

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Samaritan Versions - Schultetus**

*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**

## Samaritan Versions.

There exist three different translations of the Pentateuch in Samaritan, two of which have been translated into Greek and Arabic respectively.

**1. Samaritan.** — The origin, author, and age of the Samaritan version of the five books of Moses has hitherto — so Eichhorn quaintly observes — “always been a golden apple to the investigators, and will very probably remain so, until people leave off venturing decisive judgments upon historical subjects which no one has recorded in antiquity” (*Einleitung*, 2, 320). Indeed, modern investigators, keen as they have been, have done little towards the elucidation of the subject. According to the Samaritans themselves (De Sacy [*Mem.* 3], Paulus, Winer), their high priest Nathaniel, who died about B.C. 20, is its author. Gesenius puts its date a few years after Christ. Juynboll thinks that it had long been in use in the second post-Christian century. Frankel places it in the post-Mohammedan time, on account of the many Arabisms. Other investigators date it from the time of Esar-haddon’s priest (Schwarz), or either shortly before or after the foundation of the temple on Mount Gerizim. Kohn thinks that it was made by different authors. It seems certain, however, that it was composed before the destruction of the second Temple; and being intended, like the Targums, for the use of the people exclusively, it was written in the popular Samaritan idiom, a mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic.

As a whole, the version cannot be called a good one, since the translator seems to have been guided by no proper rules of exegesis. Hence he falls into many mistakes. “Elohim” or “Jehovah” is commonly avoided, and “angel” put instead, to suit the supposed dignity of the divine being. The names of peoples, countries, cities, mountains, and rivers are changed from the old into more modern names, as the following list of geographical names will prove. Thus we read in

### Picture for Samaritan Version

The same is the case with proper nouns. Thus, “land of the tower” (Babylonia); Potipherah (<sup>-045B</sup>Genesis 46:20) is Cohenan; Gad, “a troop will depopulate,” as it is in the Samaritan, is here rendered “a despiser will despise.” In <sup>-010B</sup>Genesis 10:31, for “these are the sons of Shem,” this version has **μç ydył y tqwl j hdh**, “these are *the portions* of the sons of Shem.” Mistakes are numerous and glaring: thus for “the two of them”

( $\mu\eta\upsilon\eta\varsigma$ , <sup><0007></sup>Genesis 3:7), the version has  $\hat{w}yhl \ [ \ ypdr$ , “pursuing them,” apparently because the translator read  $\mu\eta\eta\alpha\eta\varsigma$ . In <sup><0216></sup>Exodus 20:26, “thou shalt not go up by steps” is rendered  $qst \ al \ \hat{y}rq\epsilon b$ , “thou shalt not ascend with prevarications.” In <sup><0424></sup>Numbers 12:14,  $hyba$ , “her father,” seems to have been taken from  $awb$ , for it is rendered “in bringing her.” In <sup><0491></sup>Genesis 49:11,  $hryl$ , “his colt,” is mistaken for “city,” and is therefore translated  $htrq$ . In <sup><0243></sup>Genesis 24:63, for “Isaac went out to take a walk” ( $j \ w\epsilon l$ ), the Samaritan has “Isaac went out to pray” ( $hal \ xml$ ), taking  $j \ w\epsilon$  as equivalent to  $j \ y\epsilon$ ; but in this it agrees with Onkelos, the Arabic, and Persian. Another characteristic of this version is the great number of glosses found in it. Thus, <sup><0015></sup>Genesis 1:15,  $\mu\eta\mu\epsilon\eta \ [ \ yqrb$  is rendered  $hym\epsilon \ qwl \ p\acute{y}l \ pb$ , to which Morinus remarks, “his duabus dictionibus utitur ut firmamentum explicet;” <sup><0057></sup>Genesis 5:27,  $arbyw$  is rendered  $\hat{y}\epsilon\epsilon p \ \acute{a}wdq$ ; <sup><0015></sup>Genesis 2:3,  $tb\epsilon$  by  $qsp \ l \ fb$ ; <sup><0051></sup>Genesis 5:11,  $\hat{y}\epsilon\epsilon p$  by  $\hat{y}\epsilon\epsilon p \ \acute{a}wdq$ ; <sup><0009></sup>Genesis 3:9,  $arqyw$  by  $q[ \ zw \ arqyw$ ; <sup><0052></sup>Genesis 5:12,  $ydm[ \ httn$  by  $ym[ \ yl \ tj \ ntad = the \ one \ which \ has \ been \ brought \ to \ me$ ; <sup><0052></sup>Genesis 5:22,  $\mu l \ [ \ l \ yj \ w$  by  $yj \ w \ \mu l \ [ \ l \ \acute{a}j \ w$  (comp. Kohn, *Samaritanische Studien*, p. 32 sq. The great similarity it has with Onkelos occasionally amounts to complete identity; for instance, the following example, taken from a facsimile by Blanchini (*Evangeliarum Quadruplex*, 2, 2, after 604). On account of this similarity, many critics, such as Hottinger, Eichhorn, and Kirchheim, have held it to have been copied from Onkelos. This, however, seems to be rather an overstating of the case. It is true that  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\acute{\xi} \ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$  and words of uncertain meaning are often rendered by identical or similar expressions in both. Moreover, when Onkelos borrows from Jewish tradition, the Samaritan Targum often follows him. Yet the two are independent. The latter falls into serious blunders from which the version of Onkelos should have protected it; it often retains difficulties of the Hebrew text where the other gives a translation. For instance, the word  $rb\delta$ , “pestilence” (<sup><0015></sup>Exodus 9:15), the Samaritan renders by  $l \ l \ mm$ , “word,” as if it had read  $rb\delta$ ; “a word.” If it had followed Onkelos it could not have fallen into such a blunder, where the true reading is!  $twmb$ , i.e. “with death.”

In <sup><B144></sup>Deuteronomy 1:44, we read **pyrbd**, “bees,” where the Samaritan renders **hyl m**, “words,” as if it read **pyrbd**, which could not have been the case had it followed Onkelos, who renders it correctly by **atyrbd**, “bees.” That the Samaritan Targum has not followed the version of Onkelos may be also seen from the number of difficult Hebrew words, which, although intelligible to the Samaritan translator, he would not have retained had he followed Onkelos, who explained the same. Of such difficult words Winer mentions: <sup><B12></sup>Genesis 2:12, **µhç**; 48:22, **µkç**; 49:10, **hl ç**; 51:29, **ydy l al çy**; <sup><B16></sup>Exodus 1:16, **µynxa l [**; 8:21, **br [**; 13:18, **µyçmj**; 23:28, **h[rx**; 26:6, **ysrq**; 27:4, **rbkm**; 26:19, **µynda**; 28:8, **bçj**; 33:35, **[rp**; <sup><B15></sup>Leviticus 1:15, **ql m**; 2:2, **htrkza**; 2:14, **çr [**; 5:21, **tfwçt**, etc. (comp. p. 39 sq.). Under these circumstances, we cannot but conclude that the Samaritan translator has not known the version of Onkelos, or that he has not perused it; and we can only suppose that single passages have been interpolated from Onkelos; for, as Eichhorn has justly remarked, “the Samaritan Paraphrase went through different hands, and was afterwards edited by one or more Samaritans” (*Introduction*, vol. 1, § 305).

For purposes of exegesis the version is entirely useless. It is simply interesting as faithfully representing the religious ideas and literary progress of the Samaritans; it is valuable also for philological purposes, as being the most trustworthy monument of an important Shemitic dialect. The oldest MSS. hitherto known to exist are both at Rome the Barberini Triglot and the Vatican. The former was bought by Peiresc at Damascus, in 1631, and bequeathed by him to cardinal Barberini, in whose library it still remains. It is imperfect; the oldest parts were written in A.D. 1226, and the end of Deuteronomy was supplied by a later hand in 1482.

The Vatican MS. was bought by Pietro della Valle at Damascus, in 1616. It is much later than the one just described; it is on paper, dated A.D. 1514, with considerable lacunae of words, and even verses (comp. Assemani, *Bibl. Vat. Catal.* 1, 1, 464). This is the only text that has ever been published: it appeared in the Paris Polyglot of 1645, and was thence copied, without, however, a fresh collation of the MS., into the London Polyglot of 1657, from which A. Brüll reprinted it in Hebrew characters, and published it under the title **µwgrt hrwth l [ ynrmç** (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1875). Petermann, of Berlin, intended to publish an edition from

MSS. collated by him at Nablus, but the first part only was published: *Pentateuchus Samaritanus, ad fidem Librorum Manuscriptorum apud Nablusianos Repertorum, edidit et varias Lectiones adscripsit H. Petermann. Fasciculus 1, Genesis* (Berolini, 1872). *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum* (<sup>(A236)</sup>Leviticus 25:26, to the end of that book, and parts of Numbers), *from a Bodleian MS.*, were edited and published by Nutt (Lond. 1874). The Imperial Library of St. Petersburg contains also many fragments of the Samaritan-Arabic translation, as well as of the Samaritan Targum.

**2.** “The Samaritan” in *Greek* (τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν). In the fathers, of the 3d and 4th centuries, as well as in MSS. containing the Sept., with fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, we find scholia, or pieces of a Greek translation of the Pentateuch so designated. These fragments have been collected by Morin, Hottinger, and Montfaucon, and are in Walton’s *Prolegomena*. Castell, Vossius, and Herbst think that they are merely translated extracts from the Samaritan Version; while Gesenius, Winer, and Juynboll suppose them to be remains of a continuous Greek version of the Samaritan Pentateuch. On the other hand, Hengstenberg and Hävernick see in it only a corrected edition of certain passages of the Sept. The most probable of these opinions seems to be that which looks upon the notes or scholia as the Samaritan corrections of certain places in the Sept.

**3.** In 1070 an *Arabic* version of the Samaritan Pentateuch was made by Abu Said in Egypt, on the basis of the Arabic translation of Saadias Haggaoon (q.v.). Like the original Samaritan, it avoids anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms, replacing the latter by euphemisms, besides occasionally making some slight alterations, more especially in proper nouns. It appears to have been drawn up from the Samaritan text, not from the Samaritan Version, the Hebrew words occasionally remaining unaltered in the translation. Often, also, it renders the original differently from the Samaritan Version. Principally noticeable is its excessive dread of assigning to God anything like human attributes, physical or mental. For **μῦθι a hwhy**, “God,” we find (as in Saadias sometimes) *Malak Allah*, “the Angel of God;” for “the eyes of God” we have (<sup>(A192)</sup>Deuteronomy 9:12) “the beholding of God.” For “bread of God,” “the necessary,” etc. Great reverence is shown for Moses and the tribe of Levi; but envy of the tribe of Judah (<sup>(A190)</sup>Genesis 49:10). It is written in the common language of the Arabs, and abounds in Samaritanisms. An edition of this version was

commenced by Kuenen at Leyden. Genesis was published in 1851; Exodus and Leviticus in 1854. In Syria it would appear, at the Samaritans still used Saadias's even after Abu Said's had been made, for which reason Abul Baracat (about 1208) wrote scholia upon the latter in order to recommend it to the people. This must not be considered a new version, but a Syriac recension of the Arabic-Samaritan. The two recensions — the Syriac of Abul Baracat and the Egyptian of Abu Said — were mixed together in the MSS., and cannot now be properly separated. For further particulars we must refer to Juynboll and Eichhorn: the former in his *Orientalia*, 2, 115 sq.; the latter in the second volume of his *Einleitung* to the Old Test. Van Vloten described a MS. of Abu Said's in the University of Leyden in 1803; and Juynboll notices the MSS. at Paris, especially Nos. 2 and 4, in the *Orientalia*, 2, 115 sq.

*Literature.* — Cellarius, *Hore Samaritanoe* (Frankfort and Jena, 1705, 4to, 2d ed.), p. 1-58; Uhlemann, *Samaritan Chrestomathy* (Lipsiae, 1837); Walton, *Prolegomena*, ed. Dathé; Castell, *Observations on the Sixth Volume of the London Polyglot*; Eichhorn, *Einleitung ins A.T.* vol. 2; Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samarit. Origine*, etc.; Winer, *De Versionis Pentat. Samar. Indole* (ibid. 1817, 8vo); De Wette, *Einleitung in das A.T.*; Hävernick, *Einleitung*, 1, 1 — Juynboll, *Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samaritanæ* (Leyden, 1846, 4to); Davidson, *Treatise on Biblical Criticism*, vol. 1; Lee, *Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora*, prolegomenon 2, § 1, 3; Kohn, *De Pentateucho Samaritano*, p. 66 sq.; id. *Samaritanische Studien* (Breslau, 1868); also *Zur Sprache, Literatur u. Dogmatik der Samaritaner* (Leipsic, 1876); Brill, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur der Samariter* (Frankfort, 1876); Keil, *Introduction*, 2, 278 sq.; Kaulen, *Einleitung* (Freiburg, 1876), 1, 91 sq.; Noldeke, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, 6, 204 sq.; Barges, *Notice sur deux Fragments d'un Pentateuque Hebreu-Samaritain*, 1865, p. 15; Simon, *Histoire Critique du V.T.* p. 261; Davidson, in Kitto's *Cyclop.* 21, 750 sq.; Deutsch, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 4, 2812 sq.; Nutt, *Sketch of Samaritan History*, p. 106 sq.; Petermann, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 375 sq. (B.P.)

## Samaritans,

Modern. As already stated (under SAMARITAN), a small remnant of the old nation still dwell in their ancient capital, Shechem. There existed a tradition among them, which has yet hardly died out, that large numbers of their

brethren were dwelling in various parts of the world — in England, France, India, and elsewhere — and they have instituted inquiries from time to time in the hope of becoming acquainted with these their brethren. In past ages we do find them not only inhabiting various cities in Palestine, but even in Egypt and Constantinople (El-Masudi, *Hist. Encycl.* 1, 114; Rabbi Benjamin, *Itinerary*). They are now, however, confined to Nablus, the ancient Shechem, and their sacred city through all ages. Here they live together, Ghetto-like, on the southwestern side of the town, at the very foot of Gerizim, their sacred mount. They have dwindled down to a very small number, consisting only of some forty families; and before many generations more have passed away, the ancient Samaritan nation will have become extinct. In 1872 they numbered 135 souls, 80 of whom were males; by the defection of Jacob Shellaby and his family, they have been reduced to a total of 130 souls. Perhaps no people have been persecuted and oppressed from age to age more than they have, yet it has served to knit them the more closely together. In appearance they are superior to their circumstances, as also to all others around them — a straight and high forehead, full brow, large and rather almond-shaped eyes, aquiline nose, somewhat large mouth, and well-formed chin are their chief physiological characteristics; and, with few exceptions, they are tall and of lofty bearing. If the present small community is a fair specimen of what their nation was in ancient times, they must have been a fine race.

A deep interest is attached to this people, not only because they are the oldest and smallest sect in the world, but principally because they retain the opinions, ceremonies, and habits of their forefathers, and are, like their Jewish brethren, a living evidence of the truth of Bible history, especially that of the Pentateuch. Our object will be, therefore, to give a summary account of all the principal features of their life and manners, as exhibited by these remaining votaries; and for this purpose we chiefly follow Mills's abridgment (in Fairbairn's *Dictionary*) of his larger account (*Three Months in Nablus*, Lond. 1864).

## I. *Domestic Life and Duties.* —

**1. Circumcision.** — The first and most important is to admit the male child into the Abrahamic covenant by circumcision. This ceremony must be performed on the eighth day, even should that be the Sabbath, as it was undoubtedly the practice of the Jews of old (~~1722~~ John 7:22); and not in the synagogue, but always in the house of the parents. The performance of the

rite devolves upon the priest; but should he happen to be absent, any one acquainted with the mode of operating may do it. During the celebration of the ceremony the name of the child is announced, as of old (<sup><0159></sup>Luke 1:59), and, when over, they celebrate it (as the Jews do) by a feast, enlivened by Arab music and singing. If the child be female, the only observance is that of naming, which takes place on the third day at the parents' house, without any particular rite or gathering of friends, the priest simply announcing it in the hearing of those who may happen to be present. Formerly, they used to redeem the first-born child, as the Jews still do, according to the commandment (<sup><0113></sup>Exodus 13:13), but now the ceremony is discontinued on account of the poverty of their people.

**2. Marriage.** — Like most Easterns, the Samaritans have a strong desire for offspring, a feeling which is probably intensified by the paucity of their number. This, together with an early development in such a climate, leads them, like all their neighbors, to marry at a very early age, the males being eligible at fourteen and the females at ten years of age. But they never intermarry with persons of another creed, whether circumcised or uncircumcised; and never marry but on a Thursday, this in their estimation being a peculiarly propitious day. They have no betrothing, and the marriage rite is very simple. Upon the appointed day, two men who are witnesses of the agreement conduct the bride and her friends at midday to the bridegroom's house, where the ceremony is performed by the priest. The service is in Hebrew — an unknown tongue to those most concerned — and consists of portions of the law interspersed with certain prayers; and the marriage agreement is read, by which the young bridegroom has to pay a fixed dowry to the father of the bride. In the evening a feast is made, followed by music, singing, and dancing, performed, however, not by themselves, but by hired Mussulmans. Here we may observe that they are not given to polygamy. There is nothing in their theology prohibiting it, but this virtue has grown upon them from necessity, on account of the unequal distribution of the sexes. Their present rule, and one which has existed for some ages past, is that any one may take an additional wife if the first wife be willing, but on that condition only.

**3. Divorce.** — The Samaritans are not given to divorcement, and in this matter they stand in singular contrast to their Jewish and Mohammedan neighbors. Their modern theology at least forbids it, except only for the cause of fornication, but their strict conformity to this dogma under all circumstances is very doubtful.



**4. Purifications.** — There are seven things that particularly defile a person, four of which relate to both sexes, the remaining three pertaining to the female: (1) the conjugal act; (2) nocturnal pollution; (3) touching any dead body; (4) touching unclean birds, quadrupeds, or reptiles; (5) a female from hemorrhage; (6) a female's menstrual discharge, when she remains unclean for seven days; (7) childbirth, when the mother is accounted unclean for forty-one days if the child be male, but if female for eighty days. On account of these defilements they purify themselves most scrupulously. Formerly, when sacrifices used to be offered, the ashes of a burned heifer were kept to be mixed with running water and sprinkled on the unclean person by one that was clean according to the law (<sup><BIB></sup>Numbers 19:17-19). Now running water only is used. The washing of hands as a rite of purification at rising and before eating, etc., as the Jews do, is never observed by the Samaritans; they simply do it for the purpose of cleansing, and not as a religious ceremony (comp. <sup><BIB></sup>Mark 7:3, 4).

**5. Morning and Evening Prayer.** — The first duty on rising is to repeat the morning prayer, which is long and tedious. It is generally offered by each individual in private, although there is no law against its being performed in the presence of the family. Any one is at liberty to repeat this or any other prayer as often as he pleases during the day, but the morning and evening orisons must on no account be neglected, and must be said in the early morning and at sunset. This, like all their other prayers, is a set one in the Hebrew tongue, and consequently not understood except by some one or two besides the priest. Still, the sacredness of the language, combined with the antiquity of the formula, imparts to it a kind of hallowedness, which has a strange hold upon the conscience of the people. During the prayer they always turn towards Mount Gerizim.

**6. Food.** — When they sit to eat, a blessing is pronounced before the food is served. This duty devolves upon the head of the family. They make the broadest distinction in articles of diet; adhering faithfully to the law of Moses, and attaching the greatest importance to its observance. They never eat the flesh of any beast that does not chew the cud and divide the hoof (<sup><BIB></sup>Leviticus 11:3-8; <sup><BIB></sup>Deuteronomy 14:6-8), and swine are held in the greatest detestation. All kinds of poultry, except those notified as unclean (<sup><BIB></sup>Leviticus 11:13-25), are considered lawful, as well as all fish that have fins and scales (<sup><BIB></sup>Leviticus 11:9-12). Like the Jews, they never partake of flesh and butter (or milk) at the same meal, nor do they even place them on the table at the same time. Six hours must elapse after partaking of meat

before milk or butter can be taken. The Jews found this custom on the passage, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk” (<sup><02319></sup>Exodus 23:19), but the Samaritans refuse it the importance of a law of Moses, and only observe it as a sanatory rule laid down by their sages. They hold it unlawful to eat anything prepared by either Jews or Gentiles, therefore they make their own bread, cheese, butter, etc. Cattle and poultry too must be slaughtered by their own *shochet*, or killer, who has to pass through a course of study and training before he is qualified to kill according to the numerous rules prescribed by their sages.

## Picture for Samaritans 1

**7. Duties towards the Dead.** — The Samaritans, like the Jews, teach the dying person to say as his last words, “The Lord our God is one Lord.” This last utterance must be in the Hebrew, therefore all their people, women and children, are most carefully taught this phrase. The relations of the dead never rend their clothes, as they consider it to be contrary to the will of God. Nor have they any fixed time to mourn, or formula to repeat over the departed. With them it is simply a matter of feeling; some mourn for a long and some for a shorter time. But to indulge in grief is discouraged, forasmuch as the high priest was forbidden to mourn for the dead (<sup><02110></sup>Leviticus 21:10); so they consider the refrainment from it to be a proof of a more thorough obedience to the will of God and a higher religious state of mind. As anciently, the house wherein the dead body lies is rendered unclean (<sup><04914></sup>Numbers 19:14), and the priest carefully avoids crossing its threshold (<sup><02111></sup>Leviticus 21:11).

As soon as the dying person has expired, they perform the ceremony of **hrhfi**(*taharah*), purification, by washing the body carefully with clean running water. This is done by individuals appointed to that duty from among themselves, after which it is wrapped in a cotton shroud (<sup><03144></sup>John 11:44), and then placed in a wooden coffin. It is curious to observe that no other natives of any creed use coffins; the Samaritans, however, scrupulously follow the example set them by their father Joseph (Genesis 1, 26). When a death is expected, the law is read in the chamber of the sick, not by the priest, but by one appointed for that purpose. As soon as all hope of recovery is given up, the reading begins, is continued to the patient’s death, and again resumed after the *taharah*, and continued to <sup><04011></sup>Numbers 30:1. After arranging the funeral procession, the reading is once more proceeded with until the whole law be read.

**II. Religion.** — The Samaritan idea of religion is a national one. To them their faith and people are synonymous. In this sense they are, according to their own belief, the only peculiar people of God, with whom the Almighty has entered into covenants, and which covenants they faithfully keep. These are seven in number, and are as follows:

- a**, the covenant of Noah (<sup><0094></sup>Genesis 9:14);
- b**, the covenant of Abraham concerning circumcision (<sup><0170></sup>Genesis 17:9-14);
- c**, the covenant of the Sabbath (<sup><0312></sup>Exodus 31:12-17);
- d**, the covenant of the two tables of the ten commandments (<sup><0210></sup>Exodus 20:2-17);
- e**, the covenant of salt (<sup><0489></sup>Numbers 18:19);
- f**, the covenant of the Passover (<sup><0112></sup>Exodus 12:2);
- g**, the covenant of the priesthood (<sup><0252></sup>Numbers 25:12, 13). By virtue of these they are separated, on the one hand, from all the Gentiles, and, on the other hand, from the Jews, who, they assert, are cursed since the time of Eli.

**1. Constitution.** — Their people, according to the above idea, constitute a national religious community, over which two officers preside. The chief is the priest (<sup>^hk</sup>) Upon him devolves the performance of all the duties prescribed in the law of Moses as pertaining to the priestly office. These are now but nominal, as they have no sacrifice because they have no temple; but certain prayers are offered instead of sacrifices. These, together with the priestly blessings, are given on all occasions by the priest himself, who is in reality but a Levite, for the last of the descendants of Aaron, according to their own chronicle, died in A.D. 1631. The second officer is the minister, <sup>^zj</sup> (*chazan*), who is a member of a younger branch of the same family. It is his duty to read the public service generally, both in the synagogue and out of it. Upon him also falls the work of educating the children and instructing them in the law. These two officers sitting in assembly constitute their <sup>^yety</sup> *Beor house of judgment*. The priest sits supreme and the minister second, and before this tribunal all Samaritan matters, whether social or religious, are settled. Should a question of any difficulty arise, the priest calls other members of the priestly family to assist

in deciding the case; otherwise all kinds of questions are determined by the two officers alone.

**2. Creed.** — The Samaritans have no formula of belief or set articles of faith, excepting four great tenets: (1) to believe in Jehovah as the only God; (2) to believe in Moses as the only lawgiver; (3) to believe in the **hr/T** (*Torah*), Pentateuch, as the only divine book; (4) to believe in Mount Gerizim as the only house of God. These are the cardinal points of the Samaritan faith; but so far as a more detailed theological creed is concerned, the thirteen articles drawn up by Maimonides would as well express the Samaritan as the Jewish faith. These consist of a belief, in God as Creator and Governor; in one God only; in his not being corporeal; in God being first and last of all things; in God as the only object of prayer; in the truth of prophecy; in the truthfulness and superiority of Moses; in the law as the enactment of Moses; in the unchangeableness of the law; in the omniscience of God; in rewards and punishments; in the coming of the Messiah; and in a general resurrection (*British Jews*, p. 68). Here it is important to observe that their only authority in theology is the Pentateuch — nothing is divine and binding but the *Torah*; all their dogmas are believed, whether rightly or wrongly, to be founded upon that sacred volume; and they are, in fact, strictly and wholly the disciples of Moses. It becomes, therefore, a subject of no little interest to the Biblical student to observe how many of the principal doctrines of revealed truth are held by the Samaritans to be the teaching of the law. For instance, they found the doctrine of a future state upon <sup><12105></sup>Exodus 21:6 — “I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;” being the very passage quoted by the Savior, and drawing from it the same conclusion that “he is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living” (<sup><4125></sup>Mark 12:26, 27); and that of a resurrection they hold to be clearly revealed in <sup><3005></sup>Genesis 9:5. “And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man’s brother will I require the life of man.” But we cannot help thinking that the influence of Christianity is discernible in several points of modern Samaritanism, as well as of modern Judaism; and that some doctrines may be regarded as affiliated to the *Torah* rather than inducted therefrom. Their doctrine concerning the Messiah, although infinitely below the conception of the New Test., is yet far superior to that of the Jews. They never call him Messiah — that name not being in the law — but *Tahebah*, **hbht**, or the Arabic equivalent, *Al-Mudy*, the Restorer.

They believe him to be a man, a son of Joseph, of the tribe of Ephraim, according to the words of Moses (<sup><45316></sup>Deuteronomy 33:16). The promise of his coming was made by Moses” The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken” (<sup><45185></sup>Deuteronomy 18:15). He is to be not a king and conqueror, but a great teacher. His mission is not to shed blood, but to heal the nations; not to make war, but to bring peace. He will restore the law to its purity, preach it to the world, and bring all the nations over to its practice. In fact, he will be a great reformer, expressly sent by the Almighty, and endowed with the necessary qualifications to perform so great and glorious a work. Following his direction, they believe that the congregation will repair to Gerizim, where, under the “twelve stones,” they will find the Ten Commandments, and under the stone of Bethel the golden vessels of the temple and the manna. After one hundred and ten years the Prophet is to die and be buried beside Joseph in the valley. Soon afterwards, on the conclusion of seven thousand years from its foundation, the world is to come to an end.

**3. Synagogue.** — They themselves never call it synagogue. Sometimes they use the Arabic term *bit Allah*, house of God, but the common appellation is *kinshah*, **hçnq**, place of assembly; equivalent to the Greek **συναγωγή**, and the Hebrew **tsnKhi tyBeAt** present they have but one, a small and unsightly building, but large enough for their community. Its extreme length measures thirty-seven feet five inches, with a breadth of eighteen feet. A part of the floor — namely, that of the right — hand division in the accompanying plan is raised a foot higher than the remaining portion. On the left-hand side is a recess some four feet square. The ceiling is vaulted, and from it hang two very primitive chandeliers and a small oil lamp. In the roof is a circular, dome-like window to admit light and air, the only opening besides the door. The small, square recess is the *musbah*, or altar, which is considered to be the most sacred spot in the building. It is here the Torah, or Law of Moses, is kept, in the form of a roll, and in this respect the *musbah* answers to the Jewish *chel*. But it has a further sacredness attached to it. During the existence of the temple on Gerizim sacrifices were slain on the altar, but since its demolition they are considered unlawful; therefore the *musbale* takes the place of the altar, and prayer that of sacrifice. Its place in the synagogue, therefore, fronts the spot whereon the temple formerly stood, so that when the worshippers, during service, look towards the sacred recess their faces may be turned to Mount

Gerizim. A large, square veil hangs continually in front of the *musbah*, in order to screen it from the gaze of the people, as no one is permitted to enter it but the two officials. The congregation consists of males only; but in this particular the Samaritans do not stand alone, as it is common to the natives of all creeds, with the exception of the few Christian Protestants in the country. Should the females wish to be present, they are at liberty to gather outside the building in the court and listen to the service, but no more. On this point Jews and Samaritans agree, but not with regard to the number necessary to constitute a congregation. With the first there must be a *minyan* — i.e. ten males of full age — present before the congregation is legal and the service can be read; but with the Samaritans there is no rule, but, like the Christian practice, it may be formed of any number met together to worship. They never assemble in the synagogue during week days except on the feasts and fasts. On the Sabbath they have three services. The first is a short one at sunset on Friday, at which time their Sabbath commences. The second is early on the following morning, and is much the longest and most important, for during this service the law is shown. The minister takes it out of the *musbah*, removes its covering, opens the silver-gilt case in which it is kept, and exhibits to the congregation that column of the text which contains Aaron's blessing (<sup>(-0123)</sup>Numbers 6:24-27), when they step forward to kiss the sacred scroll. The last service is on Saturday afternoon a little before sunset, and consists of prayers interspersed with portions of the law, and arranged in one liturgy. The language being all Hebrew, the people understand the service but very imperfectly, the officials with one or two others excepted. It is performed in a kind of chant or cantillation most peculiar in its character. It differs nearly as much from the native Arab music as from that of Europeans, and seems to have an origin both ancient and peculiar. They have seventy different melodies, composed, according to their tradition, by the seventy elders of Israel in the time of Moses, which they have preserved and still use on various occasions.

## Picture for Samaritans 2

**4. Sacred Seasons.** — An important part of the Samaritan religion consists of the observance of certain sacred seasons. These are as follows:

**(1.) The Sabbath.** — Like the Jews, they reckon their days from sunset to sunset, according to the expression in Genesis — “And the evening and the morning were the first day.” The Sabbath, therefore, as already said,

commences at sunset on Friday and ends at sunset on Saturday. This day they keep most strictly as a day of rest, upon which no manner of work is to be done, according to the words of the law in ~~(2018)~~ Exodus 20:8-10. To this command they adhere most faithfully, accepting it in its literal fullness. Unlike the Jews, they employ no *gobim*, or Gentiles, to light their fires or snuff their candles, but all within the gates keep the Sabbath alike. Consequently they never have any fire on that day, but scrupulously keep the command, “Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day” (~~(2318)~~ Exodus 35:3). Not a lamp or a candle ever burns in their houses or in the synagogue on that day. When darkness comes on during the reading of the opening service on Friday evening, they never introduce lights, but finish the service in the dark, and remain so in their houses until they retire to rest. Their first and great idea of keeping the Sabbath holy is to remain quiet — never to go out of their dwellings except to the synagogue; and the second is, to live more generously than on ordinary days, but the cooking is all prepared on Friday. Although they carefully abstain from all kind of work, even the most trifling actions, they keep no such guard on their language nor check on their thoughts, but feel at liberty to talk about anything and everything; and of a higher and purer mode of sanctifying the day they have no idea.

**(2.)** *The New Moon.* — Next in frequency, but not in importance, to the observance of the Sabbath is that of the new moon, the *reosh hadesh*, equivalent to the Jewish *rosh chodesh*. The new moon is sacredly watched for, and the afternoon immediately following its appearance, about half past four, the Samaritans assemble in the synagogue to perform the appointed service. It consists of prescribed prayers composed for the occasion, intermixed with portions of the law, especially those referring to the beginning of months (~~(2400)~~ Numbers 10:10; 28:11-14). During the recital of the service, the whole of which lasts about two hours, the minister exhibits one of the roll copies of the Pentateuch to the congregation.

**(3.)** *The Feasts and Fasts.* — The Samaritans are not given to festivals. In this they greatly differ from their Jewish brethren, as well as from some Christian communities. In the Jewish calendar there are above thirty such seasons of greater or less importance; but in the Samaritan only eight, six of which are commanded in the law, the other two being less important. These are the following:

(a.) *Karaban Aphasah*, or Jewish *j sPhig i*, Passover. This is the memorial of their great national deliverance from Egypt (<sup>(P10)</sup>Exodus 12). The time of its celebration is the fifteenth day of their month Nisan, in the evening of the day; but should that happen to be a Sabbath, the feast is held on the previous day. Its place of celebration is Mount Gerizim, which they found upon <sup>(P18)</sup>Exodus 21:18. Therefore, early on the morning of the fourteenth day the whole community, with few exceptions, close their dwellings in the city, and clamber up the Mount, on the top of which, and in front of the ruins of their ancient temple, they pitch their tents in a circle. The lambs, five or six in number, and “without blemish,” are brought on the tenth day, and during the intervening days are carefully kept, and cleanly washed as a sort of purification to fit them for the paschal service (comp. <sup>(R12)</sup>John 5:2). On the sacred spot, near the tents, a fire is kindled, over which two caldrons full of water are placed. Another fire is kindled close by in a kind of circular pit sunk into the ground, where the lambs are to be roasted. At sunset the lambs are slaughtered by five or six young men dressed in blue robes of unbleached calico, having their loins girded, who dip their fingers in the streaming blood and with it mark the foreheads and noses of the children. The boiling water is carefully poured over the dead lambs, and, when fleeced, the right forelegs, which belong to the priest, are removed and placed on wood already laid for the purpose, together with the entrails; salt is added, and they are then burned. The lambs are now spitted and lowered into the oven. The spit is a long pole thrust through from head to tail, near the end of which is placed a transverse peg to prevent the carcass from slipping off. At midnight the lambs are taken up, when the paschal feast commences. A large copper dish filled with unleavened cakes and bitter herbs rolled up together is brought in and distributed among the congregation, all the adults wearing a kind of girdle around their waist, with staves in their hands, according to the command (<sup>(P21)</sup>Exodus 12:11). The lambs are then laid upon carpets and strewn over with bitter herbs, all the congregation, i.e. the men, standing in two rows, one on each side of the lambs. During all this time, a long and tedious service peculiar to the day is recited by the two officials in turn, and when the reading has arrived at a certain point, all the expectant auditors stoop at once, and, as if in haste and hunger, tear away the flesh piecemeal with their fingers, and carry portions to the females and little ones in the tents. In a few minutes the whole disappears except some fragments, which are carefully gathered up, not a particle being left, which, with the bones, are all burned in a fire kindled for that purpose (<sup>(P20)</sup>Exodus 12:10). On the



following day rejoicings continue; fish, rice, and eggs are eaten, wine and spirits are drunk, and hymns, generally impromptu, are sung. Here we may observe that those who are unable to keep the Passover on this day may do so on the same day of the following month; but this second celebration is not kept on the hill, but in their own quarter in the city.

### Picture for Samaritans 3

(b.) *Moed Aphasah*, answering to the Jewish **ג' ית' ומ' ח'י**, or Feast of Unleavened Cakes. Although this feast is intimately connected with the former, still, strictly speaking, they are two distinct solemnities, the Feast of the Passover commemorating the protection given them when the first born of the Egyptians were slain, and that of the Unleavened Bread commemorating the beginning of their march out of Egypt. The distinction of the two feasts is more marked in the Samaritan than in the Jewish mode of their celebration. On the preceding day of the feast, every family removes all leavened bread out of its dwelling, and a most careful search is made, so that the least fragment may not remain. Thus by the evening of the fourteenth day, all leavened bread and fermented drink are laid aside, and unleavened bread alone must be used during the seven following days, according to the law (<sup><01218></sup>Exodus 12:18-20). This bread they call *masat*, equivalent to the Hebrew *matstsoth*; and the cake is made in the same form as the Jewish *matstsoth*, except that it is a little larger, but of the same thickness. The Samaritans, like some of the strict Jews, hang up some of the cakes in their houses till the next Passover, believing them to have the power of charms in warding off evils and drawing many blessings upon the family. The first and seventh days of the feast are kept holy, according to <sup><01216></sup>Exodus 12:16, but the seventh is considered the most sacred of the two. At early morn they form themselves into a procession and clamber up Gerizir, "in honor of God." There, on the sacred spot, the priest repeats the service for the day, which consists of lengthy portions of the law interspersed with prayers and songs.

(c.) *Chamsin*, the "fiftieth," equivalent to the **Πεντηκοστή**; *Pentecost*, of the New Test. It is thus called because it falls upon the fiftieth day after the morrow of the Sabbath of the Unleavened Bread. The Samaritans differ from the Jews in reckoning these days. The latter begin to count them from the second day of the Unleavened Bread, on whatever day of the week it may happen; but the Samaritans commence on the morrow of the Sabbath which falls within the days of that feast, and cite as their authority



opportunity only occurs annually. The service is undertaken by the priest and minister alternately, with the occasional help of one of the congregation. A little after sunset the anxious and tedious duties of the solemn day are over.

(f.) *Sekuth*, the Jewish ~~tw~~<sup>tw</sup>~~ksu~~<sup>ksu</sup> *Tabernacles*. They begin this festival on the fifteenth day of the same month, and keep it for seven days, conforming literally to the injunctions in ~~(Ex 23)~~ Leviticus 23:34-36, 40-43. On the eleventh day they begin the erection of the booths, which must be finished by the morning of the fourteenth. These are raised in the courts of their houses, in the open air. On each day of this feast service is held in the synagogue both morning and evening, and they make in procession a daily ascent of Gerizim, "in honor of God." No servile work is done, nor is any business transacted during these days, of which the eighth and last is held the most sacred.

Besides the sacred seasons already mentioned, they have two others of less important character. The first is *Reosh-ashena*, *Rosh-hashanah* of the Jews, the beginning of the year. It is held, not on the first day of Tishri, the beginning of the civil year, but on the first day of Nisan, the commencement of their ecclesiastical year. The day is not kept sacred, for they all follow their usual vocations; they simply attend a short service in the synagogue both morning and evening. The next is *Purim*, not, like that of the Jews, held in the month Adar to commemorate the national deliverance through queen Esther, but held in the preceding month, Shebat, in commemoration of the mission of Moses to deliver the Israelites out of Egypt.

4. *Sacred Places*. — The religious rites of Palestine, whether performed in honor of the true God or that of idols, were celebrated from the earliest ages on the top of the highest mountains. The Hebrew lawgiver felt it necessary to enjoin on the Israelites the duty of destroying all these sacred high places on their coming into possession of the land (~~(De 12)~~ Deuteronomy 12:2-5); but so deeply rooted was this form of worship in the religious feelings of Israel, as of the surrounding nations, that it proved a snare to them for many ages. It was these early sympathies that made Mount Gerizim so sacred to the children of Ephraim ever since the conquest, and in the same spirit have the Samaritans regarded it through all ages even to this day. Their great holy place is Gerizim. This mountain they hold to be the earth's center, the house of God, the highest mountain on earth, the

only one not covered by the flood, the site of altars raised by Adam, Seth, and Noah, the Mount Moriah of Abraham's sacrifice, the Bethel or Luz of Jacob's vision, and the place where Joshua erected first an altar, next the tabernacle, and finally a temple. On its slope the cave of Makkedah is also shown, though now closed up. Just as the Jew in all parts of the world turns his face in prayer towards the Temple mount at Jerusalem, so does the Samaritan to Gerizim, his temp mount. To him it is "the house of God," "the house of Jehovah," "the mountain of the world," "God's mountain," "the Sanctuary," "the mountain of the Divine Presence," and other such like titles — all flowing from their extravagant notions of its sacredness. They rarely write its name without the addition "the house of God." It was this same spirit that moved the woman of Samaria to answer the Savior with such an air of pride — "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain" (~~John~~ John 4:20). *SEE GERIZIM.*

But Samaritanism has other holy places. These are the tombs of their early prophets and holy men — viz. Joseph, Eleazar, Ithamar, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, the seventy elders, and Eldad and Medad. All these, according to their tradition, are buried in the neighborhood of Shechem, and on certain occasions the congregation visit them, when portions of the law and prayers are repeated. This is especially the case with the tombs of Phinehas and Eleazar, but even more so with that of Joseph, which they visit frequently.

**III. Local Literature.** — Before giving a summary of the books of the modern Samaritans, it is necessary to remark that they are, to a certain extent, a trilingual people. Of these languages the first is Hebrew. The fact of its being the language of the Law of Moses makes it to them, as to the Jews, the *leshon hak-kodesh*, or holy tongue. All their sacred books and their religious services are therefore in Hebrew, although it is to them, with few exceptions, a dead language. The second is the Samaritan. Its basis was the Hebrew, and it was thoroughly Shemitic in framework; but its superstructure contained many anomalies, some of which were harsh and foreign. *SEE SAMARITAN LANGUAGE.* From what now remains of it, its general construction seems very simple, and not unfrequently lucid and forcible; and, as pronounced by the Samaritans, it is much more euphonious than the Arabic. Soon after the Mohammedan conquest of Palestine, it gradually lapsed into a dead language. The only literature now remaining in it consists of the forms of the Pentateuch and a few other works, above noticed. The third tongue is the Arabic, the language of their

conquerors. This soon supplanted the Samaritan, and has ever since remained their vernacular, and most of their works have been translated into Arabic for the sake of such of their people as understand no other.

## Picture for Samaritans 4

It is difficult, at this time, to determine to what extent the ancient Samaritan literature was developed, though there is enough evidence to show that much mental activity existed among the people in former ages. Of their literary productions but little remains, owing in part to the destructive hand of time, but much more to the ravages they suffered during the first centuries of the Christian era, and again under the Mohammedan rule. The works now known as extant may be classified under four heads, and we arrange the lists according to the Samaritan dates, including some already enumerated under SAMARITAN LITERATURE.

**1. Theological.** — It is to this class most belong, and the first on the list is the Torah, or Law of Moses. *SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.*

*Risalat Achbor Israel*, a work explaining the feasts, their object, and manner of keeping them, by Eleazaer, a priest who is said to have lived in the 5th century after the conquest of Palestine by the tribes. (Composed in Hebrew, of which there is an Arabic translation.)

*Sharich*, an exposition of the book of Exodus by various authors. (Written in Hebrew, with an Arabic translation. No date, but ancient.)

*El-Amir*, a commentary on portions of the law by Maraka, who flourished about fifty years before Christ. (Hebrew, with an Arabic translation.)

*Sharich*, an exposition of Genesis from the beginning to ch. 28; the author not known, but dates from the 2d century of our era. (Written in Hebrew, but, like the former, has an Arabic translation.)

*El-Kaffi*. This is a work discussing the doctrines contained in the law, written by Juseph el-Askari, A.D. 700. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Masail Chilafi*, a work discussing the differences between the Jews and Samaritans, by Munaji Naphes ed-Din, who lived in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*El-Mulhalal fi en-Nikahi*, an explanation of the laws of marriage, by Abul-Barakat, who lived in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Kitab el-Mirath*, a work on the laws and regulations of wills and testaments. (Written by the same author, in Hebrew, with an Arabic translation.)

*Sharich*, a historical exposition of the law, showing how the ancients observed it; written by El-Hhabr Jacub in the 12th century. (In Hebrew only.)

*Sharich*, an exposition of the book of Exodus, by Ghazal ed-Duik, of the 13th century. (In Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Sharich*, a book explaining the blessings and cursings of the law, by Ibrahīm el-Kaisi, of the 16th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Risalat el-Arshad*, a book on the days of the month upon which the feasts were to be held, written by Ibrahīm il-Ahi, an author of the 18th century. (Hebrew and Arabic)

*Sharich*, an exposition of the whole book of Genesis, written by Musalem el-Murjam, of the last century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Sharich*, an exposition of the books of Leviticus and Numbers, by Ghazal el-Matari who lived in the last century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Sharich*, a work concerning the Eternal, together with certain social points, principally marriage and the Sabbath, by Ghazal ibn Ramiyahn. (Hebrew and Arabic, but without date.)

**2. Liturgical.** — This class comprises all the books relating to their public and private services, such as the feasts and fasts, circumcision, marriage, and burial. They consist of passages from the Torah, interspersed with prayers and poetic compositions, the reading of which is principally performed with a kind of cantillation; hence the term *Tartil* generally applied to these books. This class is nearly as extensive as the theological, and contains much interesting matter and many beautiful passages, but the works have not yet received the attention they deserve. The most important are the services for the annual feasts and fasts, eleven in number—namely, one for the ordinary Sabbaths throughout the year; one for the two Sabbaths preceding Passover; one for the Passover; one for the days of Unleavened Bread; one for the fifty days following Passover; one for Pentecost: one for the 1st of Tishri; one for the Day of Atonement; one for

the Tabernacles; one for the first day of the year, and one for the last day of the year.

All these liturgies exist only in Hebrew, as it would be unlawful to translate them into the vulgar tongue. They are all of ancient date, but the authors and compilers are unknown. *SEE SAMARITAN LITURGY.*

**3. Historical.** — In this class there are but few works; these are:

*Tarik.* This is the Samaritan book of Joshua, as it is generally called, and is pretty well known to European scholars since the time of Scaliger, who, in A.D. 1584, received a copy from the Samaritans of Cairo, an edition of which was brought out by Juynboll (Leyden, 1848), with a Latin version and valuable annotations. It contains a brief history of themselves from the close of the Pentateuch down to modern times, and comprising some amount of valuable information mixed up with much that is fictitious and exaggerated.

Another historical work is extant, partly compiled from the above, by Abul-Fatah, an author of the 14th century, but is not held in esteem by the Samaritans themselves.

*El-Tabak*, a history of the Jews, principally relating the judgments that had befallen them; written by Abu Hassan es-Suri in the 12th century. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

*Kitab es-Satir*, a compendium of history from Adam to Moses. No author is named; but it is stated to have been written at the command of Moses. (Hebrew only.)

*Ihlm Attawarik.* This is simply a chronological table according to the Samaritan dates, extending from the creation of man to the present time. It is well known that the Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch differs in its dates from both the Jewish Hebrew text and the Sept. version, thus causing a difference in the date of all subsequent historical events. Independently of this, there is a further difference between this table and all other accepted data down to the commencement of the Christian era. For example, the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan took place, according to common chronology, in A.M. 2553; but, according to the Samaritan, it was in 2794, making a difference of 241 years. The same chronology gives the age of the world at the commencement of the Christian era as 4438 A.M., while

the accepted date is 4004, thus making a difference of 434 years. But from this period the table generally agrees with our ordinary chronology.

**4. Scientific.** — Under this head may be comprised the following:

*El- Chubs*, an astronomical work treating of the rules regulating the first month of the year, and the conjunctions of the sun and moon. It was written, we are told, under the direction of Adam. (Hebrew.)

*Risalat*. This is a sort of exposition of the former work, written by several authors, but whose names and times are unknown. (Hebrew and Arabic.)

To the foregoing list may be added the following works extant and known in Europe, but not now in the possession of the Samaritans themselves — viz. Ghazal and Zadaka on parts of the law, Abul-Hassan and Zadaka el-Israili on religion and ceremonies; and Abu Said and Abu Itshak Ibrahim on language and grammar.

### Sam'atus

(Σαματός; Vulg. *Semedius*), given in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 9:34) as the name of the fourth of the six sons of Osora (i.e. Abiah or Mochnadebai) among those Israelites who had married foreign wives after the captivity; but the Heb. list (<sup><1504></sup>Ezra 10:41, 42) contains the names Shelemiah, Shemariah, and Shallum in the corresponding place.

### Samavarti,

In Hindu mythology, is an appellation of Dhama, the god of the underworld, who judges the dead and separates the good from the wicked.

### Samba,

In Hindu mythology, was a son of Vishnu in the avatar of Krishna, born of Dshamty, the beautiful daughter of the king of the bears. Samba, guided by the counsel of his father, and in order to avert the infliction of a threatening curse to which he had imprudently exposed himself, built a city, to which he gave his own name, and introduced in it the worship of the sun, to which he gathered the priests by conveying them on the saddle horse Garudha, which was sacred to Vishnu.



## Sambation,

A river mentioned in the Talmud as flowing during the first six days of every week and drying up on the Sabbath. The rabbins are not agreed as to the situation of the river, some placing it on the borders of Ethiopia and some in India. *SEE SABBATICAL RIVER,*

## Sam-Beid, Or Saman Veda,

Is the Hindu title of the third section of the Vedas (q.v.).

## Samber,

In Hindu mythology, is an evil demon and king of giants, who brought under his power the beautiful Reti, consort of the god of love, and sought to win her for himself, but was defeated by Kamadewa, the son of Krishna.

## Sambhara,

Synonymous with SAMBER *SEE SAMBER* (q.v.). Sambhava, in Hindu mythology, is the third of the twenty-eight Buddhas who have hitherto appeared to save the world. His symbol is a horse, which therefore constantly appears with him in the representations.

## Sambiasi, Francesco,

An Italian missionary to China, was born at Cosenza in 1582, and died in 1649.

## Sa'mech

(prop. *Sa'mek*, **ס**; fully **Ĕms**; a *prop*), the fifteenth letter of the Heb. alphabet (<sup><BIB></sup>Psalm 119:113). *SEE ACROSTIC.*

## Same'ius

(**Σαμείος**, v.r. **Σαμάιος** and **Θαμάιος**), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:21) of the name **שֵׁמַיָּא** (q.v.) of the Heb. text (<sup><BIB></sup>Ezra 10:21).

## Samerius, Henry,

A Jesuit, was born in France in 1540. For some time he was confessor to Mary queen of Scots. He died about 1610. He was the author of a work entitled *Chronologia Sacra*.

## Sam'gar-ne'bo

(Heb. *Samgar' Nebu'*, *WbnArGmšj* sword of *Nebo*, or perhaps conqueror of *Nebo*; Sept. *Σαμαγάδ*, v.r. *Σαμαγαώθ*, *Σαμαγάρ*), one of the princes or commanders of Nebuchadnezzar's army against Jerusalem at its downfall (<sup><248B></sup>Jeremiah 39:3). B.C. 589. The *Nebo* (q.v.) is the Chaldean Mercury; about the *Samgar*, opinions are divided. Von Bohlen suggested that from the Sanskrit *sangara*, "war," might be formed *sangara*, "warrior," and that this was the original of *Samgar*. Fürst suggests that *nebo* should perhaps be joined to the following word *Sarsechim* (q.v.), as in the Sept., since it is contrary to analogy for this to stand at the end of a name. *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*, etc. As in ver. 13 the chief of the eunuchs is called NEBU-SHASBAN, it has been supposed that *Nebu-Sarsechim* is only another name of the same person, and that *Samgar* is but a name of his office. It may be compounded of the Persic *cham*, a "cup," and *kar*, a derivative particle, and so be equivalent to *cup bearer*, or *Rabsbakeh* (q.v.).

## Sa'mi

(*Σαμί*, v.r. *Σαβεί*, *Τοβίς*; Vulg. *Tobi*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 5:28) of the name SHOBAI *SEE SHOBAI* (q.v.) of the Heb. list (<sup><192D></sup>Ezra 2:42).

## Sami,

A species of hardwood which the Hindus employ in kindling the sacrificial fire. They believe that it contains a mysterious internal heat which must be called forth by rubbing, and the fire for sacrificial uses is accordingly never produced by any other method.

## Samia,

In Greek mythology, is (1) a daughter of the river god Maeander, who was married to Ancaeus, the son of Neptune and Astypalea, and king of the Leleges, to whom she bore Perilaus, Enudus, Samus, and Alitherses — ancestral heroes of the Samians — and also Parthenope; (2) a surname of *Juno*, derived from Samos, where a primitive statue in the Egyptian style, the work of Smilis, was erected in her honor.

## Sa'mis

(Σαμίς, v.r. Σομεΐς), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:34) of the name SHIMEI (q.v.) of the Heb. list (<sup><1508></sup>Ezra 10:38).

## Samius,

In Greek mythology, is an appellative of *Neptune*, from his temple on Samos.

## Sam'lah

(Heb. *Samlah'*, חַל מַלְחָה *a garment*; Sept Σαλαμά, Σαμαά, v.r. Σαμαδά, Σεβλά), a king who reigned in Edom before the Israelites had a king (<sup><0355></sup>Genesis 36:36, 37; <sup><1047></sup>1 Chronicles 1:47, 48). B.C. post 1618. He was the successor of Hadad or Hadar, and was of Masrekah, that being probably the chief city during his reign. This mention of a separate city as belonging to each (almost without exception) of the "*kings*" of Edom suggests that the Edomitish kingdom consisted of a confederacy of tribes, and that the chief city of the reigning tribe was the metropolis of the whole.

## Sammael,

A demon among the modern Jews, most commonly styled the Angel of Death. The rabbins allege that the removal from the present life of those who die in the land of Israel is assigned to Gabriel, whom they call an Angel of Mercy, while those who die in other countries are dispatched by the hand of Sammael, the prince of daemons. Several of the rabbins confidently assert that the latter has no power over the Jews, and God himself is represented as saying to him, "The world is in thy power except this people. I have given thee authority to root out the idolaters; but over this people I have given thee no power."

## Sammans

(SCHAMANS). *SEE SHAMANS.*

## Sammim.

*SEE SPICE.*

## Sam'mus

(Σαμμούς v.r. Σαμμού), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:43) of the name SHEMA *SEE SHEMA* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (~~כֶּרֶם~~ Nehemiah 8:4).

## Samoan (Or Navigator's) Islands,

A group of nine inhabited islands, with some islets, in the Pacific Ocean, lying north of the Friendly Islands; population in 1869, 35,107. The soil, formed chiefly by the decomposition of volcanic rock, is rich, and the climate is moist. Among the Polynesian Islands, the inhabitants of the Samoan group rank, in personal appearance, second only to the Tongese. They are well formed, and easy and graceful in their movements. Polygamy is customary, but two wives seldom live in the same house. Women are considered the equals of men, and both sexes join in the family labor. The ancient religion of the islanders acknowledged one great God, but less worship was paid to him than to some of their war gods. They had, besides, a god of earthquakes, a god who upheld the earth, and gods of hurricanes, rain, and lightning, and also many inferior gods, who guarded certain localities. They also worshipped certain chiefs, to whose memory they erected carved blocks of wood and stone. The first missionaries landed in Savaii in 1830 from the Society Islands, and, in 1836, were joined by others from England. The first Roman Catholic missionaries arrived in 1846. The inhabitants are all now nominally Christians. There are schools and a church in every village. The children can generally read in their own language at the age of seven years, and most of the adult population can read and write. The Bible has been translated and printed, as have hymn books and other works, at the missionary printing office. In 1869, the population was divided, denominationally, as follows: Independents and Presbyterians, 27,021; Wesleyans, 5082; Roman Catholics, 3004.

## Samoan Version.

The Samoan belongs to the Polynesian or Malayan languages, and is spoken in Samoa, or Navigator's Islands. The translation of the Scriptures into that language appears to have been undertaken, in the first place, by the Rev. John Williams, assisted by other missionaries of the London Missionary Society, who, after the death of Williams, continued and completed it. In 1842 the Gospel of John was published, followed, in 1845, by the Gospel of Luke, translated by Macdonald, and the Epistle to the Romans, translated by Heath. In 1846, the entire New Test., including a

revised translation of the Gospel of Matthew, was completed at press. In 1848, the missionaries sent a revised copy of the New Test. to London, and an edition of 15,000 copies was printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In the year 1855, the translation of the Old Test. was completed and printed; and as to the particulars concerning this great work, we will quote the words of the Report (1856, p. 164):

“Previous to the completion of the New Test. some progress had been made in the translation of the Old; and, in 1848, an edition of 10,000 copies of the book of Psalms was put through the press, bound, and circulated.

“In 1849, editions of 10,000 each of the books of Genesis and Exodus were printed; and in 1850 Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy were also printed, in editions of 7000 copies each. The Pentateuch was then bound in one volume.

“In 1853, editions of 5000 each of the books from Joshua to 2 Samuel inclusive were printed, and in 1854 the remaining historical books; and the whole were bound up in one volume, forming the second volume of the historical books.

“In the same year, editions of 3500 each of the books of Solomon, the Lamentations, and the minor prophets were put through the press; and in March of the present year Ezekiel and Daniel were in circulation, Isaiah in the press, and Job ready for it. The only remaining book to be revised was Jeremiah; so that before this time the whole of the Old and New Tests. will have been completed and printed. The book of Job, with those of Solomon and the Prophets, will, besides the book of Psalms, form the third volume of the Old Test.

“The plan adopted in translation has been to assign to individuals separate books or portions for most careful translation. These portions have been further submitted to the criticisms of the other members of our Mission, and finally revised for the press by a committee of not less than five, including the translators, and then printed in every respect according to the decision of the committee.

“ In the Old Test., our translations have been made from the Hebrew text sent out to us by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and executed agreeably to the rules of the Society. Our

English Authorized Version has been constantly before us, and adhered to as nearly as possible. Constant reference has been made to the Septuagint and Vulgate, and the best use made of the various Polynesian translations. With regard to the lexicography, criticism, and renderings of the sacred text, we have availed ourselves of the labors of Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Lee, Ainsworth, Blayney, Henderson, Lowth, Dathe, Patrick, Good, etc.

“These translations and revisions have cost the members of our Mission many years of patient thought and labor; and it is a cause of great and most devout thankfulness to God that some of us who commenced the work on the Samoan group, and have from the beginning taken a part in the translating of the Sacred Word into its language, have lived to be engaged in it to its completion. To the great Head of the Church, who has enabled us to put this invaluable boon into the hands of the Samoan people, be all the praise.”

Since that time new revised editions have been published. The last edition of the entire Bible left the press at London in 1873, under the editorship of the Rev. Dr. Turner. (B.P.)

### Samogitian Version.

The Samogitian is a dialect of the Lithuanian language, spoken in three districts of Lithuania — namely, Telcha, Schaul, and Rosina. The Samogitians number about 112,000 individuals, and are, with few exceptions, of the Roman Catholic persuasion, whence it is also called the “Catholic dialect.” In 1814, the New Test. had been for the first time translated into this dialect by prince Gedroitz, bishop of Samogitia, who designed to print one thousand copies at Wilna at his own expense. In 1816, a second edition left the press, and in 1831 a third one, printed by the monks in the monastery of St. Cazemir at Wilna. Of the Old Test. nothing has as yet been translated into this dialect. Comp. Dalton, *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 41, 79; *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 313. (B.P.)

### Samoiede (Or Samoyed) Mythology,

The religious system of three Arctic tribes which persist in heathenism, despite repeated efforts to convert them to Christianity. Their supreme being, who is regarded as the creator and director of the universe, is called

*Num*. Innumerable subordinate spirits or gods, called *Tatebi*, are acknowledged, who combine both good and evil qualities in their natures. The priests govern the elements and control the health of human beings. They perform ceremonies in connection with births, marriages, and deaths. The Samoieds build temples, but do not set up representations of *Num* in them, as he is held to be invisible. The only images are those of subordinate deities.

### Samokrestschentsi.

SEE SAMOKRISCHTCHINA.

### Samokrischtchina,

A sect of Russian dissenters, whose name signifies “self-baptizers,” and expresses the peculiarity by which they are distinguished from other Raskolniks.

### Samonas,

Archbishop of Gaza, flourished about 1056. His known work is *Discussion with Achmed concerning the Real Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Sacrament*, found in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 18, 577; Gr. and Lat. in *Bibl. Patr. Gallandi*, 14, 225.

### Sa’mos

(Σάμος, *distinguished*), a noted island in the Aegean Sea, near the coast of Lydia, in Asia Minor, and separated only by a narrow strait from the promontory which terminates in Cape Trogyllium. This strait, in the narrowest part, is not quite a mile in width (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 5, 34; Strabo, 14, 634; comp. Leake, *Map of Asia Minor*). For its history, from the time when it was a powerful member of the Ionic confederacy to its recent struggles against Turkey during the war of independence, and since, we must refer to Smith’s *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* s.v. Samos is a very lofty and commanding island; the word, in fact, denotes a height, especially by the seashore: hence, also, the name of Samothracia, or “the Thracian Samos,” for another similar island. Samos was illustrious at a period of remote antiquity, and was at one time mistress of the sea, but its greatness was of no long duration. Tradition ascribes the birth of Pythagoras to this island, and Creophilus, said to be the son-in-law of Homer, and himself a poet of no mean pretensions, was also a Samian. The period during which

Samos enjoyed the greatest prosperity was that occupied by the government of Polycrates, who made himself master of many among the surrounding islands. The island fell subsequently under the Athenian dominion, and was considered as one of the most valuable dependencies of Athens. The people of Samos were especially worshippers of Juno or Hera, and her temple, called the Hermeon, was enriched by some of the finest works of art known in Greece, particularly statues by Myron, Polyclethus, and Praxiteles. The chief manufacture carried on by the inhabitants was that of pottery, the Samian ware being celebrated all over the civilized world. It was made of a fine smooth clay of a deep red color, and many specimens of it remain to adorn the cabinets of archaeologists. It must be borne in mind, however, that the term Samian ware was soon applied to all of a similar character, wherever fabricated, just as at the present time all porcelain is called by the general name of china. The island is sometimes stated to have been famous for its wines, but, in fact, the wine of Samos was in ill repute. Strabo says expressly that the island was οὐκ εὖοινος. It now, however, ranks high for its Levantine wine, which is largely exported, as are also grapes and raisins. Samos, which is still called *Samo*, contained, some years ago, about 60,000 people, inhabiting eighteen large villages and about twenty small ones. Vathi is the chief town of the island in every respect, except that it is not the residence of the governor, who lives at Colonna, which takes its name from a solitary column (about fifty feet high and six in diameter), a remnant of the ancient Temple of Juno, of which some insignificant remains are lying near. Various travelers (Clarke, Tournefort, Pococke, Dallaway, Ross) have described this island. See also Georgirenes, *Description of Samos*, etc. (Lond. 1678); Panofka, *Res Samiorum* (Berlin, 1822); and especially Guerin, *Description de l'Île de Patmos et de l'Île de Samos* (Paris, 1856).

### Picture for Samos 1

### Picture for Samos 2

Samos is briefly referred to in two places in Scripture. The Romans wrote to the governor in favor of the Jews, in the time of Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 15:23), and Paul touched there when going to Jerusalem, on his return from his third missionary journey (~~4015~~ Acts 20:15). He had been at Chios, and was about to proceed to Miletus, having passed by Ephesus without touching there. The topographical notices given incidentally by Luke are most exact. The night was spent at the anchorage of Trogyllium,



in the narrow strait between Samos and the extremity of the mainland ridge of Mycale. This spot is famous both for the great battle of the old Greeks against the Persians in B.C. 479, and also for a gallant action of the modern Greeks against the Turks in 1824. Here, however, it is more natural (especially since we know, as above from 1 Macc. 15:23, that Jews resided here) to allude to the meeting of Herod the Great with Marcus Agrippa in Samos, whence resulted many privileges to the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 2, 2, 4). At that time and when Paul was there it was politically a “free city” in the province of Asia (q.v.). See Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 2, 18; Lewin, *St. Paul*, 2, 87 sq. **SEE PAUL.**

### Samosatenes, Or Samosatenians,

The followers of *Paul of Samosata* (q.v.).

### Samostrigolschtschina,

A sect of Russian dissenters, whose name signifies “self-ordainers,” and expresses the peculiarity by which they are distinguished from other Raskolniks.

### Samothra'cia, Or Samothrace

#### Picture for Samothracia 1

(**Σαμοθράκη**), a famous island in the northeastern part of the Aegean Sea, above the Hellespont, with a city of the same name. It was anciently called *Dardana*, *Leucania*, and also Samos; and, to distinguish it from the other Samos (q.v.), the name of Thrace was added, from its vicinity to that country. Hence, *Samos of Thrace*, **Σάμος Θράκης**, and by contraction **Σαμοθράκη**, Samothrace. Samothrace is about twenty miles in circumference, and about twenty miles from the coast of Thrace. The island was celebrated for the mysteries of Ceres and Proserpine, and was a sacred asylum (Diod. Sic. 3, 55; 5, 47; Ptolemy, *Geog.* 5, 11; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 4, 23). In ancient times it was the resort of numerous pilgrims, who regarded it as invested with peculiar sanctity. It was the seat of the worship and mysteries of the Cabiri — mysteries in which persons of the highest rank and consideration deemed it an especial honor to be initiated, and which have been a favorite subject for investigation among modern students. Samothrace is mountainous, and the central peak is the highest point in the northern part of the Aegean, and inferior only to Mount Athos

on the mainland. Homer places upon it the throne of Neptune; it towers high over Imbros, and the plains of Troy are distinctly visible from its summit. Homer describes Jupiter as watching from hence the progress of the Trojan war. The traditions of Samothrace extend to the remotest antiquity; they refer to a period when the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Bosphorus were but a series of inland lakes, and the Euxine was entirely shut away from the Aegean. It is the opinion of Niebuhr (*Ancient Ethnography and Geography*, 1, 182) that Samothrace was the center of the Pelasgic religion. Perseus took refuge here after his defeat by the Romans at Pydna. In later times Samothrace had, according to Pliny, the privileges of a small free state, though it was doubtless considered a dependency of the province of Macedonia. The island is now called *Samothraki*, frequently corrupted into *Samandrichi* (ἐς τὸ μανδίκι). It is but thinly peopled, principally by fishermen, and in many parts is covered with forests. It contains only a single village. The mountain is described in the *Missionary Herald* for 1836, p. 246; comp. Richter, *Wallfahrt*, p. 438 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; Conze, *Reise auf d. Inseln d. Thrakischen Meers* (Berl. 1859).

## Picture for Samothracia 2

The mention of this island in the account of Paul's first voyage to Europe (<sup><401></sup>Acts 16:11) is, for two reasons, worthy of careful notice. In the first place, being a very lofty and conspicuous island, it is an excellent landmark for sailors, and must have been full in view, if the weather was clear, throughout that voyage from Troas to Neapolis. From the shore at Troas, Samothrace is seen towering over Imbros (Homer, 2, 13, 12, 13; Kinglake, *Eöthen*, p. 64), and it is similarly a marked object in the view from the hills between Neapolis and Philippi (Clarke, *Travels*, ch. 13). These allusions tend to give vividness to one of the most important voyages that ever took place. Secondly, this voyage was made with a fair wind. Not only are we told that it occupied only parts of two days, whereas on a subsequent return voyage (<sup><401></sup>Acts 20:6) the time spent at sea was five: but the technical word here used (εὐθυδρομήσαμεν) implies that they ran before the wind. Now the position of Samothrace is exactly such as to correspond with these notices, and thus incidentally to confirm the accuracy of a most artless narrative. Paul and his companions anchored for the night off Samothrace. The ancient city, and therefore probably the usual anchorage, was on the north side, which would be sufficiently sheltered from a southeast wind. It may be added, as a further practical consideration not to

be overlooked, that such a wind would be favorable for overcoming the opposing current, which sets southerly after leaving the Dardanelles, and easterly between Samothrace and the mainland. See Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Ep. of St. Paul*, 1, 282 sq., Lewin, *St. Paul*, 1, 200.

### Samp'sames

([Σαμψάμης](#) v.r. [Σαμψάκης](#); Vulg. *Lampsacus*, *Samsames*), a name which occurs in the list of those to whom the Romans are said to have sent letters in favor of the Jews (1 Macc. 15:23). The name is probably not that of a sovereign (as it appears to be taken in the A.V.), but of a place, which Grimm identifies with *Samsun*, on the coast of the Black Sea, between Sinope and Trebizond.

### Sampson, Ezra,

A Congregational minister, was born at Middleborough, Mass., Feb. 12, 1749. He graduated at Yale College, 1773, and became pastor of the Congregational Church at Plympton, Mass., Feb., 1775. He also officiated as chaplain in the Revolutionary army, and was settled at Hudson, N.Y., 1796. While there he became associated with Rev. Harry Crosswell in the editorship of *The Balance*, one of the first literary journals in the United States (1801-4). He edited for a year (1804-5) the *Connecticut Courant*, and became judge of Columbia County in 1814. He died in New York City, Dec. 12, 1823. He was the author of *Beauties of the Bible* (1802): — *Sham Patriot Unmasked* (1803): — *The Historical Dictionary* (1804): — *The Brief Remarker on the Ways of Men* (1817, 1855). See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 2, 122.

### Sampson, Francis S., D.D.,

An eminent Presbyterian divine, was born near Dover Mills, Goochland Co, Va., in Nov., 1814. At the age of sixteen he was placed in the family of his uncle, the Rev. Thornton Rogers, of Albemarle. Finding himself now in a religious atmosphere, he was induced to seek earnestly the salvation of his soul, made a profession of religion, and became a member of the Church in Charlottesville, Aug. 13, 1831. He graduated at the University of Virginia in 1836; subsequently studied theology at the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia; and, on the resignation of Prof. Ballantine, in the spring of 1838, was appointed teacher of Hebrew, and from that time continued to perform other duties of the Oriental department; was licensed

by the East Hanover Presbytery in Oct., 1839, and ordained as an evangelist by the same presbytery in Oct. 1841. In the summer of 1848 he visited Europe, spending his time chiefly at the universities of Halle and Berlin in the prosecution of his Oriental studies, and returned in August, 1849. In Oct. 1848, he was elected professor of Oriental literature and languages in the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, and in 1849 received the degree of D.D. from Hampden Sidney College. He died April 9, 1854. In 1851 Dr. Sampson delivered, at the University of Virginia, a lecture on *The Authority of the Sacred Canon, and the Integrity of the Sacred Text*, which was afterwards published, in connection with the series of which it formed a part; and in 1856 there was published, under the editorial supervision of his successor, Dr. Dabney, *A Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. One of Dr. Sampson's most striking and valuable traits was his methodical industry. "That whatever is worth doing is worth doing well; that each task must be done with one's might in just so much time as is needed to do it perfectly, and no more; that no task is to be left till all is perfected which can be done to advantage — these were the rules of working which he carried with him from the time of his boyhood to the school, the university, the study, and the lecture room." He was eminently conscientious in everything. Family prayers were, in his house, no hurried, unmeaning form. The whole air and tone of the exercise showed deep, conscientious sincerity and earnestness. As an instructor, Dr. Robert L. Dabney says of him, "I hesitate not to say that, as a master of the art of communicating knowledge, he was, in my view, unrivalled;" and again, "One of the foundation stones of his success was his indisputable scholarship. No man ever passed through one of his classes without a profound and admiring conviction of this." See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 4, 795; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s. v. (J.L.S.)

### Sampson, Henry,

A Nonconformist divine, was born in Nottinghamshire, and studied at Leyden and Padua. He was ejected at the Reformation, and subsequently became an eminent London physician. He died in 1705. He published an edition of Porter *on Divine Grace*, and prepared materials for a history of Nonconformists.

## Sampson, Richard, LL.D.,

Bishop of Chichester in 1536. He was transferred to Coventry and Lichfield, 1542-43, and died at Eccleshall, 1554. He is the author of *Commentary on Romans*, etc. (Lond. 1546, 8vo): *Regii Sacelli* (4to).

## Sampson, Thomas,

a Puritan divine, was born (according to Strype) at Playford, in Suffolk, 1517, and educated at Oxford. He was ordained by archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley; was chaplain in the army of Lord Russell. In 1551 he was preferred to the rectory of All-hallows, London, and, in 1554, to the deanery of Chichester. During the reign of Mary he resided in Strasburg. Returning home on the accession of Elizabeth, he refused the bishopric of Norwich, because dissatisfied with the nature of the office. In Sept. 1560; he was made prebendary of Durham, and in Michaelmas term, 1561, he was installed dean of Christ Church, Oxford. So open and zealous was he against clerical habits that in 1564 he was deprived of his deanery, and for some time imprisoned. Notwithstanding his nonconformity, he was presented, in 1568, with the mastership of Wigston Hospital at Leicester, and had, according to Wood, a prebend in St. Paul's. He resided at Leicester until his death, April 9, 1589. He married bishop Latimer's niece, by whom he had two sons, John and Nathaniel. Besides editing two *Sermons of John Bradford* (1574, 8vo), a translation into English of a *Sermon of St. Chrysostom* (1550, 8vo), he published several *Letters*, and a *Brief Collection of the Church and Ceremonies thereof* (1592, 16mo).

## Sam'son

(Heb. *Shimshon*, <sup>שִׁמְשׁוֹן</sup> ~~wom~~ *as* *unlike, shining*; Sept. and N.T. *Σαμψών*, and so Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 8, 4, according to whom, however, the word means "strong:" if the root *shemesh* has the signification of "awe," which Gesenius ascribes to it, the name Samson would seem naturally to allude to the "awe" and "astonishment" with which the father and mother looked upon the angel who announced Samson's birth [see <sup><07136></sup> Judges 13:6, 18-20]), the name of the celebrated champion, deliverer, and judge of Israel, equally remarkable for his supernatural bodily prowess, his moral infirmities, and his tragical end (B.C. 1185-65). His career is one of romantic interest, and affords valuable lessons in the relations and condition of the Hebrew people.

**1. History.** — Samson was the son of Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, and was born, B.C. cir. 1200, of a mother whose name is nowhere given in the Scriptures. The circumstances under which his birth was announced by a heavenly messenger gave distinct presage of an extraordinary character, whose endowments were to be of a nature suited to the providential exigencies in which he was raised up. The burden of the oracle to his mother, who had long been barren, was that the child with which she was pregnant was to be a son, who should be a Nazarite from his birth, upon whose head no razor was to come, and who was to prove a signal deliverer to his people. She was directed, accordingly, to conform her own regimen to the tenor of the Nazaritish law, and strictly abstain from wine and all intoxicating liquor, and from every species of impure food. According to the “prophecy going before upon him,” Samson was born in the following year; and his destination to great achievements began to evince itself at a very early age by the illapses of superhuman strength which came, from time to time, upon him.

As the position of the tribe of Dan — bordering upon the territory of the Philistines — exposed them especially to the predatory incursions of this people, it was plainly the design of Heaven to raise up a deliverer in that region where he was most needed. The Philistines, therefore, became very naturally the objects of that retributive course of proceedings in which Samson was to be the principal actor, and upon which he could only enter by seeking some occasion of exciting hostilities that would bring the two peoples into direct collision. Such an occasion was afforded by his meeting with one of the daughters of the Philistines at Timnath, whom he besought his parents to procure for him in marriage, assigning as a reason that she “pleased him well” — Heb. *awh yny [ b hrçy*, *She is right in mine eyes; not beautiful, engaging, attractive, but right relative to an end, purpose, or object* (see Gousset, *Lexicon*, s.v. *rçy*, and comp. <sup><1070></sup>2 Samuel 17:4; <sup><1092></sup>1 Kings 9:12; <sup><1428></sup>2 Chronicles 12:30; <sup><0487></sup>Numbers 28:27). That he entertained a genuine affection for the woman, notwithstanding the *policy* by which he was prompted, we may, doubtless, admit; but that he intended, at the same time, to make this alliance subservient to the great purpose of delivering his country from oppression, and that in this he was acting under the secret control of Providence, would seem to be clear from the words immediately following, when, in reference to the objection of his parents to such a union. it is said that they “knew not that it was of the Lord that he sought an occasion against the Philistines.” It is here worthy of note that

the Hebrew, instead of “*against* the Philistines,” has “*of or from* the Philistines,” apparently implying that the occasion sought should be one that *originated* on the side of the Philistines. This occasion he sought under the immediate prompting of the Most High, who saw fit, in this indirect manner, to bring about the accomplishment of his designs of retribution on his enemies. His leading purpose in this seems to have been *to baffle the power of the whole Philistine nation by the prowess of a single individual*. The champion of Israel, therefore, was not appointed so much to be the leader of an army, like the other judges, as *to be an army in himself*. In order, then, that the contest might be carried on in this way, it was necessary that the entire opposition of the Philistines *should be concentrated, as far as possible, against the person of Samson*. This would array the contending parties in precisely such an attitude as to illustrate most signally the power of God in the overthrow of his enemies. But how could this result be brought about except by means of some *private quarrel* between Samson and the enemy with whom he was to contend? And who shall say that the scheme now projected was not the very best that could have been devised for accomplishing the end which God had in view? To what extent Samson himself foresaw the issue of this transaction, or how far he had a plan *distinctly laid*, corresponding with the results that ensued, it is difficult to say. The probability, we think, is that he had rather a *general strong impression*, wrought by the Spirit of God, than a *definite conception* of the train of events that were to transpire. It was, however, a conviction as to the issue sufficiently powerful to warrant both him and his parents in going forward with the measure. They were in some way assured that they were engaged in a proceeding which God would *overrule* to the furtherance of his designs of mercy to his people and of judgment to their oppressors. From this point commences that career of achievements and prodigies on the part of this Israelitish Hercules which, passing gradually from the wonderful to the miraculous, rendered him the terror of his enemies and the wonder of all ages.

(1.) On his first visit to his future bride, he slew a lion without weapons; and on his second visit, to espouse her, he found the skeleton, denuded of the flesh by the birds and jackals, occupied by a swarm of bees (~~(074)~~Judges 14:1-8). The strange incident of a Nazarite eating honey out of the carcass of a dead lion has been examined by Theodoret (*Quest. in Jud.* 22). We must not attribute too scrupulous views to the times of the Judges. It is

worthy of remark, however, that Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 8, 6) says nothing of the eating of this honey by Samson and his parents.

(2.) At his wedding feast, the attendance of a large company of paranymphs, or friends of the bridegroom, convened ostensibly for the purpose of honoring his nuptials, but in reality to keep an insidious watch upon his movements, furnished the occasion of a common Oriental device for enlivening entertainments of this nature. He propounded a riddle, the solution of which referred to his obtaining a quantity of honey from the carcass of a slain lion; and the clandestine manner in which his guests got possession of the clue to the enigma cost thirty Philistines their lives (<sup><07140></sup>Judges 14:10-20).

(3.) The next instance of his vindictive cunning was prompted by the ill treatment which he had received at the hands of his father-in-law, who, upon a frivolous pretext, had given away his daughter in marriage to another man, and was executed by securing a multitude of foxes, or rather *jackals* (μυλ [wç, *shualim*), and, by tying firebrands to their tails, setting fire to the cornfields of his enemies. (See the Latin monographs on this subject by Hilliger [Viteb. 1674], Gasser [Halle, 1751], and Vriemoet [Franc. 1738.]) The indignation of the Philistines, on discovering the author of the outrage, vented itself upon the family of his father-in-law, who had been the remote occasion of it, in the burning of their house, in which both father and daughter perished. This was a fresh provocation, for which Samson threatened to be revenged; and, thereupon falling upon them without ceremony, he smote them, as it is said, “hip and thigh, with a great slaughter” (<sup><071518></sup>Judges 15:18). The original, strictly rendered, runs, “he smote them leg upon thigh” — apparently a proverbial expression, and implying, according to Gesenius, that he cut them to pieces so that their limbs — their legs and thighs — were scattered and heaped promiscuously together; equivalent to saying that he smote and destroyed them *wholly, entirely*. Mr. Taylor, in his edition of Calmet, recognizes in these words an allusion to some kind of *wrestling combat*, in which, perhaps, the slaughter on this occasion may have commenced.

(4.) Having subsequently taken up his residence in the rock Etam, he was thence dislodged by consenting to a pusillanimous arrangement on the part of his own countrymen, by which he agreed to surrender himself in bonds, provided *they* would not themselves fall upon him and kill him. He probably gave in to this measure from a strong inward assurance that the



issue of it would be to afford him a new occasion of taking vengeance upon his foes. Being brought, in this apparently helpless condition, to a place called, from the event, *Lehi*, a *jaw*, his preternatural potency suddenly put itself forth; and, snapping the cords asunder, and snatching up the jawbone of an ass, he dealt so effectually about him that a thousand men were slain on the spot. That this was altogether the work, not of man, but of God, was soon demonstrated. Wearied with his exertions, the illustrious Danite became faint from thirst; and, as there was no water in the place, he prayed that a fountain might be opened. His prayer was heard: God caused a stream to gush from a hollow rock hard by; and Samson, in gratitude, gave it the name of *Enhakker*, a word that signifies “the well of him that prayed,” and which continued to be the designation of the fountain ever after. The place received its name from the circumstance of his having then so effectually wielded the *jawbone* (*yj l*, *Lehi*) (<sup><07515></sup>Judges 15:15 sq.; see Bauer, *Heb. Myth.* 2, 65; *Ausführl. Erklär. des W.* 2, 57; comp. <sup><0751></sup>Judges 3:31; <sup><0218></sup>2 Samuel 23:8, 18). The springing up of a fountain in the jawbone (ver. 19) has given great trouble to the interpreters; and some would remove the passage from the text, or give it a very different meaning. The most common is to render *lechi*, *yj læ* not *jawbone*, but *Lehi*, the name of a place in which the fountain sprang up; and *maktesh*, *√Tæj*, not *the socket of the tooth*, but the rift of the rock from which the water came. So the Targum, and Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 8, 9; comp. Clericus *in loc.*; Orlob, *De Fonte Simsonis prope Maxillam* [Leips. 1703]; Deyling, *Observat. Sacr.* 1, 113 sq.; Busing, in the *Biblioth. Hagana*, 2, 505 sq.; Herder, *Geist der ebr. Poesie*, 2, 235, 255; Rosenmüller, *Schol. in loc.*). It would seem that *Lehi* refers back to ver. 15, and the rendering of *maktesh* is assumed. It would be easier, with Studer, to take *Lehi* for the name of a wall of rock, an opening in which was called *maktesh*, *tooth cavity*. Yet it seems to be doubtful whether *maktesh* alone could have this meaning. (See in general Gesenius, *Thesaur.* 2, 752.) Heine (*Dissertat. Sacr.* p. 241 sq.) opposes another exegetical attempt on this passage, and clings to the entire miracle. Comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 171 sq.). **SEE LEHI.**

(5.) The Philistines were from this time held in such contempt by their victor that he went openly into the city of Gaza, where he seems to have suffered himself weakly to be drawn into the company of a woman of loose character, the yielding to whose enticements exposed him to the most imminent peril (<sup><0761></sup>Judges 16:1-3). His presence being soon noised abroad, an attempt was made during the night forcibly to detain him by closing the

gates of the city, and making them fast; but Samson, apprised of it, rose at midnight, and, breaking away bolts, bars, and hinges, departed, carrying the gates upon his shoulders to the top of a neighboring hill *that looks towards Hebron* (װרבי אַרץ | [; Sept. ἐπὶ προσώπου τοῦ Χεβρών, *facing Hebron*). The common rendering, “before Hebron,” is less appropriate, as the distance between the two cities is at least twenty miles. The hill lay, doubtless, somewhere between the cities, and in full view of both. *SEE GAZA.*

(6.) After this his enemies strove to entrap him by guile rather than by violence, and they were too successful in the end. Falling in love with a woman of Sorek, named Delilah, he became so infatuated by his passion that nothing but his bodily strength could equal his mental weakness. (But see Oeder, *De Simsone Casto* [Onold. 1718].) The princes of the Philistines, aware of Samson’s infirmity, determined by means of it to get possession, if possible, of his person. For this purpose they propose a tempting bribe to Delilah, and she enters at once into the treacherous compact. She employs all her art and blandishments to worm from him the secret of his prodigious strength. Having for some time amused her with fictions, he at last, in a moment of weakness, disclosed to her the fact that it lay in his hair, which, if it were shaved, would leave him a mere common man. Not that his strength really lay in his hair; for this, in fact, had no natural influence upon it one way or the other. His strength arose from his *relation* to God as a Nazarite; and the preservation of his hair unshorn was the *mark*, or *sign*, of his Nazariteship, and a *pledge*, on the part of God, of the continuance of his miraculous physical powers. If he lost this sign, the badge of his consecration, he broke his vow, and consequently forfeited the thing signified. God abandoned him; and he was thenceforward no more, in this respect, than an ordinary man. His treacherous paramour seized the first opportunity of putting his declaration to the test. She shaved his head while he lay sleeping in her lap; and, at a concerted signal, he was instantly arrested by his enemies lying in wait. Bereft of his grand endowment, and forsaken of God, the champion of Israel could now well adopt the words of Solomon: “I find more bitter than death the woman whose heart is snares and nets, and her hands are bands; whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her; but the sinner shall be taken by her.” Having so long presumptuously played with his ruin, Heaven leaves him to himself, as a punishment for his former guilty indulgence. He is made to reap as he had sown, and is consigned to the hands of his relentless foes. His punishment

was indeed severe, though he amply revenged it, as well as redeemed, in a measure, his own honor, by the manner in which he met his death. The Philistines, having deprived him of sight, at first immured him in a prison, and made him grind at the mill like a slave (<sup><0763></sup>Judges 16:4-21). As this was an employment which, in the East, usually devolves on women, to assign it to such a man as Samson was virtually to reduce him to the lowest state of degradation and shame. To grind corn *for others* was, even for a woman, a proverbial term expressive of the most menial and oppressed condition. How much more for the hero of Israel, who seems to have been made grinder general for the prison house! (See Lehmann, *De Simsone Molitore* (Viteb. 1711].)

(7.) In process of time, while remaining in this confinement, his hair recovered its growth, and with it such a profound repentance seems to have wrought in his heart as virtually reinvested him with the character and the powers he had so culpably lost. Of this fact his enemies were not aware. Still exulting in their possession of the great scourge of their nation, they kept him, like a wild beast, for mockery and insult. On one of these occasions, when an immense multitude, including the princes and nobility of the Philistines, were convened in a large amphitheater to celebrate a feast in honor of their god Dagon, who had delivered their adversary into their hands, Samson was ordered to be brought out to be made a laughing stock to his enemies, a butt for their scoffs, insults, mockeries, and merriment. Secretly determined to use his recovered strength to tremendous effect, he persuaded the boy who guided his steps to conduct him to a spot where he could reach the two pillars upon which the roof of the building rested (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 343). Here, after pausing for a short time while he prefers a brief prayer to Heaven, he grasps the massy pillars, and, bowing with resistless force, the whole building rocks and totters, and the roof, encumbered with the weight of the spectators, rushes down, and the whole assembly, including Samson himself, are crushed to pieces in the ruin (<sup><0762></sup>Judges 16:22 sq.).

Thus terminated the career of one of the most remarkable personages of all history, whether sacred or profane. The enrolment of his name by an apostolic pen (<sup><8113></sup>Hebrews 11:32) in the list of the ancient worthies, “who had by faith obtained an excellent repute,” warrants us, undoubtedly, in a favorable estimate of his character on the whole, while at the same time the fidelity of the inspired narrative has perpetuated the record of infirmities which must forever mar the luster of his noble deeds. It is not improbable

that the lapses with which he was chargeable arose, in a measure, from the very peculiarities of that physical temperament to which his prodigies of strength were owing; but while this consideration may palliate, it cannot excuse the moral delinquencies into which he was betrayed, and of which a just Providence exacted so tremendous a penalty in the circumstances of his degradation and death. (See Weissenborn, *De Morte Simsonis* [Jena, 1705]; Maichel, *Simson ab Crimine Vindicat.* [Tübing. 1739].)

His relatives, we are told (<sup><0761></sup>Judges 16:31), went and recovered his body, and interred it in the burying place of his father Manoah. The consternation produced at Gaza by the catastrophe connected with his death, we can easily conceive, would render this easier of accomplishment. *SEE PHILISTINE.*

**2. Representative Relations.** — Some of these have been in part touched upon in the foregoing narrative, but Samson was so striking a character that they need to be more specifically dwelt upon.

**(1.)** *As a judge* his authority seems to have been limited to the district bordering upon the country of the Philistines, and his action as a deliverer does not seem to have extended beyond desultory attacks upon the dominant Philistines, by which their hold upon Israel was weakened, and the way prepared for the future emancipation of the Israelites from their yoke. It is evident from <sup><0711></sup>Judges 13:1, 5; 15:9-11, 20, and the whole history, that the Israelites, or at least Judah and Dan, which are the only tribes mentioned, were subject to the Philistines through the whole of Samson's judgeship; so that, of course, Samson's twenty years of office would be included in the entire period of the Philistine dominion, which Usher and some others have hastily concluded was limited to the forty years of Eli's administration. From the angel's speech to Samson's mother (<sup><0715></sup>Judges 13:5) it appears further that the Israelites were already subject to the Philistines at his birth; and, as Samson cannot have begun to be judge before he was twenty years of age, it has erroneously been supposed that his judgeship must about have coincided with the last twenty years of Philistine dominion. But when we turn to the first book of Samuel, and especially to 7:1-14, we find that the Philistine dominion continued till the judgeship of Samuel. Hence it appears that Samson and Samuel were separated by the whole interval of Eli's judgeship and of Samuel's minority. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.* There are, however, several points in the respective narratives of the times of Samson and Samuel which indicate

great similarity of circumstances. First, there is the general prominence of the Philistines in their relation to Israel. Secondly, there is the remarkable coincidence of both Samson and Samuel being Nazarites (<sup><0735></sup>Judges 13:5; 16:17; comp. <sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1). It looks as if the great exploits of the young Danite Nazarite had suggested to Hannah the consecration of her son in like manner, or, at all events, as if for some reason the Nazaritish vow was at that time prevalent. No other mention of Nazarites occurs in the Scripture history till <sup><3011></sup>Amos 2:11, 12; and even there the allusion seems to be to Samuel and Samson. Thirdly, there is a similar notice of the house of Dagon in <sup><0762></sup>Judges 16:23 and <sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 5:2. Fourthly, the lords of the Philistines are mentioned in a similar way in <sup><0768></sup>Judges 16:8, 18, 27, and in <sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 7:7. The effect of Samson's prowess must have been more of a preparatory kind, by arousing the cowed spirit of his people, and shaking the insolent security of the Philistines, than in the way of decisive victory or deliverance. There is no allusion whatever to other parts of Israel during Samson's judgeship, except the single fact of the men of the border tribe of Judah, three thousand in number, fetching him from the rock Etam to deliver him up to the Philistines (<sup><0759></sup>Judges 15:9-13). The whole narrative is entirely local, and, like the following story concerning Micah (<sup><0770></sup>Judges 17:18) seems to be taken from the annals of the tribe of Dan. Still it does not follow that there were contemporary judges in other parts of the land. *SEE JUDGE.*

(2.) *As a Nazarite*, Samson exhibits the law in <sup><40601></sup>Numbers 6 in full practice. The eminence of such Nazarites as Samson and Samuel would tend to give that dignity to the profession which is alluded to in <sup><3047></sup>Lamentations 4:7, 8. *SEE NAZARITE.*

(3.) *As an inspired person*, Samson is one of those who are distinctly spoken of in Scripture as endowed with supernatural power by the Spirit of the Lord. Those specimens of extraordinary prowess, of which even the slaying of the lion at Timnath without weapons was one, were doubtless the result of that special influence of the Most High which is referred to in <sup><0735></sup>Judges 13:25"; And the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol." The import of the original word (μ[pl] ) for *moved* is peculiar. As μ[P; the radical form, signifies *an anvil*, the metaphor is probably drawn from the *repeated* and somewhat *violent strokes* of a workman with his hammer. It implies, therefore, a peculiar *urgency*, an *impelling influence*, which he could not well resist in himself, nor others in him. But we do not know that this

attribute, in its utmost degree, constantly dwelt in him. So, in later exploits, it is said, "The Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and the cords that were upon his arms became as flax burned with fire;" "The Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he went down to Ashkelon, and slew thirty men of them." But, on the other hand, after his locks were cut, and his strength was gone from him, it is said "He wist not that the Lord was departed from him" (<sup><07135></sup>Judges 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; 16:20). The phrase "the Spirit of the Lord came upon him" is common to him with Othniel and Gideon (<sup><07180></sup>Judges 3:10; 6:34); but the connection of supernatural power with the integrity of the Nazaritish vow, and the particular gift of great strength of body, as seen in tearing in pieces a lion, breaking his bonds asunder, carrying the gates of the city upon his back, and throwing down the pillars which supported the house of Dagon, are quite peculiar to Samson. Indeed, his whole character and history have no exact parallel in Scripture. It is easy, however, to see how forcibly the Israelites would be taught by such an example that their national strength lay in their complete separation from idolatry and consecration to the true God; and that he could give them power to subdue their mightiest enemies, if only they were true to his service (comp. <sup><07120></sup>1 Samuel 2:10). (See the *Eclectic Review*, Nov. 1861.)

**(4.)** *As to Mythological Coincidences.* — The narrative of Samson's deeds has often been compared with the mythical story of the Greek Hercules. (See especially Vogel, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* 2, § 6, 8 sq.; Riskoff, *Die Simsonsage u. d. Herakles-Mythus* [Leips. 1861].) Thus his combat with the lion is compared with the conquest of the Nemean lion (Diod. Sic. 4, 11; Apollod. 2, 5, 1), and another fearful lion on Mt. Cithaeron (Apollod. 2, 4, 9); his capture of the jackals with the capture of the stag of Diana (Diod. Sic. 4, 13; Apollod. 2, 5, 3), and of the Cretan bull (Apollod. 2, 5, 7; Diod. Sic. 4, 13); his slaughter of his paranymphs' friends with the overthrow of the king of the Minyae, Erginus, and his host, by Hercules, in a narrow pass (Apollod. 2, 4, 11; mentioned, too, by Herod. 2, 45); his carrying off the gates of Gaza with the carrying away of the Cretan bull (Diod. Sic. 4, 13); but, above all, the destruction of Samson by his beloved Delilah has been compared with the overcoming of Hercules through Omphale (Diod. Sic. 4:31; Apollod. 2, 6, 3; comp. Senec. *Hippol.* p. 318 sq.); in fine, Samson's wonderful birth (<sup><07135></sup>Judges 13) with that of Hercules (see Bauer, *Hebr. Myth.* 2, 86 sq.). Those, however, have far less ground who identify Samson with the Phoenician Hercules, the sun god.

Basing the view on the etymology of the name (see Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* 1, 368 sq.), they labor, viewing the whole story of Samson as a myth, to explain the details by the course and operation of the sun (Borkhausen, in the *Coburg. Annal. d. Theol.* 1833, 3, 2, 3; 4, 1; comp. Jerome, *Ep. ad Philem.* 7, 752). There are many other striking parallels in the Greek mythology — e.g. in the Croton Milo and other strong men (Pliny, 7, 19); in the deeds of Theseus, especially the destruction of the wild boar at Crommyon (Diod. Sic. 4, 59), and the carrying away of a living bull to Athens (Bauer, 1. c. p. 91 sq.); of king Nisus in Megara, who lost his kingdom at the same time with his hair (Ovid, *Met.* 8, 8 sq., 84 sq.; Virgil, *Cir.* 120 sq.; Hygar. *Fab.* 198); of the fountain Aganippe, which sprang from the footstep of Pegasus, etc. But there is no reason for rejecting the historical existence of Samson; and his character and deeds accord well with the state of the Israelites in the time of the Judges. Yet the opinion is widely held that the traditions out of which the book of Judges is compiled have exaggerated his exploits (Bauer, *Hebr. Myth.* 2, 69 sq.; *Hebr. Gesch.* 2, 88 sq.). Hence some have undertaken to explain the account from natural causes and commonplace events most fruitlessly (Harenberg, in the *Brem. u. Verd. Biblioth.* 2, 302 sq.; Bern, in Semler's *Hall. Samml.* 1, 4, 1 sq.; Hezel, *Schriftforsch.* 1, 653 sq.; Justi, in Eichhorn's *Repert.* 7, 78 sq.; also in his *Vermn. Abhandl.* 1, 146 sq.; Diederich, *Zur Gesch. Sims.* [Gött. 1778]; Herder, *Geist. d. ebr. Poes.* 2, 235 sq., 252 sq.). Yet more trifling is the hypothesis of Kaiser (*Commentar. in Priora Genes. Cap.* p. 188 sq.) that Samson was striving to mimic and mock the Philistine Hercules. Once more: "Hercules once went to Egypt, and there the inhabitants took him, and, putting a chaplet on his head, led him out in solemn procession, intending to offer him in sacrifice to Jupiter. For a while he submitted quietly; but when they led him up to the altar and began the ceremonies, he put forth his strength and slew them all" (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 45).

The passage from Lycophron, with the scholion, quoted by Bochart (*Hieroz.* pars 2, lib. 5, cap. 12), where Hercules is said to have been three nights in the belly of the sea monster, and to have come out *with the loss of all his hair*, is also curious, and seems to be a compound of the stories of Samson and Jonah. To this may be added the connection between *Samson*, considered as, derived from *Shemesh*, "the sun," and the designation of Moui, the Egyptian Hercules, as "Son of the Sun," worshipped also under the name *Sem*, which Sir G. Wilkinson compares with Samson. The Tyrian Hercules (whose temple at Tyre is described by Herod. 2, 44), he also tells

us, “was originally the sun, and the same as Baal” (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2, 44, note 7). The connection between the Phoenician Baal (called Baal Shemen, Baal Shemesh, and Baal Hamman) and Hercules is well known. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v. I [b]) tells us that in certain Phoenician inscriptions, which are accompanied by a Greek translation, *Baal* is rendered *Herakles*, and that “the Tyrian Hercules” is the constant Greek designation of the Baal of Tyre. He also gives many Carthaginian inscriptions to Baal Hamman, which he renders Baal Solaris; and also a sculpture in which Baal Hamman’s head is surrounded with rays, and which has an image of the sun on the upper part of the monument (*Mon. Phoen.* 1, 171; 2, tab. 21). Another evidence of the identity of the Phoenician Baal and Hercules may be found in *Bauli*, near Baiae, a place sacred to Hercules (“locus Herculis,” Serv.), but evidently so called from Baal. Thirlwall (*Hist. of Greece*) ascribes to the numerous temples built by the Phoenicians in honor of Baal in their different settlements the Greek fables of the labors and journeys of Hercules. Bochart thinks the custom described by Ovid (*Fast.* 54) of tying a lighted torch between two foxes in the circus, in memory of the damage once done to the harvest by a fox with burning hay and straw tied to it, was derived from the Phoenicians, and is clearly to be traced to the history of Samson (*Hieroz.* pars 1, lib. 3, cap. 8). From all this, however, arises little probability that the Greek and Latin conception of Hercules in regard to his strength was derived from Phoenician stories and reminiscences of the great Hebrew hero Samson. Some learned men connect the name *Hercules* with *Samson* etymologically (see Wilkinson’s note in Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 2, 43; Patrick, *On Judges* 16, 30; Cornel. a Lapide, etc.); but none of these etymologies are very convincing. Nevertheless, the following description of Hercules, given by C.O. Müller (*Dorians*, bk. 2, ch. 12), might almost have been written for Samson: “The highest degree of human suffering and courage is attributed to Hercules: his character is as noble as could be conceived in those rude and early times; but he is by no means represented as free from the blemishes of human nature; on the contrary, he is frequently subject to wild, ungovernable passions, when the noble indignation and anger of the suffering hero degenerate into frenzy. Every crime, however, is atoned for by some new suffering; but nothing breaks his invincible courage until, purified from earthly corruption, he ascends Mount Olympus.” Again: “Hercules was a jovial guest, and not backward in enjoying himself.... It was Hercules, above all other heroes, whom mythology placed in ludicrous situations, and sometimes made the butt of the buffoonery of others. The



Cercopes are represented as alternately amusing and annoying the hero. In works of art they are often represented as satyrs who rob the hero of his quiver, bow, and club. Hercules, annoyed at their insults, binds two of them to a pole, and marches off with his prize.... It also seems that mirth and buffoonery were often combined with the festivals of Hercules: thus at Athens there was a society of sixty men, who, on the festival of the Diomean Hercules, attacked and amused themselves and others with sallies of wit." The commentary of Adam Clarke presents us with the results of De Lavour, an ingenious French writer, on this subject, from which it will be seen that the coincidences are extremely striking, and such as would, perhaps, afford to most minds, an additional proof of how much the ancient mythologies were a distorted reflection of the Scripture narrative. Phoenician traders, it is imagined, might easily have carried stories concerning the Hebrew hero to the different countries where they traded, especially Greece and Italy; and such stories would have been molded according to the taste or imagination of those who heard them. Whatever is thought, however, of such coincidences, it is certain that the history of Samson is a historical, and not an allegorical, narrative. It has also a distinctly supernatural element which cannot be explained away. The history, as we now have it, must have been written several centuries after Samson's death (<sup>-17519-</sup>Judges 15:19, 20; 18:1, 30; 19:1), though probably taken from the annals of the tribe of Dan. Josephus has given it pretty fully, but with alterations and embellishments of his own, after his manner. The older writers on Samson contribute nothing to the interpretation of the history (e.g. Marck, in his *Dissert. Philol. Exeget.* p. 173 sq.). The effort to rid the story of its miraculous air appears already in Stackhouse (*Bibl. Hist.* 3, 776 sq.). The Wolfenbüttel Fragments (according to the specimens in Bayle and others) would simply degrade Samson; and Niemeyer (*Charak.* 3, 524 sq.) accomplishes nothing beyond showing that this willful and rough hero of the olden time, judged by the moral law, is unworthy of comparison with Christ (see Hauke, *De Simsonis Typo Christi* [Alt. 1740]). Samson was earnest and patriotic; to him his Nazaritish consecration was not a mere religious veil, but a living impulse, and no one can properly deny him the dignity of a *shophet*, or judge (Bertheau, *Buch der Richter*, p. 14, *Einleit.*), unless he understands the word in a narrow and too modern sense. The moral significance of Samson's life has been first set forth by Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 2, 401 sq.), but he seems to have idealized his hero too much (comp. the excellent remarks of Bertheau, *op. cit.* p. 168 sq.). The only mention of Samson in the New Test. confirms his historical character,

being that in <sup>שׁוֹדֵם</sup>Hebrews 11:32, where he is coupled with Gideon, Barak, and Jephthah, and spoken of as one of those who “through faith waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens.” For other monographs on Samson, see Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, col. 285.

### Samson, Bernhardin,

A Franciscan monk, who plied the traffic in indulgences in Switzerland at the time of Tetzels exploits in Saxony, was a native of Milan, but the dates of his birth and death are not known. He is described by his contemporaries as an eloquent, insolent monk. He was employed in the indulgence traffic by cardinal Forli, to whom Leo X had farmed out the territory of Switzerland. He entered Switzerland in August, 1518, and passed from canton to canton with great success, assuming great state, and giving great offense to the local clergy. Meantime Zwingli was called as priest to Zurich. He had already raised his voice against the traffic, but now he was summoned by bishop Hugo to make a direct attack upon Samson. Others also were likewise summoned. As Samson had not duly presented his credentials to the bishop, the latter ordered his whole diocese to exclude him from their churches. Samson retired into Baden, and met with great success. In his zeal in urging the indulgences upon the people, he represented the souls thereby rescued from purgatory as flying to heaven by swarms: “Ecce volant! Ecce volant!” In Feb., 1519, he went to Bremgarten, but Henry Bullinger, the priest of the place, refused to admit him into his church. Thereupon Samson pronounced the ban against him, and threatened to complain against him to the government at Zurich. On reaching Zurich, however, he was peremptorily ordered to absolve Bullinger, and to quit the country. In answer to a complaint of the Swiss authorities, pope Leo X announced (April 30, 1519) that he had already recalled Samson, and that in case their complaints were found corroborated, he should punish him. After Samson’s retiring to Italy, all trace of him is lost. See the authorities cited in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13:392-394. (J.P.L.)

### Sam’uël

(Heb. *Shemuel*, *שׁמוּאֵל* [on the signification, see below]; Sept. and New Test. *Σαμουήλ*), the last of those extraordinary regents that presided over the Hebrew commonwealth under the title of judges (q.v.), and the first of

the line of the prophets (q.v.) specially so called (<sup><HEB></sup>Acts 13:20). As such he possesses peculiar interest in the history of the chosen people. *SEE SAMUEL.*

**I. Name.** — Of this different derivations have been given:

(1) **Ἰ αμνε** “name of God;” so apparently Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* 6, 25), i. q. **Θεοκλήτος**.

(2) **μὴν Ἰ αε** “placed by God.”

(3) **Ἰ αδ Ῥαβ**; “asked of God” (<sup><HEB></sup>1 Samuel 1:20). Josephus (who gives this interpretation, **Σαμούηλος**, *Ant.* 5, 10, 3) ingeniously makes it correspond to the well-known Greek name **Θεαίτητος**.

(4) **Ἰ αε [Ῥμν]** “heard of God.” This, which is the most obvious, may have the same meaning as the previous derivation, which is supported by the sacred text (<sup><HEB></sup>1 Samuel 1:20).

**II. History.** —

**1. Private Life.** — The circumstances of his birth were ominous of his future career. He was the son of Elkanah, an Ephrathite or Ephraimite, and Hannah or Anna. His father is one of the few private citizens in whose household we find polygamy. It may possibly have arisen from the irregularity of the period, but more probably from the sterility of his wife Hannah, whom, as she is always named first, and is known to have been the favorite, he probably married first. The usual effect of polygamy was felt in Elkanah’s household. The sterility of Hannah brought upon her the taunts and ridicule of her conjugal rival, who “provoked her sore, to make her fret, because the Lord had shut up her womb” (<sup><HEB></sup>1 Samuel 1:6). The jealousy of Peninnah was excited also by the superior affection which was shown to Hannah by her husband. “To Hannah he gave a worthy portion; for he loved Hannah” (ver. 5). More especially at the period of the sacred festivals did the childless solitude of Hannah create within her the most poignant regrets, when she saw her husband give portions to all the sons and daughters of Peninnah, who, exulting in maternal pride and fondness, took advantage of these seasons to subject the favorite wife to a natural feminine retaliation. Hannah’s life was embittered, “she wept and did not eat” (ver. 7). *SEE HANNAH.*

The descent of Samuel's father, Elkanah, is involved in great obscurity. In <sup><B001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1 he is described as an Ephraimite. In <sup><B62></sup>1 Chronicles 6:22, 23 he is made a descendant of Korah the Levite (see the table below). Hengstenberg (on <sup><B81></sup>Psalm 78:1) and Ewald (2, 433) explain this by supposing that the Levites were occasionally incorporated into the tribes among whom they dwelt. The question, however, is of no practical importance, because, even if Samuel were a Levite, he certainly was not a regular priest by descent. In virtue of his semi-sacerdotal lineage as a Levite, and especially by the authority of his office as a prophet, he hesitated not to perform priestly functions, like Elijah and others. The opinion was, nevertheless, in former times very current that Samuel was a priest — nay, some imagine that he succeeded Eli in the pontificate. Many of the fathers inclined to this notion, but Jerome affirms (*Advers. Jovin.*), “Samuel propheta fuit, Judex fuit, Levita fuit, non pontifex, ne sacerdos quidem” (Ortlob, “Samuel Judex et Propheta, non Pont. aut Sacerd. Sacrificans,” in the *Thesaurus Novus Theol. Philol.* Hasaei et Ikenii, 1, 587; Selden, *De Success. ad Pontiff.* lib. 1, c, 4). The American translator of De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (2, 21) says he was a priest, though not of Levitical descent, slighting the information of Chronicles, and pronouncing Samuel at the same time to be only a mythical character.

## Picture for Samuel

Samuel's birthplace is one of the vexed questions of sacred geography, as his descent is of sacred genealogy. *SEE RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM*. All that appears with certainty from the accounts is that it was in the hills of Ephraim, and (as may be inferred from its name) a double height, used for the purpose of beacons or outlookers (<sup><B001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1). At the foot of the hill was a well (<sup><B92></sup>1 Samuel 19:22). On the brow of its two summits was the city. It never lost its hold on Samuel, who in later life made it his fixed abode.

The combined family must have been large. Peninnah had several children, and Hannah had, besides Samuel, three sons and two daughters. But of these nothing is known, unless the names of the sons are those enumerated in <sup><B65></sup>1 Chronicles 6:26, 27. It is on the mother of Samuel that our chief attention is fixed in the account of his birth. She is described as a woman of a high religious mission. Almost a Nazarite by practice (<sup><B015></sup>1 Samuel 1:15), and a prophetess in her gifts (2:1), she sought from God the gift of the

child for which she longed with a passionate devotion of silent prayer, of which there is no other example in the Old Test.; and when the son was granted, the name which he bore, and thus first introduced into the world, expressed her sense of the urgency of her entreaty — Samuel, “the asked, or heard, of God.” Living in the great age of vows, she had before his birth dedicated him to the office of a Nazarite. As soon as he was weaned, she herself, with her husband, brought him to the tabernacle at Shiloh, where she had received the first intimation of his birth, and there solemnly consecrated him. The form of consecration was similar to that with which the irregular priesthood of Jeroboam was set apart in later times (<sup>413B</sup>2 Chronicles 13:9) — a bullock of three years old (Sept.), loaves (Sept.), an ephah of flour, and a skin of wine (<sup>402B</sup>1 Samuel 1:24). First took place the usual sacrifices (Sept.) by Elkanah himself; then, after the introduction of the child, the special sacrifice of the bullock. Then his mother made him over to Eli (vers. 25, 28), and (according to the Heb. text. but not the Sept.) the child himself performed an act of worship. The hymn which followed on this consecration is the first of the kind in the sacred volume. It is possible that, like many of the psalms, it may have been enlarged in later times to suit great occasions of victory and the like. But ver. 5 specially applies to this event, and vers. 7, 8 may well express the sense entertained by the prophetess of the coming revolution in the fortunes of her son and of her country.

From this time the child is shut up in the tabernacle. The priests furnished him with a sacred garment, an ephod, made, like their own, of white linen, though of inferior quality, and his mother every year, apparently at the only time of their meeting, gave him a little mantle reaching down to his feet, such as was worn only by high personages, or women, over the other dress, and such as he retained, as his badge, till the latest times of his life. He seems to have slept near the holy place (<sup>408B</sup>1 Samuel 3:3), and his special duty was to put out, as it would seem, the sacred candlestick, and to open the doors at sunrise.

**2. Samuel's Call.** — In this way his childhood was passed. It was while thus sleeping in the tabernacle that he received his first prophetic call. The stillness of the night, the sudden voice, the childlike misconception, the venerable Eli, the contrast between the terrible doom and the gentle creature who has to announce it, give to this portion of the narrative a universal interest. It is this side of Samuel's career that has been so well caught in the well known picture of Sir Joshua Reynolds. The degeneracy

of the people at this time was extreme. The tribes seem to have administered their affairs as independent republics; the national confederacy was weak and disunited; and the spirit of public patriotic enterprise had been worn out by constant turmoil and invasion. The theocratic influence was also scarcely felt, its peculiar ministers being withdrawn, and its ordinary manifestations, except in the routine of the Levitical ritual, having ceased. The “word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision” (~~QBR~~ 1 Samuel 3:1). The young devotee, “the child Samuel,” was selected by Jehovah to renew the deliverance of his oracles. According to Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 10, 4), he was at this time twelve years old. As he reclined in his chamber adjoining the sacred edifice, the Lord, by means adapted to his juvenile capacity, made known to him his first and fearful communication — the doom of Eli’s apostate house. Other revelations speedily followed this. The frequency of God’s messages to the young prophet established his fame, and the exact fulfilment of them secured his reputation. The oracle of Shiloh became vocal again through the youthful hierophant (1 Samuel 3, 19-21). From this moment the prophetic character of Samuel was established. His words were treasured up, and Shiloh became the resort of those who came to hear him (~~QBR~~ 1 Samuel 3:19-21). The fearful fate pronounced on the head and family of the pontificate was soon executed. Eli had indulgently tolerated, or leniently palliated, the rapacity and profligacy of his sons. Through their extortions and impiety “men abhorred the offering of the Lord,” and Jehovah’s wrath was kindled against the sacerdotal transgressors. They became the victims of their own folly, for when the Philistines invaded the land an unworthy superstition among the Hebrew host clamored for the ark to be brought into the camp and into the field of battle. Hophni and Phinehas, Eli’s sons, indulging this vain and puerile fancy, accompanied the ark as its legal guardians, and fell in the terrible slaughter which ensued. Their father, whose sin seems to have been his easiness of disposition, his passive and quiescent temper, sat on a sacerdotal throne by the wayside, to gather the earliest news of the battle, for his “heart trembled for the ark of God;” and as a fugitive from the scene of conflict reported to him the sad disaster, dwelling with natural climax on its melancholy particulars — Israel routed and fleeing in panic, Hophni and Phinehas both slain, and the ark of God taken this last and overpowering intelligence so shocked him that he fainted and fell from his seat, and in his fall, from the imbecile corpulence of age, “brake his neck and died” (~~QBR~~ 1 Samuel 4:18). In the overthrow of the sanctuary we hear

not what became of Samuel. According to the Mussulman tradition, Samuel's birth was granted in answer to the prayers of the nation on the overthrow of the sanctuary and loss of the ark (D'Herbelot, s.v. Aschmouyl). This, though false in the letter, is true to the spirit of Samuel's life.

**3. Samuel's Civil Administration.** — When the feeble administration of Eli, who had judged Israel forty years, was concluded by his death, Samuel was too young to succeed to the regency; and the actions of this earlier portion of his life are left unrecorded. The ark, which had been captured by the Philistines, soon vindicated its majesty, and, after being detained among them seven months, was sent back to Israel. It did not, however, reach Shiloh, in consequence of the fearful judgment upon Beth-shemesh (~~1~~ Samuel 6:19), but rested in Kirjath-jearim for no fewer than twenty years (~~1~~ Samuel 7:2). It is not till the expiration of this period that Samuel appears again in the history. Perhaps, during the twenty years succeeding Eli's death, his authority was gradually gathering strength; while the office of supreme magistrate may have been vacant, each tribe being governed by its own hereditary phylarch. This long season of national humiliation was, to some extent, improved. "All the house of Israel lamented after the Lord;" and Samuel, seizing upon the crisis, issued a public manifesto, exposing the sin of idolatry, urging on the people religious amendment, and promising political deliverance on their reformation. The people obeyed, the oracular mandate was effectual, and the principles of the theocracy again triumphed (~~1~~ Samuel 7:4). The tribes were summoned by the prophet to assemble in Mizpeh; and at this assembly of the Hebrew comitia, Samuel seems to have been elected regent (~~1~~ Samuel 7:6). Some of the judges were raised to political power as the reward of their military courage and talents; but Samuel was raised to the lofty station of judge, from his prophetic fame, his sagacious dispensation of justice, his real intrepidity, and his success as a restorer of the true religion. His government, founded not on feats of chivalry or actions of dazzling enterprise, which great emergencies only call forth, but resting on more solid qualities, essential to the growth and development of a nation's resources in times of peace, laid the foundation of that prosperity which gradually elevated Israel to the position it occupied in the days of David and his successors. This mustering of the Hebrews at Mizpeh on the inauguration of Samuel alarmed the Philistines, and their "lords went up against Israel." Samuel offered a solemn oblation, and implored the

immediate protection of Jehovah. With a symbolical rite, expressive, partly of deep humiliation, partly of the libations of a treaty, the people poured water on the ground; they fasted; and they entreated Samuel to raise the piercing cry for which he was known in supplication to God for them. It was at the moment that he was offering up a sacrifice, and sustaining this loud cry (compare the situation of Pausanias before the battle of Plataea, Herod. 9:61), that the Philistine host suddenly burst upon them. He was answered by propitious thunder, an unprecedented phenomenon in that climate at that season of the year (comp. <sup><0928></sup>1 Samuel 12:18: Josephus says [*Ant.* 6, 2, 2] that there was also an earthquake). A fearful storm burst upon the Philistines; the elements warred against them. “The Highest gave his voice in the heaven, hailstones and coals of fire.” The old enemies of Israel were signally defeated, and did not recruit their strength again during the administration of the prophet judge. Exactly at the spot where, twenty years before, they had obtained their great victory, a stone was set up, which long remained as a memorial of Samuel’s triumph, and gave to the place its name of Ebenezer, “the Stone of Help,” which has thence passed into Christian phraseology, and become a common name of Nonconformist chapels (<sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 7:12). The old Canaanites, whom the Philistines had dispossessed in the outskirts of the Judean hills, seem to have helped in the battle; and a large portion of territory was recovered (ver. 14). This was Samuel’s first, and, as far as we know, his only, military achievement. But, as in the case of the earlier chiefs who bore that name, it was apparently this which confirmed him in the office of “judge” (comp. 12:11, where he is thus reckoned with Jerubbaal, Bedan, and Jephthah, and Ecclesiastes 46:15-18). From an incidental allusion (<sup><0974></sup>1 Samuel 7:14), we learn, too, that about this time the Amorites, the Eastern foes of Israel, were also at peace with them another triumph of a government “the weapons of whose warfare were not carnal.”

The presidency of Samuel appears to have been eminently successful. Its length is nowhere given in the Scriptures; but, from a statement of Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 13, 5), it appears to have lasted twelve years (B.C. 1105 -1093), up to the time of Saul’s inauguration. **SEE CHRONOLOGY.** From the very brief sketch given us of his public life, we infer that the administration of justice occupied no little share of his time and attention. He visited, in discharge of his duties as ruler, the three chief sanctuaries (Sept. ἐν παντι τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις τούτοις) on the west of the Jordan—Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh (<sup><0976></sup>1 Samuel 7:16). His own residence was still



his native city, Ramah, or Ramathaim, which he further consecrated by an altar (ver. 17), after the patriarchal model, like Abraham. Such a procedure was contrary to the letter of the Mosaic statute; but the prophets had power to dispense with ordinary usage (De Wette, *Bib. Dogmat.* § 70; Knobel, *Der Prophetism. der Heb.* 1, 39; Kister, *Der Prophetism. d. A. und N.T.* etc. p. 52). In this case, the reason of Samuel's conduct may be found in the state of the religious economy. The ark yet remained at Kirjath-jearim, where it had been left in terror, and where it lay till David fetched it to Zion. There seems to have been no place of resort for the tribes, the present station of the ark not having been chosen for its convenience as a scene of religious assembly. The shrine at Shiloh, which had been hallowed ever since the settlement in Canaan, had been desolate from the date of the death of Eli and his sons — so desolate as to become, in future years, a prophetic symbol of divine judgment (<sup><2072></sup>Jeremiah 7:12-14; 26:6). In such a period of religious anarchy and confusion, Samuel, a theocratic guardian, might, without any violation of the spirit of the law, superintend the public worship of Jehovah in the vicinity of his habitation (Knobel, *Der Prophetism. der Heb.* 2, 32).

At Ramah Samuel married; and two sons grew up to repeat, under his eyes, the same perversion of high office that he had himself witnessed in his childhood in the case of the two sons of Eli. One was Abiah, the other, Joel, sometimes called simply "the second" (*vashni*, <sup><133></sup>1 Chronicles 6:28). In his old age, according to the quasi-hereditary principle already adopted by previous judges, he shared his power with them; and they exercised their functions at the southern frontier in Beersheba (<sup><133></sup>1 Samuel 8:1-4). These young men possessed not their father's integrity of spirit, but "turned aside after lucre, took bribes, and perverted judgment" (ver. 3). The advanced years of the venerable ruler himself, and his approaching dissolution; the certainty that none of his family could fill his office with advantage to the country; the horror of a period of anarchy which his death might occasion; the necessity of having some one to put an end to tribal jealousies, and concentrate the energies of the nation, especially as there appeared to be symptoms of renewed warlike preparations on the part of the Ammonites (12:12) these considerations seem to have led the elders of Israel to adopt the bold step of assembling at Ramah with the avowed purpose of effecting a revolution in the form of the government.

**4. Retirement from Public Office.** — Down to this point in Samuel's life there is but little to distinguish his career from that of his predecessors.

Like many characters in later days, had he died in youth, his fame would hardly have been greater than that of Gideon or Samson. He was a judge, a Nazarite, a warrior, and (to a certain point), a prophet. But his peculiar position in the sacred narrative turns on the events which follow. He is the inaugurator of the transition from what is commonly called the theocracy to the monarchy. The misdemeanor of his own sons precipitated the catastrophe which had been long preparing. The people demanded a king. Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 3, 3) describes the shock to Samuel's mind "because of his inborn sense of justice, because of his hatred of kings as so far inferior to the aristocratic form of government, which conferred a godlike character on those who lived under it." For the whole night he lay fasting and sleepless, in the perplexity of doubt and difficulty. In the vision of that night, as recorded by the sacred historian, is given the dark side of the new institution, on which Samuel dwells on the following day (~~1~~ 1 Samuel 8:9-18). The proposed change from a republican to a regal form of government displeased Samuel for various reasons. Besides its being a departure from the first political institute, and so far an infringement on the rights of the divine head of the theocracy, it was regarded by the regent as a virtual charge against himself, and might appear to him as one of those examples of popular fickleness and ingratitude which the history of every realm exhibits in profusion. Jehovah comforts Samuel in this respect by saying, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me." Being warned of God to accede to their request for a king, and yet to remonstrate with the people, and set before the nation the perils and tyranny of a monarchical government (8:10), Samuel proceeded to the election of a sovereign. Saul, son of Kish, "a choice young man and a goodly," whom he had met unexpectedly, was pointed out to him by Jehovah as the king of Israel, and by the prophet was anointed and saluted as monarch. Samuel again convened the nation at Mizpeh, again with honest zeal condemned their project, but caused the sacred lot to be taken. The lot fell on Saul. The prophet now formally introduced him to the people, who shouted, in joyous acclamation, "God save the king!" Not content with oral explanations, this last of the republican chiefs not only told the people the manner of the kingdom, "but wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord." What is here asserted of Samuel may mean that he extracted from the Pentateuch the recorded provision of Moses for a future monarchy, and added to it such warnings and counsels and safeguards as his inspired sagacity might suggest. Saul's first battle being so successful, and the preparations for it displaying no ordinary energy and promptitude of

character, his popularity was suddenly advanced and his throne secured. Taking advantage of the general sensation in favor of Saul, Samuel cited the people to meet again in Gilgal, to renew the kingdom, to ratify the new constitution, and solemnly install the sovereign (<sup><0114></sup>1 Samuel 11:14). The assembly was held at Gilgal, immediately after the victory over the Ammonites. The monarchy was a second time solemnly inaugurated, and (according to the Sept.) “Samuel” (in the Hebrew text, “Saul”) “and all the men of Israel rejoiced greatly.” Then takes place his farewell address. By this time the long, flowing locks, on which no razor had ever passed, were white with age (<sup><0112></sup>1 Samuel 12:2). He appeals to their knowledge of his integrity. Whatever might be the lawless habits of the chiefs of those times — Hophni, Phinehas, or his own sons — he had kept aloof from all. No ox or ass had he taken from their stalls — no bribe to obtain his judgment (Sept. ἐξίλασμα) — not even a sandal (ὑπόδημα, Sept. and Ecclesiastes 46:19,. It is this appeal, and the response of the people, that have made Grotius call him the Jewish Aristides. He then sums up the new situation in which they have placed themselves; and, although “the wickedness of asking a king” is still strongly insisted on, and the unusual portent of a thunderstorm in May or June, in answer to Samuel’s prayer, is urged as a sign of divine displeasure (<sup><0116></sup>1 Samuel 12:16-19), the general tone of the condemnation is much softened from that which was pronounced on the first intimation of the change. The first king is repeatedly acknowledged as “the Messiah,” or anointed of the Lord (vers. 3, 5); the future prosperity of the nation is declared to depend on their use or misuse of the new constitution; and Samuel retires with expressions of goodwill and hope: “I will teach you the good and the right way... only fear the Lord...” (vers. 23, 24). It is the most signal example afforded in the Old Test. of a great character reconciling himself to a changed order of things, and of the divine sanctions resting on his acquiescence. For this reason it is that Athanasius is by Basil called the Samuel of the Church (Basil, *Ep.* 82). *SEE MONARCHY.*

**5. Residue of Samuel’s Life.** — His subsequent relations with Saul are of the same mixed kind. The two institutions which they respectively represented ran on side by side. Samuel was still, by courtesy at least, judge. He judged Israel “*all the days of his life*” (<sup><0101></sup>1 Samuel 7:1-15), and from time to time came across the king’s path. (But these interventions are chiefly in another capacity, which are unfolded below. The assertion may mean that even after Saul’s coronation Samuel’s power, though (formally

abdicated, was yet actually felt and exercised in the direction of state affairs (Hävernick. *Einleit. in das A.T.* § 166). No enterprise could be undertaken without Samuel's concurrence. His was an authority higher than the king's. We find Saul, having mustered his forces, about to march against the Philistines, yet delaying to do so till Samuel consecrated the undertaking. He came not at the time appointed, as Saul thought, and the impatient monarch proceeded to offer sacrifice — a fearful violation of the national law. The prophet arrived as the religious service was concluded, and, rebuking Saul for his presumption, distinctly hinted at the short continuance of his kingdom. Again, we find Samuel charging Saul with the extirpation of the Amalekites. The royal warrior proceeded on the expedition, but obeyed not the mandate of Jehovah. His apologies, somewhat craftily framed for his inconsistencies, availed him not with the prophet, and he was by the indignant seer virtually dethroned. He had forfeited his crown by disobedience to God. Yet Samuel mourned for him. His heart seems to have been set on the bold athletic soldier. But the breach was irreconcilable, and they must separate. The parting was not one of rivals, but of dear though divided friends. The king throws himself on the prophet with all his force; not without a vehement effort (Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 7, 5) the prophet tears himself away. The long mantle by which he was always known is rent in the struggle; and, like Ahijah after him, Samuel saw in this the omen of the coming rent in the monarchy. They parted, each to his house, to meet no more. But a long shadow of grief fell over the prophet. "Samuel mourned for Saul." (It grieved Samuel for Saul." "How long wilt thou mourn for Saul?" (<sup>951</sup>1 Samuel 15:11, 35; 16:1). *SEE PROPHET*. But now the Lord directed him to make provision for the future government of the country (<sup>960</sup>1 Samuel 16:1). To prevent strife and confusion, it was necessary, in the circumstances, that the second king should be appointed ere the first sovereign's demise. Samuel went to Bethlehem and set apart the youngest of the sons of Jesse, "and came to see Saul no more till the day of his death." Yet Saul and he came near meeting once again at Naioth, in Ramah (19, 24), when the king was pursuing David. As on a former occasion, the spirit of God came upon him as he approached the company of the prophets with Samuel presiding over them, and "he prophesied and lay down naked all that day and all that night." A religious excitement seized him; the contagious influence of the music and rhapsody fell upon his nervous, susceptible temperament and overpowered him. *SEE SAUL*.

The remaining scriptural notices of Samuel are in connection with David's history. *SEE DAVID*.

**6. Decease and Traditions.** — The death of Samuel is described as taking place in the year of the close of David's wanderings. It is said with peculiar emphasis, as if to mark the loss, that "*all* the Israelites" — all, with a universality never specified before — "were gathered together" from all parts of this hitherto divided country, and "lamented him," and "buried him," not in any consecrated place, nor outside the walls of his city, but within his own house, thus in a manner consecrated by being turned into his tomb (<sup>(1220)</sup>1 Samuel 25:1). His relics were translated "from Judaea" (the place is not specified), A.D. 406, to Constantinople, and received there with much pomp by the emperor Arcadius. They were landed at the pier of Chalcedon, and thence conveyed to a church near the palace of Hebdomon (see 4 *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. 20).

The situation of Ramathaim, as has been observed, uncertain. But the place long pointed out as his tomb is the height, most conspicuous of all in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, immediately above the town of Gibeon, known to the Crusaders as "Montjoye," as the spot from whence they first saw Jerusalem, now called *Neby Samwil*, "the Prophet Samuel." The tradition can be traced back as far as the 7th century, when it is spoken of as the monastery of St. Samuel (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 142). *SEE ZOPHIM*. A cave is still shown underneath the floor of the mosque. "He built the tomb in his lifetime," is the account of the Mussulman guardian of the mosque, "but was not buried here till after the expulsion of the Greeks." It is the only spot in Palestine which claims any direct connection with the first great prophet who was born within its limits; and its commanding situation well agrees with the importance assigned to him in the sacred history. *SEE MIZPEH*.

His descendants were subsisting at the same place till the time of David. Heman, his grandson, was one of the chief singers in the Levitical choir (<sup>(1163)</sup>1 Chronicles 6:33; 15:17; 25:5).

The apparition of Samuel at Endor (<sup>(1284)</sup>1 Samuel 28:14; Ecclesiastes 46:20) belongs to the history of Saul. We here follow the inspired narrative, and merely say that Saul strangely wished to see Samuel recalled from the dead, that Samuel himself made his appearance suddenly, and, to the great terror of the necromancer, heard the mournful complaint of Saul, and pronounced his speedy death on an ignoble field of loss and massacre

(Henderson, *On Divine Inspiration*, p. 165; Hales, *Chronology*, 2, 323; Scott, *On the Existence of Evil Spirits*, etc. p. 232).

It has been supposed that Samuel wrote a life of David (of course of his earlier years) which was still accessible to one of the authors of the book of Chronicles (~~1~~1 Chronicles 29:29); but this appears doubtful. Various other books of the Old Test. have been ascribed to him by the Jewish tradition — the Judges, Ruth, the two books of Samuel (the latter, it is alleged, being written in the spirit of prophecy). He is regarded by the Samaritans as a magician and an infidel (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 52).

The Persian traditions fix his life in the time of Kai-i-Kobad, second king of Persia, with whom he is said to have conversed (D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s.v. "Kai-Kobad").

**III. Samuel's Character** — So important a position did he hold in Jewish history as to have given his name to the sacred book, now divided into two, which covers the whole period of the first establishment of the kingdom, corresponding to the manner in which the name of Moses has been assigned to the sacred book, now divided into five, which covers the period of the foundation of the Jewish Church itself. In fact, no character of equal magnitude had arisen since the death of the great lawgiver.

**1.** Samuel's character presents itself to us as one of uncommon dignity and patriotism. His chief concern was his country's weal. Grotius compares him to Aristides, and Saul to Alcibiades (*Opera Theol.* 1, 119). To preserve the worship of the one Jehovah, the God of Israel, to guard the liberties and rights of the people, to secure them from hostile invasion and internal disunion, was the grand motive of his life. His patriotism was not a Roman love of conquest or empire. The subjugation of other people was only sought when they disturbed the peace of his country. He was loath, indeed, to change the form of government, yet he did it with consummate policy. First of all, he resorted to the divine mode of appeal to the Omniscient Ruler — a solemn sortilege — and brought Saul so chosen before the people, and pointed him out to them as peerless in his form and aspect. Then, waiting till Saul should distinguish himself by some victorious enterprise, and receiving him fresh from the slaughter of the Ammonites, he again confirmed him in his kingdom, while the national enthusiasm, kindled by his triumph, made him the popular idol. Samuel thus, for the sake of future peace, took means to show that Saul was both chosen of God and yet virtually elected by the people. This procedure, so

cautious and so generous, proves how little foundation there is for the remarks which have been made against Samuel by some writers, such as Schiller (*Neue Thalia*, 4, 94), Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 360), and the infamous Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist (p. 200, ed. Schmidt).

But there are two other points which more especially placed him at the head of the prophetic order as it afterwards appeared. The first is brought out in his relation with Saul, the second in his relation with David.

**2.** He represents the independence of the moral law, of the Divine Will, as distinct from regal or sacerdotal enactments, which is so remarkable a characteristic of all the later prophets. As we have seen, he was, if a Levite, yet certainly not a priest; and all the attempts to identify his opposition to Saul with a hierarchical interest are founded on a complete misconception of the facts of the case. From the time of the overthrow of Shiloh, he never appears in the remotest connection with the priestly order. Among all the places included in his personal or administrative visits, neither Shiloh, nor Nob, nor Gibeon (the seats of the sacerdotal caste) is ever mentioned. When he counsels Saul, it is not as the priest, but as the prophet; when he sacrifices or blesses the sacrifice, it is not as the priest, but either as an individual Israelite of eminence, or as a ruler, like Saul himself. Saul's sin in both cases where he came into collision with Samuel was not simply that of intruding into sacerdotal functions, but of disobedience to the prophetic voice. The first was that of not waiting for Samuel's arrival, according to the sign given by Samuel at his original meeting at Ramah (~~9108~~ 1 Samuel 10:8; 13:8); the second was that of not carrying out the stern prophetic injunction for the destruction of the Amalekites. When, on that occasion, the aged prophet called the captive prince before him, and with his own hands hacked him limb from limb in retribution for the desolation he had brought into the homes of Israel, and thus offered up his mangled remains almost as a human sacrifice ("before the Lord in Gilgal"), we see the representative of the older part of the Jewish history. But it is the true prophetic utterance such as breathes through the psalmists and prophets when he says to Saul in words which, from their poetical form, must have become fixed in the national memory, "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

**3.** Samuel is the first of the regular succession of prophets: "All the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after" (~~4183~~ Acts 3:24); "Ex quo sanctus Samuel propheta coepit, et deinceps donec populus Israel in

Babyloniam captivus veheretur,... totum est tempus prophetarum” (Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 17, 1). Moses, Miriam, and Deborah, perhaps Ehud, had been prophets. But it was only from Samuel that the continuous succession was unbroken. This may have been merely from the coincidence of his appearance with the beginning of the new order of things, of which the prophetic office was the chief expression. Some predisposing causes there may have been in his own family and birthplace. His mother, as we have seen, though not expressly so called, was, in fact, a prophetess; the word *Zophim*, as the affix of Ramathaim, has been explained, not unreasonably, to mean “seers;” and Elkanah, his father, is, by the Chaldee paraphrast on <sup><0900></sup>1 Samuel 1:1, said to be “a disciple of the prophets.” But the connection of the continuity of the office with Samuel appears to be still more direct. It is in his lifetime, long after he had been “established as a prophet” (<sup><0920></sup>1 Samuel 3:20), that we hear of the companies of disciples, called in the Old Test. “the sons of the prophets,” by modern writers “the schools of the prophets.” All the peculiarities of their education are implied or expressed — the sacred dance, the sacred music, the solemn procession (<sup><0905></sup>1 Samuel 10:5, 10; <sup><1250></sup>1 Chronicles 25:1, 6). At the head of this congregation, or “church, as it were, within a church” (Sept. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, <sup><0905></sup>1 Samuel 10:5, 10). Samuel is expressly described as “standing appointed over them” (<sup><0920></sup>1 Samuel 19:20). Their chief residence at this time (though afterwards, as the institution spread, it struck root in other places) was at Samuel’s own abode, Ramah, where they lived in habitations (*Naioth*, 19, 19, etc.) apparently of a rustic kind, like the leafy huts which Elisha’s disciples afterwards occupied by the Jordan (*Naioth* = “habitations,” but more specifically used for “pastures”). *SEE NAIOTH*.

In those schools, and learning to cultivate the prophetic gifts, were some whom we know for certain, others whom we may almost certainly conjecture, to have been so trained or influenced. Two eminent individuals had a casual or remote connection with them. One was Saul. Twice at least he is described as having been in the company of Samuel’s disciples, and as having caught from them the prophetic fervor to such a degree as to have “prophesied among them” (<sup><0900></sup>1 Samuel 10:10, 11) and on one occasion to have thrown off his clothes, and to have passed the night in a state of prophetic trance (<sup><0920></sup>1 Samuel 19:24); and even in his palace the prophesying mingled with his madness on ordinary occasions (<sup><0930></sup>1 Samuel 18:9). Another was David. The first acquaintance of Samuel with David was when he privately anointed him at the house of Jesse. *SEE DAVID*.



But the connection thus begun with the shepherd boy must have been continued afterwards. David, at first, fled to “Naioth in Ramah,” as to his second home (<sup><0909></sup>1 Samuel 19:19), and the gifts of music, of song, and of prophecy, here developed on so large a scale, were exactly such as we find in the notices of those who looked up to Samuel as their father. It is, further, hardly possible to escape the conclusion that David there first met his fast friends and companions in afterlife, prophets like himself — Gad and Nathan. In the prospect of a regal form of government he seems to have made the prophetic office a formal institute in the Jewish nation. These academies were famous for the cultivation of poetry and music, and from among their members God might select his special servants (Gramberg, *Religions-Id.* 2, 264; Vitringa, *Synag. Vet.* 1, 2, 7; Werenfels, *Diss. de Scholis Prophetar.*; De Wette, *Comm. fib. d. Psalm.* p. 9). For a different view of the schools, see Tholuck, *Literar. Anzeiger*, 1831, 1, 38. We are informed (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 9:22) that the allocation of the Levites for the Temple service was made by David and Samuel the seer; i.e. that David followed some plan or suggestion of the deceased prophet. It is stated also (26:28) that the prophet had made some munificent donations to the tabernacle, which seems to have been erected at Nob, and afterwards at Gibeon, though the ark was in Kirjath-jearim. Lastly (29:29), the acts of David the king are said to be written in the book of Samuel the seer. **SEE PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.**

It is needless to enlarge on the importance with which these incidents invest the appearance of Samuel. He there becomes the spiritual father of the Psalmist king. He is also the founder of the first regular institutions of religious instruction, and communities for the purposes of education. The schools of Greece were not yet in existence. From these Jewish institutions were developed, by a natural order, the universities of Christendom. It may be added that with this view the whole life of Samuel is in accordance. He is the prophet the only prophet till the time of Isaiah — of whom we know that he was such from his earliest years. It is this continuity of his own life and character that makes him so fit an instrument for conducting his nation through so great a change.

Accordingly, Samuel is called emphatically “the Prophet” (Acts 3, 24; 13:20). To a certain extent this was in consequence of the gift which he shared in common with others of his time. He was especially known in his own age as “Samuel the Seer” (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 9:22; 26:28; 29:29). “I am the seer,” was his answer to those who asked “Where is the seer?” “Where

is the seer's house?" (<sup><0911></sup>1 Samuel 9:11, 18, 19). "Seer," the ancient name, was not yet superseded by "Prophet" (ch. 9). By this name, Samuel *Videns* and Samuel ὁ βλέπων, he is called in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Of the three modes by which divine communications were then made, "by dreams, Urim and Thummim, and prophets," the first was that by which the divine will was made known to Samuel (<sup><0901></sup>1 Samuel 3:1, 2; Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 10, 4). "The Lord uncovered his ear" to whisper into it in the stillness of the night the messages that were to be delivered. It is the first distinct intimation of the idea of "*Revelation*" to a human being (see Gesenius, *in voc.* חֵלֶב). He was consulted far and near on the small affairs of life; loaves of "bread," or "the fourth part of a shekel of silver," were gratuities offered for the answers (<sup><0907></sup>1 Samuel 9:7, 8). **SEE PRESENT.**

From this faculty, combined with his office of ruler, an awful reverence grew up round him. No sacrificial feast was thought complete without his blessing (<sup><0913></sup>1 Samuel 9:13). When he appeared suddenly elsewhere for the same purpose, the villagers "trembled" at his approach (<sup><0916></sup>1 Samuel 16:4, 5). A peculiar virtue was believed to reside in his intercession. He was conspicuous in later times among those that "*call* upon the name of the Lord" (<sup><0916></sup>Psalm 99:6; <sup><0928></sup>1 Samuel 12:18), and was placed with Moses as "standing" for prayer, in a special sense, "before the Lord" (<sup><2450></sup>Jeremiah 15:1). It was the last consolation he left in his parting address that he would "pray to the Lord" for the people (<sup><0929></sup>1 Samuel 12:19, 23). There was something peculiar in the long-sustained cry or shout of supplication, which seemed to draw down as by force the divine answer (<sup><0908></sup>1 Samuel 7:8, 9). All night long, in agitated moments, "he *cried* unto the Lord" (<sup><0951></sup>1 Samuel 15:11). The power of Samuel with God, as an intercessor for the people, is compared to that of Moses (<sup><2450></sup>Jeremiah 15:1; <sup><0916></sup>Psalm 99:6). See Plumtre, *Life of Samuel* (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Anon. *Life and Times of Samuel* (ibid. 1863, 12mo).

### Samuel, First And Second Books Of.

These two historical portions of Scripture, in all the editions of the original and versions, immediately precede the books of Kings, and are intimately connected with them. There is less critical dispute concerning them than respecting those books that precede them.

**I. Name and Division.** — The books so called received this name (which is now customarily attached to them in Hebrew printed texts) subsequently to

the completion of the Sept., in which their present name is **Βασι λείων Πρώτη, Βασιλείν Δευτέρα** (*First and Second of Kings*); and similarly in the Vulg. Hence they are entitled in the English version “The First [or Second] Book of Samuel, otherwise called the First [or Second] Book of the Kings.” The name may in some measure be explained and justified on the ground that the early part of the first book is chiefly concerned about Samuel, and that the two kings Saul and David, whose reigns occupy all the rest of the books, were both anointed by Samuel to their office.

In Hebrew MSS. the work is one and not two. The present division was first made in the Sept., and was thence adopted into the Vulg. But Origen, as quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 6, 25), expressly states that they formed only one book among the Hebrews. Jerome (*Proefatio in Libros Samuel et Malachim*) implies the same statement; and in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 14, c. 2), wherein the authorship is attributed to Samuel, they are designated by the name of his book, in the singular number (**וְרַפְס בְּתַלְמִי**). After the invention of printing they were published as one book in the first edition of the whole Bible printed at Soncino in A.D. 1488, and likewise in the Complutensian Polyglot printed at Alcala, A.D. 1502-1517; and it was not till the year 1518 that the division of the Sept. was adopted in Hebrew, in the edition of the Bible printed by the Bombergs at Venice. The work constitutes a separate and independent whole, and is not to be joined either with the book of Judges or with that of Kings, from which it differs by many important characteristics.

**II. Contents.** — The statements of the books of Samuel belong to an interesting period of Jewish history. The preceding book of Judges refers to the affairs of the republic as they were administered after the conquest, when the nation was a congeries of independent cantons, sometimes partially united for a season under an extraordinary dictator. As, however, the mode of government was changed, and remained monarchical till the overthrow of the kingdom, it was of national importance to note the time, method, and means of the alteration. This change happening under the regency of the wisest and best of their sages, his life became a topic of interest. The first book of Samuel gives an account of his birth and early call to the duties of a seer, under Eli’s pontificate; describes the low and degraded condition of the people, oppressed by foreign enemies; proceeds to narrate the election of Samuel as judge; his prosperous regency; the degeneracy of his sons; the clamor for a change in the civil constitution; the

installation of Saul; his rash and reckless character; his neglect of, or opposition to, the theocratic elements of the government. Then the historian goes on to relate God's choice of David as king; his endurance of long and harassing persecution from the reigning sovereign; the melancholy defeat and death of Saul on the field of Gilboa; the gradual elevation of the man "according to God's own heart" to universal dominion; his earnest efforts to obey and follow out the principles of the theocracy; his formal establishment of religious worship at Jerusalem, now the capital of the nation; and his series of victories over all the enemies of Judea that were wont to molest its frontiers. The annalist records David's aberrations from the path of duty; the unnatural rebellion of his son Absalom, and its suppression; his carrying into effect a census of his dominions, and the divine punishment which this act incurred; and concludes with a few characteristic sketches of his military staff. The second book of Samuel, while it relates the last words of David, yet stops short of his death. As David was the real founder of the monarchy and arranger of the religious economy; the great hero, legislator, and poet of his country; as his dynasty maintained itself on the throne of Judah till the Babylonian invasion, it is not a matter of wonder that the description of his life and government occupies so large a portion of early Jewish history. The books of Samuel thus consist of three interlaced biographies — those of Samuel, Saul, and David. The following are the details:

**1. *Israel under Samuel*** (1 Samuel 1-12; B.C. 1120-1093). — The parentage, birth, and consecration of Samuel (ch. 1); Hannah's prayer (<sup>(OBJ)</sup>1 Samuel 2:1-10); the evil practices of the sons of Eli; a man of God predicts the troubles which shall befall Eli (<sup>(OBJ)</sup>1 Samuel 2:10-33); God calls Samuel in the night, and reveals to him the judgment of the house of Eli, to whom Samuel declares it (<sup>(OBJ)</sup>1 Samuel 3:118); Samuel is established to be a prophet in Shiloh (<sup>(OBJ)</sup>1 Samuel 3:19-4:1); a battle of the Philistines with the Israelites between Aphek and Eben-ezer; the Israelites, being defeated, send for the ark from Shiloh; another battle ensues, in which Israel is again smitten, the ark is taken, and the two sons of Eli slain; the news is carried to Eli, who dies; Ichabod is born (ch. 4); penalties inflicted on the Philistines on account of the ark of God; it is sent back with presents to Israel, first to Beth-she-mesh, and then to Kirjath-jearim (1 Samuel 5-7: 1); the reformation under Samuel and the national assembly at Mizpeh (<sup>(OBJ)</sup>1 Samuel 7:2-6); the Philistines again invade Israel, but at the cry of Samuel the Lord discomfits them with thunder, and

they are smitten before Israel; their conquests restored to Israel from Ekron to Gath, and peace established (<sup><007></sup>1 Samuel 7:7-14); Samuel judges Israel in a circuit of four cities yearly (<sup><007></sup>1 Samuel 7:15-17); becoming old, he makes his sons judges over Israel, but their conduct is bad (<sup><008></sup>1 Samuel 8:1-3); the elders of Israel come to Samuel at Ramah and demand a king; Samuel protests, but by divine direction yields at length (<sup><008></sup>1 Samuel 8:4-22); Saul, son of Kish, seeking the lost asses of his father, visits Samuel, who, forewarned by God of his coming, entertains him with honor, and on parting anoints him to be king, and gives him signs in confirmation, which come to pass; Samuel then calls an assembly at Mizpeh, and there Saul is publicly designated by lot to be king over Israel, but not acknowledged by all the people (<sup><009></sup>1 Samuel 9, 10); the men of Jabesh-gilead, sending to Gibeah in their distress, Saul is roused to aid them, and gains a great victory over the Ammonites; then Saul is joyfully recognized as king by all the people at Gilgal, where Samuel renews the kingdom (<sup><010></sup>1 Samuel 11); there Samuel addresses the people, vindicates his own conduct, and exhorts them to fidelity to God and their king; the miracle of thunder and rain at wheat harvest (<sup><010></sup>1 Samuel 12).

**2. *Israel under King Saul*** (<sup><010></sup>1 Samuel 13-31; B.C. 1093-1053). — Saul forms an army of two thousand men under his own command at Michmash, and one thousand under Jonathan at Gibeah; Jonathan smites the Philistine garrison at Geba, and the Philistines gather a great army; Israel is greatly distressed; Saul awaits Samuel at Gilgal, but begins to offer sacrifice before his arrival, for which act of disobedience he is rejected of God (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 13:1-14); in the extremity of the times Jonathan and his armor bearer discomfit the Philistines at Michmash; in the general pursuit Jonathan tastes honey contrary to the command of Saul; his life is spared at the demand of the people (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 14:15-14, 45); Saul's successes in war against the neighboring tribes; his children and relatives named (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 14:46-52); Saul, commanded to exterminate Amalek, only partially obeys, and Samuel declares to him his rejection from the kingdom; Samuel and Saul finally part (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 15); Samuel is sent to Bethlehem to anoint David, son of Jesse, to be king (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 16:1-13); in consequence of Saul's malady, David is sent for to cheer him with music (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 16:14-23); the Philistines and the Israelites arrayed for battle in the valley of Elah; Goliath challenges Israel, and is killed by David (<sup><011></sup>1 Samuel 17); Jonathan and David make a covenant of friendship; Saul retains David near him, and sets him over his men of war; the women-

singers give greater honor to David than to Saul, who is displeased, and seeks to destroy David (<sup><BRI></sup>1 Samuel 18); Jonathan takes David's part and Michal also; David flees to Samuel at Ramah; they go together to Naioth; Saul sends messengers, and then goes himself to fetch David; they all prophesy (ch. 19); David visits Jonathan; they renew their covenant; Jonathan makes known to David by the device of the arrows Saul's determination to kill him; their parting (ch. 20); David flees to Nob, where he obtains the shewbread, and proceeds to Achish, king of Gath, and feigns madness; then to the cave of Adullam, to Mizpeh of Moab, and to Hareth; Saul kills Ahimelech and the priests by the hand of Doeg the Edomite (ch. 21, 22); David saves Keilah from the Philistines, but leaves it on the approach of Saul, and abides in the wilderness of Ziph, where Jonathan visits him; Saul is recalled from the pursuit of David by an invasion of the Philistines (<sup><BRI></sup>1 Samuel 23); David in the wilderness of Engedi spares Saul's life (ch. 24); Samuel's death and burial; the narrative of Nabal and his wife Abigail (ch. 25); David again spares the life of Saul at Hachilab; he goes with six hundred men to Achish, king of Gath, who gives him Ziklag to dwell in the Philistines encamp against Israel; Saul in vain seeks counsel from God, and then has recourse to the witch of Endor; the princes of the Philistines refuse David's aid in battle (<sup><BRI></sup>1 Samuel 26-29); David returns to Ziklag and finds it desolated; he pursues the Amalekites and recovers the spoil (ch. 30); the battle of Gilboa; Saul and his three sons die (ch. 31); the news of Saul's death reaches David at Ziklag, and calls forth his touching dirge or lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Samuel 1).

**3. *The Unsettled Succession*,** — Ishbosheth king of Israel, David of Judah (2 Samuel 2-5:3; B.C. 1053-1046). — David is anointed king of Judah at Hebron; Ishbosheth is made king of Israel; the fight between the followers of David and of Ishbosheth by the pool of Gibeon (ch. 2); David's power increases in Hebron; six sons born to him there; Abner forsakes Ishbosheth, and makes terms with David to transfer the kingdom of Israel to him; is slain by Joab; David's lamentation over him (ch. 3); the head of Ishbosheth is brought by Rechab and Baanah to David, who punishes them for the deed (ch. 4); the tribes of Israel make David their king (<sup><BRI></sup>2 Samuel 5:1-3).

**4. *Israel under King David*** (<sup><BRI></sup>2 Samuel 5:4-24; B.C. 1046-1013). — David, after being king of Judah for seven years and a half, reigns thirty-three years in Jerusalem over all Israel; he captures the fortress of Zion from the Jebusite, forms a friendship with Hiram king of Tyre, defeats the

Philistines at Baal-perazim, and again from Geba unto Gazer (ch. 5); David brings up the ark of the Lord; the breach of Uzzah; the house of Obed-edom is blessed; the ark brought to Jerusalem; Michal derides David for dancing before the ark (ch. 6); David is forbidden to build a house for the Lord in a message brought to him by Nathan the prophet, who announces the establishment of his dynasty; David's prayer (ch. 7); his victories over the Philistines, Moabites, Edomites, etc., recited (ch. 8); his kindness to Mephibosheth (ch. 9); his victory over Bene-ammon (ch. 10); his sin with Bathsheba and Uriah; Nathan's parable; punishment denounced; David's penitence; the child dies; Solomon is born; David captures Rabbah of Bene-ammon (ch. 11, 12); the affair of Amnon and Tamar; Absalom's revenge and flight to Geshur; Joab artfully procures his return after three years' absence (ch. 13, 14); the rebellion of Absalom and the flight of David; the ark, the priests, and Hushai sent back to Jerusalem; the treachery of Ziba; the reviling of Shimei; conflicting advice given by Hushai and Ahitophel to Absalom, and Ahitophel's suicide (ch. 15-17); the battle in the forest of Ephraim; Absalom's death; David's great grief (ch. 18); David's return to Jerusalem; the conduct of Shimei, Mephibosheth, and Barzillai; the rivalry between Judah and Israel in bringing back the king (ch. 19); the rebellion of Sheba; Joab slays Amasa; Sheba's head given to Joab at Abel (ch. 20); the three years' famine, and the appeasement of the Gibeonites; the burial of the bones of Saul and his sons; the giants of the Philistines slain by David's servants (ch. 21); David's song (Psalm 18) (ch. 22); the last words of David; the names and exploits of his heroes (ch. 23); the numbering of the people and the pestilence (ch. 24).

**III. *Origin and Structure.*** — It is evident that Samuel could not be the author of the whole of these books, since his death is recorded in the 25th chapter of the first book, and the history continues after his death down to nearly the end of the reign of David, a period of perhaps forty-five years. There is a somewhat common opinion that the first twenty-four chapters were written by Samuel and the rest by Gad and Nathanan opinion founded on ~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 29:29: "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, are they not written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer?" There is much in the general structure of the books, (and in the relation of the several parts to each other, to render it probable that different writers, living at different times, were concerned in their production, notwithstanding the degree of uniformity which the style and language exhibit. The most reasonable

supposition is: that they were the work of one compiler, who used historical records of various sources. This opinion, though held by nearly all modern critics, as Thenius, and even by Hävernick and Keil, is not new, as Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodoret, St. Athanasius, and St. Gregory observed that the four books of Kings were historical abridgments of several books or memoirs of the prophets which are cited in them. The grounds on which this view of the origin of these books is based have, however, only in very recent times been fully expounded. Warning the reader against attaching undue importance to the evidence which has been adduced in proof of this position, his attention may nevertheless be directed to the following points:

- 1.** There is considerable difference in the manner of the writers; some portions contrasting in their brief, fragmentary, chronological character with others which are more full and copious, and (in one part at least) minutely biographical (comp. <sup><0908></sup>1 Samuel 5:1-16; 8; 20:15-22; 23:8-29, with 2 Samuel 11-20).
- 2.** In several places there may be perceived the conclusion of the original documents, to which additional matter has been attached, yet without being so joined as to appear like a natural continuation. In some places the compiler has placed *together* what he found narrated by *different* writers respecting the persons whose histories they wrote, without having so worked them up into one narrative as to harmonize all their parts (1 Samuel 7:15-17; 14:47-52; <sup><0885></sup>2 Samuel 8:15-18; 20:23-26).
- 3.** Of some events there appear to be double accounts recorded, and occasionally these accounts are different, and sometimes, apparently at least, inconsistent; as, for instance, how Saul became king (1 Samuel 9-10, 16, and 10:17-27); how and why Saul was rejected (<sup><0938></sup>1 Samuel 13:8-14, and 15:10-26); how David became known to Saul (<sup><0964></sup>1 Samuel 16:14-21, and 17:55-18:2); how David spared Saul's life (<sup><0940></sup>1 Samuel 24 and 26); how David went over to the Philistines (<sup><0210></sup>1 Samuel 21:10-15, and 27:1-4); how the proverb "Is Saul also among the prophets?" arose (<sup><0909></sup>1 Samuel 10:9-13, and 19:22-24). It should here be remarked that these alleged discrepant passages, as well as many more which skeptical critics have adduced, need to be explained, whatever opinion may be held respecting the authorship of these books. As, for instance, the statement that Samuel (<sup><0975></sup>1 Samuel 7:15-17) was all his life long judge over Israel, but according to <sup><0908></sup>1 Samuel 8:1-3 had surrendered the office to his sons



(but see <sup><OR1></sup>1 Samuel 12:2); the occasion and the motives for demanding a king, as differently stated in 8:5 and 12:12; the two accounts of Goliath (<sup><OR1></sup>1 Samuel 17:1-10, and <sup><OR2></sup>2 Samuel 21:19); the double record of Samuel's death (<sup><OR1></sup>1 Samuel 25:1 and 28:3); the two descriptions of the manner of Saul's death (<sup><OR1></sup>1 Samuel 31:1-6 and <sup><OR2></sup>2 Samuel 1:1-10); the twofold account of the battle with the Syrians (2 Samuel 8 and 10), etc. Such different, though not therefore discordant, portions of the work may probably be best explained on the assumption that the books consist of materials brought together from various sources. This origin may be granted, however, without admitting that there is any inconsistency or contradiction among the materials so joined together; just as in the case of the Gospel history, which is constituted by the separate narratives of four different, but not therefore discordant, writers. It is not the object of this article to *explain* the alleged inconsistencies, however completely that might be done. They are here mentioned only as they bear upon the question of authorship, and as they seem to indicate the use of a variety of materials by the author or compiler of these books.

**4.** The relation between the books of Chronicles and the books of Samuel is thought to point to the same conclusion. It can scarcely be maintained that the author of the Chronicles has derived from the books of Samuel all the materials for the narratives which are common to both works. There are so many variations between the history as related by the chronicler and as related in Samuel as to render it probable, not that the chronicler derived everything from Samuel, but that he had access to the sources used also by the compiler of Samuel. This may be explained by a comparison of <sup><OR1></sup>2 Samuel 5:1-10 and 23:8-39 with <sup><OR2></sup>1 Chronicles 11:12. The chronicler has placed in continuous narrative David's anointing as king of Israel at Hebron, the capture of Jerusalem, the building of the city of David, and the list of David's heroes, with their deeds, probably as he found them connected in the documents which he used; while in Samuel they are detached, the list of heroes being placed separately in the history of the latest period of the life of David. So in <sup><OR1></sup>1 Chronicles 3, the list of David's children is given in a form probably drawn from some official register to which the writer of Samuel had access, as he gives the list in two portions to suit the course of his narrative (<sup><OR2></sup>2 Samuel 3, 2-5; 5, 14-16).

**5.** The hand of a compiler is thought to be perceptible in certain detached observations here and there occurring in the course of the history, in the

way of explanation of some portion drawn from the documents; as for example, in <sup><0909></sup>1 Samuel 9:9, the expression **harb**; is explained: For “the prophet” of today was called formerly “the seer.” <sup><0974></sup>1 Samuel 17:14, 15, is regarded as an interposed remark, to connect this history with the account given in the previous chapter of the family of Jesse.

**IV. The Sources.** — Should these books then appear to be a compilation from several original documents, the interesting question arises, How far may it be possible to resolve the whole work into its constituent parts, so as to obtain some idea of the nature of the sources whence the parts were derived? Thenius has attempted to solve this difficult problem in the following way. On internal grounds he distinguishes five principal sources:

- (a.)** *A History of Samuel*, contained in <sup><0900></sup>1 Samuel 1-7, which seems to conclude naturally as a separate and independent narrative, in which Samuel is altogether the principal person.
- (b.)** *A History of Saul*, comprised in the following portions: <sup><0900></sup>1 Samuel 8; 10:17-27; 11; 12; 15; 16; 18:6-14; 26; 28:3-25; 31. The materials derived from this source are interwoven with others derived from a third source, viz.:
- (c.)** *A History of David*, from which have been derived the following portions: <sup><0945></sup>1 Samuel 14:52; 17; 18, in part; 19; 20; 21, in part; 22; 23; 24; 25; 27; 28:1, 2; 29; 30; <sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 1-5; 7; 8.
- (d.)** *Another History of Saul*, from which 1 Samuel 9; 10:1-16; 8; and 14 have been drawn. This is regarded as an older and more strictly historical document than *b*, that being considered as of much later origin, and as founded on tradition.
- (e.)** Lastly, *a Biography of David*, embracing full details of the second half of his life, and recounting his family history (2 Samuel 11; 12:1-25; 13-20).

The relation of <sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 21-24 to the preceding portions seems to be that of a supplement or appendix of matters not related in chronological order, nor having any close connection with each other.

There is doubtless very much hypercriticism in this account of Thenius. So far as authorities or sources are quoted in the books themselves, the matter is much more simple. To only one work is direct reference made, viz. to the book of the upright (Jasher), **rpservYhi**(<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 1:18),

elsewhere also quoted only once (<sup><6003></sup>Joshua 10:13), and, as both the quotations are in verse, the work is thought to have been a book of poems. *SEE JASHER, BOOK OF.*

There are, however, certain parts of the books of Samuel which must have been derived either from verbal tradition or from some written documents, such, for instance, as the following poetical pieces: the song of Hannah (<sup><9001></sup>1 Samuel 2:1-10); David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (<sup><1019></sup>2 Samuel 1:19-27); David's lament over Abner (3:33, 34); Nathan's parable (7:1-4); a song or psalm of David (22:2-51 [<sup><3801></sup>Psalm 18]); the last words of David (23:1-8). To these must be added the lists of names and genealogies, etc.

It is said in <sup><3309></sup>1 Chronicles 29:29, "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer." The old opinion as to the authorship of Samuel, to which we have already alluded, was founded on this quotation. The prophets were wont to write a history of their own times. That Samuel did so in reference to the great events of his life is evident from the statement that he "wrote the manner of the kingdom in a book, and laid it up before the Lord" (<sup><9105></sup>1 Samuel 10:25). The phrase *l almvjyr bDæ* "words of Samuel," may not refer to our present Samuel, which is not so comprehensive as this collection seems to have been. It does not, like the treatise to which the author of Chronicles refers, include "the acts of David, first and last." The annals which these three seers compiled were those of their own times in succession (Kleinert, *Aechtheit d. Jes.* pt. 1, p. 83); so that there existed a history of contemporary events written by three inspired men. The portion written by Samuel might include his own life, and the greater part of Saul's history, as well as the earlier portion of David's career. Gad was a contemporary of David, and is termed his seer. Probably also he was one of his associates in his various wanderings (<sup><9215></sup>1 Samuel 22:5). In the latter part of David's reign Nathan was a prominent counsellor, and assisted at the coronation of Solomon. We have, therefore, prophetic materials for the books of Samuel. Hävernick (§ 161) supposes there was another source of information to which the author of Samuel might resort, namely, the annals of David's reign — a conjecture not altogether unlikely, as may be seen by his reference to <sup><1017></sup>2 Samuel 8:17, compared with <sup><3724></sup>1 Chronicles 27:24. The accounts of David's heroes and their mighty feats, with the estimate of their respective bravery, have the appearance of a contribution by Seruah,

the scribe, or principal secretary of state. Out of such materials ample and authoritative, some of them written and some of them oral — the books of Samuel appear to be made up (Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, pt. 2. p. 496; Karo, *De Fontibus Librorum quoe feruntur Samuelis* [1862]).

**V. Antiquity.** — The external evidence carries the book only to the age of the Ptolemies, when the Sept. version was made, or possibly to the age of Nehemiah, if we may trust the apocryphal account of the foundation of a library by the latter (2 Macc. 2:13). But the *internal* evidence is much stronger. The high antiquity of the books of Samuel, or of the sources whence they were principally derived, in comparison with that of the Kings and Chronicles, appears from the absence of reference to older sources or authorities in the former, such as is frequently made in the latter. It hence appears that the compiler did not live at any great distance from the events which he relates, and therefore does not deem it needful to refer his readers to sources already known to them; while the original sources have for the most part all the marks of having been written by persons contemporaneous with the events described. Against this opinion as to the early age of the books of Samuel, various objections have been brought. The phrase “unto this day” is often employed in them to denote the continued existence of customs, monuments, and names whose origin has been described by the annalist (<sup><ORF></sup>1 Samuel 5:5; 6:18; 30:25). This phrase, however, does not always indicate that a long interval of time elapsed between the incident and such a record of its duration. It was a common idiom. Joshua (22:3) uses it of the short time that Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh had fought in concert with the other tribes in the subjugation of Canaan. So, again, he (23:9) employs it to specify the time that intervened between the entrance into Canaan and his resignation of the command on account of his approaching decease. Matthew, in his Gospel (27:8, and 28:15), uses it of the period between the death of Christ and the composition of his book. Reference is made in Samuel to the currency of a certain proverb (<sup><ORF></sup>1 Samuel 10:12), and to the disuse of the term *seer* (9:9), but in a manner which by no means implies an authorship long posterior to the time of the actual circumstances. The proverb, “Is Saul also among the prophets?” was one which for many reasons would obtain rapid and universal circulation; and, if no other hypothesis be considered satisfactory, we may suppose that the remark about the term “seer” becoming obsolete may be the parenthetical insertion of a later hand; or, it may be that in Samuel’s days the term *nabi* came to be technically used in

his school of the prophets. *SEE PROPHET*. There is little reason for supposing that any part of the work was composed even so late as subsequently to the division of the kingdom. For the expression "Israel and Judah" (occurring <sup><0118></sup>1 Samuel 11:8; 17:52; 18:16; <sup><0180></sup>2 Samuel 3:10; 5, 5; 24:1), which is claimed as proof of an origin *after* the division of the kingdom under Rehoboam, has no such force (as must be obvious from <sup><0118></sup>2 Samuel 2:4, 9, 10, 17, 28; 18:6, 7, 16; 19:9, compared with 12, 15, 16), from which it is clear that the phrase, if not already in use, originated in the circumstances that at first only the tribe of Judah adhered to David, while the remaining tribes under the common name of Israel formed a separate kingdom for seven years and a half, under Ishbosheth, and afterwards for a short time under Absalom. There is, however, one passage, <sup><0276></sup>1 Samuel 27:6, "Therefore hath Ziklag been to the kings of Judah till this day," which is not so clearly reconcilable with this view, unless it should prove to be a note added by a later hand.

With this claim to high antiquity the other internal evidence, so far as it goes, entirely agrees. In the unsettled times of the judges the observance of the ritual enjoined in the books of Moses had fallen greatly into disuse. Sacrifices which were lawful only before the door of the tabernacle were offered at many places, as at Mizpeh and Gilgal. No disapprobation of this practice is expressed in Samuel, though it very often is so in Kings. The Pentateuch seems to exert little influence on the habits of the people as described in Samuel, or on the ideas and language of the writers. There are, in deed, fewer allusions to Moses and his writings in Samuel than in any other of the early books of Scripture. But this may doubtless be in part accounted for by the disorganized and somewhat anomalous state into which matters fell in consequence of the capture of the ark by the Philistines, and the essentially new era which was shortly afterwards introduced by the institution of the kingdom, with the stirring events that followed in the personal histories of Saul and David. The name of Moses occurs fifty-six times in Joshua, in Judges three, in Samuel two, in Kings ten, in Chronicles thirty-one. The law of Moses is never once named in Samuel.

The language is distinguished by its purity, and this also is an argument for the early origin of these books. A considerable number of words and forms of words are peculiar to them, and several occur which are found only in one other book besides. But it is unnecessary here to give lists of them.

**VI. *The Author or Compiler.*** — With the exception of a brief expression in the Talmud (*Egyptian Gemara*, A.D. 500, *Baba Bathra*, fol. 14), **wrps bhk l awmç** (“Samuel wrote his book”), there is no opinion expressed by antiquity respecting the name of the author. No mention is made of it in the books of Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles, or in any part of the Bible. Nor is it named in the Apocrypha or in Josephus. The work is generally attributed to some competent historian, who availed himself of authentic documents in preparing it. Some writers, as Abarbanel and Grotius, ascribe it to Jeremiah, some to Ezra, and some to Isaiah. There is not nearly so much probability that Jeremiah compiled the books of Samuel (as is argued at some length by Hitzig, *Die Psalmen*, p. 48-85) as there is that he was the writer of the books of Kings. There is much greater dissimilarity of language, style, and spirit between Samuel and Jeremiah than between Kings and Jeremiah. The great number of words and forms of words peculiar to this work point out a distinct author and age, and it would seem most likely that it was compiled in an early period after the death of David, and previously to the rending of the kingdom under Rehoboam; unless the opinion which has widely prevailed in the Christian Church should be finally adopted, that the work begun by Samuel was carried on and finished before the death of David by Nathan and Gad, or that it was the work of some member of the school of the prophets who had personal knowledge of the events which he narrates. If, however, this theory cannot be maintained, and there should be grounds for supposing that the compiler lived not earlier than the times of Rehoboam (see Thenius on ~~1087~~ 2 Samuel 8:7; 14:27), still it must be acknowledged that the materials which he used were of earlier date, and must for the most part have been written by persons who were contemporaneous with the events. It appears certain that memoirs were written by Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (see ~~439~~ 2 Chronicles 29:29), and perhaps also by other members of the schools of the prophets, although it may not be equally certain that those memoirs are identical with the present books of Samuel. The fact that a recorder or remembrancer (**ryKzpi**), whose office it was to prepare memoirs or annals of passing events, is mentioned early among the household of David, is not without an important bearing on this question. It is clear that the authors of the original documents, if not of the work itself, must have occupied such positions of honor and influence as gave them ample opportunity of knowing the events of the times in which they wrote. Such minute details as we find, for instance, in the history of David, belonging rather to his

private than to his public life — the story of Bathsheba, of David's behavior on the death of her child, of Amnon and Tamar, of the secret sending to the priests from Mahanaim, etc. — bespeak perfectly well instructed writers, who had access to the best sources of information.

Stähelin (*Einleit.* § 25, etc.) conjectures that a large portion of Samuel was written by the author of the Pentateuch and of the books of Joshua and Judges. But continuity of history in the same form does not prove identity of authorship, nor are the similar phrases found in these books sufficient in number or characteristic idiom to support the theory. Nay, Samuel is free from the so called Chaldaisms of Judges and the archaisms of the Pentateuch. The peculiar theory of Jahn, on the other hand, is that the four books of Samuel and Kings were written by the same person, and at a date so recent as the 30th year of the Babylonian captivity. His arguments, however, as well as those of Eichhorn (*Einleit.* § 468), and Herbst (*Einleit.* 2, 1-139), who hold a similar view, are more ingenious than solid (introduction, § 46). The fact of all the four treatises being named "Books of Kings" is insisted on as a proof that they were originally undivided and formed a single work — a mere hypothesis, since the similarity of their contents might easily give rise to this general title, while the more ancient appellation for the first two was *The Books of Samuel*. Great stress is laid on the uniformity of method in all the books. But this uniformity by no means amounts to any proof of identity of authorship. It is nothing more than the same Hebrew historical style. The more minute and distinctive features, so far from being similar, are very different. Nay, the books of Samuel and Kings may be contrasted in many of those peculiarities which mark a different writer:

- (a.) In Kings there occur not a few references to the laws of Moses; in Samuel not one of these is to be found.
- (b.) The books of Kings repeatedly cite authorities, to which appeal is made, and the reader is directed to the "Acts of Solomon," "the book of the Chronicles of Kings of Israel," or "Judah." But in the books of Samuel there is no formal allusion to any such sources of information.
- (c.) The nature of the history in the two works is very different. The plan of the books of Samuel is not that of the books of Kings. The books of Samuel are more of a biographical character, and are more limited and personal in their view.

(d.) There are in the books of Kings many later forms of language. For a collection of some of these the reader is referred to De Wette (*Einleit. in das A.T.* § 185, note e). Scarcely any of those more recent or Chaldaic forms occur in Samuel. Besides, some peculiarities of form are noted by De Wette (§ 180), but they are not so numerous or distinctive as to give a general character to the treatise (Hirzel, *De Chaldaismi Bibl. Origine*, 1830). Many modes of expression common in Kings are absent from Samuel (Keil, *Einleit.* § 53). *SEE KINGS, BOOKS OF.*

(e.) The concluding chapters of the second book of Samuel are in the form of an appendix to the work — a proof of its completeness. The connection between Samuel and Kings is thus interrupted. It appears, then, that Samuel claims a distinct authorship from the books of Kings. Stähelin, indeed, supposes that the present division between the two treatises has not been correctly made, and that the two commencing chapters of 1 Kings really belong to 2 Samuel. This he argues on philological grounds, because the terms *ytrkhw ytl phw* (~~1~~ Kings 1:38), *çpn fl m* (1:12), and *hdp çpn* (1:29) are found nowhere in Kings but in the first two chapters, while they occur once and again in Samuel. There is certainly something peculiar in this affinity, though it may be accounted for on the principle that the author of the pieces or sketches which form the basis of the initial portions of 1 Kings not only composed those which form the conclusion of Samuel, but also supervised or published the whole work which is now called by the prophet's name.

Thus the books of Samuel have an authorship of their own — an authorship belonging to a very early period. While their tone and style are very different from the later records of Chronicles, they are also dissimilar to the books of Kings. They bear the impress of a hoary age in their language, allusions, and mode of composition. The insertion of odes and snatches of poetry, to enliven and verify the narrative, is common to them with the Pentateuch. They abound in minute sketches and vivid touches. As if the chapters had been extracted from a diary, some portions are more fully detailed and warmly colored than others, according as the original observer was himself impressed. Many of the incidents, in their artless and striking delineation, would form a fine study for a painter.

**VII. The Object.** — So far as the compiler of these books might be conscious of a direct aim in his work, producing it, as doubtless he did, under the impulse and guidance of the Holy Spirit, it might be his endeavor



to continue the history of the chosen people, and especially to record the remarkable change which was effected in the method of the divine government, when the God of Israel ceased to rule the people by judges, and permitted them to be governed by kings, as were the other nations of the earth. In pursuing this object the writer took care to point out the important distinction which was to be maintained between the kings of Israel and those of other nations, in the separation of the civil from the ecclesiastical, or the secular from the religious authority; and also to describe the origin and influence of the prophetic order in relation both to the monarchy and to the people. The books of Kings are a history of the nation as a theocracy; those of Chronicles have special reference to the form and ministry of the religious worship, as bearing upon its reestablishment after the return from Babylon. Samuel is more biographical, yet the theocratic element of the government is not overlooked. It is distinctly brought to view in the early chapters concerning Eli and his house, and the fortunes of the ark; in the passages which describe the change of the constitution; in the blessing which rested on the house of Obed-Edom; in the curse which fell on the Bethshemites and Uzzah and Saul for intrusive interference with holy things.

**VIII.** *Particular Relation to the Books of Chronicles.* — That portion of the history which is common to the books of Samuel and of Chronicles is found in ~~<1000>~~2 Samuel 1-24, and ~~<1300>~~1 Chronicles 10-21, beginning with the account of the death of Saul and ending with the story of the pestilence. Between these two narrations of the same period of history the following differences may be pointed out.

**1.** The book of Samuel contains, but that of Chronicles omits:

- 1.** The story of David's kindness to Mephibosheth, ~~<1000>~~2 Samuel 9.
- 2.** Of Bathsheba and Uriah, ~~<1000>~~2 Samuel 11:2-12, 25.
- 3.** The rebellion of Absalom, 2 Samuel 13, etc.
- 4.** The surrender of seven of the sons of Saul to the Gibeonites, ~~<1000>~~2 Samuel 21:1-14.
- 5.** A war with the Philistines, ~~<1015>~~2 Samuel 21:15-17.
- 6.** David's song (~~<1980>~~Psalm 18), 2 Samuel 22.
- 7.** The last words of David, 2 Samuel 23.

**2.** The book of Samuel omits, but that of Chronicles contains:

1. A list of David's adherents.
2. A list of those who chose David to be king at Hebron.
3. David's preparation for building the Temple.
4. The arrangement of the Levites and priests for Temple service.
5. David's officers and heroes, etc.

3. The two works present several portions of the history in a different order, such as the following:

<del>&lt;1051&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 5:11-25 .....	<del>&lt;340&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 14
<del>&lt;1061&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 6:1-10.....	<del>&lt;3100&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 11:1-9.
<del>&lt;1063&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 6:3-11.....	<del>&lt;3301&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 13.
<del>&lt;1062&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 6:12-23 .....	<del>&lt;3501&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 15.
<del>&lt;1038&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 23:8-10 .....	Chronicles 11:10-47.

4. The differences of verbal and grammatical forms in the narration of the same events in these two works are of such a nature as to indicate the greater antiquity of the books of Samuel. Nearly all the points in which Chronicles differ from Samuel may be distinctly explained by the more recent origin of the former. They are too numerous and minute to be here mentioned.

5. Many of the *numbers* in Samuel and Chronicles differ, as

<del>&lt;1003&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 10:13, 18, 24, and	<del>&lt;3392&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 19:12, 18, 25.
<del>&lt;1038&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 23:8, and	<del>&lt;33111&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 11:11.
<del>&lt;1049&gt;</del> 2 Samuel 24:9, 13, and	<del>&lt;3205&gt;</del> 1 Chronicles 21:5, 12.

These discrepancies are doubtless to be accounted for on the ground of errors of transcription. Whether the numbers in Samuel are generally right, and those in Chronicles generally wrong, which is the common (but perhaps usually incorrect) opinion, or whether errors exist in both, cannot be determined until more careful attention shall have been given to the subject, and a more critical edition of the Hebrew text shall have been prepared. *SEE CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF.*

**IX. Chronology.** — One of the most striking points of difference between the books of Samuel and of Kings is the more sparing use of dates in the former. The means of determining the periods of time in which the various events recorded in them happened are exceedingly scanty. The most helpful are found in other parts of Scripture. Thus, in ~~<4430>~~ Acts 13 we find that Saul was king “by the space of forty years.” We know already that David

reigned over Judah and all Israel forty years, and we have also calculated that Samuel must have lived about 110 years. If, then, Samuel died about five years before Saul, we find that the history covers a period of 155 years, except that brief portion of the life of David not contained in Samuel. These numbers agree with the usual dates assigned to the commencement and termination of the books of Samuel. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

**X.** *Canonicity, etc.* — The historical credibility and canonicity of these books need not be fully discussed in this place. The internal evidence of their truthfulness and the external evidence of their canonical authority are both complete. The style in which they are written is simple, natural, and bold. Places, times, and other minute details are freely and artlessly given. The course and connection of the history carry with them the proof of their truthfulness. The characters and events are in accordance with the times in which they are placed. Attempts to establish contradiction and discrepancy have not succeeded. The history contained in these books fits in and accords with the preceding and subsequent portions of the history of the Israelitish people, although the several portions were composed at long intervals and by different authors. Portions of them are quoted in the New Test. (~~1074~~ 2 Samuel 7:14, in ~~806~~ Hebrews 1:5; ~~0934~~ 1 Samuel 13:14, in ~~4132~~ Acts 13:22). References to them occur in other sections of Scripture, especially in the Psalms, to which they often afford historic illustration. The old objections of Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, and Le Clerc are well disposed of by Carpzov (*Introductio*, p. 215). Some of these supposed contradictions we have already referred to, and for a solution of others we refer to Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 544, etc. Some of the objections of Vatke, in his *Bibl. Theol.* — “*cujus mentio est refutatio*” — are summarily disposed of by Hengstenberg (*Die Authentie des Pentat.* 2, 115). See, in addition to the ordinary Introductions to the Old Test. — such as those of Horne, Hävernick, Keil, De Wette — the following later works: Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Berl. 1860), p. 355-368; Stähelin, *Specielle Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Elberfeld, 1862), p. 83-105; Davidson, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Lond. and Edinb. 1862), p. 491-536.

**XI.** *Commentaries.* — The exegetical helps on the entire books of Samuel alone have not been numerous: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* 2, 479; also in *Gallandii Bibl. Patrum*, 14); Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* 4, 331);

Theodoret, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* 1, 1); Gregory, *Expositiones* (in *Opp.* 3, 2, 1); Jerome, *Quoestiones* (in *Opp.* [ *Spur.* ], 3, 755); Eucherius, *Commentaria* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 6); Procopius, *Scholia* [includ. other hist. books] (in Meursii *Opp.* 8, 1); Isidore, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.*); Babe, *Expositio*, etc. (in various forms, in *Opp.*); Angelomus, *Enarrationes* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 15); Hildebert, *Versio Metrica* (in *Opp.* p. 1191); Raban, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*); Rupert, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 1, 345); Hugo Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 1); Abrabanel, **vWrpP** [includ. other hist. books] (s.l. et a. [Pesaro, 1522]; Naples, 1543, fol.; Leips. 1686, fol.); Bafiolas, **vWrpP** [Leiria, 1494, fol.; also in the Rabbinic Bibles]; Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* [includ. Deuteronomy] (Basil. 1524; Argent. 1525, 8vo); Menius, *Commentarius* [on 1 Samuel] (Vitemb. 1532, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 2); Lambert, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1526; Francof. 1539, fol.); Caussin [R.C.], *Dissertationes* (Par. 1550, fol.; Colon. 1552, 4to); Weller, *Commentaria* [includ. 1 Kings] (Francof. 1555, 2 vols. 8vo); Peter Martyr, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1567, fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Lips. 1569, 1583, fol.; Neost. 1591, 8vo); Borrhäus, *Commentarius* [includ. other hist. books] (Basil. 1577, fol.); Allschul, **l aWmva** [Cracow, 1595, fol., and later]; Ascheich, **hwabyXhitwar** [includ. other hist. books] (Venice, ] 1601, 1620, fol., and later); Pflacker, *Predigten* (Tüb. 1602, fol.); Lafado, **rqy; yl** [includ. other hist. books] (Venice, 1603, fol.); Bidemach, *Auslegung* (Tüb. 1605, fol.); Willet, *Harmony* (Cambr. 1606; Lond. 1607, 4to; *ibid.* 1614, fol.); Leonhart, *Hypomnete* [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Erf. 1608, 1614, 8vo); Serarius [R.C.], *Commentaria* [includ. other books] (Lugd. 1613; Mogunt. 1617, fol.); Laurent, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1615, 1616, fol.); Drusius, *Adnotationes* [on parts, includ. other books] (Franec. 1618, 4to); Rangolius [R.C.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1621-24, 2 vols. fol.); De Mendoza [R.C.], *Commentaria* [on **<000>** 1 Samuel 1-15] (Lugd. 1622-31, 3 vols. fol.); Sanchez [R.C.], *Commentarius* (Antw. 1624; Lugd. 1625, fol.); Crommius [R.C.], *Theses* (includ. other hist. books] (Lovan. 1631, 4to); De Vera [R.C.], *Commentaria* (Lima, 1635, fol.); Bonfrere [R.C.], *Commentarius* [includ. Kings and Chronicles] (Tornaci, 1643, 2 vols. fol., and later); Wulffer, *Predigten* (Nüremb. 1670, 4to); De Naxera [R.C.], *Excursus* (Lugd. 1672, 3 vols. fol.); Osiander, *Commentarius* (Stuttg. 1687, fol.); Schmid, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1687-89, 2 vols. 4to); Moldenhauer, *Erläuterung* [includ. other hist. books] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik, **raB** [on **<000>** 1 Samuel] (Vienna, 1793, 8vo); Detmold,

l awmv] (ibid. 1793, 8vo, and later); Hensler, *Erläuterung* [on 1 Samuel] (Hamb. and Kiel, 1795, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Criticism*, 1); Mulder, ~~μυνωραραγαβαδ~~ [includ. other hist. books] (Amst. 1827, 8vo); Lindsay, *Lectures* (Lond. 1828, 2 vols. 12mo); Kalkar, *Quoestiones* [on the authenticity of 1 Samuel] (Othin. 1835); Königsfeldt, *Annotationes* [on ~~1000~~ 2 Samuel and ~~1300~~ 1 Chronicles] (Havn. 1839, 8vo); Wellhausen, *Der Text d. B. S.* (Gött. 1841, 8vo); Thenius, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurzgef. exeg. Handb.*, Leips. 1842, 1864, 8vo); Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentar* (ibid. 1864; transl. in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1866, 8vo); Erdmann, *Erklärung* (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, Bielefeld, 1873, 8vo). **SEE OLD TESTAMENT.**

### Samuel Ben-David Otolengo.

**SEE OTOLENGO.**

### Samuel Ben-Isaac Oceda.

**SEE OCEDA.**

### Samuel The Little

(<sup>^</sup>fqh l awmç), a contemporary of Gamaliel 2, is known in Jewish history as the author of the prayer against the *Minim*, or Jewish Christians. In the Talmud treatise *Berakoth*, fol. 28b, we read: hrç [ hnwmç rydsh yl wqp ^w[mç rma hnbyb rdsh l [ l ayl mg ^br ynp l twkrb [ dwyç µda çy µwl k µymkj l l ayl mg wbr µhl hnqtw ^fqh l awmç dm[ µyqwdxh tkrb ^qtl ; i.e. “Simon Pakuli arranged the eighteen benedictions before rabban Gamaliel, in Jabne, in their present order. Rabban Gamaliel said to the sages, ‘Is there none who knows to prepare a benediction against the Zaddukim or Sadducees?’ Then arose Samuel the Little and prepared it.” This **µyqwdxh tkrb**, or, as it is generally called, **μυνymh tkrb**, “the benediction against the *Minim*, or *Jewish Christians*,” is the twelfth of the so-called *Sh'mone Esre*, or *Eighteen Benedictions* [ comp. the art. SYNAGOGUE], and originally read **μυνyml w hwqt yht l a μυνyçl ml w**, i.e. “let there be no hope for the *Minim* and calumniators.” That this prayer was directed against Jewish Christians is testified by Epiphanius (*Ep. adversus Hoeres.* 29, 9; ed. Petav. p. 124), who states: οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους ἑ τοὺς Ναζεραίουσ] κέκτηναι μῖσος, ἀλλὰ ἀνιστάμενοι,

ἔωθεν καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας καὶ μερὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν, τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας ὅτε εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας φάσκοντες ὅτι Ἐπικατάρᾳσι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς Ναζεραίουσ. With regard to these words of Epiphanius, Grätz remarks that Epiphanius, being by birth a Jew, is a competent witness that this formula was directed against the Jewish Christians. It will be seen that the remark of Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s.v. "Synagogue" (p. 906, note), is not justified either by the statement of Epiphanius or that of the Jewish historian Grätz. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4, 434; Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 344-346; Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, p. 502. (B.P.)

### Samuel Maroccanus.

SEE MOROCCO, SAMUEL OF.

### Samuel Ben-Meir

SEE RASHBAM.

### Samuel Yeretz,

An Armenian historian, was born at Ani (Armenia Major), and lived in the 12th century. He was a disciple of George Melrig, and was requested by Gregory IV, patriarch of Armenia, to prepare a chronicle or universal history, which work he published under the title *Samuelis, Presb. Aniensis, temporum usque ad suam Ratio*. It is divided into two parts, commencing with the creation of the world and ending with the year 1179. It is really a mere abridgment of the chronicles of Eusebius increased by matter found in the *History of Armenia* by Moses of Choren, and in earlier writings now lost. The Latin translation was prepared by Dr. Zorab and Angelo May.

### Samus,

In Greek mythology, is an ancestral hero of the Samians, from whom both that people and the island Samos derived their names. He was the son of Ancaeus, king of the Leleges, and Samia, daughter of Maeander. His brothers were Perilaus, Enudus, and Alitherses, and Parthenope was his sister.

## Sanabas'sar

(Sanab£Ssaroj V.R. Saman£Ssaroj, 1 Esdr. 2:12, 15), Or Sanabas'sarus (Sanab£Ssaroj, V.R. Saban£Ssaroj, 1 Esdr. 6:18, 20), The Greek form of the Heb. name SHESHBAZZAR in the corresponding passages (<sup>15008</sup>Ezra 1:8, 11; 5, 14, 16).

## Sanadon, Noel-Étienne,

A celebrated Jesuit, was born at Rouen, Feb. 16, 1676. At the early age of twelve he was admitted to the Order of Jesuits, and carried on his studies at Caen, where he afterwards taught rhetoric. His first literary attempt was a Latin poem entitled *Nicanor Moriens*. He subsequently wrote and translated many Latin poems, one of which, a translation of Horace, is considered his best work. In 1712 Sanadon was elected professor of rhetoric in the College of Louis the Great, and in 1728 he became librarian of the same institution. He died at Paris, Sept. 21, 1733.

## Sanagen,

In Hindu mythology, is a rajah of the children of the moon, the father of Darmatuwassa and grandfather of Kandikaiya.

## Sanakadi Sampradayis,

One of the Vaishnava sects among the Hindus. They worship Krishna and Radha conjointly, and are distinguished from other sects by a circular black mark in the center of the ordinary double streak of white earth, and also by the use of the necklace and rosary on the stem of the tulasai. The members of this sect are scattered throughout the whole of Upper India. They are very numerous about Mathura, and they are also among the most numerous of the Vaishnava sects in Bengal.

## Sanarkumaren,

In Hindu mythology, is one of the four perfect beings created by Brahma in order to recreate the destroyed human race; but as the pious offspring did not achieve that object, the evil spirit became the prevailing power in coition.

## San'asib

(Σανασίβ, v.r. Σαναβίς, Ἀνασείβ), A head of the priests, “the sons of Jeddu, the son of Jesus,” who are said to have returned, to the number of 972, with Zerubbabel from the captivity (1 Esdr. 5:24); evidently the 973 “children of Jedaiah, of the house of Jeshua,” in the Heb. texts (<sup><14726></sup>Ezra 2:36; <sup><14729></sup>Nehemiah 7:39), the name *Sanasib* having been repeated for the “Senaah” (Esdras, “Annaas”) of the preceding verse.

## Sanat,

In Finnish mythology, means songs of magical power which are chanted by the priests of the heathen Finns for the purpose of producing storms, curing the sick, causing favorable weather, bewitching cattle, etc.

## Sanbal'lat

(Heb. *Sanballat'*, **FLBİŞ**), A name of which the latter part is of uncertain etymology, but the first syllable is probably the Sanskrit *san* [Greek **σύν**], indicative of *strength*; Sept. Σανβαλλάτ, Josephus, Σαναβαλλέτης), a Horonite (q.v.), i.e. probably a native of Horonaim in Moab (<sup><14720></sup>Nehemiah 2:10, 19; 13:28). There are two very different accounts of him.

All that we know of him from Scripture is that he had apparently some civil or military command in Samaria, in the service of Artaxerxes (<sup><14712></sup>Nehemiah 4:2), and that, from the moment of Nehemiah's arrival in Judea, he set himself to oppose every measure for the welfare of Jerusalem, and was a constant adversary to the Tirshatha. B.C. 445. His companions in this hostility were Tobiah the Ammonite and Geshem the Arabian (<sup><14719></sup>Nehemiah 2:19; 4:7). For the details of their opposition, see <sup><14711></sup>Nehemiah 6, where the enmity between Sanballat and the Jews is brought out in the strongest colors. The only other incident in his life is his alliance with the high priest's family by the marriage of his daughter with one of the grandsons of Eliashib, which, from the similar connection formed by Tobiah the Ammonite (<sup><14713></sup>Nehemiah 13:4), appears to have been part of a settled policy concerted between Eliashib and the Samaritan faction. The expulsion from the priesthood of the guilty son of Joiada by Nehemiah must have still further widened the breach between him and Sanballat, and between the two parties in the Jewish state. Here, however, the scriptural narrative ends — owing, probably, to Nehemiah's return to



Persia — and with it likewise our knowledge of Sanballat. *SEE NEHEMIAH.*

But on turning to the pages of Josephus a wholly new set of actions, in a totally different time, is brought before us in connection with Sanballat, while his name is entirely omitted in the account there given of the government of Nehemiah, which is placed in the reign of Xerxes. Josephus, after interposing the whole reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus between the death of Nehemiah and the transactions in which Sanballat took part, and utterly ignoring the very existence of Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Ochus, etc., jumps at once to the reign of “Darius the last king,” and tells us (*Ant.* 11, 7, 2) that Sanballat was his officer in Samaria, that he was a Cuthaeon (i.e. a Samaritan) by birth, and that he gave his daughter Nicaso in marriage to Manasseh, the brother of the high priest Jaddua, and consequently the fourth in descent from Eliashib, who was high priest in the time of Nehemiah. He then relates that on the threat of his brother Jaddua and the other Jews to expel him from the priesthood unless he divorced his wife, Manasseh stated the case to Sanballat, who thereupon promised to use his influence with king Darius, not only to give him Sanballat’s government, but to sanction the building of a rival temple on Mount Gerizim of which Manasseh should be the high priest. Manasseh, on this, agreed to retain his wife and join Sanballat’s faction, which was further strengthened by the accession of all those priests and Levites (and they were many) who had taken strange wives. But just at this time happened the invasion of Alexander the Great; and Sanballat, with seven thousand men, joined him and renounced his allegiance to Darius (*Ant.* 11, 8, 4). Being favorably received by the conqueror, he took the opportunity of speaking to him in behalf of Manasseh. He represented to him how much it was for his interest to divide the strength of the Jewish nation, and how many there were who wished for a temple in Samaria; and so obtained Alexander’s permission to build the temple on Mount Gerizim, and make Manasseh the hereditary high priest. Shortly after this, Sanballat died; but the temple on Mount Gerizim remained, and the Shechemites, as they were called, continued also as a permanent schism, which was continually fed by all the lawless and disaffected Jews. Such is Josephus’s account. If there is any truth in it, of course the Sanballat of whom he speaks is a different person from the Sanballat of Nehemiah, who flourished fully one hundred years earlier; but when we put together Josephus’s silence concerning a Sanballat in Nehemiah’s time, and the many coincidences in the lives of the

Sanballat of Nehemiah and that of Josephus, together with the inconsistencies in Josephus's narrative (pointed out by Prideaux, *Connect.* 1, 288, 290, 395, 466), and its disagreement with what Eusebius tells of the relations of Alexander with Samaria (who says that Alexander appointed Andromachus governor of Judaea and the neighboring districts; that the Samaritans murdered him; and that Alexander, on his return, took Samaria in revenge, and settled a colony of Macedonians in it, and the inhabitants of Samaria retired to Sichem [*Chronicles Can.* p. 346]), and remember how apt Josephus is to follow any narrative, no matter how anachronistic and inconsistent with Scripture, we shall have no difficulty in concluding that his account of Sanballat is not historical. It is doubtless taken from some apocryphal romance, now lost, in which the writer, living under the empire of the Greeks, and at a time when the enmity of the Jews and Samaritans was at its height, chose the downfall of the Persian empire for the epoch, and Sanballat for the ideal instrument, of the consolidation of the Samaritan Church and the erection of the temple on Gerizim. To borrow events from some Scripture narrative and introduce some scriptural personage, without any regard to chronology or other propriety, was the regular method of such apocryphal books. (See 1 Esdras, apocryphal Esther, apocryphal additions to the book of Daniel, and the articles on them, and the story inserted by the Sept. after ~~12:24~~ 2 Kings 12:24, etc.). To receive as historical Josephus's narrative of the building of the Samaritan temple by Sanballat, circumstantial as it is in its account of Manasseh's relationship to Jaddua, and Sanballat's intercourse with both Darius Codomanus and Alexander the Great, and yet to transplant it, as Prideaux does, to the time of Darius Nothus (B.C. 409), seems scarcely compatible with sound criticism. *SEE SAMARITAN.*

### San Benito,

The garment worn by the victims of the Inquisition on the occasion of the auto-da-fé. It was a yellow frock, with a cross on the breast and on the back, devils and flames also being painted upon it. Those who were to be burned alive had the flames pointing upward, while those who had escaped this horrible fate had them pointing downward.

### Sanborn, E.C.,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bath, N.H., June 12, 1794. Early impressed that it was his duty to preach, he hesitated

for some time. At length a portion of one of his hands became maimed for life; that hand, while yet bleeding, he held towards heaven, and promised God that he would no longer resist his convictions of duty. In 1833 he joined the Genesee Conference, and continued in effective work until 1844, when, through failing health, he was obliged to desist entirely from ministerial labor. He died at the residence of his son, Hon. L.R. Sanborn, Niagara County, N.Y., April 20, 1867. He entertained a high appreciation of the varied duties of the ministry, was a firm believer in the doctrines of his Church, and an ardent admirer of her polity. See *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1867, p. 244.

### Sanborn, Jacob,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Unity, N.H., May 16, 1788. His pious parents deeply impressed the mind of their son by their religious instructions, prayers, and holy life. At the age of seventeen years (1805), he was awakened, and found peace. Although of Baptist parentage, he united (Jan. 18, 1806) with the Methodist Episcopal Church. About five years after, he became impressed that it was his duty to preach, and on Aug. 14, 1811, he went to preach as a licentiate on the Landaff Circuit, N.H. In June, 1812, he united on trial with the New England Conference, and from this time onward until 1850, with the exception of one year's location (1839-40), he performed effective labor. In 1850 he took a superannuated relation, which he retained until his death. He nevertheless continued to preach until May 10, 1863, when he delivered his last sermons in Pembroke. He died March 16, 1867. Mr. Sanborn was a more than ordinary man. He was a sound divine, good logician, able preacher, an eminently good pastor, a man of prayer, and of strict integrity of purpose and honesty of heart. See *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1867, p. 59.

### Sanbuki Codex

Is a Hebrew manuscript, now no more extant. Nothing is known of its author, the place where, and the time when it was written. According to Richard Simon (*Biblioth. Critic.* 1, 367), the name Sanbuki (yqwbnz) is derived from the owner of the MS., a Hungarian family. According to Hottinger (in *Bibliothecario Quadripartito*, p. 158, ed. Turic.), the name ought to be yqwdnz instead of yqwbnz, which is equivalent to Zadduki, or Sadducee. For other conjectures, see Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 292, 293; 4, 79) and Tychsel (*Tentamen*, p. 249, 250). As to the codex itself, some of its

readings are given in the margin of some MSS., as in Cod. Kennic. 415; Cod. Kennic. 8 (Bibl. Bodl. Hunting. 69; comp. Brunsius, *Ad Kenn. Diss. Genesis* p. 345). Besides, this codex is quoted three times by Menachem di Lonzano in his commentary *Or Thora*, as on <sup><0094></sup>Genesis 9:14, **ינחפ** (fol. 2 b, fin. ed. Amstel): **yl l hb htpb awçb yqwbzwb db l awçb ^a wnh**, i.e. in the Codex Hillel, the *nun* has only the *sh'va* (:), but in the Codex Sanbuki the *sh'va* with the *patach*; <sup><0130></sup>Leviticus 13:20, **l pç**; (fol. 14 b), **j tpb a ph yqwbzwb l pç**, i.e. in the Codex Sanbuki the *p* in **l pç** is written with the *patach*; <sup><0176></sup>Leviticus 26:36, **ytabaw** (fol. 15 b), **znkçaw st sb yqwbzwb µyml çwrybw yl l hbb w ytb ay[g çyal**, i.e. in Spanish and German MSS. there is a *gaya* (i.e. a *metheg*) under **t**, but not so in the Codd. Hillel, Jerusalem, and Sanbuki. See Strack, *Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Test. Hebr.* (Lips. 1873), p. 22. **SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.** (B.P.)

### Sanchez, Gaspar,

A learned Jesuit, was born at Cifuentes, in New Castile, about 1553. He was appointed to teach the learned languages and belles lettres in the Jesuit colleges at Oropesa, Madrid, and other places, and was at last chosen professor of divinity at Alcala. Here he spent thirteen years in commenting on the Scriptures, the result of which he published in various volumes in folio. He died in 1628.

### Sanchez, Pedro Antonio,

A learned Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Vigo, in Galicia, in 1740. He entered the Church, obtained a canonry in the Cathedral of St. James, and was likewise appointed professor of divinity in that city. His fame procured for him admission into many learned societies. He was celebrated as a preacher and admired for his benevolence, spending his income to aid the poor, so that, at his death in 1806, he left no more than was barely sufficient to defray the expenses of his funeral. Among his works are *Summa Theologiae Sacrae* (Madrid, 1789, 4 vols. 4to): — *Annales Sacrae* (ibid. 1784, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Hist. of the Church of Africa* (ibid. 1784, 8vo): — *A Treatise on Toleration*, etc. (ibid. 1785, 3 vols. 4to), and others.

## Sanchez, Thomas,

A celebrated Roman casuist, was born at Cordova in 1550. Raised in Romish piety, he joined the Jesuits in his sixteenth year. He studied philosophy, law, and theology with great success; was punctual in the fulfilment of all Church duties; and, at an early age, enjoyed a high reputation throughout Spain and Italy. His fame as a casuist was so great that he was often personally applied to for the solution of specific cases. He died at Granada in 1610. His work *De Sacramento Matrimonii* (Genuae, 1592, 3 vols.) occupies a high place in Jesuitical casuistry. It treats of every variety of obscene and immoral questions, and is justly regarded as indirectly contributive to the very immorality which it formally condemns. Pope Clement VIII used the work in preparing a solution of a specific case, and pronounced upon it the highest praise. But others have vigorously assailed it, even in the Roman Church. Arnauld of St. Cyr attacked it in his *Vindicioe Censuroe Facultatis Parisiensis* (see Bayle, *Dictionnaire* [art. "Sanchez"], 4, 134). After Sanchez's death appeared *Operis Moralis in Proceptis Dei Tomus I* (Venet. 1614): — *Consilia seu Opuscula Moralia* (Lugd. 1634). His complete works appeared at Venice in 1740, in 7 vols. See Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (N.Y. 1873), 1, 255-272; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 413. (J.P.L.)

## Sanchez De Arévalo, Roderigo,

Generally known as *Rodericus Sanctus*, a Spanish prelate, was born at Santa Maria de Nieva, in the diocese of Segovia, in 1404. After receiving his classical education at the University of Salamanca, and obtaining the degree of doctor, he entered the Church, and was made successively archdeacon of Trevino (in the diocese of Burgos), dean of Leon, and dean of Seville. About 1440 John II of Castile sent him as ambassador to Frederick III, and he was afterwards sent by Henry IV of Castile to congratulate pope Calixtus III upon his accession. On the accession of Paul II, Sanchez, who had been prevailed upon by his predecessor to settle at Rome, was appointed by that pope governor of the Castle of St. Angelo and keeper of the jewels and treasures of the Roman Church, and in course of time promoted to the bishoprics of Zamora, Calahorra, and Palencia. He died at Rome Oct. 10, 1470, and was interred in the Church of Santiago dei Spagnuoli. He wrote the following works: *Speculum Vitoe Humanoe* (Rome, 1468, fol.): — *Epistola de Expugnatione*, etc. (fol.): — *Compendiosa Historia Hispanica* (Rome, 1470, 4to; Frankfort, 1603): —

*Liber de Origine ac Differentia Principatus* (Rome, 1521). Many other works in MS. are in the Vatican Library. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

### Sanchoniatho

(Σαγχουνιάθων), The supposed author of a Phoenician history of Phoenicia and Egypt, called Φοινικκιά. He has been the subject of much discussion involving his place of birth, his works, and, indeed, his very existence. Our principal information respecting him is derived from Philo Byblius, a Greek writer at the beginning of the 2d century A.D. According to him, Sanchoniatho lived during the reign of Semiramis, and dedicated his book to Avibalus, king of Berytus. The general nature of the work is in itself sufficient to prove it to be a forgery, and yet the question remains whether the name Sanchoniatho was a pure invention of Philo or not. Movers supposes that it was the name of the sacred books of the Phoenicians and that its original form was *San-Chon-iath*, which might be represented in the Hebrew characters by  $\hat{s}i\ thji\ \hat{w}k$ , that is, “the entire law of Chon.” On this etymology we offer no opinion. According to Suidas, he also wrote a book on the theology of the Egyptians.

### Sancroft, William, D.D.,

An English prelate, was born at Fresingfield, Suffolk, Jan. 13, 1616, and educated at the grammar school of Bury St. Edmunds, and at Emanuel College, Cambridge. In 1642 Sancroft was elected a fellow of his college, but in the following year was deprived of his fellowship by the Puritans for refusing to subscribe to the famous “Engagement;” after which he went abroad. On the restoration of Charles 2, 1660, he was appointed chaplain to Cosin, bishop of Durham. After several preferments he was (1668) made archdeacon of Canterbury, and in 1677 archbishop of Canterbury. When James II issued his declaration for liberty of conscience and required the clergy to sign it, Sancroft refused. With six other bishops who joined him in his refusal, he was sent to the Tower (1688). He refused to take the oath to William and Mary, and was deposed by an act of Parliament, Aug. 1, 1689; but his actual departure from Lambeth did not take place until June 23, 1691. He then retired to his native village, where he died, Nov. 24, 1693. He published some *Sermons*, and *Letters to Mr. North*. His *Modern Policies and Practices*, from Machiavelli and others, was published in 1757.

## Sancta Sanctis.

SEE TRISAGION.

## Sancte-Bell, Sanctus-Bell, Saints'-Bell, Massbell

(old English forms, *Sacring-bell*, *Saunce-bell*), a small bell used in the Roman Catholic Church to call attention to the more solemn parts of the service of the Mass, as at the conclusion of the ordinary, when the words "Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Deus Sabaoth" are pronounced by the priest, and on the elevation of the host and chalice after consecration. It is now usually, if not always, a small handbell carried by an attendant, and was generally of this kind in England previous to the Reformation, made sometimes of silver; but in some instances a larger bell was used, and was suspended on the outside of the church in a small turret, made to receive it, over the archway leading from the nave into the chancel, and rung by a rope from within. Many of these turrets still exist, as at Isham, Rothwell, and Desborough, Northamptonshire; Boston, Lincolnshire; Bloxham, Brize-norton, Swalcliffe, and Coombe, Oxfordshire, etc.; a few still retain the bell, as at Long Compton, Warwickshire. Occasionally, also, a number of "little bells were hung in the middle of the church, which the pulling of one wheel made all to ring, which was done at the elevation of the hoste."

## Sancti, Sanctissimi,

Usual epithets of the bishops, signifying *holy*, *most holy*. Other epithets were "beati, beatissimi," *blessed*, *most blessed*; "Deo carissimi," *dearly beloved by God*.

## Sanctification,

Separation from ordinary use to a sacred purpose. The Hebrew word *vdq*; and the Greek word ἅγιος, rendered "holy," "hallowed," and "sanctified," are applied to certain times which were hallowed — as the Sabbath and the Hebrew festivals (Genesis 2, 3; <sup><1218></sup>Exodus 20:8, 11; <sup><1237></sup>Leviticus 23:37; <sup><1201></sup>2 Kings 10:20); to the things said to be hallowed, as the sacred incense or perfume (<sup><1236></sup>Exodus 30:36; <sup><1076></sup>Matthew 7:6), the sacred vestments (<sup><1281></sup>Exodus 28:2, 4), the sacred utensils (<sup><1219></sup>Exodus 30:29; <sup><1220></sup>1 Chronicles 22:10; 2 Tim. 2:21), the holy bread (<sup><1212></sup>Leviticus 21:22; <sup><1205></sup>1 Samuel 21:5), the altar (<sup><1235></sup>Exodus 29:37; 30:1, 10; <sup><1239></sup>Matthew 23:19), and portions of the sacrifices (<sup><1108></sup>Leviticus 2:3, 10). So, also, of places said

to be hallowed (<sup><0186></sup>Exodus 3:5; <sup><4073></sup>Acts 7:33), as the holy city, i.e. Jerusalem (<sup><6101></sup>Nehemiah 11:1; <sup><2382></sup>Isaiah 48:2; <sup><4045></sup>Matthew 4:5; 24:15; 27:53; <sup><4463></sup>Acts 6:13; 22:28), the holy mountain, i.e. Zion (<sup><9016></sup>Psalms 2:6), the Tabernacle (<sup><0180></sup>Numbers 18:10); the Temple (<sup><1082></sup>Psalms 138:2), the most holy place, the oracle (<sup><0253></sup>Exodus 26:33; 28:43; Heb. 9:2, 3, 12; <sup><1066></sup>1 Kings 6:16; 8:6; Ezek. 41:23). So, also, men are said to be hallowed, as Aaron and his sons (<sup><1323></sup>1 Chronicles 23:13; 24:5; <sup><2363></sup>Isaiah 43:28), the firstborn (<sup><0282></sup>Exodus 13:2), and the Hebrew people (<sup><0290></sup>Exodus 19:10, 14; <sup><0212></sup>Daniel 12), also the *pious* Hebrews, the “saints” (<sup><6333></sup>Deuteronomy 33:3; <sup><9163></sup>Psalms 16:3; <sup><0708></sup>Daniel 7:18), like the word *dysjæ*, rendered “saint” (<sup><9104></sup>Psalms 30:4; 31:23; 37:28; 1, 5; 52:9; 79:2; 97:10), and “godly” (<sup><9143></sup>Psalms 4:3).

The terms are also used of those who were ceremonially purified under the Mosaic law (<sup><0461></sup>Numbers 6:11; <sup><0216></sup>Leviticus 22:16, 32; <sup><3013></sup>Hebrews 9:13). But, though the external purifications of the Hebrews, when any one had transgressed, had to do with restoration to civil and national privileges, they did not necessarily induce moral and spiritual holiness. They, however, reminded the sincere Hebrew that he was *unclean* in the sight of God; and that the ceremonial cleansings, by which he had been restored to his civil and political rights, were symbols of those “good things that were to come” — spiritual and eternal salvation — which should accrue through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit. He was thus assured that “without holiness no man shall see the Lord” (<sup><3014></sup>Hebrews 9:14; 12:14). Hence, sanctification is used to designate that state of mind induced by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, thus producing internal and external holiness (<sup><4385></sup>John 3:5; <sup><4161></sup>1 Corinthians 6:11; <sup><4925></sup>Ephesians 5:26; <sup><5043></sup>1 Thessalonians 4:3, 4, 7). It is true, sanctification is sometimes spoken of as the work of man himself (<sup><0692></sup>Exodus 19:22; <sup><0814></sup>Leviticus 11:44; 20:7, 8; <sup><0185></sup>1 Peter 3:15). When a person solemnly and unreservedly gives himself to God, he then may be said to sanctify himself. He is then enabled to believe in Christ with his heart unto righteousness, and God instantly, by the communication of his Holy Spirit, sanctifies the believer. Thus the believer gives himself to God, and God, in return, gives himself to the believer (<sup><3365></sup>Ezekiel 36:25-29; <sup><4386></sup>1 Corinthians 3:16, 17; 6:19; <sup><0166></sup>2 Corinthians 6:16-18; <sup><4022></sup>Ephesians 2:22). This sanctification, which is received by faith, is the work of God within us.

In a general sense, “sanctification” comprehends the whole Christian life (<sup><4872></sup>Galatians 5:22, 23; <sup><0115></sup>1 Peter 1:15, 16, 22; <sup><3210></sup>Hebrews 12:10;



<3048>James 4:8). In <3162>1 Thessalonians 5:23, the apostle prays for the sanctification of the *entire* Church in all its various departments. In <4074>1 Corinthians 7:14, it is said, the unbelieving husband, or wife, is “sanctified” — that is, to be regarded not as *unclean*, but as specially claiming the attention of the Christian community. The term “sanctified” is also used in the sense of *expiation* (Heb. 10:10, 14, 29). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 281, 288, 503; Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*. **SEE HOLINESS.**

### Sanctification, Entire.

One of the most interesting, and practically one of the most important, questions connected with the divine plan of salvation is, What degree of deliverance from sin is it scriptural for the believer to expect in this life?

**I. Preliminary Concessions and Distinctions.** — There are several points upon which all schools of theology agree.

**1.** One is that the complete sanctification of believers. their perfect deliverance from sin in every sense of the term, is an integral part of the great plan of redemption. Differ as they may in regard to the time when it shall be accomplished, they unite in pronouncing sin a thing to be abhorred, a defilement from the last touch or taint of which God’s people are at some period to be delivered.

**2.** Again, all Christians agree that the true followers of Christ hate sin, loathe it, and struggle, and are bound ever to struggle, for complete deliverance from it. Whether continuous victory or daily defeat attend the contest, *that war* must go on.

**3.** All writers agree, also, in the conviction that no Christian in this life attains absolute perfection. Some, indeed, hold that through the grace of God the believer may attain what the Scriptures call *perfection*: consequently, the word itself is not to be condemned, seeing that it is employed by those who “speak not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” Nevertheless, the term *perfection* is applicable only in a restricted sense to any part of the Church militant. The holy law demands the absolute right, in word and deed, in thought and intention, in all obedience, love, and devotion. It requires payment of the debt, not only to “the uttermost farthing,” but in coin in which there is no trace of alloy.

But such service as this can be rendered only where there is perfect knowledge, not simply of the letter of the law, but of its practical application to the endlessly diversified and complicated events and circumstances of daily life. No mere man since the fall ever possessed such knowledge. The holiest of men are conscious that they are often at a loss to know what God and duty require at their hands, and that there are times when their uncertainty in matters of importance burdens and distresses them. Right and wrong sometimes seem to shade into each other, like the prismatic colors; and the sharpest eye cannot tell where the one ends or the other begins. The tenderest conscience takes alarm the soonest, and the better taught is the less liable to err; but the wisest and the most conscientious have occasion to pause now and then, waiting for clearer light, and, perhaps, wait in vain. When Paul and Barnabas at Antioch were planning a tour among the churches, Barnabas had a very positive desire that “John whose surname was Mark” should accompany them. Paul had an equally decided conviction that Mark ought not to go, seeing that he had “departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work.” Neither Paul nor Barnabas would yield; and “the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder, one from the other.” Here one or both of them failed of the absolute right. Either Paul, without being conscious of it, was unjust to a fellow disciple, or Barnabas, in his ignorance, was ready to imperil the work of the Lord by calling Mark to a position which he was not qualified to fill. Perhaps, in the sharp contention, [παροξυσμός](#), they were unjust to each other, and thus another feature of wrong was introduced. If errors of judgment may thus lead to errors of action, when the holiest of men are counseling in regard to the holiest of causes, what may we expect of those who are immersed in the interests, prejudices, and collisions of common life?

Service may also be defective in degree. Justice, truth, and love are due to our fellow men; but a still higher and nobler duty is required at our hands. We are invited to the fellowship of our Lord Jesus Christ, and God the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost; and called to love and serve “in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life.” And who that ever by faith caught a glimpse of the glory of God, the great, the holy, and the good, “the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth,” did not bow down in lowliest self-abasement, in view of the poor service which he renders? The Christian never feels in this world that his service is all that he would have

it. Though faith may never utterly fail, nor obedience be forgotten, nor love grow cold, nor devotion die, yet the most obedient, faithful, and devoted child of God will humble himself in the very dust at the remembrance of his infinite obligations to his Creator and Redeemer and the poor returns which he is daily making. Thus, if we assume that the intent is wholly right and the purpose all controlling, the service rendered will be imperfect in character, marred by lack of knowledge and errors of judgment, and deficient in degree; and sinless obedience, in the absolute sense of the term, is utterly impossible.

**4.** Still another point needs recognition. As long as we remain in this world, however deep, fervent, and thorough our religious life, there are sources of danger within. There inhere in our nature as essential elements of it, at least in this present life, appetites, passions, and affections, without which man would be unfit for this present state of existence and would cease to be man. These, although innocent in themselves, are simply unreasoning impulses over which we need to keep constant watch and ward, ruling them by reason, conscience, and divine grace, else they lead to sin and death. By these “sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” When Eve, in Eden, “saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise,” the temptation was a skilful appeal to elements in her nature which were pure from the hand of the Creator. The desire for pleasant food is not sin; nor is the higher taste which finds enjoyment in contemplating beautiful forms and colors. Nor can we condemn the still more elevated instinct of the soul which delights in mental activity and the acquisition of knowledge. If these aptitudes and instincts had not existed in original human nature, the temptation of Satan would have had no power. “The deaf adder hears not the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.”

Consequently, in the work of sanctification, the various instincts and passions of original human nature do not need to be rooted out, but to be restrained, chastened, disciplined, made to obey reason and the voice of God. The due enjoyment of pleasant food is not the gluttony which the wise man condemns. A father may provide for his children by a wise foresight which is by no means the “covetousness which is idolatry.” When foul outrage is done to the innocent and the defenseless, we may feel our souls flame with fiery indignation, and “be angry and sin not.” God “setteth the solitary in families” by the affections with which he endowed man at the beginning; and nothing is more beautiful than the relations which grow out

of them, where the divine intent rules, and nothing more debasing and destructive than their abuse.

These elements of our nature survive the deepest work of grace. When the wondrous change has come to the penitent believer and he has “put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness,” he is still human, still nothing less than man. The world appeals to him, Satan assails him, and in himself is the tinder which the glancing sparks of temptation tend to kindle. “There is no discharge in that war.” Till life itself is done, some form of peril will remain. Youth may be tempted by fleshly lusts, manhood may become ambitious and proud, age misanthropic and avaricious. The innocent appetite to which, in Eden, the forbidden fruit appealed may be perverted into the despotic thirst of the inebriate; Eve’s delight in beauty may be the germ from which shall spring a life given up to frivolity and empty show; and the nobler hunger for knowledge may break away from all authority and madly labor to reason God out of his own creation. Nevertheless, these possibilities of evil do not prove that God’s children cannot in this world be saved from moral depravity, nor that the continuous commission of willful sin must stain the lives of the holiest of them till the very hour of death. They are proof, rather, that conversion does not end probation; and that it behooves every man, whatever progress he may have made in divine things, to “keep his body under, lest that by any means he should be a castaway.”

**5.** One more point needs to be stated. Discussion on this subject has often been rendered inconclusive and unsatisfactory by the misuse of terms. The Westminster Confession, as explained by the *Exposition* published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, makes “original sin” include three wholly different things: (1) the guilt of Adam’s sin; (2) the inherited depravity of soul; (3) the damage done the body. Wesley also uses the term sin in three different senses: (1) the depravity inherited from Adam; (2) “voluntary transgression of known law;” (3) involuntary infractions of the divine law. Owing to this confusion of terms, there have been hot controversies where there was little real difference of opinion; whole octavos have been wasted in refuting what nobody holds, and proving what nobody doubts; and theological champions fight imaginary foes, and are happy in imaginary victories. If matters not really belonging to the question of entire sanctification are ruled out, we shall find that just two points need investigation: (a) What scriptural ground is there for the belief that the Christian may in this life be delivered from the moral depravity which he

inherited as a member of a fallen race? (b) How far and in what sense may the believer be kept in this life, through grace, from the commission of sin?

## II. *Different Ecclesiastical Views on the Subject.* —

**1. *The Romish Theory.*** — The Council of Trent teaches that the sacrament of baptism, rightly administered, washes away guilt and depravity of every kind. It pronounces anathema against those who presume to think or dare to assert “that, although sin is forgiven in baptism, it is not entirely removed or totally eradicated, but is cut away in such a manner as to leave its roots still firmly fixed in the soul.” The Council, however, declares that concupiscence, or the fuel of sin, remains. “Concupiscence is the effect of sin, and is nothing more than an appetite of the soul, in itself repugnant to reason. If unaccompanied with the consent of the will or unattended with neglect on our part, it differs essentially from the nature of sin.”

The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches also that “the commandments of God are not difficult of observance.” “As God is ever ready by his divine assistance to sustain our weakness, especially since the death of Christ the Lord, by which the prince of this world was cast out, there is no reason why we should be disheartened by the difficulty of the undertaking. to him who loves nothing is difficult.”

**2. *The Calvinistic Theory.*** — The Westminster Confession of Faith has the following chapter on sanctification:

“They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, by his word and spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified; and they are more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

“This sanctification is throughout the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abide still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.

“In this war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from the

sanctifying spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome; and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.”

In respect to the possibility of keeping the law, the following declarations of the Confession and the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church are sufficiently explicit:

“No man is able, either by himself or by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word, and deed.” — Catechism.

“This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin.” — Confession, ch. 6.

Thus the Calvinistic standards answer the two questions by saying, in reply to the first, that as long as a man lives on the earth “there abide still some remnants of corruption in every part” of his nature; and, in reply to the second, that every man, notwithstanding all the grace received, “doth daily break” the law of God “in thought, word, and deed;” and that this residue of corruption, “and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.” Consequently there is no such thing as entire sanctification in this life, but the holiest of God’s children must of necessity remain corrupt, at least in part, and go on in the constant commission of actual sin as long as they live. Indeed, it is not entirely clear how “the saints,” as the Confession asserts, “grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord,” seeing that the highest attainments possible in this life still leave them with corruption within, and an outward life marred by the constant commission of sin, “in thought, word, and deed.”

### 3. *Arminian Theories.* —

(1.) Arminius himself seems to have taken no very decided position on the subject, his chief fields of battle lying in other directions. Nevertheless, among “certain articles to be Diligently examined and weighed, because some controversy has arisen concerning them, even among those who profess the Reformed religion,” he makes a statement to the effect that “regeneration is not perfected in a moment, but by certain steps and intervals,” and that the regenerate man “still has within him the flesh lusting against the Spirit;” nor does he speak of any complete deliverance in this

life. On the other point, he affirms that “he who asserts that it is possible for the regenerate, through the grace of Christ, perfectly to fulfill the law in the present life, is neither a Pelagian, nor inflicts any injury on the grace of God, nor establishes justification through works.” He cites Augustine himself as declaring the abstract possibility of a man’s living in this world without sin, and as saying, “Let Pelagius confess *that it is possible for man to be without sin* in no other way than *by the grace of Christ*, and we will be at peace with him.” Arminius can hardly be said to have held any well-defined theory on the subject.

**(2.) Wesley’s Theory.** — Wesley’s views on the subject of entire sanctification were long in the process of formation, and it is no difficult task to find early statements which contradict others made at a later period. As enunciated in the latter part of his life, his views may be defined thus. He taught in regard to the work wrought in us —

1. That man by nature is depraved, so that, aside from grace, he is unfitted for all good, and prone to all evil.
2. That, through the grace of God, this moral depravity may be removed in this life, and man live freed from it.
3. That regeneration begins the process of cleansing, but, except in some exempt cases possibly, does not complete it, a degree of depravity still remaining in the regenerate.
4. That the process of cleansing is in some cases gradual, the remains of the evil nature wearing away by degrees; in others instantaneous, the believer receiving the blessing of “a clean heart” a few days, or even hours only, after his regeneration.
5. That this great gift is to be sought for specifically, and is to be obtained by a special act of faith directed towards this very object.
6. That this second attainment is attested by the Holy Spirit, which witnesses to the completion of the cleansing, as it did to the regeneration which began it.
7. That this gracious attainment, thus attested by the Holy Spirit, should be confessed, on suitable occasions, to the glory of God.

8. That the soul may lapse from this gracious state, and become again partially corrupt, or even fall wholly away from God, and be lost forever.

9. That it is the high privilege of every one who is born of God to live from that moment free from the sins which bring the soul into condemnation: that is, from “voluntary transgressions of known law;” but that involuntary errors and mistakes, needing the atonement of Christ, remain to the end.

This last item in the statement of Wesley’s views, as well as those numbered 1 and 2, is accepted by all classes of Methodist thinkers, and therefore need not be referred to again.

(3.) *The Theory of the English Wesleyans.* — It is presumable that the *Compendium of Theology*, recently published by the Rev. Dr. Pope, theological tutor in the Didsbury College, a school established by the Wesleyans for the training of the young men who are to enter their traveling ministry, may be taken as a standard of the general sentiment of the Wesleyan body at the present time. In several important points he differs from Wesley. He pronounces sanctification always a gradual work. “It must be remembered that this final and decisive act of the Spirit is the seal set upon a previous and continuous work. The processes may be, hastened, or condensed into a small space; they must be passed through.” Instead of lying within the reach of any novice, to be attained at any moment, “Christian perfection is the exceeding great reward of perseverance in the renunciation of all things for God; in the exercise of love to God, as shown in the passive submission to his will, and in the strenuous obedience of all his commandments.” He intimates that the time when the work is completed is “known only to God;” or, “if revealed in the trembling consciousness of the believer, a secret that he knows not how to utter;” consequently there is no place for the confession of it. Dr. Pope teaches also that after the highest point is attained there still remains “something of the peculiar concupiscence, or liability to temptation, or affinity with evil, which besets man in this world.” His views are almost identical with those set forth by Wesley and the Conference of 1745, but are widely different from the doctrine which Wesley began to preach in 1760.

(4.) There is still another view, which expresses the convictions of not a few of the clearest thinkers in the Methodist Episcopal churches, and is



accepted by many of the clergymen and people of other denominations. It is set forth in the following propositions:

1. Moral depravity is a real and positive quality of the unregenerate human spirit.
2. In the renewal of the soul at conversion, whereby man becomes a *new creature, a new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness*, the inborn moral depravity is removed from the immortal nature, which, so far as the work of cleansing is concerned, is in that moment fitted for heaven itself.\*

\* The great majority of Methodists, however, hold that this depravity is not wholly removed at conversion, but that its last remains are (usually at least) taken away by a subsequent act of grace. — ED.

3. From the very hour of justification the renewed soul is summoned to live a holy life, a life of continuous victory over sin, and of freedom from condemnation, and is, through grace, equipped for such a life, so that he who fails thus to live falls below both his high privilege and his bounden duty.

4. Such a life — *holy, freed from sin, cleansed from all unrighteousness* — is the Christian life, to which every child of God is summoned.

5. The believer, thus renewed, is still human, nothing less than man, possessing all the innocent appetites, passions, and affections which belong to human nature; and that these, though in themselves innocent, need to be controlled by reason and conscience, else they lead to sin.

6. It is the privilege of the believer, thus renewed, to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God, gaining day by day more of spiritual strength and beauty, until he becomes *a perfect man*, and reaches *the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ*; and that this is what is properly called maturity, or Christian perfection.

3. *Arguments on the Subject.* — The evangelical churches, therefore, divide on this line; the Calvinists holding that believers must of necessity remain in some degree depraved, and go on daily committing sin, “in thought, word, and deed,” to the end of their lives; the Arminians, with some differences among themselves in regard to the time and the conditions, holding that entire sanctification, including the cleansing of the

human spirit from moral depravity, and freedom from actual sin, in the sense of “voluntary transgression of known law,” is attainable in this life.

In support of the Arminian doctrine of entire sanctification, the following arguments are brought forward:

1. To affirm that it is by the will of God that the Christian lives in sin, and sin lives in the Christian, and that God so orders it for his own glory and the good of men, is monstrous, being neither scriptural, nor good morals, nor good sense.
2. The Word of God nowhere represents death as the hour, or the agent, that shall cleanse the heart, or relieve believers from the necessity of sinning against God.
3. Scripture, reason, and the daily experience of God’s children show that holiness is the great need of the Church and of the individual Christian.
4. The mission of Christ is to *save his people from their sins*, and to save them *to the uttermost*; and this salvation is set forth as attainable in this life.
5. God commands his children to be holy, and promises to help them to be holy, declaring that his *grace is sufficient* for their spiritual needs, and that he “will not suffer them to be tempted above that they are able” to bear.
6. Believers in general are everywhere in the Scriptures said to be *holy, sanctified, purified, saints, new men, new creatures, created anew in righteousness and true holiness*; and whenever any conduct inconsistent with this gracious state is charged upon any of them, it is to warn them of their lapsing from the grace of God, and endangering their souls.
7. Not a few of God’s faithful servants are named and described in the Scripture: Abel as *righteous*, Enoch as *walking with God*, Job as *perfect*, Zacharias and Elizabeth as *righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless*; and there is not a word in the history to compel us to take this description of them in any other than the exact, literal sense of the language employed.

**IV. Literature.** — Many books have been published on the subject of entire sanctification and Christian perfection, but most of them are devotional and practical manuals, rather than theological treatises. The following discuss the doctrine: Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*; Pope, *Compendium of Theology*; Peck (G.), *Christian*

*Perfection*; Foster, *Christian Purity*; Peck (J.T.), *The Central Idea of Christianity*; Boardman (H.A.), *The "Higher-Life" Doctrine of Sanctification*; Steele, *Love Enthroned*; Franklin, *A Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection*; Huntington, *What is it to be Holy? or the Theory of Entire Sanctification*; Endsley and others, *Our Holy Christianity*, a series of essays; Crane, *Holiness the Birthright of all God's Children*; also, article in the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1878, on *Christian Perfection and the Higher Life*; Boardman (W.E.), *The Higher Christian Life*; See, *The Rest of Faith*; Atwater, *The Higher Life and Christian Perfection* (article in the *Presb. Quar. and Princeton Rev.* July, 1877); Simpson, *Encyclop. of Methodism*, s.v. "Perfection, Christian," p. 704. (J.T.C.)

### Sanctimoniales,

A name given in early times to nuns on account of their profession of sacredness. They are also called *Virgines Dei*, *Virgines Christi*, *Ancillioe Dei*, *Sorores Ecclesioe*, etc. They must not be confounded with the ancient deaconesses.

### Sanction.

SEE PRAGMATIC SANCTION.

### Sanctuary

Is the occasional rendering, in the A.V., of two Heb. and one Greek term. A general term is **vdqpkodesh** ("sanctuary," <sup><0103></sup>Exodus 30:13, 24; 36:1, 3, 4, 6; 38:25, 26, 27; <sup><0106></sup>Leviticus 4:6; 5, 15; 10:4; 27:3, 25; Numbers 3, 28, 31, 32, 47, 50; 4:12, 15; 7:9, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 85, 86; 8:19; 18:3, 5, 10; <sup><0109></sup>1 Chronicles 9:29; <sup><0110></sup>Psalms 20:2; 58:2; 68:24; 74:3; 77:13; 114:2; 150:1; <sup><0103></sup>Isaiah 43:28; <sup><0101></sup>Lamentations 4:1; <sup><0102></sup>Ezekiel 41:21, 23; 42:20; 44:27; 45:2; <sup><0103></sup>Daniel 8:13, 14; 9:26; <sup><0104></sup>Zephaniah 3:4), which properly means *holiness* (often so rendered, frequently as an attribute, and perhaps to be regarded as a concrete of the sacred edifice), and especially the "holy place" (as very often rendered). The more specific term is **vdqjhaanikdash** (invariably rendered "sanctuary," except <sup><0103></sup>Amos 7:13, "chapel," and twice in the plur. "holy place" [<sup><0105></sup>Psalms 68:35; <sup><0102></sup>Ezekiel 21:2]), which is from the same root, and signifies the local shrine. In the New Test. we have the corresponding **ἁγίον** ("sanctuary," <sup><0102></sup>Hebrews 8:2; 9:1, 2; 13:11; elsewhere "holy

place” or “holiest”), which is simply the neut. of ἅγιος , a general term for anything *holy*. *SEE HOLY PLACE; SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

### Sanctuary.

In popish times the privilege of sanctuary was common in Scotland. Innes says: “In several English churches there was a stone seat beside the altar, where those fleeing to the peace of the Church were held guarded by all its sanctity. One of these still remains at Beverley, another at Hexham. To violate the protection of *the frithstol* (the seat of peace), or of the *fertre* (the shrine of relics behind the altar), was not, like other offenses, to be compensated by a pecuniary penalty: it was *bot-leas*, beyond compensation. That the Church thus protected fugitives among ourselves we learn from the ancient canons of the Scotican councils, where, among the list of misdeeds against which the Church enjoined excommunication. after the laying of violent hands upon parents and priests, is denounced ‘the open taking of thieves out of the protection of the Church. The most celebrated, and probably the most ancient, of these sanctuaries was that of the church of Wedale, a parish which is now called by the name of its village, ‘the Stow.’ There is a very ancient tradition that king Arthur brought with him from Jerusalem an image of the Virgin, ‘fragments of which,’ says a writer in the 11th century, ‘are still preserved at Wedale in great veneration.’ About the beginning of his reign, king William issued a precept to the ministers of the church of Wedale, and to the guardians of its ‘peace,’ enjoining them ‘not to detain the men of the abbot of Kelso, who had taken refuge there, nor their goods, inasmuch as the abbot was willing to do to them, and for them, all reason and justice.’” *SEE ASYLUM; SEE CHURCH.*

### Sanctuary,

A name for the presbytery, or eastern part of the choir of a church, in which the altar is placed.

### Sanctus, St.,

Is said to have been a physician, and a native of Otriculum (or Ocriculum), a city of Central Italy. He was put to death with great cruelty in the reign of M. Aurelius Antoninus, A.D. about 150, and his memory is celebrated on June 26.

## Sancus,

In Old Italian mythology (in its complete form *Semo Sancus*, commensurable with *Fidius*), was an immigrant god who came from the Sabines to Rome and obtained a sanctuary on the Quirinal Hill. He was subsequently compared with Hercules, and called *Hercules Sabinus*.

## Sancy, Achille Harley De,

A French diplomat and prelate, was born in 1581. In early life he gave himself to study, and, having taken orders, was in a short time made bishop of Lavaur. But in 1601 he gave up his ecclesiastical life and entered the army. After taking part in several campaigns, he was made ambassador to Turkey. Here his conduct was such as to bring upon him the displeasure of the Turkish government, and he was bastinadoed. This closed his diplomatic career, and, returning to France, he devoted himself and his fortune to the cardinal Richelieu. Subsequently he went to England and was in favor with queen Henrietta. He died Nov. 20, 1646. He was a man of great learning, is said to be the author of several unimportant works in his native language, and collected many Oriental manuscripts which are now in the Richelieu Library.

## Sand

(**l wj**, *chol*, from its tendency to *slide* or *roll*; ἄμμος). A similitude taken from the aggregate sand of the sea is often used to express a very great multitude or a very great weight; or from a single sand, something very mean and trifling. God promises Abraham and Jacob to multiply their posterity as the stars of heaven and as the sand of the sea (<sup><127></sup>Genesis 22:17; 32:12). Job (6:3) compares the weight of his misfortunes to that of the sand of the sea. Solomon says (<sup><127></sup>Proverbs 27:3) that though sand and gravel are very heavy things, yet the anger of a fool is much heavier. Ecclesiasticus says that a fool is more insupportable than the weight of sand, lead, or iron (Ecclus. 22:15). The prophets magnify the omnipotence of God, who has fixed the sand of the shore for the boundaries of the sea, and has said to it, “Hitherto shalt thou come; but here thou shalt break thy foaming waves, and shalt pass no farther” (<sup><127></sup>Jeremiah 5:22). Our Savior tells us (<sup><127></sup>Matthew 7:26) that a fool lays the foundation of his house on the sand; whereas a wise man founds his house on a rock. Ecclesiasticus says (18:8) that the years of the longest life of man are but as a drop of

water or as a grain of sand. Wisdom says (7:9) that all the gold in the world, compared to wisdom, is but as the smallest grain of sand. *SEE DUST.*

### Sand, Christoph Von Den (Lat. Sandius),

A German theologian, was born at Königsberg Oct. 12, 1644. On account of his Socinian sentiments, and unwillingness to participate in the Lutheran services, he was exiled, and went to Holland, where he spent the greater part of his life. In later years his religious views seem to have changed, as he became a firm Arminian. He died at Amsterdam Nov. 30, 1680. His principal works are: *Nucleus Historioe Ecclesiasticoe, etc.*: — *Interpretationes Paradoxoe IV Evangeliorum*: — *Confession de Foy conformement a l'Esriture*: — *Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix*: — *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum*. Sand also left a manuscript work, *Auctuariun Operis Vossiani de Historicis Latinis*, and two shorter ones which prove his Arminian sentiments.

### Sandacus,

In Greek mythology, was a son of Astynous and grandson of Phaethon, who came from Syria to Cilicia, and there founded the town of Celenderis. He married Pharnace, the daughter of Megessares, and by her had a son whom he named Cinyras.

### Sandal

#### Picture for Sandal 1

#### Picture for Sandal 2

#### Picture for Sandal 3

Occurs in the A.V. only, for the same Greek word *σανδάλιον*, <sup><400></sup>Mark 6:9; <sup><412></sup>Acts 12:8; but it more properly represents the Heb. **ל** [*hī*] *ndal*; Sept. and New Test. *ὑπόδημα*; rendered “shoe” in the English Bible. There is, however, little reason to think that the Jews really wore shoes, and the expressions which Carpzov (*Apparat.* p. 781, 782) quotes to prove that they did (viz. “put the blood of war in his shoes,” <sup><100></sup>1 Kings 2:5; “make men go over in shoes,” <sup><2115></sup>Isaiah 11:15), are equally adapted to the sandal — the first signifying that the blood was sprinkled on the thong of the sandal, the second that men should cross the river on foot instead of in

boats. The shoes found in Egypt probably belonged to Greeks (Wilkinson, 2, 333). The sandal appears to have been the article ordinarily used by the Hebrews for protecting the feet. It was usually a sole of hide, leather, or wood, bound to the foot by thongs; but it may sometimes denote such shoes and buskins as eventually came into use. The above Hebrew term *naal* implies a simple sandal, its proper sense being that of confining or shutting in the foot with thongs; we have also express notice of the thong (Ἔωσϙ ἱμάς; A.V. “shoe latchet”) in several passages (<sup><01423></sup>Genesis 14:23; <sup><2367></sup>Isaiah 5:27; Mark1:7). The Greek term ὑπόδημα properly applies to the sandal exclusively, as it means what is bound under the foot; but no stress can be laid on the use of the term by the Alexandrine writers, as it was applied to any covering of the foot, even to the Roman *calceus*, or shoe, covering the whole foot. Josephus (*War*, 6, 1-8) so uses it of the *caliga*, the thick nailed shoe of the Roman soldiers. This word occurs in the New Test. (<sup><4081></sup>Matthew 3:11; 10:10; Mark1:7; <sup><0316></sup>Luke 3:16; 10:4; <sup><0127></sup>John 1:27; <sup><4073></sup>Acts 7:33; 13:25), and is also frequently used by the Sept. as a translation of the Hebrew term; but it appears in most places to denote a sandal. Similar observations apply to σανδάλιον, which is used in a general, and not in its strictly classical sense, and was adopted in a Hebraized term by the Talmudists. We have no description of the sandal in the Bible itself, but the deficiency, can be supplied from collateral sources. Thus we learn from the Talmudists that the materials employed in the construction of the sole were either leather, felt, cloth, or wood (*Mishna, Jebam.* 12, 1, 2), and that it was occasionally shod with iron (*Sabb.* 6, 2). In Egypt various fibrous substances, such as palm leaves and papyrus stalks, were used in addition to leather (*Herod.* 2, 37; Wilkinson, 2, 332, 333), while in Assyria wood or leather was employed (*Layard, Nin.* 2, 323, 324). In Egypt the sandals were usually turned up at the toe like our skates, though other forms, rounded and pointed, are also exhibited. In Assyria the heel and the side of the foot were encased, and sometimes the sandal consisted of little else than this. This does not appear to have been the case in Palestine, for a heel strap was essential to a proper sandal (*Jebam.* 12, 1). Ladies’ sandals were made of the skin of an animal named *tachash* (<sup><2360></sup>Ezekiel 16:10), whether a hyena or a seal (A.V. “badger”) is doubtful; the skins of a fish (a species of Halicore) are used for this purpose in the peninsula of Sinai (*Robinson, Bibl. Res.* 1, 116). Ladies of rank especially appear to have paid great attention to the beauty of their sandals (<sup><2101></sup>Song of Solomon 7:1); though if the bride in that book was an Egyptian princess, as most think, the exclamation, “How beautiful are thy

feet with sandals, O prince's daughter!" may imply admiration of a luxury properly Egyptian, as the ladies of that country were noted for their sumptuous sandals (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3, 364). But this taste was probably general; for at the present day the dress slippers of ladies of rank are among the richest articles of their attire, being elaborately embroidered with flowers and other figures wrought in silk, silver, and gold. **SEE DRESS.** The thongs, those at least in Hebrew times, were handsomely embroidered (Judith 10:4; 16:9), as were those of the Greek ladies (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* s.v. "Sandalium"). Sandals were worn by all classes of society in Palestine, even by the very poor (<sup><3086></sup>Amos 8:6), and both the sandal and the thong or shoe latchet were so cheap and common that they passed into a proverb for the most insignificant thing (<sup><0143></sup>Genesis 14:23; Ecclesiastes 46:19). They were not, however, worn at all periods; they were dispensed with indoors, and were only put on by persons about to undertake some business away from their homes, such as a military expedition (Isaiah 5, 27; <sup><065></sup>Ephesians 6:15), or a journey (<sup><021></sup>Exodus 12:11; <sup><095></sup>Joshua 9:5, 13; <sup><412></sup>Acts 12:8); on such occasions persons carried an extra pair, a practice which our Lord objected to as far as the apostles were concerned (<sup><100></sup>Matthew 10:10; comp. <sup><069></sup>Mark 6:9, and the expression in <sup><204></sup>Luke 10:4, "do not carry," which harmonizes the passages). An extra pair might in certain cases be needed, as the soles were liable to be soon worn out (<sup><095></sup>Joshua 9:5), or the thongs to be broken (<sup><267></sup>Isaiah 5:27). During meal times the feet were undoubtedly uncovered, as implied in <sup><078></sup>Luke 7:38; <sup><315></sup>John 13:5, 6, and in the exceptions specially made in reference to the paschal feast (<sup><021></sup>Exodus 12:11); the same custom must have prevailed wherever reclining at meals was practiced (comp. Plato, *Sympos.* p. 213). It was a mark of reverence to cast off the shoes in approaching a place or person of eminent sanctity: hence the command to Moses at the bush (<sup><085></sup>Exodus 3:5) and to Joshua in the presence of the angel (<sup><055></sup>Joshua 5:15). In deference to these injunctions the priests are said to have conducted their ministrations in the Temple barefoot (Theodoret, *ad Ex.* 3, quaest. 7), and the Talmudists even forbade any person to pass through the Temple with shoes on (Mishna, *Berach.* 9, § 5). This reverential act was not peculiar to the Jews; in ancient times we have instances of it in the worship of Cybele at Rome (Prudent. *Peris.* 154), in the worship of Isis as represented in a picture at Herculaneum (*Ant. d'Ercol.* 2, 320), and in the practice of the Egyptian priests, according to Sil. Ital. (3, 28). In modern times we may compare the similar practice of the Mohammedans of Palestine before entering a mosque (Robinson, *Bibl.*



*Res.* 2, 36), and particularly before entering the Kaaba at Mecca (Burckhardt, *Arabia*, 1, 270); of the Yezidis of Mesopotamia before entering the tomb of their patron saint (Layard, *Nin.* 1, 282); and of the Samaritans as they tread the summit of Mount Gerizim (Robinson, 2, 278). The practice of the modern Egyptians, who take off their shoes before stepping on the carpeted *lewan*, appears to be dictated by a feeling of reverence rather than cleanliness, that spot being devoted to prayer (Lane, 1, 35). It was also an indication of violent emotion, or of mourning, if a person appeared barefoot in public (~~1050~~ 2 Samuel 15:30; ~~2302~~ Isaiah 20:2; ~~3247~~ Ezekiel 24:17, 23). This, again, was held in common with other nations, as instanced at the funeral of Augustus (Sueton. *Aug.* 100), and on the occasion of the solemn processions which derived their name of *Nudipedalia* from this feature (Tertull. *Apol.* 40). To carry or to unloose a person's sandal was a menial office, betokening great inferiority on the part of the person performing it; it was hence selected by John the Baptist to express his relation to the Messiah (~~4011~~ Matthew 3:11; ~~4007~~ Mark 1:7; ~~4027~~ John 1:27; ~~4435~~ Acts 13:25). The expression in ~~4908~~ Psalm 9:8; 107:9, "over Edom will I cast out my shoe," evidently signifies the subjection of that country; but the exact point of the comparison is obscure, for it may refer either to the custom of handing the sandal to a slave, or to that of claiming possession of a property by planting the foot on it, or of acquiring it by the symbolical action of casting the shoe; or, again, Edom may be regarded in the still more subordinate position of a shelf on which the sandals were rested while their owner bathed his feet. The use of the shoe in the transfer of property is noticed in ~~4047~~ Ruth 4:7, 8, and a similar significance was attached to the act in connection with the repudiation of a Levirate marriage (~~4650~~ Deuteronomy 25:9). Shoemaking, or rather strap making (i.e. making the straps for the sandals), was a recognized trade among the Jews (Mishna, *Pesach.* 4, § 6). **SEE SHOE.**

## Sandals,

As insignia of office. They consisted of a sole so attached to the foot as to leave the upper part bare. Without these no priest was permitted to celebrate mass; but after the 7th and 8th centuries we find them expressly mentioned as an episcopal badge, distinct from that of the priests. They were supposed to indicate firmness in God's law and the duty of lifting up the weak.

## Sandal tree

(*Santalum album*), A tree which yields an aromatic wood, much used in the pagodas for purposes of fumigation, and which is, therefore, an important article of commerce. The Hindus also grind it to a fine powder, which they dilute with water taken from the Ganges until it becomes a thin paste, with which they mark the forehead and breast each day, after bathing, in accordance with the particular worship they profess.

## Sandalwood.

*SEE ALMUG.*

## Sandanam,

In Hindu mythology, is one of the five trees which sprang from the bosom of the milk sea when the mountain Mandu was turned in order to the preparing of the Amrita, and which bore the fruits of prosperity and abundance.

## Sandanen,

In Hindu mythology, was a celebrated king of the Middle Kingdom, friend to Siva, and ancestor of the Kurus and Pandus. He fell in love with Ganga, the wife of Siva, and was punished by being turned into an ape.

## Sandanigen,

In Hindu mythology, was one of the five sons borne by Drowadei, the wife of the five Pandus, to her husbands.

## Sandeman, Robert,

The founder of the Sandemanians (q.v.), was born at Perth, Scotland, in 1718. He studied two years at the University of Edinburgh, and then entered into business. He adopted Mr. Glas's views in opposition to all National Church establishments; and, taking up his residence in Edinburgh, he married one of Mr. Glas's daughters, joined the Glasites, and became an elder in the church that was formed in that city. In 1760 he removed to London, where he preached in various places, attracting much notice. He formed a congregation there in 1762, and in 1764 removed to the American colonies, where he continued till his death. His sympathy with the mother country rendered him obnoxious to the colonists, and his

prospects for usefulness were in a great measure blighted. After collecting a few small societies, he died at Danbury, Conn., 1771. He wrote, *Letters on Theron and Aspasio* (Edinb. 1757, 1803, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Correspondence with Mr. Pike*: — *Thoughts on Christianity*: — *Sign of the Prophet Jonah*: — *Honor of Marriage, etc.*: — *On Solomon's Song*.

### Sandemanians,

The followers of Robert Sandeman (q.v.). The leading doctrine of this sect is thus expressed in the epitaph on Mr. Sandeman's tomb in Danbury: "Here lies until the resurrection the body of Robert Sandeman, who, in the face of continual opposition from all sorts of men, long and boldly contended for the ancient faith that the bare death of Jesus Christ, without a deed or thought on the part of man, is sufficient to present the chief of sinners spotless before God." He describes justifying faith as nothing more nor less than "the bare belief of the bare truth" witnessed concerning the person and work of Christ. This, however, could only be entertained through divine teaching or illumination (see ~~1~~1 Corinthians 2:14). The chief opinions and practices in which this sect differs from other Christians are their weekly administration of the Lord's supper; their love feasts, of which every member is not only allowed, but required, to partake, and which consists in their dining together at each other's houses in the interval between the morning and afternoon services; their kiss of charity, used on the occasion of the admission of a new member, and at other times when they deem it necessary and proper; their weekly collection before the Lord's supper for the support of the poor, and paying their expenses; mutual exhortations; abstinence from blood and things strangled; washing each other's feet, when, as a deed of mercy, it might be an expression of love (the precept concerning which, as well as other precepts, they understand literally); community of goods, so far that every one is to consider all that he has in his possession and power liable to the calls of the poor and the Church; and the unlawfulness of laying up treasures upon earth, by setting them apart for any distant, future, and uncertain use. They allow of public and private diversions, so far as they are unconnected with circumstances really sinful; but, apprehending a lot to be sacred, disapprove of lotteries, playing at cards, dice, etc. They maintain a plurality of elders, pastors, or bishops in each church, and the necessity of the presence of two elders in every act of discipline and at the administration of the Lord's supper. In the choice of these elders, want of learning and engagement in trade are no sufficient objection, if qualified according to

the instructions given to Timothy and Titus; but second marriages disqualify for the office, and they are ordained by prayer and fasting, imposition of hands, and giving the right hand of fellowship. In their discipline they are strict and severe, and think themselves obliged to separate from the communion and worship of all such religious societies as appear to them not to profess the simple truth for their only ground of hope, and who do not walk in obedience to it. We shall only add that in every transaction they esteem unanimity to be absolutely necessary. This sect in England has considerably diminished, so that in 1851 only six congregations were reported as belonging to the body, each having a very small attendance. They probably number less than 2000 throughout the world. See Glas, *Testimony of the King of Martyrs*; Sandeman, *Letters on Theron and Aspasio* (letter 11); Backus, *Discourse on Faith and its Influence*, p. 7-30; Adams, *View of Religions*; Bellamy, *Nature and Glory of the Gospel* (Lond. ed. notes), 1, 65-125; Fuller, *Letters on Sandemanianism*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 430, 431.

### Sander, Antony,

A Flemish ecclesiastic, was born at Antwerp in 1586, and died in 1664. He was the author of several religious and historical works in Latin.

### Sander, Immanuel Friedrich Emil, Ph.D.,

A German divine, was born in 1797 at Schafstädt. For a time he preached in the University Church at Leipsic; then at Wichlinghausen, in Westphalia; and finally he was pastor at Elberfeld, where he died in 1861. Besides a great many *Sermons*, he published, *Der Kampf der evangelischen Kirche mit dem Rationalismus* (Barmen, 1830): — *Theologisches Gutachten über die Predigerbibel des Ed. Hülsmann* (ibid. 1836): — *Der Romanismus, seine Tendenzen u. seine Methodik* (Essen, 1843): — *Das Papstthum in seiner heutigen Gestalt*, etc. (Elberfeld, 1846): — *Die Abendmahlsgemeinschaft zwischen Lutherischen u. Reformisten* (ibid. 1859). See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 2, 1113 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 747; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 3, 243. (B.P.)

### Sandercock, Edward,

An English dissenting minister, was born in 1703. He was pastor of an independent congregation in Spittal Square, London, in 1727, at Bartholomew Close in 1730, and at Rotherhithe in 1738. He retired to

York about 1762, where he died in 1770. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 8vo).

### **Sanders, Billington McCarter,**

A Baptist minister, was born in Columbia County, Ga., Dec. 2, 1789; graduated at the South Carolina College Dec. 4, 1809; and about 1811 or 1812 was rector of the Columbia County Academy. He was for one year a member of the State Legislature, and afterwards for several years one of the judges of the Superior Court. Finally he turned his attention to the ministry, and was ordained Jan. 5, 1825. After preaching for a time at Williams Creek and at Pine Grove, he became in 1826 pastor of the Union Church in Warren County. In Dec., 1832, he commenced, by the desire of the Georgia Baptist Convention, to lay the foundation of the Mercer Institute, afterwards the Mercer University, of which he was appointed the first president. He resigned this office in 1839, after having conducted the institution successfully through the six years of its academic minority and the first year of its collegiate career. He occupied highly honorable positions in divers societies. He was for several years clerk of the Georgia Association, and for nine years its moderator. For six years he was president of the Georgia Baptist Convention, and for a much longer time a member of its executive board. He was often a delegate to the General Triennial Convention, and, after the separation, was several times a delegate to the Southern Baptist Convention. He also edited for a year the *Christian Index*, and was an ardent supporter of temperance, foreign and domestic missions, Bible societies, and all kindred forms of Christian beneficence. He died March 12, 1854. See Sprague. *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6, 740.

### **Sanders, Daniel Clarke, D.D.,**

A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born in Sturbridge, Mass., May 3, 1768. He was prepared for college by Rev. Samuel West, admitted at Harvard in 1784, and graduated in 1788. After his graduation he engaged in teaching. He was licensed to preach by the Denham Association, and was ordained and installed pastor of the Congregational Church in Vergennes, Vt., June 12, 1794. He continued in this charge about six years, when he became president of the University of Vermont, which position he held fourteen years. He was installed as pastor at Medfield, Mass., May 24, 1815. He was a member of the convention that revised the constitution of

Massachusetts in 1820-21. He retired from his pastoral charge in 1829. He died at Medfield, Oct. 18, 1850. His published works consist of a *History of the Indian Wars*, etc. (Montpelier, Vt., 1812, 8vo), besides more than thirty *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8, 226 sq.

### Sanders, Edward,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of Maryland, and grew up to manhood without religious influences. In early manhood, however, he was brought to see his condition, and found peace in believing. He entered the itinerant ministry as a member of the Philadelphia Conference in 1834, and continued in that Conference until the New Jersey Conference was set off. The remainder of his effective ministry was passed in the latter Conference. While in charge of the River Church, his health failed, and, taking a supernumerary relation, he settled in Pennington, N.J., where he died, Dec. 31, 1859. His life was a rebuke to infidelity and a comfort to *Christians*. — *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1860, p. 39.

### Sanders, Nicholas,

A prominent Roman Catholic writer of the 16th century. He was born at Charlewood, in Surrey, about 1527, and educated at Winchester school, whence he removed to New College, Oxford. He was made fellow of his college in 1548, and in 1550 or 1551 took the degree of bachelor of laws. He declined the office of Latin secretary to queen Mary for the sake of study. In 1557 he was one of the professors of canon law, and delivered the *Stragglng Lectures* (lectures not endowed) until the accession of queen Elizabeth, when his principles induced him to leave England. He arrived at Rome in 1560, studied theology, became doctor of divinity, and was ordained priest by Dr. Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph. Soon after cardinal Hosius made him a member of his family, using him as assistant in the Council of Trent. Returning to Flanders, he was settled at Louvain for twelve years, and in 1579 he arrived in Ireland as papal nuncio. He died in 1580 or 1581. Among his works are, *Supper of Our Lord* (Louvain, 1566-67, 4to): — *Treatise on the Images of Christ*, etc. (ibid. 1567, 8vo): — *The Rock of the Church* (ibid. 1566-67, 8vo): — *Treatise on Usury* (1566): — and others.

### Sanderson, Robert, D.D.,

An English prelate, was born at Rotherham, Yorkshire, Sept. 19, 1587. Studied at Lincoln College, Oxford, became a fellow in 1606, and reader in logic in 1608; ordained deacon and priest in 1611. He was subrector in Lincoln College in 1613, 1614, and 1616; proctor of Oxford in 1616; bachelor of divinity in 1617; rector of Wilberton, Lincolnshire, in 1618, and of Boothby Pannel for more than forty years from 1619; prebendary of Lincoln in 1629; chaplain to Charles I in 1631; rector of Muston, Leicestershire, eight years from 1633; doctor of divinity in 1636. In 1642 he was prebendary of Southwell and of Oxford, and regius professor of divinity, with the canonry of Christ Church. He was unable to enter the professorship until 1646; was ejected from the last two appointments in 1648, but restored in 1660, and consecrated bishop of Lincoln the same year. He died Jan. 29, 1662. The following are his principal works: *Logicoe Artis Compendium* (1615, 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1841, 12mo): — *Judicium Universitatis Oxoniensis* (ibid. 1648): — *De Obligatione Conscientioe Proelectiones* (1647, 1660, 8vo; it has passed through several later editions — the last at Cambridge [1856, 8vo]). Besides other dissertations, he printed numbers of his *Sermons*, which were collected and published, together with his *Life* by Izaak Walton (Lond. 1689, fol.). See Cattermole, *Lit. of the Ch. of England*, 2, 10-34.

### Sandes,

In Persian mythology, was a fabled Persian hero, supposed to be identical with *Jemshid*, and by his deeds a counterpart of Hercules.

### Sandford, Daniel, D.D.,

A Scotch prelate, was born at Delville, near Dublin, in 1766, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he won the prize for Latin composition in 1787. At Edinburgh, in 1792, he became minister of an Episcopal congregation for whom Charlotte Chapel was built in 1797. He joined the Episcopal Church of Scotland in 1803, and was ordained bishop of Edinburgh in 1806. He consecrated for his own congregation the newly erected Chapel of St. John in 1818. Bishop Sandford died in 1830. He published, *Lectures on Passion Week* (Edinb. 1797, 8vo; 1821, 12mo; 1826, 12mo): — *Sermons preached in St. John's Chapel* (ibid. 1819, 8vo): — *Remains and Sermons*, etc. (ibid. 1830, 2 vols. 8vo).

### Sandford, David,

An American Congregational minister, was born in New Milford, Conn., Dec. 11, 1737, and graduated at Yale College in 1755. Influenced by the wish of his father, he began the study of theology, but realizing that he had not the spiritual qualifications for the ministry, he relinquished his purpose in that direction. He settled upon a farm, where he remained a number of years, when, experiencing a change of life, he resumed the study of theology, and was ordained pastor of the church at Medway, Mass., April 14, 1773. Mr. Sandford served a short time as chaplain in the army. In 1807 he suffered severely from a stroke of paralysis, and never resumed his public labors. He died April 7, 1810. His only printed production is *Two Dissertations* (1810); one on *The Nature and Constitution of the Law given to Adam*, etc., the other on *The Scene of Christ in the Garden*, etc. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 48.

### Sandford, Peter P., D.D.,

A Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of respectable parents in Lodi, N.J., Feb. 28, 1781. At eighteen years of age he was converted, and still earlier had begun to hold religious services among his neighbors. In 1807 he entered the Philadelphia Conference, and in 1810 he was transferred to the New York Conference, in which he held some of the most important appointments till his death, Jan. 14, 1857. He "was a thorough divine, an able preacher, a judicious administrator of discipline, and an eminently honest Christian." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1857, p. 320.

### Sandiadevi,

In Hindu mythology, was a daughter of Brahma, to whom he gave birth from his own person, after having assumed a human form of extraordinary attractiveness, in order that he might people the world with gods.

### Sandini, Anthony,

An Italian ecclesiastical historian, was born June 31, 1692, and became, by the interest of his bishop, cardinal Rezzonico (who was afterwards pope Clement XIII), librarian and professor of ecclesiastical history at Padua, where he died, Feb. 23, 1751. He is known principally by his *Vitoe Pontificum Romanorum* (Ferrara, 1748; reprinted under the title of *Basis Historioe Ecclesiasticoe*). He also wrote *Historioe Familioe Sacroe*: —



*Hist. SS. Apostolorum: — Disputationes XX ex. Hist. Eccles., etc.: — and Dissertations in Defence of his Hist. Fam. Sac.,* which father Serry had attacked.

### Sandomir (Also Sandomir) Agreement

(*Consensus Sandomiriensis*), An accommodation reached by the Protestant churches of Poland in 1570, at a synod held at Sandomir, now the capital of the government of Radom, by which existing differences were composed and a fraternal union was established.

The Protestantism of Poland was of three types: 1, the Lutheran, introduced from Germany, and taking root chiefly in what is now Prussian Poland; 2, the Swiss, or Reformed, dating its introduction nearly to the same period as the Lutheran, and prevailing chiefly in Cracow and the surrounding country; and, 3. the Bohemian, brought in by refugees from the persecutions which raged in their native land. The language and customs of these refugees resembled those of the country in which they sought a home, and their Church possessed further advantages in its compact organization, thorough government, and rich hymnology, by which it was enabled to make rapid advances. These successes gave rise to the first disagreements with which the Polish Reformation was troubled, and furnished evidence of a wide division between the Lutherans and the Bohemian churches, the former charging the Bohemian Brethren with erroneous teaching, particularly in respect to the doctrines of justification and the Lord's supper, and with intentional neglect of scientific culture; and the latter retorting with reflections upon the absence of Church discipline and of moral restraints among their opponents. The progress of the Reformation in Strasburg in the meantime furnished the Brethren with an opportunity to enter into relations with other Protestant churches; and a delegation from Bohemia, appointed in 1540 for that purpose, having been favorably received by Bucer, Hedio, Capito, Calvin, and other Reformers, served to establish an intimacy of friendship between the respective leaders which was carefully cherished by the Bohemian Church.

The necessity of conciliating the opposing parties was apparent. The machinations of Romanism threatened them with a common danger; and it became important, after 1551, to check the progress of the antitrinitarian movement headed by Laelius Socinus; and the efficient organization of the Bohemian congregations, together with the fact that many of the foremost personages in the state were at least their friends and patrons, indicated

that a closer relation with them was essential to the stability and required for the defense of the Reformation. The earliest attempt of which we have authentic information was made by Felix Cruciger, a supporter of the Swiss Confession and evangelical superintendent in Little Poland, through the medium of discussions on the state of the Church with representative Bohemians. A compromise was ultimately effected at the general Synod of Kozminek in 1555, by which the Bohemian Confession was adopted, the liturgy of the Bohemians to be introduced, and their consent to be obtained to any undertaking. This agreement secured the approval of many theologians of the Reformed confessions in other lands, and of such men as Paul Vergerius and Brenz among the Lutherans. But the provisions of Kozminek were not executed with energy. John à Lasko, the eminent Reformer, whose high birth and former services gave him an assured influence, returned from exile (December 1556) and discouraged further effort; and when, towards the close of the year 1557, opinions adverse to the proposed union were received from Calvin, Bullinger, Viret, and others of the Swiss Reformers, the compromise fell to the ground, having effected nothing that was expected from it, and leaving behind it the additional complication of excited feelings between the Reformed and the Bohemian parties. To remedy this failure, Lasko now proposed that a colloquy be held in Moravia for the purpose of discussing the objections raised against the Bohemian Confession, and the Brethren readily agreed. Leipnik was chosen as the place of meeting. Fifteen points were presented for discussion, bearing chiefly against the view of the Lord's supper taught by the Bohemian Church, and against the constitution of the Church itself, the latter presenting the more difficult problem to be solved. The constitution of the Bohemian Brotherhood had adopted the Romish principle of a clerocracy. The government of the churches was placed wholly in the hands of a regularly ordained and graded officary; and if the lay element was recognized in the fact that the clergy were required to depend for their support, in part, on secular occupations, this was counterbalanced by the imposition of celibacy on the priesthood, thus securing to persons of that class not only a distinctive character, but also an appearance of superior sanctity. To change the constitution of the Church in this respect was impossible without giving up the principle of an organization to which the Brotherhood owed its preservation in the most trying times of persecution. The requirement of celibacy from their priests was explained as a prudential measure dictated by the greater liability of that class to persecution; but the exclusion of the, laity from the government of the

Church admitted of no explanation satisfactory to a people whose nobles had been leaders in the Reformation and guides in the subsequent progress of the Church. The Conference of Leipnik closed without having effected any material result; and when a renewed effort to secure the approval of the Bohemian Confession by the Swiss theologians, Calvin and Musculus in particular, had failed, it was evident that all but hope was lost. The Synod of Xions (September, 1560), at which the Evangelical Church of Poland was constituted, did something, however, to keep that hope alive by admitting delegates from the Bohemian fraternity to its deliberations, and by adopting ecclesiastical terms peculiar to that Church, such as *senior* and *consenior*, into the new constitution.

In Great Poland, where Lutheranism predominated, the Melancthonian party, headed by the brothers Erasmus and Nicholas Gliczner, put forth earnest efforts in behalf of Protestant fraternity. A synod at Posen (1560), composed of representatives from the Evangelical and Bohemian churches, as well as of Lutherans, developed a plan of union which subsequently became the basis of the *Sandomir Agreement*. In the following year a discussion of doctrinal differences took place at Buzenin, the Lutherans being scantily represented, which led to the translation into Polish of the revised Bohemian Confession, and its submission for the approval of the Evangelical party; and it was resolved that delegates from either section should attend all synods without a formal invitation. The progress of the Antitrinitarian movement, headed by Laelius Socinus, together with the incursion of Anabaptist refugees from Bohemia and Moravia, likewise promoted the interests of fraternity among the Evangelicals by threatening to sweep away entire congregations from the orthodox faith. The Cracow congregation, acting under the advice of Calvin and Bullinger, met the emergency by adopting the Swiss Confession and form of government (1560), and was followed in this measure by most of the congregations in Little Poland, so that from this time the Poles must be regarded as Calvinists; and even the Lutherans of Great Poland and Lithuania took similar action by the substantial adoption of the resolutions of Xions, at a synod at Gostyn, in June 1565, reserving only the teaching of the Augsburg Confession on the Lord's supper, and certain ecclesiastical usages.

The rigid Lutherans, whose leading representative was Benedict Morgenstern, resisted the union movement at every step, and profited by the organization of the Polish Lutheran Church by the synod of Gostyn to give the opposition a more definite and vigorous form; but the matter

having — apparently by an oversight on their part — been referred to the University of Wittenberg. a reply adverse to their purposes was received 4to. 1568), which rendered futile further opposition. The nobles of the land, alarmed by the successes of Romanism, now urged the cessation of strife between the factions of Protestantism. Edicts from the throne, then occupied by the vacillating Sigismund Augustus, had pointed out the real unity of belief held by the conflicting parties by exempting them from a proscription decreed against sectaries; and when the diet of Lublin (1569), at which the union of Poland and Lithuania came to pass, convened, the evangelical nobles present decided that a synod should be called to prepare the way for establishing a national Evangelical Church. After a number of preliminary conferences had been held, the synod assembled at Sandomir, April 9, 1570, and continued its session until April 15. Various attempts to establish the confession of one party as the common faith were made and set aside, until a compromise was effected by which each party was pledged to maintain fraternal relations with the others, while guarding its own confession and independent Church life.

The Sandomir Agreement was not a measure designed to secure identity of doctrinal teaching, but a provision to effect a practical comity of intercourse between separate churches. It recognizes the independence of the several churches, but removes the principal source of trouble — the doctrine of the Lord's supper — from the central position given to it by Lutheran polemics by emphasizing the agreement of the different confessions with respect to the leading doctrines of the faith. It provides that the ministry of either Church might conduct the worship and administer the sacraments in congregations of the other churches, though under restrictions intended to guard the usages and discipline of such congregations. It binds the contracting parties to avoid controversy and strife, and to make common cause against Romanism, sectarianism, and all other forces hostile to the Gospel; and it provides, in conclusion, that all important matters affecting the churches in Poland, Lithuania, and Samogitia should be regulated in common, and that deputies from all the churches should attend the general synods held by any one of them. A synod subsequently held (May 20, 1570), at Posen, and largely attended, took further measures to secure the practical operation of the *Consensus Sandomiriensis*; and the course of events from that time has proved that agreement as constituting the most important fact in the history of the evangelical churches in Poland. Some opposition to the compromise was

manifested, and more or less uneasiness was betrayed from time to time; but the action of the general synod at Thorn, in 1595, in reenacting the Sandomir resolutions, brought the dispute to a final settlement.

See Friese, *Beiträge zur Ref. — Gesch. in Polen u. Lithauen*; Fischer, *Vers. einer Gesch. der Ref. in Polen* (Grätz, 1855); id. *Kirchengesch. des Königreichs Polen*; Gindely, *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*; id. *Fontes Rerum Historiicarum*; Löscher, *Historia Motuum*; Hartknoch, *Preuss. Kirchen-Historie*; Jablonski, *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis*; Cosack, *Paul Speratus' Leben u. Lieder* (1861); Schnaase, *Gesch. der evang. Kirche Danzigs* (Dantzic, 1863); Eichhorn, *Der ermländische Bischof u. Cardinal Hosius* (Mayence, 1854); Wengerscius, *Slavonia Reformata*. Also J.W. Walch, *Hist. u. theol. Einl. in die Rel.- Streitigkeiten*; Zorn, *Hist. der zwischen den luth. u. ref. Theologis gehaltenen Colloquiorum*; Beck, *Symbol. Bücher der evang. ref. Kirche*; Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, etc., pref. p. 70; Nitzsch, *Urkundenbuch der evang. Union*, etc.

### Sandoval, Fray Prudencio De,

A Spanish prelate and historian, was born at Valladolid about 1560. He was a Benedictine monk, and was appointed historiographer to Philip III, who employed him to continue the general history of Ambrosio Morales, which appeared under the title of *Historia de los Reyes de Castilla y de Leon*. Among his other works are a *Historia de la Vida y Hechos del Emperador Carlos V*, which is esteemed a standard work and has been translated into English, and a *Cronica del Emperador de Espana, Don Alonzo VII*. Sandoval was made bishop of Tuy in 1608, and of Pampeluna in 1612. He died at Pampeluna, March 17, 1621. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

### Sands, Elisha,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York, 1830, and was converted under the ministry of R.S. Foster. He entered the New York East Conference, and labored in Orient, Greenport, Brooklyn (York and Warren streets), Jamaica, and Patchogue. By diligent study and natural gifts, he became an eloquent, impressive, and useful minister. He died in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1868. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869, p. 93.

## Sandusky, John,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson (now Marion) County, Ky., Jan. 11, 1798. His connection with the ministry extended over a period of nearly, if not quite, fifty years, and embraced a time of arduous labor and little compensation. His death took place Oct. 15, 1874, at the house of his daughter, Catharine Logan, at which time Mr. Sandusky was a member of the Kentucky Conference. He was a man of marked character — brave, unselfish, just, and generous. He was master of the system of theology of the Church to which he belonged, clear and forcible in preaching, and greatly gifted in prayer. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences, M.E. Ch., South*, 1875, p. 223.

## Sandwich Islands, Or Hawaiian Islands,

The most northerly cluster of the Polynesian Archipelago, containing twelve islands. The chain extends about 360 miles from southeast to northwest, and lies in the Pacific Ocean between lat. 18° 55' and 22° 20' N., and long. 154° 55' and 160° 15' W. The largest island is Hawaii, containing 4040 square miles; but Oahu, more central and having a good harbor, is the seat of government and the commercial center. The population of the islands was estimated by Cook at 400,000 — doubtless an exaggeration. In 1832 the official census gave 130,313, in 1850, 84,165; in 1860, 69,800; and in 1872, 56,899. This decrease is due to many causes, of which those now principally active may be traced to their contact with the whites. "Before missionary operations commenced, the people were, if not in the lowest state of barbarism in which men are ever found, yet certainly in a very low state of intellectual, social, and moral debasement. With no written language; with no comfortable dwellings; with very little clothing; with the family constitution in ruins, unmitigated licentiousness universal, and every wild passion indulged without restraint; the people were 'a nation of drunkards,' with no laws or courts of justice. The people of all ranks were much under the influence of superstitious fears, and their religion, in connection with the cruel rites of idol worship, was in a great measure a *tabu* system — i.e. a system of religious prohibitions and consecrations, which had extended itself very widely, and had become exceedingly burdensome under the direction of kings and priests who use the system to accomplish their own purposes" (Newcomb). Vancouver, who arrived with Cook in 1778, and returned in 1792, and again in 1794, made sincere attempts to enlighten the natives. His instructions were not

forgotten, and, by a spontaneous movement, the whole nation rose up to destroy their idols and temples (1819-1820). The first missionaries to these islands were from America — Hiram Bingham and Asa Thurston, of Andover Theological Seminary. They arrived at Kailua, April 4, 1820, only a short time after the decisive battle had been fought which had subdued the party supporting idolatry. In 1822 the language was reduced to writing, since which time more than 200 works, mostly educational and religious, have been published in Hawaiian. The total number of Protestant missionaries sent to the islands, clerical and lay, including their wives, is 156 — at an expense, up to 1869, of \$1,220,000. The whole number of persons admitted to the Hawaiian Protestant churches up to 1873, inclusive, was 67,792; and the total membership of the same churches in 1873 was 12,283. In 1826, John Alexius Aug. Bachelot was appointed apostolic prefect of the islands, and arrived at Honolulu, July 7, 1827, with two other priests and four laymen. They landed without permission from the authorities, and countenanced and encouraged those who became their adherents in various violations of the laws. The government at last (Dec., 1831) sent them away to California; but in 1839 the French government sent a frigate to Honolulu, and compelled Kamehameha III to declare the Catholic religion free to all. The whole number of the Catholic population of the islands in 1872 was stated to be 23,000 — probably an exaggeration. An English Reformed Catholic mission was sent out in 1862, and met with favor from Kamehameha V. An Anglican bishop of Hawaii was appointed, who remained until 1870. Since his return in that year the interest in the mission has decreased and its success is small. See *Appleton's New Amer. Cyclop. s.v.*; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions, s.v.*

### Sandys (Or Sandes), Edwin, D.D.,

An English prelate. He was born at Hawkshead, Lancashire, England, in 1519, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became influenced in favor of the Reformation. He was junior proctor of the university in 1542, was elected master of Catharine Hall in 1547, and was about the same time vicar of Haversham, Bucks; made doctor of divinity and prebend of the Cathedral of Peterborough in 1548, and of Carlisle in 1552; vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1553. Having espoused the cause of Lady Jane Grey, he was thrown into the Tower in 1553, and remained there twenty-nine weeks. He escaped and fled to the Continent in 1554. On the death of Mary, he returned to England, and was appointed by Elizabeth one of the nine Protestant divines who were to hold a disputation before

both houses of Parliament with the same number of the Romish persuasion. He was made bishop of Worcester in 1559, of London in 1570, and archbishop of York in 1576. He died July 10, 1588. He wrote *Sermons on Various Occasions* (Lond. 1585, 4to; 1616, 4to; Cambridge, 1841, 8vo). He assisted in the translation of the Scriptures known as the "Bishop's Bible," and was one of the commissioners appointed to revise the Liturgy. See Whitaker, *Life of Edwin Sandys*; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Sandys, Edwin, Sir,

Son of archbishop Sandys, was born at Worcestershire about 1561. He was educated, under Hooker, at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; made probationer fellow in 1579, and prebendary of York in 1581. Having supported the succession of James I, he was knighted by that monarch in 1603. He was an influential member of the second London Company for Virginia, and was its treasurer in 1619; but Spanish influence was exerted against him, and in 1620 king James forbade his reelection. He was the author of a work entitled *Europes Speculum, or a View on Survey of the State of Religion in the Western Part of the World*, etc. (1605, 4to, with numerous later editions): — *The Sacred Hymns, consisting of Fifty Select Psalms of David*, etc. (1615, 4to). It is uncertain whether this version was performed by Sir Edwin or by some other of the same name (Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* [Bliss's ed.], 2, 474). See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Appleton's Cyclop.* s.v.

### Sandys, George,

An Oriental traveler, was the seventh and youngest son of archbishop Sandys, and was born at Bishopsthorpe in 1577. He entered St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and traveled in the East from 1610 till 1612. In 1621 he succeeded his brother as colonial treasurer of Virginia, and while in that colony completed his translation of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. Returning to England in 1624, he was appointed a gentleman of the king's privy chamber. He died at Bexley Abbey, Kent, the residence of his niece, lady Margaret Wyatt, in 1644.

### San Erdeni

in Lamaism, is one of the seven sacred objects which are placed before the idols in the temples of the Mongols, Kalmucks, and Tibetans. It represents



a white elephant, an animal regarded with the utmost veneration by those peoples, insomuch that the loftiest title of the sovereigns of Burma, China, and India (the former "Great Mogul") is "lord of the white elephant," and bloody wars have been waged to secure it as an exclusive right.

### Sanford, David

a Congregational minister, was born at New Milford, Conn., Dec. 11, 1737, and graduated at Yale College in 1755. He was ordained pastor of the Church at Medway, Mass., in 1773, which connection he retained until his death in 1810. He published, *On the Nature and Constitution of the Law given to Adam in Paradise: — On the Scene of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane* (Boston, 1810, 8vo).

### Sanford, Hiram

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Cheshire, Conn., Feb. 27, 1805. His parents removed to Homer, N.Y., while he was a child. While quite young, he professed conversion and united with the Church. After about eight years spent in teaching and studying in Buffalo, he joined the Genesee Conference Oct. 14, 1835. He became supernumerary in 1851, and remained in this relation until 1854, when he was superannuated, and so continued until his death, which occurred in Phelps, May 16, 1865. Mr. Sanford was modest, very industrious, and faithful in every place he occupied. See *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1865, p. 240.

### Sanford, Joseph,

A Presbyterian minister, was born in Vernon, Vt., Feb. 6, 1797. He became a communicant in the Church at the age of thirteen; pursued part of his preparatory course at Granville, Washington County, N.Y., and part at Ballston, Saratoga County, N.Y.; graduated at Union College in 1820, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., in 1823; was licensed by the Presbytery of New York in April, 1823; was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, L.I., from 1823 till 1828, and of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, from 1828 until his death, Dec. 25, 1831. Mr. Sanford's only publication was a *Farewell Sermon*, delivered at Brooklyn in 1829 (8vo). He was a model pastor and a most effective preacher. See *Memoirs of Joseph Sanford*, by the Rev. Robert

Baird (Phila. 1836, 12mo); Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4, 655; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Sanga,

A name given to the sacred pilgrimage of Isje, a central province of Japan. In Isje is the grand *Mia*, or temple of *Tensio-Dai-Dsin*, which is the model after which all the other temples are built. To this place the religious sect of the Sintoists requires each of its adherents to make a pilgrimage once a year, or at least once in their life.

## Sangallensis, Codex.

SEE GALL (ST.) MS.

## Sangarius

(Σαγγάριος), A river god, is described as the son of Oceanus and Tethys, and as the father of Hecube. The river Sangarius (in Phrygia) itself is said to have derived its name from one Sangas, who had offended Rhea, and was punished by her by being changed into water.

## Sanger, Zedekiah. D.D.,

A Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Sherburne, Mass., Oct. 4, 1748, entered Cambridge July, 1767, and graduated with high honors in 1771. His theological studies were pursued under the direction of Rev. Jason Haven, of Dedham. On July 3, 1776, he was ordained and installed pastor of the church in Duxbury. He resigned his charge in April, 1786, on account of impaired eyesight, and engaged in secular pursuits for two or three years. On Dec. 17, 1788, he was installed as the colleague of Rev. John Shaw, South Bridgewater, where he spent the rest of his days. He received the degree of D.D. from Brown University in 1807. He died, after a short illness, Nov. 17, 1820. His published works are five *Ordination Sermons* (1792-1812). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8, 99.

## Sangha,

An assembly or chapter of Buddhist priests.

## San-Gimignano, Vincenzo Da,

An Italian painter, was born in Tuscany, and flourished during the earlier part of the 16th century. He was one of the pupils of Raphael, who esteemed him very highly for the softness of his coloring and the beautiful paintings in wax with which he ornamented the facades of several palaces. During the sack of Rome in 1527, Vincenzo fled to San-Gimignano, having lost almost all his works and designs. He lived only a short time after this misfortune. His works are very rare, one being in the Museum at Dresden — a *Madonna with the Infant Jesus and St. John*.

## San-Giorgio, Gianantonio Dr,

An Italian prelate, was born at Milan in 1439. Having completed his studies at the University of Pavia, he opened a school of canonical law in that city, but at the end of six years returned to Milan. He there became a member of the College of Jurists, afterwards provost of the basilica of St. Ambrose, and in 1479 was made bishop of Alexandria. In 1493 Alexander VI bestowed upon him the cardinal's hat, and transferred him in turn to Parma, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina. This prelate was employed by the popes in various negotiations, and was a man of prudence and great learning. He died at Rome, March 14, 1509. He published several works, as *Commentaria super quarto Decretalium*: — *De Appellationibus*: — *De Usibus Feudorum*: — *Lecturoe super Decretales*.

## Sangra,

In Hindu mythology, was a daughter of Wiswakarma and wife of the Sun god, who caused his long and shining hair to be clipped from his head in order that Sangra, who could not endure their brilliant light, might remain with him.

## Sangrid,

In Norse mythology, was one of the Walkures, or messengers of Odin, who elect the warriors to be slain in battle.

## Sanhedrim

(Hebraized [see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chal. Talm.* s.v.] *Sanhedrin*, ἡ *συνᾶγωγὴ* from the Greek *Synedrium*, *συνέδριον*, as in the New Test. [<sup>4162</sup> Matthew 5:22; 26:59; <sup>4145</sup> Mark 14:55; 15:1; <sup>4216</sup> Luke 22:66; <sup>4147</sup> John 11:47; <sup>4115</sup> Acts

4:15; 5, 21, 27, 34; 6:12, 15; 22:30; 23:1, 6, 15, 20, 28; 24:20], and Josephus [*Life*, 12; *Ant.* 14, 9, 3]; apocopated **γραιησι** plural **τὸν γραιησι**), the supreme council of the Jewish nation in and before the time of Christ. In the Mishna it is also styled **γδατυβε** *Beth-Din*, “house of judgment;” and in the Apocrypha and New Test. the appellations **γερουσία**, *senate*, and **πρεσβυτέριον**, *presbytery*, seem also to be applied to it (comp. 2 Macc. 1:10; <sup><492></sup>Acts 5:21; 22:5; 1 Macc. 7:33; 12:35, etc.). As there were two kinds of Synedria, viz. the supreme or metropolitan Sanhedrim, called **ἡ μεγάλη συναγωγή** *the Great Sanhedrim* (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 5), and provincial councils called **ἡ μικρὴ συναγωγή** *the Small Sanhedrims* (*ibid.*) — differing in constitution and jurisdiction from each other — we shall describe their respective organizations and functions separately, and close with an account of their history, largely as contained in the treatise of the Talmud which is devoted to this subject.

## I. *The Great Sanhedrim, or Supreme Council.* —

**1. Number of Members and their Classification.** — The Great Sanhedrim, or the supreme court of justice (**ἡ βεθ δαι** <sup><493></sup>**γδατυβε**) as it is called (Mishna, *Homrajoth*, 1, 5; *Sanhedrin*, 11, 4), or **κατ' ἐξοχήν**, <sup><494></sup>**γδατυβε** *the court of justice, the judgment hall*, because it was the highest ecclesiastical and civil tribunal, consisted of seventy-one members (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 2, 4; *Shebuoth*, 2, 2). This is the nearly unanimous opinion of the Jews as given in the Mishna (*Sanhedrin*, 1, 6): “The Great Sanhedrim consisted of seventy-one judges. How is this proved? From <sup><495></sup>Numbers 11:16, where it is said, ‘Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel.’ To these add Moses, and we have seventy-one. Nevertheless, R. Judah says there were seventy.” The same difference made by the addition or exclusion of Moses appears in the works of Christian writers, which accounts for the variation in the books between seventy and seventy-one. Baronius, however (*Ad Ann.* 31, § 10), and many other Roman Catholic writers, together with not a few Protestants, as Drusius, Grotius, Prideaux, Jahn, Bretschneider, etc., hold that the true number was seventy-two, on the ground that Eldad and Medad, on whom it is expressly said the Spirit rested (<sup><496></sup>Numbers 11:26), remained in the camp, and should be added to the seventy (see Hartmann, *Verbindung des A.T.* p. 182; Selden, *De Synedr.* lib. 2, cap. 4).

These members represented three classes of the nation, viz.

(a) *The priests*, who were represented by their chiefs, called in the Bible *the chief priests* (γνασ μνητκβ]twbah;=πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς), of whom there were most probably four-and-twenty (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 24:4, 6; with <sup><1270></sup>Matthew 27:1; <sup><1072></sup>John 7:32; 11:47; 12:10).

(b) *The elders*, μνηαε] = πρεσβύτεροι (<sup><1162></sup>Matthew 16:21; 21:23; 26:3, 47, 57, 59; 27:1, 3, 12, 20, 41; 28:12; <sup><1083></sup>Mark 8:31; 11:27; 14:43, 53; <sup><1022></sup>Luke 9:22; 20:1; 22:52; <sup><1119></sup>John 8:9; <sup><1015></sup>Acts 4:5, 23; 6:12; 23:14; 25:15); also called *the elders of the people* (ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ <sup><1008></sup>Acts 4:8, with ver. 5), because they were the heads of the families and tribes of the people, for which reason πρεσβύτεροι and ἄρχοντες are also synecdochically used for βουλή and συνέδριον (<sup><1233></sup>Luke 23:13; 24:20; <sup><1117></sup>Acts 3:7, etc.); these elders, who most probably were also twenty-four in number (<sup><1001></sup>Revelation 4:4), were the representatives of the laity, or the people generally.

(c) *The scribes* (q.v.) or *lawyers* (μυγαε]ε = γραμματεῖς), who, as the interpreters of the law in ecclesiastical and civil matters, represented that particular portion of the community which consisted of the literary laity, and most probably were twenty-two in number. As the chief priests, elders, and scribes constituted the supreme court, these three classes are frequently employed in the New Test. as a periphrasis for the word Sanhedrim (<sup><1163></sup>Matthew 26:3, 57, 59; 27:41; <sup><1083></sup>Mark 8:31; 11:27; 14:43, 53; 15:1; <sup><1022></sup>Luke 9:22; 20:1; 22:66; <sup><1101></sup>Acts 5:1; 6:12; 22:30; 25:15); while John, who does not at all mention the Sadducees, uses the term Pharisees to denote the Sanhedrim (<sup><1024></sup>John 1:24; 4:1; 8:3; 11:46, etc.).

**2. Qualification and Recognition of Members.** — The qualifications for membership were both very minute and very numerous. The applicant had to be morally and physically blameless. He had to be middle aged, tall, good looking, wealthy, learned (both in the divine law and diverse branches of profane science, such as medicine, mathematics, astronomy, magic, idolatry, etc.), in order that he might be able to judge in these matters. He was required to know several languages, so that the Sanhedrim might not be dependent upon an interpreter in case any foreigner or foreign question came before them (*Menachoth*, 65 a; *Sanhedrin*, 17 a; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 2, 1-8). Very old persons, proselytes, eunuchs, and Nethinim were ineligible because of their idiosyncrasies; nor could such candidates be elected as had no children, because they could not sympathize with domestic affairs (*Mishna*, *Horajoth*, 1, 4; *Sanhedrin*,

36 b); nor those who could not prove that they were the legitimate offspring of a priest, Levite, or Israelite, who played dice, lent money on usury, flew pigeons to entice others, or dealt in produce of the Sabbatical year (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 3, 3).

In addition to all these qualifications, a candidate for the Great Sanhedrim was required, first of all, to have been a judge in his native town; to have been transferred from there to the Small Sanhedrim, which sat at the Temple mount or at its entrance (**tyBairhior tyBairhij tP**), thence again to have been advanced to the second Small Sanhedrim, which sat at the entrance of the Temple hall (**tyBairhij tP** | **l yj**), before he could be received as member of the seventy-one (*Sanhedrin*, 32 a, 88 b; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 2, 8).

The ordination took place when the candidate was first appointed judge in his native place. In olden days every ordained teacher could ordain his disciples; afterwards, however, the sages conferred this honor upon Hillel I, B.C. 30; it was then decreed that no one should be ordained without the permission of the president of the Sanhedrim (**ayca**); that the president and the vice-president should not ordain in the absence of each other, but that both should be present; and that any other member may ordain with the permission of the president and the assistance of two non-ordained persons, as no ordination was valid if it was effected by less than three persons (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 3). The ordination was effected, not by the laying on of hands on the head of the elder, but by their calling him rabbi, and saying to him, "Behold, thou art ordained, and hast authority to judge even cases which involve pecuniary fines" (Maimonides, *ibid.* 4, 1-4).

The Sanhedrim was presided over by a president called *Nasi* (**ayca**) = *prince, patriarch*, and a vice-president styled **^yDætyBeba**; *the father of the house of judgment*. The power of electing these high officials was vested in the corporate assembly of members, who conferred these honors upon those of their number who were most distinguished for wisdom and piety. The king was the only one disqualified for the presidential throne, because according to the Jewish law it is forbidden to differ from him or to contradict his statement; but the high priest might be elected patriarch provided he had the necessary qualifications (*Sanhedrin*, 18 b; Maimonides, *Had Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 2, 3). After the death of Hillel I, however, the presidency became hereditary in his family for

thirteen generations. *SEE HILLEL* I. The functions of the *Nasi* or the *patriarch* were more especially external. Being second to the king, the *Nasi* represented the civil and religious interests of the Jewish nation before the Roman government abroad, and before the different Jewish congregations at home; while in the Sanhedrim itself he was simply the reciting and first teacher. The vice-president, on the other hand, had his sphere of labor more especially within the Sanhedrim. It was his office to lead and control their discussions on disputed points; hence his appellation, “father of the house of judgment.” Next to the vice-president, or the third in rank in the Sanhedrim, was the  $\mu\kappa\jmath$ ; *sage, referee*, whose office it was to hear and examine the pending subject in all its bearings, and then to bring it before the court for discussion. This dignitary we first meet with under the presidency of Gamaliel II the teacher of the apostle Paul, *SEE GAMALIEL*, and his son Simon 2 (*Horajoth*, 13; *Tosephta Sanhedrin*, cap. 7; Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1, 348). Besides these high functionaries, there were sundry servants not members of the seventy-one, such as two judges’ scribes ( $\gamma\rho\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\gamma\eta\gamma\delta\alpha$ ), or *notaries*, one of whom registered the reasons for acquittal, and the other the reasons for condemnation (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 4:3); and other menial officials, denominated  $\mu\gamma\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon$   $\gamma\eta\alpha\epsilon$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\omicron\rho$  (<sup><4155></sup>Matthew 5:25; 26:58: <sup><41454></sup>Mark 14:54, 65; <sup><2128></sup>Luke 12:58; <sup><4172></sup>John 7:32, 45; 18:3, 12, 18, 22; 19:6; <sup><4162></sup>Acts 5:22, 26; 23:2, etc.).

**3. Place, Time, and Order in which the Sessions were held.** — There seems not to have been any prescribed place for holding the sessions in the early part of the Sanhedrim’s existence. In all probability they were held in some place adjoining the Temple, as the neighborhood of the sanctuary was deemed specially appropriate for the solemn assemblies which had to decide upon the most momentous questions affecting life and death, time and eternity. It was Simon ben-Shetach (B.C. 110-65) who built the *Hall of Squares* ( $\tau\kappa\iota\nu$   $\alpha\epsilon\gamma\zeta\alpha$ ), or, more briefly, the *Gazith* ( $\tau\gamma\zeta\alpha$ ), where both the Sanhedrim and the priests permanently held their meetings. This basilica, the floor of which was made of hewn square stones — whence its name (*Yoma*, 25 a) — was situated in the center of the south side of the Temple court, the northern part extending to the court of the priests ( $\zeta\delta\alpha$ ), and the southern part to the court of the Israelites ( $\iota\omega\jmath$ ); it was thus lying between these two courts, and had doors into both of them (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 11, 2; *Pea*, 3, 6; *Middoth*, 5, 3, 4; Herzfeld.

*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1, 394 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 1, 145, 275). **SEE TEMPLE**. This hall henceforth became the prescribed court for the sessions of the Sanhedrim. The assembling of the Sanhedrim in the high priest's house was illegal. Equally illegal was the assumption of the presidency by this sacerdotal functionary over this supreme court recorded in the New Test. (~~אַתָּה~~ Matthew 26:3; ~~אַתָּה~~ Acts 5:21, 27; 23:2), as Gamaliel I was then the legitimate president (*Pesachim*, 88 b). When it is remembered that this sacred office was at that time venial, and that the high priest was the creature of the Romans, this priestly arrogance will not be matter of surprise. "Forty years before the destruction of the Temple [i.e. while the Savior was teaching in Palestine], the sessions of the Sanhedrim were removed from the Hall of Squares to the Halls of Purchase" (*Sabbath*, 15 a; *Aboda Sara*, 8 b), on the east side of the Temple mount.

The Sanhedrim sat every day from the termination of the daily morning sacrifice till the daily evening sacrifice, with the exception of the Sabbath and festivals, when they retired to the synagogue on the Temple mount and delivered lectures (*Sanhedrin*, 88 b; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 3, 1). The order in which they sat was as follows: the president (~~אַתָּה~~) sat in an elevated seat; on his right hand sat the vice-president (~~יָדָאָה~~), and at his left the *chakamn* (~~מִכְּ~~), or *referee*; while the members, seated on low cushions, with their knees bent and crossed in the Oriental fashion, were arranged, according to their age and learning, in a semicircle, so that they could see each other, and all of them be seen by the president and vice-president. The two notaries stood before them, one to the right and the other to the left. Before them sat three rows of disciples (~~יְדָאָה~~), in places appropriate to their respective attainments. From the first of these rows the ranks of the judges were always filled up. When those of the second row took their seat in the first, those of the third took the seats of the second, while members of the congregation generally were selected to fill the lowest places vacated in the third row (*Mishna, Sanhedrin*, 3, 3, 4; Maimonides, *ibid.* 1, 3). Under ordinary circumstances all the seventy-one members were not required to be present in their seats, so that most of them could attend to their business, since twenty-three members formed a quorum. Less than this number during any part of the session was illegal; hence before one could go out he was obliged to look round in order to ascertain that there was the legal quorum without him (*Sanhedrin*, 88 b; *Tosephta Shekalim*, at the end; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 3, 2).



**4. Jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim.** — Being both legislative and administrative, the functions of the Sanhedrim in the theocracy extended to the institution of ordinances and the definition of disputed points in ecclesiastical matters, as well as to the adjudication of ecclesiastical and secular questions, including even political matters. The tribunal had, in the first place, to interpret the divine law, and to determine the extension or limitation of its sundry enactments, inasmuch as the members of the Sanhedrim were not only the most skilled in the written word of God, but were the bearers of the oral law which was transmitted to them by their predecessors, and which they again in succession handed down to the other members of this body. Thus the Sanhedrim had

**(a)** to watch over the purity and legality of the priests who ministered in holy things. For this purpose they appointed trustworthy persons to keep family registers (*yspdy rpsq genealogies*) of the priests in Egypt, Babylon, and in all places where the Jews resided, stating the names, and giving all the particulars both of the head of the family and all his male descendants, and to supply every priest with such a document attested by the Sanhedrim, inasmuch as those priests who could not prove that they were not the issue of proscribed marriages were disqualified for ministering in holy things, and were ordered to divest themselves of their sacerdotal robes and put on mourning (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 5; *Middoth*, 5, 4; *Bechoroth*, 45 a; *Tosephta Chagiga*, cap. 2; Josephus, *Cont. Apion.* 1, 7).

**(b)** To try cases of unchastity on the part of priests' daughters, and married women who were accused by their husbands of infidelity, which were questions of life and death (Mishna, *Sota*, 1, 4; *Sanhedrin*, 52 a).

**(c)** To watch over the religious life of the nation, and to try any tribe which was accused of having departed from the living God to serve idols (*ibid.* 1, 5).

**(d)** To bring to trial false prophets or any heretic who promulgated doctrines contrary to the tenets of the scribes or the Sanhedrim (*μυρῶν ἑρέτων*) "Such a one is not to be executed by the tribunal of his native place, nor by the tribunal at Jabne, but by the supreme court of Jerusalem; he is to be kept till the forthcoming festival, and to be executed *on the festival*," as it is written (<sup><1573></sup>Deuteronomy 17:13), "and all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously" (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 11, 3, 4; comp. also <sup><1076></sup>Matthew 26:65; 27:63; <sup><6107></sup>John 19:7; <sup><4102></sup>Acts 4:2; 5, 28;

6:13). In accordance with this is the remark of our Savior, “It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem” (<sup><4133></sup>Luke 13:33, with Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 9, 3).

**(e)** To see that neither the king nor the high priest should act contrary to the law of God. Thus the Talmud tells us that Alexander Jannseus was summoned before the Sanhedrim to witness the trial of his servant, who had committed murder (B.C. 80), under the presidency of Simon ben-Shetach (*Sanhedrin*, 19 a), and we know that Herod had to appear before this tribunal to answer for his conduct (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 9, 4).

**(f)** To determine whether a war with any nation contemplated by the king is to be waged, and to give the sovereign permission to do so (*Sanhedrin*, 1, 5; 2, 4).

**(g)** To decide whether the boundaries of the holy city or the precincts of the Temple are to be enlarged, inasmuch as it was only by the decision of the Sanhedrim that these additions could be included in the consecrated ground (*ibid.* 1, 5; *Shebuoth*, 14 a).

**(h)** To appoint the provincial Sanhedrim, or courts of justice (*Sanhedrin*, 1, 5; Gemara, *ibid.* 63 b; *Tosephta Sanhedrin*, cap. 7; *ibid. Chagiga*, cap. 2; *Jerusalem Sanhedrin*, 1, 19 b).

**(i)** To regulate the calendar and harmonize the solar with the lunar year by appointing intercalary days (*Sanhedrin*, 10 b). This jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was recognized by all the Jews both in Palestine and in foreign lands (<sup><4492></sup>Acts 9:2; 26:10; with Mishna, *Manoth*, 6, 10; *Tosephta Sanhedrin*, cap. 7; *Chagiga*, cap. 2). Thereby this supreme court secured unity of faith and uniformity of practice.

## Picture for Sanhedrim

**5. Mode of Conducting Trials, Punishments, etc.** — The humane and benevolent feelings of the rulers towards the people whom they represented were especially seen in their administration of the law. They always acted upon the principle that the accused was innocent till he could be proved guilty. Hence they always manifested an anxiety, in their mode of conducting the trial, to clear the arraigned rather than secure his condemnation, especially in matters of life and death. Their axiom was that “the Sanhedrim is to save, not to destroy life” (*Sanhedrin*, 42 b). Hence no man could be tried and condemned in his absence (<sup><4151></sup>John 7:51); and

when the accused was brought before the tribunal, the president of the Sanhedrim at the very outset of the trial solemnly admonished the witnesses, pointing out to them the preciousness of human life, and earnestly beseeching them carefully and calmly to reflect whether they had not overlooked some circumstances which might favor the innocence of the accused (*Sanhedrin*, 37 a). Even the attendants were allowed to take part in the discussion, if a mild sentence could thereby be procured; while those members of the Sanhedrim who, during the debate, once expressed themselves in favor of acquitting the accused, could not any more give their votes for his condemnation at the end of the trial. The taking of the votes always began from the junior member and gradually went on to the senior, in order that the lowest members might not be influenced by the opinion of the highest (*ibid.* 32 a). In capital offenses, it required a majority of at least two to condemn the accused; and when the trial was before a quorum of twenty-three, or before the *Small Sanhedrim*, which consisted of this number, thirteen members had to declare for the guilt (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 4, 1; Gemara, *ibid.* 2 a, 40 a). In trials of capital offenses, the verdict of acquittal could be given on the same day, but that of *guilty* had to be reserved for the following day, for which reason such trials could not commence on the day preceding the Sabbath or a festival. No criminal trial could be carried through in the night (Mishna, *ibid.* 4, 1; Gemara, *ibid.* 32). The judges who condemned a criminal to death had to fast all day (*Sanhedrin*, 63 a). The condemned was not executed the same day on which the sentence was passed; but the votes pro and con having been taken by the two notaries, the members of the Sanhedrim assembled together on the following day to examine the discussion, and to see whether there was any contradiction on the part of the judges (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 4, 1; Gemara, *ibid.* 39 a). If on the way to execution the criminal remembered that he had something fresh to adduce in his favor, he was led back to the tribunal, and the validity of his statement was examined. If he himself could say nothing more, a herald preceded him as he was led to the place of execution, and exclaimed, "A, son of B, has been found guilty of death, because he committed such and such a crime according to the testimony of C and D; if any one knows anything to clear him, let him come forward and declare it" (Mishna, *ibid.* 6, 1). Clemency and humanity, however, were manifested towards him even when his criminality was beyond the shadow of a doubt, and when the law had to take its final course. Before his execution, a stupefying beverage was administered to the condemned by pious women to deprive him of

consciousness and lessen the pain (*Sanhedrin*, 43 a, with <sup><4174></sup>Matthew 27:48; <sup><4152></sup>Mark 15:23, 36; <sup><4236></sup>Luke 23:36; <sup><4319></sup>John 19:29, 30). The property of the executed was not confiscated, but passed over to his heirs (*Sanhedrin*, 48 b). The only exception to this leniency was one who gave himself out as the Messiah, or who led the people astray from the doctrines of their fathers (*hydmmw tysm* = *πλόνους*; <sup><4176></sup>Matthew 27:63; <sup><4133></sup>Luke 13:33; <sup><4410></sup>Acts 4:2; 5, 28). Such a one had to endure all the rigors of the law without any mitigation (*Sanhedrin*, 36 b, 67 a). He could even be tried and condemned the same day or in the night (*Tosephta Sanhedrin*, 10; <sup><4171></sup>Matthew 27:1, 2).

As to the different punishments which the Sanhedrim had the power to inflict, though they were commensurate with the gravity of the offenses which fell within their jurisdiction to try, and embraced both corporal (Acts 5, 40; Mishna, *Manoth*, 3, 1-5) and capital punishments, yet even this supreme court was restricted to four modes of taking life — viz. by stoning, burning, beheading, and strangling (*hpyrc hl yqs qnj w grh*). These four modes of execution were the only legal ones among the Jews from time immemorial (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 7, 1), and could be inflicted either by the Great Sanhedrim or by the Small Sanhedrim. According to the Gospel of John, however, the Jews declare (*ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτείνειν οὐδένα*), “It is not lawful for us to put any man to death” (<sup><4181></sup>John 18:31), which agrees with the remark in the Jerusalem Talmud that “forty years before the destruction of the Temple the power of inflicting capital punishment was taken away from Israel” (*Sanhedrin*, 1, beginning; 7, 2, p. 24). But this simply means that without the confirmation of the sentence on the part of the Roman procurator, the Jews had not the power to carry the sentence of the Sanhedrim into execution. This is not only confirmed by Josephus, who tells us that the Pharisees complained to the procurator Albinus about the assumption to execute capital punishment on the part of the Sadducean high priest (*Ant.* 20, 9, 1), but by the appeal of Paul to the chief captain (<sup><4425></sup>Acts 22:25-30), and especially by the whole manner in which the trial of Jesus was conducted. The stoning of Stephen (<sup><4475></sup>Acts 7:54, etc.) was the illegal act of an enraged multitude, as Josephus (*Ant.* 20, 9, 1) expressly declares the execution of the apostle James during the absence of the procurator to have been.

## II. *The Small Sanhedrim.* —

**1. Members, Constitution, etc.** — This judicial court consisted of twenty-three members, who were appointed by the Great Sanhedrim (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 5, 6), and a president (אל פּוּמ, *excellency*) as their head (ibid. 1, 6; *Horajoth*, 4 b). They had the power not only to judge civil cases, but also such capital offenses as did not come within the jurisdiction of the supreme court (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 4; 4, 1). Such provincial courts were appointed in every town or village which had no less than 120 representative men (יָדִימ[מ]) — i.e. twenty-three judges, three ranks of disciples of twenty-three persons each (=sixty-nine), ten constant attendants in the synagogue (טִּסְנִיחַ תֵּב לִץ יָנִי לְבָרִץ[ ]), two judges' notaries, the one to write down the arguments for and the other the arguments against the accused's innocence; two court servants to administer the forty stripes save one, and to wait upon the judges; two judges, two witnesses, two counter-witnesses, two witnesses to gainsay the counter-witnesses, two almoners, and one additional to distribute the alms, one physician, one scribe (יָל בֵּל), and one schoolmaster for children — in all 120 (*Sanhedrin*, 17 b; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 1, 10).

**2. Place, Time, and Order in which the Sessions were Held.** — In the provinces these courts of justice were at first held in the market place, but afterwards in a room adjoining the synagogue (*Jerusalem Sanhedrin*, 1, 1 *Baba Metsia*, 51, 8), for the same reason which made the Great Sanhedrim hold their sittings in the Hall of Squares, in the inner court of the Temple. They sat every Monday and Thursday, being market days (*Baba Rema*, 82 a; *Kathuboth*, 3 a), from the termination of morning prayer till the sixth hour (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 3, 1). The order in which they were ranged was the same as that of the Great Sanhedrim. There were two of these lesser courts of justice in Jerusalem itself; one sat at the entrance to the Temple mount, and the other at the entrance to the Temple hall (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 9, 2), which on special occasions met together with the Great Sanhedrim (*Sanhedrin*, 88 b). There was no appeal to the Great Sanhedrim against the decision of this lesser Sanhedrim. Only when the opinion of the judges was divided did they themselves consult with the supreme court. The stripes to which offenders were sentenced were given in the synagogue by the officer already mentioned (אֲרִיבֵי Mark 13:9, with אֲרִיבֵי Matthew 10:17; 23:34), and it is evidently to such a local Sanhedrim that reference is made in אֲרִיבֵי Matthew 5:22; 10:17; אֲרִיבֵי Mark 13:9.

Besides these two courts, there was also one consisting of three judges. Within the jurisdiction of this court came suits for debts, robbery, bodily injuries, compensation for damages; thefts which involved a twofold, fourfold, or fivefold value to the proprietor (<sup><1221></sup>Exodus 22:1-9); rapes, seduction, slander, and all minor offenses (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 1-3; 3, 1). There were in Jerusalem alone 390 such Sanhedrims.

**3. Origin, Development, and Extinction of the Sanhedrim.** — According to the most ancient Jewish tradition, the Sanhedrim was instituted by Moses, when he appointed, according to the command of God, seventy elders, who, together with him as their president, were to act as magistrates and judges (<sup><04116></sup>Numbers 11:16-24), thus constituting the first Sanhedrim with its seventy-one members (Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, 1, 6; Gemara, *ibid.* 2). Hence the so-called Jerusalem Targum paraphrases <sup><0157></sup>Exodus 15:27, “And they came to Elim, and there were there twelve fountains of water, answering to the twelve tribes of Israel; and seventy palm trees, answering to the seventy elders of the Sanhedrim of Israel,” while the other Chaldee versions express the judicial courts and colleges of the remotest antiquity by the name Sanhedrim (comp. Targum, <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 28:6; <sup><0811></sup>Ruth 3:11; 4:1; <sup><0900></sup>Psalms 140:10; <sup><2122></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:12). Hence, too, the offices of president and vice-president are traced to Moses (*Jerusalem Sota*, 9, 10). In the time of the kings, we are assured, Saul was president of the Sanhedrim in his reign, and his son Jonathan was vice-president (*Moed Katon*, 26 a); and these two functions continued during the time of the later prophets (Pea, 2 b; *Nasir*, 56 b; *Tosephta Yadayim*, cap. 11). The Chaldee paraphrase on the Song of Songs tells us that the Sanhedrim existed even in the Babylonian captivity, and that it was reorganized by Ezra immediately after the return from the exile (comp. Song of Songs 6:1). But though this view has also been entertained by some of the most learned Christian scholars (e.g. Selden, Leusden, Grotius, Reland), and though allusion is made in Jeremiah (<sup><2618></sup>Jeremiah 26:8, 16) to the several distinct classes which we afterwards find constituting the Sanhedrim, while Ezekiel (<sup><2411></sup>Ezekiel 8:11, etc.) actually mentions the existence of seventy elders in his time, yet there seems to be little doubt that this supreme court, as it existed during the second Temple, developed itself in the Greek rule over Palestine. Livy expressly states (14, 32), “Pronuntiatum quod ad statum Macedoniae pertinebat, senatores, quos *synedros* vocant, legendos esse, quorum consilio republica administraretur.” If the ἡγεμονία τῶν Ἰουδαίων in 2 Macc. 1:10; 4:44;

11:27, designates the Sanhedrim — as it probably does — this is the earliest historical trace of its existence. The Macedonian origin of the Sanhedrim is corroborated by the following reasons:

**(a)** The historical books of the Bible are perfectly silent about the existence of such a tribunal.

**(b)** The prophets, who again and again manifest such zeal for justice and righteous judgment, never mention this court of justice, but always refer the administration of the law to the ruling monarch and the magnates of the land, thus showing that this central administration belongs to the period of the second Temple.

**(c)** The name **συνέδριον, συνεδρεύειν**, by which it has come down to us, points to the fact that this synod originated during the Macedonian supremacy in Palestine. It is true that Josephus does not mention the Sanhedrim before the conquest of Judea by Pompey (B.C. 63); but the very fact that it had such power in the time of Hyrcanus II as to summon Herod to answer for his unjust conduct (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 9, 4) shows that it must then have been a very old institution to have acquired such development and authority. Hence Frankel rightly remarks, “Upon more minute examination, we find that the chronicler gives a pretty plain sketch of the Great Sanhedrim, as he mentions the existence in Jerusalem of a supreme court consisting of priests, Levites, and heads of families, with the high priest as president (<sup>449B</sup>2 Chronicles 19:8, 11).... Now the chronicler, as Zunz has shown (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 32), lived as early as the beginning of the 2d century of the Seleucid era, so that at that time the Sanhedrim did already exist, and its beginning is to be placed at the period in which Asia was convulsed by Alexander and his successors of the Ptolemean and Seleucid dynasties. Palestine, too, felt deeply the consequences of these recent convulsions, and to preserve its internal religious independence it required a thoroughly organized body to watch over both its doctrines and rights. This body manifested itself in the Sanhedrim, at the head of which was the high priest, as is seen from <sup>200B</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:4, 5, and <sup>449B</sup>2 Chronicles 19:8, 11. The Sanhedrim seems to have been dissolved in the time of the Maccabean revolt in consequence of the unworthy high priests (comp. 2 Macc.), but it was reconstructed after the overthrow of the Syrian yoke. As the people, however, were unwilling to leave the whole power in the hands of the Maccabees, who were already princes and high priests, they henceforth

placed at the head of the Sanhedrim a president and a vice-president” (*Der gerichtliche Beweis*, p. 68, note). This is, moreover, corroborated by the traditional chain of presidents and vice-presidents which is uninterruptedly traced from Jose ben-Joeser (B.C. 170), as well as by the statement that with Simon the Just terminated the Great Synagogue (*Aboth*, 1, 2), from which the Sanhedrim developed itself. The transition from the Great Synagogue to the Great Sanhedrim is perfectly natural. “The Macedonian conqueror,” as Frankel justly states (*Programm.* p. 6, 1834), “with all his clemency towards Palestine, which resisted him so long and so obstinately, effected changes in the internal government of the people, and dissolved the Great Synagogue, which to a certain extent conferred independence and a republican constitution upon the land. The people, however, valued highly their old institutions, and would not relinquish them. Hence most probably in the confusions which broke out after Alexander’s death, when the attention of the fighting chiefs could not be directed towards Palestine, the supreme court was formed anew, assuming the name Synhedrion, which was a common appellation among the Greeks for a senate.” It was this development of the Great Sanhedrim from the Great Synagogue which accounts for the similarity of the two names (**tsnk hl wdgh ^yrdhns hl wdgh**).

After the destruction of Jerusalem, when the holy city was no longer adapted to be the center of religious administration, R. Jochanan ben-Zakkai transferred the seat of the Sanhedrim to Jabne or Jamnia (A.D. 68-80); it was thence transferred to Usha (*Kethuboth*, 49; *Sabbath*, 15; *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 15 b), under the presidency of Gamaliel II, ben-Simon II (A.D. 80-116); conveyed back to Jabne and again to Usha; to Shafran, under the presidency of Simon III, ben-Gamaliel II (A.D. 140-163); to Beth-Shearim and Sepphoris, under the presidency of Jehudah I the Holy, ben-Simon III (A.D. 163-193; comp. *Kethuboth*, 103 b; *Nida*, 27 a); and finally to Tiberias, under the presidency of Gamaliel III, ben-Jehudah I (A.D. 193-220), where it became more of a consistory, but still retaining, under the presidency of Jehudah II, ben-Simon III (A.D. 220-270), the power of excommunication in case any Israelite refused to abide by its decisions; while under the presidency of Gamaliel IV, ben-Jehudah II (A.D. 270-300), it dropped the appellation Sanhedrim, and the authoritative decisions were issued under the name *Beth Ham-Midrash* (**vrdMhityB**). Gamaliel VI (A.D. 400-425) was the last president. With the death of this patriarch, who was executed by Theodosius II for erecting new synagogues contrary



to the imperial inhibition, the title of *Nasi*, the last remains of the ancient Sanhedrim, became wholly extinct in the year 425.

It was with reference to this Supreme Court that Christ chose seventy disciples (~~<201>~~ Luke 10:1), answering to the seventy senators composing the Sanhedrim, just as he chose twelve apostles with reference to the twelve tribes of Israel (~~<068>~~ Matthew 19:28; ~~<023>~~ Luke 22:30), to indicate thereby to the Jews that the authority of their supreme religious court was now taken away and was vested in the seventy of his own choice, and over which he himself was the president and supreme Lord.

**4. Literature.** — Mishna, Sanhedrin, and the Gemara on this tractate; excerpts of the Gemara tractate *Sanhedrin* have been translated into Latin with elaborate notes by John Coch (Amst. 1629); the monographs of Vorstius and Witsius, in Ugolino's *Thesaurus*, vol. 25; Maimonides, *De Sanhedriis et Poenis* (ed. Houting. Amst. 1695); Selden, *De Synedriis et Proeficturis Juridicis Veterum Eboreorum* (Lond. 1650); Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 37 sq. (Berlin, 1832); *Israelitische Annaelen*, 1, 108, 131 sq. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839); Frankel, *Der gerichtliche Beweis nach mosaisch-talmudischem Rechte*, p. 68 sq. (Berlin, 1846); Rapaport, *Erech Millin*, p. 2 (Prague, 1852); Frankel, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1, 344 sq.; Levy, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 4, 266 sq., 301 sq. (Leips. 1855); Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2, 380 sq. (Nordhausen, 1855); Krochmal, in the Hebrew essays and reviews entitled *He-Chaluz*, 3, 118 sq. (Lemberg, 1856); Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, 1, 123 sq., 270 sq. (Leips. 1857); Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, p. 88 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1863); Hartmann, *Die Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (Hamb. 1831). **SEE SCHOOL**, where all the presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim will be given in chronological order; and **SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT**, where the development of the Sanhedrim from this institution will be traced. For monographs on the civil powers of the Sanhedrim in our Lord's time, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 58. **SEE COUNCIL**.

### San-Jasiis,

One of the three classes of *Jagins*, which latter are Brahmanic anchorets. They affect great abstinence, and refrain from marriage, betel, and, indeed, pleasure in general. They are allowed to make but one meal a day, and to live on alms, carrying with them a cup of earthenware only. Their clothes

are dyed with red earth, and they have a long bamboo cane in their hands. They are forbidden to touch either gold or silver, much less to carry any about them. They are not allowed to have any fixed residence, nor to lie two nights together in the same place, once a year excepted, when they are suffered to continue two months in the same place: they then select such a spot as is thought to be holy, and there they may remain for life if they wish. They are bound to be always ready to oppose six enemies, viz. *Cama, lust; Croota, anger; Lopa, avarice; Madda, pride; the love of things of this world; and Matsara, thirst for revenge.*

### Sankara, Or Sankaracharya,

The name of one of the most renowned theologians of India. The time in which he flourished is unknown, tradition placing him at about B.C. 200, but H.H. Wilson assigns him to the 8th or 9th century after Christ. Most accounts agree in making him a native of Kerala or Malabar, and a member of the caste of the Namburi Brahmans. In Malabar he is said to have divided the four original castes into seventy-two, or eighteen subdivisions each. Towards the close of his life he repaired to Cashmere, and finally to Kedarnath, in the Himalaya, where he died at the early age of thirty-two years. In the course of his career he founded the sects of the Dasnami-Dandins. His principal works, which are of considerable merit, and exercised a great influence on the religious history of India, are his commentary on the *Vedanta Sutras*, on the *Bhaga-vadgita*, and the principal *Upanishads*. A number of works are current in the south of India relating to his life, among them the *Sankara-dig-vijaya*, or the conquest of the world by Sankara. See Wilson, *Sketch of Religious Sects of the Hindus*.

### Sankhar,

An evil spirit mentioned in the Jewish Talmud as having taken possession of the throne of Solomon.

### Sankhya

(Sanskrit, *synthetic reasoning*), The name of one of the three great systems of orthodox Hindu philosophy. Like the other systems, it professes to teach the means by which eternal beatitude, or the complete and perpetual exemption from every sort of ill, may be attained. This means is the discriminative acquaintance with *tatwa*, or the true principles of all existence. Such principles are, according to the Sankhya system, twenty-

five in number, as follows: (1) *Prakriti* or *Pradhana*, substance or nature; it is the universal and material cause, eternal, productive but unproduced. Its first production is (2) *Mahat* (literally *the great*), or *Buddhi* (literally *intellect*). From it devolves (3) *Ahankara* (literally *the assertion of "I"*), the function of which consists in referring the objects of the world to one's self. It produces (4-8) five *tanmatra*, or subtle elements, which produce the five gross elements [see (20-24)]. *Ahankara* further produces (9-13) five instruments of sensation, viz. the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin; (14-18) five instruments of action, viz. the organ of speech, the hands, the feet, the excretory termination of the intestines, and the organ of generation; lastly (19), *manas*, or the organ of volition and imagination. The five subtle elements (4-8) produce (20-24) the five gross elements, viz. *akasa*, space or ether, derived from the *sonorous* tanmatra; air, derived from the *aerial* tanmatra; fire, from the *igneous* tanmatra; water, from the *aqueous* tanmatra; lastly, earth, derived from the *terrene* tanmatra. The 25th principle is *Purusha*, or soul, which is neither produced nor productive; it is multitudinous, individual, sensitive, eternal, unalterable, and immaterial.

Creation results from the union of *Prakriti* (1) and *Purusha* (25), and is either material or intellectual. Besides the twenty-five principles, the Sankhya also teaches that nature has three essential *gunas*, or qualities, viz. *satwa*, the quality of goodness or purity; *rajas* (literally *coloredness*), the quality of passion; and, *tamas*, the quality of sin or darkness; and it classifies accordingly material and intellectual creation. From the foregoing summary it will be seen that the Sankhya proper does not teach the existence of a Supreme Being, by whom nature and soul were created, and by whom the world is ruled. Its opponents have therefore accused it of being atheistical; and it is the special object of the Yoga system to remove this reproach by asserting his existence and defining his essence. Its final object is not absorption in God, whether personal or impersonal, but "Moksha," deliverance of the soul from all pain and illusion, and recovery by the soul of its true nature. The Sankhya system underwent a mythological development in the Puranas (q.v.); thus *Prakriti*, or nature, is identified with *Maya*, or the energy of Brahma; and the Matsya-Purana affirms that *Buddhi*, or *Mahat*, the intellectual principle, through the three qualities goodness, passion, and sin, becomes the three gods — Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The most important development, however, of the Sankhya is that by the Buddhistic doctrine, which is mainly based on it.

The Sankhya philosophy is supposed to date from a period anterior to the 8th century B.C., and its reaction against Brahmanism became a popular movement in the 6th century in the Buddhistic reformation of Sankhyamuni, who taught the Yoga system with little change, and named its “deliverance of the soul from pain and illusion” the *Nirvana*. The reputed author of the actual Sankhya is Kapila (literally *tawny*), who is asserted to have been a son of Brahma; by others an incarnation of Vishnu. He taught his system in Sutras (q.v.), which, distributed in six lectures, bear the name of *Sankhya-Prarachana*. The oldest commentary on this work is that by Aniruddha; another is that by Vijnanabhikshu. They owe their preservation to Ishwara Krishna, who reduced them to writing, edited by H.H. Wilson. See Fitzedward Hall, Preface to his ed. of *Sankhya-Prarachana*; H.T. Colebrooke, *Miscell. Essays* (Lond. 1837), 1, 227 sq.; Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*.

### Sankrandanna,

In Hindu mythology, is “the variable one,” a surname of *Indra*, the god of the heavens and of the air.

### Sanks, James,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Anne Arundel County, Md., June 12, 1806, and early removed to Virginia. In 1828 he was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference, where he labored until 1858. when he was transferred to the East Baltimore Conference and placed in charge of the Bellefonte district. In 1862 he was appointed to York, Pa., but soon sank under the influence of disease, and died in the borough of York, Pa., June 4, 1862. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1863, p. 11.

### Sankuman,

In Hindu mythology, is a wise and pious king, who secured the welfare of his realm and then became a penitent. He received from Vishnu the promise that the god would become incarnate in his family, which was fulfilled in his being born as Rama.

### Sannan.

SEE KIRJATH-SANNAH.

## Sanngetal,

In Norse mythology, is a surname of *Odin*.

## Sannuwadi,

In Hindu mythology, is one of the eight playmates of Ganga.

## Sanquhar Declaration.

After Hall of Haughhead had been killed at Queensferry, June 3, 1680, an unsigned paper was found in his possession, which was never recognized by the members of the Covenant. But on June 22, 1680, a party of twenty-one armed men boldly entered the little burgh of Sanquhar, and marched to the market cross, where they read and posted up a paper, throwing off all allegiance to the government, and proclaiming themselves in defiant rebellion. The Sanquhar paper was as follows: "It is not among the smallest of the Lord's mercies to this poor land that there have been always some who have given their testimony against every course of defection (that many are guilty of), which is a token for good that he doth not as yet intend to cast us off altogether, but that he will leave a remnant in whom he will be glorious, if they, through his grace, keep themselves clean still, and walk in his way and method, as it has been walked in and owned by him in our predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of reformation in the several steps thereof, from popery, prelacy, and likewise Erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him who (it is true, so far as we know) is descended from the race of our kings; yet he hath so far departed from what he ought to have been, by his perjury and usurpation in Church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land, that we have just reason to account it one of the Lord's great controversies against us that we have not disowned him and the men of his practices (whether inferior magistrates or any other) as enemies to our Lord and his crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in these lands, our Lord's espoused bride and Church. Therefore, although we be for government and governors, such as the Word of God and our covenant allow, yet we for ourselves, and all that will adhere to us, as the representatives of the true Presbyterian kirk and covenanted nation of Scotland, considering the great hazard of lying under such a sin any longer, do by these presents disown Charles Stuart, that has been reigning (or rather tyrannizing, as we may say) on the throne of Britain these years by gone, as having any right, title to, or interest in the said crown of Scotland

for government, as forfeited several years since by his perjury and breach of covenant both to God and his kirk, and usurpation of his crown and royal prerogatives therein, and many other breaches in matters ecclesiastic, and by his tyranny and breach of the very *leges regnandi* in matters civil. For which reason, we declare that several years since he should have been denuded of being king, ruler, or magistrate, or of having any power to act or to be obeyed as such. As also, we being under the standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of salvation, do declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ and his cause and covenants; and against all such as have strengthened him, sided with, or anywise acknowledge him in his tyranny, civil or ecclesiastic — yea, against all such as shall strengthen, side with, or anywise acknowledge any other in the like usurpation and tyranny — far more against such as would betray or deliver up our free reformed mother — kirk unto the bondage of antichrist, the pope of Rome. And by this we homologate that testimony given at Rutherglen, May 29, 1679, and all the faithful testimonies of those who have gone before, as also of those who have suffered of late. And we do disclaim that declaration published at Hamilton, June 1697, chiefly because it takes in the king's interest, which we are several years since loosed from, because of the foresaid reasons, and others which may after this (if the Lord will) be published. As also we disown, and by this resent, the reception of the duke of York, that professed papist, as repugnant to our principles and vows to the most high God, and as that which is the great, though not alone, just reproach of our kirk and nation. We also by this protest against his succeeding to the crown; and whatever has been done, or any are essaying to do in this land (given to the Lord) in prejudice to our work of reformation. And, to conclude, we hope after this none will blame us for, or offend at our rewarding these that are against us, as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity. This is not to exclude any that have declined, if they be willing to give satisfaction according to the degree of their offense. Given at Sanquhar, June 22, 1680.” *SEE QUEENSFERRY DECLARATION.*

## Sansan'nah

(Heb. *Sansannah'*, *חַנְסַנְחַנְחַ* palmbranch; Sept. *Σανσαννά* v.r.

*Σεθεννάκ*), A town in the southern part of the territory of Judah (<sup><0653></sup>Joshua 15:31). The corresponding lists of Simeon (<sup><0695></sup>Joshua 19:5; <sup><1391></sup>1 Chronicles 4:31) seem to call it HAZAR-SUSAH *SEE HAZAR-*

**SUSAH** (q.v.). It is identified by Schwarz with the village of *Simsum*, on a river of the same name, northeast of Gaza — a position which he acknowledges, however, to be rather in the lowlands than in the south of Judah (*Palest.* p. 101, 123); but the boundary line can easily be accommodated to this location. **SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF**. Wilton would identify it with the *Wady es-Suny* mentioned by Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 1, 299, 300), not far south of Gaza, which he supposes to have been the first resting place for horses after leaving Gaza on the way to Egypt; and he thinks a confirmation is found for this in the circumstance that various travelers, in passing north from Egypt, have noticed that they first met with horses about that locality (*Negeb*, p. 210). Lieut. Conder thinks (*Tent-Work in Palest.* 2, 339) that it was at *Beit-susin*, east of the valley of Sorek; but this could not possibly have been within the territory of Simeon.

### Sansbury (Sandsbury, Or Sansbry), John,

A native of London, entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1593, aged seventeen; vicar of the Church of St. Giles, Oxford, in 1607; bachelor of divinity in 1608; buried in Jan., 1609. He wrote, *Ilium in Italiam*: — *Oxonia ad Protectionem Regis sui Omnium Optimi Filia*, etc. (Oxon. 1608, 16mo).

### Sanscara, Or Sanskara

(Sanskrit, *completing*). The name of one of the ten essential rites or ceremonies of the Hindus of the first three castes. They are the ceremonies to be performed before and at the birth of a child; of naming the child on the tenth, eleventh, or one hundred first day; of carrying the child out to see the moon on the third lunar day of the third light fortnight, or to see the sun in the third or fourth month; of feeding him in the sixth or eighth month (or at other stated periods); the ceremony of the tonsure in the second or third year; of investiture with the string in the fifth, eighth, or sixteenth year, when he is handed to a *guru* to become a religious student; and the ceremony of marriage, after he has completed his studies and is fit to perform the sacrifices ordained by the sacred writings.

### Sanskrit Versions.

A translation of the New Test. into the Sanskrit, the ancient and classical language of India, was commenced in the year 1803 and finished at the press in 1808. The man who had immortalized his name by this translation

was the well-known Dr. Carey (q.v.). He had also commenced a translation of the Old Test., when the disastrous fire at Serampore in 1812 interrupted his labors, destroying not only a dictionary of the Sanscrit and various Indian dialects, but also his MSS. of the second book of Samuel and the first book of Kings. In 1815 Dr. Carey received an associate in Dr. Yates, and both carried on the work of translating the Old Test., which was finally completed in 1822. In 1820 a second edition of the New Test. was undertaken at Serampore, the former edition, consisting of only 600 copies, having been completely exhausted. In 1827 a second edition of the Old Test. was in press, but various circumstances retarded its completion, and in 1834 the impression had been struck off only as far as the first book of Kings. As the first attempt of translating could only be defective, especially when undertaken at a period when the language had been little studied by Europeans, and no printed copies of the standard works were in existence, a statement as to the desirableness of a new and a more polished translation was laid before the committee of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in 1835. The committee entered into communication on the subject with the bishop of Calcutta, and the new translation was undertaken by Dr. Yates, formerly the associate of Dr. Carey, upon whom the mantle of the venerable translator seemed to have fallen. Dr. Yates began the work in 1840 by the publication of the Psalms; in 1844 the Gospels were completed; and in 1846 the Proverbs and the New Test. were in the press. While prosecuting his work, Dr. Yates was overtaken by death in 1845. On examining the state of the version, it was found that the books of Genesis, Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah had all passed through the press, and that the rest of the Pentateuch, and the books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Daniel, had been prepared in MS. The work was now committed to the Rev. Mr. Wenger, the translator into the Bengalee, and in 1852 the second volume of the Old Test., containing the historical books from Judges to Esther inclusive, was completed. In 1858 a third volume, bringing the translation up to the Song of Solomon, was finished; in 1863 the translation was continued as far as the end of Isaiah; and in 1873 the translation of the whole Bible was announced as completed. Besides the translation into Sanscrit proper, there exist versions into

**(a.)** *Sanscrit-Bengalee*, i.e. reprints from the Sanscrit in Bengalee character — viz. Genesis (first published in 1855; 2d. ed. 1860), Psalms (1857), Proverbs (1855), St. Luke (1855).



**(b.) Sanscrit-Deva Nagari.** With regard to the Deva Nagari character, the *Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1877* states that “the Calcutta University has largely of late years so popularized this language and character that it has been thought desirable to print not only the book of Psalms, but also the book of Proverbs and the New Test.” Only the Psalms have as yet been printed.

**(c.) Sanscrit-Oriya.** In this character the same parts as under (a) have been published.

See the *Bible of Every Land*, p. 86, and the *Annual Reports of the Brit. and For. Bible Society*. (B.P.)

### Sansom, James Green,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Bedford, Bedford Co., Pa., May 13, 1794. So destitute was the place of educational and religious advantages, that Mr. Sansom did not hear a sermon nor enter a school house until his thirteenth year. His early religious training was received from his mother, a member of the Presbyterian Church. In his seventeenth year he was brought into association with the Methodists, in 1818 was licensed to preach, and in 1819 was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference. In 1824 he went to Uniontown, Pa., which was soon after included in the Pittsburgh Conference, and he became one of its members. From 1819 till his death he was an earnest and effective minister, eighteen years serving as presiding elder. He died in Brownsville, Pa., May 4, 1861. He was of a genial spirit, interesting as a preacher, wise as a counsellor. — *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1862, p. 44.

### Sanson, Jacques,

A French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Abbeville, Feb. 10, 1596. He took orders as a Carmelite in 1619, under the name of *Ignace-Joseph de Jesus-Marie*. He was prior of the monastery at Paris, and afterwards had charge of the novices at Charenton and at Toulouse. While in the latter city he became confessor to the duchess of Savoy, and held the position until her death, in 1663. Returning to France, he assisted in founding two monasteries — one at Abbeville, the other at Amiens. He died at Charenton, Aug. 19, 1665. His writings are of very little account except those which give some history of the province of Ponthieu. These are, *Histoire Genealogique des Comtes de Ponthieu et des Maires d'Abbeville*,

and *Histoire Ecclesiastique de la Ville d'Abbeville*. — *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.*

### Sansovino, Andrea Contucci,

An Italian sculptor and architect, was born in 1460 at Monte-Sansovino, in Tuscany. He was the son of a poor peasant, but was sent to Florence through the liberality of a fellow townsman, and studied under Antonio del Pollajuolo. At the age of thirty he was called to Portugal, where he remained nine years, and constructed various edifices for John II and Emmanuel I. In Rome are the tombs of cardinals Sforza and Basso, executed by Sansovino, and in the Church of St. Anna the group *The Madonna and St. Ann*, one of his best works. He also executed some beautiful bas reliefs at Loretto. He died in 1529.

### Santa Casa

(*holy cottage*). *SEE LORETTO, HOLY HOUSE AT.*

### Santa Croce, Prospero Di,

An Italian prelate and diplomatist, was born at Rome in 1513. He studied law at Padua, and afterwards entered the Church. Paul III gave him the bishopric of Castel-Chisamo, on the island of Candia. He was employed as papal nuncio in Germany, Portugal, Spain, and France. While in the last named country, he received, at the request of Catherine de' Medici, the bishopric of Aries, and in 1565 the cardinal's hat. In 1573 he gave up his see in favor of his nephew, Silvio di Santa Croce, and returned to Rome. Sixtus V made him bishop of Albano, but he lived only a few months after receiving the see. This cardinal introduced tobacco into Italy, and the name "Santa Croce" was given to the plant. He died at Rome, Oct. 2, 1589. He wrote the *Memoirs* of his life, and of the civil wars in France, in Latin. These have been published in the *Collectio Veterum Scriptorum* of Martenne and Durand, under the title *De Civilibus Gallioe Dissensionibus Comm.* Besides this, there are *Decisiones Rotoe Romanoe*, *Constitutiones laneoe Artis in Urbe erectoe*, and many *Letters* in French and Italian concerning the affairs of France, which are published in the *Synodes des Eglises Reformees*.

### Santali Version.

Santali is the language spoken by the Santhals of Northwestern Bengal. In this language the Gospel according to St. Matthew was for the first time printed in 1868, which was followed in 1873 by the Psalms, printed under the superintendence of the Calcutta Auxiliary Bible Society. In 1876 the *Report* of the British and Foreign Bible Society stated that the translation of St. Matthew had been revised, while the other Gospels and Acts were in the course of revision. In 1877 the *Report* stated that the Gospel of St. Mark had been printed, while St. Luke was in the press, and St. John and the Acts were ready for the press. All these portions were translated from the original by the missionaries of the Church Missionary Society. (B.P.)

### Santarelli, Antonio,

An Italian Jesuit, was born in 1569, at Atri, kingdom of Naples. At the age of sixteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and later taught belles lettres and theology at Rome. He died there Dec. 5, 1649. He was the author of a work which at the time attracted much attention — *De Hoeresi, Schismate, Apostasia, et Sollicitatione in Sacramento Poenitentioe, et de Potestate Summi Pontificis in his Delictis Puniendis*. In 1626 it was censured by the Sorbonne, and the Parliament of Paris condemned it to the flames. Santarelli held that the power of the pope extended even above that of the sovereign, and the doctrine was even opposed by the Jesuits themselves when they saw their confrere denounced by the faculties of all the principal universities. Santarelli wrote some smaller works in Italian.

### Santer, John,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of Tettngang, kingdom of Würtemberg, Germany, May 18, 1812. He came to this country about 1835. Having been converted, he was licensed to preach, and in 1844 was sent to Rahway, N.J., and after three months to Newark, N.J., where he labored with success for three years. In 1845 he was received into the New Jersey Conference, and until 1868 was in active service, filling appointments successfully in the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. From 1868 to 1874 he sustained a supernumerary and superannuated relation. On March 17 he received injuries on the railroad that proved fatal, death taking place March 24, 1874. Mr. Santer was a good man, a diligent worker, a faithful pastor, and a safe adviser. See *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1875, p. 44.

## Santi (Or Sanzio), Giovanni,

An Italian poet and painter, was born at Colbordolo, duchy of Urbino. He was the father of the immortal Raphael, and his first master. It is supposed that the elder Sanzio studied under Mantegna. His designs, without being extremely delicate, are carefully studied. Many of his works have disappeared, but there may be seen in the Museum of Berlin his *Virgin Holding Jesus*, and a *Madonna with St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Catherine*. He also composed a *Chronicle* in rhyme, in honor of one of the dukes of Urbino. This is still preserved in the Library of the Vatican. He died Aug. 1, 1494.

## Santo Volto

(*hol countenance*). *SEE HOLY HANDKERCHIEF*.

## Santos, Joao Dos,

A Portuguese missionary, was born at Evora, in the latter part of the 16th century. Belonging to the Order of St. Dominic, he obtained permission in 1596 to carry the Gospel to Eastern Africa. He traveled through Caffraria, the coast of Natal, Sofala, Mozambique, and penetrated some distance into the interior. After spending eleven years in spreading the Christian faith and founding new colonies, he returned to Europe, and published *Ethiopia Oriental e Varia Historia de Cousas Notaveis do Oriente*.

Notwithstanding the credulity which Santos shows, his work was for a long time an authority upon geographical points, and he was the first to describe the manners of those countries of which he wrote. In 1617 he was sent to India and attached to the mission at Goa. He died there in 1622. His *Commentarios da Regiao dos Rios de Cuama* have never been published. See Hoefler *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

## Sanuto, Mirino,

Called *Torsello*, an Italian chronicler, was born at Venice in the latter part of the 13th century. He was of an ancient family, which, under the name of Candiani, had for years occupied an important position in the republic. In early life he traveled extensively in the East, explored Cyprus, Rhodes, Armenia and other countries, and on his return wrote his *Liber Secretorum Fidelium super Terroe Sanctoe Recuperatione*, in which he described the countries he had visited, and the various wars with the infidels. The book

contained also four maps of the Mediterranean, the Holy Land, and Egypt. Having finished his task, Sanuto went through Europe preaching a new crusade. All his efforts were useless, and he abandoned the project. He died about 1330. The book and letters of Sanuto were published in 1611 by Bongars, in *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

### Sanyasi,

A Hindu ascetic of the most extreme kind, who assumes a state of silence, and gives up the use of fire, eats little, and asks but once in the day for food. "At the time," says the Code of Manu, "when the smoke of the kitchen fires has ceased, when the pestle lies motionless, when the burning charcoal is extinguished, when people have eaten, and when dishes are removed, let the Sanyasi bid for food." He feeds upon roots and fruits. In order to fit him for immortality, he endeavors to reach a state of indifference and entire freedom from passion and emotion of every kind. He must never walk without keeping his eyes upon the ground for the sake of preserving minute animals; and, for fear of destroying insects, he must not drink water until it has been strained. The only occupation suitable to his situation is meditation.

### Saon,

In Greek mythology, was the son of Jupiter and a nymph, or of Mercury and Rhene, who is credited with having gathered the inhabitants of Samothrace into towns and villages, and with having divided them into five tribes named after his sons, besides giving them laws.

### Saotes,

In Greek mythology, was *the preserver*.

**1.** A surname of *Jupiter*, applied to him in Thespieae. A monstrous dragon devastated that territory, and the oracle had directed that a youth be given the monster each year. When the lot fell on Cleostratus, his friend Menestratus caused a brazen coat of mail to be studded with barbed hooks and points, in which the victim went out to meet his fate. He lost his life, but so did the dragon, and Thespieae erected a bronze statue to its deliverer Jupiter.

**2.** A surname of *Bacchus*, under which he was worshipped at Troezene and about Lerna.

## Sapandomad,

In Persian mythology, was the genius of the earth, a female angel of the highest perfection, who, as one of the Amshaspands created by Ormuzd, is engaged in an incessant warfare with Astushad, one of the daemons of Ahriman.

## Saph

(Heb. *id.* **psi**, a threshold, or dish, as often; Sept. **Σέφ** v.r. **Σεφέ**), A Philistine giant of the race of Rapha, slain by Sibbechai the Hushathite (**<3218>** 2 Samuel 21:18). B.C. cir. 1050. In **<3304>** 1 Chronicles 20:4 he is called SIPPAL.

## Sa'phat (Σαφάτ),

Saphati'as (**Σαφατίας** v.r. **Σοφοτίας**), and Sa'pheth (**Σαφέθ** v.r. **Σαφουθί**, **Σαφουί**), Greek forms (respectively 1 Esdr. 5:9; 8:34; and 5:33) of the name SHEPHATIAH *SEE SHEPHATIAH* (q.v.) in the corresponding Heb. lists (respectively **<3304>** Ezra 2:4; 8:8; and 2:57).

## Sa'phir

(Heb. *Shaphir'*, **ryræ** fair; Sept. translates as adverb, **καλῶς**), A place in the kingdom of Judah, named only in **<3300>** Micah 1:11. By Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. "Saphir") it is described as "in the mountain district between Eleutheropolis and Ascalon." But in this description Dr. Robinson thinks that the *Onomasticon* incorrectly takes it for one of the Hazors of **<3652>** Joshua 15:25, in the south of Judah (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 370). On the way from Jerusalem to Gaza, at Kuratiyeh, Robinson saw a place called by the Arabs *es-Sawafir*, N. 32° W., which seems to be a plural form for Saphir (comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. **ryræ**). *Es-Sawafir* lies seven or eight miles to the northeast of Ascalon, and about twelve west of Beit-Jibrin, to the right of the coast road from Gaza (Van de Velde, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 159). Tobler prefers a village called *Saber*, close to Sawafir. containing a copious and apparently very ancient well (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 47). "In one important respect, however, the position of neither of these agrees with the notice of the *Onomasticon*, since it is not near the mountains, but on the open plain of the Shefelah. But as Beit-Jibrin, the ancient Eleutheropolis, stands on the western slopes of the mountains of Judah, it is difficult to understand how any place could be westward of it (i.e. between it and

Ascalon), and yet be itself in the mountain district, unless that expression may refer to places which, though situated in the plain, were for some reason considered as belonging to the towns of the mountains. *SEE KEILAH; SEE NEZIB*, etc. Schwarz, though aware of the existence of Sawafir (p. 116), suggests as a more feasible identification the village of *Safiriyeh*, a couple of miles northwest of Lydda (*Palest.* p. 136). The drawback to this is, that the places mentioned by Micah appear, as far as we can trace them to be mostly near Beit-Jibrin, and, in addition, that *Safiriyeh* is in clear contradiction to the notice of Eusebius and Jerome” (Smith). Van de Velde inclines to identify Saphir with one of the two other villages named *es-Sawafir* south by east of Esdfud, and nearer to it (*Memoir*, p. 346).

### Sapp, Resin,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mt. Vernon, O., Feb. 9, 1816. He was licensed to preach in 1837; and in 1838 he was admitted to the Michigan Conference, then embracing a part of Ohio. For more than thirty-four years Sapp served the Church, twenty-three of which were spent in the regular pastorate, and ten in the presiding eldership. His last sermon was preached at Alaska, Mich., Jan. 12, 1873, and on May 5 he died, in holy triumph, at Grand Rapids. He was a laborious and able member of the General Conferences held at Boston, Indianapolis, Buffalo, and Brooklyn. He was also a valuable contributor to the periodical literature of his church. See *Minutes of Annual Conf.* 1873, p. 96.

### Sapphi'ra

(*Σαφείρη*, a sapphire stone, or beautiful), The wife of Ananias, and his accomplice in the sin for which he died (Acts 5, 1-10). A.D. 30. Unaware of the judgment which had befallen her husband, she entered the place about three hours after, probably to look for him; and, being there interrogated by Peter, repeated and persisted in the “lie unto the Holy Ghost” which had destroyed her husband; on which the grieved apostle made known to her his doom, and pronounced her own” Behold, the feet of them who have buried thy husband are at the door and shall carry thee out.” On hearing these awful words, she fell dead at his feet. The cool obstinacy of Sapphira in answering as she did the questions which were probably designed to awaken her conscience deepens the shade of the foul crime common to her and her husband, and has suggested to many the

probability that the plot was of her devising, and that, like another Eve, she drew her husband into it. The interval of three hours that elapsed between the two deaths, Sapphira's ignorance of what had happened to her husband, and the predictive language of Peter towards her are decisive evidences as to the supernatural character of the whole transaction. The history of Sapphira's death thus supplements that of Ananias, which might otherwise have been attributed to natural causes. *SEE ANANIAS.*

## Sapphire

(*ryPæi sappir* [according to Gesenius, from its capacity for engraving; but according to Fürst, from its *brilliancy*]; Sept. and N.T. *σάπφειρος*; Vulg. *sapphirus*), a precious stone, apparently of a bright blue color; see <sup><0240></sup>Exodus 24:10, where the God of Israel is represented as being seen in vision by Moses and the elders with "a paved work of a *sappir* stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness" (comp. <sup><3013></sup>Ezekiel 1:26). The *sappir* was the second stone in the second row of the high priest's breastplate (<sup><0283></sup>Exodus 28:18); it was extremely precious (<sup><18816></sup>Job 28:16); it was one of the precious stones that ornamented the king of Tyre (<sup><2883></sup>Ezekiel 28:13). In the Apocalyptic vision it formed the second foundation wall of the New Jerusalem (<sup><6219></sup>Revelation 21:19). Notwithstanding the identity of name between our sapphire and the *σάπφειρος* and *sapphirus* of the Greeks and Romans, it is generally agreed that the *sapphire* of the ancients was not our gem of that name, viz. the azure or indigo blue crystalline variety of corundum, but our *lapis lazuli* (ultramarine); for Pliny (*N.H.* 37, 9) thus speaks of the *sapphirus*: "It is refulgent with spots of gold, of an azure color sometimes, but not often purple. The best kind comes from Media; it is never transparent, and is not well suited for engraving upon when intersected with hard, crystalline particles." The account of Theophrastus is similar (*De Lapid.* 23). This description answers exactly to the character of the lapis lazuli; the "crystalline particles" of Pliny are crystals of iron pyrites, which often occur with this mineral. It is, however, not so certain that the *sappir* of the Hebrew Bible is identical with the lapis lazuli; for the scriptural requirements demand transparency, great value, and good material for the engraver's art, all of which combined characters the lapis lazuli does not possess in any great degree. Pliny calls it "inutilis sculpturae." King (*Antique Gems*, p. 44) says that intagli and camel of Roman times are frequent in the material, but rarely any works of much merit. Again, the



*sappir* was certainly pellucid: “sane apud Judaeos,” says Braun (*De Vest. Sac.* p. 680, ed. 1680), “saphiros pellucidus notas fuisse manifestissimum est, adeo etiam ut *pellucidum* illorum philosophis dicatur *ryps*, *saphir*.” Beckmann (*Hist. of Invent.* 1, 472) is of opinion that the *sappir* of the Hebrews is the same as the lapis lazuli; Rosenmüller and Braun argue in favor of its being our sapphire or precious corundum.

The Oriental sapphire is a pellucid gem, little inferior in hardness to the diamond. The best are found in Pegu, and in the sand of the rivers of Ceylon. They are very seldom found of a large size. Their color is blue, varying through all the intermediate shades down to colorless. The deep blue are called male sapphires; the lighter, water sapphires, or female sapphires. The sapphire has been sometimes found red, and has then been mistaken for ruby. There is a gem called sapphirorubinus, which is a sapphire part blue, part ruby colored: it is called by the Indians *niloecundi*. Precious stones were considered by the ancients to be emblematical of some faculty or virtue. Pope Innocent III sent to king John a present of four rings: the sapphire, denoting hope; the emerald, faith; the garnet, charity; the topaz, good works. The sapphire is the stone which, in the high priest’s breastplate, bore the name of Issachar. According to the Cabalists, the sapphire was fatal to serpents. The rabbins also have an absurd story about the engraving of the gem on the high priest’s breastplate by means of a singular worm (see the Talmudical treatises *Sopha* and *Gittin*). The ancients as well as moderns had many other superstitions and speculations concerning this stone. (See Jungendres, *De Sapphiro* [Alt. 1705].) **SEE GEM.**

### Sappir Codex.

**SEE SHAPIRA MANUSCRIPT.**

### Sa’ra

(Σάρρα), a Graecized form of the Heb. name Sarah (q.v.), applied to two women in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. The wife of Abraham (<sup><S111></sup>Hebrews 11:11; <sup><G116></sup>1 Peter 3:6).
2. The daughter of Raguel and Edna, betrothed to her cousin Tobias, a native of Ecbatana in Media, in the apocryphal history of Tobit. As the story goes, she had been married to seven husbands, who were all slain on

the wedding night by Asmodaeus, the evil spirit, who loved her (Tob. 3, 7). This spirit the rabbins call Ashmedai, and say he was the incestuous offspring of Tubal-Cain by his sister Naama, who became the mother of many devils; and that he was enamored of the beauty of Sara as the angels were of the daughters of men (<sup><GREE></sup>Genesis 5). *SEE ASMODAEUS*. The breaking of the spell and the chasing away of the evil spirit by the “fishy fume,” when Sara was married to Tobias, with whom she afterwards lived in peace, are told in ch. 8. *SEE TOBIT*.

### Sarab.

*SEE BRIER*.

### Sarabaites,

A vagrant class of monks among the Egyptians in the 4th century, designated *Remboth*. They lived together in very small communities, chiefly in cities where everything they did might attract attention. They turned religion into an art, and made a gain by the exhibition of pretended miracles. Their dress was most disgusting and their conduct immoral (Jerome, Ep. 22 *ad Eustoch*).

### Sarabi'as

(*Σαραβίας*), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:48) of the name *SHEREBIAH* *SEE SHEREBIAH* (q.v.) in the Heb. text (<sup><GREE></sup>Nehemiah 8:7).

### Saracens,

Originally the name of an Arab tribe, then applied to the Bedouin, and later to all the Moorish or Mohammedan people who invaded Europe, and against whom the Crusaders fought. The true derivation of the word was long a puzzle to philologists: Du Cange deduced it from Sarah, the wife of Abraham; Hottinger (*Biblioth. Orient.*) from the Arab *saraca*, to steal; Forster (*Journey*) from *sahra*, a desert; others from the Hebrew *sarak*, poor. The opinion most generally prevalent is that the word was originally *Sharkeyn* (Arab. *Eastern people*), corrupted by the Greeks into *Σαρακηνοί*, from which the Romans derived their word *Saraceni*. *SEE CRUSADES*; *SEE MOORS*; *SEE SPAIN*.

## Sa'rah,

The name of two women in the Old Test., whose Hebrew names, however, are different.

### I. The wife of Abraham and mother of Isaac.

**1. Her Name.** — The Hebrew form of *Sarah* is **hrc**; *Sarah*, which is the regular feminine of **rci** *sar*, a *prince*, often so used and rendered (Sept., Josephus, and New Test. **Σάρρα**, “Sara” in the A.V. of the N.T.). Her original name, however, was **SARAI** *SEE SARAI* (q.v.), which is usually regarded as of kindred etymology. The change of her name from “Sarai” to “Sarah” was made at the same time that Abram’s name was changed to Abraham, on the establishment of the covenant of circumcision between him and God. That the name “Sarah” signifies “princess” is universally acknowledged. But the meaning of “Sarai” is still a subject of controversy. The older interpreters (as, for example, Jerome, in *Quoest. Hebr.*, and those who follow him) suppose it to mean “my princess;” and explain the change from Sarai to Sarah as signifying that she was no longer the queen of one family, but the royal ancestress of “all families of the earth.” They also suppose that the addition of the letter **h**, as taken from the sacred tetragrammaton Jehovah, to the names of Abram and Sarai, mystically signified their being received into covenant with the Lord. Among modern Hebraists there is great diversity of interpretation. One opinion, keeping to the same general derivation as that referred to above, explains “Sarai” as “noble,” “nobility,” etc., an explanation which, even more than the other, labors under the objection of giving little force to the change. Another opinion supposes Sarai to be a contracted form of **hryc** (*Seraydh*), and to signify “Jehovah is ruler.” *SEE SERAIAH*. But this gives no force whatever to the change, and, besides, introduces the element *Jah* into a proper name too early in the history. A third (following Ewald, *Heb. Gram.* § 324) derives it from **hrc**; a root which is found in <sup>0122</sup>Genesis 32:28; <sup>0812</sup>Hosea 12:4, in the sense of “to fight,” and explains it as “contentious” (*streitsüchtig*). This last seems to be, etymologically, the most probable, and differs from the others in giving great force and dignity to the change of name (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1338 b; Pfeiffer, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1871, 1, 145 sq.). *SEE PROPER NAME*.

**2. Her Parentage.** — She is first introduced in <sup><0112></sup>Genesis 11:29 as follows: “Abram and Nahor took them wives: the name of Abram’s wife was Sarai; and the name of Nahor’s wife was Milcah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milcah, and the father of Iscah.” In <sup><0112></sup>Genesis 20:12 Abraham speaks of her as his sister, the daughter of the same father, but not the daughter of the same mother. The common Jewish tradition, taken for granted by Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 6, 6) and by Jerome (*Quoest. Hebr. ad Genesin*, 3, 323 [ed. Ben. 1735]) is that Sarai is the same as Iscah, the daughter of Haran and the sister of Lot, who is called Abraham’s “brother” in <sup><0144></sup>Genesis 14:14, 16. Judging from the fact that Rebekah, the granddaughter of Nahor, was the wife of Isaac, the son of Abraham, there is reason to conjecture that Abraham was the youngest brother, so that his wife might not improbably be younger than the wife of Nahor. It is certainly strange, if the tradition be true, that no direct mention of it is found in <sup><0112></sup>Genesis 11:29. But it is not improbable in itself; it supplies the account of the descent of the mother of the chosen race, the omission of which in such a passage is most unlikely; and there is no other to set against it, except the assertion of Abraham himself that Sarai was his half-sister, “the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother” (<sup><0112></sup>Genesis 20:12); but this is held by many to mean no more than that Haran her father was his half-brother; for the colloquial usage of the Hebrews in this matter makes it easy to understand that he might call a niece a sister, and a granddaughter a daughter. In general discourse “daughter” comprised any and every female descendant, and “sister” any and every consanguineous relationship. (See Stempel, *De Abrahamo Matrimonium Dissimulante* [Vitemb. 1714].) In that case Abraham was really her uncle as well as husband. **SEE BROTHER.**

**3. Her History.** — This is substantially, of course, that of Abraham. She came with him from Ur to Haran, from Haran to Canaan, and accompanied him in all the wanderings of his life. Her only independent action is the demand that Hagar and Ishmael should be cast out, far from all rivalry with her and Isaac; a demand symbolically applied in <sup><0402></sup>Galatians 4:22-31 to the displacement of the Old Covenant by the New. The times in which she plays the most important part in the history are the times when Abraham was sojourning, first in Egypt, then in Gerar, in both which cases Sarah shared his deceit towards Pharaoh and towards Abimelech. On the first occasion, about the middle of her life, her personal beauty is dwelt upon as its cause (<sup><0121></sup>Genesis 12:11-15); on the second, just before the birth of

Isaac, at a time when she was old (thirty-seven years before her death), but when her vigor had been miraculously restored, the same cause is alluded to as supposed by Abraham, but not actually stated (<sup>(0109)</sup>Genesis 20:9-11). In the former case the commendations which the princes of Pharaoh bestowed upon the charms of the lovely stranger have been supposed by some to have been owing to the contrast which her fresh, Mesopotamian complexion offered to the dusky hue of their own beauties. But, so far as climate is concerned, the nearer Syria could offer complexions as fair as hers; and, moreover, a people trained by their habits to admire “dusky” beauties were not likely to be inordinately attracted by a fresh complexion. In both cases, especially the last, the truthfulness of the history is seen in the unfavorable contrast in which the conduct both of Abraham and Sarah stands to that of Pharaoh and Abimelech. She died at Hebron at the age of one hundred and twenty-seven years, twenty-eight years before her husband, and was buried by him in the cave of Machpelah, B.C. 2077. Her burial place, purchased of Ephron the Hittite, was the only possession of Abraham in the Land of Promise. It has remained, hallowed in the eyes of Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans alike, to the present day; and in it the “shrine of Sarah” is pointed out opposite to that of Abraham, with those of Isaac and Rebekah on the one side, and those of Jacob and Leah on the other (see Stanley’s *Lect. on Jewish Church*, app. 2, p. 484-509). **SEE ABRAHAM.**

**4. Her Character.** — This is no ideal type of excellence, like that of Abraham, but one thoroughly natural and truly feminine, both in its excellences and its defects. Her natural motherly affection is seen in her touching desire for children, even from her bondmaid, and in her unforgiving jealousy of that bondmaid when she became a mother; in her rejoicing over her son Isaac, and in the spirit which resented the slightest insult to him and forbade Ishmael to share his sonship. It makes her cruel to others as well as tender to her own, and is remarkably contrasted with the sacrifice of natural feeling on the part of Abraham to God’s command in the last case (<sup>(0212)</sup>Genesis 21:12). To the same character belong her ironical laughter at the promise of a child, long desired, but now beyond all hope; her trembling denial of that laughter, and her change of it to the laughter of thankful joy, which she commemorated in the name of Isaac. It is a character deeply and truly affectionate, but impulsive, jealous, and imperious in its affection.

Sarah, however, is so rarely introduced directly to our notice that it is difficult to estimate her character justly for want of adequate materials. She is seen only when her presence is indispensable; and then she appears with more of submission and of simplicity than of dignity, and manifests an unwise but not unusual promptitude in following her first thoughts, and in proceeding upon the impulse of her first emotions. Upon the whole, Sarah scarcely meets the idea the imagination would like to form of the life companion of so eminent a person as Abraham. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to observe that she was a most attached and devoted wife. Her husband was the central object of all her thoughts; and he was not forgotten even in her first transports of joy at becoming a mother (<sup><0207></sup>Genesis 21:7). This is her highest eulogium.

It is asked whether Sarah was aware of the intended sacrifice of Isaac, the son of her long-deferred hopes. The chronology is uncertain and does not decide whether this transaction occurred before or after her death. She was probably alive; and if so, we may understand from the precautions employed by Abraham that she was not acquainted with the purpose of the journey to the land of Moriah, and, indeed, that it was the object of these precautions to keep from her knowledge a matter which must so deeply wound her heart. He could have the less difficulty in this if his faith was such as to enable him to believe that he should bring back in safety the son he was commanded to sacrifice (<sup><5119></sup>Hebrews 11:19). As, however, the account of her death immediately follows that of this sacrifice, some of the Jewish writers imagine that the intelligence killed her, and that Abraham found her dead on his return (*Targ Jonath.*, and Jarchi on <sup><0232></sup>Genesis 23:2; *Pirke Eliezer*, c. 52). But there seems to be no authority for such an inference.

Isaiah is the only prophet who names Sarah (<sup><2502></sup>Isaiah 51:2) Paul alludes to her hope of becoming a mother (<sup><5049></sup>Romans 4:19); and afterwards cites the promise which she received (<sup><5009></sup>Romans 9:9); and Peter eulogizes her submission to her husband (<sup><0106></sup>1 Peter 3:6).

**II.** (Heb. *Se' rach*, **הַרְצָה** Sept. **Σάρρα**, “Sarah,” <sup><0236></sup>Numbers 26:46; being there “in pause” *Sarach*, **הַרְצָה**) the daughter of the patriarch Asher, elsewhere (<sup><0437></sup>Genesis 46:17; <sup><1070></sup>1 Chronicles 7:30) more properly Anglicized SERAE *SEE SERAE* (q.v.).

## Sa'rai

(Heb. *Saray'*, **סָרַי**; Sept. **Σάρα**; Vulg. *Sarai*), the original name of Sarah, the wife of Abraham. It is always used in the history from <sup><1119></sup>Genesis 11:29 to 17:15, when it was changed to Sarah at the same time that her husband's name from Abram became Abraham, and the birth of Isaac was more distinctly foretold. The meaning of the name appears to be, as Ewald has suggested, "contentious." **SEE SARAH.**

## Sarai'as

(**Σαράϊας** v.r. [in No. 2] **Ἀζαράϊας**), the Greek form of SERAIAH **SEE SERAIAH** (q.v.), namely:

- (a) the high priest (1 Esdr. 5:5);
- (b) the father of Ezra (1 Esdr. 8:1; 2 Esdr. 1:1).

## Sar'amel

(**Σαραμέλ** v.r. **Ἀσαραμέλ**), the place where the assembly of the Jews was held at which the high priesthood was conferred upon Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 14:28). The fact that the name is found only in this passage has led to the conjecture that it is an imperfect version of a word in the original Hebrew or Syriac from which the present Greek text of the Maccabees is a translation. Some (as Castellio) have treated it as a corruption of *Jerusalem*; but this is inadmissible, since it is inconceivable that so well known a name should be corrupted. Other conjectures are enumerated by Grimm in the *Kurzgef. exegetisches Handb.* on the passage. A few only need be named here, but none seem perfectly satisfactory. All appear to adopt the reading *Asaramel*.

(1.) *Ha-hatsar Millo*, "the court of Millo," Millo being not improbably the citadel of Jerusalem. **SEE MILLO.** This is the conjecture of Grotius, and has at least the merit of ingenuity.

(2.) *Ha-hatsar Am-El*, "the court of the people of God, that is, the great court of the Temple." This is due to Ewald (*Gesch.* 4, 387), who compares with it the well-known *Sarbeth Sabanai-El*, given by Eusebius as the title of the Maccabean history. **SEE MACCABEE.**

(3.) *Has-shaar Am-El*, "the gate of the people of God," adopted by Winer (*Realwb.*).

(4.) *Has-shaar Am-El*, “prince of the people of God,” as if not the name of a place, but the title of Simon, the “in” having been inserted by puzzled copyists. This is adopted by Grimm himself. It has in its favor the fact that without it Simon is here styled high priest only, and his second title, “captain and governor of the Jews and priests” (ver. 47), is then omitted in the solemn official record the very place where it ought to be found. It also seems to be countenanced by the Peshito-Syriac version, which certainly omits the title of “high priest,” but inserts *Rabba de-Israel*, “leader of Israel.” None of these explanations, however, can be regarded as entirely satisfactory.

### Saran,

In Hindu mythology, is a superlative bow belonging to Vishnu, whose arrows never fail to reach their mark and return of themselves to Vishnu.

### Sarantari

in the Greek Church, are masses for the dead during forty days.

### Saraph.

*SEE SERAPHIM; SEE SERPENT.*

### Sa'raph

(Heb. *Saraph'*. *ārc*; *burning*; Sept. *Σαράφ* v.r. *Σαΐα*), named as one of the sons or descendants of Shelah the son of Judah (<sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 4:22), and he seems to have lived about the time of the Eisode, as he is said to have had the dominion in Moab. B.C. cir. 1618. “Burrington (*Geneal.* 1, 179) makes Saraph a descendant of Jokim, whom he regards as the third son of Shelah. In the Targum of R. Joseph, Joash and Saraph are identified with Mahlon and Chilion, who married (¶ [B]) in Moab.”

### Sarasa, Alphonse Antoine De,

A Flemish Jesuit of the last century, was born at Nieuwpoort of Spanish parents. At the age of fifteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught in the College of Gaud. Later he gave himself to the study of mathematics, which he had studied under the famous Gregory de St. Vincent, and passed the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Anvers, July 5, 1667. He wrote *Ars Semper Gaudendi*, etc., which has



been translated into French under the title *L'Art de se Tranquilliser dans les Evenements de la Vie*. This work was held in high regard by Leibnitz, Wolf, and others of their school.

### Saraswati (Or Sarasvati)

Is, in Hindu mythology, the name of the wife, or the female energy, of the god Brahman, the first of the Hindu Trimurti, or triad. She is also the goddess of speech and eloquence, the patroness of music and the arts, and the inventress of the Sanscrit language and the Devanagari letters. She was induced to bestow these benefits on the human race by the sage Bharata, who, through his penance, caused her to descend from heaven, and to divulge her inventions. Hence she is called *Bharati*. She is also very white, hence another of her names, *Mahasweta*, or *Mahasukla* (from *mahat*, great, and *sweta*, white). *Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.*

### Sarasvati

Is also the name of a stream which flows into the Ganges at Hoogly. According to the myth, the goddess, being pursued, hid herself under the earth, and in the character of a stream forced her way until she reached the Ganges, her lover, with whom she was united. Another tradition makes Sarasvati the daughter of Brahma, whose beauty captivated the god himself. As she concealed herself behind him, he assumed five heads in order to look for her; but Siva, becoming angry, cut off one of them. She is usually represented as seated by the side of Brahma.

### Saravia, Hadrian A.,

Classed among the English divines, although of Spanish extraction, was born at Hisdin, in Artois, France, in 1531. In 1582 he became professor of divinity and preacher to the French Church at Leyden. Influenced, doubtless, by his preference for episcopal government, he went to England in 1587, where he was well received by the prelates and divines. He first settled in Jersey, where he taught school and preached to his exiled countrymen there; afterwards he was master of the free grammar school at Southampton. He was successively promoted to a prebend in the churches of Gloucester (1591), Canterbury (1595), and Westminster (1601). He showed great learning in defending the episcopacy against Beza, when the latter recommended its abolition in Scotland. He died in 1613, and was interred in Canterbury Cathedral. A collective edition of all his works,

which were in Latin, was published in 1611 (Lond. 1 vol. 4to), under the title of *Diversi Tractatus Theologice: De Diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii*. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 168, 186.

### Sarcerius, Erasmus,

An able practical theologian of the 16th century, was born at Annaberg, in Saxony, in 1501. He studied first at Leipsic, then at the feet of Luther and Melancthon in Wittenberg. In 1530 he left the university and became co-rector of a Latin school at Lubeck. Laboring here with some interruption until 1536, he then took charge of a similar school in Nassau. From 1538 he gave his attention exclusively to the work of reforming the Church of Nassau, presiding at synods, instructing the clergy, and furnishing them with written works on practice and doctrine. But, unwilling to sanction the Interim (1548), he resigned his position, retired to Annaberg, and in 1549 became a pastor in Leipsic. In 1553 he was called to be Church superintendent in Eisleben. In 1559 he accepted a call as preacher at St. John's in Magdeburg; but the high Lutheran clergy scented heresy in his mild and genial sermons, and assailed him in pamphlets. Worn out with labor, he speedily succumbed. He died in 1559 at the age of fifty-eight. In character, Sarcerius was firm, conscientious, blameless. A stranger to flattery, he walked among princes as an equal, and never quailed before a foe. His works were highly esteemed and much studied. We mention only, *Anweisung die heilige Schrift zu interpretiren* (Basle, 1528): — *Tractatus de Ratione Discendoe Theologice* (1539): — *Conciones Annuae* (1541, 4 vols.): — *De Consensu Veroe Ecclesioe et S. Patrum*: — also *Loci Communes Theologice* (1542?): — *Pastorale* (1559). (J.P.L.)

### Sarcerius, Wilhelm,

The only son of the preceding, was pastor at Eisleben, but lost his position because of holding the opinions of Flacius (q.v.). He went, thereupon, to Mansfeld, where he died as court preacher. He published, *Leichen-, Lauf-, und WasserPredigten*: — *Geistliches Herbarium*: — *Fechtschule Jesu Christi*: — *Höllischer Trauergesang*. See Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 20, 682-686.

## Sarched'onus

(*Σαρχέδονος*, v.r. *Σαχερδονός*, *Σαχερδάν*), a Graecized form (Tob. 1, 21) for the name of the Assyrian king ESAR-HADDON *SEE ESAR-HADDON* (q.v.).

## Sardee'us

(*Σαρδαίος*, v.r. *Ζαρδαίος*, *Ζεραλίας*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:28) of the name AZIZA *SEE AZIZA* (q.v.) of the Heb. list (<sup>4507</sup>Ezra 10:27).

## Sardessus,

In Greek mythology, is an appellative of *Jupiter*, derived from the city of Sardessus, in Lycia.

## Sardica,

In Illyria. A council was held at this place in 347, by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans, whom Athanasius, persecuted by the Eusebians, had petitioned to convoke a council. Twenty canons were drawn up, and regulations made concerning Easter.

## Sardine

(*σάρδινος*, apparently an adjective from *σάρδιον*, which has the same signification), the name of a gem (<sup>608B</sup>Revelation 4:3). *SEE SARDIUS*.

## Sar'dis

(*Σάρδεις*, of uncertain etymology), a city of Asia Minor, the capital of the ancient kingdom of Lydia. It was situated about two miles to the south of the river Hermus, just below the range of Tmolus (Bos Dag), on a spur of which its acropolis was built, in a fine plain watered by the river Pactolus (Herod. 7, 31; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* 7, 2-11; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*; Strabo, 13, 625). It is in lat. 38° 30' N., long. 27° 57' E. Sardis was a great and ancient city, and, from its wealth and importance, was the object of much cupidity and of many sieges.

**1. Ancient History.** — The Lydians, or Ludim, whose metropolis Sardis was, were the descendants of Lud the son of Shem, and must not be confounded with the Ludim, the children of Lud the son of Misraim the son

of Ham, who dwelt and settled in Egypt. These latter were the nation alluded to by Jeremiah (~~2419~~ Jeremiah 46:9) when he speaks of “the Lydians that handle the bow:” the distinction will appear the more clearly from the fact that the Lydians and the Libyans are mentioned together as embracing the same cause. The Shemitic Ludim were a warlike, active, and energetic people, and established an empire extending as far east as the river Halys. The city of Sardis, although of more recent origin than the Trojan war (Strabo, 13, 625), was very ancient, being mentioned by Aeschylus (*Pers.* 45); and Herodotus relates (1, 84) that it was fortified by a king Meles, who (according to the *Chronicles* of Eusebius) preceded Candaules. The city itself was, at least at first, built in a rude manner, and the houses were covered with dry reeds, in consequence of which it was repeatedly destroyed by fire; but the acropolis, which some of the ancient geographers identified with the Homeric *Hyde* (Strabo, 13, 626; comp. Pliny, 5, 30; Eustath. *ad Dion. Per.* 830), was built upon an almost inaccessible rock. In the reign of Ardys, Sardis was taken by the Cimmerians, but they were unable to gain possession of the citadel. Over this realm a series of able princes ruled, the last of whom, Croesus, obtained a world wide fame for his wealth, his misfortunes, and his philosophy. The earlier part of his reign was one of unusual glory; he extended his dominion over the whole of Asia Minor with the exception of Lycia and Cilicia, and displayed as much ability as an administrator as he had done as a conqueror. But the rising power of Cyrus soon came into collision with his own, and, by the capture of Sardis, the Persian prince brought the Lydian rule to a close. Croesus is said to have advised the victor to discourage the martial spirit of the Lydians by restraining them from all warlike occupations, and employing them in those arts only which minister to luxury and sensuality. Cyrus is reported to have taken the disgraceful advice, and the result was that, from ranking among the bravest and hardiest nations of antiquity, the Lydians became the most helpless and effeminate.

After its conquest, the Persians always kept a garrison in the citadel, on account of its natural strength, which induced Alexander the Great, when it was surrendered to him in the sequel of the battle of the Granicus, similarly to occupy it. Sardis recovered the privilege of municipal government (and, as was alleged several centuries afterwards, the right of a sanctuary) upon its surrender to Alexander the Great, but its fortunes for the next three hundred years are very obscure. It changed hands more than once in the contests between the dynasties which arose after the death of Alexander. In

the year B.C. 214 it was taken and sacked by the army of Antiochus the Great, who besieged his cousin Achaëus in it for two years before succeeding, as he at last did through treachery, in obtaining possession of the person of the latter. After the ruin of Antiochus's fortunes, it passed, with the rest of Asia on that side of Taurus, under the dominion of the kings of Pergamus, whose interests led them to divert the course of traffic between Asia and Europe away from Sardis. Its productive soil must always have continued a source of wealth; but its importance as a central mart appears to have diminished from the time of the invasion of Asia by Alexander. After their victory over Antiochus it passed to the Romans, under whom it still more rapidly declined in rank and prosperity.

In the time of the emperor Tiberius, Sardis was desolated by an earthquake (Strabo, 12, p. 579), together with eleven, or, as Eusebius says, twelve other important cities of Asia. The whole face of the country is said to have been changed by this convulsion. In the case of Sardis the calamity was increased by a pestilential fever which followed; and so much compassion was in consequence excited for the city at Rome that its tribute was remitted for five years, and it received a benefaction from the privy purse of the emperor (Tacitus, *Ann* 2, 47). This was in the year A.D. 17. Nine years afterwards the Sardians are found among the competitors for the honor of erecting, as representatives of the Asiatic cities, a temple to their benefactor. *SEE SMYRNA*. On this occasion they plead, not only their ancient services to Rome in the time of the Macedonian war, but their well-watered country, their climate, and the richness of the neighboring soil; there is no allusion, however, to the important manufactures and the commerce of the early times. In the time of Pliny it was included in the same *conventus jursidicus* with Philadelphia, with the Cadueni, a Macedonian colony in the neighborhood, with some settlements of the old Maeonian population, and a few other towns of less note. These Maeonians still continued to call Sardis by its ancient name, *Hyde*, which it bore in the time of Omphale.

## Picture for Sardis 1

**2. Biblical Notice.** — The inhabitants of Sardis bore an ill repute among the ancients for their voluptuous habits of life. Hence, perhaps, the point of the phrase in the Apocalyptic message to the city, “Thou hast a few names, *even in Sardis*, which have not defiled their garments” (~~Rev~~ Revelation 3:4). The place that Sardis holds in this message, as one of the “Seven Churches

of Asia,” is the source of the peculiar interest with which the Christian reader regards it. From what is said, it appears that it had already declined much in real religion, although it still maintained the name and external aspect of a Christian Church, “having a name to live, while it was dead” (~~Rev.~~ Revelation 3:1).

## Picture for Sardis 2

**3. Description and Modern Remains.** — Sardis was in very early times, both from the extremely fertile character of the neighboring region and from its convenient position, a commercial mart of importance. Chestnuts were first produced in the neighborhood, which procured them the name of **βάλανοι Σαρδιανοί**. The art of dyeing wool is said by Pliny to have been invented there; and, at any rate, Sardis was the entrepot of the dyed woollen manufactures, of which Phrygia, with its vast flocks (**πολυπροβατωτάη**, Herod. 5, 49), furnished the raw material. Hence we hear of the **φοινικίδες Σαρδιαναί**; and Sappho speaks of the **ποικίλος μάσθλης Λύδιον καλὸν ἔργον**, which was perhaps something like the modern Turkish carpets. Some of the woollen manufactures, of a peculiarly fine texture, were called **ψιλοτάπιδες**. The hall through which the king of Persia passed from his state apartments to the gate where he mounted on his horse was laid with these, and no foot but that of the monarch was allowed to tread on them. In the description given of the habits of a young Cyprian exquisite of great wealth, he is represented as reposing upon a bed of which the feet were silver, and upon which these **ψιλοτάπιδες Σαρδιαναί** were laid as a mattress. Sardis, too, was the place where the metal *electrum* was procured (Sophocles, *Antig.* 1037); and it was thither that the Spartans sent in the 6th century B.C. to purchase gold for the purpose of gilding the face of the Apollo at Amyclae. This was probably furnished by the auriferous sand of the Pactolus, a brook which came from Tmolus and ran through the *agora* of Sardis by the side of the great temple of Cybele. But, though its gold washings may have been celebrated in early times, the greatness of Sardis in its best days was much more due to its general commercial importance and its convenience as an entrepot. This seems to follow from the statement that not only silver and gold coins were there first minted, but there also the class of **κάπηλοι** (stationary traders, as contradistinguished from the **ἔμποροι**, or traveling merchants) first arose. It was also, at any rate between the fall of the Lydian and that of the Persian dynasty, a slave mart.

Successive earthquakes and the ravages of the Saracens and Turks have reduced this once flourishing city to a heap of ruins, presenting many remains of its former splendor. The habitations of the living are confined to a few miserable cottages, still found on the true site of Sardis, at the foot of Mount Tmolus, or Buz-dag, as the Turks call it. Two or three shepherds inhabited a hut, and a Turk with two servants a mill, at the time of Arundel's visit in 1826. In 1850 no human being found a dwelling in the once mighty and populous Sardis. The modern name of the ruins at Sardis is *Sert-Kalessi*. Travelers describe the appearance of the locality on approaching it from the northwest as that of complete solitude. The Pactolus is a mere thread of water, all but evanescent in summer time. The Wadis-tchai (Hermus), in the neighborhood of the town, is between fifty and sixty yards wide and nearly three feet deep; but its waters are turbid and disagreeable, and are not only avoided as unfit for drinking, but have the local reputation of generating the fever which is the scourge of the neighboring plains. A countless number of sepulchral hillocks, beyond the Hermus, heighten the desolateness of a spot which the multitudes lying there once made busy by their living presence and pursuits. The acropolis seems well to define the site of the city. It is a marked object, being a tall distorted rock of soft sandstone, rent as if by an earthquake. The acropolis is very difficult of ascent; it has a few fragments of ruinous walls on the summit, but no remains are visible of the temple which Alexander built there in honor of the Olympian Jove. The almost perpendicular wall towards the south was considered impregnable, and Croesus therefore, in defending his capital against Cyrus, omitted to guard it; but a Persian soldier, seeing a Lydian descend by a path of steps cut in the rock in order to regain his helmet, which had fallen down, watched his proceedings, and led a body of Persian troops into the acropolis itself.

The remains of the ancient city are few and inconsiderable. The gerusia — called also the house of Croesus — lies westward of the acropolis. Arundel measured one of its halls, and found it one hundred and fifty-six feet in length by forty-three in breadth, and having walls ten feet in thickness. There are some portions of a theater and of two churches, one of which, said to be dedicated to the Virgin, was carefully examined by Col. Leake, and found to consist almost wholly of fragments of earlier edifices; and from more recent investigations it appears that these were chiefly taken from the Temple of Cybele, and if so they are among the oldest monuments now existing in the world, the temple having been built only three hundred

years after that of Solomon. Of the few inscriptions which have been discovered, all, or nearly all, belong to the time of the Roman empire. Yet there still exist considerable remains of the earlier days. The massive Temple of Cybele still bears witness in its fragmentary remains to the wealth and architectural skill of the people that raised it. Mr. Cockerell, who visited it in 1812, found two columns standing with their architrave, the stone of which stretched in a single block from the center of one to that of the other. This stone, although it was not the largest of the architrave, he calculates must have weighed twenty-five tons. The diameters of the columns supporting it are six feet four and a half inches at about thirty-five feet below the capital. The present soil (apparently formed by the crumbling away of the hill which backs the temple on its eastern side) is more than twenty-five feet above the pavement. Such proportions are not inferior to those of the columns in the Heraeum at Samos, which divides, in the estimation of Herodotus, with the Artemisium at Ephesus the palm of preeminence among all the works of Greek art. And as regards the details, "the capitals appeared," to Cockerell, "to surpass any specimen of the Ionic he had seen in perfection of design and execution." On the north side of the acropolis, overlooking the valley of the Hermus, is a theater near four hundred feet in diameter, attached to a stadium of about one thousand. This probably was erected after the restoration of Sardis by Alexander. In the attack of Sardis by Antiochus, described by Polybius (7, 15-18), it constituted one of the chief points on which, after entering the city, the assaulting force was directed. The temple belongs to the era of the Lydian dynasty, and is nearly contemporaneous with the Temple of Zeus Panhellenius in Egina, and that of here in Samos. To the same date may be assigned the "Valley of Sweets" (γλυκὺς ἀγκών), a pleasure ground, the fame of which Polycrates endeavored to rival by the so-called Laura at Samos.

**4. Authorities.** — Ancient: Athenseus, 2, 48; 6, 231; 12, 514, 540; Arrian, 1, 17; Pliny, *H.N.* 5, 29; 15, 23; Stephanus Byz. s.v. **Υδη**; Pausanias, 3, 9, 5; Diodorus Sic. 20, 107; Scholiast, Aristoph. *Pac.* 1174; Herodotus, 1, 69, 94; 3, 48; 8, 105; Strabo, 13, § 5; Tacitus, *Annal.* 2, 47; 3, 63; 4, 55. Modern: Böckh, *Inscriptiones Groecoe*, Nos. 3451-3472; Cockerell, in Leake's *Asia Minor*, p. 343; Arundel, *Discoveries in Asia Minor.* 1, 26-28; Tchibatcheff, *Asie Mineure*, p. 232-242; Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor*, p. 316 sq. See also Smith, Hartley, Macfarlane, Arundel, and Svoboda, severally, *On the Seven Churches of Asia*; Storch, *Dissert. de Sept. Urb.*



*Asioe in Apocal.*; Richter, *Wallfahrten*, p. 511 sq.; Prokesch, *Denkwürdigk.* 2, 31 sq.

## Sard'ite

(Heb. *Sardi'*, *yDæʕi* used as a plur. with the art. prefixed; Sept. *Σαρεδί*), the patronymic title (<sup><035></sup>Numbers 26:26) of the descendants of Sered (q.v.), the son of Zebulon.

## Sardius

(Heb. *µραρο'dem*; Sept. and New Test., *σάρδιον*), one of the precious stones in the breastplate of the high priest (<sup><0217></sup>Exodus 28:17; 39:10). So also Josephus (*War*, 5, 5, 7), who, however, in *Ant.* 3, 7, 6, makes it the sardonyx (*σαρδόνυξ*). Still, as this latter named mineral is merely another variety of agate, to which also the sard or sardius belongs, there is no very great discrepancy in the statements of the Jewish historian. **SEE SARDONYX.** The *odem* is mentioned by Ezekiel (28:13) as one of the ornaments of the king of Tyre. In <sup><043></sup>Revelation 4:3, John declares that he whom he saw sitting on the heavenly throne “was to look upon like a jasper and a *sardine* stone.” The sixth foundation of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem was a *sardius* (<sup><0210></sup>Revelation 21:20). There can scarcely be a doubt that either the sard or the sardonyx is the stone denoted by *odem*. The authority of Josephus in all that relates to the high priest's breastplate is of the greatest value; for, as Braun (*De Vest. Sac. Heb.* p. 635) has remarked, Josephus was not only a Jew, but a priest, who might have seen the breastplate with the whole sacerdotal vestments a hundred times, since in his time the Temple was standing. The Vulgate agrees with his nomenclature. In Jerome's time the breastplate was still to be inspected in the Temple of Concord; hence it will readily be acknowledged that this agreement of the two is of great weight. The sard, which is a superior variety of agate, has long been a favorite stone for the engraver's art. “On this stone,” says King (*Ant. Gems*, p. 5), “all the finest works of the most celebrated artists are to be found; and this not without good cause, such is its toughness, facility of working, beauty of color, and the high polish of which it is susceptible, and which Pliny states that it retains longer than any other gem.” Sardis differ in color. There is a bright red variety which, in Pliny's time, was the most esteemed; and perhaps the Hebrew *odem*, from a root which means “to be red,” points to this kind. There is also a paler or honey-colored variety; but in sards there is always a shade of yellow

mingling with the red (see King, *Ant. Gems*, p. 6). The sardius is the stone now called the *carnelian*, from its color (a *carne*), which resembles that of raw flesh. The Hebrew name is derived from a root (סדא) which signifies *redness*. The sardius or carnelian is of the flint family, and is a kind of chalcedony. The more vivid the red in this stone, the higher is the estimation in which it is held. It was anciently, as now, more frequently engraved on than any other stone. The ancients called it *sardius*, because Sardis in Lydia was the place where they first became acquainted with it; but the sardius of Babylon was considered of greater value (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 37, 7). The Hebrews probably obtained the carnelian from Arabia. In Yemen there is found a very fine dark red carnelian, which is called *el-Akik* (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 142). The Arabs wear it on the finger, on the arm above the elbow, and in the belt before the abdomen. It is supposed to stop hemorrhage when laid on a fresh wound. See Theophr. *De Lapid.* c. 43; Cleaveland, *Mineral.* p. 250; Moore, *Anc. Mineral.* p. 153.

### Sardo,

In Greek mythology, was the daughter of Sthenelus, whose name was given to the city of Sardis.

### Sar'donyx

(σαρδόνυξ, from σάρδιον, the *sardius*, and ὄνυξ, the *onyx*) is mentioned in the New Test. once only — viz. in Revelation 21:20 — as the stone which garnished the fifth foundation of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem. “By sardonyx,” says Pliny (N.H. 37, 6), who describes several varieties, “was formerly understood, as its name implies, a sard with a white ground beneath it, like the flesh under the fingernail.” The sardonyx consists of “a white opaque layer, superimposed upon a red transparent stratum of the true red sard” (King, *Ant. Gems*, p. 9). It is, like the sard, merely a variety of agate, and is frequently employed by engravers for the purposes of a signet ring. It is a species of onyx, distinguished from the common stone of that name by having its different colors, red and white, disposed in alternate bands. But there is another stone so called, whose tint is reddish yellow or orange, with sometimes a tinge of brown (Moore, *Anc. Mineral.* p. 153).

## Sardus,

In Greek mythology, was the son of Maceris, who was known as Hercules among the Libyans and Egyptians. He led a colony of Libyans to the island of Ichnusa, who settled there without driving away the original inhabitants. The Libyans subsequently sent a statue of Sardus as a votive offering to Delphos, and gave his name to the island, which thereafter was known as Sardinia.

## Sa'reä

(Vulg. *id.*, for the Greek text is not extant), one of the five scribes “ready to write swiftly” whom Esdras was commanded to take (2 Esdr. 14:24).

## Sarep'ta

(Σάρεπτα; Vulg. *Sarepta*; Syriac, *Tsarpath*), the Greek form of the name which in the Hebrew text of the Old Test. appears as ZAREPHATH *SEE ZAREPHATH* (q.v.). The place is designated by the same formula on its single occurrence in the New Test. (<sup><1005></sup>Luke 4:26) that it is when first mentioned in the Sept. version of <sup><1170></sup>1 Kings 17:9, “Sarepta of Sidonia.”

## Sareseok,

In Persian mythology, is a bullock formed by Ormuzd out of the generative powers of the primitive ox which was slain by Ahriman. Sareseok supplied the world with animals, and became one of the greatest benefactors of mankind.

## Sar'gon

### Picture for Sargon

(Heb. *Sargon'*, <sup>וַסַּרְגֹּן</sup> either *prince of the sun* [Gesenius] or *firm king* [Rawlinson]; Sept. Ἀρνᾶ v.r. Ναρνά.), a king of Assyria, whose general, Tartan, in the time of Hezekiah, besieged Ashdod, the key of Egypt, with the view of then invading that country (<sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 20:1, 4 sq.). B.C. 715.

Sargon was one of the greatest of the Assyrian kings. His name is read in the native cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) as *Sargina* (see Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 148), while a town which he built and called after himself (now Khorsabad) was known as Sarghun to the Arabian geographers. He is mentioned by name only once in Scripture (as above), and then not in a

historical book, which formerly led historians and critics to suspect that he was not really a king distinct from those mentioned in Kings and Chronicles, but rather one of those kings under another name. Vitranga, Offerhaus (*Spicileg.* p. 125 sq.), Eichhorn, and Hupfeld (*De Rebus Assyrior.* p. 51) identified him with Shalmaneser; Grotius, Lowth, and Keil (comp. also Schröer, *Imper. Babyl.* p. 152) with Sennacherib; Perizonius, Kalinsky, and Michaelis with Esar-haddon. All these conjectures are now shown to be wrong by the Assyrian inscriptions, which prove Sargon to have been distinct and different from the several monarchs named, and fix his place in the list — where it had been already assigned by Paulus, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald, and Winer — between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. He was certainly Sennacherib's father, and there is no reason to doubt that he was his immediate predecessor (see *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 398 sq.). He ascended the throne of Assyria, as we gather from his annals, in the same year that Merodach-Baladan ascended the throne of Babylon, which, according to Ptolemy's canon, was B.C. 721. This is Col. Rawlinson's date (*Lond. Athenoeum*, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 245). But the synchronism with the Hebrew annals, **SEE HEZEKIAH; SEE SAMARIA**, would locate Sargon's accession in B.C. 720. G. Smith puts it in B.C. 722 (*Hist. of Assyria*, ch. 9), and so Prof. Rawlinson (*Ancient Monarchies*, 2, 141). He seems to have been a usurper, and not of royal birth, for in his inscriptions he carefully avoids all mention of his father. It has been conjectured that he took advantage of Shalmaneser's absence at the protracted siege of Samaria (<sup>1277B</sup>2 Kings 17:5) to effect a revolution at the seat of government, by which that king was deposed and he himself substituted in his room. **SEE SHALMANESER**. It is remarkable that Sargon claims the conquest of Samaria, which the narrative in Kings *appears* to assign to his predecessor. He places the event in his first year, before any of his other expeditions. Perhaps, therefore, he is the "king of Assyria" intended in <sup>1277B</sup>2 Kings 17:6 and 18:11, who is not said to be Shalmaneser, though we might naturally suppose so from no other name being mentioned. Or perhaps he claimed the conquest as his own, though Shalmaneser really accomplished it, because the capture of the city occurred after he had been acknowledged king in the Assyrian capital. At any rate, to him belongs the settlement of the Samaritans (27,280 families, according to his own statement) in Halah and on the Habor (Khabur), the river of Gozan, and (at a later period, probably) in the cities of the Medes.

Sargon was undoubtedly a great and successful warrior. In his annals, which cover a space of fifteen years, he gives an account of his warlike expeditions against Babylonia and Susiana, on the south; Media, on the east; Armenia and Cappadocia, towards the north; Syria, Palestine, Arabia, and Egypt, towards the west and southwest (see *Records of the Past*, 7, 25 sq.). In Babylonia he deposed Merodach-Baladan and established a viceroy; in Media he built a number of cities which he peopled with captives from other quarters; in Armenia and the neighboring countries he gained many victories; while in the far west he reduced Philistia, penetrated deep into the Arabian peninsula, and forced Egypt to submit to his arms and consent to the payment of a tribute. In this last direction he seems to have waged three wars — one in his second year, for the possession of Gaza; another in his sixth year, when Egypt itself was the object of attack; and a third in his ninth, when the special subject of contention was Ashdod, which Sargon took by one of his generals. This is the event which causes the mention of Sargon's name in Scripture. Isaiah was instructed at the time of this expedition to "put off his shoe, and go naked and barefoot," for a sign that "the king of Assyria should lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, to the shame of Egypt" (<sup>2310</sup>Isaiah 20:2-4). We may gather from this either that Ethiopians and Egyptians formed part of the garrison of Ashdod, and were captured with the city, or that the attack on the Philistine town was accompanied by an invasion of Egypt itself, which was disastrous to the Egyptians. The year of the attack, it is thought, would fall into the reign of the first Ethiopian king, Sabaco I (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 386, note 7, 2d ed.), and it is in agreement with this Sargon speaks of Egypt as being at this time subject to Meron. Besides these expeditions of Sargon, his monuments mention that he took Tyre, and received tribute from the Greeks of Cyprus, against whom there is some reason to think that he conducted an attack in person. The statue of Sargon, now in the Berlin Museum, was found at Idalium in Cyprus. It is not very likely that the king's statue would have been set up unless he had made the expedition in person.

It is not as a warrior only that Sargon deserves special mention among the Assyrian kings. He was also the builder of useful works and of one of the most magnificent of the Assyrian palaces. He relates that he thoroughly repaired the walls of Nineveh, which he seems to have elevated from a provincial city of some importance to the first position in the empire; and

adds, further, that in its neighborhood he constructed the palace and town which he made his principal residence. This was the city now known as “the French Nineveh,” or “Khorsabad,” from which the valuable series of Assyrian monuments at present in the Louvre was derived almost entirely. Traces of Sargon’s buildings have been found also at Nimrud and Koyunjik; and his time is marked by a considerable advance in the useful and ornamental arts, which seem to have profited by the connection that he established between Assyria and Egypt. He left the throne to his son, the celebrated Sennacherib (q.v.). The length of Sargon’s reign is variously reckoned by Assyriologists as from fifteen to nineteen years. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. Comp., in addition to the above, the following monographs by Oppert: *Les Fautes de Sargon* (Paris, 1863); *Les Inscriptions des Sargonides* (ibid. eod.); also Strachey, *Time of Sargon and Sennacherib* (Lond. 1856). *SEE ASSYRIA*.

### Sa’rid

(Heb. *Surid’* *dyræ* survivor, as often [Fürst, *place of refuge*]; Sept. *Σαρίδ* v.r. *Σαρδίδ*, *Σεδδούχ*, etc.), the point of departure on the southern boundary of Zebulon, lying west of Chisloth Tabor, and south of Daberath and Japhia (<sup>16910</sup>Joshua 19:10, 12). It was unknown to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast. s.v.* “Sarith”), and the name has not been discovered by modern research. Knobel, holding the word to mean an “incision,” thinks it designates merely the southern opening of the deep and narrow wady which comes down from the basin of Nazareth (q.v.), between two steep mountains (Seetzen, 2, 151 sq.; Robinson, 3, 183). Keil more definitely suggests that it may be found in one of the two heaps of ruins on the south side of the modern “Mount of Precipitation,” namely those near el-Mezrach, on the northwest. *SEE TRIBE*; *SEE ZEBULON*.

### Sarigani.

An Arabian sect of this name is mentioned by Asseman. He considers them to have been a branch of the Mendaeans (q.v.). They held the opinions of Paul of Samosata and of Arius, but were converted and admitted to Catholic communion by Maranames, metropolitan of Adjabenus, in the year 760. Some, however, were found a hundred years later in Babylon.

## Sarmentitii,

One of the numerous opprobrious epithets with which the enemies of the early Christians accosted them. It is derived from the word *sarmenta*, *sarmina*, the piles of fagots around the stake to which the martyr was fastened.

## Sa'ron

(ὁ Σαρὼν v.r. ἄσσαρῶνα, i.e. ἠσωνίη *the Sharon*), the district in which Lydda stood (<sup><4025></sup>Acts 9:35); the Greek form of the name SHARON *SEE SHARON* (q.v.) of the Old Test. “The absence of the article from Lydda, and its presence before Saron, is noticeable, and shows that the name denotes a district — as in ‘The Shefelah,’ and in our own ‘The Weald,’ ‘The Downs.’”

## Saron,

In Greek mythology, was a king of Troezene, who was fond of the chase, and, built a temple to Diana. While pursuing a deer he fell into the gulf which was from that time known as the Saronian Gulf. He was buried in the grove of Diana.

## Saronis

(Σαρωνίς), a surname of *Artemis* at Troezene, where an annual festival was celebrated in her honor under the name of Saronia. *SEE SARON*.

## Saro'thie

(Σαρωθιέ v.r. Σαρωθί; Vulg. *Caroneth*), a person named (1 Esdr. 5, 84) as one of the heads of the families of “Solomon’s servants” who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel; but see the Hebrew lists (<sup><4125></sup>Ezra 2:57; <sup><4173></sup>Nehemiah 7:59).

## Sarpedon,

In Greek mythology, was

(1.) a son of Jupiter and Europa, who quarrelled with his brother. Minos and was compelled to leave Crete. He took possession of Lycia, and was permitted by Jupiter to live the period of time allotted to three generations of men.

(2.) A son of Jupiter and Laodamia, the daughter of Bellerophon. His uncles were engaged in a protracted dispute for the possession of the crown of Lycia, which was decided by the agreement that the realm should be awarded to him who should shoot a ring from the breast of a child without injuring the child. Laodamia presented her son for this trial, and the generosity of the mother led to his being appointed king. When the Trojan war broke out, both parties sought his aid. He decided in favor of Priam, and inflicted great injury on the Greeks when they landed and afterwards. He slew Tlepolemus (being at the same time severely wounded himself), led the fifth part of the army in the storming of the fortifications, mounted the wall, slew Alcmaeon and opened the way for the advance of the Trojans, and covered Hector when stricken down by Ajax, but ultimately fell by the hand of Patroclus. His horses and armor became the spoil of the Greeks, but his body was, by Jupiter's command, borne to Lycia for honorable interment by the hands of Sleep and Death.

(3.) A son of Neptune and brother of Poltys, who lived in Thrace and was given to deeds of violence. He was slain by Hercules.

### Sarpedonia

(**Σαρπηδόνια**). a surname of *Artemis*, derived from Cape Sarpedon, in Cilicia, where she had a temple with all oracle (Strabo, 14, p. 676).

### Sarpedonius,

A surname of *Apollo* in Cilicia.

### Sarpi.

*SEE PAUL* (*Father*).

### Sarritor,

In Roman mythology, was a god of husbandry whose province was the hoeing and cultivating of the growing crops.

### Sar'sechim

(Heb. *Sarsekim*', **μυκᾶτῆ**) probably *prince of the eunuchs*; Sept. [with great confusion] **Ναβούχαρ** v.r. **Ναβουσαρσαχίμ**, etc.; Vulg. *Sarsachien*), one of the generals of Nebuchadnezzar's army at the taking of Jerusalem (<sup>288B</sup>Jeremiah 39:3), B.C. 588. He appears to have held the office



of chief eunuch, for Rabсарis (q.v.) is probably a title and not a proper name. In <sup><24913></sup>Jeremiah 39:13, Nebushasban is called Rab-saris, "chief eunuch," and the question arises whether Nebushasban and Sarsechim may not be names of the same person. Gesenius conjectures (*Thesaur. s.v.*) that Sarsechim and Rab-saris may be identical, and both titles of the same office. *SEE SAMGAR-NEBO.*

## Sartaba

(**abfrš**), the name of a mountain on which the Jews anciently lighted the beacon fire (the one next to the Mount of Olives) to herald the new moon (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 346). In one passage it is erroneously written *Sartan*, **frs** (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 162). It is undoubtedly the present *Kurn Sartabah* (Horn of Sartaba), on the edge of the Ghor, or Jordan valley, not far north of Jericho (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, 242, new ed.). The summit still retains traces of the platform erected for building the beacon fires, which Lieut. Conder of the English Engineers has mistaken for the remains of the memorial altar of <sup><16210></sup>Joshua 22:10 (*Quar. Report of "Pal. Explor. Fund,"* Oct. 1874, p. 241 sq.).

## Sarto, Andri Vannucchi,

Called *Del Sarto*, an Italian painter, was born at Florence about 1488. Having shown a taste for drawing, he was placed with a goldsmith to learn engraving on plate. Giovanni Barile, a painter, persuaded his father to entrust him to his care, and he remained with Barile three years; he was then placed by him with Pietro Cosimo. Leaving the school of Cosimo, he formed an intimacy with Francisco Bigio, with whom he executed some works in the public buildings of Florence, which gained him considerable reputation. We are told by Vasari that Sarto passed some time in Rome. After his return, he painted for the Monastery of the Salvi his admired pictures of the *Descent of the Holy Ghost*, the *Birth of the Virgin*, and the *Last Supper*. Francis I, king of France, desirous of procuring specimens of Italian art, Sarto was commissioned to paint a picture for his majesty, and sent in a *Dead Christ*, with the Virgin, St. John, and other figures, which are now among the chief ornaments of the Gallery of the Louvre. The king invited him to Paris, where he obtained employment from Francis and the nobility. His wife urging his return to Florence, he obtained leave of absence, and was intrusted with a considerable sum of money for the purchase of statues, pictures, etc. Having spent the king's money, as well

as his own, he sank into poverty, and died of the plague in 1530. The churches, convents, and palaces of Florence contain many of his best works. In the National Gallery are two pictures by him, the *Holy Family* and his own portrait.

### Sartorius, Ernst Wilhelm Christian,

One of the ablest, most fruitful, and genial theologians of modern orthodox Lutheranism, was born at Darmstadt, May 10, 1797, and died at Königsberg June 13, 1859. While studying at Göttingen (1815-18), he fell under the earnest religious influence of Planck. In 1819 he began to lecture in the University, and to produce the first of those numerous genial writings which have induced some to call him the St. John of Lutheranism. The first that appeared was three essays — one on the *Purpose of Jesus in Founding the Church*; the second on the *Origin of the Gospels* (afterwards disavowed); and the third on the *Doctrine of Grace and Faith*. Next followed (1821) the *Lutheran Doctrine of Human Inability*, in which he opposed Schleiermacher. In 1821 he became professor of theology at Marburg. Here he issued two works, *The Doctrine of Protestants as to the Respect due to the Civil Magistracy*, and *Religion Outside of the Limits of Mere Reason*. In 1824 he received the doctorate and accepted a call to Dorpat. Here appeared successively his *Contributions to Evangelical Orthodoxy*, in which he opposed Röhr, Bretschneider, and Rationalism in general. In 1831 he issued his *Discussion of the Person and Work of Christ*, which speedily passed through seven editions, and was translated into other languages. These two works attracted to him very general attention, as did also his contributions to Hengstenberg's *Church Journal*, in which appeared from 1834 to 1836 his vigorous assaults upon Möhler's *Symbolik*. After eleven years of academic labor at Dorpat, he was called to Prussia in 1835, and appointed to the position of superintendent-general of the province of Prussia and director of the royal consistory. He entered upon his duties with a sermon in the royal court-church at Königsberg in December. In 1840 he began his work on moral theology, *Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe*, which, with its modifications and its revisions for new editions, occupied him until 1856, and which he justly regarded as his chief title to a place in the world of theology. The movements of the fanatical 'Friends of Light' induced Sartorius to issue, in 1845, a work on the *Necessity and Obligatoriness of the Creeds*. In 1852 appeared his work on *Primitive Worship, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments*; in 1853 his *Defence of the Augsburg Confession*; and in 1855 his *Meditations on the*

*Glorious Manifestations of God in his Church and on the Presence of the Glorified Body of Christ in the Eucharist.* After a ministry of twenty-four years, he died in the midst of his labors. The day before his decease he had labored upon a large polemical work against Romanism, published afterwards (1860) by his son, under the title *Soli Deo Gloria! A Comparison of Lutheranism and Romanism in the Light of the Augsburg and the Tridentine Confessions, with Special Reference to Möhler's Symbolik.* Up to the end of his life he was a zealous contributor to Hengstenberg's *Church Journal*. Some of his later papers were of a very severe polemical character. Only a few of his sermons have been printed. See Kurtz, *Church History* (Eng. transl.), 2, 372; Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, 2, 374; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 426-428; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 414, 406, 494. (J.P.L.)

### Sa'ruch

(Σαρούχ), the Greek form (ⲥⲁⲣⲟⲩⲅ Luke 3:35) of the name of the patriarch SERUG *SEE SERUG* (q.v.), son of Reu.

### Saruk, Menachem, Ibn-,

An early Jewish scholar, was born about 910 at Tortosa, in Spain, and died about 970 at Cordova. He is the author of a Biblical dictionary called *ʿwrga8s* or *ʿwrtph 8s*; also *μj nm trbj m*, including the Aramenan of Daniel and Ezra, with explanations in Hebrew. A grammatical introduction precedes each letter (*trbj m*), and introductions relating to the preliminary grammatical studies, divided into ten chapters, supply in it the place of a grammar. Against this work Dunash ben-Labrat (q.v.) wrote a critique, which elicited a rejoinder from Saruk. Saruk's *Lexicon* has been edited by Philipowski (Lond. 1854). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 248 sq.; *Introd. to his Hebrew and Chaldee Dict.* p. 26; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, 336 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Geschichte*, p. 25 sq.; Kimchi, *Liber Radicum*, p. 31 sq. (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht); De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico*, p. 287 (Germ. transl.); Kämpf, *Nichtandalusische Poesie*, p. 155 sq.; Pick, *Menachem Ibn-Saruk* (in *Heb. Chr. Witness*, Lond. 1877), p. 324 sq.; Gross, *Menachem ben-Saruk* (Breslau, 1872); and Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1872, p. 81 sq. (B.P.)

## Sarum, Use Of.

In former times each bishop had the power of making some improvements in the liturgy of his Church. In process of time different customs arose, and several became so established as to receive the names of their respective churches. The 'use' or custom of Sarum derives its origin from Osmund, bishop of that see in A.D. 1078, and chancellor of England. Influenced by difficulties arising from an attempt to do away with the ancient Gregorian chanting, Osmund collected together the clergy, and composed a book for the regulation of ecclesiastical offices, which was entitled the *Custom-Book*. The substance of this was probably incorporated into the missal and other ritual books of Sarum, and ere long almost the whole of England, Wales, and Ireland adopted it. When the archbishop of Canterbury celebrated the liturgy in the presence of the bishops of his province, the bishop of Salisbury (probably in consequence of the general adoption of the 'use' of Sarum) acted as *precentor* of the College of Bishops, a title which he still retains. *SEE USE*.

## Sarvagna,

In Hindu mythology, is the *all-seeing one*, a surname of Siva.

## Sarvastivadas, Or Sarvastivadins

(literally, *those who maintain the reality of all existence*), is the name of one of the four divisions of the *Vaibhashika* system of Buddhism. Its reputed father was Rahula, the son of the Buddha Sakyamuni. See Köppen, *Die Religion des Buddha* (Berlin, 1857); Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus und seine Dogmen* (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Sas.

*SEE WORM*.

## Sasnett, William Jeremiah,

A minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Hancock County, Ga., April 29, 1820, and graduated at Oglethorpe University in 1839. After graduation he studied law, but very early entered the ministry. His active work was soon interfered with by rheumatism. He then engaged in the work of education, and accepted, in 1849, the chair of English Literature in Emory College, which he filled until 1858, when he

became president of La Grange Female College. In Sept., 1859, he opened the East Alabama Male College, as its president. At a very early day its halls were filled with young men, but the war coming on, so many of them entered the army that college exercises were necessarily suspended. Dr. Sasnett retired to his farm in Georgia, where he remained until his death, Nov. 3, 1865. As a scholar, the attainments of Dr. Sasnett were varied and extensive. As a preacher, his gifts were far from ordinary. Besides a large number of contributions to the periodical press, he published, *Progress* (1855): — *Discussions in Literature* (1860). See *Minutes of Annual Conf. of Meth. Epis. Church, South*, 1865, p. 574.

### Sason, Aaron Ben-Joseph.

SEE AARON BEN-JOSEPH SASON.

### Sasportas, Jacob Ben-Aaron,

A Jewish writer, was born in 1610 at Oran, North Africa. Very little is known about his early youth. In 1634 he became chief rabbi of six African communities, which position he held for two decades, when he was obliged to leave the country. In 1654 he arrived at Amsterdam, and a year later he was recalled by the emperor of Morocco, and charged with the ambassadorship to Spain. In 1664 he appeared as chief rabbi of London, which he left in 1672 for Hamburg. In the same year he was called to Amsterdam, and so likewise in 1680, where he went in 1693, to be gathered to his fathers in 1698. He is best known as the author of **bq[y twdl wt**, or index of Biblical passages which are explained in hagadistic manner in the Jerusalem Talmud, being a supplement to the **ˆrha twdl wt** of Ah. Pesaro (q.v.). He also wrote against the Pseudo-Messiah, Sabbatai Zebi (q.v.), in his **ybx l bwn txyx** (Amst. 1737). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 251; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, 3, 168; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10, p. 110 sq. (B.P.)

### Sassanidae,

The dynasty which succeeded that of the Arsacidæ on the throne of Persia (q.v.). See Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*.

## Sassi, Francisco Girolamo,

A noted monk, was born at Milan in 1673. He took orders in the brotherhood of the Oblates, and was made general of the order in 1700. He died at Milan, Nov. 2, 1731. He gave his life to religious instruction, and published several devotional works, among them *Christi Laudes* and *Marioe Laudes*.

## Sa'tan,

The Scripture term for the chief of fallen spirits, and the arch-principle of evil. The doctrine of Satan and of satanic agency is to be made out from revelation, and from reflection in agreement with revelation. The obscurity of the subject need not deter us from a candid investigation of it.

**I.** *Scripture Names or Titles of Satan.* — Besides *Satan*, he is called the *Devil*, the *Dragon*, the *Evil One*, the *Angel of the Bottomless Pit*, the *Prince of this World*, the *Prince of the Power of the Air*, the *God of this World*, *Apollyon*, *Abaddon*, *Belial*, *Beelzebub*. “Satan” and “devil” are the names by which he is oftener distinguished than by any other, the former being applied to him about forty times and the latter about fifty times. See each term.

*Satan* is the Hebrew word  $\text{שָׂטָן}$ ; *satan'*, transferred to the English. It is derived from the verb  $\text{שָׂטָן}$ ; which means “to lie in wait,” “to oppose,” “to be an adversary;” hence, the noun denotes an *adversary*, or opposer. The word in its *generic* sense occurs in  $\text{1 Kings 11:14}$ : “The Lord raised up an adversary (*satan*; Sept.  $\text{σατάν}$ ) against Solomon,” i.e. Hadad the Edomite. In the 23d verse the word occurs again, applied to Rezan. It is used in the same sense in  $\text{1 Samuel 29:4}$ , where David is termed an adversary, and in  $\text{Numbers 22:22}$ , where the angel “stood in the way for an adversary (*satan*) to Balaam,” i.e. to oppose him when he went with the princes of Moab. See also  $\text{2 Samuel 19:22}$ ,  $\text{1 Kings 5:4, 11:25}$   $\text{Psalm 109:6}$ , where the Sept. has  $\text{ἐπίβουλος, ἀντικείμενος, διάβολος}$ , etc. In Zechariah 3:1, 2, the word occurs in its *specific* sense as a proper name. “And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.” Here it is manifest, both from the context and the use of the article, that some particular adversary is denoted. In  $\text{Job 1, 2}$ , the same use of the word

with the article occurs several times. The events in which Satan is represented as the agent confirm this view. He was a distinguished adversary and tempter. See also <sup><1200></sup>1 Chronicles 21:1. In all these latter passages the Sept. has σατάν, and the Vulg. *Satan*. When we pass from the Old to the New Test., this doctrine of an invisible evil agent becomes more clear. With the advent of Christ and the opening of the Christian dispensation, the great opposer of that kingdom, the particular adversary and antagonist of the Savior, would naturally become more active and more known. The antagonism of Satan and his kingdom to Christ and his kingdom runs through the whole of the New Test., as will appear from the following passages and their contexts: <sup><1040></sup>Matthew 4:10; 12:26; <sup><1045></sup>Mark 4:15; <sup><1008></sup>Luke 10:18; 22:3, 31; <sup><1038></sup>Acts 26:18; <sup><6160></sup>Romans 16:20; <sup><7114></sup>2 Corinthians 11:14; <sup><6123></sup>Revelation 2:13; 12:9. Peter is once called Satan, because his spirit and conduct, at a certain time, were so much in opposition to the spirit and intent of Christ, and so much in the same line of direction with the workings of Satan. This is the only application of the word in the New Test. to any but the prince of the apostate angels. In the New Test. the word is σατανᾶς, followed by the Vulg. *Satanas*, except in <sup><7127></sup>2 Corinthians 12:7, where σατάν is used. It is found in twenty-five places (exclusive of parallel passages), and the corresponding word ὁ διάβολος in about the same number. The title ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου is used three times; ὁ πονηρός is used certainly six times, probably more frequently, and ὁ πειράζων twice.

*Devil* (Διάβολος) is the more frequent term of designation given to Satan in the New Test. Both “*Satan*” and “*devil*” are in several instances applied to the same being (<sup><6123></sup>Revelation 12:9), “That old serpent, the devil and Satan.” Christ, in the temptation (<sup><1001></sup>Matthew 4), in his repulse of the tempter, calls him Satan; while the evangelists distinguish him by the term “*devil*.” Devil is the word διάβολος transferred from the verb διαβάλλω, “to thrust through,” “to carry over,” and, tropically, “to inform against,” “to accuse.” He is also called the accuser of the brethren (<sup><6120></sup>Revelation 12:10). The Hebrew term Satan is more generic than the word *devil*, at least by its etymology. The former expresses his character as an opposer of all good; the latter denotes more particularly the relation which he bears to the saints, as their traducer and accuser. Διάβολος is the uniform translation which the Sept. gives of the Hebrew *Satan* when used with the article. Farmer says that the term Satan is not appropriated to one particular person or spirit, but signifies an adversary, or opponent in

general. This is to no purpose, since it is also applied to the “devil” as an adversary in particular. There are four instances in the New Test. in which the word “devil,” *diabolos*, is applied to human beings. In three out of the four it is in the plural number, expressive of quality and not personality (<sup><SIB1></sup>1 Timothy 3:11; <sup><SRB></sup>2 Timothy 3:3; <sup><SRB></sup>Titus 2:3). In the fourth instance (<sup><B50></sup>John 6:70), Jesus says to his disciples, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is *a devil*?” This is the only instance in the New Test. of its application to a human being in the singular number; and here Dr. Campbell thinks it should not be translated “devil.” The translation is, however, of no consequence, since it is with the use of the original word that this article is concerned. The obvious reasons for this application of **διάβολος** to Judas, as an exception to the general rule, go to confirm the rule. The rule is that, in the New Test. usage, the word in the singular number denotes individuality, and is applied to Satan as a proper name. By the exception, it is applied to Judas, from his resemblance to the devil, as an accuser and betrayer of Christ, and from his contributing to aid him in his designs against Christ. With these exceptions, the *usus loquendi* of the New Test. shows **ὁ Διάβολος** to be a proper name, applied to an extraordinary being, whose influence upon the human race is great and mischievous (<sup><D01></sup>Matthew 4:1-11; <sup><B22></sup>Luke 8:12; <sup><BR4></sup>John 8:44; <sup><H30></sup>Acts 13:10; <sup><H61></sup>Ephesians 6:11; <sup><G08></sup>1 Peter 5:8; <sup><GR8></sup>1 John 3:8; <sup><G19></sup>Revelation 12:9). *SEE DEVIL.*

The term “devil,” which is in the New Test. the uniform translation of **διάβολος**, is also frequently the translation of *daemon*, **δαίμων**, and *daemonion*, **δαίμόνιον**. Between these words and **διάβολος** the English translators have made no distinction. The former are almost always used in connection with demoniacal possessions, and are applied to the possessing spirits, but never to the prince of those spirits. On the other hand, **διάβολος** is never applied to the daemons, but only to their prince, thus showing that the one is used definitely as a proper name, while the others are used indefinitely as generic terms. The sacred writers made a distinction, which in the English and most modern versions is lost. *SEE DEMON.*

**II. Personality of Satan.** — We determine this point by the same criteria that we use in determining whether Caesar and Napoleon were real, personal beings, or the personifications of abstract ideas, viz. by the tenor of history concerning them, and the ascription of personal attributes to them. All the forms of personal agency are made use of by the sacred



writers in setting forth the character and conduct of Satan. They describe him as having power and dominion, messengers and followers. He tempts and resists; he is held accountable, charged with guilt; is to be judged, and to receive final punishment. On the supposition that it was the object of the sacred writers to teach the proper personality of Satan, they could have found no more express terms than those which they have actually used. To suppose that all this semblance of a real, veritable, conscious moral agent is only a trope, a prosopopeia, is to make the inspired penmen guilty of employing a figure in such a way that, by no ascertained laws of language, it could be known that it was a figure — in such a way that it could not be taken to be a figure, without violence to all the rhetorical rules by which they on other occasions are known to have been guided. A personification protracted through such a book as the Bible. even should we suppose it to have been written by one person, is altogether anomalous and inadmissible. But to suppose that the several writers of the different books of the Bible, diverse in their style and intellectual habits, writing under widely differing circumstances, through a period of nearly two thousand years, should each, from Moses to John, fall into the use of the same personification, is to require men to believe that the inspired writers, who ought to have done the least violence to the common laws of language, have really done the most.

But there are other difficulties than these general ones by which the theory of personification is encumbered. This theory supposes the devil to be *the principle of evil*. Let it be applied in the interpretation of two or three passages of Scripture. “Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil” (~~400~~ Matthew 4:1-11). Was Jesus tempted by a real, personal being? or was it by the principle of evil? If by the latter, in whom or what did this principle reside? Was it in Jesus? Then it could not be true that in him was no sin. The very principle of sin was in him, which would have made him the tempter of himself. This is bad hermeneutics, producing worse theology. Let it also be remembered that this principle of evil, in order to be moral evil, must inhere in some conscious moral being. Sin is evil only as it implies the state or action of some personal and accountable agent. Again: “He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth: he is a liar and the father of it” (~~404~~ John 8:44). With what propriety could these specific acts of guilt be charged upon an abstraction? An abstraction a murderer! a liar! Seriously to affirm such things of the mere abstraction of evil is a solemn fiction;

while to assert them of a fallen angel, who beguiled Eve by falsehood, and brought death upon all the race of man, is an intelligible and affecting truth.

It would be a waste of time to prove that, in various degrees of clearness, the personal existence of a Spirit of Evil is revealed again and again in Scripture. Every quality, every action, which can indicate personality, is attributed to him in language which cannot be explained away. It is not difficult to see why it should be thus revealed. It is obvious that the fact of his existence is of spiritual importance, and it is also clear, from the nature of the case, that it could not be discovered, although it might be suspected, by human reason. It is in the power of that reason to test any supposed manifestations of supernatural power, and any asserted principles of divine action which fall within its sphere of experience (“the earthly things” of ~~John~~ John 3:12). It may by such examination satisfy itself of the truth and divinity of a Person or a book; but, having done this, it must then accept and understand, without being able to test, or to explain, the disclosures of this divine authority upon subjects beyond this world (the “heavenly things,” of which it is said that none can see or disclose them, save the “Son of Man who is in heaven”).

It is true that human thought can assert an *a priori* probability or improbability in such statements made, based on the perception of a greater or less degree of accordance in principle between the things seen and the things unseen, between the effects, which are visible, and the causes, which are revealed from the regions of mystery. But even this power of weighing probability is applicable rather to the fact and tendency than to the method of supernatural action. This is true even of natural action beyond the sphere of human observation. In the discussion of the plurality of worlds, for example, it may be asserted without doubt that in all the orbs of the universe the divine power, wisdom, and goodness must be exercised; but the inference that the method of their exercise is found there, as here, in the creation of sentient and rational beings is one at best of but moderate probability. Still more is this the case in the spiritual world. Whatever supernatural orders of beings may exist, we can conclude that in their case, as in ours, the divine government must be carried on by the union of individual freedom of action with the overruling power of God, and must tend finally to that good which is his central attribute. But beyond this we can assert nothing to be certain, and can scarcely even say of any part of the method of this government whether it is antecedently probable or improbable.

Thus, on our present subject, man can ascertain by observation the existence of evil — that is, of facts and thoughts contrary to the standard which conscience asserts to be the true one, bringing with them suffering and misery as their inevitable results. If he attempts to trace them to their causes, he finds them to arise, for each individual, partly from the power of certain internal impulses which act upon the will, partly from the influence of external circumstances. These circumstances themselves arise, either from the laws of nature and society, or by the deliberate action of other men. He can conclude with certainty that both series of causes must exist by the permission of God, and must finally be overruled to his will. But whether there exist any superhuman but subordinate cause of the circumstances, and whether there be any similar influence acting in the origination of the impulses which move the will, this is a question which he cannot answer with certainty. Analogy, from the observation of the only ultimate cause which he can discover in the visible world — viz. the free action of a personal will — may lead him, and generally has led him, to conjecture the affirmative; but still the inquiry remains unanswered by authority.

The tendency of the mind in its inquiry is generally towards one or other of two extremes. The first is to consider evil as a negative imperfection arising, in some unknown and inexplicable way, from the nature of matter, or from some disturbing influences which limit the action of goodness on earth; in fact, to ignore as much of evil as possible, and to decline to refer the residuum to any positive cause at all. The other is the old Persian or Manichæan hypothesis, which traces the existence of evil to a rival creator, not subordinate to the Creator of good, though perhaps inferior to him in power, and destined to be overcome by him at last. Between these two extremes the mind varied through many gradations of thought and countless forms of superstition. Each hypothesis had its arguments of probability against the other. The first labored under the difficulty of being insufficient as an account of the anomalous facts, and indeterminate in its account of the disturbing cause; the second sinned against that belief in the unity of God and the natural supremacy of goodness, which is supported by the deepest instincts of the heart. But both were laid in a sphere beyond human cognizance; neither could be proved or disproved with certainty.

The revelation of Scripture, speaking with authority, meets the truth and removes the error inherent in both these hypotheses. It asserts in the strongest terms the perfect supremacy of God, so that under his permission

alone, and for his inscrutable purposes, evil is allowed to exist (see, for example, <sup><104></sup>Proverbs 16:4; <sup><287></sup>Isaiah 45:7; <sup><318></sup>Amos 3:6; comp. <sup><82></sup>Romans 9:22, 23). It regards this evil as an anomaly and corruption, to be taken away by a new manifestation of divine love in the incarnation and atonement. The conquest of it began virtually in God's ordinance after the fall itself, was effected actually on the cross, and shall be perfected in its results at the judgment day. Still Scripture recognizes the existence of evil in the world, not only as felt in outward circumstances ("the world"), and as inborn in the soul of man ("the flesh"), but also as proceeding from the influence of an evil spirit, exercising that mysterious power of free will, which God's rational creatures possess, to rebel against him, and to draw others into the same rebellion ("the devil").

In accordance with the "economy" and progressiveness of God's revelation, the existence of Satan is but gradually revealed. In the first entrance of evil into the world, the temptation is referred only to the serpent. It is true that the whole narrative, and especially the spiritual nature of the temptation ("to be as gods"), which was united to the sensual motive, would force on any thoughtful reader the conclusion that something more than a mere animal agency was at work; but the time had not then come to reveal, what afterwards was revealed, that "he who sinneth is of the devil" (<sup><188></sup>1 John 3:8), and that "the old serpent" of Genesis was "called the devil and Satan, who deceiveth the whole world" (<sup><111></sup>Revelation 12:9; 20:23).

Throughout the whole period of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, this vague and imperfect revelation of the source of evil alone was given. The Source of all Good is set forth in all his supreme and unapproachable majesty; evil is known negatively as the falling away from him; and the "vanity" of idols, rather than any positive evil influence, is represented as the opposite to his reality and goodness. The law gives the "knowledge of sin" in the soul, without referring to any external influence of evil to foster it; it denounces idolatry, without even hinting, what the New Test. declares plainly, that such evil implied a "power of Satan."

The book of Job stands, in any case, alone (whether we refer it to an early or a later period) on the basis of "natural religion," apart from the gradual and orderly evolutions of the Mosaic revelation. In it, for the first time, we find a distinct mention of Satan, the adversary of Job. But it is important to remark the emphatic stress laid on his subordinate position, on the absence

of all but delegated power, of all terror, and all grandeur in his character. He comes among the “sons of God” to present himself before the Lord; his malice and envy are permitted to have scope, in accusation or in action, only for God’s own purposes; and it is especially remarkable that no power of spiritual influence, but only a power over outward circumstances, is attributed to him. All this is widely different from the clear and terrible revelations of the New Test.

The captivity brought the Israelites face to face with the great dualism of the Persian mythology, the conflict of Ormuzd with Ahriman, the coordinate spirit of evil. In the books written after the captivity we have again the name of Satan twice mentioned; but it is confessed by all that the Satan of Scripture bears no resemblance to the Persian Ahriman. His subordination and inferiority are as strongly marked as ever. In <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 21:1, where the name occurs without the article (“an adversary,” not “*the* adversary”), the comparison with <sup><1020></sup>2 Samuel 24:1 shows distinctly that, in the temptation of David, Satan’s malice was overruled to work out the “anger of the Lord” against Israel. In <sup><3880></sup>Zechariah 3:1, 2, Satan is ὁ ἀντίδικος (as in <sup><608></sup>1 Peter 5:8), the accuser of Joshua before the throne of God, rebuked and put to silence by him (comp. <sup><1906></sup>Psalms 109:6). In the case, as of the good angels, so also of the evil one, the presence of fable and idolatry gave cause to the manifestation of the truth. *SEE ANGEL*. It would have been impossible to guard the Israelites more distinctly from the fascination of the great dualistic theory of their conquerors.

It is perhaps not difficult to conjecture that the reason of this reserve as to the disclosure of the existence and nature of Satan is to be found in the inveterate tendency of the Israelites to idolatry — an idolatry based, as usual, in great degree, on the supposed power of their false gods to inflict evil. The existence of evil spirits is suggested to them in the stern prohibition and punishment of witchcraft (<sup><1228></sup>Exodus 22:18; <sup><5880></sup>Deuteronomy 18:10), and in the narrative of the possession of men by an “evil” or “lying spirit from the Lord” (<sup><964></sup>1 Samuel 16:14; <sup><1222></sup>1 Kings 22:22); the tendency to seek their aid is shown by the rebukes of the prophets (<sup><2389></sup>Isaiah 8:19, etc.). But this tendency would have been increased tenfold by the revelation of the existence of the great enemy concentrating round himself all the powers of evil and enmity against God. Therefore, it would seem, the revelation of the “strong man armed” was withheld until “the stronger than he” should be made manifest.

In the New Test. this reserve suddenly vanishes. In the interval between the Old and New Test. the Jewish mind had pondered on the scanty revelations already given of evil spiritual influence. But the Apocryphal books (as, for example, Tobit and Judith), while dwelling on “daemons” (δαίμονια), have no notice of Satan. The same may be observed of Josephus. The only instance to the contrary is the reference already made to Wisd. 2, 24. It is to be noticed also that the Targums often introduce the name of Satan into the descriptions of sin and temptation found in the Old Test., as, for example, in <sup><1229></sup>Exodus 32:19, in connection with the worship of the golden calf (comp. the tradition as to the body of Moses, <sup><1345></sup>Deuteronomy 34:5, 6; <sup><1009></sup>Jude 1:9). *SEE MICHAEL*. But, while a mass of fable and superstition grew up on the general subject of evil spiritual influence, still the existence and nature of Satan remained in the background, felt, but not understood.

The New Test. first brings it plainly forward. From the beginning of the Gospel, when he appears as the personal tempter of our Lord, through all the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse, it is asserted or implied, again and again, as a familiar and important truth. To refer this to mere “accommodation” of the language of the Lord and his apostles to the ordinary Jewish belief is to contradict facts and evade the meaning of words. The subject is not one on which error could be tolerated as unimportant, but one important, practical, and even awful. The language used respecting it is either truth or falsehood; and unless we impute error or deceit to the writers of the New Test., we must receive the doctrine of the existence of Satan as a certain doctrine of revelation. Without dwelling on other passages, the plain, solemn, and unmetaphorical words of <sup><1384></sup>John 8:44, must be sufficient: “Ye are of your father the devil. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abides (ἔστηκεν) not in the truth.... When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it.” *SEE DEMONIC*.

### III. *Natural History.* —

**1.** Of the original nature and state of Satan, little is revealed in Scripture. Most of the common notions on the subject are drawn from mere tradition, popularized in England by Milton, but without even a vestige of Scriptural authority. He is spoken of as a “spirit” in <sup><1112></sup>Ephesians 2:2; as the prince or ruler of the “daemons” (δαίμονια) in <sup><1124></sup>Matthew 12:24-26; and as having “angels” subject to him in <sup><1254></sup>Matthew 25:41; <sup><1127></sup>Revelation 12:7,

9. The whole description of his power implies spiritual nature and spiritual influence. We conclude, therefore, that he was of angelic nature, a rational and spiritual creature, superhuman in power, wisdom, and energy; and not only so, but an archangel, one of the “princes” of heaven. *SEE ARCHANGEL.*

The class of beings to which Satan originally belonged, and which constituted a celestial hierarchy, is very numerous: “Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him” (<sup><2070></sup>Daniel 7:10). They were created and dependent (<sup><4003></sup>John 1:3). Analogy leads to the conclusion that there are different grades among the angels as among other races of beings. The Scriptures warrant the same. Michael is described as one of the chief princes (<sup><2703></sup>Daniel 10:13); as chief captain of the host of Jehovah (<sup><0654></sup>Joshua 5:14). Similar distinctions exist among the fallen angels (<sup><5025></sup>Colossians 2:15; <sup><0612></sup>Ephesians 6:12). It is also reasonable to suppose that they were created susceptible of improvement in all respects except moral purity, as they certainly were capable of apostasy.

**2.** As to the time when they were brought into being, the Bible is silent; and where it is silent, we should be silent, or speak with modesty. Some suppose that they were called into existence after the creation of the world; among whom is Dr. John Dick. Others have supposed that they were created just anterior to the creation of man, and for purposes of a merciful ministration to him. It is more probable, however, that as they were the highest in rank among the creatures of God, so they were the first in the order of time; and that they may have continued for ages in obedience to their Maker, before the creation of man, or the fall of the apostate angels.

We cannot, of course, conceive that anything essentially and originally evil was created by God. We find by experience that the will of a free and rational creature can, by his permission, oppose his will; that the very conception of freedom implies capacity of temptation; and that every sin, unless arrested by God’s fresh gift of grace, strengthens the hold of evil on the spirit till it may fall into the hopeless state of reprobation. We can only conjecture, therefore, that Satan is a fallen angel, who once had a time of probation, but whose condemnation is now irrevocably fixed.

**3.** The Scriptures are explicit as to the apostasy of some, of whom Satan was the chief and leader. But of the time, cause, and manner of his fall, Scripture tells us scarcely anything. It limits its disclosures, as always, to that which we need to know. The passage on which all the fabric of

tradition and poetry has been raised is <sup><6607></sup>Revelation 12:7, 9, which speaks of “Michael and his angels” as “fighting against the dragon and his angels,” till the “great dragon, called the devil and Satan,” was “cast out into the earth, and his angels cast out with him.” Whatever be the meaning of this passage, it is certain that it cannot refer to the original fall of Satan. The only other passage which refers to the fall of the angels is <sup><6114></sup>2 Peter 2:4, “God spared not the angels, when they had sinned, but having cast them into hell, delivered them to chains of darkness (**σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν**), reserved unto judgment,” with the parallel passage in <sup><6110></sup>Jude 6, “Angels, who kept not their first estate (**τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν**), but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” In these mysterious passages, however, there is some difficulty in considering Satan as one of the rest, for they are in chains and guarded (**τετηρημένους**) till the great day; he is permitted still to go about as the tempter and the adversary, until his appointed time be come. This distinction, nevertheless, may be due to Satan’s eminence among his fellows. Those who adhered to Satan in his apostasy are described as belonging to him. The company is called “the devil and his angels” (<sup><4154></sup>Matthew 25:41). The relation marked here denotes the instrumentality which the devil may have exerted in inducing those called his angels to rebel against Jehovah and join themselves to his interests. Aside from these passages, we have still to consider the declaration of our Lord in <sup><2108></sup>Luke 10:18, “I beheld (**ἑθεώρουν**) Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven.” This may refer to the fact of his original fall (although the use of the imperfect tense and the force of the context rather refer it figuratively to the triumph of the disciples over the evil spirits); but, in any case, it tells nothing of its cause or method. There is also the passage already quoted (<sup><6114></sup>John 8:44), in which our Lord declares of him, that “he was a murderer from the beginning,” that “*he* stands not (**ἔστηκε**) in the truth, because there is no truth in him,” that “he is a liar, and the father of it.” But here it seems likely the words **ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς** refer to the beginning of his action upon man; perhaps the allusion is to his temptation of Cain to be the first murderer — an allusion explicitly made in a similar passage in <sup><6110></sup>1 John 3:9-12. The word **ἔστηκε** (wrongly rendered ‘abode’ in the A.V.) and the rest of the verse refer to present time. The passage therefore throws little or no light on the cause and method of his fall. Perhaps the only one which has any value is <sup><5116></sup>1 Timothy 3:6, “lest being lifted up by pride he fall into the condemnation (**κρίμα**) of the devil.” It is concluded from this that pride was the cause of the devil’s condemnation.



The inference is a probable one; it is strengthened by the only analogy within our reach, that of the fall of man, in which the spiritual temptation of pride, the desire “to be as gods,” was the subtlest and most deadly temptation. Still it is but an inference; it cannot be regarded as a matter of certain revelation.

How Satan and his followers, being created so high in excellence and holiness, became sinful and fell is a question upon which theologians have differed, but which they have not settled. The difficulty has seemed so great to Schleiermacher and others that they have denied the fact of such an apostasy. They have untied the knot by cutting it. Still the difficulty remains. The denial of mystery is not the removal of it. Even philosophy teaches us to believe sometimes where we cannot understand. It is here that the grave question of the introduction of evil first meets us. If we admit the fact of apostasy among the angels, as by a fair interpretation of Scripture we are constrained to do, the admission of such a fact in the case of human beings will follow more easily, they being the lower order of creatures, in whom defection would be less surprising.

4. In his *physical nature*, Satan is among those that are termed spiritual beings; not as excluding necessarily all idea of matter, but as opposed rather to the *animal* nature. The good angels are all ministering spirits, *πνεύματα* (<sup><3014></sup>Hebrews 1:14). Satan is one of the angels that kept not their first principality. The fall produced no change in his physical or metaphysical nature. Paul, in warning the Ephesians against the wiles of the devil, tells them (<sup><462></sup>Ephesians 6:12) that they contended not against flesh and blood, mere human enemies, but against principalities and powers; against the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places, in which the contrast is between human and superhuman foes, the latter being spiritual natures, or spirits, in opposition to flesh and blood (Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*). Satan is immortal, but not eternal; neither omniscient nor omnipresent, but raised high above the human race in knowledge and power. The Persian mythology in its early stage, and subsequently the Gnostics and Manichaeans, ranked the evil principle as coeval and coordinate, or nearly so, with God, or the good principle. The doctrine of the Jewish Church always made him a dependent creature, subject to the control of the Almighty. By the modifications which Zoroaster subsequently introduced, the Persian angelology came more nearly to resemble that of the Jews. Some have ascribed to Satan the power of working miracles, contending that there are two series of

antagonistical miracles running through the Bible. To the miracles of Moses were opposed those of the Egyptian magicians; and to those of Christ and his apostles, the signs and wonders of false prophets and Antichrists the divine and the satanic. Olshausen maintains this view, as do some of the older commentators (*Biblischen Commentar*. 1, 242). The evidence in support of such a belief has not been sufficient to procure for it general acceptance (see Rosenmüller and Calvin on <sup><1824></sup>Matthew 24:24; <sup><1825></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:9; Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, ch. 3; also Rosenmüller and Bush on <sup><1800></sup>Exodus 7). With a substantial presence in only one place at one time, yet, as the head of a spiritual kingdom, he is virtually present wherever his angels or servants are executing his will.

**5.** Scripture describes to us distinctly the *moral character* of the Evil One. This is no matter of barren speculation to those who, by yielding to evil, may become the “children of Satan” instead of “children of God.” The ideal of goodness is made up of the three great moral attributes of God — love, truth, and purity, or holiness — combined with that spirit which is the natural temper of a finite and dependent creature, the spirit of faith. We find, accordingly, that the opposites to these qualities are dwelt upon as the characteristics of the devil. In <sup><1884></sup>John 8:44, compared with <sup><1810></sup>1 John 3:10-15, we have hatred and falsehood; in the constant mention of the “unclean” spirits, of which he is the chief, we find impurity; from <sup><1806></sup>1 Timothy 3:6, and the narrative of the temptation, we trace the spirit of pride. These are especially the “sins of the devil;” in them we trace the essence of moral evil and the features of, the reprobate mind. Add to this a spirit of restless activity, a power of craft, and an intense desire to spread corruption, and with it eternal death, and we have the portraiture of the spirit of evil as Scripture has drawn it plainly before our eyes.

More particularly, Satan’s character is denoted by his titles, Satan, Adversary, Diabolos, False Accuser, Tempter, etc. All the representations of him in Scripture show him to have unmixed and confirmed evil as the basis of his character, exhibiting itself in respect to God in assuming to be his equal, and in wishing to transfer the homage and service which belong only to God to himself; and, in respect to men, in efforts to draw them away from God and attach them to his kingdom. The evil develops itself in all possible ways and by all possible means of opposition to God, and to those who are striving to establish and extend his dominion. The immutability of his evil character precludes the idea of repentance, and,

therefore, the possibility of recovering grace. “He possesses an understanding which misapprehends exactly that which is most worthy to be known, to which the key fails without which nothing can be understood in its true relations — an understanding darkened, however deep it may penetrate, however wide it may reach. He is thereby necessarily unblessed; torn away from the center of life, yet without ever finding it in himself; from the sense of inward emptiness, continually driven to the exterior world, and yet with it, as with himself, in eternal contradiction; forever fleeing from God, yet never escaping him; constantly laboring to frustrate his designs, yet always conscious of being obliged to promote them; instead of enjoyment in the contemplation of his excellence, the never satisfied desire after an object which it cannot attain; instead of hope, a perpetual wavering between doubt and despair; instead of love, a powerless hatred against God, against his fellow beings, against himself” (Twisten).

**IV. Satan’s Power and Action.** — Both these points, being intimately connected with our own life and salvation, are treated with a distinctness and fullness remarkably contrasted with the obscurity of the previous subjects.

The agency of Satan extends to all that he does or causes to be done. To this agency the following restrictions have generally been supposed to exist: It is limited, first, by the direct power of God; he cannot transcend the power on which he is dependent for existence; secondly, by the finiteness of his own created faculties; thirdly, by the established connection of cause and effect, or the laws of nature. The miracles, which he has been supposed to have the power of working, are denominated lying signs and wonders (<sup><SIB></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:9). With these restrictions, the devil goes about like a roaring lion.

His agency is moral and physical. First, moral. He beguiled our first parents, and thus brought sin and death upon them and their posterity (<sup><OR></sup>Genesis 3). He moved David to number the people (<sup><IC></sup>1 Chronicles 21:1). He resisted Joshua the high priest (<sup><SR></sup>Zechariah 3:1). He tempted Jesus (<sup><OR></sup>Matthew 4); entered into Judas, to induce him to betray his master (<sup><OR></sup>Luke 22:3); instigated Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Ghost (<sup><HR></sup>Acts 5:3); and hindered Paul and Barnabas on their way to the Thessalonians (<sup><SIB></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:18). He is the spirit that now worketh

in the children of disobedience (<sup><4012></sup>Ephesians 2:2); and he deceiveth the whole world (<sup><6629></sup>Revelation 12:9).

The means which he uses are variously called wiles, darts, depths, snares, all deceivableness of unrighteousness. He darkens the understandings of men, to keep them in ignorance. He perverts their judgments, that he may lead them into error. He insinuates evil thoughts, and thereby awakens in them unholy desires. He excites them to pride, anger, and revenge; to discontent, repinings, and rebellion. He labors to prop up false systems of religion, and to corrupt and overturn the true one. He came into most direct and determined conflict with the Savior in the temptation, hoping to draw him from his allegiance to God, and procure homage for himself; but he failed in his purpose. Next, he instigated the Jews to put him to death, thinking thus to thwart his designs and frustrate his plans. Here, too, he failed, and was made to subserve the very ends which he most wished to prevent. Into a similar conflict does he come with all the saints, and with like ultimate ill success. God uses his temptations as the means of trial to his people, and of strength by trial; and points them out as a motive to watchfulness and prayer. Such are the nature and mode of his moral influence and agency.

But his efforts are directed against the bodies of men, as well as against their souls. That the agency of Satan was concerned in producing physical diseases the Scriptures plainly teach (<sup><1807></sup>Job 2:7; <sup><2136></sup>Luke 13:16). Peter says of Christ that he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil (<sup><4038></sup>Acts 10:38). Hymenaeus and Alexander were delivered to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme (<sup><5022></sup>1 Timothy 1:20), where physical suffering by the agency of Satan, as a divine chastisement, is manifestly intended.

The power of Satan over the soul is represented as exercised either directly or by his instruments. His direct influence over the soul is simply that of a powerful and evil nature on those in whom lurks the germ of the same evil, differing from the influence exercised by a wicked man in degree rather than in kind; but it has the power of acting by suggestion of thoughts, without the medium of actions or words — a power which is only in a very slight degree exercised by men upon each other. This influence is spoken of in Scripture in the strongest terms as a real external influence, correlative to, but not to be confounded with, the existence of evil within. In the parable of the sower (<sup><4039></sup>Matthew 13:19), it is represented as a negative

influence, taking away the action of the Word of God for good; in that of the wheat and the tares (<sup><4133></sup>Matthew 13:39), as a positive influence for evil, introducing wickedness into the world. Paul does not hesitate to represent it as a power permitted to dispute the world with the power of God; for he declares to Agrippa that his mission was ‘to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power (ἐξουσίας) of Satan unto God,’ and represents the excommunication, which cuts men off from the grace of Christ in his Church, as a “deliverance of them unto Satan” (<sup><4115></sup>1 Corinthians 5:5; <sup><5021></sup>1 Timothy 1:20). The same truth is conveyed, though in a bolder and more startling form, in the epistles to the churches of the Apocalypse, where the body of the unbelieving Jews is called a “synagogue of Satan” (<sup><4119></sup>Revelation 2:9; 3:9), where the secrets of false doctrine are called “the depths of Satan” (<sup><4124></sup>Revelation 2:24), and the “throne” and “habitation” of Satan are said to be set up in opposition to the Church of Christ. Another and even more remarkable expression of the same idea is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the death of Christ is spoken of as intended to baffle (καταργεῖν) ‘him that hath the power (τὸ κράτος) of death, that is, the devil;’ for death is evidently regarded as the ‘wages of sin,’ and the power of death as inseparable from the power of corruption. Nor is this truth only expressed directly and formally; it meets us again and again in passages simply practical, taken for granted as already familiar (see <sup><5161></sup>Romans 16:20; <sup><4121></sup>2 Corinthians 2:11; <sup><5128></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:18; <sup><5119></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:9; <sup><5415></sup>1 Timothy 5:15). The Bible does not shrink from putting the fact of satanic influence over the soul before us in plain and terrible certainty.

Yet, at the same time, it is to be observed that its language is very far from countenancing, even for a moment, the horrors of the Manichean theory. The influence of Satan is always spoken of as temporary and limited, subordinated to the divine counsel, and broken by the incarnate Son of God. It is brought out visibly, in the form of possession, in the earthly life of our Lord, only in order that it may give the opportunity of his triumph. As for himself, so for his redeemed ones, it is true that “God shall bruise Satan under their feet shortly” (<sup><5161></sup>Romans 16:20; comp. <sup><4015></sup>Genesis 3:15). Nor is this all, for the history of the book of Job shows plainly, what is elsewhere constantly implied, that satanic influence is permitted in order to be overruled to good, to teach humility, and therefore faith. The mystery of the existence of evil is left unexplained; but its present subordination and future extinction are familiar truths. So accordingly, on the other hand, his

power is spoken of as capable of being resisted by the will of man, when aided by the grace of God. “Resist the devil and he will flee from you” is the constant language of Scripture (<sup><4047></sup>James 4:7). It is indeed a power to which “place” or opportunity “is given” only by the consent of man’s will (<sup><4027></sup>Ephesians 4:27). It is probably to be traced most distinctly in the power of evil habit — a power real, but not irresistible, created by previous sin, and by every successive act of sin riveted more closely upon the soul. It is a power which cannot act directly and openly, but needs craft and dissimulation in order to get advantage over man by entangling the will. The “wiles” (<sup><4011></sup>Ephesians 6:11), the “devices” (<sup><4021></sup>2 Corinthians 2:11), the “snare” (<sup><4007></sup>1 Timothy 3:7; 6:9; <sup><4026></sup>2 Timothy 2:26) “of the devil” are expressions which indicate the indirect and unnatural character of the power of evil. It is therefore urged as a reason for “sobriety and vigilance” (<sup><4008></sup>1 Peter 5:8), for the careful use of the “whole armor of God” (<sup><4010></sup>Ephesians 6:10-17); but it is never allowed to obscure the supremacy of God’s grace, or to disturb the inner peace of the Christian. “He that is born of God keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not” (1 John 5).

Besides his own direct influence, the Scriptures disclose to us the fact that Satan is the leader of a host of evil spirits, or angels, who share his evil work, and for whom the “everlasting fire is prepared” (<sup><4254></sup>Matthew 25:41). Of their origin and fall we know no more than of his, for they cannot be the same as the fallen and imprisoned angels of <sup><4012></sup>2 Peter 2 and Jude 6; but one passage (<sup><4024></sup>Matthew 12:24-26) identifies them distinctly with the **δαμόνια** (A.V. “devils”) who had power to possess the souls of men. The Jews there speak of a Beelzebub (**Βεελζεβούλ**), “a prince of the daemons,” whom they identify with, or symbolize by, the idol of Ekron, the “god of flies”, **SEE BEELZEBUB**, and by whose power they accuse our Lord of casting out daemons. His answer is, “How can Satan cast out Satan?” The inference is clear that Satan is Beelzebub, and therefore the demons are “the angels of the devil;” and this inference is strengthened by <sup><4038></sup>Acts 10:38, in which Peter describes, the possessed as **καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου**; and by <sup><2008></sup>Luke 10:18, in which the mastery over the daemons is connected by our Lord with the “fall of Satan from heaven,” and their power included by him in the “power of the enemy” (**τοῦ ἐχθροῦ**; comp. <sup><4039></sup>Matthew 13:39). For their nature, **SEE DAMON**. They are mostly spoken of in Scripture in reference to possession; but in <sup><4012></sup>Ephesians 6:12 they are described in various lights, as

“principalities” (ἀρχαί), “powers” (ἐξουσίαι), “rulers of the darkness of this world,” and “spiritual powers of wickedness in heavenly places” (or things”) (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις); and in all as “wrestling” against the soul of man. The same reference is made less explicitly in <sup><6188></sup>Romans 8:38 and <sup><51215></sup>Colossians 2:15. In <sup><6127></sup>Revelation 12:7-9 they are spoken of as fighting with “the dragon, the old serpent called the devil and Satan,” against “Michael and his angels,” and as cast out of heaven with their chiefs. Taking all these passages together, we find them sharing the enmity to God and man implied in the name and nature of Satan; but their power and action are but little dwelt upon in comparison with his. That there is against us a power of spiritual wickedness is a truth which we need to know, and a mystery which only revelation can disclose; but whether it is exercised by few or by many is a matter of comparative indifference.

But the evil one is not only the “prince of the demons,” but also he is called the “prince of this world” (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) in <sup><61231></sup>John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11, and even the “god of this world” (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) in <sup><4041></sup>2 Corinthians 4:4; the two expressions being united in the words τὸν κοσμοκράτορα τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, used in <sup><4012></sup>Ephesians 6:12. (The word κόσμος, properly referring to the system of the universe, and so used in <sup><6100></sup>John 1, is generally applied in Scripture to human society as alienated from God, with a reference to the “pomp and vanity” which make it an idol [see, e.g., 1 John 2]; αἰών refers to its transitory character, and is evidently used above to qualify the startling application of the word θεός, a “god of an age” being of course no true God at all. It is used with κόσμος in <sup><4012></sup>Ephesians 2:2.) This power he claimed for himself *as a delegated authority* in the temptation of our Lord (<sup><4016></sup>Luke 4:6), and the temptation would have been unreal had he spoken altogether falsely. It implies another kind of indirect influence exercised through earthly instruments. There are some indications in Scripture of the exercise of this power through inanimate instruments, of an influence over the powers of nature, and what men call the “chances” of life. Such a power is distinctly asserted in the case of Job, and probably implied in the case of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (in <sup><41316></sup>Luke 13:16), and of Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” (<sup><47127></sup>2 Corinthians 12:7). It is only consistent with the attribution of such action to the angels of God (as in <sup><12123></sup>Exodus 12:23; <sup><12416></sup>2 Samuel 24:16; <sup><12195></sup>2 Kings 19:35; <sup><41223></sup>Acts 12:23), and, in our ignorance of the method of connection of the second causes of

nature with the supreme will of God, we cannot even say whether it has in it any antecedent improbability; but it is little dwelt upon in Scripture in comparison with the other exercise of this power through the hands of wicked men, who become “children of the devil,” and accordingly “do the lusts of their father.” (See <sup><4184></sup>John 8:44; <sup><4430></sup>Acts 13:10; <sup><6188></sup>1 John 3:8-10; — and comp. <sup><6160></sup>John 6:70.) In this sense the Scripture regards all sins as the “works of the devil,” and traces to him, through his ministers, all spiritual evil and error (<sup><4714></sup>2 Corinthians 11:14, 15), and all the persecution and hindrances which oppose the Gospel (<sup><6120></sup>Revelation 2:10; <sup><5128></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:18). Most of all is this indirect action of Satan manifested in those who deliberately mislead and tempt men, and who at last, independent of any interest of their own, come to take an unnatural pleasure in the sight of evil doing in others (<sup><6132></sup>Romans 1:32).

The *method* of his action is best discerned by an examination of the title by which he is designated in Scripture. He is called emphatically **ὁ διάβολος**, “the devil.” The derivation of the word in itself implies only the endeavor to break the bonds between others and “set them at variance” (see, e.g., Plato, *Symp.* p. 222 c, **διαβάλλειν ἐμὲ καὶ Ἀγάθωνα**); but common usage adds to this general sense the special idea of “setting at variance by slander.” In the New Test. the word **διάβολοι** is used three times as an epithet (<sup><5481></sup>1 Timothy 3:11; <sup><5888></sup>2 Timothy 3:3; <sup><5688></sup>Titus 2:3), and in each case with something like the special meaning. In the application of the title to Satan both the general and special senses should be kept in view. His general object is to break the bonds of communion between God and man, and the bonds of truth and love which bind men to each other to “set” each soul “at variance” both with men and God, and so reduce it to that state of self will and selfishness which is the seed plot of sin. One special means by which he seeks to do this is slander of God to man and of man to God.

The slander of God to man is seen best in the words of <sup><6084></sup>Genesis 3:4, 5: “Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day that ye eat thereof your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” These words contain the germ of the false notions which keep men from God, or reduce their service to him to a hard and compulsory slavery, and which the heathen so often adopted in all their hideousness, when they represented their gods as either careless of human weal and woe or “envious” of human excellence and happiness. They attribute selfishness and jealousy to the giver of all good. This is enough (even without the imputation of falsehood which is added) to pervert man’s natural love of



freedom till it rebels against that which is made to appear as a hard and arbitrary tyranny, and seeks to set up, as it thinks, a freer and nobler standard of its own. Such is the slander of God to man, by which Satan and his agents still strive against his reuniting grace.

The slander of man to God is illustrated by the book of Job (<sup><800B></sup>Job 1:9-11; 2:4, 5). In reference to it. Satan is called the “adversary” (ἀντίδικος) of man in <sup><08B></sup>1 Peter 5:8, and represented in that character in <sup><800B></sup>Zechariah 3:1, 2; and more plainly still designated in <sup><620B></sup>Revelation 12:10 as “the accuser of our brethren, who accused them before our God day and night.” It is difficult for us to understand what can be the need of accusation, or the power of slander, under the all-searching eye of God. The mention of it is clearly an “accommodation” of God’s judgment to the analog of our human experience; but we understand by it a practical and awful truth, that every sin of life, and even the admixture of lower and evil motives which taints the best actions of man, will rise up against us at the judgment to claim the soul as their own, and fix forever that separation from God to which, through them, we have yielded ourselves. In that accusation Satan shall in some way bear a leading part, pleading against man, with that worst of slander which is based on perverted or isolated facts; and shall be overcome, not by any counterclaim of human merit, but “by the blood of the lamb” received in true and steadfast faith.

But these points, important as they are, are of less moment than the disclosure of the method of Satanic action upon the heart itself. It may be summed up in two words — temptation and possession.

The subject of temptation is illustrated, not only by abstract statements, but also by the record of the temptations of Adam and of our Lord. It is expressly laid down (as in <sup><500B></sup>James 1:2-4) that “temptation,” properly so called, i.e. “trial” (πειρασμός), is essential to man, and is accordingly ordained for him and sent to him by God (as in <sup><020B></sup>Genesis 22:1). Man’s nature is progressive; his faculties, which exist at first only in capacity (δυνάμει), must be brought out to exist in actual efficiency (ἐνεργείᾳ) by free exercise. His appetites and passions tend to their objects, simply and unreservedly, without respect to the rightness or wrongness of their obtaining them; they need to be checked by the reason and conscience, and this need constitutes a trial in which, if the conscience prevail, the spirit receives strength and growth; if it be overcome, the lower nature tends to predominate, and the man has fallen away. Besides this, the will itself

delights in independence of action. Such independence of physical compulsion is its high privilege; but there is over it the moral power of God's law, which, by the very fact of its truth and goodness, acknowledged as they are by the reason and the conscience, should regulate the human will. The need of giving up the individual will, freely and by conviction, so as to be in harmony with the will of God, is a still severer trial, with the reward of still greater spiritual progress if we sustain it, with the punishment of a subtler and more dangerous fall if we succumb. In its struggle the spirit of man can only gain and sustain its authority by that constant grace of God, given through communion of the Holy Spirit, which is the breath of spiritual life.

It is this tentability of man, even in his original nature, which is represented in Scripture as giving scope to the evil action of Satan. He is called the "tempter" (as in <sup><400B></sup>Matthew 4:3; <sup><300B></sup>1 Thessalonians 3:5). He has power (as the record of <sup><000B></sup>Genesis 3 shows clearly), first, to present to the appetites or passions their objects in vivid and captivating forms, so as to induce man to seek these objects against the law of God "written in the heart;" and next, to act upon the false desire of the will for independence, the desire "to be as gods, knowing" (that is, practically, judging and determining) "good and evil." It is a power which can be resisted, because it is under the control and overruling power of God, as is emphatically laid down in <sup><600B></sup>1 Corinthians 10:13; <sup><500B></sup>James 4:7, etc.; but it can be so resisted only by yielding to the grace of God, and by a struggle (sometimes an "agony") in reliance on its strength.

It is exercised both negatively and positively. Its negative exercise is referred to in the parable of the sower, as taking away the word, the "engrafted word" (<sup><300B></sup>James 1:21) of grace, i.e. as interposing itself, by consent of man, between him and the channels of God's grace. Its positive exercise is set forth in the parable of the wheat and the tares, represented as sowing actual seed of evil in the individual heart or the world generally; and it is to be noticed that the consideration of the true nature of the tares ( $\zeta\iota\zeta\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$ ) leads to the conclusion, which is declared plainly in <sup><400B></sup>2 Corinthians 11:14, viz. that evil is introduced into the heart mostly as the counterfeit of good.

This exercise of the tempter's power is possible, even against a sinless nature. We see this in the temptation of our Lord. The temptations presented to him appeal, first, to the natural desire and need of food; next,

to the desire of power, to be used for good, which is inherent in the noblest minds; and, lastly, to the desire of testing and realizing God's special protection, which is the inevitable tendency of human weakness, under a real but imperfect faith. The objects contemplated involved in no case positive sinfulness; the temptation was to seek them by presumptuous or by unholy means; the answer to them (given by the Lord as the Son of Man, and therefore as one like ourselves in all the weakness and finiteness of our nature) lay in simple faith, resting upon God, and on his word, keeping to his way, and refusing to contemplate the issues of action, which belong to him alone. Such faith is a renunciation of all self confidence, and a simple dependence on the will and on the grace of God.

But in the temptation of a fallen nature Satan has a greater power. Every sin committed makes a man the "servant of sin" for the future (~~4083~~ John 8:34; ~~4066~~ Romans 6:16); it therefore creates in the spirit of man a positive tendency to evil, which sympathizes with, and aids the temptation of the evil one. This is a fact recognized by experience; the doctrine of Scripture, inscrutably mysterious, but unmistakably declared, is that, since the fall, this evil tendency is born in man in capacity, prior to all actual sins, and capable of being brought out into active existence by such actual sins committed. It is this which Paul calls "a law," i.e. (according to his universal use of the word) an external power "of sin" over man, bringing the inner man (the *νοῦς*) into captivity (~~4074~~ Romans 7:14-24). Its power is broken by the atonement and the gift of the Spirit, but yet not completely cast out; it still "lusts against the spirit" so that men "cannot do the things which they would" (~~4057~~ Galatians 5:17). It is to this spiritual power of evil, the tendency to falsehood, cruelty, pride, and unbelief, independently of any benefits to be derived from them, that Satan is said to appeal in tempting us. If his temptations be yielded to without repentance, it becomes the reprobate (*ἄδούκιμος*) mind, which delights in evil for its own sake (~~4028~~ Romans 1:28, 32), and makes men emphatically "children of the devil" (~~4084~~ John 8:44; ~~4450~~ Acts 13:10; ~~6188~~ 1 John 3:8,10) and "accursed" (~~4254~~ Matthew 25:41), fit for "the fire prepared for the devil and his angels." If they be resisted, as by God's grace they may be resisted, then the evil power (the "*flesh*" or the "old man") is gradually "crucified" or "mortified" until the soul is prepared for that heaven where no evil can enter.

This twofold power of temptation is frequently referred to in Scripture as exercised chiefly by the suggestion of evil thoughts, but occasionally by the delegated power of Satan over outward circumstances. To this latter

power is to be traced (as has been said) the trial of Job by temporal loss and bodily suffering (<K001>Job 1, 2), the remarkable expression used by our Lord as to the woman with a “spirit of infirmity” (<P036>Luke 13:16), the “thorn in the flesh.” which Paul calls the “messenger of Satan” to buffet him (<P127>2 Corinthians 12:7). Its language is plain, incapable of being explained as metaphor or poetical personification of an abstract principle. Its general statements are illustrated by examples of temptation. (See, besides those already mentioned, <P216>Luke 22:5, John 23:27 [Judas]; <P223>Luke 22:31 [Peter]; <P418>Acts 5:3 [Ananias and Sapphira]; <P415>1 Corinthians 7:5; <P421>2 Corinthians 2:11; <P518>1 Thessalonians 3:5.) The subject itself is the most startling form of the mystery of evil; it is one on which, from our ignorance of the connection of the first cause with second causes in nature, and of the process of origination of human thought, experience can hardly be held to be competent either to confirm or to oppose the testimony of Scripture.

It is of no avail that there are difficulties connected with the agency ascribed to Satan. Objections are of little weight when brought against well-authenticated facts. Any objections raised against the agency of Satan are equally valid against his existence. If he exists, he must act; and if he is evil, his agency must be evil. The fact of such an agency being revealed as it is, is every way as consonant with reason and religious consciousness as are the existence and agency of good angels. Neither reason nor consciousness could by itself establish such a fact; but all the testimony they are capable of adducing is in agreement with the Scripture representation on the subject.

On the subject of demonical possession (q.v.) it is sufficient here to remark that although widely different in form, yet it is of the same intrinsic character as the other power of Satan, including both that external and internal influence to which reference has been made above. It is disclosed to us only in connection with the revelation of that redemption from sin which destroys it — a revelation begun in the first promise in Eden, and manifested in itself at the atonement in its effects at the great day. Its end is seen in the Apocalypse, where Satan is first “bound — *for* a thousand years,” then set free for a time for the last conflict, and finally “cast into the lake of fire and brimstone ... for ever and ever” (20:2, 7-10).

**V. Traditions.** — According to the Mohammedans, who have derived their account from Jewish traditions, Satan, or, as they sometimes call him,

*Eblis*, was an archangel whom God employed to destroy the Jinns or Genii, a race intermediate between men and angels, who tenanted the earth before the creation of Adam. In riches, power, and magnificence, the pre-Adamite sultans of the Jinns far surpassed any height to which monarchs of the human race have attained; but the pride with which such glories inspired them filled them with impiety, and their monstrous crimes at length provoked the wrath of the Omnipotent. Satan was then commissioned to destroy them; he exterminated the greater part of the perfidious race, and compelled the rest to seek refuge in the caves beneath the mighty Kaf, or mountain framework which supports the universe. This victory filled Satan with pride; and when God, after the creation of Adam, required all the celestial intelligences to worship the new being, Satan and his adherents peremptorily refused, upon which he was driven from heaven, and the faithful angels threw great stones at him to accelerate his flight. Hence the common Mohammedan saying, "God preserve us from Satan who was stoned!" In revenge for this misfortune, Satan resolved to procure the expulsion of our first parents from paradise; but when he presented himself at the gate of the garden, he was refused admittance by the guard. On this he begged each of the animals, one after another, to carry him in, that he might speak to Adam and his wife; but they all refused him except the serpent, who took him between two of his teeth and thus carried him in. See D'Herlelot, *Biblioth. Orientate*, s.v. *SEE SUPERSTITION*.

**VI. Literature.** — Lists of works on this subject are given by Danz, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, s. vv. "Satan," "Teufel;" Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* Colossians 1384. 1680 sq.; and Malcom, *Theolog. Index*, s.v. See also Tweedie, *Satan as revealed in Scripture* (Edinb. 1862); Snope, *Satanic Influence* (Lond. 1854); Cowan, *idem* (ibid. 1861); and the monographs referred to under *SEE DAEMON*; *SEE DEVIL*; *SEE POSSESSED*.

### Satan, Depths Of

(~~¶~~ Revelation 2:24), probably were the mysteries of the Nicolaitans, the Simonians, and other early Gnostics, who concealed their errors under deep abstruseness derived from wild speculations of Oriental philosophy, spoke of certain intelligences which created the world, but were in opposition to the Creator. They taught a profound knowledge of the nature of angels and their different degrees. They seem to have had secret books, written in an abstruse and mysterious style. *SEE Gnostics*.

## Satan, Synagogue Of

(~~am~~ Revelation 2:9, 13), probably denotes the unbelieving Jews at Smyrna, the false zealots for the law of Moses, who at the beginning were the most eager persecutors of the Christians. They were very numerous at Smyrna, where Polycarp was bishop, to whom John writes. *SEE SMYRNA*.

## Satanaël

a being whom the Bogomiles (q.v.) of the 12th century regarded as the first-born son of the supreme God, who sat at the right hand of God, holding the second place after him. To each of the higher spirits they believed that God had committed a particular administration, while Satanael was placed over all his universal vicegerents; but, having apostatized, he persuaded his companions in apostasy to create a new heaven and a new earth, which should be an empire independent of the supreme God. He ruled in the world which he had created, bringing many thousands to ruin by his seductive wiles. But the good God resolved to rescue men from the dominion of Satanael and to deprive him of power. This was accomplished by the Logos, who became incarnate, or, rather, took an ethereal body, which resembled an earthly body only in its outward appearance. Satanael was deprived by Christ of his divine power, and obliged to give up the name of *El* and retain only that of *Satan*. This doctrine has a marked resemblance to that of the Euchites.

## Satanamis

a Hindu sect who profess to adore the true name alone, the one God, the cause and creator of all things. They borrow their notions of creation from the Vedantic philosophy. Worldly existence is with them illusion, or the work of Maya. They acknowledge the whole of the Hindu gods, and, although they profess to worship but one God, they pay reverence to what they consider manifestations of his nature visible in the Avatars, particularly Rama and Krishna. They use distinctive marks, and wear a double string of silk bound around the right wrist. They do not uniformly employ frontal lines, but some make a perpendicular streak with ashes of a burned offering to Hanuman. Their moral system approaches that of the Hindu Quietists or the Greek Stoics, consisting chiefly of a spirit of rigid indifference to the world, its pleasures and its pains, advantages and disadvantages; and a strict adherence to all ordinary social and religious

duties, combined with the calm hope of final absorption into the one spirit which pervades all things.

### Satanians

a branch of the Messalians, who appeared about A.D. 390. They derived their name from the theory which they are alleged to have held, that the power of Satan over men makes it right for them to pray that he will not exercise it to their harm. This opinion seems to be the same as that on which the worship of the Yezedees (q.v.) is grounded.

### Satanniani

Heretics of this name are mentioned by the author of *Predestinatus* as having derived their name from Satanius, and as maintaining the opinion that the resurrection of the dead will be a restoration of bodies and souls to exactly the same condition in which they exist during the present life. This seems to be the same heresy which is numbered the *eightieth* by Philaster and the *sixty-seventh* by Augustine, and to whose adherents the name *Æternales* is given by Danreus in his tract on Augustine's treatise on heresies.

### Satanow, Isaac Ha-Levi

a Jewish writer, was a native of Satanow, in Russian Poland, where he was born in the year 1732. In 1772 he came to Berlin, where he began to issue those works for which he had prepared himself in his native place, and which have secured him a lasting memorial in Hebrew literature and Biblical exegesis. His works are, a short Hebrew grammar, entitled **twnnr ytpç 8s**, *The Joyful Lips* (Berl. 1773): **tma tpç**, a Hebrew dictionary in the manner of Kimchi's: **µyçrçh 8s** (ibid. 1787; Prague, 1804): **ydj a µyrbd**; on the synonyms and homonyms of the Hebrew language (Berl. 1787; Prague, 1804): — **hpç tj a**, a Hebrew dictionary, also called **µyçrçh8s** (Berl. 1787): — A Hebrew commentary on and German translation of Job (ibid. 1799). Besides these, Satanow has also written several works of gnomes and apothegms in imitation of the Psalms and Proverbs, as well as grammatical notes on all the difficult passages of the Old Test. which have not as yet been published. Satanow died in 1802. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 251 sq.; Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte d. jüdische Poesie*, p. 115 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, 3, 398, etc.; Kitto, *Cyclop.*

s.v.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Lit.* p. 395; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 11, 132 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliograph. Handb.* p. 124; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl.* p. 2502. (B.P.)

## Satervis

in Persian mythology, is a prince of the stars and good genius who protects the region of the west, and is a leader in the contest with Ahriman. He raises the water from the sea and spreads it over the land in the form of rain.

## Sathrabuza'nes

(**Σαθραβουζάνης**), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 6:3, 7, 27 [7:1]) of the Chaldee name (<sup><488B></sup>Ezra 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13) SHETHAR-BOZNAI **SEE SHETHAR-BOZNAI** (q.v.).

## Satisfaction

(expressed in Hebrew by **al** **מ**; *to fill*; [**bōc**; *to satiate*; and **hwr**; *to glut*; in Greek [according to the A.V.] by less distinctive terms, **χορτάζω**, *to fodder*; once [<sup><5123></sup>Colossians 2:23] **πλησιμονή**, *satiety*), in general, signifies the act of giving complete or perfect pleasure. In the Christian system it denotes that which Christ did and suffered in order to satisfy divine justice, to secure the honors of the divine government, and thereby make an atonement for the sins of his people (Heb, **rp̄k**, *to atone for*). This use of the word *satisfaction* is taken from the sense of the word in the Roman law, viz. contenting an aggrieved person by some consideration consistent with a remission of the debt or offence for which the satisfaction is offered. The death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice was the satisfaction for the sins of the world (<sup><481D></sup>1 John 2:2; <sup><4851></sup>Romans 5:11). Satisfaction is, in fact, propitiation and atonement. Christ's satisfaction is vicarious and expiatory, being made for us and instead of us or our act, we having ourselves no power of offering satisfaction to the offended majesty of heaven. Satisfaction is distinguished from merit thus: The satisfaction of Christ consists in his answering the demands of the law on man, which were consequent on the breach of it. These were answered by suffering its penalty. The merit of Christ consists in what he did to fulfill what the law demanded before man sinned, which was obedience. The satisfaction of Christ is to free us from misery, and the merit of Christ is to procure happiness for us. See Owen, *On the Satisfaction of Christ*; Gill, *Body of*



*Div. s.v.*; Stillingfleet, *On Satisfaction*; Watts, *Redeemer and Sanctifier*, p. 28, 32; Hervey, *Theron and Aspasio*. **SEE ATONEMENT**; **SEE PROPITIATION**.

## Satisfaction, Romish

The catechism of the Council of Trent defines “satisfaction” as “the compensation made by man to God by doing something in atonement for the sins which he has committed.” The satisfaction which Christ makes on the cross, it is declared, ‘gives to man’s actions merit before God.’ “Canonical satisfaction” is something — prayer, fasting, or alms — deeds — “which is imposed by the priest, and must be accompanied with a deliberate and firm purpose carefully to avoid sin for the future.” This satisfaction is directed by the Council of Trent to be proportioned to the nature of the offence and the capability of the offender. It directly opposes the doctrine of justification by faith only, and is closely connected with the Romish notion of the merits of good works. **SEE PENANCE**.

## Satnius

in Greek mythology, was a son of Enops and the naiad or nymph of the stream Satniois. He was slain by Ajax, the son of Oileus.

## Satrap

(Heb. *achashdarpen*’, **Ῥεϐνῖ ἄ**) Sept. **σατραπης** and **στρατηγός**; Vulg. *satrapes*; A.V. ‘ruler of provinces;’ **Ῥεϐνῖ** Esther 3:12; 8:9; 9:3; and with the Chaldee termination, **Ῥεϐνῖ** Daniel 3:2, 3, 27; 6:2, 3). The genuine form of this name has been found in Indian inscriptions to be *ksatrapa*, i.e. *warrior of the host* (see Benfey, in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1839, p. 805 sq.; Lassen, *Zeitschrift. d. Morgenl.* 3, 161), to which the Greek **ἑξατραπης** or **ἑξαθιράπης** corresponds (Böckh, *Corp. Inscr.* No. 2691 c), from which the softer form *satrapes* gradually arose and passed into modern languages (Gesenius, *Thesaur. s.v.*). “These satraps are known in ancient history as the governors or viceroys of the provinces into which the Persian empire was divided. Strictly speaking, they had an extended civil jurisdiction over several smaller provinces, each of which had its own **h j p**, or governor. Thus Zerubbabel and Nehemiah were ‘governors’ of Judea under the Persian satraps of Syria (**Ῥεϐνῖ** Ezra 4:3, 6; **Ῥεϐνῖ** Nehemiah 2:9). The power and functions of the Persian satraps were not materially different from those of the modern Persian governors and Turkish pashas; and, indeed, the idea of

provincial government by means of viceroys intrusted with almost regal powers in their several jurisdictions, and responsible only to the king, by whom they are appointed, has always been prevalent in the East. The important peculiarity and distinction in the ancient Persian government, as admirably shown by Heeren (*Researches*, 1, 489 sq.), was that the civil and military powers were carefully separated — the satrap being a very powerful civil and political chief, but having no immediate control over the troops and garrisons, the commanders of which were responsible only to the king. The satraps, in their several provinces, employed themselves in the maintenance of order and the regulation of affairs; and they also collected and remitted to the court the stipulated tribute, clear of all charges for local government and for the maintenance of the troops (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8, 6, § 1-3). In later times this prudent separation of powers became neglected in favor of royal princes and other great persons (Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 1, § 2), who were intrusted with the military as well as civil power in their governments to which cause may be attributed the revolt of the younger Cyrus, and the other rebellions and civil wars, which, by weakening the empire, facilitated its ultimate subjugation by Alexander.” *SEE PERSIA.*

### Satrapes

in Greek mythology, was a name under which a bronze statue was erected to Neptune, first at Samicum, and afterwards in Elis, which was constantly covered with a robe of woolen, another of linen, and a third of byssus.

### Satshi

in Hindu mythology, was the wife of the sun god Indra.

### Satterlee, Alfred Brown,

a Baptist missionary, was born at Sheldon, N.Y., Oct. 26, 1823, and was a graduate of Brown University, in the class of 1852. He pursued his theological studies at the Rochester Theological Seminary, and received his appointment as a missionary of the American Baptist Missionary Union in 1853, and was set apart for the Arracan mission. He reached the field of his labors, Akyab, in Sept., 1855. He was not permitted to perform much service for his Master. At the early age of thirty-two he died of the cholera, July 1, 1856. (J.C.S.)

## Satterpai

in Persian mythology, is the heaven of the fixed stars supposed to be situated below the heaven of the moon, and presided over by twelve genii of the twelve signs of the zodiac.

## Sattiwodi

in Hindu mythology, is a daughter of the king Dassarayen, who was first married to Parassen and afterwards to Sandanen.

## Saturday

(*Saturn's day*) was, next to the Lord's day, held by the ancient Christians in great veneration, and, especially in the Eastern parts, honored with all the public solemnities of religion. This observance of the day was, doubtless, out of respect to the feelings of the Jews, who were generally the first converts to the Christian faith, and who still retained great reverence for the Sabbath. The Western Church regarded it as a fast, but the Greek Church observed it as a festival, one Sabbath (Saturday) only excepted. This was called the Great Sabbath, between Good Friday and Easter day, when our Savior lay buried, upon which account it was kept as a fast throughout the whole Church. Athanasius (*Hom. de Semente*, tom. 1, p. 1060) tells us that they assembled on Saturdays — not that they were infected with Judaism, but only to worship Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath. So far as concerns public worship, Saturday was made in all things conformable to that of the Lord's day. The Scriptures were read, as on the Lord's day, sermons preached, and the communion administered. A preference, however, was given to the Lord's day, for there were no laws forbidding lawsuits, pleadings, public shows, and games on that day. Nor were men obliged to abstain wholly from bodily labor, but, on the contrary, the Council of Laodicea (*August. Ep.* 118) has a canon forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the Sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship. The reason for the Latin Church keeping Saturday as a fast is given by pope Innocent in his epistle to the bishop of Eugubium: "If we commemorate Christ's resurrection not only at Easter, but every Lord's day, and fast upon Friday because it was the day of his passion, we ought not to pass by Saturday, which is the middle time between the days of grief and joy." He therefore concludes that Saturday ought to be kept as a fast (*Innocent. Ep. ad Decium Eugubin.* c. 4). This was the general practice, and yet in Italy itself it was otherwise at Milan,

where Saturday was a festival. The Saturdays in Ember weeks are called "in XII Lections," from the six Gospels read both in Latin and Greek. See Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Church*, p. 1137 sq.; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 652 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archceol. s.v.*

## Saturn, Or Kronos,

### Picture for Saturn

Was a principal deity in Greek and Roman mythology. The old Italic Saturn, whose name indicates that he was a god of harvests, and the old Grecian Kronos, a thoroughly symbolic being, which, like his brothers, the Titans, is suggestive of the primeval and uniform forces of nature, and has a probable though partial connection with the Phoenician Moloch (q.v.), are deities of two religions which often diverge from each other; and a modern learned mythology, which everywhere intermixes Greek and Roman elements, has met with but indifferent success in the endeavor to combine the two gods into one. Kronos, the son of Uranus and Gæa, was the most cunning of the Titans. His mother had given birth to the Centimani and the Cyclops, and Uranus had confined them in the underworld on account of their monstrous shapes and strength. Enraged by this action, Gæa proposed to her younger children to avenge their brothers; but they all shrank from laying violent hands on their father, with the exception of Kronos, who hid himself, and at night emasculated Uranus and threw the generative organs down upon the earth, thereby fructifying it. Kronos then married the Titaness Rhea, from whom sprang the entire race of the gods who ruled the world. To avoid a prophecy by his parents which foretold that one of his children should dethrone him, he swallowed all his children immediately after their birth, excepting Jupiter, whom Rhea saved by giving Kronos a stone wrapped in cloths instead. The child grew rapidly, and attained in a single year to extraordinary size and strength. Metis (cunning) now gave him an emetic, which he administered to Kronos, with the result that he cast up all the children he had swallowed, together with the stone. The latter was placed for a memorial at the foot of Mount Parnassus, and Jupiter conspired with his brothers and sisters to dethrone their father, whom he mutilated as Uranus had been; but when he sought to secure the throne for himself the Titans resisted, with the result that after ten years' war Jupiter released the Centimani and the Cyclops, and with their aid overcame the Titans, whom he imprisoned in the dungeon where the Cyclops had lain. The division of authority was then

determined among the Kronidae by lot, Pluto receiving the earth, Neptune the sea, and Jupiter the heavens and supreme authority over all. The dethroned Kronos or Saturn, it is said, now fled to Italy and inaugurated the golden age. Men lived, like the gods, without care, in uninterrupted happiness, health, and strength; they did not grow old; and to them death was a slumber which relieved them of their present nature and transformed them into daemons. The earth yielded every kind of fruit, and gave up all its treasures without cultivation and labor. Under the reign of Saturn men lived the life of paradise. To keep alive the recollection of this primitive life of innocence, freedom, and equality, the festival (of the Saturnalia was instituted at Rome, which began on Dec. 17, and continued, first a single day, but afterwards for longer periods, until in the time of the emperors it extended over an entire week. During its continuance all business was interrupted; all distinctions between masters and slaves were laid aside, so that slaves sat at the sumptuous table and masters waited on them, and every form of recreation was allowed. In Greece Kronos or Saturn possessed temples of extremely ancient date. His temple at Rome stood at the foot of the Capitol, and served as an archive of the State and also as its treasury. The god is usually represented as bearing a sickle. The scythe, wings, and hourglass, which are likewise often introduced in such representations, are added notions of more recent date, and resulted from a change in the mode of conceiving of the god. The Persians gave this deity an almost wholly animal representation: the lower parts of the body resemble those of swine, a human body with arms is added, and an animal head with crown completes the figure.

### Saturn, The Planet

seems to be named as an object of worship in ~~<sup>3016>~~ Amos 5:26, under the title *Kiyun*, <sup>WYKaw</sup> where it is said of the Israelites in the wilderness, "Ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and *Chiun*, your images," etc.; for a similar word is the name of this star in both Syriac and Arabic (comp. Aben-Ezra, *ad loc.*), and it is known that the ancient Arabians strove to propitiate Saturn as a star of evil influence (see Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 103, 120, ed. nov.; comp. Norberg, *Onomast. Cod. Nas.* p. 78 sq.; Ephrem Syr. *Opp.* 2, 458; Propert. 4, 1, 104; Lucan, 1, 652; Juvenal, 6, 569). On account of its distance from the sun it was considered by the ancient astronomers as having a cold nature (Pliny, 2, 6, p. 75 ed. Hard.), and they ascribed to it heavy storms of rain (*ibid.* 2, 39; see Harduin, *ad*

*loc.*; see also, on its evil influence, Macrobius, *Saturn*, 1, 19, p. 95, 97 Bip.; **SEE MOLOCH**). The Sept. has **Ραιφάν**; comp. ~~447B~~ Acts 7:43, where the MSS. vary much (see Griesb. *ad loc.*; comp. O. Müller, in the *Bibl. Lubec.* 7:469 sq.), but the best read **Ρηφάν**. This is a Coptic word, as Kircher has shown from an Arabico-Coptic inscription (*Ling. Aeg. Restit* p. 49; *Oedip. Aeg.* p. 1, 386 sq.). Seyffarth would derive it from PE, *to make or be*, and **ουοειν**, *light*, i.e. *shining* (comp. Tatius Isag. in *Arati Phoen.* c. 17). Jablonski, however (*Remph. .Egypt. Deus* [Frankfort and Leips. 1731], also in his *Opusc.* 2, 1 sq., and in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 23), would deny that this and the other names of planets associated with it in the inscription are Egyptian, and renders the word as Ethiopic, *king of heaven*, i.e. *sun* (comp. *Opusc.* 1, 230 sq.), from *ro*, “king,” and *phéh*, “heaven.” [Hence the true reading would be **Ρομφά**.] Then we must understand the passage in Amos to refer to the worship of Osiris. But there is little evidence for the reading with **μ**. Ign. Rossi (*Etymol. Egypt.* [Rome, 1808] p. 176) explains **Ρεμφά** as meaning *inhabitant of heaven*, from *phéh*, “heaven,” and *rene*, “inhabitant” (comp. Coptic version of ~~465B~~ 1 Corinthians 15:48 sq.). But this is not striking. More recently, Hengstenberg agrees with Jablonski in rejecting all glosses, and has returned to the old view that **Ρηφάν** is the mistake of a scribe for *Kiyun*, or *Riyun* (*Authent. des Pentat.* 1, 110 sq.); yet this seems too hasty; and Kircher’s view is supported by some well acquainted with the Coptic, and is defended by Baur (*Comment. ad loc.*) and Winer, who considers the rendering of Hengstenberg (*Gestell eurer Bilder*, i.e. *the frame or support of your images*) as without force, though Hitzig and Ewald adopt it. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* 2, 669 sq.) renders *statuam idolorum vestrorum*, i.e. *statue of your idols*, which is without good reason. (Comp., in gen., Braun, *Selecta Sacra*, p. 477 sq.; Maius and Schwab, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 23 [but these are unimportant]; Schröder, *De Tabernac. Mol. et Stella Dei Rempha* [Marb. 1745].) Rosenmüller denies that the Sept. renders *Kiyun* by **Ραιφάν**, but refers it as a word of explanation to *elohekem* **μkyhēa**; *your gods*. But this is with little reason. An attempt has been made to connect Saturn with the Jewish Sabbath, as the *day of Saturn*. See, *contra*, Bähr, *Symbol.* 2, 584. Wolff’s *Diss.* 1. *de Chiun et Remph.* (Leips. 1741) is unimportant. **SEE CHIUN**.

## Saturnalia

the festival of Saturnus, to whom the people of Latium attributed the introduction of agriculture and the arts of civilized life. It was kept towards the end of December, as a sort of harvest home, during which business was suspended; courts and schools were closed; no war was commenced or malefactor punished; slaves were relieved from ordinary labor, and, dressed in their masters' clothes, were waited upon by them at the table. Saturnus being an ancient national god of Latium, the institution of the Saturnalia is lost in the most remote antiquity. One legend ascribes it to Janus, another (by Varro) to the Pelasgi, while a third tradition represented certain followers of Hercules, whom he had left behind on his return to Greece, as the authors of the festival. At first only one day was set apart for the sacred rites of Saturnus, but additions were gradually made until it occupied seven days. In reality, during the empire, three different festivals were celebrated. First came the *Saturnalia* proper, commencing on XVI Kal. Dec., followed by the *Opalia*, anciently coincident with the *Sigillaria*, so called from little earthenware figures (*sigilla oscilla*) exposed for sale at this season.

## Saturnia And Saturnius

in Greek mythology, were appellatives of *Juno* and *Jupiter*, derived from their father Saturn.

## Saturninians, Saturnians, Or Saturnines

an early sect of Syrian Gnostics, followers of Saturninus (q.v.) or Saturnilus. The theories of Saturninus are only known through the work of Irenaeus *Against Heresies*. In this he states that Saturninus, like Menander, taught that there is one supreme Unknown, the Father (Πατήρ ἄγνωστος) The Father, he taught, was without origin, bodiless and formless, and never had in reality appeared to men; the God of the Jews was only an angel. A number of spiritual beings were created by him in successive gradations, in the lowest of which came the spirits of the seven planets. These seven, of whom the God of the Jews was chief, created the world, man, and all things. They had not power to make man an erect being, and so he continued to crawl upon the earth like a worm until the Supreme sent forth a spark of life, which gave him an erect posture, compacted his joints, and made him to live. Man now for the first time becomes possessed of a soul, and the godlike germ is destined to unfold itself in those human natures where it has been implanted, to distinct personality, and to return after a

determinate period to the original Fountain of Life. Saturninus taught that the Savior, whom he calls Aeon, **ϐοϐς** came to destroy the Demiurge, who was the God of the Jews; that he was without birth, without body, without figure, and only in appearance a man. He accounted for the existence of good and evil men by affirming that they were originally created of two kinds, the one good, whom Christ came to save, the other wicked, whom the devils succor, and whom Christ will destroy. The Saturninians considered marriage to be of Satan; they abstained from animal food, and taught that some prophecies came from the spirits who made the world, and some from Satan. Their doctrines led to a strict asceticism, and also to the celibacy of following times; they were based on dualism, and resembled those of the Docetae. As these heretics are not mentioned by St. Clement of Alexandria, it is probable — that they were not much known out of Syria, and that they were few in number. See Blunt, *Hist. of Sects*, s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1, 280 sq.

### Saturninus

a native of Antioch, in Syria, and a disciple of Menander. He was founder of a sect of Gnostics, called after him *Saturninians* (q.v.). He flourished A.D. 117-138.

### Saturninus

a Christian martyr under Diocletian, was a priest of Albitina, in Africa, who, having been informed against for officiating in his clerical capacity, was apprehended and sent to Carthage to be examined before Amelinus. On his examination, Saturninus vindicated the Christian religion with great eloquence. By command of the proconsul he was tortured and remanded to prison, where he died of starvation, about A.D. 305. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 48.

### Satyr,

### Picture for Satyr

The rendering in **Ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ** Isaiah 13:21; 34:14, of the Hebrews word ‘**ry**[**ⲁ** sair’, which properly means *hairy*; hence a *goat*, especially a *he-goat* (comp. Lat. *hircus*, from *hirsutus*, *hirtus*), and is so rendered in **Ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ** Leviticus 4:24; **Ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ** 2 Chronicles 29:23, and often. The Sept. has, in the



passages in Isaiah, **δαμόνιον**, *demon*; and so the Eng. A.V., in <sup><44115></sup>2 Chronicles 11:15, ‘devil.’ These beings are mentioned in Isaiah as the inhabitants of desert places, but particularly the ruins of Babylon and Petra, where they dance and call to each other. The Greeks probably derived their belief in the existence of beings half men and half goats from the Eastern nations, whose mythology abounds with such fabulous animals, but there is no reason to believe that they formed any part of the Jewish superstitions. Yet it has been supposed by some that Isaiah alludes to the spectral beings which the ancient Persians, the Jews, and the Mohammedans believe to haunt the ruins of Babylon. **SEE SUPERSTITION**. But in those passages where the prophet predicts the desolation of Babylon, there is probably no allusion to any species of goat, whether wild or tame. According to the old versions, and nearly all the commentators, our own translation is correct, and satyrs — that is, daemons of woods and desert places, half men and half goats — are intended. Comp. Jerome (*Comment. ad Isaiah xiii*): ‘Seirim vel incubones vel satyros vel sylvestres quosdam homines quos nonnulli fatuos ficarios vocant, aut daemonum genera intelligunt.’ This explanation receives confirmation from a passage in <sup><18707></sup>Leviticus 17:7, ‘They shall no more offer their sacrifices unto *seirim*,’ and from a similar one in <sup><44115></sup>2 Chronicles 11:15. The Israelites, it is probable, had become acquainted with a form of goat worship from the Egyptians (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 3, 825; Jablonski, *Pant. Egypt.* 1, 273 sq.). The opinion held by Michaelis (Supp. p. 23-42) and Lichtenstein (*Commentat. de Simiarum*, etc. § 4, p. 50 sq.), that the *seirim* probably denote some species of ape, has been sanctioned by some modern scientists from a few passages in Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 8; 7, 2; 8, 54). **SEE APE**. That some species of *cynocephalus* (dog-faced baboon) was an animal that entered into the theology of the ancient Egyptians is evident from the monuments and from what Horapollo (1, 14-16) has told us. The other explanation, however, has the sanction of Gesenius, Bochart, Rosenmüller, Parkhurst, Maurer, Fürst, and others. As to the ‘dancing’ satyrs, comp. Virgil, *Ecl.* 5, 73. **SEE GOAT**.

## Satyrs

in Greek mythology, were daemonic companions of Bacchus, who represented the unrestrained and luxurious life in the Bacchic circle. They are not mentioned in Homer, and Hesiod does not describe their form, though he speaks of them as a useless race having no adaptability to labor. Later writers furnish a description about as follows: Bristly hair, a short,

thick, and turned-up nose, pointed ears, the neck often marked with small lumps resembling horns, a horse tail, sometimes a goat tail over the coccyx. The endowment of these beings with horns and goats' feet was a misconception of later days by which they were identified with pans, paniscs, and fauns. The satyrs were said to be sons of Mercury and Iphthime, or of the naiads. The oldest and most prominent of them was named Silenus, and the older satyrs are called *Sileni* collectively. Marsyas, too, was a satyr. In substance, the satyrs were companions of Bacchus; they were excessively fond of wine, and are accordingly represented as drinking, as reeling with the *thyrsus*, as overcome with sleep, as wine pressers, or as playing on the flute or cymbal. Their attributes were the flute, the thyrsus staff, pandean pipes, the shepherd's staff, drinking vessels, and bottles. They were clothed in skins of beasts and crowned with vine branches, ivy, and pine twigs. They have frequently been the subject of artistic representation, and always in company with Bacchus. The Latin word *satira* (a satire), originally *satura*, has not the remotest connection with the Greek *Satyri*, and should not be in any way referred to them.

### Sauces

a Coptic name, according to Jerome, given to the Coenobites, as distinct from the Anchorets. The name is sometimes Anglicized *Sauches*. See Bingham, *Antig. of the Christ. Church*, 1, 243.

### Sauches

*SEE SAUCES.*

### Saukwimir

in Norse mythology, was one of the strongest jots, or giants. Odin slew his son, and at a subsequent visit to the jots narrated that he had killed the son of a giant and afterwards enjoyed the hospitality of the father, without having discovered his true character, or even having excited the suspicions of his host. — Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* s.v.

### Saumur

a Protestant theological seminary, located in a town of the same name, in the department of the Maine-et-Loire. It was suppressed in 1685, but during its continuance exerted considerable influence upon Protestant

thought in France. Its tendency was towards Arminianism. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 222, n. 15, 225, 225 a, 247.

## Saul

(Heb. *Shail'*, I **Wav**; *desired*; Sept. and New Test. **Σαούλ**; Josephus, **Σάουλος**), the name of several men, the following three of whom are thus known in the A.V. For the others *SEE SHAUL*.

1. An early king of the Edomites, successor of Samlah at Rehoboth (<sup><0357></sup>Genesis 36:37, 38), elsewhere called "Shaul" (<sup><0304></sup>1 Chronicles 1:4 p. 49). B.C. post 1618.
2. The first king of Israel (B.C. 1093-1053). As such his career possesses a peculiar interest in the history and relations of the chosen people.

**I.** *The Name.* — This first becomes prominent here in the history of Israel, though found before in the Edomitish prince already mentioned, and in a son of Simeon (<sup><0430></sup>Genesis 46:10; A.V. "Shaul"). It also occurs among the Kohathites in the genealogy of Samuel (<sup><0324></sup>1 Chronicles 6:24, "Shaul"), and in Saul, like the king, of the tribe of Benjamin, better known as the apostle Paul (see below). Josephus (*War*, 2, 18, 4) mentions a Saul, father of one Simon who distinguished himself at Scythopolis in the early part of the Jewish war. The name in its application to the present character seems almost like a mockery of his history.

**II.** *His Family.* — On the following page is a general view of Saul's pedigree.

In this genealogy may be observed —

1. The repetition in two generations of the names of Kish and Ner, of Nadab and Abi-nadab, and of Mephibosheth.
2. The occurrence of the name of Baal in three successive generations; possibly in four, as there were two Mephibosheths.
3. The constant shiftings of the names of God, as incorporated in the proper names: (a) *Ab-iel*=*Jehiel*; (b) *Malchi-shua*=*Je-shua*; (c) *Esh-baal*=*Ishbosheth*; (d) *Mephi-* (or *Meri-*) *baal*=*Mephi-bosheth*.
4. The long continuance of the family down to the times of Ezra.

5. Is it possible that Zimri (<sup><139D></sup>1 Chronicles 9:42) can be the usurper of 1 Kings 16--if so, the last attempt of the house of Saul to regain its ascendancy? The time would agree.

There is a disagreement between the pedigree in <sup><090D></sup>1 Samuel 9:1 and 14:51, which represents Saul and Abner as the grandsons of Abiel. and <sup><138B></sup>1 Chronicles 8:33 and 9:39, which represents them as his great-grandsons. If we adopt the more elaborate pedigree in the Chronicles, we must suppose either that a link has been dropped between Abiel and Kish, in <sup><090D></sup>1 Samuel 9:1, or that the elder Kish, the son of Abiel (<sup><130B></sup>1 Chronicles 9:36), has been confounded with the younger Kish, the son of Ner (<sup><130B></sup>1 Chronicles 9:39). The pedigree in <sup><130D></sup>1 Chronicles 8 is not free from confusion, as it omits among the sons of Abiel, Ner, who in <sup><130B></sup>1 Chronicles 9:36 is the fifth son, and who in both is made the father of Kish. *SEE ABIEL.*

Saul's more particular genealogy and lineage (so far as given) is as follows:

### Picture for Saul 1

#### III. *Saul's History.* —

1. *Up to his Coronation.* — The birthplace of Saul is not expressly mentioned; but as Zelah was the place of Kish's sepulchre (2 Samuel 21), it was probably his native village. There is no warrant for saying that it was Gibeah, though, from its subsequent connection with him, it is called often "Gibeah of Saul." *SEE GIBEAH.* (When Abiel, or Jehiel [<sup><138B></sup>1 Chronicles 8:29; 9:35], is called the father of "Gibeon," it probably means founder of *Gibeah.*)

### Picture for Saul 2

His father, Kish, was a powerful and wealthy chief, though the family to which he belonged was of little importance (<sup><090D></sup>1 Samuel 9:1, 21). A portion of his property consisted of a drove of asses. In search of these asses, gone astray on the mountains, he sent his son Saul, accompanied by a servant (ר [ח]) who acted also as a guide and assistant of the young man (ver. 3-10). After a three days' journey (ver. 20), which it has hitherto proved impossible to track with certainty, *SEE RAMAH*, through Ephraim and Benjamin, *SEE SHALIM*; *SEE SHALISHA*; *SEE ZUPH*, they arrived at the foot of a hill surrounded by a town, when Saul proposed to return

home, but was deterred by the advice of the servant, who suggested that before doing so they should consult “a man of God,” “a seer,” as to the fate of the asses, securing his oracle by a present (*backshish*) of a quarter of a silver shekel. They were instructed by the maidens at the well outside the city to catch the seer as he came out of the city to ascend to a sacred eminence, where a sacrificial feast was waiting for his benediction (<sup>1001</sup>1 Samuel 9:11-13). At the gate they met the seer for the first time — it was Samuel. A divine intimation had indicated to him the approach and the future destiny of the youthful Benjamite. Surprised at his language, but still obeying his call, they ascended to the high place, and in the inn or caravansary at the top (Sept. τὸ κατάλυμα, ver. 27) found thirty or (Sept. and Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 4, 1) seventy guests assembled, among whom they took the chief place. In anticipation of some distinguished stranger, Samuel had bidden the cook reserve a boiled shoulder, from which Saul, as the chief guest, was bidden to tear off the first morsel (Sept. <sup>1002</sup>1 Samuel 9:22-24). They then descended to the city, and a bed was prepared for Saul on the housetop. At daybreak Samuel roused him. They descended again to the skirts of the town, and there (the servant having left them) Samuel poured over Saul’s head the consecrated oil, and with a kiss of salutation announced to him that he was to be the ruler and (Sept.) deliverer of the nation (<sup>1005</sup>1 Samuel 9:25-10:1). From that moment, as he turned on Samuel the huge shoulder which towered above all the rest (Sept. 10:9), a new life dawned upon him. He returned by a route which, like that of his search, it is impossible to make out distinctly; and at every step homeward it was confirmed by the incidents which, according to Samuel’s prediction awaited him (10:9, 10). At Rachel’s sepulchre he met two men, who announced to him the recovery of the asses — his lower cares were to cease. At the oak of Tabor, *SEE PLAIN, TABOR*, he met three men carrying gifts of kids and bread and a skin of wine, as an offering to Bethel. Two of the loaves were offered to him as if to indicate his new dignity. At “the hill of God” (whatever may be meant thereby, possibly his own city, Gibeah) he met a band of prophets descending with musical instruments, and he caught the inspiration from them as a sign of his new life (Ewald, 3, 28-30).

This is what may be called the private, inner view of his call. The outer call, which is related independently of the other, was as follows. An assembly was convened by Samuel at Mizpeh, and lots (so often practiced at that time, see Aristot. *Polit.* 6, 11; Virgil, *En.* 2) were cast to find the tribe and

the family which was to produce the king. Saul was named, and, by a divine intimation, found hidden in the circle of baggage which surrounded the encampment (<sup><Q107></sup>1 Samuel 10:17-24). His stature at once conciliated the public feeling, and for the first time the shout was raised, afterwards so often repeated in modern times, “Long live the king!” (ver. 23, 24) and he returned to his own Gibeah, accompanied by the fighting part (לַיָּדָה) of the people, of whom he was now to be the especial head. The murmurs of the worthless part of the community who refused to salute him with the accustomed presents were soon dispelled by an occasion arising to justify the selection of Saul. The words which close <sup><Q127></sup>1 Samuel 10:27 are, in the Hebrew text, “he was as though he were deaf;” in Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 5, 1, and the Sept. (followed by Ewald), “and it came to pass after a month that.”

The corrupt administration of justice by Samuel’s sons furnished an occasion to the Hebrews for rejecting that theocracy of which they neither appreciated the value, nor, through their unfaithfulness, to it, enjoyed the full advantages (<sup><Q101></sup>1 Samuel 8). The prospect of the event related below seems also to have conspired with the cause just mentioned and with a love of novelty in prompting the demand for a king (<sup><Q122></sup>1 Samuel 12:12) — an officer evidently alien to the genius of the theocracy, though contemplated as a historical certainty, and provided for by the Jewish lawgiver (ver. 17-20; <sup><S1714></sup>Deuteronomy 17:14-20; on which see Grotius’s note; also *De Jure Belli*, etc. 1, 4, 6, with the remarks of Gronovius, who [as Puffendorf also does] controverts the views of Grotius). An explanation of the nature of this request, as not only an instance of ingratitude to Samuel, but of rebellion against Jehovah, and the delineation of the manner in which their kings — notwithstanding the restrictions prescribed in the law — might be expected to conduct themselves (לְמַחֲלָה) Sept. δικαίωμα τοῦ βασιλέως; <sup><Q101></sup>1 Samuel 8:11; 10:25), failed to move the people from their resolution. *SEE SAMUEL*. Both previously to that election (ver. 16), and subsequently, when insulted by the worthless portion of the Israelites, he showed that modesty, humility, and forbearance which seem to have characterized him till corrupted by the possession of power. The person thus set apart to discharge the royal function possessed, at least, those corporal advantages which most ancient nations desiderated in their sovereigns — what Euripides calls the *worthy form of royalty*. His person was tall and commanding, and he soon showed that his courage was not inferior to his strength (<sup><Q101></sup>1 Samuel 9:1; 10:23). His belonging to

Benjamin also, the smallest of the tribes, though of distinguished bravery, prevented the mutual jealousy with which either of the two great tribes, Judah and Ephraim, would have regarded a king chosen from the other.

**2. Confirmation of Saul's Appointment.** — He was (having, apparently, returned to his private life) on his way home, driving his herd of oxen, when he heard one of those wild lamentations in the city of Gibeah, such as mark in Eastern towns the arrival of a great calamity. It was the tidings of the threat issued by Nahash, king of Ammon, against Jabesh-gilead. *SEE AMMON*. For, in the meantime, the Ammonites, whose invasion had hastened the appointment of a king, having besieged Jabesh in Gilead, and Nahash their king having proposed insulting conditions to them, the elders of that town, apparently not aware of Saul's election (<sup><0910B></sup>1 Samuel 11:3), sent messengers through the land imploring help. The inhabitants of Jabesh were connected with Benjamin by the old adventure recorded in Judges 21. It was as if this one spark was needed to awaken the dormant spirit of the king. 'The Spirit of the Lord came upon him,' as on the ancient judges. The shy, retiring nature which we have observed vanished never to return. In this emergency, he had recourse to the expedient of the earlier days by the message of the flesh of two of the oxen from the herd which he was driving. Saul thus acted with wisdom and promptitude, summoning the people, en *masse*, to meet him at Bezek; and having, at the head of a vast multitude, totally routed the Ammonites (ver. 11) and obtained a higher glory by exhibiting a new instance of clemency, whether dictated by principle or policy — "Novum imperium inchoantibus utilis clementiae fama" (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4, 63), "For lowliness is young ambition's ladder" — he and the people betook themselves, under the direction of Samuel, to Gilgal, there with solemn sacrifices to reinstall the victorious leader in his kingdom (<sup><0910C></sup>1 Samuel 11). If the number set down in the Hebrew text of those who followed Saul (<sup><0910B></sup>1 Samuel 11:8) can be depended on (the Sept. more than doubles them, and Josephus outgoes even the Sept.), it would appear that the tribe of Judah was dissatisfied with Saul's election, for the soldiers furnished by the other tribes were 300,000, while Judah sent only 30,000; whereas the population of the former, compared with that of Judah, appears, from other passages, to have been as about five to three (<sup><1230B></sup>2 Kings 24:9). Yet it is strange that this remissness is neither punished (<sup><0910C></sup>1 Samuel 11:7) nor noticed. At Gilgal Saul was publicly anointed and solemnly installed in the kingdom by Samuel, who took occasion to vindicate the purity of his own administration — which he

virtually transferred to Saul — to censure the people for their ingratitude and impiety, and to warn both them and Saul of the danger of disobedience to the commands of Jehovah (<sup><0910></sup>1 Samuel 12). The effect of this military success was instantaneous on the people; the punishment of the murmurers was demanded, but refused by Saul, and the monarchy was inaugurated anew (<sup><0910></sup>1 Samuel 11:1-15). It should be observed, however, that, according to <sup><0912></sup>1 Samuel 12:12. the affair of Nahash *preceded* and occasioned the election of Saul. He became king of Israel. But he still so far resembles the earlier judges as to be virtually king only of his own tribe, Benjamin, or of the immediate neighborhood. Almost all his exploits are confined to this circle of territory or associations.

These were the principal transactions that occurred during the first decade of Saul's reign (which we venture to assign as the meaning of the first clause of ch. 13 — “the son of a year was Saul in his reigning;” the emendation of Origen, “Saul was thirty years old,” being required by the chronology, for he seems, at the next event, to have been forty years old); and the subsequent events happened in the second decade, which may be the meaning of the latter clause.

**3. Saul's First Trial and Transgression.** — Samuel, who had up to this time been still named as ruler with Saul (<sup><0910></sup>1 Samuel 11:7,12,14), now withdrew, and Saul became the acknowledged chief. The restrictions on which he held the sovereignty had (<sup><0915></sup>1 Samuel 10:25) been fully explained as well to Saul as to the people, so that he was not ignorant of his true position as merely the lieutenant of Jehovah, king of Israel, who not only gave all the laws, but whose will, in the execution of them, was constantly to be consulted and complied with. The first occasion on which his obedience to this constitution was put to the test brought out those defects in his character which showed his unfitness for his high office, and incurred a threat of that rejection which his subsequent conduct confirmed (<sup><0913></sup>1 Samuel 13:13). Saul could not understand his proper position, as only the servant of Jehovah speaking through his ministers, or confine himself to it; and in this respect he was not, what David with many individual and private faults and crimes was a man after God's own heart, a king faithful to the principles of the theocracy.

In the twentieth year of his reign (as the age of Jonathan evidently requires; the text being corrupt; see Keil, *ad loc.*) Saul began to organize an attempt to shake off the Philistine yoke which pressed on his country; not least on



his own tribe, where a Philistine officer had long been stationed even in his own field (<sup>0905</sup>1 Samuel 10:5; 13:3). Having collected a small standing army, part of which, under Jonathan, had taken a fort (or slain the officer) of the Philistines, Saul summoned the people to withstand the forces which their oppressors, now alarmed for their dominion, would, upon this signal, naturally assemble. But so numerous a host came against Saul that the people, panic stricken, fled to rocks and caverns for safety — years of servitude having extinguished their courage, which the want of arms, of which the policy of the Philistines had deprived them, still further diminished. The number of chariots, 30,000, seems a mistake; unless we suppose, with Le Clerc, that they were not war chariots, but baggage wagons (an improbable supposition), so that 3000 may be the true number. ‘Apparently reduced to extremity, and the seventh day having come, but not being ended, the expiration of which Samuel had enjoined him to wait, Saul at least *ordered* sacrifices to be offered — for the expression (ver. 9) does not necessarily imply that he intruded into the priest’s office (<sup>0963</sup>2 Samuel 6:13; <sup>1002</sup>1 Kings 3:2-4), though that is the most obvious meaning of the text. Whether that which Saul now disregarded was the injunction referred to (<sup>0908</sup>1 Samuel 10:8) or one subsequently addressed to him, this is evident, that Saul acted in the full knowledge that he sinned (<sup>0932</sup>1 Samuel 13:12); and his guilt, in that act of conscious disobedience, was probably increased by its clearly involving an assumption of authority to conduct the war according to his own judgment and will. But just after the sacrifice was completed Samuel arrived and pronounced the first curse on his impetuous zeal (<sup>0935</sup>1 Samuel 13:5-14). Samuel, having denounced the displeasure of Jehovah and its consequences, left him, and Saul returned to Gibeah (the addition made to the text of the Sept. ver. 15, where, after “from Gilgal,” the clause, “and the rest of the people went up after Saul to meet the enemy from Gilgal to Gibeah,” etc., being required apparently by the sense, which, probably, has been the only authority for its insertion). Left to himself, Saul’s errors multiplied apace. *SEE SAMUEL.*

Meanwhile the adventurous exploit of his son brought on the crisis which ultimately drove the Philistines back to their own territory. Jonathan, having assaulted a garrison of the Philistines (apparently at Michmash [<sup>0943</sup>1 Samuel 14:31], which therefore must have been situated near Migron in Gibeah [<sup>0940</sup>1 Samuel 14:1], and within sight of it [<sup>0945</sup>1 Samuel 14:15]), Saul, aided by a panic of the enemy, an earthquake, and the cooperation of his fugitive soldiers, effected a great slaughter; but by a rash and foolish

denunciation, he (1) impeded his success (<sup><0943></sup>1 Samuel 14:30), (2) involved the people in a violation of the law (<sup><0943></sup>1 Samuel 14:33), and (3), unless prevented by the more enlightened conscience of the people, would have ended with putting Jonathan to death for an act which, being done in total ignorance, could involve no guilt. *SEE JONATHAN*. This campaign was signalized by two remarkable incidents in the life of Saul. One was the first appearance of his madness in the above rash vow which all but cost the life of his son (<sup><0943></sup>1 Samuel 14:24, 44). The other was the erection of his first altar, built either to celebrate the victory, or to expiate the savage feast of the famished people (<sup><0945></sup>1 Samuel 14:35). This success against the Philistines was followed, not only by their retirement for a time within their own territory, but by other considerable successes against the other enemies of his country. Moab, Ammon, Edom, the kings of Zobah, the Amalekites, and the Philistines — all of whom he harassed. but did not subdue. These wars may have occupied two or three years, about the middle of Saul's reign (B.C. 1073-71).

**4. Saul's Second Transgression.** — The expulsion of the Philistines (although not entirely completed [<sup><0942></sup>1 Samuel 14:52]) at once placed Saul in a position higher than that of any previous ruler of Israel. Probably from this time was formed the organization of royal state, which contained in germ some of the future institutions of the monarchy. The host of 3000 has been already mentioned (<sup><0931></sup>1 Samuel 13; 24:2; 26:2; comp. <sup><1329></sup>1 Chronicles 12:29). Of this Abner became captain (<sup><0945></sup>1 Samuel 14:50). A bodyguard of young, tall, and handsome Benjamites (Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 6, 6; 7, 14) was also formed of runners and messengers (see <sup><0965></sup>1 Samuel 16:15, 17; 22:14, 17; 26:22). Of this David was afterwards made the chief. These two were the principal officers of the court, and sat with Jonathan at the king's table (20:25). Another officer is incidentally mentioned the keeper of the royal mules — the *comes stabuli*, the “constable” of the king — such as appears in the later monarchy (<sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 27:30). He is the first instance of a foreigner employed about the court — being an Edomite or (Sept.) Syrian, of the name of Doeg (<sup><0927></sup>1 Samuel 21:7; 22:9). According to Jewish tradition (Jerome, *Qu. Hoeb.* ad loc.) he was the servant who accompanied Saul in his pursuit of his father's asses — who counseled him to send for David (<sup><0936></sup>1 Samuel 9:16), and whose son ultimately killed him (<sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 1:10). The high priest of the house of Ithamar (Ahimelech or Ahijah) was in attendance upon him with the ephod, when he desired it (<sup><0943></sup>1 Samuel 14:3), and felt himself bound to assist his

secret commissioners (21:1-9; 22:14). The king himself was distinguished by a state not before marked in the rulers. He had a tall spear of the same kind as that described in the hand of Goliath, and the same that now marks the Bedouin sheik. This never left him — in repose (18:10; 19:9), at his meals (20:33), at rest (26:11), in battle (<sup><1006></sup>2 Samuel 1:6). In battle he wore a diadem on his head and a bracelet on his arm (1:10). He sat at meals on a seat of his own facing his son (<sup><0125></sup>1 Samuel 20:25; Sept.). He was received on his return from battle by the songs of the Israelitish women (18:6), among whom he was on such occasions specially known as bringing back from the enemy scarlet robes, and golden ornaments for their apparel (<sup><1024></sup>2 Samuel 1:24).

The warlike character of his reign naturally still predominated, and he was now able not merely, like his temporary predecessors, to act on the defensive, but to attack the neighboring tribes of Moab, Ammon, Edom, Zobah, and finally Amalek (<sup><0147></sup>1 Samuel 14:47). The war with Amalek is twice related, first briefly (ver. 48), and then at length (15:1-9). Its chief connection with Saul's history lies in the disobedience to the prophetic command of Samuel, shown in the sparing of the king, and the retention of the spoil (B.C. 1070). In this event another trial was afforded Saul before his final rejection namely, by the command to extirpate the Amalekites, whose hostility to the people of God was inveterate (<sup><1538></sup>Deuteronomy 25:18; <sup><0178></sup>Exodus 17:8-16; <sup><0142></sup>Numbers 14:42-45; <sup><0183></sup>Judges 3:13; 6:3), and who had not by repentance averted that doom which had been delayed 550 years (<sup><0148></sup>1 Samuel 14:48). The extermination of Amalek and the subsequent execution of Agag belong to the general question of the moral code of the Old Test. *SEE AGAG*. There is no reason to suppose that Saul spared the king for any other reason than that for which he retained the spoil — namely, to make a more splendid show at the sacrificial thanksgiving (15:21). Such was the Jewish tradition preserved by Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 7, 2), who expressly says that Agag was spared for his stature and beauty, and such is the general impression left by the description of the celebration of the victory. Saul rides to the southern Carmel in a chariot (Sept.), never mentioned elsewhere, and sets up a monument there (Heb. "a hand" [<sup><0188></sup>2 Samuel 18:18]), which in the Jewish traditions (Jerome, *Qu. Hoeb.* ad loc.) was a triumphal arch of olives, myrtles, and palms. In allusion to his crowning triumph, Samuel applies to God the phrase, "The victory (Vulg. *trumphator*) of Israel will neither lie nor repent" (<sup><0159></sup>1 Samuel 15:29; and comp. <sup><1391></sup>1 Chronicles 29:11). The apparent cruelty of

this commission was not the reason why it was not fully executed, as Saul himself confessed when Samuel upbraided him, "I feared the people and obeyed their voice" (<sup><0152></sup>1 Samuel 15:24). This stubbornness in persisting to rebel against the directions of Jehovah was now visited by that final rejection of his family from succeeding him on the throne which had before been threatened (<sup><0133></sup>1 Samuel 13:13, 14; 15:23), and which was now significantly represented, or mystically predicted, by the rending of the prophet's mantle. The struggle between Samuel and Saul in their final parting is also indicated, as he tears himself away from Saul's grasp (for the gesture, see Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 7, 5), and by the long mourning of Samuel for the separation "Samuel mourned for Saul." "How long wilt thou mourn for Saul?" (<sup><0145></sup>1 Samuel 14:35; 16:1). After this second and flagrant disobedience, accordingly, Saul received no more public countenance from the venerable prophet, who now left him to his sins and his punishment; "nevertheless the Lord repented that he had made Saul king" (15:35). *SEE SAMUEL.*

**5. Saul's Conduct towards David.** — The rest of Saul's life is one long tragedy. The frenzy which had given indications of itself before now at times took almost entire possession of him. It is described in mixed phrases as "an evil spirit of God" (much as we might speak of "religious madness"), which, when it came upon him, almost choked or strangled him from its violence (<sup><0164></sup>1 Samuel 16:14; Sept.; Josephus, *Ant.* 6:8, 2). The denunciations of Samuel sank into the heart of Saul, and produced a deep melancholy, which either really was, or which his physicians (<sup><0164></sup>1 Samuel 16:14, 15; comp. Genesis 1, 2) told him was, occasioned by a supernatural influence; unless we understand the phrase *h[r;j Wr*, an *evil spirit*, subjectively, as denoting the condition itself of Saul's mind, instead of the cause of that condition (<sup><2390></sup>Isaiah 29:10; <sup><0154></sup>Numbers 5:14; <sup><5108></sup>Romans 11:8). We can conceive that music might affect Saul's feelings, might cheer his despondency, or divert his melancholy; but how it should have the power to chase away a spiritual messenger whom the Lord had sent to chasten the monarch for his transgressions is not so easily understood. Saul's case must probably be judged of by the same principles as that of the daemioniacs mentioned in the New Test. *SEE DAEMONIAC.* In this crisis David was recommended to him by one of the young men of his guard (in the Jewish tradition groundlessly supposed to be Doeg [Jerome, *Qu. Hoeb.* ad loc.]) on account of his skill as a musician (<sup><0166></sup>1 Samuel 16:16-23). But the narrative of his introduction to Saul, his subsequently killing Goliath,

Saul's ignorance of David's person after he had been his attendant and armor bearer, with various other circumstances in the narrative (<sup><0964></sup>1 Samuel 16:14-23; 17; 18:1-4), present difficulties which neither the arbitrary omissions in the Sept. nor the ingenuity of subsequent critics has fully succeeded in removing, and which have led many eminent scholars to suppose the existence of extensive dislocations in this part of the Old Test. The change proposed by Hales and others seems to be the most ready, which would place the passage <sup><0964></sup>1 Samuel 16:14-23 after 18:9; yet why should Saul's attendants need to describe so minutely a person whom he and all Israel knew so well already? Also, how can we conceive that Saul should love so much (<sup><0962></sup>1 Samuel 16:21) a person against whom his jealousy and hatred had been so powerfully excited as his probable successor in the kingdom? (<sup><0989></sup>1 Samuel 18:9). Besides, David had occupied already a much higher position (ver. 5); and, therefore, his being made Saul's armor bearer must have been the very opposite of promotion, which the text (16:21) supposes it was. The most rational solution of the difficulty appears to be the supposition that David had in the interim grown so much that the monarch did not now recognize him. *SEE DAVID.*

Though not acquainted with the unction of David, yet having received intimation that the kingdom should be given to another, Saul soon suspected, from his accomplishments, heroism, wisdom, and popularity, that David was his destined successor; and, instead of concluding that his resistance to the divine purpose would only accelerate his own ruin, Saul, in the spirit of jealousy and rage, commenced a series of murderous attempts on the life of his rival that must have lost him the respect and sympathy of his people, which they secured for the object of his malice and envy, whose noble qualities also they both exercised and rendered more conspicuous. He attempted twice to assassinate him with his own hand (<sup><0980></sup>1 Samuel 18:10, 11; 19:10); he sent him on dangerous military expeditions (<sup><0985></sup>1 Samuel 18:5, 13, 17); he proposed that David should marry first his elder daughter, whom yet he gave to another, and then his younger, that the procuring of the dowry might prove fatal to David; and then he sought to make his daughter an instrument of her husband's destruction; and it seems probable that unless miraculously prevented he would have imbrued his hands in the blood of the venerable Samuel himself (<sup><0998></sup>1 Samuel 19:18), while the text seems to intimate (<sup><0983></sup>1 Samuel 20:33) that even the life of Jonathan was not safe from his fury, though the subsequent context may warrant a doubt whether Jonathan was the party

aimed at by Saul. The slaughter of Ahimelech the priest (ch. 22), under pretence of his being a partisan of David, and of eighty-five other priests of the house of Eli, to whom nothing could be imputed, as well as the whole inhabitants of Nob, was an atrocity perhaps never exceeded; and yet the wickedness of the act was not greater than its infatuation, for it must have inspired his subjects not only with abhorrence of their king as an inhuman tyrant, but with horror of him as an impious and sacrilegious monster. This crime of Saul put David in possession of the sacred lot, which Abiathar, the only surviving member of Eli's priestly family, brought with him, and by which he was enabled to obtain oracles directing him in his critical affairs (<sup><0222></sup>1 Samuel 22:21-23; 23:1, 2).

Having compelled David to assume the position of an outlaw, around whom gathered a number of turbulent and desperate characters, Saul might persuade himself that he was justified in bestowing the hand of David's wife on another, and in making expeditions to apprehend and destroy him. A portion of the people were base enough to minister to the evil passions of Saul (<sup><0239></sup>1 Samuel 23:19; 26:1), and others, perhaps, might color their fear by the pretence of conscience (<sup><0232></sup>1 Samuel 23:12). But his sparing Saul's life twice, when he was completely in his power, must have destroyed all color of right in Saul's conduct in the minds of the people, as it also did in his own conscience (<sup><0248></sup>1 Samuel 24:3-7; 26), which two passages, though presenting many points of similarity, cannot be referred to the same occasion without denying to the narrative all historic accuracy and trustworthiness. Though thus degraded and paralyzed by the indulgence of malevolent passions, Saul still acted with vigor in repelling the enemies of his country, and in other affairs wherein his jealousy of David was not concerned (<sup><0237></sup>1 Samuel 23:27, 28). In Saul's better moments, also, he never lost the strong affection which he had contracted for David. "He loved him greatly" (<sup><0162></sup>1 Samuel 16:21). "Saul would let him go no more home to his father's house" (<sup><0182></sup>1 Samuel 18:2). "Wherefore cometh not the son of Jesse to meat?" (<sup><0177></sup>1 Samuel 20:27). "Is this thy voice, my son David? ... Return, my son David; blessed be thou, my son David" (<sup><0246></sup>1 Samuel 24:16; 26:17, 25). Occasionally, too, his prophetic gift returned, blended with his madness. He "prophesied" or "raved" in the midst of his house — "he prophesied and lay down naked all day and all night" at Ramah (<sup><0194></sup>1 Samuel 19:24). But his acts of fierce, wild zeal increased. The massacre of the priests, with all their families — the massacre, perhaps at the same time, of the Gibeonites (<sup><0200></sup>2 Samuel

21:1), and the violent extirpation of the necromancers (<sup><020B></sup>1 Samuel 28:3, 9), are all of the same kind.

**6. Saul's Last Offense and Death.** — At length the monarchy itself, which he had raised up, broke down under the weakness of its head. The Philistines reentered the country, and with their chariots and horses occupied the plain of Esdraelon. Their camp was I pitched on the southern slope of the range now called Little Hermon, by Shunem. On the opposite side, on Mount Gilboa, was the Israelitish army, clinging, as usual, to the heights which were their safety. It was near the spring of Gideon's encampment, hence called the spring of Harod, or "trembling;" and now the name assumed an evil omen, and the heart of the king as he pitched his camp there "trembled exceedingly" (<sup><020B></sup>1 Samuel 28:5). The measure of Saul's iniquity, now almost full, was completed by an act of direct treason against Jehovah the God of Israel (<sup><022B></sup>Exodus 22:18; <sup><020B></sup>Leviticus 19:31; 20:27; <sup><028B></sup>Deuteronomy 18:10, 11). Saul, probably in a fit of zeal and perhaps as some atonement for his disobedience in other respects, had executed the penalty of the law on those who practiced necromancy and divination (<sup><020B></sup>1 Samuel 28:3). Now, however, in the loss of all the usual means of consulting the divine will, he determined, with that wayward mixture of superstition and religion which marked his whole career, to apply to one of the necromancers who had escaped his persecution. Forsaken of God, who gave him no oracles, and rendered, by a course of wickedness, both desperate and infatuated, he requested his attendants to seek him a woman who had a familiar spirit (which is the loose rendering in the English Bible of the expression occurring twice in ver. 7, *b/a tī t̄βi tva*, *a woman a mistress of Ob*; Sept. *ἐγγαστρίμυθος*, i.e. a ventriloquist; Vulg. *habens Pythonem*, i.e. a Pythoness, *SEE NECROMANCY*), that he might obtain from her that direction which Jehovah refused to afford him. She was a woman living at Endor, on the other side of Little Hermon.. According to the Hebrew tradition mentioned by Jerome, she was the mother of Abner, and hence her escape from the general massacre of the necromancers (see Leo Allatius, *De Engastrimutho*, cap. 6 in *Critici Sacri*, vol. 2). Volumes have been written on the question whether in the scene that follows we are to understand an imposture or a real apparition of Samuel. Eustathius and most of the fathers take the former view (representing it, however, as a figment of the devil); Origen, the latter view. Augustine wavers (*ibid. ut supra*, p. 1062-1114). The Sept. of <sup><027B></sup>1 Samuel 27:7 (by the above translation) and the

A.V. (by its omission of “himself” in 28:14, and insertion of “when” in ver. 12) lean to the former. Josephus (who pronounces a glowing eulogy on the woman, *Ant.* 6, 14, 2, 3) and the Sept. of <sup><300></sup>1 Chronicles 10:13, to the latter. At this distance of time it is impossible to determine the relative amount of fraud or of reality, though the obvious meaning of the narrative itself tends to the hypothesis of some kind of apparition. She recognizes the disguised king first by the appearance of Samuel, seemingly from his threatening aspect or tone as towards his enemy. Saul apparently saw nothing, but listened to her description of a godlike figure of an aged man wrapped round with the royal or sacred robe. On hearing the denunciation which the apparition conveyed, Saul fell the whole length of his gigantic stature (see <sup><080></sup>1 Samuel 28:20, margin) on the ground, and remained motionless till the woman and his servants forced him to eat.

Assured of his own death in the coming engagement, and that of his sons, of the ruin of his army and the triumph of his most formidable enemies, whose invasion had tempted him to try this unhallowed expedient all announced to him by that same authority which had foretold his possession of the kingdom, and whose words had never been falsified — Saul, in a state of dejection which could not promise success to his followers (comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 168), prepared as best he could to meet the enemy in Gilboa, on the extremity of the great plain of Esdraelon (on the localities of this battle, etc., see Hackett, *Illustrations of Script.* p. 178 sq.).

The next day the battle came on, and, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 14,7), perhaps according to the spirit of the sacred narrative, his courage and self devotion returned. The Israelites were driven up the side of Gilboa. The three sons of Saul were slain (<sup><080></sup>1 Samuel 31:2). Saul himself with his armor bearer was pursued by the archers and the charioteers of the enemy (ver. 3; <sup><006></sup>2 Samuel 1:6). He was wounded in the stomach (Sept. <sup><080></sup>1 Samuel 31:3). His shield was cast away (<sup><002></sup>2 Samuel 1:21). In his extremity, having in vain solicited death from the hand of his armor bearer (Doeg the Edomite — the Jews say, “a partner before of his master’s crimes and now of his punishment”), Saul perished at last by his own sword (<sup><080></sup>1 Samuel 31:4). According to another account (less trustworthy, or, perhaps, to be reconciled with the former by supposing that it describes a later incident), an Amalekite came up at the moment of his death wound (whether from himself or the enemy) and found him “fallen” but leaning on his spear (<sup><006></sup>2 Samuel 1:6, 10). The dizziness of



death was gathered over him (ver. 9), but he was still alive; and he was, at his own request, put out of his pain by the Amalekite, who took off his royal diadem and bracelet and carried the news to David (ver. 7-10). Not till then, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 6, 14, 7), did the faithful armor bearer fall on his sword and die with him (<sup><0810></sup>1 Samuel 31:5). The body, on being found by the Philistines on the morrow, was stripped and decapitated. The armor was sent into the Philistine cities, as if in retribution for the spoliation of Goliath, and finally deposited in the temple of Astarte, apparently in the neighboring Canaanitish city of Bethshan; and over the walls of the same city was hung the naked, headless corpse with those of his three sons (ver. 9, 10). The head was deposited (probably at Ashdod) in the temple of Dagon (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 10:10). The corpse was removed from Bethshan by the gratitude of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who came over the Jordan by night, carried off the bodies, burned them, and buried them under the tamarisk at Jabesh (<sup><0813></sup>1 Samuel 31:13). It is pleasing to think that even the worst men have left behind them those in whom gratitude and affection are duties. Saul had those who mourned him, as some hand was found to have strewn flowers on the newly made grave of Nero. After the lapse of several years, his ashes and those of Jonathan were removed by David to their ancestral sepulchre at Zelah in Benjamin (<sup><1214></sup>2 Samuel 21:14).

**IV. *Saul's Character.*** — There is not in the sacred history, or in any other, a character more melancholy to contemplate than that of Saul. Naturally humble and modest, though of strong passions, he might have adorned a private station. In circumstances which did not expose him to strong temptation, he would probably have acted virtuously. But his natural rashness was controlled neither by a powerful understanding nor a scrupulous conscience; and the obligations of duty and the ties of gratitude, always felt by him too slightly, were totally disregarded when ambition, envy, and jealousy had taken possession of his mind. The diabolical nature of these passions is seen, with frightful distinctness, in Saul, whom their indulgence transformed into an unnatural and bloodthirsty monster, who constantly exhibited the moral infatuation, so common among those who have abandoned themselves to sin, of thinking that the punishment of one crime may be escaped by the perpetration of another. In him, also, is seen that moral anomaly or contradiction, which would be incredible did we not so often witness it, of an individual pursuing habitually a course which his better nature pronounces not only flagitious, but insane (<sup><0246></sup>1 Samuel

24:16, 22). Saul knew that that person should be king whom yet he persisted in seeking to destroy, and so accelerated his own ruin. For it can hardly be doubted that the distractions and disaffection occasioned by Saul's persecution of David produced that weakness in his government which encouraged the Philistines to make the invasion in which himself and his sons perished. "I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath" (<sup><3021></sup>Hosea 12:11). In the prolonged troubles and disastrous termination of this first reign, the Hebrews were vividly shown how vain was their favorite remedy for the mischiefs of foreign invasion and intestine discord.

Saul's character is in part illustrated by the fierce, wayward, fitful nature of the tribe, *SEE BENJAMIN*, and in part accounted for by the struggle between the old and new systems in which he found himself involved. To this we must add a taint of madness, which broke out in violent frenzy at times, leaving him with long lucid intervals. His affections were strong, as appears in his love both for David and his son Jonathan, but they were unequal to the wild accesses of religious zeal or insanity which ultimately led to his ruin. He was, like the earlier Judges, of whom in one sense he may be counted as the successor, remarkable for his strength and activity (<sup><1013></sup>2 Samuel 1:23); and he was, like the Homeric heroes, of gigantic stature, taller by head and shoulders than the rest of the people, and of that kind of beauty denoted by the Hebrew word "good" (<sup><1002></sup>1 Samuel 9:2), and which caused him to be compared to the gazelle — "the gazelle of Israel." It was probably these external qualities which led to the epithet which is frequently attached to his name, "chosen" — "whom the Lord did choose" — "See ye (i.e. Look at) him whom the Lord hath chosen" (<sup><1007></sup>1 Samuel 9:17; 10:24; <sup><1006></sup>2 Samuel 21:6).

**V. Literature.** — See the treatises referred to in Darling, *Cyclop.*

*Bibliograph.* Colossians 290-302; Stanley, *Jewish Ch.* 2, lect. 21; Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, 2, 15 sq.; Niemeyer, *Charak.* 5, 75 sq.; Hasse, *König Saul* (Gries. 1854); Richardson, *Saul, King of Israel* (Edinb. 1858); Miller, *Saul, First King of Israel* (2d ed., Lond. 1866); Brooks, *King Saul* ([a tragedy], N.Y. 1871); and the monographs on his interview with the witch cited by Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3, 236. *SEE KING.*

**3.** The Jewish name of Paul (q.v.). This was the most distinguished name in the genealogies of the tribe of Benjamin, to which the apostle felt some pride in belonging (<sup><510></sup>Romans 11:1; <sup><508></sup>Philippians 3:5). He himself leads

us to associate his name with that of the Jewish king by the marked way in which he mentions Saul in his address at the Pisidian Antioch: "God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin" (~~4433~~Acts 13:21). These indications are in harmony with the intensely Jewish spirit of which the life of the apostle exhibits so many signs. The early ecclesiastical writers did not fail to notice the prominence thus given by Paul to his tribe. Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 5, 1) applies to him the dying words of Jacob on Benjamin. And Jerome, in his *Epitaphium Pauloe* (§ 8), alluding to the preservation of the six hundred men of Benjamin after the affair of Gibeah (~~4720~~Judges 20:49), speaks of them as "trecentos [sic] viros propter Apostolum reservatos." *SEE BENJAMIN.*

Nothing certain is known about the change of the apostle's name from Saul to Paul (~~4433~~Acts 13:9). Two chief conjectures prevail concerning the change. (1) That of Jerome and Augustine, that the name was derived from Sergius Paulus, the first of his Gentile converts. (2) That which appears due to Lightfoot, that Paulus was the apostle's Roman name as a citizen of Tarsus, naturally adopted into common use by his biographer when his labors among the heathen commenced. The former of these is adopted by Olshausen and Meyer. It is also the view of Ewald (*Gesch.* 6, 419, 420), who seems to consider it self evident, and looks on the absence of any explanation of the change as a proof that it was so understood by all the readers of the Acts. However this may be, after Saul has taken his place definitively as the apostle to the Gentile world, his Jewish name is entirely dropped. Two divisions of his life are well marked by the use of the two names.

### Saunders, William T.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Roman Catholic parents, in Dublin, Aug. 16, 1836. In his sixteenth year he emigrated to America, landing at New Orleans, April 13, 1852. In Sept., 1853, he was converted at a camp meeting, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He spent one term at Meadville College, but for five years after led an unsettled life. In 1859 he was admitted on trial in the Southeastern Indiana Conference and appointed to Vernon Circuit. He also served at New Washington; Patriot Circuit; Belleview; as chaplain of the Eighty-third Indiana Volunteers; Roberts and Trinity churches, Madison; Vevay; and Rising Sun. He continued to fill his pulpit until within four weeks of his death, which took place July 29, 1871. Mr. Saunders was a

man of diligent study, careful preparation for the pulpit, faithful as a pastor, while his piety was of the healthy, fruit bearing kind. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 184.

### Sauqua Behkr

(*Socquabekr*), in Norse mythology, was *the stream of death*, a place where Saga dwelt, and which Odin visited each day in order to become drunk on the precious mead which she possessed, and to enjoy her love.

### Sauras

a Hindu sect who worship only Suryapati, or the sun god. They are few in number, and scarcely differ from the rest of the Hindus in their general observances. Their mark on the forehead is made in a particular manner, with red sandalwood, and their necklace is of crystal. They eat one meal without salt every Sunday, and on every occasion of the sun's entrance into a sign of the zodiac; and they cannot eat till they have noticed the sun.

### Saure, Conrad

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Germany, and emigrated to this country in 1845. He studied theology privately, and commenced preaching in Cincinnati in 1856; two years later he was regularly ordained, and installed as pastor of the Salem church. His first sermon, it is said, was preached to six hearers. At the time of his death, in 1873, his congregation numbered between seven and eight hundred members. He was an acceptable and earnest preacher, and a faithful, laborious, and successful pastor. See the *Ref. Ch. Mess.* June 4, 1873. (D.Y.H.)

### Saurin, Elie

a French Protestant theologian, was born Aug. 28, 1639, at Usseau, Dauphiny. He was the son of a village pastor, who conducted his education, and at last sent him to study theology at Geneva. Admitted to the ministry in 1661, he preached first at Venterot, and was called to the church at Embrun in the succeeding year. Having refused to uncover his head before a priest who was carrying the sacrament to a sick person, Saurin was banished from the country. He retired to Holland, where he took charge of a church at Delft, in 1665. He was employed to examine the religious opinions of the mystic Labadie, and offered to refute them

publicly. So well did Saurin succeed that he procured the deposition of his opponent, and, in order that he should not be suspected of any personal interest in the affair, obtained for Labadie the church at Middleburg. In 1671 Saurin accepted the place of Wolzogen at Utrecht. Here he lived for two years, during the French occupation, in continual agitation caused by his disputes with Jurieu. He began the contest by stating that some of the doctrines of Jurieu were heterodox and very dangerous. Efforts were made to reconcile the two pastors, and the synod of Leeuwarden forbade their writing against each other on pain of excommunication, but all to no effect. The last years of Saurin were devoted to the publication of theological works. He died at Utrecht, on Easter Sunday, 1703. We have from his pen, *Examen de la Theologie de Jurieu: — Defense de la Doctrine e d l'Eglise Reformee, etc.: — Traite de l'Amour de Dieu: — Reflexions sur les Droits de la Conscience: — and a posthumous work, Traite de l'Amour du Prochain.*

### Saurin, Jacques

the most eloquent preacher of French Protestantism, was born at Nimes Jan. 6, 1677. In his eighth year his family, fleeing from the persecutions of Louis XIV, settled in Geneva. Quitting school at the age of sixteen, he joined a regiment of Savoyards in the general war against the French tyrant, and served nearly four years, till the Peace of Ryswick, in 1697. On his return, he took tip the study of theology under Tronchin, Pictet, and Turretin. It was only after many inner struggles that he conquered his frivolity and skepticism, and passed through the throes of the new birth. Once clearly converted, his life and influence were radically changed. His subsequent renown for eloquence began to take form even before his graduation. His mere schoolboy exercises in sermonizing attracted great attention. Entering the ministry in 1700, he took charge of a society of French Walloons in London, and preached with great success for four years. In 1705, while on a journey of recreation in Holland, he preached a few sermons and made such an impression as to occasion a call to labor at the Hague. This call he accepted; and here, for the remainder of his life twenty-five years — he labored with equal fame and usefulness. He soon became known as “the great Saurin,” the “Chrysostom of Protestantism.” The large church in which he preached was constantly overcrowded. It was not merely his eloquence, his fine manner, his melodious voice, which thus held and charmed for a quarter of a century all classes of society, but it was chiefly the weighty substance of what he said and the holy earnestness with

which he said it. Learned men (Clericus) and cold critics often went to hear him with deep prejudice, but uniformly they came away glad and captivated. The celebrated Abbadie exclaimed, after first hearing him, "Is it a man, or is it an angel!" Saurin was not a mere preacher, but also an organizer. He founded schools and asylums, and planned a grand scheme of missionary work throughout the Dutch colonies. He was also a systematic writer. In 1722 he issued an educational work, *Abrege de la Theologie et de la Morale Chretienne*. In 1724 he issued his *Catechisme*, which enjoyed a long popularity in Holland and at Geneva. In 1725 appeared at the Hague *L'Etat du Christianisme en France*, a collection of letters in favor of his fellow Protestants of France. A work which appeared between 1720 and 1728, *Discours Historiques, Critiques, Theologiques et Morceaux sur les Evenements les plus Memorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament*, though an able work in itself, had the unfortunate result of calling upon Saurin such a series of envious criticisms from his brother pastors as to embitter his last years and even to hasten his death. It is a memorable instance of the well known *odium theologicum*. It had no other basis or pretext than a few unguarded expressions in regard to the so-called falsehood of necessity.

But the posthumous fame of Saurin rests upon his *Sermons*. Of these he himself published (1707-25) five volumes. After his death, his son edited, from his papers, seven additional volumes. The whole twelve volumes have been several times reissued. The best edition is that of the Hague, in 1749; the most recent is that of Paris, in 1835. A good selection was published by Weiss, at Paris, in 1854, *Sermons Choisis de Saurin, avec une Notice sur sa Vie*. Most of these sermons have enjoyed great popularity in other languages. Five volumes of the *Sermons* were published in English by R. Robinson, in 1775. As to the form of Saurin's sermons, they are too systematic and scholastic for the taste of the present; they are encumbered with too much of learned citation. Much that they contain would be more appropriate in the professor's chair than in the pulpit. As compared with the great Catholic sermonizers, Saurin lacks the exquisite polish of Bossuet; nor does he search the secret recesses of the heart with as sharp an eye as Bourdaloue; nor are his appeals as pathetic as those of Massillon; but he surpasses them all in this, that he preaches the whole Gospel of Christ, and that he is unconscious of dependence on any other external authority than the simple Word of God. In manner, Saurin was impetuous in the extreme; greater self control would have given him greater power.

He sometimes spent so much force of voice in his opening prayer and exordium as to be very much exhausted before the close. Sometimes his voice would almost fail. The chief defect in his manner was a certain lack of unction. The understanding was convinced, the conscience was awakened, the will was aroused, but the heart was not fully subdued. After Saurin's death, his great work, *Disccurs* (2 vols. fol.), was continued by Roques and Beausobre, so that the whole consisted of six volumes. See Van Oosterzee, *Jacques Saurin* (Brus. 1856); Sayous, *Hist. de la Litter. Franc. a l'Etr.*; Weiss, *Hist. des Ref. Prot. de France*; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 13, 437-444. (J.P.L.)

### Saurus

in Greek mythology, was a noted highway robber on the borders of Elis, who was killed by Hercules.

### Saussay, Andre De

a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1589, and died Sept. 9, 1675, at Toul. His parents being poor, he was educated at the Hospital of the Holy Spirit, and on completing his studies took orders. He employed himself in preaching and controversy; was in favor at the court; and became cure of Saint-Leu, apostolic prothonotary, almoner of the king, and grand vicar of the Church of Paris. Elected bishop of Toul in 1649, he did not take possession of his see until 1657, on account of ecclesiastical troubles with its chapter. He held this office till his death. Saussay was the author of several religious works in Latin, which show great learning, but little judgment or critical acumen — as *Genealogie des Heretiques Sacrementaires, etc.*: — *De Sacro Ritu Proferendi Crucem, etc.*

### Sautrantika

is the name of the second of the four great schools or systems of Buddhism, the three others being called *Vaibhashika*, *Madhyamika*, and *Yogachara*. They recognize the authority of the *Sutras* (q.v.), but reject that of the Abhidharma. See Köppen, *Die Religion des Buddha* (Berlin, 1857); Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Savagarad

is the cap of an Armenian priest, made of cloth of gold, with an orb and cross on the top.

## Savage, Henry, D.D.

an English divine, was born at Eldsfield, Worcestershire, in 1604. He entered Baliol College, Oxford, as a commoner in 1621; took the degree of B.A. in Nov., 1625; in 1628 was made probationer fellow; and in 1630 completed his master's degree. On the commencement of the Rebellion, he traveled into France with William (lord) Sandys, whose sister, lady Mary, he afterwards married. He obtained the mastership of his college Feb. 20, 1650, and took his degree of D.D. the next year. He was made prebendary of Gloucester in 1665, and rector of Bladen, in Oxfordshire. He died, master of Baliol College, June 2, 1672, and was buried in the chapel. He published some pamphlets on infant baptism against John Tombes, and on Church reformations against Cornelius Burgess; but is best known by his *Baliofergus; or, A Commentary upon the Foundation, Founders, and Affairs of Baliol College* (Oxon. 1668, 4to).

## Savage, Isaac Aylsworth

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Edinburgh, Saratoga County, N.Y., Dec. 28, 1814. He embraced religion at the age of sixteen, graduated at the Wesleyan University in Aug., 1841, and, having been already received on trial in the New England Conference, went immediately to South Boston. He was ordained deacon in 1843 and elder in 1845. He occupied appointments in Lowell, Springfield, Boston, and Holliston until 1854, when, after a protracted illness, he fell asleep on Feb. 16. Mr. Savage was an excellent scholar, an able and faithful minister, a devoted friend. See *Minutes of Annual Con.* 1854, p. 359.

## Savage, John, D.D.

an English divine of the last century, was a member of Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees, and was D.D. of both universities. He was rector, first of Bygrave, then of Clothall, Herts, and lecturer of St. George's, Hanover Square, London. He was at one time president of the famous club at Royston. He died March 24, 1747, from a fall. Besides a visitation and an assize sermon, there are attributed to him the following:



*The Turkish History* (abridged from Knolles and Rycout [1701, 2 vols. 8vo]): *Collection of Letters of the Ancients*, etc. (1703, 8vo).

### Savage, John Adams, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Salem, Washington County, N.Y., Oct. 9, 1800. He received his preparatory training in Salem Academy; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1822; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach by Washington Associate Reformed Presbytery in 1825, and ordained by the same presbytery in 1827. His first charge was at Fort Covington, Franklin County, N.Y., where he remained until 1832, when he was called to the church in Ogdensburg, N.Y. Here his labors were abundant and successful. He remained at Ogdensburg nearly twenty years, and probably no man ever exerted so wide and powerful an influence for religion and for Presbyterianism in Northern New York as he. In 1850, at the earnest solicitation of Dr. Van Rensselaer, then corresponding secretary of the Board of Education, he went to Wisconsin, and took charge of Carroll College, at Wauketa, then in its infancy. Here he labored arduously in founding and building up a college in a new country. The charter had been obtained, and some little progress made in the enterprise before his arrival, but properly Dr. Savage is to be regarded as the founder of Carroll College. He died Dec. 13, 1864. Dr. Savage was a man of great sagacity, deep piety, and excellence of character; as a preacher, able and instructive; as a theologian, clear, sound, and scriptural, well meriting the honorary degree of D.D. conferred on him by his alma mater after his assumption of the presidency of the college. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 167. (J.L.S.)

### Savage, Samuel Morton, D.D.

a learned Independent minister, was born in London in 1721, and educated under Dr. Jennings. He became professor of divinity at Hoxton; assistant minister of St. Mary Axe, London, in 1747; and sole pastor in 1756. He died in 1791. He published *Sermons* on several evangelical and practical subjects (Taunton, 1796, 8vo).

### Savage, Thomas

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Boston, Mass., Sept. 2, 1794. He pursued his preparatory studies at Phillips Academy, in Andover; graduated with honor at Harvard University, Cambridge; and studied

theology at the divinity school connected with that institution. In 1815 he accepted an invitation to become a private tutor in Louisiana, in the vicinity of Baton Rouge, where he continued to teach and preach for nearly seven years. In 1824 he returned to Boston. and on July 5, 1826, was installed pastor of the church in Bedford, N.H., which pastorate lasted forty years. He died May 8, 1866. Mr. Savage possessed a truly symmetrical character. His ministry was in conformity with such a character. He was a practical and impressive preacher, and an accurate scholar — excelling perhaps in the classics, but familiar with the best models of his native tongue. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 196. (J.L.S.)

### Sav'aran

(*Σαυαράν* v.r. *Αὐαράν*), an erroneous form (1 Macc. 6:43) for AVARAN *SEE AVARAN* (q.v.), an epithet of the Maccabee Eleazar (q.v.).

### Savary, N.

a French writer and traveler. In 1776 he visited Egypt, and studied the antiquities and manners of the country. On his return he visited the Archipelago, and in 1780 published his translation of the Koran, which was succeeded by his *Travels in Egypt, Letters on Greece*, and a *Grammar of the Modern Arabic*. He died in 1788.

### Savastano, Francesco Eulalia

an Italian poet, was born in 1657 at Naples, where he died Oct. 23, 1717. He was a Jesuit, preached successfully, and taught rhetoric, philosophy, and theology in the College of Naples. He is the author of a Latin poem entitled *Bo. tanicorum Liber*.

### Savi'as

#### Garbled Greek

(Tavici), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 8:2) of the Hebrews name UZZI *SEE UZZI* (q.v.), the ancestor of Ezra (<sup>אֶזְרָא</sup> Ezra 7:4).

### Savigni, Order Of

a religious body connected with the Romish Church, founded in the 12th century by Vitalis de Mortain, a disciple of the famous Robert of

Arbiscelle, who instituted the Order of Fontevraud. The Order of Savigni, after continuing for a time, became merged in that of the Cistercians (q.v.).

## Savior

a title applied in Scripture, in its highest sense, to Jesus Christ, but in a subordinate way to earthly deliverers. We present a comparatively brief abstract of this very extensive subject. *SEE SOTERIOLOGY.*

**I. The Word itself.** — The term “Savior,” as applied to our Lord Jesus Christ, represents the Greek *soter* (σωτήρ), which in turn represents certain derivatives from the Hebrew root *yasha* ([*vj*); particularly the participle of the Hiphil form *moshia* ([*jv*]), which is usually rendered “Savior” in the A.V. (e.g. <sup>2340</sup>Isaiah 46:15; 49:26). In considering the true import of “Savior,” it is essential for us to examine the original terms answering to it, including in our view the use of *soter* in the Sept., whence it was more immediately derived by the writers of the New Test., and further noticing the cognate terms “to save” and “salvation,” which express respectively the action and the results of the Savior’s office. *SEE JESUS.*

**1.** The term *soter* is of more frequent occurrence in the Sept. than the term “Savior” in the A.V. of the Old Test. It represents not only the word *moshia* above mentioned, but also very frequently the nouns *yesha* ([*vj*) and *yeshuah* (h[*vvyæ*), which, though properly expressive of the abstract notion “salvation,” are yet sometimes used in a concrete sense for “Savior.” We may cite as an example <sup>2321</sup>Isaiah 52:11, “Behold, thy salvation cometh, his reward is with him,” where evidently “salvation” = *Savior*. So again in passages where these terms are connected immediately with the person of the Godhead, as in <sup>489D</sup>Psalms 58:20, “the God our Savior” (A.V. “God of our salvation”). Not only in such cases as these, but in many others where the sense does not require it, the Sept. has *soter* where the A.V. has “salvation;” and thus the word “Savior” was more familiar to the ear of the reader of the Old Test. in our Lord’s age than it is to us.

**2.** The same observation holds good with regard to the verb *σώζειν*, and the substantive *σωτηρία*, as used in the Sept. An examination of the passages in which they occur shows that they stand as equivalents for words conveying the notions of well being, succor, peace, and the like. We have further to notice *σωτηρία* in the sense of recovery of the *bodily*

health (2 Macc. 3:32), together with the etymological connection supposed to exist between the terms σωτήρ and σῶμα, to which Paul evidently alludes in <sup><4173></sup>Ephesians 5:23; <sup><1080></sup>Philippians 3:20, 21.

3. If we turn to the Hebrew terms, we cannot fail to be struck with their comprehensiveness. Our verb “to save” implies, in its ordinary sense, the rescue of a person from actual or impending danger. This is undoubtedly included in the Hebrew root *yasha*, and may be said to be its ordinary sense, as testified by the frequent accompaniment of the preposition *min* (ⲙⲓⲛ comp. the σῶσει ἀπό which the angel gives in explanation of the name Jesus, <sup><1021></sup>Matthew 1:21). But *yasha*, beyond this, expresses *assistance* and *protection* of every kind — assistance in aggressive measures, protection against attack; and, in a secondary sense, the results of such assistance victory, safety, prosperity, and happiness. We may, cite as an instance of the *aggressive* sense, <sup><6104></sup>Deuteronomy 20:4, “To fight for you against your enemies, to save you;” of *protection* against attack, <sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 26:1, “Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks;” of *victory*, <sup><1086></sup>2 Samuel 8:6, “The Lord preserved David,” i.e. gave him victory; of *prosperity* and *happiness*, <sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 60:18, “Thou shalt call thy walls Salvation;” <sup><2501></sup>Isaiah 56:10, “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation.” No better instance of this last sense can be adduced than the exclamation “Hosanna,” meaning, “( Save, I beseech thee,” which was uttered as a prayer for God’s blessing on any joyous occasion ( <sup><1305></sup>Psalm 118:25), as at our Lord’s entry into Jerusalem, when the etymological connection of the terms Hosanna and Jesus could not have been lost on the ear of the Hebrew ( <sup><4109></sup>Matthew 21:9,15). It thus appears that the Hebrew and Greek terms had their positive as well as their negative side; in other words, that they expressed the presence of blessing as well as the absence of danger, actual security as well as the removal of insecurity. The Latin language possessed in the classical period no proper equivalent for the Greek σωτήρ. This appears from the introduction of the Greek word itself in a Latinized form, and from Cicero’s remark (*in Verr.* <sup><4112></sup>Acts 2:2, 63) that there was no one word which expressed the notion *qui salutem dedit*. Tacitus (*Ann.* 15, 71) uses *conservator*, and Pliny (22, 5) *servator*. The term *salvator* appears appended as a title of Jupiter in an inscription of the age of Trajan (*Gruter*, p. 19, No. 5). This was adopted by Christian writers as the most adequate equivalent for σωτήρ, though objections were evidently raised against it (*Augustine, Serm.* 299, § 6). Another term,

*salutificator*, was occasionally used by Tertullian (*De Resurr. Carn.* 47; *De Carn. Chr.* 14).

4. The historical personages to whom the terms are applied further illustrate this view. The judges are styled “saviors,” as having rescued their country from a state of bondage (<sup><0708></sup>Judges 3:9, 15, A.V. “deliverer;” <sup><0727></sup>Nehemiah 9:27); a “savior” was subsequently raised up in the person of Jeroboam II to deliver Israel from the Syrians (<sup><1215></sup>2 Kings 13:5); and in the same sense Josephus styles the deliverance from Egypt a “salvation” (*Ant.* 3, 1, 1). Joshua, on the other hand, verified the promise contained in his name by his conquests over the Canaanites: the Lord was his helper in an aggressive sense. Similarly, the office of the “saviors” promised in Obad. 21 was to execute vengeance on Edom. The names Isaiah, Jeshua, Ishi, Hosea, Hoshea, and, lastly, Jesus, are all expressive of the general idea of *assistance* from the Lord. The Greek *soter* was in a similar manner applied in the double sense of a deliverer from foreign foes, as in the case of Ptolemy Soter, and a general protector, as in the numerous instances where it was appended as the title of heathen deities.

5. There are many indications in the Old Test. that the idea of a spiritual salvation, to be effected by God alone, was by no means foreign to the mind of the pious Hebrew. In the Psalms there are numerous petitions to God to save from the effects of sin (e.g. <sup><0908></sup>Psalms 39:8; 79:9). Isaiah, in particular, appropriates the term “savior” to Jehovah (<sup><2361></sup>Isaiah 43:11), and connects it with the notions of justice and righteousness (<sup><2362></sup>Isaiah 45:21; 55:16, 17): he adduces it as the special manner in which Jehovah reveals himself to man (<sup><2365></sup>Isaiah 45:15): he hints at the means to be adopted for effecting salvation in passages where he connects the term “savior” with “redeemer” (*goal*), as in <sup><2314></sup>Isaiah 41:14; 49:26; 55:16, and again with “ransom,” as in 43:3. Similar notices are scattered over the prophetic books (e.g. <sup><3109></sup>Zerchariah 9:9; <sup><3007></sup>Hosea 1:7), and though in many instances these notices admitted of a reference to proximate events of a temporal nature, they evidently looked to higher things, and thus fostered in the mind of the Hebrew the idea of a “Savior” who should far surpass in his achievements the “saviors” that had as yet appeared. The mere sound of the word would conjure up before his imagination visions of deliverance, security, peace, and prosperity.

II. *The Work of the Savior.* — This we propose to trace as developed in the several portions of the New Testament. .

**1.** The first three evangelists, as we know, agree in showing that Jesus unfolded his message to the disciples by degrees. He wrought the miracles that were to be the credentials of the Messiah; he laid down the great principles of the Gospel morality, until he had established in the minds of the Twelve the conviction that he was the Christ of God. Then, as the clouds of doom grew darker, and the malice of the Jews became more intense, he turned a new page in his teaching. Drawing from his disciples the confession of their faith in him as Christ, he then passed abruptly, so to speak, to the truth that remained to be learned in the last few months of his ministry, that his work included suffering as well as teaching (<sup>(465)</sup>Matthew 16:20, 21). He was instant in pressing this unpalatable doctrine home to his disciples from this time to the end. Four occasions when he prophesied his bitter death are on record, and they are probably only examples out of many more (ver. 21). We grant that in none of these places does the word “sacrifice” occur; and that the mode of speaking is somewhat obscure, as addressed to minds unprepared, even then, to bear the full weight of a doctrine so repugnant to their hopes. But that he must ( $\delta\epsilon\iota$ ) go and meet death; that the powers of sin and of this world are let loose against him for a time, so that he shall be betrayed to the Jews, rejected, delivered by them to the Gentiles, and by them be mocked and scourged, crucified, and slain; and that all this shall be done to achieve a foreseen work, and accomplish all things written of him by the prophets — these we do certainly find. They invest the death of Jesus with a peculiar significance; they set the mind inquiring what the meaning can be of this hard necessity that is laid on him. For the answer we look to other places; but at least there is here no contradiction to the doctrine of sacrifice, though the Lord does not yet say, “I bear the wrath of God against your sins in your stead; I become a curse for you.” Of the two sides of this mysterious doctrine — that Jesus dies for us willingly, and that” he dies to bear a doom laid on him as of necessity, because some one must bear it — it is the latter side that is made prominent. In all the passages it pleases Jesus to speak, not of his desire to die, but of the burden laid on him, and the power given to others against him.

**2.** Had the doctrine been explained no further, there would have been much to wait for. But the series of announcements in these passages leads up to one more definite and complete. It cannot be denied that the words of the institution of the Lord’s supper speak most distinctly of a sacrifice: “Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new covenant;” or, to follow Luke,

“the new covenant in my blood.” We are carried back by these words to the first covenant, to the altar with twelve pillars, and the burned offerings and peace offerings of oxen, and the blood of the victims sprinkled on the altar and on the people, and the words of Moses as he sprinkled it: “Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words” (~~<1241>~~ Exodus 24). No interpreter has ever failed to draw from these passages the true meaning: “When my sacrifice is accomplished, my blood shall be the sanction of the new covenant.” The word “sacrifice” is wanting; but sacrifice, and nothing else, is described. And the words are no mere figure used for illustration, and laid aside when they have served that turn. “Do this in remembrance of me.” They are the words in which the Church is to interpret the act of Jesus to the end of time. They are reproduced exactly by Paul (~~<4125>~~ 1 Corinthians 11:25). Then, as now, Christians met together, and by a solemn act declared that they counted the blood of Jesus as a sacrifice wherein a new covenant was sealed; and of the blood of that sacrifice they partook by faith, professing themselves thereby willing to enter the covenant and be sprinkled with the blood.

**3.** So far we have examined the three “synoptic” Gospels. They follow a historical order. In the early chapters of all three the doctrine of our Lord’s sacrifice is not found, because he will first answer the question about himself, “Who is this?” before he shows them “What is his work.” But at length the announcement is made, enforced, repeated; until, when the feet of the betrayer are ready for their wicked errand, a command is given which secures that the death of Jesus shall be described forever as a sacrifice and nothing else, sealing a new covenant and carrying good to many. Lest the doctrine of atonement should seem to be an after thought, as, indeed, De Wette has tried to represent it, John preserves the conversation with Nicodemus, which took place early in the ministry; and there, under the figure of the brazen serpent lifted up, the atoning virtue of the Lord’s death is fully set forth. “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life” (~~<414>~~ John 3:14,15). As in this intercessory act the image of the deadly, hateful, and accursed (~~<0084>~~ Genesis 3:14, 15) reptile became by God’s decree the means of health to all who looked on it earnestly, so does Jesus in the form of sinful man, of a deceiver of the people (~~<4176>~~ Matthew 27:63), of Antichrist (12:24; ~~<3183>~~ John 18:33), of one accursed (~~<4183>~~ Galatians 3:13), become the means of our salvation; so that whoever fastens the earnest gaze of faith on him shall

not perish, but have eternal life. There is even a significance in the words “lifted up;” the Lord used, probably, the word *āqd*, which, in older Hebrew, meant to “lift up” in the widest sense, but began in the Aramaic to have the restricted meaning of “lifting up for punishment.” With Christ the lifting up was a seeming disgrace, a true triumph and elevation. But the context in which these verses occur is as important as the verses themselves. Nicodemus comes as an inquirer; he is told that a man must be born again, and then he is directed to the death of Jesus as the means of that regeneration. The earnest gaze of the wounded soul is to be the condition of its cure; and that gaze is to be turned, not to Jesus on the mountain or in the temple, but on the cross. This, then, is no passing allusion, but it is the substance of the Christian teaching addressed to an earnest seeker after truth.

Another passage claims a reverent attention — “If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world” (<sup><416></sup>John 6:51). He is the bread; and he will give the bread. If his presence on earth were the expected food, it was given already; but would he speak of “drinking his blood” (ver. 53), which can only refer to the dead? It is on the cross that he will afford this food to his disciples. We grant that this whole passage has occasioned as much disputing among Christian commentators as it did among the Jews who heard it; and for the same reason — for the hardness of the saying. But there stands the saying; and no candid person can refuse to see a reference in it to the death of him that speaks.

In that discourse, which has well been called the prayer of consecration offered by our High priest, there is another passage which cannot be alleged as evidence to one who thinks that any word applied by Jesus to his disciples and himself must bear in both cases precisely the same sense, but which is really pertinent to this inquiry — “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself that they also might be sanctified through the truth” (<sup><417></sup>John 17:17-19). The word *ἀγιάζειν*, “sanctify,” “consecrate,” is used in the Sept. for the offering of sacrifice (<sup><421></sup>Leviticus 22:2) and for the dedication of a man to the divine service (<sup><435></sup>Numbers 3:15). Here the present tense, “I consecrate,” used in a discourse in which our Lord says he is “no more in the world,” is conclusive against the interpretation “I dedicate my *life* to thee;” for life is over. No self dedication, except that by death, can now be spoken of as



present. “I dedicate myself to thee, in my death, that these may be a people consecrated to thee;” such is the great thought in this sublime passage, which suits well with his other declaration that the blood of his sacrifice sprinkles them for a new covenant with God. To the great majority of expositors from Chrysostom and Cyril the doctrine of reconciliation through the death of Jesus is asserted in these verses.

The Redeemer has already described himself as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep (<sup><B01></sup>John 10:11, 17, 18), taking care to distinguish his death from that of one who dies against his will in striving to compass some other aim — “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.”

Other passages that relate to his death will occur to the memory of any Bible reader. The corn of wheat that dies in the ground to bear much fruit (<sup><B02></sup>John 10:24) is explained by his own words elsewhere, where he says that he came “to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many” (<sup><B03></sup>Matthew 20:28).

**4.** Thus, then, speaks Jesus of himself. What say his witnesses of him? “Behold the Lamb of God,” says the Baptist, “which taketh away the sin of the world” (<sup><B04></sup>John 1:29). Commentators differ about the allusion implied in that name. But take any one of their opinions, and a sacrifice is implied. Is it the paschal lamb that is referred to? Is it the lamb of the daily sacrifice? Either way the death of the victim is brought before us. But the allusion, in all probability, is to the well known prophecy of Isaiah (ch. 54), to the Lamb brought to the slaughter, who bore our griefs and carried our sorrows. See this passage discussed fully in the notes of Meyer, Lange (*Bibelwerke*), and Alford. — The reference to the paschal lamb finds favor with Grotius and others; the reference to Isaiah is approved by Chrysostom and many others. The taking away of sin (**ἀίρειν**) of the Baptist, and the bearing it (**φέρειν**, Sept.) of Isaiah, have one meaning and answer to the Hebrew word **אָחַז**. To take the sins on himself is to remove them from the sinners; and how can this be through his death except in the way of expiation by that death itself?

**5.** The apostles, after the resurrection, preach no moral system, but a belief in and love of Christ, the crucified and risen Lord, through whom, if they

repent, men shall obtain salvation. This was Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost (<sup><411></sup>Acts 2); and he appealed boldly to the prophets on the ground of an expectation of a suffering Messiah (3:18). Philip traced out for the eunuch, in that picture of suffering holiness in the well known chapter of Isaiah, the lineaments of Jesus of Nazareth (<sup><410></sup>Acts 8; <sup><250></sup>Isaiah 53). The first sermon to a Gentile household proclaimed Christ slain and risen, and added "that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (<sup><410></sup>Acts 10). Paul at Antioch preaches "a Savior Jesus" (<sup><412></sup>Acts 13:23); "through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (ver. 38, 39). At Thessalonica all that we learn of this apostle's preaching is "that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ" (<sup><417></sup>Acts 17:3). Before Agrippa he declared that he had preached always "that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead" (<sup><412></sup>Acts 26:23); and it was this declaration that convinced his royal hearer that he was a crazed fanatic. The account of the first founding of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles is concise and fragmentary; and sometimes we have hardly any means of judging what place the sufferings of Jesus held in the teaching of the apostles; but when we read that they "preached Jesus," or the like, it is only fair to infer from other passages that the cross of Christ was never concealed, whether Jews or Greeks or barbarians were the listeners. And this very pertinacity shows how much weight they attached to the facts of the life of our Lord. They did not merely repeat in each new place the pure morality of Jesus as he uttered it in the Sermon on the Mount: of such lessons we have no record. They took in their hands, as the strongest weapon, the fact that a certain Jew crucified afar off in Jerusalem was the Son of God, who had died to save men from their sins; and they offered to all alike an interest, through faith, in the resurrection from the dead of this outcast of his own people. No wonder that Jews and Greeks, judging in their worldly way, thought this strain of preaching came of folly or madness, and turned from what they thought unmeaning jargon.

**6.** We are able to complete from the epistles our account of the teaching of the apostles on the doctrine of atonement. "The Man Christ Jesus" is the mediator between God and man, for in him the human nature, in its sinless purity, is lifted up to the divine, so that he, exempt from guilt, can plead for the guilty (<sup><511></sup>1 Timothy 2:5; <sup><611></sup>1 John 2:1, 2; Hebrew 7:25). Thus he is

the second Adam that shall redeem the sin of the first; the interests of men are bound up in him, since he has power to take them all into himself (<sup><418></sup>Ephesians 5:29, 30; <sup><418></sup>Romans 5:12, 17; 12:5; <sup><418></sup>1 Corinthians 15:22). This salvation was provided by the Father, to “reconcile us to himself” (<sup><418></sup>2 Corinthians 5:18), to whom the name of “Savior” thus belongs (<sup><418></sup>Luke 1:47); and our redemption is a signal proof of the love of God to us (<sup><418></sup>1 John 4:10). Not less is it a proof of the love of Jesus, since he freely lays down his life for us — offers it as a precious gift, capable of purchasing all the lost (<sup><418></sup>1 Timothy 2:6; <sup><418></sup>Titus 2:14; <sup><418></sup>Ephesians 1:7; comp. <sup><418></sup>Matthew 20:28). But there is another side of the truth more painful to our natural reason. How came this exhibition of divine *love* to be needed? Because wrath had already gone out against man. The clouds of God’s anger gathered thick over the whole human race; they discharged themselves on Jesus only. God has made him to be sin for us who knew no sin (<sup><418></sup>2 Corinthians 5:21); he is made “a curse” (a thing accursed) for us that the curse that hangs over us may be removed (<sup><418></sup>Galatians 3:13); he bore our sins in his own body on the tree (<sup><418></sup>1 Peter 2:24). There are those who would see on the page of the Bible only the sunshine of the divine love; but the muttering thunders of divine wrath against sin are heard there also; and he who alone was no child of wrath meets the shock of the thunderstorm, becomes a curse for us and a vessel of wrath; and the rays of love break out of that thunder gloom and shine on the bowed head of him who hangs on the cross, dead for our sins.

**7.** We have spoken, and advisedly, as if the New Test. were, as to this doctrine, one book in harmony with itself. That there are in the New Test. different types of the one true doctrine may be admitted without peril to the doctrine. The principal types are four in number.

**(1.)** In the Epistle of James there is a remarkable absence of all explanations of the doctrine of the atonement; but this admission does not amount to so much as may at first appear. True, the keynote of the epistle is that the Gospel is the law made perfect, and that it is a practical moral system in which man finds himself free to keep the divine law. But with him Christ is no mere lawgiver appointed to impart the Jewish system. He knows that Elias is a man like himself, but of the person of Christ he speaks in a different spirit. He calls himself “a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.” who is “the Lord of glory.” He speaks of the Word of Truth of which Jesus has been the utterer. He knows that faith in the Lord of glory is inconsistent with time serving and “respect of persons” (<sup><418></sup>James

1:1, 18; 2:1). “There is one lawgiver,” he says,” who is able to save and to destroy” (4:12); and this refers, no doubt, to Jesus, whose second coming he holds up as a motive to obedience (5:7-9). These and like expressions remove this epistle far out of the sphere of Ebionitish teaching. The inspired writer sees the Savior, in the Father’s glory, preparing to return to judge the quick and dead. He puts forth Christ as prophet and king, for he makes him teacher and judge of the world; but the office of the priest he does not dwell on. Far be it from us to say that he knows it not. Something must have taken place before he could treat his hearers with confidence, as free creatures able to resist temptations, and even to meet temptations with joy. He treats “your faith” as something founded already, not to be prepared by this epistle (1:2, 3, 21). His purpose is a purely practical one. There is no intention to unfold a Christology such as that which makes the Epistle to the Romans so valuable. Assuming that Jesus has manifested himself and begotten anew the human race, he seeks to make them pray with undivided hearts, and be considerate to the poor, and strive with lusts, for which they, and not God, are responsible; and bridle their tongues, and show their fruits by their works (see Neander, *Pflanzung*, b. 6, c. 3; Schmid, *Theologie des N.T.* pt. 2; and Dorner, *Christologie*, 1, 95).

(2.) In the teaching of Peter the doctrine of the person of our Lord is connected strictly with that of his work as Savior and Messiah. The frequent mention of his sufferings shows the prominent place he would give them; and he puts forward as the ground of his own right to teach that he was “a witness of the sufferings of Christ” ([1 Peter 5:1](#)). The atoning virtue of those sufferings he dwells on with peculiar emphasis, and not less so on the purifying influence of the atonement on the hearts of believers. He repeats again and again that Christ died for us (2:21; 3:18; 4:1); that he bare our sins in his own body on the tree (2:24). He bare them; and what does this phrase suggest but the goat that “shall bear” the iniquities of the people off into the land that was not inhabited? ([Leviticus 16:22](#)), or else the *feeling the consequences* of sin, as the word is used elsewhere (20:17, 19)? We have to choose between the cognate ideas of sacrifice and substitution. Closely allied with these statements are those which connect moral reformation with the death of Jesus. He bare our sins that we might live unto righteousness. His death is our life. We are not to be content with a self-satisfied contemplation of our redeemed state, but to live a life worthy of it ([1 Peter 2:21-25; 3:15-18](#)). In these passages the whole Gospel is contained; we are justified by the death of Jesus, who bore our

sins that we might be sanctified and renewed to a life of godliness. And from this apostle we hear again the name of “the lamb,” as well as from John the Baptist; and the passage of Isaiah comes back upon us with unmistakable clearness. We are redeemed “with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1:18, 19, with ~~180~~ Isaiah 53:7). Every word carries us back to the Old Test. and its sacrificial system: the spotless victim, the release from sin by its blood (elsewhere [~~100~~ 1 Peter 1:2] by the *sprinkling* of its blood), are here; not the type and shadow, but the truth of them; not a ceremonial purgation, but an effectual reconciliation of man and God.

**(3.)** In the inspired writings of John we are struck at once with the emphatic statements as to the divine and human natures of Christ. A right belief in the incarnation is the test of a Christian man (~~100~~ 1 John 4:2; ~~101~~ John 1:14; 2 John 7); we must believe that Jesus’ Christ is come in the flesh, and that he is manifested to destroy the works of the devil (~~102~~ 1 John 3:8). And, on the other hand, he who has come in the flesh is the one who alone has been in the bosom of the Father, seen the things that human eyes have never seen, and has come to de dare them unto us (1:2; 4:14; ~~103~~ John 1:14-18). This person, at once divine and human, is “the propitiation for our sins,” our advocate with the Father,” sent into the world “that we might live through him;” and the means was his laying down his life for us, which should make us ready to lay down our lives for the brethren (~~104~~ 1 John 1:7; 2:1, 2; 3:16; 4:9, 10; 5:6, 11-13; ~~105~~ John 11:51). And the moral effect of his redemption is that “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin” (~~106~~ 1 John 1:7). The intimate connection between his work and our holiness is the main subject of his first epistle, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin (~~107~~ 1 John 3:9). As with Peter, so with John; every point of the doctrine of the atonement comes out with abundant clearness. The substitution of another, who can bear our sins, for us who cannot; the sufferings and death as the means of our redemption, our justification thereby and our progress in holiness as the result of our justification.

**(4.)** To follow out as fully, in the more voluminous writings of Paul, the passages that speak of our salvation would far transgress the limits of our paper. Man, according to this apostle, is a transgressor of the law. His conscience tells him that he cannot act up to that law, which, the same conscience admits, is divine, and binding upon him. Through the old dispensations man remained in this condition. Even the law of Moses could not justify him it only by its strict behests held up a mirror to conscience

that its frailness might be seen. Christ came, sent by the mercy of our Father who had never forgotten us; given to, not deserved by us. He came to reconcile men and God by dying on the cross for them, and bearing their punishment in their stead (<454>2 Corinthians 5:14-21; <486>Romans 5:6-8). He is “a propitiation through faith in his blood” (3:25, 26; comp. <615>Leviticus 16:15) (*ἱλαστήριον* means “victim for expiation”) — words which most people will find unintelligible, except in reference to the Old Test. and its sacrifices. He is the ransom, or price paid, for the redemption of man from all iniquity (<414>Titus 2:14). Still stronger in <506>1 Timothy 2:6, “ransom instead of (*ἀντίλυτρον*); also <400>Ephesians 1:7 (*ἀπολύτρωσις*); <411>1 Corinthians 6:20; 7:23. The wrath of God was against man, but it did not fall on man. God made his Son “to be sin for us,” though he knew no sin; and Jesus suffered, though men had sinned. By this act God and man were reconciled (<450>Romans 5:10; <478>2 Corinthians 5:18-20; <406>Ephesians 2:16; <502>Colossians 1:21). On the side of man, trust and love and hope take the place of fear and of an evil conscience; on the side of God, that terrible wrath of his, which is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, is turned away (<408>Romans 1:18; 5:9; <500>1 Thessalonians 1:10). The question whether we are reconciled to God only, or God is also reconciled to us, might be discussed on deep metaphysical grounds; but we purposely leave that on one side, content to show that at all events the intention of God to punish man is averted by this “propitiation” and “reconcilement.” *SEE RECONCILIATION.*

Different views are held about the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews by modern critics, but its numerous points of contact with the other epistles of Paul must be recognized. In both the incompleteness of Judaism is dwelt on; redemption from sin and guilt is what religion has to do for men, and this the law failed to secure. In both, reconciliation and forgiveness and a new moral power in the believers are the fruits of the work of Jesus. In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul shows that the law failed to justify, and that faith in the blood of Jesus must be the ground of justification. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same result follows from an argument rather different: all that the Jewish system aimed to do is accomplished in Christ in a far more perfect manner. The Gospel has a better priest, more effectual sacrifices, a more profound peace. In the one epistle the law seems set aside wholly for the system of faith; in the other the law is exalted and

glorified in its Gospel shape; but the aim is precisely the same — to show the weakness of the law and the effectual fruit of the Gospel.

**8.** We are now in a position to see how far the teaching of the New Test. on the effects of the death of Jesus is continuous and uniform. Are the declarations of our Lord about himself the same as those of James and Peter, John and Paul? and are those of the apostles consistent with each other? The several points of this mysterious transaction may be thus roughly described:

**(1.)** God sent his Son into the world to redeem lost and ruined men from sin and death, and the Son willingly took upon him the form of a servant for this purpose; and thus the Father and the Son manifested their love for us.

**(2.)** God the Father laid upon his Son the weight of the sins of the whole world, so that he bare in his own body the wrath which men must else have borne, because there was no other way of escape for them; and thus the atonement was a manifestation of divine justice.

**(3.)** The effect of the atonement thus wrought is that man is placed in a new position, freed from the dominion of sin, and able to follow holiness; and thus the doctrine of the atonement ought to work in all the hearers a sense of love, of obedience, and of self sacrifice.

In shorter words, the sacrifice of the death of Christ is a proof of divine *love* and of *divine justice*, and is for us a document of *obedience*.

Of the four great writers of the New Test., Peter, Paul, and John set forth every one of these points. Peter, the “witness of the sufferings of Christ,” tells us that we are redeemed with the blood of Jesus, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot; says that Christ bare our sins in his own body on the tree. If we “have tasted that the Lord is gracious” (<sup>AMB</sup>1 Peter 2:3), we must not rest satisfied with a contemplation of our redeemed state, but must live a life worthy of it. No one can well doubt, who reads the two epistles, that the love of God and Christ, and the justice of God, and the duties thereby laid on us, all have their value in them; but the love is less dwelt on than the justice, while the most prominent idea of all is the moral and practical working of the cross of Christ upon the lives of men.

With John, again, all three points find place. That Jesus willingly laid down his life for us, and is an advocate with the Father; that he is also the

propitiation, the suffering sacrifice, for our sins; and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, for that whoever is born of God doth not commit sin — all are put forward. The death of Christ is both justice and love, both a propitiation and an act of loving self surrender; but the moral effect upon us is more prominent even than these.

In the epistles of Paul the three elements are all present. In such expressions as a ransom, a propitiation, who was “made sin for us,” the wrath of God against sin, and the mode in which it was turned away, are presented to us. Yet not wrath alone. “The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again” (KJV-2 Corinthians 5:14, 15). Love in him begets love in us, and in our reconciled state the holiness which we could not practice before becomes easy.

The reasons for not finding in James similar evidence we have spoken of already.

Now, in which of these points is there the semblance of contradiction between the apostles and their Master? In none of them. In the gospels, as in the epistles, Jesus is held up as the sacrifice and victim, draining a cup from which his human nature shrank, feeling in himself a sense of desolation such as we fail utterly to comprehend on a theory of human motives. Yet no one takes from him his precious redeeming life; he lays it down of himself, out of his great love for men. But men are to deny themselves, and take up their cross and tread in his steps. They are his friends only if they keep his commands and follow his footsteps.

We must consider it proved that these three points or elements are the doctrine of the whole New Test. What is there about this teaching that has provoked in times past and present so much disputation? Not the hardness of the doctrine — for none of the theories put in its place are any easier — but its want of logical completeness. Sketched out for us in a few broad lines, it tempts the fancy to fill it in and lend it color; and we do not always remember that the hands that attempt this are trying to make a mystery into a theory, an infinite truth into a finite one, and to reduce the great things of God into the narrower limits of our little field of view. To whom was the ransom paid? What was Satan’s share of the transaction? How can one suffer for another? How could the Redeemer be miserable when he was conscious that his work was one which could bring happiness to the whole



human race? Yet this condition of indefiniteness is one which is imposed on us in the reception of every mystery. Prayer, the incarnation, the immortality of the soul, are all subjects that pass far beyond our range of thought. Here we see the wisdom of God in connecting so closely our redemption with our reformation. If the object were to give us a complete theory of salvation, no doubt there would be in the Bible much to seek. The theory is gathered by fragments out of many an exhortation and warning; nowhere does it stand out entire, and without logical flaw. But if we assume that the New Test. is written for the guidance of sinful hearts, we find a wonderful aptness for that particular end. Jesus is proclaimed as the solace of our fears, as the founder of our moral life, as the restorer of our lost relation with our Father. If he had a cross, there is a cross for us; if he pleased not himself, let us deny ourselves; if he suffered for sin, let us hate sin. And the question ought not to be. What do all these mysteries mean? but Are these thoughts really such as will serve to guide our life and to assuage our terrors in the hour of death? The answer is twofold one from history and one from experience. The preaching of the cross of the Lord even in this simple fashion converted the world. The same doctrine is now the ground of any definite hope that we find in ourselves of forgiveness of sins and of everlasting life. See Thomson, essay on the "Death of Christ," in *Aids to Faith*.

### Savior, St., Order Of

a name applied to the Order of St. Bridget (q.v.), because it was pretended that our Savior personally dictated to the founders the rules and constitution of the order. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

### Savonarola, Girolamo

an Italian monk, reformer, and martyr, the leader of an incipient reformation of the Church in the latter half of the 15th century, a man whose eventful life and tragic death have called forth the most contradictory judgments, and whose real character is even to this day a matter of dispute with certain historians. Savonarola was born of an honorable family at Ferrara, Sept. 21, 1452. His education was carefully conducted. It was intended that he should devote himself to natural and medical science, but his early religious development turned him into another course. He was fond of solitude, and avoided the public walks of the ducal palace. Impressed with terror at the wickedness which he saw

about him, he finally, in his twenty-third year, fled from his home and friends and took refuge in a Dominican cloister at Bologna. Two days after his arrival in Bologna he wrote to his parents, begging their forgiveness and blessing, and averring as his excuse that he was utterly unable to endure the spectacle of the wickedness of Italian society. He also declared that he had simply followed out a divine impulse given him in prayer, and that he felt that he should be ready to suffer anything, even death, rather than disobey the voice of duty.

At first Savonarola desired to be simply a lay brother, and to perform the commonest menial services; but his superior saw his gifts, and charged him from the start with the teaching of what was then called philosophy and physics. His chief authorities in this teaching were the great Dominican theologian Thomas Aquinas, the Church father St. Augustine, and, above all, the Holy Scriptures. The latter he knew almost by heart. He was particularly fond of the Old Test. prophets and of the Apocalypse. It was in the study of these that his spiritual imagination nurtured itself, and attained such an intense vividness as to make it easy for him to assume to himself too much of the prophetic character. His first attempts at preaching were without special results. His voice was harsh, his gestures awkward, his language clumsy and scholastic. His audience was not attracted. But, while on a visit to Brescia, his power broke forth suddenly, as waters from a pent-up fountain. The people flocked to him in great crowds to hear his imaginative exposition of the Apocalypse; and the impression was not lessened when he made definite inferences (“non per rivelazione, ma per ragione delle Scritture”) as to calamities which were soon to fall upon Italy. But his politico-reformatory labors began only in his thirty-eighth year (1490), when he was appointed as *lector* in the Dominican cloister of San Marco, Florence. His two leading thoughts now were, reformation of the Church and emancipation of Italy. In carrying out these, he shook to its foundations the Florentine government, raised against himself the anathemas of the hierarchy, and finally fell himself a victim to the task. See Rule, *Dawn of the Reformation* (Lond. 1855).

The family of the Medici had raised Florence to a high degree of prosperity, and were enjoying princely power under the forms of a republic. Cosmo de' Medici (died 1464) was the Rothschild of the age. His gifted nephew Lorenzo (died 1492) followed in his footsteps, promoted commerce, letters, and philosophy, and made Florence the temporary center of a golden age. But beneath the outward polish of refined culture,

the moral corruption of high and low festered as an ulcer. In 1492 Lorenzo's son Pietro II followed him as master of Florence, while his younger son, Giovanni — who was made a cardinal at the age of twelve, four years before his father's death — aimed at the papal chair. Such was the condition of Florence at the time when Savonarola began his efforts at political and ecclesiastical reform. He began his lectures in the cloister; then transferred them to the cloister garden; and, when the multitude overflowed this, he repaired to a spacious church. Here, on Aug. 1, 1491, he commenced his elucidation of the Apocalypse before an immense multitude. "The Church must be renewed," said he; "but previously God will send severe judgments upon Italy, and that, too, speedily." He tore off the thin disguise of glory from the much boasted Medicine age, and exposed the great gulf of moral rottenness beneath. He spared neither rank nor sex nor age; neither pope nor monk nor layman. "Your sins," exclaimed he, "make me a prophet! Hitherto I have been but as Jonah warning Nineveh. But, if you heed not my words, I shall be as Jeremiah, predicting your destruction, and weeping over the ruins: for God will renew his Church, and that will not take place without blood."

It was not a doctrinal, but a moral reformation, which he more immediately contemplated; and closely with this he connected the restoration of the former liberties of the republic. In the main he was in accord with Catholic orthodoxy, and he carried the monkish principles of abstinence and self denial to an intense extreme. But he laid great emphasis on certain doctrines which the clergy of the age had greatly neglected, viz. that the Scriptures lead us chiefly to Christ, and not to the saints; that without the forgiveness of God no priestly absolution is of any avail; and that salvation comes of faith and submission to the Redeemer, and not from outward works or educational polish. Still there was felt throughout his sermons rather more of the earnestness of the law than of the gentleness of the Gospel. One year after his arrival in Florence he was made prior of San Marco. Contrary to all precedent, Savonarola omitted to call and pay his respects to the civil ruler of the city, Lorenzo. This was all the more singular as Lorenzo had made large gifts to San Marco, and had always shown all respect to the priesthood. But Savonarola saw in him simply the incarnation of worldliness, and the robber of his country's liberties. He feared his friendship more than his hatred. Lorenzo resorted to all the arts of cunning and flattery, but in vain; he did not win the smiles of the stern preacher of righteousness. Lorenzo died April 8, 1492. On his death bed he

sent for Savonarola and desired absolution. Savonarola exacted three things: faith in Christ; the restoration of all ill gotten property; and the reestablishment of the city's liberties. To the first two he cheerfully assented; to the latter he demurred. Thereupon the stern prior of San Marco departed. This third demand is not mentioned by Politian; it may be apocryphal.

The death of Lorenzo was the signal for the outbreak of the storm. He was succeeded by his rash and arbitrary son, Pietro II. The same year the notorious cardinal Borgia ascended the papal throne as Alexander VI. Savonarola continued his exhortations to repentance and his predictions of speedy judgments. "A storm will break in," said he, "a storm that will shake the mountains; over the Alps there will come against Italy one like Cyrus of whom Isaiah wrote." Soon thereafter Charles VIII of France actually came with a great army, not to reform the Church, however, but to take the vacant throne of Naples. Pietro Medici capitulated without resistance. Thereupon the wrath of the people broke out, and the Medici were forced to fly to Bologna. The senate pronounced them traitors, and set a price on their heads. But, as the aristocratic faction still desired to retain all political offices, Savonarola summoned a great popular assembly in the cathedral, and assumed the *role* of a theocratic tribune. By general consent he became the legislator of Florence. As the foundation of the new order of things, he proposed four principles: (1) fear God; (2) prefer the weal of the republic to thine own; (3) a general amnesty; (4) a council after the pattern of Venice, but without a doge. His political maxims he borrowed mostly from Aquinas. He was not opposed to monarchy, but he believed that circumstances called for a democracy in Florence. "God alone will be thy king, O Florence!" exclaimed he; "even as he was king in Israel under the old covenant." The ruling element in this "city of God" was to be, not self seeking, but love — love to God and love to the neighbor. "How can we have peace with God if we have it not with each other?" *Viva Cristo, viva Firenze!* responded the people to the proposition of the enthusiastic monk, and, in the beginning of 1495, committed to him the remodeling of the state. With the details of the new order of things he did not, however, concern himself. His attitude was rather that of a judge in Israel, or of a Roman censor with dictatorial power. He regarded himself as the organ of Christ for the Christocratic republic. He guided it with his counsels, and breathed into it from his throne, the pulpit, a deep moral and religious earnestness. His influence over the people lasted for three years,

and was of unprecedented power. This is the testimony not only of the prudent historian Guicciardini, but of the deep seeing Machiavelli. The latter ascribes his downfall to the envy of the people, who can never long endure the spectacle of one great character towering above all the others.

With the new constitution, a new spirit took possession of the people. Unrighteous gains were given up; deadly enemies embraced each other in love; secular sports came to an end; vows of continence were made by husbands and wives; profane love songs gave place to hymns of love for Christ; artists cast their nude paintings into the fire; fasting became a delight; the communion was partaken of daily; never wearying crowds thronged to the great cathedral, over whose pulpit were inscribed the words: "Jesus Christ, the King of Florence;" committees traversed the city gathering up and destroying bad books, cards, and instruments of music; the carnival gave place to a Palm Sunday procession in which thousands of children and of adults, dressed in white, indulged in sacred dances and sang very odd Christian songs, of which the following verse is a fair sample:

*"Non fu mai piu bel solazzo,  
Piu giocondo ne maggiore,  
Che per zelo e per amore  
Di Gesu divenir pazzo.  
Ognun grida com' io grido,  
Semper pazzo, pazzo, pazzo."*

This popular excess Savonarola justified on the Monday after Holy Week, 1496, by citing the example of David dancing before the ark, and by the phenomena of Pentecost after the ascension.

But all this was but a transient enthusiasm of an excitable populace. The general character of levity had been too deeply implanted by ages of prosperity and submission to demagogues to be able now to assume suddenly the self control and steadfastness which are so essential to a religious and free government, and a reaction was inevitable. It came only too soon. The worldly spirit reasserted itself in the form of opposition to the monk's regime at home and of alliance with the pope from without. No more violent contrast could be imagined than the austere Savonarola and the profligate and infamous pope Alexander VI. It was impossible that these two could live in peace at the head of neighboring states. Savonarola hesitated not to attack the character of the papal court as it deserved; and he openly proclaimed his hope that the reform begun in Florence would

eventually embrace the whole of Italy. The papal court saw the necessity of putting down so bold a foe. Strategy was at first resorted to. Savonarola was invited to come to Rome; and a cardinal's hat and the archbishopric of Florence were offered to him. He answered the pope in strangely prophetic words: "I desire none of your gifts; I will have no other red hat than that which you have given to other servants of Christ — the red hat of martyrdom." Then Alexander *commanded* him to come to Rome.

Savonarola excused himself on the ground of his feeble health; and he continued to preach against Rome. Thereupon the pope (in the autumn of 1496) forbade him further preaching on pain of excommunication, until the termination of his trial for heresy, which was now to be commenced. At the same time, the jealousy of the Franciscan order, at the prominence of this Dominican, fell upon him. Savonarola ceased preaching for a time; but then, unable to restrain the spirit within him, recommenced. "The pope," said he, "is ill informed and misguided. It is not the ideal pope who has forbidden me to preach; the true pope is the incarnation of the spirit of Christ; and Christ cannot be against the spirit of love, otherwise he would be against himself. This wicked order is, therefore, not from the pope. I must preach, because God has called me thereto." So reasoned Savonarola; so endeavored he to reconcile disobedience to the visible pope with obedience to the Catholic Church. Meantime political affairs took an unfavorable turn for Savonarola. Charles VIII was forced to retire from Italy in inglorious failure. Combined Italy was hostile to Florence because of its alliance with the French. Also a pestilence and famine broke out in Florence (June 1497), against which Savonarola could furnish no miraculous remedy. The party of the Medici made an attempt to seize the government; this failed, and ended with the execution (Aug. 21, 1497) of five prominent men. The avengers of their blood now watched for Savonarola's life. His followers now surrounded him with an armed guard; it was only thus that he could reach his pulpit.

The pope, learning of the decline of Savonarola's popularity, excommunicated him, first in May, 1497, and then more emphatically in October, forbidding all Christians to have any intercourse with him, and threatening the city with the interdict. Savonarola, encouraged by a favorable council which was elected Jan. 1, 1498, ascended the cathedral pulpit, denied the charge of heresy, declared null and void the excommunication, and appealed from the human pope to the heavenly head of the Church. He also boldly summoned the crowned heads of all

Christendom to unite in calling a general council, to depose this pretended pope, and to heal the wounds of the Church. And yet Savonarola plainly foresaw the fatal result to himself of the present contest. "To the *cause* there can be no other outcome than victory; but to *me* it will be death." An incautious step which Savonarola now took precipitated the end. From the balcony of San Marco he asked God to consume him with fire if he had acted from unchristian motives. A Franciscan monk offered to stand the ordeal of fire against him. Savonarola hesitated. An enthusiastic monk of San Marco offered to undergo the test in Savonarola's place; then the whole body of Dominicans declared themselves also ready. Savonarola consented. The issue in controversy was the righteousness of Savonarola and the invalidity of his excommunication. A monk was selected from each order. Two great ranges of fire, close beside each other, were prepared on the great square. The two orders of monks marched in with song and banners through the innumerable multitude; but, just as the moment arrived for the test, a violent disagreement arose as to whether the parties standing the ordeal should bear the crucifix and host. The contest lasted until evening, when a violent rain put out the remnant of the fire. The people dispersed amid loud murmurs, and the whole weight of their displeasure fell upon Savonarola. The fickle people now charged him with being an impostor and a coward, and it was due to his armed guards that he left the spot alive. On the next day — Palm Sunday, 1498 his enemies besieged him in San Marco; he disdained earthly weapons, and fell upon his face in prayer. As he was taken and conducted to judgment he was greeted with all manner of abuse. His adherents were expelled from the council, and a hasty trial was entered upon. On six successive days he was dragged forth and examined under the severest tortures. During the few days of his imprisonment he wrote a beautiful exposition of the 51st Psalm, which Luther afterwards published as a tract. He was then examined again, by torture, before a clerical tribunal; it was but a mere form. He was sentenced to be hanged and burned. He was thus executed with and between two of his friends, May 23, 1498. At the foot of the scaffold he had administered the eucharist to himself and his two friends. "My Lord was pleased to die for my sins; why should not I be glad to give up my poor life out of love to him?" With such words he closed his eyes upon the world and yielded to the gibbet and the flames.

The Dominican order endeavored in later years to effect his canonization. Luther said that God had already canonized him. Though not a dogmatic

reformer in the sense of Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin, Savonarola yet holds a most honorable place by the side of Wycliffe, Huss, and Wessel, as a forerunner of the great Reformation. Monuments were erected to Savonarola in San Marco, Florence, in 1873, and in Ferrara, May 23, 1875. Savonarola left numerous writings. In his *Triumphus Crucis* (*Trionfo della Croce* [1597]), he tries to turn the Church away from its modern corruptions to Christ as the center of all moral power. In his *De Divisione Omnium Scientiarum* he opposes pagan writers and praises the riches of the fathers. Recently (1845) his sermons (*Prediche*) were printed at Florence; also his poems (*Poesie*) in 1862. A portion of his works was published at Lyons, in six volumes, in 1633-40. His *Life* has been written by Carle (Paris, 1842); by Madden (Lond. 1853); by Perrens (Paris, 1853, 2 vols.; 3d ed. 1859); by Villari (Florence, 1859-61, 2 vols.); of the latter, a French translation by G. Gruyer (1874, 2 vols). His earlier biographers were: Burlamacchi (died 1519), G.F. Picodella Mirandola, and Bartoli. Excellent modern German biographers are: Rudelbach [A.G.], *Savonarola* (Hamb. 1835); Meier [F.K.], *Savonarola* (Berl. 1836); Hase, *Neue Propheten* (Leips. 1851). See the historical works of Guicciardini, Nardi, Roscoe, Machiavelli, Sismondi, and especially Villari, *History of Savonarola* (from the Italian, by Horner [Lond. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo]); Madden, *Life of Savonarola* (Lond. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo); also the *Brit. Quarterly*, Oct. 1849; *Eclectic Review*, Dec. 1853; *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1858; *Prot. Episc. Review*, Oct. 1860; *Baptist Quarterly*, Oct. 1873; *London Quar. Rev.* July 1856; *Methodist Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1867; Schaff in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 444, 455. (J.P.L.)

## Savor

(usually *j yre*rich, a *smell* or *scent*, as elsewhere rendered; ὄσμή, elsewhere “odor;” but a perfume is Chald. *twp̄ynæ*nichoth, *incense*; εὐὼδία; and a stink is Hebrews *vab̄e*) Besides its literal sense, this word is used metaphorically to imply character or reputation, and also the degree of acceptance with which any person or thing is received (ⲉⲡⲓⲛⲁ 2 Corinthians 2:14, etc.). In ⲉⲙⲉⲛⲁ Matthew 16:23; ⲉⲙⲉⲛⲁ Mark 8:33, φρονέω, *to think*, is rendered “savor.” in the sense of being *flavored* with (or, as the old Saxon use of the verb seems to warrant, in the entirely different signification of *being mended*; see *Bible Educator*, 4, 208). So in ⲉⲙⲉⲛⲁ Matthew 5:13, μωραίνω, *to become foolish*, is applied to the loss of that sharp quality in salt by which it renders other bodies agreeable to the taste. **SEE SALT.**



## Savory Meat

(*matammim*, from *to taste*, Genesis 27:4 sq.; and so *matammoth*, “dainties,” Proverbs 23:3, 6). The patriarchal cookery, like that of the modern Arabs, appears to have been generally very simple, but in dressing a favorite joint the latter frequently use every variety of fruits and vegetables which they can procure. “Among the more common dishes,” says Mr. Lane, “are the following: lamb or mutton, cut into small pieces, and stewed with various vegetables, and sometimes with peaches, apricots, or jujubes and sugar; cucumbers, etc.; small gourds, or the fruit of the black or white eggplant stuffed with rice and mince meat, etc.; vine leaves, or pieces of lettuce leaf and cabbage leaf, enclosing a similar composition; small morsels of lamb, or lamb and mutton, roasted on skewers, and called keebab; fowls simply roasted or boned and stuffed with raisins, pistachio nuts, crumbled bread, and parsley; and various kinds of pastry and other sweets. The repast is frequently commenced with soup, and is generally ended with boiled rice mixed with a little butter and seasoned with salt and pepper; or after this is served a watermelon or other fruit, or a bowl of sweet drink composed of water with raisins, and sometimes other kinds of fruit, boiled in it, and then sugar, and with a little rosewater added to it when cool. The meat, having generally little fat, is cooked with clarified butter, and is so thoroughly done that it is easily divided with the fingers” (*Mod. Egyptians*, 1, 214). **SEE FOOD.**

### Savoy, Conference Of.

**SEE CONFERENCE, SAVOY.**

### Savoy, Confession Of,

a declaration of faith and order on the part of the Independents, agreed upon at a meeting in the Savoy in 1658. Chapters 1 to 19 of the *Savoy Confession* correspond verbally to the *Westminster Confession*; but chapter 20 “Of the Gospel and the Extent of the Grace thereof,” is additional: “in which chapter, what is dispersed and inserted by intimation in the Assembly’s confession is here brought together, and more fully, under one head.” Chapters 21 to 27 correspond to chapters 20 to 26 of the *Westminster*, with the following exceptions: Clause four of chapter 20 clauses five and six of chapter 24 and the third clause of chapter 26 are omitted; the third clause of chapter 23 is modified; and chapter 25 is

materially altered, a clause being added relating to the expectations of the Church. Chapters 30 and 31 are omitted; but the remaining chapters correspond. The *Westminster* has thirty-three chapters; the *Savoy* thirty-two. *SEE INDEPENDENCY.*

## Saw

(*hrgeaz*, *megerah*, <sup><1033></sup>2 Samuel 13:31; <sup><1109></sup>1 Kings 7:9; <sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 20:3; *rwōmī* *massor*, <sup><2305></sup>Isaiah 10:15; elsewhere *rrē*; *garar*, in the Pual; *πίων* and *πίζω*). The Hebrews knew and used not only wood saws, but stone saws also (<sup><1109></sup>1 Kings 7:9; comp. Pliny, 36, 29; 44, 48), both being of great antiquity (Rosellini, *Monum.* 2, 35). Prisoners of war, especially leaders and princes, were sometimes executed with iron saws (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 12:31; <sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 20:3; comp. <sup><8157></sup>Hebrews 11:37; and Sept. in Amos 1:3), and according to a tradition in the *Anabaticon Jes.* (ed. Lawrence, 5, 11-14), and in the Church fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Epiphanius, Lactantius), this fate befell the prophet Isaiah also, under King Manasseh (comp. Gesen. *Jesa.* 1, 12 sq.). This terrible punishment was also known in other ancient nations, e.g. the Egyptians (Herod. 2, 139), the Persians (Ctesias, *Pers.* 54; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 5, 96), the Thracians (Val. Max. 9:2, extr. 4). There were even some instances of it under the Roman emperors (Sueton. *Calig.* 27), inflicted on Jews (Dio Cass. 68, 32). *SEE CARPENTER.*

## Picture for Saw 1

## Picture for Saw 2

Ancient Egyptian saws, so far as has yet been discovered, were single handed, though Jerome has been thought to allude to circular saws. As is the case in modern Oriental saws, the teeth usually incline towards the handle instead of away from it, like ours. They have, in most cases, bronze blades apparently attached to the handles by leathern thongs, but some of those in the British Museum have their blades let into them like our knives. A double-handed iron saw has been found at Nimrûd; and double saws strained with a cord, such as modern carpenters use, were in use among the Romans. In sawing wood, the Egyptians placed the wood perpendicularly in a sort of frame and cut it downwards. No evidence exists of the use of the saw applied to stone in Egypt, nor without the double-handed saw does it seem likely that this should be the case; but we read of sawn stones used

in the Temple (~~1079~~1 Kings 7:9; Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 305; Wilkinson, *Anc. Eryp.* 2, 114, 119; Brit. Mus. *Eryp. Room*, No. 6046; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 195; Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* 28, 27). The saws “under” or “in” which David is said to have placed his captives were of iron. The expression in ~~1023~~2 Samuel 12:31 does not necessarily imply torture, but the word “cut” in ~~1318~~1 Chronicles 20:3 can hardly be understood otherwise (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1326; Thenius *on 2 Sans.* xii and 1 *Chronicles* xx). A case of sawing asunder, by placing the criminal between boards and then beginning at the head, is mentioned by Shaw, *Trav.* p. 254. **SEE HANDICRAFT.**

### Picture for Saw 3

### Picture for Saw 4

### Picture for Saw 5

However simple the idea of such an instrument, it was not among the most ancient of inventions, doubtless because it was one of the few which required from the very first to be constructed with iron. For this reason it is not known among savages; nor were even the comparatively cultivated nations of South America, being without iron, acquainted with its use. Beckmann states that, “In early periods, the trunks of trees were split with wedges into as many and as thin pieces as possible; and if it was found necessary to have them still thinner, they were hewn on both sides to the proper size.” This simple but wasteful process has continued in use down to a rather recent period, even where the saw has been known, in countries (Norway and Northern Russia, for instance) where wood is abundant, under the correct impression that boards thus hewn are much more durable, from having greater cohesion and solidity, than those which have had their fibers separated by the saw. Probably the jawbone of a fish suggested the first idea of a saw. So the Grecian fable states, in which the process of this invention is described. This fable, in its various versions, assigns the invention to the famous artist Daedalus, or rather to his nephew (called Talus by some, by others Perdix, while others leave him unnamed), who, having found the jawbone of a fish (or of a serpent according to others), was led to imitate it by filing teeth in iron, and thus forming a saw. The process is very probable; but there is nothing to say for the claim which the Greeks make to the honor of this invention. It does not appear to have been known to them in the time of Homer; for in the minute account

of the proceedings of Ulysses in building his boat, there is not the least mention of a saw, although, if such an instrument had been then known, Calypso could as easily have supplied it as she did the axe, the adze, the augers, and whatever else he required. The Greeks, probably, in common with other neighboring nations, borrowed the saw from the Egyptians, to whom it was known at a very early period, as is proved by its appearance on their ancient sculptures. The ultimate improvement which the saw received in ancient times approximates it very nearly to the state in which we continue to use it. In the *Antiquites d'Herculanum*, 1, pl. 100, there is an engraving, after an ancient painting, which shows this in a very interesting manner. Beckmann (*Inventions*, 1, 366) has very accurately described it (see the cut): "Two genii (or winged Cupids) are represented at the end of a bench, which consists of a long table that rests upon two legs, like a stool." Montfaucon gives, from Gruter, representations of two kinds of saws: one of them is without a frame, but has a handle of a round form; and the other has that high frame of wood which we see in the saws of our stone sawyers. This reminds us to observe that Beckmann, following Pliny, cannot find an instance of cutting stone with saws earlier than the 4th century B.C.; overlooking the text <sup><1K03></sup>1 Kings 7:9, where it is said that some parts of Solomon's palace were constructed with "costly stones, according to the measure of hewed stones, *sawed with a saw.*" **SEE MECHANIC.**

## Sawa

in Arabic mythology, is a female deity, said to have been worshipped by the Arabs prior to the deluge — a statement not to be reconciled with the fact that those people are descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar. — Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol. s.v.*

## Sawaku,

in Caribbean mythology, is the man who first caused fire and lightnings. He was very powerful; but, in order to prevent pursuit, he transformed himself first into a bird, and then into a star. The lightnings are still occasioned by his blowing the celestial fire through a reed, so that it darts about to great distances.

## Sawamangala,

in Hindu mythology (*the highest blessedness*), is a surname of *Parvati*, the consort of *Siva*.

## Sawyer, Cyrus

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lower Canada Dec. 22, 1811, but the next year his parents removed to Western New York. He was converted in 1822, licensed to preach in 1837, and received into the Michigan Conference, which then embraced Knox County, O., where he resided. The range of his itinerant labors was within the limits of the North Ohio Conference. He died at Delaware, O., in January, 1848. Mr. Sawyer's life was one of great excellence and moral beauty, and his ministry was eminently useful. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 4, 266. (J.L.S.)

## Sawyer, Isaac

a Baptist minister, was born in Hoosick, N.Y., Nov. 22, 1770. He was left an orphan at the age of fourteen, and two years after bound himself out to a man who soon after removed to Monkton, Vt., where there was little or no religious influence. He was converted in 1793, and became a Baptist, serving in the capacity of deacon until he began to preach. In 1797 the Church called upon him to "exercise his gift," but he delayed a long time, because of a sense of his own unfitness. On June 29, 1799, a council was called, and Mr. Sawyer was ordained. He filled the following churches: Monkton, Vt., 1799-1812; Fairfield, Vt., March, 181-213; Orwell, Vt., 1813-17; Brandon, Vt., 1818-25; Bethel, Vt., 1825-28; Westport, N.Y., 1828-34; Knowlesville, N.Y., 1834; and was for a short time at Stockton, N.Y., and Lewiston, N.Y. He died Sept. 30, 1847. He baptized during his ministry upwards of 1100 persons. He was the first president of the Vermont Baptist Convention, and a friend of education and temperance. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6, 369.

## Sawyer, James W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Palmyra, Me., Sept. 16, 1838. He removed when a child to Portland, where he was converted at the age of fifteen years. He was licensed to preach April 19, 1862, and was received on trial in the Maine Conference in April 1864. His ministerial life was short, terminating with death, Dec. 23, 1869, Mr.

Sawyer was a deeply pious man, and a good preacher. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 147.

### Sawyer, John, D.D.

an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Hebron, Conn., Oct. 9, 1755. In 1777 he entered the Revolutionary army, and, after serving for some years, entered Dartmouth College in 1781. He graduated in 1786, then devoted himself to theology, and commenced preaching within one year after leaving college. In October, 1787, he accepted a call to become pastor of the Church at Oxford, Coos County, N.H., on the condition of that Church relinquishing the practice of baptizing children on what was termed the halfway covenant (q.v.). He afterwards became successively pastor of a Church in Boothbay, Me., in 1796; of New Castle in 1806, in which latter place he commenced traveling in all directions as a home missionary; of Bangor in 1812, where he acted both as preacher and as schoolmaster; and finally of Garland, where he remained until his death, Oct. 14, 1858. Religion was the supreme governing principle of his life, and for nearly eighty years he labored faithfully in bringing souls to God. See *Amer. Cong. Yearbook*, 1859, p. 131.

### Sawyer, Seymour B.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina, Dec. 8, 1808. He was converted Oct. 1, 1821, under the ministry of the Cumberland Presbyterians, to which body he attached himself. In 1827 he was licensed to preach among them; but, dissenting from some of their doctrines, he returned his license, and removed to Mississippi, where he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1830 was licensed as a local preacher. In 1832 he was admitted on trial in the traveling connection, and stationed in Montgomery. He filled with great acceptability and usefulness many of the most important charges, until his death, which occurred Sept. 23, 1843. Mr. Sawyer was a man of mild and gentle disposition. As a pastor, he was specially diligent and affectionate. His sermons were remarkable for their simplicity and spirituality. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 3, 593.

### Saxe, Alfred

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born Sept. 5, 1814. He was converted in 1830, licensed to preach in 1832, and graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1838. The succeeding eighteen months he was principal of

the Middletown Preparatory School, after which he became principal of the high school in that city, where he remained until 1843, when he was received on trial by the New York Conference, transferred to the Troy Conference, and appointed to Ferry Street Station, Albany. In 1845 he was appointed to North White Creek, and in 1846, on account of declining health, was placed on the superannuated list. He died Oct. 8, 1846. Mr. Saxe was a sound and practical preacher, a diligent and laborious pastor, and a most affable man. In his last illness he enjoyed the consolations of religion, and appeared cheerful and happy even while passing through the vale of death. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 4, 131. (J.L.S.)

## Saxnot

in German mythology, was a god whose name occurs in the oath taken by the Saxons after their violent conversion to Christianity by Charlemagne, by which they renounced the worship of Thunar (Thor), Woden, and Saxnot. He is supposed to have been the god of war, since the word Sax (Sachs), from which the Saxons took their name, denoted a sword. Anglo-Saxon genealogies point — to a Saxneat, who was Woden's son.

## Saxon Architecture.

### Picture for Saxon 1

The buildings of the Anglo-Saxons were usually of wood, rarely of stone until the 11th century, and consequently we must not expect to find any great number of remains. The only dated examples of this style are about the middle of the 11th century, as at Deerhurst, Gloucestershire; with the exception of some slight remains at the mouth of the Tyne, which are of an earlier and distinct character, and Brixworth, which is possibly Roman work restored. The style agrees in many respects with that of the 11th century on the Continent, where the work has not been ornamented with sculpture in the 12th, as has been very frequently the case. There are, however, some peculiarities about the buildings of this class which entitle them to the name of the Anglo-Saxon style, or, more correctly, perhaps, the primitive English style; for it has been observed that they are far more numerous in the Danes' land, or the eastern counties, than in other parts of England. In the neighborhood of Lincoln and Gainsborough almost all the old country churches partake of this character. It has also been observed that the earlier examples are more like the work of carpenters than of masons. Such a tower as that of Earl's Barton, for instance, has all the

appearance of being copied from a wooden tower, and this may very probably have been the case. Ordericus Vitalis, who lived in the 11th century, mentions that Siward, the cousin of Edward the Confessor, built a *wooden church* at Shrewsbury, which was used as the parish church. This is material evidence, considering that it was built by a royal prince in a town of so much importance. This church was existing in 1082, when a stone church was commenced by the father of Ordericus Vitalis, who records these facts. It is not improbable that these primitive English churches may be among the earliest stone churches of Western Europe after the time of the Romans. The Roman art of building had become extinct in all this part of Europe, and almost extinct in Rome itself, by the 10th century, and the most ready models which the English had to copy in the 11th century were their own wooden churches. It was just at that time that Canute ordered churches to be built of stone and lime in all the places where his father or himself had burned the wooden churches of the Anglo-Saxons.

## **Picture for Saxon 2**

## **Picture for Saxon 3**

The class of buildings referred to as being considered to belong to this style contain some rather unusual features. The execution is rude and coarse: the walls are built either of rag or rubble, sometimes partly of herringbone work, without buttresses, and in many cases, if not always, have been plastered on the outside. The quoins are usually of hewn stones placed alternately flat and on end — a kind of construction to which the name “long and short” has been given; the walls are often ornamented externally with flat vertical strips of stone projecting slightly from the surface, resembling wooden framing, generally of the same “long and short” construction as the quoins. On towers there are sometimes several tiers of these, divided from each other by plain strings or bands. Semicircular arches and triangles formed of similar strips of stone are also sometimes used as ornaments; and plain projecting blocks are frequently associated with these, either as impost, or as bases for the vertical strips which often stand above them. The jambs of doorways and other openings are very commonly of “long and short” work; and when impost is used, as they generally are, they are usually rude, and often extremely massive, sometimes consisting of plain blocks and sometimes molded. Round the arch there is very often a projecting course occupying the situation of a



hood molding, which sometimes stops upon the imposts, but more frequently runs down the jambs to the ground, forming a kind of pilaster on each side of the opening. It is usually flat, but is sometimes rounded and occasionally notched on the edges, as at Dunham Magna, Norfolk; in some instances the impost is arranged so as to form a capital to each of these projections on the jambs, and they are sometimes provided with bases either formed of plain blocks or rudely molded. The arches are generally plain, but are occasionally worked with rude and massive moldings, as the chancel arch at Wittering Church, Northamptonshire; some arches are constructed with bricks (probably all of them taken from some Roman building, as at Brixworth) or thin stones, and these usually have a course of stones or bricks laid upon the top of the arch, as at Britford Church, Wiltshire: the arches are always semicircular, but some small openings, such as doors and windows, have pointed or triangular heads formed of two straight stones placed on end upon the imposts, and resting against each other at the top, as at Barnack. The windows are not large, and, when splayed, have often nearly or quite as much splay externally as internally. In belfries and other situations where they do not require to be glazed, they are frequently of two or more lights, divided by small shafts or pillars, which are very usually made like balusters, and encircled with bands of rude moldings. In the old portion of St. Alban's Abbey, erected in the latter half of the 11th century, specimens are seen. These generally have capitals, or imposts, formed of long stones reaching entirely through the wall; in some instances the balusters are oblong in plan, as in the tower of St. Michael's Church, Oxford, and in others two are placed together, one behind the other, in order to give better support to these long capitals.

#### **Picture for Saxon 4**

The whole of these peculiarities are not to be met with in any one building; and in some churches in which several of them are to be found they are associated with other features, evidently original, which so clearly belong to the Norman style as to prove that these buildings are not of Saxon date, as at the churches of Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, and Syston, Lincolnshire. In other instances the lower parts of buildings consist exclusively of this peculiar kind of construction, and are surmounted by pure Norman work which has been raised upon it subsequently to the first erection, as at the tower of Clapham Church, Bedfordshire, and Woodstone, near Peterborough. This last class of buildings appears to preponderate in favor of the Saxon theory; for, although the Norman

additions have been observed not to be remarkably early in that style, it is not very probable that so material a change would have been made in the architecture unless a considerable interval had elapsed between the erection of the different parts. Some of the churches in which the peculiarities under consideration are found are clearly Norman (and not early in the style), but it may reasonably be supposed that in many parts of the country the Saxon style would have lingered for a considerable time after the Norman invasion, and would have continued to be employed (with an increasing admixture of Norman features) in buildings erected by native workmen.

### **Picture for Saxon 5**

The following is a tolerably complete list of examples of the Saxon style:

*Bedfordshire* — Knotting; Clapham, tower.

*Berkshire* — Wickham, tower: Cholsey, tower.

*Buckinghamshire* — Caversfield, tower; Iver; Lavendon, tower, nave, and chancel.

*Cambridgeshire* — St. Benet's and St. Giles', Cambridge.

*Cornwall* — Tintagel.

*Derbyshire* — Repton, east end, and crypt.

*Durham* — Monks' Wearmouth, tower; Jarrow, walls of church and chancel, and ruins near it.

*Essex* — Boreham, church; Colchester, Trinity Church, part of the tower, etc.; Felstead, church; Great Maplestead, north door.

*Gloucestershire* — Daglingworth Church, except the tower; Deerhurst, tower; Miserden, church; Stretton, north doorway; Upleaden, chancel-arch.

*Hampshire* — Boarhunt; Corhampton; Headbourne Worthy; Hinton Ampner; Little Sombourn; Kilmeston; Tichborne.

*Hertfordshire* — St. Michael's, at St. Alban's.

*Kent* — Dover, part of the ruined church in the Castle; Swanscombe, tower; Knotting.

*Leicestershire*—Barrow on Soar; Barrow on Tugby.

*Lincolnshire* — Aukloroneh; Barton on the Humber, St. Peter's, tower; Branston; Caburn; Clee, tower; Holton-le-Clay, tower and chancel-arch; Heapham; Lincoln, St. Peter's at Gowt's; St. Mary-le-Wigford; Nettleton; Ropsley, part of the west end; Rothwell; Scartho; Skellingthorpe; Skillington, part of the church; Springthorpe; Stow, transepts; Swallow; Syston, tower; Waith, tower and chancel-arch: Winterton.

*Middlesex* — Kingsbury, part of chleurch (now hidden by plastering).

*Norfolk* — Norwich, St. Julien's; Beeston St. Lawrence; Dunham Magna, church; Elmham, ruins of bishop's palace; Howe; Newton, tower.

*Northamptonshire* — Barnack, tower; Brigstock, church; Brixworth, church: Earl's Barton, tower; Green's Norton, west end: Pattishall; Stow-nine-churches; Witterington, chancel.

*Northumberland* — Bolam, tower: Bywell, St. Andrew; Bywell; Corbridge; Hexham, crypt; Ovingham; Whittingham.

*Oxfordshire* — St. Michael's, Oxford, tower; Northleigh, tower.

*Shropshire* — Barrow, chancel-arch; Church Stretton; Clee; Stanton Lacey, nave and transept; Stottesdon.

*Somersetshire* — Cranmore, door-head; Milbourne Port.

*Suffolk* — Barhaim, part of church; Debenham; Claydon, part of church; Flixton; Gosbeck, part of church; Hemingstone; Ilketshall; Leiston.

*Surrey* — Albury; Stoke d'Abernon, some portions.

*Sussex* — Bishopstone, church; Bosham, tower; St. Botolph, chancel-arch; Burwash; Sompting, tower; Worth; Yapton.

*Warwickshire* — Wooten Wawen, substructure of tower.

*Wiltshire* — North Burcombe, east end; Brytford, north and south doors; Bremhill, west end; Somerford Keynes.

*Worcestershire* — Wyre Piddle, chancel-arch.

*Yorkshire* — Bardsey; Kirkdale, west end and chancel-arch; Kirk Homerton Laughton-en-le-Morthen, north doorway; Maltby; Ripon

minster, crypt, called Wilfred's Needle; York Cathedral, portion of crypt (Bloxham); York, church of St. Mary, Bishop-hill Junior.

### Say, Samuel H.

an English dissenting divine, was born in the year 1675. He entered as a pupil in the academy of Rev. Thomas Rowe, London, about 1692. Finishing his studies, he became chaplain to Thomas Scott, Lyminge, in Kent, in whose family he remained three years. Thence he removed to Andover, in Hampshire; then to Yarmouth, in Norfolk; and soon after to Lowestoff, in Suffolk, where he labored for eighteen years. He was co-pastor with Rev. Samuel Baxter at Ipswich nine years, and succeeded Dr. Edmund Calamy in Westminster in 1734. He died in 1743. He wrote, *Sermon* (Lond. 1736, 8vo): — *Poems and Essays* (ibid. 1745, 4to; 1749, 4to).

### Saybrook Platform

a confession of faith and a compendium of rules for the government of the churches, adopted by an assembly of Congregational ministers and lay delegates convened by order of the Legislature of Connecticut, at Saybrook, Sept. 9, 1708. The synod consisted of sixteen members — twelve clerical and four lay — who represented the councils of Hartford, Fairfield, New London, and New Haven counties. As to *doctrine*, they adopted for recommendation to the General Assembly of the colony the confession assented to by the elders and messengers assembled at Boston, May 12, 1680, which was the Savoy Confession with some small alterations, adding also the doctrinal parts of the Westminster Confession. In regard to *Church government and discipline*, they adopted fifteen articles, the substance of which was to provide (1) for one or more *consociations* in each county, with appellate and final jurisdiction, to which particular churches might refer in difficult cases; (2) for one or more *associations* in each county, consisting of the ministers, who should meet at least twice a year to consult on the common interest of the churches, and to perform certain other offices, such as the examination and recommendation of candidates for the ministry; (3) for a *general association*, to be composed of one or more delegates from each of the district associations, to meet once a year. The proceedings of the synod were approved by the Assembly of the colony, Oct. 1708, and it ordained “that all the churches within this government that are or shall be thus

united in doctrine, worship, and discipline be, and for the future shall be owned and acknowledged, established by law; provided always that nothing herein shall be intended or construed to hinder or prevent any society that is or shall be allowed by the laws of this government, who soberly differ or dissent from the united churches hereby established, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way, according to their consciences.” The decrees of the Saybrook Platform, both as regards doctrine and government, are not binding on the churches, but are only advisory in their character. See Trumbull, *Hist. of Connecticut*, vol. 1, ch. 19; *Congregational Order*; Bacon, *Discourse at Norwich, Conn.*, June, 1859.

## Sayei

in Hindu mythology, is the daughter of Wiswakarma, and probably identical with *Sangia*. She was married to the sun god, and bore him Jama, the god of the underworld.

## Sayer, Ezra

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was originally a member of the Troy Conference, and was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1850. He preached at Shelbyville, Edina, Memphis, and Kirksville, but, in 1860, he took a superannuated relation. He took up his residence near Shelbyville, preaching as his health would permit until the summer of 1864, when he died. Mr. Sayer was a preacher of no common abilities, fulfilling the duties of his station so as to win the confidence and respect of all with whom he came in contact. See *Min. of Annual Conf.* 1865, p. 7.

## Saying

a distinct or sustained monotone in sacred music analogous to the old “saying without note,” neither singing nor reading.

## Sayings, Traditional, Of Christ.

There can be no doubt that, besides the words of Christ which are mentioned in the gospels, others of more or less significance were spoken by him, and what John (<sup><431B></sup>John 20:30; 21:25) says of the works of Christ, we may equally apply to his words. Paul mentions (<sup><401B></sup>Acts 20:35) a saying of Christ, μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν (i.e. “It is more blessed to give than to receive”), which we look for in vain in the canonical

gospels. The following examples contain those sayings of Christ which the ancient Church has designated as such; and we put them together, not because we ascribe them altogether to apocryphal authors, but because they have no canonical authority in their favor:

**1.** “On the same day, having seen one working on the Sabbath, he said to him, O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the law.”

This very remarkable saying occurs in Cod. D and in Cod. Graec. β Rob. Stephani after <sup><400B></sup>Luke 6:4. Whether or not these words were originally in Luke’s Gospel, we cannot decide, but that they convey an evangelical meaning is certain (comp. Loisell. *Opusc.* p. 20; Paulus Colomesius, *Observation. Sacr.* p. 143).

**2.** “But ye seek to increase from little, and from greater to less. When ye go and are bidden to dinner (δειπνήσαι), sit not down in the highest seats, lest a more honorable man than thou come, and he that bade thee come and say to thee, Take a lower seat, and you be ashamed. But when thou sit down in a lower seat, and a less honorable man than thou come, then he that bade thee will say unto thee, Go up higher, and this will be profitable to thee.” This saying is also found in Cod. D or Cantabrig. and in some other codd. after <sup><400B></sup>Matthew 20:28 (comp. Griesbach, *N.T.* ad loc.; Tischendorf, *N.T.* ad loc.). That this addition was well known may be seen from the fact that Juvencus (q.v.), in his *Hist. Evang.* 3, 613 sq., has given it in the following verses:

“At vos ex minimis opibus transscendere vultis,  
Et sic e summis lapsi comprehenditis imos.  
Si vos quisque vocat coenae convivium ponens  
Cornibus in summis devitet ponere membra  
Quisque sapit, veniet forsan si nobilis alter,  
Turpiter eximio cogetur cedere cornu  
Quem tumor inflati cordis per summa locarat.  
Sin contentus erit mediocria prendere coena  
Inferiora dehinc si mox conviva subibit,  
Ad potiora pudens transibit strata tororum.”

**3.** “The Lord says in the Gospel, If ye keep not that which is small, who will give you that which is great? For I say unto you that he who is faithful in very little is faithful also in much.” This is found by Clem. Rom. (*Epist. II ad Corinth.* 8; comp. Iren. *Adv. Hoeres.* 2, 64).

4. “And Jesus says, For those that are sick, I was sick; and for those that hunger, I suffered hunger; and for those that thirst, I suffered thirst.” It is difficult to say whether this citation, which is found by Origen (*Comment. in Matt.* tom. 13 [tom. 3, 563, ed. De la Rue]), can claim any originality or not (comp. ~~425~~ Matthew 25:35; ~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 9:20-22).
5. “Ask great things, and the small shall be added unto you; ask heavenly things, and the earthly shall be added unto you.” This saying, which is found in Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* 1, 1, 416 [ed. Pott, 2, 488]; Orig. *De Orat.* 2, 43; *Opp.* 1, 197, 219), seems not to be taken from an apocryphal gospel (comp. Grabe, *Spicileg.* 1, 14), or from an interpolated codex (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 1, 329), but has been freely cited from ~~403~~ Matthew 6:33. Such license is often used in common life, when quoting the sentence of another, which is not done verbatim, but with such words as the circumstances and the connection of speech require.
6. “Show yourselves tried money changers” (γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι). This saying of Christ, which is found in Clement. *Homil.* 2, 51; 3, 50; 18, 20; Epiphan. *Hoeres.* 44, 2; Orig. *Ad. Joh.* tom. 19, 8, 20, p. 268; Jerome, *Epist.* 119 (ed. Vallars. 1, 815); Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 16, is first cited without any authority (in the *Apostol. Constit.* 2, 36), then as a passage of Scripture by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* 1, 1, 425), and also as an apostolic, but more especially Pauline, commandment (comp. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7, 7; Cyrill. Alex. *Ad Jes.* 2, 56). Under these circumstances, it will be difficult to decide who the author of this saying is.
7. “Let us resist all iniquity, and hold it in hatred,” quoted as the words of Christ by Barnabas (*Epist. Catholica*, 4); and *ibid.* 7 we read, “They who wish to see me and lay hold of my kingdom must receive me by affliction and suffering.”
8. “If only one of Israel will repent, and believe in God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven. After twelve years go ye into the world, lest one should say, We have not heard.” In Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* [ed. Pott], 6, 762), Peter quotes these words as those of the Lord, and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 5, 18) mentions this command of Christ, ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωρισθῆναι τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ.
9. “The Lord said, Should you be with me gathered in my bosom, and not do my commandments, I will cast you off, and say to you, Go from me, I

know you not whence you are, workers of iniquity.” This we read in Clem. Rom. (*Epist. ad Corinth. 2, 4*). In the same epistle (5), we read,

**10.** “The Lord saith, Ye shall be lambs in the midst of wolves. But Peter answered him, What, then, should the wolves tear in pieces the lambs? Jesus said to Peter, Let not the lambs fear the wolves after they are dead; and do you fear not those who kill you and can do nothing to you; but fear him who after you are dead hath power over soul and body to cast them into hellfire.” While there is some resemblance in this narrative with <sup><1006</sup>Matthew 10:16, 28; <sup><1274</sup>Luke 12:4, 5, yet the whole manner of this conversation betrays too much its apocryphal origin.

**11.** “Keep the flesh pure and the soul unspotted, that ye may receive (<sup><1006</sup>ἀπολάβητε; not as some read, ἀπολάβωμεν, “that we may receive”) eternal life” (*Epist. 8*).

**12.** “Our Lord Jesus Christ said, In whatsoever I may find you, in this will I also judge you.” This saying, which is found in Justin. Mart. (*Dial. c. Tryph.* [ed. Marani, p. 143]), is ascribed by Clem. Alex. (*Quis Dives Salvetur*, § 40) to God; by Johannes Climacus (in *Scala Paradisi*, 7, p. 159, and in the *Vita B. Antonii*, c. 15, in *Vita Patrum*, p. 41) to the prophet Ezekiel (comp. <sup><3008</sup>Ezekiel 7:3, 8; 18:30; 24:14; 33:20, with Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.* 1, 333). A comparison of the passages in Ezekiel will, however, prove that these parallels are insufficient, and some apocryphal gospel is probably the authority for this saying.

**13.** “The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stocks, and on each stock ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any saint shall have seized one bunch, another shall cry, I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord. Likewise also he said that a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand ears of corn, and each grain of wheat shall produce ten pounds of fine pure flour; and so all other fruits and seeds and each herb according to its proper nature. And that all animals, using for food what is received from the earth, shall live in peace and concord with one another, subject to men with all subjection. And when Judas the traitor believed not, and asked. How, then, shall such productions proceed from the Lord? the Lord said, They shall see who shall come to these times.” This narrative of the millennium Irenaeus (*Adv. Hoeres.* 5, 33) describes as



delivered by John to Papias. Since, however, this tradition belongs to Papias, whom Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3, 39) describes as an ἄνδρα σμικρὸν τὸν νοῦν, we must deny from the very beginning the authority of Christ as having uttered these words. Besides, the whole tenor of this narrative so conflicts with the dignity contained in all the words of Christ, that, without the least shadow of a doubt, we can ascribe to it an apocryphal origin. The description of the millennium reminds us of the Rabbinic representations of the same, especially as we find it in the *Jalkut Shimoni* (fol. 7, col. 1, No. 20), and which is too trivial to be translated. A German translation is given by Eisenmenger (*Entdecktes Judenthum*, 2, 309 sq.). An examination of the Koran (sur. 18, 32; 37, 49; 38, 53; 56, 38, etc.) will also show that the Mohammedan representation of Paradise is less sensual than that given above from a Christian source.

**14.** Pseudo-Linus (*De Passione Petri*; comp. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 1, 335, 775) quotes a mystical saying of the Lord: “Unless ye turn your right into the left and the left into the right, and that which is above into that which is below, and that which is before you into that which is behind, ye will not know the kingdom of God.”

**15.** “The Lord being asked by Salome when his kingdom will come, said, When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.” This quotation, which is found by Clem. Rom. (*Epist. ad Corinth.* 12), is, according to Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* [ed. Pott], 3, 553), taken from the Gospel of the Egyptians. From the same gospel, Clem. (*ibid.* p. 532) has preserved the following conversation of Christ with Salome:

**16.** “When Salome asked the Lord, How long shall men die? he said, As long as women bear children. Then Salome answered, I have done well that I did not bear (καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα); but the Lord replied, Thou mayest eat of every herb, but of that which has bitterness do not eat.” And further on (p. 540) he states, “I am come to make an end to the works of the woman — of the woman, viz. the lust; to the works, viz. to the birth and death.”

**17.** “He that wanders shall reign, and he that reigns shall rest” (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 453), from the Hebrew Gospel.

**18.** “I came to put an end to sacrifices; and unless ye cease from sacrificing, God’s anger will not cease from you” (*Evang. Ebion. ap. Epiph. Hoeres. 30, 16*).

**19.** “My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house” (*Clem. Alex. Strom. 5, 684*).

**20.** “In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Savior himself says, Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor.” This very singular saying is quoted by Origen, *in Joann. tom. 2* (ed. De la Rue, 4, 64); Jerome, *Comment. in Jes. 11, 2, lib. 2*; in *Micham, 7, 6*. That the Holy Ghost should be presented here as a *genus femininum* must not be looked for in the Gnostic idea of the Holy Ghost as female principle (comp. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. 1, 362 sq.*), but finds its explanation in the words of Jerome (*Comment. in Jes. 40, 11*), “Nemo autem in hac parte scandalizari debet, quod dicatur apud Hebraeos spiritus genere feminino, cum nostra lingua appellatur genere masculino, et Graeco sermone neutro; in divinitate enim nullus est sexus.”

**21.** “Never be joyful except when ye shall look on your brother in love” — so from the Hebrew Gospel by Jerome (*Comment. ad Ephes. 5, 4*).

See Grabe, *Spicilegium*, 1, 12 sq.; Fabricius, *Codex Apocr. N.T. 1, 321 sq.*, Körner, *De Sermonibus Christi ἀγράφοις* (Lips. 1776); Hoffmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, (ibid. 1851), p. 317 sq.; Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (Boston, 1867), p. 445 sq. (B.P.)

## Sayutshiam

in Hindu mythology, is a degree of blessedness or godliness which relieves man from the necessity of being born again on earth. It may be attained by solitude, virtue, and self examination, and is at all times assured to such Brahmins as become Yogis, their state being so exalted as to make them more than equal to the gods and to exempt them from every form of trial.

## Sazoma

in Lamaism, is one of the two legal wives of Cio Conciva or Xaka, the second person in the trinity of Lamaism.

## Scab

(**br**ḡ; *garab*, <sup><BR7></sup>Deuteronomy 28:27; elsewhere “scurvy,” a diseased *scurf* on the skin; **tj p**ṣḡ, *mispatchath*, <sup><BR36></sup>Leviticus 13:6, 7, 8; a harmless cutaneous eruption; **tj P**ṣ; *sappachath*, ver. 2; 14, 56, the *mange* in the hair causing it to fall out; kindred with these last two is **j p**ḡ; for **j p**ṣ; *saphach*, to “smite with a scab,” <sup><BR7></sup>Isaiah 3:17, i.e. premature baldness; **t p**Ly; *yallepheth*, <sup><BR1></sup>Leviticus 21:20; 22:22, an itching or tetter in the skin). *SEE DISEASE*; *SEE LEPROSY*.

## Scabbard

(**r [i]**ṡ; *taar*, <sup><HR6></sup>Jeremiah 47:6; elsewhere “sheath”). *SEE SWORD*.

## Scaeus

in Greek mythology, was one of the twelve sons of Hippocoön, who expelled Icarius and Tyndareus from Lacedaemon, but were afterwards themselves overcome and slain by Hercules.

## Scaffold

(**r w**K; *ziyor*, <sup><HR3></sup>2 Chronicles 6:13; elsewhere used of the “laver” and “pans” for the sacred service), a *platform* or pulpit (q.v.) for public speaking; probably raised from the floor, but whether round (as the name would seem to denote) or square (as the dimensions would imply) is uncertain.

## Scala Santa

(Ital. for *holy stair*), a celebrated staircase, consisting of twenty-eight white marble steps, in a little chapel of the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome. Romanists assert that this is the staircase which Christ several times ascended and descended when he appeared before Pilate, and that it was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Rome. Multitudes of pilgrims creep up the steps of the Scala Santa on their knees with roses in their hands, kissing each step as they ascend. On reaching the top, they repeat a prayer. The performance of this ceremony is regarded as being particularly meritorious, entitling the devout pilgrim to plenary indulgence. It was while thus ascending these holy stairs that Luther thought he heard the words “The

just shall live by faith,” and, mortified at the degradation to which his superstition had brought him, fled from the spot.

Certain churches in England had similar staircases, which enjoyed the privilege of affording composition for a visit to Rome — at Westminster Abbey, in 1504; St. Mary’s Chapel, at Boston; St. Mary’s Chapel in the Austin Canons’ Church, Norwich; and at Windsor, with a college of ten priests, until 1504.

## Scale

**1**, of fishes (τράχη, *kaskeseth*, <sup><610></sup>Leviticus 11:9, 10, 12; <sup><640></sup>Deuteronomy 14:10; <sup><290></sup>Ezekiel 29:4; so of the *laninoe* of a coat of “mail,” <sup><976></sup>1 Samuel 17:5); similarly λεπίς (a *flake*) of incrustations from the eyes (<sup><408></sup>Acts 9:18); but in <sup><8415></sup>Job 41:15 (Hebrews 7) the scaly armor of the crocodile is figuratively denoted (μυλγαεγαραι *strong ones of shields*, A.V. “scales”);

**2**, of balances (σι P, *peles*, in the sing. only, “weight,” <sup><161></sup>Proverbs 16:11; “scales,” <sup><240></sup>Isaiah 40:12; always associated with μύζαω, the *balance* proper);

**3**, as a verb, *to scale* the walls of a city (ηλ ἵ;olah, <sup><122></sup>Proverbs 21:22, *to go up*, as elsewhere often). *SEE LADDER.*

## Picture for Scale 1

Before the introduction of coins, balances were of the utmost importance for the weighing of gold and silver in every commercial transaction (<sup><0236></sup>Genesis 23:16; 43:21; <sup><246></sup>Isaiah 46:6; <sup><239></sup>Jeremiah 32:9), so that a balance was required to be of exquisite delicacy. Allusions to this are found in <sup><245></sup>Isaiah 40:15; Ecclesiastes 28:29, “small dust of the balance,” “a little grain of the balance;” and all dishonesty in the treatment of the scales is sternly forbidden and denounced (<sup><695></sup>Leviticus 19:35; <sup><277></sup>Hosea 12:7; <sup><185></sup>Amos 8:5; <sup><3161></sup>Micah 6:11; <sup><100></sup>Proverbs 11:1; 16:11). Hence arose the Rabbinic rule that the scales should be made of marble which could not wear away. The above term σι P, *peles* (rendered “weight” <sup><161></sup>Proverbs 16:11 [Sept. ῥοπη], and “scales” <sup><240></sup>Isaiah 40:12 [Sept. σταθμός), is said by Kimchi (on <sup><2307></sup>Isaiah 26:7) to be properly the *beam* of the balance. In his Lexicon he says it is the part in which the tongue moves, and which the weigher holds in his hand. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v.) supposed it was a

*steelyard*. That the steelyard was an invention known to the ancients is certain, for specimens of them, elaborately adorned, have been found at Pompeii and Herculaneum (*Mus. Borbon.* 1, 55). Still it was probably not known until the Roman era, and indeed is said to have been called *Trutina Campana*, from its invention in Campania (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. “*Trutina*”). No traces of its use have been found either in the tombs or temples of Egypt or Assyria, and this is a sufficient proof that the instrument was unknown in those countries. Hence there is no evidence that this instrument was known to the Hebrews. Of the material of which the balance was made we have no information. *SEE BALANCE*.

## Picture for Scale 2

It is thought that the Jews knew the constellation *Libra* as one of the signs of the zodiac (<sup><12316></sup>2 Kings 23:5; <sup><18882></sup>Job 38:32). *SEE ASTRONOMY*.

## Scaliger, Joseph Justus

son of Julius Caesar Scaliger, a learned critic, and his rival in learning and arrogance, was born, in 1540, at Agen, and was educated at the college of Bordeaux, and, finally, by his father and Turnebus. Languages he acquired with wonderful ease, and is said to have been master of no less than thirteen. His friends denominated him “an ocean of science,” and “the masterpiece of nature.” He died in 1609, professor of *belles lettres* at Leyden. His works, most of which are commentaries on the classics, are numerous. Of his other productions, one of the most valuable is the treatise *De Emendatione Temporum*.

## Scall

(invariably **q̄t̄n**, *nethek*, the *mange*, or diseased falling out of the hair of the head or beard, <sup><18133></sup>Leviticus 13:30 sq.). *SEE LEPROSY*.

## Scalp

(**d̄q̄ōh̄**; *kodkcd*, <sup><19812></sup>Psalm 48:21; “pate,” <sup><19716></sup>Psalm 7:16; the *crown* of the head [as elsewhere rendered], so called from the *parting* of the hair at that spot).

## Scamander

in Greek mythology, was (1) a son of Oceanus and Tethys, a river god in Troas, originally named *Xanthus*. He married the nymph Ideae, and became the father of Teucer and Glaucia. Hector's son, ordinarily called Astyanax, bore the appellative Scamandrius, derived from the name of this deity. (2) A nephew of the above, the son of Glaucia and Deimachus.

## Scamandrodice

in Greek mythology, was the name occasionally given to *Calyce*, the mother of Cycnus.

## Scamilli

plain blocks or subplinths, placed under columns, statues, etc., to elevate them. They differ from ordinary pedestals in having no moldings about them, and in being usually of smaller size.

## Scandinavia

a large peninsula in the north of Europe, bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean; on the west by the Atlantic, North Sea, Scager Rack, Cattegat, and Sound; on the south and east by the Baltic Sea, Gulf of Bothnia, and Finland, with which it is connected by an isthmus 325 miles wide. This peninsula includes the two kingdoms Norway (q.v.) and Sweden (q.v.). The ancient Scandinavia, or *Scandia*, included Northern Denmark as well as the peninsula that still retains the name. It is first mentioned by Pliny, who, unaware that the peninsula was attached to Finland on the north, considered Scandinavia as an island.

## Scandinavian Architecture.

Many of the earlier Norwegian and Swedish cathedrals were built by English or French workmen. There were six basilicas in Norway, with towers at the end of the choir aisles. In Denmark there are eight round churches and one octagonal. Roeskilde, Ribe, and Thorsager are apsidal; but the general characteristics of the Danish churches are a square east end, and an immense south porch and parvise. The wooden churches of Norway are probably of Byzantine origin, the plans having been brought back by the Varangians.

## Scandinavian Mythology.

*SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.*

### Scandinavian Versions

**1.** *The Norse or Icelandic.* — The first version into this language was made by Oddur Gotshalkson, son of a bishop of Holum, in Iceland. He attended the lectures of Luther and Melancthon, and on his return to Iceland entered upon a translation of the Scriptures. To avoid persecution, he commenced his work in a small cell in a cow house, and completed the New Test. in 1539. Finding it difficult, from the state of public opinion, to print it in Iceland, he sailed for Denmark, and published it at Copenhagen, under the patronage of Christian III. The translation, made from the Vulgate, corrected in some cases according to Luther's translation, was published in 1540. From this time on, parts of the Old Test. were published, until at length, in 1584, the entire Bible was printed in Icelandic at Holum. The work was conducted by Gudbrand Thorlakson, bishop of Holum, and has been called "a faithful mirror of Luther's German version;" and, on account of the purity of its diction, it is still held in high esteem. In 1609 a revised edition of the New Test. was published by bishop Gudbrand at Holum, with the title *Thad Nyia Testamentum, a Islendsku yfersied og lesid epter theim riettustu Utleggingum, sem til hafa feingist* (prentad a Holum i Hialltadal, anno 1609). In 1644 a revised edition of the entire Bible was published by Thorlak Skuleson, the grandson of Gudbrand, and his successor in the episcopate. In 1728 another edition was published, under the inspection of Stein Jonson, bishop of Holum. Following the Danish Bible too closely, this edition, on account of Danicisms, was found to be scarcely intelligible to the Icelanders, and hence never obtained much circulation. In 1747 a fourth edition, according to the text of 1644, was published at Copenhagen; a fifth in 1750; a sixth in 1807, chiefly at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society; and a seventh in 1813 by the same society, and often since. Since the year 1863 a revised edition of the New Test. and Psalms has been circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in 1867 the entire revised Bible, which is now in circulation, left the press at the expense of the same society.

**2.** *Danish.* — The earliest translation of any portion of the Scriptures into Danish is contained in a MS. preserved in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, supposed to have been written in the 13th or beginning of the

14th century. It proceeds no firther than the second book of Kings. In 1515, Pedersen, who is said to have been the first Lutheran clergyman in Zealand, published at Paris a Danish version of the Gospels and Epistles appointed to be read in churches. It was reprinted at Leipsic in 1518. The whole New Test., *Det Nye Testamente*, was translated by Hans Mikkelsen, sometimes called John Michaelis, and published at Leipsic in 1524, and reprinted at Antwerp in 1529. This version was executed by the command and under the patronage of Christian II. An improved edition of Mikkelsen's New Test. was published by Pedersen in 1529 at Antwerp, and republished, with the Psalms, in 1531. In 1550 the whole Bible was published in Danish at Copenhagen. This translation was undertaken at the suggestion of Bugenhagen, the celebrated Reformer, who had been invited to the court of Copenhagen to assist in the correction of ecclesiastical abuses. A revision of the entire version was undertaken in 1586 by the command of Frederick II, which was published in 1589, with Luther's notes, under the title *Biblia det er den gantske hellige Skrift, paa Danske igen offverseet oc prentet efter salige oc Hoglofflige Ikukomelse, Kong Frederichs den II Befalning. Met Register, alle D. Lutheri Fortaler, hans Udlegning i Broedden, oc Viti Theodori Summarier* (prentet i Kjöbenhavn aft Matz Vingaardt, anno 1589, fol.). In 1604 king Christian IV appointed Dr. Resen, bishop of Zealand, to superintend a fresh revision of the Scriptures, which was published in 1607, with the title *Biblia paa Danske*, etc. In 1633 an edition from the revised text of 1589 was published at Copenhagen — *Biblia det er den gantske hellige Skrift*, etc. — and in 1647 a revised edition from Resen's Bible, designated "Swaning's Bible," so called after the corrector Hans Swaning, archbishop of Zealand, was published, which was again edited in 1670. In 1714 a College of Missions was established at Copenhagen, which issued several editions of the Scriptures according to Swaning's text: one in 1717, a second in 1718, followed in 1722 by a third, and in 1728 by a fourth issue. In 1728 the mission press was destroyed by fire, and the Orphan House then obtained the exclusive privilege of printing the Danish Bible; and several editions were published by that institution between the years 1732 and 1745. In the meantime efforts were made to obtain a more correct and faithful edition of the Scriptures, and in 1748 the committee appointed by royal authority published a revised New Test.; and since that time numerous other editions were printed before the formation of the Danish Bible Society in 1814. In the year 1810 the British and Foreign Bible Society printed all edition of the Danish New Test. from the Copenhagen edition of 1799, the press



being superintended by the Rev. W.F. Rosing, minister of the Danish church in London. A second edition was published in 1814. In the following year another revision of the Bible was commenced at Copenhagen by royal authority. Bishop Muentzer, together with five learned professors, constituted the commission of revisal; and in 1819 all edition of the New Test., as corrected and revised by them, was published, followed by a fourth edition of the entire Bible in 1824. The committee of the Danish Bible Society has been engaged for several years past in the task of revising the Danish Old Test., and in 1871 a thoroughly revised text of the Danish Bible was published, which has also been adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The facilities for the circulation of the Protestant Bible in the kingdom of Denmark have within recent years been greatly increased by an arrangement happily come to between the British and Foreign Bible Society of London and the Orphan Institution at Copenhagen, which latter body possesses by law the exclusive right to print the Scriptures within the Danish realm. Prior to 1855 all editions of the Scriptures produced at Copenhagen were accompanied by the Apocrypha and explanatory notes, and hence the Bible Society was by its rules precluded from taking any part in their circulation. In that year, however, at the instance of the London society, the directors of the Orphan House agreed to produce the New Test. free from all notes and Apocryphal references. The concession thus happily obtained was at once acted on, and an edition of 10,000 Danish New Testaments was produced for the London society under the auspices of the Copenhagen Orphan Institution, and passed into rapid circulation. In 1859 a subsequent edition of 5000 was found necessary to meet the demands made upon the society's agency, which increase from year to year. As to the circulation of the entire Bible, without Apocrypha and explanatory notes, the society was prevented from doing so until 1872, when, after many negotiations, permission was obtained to circulate Bibles according to the rules laid down by the society, but with the conditions:

1. That the summaries and the references to parallel passages (with the exception of those which relate to the Apocryphal books) which are found in the editions of the Orphan House be also inserted in the editions published by the society in Denmark.
2. That the title page of these editions be as follows: *Bibelen eller den Hellige Skrift, indeholdende det Gamle og det Nye Testamentes*

*Kanoniske Böger* (“The Bible, or the Holy Scriptures, containing the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments”).

**3.** The fee to be paid to the Orphan House is provisionally fixed at one mark for each copy. We have stated above that the revised Danish text which was published in 1871 has also been adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. This was done after those marginal renderings which savor of “note or comment” had been stricken out. The annual report of 1874 stated the fact that “the first edition of the revised Danish Bible has left the press, the proofs having been read by the Rev. J. Plenge. This is the first edition of the complete Bible printed by the Orphan House at Copenhagen directly for the society.”

**3.** *Norwegian.* — Although the Norwegian and Danish Bibles were originally the same, yet the revisions of later times have made them different. Since about 1860 the Norwegian Bible, with slightly revised text, was published both by the Norwegian and the British Bible Society. A revision of the New Test. was begun about the year 1871, at the expense and by the authority of the Norwegian Bible Society, with the sanction of the chief of the Royal Church and Education departments. The changes introduced rarely touch the interpretation of the text, but are chiefly intended to express the same sense as before, only in language more conformed to the requirements of modern usage. Of the Old. Test., the Pentateuch, in a revised form, was published in 1876.

**4.** *Swedish.* — A version of the Scriptures into Swedish is said to have been made in the 14th century by order of St. Brigit, or Bridget, who, about the year 1344, founded the religious order called, from her, the Brigittines. A translation of the New Test., according to Luther’s German version (the first Swedish version of which we have any definite account), was undertaken, by command of Gustavus Vasa, in 1523, by Laurentius Andreas, and printed in 1526, in folio, at Stockholm, with the title *Thet Nyia Testamentit pa Swensko*. The first Swedish version of the entire Bible was published at Upsala in 1541, with the Apocrypha, the Old Test. being translated by Laurentius and Olaus Petri from Luther’s German version of 1534, and the New Test. was that of Laurentius Andreas, printed in 1526. Another version of the New Test., prepared by Amund Laurent, was published at Stockholm in 1550, and again in 1601 and 1621; and in the course of subsequent years several editions of the Psalms were printed. At the commencement of the 17th century, Charles IX ordered Jonas Petri,

bishop of Stregnaes, and other learned men, to collate Luther's editions of 1534 and 1545, noting such discrepancies as appeared to them of any importance, with the view of producing an improved edition of the Swedish translation. These notes, when completed, were called *Observationes Stregnenses*; and it was decreed in the Synod of Stockholm, in 1602, that they should be incorporated with the old version in a new edition of the Bible. From various causes, this new edition was not published until 1618, when it was printed in folio at Stockholm, with the following title: *Biblia thet aer all then Helgha Scrifft pa Swensko. Effter förre Bibliens Text, oförändrat medh Forsprak pa the Boeker ther förr inge woro, medh Sumsarier för Capitelen, Marginalier, flere Concordantier, samt nytlighe Förklaringar och Register, etc., förmerat och efter then stormächtigeste högborne Förstes och Herres, Herr Gustaff Adolfs, Swerikes Göthes och Wendes Konungs, Befalning* (tryckt i Stockholm, anno 1618). In 1622 not a copy of this edition remained on sale, and a reprint was therefore issued at Lubeck, followed by several successive editions at Leyden, and by two editions (in 1636 and 1646) at Stockholm. In 1650 the Stregnaes Bible was printed under the care of bishop Matthia, which was executed very negligently. The edition of 1618 was also reprinted several times, but with many deviations from the text. A revised edition of the entire Bible was undertaken under the reign of Charles XII, which was published in 1703, with the title *Biblia thet är all then Heliga Scrifft pa Swensko, effter Konung Carl then Toltfes Befalning* (Stockholm, 1703). Another revised edition appeared in 1709 at the same place. The preparation for this edition was begun by John Gezel, bishop of Abo, who died in 1690, but the work was completed and published by his son. In the course of the 18th century so many editions of the Danish Scriptures appeared that the country was generally considered well supplied with Bibles. When, however, in 1808, Dr. Paterson visited the country, the fact was ascertained that the poorer inhabitants, on account of the high price of Bibles, were almost destitute of the Word of God. The consequence was the formation of the Evangelical Society, which issued several editions for the poor, aided by grants from the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1815 the Swedish Bible Society was formed, which, with its numerous auxiliary societies, continues the important work of printing and disseminating the Scriptures. Till 1826 it received much assistance from the British and Foreign Bible Society, when the decision of the Apocryphal question in London severed the connection between the two societies. In order to maintain the circulation of Bibles in Sweden without

the Apocrypha, several editions of the Old and New Testaments have been issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Their first edition, which was stereotyped, was published in 1828. The text adopted was that of the last edition of the Swedish Bible Society. Several editions from the same text have since been printed by the same society in London, and likewise at Stockholm, through the medium of their agency maintained there. A revision of the old text is now under preparation. The total number of copies of Swedish Scriptures issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society up to March 31, 1877, amounted to 2,599,261, of which 452,879 were Bibles, 1,912,782 New Testaments and New Testaments with the Psalms, 218,650 portions of the Old Test., and 14,950 portions of the New Test.

**5. Faroese.** — Into this dialect only the Gospel of St. Matthew has been translated, about the year 1817, by the Rev. Mr. Schroeter, rector of one of the churches in the Faroe Isles. It was corrected by Mr. Lyngbye, of Jutland, who also superintended the printing of St. Matthew's Gospel, of which 1500 copies were issued. This is the only book of the New Test. that has ever been printed or translated into Faroese.

See Lorck, *Bibelgeschichte*, 1, 203 sq., 208 sq., 399 sq.; Göze, *Sammlung merkwürdiger Bibeln*, p. 277 sq.; *Index Bibliorum, in Christiano-Ernestina Bibliotheca*, p. 13, 42, 66; *Bibliotheca Biblica, oder Verzeichniss der Bibel-Sammlung der Herzogin von Braunschweig*, etc., p. 182 sq.; *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 214 sq.; Schinmeyer, *Versuch einer Geschichte der schwedischen Bibel-Uebersetzungen und Ausgaben* (Flensburg, 1777). (B.P.)

### Scape-goat

(Hebrews **זָזַז** *Azazel*) is the name given in the A.V. to one of the two goats used in the sin offering for the entire community of Israel on the great day of atonement, the goat which was to be sent away into the wilderness. To determine which of the two goats was to be slain, and which sent alive into the wilderness, it was ordered that the priest should "cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord [Jehovah], and the other lot for the scapegoat" (<sup>4868</sup>Leviticus 16:8), but literally *for Azazel* (**זָזַז**), a word nowhere else used. There can be no doubt that this has the appearance of being some sort of personage, or interest personified,

standing over against Jehovah, or somehow contradistinguished from him. But opinions have from early times been divided on the subject.

**1.** The one followed by our translators, which regards it as a name for the goat itself, is of great antiquity, and has numbers on its side — Symmachus (τράγος ἀπερχόμενος), Aquila (τράγος ἀπολελυμμένος), the Vulgate (*hircus emissarius*), Luther, and many moderns, also recently Hoffmann. The term so understood is viewed as a compound of z[ goat and l zā; *to go away*. The chief objections to it are that z[ is never used precisely of a goat; in the plural it bears the sense of *goats* generally, but in the singular it designates only *she goat*; and in <sup><1610></sup>Leviticus 16:10 and 26, the goat and Azazel are expressly distinguished from each other, “the goat. (ry[ @h) for Azazel.” These are fatal objections, and have led to the general abandonment of the view.

**2.** By others it has been taken as the name of a place, either some mountain in the desert (Pseudo-Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Jarchi), or a lonely and desolate region (Bochart, Deyling, Carpzov, Jahn). But this, also, is at variance with the natural import of the statements, especially with the expression in ver. 10, “to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness,” which would then mean, for the wilderness into the wilderness. Nor could Jehovah on the one side, and a place on the other, form a proper antithesis.

**3.** Others, again, have taken the word as a *pealpal* form of the Arabic verb l z[ , *to remove*, formed by modification from l zi ḥ[ ] so that the meaning comes to be for a *complete removing* or *dismissal* (Tholuck, Steudel, Winer, Bähr). Grammatically, no objection can be urged against this view; and it undoubtedly accords well with the general import of this part of the rite. “The true expiation,” to use the words of Bähr, “was effected by the blood of the first goat, which was set apart for Jehovah; on the other hand, the ceremony with the other goat appears as a mere addition made for special reasons, a kind of complement to the wiping away of the sins which had already been effected by means of the sacrifice... After the expiation had been accomplished by the sprinkling of the blood, the sin was still further to be carried away into the desert. What the first goat, which died as a sin offering, was no longer in a condition to set forth was supplied by the second, which was, as it were, one with the first, inasmuch as it carried the sin which had been covered entirely away, and that into the desert or desolate place, where it was quite forgotten; so that the idea of expiation,

or the extermination of sin, was rendered thereby absolutely perfect” (<sup><33719></sup>Micah 7:19). In this view of the matter, the casting of the lots had for its object the assigning of one goat to Jehovah, namely, for an atonement to his justice, and the other to complete removal or bearing away into the oblivion of the desert — namely, of the sin which had been atoned; an explanation which accords well with the general idea of the transaction, and does no violence to the language. The objection of Hengstenberg, that it gives a cold and empty appearance to the peculiar word *Azazel*, a word coined for the occasion, to suppose it to have expressed only the comparatively common idea of complete removal, may perhaps be obviated by conceiving this idea to have been for the occasion invested with a kind of personified existence — much as Sheol, the region of departed spirits, became personified — the one the coverer or dark receptacle of people’s lives, the other of their (forgiven) sins. Hence also, probably, the reason of the word being confined to this one occasion, there being no other in respect to which such utter personified oblivion could be predicated.

**4.** But there is still another class of writers who are disposed to claim for the word a more distinctly personal existence, and who would refer it directly to Satan. This view is certainly of high antiquity, and is expressed in the reading of the Sept. ἀποπομπᾶιος, which means, not scape goat, or sent away, but *the turner away*, the *avert*. The expression of Josephus is somewhat dubious (*Ant.* 3, 10, 3), but it seems also to favor the same view; and it was very common with the rabbins, as in later times it has the support of many authorities Spenser, Ammon, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, etc., who hold it to be equivalent to the Roman *averruncus*, or evil daemon, which was supposed to inhabit desert places, and who needed to be propitiated; but adopted also, though purged of this idolatrous connection, by Witsius, Meyer, Alting, Hengstenberg (in his *Bücher Moses*, transl. by Robbins, N.Y. 1843); also quite recently by Vaihinger (in Herzog) and Kurtz (*Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*). These writers hold that the view in question best preserves the contrast between the two goats — one for Jehovah, and one for the great adversary Azazel — the latter a being as well as the former, and a being who (as daemons generally) was supposed to have his peculiar dwelling in the desert. The goat, however, that was sent to this evil spirit — emphatically the removed or separate one — was no sacrifice, but rather a witness that the accepted sacrifice had been made. It proclaimed, as it were, “that the horrible wilderness, the abode of impure spirits, is alone the place to which the sins of the people,

as originally foreign to human: nature and society, properly belong; that Azazel, the abominable, the sinner from the beginning (~~John~~ John 8:44), is the one from whom they have proceeded, and to whom they must again with abhorrence be sent back, after the solemn atonement and absolution of the congregation have been accomplished” (Vaihinger). No doubt, as thus explained, the leading import of the transaction with this goat is in proper accordance with the service of the day; but it cannot appear otherwise than strange that, in the most sacred rite of the old covenant, Satan should be so formally recognized as, according to this view, he must have been; that he should there be recognized under a name which suggests a quite different idea concerning him than that under which he is elsewhere presented; and that, notwithstanding he was so publicly and so regularly associated with this name, it should never again be employed as a personal designation. Such peculiarities are rather startling, and dispose us, on the whole, to concur in the view which ranks third in the list of opinions now exhibited. *SEE AZAZEL.*

## Scapular, Or Scapulary

### Picture for Scapular

(Lat. *scapula*, the *shoulder blade*), originally a small garment without sleeves, a part of the habit of several religious orders in the Church of Rome. The several fraternities are distinguished by the color, shape, and material of these holy badges. It was first introduced by St. Benedict in lieu of a heavy cowl for the shoulders. Beirut informs us that “the badge which is called the holy scapular is made of two small pieces of woolen stuff, about the extent of a hand, hanging by two little laces down from the neck upon both the breast and back of the devout person who wears it.” The scapular usually has on it a picture of the Virgin Mary or the initials “I.H.S.” on one piece, and “J.M.J.” (for Jesus, Mary, and Joseph) or two hearts on the other. It appears to have been invented by an English Carmelite friar named Simon Stock, in 1251. According to the Romish legend, he received the original scapular from the Virgin as a distinguishing badge of the Carmelite order. It is much worn by strict Romanists, in the belief that the devil dreads this terrible weapon. It is supposed to effectually preserve against death by drowning or by fire, and, indeed, against all that might injure either the soul or the body. Besides this “Scapular of Mount Carmel,” there are three others, likewise made of two pieces of woolen cloth. The four scapulars may all be worn at once. In this

case, each of the two parts is composed of four pieces, which are sewed together like the leaves of a book; and the two parts are joined together by two tape strings about eighteen inches long. Of these four leaves or pieces in each part, the “Scapular of Mount Carmel” is brown and about four inches square; the “Scapular of our Lady of the Seven Dolors” is black and somewhat smaller, the “Scapular of the Immaculate Conception” is blue and still smaller; the “Scapular of the Most Holy Trinity” is white and the smallest, with a cross of red and blue wool in the middle of it (Barnum, *Romanism as it Is*, p. 538). Many graces and indulgences are attached to the wearing of the scapularies by many papal bulls; one of these, the bull *Sabbatina*, secures to the wearer, by direct promise from the Virgin to pope John XXI, deliverance from purgatorial fire on the first Saturday after death.

### Scarf

a piece of silk or other material, hanging from the neck, worn over the rochet or surplice. It is not mentioned in the rubric of the English ritual, but is worn by our bishops and dignitaries of the Church. It has been used from the primitive ages by the clergy, when the presbyters and bishops wore a scarf in the administration of the sacraments, and on some other occasions. According to Walcott (*Sacred Archoeology*), it properly belonged to the doctors of divinity and dignitaries, is called *talaga* in Italy and Malta, and is worn by the doctors of theology.

### Scarlatti, Alessandro

an Italian musical composer, was born at Naples in 1659. He received a good musical education, and, at the age of twenty-one, wrote his first opera. Little is known of his life except that he was master of the royal chapel under Christina of Sweden in 1680. and after her death filled the same office in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. He also taught in various musical conservatories. He died Oct. 24, 1725. His principal works are about thirty in number, chiefly upon secular subjects, but among them are several oratorios, one called *The Sacrifice of Abraham*: — two renderings of the *Stabat Mater*: — and six *Masses*. See Fetis, *Biog. Univ. des Musiciens*.



## Scarlet

### Picture for Scarlet

Often occurs in Scripture associated with purple and blue. The words so translated occur in the following forms;

1. **γναε**, *shani'*, and **μγναε** *shanim'*, alone, <sup><0133></sup>Genesis 38:28-30; <sup><0128></sup>Joshua 2:18-21; <sup><0024></sup>2 Samuel 1:24; <sup><0121></sup>Proverbs 31:21; <sup><0043></sup>Song of Solomon 4:3; <sup><0043></sup>Jeremiah 4:30; Sept. **κόκκινον**, Vulg. *coccinutm*; <sup><0018></sup>Isaiah 1:18, **φοινικοῦν**, *coccinum*.
2. **γναε** **τ [ι ἴτ]**, *tolaath shani'*, <sup><0204></sup>Exodus 25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 27:16; 28:5, 6, 8, 15; 35:6, 23, 25; 38:18, 23; 39:3; <sup><0048></sup>Numbers 4:8, **κόκκινον**, and **κόκκινον** with **διπλοῦν**, **κεκλωσμένον**, **κλώτον**, **διανενησμένον**, Vulg. *bis tinctus*, *coccus bis tinctus*, and *vermiculus*.
3. **τ [ι ἴτ γναε]** *sheni' tolaath*, <sup><0144></sup>Leviticus 14:4, 6, 49, 51, 52; <sup><0016></sup>Numbers 19:6; Sept. **κοκκίνον**, with **κεκλωσμένον**, and **κλωστόν**; *vermiculus*, *coccus*, and with *bis tinctus*.
4. **[ι ἰϜ]**, *told*, alone, <sup><0018></sup>Isaiah 1:18, **κόκκινον**, *vermiculus*; <sup><0045></sup>Lamentations 4:5, Vulg. *croceis*; <sup><0043></sup>Nahum 2:3, *coccineis*. In the New Test., <sup><0123></sup>Matthew 27:28; <sup><0049></sup>Hebrews 9:19; <sup><0673></sup>Revelation 17:3, 4, 18:12, 16; **κόκκινος**, *coccineus*. The first of these words, *shani'*, is by some derived from *shanah'*, **ηης**; "to repeat," and is thus interpreted to mean "double dyed," but which, Gesenius observes, is applicable only to the Tyrian purple (see Braunius, *De Vest.* 1, 15, § 214, p. 237; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 3, p. 525-527). Gesenius prefers an Arabic root meaning *to shine*, because scarlet garments were admired for their brightness: but Jerome asserts that the word means *coccinum* (*Epist. ad Fabiolam*). It is certain that *tola* denotes a worm, grub, or insect, and the Sept. and Vulg. plainly understood by it the *coccus*, from which the ancients procured a blood red crimson dye, the *Coccus ilicis* of Linnaeus, class 4, Tetragyma, the *kermez* of the Arabians, whence used to be derived the French word *cramoisi*, and our *crimson*; but Kilian gives *carmensinum*, because made from a worm, which, in the Phoenician tongue, is called *carmen*. Hesychius defines *coccus* as that from which the Phoenician dye is obtained. It was the female of this remarkable insect that was employed; and though supplanted by the cochineal (*Coccus cacti*), it is still used for the purpose

in India and Persia. It attains the size and form of a pea, is of a violet black color, covered with a whitish powder, adhering to plants, chiefly various species of oak, and so closely resembling grains that its insect nature was not generally known for many centuries. According to Beckman, the epithet *vermiculatus* was applied to it during the Middle Ages, when this fact became generally understood, and that hence is derived the word *vermilion*. Hence the Hebrew words mean both the *coccus* itself, and the deep red or bright rich *crimson* which was derived from it (as in <sup><204B></sup>Song of Solomon 4:3, “thy lips are like a thread of scarlet”); and so the word “scarlet” signified in the time of our translators, rather than the color now called by that name, and which was unknown in the time of James I. This insect is widely distributed over many of the southeastern countries of the ancient world. It occurs abundantly in Spain (Kirby and Spence, *Introduction to Entomology* [1828], 1, 319, 320). It is found on the *Quercus coccifera*, or *kermes* oak, in Palestine (Kitto, *Physical History*, p. 219). Pliny speaks of the *coccus* as a red color much esteemed, which he distinguishes from purple (*Hist. Nat.* 9, 65), and describes as a gay, red, lively bright, approaching the color of fire (*ibid.* and 21:22). All the ancients concur in saying that this dye was made from a sort of little grains which were gathered from the holm oak (Theophrast. *Hist. Plant.* 3, 16; Pliny, 16, 12; Dioscorides, 4, 48; Pausan. 10, 36). They not only call them grains, but speak of them as the vegetable productions of the oak itself (Plutarch, *Thesaur.* p. 7); and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 16, 12) calls them *cusculia*, from the Greek *κοσκύλλειν*, which signifies “to cut little excrescences,” because they cut or scrape off these *small grains of the oak*. Yet he was not entirely ignorant of their insect character, for he speaks of it becoming a worm (24, 4). It seems, however, that the color thus obtained was not durable (22, 3). It was known at a very early period in Canaan (<sup><033B></sup>Genesis 38:28); it was one of the colors of the high priest’s ephod (<sup><028B></sup>Exodus 28:6), and of its girdle (ver. 8), of the breastplate (ver. 15), and of cloths for sacred uses (<sup><008B></sup>Numbers 4:8); it was used in cleansing the leper (<sup><014B></sup>Leviticus 14:4), to indicate, as Abarbanel thinks, that a healthy complexion was restored to him. It was the dress of females in the time of Saul (<sup><002B></sup>2 Samuel 1:24); of opulent persons in later times (<sup><204B></sup>Lamentations 4:5); of the Babylonian and Median soldiers, who also wore red shields (<sup><304B></sup>Nahum 2:4; comp. “Scuta lectissimis coloribus distinguunt,” Tacitus, *De Mor. Germ.* c. 6, and Philostratus, *Epist. de Lacedaemoniis*). Three mistranslations of the word occur in our version, “She is not afraid of the snow for her household: for all her household are

clothed with scarlet” (<sup><312></sup>Proverbs 31:21). Since there is no connection between the color and a defense from the cold, it would be better rendered, as in the margin, “double garments.” (Comp. Sept. ἐνδεδυμένοι; Vulg. *vestiti duplicibus*.) The next verse of the Sept. begins Δισσὰς χλαίνας ἐποίησε τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς, *She hath made double garments for her husband*. In <sup><308></sup>Isaiah 1:18 and <sup><303></sup>Jeremiah 4:30 the word should be rendered “scarlet,” and not “crimson.” The final reference to scarlet is in regard to pagan Rome, which, like all cities, is represented as a female; and since everybody wore scarlet in Rome, and especially during war, she is described as being arrayed in that color. In <sup><294></sup>Exodus 39:3, it is said, “They did beat gold into their plates, and cut into wires, to work in the blue, and in the purple, and in the scarlet, and in the fine linen,” which is explained to mean that these five kinds — blue, purple, scarlet, fine linen, and gold — were twisted into one thread; thus a thread of gold with six threads of blue, and so with the rest, after which they twisted all these threads into one (Braunius, 1, 17, 26). It seems plain, from <sup><285></sup>Exodus 35:25, that the blue and purple and scarlet were spun by hand from wool already dyed of these colors. The white ground was invariably designated by the term “fine linen.” The cloth was thus in stripes or checks of different materials. Wilkinson remarks that the color was in like manner imparted by the Egyptians to the thread, etc. — that is, cloth was not dyed after being woven (*Manners and Customs*, 3, 125). It will have been perceived that great difficulty attends the attempt to determine the precise distinctions of colors known to the ancients by the various preceding names. The only possible method whereby they could have conveyed them to our minds would have been by comparing them to the colors of natural objects, whose appearance was immutable and whose identity was beyond question. Such an attempt has been made by bishop Wilkins in his *Real Character*. We may illustrate the utility of these requisites by the color blue, which is defined to mean “the color produced or exposed to the view by the blowing away, or clearing away, or dispersing of the clouds” (*Encyclop. Metropol.*) But, as is well known, the shades of ethereal blue vary in different countries, and even in different altitudes of the same country; hence the word blue, if illustrated by this standard, would convey a different idea to the inhabitants of different regions. It is most likely that all our ideas of sensible impressions are liable to errors of association. It is, however, satisfactory to know that, like all other dubious matters, these are of minor importance. We add a further reference to Goguet, *Origin of Laws, Arts, and Sciences*, 2, 95, etc. (Edinb. 1764) *SEE COLOR*.

The natural history of the κόκκος may be thus summed up. It is a genus of insects belonging to the order Homoptera, of which the males have a single pair of wings and an obsolete mouth; while the females have no wings, but a perfect mouth (*rostrum*) formed for piercing plants and sucking their juices. They live on trees and plants of various kinds. Upwards of thirty species are included in the catalogue of British insects; but of these many have probably been introduced on exotic plants. There are numerous species, many of which are known to yield rich dyes, and several have been employed in the arts. Up to the time of the discovery of America none could compete with the species which infests the evergreen oaks (*Coccus ilicis*); but that has been thrown into the shade by the superior productiveness, if not the superior color, of a Mexican species (*C. cacti*), whence we obtain cochineal. The insect called *kermes* by the Arabs is abundant wherever the tree on which it lives is common. All over the south of Europe and throughout Western Asia this occurs in extensive forests. The hills of the south of Judah about Hebron, the sides of Carmel and of Tabor, the slopes of Gilead and Bashan, besides many other localities in Palestine, are sheeted with forests and groves of the evergreen oaks, from which a copious harvest of *coccus* may be annually gathered. It is no wonder, then, that the dye was so early familiar to the people of Canaan. It is in that stage of the insect when the larva is about fully grown that it contains the coloring matter in greatest abundance. The little scales are picked from the tree and simply dried, when they yield their dye by infusion in water. To make this permanent, what is called a *mordant* is added — a substance which, having no coloring faculty in itself, acts chemically as a bond of union between the dye and the textile material, and often modifies the tint. The ancients used an impure alum for this purpose. Pliny tells us that thus was obtained from the κόκκος a color of the most brilliant character (*Hist. Nat.* 9, 65; 21, 22). The hue now produced by the *Kermes coccus* with alum is a rich blood red; but if the same mordant be used as with cochineal — solution of tin — it yields a scarlet fully as brilliant as that rich American dye, and perhaps more permanent (Bancroft, *Perm. Col.* 1, 404). The far greater proportion of coloring matter to the bulk in the latter will always, however, prevent the *kermes* from regaining its commercial importance. **SEE CRIMSON.**

### Scattergood, Samuel

an English clergyman of the latter part of the 17th century, was a fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, vicar of Blockly, Worcestershire (1678), and died

in 1696. A volume of his *Sermons* was published (Lond. 1723, 2 vols. 8vo; reprinted 1810).

**Scaurus, M. Aemilius,**

### **Picture for Scaurus**

A Roman governor of Syria in New Test. times, was the eldest son of his father of the same name, and stepson of the dictator Sulla, whom his mother, Caecilia, married after the death of his father. In the third Mithridatic war, he served under Pompey as quaestor. The latter sent him to Damascus with an army, and from thence he marched into Judea to settle the disputes between the brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. Both of them offered him large sums of money; but he decided for Aristobulus, probably because he bid the highest, B.C. 64. After driving Hyrcanus out of Judaea, Scaurus returned to Damascus. Upon Pompey's arrival at this city in the following year, an accusation was brought against Scaurus of having been bribed by Aristobulus; but, though Pompey reversed his decision and placed Hyrcanus upon the throne, he took no notice of the charges, and left Scaurus in the command of Syria with two legions. Scaurus remained in Syria till B.C. 59, when he was succeeded by L. Marcius Philippus. During his government of Syria he made a predatory incursion into Arabia Petraea, but withdrew on the payment of three hundred talents by Aretas, the king of the country.

On his return to Rome he became a candidate for the curule aedileship, which he held in B.C. 58, the year in which P. Clodius was tribune. The extraordinary splendor with which he celebrated the public games surpassed everything of the kind that had been previously witnessed in Rome, and it is by them that his name has been chiefly handed down to posterity. The temporary theater which he built accommodated 80,000 spectators, and was adorned in the most magnificent manner. Three hundred and sixty pillars decorated the stage, arranged in three stories, of which the lowest was made of white marble, the middle one of glass, and the highest of gilt wood. Between the pillars there were three thousand statues, besides paintings and other ornaments. The combats of wild beasts were equally astonishing. A hundred and fifty panthers were exhibited in the circus, and five crocodiles and a hippopotamus were seen for the first time at Rome. But Scaurus purchased the favor of the people in these shows rather too dearly. So costly were they that they not only absorbed

all the property which his father had left him and the treasures which he had accumulated in the East, but compelled him to borrow money of the usurers in order to defray the expenses.

In B.C. 56 Scaurus was praetor, during which year he presided in the court in which P. Sestius was accused, who was defended by Cicero. In the following year he governed the province of Sardinia, which he plundered without mercy, as he wanted money both to pay his debts and to purchase the consulship. On his return to Rome in B.C. 54, he became a candidate for the consulship; but before the consular elections took place his competitors, at the beginning of July, got P. Valerius Triarius and three others to accuse him of *repetundae* in Sardinia, thus hoping to get rid of a formidable opponent. His guilt was certain; there were numerous witnesses against him; and M. Cato, who presided as praetor, was not to be corrupted, and was favorable to Triarius. Still, Scaurus did not despair. He was defended by Cicero and Hortensius, as well as by four other orators. Many of the most distinguished men at Rome, and among them nine persons of consular rank, pleaded on his behalf; while the tears of Scaurus himself, and his appeals to the splendor of his aedileship, produced a powerful effect upon the judices. Thus, notwithstanding his guilt, he was acquitted on the 2d of September, almost unanimously. Soon afterwards, and in the course of the same year, he was again accused by Triarius on a charge of *ambitus* (Cicero, *Ad Att.* 4, 16, 7, 8; 4, 17, 2; *Ad Q. Fr.* 3, 2, 3). Drumann says that he was condemned in this year and went into exile. But this appears to be a mistake; for although it is evident from the preceding passages in Cicero's letters that Scaurus was accused of *ambitus* in B.C. 54, it is equally clear from the testimony of Appian (*B.C.* 2, 24) that he was condemned in the third consulship of Pompey, B.C. 52. Hence it is probable that Scaurus was acquitted in B.C. 54, and accused again in B.C. 52 under Pompey's new law against *ambitus*. From this time the name of Scaurus does not occur again. He married Mucia, who had been previously the wife of Pompey, and by her he had one son (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 3-5; *War.* 1, 7; Appian, *Syr.* 51; Cicero, *Pro Sest.* 54; *De Off.* 2, 16; Pliny, *H.N.* 36, 2; 36, 15, s. 24, et alibi; Val. Max. 2, 4, 6; Cicero, *Ad Q. Fr.* 2, 15, 4; 2, 16, 3; 3, 1, 4, 5; 3, 2, 3; *Ad Att.* 4, 15, 7, 9; 4, 16, 7, 8; 4, 17, 2; *De Off.* 1, 39; Ascon. *Argum. in Scaur.*; and the fragments of Cicero's oration for Scaurus).

The following coin was struck in the curule aedileship of Scaurus and his colleague, P. Plautius Hypsaeus. The subject of the obverse relates to

Hypsaeus, and that of the reverse to Scaurus. The former represents Jupiter in a quadriga, with P. HYPSSAEVS. AED. CVR. C. HVPSAE. COS. PREIVER. CAPTV.; the latter part of the legend referring to the conquest of Privernum by C. Plautius Hypsaeus, in B.C. 341. On the obverse side is a camel, with Aretas kneeling by the side of the animal, and holding an olive branch in his hand. The subject refers to the conquest of Aretas by Scaurus mentioned above. The legend is M. SCAVR. AED. CVR. EX. S. C., and below REX ARETAS (Eckhel, 5, 131, 275). *SEE ARETAS.*

### Scenophylaces

*SEE CEIMELIARCHAE.*

### Scenophylacium

the innermost part of the *diaconicum*, or vestry of the church, and the repository of the sacred vessels and such *anathemata* or presents as were reputed among the chiefest treasures of the church. It was otherwise called *Secretarium*, because, as Du Fresne conjectures, the consistory or tribunal of the church was kept here. See Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, 1, 311.

### Scephrus

in Greek mythology, was a son of Tegeates, king of Tegea. He had an interview with Apollo in the temple at Tegea, and his brother Limon, believing that its object was to lodge a complaint against himself, slew him. Limon was himself slain by an arrow from Diana's quiver; but a great dearth came to pass, nevertheless, and the oracle advised that mourning ceremonies be observed in memory of Scephrus. Games were accordingly instituted in honor of Apollo and Diana, in which a priestess of the latter, armed with bow and arrow, was expected to pursue any individual, in imitation of the pursuit of Limon by Diana.

### Scepticism

(from Gr. *σκέπτομαι*, *I consider*) strictly denotes that condition in which the mind is before it has arrived at conclusive opinions — when it is still in the act of investigating or reflecting. Scepticism is therefore the opposite of dogmatism. Disbelief is quite a secondary meaning of the term. The Sceptics (disciples of Pyrrho of Elis) aimed at an undisturbed tranquillity of mind, to be attained by a constant balancing of opposing arguments, thus

reducing everything to a state of uncertainty and doubt. Popularly, the word is employed to signify the rejection of all religion — infidelity.

Scepticism has assumed several forms, of which the following are among the most common.

(1) *Pantheism*, or antisupernaturalism. Spinoza, the leader of this class, talks of nothing less than demonstration, and of being infallibly led to each conclusion by arguments which admit of no reply; a geometrical method of demonstration, the use of which, he said, made it unnecessary to attend to the arguments of opponents.

(2) The *academic* form, which originated with the Sophists, and which Bayle revived, the essence of which consists in opposing all the systems of speculative belief to each other. Academic doubt is ever seeking, for the avowed purpose of never finding; and perpetually reasoning, in order that it may never come to any conclusion.

(3) The *absolute* form, which strikes at the root of all opinions, and appears to found a system of universal doubt in the human understanding itself. Of this kind of scepticism the writings of Hume furnish the great and unrivalled example in modern times.

(4) *Ridicule*. This contains no philosophy, but is a mere series of doubting and jesting. Such was the scepticism of Voltaire.

(5) The *historical* form: this is contained in a narrative relating to the times and circumstances with which religion is chiefly concerned; and while preserving an outward regard to morals, misrepresents with irony the miraculous history of the Bible, and takes care, without absolutely falsifying facts, to place it in an absurd and improbable point of view. The history of Gibbon, dealing much in insinuation and very little in argument, is, perhaps, the most dangerous production in this class which has yet appeared, because it least admits of a reply. For who, as Paley observes, “can refute a sneer?”

(6) *Sentimental* infidelity. Such was the unbelief of Rousseau. Other infidels would destroy Christianity without having fixed on any other system to substitute in its place; but, if Rousseau has no system, he has abundance of “sentiments” and imaginations, and has a dim poetical deity of his own to worship, though he can assign no definite attributes to it, nor form any positive conception of his shadowy god.



The most modern form of scepticism is rationalism (q.v.), which strictly signifies that method of thought which, in matters of religion, not only allows the use of reason, but considers it indispensable. The term has now, however, acquired a wider meaning, and stands in opposition to supernaturalism (q.v.), or the belief in that which transcends, or, as others view it, contradicts both nature and reason — as, for example, miracles.

## Sceptics

*SEE SCEPTICISM.*

## Sceptre

### Picture for Sceptre 1

### Picture for Sceptre 2

### Picture for Sceptre 3

(Hebrews **שבט** *she'bet*), in its primary signification, like the equivalent **σκῆπτρον** (for the root of the Hebrew and Greek words seems identical; comp. also English *shaft*), denotes a staff of wood (<sup><3591></sup>Ezekiel 19:11), about the height of a man, which the ancient kings and chiefs bore as insignia of honor (Homer, *Iliad*, 1, 234, 245; 2, 185 sq.; Amos 1:5; <sup><3801></sup>Zechariah 10:11; Wisd. 10:14; comp. <sup><14910></sup>Genesis 49:10; <sup><10417></sup>Numbers 24:17; <sup><2945></sup>Isaiah 14:5; *wand*, <sup><1873></sup>Leviticus 27:32). As such it is thought by some to have originated in the shepherd's staff, since the first kings were mostly nomad princes (Strabo, 16, 783; comp. <sup><1391></sup>Psalms 29). There were, however, some nations among whom the agricultural life must have been the earliest known; and we should not among them expect to find the shepherd's staff advanced to symbolical honor. Accordingly, Diodorus Siculus (3, 3) informs us that the scepter of the Egyptian kings bore the shape of a plow. The symbols of dominion, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, are various. That of Osiris was a flail and crook (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, 1, 257); that of the queens, besides the crown (q.v.), was two loose feathers on their head (*ibid.* 1, 276). A carved ivory staff discovered at Nimrûd is supposed to have been a scepter (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 195). A golden scepter — that is, perhaps, one washed or plated with gold — is mentioned in <sup><3011></sup>Ezekiel 4:11 (comp. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* 8, 7, 13; Homer, *Iliad*, 1, 15; 2, 268; *Odys.* 11, 91). Other decorations of Oriental scepters are noticed by Strabo (16, 746). Inclining the scepter was a mark

of kingly favor (<sup><7041></sup> Esther 4:11), and the kissing it a token of submission (5:2). Saul appears to have carried his javelin as a mark of superiority (<sup><1084></sup> 2 Samuel 8:14; comp. <sup><9150></sup> 1 Samuel 15:10; 22:6). The use of the staff as a symbol of authority was not confined to kings, it might be used by any leader, as instanced in <sup><0754></sup> Judges 5:14, where for “pen of the writer,” as in the A.V., we should read “scepter of the leader.” Indeed, no instance of the scepter being actually handled by a Jewish king occurs in the Bible; the allusions to it are all of a metaphorical character, and describe it simply as one of the insignia of supreme power (<sup><4956></sup> Psalm 45:6; Bar. 6:14). The term *shebet* is rendered in the A.V. “rod” in two passages where *scepter* is substantially meant, viz. in <sup><9150></sup> Psalm 2:9, where “scepter of iron” is an expression for strong authority, and in <sup><4956></sup> Psalm 125:3; a use derived from the employment of the same word as an ordinary “rod” of correction (<sup><0210></sup> Exodus 21:10, and often), and even for beating out grain (<sup><2387></sup> Isaiah 28:27). *SEE ROD*.

### Scē'va

(properly *Skeuas*, Σκευᾶς), a Jew residing at Ephesus at the time of Paul's second visit to that city (<sup><4914></sup> Acts 19:14-16), A.D. 52. He is described as a “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς.), either as having exercised the office at Jerusalem, or as being chief of one of the twenty-four classes. His seven sons attempted to exorcise spirits by using the name of Jesus, and on one occasion severe injury was inflicted by the demoniac on two of them (as implied in the term ἀμφοτέρων, the true reading in ver. 16 instead of αὐτῶν).

### Schaaf, Charles

a German Orientalist, was born at Huys, electorate of Cologne, in 1646. He was educated at Duisburg, and became professor of Oriental languages in that university in 1677. In 1679 he took the same position in the university at Leyden, where he continued until 1729, when he died of apoplexy. His works are, *Opus Armoean.* (1686, 8vo): — *Novum Testamentum Syriacum, cum Versione Latina* (1708, 4to): — *Epitome Grammatioe Hebraicoe* (1716, 8vo): — *Sermo Academicus de Linguarum Orientalium Scientia*. In 1711 he prepared a catalogue of all the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan books and MSS. of the Leyden University Library.

## Schaats, Gideon

the second pastor of the Reformed Church in Albany, N.Y., was born in Holland in 1597, and at first was a schoolmaster at Beest. Having been ordained by the Classis of Amsterdam, he was sent to this country with the Rev. Samuel Drisius, a man of great learning, who preached in Dutch, English, and French, and was one of the ministers of the Dutch Church in New York from 1652 to 1671, being colleague with Dr. John Megapolensis. Drisius had previously been pastor of a Reformed Dutch Church in London. In addition to preaching in New York, he used to go once a month to Staten Island to preach to the French Vaudois or Waldenses, who had fled to Holland from persecutions in Piedmont, and were by the liberality of the city of Amsterdam enabled to emigrate to the New Netherlands. Mr. Schaats was forty-five years old when he came to this country, and his ministry here extended over thirty years. One of his three children — his eldest son — was killed in the massacre and burning of Schenectady, Feb. 10, 1690. During his pastorate in Albany, the governor (Sir Edmund Andross) compelled dominie Schaats to receive as a colleague the Rev. Nicholas Van Ranslaer, a Church of England man, who was recommended to Andross by the duke of York, and who attempted to obtain a living by laying claim to the pulpit and also to the manor of Rensselaerwyck. Van Ranslaer officiated for about a year, when he died. The people refused to acknowledge him, as also did the Classis of Amsterdam. He was strongly suspected of being a papist in disguise. Mr. Schaats was aided in the controversy with Andross by Rev. William Van Nieuwenhuysen of New York, who was sent to Albany for the purpose, and incurred the governor's bitterest enmity on this account. The latter part of Mr. Schaats's ministry was marked by congregational and domestic troubles. He died in 1674. See Rogers, *Historical Discourse* (1858); Corwin, *Manual of Reformed Ch.*; Murphy, *Anthology of New Netherlands*. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schade, Georg

a Danish jurist in Altona, afterwards in Kiel, was born in 1711. He was the author (of a deistical work, *Die unwandelbare und ewige Religion der ältesten Naturforscher*, etc. (Leips. 1760), in which he attempts an absolute demonstration of the chief doctrines of faith and practice, independently of all revelation. He even constructs a complete theory of the resurrection of the body and of the future life. Soon after this book

appeared, a pretended refutation of it was published at Altona by a so-named professor R. Goisee, with the evident design of simply calling attention to the first work. The magistracy of Hamburg honored Schade's book with a public burning, and the king of Denmark deposed him from his office and banished him. It was only on the accession of Christian VII (1766) that he was recalled and restored to office. Thenceforth he devoted himself exclusively to his judicial duties, until his death in 1795. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20, 686-688. (J.P.L.)

### Schade, Johann Caspar

an eminent pietist, was born in 1666. He studied at Leipsic (1685-89), came into intimacy with Francke, and shared in the religious awakening of which Francke was subsequently a leader. In 1690 Schade was called to the Church of St. Nicolas, in Berlin. Spener had just previously begun his fruitful ministry in this church. The two other colleagues were also pietistically minded. Here now began for Schade a very laborious and fruitful ministry. His zeal was seraphic, his temperament ascetic. He abstained from marriage that he might be more wholly devoted to Christ. Soon there arose differences between him and Spener. Schade knew no moderation in the pursuit of what he regarded as duty. He raised his voice against the abuses of private confession, and Spener refuted him. After much agitation, a governmental decision of 1698 removed the exaction of private confession and absolution, and permitted a merely general public confession in its place. But Schade did not live to enjoy this release from what had been to him an oppressive duty. He died in July of the same year. See *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 1860, No. 489 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* (J.P.L.)

### Schadow, Friedrich Wilhelm Von

a German painter, was born at Berlin, Sept. 6, 1789. His early studies in art were directed by his father, but in 1806 he abandoned them for the military service, in which he remained for four years. In Rome he afterwards studied under Cornelius and Overbeck, became a convert to Catholicism, and assisted his masters in the decoration of several villas and churches. In 1819 he became a member of the Academy of Fine Arts at Berlin, and in 1827 he was made director of the Academy at Düsseldorf. Here his peculiar religious views and mystical tendencies led to a break with his pupils, and his school was divided, the seceding party being led by Lessing.

Schadow was made a nobleman in 1843. He published a pamphlet entitled *Sur l'Influence du Christianisme sur les Arts* (Düsseldorf, 1842): — and *Der Moderne Vasari* (Berlin, 1854). He died in 1862. Of his paintings in Rome, the most remarkable are *A Holy Family*, *The Virgin Mary*, and *The Union of Poetry and Sculpture*. In Berlin is his *Four Evangelists*, and at Frankfort *The Wise Virgins* and *The Foolish Virgins*. See Uechtriz, *Blicke in das Düsseldorf Künstlerleben.*; Püttmann, *Die Düsseldorf Malerschule*.

### Schall, Johann Adam Von

a Jesuit missionary to China, was born at Cologne in 1591. He entered the Jesuit order in 1611, and was selected, partly because of his knowledge of mathematics and astronomy, to form one of the mission to China in 1620. He not only formed a successful mission, but, on account of his learning, was invited to the imperial court at Peking. Through his influence with the emperor, he obtained an edict authorizing the building of Catholic churches and liberty of preaching throughout the empire. In the space of fourteen years the Jesuit missionaries are said to have received 100,000 proselytes. Upon the death of the emperor the edict was revoked. Schall was thrown into prison and sentenced to death, was released, again imprisoned, and died Aug. 15, 1669. A large MS. collection of his remains in Chinese, amounting to fourteen volumes in 4to, is preserved in the Vatican Library. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

### Schalling, Martin

a Lutheran divine, was born at Strasburg, April 21, 1532. He studied at Wittemberg, and was pastor at Regensburg, Vilseck (in Upper Palatine), and Amberg. In the latter place he was deposed because he would not subscribe to the *Formula Concordiæ*. He died at Nuremberg, being pastor of St. Mary's, Dec. 29, 1608. He was a pious man, of whose hymn, *Herzlich lieb' hab' ich dich, O Herr* (Eng. transl. in Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 609, "Lord! I love thee from my heart"), Gellert said that it was "worth more than many volumes of new hymns, which have no other merit than that of a smoother language." The hymn which we have mentioned, and which is based on Psalm 18 and 73, was a favorite of Spener, Gellert, the duchess of Orleans (daughter of Louis Philippe), and others. See Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 2, 282 sq.; 8, 265; Knapp, *Evangel.*

*Liederschatz*, p. 1342, s.v.; Rittelmeyer, *Die evangelischen Kirchenliederdichter des Elsasses* (Jena, 1856), p. 52 sq. (B.P.)

## Schamyl.

SEE SHAMYL.

## Schartauans

a recent sect in Sweden, named after Schartau, a clergyman, whom they profess to follow. When Schartau died, he left some skeletons of sermons and a large number of devoted followers. An idolatry of the man and his skeleton sermons commenced, and with it a new era of Christian development, especially in Southern Sweden. It is neither High-Church nor Low-Church nor Broad-Church, but a hard, stony stereotype form — a certain way of preaching, talking, looking, and moving. The Schartauans dislike all lay activity — will join in no missionary work, in no Bible society because that is to yoke with unbelievers; nor will they speak with anyone on religious subjects unless he is an exclusive Schartauan. Another distinguishing feature is a great horror of the Moravians, founded on some unpleasant experience of Schartau's own. Schartauism crept into Gothenburg about twenty years ago.

## Schedius

in Greek mythology, was (1) the son of Iphitus and grandson of Naubolus, who led the Phocians, in connection with his brother Epistrophus, to Troy. He fell by Hector's hand in the stead of Ajax. (2) A son of Perimides, likewise leader of the Phocians, and killed by Hector.

## Scheelstrate, Emmanuel De

a Belgian antiquarian and theologian, was born at Antwerp in 1649. In his youth he became much interested in ecclesiastical history, and traveled in France and Italy for the purpose of meeting with the learned men of his day. His first work — on the pontifical prerogative — gained for him a canonry and the position of chorister in the cathedral at Antwerp. Innocent XI called him to Rome, and made him librarian of the Vatican and canon of St. John Lateran. He died in Rome April 6, 1692. Scheelstrate was a great scholar and a most prolific writer, in most of his works maintaining the great dignity of the pope and endeavoring to extend his jurisdiction. Of his works we mention, *Antiquitas Illustrata circa Concilia Generalica*, etc.

(Antwerp, 1678, 4to) — *Ecclesia Africana sub Primate Carthaginiensi* (ibid. 1679, 4to), in which he endeavored to prove that this Church recognized the pope as patriarch: — *Acta Constantiensis Concilii* (ibid. 1683): — *De Auctoritate Patriarchali et Metropolitana* (ibid. 1687, 4to). See Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclesiast.*; Niceron, *Memoirs*.

### Scheffer, Ary

a French painter, was born at Dort, in Holland, Feb. 18, 1795. His studies were carried on in Paris under baron Guerin, and in 1812 his first picture appeared. His earlier pieces were in the line of historical and genre painting, and have become well known through engravings as *The Death of St. Louis*, *The Sister of Charity*, and *The Soldier's Widow*. In the romantic style which was so prevalent at the time, Scheffer did not succeed so well, and felt that his power lay in a different direction. The inspiration given to his pencil by the works of Goethe and Byron is shown by his pictures *Giaour*, *Faust*, and a series of others. In religious painting, his *Christ the Comforter* and *Christ the Remunerator*, *The Shepherds Led by the Angel*, *Christ in the Garden*, show a deep religious feeling, and are works of power and great beauty. One of his finest sentimental pieces is *Francesca di Rimini and her Lover Meeting Dante and Virgil in Hell*. As a portrait painter he achieved great success, and the portraits of Lafayette, Lamartine, and others show his power. Scheffer worked incessantly, and his drawing is truthful and full of grace, his touch firm and well adapted to his style, and his color, though often wanting in mellowness, is still very beautiful. He was undoubtedly a great artist, and received the honor due to his talent. He was made commandant of the Legion of Honor in 1848, and died June 15, 1858.

### Scheffler, Johann

(*Angelus Silesius*), a Catholic mystic of Germany of great speculative power and poetic fervor, was born at Breslau in 1624, of Polish Protestant parents, and received his early schooling at the Elisabethanum of that city. In 1643 he went to Strasburg to study medicine, but soon afterwards retired to Holland, where he spent several years, partly at Leyden. Here he became interested in the writings of Jacob Bohme, which exerted a decided influence on his subsequent life. His religious studies did not, however, interrupt his professional preparation, and in 1647 he went to the University of Padua, where he graduated July 9, 1648. Returning to Silesia,

he served three years as family physician to a duke. Here it soon became evident that he could not content himself with the stiff Lutheranism of the day, and he soon became suspected by the local clergy. The court preacher, Freitag, forbade the publication of his poems because of their mystical tone. He found a patron, however, in Franckenberg, a Silesian nobleman, who was also attracted by Bohme. A poem which he published in memory of Franckenberg in 1652 seems to have brought him into trouble. Soon afterwards he left the service of the duke, and on June 12, 1653, entered the Catholic Church at Breslau, at the age of twenty-nine. His conversion raised no little outcry against him. His motives were assailed. This led him to publish at Olmütz, in 1653, his *Fundamental Reasons for Quitting Lutheranism*, in which he gave fifty-five reasons for regarding Lutheran doctrine as erroneous and eighty-three for accepting Catholicism. "In the whole matter," said he, "I have acted simply as an honest, conscientious Christian." After his conversion he remained in Breslau, occupied with religious meditation and writing. In 1657 appeared simultaneously his two chief works, *Der cherubinische Wandersmann* and *Geistliche Hirtenlieder*. In 1661 he was consecrated to the priesthood, and thenceforth acted as an almost bigoted champion of Romanism. In 1664 he was made the intimate counsellor of the bishop of Breslau. For seven or eight years he was now engaged in embittered controversies with the Protestant Church. Among his assailants were Chemnitz of Jena and Alberti of Leipsic. Abuse, caricature, and violence characterized both sides of the controversy. Many of these later writings he collected and published under the title *Ecclesiologia*. (Neisse and Glatz, 1677, fol.). His controversial activity seems to have rapidly consumed his strength, as he died at the early age of fifty-three. Of permanent results of his attacks upon Protestantism there is no trace. His writings soon fell into neglect, and it is only in quite recent times that they have met with full appreciation. They bear the stamp of deep conviction, and give evidence of wide acquaintance with the writings of the fathers and the mystics (see Grupp, *Die römische Kirche* [Dresden, 1840], and, on the Catholic side, Wittmann, *Angelus Silesius* [Augsburg, 1842]). But it is more as a poet than as a polemic that Scheffler holds a place in literature. His work *Der cherubinische Wandersmann* consists of a collection of 1675 brief utterances, mostly in Alexandrine verses of two to four lines each, unconnected and without systematic sequence. The title explains itself from the fact that the book aims at pointing out the way whereby man, estranged from God by sin and buried in the love of the world, is to find his way back to communion with God. The undertone of



these brief verses is of a strongly mystical character, and is entirely free from confessional distinctions. That we can return to God only by profound contemplation of God; and that the more we gaze upon God with open face and submit ourselves to him in perfect resignation and patience, so much the more are we essentially united to God and made possessors of all that is God's — such is the thought that constantly recurs under a thousand images, and spreads a fragrance over every page. The Christian element in this thought is found in the fact that Scheffler presents the incarnation and redemption as the effective means of our return to God; but he also insists, mystic-like, that the process of incarnation must in some degree repeat itself in us, so that we also may become sons of God like Christ. That some of Scheffler's utterances have a leaning towards pantheism (e.g., "I am as great as God, and he is as small as I;" "When I love God more than myself, then I give to him as much as he gives to me") is not to be denied. But this may be explained partly from the intensely aphoristic form of expression at which the author aims, and partly from actual inconsistency of thought. In his second edition he earnestly repudiates all pantheism, and asserts that he never intends to imply the cessation of the creatural character of man, but only that our regenerated nature *may* become so filled with grace as that God shall *be, to us*, all and in all. Besides, he constantly emphasizes the distinctness of the world from God and the moral freedom of man. With all their defects, these aphorisms are unquestionably among the richest fruits in the whole literature of Christian mysticism. They were highly esteemed by Arnold of Giessen, and by Leibnitz. In recent times the *Wandersmann* has received the warmest praises from Friedrich Schlegel, and has been reissued in whole (Sulzbach, 1829) or in extracts (F. Horn, Varnhagen von Euse, W. Müller, and others). But the poetic fame of Scheffler rests still more upon his volume of hymns, *Seelenlust* (1657-68; latest ed. Stuttgart, 1846), many of which have found a permanent place in the whole Protestant German Church. The latest of Scheffler's poetic works consists of a very realistic presentation of the *Last Things* (Schweidnitz, 1675), but it adds nothing to his fame. As to personal character, Scheffler is not without great inconsistencies. It is hard to believe that the profound sweetness of the poet and the fanatical zealotry of the controversialist could dwell in the same heart. Evidently the two natures of the man dwelt side by side, neither entirely mastering the other. The sources for the life of Scheffler are given in A. Kahlert's *Angelus Silesius* (Breslau, 1853). See Herzog, *Real-Ecyklop.* 13, 478-485;

Gervinus, *Lit. Gesch.*; *Westminster Rev.* Oct. 1853; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 204. (J.P.L.)

### Scheid, Everard

an eminent Dutch philologist, was born at Arnheim in 1742. and became professor of Oriental literature at Leyden. He died in 1795. Among his works are, *An Arabic Grammar: — Dissertation on the Song of Hezekiah in Isaiah* (Leyden, 1759): — *Book of Genesis Revised: — Minerva, seu de Causis Latinoe Linguae.*

### Schein, Johann Hermann

was born Jan. 20, 1587, at Gruenhahn, near Zwickau. He studied philosophy and theology at Leipsic. Being, however, besides, an excellent musician, he was called in 1615 as precentor to the famous Thomas School at Leipsic, where he died Nov. 19, 1630. He is the author of the beautiful hymn *Mach's mit mir, Gott, nach deiner Guet'* (Engl. transl. "Deal with me, God, in mercy now," in the *Choral Book*, No. 191). See Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 3, 83 sq.; 8, 624; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1342, s.v. (B.P.)

### Schell, Levi

a Lutheran minister, was born Sept. 9, 1823, at Berne, Schoharie County, N.Y. Having prepared himself for the ministry at Hartwick Seminary, he was licensed in 1853, and accepted a call as pastor of St. Thomas's Lutheran Church at Churchtown, N.Y., where he spent twelve years and a half, laboring with all the enthusiasm and intensity of his ardent nature. In 1866 he followed a call to the Clay and Cicero pastorate in Onondaga County, which he soon exchanged in 1867 with West Sandlake, in Rensselaer County. Having spent six years at West Sandlake, he accepted in 1873 a call to West Camp, where, however, his valuable and successful labors were interrupted in 1876 by sickness of so serious a character that he was compelled to discontinue preaching. In 1877 he again entered upon his duties, but in May, 1878, he was obliged to close his pastoral labors. He entertained the hope that he would again be enabled to resume his loved work of proclaiming the tidings of salvation, but his impaired constitution had finally to succumb, and he died Dec. 27, 1878, at the age of fifty-five years, and after twenty-five years of arduous and successful labor in the ministry of Jesus Christ. (B.P.)

## Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Von

one of the four (Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) great speculative philosophers of modern Germany, was born at Leonberg, near Stuttgart, in 1775. His father, though but a rural clergyman, was an eminent scholar in Oriental and Rabbinical literature. Young Schelling showed early indications of his great powers. At fifteen he entered the University of Tübingen, intending to make theology his profession. Here he formed an intimate friendship with the student (afterwards rival) Hegel who was five years his senior, as also with the unfortunate poet Hölderin. Lessing, Herder, and Kant were the admired heroes of these young geniuses. Also they were enthusiastically stirred by the new political ideas of the outbreking French Revolution.

*Writings.* — Schelling's first attempt at authorship was his essay for his master's degree in his eighteenth year, *Antiquissimi de Prima Malorum Origine Philosophematis explicandi Gen. iii Tentamen Criticum* (1792). A year later he published a paper, *Ueber Mythen* (on the myths and sagas of antiquity), which shows how deeply the religious ideas of the ancients were already occupying the young scholar. The year 1794, in which Fichte began his philosophical fame at Jena, was a turning point in the history of Schelling. Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* at once set into ferment the kindred speculative powers of Schelling, who, from thenceforth for two decades, sent forth a rapid succession of works which have assured him a place among the great speculatists of the race. Adopting Fichte's idealism, he spiritedly defended it in the following papers: *Ueber die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie* (1794): — *Vom Ich als Princip der Philosophie* (1795): — *Philosophische Briefe über Dogmatismus und Kriticismus* (1795): — *Neue Deduktion des Naturrechts* (1795): — *Allgemeine Uebersicht der neuesten philosophischen Literatur* (1795). These papers show a gradual advance towards independence of thought and towards the chief features of the author's subsequent peculiar positions. In 1796 Schelling went to Leipsic and gave special attention to the study of physics. Here he began to meditate that peculiar Philosophy of Nature which took so striking a form when he began to lecture at Jena in 1798. At first he taught side by side with Fichte; and when Fichte went to Berlin, in 1799, he remained the chief philosophical star at Jena. Hardly could there be conceived a more favorable place for the young philosopher than Jena at this time was. It was the philosophical focus of Germany. Reinhold had there expounded Kant; Goethe's spirit hovered over the place; Schiller,

Humboldt, and the Schlegels were closely related to the university. Circumstances combined to invest philosophy here with an atmosphere of poetry. Schelling's *Philosophy of Nature*, which was partly a creature and partly a creator of this atmosphere, was therefore very enthusiastically received. It was presented in a variety of writings: *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur* (1797): — *Von der Weltseele* (1798): — *System der Naturphilosophie* (1799). While elaborating these works, Schelling also subjected the Fichtean philosophy of the Ego to a further development, positing the *Ego* as an antithesis to *Nature* (see his *System des transcendentalen Idealismus* [1800]). But, unable to rest in this dualism, he attempted to conciliate the antithesis in a higher unity in his *Identitätssystem* (1801). This thought is the inspiration of a fresh series of works: *Bruno, oder über das göttliche und das weltliche Princip der Dige* (1802): — *Vorlesungen fiber die Methode des akademischen Studiums* (1803) — *Philosophie und Religion* (1804): — *Darlegung des wahren Verhältnisses der Naturphilosophie zur verbesserten Fichte'-schen Lehre* (1806). How great was the influence of Schelling in this period is vividly depicted in the pages of such men as Steffens, Schubert, and Schlosser. In 1803 Schelling was called by the Bavarian government to the University of Würzburg; here he wrought in the same spirit as at Jena. On account of political changes he left this post after two years, and retired to Munich, where, in 1807, he was made secretary of the Academy of Sciences.

This is a transition period in the philosophy of Schelling. His greater originality and independence lie in his Jena period. He now begins to drift towards syncretism and a mystical theosophy. It is an effort to escape from pantheism towards Christianity, or rather to find a system which shall express the truth of both. The works which give expression to this tendency — they appear less frequently than previously — are: *Das Verhältniss der bildenden Künste zur Natur* (1807): — *Das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit* (1809): the harsh work against Jacobi, *Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen* (1812); and essays in the *Allgem. Zeitschrift* (Munich, 1813).

After the year 1815 there begins an almost uninterrupted silence of nearly forty years in Schelling's life. In 1820 he lectured for a brief period at Erlangen. In 1826 he was made professor of philosophy at the new University of Munich. His lectures here formed an epoch in the life of many rising young men. In 1841 he accepted a call to Berlin. The lectures here delivered formed a strong antithesis to the dominant Hegelianism, and are

the best expression of his later system. His last years were devoted to editing his later form of doctrine for the press. Death overtook him in Aug. 1854, while seeking relief at the baths of Ragaz, in Switzerland, at the age of seventy-nine. Soon after his death (1856) the publication of his collective works was begun by his son (a clergyman), K.F.A. Schelling. They embrace a first division of ten volumes and a second of four volumes (Stuttgart and Augsburg, 1856 sq.).

*Philosophy.* — The philosophy of Schelling does not present a definite, self-consistent unity. It was in an almost constant state of self-modification. But it presents two pretty definite, crystallizing climax points his early *pantheistic idealism* and his later *Christian theosophy*. Between these climax points lies his long period of almost total retirement from public life. As a whole, however, the growth of his thoughts may be distributed under the following five phases:

- (1.) *Schelling as a disciple of Fichte.*
- (2.) *His philosophy of nature and his transcendental idealism.*
- (3.) *His system of identity.*
- (4.) *His transition period.*
- (5.) *His theosophic approach to Christianity.*

(1.) Schelling began his thought system by absorbing and championing the reigning philosophy of the day — to wit, the system of Kant as modified by Fichte. By Fichte the idealism of Kant was emphasized into exclusive validity. According to Fichte, there is no other reality than the absolute activity of the *Ego*. It is true, this activity of the *Ego* is conditioned by an *object* — the Not-me. But this Not-me cannot be derived from any reality exterior to the *Ego*; that is, from any *thing per se*. On the contrary, the Not-me, the external world of thought and observation, is really an unconscious creation of the *Ego*, which the *Ego* then subsequently raises to an object of conscious contemplation. But which is the absolute reality with Fichte, the *Ego* as unconscious or as conscious? If as *unconscious*, then God, the All, is unconscious; and the empirical consciousness of man is delusive and unreal, and is destined to vanish into unconsciousness. If as *conscious*, then God, the supreme reality, has no existence save in the transitional flux of vanishing, finite *Egos*: he is in eternal process of becoming and of passing away. Between these two consequences Fichte's system constantly oscillated, tending at the one pole to self-annihilation, and at the other to self-deification. The latter tendency prevailed more in

his earlier, and the former in his later, life. It was as an enthusiast for this rigid idealism of Fichte that Schelling made his philosophical *debut*. With Fichte he denied self-consciousness and personality to the absolute being; and he insisted that for the idea of a divine revelation there can be no place, save in the mythological phraseology of the populace. The history of religions he regarded as only a “progressive, symbolical manifestation of the ideas of the absolute reason.” The philosophies and religions of the ancient world present in an imperfect and, as it were, unconscious form that which modern thought has developed in full consciousness of its own processes. Perhaps the chief feature in which Schelling differed from Fichte from the very outset was that he found a deeper significance in the different forms of religion than Fichte had done.

(2.) Schelling’s second phase (1796-1800) sprang from his growing conviction that a mere subjective idealism could not do justice to the empirical objective world by which we are net on every hand. He did not mean by this to give up the results of his idealism; he only meant to reach the same results upon another path — to rediscover the reason of the subject in the objective reason of the world of nature. Thereby he introduced a new stadium into his philosophy: constructive or *creative* knowledge was put into the place of the previous *critical* knowledge. As previously the Ego had concentrated itself absolutely upon itself, so now this Ego, the subject, was to expand itself over the universe and find the laws of its own intuitions there reflected. Out of *subjective* idealism sprang, thus, an *objective* idealism. From the standpoint of this idealism the *moral* element loses its importance, and *speculative* knowledge is the one thing important. The intention of Schelling in his Philosophy of Nature was simply to complement the idealism of Fichte; but in reality it grew into a direct antithesis to it. With Fichte, nature was merely a *means* for the development of the subject. With Schelling, it was a manifestation — form of the absolute Ego, and had essence and significance *in itself*. *Nature was spirit visible; spirit was nature invisible*. This conception seemed strikingly new and important. It was hailed with very great enthusiasm. Nature was to Schelling a perpetual movement of self-balancing force. By the varied interaction of attraction and repulsion are produced the infinitely varied forms of organic life. *Matter* is balanced force. Nature, when rising above the antithesis of attraction and repulsion, becomes *light*. Light is, as it were, the soul, the thought of nature. Under the influence of light, matter evolves itself dynamically in the phenomena of magnetism, electricity,

chemistry. The antithesis of crude matter and light is harmonized in the higher stage of organic life. Here light *inheres* in the objects; it is their vitality, their light. Matter becomes here a mere incident of the vitalizing principle. The stages of the dynamic process constitute the great divisions of organic life. The preponderance of objectivity or of subjectivity determines the characteristics of the three great kingdoms of organic nature — the vegetable, the animal, and the human or moral. Matter is the background upon which these three kingdoms stand out as higher stages of evolved being. Through it they stand related and are united into a unitary cosmos.

In his Philosophy of Nature Schelling thus traces the objective world in its ascent from the crudest objective stage to the highest subjective; that is, from matter to moral freedom (so far as the latter exists). But, not content with this, he now reverses the process. He starts from the highest point reached by natural philosophy — to wit, self-conscious man — and reconstructs the whole system of philosophy from a subjective standpoint. In this — his Transcendental Idealism — he traces, accordingly, the objective as rising from the subjective. He divides his subject matter here into the theoretical, the practical, and (that which unites the two) the artistic. In the theoretical part Schelling considers the various stadia of knowledge in their relation to the various stadia of matter. Matter is extinct mind. The acts and phases of self-consciousness are rediscoverable in the forces of nature and in the stages of their development. All the forces of the world are ultimately reducible to powers of ideal representation. Organization is necessary; for intelligence must view itself in its productive, successive transition from cause to effect. This it cannot do without making that succession permanent or representing it as at rest; and succession represented as at rest is organization. Intelligence is a never-ending effort at self-organization. Among the successive stages of organization there must be one which the subject is forced to regard as identical with himself. It is only through the fact that there are other intelligences than myself that the world is made objective to me. It is only through commerce with other individuals that I can come to the consciousness of my freedom. The intercommunication of rational individuals through the medium of the objective world is the condition of freedom. But whether all free beings shall, or shall not, confine their action within such limits as leave free play to the freedom of each other is not left to chance. but is safeguarded by the higher law of justice. Justice rules in

the interests of freedom with all the inviolability of a law of nature. All attempts to supplant the reign of absolute justice by an arbitrary, artificial statute code have ever proved futile and abortive. The guarantee of a good constitution in each state must lie, in the last resort, in the subordination of all states to the common law of absolute righteousness. The gradual approach towards a realization of righteousness is the substance of history. History, as a whole, is a progressive realization and manifestation of the Absolute. It is only through history as a whole that the full proof of God's existence can become manifest. All single intelligences may be regarded as integrant parts of (God or the moral order of the world. This divine order will fully exist as soon as individual intelligences establish it. Towards this consummation history is constantly advancing in consequence of a preestablished harmony between the objective necessary and the subjective free. This harmony is conceivable only on the supposition of the existence of a higher element, superior to both, as being the ground of the identity of the absolutely subjective and the absolutely objective, the conscious and the unconscious, whose original separation took place simply in order to the phenomenal manifestation of free action. If the phenomenal manifestation of freedom is necessarily unending, then history itself is a never completed revelation of the Absolute, which disrupts itself, in view of this manifestation, into the conscious and the unconscious; but which is, in the inaccessible light in which it dwells, the eternal identity of both and the eternal ground of their harmony. To this higher element of identity *no predicates can be given*. Hence it cannot be an object of knowledge, but only of *practical postulation* — that is, of *faith* or *religion*. If we turn our attention exclusively to the orderliness of the objective world, we fall into a system of *fatalism*. If, on the contrary, we regard only the subjective, we land in irreligion or anarchy. But if we rise to the thought of that higher identity of both we attain to a system of *providence* — that is, of religion in the true sense of the word. It is true, Schelling leaves here untouched the very pertinent question how this higher Absolute to which no predicates can be assigned can be described as *provident*. How he would have met the question we leave undecided.

The transcendental idealism of Schelling had grown under his hands into a complete system of philosophy. It was therefore not only coordinate with his philosophy of nature, but also superordinate. But with this twofold presentation of his system from the two poles of the finite (Nature and the Ego) Schelling was not satisfied. He now felt that what he had found as the



goal of his highest previous effort — to wit, the principle of absolute identity — should be laid as the beginning at the foundation. This brings us to the third stage of his philosophizing.

(3.) The epoch of his System of Identity. In this system everything is derived from the absolute reason, taken in the sense of the absolute identity of subject and object. The highest law of this principle is its identity with itself ( $A = A$ ). It is absolutely infinite and one. Whatever *is*, is this absolute itself. Single finite things exist only in reflection. As this absolute identity is everything, it is at the same time the totality of everything. It is not the source or the *cause* of everything, but it *is itself* everything. In his conception of this absolute identity, Schelling seems to involve himself in a shadow of self contradiction. He makes it, on the one hand, an absolute *indifference*; as such it is purely negative, and hence cannot be made the basis of a positive universe. On the other hand, he makes it the *identity* of everything — that is, he makes it the most positive of all things. In this absolute identity, Schelling distinguishes *essence* and *form*. In respect to form. it is an infinite self knowing; it can know itself, however, only as subject and object. But as this subject and object spring from identity, their only difference must be quantitative, not qualitative; that is, the absolute identity can differentiate and posit itself under a preponderance of the subjective or of the objective, but not under a form from which one of the elements is entirely absent. Any equation that can be contrasted with  $A = A$  must be simply equivalent to  $A = B$ . The whole conception may therefore be expressed under the form of an unending magnetic line with one indifference point and two poles, at the one of which A preponderates, and at the other B, thus:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A=B & & A=B \\ & A=A & \end{array}$$

At every point in this line all three elements are present. Every single object is therefore one of the forms of the essence of the absolute, and in each of these forms the absolute identity is *entire*, seeing that it is *per se* indivisible. The preponderance of the objective or real is *nature*. The first relative totality in nature is *matter*; and the ideal antithesis of matter is *light*; and from the combination of matter and light springs organic life. But it is only in an infinite self knowing that the absolute identity is *actu* real, and hence only in the sphere of the subjective and ideal. This sphere Schelling identifies with the *true*, the *good* (religion), and the *beautiful* (art). The

absolute identity is therefore the essence of nature simply in that it is the *ground* of its actual existence. Everything is nature which falls outside of absolute being. This differentiation of essence as, on the one hand, the actuality of things, and as, on the other, simply the *ground* of their actuality, was justly regarded by Schelling as one of the most important connecting links between his earlier and his later system.

The filling up of the outlines of his system of identity Schelling left incomplete; he gave chiefly the objective phase. Of the subjective or spiritual phase we have only fragmentary sketches. As filled out in his oral lectures, this phase contained the germs of his later and more theistic system. Religion is presented, not as a product of development from a state of barbarism, but as a product of instruction from higher beings. But Christianity is regarded as inferior to the great religions of the Orient; and yet Schelling insists, as against illuminism and the subjective moralism of Kant, on the necessity of the chief theological ideas of the Bible. His thoughts are these: As the universe differentiates itself, as real and ideal, into nature and history, so history itself is likewise divided. The Oriental and pagan world is the nature side of history; Christianity, on the contrary, is the ideal or moral side. The pagan religions are religions of nature; the gods are but forces of nature; the infinite is subordinated to the finite; hence the multitudinousness of deities. But in Christianity the finite is subordinated to the one infinite; hence the unity of the divine nature; In Christianity mythology can only rise from deterioration and popular ignorance. In paganism mythology is primitive, and religion can rise only from an intellectual advance beyond the primitive elements. The stream of history rises through three stages. The *stage of nature* came to its climax in the religion and poesy of the Greeks: it was a time of unconscious identity with nature, and nature was regarded as a manifestation of eternal necessity. The *period of catastrophe*, or of conflict between natural necessity and moral freedom was the tragic age of the decline of ancient civilization. The *period of harmonization*, or of *providence*, was inaugurated by Christianity. (This division corresponds in part with the one made in the author's *Transcendental Idealism*.) It is only in Christ that God becomes truly objective. But this is an *eternal* process, and the incarnation is not a merely temporal, empirical act; Christ offers up in his own person the finite, and thereby renders possible the coming of the Spirit as the light of the new world; this spirit brings, conducts, the finite back to God. From philosophic speculation Schelling looked for the new birth of

essential, or esoteric, Christianity, and the proclamation of the absolute Gospel.

Connected with these views is Schelling's next speculative work, *Philosophy and Religion* (1804). It is a self defense against Eschenmayer. In it religion is presented as the "conciliation of the finite with God;" but the finite is regarded as *per se* fallen. "God is not the positively creative cause of the finite; the finite cannot directly spring of the absolute, and it sustains to the absolute no direct relation." The finite is regarded simply as *not real*, as delusive. The general background of this work is an idealistic mysticism, derived in part from Plato and Plotinus, but also much resembling the transmigration systems of the Orient; it fails to do justice to the ideas of morality and freedom.

(4.) With this work on *Philosophy and Religion* Schelling begins his transition to a more positive Christianity. All of his works subsequent to his *System of Identity* bear a more or less mystical coloring and become less and less rigidly systematic in form; at first the mysticism resembles that of the Eleusinian mysteries and of Neo-Platonism; subsequently it approaches Christianity on the footsteps of Böhræ. But this appropriation of mystical views was entirely independent on the part of Schelling; he seems to have been forced into them by a growing feeling of incomplete satisfaction with his previous views. And it is to be regretted that he did not openly concede the erroneousness of his earlier system or systems, but constantly represented his later system as simply complementive of his previous ones.

But his change of view is very radical. It came to definite expression for the first time in 1809, in his discussion of the nature of human freedom. Here is to be found in embryo the very essence of his final system. Schelling gives up monism. *Monism* cannot solve the riddle of good and evil, and gives no play to creatural freedom. Idealism must be complemented by realism. Idealism is the soul of philosophy; realism is its vital body; it is only from the union of the two that a vital whole can result. A few of Schelling's positions here are these: As nothing exists before or outside of God, so he has the ground of his existence within himself. This ground of his existence is not God *per se*, but it is a *nature* in God; this nature is inseparable from God, but yet it is distinguishable; it is not actually, but only logically, antecedent to God. It is only from this nature in God that the diversity and multiplicity of finite things is explicable. In order that these things be other than God, it must be that they have the ground of

their existence in something which is *not* God; that is, in that in God which is not God himself. The further development of these thoughts brings us to

(5.) Schelling's Later System. The thoughts here met with are unquestionably among the most brilliant and suggestive that are anywhere to be found in the field of the philosophy of religion. At the threshold of this system we meet with an examination of the implications of creatural freedom. Among the fruitful conclusions here reached is this, that purely rational, logical thought is incapable of leading us to a knowledge of reality. This conclusion leads to a distribution of philosophy into *negative* and *positive*. By this distinction, Schelling comes into sharp antithesis to Hegel, who endeavored to comprehend the real by the processes of mere abstract thought. In the view of Schelling, this is impossible. Pure thought, pure reason, cannot *a priori* comprehend the existence of the objective world of reality. *What* a thing is and *that* it is (*quid sit et quod sit*) are clearly to be distinguished. The *what*, the essence of a thing, may be expressed in thought, in ideas. But the knowledge *that* it exists is / given by something outside of thought — to wit, its existence itself. This knowledge comes to us from *experience*, and not from reason. Existence cannot, therefore, be *demonstrated*; it can only be *experienced*. It is only through this knowledge from experience that thought reaches to true knowledge. A negative or ideal philosophy has to do only with the *possible*. It is only a positive philosophy that can rise to contact with the *real* and with that which springs from the real — to wit, *freedom and free action*. But as the whole of the results of freedom is not yet complete, a positive philosophy cannot be presented in as rounded a systematic form as is possible with the negative. The highest attainment of negative philosophy is to show *how* the highest principle is *in idea*. The connecting link which leads over from the negative to the positive form of philosophy is the conviction, forced upon us by experience, that God must be more than mere idea — that is, that he is *real*. As negative philosophy is the *a priorism* of the empirical, so positive philosophy is the *empiricism* of the a prioristic — that is, it is philosophical empiricism.

Positive philosophy can assume a starting-point almost anywhere — thus: “I will that which is higher than substance, to wit, the Lord of all being.” From this initial assumption it then proceeds *deductively*, and the experience which results reacts as verification of the assumed starting point. The world is here the *posterius*; the unconditioned *prius* is God. And the whole drama of human history is an accumulative proof that this

*posterius* is from this *prius*. It is only in the sphere of positive philosophy that we reach the field of religion — that is, of a real (not merely ideal) relation of man to God. The transition from a negative to a positive philosophy is like that from the law to the Gospel. For a purely rational science, the idea of an objective religion does not exist. Religion originates *practically* through a longing and desire of the *spirit*, which cannot be satisfied with the merely ideal God of speculation. This longing is not an expression of the practical *reason*, as Kant would have it, but rather of the individual *personality*. It is not the generic, but the specific, that leads to God; for it is not the generic element of man (the reason), but the specific (the personality), that calls for happiness. The individual, as personality, calls for a person who is outside of and above the world — a Heart with which it may commune. The object and content of positive philosophy are furnished by *revelation*. But revelation is not philosophy, even as a ledge of rocks is not geology; it becomes philosophy only when thought digests and constructs it. Revelation is as essential to religious knowledge as the crust of the earth is to geological knowledge; hence the absolute defect of rationalism; reason is not competent to judge as to what revelation *should* be, but only to construct the revelation which *is*.

Having speculatively reached the ideal of the Absolute Being, and being forced by the *heart* to assume that this Being is objectively *real*, the philosopher is now ready for the predicate of this highest reality. This Being would not be perfect if he had not the liberty of positing himself outside of himself; but this is a liberty, and not a necessity. God is, *before* the world, master *of* the world; that is, he is able to posit it or *not* to posit it. The world is therefore a consequence, not of the divine *nature*, but of the divine *will*. But God does not posit himself *into* the world. God does not become *real* in consequence of creation; and yet he would not be real without the power of creation. Monotheism is true, but not in the sense of theism. Theism admits God as a personality, but this personality is an empty undifferentiated infinity, and has within itself no potentiality, no basis for a world outside of God. God is *per se* a *plurality of potencies*, and he is the totality *of* these potencies. And the great error of pantheism is not that it holds that there is no being outside of God, and that all existence is God's existence, "for all hearts cheerfully and joyously concede this;" but it consists in assigning to God a necessary and involuntary *identity* with whatsoever *is*. It is only from this idea of monotheism as distinguished from theism and pantheism that a transition to the truth of the trinity is

possible. The entire God — that is, God as the totality of the divine potencies — is the Creator, the Father; and he is Father only in that he confronts the possibility of what is to be; and his fatherhood is fully realized only with the full actualization of creation. In the act of creation the absolute personality evolves its own self existing essence out of itself. This act of creation is a *generating*, and the divine essence so evolved is the Son. A second evolution constitutes the Spirit. The fatherly potency furnishes the material of creatural objects; the Son their form; the Spirit their perfection.

Revelation in the Old Test. lingers under the forms of mythology. In the New Test. these forms are entirely dispensed with. The focus of the new religion is the person of Christ, not as teacher or legislator, but as *content*. The person of Christ is both historical and prehistorical; as prehistorical he presided over pre-Christian history; as historical he laid aside his glory and identified himself with man in order to raise human nature into communion with God. Christ resumed the glory which he had laid aside only *gradually* and by moral process. This process began at his baptism. It is only on the complete victory of Christ over death that he could send the Spirit as comforter.

Schelling closes his philosophy of revelation with a glance at the history of the Church. He distinguishes here a prehistorical, a historical, and a post-historical Church. The latter will not appear in the present eon. The condition of the prehistorical is that of a merely subjective (negative) unity; that of the historical is a state of division as preparatory to its transition to a state of free, positive unity. The historical stage of the Church begins at the point where Christianity attains to domination in the Roman empire. Here it had to face, under a new form, all the might of the once defeated Evil Spirit. In giving itself an outer constitution, the Church appeared at first as a mere realistic, material, formal unity; as such it was of a merely *authoritative* legal character, and the more rigidly this legal character developed itself, so much the more was the *ideal* (spiritual) character driven into the background. But at the Reformation the *ideal* element came to open revolt with the *realistic*, and it then inaugurated a new phase of Church history. Both Christ and the apostles place the advance of the Church in a growth in knowledge; and the character of this new phase is, and will be, that mankind recognize more and more the supreme fact that Christianity is the highest stadium of human science. The three conditions of the Church are typified in the three apostles — Peter, Paul, and John.

Peter has the violent, aggressive nature that characterizes every beginning; Paul is steady and constructive; John has the gentle repose of maturity. The true Church is neither of the three, but the synthesis of all; its foundation was laid by Peter; its body was edified by Paul; its content was breathed into it by John. Even as God consists not simply of one person, so the Church is not embodied simply in one apostle. Peter is rather the apostle of the Father: he sees most deeply into the past. Paul is really the apostle of the Son: he is full of light. John is the mouth piece of the Spirit: he has the deep “words” of spiritual truth and warmth.

As a whole, no system of modern philosophy has more fully allied itself with Christianity than that of Schelling; he, of all the great speculatists, has alone treated this religion as “real history.” To Schelling Christianity is a higher, a supernatural stream of history flowing upon the bosom of the ocean of cosmic history. He treats this history, not atomistically, but genetically. This genetic method of theologizing has become the prevalent characteristic of modern theology. Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Rothe, Lange, Martensen, have all practiced it. Its general trait is an earnest endeavor to coordinate the parts into the whole, and to grasp the whole as a vital unity; and its stimulative relation to contemporary theological thought is an evident result of this its chief trait; and that in its details it may frequently be erroneous, or that many of its speculations are over presumptuous, does not destroy its value as a whole.

Few thinkers have had more enthusiastic disciples than Schelling. G.M. Klein espoused his system of identity. J.J. Wagner defended the earlier Schelling against the so-called later. G.A.F. Ast applied his method to the study of Plato. T.A. Rixner became a fruitful student of the history of philosophy. L. Oken applied Schelling’s thoughts to an elaborate philosophy of nature; Nees von Esenbeck applied them to the physiology of plants; B.H. Blasche, to pedagogics and religious philosophy; J.P.V. Troxler, to the science of cognition. A.K.A. Eschenmayer received here his fundamental inspiration. J. Görres adapted Schelling to Roman Catholic tendencies. G.H. Von Schubert reflected him in a popular Christian mysticism. K.F. Burdach made large use of his philosophy of nature. K.G. Carus represented him in psychology and craniology; H.C. Oersted, in physics; K.W.F. Solger, in aesthetics; H. Steffens, in general religious philosophy; J.E. Von Berger, in the philosophy of law. F. Von Baader developed and remolded Schelling’s later views into a very rich and elaborate system of Christian theosophy. K.C.F. Krause applied Schelling’s

views to general literature and freemasonry. F.G. Stahl was largely influenced by the later Schelling in his philosophy of law and in his discussion of the relations of Church and State. Coleridge received much inspiration from the early Schelling, and through Coleridge this influence went over into the pantheistic traits of Wordsworth. Agassiz was inspired by Schelling's views of nature. And many of the brilliant hypotheses which have played so large a role in modern physics — such as the metamorphosis of plants, the homologies of the skeleton, the origin of species — are really found in germ in the early works of Schelling.

On Schelling, consult Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 503-551; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. 2; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrine*; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*; Bowen, *Modern Philosophy*; and all works on modern German speculation. (J.P.L.)

### Schelling, Joseph F.

general superintendent at Maulbrunn in Württemberg, was born in 1737, and died in 1812. Among his contributions to Biblical literature are the writings of Solomon translated into Latin, with notes (Stuttgart, 1806), and a *Dissertation on the Use of the Arabic to a Thorough Knowledge of Hebrew* (Stuttgart, 1771).

### Schenck, George

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Mattewan, N.Y., Jan. 27, 1816, and graduated at Yale College, August, 1837. During his boyhood he was crippled for life by a severe fall while skating. Hip disease ensued in its most painful form. He was helpless for three or four years, and was never after able to walk without crutch or cane and a high boot. But this affliction was sanctified to his conversion during his collegiate life. He studied theology in the New Brunswick Seminary, and after graduation, in 1840, settled as pastor of the Reformed Church of Bedminster, N. J. This was his only charge — a very large, intelligent, well-trained country congregation, which has enjoyed a long succession of able ministers. Mr. Schenck was distinguished as a preacher of unusual power in the exposition of Scripture and in the application of it to the consciences of his hearers. He was at times brilliant, always earnest, and “never feared the face of clay.” His fine social qualities, deep piety, and skill as a physician of souls, endeared him to his people. His energy was marvelous. “What he began, he expected to do. His body was like a little craft driven by a



tremendous engine; and for just that reason, no doubt, the timbers so soon fell apart. He preached, as he wrote to a friend, ‘with all his might.’ He was no less zealous as a pastor.” His tastes were refined, literary, scholarly. But everything was bent to his life work as a minister. In the general affairs of the Church, in the temperance cause and educational movements, he was conspicuous for “zeal with knowledge.” His ministry was greatly blessed in conversions and revivals, and in the edification of the Church. He died in 1852, of palsy, which struck him down just after he came from a Sabbath afternoon lecture and a visit to a sick man. With characteristic modesty, he never but twice consented to frequent requests to appear in print. A *Sermon on the Second Coming of Christ* (1843) and an *Address on Music* (in which he was a proficient) (1849) are all of his publications. See *Memorial Sermon*, by Dr. T.W. Chambers; *Letter* of Rev. H.D. Ganse; Sprague’s *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*. (W.J.R.T.)

### Schenk, Hartmann

a Lutheran divine, was born April 7, 1634, at Ruhla, near Eisenach. He studied at Helmstadt and Jena, and was pastor at Bibra and Vilkershausen. His motto was, “Mea Haereditas Servator,” and he died May 2, 1681. He was a man of prayer, who not only prayed himself, but also taught others how to pray. He wrote some hymns, which are still in use in the German churches. See G. Ludovici, *De Hymnis et Hymnopoëis Hennebergicis* (Schleusingen, 1703), p. 27; Wezel, *Hymno-poeographia* (Herrnstadt, 1724), 3, 49; Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 3, 427; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1343. (B.P.)

### Schenk, Heinrich Theobald

a Lutheran hymn writer, was born at Alsfeld, and became headmaster of the school at Giessen, and afterwards chief pastor there, where he died in 1727. He is the author of *Wer sind die vor Gottes Throne* (based on Revelation 7:13-17), transl. into English by E. Cox, in *Hymns from the German*, p. 91, “Who are these, like stars appearing.” See Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 4, 535; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1343. (B.P.)

### Schermerhorn, John F

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born about 1785, graduated at Union College 1809, and entered the ministry of the Congregational Church,

which he left in 1813 for the Dutch Reformed Church. He was first settled at Middleburgh, N.Y., 1817-27. In 1817 he visited Upper Canada with Rev. Jacob Van Vechten, and labored three months among the Dutch churches there. He was appointed Secretary of Domestic Missions, 1828 or 1829, by the Northern Board of the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church to call forth the resources of the Church and determine the proper missionary fields. Subsequently he was appointed general agent for the whole Church. His energy and zeal gave a new impetus to the benevolence of the Church. Among the substantial fruits of his labors was the organization of the Reformed churches in Utica, Ithaca, and Geneva, besides others in less prominent places. But serious difficulties embarrassed his administration, and he resigned the office in 1832. He never afterwards held a pastoral charge, but was frequently a leading member of the ecclesiastical assemblies, and continued to interest himself in the benevolent movements of the Church. In 1832 president Jackson, of whom he was a warm personal and political friend, appointed him one of a commission to remove the Cherokee and Chickasaw Indians beyond the Mississippi. This work also brought with it some unhappy complications, which hindered his subsequent usefulness. He was a powerful preacher, a public debater of unusual mental vigor, acuteness, tact, and argumentative ability. His restless brain was always teeming with great schemes, which often were Utopian in their results. In conversation he was entertaining and suggestive beyond most men. His sympathies were tender; and, when preaching or conversing on the great themes of the Gospel, he not only felt deeply, but possessed great power over the hearts and consciences of his hearers. He labored much and successfully in revivals of religion as a helper to his brethren. In person he was very large, robust, and commanding. He died in 1850 after a short illness. See *Memoir of Peter Labagh, D.D.*, by G. A. Todd, D.D., p. 52, 120, 161-163. (W.J.R.T.)

### Schermerhorn, Richard E.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Nassau, Rensselaer County, N.Y., experienced religion at the age of nineteen, was received on trial by the New York Conference in 1826, transferred in the same year to the Maine Conference, admitted into full connection in 1828, and successively appointed to the Scarborough and Gotham circuits, and Belfast, Hallowell, Bangor, Buxport, and Gardiner stations. In 1834-35 he was appointed to Augusta district, and also elected as delegate to the General Conference. He died April 18, 1836. He was a man well read, of uniform and deep

piety, good preaching talents, and successful in the great object of the ministry. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 2, 409.

### Scheuchzer, John James

a Swiss naturalist and physician, was born in 1672, at Zurich, where he was professor of mathematics and natural philosophy. He died in 1733. He was the author of several scientific works: *Natural History of the Bible*, in Latin and German (1732-37, 8 vols. fol.): — *Natural History of Switzerland* (1708, 3 vols.).

### Schian, Johann Robert

a German Protestant divine, was born Oct. 31, 1828, in Loewen. In 1852 he completed his theological studies at Breslau, was appointed deacon at Liegnitz in 1858, and afterwards first deacon in the same place, where he died, Jan. 16, 1876. He was one of the most prominent ministers in Silesia; and, besides a number of sermons, he wrote, *Ratio quoe intercesserit inter Melancthonem et Lutherum explicatur et quid attribuerit ad Ecclesiam Evangelicam constituendam exponitur* (Gottingae, 1855). See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 2, 1137; *Theologisches Jahrbuch*, 1877, p. 228. (B.P.)

### Schiavone, Andrea Medula (Or Medola)

an Italian painter and engraver, was born at Sebenico, in Dalmatia, in 1522. He was of obscure parentage, and went to Venice at an early age, where he gained a livelihood as a house painter. In his leisure hours he studied the works of Giorgione and Titian. The latter artist, hearing of his poverty and seeing his ability, employed him, with Tintoretto and others, in ornamenting the grand hall of the library of San Marco. His designs were good, but the drawing so defective as to render him unable to compete successfully with his rival Tintoretto. It was only after his death that his works were appreciated. His life was miserable. He died in Venice in 1582. His principal works are, *The Eternal Father among the Angels*: — *John the Baptist in the Desert*: — *The Visit of the Virgin to Elizabeth*: — *The Death of Abel*: — and *The Assumption of the Virgin*. Etchings by him are found after his own compositions, and copies of Raphael and others.

### Schickard, Wilhelm

a learned German Orientalist and distinguished astronomer, was born at Herrenberg, near Tübingen, April 22, 1592. When he had finished his

theological course, he was for a while vicar in his native town, but in 1613 returned to Tübingen, and there gave lessons in Hebrew. In 1616 he was pastor at Nürtingen, continuing his studies in various languages. An acquaintance which sprang up between him and Kepler led to his turning his attention to mathematics, to which he afterwards gave much of his time. To occupy his spare moments, he learned the art of engraving upon wood, and made use of this acquirement in constructing a celestial globe and astronomical charts. In 1618 he became professor of Hebrew at Tübingen, and added to his knowledge of languages by studying Syriac, Arabic, Chaldee, Turkish, and Persian, all without any teacher or instruction save what he gained himself. In 1628 he was made member of the College of Arts, and in 1629 was elected inspector of the schools at Stuttgart. He occupied in 1631 the chair of astronomy at Tübingen, without giving up his Hebrew professorship. After the battle of Tübingen he retired to Austria, but returned later only to meet the plague, which bereft him of nearly his entire family, and finally terminated his own life, Oct. 23, 1635. His writings are numerous, all relating either to Oriental languages or astronomy. His most valuable work is *Jus Regium Hebroeorum*, or **למחפצם**, especially in the edition of Carpzov (Leips. 1674). See *Vita Schickardi*; Balth. Viassus, *Apotheosis Schickardi*; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3, 270 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 125 sq.; *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana*, p. 2565; R. Simon, *Hist. Critique*, p. 474; Diestel, *Gesch. des alten Testaments*, p. 322 sq., 334, 449, 501, 521; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

### Schincke, Johann Christian Gotthilf

a German theologian, was born in 1782 at Querfurt, and died in 1839 as pastor of Wispitz, in Anhalt-Köthen. He wrote, *Metakritische Beobachtungen über die preuss. Agende* (Halle, 1824): — *Jesus Christus, ein Erbauungsbuch* (ibid. 1826): — *Evangelische Geschichten und Reden in frommen Dichtergaben* (ibid. 1826): — *Biblische Alterthumskunde in alphabetischer Folge* (Neustadt, 1837-40): — *Sammlung von auserlesenen Gebeten* (Halle, 1843). See *Regensburger Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* 2, 1140. (B.P.)

## Schindler, Valentin

who died in 1604, is the author of the first polyglot lexicon, containing the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Talmudico-Rabbinic, and Arabic. It was first published at Hanau in 1612, and in a fourth edition in 1695. Besides, he also wrote, *Tractatus de Accentibus Hebr.* etc. (Wittenberg, 1596): — *Compendium Grammaticioe Hebraicoe* (ibid. 1602; 2d ed. 1613), and other linguistic treatises. See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3, 274; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 127; *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana*, p. 2566 sq.; Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebr. Sprache*, § 34; Diestel, *Gesch. des alten Testaments*, p. 447, 452. (B.P.)

## Schinmeyer, Johann Adolf

a Lutheran divine and doctor of divinity, was born in 1733 at Stettin. leaving completed his studies, he was appointed in 1757 deacon at Itzehoe; in 1764 he was made archdeacon and professor of Oriental languages at Stettin; in 1774 he became pastor of the German congregation at Stockholm; and in 1778 he was appointed general superintendent at Greifswalde. In 1779 he was called for the same office to Lubeck, where he died May 3, 1796. Besides his *Lebensbeschreibungen der drei schwedischen Reformatoren, des Kanzlers Lor. Andersen, Olaf Petersen und Lor. Petersen* (Lubeck, 1783), he published *Versuch einer vollständigen Geschichte der schwedischen Bibelübersetzungen und Ausgaben, mit Anzeige und Beurtheilung ihres Werthes* (Flensburg, 1777), the best work on the earlier Swedish Bible versions. (B.P.)

## Schinner, Matthew

a Romish bishop in Switzerland, and a cardinal just before the outbreak of the Reformation, was born in 1470. He studied at Zurich and Como, and became early noted for shrewdness and scholarship. In 1509 he was made bishop of Sion, and soon thereafter was called into diplomatic service by Leo X. In 1511 he received the cardinal's hat. He intrigued against the French in Italy, and was the agent for procuring an army of 20,000 Swiss by which, in 1512, the French were expelled from Lombardy. For this service the pope heaped titles and wealth upon Schinner, and gave to the Swiss for all time to come the appellation *Defensores Ecclesiasticoe Libertatis*. Zwingli took part in the campaign, and depicted in bright colors the glory of the occasion. Schinner now made his headquarters as papal legate at Milan. Fresh dangers from France arising again, he hastened to

England (1514), and endeavored, by his *Oratio Philippica ad excitandos contra Galliam Britannos*, to entangle Henry VIII in war with Francis I. On his return, he inspired the Swiss to resist the French at Marignano. When the Reformation began in Switzerland, this cardinal statesman gave it at first a warm greeting. Zwingli met him at Einsiedeln and Zurich, and showed him from the Scriptures his reasons for rejecting the errors of popery, and the cardinal expressed himself as very desirous of cooperating in the work of renovation. When Luther's life was in danger in Germany, the cardinal joined with those who offered him safety and refuge. On reading Luther's works, he exclaimed, "Disputet Eccius quantum velit, Lutherus veritatem scribit!" But temporal interests held him fast to the old Church. He was even induced actively to oppose the new doctrines. His last few years were spent in Rome. He died soon after assisting in the election of Adrian VI, Oct. 2, 1522. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20, 691-694; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v. (J.P.L.)

## Schinos

*SEE MASTIC.*

## Schirmer, Michael

a Lutheran minister, was born at Leipsic in 1606. In 1636 he was called as master of the Grayfriars' Grammar school at Berlin, where he died May 4, 1673. On account of his many troubles, he was called "the German Job." He is the author of some hymns, the most popular of which is his *O heil'ger Geist kehre bei uns ein* (Engl. transl. in *Choral Book for England*, No. 70, "O Holy Spirit, enter in"). See Dieterich, *Berlinische Kloster- und Schul-Historie* (Berlin, 1752); Bachmann, *M. Schirmer nach seinem Leben u. Dichten* (ibid. 1859); Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 3, 333 sq.: 8, 8, 92; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1343. (B.P.)

## Schism

*SEE HERESY.*

## Schism Bill

an act passed in the reign of queen Anne rendering Nonconformist teachers of schools liable to three months' imprisonment. It was also laid down as imperative upon every schoolmaster that he should receive the sacrament of the Church of England, take the oaths, and teach only the Church

catechism. If he should attend a conventicle, he was incapacitated and imprisoned. The queen, however, died on the very day that the act was to have received her signature, and consequently, though it had passed both houses, it fell to the ground.

### Schism Overture

an overture which came before the Scottish General Assembly of 1766, and was produced by alarm at the rapid spread of secession. The overture affirms that a hundred and twenty meeting houses had been erected, and raised the question, What shall be done to remedy so great an evil? also, whether a committee might not be appointed to correspond with presbyteries and gentlemen of property and influence, and report? The overture was rejected by a vote of 19 to 85. The argument turned chiefly on the law of patronage.

### Schisms

Various great schisms are found in the history of the Church. There was the great schism which divided the Eastern and Western churches. In the Western Church there were early schisms —

- (1) *the schism of Hippolytus at Rome*, A.D. 220-235, *SEE CALIXTUS; SEE HIPPOLYTUS;*
- (2) *the schism of Felicissimus at Carthage*, about A.D. 250, which was in reality an opposition to the episcopal authority of Cyprian under the lead of Novatus, *SEE NOVATIANS;*
- (3) *the schism of Novatian, a presbyter at Rome*, A.D. 251. There was also the *schism of Meletius*. The Popish Church was rent by a great schism in the 14th century. Seventy years did the popes reside at Avignon, and after this one party chose Urban VI and another party Clement VII. France held by the last and England by the first, and for the next half century the rival popes claimed each to be the infallible head of the Church.

### Schlatter, Michael

a Swiss missionary, was born at St. Gall, July 14, 1716. Educated at St. Gall, he became a clergyman, and in 1746 offered himself to the synods of North and South Holland as a missionary to the German Reformed emigrants in Pennsylvania. He was pastor of the Reformed churches of

Philadelphia and Germantown from 1746 to 1751, and organized churches in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. He effected the organization of the Synod of the German Reformed Church in America in Sept. 1747. He revisited Europe in 1751, and secured six other ministers for the United States. In 1757 he acted as chaplain to an expedition to Nova Scotia against the French, and, espousing the cause of the colonists when the Revolution broke out, was imprisoned in 1777. He died near Philadelphia in October, 1790.

### Schlegel, Johann Adolf

a German preacher and poet, was born at Meissen Sept. 18, 1721. His early studies were carried on at Pforte, and in 1741 he entered the University of Leipsic, where he became acquainted with Gellert, Rabener, Gaestner, and many other writers of talent. In 1744 he edited, in concert with several friends, *Bremische Beiträge* and *Vermischte Schriften* (1744 and 1757), which aided in purifying the German literary taste. In 1751 he was professor in the school at Pforte, but in 1754 left to teach theology at Zerbst. There his sermons gained for him a fine reputation for eloquence. He became pastor at Hanover in 1759, and in 1780 was promoted to the office of ecclesiastical superintendent. He died at Hanover Sept. 16, 1793. His poems have not been very highly esteemed, though some of his chants are yet sung in the Protestant churches of Germany. Besides these, he wrote, *Sammlung einiger Predigten* (Leips. 1754-64): — *Predigten über die Leidensgeschichte Jesu Christi* (ibid. 1773-74, 3 vols. 8vo). His two sons, August Wilhelm and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich (q.v.), acquired great celebrity. See Schlichtegroll, *Nekrolog*.

### Schlegel, Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von

a German author, was born in Hanover, March 10, 1772. He studied at Göttingen and Leipsic. In 1808 he, together with his wife, embraced the Roman Catholic religion, and went to Vienna, where he was appointed imperial secretary at the headquarters of the archduke Charles. He accompanied the duke to the battlefield, issuing patriotic proclamations against Napoleon. He was afterwards secretary of the Austrian embassy till 1818. The rest of his life he spent in lecturing in Vienna and Dresden. He was especially remarkable as a critic and thinker of great originality, and his principal works are, *Griechen und Römer* (1797): — *Geschichte der Poesie der Griechen und Römer* (1798): — *Ueber die Sprache und*



*Weisheit der Inder* (1808): — *Vorlesungen über die neuere Geschichte* (1811): — *Philosophie des Lebens* (1828): — *Philosophie der Geschichte* (1829, 2 vols.): — and *Philosophie der Sprache* (1830).

### Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst

was a theologian of the Reformed Church of Germany, who, standing on the borderline between the decline of rationalism and the birth of the new evangelical school of Germany, exerted an influence for good in all the higher fields of thought which has rarely been equaled by any mind in any age (“the greatest divine of the 19th century,” says P. Schaff, *Creeeds*, 1, 451). He was born at Breslau, Nov. 21, 1768. His father was an humble army chaplain of Calvinistic faith, upright life, and rather cold and harsh temper. His mother (*nee* Stubenrauch), a pastor’s daughter, was sprightly, prudent, and pious. Young Schleiermacher’s health was delicate. His education up to his fifteenth year was derived chiefly from his parents. In 1783 he was sent to the school of the Moravian Brethren at Niesky. Here he made rapid strides in knowledge; but he also began to be troubled with religious doubts. At the age of seventeen he entered the higher school of the same brethren at Barby. Here he was brought face to face with a body of doctrine which, not being able to command his full assent, had the effect of forcing him to begin the construction of a system of his own. His first chief doubts related to the substitutional atonement of Christ and the eternity of future punishment. The attempts of his teachers to remove these doubts had no other effect than to sadden him, and to convince him that his religious life would have to be nurtured outside of Moravian circles. He was frank enough to open his heart and explain his doubts to his dry, traditional father. The father rudely answered him, “O foolish son, who has bewitched thee that thou obeyest not the truth and crucifiest the Savior afresh?” Subsequent correspondence, however, brought the father into a more Christian frame of mind, and finally led each to esteem and respect the other in a far higher degree than before. With great difficulty having obtained his father’s consent, he entered the University of Halle in the spring of 1787. While thus breaking his outward connection with the Moravians, he yet bore away with him from them a spirit of tender, subjective religiousness which ever after lingered like a heavenly aroma over everything which he printed or spoke. In Halle he lived with an uncle, and studied and heard lectures just as he pleased. He was not very methodical. He heard the aged rationalist Semler, devoured the works of Wolf, Kant, and Jacobi, became familiar with modern languages, and

pursued mathematics. At this time he wrote: "I am not sure that I can construct the whole field of knowledge into such a system that I can readily assign to every question its place and its solution; but I am sure that the *nearest approach* to it will be made by a candid hearing of the reasons on *both sides*, and by not settling upon anything with positiveness until this has previously been done." These words of the youth truly express the spirit that led him throughout life. While not in every case attaining to definitive results, he yet incessantly worked towards that goal; and his one life aim was to ascertain as nearly as practicable the limits of attainable human knowledge. Leaving Halle in 1790, he passed his theological examination in Berlin, and, on the recommendation of F.S.G. Sack, became private instructor in the pious family of the count Dohna-Schlobitten in East Prussia. Differing, ultimately, with the count on certain pedagogic principles, he returned to Berlin and taught, for a while, an orphan school (1793), then preached as vicar to pastor Schumann at Landsberg, on the Wartha (1794), and finally was made one of the two pastors at the Charité, the chief hospital in Berlin, a position which he filled until 1802. From 1796 onwards, his intellectual life took on a marvelous richness of flow and depth. Surrounded with such persons as Brinkmann, Scharnhorst, Alexander Dohna, Henrietta Herz, Dorothea Veit, he breathed the most stimulating atmosphere of the Prussian capital. In his scientific and philosophical studies he made vast acquisitions. By his intimacy with the younger Schlegel he was partially imbued with the spirit of the romantic school in art. From this influence the clearness of his moral consciousness was momentarily disturbed. Hence arose his *Letters* upon Schlegel's romance, *Lucinde* (*Vertraute Briefe*, 1801), which, though well meant and full of moral earnestness, brought upon him no little odium. They can, at best, be called only a beautiful commentary to a bad text. Hence, also, sprang his romantic friendship with Leonore Grunow, the childless wife of a Berlin pastor, which was absolutely broken off only in 1805. Much satisfactory light is thrown upon this single shadow in his life by his letters to his sister Charlotte and to Henrietta Herz. These incidental matters did not interfere with the steady maturing of his intellectual and theological systems. It was, perhaps, the richest development period (from his twenty-eighth to his thirty-second year) in his life. Hence it is to be explained that with so little previous literary experience (he had only helped Sack translate Blair's *Sermons*, and himself translated Fawcett's *Sermons* and contributed a few essays to periodicals) he was able at once to electrify the nation by such a masterwork as his *Reden* (discourses on religion [1799])

and his *Monologen* (1800). Leaving behind him these earnest protests against the prevalent spirit of irreligion, he now repaired (1802) to the post of court preacher at Stolpe, in East Pomerania. Here he passed two laborious years, and wrought upon his German translation of Plato. Here appeared his first strictly philosophical work, *Kritik aller bisherigen Sittenlehren* (1803). In 1801 he was transferred to Halle and made professor extraordinary of theology. It was a trying change; his own system of theology was not yet matured in his mind; and nothing but the great practical wisdom and originality of a Schleiermacher would have succeeded under the circumstances. He began at once to lecture in a very original manner on New Test. exegesis, dogmatics, and ethics. He also preached frequently, reestablishing the academic worship which had fallen into neglect. He was soon made professor in ordinary. Although he attracted general attention, yet he was not congenial to the members of the theological faculty. Only Niemeyer and Vater drew near to him; Knapp and Nosselt did not appreciate him. His lectures and sermons made strange and contradictory impressions. Was he an atheist, a Spinozist, or a superorthodox pietist? Some thought the one; some the other. At this period he produced his *Weihnachtsfeier* (1806) and his commentary on *Timothy* (1807). The ravages of the French invasion interrupting now his labors at Halle, he returned to Berlin (autumn of 1807) and became pastor of Trinity Church (Dreifaltigkeitskirche). In 1808 he married the widow of his young friend, Von Willich. In 1810 he was made professor in ordinary of the new University of Berlin and a member of two scientific associations. Here the most influential half of his life begins. He was of the small circle of great men who called the new university into being and gave to it fame. Here he passed from a rhapsodical to a dogmatic theologian; from a proclaimer of religious philosophy to an expounder of the Word of God. It is not a revolution, however, but only a growth. Besides his scholastic labors, Schleiermacher took a lively part in the troubled politics of his country. In the darkest hours of Napoleonic oppression, he was unwearied in pulpit labors, counseling patience and inspiring with hope. He gave also much thought to the Church agitation which afterwards culminated in the "Union" of the Lutherans and the Reformed. The most important production of his first ten years in Berlin was his *Glaubenslehre*. From 1818 to 1822 he labored with De Wette and Lücke in editing the *Theologische Zeitschrift*, which, ignoring the vulgar difference between rationalism and supernaturalism, represented a more general and a higher form of religious and philosophical science. Though not one of the

founders of the *Studien und Kritiken* (1828), yet his contributions to its earlier numbers helped to give it its high character. But it was to his actual work of teaching that the strength of his life was given. He lectured from two to three hours per day, except Saturdays. His intercourse with the other members of the university — with Fichte, Savigny, and Hegel, with Buttman, Böckh, and Lachmann, with De Wette, Marheineke, and Neander — was deeply beneficial on both sides. The subjects which he taught were hermeneutics, ethics, dogmatics, dialectics, psychology, and philosophy, besides other incidental subjects. To his sermons he gave but a few moments on Saturdays, rarely throwing upon paper more than a few outlines. The majority of his published sermons arose from notes taken down by his auditors and then revised by himself. In society Schleiermacher took great delight, though not always himself the greatest talker. Society did not weary, but recreate him. To the students he was by far not so familiar as Neander, but the time he gave to them left indelible impressions. In his domestic life he was peculiarly happy. Only the death of his sole son (1829) cast a shadow into his life from which he seemed never fully to recover. Still he fulfilled all his offices and was busy with his pen to the very last. His oft expressed wish that he might die in the full possession of his consciousness was graciously granted to him. Early in February, 1834, he was attacked with inflammation of the lungs, which closed his life on the 12th. His dying hours were those of a resigned, joyous follower of Christ. His very last act and words were the administering of the eucharist to himself and his friends.

From these outlines of Schleiermacher's outward life we pass to a brief notice of his chief literary and theological productions, following in the main the article (forty-four pages) by Gass in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 13. He stood, as we have said, between the death and the birth of two ages. Combining the tendencies of the two — the rationalistic and the evangelical — in his own person, he helped to bury the one and to inaugurate the other. Yet he himself belonged to neither. He gave the death blow to rationalism, cast away the rubbish, and laid the foundations of the new evangelical edifice; but he did not fully build it. His intellectual history is the history of the Christian consciousness of his epoch. It is a growth. It has a dawn, a crystallizing period, and a philosophic maturity. It can be traced distinctly in the thirty-one volumes of his collective works as edited by his friend Jonas and others, from 1834 to 1864.

His career was opened by his *Reden*, addresses to cultivated unbelievers (1800). This work made an epoch in the German nation. It called the cultivated circles away from their pride in a high sounding philosophy and from their contempt of what they called religion. There is no incongruity, said the young prophet, between culture and religion. The culture that despises religion is but shallow presumption; the religion that despises culture is but a caricature. The foundations of religion are as deep as intuition and as broad as humanity. Each individual of the race is a vital member of the universe. By the universe he is sustained and furthered. In every life there come moments when this dependence on the universe is thrust upon the consciousness and made the very life of the soul. Such moments are as a conception, a birth, of the Eternal and Absolute within the limits of the finite and dependent. Religion is art, taste, a consciousness of the All. In becoming conscious of the Infinite we have the sentiment of our immortality. Religion is not mere dogmas and systems. It is the deepest and truest life of humanity itself. Men may sneer *at* religion, but they cannot get away *from* religion. Scorners turn from dry dogmatics to living nature. But what do they revere in nature? Not dead matter, not prosy, chemical elements, but rather nature's orderly march, its adaptation of means to ends. But this is, after all, the very essence of religion; it is a sympathy with the eternal basis of all being. Religion is thus universal. We can escape it only by putting out our reason. It is not from wholeness, but only from partialness, of vision that the cultivated turn aside from religion. The first three of the discourses treat, thus, of the nature of religion in general. The last two give a survey of religion in its historical reality. As the essence of religion is communion of feeling with the Absolute, the One, so its tendency is to organize man into communities and to express itself in organized worship. As there are infinite varieties of manifestation in nature, so the apprehension of the Infinite in the soul of man takes place under endless varieties. Hence the multiplicity of historical religions. But there are here points of greater and of less approximation. Ancient Israel stood exceptionally close to the Infinite. In Jesus of Nazareth, the One, the Infinite reached its (or his) intensest manifestation. Such is the general drift of these celebrated *Reden*. They were accused of a tendency to pantheism, though Schleiermacher resented the imputation. They were certainly not positively Christian. But they tended towards Christianity, and they unquestionably produced a more fruitful effect on the specific audience which they addressed than if they had been of more confessionally orthodox form. This effect was sudden and immense. In his preface to the

third edition (1821) Schleiermacher had occasion playfully to remark that there was then really a greater call for discourses to the over righteous and the creed worshippers among the cultivated than to unbelievers. The *Monologen*, with which Schleiermacher greeted the dawn of the 19th century, stand, as an *ethical* work, by the side of the *religious* tendency of the *Reden*. They are a self scrutinizing and self-exhorting journey through the religious consciousness. Man should not be simply one of the monotonous members of the universe; but he should, by self concentration and self virtualization, develop himself into a rich and relatively independent individual. Means to this are reflection, meditation, retirement from too great absorption in dissipation, business, and external routine — in other words, the due consecrating of our secular life with the devotional element. As in the *Reden* an influence of Spinoza has been noticed, so in the *Monologen* some have found a trace of Fichte. These two works present their author in the first stadium of his development. The *Christmas Celebration (Weihnachtsfeier* [1806]) is a transition step towards positive theology. It is a charming dialogue, in the fashion of Plato, on the significance of the birth of Christ. The three speakers defend, each his peculiar view. Neither of them represents the author's exclusive views, but rather all of them in turn.

When we pass to Schleiermacher's critical treatment of the Bible, we meet with his least satisfactory works. And yet there was combined with his rather negative tendency very much which has enriched the results of exegetics. Ignoring the dogma of inspiration, he laid free hand upon the sacred book, just as upon the dialogues of Plato, or any other ancient documents. But he did not doubt the substantial genuineness of the Bible, and he was confident that critical science is capable of drawing the line between the essential and the non essential. His posthumously edited lectures on introduction to the New Test. hermeneutics and criticism have not fully answered all expectations.

In his outlines of theology (*Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums*), which appeared first in 1810, and then, enriched with notes, in 1830, Schleiermacher assumes very positive dogmatic ground. He bases himself upon the objective fact of the Protestant Christian consciousness. Theology is a positive science, the elements of which are evolved from the Christian consciousness and from the exigencies of Church government. It is not a branch of philosophical science in general. With philosophy it must neither interfere nor by philosophy be dominated. Its truth is ascertained by

historical criticism and by the comparative study of other religions. This forms the *philosophical* part. Its product is the *historical*, and out of the philosophical and historical parts results directly the *practical* part. This little work is of great originality, and has exerted wide influence. Its classification, however, has not been extensively followed.

The richest product of Schleiermacher's life is his dogmatics (*Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche*), which was first published in 1821 (2 vols.), then, in a much enriched and revised edition, in 1831. It is a monument of genius, and has been called the greatest theological product of the 19th century. Dogmatics is here presented, not as a speculative science, but as the systematized contents of the Protestant Christian consciousness. The essence of this consciousness is defined, not as knowledge or action, but as *feeling*, and as a feeling differing from all others in being a direct consciousness of the absolute. More specifically, it is a *feeling of absolute dependence*. This feeling is for the first time clearly realized in Christian monotheism. The principal defect of this definition is that it makes no adequate room for creatural freedom. A second definition is given of the specifically *Christian* consciousness. Thus, qualitatively it is a transition from the moral condition of unhappiness into that of happiness; historically, it is an effect of the life of Christ. The two elements must stand in perfect union. This union gives the limits within which the healthy Christian life must move, and beyond which lie the shoals of all error and heresy. Redemption is infringed upon by any view of human ability which overlooks the absolute *necessity* of redemption. Christ is infringed upon by any view which makes him either *too near* to or *too remote* from the ordinary conditions of human life. Accordingly, we find, in fact, two opposite christological and two anthropological heresies — the *Ebionite* and the *Docetic*, the *Pelagian* and the *Manichæan*. From this starting point, and within these limits, the dogmatic theologian has free movement. It is his privilege to seize the historical results of the past, to shape them into self consistency, and to impress upon them in turn the historical coloring of the present. Thus the body of Christian doctrines is at no point definitively complete, but is in constant process of maturing. The dogmatics of Schleiermacher made an epoch in theology. It superseded old modes of defending Christianity, and inaugurated new and better ones. It did not begin with dry proofs of the existence of God; it found God already given in the Christian consciousness. It did not make Christ simply a part of the Christian system;

it made him its beginning, its middle, and its end. In the distribution of the subject matter of his work, Schleiermacher studies (1) man as conscious of God prior to the experience of the antithesis of sin and grace; next, after becoming conscious of such an antithesis, as (2) the subject of sin, and (3) as the subject of grace: or the states of innocence, sin, and grace. Each of these divisions is subdivided in a threefold manner, describing respectively the condition of man, the attributes of God, and the constitution of the world, as they relate to the three above-named states. Thus Schleiermacher's method departs from all previous methods. While the schoolmen begin with God and his attributes, and then pass to man; while the reformers usually begin with the rule of faith, the Bible, and then, passing to the Deity, proceed in the scholastic manner, Schleiermacher, on the contrary, begins and ends with the human consciousness and its contents. The development of this scheme showed clearly that the old form of rationalism was shallow and worthless. It emancipated religion from its entanglement with philosophical systems and placed it in the realm of feeling. It showed that spiritual insight — an awakened heart — is just as necessary to the appreciation of Christian theology as aesthetic insight is to the enjoyment of art. But with these healthful principles Schleiermacher associated consequences which were of damaging tendency. As he made the human intuitions the criterion of absolute appeal in art and morals, so he made the collective Christian consciousness the ultimate test of religious truth. The value of the apostolic testimony in Scripture arises, therefore, not from its being an absolute objective standard, but from its being the clearest existing expression of the Christian consciousness in the earliest and purest age. The Church existed before the New Testament. The New Testament appeals to the religious consciousness, but does not dictate to it. Inspiration is not mere genius: it is the outgoing of the religious consciousness; it is but a higher degree of what is common to the pious intuitions of saintly men in all ages. The Bible is a record of religious truth, not its formal organ. It is a reflection of the Christian consciousness of the apostolic age, but not a mechanical criterion for all ages. By such views as these Schleiermacher made himself absolutely dependent upon the utterances of the religious consciousness. Hence he is unable fully to appreciate such points of doctrine as are not clearly given in this consciousness. Thus sin is understood rather as unholiness than as guilt before God; redemption rather as sanctification than as justification; Christ's death as a simple incident in his life of self sacrifice; atonement as the setting forth of the union of God with man; the mode of attaining to



salvation as a spiritual realization of this union through the embracing of Christ in love (see Farrar, *Fee Thought*, p. 245-247). The Holy Ghost is presented as simply the collective Spirit of the Church, as resulting from the union of human nature with the divine. With the exception of the doctrines of immortality, eternal life, and retribution, all the other opinions in regard to man's future are questions of mere hope and speculation. The doctrine of the Trinity is not a direct utterance of the religious consciousness, nor was it a separate article of the early Christian faith; hence it does not really possess the character of an independent dogma, which the Church afterwards gave to it. The Trinity is, in fact, not a designation of Deity, but rather of the revelation of Deity. Schleiermacher inclines to an improved Sabellianism. The scholastic idea of a tripersonal God is, in his view, an undogmatic philosopheme, while the simpler old Protestant conception is a logical self contradiction (see *Theol. Zeitschrift*, pt. 3 [transl. in *Bible Repos.* Andover, vol. 5]). The reception which the public gave to Schleiermacher's dogmatics was very varying. Rationalism was displeased: the first volume was too speculative, the second too pietistic. Wegscheider regarded it as a pious representation of essential orthodoxy. The orthodox party warmly welcomed it, though without full approval. Braniss and Delbrück criticized it sharply. The latter declared it inconsistent with the foundations of Protestantism. But it speedily recovered from these shocks; and within a few years it numbered among its disciples such men as Twesten, Lücke, Nitzsch, Ullmann, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schwarz, and Gass. These men studied it, elucidated it, wrote upon it. It came to honor in nearly all the German universities. In some of them it was made the basis of special courses of lectures. But it speedily became evident that the body of disciples might be divided into three chief groups. Some held more to the negative, critical elements; others to the evangelically positive; others to the middle course of the master. Among the more positively evangelical of his disciples were Twesten, Nitzsch, Julius Muller, Hagenbach, Tholuck, Sack, Bleek, Usteri, Olshausen, Dorner, Erbkam, Martensen, Liebner, Lange, Eberard. Auberlen, Rothe, Schöberlein, Palmer, and a host of others.

In the field of *ethics* the influence of Schleiermacher was only less than in that of dogmatics; but he was not privileged to bring his thoughts to satisfactory completion and consistency. He began with a revolutionary and unhistorical criticism of previous systems in his *Kritik aller bisherigen Sittenlehren* in 1803. His personal views he began to elaborate in a series

of essays in 1819. The substance of his lectures on ethics was edited by Schweizer (*Entwurf der Sittenlehre*) in 1835, also more briefly by Twisten (*Grundriss der philosophischen Ethik*) in 1841. His positively Christian ethics (*Die christliche Sitte*) was edited by Jonas in 1843. From these varied presentations it is difficult, if not impossible, to derive a single consistent view. The classification is artificial and unsatisfactory (see a severe criticism upon it in Wuttke's *Christian Ethics* [Engl. transl.], 1, 361-371). The fruitfulness of Schleiermacher in this field was rather in furnishing impulses to other authors than as the creator of a finished system.

Next in importance stand his works on pedagogics (*Erziehungslehre*), edited by C. Platz in 1849, and his *Practical Theology* (*Praktische Theologie*), edited by Frerichs. Of less worth are his lectures on Church history (*Kirchengeschichte*), edited by Bonnel in 1840. For the light thrown upon his inner religious life, none of Schleiermacher's writings are more interesting than his sermons. There are thus far published ten volumes. Of these four were revised by the author, and six have been prepared by others, mostly by Dr. Sydow. These sermons are from every period of his life, and of every class. The larger number, however, are not textual or exegetical, but synthetic, the regular development of a theme. In contents they stand midway between the instructive and the hortatory. The great preacher placed himself on the same level as his audience, and, while enriching their conception of Christianity, endeavored to inspire them to a fuller realization of it in their lives. The uniform central point of his utterance was Christ, the Redeemer. Dr. Schaff (see *Creeds of Christendom*, 1, 880) ascribes this intense love of Christ in Schleiermacher to his early Moravian education. He says, "It is a remarkable fact that the great German theologian Schleiermacher was cradled in the Moravian community, and conceived there his love for Christian union and personal devotion to Christ, which guided him through the labyrinth of speculation and scepticism, and triumphed on his death bed. He shook almost every dogma of orthodoxy, and was willing, if necessary, to sacrifice all if he could only retain a perfect and sinless Savior." He is inexhaustible in the variety and novelty of ways in which he impresses this vital point. This singleness of aim, however, does not imply monotony, but is consistent with very wide variety of matter. There is scarcely a single point in the circle of Christian doctrine which is not the theme of some of these

sermons; hence they are often read from a merely dogmatic interest. They will long be esteemed among the richest fruits of the German pulpit.

Among the latest volumes edited from Schleiermacher's remains are his lectures on psychology (*Psychologie*), by George (1864) and his *Life of Jesus (Leben Jesu)*, by Ritenik (1864). His correspondence with J.C. Gass was edited by W. Gass in 1852, and that with other friends appeared under the title *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben* (1858-62, 4 vols.). A brief autobiography, reaching only to 1794, was issued in Niedner's *Zeitschrift* in 1851.

For sources for Schleiermacher's life (besides his own writings and letters), see G. Bauer, *Karakteristik*, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1859; Auberlen, *Ein Charakterbild* (Basle, 1859); Kosack, *Jugendleben* (Elberf. 1861); K. Schwarz (Gotha, 1861); E. Maier (1863); Baxmann (Bonn, 1864); Dilthey (1867); Schenkel (1868). On his doctrines, see Braniss, *Ueber Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre* (Berl. 1822); F. Delbrück, *Erörterungen* (Bonn, 1827); C. Baur, *Primoe Rationalismi et Supranaturalismi Historioe Capita Potiora* (1827); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Schleiermacher's Denkart u. Verdienst* (1834); Lücke, *Erinnerungen*, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1834; H. Schmid, *Ueber Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre* (Leips. 1835); Rosenkranz, *Kritik* (1836); Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis* (Tübingen, 1835); Weissenborn, *Darstellung u. Kritik der Glaubenslehre* (1849); Schaller, *Vorlesungen über Schleiermacher* (Halle, 1844). On his ethics, see Twisten's preface to his edition of Schleiermacher's *Phil. Ethik*; Vorlander, *Schleiermacher's Sittenlehre* (1851); Herzog, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1848; Reuter, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1844. On his sermons, see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, 1848. See also Schürer, *Religionsbegriff* (Leips. 1848); P. Schmidt, *Spinoza u. Schleiermacher* (Berl. 1868); also *Opuscles*, by Carl Beck (Reutlingen, 1869); F. Zachler (Breslau, 1869); W. Bender (Worms, 1868); P. Leo (Jena, 1868); Hossbach (Berl. 1868); also article in *Christ. Exam.* vol. 53; *Westm. Rev.* July, 1861; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1869; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* April, 1862; July, 1866; Oct. 1876; *Princeton Rev.* April, 1866; *Universalist Rev.* April, 1869; *Mercersb. Rev.* April, 1871; *Presb. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1868. (J.P.L.)

### Schleusner, John Frederic, D.D.

professor of theology in Wittenberg, was born in Leipsic Jan. 16, 1756, and studied theology and philology in the university (of that city). He was appointed professor of theology in Göttingen in 1784, and in 1795

professor of theology and provost of the college church in Wittenberg. He devoted himself principally to the lexicography of the Greek Scriptures. After the removal of the University of Wittenberg, he was associate director of the theological seminary. He died Feb. 21, 1831. Among his principal works are, *Lexicon Graeco-Lat. in Novum Testamentum* (Leips. 1792; last ed. 1819, 2 vols.): — *Thesaurus, sive Lexicon in LXX* (Leips. 1821, 5 vols.), reprinted in Glasgow (2 vols.) and London (3 vols.). The lexicon on the New Test. has been superseded by later works, but that on the Sept. has yet found no substitute.

### Schlurick, Friedrich Julius Hermann

doctor of theology and member of the Evangelical Lutheran Consistory in Dresden, was born at Dresden in 1815. From 1838 to 1841 he was professor at the Kreuzschule of his native place; from 1841 to 1851 he labored in Meissen; and from 1851 he was superintendent in Pirna, where he died, June 3, 1875. See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 2, 1148; *Theolog. Jahrbuch*, 1876, p. 365. (B.P.)

### Schmalkald, League Of

the name given to the defensive alliance concluded provisionally for nine years at Schmalkalden, Feb. 27, 1531, between nine Protestant princes and eleven imperial cities, with whom five other princes and ten imperial cities subsequently made common cause; and the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were appointed chiefs of the league and empowered to manage its affairs. The object of this formidable alliance — which included the whole of Northern Germany, Denmark, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, and portions of Bavaria and Switzerland — was for the common defense of the religion and political freedom of the Protestants against the emperor Charles V and the Catholic states. The league was not rendered superfluous by the religious peace of Nuremberg in 1532; and on the rumor that the emperor was meditating new hostile measures against the Protestants, another meeting of the confederates was held Dec. 24, 1535, which resolved to raise a permanent army of 10,000 foot and 2000 cavalry, and to prolong the league for ten years. The confederation was further consolidated by articles of guarantee which were drawn up by Luther at Wittenberg in 1536, and, being subscribed by the theologians present at the meeting of the league at Schmalkalden in February, 1537, were called the *Articles of Schmalkald.* Against the league the emperor, engaged as he was

at the time in contests with the Turks and French, found himself unable to contend, though supported by the Holy League, a Catholic confederation formed (in 1538) in opposition to the Protestant one. But impolitic management, mutual jealousies, and conflicting petty interests dissipated their energies and prevented united action. The “War of Schmalkald” commenced by the advance of the army of the league, under Sebastian Schartlin, into Swabia, to bar the approach of the imperial army from Italy. Schartlin forced his way to the banks of the Danube. but the miserable jealousy of the Saxon princes paralyzed his action. The emperor, by a proclamation bearing date July 20, 1546, put the two chiefs of the league under the ban of the empire; Maurice, duke of Saxony, took possession of the electorate by virtue of an imperial decree; and the Protestant army was forced to retreat. The elector of Saxony reconquered his electorate in the autumn of 1546; but meantime the imperial army subdued the northern members of the League of Schmalkald, and advanced into Franconia to meet the combined armies of Saxony and Hesse. The latter were totally routed at Mühlberg (April 24, 1547), and both chiefs fell into the emperor’s hands. This defeat, which has been ascribed to treason, and was, perhaps, as much owing to this cause as to weakness, finished the war. The object of the league — the guarantee of the liberty of religion to the Protestants — was subsequently effected by Maurice, now elector of Saxony who, by a brilliant feat of diplomacy and generalship, compelled the emperor to grant the treaty of Passau (July 31, 1552), by which this freedom was secured.

### Schmaltz, Moritz Ferdinand

doctor of theology, born in 1785 at Stolpen, near Dresden, was first pastor in Wehlen. In 1816 he was called as evangelical minister and member of consistory to Vienna, where he remained till 1819, when he was called to the pastorate in Neustadt, Dresden, which position he occupied until 1833, when he was called to become the head pastor of St. Jacobi in Hamburg, where he died, Feb. 15, 1860. Schmaltz published a great many sermons, which make a library in themselves. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* 2, 1149 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 75; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 210, 212. (B.P.)

## Schmalzgruber, Franz

a Jesuit, was born in 1663 at Griesbach. He first lectured on logic and moral theology at Ingolstadt, then on canon law, and died in 1735. He wrote *Index Ecclesiasticus* (Ingolst. 1712): *Judicium Ecclesiasticum* (ibid. 1712): — *Clerus Sæcularis et Regularis* (ibid. 1714, 2 vols.): — *Sponsalia et Alatrimonium* (ibid. 1716): — *Crimen Faori Ecclesiastici* (ibid. 1718, 2 vols.): — *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum* (ibid. 1719, 6 vols.; Rome, 1833-45, 12 vols.): — *Consilia sen Responsa Juris* (Ingolst. 1722, 2 vols.). See *Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v.* (B.P.)

## Schmeidler, Johann C. Hermann

a Protestant divine, was born at Breslau, Aug. 28, 1807, where he also died Aug. 16, 1867, after having occupied some of the most important ecclesiastical positions in his native place. He wrote, *Der Untergang des Reiches Juda* (Breslau, 1831): — *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Haupt-Pfarrkirche St. Maria Magdalena zu Breslau vor der Reformation* (ibid. 1838): — *Urkundliche Geschichte der evang. Haupt-u. Pfarrkirche zu St. Bernhardin in Breslau*, etc. (ibid. 1853). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* 2, 1152; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 75. (B.P.)

## Schmid, Christian Friedrich

a professor of theology at Tübingen, was born at Bickelsberg, 1794. Educated at Maulbronn and Tübingen, he began to lecture at the latter place in 1819. In 1826 he became professor in ordinary, and labored as such till his death, in 1852. Not prolific as an author, he has yet exerted a very great and evangelical influence on the clergy of Würtemberg. A supernaturalist from the start, he worked fruitfully by the side of the more negative Baur, defending vigorously the fundamentals of Christianity, and utilizing the better results of modern Christian speculation. Men like Dorner and Oehler have given public expression to their indebtedness to Schmid. His labors embraced practical, exegetical, and moral theology. His lectures were models of systematic Christian thought. He was not, however, simply a scientific theologian, but his influence was also deeply and positively Christian. His *Biblische Theologie des neuen Test.* appeared in 1853 (4th ed. by Dr. A. Heller, Gotha, 1868); it has enjoyed a wide popularity. His *Christliche Moral*, by the same editor, was published in 1861. See *Erinnerung an C.F. Schmid*, by Palmer and others (Tübingen,

1852); *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856; Wuttke, *Christian Ethics.* 1, 374; Hauck, *Jahresbericht*, 1869; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 604-606. (J.P.L.)

### Schmid, Konrad

a coadjutor of Zwingli in the reformation of Switzerland, born in 1476; died (with Zwingli, on the battlefield of Cappel) October, 1531. After studying at Basle, he entered a monastery at Kussnacht, and in 1519 became its commander. This same year Zwingli came as preacher to Zurich, and with him Schmid entered at once into close intimacy. In 1522 he threw aside Latin and preached at Zurich a stirring sermon in "good German," in which he opposed the excessive claims of the pope and the abuses of image worship. In a religious conference at Zurich, October, 1523, he acted as *mediator* between the violent iconoclasts and the conservatives. "Let the weak have the images," said he, "as a sort of staff to lean upon until they have taken hold upon Christ; when they once have done this, they will let go the staff as being no longer needful." Also he blamed the coarse manner in which some spoke of the mass, as if it were a mere invention of the devil. At the close of his discourse on this occasion, he recommended to the civil authorities great moderation, and urged them to provide a thorough religious education of the masses. When Zwingli attended the conference with Luther at Marburg (Oct. 1529), Schmid filled his place as preacher in the cathedral of Zurich. He was an able and holy priest of God. See Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. (J.P.L.)

### Schmid, Sebastian, D.D.

a native of Alsatia, was born Jan. 6, 1617, at Lamperheim, and died Jan. 9, 1696, at Strasburg, where he was professor of theology and canonicus. He was a voluminous writer. His principal Biblical works were his translation of the Bible: *Biblia Sacra V. T. et N. ex Linguis Original. in Ling. Lat. translata* (Strasb. 1696, 1708; New Test. 1715): — and his commentaries: *On Genesis* (Strasb. 1697): — *Judges* (ibid. 1684, 1691, 1706): — *Ruth* (ibid. 1696): — *Kings* (ibid. 1687): — *Job* (ibid. 1670, and often): — *Cohemoth* (ibid. 1704): — *Isaiah* (Hamb. 1702): — *Jeremiah* (Strasb. 1685; Frankf. 1697, 1706): — *Minor Prophets* (Leips. 1685, 1687, 1698): — *Hosea* (Frankf. 1687): — *Romans, Galatians, and Colossians*, etc. (Hamb. 1704): — *Ephesians* (Strasb. 1684, 1699): — *Hebrews* (ibid. 1680; Leips. 1693, 1722): — *1 John* (Frankf. and Leips. 1687, 1707,

1726). Some of these were posthumous publications; they are all much valued for sound and learned exegesis.

### Schmidt Erasmus

a German scholar, was born in Delitzsch, April 27, 1560. He became professor of Greek and mathematics at Wittenberg, and died in that city Sept. 22, 1637. His chief work is *Concordantie Novi Test.* (Vitemb. 1638, fol.). It was republished in Glasgow (2 vols. 8vo) and in London (1830, 48mo). He also published a highly improved edition of Beza's version of the New Test.

### Schmidt, Johann Eusebius

a Lutheran minister, was born in 1669 at Hohenfeld, in Thuringia. A friend and pupil of A.H. Franke, he lived from 1697 as pastor in Siebleben, near Gotha, until his death, in 1745. Schmidt was a fine hymn writer, and some of his hymns belong to the best of German hymnology, as *Es ist vollbracht, so ruft am Kreuze* (transl. into Engl. by Mills in his *Horoe Germanicoe*, No. 161, "'Tis finished! thus in tortures dying"): — *Fahre fort, fahre fort* (Engl. transl. in *Monthly Rel. Mag.* 1866, 35, 363, "Onward go, onward go"). See Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 4, 402 sq.; 8, 141; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1343. (B.P.)

### Schmolck, Benjamin

a gifted German hymnologist, was born in Lieglitz, 1672. He studied theology at Leipsic from 1693 to 1697, became assistant pastor to his father at Liegnitz in 1701, but the next year accepted a call to Schweidnitz as dean. Here he spent the rest of his life as a laborious pastor, exerting himself manfully to counteract the intrigues of the Jesuits and to preserve his people in their evangelical faith. In 1708 he was made archdean, in 1712 senior, and in 1714 pastor primarius. After a pastorate of thirty-five years, he entered into rest, 1737. By his hymns and songs, which appeared in various editions from 1704 and on, he has obtained an honorable place among the poets of his Church and nation. Their general tone is that of gentleness and simplicity, and of ardent love to Christ. Many of them, however, betray marks of carelessness in rhetoric and of lack of polish. A complete edition of his poems appeared at Tübingen in 1740. A selection was published by L. Grote at Leipsic in 1860. For his life, see this work of Grote and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 608, 609. (J.P.L.)



## Schmucker, Peter

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Michelstadt, grand duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, Aug. 24, 1784. His parents removed to this country while he was yet an infant, and settled in Virginia. He was converted in his eighteenth year, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church in 1814. We cannot specify the congregation he served, but his name is found in 1817 in the printed list of the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina; and in 1820 he was one of the delegates who met at Hagerstown, Md., to form the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the United States. Still later we find him recorded as a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Western Pennsylvania. In 1832 he joined the Methodist Church, and in 1838 entered the Ohio Conference to take charge of the German Mission in Cincinnati. In 1840 he was appointed to Louisville, Ky., and in 1842 sent to New Orleans to begin work among the Germans there. He continued to labor in different parts of the United States until 1848, when ill health disabled him. From that time he suffered greatly, until relieved by death, Dec. 9, 1860. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1861, p. 165.

## Schnappinger, Bonifacius M.

a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Neuburg, in Bavaria, Oct. 5, 1762, was first lecturer of theology at Würzburg, then professor of exegesis at Heidelberg, and from 1807 professor of dogmatics at Freiburg. He died Dec. 6, 1832. He published the *New Test.* with annotations (Mannheim, 1807): — *Doctrina Dogmatum Eccles. Christ. Cath. ad usum Acad.* (Augsburg, 1818): — *Entwurf einer kathol.-christl. Religions-u. Dogmeneschichte zu akad. Vorlesungen* (Carlsruhe, 1807). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 175, 306, 593; 2, 761. (B.P.)

## Schneckenburger, Matthias

an eminent modern theologian, born Jan. 17, 1804; died June 13, 1848. He studied Latin at Tuttlingen, Wirtemberg. In 1819 he began the study of theology at Urach. In 1824 he entered upon more thorough studies at Tübingen. Here his teachers were Steudel, Schmidt, Baur, Haug, and others. Philosophical theology was his favorite study; and the book which delighted him most was Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre*. He reached his master's degree in his twentieth year, and held the highest place in a group of thirty-eight competitors. In 1826 he went to Berlin to continue his

studies under Schleiermacher, Neander, Marheinecke, and Hegel. With Neander and Marheinecke he formed very close relations, as also with other eminent literary men, e.g. Chamisso and Gans. In 1827 he returned to Würtemberg and began to lecture at Tübingen. Among his pupils were Strauss, Vischer, and Märklin. In 1831 he entered into the ministry as preacher at Herrenberg. Although a gifted speaker, he soon felt that not the pulpit, but the professor's chair was his place. In 1834 he accordingly entered the new theological faculty at Berne. By his side stood Hundeshagen, Lutz, and others. His field here was Church history, dogmatics, and exegesis; but it was especially in dogmatics that his greatest interest lay. Here his position was that healthy union of practice and theory which was so characteristic of Zwingli. When the Strauss commotion broke out in Germany (1839), Schneckenburger faced the whole series of questions which it called forth, and began a course of lectures on the influence of philosophy upon theology and on the collisions between modern speculation and Christianity. His position was that of a positive theist and an opponent of Hegel. Very fruitful among his labors in the following years were his studies in comparative dogmatics. His general tendency was unionistic. He did not confine himself to academic labors, but took also an active part in the Church affairs of the canton of Berne.

In character Schneckenburger was as simple and unassuming as a child. His great defect was a deficiency of self assertion. In his wedded life he was very unfortunate. His relation to his childless wife was very similar to that of Salmasius to his domineering "Juno." Seeking relief from his domestic unhappiness in a still greater devotion to study, his health soon broke down. He died at the early age of forty-four. It was characteristic of his wife that his valuable papers were for a number of years kept under lock and key. It was only after she had fled from justice to America that they came into the hands of his colleague, Hundeshagen. Among Schneckenburger's writings are the following: *Ueber Glauben, Tradition und Kirche* (Stuttg. 1827): — *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe* (Berlin, 1828): — *Annotatio ad Epistolam Jacobi* (Stuttg. 1832): — *Einleitung ins Neue Test.* (ibid. 1832): — *Ueber das Evangelium der Aegypter* (Berne, 1834): — *Ueber den Begriff der Bildung* (ibid. 1838): — *Stapeferi, Theologi Bernensis, Christologia* (ibid. 1842): — *De Falsi Neronis Fama* (ibid. 1846): — *Zur kirchlichen Christologie* (Pforzheim, 1848): *Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformirten Lehrbegriffs* (edited by Güder, Stuttg. 1855, 2 pts.). Also

numerous contributions to the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, the *Studien und Kritiken*, the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, and others. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*; *Gedächtnissrede* von Dr. Gelpke (Berne, 1848). (J.P.L.)

### Schneider, Benjamin, D.D.

a missionary of the American Board of the Congregational Church, was born in New Hanover, Pa., Jan. 18, 1807. He joined the Church in Norristown in 1826, and soon after entered Hamilton College, in N.Y. Having remained awhile here, he went to Amherst, where he graduated in 1830. From Amherst he went directly to Andover, and entered the seminary, where the question of becoming a foreign missionary soon took possession of his mind. In June, 1832, he says, "Blessed be God for the prospect I have of consecrating myself to the good work of missions." With this thought uppermost, he pursued his studies. After graduating in 1833, he was married to Miss Abbott. He was ordained in 1833, and Dec. 12 of the same year he sailed from Boston for Smyrna. From 1834 to 1849 he was stationed at Broosa, the ancient capital of the Turkish empire, about ninety miles south of Constantinople. Though a region rich and grand in natural scenery, it was hard to cultivate. The principle of toleration had not been established in the empire, and the missionary was subjected to endless annoyances and persecutions. His chief labors were with the Greek population, and they were far less susceptible to Gospel influences than the Armenian. In 1849 he was called to take up his abode at Aintab, where he had labored for a time previously, and where a wonderful work had begun among the Armenians. Here Dr. Schneider labored until 1868, a period of nineteen years, and his labors were crowned with abundant success. He instructed the candidates for the ministry, and many of the native preachers in Central Turkey received their theological training at his hands. Though he had many things to occupy his attention in laying the foundations, his chief delight was in telling the simple story of the cross to the listening multitudes. Gentle and winning in his manners as he was scholarly, he attracted thousands by his fluency and fervor. Dr. Schauffler, another veteran missionary, in speaking of him, said, "Always when I can, I go to hear Dr. Schneider." The pulpit was his throne, the place of his power. In 1868 it was thought advisable that he should return to Broosa and resume his labors there; and a few years later he seemed to be pointed out by Providence, on account of his scholarly attainments and fitness, as the person to be put in charge of the theological seminary at Marsovan. While laboring here, such was his incessant toil that his health gave way. He was

a man of eminent gifts and qualifications, an exact scholar, especially as a linguist. He mastered with ease all the foreign tongues he was called to use, and spoke with remarkable ease and fluency. His whole heart was in his work, because he loved it. Thus he lived and died. "His record is in heaven, and his testimony on high." He died in Boston Sept. 14, 1877. (W.P.S.)

### Schneider, Johann Jacob

was born Feb. 8, 1797, at Basle, where he also pursued his theological studies. In 1819 he was called to Grenzach, in Baden, and since that time he supplied the pulpit in different places until, in 1859, he was called to Betberg, where he intended to remain. Bodily infirmities came over him and ended his life March 24, 1859. Besides a number of hymns which he composed, he published *Die christlichen Sanger des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Basle, 1847). See *Zum Andenken an J.J. Schneider, Pfarrer zu Betberg* (Basle, 1859); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7, 367 sq.; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1344; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theolog.* 2, 1167. (B.P.)

### Schnepf, Erhard

an assistant in the Lutheran Reformation, born of a noble family at Heilbronn, November, 1498. He studied first at Erfurt, then at Heidelberg. As soon as Luther appeared, Schnepf welcomed his teachings. He preached first at Weinsberg, then (1523) at Wimpen, where he married. In 1525 he was called by Philip III of Nassau to introduce the reformation at Weilburg. Here his familiarity with Scripture enabled him to triumph in a disputation over Dr. Tervich of Treves. In 1528 Philip made him a professor in his new university of Marburg, whence he exerted a reformatory influence into Westphalia. He accompanied his patron to the diet of Spire in 1529, and to Augsburg in 1530. In 1534, at the request of duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg, he united with Blaurer in the reformation of this country. His seat of operation was Stuttgart, while that of Blaurer was Tubingen. In 1544 he accepted a professorship in Tubingen, and represented the more rigid views of Luther in a Zwinglian community. Schnepf refused to accept the *interim*, and in 1548 gave up his position and fled to Heilbronn. At the suggestion of Johann Friedrich of Weimar, he became professor of Hebrew at Jena in 1549, and soon had more than sixty students. Here he became, alongside of Amsdorf and Strigel, one of the most eminent theologians in that region. Up to 1555 he had lived in peace with the synergistic Melancthonians at

Wittenberg; but now he became involved in the rigid Lutheran party of Flacius, and he assumed a milder position only at the instance of the duke Johann Friedrich. In the midst of labors abundant, he died at Jena, November, 1558. See Jo. *Rosae, De Vita Schnepfii* (Leips. 1562); Heyd, Blaurer, and Schnepf, in the *Tüb. Zeitschrift*, 1838; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 12, 618-620; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 314. (J.P.L.)

### Schnurrer, Christian Friedrich

an eminent Orientalist, professor and preacher at Tübingen, was born at Cannstadt Oct. 28, 1742. He studied at Tübingen, Göttingen, Jena, and Leipsic. Among his teachers were Michaelis, Ernesti, Dathe, Semler, Teller, and Gellert. He visited England and France to extend his familiarity with Oriental MSS. On his return in 1770 he became professor at Tübingen, and began the exegesis of the Old Test. But when, in 1772, he was placed at the head of the theological training school, he was in the place for which his talents and learning best fitted him. Here he labored with great success for thirty-two years. In 1806 he was made a prelate and brought into close connection with the government. He died at Stuttgart Nov. 10, 1822. Among the many writings of Schnurrer are, *Bibliotheca Arabica* (1799-1806, 7 parts): — *Academic Addresses* (in Latin [Tüb. 1828]): — *Erläuterung* (historical [Tüb. 1798]). See Weber, *Schnurrer's Leben* (1823); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20, 714-718. (J.P.L.)

### Schock, Charles

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stuttgart, Germany, July 1, 1812, and emigrated to Philadelphia, Pa., 1829. Removing to Wilmington, Del., he there united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. He joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1838. He became supernumerary in 1855, and so remained until his death, which occurred in Philadelphia, March 24, 1872. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 18.

### Scholastic Philosophy

SEE SCHOLASTICISM.

### Scholastic Theology

a term used to designate that peculiar phase of theological development which lies between the patristic age and the age of the Reformation. The

apostolic age had founded Christianity as a regenerative principle in human society; the patristic age had crystallized the teachings of Christianity as ecclesiastically sanctioned dogmas. The scholastic age now developed and defended and harmonized the dogmas which already were authoritatively accepted and taught by the Church.

The patristic age died away at about the close of the 6th century. The age from the 6th to the 11th century is a period of transition from the patristic to the scholastic age. The scholastic age proper extends from the age of Anselm (died 1109) to the outbreak of the Reformation. In the scholastic age we may readily distinguish three phases — the period of inception and youth; the period of greatest strength and glory; and the period of decline and dissolution.

On the threshold of scholastic theology stands unquestionably the celebrated archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm. He was the first to recognize distinctly the central principle of scholastic theology and to reduce it to masterly application. This principle is the unquestioning acceptance of the traditionally and officially sanctioned body of orthodox doctrine, and the earnest defense of the same by all the resources of logic and reason. The scholastic theologians were therefore not *patres*, generators, of dogmas, but only *doctores*, teachers and defenders; and they were not *doctores* in general, but only *doctores ecclesioe*. They taught not merely in the Church, but for the Church and in defense of the Church. Their central task was to conciliate, or at least to cast a bridge over the gulf which lies between, faith and knowledge. The instrument which they chiefly used was formal logic-syllogistic argumentation. Anselm plainly sets before himself a twofold task to safeguard theology from the charge of inculcating an absolutely blind and irrational faith, and to reprove the presumption of a too haughty and self-confiding reason. The first error — the too servilely traditionalistic tendency — had characterized the period since the decline of the patristic age. The second error was represented by some of the early scholastic philosophers, such as Roscelin. But in his attempt to find a system midway between these extremes, Anselm does not himself escape unconsciously vibrating, at times, into one and then into the other. At one time he makes knowledge positively dependent upon faith; at another he goes so far as to assume that reason can of itself demonstrate the absolute necessity of each and every dogma of the whole faith of the Church. In this he unconsciously accepts the very essence of rationalism; and yet nothing is further from his main tendency than an excessive reliance upon mere reason. On the

contrary, he is so thoroughly in bondage to the merely formal dogmas of orthodoxy that he is unable to reach any independent appreciation of either the simple word of Scripture or the direct intuitions of the moral consciousness. As a general result his writings are characterized largely by an unsatisfactory logical formalism. Philosophically, Anselm is a Platonic realist.

The same antithesis between faith and knowledge which occupied Anselm's attention reappears after his time. But while with Anselm the traditional, philosophical, and ethical elements were held in comparative equipoise, with some of his successors the center of gravity was seriously lost. This is particularly the case with Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. Of the two, Bernard (died 1153) was by far the more churchly minded. He looked upon the speculations of Abelard as daring innovations; he was a man of faith rather than of science; he bowed with awe before the body of Christian dogmas as held by the historical Church; and yet he was not a mere unthinking traditionalist. But he endeavored to appropriate the traditional system with a vital and intelligent faith. His spirit, however, is of a mystical rather than of a philosophical cast. The intellect cannot take by storm the mysteries of salvation; it is only by means of ecstatic contemplation that distant glimpses of their meaning can be obtained. What the soul sees in its mystic soarings are true foresights of what will lie open before us in our state of eternal bliss. This position of Bernard led him into violent personal opposition to his great contemporary Abelard.

Abelard (died 1142) had devoted himself at first to dialectics, i.e. philosophy, and had adhered primarily to the nominalists and subsequently to the realists; and those opposite standpoints are frequently clearly recognizable in his writings. Indeed, it is probable that Abelard himself never came to a clear decision between the two systems. His general position, however, seems to have been that which held the *universalia in re*, and which is best designated by the term conceptualism. On devoting himself to theology, Abelard subjected the whole series of dogmas to a vigorous philosophical treatment, endeavoring to commend them to the understanding by a clear presentation of their harmony with reason. He seriously complains of a failure to do this on the part of his predecessors, and insists that the exacting of faith in doctrines before the reasonableness of the doctrines has been explained can only lead to credulity and superstition. Such a course also deprives the Christian subject of the means of convincing the doubter and of refuting the opponent. Moreover, it rests

upon an unwise rejecting of the benefits of worldly science growing out of an ungrounded fear of its misuse. But Abelard is not a thorough rationalist; he does not make intellectual processes the generator of faith. He holds simply that philosophical arguments may facilitate the acceptance of Christian doctrine, while the final producer of converting faith is the influence of the Holy Spirit. He further holds that no true and full knowledge can arise without the help of personal faith. Nevertheless, it is the plain duty of the believer to strive after a scientific comprehension of that which the Church presents as a system of formal doctrine. But Abelard differs from Anselm in this — that while Anselm assumes at once the absolute truth of the official system of orthodox doctrines, and tests all philosophy by the touchstone of formal dogmas, Abelard, on the contrary, regards the official doctrines as simply a human development of what exists in germ in the Holy Scriptures, while these Scriptures themselves, together with the primitive creeds, are the real source and norm of all Christian truth. In his work *Sic et Non*, Abelard presents a series of contradictory authorities on the several dogmas with this express purpose — to show that the Church fathers are to be read, not *cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate*. He even gave much offense by insisting that the Bible itself is not to be fully appreciated without a discriminating exercise of the understanding. His general tendency was to embrace the natural and the supernatural in a single view, and to establish a bond of unity between all systems of religious faith. His standpoint was that of a formal supernaturalism with a noticeable tendency to material rationalism. The polemical conflicts in which his life was involved prevented him from coming to any very clear self consistency of system. They also led him, in some cases, to aim rather at a momentary dialectical triumph than at a solid development of Christian truth.

The sharp antitheses of tendency between the mysticism of Bernard and the dialectics of Abelard led to mediatory efforts. Prominent here is the school of the St. Victors. Hugo St. Victor (died cir. 1140) held to the Anselmic position that Scripture and tradition are the objective, and faith the subjective, norm of theological science; but he deviates from Anselm in making a broad distinction between *alia ex ratione, alia secundum rationem, alia supra rationem, and alia contra rationem*, i.e. between *necessaria, probabilia, mirabilia, and incredibilia*. What falls under the first and the fourth head is not an object of faith, but only what falls under the second and third. Under the second head fall the so called doctrines of



natural religion. Here faith is helped by reason (*ratione adjuvatur*), as also reason is perfected by faith (*ratio fide perficitur*). Under the third head fall the specifically Christian doctrines of Scripture and tradition. Here *ratio* does not help faith, because the object is beyond its range, though it may offer grounds for revering the faith which grasps that which is above it. Thus Hugo St. Victor rejects the endeavor of Anselm to demonstrate the *rationabilis necessitas* of the orthodox dogmas, and concedes only our philosophical ability to strengthen the *probabilitas* of the dicta of natural religion. And this is essentially the role which reason plays in all subsequent mediaeval theology. The motive of Hugo in thus restricting the role of reason was (1) to put a check to the subtle and fruitless freaks of dialectics, and (2) to assure room for full play for his own mystical system. His real position was this: inasmuch as scholastic dialectics is unable to attain to absolute truth, therefore there *must* be a process of immediate intuition whereby the absolute truth is directly laid hold upon with the certainty of actual vision. He further held that there are progressive degrees in which this truth is grasped, depending upon the progress of our subjective sanctification through personal communion with God. In carrying out his system Hugo is guilty of unconsciously transgressing the bounds he had set up for reason, for he subjects the official form of doctrine to no little free criticism; and he endeavors to make clear to reason the grounds of the revealed system of truth. This is simply what was to be expected; for Hugo was to some considerable degree a genius of really productive power. His mystical system as a whole had, however, more indirect than direct influence on his age; it served as a powerful check to the mad freaks of uncurbed dialectics. He has greater significance as the first systematizer of the whole body of Christian doctrine. In his *Summa Sententiarum* he treats successively of all the dogmas of the Church, sustaining them by citations from Scripture and from the fathers, adducing, then, the various objections of opponents, and finally deciding each case according to Scripture and tradition. His work *De Sacramentis*, though of more speculative power than the *Summa*, has been much less read. And though his *Summa* was subsequently largely displaced by the *Summa* of Peter Lombard, yet the work of Hugo exerted a very important influence upon later scholastics, particularly upon Lombard himself and upon Thomas Aquinas, but very especially upon theologians of a mystical tendency, such as Bonaventura and Gerson.

The contemplative or mystical element of Hugo is carried much further by his pupil Richard St. Victor (died 1173). According to Richard there are six kinds of contemplation. “We know,

- 1, by the imagination (the sensible impressions made by creation);
- 2, by reason (perception of law and order in creation);
- 3, *in* reason according to imagination (symbolical knowledge of nature as a mirror of the spiritual);
- 4, *in* reason and according to reason (the internal referred *to* the internal without a sensible image);
- 5, *above* and not *against* reason (rational knowledge carried to a higher stage by revelation);
- 6, *above* and (apparently) *against* reason (as, e.g., the mystery of the Trinity).

In discussing the Trinity, Richard makes large use of the *trias* of *power*, *wisdom*, and *love*; but he lays greatest stress upon the latter, to which he ascribes the generation of the Son. There is nothing more perfect than love. But love (*amor*), in order to be charity (*caritas*), must have for its object not itself, but something else. Hence in order to charity there must be a plurality of persons. But love towards creatures is not sufficient, for God can fully love only that which is worthy of the *highest* love. Hence the divine love must have a divine object (the Son). But even this is not the highest love, for love is essentially *social*. The two who love each other must desire that a third party be as fully loved by each as each loves the other; hence the Father and Son agree in loving a third (the Spirit). And since this love to the third party, in order to be perfect, must have a perfect object, hence this third party is equal to the other two. Each is equally divine, and there is no superiority of the one to the other (see Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* 1, 420, 467). Richard agreed with Hugo in regarding theology as the central science, and as the mother of all other sciences.

But the drift of the age was averse to the deep and rich speculations of the St. Victorians; it tended rather to concentrate all intellectual acumen upon the logical defense of the formal orthodoxy of the official Church. Hence it led mainly to the production of collections of dogmatic authorities (*summoe sententiarum*). The first real collector of such “sentences,” *sententiarius*,

was Hugo St. Victor, though the germs and forerunners of them are found as far back as in Vincent of Lerinum (died cir. 450), Gennadius of Marseilles (died cir. 493), and in Isidore of Seville; but it is only with Hugo that the process becomes of a really scientific character. The one motive of these real *sententiarii* is to bring dialectics into close service to orthodoxy. Thus they are not mere slavish compilers of the dicta of the fathers, on the one hand, nor rash speculators, on the other; but they hold the midway between them.

Among the earliest successors of Hugo was Robert Pulleyn, in his *Sententiarum Libri Octo*. He was archdeacon of Rochester, teacher in Paris and Oxford, and finally cardinal (died 1150). His chief polemical endeavor was to counteract the too daring speculations of Abelard; but Robert was far surpassed by the great *magister sententiarum*, Peter Lombard (died 1164). Of his *Sententiarum Libri Quattuor*, Hase says, "It was not so much on account of the ingenuity and depth displayed in the work as because of the position of the author in the Church, and his success in harmonizing antagonisms, as also because of the remarkable perspicuity of his work, that it became the manual of the 12th century and the model of the 13th." The chief themes of his work are the *Trinity*, *creation*, the *incarnation*, and the *sacraments*. As a whole, it is a synopsis of the whole movement of scholastic theology. "With it," says Baur, "really commences the systematization of scholasticism, the endless commenting upon the sentences of the masters." It initiated the movement of tiresome questioning and answering; of laying down theses and antitheses, arguments and counter arguments; of dividing and splitting up the matter of doctrines *ad infinitum*. Lombard was very successful in keeping the mean way between the blind copyists of tradition (*scrutatores*) and the rash reasoners (*garruli ratiocinatores*). He uses reason in the modest role of removing the seeming contradictions in Scripture and tradition. These differences he states very frankly, somewhat in the manner of Abelard's *Sic et Nons* but with a much more intent endeavor to reconcile them. He purposely avoids all ambitious philosophizing, as this seemed to him to jeopardize the dignity and independence of theology. On the whole, therefore, the tendency of Lombard was towards the enslaving of speculation in the ruts of formal tradition. This influence was felt even by writers of much greater originality, and such as had entirely broken with the whole method of the *sententiarii*, as e.g. Thomas Aquinas.

Close upon the steps of Lombard followed the gifted Peter of Poitiers; and from him on there follow a whole series of commentators upon Lombard, prominent among whom are Alexander Hales, Duns Scotus, and Occam.

But the way opened by Lombard was not docilely followed in by all. Alanus of Ryssel (died 1202), in his *Ars Cath. Fidei*, presents the successive doctrines of the Church as a series of logical steps, endeavoring to develop the one directly from the other. "Heretics and skeptics," says he, "cannot be won over by citations of authorities, therefore we must urge upon them rational arguments." But he wisely adds: "Hae vero rationes si homines ad credendum inducant, non tamen ad fidem capessendam plene sufficiunt." In this his position is related to that of Anselm. Lombard was also opposed for his use of Aristotelian logic. Walter St. Victor accuses him of drawing his whole inspiration from this secular fountain (*uno spiritu Aristotelico afflatus*). So also Joachim of Floris. A still more prominent voice against the great current of scholastic theology was that of John of Salisbury. He accused it of fruitlessness, absurdity, and presumption. It sacrificed the essence for the form, the truth for logic; but his critical ability was not supplemented by an adequate productive power. Hence he was unable materially to check the general drift towards scholastic subtleties.

Scholastic theology reached its highest development in the 13th century. Many circumstances contributed to this, especially the more full access to the writings of Aristotle, which was occasioned by the fall of Constantinople (1204). These writings, falling into the hands of a number of well-trained men, served to give theology a much wider and richer scope than it had as yet taken. The whole series of fundamental questions was now elaborately examined afresh. Among the problems discussed were, the sources of our knowledge of theology; the nature and necessity of revelation in contrast with reason and philosophy; the relation of faith to knowledge; whether theology is a science proper; whether it is a theoretical or a practical science; what is its proper object (*materia de qua*) in its contrast with philosophy; wherein Christianity *per se* differs from other religions, etc. The form which theology now assumed was partly that of commentaries upon the sentences of Lombard, and partly that of more original production. It is distinguished, on the one hand, for the immense increase of matter treated of (ethical and dogmatical, metaphysical and physical), and, on the other, by the perfection of the scholastic method, according to which, on every successive point, the authorities and reasons are cited *pro et contra* and a *resolutio* or *conclusio* duly drawn. The whole

is followed by a refutation in detail of all contrary views. Yet upon the basis of this uniformity there is manifested a large range of individual peculiarity. This sprang in part from the individual genius of the theologians, but also largely from their personal rivalry; and particularly from the rivalry and hostility that existed between the great monastic orders of Dominicans and Franciscans. and between the schools of the realists and the nominalists. Another characteristic of this climax period of scholasticism consists in the fact that it for the first time brought the whole body of specifically Catholic doctrine to its complete formal expression.

First in time, of the scholastic theologians of this period, is Alexander Hales (died 1245). He won the title of *Doctor Irrefragabilis*. His *Summa Universoe Theologioe* shows great breadth of thought; it makes large use of Aristotle, is very methodical in form, and treats of all the fundamental questions; but it introduces a vast amount of irrelevant matter, and, in its attempt to meet every possible point, raises many trivial and even foolish questions. As a whole it lacks real speculative power. It also favors some of the extreme inferences of Roman doctrine, such as the *thesaurus gratioe* and the *immaculata conceptio passiva Virginis Marioe*, and it betrays an occasional Pelagianizing tendency.

Hales is, in many respects, surpassed by the noted Dominican Albertus Magnus (died 1280). He made a much larger use of Aristotle. His commentaries on Aristotle and on Lombard and his *Summa Theologioe* exhibit an astounding universality of knowledge. His familiarity with mathematics and with the whole body of the natural science of the age won for him the repute of a magician. It is with injustice that some have styled him the *Simia Aristotelis*. He does not simply ape Aristotle, he merely makes free use of his materials; but he also combines therewith not a few of the conceptions of Plato and of the Neo-Platonists. It is true, he does not control his physical facts by an adequate criticism, and he fails to give full development to his speculations. But speculative power he really has, and from the midst of the mass of his chaotic materials there frequently dart forth surprising anticipations of great laws which subsequent scientists have fully developed — a fact which Alexander Humboldt has cheerfully conceded. As to Albert's specifically theological standpoint, he holds that theology is a practical science (*scientia de his quoe ad salutem pertinent*), treating of God and of his works. It is a science, however, not in the interest of science, but in the interest of eternal bliss. It has for its subject matter the objective *fides catholica*, which faith rests originally upon a

*supermundana illuminatio*. This *illuminatio* he attributes not only to prophets and apostles, but also to the fathers. He recognizes the two forms of faith — faith as the objective matter to be believed, and faith as a subjective activity of the individual; and upon this latter he bases the capability of attaining to real Christian knowledge. He regards revelation and reason, theology and philosophy, as absolutely in harmony, notwithstanding any seeming conflicts, for they both rest upon experience — theology upon our experience of the supernatural, and philosophy upon our experience of the natural; and the supernatural and the natural, though essentially different, rest both upon the harmonious plan and will of the one God. The supernaturalism of Albertus Magnus stands in close connection with his Platonizing derivation of all creatures, by a descending emanation, from the absolute God. Supernatural grace is needed by the creature *per se*, and irrespective of sin. Without this grace man, even had he not sinned, could not have lifted himself up out of his finiteness into likeness to the infinite God.

But Albertus Magnus did not fully develop his supernaturalism in all its bearings; this was done by his distinguished scholar, the greatest and most influential of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas (died 1274). Thomas Aquinas was very successful in vindicating to theology the character of a true science. He set before man as his highest good, as the goal of his blessedness, the vision of God (*visio Dei*). But this supermundane goal lies beyond the scope of creatural ability, for the natural cannot reach up to the divine. The highest that reason can attain to is a mere mediate knowledge of God through and from his works; and this is the furthest limit to which any of the old philosophers reached. These general religious notions form a sort of *proeambula fidei*. They can be reached, thought Aquinas, by way of logical demonstration; e.g. that there is a God, that God is one, etc. But to the supernatural end of man, as presented in Christianity, we can attain only through supernatural revelation. The seal, the witness, of this revelation are the miracles which attend it. Theology is the science which is based on revelation and guided by the light of faith; whereas the other sciences are based on nature and guided by the light of reason. The fact that theology has for its object a something that is to be accepted on authority — viz. faith — does not hinder it from being a science. All other sciences do the same thing; they accept their subject matter as an objective reality without proof, and then develop themselves therefrom as from an axiom. The axioms of theology

are the dogmas of the Church. From these it evolves and proves additional truths and consequences. This gives Aquinas's view of the relation of reason to faith. Reason cannot prove the articles of faith, for the latter spring from revelation, which is above reason. But rational and theological truths cannot possibly be in conflict, for they both come from God — the one indirectly and the other directly. Yet they do not overlap each other; they stand in different spheres. The rational truths do not reach up to the theological (*deficiunt ab eis*); they are only a *proeambula* to them. Natural reason serves, therefore, as a preparation for faith; but Thomas Aquinas elsewhere in his system robs reason of even this conceded service, for he really attributes the so called truths of natural reason to former half-remembered revelations, and regards them as implicitly containing the whole series of Christian dogmas. Another service (so teaches Aquinas) which reason renders to faith is to elucidate the doctrines of faith by means of natural analogies. The possibility of this rests on the fact that all natural objects retain a certain faint resemblance to their Author. Still another use of reason lies in convincing our adversaries. The *singularis modus convincendi adversarios* is really *ex auctoritate Scripturoe divinitus confirmata miraculis*. If the adversary concedes a part of the Christian system, his remaining errors may be removed by developing the implications of the partial truths which he does accept. If he rejects the whole, there remains no other resource than an indirect procedure, viz. by evolving the absurdities which are implied in his errors.

The form which Aquinas thus impressed upon theology was of the greatest influence upon all subsequent theological thought. It retained its sway in German orthodoxy down to the time of Schleiermacher. In the rest of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, it largely prevails even to the present. Its essential feature is the sharp distinction made between that religious knowledge which is attainable by reason and that which we owe to revelation, as also the designating of revealed truth as *supra sed non contra rationem*. It is within the range of this narrow field that Aquinas usually confines his thoughts. At times, however, he breaks forth in what might have proved very fertile speculations but for the hampering effects of his self-imposed yoke. Occasionally, however, he makes a real sophist's use of this yoke, calling in abruptly the help of mere ecclesiastical authority to veil the absurd consequences to which some of the official definitions of doctrine seemed to lead. In philosophical respects Thomas Aquinas was equally attracted by the opposed systems of Aristotle and Plato. He seems

to have oscillated not a little between the central differences of these systems — the realistic ideas of Plato and the *universalia in re* of Aristotle. Under this influence he sometimes assigns too high a role to natural reason (e.g. to demonstrate the existence of God), and at others he almost robs it of any power whatever (e.g. when he attributes the truths of natural religion to forgotten revelations). In his ontology Aquinas leans somewhat to the emanation of his master, Albertus Magnus. He does not clearly distinguish between will and nature in God; and his system, as a whole, is deterministic in its implications. In form it is an ideal of artistic construction. It is, however, not merely its form, but also and chiefly the rich fullness of its matter, which secured to it its long ascendancy over the theological activity of the Church.

Contemporary with Aquinas was the gifted and eloquent Bonaventura (died 1274). He is peculiar for the completeness with which he combined the scholastical element with the mystical. His masters were Aristotle and the St. Victorians. Less speculatively original than Aquinas, he is distinguished by a moderation which preserves him from dogmatic extremes, and by a warm religious element which lends to his pages an enduring attraction. This latter element saves him from the trivial subtleties into which his contemporaries so generally fell, and induces him to give great prominence to the simple practical elements of scriptural piety. Well did he merit the encomium of Gerson: “Recedit a curiositate quantum potest, non immiscens positiones extraneas, vel doctrinas terminis philosophicis obumbratas more multorum, sed dum studet illuminationi intellectus, totum refert ad pietatem et ad religiositatem affectus.” Hence to Bonaventura theology, though speculative as to its object, is yet predominantly a merely practical science. As to his mysticism, it does not materially affect the form of his theology; rather is it simply an attending complement serving to supplement the inadequacy of the formally logical element. As a whole, his influence, though permanent, was not so immediately effective as that of Raymund Lull (died 1315). Lull’s *Ars Generalis* was a laudable endeavor to simplify and to render more practically effective the whole arsenal of scholastic resources. The enthusiasm with which he undertook to frame a system which would absolutely annihilate the scepticism of the Averrhoists, and demonstrate Christianity with the evidence of a simple syllogistic inference, is only to be compared with the kindred ambition of Wolf in the 18th century. But the results did not justify his hopes. And though he had a



long series of enthusiastic disciples, his logical rationalism failed to produce any long-lasting benefits.

But the figure which stands as a worthy rival of Thomas Aquinas, and whose subtleties brought scholastic theology not only to its meridian of glory, but also to that stage of excessive development which broke the way for its decline, is the Franciscan monk Duns Scotus (died 1308). Scotus was unquestionably an original, creative genius. He impressed upon the course of theological development a specifically new character. He was not merely a personal rival of Aquinas, but he was an independent master. He shared, with the other scholastics, the conviction of the absolute truth of the official orthodoxy of the Church. He differed from Aquinas in making a less impassable gulf between faith and knowledge. He reduced the claims of philosophy, and in the same measure enlarged the scope of theology. With him theology is the science of man in his relations to God, and of God in his relations to the universe. He comes to a clearer conception and a larger use of man as an image of God than is previously met with. From the fact that man is in the likeness of God follows the consequence that man is able to know God, and that the intuitions of essential truth lie in germ in the very nature of the soul. Upon the path of man's likeness to God, Duns Scotus was led to a more clear distinguishing of will from nature in God than had previously been done, as also to the assigning to God's freedom a very large role. The creation of the universe was not a matter of pantheistic necessity, but was the result of a special divine volition. God might even have made the world other than as it is, and he might have given to man a different moral law. He might also have adopted a different plan of salvation. Thus, while teaching the great truth of the divine freedom and combating the determinism of Aquinas, Scotus did not guard the divine freedom against irrational arbitrariness by representing it as finding its norm of action in the divine wisdom. This great defect in Scotus's system led directly to the defeat of the most earnest endeavor of his life — viz. to settle Christian science upon an absolutely solid foundation; for it sapped the rational ground of the universe, and thus planted in theology a germ of universal scepticism. The reason of this failure lay not in a lack of ability in Scotus, but in the fundamental mistake of the whole body of scholastic theologians, viz. in the uncritical assumption of the absolute correctness of the formal dogmas of the official Church. This assumption shut them off at once from any adequate appreciation of the two true sources of all theology and philosophy, viz. Scripture and experience.

It was by developing the consequences of the scholastic method to their dangerous extremes that Duns Scotus has the merit of having at the same time raised scholastic theology to its fullest glory and also given an impulse towards its dissolution. Earliest among those who became conscious of the radical defectiveness of the whole scholastic method was Roger Bacon (died 1294). Bacon declaimed, in an almost Protestant spirit, against the enslavement of theology to human authorities, and pointed towards the Scriptures and experience as the real fountains of truth. But his influence towards the decline of scholasticism had a less potent effect to that end than the further development of scholasticism itself.

Of this third stage in the scholastic movement we can mention but the most prominent features. First of note stands the acute and independent minded Durand of St. Pourcain (died 1333). Durand held an eclectic relation to the opposed systems of Aquinas and Scotus. He was a nominalist like Scotus, but his nominalism had a realistic background. With Aquinas, he held that man is by nature incapable of knowing the laws of God. The intuitions and generalizations of the human mind have only subjective validity. The true knowledge of God can be derived only from the Scriptures, as officially interpreted by Rome. Theology aims not at the knowledge of the nature of God, but only at such a practical knowledge of God as leads to salvation. Theology relates to the will, and is hence a purely practical science. Faith cannot be begotten by arguments, but is a simple virtue; and its meritoriousness is in proportion to its difficulty. Durand denies even that the light of the Spirit shows us the *evidence* of Gospel truth. This also would destroy the merit of faith. He agrees with Aquinas in exalting the transcendental position of God in regard to man, and with Scotus in giving arbitrary play to the divine will and grace. The outcome of his whole system was to discourage the activity of human reason, and to promote a spirit of unquestioning submissiveness to the official Church. It denied all worth to philosophy, and reduced theology to a mere method of practice.

This attitude of theology was now more fully developed by Occam (died 1347). A disciple of Scotus, he yet varies from him in many points. He boldly opposed some of the claims of the popes, and substituted nominalism for the prevalent scholastic realism. This was a necessary logical outcome. Scholastic realism had utterly failed to resolve the truths of philosophy and theology into any unitary substratum of general knowledge. Hence its sole resource in order to attain to unity of thought was to give up all effort at knowing things *per se*, and to reduce our

highest intuitions and ideas to mere creations of our own subjectivity, destitute of objective value. Our highest ideas are mere *fictiones*, *abstractiones*. This nominalism was so strong with Occam that it gave to his whole system a positively skeptical tendency. Thenceforth nominalism reigns almost without rival in the waning life of scholastic theology.

After the time of Occam the development of theology becomes fitful and sporadic. The influence of Scotus led to a constantly more pronounced Pelagianism. The influence of Aquinas occasioned various attempts at a revival of Augustinian determinism. In a few cases, e.g. Wycliffe and Huss, it became a herald of the Reformation. The last scholastic proper, Gabriel Biel (died 1495), made earnest but fruitless endeavors to prop up the tottering superstructure of the old system. Further attempts in the same direction — by Raimund of Sabunde, Nicolas de Cusa, Gerson, and others of a less scholastic character — were equally unsuccessful, and served only to show the need of a thorough reformation of the whole body of theology.

The latest phenomena in theological science immediately before the Reformation were these three: An effort to revive an earnest Christian mysticism (Gerson and others); a revival of an Aristotelianism of a skeptical tendency (Pomponatius); and a syncretistic and fanciful Neo-Platonism (Ficinus, Picus Mirandula). Of these three, the first was necessarily impotent in its main endeavor, as it still held fast to the old scholastic foundation, while the second and third served only, by their skeptical and pagan tendencies, to give a final thrust at the entire effete system.

The so called ante-Reformers — Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Savonarola, Wessel — still linger under the dominion of scholastic forms and traditions. It was only the radically revolutionary spirit of the Reformers themselves that gave to scholastic theology its definitive death blow. But even subsequently to this point there have appeared not a few (though unimportant) scholastics, *scholastici post scholasticismum*. Luther himself confesses his indebtedness to scholasticism: “Ego scholasticos non clausis oculis lego, non rejicio omnia eorum, sed non probo omnia.” So also Melancthon. And it is only the shallowness of rationalism or the bigotry of ignorance that can declaim (as is often done) against the worthlessness of scholastic theology as a whole. Philosophers like Leibnitz, Hegel, Ritter, Cousin, Remusat, and Haureau, and theologians like Engelhardt, Rettberg, Liebner, Hasse, Gass, Neander, and Baur, have spoken in a very different

tone; and have contributed, in some degree, to acquaint modern times with a part of the rich treasures of thought and speculation which it contains. The dry, superficial 18th century mocked at the scholastics from the simple reason of its ignorance and its incapacity to appreciate them. The revival of theological originality since the time of Schleiermacher and the contemporary new birth of art in the romantic schools of Germany and France have awakened a very different state of mind. Even Semler has frankly declared that many a modern theologian who has abused the scholastics would not have been able to serve them as a mere amanuensis.

Faint reproductions of the scholastic period of Catholic theology have appeared in Protestantism. The 17th century was for the Lutheran and Reformed churches a really scholastic age. The systematic theologians of that century stood in the same relation to the fathers of Protestantism as the mediaeval scholastics to the *patres* of Catholicism. So is it with each of the most insignificant sects of Protestantism. Whenever any Church begins to let the writings of any of its eminent ministers stand between it and a free and direct interpretation of the Scriptures in the light of intuition and experience, that moment it enters into its scholastic stage. See Neander, *Church Hist.* vol. 4; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*; and especially Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* (J.P.L.)

## Scholasticism

(SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY — PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOLMEN), a notable phase of speculation which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages whenever any activity of thought was displayed, and which gave a distinctive character to the reasonings, to the controversies, and to the whole intellectual habit of those centuries. Scholasticism especially denotes the peculiar mode of argumentation then practiced, and the spirit by which it was guided. The Scholastic Philosophy designates the whole body of diverse and often conflicting doctrine which was generated under the scholastic procedure. The Philosophy of the Schoolmen signifies the same thing, but directs attention particularly to the very remarkable succession of acute and profound inquirers who applied and developed the scholastic method. The schoolmen were the theologians, the metaphysicians, the dialecticians, the encyclopaedists, the thinkers, and the teachers of the mediaeval period. The scholastic philosophy represented the ample and often bewildering, but always systematic, results of their labors, especially after their method had attained its curious but consummate perfection.

Scholasticism was the peculiar process of investigation and demonstration pursued by the schoolmen, with various thoroughness but unvarying uniformity, for much more than half a millennium. The schoolmen have long fallen into disrepute; little more than their names are remembered by the majority even of educated persons. Their works are unread and lie mouldering and undisturbed on the dusty shelves of ancient libraries. Their system has been for nearly three centuries the constant butt of ignorant censure and stolid pretension. Yet a system which endured so long, which engrossed so many minds of wide culture and of marvelous penetration, which attracted so much of contemporaneous regard, which enlisted such intense and general enthusiasm, which filled the intellectual atmosphere for long generations, which almost "ruled the court, the camp, the grove," in the persons of Anselm and Occam and Abelard, cannot be dismissed with a sneer or safely repudiated with indifference. Hallam, following in the wake of Brucker, with whom he was probably unacquainted, has repeated the stale reproaches against the scholastics, though acknowledging that he had read neither the works of the schoolmen themselves nor the historians of their philosophy (*Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 2). But the second-hand censures of Hallam are rendered ridiculous by the measured commendations of Leibnitz, to which he inadequately refers, and by the candid admiration of Sir William Hamilton and other competent judges. Sir William, speaking of Reid's repetition of the current abuse, observes: "This is the vulgar opinion in regard to the scholastic philosophy. The few are, however, now aware that the human mind, though partially, was never more powerfully developed than during the Middle Ages" (Reid, *Works* [ed. Hamilton], p. 268, note; comp. Hamilton, *Discuss.* p. 54, note; 2d ed. St. Hilaire, *De la Logique d'Aristote*, pref. vol. 1, p. 5; Remusat, *Abelard*, 2, 282, 548). St. Hilaire justly designates "La scolastique-berceau de l'intelligence moderne." The world cannot afford to disown any of the laborious services by which knowledge and civilization have been advanced, no matter how strange they may now appear. Nor can it wisely forget those who have labored long and earnestly in its behalf. It may always be presumed that whatever occupied the ardent endeavors of many generations had some serious meaning, whether this meaning does or does not lie open to hasty apprehension; and that it solved some serious difficulties of the time and ministered to their removal from the onward path of humanity. It is certainly blindness and arrogance to reject, without careful examination, what we do not understand, because we do not understand it; and not to understand it, because unwilling to make an effort to understand it. There

is much which is unsuited to modern habitudes of thought, much which is strange and bewildering under modern associations, and which is futile, perverse, or erroneous in the writings of the schoolmen; much that may be judiciously abandoned as having served its turn and prepared and disciplined modern intelligence. But, as Richard Baxter and Leibnitz — very dissimilar minds — both recognized, there will still remain much that is valuable and deserving of sedulous appreciation. Indeed, to those who have sipped from the original fountains, who have pondered over the divisions of Aquinas or grappled with the distinctions of Duns Scotus, there will appear no extravagance in the question of a recent writer: “What doubts have since been mooted — what difficulties suggested in morals, religion, or politics during three centuries of unfettered religious inquiry which they, the schoolmen, have not anticipated and dissected with the calmness of scientific anatomists?” (Brewer, *Letters and Papers in the Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. 3, p. 413. Comp. Proudhon, *Creation de l'Ordre dans l'Humanite*, 3, 3, § 203).

**1. Origin of the Term Scholasticism.** — The word “scholastic” (σχολαστικός) does not occur in classic Greek in the sense so familiar from its customary application to the philosophers of the Middle Ages. Bayle (s.v. “Aristotle”) says that it was not used in Aristotle’s time to “signify a scholar, a student, or a schoolman.” It occurs four times in Aristotle himself, always with the meaning of idle or disengaged — once in distinct opposition to practical. No distinct instance of its mediaeval usage is discoverable in Stephens’ *Thesaurus*. The earliest approximation to it presents itself in Posidonius (Athen. *Deipnos*. 5, 48); but it still clings to its primary meaning of unemployed, leisurely. It must be remembered that “school” had originally the same import, and that its Latin name was *ludus* (play). Gradually “scholastic” came to mean “characteristic of the school,” particularly a school of rhetoric — the master of such a school, a teacher of rhetoric, an advocate in the courts of law. It is employed in this last sense in a rescript of the emperor Constantius II (*Cod. Theod.* 8, 10, 11). It is sometimes with reference to a forensic vocation, sometimes with reference to elegant culture (which the word afterwards denoted), sometimes with reference to rhetorical instruction, that the Eastern Greeks spoke of Eulogius *scholasticus*, Leontius *scholasticus*, Sozomen *scholasticus*, Evagrius *scholasticus*, etc. The term, however, gradually lapsed into new significations, so that in the amusing account which Anna Comnena in the 12th century gives of John Italus (*Alexiad*, 5, 8), it is put in contrast with

polite, rhetorical accomplishment, and signifies a dialectician. The word is translated “umbratilis,” by Possinus, in his version of Anna, in accordance with its classical sense; and this rendering is not changed in the revision of this version by Schopen in the Bonn edition. It is impossible, however, to ignore its indication of logical pursuits. It probably received this significance by importation from the contemporaneous usage in the schools of the West. The fortune of the word in the Latin language was similar to its experiences in the Greek; but there is greater facility in tracing the mutations of its meaning. It does not occur in Cicero. The younger Pliny gives *umbraticus* as its equivalent (9, Ep. 2). In Quintilian, in the *Dialogue on Orators*, and in Aulus Gellius, it denotes “appertaining to rhetorical schools.” In Petronius it designates the pupils of such a school. In the 4th century it was used for elegant, cultivated, refined (“scholasticus, ad Graecas munditias eruditus” [Capitolin. Maximin. Jr. c. 3]). In the 5th century it meant eloquent (“scholastici ac disertii” [Salvian, *De Gub. Dei*, praef.]). Several of the meanings were, no doubt, concurrent. The predominant meaning, under the empire of Rome in the West, was a person accomplished in the studies of a school of rhetoric, whether as disciple, teacher, or graduate. Rhetorical education, as the preparation of Cicero and the *Institutes* of Quintilian abundantly attest, had early become universal or encyclopaedical instruction. As rhetorical pursuits declined and as other studies waned, while logic gradually acquired a notable preponderance in the Church and in the ecclesiastical schools, as afterwards in the rising universities of Western Europe, scholasticism became identified with logic. Logic, however, embraced, or assumed to embrace, all subjects in its rigid grasp, as is shown by the commentaries of the greater schoolmen on all the works of Aristotle, and by their violent application of the logic of the schools to all departments of knowledge and action. But the universal range claimed by rhetoric in the Roman schools of rhetoric was never renounced by those who retained the name of scholastics while substituting logic for rhetoric. The process of the transmigration of meanings is easily discernible. School study is the pursuit of those who have leisure and therefore opportunity for learning. Rhetoric became the predominant and exclusive object of school instruction, but comprehended all knowledge. Logic supplanted rhetoric. Analysis and demonstration took the place of rhetorical elegance of expression, and aspired to the dominion of all knowledge. The new teachers and pupils retained the established name; and thus the scholastic of the Middle Ages emerged out of the idler of classical antiquity. The name is early applied to the masters of the cathedral schools.

2. *Nature of Scholasticism.* — The inquiry into the changing import of the name scholastic is equally necessary for the due apprehension of the ordinary employment of the term and for understanding its appropriation by the scholastic philosophers. There is a large class of words which denote shifting conditions, social fluctuations, expanding or altering forms, that can be duly appreciated only by attention to their historical modifications. Civilization is a word of this kind, scholasticism is another. The definitions of scholasticism given in the dictionaries are for the most part tautological — *idem per idem* — and habitually partial. They convey little information to those not already acquainted with the subject; they generally proceed by cross reference. The inquirer is baffled by a game of verbal battledore and shuttlecock between the reciprocally implicated terms scholasticism, scholastic philosophy, and schoolmen. The distinctions of the historians of philosophy are of course more satisfactory, but they are seldom adequate. Brucker enters into the history of the term; but Ueberweg is almost dumb on this point. He says (*Hist. Phil.* 1, 355), “Scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine, with an accommodation, in cases of discrepancy between them, of the former to the latter.” Then Abelard, who did not touch theology till an advanced period of his career, was not a scholastic during his brilliant course at Paris. Others, who never touched theology at all, were never scholastics. Occam, and those who rejected ecclesiastical authority in whole or in part, were not scholastics. Then Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus ceased to be scholastics when composing their vast commentaries on Aristotle; but became so, suddenly, when commenting on Peter Lombard and submitting their speculations to the discipline of the Church. Then Roger Bacon would not be a schoolman. Evidently there is no such compendious definition of scholasticism as Ueberweg and many of his fellow historians suppose. The application of the Aristotelian logic to the exposition of Christian doctrine, and the subordination of the logical deductions to the orthodox dogmas of the Church, characterized the most brilliant period of scholasticism, and constituted scholastic theology. *SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.* But these characteristics did not belong to the whole period, nor to all the schoolmen, nor to all the labors of theological scholastics in any period. John Scotus Erigena with his Platonism, and Pico di Mirandola with his Cabalism were schoolmen as much as Bonaventura or Bradwardine. So also were essentially the Jew Maimonides and the Saracen Avicenna. It is necessary to regard the wavering import of the term scholasticism, to note



its various use, and to trace the progress of the scholastic procedure, in order to obtain a full knowledge of its meaning, and to detect the grounds of its diverse, and particularly of its most familiar, application.

Scholasticism, so contemplated, will be found to have meant, under the emperors of Rome, the functions of a teacher of rhetoric, embracing all knowledge in his course, then the possession of such knowledge with the refinement which it was supposed to bestow. As universal learning shrank up, even in the times of Cassiodorus, to the Trivium and Quadrivium, scholasticism suffered eclipse, but still claimed dominion over all the learning of the time. When rhetoric was supplanted by logic, scholasticism became the application of deductive reasoning to all departments of inquiry; and, at a later time, in accordance with the temper, associations, and necessities of what is regarded as distinctively the scholastic period, preeminently, though never exclusively, to theology.

Scholasticism will thus be the employment of logic, not the Peripatetic philosophy as such, in all departments of learning, whether suited to them or not — the substitution of dialectics for investigation, of authority for facts. Lord Bacon did much, but very much less than his followers, to confirm the delusion that Aristotle handled everything in subservience to the logical science which he had created. Such an error can never be entertained by any one who has read his *Natural History*, his *Parts of Animals*, his *Politics*, or even his *Rhetoric* or his *Ethics*. This exclusive application of logic to all subjects and on all occasions was alike the defect and the characteristic of the schoolmen, practiced, even when condemned and opposed, by Roger Bacon.

**3. Origin of the Scholastic Mode of Philosophizing.** — The notices of the origin of the name and of the nature of scholasticism furnish indications of the genetic development of that notable method of speculation. They do not supply the historical explanation of its growth, nor reveal its relation to the changing circumstances in the social and intellectual condition of the darkening ages which determined its appearance and progressive ascendancy. Several writers, among whom may be named Brucker, St. Hilaire, Remusat, have recognized in John of Damascus the progenitor of the scholastic system. He flourished in the earlier half of the 8th century. Long before him, germs of scholasticism and scholastic tendencies may be detected in both Christian and pagan writers. There are many evidences in Aulus Gellius that eristic dialectics constituted an habitual occupation of

scholars before the middle of the 2d century (see especially *Noct. Att.* 1, 2). There is a manifest disposition in Tertullian and other fathers of the early Church to treat religious topics in a manner analogous to that pursued a thousand years later by the most illustrious among the schoolmen. Scholasticism was a natural growth, not an arbitrary invention. It may be deemed to have been inevitable that this mode of intellectual procedure should be pursued when a revealed religion, appealing exclusively to faith in the revelation, and whose fundamental tenets “came not by observation,” was disseminated amid a highly cultivated but skeptical society, in antagonism to previously existing systems of religious belief, and to all the conclusions of its past thought and experience. Authority, divine authority, was the basis of the new truth, and furnished the premises for controversy and for apologetics alike. The inspired Scriptures were the expression of this divine authority, and were neither to be established by observation nor tested by experiment. In exegetics as well as in polemics there was thus a necessity of proceeding from the maxims of faith to the consequences of such maxims, which could be reached only by deduction. The need of accommodating the arguments adduced to the hostile temperaments and adverse habitudes of a pagan age would naturally soften and obscure the sharp precision and harsh angularities of dialectical demonstration. But the scholastic method, and even the scholastic subtleties and quodlibets, very soon appeared, and may be discerned in early patristic literature. When Christianity became prevalent and was established as the religion of the State, especially as there was a coincident decay of general culture and secular letters, the logical spirit, with its texts, its abstractions, its distinctions, its divisions, and its refinements, became predominant. This tendency is very pronounced in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, in his other writings, and in the productions of his contemporaries and immediate successors. It is not without reason that Augustine has been signalized as one of the chief promoters of the scholastic method. As letters continued to shrivel up, and as cultivation of intellectual graces and refinements became impossible or mistimed in the midst of social anarchy, barbarian incursion, and general wretchedness, the deductive method of argumentation and exposition would unavoidably prevail. The extension of the practice and the exclusiveness of such pursuits would also be greatly favored by the restriction of study to the ecclesiastical circle, and by the mighty task imposed upon the whole medieval period of converting the pagan barbarians who had occupied the Western empire, and of civilizing them through the instrumentality of the Christian faith to which they were to be

converted. Of course, as logic was the chief method of theological persuasion, the influence of Aristotle and of the Aristotelian spirit grew with the progress of time and with the progress of theological disputation, for there neither is nor ever can be any logic but that of Aristotle. There does not seem to be any sufficient evidence of the total oblivion of Aristotle and of Aristotle's dialectics at any period of the Middle Ages. The testimony of Ingulph may be spurious, but there are other indications of a meager acquaintance with Aristotelian logic through secondary channels; and it is admitted that the version of Porphyry's *Introduction*, by Boethius, was known at all times. After the conversion of the pagans in the new kingdoms, and the definite establishment of the ecclesiastical ascendancy of the Roman Church throughout the Western empire, a fresh demand and a constant provocation for the intervention of scholastic procedure arose in the ever multiplying and often pernicious heresies which occupied provincial councils, and engaged the most zealous and astute minds in their promulgation, their refutation, and their defense. A very cursory perusal of the impugned opinions, whose statement opens the several articles in the *Summa* of Aquinas, or of any similar *summa*, will show what a countless number and endless variety of dogmas required to be examined and settled for the establishment of the religious and ethical doctrine of the times. It was an inestimable service which was rendered in the long and agonizing period of the Middle Ages, in a society without other intellectual discipline or moral control, by the proposition, the ventilation, the discussion, the establishment, or the reprobation of the multitudinous perplexed problems in theology — often affecting government, society, and private conduct. It is not a question here whether the reasoning adopted, the arguments adduced, the conclusions drawn, or the decisions affirmed were correct or pernicious. The process was necessary, the task indispensable, for the effective development of European intelligence. The system does not accord with modern requirements, nor approve itself to modern modes of thought; but it inaugurated those requirements and bred those modes. Feudalism had to be swept away to make room for the growth of society and its larger expansion; but feudalism was a blessing at a time when the imperative demand of society was for confirmed authority and graduated subordination. Any "good custom will corrupt the world;" and no human custom is absolutely good or free from the taint of wrong and prospective mischief. The errors and the defects of scholasticism are nowadays manifest to all, and are habitually exaggerated. The good, "that was buried with it," is not equally apparent or as willingly sought. It requires some knowledge

of the schoolmen, of their works, and of their times — a transference of thought from our circumstances and points of view to theirs, and dispassionate reflection — to estimate their difficulties, their aims, and their achievements. One inestimable result of their labors — it is only one — was the definite establishment of the terms of reasoning, metaphysics, and theology, and, as a consequence of their procedure, the enforcement of logical coherence of thought and of precision of language. These things were indispensable preliminaries for the development of modern tongues, modern knowledge, modern enterprise, modern society, and modern government.

That this explanation of the rise and progress of scholasticism is correct is in some measure confirmed by the exhibition of the same tendencies, under analogous circumstances, in the contemporaneous speculation of the Jews and Arabs; for it is a mistake to regard scholasticism as either an ethnical or a theological idiosyncrasy.

In the manner stated, and by steps which can be only obscurely traced, scholasticism gradually assumed that form in which it is usually contemplated by the historians of philosophy; and acquired the fullness, abundance, energy, precision, and predominance which characterized the scholastic philosophy in its most vigorous manifestation.

**4. *Systematic Development of Scholasticism.*** — John Scotus Erigena, towards the close of the 9th century, is generally regarded as the first of those distinctively entitled schoolmen, though, as has been shown above, he should not be considered the earliest scholastic. The historians of philosophy have variously distributed the course of scholastic philosophy into periods. Ueberweg, who may be taken to represent the latest prevalent view, divides the scholastic age into two parts only: 1. From Scotus Erigena to Amalric, or from the 9th to the 13th century; 2. From the 13th century to the Renaissance. He thus omits both the preliminary tendencies and the expiring efforts, important as the origin and the decadence of the system must be. Sir William Hamilton (Reid, *Works*, Appendix, note B, p. 815) notes John Major, of St. Andrew's (1469-1547), as "the last of the regular schoolmen;" but the spirit survived far into the next century. Brucker does not neglect the early manifestations of scholasticism, but observes that it was conceived during the centuries extending from the 5th to the 8th; that the 9th and 10th were the time of its gestation and formation; that it was born in the 11th; that it passed its boyhood and youth

in the 12th; and that it attained full manhood in the 13th. He commences the treatment of what he holds to be the scholastic philosophy proper with the beginning of the 12th century, and divides the history into three periods: 1. From Lanfranc, or Abelard and his disciple Peter Lombard, to the middle of the 13th century, and to Albertus Magnus; 2. From 1220 to Durand of St. Pourcain; 3. From 1330 to Gabriel Biel and the close of the 15th century.

That a great change took place in the scholastic philosophy at the opening of the second period, through the rivalry and energy of the recently instituted orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, is proved by the character and career of the great schoolmen, and by Roger Bacon's curious vituperation of the "youngsters" who were teaching at Paris. These youngsters — "pueri duorum ordinum studentium" (*Compend. Studii*, 5) were Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and their colleagues. The third period is rendered memorable by the names of Duns Scotus and William of Occam, and was marked by an excess of ingenuity, an extravagance of distinctions, and a perverse subtlety which degenerated into vain and puerile captiousness in their successors. It is from the diseased state of scholasticism in its moribund age that the general estimate of the system has been formed. But there is little justice in applying to the whole philosophy the reproaches merited by it in the years of its impotent decline.

For an acquaintance with the character and consequences of the application of scholasticism to theology, for the peculiarities of the sects of the scholastics and of the leading schoolmen, for their rivalries and their antagonisms, reference should be made to the names of the schoolmen in this *Cyclopaedia*; to *SEE NOMINALISM*, *SEE REALISM*, and *SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*.

**5. Literature.** — The literature of scholasticism is so extensive that it would be equally impracticable and vain to undertake to give here any adequate enumeration of the principal works that have illustrated it. Among the chief sources of information are obviously the *opera omnia* of all the more notable schoolmen and their predecessors, from Joannes Damascenus to Gerson and Petrus Alliacus, or even down to Philip Melancthon. Next in order would come all the chief historians of philosophy. Among works of more special and immediate interest on the subject may be named — Cousin, *Fragmens Philosophiques; Phil. Scolastique* (Paris, 1840); Rousselot, *Etudes sur la Phil. dans le Moyen*

*Age* (ibid. 1840-42); Jourdain, *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote* (ibid. 1843); Caraman, *Hist. des Rev. de la Phil. en France* (ibid. 1845-48); Kaulich, *Gesch. der scholast. Philosophie* (Prague, 1853); Haureau, *La Philosophie Scolastique* (Paris, 1858); Hampden, *The Scholastic Philosophy*, etc. (Oxford, 1862); Erdmann, *Der Entwicklungsgang der Scholastik*, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie* (Halle, 1865), vol. 8; Michaud, *Guillaume de Champeaux et les Ecoles de Paris* (Paris, 1867); De Cupely, *Esprit de la Philosophie Scolastique* (ibid. 1868). (G.F.H.)

## Scholastics

*SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.*

## Scholefield, Arnold

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Nova Scotia; united himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church while quite a youth; was admitted on trial in May, 1810, from which time he traveled and labored in the work of the ministry with great acceptance and usefulness until his health failed in 1828. In 1832 he was again reported effective, and appointed to travel on Troy district, but had not traveled long before he was again rendered ineffective by paralysis, and died in 1837. He was an able and laborious minister of the Gospel, and very ardent in his religious feelings. His sermons were characterized by a peculiar richness and pleasing variety, and were usually delivered with much pathos. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 2, 495; Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 3, 252.

## Scholia

short notes of a grammatical or exegetical nature. Many scholia are found on the margin of manuscripts, or interlined, or placed at the end of a book. They have also been extracted and brought together, forming what is called *Catena Patrum*. *SEE COMMENTARY.*

## Scholiasts

writers of such brief notes on passages of Scripture. Many of the ancient Christian fathers wrote scholia (q.v.), which have come down to us, and show the views entertained of various portions of the sacred volume. Their value, of course, depends on the learning and critical acumen of the

authors. Theodoret, Theophylact, and OEcumenius are among the best of them.

### Schönemann, Karl Traugott Gottlieb

from 1799 doctor of law and professor of philosophy at Göttingen, was born in 1766 at Eisleben, and died May 2, 1802. He is known as the editor of *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum et quoe ad eos Scriptoe sunt, a S. Clemente I usque ad Innocent. III*, etc. (Göttingen, 1796). He also published *Bibliotheca Hist.-liter. Patrum Latinorum a Tertulliano principe usque ad Gregorium Magnum et Isidor. Hispal.* (Lips. 1792-94, 2 vols.). See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, 1, 694, 854; 2, 763. (B.P.)

### Schöner, Johann Gottfried

a Lutheran minister, was born April 15, 1749, at Rügheim, near Schweinfurt, where his father was the pastor of the place. He studied at Leipsic and Erlangen, and was deacon of St. Lawrence's at Nuremberg. In 1799 he was taken sick, and died June 18, 1818. He was an excellent, pious man and pastor; and besides other hymns, he wrote the beautiful German hymn *Himmelan, nur himmelan*, which has been translated by Mills, in his *Horoe Germanicoe*, No. 130, "Heavenward, still heavenward." See *Sonntagsbibliothek* (Bielefeld), 6, 4; Koch, *Geschichte d. deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 6, 399 sq.; 8, 570; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1344. (B.P.)

### Schöngauer, Martin

called *Martin Schön*, a German painter and engraver, was born about 1420, and died at Colmar Feb. 2, 1488. The paintings attributed to this artist are very numerous, but there are only a few which can be proved to be his work; among them is a panel in the church of St. Martin at Colmar. As an engraver his reputation was very high. His style is much more elevated than that of the other early German artists, and many of his heads are full of refined sentiment. His *Carrying the Cross* is a masterpiece; and the *Temptation of St. Anthony* is held in high esteem.

### Schönherr, Johann Heinrich

a very remarkable and influential German theosophist, was born at Memel November 30, 1770. At the age of fifteen he was sent to Königsberg to engage in trade. After a year of trial he concluded that he had not found his

calling. By great self denial he succeeded in entering and passing through a gymnasium course, so that at the age of twenty-two he was ready for the university. Even in his gymnasial course he became interested in those deep problems to which his subsequent life was given. But as yet it was a period of inner commotion. His early reverence for the Bible and orthodoxy was shaken by contact with the Kantian philosophy. At first intent on studying theology, he now wavered and began with jurisprudence. Soon he broke off from Kantian principles and endeavored, in his own way, to solve the problem of destiny and immortality. After a year at Königsberg he made an extensive journey, stopping a while at Greifswald and Rostock, and finally studying a whole year at the University of Rinteln. Here at Rinteln his system of theosophy began to take shape. It was rooted in a reaction against Kant's abstract idealism, and was a fervent grasping after realism. He imagined that in the simple words of revelation he had found a complete philosophy of being. "I even saw into the mystery of the Trinity," says he; "and I discovered that the world is a structure that leads to perfection." Leaving Rinteln in 1793, he passed through Göttingen, Erfurt, and Jena, and finally stopped at Leipsic to continue the study of philosophy. Here he led a quiet, studious life until February, 1794, and showed no signs of eccentricity. But of a sudden one morning he came into the room of a friend and inquired the way to the highest mountain of Thuringia, affirming that he must repair thither at once. His manner awakened a belief of his insanity, and he was at once taken to an asylum. Here he at first refused all food. After a month he was released. He returned to Königsberg in the full conviction that he had discovered a new system of religious truth, and with the full determination to devote his life to its propagation. To university studies he gave no further attention, but, gaining his daily bread by private instruction, he explained his thoughts in private, and gradually gathered to himself a little circle of admirers. His earnest assaults upon the prevalent rationalism, and his absolute enthusiasm for the literal written word of God, made a happy impression upon many a youthful heart. Two regular weekly meetings were held, Wednesday and Sunday evenings, at which were had animated discussions on the profoundest problems of philosophy and religion. They extended far into the night, sometimes until daybreak. Ladies also attended. Usually they closed with a hymn and a simple meal. These meetings were held not so much simply to impart a fully developed system as in order to develop and mature on all sides a number of fundamental principles which were regarded as already settled and certain. Hence Schönherr was also himself a



seeker of light as well as a giver. As to his outward manner, he was as unpretentious as a child, showing no trace of a desire to rule or to be held in extraordinary esteem. He was simply a thoroughly convinced believer. He believed that he had found the key to a fuller understanding of revelation and a deeper insight into nature, and he felt that a great regeneration of Christendom would go out from his teachings. But he had not the least intention of forming a sect; on the contrary, he was very constant in his attendance upon the regular Church services, and he joined in them with fervent devotion. Although the private meetings at Schönherr's house were never very large, still their very regularity and the striking appearance of Schönherr himself attracted the attention of the police to them. Measures were about to be taken for their suppression, when a casual meeting of Schönherr with the minister of public worship made such a favorable impression as to cause the matter to be dropped. Thenceforth he was left to labor unmolested until his death.

Among the young friends of Schönherr none contributed more than J. W. Ebel (q.v.) to bring his teachings into public notice. Ebel had studied at Königsberg and received the degree of Ph.D. at Leipsic. In 1810 he obtained a place as preacher in Königsberg, where his intimacy with Schönherr was renewed. His preaching soon invited general attention. His manner was attractive, his language imaginative, and his chief themes (conversion and personal holiness) almost novel. Twice the clerical authorities were impelled to call him to give account of his doctrines and of his relations to Schönherr. But no good reason could yet be seen for interfering with him. These failures to find aught against him, especially the last one, in 1814, contributed to give even greater prominence to his ministry and his theosophic views. In 1816 he attained to the most prominent place in the Church of the city. This prominence soon opened the way for the conversion of not a few eminent persons. Even professors of the university and noble dukes and ladies were brought into close intimacy with Schönherr. In the year 1819, however, a violent disagreement arose between Ebel and his master. Ebel had ripened into spiritual independence, and could no longer concede the infallibility to Schönherr which the whole circle had hitherto passively admitted. Besides, he could not admit the scripturalness of some of the later developments of his master's system. And when Schönherr actually proposed physical castigation as a means of hastening on the kingdom of God, and endeavored to sanction it by Scripture texts, Ebel took direct issue with

him, and ventured to intimate to him that, while starting well, he had stopped short and was yet entangled in the flesh. Thenceforth there were two parties, the larger one following Ebel. Schönherr continued with his diminished circle just as before. In 1823 he made a journey to St. Petersburg, and the next year another to Berlin; but he made no permanent impression. In 1825 he fell upon the insane notion of constructing a ship which was to move without sail against wind and stream, and to serve as a place of refuge for his followers amid the terrible judgments that were soon to fall upon the world. He actually constructed it. On being launched, it went to pieces amid the derision of the witnessing multitude. This came near entirely breaking up his little band of followers; yet it did not in the least shake his faith in the truth of his system or in his divine call. But his career was now about run. Broken down in health by his self mortifications and labors, he retired to Spittelhof, in the environs of Königsberg, and there died of consumption, Oct. 15, 1826, attended only by a single maid servant, who was faithful to him to the last.

What are the outlines of Schönherr's system? He never fully reduced them to writing. Only two small tractates are all he ever published: *Der Sieg der göttlichen Offenbarung*, and *Vom Sieg der göttlichen Offenbarung* (both Königsberg, 1804). But these essays contain only the embryo of his system. In addition there were found among his posthumous papers some brief notes, mostly aphoristic in form. De la Chevalerie, a disciple, also published abstracts of some of his lectures (Königsberg, 1835). All these data were used in preparing the book *Grundzüge* (Leipsic, 1852). From these sources, and from the works of Ebel and Diestel, Schönherr's most prominent disciples, the following not very clear outlines of a system may be gathered. The actual universe consists of a dualism; but the dualism can and should rise to unity. At the basis of the universe there are two primitive principles or beings. They are equally primitive and are personal and free. These beings exist in space, have a globular form, and are of the colors white and black. There is but one difference between them: the one is strong, the other weak. This difference, rightly taken, is a difference of activity and passivity. The cooperation of the two generates the world of reality. As the system grew towards self consistency, the two principles assumed the forms of spirit and nature. But in Schönherr's thought they were rather of the nature of water (the weaker) and fire (the stronger). Fire and water lie at the basis of all reality. From their union and interaction arise the universe and God. The fire poured its light upon the water, and

thus became self conscious. By the mutual action of the two a mutual effect was wrought — namely, the Word. The outer form of the Word is Day. The two first principles are the Mosaic *Elohim*. The stronger one is Jehovah; the weaker one is *matter*. From the absolute submissiveness of the latter to the former results the absolute harmony and order of the universe. To preserve and virtualize this harmony is the object of creation and providence. Creation is but another word for the plastic operation of the stronger upon the feebler principle. The Trinity is thus explained: the primitive essence of God is fire or light; this is the Spirit. The immanent power of God is the Father. The product of the essence and the power is consciousness, or the Word — that is, the Son of God. The contact of the Spirit with matter produced not only the Son of God, but also the whole series of spiritual beings. The kingdom of evil was produced by one of these highest beings turning away from light and allying himself with matter. The origin of sin in man is explained in the most realistic manner. Man, tempted by Lucifer, took into his blood the destructive substance of the tree of good and evil. Through the blood the evil is propagated as depravity in all after generations. The theory of redemption is also very realistically conceived. By the fall man disturbed the harmony of the two principles of being. By redemption this harmony is reestablished. But how? By a realistic implantation into nature of a healthful, harmonious leaven. Yet how? Thus: man's life lies in his blood. By the corruption of man's blood the whole life of nature is poisoned and depraved. Inside of humanity there is, therefore, no healthful starting point. The healthful leaven must then be furnished from on high. It is furnished in the ideal human person of Jesus Christ, in whom the absolute mastery of the active over the passive principle is realized. The healthful, undepraved blood of Jesus is the redeeming principle. When he permitted the spirit of disorder to shed his precious blood on the cross, this blood flowed out and over into the realm of nature, or passivity and sin; and there it became the potent leaven which will ultimately transfigure, and glorify, and introduce order into the whole field of darkness. As the spilling of the actual blood of Jesus upon the lap of nature is the means of regenerating the cosmos, so the right partaking of the blood of Christ in the eucharist is the means of regenerating the depravity of human nature. As with redemption, so with the resurrection, the ascension, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. All are explained in a realistic and physical manner.

As to the proximate coming of the kingdom of God on earth, Schönherr had peculiar and very detailed views. How soon the state of perfection should break in depended largely on the use of human freedom. To freedom a very high role is attributed. By freedom man, in some sense, takes the place of God. By freedom he interferes with omnipotence and omniscience. How he will help to shape the future history of the universe is not absolutely foreknown even by God. It lies within the discretion of man, by fidelity to his own possibilities, to inaugurate a new phase in the history of humanity. But there are two absolutely differing classes of men. There are central natures and subservient natures. The latter revolve about the former as planets about the sun. Let a central nature only be faithful, and he carries a whole galaxy with him into the realm of light. As such a central nature Schönherr unquestionably regarded himself. Faith in himself was the very essence of his character. Nor did he ever waver in this. Hence his oft expressed anticipation of a speedy transformation of humanity. He would be faithful, and would carry his brethren with him over into the realm of light.

After the death of Schönherr, the pastor Ebel took up the work of his master. It was a principle of the whole system that the essential thing is not knowledge, but faithfulness. Upon this maxim Ebel proceeded. In the pulpit and before the multitude he preached only the common doctrines of the catechism; but in private he gathered about his own person an elect circle of the initiated. Among them were great lords and ladies, professors and students. Best known among them are pastor Diestel and the commentator Olshausen. These were mostly "central natures;" while the uninitiated masses were but subordinate natures. The two corresponded to the two primitive principles of being, the active and the passive. But the main leader of the circle was Ebel. As the circle drew closer around him, the personal confession of every secret sin was introduced as a special means of rapid advancement in holiness. This gave Ebel an almost papal power over the consciences of the circle. It proved the means of a violent outburst which took place in 1826. Many of the chiefs of the circle left it and at once began an assault upon Ebel. For a while Ebel was prostrated by sickness, and dropped from the public attention. In 1834 he came again before the public. But a fresh storm broke out, and very soon involved Ebel and Diestel in one of the most notorious lawsuits of modern times. The two preachers were charged with unchurchly doctrines, immoral practices, and heresy. The trial lasted from 1835 to 1841, and resulted in deposing the accused

from office, but in acquitting them of intentional immorality. The result was to entirely discredit the theosophy of Schönherr. Thenceforth it has had no organic existence, though isolated theologians have, here and there, studied it with more or less admiration. See, besides the works already mentioned, *Die Schutzwehr* (Königsberg, 1834); *Geyenseitige Liebe* (ibid. 1834); *Verstand u. Vernunft im Bunde* (Leipsic, 1837); Diestel, *Ein Zeugenverhör* (ibid. 1838); *Grundzüge* (ibid. 1852) from Schönherr's papers; *Compas de Route* (Königsberg and Mohrungen, 1857), vol. 1; *Life of Rudolf Stier* (N.Y. 1874), p. 141, 142; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 620-647; Hahnenfeld, *Die religiöse Bewegung zu Königsberg* (Leipsic, 1858). (J.P.L.)

## School

occurs in the A.V. but once (~~HEB~~ Acts 19:9) as the rendering of the Greek **σχολή** (from which the English word is derived), meaning originally *leisure*; hence, a place of tuition. **SEE TYRANNUS.**

## School Brothers and Sisters

collective names of numerous associations in the Roman Catholic Church, devoted to the education of the young. The first (the Ursulines) were established at Brescia, 1537. **SEE IGNORANTINES.**

## Picture for School 1

**I. School Brothers.** — In the present article only those congregations are mentioned whose members are not priests. The most important school brotherhoods are:

- 1.** The “Brethren of the Christian Schools,” founded by Jean Baptiste de la Salle.
- 2.** The “Christian Brothers,” founded by Rev. E. Rice, at Waterford, Ireland. These have their central house and superior general in Dublin, and numerous establishments in Great Britain, Ireland, and the British colonies.
- 3.** The “Brothers Marists,” or “Christian Brothers of the Society of Mary,” founded at Bordeaux, France, in 1817, by abbe Guillaume Joseph Cheminade; approved by pope Gregory XVI in 1839. The society was introduced into the United States by archbishop Purcell in 1849, and had in

1874, 23 establishments in Ohio, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Louisiana, and Texas.

4. The “Lamennaisian Brothers,” or “Congregation of Christian Instruction,” founded in Brittany, in 1820, by abbe Jean de la Mennais. They reckoned in 1875 about 800 members and 150 establishments in France.
5. The “Brothers of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary,” founded in 1821 at Le Puy, France, by abbe Coindrin. They started in the United States at Mobile in 1847, and in 1874 had establishments in Mississippi, New Orleans, Kentucky, and Indiana.
6. The “Xaverian Brothers,” founded at Bruges, Belgium, in 1839, by Theodore Jacques Ryken. They were especially intended to labor in the United States, and were introduced by archbishop Spaulding into Louisville in 1854. In 1875 they had six schools there, one in Baltimore, and the St. Mary’s Industrial School for Boys near the city.
7. The “Brothers of Charity,” founded in Belgium in 1809, by canon P. Triest, for the education of blind and deaf mutes and training of orphans. In January, 1874, they took charge of the Industrial School of the Angel Guardian in Boston, Mass.

## Picture for School 2

**II. School Sisters.** — The following are the most important of these congregations:

1. The “Ursulines” (q.v.).
2. The “Sisters of the Visitation of Our Lady,” founded at Annecy, Savoy, in 1610, by St. Francis of Sales and St. Jeanne Frangoise de Chantal. In 1641, at the death of the latter, the order numbered 87 establishments, and in 1700, 160 establishments, with 6600 members. It had one establishment in the United States in Washington, in 1808; and in 1890 others in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. It was first approved by pope Urban VIII in 1626.
3. The “Sisters of Notre Dame.” *SEE NOTRE DAME, CONGREGATION OF.*

4. "Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur," founded at Amiens, France, in 1804, by pere Joseph Desire Varin, Julie Billiard, and Marie Louise Francoise Blin de Bourdon, and transferred to Namur, Belgium, in 1809. Its object was to educate girls of the middle class; and it was approved by pope Gregory XVI June 28, 1844. It spread rapidly through Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Ireland; and the English government intrusted to the order the direction of normal schools for Roman pupil teachers. They were called to Cincinnati in 1840 by archbishop Purcell, to Oregon by archbishop Blanchet in 1843, to California in 1851, and to Guatemala in 1859. In 1871 they had 82 establishments (20 in the United States) and 26,000 pupils.

5. "Ladies of the Sacred Heart." *SEE SACRED HEART, LADIES OF THE*. These have as their primary object the teaching of young girls; others add the care of orphans, visitation of sick and poor, and the direction of hospitals. Such are

(1) the "Ladies of the Incarnate Word," founded in 1625 by Jeanne Marie Chezard de Matel, and approved by Urban VIII in 1633. They have many establishments in France, and eight in Texas.

(2) The "Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ," founded Aug. 15, 1849, at Dernbach, Nassau, by Katharine Kaspar; approved by Pius IX in 1860, and confirmed in 1870. They first established themselves in this country at Fort Wayne, Ind., August, 1868. In 1875 they numbered 45 sisters and five houses.

(3) The "Sisters of Our Lady of Charity," or "Eudist Sisters," founded at Caen, Normandy, by abbe Jean Eudes in 1641. In 1835 they became known as the "House of the Good Shepherd." *SEE SHEPHERD, HOUSE OF THE GOOD*.

(4) The "Presentation Nuns," founded at Cork, Ireland, in 1777, by Miss Nano Nagle, for visiting and teaching, but have since become strictly cloistered. Their first establishment in America was at St. John's, Newfoundland; and in the United States, in New York city, Sept. 8, 1874.

(5) "Sisters of Mercy" (q.v.).

(6) "Sisters of Charity." *SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF*.

(7) The "Gray Nuns," or "Sisters of Charity of Montreal." *SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF*.

(8) “Sisters of St. Joseph” (q.v.). See *Appletons’ Cyclop. s.v.*; Barnum, *Romanism as it Is*.

## School, Sunday

*SEE SUNDAY SCHOOL.*

## Schoolmaster

is the inexact rendering in <sup><4134></sup>Galatians 3:24, 25 of παιδαγωγός (“instructor,” <sup><4145></sup>1 Corinthians 4:15), which does not signify a *poedagogue* in the modern sense, but a person, usually a slave or freedman, to whose care the boys of a family were anciently committed at the age of six or seven years, who watched over their physical and moral training and accompanied them to the public schools and elsewhere, or provided them with teachers (παιδομαθεῖς, Quintilian, 1, 11), but did not himself instruct them. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antig. s.v.* “Paedagogue.”

## Schoolmen

See SCHOLASTICISM.

## Schools, Alexandrian

*SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS.*

## Schools, Christian

At a very early period, schools were established in connection with the churches; and if no building was provided for this purpose, the schools were taught in the baptistry and the vestry. This is evident from the observation which Socrates makes upon the education of Julian the Apostate — “that in his youth he frequented the church, where, in those days, the schools were kept.” He speaks of the schools of grammar and rhetoric, which, it seems, were then taught at Constantinople in some apartment belonging to the church. Catechetical and charity schools were also established, especially for instruction in scriptural knowledge. The second Council of Chalons, in 813, enacted that bishops should set up schools to teach ordinary literature and a knowledge of the Scriptures. The sixth General Council of Constantinople recommended the setting up of charity schools in all the country churches. One of its canons is to this purpose: “that presbyters in country towns and villages should have



schools to teach all such children as were sent to them, for which they should exact no reward nor take anything, except the parents of the children thought fit to make them any charitable present by way of voluntary oblation. Another of those canons speaks of schools in churches and monasteries, subject to the bishop's care and direction; from which we may conclude that schools were anciently very common appendants, both of cathedral and country churches" (Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Church*, 1, 314). *SEE PAEDAGOGICS.*

### Schools, Hebrew

As this subject is intimately connected with the question of education and mode of instruction, which cannot be well dealt with separately, we propose to discuss historically these three topics in the present article, which is grounded upon the Biblical notices and the later Talmudical references. *SEE EDUCATION.*

**I. In the Patriarchal Period.** — We have nothing indicative of any place of public instruction in Scripture earlier than the Book of Samuel. But it is reasonable to suppose that, as the world became peopled, some measures were taken for the instruction of the young in all those parts of learning that were then known; and particularly among those persons who had the knowledge of the true God, who would naturally be anxious that the seeds of religious learning should be timely sown in their children's minds, and that they should be instructed in everything appertaining to divine rites and worship, of which we have reason to believe that singing and sacred poetry formed a large part. The Jewish doctors, indeed, have given us decided assertions on the subject of primitive teaching. They say that Adam instructed his posterity, and that Enoch succeeded him in the office. Enoch, we know, was a prophet (<sup>Gen 5:24</sup>Jude 14); and in the later parts of the Old Test. we shall see that prophets were public instructors. The Arabians have traditions of Enoch under the name of Edris; that he wrote thirty volumes of revelations; that he was the first who knew astronomy and arithmetic, and wrote with the pen. Eusebius says he was the first who taught the knowledge of the stars, in which he was instructed by the angels of God, *SEE ENOCH*; that on his translation to heaven he was succeeded by Noah, a preacher, or teacher, of righteousness (<sup>Gen 9:18</sup>2 Peter 2:5). The next great public instructor, according to the rabbins, was Abraham, concerning whom Josephus relates (*Ant.* 1, 8) that he taught the Egyptians astronomy and arithmetic. The ancient historians Berosus and Hecatous commend his

learning; and Eupolimus writes “that he was superior to all men in wisdom, and taught astronomy to the Phoenicians.” The Targum also countenances the idea that Abraham taught in Haran. Jacob, according to the Jewish doctors, devoted himself to teaching instead of living the life of a hunter, like Esau; for (<sup><127></sup>Genesis 25:27) “he was a plain man, dwelling in tents,” is expressed by the Targums “he was a perfect man, a minister of the house of doctrine” (i.e. a school of instruction); but all this is mere fancy.

**II. From the Exode to the Captivity.** — Being under a theocracy, and engaged almost exclusively in pastoral; and agricultural pursuits, it was most important that the Hebrews, in the early stages of their existence, should educate their youth in a preeminently religious, practical, and simple manner. The parents, upon whom the education of the children at first devolved, were therefore strictly enjoined to instruct their offspring in the precepts of the law, in the fear of God (<sup><149></sup>Deuteronomy 4:9, 10; 31:13; 32:46), and in the symbols which represented the dealings of Providence with their nation in past days, and which were evidently designed to excite the curiosity of the children and to elicit inquiry, thus furnishing the parents with pictorial illustrations to facilitate the education of those committed to their care (<sup><126></sup>Exodus 12:26, 27; 13:8, 14, 15; <sup><148></sup>Deuteronomy 6:8, 9, 20, etc.). This work of education was not to be put off for certain occasions, but was to be prosecuted at all times; no opportunity was to be lost. The father was enjoined, in sitting down with his family at the table, at home, abroad, before retiring in the evening, and after getting up in the morning, to train his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (ver. 7). The law of God powerfully supported the authority of parents in this task by the injunction of filial obedience contained in the decalogue, as well as by the heavy punishment inflicted upon refractory children (<sup><122></sup>Exodus 20:12; 21:15; <sup><149></sup>Leviticus 20:9; <sup><1218></sup>Deuteronomy 21:18-21). Still the rigor of parental authority was not to be the sole operative power in the education of children. Parents are reminded that their example may lead their children to happiness or misery (<sup><1215></sup>Exodus 20:5, 6; <sup><140></sup>Deuteronomy 4:10; 5:9; 30:19; 32:46, 47). The force of example in the education of children is most beautifully described in the praise of a royal mother who, with “the law of love upon her tongue,” instilled noble sentiments into the heart of her children (<sup><130></sup>Proverbs 31:1-9, 25); and such loving words are represented as producing an indelible impression in the picture of a son who, with pious gratitude, dwells upon the wholesome lessons which his father imparted to him in early youth (4:3, etc.). Parents are, moreover,

advised not to adopt the same indiscriminate process of teaching with all children, but to adapt their instruction to every youth (**wkrd yp l [ ]**) according to his age and inclination, so that he may abide thereby (12:6).

That reading and writing must have formed part of education from the very settlement in Palestine is evident from the fact that the Israelites were commanded to write the precepts of the law upon the door posts and gates of their respective houses, *SEE MEZUZAH*, in order to be continually reminded of their obligations to their Creator (<sup><RB></sup>Deuteronomy 6:9; 20:20). They were, moreover, enjoined to write the injunctions upon great stones (**bfh rab**) *very plainly*, immediately upon their crossing the Jordan (27:2-8), so that they might easily be read by every Israelite. Now these admonitions unquestionably presuppose that the people at large could read plain writing; that the deciphering of these memorials was a religious duty; and that it must, therefore, have formed an essential part in the strictly religious education of children. Besides, the manner in which some parts of the sacred oracles were written clearly indicates that the inspired writers reckoned upon the ability of the people to read. Thus the frequent play upon words, as, for instance, in <sup><RB></sup>Genesis 6:8, where “Noah found favor,” is obtained by a transposition of the letters in the name **hn** into **hj**; <sup><RB></sup>Genesis 38:7, where “Er... was wicked” is obtained by a transposition of the letters in the name **r [ ]** into **[ r**; the alphabetical portions of the Old Test. (Psalm 9, 10, 25, 34, 38, 111, 112, 119, 145; <sup><RB></sup>Proverbs 31:10, etc.; the Lamentations), which were intended to assist the memory and mark the gradation of ideas; the substitution of **çç** for **l bb** (<sup><RB></sup>Jeremiah 25:26; 51:4), **ymq bl** for **pydçk** (51:1), by taking the letters of the alphabet in their reverse order, would have been utterly useless and most unintelligible had not the people for whom they were intended been able to read. If we bear in mind that the understanding of the sacred oracles was not the peculiar prerogative of the priestly caste, but was enjoined upon every Israelite, it becomes self evident that the knowledge of reading and writing, which, as we have seen, is so inseparable from the understanding of the Scriptures, must have formed a prominent part in the education of children whose sole training was the understanding of the Scriptures. For the same reason arithmetic must have been taught; as the days of the week, the months, the festivals, etc., were not designated by proper names, but by numerals. The numbers occurring in the Old Test. reach to hundreds of thousands; and we have, moreover, instances of addition (<sup><RB></sup>Numbers

1:22, etc.; 26:7, etc.), subtraction (<sup><0B27></sup>Leviticus 25:27; 28:18; <sup><04B9></sup>Numbers 3:19, 43, 46), multiplication (<sup><0B18></sup>Leviticus 5:8; 27:16-18; <sup><04B4></sup>Numbers 3:46-50), and division (<sup><0B27></sup>Leviticus 25:27-50). In fact, every art or science which occurs or is alluded to in the Old Test., and upon the understanding of which depended the understanding of the Scriptures, must to some extent have formed a part of the strictly religious Jewish education.

We have already seen that the education of the children devolved upon the parents. They were the teachers in ordinary cases. This natural duty must have been a pleasant task, a welcome occupation, and a pastime to a people who led a rural life, and whose Sabbaths and festivals freed them from labor a sixth part of the year. *SEE FESTIVAL*. In these leisure hours the parents, who were strictly forbidden to engage in any secular work, were in constant contact with their children; and the many symbols, rites, and ceremonies on those occasions were used by them as so many illustrated narratives of the dealings of God. We need, therefore, not wonder that the name *school* does not occur in the Bible previous to the Babylonian captivity; before the Jews were entangled in foreign affairs; before commercial transactions with other nations and other matters had taken so many of the people away from their homes and deprived their children of their natural teachers. The traditional opinion that by **ynmkj t tbc** (2 Samuel 33:8) is meant a sort of academy (the Midrash, the Chaldee Paraphrase, Kimchi, etc.), or that **yttl d** (<sup><0184></sup>Proverbs 8:34) denotes **çrdmh tyb** (see Rashi, *ad loc.*), is purely gratuitous.

But though there were no national or elementary schools before the exile, there were cases in which professional teachers had to be resorted to, e.g. when the high position or official duties of the parents rendered parental teaching impossible, or when the parents were in any way incapacitated, when the child's abilities to learn surpassed the father's capabilities to teach, or where the son was preparing himself for a vocation different from that of his father. For such exceptional cases teachers existed from a very early period, as we have seen above. We find that Bezaleel and Aholiab were qualified by God as teachers (**wbl b ^tn trwhl w**) in certain departments. The Psalmist speaks of his having had many teachers (**yti kçh ydml m l km** [119:99]). Both teachers and pupils are mentioned in connection with the temple choir (<sup><0352></sup>1 Chronicles 15:22; 25:8); and the prophets, who, by virtue of their superior piety, high attainments, large acquaintance with the political affairs of the world, delivered public

lectures on the festivals (<sup>1002</sup>2 Kings 4:22, 23), instructed young men who aspired to a better education in order to fit themselves for public service (<sup>9005</sup>1 Samuel 10:5, 10, etc.; <sup>1008</sup>2 Kings 2:3, etc.; 4:38, etc.; 6:1, etc.).

As for the so-called *school of prophets*, no such term occurs in the Old Test. The institution, however, is substantially referred to in several passages which speak of the “sons of the prophets” (<sup>1008</sup>1 Kings 20:35; <sup>1005</sup>2 Kings 2:5, etc.), showing some kind of a college for the instruction of the prophetic order from the time of Samuel onward. The intimations on the subject are, indeed, obscure, yet sufficiently clear to warrant the general belief in their existence. In later times they were doubtless merged in the regular synagogical schools referred to below. *SEE PROPHETS, SONS OF.*

**III.** *From the Babylonian Captivity to the Close of the Talmud.* — A new epoch in the education of the Jews began with their return from Babylon. In the captivity, the exiled Jews had to a great extent forgotten their vernacular Hebrew, and they became incompetent to understand their sacred oracles. Ezra, the restorer of the law, as he is called, found it therefore necessary, immediately on their return to Jerusalem, to gather around him those who were skilled in the law, and with their assistance trained a number of public teachers. The less distinguished of these teachers went into the provincial towns of Judaea, gathered disciples, and formed synagogues; while the more accomplished of them remained in Jerusalem, became members of the Great Synagogue, and collected large numbers of young men, whom they instructed in all things appertaining to the law, in the prophets, and in the sayings of the sages of old (Ecclus. 2, 9-11; Mishna, *Aboth*, 1, 1). Scrolls were given to children upon which were written passages of Scripture, such as *Shema* (i.e. <sup>1000</sup>Deuteronomy 6:4), or the *Hallel* (i.e. Psalm 114-118, 136), the history of the creation to the deluge (Genesis 1-8:1), or <sup>1000</sup>Leviticus 1:18 (comp. Jerusalem Talmud, *Megilla*, 3, 1; *Gittin*, 60 a; *Sopherim*, 5, 9). The course of study pursued in the metropolis was more extensive (Prolog. to Ecclus. and Ecclus. 38:24, etc.; 39:1, etc.), that of provincial towns more limited, while the education of the small and more remote places or villages almost exclusively depended upon what the inhabitants learned when they went up to Jerusalem to celebrate the festivals, and was therefore very insignificant. Hence the phrase */rah*  $\mu$ , *country people*, came to denote the *uneducated*, the *illiterate*; just as *paganus*, or *pagan*, a countryman or

villager, is for a similar reason used for *heathen*; while *urbanus*, *urbane*, or *an inhabitant of a city*, denotes an *educated man*.

The schools now began to increase in importance; and the intercourse of the Jews with the Babylonians, the Persians, and the Greeks widened their notions of education, and made them study foreign languages and literature and Hebraize their philosophy. The Essenes, who found it necessary to separate themselves from the nation because of their foreign innovations, also devoted themselves to the education of the children; but their instruction was confined to the divine law and to morals (Josephus, *War*, 11, 8, 12). **SEE ESSENES**. Simon ben-Shetach (B.C. 80) has the merit of having introduced superior schools into every large provincial town, and ordained that all the youths from the age of sixteen should visit them (Jerusalem *Kethuboth*, 8, 11), introducing government education. So popular did these schools become that while in the pre-exilian period the very name of schools did not exist, we now find in a very short time no less than eleven different expressions for school, e.g. **swsyl a** = ἄλσος, or **ssyl a** = ἰλέος (*Midrash Coh.* 91); **al wbsa**, or **yl wksa** = σχολή (*Midrash Shir Hashir*, 15 a); **açrdm yb**, or more frequently **çrdmh tyb** (*Yebam.* 24 b; *Aboth*, 5, 14); **ˆpl wa tyb**, *house of learning* (*Jonath. on Exodus* 33:7); **rpsb tyb**, *the house of books* (*Midrash Echa*, 70 b); **rpsw tyb**, *the house of the teacher* (*ibid.* 77 b); **ˆbr tyb**, *the house of the master* (*Baba Bathra*, 21 a); **dwml t tyb**, *the house of instruction* (*Gittin*, 58 a); **hbyçy**, or **atbytm**, *the seat*, i.e. where the disciples sat at the feet of their master; **µrk**, *the vineyard* (Rashi on *Yebam.* 42 b); and **ards**, *an array*, where the disciples were arrayed according to their seniority and acquirements (*Cholin*, 173 b). The etymologies of some of these words, and the signification of the others, give us in a very striking manner the progressive history of Jewish education, and tell us what foreign elements were introduced into Jewish paedagogy. Some idea may be formed of the deep root juvenile education had struck in the hearts of the Jews from the following declaration in the Talmud: “The world is preserved by the breath of the children in the schools;” “A town in which there is no school must perish;” “Jerusalem was destroyed because the education of children was neglected” (*Sabbath*, 119, b).

As the national education of this period is that which the apostles and the first disciples of Christ received, and as this must be of the utmost

importance and interest to Christians of the present day, we shall now briefly state what the Talmud and the Midrashim consider to constitute the proper education of a respectable Jew, and give their notions of schools and the mode of instruction. We must begin with the schools. A school or teacher was required for every twenty-five children; when a community had only forty children, they might have one master and an assistant (*Baba Bathra*, 21 a). Schools must neither be established in the most densely crowded parts of the town (*Pesachim*, 112 a), nor near a river which has to be crossed by an insecure bridge (*Baba Bathra*, 21), so as not to endanger the health or lives of the children. The proper age for a boy to go to school is six years (*Kethuboth*, 50 a); before that time the father must instruct his son. Thus it is related that R. Chija ben-Abba would never eat his breakfast before he had repeated with his son the lesson which he gave him on the previous day, and taught him at least one new verse (*Kiddush*. 30 a). At the age of five a boy had to study the Bible, at ten the Mishna, and at fifteen the Talmud (*Aboth*, 5, 21). Great care was taken that the books from which instruction was imparted should be correctly written (*Pesachim*, 112 a), and that the lessons taught, especially from the Bible, should be in harmony with the capacities and inclinations of the children (*Aboda Zara*, 19 a; *Berach*. 63 a), practical (*Kiddush*. 40 b), few at a time, but weighty (*Vayikra Rabba*, 103). The parents never ceased to watch that their children should be in the class at the proper time. We are told that Rabba ben-Huna never partook of his breakfast till he had taken his son to school (*Kiddush*. 30 a). Josephus, therefore, did not at all exaggerate when, writing against Apion, he said, "Our principal care of all is to educate our children" (*Apion*, 1, 12). "If any of us is asked about our laws, he will more readily tell them all than he will tell his own name, and this in consequence of our having learned them as soon as ever we became sensible of anything, and of our having them, as it were, engraven on our souls. Our transgressors of them are but few, and it is impossible, when any do offend, to escape punishment" (*ibid*. 2, 19). In a similar manner Philo expresses himself: "The Jews looking upon their laws as oracles directly given to them by God himself, and having been instructed in this doctrine from their very earliest infancy, they bear in their souls the images of the commandments contained in these laws as sacred" (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31, Mang. 2, 577). "They are taught, in a manner, from their very swaddling clothes, by their parents and teachers and instructors, and even before that by their holy laws, and also by the unwritten maxims and customs, to believe that there is but one God their Father and the Creator of the world"

(*ibid.* § 16, Mang. 2, 562). Of Timothy we are told that from a child he knew the Holy Scriptures (ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας [<sup>-SIBIS-2</sup> Timothy 3:15]); and a similar statement we find in the Apocryphal book Susannah, ver. 3. From all this we can presume that the education and instruction of the children at first devolved upon the parents, who were the teachers, and who in their leisure hours, especially on Sabbaths and festivals, illustrated the many symbols, rites, and ceremonies which were used on different occasions. The importance of education having now become more and more realized, the foundation of schools became more and more a matter of necessity; and the man who immortalized his name by establishing elementary schools was Jesus of Gimlo, who fell by the hands of the zealots during the siege of Jerusalem. After that time children were not allowed to go to school from one city into another; the inhabitants of each city could be obliged to have a school and a teacher (*Baba Bathra*, 21 a), and it was even forbidden to live in a city where there was no school (*Sanhedrin*, 17 a). The number of schools now increased, and flourished throughout the length and breadth of *the* land; and though it seems exaggerated when the Talmud states that there were 400 elementary schools in Bechar, each having 400 teachers with 400 children each (*Gittin*, 58 b), and that there were 1000 pupils in the house of the father of Rabban Simeon ben-Gamaliel who were instructed in the Thora, or law, and in the Greek (*Baba Kama*, 83 a), it is certain that the number of schools, teachers, and pupils must have been large in every great place. Maimonides thus describes the school: “The teacher sat at the head, and the pupils surrounded him, as the crown the head, so that every one could see the teacher and hear his words. The teacher did not sit on a chair while the pupils sat on the ground, but all either sat on chairs or on the ground. Formerly it was customary for the teacher to sit and the pupil to stand; but shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem it was so arranged that both the teacher and scholar sat” (*Jad Hachazaka H.T.T.* 3, 2). No unmarried person could teach (*Kiddush*. 82 b). and no choleric person could be a teacher (*Aboth*, 2, 7). The teacher was to be respected by the pupil; yea, the latter was expected to show him greater respect than his own father, and to entertain for him a warmer attachment (*Aboth*, 4, 15; *Pesachim*, 22 b; *Sabbath*, 119 b; *Horayoth*, 13 a; *Baba Metsia*, 33 a). But, on the other hand, the teacher was, both by word and example, to incite his pupils to everything good and noble; he was to endeavor to secure the confidence, the respect, and the affection, both of parents and children; the latter he was to treat rather with kindness than with rigor. As to the objects the



teacher had to teach, the national literature of the people was the main object. As soon as the child could read, the teacher commenced reading Leviticus or Torath Cohanim, and the reason why this book was to be read first was because the little ones are innocent and pure, and the sacrifices symbolize purity, therefore “let the pure ones come and study the law of restoring purity by the sacrifice” (*Vayikra Rabba*, § 7). The curriculum in the study of the law being finished, that of the Mishna began, to be followed by that of the Gemara; the latter, however, belonged to the higher schools. Besides the national literature, languages were also taught, especially the Greek. Thus we read of Rabbi, who said, “What is the use of the Syriac language in Palestine? Let any one study either the Hebrew or the Greek” (*Gittin*, 28 b; *Sotah*, 49 a; *Baba Kama*, 82 b). Besides the linguistic studies, they also studied astronomy, mathematics, and natural sciences. It seems that gymnastic exercises also originally belonged to the curriculum, but were afterwards interdicted as leading to dangerous contact and assimilation with heathens (*Aboda Zara*, 18 b). Beating, if necessary, with a strap, never with a rod, was to be the principal means of correction; and an instance is mentioned where a teacher was deposed for too great severity. The alphabet was taught by drawing the letters on a board till the children remembered them. In reading, well corrected books were to be used, and the child was to point to the words as he spelled them. The teacher was to make the lesson as plain as possible, and not to lose patience if it was not immediately understood. It was one of the principal duties of an instructor of youth to impress upon their minds and hearts the lessons of morality and chastity. To acquire fluency, pupils were to read aloud, and certain mnemonic rules were devised to facilitate the committing to memory. The number of hours during which junior classes were to be kept in school was limited. As the close air of the schoolroom might prove detrimental during the heat of the day, schools were closed between ten o’clock A.M. and three P.M. For similar reasons school hours were limited to four hours a day during the period from the 17th Thamus to the 9th Ab, and the teacher forbidden to chastise his pupils during these months. The paramount importance which public instruction had assumed in the life of the nation, we can see from sayings like those above cited: “Jerusalem was destroyed because the instruction of the young was neglected” (*Sabbath*, 119 b); “The world is only saved by the breath of the school children” (*ibid.*); “A town in which there is no school must perish” (*ibid.*). The higher schools, or “kallahs,” met during certain months in the year only. Three weeks before the term, the dean prepared the students for

the lectures to be delivered by the rector: and so arduous became the task, as the number of the disciples increased, that in time no less than seven deans had to be appointed. Yet the mode of teaching was not that of our modern universities. The professors did not deliver lectures which the disciples, like the student in *Faust*, could “comfortably take home in black and white.” Here all was life, movement, debate. Question was met by counter question; answers were given wrapped up in allegories or parables; the inquirer was led to deduce the questionable point for himself by analogy — the nearest approach to the Socratic method. The New Test. furnishes many specimens of this method of instruction. The *extent* of instruction imparted in these schools embraced almost all sciences preserved in the Talmud. An important part of education, as we shall more particularly see below, was the learning of a trade. Thus we find among the most celebrated “doctors” tentmakers, sandal makers, weavers, carpenters, tanners, bakers, cooks. Besides the elementary schools, which were chiefly intended for popular education, there were, as already intimated, also superior colleges, at first confined to Jerusalem, under the management of the presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim, the *Sopherim*, or “scribes” and “doctors,” as they are called in the New Test., and members of the Sanhedrim, who made it one of their principal objects to train young men destined to become the teachers and judges of Israel, and the bearers of “the traditions of the fathers” (*Aboth*, 1, 1). Gradually these academies were multiplied in the metropolis, and spread over all the countries where the Jews resided. Akbara, Lydda, Ushach, Sepphoris, Tiberias, Jabne, Nares, Nahardea, Machuza, Selki, Shakan-Zib (El-Sib), Pumbaditha, Sora, and Alexandria, in the process of time, became distinguished for their seats of learning. The following are the presidents and vice-presidents of the colleges which were the depositories of the traditions of the fathers and the supreme arbiters in the sphere of morals and education, together with the most distinguished masters and disciples under each presidency, both in Palestine and Babylon, to the close of the Talmud, in their chronological order (more briefly summarized in part under PUMBADITHA; SORA; etc.):

### THE TANAIM EPOCH. B.C.

Simon the Just or Pious — 300

Antigonus of Soho — 200-170

**a** Jose ben-Joeser of Zereda, and Jose ben-Jochanan of Jerusalem, the first pair, 170-140

**b** Jehoshnah ben-Perachja, and Natai of Arabela — 140-110

**c** Simon ben-Shetach, their pupil, and Jehudah ben-Tabai — 110-65

**d** Shemaja, and Abtalion — 65-30

Hillel I, the Great, the Babylonian, in whose family the presidency became hereditary for fifteen generations (A.). 10-415). He was first with Menachem and then with Shammai, who founded a separate school — B.C. 30-A.D. 10

The former was designated *the school of Hillel*, which had eighty disciples, called *the elders of the house of Hillel*, among whom were Jonathan ben-Uziel the Targumist, Dossa ben-Harchinas, Jonathan his brother, and Jochanan ben-Zakkai; while the latter was denominated *the school of Shammai*, the immediate disciples or elders of which were Baba ben-Buta, Dotai of Stome, and Zadok, the originator of the Zealots. Simon ben-Hillel I — A.D. 10-30

Gamaliel I, ben-Simon I, called Ha-Zaken *the elder*, the teacher of the apostle Paul — 30-50

Simon II, ben-Gamaliel I — 50-70

Jochanan ben-Zakkai, founder of the school of Jabne or Jamnia — 68-80

## PALESTINE

Gamaliel II, of Jabue, ben-Simon II, and Eleazar ben-Azariah, who was for a little time president in the place of Gamaliel. Here are to be mentioned Eliezer ben-Hyrkanus, brother-in-law of Gamaliel, and founder of the school at Lydda, which continued the only seat of learning in Southern Judaea for several centuries; Joshua ben-Chanaja, who established a school at Bekin, in the valley between Jabne and Lydda: Ismael ben-Eliesa, the founder of the school known by the name Be-R. Ismael; Aquila the translator of the Bible: R. Ilai, R. Chaliphita, Bar-Cochba, the false Messiah — 80-116

Simon II, ben-Gamaliel II, and R. Nathan, vice-president, author of the Mishna or Tosiphta which goes by his name, and of a commentary on Aboth. The distinguished men of this presidency are, R. Judah ben-Ilai, of Ushah: R. Jose ben-Chaliphita, of Sepphoris, author of the history called *Seder Olam*; R. Jochanan, of Alexandria; R. Simon ben-Jochai, of Galilee,

the reputed originator of the Cabala and author of the far-famed *Zohar* — 140-163

Jehudah I, the Holy, Ha-Nasi, ben-Simon III, editor of the Mishna, and called *Rabbi*. His celebrated disciples, who also became heads of schools, were called *semi-Tanaim*, and perfected their master's work, the Mishna. These were R. Janai, whose school was a Akbara; R. Chija=Achija; Ushaja the elder surnamed "the father of the Mishna;" and Abba Areka, surnamed *Rab*, the founder of the school at Pumbaditha—163-193

Gamaliel III, ben-Jehuda I, in whose presidency the college was transferred from Jabne to Tiberias—193-220

### BABYLON

Nahardea, the center of learning since the Babylonian exile, and the seat of the rector-general of all the Babylonian colleges. It was destroyed through the adventurer Papa ben-Nazar, in the year A.D. 259.

R. Chanina, nephew of R. Josuah, formed a college in Nachor-Pacor, in the neighborhood of Nahardea, of which he became president; and R. Nechanja or Achiha was vice-president —138-140

R. Shila was the rector-general a Nahardea; R. Nathan, the last *Tana*, and R. Chija were both educated here. Abba Areka, who also a student here and afterwards went to Palestine to finish his studies under Jehudah I, brought with him on his first return to Babylon (A.D. 189) the complete Mishna of his master — cir. 140-190

Samuel the astronomer, also called Mar-Samuel, Arioeh, and Jarchini, succeeded R. Shila as rector of the college at Nahardea — 190-247

### THE AMORAIM EPOCH.

Jehudah II, ben-Simon III, also called *Rabbi*, the teacher of Origen. The teachers of this period were, R. Chaninah, the most distinguished disciple of Jehudah I, who founded a school at Sephoris; R. Simlai, the celebrated Haggadist, who reduced the law of Moses to 613 commandments; R. Jose of Maon; R. Chaggai, R. Jehudah ben-Nachmani, etc — 220-270

Abba Areka, surnamed *Rab*, having returned to his native place a second time, founded a school at Sora, which maintained its celebrity for nearly

800 years, and which attracted about 1200 students in the lifetime of its founder. He was the president of it twenty-eight years — 219-247

Samuel Jarchini, rector of the college at Nahardea, is elected rector-general of all the schools in Babylon — 247-257

R. Hana became rector-general. He had only 800 students, as, during his rectorate, R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel founded a school at Pumbaditha, and R. Chasda founded another school at Sora, which attracted many of his disciples. Nahardea is destroyed (259); the students emigrate into the neighborhood of the Tigris and found a school — 257-297

### TIBERIAS.

Gamaliel IV, ben-Jehudah II — 270-300

Jehudah III, ben-Gamaliel IV — 300-309

Hillel II, ben-Jehudah III, introduced the new calendar, and is said by Epiphanius to have embraced Christianity. The distinguished teachers of this period were R. Jona, R. Jose, and Tanchuma ben-Abba, the renowned Haggadist and reputed author of the *Midrash Tanchuma* — 330-365

Gamaliel V, ben-Hillel II. The teachers of this period were R. Jeremiah, R. Jacob ben-Abnu, etc — 365-385

Jehudah IV, ben-Gamaliel V — 385-400

Gamaliel the last ([hartb](#)), ben-Jehudah IV — 400-425

### SORA.

Chasda of Kaphri, founder of this school, is rector — 293-309

Rabba ben-Huna, succeeded Chasda to the rectory, and when he died the college was without a rector for nearly fifty years — 309-320

Ashi ben-Simai, surnamed Rabban (*our teacher*), resuscitated the college of Sora, and was its rector fifty-two years, during which time seven rectors died in Pumbaditha. Ashi immortalized his name by collecting the Babylonian Talmud — 352-427

R. Jemar or Mar-Jemar (contracted Maremar), succeeded R. Ashi as rector of the college, and officiated about five years — 427-432

R. Idi ben-Abin, a disciple of R. Ashi, officiated as rector for twenty years — 432-452

R. Nachman ben-Huna — 452-455

Mar bar-R. Ashi, who continued collecting the Talmud, which his father began — 455-468

Rabba Tusphan. Sora, where one of the oldest Jewish universities stood, was now destroyed by the Persian king Firuz — 468-474

Ribina II, who, with R. Jose and his colleagues, completed the Talmud — 468-540

### **PUMBADITHA.**

R. Jehuda ben-Jesheskel, founder of the school at Pumbaditha, is elected rector-general of all the colleges, and officiates two years — 297-299

Chasda of Kaphri, founder and rector of the school at Sora, is elected rector-general — 299-309

Rabba ben-Nachmani, who succeeded Chasda, revived the college to such a degree that he obtained 1200 students — 309-330

Joseph ben-Chija the blind. He translated the prophets of the Old Test. into Chaldee — 330-333

Abaji ben-Cajlil, surnamed Nachmani, the nephew of Rabba, succeeded R. Joseph the blind — 333-338

Rabba ben-Joseph, ben-Chama, who founded the school at Machuza, was elected rector after Abaji — 338-352

Nachman ben-Isaac held the rectorate four years — 352-356

R. Chama of Nahardea, Nachmani's successor, held the rectorate nineteen years — 356-377

R. Zebid ben-Ushaja — 377-385

R. Dimi ben-Chinena of Nahardea — 385-388

Raphrem ben-Papa — 388-400

R. Kahana. The celebrated men of this period were Mar-Sutra, Pheluna ben-Nathon, etc. — 400-411

Mar-Sutra — 411-414

R. Ahsa ben-Raba — 414-419

R. Gebiha of Be-Katil — 419-433

Rephrem II — 433-443

R. Rachamai — 443-456

R. Sama ben-Raba — 456-471

R. Jose — 471-520

R. Samuel ben-Abahu.

At first the organization of these schools or colleges was very simple. Besides the president or rector, who was the chief teacher, and an assistant, there were no offices or ranks. Gradually, however, superior and subordinate ranks involuntarily developed themselves, and ultimately assumed the following form: The college, which met during certain months of the year, and was generally called *Methiba* ((**abytm**), *seat of learning*, was presided over by the chief rabbi, who was called *Resh-methiba* (**abytm çar**), and was elected by the school. Next to this *Resh-methiba* or rector came the *Resh-kalla* (**hl k çar**), *the chief of the assembly*, whose office it was to expound or simplify to the students, during the first three weeks of the session, the theme upon which the rector had determined to lecture. In later times there were seven *Rashe-kalloth* (**twl k rçar**), such interpreters, composed of the associates (**µyrbj**) and members of the Sanhedrim, varying in rank. The president or teacher occupied a raised seat, the interpreters sat next to the rector on lower seats, while the disciples sat below them at the feet of their teachers (<sup>411B</sup>Acts 12:3).

The mode in which instruction was communicated was chiefly catechetical. After the master had delivered his dictum or theme, the disciples in turn asked different questions (<sup>418B</sup>Luke 2:46), which he frequently answered by parables or counter questions, a line of conduct also pursued by Christ in accordance with the custom of the time (comp. <sup>427B</sup>Matthew 22:17-22;

~~Q211~~Luke 20:2-4, etc.). Sometimes the teacher introduced the subject by simply asking a question connected with the theme he proposed to propound; the replies given by the different disciples constituted the discussion, which the master at last terminated by declaring which of the answers was the most appropriate. Thus R. Jochanan ben-Zakkai (B.C. 30), on one occasion, wanted to inform his disciples what was the most desirable thing for man to get. He then asked them, "What is the best thing for man to possess?" One replied, "a kind nature;" another, "a good companion;" another, "a good neighbor;" another, "the power to foresee consequences;" while R. Eleazer said "a good heart." Whereupon R. Jochanan remarked, "I prefer R. Eleazer's answer to yours, for in it all your answers are comprehended" (*Aboth*, 2, 9). Who is not reminded thereby of the questions put by the Savior to his disciples in ~~HK27~~Mark 8:27-30?

Allegories, riddles, stories, etc., formed another channel whereby instruction was communicated in these schools. The oppressive heat of the Eastern climate, which was especially felt in the crowded college, where, as we have seen, twelve hundred disciples were sometimes present, tended to make the students drowsy when a hard subject was discussed. The wise teacher, therefore, when he perceived that the attention began to flag, at once introduced a merry anecdote or a monstrous story, or propounded a ludicrous riddle, which immediately aroused the disciples and enabled the master to go on with his theme. Hence the abundance of both sublime and ridiculous parables and stories dispersed throughout the Talmud and Midrashim which record these lectures; and hence, also, the parabolic mode of teaching adopted by our Savior.

The extent of instruction, or what constituted education in these schools, can hardly be defined. An unbiased reader will see from a most cursory glance at any of the discussions recorded in the Talmud that all manner of subjects were brought forward in these colleges. Theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, astronomy, astrology, medicine, botany, geography, arithmetic, architecture, were all themes which alternately occupied the attention of masters and disciples. In fact, the Talmud, which has preserved the topics discussed in the colleges, is an encyclopedia of all the sciences of that time, and shows that in many departments of science these Jewish teachers have anticipated modern discoveries. It would require far more space than the limits of this article allow to quote instances in confirmation of this; we can therefore only refer the reader to the treatises quoted below.



Besides the abstruse theological and scientific subjects, etiquette occupied a prominent part in the lectures of the college, and was regarded as forming an essential part of education. The most minute directions are given as to the behavior of students towards their parents, their teachers, their superiors in age or rank. Every one met in the street must be saluted (*Aboth*, 4, 10). Not to respond to a salutation is characterized as committing a robbery (*Berach*. 6 b). An ordinary man is to be saluted with the words, "Peace be with thee!" a teacher, "Peace be with thee, my teacher and my master!" (Rashi on *Berach*. 27 b); and a king, "Peace be with thee, my king! peace!" (*Gittin*, 62 a). Salutations in the house of prayer are not allowed (*Derech Eretz*, 10). One must rise before a learned man (*Kethuboth*, 103 b), and before the hoary head, even if he be a non-Israelite (*Kiddush*. 33 b). When three persons walk together, the superior is to walk in the middle (*Erub*. 54 b); the teacher must always be on the right of the pupil in walking (*Yoma*, 37 a). One must not leave a friend without asking his permission (*Derech Eretz*, 2); when leaving one's teacher the disciple must say, "I am dismissed;" whereupon the response is, "Depart in peace" (*Berach*. 64 a). Never enter a house suddenly and without notice (*Kethuboth*, 62 b); nor sit down before the superior has seated himself (Jerus. *Kethuboth*, 25); nor lean in the company of superiors (*Derech Eretz*, § 6). "Seven things are seen in the conduct of an educated man, and seven in the behavior of an uneducated person:

1. An educated man will be quiet in the presence of one more educated than himself;
2. Will not interrupt any one speaking;
3. Will not give a hasty reply;
4. Will ask appropriate questions;
5. Will give suitable answers;
6. Will answer the first thing first, and the last thing last; and
7. Will candidly say when he does not know anything. The reverse of these things will be seen in the uneducated" (*Aboth*, 5, 10).

Another most essential part of education was the learning of a trade. Thus R. Gamaliel declares, "learning, no matter of what kind, if unaccompanied by a trade, ends in nothing and leads to sin" (*Aboth*, 2, 2). R. Judah ben-

Ilai, called “the wise,” “the first orator,” had a trade, and used to say, “labor honors the laborer” (*Nedarim*, 49 b). R. Ismael, the great astronomer and powerful opponent of Gamaliel II, was a needle maker (*Jerus. Berach.* 4, 1); R. Jose ben-Chalaphta, of Sepphoris, was a tanner (*Sabbath*, 49 b). These rabbins, like the apostle Paul, gloried in the fact that they could maintain themselves and teach independently of payment, and hence took a pride in their respective trades, which were attached to their names, viz., rabbi Jochanan, the shoemaker; rabbi Simon, the weaver; rabbi Joseph, the carpenter. This will account for the apparent anomaly that the apostle Paul, a thorough student, should have been a tent maker.

Though female education was necessarily limited, owing to the position which women occupied in the East, yet it must not be supposed that it was altogether neglected. The fact that mothers had to take part in the education of their children would of itself show that their own education must have been attended to. We are, however, not confined to this inference. The 31st chapter of Proverbs gives us a description of what was the education of a woman and a housewife in the Old Test. In the Talmud we find the daughters of R. Samuel were even first rate students of the *Halacha* (*Kethuboth*, 23 a; *Jerus. ibid.* 2, 6). R. Jochanan ben-Napucha not only urges the study of Greek as a necessary part of a man’s education, but recommends it also for women as a desirable accomplishment (*Jerus. Sota*, s.f.). To show the desirableness of uniting with Hebrew the study of Greek, this celebrated rabbi, in accordance with the ancient practice, illustrates it by a passage of Scripture (<sup><0023></sup>Genesis 9:23): “Because the two sons of Noah, Shem and Japheth, unitedly covered the nakedness of their father with one garment; Shem (representing the Jews) obtained the fringed garment, the *Talith*; Japheth (representing the Greeks) got the philosopher’s garment, i.e. *Pallium*,” which ought to be united again (*Midrash Rabba* [<sup><0023></sup>Genesis 36]). Hence R. Abbahu was not only himself a consummate Greek scholar, but had his daughter instructed in this classical language, since he regarded it as necessary to a good female education, and quoted R. Jochanan as an authority upon this subject (*Jerus. Sabbath*, 3, 1; *Sota*, s.f.).

**V. Literature.** — The best works upon this subject are the Talmud and Midrashim; but as these are not generally accessible, we mention the masterly works of Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832); Frankel, *Der gerichtliche Beweis* (*ibid.* 1846); *Monatsschrift*, 1, 509, etc.; Wunderbar, *Biblisch-talmudische Medicin*

(Riga and Leips. 1850-60); Lewysohn, *Die Zoologie des Talmuds* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vols. 3 and 4; *Ben-Chananja*, 1, 417, 460, 512; 2, 66, 167, 210, 258; 3, 539; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 297 sq.; Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, p. 466 sq.; Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des A.T. mit dem Neuen*, p. 377-384; Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, 1, 156-192; Van Gelder, *Die Volksschule des jüdischen Altherthums nach talmudischen und rabbinischen Quellen* (Berl. 1872); Marcus, *Zur Schul-Pädagogik des Talmud* (ibid. 1866).

There are numerous monographs on the subject: Held, *De Jud. Scholis* (Norimb. 1664); Heubner, *De Academiis Hebroeor.* (Vitemb. 1703); Lund, *De Scholis et Academiis Heb.* (Upsal. 1707); Reineccius, *De Scholis Hebr.* (Weissenb. 1722); Sennert, *De Scholis et Academiis Hebr.* in his *Heptas Exercit.* (Vitemb. 1657); Sgambalo, *De Acad. Jud.* (Neap. 1703); Weisner, *De Scholis et Academiis Hebr.* (Heidelb. 1782); Zorn, *De Scholis Jud.* (Sedin. 1716); and others cited by Volbeding, *Index Program.* p. 138. On the *Schools of the Prophets*: Hernig, *Von den Schulen d. Proph.* (Bresl. 1777); Winckler, *Vindicatio Scholoe Samuelis* (Hildesh. 1754); Silberrod, *De Prophetarum Filiis* (Jen. 1710). **SEE PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.**

## Schools, Parish

**SEE PARISH SCHOOLS.**

## Schools, Singing

The high estimation in which singers were held in the ancient Church appears from the institution of schools for their instruction and training, and the great attention which was paid to these schools and their presidents. Such schools were established as early as the 6th century, and became common in various parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany. The most celebrated was that founded at Rome by Gregory the Great, which was the model of many others afterwards established. From these schools originated the famous Gregorian chant, a plain system of church music, which the choir and people sang in unison. The prior or principal of these schools was a man of considerable dignity and influence in the Church. The name of this officer at Rome was *archicantor ecclesioe Romanoe*, and elsewhere *primicerius* (or prior) *scholoe cantorum*. See Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 124; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 307. **SEE SINGING.**

## Schoonmaker, Henricus

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Rochester, Ulster Co., N.Y., in 1739. He was converted early in life under the ministry of the Rev. Henricus Frelinghuysen, and studied theology with the Rev; John H. Goetschius, who became his father-in-law. Dr. Schoonmaker was one of the first ministers of the Reformed Church who were licensed by the coetus, independently of the Church in Holland. He was called immediately (1763) to the churches of Poughkeepsie and Fishkill. When the ministers arrived to ordain him, they found the church doors barred against them by the Conferentie party, and the service was conducted under the shade of a large tree in a wagon, in which upon his knees the candidate took his vows in presence of a large congregation. A ministry thus begun was not likely to be fruitless. His labors were greatly blessed, notwithstanding the opposition to which he was constantly exposed. In 1774 he removed to Acquackanonck (now Passaic), N.J., and subsequently gave a portion of his services to the neighboring church of Toteroo (now Paterson). In 1816 he resigned his charge, and died in 1820, having survived nearly all of his contemporaries. His grateful people continued his salary for life. He was the last but one of the old Dutch clergy who preached only in the language of Holland. Dr. Livingston pronounced him the most eloquent preacher in that tongue whom he had ever heard in this country. He was always popular in the pulpit, and his style was nervous, eloquent, and powerful. His life was blameless, and his ministry of over half a century was full of good fruits. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*; Kip, *Historical Discourse*. (W.J.R.T.)

## Schoonmaker, Jacob, D.D.

a son of the foregoing, was born May 11, 1777, at Acquackanonck (now Passaic), N.J. He graduated at Columbia College in 1799, and pursued his theological studies under Drs. Solomon Froeligh and John H. Livingston. He was licensed in 1801, and the next year became the pastor of the united churches of Jamaica and Newtown, L.I. This associate relation lasted until 1849, when the Newtown church became independent. He remained pastor at Jamaica one year longer, when on Aug. 6, 1850, he preached his farewell sermon, and then retired from the active ministry on account of age and infirmities. He died April 10, 1852, finishing his course with joy. Dr. Schoonmaker was a large, portly man, with a very benevolent countenance and a sweet savor of cheerful piety in his whole aspect and demeanor. He

was dignified, courteous, discreet — a faithful preacher, a devoted pastor, a sound evangelical theologian of the Calvinistic school — an active supporter of the educational institutions and benevolent agencies of the Church, and a workman who needed not to be ashamed. He was a father among his people, and, while cherishing the most profound attachment to his own Church, was truly catholic in feeling towards all who love Christ. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. 9. (W.J.R.T.)

### Schoonmaker, Martinus

a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born at Rochester, Ulster Co., N.Y., in 1737. He studied under Goetschius and Marinus, and was licensed to preach in 1765. His ministry was spent on Long Island, embracing the churches of Brooklyn, Flatbush, New Utrecht, Flatlands, Bushwick, and Gravesend. From 1765 to 1783 Harlem was also included in his extensive bishopric. All of these have long been separate and important churches. His labors were necessarily very arduous, but he bore them with untiring zeal and energy down to his old age, which was so vigorous that at fourscore his sight, hearing, and other faculties were as perfect as in former years. He was universally beloved and revered, without an enemy, and yet living in troublous times. He resided at Flatbush, while the care of all the churches of Kings County came upon him daily. During the Revolutionary war he was an ardent patriot, and it is related that on his personal word and statement he secured from the Congress in session at Harlem the release of a person who was suspected and imprisoned as a Tory. He preached only in the Holland language. His memory is held in high esteem as one of the fathers of the Church and a relic of the old race of venerable Dutch dominies. He died in 1824. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*. (W.J.R.T.)

### Schöpf, Joseph W.

a Lutheran theologian, was born at Chemnitz, April 12, 1793, and died July 15, 1831, at Dresden. He published, *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, deutsch mit Anmerkungen und Erklärungen*, etc. (Leips. 1828, 2 vols.): — *Die Widerlegung der augsburgischen Confession*, etc. (ibid. 1830): — *Der Geistliche und unsere Zeit* (Dresden, 1831). See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 2, 1173; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*. (B.P.)

## Schotanus, Christian

a Dutch savant and historian, was born at Scheng, near Franeker, Aug. 16, 1603. He entered the Church, and in 1627 was pastor in his native village. He remained there till 1629, when he removed to Cornjum, where he spent ten years. At the end of that time he became professor of Greek in the Academy of Franeker, and subsequently added ecclesiastical history to his other labors. His death, which occurred Nov. 12, 1671, was caused by extreme cold and exposure. His principal works are, *Notae ad Evangelia et Epistolas* (Leeuwarden, 1647, 12mo): — *Catechesis* (Franeker, 1653): — *Collegium Miscellaneorum Theologicorum* (ibid. 1654, 12mo): — *Beschryving van Friesland* (Leeuwarden, 1656-64, with plates and maps): — *Bibliotheca Historioe Sacrae V.T.* (Franeker, 1662-64, 2 vols. fol.): — *Hectas Disputationum Theologicarum* (ibid. 1664, 4to): — and an *Ecclesiastical and Civil History of Friesland* (down to 1558). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

## Schott, Christian Heinrich

a German doctor of philosophy, was born at Schneeberg in 1803, and died May 1, 1840, at Boritz, near Meissen, where he had been pastor since 1830. He published, *Biblische Handconcordanz* (Leips. 1827): — *Züge aus dem Leben der Christen der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (ibid. 1829): — *Das Leben unseres Herrn u. Heilandes Jesu Christi* (ibid. 1830): — *Geschichte der deutschen Bibelübersetzung Martin Luthers* (ibid. 1835). See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 2, 1174 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 764. (B.P.)

## Schott, Heinrich August

an eminent German theologian of the so called supernaturalist school, was born at Leipsic, Dec. 5, 1780, and died Dec. 29, 1835. He began his university studies at the age of sixteen, and was soon distinguished for his fine Latin style and for his progress in theology. Among his teachers at Leipsic were Beck, Platner, Cams, and Keil. In 1801 he began to give lectures, and in 1803 he became one of the university preachers. His edition of the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1804) gave him a place in the world of learning; still more so his edition of the New Testament with Latin translation (Leips. 1805). In 1809 he became professor of theology at Wittenberg, and lectured with great success on dogmatics, hermeneutics, and sacred eloquence. His *Epitome Theologiae Christianae* (1811) was an

able work, but its usefulness was diminished by its complicated style. In 1812 he went to Jena, and there spent the rest of his fruitful life. The nucleus of a preachers' seminary which he there formed was richly endowed in 1817. His lectures were delivered in Latin. His work on eloquence, *Die Theorie der Beredtsamkeit* (Leips. 1815; 2d ed. 1828), is his best title to lasting fame; but his *Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Foederis Sacros* (Jen. 1830) is abundant in erudition, and still deserves study. In character Schott was upright, simple, and deeply pious. His motto expressed his life — “proving, believing, diligent.” He was a scholar and a theologian of the noblest type. He died in 1835. See his *Life* by Danz (Leips. 1836); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 13, 698-701. (J.P.L.)

### Schott, Leopold

a German rabbi, was born at Randegg, Baden, June 27, 1807. Having finished his rabbinical studies at Hechingen and Carlsruhe, in 1829 he went to Heidelberg to attend the lectures at the university, at the same time pursuing his rabbinical studies with Salomon Fürst. In 1831, after having passed his examination, he was appointed religious instructor in his native place. In 1833 he was appointed for the rabbinate of his native city. He died Jan. 20, 1869, at Buhl, Baden. He contributed a number of essays to the *Zeitung des Judenthums* and the *Orient*, and published a number of *Sermons*. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 286; Kayserling, *Bibliothek jüd. Kanzelredner*, 2, 293 sq. (B.P.)

### Schottin, Johann D. Fr., Dr.

a German preacher, was born Jan. 4, 1789, at Heigendorf, in Weimar. He belonged to a Huguenot family, whose name was originally *Chaudien*, which the father of Johann D. Fr. changed into Schottin. Having completed his studies at Jena, he was in 1814 appointed pastor at Köstritz, in Reuss, where he remained till his end, May 16, 1866. He was an excellent pulpit orator, but the many calls which he received from Hamburg, Bremen, and Jena he refused. He is best known as one of the most recent German hymn writers. Besides, he published a number of devotional works. See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 3, 1176; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1866, p. 309; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7, 75. (B.P.)

## Schrader, Clemens

a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1820 at Itzum, in Hanover. He studied philosophy and theology at the *Collegium Germanicum* in Rome. In 1843 he was made doctor of philosophy, in 1846 he received holy orders, and in 1848 he was made doctor of theology. In 1850 he was appointed professor of dogmatics in Louvain; in 1851 he was called to Rome as professor of introduction to the New Test., where he afterwards also lectured on dogmatics; and in 1857 he was called to the Vienna University. This office he was obliged to resign, as he would not subscribe in 1868 to the new laws of the state. Since then he lived mostly in France, and died at Poitiers Feb. 23, 1875. He wrote *Theses Theologice* and *De Unitate Ecclesie*. In popular writings he explained the Syllabus, etc. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1875, p. 158. (B.P.)

## Schrader, Johann Heinrich Ludolf

a Reformed minister of Germany, was born July 12, 1800, at Gifhorn, in Luneburg, and died at Frankfort-on-the-Main Jan. 11, 1875, where he had been pastor since 1830. He published a number of *Sermons*. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1177 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, p.765; *Theologisches Jahrbuch*, 1876, p. 365. (B.P.)

## Schramm, Johann Conrad

doctor and professor of theology at Helmstädt, where he died Feb. 25, 1739, is the author of, *De Usu et Abusu Originum Linguae Sanctoe* (Helmstädt, 1707): — *Programma, quo Proeliminaria Disputationum cum Judoeis Traduntur* (ibid. 1718): — *Disputatio de Mysteriis Veterum Judaeorum Philosophicis* (ibid. 1708): — *Prolusio de Poesi Hebraeorum in Codice Sacro* (ibid. 1723): — *Introductio in Dialecticam Cabbaleorum*, etc. (Brunswick, 1703): — *Disputatio de Symboli Apostolici in Talmude Ruderibus* (Helmstadt, 1706): — *Program. de Lectione, Proecipuo Ling. Hebr. Adjumento* (ibid. 1708). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 287; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 128; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 765; supplement, p. 300. (B.P.)

## Schramm, Johann Heinrich

doctor and professor of theology, was born March 20, 1676, at Gerkhausen. In 1701 he was appointed professor of elocution, history, and



Greek at Herborn; in 1707 he was made member of consistory and preacher at Dillenburg; in 1709 he was appointed professor of theology at Herborn; in 1721 he was called to Marburg, and in 1723 to Herborn, where he died, Jan. 20, 1753. He wrote, *Dissertatio Inaug. de Manipulo Hordeaceo, cujus Oblatione Messum suam Auspicabantur Judoei ejusque Mysterio* (Frankf. a. O. 1706): — *Dissertatio de Holocaustis Judaeorum et Gentilium Κακοζηλία* (Herborn): — *Dissertatio de Mysterio Holocaustorum* (*ibid.*): — *Dissertatio de Bestia Arundineti ad Psalm 48, 31* (*ibid.* 1713): — *Dissertatio de Vigilibus Veterum* (*ibid.*); etc. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 287 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, p. 765. (B.P.)

### Schreck, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Osnabruck, Lower Prussia, about 1816. Emigrating to this country, he united with the Church, and was received into the Indiana Conference. He was afterwards a member of the Southwest German Conference. He labored as an itinerant minister for thirty-two years, and died on Herman Circuit, Ill., March 30, 1874. He was a pious, liberal, energetic man, serving the Church with holy consecration. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1874, p. 88.

### Schreiber, Heinrich

a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born July 14, 1793, at Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he also completed his studies. In 1816 he received holy orders, in 1822 he was made president of the gymnasium, and in 1826 he was appointed professor of moral theology at the university there. In 1831-34 he published his *Manual of Moral Theology* (2 vols.), in which he protested a life-long vow and celibacy. The archbishop was ordered to make him promise to keep such views in future to himself, but against such a promise Schreiber publicly protested. He was obliged to resign his theological chair, but was given a chair in the philosophical faculty, until, in 1845, he had to resign this position also on account of his joining the German Catholic movement, and died Nov. 20, 1873. His most important work is his *Ausführliche Geschichte der Stadt und Universität Freiburg* (1857-60, 7 vols.). He also wrote *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Freiburg, 1863-66, 3 vols.); etc. See *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 17; Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*, 1, 286, 484; 2, 765; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theol.* 3, 1179. (B.P.)

## Schröckh, Johann Matthias

a Protestant theologian of Germany of eminent culture and extended usefulness in the department of historical learning, was born at Vienna July 26, 1733, and was early destined for the pulpit. His education was obtained chiefly at the Lutheran Gymnasium of Presburg, the Steinmetz School at Klosterbergen, near Magdeburg, and the University of Göttingen. Mosheim and J. D. Michaelis were then in the faculty of the latter institution, and their influence over Schröckh was such that his attention became predominantly fixed on history and the Oriental languages, and he was led to form habits of independent research, and to cultivate an attractive historical style qualities which adhered to him through life. After his graduation, he was associated with an uncle, Prof. Karl A. Bell, of Leipsic, in editing several learned periodicals; but he also found time to perfect his knowledge of Greek and Roman antiquities under the tuition of professors Christ and Ernesti. In 1756 he received the master's degree, and became a tutor in the university, and subsequently custodian of the library, and in 1761 he was made professor extraordinary. The uncertainty of further preferment in the University of Leipsic, and the unsatisfactory income which he derived from literary labors, now decided him to accept a call to the chair of poetry in the University of Wittenberg, which he held until 1775, when he was transferred to the chair of history, in the duties of which station he spent the remainder of his life. He projected a three years' course, in which he was accustomed to traverse not only the history of literature, the Church, the Reformation, theology, and Christian antiquities, but also that of European states, Germany and Saxony in particular, and also of diplomacy; and, in addition to these labors, he issued numerous reviews, editions of works written by his friends, and independent works of more or less importance. His fidelity to his work was acknowledged by the government at Dresden, who transmitted to him a testimonial in writing and an honorary donation, together with the offer of a titular patent as councilor of state, which latter he declined. He was married to Frederica Pitzschig, by whom he had four children, all of whom died in early childhood; and he died Aug. 2, 1808. in consequence of a fall experienced in his library, on the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth.

As a writer of history, Schröckh was thoroughly qualified by his learning, impartial love of truth and devotion to morality, untiring industry in the work of collection and research, and the clearness, simplicity, and logic of his style. He was deficient in the critical apprehension and philosophical

penetration needed to discover the internal connection of events; and his style, as a whole, lacks the picturesque coloring and pregnancy of meaning which characterize a classical writer. He was not a master in the art of descriptive writing, but, nevertheless, a meritorious and successful author. His works were numerous, but have been superseded by more complete and thorough books of later origin. They include biographies of learned men, and of other persons eminent in the history of the world; textbooks and manuals of history, and other similar works, none of which possess permanent value. The *Historia Religionis et Ecclesioe Christianoe in Usum Lectionum*, published in a seventh edition by Marheinecke in 1828, is noticeable chiefly because of its wealth of material, its judicious references to sources and helps, the systematic arrangement of its contents, and its excellent Latin. The great work of his life, beyond question, is the *Ausführliche Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, in 45 vols., the last two of which were completed by Prof. Tzschirner after the author's death. The work covers eighteen centuries of the Christian Church, and is characterized by impartiality and completeness to a remarkable degree. No work has yet appeared which combines so great magnitude with so many advantages as does that of Schröckh, though the earlier volumes, being intended simply to furnish a comprehensive course of reading in Church history, leave much to be desired on the part of cultured readers.

See an article by Schröckh in R.G. Bayer's *Allgem. Magazin für Prediger*, etc., vol. 5, No. 2, p. 209-222; Politz, *J.M. Schröckh's Nekrolog* (Wittenberg, 1808); and notices respecting the life of Schröckh contributed to the *Allgens. Zeitung*, 1808, Nos. 247 and 248, p. 985-989. A faithful and instructive delineation is given by his friend K.L. Nitzsch in *J.M. Schröckh's Studienweise u. Maximen* (Weimar, 1809). H.G. Tzschirner's *J.M. Schröckh's Leben, Karakter, u. Schriften* was prefixed to pt. 10 of Schröckh's *Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation*, and has also been published separately since 1812, with portrait. A complete list of Schröckh's works is given in Mensel's *Gelehrtes Deutschland*, 8, 314 sq.; 10, 627, and 15, 381. See also Wähler, *Gesch. d. hist. Forschung u. Kunst*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 813 sq.; Stäudlin, *Gesch. u. Lit. d. Kirchengesch.* (Hanover, 1827); Baur, *Epochen d. christl. Kirchengesch.-Schreibung* (Tüb. 1852).

### Schröder, Friedrich Wilhelm Julius

a Reformed theologian of Germany, who died Feb. 27, 1876, at Elberfeld, where he had succeeded the celebrated Krummacher as pastor of the First Reformed Church, is the author of a *Commentary on Genesis* (Berlin, 1844): *Vesperklänge* (ibid. 1846, 2 vols.): — a *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (prepared for Lange's *Bible-work* [Elberfeld, 1866]): — a *Commentary on Ezekiel* (also prepared for Lange's work). Besides, he published a number of *Essays, Sermons, etc.* See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1182 sq.; *Theol. Jahrbuch*, 1877, p. 228. (B.P.)


### Schröder, Johann Heinrich

a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born in 1666 at Hallerspringe, in the principality of Calenberg, in Hanover. He was a pupil of the celebrated philanthropist A. H. Francke, and studied under him at Leipsic. In 1696 he became pastor at Merseburg, near Magdeburg. He wrote a few hymns which are still in use in the German Church, and died June 30, 1699. Of his hymns we mention, *Eins ist Noth, ach Herr dies Eine* (transl. by E. Cox, "One thing needful, then, Lord Jesus," in *Hymns from the German*, p. 216): — *Jesu, hilf siegen, du Fürst des Lebens* (transl. by Mills, "Jesus, help conquer! thou Prince everliving," in *Horoe Germanicoe*, p. 126). See Harnisch, in *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1857, No. 89; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, 4, 381 sq.; 8, 426 sq.; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1344. (B.P.)

### Schröder, Nicolaus Wilhelm

professor of Oriental languages and antiquities at Groningen, was born at Marburg, Aug. 22, 1721, and died May 30, 1798. He is known as the author of *Comment. Philologicocriticus de Vestitu Mulierum Ebroearum ad Jes. iii. 10-24* (Leyden, 1745). He also published a number of treatises bearing on Oriental languages and certain sections of the Bible, as *De Confusione Sermonis Babelica*: — *De Voto Jephthoe*: — *De Tabernaculo. Molochi et Stella Dei Remphan*, etc. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 291; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, p. 128; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*. (B.P.)

## Schubart, Christian Friedrich Daniel

a Lutheran divine of Germany, was born at Obersonthem, in the county of Limburg, March 26, 1736, and died as court and theater poet at Stuttgart, Oct. 10, 1791. He is the author of the beautiful hymn *Alles ist euer! O Worte des ewigen Lebens* (transl. into English in *Hymns from the Land of Luther*, p. 61, "All things are yours, O sweet message of mercy divine"), and of *Kommt heut' an eurem Stab* (based on  Luke 2:22-32, which Mills translated in his *Horae Germanicæ*, p. 275, "Ye who with years are sinking"). See Schubart, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1839-40), vol. 1-8; Strauss, *Schubarts Leben in seinen Briefen* (Berlin, 1849, 2 vols.); Koch, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, 6, 376 sq.; Knapp, *Evangel. Liederschatz*, p. 1344. (B.P.)

## Schubert, Gottlieb Heinrich Von

a German philosopher and mystic, who for more than half a century exerted a very extended and beneficent popular influence in almost every field of thought, was born in Saxony, April 26, 1780. His parents were pious and peculiar. In his fifth year he learned from his mother such a lesson on the death of Christ as remained a benediction to him to his latest hour. He studied at Greiz and Weimar, and at the latter place was taken into the house of Herder. He also came into contact with Goethe and Jean Paul. In 1799 he began to study theology at Leipsic, but in 1801 he changed theology for medicine, and went to Jena. Here he came under the personal and scientific influence of Schelling — an influence that lasted during life — as also under that of the naturalist William Ritter. In 1803 he married, and began the practice of medicine at Altenburg, supplementing his scanty fees by private lessons and other makeshifts. Here he wrote a romance, *Die Kirche und die Götter*. In 1805 he removed to Freiburg, where he began his great work *Ahndungen einer allgemeinen Geschichte des Lebens*, in which he endeavored to reduce to uniform laws the whole field of nature and humanity. Schelling applauded, but many shook their heads in doubt. In 1807 he went to Dresden and gave some public lectures, from which arose his strange and able work *Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft*. In 1809, by the help of Schelling, he was made rector of a scientific school at Nuremberg. Here he wrote his *Symbolik des Traumes*, also *Altes und Neues aus dem Gebiet der inneren Seelenkunde* (1815). This last work made a great sensation, and occasioned congratulations from Harms and Neander. Works in the same warmly

religious vein are, *Erzählungen* (4 vols.): — *Biographien und Erzählungen* (3 vols.): — and *Der Erwerb* (an autobiography, 3 vols.). His last work was *Erinnerungen an die Herzogin Helene von Orleans*. Schubert left Nuremberg in 1816; in 1819 he became professor at Erlangen; in 1827 he went to the new University of Munich. His latter years were passed in peace and affluence. He died July 1, 1860. See *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1860, No. 62; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* (J.P.L.)

### Schuderoff, Johann Georg Jonathan

a German Protestant minister, was born in 1766 at Gotha. In 1790 he was appointed minister at Drakendorf, near Jena; in 1797 subdeacon at Altenburg; in 1805 archdeacon; in 1806 first pastor and superintendent at Ronneburg, and in 1824 member of consistory. In 1836 he retired from the ministry, and died in 1843. He wrote: *Ueber allgemeine Union der christl. Bekenntnisse* (Neustadt, 1829): — *Symboloklasmus oder Symbolatrie?* (ibid. 1831): — *Ueber Consistorialverfassung in der deutsch-protestantischen Kirche* (ibid. 1831): — *Glaube u. Vernunft in ihren Verzweigungen* (ibid. 1843), etc. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1188; *Regensburger Real-Encyklop.* s.v. (B.P.)

### Schudt, Johann Jakob

a German Jewish writer, was born Jan. 14, 1664, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he also died, Feb. 14, 1722, as the rector of the gymnasium. Schudt is well known as the author of the *Memorabilia Judaica*, or *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten* (Frankf. 1714-17, 4 pts.). This may be regarded as the most important of his works, which are enumerated by Fürst in his *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 292 sq. See also Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, s.v.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur.* (B.P.)

### Schultens, Albert

an eminent Dutch Orientalist, the father of modern Hebrew grammar, was born at Groningen, 1686, and early destined to a theological career. He studied the original languages of the Bible — Chaldee, Syriac, and Rabbinic — and after a time Arabic. The earliest fruit of these studies was a public disputation with Gussetius, at the age of eighteen, in which he maintained that the study of Arabic is indispensably necessary to a knowledge of Hebrew. After completing his studies, he visited Leyden and Utrecht, and became acquainted with Reland, through whom he published

his first book, *Animadv. Philolog. in Jobum* (Utrecht, 1708, 8vo). Having returned to his home, he became candidate in theology, and in the following year (July 4, 1709) received the degree of doctor in that science. He then returned to Leyden to make use of its library. In 1711 he assumed the pastorate of the Church at Wassenaer, but exchanged that post after two years for the chair of Oriental languages in the Academy of Franeker. In 1729 he was placed in charge of the Leyden Theological Seminary and made custodian of the Warner MSS. He served three years, doing the work of a professor without enjoying the title or receiving any remuneration, after which period a chair of Arabic was specially created for him, with which the additional professorship of Hebrew antiquities was connected in 1740. He held these positions without interruption to the time of his death, Jan. 26, 1750.

The services which Schultens rendered to philological science are of great value. He was the first to overturn the notion that Hebrew is the original language given to man by God, by showing that that tongue is simply a branch of the Shemitic family, and finds an essential and indispensable aid in the comparison of the Arabic. Besides defending this position in his early disputation with Gussetius, he enforced its claims in the work *Origines Hebroeoe*. This opened a new path to Hebrew grammar and Biblical exegesis, and also contributed materially to the advancement of the study of Oriental languages and the attainment of its subsequent independent position. Numerous pupils helped to spread the knowledge of his views and methods, and founded the Dutch school of grammar and exegesis. The faults of Schultens are too great readiness in the tracing of analogies and the forming of combinations, and a lack of thorough criticism in the application of the Arabic.

Of the writings of Schultens, aside from the purely Arabic — such as editions of the *Rudimenta* (1733) and the *Grammatica* (1748) of Erpenius: — *Vita Saladini* (Lugd. Bat. 1733, fol.): — *Monum. Vetustiora Arab.* (Leyd. 1740, 4to): — *Historia Joctinidarum* (Harderov. 1786, 4to) — we mention those which have reference to Hebrew grammar and Biblical literature: *Origines Hebroeoe*, etc. (Franeker, 1734-38, 2 vols. 4to), and a preliminary work, *De Defectibus Hodiernoe Linguae Hebr.* (ibid. 1731, 4to; new ed. of both works, Leyd. 1761, 2 vols. 4to): — *Institutiones ad Fundam. Linguae Hebr.*, etc. (Leyd. 1737, 1756, 4to): — *Vetus et Regia Via Hebraizandi*, etc. (Lugd. 1738), a rejoinder to his opponents, which he carries further in *Excursus Primus ad Caput Primum Vice Veteris et*

*Requie Hebraizandi*, etc., and *Excursus Secundus* and *Tertius* (Leyd. 1739, 4to): — *Institutiones Aramoeae* (Lugd. Bat. 1745-49), a work containing a Chaldee and Syriac grammar, without preface or other guide to inquiry, and probably interrupted by the author's death, as it is broken off in the middle. Of his exegetical works the chief are, *Liber Jobi, Nova Versione ad Hebr. Fontem et Comment.*, etc. (Lugd. Bat. 1737, 2 vols. 4to): — *Proverbia Salomonis*, etc. (ibid. 1748, 4to), an abridgment of which was published by G.J.L. Vogel (Halle, 1769, 8vo). Ten separately printed dissertations and addresses were published by his son in *Opera Minora*, etc. (Lugd. 1769, 4to), and also a number of dissertations read before him by his pupils, in *Sylloge Diss. Philolog.-exeget.* (Leidas et Leovard. pars 1, 1772; pars 2, 1775, 4to). Schultens left also several commentaries and a Hebrew lexicon in MS. See Vriemoet, *Elogium Schultensii*, in *Athenae Frisiacae*, p. 762-771; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

### Schultens, Heinrich Albert

an Orientalist, the son of Johann Jacob, and grandson of Albert Schultens (q.v.), was born at Herborn, Central Germany, Feb. 15, 1749. He began the study of Greek and Latin, under the direction of the most celebrated instructors of Leyden, at the age of seven years, and followed it with that of Oriental languages and antiquities. He also became acquainted with the English, French, and German among modern tongues. In 1772 he visited England to make use of the Bodleian Library; and on his return, though not yet twenty-four years of age, was made professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Amsterdam, and in 1782 he was inducted into the chair previously occupied by his father and grandfather. His literary labors were expended chiefly on Arabic authors, and the continued effort required to prepare the *Proverbs of Meidani* undermined his health. He died of a slow fever, Aug. 12, 1793. Everard Scheid, his friend and successor, delivered his eulogium. For his life, comp. *Series Continuata Histor. Batav.* per Wagenaer, pars 1, p. 364-380; also the unimportant sketch by Rink, *H.A. Schultens*, etc. (Riga, 1794, 8vo).

### Schultens, Johann Jacob

a theologian and Orientalist, the son of Albert Schultens (q.v.), was born at Franeker, in the Netherlands, in 1716, educated under the eye of his father, and appointed professor of theology and Oriental languages in the Academy of Herborn in 1742. He held that post during seven years, was



then transferred to the Academy of Leyden, and five months afterwards became the successor of his father in the theological seminary. He died in 1778. The only writings published by him were his inaugurals, *Dissert. de Utilitate Dialect. ad tuendam Integritatem Codicis Hebr.* (Leyd. 1742) (also in the *Sylog. Dissertat.* p. 231-439; see lit. art. "Albert Schultenus"): — *De Fruct. in Theol. Reduntantibus ex Peritioribus Linguarum Orient. Cognitione* (ibid. 1749): — *Dissert. Theol. Inaug. ad Locum Apostoli Philipp. cap. 2, 5, 5-11* (*Sylog. Dissertat.* p. 443-518), and some new editions of single works written by his father.

### Schultetus

*SEE SCULTETUS.*