

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

S - Samaritan Sects

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

S

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 Evangeliiis* (1596): — *Notationes in Totam S. Scripturam* (1598).

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

([^]waGhi *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, **l a ryspt hrwt**, *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: **hy[çy ryspt**, *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 criticisms, 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:--**dAad rdbz ryspt (hrç)**, *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: — **bwya ryspt**, *A Translation of Job*, with annotations, entitled **lyd[tæ batk**, *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: — **μ yryçh ryç l [çwryp**, *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 **hyd[s8r çwrp** (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 **ἀπαξ λεγόμενα**, entitled **ryspt HDRpl a hfpl ḡ[bsl a**, 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 for 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 **tw[rw twnwma**, *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 **tanamal a batk tadaqt[al aw**, and 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 **twqllmāh; 8se twqDba** 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 reinstated 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 ältesten 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 Distinguished 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 Vorzüge 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 über die jüdischen 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.)

Saalschütz, 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 über 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 Or Sabas

Picture for Saba

(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 *πρεσβύτερος*) 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 this 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. Sabae* in Cotelerii. *Monum. Eccl. Gr.* 3, and Latin in Surius, Dec. 5; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 16, 701 sq.

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.

Sabach'thani

[many *sabachtha'ni*] (**σαβαχθανί**, a Graecized form of the Chaldee *shebakta'ni*, **ܣܒܚܬܢܝ**] *thou hast left me*), quoted by our Lord upon the cross (**4004** Matthew 17:46; **4153** Mark 15:34) from the Targum on **4021** Psalm 22:2 (where the Heb. has *azabta'ni*, **אָזַבְתָּנִי**) "thou hast forsaken me"). See Petersen, *Erforschung des Wortes σαβαχθανί* (s.l. 1701). **SEE AGONY.**

Sabae'an.

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* (μ *yabēs*] with a *samech*), the descendants of Seba or Saba, son of Cush, who ultimately settled in Ethiopia. *SEE SEBA*.

2. The *Shebaim* (μ *yabv*] 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 ^{<298>}Joel 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 ^{<246>}Jeremiah 6:20 to Sheba, as the country of frankincense and the rich aromatic reed, and also by our Lord in ^{<402>}Matthew 12:42, who says the queen of Sheba, or “the south, “came ἐκ τῶν περᾶτων τῆς γῆς, “from the earth’s extremes.” *SEE SHEBA*.

3. Another tribe of *Shebans* (Heb. *sheba*’, *abv*] also with a *shin*), a horde of Bedawin marauders in the days of Job (^{<3015>}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 (^{<1253>}Genesis 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 ^{<232>}Ezekiel 23:42 (which our version also renders by Sabaeans”), while the Keri has *Sabaiyam*’, μ *yabēs*; the Kethib has *Sobeim*’, μ *yabēs*, 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*’, *abx*] *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.*

Sabaism.

SEE SABAEAN.

Sabanus

(*σάβανος*, 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.*

Sab’aoth

[some *Saba’oth*] (*σαβαώθ*, a Graecized form of the Heb. *tsebaoth*, *t/abx*] *armies*), a word occurring in this form only in the A.V. in ~~ⲉⲃⲏⲟⲩ~~ Romans 9:29; ~~ⲉⲃⲏⲟⲩ~~ James 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*, **abxj** signifies an *army* (see ^{<0624>}Deuteronomy 24:5; ^{<0626>}Exodus 6:26). The plural is used in the sense of armies (^{<0674>}Exodus 7:4, and often). The singular is sometimes applied to the company of angels which surround the throne of Jehovah, who are called **μ yāVhiabx**; *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 **abx**; **/rMhi** *tsaba ham-marom*, “the Host on High, “in opposition to the kings of the earth. God is called **h/hy]t/abx]yhēa**, *Jehovah elohey’ tsebaoth*, “Jehovah God of hosts,” which most commentators regard as synonymous with “God of heaven” (see Zenkei *De Synonymis t/abx]et ^/yl I*, 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 (^{<1229>}1 Kings 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 (^{<9A21>}Psalms 103:21; 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’ (^{<0124>}Exodus 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.**

Sa’bat

(**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 1 Esdr. 5:34;

but the Heb. lists (^{<1027>}Ezra 2:57; ^{<1075>}Nehemiah 7:59) have no corresponding name.

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

Sabatae'as

(**Σαβαταΐας** v.r. **Σαββαταΐας** and **Σαβαταΐος**), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:48) of the Heb. name (^{<1002>}Nehemiah 7:7) SHABBETHAI *SEE SHABBETHAI* (q.v.).

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.

Sab'atus

(**Σάβατος**, v. . r. **Σάβαθος**), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:28) of the Heb. name (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:27) ZABAD *SEE ZABAD* (q.v.).

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.

SEE SABA.

Sabbae'us

(Σαββαῖος, v.r. Σαββαίος), a corruptly Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:22) of the Heb. name (^{<1510B>}Ezra 10:31) SHEMAIAH SEE *SHEMAIAH* (q.v.).

Sab'ban

(Σάββανος; Vulg. *Bauni*), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 8:63) of the Heb. name (^{<1510B>}Ezra 8:33) BINNUI SEE *BINNUI* (q.v.).

Sabbas, St. (Primoe Rasteo),

a mediaeval ecclesiastic, was born during the latter part of the 12th century. He was the son of Stephen Nemanja, 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 tour 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,

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,

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, Jewish.

The word *Sabbath* is, in Hebrew, *shabbath*', טבוי (comp. Ewald, *Ausfuhr. Lehrb.* p. 400; and see on the form *shabbathon*, ^/טבוי 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*, **ἀνάπαυσις ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου** (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** (2 Macc. 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. ⁴⁰²³Leviticus 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*, **tBVhiĒsjyme** (^{<12168>}2 Kings 16:18). See Rhenferd, *Opera Philol.* p. 770 sq.

This day was celebrated by the Hebrews as a holy day (^{<1852>}Deuteronomy 5:12), a day of rest and rejoicing (^{<2883>}Isaiah 58:13; comp. ^{<3021>}Hosea 2:11; 1 Macc. 1:41), by ceasing from all labor, with their servants and all strangers, as well as cattle (^{<12100>}Exodus 20:10; 31:13 sq.; 34:21; 35:2; ^{<1854>}Deuteronomy 5:14, comp. ^{<3472>}Jeremiah 17:21, 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. ^{<4408>}2 Chronicles 31:3; ^{<6033>}Nehemiah 10:33; ^{<5404>}Ezekiel 46:4). In the holy place of the Temple, the shewbread was renewed (^{<1348>}Leviticus 24:8; ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 9:32), and the new division of priests appointed for that week took their places (^{<12116>}2 Kings 11:5, 7, 9; ^{<4274>}2 Chronicles 23:4). The services of the priests and Levites in and about the tabernacle and Temple were not accounted *labor* (comp. ^{<4026>}Matthew 12:5), and continued through the Sabbath. Circumcision, too, as a religious ceremony, took place on the Sabbath, when that was the eighth day (^{<1072>}John 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 (^{<12314>}Exodus 31:14 sq.; 35:2), which was inflicted by stoning (^{<4152>}Numbers 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 (^{<2892>}Isaiah 56:2; 58:13; ^{<3106>}Ezekiel 20:16; 22:8; ^{<2116>}Lamentations 2:6; ^{<6136>}Nehemiah 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 (^{<12318>}Exodus 35:3; comp. Eichhorn, *Repert.* 9, 32; 13, 258) for cooking (^{<12123>}Exodus 16:23; ^{<4152>}Numbers 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. ^{<1216>}Exodus 12:16; see Mishna, *Yom Tob.*, 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 (^{<1618>}Nehemiah 10:31; 13:15, 16); and it was merely an auxiliary police regulation of Nehemiah to close the gates on that day (^{<1639>}Nehemiah 13:19). It was in the spirit of the law, too, that traveling on the Sabbath was forbidden, with reference to ^{<1229>}Exodus 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.; 2 Macc. 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. *Ep.* 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 (1 Macc. 11:34, 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 (^{<4012>}Matthew 12:2; ^{<4023>}Mark 2:23 sq.; ^{<4011>}Luke 6:1 sq.), the healing of the sick (^{<4020>}Matthew 12:10; ^{<4012>}Mark 3:2; ^{<4017>}Luke 6:7; 13:14; ^{<4014>}John 9:14, 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 *work* were freely performed in case of pressing need (^{<4021>}Matthew 12:11; ^{<4045>}Luke 14:5; comp. Gemara, *Shab.* 128, 1); yet even in the care of cattle (comp. ^{<4035>}Luke 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 *Tosiphtha* 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 (Ges. *In Jesa.* 2, 230). Hence in the synagogues everywhere on this day took place the great services of worship (^{<4012>}Mark 1:21; 6:2; ^{<4016>}Luke 4:16, 31; 6:6; 13:10; ^{<4134>}Acts 13:44; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4), with prayer and the public reading and expounding of the holy books (^{<4016>}Luke 4:16 sq.; ^{<4137>}Acts 13:27; Josephus, *Apion*, 1, 22). This, however, cannot be considered as a Mosaic regulation (see Vitranga, *Synag.* 1, 2, 2); but see LAW. Cheerful meals were held (^{<2401>}Luke 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 (^{<0016>}Judges 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 (1 Macc. 1:45, 48; 2 Macc. 6:6), their legal Sabbath was confirmed (comp. 1 Macc. 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 Tob*, 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 ^{<0016>}Genesis 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 (^{<2310>}Ezekiel 20:10 sq.; ^{<4093>}Nehemiah 9:13 sq.; comp. ^{<0854>}Deuteronomy 5:14 sq., with which ^{<0263>}Exodus 16:23 agrees). Reggio, by a peculiar explanation of ^{<0001>}Genesis 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 (^{ⲘⲚⲑⲑ}Leviticus 23:33). The word properly representing such an abstract idea of rest is ^{ⲛⲱⲔⲃⲛⲓ} *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 ^{ⲘⲚⲑⲑ}Leviticus 23:11-16, ^{ⲧⲃⲛⲓ} *Sabbath*, is synonymous with **ⲓ ⲑⲑ**, *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 **tBVhitrj m**; *morrow of the Sabbath*, is equivalent to **j sPhitrj m**; *morrow of the Passover*. The passage in ^{<R51>}Joshua 5:11, often appealed to in proof, states that on the latter day the Israelites ate the produce of Canaan (**/rah;rWb[]** 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 (^{<R34>}Leviticus 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 (^{<R3>}Numbers 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 yet become settled in their possession to which the law in question was specially applicable (^{<R30>}Leviticus 23:10; comp. ^{<R58>}Numbers 15:18).

(2.) The definite art. in **tBVhit** the 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 **tBvj** *Sabbath*, ever used in Biblical Hebrew in the sense of a literal *week*, as the Rabbinical theory assumes. The seven Sabbaths are termed *fall* (**t/myj æ** “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 (^{<ant>}Luke 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 ^{<ant>}Luke 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. ^{<B315>}Leviticus 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 ^{<B311>}Leviticus 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 Redslöb 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 (^{<R239>}Leviticus 23:39), while the great day of reconciliation was a Sabbath of Sabbaths (16:31; 23:32). Accordingly, some would understand the words in ^{<R239>}John 19:31 (**ἡν 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 ^{<R239>}Isaiah 18:13, 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 (^{<R239>}Leviticus 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 ^{<0001>}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 ^{<0165>}Exodus 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, 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 ^{<0001>}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 (⁽²²¹⁸⁾Exodus 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” (⁽²¹³⁸⁾Exodus 13:3); “Remember the word which Moses the servant of the Lord commanded you” (⁽⁴¹¹³⁾Joshua 1:13); “Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth” (⁽²¹¹³⁾Ecclesiastes 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 ⁽²¹⁶⁹⁾Exodus 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 (ver. 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 ver. 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 (ver. 22) is first related, and then we come to the injunction (ver. 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. Ver. 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 (¹²⁹⁶Exodus 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 in *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 (⁴⁸⁸¹Joshua 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 (⁴⁸⁸⁶Numbers 9:6).

(2.) The *prophets*, speaking in the name of God, always express themselves in reverential language of the Sabbath. (See, in particular, ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 56:6, 7; 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" (^{<514>}Romans 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 (^{<512>}Colossians 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 (⁴¹¹¹1 Corinthians 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.~~ Revelation 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 (⁽¹²³¹³⁾Exodus 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 (^{<6010>}Revelation 1:10);
- (4) as a day of public worship (^{<4017>}Acts 20:7; ^{<4319>}John 20:19);
- (5) as a day of joy (^{<2862>}Isaiah 56:2; ^{<4884>}Psalms 118:24);
- (6) as a day of praise (^{<4862>}Psalms 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*; Hesse, *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

($\tau\beta\upsilon\eta$ ἔσκη, *musak hash-shabbath*; Sept. ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθέδρας τῶν σαββάτων; Vulg. *Musach sabbati*, ^{<12618>}2 Kings 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 ^{<14321>}2 Chronicles 28:24 that "he shut up the doors of the house of God" that none might enter to worship. **SEE AHAZ.**

Sabbath, Morrow After The.

There has been from early times some difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words $\tau\beta\upsilon\eta$ $\tau\rho\iota\tau\eta$ μ ; *mochorath hashshabbath*, thus rendered in the computation of the Passover (^{<18231>}Leviticus 23:11, 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 ^{<R237>}Leviticus 23:7. In like manner the word **τΒγi** is evidently used as a designation of the day of atonement (^{<R232>}Leviticus 23:32); and **τΒγi** (*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 ver. 15 and 16 has also been understood as “week,” “used in the same manner as **σάββατα** in the New Test. (^{<R181>}Matthew 28:1; ^{<R182>}Luke 18:12; ^{<R183>}John 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 Sadducean) 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 ^{<R181>}Joshua 5:11, as proving, in connection with the law in ^{<R234>}Leviticus 23:14, that the omer was offered on the 16th of the month. It should be observed that the words in that passage, **τΒγi; τΒγi** mean merely *corn of the land*, not, as in the A.V., “the old corn of the land.” “The morrow after the Passover” (**τΒγi τΒγi**) 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 ^{<R181>}Joshua 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 ^{<R235>}Leviticus 23:15; Drusius, *Notae Majores* in ^{<R236>}Leviticus 23:16. It is worthy of remark that the Sept. omits **τῆ 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

(~~<401>~~Luke 6:1). *SEE SECOND FIRST SABBATH*.

Sabbathae'us

(Σαββαταῖος), a Graecized form (Esdr. 9:14) of the Heb. name (~~<4505>~~Ezra 10:15) SHABBETHAI *SEE SHABBETHAI* (q.v.).

Sabbathai Zebi

(i.e. *yḅæj* 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* (μ Kj), 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-*

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. ^{<1200>}Matthew 24:20). Whether the earlier Hebrews did or did not regard it thus, is not easy to say. Nevertheless, the natural inference from ^{<1203>}2 Kings 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" (^{<1200>}Matthew 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 ἀρχῶν*, 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 ^{<1213>}Exodus 21:13 it is said, "I will appoint thee a place (*μ wqm*) 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 *μ wqm*, which is the same word employed in ^{<1269>}Exodus 16:29. As the one *μ wqm*, *place*, was 2000 yards distant, it is inferred, according to the rule *the analogy of ideas or words* (*hwç hrzg*) that the command, "Let no man go out of his place (*wmqmm*) on the seventh day" (^{<1269>}Exodus 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* (ymwj nt bwry[]), 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. (⁴⁰¹²Acts 1:12) as expressive of a well known law, and the so called Jerusalem Targum translates ⁴⁰¹³Exodus 16:29, "And let no man go walking from his place beyond 2000 yards on the seventh day," while the Chaldee paraphrase of ⁴⁰¹⁶Ruth 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 für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* [Breslau, 1863], 12, 467 sq.).

Sabbath school.

SEE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

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,

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,

the septennial rest for the land from all tillage and cultivation enjoined in the Mosaic law (^{<10230>}Exodus 23:10, 11; ^{<R37D>}Leviticus 25:2-7; ^{<615D>}Deuteronomy 15:1-11; 31:10-13; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 12, 3). The regulation appears to have been greatly neglected during the Hebrew occupancy of Palestine (^{<482D>}2 Chronicles 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) [ἄ/τΒυιτβῖν] *Rest of entire Rest, or Sabbath of Sabbatism* (⁽¹⁸²⁰⁾Leviticus 25:4; A.V. “Sabbath of rest”), because the land is to have a complete rest from all tillage and cultivation;
- (2) τνῖν[ἄ/τΒυι] *the Year of Sabbatism or Rest* (⁽¹⁸²⁶⁾Leviticus 25:5, “year of rest”), because the rest is to extend through the year;
- (3) ἡFμαῖ] or more fully ἡFμαῖηι τνῖν] “Release,” *Remission*, or “*the Year of Release*” (⁽¹⁸⁵¹⁾Deuteronomy 15:1, 2, 9), because on it all debts were remitted; and
- (4) [βVῆι τνῖν] “*the Seventh Year*” (⁽¹⁸⁵⁹⁾Deuteronomy 15:9), because it is to be celebrated every seventh year, for which reason it is called in the Hebrew canons κατ' ἑξοξήν, τυ[βῆ] ~~ἡ~~ *the Seventh* (i.e. ἡν; *Year*), as is also the name of the tractate in the Mishna (*Shebiith*) treating on the sabbatical year. Josephus styles it the ἑβδοματικός or σαββατικός 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 ⁽¹⁸²⁰⁾Exodus 23:10, 11; ⁽¹⁸²⁶⁾Leviticus 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 ^{<1221>}Exodus 23:11; ^{<1221>}Leviticus 25:5-7, enjoins that the spontaneous growth (*j jpsæ*) of the fields or of trees (comp. ^{<2371>}Isaiah 37:30) is to be for the free use of the poor, hirelings, strangers, servants, and cattle (^{<1221>}Exodus 23:11; ^{<1221>}Leviticus 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’ (^{<1221>}Exodus 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’ (^{<1221>}Leviticus 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 (^{<1221>}Leviticus 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 ^{<1510>}Deuteronomy 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 (⁽¹²²¹⁵⁾Exodus 22:15, 16), or slander, or any judicial penalties; nor does it set aside a debt contracted on a pledge, or on a **I WBSΨσP**= **πρὸς βουλῆ** (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 ⁽⁶⁵¹⁹⁾Deuteronomy 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 (⁽⁶⁵¹⁸⁾Deuteronomy 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 ^{<1210>}Exodus 21:2 (comp. ^{<1844>}Jeremiah 34:14 sq.) require only that they be freed in the seventh year of their servitude (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 1, 1). ^{<1852>}Deuteronomy 15:12 no more relates to the law of the sabbatical year than ver. 19 sq. (comp. Ranke, *Pentat.* 2, 362), and where the sabbatical year is expressly treated of — as in ^{<1851>}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 ver. 14 refers only to the law in ^{<1210>}Exodus 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 ^{<1640>}Joshua 14:10 occupied seven years, and the division thereof between the different tribes mentioned in ^{<1681>}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 (^{<1810>}Deuteronomy 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 *arqJæthou 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’ (ver. 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) ^{<R001>}Deuteronomy 1:1-6, 3 ([mç d[µ yrbdh hl a];
- (2) ^{<R004>}Deuteronomy 6:4-8 ([mç];
- (3) ^{<F113>}Deuteronomy 11:13-22 ([wmç µ ya hyhw);
- (4) ^{<F142>}Deuteronomy 14:22-15, 23 (rç[t dç[]);
- (5) ^{<F162>}Deuteronomy 26:12-19 (rç[l hl kt yk);
- (6) ^{<F174>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20 (tçrpl mh); and
- (7) ^{<F202>}Deuteronomy 27:28 (twl l qw twkrk hçrph l k rmwgç d[]).

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 (^{<485D>}2 Chronicles 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 ^{<485D>}2 Chronicles 36:20). After the captivity, however, when all the neglected laws were more rigidly observed (see ^{<460B>}Nehemiah 10:31), the sabbatical year was duly kept, as is evident from the declaration in 1 Macc. 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-exilic minute regulations about the sabbatical year contained in the ancient Jewish writings. According to 1 Macc. 6:53, the one hundred and fiftieth year of the Seleucid era 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 (^{<484D>}Galatians 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 δευτερομῶτῳ (^{<480B>}Luke 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 (^(LXX)Leviticus 19:9; 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 ^(LXX)Leviticus 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. ^(LXX)Leviticus 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. für das Erzbisth. Freiburg*, 1, 10 sq.). On the other hand, scarcity did sometimes occur during the sabbatical year (1 Macc. 6:49, 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. über 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, *Realwörterb.* 2, 349.

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 Antiquae, seu Vetus Italica* (1743).

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,

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 Triumphant 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 Enthroned*, at Berlin. He died in 1577.

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

(σαββατισμός, ^{<810>}Hebrews 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

(*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 by 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 (*ceres 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.

Sabe’an; Sabe’us.

SEE SABEAAN; SEE SABAUS.

Sabellianism.

SEE SABELLIUS.

Sabellians.

SEE SABELLIUS.

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 indigenious 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. Compend.* 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.)

Sa'bi

[or rather SABI'E, as in the earliest editions of the A.V.] (Σαβίη, v.r. Σαβεΐν), given in 1 Esdr. 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 (^{<1815>}Ezra 2:57; ^{<1815>}Nehemiah 7:59).

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 (^{<1815>}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 ~~3016~~Zephaniah 1:5; ~~2493~~Jeremiah 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 condemn 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,

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, Poppaea,

Picture for Sabina

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).

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.

Sabinian.

SEE SABINIANUS.

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,

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).

Sab'ta

(Heb. *Subta'*, אַטבְּשֵׁי of unknown etymology, Sept. Σαβαθά v.r. Σαβατά, ^{<000>}1 Chronicles 1:9; in ^{<000>}Genesis 10:7 the Heb. [in most MSS.] is *Sabtah'*, הַטְּבַשִּׁי 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 (^{<000>}Genesis 10:7; ^{<000>}1 Chronicles 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 *yadms*, for which read *yarms*, 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 Sabbathath, 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.

Sab'tah

(~~Q1007~~Genesis 10:7). *SEE SABTA*.

Sab'techa

(Heb. *Sabteka'*, **אֲכַתְּכַי**; etymology unknown; Sept. in Genesis **Σαβαθακά** v.r. **Σαβακαθά**; in Chronicles A.V. “Sabtechah;” **Σεβεθακά** 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 (~~Q1007~~Genesis 10:7; ~~Q1009~~1 Chronicles 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*, ~~Q1001~~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 (*yagnz*, *Zingitani*).” In confirmation of this latter

view the name *Sabatok* has been discovered on the Egyptian monuments (Rosellini, *Monumenta*, 2, 198).

Sab'techah

(~~Q107~~Genesis 10:7). *SEE SABTECHA*.

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,

a festival observed by the ancient Persians and Babylonians 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.).

Sa'car

(Heb. *Sacar'*, רכר; *hire*, as often; Sept *Σαχάρ* v.r.] *Αχάρ*, and *Σαχιάρ* in ~~Q304~~1 Chronicles 26:4), the name of two Israelites.

1. The father of Abiam, one of David's mighty men; he is called a Hararite (~~Q315~~1 Chronicles 11:35), and is the same man called SHARAR (q.v.) in ~~Q123~~2 Samuel 23:33. B.C. ante 1020. See DAVID.

2. The fourth named of the eight sons of Obed-Edom (~~Q350~~1 Chronicles 26:4). B.C. cir. 1012.

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,

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

(*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 Manichaeans, who went by the name of Encratites, Saccophori, or Hydroparastate, 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

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

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

(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,

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,

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

(*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,

the thirteen cities set apart by Joshua for the family of Aaron, which lay in the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (^{<02104>}Joshua 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 (ver. 10 sq.). After the exile, too, priests dwelt in these cities (^{<04173>}Nehemiah 7:73), though many were permanently settled in Jerusalem itself (11:10 sq.). *SEE CITY; SEE LEVI; SEE PRIEST.*

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 (^{<02101>}Exodus 29:1-37; ^{<08101>}Leviticus 8:1-30; ^{<04102>}Exodus 40:12-15; comp. Bahr, *Symbolik*, 2, 166 sq.). The service consisted chiefly of two parts (comp. ^{<02103>}Exodus 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 ^{<02107>}Exodus 29:7; ^{<08102>}Leviticus 8:12, is mentioned only of the high priests; but that the common priests were also anointed is clear from ^{<04105>}Exodus 40:15 (comp. 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 (29:7; ^{<08100>}Leviticus 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-OFFERING.* 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. ^{<02335>}Exodus 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 (^{<0235>}Exodus 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 (^{<0612>}Leviticus 6:12, 14 sq.). *SEE CONSECRATION; SEE PRIEST*.

Sacerdotal Order

(designated in general by the Hebrew word *priests, kohanim*, *קֹהֲנִים* for the etymology, see various views in Gesenius, *Thesaur.* 2, 661 sq.). In the patriarchal age the head of a family was its priest (^{<0331>}Genesis 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” (^{<0465>}Numbers 16:5; ^{<0292>}Exodus 19:22; ^{<0313>}Ezekiel 42:13; comp. ^{<0403>}Numbers 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 (^{<0416>}Numbers 3:6-10, 38; 16:40). These priests, who exercised their office, after the division of the kingdom, in Judah alone (^{<1133>}1 Kings 13:33; ^{<14113>}2 Chronicles 11:13 sq.), were confined to the family of Aaron (^{<0231>}Exodus 28:1), who were

Kohathites (comp. ^{<0002>}Numbers 4:2). Hence they are called *the children of Aaron* (^{<0005>}Leviticus 3:5, 13; comp. 1:5; 2:2); although not all the descendants of Aaron who were legally qualified actually served as priests. Thus Benaiah, a priest's son (^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 27:5), held military office under David (^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23; ^{<1025>}1 Kings 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 (^{<0217>}Leviticus 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. ^{<1052>}Ezra 2:62; ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 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 (^{<0201>}Exodus 29; ^{<0001>}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 (^{<0001>}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 (^(-D34)Exodus 28:40, 42; 39:27 sq.; ^(-R18)Leviticus 6:3; 8:13):

(1.) **μ ysaκ]na** *miknasim* (Sept. **περικελή**, A.V. “linen breeches”), which were simply *drawers*, a covering for the *pubenda*, extending from the hips to the thighs (so described by Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 7, 1; but comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2, 225).

(2.) **tn̄tK]** *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.) **fn̄b̄ai** *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.) **h[Bgm̄a** *migbaah* (A.V. “bonnet,” ^(-D34)Exodus 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 (^(-R18)Exodus 3:5; ^(-R18)Joshua 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.* ἀνυποδησίῳ [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. Condit. Oriundis* [Hafn. 1745]).

The priests appear to have been divided by David into twenty-four classes for the daily service (~~134B~~ 1 Chronicles 24:3 sq.; comp. ~~484~~ 2 Chronicles 8:14; 35:4 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 14, 7), each of which had its president or ruler (~~464~~ 2 Chronicles 36:14; ~~510B~~ Ezra 10:5; ~~627~~ Nehemiah 12:7: he is called ἀρχιερεύς by Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 7, 8; *Life*, 5, 38, 39; and in the New Test., ~~414~~ Matthew 2:4; 16:21; ~~422C~~ Luke 22:52), and performed the service for one week, from Sabbath to Sabbath (~~210B~~ 2 Kings 11:9; ~~4234~~ 2 Chronicles 23:4; comp. ~~406B~~ Luke 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 Macc. 2, 1), and the Talmud asserts (Lightfoot, *Hor. Reb.* p. 708 sq.) that the four priestly families which returned with Ezra (~~523B~~ Ezra 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 (~~400~~ Luke 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 (~~448B~~ Numbers 18:3); and included the following special duties: (1.) In the Temple itself, the kindling of the incense (q.v.) morning and evening (~~410~~ Luke 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 (~~486B~~ Leviticus 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 (^{<0006>}Leviticus 1:5, 11; 3:2, 13; 4:25; ^{<0017>}2 Chronicles 30:17, etc.); waving the wave pieces (^{<0144>}Leviticus 14:24; 23:11, 20); presenting the sacrifices and gifts upon the altar, and burning those which were to be burned (2:2, 8, 16; 3:11, 16; 4:26, *SEE SACRIFICE*); then the sacred ceremonies at the cleansing of the Nazarite, on the final release from his vow (^{<0006>}Numbers 6), and at the ordeal of a woman suspected of adultery (ver. 12 sq.), and the blowing of the metal trumpets at set times (^{<0008>}Numbers 10:8 sq.; ^{<0512>}2 Chronicles 5:12; 7:6; 29:26; ^{<0241>}Nehemiah 12:41; Mishna, *Succa*, 5, 5; *Arach*, 2, 3). To these were added the examination of the unclean, especially of lepers and their cleansing (^{<0344>}Leviticus 13:14; comp. ^{<0348>}Deuteronomy 24:8; ^{<0104>}Matthew 8:4; ^{<0274>}Luke 17:14, *SEE PURIFICATION*.), the estimation of vows (^{<0201>}Leviticus 27), and the nightly watch of the inner sanctuary (Mishna, *Middoth*, 1, 1). How these were related to the priests who kept the threshold (^{<0219>}2 Kings 12:9; 25:8; ^{<0223>}Jeremiah 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* (^{<0001>}Acts 4:1; 5:24; comp. Deyling, *Observ.* 3, 302 sq.). But who, then, are the *captains of the Temple*, *στρατηγοί*, in the plural (^{<0252>}Luke 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 (^{<0578>}Deuteronomy 17:8 sq.; 19:17; 21:5; comp. ^{<0478>}2 Chronicles 17:8. sq.). King Jehoshaphat even established a high tribunal, consisting of priests and Levites, in Jerusalem (^{<0498>}2 Chronicles 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 (^{<0219>}Exodus 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 (^{<0309>}Leviticus 10:9 sq.; ^{<0342>}Ezekiel 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 (^{<B106>}Leviticus 10:6 sq.; 21:5, **SEE MOURNING**), and they were to avoid with care the touch of a corpse (^{<B101>}Leviticus 21:1 sq.; ^{<B425>}Ezekiel 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 (^{<B107>}Leviticus 21:7; ^{<B422>}Ezekiel 44:22; comp. ^{<B108>}Ezra 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 (^{<B105>}Luke 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 (^{<B109>}Leviticus 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. ^{<B188>}Jeremiah 18:18; Sirach 7:31 sq.; Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 21), although their want of piety, and even their immorality, often called for severe rebukes from the prophets (^{<B153>}Jeremiah 5:31; 6:13; 23:11; ^{<B413>}Lamentations 4:13; ^{<B226>}Ezekiel 22:26; ^{<B109>}Hosea 6:9; ^{<B117>}Micah 3:11; ^{<B104>}Zephaniah 3:4; ^{<B106>}Malachi 2). A number of cities (thirteen) were set apart for the residences of the priests, as also for the Levites (^{<B104>}Joshua 21:4, 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. ^{<B101>}Luke 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 (^{<B110>}Nehemiah 11:10 sq.).

The priesthood was supported (comp. ^{<B105>}Numbers 18; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 4, 4) by the assigned portions of the sacrifices (^{<B107>}Leviticus 2:3, 10; 5:13; 6:9, 13; 7:6, 9, 14, 32, 34; 10:12 sq.; ^{<B105>}Numbers 6:20; ^{<B105>}Deuteronomy

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 (^{<OR12>}Leviticus 21:22; Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 7; see Hottinger, *Apolog. pro Benigna Lege*, ^{<OR10>}Leviticus 22 [Frankf. 1738]; Cremer, in the *Miscell. Groning.* 2, 294 sq.; Deyling, *Observ.* 5, 70 sq.). First-fruits, heave offerings (^{<OR12>}Numbers 31:29), tithes (q.v.), the shew bread, when removed (^{<OR13>}Leviticus 24:9; ^{<OR14>}Matthew 12:4; comp. *Succa*, 5, 8), the fines for Levitical transgressions (^{<OR15>}Numbers 5:6 sq.), the redemption price of the first-born (18:15 sq.), and the subjects of vows, or the price of their redemption (^{<OR16>}Leviticus 27; ^{<OR17>}Numbers 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 (^{<OR18>}Leviticus 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 (^{<OR19>}Ezra 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 (^{<0472>}Numbers 27:2, 19; 31:12 sq., 26; 32:2; ^{<0579>}Deuteronomy 27:9; ^{<0570>}Joshua 17:4). Under the kings, they sometimes mediated between the prince and the people (^{<0091>}2 Samuel 19:11), or were prized as counselors at court (^{<1007>}1 Kings 1:7 sq., 39; 4:4; ^{<0087>}2 Samuel 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 (^{<0200>}Jeremiah 20:1 sq., 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 (^{<0775>}Judges 17:5 sq.; 18:3, 27, 30). Those who were not Levites, or at least not priests, offered on altars which they had themselves built (^{<0765>}Judges 6:26; 13:19; ^{<0709>}1 Samuel 7:9; 16:5; but ^{<0768>}Judges 6:18 does not belong here; see Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*; so in ^{<0664>}1 Samuel 6:14, as in ^{<0667>}2 Samuel 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 (^{<0088>}2 Samuel 8:18). It is true that the word מִי־יְהוָה *kohanim*, 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 ^{<4113>}2 Chronicles 11:13 (comp. ^{<1123>}1 Kings 12:31; 13:33) the priests and Levites left the kingdom of Israel under its first king, and gathered in the kingdom of Judah (but comp. ^{<1277>}2 Kings 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.,

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,

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, *Lebensbeschreibung Hans Sachsens* (Altenburg, 1765); Hoffmann, *Hans Sachs* (Nuremberg, 1847); Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 20, 636, 653. (J.P.L.)

Sachs, Marcus,

professor of Hebrew and exegetical theology, was born of Jewish parentage at Inowrazlav, 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 was 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 freethinker 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,

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 rabbinat 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): — *Beiträge 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 der jüdischen Literatur*, p. 114 sq.; *Jewish Messenger* (N.Y.), Aug. 27, 1875. (B.P.)

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, 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, 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 parties—the 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, 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 Aufsätze* (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,

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,

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

Picture for Sackbut

is the rendering in the A.V. of the Chaldee *sabbeka* (written **akBṣi** in ^{ⲀⲚⲔⲃ}Daniel 3:5, but **akBṣi** in ^{ⲀⲚⲔⲃ}Daniel 3:7, 10, 15; thought by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v., to be from **Ēbṣ**; *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 Plautus (*Stich.* 2, 2, 57) mentions the women who played it (*sambucoe*, or *sambucistrio*e, 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

(**qci** *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 (~~662~~ Revelation 6:12), and resembling the *cilicium* of the Romans (~~0573~~ Genesis 37:34; ~~1121B~~ 1 Kings 20:31; ~~1290~~ 2 Kings 19:1 sq.; ~~0121~~ Matthew 11:21; ~~2103~~ Luke 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 (~~2103~~ Isaiah 1:3; ~~662~~ Revelation 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 (~~0425~~ Genesis 42:25; ~~0813~~ Leviticus 11:32; ~~0604~~ Joshua 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 (~~704D~~ Esther 4:21), which were in extreme cases worn next the skin (~~1127~~ 1 Kings 21:27; ~~1160~~ 2 Kings 6:30; ~~1815~~ Job 16:15; ~~2321~~ Isaiah 32:11), and this even by females (~~2103~~ Joel 1:8; 2 Macc. 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 **rgj** ;

to bind, to the process of putting it on (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 3:31; ^{<1578>}Ezra 7:18, etc.). It was confined by a girdle of similar material (^{<2384>}Isaiah 3:24). Sometimes it was not laid aside even at night (^{<1277>}1 Kings 21:27). Prophets and ascetics wore it over the underclothing, to signify the sincerity of their calling (^{<2310>}Isaiah 20:2; ^{<4184>}Matthew 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 (Baruch 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,

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

(*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.

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 ~~4004~~ Matthew 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

(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 (~~4183~~ Matthew 3:13-17; ~~4008~~ Mark 1:8-11; ~~4181~~ Luke 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 ~~4048~~ John 4:1, 2, "that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." In the preceding chapter (ver. 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 (~~4189~~ Matthew 28:19). From the first exercise of their appointed office, the apostles preached baptism as a duty (~~4183~~ Acts 2:38), and administered it to those professing Christianity (see ~~4181~~ Acts 2:41; 8:12, 13, 16, 38; 9:18; 16:15, 33; 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 ~~4183~~ Matthew 26:26; ~~4142~~ Mark 14:22; ~~4279~~ Luke 22:19; ~~4123~~ 1 Corinthians 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 aquae*. 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 revered 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 arcana* (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 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 revered 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 nostrae 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 eucharist, 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 sacraments 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, overthrowes 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

☞ Revelation 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,

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,

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

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 Schlüsselburg's *Hoereticorum Catalogus* contains 492 pages "De Secta Sacramentariorum qui Cingliani seu Calvinistae vocantur." *SEE ZWINGLIANS*.

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.

SEE SACRAMENT.

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, Brothers Of The,

Picture for Sacred Heart, Brothers

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 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*. — You 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. You 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 pangs; 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 Jesuits), Ladies Of The,

Picture for Sacred, Hearts Ladies

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 Appleton's *Cyclopaedia*, 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,

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 Hearts (Of Jesus And Mary), Congregation Of The,

a religious order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded at Poitiers in 1800 by M. Coudrin and 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,

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,

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. **h_j n_hān** *minchah*, from the obsolete root **h_nm**; “to give;” used in ^{<1023>}Genesis 32:13, 20, 21, of a gift from Jacob to Esau (Sept. **δῶρον**); in ^{<1082>}2 Samuel 8:2, 6 (**ξένια**), in ^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21 (**δῶρα**), in ^{<12704>}2 Kings 17:4 (**μανά**), of a tribute from a vassal king; in ^{<1043>}Genesis 4:3, 5, of a sacrifice generally (**δῶρον** and **θυσία**, indifferently); and in ^{<1011>}Leviticus 2:1, 4, 5, 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. **ʾBrḥ**; *korban* (derived from the root **brḥ**; “to approach,” or [in Hiphil] to “make to approach”); used with *minchah* in ^{<1011>}Leviticus 2:1, 4, 5, 6 (Sept. **δῶρον θυσία**), generally rendered **δῶρον** (see ^{<4071>}Mark 7:11, **κορβάν, ὃ ἐστὶ 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. j bʒ, *zebach* (derived from the root **j bʒ**; 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 ^{<39406>}Psalm 40:6 (**θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν**), and to *olah* (the whole burned offering) in ^{<12125>}Exodus 10:25; 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. hl wḥ, *olah* (Sept. generally **ὄλοκαύτωμα**), the “whole burned offering.” *SEE BURNED OFFERING*.

6. μ l v, *shelem* (Sept. **θυσία σωτηρίου**), used frequently with **hbʒ**, and sometimes called **ᾠρη**; the “peace-” or “thank offering.” See each of these words.

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

8. μ va; *asham* (Sept. generally **πλημμελεία**), the “trespass offering” (q.v.).

9. hVaæ *ashsheh* (from **vae** *fire*), a “sacrifice made by fire;” spoken of every kind of sacrifice and offering, as commonly burned (^{<12118>}Leviticus 2:3, 10), and even of those not consumed by fire (14:7, 9); but usually in the ritual formula, “a sacrifice of sweet odor to Jehovah” (1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9; 3:5; comp. ^{<12241>}Exodus 29:41; ^{<12182>}Leviticus 8:121; briefly, ^{<12218>}Exodus 29:18, 25; ^{<12116>}Leviticus 2:16). *SEE FIRE*.

10. hd/T, *todah*, is used in a figurative sense only, a “a sacrifice of praise.” *SEE PRAISE*.

11. gj ; *chag* (from **ggh**; to *dance* in religious joy), is s properly a *festival* only; but by metonymy is occasionally used for the sacrificial victims of such occasions (^{<12218>}Exodus 23:18; ^{<12327>}Psalm 118:27; ^{<3018>}Malachi 2:3). *SEE FESTIVAL*. The term “sacrifice” is sometimes used figuratively for deep repentance (^{<15117>}Psalm 51:17), for the good works of believers

(~~5048~~ Philippians 4:18; ~~8136~~ Hebrews 13:16), and for the duties of prayer and praise (~~6121~~ Romans 12:1; ~~8135~~ Hebrews 13:15; ~~6015~~ 1 Peter 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 to 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 same 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 ~~<000>~~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 **taFj** in ~~<000>~~Genesis 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 ~~<000>~~Genesis 3:21 were skins of animals sacrificed by God’s command is a pure assumption. The argument on ~~<810>~~Hebrews 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 ver. 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 (^{Q871E}Leviticus 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 ^{Q891E}Genesis 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 ^{Q159E}Genesis 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 (**taFj** iand **μ va**) 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 ^{Q810E}Hebrews 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” (^{<S104>}Hebrews 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 (^{<O120>}Genesis 8:20) is called burned offering (*olah*). This sacrifice is expressly connected with the institution of the *covenant* which follows in 9:8-17. The same ratification of a covenant is seen in the burned offering of Abraham, especially enjoined and defined by God *in* ^{<O159>}Genesis 15:9; and is probably to be traced in the “building of altars” by Abraham on entering Canaan at Bethel (^{<O127>}Genesis 12:7, 8) and Mamre (13, 18), by Isaac at Beersheba (26, 25), and by Jacob at Shechem (33, 20), and in Jacob’s setting-up and anointing of the pillar at Bethel (25: 18; 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 (^{<O221>}Genesis 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 (^{<R105>}Job 1:5) and for his three friends (^{<R118>}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 (^{<O125>}Exodus 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 ^{<RB07>}Leviticus 4:7), and in the care taken that none of the flesh should remain till the morning (see ^{<RB20>}Exodus 12:10; 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 ver. 5; but the solemn use of the blood (comp. ^{<RB08>}Hebrews 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 (^{<RB01>}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 ^{<BOOK>}Leviticus 1:2; 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 ^{<BOOK>}1 Samuel 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 ^{<BOOK>}Judges 2:5; 6:26; 13:19; ^{<BOOK>}1 Samuel 11:15; 16:5; ^{<BOOK>}2 Samuel 6:13; ^{<BOOK>}1 Kings 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 ^{<BOOK>}Ezekiel 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, in 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 (^{<1085>}1 Kings 8:63), by Jehoiada after the death of Athaliah (^{<1238>}2 Chronicles 23:18), and by Hezekiah at his great Passover and restoration of the Temple-worship (^{<1432>}2 Chronicles 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 (^{<1238>}Exodus 29:38-42).
2. The double burned offerings on the Sabbath (^{<1089>}Numbers 28:9, 10).
3. The burned offerings at the great festivals (^{<1081>}Numbers 28:11-29:39).

(b.) Meat offerings.

1. The daily meat offerings accompanying the daily burned offerings (flour, oil, and wine) (^{<1240>}Exodus 29:40, 41).
2. The shew bread (twelve loaves with frankincense), renewed every Sabbath (^{<1045>}Leviticus 24:5-9).
3. The special meat offerings at the Sabbath and the great festivals (^{<1089>}Numbers 28:29).

4. The first fruits, at the Passover (^{<0230>}Leviticus 23:10-14), at Pentecost (28:17-20), both “wave offerings;” the first fruits of the dough and threshing floor at the harvest time (^{<0450>}Numbers 15:20, 21; ^{<0300>}Deuteronomy 26:1-11), called “heave offerings.”

(c.) *Sin offerings.*

1. Sin offering (a kid) each new moon (^{<0485>}Numbers 28:15).
2. Sin offerings at the Passover, Pentecost, Feast of Trumpets, and Tabernacles (^{<0320>}Numbers 28:22, 30; 29:5, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 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 (^{<0160>}Leviticus 16).

(d.) *Incense.*

1. The morning and evening incense (^{<0300>}Exodus 30:7, 8).
2. The incense on the Great Day of Atonement (^{<0162>}Leviticus 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 (^{<0400>}Numbers 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” (~~480~~Romans 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 Test., 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 (~~44725~~Acts 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. ~~4600~~1 Corinthians 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 remission,” 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 an atonement to the national law for moral offenses: of negligence, which in “presumptuous” — i.e. deliberate and wilful — crime was rejected (see ~~Old-Test.~~ Numbers 15:27-31; and comp. ~~Script.~~ Hebrews 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 (v/dq). 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 ^{<6121>}Romans 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 (^{<6122>}Leviticus 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 ^{<6123>}Deuteronomy 14:28, 29). To this view of sacrifice allusion is made by Paul in ^{<6124>}Philippians 4:18; ^{<6125>}Hebrews 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 keynote is contained in the words of Samuel — “Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams” (^{<0152>}1 Samuel 15:22). So Isaiah declares (as in ^{<2800>}Isaiah 50:10-20) 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 (^{<2472>}Jeremiah 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 ^{<2719>}Ezekiel 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 (^{<2816>}Hosea 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 (^{<3121>}Amos 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 (^{<3306>}Micah 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 ^{<1918>}Psalm 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 ^{<3000>}Psalm 1:13, 14, sacrifice is contrasted with prayer and adoration (comp. ^{<1912>}Psalm 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 ^{<3516>}Psalm 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) (^{300B}Hebrews 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” (^{300B}Hebrews 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 ^{400A}1 Peter 1:20) “to have been foreordained” as a sacrifice “before the foundation of the world;” or (as it is more strikingly expressed in ^{463B}Revelation 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 (~~scri~~ Galatians 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 ~~scri~~ Hebrews 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 men offering it, indeed, for those who “were still sinners” and at enmity with God. Moreover, it is called a “propitiations” (ἱλασμός or ἱλαστήριον), ^{<B14>}Romans 3:24; ^{<A12>}1 John 2:2; a “ransom” (ἀπολύτρωσις), ^{<B25>}Romans 3:25; ^{<B13>}1 Corinthians 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 (^{<B10>}Hebrews 9:7-12), and by that which hallowed the inauguration of the Mosaic covenant and cleansed the vessels of its ministration (^{<B13>}Hebrews 9:13-23). In the same way Christ is called “our Passover, sacrificed for us” (^{<B17>}1 Corinthians 5:7); and is said, in even more startling language, to have been “made sin for us,” though he “knew no sin” (^{<B21>}2 Corinthians 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 (^{<B30>}Hebrews 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 ^{<8006>}Hebrews 10:6-9) the words of ^{<9406>}Psalm 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 ^{<8021>}Romans 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 5:5) one with Christ, and members of his body. In this sense it is that we are said to be “crucified with Christ” (^{<8021>}Galatians 2:20; ^{<8006>}Romans 6:6); to lave “the sufferings of Christ abound in us” (^{<4006>}2 Corinthians 1:5); even to “fill up that which is behind” (τὰ ὑστερήματα) thereof (^{<5024>}Colossians 1:24); and to “be offered” (σπένδεσθαι) “upon the sacrifice of the faith” of others (^{<3007>}Philippians 2:17; comp. ^{<5006>}2 Timothy 4:6; ^{<0006>}1 John 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 (^{<8024>}Hebrews 9:24-28,

comp. 4:14-16; 6:19, 20; 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 (~~6684~~ Revelation 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” (~~3335~~ Hebrews 13:15, 16) as with “an odor of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable to God” (~~1048~~ Philippians 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.

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" (^{<BIB2>}Leviticus 18:21; see also 20:2; ^{<BIB3>}Deuteronomy 12:31; ^{<BIB4>}Psalms 106:37; ^{<BIB5>}Isaiah 66:3; ^{<BIB6>}Jeremiah 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 (^{<61523>}Deuteronomy 15:23).

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 (^{<61216>}Deuteronomy 12:6 sq.; ^{<6099>}1 Samuel 9:19; 16:3, 5; ^{<6069>}2 Samuel 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 (^{<6088>}Leviticus 3:3 sq., 9 sq.; 14:15); the breast and the right shoulder belonged to the officiating priests (7:31 sq.), and all the rest of the flesh was restored to the offerer (^{<6127>}Deuteronomy 27:7). This was to be eaten on the same or the following

day (^{<1876>}Leviticus 7:16), and in the company of all members of the household and of bidden guests (the Levites especially were often invited) (^{<1822>}Deuteronomy 12:12). Other sacred meals were held at the times of festivals (16:11 sq.). Upon the tithe meal, *SEE TITHE*. Heathen sacrificial meals, which were held sometimes in the temples (^{<1880>}1 Corinthians 8:10), sometimes in private houses, are mentioned (^{<1820>}Numbers 25:2). The participation of an Israelite in these was accounted idolatry (25:3 sq.; ^{<1968>}Psalms 106:28; Tob. 1:12; ^{<1810>}1 Corinthians 10:20 sq.; ^{<1814>}Revelation 2:14); hence, too, the apostles forbade Christians to join them (^{<1859>}Acts 15:29; 21:25), or at least warned against them on account of those who were weak in faith (^{<1880>}1 Corinthians 8:1 sq.; 10:28 sq.). Such “meat offered to idols,” however, was set forth on the table not only at the sacrificial meals (^{<1880>}1 Corinthians 8:10; 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 (^{<1825>}1 Corinthians 10:25). *SEE FESTIVAL*.

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 (^{<1878>}Exodus 27:3; 38:3; ^{<1844>}Numbers 4:14) and in the Temple (^{<1874>}1 Kings 7:40, 45; ^{<1854>}2 Kings 25:14 sq.; ^{<1828>}Jeremiah 52:18 sq.) the following implements of brass:

1. **t/rysa** ^{<1828>} *ayaim*’, *shovels*, perhaps to free the altar of burned offering from its ashes; to which the **t/rysa** ^{<1828>} *siroth*’, or *pots*, belonged, into which they were thrown.
2. **t/qrz** ^{<1828>} *anizrakoth*’, *basins*, to take up the blood of the victims for sprinkling.
3. **t/gl** ^{<1828>} *anizlagoth*’, *forks*, *flesh-forks*.
4. **t/Tj** ^{<1828>} *in* *machtoth*’, *firepans*, in which coals were taken up.

The brazen **t/rM** ^{<1828>} *in* *mezammeroth*’ (^{<1828>}Jeremiah 52:18), may be considered as belonging here, and will then doubtless mean *sacrificial knives*, elsewhere called **ypb** ^{<1828>} *in* *machlaphim*’. *SEE KNIFE*. The golden *vases* or *vessels* mentioned in ^{<1870>}1 Kings 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.

Picture for Sacrificial

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 (^{<004B>}Genesis 4:3 sq.; 8:20; 22:2; 31:54; 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 (^{<0206>}Leviticus 21:6; 22:25; ^{<030E>}Numbers 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 (^{<0009>}Leviticus 1:9, 13; ^{<0437>}Numbers 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 (^{<0155>}1 Samuel 15:15; ^{<0665>}Psalms 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. ^{<0029>}Genesis 1:29; 9:3; see Schickedanz, *De Natura Sacrific. 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 in general Gedicke, *Verm. Schrift.* p. 229 sq.; Wolf, *Verm. Schrift. u. Aufs.* [Halle, 1802], p. 243 sq.; Saubert, *De Sacrific. 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.; Rosenmuller, *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, ^{<4608>}Nehemiah 10:35.) Hence there is a distinction between offerings without blood (ט/י נמ] *menachoth*, προσφοράι, δῶρα) and offerings with blood (μ yj ~~בזא~~ *sebachim*, θυσίαι). See ^{<4029>}1 Samuel 2:29; 3:14, ^{<4907>}Psalms 40:7; ^{<3003>}Hebrews 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 **h**₂ **n**₂ **m**₂ **a**₂ **n**₂ **i**₂ **n**₂ **c**₂ **h**₂ **a**₂ **h**₂, in the proper sense); of the latter, wine formed the drink offerings (**Ē**₂ **s**₂ **n**₂, *nesek*). The animals offered must be clean, and such as were fit for food (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 5, 4; comp. ^{<0083>}Genesis 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*, ^{<0221>}Leviticus 22:20 sq.; comp. ^{<0008>}Malachi 1:8, 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 ^{<0221>}Leviticus 22:20 sq., see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 594 sq.; 4 comp. Baldinger, praes. Hottinger, *De Victim. Integritate 1 et Mysteriorio* [Heidelb. 1731]). Except the doves, they must be at least eight days old, because younger flesh is unfit for food (^{<0223>}Exodus 22:30; ^{<0227>}Leviticus 22:27), the smaller cattle being usually yearlings (sheep, goats, 4 calves, ^{<0238>}Exodus 29:38; ^{<0008>}Leviticus 9:3; 12:6; 14:10; 23:12, 18 sq.; ^{<0457>}Numbers 15:27; 28:9 sq.), while the larger were young, perhaps usually three years old (yet ^{<0055>}Judges 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. ^{<0001>}Leviticus 3:1, 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 (^{<0002>}Leviticus 1:2; 3:1, 6), but was determined by law in the trespass and sin offerings (^{<0003>}Leviticus 4:3). Human sacrifices, as heathenish (^{<0021>}Leviticus 18:21; 20:2 sq.; ^{<0523>}Deuteronomy 12:31), were avoided by the pious Israelites (^{<0457>}Psalms 106:37), although their sacred history contained an example of the purposed sacrifice of a son by his father (^{<0213>}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 negotiatores*; 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 (^{<B12B>}Deuteronomy 12:5 sq., 11), and every offering elsewhere was to be punished with death (^{<B174>}Leviticus 17:4 sq.; ^{<B12B>}Deuteronomy 12:13; comp. ^{<1127>}1 Kings 12:27). The place is more exactly called “the door of the tabernacle of the congregation” (^{<B00B>}Leviticus 1:3; 3:28; 4:4, 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. ^{<1127>}1 Kings 12:27). This common place of sacrifice was not always observed in the time of the judges, nor even of David (^{<1082>}1 Kings 3:2, 3). Sacrifices were made away from the tabernacle (^{<B01B>}Judges 2:5; ^{<B077>}1 Samuel 7:17; ^{<1009>}1 Kings 1:9), especially on high places (^{<B01B>}Judges 6:26; 13:19; ^{<2043>}Hosea 4:13). Even the law-abiding Samuel did this (1 Samuel *l.c.*), and David tolerated it (^{<1082>}1 Kings 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 ^{<0453>}Numbers 15:3 sq.; ^{<0126>}Deuteronomy 12:6; ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 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 (^{<1106>}1 Kings 8:5, 63 sq.; ^{<1232>}2 Chronicles 29:32 sq.; 30:24; 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 (^{<0022>}1 Samuel 1:21; 20:6). One person had sacrifices offered for another, as the Catholics with masses (^{<1306>}Job 1:5; 2 Macc. 3:32). Not only the Israelites, but the heathen, were permitted to sacrifice to Jehovah (^{<0454>}Numbers 15:14; 2 Macc. 3:35; 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 (1 Macc 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 (2 Macc. 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. Franc.]; Pfaff, *Num ex 2 Macc.* 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 (^{<0165>}1 Samuel 16:5; ^{<8005>}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 (^{<0001>}Leviticus 3:1, 12; 4:14; 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. ^{<4143>}Acts 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 (^{<0004>}Leviticus 1:4; 3:2; 4:4, 15, 24; 8:18; comp. the Egyptian custom, Herod. 2, 40). If the sacrifice was that of a community, the elders performed this duty (^{<0045>}Leviticus 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 (16:21; comp. the Mishna, *Menach.* 9, 7; yet see ^{<4023>}2 Chronicles 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 (^{<0002>}Leviticus 3:2; 4:4, 15, 24; 8:15, 19), but this might be, and in later times actually was, done by the priests (^{<4024>}2 Chronicles 29:24); perhaps even by the Levites, but ^{<4007>}2 Chronicles 30:17 does not prove this. Among the Romans, officers called *popae* or *victimarii* slew the victim (Bochart, *Hieroz.* 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. ^{<4024>}2 Chronicles 29:34) then took off the skin of the victim (^{<0006>}Leviticus 1:6), which belonged, when not burned (4:1), either to the priests (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 (^{<1806>}Leviticus 1:6; 8:20), which were, in various sacrifices, either all (as the burned offerings), or certain specially valued pieces (in all other offerings; comp. ^{<2311>}Isaiah 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 ^{<1814>}Leviticus 1:14 sq.; 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 (^{<1509>}Ezra 6:9; 1 Macc. 10:39; 2 Macc. 3:3; 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 (^{<1965>}Psalms 66:15; 110:3; Sir. 38:4; comp. ^{<1084>}Matthew 8:4; ^{<1215>}Acts 21:26), sacrifices were presented in abundance by the Hebrews through all antiquity, and he who offered none was accounted irreligious (^{<2102>}Ecclesiastes 9:2; comp. ^{<2423>}Isaiah 43:23 sq.). Oaths were made by the offerings (^{<1238>}Matthew 23:18), and in descriptions of golden antiquity the ideally magnified splendor of the sacrificial ritual appears (^{<2321>}Isaiah 19:21; 56:7; 60:7; ^{<3142>}Zerachiah 14:21; ^{<4175>}Jeremiah 17:26; 33:18), while the want of sacrifice is among the terrors of threatened exile (^{<2304>}Hosea 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 (^{<2311>}Isaiah 1:11; ^{<2461>}Jeremiah 6:20; 7:21 sq.; ^{<2106>}Hosea 6:6; ^{<3162>}Amos 5:22; ^{<3106>}Micah 6:6 sq.; comp. ^{<1917>}Psalms 40:7; 1:9 sq.; 51:18 sq.; ^{<1213>}Proverbs 21:3; ^{<4175>}Matthew 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 ^{<B71>}Leviticus 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 (*yçna dm[m]*), one of whom was appointed chief (*dm[mh]*), 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

(ἱεροσολέω, *to rob a temple*, ^{<4122>}Romans 2:22; so the noun ἱερόσυλος, “robber of churches,” ^{<4187>}Acts 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” (^{<4122>}Leviticus 21:22), “profaning hallowed things” (^{<4108>}Leviticus 19:8), “profaning the covenant” (^{<4101>}Malachi 2:10). The first sacrilegious act we read of is that of Esau selling his birthright (^{<4253>}Genesis 25:33), for which he is called “profane” by Paul (^{<4121>}Hebrews 12:16). Instances of this under the Mosaic economy (which sternly forbade it [^{<4254>}Exodus 25:14]) were the cases of Nadab and Abihu (^{<4101>}Leviticus 10), the men of Bethshemesh (^{<4101>}1 Samuel 5), Uzzah (^{<4101>}2 Samuel 6:67), Uzziah (^{<4101>}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 (^{<4108>}Malachi 3:8-10), and converted his holy temple into a market (^{<4121>}Matthew 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 (^{<4101>}Matthew 26:61). So the grand accusation against Stephen was that he spoke disrespectfully of the Temple (^{<4103>}Acts 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 (^{<4123>}Acts 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 (^{<4117>}1 Corinthians 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 (^{<4112>}1 Corinthians 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, ~~<R21>~~Leviticus 21:21), and many other instances which will occur to the classical reader.

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,

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 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

(*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

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
With holy joys be crowned,” etc.;*

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

*“Let old things pass away,
Let 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 Gesänge*, 1, 311. (B.P.)

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 precentor, 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,

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, 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 Autoritate Yutgatoe Editionis Latinae contra Whitakerum*, etc. (1604, 8vo).

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 Algorismo*.

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 Medals* (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,

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).

Sadami'as

(Vulg. *Sadamias*, the Greek original being lost), given in the Apocrypha (2 Esdr. 1, 1) instead of SHALLUM *SEE SHALLUM* (q.v.) in the ancestry of Ezra (^{<1570>}Ezra 7:2).

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.

Sa'das

(Σαδάς v.r. Ἀσταί, Ἀργαί), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5:13) of the name AZGAD *SEE AZGAD* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<1572>}Ezra 2:12).

Saddae'us

(or rather *Daddoe'us* [as in 1 Esdr. 8:46], Δαδδαῖος, v.r. Δολδαῖος, Λοδδαῖος, and Λοδαῖος), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 8:45) of the name IDDO (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (^{<1587>}Ezra 8:17).

Saddle

Picture for Saddle

(*bkrjñ*, *merkaib*, a “chariot” [^{<1085>}1 Kings 4:26; ^{<886>}Hebrews 5:6]; also a *seat* in a chariot or other vehicle, “saddle” [^{<853>}Leviticus 15:9]; “covering” of a palanquin [^{<230>}Song of Solomon 3:10]). *SEE CHARIOT*.

The word which our translators elsewhere (^{<0215>}Genesis 22:3; ^{<0221>}Numbers 22:21; ^{<0790>}Judges 19:10; ^{<1061>}2 Samuel 16:1; 17:23; 1 Kings 2, 40; 13:13, 23, 27; ^{<1024>}2 Kings 4:24) render by “to saddle” literally signifies “to bind about” (as ^{<0230>}Exodus 29:9; ^{<4116>}John 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 so 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 ^{<07910>}Judges 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 (^{<0334>}Genesis 31:34).

Sad' duc

(or rather *Saddu'cus*, Σάδδουκος, s.v. Σαδδούλουκος), the Grsecized form (1 Esdr. 8:2) of the name of ZADOK *SEE ZADOK* (q.v.), the high priest, one of Ezra's ancestors (^{<0302>}Ezra 7:2).

Sad' ducee

(strictly *Sadduce'an*, Σαδδουκαῖος [^{<0107>}Matthew 3:7; 16:1, 6, 11, 12; 22:23, 34; ^{<0128>}Mark 12:18; ^{<0107>}Luke 20:27; ^{<0401>}Acts 4:1; 5, 17; 23:6, 7, 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 ⲧⲁⲃⲃⲱⲕⲓⲙ *Tsaddukim*, of which Σαδδουκαῖοι = *Sadducei* 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 only 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. ⲁⲓⲱⲧⲏⲃ; 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 qdx , *righteousness*. He says that they call themselves Sadducees because this name is derived from *righteousness*, as *Zedek* denotes *righteousness* (Ἐπονομάζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὀρμωμένης: σεδὲκ γὰρ ἔρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη), and that there was also anciently a priest named *Zadok*, but they did not continue in the doctrines of their (ἐπιστάτης) chief (*Adversus 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 $yqwdx$ is taken as the proper name $qwr x$, with *y* appended, to translate it *a follower of Zadok*, as it would be to render $ym[bry$, *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 $\mu yq\theta\delta\alpha\grave{\iota}$ *the righteous* (Epiphanius, *Adversus Hoereses*, 1, 1, 4). Hence Dr. Low concludes that, in harmony with his Hebrew name $qyD\alpha\grave{\iota}$ the Sadducee called himself in Greek $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, *the straightforward, open, honest, righteous*, and that the opponents of this sect changed both the honorable Hebrew appellation $\mu yqyr x$; into $\mu yqwr x$ (hence the singular $yqwdx$ = *Sadducee*), and the Greek name $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, which is written in Hebrew $swtba$ (according to the analogy of $swnygba$ = $\epsilon\upsilon\gammaενής$), into $swtyb$, from which originated $\mu yswtyb$, *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 **yqwdx** from the proper name **qwdx** is set aside by the fact that the first Karaites called themselves **μ yynn[**, *followers of Anan, Ananites*; so that **yynn[**, *an Asnanite*, is an exact parallel to **yqwdx**, *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 **μ yarq**, *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 **arq**; (formed according to the analogy of **ˆYD**); or by the Aramaic form **ywoq**; (defective of **aywyq**), or **yrq**; formed according to the analogy of **yKzi**. 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 (~~401~~ Matthew 16:1, 4, 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 (~~402~~ John 7:32, 45; 11:47, 57; 18:3; 8:3, 13-19; 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 Maccabaeen 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 (~~1881~~ Deuteronomy 28:1-68, with ~~1875~~ Psalm 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* (*yⁿsm h^cml hkl h*), 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 (*twkl h*) 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 (^{<A151>}Matthew 15:11: ^{<A113>}Luke 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 Matth.* 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' ἑαυτῶν τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦναι [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 ^{<1217>}Luke 20:27; ^{<1218>}Mark 12:18; see also ^{<1223>}Matthew 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 (^{<2712>}Daniel 12:2), and this was the common doctrine as late as the second book of Maccabees (comp. 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 (^{<1212>}Exodus 20:12; 23:25, 26; ^{<18712>}Deuteronomy 7:12-15; 28:1-68). The very quotation made by our Savior (^{<1223>}Matthew 22:31, 32;

^{<1126>}Mark 12:26, 27; ^{<2157>}Luke 20:37) of ^{<0116>}Exodus 3:6, 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 (μ qw), and this people shall rise again’ (^{<6316>}Deuteronomy 31:16): from the prophets because it is written, ‘Thy dead men shall live,’ etc. (^{<2369>}Isaiah 26:19); and from the Hagiographa because it is written, ‘And the roof of thy mouth,’ etc. (Song of Songs 7:9). The Sadducees, however, would not accept these passages till he quoted the passage, ‘The land which the Lord swore unto your fathers to give it to them’ (^{<6112>}Deuteronomy 11:21). He promised it to them (μ hl) — 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” (^{<4238>}Acts 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 (^{<0107>}Genesis 16:7; 19:1; 22:11; 28:12; ^{<0231>}Exodus 23:20; ^{<0223>}Numbers 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 (^{<195111>}Psalm 51:11, 12), and would enlarge on the perils which surrounded man from the temptations of Satan and evil angels or spirits (^{<13201>}1 Chronicles 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 (^{<23811>}Ezekiel 33:11-19) in a well known passage in which he gives the responsibility 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 Sadduceean 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 (*hswra*), but denied its obligation when the marriage was consummated (*hawq̄n*). Thus, for instance, though they regarded a betrothed woman (*hswra*) 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 ^{<01830>}Genesis 38:7-10, and which — inferring from the similarity of expression used in ver. 7 and 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 (^{<01835>}Deuteronomy 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 **hxwj h**, which they translated *outer*, and regarded as the adjective of **tmh tça**, construing it with the preceding **hyj t al**, while they took **rz çyal** as 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 (^{<01223>}Matthew 22:23, etc.; ^{<01218>}Mark 12:18, etc.; ^{<01217>}Luke 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 (**hswra**), apart from the extremely rare occurrence of death between the betrothal and connubial intercourse (**hawçn**), 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* (חֲבֵיל יָד), 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 (וַיִּנְפֹּב, ⁽¹⁵⁷¹⁾Deuteronomy 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. (⁽¹⁷²³⁾Exodus 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 ⁽¹⁵⁹²⁾Deuteronomy 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 ⁽¹⁵⁹³⁾Deuteronomy 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 (⁽¹⁷⁰¹⁾Numbers 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 (⁴⁰²⁸Exodus 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 (çmç ybrw[m]). 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 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 ^(B13)Leviticus 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 ^(B72)Leviticus 7:24 in an unnatural manner, by taking the expression **hl bn** to 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; thus 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 [^{423B}Exodus 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 [^{1292b}Deuteronomy 14:21]; and sayest thou that it should be eaten?” To this the Sadducee replied, “Bravo!” (swl aq = καλῶς [*Sabbath*, 108 a]).

5. The Sadducees, who stood upon their priestly dignity and ancient prerogatives, rejected the artificial mode of *amalgamating the distances* (wymwhnt bwry[¹²⁹³): 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 ^{1293b}Exodus 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 *Tosiphtha* 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 (tbq br [¹²⁹⁴), 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 ^{1295b}Exodus 19:10, 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 (^{1295b}Numbers 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 (^{-QHEB}Numbers 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 *tbçh trhmm* (^{-QHEB}Leviticus 23:11, 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 (*μ ymhwt|syn*); and so opposed were they to this ceremony that it became the cause of separation between the Sadduceean 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 *trpkh l [hara n[b yk* (^{<B12>}Leviticus 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 *twm yrj a*, 3; *Jerusalem Yonma*, 1, 5; *Babylon Yoma*, 19 b, 53 a).

13. Though admitting that ^{<B13>}Exodus 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 (^{<B14>}Leviticus 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 (*hrhf ymd*). It is for this reason that the *h* in *hrhf* (^{<B14>}Leviticus 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 (†*tn ybrd twba*.) is the commentary of Rabbi Nathan Ha-Babli (q.v.) on the tractate of the Mishna entitled *Aboth* (*twba*) = *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 (¹⁰⁰²1 Kings 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” (⁴⁸¹⁰2 Chronicles 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 (³⁵⁰⁵Ezekiel 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 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 (1 Macc. 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 (2 Macc. 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 Maccabaeian 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 legitimize 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. ^{<4016>}Matthew 16:6 with ^{<4085>}Mark 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 (^{<4006>}Mark 3:6), as these Herodians, from their alliance with the reigning dynasty, had the temporal power for their aid. Again, in ^{<4100>}Mark 11:1 27; 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 (^{<4124>}Mark 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 ver. 13 Herodians and in ver. 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 (^{<4129>}Mark 12:19-27). When they were silenced, one of the scribes i.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 (^{<4457>}Acts 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; and, 2d, 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 Sadducoeï Angelos negarint* (Ziz. 1637); Reiske, *De Sadducoeis* (Jen. 1666); Mieg, *De Argumento Christ. adversus Sadducoeos* (Heidelb. 1677); Willemer, *De Sadduceis* (Viteb. 1680); Barthel, *De Sadduceis* (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,

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,

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,

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,

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,

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

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.,

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.,

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,

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,

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).

Sa'doc,

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 Esdr. 1, 1); one of Ezra's ancestors (^{<137D>}Ezra 7:2).

2. (Σαδώκ, *Vulg. Sadoc*). The son (great-grandson) of Azor and father of Achim (^{<1014>}Matthew 1:14) in Christ's ancestry. B.C. cir. 220. *SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST)*.

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 *Philosophicæ Consolationes et Meditationes in Adversis* (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. Sadoletto 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, Sadoletto 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 Senatam 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 irenic 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 Sadoletto, 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, Sadoletto 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-Encyclop.* 13, 297-301; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. (J.P.L.)

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,

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

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).

Saffron

Picture for Saffron

(**μ** **Κ****σ****κ****ι** *karkom'*, Sept. **κ****ρ****ό****κ****ο****ς**) occurs only once in the O.T., viz. in ²⁰¹⁴Song of Solomon 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 **κ****ρ****ό****κ****ο****ς** 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" (**κ****ρ****ό****κ****ο****π****ε****π****λ****ο****ς**) 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. nudiflorus*, 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,

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

(גִּסְרֵי, 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,

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,

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

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,

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,

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,

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 Historiæ Saxonice*, 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,

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

Sahadutha.

SEE JEGAR-SAHADUTHA.

Sahidic (Or Thebaic) Version.

SEE EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.

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). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Sail

is the incorrect rendering in the passages ^{<23323>}Isaiah 33:23; ^{<3271>}Ezekiel 27:7, of the Hebrew *snēnes*, usually a *standard or flag-staff*, and in the passages in question a *flag* of a ship. In ^{<4271>}Acts 27:17 it stands vaguely for *σκεῦδος* (a *vessel or implement* of any kind), which there designates the *tackling*, or sailing apparatus in general of a ship. *SEE MAINSAIL*.

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 centered 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 (^{2RUS}Jeremiah 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 für 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 necessariis 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 irenic 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,

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, Admirantii Aragonioe, in Legatione sua* (1598): — *Thesaurus Litanarum ac Orationum Sacer* (1598): — *Den niefwen Morghenwekker* (1612). He also translated several religious treatises into his native language.

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*. **dysjæ** *chasisd* (like the Gr. ὅσιος), denotes a mental quality; its most certain acceptation being pious, just, godly, etc. It is spoken of pious Hebrews (^{<904B>}Psalm 4:3; 30:4; 31:23; 37:28; 1:5; 3:9; 79:2; 97:10; 116:15). On the other hand, **ç/dq**; *kadosh*, and also the Greek word ἄγιος, 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 (^{<0284>}Exodus 28:41; 29:1; ^{<0206>}Leviticus 21:6; ^{<0070>}1 Samuel 7:1; 1 Peter 2, 5); the first-born (^{<0132>}Exodus 13:2; ^{<0023>}Luke 2:23; ^{<5116>}Romans 11:16); and the people of Israel (^{<0290>}Exodus 19:10, 14; ^{<2333>}Isaiah 13:3); prophets and apostles (^{<0070>}Luke 1:70; ^{<0021>}Acts 3:21; ^{<0021>}2 Peter 1:21; ^{<0085>}Ephesians 3:5); the *pious* Israelites, the *saints* (^{<0533>}Deuteronomy 33:3; ^{<0063>}Psalm 16:3; 34:9; 89:5, 7; ^{<3445>}Zechariah 14:5; ^{<2078>}Daniel 7:18, 21, 25, 27; ^{<0072>}Matthew 27:52); and the angels (^{<0080>}Job 5:1; 15:15; ^{<2083>}Daniel 8:13; ^{<0051>}Matthew 25:31; ^{<0183>}1 Thessalonians 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* (^{<0093>}Acts 9:13, 14, 32, 41; 26:10; ^{<0007>}Romans 1:7; 8:27). It may here be observed that the Hebrew word for a consecrated prostitute is **hvdeq]** *kedeshah*, derived from **vdq**; *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 **vdq**, *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 (**µ ydsj**, *chasisdim*), 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 (^{<0077>}Acts

17:17). In the New Test. the word ἅγιος, 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 (^{<A73>}Matthew 27:50), it is believed that they were persons who believed in him and waited for him in hope, as old Simeon had done (^{<A25>}Luke 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 (^{<A25>}John 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 (ἅγιος, ἅγιοι) 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-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 passe 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.,

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, 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. *serfegents*, 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-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.,

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,

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 l'Amour de Jesus-Christ* (1634): — *Methodes pour bien mourir* (1640): *L'Homme Spirituel* (1646): — *L'Idée d'un Parfait Chretien, ou la Vie de M. de Renty* (1651): — *L'Homme Religieux* (1657);

Saint-Maur.

SEE MAUR (ST.), CONGREGATION OF.

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): — *Exercices 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 Irene 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 (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-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. Grown 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 for 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.)

Saint worship.

SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

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,

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,

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 Religieuses 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,

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.

SEE SAINT.

Saints, Invocation Of.

SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Saints' Days.

SEE CALENDAR; SEE FEASTS.

Saints' Relics.

SEE RELICS.

Sair.

SEE SATYR.

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,

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,

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,

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

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,

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

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

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,

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,

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

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 *Sefer ha-Yamim* (*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 Pumbedita; 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), Königsberg (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 *Sefer ha-Yamim* (*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): — **vpNj ihwðm**; (*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,

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,

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,

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,

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,

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

Sa'la

(Σαλά), the Greek form (Ⲛⲗⲏⲥ Luke 3:35) of the name of the patriarch SALAH *SEE SALAH* (q.v.), the father of Eber (Ⲛⲓⲃⲏⲗ Genesis 10:24).

Salaam.

SEE SALUTATION.

Salacia,

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

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 Nouredin (q.v.), prince of Syria, and accompanied his uncle in his various expeditions to Egypt in command of Nouredin'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, Nouredin, 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 Nouredin'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 mediæval chivalry, invincible courage, inviolable fidelity to treaties, greatness of soul, piety, justice, and moderation.

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.

Sa'lah

(Heb. *She'lach*, **שׁלַח**, something *sent* forth, as a *javelin* or a *sprout*; Sept. and New Test. **Σαλά**, but **Σάλα** in ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 1:24; A.V. “Shelah” in ^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 1:18, 24), the only named son of the patriarch Arphaxad, and the father of Eber (^{<1112>}Genesis 10:24; 11:12, 13, 14, 15; ^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 1:18, 24), B.C. cir. 2478. See SALA. “The name is significant of *extension*, the cognate verb (**שׁלַח**) being applied to the spreading out of the roots and branches of trees (^{<2478>}Jeremiah 17:8; ^{<2676>}Ezekiel 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,

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,

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,

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

Salamis,

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.

Sal'amis

Picture for Salamis 1

(Σαλαμίς, perhaps from ἄλς, *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 (^{<4135>}Acts 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 (1 Macc. 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 (~~4119~~ Acts 11:19, 20) even before the first missionary expedition. Mnason (~~4216~~ Acts 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 (15:39). *SEE MARK.*

Picture for Salamis 2

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.

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 (~~4000~~ Matthew 10:10), to which the apostle appeals, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (~~4004~~ 1 Corinthians 9:14). In the apostolic age the maintenance of the clergy consisted merely in the supply of their personal wants (~~4700~~ 2 Corinthians 11:7, 8; ~~4046~~ Philippians 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 religious 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 sequestered. 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. Charlemagne first required the payment of tithes by statute law, and enforced the duty by severe penalties. His successors confirmed and completed the system of tithes 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.

Salasad'ai

(Σαλασαδαΐ, v.r. Σαρασαδαΐ, etc., a corruption from the Sept. Σουρισαδαΐ, for *Zurishaddai*, in ^{<0406>}Numbers 1:6), a name given (^{<0081>}Judges 8:1) as that of an Israelite, father of Samael, in the ancestry of Judith (q.v.).

Sala'thiel

(Heb. *Shealtiel'*, [אֶשְׁתִּיאֵל] *asked of God*; Sept. and New Test. Σαλαθιήλ; more correctly, "Shealtiel," in the A.V. in Ezra 3, 2; Nehemiah 12:1 Hag. 1, 12, 14; 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 (^{<0127>}Luke 3:27), and father of Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3, 17; Ezra 3, 2; ^{<0211>}Nehemiah 12:1; ^{<0312>}Haggai 1:12, 14; 2:2; ^{<0412>}Matthew 1:12; ^{<0527>}Luke 3:27. **SEE SHEALTIEL**.

Sal'cah

(Heb. *Salkah'*, חֲלָכָה from an Arabic root, signifying *migration*; Sept. Σελχά, v.r. Σελά, Σεκξάί, Ἐλχά, etc.; A.V. "Salchah," in Deuteronomy 3, 10 [*Targum Pseudo-Jon.* gives it אַיְקוּמִל ס, 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 (^{<6880>}Deuteronomy 3:10; ^{<6831>}Joshua 13:11). This city appears to have been one of the old capitals of Og's kingdom (^{<6875>}Joshua 12:5). A statement in ^{<6881>}1 Chronicles 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 (^{<6875>}Joshua 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.**

Sal'chah

(^(R20)Deuteronomy 2:10). **SEE SALCAH.**

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.)

Sa'lem

(Heb. *Shalem'*, שָׁלֵם; *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 *Jerusalem*. **SEE SHALEM.**

1. (Sept. Σαλήμ, and so N.T.) The place of which Melchizedek was king (^{<0148>}Genesis 14:18; ^{<8000>}Hebrews 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 (tarq]) Abraham, yet it is also distinctly stated that this was *after Abraham had returned* (wbWv yrē) 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 ^{<9702>}Psalms 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, *Palaestina*, 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 Evangelium*, § 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 ~~EBB~~ John 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 ~~COOB~~ Judges 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 ἀὺλῶνα Σαλήμ), is possibly, as Reland has ingeniously suggested (*Palœst.* p. 977), a corruption of εἰς ἀὺλῶνα εἰς Σαλήμ — “into the plain to Salem.” If Ἀὺλῶν 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 Zerim (Jezeel), 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*), ^{<1971D>}Psalm 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 ver. 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,

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

Sales, Francis De.

SEE FRANCIS OF SALES.

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,

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

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.

SEE SALESIANS.

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,

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 began 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 Wolfenbittel, 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 Eutychnismo 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 Wolfenbittel in 1735. He wrote, also, *Nodus*

Proedestinationis Solutus. See Ballenstedt, *De Vita et Obitu C.A. Saligii* (Helmst. 1738); Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 13, 323-325. (J.P.L.)

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*.

Sa'lim

(*Σαλείμ* v.r. *Σαλλειμ*; Vulg. *Salim*), a place named (~~ERR3~~ John 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 (ver. 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 ^{ⲉⲟⲟⲟⲁ}1 Samuel 9:4; but this latter place is itself unknown, and the name in Hebrew contains [], 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 Nablus, which is probably the Shalem of ^{ⲉⲟⲟⲟⲁ}Genesis 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.**

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,

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,

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.

SEE JOHN OF SALISBURY.

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,

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,

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.

Sal'lai

(Heb. **yl̄šī**, *Sallay'*, perhaps *lifted up*, from **l̄š**; *salal*; or *basket-maker*; Sept. **Σηλεί**, **Σαλαΐ**, 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 (^{<16108>}Nehemiah 11:8), B.C. cir. 459.

2. One of the chiefs of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (^{<16121>}Nehemiah 12:20), B.C. cir. 459. He is elsewhere (^{<16127>}Nehemiah 12:7) called SALLU (q.v.).

Sal'lu,

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

1. (Heb. **aWLSj** *Sallu'* [**aLṢi**in ^{<16107>}Nehemiah 11:7], *weighed*; Sept. **Σαλώ**, v.r. **Σηλώ**, **Σαλώμ**.) A Benjaminite, son of Meshullam, dwelling in Jerusalem after the return from exile (^{<16107>}Nehemiah 11:7; ^{<13007>}1 Chronicles 9:7), B.C. cir. 459.

2. (Heb. **WLSj** *Sallu'*, *weighed*; Sept. **Σαλού** v.r. **Σαλλουαί**.) Another name (^{<16127>}Nehemiah 12:7) for SALLAI (^{<16121>}Nehemiah 12:20), No. 2 (q.v.).

Sallu'mus

(**Σαλλουῦμος** v.r. **Σαλουῦμος**), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:25) of the name SHALLUM *SEE SHALLUM* (q.v.) of the Heb. (^{<15024>}Ezra 10:24).

Sal'ma

(Heb. **amj ḫi** *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 (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 2:51, 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,

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.

Salmana'sar

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

Salmantican

(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, in 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

(*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 II, 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, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs de Bourgogne*; Paquot, *Memoires*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 328-331. (J.P.L.)

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 Raffaele. 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,

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 III, and Pius 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.)

Sal'mon,

the name of a man and of a hill.

1. (Heb. *Salmon'*, שַׁלְמוֹן *ḥi* clothing, ^{<0021>}Ruth 4:21, Sept. Σαλμών v.r. Σαλμών; but *Salima'*, אַמְלִי *ḥi* id. ^{<0021>}1 Chronicles 2:11, Sept. Σαλμών v.r. Σαλωμών, A.V. “Salma;” and *Salmah'*, חַמְלִי *ḥi* id. ^{<0021>}Ruth 4:20, Sept. Σαλμών v.r. Σαλμών, A.V. “Salmon;” N.T. Σαλμών). The son of Nahshon and the ancestor of Boaz, of the family of Judah and David (^{<0021>}Ruth 4:20, 21; ^{<0021>}1 Chronicles 2:11; ^{<0004>}Matthew 1:4, 5; ^{<0032>}Luke 3:32). B.C. cir. 1660. *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.*

2. (Heb. *Tsalmon*, שַׁלְמוֹן *ḥi* shady.) A place named (^{<0014>}Psalms 68:14) as a battlefield, apparently during the Israelites' conquest of Canaan; probably the Mount ZALMON *SEE ZALMON* (q.v.) elsewhere (^{<0048>}Judges 9:48) referred to.

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.

Salmo'ne

Picture for 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” (^{<0027>}Acts 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, her 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,

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 Alcidence, 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.

Sa’lom

(**Σαλώμ**), a Greek form in the Apocrypha,

(a) incorrectly (1 Macc. 2, 26), for SALU *SEE SALU* (q.v.), the father of Zimri (^{<0254>}Numbers 25:14);

(b) less correctly (Bar. 1, 7), for SHALLUM *SEE SHALLUM* (q.v.), the father of Hilkiah (^{<363>}1 Chronicles 6:13).

Salo'me

(Σαλώμη, from the Heb. **שָׁלוֹם**; 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 Jannaeus. *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 ^{<4176>}Matthew 27:56 with ^{<4150>}Mark 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 ^{<4195>}John 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 assuming 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 (^{<4111>}Matthew 20:20); that she attended at the crucifixion of Jesus (^{<4150>}Mark 15:40); and that she visited his sepulchre (^{<4161>}Mark 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 ⁴⁰⁴⁶Matthew 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.

SEE LANIADO.

Salomo Ben-Abraham Parchon.

SEE PARCHON.

Salomo Ben-Abraham Urbino.

SEE URBINO.

Salomo Ben-David De Oliveyra.

SEE OLIVEYRA.

Salomo Ben-Elijakim Panzi.

SEE PANZI

Salomo Ben-Jechiel Loria.

SEE LORIA.

Salomo Ben-Jehuda Ibn-Gebirol.

SEE IBNGEBIROL.

Salomo Ben-Jehuda Verga.

SEE VERGA,

Salomo Ben-Joel Dubno.

SEE DUBNO.

Salomo Ben-Isaak.

SEE RASHI.

Salomo Levi.

SEE PAULUS BURGENSIS,.

Salomo Molcho.

SEE MOLCHO.

Salomon Di Norzi.

SEE NORZI.

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 Herrn*, 17 sermons on the Decalogue (ibid. 1846): — **μ**
yr/ab, 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 für 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,

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 Judaeos* (Frankfort, 1660): — *Programma Hebr. ad A udiendam Orationem Hebr. de Proestantia et Utilitate Lingua Hebr.* (Dantzic, 1666): — *Programma de Jubilois 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.,

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 Parabolis Salomonis et Ecclesiasten*. The style is simple, and the most of the exposition relates to ethics.

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

(*j l m*, *melach*; ἅλας), 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 (^{<RB16>}Job 6:6) and beast (^{<RB14>}Isaiah 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 (^{<RB13>}Leviticus 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 (^{<RB13>}2 Samuel 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 (^{<RB10>}Zephaniah 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 (Wisd. 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 (^{<RB16>}Nehemiah 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 (^{<41513>}Matthew 5:13; ^{<2145>}Luke 14:35). Too large an admixture, however, was held to produce sterility, as exemplified on the shores of the Dead Sea (^{<5223>}Deuteronomy 29:23; ^{<3119>}Zephaniah 2:9); hence a “salt” land was synonymous with barrenness (^{<8306>}Job 39:6; see margin; ^{<2476>}Jeremiah 17:6; comp. Josephus, *War*, 4:8, 2, ἄλμυρωσης καὶ ἄγονος); and hence also arose the custom of sowing with salt the foundations of a destroyed city (^{<4095>}Judges 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 (μωρανθῆ, ^{<41513>}Matthew 5:13), and become saltless (ἄναλον, ^{<4080>}Mark 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” (^{<8123>}Leviticus 2:13; ^{<4189>}Numbers 18:19; ^{<4135>}2 Chronicles 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” (^{<5044>}Ezra 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 (^{<1813>}Leviticus 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 (^{<1235>}Exodus 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 (^{<1099>}Mark 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 (^{<1020>}2 Kings 2:20, 21), and is also developed in the New Test. (^{<1153>}Matthew 5:13; ^{<5046>}Colossians 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, 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, City Of

(Heb. *Ir ham-Me' lach*, **י ר מלח**; Sept. αἱ πόλεις Σαδῶν, v.r. ἡ πόλις τῶν ἀλῶν; Vulg. *civitas Salis*), the fifth of the six cities of Judah which lay in the “wilderness” (~~1652~~ Joshua 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.

SEE COVENANT; SEE SALT.

Salt Sea,

Picture for Salt Sea 1

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 (**hl Mhip y**; *Yam ham-Melach*; Sept. ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ἀλῶν, or ἀλός; also ἡ θάλασσα ἡ ἀλυκῆς; Vulg. *Mare Salis*). It is evidently a descriptive name, probably intended to indicate both the saltiness 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 (^{<014B>}Genesis 14:3; ^{<040B>}Numbers 34:3; ^{<080B>}Deuteronomy 3:17; ^{<080B>}Joshua 3:16; 15:2, 5; 18:19). In the Talmudical books it is likewise called “the Sea of Salt” (**aj l md amy**). 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* (**hbr l h; μ y**; *Yam ha-Arabah*; Sept. [ἡ]θάλασσα [τῆς] Ἄραβα; 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 (^{<080B>}Deuteronomy 3:17); and possibly it may have afterwards supplanted the older name (4:49; ^{<140B>}2 Kings 14:25), with which it is sometimes associated (^{<080B>}Joshua 3:16; 12:3; ^{<080B>}Deuteronomy 3:17). **SEE ARABAH.**

3. “*The East Sea*” is the only other name employed in Scripture (**ynadPhi μ Yhi** *ha-Yam hak-Kadmoni*; Sept. ἡ θάλασσα ἡ πρὸς ἀνατολάς; Vulg. *Mare Orientale*). It is used by Ezekiel (^{<260B>}Ezekiel 47:18), Joel (^{<200B>}Joel 2:20), and Zechariah (^{<340B>}Zechariah 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” (**wrj ah**, literally “latter,” though when opposed to **wmdq** it means “western”).

In one passage (^{צפח}Ezekiel 47:8) it is styled, without previous reference, “the Sea” (μ Υηι *ha-Yanm*,), and distinguished from “the great sea” — the Mediterranean — (ver. 10).

4. *The Sea of Sodom* (μ wds I ç amy) 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* — η Ασφαλίτις 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 ἀσφαλιτοφόρος (*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, Trogius Pompeius (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 ^{צח}Daniel 11:45), “Mare . . . quod nunc appellatur mortuum.” The origin of this name is given by Jerome (ad ^{צפח}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 far as 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 (nearly) 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 incrustated 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.

Picture for Salt Sea 2

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.

Picture for Salt Sea 3

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 $31^{\circ} 6' 20''$ and $31^{\circ} 46'$ 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 $35^{\circ} 24'$ and $35^{\circ} 37'$ E. long., nearly; and its greatest width (some three miles south of Ain-Jidy) is about 9 geographical miles, or $10 \frac{1}{3}$ 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, *Official 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 *Athenaeum*).

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 3 1/2 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, *Palæst.* 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.

Picture for Salt Sea 4

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 ^{<0130>}Genesis 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 ^{<OH2>}Genesis 19:24, 25.

(2.) The second passage is ^{<OH2>}Genesis 14:2-10, which contains the story of Lot’s capture. Ver. 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 ver. 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” (ver. 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 ⁻⁰¹⁹²⁴Genesis 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” (ver. 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* (⁻⁰¹²⁰Genesis 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’ (⁻⁰¹³⁰Genesis 13:10, 11). Even to the present day, more living streams flow into the Ghor at the south end of the sea, from wadays 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; and *Physical 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 j l Mhιμ yi* (Helmst. 1712); and a recent one by Fraas, *Das todte Meer* (Stuttg. 1867). **SEE DEAD SEA.**

Salt, Valley Of

(Heb. *j l mēayḡe* *Gey Melach*, but twice with the article, *j l Mhιḡe* Sept. *Γεβελέμ, Γεμελέδ, κοιλάς* [or *φάραγξ*] *τῶν ἀλῶν*; 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 (^{<10183>}2 Samuel 8:13; ^{<13182>}1 Chronicles 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 (^{<13182>}1 Chronicles 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 (^{<11115>}1 Kings 11:15, 16; ^{<1801>}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 (^{<12147>}2 Kings 14:7; ^{<14251>}2 Chronicles 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 ^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7.) **SEE SODOM.**

(a.) The word *Gey* (אֵי) 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 ~~1656~~ *Joshua 15:62*, because of the salt mountain near it. *SEE SALT, CITY OF.*

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. He 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.,

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.

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,

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 consummation 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.)

Sa'lu

(Heb. *Salu'*, אלוּל *S*; 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 (^{<0254>}Numbers 25:14; see ver. 7 sq.). B.C. ante 1618.

Sa'lum,

a Greek form found in the Apocrypha of the Hebrew name SHALLUM *SEE SHALLUM* (q.v.): a. (Σαλοῦμος v.r. Σαλῆμος; 1 Esdr. 8:1) the father of Hilkiah (^{<1570>}Ezra 7:2); b. (Σαλούμ; 1 Esdr. 5:28) a temple “porter” (^{<1570>}Ezra 2:42).

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,

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

(from the Lat. *salus*, health, i.e. a wishing well; in the A.V. “salute” is the rendering of **ĒrB**; *barak*, to bless; **l aiv**; *shaal*, to inquire; but more properly of **μ wbn**; *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” (^{<0433>}Genesis 43:29); “Blessed be thou of the Lord” (^{<0830>}Ruth 3:10; ^{<0953>}1 Samuel 15:13); “The Lord be with you,” “The Lord bless thee” (^{<0804>}Ruth 2:4); “The blessing of the Lord be upon you; we bless you in the name of the Lord” (^{<1308>}Psalms 129:8). Hence the term “bless” received the secondary sense of “salute,” and is occasionally so rendered in the A.V. (^{<0950>}1 Samuel 13:10; 25:14; ^{<1109>}2 Kings 4:29; 10:15), though not so frequently as it might have been (e.g. ^{<0223>}Genesis 27:23; 47:7, 10; ^{<1086>}1 Kings 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 **ĒrB**; *barak*, which originally signified “to bless,” meant also “to salute” or “to welcome,” and “to bid adieu” (^{<0478>}Genesis 47:8-11; ^{<0309>}2 Kings 4:29; 10:13; ^{<1380>}1 Chronicles 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 (^{<0780>}Judges 19:20; ^{<0804>}Ruth 2:4; ^{<0276>}1 Samuel 25:6; ^{<0109>}2 Samuel 20:9; ^{<0908>}Psalms 129:8). Hence the Hebrew term used in these instances (**שָׁלוֹם**; *shalom*) has reference to general well being, and strictly answers to our “welfare,” as given in the text (^{<0457>}Genesis 43:27; ^{<0287>}Exodus 18:7). It is used, not only in the case of salutation (in which sense it is frequently rendered “to salute,” e.g. ^{<0785>}Judges 18:15; ^{<0904>}1 Samuel 10:4; ^{<0103>}2 Kings 10:13), but also in other cases, where it is designed to soothe or to encourage a person (^{<0453>}Genesis 43:23; ^{<0763>}Judges 6:23; 19:20; ^{<1328>}1 Chronicles 12:18; ^{<0709>}Daniel 10:19; comp. ^{<0921>}1 Samuel 20:21, where it is opposed to “hurt;” ^{<0828>}2 Samuel 18:28, “all is well;” and ^{<0107>}2 Samuel 11:7, where it is applied to the progress of the war). The salutation at parting consisted originally of a simple blessing (^{<0124>}Genesis 24:60; 28:1; 47:10; ^{<0216>}Joshua 22:6); but in later times the term *shalom* was introduced here also in the form “Go in peace,” or, rather, “Farewell” (^{<0917>}1 Samuel 1:17; 20:42; ^{<0159>}2 Samuel 15:9). This was current at the time of our Savior’s ministry (^{<0454>}Mark 5:34; ^{<0175>}Luke 7:50; ^{<0466>}Acts 16:36), and is adopted by him in his parting address to his disciples (^{<0347>}John 14:27). It had even passed into a salutation on meeting, in such forms as “Peace be to this house” (^{<0205>}Luke 10:5), “Peace be unto you” (^{<0236>}Luke 24:36; ^{<0309>}John 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 (^{<0169>}Matthew 26:49; 28:9; ^{<0128>}Luke 1:28) and probably also at departure. In modern times, the ordinary mode of address current in the East resembles the Hebrew: *Es-salam 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 **χαίρε, χαίρετε**; *Joy to thee! Joy to you!* rendered by

Hail! an equivalent of the Latin *Ave!* *Salve!* (^{<472>}Matthew 27:29; 28:9; ^{<4158>}Mark 15:18; ^{<4158>}Luke 1:28; ^{<4158>}John 19:3).

A still stronger form of this wish for the health of the person addressed was the expression “Live, my lord” (*ynda hwj*), 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!” (^{<103>}1 Kings 1:31), which was also employed in the Babylonian and Persian courts (^{<2784>}Daniel 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:6, 21; ^{<468>}Nehemiah 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 (^{<804>}Ruth 2:4), the traveler on the road saluted the worker in the field (^{<498>}Psalms 129:8), and members of the same family interchanged greetings on rising in the morning (^{<174>}Proverbs 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 (^{<4157>}Matthew 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 (^{<611>}2 John 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” (^{<119>}2 Kings 4:29; ^{<104>}Luke 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 ^{<2015>}Luke 10:5, 6; ^{<6100>}2 John 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 (^{<1009>}2 Kings 4:29; ^{<2014>}Luke 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 ^{<1045>}2 Kings 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!”

Picture for Salutation 1

(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 touching 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 ^{<4128>}Mark 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.*

Picture for Salutation 2

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 ^{<1010>}2 Samuel 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 (^{<1026>}Genesis 24:64; ^{<1023>}1 Samuel 25:23; ^{<1021>}2 Kings 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 ^{<1010>}2 Samuel 20:9; ^{<1021>}Genesis 29:11, 13; 33:4; 48:10-12; ^{<1027>}Exodus 4:27; 18:7. **SEE KISS.**

Picture for Salutation 3

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 ^{<1049>}2 Kings 4:19; ^{<2008>}Luke 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 (2 Macc. 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 (2 Macc. 1:1; 9:19; 1 Esdr. 6:7). A combination of the first and third persons in the terms of the salutation was not unfrequent (~~6000~~ Galatians 1:1, 2; ~~5000~~ Philemon 1:1; ~~6000~~ 2 Peter 1:1). The term used (either expressed or understood) in the introductory salutation was the Greek *χαίρειν* in an elliptical construction (1 Macc. 10:18; 2 Macc. 9:19; 1 Esdr. 8:9; ~~4236~~ Acts 23:26); this, however, was more frequently omitted, and the only apostolic passages in which it occurs are ~~4453~~ Acts 15:23 and ~~5000~~ James 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 ~~6000~~ 2 John “grace, mercy, and peace,” and in ~~6000~~ Jude “mercy, peace, and love.” The concluding salutation consisted occasionally of a translation of the Latin *valete* (~~4453~~ Acts 15:29; 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 (~~6162~~ Romans 16:22), added the salutation with his own hand (~~6162~~ 1 Corinthians 16:21; ~~5008~~ Colossians 4:18; ~~5387~~ 2 Thessalonians 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.

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

(*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,

a Jewish physician, was born at Montpellier, France, in 1796, and died at Versailles, March 17, 1873. He is the author of *Loi de Moïse, ou Systeme Relig. et Polit. des Hebreux* (Paris, 1822); republished under the title *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse 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 Judée et de la Ruine de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1847, 2 vols.); German transl. by Eichler, *Geschichte der Rönnerherrschaft 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

(properly ἡ [σω]τηρία, 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 (⁽⁶³³⁾Deuteronomy 33:29); saved from Egypt (⁽²⁴³⁾Exodus 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 (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 3:18; ^{<1215>}2 Kings 13:5; 14:27; ^{<1012>}Nehemiah 9:27), and that there was not power in man to be his own savior (^{<1804>}Job 40:14; ^{<19316>}Psalm 33:16; 44:3, 7), so that he must look to God alone for help (^{<2311>}Isaiah 43:11; 45:22; ^{<28104>}Hosea 13:4, 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 (^{<19463>}Psalm 106:13); the “rock of salvation” to a rock where any one takes refuge, and is in safety (^{<10247>}2 Samuel 22:47); “the shield of salvation” and “helmet of salvation” to protection from the attack of an enemy (^{<19185>}Psalm 18:35; ^{<25917>}Isaiah 59:17); the “horn of salvation” to the power by which deliverance is effected (^{<19182>}Psalm 18:2); “the garments of salvation” to the beauty and protection of holiness (^{<23110>}Isaiah 61:10); the “wells of salvation” to the abundant sources of the mercies of salvation, free, overflowing, and refreshing (^{<23113>}Isaiah 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 (^{<19209>}Psalm 28:9; 69:35); to the needy (^{<19704>}Psalm 72:4, 13), to the meek (^{<19769>}Psalm 76:9), to the contrite (^{<19318>}Psalm 34:18), but not to the wicked (^{<19184>}Psalm 18:41) unless they repented and turned to him. Salvation consisted not only of deliverance from enemies, and from the snares of the wicked (^{<19740>}Psalm 37:40; 59:2; 106:20), but also of forgiveness (^{<19709>}Psalm 79:9), of answers to prayer (^{<19913>}Psalm 69:13), of spiritual gifts (^{<19619>}Psalm 68:19), of joy (^{<19512>}Psalm 51:12), of truth (^{<19215>}Psalm 25:5), and of righteousness (^{<19245>}Psalm 24:5; ^{<23458>}Isaiah 45:8; 46:13; 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 (^{<23211>}Isaiah 62:11; ^{<19109>}Zechariah 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, Infant.

SEE INFANT SALVATION.

Salve.

SEE MEDICINE; SEE UNGUENT.

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.)

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 (²⁰¹⁷Daniel 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 poemate 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 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:

*“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.)

Salve Regina

(*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.).

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,

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,

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,

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,

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 liberality 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]): — *Epistoe 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,

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,

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,

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'

(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,

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,

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,

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. Another 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 Königsberg. 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 Salzburger, 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,

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 Tübingen. 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 Oecolampadius, 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'ael

(Σαμαήλ v.r. Σαλαμιήλ), a corrupt form (Judith 8:1) of the Heb. name (^{Q1006}Numbers 1:6) SHELUMIEL *SEE SHELUMIEL* (q.v.).

Samai'as

(Σαμαΐς, but v.r. in Tobit Σεμέας, Σεμελίας, etc.), a Graecized form for the name SHEMAIAH *SEE SHEMAIAH* (q.v.): *a.* a Levite (1 Esdr. 1:9), in the reign of Josiah (^{Q1219}2 Chronicles 25:9); *b.* an Israelite (1 Esdr. 8:39) of the "sons" of Adonikam (^{Q1883}Ezra 8:13); *c.* a "great" personage, father of Ananias and Jonathas (Tobit 5:13).

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

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.

Sama'ria

Picture for Samaria 1

[strictly *Samari'a*], CITY OF (Heb. *Shomeron'*, ^{Ⲱⲱⲙⲓⲣⲱⲥ} *owatch*, so called probably from its commanding site, as well as by alliteration with its original owner's name; Chald. *Shomra'yin*, ^{Ⲷⲱⲙⲓⲣⲱ}; ^{<500>}Ezra 4:10, 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 (^{<1163>}1 Kings 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 (^{<1125>}1 Kings 12:25), which had been razed to the ground by Abimelech (^{<1095>}Judges 9:45). But he soon moved to Tirzah, a place, as Dr. Stanley observes, of great and proverbial beauty (^{<2164>}Song of Solomon 6:4), which continued to be the royal residence until Zimri burned the palace and perished in its ruins (^{<1147>}1

Kings 14:17; 15:21, 33; 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 (^{<2008>}Isaiah 9:8; ^{<2023>}Jeremiah 23:13, 14; ^{<2066>}Ezekiel 16:46-55; ^{<3001>}Amos 6:1; ^{<3001>}Micah 1:1), sometimes in connection with Jerusalem (especially by Hosea). Ahab built a temple to Baal there (^{<1163>}1 Kings 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” (^{<1205>}2 Kings 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 (ver. 18-28). Samaria must have been a place of great strength. It was twice besieged by the Syrians, in B.C. 901 (^{<1100>}1 Kings 20:1) and in B.C. 892 (^{<1164>}2 Kings 6:24, 20); but on both occasions the siege was ineffectual. On the latter, indeed, it was relieved miraculously, 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 (15:13, 14); and woes denounced against the nation were directed against it by name (^{<2009>}Isaiah 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 (^{<1436>}2 Chronicles 28:6-15). In B.C. 720 Samaria was taken, after a siege set (or, rather, by his successor Sargon), king of Assyria (^{<1289>}2 Kings 18:9, 10), and the kingdom of the ten tribes was demolished by the condestryed. The city doubtless queror. Col. Rawlinson, indeed, has lately endeavored to show that Samaria was not at once depopulated (*Athenoem* 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 (**Σαμαρειτικὴ χώρα**) to the Jews to inhabit (Josephus, *c. Ap.* 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 ὄχυρωτάτη**). 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 ^{¹⁰2 Kings 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 1 Macc. 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.

Picture for Samaria 2

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 Janneus (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).

Picture for Samaria 3

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 ~~405~~ Acts 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 ver. 9 of the same chapter "the people of Samaria" represents τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας; and the phrase in ver. 25, "many villages of the Samaritans," shows that the operations of evangelizing were not confined to the city of Samaria itself (comp. ~~405~~ Matthew 10:5, "Into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not;" and ~~404~~ John 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. Palestine 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 μ γρ αἰν οφύλακες, 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 Gergashites, 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 Idumæan (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 Nablus (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 ^{<12167>}2 Kings 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 (*Travels*, 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 (^{3300b}Micah 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" (^{3300b}Micah 1:6; comp. ²⁸³¹⁶Hosea 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, *Morgenlnd.* 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, Region Of

(usually **Σαμάρεια**, the same as the city; but when distinguishing it from the latter, the Sept. and Josephus write **Σαμαρεΐτις** 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*” (^{<1132>}1 Kings 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 ^{<12724>}2 Kings 17:24, 26, 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 (^{<2085>}Hosea 8:5, 6) the “calf of Samaria;” in Amos (^{<3108>}Amos 3:9) the “mountains of Samaria” are spoken of; and the “captivity of Samaria and her daughters” is a phrase found in Ezekiel (^{<2463>}Ezekiel 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” (^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 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” (^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:29). This would be a third limitation. Nearly a century before, B.C. 860, “the Lord had begun to cut Israel short,” for “Hazeal, 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” (^{<1202>}2 Kings 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” (^{<2300>}Isaiah 9:1; 1 Macc. 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 (⁻¹⁴⁸⁰2 Chronicles 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” (⁻¹²⁷⁵2 Kings 17:5, 6), and when again we are told that “Israel was carried away out of their own land into Assyria” (⁻¹²⁷³2 Kings 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” (⁻¹⁴⁴⁶2 Chronicles 34:6). Such a progress would have been impracticable had 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” (⁻¹²⁷⁴2 Kings 17:24; comp. ⁻¹⁵⁰⁰Ezra 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, *Palest.* 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 ^{<271>}Luke 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” (^{<413B>}Acts 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*.

Samar'itan

(Heb. *Shomeroni'*, ^{γναμασο}from *Shomeron*, the Heb. name of Samaria; Sept., New Test., Josephus, and other Greek writers, **Σαμαρείτης**, fem. **λαμαρείτις**; by the later Jews, **μ γλαβκ**, i e. *Cuthites* [q.v.]; by themselves, **μ γρασο** *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 ^{<272>}2 Kings 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 People.* — As we have seen in the preceding articles, Shalmaneser, or Sargon, his successor (^{<2176>}2 Kings 17:5, 6, 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. *Arguments 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. (*Authentic 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” (^{<2176>}2 Kings 17:6, 23), and other nations were placed “in the cities of Samaria *instead* of the children of Israel”

(^{<121724>}2 Kings 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” (^{<12512>}2 Kings 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 (**σαγηνέσαντες**) 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 **σαγηνέειν** 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 **σαγηνέειν** 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” (^{<12113>}2 Kings 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 ^{<121724>}2 Kings 17:24, “the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava (Ivah, ^{<121834>}2 Kings 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 Shallmaneser; for the narrative is scarcely broken, and the re-peopling 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 ^{<1500>}Ezra 4:2, 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” (^{<2308>}Isaiah 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” (^{<12741>}2 Kings 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 ἄλλογενεῖς (~~-41718-~~Luke 17:18); and Josephus's whole account of them shows that he believed them to have been μέτοικοι ἄλλοεθνεῖς 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 (~~-41818-~~2 Chronicles 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 (ver. 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 (~~-15012-~~Ezra 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 for the repairs of the Temple, we are told that the Levites gathered the money “of the hand of *Manasseh and Ephraim, and of all the remnant of Israel,*” as well as “of Judah and Benjamin” (~~489~~2 Chronicles 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*” (~~489~~2 Chronicles 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 embittered 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" (~~1280~~2 Kings 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. ~~2300~~Isaiah 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 Assyrians 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 Assnapper" (~~1500~~Ezra 4:2, 10); and of this there can 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 repopulate 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 (^{<1283>}2 Kings 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 unholy periods (under Ahab) there were 7000 faithful men who had not bowed their knees unto Baal (^{<1198>}1 Kings 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” (^{<1311>}2 Chronicles 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 ^{<1274>}2 Kings 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 ^{<4501>}Ezra 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, ἀλλόγενής, 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 (^{<4271>}Luke 17:11-19). For it is certain that he did not class the Samaritans with the Gentiles, but made a marked distinction between them (^{<4005>}Matthew 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 (^{<4048>}John 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" (^{454B}Ezra 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" (^{450B}Ezra 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 ^{<4633>}Nehemiah 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 Cuthaeen 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 Mycenae. 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, ^{<B012>}John 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 (^{<B034>}Genesis 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 (^{<B048>}John 4:8). From ^{<B062>}Luke 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 Eccus. 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 (^{<B015>}Matthew 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 (ἄλλογενής), 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” (~~John~~ John 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) that 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 **Ιουδαϊσμός**. 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 *Repertorium*, 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.

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 Cuthaeian 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 a h

e a y

i y

u (oo) w

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. **a**) 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 **y** or **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 $\dot{\rho}$ or \therefore at the end of a sentence.

- - (also \cdot) at the end of part of a sentence, like our colon.

\therefore or \leftarrow : more seldom — \therefore etc., or compound $\leftarrow\therefore$ etc., at the end of a longer sentence or section.

$\leftarrow\therefore = \therefore$ 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* (Aldorphi, s. a.); Chr. Ravis, *A Discourse of the Oriental Tongues, viz. Ebrew, Samaritane, etc., together with a Grammar of the said Tongues* (Lond. 1649); Morini, *Opuscula Hebroeo-Samaritana* (Paris, 1657); Hilligerius, *Summarium Linguae Aramoeae, i.e. Chaldeo-Syro-Samaritanoe* (Witteb. 1679); Cellarius, *Horoë 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 Linguarum Sacrarum, sc. Samaritanoe, Hebr., et Syr. earumque Harmonia* (Aug. Vind. 1796); Uhlemann, *Institutiones Linguae Samaritane: accedit Chrestomathia Samaritana Glossario Locupletata* (Lips. 1837); Nicholls, *A Grammar of the Samaritan Language, with Extracts and Vocabulary* (Lond. 1858); Petermann, *Brevis Linguae 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.)

Picture for Samaritan

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 Nachrichten*, 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, Peirese) 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 (¹⁴⁴¹Genesis 46:1, 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 from 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, ^{<15704>}Ezra 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 (^{<15811>}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 für 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 Jubiläen* (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 Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische 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 Bibliothèque 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 Commentario 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, *Vierteljahrsschrift*, 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 *Dissert. 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.

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 **dj a al a hl a tyl**, i.e. “there is no God but one,” runs thus:

1.

hmy[q μ yhl a The everlasting God,
μ l [l d[μ y[qd Who liveth forever;

ˆyl yj l k l [hl a God above all powers,
 μ l [l ˆk ˆmmw And who thus remaineth forever.

2.

/j rtn hbrl yj b In thy great power shall we trust,
 ˆym wh tad For thou art our Lord;
 tydnad!twhl ab In thy Godhead; for thou hast created
 hçyr ˆm hml [The world from beginning.

3.

hysk!trwbq Thy power was hidden,!
 ymj rwrhfww And thy glory and mercy.
 htayskw htayl g ˆyl g Revealed are both the things that are
 revealed, and those that are unrevealed,
 8 8 wkw!twhl a ˆfl çb 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 Heidenhelm, *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 ^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17; 49:10; ^{<0247>}Numbers 24:17; and ^{<0585>}Deuteronomy 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’ (^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17); ‘to him shall the people submit themselves’ (ibid. 49:10); of him also it is said (^{<0247>}Numbers 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’ (^{<0585>}Deuteronomy 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. Heidenhelm, 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 **twmx**. *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 ^{<2312>}Exodus 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 ^{<3105>}Leviticus 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 **tyl f**, *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 ^{<3127>}Leviticus 19:27; 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

h̄çbwbw̄ymj rb μ yhl a hwhy ynda bq[yw qj xyw μ hrba
 ^nynwdabwdbwbkbw 8 8wbw h̄çm wnynday

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 [μ yçt] this prayer [arqm = 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 (qdx

yryg = 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 μ by (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 Gerizim, recognize Jerusalem (viz. its superior claims), and believe in the Resurrection.’”

See Gesenius, *Samarit. Theolog.* (Hale, 1822); *Anecdota Exon.* (Lipsice, 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 Palästina* (Freiburg, 1866), p. 90 sq., 185 sq., 232 sq., 299 sq., 407 sq.; Appel, *Quæstiones 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.

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” — μ tpyyz μ ktrwt — 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 ⁽⁵¹¹³⁾Deuteronomy 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 **h** 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 (^{<RB>}Deuteronomy 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 **hxwj h** (=w| l) to be an epithet of **tca**, “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 Ἑβραϊκόν, giving its various readings in the margin of his *Hexapla* (e.g. on ^{<RB>}Numbers 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 (^{<RB>}1 Chronicles 16:1-11). Jerome (*in Preface to Kings*) also mentions this fact, and in his comment on ^{<RB>}Galatians 3:10 he upholds the genuineness of its text over that of the Masoretic one, but in his *Quoest. in* ^{<RB>}Genesis 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 ὃ καὶ ἀληθές εἶναι καὶ πρῶτον Ἑβραῖοι 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 Nablus, 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, **hnhe**

and **h** **l** **a** **e** **i** and **d** **r** **b** **d**, and **r** **b** **d**; **l** **a** **i** and **l** **a** **e** **i** **k** **a** **y** and **l** **k** **a** **y**, **a** **r** **e** **y** **a** and **a** **y** **q** **y** **a** **v** and **c**, the suffixes at the end of a word, the **h** 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) **n** **v** , **v** **t** **a** **m** **l** **y** **j** **q** . **l** **v** > **a** **r** **h** **r** **p** **c** **h** **z** **h**

(200) , **y** **t** **a** **m** “ **y** **n** > **h** “ “

(130) , **y** > **v** **l** > **v** **h** **a** **m** “ **y** > **y** **l** > **h** “ “

(218) **x** **y** **v** **l** **y** “ **y** **i** **y** **b** **r** **h** “ “

(166) **y** **c** **v** **l** **q** “ **y** > **y** **m** **x** **h** “ “

The Samaritan Pentateuch is halved in ^{<R715>}Leviticus 7:15 (8:8, in Hebrew text), * where the words “Middle of the Torah” (**a** **t** **w** **h** **r** **a** **d** **a** **g** **l** **p**) 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 Nablus 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 ^{<R88>}Leviticus 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 ^{<R715>}Leviticus 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 been 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 (⁽¹²¹³⁶⁾Exodus 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 *hyht* “There shall not *be*,” into *hyj t*, “live,” ⁽¹⁵²¹⁸⁾Deuteronomy 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 *μ yaš* found in the Samar for *μ Aaš* of the Masoretic text; *tw* for *tAwy*; for *wA*; *μ hyl a* for *μ h| a*; *twrwam* for *tram*, etc.; sometimes a *w* is put even where the Heb. text has, in accordance with the grammatical rules, only a short vowel or a sheva: *wynpwj* is found for *wynp]* ;(⁽¹⁸¹¹²⁾Leviticus 16:12); *twynwa* for *twyna'* (⁽¹⁵²¹⁸⁾Deuteronomy 28:68).

(b.) The more poetical forms of the pronouns, probably less known to the Samuel, are altered into the more common ones. Thus *wnj n*, *μ h*, *l aš*; become *wnj na*, *hnh*, *hl ah*.

(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 **dġēw** becomes **dygtw** (⁻⁰²⁴²Genesis 24:22); **tmYwi** is emendated into **twmyw** (⁻⁰³⁵⁸Genesis 35:18); **ary** (verb **h8 8l**) into **hary** (⁻⁰⁴¹³Genesis 41:33); the final **ġ**, of the 3d pers. fem. plur. fut., into **hn**;

(d.) On the other hand, the paragogical letters **w** and **y** at the end of nouns are almost universally struck out by the Samuel corrector; e.g. **ynkwç** (⁻⁰³³⁶Deuteronomy 33:16) is shortened into **kwç**, **wtyj** into **tyh** (⁻⁰⁰²⁴Genesis 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 **µ j l** (⁻⁰⁴²⁰Genesis 49:20), **r [ç** (⁻⁰³⁵⁷Deuteronomy 15:7, etc.), **hnhm** (⁻⁰³³⁹Genesis 32:9); feminine the words **/ra** (⁻⁰¹³⁶Genesis 13:6), **!rd** (⁻⁰³²⁵Deuteronomy 28:25), **çpn** (⁻⁰⁴²⁵Genesis 46:25, etc.); wherever the word **r [n**. occurs in the sense of “girl,” a **h** is 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 **wbWçyw bWçwWl h**, “the waters returned continually,” is transformed into **wbçw wkl h wbWçyw**, “they returned, they went and they returned” (⁻⁰⁰⁸³Genesis 8:3). Where the infin. is used as an adverb, e.g. **qj rh** (⁻⁰²¹⁶Genesis 21:16), “far off,” it is altered into **hqj rh**, “she went far away,” which renders the passage almost unintelligible; or it is changed into a participle, as **[dn [wdwyh** (⁻⁰⁴⁰⁷Genesis 43:7) into the meaningless **8n [dyh**.

For obsolete or rare forms, the modern and more common ones have been substituted in a great number of places. Thus **µ yr [** for **µ ry [** (⁻⁰⁰³⁰Genesis 3:10, 11); **dl y** for **dl w** (⁻⁰¹¹⁰Genesis 11:30); **µ yrwpç** for the collective **rwpç** (⁻⁰¹⁵⁰Genesis 15:10); **twma**, “female servants,” for **twhma** (⁻⁰²⁰⁸Genesis 20:18); **hbwf yk hj wnm aryw** for the adverbial **bwf** (⁻⁰⁴⁹⁵Genesis 49:15); **yj yrb** for **µ yj yrb** (⁻⁰²³⁵Exodus 26:26, making it depend from **yx [**); **µ Vma** in the unusual sense of “from it” (comp. ⁻⁰¹⁷³1 Kings 17:13), is altered into **hNMma** (⁻⁰⁰⁸²Leviticus 2:2); **hyj** is wrongly put for **yj** (3d pers. sing. masc. of **yyj** =is>); **y [**, the obsolete form, is

replaced by the more recent *ry[æ]* (^{<0215>}Numbers 21:15); the unusual fem. termination *yAæ* (comp. *l fyba, l ygyba*) is elongated into *tyA*; *whç* is the emendation for *wyce* (^{<0520>}Deuteronomy 22:1); *yrh* for *yrēhi* (^{<0535>}Deuteronomy 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 *hçaw çya*, “man and woman,” used by ^{<0002>}Genesis 7:2 of animals, is changed into *hbqñw rkz*, “male and female;” *wyanç* (^{<0246>}Genesis 24:60), “his haters,” becomes *wybywa*, “his enemies;” for *hm* (indefin.) is substituted *hmwam*; *ary*, “he will see, choose,” is amplified by *wb*, “for himself;” *rçhi rçhai* is transformed into *rwgy rça rgh* (^{<0370>}Leviticus 17:10); *l a 8hl a rQywiµ [l b* (^{<0234>}Numbers 23:4), “And God met Bileam,” becomes with the Samuel *8b ta 8l abl m axımyw*, “and an angel of the Lord found Bileam; *hçah l [* (^{<0338>}Genesis 20:3) for the woman,” is amplified into *tdwa l [hçah*, “for the sake of the woman;” for *ydknl w*, from *dkn* (obsol., comp. < >), is put *ydgñl*, “those that are before me,” in contradistinction to “those who will come after me;” *r [l wı]* “and she emptied” (her pitcher into the trough, ^{<0249>}Genesis 24:20), has made room for *dyrwtw*, “and she took down;” *hmç ytd[wn*, “I will meet there” (A.V. ^{<0293>}Exodus 29:43), is made *µ ç ytçrdn*, “I shall be [searched] found there;” ^{<0315>}Numbers 31:15, before the words *hkqn l k µ tyhh*, “Have you spared the life of every female?” a *hMl*; “Why,” is inserted (Sept.); for *arqa hwhy µ ç yk* (^{<0538>}Deuteronomy 32:3), “If I call the name of Jehovah,” the Samuel has *µ çb*, “In the name,” etc.

3. The third class consists of conjectural emendations of difficulties; e.g. the elliptic use of *dl y*, frequent both in Hebrew and Arabic, being evidently unknown to the emendator, he alters the *dl wyænc ham ^bl h* (^{<0177>}Genesis 17:17), “shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old?” into *dyl wa*, “shall I beget?” ^{<0242>}Genesis 24:62, *awbm ab*, “he came from going” (A.V. “from the way”) to the well of Lahai-roi, the Samuel alters into *rbdmb ab*, “in or through the desert” (Sept. *διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου*).

In ^{<0374>}Genesis 30:34, **!yrbdk yhy wl ˆhē** “Behold, may it be according to thy word,” the **wl** (Arab. J) is transformed into **al**, “and if not — let it be like thy word.” ^{<0413>}Genesis 41:32, **μ wl j h twVhæ [w**, “And for that the dream was doubled,” becomes **hl [w 8h tynç**, “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, ^{<0490>}Genesis 49:10, **wyl gʾri ˆyBææ** “from between his feet,” into “from among his banners.” **wyl gd ˆybm**. ^{<2158>}Exodus 15:18, all but five of the Sam. codd. read **μ l w [l dw [w**, “forever *and longer*,” instead of **d [w**, the common form, “evermore.” ^{<2347>}Exodus 34:7, **al chQæw]hQnyj** “that will by no means clear *the sin*,” becomes **hqNyæb hqnyj** “and the innocent *to him* shall be innocent,” against both the parallel passages and the obvious sense. The somewhat difficult **Wpsy; al w**, “and they did not cease” (A.V. ^{<04125>}Numbers 11:25), reappears as a still more obscure conjectural **Wpsæyæ** which we would venture to translate, “they were not gathered in,” in the sense of “killed:” instead of either the **wçnka**, “congregated,” of the Samuel Vers., or Castell’s “continuerunt,” or Houbigant’s and Dathe’s “*convenant*.” ^{<0228>}Numbers 21:28, the **r [;** “Ar” (Moab), is emendated into **d [j** “as far as,” a perfectly meaningless reading; except that the **r [;** “city,” it seems, was a word unknown to the Samaritan. The somewhat uncommon words (^{<04132>}Numbers 11:32) **j wfç μ hl wj fçyw**, “and they (the people) spread them all abroad,” are transposed into **hfwj ç μ hl wfj çyw**, “and they slaughtered for themselves a slaughter.” ^{<6337>}Deuteronomy 28:37, the word **hMvli]** “an astonishment” (A.V.), very rarely used in this sense (^{<2498>}Jeremiah 19:8; 25:9), becomes **μ vèj** “to a name,” i.e. a bad name. ^{<6316>}Deuteronomy 33:6, **yhyw rpsm wytm]** “May his *men* be a multitude,” the Samuel, with its characteristic aversion to, or, rather, ignorance of, the use of poetical diction, reads **rpsm wTææyhyw**, “May there *be from him* a multitude,” thereby trying perhaps to encounter also the apparent difficulty of the word **rpsm**, standing for “a great number.” Anything more absurd than the **wtam** in this place could hardly be imagined. A few verses farther on, the uncommon use of **ˆmæ** in the phrase **ˆWmWqy] ˆmæ** (^{<6331b>}Deuteronomy 33:11), as “lest,” “not,” caused the no less unfortunate alteration **Wnmyqy]mas**, 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 **Ūabḏ**;

(⁻⁰³²⁵Deuteronomy 33:25; A.V. “thy strength”), **ybr** is 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 **hç[a al** (⁻⁰¹⁸⁹Genesis 18:29) becomes **al tyj ça**, according to ver. 28. Proper names, which are variously written in Hebrew, are all conformed to one orthography, as **wrtj**, Moses’s father-in-law. In ⁻⁰¹¹⁸Genesis 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, *Horie 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 *Horie 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.	A	B	C	A	B	C
Jared	162	800	962	62	785	847
Enoch	65	300	365	65	300	365
Methuselah	18	782	969	67	653	720
Lamech	182	595	777	53	600	653

POSTDILUVIANS.

Heb./Sam.	A	B	C	A	B	C
Arphaxad	35	403	438	135	303	438
Eber	34	430	464	134	270	404
Peleg	30	209	239	130	109	239
Reu	32	207	239	132	107	239
Serung	30	200	230	130	100	230
Nahor	29	119	148	79	69	148

Under this head falls the passage in ^{<0224>}Exodus 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 ^{<0817>}Galatians 3:17). In ^{<0012>}Genesis 2:2 **y[ybv**h is altered into **yvv**h, 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: **frrh** becomes **frra** (^{<0004>}Genesis 8:4); **yab** is altered into **y[b** (23:18); **hbç** into **[bç** (^{<0279>}Genesis 27:19); **yl hz** stands for **yl j z** (^{<0324>}Deuteronomy 32:24); *the h* is changed into **j** in words like **ghn**, **μ yhb**g, which become **gj n**, **μ yj b**g; **j** is altered into **[** — **rmj** becomes **rm[**. The **y** is frequently doubled (? as a *mater lectionis*): **byfyyh**; is substituted for **byfyh**; **aryya** for **arya**; **ypp** for **yp**. Many words are joined together: **rwrdr**m stands for **rwr d rm** (^{<0213>}Exodus 30:23); **^anhk**

for $\hat{a} \hat{h}k$ (^{<0445>}Genesis 41:45); $\mu yzrg rh$ is always $\mu yzrgrh$. The pronouns $T\hat{h}i$ and $\hat{T}a$, 2d pers. fem. sing. and plur., are changed into yta and $\hat{y}ta$ (the obsolete Heb. forms) respectively; the suff. \hat{U} into $!a!into!y$; the termination of the 2d pers. sing. fem. pret., $T\hat{A}$, becomes $yT\hat{a}i$ like the 1st pers.; the verbal form Aphel is used for the Hiphil; $ytrkza$ for $ytrkzh$; the medial letter of the verb $w8 8[$ is sometimes retained as a or y , instead of being dropped as in the Hebrew. Again, verbs of the form $h8888 8l$ have the y frequently at the end of the infin. fut. and part., instead of the h . Nouns of the *schema* $l f\hat{q};(l b\hat{a};$ etc.) are often spelled $l yf\hat{q};$ into which the form $l w\hat{b}q;$ is likewise occasionally transformed. Of distinctly Samaritan words may be mentioned: $!hi$ (^{<0361>}Genesis 34:31) = $!ya\hat{e}y\hat{h}$ (Chald.), “like;” μytj , for the Heb. μtwj , “seal;” $tj rp\hat{k}$, “as though it budded,” becomes $tj rpak$ = the Targ. $tj rpa dk$, 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 (^{<0203>}Genesis 20:13; 31:53; 35:7; ^{<0220>}Exodus 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 ^{<0440>}Genesis 49:7 and ^{<0332>}Deuteronomy 33:12; for example, for “cursed is their anger,” $\mu p\hat{a} rwa$, the Samuel reads, “excellent is their anger,” $\mu pa ryda$; and instead of “the beloved of the Lord shall dwell,” $hw\hat{y} dydy$, 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 ^{<0351>}Deuteronomy 25:11, $wyvbmb$ is changed into $wr\hat{c}bb$.

Here Gesenius puts the notable passage ^{<0270>}Deuteronomy 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. ^{<0048>}Genesis 4:8, where the Samuel adds, “Let us go into the field;” ^{<0213>}Genesis 22:13, **dj a, a**, instead of **rj ai** *behind* (also found in five fragments of old Jewish MSS. at St. Petersburg; see *Journ. Asiat.* 1866, 1, 542); ^{<0414>}Genesis 49:14, where **μ rg, a bone**, is **μ yræ** *bony*; and ^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14, **qdyw**, instead of **qrYwi** 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 **brqh** for **brq** (^{<0128>}Exodus 12:48); and to ignorance of the use of the infinitive absolute, as **wrkz** for **rwkz** (^{<0113>}Exodus 13:3), **rma** for **rwma** (^{<0023>}Numbers 6:23), etc.
2. The characteristics of the Galilæo-Palestinian dialect, such as the interchange of the *ahevi* letters, and of **b** for **p**, of **z** for **x**, 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 **l fε**; and **l yfq**. 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, **μ yr [ç g8 8y**, as follows:

1. **μ ywnçhw twpswhh 8ç μ zyrg rh tl [ml**, additions and alterations in favor of Mount Gerizim, e.g. ^{<0021>}Deuteronomy 5:21.
2. **twpswhh8ç twal ml**, additions to fill up.
3. **rwabh**, explications or glosses.

4. μ y n y n b h w μ y l [p h \tilde{a} w l j], change of verbs and conjugations.
5. t w m \check{c} t \tilde{a} w l j , change of nouns.
6. h a w \check{c} h h , assimilation, or bringing irregular forms into the same uniform type.
7. t r w m t t w y t w a h , permutation of letters.
8. μ y y w n k , pronouns.
9. \hat{y} m h , gender.
10. t w p s w n h t w y t y w a . letters added.
11. r w b j h w s j y h t w y t w a , addition of qualifying letters, as articles, conjunctions, and prepositions.
12. d w r p h w / w b q h , junction and separation.
13. μ l w [t w m y], chronological alterations (*Kane Shomron*, p. 32 sq.).
Comp. for No. 13, Pick, *Horoe Samaritanoe* (~~OR~~ Genesis 5 and 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 *καὶ ἕξοχήν*.

(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 (Ἰδιῶται) 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 Maccabaeian 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 (^{<12724>}2 Kings 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 (*yakswd* in 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 (Tychsel). 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 **hwhy** was 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 **ὄνεκφώνητον**, 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 **hwhy**. 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., **h** and **10:y** and **5, w** and **z, b** and **n, b** and **k, r** and **n, p** and **r, d** and **r**, 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 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.

Genesis 23:2, ^{<0232>}tyrqb qm[l a [brah = ἐν πόλει Ἀρβόκ, ἢ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ κοιλώματι; ^{<0277>}Genesis 27:27, al m hdçh j yrk = ὡς ὄσμη ἄγρου πλήρους; ^{<0438>}Genesis 43:28, awhhçyahwrb μ yhl al = εὐλογημένος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος τῷ Θεῷ; ^{<0513>}Exodus 5:13, μ kl ^tn ^bth = 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 ^{<0101>}Genesis 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 l'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 Bibelübersetzungen 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 Aufklärung uber das A. T.* (Jena, 1785, 8vo); Paulus, *Commentar uber das N.T.* (Lubeck, 1804, 8vo), pt. 4; Hupfeld, *Beleuchtung einiger dunklen und missverstandenen 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); *ʿwr̄m̄w̄c̄ ymr̄k̄*, *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, *Horoē 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.

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, ya [wbç) 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 (/rç) 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” (μ | w [l wnyhl a wrb), 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 **w d j y**. 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 ⁽¹⁰²²⁾Exodus 12:22 in the synagogue, but for "hyssop" (**bwza**) he substituted "thyme" (**r t [x]**). 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 him probably 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.)