in 1645, and was afterwards merged in that of the Quakers. The Seekers derived their name from the employment in which they represented themselves as being continually engaged, that of seeking for the true Church, ministry, Scriptures, and ordinances, all of which, they alleged, had been lost. Baxter (Life and Times, p. 76) says of them. “They taught that our Scripture was uncertain; that present miracles are necessary to faith: that our ministry is null and without authority, and our worship and ordinances unnecessary or vain.” They and the Rationalists were promoters of the deism of England. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 238.

## Seelen, Johann Heinrich Von[[@Headword:Seelen, Johann Heinrich Von]]

             a German theologian, was born Aug. 8, 1688, at Asel, near Stade. In 1713 he was called as conrector to Flensburg, in 1715 to Stade, and in 1718 as rector to Lubeck, where he died, Oct. 22, 1762. Seelen was a voluminous writer. His most important work is his Meditationes Exegeticoe, quibus Varia Utriusque Testamenti Loci Expenduntur et Illustrantur (Lübeck, 1730-37, 3 pts.). He also wrote dissertations on different passages of the Scripture, for which see Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 305 sq. — Winer, Handbuch der theologischen Literatur. (B.P.)

## Seely, Amos W[[@Headword:Seely, Amos W]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in New York city in 1805. He graduated from Union College in 1828, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1831. His ministry was spent chiefly in the Reformed Church in Western New York, and was greatly blessed in its results. He was a plain, earnest, practical preacher; a man of guileless character and tender piety. He died in 1865. He published two works which passed through several editions, Doctrinal Thoughts and Practical Thoughts. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church. (W.J.R.T.)

## Seely, Raymond Hoyt, D.D[[@Headword:Seely, Raymond Hoyt, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Norwalk, Connecticut, February 19, 1812. He graduated from New York University in 1839, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1842; became pastor at Bristol, Connecticut, in 1843; Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1849; at the American Chapel, Paris, in 1858; Haverhill, Massachusetts, in 1860, and died there,  September 7, 1885. He published several sermons and addresses. See Cong. Yearbook, 1886, page 32.

## Seelye, Edward E., D.D[[@Headword:Seelye, Edward E., D.D]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Lansingburgh, N.Y., in 1819, and graduated at Union College in 1839, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1843. Until 1858 his ministry was exercised in the Presbyterian churches of Stillwater, N.Y., from 1843 to 1850, and Sandy Hill, N.Y., from 1850 to 1858. At the latter date he removed to Schenectady as pastor of the First Reformed Church, where he died in 1865. Mr. Seelye's physique was tall, large, rugged, and indicative of the best of health. His mind was vigorous, comprehensive, and direct. His preaching was orthodox, logical, scholarly, instructive, interesting, and warm hearted. His delivery was impressive and popular. He left a valuable posthumous work entitled Bible Emblems, which has been printed by the American Tract Society, New York. See De Baun [Rev. J.A.], Tribute. (W.J.R.T.)

## Seemiller, Sebastian[[@Headword:Seemiller, Sebastian]]

             a Roman Catholic doctor of divinity, was born Oct. 17, 1752, at Velden, in Lower Bavaria, and died April 25, 1798. He wrote, Exercitt. Philol.- theologicoe ad Illustranda et Vindicanda quoedam Primi Capitis Geneseos Loca (Nuremb. 1776): — Hermeneutica Sacra (Augsburg, 1779): — De Groecis Bibliorum V.T. Versionibus Dissertatio Historico- critica (Ingolst. 1788): — Septem Psalmi Poenitentiales (ibid. 1790): Quindecim Psalmi Graduales (ibid. 1791). — See Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 307; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Seeney, Robert[[@Headword:Seeney, Robert]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Oct. 12, 1797. He graduated at Columbia College in 1817, and soon afterwards united with the Church. In 1820 he was received on trial in the New York Conference, and labored with great acceptability in its most important stations. In 1852 he was placed upon the supernumerary list, but continued to preach until he received a paralytic stroke in the left side. On July 1, 1854, he was attacked by a more violent stroke upon the right side, from which he could not rally. As a preacher, Mr. Seeney was chaste, clear, and forcible; as a Christian he was artless, affable, and faithful. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1855, p. 545.

## Seer[[@Headword:Seer]]

             is the almost invariable rendering in the A.V. of חֹזֵה, chozeh (which is otherwise translated only in Isa 28:15, “agreement;” 30:10, “prophet;” 47:13, “gazer;” Eze 13:9; Eze 13:16; Eze 22:28, “that see,” etc.), and occasionally (1Sa 9:9-19; 2Sa 15:27; 1Ch 9:22; 1Ch 26:28; 1Ch 29:29; 2Ch 16:7; 2Ch 16:10) of רֹאֶה, röeh; while the tantamount and technically used prophet is usually denoted by נָבַי, nabi (on the meaning and etymology of which see Hartmann, 3d Excurs. to his Uebers. d. Michna, p. 219 sq.; Paulus, Exeget. Conservat. 2, 122 sq.; and the different views of Redslob, Der Begr. d. Nabi [Leips. 1839], Ewald, Proph. 1, 6 sq., Hävernick, Einleit. ins A.T. 2, 2, 6 sq.). All three names are used, though applied to different persons (1Ch 29:29); and the Chronicles hold this distinction throughout — calling, e.g., Samuel röeh. Gad chozeh, and Nathan nabi — a distinction, to a great extent, lost in the A.V., where the first two are confounded. According to 1Sa 9:9, röeh was the older name for prophet, and it is especially applied to Samuel; nabi is the most usual word; chozeh perhaps passed from the ritual language into that of history. It is found almost solely in Chronicles.

These words were applied, in Hebrew antiquity, from Samuel's time until after the return from captivity, to men inspired by God (comp. Amo 3:7; 2Pe 1:21, by the spirit of Jehovah; Eze 11:5; Eze 37:1, expressed in different forms; Eze 3:14; 2Ch 24:20; comp. Gesen. Comment zu Is. 1, 338; Thesaur. 2, 742) who comprehended the principles of the theocracy, and were devoted to them, denouncing in energetic terms all that tended to undermine them; though in earlier days the name of prophet had been given to those who stood in relations of confidence with God (Gen 20:7; Exo 7:1; Exo 15:20, etc.). Of the activity of these prophets among foreigners but one example is given (Jon 1:2 sq.). At first they appear but occasionally, where the welfare of the people is in danger, or as counselors of the theocratic kings (1Sa 22:5; 2Sa 7:2 sq.); but when the kingdom was divided, a wider field was open to them (2Ki 17:13 sq.). As the fate of the people drew near, they raised their voices the more earnestly — rebuking now idolatry, religious affectation, immorality; now the wicked and selfish government, and the false policy of the king and the grandees of the realm; now warning or threatening the thankless people with the judgments of Jehovah; now casting a glance to the ennobled form of the theocracy again arising from  this ruin of the national welfare and honor. Public places, markets (Amo 5:10; Isa 29:21), streets, the courts of the Temple (Jer 7:1; Jer 19:14; Jer 26:2; comp. Jer 29:26) — were usually the localities of their action (Jer 25:2). But they also went, though not welcome then, to the palaces of kings and their noblemen (Isa 22:15), shunning no danger or repulse (Eze 13:5). Thus their order formed a beneficial balance against the misuse of the royal power, the narrow sympathies and dullness of the priests, the untheocratic tendencies of the people themselves, and accomplished a portion of that which is expected in modern times from representatives of the people and the free press.

It would be proper to call the prophets demagogues, in the original and best sense, as popular leaders (De Wette, Christl. Sittenl. 2, 1, 32). Since in the theocracy religious and political elements were mingled, the subject and the aim of the efforts of the prophets belonged sometimes to the one class, sometimes to the other; but was never merely political, since a religious reference is found in all. Their views could not be limited to the present, but extended to the future which should succeed it (comp. Von Raumer, Vorles. über allgemeine Gesch. 1, 153; Ewald, Proph. 1, 24); but usually not to a distant future, severed by centuries from the present. This we learn by an unprejudiced examination of the prophecies yet remaining, and a comparison of their contents with the historical standpoint of the authors. Indeed, the minute prediction ,of very distant events, overleaping the immediate future, would have had no purpose for the generation then living, nor would it have furthered the interests of the theocracy as a holy community. Yet Eichhorn has pressed this view too far (De Prophet. Poes. Hebr. Paralip., in the Comment. Soc. Götting. Rec. 5).

The image of the future suggested by the prophets is naturally connected with the present of the author; hence we can often, as in the Chaldee period, trace a chronological progress from the indefinite and general to the definite and special. Only in one group of prophecies did they leave the relations and circumstances of their own times and direct the people to a distant ideal future, when, not satisfied with the immediate future, they speak of the Messiah arid his blessed kingdom to come; and it was this hope of the Messiah and the renewal of their kingdom under him, set forth and cherished by the prophets, which gave the religious life of the nation that new, peculiar impulse which secured them so important a place in the history of religion and of man (comp. Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 39 sq., 67; De Wette, Christl. Sittenl. 2, 1, 34). The form of the prophetic representations was simple and artless; sometimes in dialogue (Jeremiah 28), yet never without the rhythm which is so natural to the rapid speech of the Orientals; never without imaginative elevation (comp. Ewald, Aüsfuhr. Lehrb. d. Hebr. Spr. p. 138 sq.; Umbreit, De V.T. Prophetis Claris. Antiq. Temp. Orat. [Heidelb. 1832]; Ewald, Propheten, 1, 49 sq.), and often was poetical (Amo 5:1 sq.; Isa 5:1). The early prophecies seem to have been accompanied by music, which was used as an aid to religious feeling (2Ki 3:15), and all of them by energetic gestures and often symbolic actions were connected with them (1Ki 11:29 sq.; Jer 19:1 sq.; Jer 43:9 sq.; Ezekiel 4; Eze 12:3 sq.; Eze 24:3 sq.; Eze 37:15 sq.), or symbolic costume (Isa 20:2 sq.; comp. Stäudlin, Neue Beitr. zur Erläut. d. bibl. Proph. p. 123 sq.; see Jahn, Einleit. 2, 395; Gesen. Com. zu Is. 1, 645). It should be borne in mind that the inhabitants of warmer climates are more prone to such off hand oratory by their active imagination. Yet the comparisons sometimes instituted between, the Hebrew prophets and the Italian improvisatores or the Greek seers (μάντεις; Ritter, in Scherer's Schriftforsch. 1, 372 sq.) are worthless (so De Wette, Pr. de Prophetar. in V.T. [Berl. 1816]; also in his Opusc. Theol. p. 16 sq.; Stiekel, De Prophet. Heb., in Illgen's Zeitschr. 5, 2, 55 sq.). The impulse to speak in the Hebrew prophets must be sought deeper than in the natural activity of imagination.

At a later day (after the 9th century B.C.; comp. Eichhorn, in his Biblioth. f. bibl. Lit. 10, 1077 sq.) prophetic writing became connected with prophetic utterance (Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 3, 351 sq.), at first to preserve with certainty the contents of important predictions (Isa 8:1; Isa 8:16; comp. 30:8), or in obedience to a divine command (Jer 30:2; Jer 36:2; Jer 36:28; comp. Rev 1:11; Rev 1:19; Rev 21:5); hence, perhaps, first simply records of their utterances to the people, and then often addresses penned as soon as conceived and given in writing to the people through amanuenses (comp. Pries, De Prophetis et Apost. Amanuens. Opera in Scribend. Usis [Rostock, 1757]), or even borne by messengers, to a distance (Jeremiah 29; comp. 2Ch 21:12). The people attached great value to the intercession of the prophets with God (Jer 42:2). This accorded with their relation to Jehovah and was part of their calling (Jer 7:16; Jer 11:14; Jer 14:11; comp. Job 42:8; Job 42:10). Besides their labors for the protection and advancement of the theocracy, the prophets were often useful to their countrymen and even to foreigners (2 Kings 5) by their medical and scientific knowledge and skill (2Ki 2:19 sq.; 2Ki 4:38 sq.; 2Ki 20:7 sq.; comp. 1Ki 14:2 sq.), and, filled with the spirit of God,  even wrought miracles, SEE ELIJAH; SEE ELISHA (comp. Luk 7:16). So there seem to have been theocratic historians, perhaps before the prophets became writers, who, sharing the views and sympathies of the prophets, wrote the history of a reign or of a period, mingling with it more or fewer prophetic utterances (2Ch 9:29; 2Ch 12:15; 2Ch 13:22; 2Ch 26:22; 2Ch 32:32; comp. Gesen. Comment. zu Is. 1, 24 sq.).

The dress of the prophets was usually a long folding mantle (1Ki 19:13; 2Ki 2:8; 2Ki 2:13) of coarse, hairy stuff (Zec 13:4; 2Ki 1:8), without care as to the cut (hence sak, שִׂק, Isa 20:2), and held together by a leather girdle (2Ki 1:8); a dress which corresponded best with the serious nature of the prophet's calling (comp. Mat 3:4; see Henke, Mag. 4, 191 sq.; Nicolai, De Proph. Jud. Vestitu [Magdeb. 1744]; comp. the cloak or pallium of the Greek philosophers; Ferrar, De Re Vest. 2, 4, 14. On the clothing of the Eastern dervishes, see Harmer, Observ. 3, 374 sq.). It is not strange that the prophets, on the one hand, were the objects of superstitious veneration (comp. 1Ki 17:18), and, on the other, by their bold reproof of all impiety and wickedness, became, as the fate of the state grew certain, more and more subject to the opposition and open persecution of the priesthood and of despotic or idolatrous kings. In the kingdom of Israel they were first oppressed, and almost exterminated (1 Kings 18; 1Ki 19:14; 1Ki 19:19), sharing under Ahab the fate of all pious worshippers of Jehovah. Only under the pressure of necessity did the kings there apply to them (1Ki 22:7 sq.; 2Ki 3:11 sq.; 2Ki 6:12 sq.); and they were forbidden to address the people (Amo 7:10 sq.). This was a censorship wielded by the priests. From 2Ki 4:23, we see that on Sabbaths and new moons the pious Israelites met for worship with one of the prophets. But this was not so general as to justify us in saying that the prophets took the place of the Levitical priesthood (comp. 2Ki 4:42), although it is certain that the worship and knowledge of Jehovah in the kingdom of Israel were supported mainly through the prophets. In the kingdom of Judah the prophets were early met by infidel mockery (Isa 5:19; Isa 28:10; Isa 28:22), or by a sense of security that heeded no alarm (Mic 2:6 sq.). We are told that Manasseh slew some prophets every day (Josephus, Ant. 10, 3, 1; comp. 2Ki 21:16); it is more certain that Asa imprisoned the seer Hanani (2Ch 16:10); that under Jehoash and Joiachim two prophets atoned for their boldness with their lives (2Ch 24:20 sq.; Jer 26:20 sq.); and that Jeremiah, above all, was the object of the bitter hate and active  persecution of the united court and priesthood, who supported themselves by false prophets. SEE JEREMIAH.

But the educated laity and the officers of state thought they had long outgrown the prophetic utterances, and that their views of state policy were deeper; and thus the state became ever more worldly. Afterwards, the remembrance of the abuse offered the prophets was a sad one for the people (Neh 9:26; Mat 5:12; Mat 23:31; Act 7:52; 1Th 2:15), which was little weakened by the zeal of the later Jews to seek out and adorn the tombs of the prophets. False prophets, or orators, who flattered the prevailing political principles, and even did homage to the abandoned wickedness of the times (Jer 23:14-15; Jer 28:15), yet gave themselves out as inspired by the Divine Spirit, appear, especially in the last terrible period of the kingdom, in league with the priests (Jer 5:13; Jer 5:31; Jer 6:13; Jer 8:10; Jer 14:14); and the true prophets of Jehovah not only came, at times, into open conflict with them (Jer 26:7 sq.; comp. Jer 5:15), but spoke by inspiration against them (Jer 14:13 sq.; Jer 23:16 sq.; Jer 27:9 sq.; Jer 29:31 sq.; Eze 13:2 sq.; Eze 22:25; Hos 9:7 sq.; Mic 3:11). In the law (Deu 13:1 sq.; Deu 18:20) false prophecy was punished with death (Schröder, De Pseudoprophetis [Marburg, 1720], 2, 4).

The origin of the prophets, in the meaning we have unfolded, is to be referred to the end of the period of the Judges, or to the time of Samuel (comp. Act 3:24), who was himself a prophet (1Sa 3:20), and may be considered as having founded the order by establishing schools of prophets (comp. esp. Act 19:24), and to have pointed out its relations to the theocracy. Tholuck (Literar. Anzeiger, 1831, 1, 38), indeed, makes these schools of the prophets to be merely a union of helpers of the prophets in their arduous office, such as Baruch was, who, besides the study of the law, busied themselves with sacred music; but this lacks support. Prophecy, indeed, could not be taught; and, no doubt, many of the scholars never received the inner prophetic call. But this is true now in our theological schools, yet we do not, on this account, consider them mere institutions for educating clerks, etc. Moses, in the wilderness, had given instances, in his own person, of every kind of prophetic duty; but afterwards, when the great labor to be done was the establishment of the theocratic nation in Palestine, and the spirit of Jehovah raised up warriors (the Shophtim, or Judges), there was little need of sacred oratory (Jdg 4:4 sq.; Jdg 6:8 sq.; 1Sa 2:27 sq.), and the people saw in their prophets simply wise men, soothsayers (hence the older name röeh of prophets, which is applied  even to Samuel [1Ch 9:22; 1Ch 29:29, etc.], though he is called also nabi [1Sa 3:20]), a view which prevailed up to Samuel's time (9:8 sq.), while even later the prophets were chiefly sought by the people as wonderful physicians and miracle workers. It is clear that Samuel by no means first founded prophecy among the Hebrews, as, indeed, such a spiritual movement cannot be voluntarily inaugurated among a people; but that he was led on by the establishment of royalty to impart to the prophets his judicial relation (Judges 6 and 1 Samuel). On the schools of the prophets, see Vitringa, Synag. Vet. 1, 2, 7; Buddei Hist. Eccl. V. Test. 2, 276 sq.; Maii Exercit. 1, 645 sq.; Werenfels, Diss. de Scholis Proph. (Basle, 1701); Kahl, De Proph. Scholl. (Gött. 1737); Hering, Abh. von den Schul. der Proph. (Bresl. 1777); Stäudlin, Gesch. der Sittenl. 1, 203 sq.

They existed in various cities, those often which had an ancient character for sanctity, especially Ramah (1Sa 19:19-20), Jericho (2Ki 2:5), at Bethel (2Ki 2:3), at Gilgal (4:38), all in the central part of the Holy Land. The pupils, who were not all young or unmarried men (2Ki 2:1), lived together (6:1), sometimes in great numbers (2:16; comp. 1Ki 18:4; 1Ki 18:13), had common fare (2Ki 4:38 sq,), and provided together for their wants. As to the nature of the instruction, we have no particulars. Music and singing were certainly among the subjects taught (1Sa 10:5; comp. Forkel, Gesch. d. Mus. 1, 238, 245, 248, 438 sq.); but, perhaps, more for the cultivation of noble sentiments, and for awakening inner feeling, than as an accompaniment to their exhortations. The cultivation of lyric poetry by them cannot be altogether denied, yet the extent of it has been exaggerated, and the history derives the flourishing of this kind of poetry from a royal minstrel (Nachtigal, in Henke's Mag. 6, 38 sq.; see contra Bengel, Supplem. ad Introd. in Lib. Psaln. [Tüb. 1816] p. 5 sq.; De Wette, Comm. ub. d. Psalm. p. 9 sq., 3d ed.). The chief subject of instruction was probably the law, not in its details in writing, but as a great whole, a theocratic conception; and the awakening and cultivation of the true theocratic spirit were the aim of all their labors. The pupils, when the impulse of the spirit came upon them, sometimes made excursions, during which others, who came near them, were momentarily influenced in the same way (1Sa 10:5 sq.; 1Sa 19:20 sq.); and some were employed, it would seem as a trial of them, as messengers of the prophets (2Ki 9:1). The comparison of the schools of the prophets with monkish cloisters (Jerome, Ep. 105, ad Rustic. Monach. and 58 ad Paulin.) is wide of the mark (see Hering, loc. cit. 71 sq.); and if any parallel is to be sought for anything so peculiar, that with Pythagorean union (Tennemann, Gesch. der  Phil. 1, 94 sq.) will be found more appropriate. Moreover, it is not to be supposed that all the prophets, or that the most influential of those known to us, were educated in these schools. It was open to every man or woman who felt an inward call to this office to assume the duties of a prophet (Amo 7:14); and the prophetic inspiration often broke forth suddenly (2Ch 20:14 sq.). There were also instances in which the calling of prophet seemed to be hereditary in one family (1Ki 16:1; comp. Amo 7:14; on Zec 1:1, see Rosenmüller, ad loc.). Those who had been educated by older prophets seem usually to have been consecrated to their calling by anointing or the delivery of the prophet's mantle (1Ki 19:16 sq.; comp. 2Ki 2:13 sq.); but it was the inner voice, or a vision, which directly impelled the prophets to step forward as such (Isaiah 6; Jer 1:2; Ezekiel 1). The cycle of prophetic activity was found, after the division, chiefly in the kingdom of Judah, which, at least outwardly, had remained true to the theocratic constitution, the temple, the priesthood of Jehovah, the dynasty of David; and even after the overthrow of this kingdom, and in exile, there were influential prophets among the Jews. But in the kingdom of Israel (Eichhorn, in his Biblioth. d. Bibl. Lit. 4, 193 sq.), whose establishment the prophets had aided, or, at least, not hindered (1Ki 11:29 sq.), their influence was interrupted and more of a negative character. In the changes of dynasties they not rarely took some part (1Ki 14:14 sq.; 1Ki 16:1 sq.; 1Ki 21:17 sq.; 2Ki 9:1 sq.), in which they were actuated by religious views. It cannot be doubted that the activity of the prophets, in that long period, was one of the utmost value to the people; the spirit of the theocratic life was continually refreshed by them, and no other people of that age, or of modern times, has had anything comparable to them (comp. Eichhorn, preface to his 4th vol. Einleit. ins A.T.). In this point of view, such laments as Psa 74:9; Lam 2:9, find their full justification.

The prophets mentioned in the Old Test. besides Moses (Deu 18:15; Deu 34:10), and those whose books remain in the canon, are the following, nearly in chronological order: Samuel, Gad, Nathan [see these names], the two latter under David and Solomon; Ahijah, Shemaiah, Iddo (1Ki 11:29; 1Ki 12:22; 1Ki 14:4 sq.; 2Ch 12:15; 2Ch 13:22), under Rehoboam and Jeroboam; Azariah, Hananiah, Jehu, Micah, Jehaziel, Eliezer, Oded (2Ch 15:1; 2Ch 15:8; 2Ch 16:7; 2Ch 20:37; 1Ki 16:1; 1Ki 22:8), under Asa, Baasha, and Jehoshaphat; Elijah; Elisha, Micah, under  Ahab and successors; Zechariah (2; Chronicles 24:20), under Jehoash; Jonah, under Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:25); Oded, under Ahaz (2Ch 28:9); Uriah, under Joiachim (Jer 26:20); besides three prophetesses — Deborah (Jdg 4:4), Huldah, a married woman (2Ki 22:14), and Noadiah (Neh 6:14), a false prophetess. A far greater number are named, of both sexes, by Clement Alexandrinus (Strom. 1, 145; he gives thirty-five), Epiphanius (in Coteler's Not. in Can. Apost. 4, 6, seventy-two), and the Jews (Seder Olam, p. 21, forty-eight prophets, seven prophetesses). But they act in this without any settled principle, including almost every man of note in the Old Test. among the prophets. Prophecy disappeared on the new establishment of the Jews in Palestine; and, indeed, the last prophets are thought to show less of the living inspiration than the earlier ones; and, after the erection of the second Temple, no seer's voice was heard, although the return of the prophets was hoped for continually (1Ma 4:46; 1Ma 14:41). According to the Talmudists the Bath kol sometimes took the place of prophecy. (Comp. Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.v. בת, and Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 82 sq.; see also Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. 1, 379, on the unconscious soothsaying of the rabbins. It has been applied to Joh 11:51. That in 1Pe 1:10 is different.) So entirely was the old inspiration lost that even the patriotism of the Maccabees called forth nothing beyond military heroism. The birth and consecration of the Prince of the Prophets evoked inspired utterances from but two (Luk 1:67; Luk 2:36). The appearance of Jesus even awakened false prophets, and, during the war of extermination between the Greeks and Romans, “prophet” was synonymous with deceiver and seducer of the people. Only a few scattered utterances of soothsayers occur in the centuries following the captivity (Josephus, Ant. 13, 10, 7; 13, 11, 2; comp. War, 6, 5, 3). See Gürtler, Systema Thebl. Proph. (Amst. 1702); Witsii Miscel. Sacr. bk. 1, in 24 chapters, on prophets and prophecy; Carpzov, Introd. in V.T. p. 1 sq., and his Appar. p. 113 sq.; Eichhorn, Einleit. ins A.T. 4, § 512 sq.; Jahn, Einleit. 2, 2, 324 sq.; Niemeyer, Charakt. 5, 245 sq.; Herder, Geist der hebr. P. 2, 41 sq.; Horst, Ueber die Proph. der alten Welt, etc. (Gotha, 1798); Stutzmann, Geist u. Charakt. d. hebr. Proph. (Carlsr. 1805); Gramberg, Religionsid. 2, 246 sq.; Von Cölln, in Euphron. (1833) pt. 1, ch. 5; Knobel, Der Prophetism. d. Heb. (Bresl. 1837) 2, 8; Köster, Die Propheten d. A. u. N. Test. nach ihren Wesen u. Wirken (Leips. 1838); Ewald, Propheten d. alt. Bund. (Stuttg. 1840) 1, 1 sq.; Hävernick, Einleit. ins A.T. 2, 2, 1 sq.; Baur, Amos (Giess. 1847), p. 1 sq.; Hofmann, Weissag. 1, 253 sq. The writings of Dorotheus (ed. Fabric.  [Hamb. 1714]) contain traditions of the oldest prophets. So those of an unknown writer (De Vitis Prophet.), sometimes ascribed to Epiphanius. Comp. Hamaker, Comment. in Libr. de Vita et Morte Prophet. (Amst. 1833).

On the meaning of the word “prophet” in the New Test., see the dictionaries. The name was given to certain Christians of both sexes (1Co 11:5; comp, Act 21:9) who spoke in the public assembly (1Co 11:4; 1Co 14:29), who were distinguished from apostles and teachers (12:28; 14:6; Eph 2:20; Eph 4:11; comp. Act 13:1; Neander, Pflanz. 1, 205). Prophecy was, among the charismata, a spiritual gift of the Holy Spirit (Rom 12:6; 1Co 12:10), and stood next to that of speaking with tongues (12:10; 13:8; 14:22; comp. Act 19:6), but is pointed out by Paul as more efficacious for the edifying of the Church (1Co 14:3 sq., 1Co 14:22). See, in general, Van Dale, De Idolol. p. 201 sq.; Mosheim, De Illis qui Proph. Vocantur in N.T. (Helmst. 1732); also in his Dissert. ad Hist. Eccl. 2, 125 sq.; Knapp [G.], De Dono Proph. in Eccl. N.T. (Halle, 1755); Zacharias, De Donor. Proph. Variis Grad. in Eccl. Christ. (Gott. 1767); Koppe, 3. Exc. zum Brief an die Eph. p. 148 sq. Thus prophets are those Christians who, seized by a momentary inspiration (Act 19:6), discoursed to the assembly in their own tongue (comp. 1Co 14:5; 1Co 14:24) on divine things, perhaps not unlike preachers among the Quakers. (On the distinction between these and those who spoke with tongues, see 14:32;. Neander Pflanz. d. Christ. 1, 52, 183 sq., 205.) The prediction of events to come was not the office of these prophets, yet they had some insight into the future of the Church. Comp. the Revelation of John; Crusius [B.], Opusc. p. 101 sq.; Lücke, Vollst. Einl. indie Offenb. Joh. (Bonn, 1832). SEE PROPHET,

## Seething Pot[[@Headword:Seething Pot]]

             [not seething-pot] (דּוּד נָפוּחִ, a pot blown, i.e. with a fanned fire under it), a kettle violently boiling (Job 41:20 [Hebrew 12]). SEE POT.

## Sefer[[@Headword:Sefer]]

             SEE SEPHER.

## Seforno[[@Headword:Seforno]]

             SEE SFORNO.

## Segedin, Stephen Kis, D.D[[@Headword:Segedin, Stephen Kis, D.D]]

             a Hungarian divine and educator, was born at Segedin in 1505, and. educated at the universities of Cracow and Wittensberg. In the latter place, where he spent three years, he had the privilege of attending, on the instructions of Luther and Melanchthon. He commenced his public career at Thasnyadin, where he instructed those who were studious of the best arts, and preached the gospel to the common people. This dual work he prosecuted to the end of his life, laboring successively at the following places: Gyula, Ceglede, Temeswar, Thurin, Bekeny, Tholna, Lascow (where he was ordained pastor by the imposition of hands in 1554), Calmantze, and Kevin. He died May 2, 1572. Dr. Segedin was eminent for piety, distinguished for eloquence, and held in high esteem by the Christian Church of his time for the earnestness and fidelity with which he enforced the doctrines of the Bible. See The (Lond.) Theological Magazine, February 1802, page 43.

## Segelia[[@Headword:Segelia]]

             in Roman mythology, was a rural deity who secured growth to the germinating crops of grain.

## Segneri, Paolo[[@Headword:Segneri, Paolo]]

             (1), an Italian preacher, was born at Nettuno, March 21, 1624, of an old Roman family. In 1638 he entered the Order of the Jesuits at the College of St. Andrew, in Rome, where he taught grammar, and earnestly studied the Scriptures, the fathers, and the classical writers. Unable to obtain authority as a missionary to the Indies, he traveled on foot, from 1665 to 1692, through Italy, especially in Perugia and Mantua, gathering crowds to hear his discourses. Innocent XII called him to Rome in 1692 as his preacher in ordinary; but he was not so popular there, and was shortly appointed theologian to the penitentiary and examiner of bishops. His hearing, however, having failed, he died Dec. 9, 1694, worn out with labor. He wrote several works on practical theology, which are enumerated in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Segneri, Paolo (2)[[@Headword:Segneri, Paolo (2)]]

             (2), called the Younger, an Italian Jesuit, nephew of the foregoing, was born at Rome, Oct. 18, 1673. He devoted himself to missions, and, after the earthquakes of 1708, he preached to the terrified Romans. At the request of the archduke Como III, he occupied the pulpits of the principal churches of Florence, Modena, and Bologna, and thus induced prince Frederick of Poland to abjure Lutheranism. He died at Sinigaglia, June 15, 1713. He wrote a few works on practical religion.

## Segond, Louis[[@Headword:Segond, Louis]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born in 1810, and died at Geneva, June 18, 1885, professor of Hebrew and doctor of theology. Segond is best known as the latest translator of the Bible into French, whose name will be remembered with that of Le Fevre, Olivetan; De Sacy, Martin, and Osterwaid. The Old Test. in Segond's version was first published at Geneva in 1874, then at Nancy in 1877, and lastly at Geneva in 1879. But the entire Bible was issued in 1880 from the Oxford University. Press, printed with admirable care and skill. The translation is pronounced an exquisite one. (B.P.)

## Segub[[@Headword:Segub]]

             (Heb. Segub', שַׂגיב. [v.r. in Kings Segib, שַׂגַיב], elevated; Sept. Σεγούβ v.r. in Chronicles Σερούχ), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The son of Hezron, grandson of Judah. His mother was the daughter of Machir, the “father” of Gilead, and he was himself father of Jair (1Ch 2:21). B.C. cir. 1850.

2. The youngest son of Hiel, the rebuilder of Jericho, who died for his father's sin according to Joshua's prediction (1Ki 16:34; comp. Jos 6:26). B.C. cir. 910. According to Rabbinical tradition, he died  when his father had set up the gates of the city. One story says that his father slew him as a sacrifice on the same occasion.

## Segur, Louis Gaston DE[[@Headword:Segur, Louis Gaston DE]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1820. In 1856 he was made canon of the chapter of St. Denis, and died in 1881. Segur was one of the most active and influential members of the clerical party, unjust towards the Protestants, and a promoter of ultramontane ideas. He published, La Piete  et la Vie Intrieure (1863-64, 4 volumes): — Instructions Familiares et Lectures du Soir sur Toutes les Verites de la Religion (1865, 2 volumes): — La Liberte (1869): — Le Dogme de Infallibilite (1872): — Le Jeune Ouvrier Chretien (1876), etc. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Segur, Seth Willard[[@Headword:Segur, Seth Willard]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Chittenden, Vt., Dec. 24, 1831. At fifteen years of age he united with the Church, and soon after entered Royalton Academy, where he was fitted for college. He entered Middlebury College, and graduated in 1859. After graduation he entered the Auburn (N.Y.) Theological Seminary, and graduated in 1862. He was licensed by the Royalton Association May 8, 1861, and soon after ordained. He was installed over the Church in Tallmadge, O., June 8, 1862, and, after remaining nine years, resigned. Success attended his ministry, and during his pastorate one hundred and thirty-four were received into the Church. He was next settled at Gloucester, Mass., where he was installed June 14, 1871, and remained until 1873, when he resigned to accept a call to West Medway, over which Church he was duly installed. As a preacher his elocution was easy, graceful, and impressive, and many were drawn to the ways of righteousness. While on a visit to Tallmadge to attend a semi- centennial celebration of the Church he was taken sick, and after a short illness died, Sept. 24, 1875. (W.P.S.)

## Seguy, Joseph[[@Headword:Seguy, Joseph]]

             a French Roman Catholic preacher, was born at Rodez in 1689. He was early remarkable for eloquence, and in 1729 was appointed to deliver before the French Academy a eulogy on St. Louis, for which cardinal de Fleury rewarded him with the abbey of Genlis. His success in other discourses was so great that the Academy, in 1736, gave him the prize for poetry. Seguy bore the title of preacher to the king, and continued his ministry till advanced age, when he retired to a canonicate that he held at Meaux. He died March 12, 1761. Some of his sermons have been published.

## Seho Dagung[[@Headword:Seho Dagung]]

             in Hinduism, is the name of the magnificent pyramidal temple at Rangoon, almost entirely covered with gold, and dedicated to the supreme deity of the Birmanese.

## Seid[[@Headword:Seid]]

             in Norse mythology, was a magical art universally employed among the Vanes, in which Freya, who was descended from the Vanes, was particularly skilled, and in which she had received instruction from Odin. Nothing definite is known respecting the art itself; but it would seem that a degree of knowledge in chemistry lay at its base, by which all kinds of elements became known. It was regarded as beneath the dignity of a man, however, and Odin was the only one who made use of it.

## Seidel, Caspar Timotheus[[@Headword:Seidel, Caspar Timotheus]]

             a Lutheran divine of Germany, was born Sept. 20, 1703, at Schoneberg, in Brandenburg, and died as doctor of divinity and abbot of Königslutter, at Helmstädt, May 30, 1758. He wrote, Dissertatio, in qua ostenditur Pontifaces in Ritu Confirmationis a Praxi Ecclesioe Apostol. plane Aberrare (Helmstadt, 1732): — Programma de Quoestione an Christus Pascham suam Ultimam Uno Eodemque Die cum Judoeis comederet, necne? (ibid. 1748): — Abhandlung über die Sekte der Elcenseiten (ibid. 1749): — Anweisung zur Erklärung der heil. Schrift (Halle, 1759). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 308; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Seidel, Gotthold Emanuel Friedrich[[@Headword:Seidel, Gotthold Emanuel Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, born at Ezelwang, March 10, 1774, was appointed in 1802 deacon of St., AEgidius's at Nuremberg, in 1817 pastor of the same church, and in 1829 dean of Nuremberg, where he died, Feb. 6, 1838. Seidel published several collections of sermons delivered at Nuremberg, which are enumerated in Zuchold, Biblioth. Theolog. p. 1211 sq.; and in Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur. (B.P.)

## Seidel, Heinrich Alexander[[@Headword:Seidel, Heinrich Alexander]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born Feb. 4, 1811, at Goldberg, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. He studied at Rostock and Berlin, and in 1839, he was called to the pastorate at Berlin. In 1851 he was made pastor of St. Nicolaiin Schwerin, but bodily infirmities obliged him to retire in 1859 from the pastorate, and he died Jan. 30, 1861. Seidel is best known in German hymnology by his spiritual hymns, which he published in two collections, entitled Kreuz und Harfe (Schwerin and Rostock, 1839 and 1857). See  Zuchold, Biblioth. Theolog. p. 1215; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7, 294 sq. (B.P.)

## Seidemann, Johann Karl[[@Headword:Seidemann, Johann Karl]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Dresden, April 10, 1807. He studied at Leipsic, was for some time private tutor, and in 1834 preacher at Eschdorf, Saxony. In 1871 he retired from the ministry, and died at Dresden, August 5, 1879, doctor of theology. He published, Thomas Munzer (Dresden, 1842): — Die leipziger Disputation im Jahre 1519 (1843): — Karl von Miltiz, eine chronologische Untersuchung (1844): — Erlauterungen zur Reformationsgeschichte durch bisher unbeckante Urkunden (eod.): — Beitrage zur Reformationsgeschichte (1846): — Lutherbriefe (1859): — Anton Lauterbach's, Diaconi zu Wittenberg Tagebuch (1872): — Jacob Schenk (1875): — Luther's erste und alteste Vorlesungen uber die Psalmen (1876). See Neues Archiv fur sachsische Geschichte, 1880, page 94 sq.; Zeitschrift des bergischen Geschichtsvereins, 16:257 sq. (Bonn, 1881); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Seiler, Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Seiler, Georg Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born Oct. 24, 1733, at Kreussen, near Bayreuth. In 1761 he was deacon at Neustadt-an-der-Heide, in 1764 at Coburg; in 1770, professor of theology at Erlangen; in 1772, university preacher; in 1773, member of consistory and principal of an institute for morals and liberal arts, founded by himself at Erlangen. He died May 13, 1807. In theology he represented supranaturalistic views, which he also propagated both as a teacher and a writer. His writings, mostly practical, are many, and have often been republished. Of these we mention, Sermons (1769 sq.; 4th ed. 1798): — History of the Revealed. Religion (1772; 9th ed. 1800): — Bibl. Erbauungsbuch (Erlangen, 1785-94, 17 vols.): — Opuscula Academica (ibid. 1793), etc. See the Theol. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 6, 223 sq.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. p. 1215 sq.; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 308. (B.P.)

## Seir[[@Headword:Seir]]

             (Heb. Sei'r', שֵׂעַיר, hairy [i.e. rough, by a play upon the name of Esau, see Gen 25:25]; Sept. Σηερί, v.r. in No. 1 Σηθίρ, in No. 3 Α᾿σσάρ), the name of a man and of two mountains.

1. A phylarch or chief of the Horim, who were the former inhabitants of the country afterwards possessed by the Edomites (Gen 26:20-21; 1Ch 1:38). B.C. ante 1960. The region doubtless derived its name from him (comp. Josephus, Σαείρα, Ant. 2, 1,1).

2. MOUNT SEIR (הִר שֵׂעַיר, Gen 14:6 sq.), or LAND OF SEIR (אֶרֶוֹ שֵׂעַיר, 32:3; 36:30), was the original name of the mountain ridge extending along the east side of the valley of Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf. The name (==“ the shaggy”) was probably in the first instance derived from Seir the Horite, who appears to have been the chief of the aboriginal inhabitants (36:20), and then, secondarily, by a paronomasia frequent in such cases, from the rough aspect of the whole country. The view from Aaron's tomb on Hor, in the center of Mount Seir, is enough to show the appropriateness of the appellation. The sharp and serrated ridges, the jagged rocks and cliffs, the straggling bushes and stunted trees, give the whole scene a sternness and ruggedness almost  unparalleled. In the Samaritan Pentateuch, instead of שעיר, the name, גבלהis used; and in the Jerusalem Targum, in place of “Mount Seir” we find טורא דגבלא, Mount Gabla. The word Gabla signifies “mountain,” and is thus descriptive of the region (Reland, Paloest. p. 83). The name Gebala, or Gebalene, was applied to this province by Josephus, and also by Eusebius and Jerome (Josephus, Ant. 2, 1, 2; Onomast. s.v. “Idumaea”). The northern section of Mount Seir, as far as Petra, is still called Jebal, the Arabic form of Gebal. The Mount Seir of the Bible extended much farther south than the modern province, as is shown by the words of Deu 2:1-8. In fact, its boundaries are there defined with tolerable exactness. It had the Arabah on the west (Deu 2:1; Deu 2:8); it extended as far south as the head of the Gulf of Akabah (Deu 2:8); its eastern border ran along the base of the mountain range where the plateau of Arabia begins. Its northern border is not so accurately determined. The land of Israel, as described by Joshua, extended from “the Mount Halak that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal Gad” (Jos 11:17). As no part of Edom was given to Israel, Mount Halak must have been upon its northern border. Now there is a line of “naked” (halak signified “naked”) white hills or cliffs which runs across the great valley about eight miles south of the Dead Sea, forming the division between the Arabah proper and the deep Ghor north of it. The view of these cliffs, from the shore of the Dead Sea, is very striking. They appear as a line of hills shutting in the valley, and extending up to the mountains of Seir. The impression left by them on the mind of the writer was that this is the very “Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir” (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 113, etc.; see Keil on Jos 11:17). The northern border of the modern district of Jebal is Wady el- Ahsy, which falls into the Ghor a few miles farther north (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 401).

In Deu 33:2, Seir appears to be connected with Sinai and Paran; but a careful consideration of that difficult passage proves. that the connection is not a geographical one. Moses there only sums up the several glorious manifestations of the divine majesty to the Israelites, without regard either to time or place (comp. Jdg 5:4-5).

Mount Seir was originally inhabited by the Horites, or “troglodytes,” who were doubtless the excavators of those singular rock dwellings found in such numbers in the ravines and cliffs around Petra. They were dispossessed, and apparently annihilated, by the posterity of Esau, who  “dwelt in their stead” (Deu 2:12). The history of Seir thus early merges into that of Edom. Though the country was afterwards called. Edom, yet the older name, Seir, did not pass away: it is frequently mentioned in the subsequent history of the Israelites (1Ch 4:42; 2Ch 20:10). Mount Seir is the subject of a terrible prophetic curse pronounced by Ezekiel (Ezekiel 35), which seems now to be literally fulfilled: “Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O Mount Seir, I am against thee, and I will make thee most desolate. I will lay thy cities waste,... . when the whole earth rejoiceth I will make thee desolate... . I will make thee perpetual desolations, and thy cities shall not return, and ye shall know that I am the Lord.”

The southern part of this range now bears the appellation esh-Sherah, which seems no other than a modification of the ancient name. In modern times these mountains were first visited and described by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 40), but they have often since been visited by other travelers, among whom Dr. Robinson has perhaps furnished the best description of them (Bib. Res. 2, 551, 552). At the base of the chain are low hills of limestone or argillaceous rock; then lofty masses of porphyry, which constitute the body of the mountain; above these is sandstone broken into irregular ridges and grotesque groups of cliffs; and again, farther back, and higher than all, are long elevated ridges of limestone without precipices. Beyond all these stretches off indefinitely the high plateau of the great eastern desert. The height of the porphyry cliffs is estimated by Dr: Robinson at about 2000 feet above the Arabah (the great valley between the Dead Sea and Elanitic Gulf); the elevation of Wady Musa above the same is perhaps 2000 or 2200 feet; while the limestone ridges farther back probably do not fall short of 3000 feet. The whole breadth of the mountainous tract between the Arabah and the eastern desert above does not exceed fifteen or twenty geographical miles. These mountains are quite different in character from those which front them on the other (west) side of the Arabah. The latter seem to be not more than two thirds as high as the former, and are wholly desert and sterile; while those on the east appear to enjoy a sufficiency of rain, and are covered with tufts of herbs and occasional trees. The valleys are also full of trees and shrubs and flowers, the eastern and higher parts being extensively cultivated, and yielding good crops. The general appearance of the soil is not unlike that around Hebron, though the face of the country is very different. It is, indeed, the region of which Isaac said to his son Esau, “Behold, thy dwelling shall be [far] from  the fatness of the earth, and the dew of heaven from above” (Gen 27:39). SEE IDUMEA.

3. An entirely different mountain from the foregoing formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of the territory of Judah (Jos 15:10 only). It lay westward of Kirjath-jearim, and between it and Beth- shemesh. If Kuriet el-Enab be the former, and Ain-shems the latter of these two, then Mount Seir cannot fail to be the ridge which lies between the Wady Aly and the Wady Ghurab (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 155). A village called Saris stands on the southern side of this ridge, which Tobler (Dritte Wanderung, p. 203) and Schwarz (Palest. p. 97) with great probability identify with Seir, notwithstanding considerable difference in the names. The Sa'irah, on the south of the Wady Surar (Robinson, 1st ed. 2, 364), is nearer in orthography, but not so suitable in position.

It is possibly the Σωρής, which, in the Alex. MS., is one of the eleven names inserted by the Sept. in Jos 15:59. The neighboring names agree. In the Vat. MS. it is Ε᾿ωβής

How the name of Seir came to be located so far to the north of the main seats of the Seirites we have no means of knowing. Perhaps, like other names occurring in the tribe of Benjamin, it is a monument of an incursion by the Edomites which has escaped record. See OPHNI, etc. But it is more probable that it derived its name from some peculiarity in the form or appearance of the spot. Dr. Robinson (3, 155), apparently without intending any allusion to the name of Seir, speaks of the “rugged points which composed the main ridge” of the mountain in question. Such is the meaning of the Hebrew word Seir. Whether there is any connection between this mountain and Seirath (q.v.), or has-Seirah, is not so clear. The name is not a common one, and it is not unlikely that it may have been attached to the more northern continuation of the hills of Judah which ran up into Benjamin — or, as it was then called, Mount Ephraim.

## Seirath[[@Headword:Seirath]]

             (Heb. with the art. has-Seirah', הִשַּׂעַירָה, the shaggy; Sept.; Σεειρωθά v.r. Σετειρωθά; Vulg. Seirath), the place to which Ehud fled after his murder of Eglon (Jdg 3:26), and whither, by blasts of his cow horn, he collected his countrymen for the attack of the Moabites in Jericho (Jdg 3:27). It was in “Mount Ephraim” (Jdg 3:27), a continuation, perhaps, of the same rough wooded hills (such seems to be the signification of Seir) which  stretched even so far south as to join the territory of Judah (Jos 15:10). The definite article prefixed to the name in the original shows that it was a well known spot in its day. — Smith. It is probably the same as Mount Seir (q.v.) just referred to, the Saris of the present day.

## Seirim[[@Headword:Seirim]]

             SEE SATYR.

## Seite[[@Headword:Seite]]

             in Lapp mythology, are deities whose office it was to promote the fertility of fields and herds. Very little is known respecting the form they assumed in the popular conception. They are said to have had feet like birds.

## Seitonji[[@Headword:Seitonji]]

             in Prussian mythology, were the lowest class of priests, of whom each village had one or more. They were regarded with great awe, but did not, like the other priests, enjoy the respect of the people.

## Seja[[@Headword:Seja]]

             in Roman mythology, is (1) a surname of Fortuna, to whom Servius Tullius dedicated a temple. (2) A Roman deity of sowing.

## Seja (2)[[@Headword:Seja (2)]]

             in Hindu mythology, is identical with Ananda, the noted serpent which was wound about the mountain Mandar in order to turn it into the Milk Sea.

## Sela[[@Headword:Sela]]

             (Heb. with the art. has-Se'la, הִסֶּלִע, the rock, as rendered in Jdg 1:36; 2Ch 25:12; Oba 1:3; and by the Sept. [ἡ]πέτρα; A.V. “Selah” in 2Ki 14:7), the name given in the above passages, and (in the A.V.) in Isa 16:1, to the metropolis of the Edomites in Mount Seir. In the Jewish history it is recorded that Amaziah, king of Judah, “slew of Edom, in the valley of salt, ten thousand, and took Sela by war, and called the name of it Joktheel unto this day” (2Ki 14:7). The parallel narrative of 2Ch 25:11-13 supplies fuller details. From it we learn that, having beaten the Edomitish army with a great slaughter in the “valley of salt” — the valley south of the Dead Sea —  Amaziah took those who were not slain to the cliff, and threw them headlong over it. This cliff is asserted by Eusebius (Onomast. Πέτρα) to be “a city of Edom, also called by the Assyrians Rekem,” by which there is no doubt that he intends Petra (see ibid. ῾Ρεκέμ, and the quotations in Stanley's Sin. and Pal. p. 94, note).

The title thus bestowed is said to have continued “unto this day.” This, Keil remarks, is a proof that the history was nearly contemporary with the event, because Amaziah's conquest was lost again by Ahaz less than a century afterwards (2Ch 28:17). This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; and it is still called by its original name by Isaiah (Isa 16:1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture; for it may well be doubted whether it is designated in Jdg 1:36 and Isa 42:11, as some suppose. On the ground of the sameness of signification, it is by common consent identified with the city later known as Petra, 500 Roman miles from Gaza (Pliny, 6, 32), the ruins of which, now called those of Wady Musa, are found about two days' journey north of the top of the Gulf of Akaba, and three or four south from Jericho. This place was in the midst of Mount Seir, in the neighborhood of Mount Hor (Josephus, Ant. 4, 4, 7), and therefore in Edomitish territory, but seems to have afterwards come under the dominion of Moab. In the end of the 4th century B.C. it appears as the headquarters of the Nabathaans, who successfully resisted the attacks of Antigonus (Diod. Sic. [ed. Hanov. 1604] 19, 731), and under them became one of the greatest stations for the approach of Eastern commerce to Rome (id. p. 94; Strabo, 16, 799; Apul. Flor. 1, 6). About B.C. 70 Petra appears as the residence of the Arab princes named Aretas (Josephus, Ant. 14, 1, 4; 5, 1, War, 1, 6, 2; 29, 3). It was by Trajan reduced to subjection to the Roman empire (Dion Cass. 68, 14), and from the next emperor received the name of Hadriana, as appears from the legend of a coin (Reland, Paloest. p. 931). Josephus (Ant. 4, 4, 7) gives the name of Arce (ςΑρκη) as an earlier synonym for Petra, where, however, it is probable that Α᾿ρκήμ or Α᾿ρκέμ (alleged by Eusebius, Onomast., as found in Josephus) should be read. The city Petra lay, though at a high level, in a hollow shut in by mountain cliff and approached only by a narrow ravine through which, and across the city's site, the river winds (Pliny, 6, 32; Strabo, 16, 779). SEE PETRA.

## Sela-hammahlekoth[[@Headword:Sela-hammahlekoth]]

             (Heb. Se'la hammachlekoth', סֵלִע הִמִּחְלְקוֹת; Sept. πέτρα ἡ μερισθεῖσα; Vulg. Petra dividens), a rock in the wilderness of Maon, the scene of one of those remarkable escapes which are so frequent in the history of Saul's pursuit of David (1Sa 23:28). Its name, if interpreted as Hebrew, signifies the “rock of escapes,” or “of divisions.” The former is the explanation of Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 485), the latter of the Targum and the ancient Jewish interpreters (Midrash; Rashi). The escape is that of David; the divisions are those of Saul's mind, undecided whether to remain in pursuit of his enemy or to go after the Philistines; but such explanations, though appropriate to either interpretation, and consistent with the Oriental habit of playing on words, are doubtless mere accommodations. The analogy of topographical nomenclature makes it almost certain that this cliff must have derived its name either from its smoothness (one of the radical meanings of חָלִק) or from some peculiarity of shape or position, such as is indicated in the translations of the Sept. and Vulgate. The divisions characteristic of the mountain, or rather cliff (for such Sela properly means), probably were the seams or ravines down its sides, which furnished David the means of escape. According to Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palestine, 2, 91), the name Malaky is still applied to part of a rocky gorge between Ziph and Maon,” seamed with many torrent beds.”

## Selah[[@Headword:Selah]]

             (2Ki 14:7). SEE SELA.

## Selah (2)[[@Headword:Selah (2)]]

             (Heb. id. סֶלָה). This word, which is only found in the poetical books of the Old Test., occurs seventy-one times in the Psalms, and three times in Habakkuk. In sixteen psalms it is found once, in fifteen twice, in seven three times, and in one four times — always at the end of a verse, except in Psa 55:19 [20]; Psa 57:3 [4], and Hab 3:3; Hab 3:9, where it is in the middle of a verse, though at the end of a clause. All the psalms in which it occurs, except eleven (3, 7, 24, 32, 48, 1, 82, 83, 87, 89, 143), have also the musical direction “to the Chief Musician” (comp. also Hab 3:19); and in these exceptions we find the words מַזְמֹר, mizmor (A.T. “Psalm”), Shiggaion, or Maschil, which sufficiently indicate that they were  intended for music. Besides these, in the titles of the psalms in which Selah occurs, we meet with the musical terms Alamoth (46), Altaschith (57, 59, 75), Gittith (81, 84), Mahalath Leannoth (88), Michtam (57, 59, 60), Neginah (61), Neginoth (4, 54, 55, 67, 76; comp. Hab 3:19), and Shushan-eduth (60); and on this association alone might be formed a strong presumption that, like these, Selah itself is a term which had a meaning in the musical nomenclature of the Hebrews. What that meaning may have been is now a matter of pure conjecture. Of the many theories which have been framed, it is easier to say what is not likely to be the true one than to pronounce certainly upon what is.

1. The Versions. — In the far greater number of instances the Targum renders the word by לְעִלְמַין, “forever;” four times (Psa 32:4; Psa 32:7; Psa 39:11 [12]; 4 [6]) לְעִלְמָא; once (Psa 44:8 [9]) לְעִלְמֵי עִלְמַין; and (Psa 48:8 [9])

עִד עִלְמֵי עִלְמַין, with the same meaning, “forever and ever.” In Psa 49:13 [14] it has לְעִלְמָא דְאָתֵי, “for the world to come;” in Psa 39:5 [6] לְחִיֵּי עִלְמָא, “for the life everlasting;” and in Psa 140:5 [6] תְּדַירָא, “continually.” This interpretation, which is the one adopted by the majority of Rabbinical writers, is purely traditional, and based upon no etymology whatever. It is followed by Aquila, who renders “Selah” ἀεί; by the editio quinta and editio sexta, which usually give respectively διαπαντός and εἰς τέλος; by Symmachus (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) and Theodotion (εἰς τέλος), in Habakkuk; by the reading of the Alex. MS. (είς τέλος) in Hab 3:13; by the Peshito-Syriac in Psa 3:8 [9], Psa 4:2 [3]; Psa 24:10, and Hab 3:13; and by Jerome, who has semper. In Psa 55:19 [20] קֶדֶם סֶלָה, kedem selah, is rendered in the Peshito “from before the world.” That this rendering is manifestly inappropriate in some passages, as, for instance, Psa 21:2 [3]; Psa 32:4; Psa 81:7 [8], and Hab 3:3, and superfluous in others, as Psa 44:8 [9]; Psa 84:4 [5]; Psa 89:4 [5], was pointed out long since by Aben-Ezra. In the Psalms the uniform rendering of the Sept. is διάψαλμα. Symmachus and Theodotion give the same, except in Psa 9:16 [17], where Theodotion has ἀεί, and Psa 52:5 [7], where Symmachus has εἰς ἀεί. In Hab 3:13 the Alex. MS. gives εἰς τέλος. In Psalms 38 (in the Sept.), 7; 80, 7 [8], διάψαλμα is added in the Sept., and in Hab 3:7 in the Alex. MS. In Psalms 57 it is put at the end of Psa 57:2; and in Psa 3:8 [9]; Psa 24:10; Psa 88:10-11], it is omitted altogether. In all passages except those already referred to, in which it follows the Targum,  the Peshito-Syriac has dips, an abbreviation for διάψαλμα. This abbreviation is added in Psa 48:13 [14]; 1, 15 [16]; Psa 68:13 [14]; Psa 57:2; Psa 80:7 [8], at the end of the verse; and in Psa 52:3 in the middle of the verse after מַטּוֹב; in Psalms 49 it is put after כִּצּאֹן. in Psa 49:14 [15], and in Psalms 68, after רָעָשָׁהin Psa 68:8 [9], and after לֵאלֹהַיםin Psa 68:32 [33]. The Vulgate omits it entirely, while in Hab 3:3 the editio sexta and others give μεταβολὴ διαψάλματος.

2. The Church Fathers. — These generally adopt the rendering διάψαλμα of the Sept. and other translators, although it is in every way as traditional as that of the Targum “forever,” and has no foundation in any known etymology. With regard to the meaning of διάψαλμα itself, there are many opinions. Both Origen (Comm. ad Psalm, Opp. ed. Delarue, 2, 516) and Athanasius (Synops. Script. Sacr. 13) are silent upon this point. Eusebius of Caesarea (Proef. in Psalm) says it marked those passages in which the Holy Spirit ceased for a time to work upon the choir. Gregory of Nyssa (Tract. 2 in Psalm cap. 10) interprets it as a sudden lull in the midst of the psalmody, in order to receive anew the divine inspiration. Chrysostom (Opp. ed. Montfaucon, 5, 540) takes it to indicate the portion of the psalm which was given to another choir. Augustine (On Psalms 4) regards it as an interval of silence in the psalmody. Jerome (Ep. ad Marcellam) enumerates the various opinions which have been held upon the subject; that diapsalma denotes a change of meter, a cessation of the Spirit's influence, or the beginning of another sense. Others, he says, regard it as indicating a difference of rhythm, and the silence of some kind of music in the choir; but for himself he falls back upon the version of Aquila, and renders Selah by semper, with a reference to the custom of the Jews to put at the end of their writings Amen, Selah, or Shalom. In his Commentary on Psalms 3 he is doubtful whether to regard it as simply a musical sign, or as indicating the perpetuity of the truth contained in the passage after which it is placed; so that, he says, “wheresoever Selah (that is, diapsalma or semper) is put, there we may know that what follows, as well as what precedes, belongs not only to the present time, but to eternity.” Theodoret (Proef. in Psalm) explains diapsalma by μέλους μεταβολή or ἐναλλαγή (as Suidas), “a change of the melody.” On the whole, the rendering διάψαλμα rather increases the difficulty, for it does not appear to be the true meaning of Selah, and its own signification is obscure.

3. Rabbinical Writers. — The majority of these follow the Targum and the dictum of R. Eliezer (Talm. Babyl. Erubin, 5, 54) in rendering Selah “forever;” but Aben-Ezra (On Psa 3:3) showed that in some passages this rendering was inappropriate, and expressed his own opinion that Selah was a word of emphasis, used to give weight and importance to what was said, and to indicate its truth — “but the right explanation is that the meaning of Selah is like ‘so it is,' or ‘thus,' and ‘the matter is true and right.'” Kimchi (Lex. s.v.) doubted whether it had any special meaning at all in connection with the sense of the passage in which it was found, and explained it as a musical term. He derives it from סָלִל, to raise, elevate, with הparagogic, and interprets it as signifying a raising or elevating the voice, as much as to say in this place there was an elevation of the voice in song.

4. Modern Writers. — Among these there is the same diversity of opinion. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.) derives Selah from סָלָה, salah, to suspend, of which he thinks it is the imperative Kal, with הparagogic, סְלָה, in pause סֶלָה. But this form is supported by no parallel instance. In accordance with his derivation, which is harsh, he interprets Selah to mean either “suspend the voice,” that is, “be silent,” a hint to the singers, or “raise, elevate the stringed instruments.” In either case he regards it as denoting a pause in the song, which was filled up by an interlude played by the choir of Levites. Ewald (Die Dichter des A.B. 1, 179) arrives at substantially the same result by a different process. He derives Selah from סָלִל, salal, to rise, whence the substantive סִל, which with ה paragogic becomes in pause סֶלָה(comp. הֶרָה, from הִרroot הָרִר, Gen 14:10). So far as the form of the word is concerned, this derivation is more tenable than the former. Ewald regards the phrase “Higgaion, Selah,” in Psa 9:16 [17], as the full form, signifying “music, strike up!” — an indication that the voices of the choir were to cease while the instruments alone came in. Hengstenberg follows Gesenius, De Wette, and others, in the rendering Pause! but refers it to the contents of the psalm, and understands it of the silence of the music in order to give room for quiet reflection. If this were the case, Selah at the end of a psalm would be superfluous. The same meaning of pause or end is arrived at by Fürst (Handw. s.v.), who derives Selah from a root סָלָה, salah, to cut off (a meaning which is perfectly arbitrary), whence the substantive סֵל, sel, which with ה paragogic  becomes in pause סֶלָה, a form which is without parallel. While etymologists have recourse to such shifts as these, it can scarcely be expected that the true meaning of the word will be evolved by their investigations. Indeed, the question is as far from solution as ever. Beyond the fact that Selah is a musical term, we know absolutely nothing about it, and are entirely in the dark as to its meaning. Sommer (Bibl. Abhandl. 1, 1-84) has devoted an elaborate discourse to its explanation (translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1848, p. 66 sq.). After observing that Selah everywhere appears to mark critical moments in the religious consciousness of the Israelites, and that the music was employed to give expression to the energy of the poet's sentiments on these occasions, he (p. 40) arrives at the conclusion that the word is used “in those passages where, in the Temple Song, the choir of priests who stood opposite to the stage occupied by the Levites were to raise their trumpets (סלל), and with the strong tones of this instrument mark the words just spoken, and bear them upwards to the hearing of Jehovah. Probably the Levitical minstrels supported this priestly intercessory music by vigorously striking their harps and psalteries; whence the Greek expression διάψαλμα.

To this points, moreover, the fuller direction, ‘Higgaion, Selah' (Psa 9:16); the first word of which denotes the whirr of the stringed instruments (Psa 92:4), the other the raising of the trumpets, both of which were here to sound together. The less important Higgaion fell away, when the expression was abbreviated, and Selah alone remained.” Dr. Davidson (Introd. to the Old Test. 2, 248) with good reason rejects this explanation as labored and artificial, though it is adopted by Keil in Hävernick's Einleitung (3, 120-129). He shows that in some passages (as Psa 32:4-5; Psa 52:3; Psa 55:7-8) the playing of the priests on the trumpets would be unsuitable, and proposes the following as his own solution of the difficulty: “The word denotes elevations or ascent, i.e. loud, clear. The music which commonly accompanied the singing was soft and feeble. In cases where it was to burst in more strongly during the silence of the song, Selah was the sign. At the end of a verse or strophe, where it commonly stands, the music may have readily been strongest and loudest.” It may be remarked of this, as of all the other explanations which have been given, that it is mere conjecture, based on an etymology which, in any other language than Hebrew, would at once be rejected as unsound. A few other opinions may be noticed as belonging to the history of the subject. Michaelis, in despair at being unable to assign any meaning to the word, regarded it as an abbreviation, formed by taking the first or other letters of three other  words (Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.), though he declines to conjecture what these may have been, and rejects at once the guess of Meibomius, who extracts the meaning da capo from the three words which he suggests.

For other conjectures of this kind, see Eichhorn, Bibliothek, 5, 545. Mattheson was of opinion that the passages where Selah occurred were repeated either by the instruments or by another choir: hence he took it as equal to ritornello. Herder regarded it as marking a change of key, while Paulus Burgensis and Schindler assigned to it no meaning, but looked upon it as an enclitic word used to fill up the verse. Buxtorf (Lex. Hebr.) derived it from סָלָה, salah, to spread, lay low; hence used as a sign to lower the voice, like piano. In Eichhorn's Bibliothek (5, 550) it is suggested that Selah may perhaps signify a scale in music, or indicate a rising or falling in the tone. Koster (Stud. u. Krit. 1831) saw in it only a mark to indicate the strophical divisions of the Psalms, but its position in the middle of verses is against this theory. Augusti (Pract. Einl. in d. Psalm p. 125) thought it was an exclamation, like Hallelujah! and the same view was taken by the late Prof. Lee (Heb. Gr. § 243, 2), who classes it among the interjections, and renders it Praise! “For my own part,” he says, “I believe it to be descended from the Arabic root salah, ‘he blessed,' etc., and used not unlike the word Amen, or the doxology, among ourselves.” Delitzsch thinks that the instrumental accompaniment, while the psalm was sung, was soft, and that the Selah indicated loud playing when the singing ceased (Psalmen, 1, 19). Hupfeld, the other most distinguished scholar among recent commentators on the Psalms, agrees with Delitzsch in general that the Selah was the signal for the singing to cease and the instrumental music to be performed alone; and he takes “an interlude” to be the meaning of the obscure word διάψαλμα, by which Selah has been rendered in the Sept. We conclude, therefore, as the general drift of modern interpretation, that Selah denotes a pause in the vocal performance at certain emphatic points, while the single accompanying instrument carried on the music. If any further information be sought on this subject, it may be found in the treatises contained in Ugolilo (vol. 22), in Noldius (Concord. Part. Ann. et Vind. No. 1877), in Saalschütz (Hebr. Poes. p. 346), and in the essay of Sommer quoted above. See also Stolle, Selah Philologioe Enucleatum (Wittenb. 1685); Peucer, De סלהEbroeorum (Naumb. 1739); Danville Review, 1864. SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

## Selav[[@Headword:Selav]]

             SEE QUAIL.

## Selden, John[[@Headword:Selden, John]]

             an eminent lawyer and antiquarian, was born at Salvington, a hamlet in the parish of West Farring, near Worthing, in Sussex, England, Dec. 16, 1584. He received the rudiments of his education at the Free School of Chichester, and at the age of fourteen entered at Hert Hall, Oxford, where, although possessing great abilities, he did not particularly distinguish himself. He entered himself at Clifford's Inn in 1602 for the study of law, and in 1604 removed to the Inner Temple for the completion of his legal studies. He acquired very early a taste for antiquarian research, in which department he afterwards became so eminent. He was, in fact, one of the most learned men of his age. He lived in stirring times, and was, almost inevitably, mixed up with the stormy politics of the period; but he belonged to no extreme party, although a friend of liberty and of the popular cause. He died Nov. 30, 1654. His works are very numerous and learned. The following are those which require special notice here: De Diis Syris Syntagmata Duo (1617), which contains a history of the idol deities mentioned in Scripture, and a summary of Syrian idolatry: — De Successione in Bona Defuncti ad Leges Ebroeorum (1631). An improved edition of this work appeared in 1636, including an additional treatise entitled De Successione in Pontificatum Ebroeorum. Both these treatises. were republished by the author, with additions, in 1638: — De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Ebroeorum Libri Septem (1640). In this work the author treats of the seven so called precepts of Noah, and gives a digest of all the laws of the Jews, distinguishing those which belong to universal law from those which are merely national and local: — Uxor Ebraica; seu de Nuptiis et Divortiis ex Jure Civili, id est Divino et Talmudico, Veterum Ebroeorum Tres Libri (1646). Everything relating to marriage and divorce among the Jews will be found treated of here: — De Synedriis et Proefecturis Juridicis Veterum Ebroeorum (1650). In this work, on which Selden spent twelve years, he sets forth everything recorded of the Sanhedrim, or juridical courts of the Jews, with collateral notices of similar institutions in other countries.

## Selections Of Psalms[[@Headword:Selections Of Psalms]]

             The Psalter, as it stands in the Prayer book of the Church of England, is divided into sixty portions, agreeing with the average number of mornings and evenings in the month. There are also ten selections of Psalms, any one of which may be used instead of the regular psalms of the day. These are prefixed to the Psalter, and consist of one or more psalms, chiefly on the same subject. The following are the subjects of the several selections: 1, the majesty, greatness, and compassion of God; 2, God as an all-seeing Judges 3, penitence and trust in God; 4, contrast between wicked and good; 5, blessedness of the righteous; 6, the Lord a refuge; 7, 8, the happiness and joy of those who wait upon the Lord, etc.; 9, God infinite and worthy of all praise; 10, invitation to unite in praising God.

## Seled[[@Headword:Seled]]

             (Heb. סֶלֶד, exultation; Sept. Σαλάδ v.r. Α᾿λσαλάδ). a descendant of Jerahmeel, son of Hezron, being the elder of the two sons of Nadab, and without children (t Chronicles ii, 30). B.C. post 1615.

## Selemia[[@Headword:Selemia]]

             (Vulg. Selemia, the Gr. text being lost), the third named of the five rapid scribes whom Esdras was charged to select for taking down his visions (2Es 14:24). Selemi'as (Σελεμίας) the Greek form (1Es 9:34) of the name of SHELEMIAH SEE SHELEMIAH (q.v.), one of the “sons” of Bani (Ezr 10:34).

## Selemnus[[@Headword:Selemnus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a shepherd boy of Achaia. He was found asleep among his herds by the nymph Argyra, and his youth and beauty led her to bestow on him her favor; but the beauty of man is not constant like that of a nymph, who retains her youth and beauty always, and Argyra accordingly forsook her lover when his charms were no longer, fresh and blooming to her eyes. Venus herself endeavored to turn the hard heart of the goddess, but in vain, and Selemnus pined away under the agonies of unrequited love. In her compassion Venus now changed him into a stream, on which she conferred the quality of inducing forgetfulness in the minds of all lovers who should bathe in its waters, so that they might be cured of their passion,

## Selene[[@Headword:Selene]]

             (Σελήνη, the moon), a goddess worshipped by the ancient Greeks, being the personification of the moon. She is called a daughter of Hyperion and Theia, and, accordingly, a sister of Helios and Eos. She is also called Phoebe, as the sister of Phoebus, the god of the sun. In later times Selene was identified with Artemis, and the worship of the two became amalgamated. Among the Romans she was called Luna; and had a temple on the Aventine at Rome. Selene is described as a very beautiful goddess, with long wings and a golden diadem, and AEschylus called her “the eye of night.”

## Seleucia[[@Headword:Seleucia]]

             [some wrongly Seleu'cia] (Σελεύκεια), a city of Syria, situated west of Antioch, on the sea coast, near the mouth of the Orontes; sometimes called Seleucia Pieria, from the neighboring Mount Pierus; and also Seleucia ad Mare, in order to distinguish it from several other cities of the same name, all of them denominated from Seleucus Nicanor. Its ancient name was Rivers of Water (῞Υδατος ποταμοί, Strabo, 16, 2, 8). It is fully described by Polybius (5, 39). It was practically the seaport of Antioch (q.v.), as Ostia was of Rome, Neapolis of Philippi, Cenchreae of Corinth, and the Piraeus of Athens. The river Orontes, after flowing past Antioch, entered the sea not far from Seleucia. The distance between the two towns was about sixteen miles, chiefly of broken ground, with a large mountain called Coryphaeseum on the north near the sea. We are expressly told that Paul, in company with Barnabas, sailed from Seleucia at the beginning of his first missionary circuit (Act 13:4); and it is almost certain that he landed there on his return from it (14:26). The name of the place shows at once that its history was connected with that line of Seleucidae who reigned at Antioch from the death of Alexander the Great to the close of the Roman republic, and whose dynasty had so intimate a connection with Jewish annals (1Ma 11:8; Josephus, Ant. 18, 9, 8). SEE SYRIA.

This strong fortress and convenient seaport was, in fact, constructed by the first Seleucus (died B.C. 280), and here he was buried. It was taken by Ptolemy  Euergetes on his expedition to Syria, but was recovered by Antiochus Epiphanes. It retained its importance in Roman times, and in Paul's day it had the privileges of a free city (Pliny, H.N. 5, 18). The remains are numerous, the most considerable being an immense excavation extending from the higher part of the city to the sea; but to us the most interesting are the two piers of the old harbor, which still bear the names of Paul and Barnabas. The masonry continues so good that the idea of clearing out and repairing the harbor was entertained, but not executed, by one Ali Pasha, of Aleppo. Accounts of Seleucia were first given by Pococke (Observations in the East, 22, 182), and afterwards in the narrative of the Euphrates Expedition by general Chesney, and in his papers in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society (8, 228 sq.), and also in a paper by Dr. Yates in the Museum of Classical Antiquities. The harbor has still more lately been surveyed by captain Allen (Dead Sea, etc.). See also Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1, 137; Lewin, St. Paul, 1, 116 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

## Seleucia (In Chaldoea), Council Of[[@Headword:Seleucia (In Chaldoea), Council Of]]

             was held in 410, in order to reestablish ecclesiastical discipline in Persia and Mesopotamia. Twenty-seven canons were made.

1. Orders prayers to be made for princes.

2. Contains a profession of faith agreeing with that of Nicaea.

3. Orders that the consecration of a bishop be performed by three bishops at least.

5. Excludes from every ministration priests and deacons who do not observe strict continence.

6. Ordains the same thing with respect to clerks guilty of usury.

7. Excommunicates all who have dealings with enchanters, etc.

10. Directs that priests and other clerks shall eat in a place distinct from the poor.

11. Orders that their sleeping rooms also shall be separate.

15 and

16. Ordain that there shall be but one archdeacon in each diocese, who shall act as the arm and tongue of the bishop to publish and execute his will.

20. Permits the archdeacon to celebrate the holy eucharist in the absence of the bishop, and gives him power to punish deacons under certain circumstances.

25. Forbids bishops to ordain priests and deacons anywhere save before the altar.

See Mansi, Supp. vol. 1, col. 285.

## Seleucia (In Syria), Council Of[[@Headword:Seleucia (In Syria), Council Of]]

             This council was held in the Church of St. Tecla, Sept. 27, 359, by order of the emperor Constantius. One hundred and sixty bishops were present, of whom about one hundred five were Semi-Arians, forty Anomoeans and thirteen Catholics; among these was St. Hilary of Poitiers, who for four years had been banished into Phrygia. Among the Semi-Arians were George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Basil of Ancyra, and Eustachius of Sebaste. The Anomoeans formed the party of Acacius of Caesarea. The thirteen Catholic bishops, who probably came from Egypt, alone maintained the consubstantiality of the Word. Leonas, the imperial quaestor, had orders to attend the deliberations of the assembly. The bishops forming the party of Acacius, anxious to avoid any inquiry, into the several accusations and complaints which they were aware would be brought against them, insisted that, first of all, the questions relating to the faith should be examined, and after some discussion they gained their point. In the very first sitting, however, they openly renounced the Council and the Creed of Nicaea, and maintained that the Son was of a substance different from that of the Father. A discussion ensued between them and the Semi-Arians, which ended in the Acacians leaving the assembly, disgusted with its decision, viz. that the formulary drawn up at Antioch in 341 should be adhered to.

In the second sitting the formulary of Antioch was confirmed by the Semi- Arians, who were alone in the council; while the Acacians drew up a new formulary, condemning both the similarity of substance and the contrary. In the third sitting the dispute was continued, Leonas having been deputed by the Acacians to attend for them, and to deliver their formulary of faith. In  the fourth sitting the Acacians declared that they believed the likeness of the Son to the Father to consist in a likeness of will only, and not of essence. The others maintained a likeness of essence also, and no decision was arrived at.

In the fifth sitting the Acacians were summoned to attend to examine the case of St. Cyril, who appealed from the judgment of Acacius, by whom he had been deposed. They refused to attend; and, after having frequently summoned them, the council deposed Acacius, Eudoxius of Antioch, George of Alexandria, and several others. They reduced to the communion of their respective churches, Asterius, Eusebius; and five others, until such time as they should disprove the accusations brought against them. Another bishop was elected to the see of Antioch. The sentence of the council was not, however, carried into effect, as the deposed bishops were able to secure the favor of the emperor.

## Seleucians[[@Headword:Seleucians]]

             the followers of Seleucus, a philosopher of Galatia, who, about the year 380, adopted some of the notions of the Valentinians. He taught that Jesus Christ assumed a body only in appearance; that the world was not made by God, but was eternal; that the soul was only an animated fire created by angels; that Christ does not sit at the right hand of the Father in a human body, but that he lodged his body in the sun, according to Psa 19:4; and that all the pleasures of happiness consist in corporeal delight. Augustine says that the Seleucians rejected the use of water in baptism, under the pretense that this was not the baptism instituted by Christ, because John, comparing his baptism with that of Christ, says, “I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” They deemed a baptism of fire more suitable to the spiritual nature of man than a baptism of water, since they taught that the soul was a portion of living fire. SEE HERMIANS.

## Seleucidic era[[@Headword:Seleucidic era]]

             is that chronology which dates from the victory of Seleucus over Antigonus and the recovery of Babylonia (October, B.C. 312). This “era of the Seleucidae” was at one time in general use throughout all Central and Western Asia. The Arabians, who called it the “era of the two-horned” (Dhulkarnaim), meaning Alexander, did not relinquish it till long after the religion of Mohammed had arisen, and the era of the “Hegira” (the flight of  Mohammed from Mecca to Medina) had been introduced. The Jews did not adopt this era till after they passed from under the dominion of the Egypto-Greeks to that of the Syro-Greeks, when they were obliged to employ it in their civil contracts, and therefore it was designated by them as the מנין שטרות, or “era of contracts,” and מנין יונים, or “Greek era.” Thenceforth they retained its use upwards of twelve centuries, and employed no other epoch till the final close of the schools on the Euphrates (A.D. 1040), since when they date their era from the creation. This Seleucidic era is the same which in the Books of the Maccabees is designated as “the year of the kingdom of the Greeks” (βασιλείας ῾Ελλήνων, 1 Maccabees 1, 10), and both books compute by it. The student of history can very easily make use of the Seleucidic era by bearing in mind that the first year of this era corresponds to the first year of the 117th Olympiad, or to the year 442 ab urbe condita, or to the year B.C. 312. With this guide in his hand he will be enabled to find any year corresponding to that of the Seleucidic era; thus the year

1 B.C. is =312 Sel.=753 ab u. c.=194, 4 Olymp. 1 A.D. is=313 Sel.=754 ab u. c.=195, 1 Olymp. 70 A.D. is=382 Sel.=823 ab u. c.=212, 2 Olymp. 100 A.D. is=412 Sel.=853 ab u. c.=219, 4 Olymp. 120 A.D. is=432 Sel.=873 ab u. c.=224, 4 Olymp. 130 A.D. is=442 Sel.=883 ab u. c.=227, 2 Olymp.

SEE AERA. (B.P.)

## Seleucus[[@Headword:Seleucus]]

             (Σέλευκος, a common Greek name), the name of several of the kings of the Greek dominion of Syria (q.v.), hence called that of the Seleucidae. SEE ANTIOCHUS. Of these one only is named in Scripture, although several are referred to in Daniel 11.

## Seleucus (2)[[@Headword:Seleucus (2)]]

             SEE SELEUCIANS.

## Seleucus IV[[@Headword:Seleucus IV]]

             surnamed Philopator (or Soter, in Josephus, Ant. 12, 4, 10), styled “king of Asia” (2 Maccabees 3, 3), that is, of the provinces included in the Syrian monarchy, according to the title claimed by the Seleucidae, even when they had lost their footing in Asia Minor (comp. 1Ma 8:6; 1Ma 11:13; 1Ma 12:39; 1Ma 13:32), was the son and successor of Antiochus the Great (see Appian, Syria, 3, 45). He took part in the disastrous battle of Magnesia (B.C. 190), and three years afterwards, on the death of his father, ascended the throne. He seems to have devoted himself to strengthening the Syrian power, which had been broken down at Magnesia, seeking to keep on good terms with Rome and Egypt till he could find a favorable opportunity for war. He was, however, murdered, after a reign of twelve years (B.C. 175), by Heliodorus (q.v.), one of his own courtiers, “neither in [sudden] anger nor in battle” (Dan 11:20; see Jerome, ad loc.), but by ambitious treachery, without having effected anything of importance. His son Demetrius I Soter, SEE DEMETRIUS, whom he had sent, while still a boy, as hostage to Rome, after a series of romantic adventures gained the crown in B.C. 162 (1Ma 7:1; 2Ma 11:1). The general policy of Seleucus towards the Jews, like that of his father (3, 2, 3, καὶ Σέλευκον), was conciliatory, as the possession of Palestine was of the highest importance in the prospect of an Egyptian war; and he undertook a large share of the expenses of the Temple service (2Ma 11:3; 2Ma 11:6). On one occasion, by the false representations of Simon (q.v.), a Jewish officer, he was induced to make an attempt to carry away the treasures deposited in the Temple by means of the same Heliodorus who murdered him. The attempt signally failed, but it does not appear that he afterwards showed any resentment against the Jews (4, 5, 6,); though his want of money to pay the enormous tribute due to the Romans may have compelled him to raise extraordinary revenues, for which cause he is described in Daniel as a “raiser of taxes” (11, 20; comp. Livy, 41, 19). See Manzini's monograph (in Italian) on this prince (Mailand, 1634).

## Seleznevtshini[[@Headword:Seleznevtshini]]

             a sect of dissenters from the Russo-Greek Church resembling the Strigolniks (q.v.).

## Self Deception[[@Headword:Self Deception]]

             deception proceeding from, and practiced upon, one's self, especially in forming judgments or receiving impressions of our own state, character, and conduct. For example:

1. In judging of our own character we are very apt to enhance the good qualities we possess, to give ourselves credit for others that we really have not, and to ignore the evil qualities that should be seen by us.

2. In the matter of our conduct we are very prone to persuade ourselves either that our acts were not wrong, or that the peculiar circumstances under which we were placed were so extenuating as to remove actual guilt.

3. There is a tendency to confound the non-appearance of a vicious affection with its actual extirpation.

4. An improper estimate of the reality of our repentance, faith, works, etc., or of the importance of the same. The range of objects as to which men deceive themselves is very wide, including God, Jesus Christ. the Holy Spirit, Scriptures, experience, etc. The results are great and dangerous, it renders men slaves of procrastination, leads them to overrate themselves, flatters them with an easy victory, and confirms their evil habits. The means of avoiding self deception are strict self inquiry, prayer, watchfulness, and diligent study of God's Word.

## Self Dedication[[@Headword:Self Dedication]]

             the unreserved dedication of ourselves to God with the purpose of serving him in holiness and righteousness.

## Self Defense[[@Headword:Self Defense]]

             the act of defending one's self and property from injury. The right of self defense has been questioned by many, and has also been stoutly advocated. The secular law requires no man to submit passively to the infliction of evil upon his person, but always allows him to defend himself. Of course, the violence used must only be so much as is necessary for defense. Is the principle of self defense contrary to the Gospel, or should a man choose rather to lose his own life than to save it at the expense of another's? It may be answered that where there is reason to believe that life is at stake one is justified in taking the life of the would-be murderer; for the reason  that in attempting a felony he has forfeited his life, and in preserving your own you spare the innocent. It is generally considered lawful even to kill in the defense of chastity, provided there be no other way of preserving it.

## Self Denial[[@Headword:Self Denial]]

             the forbearing to follow one's inclinations or desires. In the scriptural sense it is the renouncing of all those pleasures, profits, views, connections, or practices that are prejudicial to the true interests of the soul. The understanding must be so far denied as not to lean upon it independent of divine instruction (Pro 3:5-6). The will must be denied so far as it opposes the will of God (Eph 5:17). The affections must be denied when they become inordinate (Col 3:5). The gratification of the members of the body must be denied when out of their due course (Rom 6:12-13). The honors of the world and praise of men must be foregone when they become a snare (Heb 11:24-26); also worldly emoluments, when to be obtained in an unlawful way or when standing in opposition to religion and usefulness (Mat 4:20-22). Friends and relatives must be renounced, so far as they oppose the truth and would influence us to oppose it too (Gen 12:1). Our own righteousness must be relinquished, so as not to depend upon it (Php 3:8-9). Life itself must be laid down if called for in the cause of Christ (Mat 16:24-25). In fine, everything that is sinful must be denied, however pleasant and apparently advantageous, since, without holiness, no man shall see the Lord (Heb 12:14).

## Self Examination[[@Headword:Self Examination]]

             the act of examining one's own conduct and motives. It is a duty commanded by God (2Co 13:5), and, to result favorably, should be deliberate, frequent, impartial, diligent, wise, and with a desire of amendment. In self examination reference should always be made to the Word of God as the rule of duty.

## Self Government[[@Headword:Self Government]]

             the wise and conscientious regulation of all our appetites, affections, and habits on Christian principles.

## Self Knowledge[[@Headword:Self Knowledge]]

             the knowledge of one's own nature, abilities, duties, principles, prejudices, tastes, virtues, and vices. This knowledge is commanded in the Scriptures (Psa 4:4; 2Co 13:5). It is of great utility, as it leads to humility, contrition, prayer, self denial, charity. When by self knowledge we become acquainted with our powers, resolution, and motives, then we secure self possession. To secure self knowledge there must be watchfulness, frequent and close attention to the operations of our own mind, study of the Scriptures, and dependence on divine grace.

## Self Love[[@Headword:Self Love]]

             (in Greek, φιλαυτία), an element of character which is to be carefully distinguished from selfishness as being radically different, and not so in degree only. The former is demanded by the moral consciousness in man, while the latter is condemned, and the same distinction prevails in the Scriptures. The one is the basis for motives to self examination, for prudence and carefulness of life, for self renewal and improvement; the other the ground in which all “works of the flesh” (Gal 5:19; comp. 1Ti 6:10) are rooted.

General or philosophical ethics requires self love in the sense that each person should honor the idea of humanity or the human personality which underlies his own nature, and that he should develop it in every direction. The principle of humanity which asserts the dignity of human nature is the prevailing idea. Theological ethics treats self love as a disposition which has for its object the Christian personality, which springs from love to God and Christ, which sanctifies the Lord in the heart (1Pe 3:15), protects against all contamination of the flesh and spirit (2Co 7:1), and seeks to be renewed in the spirit of the mind (Eph 4:23)  in order that we may be glorified with Christ (2Co 3:18). The regenerated personality, therefore, constitutes both subject and object in Christian self love, while, in the natural sentiment, unregenerate man is the substituted entity, and Christian self love alone is really virtuous, a personal disposition through which the Christian presents himself to God a holy, living sacrifice (Rom 12:1).

The intimate relation subsisting between self love and love to our neighbors is such that they are inseparable and mutually condition each other. Not only does love for others limit our love of self, but the egotist degrades himself in proportion as he indulges in his egotism; and no person is capable of being useful to others in his character and his life who does not in the best sense love and care for himself. Every duty to self may accordingly be viewed as duty to our neighbors, and vice versa, if care be taken to guard against the eudaemonism which is so likely to intrude.

In its manifestations Christian self love assumes a twofold character in which the negative and positive elements predominate at different times. The former element corresponds to self respect, whose influence leads the Christian to avoid everything that may wound, or in any way impair, the dignity conferred on him, and which impels him to cultivate the habit of spiritual watchfulness. Upon this ground the positive element in self love carries forward the work of renewal, including the whole of Christian development and perfection. And inasmuch as the entire man is concerned in these objects of self love, it follows that the body must share in the development and other benefits secured to the spirit, though simply as the spirit's minister and instrument (1Th 5:23). At this point Christian self love passes over into spiritual discipline, and coincides to some extent with Christian asceticism. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. s.v.

## Self Murder[[@Headword:Self Murder]]

             SEE SUICIDE.

## Self Seeking[[@Headword:Self Seeking]]

             SEE COVETOUSNESS.

## Self baptizers[[@Headword:Self baptizers]]

             SEE SE-BAPTISTS.

## Selfishness[[@Headword:Selfishness]]

             an inordinate self love, prompting one, for the sake of personal gratification or advantage, to disregard the rights or feelings of other men. It is a negative quality — that is, it consists in not considering what is due to one's neighbors through a deficiency of justice or benevolence. Selfishness is contrary to the Scriptures, which command us to have respect for the rights and feelings of others, and forbids us to encroach thereupon.

## Selig, Gottfried[[@Headword:Selig, Gottfried]]

             a convert from Judaism, whose original name was Philipp Heynemann, was born at Weissenfels in 1722. Up to his tenth year he enjoyed the lectures of a private tutor; after this time he was sent first to Dessau and then to Fürth, to attend the Talmudical lectures there. When he was thirteen years of age, his father wished him to become a merchant, but to this proposition he would not yield. His father finally consented to give him a better education, and a candidate of theology was intrusted with his instruction in the German and Latin languages. At times the pupil, who was well acquainted with the objections against Christianity, propounded questions to his teacher which the latter could not answer, because he was not acquainted enough with the Hebrew language. The teacher then invited a certain Herrlich, who was well acquainted with the Hebrew and Rabbinic literature, to meet Philipp several times in order to dispute with him about Christianity. The result was that the sting left in the Jewish heart became the impetus for further searching the Scriptures. About Christmas of 1737, Philipp went to pastor Schumann and handed to him a paper in which certain passages of the New Test. were written down, and of which he desired an explanation. This visit decided his future course, and Sept. 17, 1738, he was baptized at Weissenfels, assuming the name Gottfried Selig. In 1767 he came to Leipsic, where Prof. Dathe examined him in Hebraicis, and Prof. Bosseck in Talmudicis et Rabbinicis, and thus he was enabled to commence his lectures in Rabbinic literature. He died after 1792. He wrote, Collectio abbreviaturarum Hebraicarum ultra 4000 Assurgens (Leipsic, 1781): — Kurze undgrundliche Anweisung zu einer leichteren Erlernung der jüdisch-deutschen Sprache (ibid. 1767): — Der Jude (ibid. 1767-71, 9 vols.), in which he describes the usages, customs, and doctrines of the Jews according to Rabbinic sources: — Compendia Vocum Hebraico-Rabbinicarum (ibid. 1780). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 309; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, p. 131; Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffnung, 8, 159 sq. (B.P.)

## Selingstad, Council Of[[@Headword:Selingstad, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Salegunstadiense). This council was held in August, 1022, by the emperor Henry; Aribo, archbishop of Mayence, presiding. Twenty canons were published.

3. Forbids the celebration of marriages from Advent to the octave of the Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, during the fourteen days preceding the Feast of John the Baptist, and on fast days and vigils.

4. Forbids a priest having drunk anything after cockcrow in summer to say mass on the following day; allows of cases of necessity in winter.

6. States that complaints had been made of the conduct of some very foolish priests who were in the habit of throwing the corporal into a fire for the sake of extinguishing it, and strictly prohibits it.

9. Forbids talking in church, or in the church porch.

10. Forbids lay persons, and particularly matrons, to hear daily the gospel “In principio erat verbum;” and particular masses, such as the mass of the Holy Trinity or of St. Michael. The canon seems to imply that this had been done for the sake of divination.

16. Forbids any person to go to Rome without first obtaining the permission of his bishop or his deputy.

18. Notices the folly of those who, being guilty of some crimes, despise the penance imposed by their own priests, and trust to obtaining a plenary absolution from the Roman pontiff. It declares that such indulgence shall not be granted to them, but that in future they shall first fulfill the penance imposed, and then go to Rome, if they choose, having first obtained leave from their own bishop.

After the canons follows an appendix concerning the manner of celebrating a council.

## Selinuntius[[@Headword:Selinuntius]]

             in Greek mythology, was a surname of Apollo, derived from his temple and oracle at Selinus.

## Selinus[[@Headword:Selinus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a son of Neptune, river god and ruler of AEgialus, and father of Helice, who was married to Ion.

## Selleck, Bradley[[@Headword:Selleck, Bradley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Dainbury, Conn., Aug. 23, 1784. At the age of twelve he professed conversion, and united with the Church. He received license as local preacher before he was twenty-one. In 1822 he joined the New York Conference, and continued to labor till 1851. He made New York his residence during the remainder of his life, and was much esteemed by ministers and laymen of his own and other churches. He died in New York city, Nov. 4, 1860. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1861, p. 114.

## Selli[[@Headword:Selli]]

             the priests among the ancient Greeks who delivered the oracles of Zeus at Dodona. They are mentioned by Homer as having observed a very rigid discipline.

## Sellman, Horace S[[@Headword:Sellman, Horace S]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Brown County, O., Jan. 14, 1821, and professed conversion in 1844. For some time he served the Church as a layman, but in 1846 he entered the Ohio Conference. He preached about thirteen years, when he was seized with hemorrhage of the lungs, and died Feb. 1, 1859. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1859, p. 234.

## Selneccer, Nicholas, Dr[[@Headword:Selneccer, Nicholas, Dr]]

             an early Lutheran poet and theologian, was born Dec. 6, 1530, at Hersbruck, near Nuremberg; and educated at Wittenberg. He was made court preacher at Dresden in 1557, but obliged to resign in 1561. because he was not in sympathy with the Melancthonian party, then in power. At Jena, where he obtained a professorship, the mildness of his views gave offence to the Flacianists, who governed the university, and they had him deposed. His next position was at Leipsic (1568). In 1570 he was charged with the conduct of the Reformation in Brunswick, and aided in the founding of the University of Helmstadt. His preference for an unmodified Lutheranism led him at the same time to attempt the work of restraining the growth of Crypto-Calvinism in Saxony, in which he succeeded temporarily by gaining the ear of the elector Augustus. He also took a prominent part in the settling of the Formula of Concord (q.v.), translating  it (after the attempt of Osiander) into Latin and furnishing it with a preface. He thus excited further opposition from the Crypto-Calvinists, which resulted in his being again deposed on the succession of Christian I and the advent to power of Dr. Crell (q.v.). A brief period of literary activity now followed, first at Leipsic and afterwards at Magdeburg; but he was soon made superintendent at Hildesheim, and intrusted with the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs in other places as well. In the performance of such duties his health gave way, and when the fall of Dr. Crell called him to Leipsic, the journey proved too fatiguing and brought about his death, May 24, 1592.

Selneccer's writings were numerous, but most of them have been forgotten. The more noteworthy are an exposition of the book of Psalms, in various editions and revisions (last ed. Leipsic, 1593), and a large number of hymns. His poetical writings evince talent of no mean order, but are marred by the constant introduction of references to personal troubles, etc., an undue attention to details, and an incessant emphasizing of pure doctrine, though the latter feature is preserved from becoming offensive by the fact that it is in the main the expression of the writer's heart. See Wetzel, Liederhistorie, vol. 3; Götze, Septem Dissertt. de N. Seln. (1723); Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, vol. 1; Mützell, Geistl. Lieder der evang. Kirche aus dem 16. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1855, 3 vols.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 149-151.

## Seloure[[@Headword:Seloure]]

             a mediaeval term for a canopy; the inner roof of a room which is sealed or closed with planking.

## Selvedge[[@Headword:Selvedge]]

             (קָצָה, katsah', an end, as often rendered), the edge of a piece of cloth (Exo 26:4). SEE TABERNACLE.

## Selwyn, George Augustus[[@Headword:Selwyn, George Augustus]]

             missionary bishop of New Zealand, was born at Hampstead, England, in 1809, and received his earlier education at Eton. He studied at Cambridge, and 1831 was appointed private tutor to Lord Powis, at Eton: while acting at the same time as a curate at Windsor. In 1841 Selwyn was appointed first bishop of the Anglican Church in New Zealand, and after having been consecrated in October, he sailed in December for his station. He landed at Sydney in April 1842, and remained some time there to confer with ;the bishop. In the first year of his arrival Selwyn established a college for the training of candidates for the ministry, and five years after his landing in New Zealand he commenced to work among the isles of the South Sea. In 1854 bishop Selwyn came to England. Twelve years' experience had taught him that his diocese must be divided, and that Melanesia must have some one who could spend all his energies on its many islands and its diverse population. His time in England was not wasted. When he returned to New Zealand he was accompanied by bishop Patteson. For some years he shared  and directed Patteson's work among the islands, and in the college at Auckland. Then the diocese was divided, and divided again. In 1866 there were six bishops under Selwyn's direction as primate, and among them Patteson was giving his whole attention to those islands among which he was afterwards to lay down his life. In 1867 Selwyn came again to England, and during his stay the diocese of Lichfield became vacant. It was offered more than once to him, and he refused. At length, on being strongly pressed by archbishop Longley, he yielded. His administration of this new and trying sphere, which comprised the so-called “Black Country," was very vigorous. Selwyn died April 11, 1878. His Life has been written by H.W. Tucker (Lond. 1879, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Selyns, Henry[[@Headword:Selyns, Henry]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam, Holland, in 1636. He was regularly educated in one of the universities of that country for the ministry, and licensed by the Classis of Amsterdam as a proponent, or candidate, in 1659. In 1660 he accepted a call made by the Dutch West India Company, through the Classis of Amsterdam, to become the minister  of the Dutch Church of Breukkelin (now Brooklyn) for four years. He was ordained in 1660 in Holland, and came to this country with Rev. Harmanus Blom, who was on his way to the Church of Kingston, N.Y. During his ministry at Brooklyn, Mr. Selyns, by special request of Gov. Stuyvesant, came over to New York and preached regularly on Sabbath evenings to the Negroes and other poor people, on his farm, or Bouwery, and on the present location of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, corner of Ninth Street and Second Avenue. His ministry at these places was very popular and useful. He returned to Holland at the close of his fourth year, ill 1664, and took charge of a congregation of poor folks who earned their bread by gathering turf. He was happy in serving them, and declined a pressing invitation in 1670 to come to New York as colleague of the aged pastor of the Collegiate Church, Johannes Megapolensis. The call was renewed and accepted by him in 1682.

The period was critical for the Dutch Church, in consequence of the English ascendency in the province and the establishment of the State Church. “The Dutch were only tolerated, according to capitulation, as dissenters. The governors attempted to exercise arbitrary powers, but the people resisted. Dominie Selyns was fully alive to the importance of the subject, and was rejoiced at the arrival of Gov. Dongan in 1683, who allowed full liberty of conscience.” An assembly of the people was soon called, which, among other matters, established the legal position of the denominations, allowing the churches to choose their own ministers. When Leisler usurped the governor's chair, Mr. Selyns was one of his most formidable opponents, and preached a jubilant sermon over his fall. This conduct divided his congregation, and his salary was partly withheld for years; but he held his ground tenaciously and triumphantly, until by the charter of May 11, 1696, he felt that the liberties of his Church were entirely secured. Not till then did he seek relief and a colleague in his large congregation. The Rev. Gualterus (Walter) Du Bois was called in 1699, and for fifty-five years “ministered before the Lord” in that one church. Mr. Selyns died July, 1701. He was the most eminent of the ministers who had yet come from Holland — prudent, sagacious, bold, earnest, of positive convictions, fearless of danger, a defender of the faith, and a peace maker. He was a successful minister of the Gospel, and had probably more to do in determining the position of the Reformed Dutch Church in America than almost any other man.

In spirit towards other churches he was liberal, kindly, and catholic. He held friendly relations with the chief men of the state, and maintained correspondence with eminent literary men of the colonies, such as the Mathers and other notables. He  was also a poet, versifying with equal ease in Latin and Dutch. Cotton Mather (in his Magnalia Christi Americana, 3, 41) says of him that “he had so nimble a faculty of putting his devout thoughts into verse that he signalized himself by the greatest frequency which perhaps ever man used of sending poems to all persons, in all places, on all occasions; and upon this, as well as upon greater accounts, was a David unto the flocks of our Lord in the wilderness.” Murphy, Anthology of New Netherland, contains much of his life and poetry. See also De Witt, Hist. Discourse; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. 9; Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 213-217. (W.J.R.T.)

## Sem[[@Headword:Sem]]

             (Σήμ), the Graecized form (Luk 3:36) of the name of SHEM SEE SHEM (q.v.), the son of the patriarch Noah.

## Semachiah[[@Headword:Semachiah]]

             (Hebrew in the prolonged form Semakya'hu, סְמִכַיָהוּ, sustained of Jehovah; Sept. Σαμαχίας v.r. Σαβαχία), the sixth and last named son of Shemaiah, the son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:7). B.C. cir. 1013.

## Semag, Or Semak[[@Headword:Semag, Or Semak]]

             SEE MOSES DE COUCY.

## Semamith[[@Headword:Semamith]]

             SEE SPIDER.

## Semantra[[@Headword:Semantra]]

             (σήμαντρα, signals), wooden boards, or iron plates full of holes, which the modern Greeks use instead of bells to summon the people to church. These instruments they hold in their hands, and knock them with a hammer or mallet. The same term is sometimes applied to a bell, or a metal drum used for the same purpose.

## Semargia[[@Headword:Semargia]]

             in Slavic mythology, was a goddess personifying winter — the cold season of the year — and highly revered among the grand Pantheon at Kief by the Russians.

## Semaxii[[@Headword:Semaxii]]

             a name mentioned by Tertullian as sometimes applied to Christian martyrs by their persecutors, from the fact that those who were burned alive were usually tied to a board or stake of about six feet in length, which the Romans called semaxis. — Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 1, ch. 2, § 10.

## Sembat[[@Headword:Sembat]]

             a Paulician who, about the year 840, formed a sect in the province of Ararat by a fusion of Parseeism and Paulicianism. He established himself at Thondrac, from which place his sect was called Thondracians (q.v.).

## Sembiani[[@Headword:Sembiani]]

             a Christian sect who were so called from their leader, Sembianus, who condemned the use of all wine. He persuaded his followers that wine was a production of Satan, denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected most of the books of the Old Test.

## Semei[[@Headword:Semei]]

             (Σεμεϊv), the Graecized form apparently of two Hebrew names:

1. SHIMEI SEE SHIMEI (q.v.), spoken of as (a) one of the “sons of Asom” (1Es 9:33), i.e. of Hashum (Ezr 10:33); (b) the son of Cisai and father of Jairus, among the ancestors of Mordecai (Esther 11:2. Σεμεϊvας)..

2. The son of Joseph and father of Mattathias in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:26, v.r. Σεμεείν), probably SHEMAIAH SEE SHEMAIAH (q.v.), the son of Shechaniah and father of Neariah (1Ch 3:22).

## Semele[[@Headword:Semele]]

             in Greek mythology, was the mother of Bacchus and daughter of Cadmus and Harmonia. SEE BACCHUS.

## Semellius[[@Headword:Semellius]]

             (Σεμέλλοις, v.r. Σαμέλλιος, Σεβέλλιος), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 2, 16, 17, 25, 30) of the name of SHIMSHAI SEE SHIMSHAI (q.v.), the Samaritan scribe (Ezr 4:8-9; Ezr 4:17; Ezr 4:23).

## Sementiree Feriae, Or Sementina Dies[[@Headword:Sementiree Feriae, Or Sementina Dies]]

             was kept in seed time by the Romans for the purpose of praying for a good crop. It lasted only one day, and was fixed by the pontifex maximus.

## Semi Judaizers[[@Headword:Semi Judaizers]]

             (1.) a Socinian sect, originated in the 6th century by Francis David, a Hungarian, who was superintendent of the Socinian churches in Transylvania. The principal doctrine which David and his followers maintained was that neither prayer nor any other act of religious worship should be offered to Jesus Christ. Faustus Socinus argued strongly against this tenet; and when all efforts to reclaim the Hungarian heretic were found to be fruitless, the public authorities threw him into prison, where he died at an advanced age, A.D. 1579. The sect, however, survived its founder, and for a long time gave no little trouble to Socinus and his followers in Poland and Lithuania. Faustus Socinus wrote a book expressly against the Semi Judaizers, while at the same time he strongly admitted that the point in debate between himself and them was of no great importance, since in his own view it was not necessary to salvation that a person should pray to Christ.

(2.) The name Semi Judaizers was also given to a sect founded near the close of the 16th century by Martin Seidelius, a Silesian, who promulgated various strange doctrines in Poland and the neighboring countries. The. chief points of this system were that God had indeed promised a Savior or a Messiah to the Jewish nation, but that this Messiah had never appeared, and never would appear, because the Jews by their sins had rendered themselves unworthy of so great a deliverer; that of course Jesus Christ was erroneously regarded as the Messiah; that it was his only business and office to explain the laws of nature, which had been greatly obscured, and therefore that whoever shall obey this law as expounded by Jesus Christ will fulfill all the religious duties that God requires of him. While diffusing these erroneous opinions, Seidelius rejected all the books of the New Test. as spurious.

(3.) In Russia, also, a small sect of Semi Judaizers, called Sabatniki (q.v.), exists, which mixes up to a considerable extent Jewish and Christian rites.

## Semi Pelagianism[[@Headword:Semi Pelagianism]]

             the name invented by the schoolmen to mark the middle line of opinion held by the Pelagians (q.v.), on one side, and the predestinarian theory of Augustine, on the other. As early as A.D. 426 the monks of Adrumetum, in Byzacene Africa, having read Augustine's letter to Sixtus (Ep. 194), were astounded at the doctrine therein propounded, viz. that men were disposed of eternally, either in the way of happiness or misery, by an arbitrary decree. To their strictures Augustine answered by putting forth his two works De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio and De Correptione et Gratia. The task of harmonizing these conflicting systems of theology was attempted by John Cassianus (q.v.), and he became the real founder of Semi- Pelagianism. Cassianus acknowledged the universal deterioration of human nature by the fall; but he assigned also an unlimited scope to the divine goodness and love, that wills the salvation of all, and bends everything to that end. He expressly condemns the main position of Pelagius: “Let no one imagine that by this we give support to the profane notion of some who assert that, the sum of salvation is in our own power, and by ascribing everything to free will make the grace of God to be dispensed according to each man's merit” (Coll. 13, 16). He entirely ignores irresistible grace and absolute decrees of divine predestination, though his doctrine with respect to preventing grace agrees generally with that of Augustine. In fact, he can neither agree with those who make the gift of grace dependent upon human merit, nor with others who deny that man has any power in himself to originate good in his own heart.

These opinions doubtless helped to form a general dislike for the theory of irresistible grace and divine predestination. Stanch partisans opposed the Semi Pelagians, the master spirit among them being Prosper of Aquitania (q.v.); while on their side we find certain great names, especially Vincentius of Lerius (q.v.). His Commonitorium was directed principally against the doctrinal development of Augustine as being unsupported by the Catholic tradition of the Church (Voss, Hist. Pelag. 1, 10). In this work he brought forward his three famous tests of the truth of a doctrine, viz. antiquity, universality, and general consent. An appeal to Celestine, the Roman bishop, against the Semi Pelagians having been unsuccessful, Prosper published several writings in refutation of their doctrines; and upon the death of Celestine, he endeavored to prevail upon Sixtus, his successor, to repress the Semi Pelagians. Failing in this, Prosper wrote several tracts on behalf of Augustinian doctrine. Shortly after the middle of the 5th century, a  question arose between Lucidus, a presbyter, and Faustus, bishop of Riez, in Provence.

The bishop admonished Lucidus in person, and afterwards wrote him a letter, setting forth in brief terms his own view of the doctrine of grace. By the advice of the council held at Arles (475). he published a work on the disputed points, De Gratia et Humanoe Mentis Libero Arbitrio. The book was answered half a century later by Caesarius of Arles in a treatise of similar title, De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, which, however, is lost. In 520 some Scythian monks assailed the work of Faustus, and presented their confession of faith to the legates of pope Hormisdas in Constantinople, in which they affirmed their belief that the will of man was powerless for any other object than to “discern and desire carnal and worldly matters,” etc. They met with a cold reception from the legates, and fared no better with Hormisdas, to whom they appealed. A council was held at Aransio (Orange), in France, July 3, 529, at which twenty-five articles concerning grace and free will, and directed against the Semi Pelagian doctrine, were drawn up, and subsequently confirmed by Boniface II. A similar expression of doctrine was made by a council at Valence, in the province of Vienne, but the problem remained unsolved how to reconcile the opposing motives — powers of grace and free will. Augustine continued to be regarded as the great light of the Western Church, although in the Middle Ages there was an occasional tendency to dispute his authority. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines. (see Index); Möller, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Neander, Kirchengesch. (2d ed. Hamb. 1847), 2, 1173-1217; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Blunt, Dict. of Theology, s.v. SEE PELAGIANISM.

## Semi Universalists[[@Headword:Semi Universalists]]

             an appellation given by Mosheim to those Dutch divines of the Reformed Church in the 17th century who maintained that God indeed wishes to make all men happy, but only on the condition of their believing; and that this faith originates from the sovereign and irresistible operation of God, or from the free, unconditional election of God. These are sometimes called Hypothetical or Conditional Universalists, and scarcely differ, except in words, from Infralapsarians (q.v.).

## Semi cope[[@Headword:Semi cope]]

             an inferior kind of cope. This term is sometimes applied to a small cope; occasionally to the old black Sarum choral copes, like cloaks without sleeves; and occasionally to a cope of linen, serge, or buckram, unornamented with embroidery.

## Semi double[[@Headword:Semi double]]

             an inferior or secondary ecclesiastical festival, ranking next above a simple feast or bare commemoration.

## Semi frater[[@Headword:Semi frater]]

             a layman or a secular cleric who, having benefited a religious house by gifts or personal service, was regarded as in some way belonging to the order or fraternity, having a share in its prayers during life, and in mortuary masses after death.

## Semi jejunia[[@Headword:Semi jejunia]]

             (half fasts), a name given to the weekly fasts in the ancient Christian Church, because the services of the Church continued on these days no longer than till three o'clock in the afternoon, whereas a perfect and complete fast was never reckoned to end before evening. These half fasts were also called Stations (q.v.).

## Semi separatists[[@Headword:Semi separatists]]

             a name given to certain persons in the 17th century who would listen to the sermons of the Church of England clergymen, but not to the common prayer. They would remain outside of the churches until the prayers were done, and then rush in and hear the sermon. See Pagitt, Heresiography (ed. 1662), p. 94.

## Semi-Arians[[@Headword:Semi-Arians]]

             a sect which arose in the 4th century, holding a modified form of Arianism. It was founded by Eusebius of Caesarea and the sophist Asterius. They were opposed alike to the strict definition of orthodox Nicene theologians like St. Athanasius, and to the equally strict definition which characterized the logical intellectualism of the old Arians. Its symbol was the Homoiousion, which they substituted for the orthodox Homoousion; that is, the Son was regarded not as of the same substance with the Father, but of a substance like in all things except in not being the Father's substance. They maintained, at the same time, that though the Son and Spirit were separated in substance from the Father, still they were so included in his glory that there was but one God. Unlike the Arians, they declared that our blessed Lord was not a creature, but truly the Son born of the substance of the Father; yet they would not allow him, with the orthodox, simply to be God as the Father was, but asserted that the Son, though distinct in substance from God, was at the same time essentially distinct from every created nature.

The Semi-Arian party first came into prominence at the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), under the leadership of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. During the fifty-six years that elapsed between the Council of Nicaea and that of Constantinople (A.D. 325-381) as many as eighty councils are on record, a large number of which were held by the Semi-Arian bishops in support of their contests with the orthodox and with their own sects. The Semi-Arian party had not one uniform definition of faith, but differed from each other on many important points; the only real bond of union was their opposition to the term which unequivocally expressed Catholic doctrine. Nothing, in fact, was more conspicuous than the unsettled variableness of the Semi- Arian creed. Two confessions of faith were drawn up at the Council of the Dedication (Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 10), held at Antioch, A.D. 341; another by the bishops of Palestine, a few months afterwards (ibid. 2, 18); four years later (A.D. 345) at Antioch; at Sirmium (A.D. 351 [see Sozomen, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 6]); and again at the same place seven years later (ibid.). From about this time a reaction went steadily on, until in A.D. 366  fifty-nine Semi-Arian bishops subscribed an orthodox formula, and were received into the Catholic Church (Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 12). There is no evidence of any large number of the party afterwards existing. Many others, doubtless, came back to the Church, not a few plunged into the heresy of the Macedonians, SEE MACEDONIUS, and some, like Eudoxius of Antioch, became avowed Anomoeans. Consult Blunt, Dict. of Theology; id. Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, vol. 1, § 92; Newman, Hist. of the Arians; Pusey, Councils of the Church, ch. 5. Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v. SEE ARIANISM; SEE SABELLIUS.

## Semidolites[[@Headword:Semidolites]]

             a sect of Acephali (q.v.), which sprang up originally under the name of Barsanians at the end of the 5th century. They had no succession of priests, and professed to keep up the celebration of a valid eucharist by placing a few crumbs of the bread which had been consecrated by Dioscurus in a vessel of meal (σεμίδαλις, whence their name), and then using as fully consecrated the bread baked from it. See Damasc. Ad Hoeres. 3; Baronius, Annal. ad ann. 535; Neale, Patriarchate of Alexandria, 2, 22.

## Semikin[[@Headword:Semikin]]

             (סמיכין), or Junctions, is a Masoretic term to denote “approaching, belonging together, connection,” of one word with another. Now, when two or more words are associated together through the addition or diminution of a letter or word, or by the interchange of words which are not in the habit of being joined in this manner, and if it only occurs so in one place, the Masorites remark thereon, לית דסמי, i.e. “not extant so joined.” Thus, on ודגן ותירש, and corn and wine (Gen 27:37), they remark “not extant so joined,” since in all other places where these two words occur the word דגן has not the Vav conjunctive (וי ו החיבור בלי); and thus the Masorah finalis under the letter Vav, p. 28 a, Colossians 2, 3, gives a list of sixty-two pairs, both words of which have Vav conjunctive, and are without parallel. The same remark is made on שית שמיר, briers, thorns (Isa 27:4), since in all other places it is with Vav conjunctive. The sixteen pairs without the Vav conjunctive are given in the Masorah. The same remark is made on שבתין שבת, Sabbatism, Sabbath (Exo 16:23), since in all other passages in which these two words are joined they are inverted. Thus in Exo 16:23 we read שבתין שבת, but everywhere else שבת שבתון. A list of thirty-nine instances which occur in this connection is given by the Masorah in the part entitled Various Readings (קריאה חלופי). See Frensdorff, Ochlah we- Ochlah, § 253, p. 50, 139 sq.; § 252, p. 50, 138 sq.; § 273, p. 53, 147 sq.; Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth (ed. Ginsburg), p. 212 sq.; Buxtorf, Tiberias, sive Commentarius Masoreticus, p. 258 sq. (B.P.)

## Seminaries, Theological, In The United States[[@Headword:Seminaries, Theological, In The United States]]

             Professional schools for the special training of ministers of the gospel are almost peculiar to America. Although most of the universities of Europe were originally instituted chiefly for ecclesiastical education, and clerical studies were for a long time mainly pursued in them, this was only an accident of the time, arising principally from the imperfect views of science then entertained, and the predominance of religious teachers in the world of letters. In some instances, such as the famous Sorbonne (q.v.) of France, the academical studies gradually supplanted the theological; while in but a few cases, such as those of Geneva in Switzerland, Montauban in France, and the Propaganda at Rome, is theology prominently or exclusively taught. To these must be added the training-schools of the English Dissenters, which are comparatively few and uninfluential. As a very general rule, however, the various branches of theology in Europe are included as departments of the great universities, and are therefore taught, almost entirely by lectures, as parts of a scientific education.

In America, on the other hand, while nearly all the higher schools were originated and are sustained by various Christian bodies, yet the system of special preparation of candidates for the ministry is very generally carried on in distinct institutions, sometimes included in a so-called university, but nevertheless having each its separate faculty and particular course of study, which is intended and arranged so as to be supplementary to those of the academy and the college. This gives a  definiteness and practical character to ministerial training scarcely attainable, or even attempted, by the looser method of European instruction. SEE MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

I. Growth and Character of American Schools of Theology. — The earliest of these institutions, exclusive of a Roman Catholic one founded in 1791, in Baltimore, Maryland, which still survives, and a private one established in 1804 by Dr. John M. Mason, in the city of New York, which lasted several years, is the Theological Seminary founded by the Congregationalists at Andover, Massachusetts, in 1808, although a foundation was made somewhat earlier for a similar institution by the Reformed Dutch Church at New Brunswick, N.J., which did not go into operation for a long time. The next great theological seminary was that of the Presbyterians, founded at Princeton, N.J., in 1812, although the College of New Jersey with which it is connected, was established in 1757. The divinity schools of Harvard and Yale are even more modern, while the universities themselves are much older. After the above dates numerous schools and departments of a strictly theological character sprang up in the more thickly settled states, and in more recent times they have rapidly multiplied throughout the Union. Thus, in the first decade of the present century (1800-1809) there were but two organized, in the second 2, in the third 14, in the fourth 9, in the fifth 8, in the sixth 19, in the seventh 38, in the eighth (1870-79) 30. The Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1883 (the latest return) gave the total of theological seminaries and departments as being 145, with an aggregate of 583 resident teachers and 5771 students.

"As to the methods pursued in the theological schools of the United States, it may be remarked that no uniformity, but a general similarity, prevails. In nearly all, primary attention is given to the study of Hebrew and New-Test. Greek, as the foundation of an enlightened Scriptural exegesis. In the departments of ecclesiastical history and systematic and practical theology, instruction is largely given by lectures, with references to text-books and collateral reading. In all the fully organized seminaries the course of study extends through three years, and is planned in reference to the attainments of graduates of colleges, although partial-course students are admitted on specified conditions." Tuition is free, and arrangements are usually made which reduce the cost of board, etc., to a very low rate.

II. Statistics. — The accompanying table, compiled from the above- mentioned report, exhibits a summary account of all the theological institutions in the Union, arranged in the alphabetical order of the several states. For further details, see the annual catalogue of each, which is furnished gratuitously on application to the presiding officer.

## Seminarist[[@Headword:Seminarist]]

             a Roman Catholic priest who has been educated in a seminary.

## Seminary priest[[@Headword:Seminary priest]]

             a name given in England to Roman Catholic clergy during the 17th century, on account of their having been educated and prepared for holy orders in one of the foreign seminaries — e.g. Rheims, Douai, or Toulouse.

## Semiophorus[[@Headword:Semiophorus]]

             (Σημειοφόρος), a Greek term for a worker of miracles.

## Semis[[@Headword:Semis]]

             (Σεμίς, v.r. Σεμεϊvς, Σενσείς ), a Graecized form (1Es 9:23) of the name SHIMEI SEE SHIMEI (q.v.) the Levite after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:23).

## Semitic Languages[[@Headword:Semitic Languages]]

             SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

## Semler, Johann Salomo[[@Headword:Semler, Johann Salomo]]

             a German theologian in the latter half of the 18th century, who became notorious as the founder of the modern school of so called historical critics of the Bible. He was born in 1725 at Saalfeld, where his father held the office of deacon; and from his earliest childhood came under the influence of the pietism of Halle. In obedience to its urgent exhortations, he formed the habit of earnest prayer. His student life at Halle, where he matriculated in 1743, was spent amid similar surroundings, but he failed to obtain peace of mind. He was specially attracted towards Baumgarten (then professor) on account of his massive learning, but appears to have been even too little influenced by the Wolfian logical schematism of that scholar. He devoured books without digesting them, and obtained, as a principal result of his studies, a suspicion which subsequently became the fundamental idea in his theology — namely, that a difference exists between theology and religion.

In 1750 he was made a master, and soon afterwards began the congenial work of editing the gazette of his native town; but in the following year he was called to the chair of history at Altorf, and six months later to a theological chair at Halle. He delivered lectures on hermeneutics and Church history; and ere long reached the conclusion that “the historical interpretation really belongs to the first century as representing the sum and contents of the conceptions of that age, and must be distinguished from the present application of Scripture, as correctly interpreted, to the instruction of Christians of today.” His discoveries were submitted to Baumgarten, who encouraged him to continued independence of thought, but warned him that he would thereby arouse the opposition of a class of people who might work material injury to his prospects.  On the death of Baumgarten, in 1757, Semler became the most prominent member of the faculty at Halle, and enjoyed an unequalled popularity despite the confusion, and even barrenness, of his deliveries. As he became bolder in the presentation of his views, he was violently opposed by the orthodox party — periodicals were filled with invectives, and ministerial associations entertained charges against him; but all this served only to increase his popularity, until none of his colleagues could venture to dispute his preeminence, though the list included such names as J.G. Knapp, Nösselt, and Gruner, J.L. Schulze, A. Freylinghausen, G. Chr. Knapp, and A.H. Niemayer.

In 1779 he wrote a reply to the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, however, and also a critique of Bahrdt's Confession of Faith (Antwort auf das Bahrdtsche Glaubensbekenntniss), in which he zealously contended for the doctrines of the Church and thereby undermined his position. His friends at once charged him with duplicity, and the government, acting through the minister Zedlitz (the patron of Bahrdt), deprived him of the directorship of the theological pedagogical seminary, on the ground that his recent course had destroyed his hold on the confidence of the public. A number of writings from his pen, devoted, on the one hand, to the promotion of free thought, and, on the other, to the defense of churchly orthodoxy, were issued in the period immediately following, and did much to intensify the opposition raised against him from every side; and when he became a believer in alchemy, in the last years of his life, it was accepted by many as a proof of impaired vigor in his mind. He died in 1791.

Semler's criticism was directed against two points: (1) the traditional view with respect to the canon of the Bible; and (2) the ordinary treatment of Church history, particularly that of the earlier period. His merit consists in having destroyed many errors in consequence of his investigations, and in having opened the way to more correct opinions.

1. Semler's Exposition of the Canon. — The traditional view regarded the canon as constituting a unit which is everywhere equally inspired; and this view had been shaken in his own mind by the studies of R. Simon Clericus, and Wettstein, and also by his own investigations. He became convinced that the opinions of recent times did not correspond with those of the earlier ages, and that theological views are subject to constant changes (his desultory mind was incapable of attaining to the idea of a progressive development in theology). With respect to the canon, he came to think that the original idea was not that of a fixed norm of doctrine which should be  binding for all ages, but rather that of “a catalog of the books which were read in the assemblies of Christians.”

These books were brought together through the force of accidental considerations rather than in pursuance of a definite plan. The early Christians decided to accept as divine those books of the Old Test. (whose canon was already variously established by the Palestinians, the Samaritans, and the Alexandrians) which should be found in the Septuagint translation, the latter being regarded as inspired; and as the enumeration of canonical books belonging to the New Test. varied in the early Church, the bishops, for the sake of uniformity, agreed upon a definite number of books which should be used as a canonica lectio in the worship of the Church. Semler's investigations into the character of the Old and New Test. texts likewise contributed to overturn the traditional idea of the inspiration of the Scriptures; for while that theory assumed that the text of the Bible had descended unaltered through the centuries to us, he urged that the Holy Spirit had himself caused a revision of the Scriptures by the hand of Ezra, and that it could not be supposed, in the face of historical and diplomatic data, that an extraordinary divine supervision had been exercised over copyists. He insisted, further, that the Scriptural writings show on their face that they were not intended to be a norm of doctrine for all men, since the Old Test. was written for Jews whose religious apprehension was but limited, the Gospel by Matthew for extra Palestinian Jews, that by John for Christians possessed of Grecian culture. He argues that it was necessary to accommodate the teachings of Christianity to the needs of these various classes, which explains the appeal to miracles and the use of “stories” by Jesus and some of the apostles — the σάρξ, according to his opinion — and the emphasizing of the πνεῦμα by Paul.

The latter apostle sought to adapt his writings to the Jewish modes of thought so long as he entertained the hope of gaining over the Jews in considerable numbers to the new religion — the Epistle to the Hebrews being an illustration; but he eventually abandoned this hope, and so became the first to make Christianity a religion for the world. The Catholic epistles, finally, were intended to unite the two ancient parties of Christendom — the Jewish and the more liberal Pauline. The very beginnings of the historical criticism thus present in outline the results attained by the most recent Tübingen school. With respect to the Apocalypse, Semler regarded it as a sort of Jewish mythology — “the production of an extravagant dreamer” — and wrote much to demonstrate its unfitness for the place it holds in the canon.  Having postulated the theory of accommodation by which the Old Test., and much of the New, lost their authoritative character, Semler was obliged to show what, if any, element of binding truth remains to Christianity after all that is merely local and temporary has been stripped off from the Bible. He finds it in “that which serves to perfect man's moral character,” but declares that even this cannot be comprised in any definite set of truths, since different individuals are stimulated to virtue by different portions of the Scriptures. Whatever develops a new and better principle, that leads to the veneration of God in the soul, is Christianity; and that is inspired or divine which convinces readers “that they know more respecting spiritual changes and perfections, and are able to derive more actual profit from such changes, than before.” He contends that there is such a thing as objective truth in Christianity, but that there can be no definite test to indicate whether any individual has apprehended it or not, since the decision can only be the expression of a moral judgment. He even thinks that nothing more than a difference in the form of expression is involved when the higher moral truths of Christianity are characterized as a revelation, or as a progressive development of the natural reason (see Schmid, Die Theol. Semlers, p. 167).

It is evident that Semler's theories remove the last distinctions between Christianity and Naturalism or Deism; but he nevertheless protests vigorously against being classed with Naturalists, and it was zeal against Naturalism that had led him to enter the lists against the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist and the Confession of Bahrdt, though he had previously (in 1759, in his introduction to Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, p. 51-57) reduced the distinguishing peculiarity of Christianity to a better morality. The solution of this contradiction must be found in the distinction Semler made between private religion and the publicly acknowledged teaching of the Church. He was open to religious impressions, given to prayer and the singing of religious hymns, and earnestly engaged in efforts to promote a Christian morality. He assured his students that an inward power, the peculiar privilege of those who possess a Christian knowledge of God, shall be realized by those who form the habit of prayer, and urged them to make the trial. It was, doubtless, owing to these consequences of his early religious training that he condemned all interference with the authoritatively established doctrines of the Church, though his separation of the faith of a private person from the teaching of the Church is open to the suspicion that he was too servile to sacrifice material prosperity in  order to uphold a privately recognized truth. He asserted that a private scholar has the right to defend new opinions in the department of his labors; but that, as a teacher appointed by superior authority, it is his duty to follow the beaten track, when required, or else to resign his office. And it is certain that he thus expressed his serious convictions, and that his views in this respect grew out of his religious temperament.

2. Semler's Researches in Church History produced less durable results. He lacked the necessary qualities for thorough work in this field — a philosophical and profoundly Christian spirit, a philosophical and religious pragmatism, and especially an unbiased judgment. He brought to light an abundance of new material, however, and became the father of the history of doctrines; while his restless scepticism contributed towards a more satisfactory settlement of many incidents, and prepared the way for more unprejudiced views respecting many historical phenomena. His faults are, that he is incapable of rising to the conception of a historical development, and therefore prefers the arrangement by centuries; that he has no philosophical apprehension of dogma; and that he gauges past centuries by the tests of his own time — e.g. enlightenment and tolerance, liberality and morality. Being convinced that the character of private religion must necessarily differ with the multitudes of individuals, he is continually outraged to find all independence of private thought repressed by the power of the Church. Lacking a profound faith himself, he naturally stamps every appearance of mysticism as fanaticism; and as he is never able to escape the suspicion of priestly cunning and despotism, the impression derived from his survey of Church history is but dreary at the best. The martyrs were people “whose minds were unsettled, monks and hermits were madmen, the bishops chiefly intriguers, Augustine keen and crafty, Tertullian highly odd and fanatical, Theodoret superstitious, Bernard sanctimonious.” Pelagius alone (whose Epp. ad Demetriadem he published with notes in 1775) meets with his approval. His method, too, was chaotic and confused. resulting in lengthy prefaces and numerous additions, appendices, and supplements to his works, most of which suffer, in addition, from the absence of indexes, and even of tables of contents. He tells us, however, that he was accustomed to deliver four or five lectures per day; and yet he managed to write no less than one hundred seventy-one books, though but one or two of them passed into a second edition.

The views of Semler on the canon of Scripture and connected subjects are developed in numerous works, prominent among which are the  Abhandlung vom freien Gebrauch des Kanons (1771-75, 4 vols.): — with which connect his Neue Untersuchungen über die Apocalypse (1776): — Vorbereitungen zur Hermeneutik (1760): — Briefe zur Erleichterung der Privat-Religion der Christen (1784): — Von freier Unters. des Kanons: — Erklärung über theol. Censuren: — Vorbereitung auf die königl. grossbritt. Aufgabe von d. Gottheit Christi (1787): — On Church history, Selecta Capita Historioe Ecclesiasticoe: — Versuch eines Auszugs aus. d. Kirchengeschichte: — Commentarii Historici de Antiquo Christianorum Statu: — and Neue Versuche die Kirchenhist. d. ersten Jahrh. mehr aufzuklären.

Sources. — Semler's Selbstbiographie (1781, 2 pts.); Eichhorn, Leben Semlers in the Bibliothek, pt. 5; Tholuck, Verm. Schriften. 2, 39; Schmid, Die Theologie Semlers (1858). SEE RATIONALISM.

## Semne[[@Headword:Semne]]

             (Σεμνή, revered), a Greek term for a nun.

## Semnion[[@Headword:Semnion]]

             (Σέμνιον), a Greek term for a monastery.

## Semnium[[@Headword:Semnium]]

             (Σεμνεῖον,, a temple), a name given by Philo to places of worship of the Therapeutae (q. i.). He says, “In every one of their dwellings there is a sacred house or chapel, which they call their semnium, or monastery, where they perform the religious mysteries proper to their holy lives” (Bingham, Christ. Antiq. vol. 7, ch. 2, § 11). Monasteries came afterwards to be called semnia, as Suicerus shows out of Balzamon, Methodius, and Suidas. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. vol. 7, ch. 2, § 14.

## Semnos[[@Headword:Semnos]]

             (Σεμνός), a Greek term for a monk.

## Sempecta[[@Headword:Sempecta]]

             a term for a monk who had passed fifty years in a monastery. He was excused from regular duties, and at Westminster and Crowland lived in the infirmary and had a young attendant.

## Semphycrates[[@Headword:Semphycrates]]

             in Graeco-Egyptian mythology, was a being which represented Hercules in combination with the Egyptian Harpocrates. It has been regarded as symbolical of the germinating period, in and through which germs make their appearance, or of the union of time and life.

## Sempiternitas[[@Headword:Sempiternitas]]

             (Lat. semper, “always,” and eternitas, “eternity”), an everlasting state of existence, having a beginning, but no end. It is used in speaking of angels and the souls of men in distinction from the eternity of God. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 166.

## Semple, Robert Baylor[[@Headword:Semple, Robert Baylor]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Rose Mount, King and Queen Co., Va., Jan. 20, 1769. After completing his academical course, he commenced the study of law; but having been induced to join the Baptist Church, he turned his attention to the ministry, and on Sept. 20, 1790, he was ordained pastor of Bruington Church, King and Queen County, which position he held until his death, Dec. 25, 1831. He is identified with the earliest efforts of the Baptist Church to send the Gospel to the heathen. He was a member of the first Baptist General Convention; president for a number of years of the Virginia Baptist Missionary Society; was often moderator of the General Association of Virginia, and president of its board of managers. He was also an earnest friend of the Colonization Society; and when the Columbian College in the District of Columbia became involved, he accepted the charge of its financial concerns (in 1827), accomplishing his difficult task with great discretion and energy. He published a Catechism (1809): — a History of Virginia Baptists (1810): — and various Memoirs and Letters. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 305.

## Sen, Keshub Chunder[[@Headword:Sen, Keshub Chunder]]

             one of the chief priests of the Brahma Somaj (q.v.), was born in India. The sect of which he was a leader was formed in 1830 by Rammohun Roy. In 1859 Keshub Chunder Sen gave a new impulse to the sect by his remarkable ability and enthusiasm. He effected the separation of those who were willing to abolish caste in their communion, as the Brahma Somaj of India. The more conservative remained in the Church at Calcutta, where the first building was opened for worship in 1869. Sen, in his published sermons and tracts, avows his belief in the unity of God, in immediate revelation, in the necessity of a new birth, in the immortality of the soul, and the importance and efficacy of prayer. His morality was pure, and he inculcated a reverence for the character of Jesus Christ, but repudiated the doctrines of his divinity, mediation, and atonement, as taught in the gospels. He believed that Christ was better than Mohammed or Confucius. Sen died in India, January 8, 1884.

## Sena Panthis[[@Headword:Sena Panthis]]

             a Hindu sect which was established by Sena, the third of the disciples of Ramanand, but is now almost, if not quite, extinct. For some time, however, Sena and his descendants were the family gurus of the rajah of Bandoogur, and from that circumstance enjoyed considerable authority and reputation.

## Senaah[[@Headword:Senaah]]

             [some Sena'ah] (Heb. Senaah', סְנָאָה, thorny; Sept. Σεναά, Σανανά, Σαανά,'etc.), the name of a man (B.C. ante 445) whose descendants, or (more probably), if a town (but none like it is elsewhere mentioned), whose inhabitants (given in various numbers, all apparently exaggerated by erroneous transcription) returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:35; Neh 7:38) and rebuilt the Fish gate at Jerusalem (Neh 3:3, Heb. with the art. has-Senaah'; Sept. Α᾿σαναά; A.V. “Hassenaah”).

## Senagen[[@Headword:Senagen]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a king belonging to the race of Children of the Sun, who is connected with the fables relating to the tyrant of Ceylon (Lanka), the noted Ravana, and consequently with the story of Rama. Ravana having demanded a vessel filled with blood from certain holy devotees, it was afterwards buried by the gigantic demon in the territories of Senagen because it brought him trouble. Senagen found it, and discovered in it a beautiful child which he recognized as an embodiment of the goddess Lakshmi. She was subsequently married to Rama, an incarnation of her consort Vishnu.

## Senate[[@Headword:Senate]]

             (γερουσία, eldership, used by classical writers for a deliberative or legislative body, and by the Sept. for the collective mass of the Jewish elders, and later for the Sanhedrim) is used once in the New Test. (Act 5:21) for some portion of the Sanhedrim, apparently the elders, who constituted its main element. SEE ELDER; SEE SANHEDRIM.

## Senatorium[[@Headword:Senatorium]]

             a place in some churches where are the seats appropriated to the use of emperors, kings, magistrates, and other persons of distinction. Some think that it is so called because the bishop and presbyters, who form the senate of the church, were seated there.

## Senault, Jean Francois[[@Headword:Senault, Jean Francois]]

             a French preacher and religious writer, was born at Anvers, near Pontoise, in 1601. After studying at Douai, in 1618 he entered the then young congregation of the Oratory, and being designated to the office of  preaching, he prepared himself by an earnest study of the Scriptures, the Church fathers, and the best French authors. For forty years he preached with success at Paris, to the court, and in the provinces. He was made superior of the Seminary of St. Magloire, and in 1662 was elected superior-general of the Oratory, an office which he administered gratuitously and with great prudence till his death, Aug. 3, 1672. He wrote several religious biographies and practical works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sendal [[@Headword:Sendal ]]

             SEE SENDEL.

## Sendel[[@Headword:Sendel]]

             a kind of taffeta, frequently used of old in the making of ecclesiastical garments and banners. The clergy in 1343 were forbidden to wear their hair rolled with fur or sendel.

## Senderling, John Z., D.D[[@Headword:Senderling, John Z., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born Nov. 12, 1800; at Philadelphia, Pa. Having in early life a thirst for knowledge and a desire to be useful in the Master's service, he was advised to prepare for the Gospel ministry. In 1817 he entered Hartwick Classical and Theological Seminary, where he remained seven years. Immediately after graduating he was licensed to preach, and took charge of a small Church in Clay, Onondaga Co., N.Y. It 1826 he went to Center Brunswick, near Troy, and then to the city of Troy, where he remained till 1856, when he received a call as pastor of St. Paul's Church in Johnstown, N.Y. In the spring of 1867 he resigned his pastorate, and lived a retired life until Dec. 20, 1877, when he was called to his rest. (B.P.)

## Seneca Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Seneca Version Of The Scriptures]]

             For this branch of the Iroquois the American Bible Society has provided the gospels, published in 1829, while the British and Foreign Bible Society published the gospels of Matthew and Mark. In general the Iroquois version (q.v.) is understood by the Senecas, Mohawks, and Oneidas. See Bible of Every Land, page 458.

## Seneca, Lucius Annaeus[[@Headword:Seneca, Lucius Annaeus]]

             Was a teacher, rhetorician, philosopher, poet, essayist, epistolographer, naturalist, advocate, magistrate, and statesman, under the later Roman emperors of the adscititious Julian house. It is in the character of philosopher that his reputation has endured through all subsequent times. This reputation has been preserved, as it was generated, mainly by the  piquancy of his style, the terseness of his expression, the incisiveness and the epigrammatic felicity of his phrase, and the constant ostentation of an earnestness which was, in some degree, factitious, and of a profundity which is more apparent than real. By whatever arts his renown was attained, or by whatever accidents it was perpetuated, the name of Seneca has ever continued the most notable and the best known in the scanty catalog of Roman philosophers, and of Romans pretending to philosophy. There, has been no period in which any smattering of letters survived when Seneca was not admired and cited. His own profession, “Nulla dies sine linea,” has been applicable to him in many forms. The fathers of the Church, the schoolmen of the Middle Age, the poets of the Renaissance, and their corrivals the Elizabethan dramatists, had all frequent recourse to Seneca, and Shakespeare was reproached with his too ready use of the convenient repertory of gnomes and maxims. In his own day, Seneca occupied a conspicuous station. His abilities merited a very high position, and his accomplishments accorded with his abilities. He obtained the quaestorship and the praetorship in the official hierarchy when these honors were conferred by imperial favor. He was the instructor and chief minister — of an emperor whose excesses and atrocities have made the name of Nero a synonym for all that is brutal and heartless in despotism, despicable in license and vanity, and unparalleled in crime. He lauded frugality and simplicity (De Tranquill. Animi, 1, 5-8; Ep. 2, 2, 9), and echoed the desire of Propertius:

“Utinam Romae nemo esset dives;

et ipse Straminea posset dux habitare casa.”

But while eulogizing cottage life — “domus haec sapientis angusta; sine cultu, sine strepitu, sine adparatu” (De Constant. 15, 5) — he passed his days in splendid villas and in palaces. He professed the wise man's indifference to the hazards of life, the caprices of fortune, and the conditions of existence, but he dwelt in all the luxury and indulgence of Roman sybaritism. He preached the blessings of obscurity in the press of courtiers, of whom he was the chief. He strenuously commended poverty, but he more sedulously increased his millions, and is charged with provoking the most serious of British revolts by the sudden recall of his usurious loans. These contrasts were human weakness — “mortalibus mos est ex magnis majora cupiendi” (De Benef. 3, 3, 2) — but they were not the sage's triumphs over human infirmities and worldly temptations. He addressed his treatise On Clemency to Nero, but he disguised, if he did not  sanction, the poisoning of Claudius; he justified the assassination of Agrippina by her son, and he failed to prevent the divorce and murder of the empress Octavia. He might well exclaim, “Mali inter malos vivimus” (De Ira, 3, 26, 4). Could he find an excuse in another of his sayings, “Mansuete immansueta tractanda?” (ibid. 27, 3). He expatiated on the evil of avarice, and wrote at great length On Beneficence, but he enriched himself by imperial confiscations. He exulted in the perfect freedom of the true philosopher, and cringed to the freedmen and minions of an imbecile and semi-idiotic sovereign (Consol. ad Polyb.; Dion Cass. 61, 10). He was prominent among the Stoics of the time, whom he patronized by his countenance and by his predications; he was chief among the satellites and profligates of the court, whom he rebuked by his precepts, but did not stigmatize by his retirement. In all things he was a rhetorician and an actor. His literary productions glitter with the coruscations of unintermitting paradox and antithesis; but the paradox of his tenets and the antithesis of his style are less novel and less startling than the contrasts between his professions and his career, his doctrine and his practice (πάντα τὰ ἐναντιώτα οις ἐφιλοσόφει ποιῶν ἠλέγχθη [Dion Cass. 61, 10]). The image and example of his life were his bequest to his friends. They should have been accompanied with the epigraph,

“Deficior prudens artis ab arte mea.”

At the first contemplation of these strange anomalies we are inclined to say, “tota vita mentitur” (Ep. 5, 4, 10) — his life was all a lie. But much that is contradictory, much that may invite the sternest reprobation, may be palliated by regarding the times, the difficulties of the situation, and the artificial and discolored lights under which all is seen. Such discrepancies, however, between the philosophy and the conduct cannot fail to stimulate curiosity and to require cautious estimation.

1. Life. — L. Annaeus Seneca was the second son of M. Annaeus Seneca, the rhetorician, and the author of the Controversial Exercises for the instruction of students of rhetoric. His elder brother, Gallio, proconsul of Achaia at the time of Paul's visit, had assumed the name of the distinguished advocate Junius Gallio, by whom he had been adopted. His younger brother, L. Annaeus Mela, was the father of Lucan, the poet of the Pharsalia. Marcus, the founder of the distinguished family, was a citizen from Corduba, in Spain, and of the equiestrian order. He was wealthy, reputable, accomplished, and noted for his wonderful memory. He took an  eminent position at Rome as a teacher of rhetoric, and lived to be an octogenarian. His illustrious son was born at Corduba. but was transferred to Rome in early life, and was educated there under his father and Papirius Fabianus, Attalus, and Sotion. Fabianus he mentions frequently in his works with respect and affection,. By Sotion he was initiated into the mysteries, vagaries, and asceticism of the Pythagoreans. Seneca was so earnest in his abstinences and in his renunciation of animal food that he became emaciated and endangered his health. By the urgent persuasions of his father he abandoned his fasts and vigils, and turned from the pursuit of severe philosophy to the business of life. He adopted a forensic career. The remains of Seneca attest his abilities, the breadth of his culture, the diversity of his acquirements, the vigor of his fancy, the variety of his reflections, the fluency and perspicuity of his style. He soon rose to eminence and lucrative employment. He became quaestor, at what time is unknown, but probably in the middle of the reign of Tiberius. Under Caius his life was nearly cut short. Jealousy of his talents, envy of his distinction, apprehension of his sentiments, hatred of his opinions and associations, or more adequate provocations, excited that insane and furious emperor's hostility, and he was designated for execution.

By adroit intervention he was spared, on the representation that he would soon sink under disease. Two years later Caligula was assassinated, but Seneca survived. The opening of the new reign was inauspicious to him. Claudius banished him to the sterile and inhospitable island of Corsica — “Horrida desertis undique vasta locis.” Messalina suspected his intimacy with the emperor's nieces, Agrippina and Julia, and alleged an intrigue with one or both. Seneca was safer and more, innocent on the most inhospitable coast than in the company of any of these infamous sirens. He had already addressed his tractate On Anger to his brother Novatus, who had not yet become Gallio. Little of his fortitude, and nothing of the tranquillity of the philosopher, were displayed by Seneca in his exile. In the first period of his expatriation he achieved a Consolation to Helvia, his mother, to calm her natural grief at the violent and hazardous separation. It abounds in, showy sentiments, in exquisite expressions, in wholesome but exaggerated reflections, which fall upon the expectant ear like the sound of hollow brass. His equanimity is belied by his effort to discover, to multiply, and to adorn reasons for equanimity. The impression is irresistible that the affected contentment of the sage is only the triumph of the rhetorician, and intended to attract public admiration and sympathy. This unfavorable effect is deepened by the Consolation to Polybius, also composed in the Corsican seclusion, and  written to the powerful freedman of Claudius to comfort him on the loss of his brother, and to invoke for himself the commiseration of the libertine and the favor of his master. The wise man, who, like Ovid, had bemoaned the miseries of banishment in elegiac verse, declared that, under Claudius, “the life of exiles was more tranquil than that of princes under Caius.” He enlarged upon the resplendent qualities of the stupid, misled, blundering pedant on the throne, whose pumpkinification he was to celebrate after his death in bitter satire. The intense servility and adulation of the twenty-sixth chapter of this discreditable Consolation have often attracted remark; but it has high literary merits.

After eight years not unprofitably spent, Seneca was recalled from his exile. The new empress, Agrippina, mindful of old intimacy, or anxious for additional support, summoned him from the sterile rocks of Corsica to the luxury and license of the imperial palace. He was advanced to the praetorship, and appointed tutor to her son, the young, handsome, promising Domitius Nero. Had not Alexander been the pupil of Aristotle? What might not be anticipated from the disciple of Seneca? It was very shortly before the acceptance of this charge that he had written the Consolatio ad Marciam on the death of her son. It was apparently followed by the disquisition On Tranquillity. Unreality of emotion characterizes both works. Marcia was the daughter of Cremutius Cordus, the republican historian of the last civil wars. Her son, for whom she was tardily consoled, had been dead three years. The praise of intellectual calm came with a suspicious air from one who had been fretting and moaning in obscurity for eight years, and was ready to welcome the bustle and extravagance of the court. There seems to have been no hesitation in accepting the proposals of Agrippina to forsake tranquillity. She was scheming to advance to the throne a son of whom his father had said that nothing but a monster could spring from sich parents. The throne was secured by poisoning the old and uxorious emperor. Seneca became prime- minister and chief administrator under Agrippina, with Burrus as head of military affairs. The first service of the political or politic philosopher was to compose for his pupil a fulsome laudation of the murdered prince, whose memory he lampooned himself. The Neronian lauds were so highly appreciated that the senate directed them to be inscribed on a pillar of silver, and to be read by the praetors when they entered on their office. When Nero had been a year upon the throne, his younger colleague, Britannicus, the son and true heir of Claudius, was removed out of his path  — perhaps by poison, though this has been disputed in late years. At this opportune moment, Seneca addresses to his imperial pupil the notable treatise On Clemency. What was the demand for it, unless cruel dispositions had been manifested? How could they have been carried into effect unless by the acquiescence of Seneca, who was now in the height of his power? Tacitus alleges (Ann. 13, 11) that he published Nero's frequent asseverations of his clemency “testificando quam honesta praeciperet, vel jactandi ingenii.”

Seneca is charged with encouraging and excusing Nero's amour with Acte to prevent worse excesses. The offense was venial in comparison with other subserviences. This liaison, however, irritated Agrippina, and inflamed the growing hostility between the mother and the son. Public affairs continued to be conducted quietly and prosperously, and Seneca has reaped the honor. The calm was only on the surface. A few years later, the indictment of Suillius, under the antiquated Cincian law, brought discredit upon Seneca, who appears to have been active in the prosecution. Suillius, in his defense, turned savagely upon him — charged him with having been the quaestor of Germanicus, and with having corrupted his daughter none the less; demanded by what wisdom or by what precepts of philosophy he had accumulated such a vast estate in four years of imperial friendship; denounced him for catching rich and childless men, as with a net, and for exhausting Italy with his usuries (Tacit. Ann. 13, 43). The arts of the infamous Poppaea Sabina widened the breach between Agrippina and her son, and the trust and influence of Seneca sickened with the declining authority of Agrippina. He was alarmed and jeopardized by the unnatural combat. The mother sustained the rights of the injured empress Octavia; the son yielded to the wiles of the sorceress Poppaea Sabina, whose victory portended the utter overthrow of the maternal supremacy. It was a conflict to be terminated only by the death of Nero or of Agrippina.

The mother, by whose crimes he had secured the throne, was the victim. It was generally credited that Seneca and Burrus assented to the matricide, though they devolved the execution on other instruments. Seneca has been accused of suggesting the crime to regain Nero's confidence. That he defended it has never been denied, and admits no exculpation. A later minister of Rome welcomed death rather than stain his conscience by apologizing for a less atrocity; but the meanness of Seneca's complicity in the crime sustained him in his position, if not in his full ascendency, for a few years longer. He was still the first subject in the empire, the most prominent of the imperial  ministers, when the “Quinquennium Neronis,” the first five years of the new reign, was celebrated by the Quinquennalian games. The imaginary felicity of these years was long a memory and a regret to the Roman world, and posterity has accepted the impression which was then made. To Seneca has been assigned the credit of those halcyon days. Yet Britannicus had been suspiciously removed; Agrippina had been murdered by her son, and Seneca had justified the murder; Poppaea Sabina had supplanted Octavia, and insured her subsequent divorce and assassination. The Quinquennium Neronis was a theatrical illusion — a hypocrisy of brief duration. With the death of Burrus (A.D. 62), the scene rapidly changes. The marriage of Poppaea Sabina to the emperor, the divorce and murder of the young and innocent empress Octavia at the age of nineteen, and the final overthrow of Seneca's influence were nearly simultaneous — “Mors Burri infregit Senecae potentiam” (Tacit. Ann. 14, 52, 1).

About the same time, Paul was brought as a prisoner to Rome, on his appeal to Caesar. Signs and portents, on earth and in heaven, terrified the superstitious. Earthquakes and bloody comets spread distress and consternation, and pestilence succeeded. In the second summer after the murder of Octavia, the fearful conflagration which led to the persecution of the Christians and the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul devastated the city for six days and seven nights. During these years, Seneca's influence had vanished, and his peril had been ever before him. The asseverations of Nero “that he would perish rather than injure him” (Sueton. Nero, 35) were scarcely reassuring. A convenient ambiguity maybe detected in the phrase. Seneca begged for his dismissal from court; he proposed to surrender his villas and his vast estates, his five hundred ivory-footed chairs of citron, his three or four millions of substance (Tacit. Ann. 14, 54; Dion Cass. 61, 10). His entreaties and his offers were disregarded, but he sought an ostentatious seclusion. He endeavored to conceal himself under the garb of a philosopher; he returned to the asceticisms of his youth; he seemed oblivious of human affairs, and to hold communion only with philosophy and with his God. “Deo parere, libertas est” (Senec. De Vit. Beat. 15, 7). To these years of solicitous obscurity ‘belong his best and most characteristic works — the treatises De Providentia, De Brevitate Vitoe, De Vita Beata, De Beneficiis, the Letters to Lucilius, and the Natural Questions. The danger so long foreseen was not averted by philosophical pretensions or by rhetorical homilies. Seneca, whether justly or not, was believed or declared to be involved in the conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso. Was he guilty? The recorded evidence is wholly inadequate.

The  probabilities alone convict him, and guilt in this case would be the most innocent of his criminalities. He knew his own peril; he knew the persistent and unscrupulous bloodthirstiness of his pupil; he knew the present and impending miseries of the Roman world when Nero's passions were unleashed; he had been cognizant and acquiescent, perhaps active in some cases, in the murder of Claudius, of Agrippina, of Octavia, and probably in many more assassinations. There is no appeal for him from his suspicious life to his sentimental morality, however lofty, pure, and fascinating. He was ordered to die, and the same decree was issued against his brother Gallio (but see Tacit. Ann 15, 73) and his nephew, the poet Lucan. The fatal mandate was promptly obeyed, but his death was lingering and painful. Nothing in the life of Seneca became him more or was more consistent with his philosophy than his manner of leaving it. There was something of parade — something of the vos plaudite of a classic comedy; but the ancients were always actors, and the ostentation of philosophic calm and indifference had been the habit of Seneca's life, and could not be wholly abandoned in the last act, when the situation was so tragic and imposing, so apt for one of his own dramas. The story of Seneca's serene but lingering death is told by Tacitus (ibid. 15, 59-65) with elaborate art and with the most adroit chiar-oscuro. It is one of the most finished of the numerous delineations in distemper of that consummate artist, and has furnished the exemplar for many inferior copies. The story has been so often repeated, and is so familiar, that it need not be reiterated here; but a suspicion remains that some of the touches of the painter's brush have no better justification than there was for the loose rumor reported by him that the conspirators had designed, if successful, to elevate Seneca to the throne of the Caesars.

2. Writings. — The literary remains of Seneca are in both prose and verse. The prose productions are moral essays, fragments of such essays, one hundred and twenty-four Letters to Lucilius (which are themselves essays), the Ludus de Morte Claudii (or Apocolocynthosis), and seven books of Natural Questions, or speculations in natural history. The Apocolocynthosis is a medley of prose and verse, but its authorship is doubtful. Seneca's poetry consists of nine epigrams — the wail of the exile — and ten tragedies, one of which (the Octavia) cannot have been written by him, while it remains uncertain whether he wrote any of them. The merits and defects of Seneca's style may be gathered from the incidental remarks already made. It may suffice at this time to quote the just censure  of the emperor Caius, “Arena sine calce,” and to approve the equally brief and accurate criticism of Quintilian,” Abundat dulcibus vitiis.” It is always affected, it is always pointed, it is always attractive, it is always radiant; but it is a string of artificial gems, not of “Orient pearls at random strung,” or of genuine diamonds.

There are some old fabrications ascribed to Seneca, which should not be left altogether unnoticed. One of these is the treatise De Formula Honestoe Vitoe, which was constantly cited as his in the Middle Ages, but is now attributed to Martinus Dumiensis, a Christian writer contemporaneous with Justinian. The other is the imaginary correspondence between Seneca and Paul, which was known to Jerome. These letters are indubitably spurious; but an acquaintance between the pagan moralist and the Christian missionary is not without probability, though it is without evidence. The belief in such acquaintance, and the favorable acceptance of the Letters by Jerome and Augustine, encouraged the fancy that Seneca had been converted to Christianity. More deserving of consideration than the possibility of such intercourse is the close agreement between many passages in the writings of the Roman philosopher and in the Epistles of the apostle, and the singular consonance of the maxims of the Stoic rhetorician with the precepts of the evangelists and apostles. This significant concord has often been noticed, and recently, with especial care, by Dr. Lightfoot, the new bishop of Durham. The parallelisms are most frequent and most startling — of course in ethical rather than in theological matters.

Almost equally suggestive is the fact that the ethical productions of Seneca are much after the fashion of sermons and hortatory discourses — preaching a purer faith, a cleaner heart, and virtuous action in the midst of a corrupt and unbelieving generation. An obvious explanation is that which induced the supposititious correspondence between Seneca and Paul. When this is rejected, it is easy to presume the diffusion of Christian doctrine by constant communications of all kinds between the several parts of the empire. It is certain that Christian influence was early discernible at Rome, and has been detected in the contemporaneous Roman law. There was a Christian community in the palace at an early period. But this does not explain all. During the whole lifetime of Seneca there was an earnest and widely extended movement in the line of moral renovation, which was illustrated by the growth of Stoicism at Rome and the expansion of its doctrines, by the tenor of the writings of Philo-Judetus, by Sibylline forgeries, and by the memorable career of Apollonius Tyaneus, which has  been disguised and obscured by the fictions of his biographers. It does not conflict with a reverential interpretation of “the ways of God to man” to conjecture that the miseries of the civil wars which had spread from Calpe to the Euphrates; the consequent disintegration of society everywhere, and the general dissoluteness which those wars had engendered, produced, along with the decay of pagan belief, a recognition of the need, a solicitude for the accomplishment, and attempts at the introduction, of a religious regeneration. Such a condition of the mind and heart of the nations would be a natural preparation for the reception and diffusion of Christianity. Nor does it seem alien to the course of Providence, who never effects great changes per saltum, and to whom “a thousand years are but as a day.”

3. Philosophy. — No distinct scheme of philosophy can claim Seneca as either its founder or its systematic expositor. He only enlarged the lines, adorned the precepts, and amplified the spirit of the philosophy which he professed. He declared himself a Stoic, has always been so regarded, and is recognized as such by Zeller, Ueberweg, and the other historians of ancient philosophy. It is therefore needless to dwell upon his doctrines. They are those of the Stoics (q.v.).. But Seneca was much more and much less than a Stoic of the old and rigid school, and much of his favor in his own and in later times may be attributed to the excess and the defect. He was thoroughly unsystematic and discontinuous. He indulges in no speculation to establish or to fortify the theory. He employs the current tenets for the practical conduct of life. He had a broader comprehension than Zeno or Chrysippus. He was latitudinarian in his sentiments. He applauds the character, commends the ethical doctrines, and cites the maxims of Epicurus. He inclines to the large intelligence of the Peripatetics, and emulates the spiritual aspirations of the Academics. Philosophy, in his conception, was no abstract and recondite study, of service only in the closet: it was the rule of life in the midst of distractions and temptations, of uncertainties and dangers — a refuge for the troubled mind, a shelter from suspicion and envy, a defense against tyranny, and the balm of a serene conscience (De Beat. Vit. 15).

Philosophy has been, since the Christian revelation, so distinct from religion, or so completely identified with it, that it is not easy to appreciate its character, its charms, and its value in those ages when it was the sole substitute for revealed truth — when from its dark, intricate, and insoluble problems could alone be expected vague hopes and vaguer aspirations, where Christianity affords absolute assurance to all. By the cultivated and  inquiring pagan, philosophy was pursued as the guide of life, the moderator of prosperity, the solace in adversity, the oracular response to the eager questions which the earnest heart and intelligent mind are ever asking about here and hereafter — about the world, its origin, and its governance; about man, his duties and his destinies; about all that lies beyond the dark veil of death and the darker veil of birth, This is fully manifested in Seneca's invitation to Paulinus to seek “the shady spaces of divine philosophy” (De Brev. Vitoe, 19, 1, 2).

Philosophy offered many inducements to its pursuit or its pretense under the early empire. It was a discipline of mind and heart to those of gentle disposition and refined tastes whose easy circumstances in life relieved them from the necessity of public or professional vocations. Hence philosophy grew into a fashion, and the fashion, like all fashions, moral or religious, was often perverted into a cloak or a pretense.

Under the pressure of despotic rule, slight differences become symbols of political faith. At Rome, Stoicism associated itself with regrets for the republic, with a mild, inert aversion to the empire, or with a more decided antipathy to the emperor. Lord of himself, the Stoic asserted his independence of all control of man by governments or by fortune. The haughty pretension afforded little offense to the constituted powers. The sole sovereignty of the Stoic had its single throne within his own bosom. There he, too, was emperor; he cared for naught beyond. He had thus the credit of independence, without assuming the complexion of a conspirator or a revolutionary. Every age illustrates the facility with which prevalent principles shrivel up into empty forms. Loud professions may disguise hollow sentiments. Sentiments accordant with the professions may be sincerely entertained, and yet produce neither earnestness of feeling nor constancy of action. Men will more readily die for their avowed faith than live for it. Genuine martyrs may be found who would scarcely practice what they die for. Their faith is in their profession — “Cum verba eruperunt, adfectus ad consuetudinem relabuntur” (Senec. De Brev. Vit. 6, 3). Of such was Seneca. Augustine's comment on his boast of independence may be applied to most of his virtues: “Adfuit scribenti, viventi defuit” (De Civ. Dei, 6, 10). To this danger he was peculiarly exposed. He was courtly in manners and courtly in associations, amiable and impressible in disposition, serene and averse to violent emotions; of affectionate and placid temperament, rather than of deep and solid nature; vain rather than ambitious, and ever mindful of his own interest. His birth,  his home influences, his education, his vocation, his career, his experience in either fortune, led him to deem that best which was most plausible or most secure. He was the son of a great rhetorician, brought up in the schools of the rhetoricians, destined for a rhetorician, winning early profit, distinction, and promotion by rhetorical displays. Rhetoric was the passion of the time; he was not constituted to despise it. He declared, “Oratio sollicita philosophum non decet” (Ep. 16, 5, 4); yet his expression was always curious and surprising. He has given us the maxim, “Qualis vir, talis oratio.” It may be justly inverted, Qualis oratio, talis vir.

All that remains of Seneca shows that he was nothing if not rhetorical. The tartness of expression, the compression of phrase, the fertility of fancy, the paradox of thought, were ever uppermost in his mind. These things did not make him false, but unreal. They did not make him insincere, but superficial. His predilections were good, but evanescent in action. He had the fragility of the man who looks to form and fashion, not to substance. This may explain the contradiction between the ethical theory and the personal morality of Seneca. An instructive parallel, on a lower plane and with narrower exorbitancies, is furnished by the contrast between the character and the Night Thoughts of Edward Young.

It is a perilous and doubtful task to unveil the depths of the human heart; to reconcile the complex and often unconscious duplicities of human nature; to decide where delusion ends and deception begins; to estimate the force of temptations and the degrees of resistance to them; to discern the subtle harmony which binds all the parts of life together, and may unite general purity and noble appetencies to grievous frailties and ignoble crimes. None but the All-seeing One, “to whom all hearts are open, and from whom no secrets are hid,” can pierce the obscure mazes of human motives. The harsh, censorious, confident, sweeping, unrestricted judgment will blunder, whether it praise or blame — “Ut absolvaris, ignosce” (Senec. De Benef. 7, 28, 3). Was it a cry from his own lacerated conscience when Seneca exclaimed so truly and so sadly,

“Magnos humanum pectus recessus habet!”

 (Fragm. 3, De Amicit.)

4. Literature. — The historians of ancient philosophy and the Works of Seneca, of course. See also Lodge, The Life of L. Annoeus Seneca, described by Justus Lipsius, in The Workes of L. Annoeus Seneca, both Morall and Naturall (Lond. 1614); La Grange, Vie de Seneque (Paris, 1819); Aubertin, De Sap. Doctoribus qui a Cic. Morte ad Neron. Princip.  Romoe Viguerunt (ibid. 1857); Bernhardt, Die Anschauung des Seneca vom Universum (Wittenb. 1861); Seidler, Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des Philosophen L. Annoeus Seneca (Fraustadt, 1863); Dourif, Du Stoicisme et du Christianisme, etc. (Paris, 1863); Montée, Le Stoicisme a Rome (ibid. 1865); Martha, Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain (ibid. 1866); Stahr, Agrippina, die Mutter Nero's (Berl. 1867); Lightfoot, Essay on St. Paul and Seneca, ap. Comm. on the Epistle to the Philippians; Westminster Rev. July, 1867, No. 173, art. 2; Merivale, Romans under the Empire (Lond. 1850-62). (G.F.H.)

## Senectus[[@Headword:Senectus]]

             in Roman mythology, a personification of old age. He dwells at the entrance to Hades.

Seneh.

SEE BUSH.

## Seneh[[@Headword:Seneh]]

             (Heb. Seneh', סְנֶהthorn; Sept. Σεννά [Vat. Ε᾿νναάρ Alex. omits]; Vulg. Sene), the name of one of the two isolated rocks which stood in the “passage of Michmash” at the time of the adventure of Jonathan and his armor bearer (1Sa 14:4). It was the southern one of the two (1Sa 14:5), and the nearest to Geba (A.V. “Gibeah”). The name in Hebrew means a “thorn,” or thorn bush, and is applied elsewhere only to the memorable thorn of Horeb; but whether it refers in this instance to the shape of the rock or to the growth of seneh upon it, we cannot ascertain. The latter is more consistent with analogy. It is remarkable that Josephus (War, 5, 2, 1), in describing the route of Titus from the north to Jerusalem, mentions that the last encampment of his army was at a spot “which in the Jews' tongue is called the valley” (or perhaps the plain) “of thorns (ἀκανθῶν αὐλών), near a certain village called Gabathsaould,” i.e. Gibeath of Saul. The ravine of Michmash is about four miles from the hill which is, with tolerable certainty, identified with Gibeah. This distance is perhaps too great to suit Josephus's expression; still the point is worth notice. — Smith. Between Jeba, or Geba, and Mukhmas, or Michmash, there are two narrow and deep valleys, or gorges, running nearly parallel towards the east, with a high, rocky, and precipitous ridge between them. These two valleys unite a little lower down, i.e. a little to the east of the direct line from Jeba to  Mukhmas. The ordinary route descends obliquely to the right from Jeba, and passes through the united valley at the junction, rounding the point of the promontory, and then ascends obliquely to the left towards Mukhmas. This is the passage of Michmash alluded to in 1Sa 13:23; Isa 10:28-29. The ridge between the two valleys has two steep or precipitous sides, one facing the south towards Geba, and the other facing the north towards Michmash. These were the two “sharp rocks” or precipices called “Seneh” and “Bozez.” The two valleys are still called Suweineh and Buweizeh. Jeba stands on the south side of Sulweineh, on the very edge of the valley, and Mukhmas on the north edge of Buweizeh. Lieut. Conder regards the valley of Suweineh itself as a trace of the name Seneh, and thinks its opposite walls were scaled by Jonathan (Quar. Statement of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” April, 1874, p. 62); and he graphically describes the descent of his own surveying party down the rocks (Tent Work in Palestine, 2, 113). SEE BOZEZ.

## Senes[[@Headword:Senes]]

             (old men), a name given to the primates of the Christian Church in Africa. Here the primacy was not confined, as in other places, to the civil metropolis, but always went along with the oldest bishop of the province, who succeeded to this dignity by virtue of his seniority, whatever place he lived in.

## Seneschal[[@Headword:Seneschal]]

             a monkish name for a steward. His duties were to seat the guests in the guest hall, send presents to strangers of degree, and in some cases to have charge of the bishop's palace. The same name was given to stewards of the year or months, minor canons or vicars, who catered for the common table.

## Seney, Robert[[@Headword:Seney, Robert]]

             a veteran Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Queen Anne, Maryland, October 12, 1799. He lost his father while yet an infant, was educated in New York city, graduated from Columbia College in 1815, studied law, was converted, licensed to exhort, travelled some time with Reverend Nathan Bangs, and in 1820 entered the New York Conference. That year he served Granville Circuit; in 1821, New Rochelle; in 1822, Wethersfield, Connecticut; in 1823, Poughkeepsie; in 1824, Middlebury, Vermont; in 1825, Flushing; in 1826 and 1827, New York city; in 1828  and 1829, Newburgh; in 1830 and 1831, Sandy Hill and Glen's Falls; in 1832, White Plains and Greenburg; in 1833, White Plains; in 1834, New Haven; in 1835, Vesey Street and Mulberry Street, New York city; in 1836, Mulberry Street, alone; in 1837 and 1838, Third Street, Brooklyn; in 1839 and 1840, Newburgh; in 1841 and :1842, First Church, Poughkeepsie; in 1843 and 1844, Allen Street Church, New York city; in 1845, Mariner's Methodist Episcopal Chapel; in 1846 and 1847, Washington Street, Brooklyn; in 1848, Danbury, Connecticut; in 1849, Carlton Avenue Church, Brooklyn; in 1850, Washington Street Church. as supernumerary; in 1851, South Brooklyn Home Mission, and in 1852 and 1853 supernumbrary at Brooklyn, where he continued to reside until the close of his life, July 1, 1854. Mr. Seney was eminently devoted and successful, able and winning. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:687; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Seng-Wan-Mau[[@Headword:Seng-Wan-Mau]]

             in Chinese mythology, is the supreme deity of the Chinese, which is composed of nothing, is created from nothing, and does or thinks nothing, though, as conceived of, is not without exalted divine attributes, e.g. incomprehensibility, omniscience, justice, etc. He is seated in the highest heaven, and thence looks down in immovable quietude on the doings of mankind. He is never pictured, because no conception of his form is possible; but there are a number of inferior gods, who preside over every rank of men, over every human occupation, city, etc., who are portrayed in every imaginable form, in clay, stone, wood, etc. These gods are subordinate to Seng-Wan-Mau, and are the rulers of human affairs, so that man's destinies, his weal and woe, are committed to their hands. Their images are worshipped, but they are also broken into fragments when the gods fail to gratify the wishes of the worshippers.

## Sengler, Jacob[[@Headword:Sengler, Jacob]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born at Husenstamm, near Frankfort-on-the Main, Sept. 11, 1799. When twenty years of age, after having learned the trade of a shoemaker, he entered the gymnasium at Frankfort. In 1824 he studied theology at Tübingen, under Möhler, and in 1828 he attended the philosophical lectures of Schelling at Munich. In 1830 he commenced publishing the Catholic Church Gazette for Germany, and numbered among his contributors, besides Döllinger and Fischer, such Protestant divines as Hoffmann, Weiss, and others. In 1831 he went to  Marburg as professor of philosophy, where he remained for eleven years, living on the best terms with his Protestant colleagues, Hupfeld, Kling, Henke, J. Müller, etc. In 1842 he was called to Freiburg, where he lectured for thirty-six years, and where he also died, Nov. 8, 1878, five days after having retired from his office. As a philosopher, he tried to harmonize speculation with Christianity; as a Roman Catholic, he never believed in the Roman spirit of exclusiveness. He wrote, Würdigung der Schrift von D. Schulz: Ueber die Lehre vom heil. Abendmahl (Mainz, 1830): — Die Idee Gottes (Heidelberg, 1845-52, 2 pts.): — Die Erkenntnisslehre (ibid. 1858). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1223; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 454, 582; 2, 73, 74, 776; Neue evangel. Kirchenzeitung, Feb. 22, 1879. (B.P.)

## Sengumara Brama[[@Headword:Sengumara Brama]]

             in Hindu mythology, is one of the most ancient sages and princes of the human race. He was contemporary with king Druven, a grandson of the father of all who have been born, and gave to him his only daughter Bravibamey in marriage.

## Senior[[@Headword:Senior]]

             (1), a monk from the age of forty to fifty years who was excused from the external offices of provisor, procurator, cellarer, almoner, kitchener, master of the works, etc., but took his turn in singing masses. (2) The head  of a college of secular calons, as at Christ-church, Hants, 1099. (3) At Osnaburg, Trent, Lübeck, and in some Italian cathedrals, the antianus, or senior, corresponds to the archpriest of certain French cathedrals, in which he acted in the bishop's absence as his representative in the administration of sacraments and the benediction of ashes, palms, and the font. Such an archpriest was required in every cathedral by the Council of Merida.

## Senior Bishop[[@Headword:Senior Bishop]]

             In the Protestant Episcopal Church, the bishop who is oldest in the order of consecration is thus known. The senior bishop is president of the House of Bishops, and has certain duties committed to him by the general constitution and canons of the Church. Except in case of infirmity, he consecrates the newly elected bishop; he also receives the testimonials of a bishop elect, in case of such election taking place during the recess of the General Convention, and transmits them to all the other bishops for their consent or dissent. Special general conventions are called by his summons on consent of all the bishops; the place of meeting of any general convention may be changed by him. This plan of deciding as to presidency was adopted in 1789; but in 1792 a different principle was adopted, viz. that of rotation. This continued only for a short time, and the order of seniority was again established.

## Seniority[[@Headword:Seniority]]

             SEE SENIOR BISHOP.

## Senir[[@Headword:Senir]]

             (1Ch 5:23; Eze 27:5). SEE SHENIR.

## Senlis, Councils Of[[@Headword:Senlis, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Silvanectense). There were several councils held in Senlis, which is a town in the department of Oise, France.

1. Held in 873 by the bishops of the provinces of Sens and Rheims, in which Carloman, the son of king Charles the Bald, was brought to judgment, deposed from every ecclesiastical dignity, and reduced to lay communion, on account of his treasonable and other evil practices. See Mansi, 9, 257.

2. Held Nov. 14,1235, by the archbishop of Rheims and six of his suffragans, who put the whole of the king's domains within the province of Rheims under an interdict. SEE COMPIEGNE, SYNODS OF.

3. This council was held in 1310 by Philip de Marigni, archbishop of Sens. Nine Templars were condemned and burned, denying in the hour of death their confession of guilt, extorted from them by torture. See Dubois, Hist. of Paris, p. 551.

4. The fourth council at Senlis was held in 1315 or 1316 by Robert de Courtenay, archbishop of Rheims, and his suffragans, in which Pierre de Latilly, bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne (accused by Louis Hutin of the death of Philip le Bel, and of another murder, and imprisoned), demanded his liberty and the restitution of his property. Subsequently he was entirely justified of the charge, and was left in quiet possession of his bishopric. See Mansi, 11, 1623.

5. Held in 1326 by William de Brie, archbishop of Rheims, with seven of his suffragans (present either in person or by deputy). Seven canons were made.

1. Lays down the proper forms to be observed in holding councils.

4. Declares excommunicated persons to be incapable of suing at law, of defending themselves, and of giving evidence.

5. Excommunicates those who violate the asylum afforded by churches, either by dragging away forcibly those who have taken refuge there, or by refusing them nourishment.

6. Against clandestine marriages.

7. Against those who impeded ecclesiastical jurisdiction. See Mansi, 11, 1768.

## Sennabris[[@Headword:Sennabris]]

             (Σενναβρίς), an encampment of the Romans under Titus, thirty furlongs from Tiberias, which was in sight (Josephus, War, 3, 9, 7); perhaps the Senabrai (סנבראי) or Tsinabri (צנברי) of the Talmud (Reland, Paloest. p. 999). Schwarz says (Palest. p. 178) that ruins in that vicinity are still  called Sinabri by the Arabs. Thomson identifies the place with the modern Shugshab, containing traces of old buildings (Land and Book, 2, 65).

## Sennacherib[[@Headword:Sennacherib]]

             [some Sennache'rib] (Heb. Sancherib', סִנְחֵרַיב; read in the cuneiform as Sinachirib, i.e. Sin [the Moon] increases brothers, thought to indicate that he was not the first born; Sept.: Σενναχηρίμ v.r. Σεναχηρείμ; Josephus, Σεναχήριβος; Herodotus Σαναχάριβος; Vulg. Sennacherib), a famous Assyrian monarch, contemporary with Hezekiah. The name of Sennacherib (in Assyrian Sin-achi-iriba) is written in various ways; but three forms are most common, of which we present the most usual. It consists of three elements: the first, Sin, or the “Moon” god; the second, achi, or “brothers” (אה); and the third, iriba, or “he increased” (רב); the meaning of the whole being “the Moon has multiplied brothers.” SEE CUNEIFORM.

1. Earlier Annals. — Sennacherib was the son and successor of Sargon (q.v.). We know very little of him during his father's lifetime. From his name, and from a circumstance related by Polyhistor, we may gather that he was not the eldest son, and not the heir to the crown till the year before his father's death. Polyhistor (following Berosus) related that the tributary kingdom of Babylon was held by a brother — who would doubtless be an elder brother — of Sennacherib's, not long before that prince came to the throne (Berosus, Fragm. 12). Sennacherib's brother was succeeded by a certain Hagisa, who reigned only a month, being murdered by Merodach- Baladan, who then took the throne and held it three months. The details of Sennacherib's campaigns are given under each year in the cuneiform records of his reign. From these it appears that he began to reign July 16, B.C. 705, and was murdered in December 681 (Smith and Sayce, Cun. Hist. of Senn. [Lond. 1878] p. 8).

His first efforts were directed to crushing the revolt of Babylonia, which he invaded with a large army. Merodach-Baladan ventured on a battle, but was defeated and driven from the country. Sennacherib then made Belibus (Bel-ibni) an officer of his court, viceroy, and, quitting Babylonia, ravaged the lands of the Aramaean tribes on the Tigris and Euphrates, whence he carried off 200,000 captives. In the ensuing year he made war upon the independent tribes in Mount Zagros, and penetrated thence to Media,  where he reduced a portion of the nation which had previously been independent.

2. Conquest of Judaea. — We give the account of this as condensed from the cuneiform annals by the late George Smith (Hist. of Assyria from the Monuments, p. 117 sq.):

“The eastern expedition of Sennacherib occupied his third year, and at the close of this year, his southern and eastern borders being secure, he had leisure to turn his attention to the affairs of Palestine. Encouraged by the king of Egypt, Hezekiah, king of Judah, had. thrown off the Assyrian yoke, several of the smaller sovereigns had either voluntarily joined him or been forced to submit to the, king of Judah, and Lulia (the Elulius of Josephus), king of Tyre and Zidon, had also rebelled against Sennacherib. The Assyrians had lost their hold on all the country from Lebanon to Arabia, and Sennacherib resolved to reconquer this region. Crossing from his capital into Syria, which he calls the land of the Hittites, he attacked first. Lulia, king of Zidon; but this prince was not prepared to resist Sennacherib, so he embarked on one of his vessels from the city of Tyre, and set sail for the land of Yatnan (the island of Cyprus), abandoning his country to the mercy of the Assyrians. Sennacherib now besieged and took the various Phoenician towns: Tyre, the strong city, appears to have successfully resisted him, but he captured Zidunnurabn (great Zidon, Jos 19:25) and the lesser Zidon; then coming south, Bitzitte and Zariptu (Zarephath, 1Ki 17:9), Mahalliba Usu (Hosah, Jos 19:29), Akzibi (Achzib, Jos 19:29), and Akku (Accho, Jdg 1:31).

The sea coast of Phoenicia, down to the land of the Philistines, was now in the hands of Sennacherib, and he raised a man named Tubahal to the throne of Zidon, and fixed upon the country an annual tribute. The success of Sennacherib along the coast, and the failure of Egyptian aid, now brought nearly the whole of Palestine to his feet, and the various rulers sent envoys with tribute, and tokens of submission to present before the Assyrian monarch. Menahem, who ruled at Samaria; Tubahal, the newly made king of Zidon; Abdilihiti, king of Arvad; Urumelek, king of Gebal; Metinti, king of Ashdod; and Buduil, king of the Ammonites; Kemosh-natbi, king of the Moabites; and Airammu, king of Edom, now made their peace, and Askelon, Ekron, and Judah alone remained in rebellion. Sennacherib started from Akku, and keeping along the coast, invaded Askelon, and capturing Zidqa, the revolting king, sent him, his wife, his sons and daughters, his brothers, and other relatives, captive to Assyria. The cities  of Askelon, Bitdaganna (Beth-dagon, Jos 15:41), Yappu (Joppa, Jon 1:3), Benai-barqa (Bene-berak, Jos 19:45), and Azuru were successively captured, and Sennacherib placed Saruludari, the son of Rukibti, on the throne. Moving from Askelon, Sennacherib attacked Ekron: he tells us that Padi, king of Ekron, had been faithful to his pledges to Assyria, and the priests, princes, and people of Ekron had conspired against him and revolted, and, putting their king in bonds, had delivered him into the hands of Hezekiah, king of Judah, to be kept prisoner at Jerusalem. The revolters at Ekron relied on the assistance of Egypt; and when Sennacherib advanced against the city, a force under the king of Egypt came to their assistance. The Egyptian army was from the kings of Egypt (the plural being used), and from the king of Miruhha, or Ethiopia.

To meet the army of Egypt, Sennacherib turned aside to Altaqu (Eltekeh, Jos 19:44), where the two forces met, and the Egyptians were defeated. See So. The overthrow of the Egyptian army was followed by the capture of Altaqu and Tamna (Timnah, 15, 10), and Sennacherib again marched to Ekron, and put to death the leading men of the city who had led the revolt, and severely treated the people. Their king, Padi, was demanded of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and, being delivered up, was once more seated on the throne. The last part of the expedition given in the Assyrian annals consists of the attack on Hezekiah. The king of Judah was the most important of the tributaries who had thrown off the yoke of Assyria, and was reserved for the last operations. After settling the affairs of Ekron, Sennacherib marched against Judah, and captured forty-six of the fortified cities of Hezekiah, agreeing with the statement of the Scripture (2Ki 18:13-16) that he came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them; all the smaller places round them were destroyed, and Sennacherib carried into captivity 200,150 people of all sorts, together with horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep in great numbers. Sennacherib goes on to relate that he shut up Hezekiah in Jerusalem like a caged bird, and built towers round the city to attack it. Sennacherib now began to portion off and dispose of the territory which he had conquered. The towns along the western side he detached from Judah, and divided them between Metinti, king of Ashdod, Sarn-ludari, king of Askelon, Padi, king of Ekron, and Zilli-bel, king of Gaza, the four kings of the Philistines who were now in submission to Assyria, and he increased the amount of the tribute due from these principalities. Hezekiah and his principal men, shut up in Jerusalem, now began to fear, and resolved on submission.

Meanwhile the soldiers of Sennacherib were attacking Lachish, one of the  last remaining strong cities of Judah. The pavilion of this proudest of the Assyrian kings was pitched within sight of the city, and the monarch sat on a magnificent throne while the Assyrian army assaulted the city. Lachish, the strong city, was captured, and thence Sennacherib dictated terms to the humbled king of Judah. Hezekiah sent by his messenger and made submission, and gave tribute, including thirty talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones of various sorts, couches and thrones of ivory, skins and horns of buffaloes, girls and eunuchs, male and female musicians. According to the record of Sennacherib, he returned to Nineveh in triumph, bearing with him this tribute and spoil, and not a single shadow of reverse or disaster appears in the whole narrative.

The accounts of this expedition of Sennacherib given in the Bible relate that after the submission of Hezekiah, the angel of the Lord went through the camp of the Assyrians and destroyed 185,000 men of Sennacherib's army, and that the Assyrian monarch returned in disgrace to Nineveh (2Ki 19:35-37). This overthrow of Sennacherib's army is confirmed by a story told to Herodotus (2, 141) by the Egyptian priests. They relate that in the time of an Egyptian king named Sethos, Sennacherib made an expedition against Egypt, and came as far as Pelusium. Sethos went out against him with an inferior army, having invoked the aid of the Egyptian gods and been promised deliverance. In the night, as the two armies lay opposite each other, hosts of field mice came and destroyed the bow strings of the Assyrians, who next morning fled.”

The discrepancy in dates between the cuneiform and the Biblical accounts of this invasion are at present irreconcilable (Journ. of Sac. Lit. July, 1854, p. 383 sq.). SEE CHRONOLOGY. There has probably been an error in reading the former, or perhaps an error in the record itself. All attempts to correct the Scripture date are forbidden by the manner in which it is interlaced and confirmed by the context. Rawlinson and others have sought a partial solution of the difficulty by the supposition of a twofold attack by Sennacherib upon Palestine; but neither the Assyrian nor the Biblical annals give any countenance to this view. SEE HEZEKIAH.

3. Later Campaigns and Death. — In his fourth year Sennacherib invaded Babylonia for the second time. Merodach-Baladan continued to have a party in that country, where his brothers still resided; and it may be suspected that the viceroy, Belibus, either secretly favored his cause, or, at  any rate, was remiss in opposing it. The Assyrian monarch, therefore, took the field in person, defeated a Chaldaean chief who had taken up arms on behalf of the banished king, expelled the king's brothers, and, displacing Belibus, put one of his own sons on the throne in his stead. In his fifth year he led an expedition into Armenia and Media; after which, from his sixth to his eighth year, he was engaged in wars with Susiana and Babylonia. From this point his annals fail us.

Sennacherib is believed to have reigned at least twenty-two, and perhaps twenty-four, years. The date of his accession appears to be fixed by the canon of Ptolemy to B.C. 702, the first year of Belibus or Elibus; but Col. Rawlinson's revised computation (in the Athenoeum, No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 245) dates the accession in B.C. 704, and the late Assyriologist George Smith makes the reign to have begun in B.C. 705. The Scripture synchronism locates its beginning in B.C. 715. The date of his death seems to be marked in the same canon by the accession of Asaridanus (Esarhaddon) to the throne of Babylon in B.C. 680; but it is possible that an interval occurred between the two. SEE ESAR-HADDON. The monuments are in conformity with the canon, for the twenty-second year of Sennacherib has been found upon them, while they have not furnished any notice of a later year. SEE ASSYRIA.

Of the death of Sennacherib nothing is known beyond the brief statement of Scripture, that “as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch (?) his god, Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword: and they escaped into the land of Armenia” (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). It is curious that Moses of Chorene and Alexander Polyhistor should both call the elder of these two sons by a different name (Ardumazanes or Argamozanus); and it is still more curious that Abydenus, who generally drew from Berosus, should interpose a king Nergilus between Sennacherib and Adrammelech, and make the latter be slain by Esarhaddon (Eusebius, Chr. Can. 1, 9; comp. 1, 5; and see also Mos. Chor. Arm. Hist. 1, 22). Moses, on the contrary, confirms the escape of both brothers, and mentions the parts of Armenia where they settled, and which were afterwards peopled by their descendants.

4. Character. — Sennacherib was one of the greatest of the Assyrian kings, and also one of the proudest of them. The prophet Isaiah pictures his haughtiness his “stout heart,” and the “glory of his high looks;” represents  him as boasting, “Are not my princes altogether kings?” and as ascribing his victories to his “strength of hand” and his “wisdom” — victories, at the same time, so complete and so easy as when one takes away the eggs of a fowl so scared that it neither fluttered nor “peeped” (10, 8-14). Sennacherib himself verifies the portrait for he calls himself “the great king,” “king of nations,” “king of the four regions,” “first of kings,” “favorite of the great gods,” etc. The accompanying seal depicts him killing a lion, and in one of his inscriptions he boasts of such a conquest. His approaching invasion filled Jerusalem with deep alarm, and Isaiah again and again depicts it. His boasts of previous conquests were not vain ones: ancient monarchies had disappeared before him, opposing armies had perished “as grass on the house tops,” and his numerous hosts had drunk up rivers on their march. An ideal march is vividly sketched for him — by Aiath, Migron, and Michmash, to Geba, and Nob on the northern shoulder of Olivet. Sennacherib did not come by this route, for he wished to prostrate Egypt; but the route sketched might have been taken, and its very difficulties are meant to picture Assyrian intrepidity and perseverance. All the while Sennacherib was only God's “rod,” an “axe in his hand;”‘ and “Lebanon,” an image of his stately and warlike grandeur, “shall fall by a mighty one.” “The virgin, the daughter of Sion,” without armor or prowess, but courageous in her seeming helplessness, laughed him to scorn. Nay, God would do to him as he had done to the captives at Lachish, “put a hook into his nose,” and ignominiously and easily turn him “back by the way he came” (Isaiah 37). “The stout-hearted are spoiled, they slept their sleep; at thy rebuke, both the chariots and horses were cast into a deep sleep;” “the earth feared and was still, when God arose to judgment” (Psa 76:5-9).

Sennacherib was not only a great warrior, but also a grand builder. He seems to have been the first who fixed the seat of government permanently at Nineveh, which he carefully repaired and adorned with splendid buildings. His great work is the palace of Koyunjik, surpassing in magnificence all the buildings of his predecessors. The royal structure, built on a platform of about ninety feet in elevation, and paved with bricks, covered fully eight acres. Its great halls and chambers were ranged round three courts; one of them 154 feet by 125, and another 124 feet by 90. One of the halls was about 180 feet in length by about 40 in breadth, and sixty smaller rooms have been explored. These rooms are broader than those of  his predecessors, probably because he used cedars from Lebanon. He built also, or repaired, a second palace at Nineveh on the mound of Nebbi Yunus, confined the Tigris to its channel by an embankment of brick, restored the ancient aqueducts, which had gone to decay, and gave to Nineveh that splendor which she thenceforth retained till the ruin of the empire. The realistic sculptures of Sennacherib are very instructive; every day scenes of Assyrian life are depicted by them; landscapes and hunting; the various processes of masonry; the carving and transportation of the great bulls; and the slaves working in gangs, and often in the presence of the king. He also erected monuments in distant countries. One of his memorials is at the mouth of the Nahr el-Kelb, on the Syrian coast, verifying his boast that he “had come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon;” and there it stands side by side with the tablet which tells of the conquests of Rameses the Great, more than five centuries before the period of Sennacherib. SEE NINEVEH.

## Sennara[[@Headword:Sennara]]

             in Hinduism, is the sacred Brahminical cord, whose use is restricted to the three superior castes as a mark of distinction. It is composed of a definite number of threads of cotton taken from a particular plant. Its length is such as to allow of its being worn diagonally across the body, from the left shoulder to the right side. The stoutest cord is that worn by Brahmins, that of the Kshatriyas being thinner and that of the Vaisyas being very slender, so that the cord serves to distinguish between the castes. (Butler, Land of the Veda, says that the Brahmin's cord is made of cotton threads, the Kshatriya's of hemp, and the Vaisya's of wool). Brahminical devotees or saints often wear a snake-skin instead of the cord.

## Sennert, Andreas[[@Headword:Sennert, Andreas]]

             a German Orientalist, was born at Wittenberg in 1606, and began the study of the Shemitic languages at the age of ten years. Having completed his education, he visited various universities in Germany and Holland, and in 1638 was appointed professor of Hebrew in his native place, where he died, Dec. 22, 1689. He wrote various philological works, among which are, Compendium Lexici Hebraici (Wittenb. 1664): — Rabbinismus (ibid. 1666): — Grammatica Orientalis. (ibid. 1666): — ῎Ασκημα Γλωττικόν (ibid. 1648). For a more complete list of his works, see Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 312 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, p. 131 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 4, 302; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Sens, Councils Of[[@Headword:Sens, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Senonense). These councils were so called from being held in Sens, a town in the department of Yonne, France.

1. This council was held in 1140. Among those present were Louis VII, Samson of Rheims, and Henry of Sens. In this council St. Bernard charged Abelard (q.v.), who was present, with his errors, accusing him of making degrees in the Trinity, as Arius had done; of preferring free will to grace, with Pelagius; and of dividing Jesus Christ, with Nestorius. He produced extracts taken from his works, and called upon Abelard either to deny having written them, or to prove their truth, or to retract them. Abelard,  instead of defending himself, appealed to Rome; whereupon the bishops present contented themselves with condemning his doctrine, passing no sentence upon him personally out of deference to Innocent II, to whom Samson and three of the bishops wrote, requesting his concurrence in their judgment. The pope condemned Abelard in the same year, and, in his answer to the letter of the bishops, declared that he concurred with them in the sentence they had passed, and that he had imposed perpetual silence upon Abelard. The latter published an apology, in which he confessed the sound Catholic faith, declared that he desisted from his appeal, and retracted all that he had written contrary to the truth. See Mansi, 10, 1018.

2. Held in 1199 by the legate Peter against the Poplicans (or Populicani), a sect of Manichaeans. Among others, the dean of Nevers, and Raynaldus, abbot of St. Martin, were charged with this heresy. The latter was deposed, being found guilty not only of this heresy, but also of those of the Stercoranists and Origenists. Both appealed from the decision of the council to the pope. See Mansi, 11, 3.

3. The third Council of Sens was held in May, 1320, by William de Melun, archbishop of Sens. Four statutes were published.

1. Enacts that the bishops should grant an indulgence of forty days to those persons who would fast on the vigil of the feast of the Holy Sacrament.

2. Directs that places in which clerks were forcibly detained should be laid under an interdict.

4. Condemns those priests who dressed themselves improperly, such as in red, green, yellow, or white boots, etc., and wore beards and long hair.

See Mansi, 11, 1860.

4. This council was held in 1485 by Tristan de Salazar, archbishop of Sens, in which the constitutions published by his predecessor, Louis, in a council held A.D. 1460, were confirmed. Among other matters treated of were the celebration of the holy office, the reform of the clergy and of the monks, the duties of laymen towards the Church, etc. It also enacted that canons shall be considered absent who are not present at noctern, before the end of the Venite; at the other hours before the first psalm, and at mass before  the end of the last Kyrie. Most of these regulations were taken from the canons of Basle, Lateran and the Pragmatic. See Mansi, 13, 1721, App.

## Sensation[[@Headword:Sensation]]

             the immediate effect produced on the mind by something acting upon the bodily organs. The earliest sign by which the Ego becomes perceptible is corporeal sensation, and this sensibility appears to be a necessary attribute of animated organic matter itself. All the perceptions of sense are rooted in the general sensation, which, however, is very obscure, even pain not being clearly felt by it at the place where it exists. The next step from this obscure, original, innate sensation is particular sensation, through the medium of the nervous system. Sensation should be distinguished from perception. The former properly expresses that change in the state of the mind which is produced by an impression upon an organ of sense; perception, on the other hand, expresses the knowledge or the intimations we obtain by means of our sensations concerning the qualities of matter. Sensation proper is not purely a passive state, but implies a certain amount of mental activity. It may be described, on the psychological side, as resulting directly from the attention which the mind gives to the affections of its own organism. Objection may be made that every severe affection of the body produces pain quite independently of any knowledge we may possess of the cause or of any operation of the will being directed towards it. Yet facts prove that if the attention of our minds be absorbed in other things, no impulse can produce in us the slightest feeling. Numerous facts prove that a certain application and exercise of mind, on one side, is as necessary to the existence of sensation as the occurrence of physical impulse, on the other. See Fleming, Vocab. of Philosophy, s.v.

## Sense Of Scripture[[@Headword:Sense Of Scripture]]

             SEE INTERPRETATION.

## Sense, Moral[[@Headword:Sense, Moral]]

             SEE MORAL SENSE.

## Sentence, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Sentence, Ecclesiastical]]

             Among the sentences pronounced by ecclesiastical judges are:

1. Definitive, a sentence which closes and puts an end to a controversial suit, and has reference to the chief subject or principal matter in dispute;

2. Interlocutory, a sentence which determines or settles some incidental question which has arisen in the progress of an ecclesiastical suit;

3. Deprivation, a sentence by which the vicar or rector of a parish is formally deprived of his preferment after due hearing and examination.

## Sentences[[@Headword:Sentences]]

             a name for the unarranged texts of Scripture, or preliminary antiphons, which, in the Prayer book of the Anglican Church, form a part of the introduction to matins and even song.

## Sentences, Book Of[[@Headword:Sentences, Book Of]]

             SEE LOMBARD, PETER.

## Sentences, Offertory[[@Headword:Sentences, Offertory]]

             a name for the texts of Scripture either said or sung at the time of the offertory in the Anglican form for the celebration of the holy eucharist. SEE OFFERTORY.

## Sententiarii[[@Headword:Sententiarii]]

             the followers of Peter Lombard (q.v.), whose four Books of Sentences, on their appearance in 1162, at once acquired such authority that all the doctors began to expound them. They brought all the doctrines of faith, as well as the principles and precepts of practical religion, under the dominion of philosophy. They were held in the highest estimation, and attracted great numbers of eager listeners, which state of things continued down to the time of the Reformation. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Senter, Anthony[[@Headword:Senter, Anthony]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lincoln County, N.C., Jan. 28, 1785, converted in 1806, admitted on trial in 1809, into full connection in 1811, and filled the following appointments: Great Peedee Circuit, 1809; Bladen, 1810; Little Peedee, 1811; Buncombe, 1812; Sparta, 1813; Georgetown, 1814; Charleston, 1815; and presiding elder of the Broad River District, 1816-17. He died Dec. 23, 1817. A strong mind and a  benevolent heart, a single eye and a steady purpose to glorify God, an unwavering faith, fervent love, and burning zeal — these were the exalted attributes of this good man. See Minutes of Conferences, 1, 307; Stevens, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 4, 243; Bangs, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 3, 79.

## Senter, M. Alverson[[@Headword:Senter, M. Alverson]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was the son of Riley Senter, of Murphey's, Cal. He graduated from the Genesee College in 1865; and united with the Troy Conference in 1867. He served the Third Street Church in Troy, N.Y., and was pastor for the same length of time of the Church in South Adams, Mass. He was then appointed to Hoosic Falls, N.Y., and served it for a little over a year. He died at the residence of Joseph Hillman in Troy, Feb. 1, 1876. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p. 81.

## Sentia[[@Headword:Sentia]]

             in Roman mythology, was the goddess of opinions, i.e. the deity who inspires opinions, views, judgments.

## Sentinus[[@Headword:Sentinus]]

             in Roman mythology, was the god who awakened and watched over the senses of the newly born.

## Senuah[[@Headword:Senuah]]

             [some Senu'ah] (Neh 11:9). SEE HASENUAH.

## Seorah[[@Headword:Seorah]]

             SEE BARLEY.

## Seorim[[@Headword:Seorim]]

             (Heb. Seorim', שְׂעֹרַים, plur of שְׂעֹרָה barley; Sept. Σεωρίμ, v.r. Σεωρίν), the head of the fourth division of priests as arranged by David (1Ch 24:8). B.C. 1012.

## Separates[[@Headword:Separates]]

             a sect of Calvinistic Methodists in the United States, which arose about 1740 in consequence of the labors of George Whitefield. They took, at first, the name of “New Lights,” and afterwards, being organized into  distinct societies, were known as “Separates.” They were soon after joined by a preacher (Shubal Stearns, of Boston) who labored among them until 1751, when he embraced the opinions of the Baptists, as did also many others of the Separates. The distinctive doctrine of the sect was that believers are guided by the immediate teachings of the Holy Spirit; such supernatural indications of the divine will being regarded by them as partaking of the nature of inspiration, and above, though not contrary to, reason. See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Separation Of Church And State[[@Headword:Separation Of Church And State]]

             SEE CHURCH AND STATE.

## Separation Of Eastern And Western Churches[[@Headword:Separation Of Eastern And Western Churches]]

             SEE SCHISM.

## Separatism[[@Headword:Separatism]]

             a term used to denote the disposition and practice by which persons withdraw from established communities or dissent from settled and common views or beliefs. This article is concerned with the religious, or more specifically the ecclesiastical, form of separatism only.

The strict meaning of the phrase “religious separatism,” which is also its only admissible meaning, makes it denote a tendency to break away from accepted religious views or a settled Church organization without sufficient cause. The imperfections and faults of the Church constitute the ordinary plea by which the action resulting from such tendency is defended; but as separatists never attempt to purify the Church from within, it is evident that the real motives by which they are actuated are personal indifference towards the Church, an alienation from the Church through the influence of rival institutions, or other reasons found in themselves. History shows that pride and perverse views have been the usual motives from which separatists have acted. All true reformers have continued in their churches until thrust out, e.g. Luther, Wesley, etc.

The term separatist (q.v.) occurs for the first time in the history of Protestantism, though it applies to movements in the ancient and Middle Age churches as well (e.g. Donatism). Separations on the grounds already indicated were not unknown in any period of the history of the organized Church. In Protestantism the churches of England and Scotland furnished  several kinds of separatists during the 16th and 17th centuries, especially the Independents and the Brownists (q.v.). The term, however, became a party name for the first time in Germany, being originally employed in the Wetterau, then in Wurtemberg, and subsequently in Bremen. In the latter place, a Lutheran student of theology named Theodore Schermer became the head of a small clique (1699) which taught a kind of purgatory, rejected infant baptism and all public worship, and recommended the disuse of the Lord's supper because of the abuses attendant on its observance. They led a retired and pious life, wholly apart from the Church. The most able refutation of their peculiar views was written by J.W. Jäger, of Tübingen (1715). Other minor separatist movements occurred about this time, which are involved in the disputes growing out of the Pietist controversy.

The congregations of the Inspired (q.v.) demand special notice in this connection. These persons denounced all ecclesiastical organization as a work of the devil, which they cursed through inspiration of the spirit, and resolutely avoided. They justified their separation by various reasons; 1, that the Church is corrupt and has been divorced from Christ; 2, the ministrations of unregenerate persons are without effect; 3, only spiritual ties can bind a Christian to the Church; 4, infant baptism has no support in Scripture; 5, an inward and powerful impulse led them to withdraw from public worship, and secured to them a wondrous rest and peace of conscience; 6, separation insures exemption from many temptations; 7, it is favorable to the cultivation of an impartial love for all pious persons, and for them only; 8, it secures solitude, quietness, love for the cross, and a self-denying temper, all of which are necessary to the welfare of the soul. They argued that only separation could deliver from the chilling and baleful influences existing in the Church, and declared that persons once earnest to purify the Church had, without exception, sunk into indifference and spiritual sloth because they had not come out from the mystical and apocalyptical Babylon. Their opponents replied by showing that in the Savior's parable the wheat and tares were made to grow together until the harvest; that Christ and the apostles did not avoid the services of the corrupt Temple, though they superseded it when its work was done; and that Protestantism had not assumed an independent organization by its voluntary action, but only when necessity, consequent on its expulsion from a Church corrupt in its very principles, had compelled that measure. God's kingdom is a leaven; but the separation of the good from the bad is  reserved for the day of judgment. The simple duty of each individual is to guard himself and his surroundings from the evil. On the Inspirationists see Weissmann, Introd. in Memorab. Eccles. Hist. Sacroe (Stuttg. 1719), pt. 2, saec. 17, p. 1264 sq., No. 9. On the Separatists generally, Schlegel, Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrhunderts, 2, 1054 sq.

## Separatists[[@Headword:Separatists]]

             a general term which may be considered as meaning dissenters from the Church of England, but also applied at different periods to certain sects as the special name by which they chose to be known.

1. In the reign of bloody Mary, the name was given to two congregations of Protestants who refused to conform to the service of the mass. Mr. Rose was minister of the one which met in Bow-church Yard, London, where thirty of them were apprehended in the act of receiving the Lord's supper, and narrowly escaped being committed to the flames. The other and much larger congregation was discovered at Islington, and Mr. Rough, its minister, and several others were burned by order of bishop Bonner.

2. In Ireland there are three distinct bodies of Separatists. The Walkerites, founded by Rev. John Walker, who seceded from the Established Church of Ireland and formed a small Church in Dublin on the principle of holding no communion with any other sect. They profess to found their principles entirely upon the New Test., and to be governed wholly by its laws. On doctrinal points they agree with the Sandemanians (q.v.). They hold that by his revealed word the spirit of God works in them, both to will and to do; that God is the sole author and agent of everything that is good; and maintain that everything that comes from the sinner himself, either before or after conversion, is essentially evil; that the idea of any successors to the apostles, or of any change in the law of Christ's kingdom, is utterly unchristian. They have, therefore, no clerical order. Another body of Irish Separatists was originated by Rev. Mr. Kelly, who seceded from the Established Church, and was soon after joined by Rev. George Carr, of New Ross. The few churches belonging to this sect hold the same order and discipline as the Sandemanians, though in doctrine they approach more nearly to the evangelical dissenters. The Darbyites, followers of the Rev. Mr. Darby, who combined strict evangelical doctrines with the peculiar tenets of the Millenarians. From these sprang the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.).

3. A German Pietist sect at Wurtemberg who separated themselves from the Lutheran Church about the middle of the 18th century. Meeting with much opposition and persecution, a number of them, under George Rapp, emigrated to Pennsylvania, and formed the Harmony Society. In 1815 they removed to Indiana, where they remained only two years, and, selling their property, returned to Pennsylvania, and in Beaver County built a town called Economy, where they have amassed considerable property. SEE RAPPISTS. Those who remained in Germany, after much opposition, were allowed to form a congregation at Kornthal, and became known as Kornthalites. SEE KORNTHAL, SOCIETY OF. Those who refused to conform to the German Evangelical Union, formed by Frederick William III of Prussia, were also called Separatists.

4. The name was assumed by some of the early Puritans, perhaps the early Traskites (q.v.). In their principles, condemning taste in dress, joyousness of life, etc., we recognize the class of Puritans afterwards represented by the Quakers. There were a few congregations of Separatists in Scotland, and one was commenced in London in 1820. See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Separatists At Zoar[[@Headword:Separatists At Zoar]]

             The village of Zoar, which is the home of this communistic society, is in Tuscarawas County, O. From Nordhoff's Communistic Societies of the United States we gather the following information respecting them:

1. History. — This society, like the Harmony Society, originated in Würtemberg, and like them, the Inspirationists, and others, were dissenters from the Established Church. Their refusal to send their children to the schools under the control of the clergy, and to allow their young men to serve as soldiers, brought upon them persecution from both civil and eccclesiastical authorities. They suffered for ten or twelve years, when they were assisted by some English Quakers to emigrate to the United States. They arrived at Philadelphia in August 1817, and bought a tract of 5600 acres of land in Ohio. They chose Joseph Bäumeler to be their leader, who, with a few able-bodied men, took possession about Dec. 1, 1817. At first it was not intended to form a communistic society, but having many very poor among them, it was thought that the only way they could keep the enterprise from failing was to establish a community of goods and efforts. An agreement to that effect was signed, April 15, 1819. Bäumeler was  chosen spiritual and temporal head, and changing his name to Bimeler, the people came to be commonly spoken of as “Bimmelers.” In March 1824, an amended constitution was adopted. Between 1828 and 1830 they began to permit marriage, Bäumeler himself taking a wife. In 1832 they were incorporated by the Legislature as the “Separatist Society of Zoar,” and a new constitution, still in force, was signed the same year. ‘They have prospered materially, and now own, in one tract, over 7000 acres of very fertile land, besides some in Iowa. They have a woolen factory, two large flour mills, saw and planing mill, shops, tannery, etc. They had in 1874 about 300 members and property worth more than $1,000,000.

2. Religion. — Their “Principles,” printed in the first volumes of Bäumeler discourses, were evidently framed in Germany, and consist of twelve articles:

“1. We believe and confess the Trinity of God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

“2. The fall of Adam and of all mankind, with the loss thereby of the likeness of God in them.

“3. The return through Christ to God, our proper Father.

“4. The Holy Scriptures as the measure and guide of our lives, and the touchstone of truth and falsehood.

“All our other principles arise out of these, and rule our conduct in the religious, spiritual, and natural life.

“5. All ceremonies are banished from among us, and we declare them useless and injurious; and this is the chief cause of our separation.

“6. We render to no mortal honors due only to God, as to uncover the head or to bend the knee. Also we address every one as ‘thou' — du.

“7. We separate ourselves from all ecclesiastical connections and constitutions, because true Christian life requires no sectarianism, while set forms and ceremonies cause sectarian divisions.

“8. Our marriages are contracted by mutual consent, and before witnesses. They are then notified to the political authority; and we reject all intervention of priests or preachers.  “

9. All intercourse of the sexes, except what is necessary to the perpetuation of the species, we hold to be sinful and contrary to the order and command of God. Complete virginity or entire cessation of sexual commerce is more commendable than marriage.

“10. We cannot send our children into the schools of Babylon [meaning the clerical schools of Germany], where other principles contrary to these are taught.

“11. We cannot serve the state as soldiers, because a Christian cannot murder his enemy, much less his friend.

“12. We regard the political government as absolutely necessary to maintain order, and to protect the good and honest and punish the wrong doers; and no one can prove us to be untrue to the constituted authorities.”

3. Practical Life. — The members of the society are divided into two classes, the novitiates and the full associates. The former are obliged to serve at least one year before admission into the latter class, and this is exacted even of their own children, if on attaining majority they wish to enter the society. According to the constitution, all officers are elected by the whole society, the women having the right to vote as well as the men. They manage, with the consent of the society, all its affairs, cases of disagreement being referred to the “Standing Committee of Five,” as a court of appeals. Before 1845, children remained with their parents until three years of age, when they ceased to be under their exclusive control. Since then the custom of the society taking care of the child ceased, being found inconvenient. The Zoar people read little except the Bible and the few pious books brought from Germany, or imported since. They belong to the peasant class of South Germany, are unintellectual, and have risen but little in culture.

In their religious observances they studiously avoid forms. On Sunday they have three meetings; in the morning, after singing, one of Bäumeler's discourses is read; in the afternoon the children meet to study the Bible; and in the evening they meet to sing and listen to the reading of some work that interests them. During the week there are no religious meetings. Audible or public prayer is not practiced among them, neither do they have any “preacher.” They use neither baptism nor the Lord's supper. They  address each other by the first name, and use no titles of any kind. They wear their hats in a public room, and seat the sexes separately in Church.

## Sephar[[@Headword:Sephar]]

             (Heb. Sephar', סְפִר, a numbering; Sept. Σαφηρά v.r. Σωφηρά), “a mountain of the east,” a line drawn from which to Mesha formed the boundary of the Joktanitic tribes (Gen 10:30). The name may remind us of Saphar, which the ancients mention as a chief place of South Arabia (Pliny, H.N. 6, 23-26). The map of Berghaus exhibits on the southwest point of Arabia a mountain called Sabber, which, perhaps, supplies the spot we seek (see Burckhardt, Arabia, p. 236). If this be the case, and Mesha be (as usually supposed) the Mesene of the ancients, the line between them would intersect Arabia from northeast to southwest. That Sephar is called “a mountain of the east” is to be understood with reference to popular language, according to which Arabia is described as the ‘“east country.” See Baumgarten, Theolog. Commentar zum A.T. 1, 152; Bochart, Phaleg. 2, 20. — Kitto. The immigration of the Joktanites was probably from west to east, SEE ARABIA; SEE MESHA, and they occupied the southwestern portion of the peninsula. The undoubted identifications of Arabian places and tribes with their Joktanitic originals are included within these limits, and point to Sephar as the eastern boundary. There appears to be little doubt that the ancient seaport town called Dhafari or Zafari, and Dhafar or Zafar (now Jofar, i.e. ez-Zofar), without the inflexional termination, represents the Biblical site or district: thus the etymology is sufficiently near, and the situation exactly agrees with the requirements of the case. Accordingly, it has been generally accepted as the Sephar of Genesis.

But the etymological fitness of this site opens out another question, inasmuch as there are no less than four places bearing the same name, besides several others bearing names that are merely variations from the same root. The frequent recurrence of these variations is curious; but we need only here concern ourselves with the four first named places, and of these two only are important to the subject of this article. They are of twofold importance, as bearing on the site of Sephar, and as being closely connected with the ancient history of the Joktanitic kingdom of Southern Arabia, the kingdom founded by the tribes sprung from the sons of Joktan. The following extracts will put in a clear light what the best Arabian  writers themselves say on the subject. The first is from the most important of the Arabic lexicons:

“Dhafari is a town of the Yemen; one says, ‘He who enters Dhafari learns the Himiyeritic.'... Es-Saghani says, ‘In the Yemen are four places, every one of which is called Dhafari; two cities and two fortresses. The two cities are Dhafari-l-Hakl, near San'a, two days' journey from it on the south; and the Tubbaas used to abide there, and it is said that it is San'a [itself]. In relation to it is called the onyx of Dhafari. (Ibn-Es-Sikkit says that the onyx of Dhafari is so called in relation to Dhafari-Asad, a city in the Yemen.) Another is in the Yemen, near Mirbat, in the extremity of the Yemen, and is known by the name of Dhafari-s-Sahib [that is, of the seacoast], and in relation to it is called the Kust-Dhafari [either costus or aloes wood], that is, the wood with which one fumigates, because it is brought thither from India, and from it to [the rest of] the Yemen.' And it Yakut meant, for he said, ‘Dhafari .. is a city in the extremity of the Yemen, near to Esh-Shihr.' As to the two fortresses, one of them is a fortress on the south of San'a, two days' journey from it, in the country of [the tribe of] Benu-Murad, and it is called Dhafari-l-Wadiyeyn [that is, of the Two Valleys]. It is also called Dhafari-Zeyd: and another is on the north thereof, also two days' journey from it, in the country of Hemdan, and is called Dhafari-dh- Dahir” (Tajel-'Arus, MS. s.v.). Yakut, in his homonymous dictionary (El-Mushtarak, s.v.), says: “Dhafari is a celebrated city in the extremity of the country of the Yemen, between, Omau and Mirbat, on the shore of the sea of India: I have been informed of this by one who has seen it prosperous, abounding in good things. It is near Esh-Shihr. Dhafari-Zeyd is a fortress in the Yemen in the territory of Habb; and Dhafari is a city near to San'a, and in relation to it is called the Dhafari onyx; in it was the abode of the kings of Himyer, and of it was said, He who enters Dhafari learns the Himyeritic, and it is said that Sau'a itself is Dhafari.”

Lastly, in the geographical dictionary called the Marasid, which is ascribed to Yakut, we read, s.v.:  “Dhafari: two cities in the Yemen, one of them near to San'a, in relation to which is called the Dhafari onyx: in it was the dwelling of the kings of Himyer; and it is said that Dhafari is the city of San'a itself. And Dhafari of this day is a city on the shore of the sea of India; between it and Mirbat are five parasangs of the territories of Esh-Shihr, [and it is] near to Suhar, and Mirbat is the other anchorage besides Dhafari. Frankincense is only found on the mountain of Dhafari of Esh-Shihr.”

These extracts show that the city of Dhafari near San'a was very little known to the writers, and that little only by tradition. It was even supposed to be the same as, or another name for, San'a, and its site had evidently fallen into oblivion at their day. But the seaport of this name was a celebrated city, still flourishing, and identified on the authority of an eyewitness. M. Fresnel has endeavored to prove that this city, and not the western one, was the Himyeritic capital; and certainly his opinion appears to be borne out by most of the facts that have been brought to light. Niebuhr, however, mentions the ruins of Dhafari near Yerim, which would be those of the western city (Descr. p. 206). While Dhafari is often mentioned as the capital in the history of the Himyeritic kingdom (Caussin, Essai, 1, passim), it was also in the later times of the kingdom the seat of a Christian Church (Philostorgius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 4). Abulfeda has fallen into an absurd error in his Geography, noticed by M. Fresnel (IVe Lettre, p. 317). He endeavors to prove that the two Zafaris were only one, by supposing that the inland town, which he places only twenty-four leagues from San'a, was originally on the sea coast.

But, leaving this curious point, it remains to give what is known respecting Dhafari the seaport, or, as it will be more convenient to call it, after the usual pronunciation, Zafar. All the evidence is clearly in favor of this site being that of the Sephar of the Bible, and the identification has accordingly been generally accepted by critics. More accurately, it appears to preserve the name mentioned in Gen 10:30, and to be in the district anciently so named. It is situated on the coast, in the province of Hadramawt, and near to the district which adjoins that province on the east, called Esh- Shihr (or as M. Fresnel says it is pronounced in the modern Himyeritic, Shher). Wellsted says of it, “Dofar is situated beneath a lofty mountain” (2, 453). In the Marasid it is said, as we have seen, that frankincense (in the author's time) was found only in the “mountain of Dhafari;” and Niebuhr (Descr. p. 248) says that it exports the best frankincense. M. Fresnel gives  almost all that is known of the present state of this old site in his Lettres sur I'Hist. des Arabes avant l'Islamisme (Ve Lettre, Journ. Asiat. 3d serie, tom. 5).

Zafar, he tells us, pronounced by the modern inhabitants “Isfor,” is now the name of a series of villages situated some of them on the shore, and some close to the shore, of the Indian Ocean, between Mirbat and Ras- Sajir, extending a distance of two days' journey, or seventeen or eighteen hours, from east to west. Proceeding in this direction, those near the shore are named Takah, Ed-Dahariz, El-Belid, El-Hafeh, Salahah, and Awkad. The first four are on the seashore, and the last two at a small distance from it. El-Belid, otherwise called Harkam, is, in M. Fresnel's opinion, the ancient Zafar. It is in ruins, but ruins that attest its former prosperity. The inhabitants were celebrated for their hospitality. There are now only three or four inhabited houses in El-Belid. It is on a small peninsula lying between the ocean and a bay, and the port is on the land side of the town. In the present day, during nearly the whole of the year, at least at low tide, the bay is a lake and the peninsula an isthmus; but the lake is of sweet water. In the rainy season, which is in the spring, it is a gulf of sweet water at low tide, and of salt water at high tide. The classical writers, as above noted, mention “Sapphar metropolis” (Σαπφάρα μητρόπολις) or Saphar (in Anon. Peripl. p. 274), in long. 88°, lat. 14° 30', according to Ptolemy, the capital of the Sappharitae (Σαπφαρῖται), placed by him (6, 6, 25) near the Homeritae; but their accounts are obscure, and probably from hearsay. In later times, as we have already said, it was the seat of a Christian Church — one of three which were founded A.D. 343, by permission of the reigning Tubbaa, in Dhafari (written Tapharon, Τάφαρον, by Philostorgius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 4), in ‘Aden, and on the shores of the Persian Gulf. Theophilus, who was sent with an embassy by order of the emperor Constantine to effect this purpose, was the first bishop (Caussin, 1, 111 sq.). In the reign of Abrahah (A.D. 537-570) St. Gregentius was bishop of these churches, having been sent by the patriarch of Alexandria (see the authorities cited by Caussin, 1, 142-145).

## Sepharad[[@Headword:Sepharad]]

             (Heb. Sepharad', סְפָרָד, meaning, if Heb., separated; Targ. אַסְפִמְיָא, i.e. Ispamia; Sept. ἕως Ε᾿φραθᾶ; Vulg. in Bosporo), a name which occurs in Oba 1:20 only, as that of a place in which the Jews of Jerusalem were then held in captivity, and whence they were to return to possess the  cities of the south. Its situation has always been a matter of uncertainty, and cannot even now be said to be settled.

1. The reading of the Sept. given above, and followed by the Arabic Version, is probably a mere conjecture, though it may point to a modified form of the name in the then original, viz. Sepharath. In Jerome's copy of the Sept. it appears to have been Εὐφράτης, since (Comm. in Abd.) he renders their version of the verse transmigratio Ierusalem usque Euphrathem. This is certainly extremely ingenious, but will hardly hold when we turn it back into Hebrew.

2. The reading of the Vulgate, Bosporus (obtained by taking the prefixed preposition as part of the name בספרד— and at the same time rejecting the final D), was adopted by Jerome from his Jewish instructor, who considered it to be “the place to which Hadrian had transported the captives from Jerusalem” (Comm. in Abd.). This interpretation Jerome did not accept, but preferred rather to treat Sepharad as connected with a similar Assyrian word signifying a “boundary,” and to consider the passage as denoting the dispersion of the Jews into all regions. We have no means of knowing to which Bosporus Jerome's teacher alluded — the Cimmerian or the Thracian. If the former (Strait of Yenikale), which was in Iberia, it is not impossible that this rabbi, as ignorant of geography outside of the Holy Land as most of his brethren, confounded it with Iberia in Spain, and thus agreed with the rest of the Jews whose opinions have come down to us. If the latter (Strait of Constantinople), then he may be taken as confirming the most modern opinion (noticed below), that Sepharad was Sardis in Lydia.

3. The Targum Jonathan (see above) and the Peshito-Syriac, and from them the modern Jews, interpret Sepharad as Spain (Ispamia and Ispania), one common variation of which name, Hesperia, does certainly bear considerable resemblance to Sepharad; and so deeply has this taken root that at the present day the Spanish Jews, who form the chief of the two great sections into which the Jewish nation is divided, are called by the Jews themselves the Sephardim, German Jews, being known as the Ashkenazim. It is difficult to suppose that either of these can be the true explanation of Sepharad. The prophecy of Obadiah has every appearance of referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and there is no reason to believe that any Jews had been at that early date transported to Spain.

4. Others have suggested the identity of Sepharad with Sipphara in Mesopotamia (Hardt, Sipphara Babylonioe [Helmst. 1708]), but that is more probably Sepharvaim.

5. The name has perhaps been discovered in the cuneiform Persian inscriptions of Naksh-i-Rustum and Behistun (see Burnouf. Mem. sur Deux Inscr. Cuneif. 1836, p. 147), and also in a list of Asiatic nations given by Niebuhr (Reiseb. 2, pl. 31). In the latter it occurs between Ka Ta Pa TUK (Cappadocia) and Ta UNA (Ionia). De Sacy was the first to propose the identification of this with Sepharad, and subsequently it was suggested by Lassen (Zeitschr. f. Morged. 5, 1, 50) that S Pa Ra D was identical with Sardis, the ancient capital of Lydia. This identification is approved of by Winer, and adopted by Dr. Pusey (Introd. to Obadiah p. 232, note, also p. 245). In support of this, Fürst (Handwb. 2, 95 a) points out that Antigonus (B.C. cir. 320) may very probably have taken some of his Jewish captives to Sardis; but it is more consistent with the apparent date of Obadiah's prophecy to believe that he is referring to the event mentioned by Joel (Joe 3:6), when “children of Judah and Jerusalem” were sold to the “sons of the Javanim” (Ionians), which — as the first captivity that had befallen the kingdom of Judah, and a transportation to a strange land, and that beyond the sea — could hardly fail to make an enduring impression on the nation.

6. Ewald (Propheten, 1, 404) considers that Sepharad has a connection with Zarephath in the preceding verse; and while deprecating the “penetration” of those who have discovered the name in a cuneiform inscription, suggests that the true reading is Sepharam, and that it is to be found in a place three hours from Akka, i.e. doubtless the modern Shefa ‘Omar, a place of much ancient repute and veneration among the Jews of Palestine (see Zunz, note to Parchi, p. 428); but it is not obvious how a residence within the Holy Land can have been spoken of as a captivity, and there are considerable differences in the forms of the two names.

7. Michaelis (Suppl. No. 1778) has devoted some space to this name; and, among other conjectures, ingeniously suggests that the “Spartans” (q.v.) of 1Ma 12:15 are accurately “Sepharadites.” This suggestion, however, does not appear to have stood the test of later investigations. But it is adopted by Keil (ad loc.), who objects to the view expressed above (No. 5) that Sardis would naturally be Hebraized סורד.

8. Juynboll proposes (Hist. Samar. p. 20) to read בְּסו פְּרָת, at the end of (i.e. beyond) the Euphrates, as the origin of the Sept. rendering, but such a phrase would be unnatural.

## Sephardim[[@Headword:Sephardim]]

             a name applied to the Spanish Jews. They were banished from Spain in 1492, and from Portugal in 1497, and yet they still maintain their identity as a separate class of Jews among their brethren in all parts of the world. They look upon themselves as a higher order of Israelites. One peculiar point of distinction which marks them out from other Jews is their daily use of the old Spanish language, with which they are so familiar that their own Scriptures are better known to them in the old Spanish version than in the original Hebrew. SEE JEWS.

## Sepharvaim[[@Headword:Sepharvaim]]

             (Heb. Sepharva'yim, סְפִוְוִים; Sept. Σεπφαρουαϊvμ, Ε᾿πφαρουαϊvμ) is mentioned by Sennacherib in his letter to Hezekiah as a city whose king had been unable to resist the Assyrians (2Ki 19:13; Isa 37:13; comp. 2Ki 18:34). It is coupled with Hena and Ava, or Ivah, which were towns on the Euphrates above Babylon. Again, it is mentioned in 2Ki 17:24 as one of the places from which colonists were transported to people the desolate Samaria, after the Israelites had been carried into captivity, where it is again joined with Ava, and also with Cuthah and Babylon. These indications are enough to justify us in identifying the place with the famous town of Sippara, on the Euphrates above Babylon (Ptolemy, 5, 18), which was near the site of the modern Mosaib. Sippara was mentioned by Berosus as the place where, according to him, Xithrus (or Noah) buried the records of the antediluvian world at the time of the deluge, and from which his posterity recovered them afterwards (Fragmn. Hist. Gr. 2, 501; 4, 280). Abydenus calls it πόλιν Σιππαρηνῶν (Fragm. 9), and says that Nebuchadnezzar excavated a vast lake in its vicinity for purposes of irrigation. Pliny seems to intend the same place by his “oppida Hipparenorum” — where, according to him, was a great seat of the Chaldaic learning (Hist. Nat. 6, 30). When Pliny places Hippara, or Sippara, on the Narragam (Nahr Agam), instead of on the Euphrates, his reference is to the artificial channel which branched off from the Euphrates at Sippara and led to the great lake (Chald. אגניא) excavated by Nebuchadnezzar. Abydenus called this branch “Aracanus”  (Α᾿ράκανος), Ar Akan (Fragm. 10). The plural form here used by Pliny may be compared with the dual form in use among the Jews; and the explanation of both is to be found in the fact that there were two Sipparas, one on either side of the river. Berosus called Sippara “a city of the sun” ( ῾Ηλίου πόλιν); and in the inscriptions it bears the same title, being called Tsipar sha-Shamas, or “Sippara of the Sun” — the sun being the chief object of worship there. Hence the Sepharvites are said, in 2Ki 17:31, to have “burned their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim” — these two distinct deities representing respectively the male and female powers of the sun, as Lunus and Luna represented the male and female powers of the moon among the Romans.

## Sepharvaim (2)[[@Headword:Sepharvaim (2)]]

             Dr. William Hayes Ward, who has recently explored the region in question, and is well versed likewise in Assyriology, finds in the ancient inscriptions four cities or districts called Sippara, the Greek, equivalent of this name. Of these the two principal ones, he thinks, were the "Sippara of the Sun," discovered by Mr. Rassam at Abu-Habba, and the original place, known as the "Sippara of Anuenit," being the one where Sargon I was exposed in his infancy, the town of Xisuthrus, the one captured by Cyrus without fighting, and the seat of the famous Jewish school, which Dr. Ward believes he has found in the large tell or mound still bearing the mediaeval name of Anbar,  south of the point of the effluence of the Sokkameh canal from the Euphrates. See Hebraica, January 1886, page 79 sq.

## Sepharvite[[@Headword:Sepharvite]]

             (Heb. Sepharvi', סְפ — רְוַי, but only in the plural; Sept. Σεπφαρουαϊvμ v.r. Σεφφαροῦν), a native of Sepharvaim (q.v.) (2Ki 18:31).

## Sephela[[@Headword:Sephela]]

             (1Ma 12:38). SEE SHEPHELAH.

## Sepher Asara Maamaroth[[@Headword:Sepher Asara Maamaroth]]

             SEE AFFENDOFULO, CALEB.

## Sepher Ha-Bahir[[@Headword:Sepher Ha-Bahir]]

             SEE NECHUNJAH BEN-HA-KANAH.

## Sepher Ha-Nikkud[[@Headword:Sepher Ha-Nikkud]]

             SEE CHAJUG, JEHUDA BEN-DAVID.

## Sepher Jezirah[[@Headword:Sepher Jezirah]]

             SEE JEZIRAH.

## Sepher Nitsachon[[@Headword:Sepher Nitsachon]]

             SEE LIPMANN, JOMTOB.

## Sepher Torah[[@Headword:Sepher Torah]]

             SEE TORAH.

## Sepher Zerubbabel[[@Headword:Sepher Zerubbabel]]

             (סֵפֶר זְרֻבָּבֶל) is the title of an apocalyptic book, written in the form of a dialogue between Zerubbabel and the angel Metatron about the birth, education, life, war, and death of Armillus, who is about to appear after the war between Gog and Magog, etc. The wonders of the Messiah were to be seen between 1063 and 1068. This work, which was probably written between 1050 and 1060, was first printed at Constantinople in 1519; then at Wilna in 1819. Lately it was published by Jellinek, according to two Leipsic MSS. (Cod. 22 and 38), in his collection entitled בֵּית הִמַּדְרִשׁ[Leipsic, 1853], 2, 54-57). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 317; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 6, 58 sq. (B.P.)

## Sephiroth[[@Headword:Sephiroth]]

             (סְפַירוֹת), a Cabalistic term of frequent occurrence in late Jewish writers. The ten Sephiroth have been represented in three different forms, all of which may be seen in H. More's Opera Philos. 1, 423; and one of which, although not the most usual, has already been given in the art. CABALA. The Sephiroth have been the theme of endless discussion; and it has even been disputed whether they are designed to express theological, philosophical, or physical mysteries. The Jews themselves generally regard them as the sum and substance of Cabalistical theology, indicating the emanating grades and order of efflux according to which the nature and manifested operation of the Supreme Being may be comprehended. Several Christian scholars have discerned in them the mysteries of their own faith, the Trinity, and the incarnation of the Messiah. In this they have received some sanction by the fact noticed by Wolf, that most learned Jewish converts endeavor to demonstrate the truth of Christianity out of the doctrines of the Cabala (Biblioth. Hebr. 1, 360). The majority of all parties appear to concur in considering the first three Sephiroth to belong to the essence of God, and the last seven to denote his attributes, or modes of existence. The following treatises on this subject are among the most remarkable: a dissertation by Rhenferd, De Stylo Apocalypseos Cabbalistico, in Danz's Nov. Test. ex Talmude Illust. p. 1090, in which he endeavors to point out many extraordinary coincidences between the  theosophy of the Cabala and the book of Revelation (which may be compared with an essay of similar tendency in Eichhorn's Bibl. Biblioth. 3, 191); some remarks by Lowe, in the last-named journal (5, 377 sq.); and a dissertation by Vitringa, De Sephiroth Kabbalistarum, in his Observat. Saucr. 1, 126, in which he first showed how the Sephiroth accorded with the human form.

## Sephorno[[@Headword:Sephorno]]

             SEE SFORNO.

## Sepphoris[[@Headword:Sepphoris]]

             (Σεπφώρις v.r. Σέφφορις), a town of Upper Galilee, not mentioned under this name in Scripture, but frequently by Josephus. It was garrisoned by Antigonus in his war with Herod the Great, until the latter took it early in his Galilaean campaign (Josephus, Ant. 14, 15, 4). It seems to have been a place of arms, and to have been occasionally the royal residence, for, in the troubles which arose in the country during the presidency of Varus, the robber chief Judas, son of Ezekias, seized the palace of Sepphoris, and carried off the arms and treasure which it contained (ibid. 17, 12, 5). It was subsequently taken and burned by Varus (ibid. 17, 12, 9). Herod the tetrarch (Antipas) afterwards rebuilt and fortified it, and made it the glory of all Galilee, and gave it independence (ibid. 18, 2, 1); although, according to the statement of Justus, the son of Pistus, he still maintained the superiority of his newly founded city, Tiberias; and it was not until Nero had assigned Tiberias to Agrippa the Younger that Sepphoris established its supremacy and became the royal residence and depository of the archives. It is termed the strongest city of Galilee, and was early taken by Gallus, the general of Cestius (War, 2, 18, 11). It maintained its allegiance to the Romans after the general revolt of Galilee (ibid. 3, 2, 4; 4, 1), but did not break with the Jewish leaders (Life, 8, 9).

Its early importance as a Jewish town, attested by the fact that it was one of the five cities in which district sanhedrim were instituted by Gabinius (War, 1, 8, 5), was further confirmed by the destruction of Jerusalem, after which catastrophe it became for some years the seat of the Great Sanhedrim until it was transferred to Tiberias (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 202). It was subsequently called Diocoesarea, which is its more common appellation in the ecclesiastical annals; while Epiphanius and Jerome recognize both names. A revolt of the Jewish inhabitants in the reign of Constantius (A.D.  339) led to the destruction of the city by Constantius Gallus Caesar (Socrates, H.E. 2, 33; Sozomen, H.E. 4, 7). This town, once the most considerable city of Galilee, was situated, according to Jerome, ten miles west of Mount Tabor (Onomast. s.v. Θαβώρ; Procopius Gazaeus, Comment. in Lib. Judicum). It was much celebrated in the history of the Crusaders for its fountain, a favorite camping place of the Christians. It is still represented by a poor village bearing the name Seffurieh, distant about five miles to the north of Nazareth, retaining no vestiges of its former greatness, but conspicuous with a ruined tower and church, both of the Middle Ages; the latter professing to mark the site of the birthplace of the Virgin Mary, assigned by a late tradition to this locality. It became the see of a suffragan bishop under the metropolitan of Scythopolis (Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, 3, 713, 714), and there are coins still extant of the reigns of Domitian, Trajan, etc. (Reland, Paloestina, p. 199-1003; Eckhel, Doct. Vet. Num. 3, 425, 426). — Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. A recent German writer (Lebrecht, in his pamphlet on the subject [Berlin, 1877]) maintains that this was the site of the Bether (q.v.) of the Talmud.

## Sepphoris (2)[[@Headword:Sepphoris (2)]]

             The modern site Seffurieh is copiously described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnamlnce Survey (1:279, 330 sq.). (See illustration on page 841.)

## Sept[[@Headword:Sept]]

             SEE SEPTUM.

## Septfoil[[@Headword:Septfoil]]

             (seven-leaf), an architectural ornament which has seven cusps or points.

## Septimana in Albis[[@Headword:Septimana in Albis]]

             (sevenfold in white) is the name frequently given to the first week in Whitsuntide with reference to the state of the newly baptized, who wore their white robes of baptism during that time. SEE ALB.

## Septimontium[[@Headword:Septimontium]]

             a Roman festival which was held in the month of December, and lasted only for a single day. The day of the Septimontium was a dies feriatus for the Montani, or the inhabitants of the seven ancient hills, who offered sacrifices to the gods in their several districts. They were believed to have been instituted to commemorate the enclosure of the seven hills of Rome within the walls of the city. SEE ROME.

## Septuagesima[[@Headword:Septuagesima]]

             (seventieth), the third Sunday before Lent. The reason of its application to the day is uncertain. Some liturgical writers — e.g. Pamelius — trace it to the association of the ancient monastic Lent of seventy days with the seventy years' captivity of Israel in Babylon. The following is more probable: There being exactly fifty days between the Sunday next before Lent and Easter day inclusive, that Sunday is termed Quinquagesima, i.e. the fiftieth; and the two immediately preceding Sundays are called from the next round numbers Sexagesima, the sixtieth, and Septuagesima, the seventieth. The observation of these days and the weeks following appears to be as ancient as the time of Gregory the Great. Some of the more devout Christians observed the whole time from the first of these Sundays to Easter as a season of humiliation and fasting, though the ordinary custom was to commence fasting on Ash Wednesday. See Eden, Dict. of the Church, s.v.; Blunt, Dict. of Theology, s.v.

## Septuagint[[@Headword:Septuagint]]

             is the common title of the earliest and most important version of the Old Testament, namely, into Greek, and is generally held to have derived its title (seventy) from the traditionary number of its translators (see below), rather than (as Eichhorn thought) from the authority of the Alexandrian Sanhedrim as consisting of seventy members. In the following account we shall endeavor to sift the truth out of the traditions on this subject. SEE GREEK VERSIONS.

I. Origin of the Version. — This is as great a riddle as the sources of the Nile. The causes which produced the translation, the number and names of the translators, the times at which different portions were translated, are all uncertain.

1. Ancient Testimony on the Subject. —

(1.) The oldest writer who makes mention of the Septuagint is Aristobulus, an author referred to by Eusebius (Proepar. Evangel. 13, 12) and Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 5, 595). According to Eusebius, he was a Jew, who united the Aristotelian with the Jewish philosophy, and composed a commentary on the law of Moses, dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor. He is also mentioned in 2 Maccabees 1, 10. Both Clement and Eusebius make him contemporary with Philometor (2d century B.C.). for the passages in their  writings, in which they speak of him under Philadelphus must either have been corrupted by ignorant transcribers or have been so written by mistake (Valckenaer, § 10, 11; Dähne, p. 81 sq.). His words relative to the Septuagint are these:

“It is manifest that Plato has followed our law, and studied diligently all its particulars; for before Demetrius Phalereus a translation had been made by others of the history of the Hebrews' going forth out of Egypt, and of all that happened to them, and of the conquest of the land, and of the exposition of the whole law. Hence it is manifest that the aforesaid philosopher borrowed many things, for he was very learned, as was Pythagoras, who also transferred many of our doctrines into his system. But the entire translation of our whole law (ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἑρμήνεια τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων) was made in the time of the king named Philadelphus, a man of greater zeal, under the direction of Demetrius Phalereus.”

The entire passage has occasioned much conjecture and discussion. It is given by Valckenaer (Diatribe, etc.), Thiersch (De Versione Alexandrina), and Frankel (Vorstudien, etc.). It appears that the words of Aristobulus do not speak of any prior Greek translation, as Hody supposes, or indeed of any translation whatever. They rather refer to some brief extracts relative to Jewish history, which had been made from the Pentateuch into a language commonly understood by the Jews in Egypt, before the time of Demetrius. The entire law was first rendered into Greek under Philadelphus. Hody, and after him Eichhorn, conjectured that the fragments of Aristobulus preserved by Eusebius and Clement were written in the 2d century by another Aristobulus, a Christian, and that Aristobulus, the professed Peripatetic, was a heathen. But the quotation of Cyril of Alexandria (Contra Julianum, lib. 6), to which they appeal, was erroneously made by that father, as may be seen by comparing it with Clement. Richard Simon also denied the authenticity of Aristobulus's remains (Histoire Critique du V.T. p. 189). But Valckenaer has sufficiently established their authenticity.

The testimony of Aristobulus is corroborated by a Latin scholion recently found in a MS. of Plautus at Rome, which has been described and illustrated by Ritschl in a little book entitled Die alexandrinischen Bibliotheken, etc. (Berlin, 1838). From the passage of Aristobulus already quoted, it appears that in the time of Aristobulus, i.e. the beginning of the 2d century B.C., this version was considered to have  been made when Demetrius Phalereus lived, or in the reign of Ptolemy Soter. Hody, indeed, has endeavored to show that this account contradicts the voice of certain history, because it places Demetrius in the reign of Philadelphus. But the version may have been begun under Soter and completed under Philadelphus, his successor. In this way may be reconciled the discordant notices of the time when it originated; for it is well known that the Palestinian account, followed by various fathers of the Church, asserts that Ptolemy Soter carried the work into execution, while according to Aristeas, Philo, Josephus, etc., his son Philadelphus was the person. Hody harmonizes the discrepancy by placing the translation of the Pentateuch in the two years during which father and son reigned conjointly (B.C. 286 and 285). The object of Demetrius in advising Soter to have in his library a copy of the Jewish laws in Greek is not stated by Aristobulus, but Aristeas relates that the librarian represented it to the king as a desirable thing that such a book should be deposited in the Alexandrian library. Some think that a literary rather than a religious motive led to the version. So Hävernick. This, however, may be reasonably doubted. Hody, Sturz, Frankel, and others conjecture that the object was religious or ecclesiastical. Eichhorn refers it to private impulse; while Hug takes the object to have been political. It is not probable, however, that the version was intended for the king's use, or that he wished to obtain from it information respecting the best mode of governing a nation and enacting laws for its economic well-being. The character and language of the version unite to show that an Egyptian king, probably ignorant of Greek, could not have understood the work. Perhaps an ecclesiastical motive prompted the Jews who were originally interested in it, while Demetrius Phalereus and the king may have been actuated by some other design.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether Aristobulus' words imply that all the books of the Old Test. were translated into Greek under Philadelphus, or simply the Pentateuch. Hody contends that νόμος, the term used by Aristobulus, meant at that time the Mosaic books alone, although it was afterwards taken in a wider sense so as to embrace all the Old Test. Valckenaer thinks that all the books were comprehended under it, It is certainly more natural to restrict it to the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch, therefore, was completed under Philadelphus.

(2.) The next historical testimony regarding the Septuagint is the prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach, a document containing the judgment of a Palestinian Jew concerning the version before us. His words are these:  “And not only these things, but the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference when they are spoken in their own language.” Frankel has endeavored to throw suspicion on this passage, as if it were unauthentic, but his reasons are extremely slender (p. 21, note w). It appears from it that the law, the prophets, and the other books had been translated into Greek in the time of the son of Sirach, i.e. that of Ptolemy Physcon, B.C. 130.

(3.) The account given by Aristeas comes next before us (see Rosenmüller, Handb. d. Lit. d. bibl. Kritik u. Exeg. 2, 413 sq.). This writer pretends to be a Gentile, and a favorite at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt. In a letter addressed to his brother Philocrates, he relates that Philadelphus, when forming a library at great expense, was advised by Demetrius Phalereus to apply to the Jewish high priest Eleazer for a copy of the book containing the Jewish laws. Having previously purchased the freedom of more than a hundred thousand captive Jews in Egypt, the king sent Aristeas and Aidreas to Jerusalem with a letter requesting of Eleazer seventy-two persons as interpreters, six out of each tribe. They were dispatched accordingly with a magnificent copy of the law, and were received and entertained by the king for several days with great respect and liberality. Demetrius led them to an island, probably Pharos, where they lodged together. The translation was finished in seventy-two days, having been written down by Demetrius piece by piece, as agreed upon after mutual consultation. It was then publicly read by Demetrius to a number of Jews whom he had summoned together. They approved of it, and imprecations were uttered against any one who should presume to alter it. The Jews requested permission to take copies of it for their use, and it was carefully preserved by command of the king. The interpreters were sent home loaded with presents.

The work of Aristeas, which was first published in the original Greek by Simon Schard (Basel, 1561, 8vo), and several times reprinted, was also given by Hody in Greek and Latin, in his book entitled De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Groecis, et Latina Vulgata (Oxon. 1705, fol.). The most accurate edition, however, is that by Galland, in the Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum, vol. 2. It was translated into English by Whiston, and published at London in 1727, 8vo. See also Aristeas, Hist. 72 Int. ex Rec. Eld. de Parchum (Francf. 1610; Oxon. 1692).

(4.) In all discussions relative to the name of Septuagint, so universally appropriated to the Greek version of Alexandria, the scholion discovered by Osann and published by Ritschl ought to be considered. The origin of this Latin scholion is curious. The substance of it is stated to have been extracted from Callimachus and Eratosthenes, the Alexandrian librarians, by Tzetzes, and from his Greek note an Italian of the 15th century has formed the Latin scholion in question. The writer has been speaking of the collecting of ancient Greek poems carried on at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, and then he thus continues: “Nam rex ille philosophis affertissimus [corr. “differtissimus,” Ritschl; “affectissimus,” Thiersch] et caeteris omnibus auctoribus claris, disquisitis impensa regiae munificentiae ubique terrarum quantum valuit voluminibus opera Demetrii Phalerei phzxa senum duas bibliothecas fecit, alteram extra regiam alteram autem in regia.” The scholion then goes on to speak of books in many languages: “Quae summa diligentia rex ille in suam linguam fecit ab optimis interpretibus converti” (see Thiersch, De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina [Erlang. 1841], p. 8, 9). Bernhardy reads instead of “phzxa senum,” “et lxx senum,” and this correction is agreed to by Thiersch, as it well may be: some correction is manifestly needed, and this appears to be right. This gives us seventy elders associated in the formation of the library. The testimony comes to us from Alexandrian authority; and this, if true (or even if believed to be true), would connect the Septuagint with the library — a designation which might most easily be applied to a version of the Scriptures there deposited; and, let the translation be once known by such a name, then nothing would be more probable than that the designation should be applied to the translators. This may be regarded as the first step in the formation of the fables. Let the Septuagint be first known as applying to the associates in the collection of the library, then to the library itself, and then to that particular book in the library which to so many had a far greater value than all its other contents. Whether more than the Pentateuch was thus translated and then deposited in the royal library is a separate question.

2. Confirmation by Later Authorities. —

(1.) Of Jewish writers, Josephus (Ant. 12, 2) agrees in the main with Aristeas; but Philo's account (De Vita Mosis, lib. 2) differs in a number of circumstances.

(2.) Among the Greek Church fathers Irenaeus (lib. 3, c. 24) relates that Ptolemy Lagi, wishing to adorn his Alexandrian library with the writings of all nations, requested from the Jews of Jerusalem a Greek version of their Scriptures; that they sent seventy elders well skilled in the Scriptures and in later languages; that the king separated them from one another and bade them all translate the several books. When they came together before Ptolemy and showed their versions, God was glorified, for they all agreed exactly, from beginning to end, in every phrase and word, so that all men may know that the Scriptures are translated by the inspiration of God.

Justin Martyr (Cohort. ad Groecos, p. 34) gives the same account, and adds that he was taken to see the cells in which the interpreters worked.

Epiphanius says that the translators were divided into pairs, in thirty-six cells, each pair being provided with two scribes; and that thirty-six versions agreeing in every point were produced, by the gift of the Holy Spirit (De Pond. et Mens. c. 3-6).

(3.) Among the Latin fathers Augustine adheres to the inspiration of the translators — “Non autem secundum LXX interpretes, qui etiam ipsi divino Spiritu interpretati, ob hoc aliter videntur nonnulla dixisse, ut ad spiritualem sensum scrutandum magis admoneretur lectoris intentio” (De Doctr. Christ. 4, 15).

But Jerome boldly throws aside the whole story of the cells and the inspiration — “Et nescio quis primus auctor Septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarent, cum Aristseus ejusdem Ptolemaei ὑπερασπιστής, et multo post tempore Josephus, nihil tale retulerint: sed in una basilica congregatos, contulisse scribant, non prophetasse. Aliud est enim vatem, aliud esse interpretem. Ibi Spiritus ventura praedicit; hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intelligit transfert” (Proef. ad Pent.).

3. Modern Opinions. —

(1.) Until the latter half of the 17th century the origin of the Sept. as given by Aristeas was firmly believed; while the numerous additions that had been made to the original story in the progress of centuries were unhesitatingly received as equally genuine. The story was first reckoned improbable by L. Vives (in a note to Augustine's De Civitate Dei); then Scaliger asserted that it was written by a Jew; and Richard Simon was too  acute a critic not to perceive the truth of Scaliger's assertion. Hody was the first who demonstrated with great learning, skill, and discrimination that the narrative could not be authentic (De Bibl. Text. Orig. Vers. Groec. et Lat. Vulg. [Oxford, 1705] lib. 4). It is now universally pronounced fabulous.

(2.) But the Pseudo-Aristeas had a basis of fact for his fiction; on three points of his story there is no material difference of opinion and they are confirmed by the study of the version itself: (a.) The version was made at Alexandria. (b.) It was begun in the time of the earlier Ptolemies, about B.C. 280. (c.) The law (i.e. the Pentateuch) alone was translated at first. It is also very possible that there is some truth in the statement that a copy was placed in the royal library. (The emperor Akbar caused the New Test. to be translated into Persian.)

(3.) But by whom was the version made? As Hody justly remarks, “It is of little moment whether it was made at the command of the king or spontaneously by the Jews; but it is a question of great importance whether the Hebrew copy of the law and the interpreters (as Pseudo-Aristeas and his followers relate) were summoned from Jerusalem and sent by the high priest to Alexandria.” On this question no testimony can be so conclusive as the evidence of the version itself, which bears upon its face the marks of imperfect knowledge of Hebrew, and exhibits the forms and phrases of the Macedonic Greek prevalent in Alexandria, with a plentiful sprinkling of Egyptian words. The forms ἤλθοσαν παρενεβάλοσαν, betray the fellow-citizens of Lycophron, the Alexandrian poet, who closes his iambic line with κἀπὸ γῆς ἐσχάζοσαν. Hotldy (2, 4) gives several examples of Egyptian renderings of names and coins and measures; among them the hippodrome of Alexandria for the Hebrew Cibrath (Gen 48:7), and the papyrus of the Nile for the rush of Job (Job 8:11). The reader of the Sept. will readily agree with his conclusion, “Sive regis jussu, sive sponte a Judaeis, a Judaeis Alexandrinus fuisse factam.” The question as to the moving cause which gave birth to the version is one which cannot be so decisively answered either by internal evidence or by historical testimony. The balance of probability must be struck between the tradition, so widely and permanently prevalent, of the king's intervention, and the simpler account suggested by the facts of history and the phenomena of the version itself. It is well known that after the Jews returned from the captivity of Babylon, having lost in great measure the familiar knowledge of the ancient Hebrew, the readings from the books of Moses in the synagogues of  Palestine were explained to them in the Chaldaic tongue in Targums or paraphrases; and the same was done with the books of the prophets when, at a later time, they also were read in the synagogues. The Jews of Alexandria had probably still less knowledge of Hebrew; their familiar language was Alexandrian Greek. They had settled in Alexandria in large numbers soon after the time of Alexander and under the earlier Ptolemies. They would naturally follow the same practice as their brethren in Palestine; the law first, and afterwards the prophets, would be explained in Greek, and from this practice would arise in time an entire Greek version. All the phenomena of the version seem to confirm this view; the Pentateuch is the best part of the version; the other books are more defective, betraying probably the increasing degeneracy of the Hebrew MSS. and the decay of Hebrew learning with the lapse of time.

(4.) Nevertheless, the opinion that the Pentateuch was translated a considerable time before the prophets is not warranted by the language of Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Hilary of Poitiers; although we are aware that Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, the Talmudists, and Jerome mention the law only as having been interpreted by the seventy-two. Hody thinks that the Jews first resorted to the reading of the prophets in their synagogues when Antiochus Epiphanes forbade the use of the law, and therefore that the prophetic portion was not translated till after the commencement of Philometor's reign. It is wholly improbable, however, that Antiochus interdicted the Jews merely from reading the Pentateuch (comp. 1Ma 1:41, etc.; and Josephus, Ant. 12, 5; Frankel, p. 48, 49). The interval between the translating of the law and the prophets, of which many speak, was probably very short. Hody's proof that the book of Joshua was not translated till upwards of twenty years after the death of Ptolemy Lagi, founded upon the word γαισός, is perfectly nugatory, although the time assigned cannot be far from the truth. The epilogue to the book of Esther does not state that this part of the Old Test. was translated under Ptolemy Philometor or that it was dedicated to him. On the contrary it refers to a certain epistle containing apocryphal additions to the canonical book of Esther (Valckenaer, p. 33, 63). It is a fruitless task to attempt to ascertain the precise times at which separate portions of the version were made. All that can be known with any degree of probability is that it was begun under Lagi and finished before the thirty-eighth year of Ptolemy Physcon.  It is obvious from internal evidence that there were several translators, but certainly not seventy-two. Hody has endeavored to parcel out their version into small portions, assigning each part to a separate person, and affirming that they were put together in one cento without revision; but his notions of rigid uniformity in the translators are such as exclude perspicuity, freedom, variety, and elegance. There is no ground for believing that the Pentateuch proceeded from more than one interpreter, who was unquestionably the most skilful of all. The entire work was made by five or six individuals at least, and must, consequently, be of unequal value. Comp. Amersfoordt, De Variis Lectio. Holmes. Loc. quorund. Pent. Mos. (Lugd. 1815); Thiersch, De Pent. Vers. Al. Libri III (Erlang. 1841); Frankel, Ueber d. Einfluss d. palest. Exeg. auf d. alex. Hermen. (Leips. 1851); Rosenmüller, op. cit. p. 435 sq.

(5.) In opposition to the Pseudo-Aristeas, we cannot but maintain that the translators were Alexandrian, not Palestinian, Jews. The internal character of the entire version, particularly of the Pentateuch, sufficiently attests the fact. We find, accordingly, that proper names and terms peculiar to Egypt are rendered in such a manner as must have been unintelligible to a Greek- speaking population other than the Egyptian Jews. That the translators were Egyptians has been proved, to the satisfaction of all, by Hody; although some of his examples are not appropriate or conclusive. Frankel supposes that the version was made not only at different times, but at different places. This is quite arbitrary. There is no reason for believing with him that different books originated after this fashion, the impulse having gone forth from Alexandria and spreading to localities where the Jews had settled, especially Cyrene, Leontopolis, and even Asia Minor.

(6.) The division into verses and chapters is much later than the age of the translators. Our present editions have been printed in conformity with the division into chapters made in the 12th century, though they are not uniform in this particular. Still, however, many MSS. have separations in the text. The Alexandrine Codex is said by Grabe to have 140 divisions, or, as they may be called, chapters, in the book of Numbers alone (Prolegomena, c. 1, § 7).

The titles given to the books, such as Γένεσις, etc., could hardly have been affixed by the translators, since often they do not harmonize with the version of the book itself to which they belong.

II. Textual Basis of the Version. —

1. It has been inquired whether the translator of the Pentateuch followed a Hebrew or a Samaritan codex. The Sept. and Samaritan harmonize in more than a thousand places, where they differ from the Hebrew. Hence it has been supposed that the Samaritan edition was the basis of the version. Various considerations have been adduced in favor of this opinion; and the names of De Dieu, Selden, Whiston, Hottinger, Hassencamp, and Eichhorn are enlisted on its behalf. But the irreconcilable enmity subsisting between the Jews and the Samaritans, both in Egypt and Palestine, effectually militates against it. Besides, in the prophets and Hagiographa, the number of variations from the Masoretic text is even greater and more remarkable than those in the Pentateuch; whereas the Samaritan extends no further than the Mosaic books. No solution, therefore, can be satisfactory which will not serve to explain at once the cause or causes both of the differences between the Seventy and the Hebrew in the Pentateuch, and those found in the remaining books. The problem can be fully solved only by such a hypothesis as will throw light on the remarkable form of the Sept. in Jeremiah and Esther, where it deviates most from the Masoretic MSS., presenting such transpositions and interpolations as excite the surprise of the most superficial reader. The above solution of the question must be rejected not only for the reasons assigned, but also for the following.

(1.) It must be taken into account that if the discrepancies of the Samaritan and Jewish copies be estimated numerically, the Sept. will be found to agree far more frequently with the latter than the former.

(2.) In the cases of considerable and marked passages occurring in the Samaritan which are not in the Jewish, the Sept. does not contain them.

(3.) In the passages in which slight variations are found, both in the Samaritan and Sept., from the Jewish text, they often differ among themselves, and the amplification of the Sept. is less than that of the Samaritan.

(4.) Some of the small amplifications in which the Samaritan seems to accord with the Sept. are in such incorrect and non-idiomatic Hebrew that it is suggested that these must be translations, and, if so, probably from the Sept.

(5.) The amplifications of the Sept. and Samaritan often resemble each other greatly in character, as if similar false criticism had been applied to the text in each case. But as, in spite of all similarities such as these, the Pentateuch of the Sept. is more Jewish than Samaritan, we need not adopt the notion of translation from a Samaritan codex, which would involve the subject in greater difficulties, and leave more points to be explained. (On some of the supposed agreements of the Sept. with the Samaritan, see bishop Fitzgerald in Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, Oct. 1848, p. 324-332.)

Some suppose that the one was interpolated from the other — a conjecture not at all probable. Jahn and Bauer imagine that the Hebrew MS. used by the Egyptian Jews agreed much more closely with the Samaritan in., the text and forms of its letters than the present Masoretic copies. This hypothesis, however, even if it were otherwise correct, would not account for the great harmony existing between the Samaritan and Sept.

Another hypothesis has been put forth by Gesenius (Commentatio de Pent. Samar. Orig. Indole, et Auctor.), viz. that both the Samaritan and Sept. flowed from a common recension (ἔκδοσις) of the Hebrew Scriptures, one older than either, and different in many places from the recension of the Masoretes now in common use. “This supposition,” says Prof. Stuart, by whom it is adopted, “will account for the differences and for the agreements of the Sept. and Samaritan.” The following objections have been made to this ingenious and plausible hypothesis.

(a.) It assumes that before the whole of the Old Test. was written there had been a recension or revision of several books. But there is no record or tradition in favor of the idea that inspired men applied a correcting hand in this manner till the close of the canon. To say that others did so is not in unison with right notions of the inspiration of Scripture, unless it be equally affirmed that they corrupted, under the idea of correcting, the holy books.

(b.) This hypothesis implies that a recension took place at a period comparatively early, before any books had been written except the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and the writings of David and Solomon. If it be improbable that a revised edition was made before the completion of the canon, it is much more improbable that it was undertaken when few books were written.

(c.) It supposes that an older recension was still current after Ezra had revised the whole collection and closed the canon. In making the Sept. version, it is very improbable that the Jews, who were the translators, followed a recension far inferior in their estimation to the copy of the sacred books corrected by Ezra. This objection rests on the assumption that Ezra completed the canon of the Old Test., having been prompted, as well as inspired, to arrange and revise the books of Scripture. Such is the Jewish tradition; and although a majority of the German critics disallow its truth, yet it is held by very able and accomplished men.

Prof. Lee (Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglot) accounts for the agreement between the Sept. and Samaritan in another way. He conjectures that the early Christians interspersed their copies with Samaritan glosses, which ignorant transcribers afterwards inserted in the text. But he has not shown that Christians in general were acquainted with the Samaritan Pentateuch and its additions to the Hebrew copy; neither has he taken into account the reverence entertained by the early Christians for the sacred books. We cannot, therefore, attribute the least probability to this hypothesis.

Another hypothesis has been mentioned by Frankel, viz. that the Sept. flowed from a Chaldee version, which was used before and after the time of Ezra — a version inexact and paraphrastic, which had undergone many alterations and corruptions. This was first proposed by R. Asaria di Rossi, in the midst of other conjectures. Frankel admits that the assumption of such a version is superfluous, except in relation to the Samaritan Pentateuch, where much is gained by it. This Chaldee version circulated in various transcripts here and there; and as the same care was not applied in preserving its integrity as was exercised with respect to the original Hebrew, the copies of it presented considerable differences among themselves. Both the Greek version and the Samaritan Pentateuch were taken from it. Frankel concedes that this hypothesis is not satisfactory with regard to the Sept., because the mistakes found in that version must have frequently originated in misunderstanding the Hebrew text. There is no evidence, however, that any Targum or Chaldee version had been made before Ezra's time, or soon after. Explanations of the lessons publicly read by the Jews were given in Chaldee, not regularly perhaps, or uniformly; but it can scarcely be assumed that a Chaldee version had been made out in writing, and circulated in different copies. Glosses, or short expositions of words and sentences, were furnished by the public readers for the benefit of the people; and it is by no means improbable that several of these  traditional comments were incorporated with the version by the Jewish translators, to Whom they were familiar.

In short, no hypothesis yet proposed commends itself to general reception, although the Vorstudien of Frankel have probably opened up the way towards a correct solution. The great source from which the striking peculiarities in the Sept. and the Samaritan flowed appears to us to have been early traditional interpretations current among the Jews, targums, or paraphrases — not written, perhaps, but orally circulated. Such glossarial versions, which must have circulated chiefly in Palestine. require to be traced back to an early epoch — to the period of the second Temple. They existed, in substance at least, in ancient times, at once indicating and modifying the Jewish mode of interpretation. The Alexandrian mode of interpretation stood in close connection with the Palestinian; for the Jews of Egypt looked upon Jerusalem as their chief city, and the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem as their ecclesiastical rulers. If, therefore, we can ascertain the traditional paraphrases of the one. those of the other must have been substantially the same (see Gieseler's Eccles. Hist., transl. by Cunningham, 1, 30).

Tychsen (Tentamen de Variis Codd. Heb. V.T. MSS. Gener.) thought that the Sept. was made from the Hebrew transcribed into Hebrew-Greek characters. It is almost unnecessary to refer to such a notion. It never obtained general currency, having been examined and refuted by Dathe, Michaelis, and Hassencamp.

2. Evidence as to the Verbal Condition of the Original. Here we naturally inquire as, to two obvious points:

(1.) Was the version made from Hebrew MSS. with the vowel-points now used? A few examples will indicate the answer.

A. PROPER NAMES.

Hebrew.Septuagint.Exo 6:17, לַבְנַי, Libni.Λοβενεί.Exo 6:19, מִחְלַי, Machli.Μοολεί.Exo 13:20, אֵתָם, Etham.Ο᾿θώμDeu 3:10, סִלְכָה, Salchah.῾Ελχᾶ. Deu 34:1, פַּסְגָּה, Pisgah.Φασγά.

B. OTHER WORDS.

Hebrew.Septuagint.Gen 1:9, מָקום, place.συναγωγή (מַקְוֶה).Gen 15:11, וִיֵּשֶׁב אֹתָםκαὶ συνεκὰθισεν αὐτοῖςand he drove them away.(וִיֵּשֶׁב אַתָּם).Exo 12:17, אֶתאּהִמִּצּוֹת,τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτηνunleavened bread.אֶתאּהִמַּצְוָה).Num 16:5, בֹּקֶר, in theἐπέσκεπταίmorning.(בָּקִר).Deu 15:18, מַשְׁנֵה, double.ἐπέτειον, (מַשָּׁנָה).Isa 9:8, דָּבָר, a word.θάνατον ( דֶּבֶר).Examples of these two kinds are innumerable. Plainly the Greek translators had not Hebrew MSS. pointed as at present. In many cases (e.g. Exo 2:25; Nah 3:8) the Sept. has possibly preserved the true pronunciation and sense where the Masoretic pointing has gone wrong.

(2.) Were the Hebrew words divided from one another, and were the final letters וֹ, , ן, ם,,ִ in use when the Sept. was made? — Take a few out of many examples:

Hebrew.Septuagint.(1) Deu 26:5, אֹבֵדאֲרִמַּי,Συρίαν ἀπέβαλενa perishing Syrian.(ארם יאֹבד).(2) 2Ki 2:14, אִŠאּהוּאַ,ἀφφώhe also.[it joins the two words in one].(3) 2Ki 22:20, לָכֵןοὐχ οὕτωςtherefore.(לאֹאּכֵן)(4) 1Ch 17:10, וָאִגַּד לְךָ,καὶ αὐξήσω δεand I told thee.(וִאֲגִדֶּלְךָ),

(5) Hos 6:5, יֵצֵא וּמַשְׁפָּטֶיךָ אוֹרκαὶ τὸ κρίμα μον ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύ σεταίand thy judgmentsThe Sept. reads:[are as] the light [that] goeth forthוּמִשְׁפָטִי כָאוֹר

(6) Zec 11:7, עֲנַיֵּי הִצּאֹןלָכֵןεἰς τὴν Χανανῖτινeven you, O poor of the flock.[it joins the first two words].Here we find three cases (2, 4, 6) where the Sept. reads as one word what makes two in the present Hebrew text; one case (3) where one Hebrew word is made into two by the Sept.; two cases (1, 5) where the Sept. transfers a letter from the end of one word to the beginning of the next. By inspection of the Hebrew in these cases it will be easily seen that the Hebrew MSS. must have been written without intervals between the words, and that the present final forms were not then in use. In three of the above examples (4, 5, 6), the Sept. has perhaps preserved the true division and sense. In the study of these minute particulars, which enable us to examine closely the work of the translators, great help is afforded by Cappelli Critica Sacra, and by the Vorstudien of Frankel, who has most diligently anatomized the text of the Sept. His projected work on the whole of the version has not been completed, but he has published a part of it in his treatise Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik, in which he reviews minutely the Sept. version of the Pentateuch.

III. Ecclesiastical Authority and Influence. — The Sept. does not appear to have obtained general authority among the Jews so long as Hebrew was understood at Alexandria. It is remarkable that Aristobulus quotes the original, even where it departs from the text of the Sept. The version was indeed spread abroad in Egypt, Northern. Africa, and Asia Minor. It seems to have been so highly esteemed by the Jews as to be publicly read in some of their synagogues. From the 146th Novella of Justinian, it would seem that some Jews wished the public interpreter, who read the lessons out of the law and the prophets in Hebrew, to give his explanations of them in Greek, while others desired to have them in Chaldee. The reader, therefore, employed this translation as, explanatory of the sections recited in the original, yet, although they highly esteemed the Greek, they did not regard  it as equal to the Hebrew. Even the Talmudists make honorable mention of its origin. It is true that the Talmud also speaks of it as an abomination to the Jews in Palestine; but this refers to the 2d century and the time following, not to the period immediately after the appearance of Christ. When controversies arose between Christians and Jews, and the former appealed with irresistible force of argument to this version, the latter denied that it agreed with the Hebrew original. Thus by degrees it became odious to the Jews — as much execrated as it had before been commended. They had recourse to the translation of Aquila, who is supposed to have undertaken a new work from the Hebrew, with the express object of supplanting the Sept. and favoring the sentiments of his brethren,

Among the Christians the ancient text, called κοινή, was current before the time of Origen. We find it quoted by the early Christian fathers — in Greek by Clemens Romanus, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus; in Latin versions by Tertullian and Cyprian. We find it questioned as inaccurate by the Jews (Just. Martyr, Apol.), and provoking them to obtain a better version (hence the versions of Aquila, etc.). We find it quoted by Josephus and Philo; and thus we are brought to the time of the apostles and evangelists, whose writings are full of citations and references, and imbued with the phraseology of the Sept. From all this we are justified in the following conclusions on this head:

1. This version was highly esteemed by the Hellenistic Jews before the coming of Christ. An annual festival was held at Alexandria in remembrance of the completion of the work (Philo, De Vita Mosis, lib. 2). The manner in which it is quoted by the writers of the New Test. proves that it had long been in general use. Wherever, by the conquests of Alexander or by colonization, the Greek language prevailed; wherever Jews were settled, and the attention of the neighboring Gentiles was drawn to their wondrous history and law, there was found the Sept., which thus became, by Divine Providence, the means of spreading widely the knowledge of the One True God and his promises of a Savior to come throughout the nations; it was indeed ostium gentibus ad Christum. To the wide dispersion of this version we may ascribe, in great measure, that general persuasion which prevailed over the whole East (percrebuerat Oriente toto) of the near approach of the Redeemer, and which led the magi to recognize the star that proclaimed the birth of the King of the Jews.

2. Not less wide was the influence of the Sept. in the spread of the Gospel. Many of those Jews who were assembled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, from Asia Minor, from Africa, from Crete and Rome, used the Greek language; the testimonies to Christ from the law and the prophets came to them in the words of the Sept.; St. Stephen probably quoted from it in his address to the Jews; the Ethiopian eunuch was reading the Sept. version of Isaiah in his chariot (ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη); they who were scattered abroad went forth into many lands, speaking of Christ in Greek, and pointing to the things written of him in the Greek version of Moses and the prophets; from Antioch and Alexandria in the East to Rome and Massilia in the West, the voice of the Gospel sounded forth in Greek; Clemens of Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Justin Martyr in Palestine, Irenaeus at Lyons, and many more, taught and wrote in the words of the Greek Scriptures; and a still wider range was given to the Sept. by the Latin version (or versions) made from it for the use of the Latin churches in Italy and Africa; and in later times by the numerous other versions into the tongues of Egypt, Ethiopia, Armenia, Arabia, and Georgia. For a long period the Sept. was the Old Test. of the far larger part of the Christian Church (see the Hulsean Prize Essay, by W.R. Churton, On the Influence of the Sept. on the Progress of Christianity [Camb. 1861J; and an art. in the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1862, vol. 3).

A number of other versions have been founded on the Sept.

1. Various early Latin translations, the chief of which was the Vetus Itala;

2. The Coptic and Sahidic, belonging to the James , 2 d centuries;

3. The Ethiopic, belonging to the 4th century;

4. The Armenian, of the 5th century;

5. The Georgian, of the 6th century;

6. Various Syriac versions, of the 6th and 8th centuries;

7. Some Arabic versions, SEE ARABIC VERSIONS;

8. The Slavonic, belonging to the 9th century.

IV. Liturgical Origin of Portions of the Version. — This is a subject for inquiry which has received but little attention; not so much, probably, as its importance deserves. It was noticed by Tregelles many years ago that the headings of certain psalms in the Sept. coincide with the liturgical directions in the Jewish Prayer book. The results were at a later period communicated in Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, April 1852, p. 207-  209. The results may be briefly stated: The 23d Psalm, Sept. (Heb. 24th), is headed in the Sept. τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου; so, too, in Heb. in De Sola's Prayers of the Sephardim, ביום הראשׁון: Psalms 47, Sept. (Hebrews 48), δευτέρᾷ σαββάτου ליום שׁני: Psalms 93, Sept. (Hebrews 94), τετράδι σαββάτου, ליום רביעי: Psalms 92, Sept. (Hebrews 93), εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου,ליום שׁשׁי; There appear to be no Greek copies extant which contain similar headings for Psalms 81, 30 (Hebrews 82 and 81), which the Jewish Prayer book appropriates to the third and fifth days; but that such once existed in the case of the latter psalm seems to be shown from the Latin Psalterium Vetus having the prefixed quinta sabbati, ליום חמישׁי. Delitzsch, in his Commentary on the Psalms, has recently pointed out that the notation of these psalms in the Sept. is in accordance with certain passages in the Talmud.

It is worthy of inquiry whether variations in other passages of the Sept. from the Hebrew text cannot at times be connected with liturgical use, and whether they do not originate in part from rubrical directions. It seems to be at least plain that the Psalms were translated from a copy prepared for synagogue worship.

V. Character of the Version. — Under this head we have to consider several special questions relating to its internal character as a translation:

1. Is the Sept. Faithful in Substance? — Here we cannot answer by citing a few examples; the question refers to the general texture, and any opinion we express must be verified by continuous reading. For a purely philological examination, SEE SEPTUAGINT, LINGUISTIC CHARACTER OF.

(1.) It has been clearly shown by Hody, Frankel, and others that the several. books were translated by different persons, without any comprehensive revision to harmonize the several parts. Names and words are rendered differently in different books; e.g. פֶּסִח, the Passover, in the Pentateuch is rendered πάσχα; in 2Ch 35:6,. φασέκ. אוּרַי, Urim, Exo 28:26, δήλωσις; Deu 33:8, δῆλοι; Ezr 2:63, (φωτίζοντες; Neh 7:65, φωτίσων. תֻמַּ, Thummim, Exo 28:26, ἀλήθεια; Ezr 2:63, τέλειον.  The Philistines in the Pentateuch and Joshua are φυλιστείμ; in the other books ἀλλόφυλοι.

The books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings are distinguished by the use of ἐγώ είμι instead of ἐγώ.

These are a few put of many like variations.

(2.) Thus the character of the version varies much in the several books; those of the Pentateuch are the best, as Jerome says (“Confitemur plus quam caeteris cum Hebraicis consonare”), and this agrees well with the external evidence that the law was translated first, when Hebrew MSS. were more correct and Hebrew better known. Perhaps the simplicity of the style in these early books facilitated the fidelity of the version.

(3.) The poetical parts are, generally speaking, inferior to the historical, the original abounding with rarer words and expressions. In these parts the reader of the Sept. must be continually on the watch lest an imperfect rendering of a difficult word mar the whole sentence. The Psalms and Proverbs are perhaps the best.

(4.) In the major prophets some of the most important prophecies are sadly obscured — e.g. Isa 9:1, τοῦτο πρῶτον πίε ταχὺ ποίει, χώρα Ζαβουλών, κ. τ. λ.; and in Isa 9:6, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὅ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος Ι᾿ωσεδὲκ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.

Ezekiel and the minor prophets (speaking generally) seem to be better rendered. The Sept. version of Daniel was not used, that of Theodotion being substituted for it.

(5.) Supposing the numerous glosses and duplicate renderings which have evidently crept from the margin into the text to be removed (e.g. Isa 7:16; Hab 3:2; Joe 1:8) — for these are blemishes not of the version itself, but of the copies — and forming a rough estimate of what the Sept. was in its earliest state, we may perhaps say of it, in the words of the well known simile, that it was, in many parts, “the wrong side of the Hebrew tapestry,” exhibiting the general outlines of the pattern, but confused in the more delicate lines, and with many ends of threads visible; or, to use a more dignified illustration, the Sept. is the image of the original seen through a glass not adjusted to the proper focus — the larger features are shown, but the sharpness of definition is lost. On Judges, see Grabii Ep. ad J. Millium qua Ostend. L. Judd. Gen. LXX Ves,. eam esse quam MS.  Alex. Exhibet, etc. (Oxf. 1705); Ziegler, Theol. Abhandl. (Gött. 1791), vol. 1. On Samuel and Kings, Thenius, Kurzgef. exeg. Hdb. z. A.T. 4, 24 sq.; 9, 13 sq. On Chronicles, Movers, Krit. Unters. (Bonn, 1834). On Esther, Fritsche's ed. (Zür. 1848). See Jeremiah s.v. Jud. Alex. ac Relig. init. Groec., em. Notisque Crit. ill. G.L. Spohn (Lips. 1794; 2d ed. 1824, by F.A.G. Spohn).

2. Is the Version Minutely Accurate in Details? — We have anticipated the answer to this question, but will give a few examples:

(1.) The same word in the same chapter is often rendered by differing words — Exo 12:13, פָּסִחְתַּי, “‘I will pass over,” Sept. σκεπάσω, but 23, פָּסִח, “will pass over,” Sept. παρελεύσεται.

(2.) Differing words by the same word — Exo 12:23, עָבִר, “pass through,” and פָּסִח, “pass over,” both by πρελεύσεται; Num 15:4-5, מַנְחָה, “offering,” and זֶבִח, “sacrifice,” both by θυσία.

(3.) The divine names are frequently interchanged; Κύριος is put for אֵֹלהַים, God, and Θεός for יְהוֹה, Jehovah; and the two are often wrongly combined or wrongly separated.

(4.) Proper names are sometimes translated, sometimes not. In Genesis 23 : — by translating the name Machpelah (τὸ διπλοῦν), the version is made to speak first of the cave being in the field (ver.9), and then of the field being in the cave (Gen 23:17), ὁ ἀγρὸς Ε᾿φρών, ὅς ην ἐν τῷ διπλῷ σπηλαίῳ, the last word not warranted by the Hebrew. Zec 6:14 is a curious example of four names of persons being translated — e.g. לַטוֹבַיָּה, “to Tobijah,” Sept. τοῖς χρησίμοις αὐτῆς; Pisgah in Deu 34:1, is φασγά, but in Deu 3:27, τοῦ λελαξευμένου.

(5.) The translators are often misled by the similarity of Hebrew words — e.g. Num 3:26, מֵיתָרָיו, “the cords of it,” Sept. τὰ κατάλοιπα. and 4:26, τὰ περισσά. In other places οἱ κάλοι, and Isa 54:2, τὰ σχοινίσματα, both rightly. Exo 4:31, יַשְׁמַעוּ, “they heard,” Sept. ἐχάρη (יַשְׂמְהוּ); Num 16:15, “I have not taken one ass” (חֲמוֹר), Sept. οὐκ ἐπιθύμημα,( חמר) εἴληφα; Deu 32:10,

יַמְצָאֵהוּ, “he found him,” Sept. αὐτάρκησεν αὐτόν; 1Sa 12:2, .

שִׂבְתַּי, “I am gray headed,” Sept. καθήσομαι (שִׁבְתַּי);Gen 3:17,

בִּעֲבוּרֶךָ” for thy sake,” Sept. ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου ( ד forר).

In very similar cases the error may be thus traced to the similarity of some of the Hebrew letters, ד and ר, ה and ת, י and 5, etc.; in some it is difficult to see any connection between the original and the version — e.g. Deu 32:8, בְּנֵי יַשְׂרָאֵל, “the sons of Israel,” Sept. ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ. Aquila and Symmachus, υἱῶν Ι᾿σραήλ.

Isa 21:11-12.Septuagint.Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?Φυλάσσετε ἐπάλξεις;The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night:Θυλάσσω τοπρωϊv καὶ τήν νύκτα.If ye will inquire, inquire ye.ἐὰν ζητῇς ζήτει·,Return, come.καὶ παῤ ἐμοὶ οἴκει.(6.) Besides the above deviations and many like them, which are probably due to accidental causes — the change of a letter, or doubtful writing in the Hebrew — there are some passages which seem to exhibit a studied variation in the Sept. from the Hebrew, e.g. Gen 2:2, on the seventh (השביעי) day God ended his work; Sept. συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾷ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.. The addition in Exo 12:40, καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ Χαναάν, appears to be of this kind, inserted to solve a difficulty.

Frequently the strong expressions of the Hebrew are softened down; where human parts are ascribed to God for hand the Sept. substitutes power; for mouth, word, etc. Exo 4:16, “Thou shalt be to him instead of God” (לֵאלֹהַום), Sept. σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (see Exo 4:15). These and many more savor of design rather than of accident or error.

The version is, therefore, not minutely accurate in details; and it may be laid down as a principle, never to build any argument on words or phrases of the Sept. without comparing them with the Hebrew. The Greek may be right; but very often its variations are wrong.

3. We shall now be prepared to weigh the tradition of the fathers, that the version was made by inspiration (κατ᾿ ἐπίπνοιαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Irenaeus; “Divino Spiritu interpretati,” Augustine). Even Jerome himself seems to  think that the Sept. may have sometimes added words to the original “ob Spiritus Sancti auctoritatem, licet in Hebraeis voluminibus non legatur” (Proefat. in Paralip. tom. 1, col. 1419).

Let us try to form some conception of what is meant by the inspiration of translators. It cannot mean what Jerome here seems to allow, that the translators were divinely moved to add to the original, for this would be the inspiration of prophets, as he himself says in another passage (Prolog. in Genesin), “Aliud est enim vertere, aliud esse interpretem.” Every such addition would be, in fact, a new revelation. Nor can it be, as some have thought, that the deviations of the Sept. from the original were divinely directed, whether in order to adapt the Scriptures to the mind of the heathen or for other purposes. This would be, pro tanto, a new revelation, and it is difficult to conceive of such a revelation; for, be it observed, the discrepancy between the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures would tend to separate the Jews of Palestine from those of Alexandria, and of other places where the Greek Scriptures were used; there would be two different copies of the same books dispersed throughout the world, each claiming divine authority; the appeal to Moses and the prophets would lose much of its force; the standard of divine truth would be rendered doubtful; the trumpet would give an uncertain sound. No! If there be such a thing as an inspiration of translators, it must be an effect of the Holy Spirit on their minds, enabling them to do their work of translation more perfectly than by their own abilities and acquirements; to overcome the difficulties arising from defective knowledge, from imperfect MSS., from similarity of letters, from human infirmity and weariness; and so to produce a copy of the Scriptures, setting forth the Word of God and the history of his people, in its original truth and purity. This is the kind of inspiration claimed for the translators by Philo (Vit. Mosis, lib. 2): “We look upon the persons who made this version not merely as translators, but as persons chosen and set apart by divine appointment, to whom it was given to comprehend and express the sense and meaning of Moses in the fullest and clearest manner.”

The reader will be able to judge from the foregoing examples whether the Sept. version satisfies this test. If it does, it will be found not only substantially faithful, but minutely accurate in details: it will enable us to correct the Hebrew in every place where an error has crept in; it will give evidence of that faculty of intuition in its highest form which enables our great critics to divine from the faulty text the true reading; it will be, in  short, a republication of the original text, purified from the errors of human hands and eyes stamped with fresh authority from heaven. This is a question to be decided by facts, by the phenomena of the version itself. We will simply declare our own conviction that, instead of such a divine republication of the original, we find a marked distinction between the original and the Sept. — a distinction which is well expressed in the words of Jerome (Prolog. in Genesin): “Ibi Spiritus ventura praedicit; hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intelligit transfert.” It will be remembered that this agrees with the ancient narrative of the version, known by the name of Aristeas, which represents the interpreters as meeting in one house, forming One council, conferring together, and agreeing on the sense (see Hody, lib. 2, c. 6).

There are some, perhaps, who will deem this estimate of the Sept. too low; who think that the use of this version in the New Test. stamps it with an authority above that of a mere translation. But as the apostles and evangelists do not invariably cite the Old Test. according to this version, we are left to judge by the light of facts and evidence. Students of Holy Scripture, as well as students of the natural world, should bear in mind the maxim of Bacon, “Sola spes est in vera inductione.”

VI. Benefits to be Derived from the Study of the Septuagint. — After all the notices of imperfection above given, it may seem strange to say, but we believe it to be the truth, that the student of Scripture can scarcely read a chapter without some benefit, especially if he be a student of Hebrew, and able, even in a very humble way, to compare the version with the original.

1. We have seen above that the Sept. gives evidence of the character and condition of the Hebrew MSS. from which it was made with respect to vowel points and the mode of writing. This evidence often renders very material help in the correction and establishment of the Hebrew text. Being made from MSS. far older than the Masoretic recension, the Sept. often indicates readings more ancient and more correct than those of our present Hebrew MSS. and editions, and often speaks decisively between the conflicting readings of the present MSS. The following are instances: Psa 22:17 (in the Sept. 21:16). The printed Hebrew text is כארי; but several MSS. have a verb in the third person plural, כארַו: the Sept. steps in to decide the doubt, ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου, confirmed by Aquila, Vσχυναν.  Psa 16:10. The printed text is חסידי, in the plural; but near two hundred MSS. have the singular, חסיד, which is clearly confirmed by the evidence of the Sept., οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.

In passages like these, which touch on the cardinal truths of the Gospel, it is of great importance to have the testimony of an unsuspected witness in the Sept. long before the controversy between Christians and Jews.

In Hos 6:5, the context clearly requires that the first person should be maintained throughout the verse; the Sept. corrects the present Hebrew text, without a change except in the position of one letter, τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύσεται, rendering unnecessary the addition of words in italics in our English version.

Other examples might be given, but we must content ourselves with one signal instance of a clause omitted in the Hebrew (probably by what is called ὁμοιοτέλευτον) and preserved in the Sept. In Gen 4:8 is a passage which in the Hebrew and in our English version is evidently incomplete: “And Cain talked (וִיּאֹמֶר) with Abel his brother; and it came to pass when they were in the field,” etc. Here the Hebrew word וִיּאֹמֶרis the word constantly used as the introduction to words spoken, “Cain said unto Abel;” but, as the text stands, there are no words spoken, and the following words “... when they were in the field” come in abruptly. The Sept. fills up the lacuna Hebroeorum codicum (Pearson), καὶ ειπε Κάϊν πρὸς Α᾿βὲλ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον (נֵלְכָה הִשָּׂדֶה). The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Syriac version agree with the Sept., and the passage is thus cited by Clemens Romanus (Ephesians 1, 4). The Hebrew transcriber's eye was probably misled by the word שָׂדֶהterminating both the clauses.

In all the foregoing cases we do not attribute any paramount authority to the Sept. on account of its superior antiquity to the extant Hebrew MSS., but we take it as an evidence of a more ancient Hebrew text, as an eyewitness of the texts, 280 or 180 years B.C. The decision as to any particular reading must be made by weighing this evidence, together with that of other ancient versions, with the arguments from the context, the rules of grammar, the genius of the language, and the comparison of parallel passages. Thus the Hebrew will sometimes correct the Greek, and  sometimes the Greek the Hebrew; both liable to err through the infirmity of human eyes and hands, but each checking the other's errors.

2. The close connection between the Old and the New Test. makes the study of the Sept. extremely valuable, and almost indispensable to the theological student. Pearson quotes from Irenaeus and Jerome as to the citation of the words of prophecy from the Sept. The former, as Pearson observes, speaks too universally when he says that the apostles “prophetica omnia ita enunciaverunt quemadmodum Seniorum interpretatio continet.” But it was manifestly the chief storehouse from which they drew their proofs and precepts. Grinfield says that “the number of direct quotations from the Old Test. in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles may be estimated at 350, of which not more than fifty materially differ from the Sept. But the indirect verbal allusions would swell the number to a far greater amount” (Apol. for LXX, p. 37). The comparison of the citations with the Sept. is much facilitated by Grinfield's Editio Hellenistica of the New Test., and by Gough's New Test. Quotations, in which the Hebrew and Greek passages of the Old Test. are placed side by side with the citations in the New. (On this subject see Hody, p. 248, 281; Kennicott, Dissert. Genesis § 84; Cappelli Critica Sacra, vol. 2.)

3. Further, the language of the Sept. is the mold in which the thoughts and expressions of the apostles and evangelists are cast. In this version Divine Truth has taken the Greek language as its shrine, and adapted it to the things of God. Here the peculiar idioms of the Hebrew are grafted upon the stock of the Greek tongue; words and phrases take a new sense. The terms of the Mosaic ritual in the Greek version are employed by the apostles to express the great truths of the Gospel, e.g. ἀρχιερεύς, θυσία, ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας. Hence the Sept. is a treasury of illustration for the Greek Testament. Many examples are given by Pearson (Proef. ad LXX), e.g. σάρξ, πνεῦμα, δικαιόω, φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός,, “Frustra apud veteres Graecos quaeras quid sit πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ vel εἰς τὸν Θεόν quid sit εἰς τὸν Κύριον, vel πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν πίστις, quae toties in Novo Foedere inculcantur, et ex lectione Seniorum facile intelliguntur.” Valckenaer also (on Luk 1:51) speaks strongly on this subject: “Graecum Novi Testamenti contextum rite intellecturo nihil est utilius, quam diligenter versasse Alexandrinam Antiqui Foederis interpretationem, e qua una plus peti poterit auxilii, quam ex veteribus scriptoribus Graecis simul sumtis. Centena reperientur in N.T. nusquam obvia in scriptis Graecorum veterum, sed frequentata in Alexa. versione.” E.g. the sense of  τὸ πάσχα in Deu 16:2, including the sacrifices of the Paschal week, throws light on the question as to the day on which our Lord kept his last Passover, arising out of the words in Joh 18:28, ἀλλ᾿ ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα.

4. The frequent citations of the Sept. by the Greek fathers, and of the Latin version of the Sept. by the fathers who wrote in Latin, form another strong reason for the study of the Sept. Pearson cites the appellation of Scaraboeus bonus applied to Christ by Ambrose and Augustine, as explained by reference to the Sept. in Hab 2:11, κάνθαρος ἐκ ξύλου.

5. On the value of the Sept. as a monument of the Greek language in one of its most curious phases, this is not the place to dwell. Our business is with the use of this version as it bears on the criticism and interpretation of the Bible; and we may safely urge the theological student who wishes to be “thoroughly furnished” to have always at his side the Sept. Let the Hebrew, if possible, be placed before him; and at his right, in the next place of honor, the Alexandrian version. The close and careful study of this version will be more profitable than the most learned inquiry into its origin; it will help him to a better knowledge both of the Old Test. and the New.

VII. Objects to be Attained by the Critical Scholar.

1. Among these a question of much interest, suggested above, still waits for a solution. In many of the passages which show a studied variation from the Hebrew (some of which are above noted), the Sept. and the Samaritan Pentateuch agree — e.g. Gen 2:2; Exo 12:40.

They also agree in many of the ages of the post-diluvian patriarchs, adding one hundred years to the age at which the first son of each was born, according to the Hebrew (see Cappelli Critica Sacaa, 3, 20, 7). SEE PATRIARCH.

They agree in the addition of the words διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον (Gen 4:8), which many have seen reason to think rightly added.

Various reasons have been conjectured for this agreement — translation into Greek from a Samaritan text, interpolation from the Samaritan into the Greek, or vice versa; but the question does not seem to have found a satisfactory answer (see § 2 above).

2. For the critical scholar it would be a worthy object of pursuit to ascertain as nearly as possible the original text of the Sept. as it stood in the time of the apostles and Philo. If this could be accomplished with any tolerable completeness, it would possess a strong interest, as being the first translation of any writing into another tongue, and the first repository of divine truth to the great colony of Hellenistic Jews at Alexandria.

The critic would probably take as his basis the Roman edition from the Codex Vaticanus as representing most nearly the ancient (κοινή) texts. The collection of fragments of Origen's Hexapla, by Montfaucon and others, would help him to eliminate the additions which have been made to the Sept. from other sources, and to purge out the glosses and double renderings; the citations in the New Test. and in Philo, in the early Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin, would render assistance of the same kind; and perhaps the most effective aid of all would be found in the fragments of the old Latin version collected by Sabbatier in 3 vols. fol. (Rheims, 1743).

3. Another work of more practical and general interest still remains to be done, viz. to provide a Greek version, accurate and faithful to the Hebrew original, for the use of the Greek Church, and of students reading the Scriptures in that language for purposes of devotion or mental improvement. Field's edition is as yet the best of this kind. It originated in the desire to supply the Greek Church with such a faithful copy of the Scriptures; but as the editor has followed the text of the Alexandrian MS., only correcting, by the help of other MSS., the evident errors of transcription (e.g. in Gen 15:15, correcting τραφείς in the Alexandrian MS. to ταφείς, the reading of the Complut. text), and as we have seen above that the Alexandrian text is far from being the nearest to the Hebrew, it is evident that a more faithful and complete copy of the Old Test. in Greek might yet be provided.

We may here remark, in conclusion, that such an edition might prepare the way for the correction of the blemishes which remain in our authorized English version. Embracing the results of the criticism of the last two hundred and fifty years, it might exhibit several passages in their original purity; and the corrections thus made, being approved by the judgment of the best scholars, would probably, after a time, find their way into the margin at least of our English Bibles.  One example only can be here given, in a passage which has caused no small perplexity and loads of commentary. Isa 9:3 is thus rendered in the Sept.: To πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ, ὅ κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται ἐνώπιόν σου, ώς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι ἐν ἀμήτῳ, καὶ ὃν τρόπον οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα It is easy to see how the faulty rendering of the first part of this has arisen from the similarity of the Hebrew letters תand ה, ד, and ר, and from an ancient error in the Hebrew text. The following translation restores the whole passage to its original clearness and force:

Ε᾿πλήθυνας τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν (הִגַּיל) ἐμεγαλύνας τὴν εὐφροσύνην· εὐφραίνονται ἐνώπιόν σου ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι ἐν ἀμήτῳ, ὃυ τρόπον ἀγαλλιῶνται οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα.

“Thou hast multiplied the gladness,

Thou hast increased the joy;

They rejoice before thee as with the joy of harvest,

As men are glad when they divide the spoil.”

Here ἀγαλλίασις and ἀγαλλιῶνται, in the first and fourth lines, correspond to גַּיל and יָגַילוּ; εὐφροσύνη and εὐφραίνονται, in the second and third lines, to שַׂמְחָה and שָׂמְחוּ. The fourfold introverted parallelism is complete, and the connection with the context of the prophecy perfect.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that in such an edition the apocryphal additions to the book of Esther, and those to the book of Daniel, which are not recognized by the Hebrew canon, would be either omitted or (perhaps more properly, since they appear to have been incorporated with the Sept. at an early date) would be placed separately, as in Field's edition and our English version. SEE APOCRYPHA; SEE CANON; SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF; SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF; SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

VIII. Manuscripts and Early Critical Labors. —

1. The various readings given by Holmes and Parsons enable us to judge, in some measure, of the character of the several MSS. and of the degree of their accordance with the Hebrew text. Many other MSS., chiefly fragments, have since been brought to light by Tischendorf, and most of them have been published in his Monum. Sacra Ined. They are  distinguished thus by Holmes: the uncial by Roman numerals, the cursive by Arabic figures. Among them may be specially noted, with their probable dates and estimates of value as given by Holmes in his preface to the Pentateuch:

UNCIAL.— PROBABLE DATE CENTURY.

(Sinaiticus. Royal Library, St. Petersburg]—. 4

1. COTTONIANUS. Brit. Mus. (fragments) — 4

2. VATICANUS. Vat. Library, Rome — 4

3. ALEXANDRINUS. Brit. Mus — 5

7. AMBROSIANUS. Ambros. Lib., Milan — 7

10. COISLINIANUS. Bibl. Nat., Paris — 7

CURSIVE.

16. Mediceus. Med. Laurentian Lib., Florence — 11

19. Chigianus. Similar to Complut. text and 108, 118 — 10

25. Monachiensis. Munich — 10

58. Vaticanus (No. x). Vat. Lib., similar to 72 — 13

59. Glasguensis — 12

61. Bodleianus. Laud. 86, notae optimae — 12

64. Parisiensis (11). National Library — 10 or 11

72. Venetus. Maximi faciendus — 13

75. Oxoniensis. Univ. Coll — 12

84. Vaticanus (1901), notae optimae — 11

106.

107.} Ferrarienses. These two agree — 14

108. {Vaticanus (330). Similar to Complut —14

118. {Parisiensis. Nat. Lib. text and (19) — 13

The texts of these MSS. differ considerably from each other, and consequently differ in various degrees from the Hebrew original (see Grabe, De Variis Vitiis LXX, etc. [Oxf. 1710]).

The following are the results of a comparison of the readings in the first eight chapters of Exodus:

(1.) Several of the MSS. agree well with the Hebrew; others differ very much.

(2.) The chief variance from the Hebrew is in the addition, or omission, of words and clauses.

(3.) Taking the Roman text as the basis, there are found eighty places (a) where some of the MSS. differ from the Roman text, either by addition or omission, in agreement with the Hebrew; twenty-six places (β) where differences of the same kind are not in agreement with the Hebrew. There is therefore a large balance against the Roman text in point of accordance with the Hebrew.

(4.) Those MSS. which have the largest number of differences of class (a) have the smallest number of class (β). There is evidently some strong reason for this close accordance with the Hebrew in these MSS.

(5.) The divergence between the extreme points of the series of MSS. may be estimated from the following statement:

72 differs from the Roman text — in 40 places, with Hebrew, in 4 places against Hebrew

59 differs from the Roman text — in 40 places with Hebrew, in 9 places against Hebrew

Between these and the Roman text lie many shades of variety. The Alexandrine text falls about half-way between the two extremes:

Differing from Roman text { in 25 places, with Hebrew. in 16 places against Hebrew.

2. But whence these varieties of text? Was the version at first more in accordance with the Hebrew, as in (72) and (59), and did it afterwards degenerate into the less accurate state of the Codex Vaticanus? Or was the version at first less accurate, like the Vatican text, and afterwards brought, by critical labors, into the more accurate form of the MSS. which stand highest in the scale?

History supplies the answer. Jerome (Ep. ad Suniam et Fretelam, 2, 627) speaks of two copies, one older and less accurate, κοινή, fragments of which are believed to be represented by the still extant remains of the old Latin version; the other more faithful to the Hebrew, which he took as the basis of his own new Latin version. In another place (Proefat. in Paralip. vol. 1, col. 1022) he speaks of the corruption of the ancient translation, and the great variety of copies used in different countries:

“Cum germana illa antiquaque translatio corrupta sit... Alexaudriat et AEgyptus in Sept. suis Hesychium laudant auctorem; Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat; mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt: quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt: totusque orbis hac inter se contraria varietate compugnat.”

The labors of Origen, designed to remedy the conflict of discordant copies, are best described in his own words (Comment. in Matthew 1, 381, ed. Huet.):  “Now there is plainly a great difference in the copies, either from the carelessness of scribes, or the rash and mischievous correction of the text by others, or from the additions or omissions made by others at their own discretion. This discrepance in the copies of the Old Covenant we have found means to remedy, by the help of God, using as our criterion the other versions. In all passages of the Sept. rendered doubtful by the discordance of the copies, forming a judgment from the other versions, we have preserved what agreed with them; and some words we have marked with an obelos as not found in the Hebrew, not venturing to omit them entirely; and some we have added with asterisks affixed, to show that they are not found in the Sept., but added by us from the other versions, in accordance with the Hebrew.”

The other ἐκδόσεις, or versions, are those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Origen (Comm. in Joann. 2, 131, ed. Huet.) says, “The same errors in names may frequently be observed in the law and the prophets, as we have learned by diligent inquiry of the Hebrews, and by comparing our copies with their copies, as represent in the still uncorrupted versions of Aquila, Theodotji, and Symmachus.” It appears from these and other passages that Origen, finding great discordance in the several copies of the Sept., laid this version side by side with the other three translations, and, taking their accordance with each other as the test of their agreement with the Hebrew, marked the copy of the Sept. with an obelos, — , where he found superfluous words, and supplied the deficiencies of the Sept. by words taken from the other versions with an asterisk, \*, prefixed. The additions to the Sept. were chiefly made from Theodotion (Jerome, Prolog. in Genesin, vol. 1; see also Proef. in Job, p. 795). From Eusebius, as quoted below, we learn that this work of Origen was called Τετραπλᾶ, the fourfold Bible. The following specimen is given by Montfaucon:  Gen 1:1

ΑΚΥΛΑΣΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣΟιΟ῾ΘΕΟΔΟΤΙΩΝἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός σύν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆνἐν ἀρχῆ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆνἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησέν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὴν γῆνἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός τὸν οὐρανόν καὶ τὴν γῆνBut this was only the earlier and the smaller portion of Origen's labors: he rested not till he had acquired the knowledge of Hebrew, and compared the Sept. directly with the Hebrew copies. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 6, 16, p. 217, ed. Vales.) thus describes the labors which led to the greater work, the Hexapla; the last clause of the passage refers to the Tetrapla:

“So careful was Origen's investigation of the sacred oracles that he learned the Hebrew tongue, and made himself master of the original Scriptures received among the Jews in the Hebrew letters; and reviewed the versions of the other interpreters of the Sacred Scriptures, besides the Sept.; and discovered some translations varying from the well-known versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which he searched out, and brought to light from their long concealment in neglected corners;... and in his Hexapla, after the four principal versions of the Psalms, added a fifth, yea, a sixth and seventh translation, stating that one of these was found in a cask at Jericho, in the time of Antoninus, son of Severus: and bringing these all into one view, and dividing them in columns over against one another, together with the Hebrew text, he left to us the work called Hexapla; having arranged separately, in the Tetrapla, the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, together with the version of the Seventy.”

So Jerome (in Catal. Script. Eccl. vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 116):

“Quis ignorat, quod tantum in Scripturis divilis habuerit studii, ut etiam hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret; et acceptis LXX interpretibus, alias quoque editiones in unum volumen congregaret: Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti, et Theodotionis Ebionaei, et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis....  Praeterea quintam et sextam et septimam editiouem, quas etiam nos de ejus bibliotheca habemus, miro labore reperit, et cum caeteris editionibus comparavit.”

From another passage of Jerome (in Epist. ad Titum, vol. 4, pt. 1, p. 437) we learn that in the Hexapla the Hebrew text was placed in one column in Hebrew letters, in the next column in Greek letters:

HEXAPLA Hos 11:1

Το ΕΒΡΑΙΚΟΝΤο ΕΒΡ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙ Σ ΓΡΑΚΥΛΑΣΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣΟἰ οΘΕΟΔΟΤΙ ΩΝואהבהו כו נער ישׁראל קראתי לבני וממצויםχι νερ Ισραηλ ουεαβηου ουμεμεσραι μ καραθι λεβανιοτι παις Ισραηλ και ηγαπησα αυτον και απο Αιγυπτου εκαλεσα τον υιον μουοτι παις Ισραηλ και ηγαπημενος εξ Αιγυπτου κεκληται υιος μουοτι νηπιος Ισραηλ και εγω ηγαπησα αυτον και εξ Αιγυπτου κεκληται υιος μουοτι νηπιος Ισραηλ και ηγαπησα αυτον και εκαλεσα υιον μου εξ ΑιγυπτουIt should here be mentioned that some take the Tetrapla as denoting, not a separate work, but only that portion of the Hexapla which contains the four columns filled by the four principal Greek versions. Valesius (Notes on Eusebius, p. 106) thinks that the Tetrapla was formed by taking those four columns out of the Hexapla, and making them into a separate book. But. the testimony of Origen himself (2, 381; 2, 131), above cited, is clear that he formed one corrected text of the Sept. by comparison of the three other Greek versions (Α., Σ., Θ.), using them as his criterion. If he had known Hebrew at this time, would he have confined himself to the Greek versions? Would he have appealed to the Hebrew, as represented by Aquila, etc.? It seems very evident that he must have learned Hebrew at a later time, and therefore that the Hexapla, which rests on q comparison with the Hebrew, must have followed the Tetrapla, which was formed by the help of Greek versions only. The words of Eusebius also (Hist. Eccl. 6, 16) appear to distinguish very clearly between the Hexapla and Tetrapla as separate works, and to imply that the Tetrapla preceded the Hexapla. The order of precedence is not a mere literary question; the view above stated,  which is supported by Montfaucon, Usher, etc., strengthens the force of Origen's example as a diligent student of Scripture, showing his increasing desire integros accedere fontes.

The labors of Origen, pursued through a long course of years, first in procuring by personal travel the materials for his great work, and then in comparing and arranging them, made him worthy of the name Adamantius. But what was the result of all this toil? Where is now his great work, the Hexapla, prepared with so much care, and written by so many skilful hands? Too large for transcription, too early by centuries for printing (which alone could have saved it), it was destined to a short existence. It was brought from Tyre and laid up in the library at Caesarea, and there probably perished by the flames, A.D. 653. One copy, however, had been made, by Pamphilus and Eusebius, of the column containing the corrected text of the Sept., with Origen's asterisks and obeli, and the letters denoting from which of the other translators each addition was taken. This copy is probably the ancestor of those codices which now approach most nearly to the Hebrew, and are entitled Hexaplar; but in the course of transcription the distinguishing marks have disappeared or become confused; and we have thus a text composed partly of the old Sept. text, partly of insertions from the three other chief Greek versions, especially that of Theodotion.

The facts above related agree well with the phenomena of the MSS. before stated. As we have codices derived from the Hexaplar text (e.g. 72, 59, 58), and at the other extreme the Codex Vaticanus (II), probably representing nearly the ancient uncorrected text, κοινή; so between these we find texts of intermediate character in the Codex Alexandrinus (III), and others, which may perhaps be derived from the text of the Tetrapla.

To these main sources of our existing MSS. must be added the recensions of the Sept. mentioned by Jerome and others, viz. those of Lucian of Antioch and Hesychius of Egypt, not long after the time of Origen. We have seen above that each of these had a wide range that of Lucian (supposed to be corrected by the Hebrew) in the churches from Constantinople to Antioch; that of Hesychius in Alexandria and Egypt; while the churches lying between these two regions used the Hexaplar text copied by Eusebius and Pamphilus (Jerome, vol. 1, col. 1022). The great variety of text in the existing MSS. is thus accounted for by the variety of sources from which they have descended.

IX. Modern Editions. —

1. This version appears at the present day in five principal editions:

1. Biblia Polyglotta Complutensis (1514-17).

2. The Aldine edition (Venice, 1518).

3. The Roman edition, edited under pope Sixtus V (1587).

4. Facsimile edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, by Baber (1816).

5. Facsimile edition of the Codex Sinaiticus, by Tischendorf (St. Petersburg, 1862, 4 vols. fol.).

The texts of (1) and (2) were probably formed by collation of several MSS. The Roman edition (3) is printed from the venerable Codex Vaticanus, but not without many errors. This text has been followed in most of the modern editions. A transcript of the Codex Vaticanus, prepared by cardinal Mai, was lately published at Rome by Vercelloni It is much to be regretted that this edition is not so accurate as to preclude the necessity of consulting the MS. The text of the codex, and the parts added by a later hand, to complete the codex (among them nearly all of Genesis), are printed in the same Greek type, with distinguishing notes. The facsimile edition by Baber (4) is, printed with types made after the form of the letters in the Codex Alexandrinus (British Museum Library) for the facsimile edition of the New Test. by Woide in 1786. Great care was bestowed upon the sheets as they passed through the press. The Codex Sinaiticus (5) was published in facsimile type at the expense of the emperor of Russia, and a very limited edition was printed. SEE SINAITIC MS.

2. Other important editions are the following: The Septuagint in Walton's Polyglot (1657) is the Roman text, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus. The Cambridge edition (1665) (Roman text) is only valuable for the preface by Pearson. An edition of the Codex Alexandrinus was published by Grabe (Oxford, 1707-20), but its critical value is far below that of Baber's. It is printed in common type, and the editor has exercised his judgment on the text, putting some words of the codex in the margin,: and replacing them by what he thought better readings, distinguished by a smaller type. This edition was reproduced by Breitinger (Zurich, 1730-32, 4 vols. 4to), with the various readings of the Vatican text. The edition of Bos (Franeq. 1709) follows the Roman texts with its scholia, and the various readings given in Walton's Polyglot, especially those of the Codex Alexandrinus. This has often been reprinted, and is now the commonest text. The valuable critical edition of Holmes, continued by Parsons, is similar in plan to the Hebrew Bible of Kennicott; it has the Roman text,  with a large body of various readings from numerous MSS. and editions (Oxford, 1798-1827). The Oxford edition by Gaisford (1848) has the Roman text, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus below. Tischendorf's editions (the 5th, 1875) are on the same plan; he has added readings from some other MSS. discovered by himself, with very useful Prolegomena. Some convenient editions have been published by Bagster, one in 8vo, others of smaller size, forming part of his Polyglot series of Bibles. His text is the Roman. The latest edition, by Field (1859), differs from any of the preceding. He takes as his basis the Codex Alexandrinus, but corrects all the manifest errors of transcription by the help of other MSS., and brings the dislocated portions of the Septuagint into agreement with the order of the Hebrew Bible. The text in Stier and Theile's Polyglotten Bibel (Bielefeld, 1854) is revised arbitrarily, and without the aid of the Codex Sinaiticus. Scrivener has promised a new critical edition.

3. Editions of particular books, more or less critically prepared, have occasionally been issued: Genesis, by Lagarde (Lips. 1868); Esther, by Fritzsche (Turici, 1848); Ruth, by the same (ibid. 1867); Jeremiah, by Spohn (Lips. 1794-1828); Ezekiel, by Vincent (Romans 1840); Jonah, by Hohner (Lips. 1787-88). The genuine text of Daniel (which was long supposed to be lost, the translation of Theodotion having been substituted for it in the common MSS.) was first published separately by Simon de Magistris in 1772, from the Codex Chigianus; and it was reprinted by J.D. Michaelis (1773-74), Segaar (1775), and more critically by Hahn (1845), from the Codex Ambrosianus.

The best Lexicon to the Septuagint is that of Schleusner, published at Leipsic (1820-21, 5 pts.), and reprinted at Glasgow (1822, 3 vols. 8vo).. An earlier one is that of Biel (Hag. 1779-80, 3 vols.). The best for the Apocrypha is Wahl's Clavis (Lips. 1863). The best Concordance is that of Trommius (Amst. 1718, 2 vols. fol.). An earlier one is that of Kircher (1607). Winer's V.T. Grammar serves an excellent purpose for philological comparison. The student may also consult Sturz, De Dialecto Macedonica (Lips. 1808); Maltby, Two Sermons before the University of Durham (1843). SEE GREEK LANGUAGE.

X. Literature. — In addition to the works named by Walch, Bibl. Theol. 4, 31 sq., 156 sq.; Rosenmüller, Handb. d. Literatur, 2, 279 sq.; and Danz; Wörterb. d. Theol. s.v. “Alex. Vers.,” the following are important: Cappelli Critica Sacra (Par. 1650); Waltoni Proleg. ad Bibl. Polyglott. (Lond.  1657); Pearsoni [Bp.] Pref. Paroenetica ad LXX (ibid. 1655); Vossius, De LXX Interp. (Hag. 1661; app. 1663); Montfaucon, Hexaplorum Origenis quoe Supersunt (Par. 1710; Lips. 1740); Hody, De Bibl. Text. Original. Vers. Grecis, et Latina Vulgata (Oxf. 1704); Hottinger, Thesaurus (Zur. 1649); Owen, Inquiry into the Sept. (Lond. 1769); Brief Account, etc. (ibid. 1787); Kennicott. Dissertationes to his Vet. Test. (Oxon. 1776-80); Wornier, De LXX Interpretibus (Hamb. 1617, 8vo); Knapp, De Versione Alex. (Hal. 1775-76, 4to); Hasenkamp, De Pentat. LXX Interp. (Marb. 1765, 4to); Stroth, Symboloe Criticoe (Lips. 1778-83); Sulzner, De LXX Interp. (Hal. 1700, 4to ); Weyhenmeyer, De Fersione LXX (Ulm. 1719, 4to); Reineke, De Dissensu Vers. Alex. ab Archetypo (Magd. 1771, 4to); Holmes, Prolegg. ad LXX (Oxf. 1798-1827); Valckenaer, Diatribe de Aristobulo Judoeo (L.B. 1806); Schleusner, Opusc. Crit. ad Verss. Gr. V.T. (Lips. 1812); Dähne, Jüdisch-alexandrinische Philosophie (Hal. 183134); Töpler, De Pentat. Interp. Alex. Indole Crit. et Hermen. (Hal. Sax. 1830); Gfrörer, Urchristenthum (Stuttg. 1831, 8vo); Fabricii Bibliotheca Sacra, ed. Harless, vol. 3; Studer, De Versionis Alexandrinoe Origine, Historia, Usu, et Abusu Critico (Bernie, 1823, 8vo); Credner, Beiträge zur Einleitung, etc. (Halle, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo); Amersfoordt, Dissertatio de Variis Lectionibus Holmesianis (Lugd. Bat. 1815, 4to); Plüschke, Lectiones Alex. et Hebr. (Bonn, 1837); Thiersch, De Pent. Fers. Alex. (Erlang. 1841); Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leips. 1841); Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese, auf die alex. Hermeneutik (ibid. 1851); Grinfield, N.T. Editio Hellenistica (ibid. 1848), and Apology for the Septuagint (ibid. 1850); Selwyn, Notoe Criticoe in Exodus 1-24, Numeros, Deuteronomium (ibid. 1856-58); also Hor. Hebr. on Isaiah 9 (ibid. 1848); Churton, Hulsean Essay (ibid. 1861); Pearson [G.], Papers, in the Journal of Sacred Lit. 1, 4, 7, 3d series.

## Septuagint, Linguistic Character Of The[[@Headword:Septuagint, Linguistic Character Of The]]

             The language of the Sept., from its close connection with that of the New Test., has been a fruitful source of discussion, and various theories on the subject have been maintained with considerable vehemence. Thus Isaac Vossius maintained that the Alexandrian Jews were studious of Attic Greek. Scaliger used the phrase “Hellenistic tongue;” Salmasius contended for a “Hellenistic Greek,” and maintained that the diction or style of the Sept. was not a form of Greek which had its origin in Alexandria, or in other parts where the Macedonian rule had prevailed, but that it was the style of translators, or of authors whose acquaintance with the language  was imperfect. It was the Greek of the unlearned, and therefore ἰδιωτικός, or unpolished; it was used to interpret Hebrew ideas and phrases, and thus it was ἑρμηνευτικός, or the language of interpreters. R. Simon used the term “synagogue Greek” to express a style of Greek which was so full of Hebrew words and Hebraisms as to be scarcely. intelligible to readers who had no knowledge of Hebrew or Chaldee. He illustrates this by the Spanish Jews' translation of the Bible into the Spanish tongue which can be understood only by those who have some knowledge of Hebrew as well as Spanish. Later critics have, however, admitted the existence of an Alexandrian dialect, from which the Sept. has derived some of its features, though these are not its most prominent characteristics. Thus Hody, quoting Crocus, says:

The Greek translators of the Scriptures are to be described as Hebraists, Chaldaists, and. Alexandrists. Their version is full of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Alexandrian words and phrases. They render word for word, and often where a passage is thus translated, the words are Greek, but the Hebrew construction is retained” (De Bibl. Text. Orig. 2, 4, 23).

As the text from which the Alexandrian version was made did not have the vowel-points, it would be very interesting to know how the translators pronounced the Hebrew, and the more so since some critics who delight in hunting after various readings would make the Sept. the standard for the Hebrew text. But here we are at a loss, and all that we know we can only make out from the version itself. Commencing with the alphabet, the pronunciation of the letters is given to us in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, where the verses are arranged alphabetically. The letters of the alphabet, thus commencing the different verses, are expressed fully, as the following scheme will show:

א=῎Αλεφ. ל= Λάμεδ. ב=Βήθ. מ= Μήμ. ג= Γίμελ. נ=Νούν ד=Δάλεθ. ס=Σάμεχ. ה=῎Η.  ע=Αἴν. ו=Οὐαῦ. פ= Φῆ. ז=Ζαίν. צ=Τσαδή. ח=῞Ηθ. ק-Κώφ. ט=Τήθ ר= ῾Ρήχς. י= Ι᾿ώδ.. ש=Χσέν. כ= Χάφ ת=Θαῦ

That וand תwere pronounced wav and tav we may infer from the fact that v is always equivalent to the Hebrew 5, thus לוי=Λευί. From the version itself we see that the letters had the following pronunciation:

א, in itself inaudible (like the Greek spiritus lenis), receives its intonation from the vowel, as אהרן, Α᾿αρών; אֵלקנה, Ε᾿λκανά. Sometimes it has the spiritus asper, as אברה, Α῾βραάμ; אליחו, ῾Ηλίας; אלון (Jdg 9:37), ῾Ηλών.

בis β, sometimes φ: יקבאּזאב (Jdg 7:25), Ι᾿ακεβζηφ; also υ, רחוב(Jos 19:30), ῾Ρααῦ;. Sometimes ב is expressed by μβ, as נבח, Νουβᾶ'/; זרובבל, Ζερουμβαβέλ: or by μ alone, as לבנה, Λεμνά; ויבשם(1Ch 7:2), ῾Ιεμασάν

גis γ, sometimes κ, as נפג, Ναφέκ; דואג, Δωήκ: also χ, as שרוג, Σερούχ.

ד is δ, but also θ, as מטרד(Gen 36:39), Ματραϊvθ. הis, like א, either inaudible, as הבל, Α᾿βέλ; or it has the spiritus asper, as הימן, Αἱμάν. וis υ, חוה=῎Ευα, לוי=Λενί. Sometimes it is β, as שוה, Σαβύ (Gen 14:5), and שוע(38:12), Σαβά. Sometimes it is not expressed at all, as ושתי, Α᾿στί; ושני(1Ch 6:13), Σανι.  זis ζ, seldom σ — as אליפז, Ε᾿λιφάς (Genesis 36; but 1 Chronicles 1, Ε᾿λιφαζ); very seldom 10, as בוז(Gen 22:21), Βαύξ.

ח is inaudible at the beginning, middle, and end of a word. Often it is χ, חם, Χάμ; נחור, Ναχώρ; sometimes κ. as טבח (Gen 22:24), Θαβέκ. ט is τ, seldom δ, as ופוט(Gen 10:6; 1Ch 1:8), Φούδ; or δ,'as אליפלט(2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 14:5), Ε᾿λιφαλάθ. יis ὶ, as יעקב, Ι᾿ακώβ; but it is also I when followed by רי8 8ש, as ירמיהו, ῾Ιερεμίας.

כ is χ, sometimes κ, as סבתכא(Gen 10:7), Σαβαθακά; seldom, γ, as כפתרים(Gen 10:14), Γαφθωρείμ. ל נ ר are λ ν ρ. מּ is μ, but sometimes is, β as נמרוד, Ναβρώδ; שמלה(1Ch 1:47), Σεβλά. ס שׁ שׂare σ. עis inaudible, as עפרון, Ε᾿φρών; or with the spiritus asper, as עשו, ῾Ησαῦ: it is also γ as עמורה, Γόμοῤῥα;”or κ (at the end of the word), as ארבע(Gen 23:2), Α᾿ρβόκ. פis φ, sometimes π, as צלפחד, Σαλπαάδ. צ is σ, seldom ζ, as עווֹ(Gen 10:23; Gen 22:21), Οὔζ. ק is κ, sometimes χ, as קטורה(Gen 25:1), Χεττουρά; חקופא(Neh 7:53), Α᾿χιφά: seldom γ, as חלק (Num 26:30), Χελέγ. ת is θ, sometimes τ, as תחש, Τοχός; גתר, Γατέρ. A greater difficulty we have in fixing the pronunciation according to our vowel-points, but in general the following rules may be laid down:

Kamets ( ) is a, as אָדָםΑδάμ; חָם, Χάμ. Pattach () is a, as אֲהִרֹן, Αὰρών. Tsere () = η: אשֵׂר, Α᾿σήρ; ישראֵל, Ι᾿σραήλ. Segol ()= ε, as אֲבַימֶלֶךְ, Α᾿βιμελέχ.

Cholem (וֹ= ω: יעקֹב, Ι᾿ακώβ; יוֹס, Ι᾿ωσήφ. Kamets chatuph ()= o, as גָלְיִת:, Γολιάθ. Long chirek ( י) = ι or ει: עֲנָמַים, Α᾿ναμίμ, μείμ; מָכַיר, Μαχίρ, είρ. Short chirek (.) = ι or υ, the latter very seldom: פְלַשְׁתַי, Φυλιστεῖμ; שַמעון, Συμεών. Shurek (וּ)= ου: לוּד, Λούδ; יְבוּס, Ι᾿εβούς. Kibbuts () = ο: בֻּקַי, Βοκκί; יְפֻנֶה, ῎Ιεφοννή.

This may be regarded as a most general outline for the vowels; for a closer examination, upon which we cannot here enter, will show that these principles are not always carried out. As to Sheva, its pronunciation is  governed by the following vowel; thus פְעוֹרis Φογώρ; רְחוֹב, ῾Ροόβ;

פְלַשְׁתַים, Φυλιστίμ; שְׁפטְיָה, Σαφατία; סִבְתְכָא, . Σαβαθακάi.' This vocalization exercises also its influence upon the vowel preceding the Sheva; thus בַלְעָ is Βαλαάμ; מַבְשָׂם = Μαβασάμ, etc. Dagesh lene is not expressed in the Sept., but the dagesh forte usually is, as צַלָּה, Σελλά; מנשה, Μανασσῆ; and it is also found, where the Hebrew text has no dagesh, as רבקה= ῾Ρεβέκκα. Sometimes the dagesh forte of the Hebrew is not expressed at all, as חֻשָּׁם, Α῾σώμ; הִכְּסֻלוֹת (Jos 19:18), Χασαλώθ..

With these preliminary remarks we have paved our way for the manner in which grammar has been used by the translators of the Sept.; but here the difficulty is greater still, for the translators, as can be seen from their mode of translating, had not the language, but the translation, of the Scripture in view, and this must account for many grammatical peculiarities which we find so often in the Alexandrian version. Thus e.g. the present is very often used for the perfect, especially in λέγω'and ὁράω, as in Gen 15:2, אבר ויאמר, λέγει δὲ Α῾βραάμ; Gen 37:29, והנה אין יוס, καὶ οὐχ ὁρᾶ'/ Ι᾿ωσήφ , or the infinitive before a definite verb is expressed by a participle or a noun. The active is often exchanged for the passive, or vice versa, as (Gen 12:15) וִתֻקִח האשה, καὶ εἰσήγαγον.. Leaving aside all further remarks on these points as not exactly belonging to our object, we now come to the subject at issue, as to the linguistic peculiarities. Here we notice –

1. Unusual formations of words and verbs, viz.:

ἃβρα, a favorite slave, Exo 2:5. αιχμαλωτιζειν, to make a prisoner, Eze 12:3. ἄκαν, a thorn, 2Ki 14:9. ὰλγηρός, sorrowful, Jer 10:9. ὰμφιάζεσθαι, to put round about, Job 29:14. ἀμφίασις, a garment, Job 22:6. ἀναθεματίζειν, to devote to destruction, Deu 13:15. ἀποκιδαροῦν , to strip the head of, Lev 10:6. ἀποπεμπτοῦν, to take up the fifth part, Gen 41:34. ἀσβόλη, soot, Lam 4:8.  βουνίζειν, to accumulate, Rth 2:14. γλωσσόκομον, a chest, 2Ch 24:8. γρηγορειν, to watch, Neh 7:3. διαρτᾶν, to deceive, Num 23:19. ἔκθεμα, an edict, Est 8:17. ἐκτοκίζειν, to put on interest, Deu 23:10. ἐντομίς, a cutting, Lev 19:28. εὐδοκεῖν, to approve, Lev 26:41. θεριστρον, a veil, Son 5:7. καταχωρίζειν, to enter in a register, 1Ch 27:24. λυτρών, a sewer, 2Ki 10:27. μαγειρεῖον, a kitchen, Eze 46:23. μαγειρισσα, a female cook, 1Sa 8:13. μακροηερεύειν, to live long, Deu 5:33. μανδόη, a coat of mail, 1Sa 17:38. πρωτοτοκεύειν, to appoint as first born, Deu 21:16. πρωτοτόκια, the birthright, Gen 25:32. ῥώξ, a grape, Isa 65:8. σαββατίζειν, to rest, Exo 16:30. σισοη, the corner of the head, Lev 19:27. σκεπεινός, covered, Neh 4:13. σκηνοπηγία, Feast of Tabernacles, Deu 16:16. τελίσκειν, to complete, Deu 23:18. φυλακίσσα, a keeper, Son 1:6.

2. New meanings of words:

ἀγχιστεύω , to redeem, Ezr 2:62. ἄθυτον, abominable, Lev 19:7. ἀπό = bir, Gen 48:10. διαφωνεῖν, to be missing, Num 31:49. μετριάζειν, to be sick, Neh 2:2.

3. An abstract used collectively:

αὶχμαλωσία, the captive, Eze 11:25. διασπορά, living here and there, Psa 47:2. ἐξουθένημα, despised, Psa 22:6. ἱεράτευμα, priesthood, Exo 19:6.

4. Peculiar forms of words, as —  ἀγαθώτατος, Gen 47:6. ἀγαθώτερος, Jdg 15:2. ἀπεκτάγκατε, Num 16:41. ἁρπᾶ'/, Lev 19:13. εἴποισαν, Psalm 34:25. ἐλθάτω, Est 5:4. ἐπρονόμευσαμεν, Deu 3:7. ἐφάγοσαν, Psalm 77:29. ἔφυγαν, 2Sa 10:14. ἑώρακαν, Deu 11:7. ἤλθοσαν, Psa 78:1. ἴδοισαν Job 21:20. ἴδοσαν, Deu 7:19. καμμύειν, Isa 6:10. κατείπαντες, Num 14:37. κεκατήρανται, Num 22:6. κεκράξαντες, Exo 22:23. κλίβανος = κρίβανος, Gen 15:17. μαχαίρῃ, Exo 15:9. παρέστηκαν, Isa 5:29. ποιήσαισαν, Deu 1:44. πραθήσεται, Eze 48:14. φαγούμεθα, Gen 3:2.

5. Syntactic peculiarities, as —

ἀθωὸς ἀπό, καθαρός ἀπό, Genesis 8. ἁμαρτάνειν ἀπό, Lev 5:15. ἁμαρτάνειν ἐν, Lev 4:14. ἁμαρτάνειν ἔναντι, Lev 4:2. ἁμαρατάνειν περί, Lev 5:5. ἁμαρτάνειν τινί, Jdg 11:27. ἀναμνησθῆαί τι, Exo 23:13. ἐξέρχεσθαί τι, Exo 9:29. ἐξιλάσκεσθαί τινι, Eze 16:63. εὐδοκεῖν τι, Ecc 9:7. καταρᾶσθαί τινα, Gen 5:29. οὶκτείρειν ἀπό τινος, Jer 13:14. οὶκτείρειν τινά, Psa 4:2.  φείδεσθαί τινα, Job 16:5. φείδεσθαί τινι, Job 7:11.

6. To these we may add:

The construction of ἔρχεσθαι and similar verbs with the infinitive, as ἀπῆλθε φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν, Neh 8:12; κατέβη λούσασθαι, Exo 2:5. The vocative is expressed by the article, as σῶσόν με ὁ θεός μον, Psa 3:7

τίς is used as a relative, as μόνον τοῦτο τὸ ἱμάτιον ... ἐν τίνι κοιμηθήσεται, Exo 22:27; καὶ ἣξει τίνος αὐτοῦ ἡ οἰκία, Lev 14:35.

The relative is connected with ἐάν, as πᾶν σκεῦος ὀστράκινον εὶς ὃ ὲὰν πέση ἀπό τούτων ἔνδον, ὅσα ἐὰν ἔνδον ῃ ὰκάθαρτα ἔσταί,, Leviticus 40:33; ἐν ἀγρῷ ου ἐὰν ῃς ἐκεῖ ... καὶ ὄψομαι ὅτι ἐὰν ῃ, 1Sa 19:3; ἄνθρωπος ... τινὶ ἐὰν ῃ ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμος, Lev 21:17. The connection with ἐν instead of εὶς, as πορεύσομαι ἐν πύλαις ἄδου, Isa 38:10; ἄξει ἐν κρίσει, Ecc 12:14. The connection of infinitives, as ευρου χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου τοῦ ἐπιγνῶναί με,, Rth 2:10; πόλις αὕτη ἐγγὺς τοῦ καταφυγεῖν με ἐκεῖ, Gen 19:20; ἤγγισαν αἱ ἡμέραι Ι᾿σραὴλ τοῦ αποθανεῖν, Gen 47:29; ἔστη τοῦ τίκτειν, Gen 29:35; ) ην αὐτῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πολλὰ τοῦ οἰκεῖν ἃμα., Gen 36:7; ἠμβλύνθησαν οί ὀφθαλμοί αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὁρᾶ'/ν, Gen 27:1.

7. Very prominent also are the Egyptian words which we find in the Sept.; and which betray the origin of the translation. The following are the most remarkable:

ἀλήθεια, truth, the rendering of תמים(Thummim, or perfections), in Exo 28:26; Lev 8:8; and Deu 33:8. According to AEliau, ἀλήθεια was the name given to an image of sapphire stone, which was hung by a golden chain round the neck of the oldest and highest in rank of the Egyptian priests, who also held the office of judge. This was to denote the truth or justice with which he was to decide the cases which were brought before him. Hence it is supposed that the use of it for the Thummim of the high priest was derived; yet not without regard to the meaning of truth, as expressing the faithfulness and righteousness of God.  The word ῎Απις (Apis, the sacred bull of the Egyptians) occurs in Jeremiah 46 [26], 15: Διατί ἔφυγεν... ῎Απις ὁ μόσχς ὀ ἐκλεκτός σου (“ Why is Apis, thy chosen calf, fled?”), where it is put as a paraphrase upon אביריthy valiant ones,” in the prophecy of the desolation of Egypt by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar. ἀρτάβη was a measure which is mentioned by Herodotus as being used in Egypt and Persia. It is put for the “homer” in Isa 5:10, and it also occurs in Daniel 13:3 (History of Bel and the Dragon).

ἄχει, or ἄχι, is an Egyptian word for the papyrus, or some other reed or growth of the marshes. It occurs both in the Hebrew and Sept. of Gen 41:2; Isa 19:7-8. It is also found in Ecclesiastes 40:16.

γένεσις, as applied to the “creation” of the world, was traced by Hody to Egyptian philosophy. But it seems rather to be derived from the תולדות, or genealogical narratives, of which the first book of the Pentateuch is composed.

ζύθος was a drink made from barley in Egypt, mentioned by Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. It is found in the Sept. version of Isa 19:10, where it seems that שכר(strong drink) was read instead of שכר(merchandise). θήρα is found in Psa 132:16, “I will abundantly bless her provision.” Jerome said that it was an Egyptian word for corn; and Hesychius mentions ἀθηρά as a decoction of milk and corn employed by the Egyptians — perhaps the medicine athara of which Pliny speaks. The Heb. ציד is, however, rendered θήρα (venison) in Gen 25:27.

ἱππόδρομος is used to denote a measurement of space in Gen 35:19; Gen 48:7. Jerome seems to have been perplexed by its introduction in these passages. Hody conjectures that the use of the word was suggested by the hippodrome which was constructed by Ptolemy Lagus at Alexandria, and was the scene of the events recorded in the 3d book of Maccabees. Thus the “hippodrome of Ephrath” signifies a certain distance from Bethlehem, which was nearly the interval between the goals of the Egyptian racecourse.

The word κόνδυ, used for a cup, in Genesis 44, Isaiah 51, is of Persian origin.

κόσυμβος, a headband or fringed garment, the wearer of which is called κοσυμβωτός (Exodus 28; Isaiah 3), was an Egyptian ornament.  νομός, in Isa 19:2, is not to be read νομός, “law,” but has the sense of “province,” or “district,” Egypt being divided into νόμοί, governed by νομάρχαι, or prefects. In this sense it occurs in 1Ma 10:30.

οἴφι, was supposed by Jerome to be the Hebrew ephah; but Hesychius states that it was an Egyptian measure containing four χοίνικες (Num 28:5; Jdg 6:19).

πάπειρος, or πάπυρος, occurs in some of the Greek texts in Exo 2:3, the Egyptian paper reed, which was the material of the ark in which the parents of Moses concealed him. It was also called βίβλος, and hence the “vessels of bulrushes” in Isa 18:2 are called ἐπιστολαὶ βιβλίναι,.

παστοφόριονis used in the Sept. for the chambers and treasures adjoining the Temple inhabited by the priests and Levites (1Ch 9:26; 1Ch 9:33; Eze 40:18, etc.). They παστοφόροι are mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus as a class of priests among the Egyptians.

Ραιφάν, in Amo 5:26, was an Egyptian name for the sun god, or the king of heaven. It is put for כיון, Chiun.

σινδών, in Jdg 14:12-13, was a fringed garment of fine linen which was made in Egypt.

στίβη, or στίμη, a dark purple or black, with which the guilty city of Jerusalem anoints her face to conceal her deformity (Jer 4:30). This is traced to στίμμις, a word of Egyptian origin.

σχοίνος, in Psa 139:2, “Thou hast searched my path,” etc., was a word which, according to Herodotus, represented a measure of space or distance of sixty stadia.

ψονθομφανήχ, in Gen 41:45, answers to the Heb. Zaphlath Paaneah. The latter is supposed to be an Egyptian word, signifying “the food of the living;” but Josephus and Origen ascribed to it the sense of “discoverer of secrets,” or “one to whom the future is revealed.” Hody supposed that ψονθομφανήχ also had this sense in the later Egyptian; but Jerome explains it to be the “Savior, or Deliverer, of the world.”

8. Another feature of this version is the many Hebrew and Chaldee expressions, as —  ἀπφώθ, Jer 52:19. μαωζαίμ, Dan 11:38. ἀριήλ, 1Ch 11:22. ναγέβ, Eze 20:46. ἀριώθ, 2Ki 4:39. νέβελ, Hos 3:2. Δαρόμ, Eze 20:46. οὐλαμούζ, Gen 28:19. Ε᾿σεφίμ, 1Ch 26:17. ξαθμέν, 1Ki 19:4. ζακχῶν, 1Ch 28:11. σαβέκ, Gen 22:13. Ι᾿αμείν, Gen 36:24. σοάμ, 1Ch 29:2. Ι᾿αρείμ, Hos 5:13. φελλανί, 1Sa 21:2. μαναά, 2Ki 8:9. χαβραθά, Gen 41:7. μασμαρώθ, Jer 52:19. χοῤῥί, 2Ki 11:4. μαχβάρ, 2Ki 8:15.

These and many more words must not be regarded, as has usually been the case, as a mark of ignorance of the Hebrew, but as attempts to mix the vernacular with Hebrew expressions. Besides such Hebrew words, we find a great many Hebraisms; as Greek words with a Hebrew signification, Greek words in Hebrew constructions, Hebrew constructions, etc. — too many to be enumerated.

9. Another peculiarity of the Alexandrian version is that the same word is differently translated, not only in different books, but also in the same book. This point is the more important, as it evidently shows that the different books must have had different translators. A comparison of the Pentateuch with the book of Joshua will prove this beyond a shadow of doubt.  A. VERBS.

חמד, to desire, Exo 20:17; Deu 5:18; Deu 7:25, ἐπιθυμεῖν τι or τινός (Exo 34:24); but Jos 7:21, ἐνθυμοῦμαί τινος.

חפר, to explore, Deu 1:22, ἑφοδεύω; Jos 2:23, κατασκοπεύω טבל, Exo 12:22; Lev 4:6; Lev 4:11; Lev 19:9; Lev 14:6; Lev 14:16; Lev 14:51; Num 19:18; Deu 33:24; Jos 3:15, βάπτω: but Gen 37:31, μολύνω.

לכד, to storm: 1. λαμβάνειν; Jos 8:21; Jos 10:1; Jos 10:28; Jos 10:32; Jos 10:35; Jos 10:39; Jos 11:12; Jos 11:17; Num 32:39; Num 32:41-42. 2. καταλαμβάνειν, Jos 8:19; Jos 11:10. 3. καταλαμβάνεσθαι, Num 21:32 4. κρατεῖν, Deu 2:34; Deu 3:4 5. κυριεύειν, Jos 15:16.

נסע, to break up, to move on: 1. ἀπαίρω, Gen 12:9; Gen 13:11; Gen 33:12; Gen 33:17; Gen 35:16; Gen 37:17; Gen 41:1; Exo 12:37; Exo 16:1; Exo 17:1; Exo 19:2; Num 9:17; Num 9:20-23; Num 14:25; Num 20:22; Num 21:4; Num 21:10; Num 21:12-13; Num 22:1; Num 33:3; Num 33:8-10, sq.; Deu 1:7; Deu 1:19; Deu 2:1; Deu 2:24; Deu 10:6-7; Deu 10:11; Jos 3:1; Jos 3:3; Jos 3:14; Jos 9:17. 2. ἐξαίρω, Gen 35:5; Exo 13:20; Num 1:51; Num 2:9; Num 2:16-17; Num 2:24; Num 2:31; Num 2:34; Num 4:5; Num 4:15; Num 9:19; Num 10:5-6; Num 10:17; Num 10:21-22; Num 10:25; Num 10:28-29; Num 10:33-35; Num 11:35; Num 12:15; Num 13:1; Num 21:11. 3. αἴρω, Num 2:17, and ibid. ἐξαίρω. 4. στρατοπεδεύω, Gen 12:2; Exo 14:10; Deu 1:40. 5. κινέω, Gen 11:2; Gen 20:1. 6. προπορεύομαι, Num 10:33. 7. ἀναζεύγνυμι, Exo 16:15; Exo 40:36-37.

These few examples may suffice.

B. NOUNS.

אהל, a tent: 1. σκηνή, Gen 4:20; Gen 12:8; Gen 13:3; Gen 13:5; Gen 18:1-2; Gen 18:6; Gen 18:9-10; Gen 26:25; Gen 31:25; Gen 33:19; Exo 33:7-8; Exo 33:10; Num 16:26-27; Deu 1:27; Deu 11:6; Jos 7:21-24. 2. σκήνωμα, Deu 33:18; Jos 3:14.3. οικος, Gen 9:27; Gen 24:67; Gen 31:33; Jos 22:4; Jos 22:7-8. 4. οἰκία, Gen 25:27. 5. συσκήνιον, Exo 16:16.  ט is, 1. παιδία, Gen 45:19; Num 14:3; Num 14:31; Deu 1:39; Deu 3:6; Jos 1:14. 2. τέκνα, Deu 2:34; Deu 3:19. 3. ἔγκονα, Deu 29:11; Deu 31:12. 4. συγγένεια, Gen 50:8. 5. οικαί, Gen 50:21. 6. ἀποσκευή, Gen 34:29; Gen 43:7; Gen 46:5 : Exo 10:10; Exo 10:24; Exo 12:37; Num 16:27; Num 31:9; Num 32:17; Num 32:24; Num 32:26; Deu 20:14. 7. ἀποσκευαί, Num 32:16. The same variations we find in adverbs, particles, propel nouns, but more especially in certain phrases.

See Thiersch, De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina (Erlangen, 1840); Frankel, Vorstudien der Septuaginta (Leips. 1841); Kaulen, Einleitung in die heilige Schrift (Freiburg, 1876), p. 85 sq. (B.P.)

## Septuagint, Talmudic Notices Concerning The[[@Headword:Septuagint, Talmudic Notices Concerning The]]

             It is strange that the writers of the art. SEPTUAGINT in Smith's Dict. of the Bible and in Kitto's Cyclop. should not have mentioned the notices we find concerning that version in the Talmud and other Jewish writings. It is true that in Kitto we find it stated, “It is spoken of in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds;” but where, and what, the reader is at loss to see. Yet these notices are very important, since they throw a great deal of light upon some points which have vexed the interpreters. The oldest notice is that contained in the Mechilta, a Midrashic commentary on Exodus (comp. the art. MIDRASH), where Exo 12:40 is thus cited: גושן ל וגו אשר ישבו במצרים ובארוֹ כנען ובארוֹ, and where we read, “And this is one of those things which they wrote to king Ptolemy. In the same manner they wrote, Gen 1:1, אלהים ברא בראשית; Gen 1:26, אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות; Gen 1:27 (comp. Gen 5:2), ונקוביו; Gen 5:2, ביום הששי ויכל אלהים; Gen 11:7, ואבלה ארדה, 40; Gen 18:12, בֹקרוביה; Gen 49:6, אבום (instead of שור); Exo 4:20, נושא אדם (for החמר); Num 16:15, חמוד; Deu 4:19 (they added) להאיר; Deu 17:3, לאומות לעבדם; and they wrote, Lev 11:6, and Deu 14:7, צעירת הרגלים(for הארנבת).” From this passage we can infer that, besides the changes enumerated here, others are not to be excluded; besides, it only speaks in general of those who wrote the Bible for Ptolemy, and neither the number seventy nor seventy-two writers or translators is mentioned. It is different with the relation given in the Jerus. Talmud, M.egilla, 1, 9.

 Here the number of changes made is given as thirteen  (י ג רבי שינו חכמים): the passages are the same as given in the Mechilta, with some very slight changes. Thus Gen 1:27 (comp. Gen 5:2) we read ונקביו; Gen 49:6, שור (instead of איש); Exo 12:40, ובכל הארצות במצרים; in Lev 11:6 (Deu 14:7) the explanation of the change is given that the name of Ptolemy's mother was ארנתא. The number of the translators is also not given. The Babylonian Talmud, Megilla, 9 a, however, mentions the number of elders as seventy-two, who were put in seventy-two different cells without knowing for what purpose. Then king Ptolemy went to each of these and said to him, “Write for me the law of Moses, your teacher.” God disposed it so that they all translated alike. The changes mentioned here are given without any number; but they are almost the same as the above, with slight modifications. Gen 1:27 (comp. Gen 5:2), ונקבהis not changed, but בראםis changed into בראו; Gen 49:6 agrees with the Jerusalem Talmud; and so, likewise, Exo 12:40. We find, as an addition, that in Exo 24:5; Exo 24:11, זאטוטיis written for נעריand אצילי; in Deu 17:3, we have the addition לעבדם. without לאומות; and to Lev 11:6 (Deu 14:7) a similar explanation is given as in the Jerusalem Talmud, that the name of Ptolemy's wife was ארנבת; and hence they thought that it would be regarded as a mockery, on the side of the Jews, should they have mentioned her name (as that of an unclean animal) in the law. In the Midrashim only single passages are mentioned thus Gen 1:27 in Bereshith Rabba;. ch. 8, as Mechilta, with which also agrees Gen 2:2 in ch. 10, Gen 11:7 with ch. 38; Gen 18:12 with ch. 48; 49, 6 with ch. 98, where, as in Mechilta, we find אבוס. All these passages are accompanied with the remark that here is one of the changes made for Ptolemy, without giving their number In Shemnoth Rabba, ch. 5 on Exo 4:20, it is stated that this is one of the eighteen changes made for Ptolemy, without stating wherein these changes consist. In Bereshith Rabba, ch. 63 on Exo 12:40, in order to show that Abraham was already called “Israel,” the verse is quoted, “It is an old matter; the dwelling of the Israelites in Egypt, Canaan, and Goshen,” etc. (and thus Abraham's stay in Egypt and Canaan is numbered among the 430 years). In the treatise Sepher Torah, 1, 8, 9, seventy elders are mentioned who wrote the law, and the alterations made are given as thirteen. In the treatise Sopherim, 1, 7, 8, we also read of thirteen alterations made by the translators.  In examining more minutely these changes we shall find the following:

1. Gen 1:1-3, according to the structure of the language and the most ancient traditions still preserved by Rashi and Aben-Ezra, is to be rendered “In the beginning when God created.” But as this supposes the existence of primordial waters and of a chaotic mass, which, by the draining of the waters on the second day, became the formed earth, it was thought necessary, in translating the Bible into Greek, and in opposition to the Greek cosmogony and polytheism, to lay great stress on the absolute unity of God and on the absolute creation from nothing. Hence the word ראשיתhad to be made independent of the following verses, and to be rendered in the beginning, ἐν ἀρχῇ

ἐποιησεν ὁ Θεός, instead of “in the beginning when.” This change the Talmud indicates by the pregnant construction אלהים ברא בראשית, thus placing בראשיתlast, and precluding every other translation than God created in the beginning (Geiger, Urschrift, p. 344, etc.).

2. Gen 1:26, where we read “Let us make man in our Image (בצלמנו), after our likeness (כדמותנו),” has been altered into “I will make man in the image (בצלם), and in the likeness (ובדמות),” to remove the appearance of polytheism.

3. Gen 2:2, where “And he ended on the seventh (השביעי) day” has been changed into (הששי) the sixth day, to avoid the apparent contradiction, since God did not work on the seventh day. This alteration is still to be found in our text of the Sept., and also in the Samaritan version (שתיתה), and in the Syriac (שתיתיא).

4. Gen 5:2 (Gen 1:27), where “Male and female created he them (בראם ברא אתם) has been altered into created he him (בְרָאו), to remove the apparent contradiction in the passage where the man and woman are spoken of as having been created together or simultaneously.

5. Gen 11:7, for the same reason as in 2, the words “Let us go down, and let us confound” ( רדה ונבלה) have been changed into “I will go down and I will confound” (ואבלה אררה

6. Gen 18:12, “After my decay I had again pleasure” has been altered into (אהרי בַּלְתַּי היתה לי עֲדֶנָה, Οὔπω μέν μοι γέγονεν του νυν), after it had been thus with me hitherto, to avoid the offensive application to the distinguished mother of Israel of the expression בָּלָה, which is used for rotten old garments (comp. Geiger, Urschrift, p. 45 sq.).

7. Gen 49:6, “In their anger they slew a man, and in their self will they hamstrung an ox,” has been altered into “In their anger they slew an ox (שוֹר), and in their self will they hamstrung a fatted bull (אָבוּס),” to do away with the wholesale slaughter of men.

8. Exo 4:20, the word חמור, ass, is altered into ὑποζύγια, beasts of burden, because of the reluctance which the translators had to mention the name of this beast. This alteration is still preserved in our text of the Sept.

9. In Exo 12:40, and all other lands, i.e. “the land of Canaan,” has been added in order to remove the apparent contradiction, since the Israelites did not sojourn four hundred and thirty years in Egypt.

10. Exo 24:5; Exo 24:11, נעריand אציליare changed into זעטוטי(=ζητητής; i.e. worthy, or searchers after wisdom), because it was not thought becoming to say that at his great revelation boys or youths (נערים) were brought as sacrifices.

11. In Lev 11:6 and Deu 14:7, ארנבת=λαγός, a hare, has been altered into χοιρογρούλλος, porcupine or hedgehog, to avoid giving offense to the Ptolemy family, whose name was Lagos.

12. Num 16:15, חמר, ass, was changed into ἐπιθύμημα=חמד, a desirable thing, for the same reason as given under 8. This alteration is still in our text of the Sept.

13. Deu 4:19, the word להאיר=διακοσμέω to shine, has been inserted so as to avoid the idolatry of the heathen being ascribed to God.

14. Deu 17:3, where we read that God had not commanded the Israelites to worship other gods (in accordance with Deu 4:19), has been altered to (לאומות לעבד אשר לא צויתי) which I have  forbidden the nations to worship, to preclude the possibility of ascribing the origin of idolatry to the God of Israel.

This much for the alterations. But there are two other very important notices, viz. “that the day on which the translation of the Bible into Greek was made was regarded as a great calamity equal to that of the worship of the golden calf” (Sopherim, 1, 7); and “the day on which it was accomplished was believed to have been the beginning of a preternatural darkness of three days' duration over the whole world, and was commemorated as a day of fasting and humiliation” (comp Kuenen, The Religion of Israel, 3, 214-216). The Samaritans took the same view on account of their hatred of the Jewish translation (comp. Herzfeld, Geschichte, 3, 537). Says dean Stanley, “It needs but slight evidence to convince us that such a feeling, more or less widely spread, must have existed. It is the same instinct which to this hour makes it a sin, if not an impossibility. in the eyes of a devout Mussulman, to translate the Koran; which in the Christian Church assailed Jerome with the coarsest vituperation for venturing on a Latin version which differed from the Greek; which at the Reformation regarded it as a heresy to translate the Latin Scriptures into the languages of modern Europe; and which, in England, has in our own days regarded it in the English Church as a dangerous innovation to revise the Authorized Version of the 17th century, or in the Roman Church to correct the barbarous dialect of the Douay translation of the Vulgate, or to admit of any errors in the text or in the rendering of the Vulgate itself. In one and all of these cases the reluctance has sprung from the same tenacious adherence to ancient and sacred forms — from the same unwillingness to admit of the dislodgment even of the most flagrant inaccuracies when once familiarized by established use. But in almost all these cases, except, perhaps, the Koran, this sentiment has been compelled to yield to the more generous desire of arriving at the hidden meaning of sacred truth, and of making that truth more widely known. So it was, in the most eminent degree, in the case of the Septuagint” (Jewish Church, 3, 286 sq.).

While we agree in the main with the learned dean, yet in the case of the Sept. the explanation of the above given Talmudic statement must be sought for somewhere else. It is known that most of the early controversies with the Jews were conducted in the Greek language, and on the common ground of the faithfulness of the Sept. version, which was quoted alike on both sides. And so it continued to be respected during the age of the writers of the New Test. and the 1st  century of the Christian era. As, however, the version grew into use among Christians, it gradually lost the confidence of the Jews, especially when it was urged against them by the Christians. The first signs of this appear in the works of Justin Martyr, in the 2d century. His Dialogue with Trypho the Jew professes to be the account of a discussion which actually took place, and Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4, 18) places the scene of it at Ephesus. The Dialogue abounds in citations from the Old Test.; and even such passages are quoted as are not to be found in the Hebrew. The latter circumstance made Justin charge the Jews with removing especially four prophecies of Christ from their copies.

The first of these is: “And Ezra said unto the people, This passover is our Savior and our refuge; and if ye consider and it enter into your heart that we shall, by a figure (ἐνσημείῳ, i.e. the cross), afflict him — and afterwards hope in him, this place shall not be made desolate to all time, saith the Lord God of Hosts. But if ye believe him not, and hear not his preaching, ye shall become a spoil for the Gentiles” (Dial. c. 72). This passage, which is also quoted by Lactantius (Instit. Divin. 4, c. 18), is not to be found in the book of Ezra, and may probably have been interpolated according to the Apocryphal Ezra (6:21) into the copies of the Sept. by some Christian. The second (from Jer 11:19) had, he said, been but recently erased from certain copies, and was retained in others which were preserved in the synagogues. This, however, is found entire in all our present copies. The third passage is said to be taken also from Jeremiah: “And the Lord God remembered his dead, who were fallen asleep in the dust of their tombs, and descended to them to declare unto them the good tidings of his salvation.” These words are remarkable from their resemblance to those of 1Pe 4:6 (νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη. The passage of Jeremiah, as alleged by Justin Martyr, read κατέβη πρός αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι). “If a genuine passage,” says Churton, “the apostle's words seem to contain an allusion to them as well as to the doctrine enunciated in the preceding chapter of his epistle. If interpolated by a Christian convert from some traditional saying of the prophet, or adapted from Peter's words, it seems that the person who introduced them into the text of the Sept. took the words of the apostle in their literal sense, and not as later commentators have conjectured, that the persons called νεκροί were alive at the time of the preaching.” The fourth and last passage is from Psa 96:10, “Declare among the heathen that the Lord hath reigned from the tree” (Dial. c. 73). Out of this passage the Jews are accused of having erased the last words, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. The words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου are quoted again by Justin Martyr in his Apology;  they are also quoted by Tertullian (Adv. Jud. c. 10), Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Gregory, and others. Yet the words occur in no Greek or Hebrew MS., and the probability is that they were added by some Christian. Under these circumstances we can very well understand the feeling of the Jews towards a version which brought such accusations against them; and this, it seems, gives us the real clue to the Talmudic passage which regarded the day of the translation of the Bible into Greek as a great calamity. See Frankel, Vorstudien zur Septuaginta, p. 25 sq.; Geiger, Urschrift der Bibel, p. 439 sq.; Masechet Soferim (ed. Müller, Leips. 1878), p. 12 sq.; Ginsburg, Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 70 sq.; Churton, The Influence of the Septuagint Version, p. 41 sq.; Reinke, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Alten Testaments, 7, 292 sq.; Friedlander, Patristische und talmudische Studien (Vienna, 1878), p. 133 sq. (B.P.)

## Septum[[@Headword:Septum]]

             a term used by certain 17th-century Anglican writers for the fixed or movable rail placed on each side of the entrance of the sanctuary to support the communicants when they knelt to receive the Lord's body and blood.

## Sepulchre[[@Headword:Sepulchre]]

             (קֶבֶר, kber, or קְבוּרָה, keburah, a burying place or grave, as sometimes rendered; τάφος, a tomb, as elsewhere rendered; also μνῆμα or μνημεῖον, a monument, likewise rendered “grave” or “tomb”). Mankind in all ages have been careful, indeed of necessity, to provide suitable resting places for the dead. In treating of the Hebrew usages in this respect, we will adduce whatever elucidation modern research has contributed to them. SEE BURIAL.

I. General Principles of Sepulture. —

1. The Duty. The Jews uniformly disposed of the corpse by entombment where possible, and, failing that, by interment; extending this respect to the remains even of the slain enemy and malefactor (1Ki 11:15; Deu 21:23), in the latter case by express provision of law. Since this was the only case so guarded by Mosaic: precept it may be concluded that natural feeling was relied on as rendering any such general injunction superfluous. Similarly, to disturb remains was regarded as a barbarity, only justifiable in the case of those who had themselves outraged  religion (2Ki 23:16-17; Jer 8:1-2). The rabbins quote the doctrine “dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” as a reason for preferring to entomb or inter their dead; but that preferential practice is older than the Mosaic record, as traceable in patriarchal examples, and continued unaltered by any Gentile influence; so Tacitus (Hist. 5, 5) notices that it was a point of Jewish custom potius corpora condere quam cremare. SEE CORPSE.

The precedent of Jacob's and Joseph's remains being returned to the land of Canaan was followed, in wish at least, by every pious Jew. Adopting a similar notion, some of the rabbins taught that only in that land could those who were buried obtain a share in the resurrection which was to usher in the Messiah's reign on earth. Thus that land was called by them “the land of the living,” and the sepulchre itself “the house of the living.” Some even feigned that the bodies of the righteous, wherever else buried, rolled back to Canaan underground, and found there only their appointed rest (Nicolaus, De Sepult. Hebrews 13, 1). Tombs were, in popular belief, led by the same teaching, invested with traditions. Thus Machpelah is stated (Lightfoot, Centuria Chorographica, s.v. “Hebron”) to have been the burial place not only of Abraham and Sarah, but also of Adam and Eve; and there was probably at the time of the New Test. a spot fixed upon by tradition as the site of the tomb of every prophet of note in the Old Test. To repair and adorn these was deemed a work of exalted piety (Mat 23:29). The scruples of the scribes extended even to the burial of the ass whose neck was broken (Exo 34:20), and of the first born of cattle (Maimon. De Primogen. 3, 4, quoted by Nicolaus, De Sepult. Heb. 16:3, 4). SEE GRAVE.

2. Rites. — On this subject we should remember that our impressions, as derived from the Old Test., are those of the burial of persons of rank or public eminence, while those gathered from the New Test. regard a private station. But in both cases “the manner of the Jews” included the use of spices where they could command the means. Thus Asa lay in a “bed of spices” (2Ch 16:14). A portion of these were burned in honor of the deceased, and to this use was probably destined part of the one hundred pounds' weight of “myrrh and aloes” in our Lord's case. On high state occasions the vessels, bed; and furniture used by the deceased were burned also. Such was probably the “great burning” made for Asa. If a king was unpopular or died disgraced (e.g. Jehoram, 2Ch 31:19; Josephus, Ant. 9, 5, 3), this was not observed. In no case, save that of Saul  and his sons, were the bodies burned, nor in that case were they so burned as not to leave the “bones” easily concealed and transported, and the whole proceeding looks like a hasty precaution against hostile violence. Even then the bones were interred and re-exhumed for solemn entombment. The ambiguous word in Amo 6:10, מְסָרְפוֹ, rendered in the A.V. “he that burneth him,” possibly means “the burner of perfumes in his honor,” i.e. his near relation, on whom such duties devolved; rather than, as most think, “the burner of the corpse.” For a great mortality never causes men to burn corpses where it is not the custom of the country; nor did the custom vary among the Jews on such an occasion (Eze 39:12-14). It was the duty of the next of kin to perform and preside over the whole funereal office; but a company of public buriers, originating in an exceptional necessity (Ezekiel loc. cit.), had become, it seems, customary in the times of the New. Test. (Act 5:6; Act 5:10). The closing of the eyes, kissing, and washing the corpse (Gen 46:4; Gen 1:1; Act 9:37) are customs common to all nations. Coffins were but seldom used, and, if used, were open; but fixed stone sarcophagi were common in tombs of rank. The bier, the word for which in the Old Test. is the same as that rendered bed, SEE BED, was borne by the nearest relatives, and followed by any who wished to do honor to the dead. The grave clothes (ὀθόνια, ἐντάφια) were probably of the fashion worn in life, but swathed and fastened with bandages, and the head was covered separately. Previously to this being done, spices were applied to the corpse in the form of ointment, or between the folds of the linen; hence our Lord's remark that the woman had anointed his body πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάζειν, “with a view to dressing it in these ἐντάφια;” not, as in the A.V., “for the burial.” For the custom of mourners visiting the sepulchre, SEE MOURN; for other usages, SEE FUNERAL.

3. The Site. — A natural cave enlarged and adapted by excavation, or an artificial imitation of one, was the standard type of sepulchre. This was what the structure of the Jewish soil supplied or suggested. A distinct and simple form of sepulture as contrasted with the complex and elaborate rites of Egypt clings to the region of Palestine, and varies but little with the great social changes between the periods of Abraham and the captivity. Jacob and Joseph, who both died in Egypt, are the only known instances of the Egyptian method applied to patriarchal remains. Sepulchres, when the owner's means permitted it, were commonly prepared beforehand, and stood often in gardens, by roadsides, or even adjoining houses. Kings and  prophets alone were probably buried within towns (1Ki 2:10; 1Ki 16:6; 1Ki 16:28; 2Ki 10:35; 2Ki 13:9; 2Ch 16:14; 2Ch 28:27; 1Sa 25:1; 1Sa 28:3). Sarah's tomb and Rachel's seem to have been chosen merely from the accident of the place of death; but the successive interments at the former (Gen 49:31) are a chronicle of the strong family feeling among the Jews. It was the sole fixed spot in the unsettled patriarchal life; and its purchase and transfer, minutely detailed, are remarkable as the sole transaction of the kind, until repeated on a similar occasion at Shechem. Thus it was deemed a misfortune or an indignity, not only to be deprived of burial (Isa 14:20; Jeremiah passim; 2Ki 9:10), but, in a lesser degree, to be excluded from the family sepulchre (1Ki 13:22), as were Uzziah, the royal leper, and Manasseh (2Ch 26:23; 2Ch 33:20). Thus the remains of Saul and his sons were reclaimed to rest in his father's tomb. Similarly, it was a mark of a profound feeling towards a person not of one's family to wish to be buried with him (Rth 1:17; 1Ki 13:31), or to give him a place in one's own sepulchre (Gen 23:6; comp. 2Ch 24:16). The head of a family commonly provided space for more than one generation; and these galleries of kindred sepulchres are common in many Eastern branches of the human race. Cities soon became populous and demanded cemeteries (comp. πολυάνδριον, Sept. at Eze 39:15), which were placed without the walls; such a one seems intended by the expression in 2Ki 23:6, “the graves of the children of the people,” situated in the valley of the Kedron or of Jehoshaphat. Jeremiah (7:32; 19:11) threatens that the eastern valley, called Tophet, the favorite haunt of idolatry, should be polluted by burying there (comp. 2Ki 23:16). Such was also the “potter's field” (Mat 27:7) which had, perhaps, been wrought by digging for clay into holes serviceable for graves., SEE CEMETERIES.

II. Explicit Information from Ancient Sources as to the Style of Sepulchres. —

1. From a Comparison with Early Heathen Nations. — It has been too much the fashion to look to Egypt for the prototype of every form of Jewish art. The Egyptian tombs at Thebes were extensive excavations in the barren, mountains which skirted the city on the west. In like manner, the magnificent tombs in the necropolis of Sela, in Arabia Petraea, were sculptured out of the sides of the rock surrounding the ancient city. SEE PETRA. The Edomites and the Egyptians seem to have regarded the habitations of the living merely as temporary resting places, while the  tombs are regarded as permanent and eternal mansions; and, while not a vestige of a habitation is to be seen, the tombs remain monuments of splendor and magnificence, perhaps even more wonderful than the ruins of their temples. Funeral urns or vases are found in great numbers on the plains and mounds of Assyria and Mesopotamia containing human skeletons or fragments of bones which appear to have been calcined.

But in Jewish history there is a total diversity from these customs in the matter of tombs. From the burial of Sarah in the cave of Machpelah (Gen 23:19) to the funeral rites prepared for Dorcas (Act 9:37) there: is no mention of any sarcophagus, or even coffin, in any Jewish burial. No pyramid was raised — no separate hypogeum of any individual king, and, what is most to be regretted by modern investigators, no inscription or painting which either recorded the name of the deceased or symbolized the religious feeling of the Jews towards the dead. It is true, of course, that Jacob, dying in Egypt, was embalmed (Gen 1:2), but it was only in order that he might be brought to be entombed in the cave at Hebron, and Joseph, as a naturalized Egyptian and a ruler in the land, was embalmed”; and it is also mentioned as something exceptional that he was put into a coffin, and was so brought by the Israelites out of the land and laid with his forefathers. But these, like the burning of the body of Saul, were clearly exceptional cases. SEE EMBALMING.

Still less were the rites of the Jews like those of the Pelasgi or Etruscans. With that people the graves of the dead were, or were intended to be, in every respect similar to the homes of the living. The lucumo lay in his robes, the warrior in his armor on the bed on which he had reposed in life, surrounded by the furniture, the vessels, and the ornaments which had adorned his dwelling when alive, as if he were to live again in a new world with the same wants and feelings as before. Besides this, no tall stele and no sepulchral mound has yet been found in the hills or plains of Judaea, nor have we any hint either in the Bible or Josephus of any such having existed which could be traced to a strictly Jewish origin. In very distinct contrast to all this, the sepulchral rites of the Jews were marked with the same simplicity that characterized all their religious observances. The body was washed and anointed (Mar 14:8; Mar 16:1; Joh 19:39, etc.), wrapped in a clean linen cloth, and borne without any funeral pomp to the grave, where it was laid without any ceremonial or form of prayer. In addition to  this, with kings and great persons there seems to have been a “great burning” (2Ch 16:14; 2Ch 21:19; Jer 34:5), all these being measures more suggested by sanitary exigencies than by any hankering after ceremonial pomp.

2. Normal Style. — This simplicity of rite led to what may be called the distinguishing characteristic of Jewish sepulchres — the deep loculus — which, so far as is now known, is universal in all purely Jewish rock cut tombs, but hardly known elsewhere. Its form will be understood by referring to the annexed diagram, representing the forms of Jewish sepulture. In the apartment marked A, there are twelve such loculi about two feet in width by three feet high. On the ground floor these generally open on the level of the floor; when in the upper story, as at C, on a ledge or platform, on which the body might be laid to be anointed, and on which the stones might rest that closed the outer end of each loculus. The shallow loculus is shown in chamber B, but was apparently only used when sarcophagi were employed, and therefore, so far as we know, only during the Graeco-Roman period, when foreign customs came to be adopted. The shallow loculus would have been singularly inappropriate and inconvenient where an unembalmed body was laid out to decay, as there would evidently be no means of shutting it off from the rest of the catacomb. The deep loculus, on the other hand, was as strictly conformable with Jewish customs, and could easily be closed by a stone fitted to the end and luted into the groove which usually exists there. This fact is especially interesting, as it affords a key to much that is otherwise hard to be understood in certain passages in the New Test. Thus in Joh 11:39, Jesus says, “Take away the stone,” and (Joh 11:40) “they took away the stone,” without difficulty, apparently; which could hardly have been the case had it been such a rock as would be required to close the entrance of a cave. Also in 20:1 the same expression is used, “the stone is taken away;” and though the Greek word in the other three Evangelists certainly implies that it was rolled away, this would equally apply to the stone at the mouth of the loculus, into which the Marys must have then stooped down to look in. In fact, the whole narrative is infinitely more clear and intelligible if we assume that it was a stone closing the end of a rock cut grave than if we suppose it to have been a stone closing the entrance or door of a hypogeum. In the latter case the stone to close a door — say six feet by three feet — could hardly have weighed less than three or four tons, and  could not have been moved without machinery. There is one catacomb — that known as the “Tombs of the Kings” (see below) — which is closed by a stone rolling across its entrance; but it is the only one, and the immense amount of contrivance and fitting which it has required is sufficient proof that such an arrangement was not applied to any other of the numerous rock tombs around Jerusalem, nor could the traces of it have been obliterated had it anywhere existed. From the nature of the openings where they are natural caverns, and the ornamental form of their doorways where they are architecturally adorned, it is evident, except in this one instance, that they could not have been closed by stones rolled across their entrances; and consequently it seems only to be to the closing of the loculi that these expressions can refer. But until a more careful and more scientific exploration of these tombs is made than has hitherto been given to the public, it is difficult to feel quite certain on this point.

Although, as we have seen, the Jews were singularly free from the pomps and vanities of funereal magnificence, they were at all stages of their independent existence an eminently burying people. From the time of their entrance into the Holy Land till their expulsion by the Romans they seem to have attached the greatest importance to the possession of an undisturbed resting place for the bodies of their dead, and in all ages seem to have shown the greatest respect, if not veneration, for the sepulchres of their ancestors. Few, however, could enjoy the luxury of a rock cut tomb. Taking all that are known, and all that are likely to be discovered, there are not probably 500, certainly not 1000, rock cut loculi in or about Jerusalem; and as that city must in the days of its prosperity have possessed a population of from 30,000 to 40,000 souls, it is evident that the bulk of the people must then, as now, have been content with graves dug in the earth, but situated as near the holy places as their means would allow their obtaining a place. The bodies of the kings were buried close to the Temple walls (Eze 43:7-9), and, however little they may have done in their life, the place of their burial is carefully recorded in the Chronicles of the Kings, and the cause why that place was chosen is generally pointed out, as if that record was not only the most important event, but the final judgment on the life of the king.

3. Talmudical Statements. — The Mishnic description of a sepulchre, complete according to Rabbinical notions, is somewhat as follows, and serves to illustrate the above plan: a cavern about six cubits square, or six by eight, from three sides of which are recessed longitudinally several  vaults, called כוכים, each large enough for a corpse. On the fourth side the cavern is approached through a small open covered court or portico, חצר, of a size to receive the bier and bearers. In some such structures the demoniac may have housed. The entry from the court to the cavern was closed by a large stone, called גלל, as capable of being rolled, thus confirming the Evangelistic narrative. Sometimes several such caverns, each with its recesses, were entered from the several sides of the same portico (Mishna, Baba Bathra, 6, 8, quoted by J. Nicolaus, De Sepulchris Hebroeorum). Such a tomb is that described in Buckingham's Travels in Arabia (p. 158), and those known to tradition as the “Tombs of the Kings” (above referred to). But earlier sepulchres were doubtless more simple, and, to judge from 2Ki 13:21, did not prevent mutual contact of remains. Sepulchres were marked sometimes by pillars, as that of Rachel, or by pyramids, as those of the Asmonseans at Modin (Josephus, Ant. 13, 6, 7), and had places of higher and lower honor. Like temples, they were, from their assumed inviolability, sometimes made the depositories of treasures (De Saulcy, 2, 183). We find them also distinguished by a “title” (2Ki 23:17). Such as were not otherwise noticeable were scrupulously “whited” (Mat 23:27) once a year, after the rains before the Passover, to warn passers by of defilement (Hottinger, Cippi Hebr. p. 1034; Rossteusch, De Sepul. Calce Notat. in Ugolino, 33).

III. Historical Notices of Hebrew Sepulchres, Illustrated from certain Antique Jewish Tombs still Extant.

1. Sepulchres of the Patriarchs and other Early Personages. — We find that one of the most striking events in the life of Abraham is the purchase of the field of Ephron the Hittite at Hebron, in which was the cave of Machpelah, in order that he might therein bury Sarah, his wife, and that it might be a sepulchre for himself and his children. His refusing to accept the privilege of burying there as a gift shows the importance Abraham attached to the transaction, and he insisted on purchasing and paying for it (Gen 23:20), in order that it might be “made sure unto him for the possession of a burying place.” There he and his immediate descendants were laid 3700 years ago, and there they are believed to rest now; but no one in modern times has seen their remains, or been allowed to enter into the cave where they repose. A few years ago, Signor Pierotti says, he was allowed, in company with the pasha of Jerusalem, to descend the steps to the iron grating that closes the entrance and to look into the cave. What he  seems to have seen was that it was a natural cavern, untouched by the chisel and unaltered by art in any way. Those who accompanied the prince of Wales in his visit to the mosque were not permitted to see even this entrance. All they saw was the round hole in the floor of the mosque which admits light and air to the cave below. The same round opening exists at Neby Samwil in the roof of the reputed sepulchre of the prophet Samuel, and at Jerusalem there is a similar opening into the tomb under the dome of the rock. In the former it is used by pious votaries to drop petitions and prayers into the tombs of patriarchs and prophets. The latter having lost the tradition of its having been a burying place, the opening now only serves to admit light into the cave below. Unfortunately, none of those who have visited Hebron have had sufficient architectural knowledge to be able to say when the church or mosque which now stands above the cave was erected; but there is no great reason for doubting that it is a Byzantine church erected there between the age of Constantine and that of Justinian. From such indications as can be gathered, it seems of the later period. On its floor are sarcophagi purporting to be those of the patriarchs; but, as is usual in Eastern tombs, they are only cenotaphs representing those that stand below, and which are esteemed too sacred for the vulgar to approach. Though it is much more easy of access, it is almost as difficult to ascertain the age of the wall that encloses the sacred precincts of these tombs. From the account of Josephus (War, 4, 7), it does not seem to have existed in his day, or he surely would have mentioned it; and such a citadel could hardly fail to have been of warlike importance in those troublous times. Besides this, we do not know of any such enclosure encircling any tombs or sacred place in Jewish times, nor can we conceive any motive for so secluding these graves. There are not any architectural moldings about this wall which would enable an archaeologist to approximate its date; and if the beveling is assumed to be a Jewish arrangement (which is very far from being exclusively the case), on the other hand it may be contended that no buttressed wall of Jewish masonry exists anywhere. There is, in fact, nothing known with sufficient exactness to decide the question, but the probabilities certainly tend towards a Christian or Saracenic origin for the whole structure, both internally and externally. SEE MACHPELAH.

For Joseph's Tomb and Rache's Tomb, see those articles respectively.  Aaron died on the summit of Mount Hor (Num 20:28; Num 33:39), and we are led to infer he was buried there, though it is not so stated; and we have no details of his tomb which would lead us to suppose that anything existed there earlier than the Mohammedan Kubr that now crowns the hill overlooking Petra, and it is, at the same time, extremely doubtful whether that is the Mount Hor where the high priest died. SEE HOR.

Moses died in the plains of Moab (Deu 34:6), and was buried there, “but no man knoweth his sepulchre to this day,” which is a singular utterance, as being the only instance in the Old Test. of a sepulchre being concealed, or of one being admitted to be unknown. SEE NEBO.

Joshua was buried in his own inheritance in Timnathserah (Jos 24:30), and Samuel in his own house at Ramah (1Sa 25:1), an expression which we may probably interpret as meaning in the garden attached to his house, as it is scarcely probable it would be the dwelling itself. We know, however, so little of the feelings of the Jews of that age on the subject that it is by no means improbable that it may have been in a chamber or loculus attached to the dwelling, and which, if closed by a stone carefully cemented into its place, would have prevented any annoyance from the circumstance. Joab (1Ki 2:34) was also buried “in his own house in the wilderness.” In fact, it appears that from the time when Abraham established the burying place of his family at Hebron till the time when David fixed that of his family in the city which bore his name, the Jewish rulers had no fixed or favorite place of sepulture. Each was buried on his own property, or where he died, without much caring either for the sanctity or convenience of the place chosen.

2. Sepulchre of David. — Of the twenty-two kings of Judah who reigned at Jerusalem from 1048 to 590 B.C., eleven, or exactly one half, were buried in one hypogeum in the “city of David.” The names of the kings so lying together were David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijab, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Ahaziah, Amaziah, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah, together with the good priest Jehoiada. Of all these it is merely said that they were buried in “the sepulchres of their fathers” or “of the kings” in the city of David, except of two — Asa and Hezekiah. Of the first it is said (2Ch 16:14), “they buried him in his own sepulchres which he had made for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed [loculus?], which was filled with sweet odors, and divers spices prepared by the apothecaries' art: and they made a very great burning for him.” It is not  quite clear, however. whether this applies to a new chamber attached to the older sepulchre, or to one entirely distinct, though in the same neighborhood.. Of Hezekiah it is said (2Ch 32:33), they buried him in “the chiefest [or highest] of the sepulchres of the sons of David,” as if there were several apartments in the hypogeum, though it may merely be that they excavated for him a chamber above the others, as we find frequently done in Jewish sepulchres. Two more of these kings (Jehoram and Joash) were buried also in the city of David, “but not in the sepulchres of the kings;” the first because of the sore diseases of which he died (2Ch 21:20); the second apparently in consequence of his disastrous end (2Ch 24:25); and one king, Uzziah (2Ch 26:23), was buried with his fathers in the “field of the burial of the kings,” because he was a leper. All this evinces the extreme care the Jews took in the selection of the burying places of their kings, and the importance they attached to the record. It should also be borne in mind that the highest honor which could be bestowed on the good priest Jehoiada (2Ch 24:16) was that “they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both towards God and towards his house.”

The passage in Neh 3:16, and in Eze 43:7; Eze 43:9, together with the reiterated assertion of the books of Kings and Chronicles, that these sepulchres were situated in the city of David, leave no doubt that they were on Zion (q.v.). It is quite clear, however, that the spot was well known during the whole of the Jewish period, inasmuch as the sepulchres were again and again opened as each king died; and from the tradition that Hyrcanus and Herod opened these sepulchres (Ant. 13, 8, 4; 16, 7, 1). The accounts of these last openings are, it must be confessed, somewhat apocryphal, resting only on the authority of Josephus; but they prove at least that he considered there could be no difficulty in finding the place. It was a secret transaction, if it took place, regarding which rumor might fashion what' wondrous tales it pleased, and no one could contradict them; but there having been built a marble stele (Ant. 16, 7, 1) in front of the tomb may have been a fact within the cognizance of Josephus, and would, at all events; serve to indicate that the sepulchre was rock cut, and its site well known. So far as we can judge from this and other indications, it seems probable there was originally a natural cavern in the rock in this locality, which may afterwards have been improved by art, and in the sides of which loculi were sunk, where the bodies of the eleven kings and of the  good high priest were laid, without sarcophagi or coffins, but “wound in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury” (Joh 19:40).

Modern tradition has assigned the name of the Tomb of David (also of Solomon) to a structure still standing on Mount Zion outside the present city walls, otherwise called the Caenaculum, from the tradition that it was likewise the building in which the Lord's supper was instituted. From the time of the notice by the apostle Peter (Act 2:29), which shows that the true site was then well known, the royal tombs appear to have been forgotten, or at least they are not mentioned till the close of the 11th century, when Raymond d'Agiles, one of the historians of the first crusade, says regarding the Coenaculum, “There are also in that church...the sepulchres of king David and Solomon, and of the holy protomartyr Stephen” (Gesta Dei per Francos, p. 174). In the next century Benjamin of Tudela visited the holy city, and wrote the following singular story, which has perhaps some foundation in fact: “On Mount Zion are the sepulchres of the house of David, and those of the kings who reigned after him. In consequence of the following circumstance, this place is hardly to be recognized. Fifteen years ago one of the walls of the church on Zion (the Coenaculum) fell down, and the patriarch commanded the priest to repair it. He ordered stones to be taken from the original wall of Zion for that purpose, and twenty workmen were hired at stated wages, who broke stones taken from the very foundation of the wall of Zion. Two laborers thus employed found a stone which covered the mouth of a cave. This they entered in search of treasures, and proceeded until they reached a large hall, supported by pillars of marble, encrusted with gold and silver, and before which stood a table with a golden scepter and crown. This was the sepulchre of David; to the left they saw that of Solomon in a similar state; and so on the sepulchres of the other kings buried there.

They saw chests locked up, and were on the point of entering when a blast of wind like a storm issued from the mouth of the cave with such force that it threw them lifeless on the ground. They lay there until evening, when they heard a voice commanding them to go forth from the place. They immediately rushed out and communicated the strange tale to the patriarch, who summoned a learned rabbi, and heard from him that this was indeed the tomb of the great king of Israel. The patriarch ordered the tomb to be walled up so as to hide it effectually.” The narrator closes by the statement,  “The above mentioned rabbi told me all this.” About the middle of the 15th century the tombs are mentioned by several travelers, and one (Tucher of Nuremberg, A.D. 1479) says that the Moslems had converted the crypt, or lower story of the Coenaculum, into a mosque, within which were shown the tombs of David, Solomon, and the other kings. In the following century, Firer, a German traveler, professes to have visited the tombs, and gives a brief description. “On the left of the Coenaculum, under the choir, is a large vaulted cave; from it we come by a narrow passage, shut in by wooden rails, to an arch on the left, in which is a very long and lofty monument cut entirely out of the rock, with carving admirably executed. Under this are buried David, Solomon, and the other kings of Judah.” This account also partakes of the marvelous, and must be received with caution. It is a fact, however, that Jews, Christians, and Moslems have now for more than four centuries agreed in regarding the Coenaculum as the spot beneath which the dust of the kings of Judah lies.

Numbers of Jews maybe often seen standing close to the venerable building, looking with affectionate sadness towards the spot. In 1839 Sir Moses Montefiore and his party were admitted to the mosque. They were led to a trellised doorway, through which they saw the tomb, but they were not permitted to enter. A few years ago an American lady, daughter of Dr. Barclay, was enabled, through the kindness of a Mohammedan lady friend, to enter and sketch the sacred chamber. She says, “The room is insignificant in its dimensions, but is furnished very gorgeously. The tomb is apparently an immense sarcophagus of rough stone, and is covered by green' satin tapestry richly embroidered with gold. A satin canopy of red, blue, green, and yellow stripes hangs over the tomb; and another piece of black velvet tapestry embroidered in silver covers a door in one end of the room, which, they said, leads to a cave underneath. Two tall silver candlesticks stand before this door, and a little lamp hangs in a window near it, which is kept constantly burning” (City of the Great King, p. 212). The real tomb, if it be in this place, must be in the cave below. The structure covered with satin and described by Miss Barclay is merely a cenotaph, like those in the mosque at Hebron. When both mosque and cave are thrown open, and full opportunity given for the search, then, and not till then, can it be satisfactorily established that the royal tombs are or are not in this place (Porter, Handbook for Palestine, p. 181 sq.).

Besides the kings above enumerated, Manasseh was, according to the book of Chronicles (2Ch 33:20) buried in his own house, which the  bo6k of Kings (2Ki 21:18) explains as the “garden of his own house, the garden of Uzza,” where his son Amon was buried, also, it is said, in his own sepulchre (2Ki 21:26); but we have nothing that would enable us to indicate where this was; and Ahaz, the wicked king, was, according to the book of Chronicles (2Ch 28:27), “buried in the city, even in Jerusalem, and they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel.” The fact of these last three kings having been idolaters, though one reformed, and their having all three been buried apparently in the city, proves what importance the Jews attached to the locality of the sepulchre, but also tends to show that burial within the city, or the enclosure of a dwelling, was not so repulsive to their feelings as is generally supposed. It is just possible that the rock cut sepulchre under the western wall of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre may be the remains of such a cemetery as that in which the wicked kings were buried.

For the sepulchres of the Maccabees, see MODIN. For the modern or traditionary “Tombs of the Kings” near Jerusalem, see below.

3. The “Tombs of the Prophets.” — The neighborhood of Jerusalem is thickly studded with tombs, many of them of great antiquity. A succinct but valuable account of them is given in Porter's Handbook (p. 143 sq.); but it is only necessary in this article to refer to two or three of the most celebrated. The only important hypogeum which is wholly Jewish in its arrangements, and may consequently belong to an earlier, or to any epoch, is that known as the Tombs of the Prophets in the western flank of the Mount of Olives. SEE OLIVET. “Through a long descending gallery, the first part of which is winding, we enter a circular chamber about twenty- four feet in diameter and ten high, having a hole in its roof. From this chamber two parallel galleries, ten feet high and five wide, are carried southwards through the rock for about sixty feet; a third diverges southeast, extending forty feet. They are connected by two cross galleries in concentric curves, one at their extreme end, the other in the middle. The outer one is 115 feet long and has a range of thirty niches on the level of its floor, radiating outwards. Two small chambers with similar niches also open into it.” This tomb, or series of tombs, has every appearance of having originally been a natural cavern improved by art, and with an external gallery some 140 feet in extent, into which twenty-seven deep or Jewish loculi open. Other chambers and loculi have been commenced in  other parts, and in' the passages there are spaces where many other graves could have been located, all which would tend to show that it had been disused before completed, and consequently was very modern. But, be this as it may, it has no architectural moldings, no sarcophagi or shallow loculi, nothing to indicate a foreign origin, and may therefore be considered, if not an early, at least as the most essentially Jewish of the sepulchral excavations in this locality — every other important sepulchral excavation being adorned with architectural features and details betraying most unmistakably their Greek or Roman origin, and fixing their date, consequently, as subsequent to that of the Maccabees; or, in other words, like every other detail of pre-Christian architecture in Jerusalem, they belong to the 140 years that elapsed from the advent of Pompey till the destruction of the city by Titus.

4. The “Tombs of the Kings.” — The most important of the great groups in the vicinity of Jerusalem is that known as Kebur es-Sultan, or the Royal Caverns, so called because of their magnificence, and also because that name is applied to them by Josephus, who, in describing the third wall, mentions them (σπήλαια βασιλικά [War, 5, 4, 2]). By some, however, they are identified with the Monument of Herod (ibid. 3, 2; 12, 2); by others, as Robinson and Porter, with the tomb of Helena, the widowed queen of Monobazus, king of Adiabene. She became a proselyte to Judaism, and fixed her residence at Jerusalem, where she relieved many of the poor during the famine predicted by Agabus in the days of Claudius Caesar (Act 11:28), and built for herself a tomb, as we learn from Josephus (Ant. 20, 2, 1 sq.; 4, 3; War, 5, 2, 2; 4, 2; Pausan. 8, 16, 5; Euseb. ii, 12; Jerome, Epit. Paulae). SEE JERUSALEM.

Into the question of the origin of these tombs it is, however, unnecessary to enter; but their structure claims our attention. They are excavated out of the rock. The traveler passes through a low arched doorway into a court ninety-two feet long by eighty-seven wide. On the western side is a vestibule or porch thirty-nine feet wide. The open front was supported by two columns in the middle. Along the front extend a deep frieze and cornice, the former richly ornamented. At the southern side of the vestibule is the entrance to the tomb. The architecture exhibits the same ill-understood Roman-Doric arrangements as are found in all these tombs, mixed with bunches of grapes, which first appear on Maccabaean coins, and foliage which is local and peculiar, and, so far as anything is known elsewhere, might be of any  age. Its connection, however, with that of the tombs of Jehoshaphat and the Judges fixes it to the same epoch. The entrance doorway of this tomb is below the level of the ground, and concealed, so far as anything can be said to be which is so architecturally adorned; and it is remarkable as the only instance of this quasi-concealment at Jerusalem. It is closed by a very curious and elaborate contrivance of a rolling stone, often described, but very clumsily answering its purpose. This, also, is characteristic of its age, as we know from Pausanias that the structural marble monument of queen Helena of Adiabene was remarkable for a similar piece of misplaced ingenuity. Within, the tomb consists of a vestibule or entrance hall about twenty feet square, from which three other square apartments open, each surrounded by deep loculi. These again possess a peculiarity not known in any other tomb about Jerusalem, of having a square apartment either beyond the head of the loculus or on one side: as, for instance, A A have their inner chambers, A' A', within, but B and B, at B' B', on one side. What the purpose of these was it is difficult to guess, but, at all events, it is not Jewish. But perhaps the most remarkable peculiarity of the hypogeum is the sarcophagus chamber D, in which two sarcophagi were found, one of which was brought home by De Saulcy, and is now in the Louvre.

5. The “Tombs of the Judges.” — The hypogeum now known by this name is one of the most remarkable of the catacombs around Jerusalem, containing about sixty deep loculi, arranged in three stories; the upper stories with ledges in front to give convenient access, and to support the stones that closed them; the lower flush with the ground: the whole, consequently, so essentially Jewish that it might be of any age if it were not for its distance from the town, and its architectural character. The latter, as before stated, is identical with that of the Tomb of Jehoshaphat, and has nothing Jewish about it. It might, of course, be difficult to prove this, as we know so little of what Jewish architecture really is; but we do know that the pediment is more essentially a Greek invention than any other part of their architecture, and was introduced at least not previously to the age of the Cypselidae, and this peculiar form not till long afterwards, and this particular example not till after an age when the debased Roman of the Tomb of Absalom had become possible.  6. Tombs in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. — There are three conspicuous sepulchres here, which we briefly describe in the order in which they occur, beginning at the south. SEE JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

(1.) The so called “Tomb of Zechariah,” said to have been constructed in honor of Zechariah, who was slain “between the temple and the altar” Joash (2 Chronicles in the reign of 24:21; Mat 23:35), is held in great veneration by the Jews. It is doubtful, however, whether it be a tomb at all, and the style of architecture can scarcely be earlier than our era. It bears a considerable resemblance to the so called Tomb of Absalom, the northernmost of the three. It consists of a square solid basement, measuring eighteen feet six inches each way, and twenty feet high to the top of the cornice. On each face are four engaged Ionic columns between antae, and these are surmounted, not by an Egyptian cornice, as is usually asserted, but by one of purely Assyrian type, such as is found at Khorsabad.

As the Ionic or voluted order came also from Assyria, this example is, in fact, a purer specimen of the Ionic order than any found in Europe, where it was always used by the Greeks with a quasi-Doric cornice. Notwithstanding this, in the form of the volutes — the egg-and-dart molding beneath, and every detail — it is so distinctly Roman that it is impossible to assume that it belongs to an earlier age than that of their influence. Above the cornice is a pyramid rising at rather a sharp angle, and hewn, like all the rest, out of the solid rock. It may further be remarked that only the outward face, or that fronting Jerusalem, is completely finished, the other three being only blocked out (De Saulcy, 2, 303), a circumstance that would lead us to suspect that the works may have been interrupted by the fall of Jerusalem, or some such catastrophe; and this may possibly also account for there being no sepulchre on its rear, if such be really the case. To call this building a tomb is evidently a misnomer, as it is absolutely solid hewn out of the living rock by cutting a passage around it. It has no external chambers, nor even the semblance of a doorway. From  what is known of the explorations carried on by M. Rénan about Byblus, we should expect that the tomb, properly so called, would be an excavation in the passage behind the monolith — but none such has been found (probably it was never looked for) — and that this monolith is the stele or indicator of that fact. If it be so, it is very singular, though very Jewish, that any one should take the trouble to carve out such a monument without putting an inscription or symbol on it to mark its destination or to tell in whose honor it was erected.

(2.) The middle tomb of this group, called that of St. James, is of a very different character. It consists of a veranda with two Doric pillars in antis, which may be characterized as belonging to a very late Greek order rather than a Roman example. Behind this screen are several apartments, which in another locality we might be justified in calling a rock cut monastery appropriate to sepulchral purposes, but in Jerusalem we know so little that it is necessary to pause before applying any such designation. In the rear of all is an apartment, apparently unfinished, with three shallow loculi, meant for the reception of sarcophagi, and so indicating a post-Jewish date for the whole, or at least for that part, of the excavation.

(3.) The remaining or so called Tomb of Absalom is somewhat larger, the base being about twenty-one feet square in plan, and probably twenty-three or twenty-four to the top of the cornice. Like the other, it is of the Roman- Ionic order, surmounted by a cornice of Ionic type; but between the pillars and the cornice a frieze, unmistakably of the Roman-Doric order, is introduced, so Roman as to be in itself quite sufficient to fix its epoch. It is by no means clear whether it had originally a pyramidical top like its neighbor. The existence of a square blocking above the cornice would lead us to suspect it had not; at all events, either at the time of its excavation or subsequently this was removed, and the present very peculiar termination erected, raising its height to over sixty feet. At the time this was done a chamber was excavated in the base, we must assume for sepulchral purposes, though how a body could be introduced through the narrow hole above the cornice is by no means clear, nor, if inserted, how disposed of in the two very narrow loculi that exist. The great interest of this excavation is, that immediately in rear of the monolith we do find just such a  sepulchral cavern as we should expect. It is called the Tomb of Jehoshaphat, with about the same amount of discrimination as governed the nomenclature of the others, but is now closed by the rubbish and stones thrown by the pious at the Tomb of the Undutiful Son, and consequently its internal arrangements are unknown; but externally it is crowned by a pediment of considerable beauty, and in the same style as that of the Tombs of the Judges, mentioned above — showing that these two, at least, are of the same age, and that this one, certainly, must have been subsequent to the excavation of the monolith; so that we may feel perfectly certain that the two groups are of one age, even if it should not be thought quite clear what that age may be. SEE ABSALOMS PILLAR.

7. Other Graeco-Roman Tombs. — Besides the tombs above enumerated, there are around Jerusalem, in the valleys of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, and on the plateau to the north, a number of remarkable rock cut sepulchres, with more or less architectural decoration, sufficient to enable us to ascertain that they are all of nearly the same age, and to assert with very tolerable confidence that the epoch to which they belong must be between the introduction of Roman influence and the destruction of the city by Titus. The proof of this would be easy if it were not that, like everything Jewish. there is a remarkable absence of inscriptions which can be assumed to be original. The excavations in the Valley of Hinnom with Greek inscriptions are comparatively modern, the inscriptions being all of Christian import, and of such a nature as to render it extremely doubtful whether the chambers were sepulchral at all, and not rather the dwellings of ascetics, and originally intended to be used for this purpose. These, however, are neither the most important nor the most architectural — indeed, none of those in that valley are so remarkable as those in the other localities just enumerated. The most important of those in the Valley of Hinnom is that known as the “Retreat place of the Apostles.” It is an unfinished excavation of extremely late date, and many of the others look much more like dwellings for the living than resting places of the dead.

In the village of Siloam there is a monolithic cell of singularly Egyptian aspect, which De Saulcy (Voyage autour de la Mer Morte, 2, 306) assumes to be a chapel of Solomon's Egyptian wife. It is probably of very much more modern date, and is more Assyrian than Egyptian in character; but as he is probably quite correct in stating that it is not sepulchral, it is  only necessary to mention it here in order that it may not be confounded with those that are so. It is the more worthy of remark, as one of the great difficulties of the subject arises from travelers too readily assuming that every cutting in the rock must be sepulchral. It may be so in Egypt, but it certainly was riot so at Cyrene or Petra, where many of the excavations were either temples or monastic establishments; and it certainly was not universally the case at Jerusalem, though our information is frequently too scanty to enable us always to discriminate exactly to which class the cutting in the rock may belong.

The same remarks as are above made respecting the “Tombs of the Judges” apply to the tomb without a name, and merely called “a Jewish tomb,” in their neighborhood, with beveled facets over its facade, but with late Roman-Doric details at its angles, sufficient to indicate its epoch; but there is nothing else about these tombs requiring especial mention (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 492).

The comparative lateness of the so called sepulchre of Gamaliel and other rabbins at Meiron is proved by the presence of sarcophagi still within them (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 433).

Since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, none of the native inhabitants have been in a position to indulge in much sepulchral magnificence, or perhaps had any taste for this class of display; and we in consequence find no rock cut hypogea, and no structural monuments that arrest attention in modern times.

IV. Comparison with Modern Oriental Tombs. — The style of the public cemeteries around the cities of ancient Palestine in all probability resembled that of the present burying places of the East, of which Dr. Shaw gives the following description: “They occupy a large space, a great extent of ground being allotted for the purpose. Each family has a portion of it walled in like a garden, where the bones of its ancestors have remained undisturbed for many generations. For in these enclosures the graves are all  distinct and separate; each of them having a stone placed upright, both at the head and feet, inscribed with the name or title of the deceased; while the intermediate space is either planted with flowers, bordered round with stone, or paved with tiles.” Examples of these tombs are given in the accompanying cuts. By these it is seen that, as among people in good circumstances, the monumental stones are placed upon quadrangular tombs, in the center of which evergreen or flowering shrubs are often planted, and tended with much care. There were other sepulchres which were private property, erected at the expense and for the use of several families in a neighborhood, or provided by individuals as a separate burying place for themselves. These were situated either in some conspicuous place, as Rachel's on the highway to Bethlehem (Gen 35:19), or in some lonely and sequestered spot, under a wide-spreading tree (Gen 35:8) in a field or a garden.

Over such garden tombs, especially when the tomb is that of some holy person, lamps are sometimes hung and occasionally lighted. The graves of the most eminent Mohammedan saints are each covered with a stone or brick edifice called wely. It has a dome or cupola over it, varying in height from eight to ten feet. Within lamps are often hung, and the grave proper is covered with carpet and strings of beads. Sometimes more costly ornamentation is used. In common cases, sepulchres were formed by digging a small depth into the ground. Over these, which were considered an humble kind of tomb, the wealthy and great often erected small stone buildings, in the form of a house or cupola, to serve as their family sepulchre. These are usually open at the sides. Sometimes, however, these interesting monuments are built up on all sides, so that the walls are required to be taken down, and a breach made, to a certain extent, on each successive interment. “This custom,” says Carne, “which is of great antiquity, and particularly prevails in the lonely parts of Lebanon, may serve to explain some passages of Scripture. The prophet Samuel was buried in his own house at Ramah, and Joab was buried in his house in the wilderness. These, it is evident, were not their dwelling houses, but mansions for the dead, or family vaults which they had built within their own precincts.” Not unfrequently, however, those who had large establishments, and whose fortunes enabled them to command the assistance of human art and labor, purchased, like Abraham, some of the natural caverns with which Palestine abounded, and converted them by some suitable alterations into family sepulchres; while others, with vast pains and expense, made excavations in the solid rock (Mat 27:60).

These, the entrance to which was either horizontal or by: a flight of  steps, had their roofs, which were arched with the native stone, so high as to admit persons standing upright, and were very spacious, sometimes being divided into several distinct apartments; in which case the remoter or innermost chambers were dug a little deeper than those that were nearer the entrance, the approach into their darker solitudes being made by another descending stair. Many sepulchres of this description are still found in Palestine; but the descent into them is so choked up with the rubbish of ages that they are nearly inaccessible, and have been explored only by a few indefatigable hunters after antiquities. Along the sides of those vast caverns niches were cut, or sometimes shelves ranged one above another, on which were deposited the bodies of the dead, while in others the ground-floor of the tomb was raised so as to make different compartments, the lowest place in the family vaults being reserved for the servants. Some of those found near Tyre, and at Alexandria, are of the round form shown in Fig. 1, but these seem exceptions; for the tombs at Jerusalem, in Asia Minor, and generally in Egypt and the East, offer the arrangements shown in Fig. 2.

On modern Oriental usages, see Hackett, Illustrations of Scripture, p. 97- 100; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 2, 103-165, 170;. Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 148 sq.; Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 579 sq.; Lane, Modern Egyptians, 1, 267, 359, etc.; and on ancient sepulture, the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 49, 66, 67; and Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 217; and those referred to under FUNERAL SEE FUNERAL .

## Sepulchre Of Christ[[@Headword:Sepulchre Of Christ]]

             This has. been alluded to in the foregoing article, but the interest of the subject demands a fuller treatment. The traditional ‘site is now occupied by the “Church of the Holy Sepulchre,” and the question of the identity of the locality is fully discussed under CALVARY; GOLGOTHA. Its general position is sufficiently indicated under JERUSALEM, and in the maps accompanying that article and PALESTINE. A full description of the building is given by Porter, Handbook for Palestine, p. 155 sq.; also in the various books of travels in the Holy Land. We have only space for a brief outline of this extensive and interesting structure, which will be intelligible by the aid of the annexed plan.

1. Exterior. — The approach to it from every direction lies through narrow, filthy lanes, and small bazaars generally filled with ragged Arab women, the venders of vegetables and snails, the latter of which are much eaten here, especially during Lent. After many crooked turnings we arrive in the large square court in front of the church. Here the scene exhibited, in the height of the pilgrim season, is of the most motley and extraordinary appearance. On the upper raised steps are tables spread with coffee, sherbet, sweetmeats, and refreshments; throughout the court are seated peddlers and the Bethlehemite venders of holy merchandise, such as crosses, beads, rosaries and amulets, and mother-of-pearl shells, which are generally brought from the Red Sea, and engraved with religious subjects chiseled in relief; models of the Holy Sepulchre in wood inlaid with mother-of-pearl, and drinking cups from the deposits of the Jordan, with verses from the Bible engraved on them; they are nearly as black as ebony, and take a fine polish. Through these wares hundreds of persons pass and repass — pilgrims of many nations in their different costumes; Latin, Armenian, Russian, Greek, and Coptish friars, with Turkish, Arnaout, and Arab soldiers — all forming the most extraordinary scene that could be found in any spot upon the globe; and a polyglot language is heard such as few other places in the world could exhibit.

The key of the church is kept by the governor of the city; the door is guarded by a Turk, and opened only at fixed hours, and then only with the consent of the three convents and in the presence of the several dragomans, an arrangement which often causes great and vexatious delays to such as desire admittance. This formality was probably intended for solemnity and effect, but its consequence is exactly the reverse; for as soon as the door is opened the pilgrims, who have almost all been kept waiting for some time and have naturally become impatient, rush in, struggling with each other, overturning the dragomans, and are thumped by the Turkish doorkeeper, and driven, like a herd of wild animals, into the body of the church.

2. First Interior Room. — Supposing, then, the rush over, and the traveler to have recovered from its effects, he will find himself in a large apartment, forming a sort of vestibule; on the left, in a recess in the wall, is a large divan, cushioned and carpeted, where the Turkish doorkeeper is usually sitting with half a dozen of his friends, smoking the long pipe and drinking coffee, and always conducting himself with great dignity and propriety. Directly in front, within the body of the church, having at each end three enormous wax candles more than twenty feet high, and a number of silver  lamps suspended above it of different sizes and fashions — gifts from the Catholic, Greek, and Armenian convents — is a long flat stone called the “Stone of Unction,” and on this it is said the body of our Lord was laid when taken down from the cross and washed and anointed in preparation for sepulture. This is the first object that arrests the pilgrims on their entrance, and here they prostrate themselves in succession, the old and the young, women and children, the rich man and the beggar, and all kiss the sacred stone. It is a slab of polished white marble, and only does duty as a substitute for the genuine stone, which is said to be beneath it: but this consideration in no degree affects the multitude or the fervor of the kisses it receives. As you advance towards the stone you have Mount Calvary immediately on your right hand.

Beyond the Stone of Unction the traveler finds himself in the body of the church, a space of about 300 feet in length and 160 in breadth. In front his progress is arrested by the southern exterior of the Greek Chapel, which occupies more than half the great area; on his left, at the western end, is a circular space about 100 feet in diameter, surrounded by clumsy square columns, which support a gallery above, and a dome 150 feet high, of imposing appearance and effect. This is the Latin Chapel, in the center of which, immediately below the aperture that admits light through the dome, rises a small oblong building of marble, twenty feet long, twelve broad, and about fifteen feet in height, surmounted by a small cupola standing on columns. This little building is circular at the back, but square and finished with a platform in front. Within it is what passes for the Holy Sepulchre. We reserve its description for the last.

3. Holy Objects in Detail. — Leaving for a moment the throng that is constantly pressing at the door of the sepulchre, let us make the tour of the church, beginning from the southwest and proceeding by the north to the east, and so round to our starting point. The church, be it observed, faces the four cardinal points.

The first object we have to notice is an iron circular railing, in the shape of a large parrot's cage, having within it a lamp, and marking the spot where Mary watched the crucifixion “afar off.” In the arcades round the Latin dome are small chapels for the Syrians, Maronites, and other sects of Christians, who have not, like the Catholics, Greeks, and Armenians, large chapels in the body of the church. The poor Copts have nothing but a  nook, about six feet square, in the western end of the sepulchre, which is tawdrily adorned in the manner of the Greeks. The Syrians have a small and very shabby recess, containing nothing but a plain altar; in the side there is a small door opening to a dark gallery, which leads, as the monks say, to the tombs of Joseph and Nicodemus, between which and that of the Savior there is a subterranean communication. The tombs are excavated in the rock which here forms the floor of the chamber.

Farther on, and nearly in range of the front of the sepulchre, is a large opening, forming a sort of court to the entrance of the Latin Chapel. On one side is a gallery containing a fine organ; and the chapel itself is neat enough, and differs but little from those in the churches of Italy. The chapel in which the organ stands is called the “Chapel of the Apparition,” where Christ appeared to the Virgin. Within the door on the right, in an enclosure completely hidden from view, is the Pillar of Flagellation, to which our Savior was tied when he was scourged, before being taken into the presence of Pontius Pilate. As in this instance the holy object cannot be reached by the lips of the faithful, it is deemed equally efficacious to kiss it through another medium. A monk stands near the rail, and, touching the pillar with a long stick that has a piece of leather at the point of it, like a billiard cue, stretches it towards the lips that are ready pouting to receive it. Only half the pillar is here; the other half is in one of the churches in Rome; where may also be seen the table on which our Savior ate his last supper with his disciples, and the stone on which the cock crowed when Peter denied his Master.

Leaving the Chapel, of the Apparition and turning to the left with our faces due east, we have on the right hand the outside of the Greek Chapel, which occupies the largest space in the body of the church, and on the left is a range. of chapels and doors, the first of which leads to the prison where they say our Savior was confined before he was led to the crucifixion. In front of the door is an unintelligible machine, described as the stone on which he was placed when put in the stocks.

In the semicircle at the eastern part of the church there are three chapels: one of these contains the stone on which our Lord rested previously to ascending Mount Calvary; another is the place where the soldiers parted his raiment among them; and the third marks the spot where Longinus, the soldier who pierced his side, passed the remainder of his days in penance. Beneath one of the altars lies a stone having a hole through it, and placed  in a short trough, so that it seems impossible for anything but a specter to pass through the hole. Nevertheless, the achievement was a customary penance among the Greeks, and called by them “purgatory;”‘ but latterly the Turks have in mercy guarded the stone by an iron grating.

In this part also is the entrance to one of the most holy places in the church, the Chapel of the Cross. Descending twenty-eight broad marble steps, the visitor comes to a large chamber eighteen paces square, dimly lighted by a few distant lamps; the roof is supported by four short columns with enormous capitals. In front of the steps is the altar, and on the right a seat on which the empress Helena, advised by a dream where the true cross was to be found, sat and watched the workmen who were digging below. Descending again fourteen steps, another chamber is reached, darker and more dimly lighted than the first, and hung with faded red tapestry; a marble slab, having on it a figure of the cross, covers the mouth of the pit in which the true cross was found.

On reascending into the body of the church and ap preaching the vestibule through which we first entered, we find Mount Calvary on our left. This we ascend by a narrow marble staircase of eighteen steps, formed of a single stone, a fact to which the pilgrim's attention is solicited by the monks as a proof that the chapel at the top is really founded on the natural rock. But this fact would prove nothing; for there is a staircase in the Ruspoli Palazzo at Rome of one hundred and twenty steps, cut from a single block of white marble. Every visible part of the chapel is a manifest fabric. To this objection it is answered that “the stonework cases the rock,” which may or may not be true; but wherever examination might be allowed it seems to be purposely withheld.

The chapel is about fifteen feet square, paved with marble in mosaic, and hung on all sides with silken tapestry and lamps dimly burning; it is divided by two short pillars, hung also with silk and supporting quadrangular arches. At the extremity is a large altar, ornamented with paintings and figures, and under the altar a circular silver plate with a hole in the center, indicating the spot in which rested the step of the cross. Behind the altar and separated from it by a thin wall is a chapel, in the center of which is a stone marking the exact spot where Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac; and the monks state that when the cross was laid down, before it was raised, our Lord's head rested  upon this point; they seem to consider the establishment of this fact necessary to the complete fulfilment of the type.

Descending to the floor of the church, we are shown another rent in the rock, said to be a continuation of the one above, but so guarded by an iron grating that examination is out of the question, as it can only be examined by thrusting a taper through the bars. Directly opposite the fissure is a large monument over the head of Adam.

The little chapel on the spot where Mary stood when St. John received our Lord's dying injunction to protect her as his mother is an appendage to Mount Calvary.

4. The Tomb itself. — The reader will probably think that all these things are enough, and more than enough, to be comprised under one roof. Having finished the tour of the church, let us return to the great object of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem — the Holy Sepulchre. Taking off the shoes on the marble platform in front, the visitor is admitted by a low door, on entering which the proudest head must needs do reverence. In the center of the first chamber is the stone which was rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre — a square block of marble cut and polished; and, though the Armenians have lately succeeded in establishing the genuineness of the stone in their chapel on Mount Zion (the admission by the other monks, however, being always accompanied by the assertion that they stole it), yet the infatuated Greek still kisses and adores the block of marble as the very stone on which the angel sat when he announced to the women, “He is not dead; he is risen; come and see the place where the Lord lay.” Again bending the head, and lower than before, the visitor enters the inner chamber, the holiest of holy places. The sepulchre “hewn out of the rock” is a marble sarcophagus, somewhat resembling a common bathing tub, with a lid of the same material. Over it hang forty-three lamps, which burn without ceasing night and day. The sarcophagus is six feet one inch long, and occupies about one half the chamber; and, one of the monks being always present to receive the gifts or tribute of the pilgrims, there is only room for three or four at a time to enter. The walls are of a greenish marble, usually called verd-antique, and this is all. It will be borne in mind that all this is in a building above ground, standing on the floor of the church.

## Sepulchre, Church Of The Holy[[@Headword:Sepulchre, Church Of The Holy]]

             See the preceding article and JERUSALEM.

## Sepulchre, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Sepulchre, Ecclesiastical]]

             a receptacle for the blessed sacrament which is reserved, among the Latins, from the mass of Maundy Thursday. There is a good example of an Eastern sepulchre in the north chapel of the Church of St. Mary, Haddenham, in Buckinghamshire, England.

## Sepulchre, Regular Canons Of[[@Headword:Sepulchre, Regular Canons Of]]

             a religious order said to have been founded by Godfrey on the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. Many of these canons journeyed into Europe; but the order was suppressed by pope Innocent VIII, and its revenues were ultimately bestowed on the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. According to Broughton, the suppression of the order did not extend to Poland.

## Sepulchre, The Easter[[@Headword:Sepulchre, The Easter]]

             a representation of the entombment of our Savior, set up in Roman Catholic churches at Easter, on the north side of the chancel, near the altar. In England, previous to the Reformation, it was most commonly a wooden erection, and placed within a recess in the wall or upon a tomb; but several churches still contain permanent stone structures that were built for the purpose, some of which are very elaborate, and are ornamented with a variety of decorations, as at Navenby and Heckington, Lincolnshire, and Hawton, Nottinghamshire, all of which are beautiful specimens of the Decorated style. Sepulchres of this kind also remain in the churches at Northwold, Norfolk; Holcombe Burnell, Devonshire, and several others. The crucifix was placed in the sepulchre with great solemnity on Good Friday, and continually watched from that time till Easter day, when it was taken out and replaced upon the altar with especial ceremony.

## Sepulveda, Juan Ginez De[[@Headword:Sepulveda, Juan Ginez De]]

             a Spanish writer, was born at. Cordova in 1491 (or 1490). He assisted cardinal Cajetan at Naples in the revision of the Greek Testament. In 1529 he went to Rome, and in 1536 was appointed chaplain and historiographer to Charles V. He is memorable for writing a Vindication of the Cruelties of the Spaniards against the Indians. Charles V suppressed the publication of  the work in his dominions, but it was published in Rome. He died at Salamanca in 1572. He was the author of various works besides the one mentioned, in particular of some Latin Letters: A Translation finom Aristotle, with Notes: — A Life of Charles V and Philip. II, printed together at Madrid (1780, 4 vols. 4to).

## Sequence[[@Headword:Sequence]]

             1. The later name of the pneuma, a melodious and varied prolongation of the Hallelujah.

2. The announcement of the Gospel of the day when taken from the middle of the Gospels, but called initium when the opening words were to follow. On the four days of Holy Week the words “The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ” replaced the ordinary sequence, or initial.

3. The name for a hymn in meter. SEE PROSE; SEE SEQUENCES.

## Sequences[[@Headword:Sequences]]

             In chanting the Graduale in the Mass it was customary to prolong the last syllables of the Hallelujah through a succession of notes without words, which were termed sequences, when considered in their combination, and jubila orjubilationes with reference to their character. They were intended to indicate that feeling had reached a point at which it was too strong for expression. The difficulty of retaining a long series of notes in the memory led to efforts for devising mnemonic helps, which eventually resulted in the adoption of suitable rhythmical language in Latin prose to fit the music — Notker Balbulus (q.v.; died 912), a monk of St. Gall, being especially distinguished in accomplishing this kind of work. The idea was suggested to him by some verses which were modulated or fitted to the series of tones in an antiphonarium belonging to a fugitive priest of Gimedia. He attempted to improve on them, and with such success that his teacher, Marcellus, a Scotchman, had his verses collected and sung by his pupils; and also persuaded Notker to dedicate his work to some prominent personage and give it to the world. Notker thus became the originator of an edifying element of worship, which was approved by the popes and speedily introduced into wider circles; and as he not only used the succession of tones already current — the mettensis major and minor, the Romana and Amoena — but also composed new series of notes, he became the creator of an elevating, melodious choir music which was  inserted in the Mass. Each piece was divided into several parts and provided with an appropriate conclusion; and, in like manner, the text, which was everywhere adapted to the melody, consisted of a number of shorter or longer sections. A poetic character was thus naturally given to the text, and such compositions were consequently called “hymns” — a term that is not misplaced when applied to those written by Notker. They were hymns of praise in which the leading features of a festival, the faithful support of the Almighty God, the Redeemer's merits, the dignity of the Blessed Virgin, etc., are fervently presented; while in their intent they were a continuation of the Hallelujah in the Gradual, though they might also be separately employed.

These sequences were introduced into use in Germany, England, France, and other countries. Notker's works became the type, and imitations in great number followed, until they were employed to edify the people at every festival; and more than one hundred were contained in the mass books. The revised Roman Missal contains but five — viz. one to the Paschal lamb, intended for Easter; one for Pentecost (Veni Sancte Spiritus); one for Corpus Christi Day (Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem, by Thomas Aquinas); one intended to glorify the Mater Dolorosa (the celebrated Stabat Mater by Jacoponus); and one for use in masses pro defunctis, Thomas de Celano's judgment hymn Dies Iroe. The last two are most unlike the early sequences, as the Hallelujah could not be chanted with them; but they are at bottom jubilee hymns like the others.

## Sequentiale[[@Headword:Sequentiale]]

             is the name given to the book in which the sequences (q.v.) were contained. It was necessary to the Church so long as a complete missal comprehending all parts of the mass was not in use; after this had been provided the sequentiale was required only by the singers.

## Sequestration[[@Headword:Sequestration]]

             a term employed to signify the separating or setting aside of a thing in controversy from the possession of both parties who contend for it. It is twofold — voluntary and necessary. Voluntary sequestration is that which is done by consent of each party; necessary is that which the judge, of his own authority, does, whether the party consents or not. Sequestration is also a kind of execution for debt on a benefice, issued by the bishop, by which the profits are to be paid to the creditor.

## Sequestration, English[[@Headword:Sequestration, English]]

             When a judgment has been obtained against a beneficed clergyman, and that judgment remains unsatisfied, the party entitled to the fruits of the judgment is obliged to levy the sum recovered by an execution. In the first instance he issues the ordinary writ of execution, called a fieri facias, to which all persons are subject, directing the sheriff to levy the amount upon the goods and chattels of the defaulter. If the sheriff, is able to do so, the amount is levied, and there is an end of. the matter; if, on the other hand, he cannot find goods and chattels sufficient, he returns the writ to the court, stating his inability, and certifying that the individual has a rectory or other ecclesiastical benefice, as the case may be, in the county. Upon this return a writ of sequestration, called either a levari facias de bonis ecclesiasticis, or a sequestrari facias, according to the mode in which it is drawn up, issues to the bishop of the diocese, requiring him to levy the amount upon the ecclesiastical goods of the clergyman. Upon this writ the bishop or his officer makes out a sequestration, directed to the church wardens or persons named by the bishop, or, upon proper security, to persons named by the party who issues the writ, requiring them to sequestrate the tithes and other profits of the benefice; which sequestration should be forthwith published, not by reading it in church during divine service (a ceremony which is, in our opinion, abolished by the second section of 7 William IV, and 1 Victoria, c. 45), but by affixing a notice of its contents at or near the church door before the commencement of the service, as required by that statute. The sequestration is a continuing charge upon the benefice, and the bishop may be called upon from time to time to return to the court an account of what has been levied under it. The court has the same power over the bishop that it has over a sheriff in respect of ordinary writs of execution; and if the bishop is negligent in the performance of his duty, or returns an untrue account of the proceedings under the writ, he is liable, in the same way as the sheriff is liable, to an action at the suit of the party damnified thereby. Sequestration is also a process of the ecclesiastical courts. When a benefice is full, the profits may be sequestered if the incumbent neglects his cure; and if there be a vacancy, the profits are to be sequestered, and to be applied so far as necessary in providing for the service of the cure during the vacancy, the successor being entitled to the surplus.

## Serah[[@Headword:Serah]]

             (Heb. Se'rach, שֵׂרִה, perhaps overflow; Sept. in Genesis Σάρα [v.r. Σορέ], but in Chronicles Σαραί [v.r. Σαάρ]; also written “Sarah” [q.v.] in Num 26:46), the daughter of Asher, son of Jacob (Gen 46:17; Num 26:46; 1Ch 7:30). B.C. cir. 1864. The mention of a female in a list of this kind, in which no others of her sex are named, and contrary to the usual practice of the Jews, seems to indicate something extraordinary in connection with her history or circumstances. This has sufficed to excite the ever active imaginations of the rabbins; and the Jews fable that she was very remarkable for piety and virtue, and was therefore privileged to be the first person to tell Jacob that his son Joseph was still living (Gen 45:26), on which account she was translated alive (like Enoch) to paradise, where, according to the ancient book Zohar, are four mansions or palaces, each presided over by an illustrious woman, viz. Sarah, daughter of Asher, the daughter of Pharaoh who brought up Moses; Jochebed, mother of Moses; and Deborah the prophetess.

## Seraiah[[@Headword:Seraiah]]

             (Heb. Serayah', שְׂרָיָה[once in the prolonged form, Seraya'hu, שְׂרָיָהוּ, Jer 36:26], warrior of Jehovah; Sept. Σαραίας or Σεραϊvα, but with many v.r.), the proper name of eight men.

1. Second named son of Kenaz, and father of a Joab who was head of a family of the tribe of Judah in the valley of the Charashim (1Ch 4:13-14). B.C. cir. 1560.

2. The scribe or secretary of David (2Sa 8:17). B.C. cir. 1015. This person's name is in other places corrupted into Sheya', שְׁיָא; A.V. “Sheva” (2Sa 20:25), “Shisha,” שֵׁישִׁא(1Ki 4:3), and “Shavsha,”, שִׁוְשָׁא(1Ch 18:16).

3. Son of Asiel and father of Josibiah of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:35). B.C. ante 720.

4. The son of Azriel, and one of the persons charged with the apprehension of Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer 36:26). B.C. 606.

5. The son of Neriah and brother of Baruch (Jer 51:59; Jer 51:61). He held a high office in the court of king Zedekiah, the nature of which is  somewhat uncertain. In the A.V. we have, “This Seraiah was a quiet prince,” שִׂר מְנוּחָה, which, according to Kimchi, means a chamberlain, or one who attended the king when he retired to rest (i.e. prince of rest); but better, perhaps, according to Gesenius, “chief of the quarters” for the king and his army, that is, quartermaster-general, after the meaning of menuchah as a halting place of an army (Num 10:33). The suggestion of Maurer, adopted by Hitzig, has more to commend it, that he was an officer who took charge of the royal caravan on its march, and fixed the place where it should halt. Hiller (Onomast.) says Seraiah was prince of Menuchah, a place on the borders of Judah and Dan, elsewhere called Manahath. This Seraiah was sent by Zedekiah on an embassy to Babylon, probably to render his submission to that monarch, about four years before the fall of Jerusalem. B.C. 594. He was charged by Jeremiah to communicate to the Jews already in exile a book in which the prophet had written out his prediction of all the evil that should come upon Babylon (Jer 51:60-64). It is not stated how Seraiah acquitted himself of his task; but that he accepted it at all shows such respect for the. prophet as may allow us to conclude that he would not neglect the duty which it imposed.

6. The high priest at the time that Jerusalem was taken by the Chaldaeans. B.C. 588. He was sent prisoner, to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, who put him to death (2Ki 25:18; 1Ch 6:14; Jer 52:24; Ezr 7:1).

7. The son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, and one of those to whom Gedaliah promised security (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8). B.C. 587.

8. A priest, the son of Hilkiah, who returned from exile (Ezr 2:2 Neh 10:2; Neh 11:11; Neh 12:1; Neh 12:12). He is called Azariah (q.v.) in Neh 7:7. B.C. 536.

## Seraphic Doctor[[@Headword:Seraphic Doctor]]

             SEE BONAVENTURA.

## Seraphic Hymn[[@Headword:Seraphic Hymn]]

             the Ter-sanctus, or “Holy, holy, holy,” which concludes the preface in the communion service. Its basis is found in Isa 6:3. The hymn itself  occurs in every ancient liturgy. It must not be confounded with the Trisagion (q.v.).

## Seraphim[[@Headword:Seraphim]]

             (Heb. Seraphim', שְׂרָפַים; Sept. Σεραφίμ, or Seraphs; the plural of the word שָׂרָ, saraph), celestial beings described in Isa 6:2-6 as an order of angels or ministers of God, who stand around his throne, having each six wings, and also hands and feet, and praising God with their voices. They were therefore of human form, and, like the Cherubim, furnished with wings as the swift messengers of God. Some have indeed identified the Cherubim and Seraphim as the same beings, but under names descriptive of different qualities: Seraphim denoting the burning and dazzling appearance of the beings elsewhere described as Cherubim.

It would be difficult either to prove or disprove this; but there are differences between the Cherubim of Ezekiel and the Seraphim of Isaiah which it does not appear easy to reconcile. The “living creatures” of the former prophet had four wings; the “Seraphim” of the latter, six; and while the Cherubim had four faces, the Seraphim had but one (comp. Isa 6:2-3; Eze 1:5-12). If the figures were in all cases purely symbolical, the difference does not signify (see Hendewerk, De Seraph. et Cherub. non Diversis [Reg. 1836]). SEE CHERUBIM.

There is much symbolical force and propriety in the attitude in which the Seraphim are described as standing, while two of their wings were kept ready for instant flight in the service of God; with two others they hid their face to express their unworthiness to look upon the Divine Majesty (see Exo 3:6; 1Ki 19:13; comp. Plutarch, Quoest. Romans vol. 10), and with two others they covered their feet, or the whole of the lower part of their bodies — a practice which still prevails in the East when persons appear in a monarch's presence (see Lowth, ad loc.). Their occupation was twofold — to celebrate the praises of Jehovah's holiness and power (Isa 6:3), and to act as the medium of communication between heaven and earth (Isa 6:6). From their antiphonal chant (“one cried unto another”) we may conceive them to have been ranged in opposite rows on each side of the throne. As the Seraphim are nowhere else mentioned in the Bible, our conceptions of their appearance must be restricted to the above particulars, aided by such uncertain light as etymology and analogy will supply. We may observe that the idea of a winged human figure was not peculiar to the Hebrews: among the sculptures found at Mourghaub, in Persia, we meet  with a representation of a man with two pairs of wings springing from the shoulders and extending, the one pair upwards, the other downwards, so as to admit of covering the head and the feet (Vaux, Nin. and Persep. p. 322).

The wings in this instance imply deification; for speed and ease of motion stand, in man's imagination, among the most prominent tokens of divinity. The meaning of the word “seraph” is extremely doubtful; the only word which resembles it in the current Hebrew is saraph, שָׂרִ, “to burn,” whence the idea of brilliancy has been extracted. Such a sense would harmonize with other descriptions of celestial beings (e.g. Eze 1:13; Mat 28:3); but it is objected that the Hebrew term never bears this secondary sense. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1341) connects it with an Arabic term signifying high or exalted, and this may be regarded as the generally received etymology; but the absence of any cognate Hebrew term is certainly worthy of remark. It may be seen in the article SERPENT SEE SERPENT that a species of serpent was called saraph, and this has led some to conceive that the Seraphim were a kind of basilisk-headed Cherubim (Bauer, Theolog. A.T. p. 189); or else that they were animal forms with serpent's heads, such as we find figured in the ancient temples of Thebes (Gesen. Comment. in Jes.). Hitzig and others identify the Seraphim with the Egyptian Serapis; for although it is true that the worship of Serapis was not introduced into Egypt till the time of the Ptolemies (Wilkinson, Anc. AEgypt. 4, 360 s. q.), it is known that this was but a modification of the more ancient worship of Kneph, who was figured under the form of a serpent of the same kind, the head of which afterwards formed the crest of Serapis. But we can hardly conceive that the Hebrews would have borrowed their imagery from such a source. Knobel's conjecture that Seraphim is merely a false reading for sharathim (שָׁרָתָים), “ministers,” is ingenious, but the latter word is not Hebrew. See the Studien und Kritiken, 1844, 2, 454. SEE ANGEL; SEE CHERUB; SEE LIVING CREATURE; SEE TERAPHIM.

## Seraphina[[@Headword:Seraphina]]

             a keyed wind instrument, the tones of which are produced by the play of wind upon metallic reeds, as in the accordion. It consists, like the organ, of a keyboard, wind chest, and bellows.

## Serapion[[@Headword:Serapion]]

             bishop of Thumeos, in Egypt, called Scholasticus because of his eloquence and dialectical keenness, is said by Rufinus to have been abbot of numerous monasteries, and to have exercised rule over some ten thousand hermits, whom he employed in reaping at harvest time, in order that their earnings might aid in supporting impoverished Christians about Alexandria. Antonius and Athanasius are reported to have been his intimate friends and counselors, the latter having secured his elevation to the bishopric. In 348 Serapion attended the Council of Sardica, and helped to procure the acquittal of Athanasius from the charges under which he lay; and when the latter had again fallen under the displeasure of the emperor Constantius, Serapion was one of the five bishops who were delegated to attempt his restoration to favor. He died A.D. 358. See Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 23.

Chrysostom's deacon at Constantinople, under Honorius and Arcadius, was another Serapion, who aided that father ill enforcing a thorough discipline among the clergy, of whom he said that only the utmost strictness could secure their improvement. The clergy were exasperated by his words and actions, and sought to excite the opposition of the populace against both reformers, but in vain; and Chrysostom ultimately made Serapion bishop of Heraclea in Thrace.

## Serapion (2)[[@Headword:Serapion (2)]]

             By way of supplement we add the following bearers of that name: (1), eighth bishop of Antioch, successor of Maximus, and opponent of the Montanists; mentioned by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 5:19, 22; (2), a martyr by the name of Serapion is mentioned by Eusebius, 4:41, said to have suffered martyrdom under Decius at Alexandria; (3), a third one by the same name is mentioned by Eusebius, 4:44, as belonging to the lapsi (q.v.); (4), another Serapion is mentioned by Cassian in Collat. 10:2, See Sozom. 8:11; Schrockh, 8:451; Gieseler, 1:2, 244; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Serapis[[@Headword:Serapis]]

             In Egyptian mythology, was a highly venerated god of Alexandria, whose origin was rather Grecian, however, than Egyptian. He was the Greek god of the underworld — Pluto, the giver of blessings on whose head was placed a bushel, to denote that the ruler of the underworld causes man's nourishment to spring from the earth. He was transferred to Alexandria in the time of the Ptolemies, and unwillingly accepted by the inhabitants; but eventually forty-two temples of Serapis were enumerated in Egypt. The following fable in relation to his importation was in circulation: A beautiful youth appeared to Ptolemy I in a dream, and commanded the king to bring his statue from Sinope, revealing, at the same time, that he was Serapis, the god who gives blessings or curses. After the surmounting of many difficulties, the enterprise was at length accomplished — the god contributing to that result by going from his temple to the ship. The city of  Alexandria erected to him a temple in the place Rhacotis. Political reasons may have determined this transfer from Asia to Egypt — e.g. the importance of making the new capital the central seat of religion; and this latter end was completely realized, inasmuch as Serapis took the place of Osiris, with the exception that he was never conceived of as suffering and dying. He was regarded as consort to Isis, as the sun and Nile god, and as the supreme god. The sick, also, invoked his aid, with the result that he was, in the end, confounded with AEsculapius. A marble bust in the Vatican represents him as a bearded, earnest man, with rays surrounding, and a grain measure surmounting, his head.

## Serarius, Nicholas[[@Headword:Serarius, Nicholas]]

             a learned Jesuit and commentator on the Scriptures, was born in, 1555 at Rambervillers, in Lorraine. After studying the languages, he taught ethics, philosophy, and theology at Würzburg and Mentz, in which last city he died, May 20, 1610, leaving many works, of which the following are the principal: De Pharisoeorum, Sadducoeorum, et Essenorum Sectis (Franeker, 1603; Mentz, 1604): — Commentarius in Libros Jos., Jud., Ruth., Reg., et Paralip. (ibid. 1609-10, 2 pts. fol.): — Prolegomena Biblica (ibid. 1612): — Rabbini et Hierodes (ibid.): — Opuscula Theologica (3 tom. fol.): — and others which are collected in 16 vols. fol. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 316; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur.

## Sered[[@Headword:Sered]]

             (Heb. id. סֶרֶד, fear; Sept. Σέρεδ v.r. Σαρέδ), the first named of three sons of Zebulon (Gen 46:14), and head of the family of the Sardites (Num 26:26). B.C. cir. 1864.

## Serestus[[@Headword:Serestus]]

             in Greek mythology, was a companion of AEneas, who gathered up the armor of Haemonides, the priest of Apollo whom Euneas had slain, and who erected a column of victory to Mars Gradivus.

## Serge[[@Headword:Serge]]

             (Lat. cereus, a wax taper). Those in a low basin were called mortars, and burned during matins at the choir door. Lyndwood says that in very many churches the two (i.e. on the altar) were furnished by the curate.

## Sergeant[[@Headword:Sergeant]]

             (ῥαβδοῦχος, literally rod-holder, Act 16:35), properly a Roman lictor, the public servant who bore a bundle of rods before the magistrates of cities and colonies as insignia of their office, and who executed the sentences which they pronounced.

## Sergeant, John[[@Headword:Sergeant, John]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Newark, N.J., in 1710. He graduated at Yale College in 1729, and was appointed tutor in 1731. The Commissioners for Indian Affairs having found the Indians living at Skatekook and Unahktukook, on the Housatonic River, disposed to receive a missionary, chose Mr. Sergeant for that position; and he went in October, 1734, to examine his field of labor. In August, 1735, he was ordained at Deerfield, and labored with the Indians until his death, July 27, 1749. He translated into the native language parts of the Old and all the New Test. excepting the book of Revelation. During his life one hundred and twenty- nine savages were baptized, and forty-two became members of the Church. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 388.

## Sergestus[[@Headword:Sergestus]]

             in Grecian mythology, was a companion of AEneas, who is named in connection with the sailing match instituted by AEneas. His vessel stuck fast on a rock; but he was nevertheless rewarded with the gift of a female slave from the hero (Virgil, L'Eneid, 1, 510; 5, 121, etc.).

## Sergiots[[@Headword:Sergiots]]

             (SERGIETS, or SERGISTS), a section of the Paulicians who held in veneration the memory and writings of one Sergius, who lived at the beginning of the 9th century. His efforts led to a division — his followers being known as Sergiots, and his opponents Baanites, after the name of their leader, Baanes. SEE PAULICIANS.

## Sergius[[@Headword:Sergius]]

             the name of several Roman Catholic pontiffs.

I, pope from 687 to 701, contemporary with the Venerable Bede, was born at Antioch and reared at Palermo. The most noteworthy event of his administration was a dispute with the Eastern Church, which ultimately led to the separation of the East from the West. The emperor Justinian II had convoked an ecumenical council (Concilium Quinsextum) at Constantinople, and legates were sent to attend it by Sergius, who signed its decrees; but, as six decrees had been passed which were contrary to the practice of Rome (e.g. omitting nearly all the Latin councils and papal decretals from the list of authentic sources of Church law, acknowledging  the validity of the whole eighty-five canones apostolici, denouncing the celibacy of the clergy, prohibiting fasting on Saturdays during Quadragesima, making the patriarch of Constantinople equal to the pope, etc.), the pope forbade their promulgation. The emperor ordered the imprisonment of the refractory pope, but was himself dethroned after a revolt in his army. Rome continued to reject this council, and this occasioned the disputes which subsequently divided the Church. Sergius succeeded, on the other hand, in restoring the communion with Rome of the churches which had been alienated through the Controversy of the Three Chapters. The other prominent incidents of his pontificate were the founding of the bishopric of Utrecht by Willibrod, and the issuing of an ordinance by which the Agnus Dei was required to be sung three times before the communion in the service of the mass. Oct. 9 was set apart in commemoration of this pope.

II, pope from 844 to 847. He contributed materially to the exaltation of the papacy by daring to disregard the requirement of seeking the confirmation of his accession and consecration by the civil power, and by maintaining his position in the face of the protest raised by the emperor Lothaire against this infraction of the law of the realm. The controversy of Paschasius Radbertus respecting the Lord's supper was begun in the reign of this pope.

III, pope from 904 to 911, who owed his elevation to the influence of the shameless Theodora and her no less shameless daughters Marozia and Theodora, the actual rulers of the time in Rome. He was grossly immoral, and lived in licentious relations with Marozia, who bore him several children, among them the future pope John XI, though the latter statement is denied by many respectable authorities. The only noteworthy events of his pontificate were his approval of the fourth marriage of the emperor Leo Philosophus, which a subsequent synod at Constantinople (920) condemned, and the renewed introduction of the Benedictine rule at Clugny by the abbot Berno.

IV, pope from 1009 to 1012, previously bishop of Alba. With him began the custom that the popes should adopt a new name on assuming the tiara. The story has it that Sergius was formerly called Bocca di Porco, i.e. swine's snout. Being ashamed of the name, he assumed that of Sergius, and thus introduced a custom which has been followed by all subsequent popes.

## Sergius Paulus[[@Headword:Sergius Paulus]]

             (Graecized Σέργιος Παῦλος, a Latin name), a Roman proconsul in command at Cyprus who was converted by the preaching of Paul and  Barnabas (Act 13:7). A.D. 44. Sergius is described by the evangelist as a” discreet” or” intelligent” man; by which we are probably to understand that he was a man of large and liberal views, and of an inquiring turn of mind. Hence he had entertained Elymas, and hence also he became curious to hear the new doctrine which the apostle brought to the island. The strongest minds at that period were drawn with a singular fascination to the occult studies of the East; and the ascendency which Luke represents the “sorcerer” as having gained over Sergius illustrates a characteristic feature of the times. For other examples of a similar character, see Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1, 177 sq. But Sergius was not effectually or long deceived by the arts of the impostor; for, on becoming acquainted with the apostle, he examined at once the claims of the Gospel, and yielded his mind to the evidence of its truth. Nothing of his history subsequent to his conversion is known from Scripture. There is no reason to suppose that he abandoned his post as governor of Cyprus; but the legends assert that he did so, and followed Paul; and that eventually he went with the apostle into Spain, and was left by him at Narbonne, in France, of which he became the bishop, and died there.

The title (inaccurately rendered “deputy” [q.v.]) given to this functionary exhibits one of those minute accuracies which, apart from their inspiration, would substantiate the sacred book as a genuine and contemporary record. Cyprus was originally a proetorian province (στρατηγική), and not proconsular; but it was left by Augustus under the senate, and hence was governed by a proconsul (ἀνθύπατος), as stated by the evangelist (Act 13:6; Act 13:8; Act 13:12; see Dion Cass. 54, 523; Kuinol, on Act 13:7. For the value of this attestation to Luke's accuracy, see Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel Narrative, 1, 32 sq.). Coins, too, are still extant on which this very title, ascribed in the Acts to Sergius Paulus, occurs as the title of the Roman governors of Cyprus (see Akerman, Numismatic Illustrations, p. 41; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1, 176, 187). SEE CYPRUS.

## Sergius, St[[@Headword:Sergius, St]]

             Several saints and martyrs occur who bear this name.

1. One is usually associated with a martyr named Bacchus, like himself a native of Rome. It is related that they were accused of being Christians, and exiled by the emperor Maximian. When nothing could  induce them to sacrifice to idols, Bacchus was tortured to death and his body thrown to wild beasts, who, however, would not harm it. Sergius was then taken to Rosaph, in Syria, and tortured, but comforted by an apparition of Bacchus, while his wounds were healed by an angel. He was beheaded in 290; and the emperor Justinian is credited with having changed the name of Rosaph to Sergiopolis, while the martyr's relics were preserved in the church of that town. Oct. 7 was set apart for the commemoration of Sergius and Bacchus.

2. Another Sergius, whose day occurs on Jan. 23, is said to have been martyred under Diocletian; and a third was a monk in the Convent of Mar Saba, in Palestine, and, together with other monks, was attacked and slain by robbers in the year 797. His day is on March 30.

3. Sergius, surnamed the Confessor, was born at Constantinople, lived in the former half of the 9th century, and wrote De Rebus in Re Publica et Ecclesia Gestis — a history of the iconoclastic controversy from the Romish point of view, which embraced the period from Constantine Copronymus to Michael II Balbus, but is now lost. He was taken prisoner while defending the worship of images (according to some statements, in the reign of Leo the Isaurian; according to others, in that of Theophilus), deprived of his goods, and exiled; for which reason Photius termed him the Confessor. The saints' calendar of the Greek Church assigns May 13 as his day. See Ausführl. Heiligen- Lexikon nebst beigefigt. Heil.-Kalender (Cologne and Frankfort, 1719), p. 2006 sq.

## Seripandi, Girolamo[[@Headword:Seripandi, Girolamo]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Naples, May 6, 1493. On the death of his father, he entered the order of the Augustines, in 1507, and made such rapid progress in study that he was appointed reader at Sienna in 1515, professor of theology at Bologna in 1517, and vicar-general in 1523. He then gave himself to preaching with great success; but in 1539 he was elected general of his order, and in 1547 was reelected. He declined the bishopric of Aquilas in 1551; but was drawn from retirement. by a mission from the city of Naples to the emperor in 1554, whereupon he was appointed archbishop of Salerno. In 1561 he was made cardinal, and designated as one of the papal legates to the Council of Trent, where he died, March 17, 1563, worn out with toil. His character was one of singular piety, benevolence, and modesty. He wrote a number of ecclesiastical works and sermons, besides a commentary on Romans and Galatians. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Serjeants[[@Headword:Serjeants]]

             servants in monastic offices: those of the church, the guest house, refectory, and infirmary were subordinate officers. The first was the bell ringer, except for high mass, vespers, matins, and obits. The candle lighter, except round the high altar (he also laid out the vestments for the celebrant at the high altar), was the chandler, who made all the wax candles, and assisted the subsacrist in baking the hosts. The serjeant of the infirmary was the barber, and, with the clerk and cook, waited on the monks who were sick or aged.

## Sermon[[@Headword:Sermon]]

             (Lat. sermo, “a discourse”), a discourse delivered in public religious services. In the early Church sermons were called tractates (expository), disputations (argumentative and controversial), allocutions, and by the Greeks διδασκαλίαι (doctrinal), or homilies (familiar addresses). The place of the sermon in the service was immediately after the reading of the psalms and lessons out of the Scriptures, before the catechumens were dismissed. The person whose duty it was to deliver the sermon was the bishop, when he was present, or one of his presbyters in any church from which he was absent: then it was considered as the bishop preaching by proxy. In some cases a special commission was given to a layman to deliver a sermon, and then he might do it by the authority of the bishop's  commission for that time. This applied to the public services in the churches, and was not necessary when laymen did it in a private way as catechists in their catechetic schools, as at Alexandria and elsewhere. Sometimes it happened that two or three sermons would be preached in the same assembly, first by the presbyters and then by the bishop. Or, if more than one bishop were present, several of them would preach one after another, reserving the last place for the most honorable person. In some places sermons were preached every day, especially in Lent and the festival days of Easter. In larger towns and cities, it seems probable that two sermons were delivered on Sunday; but this custom did not prevail in the country parishes.

The sermon was either, 1, an exposition of Scripture; 2, a panegyrical discourse upon some saint or martyr; 3, a sermon upon some particular time, occasion, festival; or, 4, a sermon upon a particular doctrine, against heresy, or to recommend the practice of virtue. Al of these have examples in the sermons of Chrysostom and Augustine. Origen appears to have been the first to deliver his sermons extempore, it having been the general practice to carefully compose and write them beforehand. It was customary to introduce the sermon with a short prayer for divine assistance for the preacher and his hearers; and sometimes, if occasion required, this prayer was said in the middle of the discourse. It was usual in many places, before beginning the sermon, for the preacher to use the common salutation Pax vobis, “Peace be unto you,” or “The Lord be with you.” There was no general rule as to the length of the sermon, that being doubtless determined by the circumstances of the occasion, e.g. whether one or more sermons were to be delivered. Scarcely any of them would take an hour in delivery, and many of them not more than half that time. It was not considered, by many in the ancient Church, to be improper for the preacher to deliver a sermon prepared by another person, they holding that it is “lawful for a man to preach the compositions of more eloquent men, provided he compose his own life answerable to God's Word.” The sermon was always concluded with a doxology to the Holy Trinity. The posture of preacher and hearers was generally the reverse of that prevalent now, for then the preacher sat and his hearers stood. It was a peculiar custom in the African Church, when the preacher chanced to cite some remarkable text of Scripture in the middle of his sermon, for the people to join with him in repeating the remainder of it. This was, no doubt, done to encourage the people to hear, read, and remember the Scriptures. It was a very general custom for the people to show their appreciation of the sermon by public applause, manifested by words (as “orthodox”), or signs,  or clapping of hands. We notice also the custom, prevailing among many ancient hearers, of writing down the sermons, word for word, as they were delivered, and by this means some extempore discourses were handed down to posterity. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. p. 705 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archoeol. s.v.

## Sermon On The Mount[[@Headword:Sermon On The Mount]]

             the common name of a discourse delivered by Jesus to his disciples and a multitude on a mountain near Capernaum, A.D. 27, perhaps in May, early in the second year of his public ministry. It is a complete system of the moral law, in the spiritual form which it assumes under the Christian dispensation, and has deservedly been made the subject of much study and learned exposition (Matthew 5, 6, 7; Luk 6:20 sq. Comp. Mar 9:47 sq.; Mat 18:8-9). The best complete exposition is certainly that of Tholuck, Bergpredig. (4th ed. 1856). An earlier edition has been translated into English (1843, 2 vols.). See also Valenti, Commentar ib. d. Bergpred. (Basel, 1849); Mackintyre, Expos. of the Sermon on the Mount (Lond. 1854); Pitman, Comment. on the Sermon on the Mount (ibid. 1852); Todd, id. (ibid. 1856); Trench, Expos. of the Sermon on the Mount (ibid. 1851); and the literature cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 32; and Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 121. SEE JESUS.

## Sermon On The Mount, The, And The Talmud[[@Headword:Sermon On The Mount, The, And The Talmud]]

             In the essay prepared by the late E. Deutsch entitled The Talmud, among other daring statements we find also the following: “We need not urge the priority of the Talmud to the New Test.... To assume that the Talmud has borrowed from the New Test. would be like assuming that Sanskrit sprang from Latin, or that French was developed from the Norman words found in English.” Similar is the remark of Rénan: “It is sometimes supposed that, the compilation of the Talmud being posterior to that of the Gospels, appropriations might have been made by the Jewish compilers from the Christian morality. But that is inadmissible; there was a wall of separation between the Church and the synagogue” (Life of Jesus, p. 108). Statements like these have been, and will be, taken as true, especially by those who have not taken the pains of examining for themselves; but sober-minded scholars have arrived at different results. Says Mr. Farrar: “Some excellent maxims — even some close parallels to the utterances of Christ may be quoted, of course, from the Talmud, where they lie imbedded like pearls in  ‘a sea' of obscurity and mud. It seems to me indisputable, and a matter which every one can now verify for himself, that these are amazingly few, considering the vast bulk of national literature from which they are drawn. And, after all, who shall prove to us that these sayings were always uttered by the rabbins to whom they are attributed? Who will supply us with the faintest approach to a proof that, when not founded on the Old Test., they were not directly or indirectly due to Christian influence or Christian thought?” (Life of Christ, 2, 486.) According to our judgment, there is only one way of arriving at a just estimate as to which copied, and this is to give the parallel passage of the Talmud with the author who uttered the sentence, and the time in which he lived. The date of the author must settle the question once for all, and this is our purpose in the sequel.

Mat 5:3 :

“Blessed are the poor in spirit.” — Sanhedrin fol. 43 b: “R. Joshua en-Levi [A.D. 219-2191 said, Behold, how acceptable before the Lord are the humble. While the temple stood, meat offerings and sacrifices were offered in expiation for sins committed; but an humble spirit, such a one as immolates the desires of the flesh and the inclination of the heart on the altar of his duty to his God, is accepted in place of sacrifices, as the psalmist says (51:19), ‘The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit'” (comp. Sotah, fol. 5).

Mat 5:7 :

“Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.” — Sabbath, fol.151 b: “R. Gamaliel II [A.D. 80-118] said, He who is merciful towards his fellow creatures shall receive mercy from heaven above.”

Mat 5:10 :

“Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake,” etc. — Baba Kamma, fol. 93 a: “Rabbi Abbahu [A.D. 279-320] said, Be rather one of the persecuted than of the persecutors.”

Mat 5:19 :

“Whosoever, therefore, shall break one,” etc. Pirke Aboth, 2, 1: “Rabbi [i.e. Judah hak-Kodesh, d. A.D. 190] said, Be equally attentive to the light and to the weighty commandments.”

Mat 5:22 :

“But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother,” etc. — Sanhedrim fol. 58 b: “Resh Lakish [A.D. 219-280] said, Whosoever lifts up his hand against his neighbor, though he do not strike him, is called an offender and sinner.”

Mat 5:24 :

“Leave thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled,” etc. — Mishna, Yoma, 8, 9 “R. Eleazar ben-Azariah [d. A.D. 82] says, The transgression which a man commits against God, the day of atonement expiates; but the transgression which he commits against his neighbor it does not expiate, unless hp has satisfied his neighbor.”

Mat 5:28 :

“But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, committeth adultery,” etc. — Berachoth, fol. 24 a: “Rabbi Shesheth [flourished cir. A.D. 285] says, Whosoever looketh on the little finger of a woman with a lustful eye is considered as having committed adultery.”

Mat 5:40 :

“And take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.” — Baba Kamma, fol. 92, Colossians 2 : “Rabba [A.D. 320-363] said to Ralbba the son of Mar, How is that popular saying? — If any one ask for thy ass, give him the saddle also.”

Mat 5:44 :

“Bless them that curse you.” — Sanhedrin, fol. 48 b and 49 a: “R. Jehudah [d. A.D. 190] said, Be rather of the accursed than of those that curse.”

Mat 6:1 :

“Take heed that ye do not your alms before men to be seen of them.” — Chagiga, fol. 5, Colossians 1 : “Rabbi Yanai [cir. A.D. 120] said to a man who gave alms in such a public manner, You had better not given him anything; in the way you gave it to him you must have hurt his feelings.”

Mat 6:26 :

“Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not,” etc. — Kiddushin, fol. 82, Colossians 2 : “R. Simon ben-Eleazar [who lived in the 3d century A.D.]  said, Hast thou ever seen a beast or a bird that followed a trade? and yet they are fed without toil. But these were only created to minister to me, while I was created to minister to my Maker. Was it not right, then, that I should be supported without toil? But I have marred my work and forfeited my support.”

Mat 7:2 :

“With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.” — Sanhedrin, fol. 100, Colossians 1 : “Rabbi Meir [q.v.] said, With what measure man metes it shall be measured to him from heaven.”

Mat 7:4 :

“Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye,” etc. — Baba Bathra, fol.15, Colossians 2 : “R. Jochan an [A.D. 199-279], surnamed Bar-Nap'ha, said, Do they say, Take the splinter out of thine eye, he will answer, Remove the beam out of thine own eye.”

It is strange that, concerning this Talmudic quotation (in the Hebraica, N.Y., March 1879), a rabbi should have said, The familiar proverb in Matthew and Luk 6:42 ... is, as is well known (sic!), like most sentences of that kind in the New Test., borrowed from contemporaneous Jewish literature.” But the chronological date of the author of that sentence is the best proof for the superficiality of statements made by men who, for the sake of the Talmud, try to disparage the New Test. The New Test. sentence is also illustrated in Erachin, fol. 16, Colossians 2, where R. Tarphon [cir. A.D. 120] says, “It would greatly astonish me if there could be found any one in this age who would receive an admonition. If he be admonished to take the splinter out of his eye, he would answer, Take the beam out of thine own.”

Mat 7:5 :

“Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see,” etc. — In Baba Metsia, fol. 107, Colossians 2, and Baba Bathra, fol. 60, Colossians 2, we read: “Resh Lakish [cir. A.D. 275] said, What is the meaning of the passage ‘Examine yourself and search?' (Zep 2:1). He who will reprove others must himself be pure and spotless.” Mat 7:12 : “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.” Sabbath, fol. 31, Colossians 1 : “Hillel [q.v.] said, תעביד זו היא  כל התורה כולה ואידפִררושה הוא דעלסִני לחברלִא: i.e. “Whatever you should not like to be done unto you, do not to others. This is the essence of the divine law; all the rest is commentary only.”

Since this sentence of Hillel has become the hobby of modern Jewish Talmudists, as Deutsch and others, and of Christian writers who, like Rénan, follow their Jewish leaders unthinkingly, we must speak a few words concerning it. In his lectures on Judaism and its History, the late rabbi Geiger, of Berlin, boldly affirms that Jesus was a Pharisee and a follower of Hillel, who never gave utterance to a new idea (“Einen neuen Gedanken sprach er keinesweges aus”). “Hillel,” he says, “was a genuine reformer;” but wherein this reformation consisted Dr. Geiger did not tell. It was not necessary, for Geiger's attempt was to disparage Jesus; and the idea that Hillel was a genuine reformer, and Jesus merely an imitator, must have been as striking as the smoke utterance of the Pythian oracle.

As to Rénan and Deutsch, we will quote the remark of Dr. Liddon in his Bampton Lectures for 1866 (N.Y. 1869, 4th ed. p. 107): “Rénan suggests, not without some hesitation, that Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus” (“Hillel fut le vrai maitre de Jesus, s'il est permis de parler de maitre quand il s'agit d'une si haute originalite” [ Vie de Jesus, p. 35]). “As an instance,” says Dr. Liddon (in a footnote), “of our Lord's real independence of Hillel, a single example may suffice. A recent writer on the Talmud gives the following story: ‘One day a heathen went to Shammal, the head of the rival academy, and asked him, mockingly, to convert him to the law while he stood on one leg. The irate master turned him from the door. He then went to Hillel, who gave him that reply — since so widely propagated — Do not unto another, etc. This is the whole law; the rest is merely commentary'” (Literary Remains [N.Y. 1874], p. 317). The writer in the Quarterly Review (October, 1867, p. 441, art. “The Talmud”) appears to assume the identity of Hillel's saying with the precept of our blessed Lord (Mat 7:12; Luk 6:31). Yet, in truth, how wide is the interval between the merely negative rule of the Jewish president and the positive precept — ὅσα ἃν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οί ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς — of the Divine Master.”

But whatever may be said of the precept (Mat 7:12) as to its being considered as a fresh discovery in moral science, most certainly Hillel cannot claim the merit of originality in respect to it. It existed long before his time. In the Apocryphal book Tobit we read words like those which he  used (4, 15): ὅ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσης (“Do that to no man which thou hatest”)' and in Ecclesiastes 31:15: νόει τὰ τοῦ πλησίου ἐκ σεαυτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντι πράγματι διανοοῦ (i.e. “Judge of the disposition of thy neighbor by thyself”). Ancient history bears ample testimony to the existence of this maxim among the ancient Greeks long before the time of Hillel. Thus Diogenes Laertius relates that Aristotle, being asked how we ought to carry ourselves to our friends, answered, “As we wish they would carry themselves to us.” Isocrates, who lived four hundred years before the publication of the Gospel, said: ἃ πάσχοντες ὑφ᾿ ἑτέρων ὀργίσεσθε ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε — i.e. “We must not do to others that which would cause anger if it were done to ourselves.” In its negative form the golden rule of our Savior, which Locke designates as the foundation of all social virtue, is also found among the sayings of Confucius: “What you do not wish done to yourselves, do not do to others;” or, as in the Conversations (bk. 15, ch. 23), where it appears condensed like a telegram: Ki su pok iuk uk sic u ing — i.e. “Self what not wish, not do to man.”

Mat 7:24-27 :

“Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock,” etc. — Pirke Aboth, 3, 17: “R. Eliezer ben-Azariah [d. A.D. 82] said, He whose knowledge surpasses his good deeds may be compared to a tree with many branches and a scanty root — every wind shakes and uproots it. But he whose good deeds excel his knowledge may be compared to a tree with a few branches and strong roots: if all the hurricanes in the world should come and storm against it, they could not move it from its place.”

Aboth di R. Nathan, c. 24, Elisha ben-Abuyah [cir. A.D. 138] said: “A man who studies the law, and acts in accordance with its commandments, is likened unto a man who builds a house the foundation of which is made of freestone, and the superstructure of bricks. Storm and flood cannot injure the house. But he who studies the law, but is destitute of good actions, is likened unto the man who builds the foundation of his house of brick and mortar and raises the upper stories with solid stone. The flood will soon undermine and overturn the house.” From these parallels, which could be, perhaps, somewhat increased, the impartial critic will make his own inferences. From the nature of the case, it would be impossible to give a parallel to each sentence of the Sermon on the Mount; for, in the first  place, it contains many allusions to the manner in which Pharisaism discharged the religious duties, and, in the second place, our aim was to give the authority of the parallel passage in order to fix the chronology. The date added to each rabbi is the same as that fixed by the Jewish historian Dr. Grätz; and the claim that the New Test. copied the Talmud must accordingly be stigmatized, once for all, as a vain glorification of reformed Judaism, which, on the one hand, rejects the Talmud as a religious code, but, on the other, makes use of it for controversial purposes. (B.P.)

## Sermonizing[[@Headword:Sermonizing]]

             the act or system of constructing sermons. While other forms of religious address have had their successive periods of predominance, the sermon has maintained the rank of preeminent importance since the time when our Lord delivered his sermon on the Mount..

I. History of the Subject. — The age of the Church fathers was that in which the homily most prevailed. The mediaeval period was that of postils. During both these periods the quality and character of religious discourses greatly declined, and the true idea of Christian preaching became at length nearly lost. To speak in the most guarded manner, it was overshadowed amid the ceremonials of worship and the abounding spirit of worldliness.

The reformers availed themselves of preaching as the means of combating the errors and superstitions into which the Church had fallen. They set themselves diligently to proclaiming the essential truths of God's Word, and by them the sermon was restored to its original importance. That importance has been so fully recognized in modern times that the sermon has come to be generally regarded as the correlate of preaching itself. The exhortation and the homily still have a place among religious addresses, but it is not said of ministers of the Gospel that they preach exhortations or homilies. If they preach, in any proper sense, they preach sermons. Hence none who regard themselves the subjects of the Savior's injunctions, “As ye go, preach,” “Preach the Gospel to every creature,” and of the apostolic precept “‘Preach the Word,” can be indifferent as to the best methods of constructing sermons.

II. Rules. — Sermonizing may be said to embrace the two important particulars of plan and style.

1. Plan. — Little is hazarded in saying that a good plan is essential to a good sermon. It is by no means essential that the plan be formally stated or even made perceptible to the hearer, but it is needed to guide the thought and accomplish the aim of the speaker. The preacher who has no plan is liable to wander from his proper line of thought, to repeat himself, to confuse his hearers, and to fail in all the important objects of a sermon. Superficial readers have imagined and sometimes asserted, that the sermons of Christ and his apostles were uttered without plan. Careful analysis will, however, reveal in every instance an underlying or pervading plan well adapted to the object in view. Still it is proper to acknowledge, judging from the reports that have come down to us, that not only during the New Test. period, but during the early Christian centuries, but little, if any, attention was given to artificial or minutely drawn plans. The style of preaching during the patristic age being for the greater part expository, preachers were naturally held to the order of the portions of Scripture expounded. To whatever extent panegyrics were introduced in the 4th and 5th centuries, in imitation of the Greek orators, the order of narration was naturally followed. Rarely were the formal parts of an oration, as described by the Greek and Roman rhetoricians, distinctly developed in sermons. It was reserved for the schoolmen of the 12th century and later to apply the minutiae of ancient rhetoric and logic to the framework of sermons. That application was, however, so ingeniously made by them as to project its influence downward through successive centuries. That influence may be traced in the preaching of both Catholics and Protestants of various countries even down to the present time. The prevailing fault of what maybe termed the scholastic method of sermonizing has been that of excess in detail. By not a few authors it has been drawn out into a minuteness of division and subdivision, and, in short, an extreme of artificiality sufficient to destroy all freedom of thought and expression. Not only professed scholastics, but various writers of comparatively recent date, have bewildered themselves and their readers with their tedious and multiplied schemes of suggestion and division. Whoever has the curiosity to see this statement illustrated may find ample material in a joint comparison of bishop Wilkins's Gift of Preaching, Claude's Essay on the Composition of a Sermon, and G.W. Hervey's Christian Rhetoric. While it may be said that in some sense these three books represent England, France, and the United States of America, and also the 17th, the 18th, and the 19th centuries, it would be more proper to say that they represent an antique  fashion, together with the action of a certain class of minds, of which more or less appear in every age.

Wilkins, seeking to simplify the detailed processes of preceding writers, so as to enable preachers to “teach clearly, convince strongly, and persuade powerfully,” gives schemes of explication, confirmation, and application which cover six continuous duodecimo pages.

Claude, in order to help preachers avoid “poor, dry, and spiritless observations,” and also to reduce “obscure matters to a natural, popular, and modern air,” prescribes twenty-seven different sources of observations, designed to aid thought and facilitate invention. They are practically copied from the Loci Communes, or Commonplaces, of Aristotle, one only of his twenty-eight being omitted.

Hervey, in the modest endeavor to do what he thinks all other American writers have failed to do — namely, “to find the true ground works of homiletics, and to reduce the science to something like a clear and sufficient system” — not only repeats the twenty-seven topics of Claude, but, on his own account, enumerates and exemplifies forty-one kinds of topical division!

It is not surprising that such excesses have called forth both opposition and ridicule, and have even provoked some minds to the rejection, if not of all plans, yet of all divisions of a sermon. Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, represented the opposition of his period to the scholastic system in his Dialogues concerning Eloquence. He said, “For the most part, divisions give only a seeming order, while they really mangle and clog a discourse by separating it into two or three parts, which must interrupt the orator's action and the effect it ought to produce. There remains no true unity after such divisions, seeing they make two or three different discourses, which are joined into one only by an arbitrary connection. Three sermons preached at different times, if they be formed upon some regular concerted plan, make one piece or entire discourse as much as the three points of any of these sermons make one whole by being joined and delivered together.” That Fenelon, in the above quotation, was arguing against the abuses of division, rather than against proper plans of discourse, is sufficiently obvious from his own subsequent directions as to the plan and development of a sermon. “We ought,” said he, “at first to give a general view of our subject, and endeavor to gain the favor of the audience by a modest introduction, a respectful address, and the genuine marks of candor  and probity. Then we should establish those principles on which we design to argue, and in a clear, easy, sensible manner, propose the principal facts we are to build on, insisting chiefly on those circumstances of which we intend to make use afterwards. From these principles and facts we must draw just consequences,. and argue in such a clear and well-connected manner that all our proofs may support each other, and so be the more remembered.

Every step we advance, our discourse ought to grow stronger, so that the hearers may gradually perceive the force and evidence of the truth; and then we ought to display it in such lively images and movements as are proper to excite the passions.” A following sentence discloses more definitely the view of Fenelon: “We ought to choose some method, but such a method as is not discovered and promised in, the beginning of our discourse.” In this he admits the importance, if not the necessity, of a plan, but denies the propriety of stating the plan in advance. In respect to the latter item, it is safe to believe that different subjects and occasions may make different requisitions of the preacher — circumstances not seldom occurring in which a lucid statement of plan may conduce greatly to the appropriate objects of a sermon. At other times and on other subjects, it may be better to carry the hearers insensibly along to conclusions, without disclosing the processes or marking the steps by which the conclusions are reached. The governing principle in this matter should be that of adaptation. Hence any attempt to fix arbitrary and unvarying rules must result in failure.

But the preacher should not, on this account, make the mistake of attempting to prepare and deliver sermons without plan. He should rather accustom himself to habits and forms of close logical analysis and synthesis, studying carefully the adaptation of the most available forms to different classes of subjects and occasions. By this means, he may rise above the necessity of loading down his mind with numerous rules, and attain not only facility, but correctness of mental action in shaping his addresses to the comprehension and the persuasion of his hearers. On this plan, an essential and ever increasing variety, both in the form and matter of his discourses, maybe secured; while without it, or some similar mode of procedure, there is great danger of falling into ruts or grooves of thought which, however easy to the preacher, become trite and wearisome to hearers. If, then, his logical plans be set on fire with evangelical love and a consuming zeal in behalf of the souls of men, he will be able to produce sermons of the highest rhetorical power.  According to all the best authorities, a sermon should have an organic structure — at least an introduction, an argument, and a conclusion. In cases of extreme brevity, the beginning and end of the argument may serve as the introduction and conclusion of the sermon. Whether and to what extent the principal and essential parts of a sermon should be marked with divisions and subdivisions should be determined with. reference to the probability of oratorical effect. If they can be made to secure greater attention on the part of hearers, and to fasten clearer and deeper impressions on their minds, it would be prudery to reject them. If, on the other hand, they would break the course of thought or mar the unity of the sermon, it would be folly to employ them. So of any style of division, if found helpful and auxiliary to good results, it is to be cultivated. If it seem artificial, redundant, or otherwise a hindrance to oratorical power, let it be sternly rejected.

2. Style. — The impracticability of prescribing fixed and arbitrary rules as to the language to be employed in preaching is quite as great as in reference to plans of discourse. Nevertheless, there are not wanting important principles to guide the composers of sermons, whether written or oral.

(1.) The language of a sermon should be prose, and not poetry.

(2.) All the essential qualities of a good prose style should be found in every sermon. Summarily stated, those qualities are purity, precision, perspicuity, unity, harmony, and strength. The lack of any one of those qualities may justly be counted as a defect in the style of any sermon. It belongs to the science of rhetoric to define and illustrate them severally, and also to give suggestions as to their attainment, their laws, and their special uses.

(3.) Superadded to the general qualities of a good style, a few special characteristics may be named as highly desirable in the style of sermons, although with some variation of degree in accordance with subjects and occasions.

No discriminating criticism of sermons can be made, apart from a proper classification of each particular sermon, on the basis of its subject or special design. By such a classification, sermons are usually distributed into five classes, viz. expository, hortatory, doctrinal, practical, and miscellaneous or occasional. The last named class requires a somewhat  extended subclassification with reference to special topics and occasions, e.g. a, missions; b, education; c, temperance; d, charity; e, funerals; f, ordinances; g, festivals, etc.

To a thoughtful mind, the law of adaptation will hardly fail to suggest important, though not easily described, variations in the style to be employed in treating topics so different in character. Yet a sermon on any one of these subjects, or, in fact, on any subject appropriate for discussion in a Christian pulpit, will fall short of the highest excellence if lacking in such qualities of style as the following:

1. A combination of simplicity with dignity. It is essential that a sermon embody such a choice of language as will tend to make wise the simple; yet, in his effort to be plain, the preacher must avoid triviality. He must employ words and present images corresponding to the grandeur of the truth which he proclaims, and which may also be understood by the unlearned. Simplicity in the sense recommended is opposed to the affectation of elegance and the straining after pompous words and unusual expressions. It employs the language of the people, but makes it the instrument of elevating their thoughts and ennobling their character.

2. It is incumbent on preachers to make frequent use of scriptural quotations and allusions as a means of declaring and illustrating God's message in its proper form and spirit. Hence the style of their sermons should be in harmony with the tenor and spirit of the Holy Scriptures. The peculiar quality hereby indicated, and which the quotations themselves do not supply, is sometimes called scriptural congruity. It is the picture or framework of silver in which the apples of gold may be fitly set.

3. Another peculiar quality of style demanded in sermons is directness of address. It is the province of poetry to sweep circles and various curvilinear lines of beauty through the realms of thought. Its objects may be well accomplished by exciting admiration and emotions of pleasure. True preaching has a higher aim, and consequently needs to focalize its power in order to produce conviction in the mind and proper emotions in the heart. Hence a good pulpit style tolerates neither the indirectness of an essay nor any rhetorical embellishments which are not auxiliary to directness of address. It rejects circumlocutions and demands those forms of expression that make hearers feel that they are personally the objects of the sacred message. As a good portrait looks every person calmly in the eye, so a good sermon seems to speak directly to every hearer. When, in  connection with a just reference to the principles above stated, preachers severally maintain their individuality of thought and expression, they will find sermonizing not only a fascinating engagement, but one full of encouragement from the happy results following.

So far as this subject has a literature, it is found in works on homiletics and preaching (q.v.). (D.P.K.)

## Seron[[@Headword:Seron]]

             (Σήρων; in Syr. and one Gr. MS. ῞Ηρων; Vulg. Seron), a general of Antiochus Epiphanes, in chief command of the Syrian army (1Ma 3:13, ὁ ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεως Συρίας), who was defeated at Beth-horon by Judas Maccabaeus (B.C. 166), as in the day when Joshua pursued the five kings “in the going down of Bethhoron” (1Ma 3:24; Jos 10:11). According to Josephus, he was the governor of Coele-Syria and fell in the battle (Ant. 12, 7,1), nor is there any reason to suppose that his statements are mere deductions from the language of 1 Macc.

## Serosh[[@Headword:Serosh]]

             in Persian mythology, was one of the mightiest of Ormuzd's genii, king of the earth, and director of all things in it. He was not, however, one of the seven amshaspands, but only an assistant to Ardibehesht, one of their number.

## Serpent[[@Headword:Serpent]]

             The frequent mention of this creature in the Bible, together with the important part which it plays in early mythology, justifies a fuller treatment of the subject here than could well be given under the special terms by which the several species are designated. To these, however, we also refer as affording further details on certain points.

I. Bible Names. — The following are the Heb. and Gr. words by which either the serpent in general or some particular kind is represented in the A.V. with great variety and little precision.

1. Nachash (נָחָשׁ, so called probably from its hissing; Sept. and New Test. ὄφις) the generic name of any serpent, occurs frequently in the Old Test. The following are the principal Biblical allusions to this animal: Its subtlety is mentioned in Gen 3:1; its wisdom is alluded to by our Lord in  Mat 10:16. The poisonous properties of some species are often mentioned (see Psa 58:4; Pro 23:32); the sharp tongue of the serpent, which it would appear some of the ancient Hebrews believed to be the instrument of poison, is mentioned in Psa 140:3; Job 20:16, “the viper's tongue shall slay him;” although in other places, as in Pro 23:32; Ecc 10:8; Ecc 10:11; Num 21:9, the venom is correctly ascribed to the bite, while in Job 20:14 the gall is said to be the poison. The habit serpents have of lying concealed in hedges is alluded to in Ecc 10:8, and in holes of walls, in Amos 5, 19; their dwelling in dry, sandy places, in Deu 8:15. Their wonderful mode of progression did not escape the observation of the author of Proverbs 30 who expressly mentions it as “one of the three things which were too wonderful for him” (Pro 30:19).. The oviparous nature of most of the order is alluded to in Isa 59:5, where the A.V., however, has the unfortunate rendering of “cockatrice.” The art of taming and charming serpents is of great antiquity, and is alluded to in Psa 58:5; Ecc 10:11; Jer 8:17, and doubtless intimated by James (Jam 3:7), who particularizes serpents among all other animals that “have been tamed by man.” SEE SERPENT CHARMING.

2. Sardah (שָׂרָ, prob. burning, SEE SERAPH; Sept. ὄφις or δράκων; A.V. “fiery”) occurs generally in connection with the above term (Num 21:6; Deu 8:15), but occasionally alone (Num 21:8; Isa 14:29; Isa 30:6), as some peculiarly venomous species.

Much has been written on the question of the “fiery serpents” (הִשְּׂרָפַים

הִנְּחָשַׁים) of Num 21:6; Num 21:8, with which it is usual to identify the “fiery flying serpent” of Isa 30:6; Isa 14:29. In the transaction recorded (Numbers loc. cit.; Deu 8:15) as having occurred at the time of the Exodus, when the rebellious Israelites were visited with a plague of serpents, there is not a word about their having been “fling” creatures; there is therefore no occasion to refer the venomous snakes in question to the kind of which Niebuhr (Descript. de l'Arab. p. 156) speaks, and which the Arabs at Basra denominate heie sursurie, or heie thiare, “flying serpents,” which obtained that name from their habit of “springing” from branch to branch of the date trees they inhabit. Besides these are tree serpents (dendrophidoe), a harmless family of the colubrine snakes, and therefore quite out of the question. The Heb. term rendered “fiery” by the  A.V. is by the Alexandrine edition of the Sept. represented by θανατοῦντες, “deadly.” Onkelos, the Arabic version of Saadias, and the Vulg. translate the word “burning,” in allusion to the sensation produced by the bite; other authorities understand a reference to the bright color of the serpents. It is impossible to point out the species of poisonous snake which destroyed the people in the Arabian desert. Niebuhr says that the only truly formidable kind is that called boetan, a small slender creature spotted black and white, whose bite is instant death, and whose poison causes the dead body to swell in an extraordinary manner (see Forskal, Descript. Animal. p. 15). It is obvious that either the cerastes or the naja haje, or any other venomous species frequenting Arabia, may denote the “serpent of the burning bite” which destroyed the children of Israel. See Ziegra, De Serpentibus Ignitis (Jena, 1732).

The “fiery flying serpent” of Isaiah (loc. cit.) can have no existence in nature if taken in strict literalness, though it is curious to notice that Herodotus (2, 75; 3, 108) speaks of serpents with wings whose bones he imagined he had himself seen near Buto in Arabia. Monstrous forms of snakes with birds' wings occur on the Egyptian sculptures; it is probable that some kind of flying lizard (Draco, Dracocella, or Dracunculus) may have been the “flying serpent” of which Herodotus speaks; and perhaps, as this animal, though harmless, is yet calculated to inspire horror by its appearance, it may denote the flying serpent of the prophet, and may have been regarded by the ancient Hebrews as an animal as terrible as a venomous snake. Accordingly, Hamilton Smith is disposed to take the saraph, or supposed winged serpent, to be a haje, one of the more Eastern species or varieties of the cobra or naja, which have the faculty of actually distending the hood, as if they had wings at the side of the head, and are the same as, or nearly allied to, the well known spectacle snake of India; and this interpretation seems to accord with the words of Moses, the serpents, the burning ones (Num 21:6).

The serpent may exhibit this particular state of irritation when it stands half erect with its hood distended, or it may be that variety which is possessed of this faculty to the greatest extent. Naja. reflectrix, the pof or spook adder of the Cape colonists, is reported by Dr. Smith to' be scarcely distinct from the Egyptian naja haje. With regard to the faculty of flying, the lengthened form, the muscular apparatus, the absence of air cells, and the whole osteological structure are all incompatible with flight or the presence of  wings: hence Herodotus, in his search for flying serpents at Buto, may have observed heaps of exuviae of locusts cast on shore by the sea — a phenomenon not unfrequent on that coast — but most assuredly not heaps of bones and ribs of serpents. As for those of Plutarch, they may have been noxious sand flies. Flying serpents are only found represented in the symbolical pictures of Egypt, where they occur with birds' wings. Those of history, and of barbarous nations excessively habituated to figurative forms of speech, are various; some being so called because of their rapid motion, others on account of a kind of spring they are said to make at their victims, and a third class because they climb trees, and are reported to swing themselves from thence upon their victims, or to other trees. Now, many species of serpents are climbers; many hang by the tail from slender branches of low trees in highly heated glens, snapping at insects as they wheel around them; but all are delicately jointed, and if any should swing further than merely to change their hold, and should miss catching a branch, they would most certainly be dislocated, and, if not killed, very seriously injured. From personal experiments, we can attest that serpents are heavy in proportion to their bulk, and without the means of breaking their fall; that few, large or small, could encounter the shock of twelve or fourteen feet elevation without fracturing many spinous processes of their vertebrae, and avoid being stunned for a length of time, or absolutely crushed to death. Being instinctively conscious of the brittleness of their structure, nearly all snakes are timid, and desirous of avoiding a contest unless greatly provoked.

This remark applies, we believe, to all innoxious serpents, the great boas perhaps excepted, and to most of the poisonous, exclusive of several species of viper and cobra-de-capello (comp. Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 333). Of the so called flying, or rather darting, serpents, Niebuhr found near Basra a venomous species called heie sursurie and heie thiare — that is, “flying serpent” — because it was said to fling itself from one tree to another. Admiral Anson heard, at the island of Quibo, of snakes flying without wings: we may notice the Acontias and Prester, that fell like arrows from the tops of trees, and the green AEtula of Ceylon, said to spring from trees at the eyes of cattle — an accusation repeated of more than one species in tropical America. Next we have the uler tampang hari, seen in a forest near the river Pedang Bessie, somewhere, we believe, in the Australasian islands, under circumstances that most certainly require confirmation; since this fiery serpent, so called from the burning pain and fatal effect of its bite, swung itself from one tree to another, 240 feet distant, with a declination to the horizon of only about  fifteen degrees. We may thus refer the “winged” or “flying” serpent to the Naja tripudians, in one of its varieties, because, with its hood dilated into a kind of shining wing on each side of the neck, standing, in undulating motion, one half or more erect, rigid, and fierce in attack and deadly poisonous, yet still denominated “good spirit,” and in Egypt ever figured in combination with the winged globe, it may well have received the name of saraph, and may thus meet all the valid objections and conciliate seemingly opposite comments (see Num 21:6; Num 21:8; Deu 8:15; Isaiah 16:29; 30:6; and Paxton's Illustrations), excepting the authority of Herodotus, Pausanias, and Bochart, which, with all the respect due to their names, is not now sufficient to establish the existence of a kind of serpent whose structure is contrary to the laws of zoological organization. In Isa 14:29; Isa 30:6, the epithet מְעוֹפֵ, meophaph, vibrating (rendered “flying” in the A.V.), is another form for “winged,” and occurs in passages unconnected with the events in Exodus. Both bear metaphorical interpretations. A further confirmation of the “fiery serpents,” or “serpents of the burning bite,” being najas, occurs in the name Ras om-Haye (Cape of the Haje serpents), situated in the locality where geographers and commentators agree that the children of Israel were afflicted by these reptiles. Should it be objected that these are the haje and not the spectacle snake, it may be answered that both Arabs and Hindus confound the species.

3. Akshub (עִכְשׁוּב, Sept. ἀσπίς, A.V. “adder”) is found only in Psa 140:3, “They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders' poison is under their lips.” The latter half of this verse is quoted by Paul from the Sept. in Rom 3:13 (“asp”). The poison of venomous serpents is often employed by the sacred writers in a figurative sense to express the evil tempers of ungodly men; that malignity which, as bishop Horne says, is “the venom and poison of the intellectual world” (comp. Deu 32:33; Job 20:14; Job 20:16).

It is not possible to say with any degree of certainty what particular species of serpent is intended by the Hebrew word; the ancient versions do not help us at all, although nearly all agree in some kind of serpent, with the exception of the Chaldee paraphrase, which understands a spider by akshub, interpreting this Hebrew word by one of somewhat similar form (עִכָּבַישׁ, akkabish). The etymology of the term is not ascertained with sufficient precision to enable us to refer the animal to any determinate  species. Gesenius derives it from two Hebrew roots ( עָכִשׁ, akash, “to turn backward,” and עָקִב, “to lie in wait”), the combined meaning of which is “rolled in a spire and lying in ambush;” a description which would apply to almost any kind of serpent.

The number of poisonous serpents with which the Jews were acquainted was in all probability limited to some five or six species, and it is not improbable that the akshub may be represented by the Toxicoa of Egypt and North Africa. At any rate, it is unlikely that the Jews were unacquainted with this kind, which is common in Egypt and probably in Syria. SEE ADDER.

4. Pethen (פֶּתֶן, from an obsolete root prob. signifying to twist or to be strong; Sept. ἀσπίς, δράκων, βασιλίσκος), The Hebrew word occurs in the six following passages: Deu 32:33; Psa 58:5; Psa 91:13; Job 20:14, Isa 11:8. It is expressed in the passages from the Psalms by “adder” in the text of the A.V. and by “asp” in the margin; elsewhere the text of the A.V. has “asp” as the representative of the original word pethen.

That some kind of poisonous serpent is denoted by the Hebrew word is clear from the passages quoted above. We further learn from Psa 58:5 that the pethen was a snake upon which the serpent charmers practiced their art. In this passage the wicked are compared to “the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear, which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely;” and from Isa 11:8, “the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp,” it would appear that the pethen was a dweller in holes of walls, etc. The question of identity is one which it is by no means easy to determine. Bochart contributes nothing in aid to a solution when he attempts to prove that the pethen is the asp (Hieroz. 3, 156), for this species of serpent, if a species be signified by the term, has been so vaguely described by authors that it is not possible to say what known kind is represented by it. The term asp in modern zoology is generally restricted to the Vipera aspis of Latreille; but it is most probable that the name, among the ancients, stood for different kinds of venomous serpents. Solinus (c. 27) says, “plures diversaeque sunt aspidum species;” and AElian (N. Anim. 10, 31) asserts that the Egyptians enumerate sixteen kinds of asp. Bruce thought that the asp of the ancients should be referred  to the cerastes, while Cuvier considered it to be the Egyptian cobra (Naja haje). Be this, however, as it may, there can be little doubt that the Hebrew name pethen is specific, as it is mentioned as distinct from akshub, shephiphon, tsiphoni, etc., names of other members of the Ophidia.

Oedman (Vermisch. Samml. 10, 81) identifies the pethen with the Coluber lebetinus, Linn., a species described by Forskal (Desc. Anim. p. 15). Rosenmüller (Not, ad Hieroz. 3, 156), Dr. Lee (Heb. Lex. s.v. פּתן), Dr. Harris (Nat. Hist. of Bible, art. “Asp”), Col. H. Smith (Encyc. Bib. Lit, art. “Serpent”), believe that the pethen of Scripture is to be identified with the Coluber boetan of Forskal. Oedman has no hesitation in establishing an identity between the C. lebetinus and the C. boetan; but from Forskal's descriptions it is most probable that the two species are distinct. The whole argument that seeks to establish the identity of the C. boetan with the pethen of Scripture is based entirely upon a similarity of sound. Rosenmüller thinks that the Arabic word boetan ought to be written poetan, and thinks there can be no doubt that this species represents the pethen of Scripture. Oedman's argument, also, is based on a similarity of sound in the words, though he adduces an additional proof in the fact that, according to the Swedish naturalint quoted above, the common people of Cyprus bestow the epithet of kouphe (κοῦφη), “deaf,” upon the C. lebetinus. He does not, however, believe that this species is absolutely deaf, for he says it can hear well. This epithet of deafness attributed to the C. lebetinus Oedman thinks may throw light on the passage in Psa 58:5, about “the deaf adder.” As regards the opinion of Rosenmüller and others who recognize the pethen under the boetan of Forskal,. it may be stated that, even if the identity is allowed, we are as much in the dark as ever on the subject, for the C. boetan of Forskal has never been determined.

If C. boetan be the same as C. lebetinus, the species denoted may be the Echis arenicola (Toxicoa) of Egypt (Catalogue of Snakes in Brit. Mus. 1, 29). Probably all that naturalists have ever heard of the C. boetan is derived from two or three lines of description given by Forskal. “The whole body is spotted with black and white; it is a foot in length, and of the thickness of two thumbs; oviparous; its bite kills in an instant, and the wounded body swells.” The evidence afforded by the deaf snake of Cyprus, and adduced in support of his argument by Oedman, is of no value whatever; for it must be remembered that audition in all the Ophidia is very imperfect, as all the members of this order are destitute of a tympanic cavity. The epithet “deaf,” therefore, so far as relates to the power all  serpents possess of hearing ordinary sounds, may reasonably be applied to any snake. Vulgar opinion in many countries attributes “deafness” to the adder; but it would be very unreasonable to infer from thence that the common adder (Pelias berus) is identical with the “deaf adder” of the 58th Psalm. Vulgar opinion in Cyprus is of no more value in the matter of identification of species than vulgar opinion elsewhere. A preliminary proof; moreover, is necessary for the argument. The snake of Cyprus must be demonstrated to occur in Egypt or the Holy Land: a fact which has never yet been proved, though. as was stated above, the snake of Cyprus (C. lebetinus) may be the same as the Echis arenicola of North Africa.

Very absurd are some of the explanations which commentators have given of the passage concerning the “deaf adder that stoppeth her ears;” the rabbi Solomon (according to Bochart, 3, 162) asserts that “this snake becomes deaf when old in one ear; that she stops the other with dust, lest she should hear the charmer's voice.” Others maintain that “she applies one ear to the ground and stops the other with her tail.” That such errors should have prevailed in former days, when little else but foolish marvels filled the pages of natural history, is not to be wondered at, and no allusion to them would have been made here if this absurd error of “the adder stopping her ears with her tail” had not been perpetuated in our own day. In Bythner's Lyre of David, p. 165 (Dee's translation, 1847), the following explanation of the word pethen, without note or comment, occurs: “Asp, whose deafness marks the venom of his malice, as though impenetrable even to charms; it is deaf of one ear, and stops the other with dust or its tail, that it may not hear incantations.” Dr. Thomson also (Land and Book, 1, 221) seems to give credence to the fable when he writes: “There is also current an opinion that the adder will actually stop up his ear with his tail to fortify himself against the influence of music and other charms.” It is not then needless to observe, in confutation of the above error, that no serpent possesses external openings to the ear. The true explanation of Psa 58:5 is simply as follows: There are some serpents, individuals of the same species perhaps, which defy all the attempts of the charmer — in the language of Scripture such individuals may be termed deaf. The point of the rebuke consists in the fact that the pethen was capable of hearing the charmer's song, but refused to do so. The individual case in question was an exception to the rule.

If, as some have supposed; the expression “deaf adder” denoted some species that was incapable of hearing, whence it had its specific name, how could there be any force in the comparison which  the psalmist makes with wicked men? Serpents, though, comparatively speaking, deaf to ordinary sounds, are no doubt capable of hearing the sharp, shrill sounds which the charmer produces either by his voice or by an instrument; and this comparative deafness is, it appears to us, the very reason why such sounds as the charmer makes produce the desired effect in the subject under treatment. As the Egyptian cobra is more frequently than any other species the subject upon which the serpent charmers of the Bible-lands practice their science, as it is fond of concealing itself in walls and in holes (Isa 11:8), and as it is not impossible that the derivation of the Hebrew word pethen has reference to the expanding powers of this serpent's neck when irritated, it appears to us to have at least as good a claim to represent the pethen as the very doubtful species of Coluber boetan, which on such slender grounds has been so positively identified with it. SEE SERPENT CHARMING.

5. Epheh (אֵפַעֶה; Sept. ὄφις, ἀσπίς, βασιλίσκος) occurs in Job 20:16; Isa 30:6; and Isa 54:5, in all of which passages the A.V. has “viper.” There is no scriptural allusion by means of which it is possible to determine the species of serpent indicated by the Heb. term, which is derived from a root which signifies “to hiss.” Shaw (Trav. p. 251) speaks of some poisonous snake which the Arabs call leffah (el-effah): “it is the most malignant of the tribe, and rarely above a foot long.” Jackson also: (Morocco, p. 110) mentions this serpent; from his description it would seem to be the Algerine adder (Echidna arietans var. Mauritanica). The snake (ἔχιδνα) that fastened on Paul's hand when he was at Melita (Act 28:3) was probably the common viper (Pelias bertus), which is widely distributed throughout Europe and the islands of the Mediterranean, or else the Vipera aspis, a not uncommon species on the coasts of the same sea. See VIPER.

6. Tsepha, or Tsiphoni (צַפְעוֹנַי צֶפִע; Sept. ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων, κεράστης), occurs five times in the Hebrew Bible. In Pro 23:32 it is translated “adder,” and in the three passages of Isaiah quoted above, as well as in Jer 8:17, it is rendered “cockatrice.” The derivation of the word from a root which means “to hiss” does not help us at all to identify the animal. From Jeremiah we learn that it was of a hostile nature, and from the parallelism of Isa 11:8 it appears that the tsiphoni was considered even more dreadful than the pethen. Bochart, in his Hieroz. (3, 182, ed. Rosenmüller), has endeavored to prove that the tsiphoni is the  basilisk of the Greeks (whence Jerome in Vulg. reads regulus), which was then supposed to destroy life, burn up grass, and break stones by the pernicious influence of its breath (comp. Pliny, H.N. 8, 33); but this is explaining an “ignotum per ignotius.”

The whole story of the basilisk is involved in fable, and it is in vain to attempt to discover the animal to which the ancients attributed such terrible power. It is curious to observe, however, that Forskal (Descr. Animal. p. 15) speaks of a kind of serpent (Coluber holleik is the name he gives it) which he says produces irritation on the spot touched by its breath; he is quoting, no doubt, the opinion of the Arabs. Is this a relic of the basiliskan fable? This creature was so called from a mark on its head, supposed to resemble a kingly crown. Several serpents, however, have peculiar markings on the head — the varieties of the spectacle cobras of India, for example — so that identification is impossible. As the Sept. makes use of the word basilisk (Psa 90:13; Psa 91:13 A.V.), it was thought desirable to say this much on the subject. The basilisk of naturalists is a most forbidding looking yet harmless lizard of the family Iguanidoe, order Sauria. In using the term, therefore, care must be taken not to confound the mythical serpent with the veritable Saurian. Basilisk is an indefinite English name, which belongs to no identified serpent, and now appears only in the works of ancient compilers and heralds, where it is figured with a crest, though there is no really crested or frilled species known to exist in the whole Ophidian order. Crested serpents occur, it is true, on Greek and Etruscan vases; but they are invariably mythological representations, probably derived from descriptive rumors of the hooded najas, cerastes, and perhaps muroenoe; the first of these having what may be likened to a turbaned, the other to a coronated head, and the third fins at the operculum. But it is from the apparently crowned form that the denominations of basilisk and regulus were derived. SEE BASILISK.

It is possible that the tsiphoni may be represented by the Algerine adder (Clotho Mauritanica), but it must be confessed that this is mere conjecture. Dr. Harris, in his Natural History of the Bible, erroneously supposes it to be identical with the Rajah zephen of Forskal, which, however, is a fish (Trigon zephen, Cuv.), and not a serpent. SEE COCKATRICE.

7. Shephiphon (שְׁפַיפֹן; Sept. ἐγκαθήμενος) occurs only in Gen 49:17, where it is used to characterize the tribe of Dan: “Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse's heels, so that his rider shall fall backwards.” Various are the readings of the old versions in this passage: the Samaritan interprets shephiphon by “lying in wait;” the Targums of Jonathan, of Onkelos, and of Jerusalem, with the Syriac, “a basilisk” (חורמן, churmon, destructive) The Arabic interpreters Erpenius and Saadias have “the horned snake;” and so the Vulg. cerastes. The Sept., like the Samaritan, must have connected the Hebrew term with a word which expresses the idea of “sitting in ambush.” The original word comes from a root (שָׁפִ) which signifies “to prick,” “pierce,” or “bite.”

The habit of the shephiphon alluded to in Jacob's prophecy — namely, that of lurking in the sand and biting at the horse's heels — suits the character of a well known species of venomous snake, the celebrated horned viper, the asp of Cleopatra (Cerastes Hasselquistii), which is found abundantly in the sandy deserts of Egypt, Syria, and Arabia. The Hebrew word shephiphon is no doubt identical with the Arabic siffon. If the translation of this Arabic word by Golius be compared with the description of the cerastes in the British Museum, there will appear good reason for identifying the shephiphon of Genesis with the cerastes of naturalists: “Siffon, serpentis genus leve, punctis maculisque distinctum” — “a small kind of serpent marked with dots and spots” (Golius, Arab. Lex. s.v.). “The cerastes (Cerastes Hasselquistii) is brownish white, with pale-brown, irregular unequal, spots” (Catalogue of Snakes in Brit. Mus. 1, 29). It is not pretended that the mere fact of these two animals being spotted affords sufficient ground, when taken alone, for asserting that they are identical, for many serpents have this character in common; but when taken in connection with what has been adduced above, coupled with the fact that this spotted character belongs only to a very few kinds common in the localities in question, it does at least form strong presumptive evidence in favor of the identity of the shephiphon with the cerastes. The name of cerastes is derived from a curious horn like process above each eye in the male (and occasionally, it would seem, in the female likewise), which gives it a formidable appearance. Bruce, in his Travels in Abyssinia, has given a  very accurate and detailed account of these animals. He observes that he found them in great numbers in those parts which were frequented by the jerboa, and that in the stomach of a cerastes he discovered the remains of a jerboa.

He kept two of these snakes in a glass vessel for two years without any food. Another circumstance mentioned by Bruce throws some light on the assertions of ancient authors as to the movement of this snake; AElian (De Anim. 15, 13), Isidorus, AEtius, have all recorded of the cerastes that, whereas other serpents creep along in a straight direction, this one and the hoemorrhous (no doubt the same animal under, another name) move sideways, stumbling, as it were, on either side (and comp. Bochart). Let this be compared with what Bruce says, “The cerastes moves with great rapidity and in all directions, forwards, backwards, sideways; when he inclines to surprise any one who. is too far from him, he creeps with his side towards the person,” etc. The words of Ibn-Sina, or Avicenna, are to the same effect. It is right, however, to state that nothing unusual has been observed in the mode of progression of the cerastes in the gardens of the Zoological Society; but, of course, negative evidence in the instance of a specimen not in a state of nature does not invalidate the statement of so accurate an observer as Bruce. The celebrated John Ellis seems to have been the first Englishman who gave an accurate description of the cerastes (see Philosoph. Transact. 1760). Hasselquist minutely describes it (Itin. p. 241, 365). The cerastes is extremely venomous; Bruce compelled one to scratch eighteen pigeons upon the thigh as quickly as possible, and they all died nearly in the same interval of time. It averages from twelve to fifteen inches in length, but is occasionally found larger. It belongs to the family Viperidoe, order Ophidia. This is a dangerous species, usually burrowing in sand near the holes of jerboas, and occasionally in the cattle paths; for there are now few or no ruts of cart wheels, where it is pretended they used to conceal themselves to assault unwary passers. It is still common in Egypt and Arabia.

Another kind of horned serpent is the Eryx cerastes of Daudin, also small, having no movable poison fangs, but remarkable for two very long back teeth in the lower jaw, which pass through the upper jaw, and appear in the shape of two white horns above its surface. It is known to the Egyptian Arabs by the name of harbagi, which may be a distortion of οὐβαῖος in Horapollo, and is classed by Hasselquist among slowworms, because in form the tail does not taper to a point. Its colors are black and white marblings, and the eyes are lateral and very near the snout. See ASP.

8. Tsimmaon (צַמָּאוֹן, Deu 8:15) appears to be a serpent, though rendered by drought” in the A.V. and others, so called because of the intolerable thirst occasioned by its bite. If this translation be correct, it will form in modern nomenclature one of the genus Hurria, and subgenus Dipsas or Bongarus. But no species of this division of snakes has yet been found in Western Asia, albeit there are several in India; and Avicenna locates the Torrida dipsas in Egypt and Syria; whereupon Cuvier remarks that Gesner's figure of Dipsas belongs precisely to the subgenus here pointed out. As one of the colubrine family, it should not be venomous; but the last mentioned writer remarks that several of these are regarded in their native localities with great dread; and on examination it is found that, although they have no erectile tubercular fangs, with a poison bag at the roots, there is on the long back teeth a groove, and a large gland at the base of the maxilla, which it is not unlikely contains, in some at least, a highly venomous poison. SEE DROUGHT.

9. Zochel (זוֹחֵל, literally a crawler) occasionally stands (Deu 32:24,” serpent;” Mic 7:7,” worm”) as a general term for the serpent tribe. See WORM.

10. Tannin (תִּנַּיַן, “serpent,” Exo 7:9-10; Exo 7:12; elsewhere usually “dragon”) seems in the above instances to denote a venomous reptile (Deu 32:33); but of a vague character. SEE SEA MONSTER.

11. The usual and proper term for “serpent” in the New Test. Is ὄφις, a snake of any kind; but once (Jam 3:7) ἑρπετόν (elsewhere “creeping thing”) is thus rendered. More specific terms, noticed above, are ἀσπίς, ἔχιδνα, δράκων.

II. Scientific Classification and Characteristics. —

1. Systematical nomenclators and travelers enumerate considerably more than forty species of serpents in Northern Africa, Arabia, and Syria. Of these it is scarcely possible to point out with certainty a single one named in the Bible, where very few descriptive indications occur beyond what in scientific language would now be applied generically. It is true that, among the names of the list, several may be synonyms of one and the same species; still none but the most recent researches give characters sufficient to be depended upon, and as yet nothing like a complete herpetology of the regions in question has been established. For, snakes being able to resist a  certain degree of cold, and also the greatest heat, there are instances of species being found, such as the hajes, precisely the same, from the Ganges to the Cape of Good Hope; others, again, may be traced from Great Britain to Persia and Egypt, as is instanced in the common viper and its varieties. Instead, therefore, of making vain efforts at identifying all the serpents named, it will be a preferable course to assign them to their proper families, with the exception of those that can be pointed out with certainty; and in so doing it will appear that even now species of importance mentioned by the ancients are far from being clearly established.

Serpents may be divided generally into two very distinct sections — the first embracing all those that are provided with movable tubular fangs and poison bags in the upper jaw; all regarded as ovo-viviparous, and called by contraction vipers: they constitute not quite one fifth of the species hitherto noticed by naturalists. The second section, much more numerous, is the colubrine, not so armed, but not therefore always entirely innocuous, since there may be in some cases venomous secretions capable of penetrating into the wounds made by their fixed teeth, which in all serpents are single points, and in some species increase in size as they stand back in the jaws. The greater part, if not all of these comparatively innocuous species are oviparous, including the largest or giant snakes, and the pelamis and hydrophis, or water serpents, among which several are venomous.

If we are right in the above identification, one class of serpents, the cobra tribe, may be regarded as the type of the most venomous in the East. The genus Naja — Haridi (?) of Savary — is distinguished by a plaited head, large, very venomous fangs, a neck dilatable under excitement, which raises the ribs of the anterior part of the body into the form of a disk or hood, when the scales, usually not imbricated, but lying in juxtaposition, are separated, and expose the skin, which at that time displays bright iridescent gleams, contrasting highly with their brown, yellow, and bluish colors. The species attain at least an equal, if not a superior, size to the generality of the genus viper; are more massive in their structure; and some possess the faculty of self inflation to triple their diameter, gradually forcing the body upwards into an erect position, until, by a convulsive crisis, they are said suddenly to strike backwards at an enemy or a pursuer. Capt. Stevens, of the Royal Marines, in order to ascertain the truth of the universal report concerning the mode of striking back ascribed to the serpent, had a quill introduced into the vent of one lying dead on the table, and blown into. The skin distended till the body rose up nearly all its  length; he then caused the experiment to stop, from the alarming attitude it assumed.

2. Among the various tribes of animals which are inimical to man, there is none that can compare with the venomous snakes for the deadly fatality of their enmity: the lightning stroke of their poison fangs is the unerring signal of a swift dissolution, preceded by torture the most horrible. The bite of a vigorous serpent has been known to produce death in two minutes. Even where the consummation is not so fearfully rapid, its delay is but a brief prolongation of the intense suffering. The terrible symptoms are thus described: A sharp pain in the part, which becomes swollen, shining, hot, red, then livid, cold, and insensible. The pain and inflammation spread, and become more intense; fierce shooting pains are felt in other parts, and a burning fire pervades the body. The eyes water profusely; then come swoonings, sickness, and bilious vomitings, difficult breathing, cold sweats, and sharp pains in the loins. The skin becomes deadly pale or deep yellow, while a black watery blood runs from the wound, which changes to a yellowish matter. Violent headache succeeds, and giddiness, faintness, and overwhelming terrors, burning thirst, gushing discharges of blood from the orifices of the body, intolerable fetor of breath, convulsive hiccoughs, and death.

The agent of these terrible results is an inodorous, tasteless, yellow fluid, secreted by peculiar glands seated on the cheeks, and stored for use in membranous bags, placed at the side of each upper jaw, and enveloping the base of a large, curved, pointed tooth, which is tubular. These two teeth, or fangs, are capable of being erected by a muscular apparatus under the power of the animal, when they project at nearly a right angle from the jaw.

The manner in which the deadly blow is inflicted is remarkable, and is alluded to in Scripture. When the rage of the snake is excited, it commonly throws its body into a coil more or less close, and raises the anterior part of its body. The neck is now flattened and dilated, so that the scales, which ordinarily lie in close contact, are separated by wide interspaces of naked skin. The neck is bent more or less back, the head projecting in a horizontal position. In an instant the whole fore part of the animal is launched forward towards the object of its anger, the erected tooth is forcibly struck into the flesh, and withdrawn with the velocity of a thought. No doubt the rage which stimulates the action calls forth an increased action of the poison  glands, by which the store sac is filled with the secretion. The muscular contraction which gives the rapid blow compresses at the same instant the sac; and as the acute point of the fang enters the flesh, the venom is forced through the tubular center into the wound.

3. Scripture History. — It was under the form of a serpent that the devil seduced Eve; hence in Scripture Satan is called “the old serpent” (Rev 12:9, and comp., 2Co 11:3). On this metaphorical use of the word, see the Jour. of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1852, p. 351 sq.; comp. Biblioth. Sacra, Jan. 1864.

The part which the serpent played in the transaction of the fall must not be passed over without some brief comment, being full of deep and curious interest. First of all, then, we have to note the subtlety ascribed to this reptile, which was the reason for its having been selected as the instrument of Satan's wiles, and to compare with it the quality of wisdom mentioned by our Lord as belonging to it, “Be ye wise as serpents” (Mat 10:16). It was an ancient belief, both among Orientals and the people of the Western world, that the serpent was endued with a large share of sagacity. The Hebrew word עָרוּם, translated “subtile,” though frequently used in a good sense, implies, it is probable, in this passage, “mischievous and malignant craftiness,” and is well rendered by Aquila and Theodotion by πανοῦργος, and thus commented upon by Jerome, “Magis itaque hoc verbo calliditas et versutia quam sapientia demonstratur” (see Rosenmüller, Schol. ad loc.). The ancients give various reasons for regarding serpents as being endued with wisdom, as that one species, the cerastes, hides itself in the sand and bites the heels of animals as they pass, or that, as the head was considered the only vulnerable part, the serpent takes care to conceal it under the folds of the body. Serpents have in all ages been regarded as emblems of cunning craftiness. The particular wisdom alluded to by our Lord refers, it is probable, to the sagacity displayed by serpents in avoiding danger. The disciples were warned to be as prudent in not incurring unnecessary persecution.

It has been supposed by many commentators, that the serpent, prior to the fall, moved along in an erect attitude, as Milton (P.L. 9, 496) says —

Not with indented wave Prone on the ground, as since, but on his rear, Circular base of rising folds that tower'd Fold above fold, a surging maze.”

Comp. also Josephus (Ant. 1, 1, 4), who believed that God now for the first time inserted poison under the serpent's tongue, and deprived him of the use of feet, causing him to crawl low on the ground by the undulating inflections of the body (κατὰ τῆς ἰλυσπώμενον). Patrick (Comment. ad loc.) entertained the extraordinary notion that the serpent of the fall was a winged kind (saraph), and Adam Clarke has been the laughing stock of exegetes ever since for maintaining that the serpent of the garden was an orang-outang (Comment. ad loc.).

It is quite clear that an erect mode of progression is utterly incompatible with the structure of a serpent, whose motion on the ground is so beautifully effected by the mechanism of the vertebral column and the multitudinous ribs, which, forming as it were so many pairs of levers, enable the animal to umove its body from place to place; consequently, had the snakes before the fall moved in an erect attitude, they must have been formed on a different plan altogether. It is true that there are saurian reptiles, such as the Saurophis tetradactylus and the Chamoesaura anguina of South Africa, which in external form are very like serpents, but with quasifeet; indeed, even in the boa constrictor, underneath the skill near the extremity, there exist rudimentary legs. Some have been disposed to believe that the snakes before the fall were similar to the Saurophis. Such a hypothesis, however, is untenable, for all the fossil Ophidia that have hitherto been found differ in no essential respects from modern representatives of that order: it is, moreover, beside the mark, for the words of the curse, “upon thy belly shalt thou go,” are as characteristic of the progression of a saurophoid serpent before the fall as of a true ophidian after it. There is no reason whatever to conclude, from the language of Scripture, that the serpent underwent any change of form on account of the part it played in the history of the fall. The sun and the moon were in the heavens long before they were appointed “for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years.” The typical form of the serpent and its mode of progression were, in all probability, the same before the fall as after it; but subsequent to the fall its form and progression were to be regarded with hatred and disgust by all mankind, and thus the animal was cursed “above all cattle,” and a mark of condemnation was forever stamped upon it. There is no necessity to show how that part of the curse is literally fulfilled which speaks of the “enmity” that was henceforth to exist between the serpent and mankind; and though, of course, this has more especial allusion to the devil whose instrument the serpent was in his deceit, yet it is  perfectly true of the serpent. Few will be inclined to differ with Theocritus (Id. 15, 58) —

τὸν ψυχρὸν ὄφιν ταμάλιστα δεδοίκω Ε᾿κ παιδός.

Serpents are said in Scripture to “eat dust” (see Gen 3:14; Isaiah 55:25; Mic 7:17); these animals, which, for the most part, take their food on the ground, do consequently swallow with it large portions of sand and dust (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 332).

IV. Mythology. — As already seen, scriptural evidence attests the serpent's influence on the early destinies of mankind; and this fact may be traced in the history, the legends, and creeds of most ancient nations. It is far from being obliterated at this day among the pagan, barbarian, and savage tribes of both hemispheres, where the most virulent and dangerous animals of the viviparous class are not uncommonly adored, but more generally respected, from motives originating in fear; and others, of the oviparous race, are suffered to abide in human dwellings, and are often supplied with food, from causes not easily determined, excepting that the serpent is ever considered to be possessed of some mysterious superhuman knowledge or power. Hence, besides real species, ideal forms, taken from the living, but combining other or additional properties, occur, at the most early periods, as metaphorical types, in fable and history, and in the hieroglyphics and religious paintings of many nations. Such are the innumerable fables in Hindu lore of Nagas and Naga kings; the primeval astronomy which placed the serpent in the skies, and called the Milky Way by the name of Ananta and Sesha Naga; the pagan obscure yet almost universal record of the deluge typified by a serpent endeavoring to destroy the ark, which astronomy has likewise transferred to the skies in the form of a dragon about to devour the moon, when, in an eclipsed state, it appears in the form of an amphipromnos or crescent-shaped boat; and, strange as it may seem, lunar eclipses still continue to be regarded in this character, and to excite general apprehension in Central Africa as well as in China, in the South Sea Islands as well as in America. SEE DRAGON.

The nations of the North once believed in the Jormunds Gander, or Kater serpent of the deep; and they, together with the Celts and Basques and all Asia, had legends of the Orm, the Paystha, the dragon guardian of riches, brooding on gold in caverns deep below the surface of the earth, or lying in huge, folds on dreary and extensive heaths. These fables were a residue of that antique dragon worship which had its temples from High Asia and  Colchis to the north of Great Britain, and once flourished both in Greece and Northern Africa — structures with avenues of upright stones of several miles in length, whereof the ruins may still be traced at Carnak in Brittany, Abury in Wiltshire, and Redruth in Cornwall — the two last mentioned more particularly showing their connection with the circle constituting a form of the mundane egg, which again was an emblem of the deluge and the ark. The Hesperian, Colchian, and Lernaean dragons are only Greek legends of the same doctrine, still more distorted, and affording ample proof how far the pagan world had departed from the simplicity of scriptural truth, from the excessive use of metaphorical descriptions and fanciful symbols.

In Egypt, the early center of ophiolatry, this debasing service was so deeply rooted that a Christian sect of heretics, called Ophitae, or, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, Ophiani, arose in the 2d century of our era. As an emanation of the Gnostics, their errors are particularly noticed by Tertullian, and form a signal instance of human perverseness ingeniously misleading itself and others by the abuse of symbols; yet, when the anguine type did not pass into long, distorted legends, it is evident, from the brazen serpent raised by Moses in the wilderness, that it was correctly appreciated by' the people as a sign, not in itself a power, of divine aid; and that its true symbolical meaning did not escape even pagan comprehension appears from profane history, in Meissi, the good serpent, being likewise properly understood by the Egyptians, until idolatry distorted all the national reminiscences, and the promise of what was not fully revealed till the Savior appeared on earth was obliterated. Ob, Oub, the Coptic Hof, Obion in Kircher, was, however, the general name for serpents in Egypt; and Kneph, or Cnuphis, or Ih-Nuphi, the good genius, always figured as the Nachash or Thermuth, is, therefore, the same as Naga Sahib, or lord serpent of India, and still a personification of the vanquisher of the deluge — Vishnu and many others being pagan denominations of Noah. In this sense the good genius Cnuphis was a type of the Savior of men, and called by them the spirit pervading nature, the creator from whose mouth proceeded the mundane egg; being referred, after the loss of the true interpretation, to any typical form of the patriarch, the events of the deluge and the creation, thus confounding the operations of the Almighty with the ministry of his servant. (See Deane, The Worship of the Serpent traced throughout the World [Lond. 1833].) SEE SERPENT WORSHIP.

There was, however, another idolized snake of the great destroyer Python tribe, which devour even each other; it is represented on Egyptian monuments bearing a mummy figure on its tail, and gliding over a seated divinity with an egg on the head, while human sacrifice by decapitation is performed before it. This serpent is so carefully drawn that we recognize the Thaibanne, Ophites Thebanus, which grows to twelve or more feet in length, is still found in Upper Egypt, and is a congener, if not the same as Python tigris albicans, the great snake even at present worshipped in Cutch: it may be the Aphophis of the Egyptians. To descant further on this subject would lead us too far from our purpose; but the Egyptian Python here noticed, changing its character from being a type of the deluge to that of an emblem of the ark carrying the spirit of human life within or upon it, was not without its counterpart in England, where lately, in digging out the deep, black mud of a ditch, a boat-shaped Python, carrying the eight Eones (?) or Noachidae, has been discovered, with emblems that denote them to be the solar regenerators of mankind. Thus, as is ever the case in polytheistical legends, the type disappears through multiplied transitions and the number of other symbols and personifications characterized by the same emblem. It was so in this instance, when the snake form was conferred also on abstractions bearing the names of divinities, such as Ranno, Hoph, Bai, Hoh or Hih, and others.

The asserted longevity of the serpent tribe may have suggested the representation of the harmless house snake biting its tail as typical of eternity; and this same quality was, no doubt, the cause why this animal, entwined round a staff, was the symbol of health and the distinctive attribute of the classical AEsculapius and Hygeia. There are species of this genus common to Palestine and the southern parts of continental Europe. They were domesticated in Druidical and other pagan sanctuaries, and were employed for omens and other impostures; but the mysterious Ag or Hagstone was asserted to be produced by the venomous viper species. With such powers of destroying animal life, and with an aspect at once terrible and resplendent, it may easily be imagined how soon fear and superstition would combine, at periods anterior to historical data, to raise these monsters into divinities, and endeavor to deprecate their wrath by the blandishments of worship; and how design and cupidity would teach these  very votaries the manner of subduing their ferocity, of extracting their instruments of mischief, and making them subservient to the wonder and amusement of the vulgar by using certain cadences of sound which affect their hearing, and exciting in them a desire to perform a kind of pleasurable movement that may be compared to dancing. Hence the Nagas of the East, the Hagworms of the West, and the Haje have all been deified, styled agathodoemon, or good spirit; and figures of them occur wherever the superstition of pagan antiquity has been accompanied by the arts of civilization.

“Almost throughout the East,” writes Kalisch (Hist. and Crit. Comment. Genesis 3, 1) “the serpent was used as an emblem of the evil principle, of the spirit of disobedience and contumacy. A few exceptions only can be discovered. The Phoenicians adored that animal as a beneficent genius; and the Chinese consider it as a symbol of superior wisdom and power, and ascribe to the kings of heaven (tien-hoangs) bodies of serpents. Some other nations fluctuated in their conceptions regarding the serpent. The Egyptians represented the eternal spirit Kneph, the author of all good, under the mythic form of that reptile; they understood the art of taming it, and embalmed it after death; but they applied the same symbol for the god of revenge and punishment (Tithrambo), and for Typhon, the author of all moral and physical evil; and in the Egyptian symbolical alphabet the serpent represents subtlety and cunning, lust and sensual pleasure. In Greek mythology it is certainly, on the one hand, the attribute of Ceres, of Mercury, and of AEsculapius, in their most beneficent qualities; but it forms, on the other hand, a part of the terrible Furies, or Eumenides: it appears in the form of a Python as a fearful monster, which the arrows of a god only were able to destroy; and it is the most hideous and most formidable part of the impious giants who despise and blaspheme the power of Heaven. The Indians, like the savage tribes of Africa and America suffer and nourish, indeed, serpents in their temples, and even in their houses.

They believe that they bring happiness to the places which they in habit; they worship them as the symbols of eternity, but they regard them also as evil genii, or as the inimical powers of nature, which is gradually depraved by them, and as the enemies of the gods, who either tear them to pieces or tread their venomous head under their all-conquering feet. So contradictory is all animal worship. Its principle is, in some instances, gratitude, and in others fear; but if a noxious animal is very dangerous, the  fear may manifest itself in two ways — either by the resolute desire of extirpating the beast, or by the wish of averting the conflict with its superior power: thus the same fear may, on the one hand, cause fierce enmity, and, on the other, submission and worship.” See, on the subject of serpent worship, Vossius, De Orig. Idol. 1, 5; Bryant, Mythology, 1, 420- 490: it is well illustrated in the apocryphal story of “Bel and the Dragon;” comp. Steindorf; De Ο᾿φιολατρείᾷ; Winer, Bib. Realwört. 2, 488.

From a modification, perhaps, of this idea of a tutelary genius, in Egypt and other Oriental countries a serpent was the common symbol of a powerful monarch. It was embroidered on the robes of princes and blazoned on their diadems to signify their invincible might; and that, as the wound inflicted by them is incurable, so the fatal effects of royal displeasure were neither to be averted nor endured.

The evil spirit in the form of a serpent appears in the Ahriman, or lord of evil, who, according to the doctrine of Zoroaster, first taught men to sin under the guise of this reptile (Zendavesta [ed. Kleuk.], 1, 25; 3, 84; see Rus, De Sepente Seductore non Naturali sed Diabolo [Jen. 1712], and Grapius, De Tentatione Evoe et Christi a Diabolo in Assumpto Corpore Facta [Rostoch. 1712]). But compare the opinion of Dr. Kalisch, who (Comment. on Genesis 3, 14, 1-5) says “the serpent is the reptile, not an evil demon that had assumed its shape.... If the serpent represented Satan, it would be extremely surprising that the former only was cursed, and that the latter is not even mentioned.

It would be entirely at variance with the divine justice forever to curse the animal whose shape it had pleased the evil one to assume.” According to the Talmudists, the name of the evil spirit that beguiled Eve was Sammael (סִמָּאֵל): “R. Moses ben-Majemon scribit in More (lib. 2, c. 30), Sammaelem inequitasse serpenti antique et seduxisse Evam. Dicit etiam nomen hoc absolute usurpari de Satana, et Sammaelem nihil aliud esse quam ipsum Satanam” (Buxtorf, Lex.-Talm. col. 1495).

It is of more importance to remark that in the traditions of most pagan nations, which have been embodied in their mythology, the serpent appears as the enemy of man, and a triumph over this enemy is usually described as  the greatest achievement of a popular deity. The Egyptian Horus is frequently represented piercing the head of some terrific serpent with his spear. From this source the Greeks and Romans adopted the fable of Apollo and the serpent Python, which is thus narrated by Ovid:

“Of new monsters earth created more Unwillingly, but yet she brought to light Thee, Python, too, the wondering world to fright And the new nations with so dire a sight: So monstrous was his bulk, so large a space Did his vast body and long train embrace. Him Phoebus basking on a bank espied, And all his skill against the monster tried; Though every shaft took place, he spent the store Of his full quiver, and ‘twas long before The expiring serpent wallowed in his gore.”

Lok, one of the favorite heroes of the Northern mythology, is represented as a destroyer of serpents, and a legend similar to the classic story just quoted represents him as destroying a monstrous serpent with his hammer or mace. The similarity of all these accounts to the scriptural narrative is obvious; but a still more striking parallel has been discovered in the Mexican mythology by baron Humboldt. He says:

“The group represents the celebrated serpent woman Chinacohuatl, called also Quilaztli, or Tonacacihua, ‘Woman of our flesh;' she is the companion of Tonacatenetli. The Mexicans considered her as the mother of the human race, and after the god of the celestial paradise, Ometenetli, she held the first rank among the divinities of Anahual. We see her always represented with a great serpent. Other paintings exhibit to us a feather headed snake cut in pieces by the great spirit Tezcatlipoca, or by the sun personified, the god Tonatinh. These allegories remind us of the ancient traditions of Asia. In the woman and serpent of the Aztecs we think we perceive the Eve of the Shemitic nations, in the snake cut in pieces the famous serpent Raliya, or Kalinaga, conquered by Vishnu when he took the form of Krishna. The Tonatiuh of the Mexicans appears also to be identical with the Krishna of the Hindus, recorded in the Bhagavata-Purana, and with the Mithras of the Persians. The most ancient traditions of nations go back to a state of things when the earth, covered by bogs, was inhabited by snakes and other animals  of gigantic bulk. The beneficent luminary, by drying up the soil, delivered the earth from these aquatic monsters. Behind the serpent, who appears to be speaking to the goddess Chinacohuatl, are two naked figures; they are of different color, and seem to be in the attitude of contending with each other. We might be led to suppose that the two vases which we see at the bottom of the picture, one of which is overturned, is the cause of this contention. The serpent woman was considered at Mexico as the mother of two twin children. These naked figures are, perhaps, the children of Chinacohuatl. They remind us of the Cain and Abel of Hebrew tradition.”

An extraordinarily clear tradition of the agency of the serpent in the fall has lately been brought to light in the Assyrian tablets, being the story of the water dragon as read by the late George Smith (Chaldoean Account of Genesis, p. 91):

“The dragon, which in the Chaldean account of the creation leads man into sin, is the creature of Tiamat, the living principle of the sea and of chaos, and he is the embodiment of the spirit of chaos, or disorder, which was opposed to the deities at the creation of the world. It is clear that the dragon is included in the curse after the fall, and that the gods invoke on the head of the human race all the evils which inflict humanity. Wisdom and knowledge shall injure him (line 22); he shall have family quarrels (line 23); he shall submit to tyranny (line 24); he will anger the gods (line 25); he shall not eat the fruit of his labor (line 26); he shall be disappointed in his desires (line 27); he shall have trouble of mind and body (lines 29 and 31); he shall commit future sin (line 32). No doubt subsequent lines continue these topics, but again our narrative is broken, and it only reopens where the gods are preparing for war with the powers of evil, which are led by Tiamat, which war probably arose from the part played by Tiamat in the fall of man.” SEE SNAKE.

## Serpent charming[[@Headword:Serpent charming]]

             There can be no question at all of the remarkable power which from time immemorial has been exercised by certain people in the East over poisonous serpents. The art is most distinctly mentioned in the Bible, SEE CHARM, and probably alluded to by St. James (Jam 3:7). The usual species operated upon, both in Africa and India, are the hooded snakes (Naja tripudians, and Naja haje) and the horned cerastes. The skill of the Italian marsi and the Libyan psylli in taming serpents was celebrated throughout the world; and to this day, as we are told by Sir G. Wilkinson (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 3, 124, note, ed. 1862), the snake players of the coast of Barbary are worthy successors of the psylli (see Pliny, 8, 25; 11, 25; and especially Lucan's account of the psylli [Pharsal. 9, 892.]). See  numerous references cited by Bochart (Hieroz. 3, 164, etc.) on the subject of serpent taming. Multitudes of modern observers have described the practices of the snake charmers in such terms as to leave no doubt of the fact. One instance may suffice for illustration. Mr. Gogerly, a missionary in India, says that some persons, being incredulous on the subject, after taking the most careful precautions against any trick or artifice being played, sent a charmer into the garden to prove his powers: “The man began to play upon his pipe, and, proceeding from one part of the garden to another for some minutes, stopped at a part of the wall much injured by age, and intimated that a serpent was within.

He then played quicker, and his notes were louder, when almost immediately a large cobra-de-capello put forth its hooded head, and the man ran fearlessly to the spot, seized it by the throat, and drew it forth. He then showed the poison fangs, and beat them out; afterwards it was taken to the room where his baskets were left and deposited among the rest.... The snake charmer,” observes the same writer, “applies his pipe to his mouth and sends forth a few of his peculiar notes, and all the serpents stop as though enchanted; they then turn towards the musician, and, approaching him within two feet, raise their heads from the ground, and, bending backward and forward, keep time with the tune. When he ceases playing, they drop their heads and remain quiet on the ground.” That the charmers frequently, and perhaps generally, take the precaution of extracting the poison fangs before the snakes are subjected to their skill there is much probability for believing, but that this operation is not always attended to is clear from the testimony of Bruce and numerous other writers. “Some people,” says the traveler just mentioned,” have doubted that it was a trick, and that the animals so handled had been first trained and then disarmed of their power of hurting, and, fond of the discovery, they have rested themselves upon it without experiment, in the face of all antiquity.

But I will not hesitate to aver that I have seen at Cairo a man ... who has taken a cerastes with his naked hand from a number of others lying at the bottom of the tub, has put it upon his bare head, covered it with the common red cap he wears, then taken it out, put it in his breast, and tied it about his neck like a necklace, after which it has been applied to a hen and bit it, which has died in a few minutes.” Dr. Davy, in his Interior of Ceylon, speaking of the snake charmers, says on this subject: “The ignorant vulgar believe that these men really possess a charm by which they thus play without dread, and with impunity, from danger. The more enlightened, laughing at this idea, consider the men impostors, and that in playing their tricks there is no danger to be avoided, it being removed by  the abstraction of the poison fangs. The enlightened in this instance are mistaken, and the vulgar are nearer the truth in their opinion. I have examined the snakes I have seen exhibited, and have found their poison fangs in and uninjured. These men do possess a charm, though not a supernatural one, viz. that of confidence and courage... They will play their tricks with any hooded snakes (Naja tripudians), whether just taken or long in confinement, but with no other kind of poisonous snake.” (See also Tennent, Ceylon, 3d ed. 1, 199.) Some have supposed that the practice of taking out or breaking off the poison fangs is alluded to in Psa 58:6, “Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth.” The serpent charmer's usual instrument is a flute. Shrill sounds, it would appear, are those which serpents, with their imperfect sense of hearing, are able most easily to discern; hence it is that the Chinese summon their tame fish by whistling or by ringing a bell. The reader will find much interesting matter on the art of serpent charming, as practiced by the ancients, in Bochart (Hieroz. 3, 161); in the dissertation by Böhmer entitled De Psyllorum, Marsorum, et Ophiogenum adversus Serpentes Virtue (Lips. 1745); and in Kämpfer, Amoenitates Exoticoe, 3, 9; 565; see also Broderip, Notebook of a Naturalist, and Anecdotes of Serpents, published by Chambers; Lane, Modern Egyptians, 2, 106. Those who professed the art of taming serpents were called by the Heb. menachashim (מְנִחֲשַׁים), while the art itself was called lachash (לִחִשׁ), Jer 8:17; Ecc 10:11; but these terms were not always used in this restricted sense. SEE DIVINATION.

In general, these serpent charmers were, and are, distinct tribes of men in their several countries, professing the power they claim to be an inherent and natural function. The most famous serpent charmers of antiquity were the Psylli, a people of Cyrenaica; and that theirs was believed to be a natural power appears from the story told by Pliny, that they were accustomed to try the legitimacy of their newborn children by exposing them to the most cruel and venomous serpents, who dared not molest or even approach them unless they were illegitimate. He thinks their power resided in some peculiar odor in their persons, which the serpents abhorred (Hist. Nat. 7, 2). Lucan says the same; and the passage in which that poet speaks of them affords a complete exposition of the ancient belief concerning the charming of serpents. He chiefly describes the measures which they took to protect the Roman camp. When the encampment was marked out, they marched around it chanting their charms, the “mystic sound” of which chased the serpents far away. But not trusting entirely to  this, they kept up fires, of different kinds of wood, beyond the farthest tents, the smell of which prevented the serpents from approaching. Thus, the camp was protected during the night. But if any soldier, when abroad in the daytime, happened to be bitten, the Psylli exerted their powers to effect, a cure. First they rubbed the wounded part around with saliva, to prevent, as they said, the poison from spreading while they assayed their arts to extract it (Pharsalia, 9). SEE ENCHANTMENT.

In this account we find the voice repeatedly mentioned; and it is to “the voice of the charmer” that the Psalmist refers. We may suppose that, as in the passage we have quoted, the charmers use a form of words — a charm — or else chanted a song in some peculiar manner. So Eusebius, in mentioning that Palestine abounded in serpent charmers in his time, says that they usually employed a verbal charm. This is still one of the processes of the Oriental serpent charmers. Roberts says that the following is considered in India the most potent form of words against serpents: “Oh, serpent! thou who art coiled in my path, get out of my way; for around thee are the mongoos, the porcupine, and the kite in his circles is ready to take thee!” The Egyptian serpent charmer also employs vocal sounds and a form of words to draw the venomous creatures from their retreats. Mr. Lane says, “He assumes an air of mystery, strikes the walls with a short palm stick, whistles, makes a clucking noise with his tongue, and spits upon the ground; and generally says, I adjure you by God, if ye be above, or if ye be below, that ye come forth; I adjure ye by the most great name, if ye be obedient, come forth; and if ye be disobedient, die! die! die!'” (Modern Egyptians, 2, 104). SEE ADDER.

With regard to the manipulation of serpents by the Egyptian magicians (Exodus 4), we may remark that in modern times the psylli, or charmers, by a particular pressure on the neck of the cobra or haje, have the power of rendering the inflation of the animal — which is a character of the genus — so intense that the serpent becomes rigid, and can be held out horizontally as if it were a rod. This practice explains what the soothsayers of Pharaoh could perform when they were opposing Moses, and reveals one of the, names by which the Hebrews knew the species; for although the text (Exo 4:3) uses, for the rod of Aaron converted into a serpent, the word נחשׁ, nachash, and subsequently (Exo 7:15) תנין, tannin, it is plain that, in the second passage, the word indicates “monster,” as applied to the nachash just named — the first being an appellative, the second an epithet. That the rods of the magicians of Pharaoh were of the  same external, character is evident from no different denomination being given to them; therefore we may infer that they used a real serpent as a rod — viz. the species now called haje — for their imposture, since they no doubt did what the present serpent charmers perform with the same species by means of the temporary asphyxiation, or suspension of vitality, before noticed, and producing restoration to active life by liberating or throwing down. Thus we have the miraculous character of the prophet's mission shown by his real rod becoming a serpent, and the magicians' real serpents merely assuming the form of rods; and when both were opposed, in a state of animated existence, by the rod devouring the living animals, conquering the great typical personification of the protecting divinity of Egypt. SEE SERPENT.

## Serpent of Brass[[@Headword:Serpent of Brass]]

             (נְחִשׁ הִנְּחשֶׁת; Sept. ὄφις ὁ χαλακοῦς, Num 21:9; 2Ki 18:4). In addition to the treatment of this subject under BRAZEN SERPENT and NEHUSHTAN, some important particulars may here be enumerated. The familiar history of the brazen serpent need not be repeated here. The nature  of the fiery snakes by which the Israelites were attacked has been discussed under SERPENT. The scene of the history, determined by a comparison of Num 21:3; Num 33:42, must have been either Zalmonah or Punon. The names of both places probably connect themselves with it, Zalmonah as meaning “the place of the image,” Punon as probably identical with the Φαινοί mentioned by Greek writers as famous for its copper mines, and therefore possibly supplying the materials (Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 3,13). SEE PUNON; SEE ZALMONAH. The chief interest of the narrative lies in the thoughts which have at different times gathered round it. We meet with these in four distinct stages, embodied in as many widely separated passages of Scripture. We have to ask by what associations each was connected with the others.

1. The Formation of the Object (Num 21:8-9). — The truth of the history will, in this place, be taken for granted. Those who prefer it may choose among the hypotheses by which men halting between two opinions have endeavored to retain the historical and to eliminate the supernatural element. The theory which ascribes the healing to mysterious powers known to the astrologers or alchemists of Egypt may be mentioned, but hardly calls for examination (Marsham, Can. Chronicles p. 148, 149; R. Tirza, in Deyling, Exercitt. Sacr. 2, 210). Unbelievers may look on the cures as having been effected by the force of imagination, which the visible symbol served to heighten, or by the rapid rushing of the serpent bitten from all parts of the camp to the standard thus erected, curing them, as men are said to be cured of the bite of the tarantula by dancing (Bauer, Heb. Gesch. 2, 320; Paulus, Comm. 4, 1, 198). They may see in the serpent the emblematic signpost, as it were, of the camp hospital to which the sufferers were brought for special treatment, the form in this instance, as in that of the rod of AEsculapius, being a symbol of the art of healing (Hoffmann, in Scherer, Schrift. Forsch. 1, 576). Leaving these conjectures on one side, it remains for us to inquire into the fitness of the symbol thus employed as the instrument of healing. To most of the Israelites it must have seemed as strange then as it did afterwards to the later rabbins that any such symbol should be employed. One of the Jewish interlocutors in the dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho (p. 322) declares that he had often asked his teachers to solve the difficulty, and had never found one who explained it satisfactorily. Justin himself, of course, explains it as a type of Christ.  The second commandment appeared to forbid the likeness of any living thing. The golden calf had been destroyed as an abomination. Now the colossal serpent (the narrative implies that it was visible from all parts of the encampment), made, we may conjecture, by the hands of Bezaleel or Aholiab, was exposed to their gaze, and they were told to look to it as gifted with a supernatural power. What reason was there for the difference? In part, of course, the answer may be that the second commandment forbade, not all symbolic forms as such, but those that men made for themselves to worship; but the question still remains, Why was this form chosen?

It is hardly enough to say, with Jewish commentators, that any outward means might have been chosen, like the lump of figs in Hezekiah's sickness, the salt which healed the bitter waters, and that the brazen serpent made the miracle yet more miraculous, inasmuch as the glare of burnished brass, the gaze upon the serpent form, were, of all things, most likely to be fatal to those who had been bitten (Gem. Bab. Yomna; Aben- Ezra and others, in Buxtorf, Hist. Ein. Serp. c. 5). The fact is doubtful, the reason inadequate. Another view, verging almost on the ludicrous, has been maintained by some Jewish writers. The serpent was set up in terrorem, as a man who has chastised his son hangs up the rod against the wall as a warning (Otho, Lexic. Rabbin. s.v. “Serpens”).

It is hardly enough again to say, with most Christian interpreters, that it was intended to be a type of Christ. Some meaning it must have had for those to whom it was actually presented; and we have no grounds for assuming, even in Moses himself, still less in the multitude of Israelites slowly rising out of sensuality, unbelief, rebellion, a knowledge of the far off mystery of redemption. If the words of our Lord in Joh 3:14-15, point to the fulfilment of the type, there must yet have been another meaning for the symbol. Taking its part in the education of the Israelites, it must have had its starting point in the associations previously connected with it. Two views, very different from each other, have been held as to the nature of those associations. On the one side it has been maintained that, either from its simply physical effects, or from the mysterious history of the temptation in Genesis 3, the serpent was the representative of evil. To present the serpent form as deprived of its power to hurt, impaled as the trophy of a conqueror, was to assert that evil, physical and spiritual, had been overcome, and thus help to strengthen the weak faith of the Israelites in a victory over both. The serpent, on this view, expressed the same idea  as the dragon in the popular representations of the archangel Michael and St. George (Ewald, Geschichte, 2, 228). To some writers, as to Ewald, this has commended itself as the simplest and most obvious view. It has been adopted by some orthodox divines who. have been unable to convince themselves that the same form could ever really have been at once a type of Satan and of Christ (Jackson, Humiliation of the Son of God, ch. 31; Patrick, Comm. ad loc.; Espagnaeus, Burmann, Vitringa, in Deyling, Observatt. Sac. 2, 15). Others, again, have started from a different ground. They raise the question whether Genesis 3 was then written, or, if written, known to the great body of the Israelites. They look to Egypt as the starting point for all the thoughts which the serpent could suggest, and they find there that it was worshipped as an agathodoemon, the symbol of health and life (comp. SEE SERPENT, and, in addition to the authorities there referred to, Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 2, 134; 4, 395; 5, 64, 238; Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant [Eng. transl.], 3, 348; Witsius, AEgyptiaca, in Ugolino, 1, 852). This, for them, explains the mystery. It was as the known emblem of a power to heal that it served as the sign and sacrament on which the faith of the people might fasten and sustain itself.

Contrasted as these views appear, they have, it is believed, a point of contact. The idea primarily connected with the serpent in the history of the fall, as throughout the proverbial language of Scripture, is that of wisdom (Gen 3:1; Mat 10:16; 2Co 11:3). Wisdom, apart from obedience to a divine order, allying itself to man's lower nature, passes into cunning. Man's nature is envenomed and degraded by it. But wisdom, the self same power of understanding, yielding to the divine law, is the source of all healing and restoring influences, and the serpent form thus becomes a symbol of deliverance and health. The Israelites were taught that it would be such to them in proportion as(they ceased to be sensual and rebellious. There were facts in the life of Moses himself which must have connected themselves with this twofold symbolism. When he was to be taught that the divine wisdom could work with any instruments, his rod became a serpent (Exo 4:1-5). (Comp. Cyril. Alex. Schol. 15; Glaphyra in Exodus 2. The explanation given by Cyril is, as might be expected, more mystical than that in the text. The rod transformed into a serpent represents the Divine Word taking on himself the likeness of sinful flesh.) When he and Aaron were called to their great conflict with the perverted wisdom of Egypt, the many serpents of the magicians were  overcome by the one serpent of the future high priest. The conqueror and the conquered were alike in outward form (Exo 7:10-12).

2. The Destruction of the Object (2Ki 18:4). — The next stage in the history of the brazen serpent shows how easily even a legitimate symbol, retained beyond its time, after it had done its work, might become the occasion of idolatry. It appears in the reign of Hezekiah as having been, for some undefined period, an object of worship. The zeal of that king leads him to destroy it. It receives from him, or had borne before, the name Nehushtan (q.v.). We are left to conjecture when the worship began, or what was its locality. Ewald's conjecture (Geschichte, 4, 622) that till then the serpent may have remained at Zalmonah, the object of occasional pilgrimages, is probable enough. It is hardly likely that it should have been tolerated by the reforming zeal of kings like Asa and Jehoshaphat. It must, we may believe, have received a fresh character and become more conspicuous in the period which preceded its destruction. All that we know of the reign of Ahaz makes it probable that it was under his auspices that it received a new development, that it thus became the object of a marked aversion to the iconoclastic party who were prominent among the counselors of Hezekiah. Intercourse with countries in which ophiolatry prevailed — Syria, Assyria, possibly Egypt also — acting on the feeling which led him to bring together the idolatries of all neighboring nations, might easily bring about this perversion of the reverence felt for the time honored relic.

Here we might expect the history of the material object would cease, but the passion for relics has prevailed even against the history of the Bible. The Church of St. Ambrose at Milan has boasted for centuries of possessing the brazen serpent which Moses set up in the wilderness. The earlier history of the relic, so called, is matter for conjecture. Our knowledge of it begins in the year A.D. 971. when an envoy was sent by the Milanese to the court of the emperor John Zimrisces at Constantinople. He was taken through the imperial cabinet of treasures and invited to make his choice, and he chose this, which, the Greeks assured him, was made of the same metal as the original serpent (Sigonius, Hist. Regn. Ital. bk. 7). On his return it was placed in the Church of St. Ambrose, and popularly identified with that which it professed to represent. It is, at least, a possible hypothesis that the Western Church has in this way been led to venerate what was originally the object of the worship of some Ophite sect.

3. The Apocryphal Notices of the Object. — When the material symbol had perished, its history began to suggest deeper thoughts to the minds of men. The writer of the book of Wisdom, in the elaborate contrast which he draws between true and false religions in their use of outward signs, sees in it a σύμβολον σωτηρίας, εἰς ἀνάμνμσιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου; “he that turned himself was not saved by the thing that he saw (διὰ τὸ θεωρουμένον), but by thee that art the Savior of all” (Wisdom 16, 6, 7). The Targum of Jonathan paraphrases Num 21:8, “He shall be healed if he direct his heart unto the Name of the Word of the Lord.” Philo, with his characteristic taste for an ethical, mystical interpretation, represents the history as a parable of man's victory over his lower, sensuous nature. The metal, the symbol of permanence and strength, has changed the meaning of the symbol, and that which had before been the emblem of the will, yielding to and poisoned by the serpent pleasure, now represents σωφροσύνη, the ἀντιπαθὲς ἀκολαδίας φάρμακον (De Agricult.). The facts just stated may help us to enter into the bearing of the words of Joh 3:14-15. If the paraphrase of Jonathan represents, as it does, the current interpretation of the schools of Jerusalem, the devout rabbi to whom the words were spoken could not have been ignorant of it. The new teacher carried the lesson a step further. He led him to identify the “Name of the Word of the Lord” with that of the Son of man. He prepared him to see in the lifting up of the crucifixion that which should answer in its power to heal and save to the serpent in the wilderness.

4. Our Lord's Allusion to the Object (John 3). — A full discussion of the typical meaning here unfolded belongs to exegesis rather than to a dictionary. It will be enough to note here that which connects itself with facts or theories already mentioned. On the one side the typical interpretation has been extended to all the details. The pole on which the serpent was placed was not only a type of the cross, but was itself crucial in form (Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 322). The serpent was nailed to it as Christ was nailed. As the symbol of sin, it represented his being made sin for us. The very metal, like the fine brass of Rev 1:15, was an emblem of the might and glory of the Son of Man (comp. Lampe, ad loc.). On the other, it has been maintained (Patrick and Jackson, ut supra) that the serpent was from the beginning, and remains still, exclusively the symbol of evil; that the lifting up of the Son of man answered to that of the serpent because on the cross the victory over the serpent was accomplished. The point of comparison lay not between the serpent and  Christ, but between the look of the Israelite to the outward sign and the look of a justifying faith to the cross of Christ. It will not surprise us to find that in the spiritual, as in the historical interpretation, both theories have an element of truth. The serpent here also is primarily the emblem of the “knowledge of good and evil.” To man, as having obtained that knowledge by doing evil, it has been as a venomous serpent, poisoning and corrupting. In the nature of the Son of Man it is once more in harmony with the divine will, and leaves the humanity pure and untainted. The crucifixion is the witness that the evil has been overcome by the good. Those who are bitten by the serpent find their deliverance in looking to him who knew evil only by subduing it, and who is therefore mighty to save. Well would it have been for the Church of Christ if it had been content to rest in this truth. Its history shows how easy it was for the old perversion to reproduce itself. The highest of all symbols might share the fate of the lower. It was possible even for the cross of Christ to pass into a Nehushtan (comp. Stier, Words of the Lord Jesus, on John 3, and Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant [Eng. transl.], 3, 344-358).

What, then, are the particulars in which these acts in the Old and in the New Test. correspond; or what are the points of resemblance implied in our Lord's words — as and even so? In our answer we must avoid the error of trying to reckon up a number of these resemblances; and, indeed, we must look to essential correspondence, not to any fanciful likeness on the surface. This we must do in agreement with the principle that the relation is the same between the bitten Israelites and the serpent lifted up for them to look at as between perishing sinners and the crucified Savior who is offered to them. There are three such correspondences:

(1) There is “the serpent” which Moses lifted up in the wilderness, and there is “the Son of Man,” lifted up in due time on the cross. It is in stating this point of resemblance, however, that there have been most extravagance and error, which have disgusted some sober thinkers, and induced them to deny it altogether — a denial which we think unwarrantable, when we observe the manner in which the two objects are singled out and placed together. The reference is certainly not at all to heathenish notions of the serpent as possessed of a healing power. Nor even is it directly to the old serpent, on whom Christ has inflicted a fatal wound, and made a show of him openly, triumphing over him in his cross. It is better to say that the brazen serpent had the form indeed of the serpents that actually wrought the mischief, but yet a serpent destitute of  venom and impotent for evil; and that so God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without sin. We prefer, however, to say that the brazen serpent seemed a most improbable means of curing the serpents' bites; and so he who was condemned and crucified as a malefactor seemed most unsuitable to save condemned and perishing men.

(2) There is the lifting up of the serpent upon the pole, no doubt in such a way as to render it conspicuous to the farthest extremities of the camp, which would be the more easily effected on account of its metallic brilliancy. Corresponding to this there is the lifting up of the Son of man, who says, “Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth” (Isa 45:22); as the apostle says to those who have heard the Gospel, “Before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you” (Gal 3:1). It is impossible to overlook this comparison, except by misinterpreting the expression “the Son of Man must be lifted up;” though there is no room for mistake when we have our Lord's own words, “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me,” by which phrase he signified the manner of his death, and was understood as doing so (Joh 12:32-34).

(3) There is the healing of the physical wound by the bodily eye looking to the serpent, and the corresponding spiritual healing by looking to the crucified Son of Man with the eye of faith — the natural life in the one case having that relation to the everlasting life in the other which the type always bears to the antitype.

## Serpent worship[[@Headword:Serpent worship]]

             The extent to which this species of idolatry has prevailed is very remarkable. From the fact that Satan assumed the form of a serpent, in his temptation of our first parents, it has been adopted as the symbol of Typhon, or the evil deity of the ancient Egyptians; of Ahriman among the Persians; and of the spirit of evil in the hieroglyphics of the Chinese and Mexicans. The serpent whose head the Messiah was to crush was transformed, in heathen fable, into the hydra which Hercules vanquished, and in India into that over which Krishna triumphed; into Horus in Egypt, Siegfried among the Germans, and Crac in Poland. We have also the serpent Python slain by Apollo, and the hundred-headed snake destroyed by Jupiter. The serpent was anciently worshipped in Chaldaea and in several other nations of the East. Servius tells us that the ancient Egyptians called serpents good daemons. The asp was the emblem of the goddess Ranno, and was supposed to protect the houses, or the gardens, of individuals, as well as the infancy of a royal child. This serpent was called Thermuthis, and with it the statues of Isis were crowned as with a diadem. The snake Bai also appears to have figured as a goddess; and another snake-headed goddess had the name of Hoh or Hih. The Typhon of the Egyptians had the upper part of his person decorated with a hundred heads like those of a serpent or dragon.  In the religions of all the Asiatic nations the serpent is regarded as a wicked being who brought evil into the world.

As such it became, in course of time, an object of religious worship in almost every part of heathendom, the worship being, inspired rather by the desire to avert evil than to express reverence or gratitude. The Hindu serpent is the type and emblem of the evil principle in nature; and as such we see it wrestling with the goddess Parvati, or writhing under the victorious foot of Krishna, when he saves from its corrupting breath the herds that pasture near the waters of the Yamuna. “As a further illustration of this view, it is contended that many Hindus, who feel themselves constrained to pay religious worship to the serpent, regard it, notwithstanding, as a hideous reptile, whose approach inspires them with a secret awe and insurmountable horror.” In the symbolic language of antiquity the serpent occupies a conspicuous place. . In Gen 3:1 we are told that “the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made.” In consonance with this view the Chinese regard Long, or the winged dragon, as the being who excels in intelligence. The supreme god of the Chaldaeans, Bel, was adored under the form of a serpent or dragon; hence the Apocryphal book. Bel and the Dragon. To represent the Almighty upholding the world by his powerful Word, the Hindus describe it as resting upon a serpent which bites its own tail; and the Phoenicians entwine the folds of a serpent around the cosmic egg. On the Egyptian monuments Kneph is seen as a serpent carried upon two legs of a man, or a serpent with a lion's head. The Siamese, while they are afraid of venomous serpents, never dare to injure them; but, on the contrary, they consider it a lucky omen to have them in or near their houses. Among the Chinese the serpent is a symbolic monster, dwelling in spring above the clouds to give rain, and in autumn under the waters.

Among the North American Indians the serpent was formerly held in great veneration; the Mohicans paying the highest respect to the rattlesnake, which they called their grandfather. Many primitive nations, however, looked upon the serpent as the personification of the evil principle. Among the idolatrous nations who descended from Ham this species of idolatry was universally practiced, and has sometimes been alleged to have been the most prevalent kind of worship in the antediluvian world. See Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship (Lond. 1869, 4to). SEE SERPENT.

## Serpent, Christian Symbolism Of[[@Headword:Serpent, Christian Symbolism Of]]

             As a symbol, the serpent was used by the early Christians in three different senses.

1. To signify the victory of Jesus Christ over the devil.. This was represented by a coiled serpent at the foot of the monogram on the cross to  show “ut qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur.” Antique gems bearing this device have been discovered, but their date cannot be earlier than the time of Constantine. The type is somewhat altered on medals of this emperor, having a dragon pierced by the staff of the labarum.

Ancient iconography often represented the saints as treading upon the serpent to express their victory over the spirit of darkness.

2. The figure of the serpent was also employed to signify the virtue of prudence or wisdom as commanded by Christ, “Be ye wise as serpents;” and as it was supposed that bishops should exemplify this virtue in its highest form (1Ti 3:2), we often find the pictures of early bishops surrounded by a serpent as by a frame. For the same reason, in the early Latin Church the pastoral staff was terminated at the top by a serpent's head.

3. The serpent was used as a symbol of the cross and of Christ himself. These allegories have been developed by Gretzer and Giacomo Bosio in their works on this subject (De Cruce and De Cruce Triumphale). This use of the symbol, derived from the teachings of Christ (Joh 3:14), soon degenerated into a worship of the serpent itself. This reached its climax among the Ophites (q.v.), who set it in the place of Christ himself (Augustine, De Hoeres. c. 17, 46).

In times of persecution, when the exhibition of the cross was interdicted, the early Christians made use in its stead of the emblem of the serpent, as of the lamb, the good shepherd, and many others. These they wore as amulets and in other ways to show their confidence in the Savior which they typified. They are found made of precious stones, on some of which is cut the figure of Moses, a rod in his hand, and an enormous serpent before him; a second person on the other side of the serpent represents the Jewish people. In the commentary upon the 37th Psalm, Ambrose makes use of the type of the serpent principally as a symbol of the resurrection and of immortality.

## Serpentinians[[@Headword:Serpentinians]]

             SEE OPHITES.

## Serpilius, Georg[[@Headword:Serpilius, Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Oedenburg, Hungary, June 11, 1668. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1690 deacon at Wilsdrup, near Dresden, in 1695 pastor at Ratisbon, and died November 23, 1728. He published, Vollstandige Liederconcordanz (Pirna, 1696): — Descriptio Synagogae Serpilianae Inculenta (Ratisbon, 1723): — Personalia Mosis, Josttae, Samuelis, Esrae, Nehemiae, Mordechai et Estheri (Leipsic. 1708): — Personalia Jobi (1710 ): — Personalia Davidis (1713): — Salomo in Continuationem Scriptorum Bibliorum (1715): — Personalia Iesaiae (1717), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Ftirst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Serrad, Giovanni Andrea[[@Headword:Serrad, Giovanni Andrea]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Castel Monardo (now Filadelfia), Feb. 4, 1731, and studied for the priesthood twelve years at Rome under the best teachers. He reorganized the Seminary of Tropea in 1759, and then went to Naples in connection with marquis Fraggianni, whose life he wrote, and also with abbe Genovesi, who procured him the chair of history in the Royal University, and afterwards that of theology in the College of the Savior (1768). He was appointed bishop of Potenza in 1782, but was not consecrated till a year later, owing to some technical opposition. At the reorganization of the Royal Academy of Naples in 1778, he was chosen one of its perpetual secretaries. He was massacred Feb. 24, 1799, during the revolution which followed the French army. He wrote several works on local ecclesiastical history, in Latin and Italian, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Serres (Lat. Serranus), Jean De[[@Headword:Serres (Lat. Serranus), Jean De]]

             , a French Protestant historian and theologian, was born at Villeneuve de Berg about 1540, and educated at Lausanne, especially in ancient languages and philosophy. He early distinguished himself by his learned historical writings. In 1578 he was called to Nismes as rector of the academy and principal of the College of Arts. He was very active and conspicuous in the ecclesiastical affairs of the times, especially by his writings and the part he took in public religious bodies. He died at Geneva, May 31, 1598. For his extensive works, chiefly embracing Church history and polity, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Serry, Francois Jacques Hyacinthe[[@Headword:Serry, Francois Jacques Hyacinthe]]

             a French theologian, was born at Toulon in 1659. He early entered the Order of St. Dominic, and was sent to Paris for an education, where he applied himself to philosophy and began preaching. In 1690 he went to Rome, and became theologian to cardinal Altieri, and was engaged on the Index. He returned to Paris in 1696, and the next year took the degree of doctor, and was called as professor of theology to Padua, where he died, March 12, 1738. His works on ecclesiastical history and theology are enumerated in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v. Among them are, De Christo ejusque Virgine Matre (Venice, 1719): — Historia Congregationum de Aux. Div. Grat. sub Summis Pontiff. Clem. VIII et  Paulo V (in 4 libr. distributa, Louvain, 1700; Antw. 1709, fol.). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 317; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur.

## Serug[[@Headword:Serug]]

             (Heb. Serug', שְׂרוּג, branch [Gesen.], or strength [Fürst]; Sept. Σερούχ; New Test. Σαρούχ, ‘“ Saruch,” Luk 3:35; Josephus Σεροῦγος, Ant. 1, 6, 5), one of the postdiluvian patriarchs, being the son of Reu, and the father of Nahor the grandfather of Abraham (Gen 11:20; 1Ch 1:6). B.C. 2352-2122. His age is given in the Hebrew Bible, at the above passages, as 230 years — thirty years before he begat Nahor and two hundred years afterwards. But in the Sept. 130 years are assigned to him before he begat Nahor (making his total age 330), being one of its systematic variations in the ages of the patriarchs between Shem and Terah. SEE CHRONOLOGY. Bochart (Phaleg, 2, 114) conjectures that the town of Seruj, a day's journey from Charrse, in Mesopotamia, was named from this patriarch. Suidas and others ascribe to him the deification of dead benefactors of mankind. Epiphanius (Adv. Hoeres. 1, 6, 8), who says that his name signifies “provocation,” states that, though in his time idolatry took its rise, yet it was confined to pictures; and that the deification of dead men, as well as the making of idols, was subsequent. He characterizes the religion of mankind up to Serug's days as Scythic; after Serug and the building of the Tower of Babel, the Hellenic or Greek form of religion was introduced, and continued to the writer's time (see Petavius, Anim. adv. Epiph. Oper. 2:13). The account given by John of Antioch is as follows: Serug, of the race of Japhet, taught the duty of honoring eminent deceased men, either by images or statues (εἰκόνες) and ἀνδρίαντες, which, however, may here be used of pictures), of worshipping them on certain anniversaries as if still living, of preserving a record of their actions in the sacred books of the priests, and of calling them gods as being benefactors of mankind. Hence arose polytheism and idolatry (see Fragm. Historic. Groec. 4, 345, and note). It is in accordance with his being called of the race of Japhet that Epiphanius sends Phaleg and Reu to Thrace (Epist. ad Descr. Paul. § 2). There is, of course, little or no historical value in any of these statements, beyond the fact that the charge of idolatry is brought against Terah and the fathers beyond the Euphrates in Jos 24:2.

## Seruk Menachem[[@Headword:Seruk Menachem]]

             SEE SARUK.

## Serumner[[@Headword:Serumner]]

             In Norse mythology, was the beautiful hall in Freya's dwelling of Folkwang, where she gathered about herself, in the service of love and for the enjoyment of all the pleasures of life, half the heroes of the earth. The abode of all the Einheriars is either here or in the Valhalla. — Vollmer, Wörterb. d. Mythol. s.v.

## Servant[[@Headword:Servant]]

             (usually עֶבֶד, ebed, δοῦλος, which are invariably rendered thus in the A.V. or else “bondman;” but “servant” is occasionally the rendering of נִעִר,na'ar, properly a lad or “young man;” or מְשָׁרֵת, meshareth [Exo 33:11; Num 11:28; 2Sa 13:17-18; Pro 29:12], a minister, as elsewhere rendered; Gr. in like manner sometimes παῖς, διάκονος, etc.). SEE EBED. The Hebrew terms na'ar and meshareth, which alone answer to our “servant,” in so far as this implies the notions of liberty and voluntariness, are of comparatively rare occurrence. On the other hand, ebed, which is common in the A.V., properly means a slave. In many passages the correct reading would add considerable force to the meaning — e.g. in Gen 9:25, “Cursed be Canaan; a slave of slaves shall he be unto his brethren;” in Deu 5:15, “Remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt;” in Job 3:19, “The slave is free from his master;” and particularly in passages where the speaker uses the term of himself, as in Gen 18:3, “Pass not away, I pray thee, from thy slave.” Slavery was, in point of fact, the normal condition of the underling in the Hebrew commonwealth, while the terms above given refer to the exceptional cases of young or confidential attendants. Joshua, for instance, is described as at once the na'ar and meshareth of Moses (Exo 33:11); Elisha's servant sometimes as the former (2Ki 4:12; 2 Kings 5, 20), sometimes as the latter (4:43; 6:15). Amnon's servant was a meshareth (2Sa 13:17-18), while young Joseph was a na'ar to the sons of Bilhah (Gen 37:2, where instead of “the lad was with,” we should read “he was the servant boy to” the sons of Bilhah). The confidential designation mesharath is applied to the priests and Levites in their relation to Jehovah (Ezr 8:17; Isa 61:6;  Eze 44:11), and the cognate verb to Joseph after he found favor with Potiphar (Gen 39:4), and to the nephews of Ahaziah (2Ch 22:8). In 1Ki 20:14-15, we should substitute “servants” (na'ar) for “young men.” SEE HIRELING; SEE SLAVE.

## Servant Of Jehovah[[@Headword:Servant Of Jehovah]]

             (עֶבֶד יְהוִֹה, δοῦλος τοῦ Κυρίου, “servant of the Lord,” also in the phrase “my servant,” etc.), a term used tropically in several senses.

1. A worshipper of God (Neh 1:10); so the Israelites in general (Ezr 5:11), and Daniel in particular (Dan 6:21). In this sense it is applied as an epithet to the pious: e.g. to Abraham (Psa 105:6; Psa 105:42), Joshua (Jos 24:29; Jdg 2:8), Job (Job 1:8, etc.), David (Psa 18:1, etc.), Eliakim (Isa 22:20), Zerubbabel (Haggai 2:24), and to saints in general (Psalm 34:23, etc.; Isa 54:17, etc.). SEE SAINT.

2. A minister or ambassador of God, called and sent to perform any service (Isa 49:6), e.g. Nebuchadnezzar, whom God used as his instrument in chastising his people (Jer 27:6; Jer 43:10); but usually some favorite servant, as the angels (Job 4:18), or prophets (Amo 3:7; Jer 7:25, etc.; Dan 9:6; Ezr 9:11), especially Moses (Deu 34:5; Jos 1:1; Jos 1:13; Jos 1:15; Psa 105:26), and Isaiah (Isa 20:3). Sometimes the two ideas of a pious worshipper of God and a special messenger sent by him seem to have coalesced, as in the passages relating to Abraham and Moses, and particularly in those where Israel or Jacob, i.e. the people of Israel, is addressed by this honorable and endearing appellation (as Isa 41:8, etc.; Jer 30:10, etc.; Eze 28:25; Eze 37:25; comp. Hos 11:1).

3. Peculiarly the Messiah is thus typified, especially in the latter chapters of Isaiah (more particularly 42:1; 52:13; comp. Mat 12:13), as preeminently Jehovah's chosen servant for accomplishing the work of redemption. See Gesenius, Comment. in Jesa. ad loc.; Stier, Words of the Lord Jesus, 2, 566 [Am. ed.]; Steudel, De עֶבֶד י8 8י(Tüb. 1829); Umbreit, Der Knecht Gottes (Hamb. 1840); Schmutz, Le Serviteur de Jehovah (Strasb. 1858); Oehler, Knecht Jehovah's (Stuttg. 1865); Urwick, The Servant of Jehovah (Edinb. 1877). SEE DOUBLE SENSE.

## Servants[[@Headword:Servants]]

             SEE SLAVES.

## Servatius, Saint[[@Headword:Servatius, Saint]]

             According to Athanasius (Apol. 2:767), a Gallican bishop, by the name of Servatius, was among those who attended the Council of Sardica in 347, and he may probably have been the same whom Sulpicius Severus sent to Rimini in 359 to defend the Athanasian orthodoxy against the Arians. See  Rettberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 1:204 sq.; Friedrich, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 1:300 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 1:515; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. Servais. (B.P.)

## Servator[[@Headword:Servator]]

             in Roman mythology, was a surname of Jupiter, signifying the preserver.

## Server[[@Headword:Server]]

             one who assists the priest at the celebration of the holy eucharist by lighting the altar tapers, arranging the books, bringing bread, wine, and water for the sacrifice, and by making the appointed responses in the name and behalf of the assembled congregation. He was sometimes called “adjutor.” The Clugniacs allowed one server, but the Cistercians, in obedience to pope Soter's injunction and the plural wording of the Dominus vobiscum, required always two.

## Servetus, Michael[[@Headword:Servetus, Michael]]

             (Serveto, surnamed Reves, known in France as Michel de Villeneuve), unquestionably the leading Antitrinitarian in the period of the Reformation, was born at Villaneuva, in Arragon, in 1509 or 1511, and belonged to an ancient Christian family of prominence, perhaps of noble rank. His father was a jurist and notary, and Michael was sent at an early age to Toulouse in preparation for a similar career; but his impetuous and imaginative spirit was not attracted by the dry study of jurisprudence, and turned with preference towards theological investigations, prompted, perhaps, by the fact that at Toulouse he first became acquainted with the Bible. The above statements are taken from his own testimony at the Geneva trial, and are probably truthful in the main; but it is difficult to harmonize them with his declarations at Vienne, according to which he entered the service of father Quintana, the confessor of Charles V, at the early age of perhaps fourteen or fifteen years, and with his master accompanied the court to Italy on the occasion of the emperor's coronation at Bologna, and to Germany on its return.

The further statement that he remained with Quintana in Germany until the death of the latter in 1532 is known to be positively untrue, since he was at Basle, and alone, by the close of the summer of 1530; and the Geneva testimony recites that he came to Basle direct from Toulouse, by way of Lyons and Geneva, without referring in any way to travels in Italy or Germany. When Servetus came to Basle he was without experience in  the Christian life, and his moral consciousness was undeveloped. Religion was not to him an answer to the questionings of the human heart — a dissolving of doubts in the field of morals, a deliverance from internal conflicts. The unmistakably speculative tendency of his mind led him to conceive of Christianity as being first of all a system of doctrine, and he had already developed a scheme in which the doctrines of God and of his manifestation in Christ, in their speculative aspects, were regarded as constituting its essential basis. The object of his visit was to find a publisher for the book in which he had embodied his views, and to secure the favorable regards of the Swiss reformers in behalf of the modifications he proposed to introduce into. the teaching of the Reformation. OEcolampadius, however, found his statements of doctrinal views obscure and misleading, contrary to the Scriptures, and even blasphemous, as being directed against the eternal godhead of Christ; and when the book finally appeared in 1531 from the press of Conrad Rous, of Hagenau and Strasburg (under the title De Trinitatis Erroribus Libri Septem, etc., 15 sheets, 8vo), it was condemned on every hand. Bucer declared its author to be deserving of death; and when Servetus brought a portion of the edition to Basle, it would seem that the town council confiscated the book and required from him a retraction of its teachings.

A second work from the same press in 1532 (Dialog. de Trinit. Libr. II, de Just. Regni Christi Capit. 4, 8 sheets, 8vo) begins with a retraction of the former book, but on the ground of its immaturity rather than substantial error. This work produced no impression whatever, and Servetus was obliged to renounce the hope of exercising a determining influence over the progress of the Reformation in Germany. He withdrew to France, assumed the name of De Villeneuve, and entered on the study of mathematics and medicine, and also that of philosophy, particularly of theosophic Neo-Platonism, at Paris. At this time he first sought the acquaintance of Calvin, but failed to attend an interview granted at his solicitation by the latter. The life of Servetus while in France was unsettled; the first six years being spent in Paris, Orleans, Lyons, Paris again, where he taught mathematics in the Lombard College, Avignon, and Charlieu; and it was disturbed with frequent disputes, which occasionally involved serious consequences for him. One of these quarrels determined him to leave Paris forever. He had acquired considerable knowledge in medical science — as is attested by his observation of the circulation of the blood, long before Harvey's discovery — and was a zealous student of astrology; but his vanity led him to speak disparagingly of other physicians, and brought on him the opposition of the  medical faculty and of the entire university. He was condemned by the Parliament to destroy all the copies of an apology which he had written to substantiate his position, and to abstain from meddling with astrology except in so far as the natural influence of the stars upon human affairs might be concerned. He ultimately settled at Vienne in response to the invitation of his patron and former pupil, the archbishop P. Paulmier, and spent twelve years in that town in the practice of medicine and in intercourse with the leading clergy; but he still found time for learned labors, both in the line of his own profession and in other departments, one of the results being a new edition of the Latin version of the Bible by Sanctes Pagninus (Lugd. ap. Hug. a Porta, 1542, fol.), with notes.

This work was but carelessly done; the few notes from his pen being chiefly attached to the Messianic prophecies, and aiming to show that such prophecies invariably referred in the minds of the prophets to historical personages and events in the immediate future, and that they had only a typical reference to Christ. The work was accordingly placed in Spain and the Netherlands on the Index Expurgandorum. Servetus had by no means given up his theological speculations, though he accommodated his habits in all respects to his Roman Catholic surroundings. He believed himself called to effect a restoration of true Christianity, which had been obscured and even lost to the world since the beginning of the 4th century, and to promote his ends he opened a correspondence with the Reformed leaders Viret and Calvin. The latter responded, and at first with moderation; but as Servetus assumed a depreciatory attitude, and persisted in the endeavor to contradict the responses made to his inquiries, the reformer eventually refused to continue the correspondence, and referred to his Institutes for further information.. Servetus now resolved to bring before the public the work in which he had laid down the results of his long continued cogitations, and, in utter disregard of the warnings already received from Calvin, as well as of the dangers clearly recognized as impending by his own mind, he carried forward the project to its conclusion. The rashness and almost fanatical tenacity of his natural temper are well illustrated in this undertaking; but the method by which it was accomplished serves to show with equal clearness that he was not above the use of caution, artifice, and even duplicity, when needed to secure himself against the consequences of his action. The bookseller Arnoullet, of Vienne, was secured by the use of money and the false assurances of a friend; the printing was conducted with the utmost secrecy and haste, and immediately on its completion the book was sent to Lyons, Chatillon, Geneva, and Frankfort, without the  knowledge of persons resident in Vienne. It appeared early in 1553, and bore the title Christianismi Restitutio, etc. The author's name is indicated at the end by the letters “M.S.V.” and the name of the publisher and the place of printing are not given.

This most extensive of the works of Servetus (734 pp. 8vo) presents no thorough elaboration and systematic statement of his ideas, but consists rather of a series of disconnected papers, some of them new and others emendations of earlier productions from his pen. It contains seven books De Trinitate Divina; three books De Fide et Justitia Regni Christi, et de Caritate; five books De Regeneratione et Manducatione Superna et de Regno Antichristi; Epistoloe Triginta ad. Jo. Calvinum; Signa Sexaginta Regni Antichristi et Revelatio ejus jam nunc Proesens; and De Mysterio Tinitatis et Veterum Disciplina ad Ph. Melancthonem, etc., Apologia. The attitude of the author towards the dogma of God, the Father, Son, and Spirit, as held by the Church, is that of uncompromising hostility. He regards it as of necessity involving tritheism and polytheism, and even atheism; or, on the other hand, as inconceivable; and he finds it significant that this doctrine began to prevail at the very time from which the Church must date its growing degeneracy. But, while rejecting a trinity of essence in the Godhead, he insists on a trinity of manifestation; the fundamental principle that God is one and undivided leads to a second principle — namely, that everything which comes to pass in or with the divine nature is but a disposition, which does not affect the divine essence, but must be regarded somewhat as one of its accidents. God is able to dispose and manifest himself because he is not an abstract unit, a bare mathematical point, but rather an infinite Spirit, an infinite ocean of substance which fashions all forms and bears them within itself. His manifestation of himself results from the act of his will, rather than from any necessity lying in his nature, and takes place because without such revelation of himself he could not be known by his creatures.

The mode of manifestation is likewise wholly subject to his will, and he is by no means limited to only two revelations of himself; his incorporation in Christ was determined simply by the needs of the world he has chosen to create and those of the human race. It pleased him, consequently, to dispose himself to a twofold manifestation, the one a mode of revelation by the Word, the other a mode of impartation by the Spirit. The Word, however, was not merely an empty articulate sound, but, in harmony with the nature of God, an uncreated light. The Logos is the Eternal Thought, the Eternal Reason, the Ideal  World, the Archetype of the world in which the original types of all things are contained. In this Divine Light was already manifested the form of the future Christ, not ideally alone, but actually and visibly; and from this original type and mode of divine revelation proceed all the modifications of the Deity. The creation of the world, for example, was the necessary condition for the incarnation of the Christ who was preformed in the Eternal Light, which incarnation had been decreed by the will of God; so that the world came into being through Christ, and solely to admit of his becoming man, and it has no significance aside from him who should appear in it and reign. But as a vapor rises with the utterance of a word, so the spirit of God came forth on the utterance of the Creative Word, and the second mode of revelation and disposition was given, in intimate combination with the first. That spirit is more immediately the spirit of natural life, which moves on the waters and breathes in the air — the world soul, by which in respiration the living soul is first given to man. The incarnation of Christ was delayed and obscured by man's fall into sin, but he nevertheless revealed himself in many though imperfect forms. Adam was created in his image; angels and theophanies were his shadows, the cloud of light in the wilderness was the reflection of the heavenly light. The spirit, too, was in the world, but only as a spirit of law and terror.

The truth, and God himself; attained to a full manifestation and revelation for the first time in the man Jesus, in whom the Eternal Word became incarnate in time. The generation of this man is to be conceived of as literal, the Deity which formed the substance of the Logos in the Uncreated Light taking the place of the paternal seed, and the three superior elements contained in that, light — fire, air, and water — combined with the Christ idea and the Life spirit, uniting with the blood and earth substance of the Virgin to form a real man; but the man is so penetrated by the Deity that he becomes God in his flesh and blood, his body, soul, and spirit; he was such while in the embryo, and continues to bear the substantial form of the Godhead when in the grave. The Word, accordingly, did not assume flesh, but became flesh. By virtue of this nature Christ is the Son of God — the only Son, especially the only eternal Son. The eternal generation of the Son within the Godhead is a simple monstrosity, since generation is a function of the flesh alone; an ante-mundane person is conceivable only as it signifies the image or form of Christ as the pre-existing Word, who first became the actual Son of God, however, when he appeared in time and in the nature of man. The manifestation of the divine glory in the person of Christ was, moreover, a gradual process, not fully realized so far as his  body is concerned until the resurrection, when he returned into the divine idea as he had previously come out from that idea into corporeal existence. He is now Jehovah — not Elohim, the God who may appear — and as such is seen by the eye of faith and participates in all the creative power, honor, and dominion of God, with whom he is identified. The Holy Ghost, too, is dependent on the resurrection of Christ for the consummation of his character and his truth. The fullness of the Divine Spirit was, imparted in connection with the Word to the soul of Christ on his becoming incarnate, the two constituting but a single and indivisible substance; but the soul included corruptible elements of blood and created light down to the experience of the resurrection. In that experience he was, so to speak, born again; the creature element was laid aside his human spirit was wholly absorbed into the Spirit of God, and the resultant combination forms the true Holy Spirit, the principle of all regeneration, which proceeds from the mouth of Christ. In this way the real Trinity is constituted — a trinity not of things or so called persons in the divine essence, but a threefold manifestation of himself by the one and indivisible God.

Such was the teaching which Servetus presented to the world as the restored truth of Christianity. He, was incapable, from the tendency of his mind, of admitting the importance of the element of practical ethics in the scheme of Christianity, and regarded the latter as preeminently a system of doctrine. He speaks constantly of the person of Christ, but rarely of his work of redemption. Faith is represented as the central and fundamental element, but rather in the character of apprehension and assent than of trust. The ideas of sin and guilt are scarcely recognized, and are confined to wicked actions; and the results of such actions are held to be not unto death in the case of persons under twenty years of age. The baptism of children is accordingly condemned, and is even characterized as being a principal source of the corruption of the Church. Baptism should not be conferred until persons have reached the age of thirty years, and have been prepared by preaching, careful instruction, repentance, and faith. The Lord's supper should be administered immediately after baptism, since the new man will at once require sustenance. Good works and holy living do not necessarily spring from faith, but they are not beyond the ability of mankind, even in the heathen state. By them a higher degree of blessedness may be attained, and they are useful to strengthen faith and guard against reactions of the flesh; for which reason such works as will subdue the flesh are recommended, and such others as will satisfy the claims of justice  (prayer, almsgiving, voluntary confession, etc.) so far as to wholly or partially deliver from the purgatorial fires which await even the faithful and the baptized in the region of the dead.

The measures by which it was hoped to conceal the author of this book proved insufficient, and Servetus was denounced to the archiepiscopal tribunal of Lyons. Evidence to substantiate the charge was obtained, and the governor-general of Dauphiny ordered his apprehension and trial; and having allowed himself to be entrapped into an acknowledgment of the offense, he was on June 17 condemned to death by fire. He was enabled to effect an escape before the conclusion of the trial, evidently through the assistance of powerful friends, and was accordingly burned in effigy. The sentence of the spiritual court was not pronounced until after his death.

The first intention of Servetus was to escape into Spain, but he soon turned towards Switzerland in the hope of being ultimately able to reach Naples. He arrived at Geneva in the middle of July, and remained about a month in the public hostelry, when Calvin learned of his presence and caused him to be apprehended (Aug. 13). As the laws required that a civilian should appear as the accuser, Nicholas de la Fontaine, Calvin's pupil and amanuensis, acted in that relation, and charged Servetus with having disseminated grossly erroneous teachings, on account of which he had already been imprisoned and was now a fugitive. Thirty-eight articles were attached to this charge, which had been drawn up by Calvin, and to which the accused was required to render categorical answers. Servetus bore himself quietly, and answered with considerable frankness, but the council nevertheless ordered the case to proceed to trial. In a subsequent examination, the accused conceded his rejection of certain orthodox doctrines, and claimed the privilege of publicly and in the Church convincing Calvin, in whom he recognized his principal antagonist, that such doctrines were unscriptural and erroneous.

The action of Philibert Berthelier, a declared enemy to Calvin and leader of the libertine party, who openly sought to protect Servetus, led the reformer to declare himself the real accuser, and he was accordingly admitted to the sessions of the court and allowed to take part in the proceedings. The presence of Calvin, and his own confidence in the protection of powerful supporters, influenced Servetus to display more arrogance in his replies, until in the heat of argument he gave utterance to strong and unequivocally pantheistic assertions. It now appeared that his guilt in the principal matter was proved, and the determination of his punishment alone remained to be  settled. The procurator-general (Aug. 23) brought forward thirty new questions relating to the circumstances of the prisoner's life, his designs, and his intercourse with other theologians, and the warnings he had received from them, to which Servetus responded with greater moderation, though not without doing violence to the truth.

He also petitioned that he might be discharged from trial under criminal process, since such action had never been usual in matters concerning the faith before the time of Constantine, and was the more unreasonable in his case, as his views had been made known to a few scholars only, and he had nothing in common with the rebellious Anabaptists; and he requested, further, that he be furnished with legal counsel as especially necessary to a stranger in his situation. His petition was denied on the recommendation of the procurator-general, to which it is supposed that Calvin was no stranger; but his earlier request for a discussion with Calvin was granted, with the modification that it should take place before the council rather than in the Church. Servetus, however, suddenly changed his tactics, and instead of entering on a discussion with Calvin at their meeting on Sept. 1, he proceeded to deny the competency of civil tribunals to deal with questions of faith; and on the ground that the Church of Geneva could not impartially determine in matters at issue between Calvin and himself, he appealed to the judgment of the churches in other places.

As this appeal corresponded with a resolution already reached in the council, it was entertained, and the matter referred to the authorities of the four evangelical cities of Switzerland; and it was determined that all further transactions should be conducted in writing and in the Latin language. Calvin accordingly extracted from the works of Servetus their most hurtful teachings, and submitted them, accompanied with remarks intended to show their blasphemous and dangerous character, on Sept. 5. Servetus responded with complaints about the treatment he was obliged to undergo, and appealed from the smaller council to the Council of the Two Hundred, many of whose members, as he knew, were hostile to Calvin; but finding it necessary to reply to Calvin's allegations, he permitted himself the use of violent attacks and reproaches against his opponent, while at the same time presenting more clearly, and with less dissimulation than before, the meaning and tendencies of his views. A comprehensive reply by Calvin and his colleagues was met with further insult, though a private communication intended to instruct the former in certain principles of philosophy and other matters was written in a spirit of greater moderation. A messenger from the council conveyed the writings exchanged between the respective parties,  and a copy of the principal work written by Servetus to the councillors and the clergy of Zurich, Berne, Basle, and Schaffhausen. Calvin (did not neglect to influence his friends by means of his private correspondence in the endeavor to secure an approval of his course; and Servetus, in the meantime, directed a complaint against Calvin as a false accuser, and demanded that he should be imprisoned and tried, the prosecution to continue until one of the antagonists should be sentenced to suffer death or some other punishment.

The opinions of the cities had all been received by Oct. 22, and were unanimous in condemning the false teachings of Servetus as not to be tolerated in the Church. The Council of Berne especially urged the use of severe measures to prevent the introduction of such errors, while the clergy of that city sought to moderate the force of that recommendation by a warning against indiscretion. Calvin and his associates were decidedly of the opinion that the penalty of death should be inflicted on the accused, and so expressed themselves, though averse to death by fire as involving unnecessary cruelty. When the council met to determine the penalty to be imposed (Oct. 23), opinions were divided, and several councillors were absent. A recess was therefore taken until Oct. 26. The syndic A. Perrin, a zealous opponent of Calvin, then proposed; first, an acquittal of the accused, and afterwards a reference of the matter to the Council of the Two Hundred, but in each case without success. The sentence of death by fire was pronounced in conformity with the laws of the empire. The condemned man was profoundly, moved, and pleaded earnestly for mercy, but he could not be persuaded to recant. He died Oct. 27, 1553, without having changed his views in any important particular, but not without exhibiting the marks of a Christian spirit.

It is not possible to regard the character of Servetus as favorably as it has been described by the opponents of Calvin. He was not pure and great, and though he ultimately died for his convictions, he was by no means a martyr for the truth. He concealed his beliefs and attended mass in France during more than twenty years at a time when multitudes chose death or the loss of country and prospects rather than deny their faith. He availed himself unhesitatingly of falsehood and perjury, especially in the trial at Vienne. He certainly did not possess a high degree of moral earnestness. As a thinker, he was noticeable for originality and ingenuity, for speculative depth and a wealth of ideas, though the very number of ideas prevented him from presenting them with adequate clearness. His theological and christological  system rested to a much greater extent than he imagined upon hypotheses and theories in natural philosophy, and to a much smaller extent upon the Bible. His one-sided intellectualism, finally, afforded no satisfaction to the religious sense in man, while his strongly pantheistic leanings and his irreverent polemics necessarily offended the religious consciousness. His pyre unfortunately did more to enlighten the world than all his books. His teachings were scarcely understood until the most recent times. His so called followers, the later Antitrinitarians, failed to comprehend either their organic unity or their fullness and depth, and, while they appropriated. surface ideas, were unable to appreciate what is really speculative in his books. Gribaldo and Gentile, for example, sensualize the twofold manifestation of God into an essentiation of subordinate deities, and Socinus degrades the real Sonship and Deity of Christ as taught by Servetus until nothing beyond his essential manhood remains.

The course pursued by Calvin in the trial of Servetus has been the subject of incessant dispute from his own day until now. His contemporaries already condemned his action, though the most eminent orthodox thinkers and theologians approved his course; and though the argument has been renewed as often as occasion offered, the Christian world is not yet able to agree upon a judgment which shall afford universal satisfaction. The facts upon which a decision must be based are as follows:

1. Calvin was thoroughly convinced that the welfare of the Church demanded the death of Servetus as an incorrigible heretic, and never hesitated to acknowledge that conviction. When Servetus requested that Calvin should protect him during a proposed visit to Geneva, the latter refused, and wrote to Farel, under date of Feb. 7, 1546, “If he [Servetus] should come hither, I will not permit him to escape with his life, if my authority has any weight” (Henry, Leben J. Calvin's, 3, 66, appendix). His views upon the subject never changed, as appears from his correspondence while the trial was in progress, e.g. the letter of Sept. 14, 1553 (Ep. et Resp. fol. 127), in which Bullinger urges Calvin not to leave Geneva even though Servetus should not be punished with death. The absence of such facts from the records of the trial is sufficiently explained by the consideration that they were not matter for public record; and the Fidelis Expositio Errorum M. Serveti, etc., written to explain his conduct in that unhappy business, does not justify the argument sometimes based on it to show that Calvin did not desire the death of Servetus, since the book was  intended to show, first, that incorrigible heretics ought to be punished by the secular arm; and, second, that Servetus was such a heretic.

2. In obedience to such convictions, Calvin caused the imprisonment of Servetus as soon as he learned that the latter was in Geneva, and personally directed the prosecution of the trial. Both statements rest on his own repeated acknowledgments in letters to his friends and in his Refutatio, and are substantiated by the public records.

3. While Calvin wished Servetus to die, he did not favor his being burned at the stake (comp. the letter to Farel of Aug. 20, 1553 [Ep. et Resp. fol. 114], and Beza, Joan. Calv. Vita).

It is no longer possible to undertake an unconditional defense of the opinions by which Calvin was governed in this matter, nor of the action which resulted. Unbiased minds are compelled to see that the reformer not only failed in this respect to rise above the errors of his time, but that in his management of the case he was guilty of evasions and exaggerations which form a real blot on his record; but there is no reason to doubt that his course was dictated by his sense of the duty he owed to God, to the Church in general, and to the Church of Geneva in particular; and this forms the only explanation which will justify his action in any degree to candid minds. His failure to save his antagonist from the cruel death by fire was doubtless owing to his difficult position at this very time. The ruling party in Geneva was opposed to Calvin, and had neutralized his measures in some instances insomuch that he declared his intention of leaving that city unless such action should cease; the Council of the Two Hundred was strongly hostile to him; and in the smaller council, before which Servetus was tried, measures were passed of which Calvin did not approve (e.g. the resolution to consult with the authorities of other cities), and direct efforts were made to save the accused from his impending doom. He could not suggest before the council that a different form of capital punishment from that prescribed by law should be inflicted, lest his own sincerity should be impugned by his opponents; and it is not difficult to discover reasons which may have neutralized whatever private efforts he employed. There is, at all events, no sufficient reason for doubting his own explicit statements on the matter. Sources. — The Works of Servetus and Calvin's Refutation; Calvini Ep. et Resp.; Mosheim, Vers. ein. vollst. u. unpart. Ketzergesch. (Helmst. 1748); id. Neue Nachr. v. d. beruhmt. span. Arzte M. Serveto (ibid. 1750); Trechsel, M. Servet u. seine Vorgänger (Heidelb. 1839);  Henry, Leben J. Calvin's, 2, 95 sq., and Beilagen, p. 49 sq. On the teachings of Servetus, see Heberle, M. Servet's Trinitatslehre u. Christologie, in the Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1840, No. 2; Baur, Christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes, 3, 54 sq.; Dorner, Person Christi, 2, 649 sq.; Meier, Lehre v. d. Trinitat in ihrer histor. Entw. 2, 5 sq. On the Genevan trial of Servetus, see Rilliet, Relation du Proces contre M. Servet, etc. (Genèv. 1844). See also Galiffe, Notices Geneal. sur les Familles Genev. and Nouvelles Pages d'Histoire Exacte; Stähelin, J. Calvin, Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften (Elberfeld, 1860-63, 2 vols.).

## Servia[[@Headword:Servia]]

             (Turkish, Sirb Vilayeti), a state of Europe, bounded north by Slavonia and Hungary proper, east by Roumania and Bulgaria, south by Roumelia, and west by Bosnia. Until 1878, Servia was a dependency of Turkey, but in that year the treaty of Berlin established its entire independence. The Servian nationality extends far beyond the boundaries of the principality of Servia. Servians constitute nearly the entire population of Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzegovina; they constitute ninety-five percent of the population in the former kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia, ninety percent in Dalmatia, and eighty percent in the former military frontier. Including all these districts, the Servians occupy a territory of about 69,000 square miles, with a compact population numbering more than 6,000,000 persons. The majority of all the Servians belong to the Orthodox Eastern (or Greek) Church. The following article refers to the principality of Servia exclusively. SEE AUSTRIA; SEE HUNGARY; SEE MONTENEGRO; SEE TURKEY.

1. Area, Population, etc. — Servia contained before the treaty of Berlin 16,817 square miles. Its population in 1885 was 1,902,419, all Serbs of Slavic origin, excepting about 140,000 Wallachs, 25,000 Gypsies, and 15,000 Turks, Bulgarians, Jews, Germans, and Hungarians. By the treaty. of Berlin in 1878 a territory formerly belonging to Turkey was annexed to Servia, and the area of the principality raised to 18,687 square miles, with a population of 1,720,000 inhabitants. The country is mountainous and densely wooded. From the interior numerous chains proceed northward, forming massive barriers both on the eastern and western frontiers, and sloping pretty steeply towards the swampy plains along the Save and the Danube. The principal rivers are the Morava and Timok, affluents of the Danube, and the Kolubara, an affluent of the Save, which itself falls into  the Danube at Belgrade. The principal towns are Belgrade (the capital), Kraguyevatz, Semendria, Uzhitza, and Shabatz, and in the new districts Nish and Vranya. The climate is temperate and salubrious, but somewhat cold in the higher regions. The soil in the valleys is fertile, and cereals are raised in abundance. The mountains are believed to be rich in valuable minerals, but mining is almost unknown, and manufacturing industry is in the most backward condition. There is no nobility, and the peasants are free householders.

2. Church History. — The original inhabitants of Servia were principally Thracians. Conquered, shortly before Christ, by the Romans, it formed part of Illyricum, under the name of Moesia Superior. Overrun by the Huns, Ostrogoths, Longobards, etc., it came under Byzantine rule about the middle of the 6th century, but was wrested therefrom early in the 7th century by the Avars. These latter were driven out by the Serbs, then living north of the Carpathians, who themselves spread over the country in great numbers. About the middle of the 9th century they were converted to Christianity by missionaries sent by the emperor Basil. For about 200 years they were almost constantly at war with the neighboring Bulgarians, but in 1043 Stephen Bogislas broke their power. His son Michael (1050-80) took the title of king, and was recognized as such by pope Gregory VII. A struggle of nearly a hundred years resulted in the maintaining of their independence, and in 1165 Stephen Nemanja founded a dynasty which lasted for two centuries. During this period the kingdom attained the acme of its power and prosperity, embracing, under Stephen Dushan (1336-56), the whole of Macedonia, Albania, Thessaly, Northern Greece, and Bulgaria. At the request of king Stephen II, son of Stephen Nemanja, the bishops of Servia were in 1221 authorized by the patriarch of Constantinople to elect their metropolitan on condition that he be confirmed by the patriarch.

The brother of the king, St. Sabbas, became the first archbishop of Uzhitza and all Servia. Stephen Dushan, in 1351, convoked the synod at Seres, which raised the metropolitan of Servia to the dignity of a patriarch, and declared him independent of the patriarch of Constantinople. The jurisdiction of the Servian patriarch extended not only over Servia and Bulgaria, but also over a large portion of Macedonia. He had his residence near Ipek, at the termination of the Streta Gora Mountains in Albania. In consequence of this measure, the patriarch of Constantinople pronounced the anathema against the Servian patriarch, but this was revoked in 1379.  The progress of the Turkish arms proved fatal to the welfare of Servia. In 1389 Lazarus I was defeated at Kossovopolje, and his son and successor, Stephen, became a vassal of Turkey. In 1459 Mohammed II incorporated Servia with Turkey, excepting Belgrade, which was held by the Hungarians until 1521.

By the treaty of Passarowitz (1718) a considerable portion of the country was made over to Austria, but in 1739 it reverted to Turkey. During all this time the Turkish government had allowed the patriarchate to continue. Even when, in 1690, patriarch Arsenius III, after the failure of the Servian insurrection which the Austrians had instigated against Turkish rule, had emigrated with 37,000 Servian families to Austrian territory, the patriarchate of Ipek was not interfered with, but the appointment was always conferred upon a Greek, who purchased the position from the divan of Constantinople; In 1765 (according to another statement in 1769) this patriarchate was abolished and united with that of Constantinople. The last patriarch (Basil) fled to Russia, where he died, in St. Petersburg. Four metropolitans, generally Greeks, were now appointed for Servia, the sees of whom were Belgrade, Nish, Uzhitza. and Novi-Bazar, and none of whom had a suffragan. After sixty years of oppression, the people, under George Czerny, rebelled, and, with the assistance of Russia, triumphed, and Czerny was elected by the people prince of Servia. Deserted by Russia and France, the Turks again became masters of the country (1813). But two years after, under Milosh Obrenovitch, the people won back their liberties. Milosh was chosen prince of Servia (1817), and subsequently recognized by the sultan. After the election of Czerny, the metropolitan of Carlovitz, in Austria, had been recognized as the head of the Servian Church; but in 1830 Milosh again appointed a metropolitan for Servia. In 1834 Turkey restored six Servian districts which she had retained since 1813, and in the spring of 1872 relinquished a few additional localities, though not all that Servia claimed as her own. The seat of the legislature, which had always been at Kraguyevatz, was removed to Belgrade in October, 1875.

3. Religion, etc. — The inhabitants nearly all belong to the Greek Church, but are independent of the patriarch of Constantinople.

The hierarchy of the Church of Servia consists at present (1879) of a metropolitan and five bishops. The metropolitan is elected by the prince and the Servian bishops. He resides at Belgrade, and, according to the regulations of 1839, is assisted in the government of the Church by a titular bishop and several protopresbyters and presbyters. The titular bishop and  the other diocesan bishops constitute, at the same time, the Synod of the Metropolitan, to which are referred all marriage affairs, as well as all complaints of the administration and government of the Church by the metropolitan. The metropolitan receives fees far the ordination of presbyters, the consecration of churches, etc., and a fixed annual income of 6000 florins (about $2400). He also possesses some real estate, especially vineyards near Semendria. The bishops are elected by the people, under the superintendence and guidance of the minister of justice, and ordained by the metropolitan. They have an unlimited jurisdiction in all matters purely ecclesiastical. All churches and ecclesiastical institutions are under the superintendence of the minister of justice, who makes the necessary arrangements conjointly with the elders of the Church. Servia has now five diocesan bishops, namely, the bishop of Shabatz, the bishop of Uzhitza (who resides at Karanovatz), the bishop of Negotin, and in the districts annexed in 1878 to Servia the bishops of Nish and Vranya. Each of them has a fixed income of 4000 florins (about $1600). He also receives fees for ordinations, consecration, and other ecclesiastical functions. In regard to fees for burials, the bishop has to come to an understanding with the family of the deceased. All other fees were abolished in 1822, although voluntary gifts are still frequently made and accepted. The bishops have to pay from their income their archdeacons and secretaries. The secular clergy number about nine hundred members. The clergymen in the town receive fixed salaries, while those in the rural districts only receive fees. Every parish priest is obliged to keep accurate lists of births, marriages, and deaths..

Servia has many convents, most of which, however, have only a small number of inmates. Many of the convents have been wholly abandoned; others are hermitages, near which lodging houses are erected at the time of pilgrimages. The convent Sweti Kral (holy king) at Studenitza contains the bones of king Stephen Nemanja, by whom it was founded, and who in 1200 died as monk of one of the convents on Mount Athos. His son Rastka, better known in Servian history as St. Sabbas, the first archbishop of Uzhitza, transferred the bones of his father in 1203 to the Convent of Studenitza; which after the cloister name of king Stephen is sometimes called the Laura of St. Simon.

A Roman Catholic bishopric was established by pope Innocent X in 1644 at Belgrade. In 1728 the see was transferred from Belgrade to Semendria, and the name of the diocese is now Belgrade and Semendria. The bishop is a suffragan of the archbishop of Antivari, in Albania. The number of  Roman Catholics is small. In 1861 some accounts claimed a population of 30,000, but the Roman statistician Petri (Prospetto della Gerarchia Episcopale [Rome, 1850]) says nothing of the Roman Catholic population of the diocese. The official statistical bureau of Belgrade gave the number of Roman Catholics in 1874 as 4161. In 852,.the papal ‘nuncio of Vienna, Viale Prela, visited Belgrade in order to reorganize the diocese, but no account of the results of his mission has ever been published. The Protestants numbered in 1874, according to the official statistical report of the government, 463, the Jews 2049, and the Mohammedans 6306. In the districts annexed in 1878 there are estimated to be 75,000 Mohammedans. Secession from the State Church is rigorously forbidden, but otherwise all the other religious denominations enjoy entire religious liberty.

Education is making rapid progress in Servia. Fifty years ago there was no public primary school; now education is compulsory, and for its management a special ministry of education has been organized. In 1874 there were 517 public schools, with 23,000 pupils. The first gymnasium was established in 1830, and in 1874 the principality had two complete gymnasia and five progymnasia, with an aggregate attendance of 2000 students. A normal school was established in 1872. The high school in Belgrade contains three faculties, and has about 200 students.

4. Character. — The Servians are distinguished for the vigor of their frame, their personal valor, love of freedom, and glowing poetical spirit. Their manners and mode of life are exceedingly picturesque, and strongly prepossess a stranger in their favor. They rank among the most gifted and promising members of the Slavic family. See Ranke, Die serbische Revolution (Hamburg, 1829; 2d ed. 1844); Milutinovitch, Gesch. Serbiens von 1389-1815 (Leipsic, 1837); Cunibert, Essai Historique sur les Revolutions et l'Independance de la Serbie depuis 1804 jusqu'a 1850 (ibid. 1855, 2 vols.); Hilferding, Gesch. der Serben und Bulgaren (Bautzen, 1856) Denton [Rev. W.], Servia and the Servians (Lond. 1862); Elodie Lawton Mijatovics (Wm. Tweedie), Hist. of Modern Servia (ibid. 1874); Saint-René Taillandier, La Serbie au 19e Siecle, Kara George et Milosch (Paris, 1875); Grieve, The Church and People of Servia (Lond. 1864); Jakshich, Recueil Statistique sur les Contrées Serbes (Belgrade, 1875).

## Servian Version[[@Headword:Servian Version]]

             SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

## Service[[@Headword:Service]]

             (properly עֲבודָה, δουλεία, i.e. bondage; but the rendering in the A.V. in many places of less severe words, as צָבָא שַׂרָד, διακονία, λατρεία, etc.). SEE SERVITUDE.

## Service Of The Church[[@Headword:Service Of The Church]]

             It appears that there was a daily celebration of divine worship in the time of Cyprian; and it has been supposed that the practice of offering public prayer every morning and evening was established during the 3d century. The order of the daily morning and evening services, as they undoubtedly obtained in the 4th century was as follows: The morning service began with the reading of Psalms 63, followed by prayers for the catechumens, energumens, candidates for baptism, and penitents; for the faithful, the peace of the world, and the state of the Church. Then followed a short prayer for preservation during the day, the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, the imposition of hands, or bishop's benediction, concluding with the dismissal of the congregation with the usual form, Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ “Depart in peace.” The evening service (called hora lucernaris, because it began at the time of lighting candles) was in most parts the same with that of the morning, except with such variation of psalms, hymns, and prayers as were proper to the occasion. 1. The psalm was the one hundred and forty-first; 2. Proper prayer for the evening; 3. The evening hymn. In some churches the Lord's Prayer was always made a part of the daily worship both morning and evening (see Bingham, Christ. Antiq. 13, 10, 11). At the Reformation, in order to supply the absence of a vain and idolatrous worship by a scriptural and reasonable service, it was appointed that the “morning and evening service” should be “said daily throughout the year.” This order is observed in cathedral and collegiate churches, in the universities, and in some parishes, but has not been generally followed in parochial churches.

## Service book[[@Headword:Service book]]

             a book of devotion, of prayer.  That of the Church of England contains the Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church. SEE COMMON PRAYER.

The service books of the Latin Church include the Missal, the Pontifical, the Day Hours, the Breviary, the Ritual, the Processional, the Ceremonial for Bishops, the Benedictional.

Those of the Greek Church are, (1) the Euchologion, corresponding to the Missal; (2) the Menoea, answering to the Breviary, without the ferial offices, and full of ecclesiastical poetry in measured prose; (3) Paracletice, or great Octoechus, the ferial office for eight weeks, mainly the work of Joseph of the Studium; (4) Triodion, the Lent volume, from the Sunday before Septuagesima to Easter; and (5) the Pentecostarion, the office for Eastertide.

## Service, John, D.D[[@Headword:Service, John, D.D]]

             a minister of the Church of Scotland, was born at Campsie, February 26, 1833. He studied at the University of Glasgow in 1858-62, but did not graduate. He was sub-editor of Mackenzie's Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography. For ten months in 1862 he was minister at Hamilton, but was compelled by ill-health to resign. He next went to Melbourne, Australia, for two years, leaving it for Hobart Town, Tasmania, where he remained for four years, 1866-70. He then returned home, and in 1872 was appointed to the parish of Inch, which he left in 1879 for Hyndland Established Church, Glasgow, where he remained until his death, March 15, 1884. He wrote a novel, Lady Hetty (3 volumes, 1875): — Salvation Here and Hereafter: — Sermons and Essays (1876).

## Service, The[[@Headword:Service, The]]

             SEE LORDS SUPPER.

## Services[[@Headword:Services]]

             an ecclesiastical name for arrangements of the Canticles, Te Deum, Benedictus, Benedicite, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis, and the psalms sung by substitution for them, consisting of a succession of varied airs, partly verse and partly chorus, sung in regular choirs, of which, probably, the germ is to be found in the Ambrosian Te Deum, a succession of chants which is mentioned first by Boethius, who lived a century after Augustine. The simplified notation of this music, as used in the Salisbury and Roman breviaries, was composed by Marbecke. Tallis's service is an imitation, rather than an adaptation, of the original arrangement. Probably the first was the setting of the Venite by Caustun in the time of Henry VIII. In 1641 complaint was made of “singing the Te Deum in prose after a cathedral church way.” There are two classes:

(1) full services, which have no repetitions, and are sung with an almost regular alternation by the two choirs:

(2) verse services, which have frequent repetitions, no regular alternations, and are full of verses, either solos or passages sung in slower time by a selected number of voices.

## Services, Domestic[[@Headword:Services, Domestic]]

             The domestic officers (servitia) of a monastery were the cook, baker, brewer, laundryman, and tailor. At Rochester these were appointed by the bishop.

## Serving Dress or Robe[[@Headword:Serving Dress or Robe]]

             SEE SURPLICE.

## Serving Tables[[@Headword:Serving Tables]]

             one of the parts of the Presbyterian sacramental service. Where the Presbyterians have not adopted the Congregational mode of partaking of the sacrament, the following is the order: “The table on which the elements are placed, being decently covered, the bread in convenient dishes, and the wine in cups, and the communicants orderly and gravely sitting around the table or in their seats before it, the minister sets the elements apart by prayer and thanksgiving,” etc. The whole of the communicants not partaking at once, it is found necessary to continue the distribution of the elements, with intervals of psalm singing; during which those who have eaten leave the table to give place to a fresh set of communicants. The distribution of the bread and wine and the delivery of an address are what constitutes serving the table. The number of tables varies from four to eight, and each address occupies ten minutes or a quarter of an hour. The minister of the place serves the first table; the rest are served by his assisting brethren.

## Servites, Or Servants Of The Blessed Virgin Mary[[@Headword:Servites, Or Servants Of The Blessed Virgin Mary]]

             an order of monks in the Roman Catholic Church founded (1233) in Florence by seven rich Florentine merchants. Their main object was to propagate devotion to the Virgin Mary. They lived at first as hermits, but, becoming a monastic order, adopted the rule of St. Augustine and obtained from pope Martin V the privileges of a mendicant order. The order having become relaxed, it was reestablished in 1593 in its original strictness as “Servites Eremites.” This order has produced a large number of distinguished men, among whom may be mentioned father Paul Sarpi, author of the History of the Council of Trent, and St. Philip Benizi (died 1285), one of the apostles of Western Europe in the 13th century. The Servites were extremely popular during the 16th century because of their  many works of charity. Their dress was a cassock of serge, a cloak, a scapular, and an alms bag.

There were also female Servites, who were never very numerous, and a large body of Tertiarians (q.v.). The order, in 1870, was divided into twenty-seven provinces, the central house being the monastery of the Annunziazione in Florence. They were involved in the decrees suppressing religious orders in Italy and Germany. They were introduced into the United States in 1870 by bishop Melcher of Green Bay, Mich. There was a similar order founded In Naples in 1243.

## Servitor[[@Headword:Servitor]]

             (מְשָׁרֵת, meshareth, a minister, as elsewhere rendered), a personal attendant, but not in a menial capacity (2Ki 4:43). SEE SERVANT.

## Servitude[[@Headword:Servitude]]

             (עֲבֹדָה). The servants of the Israelites were slaves, and usually foreigners (1Ch 2:34), who vet were required to be circumcised (comp. Gen 17:23; Gen 17:27). Servants of both sexes were acquired (comp. Mishna, Kiddushin, 1, 2 sq.), sometimes as prisoners of war, whose lives were spared (comp. Num 31:26 sq.), sometimes by purchase in peace (these were called miknath keseph, “purchased,” Jdt 4:10; comp. Livy, 41, 6; see Gen 17:23; Exo 21:7; Exo 22:2; Lev 25:44; and on their purchase in Abyssinia now, see Russegger, Reis. 1, 156). But foreign servants who had escaped could neither be enslaved nor given up to their masters (Deu 23:15 sq.). The children of slaves were of course the property of the master (comp. Gen 17:23; Exo 21:4). These were generally considered most faithful (Horace, Ephesians 2, 2, 6). At the legal valuation, perhaps an average, thirty silver shekels were given for a servant (Exo 21:32), while a free Israelite was valued at fifty (Lev 27:3 sq.). On the price of remarkable servants in Egypt under the Ptolemies, see Josephus (Ant. 12, 4, 9). A moderate price for a Jewish slave was one hundred and twenty drachms (ibid. 12, 2, 3). An Israelite could become by purchase the property of another (Exo 21:2; Deu 15:12) if he was compelled by poverty to sell himself (Lev 25:39), but he could not, according to the law, be treated as a slave, and in any case he obtained his freedom again, without ransom, after six years of service, or in the year of jubilee  (Exo 21:2 sq. Lev 25:39-40 sq.), if he were not ransomed earlier (Lev 25:48 sq.). Perhaps the case was different with him who was sold for theft (Exo 22:3). Even this sale was always to an Israelite.(Josephus, Ant. 16, 1, l), though whether to the injured man or to the highest bidder is doubtful (ibid. 4, 8, 27). It seems that hard creditors could sell insolvent debtors or their families (Isa 1:1; Neh 5:5; Mat 18:25), but perhaps not legally, as sometimes among the Greeks (Becker, Charik. 2, 32). Parents were permitted to sell daughters (Exo 21:7), but the law showed much favor to such servants (Exo 21:8 sq.), for, though there is difficulty in the statements, it is plain that they were protected against violence (see Hengstenberg, Pentat. 2, 438 sq., whom Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 216, contradicts without reason). It is plain that servants could not have been dispensed with among a people where almost every man was an agriculturist, and where there were few of a lower class to work for hire (yet comp. Lev 19:13; Deu 24:14; Job 7:2; also Josephus, Ant. 4, 8, 38); and, indeed, the ancestors of the Israelites, the nomadic patriarchs, had numbered slaves among their valuable possessions (Gen 12:16; Gen 24:35; Gen 30:43; Gen 32:5).

 These were very numerous (Gen 14:14), and, in case of need, served as an army for defense (Gen 14:14 sq.). When a daughter of the family married a stranger, a female servant accompanied her to her new home (Gen 29:24; Gen 29:29). The Mosaic law sought to establish on just principles a permanent relation between master and servant, and conferred many favors on the servants. They not only enjoyed rest from all work every seventh day (Exo 20:10); not only was it forbidden to punish a slave so severely that he should die on the spot (Exo 21:20), or to mutilate him (Exo 20:26 sq.), on penalty, in the former case, of suffering punishment (not death, perhaps, as the rabbins say; comp. Koran, 2, 179); in the latter, of the freedom of the slave (less protection than this was given to the Greek and Roman slaves; see Becker, Charik. 2, 48; Röm. Alter. 2, 1, 58 sq.); not only were they to be admitted to certain festivals (Deu 12:12; Deu 12:18; Deu 16:11; Deu 16:14, comp. Athen. 14, 639; Buttmann, Myth. 2, 52 sq.), but every slave of Hebrew descent obtained his freedom after six years' servitude (Exo 21:2 sq.; Deu 15:12; comp. Josephus, Ant. 16, 1, 1; including females, Deu 15:12); yet without wife or child, if these had come to him in the house of his master (Exo 21:3 sq.); and the year of jubilee emancipated all slaves of Hebrew descent (Lev 25:41; Jer 34:8 sq.; comp. Josephus, Ant. 3, 12, 3). If a slave would not  make use of the legal freedom granted him in the seventh year, but wished to remain in his master's house, then he was led to the judge, and his ear was bored (Exo 21:6; Deu 15:17. So the bored ears among other nations were a proof of servitude — as the Arabians [Petron, Satir. 102], the Lydians, Indians, and Persians [Xenoph. Anab. 3, 1, 31; Plutarch, Sympos. 2, 1, 4];. yet comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 2, 70 sq., and on the symbolic customs at manumission by the Romans, see Becker, Rom. Alter 2, 1, 66 sq. Plautus [Poen. 5, 2, 21] shows that the wearing of earrings was a mark of a slave).

There is no other kind of manumission mentioned in the Old Test. (see Mishna, Maas. Sheni, 5, 14). It was at least allowed to slaves of Israelitish descent to acquire some property (Lev 25:49; comp. Arvieux, 4, 3 sq.); and though, on the whole, the servants were required to labor diligently (Job 7:2; Sir 33:26; Sir 33:28), and the masters required attention and obedience in service (Psa 123:2), inflicting corporal punishment when necessary (Pro 29:19; Pro 29:21; Sir 23:10; Sir 33:10), yet the lot of Israelitish servants seems to have been more tolerable than that of those in Rome (Becker, Gallus, 1, 128 sq.) and of the modern slaves in the East; yet the tatter, even among the Turks, are not treated so inhumanely as is often thought (comp. Arvieux, 3, 385; Burckhardt, Reise durch Arabien u. Nubien, p. 232 sq.; Wellsted, 1, 273, Russegger, 2, 2, 524. On the mild treatment of slaves in ancient India, see Von Bohlen, Indien, 2, 157 sq.). Hebrew slaves sometimes married their masters' daughters (1Ch 2:35; see Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3, 253 sq.). It was more usual for the masters to give Israelitish slaves as wives to. their sons, by which they acquired the rights of daughters (Exo 21:9; comp. Gen 30:3; Chardin, Voyage, 2, 220). The relation of chief servant, or head of the house, in. whom the master reposed full confidence, may have continued in the more important families from patriarchal times (Gen 24:2; comp. 15:2; 39:2; and for a modern parallel, Arvieux, 4, 30) and slaves seem even to have been employed to educate the sons of the house (παιδαγωγοί, Gal 3:24 sq.; see Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterth. 2, 368).

The common slaves were required to do field and house work (Luk 17:7 sq.), and, especially the females, to turn the hand mill, and to take off or carry the master's sandals, etc. None but the Essenes, among the Jews, rejected all slavery, as contradicting the natural freedom of men (Philo, Op. 2, 458, etc.; so the Therapeutae, ibid. 2, 482).  It is well known that in war with foreign nations many Jews were sold abroad as slaves (Joe 3:11; Amo 1:6; Amo 1:9; 1Ma 3:41; 2Ma 8:11, comp. Deu 28:68). This happened. especially in the wars with Egypt (Josephus, Ant. 12, 2, 3) and Syria, then with Rome; and after the destruction of Jerusalem ninety-seven thousand Jews fell into the power of the victorious enemy (id. War, 6, 9, 2). The Jewish community at Rome consisted, in great measure, of freed slaves. See, in general, Pignoria, De Servis et eor. ap. Vet. Minister. (Patav. 1694, and often); Mos. Maimon. De Servis et Ancillis (tract. c. vers. et not. Kall, Hafn. 1744); Abicht, De Servor. Hebr. Acquis. atq. Serv. (Lips. 1704); Alting,. Opp. 5, 222 sq,; Mieg, Constitut. Servi Hebr. ex Script. et Rabbin. Collect. (Herborn, 1785); Michaelis, Mos. Rit. 2, 358 sq.; Amn. Bib. Repos. 2d Ser. 11, 302 sq. SEE NETHINIM; SEE SLAVE.

## Servus Servorum Dei[[@Headword:Servus Servorum Dei]]

             (Servant of the servants of God), an official title of the Roman pontiffs, in use since the time of Gregory the Great, by whom, according to his biographer, Paul the Deacon, it was assumed as a practical rebuke of the ambitious assumption of the title of “OEcumenical (or universal) Patriarch” by John, surnamed Nestentes, or the Faster, contemporary patriarch of Constantinople. Other Christian bishops previous to Gregory had employed this form, but he was doubtless the first of the bishops of Rome to adopt it as a distinctive title. It is found in all the letters of Gregory preserved by the Venerable Bede in his history.

## Sescuplum[[@Headword:Sescuplum]]

             (taken once and a half), that sort of usury which consisted in making loans at fifty percent interest. Being a grievous extortion and great oppression, it was condemned in the clergy by the councils of Nice and Laodicea, under the name of ἡμιολίαι; and also in laymen by the law of Justinian, which allows nothing above centesimal interest in any case. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. 6, 2, 6. SEE USURY.

## Sesha[[@Headword:Sesha]]

             is, in Hindu mythology, the great king of the serpent race, on whom Vishnu reclines on the primeval waters. He has a thousand heads, which serve as a canopy to Vishnu; and he upholds the world, which rests on one  of his heads. His crest is ornamented with jewels. Coiled up, Sesha is the emblem of eternity. He is often also called Vasuki or Ananta, “the eternal.”

## Sesis[[@Headword:Sesis]]

             (Σεσίς v.r.Σεσσείς) a Graecized form (1Es 9:34) of the name SHESHAI SEE SHESHAI (q.v.), in the Hebrew list (Ezr 10:40).

## Session Of Christ[[@Headword:Session Of Christ]]

             the perpetual presence of our Lord's human nature in the highest glory of heaven. The statement of the fact appears in all the Latin forms of the Creed; its earlier words being “Sedet ad dexteram Patris,” which developed into “Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis” at some time not later than the 6th century. The article does not appear in the Creed of Nicaea, but in the Constantinopolitan expansion of that formulary it is given in words which are similar to those of the ancient Latin Church, καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός. Naturally two questions suggest themselves for consideration:

1. What does this exaltation of Christ's human nature imply? We answer, An actual translation of his body and soul to heaven and their actual continued abode there, and that in uninterrupted identity with the body and soul which had been born of Mary. This identity was historically established by the chosen witnesses of the resurrection, who saw his ascension and heard the words of the angels, “This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven,” etc. (Act 1:11); and not long after by the declaration of Stephen (Act 7:56). Although the body of Christ has doubtless undergone a change so that it is a spiritual body, yet locality may be predicated of it now as well as previous to his death. It is an error, therefore, to suppose that the bodily presence of Christ is that of the omnipresent Deity, as is maintained by the Ubiquitarians (q.v.). Because of this local bodily presence Christ sends his Holy Spirit to men..

2. What is the result of this exaltation? It was accomplished partly with reference to the glory of his own person, and partly with reference to his work as the Savior of mankind. The human nature which, united with the divine nature, accomplished. the purpose of God was fittingly raised up to the highest glory — “Wherefore God highly exalted him,” etc. The ultimate object of the Incarnation was to bring us to God, into the divine presence. By this exaltation of our nature in the person of Christ a capacity was  originated for its exaltation in ourselves. And, being the firstborn among many brethren, he carried out humanity into heaven as the “Forerunner” of those who are united to him, as he said, “that where I am, there ye may be also” (Joh 14:2-3). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. “Stand Christi;” Blunt, Dict. of Doct. Theology, s.v. SEE INTERCESSION; SEE RESURRECTION.

## Session, Church (or Kirk)[[@Headword:Session, Church (or Kirk)]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIANISM.

## Sessions, John, D.D[[@Headword:Sessions, John, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Putney, Vermont, September 29, 1795. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1822, studied one year at Princeton Theological Seminary, ministered at various Presbyterian and Congregational churches in New York, Ohio, and Connecticut, teaching several years meanwhile until 1863, when he removed to California, and in 1879 to Honolulu, where he died, April 6, 1884. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 10.

## Sesthel[[@Headword:Sesthel]]

             (Σεσθήλ), a corrupt form (1Es 9:31) of the Hebrew name BEZALEEL SEE BEZALEEL (q.v.), of the “sons” of Pahath-moab (Ezr 10:30).

## Sesuto (Or Sisuta) Version Of The Holy Scriptures[[@Headword:Sesuto (Or Sisuta) Version Of The Holy Scriptures]]

             The Sesuto belongs to the African languages, and is spoken by the Basutos, who form a part of the Bechuana nation, dwelling between the Winterberg mountains and the higher branches of the Yellow River. For this people of South Africa the Gospel of Matthew was translated and printed in 1837. In 1839 the gospels of Mark and Luke, as translated by the French missionaries Pelissier, Arbousset, and Casalis, were printed in Cape Town, to which in 1849 the Gospel of John was added. Since that time not only the rest of the New Test., but also parts of the Old Test., have been added, and it is hoped that very soon this people will have the whole Bible in their own vernacular. Up to March 30, 1878, about 25,532 copies of portions of the Scriptures had been circulated among them. See The Bible of Every Land, but more especially the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society since 1860. (B.P.)

## Set[[@Headword:Set]]

             (or Sutekh), an ass-headed deity, the national god of the Shemitic Hyksos, who, on their invasion of Egypt in the interval between the thirteenth and eighteenth dynasties, forced his sole worship upon the Egyptians. Set was already one of the cosmical deities of the country, but after the expulsion of the Hyksos his worship was annulled, his statues defaced, and his name everywhere erased. He was represented as an ass-headed man, holding the usual crux ansata, or staff of life, and the cucufa, staff of divine power. The Egyptians were accustomed to regard Set as a personification of the evil principle. "The worship of this god passed through two historical phases. At one time he was held in honor, and accounted as one of the greater gods of Abydos. He appears to have had a position analogous to that of the Theban deity Mentu, in which he was the adversary of the serpent Apophis, the symbol of wickedness and darkness. Some time later on, in consequence of political changes, the worship of Set was abolished, and his statues were destroyed. It is difficult to state at what period Set was introduced into the Osirian myths as a personification of evil, and thus became identified with Typhon as the murderer of the great Egyptian god Osiris. The treatise (by Plutarch), De Iside et Osiride, makes Nephthys the companion of Set, and she is represented united with him in a group in the Museum of the Louvre, in the Hall of the Gods. The animal symbolical of Set was a carnivorous quadruped, at one time confounded with the ass-god of Josephus and Apion, having a long, curved snout and upright, square- topped ears, which characters are often exaggerated to distinguish him from the jackal of Anubis" (Pierret). After the second restoration of the old mythology, in the period of the nineteenth dynasty, Set was identified with the Hyksos Sutekh, who was properly an Asiatic deity, and whose worship was maintained even by Seti I and Rameses II. Both gods, however, were treated as impious, and their worship as heretical, and it is at the present time impossible to distinguish exactly between them, owing to the  complete destruction by the Egyptians of all those parts of the monuments whereon their names occur.

## Set Off (Or Offset)[[@Headword:Set Off (Or Offset)]]

             The part of a wall, etc., which is exposed horizontally when the portion above it is reduced in thickness. Set offs are not unfrequently covered, and in great measure concealed, by cornices or projecting moldings, but are more usually plain. In the latter case, in classical architecture, they are generally nearly or quite flat on the top, but in Gothic architecture are  sloped, and in most instances have a projecting drip on the lower edge toe prevent the wet from running down the walls: this is especially observable in the set offs of buttresses.

## Seth[[@Headword:Seth]]

             (Heb. Sheth, שֵׁת, i.e. compensation; Sept. and New Test. Σήθ; Josephus, Σῆθος [Ant. 1, 2, 3]; A.V. “Sheth” in 1Ch 1:1; Num 24:7), the third son of Adam (born B.C. 4042), and the father of Enos (when 105 years old); he died at the age of 912 (Gen 4:25-26; Gen 5:3-8; 1Ch 1:1; Luk 3:38). The signification of his name (given in Gen 4:25) is “appointed” or “put” in the place of the murdered Abel, and Delitzsch speaks of him as the second Abel; but Ewald (Gesch. 1, 353) thinks that another signification, which he prefers, is indicated in the text, viz. “seedling,” or “germ.” The phrase “children of Sheth” (Num 24:17) has been understood as equivalent to all mankind, or as denoting the tribe of some unknown Moabitish chieftain; but later  critics, among whom are Rosenmüller and Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 346), bearing in mind the parallel passage (Jer 48:45), render the phrase “children of noise, tumultuous ones,” i.e. hostile armies. SEE SHETH.

In the 4th century there existed in Egypt a sect calling themselves Sethians, who are classed by Neander (Ch. Hist., 2, 115, ed. Bohn) among those Gnostic sects which, in opposing Judaism, approximated to paganism. (See. also Tillemont, Memoires, 2, 318.) Irenaeus (1, 30; comp. Massuet, Dissert. 1, 3, 14) and Theodoret (Hoeret. Fab. 14, 306), without distinguishing between them. and the Ophites, or worshippers of the serpent, say that in their system Seth was regarded as a divine effluence or virtue. Epiphanius, who devotes a chapter to them (Adv. Hoer. 1, 3, 39), says that they identified Seth with our Lord. See Quandt, De Christo in Nomine Sethi Adumbrato (Regiom. 1726).

## Seth, Traditions Concerning[[@Headword:Seth, Traditions Concerning]]

             There are many traditions concerning Seth (q.v.), not only in Rabbinic, but also in Christian, writings. According to the Rabbinic traditions, Seth was one of the thirteen who came circumcised into the world. The rest were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Terak, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah (Midrash Tillim, fol. 10, Colossians 2). The book Shene Luchoth says that the soul of the righteous Abel passed into the body of Seth, and afterwards this same soul passed into Moses; thus the law, which was known to Adam and in which Abel had been instructed, was not new to Moses (Eisenmenger, Neuentdecktes Judenthum, 1, 645). Josephus relates that after the things that were to take place had been revealed to Seth how the earth was to be destroyed, first with water and then with fire lest those things which he had discovered should perish from the memory of his posterity, he set up two pillars, one of brick, the other of stone, and he wrote there on all the science he had acquired, hoping that, in the event of the brick pillar perishing by the rain, the stone would endure (Ant. 1, 2). Suidas (s.v. Σήθ) says, “Seth was the son of Adam of him it is said the sons of God went in unto the daughters of men — that is to say, the sons of Seth went in unto the daughters of Cain; for in that age Seth was called God, because he had discovered Hebrew letters and the names of the stars, but especially on account of his great piety, so that he was the first to bear the name of God.” Anastasius Sinaita (q.v.) in his ῾Οδηγός, p. 269 (ed. Gretser. Ingolst. 1606]), says that when God created Adam after his image and likeness, he breathed into him grace and illumination and a ray of the  Holy Spirit. But when he sinned this glory left him, and his face became clouded. Then he became the father of Cain and Abel. But afterwards, it is said in Scripture, “he begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth,” which is not said of Cain and Abel; and this means that Seth was begotten in the likeness of unfallen man, and after the image of Adam in paradise; and he called his name Seth — that is, by interpretation, “resurrection,” because in him he saw the resurrection of his departed beauty and wisdom and glory, and radiance of the Holy Spirit. And all those then living, when they saw how the face of Seth shone with divine light, and heard him speak with divine wisdom, said, “He is God.” Therefore his sons were commonly called the sons of God. That Seth means “resurrection” is also the opinion of Augustine (De Civitate Dei, 15, 17, 18): “Ita Seth, quod interpretatur resurrectio.”

The most remarkable of the traditions, however, is undoubtedly the one which we read in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, c. 19:

“While John, therefore, was thus teaching those in Hades, the first created and forefather Adam heard and said to his son Seth, My son, I wish thee to tell the forefathers of the race of men and the prophets all that thou heardest from Michael, the archangel, when I sent thee to the gates of Paradise to implore God that he might send thee his angel to give thee oil from the tree of mercy, with which to anoint my body when I was sick. Then Seth said, Prophets and patriarchs, Hear. When my father Adam, the first created, was about to fall, once upon a time, into death, he sent me to make entreaty to God, very close by the gate of Paradise, that he would guide me by an angel to the tree of compassion, and that I might take oil and anoint my father, and that he might rise up from his sickness, which thing, therefore, I then did. And after the prayer an angel of the Lord came and said to me, What, Seth, dost thou ask? Dost thou ask oil which raiseth up the sick; or the tree from which this oil flows on account of the sickness of thy father? This is not to be found now. Go, therefore, and tell thy father that after the accomplishing of 5500 years from the creation of the world, then shall come into the world the only-begotten Son of God, being made man; and he shall anoint him with this oil, and shall raise him up, and shall baptize with water and with the Holy Spirit both him and those out of him, and then shall he be healed of every disease  but now this is impossible. When the prophets and the patriarchs heard these words, they rejoiced greatly.”

In the Apocryphal literature Seth plays a prominent role, and even in Reynard the Fox Seth is mentioned as seeking for the oil of compassion:

“Die drei gegrabenen Namen Brachte Seth der Fromme vom Paradiese hernieder, Als er das Oel der Barmherzigkeit suchte.”

See Fabricius, Cod. Pseudepigr. V.T. 1, 139 sq.; 2, 49 sq.; Syncellus, Chronogr. p. 10; Selden, Diss. de Horto Hedenis in his Otia Theolog. p. 600; Baring-Gould, Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 81 sq. (B.P.)

## Sethians, Or Sethites[[@Headword:Sethians, Or Sethites]]

             a sect of the Ophites (q.v.), of the 2d century, who paid divine honor to Seth, believing him to have reappeared in the person of Jesus Christ. They taught that Seth was made by a third divinity, and substituted in the room of the two families of Abel and Cain, destroyed by the deluge. They were thus distinguished from the Cainites (q.v.), who assigned the highest place to Cain. The Sethians regarded Cain as a representative of the Hylic, Abel of the Psychical, and Seth, who was finally to reappear in the person of the Messiah, of the Pneumatic principle. See Neander, Church Hist. (Torrey), 1, 448.

## Sethur[[@Headword:Sethur]]

             (Heb. Sethur', סְתוּר, hidden; Sept. Σαθούρ), the son of Michael, of the tribe of Asher, and one of the twelve spies sent by Moses to view the promised land (Num 13:13). B.C. 1657. See Van Sarn, Obs. Lightfootiana de Nomine Sethur (in the Miscell. Duisb. 1, 482 sq.).

## Seton, Elizabeth Ann[[@Headword:Seton, Elizabeth Ann]]

             founder of the Sisters of Charity in the United States, was born in New York city, Aug. 28, 1774. She was the daughter of Dr. Richard Bayley, and in her twentieth year married William Seton, whom she accompanied to Italy in 1803. Upon his death, in Pisa, in 1804, she returned to New York and entered the Roman Catholic Church, March 14, 1805. Left, by her husband's misfortunes, without resources, she opened a school in Baltimore in 1805-08. With her sisters-in-law, Harriet and Cecilia Seton, she took the veil as Sister of Charity, Jan. 1, 1809, at Emmettsburg, Md. (being the first members of that order in the United States). A conventual establishment was opened at Emmettsburg, July 30, 1812, with “Mother Seton” as superior-general. She died at Emmettsburg, Jan. 4, 1821. See  White, Life of Eliz. A. Seton (N.Y. 1853; 5th ed. Baltimore, 1865); Seton [Rev. Robert], Memoir, Letters, etc., of E.A. Seton (N.Y. 1869, 2 vols.). SEE SISTERS OF CHARITY.

## Settlements, Violent[[@Headword:Settlements, Violent]]

             took place when a patron in Scotland presented a clergyman whom the people would not have, but whom the ecclesiastical courts were determined, in spite of all opposition, to ordain. In such cases the parish sometimes rose to oppose the settlement by force, and obstructed the presbytery. The military were occasionally called to protect the presbytery. Such scenes happened in many parts of the country.

## Seven[[@Headword:Seven]]

             (שֶׁבִע, sheba). The frequent recurrence of certain numbers in the sacred literature of the Hebrews is obvious to the most superficial reader; and it is almost equally obvious that these numbers are associated with certain ideas, so as in some instances to lose their numerical force, and to pass over into the province of symbolic signs. This is more or less true of the numbers three, four, seven, twelve, and forty; but seven so far surpasses the rest, both in the frequency with which it recurs, and in the importance of the objects with which it is associated, that it may fairly be termed the representative symbolic number. It has hence attracted considerable attention, and may be said to be the keystone on which the symbolism of numbers depends. The origin of this symbolism is a question that meets us at the threshold of any discussion as to the number seven. Our limits will not permit us to follow out this question to its legitimate extent, but we may briefly state that the views of Biblical critics may be ranged under two heads, according as the symbolism is attributed to theoretical speculations as to the internal properties of the number itself, or to external associations of a physical or historical character. According to the former of these views, the symbolism of the number seven would be traced back to the symbolism of its component elements three and four, the first of which = Divinity, and the second= Humanity, whence seven =Divinity+ Humanity, or, in other words, the union between God and man, as effected by the manifestations of the Divinity in creation and revelation. So again the symbolism of twelve is explained as the symbolism of 3 x 4, or a second combination of the same two elements, though in different proportions, the representative number of Humanity, as a multiplier, assuming a more  prominent position (Bähr, Symbolik, 1, 187, 201, 224). This theory is seductive from its ingenuity and its appeal to the imagination, but there appears to be little foundation for it. For

(1) we do not find any indication, in early times at all events, that the number seven was resolved into three and four, rather than into any other arithmetical; elements, such as two and five. Bengel notes such a division as running through the heptads of the Apocalypse (Gnomon, at Rev 16:1), and the remark undoubtedly holds good in certain instances, e.g. the trumpets, the three latter being distinguished from the four former by the triple “woe” (Rev 8:13); but in other instances, e.g. in reference to the promises (Gnomon, at Rev 2:7), the distinction is not so well established; and even if it were, an explanation might be found in the adaptation of such a division to the subject in hand. The attempt to discover such a distinction in the Mosaic writings — as, for instance, where an act is to be done on the third day out of seven (Num 19:12) appears to be a failure.

(2) It would be difficult to show that any associations of a sacred nature were assigned to three and four previously to the sanctity of seven.. This latter number is so far the sacred number κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν that we should be less surprised if, by a process the reverse of the one assumed, sanctity had been subsequently attached to three and four as the supposed elements of seven. But

(3) all such speculations on mere numbers are alien to the spirit of Hebrew thought; they belong to a different stage of society, in which speculation is rife, and is systematized by the existence of schools of philosophy.

We turn to the second class of opinions, which attribute the symbolism of the number seven to external associations. This class may be again subdivided into two, according as the symbolism is supposed to have originated in the observation of purely physical phenomena, or, on the other hand, in the peculiar religious enactments of Mosaism. The influence of the number seven was not restricted to the Hebrews; it prevailed among the Persians (Est 1:10; Est 1:14), among the ancient Indians (Von Bohlen, Alt. Indien, 2, 224 sq.), among the Greeks and Romans to a certain extent, and probably among all nations where the week of seven days was established, as in China, Egypt, Arabia, etc. (Ideler, Chronol. 1, 88, 178; 2, 473). Cicero calls it the knot and cement of all things, as being that by which the natural and spiritual world are comprehended in one idea (Tusc.  Quoest. 1, 10). The wide range of the word seven is in this respect an interesting and significant fact with the exception of “six,” it is the only numeral which the Shemitic languages have in common with the Indo- European; for the Hebrew sheba is essentially the same as ἑπτά, septem, seven, and the Sanskrit, Persian, and Gothic names for this number (Pott, Etym. Forsch. 1, 129). In the countries above enumerated, the institution of seven as a cyclical number is attributed to the observation of the changes of the moon or to the supposed number of the planets. The Hebrews are held by some writers to have borrowed their notions of the sanctity of seven from their heathen neighbors, either wholly or partially (Von Bohlen, Introd. to Genesis 1, 216 sq.; Hengstenberg, Balaam [Clark's ed.], p. 393); but the peculiarity of the Hebrew view consists in the special dignity of the seventh, and not simply in that of seven. Whatever influence, therefore, may be assigned to astronomical observation or to prescriptive usage, in regard to the original institution of the week, we cannot trace back the peculiar associations of the Hebrews further than to the point when the seventh day was consecrated to the purposes of religious rest.

Assuming this, therefore, as our starting point, the first idea associated with seven would be that of religious periodicity. The Sabbath, being the seventh day, suggested the adoption of seven as the coefficient, so to say, for the appointment of all sacred periods; and we thus find the seventh month ushered in by the Feast of Trumpets, and signalized by the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles and the great Day of Atonement; seven weeks as the interval between the Passover and the Pentecost; the seventh year as the sabbatical year; and the year succeeding 7 x 7 years as the jubilee year. From the idea of periodicity it passed, by an easy transition, to the duration or repetition of religious proceedings; and thus seven days were appointed as the length of the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles; seven days for the ceremonies of the consecration of priests: seven days for the interval to elapse between the occasion and the removal of various kinds of legal uncleanness, as after childbirth, after contact with a corpse, etc.; seven times appointed for aspersion either of the blood of the victim (e.g. Lev 4:6; Lev 16:14) or of the water of purification (Lev 14:51; comp. 2Ki 5:10; 2Ki 5:14); seven things to be offered in sacrifice (oxen, sheep, goats, pigeons, wheat, oil, wine); seven victims to be offered on any special occasion, as in Balaam's sacrifice (Num 23:1), and especially at the ratification of a treaty, the notion of seven being embodied in the very term (נַשְׁבִּע) signifying to swear, literally meaning to do seven  times (Gen 21:28; comp. Herod. 3, 8 for a similar custom among the Arabians). The same idea is further carried out in the vessels and arrangements of the Tabernacle — in the seven arms of the golden candlestick, and the seven chief utensils (altar of burned offerings, laver, showbread table, altar of incense, candlestick, ark, mercy seat).

The number seven, having thus been impressed with the seal of sanctity as the symbol of all connected with the Divinity, was adopted generally as a cyclical number, with the subordinate notions of perfection or completeness. It hence appears in cases where the notion of satisfaction is required, as in reference to punishment for wrongs (Gen 4:15; Lev 26:18; Lev 26:28; Psa 79:12; Pro 6:31), or to forgiveness of them (Mat 18:21). It is again mentioned in a variety of passages too numerous for quotation (e.g. Job 5, 19; Jer 15:9; Mat 12:45) in a sense analogous to that of a “round number,” but with the additional idea of sufficiency and completeness. To the same head we may refer the numerous instances in which persons or things are mentioned by sevens in the historical portions of the Bible e.g. the seven kine and the seven ears of corn in Pharaoh's dream, the seven daughters of the priest of Midian, the seven sons of Jesse, the seven deacons, the seven sons of Sceva, the twice seven generations in the pedigree of Jesus (Mat 1:17); and, again, the still more numerous instances in which periods of seven days or seven years are combined with the repetition of an act seven times; as, in the taking of Jericho, the town was surrounded for seven days, and on the seventh day it fell at the blast of seven trumpets borne round the town seven times by seven priests; or, again, at the flood, an interval of seven days elapsed between the notice to enter the ark and the coming of the flood, the beasts entered by sevens, seven days elapsed between the two missions of the dove, etc. So, again, in private life, seven years appear to have been the usual period of a hiring (Gen 29:18), seven days for a marriage festival (Gen 29:27; Jdg 14:12), and the same, or in some cases seventy days, for mourning for the dead (Gen 50:3; Gen 50:10; 1Sa 31:13).

The foregoing applications of the number seven become of great practical importance in connection with the interpretation of some of the prophetical portions of the Bible, and particularly of the Apocalypse. For in this latter book the ever-recurring number seven both serves as the mould which has decided the external form of the work, and also, to a certain degree, penetrates into the essence of it. We have but to run over the chief subjects  of that book — the seven churches, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven vials, the seven angels, the seven spirits before the throne, the seven horns and seven eves of the Lamb, etc. — in order to see the necessity of deciding whether the number is to be accepted in a literal or a metaphorical sense — in other words, whether it represents a number or a quality. The decision of this question affects not only the number seven, but also the number which stands in a relation of antagonism to seven, viz. the half of seven, which appears under the form of forty — two months, =3 ½ years (Rev 13:5); twelve hundred and sixty days, also =3 ½ years (Rev 11:3; Rev 12:6); and, again, a time, times, and half a time, =3 ½ years (Rev 12:14). We find this number frequently recurring in the Old Test., as in the forty- two stations of the wilderness (Numbers 33); the three and a half years of the famine in Elijah's time (Luk 4:25); the “time, times, and the dividing of time;” during which the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes was to last (Dan 7:25), a similar period being again described as “the midst of the week,” i.e. the half of seven years (Dan 9:27); “a time, times, and a half” (Daniek 12:7); and again, probably, in the number of days specified in Dan 8:14; Dan 12:11-12. If the number seven express the notion of completeness, then the number half-seven =incompleteness and the secondary ideas of suffering and disaster: if the one represent divine agency, the other we may expect to represent human agency. Mere numerical calculations would thus, in regard to unfulfilled prophecy, be either wholly superseded, or, at all events, take a subordinate position to the general idea conveyed. See Journal of Sacred Literature, Oct. 1851, p. 134 sq.; New-Englander, No. 1858. SEE NUMBER.

## Seven Capital Sins[[@Headword:Seven Capital Sins]]

             SEE SEVEN DEADLY SINS.

## Seven Chief Virtues[[@Headword:Seven Chief Virtues]]

             THE. According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, these virtues are faith, hope, charity, prudence, temperance, chastity, and fortitude.

## Seven Days After[[@Headword:Seven Days After]]

             the term by which the octave of a festival is described in the Book of Common Prayer. Thus the proper prefaces in the communion service,  except that for Trinity Sunday, are to be said upon certain days, and, likewise, during seven days afterwards.

## Seven Deadly Sins[[@Headword:Seven Deadly Sins]]

             THE, as defined by the Romish Church, are pride, anger, envy, sloth, lust, covetousness, and gluttony.

## Seven Dolors Of The Blessed Virgin Mary Feast Of[[@Headword:Seven Dolors Of The Blessed Virgin Mary Feast Of]]

             a modern festival of the Roman Catholic Church, which, although bearing the name of devotion to the Virgin Mary, in reality regards those incidents in the life and passion of Christ with which his mother is most closely associated. This festival is celebrated on the Friday preceding Palm Sunday (q.v.)., The “Dolors,” or sorrows, of the Blessed Virgin, have long been a favorite theme of Roman Catholic devotion, of which the pathetic Stabat Mater Dolorosa is the best known and most popular expression; and the festival of the Seven Dolors is intended to individualize the incidents of her sorrows, and to present them for meditation. The seven incidents referred to under the title of “Dolors” are: 1. The prediction of Simeon (Luk 2:34); 2. The flight into Egypt; 3. The loss of Jesus in Jerusalem; 4. The sight of Jesus bearing his cross towards Calvary; 5. The sight of Jesus upon the cross; 6. The piercing of his side with the lance; 7. His burial. This festival was instituted by pope Benedict XIII in 1725.

## Seven Heroes Of Thebes[[@Headword:Seven Heroes Of Thebes]]

             SEE THEBES, SEVEN HEROES OF.

## Seven Sacraments[[@Headword:Seven Sacraments]]

             The Council of Trent session 7, canon 1, says, “If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than seven — to wit, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony — or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema.” SEE SACRAMENT.

## Seven Sleepers[[@Headword:Seven Sleepers]]

             the heroes of a celebrated legend, first related by Gregory of Tours at the close of the 6th century (De Gloria Martyrum, c. 96); but the date of which is assigned to the 3d century and to the persecution of the Christians under Decius. According to the narrative, seven Christians of Ephesus took refuge in a cave near the city, where they were discovered by their pursuers, who walled up the entrance in order to starve them to death. A miracle, however, was interposed in their behalf, they fell into a preternatural sleep, in which they lay for nearly two hundred years. The concealment is supposed to have taken place in 250 or 251, and the sleepers to have been reanimated in 447. Their sleep seemed to them to have been for only a night, and they were greatly astonished, on going into the city, to see the cross exposed upon the church tops, which but a few hours ago, as it appeared, was the object of contempt. Their wonderful story told, they were conducted in triumph into the city; but all died at the same moment.

## Seven Spirits And Orders Of The Clergy[[@Headword:Seven Spirits And Orders Of The Clergy]]

             The Roman Catholics of the Western Church, in general, abide firmly by the principle established by the schoolmen, that the priesthood is to consist of seven classes, corresponding to the seven spirits of God. Of these the three who are chiefly employed in the duties of the ministerial office compose the superior order SEE CLERGY, 3; and the four whose duty it is to wait upon the clergy in their ministrations, and to assist in conducting public worship, belong to the inferior order. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq. p. 73.

## Sevenfold Gifts[[@Headword:Sevenfold Gifts]]

             the gifts of the Holy Spirit; so called from their enumeration in Isa 11:1-6. There is an allusion to them in the hymn Veni, Creator Spiritus in the Ordinal (q.v.), thus —

“Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,

And lighten with celestial fire:

Thou the anointing Spirit art,

Who dost thy sevenfold gifts impart.”

In a prayer of the Order of Confirmation these gifts are specified as follows: “Daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace — the spirit of  wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; and fill them, O Lord, with the spirit of thy holy fear.”

## Seventh-Day Baptists (German)[[@Headword:Seventh-Day Baptists (German)]]

             SEE BAPTISTS.

## Seventh-day[[@Headword:Seventh-day]]

             SEE SABBATH.

## Seventh-day Adventists[[@Headword:Seventh-day Adventists]]

             SEE ADVENTISTS, SEVENTH-DAY.

## Seventh-day Baptists[[@Headword:Seventh-day Baptists]]

             SEE BAPTISTS.

## Seventy[[@Headword:Seventy]]

             (שַׁבְעַי ם, shibim), as being the multiple of the full number seven and the perfect number ten, shares in the sacredness or conventionality of the former in Scripture. SEE SEVEN. They are sometimes put in contrast in the complete phrase “seventy times seven” (Gen 4:24; Mat 18:21). Some of the most remarkable combinations of this number are specified below.

## Seventy Disciples Of Our Lord[[@Headword:Seventy Disciples Of Our Lord]]

             (Luk 10:1; Luk 10:17). These seem to have been appointed in accordance with the symbolism of the seventy members of Jacob's household (Exo 1:5) and, likewise, the seventy elders of the Jews (24:1; Num 11:16). See SANHEDRIM. The following is the traditionary list of their names (see Townsend, New Test.; and the monographs cited by Danz, Worterb. s.v. “Lucas,” Nos. 60-63; and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 165):

1. Agabus the prophet.

2. Amphias of Odyssus, sometimes called Amphiatus.

3. Ananias, who baptized Paul, bishop of Damascus.

4. Andronicus of Pannonia, or Spain.

5. Apelles of Smyrna, or Heraclea.

6. Apollo of Caesarea.

7. Aristarchus of Apamea.

8. Aristobulus of Britain.

9. Artemas of Lystra.

10. Asyncritus of Hyrcania.

11. Barnabas of Milan.

12. Barnabas of Heraclea.

13. Caesar of Dyrrachium.

14. Caius of Ephesus.

15. Corpus of Berytus in Thrace.

16. Cephas, bishop of Konia.

17. Clemens of Sardinia.

18. Cleophas of Jerusalem.

19. Crescens of Chalcedon in Galatia.

20. Damus, a priest of idols.

21. Epenetus of Carthage.

22. Epaphroditus of Andriace.

23. Erastus of Paneas, or of the Philippians.

24. Evodias of Antioch.

25. Hermas of Philippi, or Philippolis.

26. Hermes of Dalmatia.

27. Hermogenes, who followed Simon Magus.

28. Hermogenes, bishop of the Megarenes.

29. Herodion of Tarsus.

30. James, the brother of our Lord, at Jerusalem.

31. Jason of Tarsus.

32. Jesus Justus, bishop of Eleutheropolis.

33. Linus of Rome.

34. Luke the Evangelist.

35. Lucius of Laodicea in Syria.

36. Mark, who is also John, of Biblopolis, or Biblus.

37. Mark the Evangelist, bishop of Alexandria.

38. Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, bishop of Apollonia.

39. Matthias, afterwards the apostle.

40. Narcissus of Athens.

41. Nicanor, who died when Stephen suffered martyrdom.

42. Nicolaus of Samaria.

43. Olympius, a martyr at Rome.

44. Onesiphorus, bishop of Corone.

45. Parmenas of the Soli.

46. Patrobulus, the same with Patrobas (Rom 16:14) of Puteoli, or, according to others, of Naples.

47. Philemon of Gaza.

48. Philemon, called in the Acts Philip, who baptized the eunuch of Candace, of Trallium, in Asia.

49. Philologus of Sinope.

50. Phlegon, bishop of Marathon.

51. Phigellus of Ephesus, who followed Simon Magus.

52. Prochorus of Nicomedia, in Bithynia.

53. Pudens.

54. Quartus of Berytus.

55. Rhodion, a martyr at Rome.

56. Rufus of Thebes.

57. Silas of Corinth.

58. Sylvanus of Thessalonica.

59. Sosipater of Iconium.

60. Sosthenes of Colophon.

61. Stachys of Byzantium.

62. Stephen, the first martyr.

63. Tertius of Iconium.

64. Thaddaeus, who carried the epistle of Jesus to Edessa, to Abgarus.

65. Timon of Bostra of the Arabians.

66. Trophimus, who suffered martyrdom with Paul.

67. Tychicus, bishop of Chalcedon, of Bithynia.

68. Tychicus of Colophon.

69. Urbanus of Macedonia.

70. Zenas of Diospolis.

## Seventy Weeks Of Daniels Prophecy[[@Headword:Seventy Weeks Of Daniels Prophecy]]

             (Dan 9:25-27). This is so important a link in sacred prediction and chronology as to justify its somewhat extensive treatment here. We first give an exact translation of the passage.

“Seventy heptads are decreed [to transpire] upon thy nation, and upon thy holy city, for [entirely] closing the [punishment of] sin, and for sealing up [the retributive sentence against their] offenses, and for expiating guilt, and for bringing in [the state of] perpetual righteousness, and for sealing up [the verification of] vision and prophet, and for anointing holy of holies. And thou shalt know and consider, [that] from [the time of] a command occurring for returning and building [i.e. for rebuilding] Jerusalem till [the sixty and two heptads; [its] street shall return and be built [i.e. shall be rebuilt], and [its] fosse, and [that] in distress of the times. And after the sixty and two heptads, Messiah shall be cut off, and nothing [shall be left] to him; and people of the coming prince shall destroy the city and the holy [building] and his end [of fighting shall come] with [or, like] a flood, and until the end of warring [shall occur the] decreed desolations. And he shall establish a covenant towards many [persons during] one heptad, and [at the] middle of the heptad he shall cause to cease sacrifice and offering; and upon [the topmost] corner [of the Temple shall be reared] abominations [i.e. idolatrous images] of [the] desolator, and [that] till completion, and a decreed [one] shall pour out upon [the] desolator.”

In Dan 9:24 we have a general view of the last great period of the Jewish Church (see the middle line in the diagram). It was to embrace four hundred and ninety years, from their permanent release from Babylonian bondage till the time when God would cast them finally off for their incorrigible unbelief. SEE WEEK. Within this space Jehovah would fulfil what he had predicted, and accomplish all his designs respecting them under their special relation. The particulars noted in this cursory survey are, first, the conclusion of the then existing exile (expressed in three variations, of which the last phrase, “expiating guilt,” explains the two former, “closing the sin” and “sealing up offenses”); next, the fulfilment of ancient prophecy by ushering in the religious prosperity of Gospel times; and, lastly, as the essential feature, the consecration of the Messiah to his redeeming office.

The only “command” answering to that of Dan 9:25 is that of Artaxerxes Longimanus, issued in the seventh year of his reign, and recorded in the seventh chapter of Ezra, as Prideaux has abundantly shown (Connection, s.a. 409), and as most critics agree. At this time, also, more Jews returned to their home than at any other, and the literal as well as spiritual “rebuilding of Jerusalem” was prosecuted with unsurpassed vigor. The period here referred to extends “till the Messiah” (see the upper line of above diagram); that is, as far as his public recognition as such by the voice at his baptism, the “anointing” of the previous verse; and not to his death — as is commonly supposed, but which is afterwards referred to in very compass of the prophecy vary much from four hundred and ninety years. The period of this verse is divided into two portions of “seven heptads” and “sixty-two heptads.” as if the “command” from which it dates were renewed at the end of the first portion; and this we find was the case; Ezra, under whom this reformation of the state and religion began, was succeeded in the work by Nehemiah, who, having occasion to return to Persia in the twenty-fifth year after. the commencement of the work (Neh 13:6), returned “after certain days,” and found that it had so far retrograded that he was obliged to institute it anew. The length of his stay at court is not given, but it must have been considerable to allow so great a backsliding among the lately reformed Jews. Prideaux contends that his return to Judea was after an absence of twenty-four years; and we have supposed the new reform then set on foot by him to have occupied a little over three years, which is certainly none too much time for the task (see the lower line of the diagram). The “rebuilding of the streets and intrenchments in times of distress” seems to refer, in its literal sense, to the former part especially of the forty-nine years (comp. Nehemiah 4), very little having been previously done towards rebuilding the city, although former decrees had been issued for repairing the Temple; and in its spiritual import it applies to the whole time, and peculiarly to the three years of the last reform.

The “sixty-two weeks” of Nehemiah 4:26, be it observed, are not said to commence at the end of the “seven weeks” of Nehemiah 4:25, but, in more general terms, after the “distressing times” during which the reform was going on; hence they properly date from the end of that reform, when things became permanently settled. It is in consequence of a failure to notice this variation in the limits of the two periods of sixty-two weeks referred to by the prophet (comp. the middle portions of the upper and of the lower line in the diagram) that critics have thrown the whole scheme of this prophecy into disorder, in. applying to the same event such irreconcilable language as is used in describing some of its different elements. By the ravaging invasion of foreigners here foretold is manifestly intended the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman troops, whose emperor's son, Titus, is here styled a “prince” in command of them. The same allusion is also clear from the latter part of the following verse. But this event must not be included within the seventy weeks; because, in the first place, the accomplishment would not sustain such a view — from the decree, B.C. 459, to the  destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, being five hundred and twenty-eight years; secondly, the language of Nehemiah 4:24 does not require it — as it is not embraced in the purposes for which the seventy weeks are there stated to be appointed to Jerusalem and its inhabitants; and, lastly, the Jews then no longer formed a link in the chain of ecclesiastical history in the divine sense — Christian believers having become the true descendants of Abraham. At the close of the verse we have the judgments with which God would afflict the Jews for cutting off the Messiah: these would be so severe that the prophet (or, rather, the angel instructing him) cannot refrain from introducing them here in connection with that event, although he afterwards adverts to them in their proper order. What these sufferings were, Josephus iarrates with a minuteness that chills the blood, affording a wonderful coincidence with the prediction of Moses in Deu 28:15-68; they are here called a “flood,” the well known Scripture emblem of terrible political calamities (as in Isa 8:7-8; Dan 11:10; Dan 11:22; Nah 1:8).

Deu 28::27 has given greater trouble to critics than any other in the whole passage; and, indeed, the common theory by which the seventy weeks are made to end with the crucifixion is flatly contradicted by the cessation of the daily sacrificial offerings at the Temple “in the middle of the week.” All attempts to crowd aside this point are in vain; for such an abolition could not be said to occur in any pertinent sense before the offering of the great sacrifice, especially as Jesus himself, during his ministry, always countenanced their celebration. Besides, the advocates of this scheme are obliged to make this last “week” encroach upon the preceding. “sixty-two weeks,” so as to include John the Baptist's ministry, in order to make out seven years for “confirming the covenant;” and when they have done this, they run counter to the previous explicit direction, which makes the first sixty-nine weeks come down “to the Messiah,” and not end at John. By means of the double line of dates exhibited in the above diagram, all this is harmoniously adjusted; and, at the same time, the only satisfactory interpretation is retained — that, after the true atonement, these typical oblations ceased to have any meaning or efficacy, although before it they could not consistently be dispensed with, even by Christ and his apostles.

The seventy weeks, therefore, were allotted to the Jews as their only season of favor or mercy as a Church, and we know that they were not immediately cast off upon their murder of Christ (see Luk 24:27; Act 3:12-26). The Gospel. was specially directed to be first preached  to them; and not only during our Savior's personal ministry, but for several years afterwards, the invitations of grace were confined to them. The first instance of a “turning to the Gentiles” proper was the baptism of the Roman centurion Cornelius, during the fourth year after the resurrection of Christ. In this interval the Jewish people had shown their determined opposition to the new “covenant” by imprisoning the apostles, stoning Stephen to death, and officially proscribing Christianity through Sanhedrim. Soon after this martyrdom occurred the conversion of Saul, who “was a chosen vessel to bear God's name to the Gentiles;” and about two years after this event the door was thrown wide open for their admission into the covenant relation of the Church, instead of the Jews, by the vision of Peter and the conversion of Cornelius. Here we find a marked epoch, fixed by the finger of God in all the miraculous circumstances of the event, as well as by the formal apostolical decree ratifying it, and obviously forming the great turning point between the two dispensations. We find no evidence that “many” of the Jews embraced Christianity after this period, although they had been converted in great numbers on several occasions under the apostles' preaching, not only in Judea, but also in Galilee, and even among the semi-Jewish inhabitants of Samaria. The Jews had now rejected Christ as a nation with a tested and incorrigible hatred; and having thus disowned their God, they were forsaken by him, and devoted to destruction, as the prophet intimates would be their retribution for that “decision” in which the four hundred and ninety years of this their second and last probation in the promised land would result. It is thus strictly true that Christ personally and by his apostles “established the covenant” which had formerly been made, and was now renewed with many of the chosen people for precisely seven years after his public appearance as a teacher; in the very middle of which space he superseded forever the sacrificial offerings of the Mosaic ritual by the one perfect and sufficient offering of his own body on the cross.

In the latter part of this verse we have a graphic outline of the terrible catastrophe that should fall upon the Jews in consequence of their rejection of the Messiah — a desolation that should not cease to cover them but by the extinction of the oppressing nation it forms an appendix to the main prophecy. Our Savior's language leaves no doubt as to the application of this passage, in his memorable warning to his disciples that when they should be about to “see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel  the prophet, stand in the holy place,” they should then “flee into the mountains” (Mat 24:15-16; comp. 23:36, 38).

In the scheme at the head of preceding page, several chronological points have been partially assumed which entire satisfaction with the results obtained would require to be fully proved. A minute investigation of the grounds on which all the dates involved rest would occupy too much space for the present discussion; we therefore content ourselves with determining the two boundary dates of the entire period, trusting the intermediate ones to such incidental evidences of their correctness as may have been afforded in the foregoing elucidation, or may arise in connection with the settlement proposed (see Browne, Ordo Soeclorum, p. 96-107, 202). If these widely distant points can be fixed by definite data independently of each other, the correspondence of the interval will afford strong presumption that it is the true one, which will be heightened as the subdivisions fall naturally into their prescribed limits; and thus the above coincidence in the character of the events will receive all the confirmation that the nature of the case admits.

1. The Date of' the Edict. — We have supposed this to be from the time of its taking effect at Jerusalem rather than from that of its nominal issue at Babylon. The difference, however (being only four months), will not seriously affect the argument. Ezra states (Ezr 7:8) that “he arrived at Jerusalem in the fifth month [Ab, our July-August] of the seventh year of the king,” Artaxerxes. Ctesias, who had every opportunity to know, makes Artaxerxes to have reigned forty-two years; and Thucydides states that an Athenian embassy sent to Ephesus in the winter that closed the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war was there met with the news of Artaxerxes's death: πυθόμενοι ... Α᾿ρταξέρξην... νεωστὶ τεθνηκότα (κατὰ γὰρ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐτελεύτησεν)) (Bell. Pelop. 4, 50). Now this war began in the spring of B.C. 431, as all allow (Thuc. 2, 2), and its seventh year expired with the spring of B.C. 424; consequently, Artaxerxes died in the winter introducing this latter calendar year, and his reign began some time in B.C. 466. The same historian also states that Themistocles, in his flight to Asia, having been driven by a storm into the Athenian fleet, at that time blockading Naxos managed to get safely carried away to Ephesus, whence he despatched a letter of solicitation to Artaxerxes, then lately invested with royalty, νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα (Bell. Pelop. 1, 137). The. date of the conquest of that island is B.C. 466, which is, therefore, also that of the Persian king's accession. It is now necessary to fix the season of  the year in which he became king. If Ctesias means that his reign lasted forty-two full years, or a little over rather than under that length, the accession must be dated prior to the beginning of B.C. 466; but it is more in accordance with the usual computation of reigns to give the number of current years, if nearly full, and this will bring the date of accession down to about the beginning of summer, B.C. 466. This result is also more in accordance with the simultaneous capture of Naxos, which can hardly have occurred earlier in that year; I may add that it likewise explains the length assigned to this reign (forty-one years) by Ptolemy, in his astronomical canon, although he has misled modern compilers of ancient history by beginning it in B.C. 465, having apparently himself fallen into some confusion, from silently annexing the short intermediate periods of anarchy, sometimes to the preceding and at others to the ensuing reign. The “seventh year” of Artaxerxes, therefore, began about the summer of B.C. 460, and the “first [Hebrew] month” (Nisan) occurring within that twelve- month gives the following March-April of B.C. 459 as the time when Ezra received his commission to proceed to Jerusalem for the purpose of executing the royal mandate.

2. The Date of the Conversion of Cornehius. — The solution of this question will be the determination of the distance of this event from the time of our Savior's Passion; the absolute date of this latter occurrence must, therefore, first be determined. This is ascertained to have taken place in A.D. 29 by a comparison of the duration of Christ's ministry with the historical data of Luk 3:1-23; but the investigation is too long to be inserted here. SEE CHRONOLOGY. A ready mode of testing this conclusion is by observing that this is the only one of the adjacent series of years in which the calculated date of the equinoctial full moon coincides with that of the Friday of the crucifixion Passover, as any one may see — with sufficient accuracy for ordinary purposes — by computing the mean lunations and the week-day back from the present time. This brings the date of Christ's baptism to A.D. 25; and the whole tenor of the Gospel narratives indicates that this took place in the latter part of summer.

The following are special treatises on this prophecy: Hulsius, Abrabanelis Com. in LXX Heb. Confut. (Breda, 1653); Calov, De LXX Septimanis (Vitemb. 1663); Sosimann, De LXX Hebd. Daniel (Lugd. 1678); Schonwald, Diss. de LXX Hebd. (Jen. 1720); Marshall. Treatise on the 70 Weeks of Daniel (Lond. 1725); Markwick, Calculation of the LXX Weeks of Daniel (ibid. 1728); Pfaff, Diss. de LXX Hebd. (Tub. 1734); Pagendorn,  Diss. de Hebd. Danielis (Jen. 1745); Ayrolus, Liber LXX Hebdomatum Resignatus (Romans 1748); Offerhaus, De LXX Septimanis Danielis (Groning. 1756); Parry, On Daniel's 70 Weeks (Northampton, 1762); Michaelis, Versuch uber d. 70 Wochen Daniels (Gott. 1771); also Epistoloe de LXX Hebdomadibus (Lond. 1773); Hasenkamp, Neue Erkltr. d. 70 W. (Lemgo, 1772); Kluit, Explicatio LXX Hebd. (Middelb. 1774); Jung, Chronologia LXX Hebd. (Heidelb. 1774); Blayney, Dissertation on the 70 W. (Oxf. 1775); Winter, Sermons on the 70 W. (Lond. 1777); Lorenz, Intepret. Nov. LXX Hebd. (Argent. 1781); Wiesner, Inquis. in LXX Hebd. (Wirceb. 1787); Vri, Interpret. LXX Iebd. (Oxon. 1788); Butt, Commentary on the 70 W. (Lond. 1807); Faber, Dissertation. on the 70 W. (ibid. 1811); Stonard, Dissertation on the 70 W. (ibid. 1825).; Scholl, Comment. de LXX Hebd. (Francf. 1829); Steudel, Disq. de LXX HJebd. (Tub. 1833).; Wieseler, Die 70 W. erortert (Gott. 1839); Hoffmann, Die 70 Jahrwochen (Nutremb. 1836); Denny, Chiarts of the 70 W. (Lond. 1849); Blackley, The 70 W. Explained (ibid. 1850). See also the Stud. un d Knrit. 1834, 2, 270; 1858, 4; (Gettysb.) Eangel. Rev. April, 1867, 3; Goode; Warburton Lect. for 1854-58 (Lond. 1860). SEE DANIEL.

## Seventy Years[[@Headword:Seventy Years]]

             is a frequent number in Scripture, both symbolical and literal; e.g. the seventy years of Tyre's depression after its capture by Nebuchadnezzar till its relief by the downfall of Babylon (Isa 23:15-17); and especially the seventy years of, the Jewish captivity at Babylon (Jer 25:11; Jer 29:10). SEE CAPTIVITY.

## Severally[[@Headword:Severally]]

             In the office for the baptism (Protestant Episcopal Church) of those of riper years, the questions proposed by the minister to the candidates are to be considered as addressed to them severally, and the answers to be made accordingly. By this rubric every candidate is to view himself as isolated and alone, although the minister is not obliged to distinctly propose the questions to every individual. In the Order of Confirmation there is a rubric somewhat analogous. The candidates “kneeling before the bishop, he shall lay his hands upon the head of every one severally, saying,” etc.

## Severans[[@Headword:Severans]]

             an old term not now in use, which seems to have signified a kind of cornice, or string course.

## Severians[[@Headword:Severians]]

             a sect of Encratite Gnostics, successors of the Tatianists, whose complicated system of Aeons they abandoned, but whose Encratite notions of creation they developed or heightened. The Severians held that the well known Gnostic power Ialdabaoth was a great ruler of the powers; that from him sprang the Devil; that the Devil, being cast down to the.earth in the form of a serpent, produced the vine, whose snake-like tendrils indicate its origin; that the Devil also created woman and the lower half of man. Eusebius states that the Severians made use of the law and prophets and Gospels, giving them a peculiar interpretatiion, but abused the apostle Paul and rejected his epistles, as also the Acts of the Apostles (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4, 29). Augustine, on the other hand, states that they rejected the Old Test. (Aug.Hoer. 24). The tenet of the creation of the world by an inferior Demiurge presupposes the inherent evil of matter, and it is a natural deduction from this to deny the resurrection of the body. The Severians followed out their principle to this conclusion, according to Augustine (Hoer. 24), while Natalis Alexander denies the probability of Augustine's report. The Severians were Docetae, as were the Tatianists. See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v. “Monophysites;” Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. 1, 280; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3, 170. SEE ENCRATITES; SEE MONOPHYSITES.

## Severianus[[@Headword:Severianus]]

             bishop of Gabala, in Syria. The historical appearance of this personage is interwoven with the life and fortunes of John Chrysostom. During a protracted absence of the latter in Asia Minor, Severianuis acted as his representative, and availed himself of the opportunity to intrigue against Chrysostom, for which he was expelled from Constantinople. Being soon recalled by his patroness, the empress Eudoxia, he became reconciled to Chrysostom; but he afterwards renewed his intriguing efforts in connection with Theophilus of Alexandria. His later history is unknown. Six sermons on the history of the creation, together with other sermons by this man, are published in the works of Chrysostom in the Montfaucon ed. 1, 6 and the Mechitarists of Venice published certain of his homilies in 1827. On his  life, see Palladius, De Vita S. Joh. Chrysostom.; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 6, 18; Sozomen, Hist. Ecclesiastes 8, 6.

## Severianus, St.[[@Headword:Severianus, St.]]

             the apostle of Noricum. The records of his early life are scanty, but indicate that he was born of Christian parents in Italy early in the 5th century. He chose a hermit's life in early youth, and settled in the East in pursuance of that purpose, but soon returned to the West in order to devote himself to the active propagation of Christianity among the heathen, establishing himself first in Pannonia, but afterwards iu Noricum. . The latter was an imperial province lying between the river Danube and the Alps, and was intersected with Roman roads on which were located not only flourishing native towns, but numerous Roman colonies, municipalities, and camps, which contained a Roman population (comp. Strabo, 4, 206, and 7, 304, 313; Tacitus, Ann. 2, 63; id. Hist. 1, 11, 70; Pliny, 21, 7, 20; Ptolemy, 2, 1, 12; 8, 6, 2, 7; 1, 8, 2; Zosimus, 4, 35). The population had also adopted the Roman language, culture, and customs, and carried on an active trade with the Italian cities, particularly Rome and Aquileia. Christianity had, consequently, been long introduced when Severinus settled in Noricum; but it had failed to subdue the prevailing paganism, so that in the middle of the 4th century St. Valentine was repeatedly expelled from the country because of his attempts to preach the Gospel. A complete recognition was not accorded to Christianity until after Theodosius the Great had issued a general edict prohibiting all idolatry throughout the empire (in 392 [Cod. Theod. de Paganis, 1, 7, 9, 11 sq.]); and an additional difficulty was encountered in the convulsions which grew out of the migration of Eastern nations then in progress.

Severinus fixed his residence in the neighborhood of Faviana, a town on the Danube near where the modern Pochlarn stands, and engaged in the practice of a rigid asceticism. He also founded a monastery and gathered a large number of pupils, whom he trained, by precept and example, to imitate the virtues of the early Christians and to avoid the corrupt manners of the world. He never partook of food before sundown except on feast- days, walked constantly with bare feet, and always slept on a cilicium spread on the bare floor of his chamber. But, not content with fulfilling his vow in the most faithful manner, he also frequently traversed the country to preach the Gospel, to comfort the Christian communities, who were incessantly ravaged by the predatory assaults of barbarous hordes, and to  admonish them to avert the threatening dangers by prayers and good works, and to faithfully pay tithes for the support of the poor. He was also indefatigable in laboring to secure the liberation of imprisoned Christians, in healing the sick, and in entertaining and aiding helpless fugitives. Being endowed with the ability to form a correct estimate of existing conditions, he was frequently able to point out the places which were exposed to attacks from the enemy, and he never failed to give timely warning of danger and to suggest proper. measures of defense. His reputation accordingly increased more and more, so that he was barely able to attend to all the requests addressed to him for instruction, counsel, comfort, and aid. Even the famous Odoacer, leader of the Rugians and Herulians, did not disdain to seek him and ask for his counsel and blessing when about to engage in his expedition to Italy in A.D. 476.

The zeal displayed by Severinus for the outward welfare of the people and for the success of Christianity led several congregations to make him their bishop; but he declined the office on the ground that he preferred his solitude. The later years of his life were disturbed by the incursions of the Alemanni and the Rugians. One of the latest acts of his life was an attempt to persuade the Rugian king Fava, of Feletheus, and his cruel queen, Gisa, to refrain from hostilities against the Noricans. He died Jan. 8, 482, and was eventually buried in Italy, first at Monte Feltre, and afterwards on a small island near Naples, where a costly tomb had been erected for him by a noblewoman. Christianity had been firmly established in Noricum during his life; the bishopric of Lohr, subsequently transferred to Passau, had already been founded (Vita S. c. 30), and three others (Teurnia, or Tiburnia, Celleia, now Cilley, and Aemona, now Laybach, whose bishops are recorded among the members of a synod held at Grado in 579) were established in the course of the. next century.

Literature. — Eugipputs, Vita S. Severini, in M. Welseri Opp. Hist. et Phil. (Norimb. 1672), p. 631 sq., and in Pez, Scriptt. Rer. Austr. 1, 62 sq.; the Bollandists' Aeta SS. ad Jan. 8. See also Mannert, Geogr. d. Griechen u. Roier, 3, 528 sq.; Forbiger, Handb. d. alt. Geogr. 3, 455 sq.; Muchar, Das rom. Noricum, etc. (Gratz, 1825, 2 pts. 8vo); Mascou, Gesch. d. Teutscheun, etc., II, 2, 2, and 13, 36); Stritter, Memorioe Populorum olim ad Danub., etc. (St. Petersburg, 1771-74, 2 vols. 4to); Mosheim, De Rebus Christ. etc., p. 211 sq.; Fleury, Hist. Eccles. 6, 839 sq.; Schrockh, Christliche Kirchengeschichte, 16, 261 sq.; Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands (Gott. 1846), 1, 8, 21, 84.

## Severinus[[@Headword:Severinus]]

             pope from 638 to 640, and successor of Honorius I. The Monotitelite troubles led to the postponing of his confirmation by the emperor Heraclius until 640, when it was obtained on the pledge of his legates that the Roman clergy should subscribe to the emperor's Ecthesis (q.v.). He was enthroned May 28, and died Aug. 1 following. He condemned the Ecthesis, and consequently the Monothelite doctrine. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Severites[[@Headword:Severites]]

             SEE ANGELITES.

## Severus[[@Headword:Severus]]

             founder of the Gnostic sect named after him Severians (q.v.). He came from Sozopolis to Pisidia, and while a pagan was a lawyer. Receiving baptism at Tripoli, in Phoenicia, he became a monk and united himself with a society of zealous Monophysites. Banished, he came to Constantinople to seek protection from the emperor. He told him that the defense of the Chalcedonian Council was the cause of all the disturbances, and sought to introduce a certain addition to the old and venerated Church song the Trisagion which might serve as the basis of a coalition between the opposing parties. Later, in the reign of Justin, Severus, who had managed to become patriarch of Antioch, saved his life by fleeing to Egypt. He returned to Constantinople with Anthimus, under the protection of the empress Theodora; but Justinian, finding that he had been imposed upon by the Monophysites, deposed Anthimus, and decreed that “the writings of Severus should be burned, and none should be permitted either to own or transcribe them.” See Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 531 sq.

## Severus, Alexander[[@Headword:Severus, Alexander]]

             SEE ALEXANDER SEVERUS.

## Severus, Sulpicius, St.[[@Headword:Severus, Sulpicius, St.]]

             was born about 363, of a prominent family, and in manhood shone for a time as a forensic orator. He married the daughter of a wealthy consul; but she died about 392, and he spent the remainder of his life in monastic seclusion with a few like-minded persons, in Aquitaine. He was an admirer of Martin of Tours, whom he repeatedly visited. Gennadius states that he was gained over to Pelagianism when in his old age, and that he had expressed himself in favor of that system; but that, having discovered his error, he imposed on himself perpetual silence as a penance. He died at  Marseilles, whither he had retired, soon after A.D. 410. The writings of Severus are, Vita S. Martini Turonensis, with legendary embellishments: — Historia Sacra, or Chronica Sacra, containing Jewish and Church history to A.D. 400, interspersed with marvels, but written in a flowing style: Dialogues, written about A.D. 405, and treating in part of the monastic life and virtues, in part of the merits of Martin of Tours; finally, some letters of no importance and doubtful authenticity (see Bahr, Christl. rom. Theol. p. 218-222). The works of Severus have been separately published in various editions; the best complete edition is that of Hieronymus de Prato (Verona, 1751-54), without the letters. A reprint from this ed. with the letters added is given in Gallandi, Bibl, Patrum, 8, 355 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encykop. s.v.

## Severy[[@Headword:Severy]]

             (also Severey, Severie, Civery), a bay or compartment of a vaulted ceiling.

## Seville, Councils Of[[@Headword:Seville, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Hispalense).

I. The first Council of Seville was held Nov. 4, 590, composed of eight bishops, St. Leander, bishop of Seville, presiding. It was decided that the donations and alienations of Church property made by the bishop Gaudentius were uncanonical and void; nevertheless, it was decreed that the serfs who had been freed by him should remain free, although still subject to the Church, and should be prohibited from leaving their property to all persons except their children, who should remain, in perpetuity, subjects of the Church; also, authority was given to the lay judges to separate the clergy from their wives or mistresses. See Mansi, Concil. 5, 1588.

II. The second council was held in November, 618, by St. Isidore, the archbishop, at the head of seven other bishops, against the Acephalists, who denied the two natures in one person. Various regulations, chiefly relating to the particular circumstances of their Church, were also drawn up. All the acts of the council are contained in thirteen chapters.

1. Theodulphus, bishop of Malaga, having complained of the conduct of the bishops of his neighborhood, who, during the confusion consequent  upon the war, had appropriated to themselves much of his territory, it was ordered that all should be restored to him.

4. Forbids the ordination of clerks who had married widows, and declares such to be void.

5. Orders the deposition of a priest and two deacons, ordained under the following circumstances: The bishop, who labored under an affection of the eyes, had merely laid his hands upon them, while a priest pronounced the benediction.

7. Relates to the conduct of Agapius, bishop of Cordova, who, being little skilled in ecclesiastical discipline, had granted permission to certain priests to erect altars and consecrate churches in the absence of the bishop. The council forbids all such proceedings for the future.

10 and 11. Confirm the recent establishment of certain monasteries in the province of Betica, and forbid the bishops, under pain of excommunication, to take possession of their property; also allows monks to take charge of property appertaining to nunneries, upon condition that they dwell iu distinct houses, and abstain from all familiar intercourse with the nuns.

13 and 14. Assert the doctrine of two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ united in one person. See Mansi, 5, 1663.

## Sewafioll[[@Headword:Sewafioll]]

             in Norse mythology, was the dwelling place of the beautiful and strong Sigrun. It is believed to be Mount Seva, in West Gothland, Sweden.

## Sewall, Joseph, D.D.[[@Headword:Sewall, Joseph, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Boston, Aug. 15, 1688 (O.S.). He graduated at Harvard College in 1707, and was ordained Sept. 16, 1713, colleague pastor of the Old South Church, where he spent his life, having declined the presidency of Harvard College, which was urged upon him in 1724. In 1728 he accepted a fellowship and served until 1765, when he resigned, and died June 27, 1769. He was made D.D. by the University of Glasgow in 1731. Dr. Sewall's publications were, The Holy Spirit Convincing the World of Sin, of Righteousness, and of Judgment Four Sermons (1741): — and a large number of Occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 278.

## Sewall, Jotham[[@Headword:Sewall, Jotham]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at York, Me., Jan. 1, 1760. Shortly after he attained his majority he migrated to the Kennebec and worked at his trade (mason). In 1783 his mind first took a permanent religious direction, and he found peace. He was licensed to preach May 8, 1798, and ordained as an evangelist June 18, 1800. For a short time he had charge of the Church in Chesterville, where he resided; but the greater part of his subsequent life was spent in missionary labor, chiefly in Maine. He labored till near the close of his life, preaching only three weeks before his death, which took place Oct. 3, 1850. He was a man of fervid, massive strength. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 430.

## Sewall, Samuel[[@Headword:Sewall, Samuel]]

             chief-justice of the supreme court of Massachusetts, was born at Bishopstoke, England, March 28, 1652, His father established himself in the United States in 1661, when Samuel was nine years old. In his childhood the latter was under the instruction of Mr. Parker, of Newbury. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1671, and afterwards preached for a short time. In 1688 he went to England. He returned to the United States in 1689. In 1692 he was appointed in the new charter one of the council, il which station he continued till 1725. He was made one of the judges in 1692, and chief-justice of the superior court in 1718. Sharing in the then general belief in witchcraft, he concurred in its condemnation in 1692; but at a public fast, Jan. 14, 1697, he acknowledged his wrong. In 1699 he was chosen one of the commissioners of the. society in England for the propagation of the Gospel in New England. He died Jan. 1, 1730. By his wife he received a large fortune, thirty thousand pounds, which he employed for the glory of God and the advantage of men. Eminent for piety, wisdom, and learning, in all the relations of life he exhibited the Christian virtues and secured universal respect. For a long course of years he was a member of the Old South Church and one of its greatest ornaments. Judge Sewall's writings are, Answer to Queries respecting America (1690): — Prospects touching the Accomplishment of Prophecies (Boston, 1713, 4to): — Memorial relating to the Kennebec Indians (1721, 4to): — -Phoenomena quoedam Apocalyptica ad Aspectum Novi Orbis Configurata (2d ed. 1727, 4to).

## Sewall, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Sewall, Thomas, D.D.]]

             a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Essex, Mass., April 28, 1818. He was educated at Wilbraham, and graduated from the Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 1837. He united with the Baltimore Conference in 1838, but in 1841 was returned supernumerary, and spent a year in Europe and the East. He entered upon active work when he returned, but on account of ill health located in 1848. He was readmitted in 1849 and given a superannuated relation, which he retained until 1853, when he resumed pastoral work. In 1866 he was transferred to New York East Conference and stationed in Brooklyn, and was retransferred in 1869, taking a supernumerary relation. He died Aug. 11, 1870. In 1860 Dr. Sewall was a delegate to the General Conference. He was a man of refined tastes and scholarly culture, a born orator, and a successful minister. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 19.

## Sewell, William (1)[[@Headword:Sewell, William (1)]]

             the historian of the Quakers, was the son of Jacob Williamson Sewell, and was born at Amsterdam in 1650. His grandfather left his native country, England, that, as a Brownist, he might enjoy more freedom in Holland. William Sewell lost both his parents in early life, but, having been instructed by them in the principles of the Quakers, he adhered to them during life. He was a student of unwearied application, attaining a knowledge of Greek, Latin, English, French, and High Dutch. He is chiefly noted for his History of the People called Quakers, written first in Low Dutch, and afterwards by himself in English. One principal object with the author was a desire to correct what he conceived to be gross misrepresentations in Gerard Croese's History of Quakerism. The work seems to have been first published in 1722, folio, and reprinted in 1725.

## Sewell, William (2)[[@Headword:Sewell, William (2)]]

             an English clergyman, was born in the Isle of Wight about 1805. The son of a solicitor, he was educated at Harrow and Oxford, became fellow of Exeter College, and incumbent of Carisbrooke Castle chapel, Isle of Wight. He was public examiner in the university from 1836 to 1841, and in 1852 was appointed principal of St. Peter's College at Radley. He was a supporter of the tractarian movement. His published works are, Horoe Philologicoe: — Conjectures on the Structure of the Greek Language (1830): — Sacred Thoughts in Verse (1831; 2d ed. 1842): — Christian  Vestiges of Creation (1861): — besides Sermons, and tracts on Christian morals and politics, etc.

## Sewell, William D.[[@Headword:Sewell, William D.]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in. Chesterville, Me., July 15, 1813. He was converted in 1831, entered the itinerancy on Sidney Circuit September, 1836, under the presiding elder; admitted on trial in 1837, and served two years on Kilmarnock and Harmony circuits; was received into full connection in 1839, and appointed to Vassalborough Circuit, where he pursued his labors with great zeal and success until near the time of his death, which occurred April 24, 1840. He possessed a good and well- cultured mind. His attachment to the doctrines and institutions of the Church was strong and unwavering. See Minutes of Conferences, 3, 145.

## Sexagesima[[@Headword:Sexagesima]]

             the Sunday which, in round numbers, is sixty days before Easter.

## Sexes, Separation Of, In Churches[[@Headword:Sexes, Separation Of, In Churches]]

             The rules of the primitive churches required the separation of the sexes in the churches, and this was generally observed. The men occupied the left of the altar on the south side of the church, and the women the right on the north. They were separated from each other by a veil or lattice. In the Eastern churches the women and catechumens occupied the galleries above, while the men sat below. In some churches a separate apartment was also allotted to widows and virgins. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq. s.v.

## Sext[[@Headword:Sext]]

             a name given to the noonday service (q.v.) of the early Christian Church because it was held at the sixth hour.

## Sexton[[@Headword:Sexton]]

             a corruption of sacristan (q.v.). This officer was anciently the attendant and waiter on the clergy. His duties at the present day in the Church of England is to keep the church, dig graves, provide the necessaries for service — as for baptism and the Lord's supper — under the direction of the church wardens. The office may be held by a woman, and the salary usually depends on the annual vote of the parishioners. In Scotland the  sexton, whose duties are much the same as in England, is usually called the beadle, from the Saxon bydde, to cry, or to make proclamation. The appointment to office in the Established Church is with the heritors.

## Sextry[[@Headword:Sextry]]

             SEE SACRISTY.

## Sextus[[@Headword:Sextus]]

             a term, in the ancient canon law, to signify a collection of decretals made by pope Boniface VIII; thus called from the title, Liber Sextus, and being an addition to the five volumes of decretals collected by Gregory IX. The persons reputed to have been commissioned to draw it up were William de Mandegotte, archbishop of Ambrun; Berenger, bishop of Beziers; and Richard, bishop of Sienna.

## Seyffarth, Gustav[[@Headword:Seyffarth, Gustav]]

             a Lutheran theologian and archeologist of Germany, was born at Ubigau, Saxony, July 13, 1796. He studied at Leipsic, and commenced his academical career there in 1823. In 1857 he came to America, was professor at the Lutheran Concordia College, in St. Louis, Missouri, retired in 1871 to New York city, and died November 17, 1885. He published, Ueber die urspringlichen Laute der hebr. Buchstaben (Leipsic, 1824): — Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Literatur, Kunst, Mythologie und Geschichte der alten Egypter (1826-40): — Chronologia Sacra (1846): — Dals tausendjahrige Reich im Lichte der Offenbarungen des Alten und Neuen Testamenets (N.Y. 1860). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Seymour, Truman[[@Headword:Seymour, Truman]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Albany, N.Y., Jan. 25, 1799, and united with the Church there at the age of seventeen. In 1829 he joined the New York Conference, and was a member of this, and, later, of the Troy Conference, until his death, Nov. 15, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 64.

## Seys, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Seys, John, D.D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Santa Cruz Island, West Indies, March 30, 1799. In 1821 he joined the Wesleyan Church in the island of St. Eustatius. Notwithstanding much opposition from friends, he continued in this Church, and in 1825 was licensed a local preacher. He was ordained in 1829, and, coming to the United States, joined the Oneida Conference. In 1833 he was a missionary among the Oneida Indians, and in 1834 sailed for Liberia as superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church Missions in West Africa. He returned in 1841, and in 1842 he was appointed to Wilkesbarre, Pa. The following year he went again to Liberia, from which he returned in 1845, when he resigned his connection with the mission and joined the New York Conference. In 1850 he became travelling agent of the Maryland Colonization Society, locating at Baltimore, where he remained six years. He was then appointed agent for the Colonization Society of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and moved to Springfield, O. The same year he went to Africa and located a  settlement, and from this time to 1870 was associated with Africa and the improvement of the colored race. He also acted as United States agent for. recaptured slaves, and as United States consul and minister resident in Liberia. On his return to the United States, he became, by request, a member of the Cincinnati Conference. He died Feb. 9, 1872. See Minutes of Anual Conferences, 1872, p. 107.

## Sfondrata, Celestine[[@Headword:Sfondrata, Celestine]]

             prince abbot of St. Gall, and nephew of Gregory XIV, was born at Milan in 1644. He was educated in the abbey of St. Gall, taught theology, philosophy, and canon law at various places, and was elected prince-abbot of St. Gall in 1689. In 1695 Innocent XII made Sfondrata a cardinal, but he died soon after his promotion, in the same year, at Rome. Sfondrata wrote, Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici Assertum et Quatuor Propositionibus Explicatum (1684), which is a defence of the absolute supremacy of the pope over and against the pretensions of the Gallican Church. Five French bishops refuted this work: — Nodus Praedestinationis . . . Dissolutus (Rome, 1696; Venice, 1698). This posthumous work was attacked by the Sorbonne, Bossuet, and others, who in vain tried to have the book put on the Index. See Moreri, Auctores Diarsii Italici (Venice, 1732), volume 6; Journal des Savants, 1698, 1708, and 1709; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Sforno, Obadiah[[@Headword:Sforno, Obadiah]]

             SEE OBADIAH BEN-JACOB DE SFORNO.

## Shaalabbin[[@Headword:Shaalabbin]]

             (Heb. Shaalabbin', שִׁעֲלִבַּין; but many MSS. Shaalabbim', שִׁעֲלִבַּי ם, city of foxes; Sept. Σαλαβίν v.r. Σαλαμείν; Vulg. Selebin). a town in the tribe of Dan (Jos 19:42, where it is named between Ir-shemesh and Ajalon); probably the same elsewhere (Jdg 1:35; 1Ki 4:9) called SHAALBIM SEE SHAALBIM (q.v.).

## Shaalbim[[@Headword:Shaalbim]]

             (Heb. Shaalbim', שִׁעֲלְבַי ם, according to Furst = בֵּית שׁוּעִלַי ם, house [i.e. place] offoxes; Sept. Σαλαβίν, Σαλαβείμ, v.r. Θααλαβείν, Βηθαλαμεί, and even αἱ ἀλώπεκες) occurs in an ancient fragment of history inserted in Judges 1, enumerating the towns of which the original inhabitants of Canaan succeeded in keeping possession after the general conquest. Mount Heres, Aijalon, and Shaalbim were held against the Danites by the Amorites (Jdg 1:35) till, the help of the great tribe of Ephraim being called in, they were at last compelled to succumb. It is mentioned with Aijalon again in Jos 19:42 (Shaalabbin), and with Bethshemesh both there and in 1Ki 4:9, in the last passage as making up one of Solomon's commissariat districts.. By Eusebius and Jerome it is mentioned in the Onomasticon (s.v. ‘Selab') as a large village in the district of Sebaste (i.e. Samaria), and as then called Selaba. But this is not very intelligible, for, except in the statement of Josephus (Ant. 5, 1, 22) that the allotment of the Danites extended as far north as Dor (Tantura), there is nothing to lead to the belief that any of their towns were at all near Samaria (see Schwarz, Palest. p. 140), while the persistent enumeration of Shaalbim with Aijalon and Beth-shemesh, the sites of both which are known with tolerable certainty as within a radius of fifteen miles west of Jerusalem, is strongly against it. It is also at variance with another  notice of Jerome, in his commentary on Eze 48:22, where he mentions the ‘towers of Ailon and Selebi and Emmaus-Nicopolis,' in connection with Joppa, as three landmarks of the tribe of Dan.” Shaalbim may possiblv be identified with the modern village Beit Sira, a village a little north of Yalo, on the south side of Wady Suleiman; or, perhaps (so Furst), rather with Selbit, a ruined village north of the wady (Robinson, Researches, 1852, 3, 144, notes). SEE SHAALBONITE.

## Shaalbim (2)[[@Headword:Shaalbim (2)]]

             The probable representative of this place, Selbit, lies two miles north of Amwds. It is a deserted ruin, and "appears to be the Selebi of Jerome's Comment. on Eze 48:22" (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:52).

## Shaalbonite[[@Headword:Shaalbonite]]

             (Heb. Shaalboni', שִׁעֲלְבֹנַי; Sept. Σαλαβωνίτης, v.r. Σαλαβωνί, Σωμεί, and even Ο᾿μεί; Vulg. Salabonites, de Salboni), an epithet of Eliahba (q.v.), one of David's thirty-seven chief heroes (2Sa 23:32; 1Ch 11:33); evidently as being a native of Shaalbon. a place otherwise unknown, unless identical with Shaalbim (q, v.)..

## Shaaph[[@Headword:Shaaph]]

             (Heb. id. שִׁעִ; Gesenius division, but Furst union; Sept. Σαγάφ, v.r. Σαγαέ, Σέφ, Σαάφ), the name of two men.

1. Last named of six sons of Jahdai, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:47). B.C. prob. post 1612.

2. Third named of four sons of Maachah, concubine of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah; he was the “fathers” (i.e. founder) of Madmannah (1Ch 2:49). B.C. post 1612.

## Shaaraim[[@Headword:Shaaraim]]

             (Heb. Shaara'yim, שִׁעֲרִיַ ם, two gates; Sept. in Joshua Σακαρίμ, in Samuel αἱ πόλεις, in Chron. Σεωρείμ [v.r. Σαρίμ]; Vulg. Saraim, Saarim), a town in the “valley” or maritime plain of Judah (Jos 15:36, A.V. “Sharaim,” where it is named between Azekah and Adithaim). Its occurrence among the cities of Simeon (1Ch 4:31) is probably a clerical error for Sharuhen (Jos 19:6). “It is mentioned again in the account of the rout which followed the fall of Goliath, where the wounded fell down on the road to Shaaraim and as far as Gath and Ekron (1Sa 17:52). These two notices are consistent with each other. Goliath probably fell in the Wady es-Sumt, on opposite sides of which stand the representatives of Socoh and Jarmuth; Gath was at or near  Tell es-Safieh, a few miles west of Socoh at the mouth of the same wady; while Ekron (if ‘Akir be Ekron) lies farther north. Shaaraim is probably therefore to be looked for somewhere west of Shuweikeh, on the lower slopes of the hills, where they subside into the great plain” (Smith). “The valley of Elah runs down among the hills for some distance, and then forks below Tell-Zakartah; one branch, or rather side valley, running to Gath (Tell es-Safieh), and the other to the plain of Ekron. Perhaps the town of Shaaraim may have been situated at the fork, and may have taken its name from the ‘two passes' (see Porter, Hand-book for Sin. and Pal. p. 264)” (Kitto). It is probably identical with. the Ir-Tarain of the Talmud (Tosephtah, Ahaloth, s.f.), for the Chaldee tarain has the same meaning, gates (Schwarz, Palest. p. 102). From the associated localities it must be sought in the vicinity of the modern Shahmeh, a village with traces of ruins about two and a half miles south of Ekron (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 114). Lieut. Conder at first proposed Tell Zakariah as a suitable position for Shaaraim (Quar. Statement of “the Pal. Explor. Fund,” 1875, p. 194), but M. Ganneau suggests the ruin. Sa'ireh (ibid. p. 182), mentioned in Dr. Robinson's list (Append. to vol. 3, 1st ed. of Researches) between Shuweikeh and Beit-Netif, in which Lieut. Conder seems finally to coincide (Tent Work in Pal. 2, 339).

## Shaaraim (2)[[@Headword:Shaaraim (2)]]

             The probable site is that of Khu-bet Saireh, three and a half miles north- east of Beit Nettif, and one a half west of Belt Atab. It consists of "foundations on a hill, with a spring below" (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:124).

## Shaashgaz[[@Headword:Shaashgaz]]

             (Heb. Shaashgaz', שִׁעִשְׁגִּז, Persian, servant of the beautiful; Sept. Γαι), the appropriate name of a Persian eunuch, the keeper of the concubines in the court of Xerxes (Est 2:14). B.C. cir. 525. SEE HEGAI.

## Shabbath[[@Headword:Shabbath]]

             SEE SABBATH; SEE TALMUD.

## Shabbethai[[@Headword:Shabbethai]]

             [many Shabbeth'ai', some Shabbetha'i] (Heb. Shabbethai', שִׁבִּתִי, Sabbatical, i.e. born on the Sabbath; Sept. Σαββαθα‹ v.r. Σαβαθα‹ and Καββαθα‹; in Neh 8:7 Σαββαθαῖος), one of the chief Levites, who was active in the reformations and restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah. (Ezr 10:15; Neh 8:7; Neh 11:16). B.C. cir. 450.

## Shablul[[@Headword:Shablul]]

             SEE SNAIL.

## Shachal[[@Headword:Shachal]]

             SEE LION.

## Shachaph[[@Headword:Shachaph]]

             SEE CUCKOO.

## Shachia[[@Headword:Shachia]]

             [many Schach'ia] (Heb. Shokyah', שָׁכְיָה[so the margin], accusation [Gesenius] or announcement [Furst]; but the text has Shobyah', שָׁבְיָה, captivity; Sept. Σεβιά v.r. Σαβιά and Ζαβία; Vulg. Sechia), the sixth named of the seven sons of Shaharaim (q.v.). of the tribe of Benjamin, by his wife Hodesh (1Ch 8:10). B.C. post 1612.

## Shadanana[[@Headword:Shadanana]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a surname of the god Kartikeya, signifying “the head with six faces.”

## Shaddai[[@Headword:Shaddai]]

             (Heb. Shadday', שִׁדֵּי, in pause שִׁדָּי), an ancient name of God, rendered “Almighty” everywhere in the A.V. In all passages of Genesis except one (Gen 49:25), in Exo 6:3, and in Eze 10:5, it is found in connection with אֵל, el, “God,” El Shaddai being there rendered “God Almighty,” or “the Almighty God.” It occurs six times in Genesis (Gen 17:1; Gen 28:3; Gen 35:11; Gen 43:14; Gen 48:3; Gen 49:25), once in Exodus (Exo 6:3), twice in Numbers (Num 24:4; Num 24:16), twice in Ruth (Rth 1:20-21), thirty- one times in Job, twice in the Psalms (Psa 68:14 [15]; Psa 91:1), once in Isaiah (Isa 13:6), twice in Ezekiel (Eze 1:24; Eze 10:5), and once in Joel (Joe 1:15). In Genesis and Exodus it is found in what are called the Elohistic portions of those books, in Numbers in the Jehovistic portion, and throughout Job the name Shaddai stands in parallelism with Elohim, and never with Jehovah. By the name or in the character of El Shaddai, God was known to the patriarchs — to Abraham (Gen 17:1), to Isaac (Gen 28:3), and to Jacob (Gen 43:14; Gen 48:3; Gen 49:25) —  before the name Jehovah, in its full significance, was revealed (Exo 6:3). By this title he was known to the Midianite Balaam (Num 24:4; Num 24:16), as God the Giver of Visions, the Most High (comp. Psa 91:1); and the identity of Jehovah and Shaddai, who dealt bitterly with her, was recognized by Naomi in her sorrow (Rth 1:20-21). Shaddai, the Almighty, is the God who chastens men (Job 5:17; Job 6:4; Job 23:16; Job 27:2); the just God (Job 8:3; Job 34:10), who hears prayer (Job 8:5; Job 22:26; Job 27:10); the God of power who cannot be resisted (Job 15:25), who punishes the wicked (Job 21:20; Job 27:13), and rewards and protects those who trust in him (Job 22:23; Job 22:25; Job 29:5); the God of providence (Job 22:17; Job 22:23; Job 27:11) and of foreknowledge (Job 24:1), who gives to men understanding (Job 32:8) and life (Job 33:4): “excellent in power, and in judgment, and in plenty of justice,” whom none can perfectly know (Job 11:7; Job 37:23). The prevalent idea attaching to the name in all these passages is that of strength and power, and our translators have probably given to “Shaddai” its true meaning when they rendered it “Almighty.”

In the Targum throughout, the Hebrew word is retained, as in the Peshito- Syriac of Genesis and Exodus, and of Rth 1:20. The Sept. gives ἱκανός, ἰσχυρός, Θεός, Κύριος, παντοκράτωρ, Κύριος παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας (Job 8:3), ἐπουράνιος (Psa 68:14 [15]), ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Psa 91:1), σαδδαϊv (Eze 10:5), and ταλαιπωρία (Joel i, 15). In Job 29:5 we find the strange rendering ὑλώδης. In Genesis and Exodus “El Shaddai” is translated ὁ Θεός μου, or σου, or αὐτῶν, as the case may be. The Vulgate has omnipotens in all cases except Dominus (Job 5:17; Job 6:4; Job 6:14; Isa 13:6), Deus (Job 22:3; Job 40:2), Deus coeli (Psa 91:1), sublimis Deus (Eze 1:24), colestis (Psa 68:14 [15]), potens (Joe 1:15), and digne (Job 37:23). The Veneto-Greek has κραταιός. The Peshito-Syriac, in many passages, renders “Shaddai” simply “God,” in others chasino, “strong, powerful” (Job 5:17; Job 6:4; etc.), and once ‘eloyo, “Most High” (Job 6:14). The Samaritan version of Gen 17:1 has for “El Shaddai” “powerful, sufficient,” though in the other passages of Genesis and Exodus it simply retains the Hebrew word; while in Num 24:4; Num 24:16, the translator must have read שָׂדֶה, sadeh, “a field,” for he renders “the vision of Shaddai” “the vision of the field,” i.e. the vision seen in the open plain. Aben-Ezra and Kimchi render it “powerful.”  The derivations assigned to Shaddai are various. We may mention, only to reject, the Rabbinical etymology which connects it with דִּי, dai, “sufficiency,” given by Rashi (on Gen 17:1), “I am he in whose Godhead there is sufficiency for the whole creation;” and in the Talmud (Chagiga, fol. 12, Colossians 1), “I am he who said to the world, Enough!” According to this, שִׁדִּי=אֲשֶׁר דִי, “He who is sufficient,” “the all-sufficient One;” and so “He who is sufficient in himself,” and therefore self existent. This is the origin of the ἱκανός of the Sept., Theodoret, and Hesychius, and of the Arabic alkafi of Saadias which has the same meaning. Gesenius (Gram. § 86, and Jesaia 13:6) regards שִׁדִּי, shaddai, as the plural of majesty, from a singular noun, שִׁד, shad, root שָׁדִד, shadad, of which the primary notion seems to be “to be strong” (Furst, Handwb.). It is evident that this derivation was present to the mind of the prophet from the play of words in Isa 13:6. Ewald (Lehrb. § 155 c, 5th ed.) takes it from a root שָׁדָה=שָׁדִד, and compares it with דִּיָּי, davvai, from דָּוָה, davah, the older termination יִיbeing retained. He also refers to the proper names יַשִׁי, Yishai (Jesse), and בִּוִּי, Bavvai (Neh 3:18). Rodiger (Gesen. Thesaur. s.v.) disputes Ewald's explanation, and proposes, as one less open to objection, that Shaddai originally signified “my powerful ones,” and afterwards became the name of God Almighty, like the analogous form Adonai. In favor of this is the fact that it is never found with the definite article, but such would be equally the case if Shaddai were regarded as a proper name. On the whole there seems no reasonable objection to the view taken by Gesenius, which Lee also adopts (Gram. § 139, 6).

Shaddai is found as ant element in the proper names Ammishaddai, Zurishaddai, and possibly also in Shedeur there may be a trace of it.

## Shade, Jacob B.[[@Headword:Shade, Jacob B.]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Montgomery County, Pa., April 25, 1817. He began his studies in Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., in May, 1839; and finished his theological studies in the seminary located in the same place. Full of zeal, he preached, while in the seminary, in destitute places among the mountains west of Mercersburg, and was the means of organizing several congregations. He was licensed and ordained in May, 1843, and continued his labors for a short time in the mountains where he had preached before. At the close of the same year he became colporteur in Berks County, Pa., for the American Tract Society,  spending one year in that field. In 1844-45 he spent a year in the same work in Alabama. On his return his health had entirely failed, and he died Jan. 6, 1846. With ordinary natural abilities, he was possessed of extraordinary zeal and devotion to the work of Christ. He preached in German and English.

## Shadford, George[[@Headword:Shadford, George]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born. at Scotter, in Lindsley, Lincolnshire, England, Jan. 19, 1739. At the age of sixteen he received his first communion in the Established Church, and for a time was very serious and punctual in the discharge of religious duties; but he fell back into sin.. He enlisted in the militia while still a youth, and became quite desperate in wickedness. He was hopefully converted May 5, 1762, and within two weeks became a member of the Methodist Society. In 1768 he united with the Conference, and was appointed to labor in the west of Cornwall. He was sent in the spring of 1773 to America; and labored for a month in New Jersey, four months in New York city, and four or five months in Philadelphia. He was stationed in 1776 in Virginia, and in 1777 at Baltimore. Not being willing to take the test oath during the Revolutionary war, he returned in 1778 to Great Britain. There he resumed his labors, and continued them with unabated diligence and fidelity till disease and infirmity obliged him to retire. He died March 11, 1816. Mr. Shadford had a Christian character that was decidedly marked. He was a man of prayer, of Christian temper, and godly conversation. As a preacher he was not above mediocrity, and yet his labors were very successful. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 34.

## Shadow[[@Headword:Shadow]]

             (צֵל, tsl, or צֵלֶלtselel; σκία, either simply or in composition), the privation of light by an object interposing between a luminary and the surface on which the shadow appears. The light of the sun may be obscured; but “with the Father of light there is no parallax nor tropical shadow;” no interposing bodies can change his purposes or for a moment intercept and turn aside his truth, because he is equally present everywhere (Jam 1:17). A shadow falling on a plate follows the course of the body which causes it; and, as it is often extremely rapid, the fleetness of human life is often compared to it (1Ch 29:15; Job 14:2).  Shadow is also used in the sense of darkness, gloom, “the shadow of death” — i.e. death-shade, a season of severe trial, heavy sorrow (Psalms 23), or depicting a state of ignorance and wretchedness (Mat 4:16; Luk 1:79). Hackett (Illust. of Script. p. 46 sq.) thinks that David's image of the valley of death's shadow may have been suggested by such wild, dreary ravines as the Wady Aly. Shadow is also used for covering and protection from the heat for repose, where the word shade would be preferable. The Messiah “is as the shade of a great rock in a weary land” (Isa 32:2; Isa 49:2; Son 2:3; Psa 17:8; Psa 63:7; Psa 91:1) (comp. Hackett, Illust. of Script. p. 50 sq.). Shadow is used to indicate that the Jewish economy was an adumbration, or a shadowing forth, of the things future and more perfect in the Christian dispensation (Heb 8:5; Heb 10:1; Col 2:17). On the curative power of Peter's shadow (Act 5:15), see Engelschall, De Umbra Petri (Lips. 1725); Krakewitz, id. (Rost. 1704).

## Shadrach[[@Headword:Shadrach]]

             (Heb. Shadrak', שִׁדְרִךְ; Sept. Σεδράκ v.r. Σεδράχ; Vulg. Sidrach), the Chaldee name of Hananiah, the chief of the “three children” who were Daniel's companions (Dan 1:7, etc.). His song, as given in the Apocryphal. Daniel, forms part of the service of the Church of England, under the name of “Benedicite omnia opera.” A long prayer in the furnace is also ascribed to him in the Sept. and Vulgate; but this is thought to be by a different hand from that which added the song. The history of Shadrach, or Hananiah, is briefly this. He was taken captive with Daniel, Mishael, and Azariah at the first invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, in the fourth, or, as Daniel (Dan 1:1) reckons, in the third, year of Jehoiakim, at the time when the Jewish king himself was bound in fetters to be carried off to Babylon. B.C. 606. Being, with his three companions, apparently of royal birth (Dan 1:3), of superior understanding and of goodly person, he was selected, with them, for the king's immediate service; and was for this end instructed in the language and in all the learning and wisdom of the Chaldaeans as taught in the college of the magicians. Like Daniel, he avoided the pollution of the meat and wine which formed their daily provision at the king's cost, and obtained permission to live on pulse and water. When the time of his probation was over, he and his three companions, being found superior to all the other magicians, were advanced to stand before the king.

When the decree for the slaughter of all  the magicians went forth from Nebuchadnezzar, we find Shadrach uniting with his companions in prayer to God to reveal the dream to Daniel; and when, in answer to that prayer, Daniel had successfully interpreted the dream and been made ruler of the province of Babylon and head of the college of magicians, Shadrach was promoted to a high civil office. But the penalty of Oriental greatness, especially when combined with honesty and uprightness, soon had to be paid by him, on the accusation of certain envious Chaldaeans. For refusing to worship the golden image he was cast with Meshach and Abed-nego into the burning furnace. But his faith stood firm; and his victory was complete when he came out of the furnace with his two companions unhurt, heard the king's testimony to the glory of God, and was “promoted in the province of Babylon.” We hear no more of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the Old Test. after this; neither are they spoken of in the New Test. except in the pointed allusion to them ‘in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as having “through faith quenched the violence of fire” (Heb 11:33-34). But there are repeated allusions to them in the-later Apocryphal books, and the martyrs of the Maccabaean. period seem to have been much encouraged by their example. See 1Ma 2:59-60; 3Ma 6:6; 4Ma 13:9; 4Ma 16:3; 4Ma 16:21; 4Ma 18:12. Ewald (Geschichte, 4, 557) observes, indeed, that next to the Pentateuch no book is so often referred to in these times, in proportion, as the book of Daniel. The apocryphal additions to Daniel contain, as usual, many supplementary particulars about the furnace, the angel, and Nebuchadnezzar, besides the introduction of the prayer of Shadrach and the hymn. Theodore Parker observes with truth, in opposition to Bertholdt, that these additions of the Alexandrine prove that the Hebrew was the original text, because they are obviously inserted to introduce a better connection into the narrative (Josephus, Ant. 10, 10; Prideaux, Connect. 1, 59, 60; Parker's De Wette's Introd. 2, 483-510; Grimm, on 1 Macc. 2, 60; Hitzig [who takes a thoroughly sceptical view], on Daniel 3; Ewald, 4, 106, 107, 557-559; Keil, Einleit. Daniel). SEE DANIEL.

As to the etymology, “this name is identified by some with Hadrach,! חדר (Zec 9:1), the name of a Syrian god who represents the seasons ( חדר= חזר, ‘to turn,' ‘wind'). The interchange of ח with sibilants is not without parallel. Others profess to trace the name to a Babylonian source, and connect it with the Assyrian Sadhiru. or Sadhru, ‘the great scribe' (שטר), with the non-Assyrian guttural termination, or with sed (comp. Sept. Σεδ-), the Assyrian equivalents of mas (comp. Meshech, and the  analogy suggested by חנניה), followed by the insertion of the r (frequent in Assyrian) before the guttural” (Speaker's Commentary). According to Bohlen, the name is Persian, and signifies rejoicing in the way; according to Benfey, it is Zend, meaning royal.

## Shady trees[[@Headword:Shady trees]]

             in Job 40:21-22, is the rendering of the Hebrew tseelim, צֶאֵַלי ם (Sept. and Vulg. render at random), which perhaps means properly the prickly lotus bushes. SEE TREE.

## Shafer, Joseph L., D.D[[@Headword:Shafer, Joseph L., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Stillwater, N.J., May 9, 1787. He graduated from Princeton College in 1808, studied theology under Reverend Dr. Woodhull, was licensed to preach in 1810, served twon years as a missionary, and thereafter as pastor at Newton (with the exception of three years at Middletown Point), until his death, November 12, 1853. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## Shaffer, Hiram M.[[@Headword:Shaffer, Hiram M.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal. Church, was born in Carroll County, O., in 1804, and graduated as a physician when but eighteen years of age. He afterwards studied law, and was admitted to the bar at Sidney. He joined the Church in 1831, was licensed to preach in 1832, and entered the Ohio Conference the same year. In this and the Central Ohio Conference he passed his ministerial life. He was several times elected delegate to the General Conference. He died near Richwood, O., Dec. 29, 1871. He published a work on Infant Baptism (N.Y. 1856, 12mo). See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, p. 92.

## Shaft[[@Headword:Shaft]]

             appears in a few. passages of the A.V. in two senses as the rendering of

(a) חֵוֹ, chets (Isa 49:2), an arrow (as often elsewhere);

(b) יָרֵךְ, yarek, properly a thigh (as often); hence the shank of the golden candelabrum in the Tabernacle, where the stem (קָנֶה) separated into the three feet (Exo 25:31; Exo 37:17; Num 8:4). SEE CANDLESTICK.

## Shaft (2)[[@Headword:Shaft (2)]]

             the body of a column or pillar; the part between the capital and base. In Middle-Age architecture the term is particularly applied to the small columns which are clustered round pillars, or used in the jambs of doors and windows, in arcades, and various other situations. They are sometimes  cut on the same stones as the main body of the work to which they are attached, and sometimes of separate pieces. In the latter case they are very commonly of a different material from the rest of the work, and are not unfrequently polished this mode of construction appears to have been first introduced towards the end of the Norman style. In Early Norman work they are circular, but later in the style they are occasionally octagonal, and are sometimes ornamented with zigzags, spiral moldings, etc. In the Early English style they are almost always circular, generally in separate stones from the other work to which they are attached, and very, often banded; in some instances they have a narrow fillet running up them. In the Decorated style they are commonly not set separate, and are frequently so small as to be no more than vertical moldings with capitals and bases; they are usually round and filleted, but are sometimes of other forms. In the Perpendicular style they are cut on the same stones with the rest of the work. They are most generally round, and are sometimes filleted; in some cases they are polygonal, with each side slightly hollowed. The part of a chimney stack between the base and cornice is called the shaft.

## Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper[[@Headword:Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper]]

             the third earl of; was born in London, Feb. 26, 1671. He was educated under the supervision of Locke, entered Parliament in 1693, from which he withdrew on account of delicate health, and took up his residence in Holland in 1698 or 1699. He entered the House of Lords in 1700, supporting the measures of William III, and retiring upon the king's death. He was noted as a philanthropist, was stigmatized as a freethinker, and wrote a Letter on Enthusiasn (1708) in defense of the rights of the French Prophets: — The Moralist (1709), a philosophical rhapsody: — Sensus Communis (1710): — -A Soliloquy, or Advice to an Author (1710). He died at Naples, Feb. 5, 1713. His principal work, Characteristics of Men, Matters, Opinions, and Times, was posthumously published (1713-23, 3 vols.).

## Shage[[@Headword:Shage]]

             (Heb. Shage', שָׁגֵא, erring; Sept. Σαγή v.r. Σωλά), a “Hararite,” appears as the father of Jonathan, one of David's captains (1Ch 11:34). B.C. cir. 1050. In the parallel list of 2Sa 23:33, he is called SHAMMAH (q.v.), unless, as seems probable, there is a confusion between  Jonathan the son of “Shage the Hararite,” Jonathan the son of Shammah, David's brother, and “Shammah.the son of Agee the Hararite.”

## Shahar[[@Headword:Shahar]]

             SEE AIJELETH-SHAHAR.

## Shaharaim[[@Headword:Shaharaim]]

             (Heb. Shachara'yim, שִׁחֲרִיַ ם, double dawn, i.e. the morning and evening twilight; Sept. Σααρήμ v.r. Σααρίν and Σααρήλ; Vulg. Saharaim), a person named among the descendants of Benjamin as the father of several children in the land of Moab by two wives (1Ch 8:8). B.C. ante 1612. Considerable confusion appears to have crept into the text where this name occurs (1Ch 8:3-11), which may perhaps be removed by transposition of the middle clause of 1Ch 8:8 and the whole of 1Ch 8:6 after 1Ch 8:7, and rendering as follows: “And there were sons (born) to Bela, Addar, and Gera, and Abihud, and Abishua, and Naaman, and Achoach [or Achiah], and Gera [repeated by error], and Shephuphan [spuriously inserted], and Huram [spuriously inserted likewise from the sons of Becher]; and (their father) himself banished Naaman, and Achiah [or Achoach], and Gera; and after his dismissal of them, he begot Uzza and Achichud. And these are the descendants of Echud [i.e. Achiah, otherwise Acharah], chiefs of the progenitors of the inhabitants of Geba (afterwards) exiled to Manachath. Shacharayim begot (children) in the land of Moab of his two wives Hushim and Baara [or Chodesh] — namely, of the latter, Yobah, and Tsibya, and Meysha, and Malkam, and Yeuts, and Shobya [v.r. Shokyah], and Mirmah, chieftains of their lineage; and of the other, Abitub and Elpaal.” SEE JACOB.

## Shahazimah[[@Headword:Shahazimah]]

             [some Shahazi'mah] (Heb. Shachatsi'mah, שִׁחֲצַימָה[so the marg., but the text has Shachatzu'mah, שִׁחֲצוּמָה, towards the heights [for the word is plur. with the ה local added]; Sept. Σαλεὶμ κατὰ θάλασσαν [taking the last syllable for יִמָּה, to the sea], v.r. Σασιμά; Vulg. Seesima), a place in the tribe of Issachar, between Mount Tabor and the Jordan (Jos 19:22). A trace of the name may yet remain in the village of Sirin, north of Wady Sherar, near where it joins Wady Bireh, southeast of Tabor.

## Shahazimah (2)[[@Headword:Shahazimah (2)]]

             is conjectured by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 2:339) to be the present Tell esh-Sheikh Kasim, "a very large artificial mound near the Jordan " (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:128), eight miles south of the Sea of Galilee; but there is no special ground for this identification.

## Shailer, William H., D.D[[@Headword:Shailer, William H., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Haddam, Connecticut, November 20, 1807. He graduated from Madison University in 1835; studied at the Newton Theological Institution, teaching meanwhile; became pastor at Deep River, Connecticut, in 1836; at Brookline, Massachusetts, in 1837 at Portland, Maine, in 1854, and without charge from 1877 until his death, February 20, 1881. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Shaked[[@Headword:Shaked]]

             SEE ALMOND.

## Shakers[[@Headword:Shakers]]

             the popular name of an American communistic sect who call themselves “The United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing.”

I. History. — The Shakers arose as a distinct body in the first half of the 18th century, but are accustomed to trace their origin back to the Camisards (q.v.), or French Prophets. Three of their number went to England about 1705 and propagated the prophetic spirit so rapidly that in the course of the year there were two hundred or three hundred of these prophets in and about London. The great subject of prediction was the near approach of God's kingdom and the millennial state. In 1747 James Wardley, originally a Quaker, headed a party who had no established creed or particular modei of worship and professed to be governed as the spirit of God should dictate. In 1757 Ann Lee (Mrs. Standley) adopted Wardley's views, joined the society, and became its head, the society adopting its distinguishing name of Shakers. “The work,” they said, “which God promised to accomplish in the latter day was eminently marked out by the prophets to be a work of shaking.” From this time till 1770 Ann Lee professed to have received by special manifestation of divine light those revelations in virtue of which her followers have ever since called her Mother Lee, and have regarded her as the equal of Jesus Christ, head of all women, as he was head of all men. She lived apart from her husband from that time, and he took another wife. SEE LEE, ANN.

In 1774, obeying what she believed to be a divine command, Ann Lee sailed from Liverpool and came to the United States. Their first settlement was in the town of Watervliet, N.Y., seven miles. from Albany, where they remained in retirement till the spring of 1780. In 1779 a religious revival took place, chiefly among the Baptists, at New Lebanon, Columbia Co., N.Y., accompanied by remarkable physical manifestations, and in the spring of 1780 some of those most affected visited mother Lee, and there. as they believed, found a key to their experiences. Mother Lee traveled from place to place preaching and advising; in Massachusetts she appears to have remained two years, and, it is asserted, performed miracles in several places. Mother Lee died in 1784, having already broached the idea of community of property, and having formed her little family into a model  for Shaker organizations. Mother Ann was succeeded in her rule over the society by elder James Whittaker, who had come from England with her. He was called Father James, and under his ministry was erected (1785) “the first house for public worship ever built by the society.” He died in July, 1787. In the same year Joseph Meachem, formerly a Baptist preacher and a convert of mother Lee, collected her followers in a settlement in New Lebanon, which still remains as a common center of union. In the course of five years, under the administration of Meachem, eleven Shaker settlements were founded — viz. at New Lebanon and Watervliet, N.Y.; at Hancock, Tyringham, Harvard, and Shirley, Mass.; at Enfield, Conn.; at Canterbury and Enfield, N.H.; and at Alfred and New Gloucester, Me. There were no other societies formed till 1805, When three missionaries from New Lebanon established the following: Union Village, Watervliet, White Water, and North Union in Ohio; and Pleasant Hill.and South Union in Kentucky. They number from six thousand to eight thousand souls.

II. Theological Doctrines. — The Shakers hold:

1. That God has given to man four revelations. “They believe, that the first light of salvation was given or, made known to the patriarchs by promise; and that these believed in the promise of. Christ, and were obedient to the command of God made known unto them as the people of God; and were accepted by him as righteous or perfect in their generation, according to the measure of light and truth manifested unto them; which were as waters to the ankles, signified by Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters (ch. 47). The second, light of dispensation was the law that was given of God to Israel by the hand of Moses, which was a further manifestation of that salvation, as water to the knees (Jos 19:4). The third light of dispensation was the gospel of Christ's first appearance in the flesh, which was as water to the loins (Jos 19:4). The fourth light of dispensation is the second appearance of Christ, or final and last display of God's grace to a lost world, in which the mystery of God will be finished and a decisive work accomplished, to the final salvation or damnation of all the children of men; which, according to the prophecies, rightly calculated and truly understood, began in the year of our Savior 1747.” In the first revelation God was only known as a Great Spirit. In the second; or Jewish, period he was revealed as the Jehovah, he, she, or, a dual being, male and female. In the third cycle God was made known as the Father; and in the last cycle, commencing with 1770, God is revealed as an Eternal Mother, the bearing spirit of the creation of God. Christ they also believe to be dual, male and female, a supermundane being,  making in his first appearance a revelation to Jesus, a divinely instructed and perfect man, and who by virtue of his anointing became Jesus Christ.

2. The new revelation teaches the doctrines of the soul's immortality and its resurrection, which they believe to be the quickening of the germ of a new and spiritual life, denying a bodily resurrection. Those who marry and indulge in the earthly procreative relation they term “the children of this world.” They do not condemn them, but believe themselves called to lead spiritual and holy lives, free from lust and carnal indulgence, and therefore refrain from marriage. Thus, like the Egyptian hermits in the 3d century, they place holiness in a life of celibacy. They hold that Christ revealed to Jesus the doctrines of non-resistance and non-participation in any earthly government.

3. The second appearing of Christ the Shakers believe to have taken place through mother Ann Lee in 1770 who, by strictly obeying the light in her, became righteous even as Jesus was righteous. The necessity for this appearing of Christ in the female forum resulted from the dual nature of Christ and of deity. This second appearing of Christ is the true resurrection state and a physical resurrection is to be repudiated as repugnant to science, reason, and Scripture.

4. The Shakers assign to each revelation or cycle its heavens and hells. The first revelation was to the antediluvians, and its heaven and hell were for the good and bad among them; the wicked of that cycle being “the spirits in prison” (1Pe 3:19). To the second hell, Gehenna, they consign the Jews and heathen who died before the coming of Jesus; the second heaven being Paradise, which was promised to the thief on the cross. The third dispensation is that of the Church of the first appearing of Christ, and to its heaven Paul was caught up. The fourth heaven is now forming; in it Jesus and mother Ann reside, and to it all will go who have resisted temptation until all their evil propensities and lusts are destroyed. It is the heaven of heavens, and to it will be gathered all who accept the doctrines of the Shakers here, and all in the lower hells and heavens who shall yet accept them.

5. They hold to oral confession of sin as neessary to receive power to overcome it. They also believe in the power of some of their members to heal diseases by prayer and dietetics. They believe themselves to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, and maintain that it is unlawful to take oaths, to use compliments, or to play at games of chance.

6. The Shakers are spiritualists in a practical sense. They hold Swedenborg to be the angel of spiritualism mentioned in Revelation 18, and regard the spiritualistic movement as a preparation of the people to receive their doctrines. For a study of their peculiar views we refer the reader to A Selection of Hymns, etc. (Watervliet, O., 1833); Millennial Hymns (Canterbury, N.H. 1847); Fifteen Years in the Senior Order of Shakers, A Holy, Sacred, and Divine Roll and Book, etc. (1843); The Divine Book of Holy and Eternal Wisdom (Canterbury, N.H., 1849).

III. Worship. — In their mode of worship they are remarkable for their habit of dancing to express the joy they have in the Lord. They enter their house of worship and kneel in silent prayer, then rise and form in regular columns, the men on one side and the women on the other. Several men and women then commence a tune, while every other person dances, keeping time admirably for at least half an hour. The hymns or “spiritual songs” which they sing are believed by the Shakers to be brought to them, almost without exception, from the “spirit-land;” also the airs to which these songs are sung. When dancing is over, the seats are placed and an exhortation begins, then, rising, they sing a hymn, another exhortation follows, and the meeting concludes. They neither practice baptism, nor observe the Lord's supper, holding that these ceased with the apostolic age. They hold general fasts, and have no order of persons regularly educated for the ministry.

IV. Temporalities. — The Shakers have a ministry composed of two brethren and two sisters, who have the oversight of from one to four societies; also each family in every society has four elders, two brethren and two sisters, who have charge of the family. There are three classes of members:

(1.) Novitiates: those who accept the doctrines of the society, but do not enter into temporal connection with it, remaining with their own families and controlling their own property.

(2.) Juniors: those who become members of the community and unite in labor and worship, but who have not surrendered their property to the  society, or, if so, only, conditionally, and with the privilege of receiving it back, though without interest.

(3.) Seniors: those who, after a satisfactory probation, enter into a contract to consecrate themselves, their services, and their property to the society, never to be reclaimed by them or their legal heirs. Before joining the society the candidate must pay all debts, discharge all bonds and trusts, renounce all contracts, and, in short, separate honorably from the world. The Shakers are republican in their ideas of government, never vote nor accept office from the government. They are orderly, temperate, and frugal, cultivating the soil with great success, and also engaging in other branches of trade. They have published since 1870 the Shaker and Shakeress, a monthly, edited by F.W. Evans and Antoinette Doolittle (Mount Lebanon, N.Y.). See Burder, Hist. of Religions; Gardner, Faiths of the World; Harper's Magazine, 15, 146 sq.; Marsden, Dict. of Churches; Nordhoff Communistic Societies of the United States (N.Y. 1875), p. 117 sq.

## Shakli[[@Headword:Shakli]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the consort of Siva, whom he loved so greatly that despair led him to pull out one of his hairs on the occasion of her death. Her father had offended Siva, and she resented the insult to such an extent that she laid aside the body she had received from him, and was born again as Parvati.

## Shakra[[@Headword:Shakra]]

             in Hindu mythology, is Vishnu's celebrated weapon — a circular plate endowed with reason, inflicting mortal wounds and returning to the god after performing its mission of punishment. The inhabitants of the mountainous sections of Northern India still use a similar weapon, which becomes terrible in their hands. It is a plate of hardened steel, two lines thick in the center and keen-edged about the circumference. It may be thrown a distance of two hundred feet, and will penetrate the most approved armor.

## Shaktus[[@Headword:Shaktus]]

             a principal Hindu sect, the worshippers of Bhuguvatee, or the goddess Durga. They are chiefly Brahmins, but have their peculiar rites, marks on  their bodies, formulas, priests, and festivals. They reject animal food, but sometimes partake of spirituous liquors presented to their goddess. None of them become mendicants. See Ward, History of the Hindoos.

## Shalak[[@Headword:Shalak]]

             SEE CORMORANT.

## Shalal[[@Headword:Shalal]]

             SEE MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ.

## Shalem[[@Headword:Shalem]]

             (Heb. Shalem', שָׁלֵ ם, safe; Samar. שלו ם, Sept. Σαλήμ, Vulg. Salem) appears in the A.V. as the name of a place near Shechem, to which Jacob came on his return from Mesopotamia (Gen 33:18). It seems more than probable, however, that this word should not here be taken as a proper name, but that the sentence should be rendered “Jacob came safe to the city of Shechem” (וִיָּבֹא יִעֲקֹב שָׁלֵ ם עַיר שְׁכֶ ם). Our translators have followed the Sept., Peshito-Syriac, and Vulg. among ancient, and Luther's among modern, versions, in all of which Shalem is treated as a proper name, and considered as a town dependent on or related to Shechem. And it is certainly remarkable that there should be a modern village bearing the name of Salim in a position to a certain degree consistent with the requirements of the narrative when so interpreted, viz. three miles east of Nablus (the ancient Shechem), and therefore between it and the Jordan valley, where the preceding verse (ver17) leaves Jacob settled (Robinson. Bib. Res. 2, 279, Wilson, Bible Lands, 2, 72; Van de Velde, Syr. and Pal. 2, 302, 334; Schwarz, Palest. p. 151). But there are several considerations which weigh very much against this being more than a fortuitous coincidence. SEE JACOB.

1. If Shalem were the city in front of which Jacob pitched his tent, then it certainly was the scene of the events of ch. 34; and the well of Jacob and the tomb of Joseph must be removed from the situation in which tradition has so appropriately placed them to some spot farther eastward and nearer to Salim. Eusebius and Jerome felt this and they accordingly make Sychem and Salem one and the same (Onomast. under both these heads). SEE SYCHEM.

2. Though east of Nablus, Salim does not appear to lie near any actual line of communication between it and the Jordan valley. The road from Sakut to Nabls would be either by Wady Maleh, through Teyasir, Tubas, and the Wady Bidan, or by Kerawa, Yanun, and Beit-Furik. The former passes two miles to the north, the latter two miles to the south, of Salim, but neither approaches it in the direct way which the narrative of Gen 33:18 seems to denote that Jacob's route did. But see Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 146. SEE SHECHEM.

3. With the exceptions already named, the unanimous voice of translators and scholars is in favor of treating shalem as a mere appellative. Among the ancients, Josephus (by his silence, Ant. 1, 21.), the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, the Samaritan Codex, the Arabic Version; among the moderns, the Veneto-Greek Version, Rashi, Junius and Tremellius, Meyer (Annot. on Seder Olam), Ainsworth, Reland (Palest. and Dissert. Misc.), Schumann, Rosenmuller, J.D. Michaelis (Bibel fur Ugelehrt.), Tuch, Baumgarten, Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1422), Zunz (24 Bucher, and Handwb.), De Wette, Luzzatto, Knobel, Kalisch, Keil, Lange, Philippson — all these take shalem to mean “safe and sound,” and the city before which Jacob pitched to be the city of Shechem. This view is also confirmed by the evident allusion in this term to the fulfilment of the condition of Jacob's vow (Gen 28:21). Hitzig (on Jer 41:5) would make Shalem the name of the tower of Shechem (Jdg 9:46). Comp. Hackett, Illustrations of Script. p. 193 sq. SEE PEACE.

4. This question is somewhat complicated with the position of the Shalim of the New Test. (Joh 3:21); but the two places are not necessarily the same. SEE SALIM.

## Shalim[[@Headword:Shalim]]

             (Heb. Shaalim', שִׁעֲלַי ם, region of foxes; Sept. Σεγαλίμ, v.r. Σααλείμ, Ε᾿ασακέμ), a region (אֶרֶוֹ, “land”) through which Saul, the son of Kish, went in search of his father's asses (1Sa 9:4). It is identified by Schwarz (Palest. p. 155) with Skual, near Ophrah (1Sa 13:17). “It appears to have lain between the ‘land of Shalisha' and the ‘land of Yemini' (probably, but by no means certainly, that of Benjamin). In the uncertainty which attends the route — its starting point and termination no less than its whole course — it is very difficult to hazard any conjecture on the position of Shalim. The spelling of the name in the original shows that  it had no connection with Shalem or with the modern Salim east of Nablus (though between these two there is probably nothing in common except the name). It is more possibly identical with the ‘land of Shual' (q.v.), the situation of which appears, from some circumstances attending its mention, to be almost necessarily fixed in the neighborhood of Taivibeh, i.e. nearly six miles north of Michmash, and about nine from Gibeah of Saul.” SEE RAMAH.

## Shalisha[[@Headword:Shalisha]]

             [some Shali'sha] (Heb. Shalishah', שָׁלשָׁה, perhaps triangle; Sept. Σαλισσά v.r. Σελχά, a district (אֶרֶוֹ, “land”) traversed by Saul when in search of the asses of Kish (1Sa 9:4). It apparently lay between “Mount Ephraim” and the “land of Shaalim,” a specification which, with all its evident preciseness, is irrecognizable, because the extent of Mount Ephraim is so uncertain; and Shaalim, though probably near Taiyibeh, is not yet definitely fixed there. The difficulty is increased by locating Shalisha at Saris or Khirbet Saris, a village a few miles west of Jerusalem, south of Abu Gosh (Tobler; Dritte Wand. p. 178), which one have proposed. If the land of Shalisha contained, as it not impossibly did, the place called Baal-shalisha (2Ki 4:42), which, according to the testimony of Ebuseus and Jerome (Onom. s.v. “Beth-Salisha), lay fifteen Roman (or twelve English) miles north of Lydd, then the whole disposition of Saul's route would be changed. The words Eglath Shalishiyah in Jer 48:34 (A.V. “a heifer of three years old”) are by some translators rendered as if denoting a place named Shalisha. But even if this be correct, it is obvious that the Shalisha of the prophet was on the coast of the Dead Sea, and therefore by no means appropriate for that of Saul. Lieut. Conder proposes (Tent Work in Palest. 2, 339) to identify Shalisha with Kefr Thilth, a ruined village on the western slope of Mount Ephraim, situated on the south side of Wady Azzun, which runs into the river Kanah (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 136, note); but there is nothing special to recommend the site except a considerable correspondence in the names. SEE RAMAH.

## Shallecheth[[@Headword:Shallecheth]]

             [some Shalle'cheth] (Heb. Shalle'keth, שִׁלֶּכֶת, overthrow; Sept. παστοφόριον), the name of a gate on the west of Solomon's temple, which fell to the lot of the porters Shuppim and Hosah (1 Chronicles probably was that called Kipponos (Coponius) in the Talmud (Middoth, 1, 3). It is probably also identical with the gate Sur (2Ki 11:6) or that of the “Foundation” (2Ch 23:5). If, however, the causeway be the same as that by which the water is now conveyed to the Haram, the gate in question may have been at the present Bab Silsileh, much farther north. SEE TEMPLE.

## Shallum[[@Headword:Shallum]]

             (Heb. Shallum', שִׁלּוּ ם, retribution; Sept. usually Σελλούμ), the name of at least twelve Hebrews.

1. The youngest son of Naphtali (1Ch 7:13), called also SHILLEM. (Gen 46:24). B.C. 1874.

2. The third in descent from Simeon, son of Shaul and father of Mibsam (1Ch 4:25). B.C. ante 1618.

3. Son of Sisamai and father of Jekamiah, of the house of Sheshan and tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:40-41). B.C. post 1300.

4. Son of Kore, and chief of the porters of the sanctuary in David's time.(1Ch 9:17 sq., 1Ch 9:31). B.C. cir. 1050. He seems to be the same Shallum whose descendants returned from captivity (Ezr 2:42; Ezr 10:24; Neh 7:45). He is apparently elsewhere called Meshullam (12:25), Meshelemiah (1Ch 26:1), and Shelemiah (1Ch 26:14). He was perhaps also the same with the “father” of Maaseiah in Jer 35:4.

5. Son of Zadok and father of Hilkiah, a high priest (1Ch 6:12-13; 1Ch 9:11), and an ancestor of Ezra the scribe (Ezr 7:2). B.C. post 950. He is called Sallumus by Josephus (Σάλλουμος, Ant. 10, 8, 6). He is the Meshullam of 1Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

6. The sixteenth king of Israel. His father's name was Jabesh. In the troubled times which followed the death of Jeroboam II (B.C. 781), the latter's son Zechariah was slain in the presence of the people by Shallum (B.C. 769), who by this act extinguished the dynasty of Jehu, as was predicted (2Ki 10:30). SEE JEHU; SEE ZECHARIAH. being opposed and slain by Menahem, who ascended the throne thus vacated (2Ki 15:10-15). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

7. The father of Jehizkiah, which latter was one of the leading Ephraimites in the time of Ahaz and Pekah (2Ch 28:12). B.C. ante 740.

8. The son of Tikvah and husband of the prophetess Hulldah (2Ki 22:14). B.C. cir. 630. He appears to have been the custodian of the sacerdotal wardrobe (2Ch 34:22). He was probably the same with Jeremiah's uncle (Jer 32:7).

9. King of Judah, son of Josiah (Jer 22:11), better known as Jehoahaz II (q.v.). Hengstenberg (Christology of the Old Test. 2, 400, Eng. transl.) regards the name as symbolical, “the recompensed one,” and given to Jehoahaz in token of his fate, as one whom God recompensed according to his deserts. This would be plausible enough if it were only found in the prophecy; but a genealogical table is the last place where we should expect to find a symbolical name, and Shallum is more probably the original name of the king, which was changed to Jehoahaz when he came, to the crown. Upon a comparison of the ages of Jehoiakim, Jehoahaz or Shallum, and Zedekiah, it is evident that of the two last Zedekiah must have been the younger, and therefore that Shallum was the third, not the fourth, son of Josiah, as stated in 1Ch 3:15.

10. A priest of the descendants of Bani, who had taken a strange (i.e. idolatrous) wife, and was compelled by Ezra to put her away (Ezr 10:42). B.C. 457.

11. One of the Levitical porters who did the same (Ezr 10:24). B.C. 457.

12. Son of Halohesh and “ruler of the half part of Jerusalem,” who, with his daughters, aided in building the walls (Neh 3:12). B.C. 445.

## Shallun[[@Headword:Shallun]]

             (Heb. Shallun', שָׁלוּן, another form of Shallum, retribution; Sept. Σαλωμών), son of Col-ho-zeh, and ruler of a district of the Mizpah; he assisted Nehemiah in repairing the spring gate and “the wall of the pool of Has-shelach” (A.V. “Siloah”) belonging to the king's garden, “even up to the stairs that go down from the city of David” (Neh 3:15). B.C. 445.

## Shalmai[[@Headword:Shalmai]]

             (Heb. margin in Ezra Shalmay', שִׁלְמִי, my thanks; text Shamlay', שִׁמְלִי; Sept. Σελαμί; in Nehemiah Salmay', שִׂלְמִי, my garments; Sept. Σελμεϊv), one of the head Nethinim whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezr 2:46; Neh 7:48). B.C. ante 536.

## Shalman[[@Headword:Shalman]]

             (Heb. Shalman שִׁלְמִן, perhaps Persian, fire-worshipper; Sept. Σαλαμάν; Vulg. Salmana), a name occurring but once (Hos 10:14, “as Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle”). It appears to be an abbreviated form of Shalmaneser (q.v.). Ewald, however, speaks of Shalman as an unknown king, but probably the predecessor of Pul (Die Propheten, 1, 157; see Simson, Der Prophet Hosea, p. 287). The Sept. reading כְּשָׂרfor כְּשֹׁד, “as he spoiled,” renders ὡς ἄρχων, and the Vulgate, confounding Shalman with the Zalmunnah of Judges (ch. 8), gives, from another misreading, a domo ejus qui judicavit Baal, so that Newcome ventures to translate “Like the destruction of Zalmunnah by the hand of Jerubbaal” (Gideon). Indeed, the Vatican edition of the Sept. has ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ῾Ιεροβοάμ, and the Alexandrian has ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ῾Ιεροβάαλ. — misreadings of the word Beth-arbel. The Targum of Jonathan and Peshito- Syriac both give “Shalma;” the former for בֵּית אִרְבֵּאלreading בְּמִאֲרָב, “by an ambush,” the latter בֵּית אֵל, “Beth-el.” The Chaldee translator seems to have caught only the first letters of the word “Arbel,” while the Syrian only saw the last two. The Targum possibly regards “Shalman” as an appellative, “the peaceable,” following in this the traditional interpretation of the verse recorded by Rashi, whose note is as follows: “As spoilers that come upon a people dwelling in peace, suddenly by means of an ambush, who have not been warned against them to flee before them, and destroy all.” SEE BETH-ARBEL.

## Shalmaneser[[@Headword:Shalmaneser]]

             (Heb. id. שִׁלְמִנְאֶסֶר, signif. uncertain [according to Von Bohlen, fire- worshipper, with which Gesenius agrees]; on the monuments Salmanuzzur, or Salman-aser; Sept. Σαλαμανασσάρ, but in Tobit Ε᾿νεμέσαρος by some error; Josephus, Σαλμανασσάρης; Vulg. Salmanasar) was the Assyrian king who reigned immediately before Sargon, and probably immediately after Tiglath-pileser. He was the fourth Assyrian monarch of the same name (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 2, 135 sq.). Very little is known of him, since Sargon, his successor, who was of a different family, and most likely a rebel against his authority, seems to have destroyed his monuments. He was contemporary with So of Egypt (2Ki 17:4). He can scarcely have ascended the throne earlier than B.C. 730, and may possibly not have done so till a few years later. SEE TIGLATH-PILESER.

It must have been soon after, his accession that he led the forces of Assyria into Palestine, where Hoshea, the last king of Israel, had revolted against his authority (2Ki 17:3) No sooner had he come than Hoshea submitted, acknowledged himself a “servant” of the great king, and consented to pay him a fixed tribute annually. Shalmaneser upon this returned home; but soon afterwards he “found conspiracy in Hoshea,” who had concluded an alliance with the king of Egypt, and withheld his tribute in consequence. In B.C. 723 Shalmaneser invaded Palestine for the second time, and, as Hoshea refused to submit, laid siege to Samaria. The siege lasted to the third year (B.C. 720), when the Assyrian arms prevailed; Samaria fell; Hoshea was taken captive and shut up in prison, and the bulk of the Samaritans were transported from their own country to Upper Mesopotamia (2Ki 17:4-6; 2Ki 18:9-11). It is uncertain whether Shalmaneser conducted the siege to its close, or whether he did not lose his crown to Sargon before the city was taken. Sargon claims the capture as his own exploit in his first year; and Scripture, it will be found, avoids saying that Shalmaneser took the place.

In 2Ki 17:6, the expression is simply “the king of Assyria took it.” In 2Ki 18:9-10, we find, still more remarkably, “Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, came up against Samaria and besieged it; and at the end of three years they took it.” Perhaps Shalmaneser died before Samaria, or perhaps, hearing of Sargon's revolt, he left his troops, or a part of them, to continue the siege, and returned to Assyria, where he was defeated and deposed (or murdered) by his enemy. According to Josephus, who professes to follow the Phoenician history of Menander of Ephesus, Shalmaneser engaged in an important war with Phoenicia in defense of  Cyprus (Ant. 9, 14, 2). It is possible that he may have done so, though we have no other evidence of the fact; but it is perhaps more probable that: Josephus or Menander made some confusion between him and Sargon, who certainly warred with Phoenicia and set up a memorial in Cyprus. Ewald (Isr. Gesch. 3, 315) supposes these events to have preceded even Hoshea's alliance with Egypt, but this is improbable (Knobel, Jesa. p. 139 sq.). According to Layard (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 48), he was perhaps the same with Sargon, but this is doubtful. It may yet turn out, however, that he was only a deputy or viceroy, and in that case the discrepancies in this part of the history will receive a ready solution. SEE SARGON.

## Shama[[@Headword:Shama]]

             (Heb. Shama', שָׁמָע, obedient; Sept. Σαμμά v.r. Σαμμαθά), the first named of two sons of Hothan, who were valiant captains in the bodyguard of David (1Ch 11:44). B.C. cir. 1020. SEE DAVID.

## Shamana[[@Headword:Shamana]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the surname of the god of the underworld, signifying “the stream of hell.”

## Shamanism[[@Headword:Shamanism]]

             (a corruption of Sanscr. cramana) is the ancient religion of the Tartar, and of some of the other Asiatic tribes, and is one of the earliest phases of religious life. It is a belief in Sorcery, and a propitiation of evil daemons by sacrifices and frantic gestures The adherents of this religion acknowledge the existence of a supreme God, but do not offer him any worship. Indeed, they worship gods of no description, but only demons, whom they suppose to be cruel, revengeful, and capricious, and who are worshipped by bloody sacrifices and wild dances. The Shamanists have no regular priesthood. The priests, or magicians, are men or women, married or single, and affect to understand the secret of controlling the actions of evil spirits. When they are officiating, they wear a long robe of elk skin, hung with small and large brass and iron bells.

They also carry staves carved at the top into the shape of horses' heads, also hung with bells; and with the assistance of these staves they leap to an extraordinary height. They have neither altars nor idols, but perform their sacrifices in a hut raised on an open space in a forest or on a hill. Nor are there fixed periods for the performance of their ceremonies; births, marriages, sickness, uncommon calamities, etc., are  generally the occasions which call for them. The animal to be sacrificed is generally fixed upon by the Shaman or donor, and is killed by tearing out its heart. The officiating magician or priest works himself into a frenzy, and pretends or supposes himself to be possessed of the daemon to whom worship is being offered. After the rites are over, he communicates to those who consult him the information he has received. In Siberia the Shaman affected to cure dangerous diseases, hurts, etc., sucking the part of the body the most affected by pain; and finally taking out of his mouth a thorn, a bug, a stone, or some other object, which he shows as the cause of the complaint. Very many of its votaries have passed over to Lamaism, which is, in a measure, a kind of Shamanism, but infused with Buddhistic doctrines. See Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World.

## Shamans[[@Headword:Shamans]]

             a Hindu name given to pious persons among the worshippers of Buddha; a term which passed over from them to the Tartars and inhabitants of Siberia, and became the title of their priests, magicians, and physicians. Hence Shamanism is the name given to the religion of most of the tribes of Northern Asia, from Tartary to Kamtchatka. By means of enchantments they professed to be able to cure diseases, avert calamities, and acquaint people with the purposes, etc., of the daemons. By these arts they acquired a great ascendency over the people. SEE SHAMANISM.

## Shamariah[[@Headword:Shamariah]]

             (2Ch 11:19). SEE SHEMARIAH.

## Shambles[[@Headword:Shambles]]

             (μάκελλον, from the Lat. macellum, a meat market). Markets for the sale of meat appear to have been unknown in Judaea previous to the Roman conquest. We learn from the Talmud that most of the public butchers under the Romans were Gentiles, and that the Jews were forbidden to deal with them because they exposed the flesh of unclean beasts for sale. Hence Paul, dissuading the Corinthian converts from adopting Jewish scruples, says, “Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake” (1Co 10:25). SEE ALISGEMA.

## Shame[[@Headword:Shame]]

             (usually בּוֹשׁ, αἰσχύνη), a painful sensation, occasioned by the quick apprehension that reputation and character are in danger, or by the perception that they are lost. It may arise, says Dr. Cogan, from the immediate detection, or the fear of detection, in something ignominious. It may also arise from native diffidence in young and ingenuous minds, when surprised into situations where they attract the especial attention of their superiors. The glow of shame indicates, in the first instance, that the mind is not totally abandoned; in the last, it manifests a nice sense of honor and delicate feelings, united with inexperience and ignorance of the world. SEE MODESTY.

## Shamed, Or Rather Shemer[[@Headword:Shamed, Or Rather Shemer]]

             (Heb. She'mer, שֶׁמֶר, in “pause” Sha'mer, שָׁמֶר, keeper [but some copies have שמד]; Sept. Σεμμήρ v.r. Σεμής and Σαμής; Vulg. Samed), the third named of the three sons of Elpaal, and builder of Ono and Lod. He was of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:12). B.C. post 1618,

## Shamel[[@Headword:Shamel]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the angel who bears the prayers of men to God.

## Shamer[[@Headword:Shamer]]

             (Heb. She'mer, שֶׁמֶר, “in pause” Sha'mer, שָׁמֶר, keeper; Sept. Σεμμήρ v.r. Σωμήρ and Σεμήρ respectively), the name of several men. SEE SHAMED; SEE SHEMER.

1. The second named of four children of Heber (1Ch 7:32), and father of Ahi and others (1Ch 7:34). B.C. perhaps ante 1658. In the first of these passages he is called SHOMER SEE SHOMER (q.v.).

2. The son of Mahli and father of Bani, of the tribe of Levi (1Ch 6:46). B.C. perhaps cir. 1658.

## Shamgar[[@Headword:Shamgar]]

             (Heb. Shamnar', שִׁמְגִּר, possibly sword [comp. Samgar]; Sept. Σαμεγάρ, Josephus Σανάγαρος), son of Anath, and third judge of Israel. B.C. 1429. It is possible, from his patronymic, that Shamgar may have been of the  tribe of Naphtali, since Bethanath is in that tribe (Jdg 1:33). Ewald conjectures that he was of Dan — an opinion in which Bertheau (On Jdg 3:31) does not coincide. Since the tribe of Naphtali bore a chief part in the war against Jabin and Sisera (Jdg 4:6; Jdg 4:10; Jdg 5:18), we seem to have a point of contact between Shamgar and Barak. It is not known whether the only exploit recorded of him was that by which his authority was acquired. It is said that he “slew of the Philistines six hundred men with an ox goad” (Jdg 3:31). It is supposed that he was laboring in the field, without any other weapon than the long staff armed with a strong point used in urging and guiding the cattle yoked in the plough, SEE GOAD, when he perceived a party of the Philistines, whom, with the aid of the husbandmen and neighbors, he repulsed with much slaughter.

The date and duration of his government are not stated in Scripture (Josephus [Ant. 5, 4, 3] says it lasted less than one year), but may be probably assigned to the end of that long period of repose which followed the deliverance under Ehud. He is not expressly called a judge, nor does he appear to have effected more than a very partial and transient relaxation of the Philistine oppression under which Israel groaned; and the next period of Israel's declension is dated, not from Shamgar's, but from Ehud's ascendency (Jdg 4:1); as if the agency of Shamgar were too occasional to form an epoch in the history. The heroic deed recorded of him was probably a solitary effort, prompted by a kind of inspiration at the moment, and failing of any permanent result from not being followed up either on his own part or that of his countrymen. In Shamgar's time, as the Song of Deborah informs us (5:6), the condition of the people was so deplorably insecure that the highways were forsaken, and travelers went through by ways, and, for the same reason, the villages were abandoned for the walled towns. Their arms were apparently taken from them, by the same policy as was adopted later by the same people (3:31; 5, 8; comp. with 1Sa 13:19-22). From the position of “the Philistines” in 1Sa 12:9, between “Moab” and “Hazor,” the allusion seems to be to the time of Shamgar. SEE JUDGES.

## Shamhusai[[@Headword:Shamhusai]]

             in Hindu mythology, is an angel who resisted the creation of man, and was therefore cast out from God.

## Shamhuth[[@Headword:Shamhuth]]

             (Heb. Shamhuth', שִׁמְהוּת, prob. desolation; Sept. Σαμαώθ v.r. Σαλαώθ; Vulg. Samaoth), the fifth captain for the fifth month in David's arrangement of his army (1Ch 27:8). B.C. 1020. His designation הִיַּזְרָח, hay-yizrach, i.e. the Yizrach, is perhaps for הִזִּרְחַי, haz-zarchi, the Zarhite, or descendant of Zerah, the son of Judah. From a comparison of the lists in 1Ch 11:27, it would seem that Shamhuth is the same as Shammoth (q.v.) the Harorite.

## Shamir[[@Headword:Shamir]]

             (Heb. Shamir', שָׁמיר, a sharp point, as of a thorn [text in Chronicles Shamur', שָׁמוּר, tried]; Sept. Σαμίρ, v.r. [in Joshua] Σαφείρ, [in Judges] Σαμαρεία, [in Chronicles] Σαμήρ), the name of two places and of a man.

1. A town in the mountain district of Judah (Jos 15:48), where it is named in connection with Jattir and Socoh, in the group in the extreme south of the tribe, west of south from Hebron. Keil (Comment. ad loc.) suggests that it may be the ruined site Um Shaumerah mentioned by Robinson (Bib. Res. 1st ed. 3, Append. p. 115), which is perhaps the Somerah suggested by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palestine, 2, 339), although the position of neither is exactly indicated. We venture to suggest its possible identity with the ruined village Simieh southwest of Hebron (Robinson, ibid. p. 116), and in the immediate vicinity required, being three miles west of Juttah.

2. A place in Mount Ephraim, the residence and burial place of Tola the judge (Jdg 10:1-2). It is singular that this judge, a man of Issachar, should have taken up his official residence out of his own tribe. We may account for it by supposing that the plain of Esdraelon, which formed the greater part of the territory of Issachar, was overrun, as in Gideon's time, by the Canaanites or other marauders; of whose incursions nothing whatever is told us — though their existence is certain — driving Tola to the more secure mountains of Ephraim. Or, as Manasseh had certain cities out of Issachar allotted to him, so  Issachar, on the other hand, may have possessed some towns in the mountains of Ephraim. Both these suppositions, however, are but conjecture, and have no corroboration in any statement of the records.

Shamir is not mentioned by the ancient topographers. Schwarz (Palest. p. 151) proposes to identify it with Sanur, a place of great natural strength (which has some claims to be Bethulia), situated in the mountains, halfway between Samaria and Jenin, about eight miles from each. Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 348) proposes Khirbet Sammer, a ruined site in the mountains overlooking the Jordan valley, ten miles east southeast of Nablus. There is no connection between the names Shamir and Samaria, as proposed in the Alex. Sept. (see above), beyond the accidental one which arises from the inaccurate form of the latter in that version and in our own, it being correctly Shomron.

3. A Kohathite Levite, son of Michah, and a servant in the sanctuary in David's time (1Ch 24:24). B.C. cir. 1020.

## Shamir (2)[[@Headword:Shamir (2)]]

             SEE BRIER, DIAMOND.

## Shamir In Jewish Tradition[[@Headword:Shamir In Jewish Tradition]]

             In the Pirke Aboth, 5, 8, we read that “ten things were created on the eve of the Sabbath,” among which was also the “Shamir.” According to Jewish tradition; the Shamir was a little worm by the aid of which Moses fitted and polished the gems of the ephod and the two tables of the law, Solomon the stones of the Temple. On 1Ki 6:7, “there was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house while it was in building,” D. Kimchi writes thus; “By means of a worm called Shamir, when placed on a stone, it split. Although not larger than a barleycorn, the Shamir was so strong that by its touch mountains were removed from their places, and the hardest stones were easily split and shaped. By means of this worm Solomon prepared the stones for the building of the Temple. But who gave it to him? An eagle brought it to him from the Paradise, as it is written, ‘He spake of beasts and of fowl' (1Ki 4:33). But what did he speak to the fowl? He asked where the Shamir was. The eagle went and fetched the Shamir from Eden. By means of this Shamir Moses prepared the stones of the ephod and the first and the second tables.

This is the tradition.” As to the tradition to which Kimchi refers, so far as Solomon is concerned, the Talmud (Tr. Gittin, fol. 68, Colossians 1) contains a pretty story, which is, a fine specimen of Jewish legendary lore. The story runs as follows:  “Solomon asked the rabbins, How shall I build the Temple without the use of iron)? They referred him to the worm Shamir which Moses had employed. How could it be found? They replied, Tie a he and she devil together; perhaps they know it and will tell thee. This being done, they said, We do not know it; perhaps Asmodeus, the king of the devils, will tell thee. But where is he to be found? They answered that on a certain mountain he had dug a hole, filled it with water, covered it with a stone, and sealed it with his ring. Every day he also ascends on high and learns in the school above; then he comes down to study in the school below. He then goes and examines his seal, opens the hole, and drinks; after this he seals it up again and goes away. He (Solomon) then sent Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, and gave him a chain on which was inscribed Shem hammephorash (i.e. the Tetragrammaton), and a ring upon which was also inscribed the name, and a little wool and wine. When Benaiah had come to the mountain, he made a pit under that of Asmomdeus, made the water run off, and stopped the hole with the wool. He then made at pit above the first, poured some wine into it, covered it and climbed on a tree.

When Asmodeus came back, examined his seal and opened the pit and found the wine, he said, It is written (Pro 20:1) ‘Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging: and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise;' and it is also written (Hos 4:11) ‘Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart,' and did not drink. But being very dry, he could not restrain himself, drank, became drunk, lay down and went to sleep. Benaiah then descended from the tree, put the chain around him and fastened it. When Asmodeus woke up, he was almost raging, but Benaiah said, The name of thy Lord is upon thee, the name of thy Lord is upon thee! After this the two set out. On their way they came to a date tree, which Asmodeus broke; then to a house, which he overturned; then to a widow's cottage, which he would have destroyed also, were it not for the poor woman that came out and entreated him. When he crossed over to the other side; he broke a bone and said, So is it written (Pro 25:15), ‘A soft tongue breaketh a bone.' When they had come to the palace, he was not brought before the king for three days. On the first day Asmodeus asked why the king did not let him come before him. They said, He has been drinking too much. At this he took a brick and set it upon another and they went ‘Go and give him more to drink.' On the second day he asked again why he was not brought before the king. They answered, because he had eatten too much. At this he took the bricks down and placed them on the ground.

When the king heard this, he told the servants to give him little to eat. On the third day Asmodeus was brought before the king, took a measure, meted out four cubits, threw it away, and said to the king, When thou diest, thou wilt have but four cubits in the world. Thou hast conquered the whole world, and art not satisfied till thou hast subdued me also. Solomon replied, I want nothing of thee; I will build the Temple, and need for it the Shamir. Asmodeus answered, It is not mine, but belongs to the chief of the sea, which he only gives to the wild cock that is faithful to him because of the oath. But what does he do with it? He takes it up to the mountains, where none dwell, puts it on the mountain rocks and splits the mountain, and then takes it away. He then takes the seed of trees, throws it there, and a dwelling place is prepared: hence he is called a mountain artificer (naggar tura). When they had found the nest of the wild cock containing young ones, they covered the nest with glass. When the parent bird came and could not get in, he went and fetched the Shamir and put it on the glass. But Benaiah shouted so loud that the bird dropped the Shamir, which Benaiah then took. The bird went away and hanged himself for having violated the oath.” (B.P.)

## Shamma[[@Headword:Shamma]]

             (Heb. Shamma', שִׁמָּא, astonishment or desolation; Sept. Σαμμά v.r. Σαμά and Σεμά), the eighth named of the eleven sons of Zophah of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:37). B.C. post 1658.

## Shammah[[@Headword:Shammah]]

             (Heb. Shammah', שִׁמָּה, astonishment or desolation), the name of four or five Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Σομέ v.r. in Chron. Σομμέ.) Son of Reuel and head of a family along Esau's descendants (Gen 36:13; Gen 36:17; 1Ch 1:7). B.C. ante 1850. David (1Sa 16:9; 1Sa 17:13). From these two passages we learn that he was present at David's anointing by Samuel, and that with his two elder brothers he joined the Hebrew army in the valley of Elah to fight with the Philistines. B.C. 1068. He is elsewhere, by a slight change in the name, called SHIMEA SEE SHIMEA [q.v.] (1Ch 20:7), SHIMEAH (2Sa 13:3; 2Sa 13:32), and SHIMMA (1Ch 2:13).

3. (Sept. Σαμαϊvα vr. Σαμμεάς.) The son of “Agee the Hararite,” and one of the three chief of the thirty champions of David. B.C. 1061. The exploit by which he obtained this high distinction, as described in 2Sa 23:11-12, is manifestly the same as that which in 1Ch 11:12-14 is ascribed to David himself, assisted by Eleazar, the son of Dodo. The inference, therefore, is that Shammah's exploit lay in the assistance which he had thus rendered to David and Eleazar. It consisted in the stand which the others had enabled David to make, in a cultivated field, against the Philistines. Shammah also shared in the dangers which Eleazar and Jashobeam incurred in the chivalric exploit of forcing a way through the Philistine host to gratify David's thirst for the waters of Bethlehem (2Sa 23:16). — Kitto. The scene of Shammah's exploit is said in Samuel to be a field of lentiles (עֲדָשַׁי ם), and in 1 Chronicles a field of barley (שְׂעוֹרְי ם). Kennicott proposes in both cases to read “barley,” the words being in Hebrew so similar that one is produced from the other by a very slight change and transposition of the letters (Dissert. p. 141). It is more likely, too, that the Philistines should attack and the Israelites defend a field of barley than a field of lentiles. In the Peshito-Syriac, instead of being called “the Hararite,” he is said to be “from the king's mountain,” and the same is repeated at 2Sa 23:25. The Vat. MS. of the Sept. makes him the son of Asa (υἱὸς Ασα οΑ῾᾿ρουχαῖος, where Α᾿ρουδαῖος was perhaps the original reading). Josephus (Ant. 7, 12, 4) calls him Cesaboeus the son of Ilus (Ι᾿λοῦ μέν υἱὸς Κησαβαῖος δὲ ὄνομα),

4. (Sept. Σαιμά v.r. Σαμμαἰ.) The Harodite, one of David's mighties (2Sa 23:25). He is called “Shammoth the Harorite” in 1Ch 11:27, and in 27:8 “Shamhuth the Izrahite.” Kennicott maintained the true reading in both to be “Shamhoth the Harodite” (Dissert. p. 181). He is evidently different from the preceding, as still ranking among the lower thirty. 2Sa 23:32-33, we find “Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite;” while in the corresponding verse of 1Ch 11:34 it is “Jonathan, the son of Shage the Hararite.” Combining the two, Kennicott proposes to read “Jonathan, the son of Shamha, the Hararite,” David's nephew who slew the giant in Gath (2Sa 21:21). Instead of “the Hararite,” the Peshito-Syriac has “of the Mount of Olives;” in 23:33, and in 1Ch 11:34, “of Mount Carmel;” but the origin of both these interpretations is obscure. The term “Hararite” (q.v.) may naturally designate a mountaineer, i.e. one from the mountains of Judah. Not only is the name Shammah here suspicious, as having already been assigned to two men in the list of David's heroes, but the epithet “Shage” is suspiciously similar to “Agee,” and “Harorite” to “Hararite” given above. SEE DAVID.

## Shammai[[@Headword:Shammai]]

             [many Sham'mai] (Heb. Shammay', שִׁמִּי, desolate; Sept. 1Ch 2:28 Σαμμαϊv; but 1Ch 2:32 Α᾿χισαμμά [combining Ahi with Shammai]; 1Ch 2:44 Σεμαά; 4:17 Σεμμαϊv, v.r. Σαμμαά, Σαμαϊv, Σεμεϊv), the name of three men.

1. The elder of two sons of Onam, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:28; 1Ch 2:32). B.C. cir. 1618.

2. Son of Rekem and father (founder) of Maon, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:44-45). B.C. post 1618.

3. Sixth child of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, by a first wife (1Ch 4:17). B.C. post 1618. He was possibly the same called Shimon (q.v.) in 1Ch 4:20. “Rabbi D. Kimchi conjectures that these were the children of Mered by his Egyptian wife Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh. SEE MERED. The Sept. makes Jether the father of all three. The tradition in the Quoest. in Libr. Paral. identifies Shammai with Moses, and Ishbah with Aaron.”

## Shammai Of Shammai[[@Headword:Shammai Of Shammai]]

             was the colleague of Hillel the Great (q.v.), with whom he is as closely associated in Jewish history as are the names of Castor and Pollux in Greek and Roman mythology. But comparatively little is known of him. Though  one of his maxims was “Let the study of the law be fixed, say little and do much, and receive every one with the aspect of a fair countenance” (Aboth, 1, 15), yet he is said to have been a man of a forbidding and uncompromising temper, and in this respect, as in others, the counterpart of his illustrious companion, of whom, both in their dispositions and divisions on a multitude of Rabbinical questions, he was, as we may say, the antithesis. This antithesis is especially shown in the famous controversy carried on between Hillel and Sham'mai concerning the egg laid on the Sabbath, and which lent its title, Beza, i.e. the egg, to a whole Talmudic treatise of 79 pages.

Very graphically does dean Stanley describe the. disputes of both these sages. in the following words: “The disputes between Hillel and Shammai turn, for the most part, on points so infinitely little that the small controversies of ritual and dogma which have vexed the soul of Christendom seem great in comparison. They are worth recording only as accounting for the obscurity into which they have fallen, and also because churches of all ages and creeds may be instructed by the reflection that questions of the modes of eating and cooking and walking and sitting seemed as important to the teachers of Israel — on the eve of their nation's destruction. and of the greatest religious revolution that the world has seen — as the questions of dress or posture, or modes of appointment, or verbal formulas have seemed to contending schools of Christian theology” (Jewish Church, 3, 501). Though each gave often a decision the reverse of the other, yet, by a sort of fiction in the practice of schools, these contrary decisions were held to be coordinate in authority, and, if we may believe the Talmud, were confirmed as of like authority by a Bath-Kol (or voice from heaven); or, at least, while a certain conclusion of Hillel's was affirmed, it was revealed that the opposite one of Shammai was not to be denied as heretical. חיי ם אלו ואלו אומרי ם דברי אלהי ם, “Both these and these speak the words of the living God.”

This saying passed for law, and the contradictory sayings of both these rabbins are perpetuated in the Talmud to this day. And although both were rabbinically one, yet their disciples formed two irreconcilable parties, like the Scotists and Thomists of the Middle Ages, whose mutual dissidence manifested itself not only in the strife of words, but also in that of blows, and in some cases in that of bloodshed. So great was the antagonism between them that it was said that “Elijah the Tishbite would never be able to reconcile the disciples of Shammai and Hillel.” Even in Jerome's times this antagonism between these two schools lasted, for he reports (Comment. in Esaiam, 8, 14) that the Jews regarded them with little favor, for Shammai's school they called  the “Scatterer,” and Hillel's the “Profane,” because they deteriorated and corrupted the law with their inventions. See Jost, Gesch. des Judenthuns, 1, 259 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 3, 178, 186, 205; Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 137; Rule, Hist. of the Karaite Jews, p. 33 sq.; Bartolocci, Biblioth. Magna Rabbinica, s.v. הלל; Pick, The Scribes Before and in the Time of Christ (Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, 1878), p. 272. (B.P.)

## Shammar[[@Headword:Shammar]]

             in Lamaism, is the name of three chiefs of the sect of Red-bonnets among the worshippers of the Lama, nearly equal to the Dalai-Lama in exalted dignity. The first of them lives in a large convent at Tassisudor, the capital of Bootan. A numerous clergy are subordinated to these princes of the Church, all of whose members are celibates and live in convents. They are of different grades, inconceivably numerous and widely extended, as well as highly venerated. The instruction of the young is altogether in their hands. Their convents are very numerous, Lhassa, the capital of Tibet, alone containing 3000 — Vollmer, Worterb. d. Mythol. s.v.

## Shammatta[[@Headword:Shammatta]]

             (שִׁמִּתָּא), the: highest form of excommunication among the Jews. SEE ANATHEMA.

## Shammoth[[@Headword:Shammoth]]

             (Heb. Shammoth', שִׁמּוֹת, desolation; Sept. Σαμαώθ, v.r. Σαμώθ, Σαμμαώθ), the name of a person entitled “the Harorite,” one of David's guard (1Ch 11:27); apparently the same with “Shammah the Harodite” (2Sa 23:25), and with “Shamhuth” (1Ch 27:8).

## Shammua[[@Headword:Shammua]]

             (Heb. id. שִׁמּוּעִ, renowned; Sept. Σαμουήλ in Num 13:4; Σαμμουά in 2Sa 5:14; Σαμμαού in 1Ch 14:4, v.r. Σαμαά; Σαμαίου in Neh 11:17, v.r. Σαμουί), the name of four men.

1. The son of Zaccur and the representative of the tribe of Reuben among those first sent by Moses to explore Canaan (Num 13:4). B.C. 1657.

2. One of the sons of David, by his wife Bathsheba, born to him in Jerusalem (1Ch 14:4). B.C. cir. 1045. In the A.V. of 2Sa 5:14 the same Heb. name is Anglicized “Shammuah,” and in 1Ch 3:5 he is called SHIMEA SEE SHIMEA (q.v.). In all the lists he is placed first among the four sons of Bathsheba; but this can hardly have been the chronological order, since Solomon appears to have been born next to the infant which was the fruit of her criminal connection with David (2Sa 12:24).

3. A Levite, the grandson of Jedulthun, son of Galal, and father of Abda (Neh 11:17). B.C. ante 450. He is the same as SHEMAIAH the father of Obadiah (1Ch 9:16).

4. The representative of the priestly family of Bilgah, or Bilgai, in the days of the high priest Joiakim (Neh 12:18). B.C. cir. 500.

## Shammuah[[@Headword:Shammuah]]

             (2Sa 5:14). SEE SHAMMUA.

## Shamsherai[[@Headword:Shamsherai]]

             [usually. Shamshera'i] (Heb. Shamsheray', שִׁמְשְׁרִי, sunlike; Sept. Σαμσαρία v.r. Σαμσαρί), the first named of six sons of Jeroham, of the tribe of Benjamin, resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:26). B.C. post 1500.

## Shamyl, Or Schamyl[[@Headword:Shamyl, Or Schamyl]]

             (i.e. Samuel), a celebrated leader of the Caucasus, was born at Aul-Himry, in Northern Daghestan. He belonged to a wealthy Lesghian family of rank, and early became a zealous disciple of Kasi-Mollah, the great apostle of Muridism, who brought together the various Caucasian tribes, and led them against the heretical Russians. After the assassination of Hamzad Bey, the successor of Kasi-Mollah (1834), Shamyl was unanimously elected imam; and being absolute temporal and spiritual chief of the tribes which acknowledged his authority, he made numerous changes in their religious creed and political administration. His military tactics, consisting  of surprises, ambuscades, etc., brought numerous successes to the mountaineers. In 1837 he defeated general Ivelitch, but in 1839 the Russians succeeded in hemming Shamyl into Akulgo, in Daghestan, took the fortress by storm, and it was supposed that he perished, as the defenders were put to the sword. But he suddenly reappeared, preaching more vigorously than ever the “holy war against the heretics.” In 1843 he conquered all Avares, besieged Mozdok, foiled the Russians in their subsequent campaign, and gained over to his side the Caucasian tribes which had hitherto favored Russia. In 1844 he completed the organization of his government, made Dargo his capital, and established a code of laws and a system of taxation and internal communication. The fortunes of war changed till 1852, when Bariatinsky compelled Shamyl to assume the defensive, and deprived him of his victorious prestige.

Religious indifference and political dissensions began to undermine his power, and at the close of the Crimean war Russia again attempted the subjection of the Caucasus. For three years Shamyl bravely held out, although for several months he was a mere guerilla chief, hunted from fastness to fastness. At last (Sept. 6, 1859), he was surprised on the plateau of Ghunib, and, after a desperate resistance, was taken prisoner. His wives and treasure were spared to him, and he was taken to St. Petersburg, where he met with a gracious reception from Alexander II. After a short stay, he was assigned to Kaluga, receiving a pension of 10,000 rubles. From here he removed (December, 1868) to Kief, and in January, 1870 to Mecca, remaining a parole prisoner of the Russian government. He died in Medina, Arabia, in March, 1871.

## Shan[[@Headword:Shan]]

             SEE BETH-SHAN.

## Shane, John Dabney[[@Headword:Shane, John Dabney]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cincinnati, O., in 1812. He graduated at Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward Co., Va., and studied theology at the Union Theological Seminary in that state. He was licensed by the Cincinnati Presbytery on May 31, 1842, and shortly after ordained by the West Lexington Presbytery, laboring until 1855 at North Middleton, Ky., and with other churches in that region of country. He returned to Cincinnati in 1857, and afterwards preached as occasion presented in the bounds of the Cincinnati Presbytery. He died Feb. 7, 1864. Mr. Shane,  from his earliest years, revealed a passion for collecting and hoarding everything that had any direct or indirect bearing upon the planting and history of the Presbyterian Church in the Mississippi valley. To carry out the great objects of his life, he declined the pastoral office, as he had that of the family relation, so that he could roam untrammelled over that broad land. After his death, his collections were sold at auction, and realized about $3000. A large portion of them were secured through the attention of Mr. Samuel Agnew, of Philadelphia, for the Presbyterian Historical Society. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 119. (J.L.S.)

## Shane, Joseph[[@Headword:Shane, Joseph]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Jefferson County, O., April 9, 1834, and united with the Church when about seventeen years old. He was licensed as a local preacher April 25, 1857, and in 1859 was received into the Pittsburgh Conference. In the spring of 1865 he was compelled to, resign his charge, and after a few months of illness, died in Apollo, Armstrong Co., Pa., Jan. 16, 1866. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1866, p. 21 .

## Shang-te[[@Headword:Shang-te]]

             a deity of the Chinese, often spoken of in terms which seem to point him out as, in their view, the Supreme Being, the only true God. This is, however, a much disputed point. Mr. S.C. Malan, in his work Who is God in China? argues in favor of Shang-te as identical with the God of the Christians. Others, (and among them Rev. Mr. M'Letchie) maintain that: Shang-te is not a personal being distinct from matter, but a soul of the world. The word is often used by Chinese classical writers to denote the power manifested in the various operations of nature, but is never applied to a self-existent Almighty Being, the Creator of the universe. In the sacred book Shoo-king there are no fewer than thirty-eight allusions to a great power or being called Shang-te. The name itself, as we learn from Mr. Hardwick, imports august or sovereign ruler.

To him especially is offered the sacrifice Looe, and the six Tsong, beings of inferior rank, appear to constitute his retinue. In the Shoo-king it is stated, and perhaps with reference to the nature of Shang-te, “Heaven is supremely intelligent: the perfect man imitates him (or it), the ministers obey him (or it) with respect, the people follow the orders of the government.” Others maintain that in the very oldest products of the Chinese mind no proper personality has  ever been ascribed to the supreme power. Heaven is called the father of the universe, but only as earth is called the mother. Both are said to live, to generate, to quicken; are made the objects of prayer and sacrifice. Heaven is a personification of ever present law, order, and intelligence. By these writers Shang-te is believed to be nothing more than a great “Anima mundi,” energizing everywhere in all the processes of nature, and binding all the parts together in one mighty organism.

## Shani[[@Headword:Shani]]

             SEE CRIMSON; SEE SCARLET.

## Shank, Joseph[[@Headword:Shank, Joseph]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Schoharie, N.Y., about 1818, and professed conversion at the age of twenty. He was licensed to preach in 1841, and soon after joined the Oneida Conference. In 1864 he was transferred to the Detroit Conference, but his health failed him in 1866. After a trip to the sea coast, he returned to Fentonville, Mich., where he died Sept. 30, 1867. See Minutes of Annual Conferences 1868, p. 174.

## Shanks, Asbury H.[[@Headword:Shanks, Asbury H.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in South Carolina in 1808. He joined the Church in 1830, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1831. His ordination of deacon was received in 1833, and that of elder in 1835. After fourteen years of labor, he located, studied law, and graduated from the law department of the Transylvania University. In 1849 he went to Texas, and engaged in the practice of his profession. He was admitted into the East Texas Conference in 1858, but owing to ill health was obliged to superannuate in 1859, and held that relation until his death, Oct. 20, 1868. He was a preacher of great power, a sound theologian, and in the practice of law never compromised his ministerial character. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch. South, 1868, p. 283.

## Shapham[[@Headword:Shapham]]

             (Heb. Shapham', שָׁפָ ם, bold [Gesen.] or vigorous [ Furst ], Sept. Σαφάμ 5, r. Σαφάτ), the chief second in authority among the Gadites in the days of Jotham (1Ch 5:12). B.C. cir. 750.

## Shaphan[[@Headword:Shaphan]]

             (Heb. Shaphan', שָׁפָן, coney; Sept. Σαφἀν v.r. Σαπφάν, and Σαφφάν in 2 Kings 22), the scribe or secretary of king Josiah, and the father of another of his principal officers. B.C. cir. 628. He was the son of Azaliah (2Ki 22:3, 2Ch 34:8), father of Ahikam (2Ki 22:12; 2Ch 34:20), Elasah (Jer 29:3), and Gemariah (36:10-12), and grandfather of Gedaliah (39:14; 40:5, 9, 11; 41:2; 43:6), Michaiah (36:11), and probably of Jaazaniah (Eze 8:11). There seems to be no sufficient reason for supposing, as many have done, that Shaphan the father of Ahikam, and Shaphan the scribe, were different persons. The history of Shaphan brings out some points with regard to the office of scribe which he held. He appears on an equality with the governor of the city and the royal recorder, with whom he was sent by the king to Hilkiah to take an account of the money which had been collected by the Levites for the repair of the Temple and to pay the workmen (2Ki 22:4; 2Ch 34:9; comp. 2Ki 12:10).

Ewald calls him minister of finance (Gesch. 3, 697). It was on this occasion that Hilkiah communicated his discovery of a copy of the law, which he had probably found while making preparations for the repair of the Temple. Shaphan was intrusted to deliver it to the king. Whatever may have been the portion of the Pentateuch thus discovered, the manner of its discovery, and the conduct of the king upon hearing it read by Shaphan, prove that for many years it must have been lost and its.contents forgotten. The part read was apparently from Deuteronomy, and when Shaphan ended, the king sent him with the high priest Hilkiah, and other men of high rank, to consult Huldah the prophetess. Her answer moved Josiah deeply, and the work which began with the restoration of the decayed fabric of the Temple quickly took the form of a thorough reformation of religion and revival of the Levitical services, while all traces of idolatry were for a time swept away. Shaphan was then probably an old man, for his son Ahikam must have been in a position of importance, and his grandson Gedaliah was already born as we may infer from the fact that thirty-five years afterwards he was made governor of the country by the Chaldaeans, an office which would hardly be given to a very young man. Be this as it may, Shaphan disappears from the scene, and probably died before the fifth year of Jehoiakim, eighteen years later, when we find Elishama was scribe (Jer 36:12). There is just one point in the narrative of the burning of the roll of Jeremiah's prophecies by the order of the king which seems to identify Shaphan the  father of Ahikam with Shaphan the scribe. It is well known that Ahikam was Jeremiah's great friend and protector at court, and it was therefore consistent with this friendship of his brother for the prophet that Gemariah the son of Shaphan should warn Jeremiah and Baruch to hide themselves, and should intercede with the king for the preservation of the roll (36:12, 19, 25).

## Shaphan (2)[[@Headword:Shaphan (2)]]

             SEE CONEY.

## Shaphat[[@Headword:Shaphat]]

             (Heb. Shaphat', שָׁפָט, judge; Sept. Σαφάτ, v.r. Σωφάτ, Σαφάθ, etc.), the name of five men.

1. The son of Hori and spy from the tribe of Simeon on the first exploration of Canaan (Num 13:5). B.C. 1657.

2. A son of Adlai, who had charge of king David's herds in the valleys (1Ch 27:29). B.C. cir. 1020.

3. The father of Elisha the prophet (1Ki 19:16; 1Ki 19:19; 2Ki 3:11; 2Ki 6:31). B.C. ante 900.

4. A Gadite who dwelt in Bashan in Jotham's time (1Ch 5:12). B.C. cir. 750.

5. One of the descendants of king David, through the royal line (1Ch 3:22). He seems to have lived as late as B.C. 350, for he was the brother of Neariah (q.v.).

## Shapher[[@Headword:Shapher]]

             (Heb. She'pher, שֶׁפֶר, brightness, as in Gen 49:21; always occurring “in pause” Sha'pher, שָׁפֶר; Sept. Σαφάρ v.r. Σαρσαφάρ), the name of a mountain at which the Israelites encamped during their sentence of extermination in the desert; situated between Kehelathah and Haradah (Num 33:23-24). Hitzig (Philist. p. 172) regards it as identical with Mount Halak (Jos 11:16); but the latter appears to have lain farther northeast. It is, perhaps, the present Araif en-Nakah, about in the middle of the upper portion of the plateau Et-Tih. SEE EXODE. For a different identification, SEE WANDERINGS IN THE WILDERNESS.

## Shapira Manuscript[[@Headword:Shapira Manuscript]]

             is the name given by Bar and Delitzsch to a Hebrew codex which Jacob Shapira or Sappir, a Jewish rabbi from Jerusalem, brought from Arabia, and sold to the public library at Paris in 1868. It is written on parchment, and, according to Delitzsch in his preface to his edition of the book of Isaiah in connection with S. Bar (Leips. 1872), it is “pervetustum, integrum et omnino eximium.” This codex contains some very valuable readings, of which we note e.g. the following:

1Ki 20:33, it reads in the text ויחלטוּ הָממנו, and in the margin in the Keri ויחלטוּהָ ממנו

Isa 10:15, וְאֶתאּמרימיו(Van der Hooght אתאּ), which is also supported by a great many MSS. and printed editions, as the Complut.: Venice, 1518, 1521; Munster's, 1534, 1546; Stephan's, Hutter's, 1587; Venice, 1678, 1690, 1730, 1739; Mantuan, 1742, etc.

Isa 15:2, גרועה(Van der Hooght גדועה), which is in accordance with the Masorah, and which is also found in Jer 48:37.

Isa 63:11, רעי(Van der Hooght געה), so many MSS. and editions.

Psa 78:51, בְאָהָלֵיהֶ ם(V. d. Hooght בְאָהָלִיאּחָ ם), which is also found in 2 codd. Kermic (No. 97, 133). (B.P.)

## Shara Malachai[[@Headword:Shara Malachai]]

             (Yellow-bonnets), the party of Lamaites who reject the Bogdo-Lama (chief of the Red-bonnets) and recognize the Dalai-Lama alone as an infallible spiritual head.

## Sharab[[@Headword:Sharab]]

             SEE MIRAGE.

## Sharai [[@Headword:Sharai ]]

             [many Shar'ai, some Shara'i] (Heb. Sharay', שָׁרָי, releaser; Sept. Σαριού v.r. Α᾿ρού), one of the “sons” of Bani, who had married strange wives after the captivity (Ezr 10:40). B.C. cir. 457.

## Sharaim[[@Headword:Sharaim]]

             (Jos 15:30). SEE SHAARAIM.

## Sharar[[@Headword:Sharar]]

             (Heb. Sharar', שָׁרָר, strong, Sept. Α᾿ραϊv v.r. Σαράρ), the father of Ahiam the Hararite, one of David's mighty men (2Sa 23:33). B.C. cir. 1040. In the parallel passage (1Ch 11:35) he is called SACAR, which is, perhaps, the better reading (Kennicott, Dissert. p. 203). SEE DAVID.

## Sharasandha[[@Headword:Sharasandha]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a powerful king who ruled over the.entire southern part of India, and the most dangerous enemy of Krishna, with whom he disputed the sovereignty in seventeen battles and in a duel.

## Share[[@Headword:Share]]

             is the rendering in 1Sa 13:20 of מֵחֲרֶשֶׁת, macharesheth (from חָרִשׁ, to scratch or cut), an agricultural instrument requiring to be sharpened; probably some implement essentially corresponding to a modern hoe. SEE MATTOCK.

## Sharezer[[@Headword:Sharezer]]

             (Heb. Share'tser; שִׁרְאֶצֶר, Persian for prince of fire; Sept. Σαρασάρ v.r. Σαρασά), the name of two men.

1. A son of Sennacherib (q.v.), who, with his brother Adrammelech, murdered their father in the house of the god Nisroch (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). B.C. post 711. “Moses of Chorene calls him Sanasar, and says that he was favorably received by the Armenian king to whom he fled, and given a tract of country on the Assyrian frontier, where his descendants became very numerous (Hist. Amen. 1, 22). He is not mentioned as engaged in the murder, either by Polyhistor or Abydenus. who both speak of Adrammelech.”

2. A messenger sent along with Regem-melech (q.v.), in the fourth year of Darius, by the people who had returned from the captivity to inquire  concerning fasting in the fifth month (Zec 7:2, A.V. “Sherezer”). B.C. 519.

## Shariver[[@Headword:Shariver]]

             in Persian mythology, is one of the seven good spirits created by Ormuzd to make war on Ahriman, and who had control over metals.

## Sharon[[@Headword:Sharon]]

             (Heb, Sharon', שָׁרוֹן, a plain; Sept. usually Σαρών [comp. Act 9:35], Σαρωνάς), the name, apparently, of three places in Palestine. SEE SHARONITE.

In the treatment of these we adduce the elucidations of modern critical and archaeological research.

I. The district along the Mediterranean is that commonly referred to tunder this distinctive title. SEE SARON.

1. The Name. — This has invariably, when referring to this locality (1Ch 27:29; Son 2:1; Isa 33:9; Isa 35:2; Isa 65:10), the definite article, הִשָּׁרוֹן, hash-Sharon; and this is represented, likewise, in the Sept. renderings ὁ Σαρών, ὁ δρυμός, τὸ πεδίον.. Two singular variations of this are found in the Vat. MS. (Mai), viz. 1Ch 5:16, Γεριάμ; and 27:29, ‘Α᾿σειδῶν, where the A is a remnant of the Hebrew definite article. It is worthy of remark that a more decided trace of the Hebrew article appears in Act 9:35, where some MSS. have Α᾿σσαρωνᾶ. The Lasharon (q.v.) of Jos 12:18, which some scholars consider to be Sharon with a preposition prefixed, appears to be more probably correctly given in the A.V. The term thus appears to be denominative of a peculiar place, like “the Arabah,” “the Shephelah, “the Ciccar,” “the Pisgah,” etc. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

Sharon is derived by Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 642) from יָשֹׁ — ר, to be straight or even — the root, also, of Mishor, the name of a district east of Jordan. The application to it, however, by the Sept., by Josephus (Ant. 15, 13, 3; War, 1, 13, 2), and by Strabo (16, p. 758) of the name Δρυμός or Δρυμοί, “woodland,” is singular. It does not seem certain that that term implies the existence of wood on the plain of Sharon. Reland has pointed out (Palmest. p. 190) that the Saronicus Sinus, or Bay of Saron, in Greece,  was so called (Pliny, H.N. 4, 5) because of its woods, σάρωνις meaning an oak. Thus it is not impossible that Δρυμός was used as an equivalent of the name Sharon, and was not intended to denote the presence of oaks or woods on the spot. May it not be a token that the original meaning of Saron, or Sharon, is not that which its received Hebrew root would imply, and that it has perished except in this one instance? The Alexandrine Jews who translated the Sept. are not likely to have known much either of the Saronic Gulf or of its connection with a rare Greek word. The thickets and groves of the region are proverbial (see below).

2. Description. — According to Act 9:15, this district was the level region adjacent to Lydda. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. “Saron”), under the name of Saronas, specify it as the region extending from Caesarea to Joppa. This is corroborated by Jerome in his comments on the three passages in Isaiah, in one of which (on 55, 10) he appears to extend it as far south as Jamnia. He elsewhere (Comm. on Isa 35:2) characterizes it in words which admirably portray its aspects even at the present: “Omnis igitur candor [the white sand hills of the coast], cultus Dei [the wide crops of the finest corn], et circumcisionis scientia [the well- trimmed plantations], et loca uberrima et campestria [the long gentle swells of rich red and black earth], quae appellantur Saron.” It is that broad, rich tract of land which lies between the mountains of the central part of the Holy Land and the Mediterranean — the northern continuation of the Shephelah. From the passages above cited we gather that it was a place of pasture for cattle, where the royal herds of David grazed (1Ch 27:29): the beauty of which was as generally recognized as that of Carmel itself (Isa 35:2), and the desolation of which would be indeed a calamity (Isa 33:9), and. its reestablishment a symbol of the highest prosperity (Isa 65:10). The rose of Sharon (q.v.) was a simile for all that a lover would express (Son 2:1).

Add to these slight traits the indications contained in the renderings of the Sept., τὸ πεδίον, “the plain,” and ὁ δρυμός, “the wood,” and we have exhausted all that we can gather from the Bible of the characteristics of Sharon. There are occasional allusions to wood in the description of the events which occurred in this district in later times. Thus, in the chronicles of the Crusades, the “Forest of Saron” was the scene of one of the most romantic adventures of Richard (Michaud, Histoire, 8); the “Forest of Assur” (i.e. Arsuf) is mentioned by Vinisauf (4, 16). To the southeast of Kaisariyeh there is still “a dreary wood of natural dwarf pines and entangled bushes”  (Thomson, Land and Book, ch. 33). The orchards and palm groves round Jimzu, Lydd, and Ramleh, and the dense thickets of dom in the neighborhood of the two last, as well as the mulberry plantations in the valley of the Aujeh, a few miles from Jaffa — an industry happily increasing every day — show how easily wood might be maintained by care and cultivation (see Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p. 1260, note). It was famous for Saronite wine (Mishna, Nidda, 2, 7, comp. Chilaim, 2, 6), for roses, anciently (Mariti. Voyage, p. 350; Chateaubriand, Trav. 2, 55, comp. Russegger, 3, 201, 287) as well as now (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 269). In Its midst, between Lydda and Arsuf, according to some, lay the village of Sharon (see Mariti, loc. cit.), once a city. (This is meant, perhaps, in Jos 12:18, Acts 40:35.) But later travelers do not mention it, and it is not certain that the passages adduced refer to a city. There are many villages still on the plain (Berggren, Reis. 3, 162). The district has lost much of its ancient fertility, but it is yet good pasture land; there are, still flocks to be found grazing on it, though few in comparison with former days. Like the plain of Esddraelon, Sharon is very much, we might say entirely, deserted. Around Jaffa, indeed, it is well cultivated, and as you move northward from that town you are encompassed with groves of orange, olive, fig, lemon, pomegranate, and palm; the fragrance is delicious, almost oppressive. But farther north, save in a few rich spots, you find but little cultivation. Yet over all the undulating waste your eye is refreshed by the profusion of wild flowers scattered everywhere. Like many of the spots famed anciently for beauty and fertility, it only gives indications of what it might become (see Porter, Hand-book for Pal. p. 380).

II. The Sharon of 1Ch 5:16 is distinguished from the western plain by not having the article attached to its name. It is also apparent from the passage itself that it was some district on the east of Jordan in the neighborhood of Gilead and Bashan (see Bachiene, 2, 3, 233). Reland objects to this (Palest. p. 371), but on insufficient grounds. The expression “suburbs” (מַגְרְשֵׁי) is in itself remarkable. The name has not been met with in that direction, and the only approach to an explanation of it is that of Prof. Stanley (Sinai and Pal. App. § 7), that Sharon may here be a synonym for the Mishor — word, probably, derived from the same root, describing a region with some of the same characteristics and attached to the pastoral plains east of the Jordan.

III. Another Sharon is pointed out by Eusebius (ut sup.) in North Palestine, between Tabor and the Sea of Tiberias; and Dopke would understand this to be meant in Son 2:1, because this book so often refers to the northern region of the Jordan. But this is very doubtful.

## Sharonite[[@Headword:Sharonite]]

             (Heb. Sharoni', שָׁרוֹנַי, a Gentile adj. from Sharon; Sept. Σαρωνίτης), the designation (1Ch 27:29) of Shitrai, David's chief herdsman in the plain of Sharon, where he of course resided.

## Sharp, Daniel, D.D.[[@Headword:Sharp, Daniel, D.D.]]

             a Baptist preacher, was born at Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England, Dec. 25, 1783. He was the son of a Baptist preacher and received early religious training. He originally joined an Independent Church; but subsequently, as the result of inquiry and conviction, became a Baptist. Engaged in a large commercial house in Yorkshire, he came to the United States as their agent, arriving in New York Oct. 4, 1805. He soon decided to enter the ministry, and began his theological studies under Rev. Dr. Stoughton, of Philadelphia. He was set apart as pastor of the Baptist Church at Newark, N.J., May 17, 1809; and was publicly recognized as pastor of the Third Church, Boston, April 20, 1812. He became an active member of the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society; was for several years associate editor of the American Baptist Magazine; and upon the formation of the “Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in India,” he, as its secretary, conducted the correspondence. For many years he was president of the acting board of the General Convention of the Baptist denomination; and in 1814 was one of the originators of an association which resulted in the Northern Baptist Education Society. He was closely identified with the origin of the Newton Theological Seminary, and was for eighteen years president of its board of trustees. In 1828 he was chosen a fellow of Brown University, and held the office till the close of his life. He received his degree of D.D. from Harvard University in 1828, of whose board of officers he was appointed a member in 1846. He died in Baltimore, June 23, 1852. Mr. Sharp published seventeen Sermons and Discourses (1824- 52): — also Recognition of Friends in Heaven (4 editions): — and a Tribute of Respect to Mr. Ensign Lincoln (1832). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 565.

## Sharp, David[[@Headword:Sharp, David]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Jersey Sept. 5, 1787, and removed with his parents to Virginia, and in 1800 to Logan County, O. Of Quaker parentage, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1807, and in 1810 he was licensed to preach. He entered the Ohio Conference in September, 1813, and in 1819 was transferred to the Missouri Conference, where he served five years as presiding elder. In 1825 he was transferred to the newly organized Pittsburgh Conference, in which he labored twenty-four years; and was then (1849) transferred back to the Ohio Conference. Upon its division (1852) he fell into the Cincinnati Conference, and in 1860 received a superannuated relation. He died April 21, 1865. Mr. Sharp was an- efficient, acceptable, and successful minister. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1865, p. 162.

## Sharp, Elias C.[[@Headword:Sharp, Elias C.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Willington, Conn., March 18, 1814. He was left an orphan in early years, but by patient effort was able to attend Amherst College, where he graduated; studied divinity in the Western Reserve Theological Seminary, Hudson, O.; was licensed by Cleveland Presbytery Sept. 1, 1840; and ordained by Portage Presbytery, June 1, 1842, as pastor of the First Congregational Church of Atwater, Portage Co., O. This was his only charge. Here he labored for a quarter of a century, and died Jan. 5, 1867. Mr. Sharp possessed ability, both natural and acquired. As a minister he was eminently successful; and while pastor of his only charge, nearly two hundred connected themselves with the Church of God. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 226. (J.L.S.)

## Sharp, Granville[[@Headword:Sharp, Granville]]

             a Christian philanthropist and writer, was born in 1734. He was educated for the bar, but, leaving the legal profession, he obtained a place in the Ordnance Office, which he resigned at the commencement of the American war, the principles of which he did not approve. He then took chambers in, the Temple, and devoted himself to a life of study. He first became known to the public by his interest in a poor and friendless negro brought from the West Indies, and turned out in the streets of London to beg or die. Sharp befriended the negro, not only feeding him and securing him a situation, but also defending him against his master, who wished to reclaim him as a  runaway slave. But the decision of the full bench was with Sharp, that the negro was under the protection of English law and no longer the property of his former owner. Thus Sharp emancipated forever the blacks from slavery while on British soil, and, in fact, banished slavery from Great Britain. He now collected a number of other negroes found wandering about the streets of London and sent them back to the West Indies, where they formed the colony of Sierra Leone. He was also the institutor of the “Society for the Abolition of the Slave trade.”

Sharp was led to oppose the practice of marine impressment; and on one occasion obtained a writ of habeas corpus from the Court of King's Bench to bring back an impressed citizen from a vessel at the Nore, and by his arguments obliged the court to liberate him. He became the warm advocate of “parliamentary reform,” arguing the people's natural right to a share in the legislature. Warmly attached to the Established Church, he was led to recommend an Episcopal Church in America, and introduced the first bishops from this country to the archbishop of Canterbury for consecration. Sharp died July 6, 1813. He was an able linguist, deeply read in theology, pious and devout. He published sixty-one works, principally pamphlets upon theological and political subjects and the evils of slavery. The following are the most important: Remarks on a Printed Paper entitled a Catalogue of the Sacred Vessels restored by Cyrus, etc. (Lond. 1765, 1775, 8vo): — Remarks on Several very Important Prophecies (1768, 1775, 8vo, 5 parts): — Slavery in England (1769, 8vo; with appendix, 1772, 8vo): — Declaration of the People's Natural Rights, etc. (1774, 1775, 8vo): — Remarks on the Uses of the Definite Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament (Durham, 1798, 8vo; 2d ed. with an appendix on Christ's divinity, 1802, 12mo): — On, Babylon (1805, 12mo): — Case of Saul (1807, 12mo): — Jerusalem (1808, 8vo). See Hoare, Memoirs and Correspondence of Granville Sharp (1820, 4to: 2d ed. 1828, 2 vols. 8vo); Stuart, Memoirs of Granville Sharp (N.Y. 1836, 12mo).

## Sharp, James[[@Headword:Sharp, James]]

             archbishop of St. Andrew's, was the son of William Sharp, sheriff-clerk of Banffshire, and was born in the castle of Banff, May, 1618. He was educated for the Church at the University of Aberdeen, but on account of the Scottish Covenant retired to England in 1638. Returning to Scotland, he was appointed professor of philosophy at St. Andrew's, through the influence of the earl of Rothes, and soon after minister of Crail. In 1656 he was chosen by the moderate party in the Church to plead their cause before  the Protector against the Rev. James Guthrie, a leader of the extreme section (the Protestors, or Remonstrators). Upon the eve of the Restoration Sharp was appointed by the moderate party to act as its representative in the negotiations opened up with Monk and the king, In this matter he is believed to have acted with perfidy, receiving as a compensation, after the overthrow of Presbyterian government by Parliament, the archbishopric of St. Andrew's, to which he was formally consecrated at London by the bishop of London and three other prelates. His government of the Scottish Church was tyrannical and oppressive, and, in consequence, he became an object of hatred and contempt. He had a servant, one Carmichael, who by his cruelty had rendered himself particularly obnoxious to the Presbyterians. Nine men formed the resolution of waylaying the servant in Magus Muir, about three miles from St. Andrew's. While they were there waiting, Sharp appeared in a coach with his daughter, and was immediately despatched despite her tears and entreaties, May 3, 1679. In defense of Sharp, the utmost that can be said is that he was simply an ambitious ecclesiastic who had no belief in .the “divine right” of Presbytery, and who thought that if England were resolved to remain Episcopalian it would be very much better if Scotland would adopt the same form of Church government.

## Sharp, John MClure[[@Headword:Sharp, John MClure]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rush County, Ind., 1825, and united with the Church in 1841. He received license to preach in 1854, and was admitted into the Southeastern Indiana Conference in 1860. In 1865 he was obliged to retire from the work, and Sept. 15, 1866, he died. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1866, p. 204.

## Sharp, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Sharp, John, D.D.]]

             an English prelate, was born at Bradford, Yorkshire, 1644. He was admitted to Christ College, Cambridge, from which he graduated in December, 1863. In 1667 he took the degree of M.A., was ordained both deacon and priest, and became domestic chaplain to Sir Heneage Finch, through whose influence he was appointed, in 1672, archdeacon of Berkshire. Three years later he was preferred to a prebend of Norwich. to the rectory of St. Bartholomew's, Royal Exchange, London, and to the rectory of St. Giles's in the Fields. In 1679 he took the degree of D.D. and accepted the lectureship at St. Lawrence Jury, which he resigned in 1683. He was promoted by Sir H. Finch to the deanery of Norwich in 1681. Because of the firm position he took, May 2, 1686, against popery, he was suspended, but was reinstated in January, 1687. He was installed dean of Canterbury, Nov. 25, 1689, and was consecrated archbishop of York, July 5, 1691. On the accession of queen Anne, Mr. Sharp became a member of her privy council and her lord almoner. He died at Bath, Feb. 2, 1714. Bishop Sharp was a man of amiable disposition and unshaken integrity, a faithful and vigilant governor. He published a number of separate sermons  which were collected into 7 vols. 8vo, 1709; also 1715, 1728, 1729, 1735, 1749; and in 7 vols. 12mo in 1754 and 1756. They were republished under title of Works (Oxford, 1829, 5 vols. 8vo). See his Life, by Thomas Sharp, D.D. (Lond. 1825. 2 vols. 8vo).

## Sharp, Lionel, D.D.[[@Headword:Sharp, Lionel, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was chaplain to Henry, Prince of Wales; also rector of Malpas, minister of Tiverton, and in 1605 archdeacon of Berks. He died in 1630. His published works are, Oratio Funebris in Hon. Hen. Wall. Principis (Lond. 1612, 4to): — Novum Fidei Symbolum, sive de Novis (1612, 4to); Speculum Papae, etc. (1612, 4to);. Nos. 2 and 3 were translated into English and published under the title of A Looking-glass for the Pope (1623, 4to). He also published a Sermon (1603, 8vo): — and other sermons. See Bliss's Wood's Fasti Oxon. 1, 385; also Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sharp, Samuel M.[[@Headword:Sharp, Samuel M.]]

             a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, was born in West Middletown, Pa., Nov. 23, 1834. He received a thorough Christian training at the hands of his parents, graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1850, and at the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, Pa., in 1858, was licensed and ordained as an evangelist in the spring of the same year, and sailed for Bogota, South America, June 18, 1858. Arriving there July 20, he at once commenced his great life work. His wife (being the daughter of Rev. Jesse M. Jamieson, one of the missionaries to India) was his help meet and adviser, and their prospects for eminent usefulness were indeed bright; but in the midst of their labors he was taken ill with fever, and died at the mission house in Bogota, Oct. 30, 1860. Mr. Sharp was a good man and a devoted missionary, of earnest and consistent piety. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 117. (J.L.S.)

## Sharp, Solomon[[@Headword:Sharp, Solomon]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Carolina County, Md., April 6, 1771. His parents were pioneer Methodists. In 1791, when about twenty years old, he began to travel “under the presiding elder.” In 1792 he was admitted to the conference and sent to Milford Circuit, Del.; and he continued in the service, occupying almost all important appointments in New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania down to 1835, when he was reported superannuated. He died at Smyrna, Del., March 13, 1836. Mr. Sharp was an original, an eccentric, but a mighty man. “His sermons were powerful, and delivered with a singular tone of authority, as if he were conscious of his divine commission.” He was noted for his courage, and it is believed that he was hardly capable of feeling fear. See Minutes of Conferences, 2, 409; Stevens, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 3, 413-415; Sprague, Annals, of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 217; Manship, Thirteen, Years in the Itinerancy, p. 49; Simpson, Cyclopaedia of Methodism, s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Sharp, Thomas[[@Headword:Sharp, Thomas]]

             a younger son of John Sharp (q.v.), and also an English prelate, was born in 1693, entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 1708, and took his B.A. in 1712 and M.A. in 1716. He was a fellow of the college, and took the degree of D.D. in 1729. At first chaplain to archbishop Dawes, he was, July 1720, collated to the rectory of Rothbury, Northumberland. He held the prebend of Southwell, and afterwards that of Wistow, in York Cathedral, and in 1722 he became archdeacon of Northumberland.. In 1755 he succeeded Dr. Mangey in the officiality of the dean and chapter. He died March 6, 1758 and was interred in Durham Cathedral. He published a Concio ad Clerum when he took his doctor's degree: — The Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer (1753): — Sermons (1763, 8vo): — Two Dissertations on the Hebrew Words Elohim and Berith (1751, 8vo).

## Sharpe, Gregory, D.D.[[@Headword:Sharpe, Gregory, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was born in Yorkshire, in 1713, and, after passing some time at the grammar school. of Hull, went to Westminster, where he studied under Dr. Freind; but in 1731 he was settled with principal Blackwell in Aberdeen. Here he remained until he had finished his studies, when he returned to England, and in a few years entered into orders. He was appointed minister of the Broadway chapel, in which he continued till  the death of Dr. Nicholls of the Temple, when he was declared the doctor's successor and in this station he continued until his death, which occurred in the Temple house, Jan. 8, 1771. His works were, a Defence of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke (Lond. 1774, 8vo): — two Dissertations: Upon the Origin, etc.; of Languages; and Upon the Original Powers of Letters (ibid. 1751, 8vo): — two Arguments in Defense of Christianity (ibid. 1755-62, 8vo): — The Rise and Fall of the Holy City and Temple of Jerusalm (ibid. 1765-66, 8vo): — besides various Letters and Sermons.

## Sharpe, Samuel[[@Headword:Sharpe, Samuel]]

             an Egyptologist and Hebrew scholar, was born in England in 1799. After starting in life as a banker, he soon retired from business, and devoted himself to the studies of Egyptology and Hebrew. The numerous volumes which came from his pen during his long and busy life he died in August 1881 were all concerned either with the monuments of ancient Egypt, or with Biblical researches. "A Unitarian and liberal," says the Academy, "he occupied himself in popularizing a mode of interpreting the Scriptures which, though it would now be considered at once conservative and narrow, seemed half a century ago starting, if not profane." His chief Egyptological works were the following: Early History of Egypt from the Old Testament, Herodotus, Manetho, and the Hieroglyphic Inscriptions (1836): — Egyptian inscriptions from the British Museum and other Sources (first series, 1837; second series, 1855): — The Rudiments of a Vocabulary of the Egyptian Hieroglyphics (1837): — The History of Egypt under the Ptolemies (1838): — History of Egypt under the Romans (1842): — The History of Egypt from the Earliest Times till the Conquest of the Arabs, A.D. 640 (1846; 5th ed. 1870): — The Chronology and Geography of Ancient Egypt (1849): — Historical Sketch of the Egyptian Buildings and Sculpture (1854): — Alexandrian Chronology (1857): —  Egyptian Hieroglyphics (1861): — Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum (1862): — The Decree of Canopus (1870): — The Rosetta Stone (1871). His most important publication on Biblical matters were, Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testaments (1854; 3d ed. 1858): — Critical Notes on the Authorized English Version of the Old Testament (1856; 2d ed. 1867): — The Chronology of the Bible (1868): — Texts from the Holy Bible Explained by the Help of the Ancient Monuments (eod.): — History of the Hebrew Nation and Literature (1869; 2d ed. 1872): — On the Journeys and Epistles of the Apostle Paul (1876): — A Short Hebrew Grammar without Points (1877): — The Book of Isaiah arranged Chronologically in a Revised Translation, and Accompanied with Historical Notes (eod.). Mr. Sharpe's two lines of study met in his work on Egyptian Mythology and Egyptiln Christianity, with their Influence on the Opinions of Modern Christendom (1863). In 1875 he brought out a volume on Hebrew Inscriptions from the Valleys between Eqypt and Mount Sinai, and shortly after his death was published his Βαρναβᾶ Επιστολή, The Epistle of Barnabas from the Sinaitic Manuscript of the Bible, with an English translation (1881), in which he seeks to fix its date to the year of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. (B.P.)

## Sharpness Of Death[[@Headword:Sharpness Of Death]]

             are, in the Te Deum, the pains and agonies suffered by the Redeemer on the cross, but which he overcame at his resurrection, God having raised him up, “having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it” (Act 2:24).

## Sharrock, Robert[[@Headword:Sharrock, Robert]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Adstock, in Buckinghamshire, in the 17th century, and was sent from Winchester School to New College, Oxford, where he was admitted perpetual fellow in 1649. In 1660 he took the degree of doctor of civil law, was prebendary and archdeacon of Winchester, and rector of Bishop's Waltham, in Hampshire. He died July 11, 1684, having the character of a good divine, civilian, and lawyer. His works are, History of the Propagation, etc., of Vegetables, etc. (Oxon. 1666 and 1672, 8vo) — Hypothesis de Oficiis secundum Humanoe Rationis Dictata, etc. (ibid. 1660, 8vo, and 1682): — also ten sermons on the Ends of the Christian Religion (4to).

## Sharuhen[[@Headword:Sharuhen]]

             [some Shar'uhen] (Heb. Sharuchen', שָׁרוּחֶן, refuge of grace; Sept. ἀγροὶ αὐτῶν [probably reading שׂדיהן]), a town originally in Judah, afterwards set off to Simeon (Jos 19:6); hence in the Negeb, or “south country.” SEE JUDAH. It seems to be the same elsewhere called SHILHIM (Jos 15:32), or SHAARAIM (1Ch 4:31), but probably by erroneous transcription, in the latter case at least. Knobel (Exeg. Handb. on Jos 15:32) suggests, as a probable identification, Tell Sheri'ah, about ten miles west of Bir-es-Seba, at the head of Wady Sheri'ah (the “watering place”). Wilton locates it near Ruhaibah (Rehoboth), but his reasons are uncritical (The Negeb, p. 217 sq.). SEE SIMEON.

## Sharuhen (2)[[@Headword:Sharuhen (2)]]

             The probable representative of this place, Tell esh-Sheriah, lies ten miles north-west of Khurbet Bir es-Seba, and is thus described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey (3:339): "A large mound on the north bank of the valley. Broken pottery and a few small unhewn stones are found on the top. In the valley is a well-cut trough of basalt."

## Shashabigna[[@Headword:Shashabigna]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a surname of Buddha, denoting “the possessor of the six sciences.”

## Shashai[[@Headword:Shashai]]

             [many Shash'ai, some Shasha'i] (Heb. Shashay', שָׁשִׁי, whitish [Gesenius], or noble [Furst]; Sept. Σεσει), one of the “sons” of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:40). B.C. 457

. SEE SHESHAI.

## Shashak[[@Headword:Shashak]]

             (Heb. Shashak', שָׁשִׁק, longing; Sept. Σωσήκ), a Benjamite, son of Beriah, descendant of El-paal, and father of Ishpan and many others (1Ch 8:14; 1Ch 8:25). B.C. post 1618.

## Shastamuni[[@Headword:Shastamuni]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a surname of Buddha, signifying “the instructor of the Munis.”

## Shastava[[@Headword:Shastava]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a surname of Siva, denoting “the avenger.”

## Shastras, Or Shasters, The Great[[@Headword:Shastras, Or Shasters, The Great]]

             (from the Sanscrit sas, “to teach”), the sacred books of the Hindus. They are all of them written in the Sanskrit language, and believed to be of divine inspiration. They are usually reduced to four classes, which again are subdivided into eighteen heads. The first class consists of the four Vedas, which are accounted the most ancient and the most sacred compositions. The second class consists of the four Upa-vedas, or sub-Scriptures, and the third class of the six Ved-angas, or bodies of learning. The fourth class consists of the four Up-asngas, or appended bodies of learning.. The first of these embraces the eighteen Puranas, or sacred poems. Besides the Puranas, the first Up-anga comprises the Ramayana and Mahabhbrata. The second and third Up-angas consist of the principal works on logic and metaphysics. The fourth and last Up-anya consists of the body of law; in eighteen books, compiled by Manu, the son of Brahma, and other sacred personages.

## Shatrani[[@Headword:Shatrani]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the wife of the man Shutri, or Kshetri, whom Brahma formed out of his right arm, and who became the ancestor of the Kshetri, or warrior caste. Shatrani was created by Brahma out of his left arm.

## Shaul[[@Headword:Shaul]]

             (Heb. Shaul', שָׁאוּל, asked; Sept. Σαούλ), the name of three men thus designated in the A.V. For others, SEE SAUL.

1. The son of Simeon by a Canaanitish woman (Gen 46:10; Exo 6:15; Num 26:13; 1Ch 1:24), and founder of the family of the Shaulites. B.C. cir. 1880, The Jewish traditions identify him with Zimri, “who did the work of the Canaanites in Shittim” (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. on Genesis 46).

2. Shaul of Rehoboth by the river was one of the kings of Edom, and successor of Samlah (1Ch 1:48-49). In the A.V. of Gen 36:37 he is less accurately called Saul (q.v.).

3. A Kohathite, son of Uzziah (1Ch 6:24). B.C. cir. 1030.

## Shaulite[[@Headword:Shaulite]]

             (Heb. Shauli', שָׁאוּלַי; Sept. Σαουλί), a designation of the descendants of Shaul 1 (Num 26:13).

## Shaveh[[@Headword:Shaveh]]

             (Heb. Shaveh', שָׁוֵה, plain; Sept. Σαυῆ v.r. Σαυήν and Σαβύ; Vulg. Save), a name found thus alone in Gen 14:17 only, as that of a place where the king of Sodom met Abraham. It occurs also in the name Shavehkiriathaim (q. v). The Samar. Codex inserts the article, השוה; but the Samaritan Version has מפנה. The Targum of Onkelos gives the same equivalent, but with a curious addition, “the plain of Mefana, which is the king's place “of racing,” recalling the ἱππόδρομος so strangely inserted by the Sept. in Gen 48:7. It is one of those archaic names with which this venerable chapter abounds — such as Bela, En-mishpat, Ham, Hazezontamart — so archaic that many of them have been elucidated by  the insertion of their more modern equivalents in the body of the document by a later but still very ancient hand. If the signification of Shaveh be “valley,” as both Gesenius and Furst assert, then its extreme antiquity is involved in the very expression “the Emekshaveh,” which shows that the word had ceased to be intelligible to the writer, who added to it a modern word of the same meaning with itself. It is equivalent to such names as “Puente de Alcantara,” “the Greesen Steps,” etc., where the one part of the name is a mere repetition or translation of the other, and which cannot exist till the meaning of the older term is obsolete. In the present case the explanation does not throw any very definite light upon the locality of Shaveh: “The valley of Shaveh, that is the valley of the king” (Gen 14:17).

True, the “valley of the king” is mentioned again in 2Sa 18:18 as the site of a pillar set up by Absalom; but this passage again conveys no clear indication of its position, and it is by no means certain that the two passages refer to the same spot. The extreme obscurity in which the whole account of Abraham's route from Damascus is involved has already been noticed under SALEM. A notion has long been prevalent that the pillar of Absalom is the well known pyramidal structure which forms the northern member of the group of monuments at the western foot of Olivet. This is apparently first mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (A.D. 1160), and next by Maundeville (1323), and is perhaps originally founded on the statement of Josephus (Ant. 7, 10, 3) that Absalom erected (ἕστηκε) a column (στήλη) of marble (λίθου μαρμαρίνον) at a distance of two stadia from Jerusalem. But neither the spot nor the structure of the so called “Absalom's tomb” agrees either with this description or with the terms of 2Sa 18:18. The “valley of the king” was an Emek — that is, a broad, open valley, having few or no features in common with the deep, rugged ravine of the Kedron, unless, perhaps, in its lower part. SEE VALLEY. The pillar of Absalom — which went by the name of “Absalor's hand” — was set up, erected (יָצֶב), according to Josephus, in marble, while the lower existing part of the monument (which alone has any pretension to great antiquity) is a monolith not erected, but excavated out of the ordinary limestone of the hill, and almost exactly similar to the so called “tomb of Zechariah,” the second from it on the south. Yet even this cannot claim any very great age, since its Ionic capitals and the ornaments of the frieze speak with unfaltering voice of Roman art. Nevertheless, in the absence of any better indication, we are perhaps warranted in holding this traditionary location. SEE KINGS DALE.

## Shaveh-kiriathaim[[@Headword:Shaveh-kiriathaim]]

             (Heb. Shaveh' Kiryatha'yim, שָׁוֵה קרַיָתָיַ ם, plain of the double city; Sept. Σαυή ὴ πόλις), a plain at or near the city of Kiriathaim, occupied by the Emim at the time of Chedorlaomer's invasion (Gen 14:5). Schwarz finds the town (which is known to have been located east of the Jordan) in. the ruins of Kiriat, one and a half mile southwest from Mount Atara (Palest. p. 228), and the dale, or Shaveh (q.v.), must have been in the immediate vicinity. SEE KIRJATHAIM.

## Shaving[[@Headword:Shaving]]

             (properly גָּלִח, ξυράω). The ancient Egyptians were the only Oriental nation who objected to wearing the beard. Hence, when Pharaoh sent to summon Joseph from his dungeon, we find it recorded that the patriarch “shaved himself” (Gen 41:14). Shaving was therefore a remarkable custom of the Egyptians, in which they were distinguished from other Oriental nations, who carefully cherished the beard, and regarded the loss of it as a deep disgrace. That this was the feeling of the Hebrews is obvious from many passages (see especially 2Sa 10:4); but here Joseph shaves himself in conformity with an Egyptian usage, of which this passage conveys the earliest intimation, but which is confirmed not only by the subsequent accounts of Greek and Roman writers, but by the ancient sculptures and paintings of Egypt, in which the male figure is usually beardless. It is true that in sculptures some heads have a curious rectangular beard, or rather beard case attached to the chin; but this is proved to be an artificial appendage by the same head being represented sometimes with and at other times without it, and still more by the appearance of a band which passes along the jaws and attaches it to the cap on the head or to the hair. It is concluded that this appendage was never actually worn, but was used in sculpture to indicate the male character. SEE BEARD.

The practice of shaving. the beard and hair, and sometimes the whole body, was observed among the Hebrews only under extraordinary circumstances. The Levites on the day of their consecration, and the lepers at their purification, shaved all the hair off their bodies (Num 8:7; Lev 14:8-9). A woman taken prisoner in war, when she married a Jew, shaved the hair off her head (Deu 22:12), and the Hebrews generally, and also the nations bordering on Palestine, shaved  themselves when they mourned, and in times of great calamity, whether public or private (Isa 7:20; Isa 15:2; Jer 41:5; Jer 48:37; Bar 6:30). God commanded the priests not to cut their hair or beards in their mournings (Lev 21:5). It may be proper to observe that, among the most degrading of punishments for: women is the loss of their hair; and the apostle hints at this (1Co 11:6): “If it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven,” etc. SEE HAIR.

Modern Orientals shave the head alone, and that only in the case of settled residents in towns (Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 517). SEE BARBER.

## Shaving (2)[[@Headword:Shaving (2)]]

             In the early Church the clergy were exhorted to a decent mean in dress and habits. Thus, for instance, long hair and baldness, by shaving the head or beard, being then generally reputed indecencies in contrary extremes, the clergy were obliged to observe a becoming mediocrity between them. This is the meaning, according to its true reading, of that controverted canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, which says that a clergyman shall neither indulge long hair, nor shave his beard: “Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam radat.” Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. 4, ep. 24) describes his friend Maximus Palatinus, a clergyman, as having his hair short and his beard long. Shaving of the monks was performed at certain fixed times, the razors being kept in an ambry close to the entrance to the dormitory (Bingham, Christ. Antiquities, 6, 4, 15). Eustathius, the heretic, was for having all virgins shorn or shaven at their consecration, but the Council of Gangra immediately rose up against him and anathematized the practice, passing a decree in these words: “If any woman, under pretense of an ascetic life, cut off her hair, which God hath given her for a memorial of subjection, let her be anathema, as one that disannuls the decree of subjection.” Theodosius the Great added a civil sanction to confirm the ecclesiastical decree. See Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, 7, 4, 6. SEE TONSURE.

## Shaving man[[@Headword:Shaving man]]

             the officer — frequently a doorkeeper, as at St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford — whose duty it was to shave the beards of the clerics in a college or religious house.

## Shavsha[[@Headword:Shavsha]]

             (Heb. Shavsha', שִׁוְשָׁא, nobility [Furst]; Sept. Σουσά v.r. Σούς, and even Ι᾿ησοῦς), the royal secretary in the reign of David (1Ch 18:16). He is apparently the same with SERAIAH (2Sa 8:17), who is called Σεισά by Josephus (Ant. 7, 5, 4), w and Σασά in the Vat. MS. of the Sept. Shisha is the reading of two MSS. and of the Targum in 1Ch 18:16. In 2Sa 20:25 he is called SHEVA, and in 1Ki 4:3 SHISHA.

## Shaw, Addison C.[[@Headword:Shaw, Addison C.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about 1814, and united with the Church when fourteen years of age. He was licensed as a local preacher when twenty-four years old, and joined the Michigan Conference, becoming a member of the Detroit Conference at its formation. He died at Ypsilanti, Dec. 21, 1875. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p. 100.

## Shaw, Jacob[[@Headword:Shaw, Jacob]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, entered the New York Conference in 1831, and occupied various stations and circuits in that and the New York East Conference. In 1858 he retired from itinerancy, but continued to preach as his strength would permit. He died at his residence in Redding, Conn., in April, 1861. He was a man of superior mind and large information, and a preacher of great acceptability. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1862, p. 81.

## Shaw, John (1)[[@Headword:Shaw, John (1)]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Bedlington, Durham, England, and entered Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1629, aged fifteen years. He was instituted rector of Whalton, Northumberland, in 1645, but was not admitted until 1661. In the interval he served the church of Bolton, Craven, Yorkshire. He died in 1689. His works are, No Reformation of the Established Reformation (Lond. 1685, 8vo): — Portraiture of the Primitive Saints (4to): — Origo Protestantium (ibid. 1677, 4to).

## Shaw, John (2)[[@Headword:Shaw, John (2)]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Waterford, Me., Feb. 12, 1800, was licensed as a local preacher in 1821, commenced travelling on Livermore Circuit, and in June, 1822, was admitted on trial in the traveling connection and appointed to St., Croix Circuit, in 1823 to Bethel, and in 1824 to Buxton, where he died, Aug. 20, 1825. He was a man of uniform piety, strong in his attachment to the cause of God, and his praise as a preacher was in all the circuits where he labored. See Minutes of Conferences, 1, 546; Bangs, Hist. of the M.E. Church, 3, 359.

## Shaw, John (3)[[@Headword:Shaw, John (3)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Bristol, Ontario Co., N.Y., July 11, 1807, and united with the Church at the age of eighteen. He was received into the Genesee Conference in 1831, and ordained deacon in 1833 and elder in 1835. He spent thirty-six years in the effective ministry, was superannuated in 1869, and died Jan. 16 of the same year at Himrods, Yates Co., N.Y. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 282.

## Shaw, John B.[[@Headword:Shaw, John B.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rutland, Vt., May 23, 1798. He graduated at Midilebury College, Vt., studied theology with Rev. Charles Walker, and was licensed by the Rutland Congregational Association. In 1824 he was ordained by Troy Presbytery, and installed pastor of the Congregational Church at South Hartford, Washington Co., N.Y., and subsequently preached as follows: North Granville, Washington Co., N.Y.; Bethel; Utica, N.Y., Congregational Church, Romeo, Mich.; Norwalk, Conn.; a second time at South Hartford, N.Y.; Presbyterian Church, Fort Ann, N.Y., as a missionary; Congregational Church, Fairhaven, N.Y.; the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, Buskirk's Bridge, N.Y.; and the Presbyterian Church at Stephentown, Rensselaer Co., N.Y. He died May 8, 1865. Mr. Shaw was a man of unusual Christian devotedness. “His highly evangelical mode of expressing truth, his eminently successful pastoral qualifications, and his Christian gentleness of spirit made him an exceedingly useful man in his day.” See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 224. (J.L.S.)

## Shaw, John D.[[@Headword:Shaw, John D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Londonderry County, Ireland, about 1833, but he emigrated to this country, and joined the Methodist Church at Jackson, La., in February, 1851. He studied at Centenary College, Jackson, entered the ministry about 1852 or 1854, and died in Bolivar County, Miss., Oct. 30, 1866. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Church, South, 1866, p. 47.

## Shaw, John Knox[[@Headword:Shaw, John Knox]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ireland, April 12, 1800. but while an infant was brought to Washington County, N.Y. He was licensed to preach Nov. 19, 1824, and was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1825. His active ministerial life lasted until 1858, during which he occupied many important stations, and also served as presiding elder. At the division of the Philadelphia Conference, he became a member of the Newark Conference. He took an active part in the founding of the Pennington Seminary, Pennington, N.J., of which he was a trustee at the time of his death. He died at Newark, N.J., Oct. 4, 1858. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1859; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Shaw, Joseph, LL.D.[[@Headword:Shaw, Joseph, LL.D.]]

             a minister of the Associate Church of America, was born in the parish of Rattray, Aberdeenshire, Scotland, Dec. 6, 1778. He received his preparatory education in his native village, and entered the University of Edinburgh a little before he had completed his thirteenth year. He graduated in 1794, and immediately entered the Associate Divinity Hall at Whitburn, where he remained five years, and in 1799 was licensed to preach. Application being made by the Walnut Street Church, Philadelphia, for a preacher, Mr. Shaw was appointed to the place. He accepted the appointment, and commenced to serve that people in the fall of 1805. In 1809 his lungs became affected, and in 1810 he terminated his ministry in Philadelphia. In 1813 he became professor of languages in Dickinson College, and in 1815 accepted the similar professorship in the Albany Academy. In 1821 he was honored with the degree of LL.D. from Union College. He died in August, 1824. He published a Sermon preached before the Albany Bible Society in 1820 (8vo); and his last sermon, The Gospel  Call, was published shortly after his death, with a brief biographical notice. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 85.

## Shaw, Levi[[@Headword:Shaw, Levi]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Frankfort, Me., Sept. 4, 1822. He received regenerating grace Nov. 17, 1842, and soon after united with the Church. He obtained license as a local preacher in 1846, and in 1851 was received on trial in the East Maine Conference. He took, because of ill health, a superannuated relation in 1860, and held it until his death, at Newburyport, Mass. Aug. 17, 1867. After he had become superannuated, he still continued to labor for shorter or longer periods upon different charges, and also served as a delegate of the Christian Commission. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1868, p. 142.

## Shaw, Samuel[[@Headword:Shaw, Samuel]]

             a learned Nonconformist, was born at Repton, Derbyshire, England, in 1635. At the age of fourteen he entered St. John's College, Cambridge. He was master of the Free School at Tamworth in 1656, and in 1658 obtained a presentation from Cromwell to the rectory of Long Whatton, which he was deprived of about a year before the Act of Uniforformity. He refused it afterwards on the condition of reordination, as he would not declare his Presbyterian ordination invalid. In 1666 he was chosen master of the Free School at Ashby-de-la-Zouch. which position he retained until his death, Jan.. 22, 1696. His works are, Immanuel, or a Discovery of True Religion (Lond. 1667, 12mo): — another edition, with memoir, etc. (Leeds, 1804): — Words Made Visible, or Grammar and Rhetoric (1679, 8vo): — also several religious Tracts.

## Shaw, Samuel P.[[@Headword:Shaw, Samuel P.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Jersey, Nov. 6, 1798, but was taken to Ohio when a child, his parents settling in Hamilton County. He was licensed to preach when about twenty-two years old, and in 1825 was received on trial into the Ohio Conference, afterwards becoming a member of the North Ohio Conference. For several years he was a missionary among the Wyandots at Upper Sandusky, and also served as presiding elder on several districts. He retired from the pastoral work several years before his death, which occurred near Bucyrus, O., Aug. 19, 1875. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 104.

## Shaw, Thomas[[@Headword:Shaw, Thomas]]

             an English clergyman and traveler, was born at Kendal, Westmoreland, about 1692, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, Oct. 5, 1711. He took. his degree of bachelor of arts July 5, 1716, was made master of arts Jan. 16, 1719, went into orders, and became chaplain to the English factory at Algiers. Here he remained several years, spending much of his time in traveling. He was chosen fellow of his college March 16, 1727, and on his return to England (1733), took the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1740 he became principal of St. Edmund's Hall, and received also the living of Bramley, Hants; He was regius professor of Greek at Oxford till his death, which occurred Aug. 15, 1751. Mr. Shaw published, Travels, etc., in Barbary and the Levant (Oxf. 1738): — Vindication of the Above (Lond.1757, 4to), with supplement. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Shaw, William C.[[@Headword:Shaw, William C.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Vevay, Ind., Oct. 2, 1833. He became a Christian when seventeen, and three years later entered Asbury University. In 1854 he was licensed to preach, and in 1857 was received into the Southeastern Indiana Conference; but in 1859 he went to Minnesota, and entered the Minnesota Conference. In 1863 he was superannuated, but in 1864 resumed work, was again superannuated in 1872, made effective in 1873, and appointed to Reed's and Wabashaw, his last appointment. He died at Reed's Landing, Minn. Feb. 16, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 152.

## Shaw, William, D.D[[@Headword:Shaw, William, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Massachusetts, ordained pastor of the Church in Marshfield in April, 1769; and died June 1, 1816. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:573.

## Shawm[[@Headword:Shawm]]

             In the Prayer book version of Psa 98:7, “with trumpets also and shawms” is the rendering of what stands in. the A.V. “with trumpets and sound of cornet.” The Hebrew word translated “cornet” will be found treated under that head. The “shawm” was a musical instrument resembling the clarionet. The word occurs in the forms shalm, shalmie, and is connected with the German Schalmeie, a reed pipe.

“With shaumes and trompets, and with clarions sweet.” Spenser, F. Q. 1, 12, 13.

“Even from the shrillest shaum unto the cornamnute.”

Drayton, Polyolb. 4, 366. Mr. Chappell says (Pop. Mus. 1, 35, note b), “The modern clarionet is an improvement upon the shawm; which was played with a reed like the wayte, or hautboy, but, being a bass instrument, with about the compass of an octave, had probably more the tone of a bassoon.” In the same note he quotes one of the “proverbis” written about the time of Henry VII on the walls of the Manor House at Leckingfield, near Beverley, Yorkshire

“A shawme maketh a swete sounde,

 for he tunythe the basse;

It mountithe not to hye, but kepith rule and space.

Yet yf it be blowne with to vehement a wynde,

 It makithe it to mysgoverne out of his kinde.”

From a passage quoted by Nares (Glossary), it appears that the shawm had a mournful sound:

“He that never wants a Gilead full of balm For his elect,

 shall tirn thy woful shalmn Into the merry pipe.” G. Tooke, Belides, p. l8.

## Shayith[[@Headword:Shayith]]

             SEE THORN.

## She-kia[[@Headword:She-kia]]

             a name given to Buddha (q.v.) among the Chinese. He is also called Fo.

## She-king[[@Headword:She-king]]

             one of the sacred books of the Chinese. It contains 311 odes and other lyrics, chiefly of a moral tone and character, including several pieces which were probably composed twelve centuries before Christ. It is believed to be a selection from a larger number which were extant in the time of Confucius and by him collected and published.

## Sheaf[[@Headword:Sheaf]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the following words in the original:

1. אֲלֻמּה, alummah, prop. a bundle (“sheaf,” Gen 27:7; Psa 19:6);

2. עָמַיר, amir, prop. a handful (as rendered in Jer 9:22); hence a sheaf (Amo 2:13; Mic 4:12; Zec 12:6); and the equivalent עֹמֶר, omer (“sheaf,” Lev 23:10-12; Lev 23:15; Deu 24:19; Rth 2:7; Rth 2:15; Job 24:10), as well as the cognate verb עָמִר, to bind sheaves (Psa 129:7); 3. עֲרֵמָה, aremah, prop. a heap (as rendered in Rth 3:7, etc.); hence a sheaf (as rendered in Neh 13:15; improperly “heap” in Son 7:2).

The Mosaic statutes contained two prescriptions respecting the sheaves of harvest: 1. One accidentally dropped or left upon the field was not to be  taken up, but remained for the benefit of the poor (Deu 24:19). SEE GLEAN. 2. The day after the feast of the Passover, the Hebrews brought into the Temple a sheaf of corn as the first fruits of the barley harvest, with accompanying ceremonies (Lev 18:10-12). On the fifteenth of Nisan, in the evening, when the feast of the first day of the Passover was ended and the second day begun, the house of judgment deputed three men to go in solemnity and gather the sheaf of barley. The inhabitants of the neighboring cities assembled to witness the ceremony, and the barley was gathered into the territory of Jerusalem. The deputies demanded three times if the sun were set, and they were as often answered, It is. They afterwards demanded as many times if they might have leave to cut the sheaf, and leave was as often granted. They reaped it out of three different fields with three different sickles, and put the ears into three boxes to carry them to the Temple. The sheaf, or rather the three sheaves, being brought into the Temple, were threshed in the court. From this they took a full omer, that is, about three pints of the grain; and after it had been well winnowed, parched, and bruised, they sprinkled over it a log of oil, to which they added a handful of incense; and the priest who received this offering waved it before the Lord towards the four quarters of the world, and cast part of it on the altar. After this every one might begin his harvest. SEE PASSOVER.

## Sheal[[@Headword:Sheal]]

             (Heb. Sheal', שְׁאָל, asking; Sept. Σαάλ v.r. Σαλονία), one of the “sons” of Bani, who divorced their foreign wives after the captivity (Ezr 10:29). B.C. 457.

## Shealtiel[[@Headword:Shealtiel]]

             (Heb. Shealtiel', שְׁאִלְתַּיאֵל, asked of God; Anglicized thus in the A.V. at Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:8; Ezr 5:2; Neh 12:1; Hag 1:1; but “Salathiel” at 1Ch 3:17; also in the contracted form Shaltiel', שַׁלְתַּיאֵל, “Shealtiel,” Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14; Hag 2:2; Sept., Apocrypha, Josephus, and N. Test., Σαλαθιήλ; “Salathiel,” 1Es 5:5; 1Es 5:48; 1Es 5:56; 1Es 6:2; 2Es 5:16; Mat 1:12; Luk 3:27), the son of Jechoniah, or Jehoiachin, king of Judah, and father of Zorobabel, according to Mat 1:12, but son of Neri (Neriah) and father of Zorobabel (Zerubbabel) according to Luk 3:27; while the genealogy in 1Ch 3:17-19 leaves it doubtful whether he is the son of Assir or Jechoniah, and makes  Zerubbabel his nephew. The truth seems to be that he was the son of the captive prince Jechoniah, or Jehoiachin (for the prophecy in Jer 22:30 seems only to mean that he should have no successor on the throne), by a daughter of Neri, or Neriah, of the private line of David; and that having himself no heir, he adopted his nephew Zerubbabel, or perhaps was the father of this last by his deceased brother's widow. B.C. cir. 580. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Shear-jashub[[@Headword:Shear-jashub]]

             (Heb. Shear' Yashub', שְׁאִר וָשׁוּבa remnant shall return; Sept. ὁ καταλειφθεὶς Ι᾿ασούβ), son of the prophet Isaiah, who accompanied his father when he proceeded: to deliver to king Ahaz the celebrated prophecy contained in Isaiah 7 (see Isa 7:3). B.C. cir. 735. As the sons of Isaiah sometimes stood for signs in Israel (Isa 8:18), and the name of Maher-shalal-hash-baz was given to one of them by way of prophetic intimation, it has been conjectured that the somewhat remarkable name of Shear-jashub intimated that the people who had then retired within the walls of Jerusalem should return in peace to their fields and villages (comp. Isa 10:20-22). Fairbairn's theory that these events occurred only in visions (On Prophecy, 1, 5, 2) is in violatioin of the plain import of the language.

## Sheariah[[@Headword:Sheariah]]

             (Heb. Shearyah', שְׁעִרְיָה, valued of Jehovah; Sept. Σαραϊvα v.r. Σαρϊvα), the fourth named of the six sons of Azel of the descendants of Saul (1Ch 8:38; 1Ch 9:44). — B.C. long post 1000.

## Shearing house[[@Headword:Shearing house]]

             (Heb. בֵּית עֵקֶד הָרֹעַי ם, Beyth E'ked'ha-Roim; Sept. Βαιθακὰθ [v. r. Βαιθακὰδ] τῶν ποιμένων; Vulg. Camera pastorum), a place on the road between Jezreel and Samaria, at which Jehu, on his way to the latter, encountered forty-two members of the royal family of Judah, whom he slaughtered at the well or pit attached to the place (2Ki 10:12; 2Ki 10:14). The translators of our version have given in the margin the literal meaning of the name — “house of binding of the shepherds,” and in the text an interpretation perhaps adopted from Jos. Kimchi. Binding, however, is but a subordinate part of the operation of shearing, and the word akad is not anywhere used in the Bible in connection therewith. SEE SHEEP SHEARER. The interpretation of the Targum and Arabic version, adopted by Rashi, viz. “house of the meeting of shepherds,” is accepted by Simonis (Onomast. p. 186 ) and Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 195 b). Other renderings are given by Aquila and Symmachus. None of them, however, seem satisfactory, and it is probable that the original meaning has escaped. By the Sept., Eusebius, and Jerome it is treated as a proper name, as they also treat the “garden house” of 9:27. Eusebius (Onomast. s.v.) mentions it as a village of Samaria “in the great plain [of Esdraelon] fifteen miles from Legeon.” It is remarkable that at a distance of precisely fifteen Roman miles from Lejjun the name of Beth-Kad appears in Van de Velde's map (see also Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 316); but this place, though coincident in point of distance, is not on the plain, nor can it either belong to Samaria or be on the road from Jezreel thither, being behind (south of) Mount Gilboa. The slaughter at the well recalls the massacre of the pilgrims by Ishmael  ben-Nethaniah at Mizpah, and the recent tragedy at Cawnpore. SEE BETH-EKED.

## Sheath[[@Headword:Sheath]]

             (Heb. נָדָן, nadan, 1Ch 21:27; תִּעִר, taar, 1Sa 17:51; 2Sa 20:8; Eze 21:3-5; Eze 21:30; “scabbard,” Jer 47:6; θήκη, Joh 18:11), the case in which a dagger or sword blade is carried. SEE KNIFE; SEE SWORD.

## Sheba[[@Headword:Sheba]]

             the name of several men and places in the Bible, but occurring in two forms in the original:

(a) Heb. Sheba', שְׁבָא(of uncertain etymology, see below), which is the name of three fathers of tribes in the early genealogy of Genesis, often referred to in the sacred books, one of them located in Ethiopia (No. 1, below), and the other two in Arabia (Nos. 2 and 3 respectivelv);

(b) Heb. She'ba, שֶׁבִע, an oath, or seven, which is the name of two men, and also of a place (Nos. 4, 5, and 6, below). SEE BEER-SHEBA.

1. (Sept. Σαβά v.r. Σαβάτ.) First named of the two sons of Raamah, son of Cush (Gen 10:7; 1Ch 1:9). B.C. post 2515. This Sheba settled somewhere on the shores of the Persian Gulf. In the Marasid (s.v.) there is found an identification which appears, to be  satisfactory — that on the island of Awal (one of the “Bahrein Islands”) are the ruins of an ancient city called Seba. Viewed in connection with Raamah, and the other facts which we know respecting Sheba, traces of his settlements ought to be found on or near the shores of the gulf. It was this Sheba that carried on the great Indian traffic with Palestine in conjunction with, as we hold, the other. Sheba, son of Jokshan son of Keturah, who, like Dedan, appears to have formed with the Cushite of the same name one tribe — the Cushites dwelling on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and carrying on the desert trade thence to Palestine in conjunction with the nomad Keturahite tribes, whose pasturages were mostly on the western frontier. The trade is mentioned by Eze 27:22-23, in an unmistakable manner, and possibly by Isa 60:6, and Jer 6:20, but these latter, we think, rather refer to the Joktanite Sheba. The predatory bands of the Sabaeans are mentioned in Job 1:15; Job 6:19, in a manner that recalls the forays of modern Bedawin (comp. Joe 3:8). — Smith. SEE ARABIA; SEE DEDAN, etc.

2. (Sept. Σαβά v.r. Σαβεύ and Σαβάν.) Tenth named of the thirteen sons of Joktan son of the patriarch Eber (Gen 10:28; 1Ch 1:22). B.C. cir. 2350. H e seems to have been the founder and eponymous head of the Sabaeans (q.v.), and to have given his name to Sheba or Seba (q.v.), a district in Arabia Felix abounding in frankincense, spices, gold, and precious stones (Isa 60:6 Jer 6:20; Psa 72:15). From this region came the queen to see and converse with Solomon (1Ki 10:1-13; 2Ch 9:1-12; Mat 12:42; Luk 11:31). The. Sabaeans were celebrated for their great trade (Psa 72:10; Eze 27:22; Joe 3:8) and for plundering (Job 1:15; Job 6:19; comp. Strabo, 16:768-780; Abulfeda, p. 96). In the following detailed treatment of this name we introduce the illustrations of it from modern ethnographical, archaeological, and geographical sources.

It has been shown, in the art. ARABIA and other articles, that the Joktanites were among the early colonists of Southern Arabia, and that the kingdom which they there founded was, for many centuries, called the kingdom of Sheba, after one of the sons of Joktan. They appear to have been preceded by an aboriginal race, which the Arabian historians describe as a people of gigantic stature, who cultivated the land and peopled the deserts alike, living with the Jinn in the “deserted quarter,” or, like the tribe of Thamud, dwelling in caves. This people correspond, in their traditions, to the  aboriginal races of whom remains are found wherever a civilized nation has supplanted and dispossessed the ruder race. But, besides these extinct tribes, there are the evidences of Cushite settlers, who appear to have passed along the south coast from west to east, and who, probably, preceded the Joktanites and mixed with them when they arrived in the country.

Sheba seems to have been the name of the great South Arabian kingdom and the peoples which composed it, until that of Himyer took its place in later times. On this point much obscurity remains; but the Sabaeans are mentioned by Diod. Sic., who refers to the historical books of the kings of Egypt in the Alexandrian library, and by Eratosthenes, as well as Artemidorus, or Agatharchides (3, 38, 46), who is Strabo's chief authority; and the Homeritae or Himyerites are first mentioned by Strabo in the expedition of Aelius Gallus (B.C. 24). Nowhere earlier, in sacred or profane records, are the latter people mentioned, except by the Arabian historians themselves, who place Himyer very high in their list, and ascribe importance to his family from that early date. We have endeavored, in other articles, to show reasons for supposing that in this very name of Himyer we have the Red Man and the origin of Erythrus, Erythriean Sea, Phoenicians, etc. SEE ARABIA; SEE RED SEA.

The apparent difficulties of the case are reconciled by supposing, as M. Canssin de Perceval (Essai, 1, 54, 55) has done, that the kingdom and its people received the name of Sheba (Arabic, Seba), but that its chief and sometimes reigning family or tribe was that of Himyer; and that an old name was thus preserved until the foundation of the modern kingdom of Himyer or the Tubbaas, which M. Caussin is inclined to place (but there is much uncertainty about this date) about a century before our era, when the two great rival families of Himyer and Kahlan, together with smaller tribes, were united under the former. In support of the view that the name of Sheba applied to the kingdbm and its people as a generic or national name, we find in the Kamus “the name of Sebhi comprises the tribes of the Yemen in common” (s.v.” Seba”); and this was written long after the later kingdom of Himyer had flourished and fallen. And, further, as Himyer meant the “Red Man,” so, probably, did Seba. In Arabic the verb seba — said of the sun, or of a journey, or of a fever — means “it altered” a man, i.e. by turning him red; the noun seba, as well as siba and sebee-ah, signifies “wine” (Taj el-'Arus MS.). The Arabian wine was red; for we read “Kumeit is a name of wine, because there is in it blackness and redness” (Sihah MS.). It appears, then, that in  Seba we very possibly have the oldest name of the Red Man whence came φοῖνιξ,' Himyer, and Erythrus.

We have assumed the identity of the Arabic Seba with Sheba (שְׂבָא). The plur. form שְׁבָאַיםcorresponds with the Gr. Σαβαῖοι and the Lat. Saboei. Gesenius compares the Heb. with Ethiop. Sebe, “man.” The Hebrew Shin is, in by far the greater number of instances, Sin in Arabic [see Gesen.]; and the historical, ethnological, and geographical circumstances of the case all require the identification.

In the Bible the Joktanite Sheba, mentioned genealogically in Gen 10:28, recurs as a kingdom, in the account of the visit of the queen of Sheba to king Solomon, when she heard of his fame concerning the name of the Lord, and came to prove him with hard questions (1Ki 10:1): “And she came to Jerusalem with a very great train, with camels that bare spices, and very much gold, and precious stones” (1Ki 10:2). Again, “She gave the king an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones: there came no more such abundance of spices as these which the queen of Sheba gave to king Solomon” (1Ki 10:10). She. was attracted by the fame of Solomon's wisidom, which she had heard in her own land; but the dedication of the Temple had recently been solemnized, and, no doubt, the people of Arabia were desirous to see this famous house. That the queen was of Sheba in Arabia, and not of Seba the Cushite kingdom of Ethiopia, is unquestionable. Josephus and some of the Rabbinical writers perversely, as usual, refer her to the latter; and the Ethiopian (or Abyssinian) Church has a convenient tradition to the same effect (comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 6, 5; Ludolf, Hist. Ethiop. 2, 3; Harris. Abyasiie, 2, 105). Aben-Ezra (on Dan 11:6), however, remarks that the queen of Sheba came from the Yemen, for she spoke an Ishmaelitic, or rather a Shemitic, language. The Arabs call her Bilkis (or Yelkamah or Balkamah; Ibn-Khaldun), a queen of the later Himyerites, who, if M. Caussin's chronological adjustments of the early history of the Yemen be correct, reigned in the 1st century of our mera (Essai, 1, 75, etc.); and an edifice at Ma-rib (Mariaba) still hears her name, while M. Fresnel read the name of “Alrnacah” or “Balmacah” in many of the Himyeritic inscriptions. The Arab story of this queen is, in the present state of our knowledge, altogether unhistorical and unworthy of credit; but the attempt to make her Solomon's queen of Sheba probably arose, as M. Caussin conjectures, from the latter being mentioned in the Koran without any name, and the  commentators adopting Bilkis as the most ancient queen of Sheba in the lists of the Yemen. The Koran, as usual, contains a very poor version of the Biblical narrative, diluted with nonsense and encumbered with fables (27:24, etc.).

The other passages in the Bible which seem to refer to the Joktanite Sheba occur in Isa 60:6, where we read “All they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense,” in conjunction with Midian, Ephah, Kedar, and Nebaioth. Here reference is made to the commerce that took the road from Sheba along the western borders of Arabia (unless, as is possible, the Cushite or Keturahite Sheba be meant); and again in Jer 6:20, it is written “To what purpose cometh there, to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country?” (but comp. Eze 27:22-23, and see below). On the other hand, in Psa 62:10, the Joktanite Sheba is undoubtedly meant; for the kingdoms of Sheba and Seba are named together, and in Psa 72:15 the gold of Sheba is mentioned. In Job 1:15; Job 6:19, the predatory habits of the Keturahite Sabaeans have been thought to be referred to, but these were later than our date of that book. We prefer to assign that passage, as well as Joe 3:8, which speaks of their kidnapping propensities, to the Joktanite tribe, with which the other seems to have coalesced. The fact of the chief and best ascertained settlement of the Sheba tribe being in the extreme south of the Arabian peninsula sufficiently explains the language used of the queen who came from thence to hear the wisdom of Solomon, that she was a queen of “the south,” and “came from the uttermost parts of the earth,” i.e. from the extremities of the then known world (Mat 12:42; Luk 11:31). The distance in a straight line could scarcely be under a thousand miles. On, the other hand, the fact that this was a queen seems to point to the Cushite Saba, or Meroe, the sovereigns of which are well known to have been chiefly or exclusively females. Later essays on the queen of Sheba's merits have been written by Rost (Bautz. 1782), Zeibich (Viteb. 1774), Schultens (Lugd. 1740), Norberg (Lond. and Goth. 1797). SEE CANDACE.

The kingdom of Sheba embraced the greater part of the Yemen, or Arabia Felix. Its chief cities, and probably successive capitals, were Seba, San'a (Uzal), and Zafar. (Sephar). Seba was probably the name of the city, and. generally of the country and nation; but the statements of the Arabian writers are conflicting on this point, and they are not made clearer by the accounts of the classical geographers. Ma-rib was another name of the city,  or of the fortress or royal palace in it: “Seba is a city known by the name of Ma-rib. three nights' journey from San'a” (Ez-Zejjaj, in the Tdj-el-'Arus MS.). Again, “Seba was the city of Marib (Mushtarak, s.v.), or the country in the Yemen, of which the city was Ma-rib” (Marasid, s.v.). Near Seba was the famous dike of El-'Arim, said by tradition to have been built by Lukman the ‘Adite, to store water for the inhabitants of the place, and to avert the descent of the mountain torrents. The catastrophe of the rupture of this dike is an important point in Arab history, and marks the dispersion in the 2d century of the Joktanite tribes. This, like all we know, of Seb, points irresistibly to the great importance of the city as the ancient center of Joktanite power. Although, Uzal (which is said to be the existing San'a) has been supposed to be of earlier foundation, and Zafar (Sephar) was a royal residence, we cannot doubt that Seba was the most important of these chief towns of the Yemen. Its value, in the eyes of the old dynasties, is shown by their struggles to obtain and hold it; and it is narrated that it passed several times into the hands, alternately, of the so called Himyerites and the people of Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth). Eratosthenes, Artemidorus, Strabo, and Pliny speak of Mariaba; Diodorus, Agatharchides, Stephanus Byzant. of Saba (Σαβαί [Steph. Byzant.]; Σαβᾶς [Agath.]); Ptolemy (6, 7, § 30, 42), and Pliny (6, 23, § 34) mention Σάβη. But the first all say that Mariaba was the metropolis of the Sabaei; and we may conclude that both names applied to the same place — one the city, the other its palace or fortress (though probably these writers were not aware of this fact) — unless, indeed, the form Sabota (with the variants Sabatha, Sobatale, etc.) of Pliny (H.N. 6, 28, § 32) have reference to Shibam, capital of Hadramaut, and the name, also, of another, celebrated city, of which the Arabian writers (Marisid., s.v.) give curious accounts. The classics are generally agreed in ascribing to the Sabaei the chief riches, the best territory, and the greatest numbers of the four principal peoples of the Arabs which they name — the Sabaei, Atramitae (=Hadramaut), Katabeni (=Kahtan=Joktan), and Minaei (for which SEE DIKLAH ). See Bochart (Phaleg, 26), and Muller (Geog. Min.), p. 186 sq.

The history of the Sabaeans has been,examined by M. Caussimi de Perceval (Essai sur l'Hist. des Arabes); but much reimaeins to be adjusted before its details can be received as trustworthy, the earliest safe chronological point being about the commencement of our era. An examination of the existing remains of Sabaean and Himyeritic cities and buildings will, it cannot be doubted, add more facts to our present  knowledge; and a further acquaintance with the language, from inscriptions aided, as M. Fresnel believes, by an existing dialect, will probably give us some safe grounds for placing the building or mera of the dike. In the art. ARABIA it is stated that there are dates on the ruins of the dike, and the conclusions are given which De Sacy and Caussin have drawn from those dates and other indications respecting the date of the rupture of the dike, which forms, then, an important point in Arabian history; but it must be placed in the 2d century of our era, and the older era of the building is altogether unfixed, or, indeed, any date before the expedition of Elius Gallus. The ancient buildings are of massive masonry, and evidently of Cushite workmanship or origin. Later temples and palace temples, of which the Arabs give us descriptions, were probably of less massive character; but Sabaean art is an almost unknown and interesting subject of inquiry. The religion celebrated in those temples was cosmic; but this subject is too obscure and too little known to admit of discussion in this place. It may be necessary to observe that whatever connection there was in religion between the Sabaeans and the Sabians, there was none in name or in race. Respecting the latter the reader may consult Chwolson's Ssabiea, a work that may be recommended with more confidence than the same author's Nabathoean Agriculture. SEE NEBAIOTH. Some curious papers have also appeared in the Journal of the German Oriental Society of Leipsic, by Dr. Osiander.

3. (Sept. Σαβά v.r. Σαβαϊv and Σαβάν.) Elder of the two sons of Jokshan, one of Abraham's sons by Keturah (Gen 25:3; 1Ch 1:32). B.C. cir. 1980. He evidently settled somewhere in Arabia, probably on the eastern shore of the Arabian Gulf, where his posterity appear to, have. become incorporated with the earlier Sabaeans of the Joktanic branch.

4. (Sept. Σαβεέ v.r. Α᾿βεέ; Josephus Σαβαῖος, Ant. 7:11, 7.) The son of Bichri, a Benjamite from the mountains of Ephraim (2Sa 20:1-22), the last chief of the Absalom insurrection. B.C. 1023. He is described as a “man of Belial,” which seems SEE SHIMEI to have been the usual term of invective cast to and fro between the two parties. But he must have been a person of some consequence, from the immense effect produced by his appearance. It was, in fact, all but an anticipation of the revolt of Jeroboam. It was not, as in the case of Absalom, a mere conflict between two factions in the court of Judah, but a struggle, arising out of that conflict, on the part of the tribe of Benjamin to recover its lost ascendency  — a struggle of which some indications had already been manifested in the excessive bitterness of the Benjamite Shimei. The occasion seized by Sheba was the emulation, as if from loyalty, between the northern and southern tribes on David's return. Through the ancient custom he summoned all the tribes to their tents;” and then and afterwards Judah alone remained faithful to the house of David (2Sa 20:1-2). The king might well say “Sheba the son of Bichri shall do us more harm than did Absalom” (2Sa 20:6). What he feared was Sheba's occupation of the fortified cities. This fear was justified by the result. Sheba traversed the whole of Palestine, apparently rousing the population, Joab: following him in full pursuit, and so deeply impressed with the gravity of the occasion that the murder even of the great Amasa was but a passing incident in the campaign. He stayed but for the moment of the deed, and “pursued after Sheba the son of Bichri.” The mass of the army halted for an instant by the bloody corpse, and then they also “went on after Joab to pursue after Sheba the son of Bichri.” It seems to have been his intention to establish himself in the fortress of Abel-Beth-maacah — in the northernmost extremity of Palestine — possibly allied to the cause of Absalom through his mother, Maacah, and famous for the prudence of its inhabitants (2Sa 20:18). That prudence was put to the test on the present occasion. Joab's terms were the head of the insurgent chief. A woman of the place undertook the mission to her city, and proposed the execution to her fellow citizens. The head of Sheba was thrown over the wall and the insurrection ended. SEE DAVID.

5. (Sept.' Σεβεέ v.r. Σοβαθέ.) A chief Gadite resident in Bashan in the reign of Jeroboam II (1Ch 5:13). B.C. 781.

6. (Sept. Σαμαά v.i. Σαβεέ.) One of the towns of the allotment of Simeon (Jos 19:2). It occurs between Beer-sheba and Moladah. In the list of the cities of the south of Judah, out of which those of Simeon were selected, no Sheba appears apart from Beer-sheba; but there is a Shema (15:26), which stands next to Moladah and which is probably the Sheba in question. This suggestion is supported by the reading of the Vatican copy of the Sept. The change from b to m is an easy one both in speaking and in writing, and in their other letters the words are identical. Some have supposed that the name Sheba is a mere repetition of the latter portion of the preceding name, Beer-sheba — by the common error called homoiotelewton — and this is supported by the facts that the number of names given in 19:2-6 is, including Sheba, fourteen, though the number stated is thirteen; and that in the list of Simeon of 1 Chronicles (4:28)  Sheba is entirely omitted. Gesenius suggests that the words in 19:2 may be rendered “Beer-sheba, the town, with Sheba, the well;” but this seems forced, and is, besides, inconsistent with the fact that the list is a list of “cities” (Thesaur. p. 1355 a, where other suggestions are cited). SEE SHEMA.

## Shebah[[@Headword:Shebah]]

             (Heb. Shibah', שַׁבְעָה, fem. of Sheba, i.e. seven or an oath; Sept. accordingly ὅρκος; Vulg. translates less well abundantia), the famous well which gave its name to the city of Beer-sheba (Gen 26:33). According to this version of the occurrence, it was the fourth of the series of wells dug by Isaac's people, and received its name from him, apparently in allusion to the oaths (Gen 26:31, יַשָּׁבְעוּ, yishshabeu) which had passed between himself and the Philistine chieftains the day before. It should not be overlooked that according to the narrative of an earlier chapter the well owed its existence and its name to Isaac's father (Gen 21:32). Indeed, its previous existence may be said to be implied in the narrative now directly under consideration (Gen 26:23). The two transactions are curiously identical in many of their circumstances — the rank and names of the Philistine chieftains, the strife between the subordinates on either side, the covenant, the adjurations, the city that took its name from the well. They differ alone in the fact that the chief figure in the one case is Abraham, in the other Isaac. Some commentators, as Kalisch (Genesis, p. 500), looking to the fact that there are two large wells at Bir es-Seba, propose to consider the two transactions as distinct, and as belonging the one to the one well, the other to the other. Others see in the two narratives merely two versions of the circumstances under which this renowned well was first dug. Certainly in the analogy of the early history of other nations, and in the very close correspondence between the details of the two accounts, there is much to support this. The various plays on the meaning of the name שבע, interpreting it as “seven,” as an “oath,” as “abundance” (so Jerome, as if reading שַׂבְעָה), as “a lion” (such is the meaning of the modern Arabic Seba) — are all so many direct testimonies to the remote date and archaic form of this most venerable of names, and to the fact that the narratives of the early history of the Hebrews are under the control of the same laws which regulate the early history of other nations. — Smith. In explanation of the repetition of the names of these wells, it should be noted that the sacred text expressly states that Isaac, after reopening them,  “called their names after the names which his father had called them” (Gen 26:18). A minute description of the wells and vicinity of Beer- sheba is given by Lieut. Conder in the Quar. Statement of “The Pal. Explor. Fund” for Jan. 1875, p. 23 sq. SEE BEER-SHEEBA; SEE WELL.

## Shebam[[@Headword:Shebam]]

             (Heb. Sebam', שְׂבָם, fragrance; Sept. Σεβαμά, and so the Samar. Cod. שבמה), one of the towns in the pastoral district on the east of Jordan — the “land of Jazer and the land of Gilead” — demanded, and finally ceded to the tribes of Reuben and Gad (Num 32:3). It is named between Elealeh and Nebo, and is probably the same which, in a subsequent verse of the chapter and on later occasions, appears in the altered forms of SHIBMAH and SIBMAH SEE SIBMAH (q.v.).

## Shebaniah[[@Headword:Shebaniah]]

             (Heb. Shebanyah', שְׁבִנְיָה, increased of Jehovah; once [1Ch 15:24] in the prolonged form Shebanya'hu, שְׁבִנְיָהוּ), the name of four Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Σεβενία v.r. Σοβνεία and Σομνία.) One of the Levitical trumpeters on the removal of the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:24). B.C. 1043.

2. (Sept. Σαβανία and Σεχενία, v.r. Σεβανία, Σαχανία, etc.) One of Ezra's Levitical attendants, who stood upon the steps and uttered the prayer of confession and thanksgiving (Neh 9:4-5), and joined in the sacred covenant (10:10). B.C. 459.

3. (Sept. Σεβανία.) Another Levite who joined in the same covenant (Neh 10:12). B.C. 459.

4. (Sept. Σεβανί, Σεχενία.) A priest who did the same (Neh 10:4; Neh 12:14). B.C. 459. He had a son named Joseph (Neh 12:14). Hie is apparently the same elsewhere (Neh 12:3) called SHECHANIAH (q.v.).

## Shebarim[[@Headword:Shebarim]]

             (Heb. with the art., hash-Shebarim', הִשְּׁבָרְי, the breaches, as often elsewhere rendered; Sept. συνέτριψαν; Vulg. Sebarim) is given in the A.V. as the name of a place to which the Israelites retreated in the first  attack of Ai (Jos 7:5). “The root of the word has the force of ‘dividing' or ‘breaking,' and it is therefore suggested that the name was attached to a spot where there were fissures or rents in the soil, gradually deepening till they ended in a sheer descent or precipice to the ravine by which the Israelites had come from Gilgal—'the going down' (הִמּוֹרָד; see Jos 7:5 and the margin of the A.V.). The ground around the site of Ai, on any hypothesis of its locality, was very much of this character. Keil (Josua, ad loc.) interprets Shebarim by ‘stone quarries;' but this does not appear to be supported by other commentators or by lexicographers. The ancient interpreters (Sept., Targ., and Syr.) usually discard it as a proper name, and render it ‘till they were broken up,' etc.” But this is opposed both to the use of the art. here — which seems to indicate a well known and specific locality — and to the fact that but few of the Hebrews were slain there. A minute examination of the locality would doubtless reveal some clue to the name. SEE AI.

## Shebat[[@Headword:Shebat]]

             SEE SEBAT.

## Sheber[[@Headword:Sheber]]

             (Heb. id. שֶׁבֶר, breaking; Sept. Σεβέρ v.r. Σαβέρ), first named of the sons of Caleb (son of Hur) by his concubine Maachah (1Ch 2:43). B.C. post 1856.

## Shebiith[[@Headword:Shebiith]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Shebna[[@Headword:Shebna]]

             (Heb. Shebna', שֶׁבְנָא[occasionally Shebnah', שֶׁבְנָה, 2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 19:2]. vigor; Sept. Σεβνάς v.r. Σομνάς; Josephus, Σοβναῖος [Ant. 10, 1,1]), a person of high position in Hezekiah's court, holding at one time the office of praefect of the palace (Isa 22:15), but subsequently the subordinate office of secretary (36:3;2 .Kings 19:2), his former post being given to Eliakim, .B.C. 713. This change appears to have been effected by Isaiah's interposition; for Shebna had incurred the prophet's extreme displeasure, partly on account of his pride (Isa 22:16), his luxury (Isa 22:18), and his tyranny (as implied in the title of “father” bestowed on  his successor, Isa 22:21), and partly (as appears from his successor being termed a “servant of Jehovah,” Isa 22:20) on account of his belonging to the political party which was opposed to the theocracy and in favor of the Egyptian alliance. From the omission of the usual notice of his father's name, it has been conjectured that he was a novrus homo. Winer thinks, from the Aramaean form of his name, that he was a foreigner. He is also mentioned in 2Ki 18:37, Isa 36:11; Isa 36:22; Isa 37:2.

## Shebo[[@Headword:Shebo]]

             SEE AGATE.

## Shebuel[[@Headword:Shebuel]]

             [many Sheb'uel] (Heb. Shebuel, שְבוּאֵל, captive [or renown] of God; Sept. Σουβαήλ; Vulg. Sabuel), the name of two Levites.

1. A leading descendant of Gershom, the son of Moses (1Ch 23:16), who was ruler of the treasures of the house of God (26:24); called also Shubael (24:20). B.C. 1013. “The Targum of 1Ch 26:24 has a strange piece of confusion: ‘And Shebuel, that is, Jonathan the son of Gershom the son of Moses, returned to the fear of Jehovah, and when David saw that he was skilful in money matters he appointed him chief over the treasures.' He is the last descendant of Moses of whom there is any trace.”

2. One of the fourteen sons of Heman the minstrel, and chief of the thirteenth band of twelve in the temple choir (1Ch 25:4); also called SHUBAEL (1Ch 25:20). B.C. 1013.

## Shebuoth[[@Headword:Shebuoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Shecaniah[[@Headword:Shecaniah]]

             (1Ch 24:11; 2Ch 31:15), the same name usually Anglicized SHECHANIAH SEE SHECHANIAH (q.v.).

## Shechaniah[[@Headword:Shechaniah]]

             (Heb. Shekanyah', שְׁכִנְיָה, dweller [i.e. intimate] with Jehovah, twice in the prolonged form Shekanya'hu, שְׁכִנְיָהוּ[ 1Ch 24:11; 1 Chronicles 2  Chronicles 31:15], which is always Anglicized “Shecaniah” in the A.V.; Sept. Σεχενίας, but Σεχονίας in 2Ch 31:15; Ezr 8:5; Σεχανίας in Ezr 8:3; Σεχενία in Neh 12:3; Vulg. Sechenias, but Sebenias in 12:3), the name of several men, chiefly during the post-exilian period.

1. The chief of the tenth division of priests according to the arrangement under David (1Ch 24:11, “Shecaniah”). B.C. 1014.

2. Last named of the priests appointed by Hezekiah to distribute the daily services among the sacerdotal order (2Ch 31:15, “Shecaniah”). B.C. 726.

3. One of the “priests and Levites” (but to which of these orders he belonged does not certainly appear, probeably the former, however) who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:3). B.C. 536. In Neh 12:14 (and perhaps 10:4) he is apparently called SHEBANIAH SEE SHEBANIAH (q.v.). But he is not the same with the Shecaniah who was tenth in order of the priests in the reign of David; inasmuch as in the lists in Nehemiah his name continually occurs in the seventh or eighth place (see Keil, ad loc.).

4. A person apparently mentioned as one of the “sons” of Pharosh (i.e. Parosh), and father or progenitor of a Zechariah who returned from the exile in the time of Artaxerxes (Ezr 8:3). B.C. ante 459. As the phraseology, however, is here peculiar, many connect the clause containing this name with the preceding verse (as in the Sept. and 1 Esdr.; but contrary to the Masoretic punctuation), so as to read, “Hattush of the sons of Shechaniah;” thus identifying this person with No. 9. The clause containing this name is perhaps an interpolation from Ezr 8:5. SEE HATTUSH.

5. Another person similarly mentioned in the same list (Ezr 8:5) as progenitor of “the son of Jahaziel,” who likewise returned from Babylon with Ezra; but as the name Shechaniah itself is not found in the parallel list of Ezra 2, and as the mere patronymic ben-Jahaziel is scarcely a sufficient designation, we may conjecture (comp. Ezr 2:10) that a name (actually supplied in the Zathoe of the Sept. and 1 Esdr., evidently the Zattu of Ezr 2:8) has dropped out of the Heb. text before “Shechaniah” (Bertheaui Kurzgef. Handb. ad loc.). This individual, i.e. Shechaniah, will  then appear (in conformity with the phraseology of the adjoining enumerations) as the son of the Zechariah in question, and himself one of the returned exiles. B.C. 459. SEE ZATTU.

6. A son of Jehiel, of the “sons of Elam,” and the one who proposed to Ezra the repudiation of the Gentile wives taken after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:2), B.C. 458.

7. The father of Shemaiah, which latter was “keeper of the east gate,” and repaired part of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh 3:29). B.C, ante 446., He was perhaps identical with No. 9.

8. The son of Arah and father-in-law of Tobiah, the Jews' enemy during the restoration of Jerusalem (Neh 6:18). B.C. cir. 434.

9. A descendant of the Davidic line, father of Shemaiah, and apparently the son of Obadiah (1Ch 3:21-22). B.C. cir. 410. He may also have been the ELIAKIM (Mat 1:13) or JOSEPH (Luk 3:26) of our Savior's ancestry (Strong, Harm. and Expos. p. 16, 17). See Nos. 4 and 7.

## Shechem[[@Headword:Shechem]]

             (Heb. Shekem',. שְׁכֶם[“in pause” She'kem, שֶׁכֶם, both as a common noun (Psa 21:13) and as a proper name (Num 26:31; Jos 17:2; 1Ch 7:19)], a shoulder; Sept. Συχέμ), the name of three men and one place in the Bible.

1. The son of Hamor, prince of the country or district of Shechem in which Jacob formed his camp oa his return from Mesopotamia. B.C. 1906. This young man, having seen Jacob's daughter Dinah, was smitten, with her beauty, and deflowered her. This wrong was terribly and cruelly avenged by the damsel's uterine brothers, Simeon and Levi. SEE DINAH. It seems likely that the town of Shechem, even if of recent origin, must have existed before the birth of a man so young as Hamor's son appears to have been; aid we may therefore suppose it a name preserved in the family, and which both the town and the princes inherited. See No. 4 below. Shechem's name is always connected with that of his father, Hamor (Gen 33:19; Genesis 34; Jos 24:32; Jdg 9:28; Act 7:16). SEE JACOB.

2. A son of Gilead, of the tribe of Manasseh, and head of the family of the' Shechemites (Num 26:31). B.C. post 1856. His family are again mentioned as the Beni-Shechem (Jos 17:2).

3. In the lists of 1 Chronicles another Shechem is named among the Gileadites as a son of Shemidah, a younger member of the family of the foregoing (7:19). B.C. post 1856. It must have been the recollection of one of these two Gileadites which led Cyril of Alexandria into his strange fancy (quoted by Reland, Paloest. p. 1007, from his Comm. on Hosea) of placing the city of Shechem on the eastern side of the Jordan.

4. An ancient and important city of Central Palestine, which still subsists, although under a later designation. In our account of it we introduce the copious illustrations by modern explorers.

I. The Name. — The Hebrew word, as above seen, means a “shoulder,” or, more correctly, the upper part of the back, just below the neck, like the Latin dorsum, a ridge (Gesenius, s.v.). The origin of this name is doubtful. Some have supposed it was given to the town from its position on the watershed lying between the valley of the Jordan, on the east, and the Mediterranean, on the west. But this is not altogether correct, for the watershed is more than halfway from the city to the entrance of the valley; and, had it been otherwise, the elevation at that point is so slight that it would neither suggest nor justify this as a distinctive title. It has also been made a question whether the place was so called from Shechem, the son of Hamor, head of their tribe in the time of Jacob (Gen 33:18 sq.), or whether he received his name from the city. The import of the name favors, certainly, the latter supposition, since its evident signification as an appellative, in whatever application, would naturally originate such a name; and the name, having been thus introduced, would be likely to appear again and again in the family of the hereditary rulers of the city or region. The name, too, if first given to the city in the time of Hamor, would have been taken, according to historical analogy, from the father rather than the son. Some interpret Gen 33:18-19 as showing that Shechem in that passage may have been called also Shalem. But this opinion has no support except from that passage; and the meaning even there more naturally is that Jacob came in safety to Shechem (שָׁלֵם, as an adjective, safe; comp. Gen 28:21); or (as recognized in the English Bible) that Shalem belonged to Shechem as a dependent tributary village. SEE SHALEM. The name is also given in the, A,V. in the form of SICHEM (Gen 12:6)  and SYCHEM (Act 7:16), to which, as well as SYCHAR (Joh 4:5), the reader is referred. In the Sept., above stated, it is (as in the New Test. above) usually designated by Συχέμ, but also ἡ Σίκιμα in 1Ki 12:25; and τὰ Σίκιμα, as in Jos 24:32, which is the form generally used by Josephus and Eusebius (in the Onomast.). But the place has also been known by very different names from these variations of the ancient Shechem. To say nothing of Mabortha (Μαβορθά or Μαβαθρά), which Josephus says (War, 4, 8, 1) it was called by the people of the country (מִעֲבִרְתָּא, ithe thoroughfare or gorge), and which also appears, with a slight variation (Mamortha) in Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 13), Josephus (ibid.) calls it Neapolis (Νεάπολις, “New Town”), from its having been rebuilt by Vespasian after the Roman war in Palestine; and this name is found on coins still extant (Enckel, Doctr. Num. 3, 433). SEE NEAPOLIS. This last name it has still retained in the Arab Nablus, and is one of the very few instances throughout the country where the comparatively modern name has supplanted the original

II. Location. — The scriptural indications of its locality are not numerous. Joshua places it in Mount Ephraim (20:7; see also 1Ki 12:25). Shiloh was “on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem” (Jdg 21:19); hence Shechem must have been farther north than Shiloh. In the story of Jotham it is more precisely located under Mount Gerizim (9:7); which corresponds with the more full and exact description of Josephus, who places it between Gerizim and Ebal (Ant. 4,8, 44). Further, Shechem, as we learn from Joseph's history (Gen 37:12, etc.), must have been near Dothan; and, assuming Dothan to be the place of that name a few miles northeast of Nablus, Shechem must have been among the same mountains, not far distant. So, too, as the Sychar in Joh 4:5 was probably the ancient Shechem, that town must have been near Mount Gerizim, to which the Samaritan woman pointed or glanced as she stood by the well at its foot. The collateral evidences in support of this opinion we may briefly state.

1. The city is not built on an elevated position, as almost all the towns of Palestine are, but at the foot of Gerizim and along the valley, indicating a date anterior to the warlike and unsettled state of the country which led the inhabitants to select a more secure and defensive site for their towns; as also the unwillingness of the people through future generations to change the site of their ancient and renowned city.

2. The advantage which it affords of a good supply of running water — a most important consideration in that climate especially. No spot in this favored locality has such an abundance as the city itself.

3. The road which has connected the valley with the summit of Mount Gerizim through all past ages is the one ascending behind the present town. It is true that there is another path leading up from the valley about halfway between the city and the east end of the valley; but this has never been more than a kind of by path, used by few except shepherds.

4. The antiquities in and around the city. These are neither numerous nor important in themselves, but as evidence on the subject in question they are of considerable value. They consist of portions of walls, cisterns, fragments of potteries, and such like, all of early date, and some evidently of Hebrew origin. These being either within the walls of the present city, or in its immediate vicinity, and none to be met with in any other part of the valley, seem to be a pretty conclusive proof that the present site is the original one.

5. The narrative of Jotham's parable to the people of Shechem clearly indicates the same spot (Jdg 9:7-21). He would have stood on one of those large projections of Gerizim that overlook the city; and in no other spot in the valley would the whole story tally so well. Josephus, in relating Jotham's exploit, confirms this beyond all dispute. His words are that Jotham went up to Mount Gerizim, which overhangs the city Shechem (Ant. v, 7, 2). We may remark that Josephus usually retains the old name Shechem when speaking of the city, but occasionally adopts, the new name, Neapolis (War, 4, 8, 1); and thus clearly identifies Shechem with Nablus. This was certainly the Jewish opinion, as we read in Midrash Rabbah that “Shechem in Mount Ephraim is Napulis.” So, also, the early Christians Epiphanius (Adv. Hoer. 3, 1055) and Jerome (Epit. Paula). The only ancient author that makes a distinction between Shechem and Nablus is Eusebius, if indeed he means to assert the fact, which seems doubtful from his mode of expression (Onomast. s.v. Τερέβινθος, Συχέμ). But his contemporary, the Bordeaux Pilgrim, who visited the place in A.D. 333, not only identities the two, but also never calls the city by its new name, Neapolis, but only its ancient name, Sychem; and most likely he thus only expressed the general and probably universal opinion that then prevailed among both Jews and Christians.  The ancient town, in its most flourishing age, may have filled a wider circuit than its modern representative. It could easily have extended farther up the side of Gerizim, and eastward nearer to the opening into the valley from the plain But any great change in this respect, certainly the idea of an altogether different position, the natural conditions of the locality render doubtful. That the suburbs of the town, in the age of Christ, approached nearer than at present to the entrance into the valley between Gerizim and Ebal may be inferred from the implied vicinity of Jacob's well to Sychar in John's narrative (Joh 4:1 sq.). The impression made there on the reader is that the people could be readily seen as they came forth from the town to repair to Jesus at the well; whereas Nablus is more than a mile distant, and not visible from that point. The present inhabitants have a belief or tradition that Shechem occupied a portion of the valley on the east beyond the limits of the modern town; and certain travelers speak of ruins there, which they regard as evidence of the same fact. The statement of Eusebius that Sychar lay east of Neapolis may be explained by the circumstance that the part of Neapolis in that quarter had fallen into such a state of ruin when he lived as to be mistaken for-the site of a separate town (see Reland, Palest.. p. 1004). The portion of the town on the edge of the plain was more exposed than that in the recess of the valley, and, in the natural course of things, would be destroyed first, or be left to desertion and decay. Josephus says that more than ten thousand Samaritans (inhabitants of Shechem are meant) were destroyed by the Romans on one occasion (War, 3, 7, 32). The population, therefore, must have been much greater than Nablus, with its present dimensions, would contain.

III. History. — The allusions to Shechem in the Bible are numerous, and show how important the place was in Jewish history. Abraham, on his first migration to the land of promise, pitched his tent and built an altar under the oak (or Terebinth) of Moreh at Shechem. The Canaanite was then in the land;” and it is evident that the region, if not the city, was already in possession of the aboriginal race (see Gen 12:6). Some have inferred from the expression “place of Shechem” (מְקוֹם שְׁכֶם) that it was not inhabited as a city in the time of Abraham. But we have the same expression used of cities or towns in other instances (Gen 18:24; Gen 19:12; Gen 29:22); and it may have been interchanged here, without any difference of meaning, with the phrase, “city of Shechem,” which occurs in Gen 33:18. A position affording such natural advantages would hardly fail to be occupied as soon as any population existed in the country.  The narrative shows incontestably that at the time of Jacob's arrival here, after his sojourn in Mesopotamia (Gen 33:18; ch. 34), Shechem was a Hivite city, of which Hamor, the father of Shechem, was the head man. It was at this time that the patriarch purchased from that chieftain “the parcel of the field,” which he subsequently bequeathed, as a special patrimony, to his son Joseph (Gen 43:22; Jos 24:32; Joh 4:5). The field lay undoubtedly on the rich plain, of the Mukhna, and its value was the greater on account of the well which Jacob had dug there, so as not to be dependent on his neighbors for a supply of water.

The defilement of Dinah, Jacob's daughter, and the capture of Shechem and massacre of all the male inhabitants by Simeon and Levi, are events that belong to this period (Gen 34:1 sq.). As this bloody act, which Jacob so entirely condemned (Gen 34:30) and reprobated with his dying breath (Gen 49:5-7), is ascribed to two persons, some urge that as evidence of the very insignificant character of the town at the time of that transaction. But the argument is by no means decisive. Those sons of Jacob were already at the head of households of their own, and may have had the support, in that achievement of their numerous slaves and retainers. We speak in like manner of a commander as taking this or that city when we mean that it was done under his leadership. The oak under which Abraham had worshipped survived to Jacob's time; and the latter, as he was about to remove to Beth-el, collected the images and amulets which some of his family had brought with them from Padan-aram and buried them “under the oak which was by Shechem” (Gen 35:1-4). The “oak of the monument” (if we adopt that rendering of אֵלוֹן מֻצָּב in Jdg 9:6), where the Shechemites made Abimelech king, marked, perhaps, the veneration with which the Hebrews looked back to these earliest footsteps (the incunabula gentis) of the patriarchs in the Holy Land. SEE MEONENIM.

During Jacob's sojourn at Hebron his sons, in the course of their pastoral wanderings, drove their flocks to Shechem, and at Dothan, in that neighborhood, Joseph, who had been sent to look after their welfare, was seized and sold to the Ishmaelites (Gen 37:12; Gen 37:28). In the distribution of the land after its conquest by the Hebrews, Shechem fell to the lot of Ephraim (Jos 20:7), but was assigned to the Levites, and became a city of refuge (21:20, 21). It acquired new importance as the scene of the renewed promulgation of the law, when its blessings were heard from Gerizim and its curses from Ebal, and the people bowed their heads and acknowledged Jehovah as their king and ruler (Deu 27:11; Joshua 9:32-35). It was here Joshua assembled the people,  shortly before his death, and delivered to them his last counsels (Jos 24:1; Jos 24:25). After the death of Gideon, Abimelech, his bastard son, induced the Shechemites to revolt from, the Hebrew commonwealth and elect him as king (Judges 9). It was to denounce this act of usurpation and treason that Jotham delivered his parable of the trees to the men of Shechem from the top of Gerizim, as recorded at length in Jdg 9:22 sq. The picturesque traits of the allegory, as Prof. Stanley suggests (Sinai and Palestine, p. 236; Jewish Church, p. 348), are strikingly appropriate to the diversified foliage of the region. In revenge for his expulsion, after a reign of three years, Abimelech destroyed the city, and, as an emblem of the fate to which he would consign it, sowed the ground with salt (Jdg 9:34-45).

It was soon restored, however, for we are told in 1 Kings 12 that all Israel assembled at Shechem, and Rehoboam, Solomon's successor, went thither to be inaugurated as king. Its central position made it convenient for such assemblies; its history was fraught with recollections which would give the sanctions of religion as well as of patriotism to the vows of sovereign and people. The new king's obstinacy made him insensible to such influences. Here, at this same place, the ten tribes renounced the house of David and transferred their allegiance to Jeroboam (1Ki 12:16), under whom Shechem became for a time the capital of his kingdom. We come next to the epoch of the exile.. The people of Shechem doubtless shared the fate of the other inhabitants, and were, most of them at least, carried into captivity (2Ki 17:5-6; 2Ki 18:9 sq.). But Shalmaneser, the conqueror, sent colonies from Babylonia to occupy the place of the exiles (17:24). It would seem that there was another influx of strangers, at a later period, under Esar-haddon (Ezr 4:2). The “certain men from Shechem” mentioned in Jer 41:5, who were slain on their way to Jerusalem, were possibly Cuthites, i.e. Babylonian immigrants who had become proselytes or worshippers of Jehovah (see Hitzig, Der Proph. Jeremiah p. 331)., These Babylonian settlers in the land, intermixed, no doubt, to some extent with the old inhabitants, were the Samaritans, who erected at length a rival temple on Gerizim (B.C. 300), and between whom and the Jews a bitter hostility existed for so many ages (Josephus, Ant. 12, 1, 1; 13, 3, 4). The Son of Sirach (1, 26) says that “a foolish people,” i.e. the Samaritans, “dwelt at Shechem” (τὰ Σίκιμα). From its vicinity to their place of worship, it became the principal city of the Samaritans, a rank which it maintained at least till the destruction of their temple, about B.C. 129, a period of nearly two hundred years (ibid. 13, 9, 1; War, 1, 2, 6). From the time of the origin of the Samaritans the  history of Shechem blends itself with that of this people and of their sacred mount, Gerizim; and the reader will find the proper information on this part of the subject under those heads. The city was taken and the temple destroyed by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129 (Ant. 13, 9, 1; War, 1, 2, 6).

As already intimated, Shechem reappears in the New Test. It is probably the Sychar of Joh 4:5, near which the Savior conversed with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well. Συχάρ, as the place is termed there (Σιχάρ in Rec. Text is incorrect), found only in that passage, was no doubt current among the Jews in the age of Christ, and was either a term of reproach (שֶׁקֶר, “a lie”) with reference to the Samaritan faith and worship, or, possibly, a provincial mispronunciation of that period (see Lucke, Comm. ub. Johan. 1, 577). The Savior, with his disciples, remained two days at Sychar on his journey from Judaea to Galilee. He preached the Word there, and many of the people believed on him (Joh 4:39-40). In Act 7:16, Stephen reminds his hearers that certain of the patriarchs (meaning Joseph, as we see in Jos 24:32, and following, perhaps, some tradition as to Jacob's other sons) were buried at Sychem. Jerome, who lived so long hardly more than a day's journey from Shechem, says that the tombs of the twelve patriarchs were to be seen there in his day. The anonymous city in Act 8:5, where Philip preached with such effect, may have been Sychem, though many would refer that narrative to Samaria, the capital of the province.

We have seen that not long after the times of the New Test. the place received the name of Neapolis, which it still retains in the Arabic form of Nablus, being one of the very few names imposed by the Romans in Palestine which have survived to the present day. It had probably suffered much, if it was not completely destroyed, in the war with the Romans (see Rambach, De Urbe Sichem Sale Conspersa [Hal. 1730]), and would seem to have been restored or rebuilt by Vespasian, and then to have taken this new name; for the coins of the city, of which there are many, all bear the inscription Flavia Neapolis — the former epithet no doubt derived from Flavius Vespasian (Mionnet, Med. Antiq. 5, 499). The name occurs first in Josephus (War, 4, 8, 1), and then in Pliny; (Hist. Nat. 5, 14), Ptolemy (Geog. v, 16). As intimated above, there had already been converts to the Christian faith at this place under our Savior, and it is probable that a Church had been gathered here by the apostles (Joh 4:30-42; Act 8:25; Act 9:31; Act 15:3). Justin Martyr was a native of Neapolis (Apolog. 2, 41). The name of Germanus, bishop of Neapolis, occurs in A.D. 314; and other,  bishops continue to be mentioned down to A.D. 536, when the bishop John signed his name at the synod of Jerusalem (Reland, Palest. p. 1009). When the Moslems invaded Palestine, Neapolis and other small towns in the neighborhood were subdued. while the siege of Jerusalem was going on (Abulfeda, Annal. 1, 229). After the taking of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, Neapolis and other towns in the mountains of Samaria tendered their submission, and Tancred took possession of them without resistance (Will. Tyr. 9, 20). Neapolis was laid waste by the Saracens in A.D. 1113; but a few years after (A.D. 1120) a council was held here by king Baldwin II to consult upon the state of the country (Fulcher, p. 424; Will. Tyr. 12, 13). Neapolis was not made a Latin bishopric, but belonged probably to that of Samaria, and the property of it was assigned to the abbot and canons of the Holy Sepulchre (Jac. de Vitriacus, ch. 58). After some disasters in the unquiet times which ensued, and after some circumstances which show its remaining importance, the place was finally taken from the Christians in A.D. 1242 by Abu Ali, the colleague of sultan Bibars, and has remained in Moslem hands ever since.

IV. Description. —

1. The natural features of the neighborhood are the two mountains Gerizim and Ebal, standing in front of each other like two giants, with the little valley running between, and on the eastern side the noble plain of Mukhna stretching from north to south. The two mountains run in parallel ranges from east to west — Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south — and both reach an elevation of some 2500 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, and 800 feet above the valley itself. From the town to the eastern opening of the valley, a distance of about a mile and a half, where the two mountain ranges have their starting points, and to which parts the names of Gerizim and Ebal are confined, both mountains rise immediately from the valley in steep and mostly precipitous declivities to the height stated; and both, as seen, from the valley, are equally naked and sterile. But immediately behind the city, and there only, Gerizim has the advantage, owing to a copious stream that flows through a small ravine at the west side of the town. Here are several orchards and gardens, producing abundantly. On Ebal also, opposite the town, there are several gardens and cultivated plots — some old, but the majority of late planting — and all in a comparatively thriving condition but these can never equal those on the Gerizim side on account of the deficiency of water. The valley itself stands at an elevation of some 1700 feet above the Mediterranean, running from  east to west, and extending from the eastern abutments of the two mountains as far as Sebustieh (Samaria) westward.

A portion of this only belongs to our present notice, namely, from its eastern opening to the town of Nablus, a distance of about a mile and a half. Its width varies. At its commencement it measures somewhat more than half a mile; but near halfway to the town it contracts to about half that width. But as we proceed towards the city the mountains again recede, and the valley widens to its former width; but again, at the city, contracts to its narrowest dimension. It is hardly in any part a flat level, but rather a gradual slope of the two mountains, until they dovetail into each other. Just at the commencement of the valley, on either side, are Jacob's well and Joseph's tomb. (See below.) A little farther on, and near the center of the valley, stands the hamlet Balata, the remains of a town of the same name mentioned by Parchi (Kapht va-Pherach), but of no historical importance. Near halfway up the valley is the highest ground, forming the watershed between the valley of the Jordan and the Mediterranean. The valley thus far is almost without trees of any kind, but the part nearest the town is well wooded. The principal kind of tree is the olive, as it seems to have been in the days of Jotham (Jdg 9:8). The town itself is surrounded by orchards and gardens, where figs, mulberries, grapes, almonds, oranges, apricots, and other fruit grow luxuriantly.

One of the great and peculiar features of this valley is the abundance of water. Dr. Kosen says that the inhabitants boast of the existence of not less than eighty springs of water within and around the city. He gives the names of twenty-seven of the principal of them. Within some two miles' radius from thirty to forty copious springs exist. But within the area now under notice they are more copious than numerous. There is not a single spring on the Ebal side till we have passed the city for some distance. On the Gerizim side, outside the city, there are three. The first, rising near the watershed, dries up in summer. The next, ‘Ain Dafna (the Δάφνη of the Roman period of the city), a very large stream, issues out near the road and runs in an open channel past Jacob's well, turning a mill on its way, and emptying itself to water the plain. ‘Ain Balata, named from the little village whence it flows, is the other, issuing from a subterranean chamber supported by three pillars, and sufficiently copious to supply a large population. Within the city itself the principal supply is derived from a stream descending from a ravine on the western side of the town, which is made to flow in abundance along the channels of some of the streets. The  fountains are numerous. The most remarkable, ‘Ain el-Kerun, is under a vaulted dome, and is reached by a flight of steps.' The water is conveyed, hence by conduits to two of the principal mosques and some private houses, and afterwards serves to water the gardens below. The various streams run on the northern side of the town into one channel, which serves to turn a corn mill that is kept going summer and winter.

On the eastern side of the valley, as already mentioned, lies the extensive plain of the Mukhna, stretching for many miles from north to south, and hemmed in on both sides by mountain chains, the slopes of which support several villages and hamlets. In Scripture it is called Sadeh (שָׂדֶה), a smooth or level cultivated open land (Gen 33:19), to which our Savior pointed when he said, “Say ye not, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest?” etc. (Joh 4:35).

The situation of the town is one of surpassing beauty. “The land of Syria,” said Mohammed, “is beloved by Allah beyond all lands, and the part of Syria which he loveth most is the district of Jerusalem, and the place which he loveth most in the district of Jerusalem is the mountain of Nablus” (Fundgr. des Orients, 2, 139). Its appearance has called forth the admiration of all travelers who have any sensibility to the charms of nature. It lies in a sheltered valley, protected by Gerizim on the south and Ebal on the north. The feet of these mountains, where they rise from the town, are not more than five hundred yards apart. The bottom of the valley is about 1800 feet above the level of the sea, and the top of Gerizim 800 feet higher still. Those who have been to Heidelberg will assent to Von Richter's remark that the scenery, as viewed from the foot of the hills, is not unlike that of the beautiful German town.

The site of the present city, which we believe to have been also that of the Hebrew city, occurs exactly On the water summit; and streams issuing from the numerous springs there flow down the opposite slopes of the valley, spreading verdure and fertility in every direction. Travelers vie with each other in the language which they employ to describe the scene that bursts here so suddenly upon them on arriving in spring or early summer at this paradise of the Holy Land. The somewhat sterile aspect of the adjacent mountains becomes itself a foil, as it were, to set off the effect of the verdant fields and orchards which fill up the valley. “There is nothing finer in all Palestine,” says Dr. Clarke, “than a view of Nablus from the heights around it. As the traveler descends  towards it from. the hills, it appears luxuriantly embosomed in the most delightful and fragrant bowers, half concealed by rich gardens and by stately trees collected into groves, all around the bold and beautiful valley in which it stands.” “The whole valley,” says Dr. Robinson, “was filled with gardens of vegetables and orchards of all kinds of fruits, watered by fountains which burst forth in various parts and flow westward in refreshing streams. It came upon us suddenly, like a scene of fairy enchantment. We saw nothing to compare with it in all Palestine. Here, beneath the shadow of an immense mulberry tree, by the side of a purling rill, we pitched our tent, for the remainder of the day and the night.... We rose early, awakened by the songs of nightingales and other birds, of which the gardens around us were full.” “There is no wilderness here,” says Van de Velde (1, 386), “there are no wild thickets, yet there is always verdure, always shade, not of the oak, the terebinth, and the caroub tree, but of the olive grove, so soft in color, so picturesque in form, that, for its sake, we can willingly dispense with all other wood. There is a singularity about the vale of Shechem, and that is the peculiar coloring which objects assume in it. You know that wherever there is water the air becomes charged with watery particles, and that distant objects beheld through that medium seem to be enveloped inl a pale blue or gray mist, such as contributes not a little to give a charm to the landscape.

But it is precisely those atmospheric tints that, we miss so much in Palestine. Fiery tints are to be seen both in the morning and the evening, and glittering violet or purple-colored hues where the light falls next to the long, deep shadows; but there is an absence of coloring, and of that charming dusky hue in which objects assume such softly blended forms, and in which also the transition in color from the foreground to the farthest distance loses the hardness of outline peculiar to the perfect tansparency of an Eastern sky. It is otherwise in the vale of Shechem, at least in the morning and the evening. Here the exhalations remain hovering among the branches and leaves of the olive trees, and hence that lovely bluish haze. The valley is far from broad, not exceeding in some places a few hundred feet. This you find generally enclosed on all sides; here, likewise, the vapors are condensed. And so you advance under the shade of the foliage, along the living waters, and charmed by the melody of a host of singing birds — for they, too, know where to find their best quarters — while the perspective fades away and is lost in the damp, vapory atmosphere.” Apart entirely from the historic interest of the place, such are the natural attractions of this favorite resort of the patriarchs of old, such the beauty of the scenery, and the indescribable air of tranquillity  and repose which hangs over the scene, that the traveler, anxious as he may be to hasten forward in his journey, feels that he would gladly linger, and could pass here days and weeks without impatience.

2. The modern city, as already observed, is situated in the valley, about a mile and a half from its eastern opening. It stands at the foot of Gerizim, and stretches from east to west in an irregular form. Just where the city stands there is scarcely any flat ground, the gradual slopes of the two mountains dovetailing into each other. The roads leading to the town from all parts are in a most primitive and wretched condition, and the town itself is surrounded by all kinds of filth. The city is encompassed by a wall of very common structure, and in a most dilapidated condition. The two principal gates — one in the eastern and the other in the western end of the town — are in keeping with the walls, and would not give so much trouble to a conqueror as in the time of Abimelech. Notwithstanding, they are of no small importance in the economy of the town. Here we still find a faint emblem of what gates were in ancient times — the great emporiums where all the public affairs of the city were transacted.

The gates of Nablus retain their importance in part. At the western gate the revenue department is still located, and all who pass through with any commodities to sell, and purchasers, are charged a certain toll according to the value of the articles. The main street, following the line of the valley from east to west, runs almost in a straight line the whole length of the town, connecting the two gates. Most of the other streets cross this quite irregularly, and are, almost without exception, narrow and dirty. Nearly all of them have a channel along the center, in which runs a stream of water. In the winter season these streams are full, but diminish during the summer months, and several are dried up. This arrangement of the water causes the town to be very damp during the winter; and, however pleasant it may be in summer, it certainly forms anything but a good element in the sanitary condition of the place. This state of the streets, together with the fact of some of them being arched, makes the town uncommonly sombre and dull. But when we speak of streets, our readers must not imagine them to be similar to European streets, formed by the front of lines of houses, private or public; but the streets of Nablus, like those of other Oriental towns, are only passages between dead walls, except where the bazaars break the monotony. These are the Eastern shops or marketplaces — a kind of recesses in the walls — and are comparatively numerous in Nablus. They  are grouped according to the merchandise they contain, and are situated principally in the main street.

With regard to the buildings, we may remark that all the houses are built of stone, and are heavy and sombre. They are entered from the street through a ponderous strong door, barred on the inside (2Sa 13:18); a large iron knocker is attached, and two or three blows with this will suffice to bring one of the inmates to ask, “Who is there?” (Act 12:13). From the inside it will be found that each house stands detached from its neighbor, and consists of detached vaulted rooms, all built of stone, and all. opening into the court, which is uncovered, but screened from the observation of all but the inmates by the high walls of the house on all sides. Every house has one dome or more; but the roof is flat, with, battlements surrounding it, to prevent any one falling into the street or court (Deu 22:8). In the better sort of houses a kind of family saloon is built on a portion of the roof of the house, much more spacious and airy than the other rooms, and preserved principally for the entertainment of guests who are to be treated with marked respect. This is the aliyah, עֲלַיָּה, of the Old Test. (1Ki 17:19), and the “larger upper room” (ἀνώγαιον μέγα) of the New (Mar 14:15). The windows of the houses are sometimes only square holes in the wall (Act 20:9); but generally finished with lattice work as of old (Jdg 5:28; Son 2:9).

There are no public buildings worth mentioning. The Keniseh, or synagogue of the Samaritans, is a small edifice, in the interior of which there is nothing remarkable, unless it be an alcove, screened by a curtain, in which their sacred writings are kept. The structure may be three or four centuries old. A description and sketch plan of it are given in Mr. Grove's paper On the Modern Samaritans, in Vacation Tourists for 1861. Nablus has five mosques, two of which, according to a tradition in which Mohammedans, Christians, and Samaritans agree, were originally churches. One of them, it is said, was dedicated to John the Baptist; its eastern portal, still well preserved, shows the European taste of its founders. The domes of the houses and the minarets, as they show themselves above the sea of luxuriant vegetation which surrounds them, present a striking view to the traveler approaching from the east or the west.

There are a few small portions of the town remaining, in all probability, from ancient times. The arched passage in the Samaritan quarter seems to be partly of this class, comprising levelled stones of Jewish style. Similar  ones are in other parts of the town. The marble troughs used at the principal streams are probably Israelitish remains. These are five in number, dug up in the plain on the eastern side of Gerizim, and originally the sarcophagi of the dead. Rosen, during his stay at Nablus, examined anew the Samaritan inscriptions found there, supposed to be among the oldest written monuments in Palestine. He has furnished, as Prof. Rodiger admits, the best copy of them that has been taken (see a facsimile in Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1860, p. 621). The inscriptions, on stone tablets, distinguished in his account as No. 1 and No. 2, belonged originally to a Samaritan synagogue which stood just out of the city, near the Samaritan quarter, of which synagogue a few remains only are now left.. They are thought to be as old at least as the age of Justinian, who (A.D. 529) destroyed so many of the Samaritan places of worship. Some, with less reason, think they may have been saved from the Temple on Gerizim, having been transferred afterwards to a later synagogue. One of the tablets is now inserted in the wall of a minaret; the other was discovered not long ago in a heap of rubbish not far from it. The inscriptions consist of brief extracts from the Samaritan Pentateuch, probably valuable as paleographic documents. Similar slabs are to be found built into the walls of several of the sanctuaries in the neighborhood of Nablus; as at the tombs of Eleazar, Phinehas, and Ithamar at Awertah.

3. To complete our survey of Shechem and its neighborhood, we must take a brief glance at the traditional monuments that exist there. The most interesting by far are the Well of Jacob and the Tomb of Joseph. These stand at the eastern opening of the valley, the former near the foot of Gerizim, and the latter near the foot of Ebal, as if keeping guard over the parcel of field bought by the patriarch of the children of Hamor.

(1.) With regard to the first of these, we may observe that the language in the original is remarkably descriptive of the spot. Had Jacob bought a portion of the valley, we should have had emek, עֵמַק. but here it is a part of the sadeh, הִשָּׂדֶה, the level cultivated land, the plain of Mukhna already described; and to no other part of the country could this term be applied. This, in connection with the unbroken tradition of the spot, renders its genuineness beyond all doubt. The well is not an ‘ain, עִיַן, a fountain of living water; but a beer, בְּאֵר, a cistern to hold rainwater. Hence our Savior's contrast, with the Samaritan woman, between the cistern (φρέαρ) which Jacob gave them and the fountain (πηγή) which he should give them  (Joh 4:12; Joh 4:14). Faithful to the language of Scripture, the natives never call it ‘Ain, Yakub, but always Bir Yakub, Jacob's Well. The native Christians of Nablus frequently call it Bir Samariyeh, the Samaritan Well; but the Samaritans themselves only call it Bir Yakub.

“A low spur projects from the base of Gerizim in a northeastern direction, between the plain and the opening of the valley. On the point of this spur is a little mound of shapeless ruins, with several fragments of granite columns. Beside these is the well. Formerly there was a square hole opening into a carefully built vaulted chamber, about ten feet square, in the floor of which was the true mouth of the well. Now a portion of the vault has fallen in and completely covered up the mouth, so that nothing can be seen above but a shallow pit half filled with stones and rubbish. The well is deep — seventy-five feet when last measured, and there was probably a considerable accumulation of rubbish at the bottom. Sometimes it contains a few feet of water; but at others it is quite dry. It is entirely excavated in the solid rock, perfectly round, nine feet in diameter, with the sides hewn smooth and regular” (Porter, Handbook, p. 340). The well is fast filling up with the stones thrown in by travelers and others. At Maundrell's visit (1697) it was 105 feet deep, and the same measurement is given by Dr. Robinson as having been taken in May, 1838. But, five years later, when Dr. Wilson recovered Mr. A. Bonar's Bible from it, the depth had decreased to “exactly seventy-five” (Wilson, Lands, 2, 57). Maundrell (March 24) found fifteen feet of water standing in the well. It appears now to be always dry.

“It has every claim to be considered the original well, sunk deep into the rocky ground by ‘our father Jacob.'” This, at least, was the tradition of the place in the last days of the Jewish people (Joh 4:6; Joh 4:12). Its position adds probability to the conclusion, indicating, as has been well observed, that it was there dug by one who could not trust to the springs so near in the adjacent vale — the springs of Ain Balata and ‘Ain Dafna — which still belonged to the Canaanites. Of all the special localities of our Lord's life, this is almost the only one absolutely undisputed. “The tradition, in which, by a singular coincidence, Jews and Samaritans, Christians and Mohammedans, all agree, goes back,” says Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 2, 284), “at least to the time of Eusebius, in the early part of the 4th century. That writer indeed speaks only of the sepulchre; but the Bordeaux Pilgrim, in A.D. 333, mentions also the well; and neither of these writers has any allusion to a church. But Jerome, in Epitaphium Pauloe, which is referred  to A.D. 404, makes her visit the church erected at the side of Mount Gerizim around the Well of Jacob, where our Lord met the Samaritan woman.

The church would seem, therefore, to have been built during the 4th century; though not by Helena, as is reported in modern times. It was visited and is mentioned, as around the well, by Antoninus Martyr near the close of the 6th century; by Arculfus a century later, who describes it as built in the form of a cross; and again by St. Willibald in the 8th century. Yet Saewulf, about A.D. 1103, and Phocas in 1185, who speak of the well, make no mention of the church; whence we may conclude that the latter had been destroyed before the period of the Crusades. Brocardus speaks of ruins around the well, blocks of marble and columns, which he held to be the ruins of a town, the ancient Thebez; they were probably those of the church, to which he makes no allusion. Other travelers, both of that age and later, speak of the church only as destroyed, and the well as already deserted. Before the days of Eusebius there seems to be no historical testimony to show the identity of this well with that which our Savior visited; and the proof must therefore rest, so far as it can be made out at all, on circumstantial evidence.

I am not aware of anything, in the nature of the case, that goes to contradict the common tradition; but, on the other hand, I see much in the circumstances tending to confirm the supposition that this is actually the spot where our Lord held his conversation with the Samaritan woman. Jesus was journeying from Jerusalem to Galilee, and rested at the well, while his disciples were gone away into the city to buy meat. The well, therefore, lay apparently before the city, and at some distance from it. In passing along the eastern plain, Jesus had halted at the well, and sent his disciples to the city situated in the narrow valley, intending, on their return, to proceed along the plain on his way to Galilee, without himself visiting the city. All this corresponds exactly to the present character of the ground. The well, too, was Jacob's Well, of high antiquity, a known and venerated spot, which, after having already lived for so many ages in tradition, would not be likely to be forgotten in the two and a half centuries intervening between John and Eusebius.”

It is understood that the well, and the site around it, have lately been purchased by the Russian Church, not, it is to be hoped, with the intention of erecting a Church over it, and thus forever destroying the reality and the sentiment of the place. A special fund has recently been raised in England for the purpose of surveying the premises and cleaning out the well. SEE JACOBS WELL.

(2.) The second of the spots alluded to is the Tomb of Joseph. It lies about a quarter of a mile north of the well, exactly in the center, of the opening of the valley between Gerizim and Ebal. It is a small square enclosure of high whitewashed walls, surrounding a tomb of the ordinary kind, but with the peculiarity that it is placed diagonally to the walls, instead of parallel, as usual. A rough pillar used as an altar, and black with the traces of fire, is at the head, and another at the foot of the tomb. In the left-hand corner as you enter is a vine, whose branches “run over the wall,” recalling exactly the metaphor of Jacob's blessing (Gen 49:22). In the walls are two slabs with Hebrew inscriptions. One of these is given by Dr. Wilson (Lands, etc. 2, 61), and the interior is almost covered with the names of pilgrims in Hebrew, Arabic, and Samaritan. Beyond this there is nothing to remark in the structure itself. It purports to cover the tomb of Joseph, buried there in the “parcel of ground” which his father bequeathed especially to him his favorite son, and in which his bones were deposited after the conquest of the country was completed (Jos 24:32).

The local tradition of the tomb, like that of the well, is as old as the beginning of the 4th century. Both Eusebius (Onomast. Συχέμ ) and the Bordeaux Pilgrim mention its existence. So do Benjamin of Tudela (1160- 79) and Maundeville (1322), and so — to pass over intermediate travelers- does Maundrell (1697). All that is wanting in these accounts is to fix the tomb which they mention to the present spot. But this is difficult. Maundrell describes it as on his right hand, in leaving Nablus for Jerusalem; “just without the city” — a small mosque, “built over the sepulchre of Joseph” (March 25). Some time after passing it he arrives at the well. This description is quite inapplicable to the tomb just described, but perfectly suits the Wely at the northeast foot of Gerizim, which also bears (among the Moslems) the name of Joseph. When the expressions of the two oldest authorities cited above are examined, it will be seen that they are quite as suitable, if not more so, to this latter spot as to the tomb on the open plain. On the other hand, the Jewish travelers, from hap-Parchi (cir. 1320) downwards, specify the tomb as in the immediate neighborhood of the village el-Balata. See the itineraries entitled Jichus hat-Tsadikim (A.D. 1561) and Jichus ha-Aboth (1537), in Carmoly, Itineraires de la Terre- Sainte. Stanley states, after Buckingham, that it is said by the Samaritans to be thus called after a rabbi Joseph of Nablus (Sin. and Pal. p. 241, note). But this identification seems to be a mistake, probably a Mohammedan legend, and imposed upon inquisitive travelers by unscrupulous guides.  The present Samaritans know of no Joseph's tomb but the generally accepted one; and to it does the Jewish as well as the Samaritan tradition bear testimony. Hap-Parchi, who spent some years exploring Palestine, fixes Joseph's Tomb fifty yards north of Balata (Kapht. va-Pherach).

In this conflict of testimony, and in the absence of any information on the date and nature of the Moslem tomb, it is impossible to come to a definite conclusion. There is some force, and that in favor of the received site, in the remarks of a learned and intelligent Jewish traveler (Lowe, in the Allg. Zeitung des Judenthums [Leipsig, 1839], No. 50) on the peculiar form and nature of the ground surrounding the tomb near the well, the more so because they are suggested by the natural features of the spot, as reflected in the curiously minute, the almost technical, language of the ancient record, and not based on any mere traditional or artificial considerations. “The thought,” says he, “forced itself upon me, how impossible it is to understand the details of the Bible without examining them on the spot. This place is called in the Scripture neither emek (‘valley') nor shephelah (‘plain'), but by the individual name of Chelkath has-Sadeh; and in the whole of Palestine there is not such another plot to be found — a dead level, without the least hollow or swelling in a circuit of two hours. In addition to this, it is the loveliest and most fertile spot I have ever seen.” SEE JOSEPHS TOMB.

(3.) About halfway between Jacob's Well and the city, and nestling in a bend of Mount Gerizim, is the mosque Sheik el-'Amud (the Saint of the Pillar), so called from a Mussulman saint. This saint, however, is only a modern invention of the Mohammedans. By the Samaritans the place is simply called El-'Amud, the Pillar, their tradition identifying it with the pillar of stone set up by Joshua, as noticed above. They also believe that the celebrated oak of Moreh stood on the same spot. The Mohammedans come here occasionally to pray, but no great honor is paid to the place if we may judge from its present dilapidated state.

(4.) About one third of the way up the side of Mount Ebal, in front of the town, is a bold perpendicular rock, some sixty feet high, called, after a Mohammedan female saint, Sit es-Salamiyeh. In front of the rock stands a small building, consisting of two chambers and a wely for prayer, but all in a dilapidated state. This part of the mountain is called by the saint's name.

(5.) A little farther westward, and about midway to the summit, stands the only edifice now remaining on Mount Ebal. This is called ‘Imad ed-Din —  the Column of Religion. According to the current tradition, this building was erected over the tomb of a Mohammedan saint, honored by the above name (and the building, of course, receiving its name from the saint), who flourished some five hundred years ago. The building is used as a mosque, but the native Christians say that originally it was a Christian church. It consists of two apartments, the floor of the first still partly paved with fragments of very beautiful mosaic work, wrought in marble of red, blue, and white. On the middle of the inner room stands a large wooden lamp stand in imitation of a tree, with a goodly number of branches, on which a number of oil lamps are hanging, together with a formidable array of filthy rags placed there by pilgrims in honor of the saint, whose tomb, they say, is in the northern wall, indicated by a marble slab placed against it. This part of the mount is frequently called by the natives after the saint, ‘Imad ed- Din.

4. The present inhabitants of Nablus, with very few exceptions, are Arabs. It is difficult to say with exactness what is the number of its population, inasmuch as no census is taken. About 10,000 is near the mark. Of these there are about 100 Jews, 150 Samaritans, from 500 to 600 native Christians; the remaining 9400 are Mohammedans — the most bigoted and unruly, perhaps, in Palestine. The enmity between the Samaritans and Jews is as inveterate still as it was in the days of Christ.

Being, as it is, the gateway of the trade between Jaffa and Beirut on the one side, and the transjordanic districts on the other, and the center also of a province so rich in wool, grain, and oil, Nablus becomes, necessarily, the seat of an active commerce, and of a comparative luxury to be found in very few of the inland Oriental cities. It produces, in its own manufactories, many of the coarser woollen fabrics, delicate silk goods, cloth of camel's hair, and especially soap, of which last commodity large quantities, after supplying the immediate country, are sent to Egypt and other parts of the East. The ashes and other sediments thrown out of the city, as the result of the soap manufacture, have grown to the size of hills, and give to the environs of the town a peculiar aspect. The olive, as in the days when Jotham delivered his famous parable, is still the principal tree. Figs, almonds, walnuts, mulberries, grapes, oranges, apricots, pomegranates, are abundant. The valley of the Nile itself hardly surpasses Nablus in the production of vegetables of every sort.  See Robinson, Palestine, 2, 94-136; Olin, Travels, 2, 339-365; Narrative of the Scottish Deputation, p. 208-218; Schubert, Morgenland, 3, 136- 154; Lord Nugent, Lands Classical and Sacred, 2, 172-180; Hackett, Illustrations of Scripture, p. 193 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 203; Conder, Tent Work in Palestine, 1, 61 sq. Dr. Rosen, in the Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenland. Gesellschaeft for 1860 (p. 622-639), has given a careful plan of Nablus and the environs, with various accompanying remarks. SEE SAMARITANS, MODERN.

## Shechemite[[@Headword:Shechemite]]

             (Heb. with the art. and collectively hash-Shikmi', הִשַּׁכְמַי, a patronymic Sept.' ὁ Συχεμί), a family designation of the descendants of Shechem (q.v.), the son of Shemidah of the tribe of Manasseh (1Ch 7:19).

## Shechesh[[@Headword:Shechesh]]

             The archaeological remains of the modern Nablus are copiously described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey (2:203 sq.).

## Shechinah[[@Headword:Shechinah]]

             [some Shech'inah; also written Shekinah] (in .Chaldee and Neo-Hebrew Shekinah', שְׁכינָה, strictly residence, i.e. of God, his visible presence, from

שָׁכִן, to dwell), a word not found in the Bible, but used by the later Jews, and borrowed by Christians from them, to express the visible majesty of the Divine Presence, especially when resting or dwelling between the cherubim on the mercy seat in the tabernacle and in the Temple of Solomon; but not in Zerubbabels temple, for it was one of the five particulars which the Jews reckon to have been wanting in the second Temple (Castell, Lexic. s.v.; Prideaux, Connect. 1, 138).

1. Rabbinical import. — The use of the term is first found in the Targums, where it forms a frequent periphrasis for God, considered as dwelling among the children of Israel, and is thus used, especially by Onkelos, to avoid ascribing corporeity to God himself, as Castell tells us, and may be compared to the analogous periphrasis so frequent in the Targum of Jonathan, “the Word of the Lord.” Many Christian writers have thought that this threefold expression for the Deity the Lord, the Word of the Lord, and the Shechinah indicates the knowledge of a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and accordingly, following some Rabbinical writers, identify the Shechinah with the Holy Spirit. Others, however, deny this (Calmet, Dict. of the Bible; Saubert [Joh.], On the Logos, § 19, in Critic. Sacr.; Glass, Philolog. acr. v, 1; 7, etc.).  Without stopping to discuss this question, it will not conduce to give an accurate knowledge of the use of the term Shechinah by the Jews themselves if we produce a few of the most striking passages in the Targums where it occurs. In Exo 25:8, where the Hebrew has “Let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell (וְשָׁכִנְתַּי) among them,” Onkelos has “I will make my Shechinah to dwell among them.” In 29:45, 46, for the Hebrew “I will dwell among the children of Israel,” Onkelos has “I will make my Shechinah to dwell,” etc. In Psa 74:2, for “this Mount Zion wherein thou hast dwelt” the Targum has “wherein thy Shechinah hath dwelt.” In the description of the dedication of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 8:12-13) the Targum of Jonathan runs thus: “The Lord is:pleased to make his Shechinah dwell in Jerusalem.

I have built the house of the sanctuary for the house of thy Shechinah forever,” where it should be noticed that in 1Ki 8:13 the Hebrew שָׁכִןis not used, but זְכֻלand יָשִׁב. In 1Ki 6:13, for the Hebrew “I will dwell among the children of Israel” Jonathan has “I will make my Shechinah dwell,” etc. In Isa 6:5 he has the combination “the glory of the Shechinah of the King of ages, the Lord of hosts;” and in the next verse he paraphrases “from off the altar” by “from before his Shechinah on the throne, of glory in the lofty heavens that are above the altar” (comp. also Num 5:3; Num 35:34, Psa 68:17-18; Psa 135:21; Isa 33:5; Isa 57:15; Joe 3:17; Joe 3:21, and numerous other passages). On the other hand, it should be noticed that the Targums never render “the cloud” or “the glory” by Shechinah, but by עֲנָנָאand יְקָרָה, and an that even in such passages as Exo 24:16-17; Num 9:17-18; Num 9:22; Num 10:12, neither the mention of the cloud nor the constant use of the verb שָׁכִןin the Hebrew provokes any reference to the Shechinah. Hence, as regards the use of the word Shechinah in the Targums it may be defined as a periphrasis for God whenever he is said to dwell on Zion among Israel or between the .cherubims, and so on, in order, as before said, to avoid the slightest approach to materialism. Far most frequently this term is introduced when the verb שָׁכִן occurs in the Hebrew text; but occasionally, as in some of the above-cited instances, where it does not, but where the paraphrast wished to interpose an abstraction corresponding to presence to break the bolder anthropopathy of the Hebrew writer.

Our view of the Targumistic notion of the Shechinah would not be complete if we did not add that, though, as we have seen, the Jews  reckoned the Shechinah among the marks of the divine favor which were wanting to the second Temple, they manifestly expected the return of the Shechinah in the days of the Messiah. Thus Hag 1:8, “Build the house, and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified,” saith the Lord is paraphrased by Jonathan “I will cause my Shechinah to dwell in it in glory.” Zec 2:10, “Lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord” is paraphrased “I will be revealed, and will cause my Shechinah to dwell in the midst of thee;” and 8:3, “I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem,” is paraphrased “I will make my Shechinah dwell in the midst of Jerusalem;” and, lastly, in Eze 43:7; Eze 43:9, in the vision of the return of the glory of God to the Temple, Jonathan paraphrases thus: “Son of man, this is the place of the house of the throne of my glory, and this is the place of the house of the dwelling of my Shechinah, where I will make my Shechinah dwell in the midst of the children of Israel forever.... Now let them cast away their idols,... and I will make my Shechinah dwell in the midst of them forever” (comp. Isa 4:5, where the return of the pillar of cloud by day and fire by night is foretold as to take place in the days of the Messiah).

The rabbins affirm that the Shechinah first resided in the tabernacle prepared by Moses in the wilderness, into which it descended on the day of its cohnsecratio in in the figure of a cloud. It passed thence into the sanctuary of Solomon's Temple on the day of its dedication by this prince, where it continued till the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Chaldmeans, and was not afterwards seen there.

2. Biblical History. — As regards the visible manifestation of the Divine Presence dwelling among: the Israelites to which the term Shechinah has attached itself, the idea which the different accounts in Scripture convey is that of a most brilliant and glorious light enveloped in a cloud, and usually concealed by the cloud so that the cloud itself was for the most part alone visible; but on particular occasions the glory (in Heb. כְּבוֹד י, in Chald. יַקִר י) appeared. Thus, at the Exodus, “the Lord went before” the Israelites “by day in a pillar of cloud... and by night, in a pillar of fire to give them light.” Again, we read that this pillar “was a cloud and darkness” to the Egyptians, “but it gave light by night” to the Israelites. But in the morning watch “the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians” — i.e. as Philo (quoted by Patrick) explains it, “the fiery appearance of the  Deity shone forth from the cloud,” and by its amazing brightness confounded them. So, too, in the Pirke Eliezer it is said, “The blessed God appeared in his glory upon the sea, and it fled back,” with which Patrick compares Psa 77:16, “The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid,” where the Targum has “They saw thy Shechinah in the midst of the waters.” In Exo 19:9, “the Lord said to Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud,” and accordingly in Exo 19:16 we read that “a thick cloud” rested “upon the mount,” and in Exo 19:18 that “Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire.” This is further explained in 24:16, where we read that “the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it (i.e. as Aben-Ezra explains it, the glory) six days.” But upon the seventh day, when the Lord called “ unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud,” there was a breaking forth of the glory through the cloud, for “the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel” (Exo 19:17).

So, again, when God, as it were, took possession of the Tabernacle at its first completion (40:34,35), “the cloud covered the tent of the congregation (externally), and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle (within), and Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation” (rather, of meeting); just as at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 8:10-11) “the cloud filled the house of the Lord so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.” In the tabernacle, however, as in the Temple, this was only a temporary state of things, for throughout the books of Leviticus and Numbers we find Moses constantly entering into the tabernacle. When he did so, the cloud which rested over it externally, dark by day and luminous at night (Num 9:15-16), came down and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses inside, “face to face, as a man talketh with his friend” (Exo 33:7-11). It was on such occasions that Moses “heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of testimony, from between the two cherubim” (Num 7:89), in accordance with Exo 25:22; Lev 16:2. But it does not appear that the glory was habitually seen either by Moses or the people. Occasionally, however, it flashed forth from the cloud which concealed it, as Exo 16:7; Exo 16:10; Lev 9:6; Lev 9:23, when “the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people” according to a previous promise, or as Num 14:10; Num 16:19; Num 16:42; Num 20:6, suddenly to strike terror in the people in their rebellion. The last occasion on which the glory of the Lord  appeared was that mentioned in 20:6, when they were in Hadesh in the fortieth year of the Exodus, and murmured for want of water; and the last express mention of the cloud as visibly present over the tabernacle is in Deu 31:15, just before the death of Moses. The cloud had not been mentioned before since the second year of the Exodus (Num 10:11; Num 10:34; Num 12:5; Num 12:10); but as the description in Exo 9:15-23; Exo 40:38, relates to the whole time of their wanderings in the wilderness, we may conclude that, at all events, the cloud visibly accompanied them through all the migrations mentioned in Numbers 33 till they reached the plains of Moab and till Moses died. From this time we have no mention whatever in the history either of the cloud, or of the glory, or of the voice from between the cherubim, till the dedication of Solomon's Temple. But since it is certain that the ark was still the special symbol of God's presence and power (Jos 3:4; Jos 3:6; 1 Samuel 4; Psa 68:1 sq.; comp. with Num 10:35; Psa 132:8; Psa 80:1; Psa 99:1), and since such passages as 1Sa 4:4; 1Sa 4:21-22; 2Sa 6:2; Psa 99:7; 2Ki 19:15, seem to imply the continued manifestation of God's presence in the cloud between the cherubim, and inasmuch as Lev 16:2 seemed to promise so much, and as more general expressions, such as Psa 9:11; Psa 132:7-8; Psa 132:13-14; Psa 76:2; Isa 8:18, etc., thus acquire much more point, we may perhaps conclude that the cloud did continue, though with shorter or longer interruptions, to dwell between “the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy seat” until the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar.

The allusions in the New Test. to the Shechinah are not unfrequent. Thus, iii the account of the nativity, the words “Lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them” (Luk 2:9), followed by the apparition of “the multitude of the heavenly host,” recall the appearance of the divine glory on Sinai, when “He shined forth from Paran, and came with ten thousands of saints” (Deu 33:2; comp. Psa 68:17; Act 7:53; Heb 2:2; Eze 43:2). The “God of glory” (Act 7:2; Act 7:55), “the cherubim of glory” (Heb 9:5), “the glory” (Rom 9:4), and other like passages, are distinct references to the manifestations of the glory in the Old Test. It appeared at the baptism and-transfiguration of Jesus, and is called the excellent glory by Peter (2Pe 2:10). When we read in Joh 1:14 that “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμϊvν), and we beheld his glory;” or in 2Co 12:9 “that the power of  Christ may rest upon me” (ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ᾿ ἐμέ); or in Rev 21:3, “Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them” (ἡ σκηνή τοῦ Θεοῦ ... καὶ σκηνώσει μετ᾿ αὐτῶν), we have not only references to the Shechinah (the Greek σκηνή being itself, perhaps, an echo of the Heb. שָׁכִן, shakan), but are distinctly taught to connect it with the incarnation and future coming of Messiah, as type with antitype. Nor can it be doubted that the constant connection of the second advent with a cloud; or clouds, and attendant angels points in the same direction (Mat 26:64; Luk 21:27; Act 1:9; Act 1:11; 2Th 1:7-8; Rev 1:7).

It should also be specially noticed that the attendance of angels is usually associated with the Shechinah. These are most frequently called (Ezekiel 10, 11) cherubim; but sometimes, as in Isaiah 6, seraphim (comp. Rev 4:7-8). In Exo 14:19 “the angel of God” is spoken of in connection with the cloud, and in Deu 33:2 the descent upon Sinai is described as being “with ten thousands of saints” (comp. Psa 68:17; Zec 14:5). The predominant association, however, is with the cherubim, of which the golden cherubim on the mercy seat were the representation. This gives forces to the interpretation that has been put upon Gen 3:24 (Jerus, Targum) as being the earliest notice of the Shechinah, under the symbol of a pointed flame, dwelling between the cherubim, and constituting that local presence of the Lord from which Cain went forth, and before which the worship of Adam and succeeding patriarchs was performed (see Hale, Chronol. 2:94; Smith, Sacr. Annal. 1, 173, 176, 177). Parkhurst went so far as to imagine a tabernacle containing the cherubim and the glory all the time from Adam to Moses (Heb. Lex. p. 623). It is, however, pretty certain that the various appearances to Abraham and that to Moses in the bush were manifestations of the Divine Majesty similar to those later ones to which the term Shechinah is applied (see especially Act 7:2).

3. From the tenor of these texts it is evident that the Most High, whose essence no man hath seen or can see, was pleased anciently to manifest himself to the eyes of men by an external visible symbol. As to the precise nature of the phenomenon thus exhibited we can only say that it appears to have been a concentrated; glowing brightness, a preternatural splendor, an effulgent something, which was appropriately expressed by the term “glory;” but whether in philosophical strictness it was material or immaterial it is probably impossible to determine. A luminous object of this  description seems intrinsically the most appropriate symbol of that Being of whom, perhaps in allusion to this very mode of manifestation, it is said that “he is light” and that “he dwelleth in light unapproachable, and full of glory.” The presence of such a sensible representation of Jehovah seems to be absolutely necessary in order to harmonize what is frequently said of “seeing God” with the truth of his nature as an incorporeal and essentially invisible spirit. While we are told in one place that “no man hath seen God at any time,” we are elsewhere informed that Moses and Aaron and the seventy elders “saw the God of Israel” when called up to the summit of the holy mount. So, also, Isaiah says of himself (6:1, 5) that “in the year that king Uzziah died he saw the Lord sitting upon his throne,” and that, in consequence, he cried out, “I am undone; for mine eyes have seen the Lord of hosts.” In these cases it is obvious that the object seen was not God in his essence, but some external, visible symbol which, because it stood for God, is called by his name.

But of all these ancient recorded theophanies the most signal and illustrious was undoubtedly that which was vouchsafed in the pillar of cloud that guided the march of the children of Israel through the wilderness on their way to Canaan. A correct view of this subject clothes it at once with a sanctity and grandeur which seldom appear from the naked letter of the narrative. There can be little doubt that the columnar cloud was the seat of the Shechinah. We have already seen that the term shechinizing is applied to the abiding of the cloud on the summit of the mountain (Exo 24:16). Within the towering aerial mass, we suppose, was enfolded the inner effulgent brightness to which the appellation “glory of the Lord” more properly belonged, and which was only occasionally disclosed. In several instances in which God would indicate his anger to his people it is said that they looked to the cloud and beheld the “glory of the Lord” (Num 14:10; Num 16:19; Num 16:42). So when he would inspire a trembling awe of his majesty at the giving of the law, it is said the “glory of the Lord appeared as a devouring fire” on the summit of the mount. Nor must the fact be forgotten in this connection that when Nadab and Abihu, the two sons of Aaron, offended by strange fire in their offerings, a fatal flash from the cloudy pillar instantaneously extinguished their lives. The evidence would seem, then, to be conclusive that this wondrous pillar-cloud was the seat or throne of the Shechinah, the visible representative of Jehovah dwelling in the midst of his people, See Anon. De שכינה(Jen. 1720); Lowman. On the Shechinah; Taylor Letters of Ben-Mordecai; Skinner,  Dissertation on the Shechinah (in Works, vol. 2); Watts, Glory of Christ; Upham, On the Logos; Bash, Notes on Exodus; Tenison, On Idolatry; Fleming, Christology; Patrick, Commentary on Exodus; Buxtorf, Hist. Arc. Fed. ch. 11; Wells, The Shechniath (in Help for Understanding the Scripture, p. 4); (Am.) Evang. Review, Jan. 1860. SEE CHERUB; SEE CLOUD; SEE PILLAR.

## Shedd, William[[@Headword:Shedd, William]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Mount Vernon, N.H., in 1798, graduated at Dartmouth College in 1819, and ordained an evangelist in 1823. He was minister for one year at Abington, Mass., where he died in 1830. He wrote Letters to W.E. Channing on the Existence and Agency of Fallen Spirits, by Canonicus (Boston, 1828, 8vo).

## Sheddan, Samuel Sharon, D.D.[[@Headword:Sheddan, Samuel Sharon, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Northumberland County, Pa., Sept. 13, 1810. His ancestors came from Scotland and settled on the Susquehanna River in that county, where the homestead of his family remains. He was prepared for college in the Milton Academy, Pa. He entered Jefferson College in 1830, and graduated therefrom in two years. He afterwards pursued his theological studies in Princeton Seminary, and was licensed to preach in the fall of 1834. The first fifteen years of his ministry were spent in connection with the churches of Williamsport, Murray, and Warrior Run, the latter place being the home of Dr. Sheddan's childhood. His father and grandfather were ruling elders in this Church. From Warrior Run he was unanimously called to the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church of Rahway, N.J. The life of Dr. Sheddan was a most laborious and useful one. During his ministry at Warrior Run he united the office of teacher with that of pastor, and, by unremitting toil, carried on successfully both his school and his Church. From among the young men he prepared for college, more than a dozen became ministers of the Gospel. He was a wise counsellor and warm friend of the young men studying for the ministry. He was eminently judicious as an adviser in the matter of new Church enterprises in the bounds of the Presbytery of Elizabeth, and his services will be held in grateful remembrance. Dr. Sheddan remained as pastor of the Rahway Church twenty-two years. The position he held among his ministerial brethren in the community where he labored and throughout the State of New Jersey is shown by the profound  impression produced by his death, and the tribute of respect paid to his memory by the synod then in session, which appointed a committee to attend his funeral. He was for several years one of the directors of the Princeton Theological Seminary. He died in Rahway, N.J., Oct. 18, 1874. (W.P.S.)

## Shedeur[[@Headword:Shedeur]]

             (Heb. Shedeur', שְׁדֵיאוּר, darter of light; Sept. Σεδιούρ v.r. Εδιούρ), father of Elizur, which latter was chief of the tribe of Reuben at the time of the Exode (Num 1:5; Num 2:10; Num 7:30; Num 7:35; Num 10:18). B.C. ante 1658.

## Sheep[[@Headword:Sheep]]

             The following Hebrew words occur as the names of sheep: צֹאן, tson (varieties צְאוֹןtseon, צֹנֵא, tsone, or צֹנֶה, tsoneh), a collective noun to denote “a flock of sheep or goats,” to which is opposed the noun of unity, שֶׂה, seh, “a sheep” or “a goat,” joined to a masculine where “rams” or “he- goats” are signified, and with a feminine when “ewes” or “she-goats” are meant, though, even in this case sometimes to a masculine (as in Gen 31:10): אִיַל, dyil, “a ram;” רָחֵל, rachel, “a ewe;” כֶּבֶשׂ, keseb, or כֶּשֶׂב, keseb (fem. כַּשְׂבָּה, or כַּבְשָׂה), “a lamb,” or rather “a sheep of a year old or above,” opposed to טָלֶה, taleh, “a sucking or very young lamb;” כִּר, kar, is another term applied to a lamb as it skips (כָּרִר) in the pastures. The Chald. אַמִּר, immar (Ezr 6:9; Ezr 6:17; Ezr 7:17), is a later word, apparently indicating lambs intended for sacrifice, while עִתּוּד, attud, rendered “ram” in Genesis 31 signifies a he-goat. SEE EWE; SEE LAMB; SEE RAM.

The term קְשַׂיטָה, kesitah (literally something weighed out, A.V. “piece of money,” Gen 33:19; Job 42:11; “piece of silver,” Jos 24:32), has been supposed by many to denote a coin stamped with the figure of a lamb; but Gesenius suggests (Thesaur. p. 1241) that specimens of that sort are probably only those of Cyprus, which bore that mark. SEE KESITAH.

This well known domestic animal has, from the earliest period, contributed to the wants of mankind. Sheep were an important part of the possessions of the ancient Hebrews and of Eastern nations generally. The first mention of sheep occurs in Gen 4:2. The following are the principal Biblical allusions to these animals. They were used in the sacrificial offerings, both the adult animal (Exo 20:24; 1Ki 8:63; 2Ch 29:33) and the lamb, כֵּבֵשׁ, i.e. “a male from one to three years old;” but young lambs of the first year were more generally used in the offerings (see Exo 29:38; Lev 9:3; Lev 12:6; Num 28:9, etc.). No lamb under eight days old was allowed to be killed (Lev 22:27). A very young lamb was called טִלֶה. taleh (see 1Sa 7:9; Isa 65:25). Sheep and lambs formed an important article of food (1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 1:19; 1Ki 4:23; Psalm 64:11; etc.), and ewe's milk is associated with that of the cow (Isa 7:21; Isa 7:23). The wool was used as clothing (Lev 13:47; Deu 22:11; Pro 31:13; Job 31:20, etc.). SEE WOOL.

Trumpets may have been made of the horns of rams (Jos 6:4), though the rendering of the A.V. in this passage is generally thought to be incorrect. “Rams' skins dyed red” were used as a covering for the tabernacle (Exo 25:5). Sheep and lambs were sometimes paid as tribute (2Ki 3:4). It is very striking to notice the immense numbers of sheep that were reared in Palestine in Biblical times: see, for instance, 1Ch 5:21; 2Ch 15:11; 2Ch 30:24; 2Ki 3:4; Job 42:12. Especial mention is made of the sheep of Bozrah (Mic 2:12; Isa 34:6), in the land of Edom, a district well suited for pasturing sheep. “Bashan and Gilead” are also mentioned as pastures (Mic 7:14). “Large parts of Carmel, Bashaul, and Gilead,” says Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 304), “are at their proper seasons alive with countless flocks” (see also p. 331). “The flocks of Kedar” and “the rams of Nebaioth,” two sons of Ishmael (Gen 25:13) that settled in Arabia, are referred to in Isa 60:7. Sheep shearing is alluded to in Gen 31:19; Gen 38:13; Deu 15:19; 1Sa 25:4; Isa 53:7; etc. Sheep dogs were employed in Biblical times, as is evident from Job 30:1, “the dogs of my flock.” From the manner in which they are spoken of by the patriarch it is clear, as Thomson (ibid. 1, 301) well observes, that the Oriental shepherd dogs were very different animals from the sheep dogs of our own land. The existing breed are described as being “a mean, sinister, ill-conditioned generation, which are kept at a distance, kicked  about, and half starved, with nothing noble or attractive about them.” They were, however, without doubt, useful to the shepherds, more especially at night, in keeping off the wild beasts that prowled about the hills and valleys (comp. Theocrit. Id. 5, 106). Shepherds in Palestine and the East generally go before their flocks, which they induce to follow by calling to them (comp. Joh 10:4; Psa 77:20; Psa 80:1), though they also drove them (Gen 33:13). SEE SHEPHERD.

It was usual among the ancient Jews to give names to sheep and goats, as we do to our dairy cattle (see Joh 10:3). This practice prevailed among the ancient Greeks (see Theocrit. Id. 5, 103): Οὐκ ἀπὸ τᾶς δρυὸς ο῏υτος ὁ Κώμαρος, § τε Κυναίδα; The following quotation from Hartley (Researches in Greece and the Levant, p. 321) is so strikingly illustrative of the allusions in Joh 10:1-16 that we cannot do better than quote it: “Having had my attention directed last night to the words in Joh 10:3, I asked my man if it was usual in Greece to give names to the sheep. He informed me that it was, and that the sheep obeyed the shepherd when he called them by their names. This morning I had an opportunity of verifying the truth of this remark. Passing by a flock of sheep, I asked the shepherd the same question which I had put to the servant, and he gave me the same answer. I then bade him call one of his sheep; he did so, and it instantly left its pasturage and its companions and ran up to the hands of the shepherd with signs of pleasure and with a prompt obedience which I had never before observed in any other animal. It is also true in this country that a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him. The shepherd told me that many of his sheep were still wild, that they had not yet learned their names, but that by teaching them they would all learn them.” See also Thomson (1, 301): “The shepherd calls sharply from time to time to remind the sheep of his presence. They know his voice and follow on; but if a stranger call, they stop short, lift up their heads in alarm, and if it is repeated they turn and flee, because they know not the voice of a stranger.” Henderson, in Iceland, notices a shepherdess with a flock of fifty sheep, every one of which she professed to know by name (Iceland, 1, 189).

Domestic sheep, although commonly regarded as the progeny of one particular wild species, are probably an instance, among many similar, where the wisdom of Providence has provided subsistence for man in different regions by bestowing the domesticating and submissive instincts  upon the different species of animals which the human family might find in their wanderings; for it is certain that even the American argali can be rendered tractable, and that the Corsican musmon will breed with the common sheep. The normal animal, from which all or the greater part of the Western domestic races are assumed to be descended, is still found wild in the high mountain regions of Persia, and is readily distinguished from two other wild species bordering on the same region. What breeds the earliest shepherd tribes reared in and about Palestine can now be only inferred from negative characters; yet they are sufficient to show that they were the same, or nearly so, as the common horned. variety of Egypt and continental Europe: in general white, and occasionally black, although there was on the Upper Nile a speckled race; and so early as the time of Aristotle the Arabians possessed a rufous breed, another with a very long tail, and, above all, a broad-tailed sheep, which at present is commonly denominated the Syrian. These three varieties are said to be of African origin, the red hairy in particular having all the characteristics to mark its descent from the wild Ovis tragelaphus or barbatus, or kebsh of the Arabian and Egyptian mountains. Flocks of the ancient breed, derived from the Bedawin, are now extant in Syria, with little or no change in external characters, chiefly the broad-tailed and the common horned white, often with black and white about the face and feet, the tail somewhat thicker and longer than the European.

The sheep of Syria and Palestine are the broad-tail (Ovis laticaudatus), and a variety of the common sheep of this country (Ovis aries) called the Bidowin, according to Russell (Aleppo, 2, 147). The broad-tailed kind has long been reared in Syria. Aristotle, who lived more than 2000 years ago, expressly mentions Syrian sheep with tails a cubit wide. This or another variety of the species is also noticed by Herodotus (3, 113) as occurring in Arabia. The fat tail of the sheep is probably alluded to in Lev 3:9; Lev 7:3, etc, as the fat and the whole rump that was to be taken off hard: by the backbone, and was to be consumed on the altar. “The carcass of one of these sheep, without including the head, feet, entrails, and skin, generally weighs from fifty to sixty pounds, of which the tail makes up fifteen pounds; but some of the largest breed, that have been fattened with care, will sometimes weigh 150 pounds, the tail alone composing a third of the whole weight. This tail — a broad and fiatish appendage — has the appearance of a large and loose mass of flesh or fat upon the rump and  about the root of the tail; and from the odd motion which it receives when the animal walks one would suppose it connected to the animals' body only by the skin with which it is covered.” In the Egyptian variety this tail is quite pendulous and broad throughout, but in the Syrian variety the tail harrows almost to a point towards the end, and the extremity is turned tip. This is a great convenience to the animal. The sheep of the extraordinary size mentioned before are very rare, and usually kept in yards, so that they are in little danger of injuring the tail as they walk. But in the fields, in order to prevent injury from the bushes, the shepherds in several places of Syria fix a thin piece of board on the under part (which is not, like the rest, covered with wool), and to this board small wheels are sometimes added.... The tail is entirely composed of a substance between marrow and fat, serving very often in the kitchen in the place of butter, and, cut into small pieces, makes an ingredient in various dishes;, when the animal is young it is little inferior to the best marrow” (Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 306; see also Thomson, ut sup. 1, 178).

The whole passage in Genesis 30 which bears on the subject of Jacob's stratagem with Laban's sheep is involved in considerable perplexity, and Jacob's conduct in this matter has been severely and uncompromisingly condemned by some writers. We touch upon the question briefly in its zoological bearing. It is altogether impossible to account for the complete success which attended Jacob's device of setting peeled rods before the ewes and she-goats as they came to drink in the watering troughs, on natural grounds. The Greek fathers, for the most part, ascribe the result to the direct operation of the Deity, whereas Jerome and the Latin fathers regard it as a mere natural operation of the imagination, adducing as illustrations in point various devices that have been resorted to by the ancients in the cases of mares, asses, etc., (see Oppian, Cyyneg. 1, 327, 357; Pliny, H.N. 7, 10, and the passages from Quintilian, Hippocrates, and Galen, as cited by Jerome, Grotius, and Bochart). None of the instances cited by Jerome and others are exact parallels with that in question. The quotations adduced, with the exception of those which speak of painted images set before Spartan women inter concipiendum, refer to cases in which living animals themselves, and not reflections of inanimate objects, were the cause of some marked peculiarity in the fetus. Rosenmuller, however (Schol. ad. loc.), cites Hastfeer (De Re Oviria, German version p.17, 30, 43, 46, 47) as a writer by whom the contrary opinion is  confirmed. Even granting the general truth of these instances, and acknowledging the curious effect which peculiar sights through some nervous influence do occasionally produce in the fetus of many animals, yet we must agree with the Greek fathers and ascribe the production of Jacob's spotted sheep and goats to divine agency.

The whole question has been carefully considered by Nitschmann (De Corylo Jacobi, in Thes. Nov. Theol. Phil. 1, 202-206), from whom we quote the following passage: “Fatemur itaque, cum Vossio aliisque piis viris, illam pecudum imaginationem tantum fuisse causam adjuvantem, ac plus in hoc negotio divinae tribuendum esse virtuti, quae suo concursu sic debilem, causae secundae vim adauxit ut quod ea sola secundum naturam praestare non valeret id divina benedictione supra naturam praestaret;” and then Nitschmann cites the passage in Gen 31:5-13, where Jacob expressly states that his success was due to divine interference; for it is hard to believe that Jacob is here uttering nothing but a tissue of falsehoods, which appears to be the opinion of Kalisch (Hist. and Crit. Comment. Genesis 30, 31), who represents the patriarch as “unblushingly executing frauds suggested by his fertile invention, and then abusing the authority of God in covering or justifying them. “We are aware that still graver difficulty in the minds of some persons remains, if the above explanation be adopted; but we have no other alternative, for, as Patrick has observed, “let any shepherd now try this device, and he will not find it do what it did then by a divine operation.” The greater difficulty alluded to is the supposing that God would have directly interfered to help Jacob to act fraudulently towards his uncle. But are we quite sure that there was any fraud fairly called such in the matter? Had Jacob not been thus aided, he might have remained the dupe of Laban's niggardly conduct all his days. He had served his money loving uncle faithfully for fourteen years. Laban confesses his cattle had increased considerably under Jacob's management, but all the return he got was unfair treatment and a constant desire on the part of Laban to strike a hard bargain with him (Gen 31:7).

God vouchsafed to deliver Jacob out of the hands of his hard master, and to punish Laban for his cruelty, which he did by pointing out to Jacob how he could secure to himself large flocks and abundant cattle. God was only helping Jacob to obtain that which justly belonged to him, but which Laban's rapacity refused to grant. “Were it lawful,” says Stackhouse, “for any private person to make reprisals, the injurious treatment Jacob had received from Laban, both in imposing a wife upon him and prolonging his servitude without wages, was enough to give him both the provocation and  the privilege to do so. God Almighty, however, was pleased to take the determination of the whole matter into his own hands.” This seems to us the best way of understanding this disputed subject.

The relation of the sheep to man, in a pastoral country, gave rise to many beautiful symbols and interesting illustrations. Jehovah was the shepherd of his people, and Israel was his flock (Psa 23:1; Psa 80:1; Psa 79:13; Isa 40:11; Jer 23:1-2; Ezekiel 34, and often elsewhere); the apostasy of sinners from God is the straying of a lost sheep (Psa 119:176; Isa 53:6; Jer 50:6); and the ever-blessed Son of God coming down to our world is a shepherd seeking his sheep which were lost (Luk 15:4-6). He is the only shepherd; all who do not own him are thieves and robbers (Joh 10:8); wolves in sheep's clothing (Mat 7:15). He is the good shepherd, who gave his life for the sheep (Joh 10:11); and now he gives them his own life in resurrection, and this is eternal life (Joh 10:28; Rom 6:9-11; Col 2:12). As the sheep is an emblem of meekness, patience, and submission, it is expressly mentioned as typifying these quantities in the person of our blessed Lord (Isa 53:7; Act 2:32, etc.).

In the vision of the prophet Daniel, recorded in ch. 8, the Medo-Persian monarchy was seen under the figure of a ram with two unequal horns, which was overthrown by a one-horned he goat, representing the Macedonian power. We have already remarked on the propriety of the latter symbol SEE GOAT, and the former is no less correct. There is abundant evidence that the ram was accepted as the national emblem by the Persian people, as the he goat was by the Macedonians. Ammianus Marcellinus states that the king of Persia wore a ram's head of gold set with precious stones, instead of a diadem. The type of a ram is seen on ancient Persian coins, as on one of undoubted genuineness in Hunter's collection, in which the obverse is a ram's head and the reverse a ram couchant. Rams' heads, with horns of unequal height, are still to be seen sculptured on the pillars of Persepolis.

## Sheep Market[[@Headword:Sheep Market]]

             (Joh 5:2). The word “market” is an interpolation of our translators, possibly after Luther who has Schafhaus. The words of the original are ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ, to which should probably be supplied not market, but gate (πυλῇ), as in the Sept. version of the passages in Nehemiah quoted in the foregoing article (q.v.). The Vulgate connects the προβατική with the  κολυμβήθρα and reads Probatica piscina; while the Syriac omits all mention of the sheep and names only a place of baptism.

## Sheep Master[[@Headword:Sheep Master]]

             (נֹקֵד, noked), properly a shepherd (q.v.) or sheep breeder (2Ki 3:4); hence a “herdsman” in general (Amo 1:1)

## Sheep shearer[[@Headword:Sheep shearer]]

             (ָֹגּזֵז gozez, 2Sa 13:23-24; fully with צאן tson, added, Gen 33:12). The time of sheep shearing was, among the Hebrews, a season of great festivity (Gen 31:19; 1Sa 5:4; 2Sa 13:23-28; 2Ki 10:12; 2Ki 10:14; Isa 53:7).

## Sheepcote (Or Sheepfold)[[@Headword:Sheepcote (Or Sheepfold)]]

             is designated by several Heb. terms נָוֶה, naveh (a habitation or dwelling place, as usually rendered, “sheepcote,” 2Sa 7:8 1Ch 17:1; “fold,” Isa 65:10; Jer 23:3; Eze 34:14;  “stable,” exe 25:5), means, in a general sense, a place where flocks repose and feed; and, as the Orientals do not usually fold their flocks at night, it must be left to the context to determine whether we are to understand “pastures” or “sheepfolds.” A more distinctive term is גְּדֵרָה, gederah, an enclosure, “cote” (1Sa 24:3; “fold,” Num 32:16; Num 32:24; Num 32:36; Zep 2:6; elsewhere “hedge” or “wall”), which means a built pen or safe structure, such as adjoins buildings, and used for cattle as well as sheep. Special terms are מַכְלָה, miklah (a pen for flocks; “fold,”  Psa 78:70; Hab 3:17), and מַשְׁפְּתִיַ, mishpethayim (the dual form of which indicates double rows, as of stalls for cattle or sheep; “sheepfolds,” Judges 16; “two burdens,” Gen 49:14). It is to be observed that the Oriental flocks, when they belong to nomads, are constantly kept in the open country, without being folded at night. This is also the case when the flocks belonging to a settled people are sent out to feed, to a distance of perhaps one, two, or three days' journey in the deserts or waste lands where they possess or claim a right of pasturage.

This seems to have been the case with the flocks fed by David. As such flocks are particularly exposed to the predatory attacks of the regular nomads, who consider the flocks of a settled people as more than even usually fair prey, and contest their right to pasture in the deserts, the shepherds, when they are in a district particularly liable to danger from this cause, or from the attacks of wild beasts, and doubt whether themselves and their dogs can afford adequate protection, drive their flocks at night into caves, or, where there are none, into uncovered enclosures, which have been erected for the purpose at suitable distances. These are generally of rude construction, but are sometimes high and well-built enclosures or towers (generally round) which are impregnable to any force of the depredators when once the flock is within them. Such towers also occur in districts where there are only small dispersed settlements and villages, and serve the inhabitants not only for the protection of their flocks, but as fortresses in times of danger, in which they deposit their property, and, perhaps, when the danger is imminent, their females and children. When no danger is apprehended or none from which the protection of the shepherds and dogs is not sufficient, the flocks are only folded when collected to be shorn. They are then kept in a walled, but still uncovered, enclosure, partly to keep them together, but still more under the impression that the sweating and evaporation which result from their being crowded together previously to shearing improve the quality of the wool.

Those poor  villagers who have no large flocks to send out to the wilderness pastures with a proper appointment of shepherds, but possess a few sheep and cattle which feed during the day in the neighboring commons under the care of children or women and who cannot provide the necessary watch and protection for them at night, drive them home, and either fold them in a common enclosure, such as we have mentioned, in or near the village, or pen them separately near their own dwellings. Pens or cotes of this class serve also for the lambs and calves, while too young to be kept out with the flocks or to be trusted in a common enclosure. They usually are near the dwellings, which are merely huts made of mats on a framework of palm branches these we conceive to answer well to the “tabernacles” (booths), “shepherds' cottages,” and other humbler habitations noticed in Scripture. Such villages are of a class belonging to a people (Arabs) who, like the Israelites, have relinquished the migratory life, but who still give their principal attention to pasturage, and do some little matters in the way of culture. It is possible that the villages of the Hebrews, when they first began to settle in Palestine, were of a very similar description. See Kitto, Pict. Bible, note at 1Ch 17:2.

## Sheepgate[[@Headword:Sheepgate]]

             (שִׁעִר הִצּאֹן, Sha'ar hats-Tson Sept. ἡ πύλη ἡ προβατική; Vulg. Porta gregis), one of the gates of Jerusalem as rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh 3:1; Neh 12:39). It stood between the tower of Meah and the chamber of the corner (3:1, 32) or gate of the guard house (12:39 “prison gate”). It is probably the same with the προβατική of Joh 5:2 placing it at the present St. Stephen's Gate (so also Keil, after Tobler), since no wall existed north of the Temple enclosure nearly as far to the east as that point till after the (death of Christ. SEE JERUSALEM. Barclay locates it in a presumed outer wall beyond the precincts of the Temple the on the east (City of the Great King, p. 116) but it is doubtful whether any such separate wall existed. The adjoining localities would seem to fix it.

## Sheepshanks, William[[@Headword:Sheepshanks, William]]

             a learned English clergyman, was born at Linton, Craven, Yorkshire, March 18, 1740. Educated in the grammar school of his own parish, he was admitted in 1746 to St. John's College, Cambridge. He took the degree of B.A. In January 1766 and in 1767 was elected fellow and took the degree of M.A. In 1771 and 1772 he served the university in the office of moderator. He accepted the rectory of Ovington, Norfolk, in 1773 and having settled in Grassington, he received a limited number of pupils into his house. In 1777 he was presented to the living of Seberham Cumberland in 1783 was appointed to the valuable cure of St. John's Leeds, and in 1792 was collated to a prebend in Lincoln, which he exchanged in 1794, or 1795, for a much more valuable stall at Carlisle. He died at Leeds, July 26, 1816 and was interred in his own church.

## Sheer Thursday[[@Headword:Sheer Thursday]]

             (spelled also Chare, Shere, or Shier) is also known as Maunday , (q.v.) or Shrift Thursday. These are names given in England to the Thursday of Passion Week. It is known in the Romish Church as Quinta Feria Dominica in Ramis Palmarum and its institution is attributed to (Leo II about 682 put the day was observed as early as the 5th century by the celebration of the Lord's supper in connection with the washing of feet. It has had several apellations in allusion to events commemorated or ceremonies observed, such as Dies Coenoe Dominicoe, the Day of the Lord's Supper; Dies Natalis Eucharistioe, the Birthday of the Eucharist;  Natalis Calicis, the Birthday of the Cup; Dies Panis, the Day of Bread; Dies Lucis, the Day of Light, with allusion perhaps to the lights used at the Lord's supper; Dies Viridium, a title of doubtful meaning. It was also called Capitularium, because the heads (capita) of catechumens were washed that day preparatory to baptism. The name given to it in England was derived from the custom of men polling their beards on this day as a token of grief for our Lord's betrayal “for that in old fathers' days the people would that day shere their heedes, and clypp theyr bordes, and pool theyr heedes, and make them honest ayent Easter day.” In Saxony it is called Good Thursday, and in the north of England Kiss-Thursday, in allusion to the Judas kiss. Among the observances of the day were the silence of all bells from this day till Easter eve; the admission of penitents who had been excluded from religious services at the beginning of Lent; and the consecration of the elements by the pope below the altar of the Lateran. Oil for extreme unction, for chrism, and for baptism was consecrated on this day. After vespers on this day two acolytes strip the altars of all their ornaments, and cover them with black trimmings, while in many places the halters are washed wine and water and rubbed with herbs.

## Sheet[[@Headword:Sheet]]

             stands in the A.V. for the Heb. סָדִיןsadin (Jdg 14:12-13; “fine linen,” Pro 31:24; Isa 3:23; comp. σινδών), and the Gr. ὀθόνη (Act 10:11; Act 6:5), which both mean properly a linen cloth; hence the former a shirt (as in the marg. and the latter a sail. SEE LINEN.

## Shegog, William A.[[@Headword:Shegog, William A.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford County, C., Nov. 8, 1821. He professed religion in 1843, was licensed to preach about 1850; and in 1853 was admitted into the Alabama Conference. He located in 1807, was readmitted into the Alabama Conference in 1859, and in 1860 was transferred to the Texas Conference. He labored in Texas until shortly before his death, April 28, 1864. See Minutes of Ann. Conferences of M.E. Ch. South, 864, p. 525.

## Shehariah[[@Headword:Shehariah]]

             (Heb. Shecharyah', שְׁחִרְיָה, dawning of Jehovah; Sept. Σααρίας, v.r. Σαραία and Σααρία), second named of the six sons of Jeroham,  Benjamites residing in Jerusalem at the captivity.(1Ch 8:26). B.C. 588.

## Sheik[[@Headword:Sheik]]

             (Arabic for elder), a title of reverence, applied chiefly to a learned man or a reputed saint, but also used sometimes as an ordinary title of respect, like the European Mr., Herr, etc., before the name. It is, however, only given to a Moslem. The term is also applied to heads of Mohammedan monasteries, and to the higher order of religious preachers. The sheik of Mecca, by virtue of his supposed descent from the prophet, levies a kind of tribute on all the pilgrims to the Kaaba.

## Sheik Al-Gebal[[@Headword:Sheik Al-Gebal]]

             (Ancient of the Mountain) is the name of the prince of the Assassins, or those Israelites of Irak who undertook to assassinate all those whom their chief would pronounce to be his enemies.

## Sheik El-Islam[[@Headword:Sheik El-Islam]]

             one of the titles of the grand mufti of Constantinople, who is president of the Ulema or College of the Professors of the Mohammedan Law. “The title is supposed to have been assumed first by Mohammed II in 1453, when Constantinople became the seat of his empire.

## Sheiri[[@Headword:Sheiri]]

             tutelary spirits of the Caribs, who are the protectors of the male sex among men.

## Shekalim[[@Headword:Shekalim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Shekel[[@Headword:Shekel]]

             [many shek'el] (Heb. shekel, שֶׁקֶל, from שָׁקִלַ, to weigh out), the Hebrew standard of valuation as the cubit was of mensuration. SEE METROLOGY.

I. Scriptural Description. — The shekel was properly a certain weight according to which the quantity and price of things were determined e.g. bread (Eze 4:10); hair (1Sa 14:26), especially metals, as  brass, iron, silver, gold, and articles made of metal, as arms, vessels, etc. (Exo 38:24-25; Exo 38:29; Num 7:13 sq.; Num 31:52; 1Sa 17:5; 1Sa 17:7; Jos 7:21; 1Ch 3:9). Especially did the Hebrews use silver weighed by the shekel as money, and often it was actually weighed out, although they may early have had pieces or bars of silver marked with the weight (Gen 23:16; Lev 5:15; Lev 27:3-7; 2Sa 24:24; Jer 32:9; Jeremiah 10; Eze 21:32). From the common shekel is distinguished the sacred shekel ( שֶׁקֶל הִקּדֶשׁ“shekel of the sanctuary”), somewhat heavier, it would seem, or at least of just and full weight, according to which all contributions and tribute for sacred purposes were to be reckoned (Exo 30:13; Exo 30:24; Exo 38:24; Lev 5:15; Lev 27:3; Lev 27:2; Num 3:47; Num 3:50; Num 7:13; Num 18:16); but whether the shekel of the king's weight ( שֶׁקֶל בְּאֶבֶןהִמֶּלֶךְ2Sa 14:26) is still different, cannot be determined. Nor can the exact weight of the shekel be fully ascertained. The sacred shekel contained twenty gerahs, beans, carrot corns, as some suppose (Exo 30:13; Lev 27:25; Num 3:47; Num 18:16; Eze 45:12).

More to the purpose is the specification of the rabbins that the shekel was equal to 320 barley grains; since this accords tolerably well with the actual weight of the Maccabaean shekels still preserved. In the time of the Maccabees (1Ma 15:6) silver coins were struck, each weighing one shekel, and stamped with the words שקל ישראל, a shekel of Israel (see Bayer, De Nmmis Hebraeo- Samaritanis [Valent. 1781, 4to], p. 171 sq.; Eckhel, Doctr. Numor. Vet. I, 3, 465 sq.), Some of the specimens still extant, though worn by age, weigh 266 or 270 Paris grains; so that the full Maccabaean shekel must have been at least about 274 grains, and thus equivalent to the didrachm of Aegina. Hence the Sept. renders the word sometimes σίκλος, and sometimes δίδραχμον or δίδραχμα. But Josephus and later writers give the value at four Attic drachma (Ant. 3, 8, 2; Hesych. s.v.; Jerome, Ad Ezech. p. 43, ed. Vallars.). In their time, however, the Attic drachma had depreciated and was reckoned as equal to the Roman denarius, i.e. 7 ½ d. sterling, or 15 cents (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 21, 109). The Maccabaean shekel, therefore, may be estimated at 2s. 6d. sterling, or 60 cents. (See Bockh, Metrol. Untersuch. p. 55-57, 62, 63, 2, 99, Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. “Denarius”). Hence the half shekel, which was to be paid yearly to the temple (Exo 38:26), is called δίδραχμον in Mat 17:24. Some suppose that the earlier common shekel was less than the Maccabaean by one half (Bockh, ut. sup. p. 63; Bertheau, Abhandl. p. 26).  At Ephesus a shekel of gold was in use, according to Alexander Aetolus (ap Macrob. Sat. 5, 22). Some understand such a coin in 1Ch 21:25 but the words imply rather weight.

In silver shekels were paid the contributions to the Temple (Exo 30:13), the fines for offenses (Exodus chaps. 21, 22; Deu 22:19; Deu 22:29, Leviticus 5 :l5), taxes exacted by kings or governors (2Ki 15:20; Neh 5:15), the price of articles (2Sa 24:24; 2Ki 7:1), etc. In some cases large sums were weighed together (Gen 23:16, Jer 32:9), though it is certain that there were pieces of different denominations both half and quarter shekels (Exo 30:13; Exo 30:15; 1Sa 9:8-9). In many instances relating to purchases, a word is omitted in the Hebrew, and the rendering is always “a thousand,” or the like, “of silver.” The term “pieces” has been supplied in the A.V., but there is not much doubt that “shekels” is the word understood in all cases. SEE SILVER, PIECE OF.

In Neh 5:15 mention is made of shekels of silver paid to the governors and probably these shekels may have been the silver coin circulating in Persia called σίγλος. This coin has generally been considered a kind of shekel; but as according to Xenophon (Anab. 1, 5, 6), it was equal to 7½ Atitic oboli, and an obolus weighed 11.25 grains (11.25 x 7.5 =84.375), giving a Persian silver coin of 84 grains, it is clear that the σίγλος can have no connection with the σικλος (weighing 220 grains), except in name. (See Leake, Num. Hell. Europe, p. 21; Madden [F.W.], Hist. Jew. Coin. p. 20.) But at this time there were coins also current in Persia of the same standard as the Shekel (Mionnet, Descrip. de Med. 5, 645, No. 30-40; 8, 426, No. 29-33). See also Schickard, De Numis Hebr. p. 15; Bayer, Siclus Sacer et Profan. (Lips. 1667); Iseling, De Siclis Hebroeor. (Basil. 1708) For further information on this question, consult the remarks of the abbe Cavedoni (Le Princ. Quest. la Num. Giud. Definitiv. Decise [Modena, 1864]), Madden (Num. Chron. 5, 191), and Plumptre (Bible Educator 3, 96, sq.). SEE COIN.

II. Extant Specimens. —

1. Rabbinical Notices. — Our attention is, in the first place, directed to the early notices of these shekels in Rabbinical writers. It might be supposed that in the Mishna where one of the treatises bears the title of “Shekalim,” or Shekels, we should find some information on the subject. But this treatise, being devoted to the consideration of the laws relating to the  payment of the half shekel for the Temple, is of course useless for our purpose.

Some references are given to the works of Rashi and Maimonides (contemporary writers of the 12th century) for information relative to shekels and the forms of Hebrew letters in ancient times but the most important Rabbinical quotation given by Bayer is that from Ramban, i.e. Rabbi Moses Bar-Nachman, who lived about the commencement of the 13th century. He describes a shekel which he had seen and of which the Cuthoeans read the inscription with ease. The explanation which they gave of the inscription was, on one side Shekel ha-Shekalim, “The Shekel of Shekels,” and on the other, “Jerusalem the Holy.” The former was doubtless a misinterpretation of the usual inscription, “The shekel of Israel;” but the latter corresponds with the inscription on our shekels (Bayer, a De Tiunis. p. 11). In the 16th century Azarias de Roasst states that R. Moses Basula had arranged a Cuthaean, i.e. Samaritan alphabet from coins, and Moses Alaskar (of whom little is known) is quoted by Baser as having read on some Samaritan coins “In such a year of the consolation of Israel, in such a year of such a king.” The same R. Azarias de Rossi (or de Adumim, as he is called by Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb. 1, 8 in his מאור עיני ם, “The Light of the Eyes” (not Fons Oculorum as Bayer translates it, which would require מעיו, not מאיר), discusses the Transfluvial or Samaritan letters, and describes the above mentioned shekel of Israel, he also determines the weight, which he makes about half an ounce.

We find, therefore that in early times, shekels were known to the Jewish rabbins with Samaritan inscriptions is corresponding with those now found (except one point, which is probably in error), and corresponding with them in weight. These are important considerations in tracing the history of this coinage.

2. Later Notices. — We pass on now to the earliest mention of these shekels by Christian writers. We believe that W. Postell is the first Christian writer who saw and described a shekel. He was a Parisian traveler who visited Jerusalem early in the 16th century. In a curious work published by him in 1538, entitled Alphabetum Duodecim Linguarum, the following passage occurs. After stating that the Samaritan alphabet was the original form of the Hebrew, he proceeds thus:  “I draw this inference from silver coins of great antiquity which I found among the Jews. They set such store by them that I could not get one of them (not otherwise worth a qincunx) from two gold pieces. The Jews say they are of the time of Salomon and they added that, hating the Samaritans, as they do, worse than dogs, and never speaking to them, nothing endears these coins so much to them as the consideration that these characters were once in their common usage, nature, as it were, yearning after the things of old. They say that at Jerusalem, now called Chus or Chussembarich, in the masonry and in the deepest pit of the ruins, these coins are dug up daily.”

Postell gives them a very bad wood cut of one of these shekels, but the inscription is correct. He was unable to explain the letters over the vase, which soon became the subject of a discussion among the learned men of Europe, that lasted for nearly two centuries. Their attempts to explain them are enumerated by Bayer in his treatise De Nummis Hebroeo-Samaritanis, which may be considered as the first work which placed the explanation of these coins on a satisfactory basis. But it would obviously be useless here to record so many unsuccessful guesses as Bayer enumerates.

The work of Bayer, although some of the authors nearly solved the problem, called forth an antagonist in Prof. Tychsen, of Rostock, a learned Orientalist of that period. Several publications between them which it is unnecessary to enumerate, as Tychsen gave a summary of his objections in a small pamphlet entitled O.G. Tychsen De Numis Hebraicis Diatribe qua sinul ad Nuperas ill F.P. Bayerii Objectiones Respondetur (Rostochii, 1791). His first position is, that (1) either all the coins, whether with Hebrew or Samaritan inscriptions are false or (2) if any are genuine, they belong to Bar-cocheba (p. 6) This he modifies slightly in a subsequent part of the treatise (p. 52, 53), where he states it to be his conclusion (1) that the Jews had no coined money before the time of our Savior; (2) that during the rebellion of Bar-cocheba (or Bar-coziba.), Samaritan money was coined either by the Samaritans to please the Jews, or by the Jews to please the Samaritans, and that the Samaritan letters were used in order to make the coins desirable amulets and (3) that the coins attributed to Simon Maccabaeus belong to this period. Tychsen has quoted some curious passages, but his arguments are wholly untenable. In the first place, no numismatist can doubt the genuineness of the shekels attributed to Simon Maccabaeus, or believe that they belong to the same epoch as the coins of Bar-cocheba. But as Tychsen never saw a shekel, he was not a competent  judge. There is another consideration, which, if further demonstration were needed, would supply a very strong argument. These coins were first made known to Europe through Postell, who does not appear to have been aware of the description given of them in Rabbinical writers. The correspondence of the newly found coins with the earlier description is almost demonstrative. But they bear such undoubted marks of genuineness that no judge of ancient coins could doubt them for a moment. Postell quotes e.g. the following passage from the Jerusalem Talmud שמרד מטבע (מחלל) כגוןבןבוזיבא אינו מחל(ִשמרי), “Revolution (Samaritan) money, like that of Ben-Coziba, does not defile.” The meaning of this is not very obvious nor does Tychsen's explanation appear quite satisfactory. He adds, “does not defile if used as an amulet.” We should rather inquire whether the expression may not have some relation to that of “defiling the hands,” as applied to the canonical books of the Old Test., (see Ginsburg, Commentary on the Song of Songs, p. 3). The word for polluting is different but the expressions may be analogous. But on the other hand, these coins are often perforated which gives countenance to the notion that they were used as amulets. The passage is from the division of the Jerusalem Talmud entitled מעשר שניMaaser Sheni, or “The Second Tithe.”

It may here be desirable to mention that although some shekels are found with Hebrew letters instead of Samaritan, these are undoubtedly all forgeries. It is the more needful to make this statement as in some books of high reputation, e.g. Walton's Polyglot these shekels are engraved as if they were genuine. It is hardily necessary to suggest the reasons which may have led to this series of forgeries. Bit the difference between the two is not confined to the letters only the Hebrew shekels are much larger and in than the Samaritan, so that a person might distinguish them merely by the touch, even under a covering. The character nearly resembles that of Samaritan MSS., although it is not quite identical with it. The Hebrew and Samaritan alphabets appear to be divergent representatives of some older form as may be inferred from several of the letters. Thus the Beth and several other letters are evidently identical in their origin. Also the ש(Shin), of the Hebrew alphabet is the same as that of the Samaritan for if we make the two middle strokes of the Samaritan letter coalesce, it takes the Hebrew form. We may add that Postell appears to have arranged his Samaritan alphabet from the coins which he describes.  In the course of 1862 a work of considerable importance was published at Breslau by Dr. M.A. Levy, entitled: “Geschichten der judischen Munzen. It appears likely to be useful in the elucidation of the questions relating to the Jewish coinage which have been touched upon in the present article. There are one or two points on which it is desirable to state the views of the author, especially as he quotes coins which have only become known lately. Some coins have been described in the Revue Numismatique (1-860, p. 260 sq.), to which the name of Eleazar coins has been given. A coin was published some time ago by De Saulcy which is supposed by that author to be a counterfeit. It is scarcely legible, but it appears to contain the name Eleazar on one side, and that of Simon on the other. During the troubles which preceded the final destruction of Jerusalem, Eleazar (the son of Simon), who was a priest, and Simon ben-Giora, were at the head of large factions. It is suggested, by Dr. Levy that money may have been struck which bore the names of both these leaders but it seems scarcely probable, as they do not appear to have acted in concert. Yet a copper coin has been published in the Revue Numismatique which undoubtedly bears the inscription of “Eleazar the priest.” Its types are—

Obverse. A vase with one handle and the inscription אלעזר הכוה, “Eleazar the Priest,” in Samaritan letters.

Reverse. A bunch of grapes with the inscription שנתא[נתא] חת לגאלת יש, “Year one of the Redemption of Israel.”

Some silver coins also, first published by Reichardt, bear the same inscription on the obverse, under a palm tree, but the letters run from left to right. The reverse bears the same type and inscription as the copper coins.

These coins, as well as some that bear the name of Simon, or Simeon, are attributed by Dr. Levy to the period of this first rebellion. It is quite clear, however, that some of the coins bearing sim lar inscriptions belong to the period of Bar-cocheba's rebellion (or Barcoceba's as the name is often spelled) under Hadrian, because they are stamped upon denarii of Trajan, his predecessor. The work of Levy will be found very useful, as collecting together notice of all these coins and throwing out very useful suggestions as to their attribution; but we must still look to further researches and fresh collections of these coins for full satisfaction on many points. The attribution of the shekels and half shekels to Simon Maccabaeus may be  considered as well established and several of the other coins described in the article MONEY offer no grounds for hesitation or doubt. But still this series is very much isolated from other classes of coins, and the nature of the work hardly corresponds in some cases with the periods to which we are constrained, from the existing evidence, to attribute the coins. We must therefore still look for further light from future inquiries.

3. Characteristics and Classification. — The average weight of the silver coins is about 220 grains troy for the shekel, and 110 for the half shekel. Among the symbols found on this series of coins is one which is considered to represent that which was called Lulab by the Jews. This term was applied (see Maimonides on the section of the Mishna called Rosh Hashanah, or Commencement of the Year, 7, 1, and the Mishna itself in Succah, סוכה, or Booths, 3, 1, both of which passages are quoted by Bayer, De Num. p. 129) to the branches of the three trees mentioned in Lev 23:40, which are thought to be the palm, the myrtle, and the willow. These, which were to be carried by the Israelites at the Feast of Tabernacles, were usually accompanied by the fruit of the citron which is also found in this representation. Sometimes two of these Lulabs are found together. At least such is the explanation given by some authorities of the symbols called in the article MONEY by the name of Sheaves. The subject is involved in much difficulty and obscurity, and we speak, therefore, with some hesitation and diffidence, especially as experienced numismatists differ in their views his explanation is, however, adopted by Bayer (De Num. p. 128, 219, etc.), and by Cavedoni (Bibl. Num. p. 31, 32, of the German translation), who adds references to 1Ma 4:59. Joh 10:22, as he considers that the Lulab was in use at the Feast of the Dedication on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month as well as at that of Tabernacles. He also refers to 2Ma 1:18; 2Ma 10:6-7, where the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles is described, and the branches carried by the worshippers are specified. The symbol on the reverse of the shekels, representing a twig, with three buds, appears to bear more resemblance to the buds of the pomegranate than to any other plant.

The following lists is substantially that given by Cavedoni (p. 11 of the German translation) as an enumeration of all the coins which can be attributed with any certainty to Simon Maccabaeus. SEE NUMISMATICS.

A. SILVER. —

I. Shekels of three years, with the inscription שקל ישראל, Shekel Israel (“Shekel if Israel”), on the obverse, with a vase over which appears

(1) an א, Alteph [first year]; (2) the letter ש, Shin [for שנת, Shenath, “year”], with a ב, Beth [year 2]; (3) the letter ש, Shin, with a ג, Gimel [year 3].

On the reverse is the twig with three buds and the inscription ירושל ם קדשה, Jerusalem Kedushah, or הקדושה, Hak-kedushah (“Jerusalem the Holy”). The spelling varies with the year. The shekel of the first year has only ירושל ם קדושה; while those of the second and third years have the fuller form, ירושלי ם הקדושה. The second יof the Jerusalem is important as showing that both modes of spelling were in use at the same time.

II. The same as above, only half the weight, which is indicated by the word חצי, chatsi, “a half.” These occur only in the first and second years.

B. Copper.

I. לגאלת ציו, Ligullath Tsion, “Of the Liberation of Zion.” The vase as oil the silver shekel and half shekel. On the reverse, שנת ארבע, Shenath Arba, “The Fourth Year.” Lulab between two citrons.

II. שנת ארבע חציShenath Arba Chatsi, “The Fourth Year, a Half.” A citron between o Lultabs.

On the reverse, ]לגאלת ציו, Ligullafth Tsion, “Of the Liberation of Zion.” A palm tree between two baskets of fruit.

III. שנת ארבע רביע, Shenath Arba Rebia, “The Fourth Year, a Fourth.” Two Lulabs.

On the reverse, לגאלת ציי— as before. Citron fruit.

## Shekinah[[@Headword:Shekinah]]

             SEE SHECHINAH.

## Shel omi[[@Headword:Shel omi]]

             [some Shelo'mi] (Heb. Shelomi', שְׁלֹמַי, peaceful Sept. Σελεμί), father of Ahihud which latter was the Asherite commissioner to distribute the land east of the Jordan (Num 34:27). B.C. ante 1618.

## Shelah[[@Headword:Shelah]]

             (Heb. Shelah', שֵׁלָה, a petition, as in 1Sa 1:17; or rather perhaps peace, i.q. Shiloh Sept. Σηλώμ or Σηλώ ν. r. Σηλώ), the youngest son of Judah by the daughter of Shuah the Canaanite (Gen 38:5; Gen 38:11; Gen 38:14; Gen 38:26; Gen 41:12; 1Ch 2:2). B.C. ante 1873. His descendants, some of whom are numerated in 1Ch 4:21-23 are called (Num 26:20) Shelanites q.v.). For Shelach (A.V. “Shelah,” 1Ch 1:18), the son of Arphaxad, SEE SELA.

## Shelanite[[@Headword:Shelanite]]

             (Heb. collectively in the sing and with the art. hash-Shelani', חִשֵּׁלָנַי, an irregular patronymic from Shelah, as if Shelan [comp. Shiloh, Shilonite]; Sept. ὁ Σηλωνί) a designation of the descendants of Shelah (q.v.), the son of Judah (Num 26:20).

## Shelden, Francis F.[[@Headword:Shelden, Francis F.]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Monroe County, N.Y., March 16, 1814, admitted on trial by the Indiana Conference in 1840, and filled the following appointments: Noblesville, Franklin, Versailles, Greenfield,  Belleville, Springville, and Leesville. In 18484, owing to declining health he received a superannuated relation and died Jan. 16, 1850. Mr. Shelden , was a good English scholar, possessed an investigating mind, and was a fluent preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4, 533.

## Sheldon, George, D.D[[@Headword:Sheldon, George, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, October 12, 1813. He graduated from Williams College in 1835, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1838. He was pastor of the Presbyterian Church near Charleston, S.C., from 1840 to 1843, and was afterwards chosen district secretary of the American Bible Society for New Jersey and Delaware, which office he filled for thirty years. It may be said his life was spent in organizing means for the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, and in the discharge of his duties he displayed great energy, wisdom, and executive ability. He was much esteemed by the citizens of Princeton, where he resided twenty years. He died there, June 16, 1881. See N.Y. Observer, June 23, 1881. (W.P.S.)

## Sheldon, Gilbert[[@Headword:Sheldon, Gilbert]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was the youngest son of Roger Sheldon of Stanton, in Staffordshire, England, and was born there July 19, 1598. He was admitted a commoner of Trinity College, Oxford, in 1613; was made Bachelor of Arts Nov. 27, 1617; and Master of Arts May 20, 1620; was elected fellow of All Souls College in 1622, and about the same time entered holy orders. He became domestic chaplain of the lord keeper of Coventry, who gave him a prebend of Gloucester. He was some time rector of Ickford, in Bucks, and was presented to the rectory of Newington by archbishop Laud. He received the degree of Bachelor of Divinity Nov. 11, 1628, and was presented by the king to the vicarage of Hackney, in Middlesex. On June 25, 1634, he was made Doctor of Divinity, and in March 1635, was elected warden of All Souls. Dr. Sheldon became chaplain in ordinary to Charles I, and was afterwards clerk of the closet. During the rebellion, he adhered to the royal cause, and in February, 1644, was sent to attend the king's commissioners at the treaty of Uxbridge. In April 1646, he attended the king at Oxford, and was witness to the vow made by him to restore to the Church all impropriations lands, etc., if it pleased God to re-establish his throne. While the king was at Newmarket in 1647, Dr. Sheldon attended him as one of his chaplains. He was ejected from his wardenship by the Parliament visitors on March 30, 1647 (or 1648), and imprisoned. He was set at liberty on Oct. 24, 1648, and retired to Snelston, in Derbyshire. Soon after the king's return, he was made dean of the Royal Chapel, and on Oct. 28, 1660, was consecrated bishop of London. The Savoy Conference (q.v.) was held (1661) at his lodgings. He was elected to the see of Canterbury, Aug. 11, 1663, and on Dec. 20, 1667, chancellor of Oxford, but resigned that office July 31, 1669. He died at Lambeth, Nov. 9, 1677.

## Sheldon, Luther, D.D[[@Headword:Sheldon, Luther, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Rupert, Vermont, February 18, 1786. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1808, and was ordained at Easton, Massachusetts, in 1810, which pastorate he retained until his resignation in 1855. He preached six thousand written sermons, and declined eight calls to larger salaries. He died at Easton, September 16,1866. See Cong. Quarterly, 1867, page 304.

## Shelemiah[[@Headword:Shelemiah]]

             (Heb. Shelemyah', שֶׁלֶמְיָה; but [except in Ezr 10:39; Neh 3:30; Neh 13:13; Jer 37:3; Jer 37:13] in the prolonged form, Shelemya'hu,

שֶׁלֵמַיָהוּ, repaid of Jehovah; Sept. Σαλεμία or Σελεμίας), the name of nine Hebrews.

1. A Levite appointed to guard the east entrance to the tabernacle under David, while his son Zechariah had the northern gate (1Ch 26:14). B.C. 1043. In 1Ch 9:21; 1Ch 26:1-2, he is called MESHELEMIAH; in Neh 12:25, MESHULLAM; and in 1Ch 9:17; 1Ch 9:31, SHALLUM.

2. Son of Cushi and father of Netaniah, which latter was father of the Jehudi whom the princes sent to Baruch with an invitation to read Jeremiah's roll to them (Jer 36:14). B.C. much ante 605.

3. Father of Jehucal or Jucal, which latter Zedekiah ordered to request Jeremiah to interceded for the city (Jer 37:3; Jer 38:1). B.C. ante 589.

4. Son of Hananiah and father of Irijah, which latter arrested Jeremiah as he was leaving the city (Jer 37:13). B.C. ante 589.

5. Son of Abdeel and one of those ordered to apprehend Baruch and Jeremiah (Jer 36:26). B.C. 604.

6. One of the “sons” of Bani who renounced their Gentile wives after the captivity (Ezr 10:39). B.C. 458.

7. Another of the “sons” of Bani who did the same (Ezr 10:41). B.C. 458.

8. Father of the Hananiah who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:30). B.C. ante 446. He is perhaps the same as “one of the apothecaries,” i.e. manufacturers of the sacred incense, who is mentioned in Neh 3:8 as the father of Hananiah.

9. A priest appointed by Nehemiah as commissary of the Levitical tithes (Neh 8:13). B.C. cir. 434.

## Sheleph[[@Headword:Sheleph]]

             (Heb. id. שֶׁלֶ, but always occurring “in pause” as Sha'leph, שָׁלֶ, a drawing forth Sept. Σαλέφ, v.r. Σαλέθ, etc.), the second named of the thirteen sons of Joktan (Gen 10:26; 1Ch 1:20). B.C. much post 2515. The tribe which sprang from him has been satisfactorily  identified, both in modern and classical times, as well as the district of the Yemen named after him. It has been shown in other articles, SEE ARABIA; SEE JOKTAN, etc. that the evidence of Joktan's colonization of Southern Arabia is indisputably proved, and that it has received the assent of critics. Sheleph is found where we should expect to meet with him in the district (Mikhlaf as the ancient divisions of the Yemen are called by the Arabs) of Sula. (Marasid, s.v.), which appears to be the same as Niebuhr's Salfie (Descr. p. 215), written in his map Selfia, with the vowels, probably Sulafiyeh. Niebuhr says of it, “Grande etendue de pays gouvernee par sept schechs.” It is situated in N. lat. 14 degrees 30', and about sixty miles nearly south of San'a. Besides this geographical trace of Sheleph, we have the tribe of Shelif, or Shulaf, of which the first notice appeared in the Zeitschrift d deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, 11, 153, by Dr. Osiander, and to which we are indebted for the following information. Yakut, in the Moajam, s.v., says “Es-Selif or Es-Sulaf is an ancient tribe of the region of Yemen; Hisham Ibn-Mohammed says they are the children of Yuktan [Joktan], and Yuktan was the son of Eber the son of Salah the son of Arphaxad the son of Shem the son of Noah.. And a district in El-Yemen is named after the Sulaf.” El-Kalkasander (in the British Museum Library) says “El-Sulaf, called also Benies-Silfan, a tribe of the descendants of Kahtan [Joktan]. The name of their father has remained with them, and they are called EsSulaf they are children of Es-Siulaf, son of Yuktan, who is Kahtan.. Es-Sulaf originally signifies one of the little ones of the partridge, and Es-Silfan is its plural; the tribe was named after that on account of translation.” Yakut also says (s.v. “Muntabik”) that El- Muntabik was an idol belonging to Es-Sulaf. Finally, according to the Kamus (and the Lubb-el-Lubab, cited in the Marasid, s.v.), Sulaf was a branch tribe of Dhu-l-Kilaa [a Himyeritic family or tribe (Caussin, Essai, 1, 113), not to be confounded with the later king or Tubbaa of that name]. This identification is conclusively satisfactory, especially when we recollect that Hazarmaveth (Hadramaut), Sheba (Seba), and other Joktanitic names are in the immediate neighborhood. It is strengthened, if further evidence were required , by the classical mention of the Σαλαπηνοί, Salapeni, also written ‘Αλαπηνοί, Alapeni (Ptolemy, 6, 7). Bochart puts forward this people with rare brevity. (Opera, 1, 99). The more recent researches in Arabic MSS. have, as we have shown, confirmed in this instance his theory for we do not lay much stress on the point that Ptolemy's Salapeni are placed by him in N. lat. 22°. — Smith. Forster endeavors (Geogr. of Arabia, 1, 109) to identify the descendants of Sheleph with the Meteir  tribe, whose chief residence is in a Kasim, in the province of Nejd (Burckhardt, Bedouin, p. 233); but for this there appears to be no sufficient evidence.

## Shelesh[[@Headword:Shelesh]]

             (Heb. id. שֵׁלֶשׁ, triad [Gesenius], or might [Furst] Sept. Σελλής v.r. Σειμή), third named of the four sons of Helem the brother of Shamer, or Shomer, an Asherite (1Ch 7:35). B.C. apparently cir. 1015.

## Shelomith[[@Headword:Shelomith]]

             [some Shelo'mith] (Heb. Shelomith', שְׁלֹמַיתor [Ezr 8:10] שְׁלוֹמַית, peaceful [strictly a fem. form of Shelomi] twice Shelomoth', שְׁלֹמוֹת[1Ch 23:9; 1Ch 26:25], in both which places, however, the Keri has שְׁלֹמַית[1Ch 26:26]), the name of four or five Hebrews and two or three Hebrewesses.

1. (Sept. Σαλωμείθ.) A Danite female, daughter of Dibri, wife of an Egyptian, and mother of the man who was stoned for blasphemy (Lev 24:11). B.C. ante 1658. The Jewish rabbins have overlaid these few simple facts with a mass of characteristic fable. “They say that Shelomith was a very handsome and virtuous woman who was solicited and tempted to criminal conversation by an Egyptian, an overseer of the Hebrews' labors, without complying with him. He at last found an opportunity, by night, of slipping into the house and bed of Shelomith, in the absence of her husband, and abused her simplicity. The day following, when this woman discovered the injury, she bitterly complained of it to her husband when he returned. He at first thought of putting her away, but kept her some time to see if she should prove with child by the Egyptian. After some months, her pregnancy, becoming evident, he sent her away, and with words he assaulted the officer who had done this outrage. The Egyptian abused him still further, both by words and blows, Moses, coming hither by chance and hearing of this injury done by the Egyptian to the Israelite, took up his defense, killed the Egyptian, and buried him in the  sand. The brethren of Shelomith, seeing their sister put away like an adulteress, pretended to call her husband to account for it and to make him take her again. He refused, and they came to blows. Moses happened to be there again, and wished to reconcile them, but the husband of Shelomith asked him what he had to do in the matter? who had made him a judge over them? and whether he had a mind to kill him, also, as yesterday he killed the Egyptian? Moses, hearing this, fled from Egypt into the country of Midian. The blasphemer stoned in the wilderness (Lev 24:10-11) was, say the Jews, the son of Shelomith and this Egyptian. The officer who inspected the Hebrews' labor is he of whom Moses speaks in Exo 2:11-12; and the husband of Shelomith is intimated in the same place (Exo 2:13-14).”

2. (Sept. Σαλουμώθ.ς.r. Σαλωμώθ.) A Levite, chief of the sons of Ishar in the time of David (1Ch 23:18). B.C. 1013. He is elsewhere (1Ch 24:22-23) called SHELOMOTH SEE SHELOMOTH (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Σαλωμώθ.) A Levite descended from Eliezer the son of Moses, and put in charge of the Temple treasury under David (1Ch 26:25-26; 1Ch 26:28). B.C. 1018.

4. (Sept. Σαλωμίθ v.r. ‘Αωθείμ.) First named of the three sons of Shimei, chief of the Gershonites in the time of David (1Ch 23:9). B.C. 1013. In 1Ch 23:10 his name should probably be read instead of Shimei (q.v.).

5. (Sept. Σελημώθ.) The last named of the three children of Rehoboam by his second wife, Maachah, but whether a son or a daughter is uncertain (2Ch 11:20). B.C. cir. 970.

6. (Sept. Σαλωμεθί v.r. Σαλωμίθ.) A daughter of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19). B.C. post 53..

7. (Sept. Σαλειμούθ v.r. Σελιμούθ.) According to the present text of Ezr 8:10, the sons of Shelomith, with the son of Josiphiah at their head, returned from Babylon with Ezra to the number of eighty males, B.C. ante 459. There appears, however, to be an omission, which may be supplied from the Sept., and the true reading is probably “Of the sons of Bani, Shelomith the son of Josiphiah.” See also 1Es 8:36, where he is called “Assamoth son of Josaphias.” See Keil, ad oc.

## Shelomoh[[@Headword:Shelomoh]]

             SEE SOLOMON.

## Shelomoth[[@Headword:Shelomoth]]

             [some Shelo'moth] (Heb. Shelomoth', שְׁלֹמוֹת, peaceful [strictly a plur. fen. of, שָׁלוֹ, peace]; Sept. Σαλωμώθ), one of the descendants of Izhar.the grandson of Levi (1Ch 24:22-23); elsewhere (23:18) called SHELOMITH SEE SHELOMITH (q.v.).

## Shelper, Charles[[@Headword:Shelper, Charles]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bovenden, kingdom of Hanover, Jan.. 10, 1800. In 1836 he emigrated to the United States, and settled in Wheeling, W.Va.: The following year he was converted and joined the Church. Soon after he entered the travelling ministry, among his countrymen. He labored until April, 1860, when he had a paralytic stroke. His effective relation to the Conference then ceased. In March, 1865, he had a second paralytic stroke, and in July a third stroke followed. He died Sept. 4, 1865, being at the time a member of the Central German Conference. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1866, p. 181.

## Shelton, George A., D.D[[@Headword:Shelton, George A., D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, rector of St. James' Church, Newtown, L.I.; died December 27, 1863, aged sixty-three years. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. April 1864, page 150.

## Shelton, Philo[[@Headword:Shelton, Philo]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Ripton (now Huntington), Conn., May 5, 1754. He graduated at Yale College in. 1775, and studied theology, probably with Rev. James Scoville, of Waterbury. He was ordained deacon Aug. 3, 1785, and priest on September 16. On February 24 preceding, he received a call from Fairfield, North Fairfield, and Stratfield, which he accepted. Here he labored until he entered into rest, Feb. 22, 1825. Mr. Shelton “was distinguished for simplicity, integrity, and an honest and earnest devotion to the interests of pure and undefiled religion.” He was one of the clergymen who were instrumental in securing a charter for Trinity College, Hartford, which was accomplished by a union with a political party, then in the minority. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit 5, 349.

## Shelton, William, D.D[[@Headword:Shelton, William, D.D]]

             a clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Fairfield, Connecticut, in September 1798, his father being the Reverend Philo Shelton, the first Episcopal clergyman ordained in America. William graduated from the General Theological Seminary of New York in 1823, was ordained deacon the same year, and presbyter in 1826; ministered at Plattsburgh and Red Hook, N.Y., and in his native town, until 1829, when he became rector of St. Paul's Church, Buffalo. In 1879 he was made pastor emeritus, and so continued until his death, at the old Fairfield parsonage, October 11, 1883. See (N.Y.) Church Almanac, 1884, page 103.

## Shelumiel[[@Headword:Shelumiel]]

             (Heb. Shelumiel', שְׁלֻמַיאֵל, friend of God; Sept. Σαλαμιήλ), son of Zurishaddai (Num 2:12) and phylarch of Simeon (Num 10:19), appointed to number his people at the Exode (Num 1:6), who then amounted to 59, 300 males (Num 1:7). B.C. 1057. He made his offering for the tabernacle like the rest (Num 7:36; Num 7:41).

## Shem[[@Headword:Shem]]

             (Heb. id., שֵׁ, name; Sept. [and New Test. Luke 3:39] Σήμ, Josephus Σήμας [Ant. 1, 4, 1]; Vulg. Sent), the son of Noah, born (Gen 5:32) when his father had attained the age of 500 years. B.C. 2613. He was 98 years old, married, and childless, at the time of the flood. After it he, with his father, brothers, sisters-in-law, and wife, received the blessing of God (Gen 9:1), and entered into the covenant. Two years afterwards he became the father of Arphaxad (Gen 11:10), and other children were born to him subsequently. With the help of his brother Japheth he covered the nakedness of their father, which Canaan and Ham did not care to hide. In the prophecy of Noah which is connected with this incident (Gen 9:25-27), the first blessing falls on Shem. He died at the age of 600 years. B.C. 2013.

Assuming that the years ascribed to the patriarchs in the present copies of the Hebrew Bible are correct, it appears that Methuselah, who in his first 243 years was contemporary with Adam, had still nearly 100 years of his long life to run after Shem was born. Again, when Shem died Abraham was 148 years old, and Isaac had been nine years married. There are, therefore, but two links — Methuselah and Shem — between Adam and Isaac. Thus the early records of the creation and the fall of man which came down to Isaac, would challenge (apart from their inspiration) the same confidence which is readily yielded to a tale that reaches the hearer through two well known persons between himself and the original chief actor in the events related. SEE LONGEVITY. There is, indeed, no chronological improbability in that ancient Jewish tradition which brings Shem and Abraham into personal conference. SEE MELCHIZEDEK.

The portion of the earth occupied by the descendants of Shem (Gen 10:21-31) intersects the portions of Japheth and Ham, and stretches in an. uninterrupted line from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean.  Beginning at its northwestern extremity, with Lydia (according to all ancient authorities, though doubted by Michaelis [see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 745]), it includes Syria (Aram), Chaldaea (Arphaxad), parts of Assyria (Asshur), of Persia (Elam), and of the Arabian peninsula (Joktan) SEE ETHNOLOGY; SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

The servitude of Canaan under Shem, predicted by Noah (Gen 9:26); was fulfilled primarily in the subjugation of the people if Palestine (Jos 23:4; 2Ch 8:7-8). It is doubtful whether, in Gen 10:27, God. or Japheth is mentionied as the dweller in the tents of Shem. In the former sense the verse may refer to the special presence of God with the Jews, and to the descent of Christ from them; or, in the latter sense, to the occupation of Palestine and adjacent countries by the Romans, and, spiritually understood, to, the accession of the Gentiles to the Church of God (Eph 3:6). See Pfeifferi Opera, p. 40; Newton, On the Prophecies, Diss. 1.

Buttmann has conjectured (from the resemblance of ש ֵׁwith, שָׁמִיַ) that Shem was the original of Saturn or Uranus (Abhandl. d. Berliner Akad. 1816; 1817, p. 150 sq.; Philos. Classe und im Mythol. 1, 221 sq.); but there is no good ground for such a fancy. Comparative Ages of Noah's Sons. In Gen 10:21 occurs a statement on this point, but the original is unfortunately ambiguous: כָּלאּבְּנֵיאּעֹבֶר אֲחַי יֶפֶת הִגָּדוֹל׃וּלְשֵׁ םיֻלִּד גִּ םאּהוּא אֲבַ8י. This may be rendered either, “And to Shem [there] was born also [to] him [a son], [the] father of all [the] sons of Eber, [the] brother of [the] elder Japheth, ” or “[the] elder brother of Japheth.” The English A.V. adopts the former rendering (“brother of Japheth the elder”), following the Sept. (ἀδελφῷΙ᾿άφεθ τοῦ μείζονος [Vat. and Alex.; Sin. is wanting]), Symmachus, the Targum of Onkelos (אֲחיּהַי דְיֶפֶת רִבָּא), and the Masoretic accents (as given above); and this view is also taken by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Luther, Junius, Piscator, Mercer, Montanus, Le Clerc, J. D. Michaelis, Mendelssohn, De Sola, Jervis, and other eminent Hebraists. The other rendering is adopted by the Samaritan Codex, the Latin Vulgate (“fratre Japheth majore”), the Peshito-Syriac, the Arabic of Saadias, and most modern commentators (Rosenmuller, Turner, Bush, Philippson, Kalisch, Conant, Lange, Tayler Lewis, Keil, Murphy, etc.). To our mind both the diplomatic and the linguistic arguments are conclusive for the common English rendering.

(I.) Chronological Considerations. — These may be briefly stated as follows:

1. Noah had a son born when he was himself 500 years old (Gen 5:32). This must have been either his oldest or his youngest son, for it would be entirely nugatory to say that the middle one of his three sons was then born, unless that middle one were Shem himself.

2. The son then born was not Shem, for

a. In that case he would have been 99 years old at the beginning of the flood (Gen 7:1; in Noah's 600th year, not when he was 600 years old), or 100 years old at its close (Gen 8:13).

b. On the contrary, Shem was not 100 years old till two years after the flood (Gen 11:10).

3. Nor was Ham the son there referred to, for

a. Shem himself, we have seen, was not born so early as when Noah was 500 years old.

b. Much less could Ham, who was younger than Shem (Gen 9:24), have been, born so early.

4. It hence necessarily follows that Japheth was the son then born, and that he was the oldest of the three.

5. The three sons are not mentioned in the order of age, but of familiarity and importance to the Hebrews. Hence Ham, although the youngest, is named second. So likewise Arphaxad, although the first born (Gen 11:10), is named third (Gen 10:22). A precisely analogous case appears in the family of Terah (Gen 11:26), where the second son, Abram, is named first, as being the most important, and the oldest, Haran, last, as having died early.

6. The efforts of commentators to evade the force of these considerations betray the weakness of their cause. They all proceed upon the unfounded assumption that the numbers in the texts above considered are merely vague statements (“round numbers”), and may therefore be neglected in an exact calculation. They especially dwell upon the fact that all three sons are assigned to the same year. (Noah's 500th), whereas that expression evidently refers to the oldest, or the heir, only, as the foregoing  comparisons show; in any other sense the assertion would be irrelevant or absurd.

(II.) Grammatical Considerations.— On this point most later commentators and translators seem content to follow implicitly the views of Rosenmuller (Schol. ad loc.): “In this clause the word הִגָּדֹל‘the elder,' is ambiguous as to whether it should be joined with Japheth, thus indicating him as the senior, or with Shem. The former has seemed to many interpreters probable chiefly because, inasmuch as Noah is said to have begotten the first of his sons who survived the flood in the one hundredth year before the flood (Gen 5:32), and Shem is said to have lived his one hundredth year two years after the flood (Gen 11:10), therefore the latter could not have been the first born. But since it is not at all likely that Noah begot in one and the same year the three sons mentioned in Gen 5:32, it is credible that in that passage round numbers only are named, as often occurs, and that the five hundredth year is set down in the same connection instead of the five hundred and second, as that in which Noah began to be a father. Hence it does not appear from this passage that Japheth was the oldest son. On the contrary, since in the preceding context the sons of Noah are six times mentioned in such order that Shem is set in the first place, Ham in the second, and Japheth in the third (Gen 5:32; Gen 6:10; Gen 7:13; Gen 9:16; Gen 9:23; Gen 10:1) — passages so clear as to admit of no doubt — it follows that in the present passage likewise the term ‘the elder' is to be joined to אֲחי, ‘the brother of, ' so as to make Shem the oldest. But there is also another grammatical reason.: If the writer in this place had wished to say that Japheth was the oldest son of Noah, he would doubtless have written בֶּןאּנוֹחִ הִגָּדֹלthe older son of Noah; for הִגָּדֹל, ‘the elder, ' thus placed nude, nowhere else occurs (with reference to a person's age), but is always joined either with] בֵּ, ‘son, ' or with אָח, ‘brother.' All this has been fully set forth by J.F. Schelling in his monograph entitled Ueber die Geburtsfolge der Sohne Noah, at the beginning of part 17 of his Repertorium Biblicoe et Orientalis Literaturoe.” These points, however, are not well taken; for

1. It is not usual for the sacred writers to employ round numbers in chronological accounts. In this Cyclopoedia we have thoroughly examined every date in the Bible, and find no such instance. Each definite number is susceptible of explanation as being precisely correct, except a very few corruptions of the text. In this case, particularly, all the leading  chronologers from Usher, Jackson, Hales, and Clinton down to Browne and the author of Palmoni — take the date as being exact. It is a superficial evasion of a difficulty to resort to this slur upon the accuracy of Scripture chronology.

2. The sacred writer might indeed have said, if he had chosen, “the brother of Japheth the elder son of Noah;” but this is a tedious and awkward phrase, and would have been just as ambiguous as the one he has employed, its sense entirely depending upon the interpunction.

3. גָּדֹל does occur in as “nude a form” as here in at least one passage (Eze 21:14 [Hebrews 19]), as noticed below. It is true the adj. there does not refer to comparative age, but that makes no difference in the grammatical construction. The assertion that גָּדֹל does not occur (in the sense of age) without the addition of] ב or אח expressed is not true, as may be seen from Gen 29:16; Gen 44:2, and other instances where one of these nouns is merely implied, precisely as in the case before us. In fine, the adj. is not here “nude” or independent at all; it regularly belongs to the second noun, brother of the elder Japheth.”

4. The argument from the order of the names is amply refuted (as above) by the analogous cases of Arphaxad (Gen 11:22), Abraham (Gen 11:27), and, indeed, almost every other patriarch. They were arranged in the order of proximity and importance to the Hebrews; Among the arguments on the other side we may note —

a. The chronological point is irrefragable, except by the evasion above noticed.

b. The position of the words, although ambiguous, certainly allows the construction of the Authorized Version. We append a few instances of the same adj. qualifying a noun after a construct:

Num 35:28, bis — מוּת הִכֹּהֵןהִגָּדֹל Jos 20:6 — the same. Isa 36:13 — דַּבְרֵי הִמֶּלֶךְ הִגָּדֹל Eze 47:9— דְּגִת הִיָּ םהִגָּדֹל Dan 10:4. — יִד הִנָּהָר הִגָּדֹל  Had the word יֶפֶת preceding the qualifying adj. in the passage in question not been a proper name; it would have taken the article, as in these instances, and thus all ambiguity would have been avoided. An instance strictly parallel is Eze 21:14 [Heb. 19], הִגָּדֹל חֶרֶב חָלָל, where the adj., being masc. must belong to the second noun, though neither has the art. Others similar doubtless occur, if not with גָּדֹלor]קָט, yet with other adjectives.

c. Had the sacred writer intended the adj. in the passage in question to apply to the last noun, he could scarcely have, expressed his meaning in any other way than he has. On the other hand, had he meant it to refer to the former, he would undoubtedly have added מַמֶּנּוּ, as in Jdg 1:13; Jdg 3:9 (אֲחַי כָּלֵב הִקָּטֹןמַמֶּנּוּ), which are the only strictly parallel cases of usage under that view (the adj. being קָטֶןֹ, however, instead of גָּדֹל). Jdg 9:5 (בֶּןאּיְרֻבִּעִל הִקָּטן) is not a case in point, as there could be no ambiguity there.

d. The Masoretic accents are clearly for the old rendering. In all the above instances the adj. is connected by a conjunctive with the noun immediately preceding, and the first noun (though in the construct) is separated by a disjunctive. In cases of the other construction the reverse interpunction prevails invariably, so far as we have examined. The authority of the Masorites countervails that of all modern scholars, most of whom seem to have given the subject but a cursory examination. The criticism of Keil (Commentary on the Pentateuch, 1, 156, Clark's ed.) is particularly lame. Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 4) calls “Shem the third son of Noah, “ but elsewhere (1, 4, 1) he names them in a different order, that of relative familiarity (“Shem and Japheth and Ham”). As to the other ancient versions, as above noted, the Sept. (the translator of which in this part was a good Hebraist) refers the adj. to Japheth, although some printed editions have it otherwise, in order to correspond with the Vulg., which reflects the Jewish national pride. The Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic of course follow the Vulgate but the Targum of Onkelos has “the brother of Japheth the great.” Schelling, whom Rosenmuller (as above) refers to (Repertorium, etc. [1785], 17, 8 sq.), thinks that the lists in Genesis only mean that Noah had passed his five hundredth year before he had any heir, since in any case the three sons could not have been all born in the same year, to which they are all equally  assigned; and that therefore only the round number or approximate date is given” (p. 20).

e. The reason why the sacred writer adds the epithet “elder” brother to the name of Japheth, is precisely to prevent the inference that would otherwise naturally be drawn from the continual mention of Shem first in the lists elsewhere, that he was the oldest son; and to explain why the names are here inverted. In the present chapter, however, as usual in detailed genealogies (1Ch 1:29 sq.; 1Ch 2:1 sq., 1Ch 2:42; 1Ch 3:1 sq., etc.), the strict order of primogeniture is observed. Had Shem been the oldest, there seems to be no good reason why in this pedigree the same order should not have been observed as elsewhere. Rosenmuller's remark that this was done “in order that the transition from the lineage of Shemn to the history of Abraham might be more easy, ” does not apply; for the next chapter begins with an account of the Tower of Babel, which is neither Abrahamic nor Shemitic history in particular, but rather Hamitic (see 1Ch 3:10); so that this list of Shem's descendants is thrust in between two portions of Ham's history arbitrarily, unless for the sake of chronological order.

## Shem hammephorash[[@Headword:Shem hammephorash]]

             (שֵׁ םהִמְּפֹרִשׁ, shem hammephorash, as if the peculiar Name; but perhaps factitious). By this expression the Jews mean the name of God written יהוה, but since the time of the Reformation, i.e. from the time that Christians began to study Hebrew, pronounced, according to its accompanying vowel points, Jehovah.. Before entering upon the explanation of the word it will be well to review what is said concerning. that name of God. Jerome, who was not only acquainted with the language, but also with the tradition, of the Jews, says, in Prologus Galeatus: “Nomen Domini tetragrammaton (i.e. יהוה) in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum literis invenimus;” and in the 136th letter to Marcellus, where he treats of the ten names of God, he says: “Nonum (sc. nomen Dei) est tetragrammum, quod ἀνεκφώνητον, i.e., lei. ineffabile, putaverunt, qoud his literis scribitur Iod, E, Vau, E. Quod quidam non intelligentes propter elemenorum similitudinem, quum in Graecis libris repererint, Pi Pi legere consueverunt” (Opp. ed. Vallarsi, 1, 131; 720). Similar is the statement found in a fragmenit of Evagrius treating of the ten Jewish names of God, that the ineffable Tetragram, which καταχρηστικῶς is pronounced by the Jews ἀδωναι. by the Greeks κύριος, according to Exo 28:36, was written on the plate of the high priest: ἁγίασμα κυρίῳ II I II I [in some codd. πι πἰ.. τούτοις γραφόμενον τοῖς στοιχέιοις ιωθ ηπ ουαυ ιηπ II I II I, ο ῾Θεός (cf.Cotelerius, Monum. Eccl. Groeoc, 3, 216, by Vallarsi, 3, 726; Lagarde, Onomastica Sacra, p. 205 sq.). Almost the same we find in Origen, Onomasticon (cf. Lagarde, loc. cit.). Fromn these statements we see that at and before the time of Jerome there were already Greek MSS. of the Old Test. in, which the Tetragram was written with Hebrew letters which were regarded, as the Greek uncial letters II I II I. Such a mistake was only possible when the Hebrew square alphabet was used. When in the last quarter of the last century, the attention of the learned was again called to the Syriac translation of the Sept., by the bishop Paul of Tela, they found  ind many places the Hebrew name of God, which otherwise is expressed by the Greek κύριος and the Syriac מריא, represented by פיפיIt was, however, more surprising that in the main manuscript of this version in the celebrated Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus at Milan, i the notes on Isaiah, instead of <>, the word יהיה was found.

The connection between the Greek II I II I and this יהיהwas soon perceived, but not in a correct manner, so that in 1835 Middeldorpf, in his edition of Codex Syro- Hexaplaris, could but explain it as “ita ut inscius quidam librarius, Cod. Syr. Hexaplarem describens, sed sensum Graeci illius II I II I haun perspiciens Graecum characterem II loco Hebraici ה positum esse opinaretur, quemadmodum I loco Hebr. י, ideoque Syriace יהיה scriberet.” Bernstein, in reviewing Middeldorpf's edition, quoted a scholion of Bar-Hebraeus, which gives us the following interesting notice: “The Hebrews call the. glorious name of God ש םפרוש, which is יהיה(יהוה), and dare not to pronounce it with.thier lips, but read and speak instead to those who listen, אדני. Since the seventy interpreters retained the Hebrew nomenclature, the Greeks fell into an error and believed that these two letters were Greeek, and read it from the left to the right, and the name II I II I was formed, and thus יהיה(יהוה), which designates the Eternal Being, was changed into II I II I, which yields no sense at all. The Yod of the Hebrews is like the Yod (Iota) of the Greeks, and He of the Hebrews has the form of the Greek Pi (II). Hence, in the Syriac copies of the Sept. we find everywhere the name מריא(i.e. where מריאstands for κύριος῟יהוה), with פיפיwritten above.” On this scholium Bernstein remarks that ש םפרושcorresponds to the Rabbinic שׁ םהמפרש, Sem hammephorash. In his lexicon, Bernstein writes: “פרוש. is one who separates, discerns, hence ש םפרוש is a discerning, separating, or especial name, nomen separatum, secretum., occultum. Schroeter, in his edition of Bar-Hebraeus, explains ש םפרושby nomen distinctum), singulare.

But Bar-Hebraeus tells us only what he found in Jacob of Edessa, who has a whole scholium entitled “Scholium on the Singular and Distinguished Name which is found in the Syriac Holy Writings translated from the Greek, and which is called among the Jews ש םפרוש.” From this scholium, which Nestle published in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenanldischen Gesellschaft, 1878, 32, 465 sq., and which purports to give what Jewish tradition believed concerning this name, we see that it  means the separated, i.e. singular name of God — a view also adopted by Nestle himself. But a review of the different opinions will show that there is a great difference as to what the meaning of the word ש םהמפרשis. Some translate it by nomen explcitum, others by nomen separatum, (comp. Buxtorf, Lex.Talm. s.v.); Petrus Galatinus, De Arcanis Catholicoe Veritatis, 2, 18, by seperatum, i.e.” sejunctum. et distinctum ab aliis omnmibus. Dei nominibus, aet soli Deo proprie conveniens.” Reuchlin, in the third book of De Arte Cabalistica, explains it by nomen expositorium; Munk, le nom distinctement prononce; Geiger, der ausdruckliche Name; Levy, der deutlich ausgesprochene Name.

In settling the question all must depend on the meaning of פרש, whether it means only “to separate, ” or whether it occurs also in the sense of “to pronounce distinctly.” In the latter sense it occurs very often, especially in the Targum and Talmud, as Dr. Furst has shown against Dr. Nestle in Z. d. d. m. G. 1879, 33:297, claiming that פירש את השis only the Aramaized form for הזכיר את הש, “to pronounce distinctly the name of God.” In the Mishna (Yoma, 6:2) we are, told that both the priests and people, when they heard, on the Day of Atonement, the ש םהמפורש, fell to the ground; and we are also told that the voice of the high priest, when he pronounced “the name, ” on the Day of Atonement, was heard as far as Jericho.

Whatever may be the meaning of this word in a philological point of view, Jewish traditionl ascribed to it great power. By means of the Shem hammephorash Christ is, said to have performed his miracles; Moses is said to have slain the Egyptian by the same means. Any one interested in these and other silly stories will find them in Eisenmenger, Neuentdecktes Judenthum, 1, 154 sq. See, besides the essays of Nestle and Furst already quoted, also Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. (ed. Fischer), p. 1205 sq.; Geiger, Urschrift der Bibel, p. 263 sq. SEE JEHOVAH. (B.P.)

Practically, Shem-hammephorash is a cabalistic word among the Rabbinical Jews, who reckon it as of such importance that Moses spent forty days on Mount Sinai in learning it from the angel Saxael. It is not, however, the real word of power, but a representatioin of it. The rabbins differ as to whether the genuine word consisted of twelve, or forty-two, or seventy- two letters, and try by their gematria, or cabalistic arithmetic, to reconstruct it. They affirm that Jesus stole it from the Temple, and by its means was enabled to perform many wonderful works. It is now Iost, and  hence, according to the rabbins, the lack of power in the prayers of Israel. They declare that if any one were able rightly and devoutly to pronounace it, he would by this means be able to create a world. It is alleged, indeed, that two letters of the word inscribed by a cabalist on a tablet and thrown into the sea raised the storm which, A.D. 1542, destroyed the fleet of Charles V. They say, further, that if you write this name on the person of a prince, you are sure of his abiding favor. The rationale of its virtue is thus described by Mr. Alfred Vaughan -in his Hours with the Mystics: “The Divine Being was supposed to have commenced the work of creation by concentrating on certain points the primal, universal Light. Within the region of these was the appointed place of our world. Out of the remaining luminous points, or foci, he constructed certain letters — a heavenly alphabet. These characters he again combined into certain, creative words, whose secret potency produced the forms of the material world. The word ‘Shem-hammephorash' contains the sum of these celestial letters with all their inherent virtue, in its mightiest combination.”

## Shem-Tob[[@Headword:Shem-Tob]]

             (שֵׁ םטוֹב, i.e. good name), a name common to many Jewish writers, of whom we mention the following:

1. BEN-ABRAHAM IBN-GAON, a famous Cabalist, born 1283, died about 1332, the author of many Cabalistic works.

2. BEN-SHEM-TOB, who died in 1430, is the author of ספר האמונות, or the Book of Faithfulness, in which he attacks the Jewish philosophers Aben-Ezra, Maimonides, Levi bei-Gershon, etc., and denounces the students of philosophy as heretics, maintaining, however, that the salvation of Israel depends upon the Cabala. He also wrote דרשות על התורה, or homilies on the Pentateuch, the feasts and fasts, etc, in which the Cabalistic doctrines are fully propounded.

3. ISAAC SHAPRUT, a native of Tudela he was a celebrated philosopher, physician, and Talmudist, and wrote, under the title of אבןבח, The Touchstone, a polemical work against Christianity, inveighing bitterly against the doctrines of the Trinity, incarnation, transubstantiation, etc. One portion of the book consists of a translation of Matthew's Gospel into Hebrew, said to be so unfairly performed that, among other faults, the names in the genealogy are “grossly misspelled, and are therefore of no avail for comparison with the Old Test. To each chapter are subjoined questions for Christians to answer. An appendix to the work is called “Replies to Alfonso the Apostate.” The MS is still in Rome, and dated at Turiasso, Old Castile, 1340. He also wrote Remarks on Aben-Ezra's Commentary on the Law under the title צפנת פענח, and The Garden of Pomegranates; פרדס רמוניexplaining the allegories of the Talmud.  See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 259; 265 sq.; De Rossi; Dizionario Storico, p. 289, 301 sq.; id. Bibl. Jud. Antichrist. p. 103 sq.; Ginsburg, The Kabalah, p. 11, 122; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain, p. 159; Finn, Sephardim, p. 308 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 127; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 23 sq.; Cassel, Lehrbuch der jud. Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 283, 257, 302, 304, 316. (B.P.)

## Shema[[@Headword:Shema]]

             (Heb. in three forms, Shema', שְׁמָע, Jos 15:26; Shema', שֵׁמִע;, elsewhere, except “in pause, ” She'ma, שָׁמִע, 1Ch 2:43 all meaning rumor; Sept. Σαμά, v.r. Σαμαά, Σαλμάα, Σαμαϊvας, etc.), the name of four men and of one place.

1. Last named of the four sons of Hebron, and father of Raham, descendants of Caleb, great-grandson of Judah (1Ch 2:43-44). B.C. ante 1658.

2. A Benjamite, son of Elpaal, and one of the heads of the fathers of the inhabitants of Aijalon, who drove out the inhabitants of Gath (1Ch 8:13). B.C. post 1618. He is probably the same as Shimhi (1Ch 8:21).

3. Son of Joel and father of Azaz, among the Reubenite chiefs (1Ch 5:8). B.C. ante 1090. Perhaps the same with Shemaiah (q.v.) of 1Ch 5:4. SEE Joel 2.

4. One of those (apparently laymen) who stood at Ezra's right hand while lie read the law to the people (Neh 8:4). B.C. 458.

5. A town in the south of Judah, named between Amam and Moladah (Jos 15:26). The place seems to have no connection with No. 1 above (see Keil, ad loc. Chronicles). In the parallel list of towns set off from Judah to Simeon (Jos 19:2), the name appears as Sheba (q.v.), which is perhaps the more correct, as Shema never, elsewhere appears as the appellation of a town. Knobel (in the Kurzgef. exeg. Handb. ad loc.) suggests that it may be the present ruins Sameh, between Milh and Beer- sheba (Van de Velde, Syria, 2, 148).

## Shema (2)[[@Headword:Shema (2)]]

             Of the many prayers now constituting the Jewish ritual, the Shema, so called from the first word, שְׁמִע, i.e. hear, occurring in it, was the only really fixed form of daily prayer which is mentioned at an early period. Being a kind of confession of faith, every Israelite was to repeat it morning and evening. The Shema itself consists of three passages from the Pentateuch:

1. Shema Israel (Deu 6:4-9);

2. Vehayah im shamoa (11:13-21); and

3. Vayomer Jehovah el Mosheh (Num 15:37-41). In the morning it was preceded by two and succeeded by one, and in the evening both preceded and succeeded by two prayers, which, although considerably enlarged, are still in use. We quote them (omitting all later additions), as probably in use at the time of our Lord:

Before the Shema, Morning and Evening.—”Blessed art thou, O Lord, King of the world, who formest the light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst everything; who in mercy givest light to the earth and to those who dwell upon it, and in thy goodness renewest day by day, and continually, the works of creation. Blessed be the Lord our God for the glory of his handiworks, and for the light-giving lights which he hath made for his praise, Selah! Blessed be the Lord who formed the lights!”

Subjecting the second prayer to the same criticism, we read it:

“With great love thou hast loved us, O Lord our God! and with thy great compassion thou hast abundance of pity on us. O our Father! our King! for the sake of our fathers who trusted in thee, to whom  thou didst teach the statutes of life, have compassion on us, and enlighten our eyes in thy law, and bind our hearts in thy commandments. O unite our hearts to love and fear thy name, that we may not be abashed for evermore. For thou art a God who preparest salvation, and us hast thou chosen from among all nations and tongues, and hast in truth brought us near to thy great name, Selah, in order that we in love may praise thee and praise thy unity. Blessed be the Lord who in love chose his people Israel, .”

Then follows the Shema:

“Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, land with, all thy might, and these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart. And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the; way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates” (Deu 6:4-9). “And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments which I commanded you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul, that I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full. Take heed to yourselves that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside and serve other gods, and Worship them; and the Lord's wrath be kindled against, you, and he shut, up the heaven, that there be no rain and that the land yields not her fruit; amid lest ye perish quickly from off the good land which the Lord giveth you. Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they many be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in a thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house, and upon thy gates: that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the  Lord sware unto your fathers to give them as the days of heaven upon the earth” (Deu 11:13-21). “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make them fringes, in the borders of their garments throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a ribband of blue: and it shall be unto you for a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the.Lord, and do them; and that ye seek not after your town heart and your own eyes, after which ye used to go astray: that ye may remember and do all my commandments, and be holy unto your God. I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: I am the Lord your God” (Num 15:37-41). The morning prayers concluded with the following, now in use: “It is true that thou art the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers; our Redeemer, and the Redeemer of our fathers; our Rock, and the Rock of our salvation. Our Redeemer and Deliverer; this is thy name from everlasting; there is no other God besides thee. A new song did they that were delivered sing to thy name by the seashore, together did all praise, and own thee King, and say, Jehovah shall reign world without end! Blessed be the Lord who saveth Israel.”

An addition dating from the 2d century inserts before the words “A new song, ” etc., a particular record of God's past dealings. The additional prayer for the evening is as follows:

“O Lord our God! cause us to lie, down in peace, and raise us up, O our King! to a happy lifte. Oh spread thy pavilion of peace over us, and direct us with good counsel from thy presence; and save us for the sake of thy name. Oh shield us, and remove from us the stroke of the enemy, the pestilence, sword, famine, and sorrow: and remove the adversary from before and behind us and conceal us under the shadow of thy wings; for thou, O God! art our Guardian and Deliverer; and thou, O God! art a merciful and gracious King. Oh guard us at our going out and coming in with a happy and peaceable life, from henceforth and forevermore.” Although these prayers were sometimes lengthened or shortened, they were at a very early period in general use among the Hebrews. Like many  other things these prayers were made the subject of casuistic discussions, and the very first pages of the Talmud are crowded with questions and answers as to “how” and “when” the Shema is to be read (see treatise Berachoth). Women and servants and little children, or those under twelve years, are exempted by the Mishna from this obligation. See Zuni, Gottesd. Vortrage den Juden p. 367, 369-371; Schurer, Lehrbuch der neutestament Zeitgeschichte, p. 499 sq.; Prideaux, Connection (Wheeler's led.), 1, 31; Etheridge Introduction to Hebrew literature, p.93 sq.; Edersheim, History the Jewish Nation, p. 360 sq. SEE PHYLACTERY. (B.P.)

## Shema (3)[[@Headword:Shema (3)]]

             The Sameh between Tell Milh and Beersheba, proposed for this place, is an error for Saweh (i.e., Hazor-Shual); and Tristram suggests (Bible Places, page 18) that Shema (i.e., Sheba) is represented by Tell es-Seba, about two miles east of Bir es-Seba. SEE BEERSHEBA.

## Shemachoth[[@Headword:Shemachoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Shemaiah[[@Headword:Shemaiah]]

             (Heb. Shemayah', שְמִעְיָה, heard [or rumor] of Jehovah [twice in the prolonged form, Shemaya'hu, שְׂמִעְיָהוּ, 2Ch 11:2; Jer 29:24]; Sept. Σαμαίας, v.r. Σαμα῏Ια, Σαμε῏Ι, etc.), the name of a large number of Hebrews.

1. A Reubenite son of Joel. and father of Gog (1 Chronicles 5, 4). B.C. post 1874. He was perhaps the same as the Shema (q.v.) of 1 Chronicles 5, 4:8.

2. Son of Elizaphan, and chief of his house (of two hundred men) in the reign of David, who took part in the ceremonial with which the king brought the ark from the house of Obed-edom (1Ch 15:8; 1Ch 15:11). B.C. 1043.

3. A Levite, son of Nethaneel, and also a scribe in the time of David, who registered the divisions of the priests by lot into twenty-four orders (1Ch 24:6). B.C. 1014.

4. Eldest of the eight sons of Obed-edom the Levite. He and his four valiant sons and other relatives, to the number of sixty-two, were gate keepers of the Temple (1Ch 26:4; 1Ch 26:6-7). B.C. 1014.

5. A prophet in the reign of Rehoboam who, when the king had assembled 180, 000 men of Benjamin and Judah to reconquer the northern kingdom after its revolt, was commissioned to charge them to return to their homes and not to war against their brethren (1Ki 12:22; 2Ch 11:2). B.C. 972. His second and last appearance upon the stage was upon the- occasion of the invasion of Judah and siege of Jerusalem by Shishak, king of Egypt. B.C. 969. His message was then one of comfort, to assure the princes of Judah that the punishment of their idolatry should not come by the hand of Shishak. (2Ch 12:5; 2Ch 12:7). From the circumstance that in 2Ch 11:1 the people of Rehoboam are called “Israel, ” whereas in 2Ch 11:5-6 the princes are called indifferently “of Judah” and “of Israel, ” some have unwarrantably inferred that the latter event occurred before the disruption of the kingdom. Shemaiah wrote a chronicle containing the events of Rehoboam's reign (2Ch 11:15).

6. One of the Levites who, in the third year of Jehoshaphat accompanied two priests and some of the princes of Judah to teach the people the book of the law (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 909.

7. Father of Shimri and ancestor of Ziza, which last was a chief of the. tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:37). B.C. long ante 726. He was perhaps the same with the Shimei (q.v.) of 1Ch 4:26-27.

8. A descendant of Jeduthun the singer who lived in the reign of Hezekiah. He assisted in the purification of the Temple and the reformation of the service, and with Uzziel represented his family on that occasion (2Ch 29:14). B.C. 726. (See No. 9.)

9. One of the Levites in the reign of Hezekiah who were placed in the cities of the priests to distribute the tithes among their brethren (2Ch 31:15). B.C. 726. He was perhaps identical with No. 8.

10. A chief Levite in the reign of Josiah who, with his brethren Conaniah. and Nathaneel, contributed sacrifices for the Passover (2Ch 35:9). B.C. 628.

11. Father of the prophet Urijah of Kirjath-jearim (Jerimiah 26:20). B.C. ante 608.

12. Father of Delilah, which latter was one of the princes who heard Baruch's roll (Jer 36:12). B.C. ante 605.

13. A Nehelamite and a false prophet in the time of Jeremiah. B.C. 606. He prophesied to the people of the captivity in the name of Jehovah, and attempted to counteract the influence of Jeremiah's advice that they should settle quietly in the land of their exile, build houses, plant vineyards, and wait patiently for the period of their return at the end of seventy years. His animosity to Jeremiah exhibited itself in the more active form of a letter to the high priest Zephaniah, urging him to exercise the functions of his office and lay the prophet in prison, and in the stocks. The letter was read by Zephaniah to Jeremiah, who instantly pronounced the message of doom against Shemaiah for his presumption that he should have none of his family to dwell among the people, and that himself should not live to see their return from captivity (Jer 29:24-32). SEE JEREMIAH.

14. A chief priest who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:6; Neh 12:18). B.C. 536. He lived to sign the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:8).B.C. 410.

15. One of the three “last sons” (i.e. supplementary heads of families) of Adonikam who returned with sixty males from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:13) B.C. 459.

16. One of the “heads” of the Jewish families whom Ezra sent for to his camp by the river of Ahava, for the purpose of obtaining Levites and ministers for the Temple from “the place Casiphia” (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

17. One of the priests of the “sons of Harim” who renounced their Gentile wives after the captivity (Ezr 10:21). B.C. 458. (Comp. No. 18.).

18. An Israelite of the “sons of Harim” who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:31). B.C. 458. (See No. 17.)

19. A priest, son of Mattauniah (q.v.) and father of Jonathan in the lineage of “Asaph” (Neh 12:35). B.C. ante 446.

20. Son of Galal and father of the Levite Obadiah (or Abda) who “dwelt in the villages of the Netophathites” after the return from Babylon (1  Chronicles 9:6). B.C. ante 446. He is elsewhere (Neh 11:17), called SHAMMUA SEE SHAMMUA (q.v.).

21. Son of Shechaniah and keeper of the east gate at Jerusalem, who assisted in repairing the wall after the captivity (Neh 3:29). B.C. 446.

22. Son of Delaiah the son of Mehetabel, a prophet in the time of Nehemiah who was bribed by Sanballat and his confederates to frighten the Jews from their task of rebuilding the wall, and to put Nehemiah in fear. In his assumed terror, he appears to have shut up his house and to have proposed that all should retire into the Temple and close the doors (Neh 6:10). B.C. 446.

23. Son of Hasshub, a Merarite Levite who lived in Jerusalem after the captivity (1Ch 9:14), and one of those who had oversight of the outward business of the house of God (Neh 11:15). B.C. 446.

24. One of the princes of Judah. who was in the procession that went towards the south when the two thanksgiving companies celebrated the solemn dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 12:34). B.C. 446.

25. One of the choir who took part in the procession with which the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem by Ezra was accompanied (Neh 12:36). B.C. 446. He appears to have been a Gershonite Levite and descendant of Asaph, for reasons which are given under MATTANIAH 8

26. One of the priests who blew with trumpets in the procession upon the newly completed walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

27. The son of Shechaniah and father of five sons among the descendants of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:22). He was possibly the same with No. 21. Lord Hervey. (Geneal. p. 107) uncritically proposes to omit the words at the beginning of 1Ch 3:22 as spurious, and, to consider Shemaiah identical with Shimei (q.v.), the brother of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19). This Shemaiah seems to be the same as the Semei of Luk 3:26. B.C. cir. 380. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Shemariah[[@Headword:Shemariah]]

             (Heb. Shemaryah', שְׁמִרְיָה, kept of Jehovah; or, in the prolonged from [1Ch 12:5], Shemarya'hu, שְׁמִרְיָהוּ; Sept. Σαμαρία, v.r. Σαμαρεία, Σαμαραία, Σαμορία), the name of four Hebrews.

1. One of the valiant Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5). B.C. 1054.

2. Middle named of the three sons of Rehoboam by his second wife, Abihail (2Ch 11:19. A.V. “Shamariah”). B.C. cir. 973.

3. A laymaan, of the “sons of Harim” who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:32). B.C. 458.

4. Another layman of the “sons of Bani” who did the same (Ezr 10:41). B.C. 458.

## Shemarim[[@Headword:Shemarim]]

             SEE LEES.

## Shemeber[[@Headword:Shemeber]]

             [many Sheme'ber] (Heb. id. שֶׁמְאֵבֶר, lofty flight [Gesenius], or splendor of heroism [Furst]; Sept. Σομοβόρ; Josephus, Συμόβορος, Ant. 9, 1), the king of Zeboim (q.v.) at the time of the attack of Sodom by Chedorlaomer (Gen 14:2). B. cir. 2088.

## Shemer[[@Headword:Shemer]]

             (Heb. id.; שֶׁמֶר, something kept, as lees of wine; Sept. Σεμήρ; Josephus, Σέμαρος, Ant. 8:12, 5), the original owner of the hill of Samaria, which derived its name from him. B.C. 917. Omri bought the hill for two talents of silver, and built thereon the city, also called Samaria, which made the capital of his kingdom (Kings 16:24). We should rather have expected that the name of the city would have been Shimron, for Shmeron would have been the name given after an owner Shomer. This latter form, which occurs in 1Ch 7:32, appears to be that adopted by the Vulgate and Syriac, which read Somer and Shomir respectively; but the Vatican MS. of the Sept. at that place retains the form “Shomer, ” and changes the name of the city to Σεμερών or Σεμηρών. Both names have the same radical  meaning, from שָׁמִר, to watch, referring, perhaps, by paronomasia, to this conspicuous post of observation. SEE SAMARIA. As the Israelites were prevented by the law (Lev 21:23) from thus alienating their inheritances, and as his name occurs without the usual genealogical marks, it is more than probable that Shemmer was descended from those Canaanites whom the Hebrews had not dispossessed of their lands.

## Shemida[[@Headword:Shemida]]

             (Heb. Shemida', שְׁמַידָע. fame of knowing, i.e. wise; Sept. Σεμιρά, v.r. Συμαρίμ, Συμαέρ. etc.), one of the sons of Gilead (Jos 17:2), fifth named among the six, and progenitor of the family of the Shemidaites (Num 26:32). His three “sons” are mentioned (1Ch 2:19, A.V. “Shemidah”). B.C. post 1856

## Shemidah[[@Headword:Shemidah]]

             (1Ch 7:19). SEE SHEMIDA.

## Shemidaite[[@Headword:Shemidaite]]

             (Heb. with the art. in the sing. used collectively, hash-Shemidai', הִשְּׁמַידָעַי, patronymic from Shemida; Sept. ὁ Συμαερί), a designation (Num 26:32) of the descendants of Shemida (q.v.), the son of Gilead, who obtained their inheritance among the male posterity of Manasseh (Jos 17:2, where they are called “children of Shemida”).

## Sheminith[[@Headword:Sheminith]]

             (Heb. with the art. hash-Sheminith', הִשְּׁמַינַית, fem. sing. of שַׁמַינַי, eighth.) The title of Psalms 6 contains a direction to the leader of the  stringed instruments of the Temple choir concerning the manner in which the psalm was to be sung. “To the chief musician on Neginoth upon Sheminith” or “the eighth,” as the margin of the A.V. has it, and as the same word is elsewhere rendered (Lev 25:32, etc.). A similar direction is found in the title of Psalms 12. The Sept. in both passages renders ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀγδόης, and the Vulg. pro octava. The Geneva Version gives “upon the eighth tune.” Referring to 1Ch 15:21, we find that certain Levites were appointed by David to play “with harps on the Sheminith,” which the Vulgate renders as above, and the Sept. by ἀμασενίθ, which is merely a corruption of the Hebrew. The Geneva version explains in the margin “which was the eighth tune, over the which he that was the most excellent had charge.” As we know nothing whatever of the music of the Hebrews, all conjectures as to the meaning of their musical terms are necessarily vague and contradictory.

With respect to Sheminith, most Rabbinical writers, as Rashi and Aben-Ezra, follow the Targum on the Psalms in regarding it as a harp with eight strings; but this has no foundation, and depends upon a misconstruction of 1Ch 15:21. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. נצח) says it denotes the bass, in opposition to Alamoth (1Ch 15:20), which signifies the treble. But as the meaning of Alamoth itself is very obscure, we cannot make use of it for determining the meaning of a term which, though distinct from, is not necessarily contrasted with it. Others, with the author of Shilte Haggibborim, interpret “the sheminith” as the octive; but there is no evidence that the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the octave as understood by ourselves so comparing the manner in which the word occurs in the titles of the two psalms already mentioned with the position of the terms Aijeleth Shahar, Jonath-elem-rechokim, etc., in other psalms, which are generally regarded as indicating the melody to be employed by the singers, it seems probable that Sheminlith is of the same kind, and denotes a certain air known as the eighth, or a certain key in which the psalm was to be sung. Maurer (Comm. in Psalms 6) regards Sheminith as an instrument of deep tone like the violoncello, while Alamoth he compares with the violin; and such, also, appears to be the view taken by Junius and Tremellius. SEE PSALMS.

## Shemiramoth[[@Headword:Shemiramoth]]

             (Heb. Shemiramoth', שְׁמַירָמוֹת, name of heights, i.e. Jehovah; Sept. Σμιραμώθ, v.r. Σιμιραμώθ, Σαμειραμώθ, etc.), the name of two Levites.

1. A musician “of the second degree” in the arrangement of the choral services by David (1Ch 15:18), playing “With psalteries on Alamoth” (1Ch 15:20), and harps (16:5). B.C. 1043.

2. One of those sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the law throughout the land (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 909.

## Shemitic Languages[[@Headword:Shemitic Languages]]

             I. Among the peoples of Hither Asia lay the root stem of these languages which are denominated “Shemitic,” or “Semitic” according to the French, which is supposed to have been spoken by the descendants of Shem. The ordinary denomination of thee languages, in earlier times, was “the Oriental languages.” This was employed by Jerome, and is still used to some extent in modern times. As long as the other languages of the East, which do not belong to the Shemitic stock, were not known in the West, this term was perfectly satisfactory, and the more so when Hebrew was viewed as the mother of all languages. Now, however, that an acquaintance with the Eastern languages is more developed, and a scientific study of them has spread so widely and extended itself especially in the academies, not only to the Persian, but also to the Egyptian, Chinese, Armenian and especially the Indian (Sanskrit), it naturally follows that all these languages belonging to different stems are comprehended under the name “Oriental,” so that this has now become an unsuitable term. The necessity arose to find a proper appellation which would distinguish that stem, forming now the Shemitic languages, from the other Oriental languages; and thus different suggestions were made. Leibnitz, e.g., suggested “Arabic;” Hupfeld (Hebr. Gram. p. 2) proposed “Hither-Asiatic” languages; Renan thinks that, in analogy to Indo-European, “Le veritable nom des langues qui nous occupent serait Syro-arabes.” Neither of these suggestions prevailed; but the term “Shemitic,” proposed by Schlozer in 1781, and recommended by Eichhorn (Allgem. Bibl. der bib. Lit. 6, 50, 772 sq.), has come into use. This latter term is based on the fact that in Gen 10:21-31 the Hebrews, together with the other tribes belonging to this stem, are derived  from Shem. But, like the former terms, the latter was also opposed, especially by Stange in his Theol. Symmikta (1802), pt. 1, p. 1-39. “And, indeed,” says Bleek, “it must be acknowledged that if we regard this catalogue of nations as its groundwork, there is not quite so much to be said in favor of it. We there read (Gen 10:22).

The children of Shem. Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram. Of these, Arphaxad is described as the grandfather of Eber, and Eber as the father” of Peleg and Joktan, the latter of whom is mentioned in the following verses as the head of many Arabian tribes; while Peleg is spoken of in ch. 11 as the great-great-grandfather of Terah, the father of Abraham, so that Arphaxad may be regarded as the progenitor of the Hebrews and of other tribes related to them by language. Aram, also as the progenitor of the Aramaeans would belong to this language stem. On the other hand, Elam certainly does not belong to it, but to the same stem as the Persians; the same may probably be said of Asshur and, also of Lud, whom we may, with Josephus, regard as the parent of the Lydians. On the other side, however, we find the Canaanites and Phoenicians (10, 15-19), the Ethiopians (Cush [Gen 10:6-7]), and several Arabian tribes traced up to Ham, although there is no doubt that so far as language is concerned they belong to the same stem as the Hebrews and Aramaeans. From Bleek's statement it will be seen that the term “Shemitic” does not serve all purposes. True as this is, yet, in default of a better term, the name Shemitic languages has been retained, and is now current, with the distinct understanding of its being a false and merely conventional expression.

II. Division. — Viewing the Shemitic languages from a geographical point of view, they may be divided into three principal branches. Thus we a have: (a) The Northern or Northeastern branch, the Aramaic; (b) The Southern, among which the Arabic is the chief dialect, and with which the Ethiopic is also connected; (c) The Middle, the Hebrew, with which the Canaanitish and Phoenician (Punic) nearly coincide. With this a division, Renan says corresponds the one which we may call the historical, according to which the Hebraic would assume the first place, extending from the earliest. times of our knowledge of it down to the 6th century B.C., when the Aramaic begins to take the lead, and the field of Hebrew and Phoenician (the chief representatives of Hebraic) becomes more and more restricted. The Aramaic, again, would be followed by the Arabic period, dating from the time of Mohammed, when the Islam and its conquests spread the language of the Koran, not merely over the whole Shemitic territory, but over a vast  portion of the inhabited globe. But this division, as M. Renan remarks, “ne doit etre prise que dans un sens general, et avec trois restrictions importantes.

1. Les idiomes remplaces par un autre, l'Hebreu par l'Arameen, le Syriaque par l'Arabe, ne disparaissent pas pour cela entierement: ils restent langue savante et sacree, et, a ce titre, continuent d'etre cultives longtemps apres avoir cesse d'etret vulgaires.

2. Cette succession des trois langies Semitiques ne peut signifier que chacune d'elles ait ete parlee en meme temps dans toute l'etendue des pays occupes par la race Semitique elle signifie seulement que chacun de ces trois dialectes fut tour a tour dominant, et representa, a son jour, le plus haut developpement de l'esprtit Semitique. Toute l'histoire intellectuelle des Semites, en effet, se partage, comme l'histoire des langues Semitiques elles-memes, en trois phases — Hebraique, Chaldeo-Syriaque, et Arabe.

3. Cette division, enfin, ne doit point etre entendue d'une maneire absolue, mais seulement par rapport a l'etat de nos connaissances” (Histoire des Lang. Sem. p. 108). The writer of the art. Shemitic Languages in Kitto's Cyclopedia, Mr. E. Deutsch, seems to have known M. Renan's work and those of others holding the same view for he says that these authors “had to hedge it in with many and variegated restrictions.” But any one reading the remarks of M. Renan will hardly understand the unnecessary zeal exhibited by the writer in Kitto when he says, “But we further protest all the more strongly against it, as it might easily lead to the belief that the one idiom gradually merged into the other.”

Out of the three principal branches, in the course of time, others developed themselves. The following table, taken from Prof. M. Muller's Science of Language, 1, 396 (Amer. ed.), exhibits them in a genealogical way:

III. Characteristics of the Shemitic Languages. — Not only are all these languages (with the exception of the Ethiopic and Amharic) written from right to left, but they are related to each other in much the same manner as those of the Germanic family (Gothic, Old Northern, Danish, Swedish High and Low German, in the earlier and later dialects), or as those of the Slavic tongues (Lithuanian, Lettish; Old Slavic, Servian, Russian, Polish,  Bohemian), bearing in mind, however, that the relationship in the former case is more thorough and complete than in the latter.

In the first place, the whole of the Shemitic dialects agree substantially with regard to the root words and their meaning; the only difference being that one language, the Arabic, is comparatively far richer than the other dialects. Thus, e.g., the Arabic possesses nearly 6000 roots and about 60,000 words, while in Hebrew only about 2000 roots and 6000 words are known to us. Or, again, the Arabic philologists quote 1000 different terms for a sword, 500 for a lion, 200 for a serpent, 400 for misfortune. But we must take this into consideration, that in the other dialects only a small number, of literary records, comparatively speaking, have been preserved and that the Arabic, as a living language, is known to us in a far later development than the Hebrew. But by far the larger part of the root words which are found in Hebrew appear also in the other dialects, and in essentially the same or only a slightly modified signification. Besides, in, the present form of the language in all these dialects, nearly all the stem words are composed of three consonants. In all the Shemitic dialects the consonants are seen to be far more essential than the vowels. The former almost alone determine the essential meaning of the word, while the differences of the vowels do no more than give the different references and modifications of this meaning.

Not the less do we find in the whole grammatical construction, as well as in particular instances of grammatical formation and structure, the greatest and most surprising agreement between the various Shemitic languages or dialects thus we have but two genders, and these are also distinguished in the second and third persons of the verb. In the inflection of verbs they have only two moods (commonly considered to be tenses); but these are strongly contrasted by the position of the marks of the persons at the end or at the beginning the so called perfect for the completed or actual, and the imperfect for the incomplete or hypothetical, without decidedly giving expression to the tenses by peculiar forms. Nouns are not declined by means of case endings, but the genitive is expressed by closely combining two words, and other cases by using prepositions, while the pronouns have mere suffixes for the oblique cases. Finally, they are characterized by poverty in the particles, and consequently they have their clauses formed with extreme simplicity and they are defective in the structure of sentences, at least if they are judged by the standard of the Latin and the German languages. Considering all these facts, they plainly show that one original  language lies at the foundation of them all that in early times — anterior, however, to all our historical knowledge of them — these nations certainly all spoke one language, which has in later periods, as they separated one from the other, developed into these various dialects” (Bleek).

IV Comparison of the Shemitic Languages with One Another. — When we enter on the consideration of the mutual relation, we find that by far the richest and most developed of the Shemitic languages is that of the South, known to us as

1. The Arabic. — Referring the reader to the art. SEE ARABIC LANGUAGE in this Cyclopedia, we will only make a few general remarks. Before the time of Mohammed it was confined to Arabia, and scarcely cultivated except in poetry; but along with Islam it has spread itself over the greater part of Asia and Africa, and has unfolded its great wealth in a very comprehensive literature, which extends to almost all the domains of knowledge.

Even in the earliest times it is possible that this dialect was separated from those with which it is allied, though the traces of this are few. The most marked is the form אּלְמוֹדִד ּ(Gen 10:26), the designation of a district of Arabia Felix, having the article prefixed, which has also been preserved elsewhere in some Hebrew documents, as in Pro 30:31, אלְקו, Jos 15:30, comp. 1Ch 4:29. We know, also, that already in the time of Solomon the wisdom of the Arabs was highly prized; and that enigmas, and so, at least, the beginning of poesy, were to be found in Yemen, or rather in Sabaea: (1Ki 4:30; 1Ki 10:1 sq.).

In the beginning it probably had forms which were simpler and more like the Hebrew than those in which it is known to us, which have been cultivated to the very uttermost; but soon the one language fell to pieces, as the many independent tribes formed their several dialects, of which the Himyeritic in Yemen was strongly marked by differences from the language of Central Arabia, being simpler, and so more nearly allied to the Hebrew. But when the Himyarites kingdom fell, this dialect was compelled to yield to that of Mecca (the Modarensitic or Koraishitic), which had become a written form of speech before Mohammed's time, and is in the Koran (Sura 16:103) named the Arabic language, κατ ἐξοχήν. In this dialect the entire Arabic literature is composed. Then it was gradually supplanted by the present commonly spoken language, which has not only  adopted many foreign words, Turkish especially, but has also lost the variety of forms which it possessed and the very capacity for forming others, and thus has returned nearer to the ancient simplicity as well as to the Hebrew and Aramaic.

From the intimate connection from the earliest times between South Arabia and Ethiopia it has arisen that we have in the Ethiopic language (q.v.) a remnant of the old Himyeritic dialect, lost even to the Arabic itself. In this ancient written language (the Geez) we possess a translation of the Bible and other ecclesiastical writings, of which the most important is the translation of the book of Enoch. The language has a simpler character than the more cultivated Arabic, and approaches more to the Hebrew and Aramaic idiom. In the 14th century it was supplanted by Amharic, and is now only a learned language.

The literature of the Arabic language being very rich, we shall only mention here, by way of supplement to the article ARABIC LANGUAGE in this Cyclopedia, the works published recently in so far as they have come under our observation

A. Grammars of both the Ancient and Modern Arabic Bresuier, Cours Pratique et Theorique de la Langue Arabe, etc. (Alger. 1855); id. Grammaire Arabe Elementaire, etc. (ibid. 1866); Mohamed Cadi, La Langue Arabe, etc. (Cairo, 1862, 3 vols.) Caspari, Grammatik der arab Sprache (Leips. 1866); Fahrat, Grammaire Arabe (Beirut, 1865); Faris-el- Shidiak, A Practical Grammar of the Arabic Language, etc. (Lond. 1866); Freytag, Einleitung in das Studium der arab. Sprache (Bonn, 1861); Goldenthal, Grammaire Arabe ecrite en Hebreu, etc. (Vienna, 1857); Gorguos, Cours d'Arabe Vulgaire (Paris, 1864, 2 pts.); Hassan, Kurzgefasste Grammatik der vulgar-arabischen Sprache (Vienna, 1869); Leitner, Introduction to a Philosophical Grammar of Arabic (Lahore, 1870); Mallouf, Fevay de Charquive, ou Abrege de Grammaire Arabe, etc. (Smyrna, 1854); Narul Kira, Nasif El Yazighy (Beirut, 1863), an Arabic grammar in Arabic; Newman, A Handbook of Modern Arabic (Lond. 1866); Raabe, Gemeinschaftliche Grammatik der arabischen u. der semitischen Sprachen (Leips. 1874); Sapeto, Grammatica Araba Volgare (Florence, 1867); Schier, Grammaire Arabe (Leips. 1862); Zschokke, Institiutiones Fundamentales Linguoe Arabicoe (Vienna, 1869); Wolff, Arabischer Dragoman (Leips. 1867).

B. Dictionaries. — Bochtor, Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe, etc. (Paris, 1S64); Butrus a Bustany (Beirut, 1866-70, 2 vols. fol., an abridged edition, ibid. 1867-70), an Arabic dictionary explained in Arabic; Calligaris, Le Compagnon de Tous, ou Dictionnaire Polyglotte, etc. (Turin, 1864-70, 2 vols.); Cherbonneau, Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe (Par. 1872); Helot, Dictionnaire de Poche Francais-Arabe et Arabe-Francais (Alger. 1870); Henry, Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe (Beirut, 1867); Kazimirski, Dictionnaire Arabe-Francais, etc. (Paris, 1860, 2 vols.); Marcel, Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe des Dialectes Vulgaires (ibid. 1869); Newman, A Dictionary of Modern Arabic (Lond. 1870, 2 vols.): Paulmier, Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe (Paris, 1872); Roland de Bussy, Petit Dictionnaire Francais-Arabe et Arabe-Francais (Alger. 1867); Schiaparelli, Vocabulista in Arabico (Florence, 1871); Wahrmund, Handworterbuch der arabischen und deutschen Sprache (Giessen, 1874, 2 vols.).

C. Chrestomathies. — Cherbonneau. Exercises pour la Lecture de Manuscrits Arabes, etc. (Paris, 1853); id. Lecons de Lecture Arabe etc. (ibid. 1864); Combarel, Cahiers d'Ecritures Arabes, etc. (ibid. 18S 0).

2. The Syro-Chaldee. — That the Arabic in the South was not the most developed of all the Shemitic languages we see in the Aramaic language (q.v.). Here, also, we cannot enter upon a minute history of that language, for which the reader is referred to the article in this Cyclopoedia. Our remarks can only be of a general character.

The countries in the north of Palestine stretching from the Tigris to the Taurus are comprehended in Scripture under the name of Aram, or Highland. Their inhabitants, the ‘Αραμαῖοι and ῎Αριμοι of the ancients (Hom. Il. 2, 783), were of different nations (even in Scripture they are distinguished as Aram-Damascus, אֲרִ םדִּמֶשֶׁק;, Padan-Aram, פִדִּןאֲרִ;. Aram-Zobah, אִרִ םצוֹבָה etc.), and they passed historically through the most diversified relations. The common language of these people, in respect of its general character, as it is of all the Shemitic dialects the most northern, so also is it the harshest (in place of the softer labials ש ז, and צ, it has ד, ת, and ט, i.e. the d and t sounds) the poorest (it wants a complete vowel system, hence as verbal form כְּתִב[Heb. כָּתִב], noun form מְלֵך ְ[Heb. מֶלֶךְ]); it has corresponding with this a scanty conjugation system; it possesses no vestige of the conjugation Niphal, but forms all its passives  by the prefix את; it does not carefully distinguish the formation of the weaker roots, but interchanges the verbs and nouns, לאand לה, פו and פי, etc., and in general the least cultivated.

In the Old Test. we find this dialect denominated, in opposition to the Palestinian, the Aramaic language (ארמית, Isa 36:11; 2Ki 18:26). In the time of Isaiah, as appears from the passage just cited, educated Hebrews could speak Aramaic, and, conversely, educated Arameans could speak Hebrew (Isa 36:4 sq.); while the common people understood only their vernacular dialect. The subsequent transportation of the Jewish people into Babylon contributed to silence more entirely the ancient vernacular in Judaea, and to render the triumph of the Aram seal in those parts more general. Finally, during the long exile of the Jews in Babylon, the language of their fatherland appears to have been altogether laid aside, so that those who at the termination of the captivity returned into Palestine brought with them the dialect of Babylon as their customary medium of speech. Among the priesthood and learned men, the Hebrew had, indeed, been retained as the language of literature and religion but so fully had it passed from the populace in general that we find them, on the reinstitution of public worship at Jerusalem, incapable of understanding the holy writings except as paraphrased in Aramaic (Neh 8:8).

This was the tongue which, with a slight intermixture of Persic and Greek (in consequence of the temporary dominion of the Persians and Macedonians in Palestine), had prevailed from the period of the return from Babylon, and was still maintained in popular use at the opening of the Christian dispensation under the name of Palestinian Aramaic, or Palestinian Syriac.

This Palestinian Syriac is a language, therefore, preeminently interesting to the Christian. “It was sanctified by the lips of the Divine Redeemer. In these forms of speech he conversed with the Virgin mother, instructed his disciples, and proclaimed to myriads the promises of eternal life. In them he gave forth those sovereign mandates which controlled the tempestuous elements, dispossessed the demoniac brought health to the diseased, and a resurrection life to the dead. In this very tongue we have still the words in which he taught his people the prayer which calls upon the Almighty God as our Father in heaven. Finally, it was in this language that he himself prayed upon earth, and that the Father spoke audibly to him from the  heavens. Thus consecrated, it became a celestial language, a holy tongue, a chosen vehicle which conveyed the thoughts of the uncreated mind and the purposes of eternal love to the sons of men.”

The Aramaean language may be said, in general terms, to have been distinguished into the Eastern and Western Aramaic. Of these, a full account is given in this Cyclopaedia under the respective heads of CHALDEE LANGUAGE and SYRIAC LANGUAGE. We therefore here consider some of the more obscure dialects.

(1.) The Samaritan. — This dialect occupies an intermediate position with reference to Hebrew and Aramaic, and is particularly characterized by changes in the guttural, also by containing many non-Shemitic (Cuthaic) words. The Samaritans have no means of distinguishing between the Hebrew letters ש ׂand שׁ the have no final or dilatable forms, like the Hebrews, for any of the letters, but use the same form under all circumstances. The character used is the most ancient of the Shemitic characters, which the Samaritans retained when the Hebrews adopted the square character. Few remains of this dialect are extant (comp. the articles SEE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, etc.).

(2.) The Sabian or Nazarean. — This language, known as yet only from the Codex Nazaraeus, also called The Book of Adam (edited by M. Norberg, Gottingen, 1815-17, 3 vols.), occupies a place between the Syrian and Chaldee, makes frequent changes in gutturals and other letters, is in general incorrect in spelling and grammar, and has adopted many Persian words. The MSS. are written in a peculiar character; the letters are formed like those of the Nestorian Syriac, and the vowels are inserted as letters in the text.

(3.) The Palmyrene. — Of this dialect no specimens are now extant, except such scanty fragments as are contained in the Palmyrian inscriptions, for an account of which we may refer to R. Wood's Ruins of Palmyra (Lond. 1753), interpreted independently by Barthelemy in Paris, and better by Swinton in Oxford. Some more specimens were given by Eichhorn, Marmora Palmyrena Explicata (Gottingen, 1827, 4to). The inscriptions are chiefly bilingual — in an Aramaic which is much like the common dialect, and in Greek — the earliest being A.D. 49, but most of them being in the 2d and 3d centuries.

(4.) The Old Phoenician, together with Punic. — A document of some size in the old Phoenician was first discovered in 1855, communicated by Dr. Thomson, of Beirut, and purchased by the duc de Luynes for the Louvre. Rodiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, Schlottmann, De Luynes, Ewald, and Munk endeavored to interpret it. More recent is the sacrificial tablet discovered at Marseilles, explained by Movers (Breslau, 1847), Ewald, and A. C. Judas. Of chief importance for the Punic are the Punic passages in the Poenulus of Plautus, illustrated by Movers and Ewald. The rest of the Phoenician and Punic inscriptions (including those on coins) hitherto discovered have been collected and illustrated by Gesenius in Mon. Ling. Phoen. (Lips. 1837, 3 vols.), to which must be added forty-five inscriptions by the abbe Bourgade (Paris, 1852, fol.), deciphered by the abbe Barges. SEE PHOENICIA.

Linguistic Literature. —

A. Chaldee. — Passing over the more ancient works, we will only give some of the more modern:

I. Grammars. — Harris [W.], Elements of the Chaldee Language, etc. (Lond. 1822); Nolan, An Introduction to Chaldee Grammar, etc. (ibid. 1821); Rigge [El.], Manual of the Chaldee Language (Boston, 1832); Winer-Hackett, Grammar of the Chaldee Language (Andover, 1845); Luzzatto-Kruger, Grammatik der biblisch-chaldaischen Sprache (Breslau, 1873); Chaldee Reading-Lessons, with a Grammatical Praxis, etc. (Lond. ed. Bagster).

II. Lexicons. — In this department the Thesaurus is the great work of Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum, talmudicum, et. Rabbinicum (Basil. 1640; new ed. by Fischer, Leips. 1666-44); Schonhak, Aramaisch-rabbinisches Worterburch (Warsaw, 1859); Levy [I.], Chaldaisches Worterbuch uber die Targumim (Leips. 1867); id. Neuhebr und chald. Worterbuch (ibid.), now in course of publication.

B. Syriac. —

I. Grammars. — Cowper [B.H.], The Principles of the Syriac Grammar (Lond. 1858); Merx [A.], Grammatica Syriaca (Halle, 1867-69); Nolan. [F.], An Introduction to the Syriac Language, etc. (Lond. 1821); Philips [S.], Syriac Grammar (Cambridge, 1866); Uhlemann Hutchinson, Syriac Grammar (N.Y. 1855); Syriac Reading-Lessons, etc. (Loud. ed. Bagster).

II. Lexicons. — Frost [M.], Lexicon Syriacum (1623); Gutbir [Aeg.], Lexicon Syriacum, continens omnes N.T. Syr. Dictiones. et Particulas, etc. (Hamb. 1667): a neat and improved. edition of this Lexicon was given by Dr. Henderson (Lond. 183G, Bagster); Bernstein [G. H.], Lexicon Linguoe Syr. (Berol. 1857, fol. vol. 1). Older ones we omit.

C. Samaritan. — SEE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, etc.

D. The Sabian or Nazarean. — Norberg [M.], Onomasticon Codicis Nasarei (Lund. 1817, 2 vols.); id. Lexicon Codicis Nasarei (ibid. 1816).

E. The Palmyrene. — Bartholemy, Reflexions sur Alphabet et sur la Langue dont ont se servoit autrefois a Palmyre, in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptionis, tom. 26.

F. The Phoenician. — Levy [Dr. M.A.], Phonizisches Worterbuch (Breslau, 1864); Schroder [P.], Grammatische Untersuchungen uber die phonizische Sprache, etc. (Halle, 1869); Wuttke H.], Entstehung u. Beschafenheit des fonikisch-hebr. Alfabetes, in the Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft (1857), 11, 75.

3. The third main branch of the Shemitic the Mid-Shemitic, is best known to us as the Hebrew language (q.v.). As this is the most important to the student of Sacred Writ, we will give a short outline of the same, following its history through the different stages, till, like the Arabic, it became an object of philological study.

(1.) Name and Origin. — The Hebrew language takes its name from Abraham's descendants, the Israelites, who are ethnographically called Hebrews,\* and who spoke this language while they were an independent people. In the Old Test. it is poetically called the language of Canaan (שְׂפִת כְּנִעִן, γλῶσσα ἡ Χαναανῖτις, Isa 19:18, “emphatically the language of the holy land consecrated to Jehovah, as contrasted with that of the profane Egypt,” as Havernick expresses it and also the Jews' language (לָשוֹןיְהוּדַית, Ιουδαϊστί, 2Ki 18:26; Isa 36:11; Isa 36:13; Neh 13:24), from the kingdom of Judah. The name “Hebrew language” nowhere occurs in the Old Test., since in general there is rarely anything said of the language of the Israelites; it appears in the prologue to Ecclus., ῾Εβραϊστι, and in Josephus (Ant. 1, 1, 2), γλῶττα τῶν ῾Εβραίων. In the New Test. ῾Εβραϊστί (Joh 5:2; Joh 19:13; Joh 19:17, etc.) and ῾Εβραϊvς διάλεκτος (Act 21:40; Act 22:2; Act 26:14) denote the Aramaic,  which was spoken in the country at the time.\*\* In later Jewish writers (as in the Targumists) the Hebrew language is called לַשָׁןדְּקוּדְשָׁא(the sacred tongue), in contrast with the Aramaic (לְשׁוֹןחוֹל).

\* There is a controversy as to the origin of this name. Aben-Ezra (d. 1168), Buxtorf (d. 1629), Loscher [F.E.] 1749), Buddeus [J.G.] (d. 1764), Lengerke (d. 1855), Meier [E.] (d. 1866), Ewald (d. 1875), and others derive it from the Shemite Eber (Gen 10:24; Gen 11:14 sq.), while most of the rabbins and of the fathers (as Jerome, Theodoret, Origen. Chrysostom), Arias Montanus, Paulus Burgensis, Munster, Luther, Grotius, Scaliger, Eusebius, Walton, Clericus, Rosenmuller, Gesenius, Eichhorn, Hengstenberg, Bleek, and others derive it from עֵבֵר“beyond,” following the Sept., which translates עַבְרַי (Gen 14:13) by ὁ περάτης, “the man from beyond,” referring to Abraham's immigration.

\*\* The passage in Philo (De Vita Mosis, 2, 509, ed. Colon., Young's transl. 3, 82), according to which the original of the Pentateuch was written in Chaldaic, shows how much the Alexandrians of that time had lost the knowledge of the difference of the dialect, and is to be ascribed to Philo's ignorance in this department.

(2.) Antiquity of the Hebrew Language. — On this point, and the question whether the Hebrew was the primitive language, there is a great diversity of opinion. “It is clear,” says Havernick (introd. p. 128), “that this question can be satisfactorily answered only by those who regard the Biblical narrative (viz. Gen 11:1 sq.) as true history. Those who, like the mass of recent interpreters, look at it from a mythical point of view. cannot possibly obtain any results. Gesenius says that, as respects the antiquity and origin of the Hebrew language, if we, do not take this mythical account, we find ourselves totally deserted by the historian.” Returning, then, to the ancient view of this passage, we find that most of the rabbins,\* the fathers,\*\* the older theologians — Buxtorf [John], the son (Dissert. Phil. Theol. [Basil. 1662], Diss. 1), Walton (Proleg. 3, 3 sq.), Pfeiffer [A.] (Decas Select. Exercitt. Bibl., in his Dubia Vexata, p. 59 sq.), St. Morinus (De Ling. Primoeva [Ultraj. 1694]), Loscher [Val.] (De Causis Ling. Hebrews 1, 2, 5 ), Carpzov (Rit. Sacr. p. 174 sq.), among the moderns and, with some limitation, Pareau, Havernick, Von Gerlach, Baumgarten, and others, believe that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind, while some contend that if any of the Asiatic tongues may claim the honor of being the ancestral language of our race, the palm should be given to the Sanskrit. Between these two opinions the question now rests, and “it is  astonishing,” says. Prof. Muller (Science of Language, 1, 133), “what an amount of real learning and ingenuity was wasted on this question during the 17th and 18th, centuries. It might have been natural for theologians in the 4th and 5th centuries, many of whom knew neither Hebrew nor any language except their own, to take it for granted that Hebrew was the source of all languages; but there is neither in the Old. nor in the New Test. a single word to necessitate this view. Of the language of Adam we know nothing; but if Hebrew, as we know it was one of the languages that sprang from the confusion of tongues at Babel, it could not well have been the language of Adam, or of the whole earth when the whole earth was still of one speech.'” The first who really conquered the prejudice that Hebrew was the source of all language was Leibnitz, the contemporary and rival of Newton. “There is as much reason,” he said, “for supposing Hebrew to have been the primitive language of mankind as there is for adopting the view of Serapius, who published a work at Antwerp, in 1550, to prove that Dutch was the language spoken in Paradise.” In a letter to Tenzel, Leibnitz writes: “To call Hebrew the primitive language is like calling the branches of a tree primitive branches, or like imagining that in some country hewn trunks would grow instead of trees. Such ideas may be conceived, but they do not agree with the laws of nature and with the harmony of the universe that is to say, with the Divine Wisdom.”

\*”And all the inhabitants of the earth were [of] one language, and of one speech, and one counsel for they spake the holy language by which the world was created at the beginning” (Targum on Gen 11:1; comp. also Rashi and Abel-Ezra, ad loc.).

\*\*The fathers of the Church have never expressed any doubt on this point. Jerome (d. 420), in one of his epistles to Damasus, writes, “The whole of antiquity (universa antiquitas) affirms that Hebrew, in which the Old Test. is written, was the beginning of all human speech;” and in his Comm. in Soph. c. 3, he says “Linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum esse matricem.” Origen (d. 254), in his eleventh homily on the book of Numbers, erxαὐτὸς ὁ ῾῏Εβερ ἔμενε τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων διάλεξιν, ηνπερ καὶ προτερον, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο σημεῖον ἐναργές γένηται τῆς οιαιρέσεως [Hom. 30, in Gen. p. 300, ed. Montf.]), and Augustine (d. 430), in his De Civitate Dei, 16, 11, “Quae lingua prius humane generi non immerito creditur fuisse communis, deinceps Hebraea est nuncupata” (i.e. his family [Heber's] preserved that language which is not unreasonably believed to have been the common language of the race; it was on this account thenceforth called Hebrew). Theodoret (d. 452), in  Quest. in. Genesin, p. 60, however, believes, like Delitzsch, that the Syriac was the primitive language, holding that Hebrew was first introduced by God through Moses as a holy language.

(3.) Character and Development of the Hebrew Language. — In relation to the rest of the Shemitic languages, the Hebrew, whether regarded as the primitive language or not, has for the most part retained the stamp of high antiquity, originality, and greater simplicity and purity of forms. In its earliest written state it exhibits, in the writings of Moses, a perfection of structure which was never surpassed. As it had, no doubt, been modified between the time of Abraham and Moses by the Egyptian and Arabic; so in the period between Moses and Solomon it was influenced by the Phoenician, and, down to the time of Ezra, continued to receive an accession of exotic terms which, though tending to enlarge its capabilities as a spoken and written tongue, materially affected the primitive simplicity, and purity of a language compared with which none may be said to have been so poor, and yet none so rich. But with the period of the captivity there arose an entirely new literature, strikingly different from the earlier, and this is to be traced to the influence exerted by the Aramaic tongue upon the Hebrew, which had previously been developing itself within restricted limits. This was the introduction to its gradual decay, which did not become fully manifest, however, until the commencement of the Chaldaean period. Not only did the intrusion of this powerful Aramaic element greatly tarnish the purity of the Hebrew words and their grammatical formation, older ones having been altered and supplanted by newer ones, which are Aramaic for the most part;\* it also obscured the understanding of the old language,\*\* and it enfeebled its instinctive operations, until at length it stifled them. The consequence was that the capacity of observing grammatical niceties in the old pure Hebrew was entirely lost;\*\*\* partly the distinction of prose and poetical diction was forgotten;\*\*\*\* and, finally, as the later writers went back upon the Pentateuch and other older compositions, many elements which had already died out of the language were reproduced as archaisms.\*\*\*\*\*

\* This is especially seen in the coining of new words for abstract ideas by means of prefixed letters or syllables added, as תִּגְמוּל for גְּמוּל (Psa 116:12); תִּזְנוּת for זְנוּה(Eze 16:18; Eze 16:20); בִּקָשָׁה (Ezr 1:6; Est 5:3; Est 5:7-8), etc. \*\* This is shown by the increasing use of the scriptio plena, as יָצוּמוּ four יֶצֻמוּ; the interchange of the weak letters ה and א for instance, הֵיךְ(1Ch 13:12) for אֵיך ְ(2Sa 6:9); the resolution of the dagesh forte in sharpened syllables by inserting a vowel, as אַיתִי for אַתֵּי (1Ch 1:31), or by inserting a liquid, דִּרְמֶשֶׁקfor דִּמֶשֶׂק(1Ch 18:5-6).

\*\*\* Interchange of אֵת as the sign of the accusative, and as meaning “with” — for instance, Jer 1:16; Jer 19:10; Jer 20:11, etc.; the use of ל to mark the accusative instead of the dative (1Ch 5:26; 1Ch 16:37; 1Ch 29:20; 1Ch 29:22, etc.) the use of עִל instead of אֶל; the use of Aramaic forms of inflection, as, אִתְּי for אִתְּ (Jer 4:30); תְי. For תְ (Jer 2:33; Jer 3:4-5; Jer 4:19), etc.

\*\*\*\* Comp. בַּלֵּהִּ, (Piel), “to be afraid” (Ezr 4:4, elsewhere only the substantive בִּלָהָה in poetry); זָנִה, “to reject with loathing” (1Ch 28:9; 2Ch 11:14; 2Ch 29:19, earlier only in poets, and in Hos 7:3; Hos 7:5; Zec 10:6).

\*\*\*\*\* E.g. מַי, “species” (Eze 47:10, taken from the Pentateuch); מְשׂוּרָה, “a measure” (1Ch 23:29); Eze 4:11; Eze 4:16, etc., from Lev 19:35); נָכִל, “to act cunningly” (Mal 1:1; Mal 1:4; Psa 105:25, from Gen 37:18 or Num 25:18), etc.

(4.) Decay of the Hebrew Language. — But the great crisis of the language occurs at the time of the captivity of Babylon. Then, as a spoken tongue, it became deeply tinged with Aramaic. The Biblical Hebrew, abiding in the imperishable writings of the prophets, continued to be the study of the learned; it was heard on the lips of the priest in the services of religion, and was the vehicle of written instruction; but as the medium of common conversation it was extensively affected, and, in the case of multitudes, superseded, by the idiom of the nation among whom Providence had cast their lot. So an Aramaized Hebrew, or a Hebraized Aramaean, continued to be spoken by such of them as resettled in Palestine under Ezra and Nehemiah, while the yet greater number who preferred the uninterrupted establishment of their families in Babylonia fell entirely into the use of Aramaic.

This decline of the popular knowledge of pure Hebrew gave occasion to the appointment of an order of interpreters (meturgemadin) in the  synagogue for the explication of the Scriptures in this more current dialect, as can be seen from Neh 8:8, where we read, “They [the priests and Levites] read in the book, in the law of God מְפֹרְשׁ, and appended thereto the sense, and caused them to understand the reading,” where the word means, “with an explanation subjoined,” i.e. with an interpretation added, with an explanation in Chaldee the vulgar tongue, as appears from the context; and by a comparison of Ezr 4:18 and Ezr 4:7. Accordingly, the Talmudists have already correctly explained our passage, מפרש זה תרגו, and so also Clericus, Dathe, etc. SEE TARGUM.

But while these changes were taking place in the vernacular speech, the Hebrew language itself still maintained its existence. It is a great mistake to call Hebrew a dead language. It has never died, it will never die. In the days to which we are now referring, it was still loved and revered by the Jewish people as the “holy tongue” of their patriarchs and prophets. Not only the remaining canonical Scriptures, but the prayers and hymns of the Temple and synagogue, were, for the most part, written in it, and even the inscriptions of the coinage retained both the language and the more antique characters, in preference to those more recently introduced by Ezra.

(5.) The Written Hebrew. — About the time when the language underwent this internal change, it was also changed externally. That we have not the original Hebrew characters in MS. and printed texts of the Bible is evident from a tradition we have in the Talmud that “at first the law was given to Israel in the Hebrew writing and the holy tongue, and again it was given to them in the days of Ezra in the Assyrian writing and the Syrian tongue. They chose for the Israelites the Assyrian writing and the holy tongue and. left to the Idiotoe (i.e. the Samaritans) the Hebrew writing and the Syrian tongue.. And although the law was not given by Ezra's hand, yet the writing and language were called the Assyrian (Sanhedr. 21, 2; 22, 1). This Assyrian writing (כְּתָב אִשּׁוּרי) is also called “square writing” (כְּתָב מְרֻבָּע), “correct writing” (כְּתיבָה תִמָּהְ), and by the Samaritans “Ezra's writing” (כְּתָב עֶזְרָא). We must suppose that the square character, which came into use after the exile, only gradually thrust the elder character aside. for in the Maccabaean coinage the ancient Hebrew character was used, and while we may trace back the origin of the new characters nearly to the times of Ezra, certain it is that at a later time it was perfected in its present form, and long before the time of the Talmud, since there we find  directions given concerning the writing of the alphabet, of which we will speak farther on.

(6.) Tradition; Period of the Hebrew Language — It is chiefly among the Jews of Palestine that we are to seek the preservation of the knowledge of the Hebrew language. Though the Hebrew ceased to be even a written language, yet for practical ends in the sages of worship the study of the old Hebrew documents became for them an indispensable duty for which the affinity of the language they used must have offered them peculiar facilities. Hence, as early as the book of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), which was probably written between B.C. 290 and 280, mention is made of the study of Scripture as the chief and fairest occupation of the γραμματεύς, the διανοεῖσθαι ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου, and σοφίαν πάτων ἀρχαίων ἐκζητήσει, καὶ ἐν προφητείαις ἀσχοληθῆσεται (Sir 29:1 sq.). The more erudite study of Hebrew Scripture was prosecuted in Palestine and Babylonia from the days of Ezra, not only by individual scribes, but also in formal schools and academies, the בָּתֵּי הִמַּדְרָשׁ, also בְּתֵּי רִבָּנָ, and ישַׁיבוֹת, which were established there before the time of Christ. The chief seat of these at first was principally at Jerusalem, then after the destruction of this city by the Romans it was transferred to Jamnia or Jabneh, under Jochanan ben-Zachai (i.q.), till under Gamaliel III ben-Jehudah I (A.D. 93- 220) Tiberias became the seat of learning. Among the teachers of Tiberias, rabbi Jehudah the Holy, or hak-Kodesh (q.v.), the compiler of the Mishna obtained a remarkable reputation in the latter half of the 2d century. After his death, the seat of this scriptural erudition was once more transplanted to Babylonia, where, with reference to this, the schools at certaficaties on the Euphrates — Sora, Pumbaditha, and Nahardea — attained preeminently to high esteem. Still, along with these, the Palestinian schools subsisted uninterruptedly, especially the school at Tiberias, and to the labors of these schools are due in part the Targums, but principally the Talmud and the Masorah.

\* Jerome, in Prol. Gal.: “Certum est, Esdram alias literas reperisse, quibus nunc utimur, cum ad illud usque tempus iidem Samaritanorum et Hebraeorum characteres fuerint.” See also Origen, in Ezr 9:4; Psalms 2 (3, 539).

The activity of these schools took different shapes at different periods, and into four of these periods it may be divided

1. The period of the more ancient Sopherim (scribes, רַאשׁוֹנַיֹ םסופְרַי), from the close of the canon to the ruin of the Jewish commonwealth. They settled fixedly the external and internal form of the sacred text (מַקְרָא), the correct writing and reading, the arrangement of the books and their sections the numbering of the verses, words, and letters, etc.

2. The period of the Talmudists, from the 2d to the 6th century of the Christian era.

3. The period of the Masoites, from the 6th to the 9th century.

4. The period. of the Grammarians and Expositors, from the 9th to the 6th century. Following the examples of the Arabians, they endeavored to lay a scientific foundation for Hebrew philology and for understanding the text of the Bible, by means of various labors in grammar and lexicography, including the comparison of the Aramaic and Arabic dialects.

For the history of the philological study of the Hebrew language, the reader is referred to the art. SEE HEBREW LANGUAGE in this Cyclopoedia, where he will also find more details.

V. Relation of the Shemitic Languages to the Indo-European Languages. — One of the most vexed questions of comparative philology is that of the relation of the Shemitic family to that of the Indo-European. As earl as the year 1778 Nathaniel Brassey Halhed in his Grammar of the Bengal Language, said, “I have been astonished to find the similitude of Sanskrit words with those of Arabic [the Shemitic], and these not in technical and metaphorical terms, which the mutation of refined arts and improved manners might have occasionally introduced, but in the main groundwork of language, in monosyllables, in the names of numbers, and the application of such things as would be first discriminated on the immediate dawn of civilization.” When the Sanskrit became better known in Europe, scholars like Adelung, Klaproth, Bopp, etc., in their studies on comparative philology, undertook to trace out the affinity between these two families. Untenable as were their theories, yet they paved the way. With greater precaution Gesenius entered upon the arena of comparative philology. Being persuaded that the Hebrew has no relation with the Indo-European languages, the main object of his comparisons was to find analogies, while in such words as appeared to him to have some similarities with the oldest original languages of Eastern Asia, as שבע, seven, Sanskrit, sapta; נער, a  youth, Sanskrit, Nar, etc., he either perceived marks of early borrowings or a play of accident. Furst, however, went a step further, and espoused the unhappy idea of a Sanscrito-Shemitic stem, which divides itself into the Sanskrit, Medo-Persian, Shemitic Graeco-Latin, Germanic, and Slavic families.

But the advancement in the science of the Indo-European languages has shown that there is no connection whatever between these two languages; and even Delitzsch's endeavor has not been able to prove the contrary, although it must be admitted. that he was the first to bring about (in his Jesurun sive Isagoge in Grammaticam et Lexicographiam Linguoe Hebraicoe [Grimmae, 1838]) some system and method in the comparison of these languages. Of still less value is the endeavor of E. Meier, who, in his Hebr. Wurzelworterbuch (Mannheim, 1845), seeks to trace back the Shemitic triliteral stems to monosyllabic biliteral roots, and from their fundamental meanings to derive the meanings of our Hebrew words in their various modifications. “This,” as Bleek remarks, “is an attempt which merits attention, although he certainly brings forward many things which are uncertain, and even improbable.” Without enlarging any further upon this question, which is to this very day a matter of dispute, we will only mention those who made the subject a matter of investigation. Among those who believe in a relation between it the Shemitic and Indo- European languages we mention Ewald (Ausf. Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache 8th ed. 18, 70. p., 31, Olshausen, (Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache, 1861, p. 6 sq.); Lassen (Indische, Alterthumskunde [2d ed.], 1, 637 sq.); Lepsius, Schwartze, Benfey, and Bunsen, who, with, the help of the Egyptian, tried to; bring about the result M. Muller and Steinthal, who believe not only in the possibility, but also in the probability, of such connection Eugene Burnouf and Pictet, who admit it with some reserve To these we may add the names of Ascoli, R.v. Raumer, Renan, and more especially that of Friedrich Delitzsch, who in his work (the latest, so far as we know) Studien uber indogermanis-semitische Wurzelwandtschaft (Leips. 1873), has not only, given a resume of the labors of his predecessors and a list of their works, but has also taken up the subject of relationship. Whether his researches wilt bring more tag it into the chaos of opinions, and prove themselves more acceptable, is yet to be seen. SEE PHILOLOGY.

VI. Literature. — see, besides the articles Shemitic languages in Kitto's Cylop. And Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, the introductions of Bleek, Keil, and Havernick; Renan Histoire Generale at Systeme Compare des Langues Semitiques (4th Ed. Paris, 1863), the literature as given in  Delitzsch's Studien, the introductions to the Hebrew grammars of Gesenius, Bottcher, Preiswerk, and Bickell (Engl. transl. By Curtiss [Leips. 1877]) The literature on the different languages is found under their respective heads in this Cyclopoedia and supplemented in this article. The more recent will be found in Frederici's Bibliotheca Orientalis (London, 1876-78).

## Shemoneh Esreh[[@Headword:Shemoneh Esreh]]

             (שמונה עשרה) is a collection of eighteen benedictions, called Tephillah, or prayer κατ ἐξοχήν, which every Israelite is bound to say every day. They constitute a very important part of the Jewish liturgy, and in their present form must have originated about A.D. 100, although many parts belong to the ante-Christian period. In the present form there are nineteen instead of eighteen, one having been added by Samuel the Little (q.v.) against the Sadducees, the so called:, ברכת הצרוקי or ברכת המינר, i.e. the prayer against the Minim, a name applied to Christians. These benedictions are as follows:

1. (ברו)ִ “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the great God! powerful and tremendous, the most high God! bountifully dispensing benefits, the Creator of all things; who, remembering the piety of the fathers, wilt send a redeemer to their posterity for his name's sake in love. Remember us unto life, O King I thou who delightest in life, and write us in the book of life for thy sake, O God of life. O King, thou art our Supporter Savior, and Protector blessed art thou, O Lord! the shield of Abraham.”

2. (אתה גבור)ῥ “Thou, O Lord! art forever powerful; thou restorest life to the dead, and art mighty to save; sustaining thy benevolence the living, and by thine abundant mercies animating the dead; supporting those that fall, healing the sick, setting at liberty those that are in bonds; and performest thy faithful words, unto those that sleep in the dust? Who is like unto thee, O Lord! most mighty? or who may be compared with thee, the King who killeth and again restoreth life, and causeth salvation to flourish? Who is like unto thee, most merciful Father! who rememberest thy creatures to life. Thou art also faithful to revive the dead. Blessed art thou, O Lord; who revivest the dead.”

3. (אתה קדושׁ) “Thou art holy, and holy is thy name, and the saints praise thee daily. Selah. Blessed art thou, O Lord, holy God! We will sanctify thy name in the world, as thy sanctifiers in the heavens above; as it is written by the hands of thy prophet. And one called unto another and said, Holy, Holy; Holy, O Lord of Hosts! the whole earth is full of his glory. And against each other with blessings they say, Blessed be the glory of the Lord, from his place.” And in thy holy word thou hast written, saying, the Lord shall reign forever, thy God in Zion, from generation to generation. Praise ye the Lord. Unto all generations we will declare thy greatness, and to all eternity we will sanctify thy holiness; and thy praise, O our God! shall not depart from our mouths, for ever and ever: for thou art Almighty, great and holy King blessed art thou, O Lord, the God most holy!”

4. (אתה חונן) “Thou favorest mankind with knowledge and teachest them understanding. Thou hast favored us with the knowledge of the law, and thou hast taught us to perform the statutes of thy will; and thou hast made us a division, O Lord our God! between the holy and the profane, between light and darkness, between Israel and the nations, and between the seventh day and the six days of work. O our Father, our King! let us rest in peace on those days which approach towards us, free from all sins, and clean from all iniquities, and make us steadfast in thy fear. And let us be favored with knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the favorer of knowledge.”

5. (השבינו) “Return us, O our Father! to the observance of thy law, and draw us near, O our King! to thy service; and, convert us to thee by perfect repentance. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who vouchsafest repentance.”

6. (סלת) “Forgive us, we beseech time, O our Father! for we have sinned; pardon us, O our King for we have transgressed; for thou art ready to pardon and to forgive. Blessed, art thou, O Lord who art gracious, and ready to pardon.”

7. (ראה) “Oh, look upon our afflictions, we beseech thee, an plead ole ur cause;. and redeem us speedily for the sake of thy name; for thou art a mighty Redeemer. Blessed art thou; O Lord! who redeemest Israel.”

8. (רפאנו) “Heal us, O Lord.! and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for thou art our praise. Oh, grant us a perfect cure for all our wounds; for thou art an omnipotent King, merciful and faithful  physician. Blessed art thou, Lord! who healest the diseases of thy people Israel.”

9. (ברעִלהנו) “O Lord our God! bless this year for us, as also every species of its fruits for our benefit; and bestow (in winter say, dew and rain for) a blessing upon the face of the earth. Oh, satisfy us with thy goodness, this year as other good and fruitful years. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who blessest the years.

10. (תקע) “Oh, sound the great cornet, as a signal for our freedom; hoist the banner to collect our captives, so that we may all be gathered together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art thou, O Lord!” who gatherest together the outcasts of thy people Israel.”

11. (השיבה) “Oh, restore our judges, as aforetime, and our counselors as at the beginning; remove from us sorrow and sighing. O Lord! reign thou alone over us in kindness and mercy; and justify us in judgment. Blessed art thou, O Lord! the King who loveth righteousness and justice.”

12. ( ולמלשיני ם“And let there be no hope for the calumniators, let all heretics (Minin) speedily pass away, and let all thine enemies be cut off. Speedily root up, break down, and tear up the wicked, and lay them low speedily, in our days: blessed be the Lord, who breaketh down the enemies, and layeth low the wicked.” (This prayer is altered in most editions of the Jewish Prayer book.)

13. (על הצדוקי ם) “O Lord our God! may thy tender mercy be moved towards the just, the pious, and the elders of thy people, the house of Israel; the remnant of their scribes, the pious proselytes, as also towards us; and bestow a good reward unto all who faithfully put their trust in thy name; and grant that our portion may ever be with them, so that we may not be put to shame; for we trust in thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who art the support and confidence of the just”

14. (ילרושלי ם) “Oh, be mercifully pleased to return to Jerusalem, thy city; and dwell therein, as thou hast promised. Oh, rebuild it shortly, even in our days, a structure of ever lasting fame, and speedily establish the throne of David therein. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who rebuildest Jerusalem.”

15. (את צמח) “Oh, cause the offspring of thy servant David speedily to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in thy salvation for we daily hope for thy salvation. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who causest the horn of salvation to flourish.”

16. (שמע קולנו) “Hear our voice, O Lord our God! Oh, have compassion and mercy upon us, and accept our prayers with mercy and favor; for thou art omnipotent. Thou hearkenest to prayers and supplications, and from thy presence, O our King! dismiss us not empty; for thou hearest the prayers of thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who hearkenest unto prayers.”

17. (רצה) “Graciously accept, O Lord our God! thy people Israel, and have regard unto their prayers. Restore the service to the inner part of thine house; and accept of the burned offerings of Israel, and their prayers with love and favor. And may the service of Israel, thy people, be ever pleasing to thee. Oh that our eyes may behold thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who restorest thy divine presence unto Zion.

18. (מודי ם) “We bow down before thee, because thou art Jehovah, our God, and the God of our fathers for ever and ever. The Rock of our lives, the Shield of our salvation art thou, from generation to generation. We will bless thee, and show forth thy praises for these our lives, which are in thy hand, and for our souls, which we commit to thee, and for thy wondrous works, which we witness every day; for thy marvelous doings and thy mercies at all times — evening, morning, and noon. Gracious God! because thy mercies are without bounds; merciful Lord! because thy kindnesses are never done, we trust in thee to all eternity.”

19. (שי םשלו ם“Oh, grant peace, happiness, and blessing, grace, favor, and mercy unto us, and all thy people Israel; bless us, even all of us together, O our Father! with the light of thy countenance; for by the light of thy countenance hast thou given us, O Lord our God, the law of life, benevolent love, righteousness, blessing, mercy, life, and peace; and may it please thee to bless thy people Israel at all times with thy peace.”

In the prayer books of the so called Reformed Jews these benedictions and all such as allude to the bringing back to Jerusalem and to the Messiah have undergone very great changes. The first and last three are considered  to be the most ancient. They are undoubtedly of the Sopherite age, and probably belong to the time of Simon the Just. The others belong to five or six epochs extending over a period of three hundred years. The benedictions are mentioned in the Mishna, Rosh hash-Shanah, c. 4; Berachoth, 4, 3, Tosiphta Berachoth, c. 3; Jerusalem Berachoth, c. 2; Megilla, 17 a. See Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortrage der Juden, p. 367 sq.; Schurer, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlischen Zeitgeschichte, p 499 sq: (B.P.)

## Shemuel[[@Headword:Shemuel]]

             (Heb. Shemuel', שְׁמוּאֵל, heard of God, the same as Samuel [q.v.]), the name of three Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Σαλαμούλ.) Son of Ammihud and commissioner from the tribe of Simeon, among those appointed by Moses to divide Palestine (Num 34:20). B.C. 1618.

2. (Sept. Σαμουήλ.) A more correct Anglicism (1Ch 6:33) of the, name of the prophet Samuel (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Ισαμουήλ.) A descendant of Tola, the son of Issachar, among the chiefs of that tribe in David's time (1Ch 7:2). B.C. 1014.

## Shen[[@Headword:Shen]]

             (Heb. with the art., hash-Shen, הִשֵּׁ, the tooth Sept. ἡ παλαι¡α Vulg. Sen), a place mentioned only in Samuel 7:12, defining the spot at which Samuel set up the stone Ebenezer to commemorate the rout of the Philistines. The pursuit had extended to “below Bethcar,” and the stone was erected “between the Mizpah and between the Shen.” The Targum has Shinna. The Peshito-Syriac and Arabic versions render both Bethcar and Shen by Beit- Jasan, evidently following the Sept., which appears to have read ישׁ yashan, i.e. old. The name indicates not a village, but merely a sharp rock or conspicuous crag in the vicinity, like Seneh (1Sa 14:4). SEE EBENEZER.

## Shenaah[[@Headword:Shenaah]]

             (Heb. with the art. hash-Shemaah' הִשְּׁמָעָה, the rumor; Sept. ‘Ασμά, v.r. Σαμαά, aa), a Benjamite of Gibeah, and father of Ahiezer and Joash, who joined David at Ziklag (l Chronicles 12:3). B.C. ante 1054.

## Shenazar[[@Headword:Shenazar]]

             (Heb. Shenatstsar' שֵׁנְאִצִּרfiery tooth [Gesenius] or splendid leader [Furst]; Sept. Σανεσάρ) v.r. Σαναζάρ), fourth named of the seven sons of king Jeconiah or Jehoiakim, born during his captivity (1Ch 3:18). BC. post 606.

## Shenir[[@Headword:Shenir]]

             (Heb., Shenir' שְׁניר[so in Deu 3:9 Son 4:8 but in 1Ch 5:23, Eze 27:5, Senir' שְׂנַיר], Gesenius, “coat of mail, or cataract; “ Furst, “either a projecting mountain peak or snow mountain” Sept. Σανίρ v.r. Σενείρ), the Amoritish name for the mountain in the north of Palestine (Deu 3:9; Ezekiel 27) which the Hebrews called Hermon, and the Phoenicians Sirion; or perhaps it was a name rather for a portion of the mountain than for the whole. In 1Ch 5:23, and Son 4:8, Hermon and it are mentioned as distinct. Abulfeda (ed. Kohler, p. 164, quoted by Gesenius) reports that the part of Antilebanon north of Damascus that usually denominated Jebel esh-Shurky, “the East Mountain” was in his day called Seir. The use of the word in Ezekiel is singular. In describing Tyre we should naturally expect to find the Phoenician name (Sirion) of the mountain employed, “if the ordinary Israelitish name (Hermon) were discarded. That it is not so may show that in the time of Ezekiel the name of Senir had lost its original significance as an Amoritish name, and was employed without that restriction. The Targum of Joseph on 1Ch 5:23 (ed. Beck) renders Senir by טוּר מֵישֵׁרֵי פִרַזַי, of which the most probable translation is “the mountain of the plains of the Perizzites.” In the edition of Wilkins the text is altered to ט מִסְרֵי פַּירְוְי, “the mountain that corrupteth fruits,” in agreement with the Targums on Deu 3:9, though it is there given as the equivalent of Sirion. Which of these is the original it is perhaps impossible now to decide. The former has the slight consideration in its favor that the Hivites are specially mentioned as “under Mount Hermon,” and thus may have been connected or confounded with the Perizzites; or the reading may have arisen from mere caprice, as that of the Samaritan version of Deu 3:9 appears to have done. SEE ANTILIBANUS.

## Sheol[[@Headword:Sheol]]

             שְׁאוֹל. This Hebrew name for “the place of departed spirits,” and the “state of the dead,” is used in a variety of senses by the writers of the Old. Test., which it is desirable to investigate, referring to the articles SEE HELL, SEE HADES, etc. for the general opinions of the Jews respecting the continuance of existence after death.

I. Signification of the Word. — The word is usually said to be derived. from שֹׁאֵל, shaal, “to ask or seek,” and may, be supposed to have the same metaphorical signification as the orcus rapax of the Latins, or “the insatiable sepulchre” of English writers. This etymology, however, is rather uncertain, and no aid can be obtained from the cognate Shemitic languages, for, though the word occurs in Syriac and Ethiopic, its use is too indeterminate to afford any clue to its origin. We are therefore left to determine its meaning from the context of the most remarkable passages in which it occurs. s.v.

The first is (Gen 37:35) “And (Jacob) said, I will go down into the grave (שְׁאלָה, sheolah) unto my son mourning.” The, meaning of this passage is obviously given in the translation. There is rather more difficulty in Num 16:30, where Moses declares that Korah and his company shall go down alive into sheol (שְׁאֹלָה, sheolah), and in Num 16:33, which describes the fulfilment of the prophecy. But on referring to Deu 32:22, we find that sheol is used to signify “the underworld.” “For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and it shall burn to the lowest hell” (שְׁאוֹל תְּחַתַית, sheol techithith); to which the sequel gives the foilowing parallelism: “It shall set on fire the foundations of the mountains.” Hence it would appear” that, in the description of Korah's punishment, sheol simply means the interior of the earth, and does, not imply a place of torment. In 2Sa 22:6, the English version stands thus: “The sorrows of hell compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me.” The English word “hell” (from the Saxon hela “to conceal”) does not here mean a place of torment, as will at once appear from a literal translation of the passage in which the parallelism of the Hebrew is preserved. “The snares of sheol (חֶבְלֵי שְׁאוֹל, chebley sheol), encompassed me;” “The nets of death (מוֹקְשֵׁי מָיֶת, mokeshey maveth) came upon me.” Thus viewed, it appears that “the snares of sheol” are precisely equivalent to “the nets of death.” In Job 11:8, there seems to be “an allusion to a belief common among ancient nations that there is a deep and dark abysss beneath the surface of the earth, tenanted by departed spirits, but not necessarily a place of torment:

Canst thou explore the deep things of God?

Canst thou comprehend the whole power of the Almighty?

Higher than heaven!

What canst thou do?

Deeper than sheol!

What canst thou know?

Again (Job 26:5-6), in the description of God's onmipotence:

Sheol is open before him,

And there is no covering for the region of the dead.

In Isa 14:9, “Sheol from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming,” the meaning of the prophet is, that when the king of Babylon, whose miserable fate he is predicting, should go down into the underworld, or sheol, the ghosts of the dead would there rise up to meet him with contumely and insult. Our English version in this passage renders sheol “hell;” but, clearly, the place of torment, cannot be meant, for it is said in Isa 14:18 that all the kings of the nations repose in glory there — that is, “rest in their sepulchres, surrounded by all the ensigns of splendor which the Eastern nations were accustomed to place around the bodies of deceased kings.”

These and many other passages which might be quoted sufficiently prove that a belief in futurity of existence was familiar, to the Hebrews, but that it was unfixed and indeterminate. It is difficult, and in some cases impossible, to determine whether the term sheol, when used in a menacing form, implies the idea of future punishment or premature death. Hence, while we are led to conclude, with the Articles of the Church of England, that “the old fathers did not look merely to transitory promises,” we see that only through the Gospel were “life, and immortality brought to light.”

II. Is Sheol a Place? — According to the notions of the Jews, sheol was a vast receptacle where the souls of the dead existed in a separate state until the resurrection of their bodies. The region of the blessed during this interval, or the inferior paradise, they supposed to be in the upper part of this receptacle; while beneath was the abyss, or Gehenna (Tatrtarus), in which the souls of the wicked were subjected to punishment.

The question whether this is or is not the doctrine of the Scriptures is one, of much importance, and has, first and last, excited no small amount of discussion. It is a doctrine received by a large portion of the nominal Christian Church; and it forms the foundation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, for which there would be no ground but for this interpretation of the word Hades. The question, therefore, rests entirely up the interpretation of this latter word. At the first view the classical signification would seem to support the sense above indicated. On further, consideration, however, we are referred back to the Hebrew sheol; for the  Greek term did not come to the Hebrews from any classical source or with any classical meanings, but through the Sept. as a translation of their own word; and whether correctly translating it or not is a matter of critical opinion. The word Hades is, therefore, in no wise binding upon us in any classical meaning which may be assigned to it. The real question, therefore, is, what is the meaning which sheol bears in the Old Test. and Hades in the New? A careful examination of the passages in which these words occur will probably lead to the conclusion that they afford no real sanction to the motion of an intermediate place of the kind indicated, but are used by the inspired writers to denote the grave — the resting place of the bodies both of the righteous and the wicked; and that they are also used to signify hell, the abode of miserable spirits. But it would be difficult to produce any instance in which they can be shown to signify the abode of the spirits of just men made perfect, either before or after the resurrection.

As already seen, in the great majority of instances sheol is, in the Old Test., used to signify the grave, and in most of these cases is so translated in the A.V. It can have no other meaning in such texts, as Gen 37:35; Gen 42:38; 1Sa 2:6; 1Ki 2:6 Job 14:13; Job 17:13; Job 17:16; and in numerous other passages in the writings of David, Solomon, and the prophets. But as the grave is regarded by most persons, and was more especially so by the ancients, with awe and dread as being the region of gloom and darkness, so the word denoting it soon came to be applied to that more dark and gloomy world which was to be the abiding place of the miserable. Where our translators supposed the word to have this sense, they rendered it by “hell.” Some of the passages in which this has been done may be doubtful, but there are others of which a question can scarcely be entertained. Such are those (as Job 11:8; Psa 139:8; Amo 9:3) in which the word denotes the opposite of heaven, which cannot be the grave nor the general state or region of the dead, but hell. Still more decisive are such passages as Psa 9:17; Pro 23:9; in which sheol cannot mean any place, in this world or the next, to which the righteous as well as the wicked are sent, but the penal abode of the wicked as distinguished from and opposed to the righteous. The only case in which such passages could, by any possibility, be supposed to mean the grave would be if the grave — that is, extinction — were the final doom of the unrighteous.

In the New Test. the word ¯δης is used in much the same sense as שאול in the Old, except that in a less proportion of cases can it be construed to  signify “the grave.” There are still, however, instances in which it is used in this sense, as in Act 2:31; 1Co 15:55; but in general the Hades of the New Test. appears to be no other than the world of future punishments (e.g. Mat 11:23; Mat 16:18; Luk 16:23).

The principal arguments for the intermediate Hades as deduced from Scripture are founded on those passages in which things “under the earth” are described as rendering homage to God and the Savior (Php 2:10; Rev 5:13. etc.);. If such passages, however, be compared with others (as with Rom 14:10-11, etc.), it will appear that they must refer to the day of judgment, in which every creature will render some sort of homage to the Savior; but then the bodies of the saints will have been already raised, and the intermediate region, if there be any, will have been deserted.

One of the seemingly strongest arguments for the opinion under consideration is founded on 1Pe 3:19, in which Christ is said to have gone and “preached to the spirits in prison.” These spirits in prison are opposed to be the holy dead — perhaps the virtuous heathen — imprisoned in the intermediate place into which the soul of the Savior, went at death that he might preach to them the Gospel. This passage must be allowed to present great difficulties. The most intelligible meaning, suggested by the context is, however, that Christ by his spirit preached to those who in the time of Noah, while the ark was preparing, were disobedient, and whose spirits were thus in prison awaiting the general deluge. Even if that prison were Hades, yet what Hades is must be determined by other passages of Scripture; and, whether it is the grave or hell, it is still a prison for those who yet await the judgment day. This interpretation is in unison with other passages of Scripture, whereas the other, is conjecturally deduced from this single text. SEE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

Another argument is deduced from Rev 20:14; which describes “death and Hades” as “cast into the lake of fire” at the close of the general judgment meaning, according to the advocates of the doctrine in question, that Hades should then cease as an intermediate place. But this is also true if understood of the grave, or, of the general intermediate condition of the dead, or even of hell, as once more and forever reclaiming what it had temporarily yielded up for judgment — just as we every day see criminals  brought from prison to judgment, and, after judgment, returned to the prison from which they came.

It is further urged, in proof of Hades being an intermediate place other than the grave, that the Scriptures represent the happiness of the righteous as incomplete till after the resurrection. This must be admitted; but it does not thence follow that their souls are previously imprisoned in the earth, or in any other place or region corresponding to the Tartarus of the heathen. Although at the moment of death the disembodied spirits of the redeemed ascend to heaven and continue there till the resurrection, it is very possible that their happiness shall be incomplete until they have received their glorified bodies from the tomb and entered upon the full rewards of eternity.

On this subject, see Dr. Enoch Pond, On the Intermediate Place, in American Biblical Repository for April, 1841, whom we have here chiefly followed; comp. Knapp, Christian Theology, § 104; Meyer, De Notione. Orci ap. Hebraeos (Lub. 1793); Bahrens, Freimuthige Unters. uber d. Orkus d. Hebraer (Halle, 1786); Witter, De Purgatorio Judoeorum (Helms. 1704); Journ. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1856.;

## Shepard, David A.[[@Headword:Shepard, David A.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Augusta, Oneida Co., N.Y., June 2, 1802. He professed conversion in his sixteenth year, and received license as a local preacher when twenty. In 1824 he was admitted on trial in the Genesee Conference. During his active ministry he served as presiding elder on the Chenango, Cayuga, Susquehanna, and Wyoming districts; and also five years as chaplain to Auburn state prison. In 1873 he took a superannuated relation, which he held until his death, at Washington, D.C., Oct. 8, 1876. He was for some time previous a member of the Wyoming Conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1877, p. 59.

## Shepard, George, D.D[[@Headword:Shepard, George, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Connecticut in 1802. He graduated from Amherst College in 1824, from Andover Theological Seminary in 1827, and was ordained February 5, 1828, pastor at Hallowell, Maine. He became professor of sacred rhetoric in the Theological Seminary at Bangor in 1836, and died there, March 23, 1868. See Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Semn 1870, page 76.

## Shepard, Hiram[[@Headword:Shepard, Hiram]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Turin, Lewis Co., N.Y., July 8, 1804, and at the age of eighteen he made a profession of religion. In 1830 he was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Black River Conference. He continued to be actively engaged in preaching until his death, which occurred at Malone, N.Y., May 25, 1863. He was an  able defender of the truth and an impressive minister. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1863, p. 115.

## Shepard, Lewis Morris[[@Headword:Shepard, Lewis Morris]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Potsdam, St. Lawrence Co. N.Y., in 1810. He was converted at the age of sixteen; was educated at the Oneida Institute at Whitesborough, N.Y.; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach by Watertown Presbytery, Aug. 29, 1838, and ordained and installed by the same body at Theresa, Jefferson Co., N.Y., in February,. 1839. In that vicinity he preached for twelve years, occupying different localities, at Theresa and Plesis, then at Champion, Smithville, and North Adams. In 1850 he united with the Albany Presbytery and supplied the Church at Tribe s Hill until 1852, when he removed to Monroe, Fairfield Co., Conn., where he labored until 1858, when he became pastor of the Church in Huron, Wayne Co., N.Y. In every place where he labored he had more or less evidence that his work was owned by the Master of the vineyard. He died Oct. 16, 1863. Mr. Shepard was an earnest, diligent, and self-denying minister of Christ. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 170. (J.L.S.)

## Shepard, Mase[[@Headword:Shepard, Mase]]

             a Congregational minister, was born May 28, 1759. When about twenty- one years of age he was led to Christ, and immediately his thoughts were turned towards the ministry. He prepared for college under the direction of the Rev. William Conant, of Lyme, N.H., entered Dartmouth College in 1781, and graduated in 1785. He then studied theology with Rev. Ephraim Judson, of Taunton, and on Sept. 19, 1787, was settled at Little Compton, R.I. He died in perfect calmness after a short illness, Feb. 14, 1821. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 265.

## Shepard, Samuel (1), M.D[[@Headword:Shepard, Samuel (1), M.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Salisbury, Mass., June 22, 1739. He studied medicine, settled as a practicing physician at Brentwood, N.H., and soon became distinguished in his profession. He then turned his attention to preaching, and in 1771 became pastor of three churches, at Stratham, Brentwood, and Nottingham, which he had formed. He was one of the most active and honored ministers of his denomination, and continued his  labors until his death, Nov. 4, 1815. He published a number of tracts and pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 135.

## Shepard, Samuel (2), D.D.[[@Headword:Shepard, Samuel (2), D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Portland, Conn., November, 1772 He graduated at Yale College in 1793 and was ordained, April 30, 1795, pastor in Lenox, Mass., where he remained until the close of his life. He was a member of the corporations of Middlebury and Williams colleges and vice-president of the latter until his death, Jan. 5, 1846. He published a few occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 364.

## Shepard, Thomas[[@Headword:Shepard, Thomas]]

             a Congregational. minister, was born at Towcester, near Northampton, England, Nov. 5, 1605. His father was a decided Puritan, in so much that he removed to another town for the sole purpose of enjoying what he considered an evangelical ministry. Thomas entered Emanuel College, Cambridge, as a pensioner, in 1619, and while in college, after a very severe struggle, found peace in Christ. He took the degree of B.A. in 1623, and completed his course of study in 1625. In 1627, after receiving his M.A., he was appointed lecturer in Earles-Colne, Essex. He remained, laboring with great success, for three years and six months. On Dec. 16, 1630, he was summoned to London to answer before bishop Laud for alleged irregular conduct, and was by him forbidden to exercise any ministerial function in his diocese. Examining the various usages and ceremonies to which he was required to conform, he was less disposed to adhere to the Establishment that never. Summoned a second time before the bishop, he was required by him to immediately leave the place. He now entered the family of Sir Richard Darley, in Yorkshire, as chaplain, where he remained about. a year, and then accepted an invitation to Heddon, Northumberland, where he also remained about a year. Owing to his Nonconformist principles, he was greatly persecuted, with difficulty avoiding arrest, until Aug. 10, 1635, when he and his family embarked for America. He arrived in Boston Oct. 2, 1635, and took up his residence in Newtown (now Cambridge), Mass. Here he became pastor of a newly organized Church, Feb. 1, 1636, of which he continued to be the pastor until his death. Mr. Shepard soon became involved in the famous Antinomian controversy, and was one of the most active members of the noted synod by which the storm was finally quelled. There is also good  reason to believe that he had an important agency in originating and carrying forward the measures resulting in the establishment of Harvard College. He died Aug. 25, 1649. Johnson speaks of him as “that gracious, sweet, heavenly minded, and soul ravishing minister,” which testimony is sustained by that of many others. The following are some of his works: New England's Lamentation for Old England's Errors (Lond. 1645, 4to): — Theses Sabbaticoe (ibid. 1649): — Of Liturgies, etc. (1653) Parable of the Ten Virgins Opened and Applied (1659, fol.). A collective edition of his works, with a memoir, was published by the Doctrinal Tract and Book Society (Boston, 1853, 3 vols. 12mo). For a full list of his works, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 59.

## Shepard, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Shepard, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Norton, Massachusetts, May 7, 1792. After studying at Taunton Academy, he graduated from Brown University in 1813, and in 1816 from Andover Theological Seminary. The two succeeding years he was a home missionary in Georgia. In 1818 and 1819 he was agent for the Connecticut Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb. He was ordained pastor at Ashfield, Massachusetts, June 16, 1819, and remained until May 8, 1833. From 1833 to 1835 Dr. Shepard was agent of the American Bible Society. From April 30, 1835, until his death he was pastor at Bristol, R.I., although he bad resigned active service in 1865. In 1846 he was elected a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He died October 5, 1879. Among his publications were various sermons, and thirty New Year's Annuals. See Cong. Year-book, 1880, page 27.

## Shepham[[@Headword:Shepham]]

             (Heb. Shepham, שְׁפָ, fruitful [Gesen.], or bare [Furst]; Sept. Σεφαμάρ [running it on into the following word, with the הdirective]), a place mentioned only in the specification by Moses of the eastern boundary of the Promised Land. (Num 34:10-11), the first landmark from Hazer-enan, at which the northern boundary terminated, and lying between it and Riblah. The ancient interpreters (Targ. Pseudo-Jon., Saadia) render the name by Apameia; but it seems uncertain whether by this they intend the Greek city of that name on the Orontes, fifty miles below Antioch, or whether they use it as a synonym of Banias or Dan, as Schwarz affirms (Palest. p. 27). No trace of the name appears, however, in that direction. Porter (Damascus, 2, 354) would fix Hazer-enan at Kuryetein, seventy miles east northeast of Damascus, which would remove Shepham into a totally different region, in which there is equally little trace of it. The Riblah mentioned in the above passage was not the city of that name in the hand of Hamath (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.), but a much more southern one. SEE RIBLAH. The other more definitely known localities adjoining seem to point out, a position for Shepham not far from the later Caesarea- Philippi (q.v.).

## Shephard, Paul[[@Headword:Shephard, Paul]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayette, N.Y., June 3, 1803. He was educated at Oberlin College, studied theology, in the same institution, was licensed and ordained by the Oberlin Association in 1839, and preached at the following places: Richmond and Allegan, Mich.; in 1846 at Medina,  Mich.; in 1851 at Dover, Mich. In 1856 he visited Kansas Territory and established a Church at Tecumseh, and was one of the original members of Kansas Presbytery. In 1859 he returned to Monroe Presbytery, and was stated supply for the Church at Dover and Clayton, Mich. Here he labored until his death, Nov. 9, 1860. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 195.

## Shephathiah[[@Headword:Shephathiah]]

             (1Ch 9:8). SEE SHEPHATIAH.

## Shephatiah[[@Headword:Shephatiah]]

             (Heb. Shephatyah', שְׁפִטְיָה [thrice in the prolonged form Shephatya'hu, שְׁפִטְיָהוּ, 1Ch 12:5; 1Ch 27:16; 2Ch 21:2], judged of Jehovah; Sept. Σαφατία v.r. Σαφατίας, etc.), the name of a considerable number of Israelites.

1. The Haruphite (or descendant of Hareph), and one of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5). B.C. 1054.

2. The fifth son of David, born of his wife Abital during his reignm in Hebron (2Sa 3:4; 1Ch 3:3). B.C. cir. 1050.

3. Son of Maachah, and phylarch of the Simeonites in the time of David (1Ch 27:16). B.C. 1014.

4. Last named of the six brothers of Jehoram, the son of king Jehoshaphat, whom their father endowed richly (2Ch 21:2). B.C. 887.

5. Son of Mahalaleel and father of Amariah, ancestors of Athaiah of the family of Pharez, son of Judah (Neh 11:4). B.C. long ante 536.

6. Son of Reuel and father of Meshullam, the Benjamite chieftain at the time of the captivity (l Chronicles 9:5, A.V. “Shephathiah”). B.C. ante 588. See No. 8.

7. Son of Mattan, and one of the princes who advised Zedekiah to put Jeremiah to death (Jer 38:1). B.C. 589.

8. An Israelite whose descendants (or perhaps a place whose inhabitants) to the number of three hundred and. seventy-two returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezr 2:4; Neh 7:9). B.C. ante 536. He is  apparently the same with him whose descendants to the number of eighty males returned under the leadership of Zebadiah, with Ezra (Ezr 1:3; Ezr 1:8). Whether he was identical with No. 6 is uncertain.

9. One of “Solomon s servants” whose descendants returned from Babylon under Zeriubbabel (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59).B.C. ante 536.

## Shephelah, The[[@Headword:Shephelah, The]]

             (הִשַּׁפֵלָה, hash- Shephelah', the low; Sept. ἡ Σεφηλά, 1Ma 12:38; Jerome, Sephela, in Onomast.), the native name for the southern division of the low lying, fLat district which intervenes between the central highlands of the Holy Land and the Mediterranean, the other and northern portion of which was known as Sharon. The name occurs throughout the topographical records of Joshua, the historical works, and the topographical passages in the prophets, always with the article prefixed, and always denoting the same region (Deu 1:7; Jos 9:1; Jos 10:40; Jos 11:2; Jos 11:16 a; Jos 12:8; Jos 15:33; Jdg 1:9; 1Ki 10:27; 1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 1:15; 2Ch 9:27; 2Ch 26:10; 2Ch 28:18; Jer 17:26; Jer 32:44; Jer 33:13; Oba 1:19; Zec 7:7). So absolute is this usage that in the, single instance in which the word stands without the article (Jos 11:16 b) it evidently does not denote the region referred to above, but the plains surrounding the mountains of Ephraim. In each of the above passages, however, the word is treated in the A.V. not as a proper name, analogous to the Campagna, the Wolds, the Carse, but as a mere appellative, and rendered “the vale,” “the valley,” “the plain,” “the low plains,” and “the low country.” How destructive this is to the force of the narrative may be realized by imagining what confusion would be caused in the translation of an English historical work into a foreign tongue if such a name as “the Downs” were rendered by some general term applicable to any other district in the country of similar formation. Fortunately the book of Maccabees has redeemed our version from the charge of having entirely suppressed this interesting name.

 In 1Ma 12:38; the name Sephela is found, though even here stripped of the article, which was attached to it in Hebrew, and still accompanies, it in the Greek of the passage. Whether the name is given in the Hebrew Scriptures in the shape in which the Israelites encountered it on entering the country or modified so as to conform it to the Hebrew root שָׁפִל, shaphal, “to be low,” and thus (according to the constant tendency of language) bring it into a form intelligible to Hebrews, we shall probably never know. The root to which it is related is in common  use both in Hebrew and Arabic. In the latter it has originated more than one proper name — as Mespila, now known as Koyunjik; el-Mesfale, one of the quarters of the city of Mecca (Barckhardt, Arabia, 1, 203, 204); and Seville, originally Hi-spalis, probably so called from its wide plain (Arias Montano, in Ford, Hand-book for Spain).The name Shephelah is retained in the old versions, even those of the Samaritans, and rabbi Joseph on Chronicles (probably as late as the 11th century). It was actually in use down to the 5th century. Eusebius, and after him Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Sephela,” and Comm. on Obad.), distinctly state that “the region round Eleutheropolis on the north and west was so called.” In his comment on Obadiah, Jerome appears to extend it to Lydda and Emmaus-Nicopolis; and, at the same time, to extend Sharon so far south as to include the Philistine cities. A careful investigation might not improbably discover the name still lingering about its ancient home even at the present day. SEE PLAIN.

No definite limits are mentioned to the Shephelah, nor is it probable that there were any. In the list of Joshua (Jos 15:33-47) it contains forty- three “cities,” as well as the hamlets and temporary villages dependent on them. Of these, so far as our knowledge avails us, the most northern was Ekron, the most southern Gaza, and the most eastern Nezib (about seven miles north northwest of Hebron). A large number of these towns, however, were situated not in the plain, nor even on the western slopes of the central mountains, but in the mountains themselves. SEE JARMUTH; SEE KELAH; SEE NEZIB, etc.

This seems to show as either that, on the ancient principle of dividing territory, one district might intrude into the limits of another, or, which is more probable, that, as already suggested, the name Shephelah did not originally mean a lowland, as it came to do in its accommodated Hebrew form. The Shephelah was, and is, one of the most productive regions in the Holy Land. Sloping, as it does, gently to the sea, it receives every year a fresh dressing from the materials washed down from the mountains behind it by the furious rains of winter. This natural manure, aided by the great heat of its climate, is sufficient to enable it to reward the rude husbandry of its inhabitants, year after year, with crops of corn which are described by travellers as prodigious. Thus it was ancient times the cornfield of Syria, and as such the constant subject of warfare between Philistines and Israelites, and the refuge of the latter when the harvests in the central country were ruined by drought (2Ki 8:1-3). But it was also, from its evenness, and from its situation on the road  between Egypt and Assyria, exposed to continual visits from foreign armies, visits which at last led to the destruction of the Israelitish kingdom. In them earlier history of the country the Israelites do not appear to have ventured into the Shephelah, but to have awaited the approach of their enemies from thence. Under the Maccabees, however, their tactics were changed, and it became the field where some of the most hardly contested and successful of their battles were fought. These conditions have scarcely altered in modern times. Any invasion of Palestine must take place through the maritime plain, the natural and only road to the highlands. It did so in Napoleon's case. The Shephelah is still one vast cornfield, but the contests which take place on it are, now reduced to those between the oppressed peasants and the insolent and rapacious officials of the Turkish government, who are gradually putting a stop by their extortions to all the industry of this district, and driving active and willing hands to better- governed regions. — Smith. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

This tract, as above intimated, comprises not so much the mere maritime plain, but rather the lower range or spurs of the Judean hills on the Mediterranean side. It consists, in fact. of low hills, about five hundred feet above the sea, of white, soft limestone, with great bands of beautiful brown quartz running between the strata. The broad valleys among these hills, forming the entrance to the hill country proper, produce fine crops of corna, and on the hills olive groves flourish better than in either of the adjoining districts. This part of the country is also the most thickly populated, and ancient wells, and occasionally fine springs, occur throughout. The villages are partly of stone, partly of mud; the ruins are so thickly spread over hill and valley that in some parts there are as many as three ancient sites to two square miles. All along the base of these hills, commanding the passes to the mountains, important places are to be found, such as Gath and Gezer, Emmaus and Beth-horon, and no part of the country is more rich in Biblical sites or more famous in Bible history (Conder, Tent Work in Palestine, 1, 10). SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

## Shepherd[[@Headword:Shepherd]]

             (usually רעֶה, roeh, a feeder, ποιμήν; but substantially denoted also by בּוֹקֵר, boker, a “herdman,” Amo 7:14; and by נֹקֵד, noked, a “sheep master,” 2Ki 3:4; “herdman,” Amo 1:1). In a nomadic state of society, every man, from the sheik down to the slave, is more or less a  shepherd. As many regions in the East are adapted solely to pastoral pursuits, the institution of the nomad life, with its appliances of tents and camp equipage, was regarded as one of the most memorable inventions (Gen 4:20). The progenitors of the Jews in the patriarchal age were nomads, and their history is rich in scenes of pastoral life. The occupation of tending the flocks was undertaken, not only by the sons of wealthy chiefs (Gen 30:29 sq.; Gen 37:12 sq.), but even by their daughters (Gen 29:6 sq.; Exo 2:19). The Egyptian captivity did much to implant a love of settled abode, and consequently we find the tribes which still retained a taste for shepherd. life selecting their own quarters apart from their brethren in the Transjordanic district (Num 32:1 sq.). Henceforward in Palestine proper the shepherd held a subordinate position; the increase of agriculture involved the decrease of pasturage; and though large flocks were still maintained in certain parts, particularly on the borders of the wilderness of Judah, as about Carmel (1Sa 25:2), Bethlehem (1Sa 16:11; Luk 2:8), Tekoah (Amo 1:1), and, more to the south, at Gedor (1Ch 4:39), the nomad life was practically extinct, and the shepherd became one out of many classes of the laboring population. The completeness of the transition from the pastoral to the agricultural state is strongly exhibited in those passages which allude to the presence. of the shepherd's tent as a token of desolation (e.g. Eze 25:4; Zep 2:6). The humble position of the shepherd at the same period is implied in the notices of David's wondrous elevation (2Sa 7:8; Psa 78:70), and again in the self-depreciating confession of Amos (Amo 7:14). The frequent and beautiful allusions to the shepherd s office in the poetical portions of the Bible (e.g. Psalms 23; Isa 40:11; Isa 49:9-10; Jer 23:3-4; Eze 34:11-12; Eze 34:23), rather bespeak a period when the shepherd had become an ideal character, such as the Roman poets painted the pastors of Arcadia. SEE PASTURE.

The office of the Eastern shepherd, as described in the Bible, was attended with much hardship and even danger. He was exposed to the extremes of heat and cold (Gen 31:40); his food frequently consisted of the precarious supplies afforded by nature, such as the fruit of the “sycamore,” or Egyptian fig, (Amo 7:14), the “husks” of the carob tree (Luk 15:16), or perchance the locusts and wild honey which supported the Baptist (Mat 3:4); he had to encounter the attacks of wild beasts, occasionally of the larger species, such as lions, wolves, panthers, and bears (1Sa 17:34; Isa 31:4; Jer 5:6; Amo 3:12); nor was he free from the risk of robbers or predatory hordes (Gen 31:39). To meet these various. foes the shepherd's equipment consisted of the following articles: a mantle, made probably of sheep's skin with the fleece on, which he turned inside out in cold weather, as implied, in the comparison in Jer 43:12 (comp. Juv. 14:187); a scrip or wallet, containing a small amount of food (1Sa 17:40; Porter, Damascus, 2, 100); a sling, which is still the favorite weapon of the Bedawi shepherd (1Sa 17:40; Burckhardt, Notes,1, 57); and, lastly, a staff, which served the double purpose of a weapon against foes and a crook for the management of the flock (1Sa 17:40; Psa 23:4; Zec 11:7). If the shepherd was at a distance from his home, he was provided with a light tent (Son 1:8; Jer 35:7), the removal of which was easily effected (Isa 38:12). In certain localities, moreover, towers were erected for the double purpose of spying an enemy at a distance and, protecting the flock; such towers were erected by Uzziah and Jotham (2Ch 26:10; 2Ch 27:4), while their existence in earlier times is testified by the name Migdal-Eder (Gen 35:21, A.V. “tower of Edar;” Mic 4:8, A.V. tower of the flock”). SEE TOWER.

The routine of the shepherd's duties appears to have been as follows: in the morning he led forth his flock from the fold (Joh 10:4), which he did by going before them and calling to them, as is still usual in the East; arrived at the pasturage, he watched the flock with the assistance of dogs (Job 30:1), and, should any sheep stray, he had to search for it until he found it (Eze 34:12; Luk 15:4); he supplied them with water, either at a running stream or at troughs attached to wells (Gen 29:7; Gen 30:38; Exo 2:16; Psa 23:2); at evening he brought them back to the fold, and reckoned them to see that none were missing, by passing them “under the rod” as they entered the door of the enclosure (Lev 27:32; Eze 20:37), checking each sheep as it passed by a motion of the hand (Jer 33:13); and, finally, he watched the entrance of the fold throughout the night, acting as porter (Joh 10:3). We need not assume that the same person was on duty both by night and by day; Jacob, indeed, asserts this of himself (Gen 31:40), but it would be more probable that the shepherds took it by turns, or that they kept watch for a portion only of the night, as may possibly be implied in the expression in Luk 2:8, rendered in the A.V. “keeping watch,” rather “keeping the watches” (φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς).The shepherd's office  thus required great watchfulness, particularly by night (Luk 2:8; comp. Nah 3:18). It also required tenderness towards the young and feeble (Isa 40:11), particularly in driving them to and from the pasturage (Gen 33:13). In large establishments there were various grades, of shepherds, the highest being styled “rulers” (Gen 47:6) or “chief shepherds” (1Pe 5:4); in a royal household the title of אִבַּיר, abbir, “mighty,” was bestowed on the person who held the post (1Sa 21:7). Great responsibility attached to the office; for the chief shepherd had to make good all losses (Gen 31:39); at the same time he had a personal interest in the flock, inasmuch as he was not paid in money, but received a certain amount of the produce (30:32; 1Co 9:7). The life of the shepherd was a monotonous one; he may perhaps have whiled away an hour in playing on some instrument (1Sa 16:18; Job 21:12; Job 30:31), as his modern representative still occasionally does. (Wortabet, Syria, 1, 234). He also had his periodical entertainments at the shearing time, which was celebrated by a general gathering of the neighborhood for festivities (Gen 31:19; Gen 38:12; 2Sa 13:23); but, generally speaking, the life must have been but dull. Nor did it conduce to gentleness of manners; rival shepherds contended for the possession or the use of water with great acrimony (Gen 21:25; Gen 26:20 sq.; Exo 2:17) or perhaps is this a matter of surprise, as those who come late to a well frequently have to wait a long time until their turn comes (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 63). SEE SHEEP.

Large flocks of sheep and goats often constituted the chief wealth of patriarchal times. Job possessed seven thousand sheep (Job 1:3), and Nabal three thousand sheep and a thousand goats (1Sa 25:2). At the present day both sheep and goats usually intermingle in the same flock for pasturage, in the valleys and on the hills of Palestine (Gen 30:35). In one Arab encampment Prof. Robinson saw about six hundred sheep and goats, the latter being the most numerous; and the process of milking was going on at four o clock in the morning. The Arabs have few cows. In Deu 32:14, Moses, in his farewell song, represents Jehovah as having fed Israel with “butter of kine and milk of sheep;” and the apostle asks, “Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?” (1Co 9:7). “It shall come to pass in that day that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep; and it shall, come to pass, for the abundance of milk that they shall give, that he shall eat butter: for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land” (Isa 7:21-22). Here the milk is the production of the sheep as well as of the cow. SEE MILK.

The hatred of the Egyptians towards shepherds (Gen 46:34) may have been mainly due to their contempt for the sheep itself, which appears to have been valued neither for food (Plutarch, De Is. 72) nor generally for sacrifice (Herod. 2, 42), the only district where they were offered being about the Natron lakes (Strabo, 17, 803). It may have been increased by the memory of the shepherd invasion (Herod, 2, 128). Abundant confirmation of the fact of this hatred is supplied by the low position which all herdsmen held in the castes of Egypt, and by the caricatures of them in Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson, 2, 169). SEE HYKSOS.

The term “shepherd” is applied in a metaphorical sense to princes (Isa 44:28; Jer 2:8; Jer 3:15; Jer 22:22, Eze 34:2, etc.), prophets (Zec 11:5; Zec 11:8; Zec 11:16), teachers, (Ecc 12:11), and to Jehovah himself (Gen 49:24; Psa 23:1; Psa 80:1); to the same effect are the references to “feeding” in Gen 48:15; Psa 28:9; Hos 4:16. The prophets often inveigh against the shepherds of Israel, against the kings who feed themselves and neglect their flocks; who distress, ill treat, seduce, and lead them astray (see Eze 34:10 sq.; Num 27:17; 1Ki 22:17; Isa 40:11; Isa 44:28; Jdt 11:15). SEE PASTOR.

## Shepherd Of Hermas[[@Headword:Shepherd Of Hermas]]

             A book entitled The Shepherd, ascribed to Hermas, who is mentioned by Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, became generally known about the middle of the 2d century. For an account of its contents, credibility, etc., SEE HERMAS.

## Shepherd kings[[@Headword:Shepherd kings]]

             a series of foreign rulers in Egypt, whose domination must have occurred about the time of the sojourn of the Hebrews there. The relation of these two classes to each other, and to the other Egyptians, is so interesting, if not intimate, especially to the Biblical student, that our treatment of the subject under EGYPT and HYKSOS requires a somewhat fuller consideration of this topic. The discussion of it began as early as the days of Josephus, who, in fact, gives us, in two controversial passages, nearly all the information we possess on the question. He professes to cite the exact words of Manetho, and says, in substance (Apion, 1, 14, 15), that the Hyksos (a name which he etymoligically interprets as meaning “Shepherd kings”) were an ignoble people, who invaded Egypt from the East (evidently meaning that they were Arabs) during the reign of Timaeus (a king nowhere else mentioned), and; eventually established a one of themselves, named Salatis, king at Memphis, who founded a city on the  Bubastic arm of the Nile, called Avaris, as a barrier against the Assyrians; but that after a domination of 511 years these people were attacked by “the kings of Thebais and the other parts of Egypt” (language which proves the contemporaneousness of the Theban line at least), who, under a king named Alisphragmuthosis, subdued them, and that his son Thummosis finally drove them out of the country. The extract from Manetho further states that these refugees were the builders of Jerusalem, a statement with which Josephus joins issue, as identifying them with the Hebrews; but the language may, perhaps, be referred to the Canaanites who fortified. Jaebus in the interval between the Exodus and the time of David.

Josephus then proceeds to recount the kings of Egypt after the expulsion of the Hyksos, beginning with Tethmosis and the list is evidently that of Manetho's eighteenth dynasty beginning with Amosis. In the other passage (ibid. 26), Josephus cites a story from Mainetho to the effect that the Jewish lawgiver, Moses, was the same as a priest, Osarsiph of Heliopolis, whom a degraded leprous caste of the Egyptians made their ruler in an insurrection, and invited the escaped Shepherds back to Egypt, where they ravaged the country and committed all sorts of atrocities. The Egyptian king under whom this revolt occurred is given as Amenophis, the father of Sethbos- Ramses, and the son of Rhampses, names which clearly point to Menephtah I, of the nineteenth dynasty. “The narrative goes on to state, however, that as soon as Amenophis, who at the time of the outbreak was absent in Ethiopia, returned with his army, he totally defeated and expelled the rebels. This account, of course, Josephus violently controverts but there is no occasion to doubt its accuracy, except as to the evidently malicious and, arbitrary, identification of these leprous insurrectionists with the Hebrews. The most casual reader cannot fail, as Josephus intimates, to note the contradiction in Manetho, if he meant to make out an identity of the Jews with both the Hyksos and the rebels, since the Shepherds had been totally expelled long before the date of the lepers, and the Hebrews had but one Exodus.

In connection with these excerpts from Manetho, Josephus cites passages from Chaeremon and others bearing upon the same subject, but they contain nothing of importance to our purpose. We are not concerned here to refute, whether indignantly or coolly, either part of this migration as a garbled account of the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt; our only object is to ascertain, if possible its chronological position with reference to the Exodus. We know of no positive method for doing this but by a direct comparison of the dates, of the two events, as nearly as they can be historically, or rather chronologically, determined.  Unfortunately the uncertainty of many of the elements that enter into the settlement of this early portion of both the Egyptian and the Biblical chronology forbids any absolute, satisfaction on this point. If, however, we may trust to the accuracy of the conclusions recently arrived at, we may, with, tolerable safety, set down the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt as continuing B.C. 1874-1658, and the rule of the Hyksos as lasting B.C. 2003-1470; in other words, the entire period of 216 years during which the Hebrews were in Egypt was contemporaneous with that of the Hyksos, and about the middle of the latter. Some writers have claimed (Birch, Egypt, p. 131) that the name Raamses (or Rameses), one of the treasure cities, built by the Israelites in their period of bondage (Exo 1:11), is conclusive, proof that the oppression took place under the Ramessidoee (nineteenth dynasty, B.C. 1302); but this is inconsistent with the fact that Goshen is called, “the land of Rameses” (Gen 47:11) in the time of Joseph (B.C. 1874).

The only information we have of the Hyksos from other ancient writers on Egypt consists of such slight notices in the fragments of Manetho as the following by Africanus: “Fifteenth dynasty — six foreign phoenician kings, who also took Memphis, they likewise founded a city in the Sethroite nome, advancing from, which they reduced the Egyptians to subjection;” “Sixteenth dynasty — thirty, other Shepherd kings;” “Seventeenth dynasty — forty-three other Shepherd kings, and forty-three Theban diospolites together.” Instead of this Eusebius has simply “Seventeenth dynasty — (four) foreign Phoenician Shepherd kings (brothers), who also took Memphis. They founded a city in the Sethroite name, advancing from which they subdued Egypt.” There are a few indications in the Biblical records our mind go far toward which have been mostly overlooked in this discussion, but which go far towards confirming this relative, position of the two periods. In the first place, we are expressly told that in the time of Joseph “every Shepherd was an abomination unto the Egyptians” (Gen 46:34).

This shows that the Shepherd invasion, had occurred before that date, as it seems to be the only reasonable explanation of so deep an abhorrence. In the second place, however, it is clear, not only from the entire narrative, but especially from the fact that the Israelites were placed in Goshen, evidently as a break water against these foreign irruptions, That the Hyksos had not yet gained the upper hand, at least in Memphis, Where the capital of Joseph's Pharaoh seems to have been, located; and this accords, with the language of Josephus above, which  implies that the capture of Memphis did not occur till an advanced period in the Shepherd line, perhaps the beginning of the sixteenth dynasty. It is true, Josephus seems to locate the first Shepherd king at Memphis, but he betrays The inaccuracy of this expression by adding immediately that the king in question built Avaris as his capital; and the table of dynasties shows that the Memphitic dynasty continued till about the beginning of the Shepherd dynasty XVI. Indeed, the change in the policy of the Egyptians towards the Hebrews (Exo 1:8), which took place B.C. cir. 1738, singularly Accords with the revolution in lower Egypt at the end of the eighth dynasty (B.C. 1740), or the beginning of the sixteenth (B.C. 1755). Finally, the remark incidentally dropped as a reason by the “new king” for oppressing the Israelites, “lest, when there falleth out any war, they join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land,” which at first sight seems most appropriate in the mouth of one of the regular Memphitic line, bears, when more closely examined, strongly in the opposite direction.

So far as joining the enemy is concerned, There could be little difference the Shepherds are supposed by some to have been naturally friendly towards their neighbors and fellow Shepherds the Hebrews; but, on the other hand, we know the Hebrews were closely In alliance with the long established and apparently legitimate native sovereigns had been so, in fact, ever since the days of Abraham (Gen 12:16); and since the Hebrews had been located, as we have seen above, In (Goshen expressly for a purpose adverse to the Hyksos, we can hardly suppose that they had coalesced in sympathy or plans. The tyrant's fear was not so much of the arms of the Hebrews, for they were certainly not formidable soldiers, but rather lest they should seize the opportunity of the existing civil convulsion to escape from Egypt. He was not alarmed, it seems, at the prospect of their increasing as an invading force, such as were the Hyksos, but only lest their growing, numbers should, warrant them in migrating bodily to some more comfortable region. This implies that they had already experienced ill treatment or dissatisfaction. From what source could this have arisen? They had the best possible land for their vocation (Gen 47:6); they had enjoyed royal patronage to the full; they had never hitherto been oppressed by government. They had always been peaceable and loyal citizens. Why should they now be suspected And distrained? The jealousy, if on the part of the native regime, seems inexplicable; and we may add that such a rigorous and illegal course is not in accordance with what are otherwise know of the polity of the legitimate sovereigns of ancient Egypt.

We  cannot but suspect that bickerings, rivalries, and animosity had long existed between the Hebrews and the lawless, uncultivated Hyksos on their frontier, and raids such as the Israelites afterwards experienced from their bedawin neighbors in Palestine had, doubtless, often been made upon their quiet domain by; these Benke-edem, as Josephus virtually styles them. It was this annoyance that had tempted the Hebrews to long for a less exposed situation; and when they saw these freebooters installed as lords, they might even think it high time to decamp. The whole conduct of the Hyksos, as revealed by Josephus, shows them to have been of this domineering, foraging, semi-savage character. They were, in fact, congeners of the canaaniites, with whom the Israelites had henceforth a perpetual enmity, despite the traditional comity of earlier days. No genuine Egyptian monarch seems capable of the barbarity of the Pharaoh of the Exodus; but the atrocities which Josephus states that the Hyksos perpetrated in their later invasion justify the belief that it was they who, in the days of their power, made Egypt known As “the house of bondage.” The iritation and vexation caused by this system of petty persecution during the long contact of the, Israelites with the Hyksos in Egypt cherished as well as disclosed the early purpose of the former to return to the land of their forefathers (Gen 1:25), and had been predicted of old (Gen 15:13); but it was not till the domination of the latter had made it galling to an intolerable degree that the resolve ripened into a fixed determination. Sectionial jealousies and tribal animosities of this sort are proverbially hereditary, and are peculiarly inveterate, in the east. Where they are so liable to be aggravated by blood feuds. We can trace distinct evidences of such a national grudge in this case from the time when the son of the Egyptian bondwoman who was, doubtless, no other than a captive from these “sons of the east” bordering on Egypt was expelled from the Hebrew homestead for mocking the son of the free woman (Gen 21:9) till Moses slew the Egyptian task master (Exo 2:12).

Hagar naturally retired to the wilderness of Beersheba” (Gen 21:14), which was part of what was known by the more general name of the desert of Paran, where her childhood had doubtless been spent, and there contracted a marriage for her son among her kindred tribes, called even then part of the land of Egypt (Gen 11:21). His descendants, the notorious Ishmaelites, who roved as brigands over the region between Egypt and Canaan, intensified the clannish variance, which became, still more sharply defined between the caivalierlvy Esau and the puritan Jacob in the next generation. These two representative characters, indeed, both went under the common title of  shepherds or herdsmen, for flocks and herds constituted the staple of the property of each (Gen 33:9). but the “cunning hunter of the field” evidently looked with Bedawi disdain upon his “simple tent” dwelling” brother as a Fellah (Gen 25:27 sq.). The collision s between the Philistine herdsmen aid Jacob's (Gen 21:17-22) seem to belong to the same line of difference, and may serve to remind us that Philistia, as the intermediate battle ground of the expelled Hyksos in later times, retained in military prowess and panoplied champions traces of their warlike encounters with the arms of Egypt. The iron war chariots of the Canaanites are especially traceable to the Egyptian use of cavalry, and these could only deploy successfully in the level sea coast and its connected plains. The fear of encountering these disciplined foes or the part of the Israelites in their departure from Egypt betrays the hereditary hostility between them. The Amalekites who attacked the Hebrews in the desert (Exo 17:8) were evidently a branch of the same roving race of Arabs in the northern part of the peninsula of Sinai, and they repeated the attack at the southern border of Canaans (Num 14:45).

The ban of eventual extermination against them (Exo 17:16) was but the renewal of the old enmity. It was a caravan of these gypsy traders, (indifferently called Ishmaelites or Midianites, Genisis Exo 37:28) who purchased Joseph and carried him to their comrades in Egypt. The second irruption of the Hyksos in to Egypt, as narrated by Josephus, manifestly was, when stripped, of its apocryphal exaggerations, merely one of the forays which characterized, or rather constituted, the guerilla system seem, on various occasions to have, prevailed on the southern border of Palestine, such as Saul's raid against Amalek (1Sa 15:3), Daivid's expeditions from Ziklag (1Sa 20:2; 1Sa 20:8) and the later marauds of the Simeonites (1Ch 5:18; 1Ch 5:22). The date assigned to it by Josephus would be about B.C. 1170-50, or during the troubled judgeship of Eli, when the Philistines and other aborigines had everything pretty much their own way.” This was some three centuries after the close of the Shepherd rule in Egypt, which ended about B.C. 1492, or during the judgeship of Ehud. As the route of the invading and retreating hordes, was, of course, along the sea coast, they may have marched and counter marched freely at any time prior to David's region without disturbing in the least, the current of Hebrew alms, which at that period are confined to the. mountain backbone of the country and the Jordan valley.  The Shasus (whose name, seems to be identical with the last syllable of Hyksos), with whom the monuments represent the Ramessidae as warring, were the Shemites or Arabs of this period. They sometimes appear in connection with the heta or, Hittites, i.e. Syrians.

An interesting confirmation of this chronological, position of the Hebrew, transmigration is found in the fact that horses do not appear on the Egyptian monuments prior to the eighteenth dynasty (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians [Amer. ed.], 1, 386), haying, in, all probability, been introduced by the Bedawin Hyksos, of whom, however, few, if any, pictorial representations remain. Accordingly, at the removal of the Israelites to Egypt, in the early part of the Shepherd rule, we read only of asses and wagons for transportation (Gen 14:19-23) — the latter, no doubt, for oxen, like those employed in the desert (Num 7:3), but at the Exode, in the latter part of the Shepherd rule, the cavalry, consisting exclusively of chariots, formed an important arm of the military service (Exo 11:7)., The incidental mention of horses, however, in Gen 47:17, as a part of the Egyptian farm stock in Joseph's day, shows that they were not unknown in domestic relations at that date.

## Shepherd, Jacob R[[@Headword:Shepherd, Jacob R]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born near Halifax, Pa., April 3, 1788. He was converted in 1814, admitted into the itinerancy in the Baltimore Conference in 1821, and served the Church effectively until 1830, when his health gave way, and he took a superannuated relation. As his strength permitted, he still went about doing good. He died Sept. 4, 1846. Mr. Shepherd possessed powers of mind above mediocrity, as a good and useful preacher, and died in the faith. See Minutes of Annual Conferences 4, 100.

## Shepherd, James[[@Headword:Shepherd, James]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Westfield, Mass., Dec. 14, 1802. In 1833 he was received on trial into the New England Conference, was ordained deacon in 1830, and elder in 1837. He continued to labor without intermission until seized with an illness which terminated his life, May 22, 1855. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1856, p. 41.

## Shepherd, John[[@Headword:Shepherd, John]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pennsylvania Nov. 7 1789. He was licensed to preach in Illinois about 1823, and received on trial into the Illinois Conference in 1836. His ministerial labor lasted twenty-four years; and in 1860 the Southern Illinois Conference granted him a superannuated relation. He died about twenty days after, in  November, 1860. He as “a faithful minister, remarkable for his punctuality, and greatly beloved.” See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1861, p. 217.

## Shepherd, Moses[[@Headword:Shepherd, Moses]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was admitted into the Illinois Conference in 1851. Of frail health he husbanded his powers, and was thus able to somewhat extend his labors. He died (while presiding elder of the Jonesborough District, Southern Illinois Conference) Sept. 20, 1862. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1862, p. 211.

## Shepherd, Order Of The Good[[@Headword:Shepherd, Order Of The Good]]

             The “Sisters of Our Lady of Charity,” or “Eudist Sisters,” were founded at Caen, in Normandy, in 1641, by abbe Jeani Eudes. In 1835 a modification of the rule enabling them to take charge of penitent women was introduced at Augers, the establishment there becoming known as the “House of the Good Shepherd.” They were introduced into the United States in 1849. The “Sisters of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd,” and “Sisters of the Good Shepherd,” and “Religious of the Good Shepherd,” are apparently of the  same congregation, which, under one or the other of these names, is reported from fourteen establishments in nine states. These are in New York, Buffalo, and Brooklyn, N.Y.; two in Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md. New Orleans, La.; Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Franklin, O; Louisville, Ky.; St. Louis, Mo.; Chicago, Ill.; St. Paul, Minn. They have Magdalena asylums for maidens, industrial schools for reclaiming young truant girls, protectories for young girls, reformatories for girls, and parochial schools. The number of sisters, novitiates, and lay sisters is probably from 350 to 400, with 2500 or more penitents and girls under their charge. The “Third Order of St. Teresa, composed of reformed penitents who remain for life,” and reported in New York and St. Louis, appears to be under the supervision and patronage of this community. See Barnum, Romanism, etc. p. 328.

## Shepherd, Vincent[[@Headword:Shepherd, Vincent]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Wantage, Sussex Co., N.J., October, 1808. He was licensed to exhort Nov. 4, 1832; and as local preacher, Feb. 23, 1833. In the same year he was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, and appointed to Milford Circuit; in 1834 to Essex, in 1835 to Rockaway, in 1836 to Easton, and in 1837 ordained elder and appointed to Smyrna. In 1838-39 he was transferred to the New Jersey Conferences and stationed in Plainfield; in 1840, Belvidere; in 1841, New Brunswick; in 1842-43, Jersey City, and in 1844-45, Rahway, where his health failed, and he took a supernumerary relation. He died July 1, 1848. Mr. Shepherd was a good preacher, a diligent student, and a faithful pastor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4, 320.

## Shepherds (French Insurgents)[[@Headword:Shepherds (French Insurgents)]]

             SEE PASTOUREAUX.

## Shephi[[@Headword:Shephi]]

             (Heb. Shephi', שׁפַי, bareness, hence a naked hill; Sept. Σωφί v.r. Σωφάρ), the fourth named of the five sons of Shobal the son of the aboriginal Seir of Edom (1Ch 1:40), called in the parallel passage (Gen 36:23) Shepho (Heb. Shepho', שְׁפוֹ, of the same signification, Sept. Σωφάρ), which Burrington (Genealogies, 1, 49) regards as the preferable, reading. B.C. cir, 1920.

## Shephiphon[[@Headword:Shephiphon]]

             SEE ADDER.

S

hepho (Gen 36:23). SEE SHEPHI.

## Shephuphan[[@Headword:Shephuphan]]

             (Heb. Shephuphan', ]שְׁפוּפָ, an adder; Sept. Σωφάν v.r. Σεφουφάμ), next to the last named of the sons of Bela oldest son of Benjamin (1Ch 3:5), elsewhere called (perhaps more properly) Shephupham (Numbers 11:39, A.V. “Shupham”), Shuppim (1Ch 7:12; 1Ch 7:15), and Muppim (Gen 46:21). SEE JACOB.

## Shepley, David, D.D[[@Headword:Shepley, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Solon, Maine, in May 1804. His father dying when David was quite young, he went to Norridgewock, where he resided for a time in the family of Reverend Jonah Peet, and became a Christian. He pursued his preparatory studies at Saco, graduated from Bowdoin College in 1825, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1828. He was ordained as pastor of the First Church at Yarmouth, Me., in February 1829, and resigned in April 1849. He was next pastor at  Winslow from September 1851, until June 1862; subsequently of the Central Church at Falmouth for a short time, and then provisional secretary of the Maine Missionary Society. His health failing, he removed to Providence, R.I., in 1871, where he remained until his death, December 1, 1881. See Providence Journal, December 3, 1881. (J.C.S.)

## Sherah[[@Headword:Sherah]]

             (Heb. Sheerah', שֶׁאֵָרה. relationship, i.e. kinswoman [as in Lev 18:1-7]; Sept. Σααρά v.r. Σαραά), a “daughter” of Ephraim, and foundress of the two Beth-horons and also of a town called, after her, Uzzen-sherah (1Ch 7:24). B.C. cir. 1612.

## Sherd[[@Headword:Sherd]]

             (Isa 30:14; Eze 23:34). SEE POTSHERD.

## Sherebiah[[@Headword:Sherebiah]]

             (Heb. Sherebyah' שֵׁרֵבְיָה, heat [Furst, sprout] of Jehovah; Sept.'Σαραβία, v.r. Σαραβίας, Σαραβαϊvα, Σαραϊvα, ettc.), a prominent Levite of the family of Mahli the Merarite, who, with his sons and brethren (eighteen all) joined Ezra's party of returning colonists at the river Ahava (Ezr 8:18), and who, along with Hashabiah and ten others was commissioned to carry the treasures to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:24, where they are vaguely called “chief of the priests”). B.C. 459. He also assisted Ezra in reading to the people (Nahum 8:7), took part in the psalm of confession and thanksgiving which; was sung at the solemn fast after the Feast of Tabernacles, (Nahum 9:4, 5), and signed, the covenant with, Nehemiah (Neh 10:12). He is again mentioned among the chief of the Levites who belonged to the choir (Neh 12:8; Neh 12:24).

## Sheresh[[@Headword:Sheresh]]

             (Heb. id' שֶׁרֶשׁ,. but occurring only “in pause,” Sha'resh, שָׁרֶשׁ, root, [Furst, union]; Sept. Σορός.v. r. Σο υρος), second of the two sons of Machir by Maachah, and father of Ulam and Rakem (1Ch 7:16). B.C. ante 1658.

## Sherets[[@Headword:Sherets]]

             SEE CREEPING THING

## Sherezer[[@Headword:Sherezer]]

             (Zec 7:2). SEE SHAREZER 2.

## Sheridan, Andrew J.[[@Headword:Sheridan, Andrew J.]]

             a. minister of the Methodist Episcopal.Church, was born in Butler, County, O., Feb. 7, 1825, but emigrated early to Indiana. He was converted and joined the Church in 1841, and licensed to preach in 1852. He was admitted on trial into the Northwest Indiana Conference in 1853, after spending four years in the Asbury University. In 1860 he received a superannuated relation, which he changed to that of effective in 1865. He was then appointed to Mechanicsburg. Circuit, where he died, Jan. 10, 1867. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1867, p. 197.

## Sheridan, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Sheridan, Thomas, D.D.]]

             was an Irish clergyman, born in the County of Cavah about 1684. By the help of friends he was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He afterwards entered into orders, and was named chaplain to “the lord lieutenant.” He lost his fellowship by marriage, and set up a school in Dublin, which was at first successful, bait was afterwards ruined by negligence and extravagance. His intimacy with Swift procured him a living in the south of Ireland in 1725, worth about £150; but he lost his chaplaincy and all hope of rising by preaching a sermon on the king's birthday. from the text “Sufficient unto the day is “the evil thereof.” He exchanged his living for that of Dunboyne, but gave it up for the free school of Cavan. He soon sold the school for. about £.400, spent the money rapidly, lost his health, and died Sept. 10, 1738. He was a good natured, improvident man, continuing, to the last to be a punster, a quibbler, a fiddler, and a wit.

## Sheridan, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Sheridan, William, D.D.]]

             an English prelate of the latter part of the 17th century, was bishop of Kilmote and Ardagh in 1681, and was deprived in 1691 for not taking the oath at the Revolution. His works consist of Sermons, etc., published in 1665, 4to; 1685; 4to; 1704, 1705, 1706, 3 vols. 8vo; 1720, 3 vols. (of vol. 1, 2d ed.) 8vo., See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sherif[[@Headword:Sherif]]

             (Arab. for noble) designates, among Moslems, a descendant of Mohammed through, his daughter Fatima and Ali. The title is inherited both from the maternal and paternal side; and thus the number of members of this aristocracy is very large. The men have the privilege of wearing the green turban, the women the green veil; and they mostly avail. themselves of this outward badge of nobilility (the prophet's color), while that of the other Moslems' turbans is white. Many of these sherifs founded dynasties in Africa; and the line which now rules in Fez and Morocco still boasts of that proud designation.

## Sheriff[[@Headword:Sheriff]]

             occurs only in Dan 3:2-3, as a rendering; in the A.V. of the Chald. תַּפְתִּי, tiphtay (according to Fürst “a derivation from the old Persic atipaiti= supreme master [Stern Monatsnamen, p. 196 ];” Sept. ἐπ᾿ ἐξουσιών; Vulg. proefectus) one of the classes of court officials at Babylon, probably lawyers or jurists, like the present Mohammedan mufti, who decides points of laws in the Turkish courts.

## Sheringham, Robert[[@Headword:Sheringham, Robert]]

             a learned fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, who was ejected during the Commonwealth and retired to Holland, but was restored in 1662. His works were, Joma: Codex Talmudicus de Sacrificiis, etc.: — Diei Expiationes, etc. (Lond. 1648, 4to): — Franequer, etc. (ibid. 1696, 8vo): — The King's Supremacy Asserted (ibid. 1660, 1682, 4to): — De Anglorum Origine, etc. (Cantab; 1670, 8 vo): — also Sermons. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sherlock, Martin[[@Headword:Sherlock, Martin]]

             was an Irish divine and chaplain to the earl of Bristol during the latter part of the last century. He left the following works: Consiglio ad un Giovane Poeta (counsel to a young poet) (Naples, 1779, 8vo): — Lettres d'un Voyageur Anglois (Geneva, 1779; Neufchatel, 1781, 8vo; in English not by the author], Lond. 1780, 4to): — Letters, on various subjects (1781, 2 vols. 12mo): — New Letters from an English Traveller (1781, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Sherlock, Richard, D.D.[[@Headword:Sherlock, Richard, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Oxton; Cheshire, in 1613; and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and Trinity College, Dublin. He was minister of several parishes in Ireland, and afterwards became rector of Winwick, England. He died in 1689. His works are, Answer to the Quakers Objection to Ministers (Lond. 1656, 4to): —Quakers Wild Questions Answered (ibid. 1656, 12mo): —Mercurius Christianus, or The Practical Christian (ibid. 1673, 8vo): — and Sermons, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auths, s.v.

## Sherlock, Thomas[[@Headword:Sherlock, Thomas]]

             an English prelate, was the son of Dr. William Sherlock (q.v.) and was born in London in 1678. He early went to Eton, from which (about 1693) he was removed to Cambridge, and was admitted into Catherine Hall. He took his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1697, and that of Master of Arts in 1701. Between these dates he entered the ministry, and was appointed to the mastership of the Temple in 1704, which he held until 1753. In 1714 he took his degree of Doctor of Divinity, became master of Catherine Hall. and vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and in 1871 was created dean of Chichester. He was created bishop of Bangor in 1728, of Salisbury in 1734; and in 1747 the see of Canterbury was offered to him but he declined it on account of ill health. The following year he accepted the see of London. He died in 1761. Bishop Sherlock published, in opposition to Dr. Hoadly in the Bangorian Controversy, The Use and Intent of Prophecy: — Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus: — and a collection of his Discourses. The first complete edition of his, works was published (Lond. 1830) in 5 vols, 8vo.

## Sherlock, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Sherlock, William, D.D.]]

             a learned English, divine, was born in Southwark, London, in 1641. educated at Eton, and thence removed to Peter House, Cambridge, in May, 1657. He was made rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, London, in 1669. In 1680 he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and in 1681 was collated to a prebend of St. Paul's. He was master of the Temple in 1684, and as the rectory of Therfeld, Hertfordshire. Refusing to take the oaths at the Revolution, he was suspended; but complying. in 1690, he was restored, and became dean of St. Paul's in the following year. He died at Hampsteald, June 19, 1707 and was interred in St. Paul's Cathedral. More  than sixty of his publications are given, of which we notice the following: Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, etc. (Lond. 1674, 8vo); Defense and Continuation of the same (ibid. 1675, 8vo): —The Case of Resistance to the Supreme Powers Stated, etc. (ibid. 1684, 8vo).

## Sherman, Charles[[@Headword:Sherman, Charles]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Woodbury Conn., Oct. 20, 1803. He was converted in his seventeenth year, licensed as a local preacher in 1823, and admitted into the itinerancy, in 1830, laboring successively in Stratford and Burlingtoun in the New York Conference, and Albany and Troy in the Troy Conference, to which he was transferred in 1834. In 1838 he was appointed presiding elder in Albany District, in which he labored four years. In 1842, owing to failing health, he was appointed to Jonesville, a small station in Saratoga. County, N.Y.; in 1843 to Troy, where he died, March 10, 1844. Mr. Sherman was an excellent preacher, clear in his method, and forcible in his manner of address. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 3, 582, Sprague, Annals. of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 679.

## Sherman, John (1)[[@Headword:Sherman, John (1)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Dedham, England, Dec 26, 1613. He was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He came to New England in 1634, preached a short time at Watertown, and moved to New Haven, where he was made a magistrate and lived until 1644, when he accepted an invitation to become pastor at Waertown. There he labored until his dearth, Aug. 8, 1685. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1 44.

## Sherman, John (2)[[@Headword:Sherman, John (2)]]

             a Unitarian minister; was born in New Haven, Conn., June 30, 1772; entered Yale College when not far from sixteen years of age, and graduated in 1792. He studied theology partly under president Dwight, but mainly under Rev. David Austin, of Elizabeth, N.J. He was licensed to preach by the New Haven Association in 1796; and was ordained and installed pastor of the First Church, Mansfield, Conn, Nov. 15, 1797. Not long after his settlement he began to doubt the doctrines he had been accustomed to believe and preach, especially that of the Trinity. On Oct. 23, 1805, he received a dismissal from a council called for the purpose, and  became pastor of the Reformed Christian Church (Unitarian) at Oldenbarneveld (Trenton village), N.J., March 9, 1806. After preaching a short time, he established an academy in the neighborhood, which occupied his attention for many years. In 1822 he built a hotel at Trenton Falls, into which he removed the next year. He died Aug. 2, 1828. He published, One God in One Person Only, etc. (1805, 8vo), the first formal and elaborate defense of Unitarianism that ever appeared in New England: — A View of Ecclesiastical Proceedings in the County of Windom, Conn. (1806, 8vo): — Philosophy of Language Illustrated (Trenton Falls, 1826, 12mo): — Description of Trenton Falls (Utica, 1827, 18mo). See Sprague Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 326.

## Sherman, Joseph, LL.D[[@Headword:Sherman, Joseph, LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister and educator, was born at Edgecomb, Maine, March 3, 1800. He graduated from Bowdoin College in 1826, was principal for six years of the Academy at North Yarmouth, studied two years at Andover, and in 1834 went to Columbia, Tennessee, as professor of ancient languages in Jackson College. For fifteen years he was connected with the college, during three of which he was its president. He died in June 1849. See Hist. of Bowdoin College, page 355. (J.C.S.)

## Sherrill, Edwin Jenner[[@Headword:Sherrill, Edwin Jenner]]

             a Congregational minister, was burn in Shoreham, Vt., Oct. 23, 1806. His preparatory studies were completed in Middlebury, after which he entered Hamilton, College, N.Y., whence he was graduated in 1832. He spent two years of study in Yale Theological Seminary, Mass., and one year at Andover Seminary. He was ordained at Eaton, Quebec, June 15, 1838, and continued in the pastoral charge of that church until November, 1873. Though not formally dismissed, he removed to Lee, Mass. in 1875. He died in the city of New York, June 1, 1877. (W.P.S.)

## Sherwood, Adiel, D.D[[@Headword:Sherwood, Adiel, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Fort Edward, N.Y., October 3, 1791. He studied three years at Middlebury College, graduated .from Union College in 1817, studied one year in the Andover Theological Seminary, and then went to Georgia for his health, where he took high rank as a preacher. He was ordained pastor at Bethlehem, near Lexington, in 1820. While at Eatonton, whither he went in 1827, having charge of an academy, as well as preaching, a most remarkable revival began in his church, and for two years it spread through the state. He may be said to have been the originator -of what is now Mercer University. In 1837 and 1838 he was a professor in Columbian College, Washington, D.C., and from 1839 to 1841 professor of sacred literature in Mercer University, Georgia. For several years he was president of Shurtleff College, Alton, Illinois. In 1848 and 1849 he was president of the Masonic College, Lexington, Missouri, and from 1849 to 1857 pastor of the Church at Cape Girardeau. Returning to Georgia, he was president of Marshall College for a few years. The closing years of his life were spent in Missouri, his death occurring at St. Louis, August 18, 1879. Among the numerous productions of his pen may be mentioned his Gazetteer of Georgia, Christian and, Jewish Churches, and his Notes on the New Testament. In his personal appearance Dr. Sherwood was tall and commanding, with noble and dignified features. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1054. (J.C.S.)

## Sherwood, James Manning[[@Headword:Sherwood, James Manning]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Fishnkill, N.Y., September 29, 1814. After an education mainly through private tutors, he served various churclies as pastor from 1835 to 1858, and then owing to ill-health took up literary work, until his death, October 22, 1890. He was editor of the Natioial Preacher, Biblical Repository, New York Evangelist, Eclectic Magazine, Princeton Review, Hours at Home, Homiletic Review, and Missionary Review of the World. He also wrote A History of the Cross,  and superintended an edition of the Life of David Brainerd. See the Missionary Review of the World; January 1891, pages 1-3.

## Sherwood, Mary Martha[[@Headword:Sherwood, Mary Martha]]

             an English authoress, was born at Stallford, Worcestershire, July 6, 1775. In 1803 she married her cousin, Henry Sherwood, and accompanied him in 1804 to India, where she instructed the children of his regiment. In 1818 they returned to England, and in 1821 settled at Wickwar, county of Gloucester, where they resided for the next twenty-seven years. Mrs. Sherwood's works number ninety volumes, of which mention is made of the following: Chronology of Ancient History: — Dictionary of Scripture Types. The remainder are largely works of fiction.

## Sherwood, Reuben, D.D[[@Headword:Sherwood, Reuben, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, died at Hyde Park, N.Y., May 11, 1856, aged sixty-six years. He was one of the oldest clergymen of his denomination in Dutchess County, and for the last twenty-two years of his life had been rector of St. James' Church at Hyde Park. He was formerly, for a long time, in charge of the Church at Norwalk, Connecticut, and was the founder of the parishes at Saugerties and Esopus, N.Y. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1856, page 301.

## Shesh[[@Headword:Shesh]]

             SEE LINEN; SEE MARBLE; SEE SILK.

## Sheshach[[@Headword:Sheshach]]

             (Heb. Seshak', שֵׁשִׁךְ, probably an artificial word; Sept. Σεσάκ v.r. Σησάχ), a term occurring only in Jeremiah (25:26; 51:41) who evidently uses it as a  synonym either for Babylon or for Babylonia. According to the Jewish interpreters, followed by Jerome, it represents בבל, “Babel, “ on a Cabalistic principle called “Athbash” well known to the later Jews the substitution of letters according to their position in the alphabet, counting backwards from the last letter, for those which hold the same numerical position counting in the ordinary way. SEE CABALA. Thus תrepresents א, שׁ represents ב, רrepresents ג, and so on. It may well be doubted, however, whether this fanciful practice were as old as Jeremiah's time; and even supposing that were the case, why should he use this obscure term here, when Babylon is called by its proper name in the same verse? C.B. Michaelis conjectures that שׁש ׁcomes from שׁבשׁ, shikshak, “to overlay with iron or other plates, “so that it might designate Babylon as χαλκόπυλος. Von Bohlen thinks the word synonymous with the Persian Shih-shah, i.e. “house of the prince;” but it is doubtful whether, at so early a period as the age of Jeremiah, Babylon could have received a Persian name that would be known in Judea. Sir H. Rawlinson has observed that the name of the moon god, which was identical, or nearly so, with that of the city of Abraham Ur (or Hur), “might have been read in one of the ancient dialects of Babylon as Shishaki, “ and that consequently “a possible explanation is thus obtained of the Sheshach of Scripture” (Herod. 1, 616). Shesach may stand for Ur; Ur itself, the old capital, being taken (as Babel, the new capital, constantly was) to represent the country.

## Sheshai[[@Headword:Sheshai]]

             (Heb. Sheshay', שֵׁשִׁי, schitish [Gesen.] or noble [Furst]; Sept. Σεσσί, v.r. Σουί, Σουσαί, Σεμεί, etc.), the second named of the three sons of Anak who dwelt in Hebron, (Num 13:22), and were driven thence and slain by Caleb at the head of the children of Judah (Jos 15:14; Jdg 1:10). B.C. 1612.

## Sheshan[[@Headword:Sheshan]]

             (Heb. Sheshan', ]שֵׁשָׁ, lily [Gesen.] or noble [Furst]; Sept. Σωσάν v.r. Σωσάμ, a “son” of Ishi and “father” of Ahlai or Atlai, among the descendants of Jerahmeel the son of Hezron; being a representative of one of the chief families of Judah, who, in consequence. of the failure of male issue, gave his daughter in marriage to Jarha (q.v.), his Egyptian slave, and  through this union the line was perpetuated (1Ch 2:31; 1Ch 2:34-35). B.C. post 1856.

## Sheshbazzar[[@Headword:Sheshbazzar]]

             (Heb. Sheshbatstsar', שֵׁשְׁבִּצִּר, from the Persian for worshipper of fire [Von Bohlen], or the Sanscrit cacvicari= “distinguished one” [Luzzatto]; Sept., Σασαβασάρ v.r. Σαναβασάρ, etc.), the Chaldaeani or, Persian name given to Zerubbabel (q.v.). in Ezr 1:8; Ezr 1:11; Ezr 5:14; Ezr 5:16, after the analogy of Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, Belteshazzar, and Esther. In like manner, also, Joseph received the name of Zaphnath-Paaneah, and we learn from Manetho, as quoted by Josephus (Apion, 1, 28), that, Moses' Egyptian name was Osarsiph. The change of name in the case of Jehiakim and Zedekiah, (2Ki 23:34; 2Ki 24:17) may also be compared. That Sheshbazzar means Zerubbabel is proved by his being called the prince (הִנָּשּׂיא) of Judah, and governor (פֶּחָה), the former term marking him as the head of the tribe in the Jewish sense (Num 7:2; Num 7:10-11, etc.), and the latter as the Persian governor appointed by Cyrus, both which Zerubbabel was; and yet more distinctly by the assertion (Ezr 5:16) that Sheshbazzar laid the foundation of the house of God which is in Jerusalem, “compared with the promise to Zerubbabel (Zec 4:9), “The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house, his hands shall, also finish it.” It is also apparent from the mere comparison of Ezr 1:11 with 2:1, 2 and the whole history of the returned exiles. The Jewish tradition that Sheshbazzar is Daniel is utterly without weight.

## Sheshunogunde[[@Headword:Sheshunogunde]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the wife of Waishia, second. son of the first man (Puru), from whom the mercantile caste is descended. She was created by Brahma in the lands of the South.

## Sheth[[@Headword:Sheth]]

             (Heb. id. שֵׁת), the form of two names, one more accurate that that elsewhere, the other doubtful.

1. The patriarch Seth (1Ch 1:1).

2. In the A.V. of Num 24:17, שֵׁתis rendered as a proper name, but there is reason to regard it as an appellative, and to translate, instead of  “the Sons of Sheth,” “the sons of tumult,” the wild warriors of Moab, for in the parallel passage (Jer 48:45) שָׁאוֹ, shaon, “tumult, “ occupies the place of sheth שֵׁת, sheth, is thus equivalent to שֵׁאת, sheth, as in Lam 3:47. Ewald proposes, very unnecessarily, to read שֵׁת, seth= שְׂאֵת, and to translate “the sons of haughtiness” (Hochmuthsssohne). Rashi takes the word as a proper name, and refers it to Seth the son of Adam; and this seems to have been the view taken by Onkelos, who renders “he shall rule all the souls of men.” The Jerusalem Targum gives “all the sons of the East;” the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel retains the Hebrew word Sheth, and explains it “of the armies of Gog who were to set themselves in battle array against Israel.”

## Shethar[[@Headword:Shethar]]

             (Heb. Shethar', שֵׁתָר, Persic for star, like ἀστρή [Gesen.], or Zend shathiao = “commander” [Furst; Sept. Σαρσαθαὶος v.r. Σαρρέσθεος, etc.), second named of the seven princes of Persia and Media, who had access to the king's presence, and were the first men in the kingdom, in the third year of Xerxes (Est 1:14). B.C. 483. Comp. Ezr 7:14 and the ἑπτὰ τ ων Περσ ων ἐπίσημοι of Ctesias (14), and the statement of Herodotus (3, 84) with regard to the seven noble Persians who slew Smerdis, that it was granted to them as a privilege to have access to the king's presence at all, times, without being sent for, except when he was with the women; and, that the king might only take a wife from one of these seven families. SEE CARSHENA; SEE ESTHER.

## Shethar-boznai[[@Headword:Shethar-boznai]]

             (Chald. Shethar' Bozenay', שְׁתִר בּוֹזְנִי, Persic =shining star [comp. Oppert, Jour. Asiatique, 1851, p. 400]; Sept. Σαθαρ-βουζανα‹ v.r. -ζαν, etc.), a Persian officer of rank, having a command in the province “on this side the river” under Tatnai (q.v.) the satrap (פִּחִת), in the reign of Darius Hystaspis (Ezr 5:3; Ezr 5:6; Ezr 6:6; Ezr 6:13). B.C. 520. He joined with Tatnai and the Apharsachites in trying to obstruct the progress of the Temple in the time of Zerubbabel, and in writing a letter to Darius, of which a copy is preserved in Ezra 5, in which they reported that “the house of the great God” in Judaea was in process of being built with great stones, and that the work was going on fast, on the alleged authority of a decree from Cyrus. They requested that search might be made in the rolls court whether such a  decree was ever given, and asked for the king's pleasure in the matter. The decree was found at Ecbatana, and a letter was sent to Tatnai and Shethar- boznai from Daritis, ordering them no more to obstruct, but, on the contrary, to aid the elders of the Jews in rebuilding the Temple by supplying them both with money and with beasts, corn, salt, wine, and oil, for the sacrifices. Shethar-boznai after the receipt of this decree offered no further obstruction to the Jews. The account of the Jewish prosperity in 6:14-22 would indicate that the Persian governors acted fully up to the spirit of their instructions from the king. SEE EZRA.

As regards the name Shethar-boznai, it seems to be certainly Persian. The first element of it appears as the name Shethar, one of the seven Persian princes in Est 1:14. It is perhaps also contained in the name Pharna- zathres (Herod. 7:65); and the whole, name is note unlike Sati-barzanes, a Persian in the time of Artaxerxes Mnemon (Ctesias, 57). If the names of the Persian officers mentioned in the book of Ezra could be identified. in any inscriptions or other records of the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, it would be of immense value in clearing up the difficulties of that book. “The Persian alliteration of the name in cuneiform characters was probably Chitrabarshana, a word which the Greeks would have most properly rendered by Σιτραβαρζάνης (comp. the Σαθαρβουζανα‹ of the Sept.). Chitrabarshana would be formed from chitra, ‘race,' ‘family,' and barshana, a cognate form with the Zend berez, ‘splendid'” (Speaker's Commentary, ad loc.).

## Sheva[[@Headword:Sheva]]

             (Heb. text Sheya', שְׁיָא, margin Sheva', שְוָאin Samuel), the name of two Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Σαού v.r. Σαούλ; Vulg. Sue.) Last named of ine four sons of Caleb ben-Hezron by his concubine Maachah. He was the “father, “ i.e. founder or chief, of. Machbena and Gibea (1Ch 2:49). B.C. cir. 1612.

2. (Sept. Σουσά v.r. Ισο υς.) The scribe or royal secretary of David (2Sa 20:25); elsewhere called Seraiah (2Sa 7:17), Shisha (1Ki 4:3), and Shavsha (1Ch 16:18).

## Shew bread[[@Headword:Shew bread]]

             SEE SHOW BREAD.

## Shiahs[[@Headword:Shiahs]]

             SEE SHIITES.

## Shibboleth[[@Headword:Shibboleth]]

             (Heb. Shibbo'leth, שׁבֹּלֶת). After Jephthah bad beaten the Ammonites, the men of Ephraim were jealous of the advantage obtained by the tribes beyond Jordan, and complained loudly that they had not been called to that expedition. Jephthah answered with much moderation; but that did not prevent the Ephraimites from using contemptuous language towards the men of Gilead. They taunted them with being only fugitives from Ephraim and Manasseh a kind of bastards that belonged to neither of the two tribes. A war ensued, and the men of Gilead killed a great number of Ephraimites; after which, they set guards at all the passes of Jordan, and when an Ephraimite who had escaped came to the riverside and desired to pass over, they asked him if he were not an Ephraimite? If he said No, they bade him pronounce Shibboleth; but he pronouncing it Sibboleth (q.v.), substituting שׂor סfor שׁ, according to the diction of the Ephraimites, they killed him. In this way there fell 42,000 Ephraimites (Judges 12). SEE JEPHTHAH.

The word Shibboleth, which has now a second life in the English language in a new signification, has two meanings in Hebrew:

(1) an ear of corn. (Genesis 41, etc.);

(2) a stream or flood and it was, perhaps, in the latter sense that this particular word suggested itself to the Gileadites, the Jordan being a rapid river. The word, in the latter sense, is used twice in Psalms 69, in Psa 69:2; Psa 69:15, where the translation of the A.V. is “the floods overflow me,” and “let not the water flood overflow me;” also in Isa 27:12 (“channel”); Zec 4:12 (“branch”). If in English the word retained its original meaning, the latter passage might be translated “let not a shibboleth of waters drown me.” — There is no mystery in this particular word. Any word beginning with the sound sh would have answered equally well as a test.  The above incident should not be passed over without observing that it affords proof of dialectical variations among the tribes of the same nation, and speaking the same language in those early days. There can be no wonder, therefore, if we find in later ages the, same word written different ways, according to the pronunciation of different tribes or of different colonies or residents of the Hebrew people; whence various pointings, etc. That this continued is evident from the peculiarities of the Galilaean dialect, by which Peter was discovered to be of that district (Mar 14:70). Before the introduction of vowel points (which took place not earlier than the 6th century A.D.) there was nothing in Hebrew to distinguish the letters Shin and Sin, so it could not be known, by the eye in reading when h was to be sounded after s, just as now in English there is nothing to show that it should be sounded in the words sugar, Asia, Persia; or in German, according to the most common pronunciation, after s in the words Sprache, Spiel, Sturm, Stiefel, and a large class of similar words. It is to be noted that the sound sh is unknown to the Greek language, as the English th is unknown to so many modern languages. Hence in the Sept. proper names commence simply with s which in Hebrew commence with sh; and one result has been that, through the Sept. and the Vulg., some of these names, such as Samuel, Samson, Simeon, and Solomon, having become naturalized in the Greek form in the English language, have been retained in this form in the English version of the Old Test. Hence, likewise, it is a singularity of the Sept. version that in the passage in Jdg 12:6 the translator could not introduce the word “Shibboleth” and has substituted one of its translations, στάχυς “an ear of corn,” which tells the original story by analogy. It is not impossible that this word, may have been ingeniously preferred to any Greek word signifying “stream,” or “flood,” from its first letters being rather harsh sounding, independently of its containing a guttural. See Gunther, De Dialect. Triburum Judoe, Ephraim, et Benjamin (Lips. 1714). SEE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

## Shibmah[[@Headword:Shibmah]]

             (Num 32:38). SEE SIBMAH.

## Shicron[[@Headword:Shicron]]

             [some Shic'ron] (Heb. Shikron', ]שַׁכְרוֹ, drunkenness [as in Eze 23:33; Eze 39:19; but Furst says fruitfulness]; Sept. Σοκχώθ v.r.Α᾿κκαρωνά [imitating the הdirective]), a town near the western end of the northern  boundary of Judah, between Ekron and Mt. Baalah towards Jabneel (Jos 15:11). It seems to have been in Dan, as it is not enumerated among the cities of Judah (Jos 15:21-63). The Targum gives it as Shikaron, and with this agrees Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Σαχωράν), though no knowledge of the locality of the place is to be gained from his notice. Neither Schwarz (Palest. p. 98) nor Porter (Handb. for Pal. p. 275) has discovered any trace of it. It is, perhaps, the present ruined village Beit Shit, about halfway between Ekron and Ashdod.

## Shicron (2)[[@Headword:Shicron (2)]]

             is thought by Tristram (Bible Places, page 34) to be the modern Zernuka, which lies two and a half miles north-east of Yebnah (Jabneh), and is "a large mud village, with cactus hedges around it, and wells in the gardens" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 2:414). Lieut. Conder suggests (Quar. Statement of "Pal. Explor. Fund," October 1876, page 170, note) that it may be the Khurbet Sukereir, a small ruined khan, near the river of the same name, four and a half miles south-west of Yebnah, and exhibiting traces of a cistern, a reservoir, a viaduct, and a canal (Memoirs, 2:425).

## Shidders[[@Headword:Shidders]]

             in Hindu mythology, is a class of good genii, or devetas, not to be identified with the devs of the Persians, which are evil genii.

## Shie-tsih[[@Headword:Shie-tsih]]

             gods of the land and grain among the Chinese. There is an altar to these deities in Pekin, which is square, and only ten feet high, being divided into two stories of only five feet each. Each side of the square measures fifty- eight feet. The emperor alone has the privilege of worshipping at this altar, and it is not lawful to erect a similar one in any part of the empire for the use of any of his subjects.

## Shield[[@Headword:Shield]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the four following Hebrew words, of which the first two are the most usual and important; likewise of one Greek word.

1. The tsinnah (צַנָּה, from a root]צָנִ, to protect) was the large shield, encompassing (Psa 5:12) and forming a protection for the whole person. When not in actual conflict, the tsinnah was carried before the warrior (1Sa 17:7; 1Sa 17:41). The definite article in the former passage (the shield, not a shield” as in the A.V.) denotes the importance of the weapon. The word is used with “spear,” romach (1Ch 12:8; 1Ch 12:14; 2 Chronicles 11:32, etc.), and chanith (1Ch 12:34) as a formula for weapons generally.

2. Of smaller dimensions was the magen ( מָגֵן from גָּנֵ, to cover), a buckler or target, probably for use in hand to hand fight. The difference in size between this and the tsinnah is evident from 1Ki 10:16-17; 1Ki 10:29 2Ch 9:15-16, where a much larger quantity of gold is named as being used for the latter than for the former. The portability of the magen may be inferred from the notice in 2Ch 12:9-10; and perhaps also from 2Sa 1:21. The word is a favorite one with the poets of the Bible (see Job 15:26; Psa 3:3; Psa 18:2, etc.). Like tsinnah, it occurs in the  formulated expressions for weapons of war, but usually coupled with light weapons, the bow (2Ch 14:8; 2Ch 17:7), darts, שֶׁלִה (2Ch 32:5).

3. What kind of arm the shelet (שֶׁלֶט) was it is impossible to determine. By some translators it is rendered a “quiver,” by some “weapons” generally, by others a “shield.” Whether either or none of these is correct, it is clear that the word had a very individual sense at the time; it denoted certain special weapons taken by David from Hadadezer, king of Zobah (2Sa 8:7; 1Ch 18:7), and dedicated in the temple, where they did service on the memorable occasion of Joash's proclamation (2Ki 11:10; 2Ch 23:9), and where their remembrance long lingered (Son 4:4). From the fact that these arms were of gold, it would seem that they cannot have been for offense. In the two other passages of its occurrence (Jer 51:11; Eze 27:11) the word has the force of a foreign arm.

4. In two passages (1Sa 17:45; Job 39:23) kidon (כַּידוֹן), a dart, is thus erroneously rendered.

To these we may add socherah (סֹחֵרָה, “buckler”), a poetical term, occurring only in Psa 91:4.

Finally, in Greek, θυρεός (probably a door, hence a large shield) occurs metaphorically once (Eph 6:16).

Among the Hebrews the ordinary shield consisted of a framework of wood covered with leather; it thus admitted of being burned (Eze 39:9). The magen was frequently cased with metal, either brass or copper; its appearance in this case resembled gold, when the sun shone on it (1Ma 6:39), and to this rather than to the practice of smearing blood on the shield we may refer the redness noticed by Nahum (Nah 2:3). The surface of the shield was kept bright by the application of oil as implied in Isa 21:5; hence, Saul's shield is described as “not anointed with oil,” i.e. dusty and gory (2Sa 1:21). Oil would be as useful for the metal as for the leather shield. In order to preserve it from the effects of  weather, the shield was kept covered except in actual conflict (Isa 22:6; comp. Caesar, B. G. 2, 21; Cicero, Nat. Deor. 2, 14). The shield was worn oh the left arm, to which it was attached by a strap. It was used not only in the field, but also in besieging towns, when it served for the protection of the head, the combined shields of the besiegers forming a kind of testudo (Eze 26:8). Shields of state were covered with beaten gold. Solomon made such for use in religious processions (1Ki 10:16-17); when these were carried off they were replaced by shields of brass, which, as being less valuable, were kept in the guard room (1Ki 14:27), while the former had been suspended in the palace for ornament.

A large golden shield was sent as a present to the Romans when the treaty with them was renewed by Simon Maccabaeus (1Ma 14:24; 1Ma 15:18) it was intended as a token of alliance (σύμβολον τ ης συμμαχίας, Josephus, Ant. 14, 8, 5); but whether any symbolic significance was attached to the shield in particular as being the weapon of protection is uncertain. Other instances of a similar present occur (Sueton. Calig. 16), as well as of complimentary presents of a different kind on the part of allies (Cicero, Verr. 2 Act. 4, 29, 67). Shields were suspended about public buildings for ornamental purposes (1Ki 10:17; 1Ma 4:57; 1Ma 6:2). This was particularly the case with the shields (assuming shelet to have this meaning) which David took from Hadadezer (2Sa 8:7; Son 4:4), and which were afterwards turned to practical account (2Ki 11:10; 2Ch 23:9). The Gammadim similarly suspended them about their towers (Eze 27:11). SEE GAMMADIM. In the metaphorical language of the Bible the shield generally represents the protection of God (e.g. Psa 3:3; Psa 28:7); but in 47:9 it is applied to earthly rulers, and in Eph 6:16 to faith.

The large shield (ἀσπίς, clipeus) of the Greeks and Romans was originally of a circular form, and in the Homeric times was large enough to cover the whole body. It was made sometimes of osiers twisted together, sometimes of wood, covered with ox hides several folds thick. On the center was a projection called ὀμφάλος, umbo, or boss, which sometimes terminated in a spike. After the Roman soldier received pay, the clipeus was discontinued for the scutum, θυρεός, of oval or oblong form, and adapted to the shape of the body. Significant devices on shields are of great antiquity. Each Roman soldier had his name inscribed on his shield. Paul (Eph 6:16) uses the word θυρεός rather than ἀσπίς. because he is describing  the armor of a Roman soldier. See Kitto, Pict. Bible, note at Jdg 5:8. SEE ARMOR.

## Shields, Alexander[[@Headword:Shields, Alexander]]

             was an English clergyman and minister of St. Andrew's. He was chaplain to the Cameronian Regiment in 1689. In August, 1699, he accompanied the second Darien expedition, and died, “worn out and heart broken, “ in Jamaica (see Macaulay, Hist. of Eng. [1861], 5, 24). His published works are, A Hind Let Loose; or, A Historical Representation of the Church of Scotland (1687, 8vo): — History of the Scotch Presbytery (1691, 4to), an epitome of the foregoing: — Elegy on the Death of James Renwick (1688): — An Inquiry into Church Communion (2d ed. Edinb. 1747, sm, 8vo): — The Scots Inquisition (1745, sm. 8vo): — also Sermons. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Shields, Hugh K.[[@Headword:Shields, Hugh K.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Elk Ridge Church, Giles County, Tenn., Dec. 10, 1806. He was converted to God in his seventeenth year, and, feeling his call to the work of the ministry, he entered upon a course of study with that object in view. He graduated at an academy near Elk Ridge, then at Jackson College, Columbus, Tenn., studied theology privately, and was licensed by West Tennessee Presbytery in 1836, and ordained by the same in 1837. He subsequently preached at the following places: Bethberei, Hopewell, Savannah, Elk Ridge, Cornersville, Richland, Campbellsville, and Lynnville all in Tenn. His active ministry lasted twenty- seven years; two years before his death, Sept. 13, 1865, he was disabled from work by a severe accident. Mr. Shields was a zealous and faithful minister of the Gospel, exhibiting to a high degree the characteristics of one who walked with God. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 362. (J.L.S.)

## Shields, James[[@Headword:Shields, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., Dec. 11, 1812. He graduated at the Western University of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, in 1830, studied theology four years under the instruction of Revs. Mungo Dick and John Pressly, D.D., was licensed April 2, 1834, by the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Monongahela, and ordained in 1835 as pastor of  the congregations of Fermanagh and Tuscarora, Juniata County, Pa. Here he labored with varied success until the spring of 1859, when, on account of failing health, he ceased to preach in the Tuscarora branch of his charge, and gave all his time to the Fermanagh congregation. He died Aug. 19, 1862. Mr. Shields possessed a mind of more than ordinary power, and his exercises were always of a high order. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 354. (J.L.S.)

## Shier Thursday[[@Headword:Shier Thursday]]

             SEE SHEER THURSDAY.

## Shiggaion[[@Headword:Shiggaion]]

             (Heb. Shiggayon', ]שְׁגָּיוֹ; Sept. ψαλμός; Vulg. Psalmus [Psa 7:1]), a particular kind of psalm, the specific character of which is not now known. In the singular, number the word occurs nowhere in Hebrew except in the inscription of the above psalm; and there seems to be nothing peculiar in that psalm to distinguish it from numerous others, in which the author gives utterance to his feelings against his enemies and implores the assistance, of Jehovah against them, so that the contents of the psalm justify no conclusive inference as to the meaning of the word. In the inscription to the ode of the prophet Habakkuk (Hab 3:1), the word occurs in the plural number; but the phrase in which it stands, ‘al shigyonoth is deemed almost unanimously, as it would seem, by modern Hebrew scholars, to mean “after the manner of the shiggaion, and to be merely a direction as to the kind of musical measures by which the ode was to be accompanied. This being so, the ode is no real help in ascertaining the meaning of shiggaion; for the ode itself is, not so called, though it is directed to be sung according to the measures of the shiggaion. Indeed, if it were called a shiggaion, the difficulty would not be diminished; for, independently of the inscription, no one would have ever thought that the  ode and the psalm belonged to the same species of sacred poem.

And even since their possible similarity has been suggested, no one has definitely pointed out in what that similarity consists, so as to justify a distinct classification. In this state of uncertainty, it is natural to endeavor to form a conjecture as to the meaning of shiggaion from its etymology; but, unfortunately, there are no less than three rival etymologies, each with plausible claims to attention. Gesenius and Furst (s.v.) concur in deriving it from שַׁגָּה(the Piel of שָׁנָה), in the sense of magnifying or extolling with praises; and they justify, this derivation by kindred Syriac words. Shiggaion would thus mean a hymn or psalm; but its specific, meaning, if it have any, as applicable to Psalms 2, would continue unknown: Ewald (Die poetischen Bucher des alten Bundes, 1, 29), Rodiger (s.v. in his continuation of Gesenius's Thesaurus), and Delitzsch (Commentar uber den Psalter, 1, 51), derive it from שָׁגָה, in the sense of reeling, as from wine, and consider the word to be somewhat equivalent to a dithyrambus; while De Wette (Die Psalmen, p. 34), Lee (s.v.), and Hitzig (Die zwolf kleinen Propheten, p. 26) interpret the word as a psalm of lamentation, or a psalm in distress, as derived from Arabic. Hupfeld, on the other hand (Die Psalmen, 1, 109, 199), conjectures that shiggaion is identical with higgaion (Psa 9:16), in the sense of poem or song, from הגה, to meditate or compose; but even then no information would be conveyed as to the specific nature of the poem.

As to the inscription of Habakkuk's ode, עִל שַׁגְיֹנוֹת, the translation of the Sept. is μετὰ ᾠδ ης, which conveys no definite meaning. The Vulgate translates pro ignorantiis, as if the word had been shegagoth, transgressions through ignorance (Lev 4:2; Lev 4:27; Num 15:27, Ecc 5:6), or shegioth (Psa 19:13), which seems to have nearly the same meaning. Perhaps the Vulgate was influenced by the Targum of Jonathan, where shigyonoth seems to be translated כשלותא. In the A.V. of Hab 3:1, the. rendering is “upon shigionoth,” as if shigionoth were some musical instrument. But under such circumstances ‘al (על) must not be translated “upon” in the sense of playing upon an instrument. Of this use there is not a single undoubted example in prose, although, playing on musical instruments is frequently referred to and in poetry, although there is one passage (Psa 92:3) where the word might be so translated, it might equally well be rendered there “to the accompaniment of” the musical instruments therein specefied; and this translation is preferable. Some writers even doubt whether ‘al signifies “upon” when preceding the  supposed musical instruments Gittith, Machalath, Neginath, Nechiloth, Shushan, Shoshannim (Psa 8:1; Psa 81:1; Psa 84:1; Psa 53:1; Psa 88:1; Psa 56:1; Psa 5:1; Psa 55:1; Psa 45:1; Psa 69:1; Psa 80:1). Indeed, all these words as regarded by Ewald (Poet. Buch. 1, 77) as meaning musical keys, and by Furst (s.v.) as meaning musical bands. Whatever may be thought of the proposed substitutes, it is very singular, if those six words signify musical instruments, that not one of them should be mentioned elsewhere in the whole Bible. SEE PSALMS.

## Shigionoth[[@Headword:Shigionoth]]

             (Hab 3:1). SEE SHIGGAION.

## Shigmu[[@Headword:Shigmu]]

             in Chinese mythology, was the mother of Fo. While still a virgin she ate a lotus flower, found while bathing, and was thus impregnated by some deity.

## Shihon[[@Headword:Shihon]]

             (Heb. Shion', שַׁיאוןruin; Sept. Σιων α v.r. Σειάν; Vulg. Seon; A.V. originally “Shion”), a town of Issachar named only in Jos 19:19, where it occurs between Haphraim and Anaharath. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast.) mention it as then existing “near Mount Tabor.” A name resembling it at present in that neighborhood is the Khirbet Shi'in of Dr. Schulz (Zimmermann, Map of Galilee, 1861), one and a half mile northwest of Deburieh. This is probably the place mentioned by Schwarz (Palest. p. 166) as “Sain between Duberieh and Jafa.” The identification is, however, very uncertain, since Shi'in appears to contain the Ain, while the Hebrew name does not. — Smith. On this and other accounts we prefer the position of the modern village esh-Shajerah, a little north of Tabor (Robinson, Researches 3, 219, note).

## Shihon (2)[[@Headword:Shihon (2)]]

             For this place both Tristram (Bible Places, page 277) and Conder (Tent Work, 2:339) accept Ayuin esh-Shain, two miles northeast of Debunrieh, which consists merely of two springs, built utp with masonry, about thirty yards apart; good perennial supply of water; no stream" (Memoirs of Ordnance Survey, 1:377). On the other hand esh-Shejerah, four and a half miles north by east of Debfrieh, contains the ruins of an ancient building later used as a mosque (ibid. page 414).

## Shihor[[@Headword:Shihor]]

             (Heb. Shichor', שַׁיחוֹר, [thus only in Jos 13:2-3; 1Ch 13:5], or שַׁיהר [Jer 2:18], or שׁחֹר [Isa 23:3], dark; once with the art. הִשּׁיחוֹר, Jos 13:3, and once with the addition “of Egypt,” 1Ch 13:5; Sept. Γη ων, ἡ αἰοίκητος, ὅρια, and μεταβολή; Vulg. Sihior, Nilus, fluvius turbidus, and aqua turbida; A.V. “Sihor” in all passages except 1Ch 13:5), one of the names  given to the river Nile, probably arising from its turbid waters, like the Greek Μέλας (Gesen. Thesaurus, s.v.). Several other names of the Nile maybe compared. Νε ιλος itself, if it be as is generally supposed, of Iranian origin, signifies “the blue,” that is, “the dark” rather than the turbid; for we must then compare the Sanscrit Nilah “blue, “ probably especially “dark blue, “ also even “black, “ as “black mud.” The Arabic azrak, “blue,” signifies “dark” in the name Bahr el-Azrak, or Blue River, applied to the eastern of the two great confluents of the Nile. Still nearer, is the Latin Melo, from μέλας, a name of the Nile, according to Festus and Servius (ad Virg. Georg. 4, 29, 1; Aen. 1, 745; 4, 246); but little stress can be laid upon such a word resting on no better authority. With the classical writers it is the soil of Egypt that is black rather than its river. So, too, in hieroglyphics, the name of the country, Kem, means “the black;” but there is no name of the Nile of like signification. In the ancient painted sculptures, however, the figure of the Nile god is colored differently according as it represents the river during the time of the inundation, and during the rest of the year; in the former case red, in the latter blue. SEE NILE.

There are but three ocurrences of Shihor unqualified in the Bible, and but one of Shihor of Egypt, or Shihormizraim. In 1Ch 13:5 it is mentioned, as the southern boundary of David's kingdom: “David gathered all Israel, from Shihor of Egypt even unto the entering of Hamath.” At this period the kingdom of Israel was at the highest pitch of its prosperity. David's rule extended over a wider space than that of any other monarch who ever sat upon the throne; and, probably, as an evidence of this fact, and as a recognition of the fulfilment of the divine promise to Abraham (Gen 15:18) “Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates” the sacred historian may here have meant the Nile. Yet, in other places, where the northern boundary is limited to the “entrance of Hamath,” the southern is usually “the torrent of Egypt,” that is, Wady (נחל, not נהר) el-Arish (Num 34:5; 1Ki 8:65). There is no other evidence that the Israelites ever spread westward beyond Gaza. It may seem strange that the actual territory dwelt in by them in David's time should thus appear to be spoken of as extending as far as the easternmost branch of the Nile; but it must be remembered that more than one tribe, at a later period, had spread beyond even its first boundaries, and also that the limits may be those of David's dominion rather than of the land actually fully inhabited by the Israelites.

The passage in Jos 13:3 is even more obscure. The sacred writer is  describing the territory still remaining to be conquered at the close of his life, and when about to allot the conquered portion to the tribes. “This is the land that yet remaineth all the borders of the Philistines and all Geshuri. from Shihor which is before (עלאּפני, in the face of, not east of, but rather on the front of) Egypt, even unto the borders, of Ekron northward.” Keil argues that Wady el-Arish, and not the Nile, must here be meant (Comment. ad loc.); but his arguments are not conclusive. Joshua may have had the Lord's covenant promise to Abraham in view; if so, Shihor means the Nile; but, on the other hand, if he had the boundaries of the land as. described by Moses in Num 33:5 sq. in view, then Shihor must mean Wady el-Arish. It is worthy of note that, while in all the other passages in which this word is used it is anarthrous, here it has the article. This does not seem to indicate any specific meaning; for it can scarcely be doubted that here and in 1Ch 13:5 the word is employed in the same sense. The use of the article indicates that the word is, or has been, an appellative rather the former if we judge only from the complete phrase. It must also be remembered that Shihor-mizraim is used interchangeably with Nahal-mizraim, and that the name Shihor-libnath, in the north of Palestine, unless derived from the Egyptians or the Phoenician colonists of Egypt, on account of the connection of that country with the ancient manufacture of glass, shows that the word Shihor is not restricted to a great river. That the stream intended by Shihor unqualified, was a navigable river is evident from a passage in Isaiah, where it is said of Tyre, “And by great waters, the sowing of Shihor, the harvest of the river (Yeor, יַאר) [is] her revenue” (1Ch 23:3).

Here Shihor is either the same as, or compared with, Yeor, generally thought to be the Nile. In Jeremiah the identity of Shihor with the Nile seems distinctly stated where it is said of Israel, “And now what hast thou to do in the way of Egypt to drink the waters of Shihor? or what hast thou to do in the way of Assyria to drink the waters of the river?” i.e. Euaphrates (Jer 2:18). Gesenius (ut sup.) considers that Sihor, wherever used, means the Nile; and upon a careful consideration of the several passages, and of the etymology of the word, we are of the opinion that it cannot appropriately be applied to Wady el- Arish, and must therefore be regarded as a name of the river Nile (see Jerome, ad Isa 23:3; Reland, Paloest. p. 286). SEE RIVER OF EGYPT.

## Shihor-libnath[[@Headword:Shihor-libnath]]

             (Heb. Shichor' Libnath', לַבְנָת שַׁיחוֹר, literally, black of whiteness; Sept. ὁ Σειώρ [v.r. Ειών] καὶ Λιβανάθ; Vulg. Sichor et Labanath), a locality mentioned only in Jos 19:26 as one of the landmarks of the southern boundary of Asher in the vicinity of Carmel and Beth-dagon. By the ancient translators and commentators (as Peshito-Syriac, and Eusebius and Jerome in the Onomasticon) the names are taken as belonging to two distinct places. But modern commentators, beginning perhaps with Masius, have inferred from the fact that Shihor alone is a name of the Nile, that Shihor-libnath is likewise a river. Led by the meaning of Libnath as “white,” they interpret the Shihor-libnath as the glass river, which they then naturally identify with the Belus (q.v.) of Pliny (H.N. 5, 19), the present Nahr Naman, which drains part of the plain of Akka, and enters the Mediterranean a short distance below that city. This theory, at once so ingenious and so consistent, is supported by the great names of Michaelis (Suppl. No. 2462) and Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1393); but the territory of Asher certainly extended far south of the Naman. Reland's conjecture of the Crocodile River, probably the Nahr Zerka close to Kaisariyeh, is on the other hand, too far south, since Daor is not within the limits of Asher. The Shihor-libnath, if a stream at all, is more likely to have been the little stream (marked on Van de Velde's Map as Wady Milleh, but as Wady en- Nebra the specimen of the Ordnance Survey in the Pal. Explor. Quarterly for Jan. 1875) which enters the Mediterranean a little south of Athlit. The sand there is white and glistening, and this, combined with the turbid character of a mountain stream agrees well with the name.

## Shihor-libnath (2)[[@Headword:Shihor-libnath (2)]]

             Both Tristram (Bible Places, page 289) and Conder (Tent Work, 2:339) identify this stream with the Wady esh-Shagur, which comes down the mountains east of Acre, and by its junction with Wady Shulb forms the Wady ei-Halzfn, that runs into the Nahr Numein, or Belus. This, however, is at least fourteen miles north-east of Carmel, and more than twenty from the south-west extremity of Asher.

## Shiites[[@Headword:Shiites]]

             (Arab. Shiah, Shiat, “a party or faction”), the name given to a Mohammedan sect by the Sunnites (q.v.), or orthodox Moslems. The Shiites never assume that name, but call themselves Al-Adeliat, “Sect of the Just Ones.”The principal difference between the two consists in the belief of the Shiites that the imamat, or supreme rule, both spiritual and secular, over all Mohammedans was originally vested in Ali Ibn Abi Taleb, and has been inherited by his descendants, to whom it now legitimately. belongs. They are subdivided into five sects, to one of which, that of Haidar, the Persians belong. They believe in metempsychosis and the descent of God upon his creatures, inasmuch as he, omnipresent, sometimes appears in some individual person, such as their imams. Their  five subdivisions they liken unto five trees with seventy branches for their minor divisions of opinions, on matters of comparatively unimportant points of dogma, are endless. In this, however, they all agree that they consider the caliphs Abu-Bekr, Omar, and Othman — who are regarded with the highest reverence by the Sunniites as unrighteous pretenders and usurpers of the sovereign power which properly should have gone to Ali direct from the prophet. They also reject the Abasside. caliphs, notwithstanding their descent from Mohammed, because they did not belong to Ali's line.

## Shilhi[[@Headword:Shilhi]]

             (Heb. Shilchi', שׁלְחי; probably armed, from שֵׁלֵח, a missile, Sept. Σαλί, v.r. Σαλα‹, Σαλαλά, etc.), the father of Azubah, king Jehoshaphat's mother (2 Kings 22:42, 2Ch 20:31). B.C. ante 946.

## Shilhim[[@Headword:Shilhim]]

             (Heb. Shilchim', שַׁלְחי, armed men [Gesenius], or fountains [Furst]; Sept. Σελείμ v.r. Σαλή), a city in the southern portion of the tribe of Judab, mentioned between Lebaoth and Ain, or Ain-Rimmon (Jos 15:32). In the list of Simeon's cities in Joshua 19, Sharyhen (Jos 19:6) occupies the place of Shilhim, and in 1Ch 4:31 this is still further changed to Shaaraim. It is difficult to say whether these are mere corruptions or denote any actual variations of name. The juxtaposition of Shilhim and Ain has led to the conjecture that they are identical with the Salim and Aenon of John the Baptist; but their position in the south of Judah, so remote from the scene of John's labors and the other events of the Gospel history, seems to forbid this.