

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Sects, Jewish - Seven Sacraments

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

Sects, Jewish (Ancient)

These were of two kinds, arising from the fact that the differences of opinion, sentiment, and conduct were sometimes of a theosophical and sometimes of a practical character; but, among the ancient Jews, so close was the connection of Church and State that all theological or philosophical views necessarily affected the civil and social relations.

I. Religious. —

1. The Pharisees. — These were the orthodox party, and our Lord testifies to the general correctness of their creed (^{421B}Matthew 22:3). It was chiefly in liturgical and ceremonial particulars that their excessive regard for traditional observances was betrayed. In this regard the Rabbinical Jews of modern times are their acknowledged successors. *SEE RABBINISM*. In external deportment they were scrupulously exact; but, their motive being a love of popularity and a pride of self righteousness, they were sternly rebuked by our Lord as arch hypocrites and ecclesiastical tyrants. *SEE PHARISEE*.

2. The Sadducees. — These were next in importance, and of even more aristocratic influence, but they were the rationalists of their day (^{427B}Acts 23:8). They are represented by inimical writers as the originals of the modern *Karaites* (q.v.). *SEE SADDUCEE*.

3. The Essenes. — These were rather a class of ascetics or Jewish hermits, who are not mentioned in the New Test., and are chiefly known from the description of Josephus, who at one time belonged to their fraternity. *SEE ESSENES*.

II. Political. —

1. The Zealots. — These are mentioned in the New Test. and by Josephus as the violent party who contended for *native* rights and independence from all foreign influence. They had their type in the *Chasidim* of earlier and later times. *SEE ASSIDAEAN*. They largely contributed to the final collision of the Jews with the Romans. *SEE ZELOTES*.

2. The Herodians. — These appear, from the slight notices of them (^{426B}Matthew 2:16, etc.), to have been the *temporizing* party, who favored Graeco-Roman innovations. They had their originals in the apostates under Antiochus Epiphanes (^{271B}Daniel 11:35). *SEE HERODIAN*.

On the subject generally, see, in addition to the works cited under the articles on each of the above, Serarii, Drusii et Scaligeri *Opusc. de Trib. Judaeorum Sectis* (Delph. 1703); separately, Drusius, *De Hassidoeis* (Franek. 1603); *De Sectis Judaicis* (Arnh. 1619); Serarius, *De Tribus Sectis*, etc. (Franek. 1603; Mainz, 1604); Scaliger, *De Tribus Jud. Hoeresibus* (Franek. 1605; Arnh. 1619); Lund, *De Sectis Judaeorum* (Upsal. 1700); Geiger, *Sadducäer und Pharisaer* (Bresl. 1863); *Die Ebioniter des Alten Testaments*, in the *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wiss. des Judenthums*, Jan. 1869; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. 128.

Sects, Jewish (Modern)

In the 17th century existed the sect of the Sabbathaites, so called after Sabbathai-Zebi (q.v.), whose apostasy to Islamism, and death in 1676, did not diminish the number of his followers, but rather increased it; and as there is no calculating the obstinacy of human credulity, his followers gave out that he had been transported to heaven, like Enoch and Elijah. Notwithstanding the constant and active opposition of the Jewish priesthood, the sect spread in all quarters, and numbered among its members men like Mose Chayim Luzzatto (q.v.). "Sabbathism," says Milman, "still exists as a sect of Judaism, though, probably, among most of its believers, rather supported by that corporate spirit which holds the followers of a political or religious faction together than by any distinct and definite articles of belief."

But, in the middle of the last century, an extraordinary adventurer named Jacob Frank (q.v.) organized a sect out of the wrecks of the Sabbathaitic party, of which we will speak now, although in the order of time an earlier sect, that of the Chasidim, ought to be mentioned. The sect which Frank organized assumed the name of *Soharites* or *Cabalists*, also of *Frankists*. As to the creed of this sect, it leaned towards Christianity rather than Islamism. It rejected the Talmud, but insisted on a hidden sense in the Scriptures. It admitted the Trinity and the incarnation of the Deity, but preserved an artful ambiguity as to the person in whom the Deity was incarnate, whether Jesus Christ or Sabbathai-Zebi. With the death of Frank the whole movement seems to have abated. Of greater significance is the sect of the *Hassidim*, or *Chasidim* (q.v.), or New Saints, or Pietists. The founder of this sect was Rabbi Israel ben-Eliezer Baal-Shem, also called *Besht*, f8ç8[b, from the initials of byf µç I [b As the tenets of these.

Saints, who still exist. in Poland, Galicia, etc., are given in the article CHASIDIM, we can only refer to it. (B.P.)

Secular Clergy

Parish priests and all who were charged with the cure of souls were named *clerici seculares*, so called as living according to the manners of the time (*seculum*). They were so called in contradistinction to *regular* clergy (q.v.), who belonged to the monastic orders or religious congregations.

Secular Court, Delivering Up To The

a punishment peculiar to delinquent clergymen. The ancient law comprises it under the name of *curioe tradi*, and gave to it a different meaning from that which modern use and practice has put upon it. Among the modern canonists it signifies delivering a clergyman up to the secular judge after degradation, to be punished for some great crime with death, or such capital punishment as the Church had no power to inflict. In the old law the *curia* has a larger sense, not only to denote the judge's court, but the corporation of any city. In this there were some servile offices; and when a clergyman was degraded for any offense and reduced to the quality of layman, he was obliged to serve the *curia*, or secular corporation of the city, and that, many times, only in some mean office and servile condition. This was looked upon as being a slave to an earthly power, and precluded him from ever regaining his clerical dignity again, for no *curiale* was allowed to enter the ecclesiastical state. Besides this, there was another way of delivering over delinquent clergymen to the secular courts, which was when they had committed crimes such as were properly of civil cognizance; for clergymen were considered in a double capacity — as ministers of the Church and as members of the commonwealth. See Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Church*, p. 1033.

Secular Power

SEE SECULAR COURT.

Secular Sermons

in Roman Catholic terminology, are discourses preached at the centennial jubilee of any religious or benevolent institution, association, etc. Their purpose is to review the history and work of the agency in question, or to rehearse the displays of divine grace manifested in and through its life. The

scope of such sermons will consequently be determined in each case by the character of the solemnities of which they form a part. An appropriate treatment of the theme selected will include the presentation of noteworthy features belonging to the subject, or the discussion of some religious topic which may be deduced from or illustrated by the occasion in which the celebration takes its rise, followed by direct application of the theme, and concluding with a prayer or doxology or a suitable exhortation. The style and mode of delivery should be solemn. When the celebration is on account of a nonreligious subject, the nature of religious discourse requires that it be discussed in its religious or moral bearings.

Secularism

an atheistical movement which prevailed in England during the sixth decade of the present century to an extent that gained it many followers and excited much attention. Its leading apostle was George J. Holyoake, a friend to Robert Owen and his socialistic views. Holyoake and several like minded associates founded a journal named *The Reasoner*, in 1846, which speedily became the recognized organ of the modern school of English freethinkers. Its governing principle was atheism, though Holyoake and his friends preferred to designate the tendency they represented as *non-theism*, inasmuch as they simply refrained from inquiring whether a Deity exist or not. The term *Secularism* was subsequently applied to the entire movement, whose professed aim was proclaimed to be “to live and die for, the world, and to work for the welfare of men in this world.” The ethics of the party — was comprehended in the phrase “present human improvement by present human means,” its law had regard simply to the natural, utilitarian, and artistic aspects of life; its object was merely scientific culture and a suitable provision for the things of this life. The leading, and, indeed, the only principle of the morality of this movement is utility and the movement itself may be characterized as a thoroughly consistent utilitarianism, and also as an “atheistical ethics built upon the ruins of religion,” since no supernatural element is permitted to exercise any influence whatever over the actions of these worldly moralists.

The dogmatics of Secularism, if the term may be applied to a systematic negation of all positive doctrines, is analogous to its ethics in character. It denies that any competent knowledge concerning the existence of God is possessed by the world: matter, though self existent and eternal, is not God, since it lacks the constituent factors of personality — self

consciousness and freewill. *Experience* teaches that there is no Providence, no Father in heaven. The teleological argument for God's existence is valueless, yielding only a "confused reflection of man's own image:" on the one hand, it leads only to uncertain analogies; on the other, it proves too much, as it becomes necessary, after postulating a most wise Creator of the most wisely arranged creation, to assume a still wiser originator, and so on without end. In this line of argument Holyoake connects himself with the atheistical poet Shelley and the naturalist Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, and directs his criticism chiefly against Paley's *Natural Theology*. The secularists assert that nothing is known respecting the world beyond the grave, and that we are therefore not to concern ourselves about its conditions; our moral efforts should be wholly expended upon the present world. "If other worlds exist to which we are removed after this life is over, precisely they who have made it their one business to promote the common welfare of mankind in this world will be best able to enjoy them; if there be no hereafter, men evidently stand in their own light if they omit to enjoy *this* world." (Comp. Holyoake, *The Logic of Death* [Lond. 1849]).

It is to be remarked that the relation between Secularism and the Positivism of Comte (q.v.) is such as to warrant the statement that Secularism is merely the French Positivism translated into English.

See *Positivismus u. Secularismus*, etc., in *Neue Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1863, Nos. 19 and 20; Buchanan, *Faith in God and Modern Atheism Compared* (Lond. 1857, 2 vols.; *The Theory of Secularism* in 2, 223-291, also published separately); *Christian Examiner* for Nov. 1859. **SEE SECULARISTS.**

Secularists

the name assumed by a sect of modern unbelievers to express their fundamental tenet that the duties and interests connected with the world which we see around us are those with which alone we have any concern. The Secularists are atheists, so far as they consider the existence of a personal God an open question, for belief in which no sufficient proofs are adduced. They are pantheists, so far as they consider nature to be the only God whose existence can be at all demonstrated. Another essential article of their creed is that "science is the providence of men, and that absolute spiritual dependence may involve material destruction." Science they define to be "those methodized agencies which are at our command; that systematized knowledge which enables us to use the powers of nature for

human benefit.” The doctrine, then, of the Secularists is that if men properly use the powers of nature which are within their reach, they have no need to resort to prayer, with the view of seeking assistance from heaven. On the subject of morality they maintain that “there exist, independently of Scripture authority, guarantees of morals in human nature, intelligence, and utility.” The facts and doctrines ‘of Christianity are, of course, denied by them. Although the Secularists profess to be independent thinkers, their principles are in reality nothing more or less than the echo of rationalism and positivism among the less educated classes of thoughtful men. See Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Secularization

of persons belonging to religious orders in the Roman Catholic Church, is a term which denotes the severing of the vows which bind to poverty and monastic obedience. Permission to this end can proceed only from the papal chair, and is but rarely granted. The persons affected thereby are clergymen in the higher orders of the ministry, who are thus transferred to the secular clergy, and permitted to live outside of their monasteries (*clerici seculares*); and nuns, and the lay brothers and sisters of suppressed convents, who have taken the vows of their orders upon them, and are by this act restored to the world, though *salvo voto castitatis*. Secularization differs from *laicizing*, or entire dissolution of the rule imposed by the order, in that the latter absolves from the vow of chastity and makes marriage valid.

Seculars

In the early Christian Church there existed a distinction between the clergy and laity, the latter being called not only laymen, but also βιωτικοί, “seculars” (Chrysostom, *Homr.* 3, in *Laz.*; *Hom.* 23 in *Romans*; *Hom.* 35 in *1 Corinthians* 14; Theodoret, *Com. in* ~~6416~~ *1 Corinthians* 14:16). See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 191.

Secundians

a Gnostic sect of the 2d century, owing for their leader Secundus, “who was born,” says Hippolytus, “about the same time as Ptolemaeus,” and thus was contemporary with the immediate followers of Valentinus. Irenaeus represents the Secundians as a branch of the Valentinian school (*Hoeres.* 1,

11, 2); but, although they emanated from that school (Hippolytus, *Refut.* 6, 32, 33), they introduced a principle so distinct as to render Secundus more properly a rival than the disciple of Valentinus. Secundus placed at the head of his AEons, whom he appears to have considered as real substances or persons, two principles, Light and Darkness. “He divides the Ogdoad into a pair of Tetrads, a right hand and a left Tetrad, one Light and the other Darkness” (Tertullian *Adv. Valent.* 38). This admission of the principle of dualism constitutes an essential difference between the Secundians and the Valentinians. It is evidently borrowed from the Oriental philosophy, and brings the Secundians so far nearer the Manichaeans. Accordingly, Dorner classes as adherents of the dualism whose character was predominantly physical, the Ophites, Saturnilus, Secundus, and subsequently the Manichaeans; as adherents of pantheistic Monism; Valentinus and his widespread school, especially Heracleon his contemporary, Ptolemaeus, and Marcus (*Person of Christ*, 1, append. p. 448). There is also mentioned as a distinction between the Valentinians and Secundus that the latter did not derive the power Acharnoth from any one of the thirty AEons, but from the fruits which issued out of their substance (Tertullian, *ut sup.*). He invented first four more AEons, and then four in addition (Pseudo-Tertullian, 13). The Secundians were Docetae. Augustine (*Hoeres.* 12) and Auctor Praedestinati (12) charge them with gross immorality. The latter adds that they were condemned by Diodorus, bishop of Crete.

Secundinus

the name of two persons in the early Christian Church.

1. A Manichaean of Africa, who wrote against Augustine because of his departure from that heresy. Augustine replied to him, under date of about A.D. 405, in the tract *Contra Secundinum Manichoeum*, lib. 1, showing why he had embraced orthodox views, and confuting the Manichaeans from the letter of his opponent (Migne, *Patrologie*, 43, *Op. August.* p. 578).

2. A son of the Lombard Restitutus and Dareca, a sister of St. Patrick. He lived in Ireland from A.D. 439, and died at the age of seventy-five, in 459. Secundinus was bishop of Domnach, and composed an ode on St. Patrick during the life of the latter, which was long on the lips of the Irish. It is given in Migne (*Patrologie*, 53, 838). Immediately after having composed

the above, ode, he died, thus verifying a prediction of St. Patrick. He was buried at Domnach (*Acta Sanctorum*, March 17, p. 523 sq., in the life of St. Patrick.

Secundus

(the Lat. word Graecized, **Σεκοῦνδος**), a Christian of Thessalonica, and one of the party who went with the apostle Paul from Corinth as far as Asia (**ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας**), probably to Troas or Miletus (all of them so far, some farther), on his return to Jerusalem from his third missionary tour (^{<400>}Acts 20:4). A.D. 55.

Secundus

(heretic). *SEE SECUNDIANS.*

Securitas

in Roman mythology, was a personification of *security*, represented on coins as a quietly gazing matron, with the nether limbs crossed, the left elbow braced against a column, and the right hand placed over the head. She is furnished with a spear, a cornucopia, and an olive or palm branch.

Sedeci'as

(**Σεδεκίας**), the Graecized form of the Hebrew name Zedekiah (q.v.), applied in the Apocrypha to two men 1. A person mentioned (Bar. 1, 1) as the father of Maaseiah, himself the grandfather of Baruch, and apparently identical with the false prophet Zedekiah in ^{<200>}Jeremiah 29:21, 22; 2. The "son of Josiah, king of Judah" (Bar. 1, 8), the Zedekiah under whom Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians.

Seder ha-Doroth

SEE HEILPRIN, JECHIEL.

Seder Kodashim

SEE MISHNA.

Seder Moëd

SEE MISHNA.

Seder Nashim

SEE MISHNA.

Seder Nezikin

SEE MISHNA.

Seder Olam

($\mu\lambda$ / \lceil rds), or *the Succession of the World's History*, is an ancient Jewish chronicle, written by R. Jose ben-Chalafta, of Sepphoris, who flourished about A.D. 100-150. In thirty chapters it professes to give the history of Israel up to the time of the author, or rather to the termination of the last Jewish war under Bar-cocheba. At the close of the work there are some omissions, which, in part, are compensated by another historical work which bears the same title, but, in contradistinction to the *Seder Olam*, or the *Seder Olam Rabba* (abr $\mu\lambda$ w \lceil rds)=*the Major Chronicle*, it is designated the *Seder Olam Zutta* (afwz $\mu\lambda$ w \lceil rds)=*the Minor Chronicle*. The best edition of the *Seder Olam* is that by Meyer (Amsterdam, 1699), which appeared together with the *Seder Olam Zutta*, a Latin translation, and very elaborate annotations; See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2, 107 sq.; Zunz, *Gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, p. 85, 138; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*. 4:536 sq.; Edersheim, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, p. 263 sq.; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 32. (B.P.)

Seder Tohoroth

SEE MISHNA.

Seder Zeraim

SEE MISHNA.

Sedes

(Lat. *a seat*), a term used by the Latin ecclesiastical writers to denote a bishop's throne, which, with the thrones of his presbyters on each side of it, were arranged in a semicircle above the altar. Some suppose this to have been so arranged in imitation of the Jewish synagogues, in which, according to Maimonides, at the upper end the law was placed in the wall in an arch, and on each side the elders were seated in a semicircle. The

bishop's seat was usually covered with some decent material, suitable to the dignity of his office and person. See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, 1, 299.

Sedes Apostolica

SEE APOSTOLICAL.

Sedes Impedita

(*a hindered see*). An expression by which the canons designate the state of the papal or an episcopal office when its functions are seriously hindered or altogether interrupted by the force of difficulties from without.

1. The interruption of episcopal functions (*sedes episcopalis impedita*) may be occasioned (1) when outward foes (pagans or heretics) have seized the occupant of the chair and hold him prisoner. In this case the chapter administers the diocese, either directly or through a vicar, until the will of the pope can be ascertained (*Sext. c. 3; De Suppl. Negl. Proel.* 1, 8). (2) When a bishop is removed from his diocese and imprisoned by the government of his own country. The chapter must then immediately report the circumstance to the papal chair, and until the case is decided the administration will rest in the hands of the vicar-general on the spot (comp. Phillips and Görres, *Hist.-polit. Blätter*, vol. 2, No. 3, p. 158 sq.). (3) When the bishop has been suspended or excommunicated, or when physical weakness or mental imbecility unfits him for the further exercise of his office. Since in the former case the action emanated directly from the papal chair, and that action operates to destroy the official authority of the vicar-general at the same time (*Sext. c. 1; De Off. Vicar.* 1, 13), the pope at once makes provision for the temporary government of the diocese. In the latter case an episcopal coadjutor must be appointed.

2. Papal functions are interrupted (*sedes apostolica impedita*) when the pope is imprisoned and prevented from administering his office, in which case as many cardinals as may be available perform its functions so far as strict necessity requires, or as the provisional directions of the pope himself may allow; or when hostile powers prevent access to the papal chair or render it extremely difficult. In this case the authority of bishops within their dioceses is extended to take such provisional action as may become necessary, but in harmony with the current practice of the apostolical chair.

Sedes Vacans

(*a vacant see*), strictly a vacancy of the papal or an episcopal chair, since the term *sedes* (ἑπόνοϛ) is applied only to *apostolica*, i.e. Roman and other episcopal sees; but it is in use extended to abbeys, prelatures, and all dignities to which the right of collating to benefices belongs. For the rules which govern in the event of the vacation of the papal chair, *SEE CARDINAL; SEE CONCLAVE; SEE POPE*. This article will be devoted to the subject with reference to bishoprics only.

A *sedes vacans* occurs by death, resignation, translation, deprivation, etc., and continues until a successor has been regularly installed. The current business of a bishopric during such interim was formerly administered by its presbytery, but subsequently, after the 4th century, by an officer termed *intercessor*, *interventor*, *visitator*, or *commendator*. A provision was made that the see should be filled within a year, in order, to prevent the seizure of the office by the temporary administrators, and also to hinder secular lords from appropriating the income of a vacant see. Still later the temporary administration was intrusted to the chapters, at first in *spiritualia*, and afterwards in temporalities as well. The modern usage is based on the decisions of the Council of Trent and of the *Congregatio Concilii*. The episcopal jurisdiction during a vacancy inheres in the chapter, but is administered by one or more “oeconomists” and a *capitular vicar*, who may be the general vicar of the late bishop, and all of whom must be appointed within eight days after knowledge of the vacancy has been obtained. The capitular vicar must be a doctor or licentiate of canon law, or else possess abilities in that direction, and, must be taken from the chapter if a suitable person can be found. When there is no chapter, or when the chapter neglects to appoint administrators, the metropolitan is empowered to act in its stead if the church be a suffragan church, the oldest suffragan bishop if it be a metropolitan church, and the nearest bishop if it be an exempt church. The capitular vicar is not the agent of the chapter in this instance, but administers independently; and he is not liable to be deprived of his office without sufficient reason, the determining of which does not rest with the chapter, but with the *Congregatio super Negotiis Episcoporum*. Certain general limitations, however, restrict his action. All episcopal rights which inhere in the *ordo episcopalis*, or are delegated by the pope, are in abeyance during the vacancy, except as provision for their exercise is otherwise made by the *curia*, or circumstances compel the employment of a neighboring bishop. A year of mourning (*annus luctus*) is

appointed, during which no orders may be conferred within the bishopric, except they become necessary to administer a benefice which has been, or is about to be, received. Nor may the capitular vicar dispose of benefices which are subject to the bishop's collation, or the income of the diocese be in any way employed, except perhaps to pay the salary of the administrator. No real estate may be transferred to other hands, and, in general, no change which might result in disadvantage to the future bishop may be introduced. The *sedes vacans* ends with the installation of the new bishop, who is authorized to exact a complete account of the bishopric and its administration during the interim. A *quasi vacans* is distinguished from the *sedes vacans*, for which **SEE SEDES IMPEDITA**.

On the general subject, comp. the literature given in Pütter, *Lit. des deutsch. Staatsrechts*, vol. 3, § 1461; in Klüber's *Fortsetzung*, vol. 4:§ 1461, p. 528, 529; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca: Canonica*, s.v.; Ritter, *Der Capitular-Vikar* (Münster, 1842); Rau, *Rechte der Domcapitel*, etc., in the *Tüb. theol. Quartalschrift*, 1842, 3, 365-412; Huller, *Die jurist. Persönlichkeit d. kath. Domcapitel in Deutschland* (Bamberg, 1860).


Sedgwick, Obadiah

a Nonconformist divine, was born at Marlborough, in Wiltshire, England, in 1600, and educated at Queen's College and at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He became chaplain to lord Horatio Vere, whom he accompanied to the Netherlands. Returning to Oxford, he was admitted to the reading of sentences in 1629. He preached at St. Mildred's, London, until interrupted by the bishop, and in 1639 became vicar of Coggeshall, Essex. In the rebellion he took part against the Church and State. In 1646 he was preacher at St. Paul's, Covent Garden; and, retiring to Marlborough, he died there in January, 1658. The principal of his works are, *The Fountain Opened* (1657): — *An Exposition of Psalm 23* (1658, 4to): — *The Anatomy of Secret Sins* (1660): — *Parable of the Prodigal* (1660): *Synopsis of Christianity*.

Sedile

Picture for Sedile 1

Picture for Sedile 2

(plur. *sedilia*), the Latin name for a seat, a term which in modern times has come to be pretty generally applied by way of distinction to the seats on the south side of the choir near the altar in churches, used in the Roman Catholic service by the priest and his attendants, the deacon and subdeacon, during certain parts of the mass; or in the Episcopal Church for the priests and deacons during the eucharistic service. Sedilia were sometimes movable, but more usually in England were formed of masonry and recessed in the wall like niches. Sedilia are comparatively rare on the Continent, but very numerous examples remain in Great Britain, a few of which are of as early date as the latter part of the 12th century; but the majority are later, extending to the end of the Perpendicular style. The earliest form in the catacombs, and repeated at St. David's, was a bishop's throne flanked by collateral seats. In general they contain three separate seats, but occasionally two, or only one, and in a few rare instances four, as at Rothwell Church, Northamptonshire, and Furness Abbey; or five, as at Southwell Minster; sometimes a single seat under one arch, or formed on the back of a window, is found, long enough for two or three persons. They are very commonly placed at different levels, the eastern seat being a step the highest and the western the lowest; but sometimes, when three are used, the two western seats are on the same level, a step below the other, and sometimes the two eastern are level and the western a step below them. The decorations used about them are various, and in enriched buildings they are occasionally highly ornamented, and sometimes surmounted with tabernacle work, pinnacles, etc. Some ancient sedilia consist of plain benches formed of masses of masonry projecting from the wall, and it is not improbable that such may have once existed in some of the churches in which no traces of these seats are now to be found. At Lenham Church, Kent, is a single seat projecting considerably from the wall (though the back is slightly recessed), with stone elbows resembling  an armchair: this is popularly called the confessional. At Beckley Church, Oxfordshire, is also a single stone seat with one elbow.

Sedition

In the early Church, kings and emperors were looked upon as political parents, whose authority and majesty were reputed sacred and supreme under God. All disloyalty or disrespect shown them, either in word or action, was always severely chastised by the laws of the Church. For the first three hundred years, Christians gloried over the heathens in this, that though the emperors were heathen, and some of them furious persecutors of the Christians, yet there were never any seditious or disloyal persons to be found among them. The fourth Council of Carthage forbids the ordination of any seditious person. The fourth Council of Toledo orders all clergymen that took up arms in any sedition to be degraded from their order, and to be confined to a monastery to do penance all their lives. See Bingham *Antiq. of the Christ. Church*, p. 985 sq.

Sedlnitzky, Leopold Von

formerly prince-bishop of Breslau, was born July 29, 1787, at Geppersdorf, in Austro-Silesia. Appointed for the Church, he was educated accordingly, and in 1798 the cathedral chapter of Breslau already nominated him as dean. In 1804 he commenced his studies at the Breslau University, where ex-Jesuits or their pupils were his teachers. In 1830, Sedlnitzky (not Seldnitzky, as Dr. Kurtz has it) was made provost of the chapter, and in 1835 prince-bishop. In the different positions which Sedlnitzky occupied, he had the best opportunity of seeing the doings of the hierarchy. A rupture with the see of Rome became finally a mere question of time, and on May 10, 1840, he resigned his bishopric. Frederick William IV, then king of Prussia, appointed him as member of the council of state, and thus he was obliged to take up his abode at Berlin. He now studied Church history and symbolics. The authority of the councils lost its power with him, as not founded upon the Holy Scriptures. He saw that the faith in the free grace of God in Christ, and not the episcopal government, was the uniting link of the Church. At first he attended the divine service of his Church, but this he soon abandoned, and listened to the preaching in different evangelical churches. He had a great desire for the Lord's supper, and it was a great pain to him to be deprived of this communion with the Lord and the brethren. After many hard inward struggles, he resolved in 1863 to join the evangelical Church, and in the church of Friedrich Werder he partook of the Lord's supper. From his own means he founded two institutions at Berlin — the Paulinum in 1862 and Johanneum in 1864 — both for the

education of teachers for the school and Church. In Breslau, also, he founded an institution for evangelical students of theology. Sedlnitzky died May 25, 1871, being the first Roman Catholic bishop who after the time of the Reformation became a convert to the evangelical Church. See Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (1874), 2, 262, especially the autobiography of Sedlnitzky, which was published in 1872, and which is an important contribution to modern Church history. For a review of this biography, see Hauck, *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, 1871, 7, 700 sq. (B.P.)

Sedulius, Caius Coelius (Or Caecilius)

a priest and Christian poet in the reigns of Theodosius II and Valentinian III. Little is known respecting his parentage and life. He is said to have taught philosophy and rhetoric in Italy, and to have subsequently become a priest in Achaia, and ultimately a bishop. The year of his death is not known. He obtains recognition chiefly as the author of a number of religious writings, among them the hexameter poem *Carmen Paschale*, etc., in which Old Test. miracles, the miracles of Christ's life, and finally his death, resurrection, and ascension, are treated — the whole in opposition to the heretical views of Arius and Sabellius. Various editions of this poem have been published — by Cellarius (1704), Gallandi (1773), and others, the latest edition being by Arevalo, or Aurival (Rome, 1794). In response to the request of the priest Macedonius, Sedulius translated the work into prose, and called it *Opus Paschale*. Two other hymns are also attributed to him — namely, *Elegia*, or *Collatio eteris et Novi Testamenti*, and *A Solis Ortus Ordine*, an acrostic on the life of Christ which is sometimes called the *Abecedarius*.

Sedulius, Scotus (Or Junior)

a Christian writer of the 8th century, of whose works we possess, *Collectanea in Omnes Epistolas S. Pauli* (first published at Basle [1528], and afterwards in the *Bibliotheca Max.* [Lugd. 1677] tom. 6): — some exegetical labors on the first three Gospels published by cardinal A. Mai in the *Scriptorum Veterum Collectio Nova*, tom. 9: — and a political and religious work entitled *De Rectoribus Christianis et Convenientibus Regulis, quibus Res Publica rite Gubernanda est* (first published at Leipsic in 1619). The MS. belonged to the library of the Heidelberg University, with which it was taken to Rome in 1622, and has been admitted into the

Spicilegium Romanum Vaticanum (Rom. 1339-1844), tom. 10, of cardinal Mai. In tom. 8 of the latter work may also be found *Explanationes in Proefationes S. Hieronymi ad Evangelia* by Sedulius. Comp. *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, par Pierre Bayle (Rotterdam, 1720), tom. 30, pl. 2562 sq. *Biog. Universelle* (Paris, 1825), tom. 41, p. 436 sq.

See

(properly *har*; *raah*; εἶδον), a term used in Scripture not only of the sense of vision by which we perceive external objects, but also of inward perception, of the knowledge of spiritual things, and even of the supernatural sight of hidden things — of prophecy, visions, ecstasies. Hence it is that those persons were formerly called seers who afterwards were called *Nabi*, or prophets, and that prophecies were called visions.

SEE SEER.

The verb *to see* is Hebraistically used to express all kinds of sensations. It is said (^{<1218>}Exodus 20:18) that the Israelites *saw* voices, thunder, lightnings, the sound of the trumpet, and the whole mountain of Sinai covered with clouds or smoke. To see good, or goods, is to enjoy them. “I believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living” (^{<1273>}Psalms 27:13), i.e. I hope that God will bring me back into my own country, into the land of Judea, where I shall live in peace and prosperity. Job says (^{<1307>}Job 7:7), “I shall die, and see no more; I shall no longer enjoy the good things of this world.” The psalmist says (^{<1406>}Psalms 4:6), “There be many that say, Who will show us any good?” that is, to enjoy any happiness in this life.

By an easy metaphor from this, *to see* the face of the king is to be of his council, his household, or to approach him. The kings of Persia, to maintain their respect and majesty, seldom permitted their subjects to see them, and hardly ever showed themselves in public. None but their most intimate friends or their familiar domestics had the honor of beholding their faces (^{<1710>}Esther 1:10, 14). Frequent allusion is made to this custom in Scripture, which mentions the seven principal angels that see the face of the Lord and appear in his presence (^{<1604>}Revelation 1:4).

See

(Lat. *sedes*, a *seat*), the seat of the bishop’s throne, and used also to denote the whole extent of his episcopal jurisdiction.

See, Apostolical

This term, under the full form of “holy apostolical see,” is now used to designate the jurisdiction and power of the pope as bishop of Rome. But anciently every bishop’s see was dignified with the title of *sedes apostolica*, **SEE APOSTOLICAL**, as deriving its authority through its succession from the apostles **SEE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION**. Pope Siricius himself (Siric. *Ep.* 4, c. 1) gives all primates the appellation *apostolici*. St. Augustine, Sidonius Apollinaris, and others make no distinction in favor of the bishop of Rome. See Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Church*, p. 22, 67.

See, Andrew J.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Dec. 6, 1832, and joined the Church when about fifteen. He was licensed to preach in 1854, in the fall of which year he was admitted on trial into the Memphis Conference. He labored without intermission until his death, in 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 577.

Seed

([**רִז**, *zera*; **σπέρμα**). The seed time of Palestine (^(**רבים**) Leviticus 26:5) for grain came regularly in November and December (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 340, 1003; Korte, *Reis.* p. 432). Since the harvest began in the middle of Nisan, the time of growth and culture was about four months (^(**רבים**) John 4:35; see Lücke, *ad loc.*). But this was certainly a very general reckoning, and perhaps had become proverbial. (In this passage the word **עַתָּה**, *yet*, does not seem to accord with this explanation; see also Anger, *De Temp. Act. Ap.* p. 24 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 216 sq.; Jacobi, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 858 sq.). **SEE AGRICULTURE**.

Sowing was done by the hand, as often with us, though according to the Gemara (*Baba Metsia*, fol. 105) the Jews used machines also for this purpose (Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 685). The seed when sown and the young plants have more enemies in the East than even here: not only drought, hail, mice (^(**רבים**) 1 Samuel 6:5), fire, but also grasshoppers and locusts (see these words), often destroy promising harvests. The following legal regulations are found in the Pentateuch:

1. Two kinds of seed, as wheat and barley, must not be sown on the same land (^(**רבים**) Leviticus 19:19; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 8, 20). The Talmudists

(Mishna, *Chilaim*, 2, 8) say that between two fields sown with different seeds must intervene either fallow ground or a ditch, path, or wall; but the law does not include garden beds (*ibid.* 3, 1; *Shab.* 9, 2). Michaelis (*Mos. R.* 4, 320 sq.) strives to show that the lawgiver meant simply to require a careful sorting of the seed, which is recommended by the ancients as very advantageous (Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 193 sq.; Varro, *R. R.* 1, 52, 1), and which would render impossible the springing up of weeds (especially the *Lolium temulentum*). But this cannot be supported, and a custom so advantageous to the agriculturist did not need the authority of law. Lappenberg (in the *Brem. u. Verdensch. Biblioth.*, 5, 937 sq.) gives a purely theological exposition of it; and perhaps other parts of the law furnish an easier explanation of this class of regulations than this one. **SEE DIVERSE**. The more exact requirements of the rabbins will be found in the Mishna (*Chilaiz*, ch. 1-3). They are very trifling, and sometimes show a disposition to evade the law; but even anciently it was not so strictly enforced as to prevent giving a field of barley a border of spelt (^{<2085>}Isaiah 28:25; see marg. A.V.). In general the rule is confined to Palestine, and the Jews do not refuse elsewhere to enjoy the fruit of mixed harvests (comp. Hottinger, *Hebr. Leges*, p. 376 sq.; Darsov, *De Mirodis Seminandi Diversa Semina Hebr. Vet.* [Viteb. 1695]).

2. ^{<0815>}Leviticus 11:37 sq. provides that seed set apart for sowing should remain clean if the carcass of a creeping beast fell upon it; but if it had been wet, it should be made unclean, perhaps because wet seed takes up impurities far easier than dry (comp. the analogy, ver. 34). Similar is the law of purification in the Zendavesta (2, 335, Kleuker), and a similar distinction of wet and dry is observed among the Arabs still (Niebuhr, *Beschs* p. 40).

By an easy metaphor, *seed*, as the prolific principle of future life, is taken in Scripture for *posterity*, whether of man, beasts, trees, etc., all of which are said to be sown and to fructify as the means of producing a succeeding generation (^{<2412>}Jeremiah 31:27). Hence seed denotes an individual, as Seth in the stead of Abel (^{<0005>}Genesis 4:25 etc.) and the whole line of descent; as the seed of Abraham, of Jacob, etc., the seed royal, etc., much in the same acceptance as children. The seed of Abraham denotes not only those who descend from him by natural issue, but those who imitate his character (^{<4046>}Romans 4:16), for if he be “the father of the faithful,” then the faithful are his seed by character, independent of natural descent; and hence the Messiah is said to see his seed, though, in fact, Jesus left no children by

descent, but by grace or conversion only (^{<2530>}Isaiah 53:10). This is occasionally restricted to one chief or principal seed, one who by excellence is the seed, as the seed of the woman (^{<0015>}Genesis 3:15; ^{<8816>}Galatians 3:16), the seed of Abraham, the seed of David — meaning the most excellent descendant of the woman, of Abraham, of David. Or understand by the “seed of the woman” the offspring of the female sex only, as verified in the supernatural conception of Jesus (^{<4018>}Matthew 1:18, etc.; ^{<4026>}Luke 1:26, etc.), and of which the birth of Abraham’s seed (Isaac) was a figure. See below.

Seed is likewise taken figuratively for the Word of God (^{<4085>}Luke 8:5; ^{<4023>}1 Peter 1:23), for a disposition becoming a divine origin (^{<4378>}1 John 3:9), and for truly pious persons (^{<4038>}Matthew 13:38).

Seed, The One

(^{<8816>}Galatians 3:16). The logic of this passage has eluded the search of our best critics, and yet it is worth pursuing, even against hope. The question involved is one purely of grammar, and particularly of Hebrew grammar — namely, How may we determine the *number* of [רִצְ], when it is plural and when singular? This word, when representing the seed of plants, forms a regular plural like other masculine nouns; but when used for posterity, it never changes its form: in this use it resembles our English word *sheep*. We must, then, have recourse to the construction, and this is found to be very peculiar. The adjective is always singular, like itself, although the subject be numerous as the stars (^{<4392>}Ezra 9:2; ^{<4065>}Job 5:25; 21:8; ^{<4375>}Psalms 37:25; 112:2). With verbs it is construed as a collective noun, the verb varying according to the circumstances, with no marked peculiarity. In connection with pronouns, the construction is entirely different from both the preceding. A singular pronoun marks an individual, an only one, or one out of many; while a plural pronoun represents all the descendants. This rule is followed invariably by the Sept., which always puts the pronouns of σπέρμα in the *constructio ad sensum*, just as the apostle does in the text, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου: Ὅς ἐστὶ Χριστός. Peter understood this construction, for we find him inferring a singular seed from ^{<0227>}Genesis 22:17, 18, when speaking to native Jews in the city of Jerusalem before Paul’s conversion (^{<4435>}Acts 3:26), as David had set the example a thousand years before (^{<4927>}Psalms 72:17). Read this in the Sept.

[רֵז, in the singular form, takes the pronouns plural in the following places: ^{<0153>}Genesis 15:13; 17:7; ^{<0202>}Exodus 30:21; ^{<0217>}Leviticus 21:17; ^{<0273>}2 Kings 17:20; ^{<0405>}2 Chronicles 20:7, etc.; ^{<0602>}Nehemiah 9:2, etc.; ^{<0967>}Psalms 106:27; ^{<2509>}Isaiah 61:9; ^{<2528>}Jeremiah 23:8; 33:26; 46:27; ^{<3305>}Ezekiel 20:5-11. [רֵז, in the same singular form, has pronouns singular in the following: ^{<0085>}Genesis 3:15; 22:17; 24:60; ^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:11; ^{<0072>}2 Samuel 7:12; ^{<0371>}1 Chronicles 17:11. These passages embrace seventy-one pronouns in all — twenty-three singular and forty-eight plural. They are all the places where the pronoun represents [רֵז, Pronouns merely in apposition do not come under the rule. This presents a syntax different from the word, showing that *seed* has a *double construction*. The distinction made by Paul is not between one seed and another, but between the one seed and the many; and if we consider him quoting the same passage with Peter (*loc. cit.*), his argument is fairly sustained by the pronoun “*his* enemies.” *Seed* with a pronoun singular is exactly equivalent to *son*. It is worth noting that the Aramaean relatives of Rebekah have retained the peculiar syntax of the covenant, where our translators missed the mark, in ^{<0246>}Genesis 24:60, “Those who hate *him*.” Whether these Syrians understood the Messianic aspect of the promise, or whether, like the Sept., *who did not* see the ὁ ἑρχόμενος, they merely followed the grammar, their language conveys the idea of *One* among the thousands of millions who will subdue all *His* haters.

^{<2389>}Isaiah 48:19, as it stands in our Hebrew Bibles, furnishes an exception to the principle laid down above. If we should attach importance to *one* exception, occurring in a composition highly poetical, against threescore plain examples, it is to be observed that the Sept. has a different reading, and Lowth prefers it — thus removing all difficulty in the case.

With this clue to the Abrahamic covenant, and through it to the protevangel, we arrive with precision at the unity of the seed promised there — the *He* that shall bruise Satan on the head. The masculine singular copied by the Sept. is twice used in that promise. He is the God of peace who bruises Satan (^{<0560>}Romans 16:20). (R.H.)

Seeded

a phrase indicating that tapestry, hangings, or church vestments were, for their greater ornamentation, sprinkled over at regular intervals with pearls, anciently called “seeds.”

Seekers

a small sect of Puritans which arose in England in 1645, and was afterwards merged in that of the Quakers. The Seekers derived their name from the employment in which they represented themselves as being continually engaged, that of *seeking* for the true Church, ministry, Scriptures, and ordinances, all of which, they alleged, had been lost. Baxter (*Life and Times*, p. 76) says of them. "They taught that our Scripture was uncertain; that present miracles are necessary to faith: that our ministry is null and without authority, and our worship and ordinances unnecessary or vain." They and the Rationalists were promoters of the deism of England. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 238.

Seelen, Johann Heinrich Von

a German theologian, was born Aug. 8, 1688, at Asel, near Stade. In 1713 he was called as conrector to Flensburg, in 1715 to Stade, and in 1718 as rector to Lubeck, where he died, Oct. 22, 1762. Seelen was a voluminous writer. His most important work is his *Meditationes Exegeticoe, quibus Varia Utriusque Testamenti Loci Expenduntur et Illustrantur* (Lübeck, 1730-37, 3 pts.). He also wrote dissertations on different passages of the Scripture, for which see Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 3, 305 sq. — Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*. (B.P.)

Steel-stone

a mediaeval mason's term for that stone which was placed on the top of a niche or tabernacle to crown and complete it. "Item, for garnyshing ye seelstone, iis. ivd."

Seely, Amos W.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in New York city in 1805. He graduated from Union College in 1828, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1831. His ministry was spent chiefly in the Reformed Church in Western New York, and was greatly blessed in its results. He was a plain, earnest, practical preacher; a man of guileless character and tender piety. He died in 1865. He published two works which passed through several editions, *Doctrinal Thoughts* and *Practical Thoughts*. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*. (W.J.R.T.)

Seelye, Edward E., D.D.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Lansingburgh, N.Y., in 1819, and graduated at Union College in 1839, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1843. Until 1858 his ministry was exercised in the Presbyterian churches of Stillwater, N.Y., from 1843 to 1850, and Sandy Hill, N.Y., from 1850 to 1858. At the latter date he removed to Schenectady as pastor of the First Reformed Church, where he died in 1865. Mr. Seelye's physique was tall, large, rugged, and indicative of the best of health. His mind was vigorous, comprehensive, and direct. His preaching was orthodox, logical, scholarly, instructive, interesting, and warm hearted. His delivery was impressive and popular. He left a valuable posthumous work entitled *Bible Emblems*, which has been printed by the American Tract Society, New York. See De Baun [Rev. J.A.], *Tribute*. (W.J.R.T.)

Seemiller, Sebastian

a Roman Catholic doctor of divinity, was born Oct. 17, 1752, at Velden, in Lower Bavaria, and died April 25, 1798. He wrote, *Exercitt. Philol.-theologicoe ad Illustranda et Vindicanda quaedam Primi Capituli Geneseos Loca* (Nuremb. 1776): — *Hermeneutica Sacra* (Augsburg, 1779): — *De Groecis Bibliorum V.T. Versionibus Dissertatio Historico-critica* (Ingolst. 1788): — *Septem Psalmi Poenitentiales* (ibid. 1790): *Quindecim Psalmi Graduales* (ibid. 1791). — See Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 3, 307; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*. (B.P.)

Seeney, Robert

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Oct. 12, 1797. He graduated at Columbia College in 1817, and soon afterwards united with the Church. In 1820 he was received on trial in the New York Conference, and labored with great acceptability in its most important stations. In 1852 he was placed upon the supernumerary list, but continued to preach until he received a paralytic stroke in the left side. On July 1, 1854, he was attacked by a more violent stroke upon the right side, from which he could not rally. As a preacher, Mr. Seeney was chaste, clear, and forcible; as a Christian he was artless, affable, and faithful. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1855, p. 545.

Seer

is the almost invariable rendering in the A.V. of *hzeꝑchozeh* (which is otherwise translated only in ^{<23815>}Isaiah 28:15, “agreement;” 30:10, “prophet;” 47:13, “gazer;” ^{<3339>}Ezekiel 13:9, 16; 22:28, “that see,” etc.), and occasionally (^{<909>}1 Samuel 9:9-19; ^{<1057>}2 Samuel 15:27; ^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 9:22; 26:28; 29:29; ^{<1467>}2 Chronicles 16:7, 10) of *harꝑröeh*; while the tantamount and technically used *prophet* is usually denoted by *ybaꝑnabi* (on the meaning and etymology of which see Hartmann, *3d Excurs.* to his *Uebers. d. Michna*, p. 219 sq.; Paulus, *Exeget. Conservat.* 2, 122 sq.; and the different views of Redslob, *Der Begr. d. Nabi* [Leips. 1839], Ewald, *Proph.* 1, 6 sq., Hävernick, *Einleit. ins A.T.* 2, 2, 6 sq.). All three names are used, though applied to different persons (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 29:29); and the Chronicles hold this distinction throughout — calling, e.g., Samuel *röeh*. Gad *chozeh*, and Nathan *nabi* — a distinction, to a great extent, lost in the A.V., where the first two are confounded. According to ^{<909>}1 Samuel 9:9, *röeh* was the older name for prophet, and it is especially applied to Samuel; *nabi* is the most usual word; *chozeh* perhaps passed from the ritual language into that of history. It is found almost solely in Chronicles.

These words were applied, in Hebrew antiquity, from Samuel’s time until after the return from captivity, to men inspired by God (comp. ^{<3187>}Amos 3:7; ^{<602>}2 Peter 1:21, by the *spirit of Jehovah*; ^{<3115>}Ezekiel 11:5; 37:1, expressed in different forms; 3:14; ^{<1240>}2 Chronicles 24:20; comp. Gesen. *Comment zu Is.* 1, 338; *Thesaur.* 2, 742) who comprehended the principles of the theocracy, and were devoted to them, denouncing in energetic terms all that tended to undermine them; though in earlier days the name of prophet had been given to those who stood in relations of confidence with God (^{<927>}Genesis 20:7; ^{<970>}Exodus 7:1; 15:20, etc.). Of the activity of these prophets among foreigners but one example is given (^{<3102>}Jonah 1:2 sq.). At first they appear but occasionally, where the welfare of the people is in danger, or as counselors of the theocratic kings (^{<9215>}1 Samuel 22:5; ^{<1012>}2 Samuel 7:2 sq.); but when the kingdom was divided, a wider field was open to them (^{<12713>}2 Kings 17:13 sq.). As the fate of the people drew near, they raised their voices the more earnestly — rebuking now idolatry, religious affectation, immorality; now the wicked and selfish government, and the false policy of the king and the grandees of the realm; now warning or threatening the thankless people with the judgments of Jehovah; now casting a glance to the ennobled form of the theocracy again arising from

this ruin of the national welfare and honor. Public places, markets (^{<3150>}Amos 5:10; ^{<2321>}Isaiah 29:21), streets, the courts of the Temple (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 7:1; 19:14; 26:2; comp. 29:26) — were usually the localities of their action (^{<2430>}Jeremiah 25:2). But they also went, though not welcome then, to the palaces of kings and their noblemen (^{<2325>}Isaiah 22:15), shunning no danger or repulse (^{<2635>}Ezekiel 13:5). Thus their order formed a beneficial balance against the misuse of the royal power, the narrow sympathies and dullness of the priests, the untheocratic tendencies of the people themselves, and accomplished a portion of that which is expected in modern times from representatives of the people and the free press. It would be proper to call the prophets *demagogues*, in the original and best sense, as popular leaders (De Wette, *Christl. Sittenl.* 2, 1, 32). Since in the theocracy religious and political elements were mingled, the subject and the aim of the efforts of the prophets belonged sometimes to the one class, sometimes to the other; but was never merely political, since a religious reference is found in all. Their views could not be limited to the present, but extended to the future which should succeed it (comp. Von Raumer, *Vorles. über allgemeine Gesch.* 1, 153; Ewald, *Proph.* 1, 24); but usually not to a distant future, severed by centuries from the present. This we learn by an unprejudiced examination of the prophecies yet remaining, and a comparison of their contents with the historical standpoint of the authors. Indeed, the minute prediction of very distant events, overleaping the immediate future, would have had no purpose for the generation then living, nor would it have furthered the interests of the theocracy as a holy community. Yet Eichhorn has pressed this view too far (*De Prophet. Poes. Hebr. Paralip.*, in the *Comment. Soc. Götting. Rec.* 5). The image of the *future* suggested by the prophets is naturally connected with the *present* of the author; hence we can often, as in the Chaldee period, trace a chronological progress from the indefinite and general to the definite and special. Only in one group of prophecies did they leave the relations and circumstances of their own times and direct the people to a distant ideal future, when, not satisfied with the immediate future, they speak of the Messiah and his blessed kingdom to come; and it was this hope of the Messiah and the renewal of their kingdom under him, set forth and cherished by the prophets, which gave the religious life of the nation that new, peculiar impulse which secured them so important a place in the history of religion and of man (comp. Crusius, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 39 sq., 67; De Wette, *Christl. Sittenl.* 2, 1, 34). The form of the prophetic representations was simple and artless; sometimes in dialogue (^{<2430>}Jeremiah

28), yet never without the rhythm which is so natural to the rapid speech of the Orientals; never without imaginative elevation (comp. Ewald, *Aüsfuhr. Lehrb. d. Hebr. Spr.* p. 138 sq.; Umbreit, *De V.T. Prophetis Claris. Antiq. Temp. Orat.* [Heidelb. 1832]; Ewald, *Propheten*, 1, 49 sq.), and often was poetical (^{<310E>}Amos 5:1 sq.; ^{<210E>}Isaiah 5:1). The early prophecies seem to have been accompanied by music, which was used as an aid to religious feeling (^{<110E>}2 Kings 3:15), and all of them by energetic gestures and often symbolic actions were connected with them (^{<111E>}1 Kings 11:29 sq.; ^{<219E>}Jeremiah 19:1 sq.; 28; 35; 43:9 sq.; Ezekiel 4; 12:3 sq.; 24:3 sq.; 37:15 sq.), or symbolic costume (^{<210E>}Isaiah 20:2 sq.; comp. Stäudlin, *Neue Beitr. zur Erläut. d. bibl. Proph.* p. 123 sq.; see Jahn, *Einleit.* 2, 395; Gesen. *Com. zu Is.* 1, 645). It should be borne in mind that the inhabitants of warmer climates are more prone to such off hand oratory by their active imagination. Yet the comparisons sometimes instituted between, the Hebrew prophets and the Italian improvisatores or the Greek seers ($\mu\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; Ritter, in Scherer's *Schriftforsch.* 1, 372 sq.) are worthless (so De Wette, *Pr. de Prophetar. in V.T.* [Berl. 1816]; also in his *Opusc. Theol.* p. 16 sq.; Stielckel, *De Prophet. Heb.*, in Illgen's *Zeitschr.* 5, 2, 55 sq.). The impulse to speak in the Hebrew prophets must be sought deeper than in the natural activity of imagination.

At a later day (after the 9th century B.C.; comp. Eichhorn, in his *Biblioth. f. bibl. Lit.* 10, 1077 sq.) prophetic writing became connected with prophetic utterance (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 3, 351 sq.), at first to preserve with certainty the contents of important predictions (^{<210E>}Isaiah 8:1, 16; comp. 30:8), or in obedience to a divine command (^{<210E>}Jeremiah 30:2; 36:2, 28; comp. ^{<611E>}Revelation 1:11, 19; 21:5); hence, perhaps, first simply records of their utterances to the people, and then often addresses penned as soon as conceived and given in writing to the people through amanuenses (comp. Pries, *De Prophetis et Apost. Amanuens. Opera in Scribend. Usis* [Rostock, 1757]), or even borne by messengers, to a distance (Jeremiah 29; comp. ^{<412E>}2 Chronicles 21:12). The people attached great value to the intercession of the prophets with God (^{<240E>}Jeremiah 42:2). This accorded with their relation to Jehovah and was part of their calling (^{<217E>}Jeremiah 7:16; 11:14; 14:11; comp. ^{<38E>}Job 42:8, 10). Besides their labors for the protection and advancement of the theocracy, the prophets were often useful to their countrymen and even to foreigners (^{<110E>}2 Kings 5) by their medical and scientific knowledge and skill (^{<119E>}2 Kings 2:19 sq.; 4:38 sq.; 20:7 sq.; comp. ^{<114E>}1 Kings 14:2 sq.), and, filled with the spirit of God,

even wrought miracles, *SEE ELIJAH; SEE ELISHA* (comp. ^{<1716>}Luke 7:16). So there seem to have been theocratic historians, perhaps before the prophets became writers, who, sharing the views and sympathies of the prophets, wrote the history of a reign or of a period, mingling with it more or fewer prophetic utterances (^{<492>}2 Chronicles 9:29; 12:15; 13:22; 26:22; 32:32; comp. Gesen. *Comment. zu Is.* 1, 24 sq.).

The dress of the prophets was usually a long folding mantle (^{<1193>}1 Kings 19:13; ^{<118>}2 Kings 2:8, 13) of coarse, hairy stuff (^{<814>}Zechariah 13:4; ^{<1108>}2 Kings 1:8), without care as to the cut (hence *sak*, *qci* ^{<2310>}Isaiah 20:2), and held together by a leather girdle (^{<1108>}2 Kings 1:8); a dress which corresponded best with the serious nature of the prophet's calling (comp. ^{<404>}Matthew 3:4; see Henke, *Mag.* 4, 191 sq.; Nicolai, *De Proph. Jud. Vestitu* [Magdeb. 1744]; comp. the cloak or *pallium* of the Greek philosophers; Ferrar, *De Re Vest.* 2, 4, 14. On the clothing of the Eastern dervishes, see Harmer, *Observ.* 3, 374 sq.). It is not strange that the prophets, on the one hand, were the objects of superstitious veneration (comp. ^{<1178>}1 Kings 17:18), and, on the other, by their bold reproof of all impiety and wickedness, became, as the fate of the state grew certain, more and more subject to the opposition and open persecution of the priesthood and of despotic or idolatrous kings. In the kingdom of Israel they were first oppressed, and almost exterminated (18; 19:14, 19), sharing under Ahab the fate of all pious worshippers of Jehovah. Only under the pressure of necessity did the kings there apply to them (22:7 sq.; ^{<1101>}2 Kings 3:11 sq.; 6:12 sq.); and they were forbidden to address the people (^{<3170>}Amos 7:10 sq.). This was a censorship wielded by the priests. From ^{<1243>}2 Kings 4:23, we see that on Sabbaths and new moons the pious Israelites met for worship with one of the prophets. But this was not so general as to justify us in saying that the prophets took the place of the Levitical priesthood (comp. ver. 42), although it is certain that the worship and knowledge of Jehovah in the kingdom of Israel were supported mainly through the prophets. In the kingdom of Judah the prophets were early met by infidel mockery (^{<2359>}Isaiah 5:19; 28:10, 22), or by a sense of security that heeded no alarm (^{<3116>}Micah 2:6 sq.). We are told that Manasseh slew some prophets every day (Josephus, *Ant.* 10, 3, 1; comp. ^{<1216>}2 Kings 21:16); it is more certain that Asa imprisoned the seer Hanani (^{<4460>}2 Chronicles 16:10); that under Jehoash and Joiachim two prophets atoned for their boldness with their lives (^{<1490>}2 Chronicles 24:20 sq.; ^{<2650>}Jeremiah 26:20 sq.); and that Jeremiah, above all, was the object of the bitter hate and active

persecution of the united court and priesthood, who supported themselves by false prophets. *SEE JEREMIAH*. But the educated laity and the officers of state thought they had long outgrown the prophetic utterances, and that their views of state policy were deeper; and thus the state became ever more worldly. Afterwards, the remembrance of the abuse offered the prophets was a sad one for the people (^{<4625>}Nehemiah 9:26; ^{<4152>}Matthew 5:12; 23:31; ^{<4075>}Acts 7:52; ^{<3125>}1 Thessalonians 2:15), which was little weakened by the zeal of the later Jews to seek out and adorn the tombs of the prophets. False prophets, or orators, who flattered the prevailing political principles, and even did homage to the abandoned wickedness of the times (^{<2234>}Jeremiah 23:14, 15; 28:15), yet gave themselves out as inspired by the Divine Spirit, appear, especially in the last terrible period of the kingdom, in league with the priests (^{<2453>}Jeremiah 5:13, 31; 6:13; 8:10; 14:14); and the true prophets of Jehovah not only came, at times, into open conflict with them (^{<2417>}Jeremiah 26:7 sq.; 28; comp. 5:15), but spoke by inspiration against them (^{<2443>}Jeremiah 14:13 sq.; 23:16 sq.; 27:9 sq.; 29:31 sq.; ^{<2631>}Ezekiel 13:2 sq.; 22:25; ^{<2007>}Hosea 9:7 sq.; ^{<3181>}Micah 3:11). In the law (^{<1531>}Deuteronomy 13:1 sq.; 18:20) false prophecy was punished with death (Schröder, *De Pseudopphetis* [Marburg, 1720], 2, 4).

The origin of the prophets, in the meaning we have unfolded, is to be referred to the end of the period of the Judges, or to the time of Samuel (comp. ^{<4124>}Acts 3:24), who was himself a prophet (^{<4081>}1 Samuel 3:20), and may be considered as having founded the order by establishing schools of prophets (comp. esp. 19:24), and to have pointed out its relations to the theocracy. Tholuck (*Literar. Anzeiger*, 1831, 1, 38), indeed, makes these schools of the prophets to be merely a union of helpers of the prophets in their arduous office, such as Baruch was, who, besides the study of the law, busied themselves with sacred music; but this lacks support. Prophecy, indeed, could not be taught; and, no doubt, many of the scholars never received the inner prophetic call. But this is true now in our theological schools, yet we do not, on this account, consider them mere institutions for educating clerks, etc. Moses, in the wilderness, had given instances, in his own person, of every kind of prophetic duty; but afterwards, when the great labor to be done was the establishment of the theocratic nation in Palestine, and the spirit of Jehovah raised up warriors (the *Shophetim*, or *Judges*), there was little need of sacred oratory (^{<4004>}Judges 4:4 sq.; 6:8 sq.; ^{<4027>}1 Samuel 2:27 sq.), and the people saw in their prophets simply *wise men, soothsayers* (hence the older name *röeh* of prophets, which is applied

even to Samuel [^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 9:22; 29:29, etc.], though he is called also *nabi* [^{<983>}1 Samuel 3:20]), a view which prevailed up to Samuel's time (9:8 sq.), while even later the prophets were chiefly sought by the people as wonderful physicians and miracle workers. It is clear that Samuel by no means first founded *prophecy* among the Hebrews, as, indeed, such a spiritual movement cannot be voluntarily inaugurated among a people; but that he was led on by the establishment of royalty to impart to the prophets his judicial relation (^{<971>}Judges 6 and ^{<900>}1 Samuel). On the schools of the prophets, see Vitringa, *Synag. Vet.* 1, 2, 7; Buddei *Hist. Eccl. V. Test.* 2, 276 sq.; Maii *Exercit.* 1, 645 sq.; Werenfels, *Diss. de Scholis Proph.* (Basle, 1701); Kahl, *De Proph. Scholl.* (Gött. 1737); Hering, *Abh. von den Schul. der Proph.* (Bresl. 1777); Stäudlin, *Gesch. der Sittenl.* 1, 203 sq. They existed in various cities, those often which had an ancient character for sanctity, especially Ramah (^{<999>}1 Samuel 19:19, 20), Jericho (^{<1115>}2 Kings 2:5), at Bethel (ver. 3), at Gilgal (4:38), all in the central part of the Holy Land. The pupils, who were not all young or unmarried men (ver. 1), lived together (6:1), sometimes in great numbers (2:16; comp. ^{<1180>}1 Kings 18:4,13), had common fare (^{<1248>}2 Kings 4:38 sq.), and provided together for their wants. As to the nature of the instruction, we have no particulars. Music and singing were certainly among the subjects taught (^{<905>}1 Samuel 10:5; comp. Forkel, *Gesch. d. Mus.* 1, 238, 245, 248, 438 sq.); but, perhaps, more for the cultivation of noble sentiments, and for awakening inner feeling, than as an accompaniment to their exhortations. The cultivation of lyric poetry by them cannot be altogether denied, yet the extent of it has been exaggerated, and the history derives the flourishing of this kind of poetry from a royal minstrel (Nachtigal, in Henke's *Mag.* 6, 38 sq.; see *contra* Bengel, *Supplem. ad Introd. in Lib. Psalm.* [Tüb. 1816] p. 5 sq.; De Wette, *Comm. ub. d. Psalm.* p. 9 sq., 3d ed.). The chief subject of instruction was probably the law, not in its details in writing, but as a great whole, a theocratic conception; and the awakening and cultivation of the true theocratic spirit were the aim of all their labors. The pupils, when the impulse of the spirit came upon them, sometimes made excursions, during which others, who came near them, were momentarily influenced in the same way (^{<905>}1 Samuel 10:5 sq.; 19:20 sq.); and some were employed, it would seem as a trial of them, as messengers of the prophets (^{<1191>}2 Kings 9:1). The comparison of the schools of the prophets with monkish cloisters (Jerome, *Ep.* 105, ad *Rustic. Monach.* and 58 ad *Paulin.*) is wide of the mark (see Hering, *loc. cit.* 71 sq.); and if any parallel is to be sought for anything so peculiar, that with Pythagorean union (Tennemann, *Gesch. der*

Phil. 1, 94 sq.) will be found more appropriate. Moreover, it is not to be supposed that all the prophets, or that the most influential of those known to us, were educated in these schools. It was open to every man or woman who felt an inward call to this office to assume the duties of a prophet (^{<3074>}Amos 7:14); and the prophetic inspiration often broke forth suddenly (^{<4004>}2 Chronicles 20:14 sq.). There were also instances in which the calling of prophet seemed to be hereditary in one family (^{<1160>}1 Kings 16:1; comp. ^{<3074>}Amos 7:14; on ^{<3000>}Zechariah 1:1, see Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*). Those who had been educated by older prophets seem usually to have been consecrated to their calling by anointing or the delivery of the prophet's mantle (^{<1196>}1 Kings 19:16 sq.; comp. ^{<4213>}2 Kings 2:13 sq.); but it was the inner voice, or a vision, which directly impelled the prophets to step forward as such (Isaiah 6; ^{<3002>}Jeremiah 1:2; Ezekiel 1). The cycle of prophetic activity was found, after the division, chiefly in the kingdom of Judah, which, at least outwardly, had remained true to the theocratic constitution, the temple, the priesthood of Jehovah, the dynasty of David; and even after the overthrow of this kingdom, and in exile, there were influential prophets among the Jews. But in the kingdom of Israel (Eichhorn, in his *Biblioth. d. Bibl. Lit.* 4, 193 sq.), whose establishment the prophets had aided, or, at least, not hindered (^{<1112>}1 Kings 11:29 sq.), their influence was interrupted and more of a negative character. In the changes of dynasties they not rarely took some part (^{<1144>}1 Kings 14:14 sq.; 16:1 sq.; 21:17 sq.; ^{<4200>}2 Kings 9:1 sq.), in which they were actuated by religious views. It cannot be doubted that the activity of the prophets, in that long period, was one of the utmost value to the people; the spirit of the theocratic life was continually refreshed by them, and no other people of that age, or of modern times, has had anything comparable to them (comp. Eichhorn, preface to his 4th vol. *Einleit. ins A.T.*). In this point of view, such laments as ^{<5749>}Psalms 74:9; ^{<2819>}Lamentations 2:9, find their full justification.

The prophets mentioned in the Old Test. besides Moses (^{<5185>}Deuteronomy 18:15; 34:10), and those whose books remain in the canon, are the following, nearly in chronological order: Samuel, Gad, Nathan [see these names], the two latter under David and Solomon; Ahijah, Shemaiah, Iddo (^{<1112>}1 Kings 11:29; 12:22; 14:4 sq.; ^{<4215>}2 Chronicles 12:15; 13:22), under Rehoboam and Jeroboam; Azariah, Hananiah, Jehu, Micah, Jehaziel, Eliezer, Oded (^{<4150>}2 Chronicles 15:1, 8; 16:7; 20:37; ^{<1160>}1 Kings 16:1; 22:8), under Asa, Baasha, and Jehoshaphat; Elijah; Elisha, Micah, under

Ahab and successors; Zechariah (2; Chronicles 24:20), under Jehoash; Jonah, under Jeroboam II (^{<1245>}2 Kings 14:25); Oded, under Ahaz (^{<1289>}2 Chronicles 28:9); Uriah, under Joiachim (^{<297>}Jeremiah 26:20); besides three prophetesses — Deborah (^{<1004>}Judges 4:4), Huldah, a married woman (^{<1224>}2 Kings 22:14), and Noadiah (^{<1094>}Nehemiah 6:14), a false prophetess. A far greater number are named, of both sexes, by Clement Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 1, 145; he gives *thirty-five*), Epiphanius (in Cotelier's *Not. in Can. Apost.* 4, 6, *seventy-two*), and the Jews (*Seder Olam*, p. 21, *forty-eight prophets, seven prophetesses*). But they act in this without any settled principle, including almost every man of note in the Old Test. among the prophets. Prophecy disappeared on the new establishment of the Jews in Palestine; and, indeed, the last prophets are thought to show less of the living inspiration than the earlier ones; and, after the erection of the second Temple, no seer's voice was heard, although the return of the prophets was hoped for continually (1 Macc. 4:46; 14:41). According to the Talmudists the *Bath kol* sometimes took the place of prophecy. (Comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.v. **tb**, and Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 82 sq.; see also Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 1, 379, on the unconscious soothsaying of the rabbins. It has been applied to ^{<315>}John 11:51. That in ^{<1010>}1 Peter 1:10 is different.) So entirely was the old inspiration lost that even the patriotism of the Maccabees called forth nothing beyond military heroism. The birth and consecration of the Prince of the Prophets evoked inspired utterances from but two (^{<416>}Luke 1:67; 2:36). The appearance of Jesus even awakened false prophets, and, during the war of extermination between the Greeks and Romans, "prophet" was synonymous with deceiver and seducer of the people. Only a few scattered utterances of soothsayers occur in the centuries following the captivity (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 7; 13, 11, 2; comp. *War.* 6, 5, 3). See Gürtler, *Systema Thebl. Proph.* (Amst. 1702); Witsii *Miscel. Sacr.* bk. 1, in 24 chapters, on prophets and prophecy; Carpzov, *Introd. in V.T.* p. 1 sq., and his *Appar.* p. 113 sq.; *Eichhorn, Einleit. ins A.T.* 4, § 512 sq.; *Jahn, Einleit.* 2, 2, 324 sq.; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 5, 245 sq.; Herder, *Geist der hebr. P.* 2, 41 sq.; Horst, *Ueber die Proph. der alten Welt*, etc. (Gotha, 1798); Stutzmann, *Geist u. Charakt. d. hebr. Proph.* (Carlsr. 1805); Gramberg, *Religionsid.* 2, 246 sq.; Von Cölln, in *Euphron.* (1833) pt. 1, ch. 5; Knobel, *Der Prophetism. d. Heb.* (Bresl. 1837) 2, 8; Köster, *Die Propheten d. A. u. N. Test. nach ihren Wesen u. Wirken* (Leips. 1838); Ewald, *Propheten d. alt. Bund.* (Stuttg. 1840) 1, 1 sq.; Hävernick, *Einleit. ins A.T.* 2, 2, 1 sq.; Baur, *Amos* (Giess. 1847), p. 1 sq.; Hofmann, *Weissag.* 1, 253 sq. The writings of Dorotheus (ed. Fabric.

[Hamb. 1714]) contain traditions of the oldest prophets. So those of an unknown writer (*De Vitis Prophet.*), sometimes ascribed to Epiphanius. Comp. Hamaker, *Comment. in Libr. de Vita et Morte Prophet.* (Amst. 1833).

On the meaning of the word “prophet” in the New Test., see the dictionaries. The name was given to certain Christians of both sexes (^{<410>}1 Corinthians 11:5; comp. ^{<420>}Acts 21:9) who spoke in the public assembly (^{<410>}1 Corinthians 11:4; 14:29), who were distinguished from apostles and teachers (12:28; 14:6; ^{<412>}Ephesians 2:20; 4:11; comp. ^{<413>}Acts 13:1; Neander, *Pflanz.* 1, 205). Prophecy was, among the *charismata*, a spiritual gift of the Holy Spirit (^{<516>}Romans 12:6; ^{<520>}1 Corinthians 12:10), and stood next to that of speaking with tongues (12:10; 13:8; 14:22; comp. ^{<416>}Acts 19:6), but is pointed out by Paul as more efficacious for the edifying of the Church (^{<545>}1 Corinthians 14:3 sq., 22). See, in general, Van Dale, *De Idolol.* p. 201 sq.; Mosheim, *De Illis qui Proph. Vocantur in N.T.* (Helmst. 1732); also in his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccl. 2*, 125 sq.; Knapp [G.], *De Dono Proph. in Eccl. N.T.* (Halle, 1755); Zacharias, *De Donor. Proph. Variis Grad. in Eccl. Christ.* (Gott. 1767); Koppe, 3. *Exc. zum Brief an die Eph.* p. 148 sq. Thus *prophets* are those Christians who, seized by a momentary inspiration (^{<416>}Acts 19:6), discoursed to the assembly in their own tongue (comp. ^{<545>}1 Corinthians 14:5, 24) on divine things, perhaps not unlike preachers among the Quakers. (On the distinction between these and those who spoke with tongues, see 14:32; Neander *Pflanz. d. Christ.* 1, 52, 183 sq., 205.) The prediction of events to come was not the office of these prophets, yet they had some insight into the future of the Church. Comp. the Revelation of John; Crusius [B.], *Opusc.* p. 101 sq.; Lücke, *Vollst. Einl. indie Offenb. Joh.* (Bonn, 1832). **SEE PROPHET,**

Seething Pot

[*not seething-pot*] (j ^{<1>}Wpn; dWD, a pot blown, i.e. with a fanned fire under it), a kettle violently boiling (^{<3811>}Job 41:20 [Hebrew 12]). **SEE POT.**

Sefer

SEE SEPHER.

Seforno

SEE SFORNO.

Segelia

in Roman mythology, was a rural deity who secured growth to the germinating crops of grain.

Segneri, Paolo

(1), an Italian preacher, was born at Nettuno, March 21, 1624, of an old Roman family. In 1638 he entered the Order of the Jesuits at the College of St. Andrew, in Rome, where he taught grammar, and earnestly studied the Scriptures, the fathers, and the classical writers. Unable to obtain authority as a missionary to the Indies, he traveled on foot, from 1665 to 1692, through Italy, especially in Perugia and Mantua, gathering crowds to hear his discourses. Innocent XII called him to Rome in 1692 as his preacher in ordinary; but he was not so popular there, and was shortly appointed theologian to the penitentiary and examiner of bishops. His hearing, however, having failed, he died Dec. 9, 1694, worn out with labor. He wrote several works on practical theology, which are enumerated in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Segneri, Paolo

(2), called *the Younger*, an Italian Jesuit, nephew of the foregoing, was born at Rome, Oct. 18, 1673. He devoted himself to missions, and, after the earthquakes of 1708, he preached to the terrified Romans. At the request of the archduke Como III, he occupied the pulpits of the principal churches of Florence, Modena, and Bologna, and thus induced prince Frederick of Poland to abjure Lutheranism. He died at Sinigaglia, June 15, 1713. He wrote a few works on practical religion.

Se'gub

(Heb. *Segub'*, ~~bygcā~~ v.r. in Kings *Segib*, ~~bygcā~~ *elevated*; Sept. Σεγοῦβ v.r. in Chronicles *Σερούχ*), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The son of Hezron, grandson of Judah. His mother was the daughter of Machir, the "father" of Gilead, and he was himself father of Jair (^{<1163>}1 Chronicles 2:21). B.C. cir. 1850.

2. The youngest son of Hiel, the rebuilder of Jericho, who died for his father's sin according to Joshua's prediction (^{<1163>}1 Kings 16:34; comp. ^{<1163>}Joshua 6:26). B.C. cir. 910. According to Rabbinical tradition, he died

when his father had set up the gates of the city. One story says that his father slew him as a sacrifice on the same occasion.

Segur, Seth Willard

a Congregational minister, was born at Chittenden, Vt., Dec. 24, 1831. At fifteen years of age he united with the Church, and soon after entered Royalton Academy, where he was fitted for college. He entered Middlebury College, and graduated in 1859. After graduation he entered the Auburn (N.Y.) Theological Seminary, and graduated in 1862. He was licensed by the Royalton Association May 8, 1861, and soon after ordained. He was installed over the Church in Tallmadge, O., June 8, 1862, and, after remaining nine years, resigned. Success attended his ministry, and during his pastorate one hundred and thirty-four were received into the Church. He was next settled at Gloucester, Mass., where he was installed June 14, 1871, and remained until 1873, when he resigned to accept a call to West Medway, over which Church he was duly installed. As a preacher his elocution was easy, graceful, and impressive, and many were drawn to the ways of righteousness. While on a visit to Tallmadge to attend a semi-centennial celebration of the Church he was taken sick, and after a short illness died, Sept. 24, 1875. (W.P.S.)

Seguy, Joseph

a French Roman Catholic preacher, was born at Rodez in 1689. He was early remarkable for eloquence, and in 1729 was appointed to deliver before the French Academy a eulogy on St. Louis, for which cardinal de Fleury rewarded him with the abbey of Genlis. His success in other discourses was so great that the Academy, in 1736, gave him the prize for poetry. Seguy bore the title of preacher to the king, and continued his ministry till advanced age, when he retired to a canonicate that he held at Meaux. He died March 12, 1761. Some of his sermons have been published.

Seho Dagung

in Hinduism, is the name of the magnificent pyramidal temple at Rangoon, almost entirely covered with gold, and dedicated to the supreme deity of the Birmanese.

Seid

in Norse mythology, was a magical art universally employed among the Vanes, in which Freya, who was descended from the Vanes, was particularly skilled, and in which she had received instruction from Odin. Nothing definite is known respecting the art itself; but it would seem that a degree of knowledge in chemistry lay at its base, by which all kinds of elements became known. It was regarded as beneath the dignity of a man, however, and Odin was the only one who made use of it.

Seidel, Caspar Timotheus

a Lutheran divine of Germany, was born Sept. 20, 1703, at Schoneberg, in Brandenburg, and died as doctor of divinity and abbot of Königsutter, at Helmstädt, May 30, 1758. He wrote, *Dissertatio, in qua ostenditur Pontifaces in Ritu Confirmationis a Praxi Ecclesioe Apostol. plane Aberrare* (Helmstadt, 1732): — *Programma de Quoestione an Christus Pascham suam Ultimam Uno Eodemque Die cum Judoeis comederet, necne?* (ibid. 1748): — *Abhandlung über die Sekte der Elcenseiten* (ibid. 1749): — *Anweisung zur Erklärung der heil. Schrift* (Halle, 1759). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 308; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur.* (B.P.)

Seidel, Gotthold Emanuel Friedrich

a Lutheran theologian of Germany, born at Ezelwang, March 10, 1774, was appointed in 1802 deacon of St., AEgidius's at Nuremberg, in 1817 pastor of the same church, and in 1829 dean of Nuremberg, where he died, Feb. 6, 1838. Seidel published several collections of sermons delivered at Nuremberg, which are enumerated in Zuchold, *Biblioth. Theolog.* p. 1211 sq.; and in Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur.* (B.P.)

Seidel, Heinrich Alexander

a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born Feb. 4, 1811, at Goldberg, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. He studied at Rostock and Berlin, and in 1839, he was called to the pastorate at Berlin. In 1851 he was made pastor of St. Nicolai in Schwerin, but bodily infirmities obliged him to retire in 1859 from the pastorate, and he died Jan. 30, 1861. Seidel is best known in German hymnology by his spiritual hymns, which he published in two collections, entitled *Kreuz und Harfe* (Schwerin and Rostock, 1839 and 1857). See

Zuchold, *Biblioth. Theolog.* p. 1215; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7, 294 sq. (B.P.)

Seiler, Georg Friedrich

a German theologian, was born Oct. 24, 1733, at Kreussen, near Bayreuth. In 1761 he was deacon at Neustadt-an-der-Heide, in 1764 at Coburg; in 1770, professor of theology at Erlangen; in 1772, university preacher; in 1773, member of consistory and principal of an institute for morals and liberal arts, founded by himself at Erlangen. He died May 13, 1807. In theology he represented supranaturalistic views, which he also propagated both as a teacher and a writer. His writings, mostly practical, are many, and have often been republished. Of these we mention, *Sermons* (1769 sq.; 4th ed. 1798): — *History of the Revealed. Religion* (1772; 9th ed. 1800): — *Bibl. Erbauungsbuch* (Erlangen, 1785-94, 17 vols.): — *Opuscula Academica* (ibid. 1793), etc. See the *Theol. Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 6, 223 sq.; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* p. 1215 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 308. (B.P.)

Se'ir

(Heb. *Sei'r*, ry[æ]hairy [i.e. *rough*, by a play upon the name of *Esau*, see ^{<025>}Genesis 25:25]; Sept. *Σηερί*, v.r. in No. 1 *Σηθίρ*, in No. 3 *Ἀσσάρ*), the name of a man and of two mountains.

1. A phylarch or chief of the Horim, who were the former inhabitants of the country afterwards possessed by the Edomites (^{<020>}Genesis 26:20, 21; ^{<018>}1 Chronicles 1:38). B.C. ante 1960. The region doubtless derived its name from him (comp. Josephus, *Σαείρα*, *Ant.* 2, 1,1).

2. MOUNT SEIR (ry[æ]rhi ^{<046>}Genesis 14:6 sq.), or LAND OF SEIR (ry[æ]ra, 32:3; 36:30), was the original name of the mountain ridge extending along the east side of the valley of Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf. The name (==“the shaggy”) was probably in the first instance derived from Seir the Horite, who appears to have been the chief of the aboriginal inhabitants (36:20), and then, secondarily, by a paronomasia frequent in such cases, from the rough aspect of the whole country. The view from Aaron's tomb on Hor, in the center of Mount Seir, is enough to show the appropriateness of the appellation. The sharp and serrated ridges, the jagged rocks and cliffs, the straggling bushes and stunted trees, give the whole scene a sternness and ruggedness almost

unparalleled. In the Samaritan Pentateuch, instead of $\text{ry}[\zeta]$, the name, hl bg is used; and in the Jerusalem Targum, in place of "Mount Seir" we find al bgd arwf , *Mount Gabla*. The word *Gabla* signifies "mountain," and is thus descriptive of the region (Reland, *Palœst.* p. 83). The name Gebala, or Gebalene, was applied to this province by Josephus, and also by Eusebius and Jerome (Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 1, 2; *Onomast.* s.v. "Idumaea"). The northern section of Mount Seir, as far as Petra, is still called *Jebal*, the Arabic form of Gebal. The Mount Seir of the Bible extended much farther south than the modern province, as is shown by the words of ^{<BIB>}Deuteronomy 2:1-8. In fact, its boundaries are there defined with tolerable exactness. It had the Arabah on the west (ver. 1 and 8); it extended as far south as the head of the Gulf of Akabah (ver. 8); its eastern border ran along the base of the mountain range where the plateau of Arabia begins. Its northern border is not so accurately determined. The land of Israel, as described by Joshua, extended from "the Mount Halak that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal Gad" (^{<BIB>}Joshua 11:17). As no part of Edom was given to Israel, Mount Halak must have been upon its northern border. Now there is a line of "naked" (*halak* signified "naked") white hills or cliffs which runs across the great valley about eight miles south of the Dead Sea, forming the division between the Arabah proper and the deep Ghor north of it. The view of these cliffs, from the shore of the Dead Sea, is very striking. They appear as a line of hills shutting in the valley, and extending up to the mountains of Seir. The impression left by them on the mind of the writer was that this is the very "Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir" (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2, 113, etc.; see Keil on ^{<BIB>}Joshua 11:17). The northern border of the modern district of Jebal is Wady el-Ahsy, which falls into the Ghor a few miles farther north (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 401).

In ^{<BIB>}Deuteronomy 33:2, Seir appears to be connected with Sinai and Paran; but a careful consideration of that difficult passage proves that the connection is not a geographical one. Moses there only sums up the several glorious manifestations of the divine majesty to the Israelites, without regard either to time or place (^{<BIB>}Judges 5:4, 5).

Mount Seir was originally inhabited by the Horites, or "troglodytes," who were doubtless the excavators of those singular rock dwellings found in such numbers in the ravines and cliffs around Petra. They were dispossessed, and apparently annihilated, by the posterity of Esau, who

“dwelt in their stead” (^{}Deuteronomy 2:12). The history of Seir thus early merges into that of Edom. Though the country was afterwards called Edom, yet the older name, Seir, did not pass away: it is frequently mentioned in the subsequent history of the Israelites (^{}1 Chronicles 4:42; ^{}2 Chronicles 20:10). Mount Seir is the subject of a terrible prophetic curse pronounced by Ezekiel (^{}Ezekiel 35), which seems now to be literally fulfilled: “Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O Mount Seir, I am against thee, and I will make thee most desolate. I will lay thy cities waste,... . when the whole earth rejoiceth I will make thee desolate... . I will make thee perpetual desolations, and thy cities shall not return, and ye shall know that I am the Lord.”

The southern part of this range now bears the appellation *esh-Sherah*, which seems no other than a modification of the ancient name. In modern times these mountains were first visited and described by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 40), but they have often since been visited by other travelers, among whom Dr. Robinson has perhaps furnished the best description of them (*Bib. Res.* 2, 551, 552). At the base of the chain are low hills of limestone or argillaceous rock; then lofty masses of porphyry, which constitute the body of the mountain; above these is sandstone broken into irregular ridges and grotesque groups of cliffs; and again, farther back, and higher than all, are long elevated ridges of limestone without precipices. Beyond all these stretches off indefinitely the high plateau of the great eastern desert. The height of the porphyry cliffs is estimated by Dr. Robinson at about 2000 feet above the Arabah (the great valley between the Dead Sea and Elanitic Gulf); the elevation of Wady Musa above the same is perhaps 2000 or 2200 feet; while the limestone ridges farther back probably do not fall short of 3000 feet. The whole breadth of the mountainous tract between the Arabah and the eastern desert above does not exceed fifteen or twenty geographical miles. These mountains are quite different in character from those which front them on the other (west) side of the Arabah. The latter seem to be not more than two thirds as high as the former, and are wholly desert and sterile; while those on the east appear to enjoy a sufficiency of rain, and are covered with tufts of herbs and occasional trees. The valleys are also full of trees and shrubs and flowers, the eastern and higher parts being extensively cultivated, and yielding good crops. The general appearance of the soil is not unlike that around Hebron, though the face of the country is very different. It is, indeed, the region of which Isaac said to his son Esau, “Behold, thy dwelling shall be [far] from

the fatness of the earth, and the dew of heaven from above” (^{<01273>}Genesis 27:39). *SEE IDUMEA*.

3. An entirely different mountain from the foregoing formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of the territory of Judah (^{<01650>}Joshua 15:10 only). It lay westward of Kirjath-jearim, and between it and Bethshemesh. If Kuriet el-Enab be the former, and Ain-shems the latter of these two, then Mount Seir cannot fail to be the ridge which lies between the Wady Aly and the Wady Ghurab (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3, 155). A village called *Saris* stands on the southern side of this ridge, which Tobler (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 203) and Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 97) with great probability identify with Seir, notwithstanding considerable difference in the names. The *Sa'irah*, on the south of the Wady Surar (Robinson, 1st ed. 2, 364), is nearer in orthography, but not so suitable in position.

It is possibly the **Σωρής**, which, in the Alex. MS., is one of the eleven names inserted by the Sept. in ^{<01659>}Joshua 15:59. The neighboring names agree. In the Vat. MS. it is **Ἐωβής**

How the name of Seir came to be located so far to the north of the main seats of the Seirites we have no means of knowing. Perhaps, like other names occurring in the tribe of Benjamin, it is a monument of an incursion by the Edomites which has escaped record. See OPHNI, etc. But it is more probable that it derived its name from some peculiarity in the form or appearance of the spot. Dr. Robinson (3, 155), apparently without intending any allusion to the name of Seir, speaks of the “rugged points which composed the main ridge” of the mountain in question. Such is the meaning of the Hebrew word *Seir*. Whether there is any connection between this mountain and Seirath (q.v.), or *has-Seirah*, is not so clear. The name is not a common one, and it is not unlikely that it may have been attached to the more northern continuation of the hills of Judah which ran up into Benjamin — or, as it was then called, Mount Ephraim.

Se'irath

(Heb. with the art. *has-Seirah'*, **hry[~~abi~~]** *the shaggy*; Sept.; **Σειρωθά** v.r. **Σειρωθά**; Vulg. *Seirath*), the place to which Ehud fled after his murder of Eglon (^{<01036>}Judges 3:26), and whither, by blasts of his cow horn, he collected his countrymen for the attack of the Moabites in Jericho (ver. 27). It was in “Mount Ephraim” (ver. 27), a continuation, perhaps, of the same rough wooded hills (such seems to be the signification of *Seir*) which

stretched even so far south as to join the territory of Judah (^{<1651>}Joshua 15:10). The definite article prefixed to the name in the original shows that it was a well known spot in its day. — Smith. It is probably the same as Mount *Seir* (q.v.) just referred to, the *Saris* of the present day.

Seirim

SEE SATYR.

Seite

in Lapp mythology, are deities whose office it was to promote the fertility of fields and herds. Very little is known respecting the form they assumed in the popular conception. They are said to have had feet like birds.

Seitonji

in Prussian mythology, were the lowest class of priests, of whom each village had one or more. They were regarded with great awe, but did not, like the other priests, enjoy the respect of the people.

Seja

in Roman mythology, is (1) a surname of Fortuna, to whom Servius Tullius dedicated a temple. (2) A Roman deity of sowing.

Seja

in Hindu mythology, is identical with *Ananda*, the noted serpent which was wound about the mountain Mandar in order to turn it into the Milk Sea.

Se'la

(Heb. with the art. *has-Se'la*, [I Shj] *the rock*, as rendered in ^{<1003>}Judges 1:36; ^{<4252>}2 Chronicles 25:12; ^{<3100>}Obadiah 1:3; and by the Sept. [ἦ]πέτρα; A.V. “Selah” in ^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7), the name given in the above passages, and (in the A.V.) in ^{<2161>}Isaiah 16:1, to the metropolis of the Edomites in Mount Seir. In the Jewish history it is recorded that Amaziah, king of Judah, “slew of Edom, in the valley of salt, ten thousand, and took Sela by war, and called the name of it Joktheel unto this day” (^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7). The parallel narrative of ^{<4251>}2 Chronicles 25:11-13 supplies fuller details. From it we learn that, having beaten the Edomitish army with a great slaughter in the “valley of salt” — the valley south of the Dead Sea —

Amaziah took those who were not slain to the cliff, and threw them headlong over it. This cliff is asserted by Eusebius (*Onomast.* Πέτρα) to be “a city of Edom, also called by the Assyrians *Rekem*,” by which there is no doubt that he intends *Petra* (see *ibid.* Ρεκέμ, and the quotations in Stanley’s *Sin. and Pal.* p. 94, note). The title thus bestowed is said to have continued “unto this day.” This, Keil remarks, is a proof that the history was nearly contemporary with the event, because Amaziah’s conquest was lost again by Ahaz less than a century afterwards (⁴⁸¹⁷2 Chronicles 28:17). This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; and it is still called by its original name by Isaiah (²³¹⁰Isaiah 16:1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture; for it may well be doubted whether it is designated in ⁰⁰¹³⁶Judges 1:36 and ²⁴²¹Isaiah 42:11, as some suppose. On the ground of the sameness of signification, it is by common consent identified with the city later known as *Petra*, 500 Roman miles from Gaza (Pliny, 6, 32), the ruins of which, now called those of *Wady Musa*, are found about two days’ journey north of the top of the Gulf of Akaba, and three or four south from Jericho. This place was in the midst of Mount Seir, in the neighborhood of Mount Hor (Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 4, 7), and therefore in Edomitish territory, but seems to have afterwards come under the dominion of Moab. In the end of the 4th century B.C. it appears as the headquarters of the Nabathaans, who successfully resisted the attacks of Antigonus (Diod. Sic. [ed. Hanov. 1604] 19, 731), and under them became one of the greatest stations for the approach of Eastern commerce to Rome (id. p. 94; Strabo, 16, 799; Apul. *Flor.* 1, 6). About B.C. 70 *Petra* appears as the residence of the Arab princes named Aretas (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 1, 4; 5, 1, *War.* 1, 6, 2; 29, 3). It was by Trajan reduced to subjection to the Roman empire (Dion Cass. 68, 14), and from the next emperor received the name of *Hadriana*, as appears from the legend of a coin (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 931). Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 4, 7) gives the name of Arce (Ἀρκη) as an earlier synonym for *Petra*, where, however, it is probable that Ἀρκήμ or Ἀρκέμ (alleged by Eusebius, *Onomast.*, as found in Josephus) should be read. The city *Petra* lay, though at a high level, in a hollow shut in by mountain cliff and approached only by a narrow ravine through which, and across the city’s site, the river winds (Pliny, 6, 32; Strabo, 16, 779). **SEE PETRA.**

Se'la-hammah'lekoth

(Heb. *Se'la hammachlekoth'*, תַּוּקַל יְמַחֵ לִי סֵפֶ Sept. πέτρα ἡ μερισθεῖσα; Vulg. *Petra dividens*), a rock in the wilderness of Maon, the scene of one of those remarkable escapes which are so frequent in the history of Saul's pursuit of David (^{<1238>}1 Samuel 23:28). Its name, if interpreted as Hebrew, signifies the "rock of escapes," or "of divisions." The former is the explanation of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 485), the latter of the Targum and the ancient Jewish interpreters (Midrash; Rashi). The escape is that of David; the divisions are those of Saul's mind, undecided whether to remain in pursuit of his enemy or to go after the Philistines; but such explanations, though appropriate to either interpretation, and consistent with the Oriental habit of playing on words, are doubtless mere accommodations. The analogy of topographical nomenclature makes it almost certain that this cliff must have derived its name either from its *smoothness* (one of the radical meanings of קַל יְ) or from some peculiarity of shape or position, such as is indicated in the translations of the Sept. and Vulgate. The *divisions* characteristic of the mountain, or rather *cliff* (for such *Sela* properly means), probably were the seams or *ravines* down its sides, which furnished David the means of escape. According to Lieut. Conder (*Tent Work in Palestine*, 2, 91), the name *Malaky* is still applied to part of a rocky gorge between Ziph and Maon," seamed with many torrent beds."

Se'lah

(^{<1247>}2 Kings 14:7). *SEE SELA*.

Se'lah

(Heb. *id.* הַלֵּ סֵ). This word, which is only found in the poetical books of the Old Test., occurs seventy-one times in the Psalms, and three times in Habakkuk. In sixteen psalms it is found once, in fifteen twice, in seven three times, and in one four times — always at the end of a verse, except in ^{<1259>}Psalms 55:19 [20]; 57:3 [4], and ^{<1268>}Habakkuk 3:3, 9, where it is in the middle of a verse, though at the end of a clause. All the psalms in which it occurs, except eleven (3, 7, 24, 32, 48, 1, 82, 83, 87, 89, 143), have also the musical direction "to the Chief Musician" (comp. also ^{<1269>}Habakkuk 3:19); and in these exceptions we find the words *rmzha*, *mizmor* (A.T. "Psalm"), *Shiggaion*, or *Maschil*, which sufficiently indicate that they were

intended for music. Besides these, in the titles of the psalms in which Selah occurs, we meet with the musical terms Alamoth (46), Altaschith (57, 59, 75), Gittith (81, 84), Mahalath Leannoith (88), Michtam (57, 59, 60), Neginah (61), Neginoth (4, 54, 55, 67, 76; comp. ^{<38B9>}Habakkuk 3:19), and Shushan-eduth (60); and on this association alone might be formed a strong presumption that, like these, Selah itself is a term which had a meaning in the musical nomenclature of the Hebrews. What that meaning may have been is now a matter of pure conjecture. Of the many theories which have been framed, it is easier to say what is not likely to be the true one than to pronounce certainly upon what is.

1. The Versions. — In the far greater number of instances the Targum renders the word by ^{<38B9>}*ymǣl l* “forever;” four times (^{<38B9>}Psalm 32:4, 7; 39:11 [12]; 4 [6]) *am̄ l l* once (44:8 [9]) ^{<38B9>}*ymǣl iymē l l* and (48:8 [9]) ^{<38B9>}*ymǣl iymē l id l* with the same meaning, “forever and ever.” In ^{<38B3>}Psalm 49:13 [14] it has *ytad]am̄ l l* “for the world to come;” in ^{<38B5>}Psalm 39:5 [6] *am̄ l iyyēl* “for the life everlasting;” and in ^{<38B5>}Psalm 140:5 [6] *arydǣ*, “continually.” This interpretation, which is the one adopted by the majority of Rabbinical writers, is purely traditional, and based upon no etymology whatever. It is followed by Aquila, who renders “Selah” ^{<38B5>}*ἀεί*; by the *editio quinta* and *editio sexta*, which usually give respectively ^{<38B5>}*διαπαντός* and ^{<38B5>}*εἰς τέλος*; by Symmachus (^{<38B5>}*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) and Theodotion (^{<38B5>}*εἰς τέλος*), in Habakkuk; by the reading of the Alex. MS. (^{<38B5>}*εἰς τέλος*) in ^{<38B3>}Habakkuk 3:13; by the Peshito-Syriac in ^{<38B3>}Psalm 3:8 [9], 4:2 [3]; 24:10, and ^{<38B3>}Habakkuk 3:13; and by Jerome, who has *semper*. In ^{<38B9>}Psalm 55:19 [20] *hl s,mdq*, *kedem selah*, is rendered in the Peshito “from before the world.” That this rendering is manifestly inappropriate in some passages, as, for instance, ^{<38B9>}Psalm 21:2 [3]; 32:4; 81:7 [8], and ^{<38B3>}Habakkuk 3:3, and superfluous in others, as ^{<38B5>}Psalm 44:8 [9]; 84:4 [5]; 89:4 [5], was pointed out long since by Aben-Ezra. In the Psalms the uniform rendering of the Sept. is ^{<38B5>}*διάψαλμα*. Symmachus and Theodotion give the same, except in ^{<38B6>}Psalm 9:16 [17], where Theodotion has ^{<38B5>}*ἀεί*, and ^{<38B5>}Psalm 52:5 [7], where Symmachus has ^{<38B5>}*εἰς ἀεί*. In ^{<38B3>}Habakkuk 3:13 the Alex. MS. gives ^{<38B5>}*εἰς τέλος*. In Psalm 38 (in the Sept.), 7; 80, 7 [8], ^{<38B5>}*διάψαλμα* is added in the Sept., and in ^{<38B7>}Habakkuk 3:7 in the Alex. MS. In Psalm 57 it is put at the end of ver. 2; and in ^{<38B5>}Psalm 3:8 [9]; 24:10; 88:10, 11, it is omitted altogether. In all passages except those already referred to, in which it follows the Targum,

the Peshito-Syriac has *dips*, an abbreviation for **διάψαλμα**. This abbreviation is added in ^{<9983>}Psalm 48:13 [14]; 1, 15 [16]; 68:13 [14]; 57:2; 80:7 [8], at the end of the verse; and in ^{<9513>}Psalm 52:3 in the middle of the verse after **ܒܘܫܡܝܢ** in Psalm 49 it is put after **ܐܝܟܝ** in ver. 14 [15], and in Psalm 68, after **ܚܢ** in ver. 8 [9], and after **ܡܝܗܘܠܐ** in ver. 32 [33]. The Vulgate omits it entirely, while in ^{<888>}Habakkuk 3:3 the *editio sexta* and others give **μεταβολή διαψάλματος**.

2. The Church Fathers. — These generally adopt the rendering **διάψαλμα** of the Sept. and other translators, although it is in every way as traditional as that of the Targum “forever,” and has no foundation in any known etymology. With regard to the meaning of **διάψαλμα** itself, there are many opinions. Both Origen (*Comm. ad Psalm, Opp.* ed. Delarue, 2, 516) and Athanasius (*Synops. Script. Sacr.* 13) are silent upon this point. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Proef. in Psalm*) says it marked those passages in which the Holy Spirit ceased for a time to work upon the choir. Gregory of Nyssa (*Tract. 2 in Psalm* cap. 10) interprets it as a sudden lull in the midst of the psalmody, in order to receive anew the divine inspiration. Chrysostom (*Opp.* ed. Montfaucon, 5, 540) takes it to indicate the portion of the psalm which was given to another choir. Augustine (*On Psalm 4*) regards it as an interval of silence in the psalmody. Jerome (*Ep. ad Marcellam*) enumerates the various opinions which have been held upon the subject; that *diapsalma* denotes a change of meter, a cessation of the Spirit’s influence, or the beginning of another sense. Others, he says, regard it as indicating a difference of rhythm, and the silence of some kind of music in the choir; but for himself he falls back upon the version of Aquila, and renders *Selah* by *semper*, with a reference to the custom of the Jews to put at the end of their writings Amen, *Selah*, or *Shalom*. In his *Commentary on Psalm 3* he is doubtful whether to regard it as simply a musical sign, or as indicating the perpetuity of the truth contained in the passage after which it is placed; so that, he says, “wheresoever *Selah* (that is, *diapsalma* or *semper*) is put, there we may know that what follows, as well as what precedes, belongs not only to the present time, but to eternity.” Theodoret (*Proef. in Psalm*) explains *diapsalma* by **μέλους μεταβολή** or **ἐναλλαγή** (as Suidas), “a change of the melody.” On the whole, the rendering **διάψαλμα** rather increases the difficulty, for it does not appear to be the true meaning of *Selah*, and its own signification is obscure.

3. Rabbinical Writers. — The majority of these follow the Targum and the dictum of R. Eliezer (Talm. Babyl. *Erubin*, 5, 54) in rendering *Selah* “forever;” but Aben-Ezra (*On* ^{<99B>}*Psalm* 3:3) showed that in some passages this rendering was inappropriate, and expressed his own opinion that *Selah* was a word of emphasis, used to give weight and importance to what was said, and to indicate its truth — “but the right explanation is that the meaning of *Selah* is like ‘so it is,’ or ‘thus,’ and ‘the matter is true and right.’” Kimchi (*Lex.* s.v.) doubted whether it had any special meaning at all in connection with the sense of the passage in which it was found, and explained it as a musical term. He derives it from **l l š**; *to raise, elevate*, with **h** paragogic, and interprets it as signifying a raising or elevating the voice, as much as to say in this place there was an elevation of the voice in song.

4. Modern Writers. — Among these there is the same diversity of opinion. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v.) derives *Selah* from **hl š**; *salah, to suspend*, of which he thinks it is the imperative Kal, with **h** paragogic, **hl š]** in pause **hl š**. But this form is supported by no parallel instance. In accordance with his derivation, which is harsh, he interprets *Selah* to mean either “suspend the voice,” that is, “be silent,” a hint to the singers, or “raise, elevate the stringed instruments.” In either case he regards it as denoting a pause in the song, which was filled up by an interlude played by the choir of Levites. Ewald (*Die Dichter des A.B.* 1, 179) arrives at substantially the same result by a different process. He derives *Selah* from **l l š**; *salal, to rise*, whence the substantive **l š]** which with **h** paragogic becomes in pause **hl š**, (comp. **hrh**, from **rhi**root **rrh**; ^{<0140>}Genesis 14:10). So far as the form of the word is concerned, this derivation is more tenable than the former. Ewald regards the phrase “Higgaion, *Selah*,” in ^{<0016>}Psalm 9:16 [17], as the full form, signifying “music, strike up!” — an indication that the voices of the choir were to cease while the instruments alone came in. Hengstenberg follows Gesenius, De Wette, and others, in the rendering *Pause!* but refers it to the contents of the psalm, and understands it of the silence of the music in order to give room for quiet reflection. If this were the case, *Selah* at the end of a psalm would be superfluous. The same meaning of *pause* or *end* is arrived at by Fürst (*Handw.* s.v.), who derives *Selah* from a root **hl š**; *salah, to cut off* (a meaning which is perfectly arbitrary), whence the substantive **l šesel**, which with **h** paragogic

becomes in pause **hl s**, a form which is without parallel. While etymologists have recourse to such shifts as these, it can scarcely be expected that the true meaning of the word will be evolved by their investigations. Indeed, the question is as far from solution as ever. Beyond the fact that *Selah* is a musical term, we know absolutely nothing about it, and are entirely in the dark as to its meaning. Sommer (*Bibl. Abhandl.* 1, 1-84) has devoted an elaborate discourse to its explanation (translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 66 sq.). After observing that *Selah* everywhere appears to mark critical moments in the religious consciousness of the Israelites, and that the music was employed to give expression to the energy of the poet's sentiments on these occasions, he (p. 40) arrives at the conclusion that the word is used "in those passages where, in the Temple Song, the choir of priests who stood opposite to the stage occupied by the Levites were to raise their trumpets (**l l s**), and with the strong tones of this instrument mark the words just spoken, and bear them upwards to the hearing of Jehovah. Probably the Levitical minstrels supported this priestly intercessory music by vigorously striking their harps and psalteries; whence the Greek expression **διάψαλμα**. To this points, moreover, the fuller direction, 'Higgaion, *Selah*' (^{<3916>}Psalm 9:16); the first word of which denotes the whirr of the stringed instruments (^{<3920>}Psalm 92:4), the other the raising of the trumpets, both of which were here to sound together. The less important *Higgaion* fell away, when the expression was abbreviated, and *Selah* alone remained." Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to the Old Test.* 2, 248) with good reason rejects this explanation as labored and artificial, though it is adopted by Keil in Hävernick's *Einleitung* (3, 120-129). He shows that in some passages (as ^{<3920>}Psalm 32:4, 5; 52:3; 55:7, 8) the playing of the priests on the trumpets would be unsuitable, and proposes the following as his own solution of the difficulty: "The word denotes *elevations* or *ascent*, i.e. *loud*, *clear*. The music which commonly accompanied the singing was soft and feeble. In cases where it was to burst in more strongly during the silence of the song, *Selah* was the sign. At the end of a verse or strophe, where it commonly stands, the music may have readily been strongest and loudest." It may be remarked of this, as of all the other explanations which have been given, that it is mere conjecture, based on an etymology which, in any other language than Hebrew, would at once be rejected as unsound. A few other opinions may be noticed as belonging to the history of the subject. Michaelis, in despair at being unable to assign any meaning to the word, regarded it as an abbreviation, formed by taking the first or other letters of three other

words (*Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.*), though he declines to conjecture what these may have been, and rejects at once the guess of Meibomius, who extracts the meaning *da capo* from the three words which he suggests. For other conjectures of this kind, see Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5, 545. Mattheson was of opinion that the passages where Selah occurred were repeated either by the instruments or by another choir: hence he took it as equal to *ritornello*. Herder regarded it as marking a change of key, while Paulus Burgensis and Schindler assigned to it no meaning, but looked upon it as an enclitic word used to fill up the verse. Buxtorf (*Lex. Hebr.*) derived it from **hl s**; *salah*, to spread, lay low; hence used as a sign to lower the voice, like *piano*. In Eichhorn's *Bibliothek* (5, 550) it is suggested that Selah may perhaps signify a scale in music, or indicate a rising or falling in the tone. Koster (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1831) saw in it only a mark to indicate the strophical divisions of the Psalms, but its position in the middle of verses is against this theory. Augusti (*Pract. Einl. in d. Psalm* p. 125) thought it was an exclamation, like *Hallelujah!* and the same view was taken by the late Prof. Lee (*Heb. Gr.* § 243, 2), who classes it among the interjections, and renders it *Praise!* "For my own part," he says, "I believe it to be descended from the Arabic root *salah*, 'he blessed,' etc., and used not unlike the word *Amen*, or the *doxology*, among ourselves." Delitzsch thinks that the instrumental accompaniment, while the psalm was sung, was soft, and that the Selah indicated loud playing when the singing ceased (*Psalmen*, 1, 19). Hupfeld, the other most distinguished scholar among recent commentators on the Psalms, agrees with Delitzsch in general that the *Selah* was the signal for the singing to cease and the instrumental music to be performed alone; and he takes "an interlude" to be the meaning of the obscure word **διάψαλμα**, by which Selah has been rendered in the Sept. We conclude, therefore, as the general drift of modern interpretation, that *Selah* denotes a pause in the vocal performance at certain emphatic points, while the single accompanying instrument carried on the music. If any further information be sought on this subject, it may be found in the treatises contained in Ugolilo (vol. 22), in Noldius (*Concord. Part. Ann. et Vind.* No. 1877), in Saalschütz (*Hebr. Poes.* p. 346), and in the essay of Sommer quoted above. See also Stolle, *Selah Philologie Enuclatum* (Wittenb. 1685); Peucer, *De hl s Ebroeorum* (Naumb. 1739); *Danville Review*, 1864. **SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.**

Selav

SEE QUAIL.

Selden, John

an eminent lawyer and antiquarian, was born at Salvington, a hamlet in the parish of West Farring, near Worthing, in Sussex, England, Dec. 16, 1584. He received the rudiments of his education at the Free School of Chichester, and at the age of fourteen entered at Hert Hall, Oxford, where, although possessing great abilities, he did not particularly distinguish himself. He entered himself at Clifford's Inn in 1602 for the study of law, and in 1604 removed to the Inner Temple for the completion of his legal studies. He acquired very early a taste for antiquarian research, in which department he afterwards became so eminent. He was, in fact, one of the most learned men of his age. He lived in stirring times, and was, almost inevitably, mixed up with the stormy politics of the period; but he belonged to no extreme party, although a friend of liberty and of the popular cause. He died Nov. 30, 1654. His works are very numerous and learned. The following are those which require special notice here: *De Diis Syris Syntagmata Duo* (1617), which contains a history of the idol deities mentioned in Scripture, and a summary of Syrian idolatry: — *De Successione in Bona Defuncti ad Leges Ebroeorum* (1631). An improved edition of this work appeared in 1636, including an additional treatise entitled *De Successione in Pontificatum Ebroeorum*. Both these treatises were republished by the author, with additions, in 1638: — *De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Ebroeorum Libri Septem* (1640). In this work the author treats of the seven so called precepts of Noah, and gives a digest of all the laws of the Jews, distinguishing those which belong to universal law from those which are merely national and local: — *Uxor Ebraica; seu de Nuptiis et Divortiis ex Jure Civili, id est Divino et Talmudico, Veterum Ebroeorum Tres Libri* (1646). Everything relating to marriage and divorce among the Jews will be found treated of here: — *De Synedriis et Proefecturis Juridicis Veterum Ebroeorum* (1650). In this work, on which Selden spent twelve years, he sets forth everything recorded of the Sanhedrim, or juridical courts of the Jews, with collateral notices of similar institutions in other countries.

Selections Of Psalms

The Psalter, as it stands in the Prayer book of the Church of England, is divided into sixty portions, agreeing with the average number of mornings and evenings in the month. There are also ten *selections* of Psalms, any one of which may be used instead of the *regular* psalms of the day. These are prefixed to the Psalter, and consist of one or more psalms, chiefly on the same subject. The following are the subjects of the several selections: 1, the majesty, greatness, and compassion of God; 2, God as an all-seeing judge; 3, penitence and trust in God; 4, contrast between wicked and good; 5, blessedness of the righteous; 6, the Lord a refuge; 7, 8, the happiness and joy of those who wait upon the Lord, etc.; 9, God infinite and worthy of all praise; 10, invitation to unite in praising God.

Se'led

(Heb. **dl s**, *exultation*; Sept. **Σαλάδ** v.r. **Αλσαλάδ**). a descendant of Jerahmeel, son of Hezron, being the elder of the two sons of Nadab, and without children (t Chronicles ii, 30). B.C. post 1615.

Selemi'a

(Vulg. *Selemia*, the Gr. text being lost), the third named of the five rapid scribes whom Esdras was charged to select for taking down his visions (2 Esdr. 14:24). Selemi'as (**Σελεμίας**) the Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:34) of the name of SHELEMIAH *SEE SHELEMIAH* (q.v.), one of the "sons" of Bani (^{1504} Ezra 10:34).

Selemnus

in Greek mythology, was a shepherd boy of Achaia. He was found asleep among his herds by the nymph Argyra, and his youth and beauty led her to bestow on him her favor; but the beauty of man is not constant like that of a nymph, who retains her youth and beauty always, and Argyra accordingly forsook her lover when his charms were no longer, fresh and blooming to her eyes. Venus herself endeavored to turn the hard heart of the goddess, but in vain, and Selemnus pined away under the agonies of unrequited love. In her compassion Venus now changed him into a stream, on which she conferred the quality of inducing forgetfulness in the minds of all lovers who should bathe in its waters, so that they might be cured of their passion,

Selene

(Σελήνη, the *moon*), a goddess worshipped by the ancient Greeks, being the personification of the moon. She is called a daughter of Hyperion and Theia, and, accordingly, a sister of Helios and Eos. She is also called *Phoebe*, as the sister of Phoebus, the god of the sun. In later times Selene was identified with *Artemis*, and the worship of the two became amalgamated. Among the Romans she was called *Luna*; and had a temple on the Aventine at Rome. Selene is described as a very beautiful goddess, with long wings and a golden diadem, and AEschylus called her “the eye of night.”

Seleuci'a

Picture for Seleucia 1

Picture for Seleucia 1

Picture for Seleucia 3

[some wrongly *Seleu'cia*] (Σελεύκεια), a city of Syria, situated west of Antioch, on the sea coast, near the mouth of the Orontes; sometimes called *Seleucia Pieria*, from the neighboring Mount Pierus; and also *Seleucia ad Mare*, in order to distinguish it from several other cities of the same name, all of them denominated from Seleucus Nicanor. Its ancient name was *Rivers of Water* (Υδατος ποταμοί, Strabo, 16, 2, 8). It is fully described by Polybius (5, 39). It was practically the seaport of Antioch (q.v.), as Ostia was of Rome, Neapolis of Philippi, Cenchreae of Corinth, and the Piraeus of Athens. The river Orontes, after flowing past Antioch, entered the sea not far from Seleucia. The distance between the two towns was about sixteen miles, chiefly of broken ground, with a large mountain called Coryphaesium on the north near the sea. We are expressly told that Paul, in company with Barnabas, sailed from Seleucia at the beginning of his first missionary circuit (Acts 13:4); and it is almost certain that he landed there on his return from it (14:26). The name of the place shows at once that its history was connected with that line of Seleucidae who reigned at Antioch from the death of Alexander the Great to the close of the Roman republic, and whose dynasty had so intimate a connection with Jewish annals (1 Macc. 11:8; Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 9, 8). **SEE SYRIA**. This strong fortress and convenient seaport was, in fact, constructed by the first Seleucus (died B.C. 280), and here he was buried. It was taken by Ptolemy

Euergetes on his expedition to Syria, but was recovered by Antiochus Epiphanes. It retained its importance in Roman times, and in Paul's day it had the privileges of a free city (Pliny, *H.N.* 5, 18). The remains are numerous, the most considerable being an immense excavation extending from the higher part of the city to the sea; but to us the most interesting are the two piers of the old harbor, which still bear the names of Paul and Barnabas. The masonry continues so good that the idea of clearing out and repairing the harbor was entertained, but not executed, by one Ali Pasha, of Aleppo. Accounts of Seleucia were first given by Pococke (*Observations in the East*, 22, 182), and afterwards in the narrative of the *Euphrates Expedition* by general Chesney, and in his papers in the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* (8, 228 sq.), and also in a paper by Dr. Yates in the *Museum of Classical Antiquities*. The harbor has still more lately been surveyed by captain Allen (*Dead Sea*, etc.). See also Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1, 137; Lewin, *St. Paul*, 1, 116 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.

Seleucia (In Chaldoea), Council Of

was held in 410, in order to reestablish ecclesiastical discipline in Persia and Mesopotamia. Twenty-seven canons were made.

1. Orders prayers to be made for princes.
2. Contains a profession of faith agreeing with that of Nicaea.
3. Orders that the consecration of a bishop be performed by three bishops at least.
5. Excludes from every ministration priests and deacons who do not observe strict continence.
6. Ordains the same thing with respect to clerks guilty of usury.
7. Excommunicates all who have dealings with enchanter, etc.
10. Directs that priests and other clerks shall eat in a place distinct from the poor.
11. Orders that their sleeping rooms also shall be separate.

15 and **16**. Ordain that there shall be but one archdeacon in each diocese, who shall act as the arm and tongue of the bishop to publish and execute his will.

20. Permits the archdeacon to celebrate the holy eucharist in the absence of the bishop, and gives him power to punish deacons under certain circumstances.

25. Forbids bishops to ordain priests and deacons anywhere save before the altar.

See Mansi, *Supp.* vol. 1, col. 285.

Seleucia (In Syria), Council Of

This council was held in the Church of St. Tecla, Sept. 27, 359, by order of the emperor Constantius. One hundred and sixty bishops were present, of whom about one hundred five were Semi-Arians, forty Anomoeans and thirteen Catholics; among these was St. Hilary of Poitiers, who for four years had been banished into Phrygia. Among the Semi-Arians were George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Basil of Ancyra, and Eustachius of Sebaste. The Anomoeans formed the party of Acacius of Caesarea. The thirteen Catholic bishops, who probably came from Egypt, alone maintained the consubstantiality of the Word. Leonas, the imperial quaestor, had orders to attend the deliberations of the assembly. The bishops forming the party of Acacius, anxious to avoid any inquiry, into the several accusations and complaints which they were aware would be brought against them, insisted that, first of all, the questions relating to the faith should be examined, and after some discussion they gained their point. In the very first sitting, however, they openly renounced the Council and the Creed of Nicaea, and maintained that the Son was of a substance different from that of the Father. A discussion ensued between them and the Semi-Arians, which ended in the Acacians leaving the assembly, disgusted with its decision, viz. that the formulary drawn up at Antioch in 341 should be adhered to.

In the second sitting the formulary of Antioch was confirmed by the Semi-Arians, who were alone in the council; while the Acacians drew up a new formulary, condemning both the similarity of substance and the contrary. In the third sitting the dispute was continued, Leonas having been deputed by the Acacians to attend for them, and to deliver their formulary of faith. In

the fourth sitting the Acacians declared that they believed the likeness of the Son to the Father to consist in a likeness of will only, and not of essence. The others maintained a likeness of essence also, and no decision was arrived at.

In the fifth sitting the Acacians were summoned to attend to examine the case of St. Cyril, who appealed from the judgment of Acacius, by whom he had been deposed. They refused to attend; and, after having frequently summoned them, the council deposed Acacius, Eudoxius of Antioch, George of Alexandria, and several others. They reduced to the communion of their respective churches, Asterius, Eusebius; and five others, until such time as they should disprove the accusations brought against them. Another bishop was elected to the see of Antioch. The sentence of the council was not, however, carried into effect, as the deposed bishops were able to secure the favor of the emperor.

Seleucians

the followers of Seleucus, a philosopher of Galatia, who, about the year 380, adopted some of the notions of the Valentinians. He taught that Jesus Christ assumed a body only in appearance; that the world was not made by God, but was eternal; that the soul was only an animated fire created by angels; that Christ does not sit at the right hand of the Father in a human body, but that he lodged his body in the sun, according to ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 19:4; and that all the pleasures of happiness consist in corporeal delight. Augustine says that the Seleucians rejected the use of water in baptism, under the pretense that this was not the baptism instituted by Christ, because John, comparing his baptism with that of Christ, says, "I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." They deemed a baptism of fire more suitable to the spiritual nature of man than a baptism of water, since they taught that the soul was a portion of living fire. *SEE HERMIANS.*

Seleucidic era

is that chronology which dates from the victory of Seleucus over Antigonus and the recovery of Babylonia (October, B.C. 312). This "era of the Seleucidae" was at one time in general use throughout all Central and Western Asia. The Arabians, who called it the "era of the two-horned" (*Dhulkarnaim*), meaning Alexander, did not relinquish it till long after the religion of Mohammed had arisen, and the era of the "Hegira" (the flight of

Mohammed from Mecca to Medina) had been introduced. The Jews did not adopt this era till after they passed from under the dominion of the Egypto-Greeks to that of the Syro-Greeks, when they were obliged to employ it in their civil contracts, and therefore it was designated by them as the $\tau\omega\rho\ \phi\varsigma\ \acute{\gamma}\eta\mu$, or “era of contracts,” and $\mu\gamma\eta\omega\gamma\ \acute{\gamma}\eta\mu$, or “Greek era.” Thenceforth they retained its use upwards of twelve centuries, and employed no other epoch till the final close of the schools on the Euphrates (A.D. 1040), since when they date their era from the creation. This Seleucidic era is the same which in the Books of the Maccabees is designated as “the year of the kingdom of the Greeks” ($\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, 1 Macc. 1, 10), and both books compute by it. The student of history can very easily make use of the Seleucidic era by bearing in mind that the first year of this era corresponds to the first year of the 117th Olympiad, or to the year 442 *ab urbe condita*, or to the year B.C. 312. With this guide in his hand he will be enabled to find any year corresponding to that of the Seleucidic era; thus the year

1 B.C. is =312 Sel.=753 ab u. c.=194, 4 Olymp.

1 A.D. is=313 Sel.=754 ab u. c.=195, 1 Olymp.

70 A.D. is=382 Sel.=823 ab u. c.=212, 2 Olymp.

100 A.D. is=412 Sel.=853 ab u. c.=219, 4 Olymp.

120 A.D. is=432 Sel.=873 ab u. c.=224, 4 Olymp.

130 A.D. is=442 Sel.=883 ab u. c.=227, 2 Olymp.

SEE AERA. (B.P.)

Seleu'cus

Picture for Seleucus

($\Sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, a common Greek name), the name of several of the kings of the Greek dominion of Syria (q.v.), hence called that of the Seleucidae.

SEE ANTIOCHUS. Of these one only is named in Scripture, although several are referred to in ²⁷¹⁰Daniel 11.

Seleucus IV

surnamed *Philopator* (or *Soter*, in Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 4, 10), styled “king of Asia” (2 Macc. 3, 3), that is, of the provinces included in the Syrian monarchy, according to the title claimed by the Seleucidae, even when they had lost their footing in Asia Minor (comp. 1 Macc. 8:6; 11:13, 12:39,

13:32), was the son and successor of Antiochus the Great (see Appian, *Syria*, 3, 45). He took part in the disastrous battle of Magnesia (B.C. 190), and three years afterwards, on the death of his father, ascended the throne. He seems to have devoted himself to strengthening the Syrian power, which had been broken down at Magnesia, seeking to keep on good terms with Rome and Egypt till he could find a favorable opportunity for war. He was, however, murdered, after a reign of twelve years (B.C. 175), by Heliodorus (q.v.), one of his own courtiers, “neither in [sudden] anger nor in battle” (²⁷¹¹³Daniel 11:20; see Jerome, *ad loc.*), but by ambitious treachery, without having effected anything of importance. His son Demetrius I Soter, *SEE DEMETRIUS*, whom he had sent, while still a boy, as hostage to Rome, after a series of romantic adventures gained the crown in B.C. 162 (1 Macc. 7:1; 2 Macc. 11:1). The general policy of Seleucus towards the Jews, like that of his father (3, 2, 3, *καὶ Σέλευκον*), was conciliatory, as the possession of Palestine was of the highest importance in the prospect of an Egyptian war; and he undertook a large share of the expenses of the Temple service (ver. 3, 6). On one occasion, by the false representations of Simon (q.v.), a Jewish officer, he was induced to make an attempt to carry away the treasures deposited in the Temple by means of the same Heliodorus who murdered him. The attempt signally failed, but it does not appear that he afterwards showed any resentment against the Jews (4, 5, 6,); though his want of money to pay the enormous tribute due to the Romans may have compelled him to raise extraordinary revenues, for which cause he *is* described in Daniel as a “raiser of taxes” (11, 20; comp. Livy, 41, 19). See Manzini’s monograph (in Italian) on this prince (Mailand, 1634).

Seleucus

SEE SELEUCIANS.

Seleznevtshini

a sect of dissenters from the Russo-Greek Church resembling the Strigolniks (q.v.).

Self baptizers

SEE SE-BAPTISTS.

Self Deception

deception proceeding from, and practiced upon, one's self, especially in forming judgments or receiving impressions of our own state, character, and conduct. For example:

- 1.** In judging of our own character we are very apt to enhance the good qualities we possess, to give ourselves credit for others that we really have not, and to ignore the evil qualities that should be seen by us.
- 2.** In the matter of our conduct we are very prone to persuade ourselves either that our acts were not wrong, or that the peculiar circumstances under which we were placed were so extenuating as to remove actual guilt.
- 3.** There is a tendency to confound the non-appearance of a vicious affection with its actual extirpation.
- 4.** An improper estimate of the reality of our repentance, faith, works, etc., or of the importance of the same. The range of objects as to which men deceive themselves is very wide, including God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, Scriptures, experience, etc. The results are great and dangerous, it renders men slaves of procrastination, leads them to overrate themselves, flatters them with an easy victory, and confirms their evil habits. The means of avoiding self deception are strict self inquiry, prayer, watchfulness, and diligent study of God's Word.

Self Dedication

the unreserved dedication of ourselves to God with the purpose of serving him in holiness and righteousness.

Self Defense

the act of defending one's self and property from injury. The right of self defense has been questioned by many, and has also been stoutly advocated. The secular law requires no man to submit passively to the infliction of evil upon his person, but always allows him to defend himself. Of course, the violence used must only be so much as is necessary for defense. Is the principle of self defense contrary to the Gospel, or should a man choose rather to lose his own life than to save it at the expense of another's? It may be answered that where there is reason to believe that life is at stake one is justified in taking the life of the would-be murderer; for the reason

that in attempting a felony he has forfeited his life, and in preserving your own you spare the innocent. It is generally considered lawful even to kill in the defense of chastity, provided there be no other way of preserving it.

Self Denial

the forbearing to follow one's inclinations or desires. In the scriptural sense it is the renouncing of all those pleasures, profits, views, connections, or practices that are prejudicial to the true interests of the soul. The understanding must be so far denied as not to lean upon it independent of divine instruction (^{<4185>}Proverbs 3:5, 6). The will must be denied so far as it opposes the will of God (^{<4057>}Ephesians 5:17). The affections must be denied when they become inordinate (^{<5185>}Colossians 3:5). The gratification of the members of the body must be denied when out of their due course (^{<4162>}Romans 6:12, 13). The honors of the world and praise of men must be foregone when they become a snare (^{<5124>}Hebrews 11:24-26); also worldly emoluments, when to be obtained in an unlawful way or when standing in opposition to religion and usefulness (^{<4093>}Matthew 4:20-22). Friends and relatives must be renounced, so far as they oppose the truth and would influence us to oppose it too (^{<4121>}Genesis 12:1). Our own righteousness must be relinquished, so as not to depend upon it (^{<5188>}Philippians 3:8, 9). Life itself must be laid down if called for in the cause of Christ (^{<4163>}Matthew 16:24, 25). In fine, everything that is sinful must be denied, however pleasant and apparently advantageous, since, without holiness, no man shall see the Lord (^{<5124>}Hebrews 12:14).

Self Examination

the act of examining one's own conduct and motives. It is a duty commanded by God (^{<4715>}2 Corinthians 13:5), and, to result favorably, should be deliberate, frequent, impartial, diligent, wise, and with a desire of amendment. In self examination reference should always be made to the Word of God as the rule of duty.

Self Government

the wise and conscientious regulation of all our appetites, affections, and habits on Christian principles.

Selfishness

an inordinate self love, prompting one, for the sake of personal gratification or advantage, to disregard the rights or feelings of other men. It is a negative quality — that is, it consists in *not* considering what is due to one's neighbors through a deficiency of justice or benevolence. Selfishness is contrary to the Scriptures, which command us to have respect for the rights and feelings of others, and forbids us to encroach thereupon.

Self Knowledge

the knowledge of one's own nature, abilities, duties, principles, prejudices, tastes, virtues, and vices. This knowledge is commanded in the Scriptures (^{<4904>}Psalm 4:4; ^{<4715>}2 Corinthians 13:5). It is of great utility, as it leads to humility, contrition, prayer, self denial, charity. When by self knowledge we become acquainted with our powers, resolution, and motives, then we secure self possession. To secure self knowledge there must be watchfulness, frequent and close attention to the operations of our own mind, study of the Scriptures, and dependence on divine grace.

Self Love

(in Greek, *φιλαυτία*), an element of character which is to be carefully distinguished from *selfishness* as being radically different, and not so in degree only. The former is demanded by the moral consciousness in man, while the latter is condemned, and the same distinction prevails in the Scriptures. The one is the basis for motives to self examination, for prudence and carefulness of life, for self renewal and improvement; the other the ground in which all “works of the flesh” (^{<4859>}Galatians 5:19; comp. ^{<5460>}1 Timothy 6:10) are rooted.

General or philosophical ethics requires self love in the sense that each person should honor the idea of humanity or the human personality which underlies his own nature, and that he should develop it in every direction. The principle of humanity which asserts the dignity of human nature is the prevailing idea. Theological ethics treats self love as a disposition which has for its object the *Christian* personality, which springs from love to God and Christ, which sanctifies the Lord in the heart (^{<4185>}1 Peter 3:15), protects against all contamination of the flesh and spirit (^{<4001>}2 Corinthians 7:1), and seeks to be renewed in the spirit of the mind (^{<4023>}Ephesians 4:23)

in order that we may be glorified with Christ (^{<1183>}2 Corinthians 3:18). The regenerated personality, therefore, constitutes both subject and object in Christian self love, while, in the natural sentiment, unregenerate man is the substituted entity, and Christian self love alone is really virtuous, a personal disposition through which the Christian presents himself to God a holy, living sacrifice (^{<511>}Romans 12:1).

The intimate relation subsisting between self love and love to our neighbors is such that they are inseparable and mutually condition each other. Not only does love for others limit our love of self, but the egotist degrades himself in proportion as he indulges in his egotism; and no person is capable of being useful to others in his character and his life who does not in the best sense love and care for himself. Every duty to self may accordingly be viewed as duty to our neighbors, and *vice versa*, if care be taken to guard against the eudaemonism which is so likely to intrude.

In its manifestations Christian self love assumes a twofold character in which the negative and positive elements predominate at different times. The former element corresponds to *self respect*, whose influence leads the Christian to avoid everything that may wound, or in any way impair, the dignity conferred on him, and which impels him to cultivate the habit of spiritual watchfulness. Upon this ground the positive element in self love carries forward the work of renewal, including the whole of Christian development and perfection. And inasmuch as the entire man is concerned in these objects of self love, it follows that the body must share in the development and other benefits secured to the spirit, though simply as the spirit's minister and instrument (^{<1183>}1 Thessalonians 5:23). At this point Christian self love passes over into spiritual discipline, and coincides to some extent with Christian asceticism. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos.* s.v.

Self Murder

SEE SUICIDE.

Self Seeking

SEE COVETOUSNESS.

Selig, Gottfried

a convert from Judaism, whose original name was *Philipp Heynemann*, was born at Weissenfels in 1722. Up to his tenth year he enjoyed the lectures of a private tutor; after this time he was sent first to Dessau and then to Fürth, to attend the Talmudical lectures there. When he was thirteen years of age, his father wished him to become a merchant, but to this proposition he would not yield. His father finally consented to give him a better education, and a candidate of theology was intrusted with his instruction in the German and Latin languages. At times the pupil, who was well acquainted with the objections against Christianity, propounded questions to his teacher which the latter could not answer, because he was not acquainted enough with the Hebrew language. The teacher then invited a certain Herrlich, who was well acquainted with the Hebrew and Rabbinic literature, to meet Philipp several times in order to dispute with him about Christianity. The result was that the sting left in the Jewish heart became the impetus for further searching the Scriptures. About Christmas of 1737, Philipp went to pastor Schumann and handed to him a paper in which certain passages of the New Test. were written down, and of which he desired an explanation. This visit decided his future course, and Sept. 17, 1738, he was baptized at Weissenfels, assuming the name *Gottfried Selig*. In 1767 he came to Leipsic, where Prof. Dathe examined him in *Hebraicis*, and Prof. Bosseck in *Talmudicis et Rabbinicis*, and thus he was enabled to commence his lectures in Rabbinic literature. He died after 1792. He wrote, *Collectio abbreviatarum Hebraicarum ultra 4000 Assurgens* (Leipsic, 1781): — *Kurze undgrundliche Anweisung zu einer leichteren Erlernung der jüdisch-deutschen Sprache* (ibid. 1767): — *Der Jude* (ibid. 1767-71, 9 vols.), in which he describes the usages, customs, and doctrines of the Jews according to Rabbinic sources: — *Compendia Vocum Hebraico-Rabbinicarum* (ibid. 1780). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 309; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, p. 131; Delitzsch, *Saat auf Hoffnung*, 8, 159 sq. (B.P.)

Selingstad, Council Of

(*Concilium Salegunstadiense*). This council was held in August, 1022, by the emperor Henry; Aribo, archbishop of Mayence, presiding. Twenty canons were published.

- 3.** Forbids the celebration of marriages from Advent to the octave of the Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, during the fourteen days preceding the Feast of John the Baptist, and on fast days and vigils.
- 4.** Forbids a priest having drunk anything after cockcrow in summer to say mass on the following day; allows of cases of necessity in winter.
- 6.** States that complaints had been made of the conduct of some very foolish priests who were in the habit of throwing the corporal into a fire for the sake of extinguishing it, and strictly prohibits it.
- 9.** Forbids talking in church, or in the church porch.
- 10.** Forbids lay persons, and particularly matrons, to hear daily the gospel “In principio erat verbum;” and particular masses, such as the mass of the Holy Trinity or of St. Michael. The canon seems to imply that this had been done for the sake of divination.
- 16.** Forbids any person to go to Rome without first obtaining the permission of his bishop or his deputy.
- 18.** Notices the folly of those who, being guilty of some crimes, despise the penance imposed by their own priests, and trust to obtaining a plenary absolution from the Roman pontiff. It declares that such indulgence shall not be granted to them, but that in future they shall first fulfill the penance imposed, and then go to Rome, if they choose, having first obtained leave from their own bishop.

After the canons follows an appendix concerning the manner of celebrating a council.

Selinuntius

in Greek mythology, was a surname of *Apollo*, derived from his temple and oracle at Selinus.

Selinus

in Greek mythology, was a son of Neptune, river god and ruler of Aegialus, and father of Helice, who was married to Ion.

Selleck, Bradley

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Dainbury, Conn., Aug. 23, 1784. At the age of twelve he professed conversion, and united with the Church. He received license as local preacher before he was twenty-one. In 1822 he joined the New York Conference, and continued to labor till 1851. He made New York his residence during the remainder of his life, and was much esteemed by ministers and laymen of his own and other churches. He died in New York city, Nov. 4, 1860. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1861, p. 114.

Selli

the priests among the ancient Greeks who delivered the oracles of Zeus at Dodona. They are mentioned by Homer as having observed a very rigid discipline.

Sellman, Horace S.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Brown County, O., Jan. 14, 1821, and professed conversion in 1844. For some time he served the Church as a layman, but in 1846 he entered the Ohio Conference. He preached about thirteen years, when he was seized with hemorrhage of the lungs, and died Feb. 1, 1859. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1859, p. 234.

Selnecker, Nicholas, Dr.

an early Lutheran poet and theologian, was born Dec. 6, 1530, at Hersbruck, near Nuremberg; and educated at Wittenberg. He was made court preacher at Dresden in 1557, but obliged to resign in 1561. because he was not in sympathy with the Melancthonian party, then in power. At Jena, where he obtained a professorship, the mildness of his views gave offence to the Flacianists, who governed the university, and they had him deposed. His next position was at Leipsic (1568). In 1570 he was charged with the conduct of the Reformation in Brunswick, and aided in the founding of the University of Helmstadt. His preference for an unmodified Lutheranism led him at the same time to attempt the work of restraining the growth of Crypto-Calvinism in Saxony, in which he succeeded temporarily by gaining the ear of the elector Augustus. He also took a prominent part in the settling of the *Formula of Concord* (q.v.), translating

it (after the attempt of Osiander) into Latin and furnishing it with a preface. He thus excited further opposition from the Crypto-Calvinists, which resulted in his being again deposed on the succession of Christian I and the advent to power of Dr. Crell (q.v.). A brief period of literary activity now followed, first at Leipsic and afterwards at Magdeburg; but he was soon made superintendent at Hildesheim, and intrusted with the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs in other places as well. In the performance of such duties his health gave way, and when the fall of Dr. Crell called him to Leipsic, the journey proved too fatiguing and brought about his death, May 24, 1592.

Selnecker's writings were numerous, but most of them have been forgotten. The more noteworthy are an exposition of the book of Psalms, in various editions and revisions (last ed. Leipsic, 1593), and a large number of hymns. His poetical writings evince talent of no mean order, but are marred by the constant introduction of references to personal troubles, etc., an undue attention to details, and an incessant emphasizing of *pure doctrine*, though the latter feature is preserved from becoming offensive by the fact that it is in the main the expression of the writer's heart. See Wetzel, *Liederhistorie*, vol. 3; Götze, *Septem Dissertt. de N. Seln.* (1723); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, vol. 1; Mützell, *Geistl. Lieder der evang. Kirche aus dem 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1855, 3 vols.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 149-151.

Seloure

a mediaeval term for a canopy; the inner roof of a room which is sealed or closed with planking.

Selvedge

(**hxq**; *katsah'*, an *end*, as often rendered), the edge of a piece of cloth (⁽¹²³⁴⁾Exodus 26:4). *SEE TABERNACLE.*

Selyns, Henry

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Amsterdam, Holland, in 1636. He was regularly educated in one of the universities of that country for the ministry, and licensed by the Classis of Amsterdam as a proponent, or candidate, in 1659. In 1660 he accepted a call made by the Dutch West India Company, through the Classis of Amsterdam, to become the minister

of the Dutch Church of Breukkelin (now Brooklyn) for four years. He was ordained in 1660 in Holland, and came to this country with Rev. Harmanus Blom, who was on his way to the Church of Kingston, N.Y. During his ministry at Brooklyn, Mr. Selyns, by special request of Gov. Stuyvesant, came over to New York and preached regularly on Sabbath evenings to the Negroes and other poor people, on his farm, or *Bouwery*, and on the present location of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, corner of Ninth Street and Second Avenue. His ministry at these places was very popular and useful. He returned to Holland at the close of his fourth year, ill 1664, and took charge of a congregation of poor folks who earned their bread by gathering turf. He was happy in serving them, and declined a pressing invitation in 1670 to come to New York as colleague of the aged pastor of the Collegiate Church, Johannes Megapolensis. The call was renewed and accepted by him in 1682. The period was critical for the Dutch Church, in consequence of the English ascendancy in the province and the establishment of the State Church. "The Dutch were only tolerated, according to capitulation, as dissenters. The governors attempted to exercise arbitrary powers, but the people resisted. Dominie Selyns was fully alive to the importance of the subject, and was rejoiced at the arrival of Gov. Dongan in 1683, who allowed full liberty of conscience." An assembly of the people was soon called, which, among other matters, established the legal position of the denominations, allowing the churches to choose their own ministers. When Leisler usurped the governor's chair, Mr. Selyns was one of his most formidable opponents, and preached a jubilant sermon over his fall. This conduct divided his congregation, and his salary was partly withheld for years; but he held his ground tenaciously and triumphantly, until by the charter of May 11, 1696, he felt that the liberties of his Church were entirely secured. Not till then did he seek relief and a colleague in his large congregation. The Rev. Gualterus (Walter) Du Bois was called in 1699, and for fifty-five years "ministered before the Lord" in that one church. Mr. Selyns died July, 1701. He was the most eminent of the ministers who had yet come from Holland — prudent, sagacious, bold, earnest, of positive convictions, fearless of danger, a defender of the faith, and a peace maker. He was a successful minister of the Gospel, and had probably more to do in determining the position of the Reformed Dutch Church in America than almost any other man. In spirit towards other churches he was liberal, kindly, and catholic. He held friendly relations with the chief men of the state, and maintained correspondence with eminent literary men of the colonies, such as the Mathers and other notables. He

was also a poet, versifying with equal ease in Latin and Dutch. Cotton Mather (in his *Magnalia Christi Americana*, 3, 41) says of him that “he had so nimble a faculty of putting his devout thoughts into verse that he signalized himself by the greatest frequency which perhaps ever man used of sending poems to all persons, in all places, on all occasions; and upon this, as well as upon greater accounts, was a David unto the flocks of our Lord in the wilderness.” Murphy, *Anthology of New Netherland*, contains much of his life and poetry. See also De Witt, *Hist. Discourse*; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. 9; Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 213-217. (W.J.R.T.)

Sem

(Σήμ), the Graecized form (^{<AR6>}Luke 3:36) of the name of SHEM *SEE SHEM* (q.v.), the son of the patriarch Noah.

Semachi'ah

(Hebrew in the prolonged form *Semakya'hu*, **Whykæis**] *sustained of Jehovah*; Sept. Σαμαχίας v.r. Σαβαχία), the sixth and last named son of Shemaiah, the son of Obed-edom (^{<1307>}1 Chronicles 26:7). B.C. cir. 1013.

Semag, Or Semak

SEE MOSES DE COUCY.

Semamith

SEE SPIDER.

Semantra

(σημαντρα, *signals*), wooden boards, or iron plates full of holes, which the modern Greeks use instead of bells to summon the people to church. These instruments they hold in their hands, and knock them with a hammer or mallet. The same term is sometimes applied to a bell, or a metal drum used for the same purpose.

Semargia

in Slavic mythology, was a goddess personifying *winter* — the cold season of the year — and highly revered among the grand Pantheon at Kief by the Russians.

Semaxii

a name mentioned by Tertullian as sometimes applied to Christian martyrs by their persecutors, from the fact that those who were burned alive were usually tied to a board or stake of about six feet in length, which the Romans called *semaxis*. — Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 1, ch. 2, § 10.

Sembat

a Paulician who, about the year 840, formed a sect in the province of Ararat by a fusion of Parseism and Paulicianism. He established himself at Thondrac, from which place his sect was called Thondracians (q.v.).

Sembiani

a Christian sect who were so called from their leader, Sembianus, who condemned the use of all wine. He persuaded his followers that wine was a production of Satan, denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected most of the books of the Old Test.

Sem'ei

(Σεμεΐ), the Graecized form apparently of two Hebrew names:

1. SHIMEI *SEE SHIMEI* (q.v.), spoken of as (*a*) one of the “sons of Asom” (1 Esdr. 9:33), i.e. of Hashum (^{<451RB>}Ezra 10:33); (*b*) the son of Cisai and father of Jairus, among the ancestors of Mordecai (Esther 11:2. Σεμεΐος)..

2. The son of Joseph and father of Mattathias in our Lord's genealogy (^{<40RB>}Luke 3:26, v.r. Σεμεΐν), probably SHEMAIAH *SEE SHEMAIAH* (q.v.), the son of Shechaniah and father of Neariah (^{<13RB>}1 Chronicles 3:22).

Semele

in Greek mythology, was the mother of Bacchus and daughter of Cadmus and Harmonia. *SEE BACCHUS*.

Semel'ius

(Σεμέλλιος, v.r. Σαμέλλιος, Σεβέλλιος), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 2, 16, 17, 25, 30) of the name of SHIMSHAI *SEE SHIMSHAI* (q.v.), the Samaritan scribe (^{<40RB>}Ezra 4:8, 9, 17, 23).

Sementiree Feriae, Or Sementina Dies

was kept in seed time by the Romans for the purpose of praying for a good crop. It lasted only one day, and was fixed by the pontifex maximus.

Semi-Arians

a sect which arose in the 4th century, holding a modified form of Arianism. It was founded by Eusebius of Caesarea and the sophist Asterius. They were opposed alike to the strict definition of orthodox Nicene theologians like St. Athanasius, and to the equally strict definition which characterized the logical intellectualism of the old Arians. Its symbol was the *Homoiousion*, which they substituted for the orthodox *Homoousion*; that is, the Son was regarded not as of the same substance with the Father, but of a substance like in all things except in not being the Father's substance. They maintained, at the same time, that though the Son and Spirit were separated in substance from the Father, still they were so included in his glory that there was but one God. Unlike the Arians, they declared that our blessed Lord was not a creature, but truly the Son born of the substance of the Father; yet they would not allow him, with the orthodox, simply to be God as the Father was, but asserted that the Son, though distinct in substance from God, was at the same time essentially distinct from every created nature.

The Semi-Arian party first came into prominence at the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), under the leadership of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. During the fifty-six years that elapsed between the Council of Nicaea and that of Constantinople (A.D. 325-381) as many as eighty councils are on record, a large number of which were held by the Semi-Arian bishops in support of their contests with the orthodox and with their own sects. The Semi-Arian party had not one uniform definition of faith, but differed from each other on many important points; the only real bond of union was their opposition to the term which unequivocally expressed Catholic doctrine. Nothing, in fact, was more conspicuous than the unsettled variableness of the Semi-Arian creed. Two confessions of faith were drawn up at the Council of the Dedication (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 10), held at Antioch, A.D. 341; another by the bishops of Palestine, a few months afterwards (*ibid.* 2, 18); four years later (A.D. 345) at Antioch; at Sirmium (A.D. 351 [see Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 6]); and again at the same place seven years later (*ibid.*). From about this time a reaction went steadily on, until in A.D. 366

fifty-nine Semi-Arian bishops subscribed an orthodox formula, and were received into the Catholic Church (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 12). There is no evidence of any large number of the party afterwards existing. Many others, doubtless, came back to the Church, not a few plunged into the heresy of the Macedonians, *SEE MACEDONIUS*, and some, like Eudoxius of Antioch, became avowed Anomoeans. Consult Blunt, *Dict. of Theology*; id. *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. 1, § 92; Newman, *Hist. of the Arians*; Pusey, *Councils of the Church*, ch. 5. Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v. *SEE ARIANISM*; *SEE SABELLIUS*.

Semi cope

an inferior kind of cope. This term is sometimes applied to a small cope; occasionally to the old black Sarum choral copes, like cloaks without sleeves; and occasionally to a cope of linen, serge, or buckram, unornamented with embroidery.

Semidolites

a sect of Acephali (q.v.), which sprang up originally under the name of *Barsanians* at the end of the 5th century. They had no succession of priests, and professed to keep up the celebration of a valid eucharist by placing a few crumbs of the bread which had been consecrated by Dioscurus in a vessel of meal (*σεμίδαλις*, whence their name), and then using as fully consecrated the bread baked from it. See Damasc. *Ad Hoeres.* 3; Baronius, *Annal.* ad ann. 535; Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, 2, 22.

Semi double

an inferior or secondary ecclesiastical festival, ranking next above a simple feast or bare commemoration.

Semi frater

a layman or a secular cleric who, having benefited a religious house by gifts or personal service, was regarded as in some way belonging to the order or fraternity, having a share in its prayers during life, and in mortuary masses after death.

Semi jejunia

(*half fasts*), a name given to the weekly fasts in the ancient Christian Church, because the services of the Church continued on these days no longer than till three o'clock in the afternoon, whereas a perfect and complete fast was never reckoned to end before evening. These half fasts were also called Stations (q.v.).

Semi Judaizers

(1.) a Socinian sect, originated in the 6th century by Francis David, a Hungarian, who was superintendent of the Socinian churches in Transylvania. The principal doctrine which David and his followers maintained was that neither prayer nor any other act of religious worship should be offered to Jesus Christ. Faustus Socinus argued strongly against this tenet; and when all efforts to reclaim the Hungarian heretic were found to be fruitless, the public authorities threw him into prison, where he died at an advanced age, A.D. 1579. The sect, however, survived its founder, and for a long time gave no little trouble to Socinus and his followers in Poland and Lithuania. Faustus Socinus wrote a book expressly against the Semi Judaizers, while at the same time he strongly admitted that the point in debate between himself and them was of no great importance, since in his own view it was not necessary to salvation that a person should pray to Christ.

(2.) The name Semi Judaizers was also given to a sect founded near the close of the 16th century by Martin Seidelius, a Silesian, who promulgated various strange doctrines in Poland and the neighboring countries. The chief points of this system were that God had indeed promised a Savior or a Messiah to the Jewish nation, but that this Messiah had never appeared, and never would appear, because the Jews by their sins had rendered themselves unworthy of so great a deliverer; that of course Jesus Christ was erroneously regarded as the Messiah; that it was his only business and office to explain the laws of nature, which had been greatly obscured, and therefore that whoever shall obey this law as expounded by Jesus Christ will fulfill all the religious duties that God requires of him. While diffusing these erroneous opinions, Seidelius rejected all the books of the New Testament as spurious.

(3.) In Russia, also, a small sect of Semi Judaizers, called *Sabatniki* (q.v.), exists, which mixes up to a considerable extent Jewish and Christian rites.

Semikin

(*ḡkym*s), or *Junctions*, is a Masoretic term to denote “approaching, belonging together, connection,” of one word with another. Now, when two or more words are associated together through the addition or diminution of a letter or word, or by the interchange of words which are not in the habit of being joined in this manner, and if it only occurs so in one place, the Masorites remark thereon, *ymsd tyl*, i.e. “not extant so joined.” Thus, on *ḡrytw ḡgdw*, and *corn and wine* (^{<0123>}Genesis 27:37), they remark “not extant so joined,” since in all other places where these two words occur the word *ḡgd* has not the Vav conjunctive (*yl b rwbyj h w8 8yw*); and thus the Masorah finalis under the letter *Vav*, p. 28 a, Colossians 2, 3, gives a list of sixty-two pairs, both words of which have Vav conjunctive, and are without parallel. The same remark is made on *rymḡ tyḡ*, *briers, thorns* (^{<2374>}Isaiah 27:4), since in all other places it is with Vav conjunctive. The sixteen pairs without the Vav conjunctive are given in the Masorah. The same remark is made on *tbḡ ḡyḡbḡ*, *Sabbatism, Sabbath* (^{<0163>}Exodus 16:23), since in all other passages in which these two words are joined they are inverted. Thus in ver. 23 we read *tbḡ ḡyḡbḡ*, but everywhere else *ḡwtbḡ tbḡ*. A list of thirty-nine instances which occur in this connection is given by the Masorah in the part entitled *Various Readings* (*ypwl j hayrq*). See Frensdorff, *Ochlah we-Ochlah*, § 253, p. 50, 139 sq.; § 252, p. 50, 138 sq.; § 273, p. 53, 147 sq.; Levita, *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth* (ed. Ginsburg), p. 212 sq.; Buxtorf, *Tiberias, sive Commentarius Masoreticus*, p. 258 sq. (B.P.)

Seminarist

a Roman Catholic priest who has been educated in a seminary.

Seminary priest

a name given in England to Roman Catholic clergy during the 17th century, on account of their having been educated and prepared for holy orders in one of the foreign seminaries — e.g. Rheims, Douai, or Toulouse.

Semiophorus

(*Σημειοφόρος*), a Greek term for a *worker of miracles*.

Semi Pelagianism

the name invented by the schoolmen to mark the middle line of opinion held by the Pelagians (q.v.), on one side, and the predestinarian theory of Augustine, on the other. As early as A.D. 426 the monks of Adrumetum, in Byzacene Africa, having read Augustine's letter to Sixtus (*Ep.* 194), were astounded at the doctrine therein propounded, viz. that men were disposed of eternally, either in the way of happiness or misery, by an arbitrary decree. To their strictures Augustine answered by putting forth his two works *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio* and *De Correptione et Gratia*. The task of harmonizing these conflicting systems of theology was attempted by John Cassianus (q.v.), and he became the real founder of Semi-Pelagianism. Cassianus acknowledged the universal deterioration of human nature by the fall; but he assigned also an unlimited scope to the divine goodness and love, that wills the salvation of all, and bends everything to that end. He expressly condemns the main position of Pelagius: "Let no one imagine that by this we give support to the profane notion of some who assert that, the sum of salvation is in our own power, and by ascribing everything to free will make the grace of God to be dispensed according to each man's merit" (*Coll.* 13, 16). He entirely ignores irresistible grace and absolute decrees of divine predestination, though his doctrine with respect to preventing grace agrees generally with that of Augustine. In fact, he can neither agree with those who make the gift of grace dependent upon human merit, nor with others who deny that man has any power in himself to originate good in his own heart. These opinions doubtless helped to form a general dislike for the theory of irresistible grace and divine predestination. Stanch partisans opposed the Semi Pelagians, the master spirit among them being Prosper of Aquitania (q.v.); while on their side we find certain great names, especially Vincentius of Lerius (q.v.). His *Commonitorium* was directed principally against the doctrinal development of Augustine as being unsupported by the Catholic tradition of the Church (Voss, *Hist. Pelag.* 1, 10). In this work he brought forward his three famous tests of the truth of a doctrine, viz. antiquity, universality, and general consent. An appeal to Celestine, the Roman bishop, against the Semi Pelagians having been unsuccessful, Prosper published several writings in refutation of their doctrines; and upon the death of Celestine, he endeavored to prevail upon Sixtus, his successor, to repress the Semi Pelagians. Failing in this, Prosper wrote several tracts on behalf of Augustinian doctrine. Shortly after the middle of the 5th century, a

question arose between Lucidus, a presbyter, and Faustus, bishop of Riez, in Provence. The bishop admonished Lucidus in person, and afterwards wrote him a letter, setting forth in brief terms his own view of the doctrine of grace. By the advice of the council held at Arles (475). he published a work on the disputed points, *De Gratia et Humanoe Mentis Libero Arbitrio*. The book was answered half a century later by Caesarius of Arles in a treatise of similar title, *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, which, however, is lost. In 520 some Scythian monks assailed the work of Faustus, and presented their confession of faith to the legates of pope Hormisdas in Constantinople, in which they affirmed their belief that the will of man was powerless for any other object than to “discern and desire carnal and worldly matters,” etc. They met with a cold reception from the legates, and fared no better with Hormisdas, to whom they appealed. A council was held at Aransio (Orange), in France, July 3, 529, at which twenty-five articles concerning grace and free will, and directed against the Semi Pelagian doctrine, were drawn up, and subsequently confirmed by Boniface II. A similar expression of doctrine was made by a council at Valence, in the province of Vienne, but the problem remained unsolved how to reconcile the opposing motives — powers of grace and free will. Augustine continued to be regarded as the great light of the Western Church, although in the Middle Ages there was an occasional tendency to dispute his authority. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*. (see Index); Möller, in Herzog’s *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* (2d ed. Hamb. 1847), 2, 1173-1217; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Blunt, *Dict. of Theology*, s.v. **SEE PELAGIANISM.**

Se'mis

(Σεμίς, v.r. Σεμείς, Σενσείς), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:23) of the name SHIMEI **SEE SHIMEI** (q.v.) the Levite after the return from Babylon (^{<1502>}Ezra 10:23).

Semi separatists

a name given to certain persons in the 17th century who would listen to the sermons of the Church of England clergymen, but not to the common prayer. They would remain outside of the churches until the prayers were done, and then rush in and hear the sermon. See Pagitt, *Heresiography* (ed. 1662), p. 94.

Semitic Languages

SEE *SHEMITIC LANGUAGES*.

Semi Universalists

an appellation given by Mosheim to those Dutch divines of the Reformed Church in the 17th century who maintained that God indeed wishes to make all men happy, but only on the condition of their believing; and that this faith originates from the sovereign and irresistible operation of God, or from the free, unconditional election of God. These are sometimes called *Hypothetical* or *Conditional Universalists*, and scarcely differ, except in words, from *Infralapsarians* (q.v.).

Semler, Johann Salomo

a German theologian in the latter half of the 18th century, who became notorious as the founder of the modern school of so called historical critics of the Bible. He was born in 1725 at Saalfeld, where his father held the office of deacon; and from his earliest childhood came under the influence of the pietism of Halle. In obedience to its urgent exhortations, he formed the habit of earnest prayer. His student life at Halle, where he matriculated in 1743, was spent amid similar surroundings, but he failed to obtain peace of mind. He was specially attracted towards Baumgarten (then professor) on account of his massive learning, but appears to have been even too little influenced by the Wolfian logical schematism of that scholar. He devoured books without digesting them, and obtained, as a principal result of his studies, a suspicion which subsequently became the fundamental idea in his theology — namely, that *a difference exists between theology and religion*. In 1750 he was made a master, and soon afterwards began the congenial work of editing the gazette of his native town; but in the following year he was called to the chair of history at Altorf, and six months later to a theological chair at Halle. He delivered lectures on hermeneutics and Church history; and ere long reached the conclusion that “the historical interpretation really belongs to the first century as representing the sum and contents of the conceptions of that age, and must be distinguished from the present application of Scripture, as correctly interpreted, to the instruction of Christians of today.” His discoveries were submitted to Baumgarten, who encouraged him to continued independence of thought, but warned him that he would thereby arouse the opposition of a class of people who might work material injury to his prospects.

On the death of Baumgarten, in 1757, Semler became the most prominent member of the faculty at Halle, and enjoyed an unequalled popularity despite the confusion, and even barrenness, of his deliveries. As he became bolder in the presentation of his views, he was violently opposed by the orthodox party — periodicals were filled with invectives, and ministerial associations entertained charges against him; but all this served only to increase his popularity, until none of his colleagues could venture to dispute his preeminence, though the list included such names as J.G. Knapp, Nösselt, and Gruner, J.L. Schulze, A. Freylinghausen, G. Chr. Knapp, and A.H. Niemayer. In 1779 he wrote a reply to the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, however, and also a critique of Bahrds's *Confession of Faith* (*Antwort auf das Bahrdsche Glaubensbekenntniss*), in which he zealously contended for the doctrines of the Church and thereby undermined his position. His friends at once charged him with duplicity, and the government, acting through the minister Zedlitz (the patron of Bahrds), deprived him of the directorship of the theological pedagogical seminary, on the ground that his recent course had destroyed his hold on the confidence of the public. A number of writings from his pen, devoted, on the one hand, to the promotion of free thought, and, on the other, to the defense of churchly orthodoxy, were issued in the period immediately following, and did much to intensify the opposition raised against him from every side; and when he became a believer in alchemy, in the last years of his life, it was accepted by many as a proof of impaired vigor in his mind. He died in 1791.

Semler's criticism was directed against two points: (1) the traditional view with respect to the canon of the Bible; and (2) the ordinary treatment of Church history, particularly that of the earlier period. His merit consists in having destroyed many errors in consequence of his investigations, and in having opened the way to more correct opinions.

1. Semler's Exposition of the Canon. — The traditional view regarded the canon as constituting a unit which is everywhere equally inspired; and this view had been shaken in his own mind by the studies of R. Simon Clericus, and Wettstein, and also by his own investigations. He became convinced that the opinions of recent times did not correspond with those of the earlier ages, and that theological views are subject to constant changes (his desultory mind was incapable of attaining to the idea of a progressive development in theology). With respect to the canon, he came to think that the original idea was not that of a fixed norm of doctrine which should be

binding for all ages, but rather that of “a catalog of the books which were read in the assemblies of Christians.” These books were brought together through the force of accidental considerations rather than in pursuance of a definite plan. The early Christians decided to accept as divine those books of the Old Test. (whose canon was already variously established by the Palestinians, the Samaritans, and the Alexandrians) which should be found in the Septuagint translation, the latter being regarded as inspired; and as the enumeration of canonical books belonging to the New Test. varied in the early Church, the bishops, for the sake of uniformity, agreed upon a definite number of books which should be used as a *canonica lectio* in the worship of the Church. Semler’s investigations into the character of the Old and New Test. texts likewise contributed to overturn the traditional idea of the inspiration of the Scriptures; for while that theory assumed that the text of the Bible had descended unaltered through the centuries to us, he urged that the Holy Spirit had himself caused a revision of the Scriptures by the hand of Ezra, and that it could not be supposed, in the face of historical and diplomatic data, that an extraordinary divine supervision had been exercised over copyists. He insisted, further, that the Scriptural writings show on their face that they were not intended to be a norm of doctrine for all men, since the Old Test. was written for Jews whose religious apprehension was but limited, the Gospel by Matthew for extra Palestinian Jews, that by John for Christians possessed of Grecian culture. He argues that it was necessary to *accommodate* the teachings of Christianity to the needs of these various classes, which explains the appeal to miracles and the use of “stories” by Jesus and some of the apostles — the **σάρξ**, according to his opinion — and the emphasizing of the **πνεῦμα** by Paul. The latter apostle sought to adapt his writings to the Jewish modes of thought so long as he entertained the hope of gaining over the Jews in considerable numbers to the new religion — the Epistle to the Hebrews being an illustration; but he eventually abandoned this hope, and so became the first to make Christianity a religion for the world. The Catholic epistles, finally, were intended *to unite* the two ancient parties of Christendom — the Jewish and the more liberal Pauline. The very beginnings of the historical criticism thus present in outline the results attained by the most recent Tübingen school. With respect to the Apocalypse, Semler regarded it as a sort of Jewish mythology — “the production of an extravagant dreamer” — and wrote much to demonstrate its unfitness for the place it holds in the canon.

Having postulated the theory of accommodation by which the Old Test., and much of the New, lost their authoritative character, Semler was obliged to show what, if any, element of binding truth remains to Christianity after all that is merely local and temporary has been stripped off from the Bible. He finds it in “that which serves to perfect man’s moral character,” but declares that even this cannot be comprised in any definite set of truths, since different individuals are stimulated to virtue by different portions of the Scriptures. Whatever develops a new and better principle, that leads to the veneration of God in the soul, is Christianity; and that is *inspired* or divine which convinces readers “that they know more respecting spiritual changes and perfections, and are able to derive more actual profit from such changes, than before.” He contends that there is such a thing as *objective* truth in Christianity, but that there can be no definite test to indicate whether any individual has apprehended it or not, since the decision can only be the expression of a moral judgment. He even thinks that nothing more than a difference in the form of expression is involved when the higher moral truths of Christianity are characterized as a *revelation*, or as a *progressive development of the natural reason* (see Schmid, *Die Theol. Semlers*, p. 167).

It is evident that Semler’s theories remove the last distinctions between Christianity and Naturalism or Deism; but he nevertheless protests vigorously against being classed with Naturalists, and it was zeal against Naturalism that had led him to enter the lists against the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist and the *Confession* of Bahrds, though he had previously (in 1759, in his introduction to Baumgarten’s *Glaubenslehre*, p. 51-57) reduced the distinguishing peculiarity of Christianity to a *better morality*. The solution of this contradiction must be found in the distinction Semler made between *private religion* and the *publicly acknowledged teaching of the Church*. He was open to religious impressions, given to prayer and the singing of religious hymns, and earnestly engaged in efforts to promote a *Christian* morality. He assured his students that an inward power, the peculiar privilege of those who possess a Christian knowledge of God, shall be realized by those who form the habit of prayer, and urged them to make the trial. It was, doubtless, owing to these consequences of his early religious training that he condemned all interference with the authoritatively established doctrines of the Church, though his separation of the faith of a private person from the teaching of the Church is open to the suspicion that he was too servile to sacrifice material prosperity in

order to uphold a privately recognized truth. He asserted that a private scholar has the right to defend new opinions in the department of his labors; but that, as a teacher appointed by superior authority, it is his duty to follow the beaten track, when required, or else to resign his office. And it is certain that he thus expressed his serious convictions, and that his views in this respect grew out of his religious temperament.

2. *Semler's Researches in Church History* produced less durable results. He lacked the necessary qualities for thorough work in this field — a philosophical and profoundly Christian spirit, a philosophical and religious pragmatism, and especially an unbiased judgment. He brought to light an abundance of new material, however, and became the father of the history of doctrines; while his restless scepticism contributed towards a more satisfactory settlement of many incidents, and prepared the way for more unprejudiced views respecting many historical phenomena. His faults are, that he is incapable of rising to the conception of a historical development, and therefore prefers the arrangement by centuries; that he has no philosophical apprehension of dogma; and that he gauges past centuries by the tests of his own time — e.g. enlightenment and tolerance, liberality and morality. Being convinced that the character of private religion must necessarily differ with the multitudes of individuals, he is continually outraged to find all independence of private thought repressed by the power of the Church. Lacking a profound faith himself, he naturally stamps every appearance of mysticism as fanaticism; and as he is never able to escape the suspicion of priestly cunning and despotism, the impression derived from his survey of Church history is but dreary at the best. The martyrs were people “whose minds were unsettled, monks and hermits were madmen, the bishops chiefly intriguers, Augustine keen and crafty, Tertullian highly odd and fanatical, Theodoret superstitious, Bernard sanctimonious.” Pelagius alone (whose *Epp. ad Demetriadem* he published with notes in 1775) meets with his approval. His method, too, was chaotic and confused. resulting in lengthy prefaces and numerous additions, appendices, and supplements to his works, most of which suffer, in addition, from the absence of indexes, and even of tables of contents. He tells us, however, that he was accustomed to deliver four or five lectures per day; and yet he managed to write no less than one hundred seventy-one books, though but one or two of them passed into a second edition.

The views of Semler on the canon of Scripture and connected subjects are developed in numerous works, prominent among which are the

Abhandlung vom freien Gebrauch des Kanons (1771-75, 4 vols.): — with which connect his *Neue Untersuchungen über die Apocalypse* (1776): — *Vorbereitungen zur Hermeneutik* (1760): — *Briefe zur Erleichterung der Privat-Religion der Christen* (1784): — *Von freier Unters. des Kanons: — Erklärung über theol. Censuren: — Vorbereitung auf die königl. grossbritt. Aufgabe von d. Gottheit Christi* (1787): — *On Church history, Selecta Capita Historioe Ecclesiasticoe: — Versuch eines Auszugs aus. d. Kirchengeschichte: — Commentarii Historici de Antiquo Christianorum Statu: — and Neue Versuche die Kirchenhist. d. ersten Jahrh. mehr aufzuklären.*

Sources. — *Semler's Selbstbiographie* (1781, 2 pts.); Eichhorn, *Leben Semlers in the Bibliothek*, pt. 5; Tholuck, *Verm. Schriften.* 2, 39; Schmid, *Die Theologie Semlers* (1858). **SEE RATIONALISM.**

Semne

(Σεμνή, *revered*), a Greek term for a *nun*.

Semnion

(Σέμνιον), a Greek term for a *monastery*.

Semnium

(Σεμνεῖον, a *temple*), a name given by Philo to places of worship of the Therapeutae (q. i.). He says, "In every one of their dwellings there is a sacred house or chapel, which they call their *semmium*, or monastery, where they perform the religious mysteries proper to their holy lives" (Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* vol. 7, ch. 2, § 11). Monasteries came afterwards to be called *semmia*, as Suicerus shows out of Balzamon, Methodius, and Suidas. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* vol. 7, ch. 2, § 14.

Semnos

(Σεμνός), a Greek term for a *monk*.

Sempecta

a term for a monk who had passed fifty years in a monastery. He was excused from regular duties, and at Westminster and Crowland lived in the infirmary and had a young attendant.

Semphycrates

in Graeco-Egyptian mythology, was a being which represented Hercules in combination with the Egyptian Harpocrates. It has been regarded as symbolical of the germinating period, in and through which germs make their appearance, or of the union of time and life.

Sempiternitas

(Lat. *semper*, “always,” and *eternitas*, “eternity”), an everlasting state of existence, having a beginning, but no end. It is used in speaking of angels and the souls of men in distinction from the eternity of God. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 166.

Semple, Robert Baylor

a Baptist minister, was born at Rose Mount, King and Queen Co., Va., Jan. 20, 1769. After completing his academical course, he commenced the study of law; but having been induced to join the Baptist Church, he turned his attention to the ministry, and on Sept. 20, 1790, he was ordained pastor of Bruington Church, King and Queen County, which position he held until his death, Dec. 25, 1831. He is identified with the earliest efforts of the Baptist Church to send the Gospel to the heathen. He was a member of the first Baptist General Convention; president for a number of years of the Virginia Baptist Missionary Society; was often moderator of the General Association of Virginia, and president of its board of managers. He was also an earnest friend of the Colonization Society; and when the Columbian College in the District of Columbia became involved, he accepted the charge of its financial concerns (in 1827), accomplishing his difficult task with great discretion and energy. He published a *Catechism* (1809): — a *History of Virginia Baptists* (1810): — and various *Memoirs* and *Letters*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6, 305.

Sena Panthis

a Hindu sect which was established by Sena, the third of the disciples of Ramanand, but is now almost, if not quite, extinct. For some time, however, Sena and his descendants were the family *gurus* of the rajah of Bandoogur, and from that circumstance enjoyed considerable authority and reputation.

Sen' aah

[some *Sena' ah*] (Heb. *Senaah'*, **hans**] *thorny*; Sept. **Σενάά, Σανανά, Σααννά,** 'etc.), the name of a man (B.C. ante 445) whose descendants, or (more probably), if a town (but none like it is elsewhere mentioned), whose inhabitants (given in various numbers, all apparently exaggerated by erroneous transcription) returned from Babylon (^{<1525>}Ezra 2:35; ^{<1678>}Nehemiah 7:38) and rebuilt the Fish gate at Jerusalem (^{<1678>}Nehemiah 3:3, Heb. with the art. *has-Senaah'*; Sept. **Ἀσαναά;** A.V. "Hassenaah").

Senagen

in Hindu mythology, is a king belonging to the race of Children of the Sun, who is connected with the fables relating to the tyrant of Ceylon (Lanka), the noted Ravana, and consequently with the story of Rama. Ravana having demanded a vessel filled with blood from certain holy devotees, it was afterwards buried by the gigantic demon in the territories of Senagen because it brought him trouble. Senagen found it, and discovered in it a beautiful child which he recognized as an embodiment of the goddess Lakshmi. She was subsequently married to Rama, an incarnation of her consort Vishnu.

Senate

(**γερονσία**, *eldership*, used by classical writers for a deliberative or legislative body, and by the Sept. for the collective mass of the Jewish elders, and later for the Sanhedrim) is used once in the New Test. (^{<4171>}Acts 5:21) for some portion of the Sanhedrim, apparently the elders, who constituted its main element. **SEE ELDER; SEE SANHEDRIM.**

Senatorium

a place in some churches where are the seats appropriated to the use of emperors, kings, magistrates, and other persons of distinction. Some think that it is so called because the bishop and presbyters, who form the *senate* of the church, were seated there.

Senault, Jean Francois

a French preacher and religious writer, was born at Anvers, near Pontoise, in 1601. After studying at Douai, in 1618 he entered the then young congregation of the Oratory, and being designated to the office of

preaching, he prepared himself by an earnest study of the Scriptures, the Church fathers, and the best French authors. For forty years he preached with success at Paris, to the court, and in the provinces. He was made superior of the Seminary of St. Magloire, and in 1662 was elected superior-general of the Oratory, an office which he administered gratuitously and with great prudence till his death, Aug. 3, 1672. He wrote several religious biographies and practical works, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Sendal

SEE SENDEL.

Sendel

a kind of taffeta, frequently used of old in the making of ecclesiastical garments and banners. The clergy in 1343 were forbidden to wear their hair rolled with fur or sendel.

Senderling, John Z., D.D.

a Lutheran minister, was born Nov. 12, 1800; at Philadelphia, Pa. Having in early life a thirst for knowledge and a desire to be useful in the Master's service, he was advised to prepare for the Gospel ministry. In 1817 he entered Hartwick Classical and Theological Seminary, where he remained seven years. Immediately after graduating he was licensed to preach, and took charge of a small Church in Clay, Onondaga Co., N.Y. In 1826 he went to Center Brunswick, near Troy, and then to the city of Troy, where he remained till 1856, when he received a call as pastor of St. Paul's Church in Johnstown, N.Y. In the spring of 1867 he resigned his pastorate, and lived a retired life until Dec. 20, 1877, when he was called to his rest. (B.P.)

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus,

Picture for Seneca

Was a teacher, rhetorician, philosopher, poet, essayist, epistolographer, naturalist, advocate, magistrate, and statesman, under the later Roman emperors of the adscititious Julian house. It is in the character of philosopher that his reputation has endured through all subsequent times. This reputation has been preserved, as it was generated, mainly by the

piquancy of his style, the terseness of his expression, the incisiveness and the epigrammatic felicity of his phrase, and the constant ostentation of an earnestness which was, in some degree, factitious, and of a profundity which is more apparent than real. By whatever arts his renown was attained, or by whatever accidents it was perpetuated, the name of Seneca has ever continued the most notable and the best known in the scanty catalog of Roman philosophers, and of Romans pretending to philosophy. There, has been no period in which any smattering of letters survived when Seneca was not admired and cited. His own profession, “Nulla dies sine linea,” has been applicable to him in many forms. The fathers of the Church, the schoolmen of the Middle Age, the poets of the Renaissance, and their corrivals the Elizabethan dramatists, had all frequent recourse to Seneca, and Shakespeare was reproached with his too ready use of the convenient repertory of gnomes and maxims. In his own day, Seneca occupied a conspicuous station. His abilities merited a very high position, and his accomplishments accorded with his abilities. He obtained the quaestorship and the praetorship in the official hierarchy when these honors were conferred by imperial favor. He was the instructor and chief minister — of an emperor whose excesses and atrocities have made the name of Nero a synonym for all that is brutal and heartless in despotism, despicable in license and vanity, and unparalleled in crime. He lauded frugality and simplicity (*De Tranquill. Animi*, 1, 5-8; *Ep.* 2, 2, 9), and echoed the desire of Propertius:

*“Utinam Romae nemo esset dives; et ipse
Straminea posset dux habitare casa.”*

But while eulogizing cottage life — “domus haec sapientis angusta; sine cultu, sine strepitu, sine adparatu” (*De Constant.* 15, 5) — he passed his days in splendid villas and in palaces. He professed the wise man’s indifference to the hazards of life, the caprices of fortune, and the conditions of existence, but he dwelt in all the luxury and indulgence of Roman sybaritism. He preached the blessings of obscurity in the press of courtiers, of whom he was the chief. He strenuously commended poverty, but he more sedulously increased his millions, and is charged with provoking the most serious of British revolts by the sudden recall of his usurious loans. These contrasts were human weakness — “mortalibus mos est ex magnis majora cupiendi” (*De Benef.* 3, 3, 2) — but they were not the sage’s triumphs over human infirmities and worldly temptations. He addressed his treatise *On Clemency* to Nero, but he disguised, if he did not

sanction, the poisoning of Claudius; he justified the assassination of Agrippina by her son, and he failed to prevent the divorce and murder of the empress Octavia. He might well exclaim, “Mali inter malos vivimus” (*De Ira*, 3, 26, 4). Could he find an excuse in another of his sayings, “Mansuete immansueta tractanda?” (*ibid.* 27, 3). He expatiated on the evil of avarice, and wrote at great length *On Beneficence*, but he enriched himself by imperial confiscations. He exulted in the perfect freedom of the true philosopher, and cringed to the freedmen and minions of an imbecile and semi-idiotic sovereign (*Consol. ad Polyb.*; Dion Cass. 61, 10). He was prominent among the Stoics of the time, whom he patronized by his countenance and by his predications; he was chief among the satellites and profligates of the court, whom he rebuked by his precepts, but did not stigmatize by his retirement. In all things he was a rhetorician and an actor. His literary productions glitter with the coruscations of unintermitting paradox and antithesis; but the paradox of his tenets and the antithesis of his style are less novel and less startling than the contrasts between his professions and his career, his doctrine and his practice (πάντα τὰ ἐναντιώτα οἷς ἐφιλοσόφει ποιῶν ἡλέγχθη [Dion Cass. 61, 10]). The image and example of his life were his bequest to his friends. They should have been accompanied with the epigraph,

“Deficior prudens artis ab arte mea.”

At the first contemplation of these strange anomalies we are inclined to say, “tota vita mentitur” (*Ep.* 5, 4, 10) — his life was all a lie. But much that is contradictory, much that may invite the sternest reprobation, may be palliated by regarding the times, the difficulties of the situation, and the artificial and discolored lights under which all is seen. Such discrepancies, however, between the philosophy and the conduct cannot fail to stimulate curiosity and to require cautious estimation.

1. Life. — L. Annaeus Seneca was the second son of M. Annaeus Seneca, the rhetorician, and the author of the *Controversial Exercises* for the instruction of students of rhetoric. His elder brother, Gallio, proconsul of Achaia at the time of Paul’s visit, had assumed the name of the distinguished advocate Junius Gallio, by whom he had been adopted. His younger brother, L. Annaeus Mela, was the father of Lucan, the poet of the *Pharsalia*. Marcus, the founder of the distinguished family, was a citizen from Corduba, in Spain, and of the equestrian order. He was wealthy, reputable, accomplished, and noted for his wonderful memory. He took an

eminent position at Rome as a teacher of rhetoric, and lived to be an octogenarian. His illustrious son was born at Corduba. but was transferred to Rome in early life, and was educated there under his father and Papirius Fabianus, Attalus, and Sotion. Fabianus he mentions frequently in his works with respect and affection,. By Sotion he was initiated into the mysteries, vagaries, and asceticism of the Pythagoreans. Seneca was so earnest in his abstinences and in his renunciation of animal food that he became emaciated and endangered his health. By the urgent persuasions of his father he abandoned his fasts and vigils, and turned from the pursuit of severe philosophy to the business of life. He adopted a forensic career. The remains of Seneca attest his abilities, the breadth of his culture, the diversity of his acquirements, the vigor of his fancy, the variety of his reflections, the fluency and perspicuity of his style. He soon rose to eminence and lucrative employment. He became quaestor, at what time is unknown, but probably in the middle of the reign of Tiberius. Under Caius his life was nearly cut short. Jealousy of his talents, envy of his distinction, apprehension of his sentiments, hatred of his opinions and associations, or more adequate provocations, excited that insane and furious emperor's hostility, and he was designated for execution. By adroit intervention he was spared, on the representation that he would soon sink under disease. Two years later Caligula was assassinated, but Seneca survived. The opening of the new reign was inauspicious to him. Claudius banished him to the sterile and inhospitable island of Corsica — "Horrida desertis undique vasta locis." Messalina suspected his intimacy with the emperor's nieces, Agrippina and Julia, and alleged an intrigue with one or both. Seneca was safer and more, innocent on the most inhospitable coast than in the company of any of these infamous sirens. He had already addressed his tractate *On Anger* to his brother Novatus, who had not yet become Gallio. Little of his fortitude, and nothing of the tranquillity of the philosopher, were displayed by Seneca in his exile. In the first period of his expatriation he achieved a *Consolation to Helvia*, his mother, to calm her natural grief at the violent and hazardous separation. It abounds in, showy sentiments, in exquisite expressions, in wholesome but exaggerated reflections, which fall upon the expectant ear like the sound of hollow brass. His equanimity is belied by his effort to discover, to multiply, and to adorn reasons for equanimity. The impression is irresistible that the affected contentment of the sage is only the triumph of the rhetorician, and intended to attract public admiration and sympathy. This unfavorable effect is deepened by the *Consolation to Polybius*, also composed in the Corsican seclusion, and

written to the powerful freedman of Claudius to comfort him on the loss of his brother, and to invoke for himself the commiseration of the libertine and the favor of his master. The wise man, who, like Ovid, had bemoaned the miseries of banishment in elegiac verse, declared that, under Claudius, "the life of exiles was more tranquil than that of princes under Caius." He enlarged upon the resplendent qualities of the stupid, misled, blundering pedant on the throne, whose *pumpkinification* he was to celebrate after his death in bitter satire. The intense servility and adulation of the twenty-sixth chapter of this discreditable *Consolation* have often attracted remark; but it has high literary merits.

After eight years not unprofitably spent, Seneca was recalled from his exile. The new empress, Agrippina, mindful of old intimacy, or anxious for additional support, summoned him from the sterile rocks of Corsica to the luxury and license of the imperial palace. He was advanced to the praetorship, and appointed tutor to her son, the young, handsome, promising Domitius Nero. Had not Alexander been the pupil of Aristotle? What might not be anticipated from the disciple of Seneca? It was very shortly before the acceptance of this charge that he had written the *Consolatio ad Marciam* on the death of her son. It was apparently followed by the disquisition *On Tranquillity*. Unreality of emotion characterizes both works. Marcia was the daughter of Cremutius Cordus, the republican historian of the last civil wars. Her son, for whom she was tardily consoled, had been dead three years. The praise of intellectual calm came with a suspicious air from one who had been fretting and moaning in obscurity for eight years, and was ready to welcome the bustle and extravagance of the court. There seems to have been no hesitation in accepting the proposals of Agrippina to forsake tranquillity. She was scheming to advance to the throne a son of whom his father had said that nothing but a monster could spring from such parents. The throne was secured by poisoning the old and uxorious emperor. Seneca became prime-minister and chief administrator under Agrippina, with Burrus as head of military affairs. The first service of the political or politic philosopher was to compose for his pupil a fulsome laudation of the murdered prince, whose memory he lampooned himself. The Neronian lauds were so highly appreciated that the senate directed them to be inscribed on a pillar of silver, and to be read by the praetors when they entered on their office. When Nero had been a year upon the throne, his younger colleague, Britannicus, the son and true heir of Claudius, was removed out of his path

— perhaps by poison, though this has been disputed in late years. At this opportune moment, Seneca addresses to his imperial pupil the notable treatise *On Clemency*. What was the demand for it, unless cruel dispositions had been manifested? How could they have been carried into effect unless by the acquiescence of Seneca, who was now in the height of his power? Tacitus alleges (*Ann.* 13, 11) that he published Nero's frequent asseverations of his clemency "testificando quam honesta praeciperet, vel jactandi ingenii."

Seneca is charged with encouraging and excusing Nero's amour with Acte to prevent worse excesses. The offense was venial in comparison with other subserviencies. This liaison, however, irritated Agrippina, and inflamed the growing hostility between the mother and the son. Public affairs continued to be conducted quietly and prosperously, and Seneca has reaped the honor. The calm was only on the surface. A few years later, the indictment of Suillius, under the antiquated Cincian law, brought discredit upon Seneca, who appears to have been active in the prosecution. Suillius, in his defense, turned savagely upon him — charged him with having been the quaestor of Germanicus, and with having corrupted his daughter none the less; demanded by what wisdom or by what precepts of philosophy he had accumulated such a vast estate in four years of imperial friendship; denounced him for catching rich and childless men, as with a net, and for exhausting Italy with his usuries (*Tacit. Ann.* 13, 43). The arts of the infamous Poppaea Sabina widened the breach between Agrippina and her son, and the trust and influence of Seneca sickened with the declining authority of Agrippina. He was alarmed and jeopardized by the unnatural combat. The mother sustained the rights of the injured empress Octavia; the son yielded to the wiles of the sorceress Poppaea Sabina, whose victory portended the utter overthrow of the maternal supremacy. It was a conflict to be terminated only by the death of Nero or of Agrippina. The mother, by whose crimes he had secured the throne, was the victim. It was generally credited that Seneca and Burrus assented to the matricide, though they devolved the execution on other instruments. Seneca has been accused of suggesting the crime to regain Nero's confidence. That he defended it has never been denied, and admits no exculpation. A later minister of Rome welcomed death rather than stain his conscience by apologizing for a less atrocity; but the meanness of Seneca's complicity in the crime sustained him in his position, if not in his full ascendancy, for a few years longer. He was still the first subject in the empire, the most prominent of the imperial

ministers, when the “Quinquennium Neronis,” the first five years of the new reign, was celebrated by the Quinquennialian games. The imaginary felicity of these years was long a memory and a regret to the Roman world, and posterity has accepted the impression which was then made. To Seneca has been assigned the credit of those halcyon days. Yet Britannicus had been suspiciously removed; Agrippina had been murdered by her son, and Seneca had justified the murder; Poppaea Sabina had supplanted Octavia, and insured her subsequent divorce and assassination. The Quinquennium Neronis was a theatrical illusion — a hypocrisy of brief duration. With the death of Burrus (A.D. 62), the scene rapidly changes. The marriage of Poppaea Sabina to the emperor, the divorce and murder of the young and innocent empress Octavia at the age of nineteen, and the final overthrow of Seneca’s influence were nearly simultaneous — “Mors Burri infregit Senecae potentiam” (Tacit. *Ann.* 14, 52, 1). About the same time, Paul was brought as a prisoner to Rome, on his appeal to Caesar. Signs and portents, on earth and in heaven, terrified the superstitious. Earthquakes and bloody comets spread distress and consternation, and pestilence succeeded. In the second summer after the murder of Octavia, the fearful conflagration which led to the persecution of the Christians and the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul devastated the city for six days and seven nights. During these years, Seneca’s influence had vanished, and his peril had been ever before him. The asseverations of Nero “that he would perish rather than injure him” (Sueton. *Nero*, 35) were scarcely reassuring. A convenient ambiguity maybe detected in the phrase. Seneca begged for his dismissal from court; he proposed to surrender his villas and his vast estates, his five hundred ivory-footed chairs of citron, his three or four millions of substance (Tacit. *Ann.* 14, 54; Dion Cass. 61, 10). His entreaties and his offers were disregarded, but he sought an ostentatious seclusion. He endeavored to conceal himself under the garb of a philosopher; he returned to the asceticisms of his youth; he seemed oblivious of human affairs, and to hold communion only with philosophy and with his God. “Deo parere, libertas est” (Senec. *De Vit. Beat.* 15, 7). To these years of solicitous obscurity ‘belong his best and most characteristic works — the treatises *De Providentia*, *De Brevitate Vitae*, *De Vita Beata*, *De Beneficiis*, the *Letters to Lucilius*, and the *Natural Questions*. The danger so long foreseen was not averted by philosophical pretensions or by rhetorical homilies. Seneca, whether justly or not, was believed or declared to be involved in the conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso. Was he guilty? The recorded evidence is wholly inadequate. The

probabilities alone convict him, and guilt in this case would be the most innocent of his criminalities. He knew his own peril; he knew the persistent and unscrupulous bloodthirstiness of his pupil; he knew the present and impending miseries of the Roman world when Nero's passions were unleashed; he had been cognizant and acquiescent, perhaps active in some cases, in the murder of Claudius, of Agrippina, of Octavia, and probably in many more assassinations. There is no appeal for him from his suspicious life to his sentimental morality, however lofty, pure, and fascinating. He was ordered to die, and the same decree was issued against his brother Gallio (but see Tacit. *Ann* 15, 73) and his nephew, the poet Lucan. The fatal mandate was promptly obeyed, but his death was lingering and painful. Nothing in the life of Seneca became him more or was more consistent with his philosophy than his manner of leaving it. There was something of parade — something of the *vos plaudite* of a classic comedy; but the ancients were always actors, and the ostentation of philosophic calm and indifference had been the habit of Seneca's life, and could not be wholly abandoned in the last act, when the situation was so tragic and imposing, so apt for one of his own dramas. The story of Seneca's serene but lingering death is told by Tacitus (*ibid.* 15, 59-65) with elaborate art and with the most adroit *chiar-oscuro*. It is one of the most finished of the numerous delineations in distemper of that consummate artist, and has furnished the exemplar for many inferior copies. The story has been so often repeated, and is so familiar, that it need not be reiterated here; but a suspicion remains that some of the touches of the painter's brush have no better justification than there was for the loose rumor reported by him that the conspirators had designed, if successful, to elevate Seneca to the throne of the Caesars.

2. Writings. — The literary remains of Seneca are in both prose and verse. The prose productions are moral essays, fragments of such essays, one hundred and twenty-four *Letters to Lucilius* (which are themselves essays), the *Ludus de Morte Claudii* (or *Apocolocyntosis*), and seven books of *Natural Questions*, or speculations in natural history. The *Apocolocyntosis* is a medley of prose and verse, but its authorship is doubtful. Seneca's poetry consists of nine epigrams — the wail of the exile — and ten tragedies, one of which (the *Octavia*) cannot have been written by him, while it remains uncertain whether he wrote any of them. The merits and defects of Seneca's style may be gathered from the incidental remarks already made. It may suffice at this time to quote the just censure

of the emperor Caius, "Arena sine calce," and to approve the equally brief and accurate criticism of Quintilian," Abundat dulcibus vitiis." It is always affected, it is always pointed, it is always attractive, it is always radiant; but it is a string of artificial gems, not of "Orient pearls at random strung," or of genuine diamonds.

There are some old fabrications ascribed to Seneca, which should not be left altogether unnoticed. One of these is the treatise *De Formula Honestoe Vitoe*, which was constantly cited as his in the Middle Ages, but is now attributed to Martinus Dumiensis, a Christian writer contemporaneous with Justinian. The other is the imaginary correspondence between Seneca and Paul, which was known to Jerome. These letters are indubitably spurious; but an acquaintance between the pagan moralist and the Christian missionary is not without probability, though it is without evidence. The belief in such acquaintance, and the favorable acceptance of the *Letters* by Jerome and Augustine, encouraged the fancy that Seneca had been converted to Christianity. More deserving of consideration than the possibility of such intercourse is the close agreement between many passages in the writings of the Roman philosopher and in the *Epistles* of the apostle, and the singular consonance of the maxims of the Stoic rhetorician with the precepts of the evangelists and apostles. This significant concord has often been noticed, and recently, with especial care, by Dr. Lightfoot, the new bishop of Durham. The parallelisms are most frequent and most startling — of course in ethical rather than in theological matters. Almost equally suggestive is the fact that the ethical productions of Seneca are much after the fashion of sermons and hortatory discourses — preaching a purer faith, a cleaner heart, and virtuous action in the midst of a corrupt and unbelieving generation. An obvious explanation is that which induced the supposititious correspondence between Seneca and Paul. When this is rejected, it is easy to presume the diffusion of Christian doctrine by constant communications of all kinds between the several parts of the empire. It is certain that Christian influence was early discernible at Rome, and has been detected in the contemporaneous Roman law. There was a Christian community in the palace at an early period. But this does not explain all. During the whole lifetime of Seneca there was an earnest and widely extended movement in the line of moral renovation, which was illustrated by the growth of Stoicism at Rome and the expansion of its doctrines, by the tenor of the writings of Philo-Judetus, by Sibylline forgeries, and by the memorable career of Apollonius Tyaneus, which has

been disguised and obscured by the fictions of his biographers. It does not conflict with a reverential interpretation of “the ways of God to man” to conjecture that the miseries of the civil wars which had spread from Calpe to the Euphrates; the consequent disintegration of society everywhere, and the general dissoluteness which those wars had engendered, produced, along with the decay of pagan belief, a recognition of the need, a solicitude for the accomplishment, and attempts at the introduction, of a religious regeneration. Such a condition of the mind and heart of the nations would be a natural preparation for the reception and diffusion of Christianity. Nor does it seem alien to the course of Providence, who never effects great changes *per saltum*, and to whom “a thousand years are but as a day.”

3. Philosophy. — No distinct scheme of philosophy can claim Seneca as either its founder or its systematic expositor. He only enlarged the lines, adorned the precepts, and amplified the spirit of the philosophy which he professed. He declared himself a Stoic, has always been so regarded, and is recognized as such by Zeller, Ueberweg, and the other historians of ancient philosophy. It is therefore needless to dwell upon his doctrines. They are those of the Stoics (q.v.). But Seneca was much more and much less than a Stoic of the old and rigid school, and much of his favor in his own and in later times may be attributed to the excess and the defect. He was thoroughly unsystematic and discontinuous. He indulges in no speculation to establish or to fortify the theory. He employs the current tenets for the practical conduct of life. He had a broader comprehension than Zeno or Chrysippus. He was latitudinarian in his sentiments. He applauds the character, commends the ethical doctrines, and cites the maxims of Epicurus. He inclines to the large intelligence of the Peripatetics, and emulates the spiritual aspirations of the Academics. Philosophy, in his conception, was no abstract and recondite study, of service only in the closet: it was the rule of life in the midst of distractions and temptations, of uncertainties and dangers — a refuge for the troubled mind, a shelter from suspicion and envy, a defense against tyranny, and the balm of a serene conscience (*De Beat. Vit.* 15).

Philosophy has been, since the Christian revelation, so distinct from religion, or so completely identified with it, that it is not easy to appreciate its character, its charms, and its value in those ages when it was the sole substitute for revealed truth — when from its dark, intricate, and insoluble problems could alone be expected vague hopes and vaguer aspirations, where Christianity affords absolute assurance to all. By the cultivated and

inquiring pagan, philosophy was pursued as the guide of life, the moderator of prosperity, the solace in adversity, the oracular response to the eager questions which the earnest heart and intelligent mind are ever asking about here and hereafter — about the world, its origin, and its governance; about man, his duties and his destinies; about all that lies beyond the dark veil of death and the darker veil of birth, This is fully manifested in Seneca's invitation to Paulinus to seek "the shady spaces of divine philosophy" (*De Brev. Vitoe*, 19, 1, 2).

Philosophy offered many inducements to its pursuit or its pretense under the early empire. It was a discipline of mind and heart to those of gentle disposition and refined tastes whose easy circumstances in life relieved them from the necessity of public or professional vocations. Hence philosophy grew into a fashion, and the fashion, like all fashions, moral or religious, was often perverted into a cloak or a pretense.

Under the pressure of despotic rule, slight differences become symbols of political faith. At Rome, Stoicism associated itself with regrets for the republic, with a mild, inert aversion to the empire, or with a more decided antipathy to the emperor. Lord of himself, the Stoic asserted his independence of all control of man by governments or by fortune. The haughty pretension afforded little offense to the constituted powers. The sole sovereignty of the Stoic had its single throne within his own bosom. There he, too, was emperor; he cared for naught beyond. He had thus the credit of independence, without assuming the complexion of a conspirator or a revolutionary. Every age illustrates the facility with which prevalent principles shrivel up into empty forms. Loud professions may disguise hollow sentiments. Sentiments accordant with the professions may be sincerely entertained, and yet produce neither earnestness of feeling nor constancy of action. Men will more readily die for their avowed faith than live for it. Genuine martyrs may be found who would scarcely practice what they die for. Their faith is in their profession — "Cum verba eruperunt, adfectus ad consuetudinem relabuntur" (*Senec. De Brev. Vit.* 6, 3). Of such was Seneca. Augustine's comment on his boast of independence may be applied to most of his virtues: "Aduit scribenti, viventi defuit" (*De Civ. Dei*, 6, 10). To this danger he was peculiarly exposed. He was courtly in manners and courtly in associations, amiable and impressible in disposition, serene and averse to violent emotions; of affectionate and placid temperament, rather than of deep and solid nature; vain rather than ambitious, and ever mindful of his own interest. His birth,

his home influences, his education, his vocation, his career, his experience in either fortune, led him to deem that best which was most plausible or most secure. He was the son of a great rhetorician, brought up in the schools of the rhetoricians, destined for a rhetorician, winning early profit, distinction, and promotion by rhetorical displays. Rhetoric was the passion of the time; he was not constituted to despise it. He declared, "Oratio sollicita philosophum non decet" (*Ep.* 16, 5, 4); yet his expression was always curious and surprising. He has given us the maxim, "Qualis vir, talis oratio." It may be justly inverted, Qualis oratio, talis vir.

All that remains of Seneca shows that he was nothing if not rhetorical. The tartness of expression, the compression of phrase, the fertility of fancy, the paradox of thought, were ever uppermost in his mind. These things did not make him false, but unreal. They did not make him insincere, but superficial. His predilections were good, but evanescent in action. He had the fragility of the man who looks to form and fashion, not to substance. This may explain the contradiction between the ethical theory and the personal morality of Seneca. An instructive parallel, on a lower plane and with narrower exorbitancies, is furnished by the contrast between the character and the *Night Thoughts* of Edward Young.

It is a perilous and doubtful task to unveil the depths of the human heart; to reconcile the complex and often unconscious duplicities of human nature; to decide where delusion ends and deception begins; to estimate the force of temptations and the degrees of resistance to them; to discern the subtle harmony which binds all the parts of life together, and may unite general purity and noble appetencies to grievous frailties and ignoble crimes. None but the All-seeing One, "to whom all hearts are open, and from whom no secrets are hid," can pierce the obscure mazes of human motives. The harsh, censorious, confident, sweeping, unrestricted judgment will blunder, whether it praise or blame — "Ut absolvaris, ignosce" (*Senec. De Benef.* 7, 28, 3). Was it a cry from his own lacerated conscience when Seneca exclaimed so truly and so sadly,

"Magnos humanum pectus recessus habet!" (Fragm. 3, De Amicit.)

4. Literature. — The historians of ancient philosophy and the *Works* of Seneca, of course. See also Lodge, *The Life of L. Annoeus Seneca, described by Justus Lipsius, in The Workes of L. Annoeus Seneca, both Morall and Naturall* (Lond. 1614); La Grange, *Vie de Seneque* (Paris, 1819); Aubertin, *De Sap. Doctoribus qui a Cic. Morte ad Neron. Princip.*

Romoe Viguerunt (ibid. 1857); Bernhardt, *Die Anschauung des Seneca vom Universum* (Wittenb. 1861); Seidler, *Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des Philosophen L. Annoeus Seneca* (Fraustadt, 1863); Dourif, *Du Stoicisme et du Christianisme*, etc. (Paris, 1863); Montée, *Le Stoicisme a Rome* (ibid. 1865); Martha, *Les Moralistes sous l'Empire Romain* (ibid. 1866); Stahr, *Agrippina, die Mutter Nero's* (Berl. 1867); Lightfoot, *Essay on St. Paul and Seneca*, ap. *Comm. on the Epistle to the Philippians*; *Westminster Rev.* July, 1867, No. 173, art. 2; Merivale, *Romans under the Empire* (Lond. 1850-62). (G.F.H.)

Senectus

in Roman mythology, a personification of *old age*. He dwells at the entrance to Hades.

Seneh.

SEE BUSH.

Se'neh

(Heb. *Seneh'*, *hnsj*]thorn; Sept. *Σεννά* [Vat. *Ἐννάαρ* Alex. omits]; Vulg. *Sene*), the name of one of the two isolated rocks which stood in the "passage of Michmash" at the time of the adventure of Jonathan and his armor bearer (^{OLD}1 Samuel 14:4). It was the southern one of the two (ver. 5), and the nearest to Geba (A.V. "Gibeah"). The name in Hebrew means a "thorn," or thorn bush, and is applied elsewhere only to the memorable thorn of Horeb; but whether it refers in this instance to the shape of the rock or to the growth of *seneh* upon it, we cannot ascertain. The latter is more consistent with analogy. It is remarkable that Josephus (*War*, 5, 2, 1), in describing the route of Titus from the north to Jerusalem, mentions that the last encampment of his army was at a spot "which in the Jews' tongue is called the valley" (or perhaps the plain) "of thorns (*ἀκανθῶν ἀλώων*), near a certain village called Gabathsould," i.e. Gibeath of Saul. The ravine of Michmash is about four miles from the hill which is, with tolerable certainty, identified with Gibeah. This distance is perhaps too great to suit Josephus's expression; still the point is worth notice. — Smith. Between Jeba, or Geba, and Mukhmas, or Michmash, there are two narrow and deep valleys, or gorges, running nearly parallel towards the east, with a high, rocky, and precipitous ridge between them. These two valleys unite a little lower down, i.e. a little to the east of the direct line from Jeba to

Mukhmas. The ordinary route descends obliquely to the right from Jeba, and passes through the united valley at the junction, rounding the point of the promontory, and then ascends obliquely to the left towards Mukhmas. This is the passage of Michmash alluded to in ^{<0933>}1 Samuel 13:23; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:28, 29. The ridge between the two valleys has two steep or precipitous sides, one facing the south towards Geba, and the other facing the north towards Michmash. These were the two “sharp rocks” or precipices called “Seneh” and “Bozez.” The two valleys are still called *Suweineh* and *Buweizeh*. Jeba stands on the south side of Suweineh, on the very edge of the valley, and Mukhmas on the north edge of Buweizeh. Lieut. Conder regards the valley of Suweineh itself as a trace of the name Seneh, and thinks its opposite walls were scaled by Jonathan (*Quar. Statement of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,”* April, 1874, p. 62); and he graphically describes the descent of his own surveying party down the rocks (*Tent Work in Palestine*, 2, 113). **SEE BOZEZ.**

Senes

(*old men*), a name given to the primates of the Christian Church in Africa. Here the primacy was not confined, as in other places, to the civil metropolis, but always went along with the oldest bishop of the province, who succeeded to this dignity by virtue of his seniority, whatever place he lived in.

Seneschal

a monkish name for a *steward*. His duties were to seat the guests in the guest hall, send presents to strangers of degree, and in some cases to have charge of the bishop’s palace. The same name was given to stewards of the year or months, minor canons or vicars, who catered for the common table.

Sengler, Jacob

a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born at Husenstamm, near Frankfort-on-the Main, Sept. 11, 1799. When twenty years of age, after having learned the trade of a shoemaker, he entered the gymnasium at Frankfort. In 1824 he studied theology at Tübingen, under Möhler, and in 1828 he attended the philosophical lectures of Schelling at Munich. In 1830 he commenced publishing the *Catholic Church Gazette* for Germany, and numbered among his contributors, besides Döllinger and Fischer, such Protestant divines as Hoffmann, Weiss, and others. In 1831 he went to

Marburg as professor of philosophy, where he remained for eleven years, living on the best terms with his Protestant colleagues, Hupfeld, Kling, Henke, J. Müller, etc. In 1842 he was called to Freiburg, where he lectured for thirty-six years, and where he also died, Nov. 8, 1878, five days after having retired from his office. As a philosopher, he tried to harmonize speculation with Christianity; as a Roman Catholic, he never believed in the Roman spirit of exclusiveness. He wrote, *Würdigung der Schrift von D. Schulz: Ueber die Lehre vom heil. Abendmahl* (Mainz, 1830): — *Die Idee Gottes* (Heidelberg, 1845-52, 2 pts.): — *Die Erkenntnisslehre* (ibid. 1858). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1223; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 454, 582; 2, 73, 74, 776; *Neue evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, Feb. 22, 1879. (B.P.)

Sengumara Brama

in Hindu mythology, is one of the most ancient sages and princes of the human race. He was contemporary with king Druven, a grandson of the father of all who have been born, and gave to him his only daughter Bravibamey in marriage.

Seng-Wan-Mau

in Chinese mythology, is the supreme deity of the Chinese, which is composed of nothing, is created from nothing, and does or thinks nothing, though, as conceived of, is not without exalted divine attributes, e.g. incomprehensibility, omniscience, justice, etc. He is seated in the highest heaven, and thence looks down in immovable quietude on the doings of mankind. He is never pictured, because no conception of his form is possible; but there are a number of inferior gods, who preside over every rank of men, over every human occupation, city, etc., who are portrayed in every imaginable form, in clay, stone, wood, etc. These gods are subordinate to Seng-Wan-Mau, and are the rulers of human affairs, so that man's destinies, his weal and woe, are committed to their hands. Their images are worshipped, but they are also broken into fragments when the gods fail to gratify the wishes of the worshippers.

Senior

(1), a monk from the age of forty to fifty years who was excused from the external offices of provisor, procurator, cellarer, almoner, kitchener, master of the works, etc., but took his turn in singing masses. (2) The head

of a college of secular calons, as at Christ-church, Hants, 1099. (3) At Osnaburg, Trent, Lübeck, and in some Italian cathedrals, the antianus, or *senior*, corresponds to the archpriest of certain French cathedrals, in which he acted in the bishop's absence as his representative in the administration of sacraments and the benediction of ashes, palms, and the font. Such an archpriest was required in every cathedral by the Council of Merida.

Senior Bishop

In the Protestant Episcopal Church, the bishop who is oldest in the order of consecration is thus known. The senior bishop is president of the House of Bishops, and has certain duties committed to him by the general constitution and canons of the Church. Except in case of infirmity, he consecrates the newly elected bishop; he also receives the testimonials of a bishop elect, in case of such election taking place during the recess of the General Convention, and transmits them to all the other bishops for their consent or dissent. Special general conventions are called by his summons on consent of all the bishops; the place of meeting of any general convention may be changed by him. This plan of deciding as to presidency was adopted in 1789; but in 1792 a different principle was adopted, viz. that of rotation. This continued only for a short time, and the order of seniority was again established.

Seniority

SEE SENIOR BISHOP.

Se'nir

(^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 5:23; ^{<3715>}Ezekiel 27:5). *SEE SHENIR.*

Senlis, Councils Of

(*Concilium Silvanectense*). There were several councils held in Senlis, which is a town in the department of Oise, France.

1. Held in 873 by the bishops of the provinces of Sens and Rheims, in which Carloman, the son of king Charles the Bald, was brought to judgment, deposed from every ecclesiastical dignity, and reduced to lay communion, on account of his treasonable and other evil practices. See Mansi, 9, 257.

2. Held Nov. 14, 1235, by the archbishop of Rheims and six of his suffragans, who put the whole of the king's domains within the province of Rheims under an interdict. *SEE COMPIEGNE, SYNODS OF.*

3. This council was held in 1310 by Philip de Marigni, archbishop of Sens. Nine Templars were condemned and burned, denying in the hour of death their confession of guilt, extorted from them by torture. See Dubois, *Hist. of Paris*, p. 551.

4. The fourth council at Senlis was held in 1315 or 1316 by Robert de Courtenay, archbishop of Rheims, and his suffragans, in which Pierre de Latilly, bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne (accused by Louis Hutin of the death of Philip le Bel, and of another murder, and imprisoned), demanded his liberty and the restitution of his property. Subsequently he was entirely justified of the charge, and was left in quiet possession of his bishopric. See Mansi, 11, 1623.

5. Held in 1326 by William de Brie, archbishop of Rheims, with seven of his suffragans (present either in person or by deputy). Seven canons were made.

1. Lays down the proper forms to be observed in holding councils.

4. Declares excommunicated persons to be incapable of suing at law, of defending themselves, and of giving evidence.

5. Excommunicates those who violate the asylum afforded by churches, either by dragging away forcibly those who have taken refuge there, or by refusing them nourishment.

6. Against clandestine marriages.

7. Against those who impeded ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

See Mansi, 11, 1768.

Sennabris

(Σενναβρίς), an encampment of the Romans under Titus, thirty furlongs from Tiberias, which was in sight (Josephus, *War*, 3, 9, 7); perhaps *the Senabrai* (yarbns) or *Tsinabri* (yrbnx) of the Talmud (Reland, *Palest.* p. 999). Schwarz says (*Palest.* p. 178) that ruins in that vicinity are still

called *Sinabri* by the Arabs. Thomson identifies the place with the modern *Shugshab*, containing traces of old buildings (*Land and Book*, 2, 65).

Sennach'erib

[some *Sennache'rib*] (Heb. *Sancherib'*, *byrjæš*; read in the cuneiform as *Sinachirib*, i.e. *Sin* [the Moon] *increases brothers*, thought to indicate that he was not the first born; Sept.: *Σενναχηρίμ* v.r. *Σενναχηρείμ*; Josephus, *Σενναχήριβος*; Herodotus *Σαναχάριβος*; Vulg. *Sennacherib*), a famous Assyrian monarch, contemporary with Hezekiah. The name of Sennacherib (in Assyrian *Sin-achi-iriba*) is written in various ways; but three forms are most common, of which we present the most usual. It consists of three elements: the first, *Sin*, or the "Moon" god; the second, *achi*, or "brothers" (*ha*); and the third, *iriba*, or "he increased" (*br*); the meaning of the whole being "the Moon has multiplied brothers." *SEE CUNEIFORM*.

Picture for Sennacherib 1

1. Earlier Annals. — Sennacherib was the son and successor of Sargon (q.v.). We know very little of him during his father's lifetime. From his name, and from a circumstance related by Polyhistor, we may gather that he was not the eldest son, and not the heir to the crown till the year before his father's death. Polyhistor (following Berosus) related that the tributary kingdom of Babylon was held by a brother — who would doubtless be an elder brother — of Sennacherib's, not long before that prince came to the throne (Berosus, *Fragm.* 12). Sennacherib's brother was succeeded by a certain Hagisa, who reigned only a month, being murdered by Merodach-Baladan, who then took the throne and held it three months. The details of Sennacherib's campaigns are given under each year in the cuneiform records of his reign. From these it appears that he began to reign July 16, B.C. 705, and was murdered in December 681 (Smith and Sayce, *Cun. Hist. of Senn.* [Lond. 1878] p. 8).

His first efforts were directed to crushing the revolt of Babylonia, which he invaded with a large army. Merodach-Baladan ventured on a battle, but was defeated and driven from the country. Sennacherib then made Belibus (Bel-ibni) an officer of his court, viceroy, and, quitting Babylonia, ravaged the lands of the Aramaean tribes on the Tigris and Euphrates, whence he carried off 200,000 captives. In the ensuing year he made war upon the independent tribes in Mount Zagros, and penetrated thence to Media,

where he reduced a portion of the nation which had previously been independent.

2. Conquest of Judaea. — We give the account of this as condensed from the cuneiform annals by the late George Smith (*Hist. of Assyria from the Monuments*, p. 117 sq.):

“The eastern expedition of Sennacherib occupied his third year, and at the close of this year, his southern and eastern borders being secure, he had leisure to turn his attention to the affairs of Palestine. Encouraged by the king of Egypt, Hezekiah, king of Judah, had. thrown off the Assyrian yoke, several of the smaller sovereigns had either voluntarily joined him or been forced to submit to the, king of Judah, and Lulia (the Elulius of Josephus), king of Tyre and Zidon, had also rebelled against Sennacherib. The Assyrians had lost their hold on all the country from Lebanon to Arabia, and Sennacherib resolved to reconquer this region. Crossing from his capital into Syria, which he calls the land of the Hittites, he attacked first. Lulia, king of Zidon; but this prince was not prepared to resist Sennacherib, so he embarked on one of his vessels from the city of Tyre, and set sail for the land of Yatnan (the island of Cyprus), abandoning his country to the mercy of the Assyrians. Sennacherib now besieged and took the various Phoenician towns: Tyre, the strong city, appears to have successfully resisted him, but he captured Zidunnurabn (great Zidon, ^{<6625>}Joshua 19:25) and the lesser Zidon; then coming south, Bitzitte and Zariptu (Zarephath, ^{<1179>}1 Kings 17:9), Mahalliba Usu (Hosah, ^{<6629>}Joshua 19:29), Akzibi (Achzib, ver. 29), and Akku (Accho, ^{<7013>}Judges 1:31). The sea coast of Phoenicia, down to the land of the Philistines, was now in the hands of Sennacherib, and he raised a man named Tubahal to the throne of Zidon, and fixed upon the country an annual tribute. The success of Sennacherib along the coast, and the failure of Egyptian aid, now brought nearly the whole of Palestine to his feet, and the various rulers sent envoys with tribute, and tokens of submission to present before the Assyrian monarch. Menahem, who ruled at Samaria; Tubahal, the newly made king of Zidon; Abdilihiti, king of Arvad; Urumelek, king of Gebal; Metinti, king of Ashdod; and Buduil, king of the Ammonites; Kemosh-natbi, king of the Moabites; and Airammu, king of Edom, now made their peace, and Askelon, Ekron, and Judah alone remained in rebellion. Sennacherib started from Akku, and keeping along the coast, invaded Askelon, and capturing Zidqa, the revolting king, sent him, his wife, his sons and daughters, his brothers, and other relatives, captive to Assyria. The cities

of Askelon, Bitdaganna (Beth-dagon, ^{<1654>}Joshua 15:41), Yappu (Joppa, ^{<300B>}Jonah 1:3), Benai-barqa (Bene-berak, ^{<1695>}Joshua 19:45), and Azuru were successively captured, and Sennacherib placed Saruludari, the son of Rukibti, on the throne. Moving from Askelon, Sennacherib attacked Ekron: he tells us that Padi, king of Ekron, had been faithful to his pledges to Assyria, and the priests, princes, and people of Ekron had conspired against him and revolted, and, putting their king in bonds, had delivered him into the hands of Hezekiah, king of Judah, to be kept prisoner at Jerusalem. The revolters at Ekron relied on the assistance of Egypt; and when Sennacherib advanced against the city, a force under the king of Egypt came to their assistance. The Egyptian army was from the kings of Egypt (the plural being used), and from the king of Miruhha, or Ethiopia. To meet the army of Egypt, Sennacherib turned aside to Altaqu (Eltekeh, ver. 44), where the two forces met, and the Egyptians were defeated. See So. The overthrow of the Egyptian army was followed by the capture of Altaqu and Tamna (Timnah, 15, 10), and Sennacherib again marched to Ekron, and put to death the leading men of the city who had led the revolt, and severely treated the people. Their king, Padi, was demanded of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and, being delivered up, was once more seated on the throne. The last part of the expedition given in the Assyrian annals consists of the attack on Hezekiah. The king of Judah was the most important of the tributaries who had thrown off the yoke of Assyria, and was reserved for the last operations. After settling the affairs of Ekron, Sennacherib marched against Judah, and captured forty-six of the fortified cities of Hezekiah, agreeing with the statement of the Scripture (^{<2183>}2 Kings 18:13-16) that he came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them; all the smaller places round them were destroyed, and Sennacherib carried into captivity 200,150 people of all sorts, together with horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep in great numbers. Sennacherib goes on to relate that he shut up Hezekiah in Jerusalem like a caged bird, and built towers round the city to attack it. Sennacherib now began to portion off and dispose of the territory which he had conquered. The towns along the western side he detached from Judah, and divided them between Metinti, king of Ashdod, Sarn-ludari, king of Askelon, Padi, king of Ekron, and Zilli-bel, king of Gaza, the four kings of the Philistines who were now in submission to Assyria, and he increased the amount of the tribute due from these principalities. Hezekiah and his principal men, shut up in Jerusalem, now began to fear, and resolved on submission. Meanwhile the soldiers of Sennacherib were attacking Lachish, one of the

last remaining strong cities of Judah. The pavilion of this proudest of the Assyrian kings was pitched within sight of the city, and the monarch sat on a magnificent throne while the Assyrian army assaulted the city. Lachish, the strong city, was captured, and thence Sennacherib dictated terms to the humbled king of Judah. Hezekiah sent by his messenger and made submission, and gave tribute, including thirty talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones of various sorts, couches and thrones of ivory, skins and horns of buffaloes, girls and eunuchs, male and female musicians. According to the record of Sennacherib, he returned to Nineveh in triumph, bearing with him this tribute and spoil, and not a single shadow of reverse or disaster appears in the whole narrative.

The accounts of this expedition of Sennacherib given in the Bible relate that after the submission of Hezekiah, the angel of the Lord went through the camp of the Assyrians and destroyed 185,000 men of Sennacherib's army, and that the Assyrian monarch returned in disgrace to Nineveh (¹²⁰⁸⁵2 Kings 19:35-37). This overthrow of Sennacherib's army is confirmed by a story told to Herodotus (2, 141) by the Egyptian priests. They relate that in the time of an Egyptian king named Sethos, Sennacherib made an expedition against Egypt, and came as far as Pelusium. Sethos went out against him with an inferior army, having invoked the aid of the Egyptian gods and been promised deliverance. In the night, as the two armies lay opposite each other, hosts of field mice came and destroyed the bow strings of the Assyrians, who next morning fled."

Picture for Sennacherib 2

The discrepancy in dates between the cuneiform and the Biblical accounts of this invasion are at present irreconcilable (*Journ. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 383 sq.). *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. There has probably been an error in reading the former, or perhaps an error in the record itself. All attempts to correct the Scripture date are forbidden by the manner in which it is interlaced and confirmed by the context. Rawlinson and others have sought a partial solution of the difficulty by the supposition of a twofold attack by Sennacherib upon Palestine; but neither the Assyrian nor the Biblical annals give any countenance to this view. *SEE HEZEKIAH*.

3. Later Campaigns and Death. — In his fourth year Sennacherib invaded Babylonia for the second time. Merodach-Baladan continued to have a party in that country, where his brothers still resided; and it may be suspected that the viceroy, Belibus, either secretly favored his cause, or, at

any rate, was remiss in opposing it. The Assyrian monarch, therefore, took the field in person, defeated a Chaldaean chief who had taken up arms on behalf of the banished king, expelled the king's brothers, and, displacing Belibus, put one of his own sons on the throne in his stead. In his fifth year he led an expedition into Armenia and Media; after which, from his sixth to his eighth year, he was engaged in wars with Susiana and Babylonia. From this point his annals fail us.

Sennacherib is believed to have reigned at least twenty-two, and perhaps twenty-four, years. The date of his accession appears to be fixed by the canon of Ptolemy to B.C. 702, the first year of Belibus or Elibus; but Col. Rawlinson's revised computation (in the *Athenoeum*, No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 245) dates the accession in B.C. 704, and the late Assyriologist George Smith makes the reign to have begun in B.C. 705. The Scripture synchronism locates its beginning in B.C. 715. The date of his death seems to be marked in the same canon by the accession of Asaridanus (Esarhaddon) to the throne of Babylon in B.C. 680; but it is possible that an interval occurred between the two. *SEE ESAR-HADDON*. The monuments are in conformity with the canon, for the twenty-second year of Sennacherib has been found upon them, while they have not furnished any notice of a later year. *SEE ASSYRIA*.

Of the death of Sennacherib nothing is known beyond the brief statement of Scripture, that "as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch (?) his god, Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword: and they escaped into the land of Armenia" (~~2~~¹ Kings 19:37; ~~2378~~²³⁷⁸ Isaiah 37:38). It is curious that Moses of Chorene and Alexander Polyhistor should both call the elder of these two sons by a different name (Ardumazanes or Argamozanus); and it is still more curious that Abydenus, who generally drew from Berosus, should interpose a king Nergilus between Sennacherib and Adrammelech, and make the latter be slain by Esarhaddon (Eusebius, *Chr. Can.* 1, 9; comp. 1, 5; and see also Mos. Chor. *Arm. Hist.* 1, 22). Moses, on the contrary, confirms the escape of both brothers, and mentions the parts of Armenia where they settled, and which were afterwards peopled by their descendants.

Picture for Sennacherib 3

4. Character. — Sennacherib was one of the greatest of the Assyrian kings, and also one of the proudest of them. The prophet Isaiah pictures his haughtiness his "stout heart," and the "glory of his high looks;" represents

him as boasting, “Are not my princes altogether kings?” and as ascribing his victories to his “strength of hand” and his “wisdom” — victories, at the same time, so complete and so easy as when one takes away the eggs of a fowl so scared that it neither fluttered nor “peeped” (10, 8-14). Sennacherib himself verifies the portrait for he calls himself “the great king,” “king of nations,” “king of the four regions,” “first of kings,” “favorite of the great gods,” etc. The accompanying seal depicts him killing a lion, and in one of his inscriptions he boasts of such a conquest. His approaching invasion filled Jerusalem with deep alarm, and Isaiah again and again depicts it. His boasts of previous conquests were not vain ones: ancient monarchies had disappeared before him, opposing armies had perished “as grass on the house tops,” and his numerous hosts had drunk up rivers on their march. An ideal march is vividly sketched for him — by Aiath, Migron, and Michmash, to Geba, and Nob on the northern shoulder of Olivet. Sennacherib did not come by this route, for he wished to prostrate Egypt; but the route sketched might have been taken, and its very difficulties are meant to picture Assyrian intrepidity and perseverance. All the while Sennacherib was only God’s “rod,” an “axe in his hand;” and “Lebanon,” an image of his stately and warlike grandeur, “shall fall by a mighty one.” “The virgin, the daughter of Sion,” without armor or prowess, but courageous in her seeming helplessness, laughed him to scorn. Nay, God would do to him as he had done to the captives at Lachish, “put a hook into his nose,” and ignominiously and easily turn him “back by the way he came” (²³⁷⁰Isaiah 37). “The stout-hearted are spoiled, they slept their sleep; at thy rebuke, both the chariots and horses were cast into a deep sleep;” “the earth feared and was still, when God arose to judgment” (^{1970B}Psalms 76:5-9).

Picture for Sennacherib 4

Sennacherib was not only a great warrior, but also a grand builder. He seems to have been the first who fixed the seat of government permanently at Nineveh, which he carefully repaired and adorned with splendid buildings. His great work is the palace of Koyunjik, surpassing in magnificence all the buildings of his predecessors. The royal structure, built on a platform of about ninety feet in elevation, and paved with bricks, covered fully eight acres. Its great halls and chambers were ranged round three courts; one of them 154 feet by 125, and another 124 feet by 90. One of the halls was about 180 feet in length by about 40 in breadth, and sixty smaller rooms have been explored. These rooms are broader than those of

his predecessors, probably because he used cedars from Lebanon. He built also, or repaired, a second palace at Nineveh on the mound of Nebbi Yunus, confined the Tigris to its channel by an embankment of brick, restored the ancient aqueducts, which had gone to decay, and gave to Nineveh that splendor which she thenceforth retained till the ruin of the empire. The realistic sculptures of Sennacherib are very instructive; every day scenes of Assyrian life are depicted by them; landscapes and hunting; the various processes of masonry; the carving and transportation of the great bulls; and the slaves working in gangs, and often in the presence of the king. He also erected monuments in distant countries. One of his memorials is at the mouth of the Nahr el-Kelb, on the Syrian coast, verifying his boast that he “had come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon;” and there it stands side by side with the tablet which tells of the conquests of Rameses the Great, more than five centuries before the period of Sennacherib. *SEE NINEVEH.*

Sennert, Andreas

a German Orientalist, was born at Wittenberg in 1606, and began the study of the Shemitic languages at the age of ten years. Having completed his education, he visited various universities in Germany and Holland, and in 1638 was appointed professor of Hebrew in his native place, where he died, Dec. 22, 1689. He wrote various philological works, among which are, *Compendium Lexici Hebraici* (Wittenb. 1664): — *Rabbinismus* (ibid. 1666): — *Grammatica Orientalis*. (ibid. 1666): — *Ἀσκημα Γλωττικόν* (ibid. 1648). For a more complete list of his works, see Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 312 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, p. 131 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 4, 302; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Sens, Councils Of

(*Concilium Senonense*). These councils were so called from being held in Sens, a town in the department of Yonne, France.

1. This council was held in 1140. Among those present were Louis VII, Samson of Rheims, and Henry of Sens. In this council St. Bernard charged Abelard (q.v.), who was present, with his errors, accusing him of making *degrees* in the Trinity, as Arius had done; of preferring free will to grace, with Pelagius; and of dividing Jesus Christ, with Nestorius. He produced extracts taken from his works, and called upon Abelard either to deny having written them, or to prove their truth, or to retract them. Abelard,

instead of defending himself, appealed to Rome; whereupon the bishops present contented themselves with condemning his doctrine, passing no sentence upon him personally out of deference to Innocent II, to whom Samson and three of the bishops wrote, requesting his concurrence in their judgment. The pope condemned Abelard in the same year, and, in his answer to the letter of the bishops, declared that he concurred with them in the sentence they had passed, and that he had imposed perpetual silence upon Abelard. The latter published an apology, in which he confessed the sound Catholic faith, declared that he desisted from his appeal, and retracted all that he had written contrary to the truth. See Mansi, 10, 1018.

2. Held in 1199 by the legate Peter against the Poplicans (*or Populicani*), a sect of Manichaeans. Among others, the dean of Nevers, and Raynaldus, abbot of St. Martin, were charged with this heresy. The latter was deposed, being found guilty not only of this heresy, but also of those of the Stercoranists and Origenists. Both appealed from the decision of the council to the pope. See Mansi, 11, 3.

3. The third Council of Sens was held in May, 1320, by William de Melun, archbishop of Sens. Four statutes were published.

- 1.** Enacts that the bishops should grant an indulgence of forty days to those persons who would fast on the vigil of the feast of the Holy Sacrament.
- 2.** Directs that places in which clerks were forcibly detained should be laid under an interdict.
- 4.** Condemns those priests who dressed themselves improperly, such as in red, green, yellow, or white boots, etc., and wore beards and long hair.

See Mansi, 11, 1860.

4. This council was held in 1485 by Tristan de Salazar, archbishop of Sens, in which the constitutions published by his predecessor, Louis, in a council held A.D. 1460, were confirmed. Among other matters treated of were the celebration of the holy office, the reform of the clergy and of the monks, the duties of laymen towards the Church, etc. It also enacted that canons shall be considered absent who are not present at nocturn, before the end of the *Venite*; at the other hours before the first psalm, and at mass before

the end of the last *Kyrie*. Most of these regulations were taken from the canons of Basle, Lateran and the Pragmatic. See Mansi, 13, 1721, App.

Sensation

the immediate effect produced on the mind by something acting upon the bodily organs. The earliest sign by which the Ego becomes perceptible is corporeal sensation, and this sensibility appears to be a necessary attribute of animated organic matter itself. All the perceptions of sense are rooted in the *general* sensation, which, however, is very obscure, even pain not being clearly felt by it at the place where it exists. The next step from this obscure, original, innate sensation is *particular* sensation, through the medium of the nervous system. Sensation should be distinguished from *perception*. The former properly expresses *that change in the state of the mind* which is produced by an impression upon an organ of sense; perception, on the other hand, expresses the *knowledge* or the *intimations* we obtain by means of our *sensations* concerning the qualities of matter. Sensation proper is not purely a passive state, but implies a certain amount of mental activity. It may be described, on the psychological side, as resulting directly from the attention which the mind gives to the affections of its own organism. Objection may be made that every severe affection of the body produces pain quite independently of any knowledge we may possess of the cause or of any operation of the will being directed towards it. Yet facts prove that if the attention of our minds be absorbed in other things, no impulse can produce in us the slightest feeling. Numerous facts prove that a certain application and exercise of mind, on one side, is as necessary to the existence of sensation as the occurrence of physical impulse, on the other. See Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s.v.

Sense, Moral

SEE MORAL SENSE.

Sense Of Scripture

SEE INTERPRETATION.

Sentence, Ecclesiastical

Among the sentences pronounced by ecclesiastical judges are:

1. *Definitive*, a sentence which closes and puts an end to a controversial suit, and has reference to the chief subject or principal matter in dispute;
2. *Interlocutory*, a sentence which determines or settles some incidental question which has arisen in the progress of an ecclesiastical suit;
3. *Deprivation*, a sentence by which the vicar or rector of a parish is formally deprived of his preferment after due hearing and examination.

Sentences

a name for the unarranged texts of Scripture, or preliminary antiphons, which, in the Prayer book of the Anglican Church, form a part of the introduction to matins and even song.

Sentences, Book Of

SEE LOMBARD, PETER.

Sentences, Offertory

a name for the texts of Scripture either said or sung at the time of the offertory in the Anglican form for the celebration of the holy eucharist.
SEE OFFERTORY.

Sententiarii

the followers of Peter Lombard (q.v.), whose four *Books of Sentences*, on their appearance in 1162, at once acquired such authority that all the doctors began to expound them. They brought all the doctrines of faith, as well as the principles and precepts of practical religion, under the dominion of philosophy. They were held in the highest estimation, and attracted great numbers of eager listeners, which state of things continued down to the time of the Reformation. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Senter, Anthony

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lincoln County, N.C., Jan. 28, 1785, converted in 1806, admitted on trial in 1809, into full connection in 1811, and filled the following appointments: Great Peedee Circuit, 1809; Bladen, 1810; Little Peedee, 1811; Buncombe, 1812; Sparta, 1813; Georgetown, 1814; Charleston, 1815; and presiding elder of the Broad River District, 1816-17. He died Dec. 23, 1817. A strong mind and a

benevolent heart, a single eye and a steady purpose to glorify God, an unwavering faith, fervent love, and burning zeal — these were the exalted attributes of this good man. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1, 307; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 4, 243; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 3, 79.

Senter, M. Alverson

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was the son of Riley Senter, of Murphey's, Cal. He graduated from the Genesee College in 1865; and united with the Troy Conference in 1867. He served the Third Street Church in Troy, N.Y., and was pastor for the same length of time of the Church in South Adams, Mass. He was then appointed to Hoosic Falls, N.Y., and served it for a little over a year. He died at the residence of Joseph Hillman in Troy, Feb. 1, 1876. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 81.

Sentia

in Roman mythology, was the goddess of *opinions*, i.e. the deity who inspires opinions, views, judgments.

Sentinus, in Roman mythology, was the god who awakened and watched over the senses of the newly born.

Sen'uah

[some *Senu'ah*] (^{<1610>}Nehemiah 11:9). **SEE HASENUAH.**

Seorah

SEE BARLEY.

Seö'rim

(Heb. *Seorim'*, **μῦρ[α]** plur of **hr[α]** *barley*; Sept. **Σεωρίμ**, v.r. **Σεωρίν**), the head of the fourth division of priests as arranged by David (^{<1248>}1 Chronicles 24:8). B.C. 1012.

Separates

a sect of Calvinistic Methodists in the United States, which arose about 1740 in consequence of the labors of George Whitefield. They took, at first, the name of "New Lights," and afterwards, being organized into

distinct societies, were known as “Separates.” They were soon after joined by a preacher (Shubal Stearns, of Boston) who labored among them until 1751, when he embraced the opinions of the Baptists, as did also many others of the Separates. The distinctive doctrine of the sect was that believers are guided by the immediate teachings of the Holy Spirit; such supernatural indications of the divine will being regarded by them as partaking of the nature of inspiration, and above, though not contrary to, reason. See Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Separation Of Church And State

SEE CHURCH AND STATE.

Separation Of Eastern And Western Churches

SEE SCHISM.

Separatism

a term used to denote the disposition and practice by which persons withdraw from established communities or dissent from settled and common views or beliefs. This article is concerned with the religious, or more specifically the ecclesiastical, form of separatism only.

The strict meaning of the phrase “religious separatism,” which is also its only admissible meaning, makes it denote a tendency to break away from accepted religious views or a settled Church organization without sufficient cause. The imperfections and faults of the Church constitute the ordinary plea by which the action resulting from such tendency is defended; but as separatists never attempt to purify the Church from within, it is evident that the real motives by which they are actuated are personal indifference towards the Church, an alienation from the Church through the influence of rival institutions, or other reasons found in themselves. History shows that pride and perverse views have been the usual motives from which separatists have acted. All true reformers have continued in their churches until thrust out, e.g. Luther, Wesley, etc.

The term *separatist* (q.v.) occurs for the first time in the history of Protestantism, though it applies to movements in the ancient and Middle Age churches as well (e.g. Donatism). Separations on the grounds already indicated were not unknown in any period of the history of the organized Church. In Protestantism the churches of England and Scotland furnished

several kinds of separatists during the 16th and 17th centuries, especially the Independents and the Brownists (q.v.). The term, however, became a party name for the first time in Germany, being originally employed in the Wetterau, then in Wurtemberg, and subsequently in Bremen. In the latter place, a Lutheran student of theology named Theodore Schermer became the head of a small clique (1699) which taught a kind of purgatory, rejected infant baptism and all public worship, and recommended the disuse of the Lord's supper because of the abuses attendant on its observance. They led a retired and pious life, wholly apart from the Church. The most able refutation of their peculiar views was written by J.W. Jäger, of Tübingen (1715). Other minor separatist movements occurred about this time, which are involved in the disputes growing out of the Pietist controversy.

The congregations of the Inspired (q.v.) demand special notice in this connection. These persons denounced all ecclesiastical organization as a work of the devil, which they cursed through inspiration of the spirit, and resolutely avoided. They justified their separation by various reasons; 1, that the Church is corrupt and has been divorced from Christ; 2, the ministrations of unregenerate persons are without effect; 3, only spiritual ties can bind a Christian to the Church; 4, infant baptism has no support in Scripture; 5, an inward and powerful impulse led them to withdraw from public worship, and secured to them a wondrous rest and peace of conscience; 6, separation insures exemption from many temptations; 7, it is favorable to the cultivation of an impartial love for all pious persons, and for them only; 8, it secures solitude, quietness, love for the cross, and a self-denying temper, all of which are necessary to the welfare of the soul. They argued that only separation could deliver from the chilling and baleful influences existing in the Church, and declared that persons once earnest to purify the Church had, without exception, sunk into indifference and spiritual sloth because they had not come out from the mystical and apocalyptic Babylon. Their opponents replied by showing that in the Savior's parable the wheat and tares were made to grow together until the harvest; that Christ and the apostles did not avoid the services of the corrupt Temple, though they superseded it when its work was done; and that Protestantism had not assumed an independent organization by its voluntary action, but only when necessity, consequent on its expulsion from a Church corrupt in its very principles, had compelled that measure. God's kingdom is a leaven; but the separation of the good from the bad is

reserved for the day of judgment. The simple duty of each individual is to guard himself and his surroundings from the evil. On the Inspirationists see Weissmann, *Introd. in Memorab. Eccles. Hist. Sacroe* (Stuttg. 1719), pt. 2, saec. 17, p. 1264 sq., No. 9. On the Separatists generally, Schlegel, *Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrhunderts*, 2, 1054 sq.

Separatists

a general term which may be considered as meaning dissenters from the Church of England, but also applied at different periods to certain sects as the special name by which they chose to be known.

1. In the reign of bloody Mary, the name was given to two congregations of Protestants who refused to conform to the service of the mass. Mr. Rose was minister of the one which met in Bow-church Yard, London, where thirty of them were apprehended in the act of receiving the Lord's supper, and narrowly escaped being committed to the flames. The other and much larger congregation was discovered at Islington, and Mr. Rough, its minister, and several others were burned by order of bishop Bonner.

2. In Ireland there are three distinct bodies of Separatists. The Walkerites, founded by Rev. John Walker, who seceded from the Established Church of Ireland and formed a small Church in Dublin on the principle of holding no communion with any other sect. They profess to found their principles entirely upon the New Test., and to be governed wholly by its laws. On doctrinal points they agree with the Sandemanians (q.v.). They hold that by his revealed word the spirit of God works in them, both to will and to do; that God is the sole author and agent of everything that is good; and maintain that everything that comes from the sinner himself, either before or after conversion, is essentially evil; that the idea of any successors to the apostles, or of any change in the law of Christ's kingdom, is utterly unchristian. They have, therefore, no clerical order. Another body of Irish Separatists was originated by Rev. Mr. Kelly, who seceded from the Established Church, and was soon after joined by Rev. George Carr, of New Ross. The few churches belonging to this sect hold the same order and discipline as the Sandemanians, though in doctrine they approach more nearly to the evangelical dissenters. The Darbyites, followers of the Rev. Mr. Darby, who combined strict evangelical doctrines with the peculiar tenets of the Millenarians. From these sprang the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.).

3. A German Pietist sect at Wurtemberg who separated themselves from the Lutheran Church about the middle of the 18th century. Meeting with much opposition and persecution, a number of them, under George Rapp, emigrated to Pennsylvania, and formed the *Harmony Society*. In 1815 they removed to Indiana, where they remained only two years, and, selling their property, returned to Pennsylvania, and in Beaver County built a town called Economy, where they have amassed considerable property. *SEE RAPPISTS*. Those who remained in Germany, after much opposition, were allowed to form a congregation at Kornthal, and became known as Kornthalites. *SEE KORNTHAL, SOCIETY OF*. Those who refused to conform to the German Evangelical Union, formed by Frederick William III of Prussia, were also called Separatists.

4. The name was assumed by some of the early Puritans, perhaps the early Traskites (q.v.). In their principles, condemning taste in dress, joyousness of life, etc., we recognize the class of Puritans afterwards represented by the Quakers. There were a few congregations of Separatists in Scotland, and one was commenced in London in 1820. See Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Separatists At Zoar

The village of Zoar, which is the home of this communistic society, is in Tuscarawas County, O. From Nordhoff's *Communistic Societies of the United States* we gather the following information respecting them:

1. History. — This society, like the Harmony Society, originated in Würtemberg, and like them, the Inspirationists, and others, were dissenters from the Established Church. Their refusal to send their children to the schools under the control of the clergy, and to allow their young men to serve as soldiers, brought upon them persecution from both civil and ecclesiastical authorities. They suffered for ten or twelve years, when they were assisted by some English Quakers to emigrate to the United States. They arrived at Philadelphia in August 1817, and bought a tract of 5600 acres of land in Ohio. They chose Joseph Bäumeler to be their leader, who, with a few able-bodied men, took possession about Dec. 1, 1817. At first it was not intended to form a communistic society, but having many very poor among them, it was thought that the only way they could keep the enterprise from failing was to establish a community of goods and efforts. An agreement to that effect was signed, April 15, 1819. Bäumeler was

chosen spiritual and temporal head, and changing his name to Bimeler, the people came to be commonly spoken of as “Bimmeler.” In March 1824, an amended constitution was adopted. Between 1828 and 1830 they began to permit marriage, Bäumeler himself taking a wife. In 1832 they were incorporated by the Legislature as the “Separatist Society of Zoar,” and a new constitution, still in force, was signed the same year. ‘They have prospered materially, and now own, in one tract, over 7000 acres of very fertile land, besides some in Iowa. They have a woolen factory, two large flour mills, saw and planing mill, shops, tannery, etc. They had in 1874 about 300 members and property worth more than \$1,000,000.

2. Religion. — Their “Principles,” printed in the first volumes of Bäumeler discourses, were evidently framed in Germany, and consist of twelve articles:

“**1.** We believe and confess the Trinity of God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

“**2.** The fall of Adam and of all mankind, with the loss thereby of the likeness of God in them.

“**3.** The return through Christ to God, our proper Father.

“**4.** The Holy Scriptures as the measure and guide of our lives, and the touchstone of truth and falsehood.

“All our other principles arise out of these, and rule our conduct in the religious, spiritual, and natural life.

“**5.** All ceremonies are banished from among us, and we declare them useless and injurious; and this is the chief cause of our separation.

“**6.** We render to no mortal honors due only to God, as to uncover the head or to bend the knee. Also we address every one as ‘thou’ — *du*.

“**7.** We separate ourselves from all ecclesiastical connections and constitutions, because true Christian life requires no sectarianism, while set forms and ceremonies cause sectarian divisions.

“**8.** Our marriages are contracted by mutual consent, and before witnesses. They are then notified to the political authority; and we reject all intervention of priests or preachers.

“**9.** All intercourse of the sexes, except what is necessary to the perpetuation of the species, we hold to be sinful and contrary to the order and command of God. Complete virginity or entire cessation of sexual commerce is more commendable than marriage.

“**10.** We cannot send our children into the schools of Babylon [meaning the clerical schools of Germany], where other principles contrary to these are taught.

“**11.** We cannot serve the state as soldiers, because a Christian cannot murder his enemy, much less his friend.

“**12.** We regard the political government as absolutely necessary to maintain order, and to protect the good and honest and punish the wrong doers; and no one can prove us to be untrue to the constituted authorities.”

3. Practical Life. — The members of the society are divided into two classes, the novitiates and the full associates. The former are obliged to serve at least one year before admission into the latter class, and this is exacted even of their own children, if on attaining majority they wish to enter the society. According to the constitution, all officers are elected by the whole society, the women having the right to vote as well as the men. They manage, with the consent of the society, all its affairs, cases of disagreement being referred to the “Standing Committee of Five,” as a court of appeals. Before 1845, children remained with their parents until three years of age, when they ceased to be under their exclusive control. Since then the custom of the society taking care of the child ceased, being found inconvenient. The Zoar people read little except the Bible and the few pious books brought from Germany, or imported since. They belong to the peasant class of South Germany, are unintellectual, and have risen but little in culture.

In their religious observances they studiously avoid forms. On Sunday they have three meetings; in the morning, after singing, one of Bäumeler’s discourses is read; in the afternoon the children meet to study the Bible; and in the evening they meet to sing and listen to the reading of some work that interests them. During the week there are no religious meetings. Audible or public prayer is not practiced among them, neither do they have any “preacher.” They use neither baptism nor the Lord’s supper. They

address each other by the first name, and use no titles of any kind. They wear their hats in a public room, and seat the sexes separately in Church.

Se'phar

(Heb. *Sephar'*, רפֿס] *a numbering*; Sept. Σαφηρά v.r. Σωφηρά), “a mountain of the east,” a line drawn from which to Mesha formed the boundary of the Joktanitic tribes (^(-III)Genesis 10:30). The name may remind us of *Saphar*, which the ancients mention as a chief place of South Arabia (Pliny, *H.N.* 6, 23-26). The map of Berghaus exhibits on the southwest point of Arabia a mountain called *Sabber*, which, perhaps, supplies the spot we seek (see Burckhardt, *Arabia*, p. 236). If this be the case, and Mesha be (as usually supposed) the Mesene of the ancients, the line between them would intersect Arabia from northeast to southwest. That Sephar is called “a mountain of *the east*” is to be understood with reference to popular language, according to which Arabia is described as the “east country.” See Baumgarten, *Theolog. Commentar zum A.T.* 1, 152; Bochart, *Phaleg.* 2, 20. — Kitto. The immigration of the Joktanites was probably from west to east, **SEE ARABIA**; **SEE MESHA**, and they occupied the southwestern portion of the peninsula. The undoubted identifications of Arabian places and tribes with their Joktanitic originals are included within these limits, and point to Sephar as the eastern boundary. There appears to be little doubt that the ancient seaport town called Dhafari or Zafari, and Dhafar or Zafar (now *Jofar*, i.e. *ez-Zofar*), without the inflexional termination, represents the Biblical site or district: thus the etymology is sufficiently near, and the situation exactly agrees with the requirements of the case. Accordingly, it has been generally accepted as the Sephar of Genesis.

But the etymological fitness of this site opens out another question, inasmuch as there are no less than four places bearing the same name, besides several others bearing names that are merely variations from the same root. The frequent recurrence of these variations is curious; but we need only here concern ourselves with the four first named places, and of these two only are important to the subject of this article. They are of twofold importance, as bearing on the site of Sephar, and as being closely connected with the ancient history of the Joktanitic kingdom of Southern Arabia, the kingdom founded by the tribes sprung from the sons of Joktan. The following extracts will put in a clear light what the best Arabian

writers themselves say on the subject. The first is from the most important of the Arabic lexicons:

“Dhafari is a town of the Yemen; one says, ‘He who enters Dhafari learns the Himiyeritic.’ ... Es-Saghani says, ‘In the Yemen are four places, every one of which is called Dhafari; two cities and two fortresses. The two cities are Dhafari-l-Hakl, near San’a, two days’ journey from it on the south; and the Tubbaas used to abide there, and it is said that it is San’a [itself]. In relation to it is called the onyx of Dhafari. (Ibn-Es-Sikkit says that the onyx of Dhafari is so called in relation to Dhafari-Asad, a city in the Yemen.) Another is in the Yemen, near Mirbat, in the extremity of the Yemen, and is known by the name of Dhafari-s-Sahib [that is, of the seacoast], and in relation to it is called the Kust-Dhafari [either costus or aloes wood], that is, the wood with which one fumigates, because it is brought thither from India, and from it to [the rest of] the Yemen.’ And it Yakut meant, for he said, ‘Dhafari .. is a city in the extremity of the Yemen, near to Esh-Shihr.’ As to the two fortresses, one of them is a fortress on the south of San’a, two days’ journey from it, in the country of [the tribe of] Benu-Murad, and it is called Dhafari-l-Wadiyeyn [that is, of the Two Valleys]. It is also called Dhafari-Zeyd: and another is on the north thereof, also two days’ journey from it, in the country of Hemdan, and is called Dhafari-dh-Dahir” (*Tajel-’Arus*, MS. s.v.).

Yakut, in his homonymous dictionary (*El-Mushtarak*, s.v.), says:

“Dhafari is a celebrated city in the extremity of the country of the Yemen, between, Omau and Mirbat, on the shore of the sea of India: I have been informed of this by one who has seen it prosperous, abounding in good things. It is near Esh-Shihr. Dhafari-Zeyd is a fortress in the Yemen in the territory of Habb; and Dhafari is a city near to San’a, and in relation to it is called the Dhafari onyx; in it was the abode of the kings of Himyer, and of it was said, He who enters Dhafari learns the Himyeritic, and it is said that Sau’a itself is Dhafari.”

Lastly, in the geographical dictionary called the *Marasid*, which is ascribed to Yakut, we read, s.v.:

“Dhafari: two cities in the Yemen, one of them near to San’a, in relation to which is called the Dhafari onyx: in it was the dwelling of the kings of Himyer; and it is said that Dhafari is the city of San’a itself. And Dhafari of this day is a city on the shore of the sea of India; between it and Mirbat are five parasangs of the territories of Esh-Shihr, [and it is] near to Suhar, and Mirbat is the other anchorage besides Dhafari. Frankincense is only found on the mountain of Dhafari of Esh-Shihr.”

These extracts show that the city of Dhafari near San’a was very little known to the writers, and that little only by tradition. It was even supposed to be the same as, or another name for, San’a, and its site had evidently fallen into oblivion at their day. But the seaport of this name was a celebrated city, still flourishing, and identified on the authority of an eyewitness. M. Fresnel has endeavored to prove that this city, and not the western one, was the Himyeritic capital; and certainly his opinion appears to be borne out by most of the facts that have been brought to light. Niebuhr, however, mentions the ruins of Dhafari near Yerim, which would be those of the western city (*Descr.* p. 206). While Dhafari is often mentioned as the capital in the history of the Himyeritic kingdom (Caussin, *Essai*, 1, *passim*), it was also in the later times of the kingdom the seat of a Christian Church (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 4). Abulfeda has fallen into an absurd error in his *Geography*, noticed by M. Fresnel (*Ive Lettre*, p. 317). He endeavors to prove that the two Zafaris were only one, by supposing that the inland town, which he places only twenty-four leagues from San’a, was originally on the sea coast.

But, leaving this curious point, it remains to give what is known respecting Dhafari the seaport, or, as it will be more convenient to call it, after the usual pronunciation, Zafar. All the evidence is clearly in favor of this site being that of the Sephar of the Bible, and the identification has accordingly been generally accepted by critics. More accurately, it appears to preserve the name mentioned in ^{CHB}Genesis 10:30, and to be in the district anciently so named. It is situated on the coast, in the province of Hadramawt, and near to the district which adjoins that province on the east, called Esh-Shihr (or as M. Fresnel says it is pronounced in the modern Himyeritic, *Shher*). Wellsted says of it, “Dofar is situated beneath a lofty mountain” (2, 453). In the *Marasid* it is said, as we have seen, that frankincense (in the author’s time) was found only in the “mountain of Dhafari;” and Niebuhr (*Descr.* p. 248) says that it exports the best frankincense. M. Fresnel gives

almost all that is known of the present state of this old site in his *Lettres sur l'Hist. des Arabes avant l'Islamisme* (Ve Lettre, *Journ. Asiat.* 3d serie, tom. 5). Zafar, he tells us, pronounced by the modern inhabitants "Isfor," is now the name of a series of villages situated some of them on the shore, and some close to the shore, of the Indian Ocean, between Mirbat and Ras-Sajir, extending a distance of two days' journey, or seventeen or eighteen hours, from east to west. Proceeding in this direction, those near the shore are named Takah, Ed-Dahariz, El-Belid, El-Hafeh, Salahah, and Awkad. The first four are on the seashore, and the last two at a small distance from it. El-Belid, otherwise called Harkam, is, in M. Fresnel's opinion, the ancient Zafar. It is in ruins, but ruins that attest its former prosperity. The inhabitants were celebrated for their hospitality. There are now only three or four inhabited houses in El-Belid. It is on a small peninsula lying between the ocean and a bay, and the port is on the land side of the town. In the present day, during nearly the whole of the year, at least at low tide, the bay is a lake and the peninsula an isthmus; but the lake is of sweet water. In the rainy season, which is in the spring, it is a gulf of sweet water at low tide, and of salt water at high tide. The classical writers, as above noted, mention "Sapphar metropolis" (Σαπφάρα μητρόπολις) or Saphar (in *Anon. Peripl.* p. 274), in long. 88°, lat. 14° 30', according to Ptolemy, the capital of the Sappharitae (Σαπφαρίται), placed by him (6, 6, 25) near the Homeritae; but their accounts are obscure, and probably from hearsay. In later times, as we have already said, it was the seat of a Christian Church — one of three which were founded A.D. 343, by permission of the reigning Tubbaa, in Dhafari (written Tapharon, Τάφαρον, by Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, 4), in 'Aden, and on the shores of the Persian Gulf. Theophilus, who was sent with an embassy by order of the emperor Constantine to effect this purpose, was the first bishop (Caussin, 1, 111 sq.). In the reign of Abrahah (A.D. 537-570) St. Gregentius was bishop of these churches, having been sent by the patriarch of Alexandria (see the authorities cited by Caussin, 1, 142-145).

Seph'arad

(Heb. *Sepharad**, *drpsl*], meaning, if Heb., *separated*; Targ. *aymṣṣḥæ* i.e. *Ispamia*; Sept. ἕως Ἐφραθά; Vulg. *in Bosporo*), a name which occurs in ^{<301>}Obadiah 20 only, as that of a place in which the Jews of Jerusalem were then held in captivity, and whence they were to return to possess the

cities of the south. Its situation has always been a matter of uncertainty, and cannot even now be said to be settled.

1. The reading of the Sept. given above, and followed by the Arabic Version, is probably a mere conjecture, though it may point to a modified form of the name in the then original, viz. *Sepharath*. In Jerome's copy of the Sept. it appears to have been **Εὐφράτης**, since (*Comm. in Abd.*) he renders their version of the verse *transmigration Ierusalem usque Euphrathem*. This is certainly extremely ingenious, but will hardly hold when we turn it back into Hebrew.

2. The reading of the Vulgate, *Bosporus* (obtained by taking the prefixed preposition as part of the name **drpsb** — and at the same time rejecting the final D), was adopted by Jerome from his Jewish instructor, who considered it to be “the place to which Hadrian had transported the captives from Jerusalem” (*Comm. in Abd.*). This interpretation Jerome did not accept, but preferred rather to treat Sepharad as connected with a similar Assyrian word signifying a “boundary,” and to consider the passage as denoting the dispersion of the Jews into all regions. We have no means of knowing to which Bosporus Jerome's teacher alluded — the Cimmerian or the Thracian. If the former (Strait of Yenikale), which was in Iberia, it is not impossible that this rabbi, as ignorant of geography outside of the Holy Land as most of his brethren, confounded it with Iberia in Spain, and thus agreed with the rest of the Jews whose opinions have come down to us. If the latter (Strait of Constantinople), then he may be taken as confirming the most modern opinion (noticed below), that Sepharad was Sardis in Lydia.

3. The Targum Jonathan (see above) and the Peshito-Syriac, and from them the modern Jews, interpret Sepharad as *Spain* (Ispamia and Ispania), one common variation of which name, Hesperia, does certainly bear considerable resemblance to Sepharad; and so deeply has this taken root that at the present day the Spanish Jews, who form the chief of the two great sections into which the Jewish nation is divided, are called by the Jews themselves the *Sephardim*, German Jews, being known as the *Ashkenazim*. It is difficult to suppose that either of these can be the true explanation of Sepharad. The prophecy of Obadiah has every appearance of referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and there is no reason to believe that any Jews had been at that early date transported to Spain.

4. Others have suggested the identity of Sepharad with *Sipphara* in Mesopotamia (Hardt, *Sipphara Babylonioe* [Helmst. 1708]), but that is more probably Sepharvaim.
5. The name has perhaps been discovered in the cuneiform Persian inscriptions of Naksh-i-Rustum and Behistun (see Burnouf. *Mem. sur Deux Inscr. Cuneif.* 1836, p. 147), and also in a list of Asiatic nations given by Niebuhr (*Reiseb.* 2, pl. 31). In the latter it occurs between Ka Ta Pa TUK (Cappadocia) and Ta UNA (Ionia). De Sacy was the first to propose the identification of this with Sepharad, and subsequently it was suggested by Lassen (*Zeitschr. f. Morged.* 5, 1, 50) that S Pa Ra D was identical with *Sardis*, the ancient capital of Lydia. This identification is approved of by Winer, and adopted by Dr. Pusey (*Introd. to Obadiah* p. 232, note, also p. 245). In support of this, Fürst (*Handwb.* 2, 95 a) points out that Antigonus (B.C. cir. 320) may very probably have taken some of his Jewish captives to Sardis; but it is more consistent with the apparent date of Obadiah's prophecy to believe that he is referring to the event mentioned by Joel (~~2:6~~ Joel 3:6), when "children of Judah and Jerusalem" were sold to the "sons of the Javanim" (Ionians), which — as the first captivity that had befallen the kingdom of Judah, and a transportation to a strange land, and that beyond the sea — could hardly fail to make an enduring impression on the nation.
6. Ewald (*Propheten*, 1, 404) considers that Sepharad has a connection with *Zarephath* in the preceding verse; and while deprecating the "penetration" of those who have discovered the name in a cuneiform inscription, suggests that the true reading is Sepharam, and that it is to be found in a place three hours from Akka, i.e. doubtless the modern Shefa 'Omar, a place of much ancient repute and veneration among the Jews of Palestine (see Zunz, note to Parchi, p. 428); but it is not obvious how a residence within the Holy Land can have been spoken of as a captivity, and there are considerable differences in the forms of the two names.
7. Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1778) has devoted some space to this name; and, among other conjectures, ingeniously suggests that the "Spartans" (q.v.) of 1 Macc. 12:15 are accurately "Sepharadites." This suggestion, however, does not appear to have stood the test of later investigations. But it is adopted by Keil (*ad loc.*), who objects to the view expressed above (No. 5) that Sardis would naturally be Hebraized **drws**.

8. Juynboll proposes (*Hist. Samar.* p. 20) to read **trP]āwsB]** at the end of (i.e. beyond) *the Euphrates*, as the origin of the Sept. rendering, but such a phrase would be unnatural.

Sephardim

a name applied to the Spanish Jews. They were banished from Spain in 1492, and from Portugal in 1497, and yet they still maintain their identity as a separate class of Jews among their brethren in all parts of the world. They look upon themselves as a higher order of Israelites. One peculiar point of distinction which marks them out from other Jews is their daily use of the old Spanish language, with which they are so familiar that their own Scriptures are better known to them in the old Spanish version than in the original Hebrew. *SEE JEWS.*

Sepharva'im

(Heb. *Sepharva'yim*, **ספראים**] Sept. **Σεφαραυαίμ, Ἐφαραυαίμ**) is mentioned by Sennacherib in his letter to Hezekiah as a city whose king had been unable to resist the Assyrians (^{<1293>}2 Kings 19:13; ^{<23713>}Isaiah 37:13; comp. ^{<12834>}2 Kings 18:34). It is coupled with Hena and Ava, or Ivah, which were towns on the Euphrates above Babylon. Again, it is mentioned in ^{<12724>}2 Kings 17:24 as one of the places from which colonists were transported to people the desolate Samaria, after the Israelites had been carried into captivity, where it is again joined with Ava, and also with Cuthah and Babylon. These indications are enough to justify us in identifying the place with the famous town of *Sippara*, on the Euphrates above Babylon (Ptolemy, 5, 18), which was near the site of the modern *Mosaib*. Sippara was mentioned by Berosus as the place where, according to him, Xithrus (or Noah) buried the records of the antediluvian world at the time of the deluge, and from which his posterity recovered them afterwards (*Fragmn. Hist. Gr.* 2, 501; 4, 280). Abydenus calls it **πόλις Σιππαρηνών** (*Fragm.* 9), and says that Nebuchadnezzar excavated a vast lake in its vicinity for purposes of irrigation. Pliny seems to intend the same place by his “oppida Hipparenorum” — where, according to him, was a great seat of the Chaldaic learning (*Hist. Nat.* 6, 30). When Pliny places Hippara, or Sippara, on the Narragam (Nahr Agam), instead of on the Euphrates, his reference is to the artificial channel which branched off from the Euphrates at Sippara and led to the great lake (Chald. **aynga**) excavated by Nebuchadnezzar. Abydenus called this branch “Aracanus”

(Ἀράκωνος), Ar Akan (*Fragm.* 10). The plural form here used by Pliny may be compared with the dual form in use among the Jews; and the explanation of both is to be found in the fact that there were two Sipparas, one on either side of the river. Berosus called Sippara “a city of the sun” (Ἡλίου πόλιν); and in the inscriptions it bears the same title, being called *Tsipar sha-Shamas*, or “Sippara of the Sun” — the sun being the chief object of worship there. Hence the Sepharvites are said, in ^{<1273>}2 Kings 17:31, to have “burned their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim” — these two distinct deities representing respectively the male and female powers of the sun, as Lunus and Luna represented the male and female powers of the moon among the Romans.

Se’pharvite

(Heb. *Sepharvi*’, *שְׁפָרַי*— *פְּסַי*] but only in the plural; Sept. *Σεφφαρουαίμ* v.r. *Σεφφαροῦν*), a native of Sepharvaim (q.v.) (^{<1281>}2 Kings 18:31).

Sephe’la

(1 Macc. 12:38). *SEE SHEPHELAH*.

Sepher Asara Maamaroth.

SEE AFFENDOFULO, CALEB.

Sepher Ha-Bahir.

SEE NECHUNJAH BEN-HA-KANAH.

Sepher Ha-Nikkud.

SEE CHAJUG, JEHUDA BEN-DAVID.

Sepher Jezirah

SEE JEZIRAH.

Sepher Nitsachon

SEE LIPMANN, JOMTOB.

Sepher Torah

SEE TORAH.

Sepher Zerubbabel

(*Ḳiḳḳuḳ*) is the title of an apocalyptic book, written in the form of a dialogue between Zerubbabel and the angel Metatron about the birth, education, life, war, and death of Armillus, who is about to appear after the war between Gog and Magog, etc. The wonders of the Messiah were to be seen between 1063 and 1068. This work, which was probably written between 1050 and 1060, was first printed at Constantinople in 1519; then at Wilna in 1819. Lately it was published by Jellinek, according to two Leipsic MSS. (Cod. 22 and 38), in his collection entitled *vr̄d̄m̄tiBe* [Leipsic, 1853], 2, 54-57). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 317; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 6, 58 sq. (B.P.)

Sephiroth

(*Ḳiḳḳuḳ*), a Cabalistic term of frequent occurrence in late Jewish writers. The ten Sephiroth have been represented in three different forms, all of which may be seen in H. More's *Opera Philos.* 1, 423; and one of which, although not the most usual, has already been given in the art. CABALA. The Sephiroth have been the theme of endless discussion; and it has even been disputed whether they are designed to express theological, philosophical, or physical mysteries. The Jews themselves generally regard them as the sum and substance of Cabalistical theology, indicating the emanating grades and order of efflux according to which the nature and manifested operation of the Supreme Being may be comprehended. Several Christian scholars have discerned in them the mysteries of their own faith, the Trinity, and the incarnation of the Messiah. In this they have received some sanction by the fact noticed by Wolf, that most learned Jewish converts endeavor to demonstrate the truth of Christianity out of the doctrines of the Cabala (*Biblioth. Hebr.* 1, 360). The majority of all parties appear to concur in considering the first three Sephiroth to belong to the essence of God, and the last seven to denote his attributes, or modes of existence. The following treatises on this subject are among the most remarkable: a dissertation by Rhenferd, *De Stylo Apocalypseos Cabbalistico*, in Danz's *Nov. Test. ex Talmude Illust.* p. 1090, in which he endeavors to point out many extraordinary coincidences between the

theosophy of the Cabala and the book of Revelation (which may be compared with an essay of similar tendency in Eichhorn's *Bibl. Biblioth.* 3, 191); some remarks by Lowe, in the last-named journal (5, 377 sq.); and a dissertation by Vitranga, *De Sephiroth Kabbalistarum*, in his *Observat. Saucr.* 1, 126, in which he first showed how the Sephiroth accorded with the human form.

Sephorno

SEE SFORNO.

Sepphoris

(Σεπφόρις v.r. Σέφφορις), a town of Upper Galilee, not mentioned under this name in Scripture, but frequently by Josephus. It was garrisoned by Antigonus in his war with Herod the Great, until the latter took it early in his Galilaean campaign (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 15, 4). It seems to have been a place of arms, and to have been occasionally the royal residence, for, in the troubles which arose in the country during the presidency of Varus, the robber chief Judas, son of Ezekias, seized the palace of Sepphoris, and carried off the arms and treasure which it contained (*ibid.* 17, 12, 5). It was subsequently taken and burned by Varus (*ibid.* 17, 12, 9). Herod the tetrarch (Antipas) afterwards rebuilt and fortified it, and made it the glory of all Galilee, and gave it independence (*ibid.* 18, 2, 1); although, according to the statement of Justus, the son of Pistus, he still maintained the superiority of his newly founded city, Tiberias; and it was not until Nero had assigned Tiberias to Agrippa the Younger that Sepphoris established its supremacy and became the royal residence and depository of the archives. It is termed the strongest city of Galilee, and was early taken by Gallus, the general of Cestius (*War*, 2, 18, 11). It maintained its allegiance to the Romans after the general revolt of Galilee (*ibid.* 3, 2, 4; 4, 1), but did not break with the Jewish leaders (*Life*, 8, 9). Its early importance as a Jewish town, attested by the fact that it was one of the five cities in which district sanhedrim were instituted by Gabinius (*War*, 1, 8, 5), was further confirmed by the destruction of Jerusalem, after which catastrophe it became for some years the seat of the Great Sanhedrim until it was transferred to Tiberias (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3, 202). It was subsequently called *Diocoesarea*, which is its more common appellation in the ecclesiastical annals; while Epiphanius and Jerome recognize both names. A revolt of the Jewish inhabitants in the reign of Constantius (A.D.

339) led to the destruction of the city by Constantius Gallus Caesar (Socrates, *H.E.* 2, 33; Sozomen, *H.E.* 4, 7). This town, once the most considerable city of Galilee, was situated, according to Jerome, ten miles west of Mount Tabor (*Onomast.* s.v. **Θαβώρ**; Procopius Gazaeus, *Comment. in Lib. Judicum*). It was much celebrated in the history of the Crusaders for its fountain, a favorite camping place of the Christians. It is still represented by a poor village bearing the name *Seffurieh*, distant about five miles to the north of Nazareth, retaining no vestiges of its former greatness, but conspicuous with a ruined tower and church, both of the Middle Ages; the latter professing to mark the site of the birthplace of the Virgin Mary, assigned by a late tradition to this locality. It became the see of a suffragan bishop under the metropolitan of Scythopolis (Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 3, 713, 714), and there are coins still extant of the reigns of Domitian, Trajan, etc. (Reland, *Paloestina*, p. 199-1003; Eckhel, *Doct. Vet. Num.* 3, 425, 426). — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. A recent German writer (Lebrecht, in his pamphlet on the subject [Berlin, 1877]) maintains that this was the site of the *Bether* (q.v.) of the Talmud.

Sept

SEE SEPTUM.

Septfoil

(*seven-leaf*), an architectural ornament which has seven cusps or points.

Septimana in Albis

(*sevenfold in white*) is the name frequently given to the first week in Whitsuntide with reference to the state of the newly baptized, who wore their white robes of baptism during that time. *SEE ALB.*

Septimontium

a Roman festival which was held in the month of December, and lasted only for a single day. The day of the Septimontium was a *dies feriatius* for the Montani, or the inhabitants of the seven ancient hills, who offered sacrifices to the gods in their several districts. They were believed to have been instituted to commemorate the enclosure of the seven hills of Rome within the walls of the city. *SEE ROME.*

Septuagesima

(*seventieth*), the third Sunday before Lent. The reason of its application to the day is uncertain. Some liturgical writers — e.g. Pamelius — trace it to the association of the ancient monastic Lent of seventy days with the seventy years' captivity of Israel in Babylon. The following is more probable: There being exactly fifty days between the Sunday next before Lent and Easter day inclusive, that Sunday is termed Quinquagesima, i.e. the fiftieth; and the two immediately preceding Sundays are called from the next round numbers Sexagesima, the sixtieth, and Septuagesima, the seventieth. The observation of these days and the weeks following appears to be as ancient as the time of Gregory the Great. Some of the more devout Christians observed the whole time from the first of these Sundays to Easter as a season of humiliation and fasting, though the ordinary custom was to commence fasting on Ash Wednesday. See Eden, *Dict. of the Church*, s.v.; Blunt, *Dict. of Theology*, s.v.

Septuagint

is the common title of the earliest and most important version of the Old Testament, namely, into Greek, and is generally held to have derived its *title* (*seventy*) from the traditionary number of its translators (see below), rather than (as Eichhorn thought) from the authority of the Alexandrian Sanhedrim as consisting of seventy members. In the following account we shall endeavor to sift the truth out of the traditions on this subject. **SEE GREEK VERSIONS.**

I. Origin of the Version. — This is as great a riddle as the sources of the Nile. The causes which produced the translation, the number and names of the translators, the times at which different portions were translated, are all uncertain.

1. Ancient Testimony on the Subject. —

(1.) The oldest writer who makes mention of the Septuagint is Aristobulus, an author referred to by Eusebius (*Proepar. Evangel.* 13, 12) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, 5, 595). According to Eusebius, he was a Jew, who united the Aristotelian with the Jewish philosophy, and composed a commentary on the law of Moses, dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor. He is also mentioned in 2 Macc. 1, 10. Both Clement and Eusebius make him contemporary with Philometor (2d century B.C.) for the passages in their

writings, in which they speak of him under Philadelphus must either have been corrupted by ignorant transcribers or have been so written by mistake (Valckenaer, § 10, 11; Dähne, p. 81 sq.). His words relative to the Septuagint are these:

“It is manifest that Plato has followed our law, and studied diligently all its particulars; for before Demetrius Phalereus a translation had been made by others of the history of the Hebrews’ going forth out of Egypt, and of all that happened to them, and of the conquest of the land, and of the exposition of the whole law. Hence it is manifest that the aforesaid philosopher borrowed many things, for he was very learned, as was Pythagoras, who also transferred many of our doctrines into his system. But the entire translation of our whole law (ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἐρμῆνεια τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων) was made in the time of the king named Philadelphus, a man of greater zeal, under the direction of Demetrius Phalereus.”

The entire passage has occasioned much conjecture and discussion. It is given by Valckenaer (*Diatribes*, etc.), Thiersch (*De Versione Alexandrina*), and Frankel (*Vorstudien*, etc.). It appears that the words of Aristobulus do not speak of any *prior Greek translation*, as Hody supposes, or indeed of any translation whatever. They rather refer to some brief extracts relative to Jewish history, which had been made from the Pentateuch into a language commonly understood by the Jews in Egypt, before the time of Demetrius. The *entire law* was first rendered into Greek under Philadelphus. Hody, and after him Eichhorn, conjectured that the fragments of Aristobulus preserved by Eusebius and Clement were written in the 2d century by another Aristobulus, a Christian, and that Aristobulus, the professed Peripatetic, was a heathen. But the quotation of Cyril of Alexandria (*Contra Julianum*, lib. 6), to which they appeal, was erroneously made by that father, as may be seen by comparing it with Clement. Richard Simon also denied the authenticity of Aristobulus’s remains (*Histoire Critique du V.T.* p. 189). But Valckenaer has sufficiently established their authenticity. The testimony of Aristobulus is corroborated by a Latin scholion recently found in a MS. of Plautus at Rome, which has been described and illustrated by Ritschl in a little book entitled *Die alexandrinischen Bibliotheken*, etc. (Berlin, 1838). From the passage of Aristobulus already quoted, it appears that in the time of Aristobulus, i.e. the beginning of the 2d century B.C., this version was considered to have

been made when Demetrius Phalereus lived, or in the reign of Ptolemy Soter. Hody, indeed, has endeavored to show that this account contradicts the voice of certain history, because it places Demetrius in the reign of Philadelphus. But the version may have been begun under Soter and completed under Philadelphus, his successor. In this way may be reconciled the discordant notices of the time when it originated; for it is well known that the Palestinian account, followed by various fathers of the Church, asserts that Ptolemy Soter carried the work into execution, while according to Aristeas, Philo, Josephus, etc., his son Philadelphus was the person. Hody harmonizes the discrepancy by placing the translation of the Pentateuch in the two years during which father and son reigned conjointly (B.C. 286 and 285). The object of Demetrius in advising Soter to have in his library a copy of the Jewish laws in Greek is not stated by Aristobulus, but Aristeas relates that the librarian represented it to the king as a desirable thing that such a book should be deposited in the Alexandrian library. Some think that *a literary* rather than *a religious* motive led to the version. So Hävernick. This, however, may be reasonably doubted. Hody, Sturz, Frankel, and others conjecture that the object was *religious* or *ecclesiastical*. Eichhorn refers it to *private impulse*; while Hug takes the object to have been *political*. It is not probable, however, that the version was intended for the king's use, or that he wished to obtain from it information respecting the best mode of governing a nation and enacting laws for its economic well-being. The character and language of the version unite to show that an Egyptian king, probably ignorant of Greek, could not have understood the work. Perhaps *an ecclesiastical* motive prompted the Jews who were originally interested in it, while Demetrius Phalereus and the king may have been actuated by some other design.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether Aristobulus' words imply that *all* the books of the Old Test. were translated into Greek under Philadelphus, or simply the Pentateuch. Hody contends that νόμος, the term used by Aristobulus, meant at that time the Mosaic books alone, although it was afterwards taken in a wider sense so as to embrace all the Old Test. Valckenaer thinks that *all* the books were comprehended under it. It is certainly more natural to restrict it to the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch, therefore, was completed under Philadelphus.

(2.) The next historical testimony regarding the Septuagint is the prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach, a document containing the judgment of a Palestinian Jew concerning the version before us. His words are these:

“And not only these things, but the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference when they are spoken in their own language.” Frankel has endeavored to throw suspicion on this passage, as if it were unauthentic, but his reasons are extremely slender (p. 21, note w). It appears from it that the law, the prophets, and the other books had been translated into Greek in the time of the son of Sirach, i.e. that of Ptolemy Physcon, B.C. 130.

(3.) The account given by Aristeas comes next before us (see Rosenmüller, *Handb. d. Lit. d. bibl. Kritik u. Exeg.* 2, 413 sq.). This writer pretends to be a Gentile, and a favorite at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt. In a letter addressed to his brother Philocrates, he relates that Philadelphus, when forming a library at great expense, was advised by Demetrius Phalereus to apply to the Jewish high priest Eleazer for a copy of the book containing the Jewish laws. Having previously purchased the freedom of more than a hundred thousand captive Jews in Egypt, the king sent Aristeas and Aidreas to Jerusalem with a letter requesting of Eleazer seventy-two persons as interpreters, six out of each tribe. They were dispatched accordingly with a magnificent copy of the law, and were received and entertained by the king for several days with great respect and liberality. Demetrius led them to an island, probably Pharos, where they lodged together. The translation was finished in seventy-two days, having been written down by Demetrius piece by piece, as agreed upon after mutual consultation. It was then publicly read by Demetrius to a number of Jews whom he had summoned together. They approved of it, and imprecations were uttered against any one who should presume to alter it. The Jews requested permission to take copies of it for their use, and it was carefully preserved by command of the king. The interpreters were sent home loaded with presents.

The work of Aristeas, which was first published in the original Greek by Simon Schard (Basel, 1561, 8vo), and several times reprinted, was also given by Hody in Greek and Latin, in his book entitled *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Groecis, et Latina Vulgata* (Oxon. 1705, fol.). The most accurate edition, however, is that by Galland, in the *Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum*, vol. 2. It was translated into English by Whiston, and published at London in 1727, 8vo. See also Aristeas, *Hist. 72 Int. ex Rec. Eld. de Parchum* (Francof. 1610; Oxon. 1692).

(4.) In all discussions relative to the name of *Septuagint*, so universally appropriated to the Greek version of Alexandria, the scholion discovered by Osann and published by Ritschl ought to be considered. The origin of this Latin scholion is curious. The substance of it is stated to have been extracted from Callimachus and Eratosthenes, the Alexandrian librarians, by Tzetzes, and from his *Greek* note an Italian of the 15th century has formed the Latin scholion in question. The writer has been speaking of the collecting of ancient Greek poems carried on at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, and then he thus continues: “Nam rex ille philosophis affertissimus [corr. “differtissimus,” Ritschl; “affectissimus,” Thiersch] et caeteris omnibus auctoribus claris, disquisitis impensa regiae munificentiae ubique terrarum quantum valuit voluminibus opera Demetrii Phalerei *phzxa* senum duas bibliothecas fecit, alteram extra regiam alteram autem in regia.” The scholion then goes on to speak of books in many languages: “Quae summa diligentia rex ille in suam linguam fecit ab optimis interpretibus converti” (see Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina* [Erlang. 1841], p. 8, 9). Bernhardt reads instead of “*phzxa* senum,” “et *lxx* senum,” and this correction is agreed to by Thiersch, as it well may be: some correction is manifestly needed, and *this* appears to be right. This gives us *seventy elders* associated in the formation of the library. The testimony comes to us from Alexandrian authority; and this, if true (or even if believed to be true), would connect the *Septuagint* with the library — a designation which might most easily be applied to a version of the Scriptures there deposited; and, let the translation be once known by such a name, then nothing would be more probable than that the designation should be applied to the *translators*. This may be regarded as the first step in the formation of the fables. Let the *Septuagint* be first known as applying to the associates in the collection of the library, then to the library itself, and then to that particular book in the library which to so many had a far greater value than all its other contents. Whether more than the Pentateuch was thus translated and then deposited in the royal library is a separate question.

2. Confirmation by Later Authorities. —

(1.) Of Jewish writers, Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 2) agrees in the main with Aristeas; but Philo’s account (*De Vita Mosis*, lib. 2) differs in a number of circumstances.

(2.) Among the Greek Church fathers Irenaeus (lib. 3, c. 24) relates that Ptolemy Lagi, wishing to adorn his Alexandrian library with the writings of all nations, requested from the Jews of Jerusalem a Greek version of their Scriptures; that they sent seventy elders well skilled in the Scriptures and in later languages; that the king *separated them from one another* and bade them all translate the several books. When they came together before Ptolemy and showed their versions, God was glorified, for *they all agreed exactly*, from beginning to end, in every phrase and word, so that all men may know *that the Scriptures are translated by the inspiration of God*.

Justin Martyr (*Cohort. ad Groecos*, p. 34) gives the same account, and adds that he was taken to see the cells in which the interpreters worked.

Epiphanius says that the translators were divided into pairs, in thirty-six cells, each pair being provided with two scribes; and that thirty-six versions agreeing in every point were produced, *by the gift of the Holy Spirit* (*De Pond. et Mens.* c. 3-6).

(3.) Among the Latin fathers Augustine adheres to the inspiration of the translators — “Non autem secundum LXX interpretes, qui etiam ipsi divino Spiritu interpretati, ob hoc aliter videntur nonnulla dixisse, ut ad spiritualem sensum scrutandum magis admoneretur lectoris intentio” (*De Doctr. Christ.* 4, 15).

But Jerome boldly throws aside the whole story of the cells and the inspiration — “Et nescio quis primus auctor Septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarent, cum Aristseus ejusdem Ptolemaei ὑπερασπιστής, et multo post tempore Josephus, nihil tale retulerint: sed in una basilica congregatos, contulisse scribant, non prophetasse. Aliud est enim vatem, aliud esse interpretem. Ibi Spiritus ventura praedicat; hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intelligit transfert” (*Proef. ad Pent.*).

3. Modern Opinions. —

(1.) Until the latter half of the 17th century the origin of the Sept. as given by Aristeas was firmly believed; while the numerous additions that had been made to the original story in the progress of centuries were unhesitatingly received as equally genuine. The story was first reckoned improbable by L. Vives (in a note to Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei*); then Scaliger asserted that it was written by a Jew; and Richard Simon was too

acute a critic not to perceive the truth of Scaliger's assertion. Hody was the first who demonstrated with great learning, skill, and discrimination that the narrative could not be authentic (*De Bibl. Text. Orig. Vers. Groec. et Lat. Vulg.* [Oxford, 1705] lib. 4). It is now universally pronounced fabulous.

(2.) But the Pseudo-Aristeas had a basis of fact for his fiction; on three points of his story there is no material difference of opinion and they are confirmed by the study of the version itself: (a.) The version was made at Alexandria. (b.) It was begun in the time of the earlier Ptolemies, about B.C. 280. (c.) The law (i.e. the Pentateuch) alone was translated at first. It is also very possible that there is some truth in the statement that a copy was placed in the royal library. (The emperor Akbar caused the New Test. to be translated into Persian.)

(3.) But by whom was the version made? As Hody justly remarks, "It is of little moment whether it was made at the command of the king or spontaneously by the Jews; but it is a question of great importance whether the Hebrew copy of the law and the interpreters (as Pseudo-Aristeas and his followers relate) were summoned from Jerusalem and sent by the high priest to Alexandria." On this question no testimony can be so conclusive as the evidence of the version itself, which bears upon its face the marks of imperfect knowledge of Hebrew, and exhibits the forms and phrases of the Macedonic Greek prevalent in Alexandria, with a plentiful sprinkling of Egyptian words. The forms ἡλθοσαν παρενεβάλοσαν, betray the fellow-citizens of Lycophron, the Alexandrian poet, who closes his iambic line with *κάπὸ γῆς ἐσχάζοσαν*. Hotlly (2, 4) gives several examples of Egyptian renderings of names and coins and measures; among them the hippodrome of Alexandria for the Hebrew *Cibrath* (^{<0487>}Genesis 48:7), and the papyrus of the Nile for the rush of Job (^{<881>}Job 8:11). The reader of the Sept. will readily agree with his conclusion, "Sive regis jussu, sive sponte a Judaeis, a Judaeis Alexandrinus fuisse factam." The question as to the moving cause which gave birth to the version is one which cannot be so decisively answered either by internal evidence or by historical testimony. The balance of probability must be struck between the tradition, so widely and permanently prevalent, of the king's intervention, and the simpler account suggested by the facts of history and the phenomena of the version itself. It is well known that after the Jews returned from the captivity of Babylon, having lost in great measure the familiar knowledge of the ancient Hebrew, the readings from the books of Moses in the synagogues of

Palestine were explained to them in the Chaldaic tongue in Targums or paraphrases; and the same was done with the books of the prophets when, at a later time, they also were read in the synagogues. The Jews of Alexandria had probably still less knowledge of Hebrew; their familiar language was Alexandrian Greek. They had settled in Alexandria in large numbers soon after the time of Alexander and under the earlier Ptolemies. They would naturally follow the same practice as their brethren in Palestine; the law first, and afterwards the prophets, would be explained in Greek, and from this practice would arise in time an entire Greek version. All the phenomena of the version seem to confirm this view; the Pentateuch is the best part of the version; the other books are more defective, betraying probably the increasing degeneracy of the Hebrew MSS. and the decay of Hebrew learning with the lapse of time.

(4.) Nevertheless, the opinion that the Pentateuch was translated a considerable time before the prophets is not warranted by the language of Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Hilary of Poitiers; although we are aware that Aristeeus, Josephus, Philo, the Talmudists, and Jerome mention *the law only* as having been interpreted by the seventy-two. Hody thinks that the Jews first resorted to the reading of the prophets in their synagogues when Antiochus Epiphanes forbade the use of the law, and therefore that the prophetic portion was not translated till after the commencement of Philometor's reign. It is wholly improbable, however, that Antiochus interdicted the Jews merely from reading the Pentateuch (comp. 1 Macc. 1:41, etc.; and Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 5; Frankel, p. 48, 49). The interval between the translating of the law and the prophets, of which many speak, was probably very short. Hody's proof that the book of Joshua was not translated till upwards of twenty years after the death of Ptolemy Lagi, founded upon the word *γαϊσόζ*, is perfectly nugatory, although the time assigned cannot be far from the truth. The epilogue to the book of Esther does *not* state that this part of the Old Test. was translated under Ptolemy Philometor or that it was dedicated to him. On the contrary it refers to a certain epistle containing apocryphal additions to the canonical book of Esther (Valckenaer, p. 33, 63). It is a fruitless task to attempt to ascertain the precise times at which separate portions of the version were made. All that can be known with any degree of probability is that it was begun under Lagi and finished before the thirty-eighth year of Ptolemy Physcon.

It is obvious from internal evidence that there were several translators, but certainly not seventy-two. Hody has endeavored to parcel out their version into small portions, assigning each part to a separate person, and affirming that they were put together in one cento without revision; but his notions of rigid uniformity in the translators are such as exclude perspicuity, freedom, variety, and elegance. There is no ground for believing that the Pentateuch proceeded from more than one interpreter, who was unquestionably the most skilful of all. The entire work was made by five or six individuals at least, and must, consequently, be of unequal value. Comp. Amersfoort, *De Variis Lectio. Holmes. Loc. quorund. Pent. Mos.* (Lugd. 1815); Thiersch, *De Pent. Vers. Al. Libri III* (Erlang. 1841); Frankel, *Ueber d. Einfluss d. palest. Exeg. auf d. alex. Hermen.* (Leips. 1851); Rosenmüller, *op. cit.* p. 435 sq.

(5.) In opposition to the Pseudo-Aristeas, we cannot but maintain that the translators were *Alexandrian*, not *Palestinian*, Jews. The internal character of the entire version, particularly of the Pentateuch, sufficiently attests the fact. We find, accordingly, that proper names and terms peculiar to Egypt are rendered in such a manner as must have been unintelligible to a Greek-speaking population other than the Egyptian Jews. That the translators were Egyptians has been proved, to the satisfaction of all, by Hody; although some of his examples are not appropriate or conclusive. Frankel supposes that the version was made not only at different times, but *at different places*. This is quite arbitrary. There is no reason for believing with him that different books originated after this fashion, the impulse having gone forth from Alexandria and spreading to localities where the Jews had settled, especially Cyrene, Leontopolis, and even Asia Minor.

(6.) The division into verses and chapters is much later than the age of the translators. Our present editions have been printed in conformity with the division into chapters made in the 12th century, though they are not uniform in this particular. Still, however, many MSS. have separations in the text. The Alexandrine Codex is said by Grabe to have 140 divisions, or, as they may be called, *chapters*, in the book of Numbers alone (*Prolegomena*, c. 1, § 7).

The titles given to the books, such as *Γένεσις*, etc., could hardly have been affixed by the translators, since often they do not harmonize with the version of the book itself to which they belong.

II. *Textual Basis of the Version.* —

1. It has been inquired whether the translator of the Pentateuch followed a Hebrew or a Samaritan codex. The Sept. and Samaritan harmonize in more than a thousand places, where they differ from the Hebrew. Hence it has been supposed that the Samaritan edition was the basis of the version. Various considerations have been adduced in favor of this opinion; and the names of De Dieu, Selden, Whiston, Hottinger, Hassencamp, and Eichhorn are enlisted on its behalf. But the irreconcilable enmity subsisting between the Jews and the Samaritans, both in Egypt and Palestine, effectually militates against it. Besides, in the prophets and Hagiographa, the number of variations from the Masoretic text is even greater and more remarkable than those in the Pentateuch; whereas the Samaritan extends no further than the Mosaic books. No solution, therefore, can be satisfactory which will not serve to explain at once the cause or causes both of the differences between the Seventy and the Hebrew in the Pentateuch, and those found in the remaining books. The problem can be fully solved only by such a hypothesis as will throw light on the remarkable form of the Sept. in Jeremiah and Esther, where it deviates most from the Masoretic MSS., presenting such transpositions and interpolations as excite the surprise of the most superficial reader. The above solution of the question must be rejected not only for the reasons assigned, but also for the following.

- (1.)** It must be taken into account that if the discrepancies of the Samaritan and Jewish copies be estimated numerically, the Sept. will be found to agree *far more frequently* with the latter than the former.
- (2.)** In the cases of considerable and marked passages occurring in the Samaritan which are not in the Jewish, the Sept. does not contain them.
- (3.)** In the passages in which slight variations are found, both in the Samaritan and Sept., from the Jewish text, they often differ among themselves, and the amplification of the Sept. is less than that of the Samaritan.
- (4.)** Some of the small amplifications in which the Samaritan seems to accord with the Sept. are in such incorrect and non-idiomatic Hebrew that it is suggested that these must be *translations*, and, if so, probably from the Sept.

(5.) The amplifications of the Sept. and Samaritan often resemble each other greatly in character, as if similar false criticism had been applied to the text in each case. But as, in spite of all similarities such as these, the Pentateuch of the Sept. is more Jewish than Samaritan, we need not adopt the notion of translation from a Samaritan codex, which would involve the subject in greater difficulties, and leave more points to be explained. (On some of the supposed agreements of the Sept. with the Samaritan, see bishop Fitzgerald in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1848, p. 324-332.)

Some suppose that the one was *interpolated* from the other — a conjecture not at all probable. Jahn and Bauer imagine that the Hebrew MS. used by the Egyptian Jews agreed much more closely with the Samaritan in., the text and forms of its letters than the present Masoretic copies. This hypothesis, however, even if it were otherwise correct, would not account for the great harmony existing between the Samaritan and Sept.

Another hypothesis has been put forth by Gesenius (*Commentatio de Pent. Samar. Orig. Indole, et Auctor.*), viz. that both the Samaritan and Sept. flowed from a common recension (ἔκδοσις) of the Hebrew Scriptures, one older than either, and different in many places from the recension of the Masoretes now in common use. "This supposition," says Prof. Stuart, by whom it is adopted, "will account for the differences and for the agreements of the Sept. and Samaritan." The following objections have been made to this ingenious and plausible hypothesis.

(a.) It assumes that before the whole of the Old Test. was written there had been a recension or revision of several books. But there is no record or tradition in favor of the idea that *inspired men* applied a correcting hand in this manner till the close of the canon. To say that *others* did so is not in unison with right notions of the inspiration of Scripture, unless it be equally affirmed that they *corrupted*, under the idea of *correcting*, the holy books.

(b.) This hypothesis implies that a recension took place at a period comparatively early, before any books had been written except the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and the writings of David and Solomon. If it be improbable that a revised edition was made before the completion of the canon, it is much more improbable that it was undertaken when few books were written.

(c.) It supposes that an older recension was still current after Ezra had revised the whole collection and closed the canon. In making the Sept. version, it is very improbable that the Jews, who were the translators, followed a recension far inferior in their estimation to the copy of the sacred books corrected by Ezra. This objection rests on the assumption that Ezra completed the canon of the Old Test., having been prompted, as well as inspired, to arrange and revise the books of Scripture. Such is the Jewish tradition; and although a majority of the German critics disallow its truth, yet it is held by very able and accomplished men.

Prof. Lee (*Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglot*) accounts for the agreement between the Sept. and Samaritan in another way. He conjectures that the early Christians interspersed their copies with Samaritan glosses, which ignorant transcribers afterwards inserted in the text. But he has not shown that Christians in general were acquainted with the Samaritan Pentateuch and its additions to the Hebrew copy; neither has he taken into account the reverence entertained by the early Christians for the sacred books. We cannot, therefore, attribute the least probability to this hypothesis.

Another hypothesis has been mentioned by Frankel, viz. that the Sept. flowed from a Chaldee version, which was used before and after the time of Ezra — a version inexact and paraphrastic, which had undergone many alterations and corruptions. This was first proposed by R. Asaria di Rossi, in the midst of other conjectures. Frankel admits that the assumption of such a version is superfluous, except in relation to the Samaritan Pentateuch, where much is gained by it. This Chaldee version circulated in various transcripts here and there; and as the same care was not applied in preserving its integrity as was exercised with respect to the original Hebrew, the copies of it presented considerable differences among themselves. Both the Greek version and the Samaritan Pentateuch were taken from it. Frankel concedes that this hypothesis is not satisfactory with regard to the Sept., because the mistakes found in that version must have frequently originated in misunderstanding the Hebrew text. There is no evidence, however, that any Targum or Chaldee version had been made before Ezra's time, or soon after. Explanations of the lessons publicly read by the Jews were given in Chaldee, not regularly perhaps, or uniformly; but it can scarcely be assumed that a Chaldee version had been made out in writing, and circulated in different copies. Glosses, or short expositions of words and sentences, were furnished by the public readers for the benefit of the people; and it is by no means improbable that several of these

traditional comments were incorporated with the version by the Jewish translators, to Whom they were familiar.

In short, no hypothesis yet proposed commends itself to general reception, although the *Vorstudien* of Frankel have probably opened up the way towards a correct solution. The great source from which the striking peculiarities in the Sept. and the Samaritan flowed appears to us to have been early traditional interpretations current among the Jews, *targums*, or *paraphrases* — not written, perhaps, but orally circulated. Such glossarial versions, which must have circulated chiefly in Palestine. require to be traced back to an early epoch — to the period of the second Temple. They existed, in substance at least, in ancient times, at once indicating and modifying the Jewish mode of interpretation. The Alexandrian mode of interpretation stood in close connection with the Palestinian; for the Jews of Egypt looked upon Jerusalem as their chief city, and the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem as their ecclesiastical rulers. If, therefore, we can ascertain the traditional paraphrases of the one. those of the other must have been substantially the same (see Gieseler's *Eccles. Hist.*, transl. by Cunningham, 1, 30).

Tychsen (*Tentamen de Variis Codd. Heb. V.T. MSS. Gener.*) thought that the Sept. was made from the Hebrew transcribed into Hebrew-Greek characters. It is almost unnecessary to refer to such a notion. It never obtained general currency, having been examined and refuted by Dathe, Michaelis, and Hassencamp.

2. Evidence as to the Verbal Condition of the Original. Here we naturally inquire as, to two obvious points:

(1.) Was the version made from Hebrew MSS. with the vowel-points now used? A few examples will indicate the answer.

A. PROPER NAMES.

Hebrew.	Septuagint.
<0167> Exodus 6:17, ynb l Libni.	Λοβενεί.
6:19, yl ḥ Machli.	Μοολεί.
13:20, ḥ tae Etham.	Ὠθώμ
<0160> Deuteronomy 3:10, hkl ḥ Salchah.	Ἑλχᾶ.
4:43, r x B , Bezer.	Βοσόρ.

34:1, **hGSpa** Pisgah.

Φασγά.

B. OTHER WORDS.

<i>Hebrew.</i>	<i>Septuagint.</i>
<0000> Genesis 1:9, mwqm ; <i>place.</i>	συναγωγή (hwqjhae)
15:11, mtabvya <i>and he drove them away.</i>	καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς (μTaaenvya).
<0217> Exodus 12:17, twMhAata , <i>unleavened bread.</i>	τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην hwjMbaAata).
<0445> Numbers 16:5, rqB <i>in the</i> <i>morning.</i>	ἐπέσκεπαί (rqB).
<0558> Deuteronomy 15:18, hnevhae <i>double.</i>	ἐπέτειον, (hnevhae)
<2398> Isaiah 9:8, rbD ; <i>a word.</i>	θάνατον (rbD).

Examples of these two kinds are innumerable. Plainly the Greek translators had not Hebrew MSS. pointed as at present. In many cases (e.g. <0125> Exodus 2:25; <3498> Nahum 3:8) the Sept. has possibly preserved the true pronunciation and sense where the Masoretic pointing has gone wrong.

(2.) Were the Hebrew words divided from one another, and were the final letters /, ā, ^, μ, ! in use when the Sept. was made? — Take a few out of many examples:

<i>Hebrew.</i>	<i>Septuagint.</i>
(1) <0345> Deuteronomy 26:5, dbao yMaa} <i>a perishing Syrian.</i>	Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν (dbaomra).
(2) <1214> 2 Kings 2:14, awhaAaj <i>he also.</i>	ἄφω [it joins the two words in one].
(3) <1221> 2 Kings 22:20, ^kē ; <i>therefore.</i>	οὐχ οὕτως (^kAab)
(4) <1370> 1 Chronicles 17:10, ÚI]dGai ; <i>and I told thee.</i>	καὶ αὐξήσω δε (ÚI]dGai),

(5) ^{<2065>} Hosea 6:5, $\text{rwa } \dot{\text{y}}\text{fPv}\dot{\text{h}}\text{wax}\ddot{\text{e}}$	καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύ σεταιί
<i>and thy judgments</i>	The Sept. reads:
[are as] <i>the light</i> [that] goeth forth	$\text{rw}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{k};\text{y}\text{f}\dot{\text{p}}\text{v}\dot{\text{h}}\text{w}$
(6) ^{<3107>} Zechariah 11:7, $\text{^a}\dot{\text{a}}\text{h}\dot{\text{i}}\text{y}\text{w}\ddot{\text{e}}\text{f}$ $\text{^k}\ddot{\text{e}};$	εἰς τὴν Χανανίτιν
<i>even you, O poor of the flock.</i>	[it joins the first two words].

Here we find three cases (2, 4, 6) where the Sept. reads as one word what makes two in the present Hebrew text; one case (3) where one Hebrew word is made into two by the Sept.; two cases (1, 5) where the Sept. transfers a letter from the end of one word to the beginning of the next. By inspection of the Hebrew in these cases it will be easily seen that the Hebrew MSS. must have been written without intervals between the words, and that the present final forms were not then in use. In three of the above examples (4, 5, 6), the Sept. has perhaps preserved the true division and sense. In the study of these minute particulars, which enable us to examine closely the work of the translators, great help is afforded by Cappelli *Critica Sacra*, and by the *Vorstudien* of Frankel, who has most diligently anatomized the text of the Sept. His projected work on the whole of the version has not been completed, but he has published a part of it in his treatise *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, in which he reviews minutely the Sept. version of the Pentateuch.

III. Ecclesiastical Authority and Influence. — The Sept. does not appear to have obtained general authority among the Jews so long as Hebrew was understood at Alexandria. It is remarkable that Aristobulus quotes the original, even where it departs from the text of the Sept. The version was indeed spread abroad in Egypt, Northern Africa, and Asia Minor. It seems to have been so highly esteemed by the Jews as to be publicly read in some of their synagogues. From the 146th Novella of Justinian, it would seem that some Jews wished the public interpreter, who read the lessons out of the law and the prophets in Hebrew, to give his explanations of them in Greek, while others desired to have them in Chaldee. The reader, therefore, employed this translation as, explanatory of the sections recited in the original, yet, although they highly esteemed the Greek, they did not regard

it as equal to the Hebrew. Even the Talmudists make honorable mention of its origin. It is true that the Talmud also speaks of it as an abomination to the Jews in Palestine; but this refers to the 2d century and *the time following*, not to the period *immediately* after the appearance of Christ. When controversies arose between Christians and Jews, and the former appealed with irresistible force of argument to this version, the latter denied that it agreed with the Hebrew original. Thus by degrees it became odious to the Jews — as much execrated as it had before been commended. They had recourse to the translation of Aquila, who is supposed to have undertaken a new work from the Hebrew, with the express object of supplanting the Sept. and favoring the sentiments of his brethren,

Among the Christians the ancient text, called **κοινή**, was current before the time of Origen. We find it quoted by the early Christian fathers — in Greek by Clemens Romanus, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus; in Latin versions by Tertullian and Cyprian. We find it questioned as inaccurate by the Jews (Just. Martyr, *Apol.*), and provoking them to obtain a better version (hence the versions of Aquila, etc.). We find it quoted by Josephus and Philo; and thus we are brought to the time of the apostles and evangelists, whose writings are full of citations and references, and imbued with the phraseology of the Sept. From all this we are justified in the following conclusions on this head:

1. This version was highly esteemed by the Hellenistic Jews before the coming of Christ. An annual festival was held at Alexandria in remembrance of the completion of the work (Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, lib. 2). The manner in which it is quoted by the writers of the New Test. proves that it had long been in general use. Wherever, by the conquests of Alexander or by colonization, the Greek language prevailed; wherever Jews were settled, and the attention of the neighboring Gentiles was drawn to their wondrous history and law, there was found the Sept., which thus became, by Divine Providence, the means of spreading widely the knowledge of the One True God and his promises of a Savior to come throughout the nations; it was indeed *ostium gentibus ad Christum*. To the wide dispersion of this version we may ascribe, in great measure, that general persuasion which prevailed over the whole East (*percrebuerat Oriente toto*) of the near approach of the Redeemer, and which led the magi to recognize the star that proclaimed the birth of the King of the Jews.

2. Not less wide was the influence of the Sept. in the spread of the Gospel. Many of those Jews who were assembled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, from Asia Minor, from Africa, from Crete and Rome, used the Greek language; the testimonies to Christ from the law and the prophets came to them in the words of the Sept.; St. Stephen probably quoted from it in his address to the Jews; the Ethiopian eunuch was reading the Sept. version of Isaiah in his chariot (ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη); they who were scattered abroad went forth into many lands, speaking of Christ in Greek, and pointing to the things written of him in the Greek version of Moses and the prophets; from Antioch and Alexandria in the East to Rome and Massilia in the West, the voice of the Gospel sounded forth in Greek; Clemens of Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Justin Martyr in Palestine, Irenaeus at Lyons, and many more, taught and wrote in the words of the Greek Scriptures; and a still wider range was given to the Sept. by the Latin version (or versions) made from it for the use of the Latin churches in Italy and Africa; and in later times by the numerous other versions into the tongues of Egypt, Ethiopia, Armenia, Arabia, and Georgia. For a long period the Sept. was the Old Test. of the far larger part of the Christian Church (see the Hulsean Prize Essay, by W.R. Churton, *On the Influence of the Sept. on the Progress of Christianity* [Camb. 1861J; and an art. in *the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 1862, vol. 3).

A number of other versions have been founded on the Sept.

1. Various early Latin translations, the chief of which was the *Vetus Itala*;
2. The Coptic and Sahidic, belonging to the 1st and 2d centuries;
3. The Ethiopic, belonging to the 4th century;
4. The Armenian, of the 5th century;
5. The Georgian, of the 6th century;
6. Various Syriac versions, of the 6th and 8th centuries;
7. Some Arabic versions, *SEE ARABIC VERSIONS*;
8. The Slavonic, belonging to the 9th century.

IV. *Liturgical Origin of Portions of the Version.* — This is a subject for inquiry which has received but little attention; not so much, probably, as its importance deserves. It was noticed by Tregelles many years ago that the headings of certain psalms in the Sept. coincide with the liturgical directions in the Jewish Prayer book. The results were at a later period communicated in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature*, April 1852, p. 207-

209. The results may be briefly stated: The 23d Psalm, Sept. (Heb. 24th), is headed in the Sept. *τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου*; so, too, in Heb. in De Sola's *Prayers of the Sephardim*, *ἠνναρη μωυב*: ^{<1970>}Psalm 47, Sept.

(^{<380>}Hebrews 48), *δευτέρᾳ σαββάτου γην μωυλ* : ^{<1980>}Psalm 93, Sept.

(^{<390>}Hebrews 94), *τετράδι σαββάτου, γ[γβγ μωυλ* : ^{<1990>}Psalm 92, Sept.

(^{<380>}Hebrews 93), *εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, γνν μωυλ* ; There appear to be no Greek copies extant which contain similar headings for ^{<1980>}Psalm 81 and ^{<1980>}30 (^{<380>}Hebrews 82 and 81), which the Jewish Prayer book appropriates to the *third* and *fifth* days; but that such once existed in the case of the latter psalm seems to be shown from the Latin *Psalterium Vetus* having the prefixed *quinta sabbati*, *γννμγ μωυλ* . Delitzsch, in his *Commentary on the Psalms*, has recently pointed out that the notation of these psalms in the Sept. is in accordance with certain passages in the Talmud.

It is worthy of inquiry whether variations in other passages of the Sept. from the Hebrew text cannot at times be connected with liturgical use, and whether they do not originate in part from rubrical directions. It seems to be at least plain that the Psalms were translated from a copy prepared for synagogue worship.

V. Character of the Version. — Under this head we have to consider several special questions relating to its internal character as a translation:

1. Is the Sept. Faithful in Substance? — Here we cannot answer by citing a few examples; the question refers to the general texture, and any opinion we express must be verified by continuous reading. For a purely philological examination, *SEE SEPTUAGINT, LINGUISTIC CHARACTER OF*.

(1.) It has been clearly shown by Hody, Frankel, and others that the several books were translated by different persons, without any comprehensive revision to harmonize the several parts. Names and words are rendered differently in different books; e.g. *j sP*, the Passover, in the Pentateuch is rendered *πάσχα*; in ^{<14816>}2 Chronicles 35:6, *φασέκ*.

yrwa, *Urim*, ^{<12335>}Exodus 28:26, *δήλωσις*; ^{<15313>}Deuteronomy 33:8, *δῆλοι*; ^{<1515>}Ezra 2:63, (*φωτίζοντες*; ^{<1675>}Nehemiah 7:65, *φωτίσων*.

Ma, *Thummim*, ^{<12335>}Exodus 28:26, *ἀλήθεια*; ^{<1515>}Ezra 2:63, *τέλειον*.

The Philistines in the Pentateuch and Joshua are **φυλιστεύμ**; in the other books **ἀλλόφυλοι**.

The books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings are distinguished by the use of **ἐγώ εἶμι** instead of **ἐγώ**.

These are a few put of many like variations.

(2.) Thus the character of the version varies much in the several books; those of the Pentateuch are the best, as Jerome says (“Confitemur plus quam caeteris cum Hebraicis consonare”), and this agrees well with the external evidence that the law was translated first, when Hebrew MSS. were more correct and Hebrew better known. Perhaps the simplicity of the style in these early books facilitated the fidelity of the version.

(3.) The poetical parts are, generally speaking, inferior to the historical, the original abounding with rarer words and expressions. In these parts the reader of the Sept. must be continually on the watch lest an imperfect rendering of a difficult word mar the whole sentence. The Psalms and Proverbs are perhaps the best.

(4.) In the major prophets some of the most important prophecies are sadly obscured — e.g. ^{<200>}Isaiah 9:1, **τοῦτο πρῶτον πίε ταχὺ ποίει, χώρα Ζαβουλὼν, κ. τ. λ.**; and in 9:6, **καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος Ἰωσεδὲκ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις**.

Ezekiel and the minor prophets (speaking generally) seem to be better rendered. The Sept. version of Daniel was not used, that of Theodotion being substituted for it.

(5.) Supposing the numerous glosses and duplicate renderings which have evidently crept from the margin into the text to be removed (e.g. ^{<2016>}Isaiah 7:16; ^{<2017>}Habakkuk 3:2; ^{<2018>}Joel 1:8) — for these are blemishes not of the version itself, but of the copies — and forming a rough estimate of what the Sept. was in its earliest state, we may perhaps say of it, in the words of the well known simile, that it was, in many parts, “the wrong side of the Hebrew tapestry,” exhibiting the general outlines of the pattern, but confused in the more delicate lines, and with many ends of threads visible; or, to use a more dignified illustration, the Sept. is the image of the original seen through a glass not adjusted to the proper focus — the larger features are shown, but the sharpness of definition is lost. On Judges, see Grabii *Ep. ad J. Millium qua Ostend. L. Judd. Gen. LXX Ves., eam esse quam MS.*

Alex. Exhibet, etc. (Oxf. 1705); Ziegler, *Theol. Abhandl.* (Gött. 1791), vol. 1. On Samuel and Kings, Thenius, *Kurzgef. exeg. Hdb. z. A.T.* 4, 24 sq.; 9, 13 sq. On Chronicles, Movers, *Krit. Unters.* (Bonn, 1834). On Esther, Fritsche's ed. (Zür. 1848). See *Jeremiah s.v. Jud. Alex. ac Relig. init. Groec., em. Notisque Crit. ill.* G.L. Spohn (Lips. 1794; 2d ed. 1824, by F.A.G. Spohn).

2. *Is the Version Minutely Accurate in Details?* — We have anticipated the answer to this question, but will give a few examples:

(1.) The *same* word in the same chapter is often rendered by *differing* words — ^{<1273>}Exodus 12:13, **γτῆσθ**; “I will pass over,” Sept. **σκεπάσω**, but 23, **ἵσθ**; “will pass over,” Sept. **παρελεύσεται**.

(2.) *Differing* words by the *same* word — ^{<1273>}Exodus 12:23, **ῥβῖ**; “pass through,” and **ἵσθ**; “pass over,” both by **πρελεύσεται**; ^{<11504>}Numbers 15:4, 5, **ἡνῆ** “offering,” and **ἵβ**, “sacrifice,” both by **θυσία**.

(3.) The divine names are frequently interchanged; **Κύριος** is put for **μῆτῆ**, God, and **θεός** for **ἡ20why** Jehovah; and the two are often wrongly combined or wrongly separated.

(4.) Proper names are sometimes translated, sometimes not. In Genesis 23: — by translating the name *Machpelah* (**τὸ διπλοῦν**), the version is made to speak first of the cave being in the field (ver.9), and then of *the field being* in the cave (ver. 17), **ὁ ἀγρὸς Ἐφρών, ὃς ἦν ἐν τῷ διπλῷ σπηλαίῳ**, the last word not warranted by the Hebrew. ^{<3164>}Zechariah 6:14 is a curious example of four names of persons being translated — e.g. **ἡβρῆ** “to Tobijah,” Sept. **τοῖς χρησίμοις αὐτῆς**; Pisgah in ^{<1541>}Deuteronomy 34:1, is **φασγά**, but in ^{<1527>}Deuteronomy 3:27, **τοῦ λελαξευμένου**.

(5.) The translators are often misled by the similarity of Hebrew words — e.g. ^{<1435>}Numbers 3:26, **wyrtyme** “the cords of it,” Sept. **τὰ κατάλοιπα**. and 4:26, **τὰ περισσά**. In other places **οἱ κάλοι**, and ^{<2542>}Isaiah 54:2, **τὰ σχοινίσματα**, both rightly. ^{<1161>}Exodus 4:31, **W[mæ]æ** “they heard,” Sept. **ἐχάρη (Whmçj)** ^{<1165>}Numbers 16:15, “I have not taken one ass” (**rwj**), Sept. **οὐκ ἐπιθύμημα, (rmj) εἴληφα**; ^{<1520>}Deuteronomy 32:10, **Whæm]æ** “he found him,” Sept. **αὐτάρκησεν αὐτόν**; ^{<1122>}1 Samuel 12:2, .

γΤῃ; “I am gray headed,” Sept. καθήσομαι (γΤῃ); ^{<087>}Genesis 3:17, Ὑρῶβ[β]’ for thy sake,” Sept. ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου (d for r).

In very similar cases the error may be thus traced to the similarity of some of the Hebrew letters, d and r, h and t, y and 5, etc.; in some it is difficult to see any connection between the original and the version — e.g.

^{<638>}Deuteronomy 32:8, [I αεϛϛῶβ] “the sons of Israel,” Sept. ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ. Aquila and Symmachus, υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

^{<211>} Isaiah 21:11, 12.	Septuagint.
Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?	Φυλάσσετε ἐπάλξεις;
The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night:	Θυλάσσω τοπρωί καὶ τὴν νύκτα.
If ye will inquire, inquire ye.	ἐὰν ζητῆς ζητει.
Return, come.	καὶ παρ’ ἐμοὶ οἶκει.

(6.) Besides the above deviations and many like them, which are probably due to accidental causes — the change of a letter, or doubtful writing in the Hebrew — there are some passages which seem to exhibit a studied variation in the Sept. from the Hebrew, e.g. ^{<082>}Genesis 2:2, on the seventh (y[ybçh) day God *ended his work*; Sept. συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.. The addition in ^{<124>}Exodus 12:40, καὶ ἐν τῇ γῆ Χαναάν, appears to be of this kind, inserted to solve a difficulty.

Frequently the strong expressions of the Hebrew are softened down; where human parts are ascribed to God for *hand* the Sept. substitutes *power*; for *mouth*, *word*, etc. ^{<016>}Exodus 4:16, “Thou shalt be to him instead of God” (μῶνῃ) Sept. σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔση τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (see ^{<015>}Exodus 4:15). These and many more savor of design rather than of accident or error.

The version is, therefore, not minutely accurate in details; and it may be laid down as a principle, *never to build any argument on words or phrases of the Sept. without comparing them with the Hebrew*. The Greek may be right; but very often its variations are wrong.

3. We shall now be prepared to weigh the tradition of the fathers, that the version was made by inspiration (κατ’ ἐπίπνοίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Irenaeus; “Divino Spiritu interpretati,” Augustine). Even Jerome himself seems to

think that the Sept. may have sometimes added words to the original “ob Spiritus Sancti auctoritatem, licet in Hebraeis voluminibus non legatur” (*Proefat. in Paralip.* tom. 1, col. 1419).

Let us try to form some conception of what is meant by the *inspiration of translators*. It cannot mean what Jerome here seems to allow, that the translators were divinely moved to add to the original, for this would be the *inspiration of prophets*, as he himself says in another passage (*Prolog. in Genesin*), “Aliud est enim vertere, aliud esse interpretem.” Every such addition would be, in fact, a new revelation. Nor can it be, as some have thought, that the deviations of the Sept. from the original were divinely directed, whether in order to adapt the Scriptures to the mind of the heathen or for other purposes. This would be, *pro tanto*, a new revelation, and it is difficult to conceive of such a revelation; for, be it observed, the discrepancy between the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures would tend to separate the Jews of Palestine from those of Alexandria, and of other places where the Greek Scriptures were used; there would be two different copies of the same books dispersed throughout the world, each claiming divine authority; the appeal to Moses and the prophets would lose much of its force; the standard of divine truth would be rendered doubtful; the trumpet would give an uncertain sound. No! If there be such a thing as an *inspiration of translators*, it must be an effect of the Holy Spirit on their minds, enabling them to do their *work of translation* more perfectly than by their own abilities and acquirements; to overcome the difficulties arising from defective knowledge, from imperfect MSS., from similarity of letters, from human infirmity and weariness; and so to produce a copy of the Scriptures, setting forth the Word of God and the history of his people, in its original truth and purity. This is the kind of inspiration claimed for the translators by Philo (*Vit. Mosis*, lib. 2): “We look upon the persons who made this version not merely as translators, but as persons chosen and set apart by divine appointment, to whom it was given to comprehend and express the sense and meaning of Moses in the fullest and clearest manner.”

The reader will be able to judge from the foregoing examples whether the Sept. version satisfies this test. If it does, it will be found not only substantially faithful, but minutely accurate in details: it will enable us to correct the Hebrew in every place where an error has crept in; it will give evidence of that faculty of intuition in its highest form which enables our great critics to divine from the faulty text the true reading; it will be, in

short, a republication of the original text, purified from the errors of human hands and eyes stamped with fresh authority from heaven. This is a question to be decided by facts, by the phenomena of the version itself. We will simply declare our own conviction that, instead of such a divine republication of the original, we find a marked distinction between the original and the Sept. — a distinction which is well expressed in the words of Jerome (*Prolog. in Genesin*): “Ibi Spiritus ventura praedicit; hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intelligit transfert.” It will be remembered that this agrees with the ancient narrative of the version, known by the name of Aristeeas, which represents the interpreters as meeting in one house, forming One council, conferring together, and agreeing on the sense (see Hody, lib. 2, c. 6).

There are some, perhaps, who will deem this estimate of the Sept. too low; who think that the use of this version in the New Test. stamps it with an authority above that of a mere translation. But as the apostles and evangelists do not invariably cite the Old Test. according to this version, we are left to judge by the light of facts and evidence. Students of Holy Scripture, as well as students of the natural world, should bear in mind the maxim of Bacon, “Sola spes est in vera inductione.”

VI. *Benefits to be Derived from the Study of the Septuagint.* — After all the notices of imperfection above given, it may seem strange to say, but we believe it to be the truth, that the student of Scripture can scarcely read a chapter without some benefit, especially if he be a student of Hebrew, and able, even in a very humble way, to compare the version with the original.

1. We have seen above that the Sept. gives evidence of the character and condition of the Hebrew MSS. from which it was made with respect to vowel points and the mode of writing. This evidence often renders very material help in the correction and establishment of the Hebrew text. Being made from MSS. far older than the Masoretic recension, the Sept. often indicates readings more ancient and more correct than those of our present Hebrew MSS. and editions, and often speaks decisively between the conflicting readings of the present MSS. The following are instances: ~~Psalm 22:17~~ Psalm 22:17 (in the Sept. 21:16). The printed Hebrew text is **yraak**; but several MSS. have a verb in the third person plural, **wraak**: the Sept. steps in to decide the doubt, **ῶρουξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου**, confirmed by Aquila, **σχυναν**.

<D160> Psalm 16:10. The printed text is *ydysj* , in the plural; but near two hundred MSS. have the singular, *dysj* , which is clearly confirmed by the evidence of the Sept., οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.

In passages like these, which touch on the cardinal truths of the Gospel, it is of great importance to have the testimony of an unsuspected witness in the Sept. long before the controversy between Christians and Jews.

In <3015> Hosea 6:5, the context clearly requires that the first person should be maintained throughout the verse; the Sept. corrects the present Hebrew text, without a change except in the position of one letter, τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύσεται, rendering unnecessary the addition of words in italics in our English version.

Other examples might be given, but we must content ourselves with one signal instance of a clause omitted in the Hebrew (probably by what is called ὁμοιοτέλευτον) and preserved in the Sept. In <0108> Genesis 4:8 is a passage which in the Hebrew and in our English version is evidently incomplete: “And Cain talked (*rmāwī*) with Abel his brother; and it came to pass when they were in the field,” etc. Here the Hebrew word *rmāwī* is the word constantly used as the introduction to words spoken, “Cain *said* unto Abel;” but, as the text stands, there are no words spoken, and the following words “... *when they were in the field*” come in abruptly. The Sept. fills up the *lacuna Hebroeorum codicum* (Pearson), καὶ εἶπε Κάιν πρὸς Ἀβὲλ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον (*hdChi hkl* ¶). The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Syriac version agree with the Sept., and the passage is thus cited by Clemens Romanus (*Ep.* 1, 4). The Hebrew transcriber’s eye was probably misled by the word *hdç*; terminating both the clauses.

In all the foregoing cases we do not attribute any paramount *authority* to the Sept. on account of its superior antiquity to the extant Hebrew MSS., but we take it as an evidence of a more ancient Hebrew text, as an eyewitness of the texts, 280 or 180 years B.C. The decision as to any particular reading must be made by weighing this evidence, together with that of other ancient versions, with the arguments from the context, the rules of grammar, the genius of the language, and the comparison of parallel passages. Thus the Hebrew will sometimes correct the Greek, and

sometimes the Greek the Hebrew; both liable to err through the infirmity of human eyes and hands, but each checking the other's errors.

2. The close connection between the Old and the New Test. makes the study of the Sept. extremely valuable, and almost indispensable to the theological student. Pearson quotes from Irenaeus and Jerome as to the citation of the words of prophecy from the Sept. The former, as Pearson observes, speaks too universally when he says that the apostles “*prophetica omnia ita enunciauerunt quemadmodum Seniorum interpretatio continet.*” But it was manifestly the chief storehouse from which they drew their proofs and precepts. Grinfield says that “the number of direct quotations from the Old Test. in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles may be estimated at 350, of which not more than fifty materially differ from the Sept. But the indirect verbal allusions would swell the number to a far greater amount” (*Apol. for LXX*, p. 37). The comparison of the citations with the Sept. is much facilitated by Grinfield's *Editio Hellenistica* of the New Test., and by Gough's *New Test. Quotations*, in which the Hebrew and Greek passages of the Old Test. are placed side by side with the citations in the New. (On this subject see Hody, p. 248, 281; Kennicott, *Dissert. Genesis* § 84; Cappelli *Critica Sacra*, vol. 2.)

3. Further, the language of the Sept. is the mold in which the thoughts and expressions of the apostles and evangelists are cast. In this version Divine Truth has taken the Greek language as its shrine, and adapted it to the things of God. Here the peculiar idioms of the Hebrew are grafted upon the stock of the Greek tongue; words and phrases take a new sense. The terms of the Mosaic ritual in the Greek version are employed by the apostles to express the great truths of the Gospel, e.g. ἀρχιερέυς, θυσία, ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας. Hence the Sept. is a treasury of illustration for the Greek Testament. Many examples are given by Pearson (*Proef. ad LXX*), e.g. σάρξ, πνεῦμα, δικαιοῶ, φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, “Frustra apud veteres Graecos quaeras quid sit πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ vel εἰς τὸν Θεόν quid sit εἰς τὸν Κύριον, vel πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν πίστις, quae toties in Novo Foedere inculcantur, et ex lectione Seniorum facile intelliguntur.” Valckenaer also (on ⁴¹⁵Luke 1:51) speaks strongly on this subject: “Graecum Novi Testamenti contextum rite intellecturo nihil est utilius, quam diligenter versasse Alexandrinam Antiqui Foederis interpretationem, e qua una plus peti poterit auxilii, quam ex veteribus scriptoribus Graecis simul sumtis. Centena reperientur in N.T. nusquam obvia in scriptis Graecorum veterum, sed frequentata in Alexa. versione.” E.g. the sense of

τὸ πάσχα in ^{<614D>}Deuteronomy 16:2, including the sacrifices of the Paschal week, throws light on the question as to the day on which our Lord kept his last Passover, arising out of the words in ^{<618B>}John 18:28, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα.

4. The frequent citations of the Sept. by the Greek fathers, and of the Latin version of the Sept. by the fathers who wrote in Latin, form another strong reason for the study of the Sept. Pearson cites the appellation of *Scaraboeus bonus* applied to Christ by Ambrose and Augustine, as explained by reference to the Sept. in ^{<8121>}Habakkuk 2:11, κύνθαρος ἐκ ξύλου.

5. On the value of the Sept. as a monument of the Greek language in one of its most curious phases, this is not the place to dwell. Our business is with the use of this version as it bears on the criticism and interpretation of the Bible; and we may safely urge the theological student who wishes to be “thoroughly furnished” to have always at his side the Sept. Let the Hebrew, if possible, be placed before him; and at his right, in the next place of honor, the Alexandrian version. The close and careful study of this version will be more profitable than the most learned inquiry into its origin; it will help him to a better knowledge both of the Old Test. and the New.

VII. *Objects to be Attained by the Critical Scholar.*

1. Among these a question of much interest, suggested above, still waits for a solution. In many of the passages which show a *studied variation* from the Hebrew (some of which are above noted), the Sept. and the Samaritan Pentateuch agree — e.g. ^{<0102>}Genesis 2:2; ^{<0220>}Exodus 12:40.

They also agree in many of the ages of the post-diluvian patriarchs, adding one hundred years to the age at which the first son of each was born, according to the Hebrew (see Cappelli *Critica Sacra*, 3, 20, 7). **SEE PATRIARCH.**

They agree in the addition of the words διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον (^{<0048>}Genesis 4:8), which many have seen reason to think rightly added.

Various reasons have been conjectured for this agreement — translation into Greek from a Samaritan text, interpolation from the Samaritan into the Greek, or *vice versa*; but the question does not seem to have found a satisfactory answer (see § 2 above).

2. For the critical scholar it would be a worthy object of pursuit to ascertain as nearly as possible the original text of the Sept. as it stood in the time of the apostles and Philo. If this could be accomplished with any tolerable completeness, it would possess a strong interest, as being the first translation of any writing into another tongue, and the first repository of divine truth to the great colony of Hellenistic Jews at Alexandria.

The critic would probably take as his basis the Roman edition from the *Codex Vaticanus* as representing most nearly the ancient (κοινή) texts. The collection of fragments of Origen's *Hexapla*, by Montfaucon and others, would help him to eliminate the additions which have been made to the Sept. from other sources, and to purge out the glosses and double renderings; the citations in the New Test. and in Philo, in the early Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin, would render assistance of the same kind; and perhaps the most effective aid of all would be found in the fragments of the old Latin version collected by Sabbatier in 3 vols. fol. (Rheims, 1743).

3. Another work of more practical and general interest still remains to be done, viz. to provide a Greek version, accurate and faithful to the Hebrew original, for the use of the Greek Church, and of students reading the Scriptures in that language for purposes of devotion or mental improvement. Field's edition is as yet the best of this kind. It originated in the desire to supply the Greek Church with such a faithful copy of the Scriptures; but as the editor has followed the text of the Alexandrian MS., only correcting, by the help of other MSS., the evident errors of transcription (e.g. in ^{<OISIS}Genesis 15:15, correcting **τραφείζ** in the Alexandrian MS. to **ταφείζ**, the reading of the Complut. text), and as we have seen above that the Alexandrian text is far from being the nearest to the Hebrew, it is evident that a more faithful and complete copy of the Old Test. in Greek might yet be provided.

We may here remark, in conclusion, that such an edition might prepare the way for the correction of the blemishes which remain in our authorized English version. Embracing the results of the criticism of the last two hundred and fifty years, it might exhibit several passages in their original purity; and the corrections thus made, being approved by the judgment of the best scholars, would probably, after a time, find their way into the margin at least of our English Bibles.

One example only can be here given, in a passage which has caused no small perplexity and loads of commentary. ^{200B}Isaiah 9:3 is thus rendered in the Sept.: Το πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ, ὃ κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται ἐνώπιόν σου, ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι ἐν ἀμήτῳ, καὶ ὃν τρόπον οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα. It is easy to see how the faulty rendering of the first part of this has arisen from the similarity of the Hebrew letters **t** and **h**, **d**, and **r**, and from an ancient error in the Hebrew text. The following translation restores the whole passage to its original clearness and force:

Ἐπλήθυνας τὴν ἀγαλλίασιν (I yGħæ)
 ἔμεγαλύνας τὴν εὐφροσύνην:
 εὐφραίνονται ἐνώπιόν σου ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι ἐν ἀμήτῳ,
 ὃν τρόπον ἀγαλλιώνται οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα.

*“Thou hast multiplied the gladness,
 Thou hast increased the joy;
 They rejoice before thee as with the joy of harvest,
 As men are glad when they divide the spoil.”*

Here ἀγαλλίασις and ἀγαλλιώνται, in the first and fourth lines, correspond to I yGħæ and Wj yGħæ εὐφροσύνη and εὐφραίνονται, in the second and third lines, to hj mċæ and Wj mċ; The fourfold *introverted* parallelism is complete, and the connection with the context of the prophecy perfect.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that in such an edition the apocryphal additions to the book of Esther, and those to the book of Daniel, which are not recognized by the Hebrew canon, would be either omitted or (perhaps more properly, since they appear to have been incorporated with the Sept. at an early date) would be placed separately, as in Field’s edition and our English version. *SEE APOCRYPHA; SEE CANON; SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF; SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF; SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.*

VIII. Manuscripts and Early Critical Labors. —

1. The various readings given by Holmes and Parsons enable us to judge, in some measure, of the character of the several MSS. and of the degree of their accordance with the Hebrew text. Many other MSS., chiefly fragments, have since been brought to light by Tischendorf, and most of them have been published in his *Monum. Sacra Ined.* They are

distinguished thus by Holmes: the *uncial* by Roman numerals, the *cursive* by Arabic figures. Among them may be specially noted, with their probable dates and estimates of value as given by Holmes in his preface to the Pentateuch:

UNCIAL.— PROBABLE DATE CENTURY.

(*Sinaiticus*. Royal Library, St. Petersburg]— 4

- 1.** COTTONIANUS. Brit. Mus. (fragments) — 4
- 2.** VATICANUS. Vat. Library, Rome — 4
- 3.** ALEXANDRINUS. Brit. Mus — 5
- 7.** AMBROSIANUS. Ambros. Lib., Milan — 7
- 10.** COISLINIANUS. Bibl. Nat., Paris — 7

CURSIVE.

- 16.** Mediceus. Med. Laurentian Lib., Florence — 11
- 19.** Chigianus. Similar to Complut. text and 108, 118 — 10
- 25.** Monachiensis. Munich — 10
- 58.** Vaticanus (No. x). Vat. Lib., similar to 72 — 13
- 59.** Glasguensis — 12
- 61.** Bodleianus. Laud. 86, notae optimaе — 12
- 64.** Parisiensis (11). National Library — 10 or 11
- 72.** Venetus. Maximi faciendus — 13
- 75.** Oxoniensis. Univ. Coll — 12
- 84.** Vaticanus (1901), notae optimaе — 11
- 106. 107.}** Ferrarienses. These two agree — 14
- 108.** {Vaticanus (330). Similar to Complut — 14
- 118.** {Parisiensis. Nat. Lib. text and (19) — 13

The texts of these MSS. differ considerably from each other, and consequently differ in various degrees from the Hebrew original (see Grabe, *De Variis Vitiis LXX*, etc. [Oxf. 1710]).

The following are the results of a comparison of the readings in the first eight chapters of Exodus:

(1.) Several of the MSS. agree well with the Hebrew; others differ very much.

(2.) The chief variance from the Hebrew is in the addition, or omission, of words and clauses.

(3.) Taking the Roman text as the basis, there are found eighty places (*a*) where some of the MSS. differ from the Roman text, either by addition or omission, *in agreement with the Hebrew*; twenty-six places (β) where differences of the same kind are *not in agreement with the Hebrew*. There is therefore a large balance against the Roman text in point of accordance with the Hebrew.

(4.) Those MSS. which have the largest number of differences of class (*a*) have the smallest number of class (β). There is evidently some strong reason for this close accordance with the Hebrew in these MSS.

(5.) The divergence between the extreme points of the series of MSS. may be estimated from the following statement:

72 differs from the Roman text — in 40 places, *with Hebrew*, in 4 places *against Hebrew*

59 differs from the Roman text — in 40 places *with Hebrew*, in 9 places *against Hebrew*

Between these and the Roman text lie many shades of variety. The Alexandrine text falls about half-way between the two extremes:

Differing from Roman text { in 25 places, *with Hebrew*. in 16 places *against Hebrew*.

The diagram below, drawn on a scale representing the comparison thus instituted (by the test of agreement with the Hebrew in respect of additions or omissions), may help to bring these results more clearly into view. The baseline R.T. represents the Roman text.

- T
72. Venetus.
 59. Glasguensis.
 58. Vaticanus (No. 10).
 10. COISLINIANAS.
 16. Mediceus.
 7. AMBROSTANUS.
 Ed. Complutensis Codd. 19, 108, 118.
 3. ALEXANDRINUS.
 84. Vaticanus (1901).
- R Edit. Aldina.

The above can only be taken as an approximation, the range of comparison being limited. A more extended comparison might enable us to discriminate the several MSS. more accurately, but the result would perhaps hardly repay the labor.

2. But whence these varieties of text? Was the version at first more in accordance with the Hebrew, as in (72) and (59), and did it afterwards degenerate into the less accurate state of the Codex Vaticanus? Or was the version at first less accurate, like the Vatican text, and afterwards brought, by critical labors, into the more accurate form of the MSS. which stand highest in the scale?

History supplies the answer. Jerome (*Ep. ad Suniam et Fretelam*, 2, 627) speaks of two copies, one older and less accurate, *κοινή*, fragments of which are believed to be represented by the still extant remains of the old Latin version; the other more faithful to the Hebrew, which he took as the basis of his own new Latin version. In another place (*Proefat. in Paralip.* vol. 1, col. 1022) he speaks of the corruption of the ancient translation, and the great variety of copies used in different countries:

“Cum germana illa antiquaque translatio corrupta sit... Alexaudriat et AEGYPTUS in Sept. suis Hesychium laudant auctorem; Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat; mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt: quos *ab Origene elaboratos* Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt: totusque orbis hac inter se contraria varietate compugnat.”

The labors of Origen, designed to remedy the conflict of discordant copies, are best described in his own words (*Comment. in Matthew* 1, 381, ed. Huet.):

“Now there is plainly a great difference in the copies, either from the carelessness of scribes, or the rash and mischievous correction of the text by others, or from the additions or omissions made by others at their own discretion. This discrepance in the copies of the Old Covenant we have found means to remedy, by the help of God, *using as our criterion the other versions*. In all passages of the Sept. rendered doubtful by the discordance of the copies, *forming a judgment from the other versions*, we have preserved what agreed with them; and some words we have marked with an *obelos* as not found in the Hebrew, not venturing to omit them entirely; and some we have added with asterisks affixed, to show that they are not found in the Sept., but added by us from the other versions, in accordance with the Hebrew.”

The other **ἐκδόσεις**, or versions, are those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Origen (*Comm. in Joann. 2*, 131, ed. Huet.) says, “The same errors in names may frequently be observed in the law and the prophets, as we have learned by diligent inquiry of the Hebrews, and by comparing our copies with their copies, as represent in the still uncorrupted versions of Aquila, Theodotji, and Symmachus.” It appears from these and other passages that Origen, finding great discordance in the several copies of the Sept., laid this version side by side with the other three translations, and, *taking their accordance with each other as the test of their agreement with the Hebrew*, marked the copy of the Sept. with an *obelos*, — , where he found superfluous words, and supplied the deficiencies of the Sept. by words taken from the other versions with an *asterisk*, *, prefixed. The additions to the Sept. were chiefly made from Theodotion (Jerome, *Prolog. in Genesin*, vol. 1; see also *Proef. in Job*, p. 795). From Eusebius, as quoted below, we learn that this work of Origen was called **Τετραπλῶ**, *the fourfold Bible*. The following specimen is given by Montfaucon:

GENESIS 1:1

ΑΚΥΛΑΣ	ΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣ	ΟΙΘ	ΘΕΟΔΟΤΙΩΝ
ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν	ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν	ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησέν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὴν γῆν	ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν

But this was only the earlier and the smaller portion of Origen's labors: he rested not till he had acquired the knowledge of Hebrew, and compared the Sept. directly with the Hebrew copies. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 6, 16, p. 217, ed. Vales.) thus describes the labors which led to the greater work, the *Hexapla*; the last clause of the passage refers to the *Tetrapla*:

“So careful was Origen's investigation of the sacred oracles that he learned the Hebrew tongue, and made himself master of the original Scriptures received among the Jews in the Hebrew letters; and reviewed the versions of the other interpreters of the Sacred Scriptures, besides the Sept.; and discovered some translations varying from the well-known versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which he searched out, and brought to light from their long concealment in neglected corners;... and in his *Hexapla*, after the four principal versions of the Psalms, added a fifth, yea, a sixth and seventh translation, stating that one of these was found in a cask at Jericho, in the time of Antoninus, son of Severus: and bringing these all into one view, and dividing them in columns over against one another, together with the Hebrew text, he left to us the work called *Hexapla*; having arranged separately, in the *Tetrapla*, the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, together with the version of the Seventy.”

So Jerome (in *Catal. Script. Eccl.* vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 116):

“Quis ignorat, quod tantum in Scripturis divinis habuerit studii, ut etiam hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret; et acceptis LXX interpretibus, alias quoque editiones in unum volumen congregaret: Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti, et Theodotionis Ebionaei, et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis....

Praeterea quintam et sextam et septimam editiouem, quas etiam nos de ejus bibliotheca habemus, miro labore reperit, et cum caeteris editionibus comparavit.”

From another passage of Jerome (in *Epist. ad Titum*, vol. 4, pt. 1, p. 437) we learn that in the *Hexapla* the Hebrew text was placed in one column in Hebrew letters, in the next column in Greek letters:

HEXAPLA ^{<810>}HOSEA 11:1

To EBPAIKON	To EBP ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙ Σ ΓΡ	ΑΚΥΛΑΣ	ΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣ	Οἱ ο	ΘΕΟΔΟΤΙ ΩΝ
l arvy r[n wk whbhaw μywxmmw ynbl ytarq	χι νερ Ισραηλ ουεαβηου ουμεμεσραι μ καραθι λεβανι	οτι παις Ισραηλ και ηγαπησα αυτον και απο Αιγυπτου εκαλεσα τον υιον μου	οτι παις Ισραηλ και ηγαπημενος εξ Αιγυπτου κεκληται υιος μου	οτι νηπιος Ισραηλ και εγω ηγαπησα αυτον και εξ Αιγυπτου κεκληται υιος μου	οτι νηπιος Ισραηλ και ηγαπησα αυτον και εκαλεσα υιον μου εξ Αιγυπτου

It should here be mentioned that some take the *Tetrapla* as denoting, not a separate work, but only that portion of the *Hexapla* which contains the four columns filled by the four principal Greek versions. Valesius (*Notes on Eusebius*, p. 106) thinks that the *Tetrapla* was formed by taking those four columns out of the *Hexapla*, and making them into a separate book. But the testimony of Origen himself (2, 381; 2, 131), above cited, is clear that he formed one corrected text of the Sept. by comparison of the three other Greek versions (A., Σ., Θ.), using them as his criterion. If he had known Hebrew at this time, would he have confined himself to the Greek versions? Would he have appealed to the Hebrew, as represented by Aquila, etc.? It seems very evident that he must have learned Hebrew at a later time, and therefore that the *Hexapla*, which rests on q comparison with the Hebrew, must have followed the *Tetrapla*, which was formed by the help of Greek versions only. The words of Eusebius also (*Hist. Eccl.* 6, 16) appear to distinguish very clearly between the *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla* as separate works, and to imply that the *Tetrapla* preceded the *Hexapla*. The order of precedence is not a mere literary question; the view above stated,

which is supported by Montfaucon, Usher, etc., strengthens the force of Origen's example as a diligent student of Scripture, showing his increasing desire *integros accedere fontes*.

The labors of Origen, pursued through a long course of years, first in procuring by personal travel the materials for his great work, and then in comparing and arranging them, made him worthy of the name *Adamantius*. But what was the result of all this toil? Where is now his great work, the *Hexapla*, prepared with so much care, and written by so many skilful hands? Too large for transcription, too early by centuries for printing (which alone could have saved it), it was destined to a short existence. It was brought from Tyre and laid up in the library at Caesarea, and there probably perished by the flames, A.D. 653. One copy, however, had been made, by Pamphilus and Eusebius, of the column containing the corrected text of the Sept., with Origen's *asterisks* and *obeli*, and the letters denoting from which of the other translators each addition was taken. This copy is probably the ancestor of those codices which now approach most nearly to the Hebrew, and are entitled *Hexaplar*; but in the course of transcription the distinguishing marks have disappeared or become confused; and we have thus a text composed partly of the old Sept. text, partly of insertions from the three other chief Greek versions, especially that of Theodotion.

The facts above related agree well with the phenomena of the MSS. before stated. As we have codices derived from the *Hexaplar* text (e.g. 72, 59, 58), and at the other extreme the Codex Vaticanus (II), probably representing nearly the ancient uncorrected text, *κοινή*; so between these we find texts of intermediate character in the Codex Alexandrinus (III), and others, which may perhaps be derived from the text of the *Tetrapla*.

To these main sources of our existing MSS. must be added the recensions of the Sept. mentioned by Jerome and others, viz. those of Lucian of Antioch and Hesychius of Egypt, not long after the time of Origen. We have seen above that each of these had a wide range that of Lucian (supposed to be corrected by the Hebrew) in the churches from Constantinople to Antioch; that of Hesychius in Alexandria and Egypt; while the churches lying between these two regions used the *Hexaplar* text copied by Eusebius and Pamphilus (Jerome, vol. 1, col. 1022). The great variety of text in the existing MSS. is thus accounted for by the variety of sources from which they have descended.

IX. Modern Editions. —

1. This version appears at the present day in five *principal* editions:

1. Biblia Polyglotta Complutensis (1514-17).
2. The Aldine edition (Venice, 1518).
3. The Roman edition, edited under pope Sixtus V (1587).
4. Facsimile edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, by Baber (1816).
5. Facsimile edition of the Codex Sinaiticus, by Tischendorf (St. Petersburg, 1862, 4 vols. fol.).

The texts of (1) and (2) were probably formed by collation of several MSS. The Roman edition (3) is printed from the venerable Codex Vaticanus, but not without many errors. This text has been followed in most of the modern editions. A transcript of the Codex Vaticanus, prepared by cardinal Mai, was lately published at Rome by Vercelloni. It is much to be regretted that this edition is not so accurate as to preclude the necessity of consulting the MS. The text of the codex, and the parts added by a later hand, to complete the codex (among them nearly all of Genesis), are printed in the same Greek type, with distinguishing notes. The facsimile edition by Baber (4) is, printed with types made after the form of the letters in the Codex Alexandrinus (British Museum Library) for the facsimile edition of the New Test. by Woide in 1786. Great care was bestowed upon the sheets as they passed through the press. The Codex Sinaiticus (5) was published in facsimile type at the expense of the emperor of Russia, and a very limited edition was printed. *SEE SINAITIC MS.*

2. Other important editions are the following: The Septuagint in Walton's Polyglot (1657) is the Roman text, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus. The Cambridge edition (1665) (Roman text) is only valuable for the preface by Pearson. An edition of the Codex Alexandrinus was published by Grabe (Oxford, 1707-20), but its critical value is far below that of Baber's. It is printed in common type, and the editor has exercised his judgment on the text, putting some words of the codex in the margin, and replacing them by what he thought better readings, distinguished by a smaller type. This edition was reproduced by Breitinger (Zurich, 1730-32, 4 vols. 4to), with the various readings of the Vatican text. The edition of Bos (Franco, 1709) follows the Roman texts with its scholia, and the various readings given in Walton's Polyglot, especially those of the Codex Alexandrinus. This has often been reprinted, and is now the commonest text. The valuable critical edition of Holmes, continued by Parsons, is similar in plan to the Hebrew Bible of Kennicott; it has the Roman text,

with a large body of various readings from numerous MSS. and editions (Oxford, 1798-1827). The Oxford edition by Gaisford (1848) has the Roman text, with the various readings of the Codex Alexandrinus below. Tischendorf's editions (the 5th, 1875) are on the same plan; he has added readings from some other MSS. discovered by himself, with very useful Prolegomena. Some convenient editions have been published by Bagster, one in 8vo, others of smaller size, forming part of his Polyglot series of Bibles. His text is the Roman. The latest edition, by Field (1859), differs from any of the preceding. He takes as his basis the Codex Alexandrinus, but corrects all the manifest errors of transcription by the help of other MSS., and brings the dislocated portions of the Septuagint into agreement with the order of the Hebrew Bible. The text in Stier and Theile's *Polyglotten Bibel* (Bielefeld, 1854) is revised arbitrarily, and without the aid of the Codex Sinaiticus. Scrivener has promised a new critical edition.

3. Editions of *particular books*, more or less critically prepared, have occasionally been issued: Genesis, by Lagarde (Lips. 1868); Esther, by Fritzsche (Turici, 1848); Ruth, by the same (ibid. 1867); Jeremiah, by Spohn (Lips. 1794-1828); Ezekiel, by Vincent (Romans 1840); Jonah, by Hohner (Lips. 1787-88). The genuine text of Daniel (which was long supposed to be lost, the translation of Theodotion having been substituted for it in the common MSS.) was first published separately by Simon de Magistris in 1772, from the Codex Chigianus; and it was reprinted by J.D. Michaelis (1773-74), Segaar (1775), and more critically by Hahn (1845), from the Codex Ambrosianus.

The best *Lexicon* to the Septuagint is that of Schleusner, published at Leipsic (1820-21, 5 pts.), and reprinted at Glasgow (1822, 3 vols. 8vo).. An earlier one is that of Biel (Hag. 1779-80, 3 vols.). The best for the Apocrypha is Wahl's *Clavis* (Lips. 1863). The best *Concordance* is that of Trommius (Amst. 1718, 2 vols. fol.). An earlier one is that of Kircher (1607). Winer's *V.T. Grammar* serves an excellent purpose for philological comparison. The student may also consult Sturz, *De Dialecto Macedonica* (Lips. 1808); Maltby, *Two Sermons before the University of Durham* (1843). **SEE GREEK LANGUAGE.**

X. *Literature.* — In addition to the works named by Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 4, 31 sq., 156 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handb. d. Literatur*, 2, 279 sq.; and Danz; *Wörterb. d. Theol.* s.v. "Alex. Vers.," the following are important: Cappelli *Critica Sacra* (Par. 1650); Waltoni *Proleg. ad Bibl. Polyglott.* (Lond.

1657); Pearsoni [Bp.] *Pref. Paroenetica ad LXX* (ibid. 1655); Vossius, *De LXX Interp.* (Hag. 1661; app. 1663); Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quoque Supersunt* (Par. 1710; Lips. 1740); Hody, *De Bibl. Text. Original. Vers. Grecis, et Latina Vulgata* (Oxf. 1704); Hottinger, *Thesaurus* (Zur. 1649); Owen, *Inquiry into the Sept.* (Lond. 1769); *Brief Account*, etc. (ibid. 1787); Kennicott. *Dissertationes to his Vet. Test.* (Oxon. 1776-80); Wornier, *De LXX Interpretibus* (Hamb. 1617, 8vo); Knapp, *De Versione Alex.* (Hal. 1775-76, 4to); Hasenkamp, *De Pentat. LXX Interp.* (Marb. 1765, 4to); Stroth, *Symboloe Criticoe* (Lips. 1778-83); Sulzner, *De LXX Interp.* (Hal. 1700, 4to); Weyhenmeyer, *De Fersione LXX* (Ulm. 1719, 4to); Reineke, *De Dissensu Vers. Alex. ab Archetypo* (Magd. 1771, 4to); Holmes, *Prolegg. ad LXX* (Oxf. 1798-1827); Valckenaer, *Diatribes de Aristobulo Judoeo* (L.B. 1806); Schleusner, *Opusc. Crit. ad Verss. Gr. V.T.* (Lips. 1812); Dähne, *Jüdisch-alexandrinische Philosophie* (Hal. 183134); Töpler, *De Pentat. Interp. Alex. Indole Crit. et Hermen.* (Hal. Sax. 1830); Gfrörer, *Urchristenthum* (Stuttg. 1831, 8vo); Fabricii *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ed. Harless, vol. 3; Studer, *De Versionis Alexandriniae Origine, Historia, Usu, et Abusu Critico* (Bernie, 1823, 8vo); Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung*, etc. (Halle, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo); Amersfoort, *Dissertatio de Variis Lectionibus Holmesianis* (Lugd. Bat. 1815, 4to); Plüschke, *Lectiones Alex. et Hebr.* (Bonn, 1837); Thiersch, *De Pent. Fers. Alex.* (Erlang. 1841); Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leips. 1841); *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese, auf die alex. Hermeneutik* (ibid. 1851); Grinfield, *N.T. Editio Hellenistica* (ibid. 1848), and *Apology for the Septuagint* (ibid. 1850); Selwyn, *Notoe Criticoe in Ex. 1-24, Numeros, Deuteronomium* (ibid. 1856-58); also *Hor. Hebr. on ~~301~~ Isaiah 9* (ibid. 1848); Churton, *Hulsean Essay* (ibid. 1861); Pearson [G.], *Papers*, in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* 1, 4, 7, 3d series.

Septuagint, Linguistic Character Of The.

The language of the Sept., from its close connection with that of the New Test., has been a fruitful source of discussion, and various theories on the subject have been maintained with considerable vehemence. Thus Isaac Vossius maintained that the Alexandrian Jews were studious of Attic Greek. Scaliger used the phrase "Hellenistic tongue;" Salmasius contended for a "Hellenistic Greek," and maintained that the diction or style of the Sept. was not a form of Greek which had its origin in Alexandria, or in other parts where the Macedonian rule had prevailed, but that it was the style of translators, or of authors whose acquaintance with the language

was imperfect. It was the Greek of the unlearned, and therefore ἰδιωτικός, or unpolished; it was used to interpret Hebrew ideas and phrases, and thus it was ἑρμηνευτικός, or the language of interpreters. R. Simon used the term “*synagogue Greek*” to express a style of Greek which was so full of Hebrew words and Hebraisms as to be scarcely intelligible to readers who had no knowledge of Hebrew or Chaldee. He illustrates this by the Spanish Jews’ translation of the Bible into the Spanish tongue which can be understood only by those who have some knowledge of Hebrew as well as Spanish. Later critics have, however, admitted the existence of an Alexandrian dialect, from which the Sept. has derived some of its features, though these are not its most prominent characteristics. Thus Hody, quoting Crocus, says:

The Greek translators of the Scriptures are to be described as Hebraists, Chaldaists, and Alexandrists. Their version is full of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Alexandrian words and phrases. They render word for word, and often where a passage is thus translated, the words are Greek, but the Hebrew construction is retained” (*De Bibl. Text. Orig.* 2, 4, 23).

As the text from which the Alexandrian version was made did not have the vowel-points, it would be very interesting to know how the translators pronounced the Hebrew, and the more so since some critics who delight in hunting after various readings would make the Sept. the standard for the Hebrew text. But here we are at a loss, and all that we know we can only make out from the version itself. Commencing with *the alphabet*, the pronunciation of the letters is given to us in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, where the verses are arranged alphabetically. The letters of the alphabet, thus commencing the different verses, are expressed fully, as the following scheme will show:

a=”Αλεφ.

l = Λάμεδ.

b = Βήθ.

m= Μήμ.

g = Γίμελ.

n=Νούν

d = Δάλεθ.

s=Σάμεχ.

h =”Η.

[= Αῖν.
 w = Οὐαὺ.
 p = Φῆ.
 z = Ζαίν.
 x = Τσαδῆ.
 j = ῥΗθ.
 q = Κώφ.
 f = Τήθ.
 r = ῥήχς.
 y = Ἰώδ..
 ç = Χσέν.
 k = Χάφ.
 t = Θαὺ.

That **w** and **t** were pronounced *wav* and *tav* we may infer from the fact that *v* is always equivalent to the Hebrew 5, thus **ywl** = Λευί. From the version itself we see that the letters had the following pronunciation:

a, in itself inaudible (like the Greek *spiritus lenis*), receives its intonation from the vowel, as **ῥha**, Ἀαρών; **hql aē** Ἐλκανά. Sometimes it has the *spiritus asper*, as **hrba**, Ἄβραάμ; **wj yl a**, ῥ Ηλίας; **ῥwl a** (^{<0087>}Judges 9:37), ῥ Ηλών.

b is **β**, sometimes **φ**: **bazAbqy** (^{<0025>}Judges 7:25), Ἰακεβζηφ; also **v**, **bwj r** (^{<0090>}Joshua 19:30), ῥ Ρααὺ;. Sometimes **b** is expressed by **μβ**, as **j bn**, Νουβῶ; **I bbw rz**, Ζερουμβαβέλ: or by **μ** alone, as **hnl**, Λεμνά; **μçbyw** (^{<1002>}1 Chronicles 7:2), ῥ Ιεμασάν

g is **γ**, sometimes **κ**, as **grn**, Ναφέκ; **gawd**, Δωήκ: also **χ**, as **gwr ç**, Σερούχ.

d is **δ**, but also **θ**, as **drfm** (^{<0039>}Genesis 36:39), Ματραίθ. **h** is, like **a**, either inaudible, as **I bh**, Ἀβέλ; or it has the *spiritus asper*, as **ῥmyh**, Αἰμάν. **w** is **v**, **hwj** = ῥ Ένα, **ywl** = Λευί. Sometimes it is **β**, as **hwç**, Σαβύ (^{<0045>}Genesis 14:5), and **[wç** (38:12), Σαβά. Sometimes it is not expressed at all, as **ytçw**, Ἀστί; **yhçw** (^{<1063>}1 Chronicles 6:13), Σανι.

z is ζ, seldom σ — as *zryl a*, Ἐλιφάς (^{<0301>}Genesis 36; but ^{<0301>}1 Chronicles 1, Ἐλιφάζ); very seldom 10, as *zwb* (^{<0221>}Genesis 22:21), Βαύξ.

j is inaudible at the beginning, middle, and end of a word. Often it is χ, *μj*, Χάμ; *rwj n*, Ναχώρ; sometimes κ. as *j bf* (Gen 22:24), Θαβέκ. *f* is τ, seldom δ, as *fwrw* (^{<0105>}Genesis 10:6; ^{<0301>}1 Chronicles 1:8), Φούδ; or δ, as *fl ryl a* (^{<0156>}2 Samuel 5:16; ^{<0345>}1 Chronicles 14:5), Ἐλιφאלάθ. *y* is ι, as *bq[y]*, Ἰακώβ; but it is also I when followed by *ç8 8yr*, as *whymry*, Ἱερεμίας.

k is χ, sometimes κ, as *aktbs* (^{<0107>}Genesis 10:7), Σαβαθακά; seldom, γ, as *myrtrk* (ver. 14), Γαφθωρείμ. *r n l* are λ ν ρ. *M* is μ, but sometimes is, β as *dwrmn*, Ναβρώδ; *hl mc* (^{<0347>}1 Chronicles 1:47), Σεβλά. *c v s* are σ. [*i* is inaudible, as *ˆwrp[*, Ἐφρών; or with the *spiritus asper*, as *wç[*, Ἡσαϋ: it is also γ as *hrwm[*, Γόμορρά;” or κ (at the end of the word), as [*bra* (^{<0231>}Genesis 23:2), Ἀρβόκ. *p* is φ, sometimes π, as *dj pl x*, Σαλπαάδ. *x* is σ, seldom ζ, as */w[* (^{<0103>}Genesis 10:23; 22:21), Ούζ. *q* is κ, sometimes χ, as *hrwfq* (^{<0231>}Genesis 25:1), Χεττουρά; *arwj* (^{<0153>}Nehemiah 7:53), Ἀχιφά: seldom γ, as *ql j* (^{<0251>}Numbers 26:30), Χελέγ. *t* is θ, sometimes τ, as *çj t*, Τοχός; *rtg*, Γατέρ. A greater difficulty we have in fixing the pronunciation according to our *vowel-points*, but in general the following rules may be laid down:

Kamets () is a, as *mda*; Αδάμ; *μj*; Χάμ. *Pattach* () is a, as *ˆrbā}* Ἀάρών. *Tsere* () = η: *rca*, Ἀσήρ; *l aεçy*, Ἰσραήλ. *Segol* () = ε, as *Ël mybæ}* Ἀβιμελέχ.

Cholem (wε ω: *bqfy*, Ἰακώβ; *ās/y*, Ἰωσήφ. *Kamets chatuph* () = o, as *tyl j*; Γολιάθ. *Long chirek* (y) = ι or ει: *mymaæ}*, Ἀναμίμ, μείμ; *rykaæ*, Μαχίρ, εἶρ. *Short chirek* (.) = ι or υ, the latter very seldom: *ytæ}* *æ}* Φυλιστεῖμ; *ˆw[mçæ}* Συμεών. *Shurek* (w) = ου: *dwl*, Λούδ; *swwy}* Ἰεβούς. *Kibbutz* () = ο: *yqba}* Βοκκί; *hprwj}* Ἱεφοννή.

This may be regarded as a most general outline for the vowels; for a closer examination, upon which we cannot here enter, will show that these principles are not always carried out. As to *Sheva*, its pronunciation is

governed by the following vowel; thus $\text{rw}\bar{\phi}\text{rj}$ is Φογώρ; $\text{bw}\bar{\phi}\text{rj}$ Ροόβ; $\text{myt}\bar{\alpha}\text{e}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}$ Φυλιστίμ; $\text{hyf}\bar{\beta}\text{v}$ Σαφατία; $\text{akt}\bar{\beta}\bar{\beta}\bar{\beta}$. Σαβαθακάι.' This vocalization exercises also its influence upon the vowel preceding the Sheva; thus $[\text{I}\bar{\beta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\sigma}$ Βαλαάμ; $\text{mcb}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\epsilon}$ Μαβασάμ, etc. *Dagesh lene* is not expressed in the Sept., but the *dagesh forte* usually is, as $\text{hLx}\bar{\alpha}$ Σελλά; $\text{h}\bar{\eta}\text{nm}$, Μανασσή; and it is also found, where the Hebrew text has no dagesh, as hqbr = Ρεβέκκα. Sometimes the *dagesh forte* of the Hebrew is not expressed at all, as mVj μ Ἀσώμ; $\text{tw}\bar{\beta}\text{sk}\bar{\eta}\text{h}$ (^{<06918>}Joshua 19:18), Χασαλώθ..

With these preliminary remarks we have paved our way for the manner in which grammar has been used by the translators of the Sept.; but here the difficulty is greater still, for the translators, as can be seen from their mode of translating, had not the language, but the translation, of the Scripture in view, and this must account for many grammatical peculiarities which we find so often in the Alexandrian version. Thus e.g. the present is very often used for the perfect, especially in λέγω'and ὀράω, as in ^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2, rmayw rba , λέγει δὲ Ἄβραάμ; 37:29, $\bar{\alpha}\text{swy } \bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}$ hnhw , καὶ οὐχ ὀρᾷ Ἰωσήφ, or the infinitive before a definite verb is expressed by a participle or a noun. The active is often exchanged for the passive, or *vice versa*, as (^{<0125>}Genesis 12:15) $\text{h}\bar{\eta}\text{ch j qit}\bar{\eta}$ καὶ εἰσήγαγον.. Leaving aside all further remarks on these points as not exactly belonging to our object, we now come to the subject at issue, as to the linguistic peculiarities. Here we notice –

1. Unusual formations of words and verbs, viz.:

- ἄβρα, a favorite slave, ^{<0017>}Exodus 2:5.
- αιχμαλωτιζειν, to make a prisoner, ^{<2623>}Ezekiel 12:3.
- ἄκαν, a thorn, ^{<2149>}2 Kings 14:9.
- ἀλγηρός, sorrowful, ^{<2409>}Jeremiah 10:9.
- ἀμφιάζεσθαι, to put round about, ^{<1894>}Job 29:14.
- ἀμφίασις, a garment, ^{<1216>}Job 22:6.
- ἀναθεματίζειν, to devote to destruction, ^{<0535>}Deuteronomy 13:15.
- ἀποκιδαρῶν, to strip the head of, ^{<0806>}Leviticus 10:6.
- ἀποπεμπτοῦν, to take up the fifth part, ^{<0434>}Genesis 41:34.
- ἀσβόλη, soot, ^{<2148>}Lamentations 4:8.

βουνίζειν, to accumulate, <18214> Ruth 2:14.
 γλωσσόκομον, a chest, <4218> 2 Chronicles 24:8.
 γρηγορειν, to watch, <10108> Nehemiah 7:3.
 διαρτάν, to deceive, <12319> Numbers 23:19.
 ἕκθεμα, an edict, <17077> Esther 8:17.
 ἔκτοκίζειν, to put on interest, <15210> Deuteronomy 23:10.
 ἔντομίζ, a cutting, <18508> Leviticus 19:28.
 εὐδοκεῖν, to approve, <13541> Leviticus 26:41.
 θεριστρον, a veil, <21817> Song of Solomon 5:7.
 καταχωρίζειν, to enter in a register, <13724> 1 Chronicles 27:24.
 λυτρών, a sewer, <12107> 2 Kings 10:27.
 μαγειρεῖον, a kitchen, <34623> Ezekiel 46:23.
 μαγειρισσα, a female cook, <10183> 1 Samuel 8:13.
 μακροηγερεύειν, to live long, <15533> Deuteronomy 5:33.
 μανδύη, a coat of mail, <10178> 1 Samuel 17:38.
 πρωτοτοκεύειν, to appoint as first born, <15216> Deuteronomy 21:16.
 πρωτοτόκια, the birthright, <12572> Genesis 25:32.
 ῥώξ, a grape, <23818> Isaiah 65:8. σαββατίζειν, to rest, <12160> Exodus
 16:30.
 σισση, the corner of the head, <18527> Leviticus 19:27.
 σκεπεινός, covered, <10113> Nehemiah 4:13.
 σκηνοπηγία, Feast of Tabernacles, <15166> Deuteronomy 16:16.
 τελίσκειν, to complete, <15238> Deuteronomy 23:18.
 φυλακίσσα, a keeper, <21106> Song of Solomon 1:6.

2. New meanings of words:

ἀγχιστεύω, to redeem, <15182> Ezra 2:62.
 ἄθυτον, abominable, <15107> Leviticus 19:7.
 ἀπό = bir, <14810> Genesis 48:10.
 διαφωνεῖν, to be missing, <10149> Numbers 31:49.
 μετριάζειν, to be sick, <10112> Nehemiah 2:2.

3. An abstract used collectively:

αἰχμαλωσία, the captive, <36125> Ezekiel 11:25.
 διασπορά, living here and there, <19702> Psalm 47:2.
 ἐξουθένημα, despised, <19216> Psalm 22:6.
 ἱεράτευμα, priesthood, <12105> Exodus 19:6.

4. Peculiar forms of words, as —

ἀγαθώτατος, <04706> Genesis 47:6.
 ἀγαθώτερος, <07152> Judges 15:2.
 ἀπεκτάγκατε, <04164> Numbers 16:41.
 ἀρπᾶ, <08913> Leviticus 19:13.
 εἴποισαν, <09342> Psalm 34:25.
 ἐλθάτω, <07804> Esther 5:4.
 ἐπρονόμυσάμεν, <06802> Deuteronomy 3:7.
 ἐφάγοσαν, <09702> Psalm 77:29.
 ἔφυγαν, <00044> 2 Samuel 10:14.
 ἐώρακαν, <05107> Deuteronomy 11:7.
 ἦλθοσαν, <09801> Psalm 78:1.
 ἴδοισαν <08212> Job 21:20.
 ἴδοσαν, <06779> Deuteronomy 7:19.
 καμμύειν, <23160> Isaiah 6:10.
 κατείπαντες, <04457> Numbers 14:37.
 κεκατήρνανται, <02216> Numbers 22:6.
 κεκράξαντες, <02223> Exodus 22:23.
 κλίβανος = κρίβανος, <01572> Genesis 15:17.
 μαχαίρη, <02151> Exodus 15:9.
 παρέστηκαν, <23153> Isaiah 5:29.
 ποιήσασαν, <06044> Deuteronomy 1:44.
 πραθήσεται, <26814> Ezekiel 48:14.
 φαγούμεθα, <00032> Genesis 3:2.

5. Syntactic peculiarities, as —

ἄθως ἀπό, καθάρως ἀπό, <00001> Genesis 8.
 ἄμαρτάνειν ἀπό, <06515> Leviticus 5:15.
 ἄμαρτάνειν ἐν, <06044> Leviticus 4:14.
 ἄμαρτάνειν ἔναντι, <06042> Leviticus 4:2.
 ἄμαρτάνειν περί, <06805> Leviticus 5:5.
 ἄμαρτάνειν τινί, <07127> Judges 11:27.
 ἀναμνησθῆαί τι, <02213> Exodus 23:13.
 ἐξέρχεσθαί τι, <06029> Exodus 9:29.
 ἐξιλάσκεσθαί τι, <23163> Ezekiel 16:63.
 εὐδοκεῖν τι, <21007> Ecclesiastes 9:7.
 καταρᾶσθαί τινα, <00629> Genesis 5:29.
 οἰκτεῖρειν ἀπό τινος, <24314> Jeremiah 13:14.
 οἰκτεῖρειν τινά, <09002> Psalm 4:2.

φείδεσθαί τινα, <18415> Job 16:5.

φείδεσθαί τινι, <18711> Job 7:11.

6. To these we may add:

The construction of ἔρχεσθαι and similar verbs with the infinitive, as ἀπήλθε φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν, <16182> Nehemiah 8:12; κατέβη λούσασθαι, <10115> Exodus 2:5. The vocative is expressed by the article, as σῶσόν με ὁ θεός μου, <19117> Psalm 3:7

τίς is used as a relative, as μόνον τοῦτο τὸ ἱμάτιον ... ἐν τίνι κοιμηθήσεται, <10227> Exodus 22:27; καὶ ἦξει τίνος αὐτοῦ ἡ οἰκία, <10445> Leviticus 14:35.

The relative is connected with ἐάν, as πᾶν σκευὸς ὀστράκινον εἰς ὃ ἐάν πέσῃ ἀπὸ τούτων ἔνδον, ὅσα ἐάν ἔνδον ἢ ἀκάθαρτα ἔσταί,, Leviticus 40:33; ἐν ἀγρῷ σου ἐάν ἦς ἐκεῖ ... καὶ ὄψομαι ὅτι ἐάν ἦ, <10418> 1 Samuel 19:3; ἄνθρωπος ... τινὶ ἐάν ἦ ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμος, <10217> Leviticus 21:17. The connection with ἐν instead of εἰς, as πορεύσομαι ἐν πύλαις ἄδου, <23310> Isaiah 38:10; ἄξει ἐν κρίσει, <21214> Ecclesiastes 12:14. The connection of infinitives, as ευρου χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου τοῦ ἐπιγνώναί με,, <10210> Ruth 2:10; πόλις αὕτη ἐγγὺς τοῦ καταφυγεῖν με ἐκεῖ, <10150> Genesis 19:20; ἦγγισαν αἱ ἡμέραι Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν, 47:29; ἔστη τοῦ τίκτειν, 29:35;) ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πολλὰ τοῦ οἰκεῖν ἄμα., 36:7; ἠμβλύθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄρα, 27:1.

7. Very prominent also are the *Egyptian* words which we find in the Sept.; and which betray the origin of the translation. The following are the most remarkable:

ἀλήθεια, truth, the rendering of **μymt** (*Thummim*, or *perfections*), in <10236> Exodus 28:26; <10188> Leviticus 8:8; and <10318> Deuteronomy 33:8. According to AEliaiu, **ἀλήθεια** was the name given to an image of sapphire stone, which was hung by a golden chain round the neck of the oldest and highest in rank of the Egyptian priests, who also held the office of judge. This was to denote the truth or justice with which he was to decide the cases which were brought before him. Hence it is supposed that the use of it for the *Thummim* of the high priest was derived; yet not without regard to the meaning of truth, as expressing the faithfulness and righteousness of God.

The word Ἄπις (*Apis*, the sacred bull of the Egyptians) occurs in Jeremiah 46 [26], 15: Διὰ τί ἔφυγεν... Ἄπις ὁ μὸσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός σου (“Why is Apis, thy chosen calf, fled?”), where it is put as a paraphrase upon γρυβα thy valiant ones,” in the prophecy of the desolation of Egypt by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar. ἄρτάβη was a measure which is mentioned by Herodotus as being used in Egypt and Persia. It is put for the “homer” in ^{<2350>}Isaiah 5:10, and it also occurs in Daniel 13:3 (History of Bel and the Dragon).

ἄχει, or ἄχι, is an Egyptian word for the papyrus, or some other reed or growth of the marshes. It occurs both in the Hebrew and Sept. of ^{<0440>}Genesis 41:2; ^{<2390>}Isaiah 19:7, 8. It is also found in Ecclesiastes 40:16.

γένεσις, as applied to the “creation” of the world, was traced by Hody to Egyptian philosophy. But it seems rather to be derived from the twdl wt, or genealogical narratives, of which the first book of the Pentateuch is composed.

ζύθος was a drink made from barley in Egypt, mentioned by Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. It is found in the Sept. version of ^{<2390>}Isaiah 19:10, where it seems that ρκς (strong drink) was read instead of ρκς (merchandise). θήρα is found in ^{<0216>}Psalms 132:16, “I will abundantly bless her provision.” Jerome said that it was an Egyptian word for corn; and Hesychius mentions ἄθηρά as a decoction of milk and corn employed by the Egyptians — perhaps the medicine *athara* of which Pliny speaks. The Heb. dyx is, however, rendered θήρα (venison) in ^{<0250>}Genesis 25 and 27.

ἵππόδρομος is used to denote a measurement of space in ^{<0359>}Genesis 35:19; 48:7. Jerome seems to have been perplexed by its introduction in these passages. Hody conjectures that the use of the word was suggested by the hippodrome which was constructed by Ptolemy Lagus at Alexandria, and was the scene of the events recorded in the 3d book of Maccabees. Thus the “hippodrome of Ephrath” signifies a certain distance from Bethlehem, which was nearly the interval between the goals of the Egyptian racecourse.

The word κόνδυ, used for a cup, in ^{<0440>}Genesis 44, ^{<2500>}Isaiah 51, is of Persian origin.

κόσμβος, a headband or fringed garment, the wearer of which is called κοσμβωτός (^{<0280>}Exodus 28; ^{<2390>}Isaiah 3), was an Egyptian ornament.

νομός, in ^{<239D>}Isaiah 19:2, is not to be read νομός, “law,” but has the sense of “province,” or “district,” Egypt being divided into νόμοί, governed by νομάρχαι, or prefects. In this sense it occurs in 1 Macc. 10:30.

οἴφι, was supposed by Jerome to be the Hebrew *ephah*; but Hesychius states that it was an Egyptian measure containing four χοίνικες (^{<0E3E>}Numbers 28:5; ^{<0769>}Judges 6:19).

πάπειρος, or πάπυρος, occurs in some of the Greek texts in ^{<011B>}Exodus 2:3, the Egyptian paper reed, which was the material of the ark in which the parents of Moses concealed him. It was also called βίβλος, and hence the “vessels of bulrushes” in ^{<238D>}Isaiah 18:2 are called ἐπιστολαὶ βιβλίαι.

παστοφόριον is used in the Sept. for the chambers and treasures adjoining the Temple inhabited by the priests and Levites (^{<131B>}1 Chronicles 9:26, 33; ^{<3018>}Ezekiel 40:18, etc.). They παστοφόροι are mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus as a class of priests among the Egyptians.

ῥαιφάν, in ^{<105E>}Amos 5:26, was an Egyptian name for the sun god, or the king of heaven. It is put for Ѡwyк, Chiun.

σινδών, in ^{<0742>}Judges 14:12, 13, was a fringed garment of fine linen which was made in Egypt.

στίβη, or στίμη, a dark purple or black, with which the guilty city of Jerusalem anoints her face to conceal her deformity (^{<204D>}Jeremiah 4:30). This is traced to στίμμης, a word of Egyptian origin.

σχοίνος, in ^{<1D9D>}Psalms 139:2, “Thou hast searched my path,” etc., was a word which, according to Herodotus, represented a measure of space or distance of sixty stadia.

ψονθομφανήχ, in ^{<044E>}Genesis 41:45, answers to the Heb. Zaphlath Paaneah. The latter is supposed to be an Egyptian word, signifying “the food of the living;” but Josephus and Origen ascribed to it the sense of “discoverer of secrets,” or “one to whom the future is revealed.” Hody supposed that ψονθομφανήχ also had this sense in the later Egyptian; but Jerome explains it to be the “Savior, or Deliverer, of the world.”

8. Another feature of this version is the many *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* expressions, as —

ἀπφώθ, ^{<3529>}Jeremiah 52:19.
 μαωζαίμ, ^{<27138>}Daniel 11:38.
 ἀριήλ, ^{<43122>}1 Chronicles 11:22.
 ναγέβ, ^{<33046>}Ezekiel 20:46.
 ἀριώθ, ^{<12049>}2 Kings 4:39.
 νέβελ, ^{<3002>}Hosea 3:2.
 Δαρόμ, ^{<33046>}Ezekiel 20:46.
 οὐλαμούζ, ^{<02349>}Genesis 28:19.
 Ἐσεφίμ, ^{<13317>}1 Chronicles 26:17.
 ξαθμέν, ^{<11504>}1 Kings 19:4.
 ζακχών, ^{<13311>}1 Chronicles 28:11.
 σαβέκ, ^{<01213>}Genesis 22:13.
 Ἰαμείν, ^{<01354>}Genesis 36:24.
 σοάμ, ^{<13202>}1 Chronicles 29:2.
 Ἰαρείμ, ^{<20513>}Hosea 5:13.
 φελλανί, ^{<02102>}1 Samuel 21:2.
 μαναά, ^{<12049>}2 Kings 8:9.
 χαβραθά, ^{<04407>}Genesis 41:7.
 μασμαρώθ, ^{<3529>}Jeremiah 52:19.
 χορρί, ^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4.
 μαχβάρ, ^{<12045>}2 Kings 8:15.

These and many more words must not be regarded, as has usually been the case, as a mark of ignorance of the Hebrew, but as attempts to mix the vernacular with Hebrew expressions. Besides such Hebrew words, we find a great many Hebraisms; as Greek words with a Hebrew signification, Greek words in Hebrew constructions, Hebrew constructions, etc. — too many to be enumerated.

9. Another peculiarity of the Alexandrian version is that the same word is differently translated, not only in different books, but also in the same book. This point is the more important, as it evidently shows that the different books must have had different translators. A comparison of the Pentateuch with the book of Joshua will prove this beyond a shadow of doubt.

A. VERBS.

dmj, *to desire*, <0207>Exodus 20:17; <01518>Deuteronomy 5:18; 7:25, ἐπιθυμῆν τι or τινός (<02404>Exodus 34:24); but <0072>Joshua 7:21, ἐνθυμοῦμαί τινος.

rpj, *to explore*, <0102>Deuteronomy 1:22, ἐφοδεύω; <01023>Joshua 2:23, κατασκοπεύω I bf, <0122>Exodus 12:22; <0046>Leviticus 4:6, 11; 19:9; 14:6, 16, 51; <04918>Numbers 19:18; <03324>Deuteronomy 33:24; <00815>Joshua 3:15, βάπτω; but <01371>Genesis 37:31, μολύνω.

dki, *to storm*: 1. λαμβάνειν; <0082>Joshua 8:21; 10:1, 28, 32, 35, 39; 11:12, 17; <0423>Numbers 32:39, 41, 42. 2. καταλαμβάνειν, <0089>Joshua 8:19; 11:10. 3. καταλαμβάνεσθαι, <02132>Numbers 21:32. 4. κρατεῖν, <01234>Deuteronomy 2:34; 3:4. 5. κυριεύειν, <01516>Joshua 15:16.

[sn, *to break up, to move on*: 1. ἀπαίρω, <01129>Genesis 12:9; 13:11; 33:12, 17 35:16; 37:17; 41:1; <02257>Exodus 12:37; 16:1; 17:1; 19:2; <04917>Numbers 9:17, 20, 21, 22, 23; 14:25; 20:22; 21:4, 10, 12, 13; 22:1; 33:3, 8, 9, 10, sq.; <00107>Deuteronomy 1:7,19; 2:1. 24; 10:6, 7, 11; <00801>Joshua 3:1, 3, 14; 9:17. 2. ἐξαίρω, <01315>Genesis 35:5; <02130>Exodus 13:20; <04151>Numbers 1:51; 2:9,16, 17, 24, 31, 34; 4:5, 15; 9:19; 10:5, 6, 17, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35; 11:35; 12:15; 13:1; 21:11. 3. αἶρω, <04217>Numbers 2:17, and ibid. ἐξαίρω. 4. στρατοπεδεύω, <01122>Genesis 12:2; <02400>Exodus 14:10; <00840>Deuteronomy 1:40. 5. κινέω, <01102>Genesis 11:2; 20:1. 6. προπορεύομαι, <04033>Numbers 10:33. 7. ἀναξεύγνυμι, <02165>Exodus 16:15; 40:36, 37.

These few examples may suffice.

B. NOUNS.

I ha, *a tent*: 1. σκηνή, <00020>Genesis 4:20; 12:8; 13:3, 5; 18:1, 2, 6, 9, 10; 26:25; 31:25; 33:19; <02317>Exodus 33:7, 8, 10; <04165>Numbers 16:26, 27; <00127>Deuteronomy 1:27; 11:6; <00721>Joshua 7:21, 22, 23, 24. 2. σκηνώμα, <03318>Deuteronomy 33:18; <00814>Joshua 3:14. 3. οικος, <00027>Genesis 9:27; 24:67; 31:33; <01204>Joshua 22:4, 7, 8. 4. οἰκία, <01257>Genesis 25:27. 5. συσκήνιον, <02166>Exodus 16:16.

āf is, 1. **παῖδια**, ^{<0459>}Genesis 45:19; ^{<0448>}Numbers 14:3, 31; ^{<0103>}Deuteronomy 1:39; 3:6; ^{<0114>}Joshua 1:14. 2. **τέκνα**, ^{<0124>}Deuteronomy 2:34; 3:19. 3. **ἔγκονα**, ^{<0291>}Deuteronomy 29:11; 31:12. 4. **συγγένεια**, ^{<0108>}Genesis 50:8. 5. **οικαί**, ^{<0121>}Genesis 50:21. 6. **ἀποσκευή**, ^{<0329>}Genesis 34:29; 43:7; 46:5; ^{<0200>}Exodus 10:10, 24; 12:37; ^{<0467>}Numbers 16:27; 31:9; 32:17, 24, 26; ^{<0104>}Deuteronomy 20:14. 7. **ἀποσκευαί**, ^{<0426>}Numbers 32:16. The same variations we find in *adverbs*, *particles*, *propel nouns*, but more especially in certain phrases.

See Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina* (Erlangen, 1840); Frankel, *Vorstudien der Septuaginta* (Leips. 1841); Kaulen, *Einleitung in die heilige Schrift* (Freiburg, 1876), p. 85 sq. (B.P.)

Septuagint, Talmudic Notices Concerning The

It is strange that the writers of the art. SEPTUAGINT in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible* and in Kitto's *Cyclop.* should not have mentioned the notices we find concerning that version in the Talmud and other Jewish writings. It is true that in Kitto we find it stated, "It is spoken of in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds;" but where, and what, the reader is at loss to see. Yet these notices are very important, since they throw a great deal of light upon some points which have vexed the interpreters. The oldest notice is that contained in the *Mechilta*, a Midrashic commentary on Exodus (comp. the art. MIDRASH), where ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40 is thus cited: **8wgw 8l ^çwgw /rabw ^[nk /rabw pyrxmb wbcy rça**, and where we read, "And this is one of those things which they wrote to king Ptolemy. In the same manner they wrote, ^{<0101>}Genesis 1:1, **tyçarb arb myhl a**; ver. 26, **twmdbw ml xb µda hç[a**; ver. 27 (comp.5:2), **wybwqnw**; 2, **yççh µwyb µyhl a l kyw**; 11:7, **hdra hl baw**,40; 18:12, **hybwrqbo**49:6, **µwba** (instead of **rwç**); ^{<0103>}Exodus 4:20, **µda açwn** (for **rmj h**); ^{<0465>}Numbers 16:15, **dwmj**; ^{<0349>}Deuteronomy 4:19 (they added) **ryahl**; 17:3, **µdb[l twmwal**; and they wrote, ^{<0106>}Leviticus 11:6, and ^{<0147>}Deuteronomy 14:7, **µyl grh try[x** (for **tbnrah**)." From this passage we can infer that, besides the changes enumerated here, others are not to be excluded; besides, it only speaks in general of those who wrote the Bible for Ptolemy, and neither the number seventy nor seventy-two writers or translators is mentioned. It is different with the relation given in the Jerus. Talmud, *M.egilla*, 1, 9. Here the number of changes made is given as thirteen

($\mu\text{ymkj wny}\zeta\text{ ybr g8 8y}$): the passages are the same as given in the *Mechilta*, with some very slight changes. Thus ^{<00027>}Genesis 1:27 (comp. 5, 2) we read wybqnrw ; 49:6, $\text{rw}\zeta$ (instead of ζya); ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40, $\mu\text{yrxmb twxrah l kbw}$; in ^{<0106>}Leviticus 11:6 (^{<0547>}Deuteronomy 14:7) the explanation of the change is given that the name of Ptolemy's mother was atnra . The number of the translators is also not given. The Babylonian Talmud, *Megilla*, 9 a, however, mentions the number of elders as seventy-two, who were put in seventy-two different cells without knowing for what purpose. Then king Ptolemy went to each of these and said to him, "Write for me the law of Moses, your teacher." God disposed it so that they all translated alike. The changes mentioned here are given without any number; but they are almost the same as the above, with slight modifications. ^{<00027>}Genesis 1:27 (comp. 5:2), hbqnrw is not changed, but μarb is changed into warb ; 49:6 agrees with the Jerusalem Talmud; and so, likewise, ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40. We find, as an addition, that in ^{<0245>}Exodus 24:5,11, yfwfaz is written for yr [n and yl yxa ; in ^{<0578>}Deuteronomy 17:3, we have the addition $\mu\text{db [l}$. without twmwal ; and to ^{<0106>}Leviticus 11:6 (^{<0547>}Deuteronomy 14:7) a similar explanation is given as in the Jerusalem Talmud, that the name of Ptolemy's wife was tbnra ; and hence they thought that it would be regarded as a mockery, on the side of the Jews, should they have mentioned her name (as that of an unclean animal) in the law. In the Midrashim only single passages are mentioned thus ^{<00027>}Genesis 1:27 in *Bereshith Rabba*; ch. 8, as *Mechilta*, with which also agrees ^{<0002>}Genesis 2:2 in ch. 10, 11:7 with ch. 38; 18:12 with ch. 48; 49, 6 with ch. 98, where, as in *Mechilta*, we find swba . All these passages are accompanied with the remark that here is one of the changes made for Ptolemy, without giving their number In *Shemnoth Rabba*, ch. 5 on ^{<0020>}Exodus 4:20, it is stated that this is one of the *eighteen* changes made for Ptolemy, without stating wherein these changes consist. In *Bereshith Rabba*, ch. 63 on ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40, in order to show that Abraham was already called "Israel," the verse is quoted, "It is an old matter; the dwelling of the Israelites in Egypt, Canaan, and Goshen," etc. (and thus Abraham's stay in Egypt and Canaan is numbered among the 430 years). In the treatise *Sepher Torah*, 1, 8, 9, seventy elders are mentioned who wrote the law, and the alterations made are given as thirteen. In the treatise *Sopherim*, 1, 7, 8, we also read of thirteen alterations made by the translators.

In examining more minutely these changes we shall find the following:

1. ^{<0002>}Genesis 1:1-3, according to the structure of the language and the most ancient traditions still preserved by Rashi and Aben-Ezra, is to be rendered “*In the beginning when God created.*” But as this supposes the existence of primordial waters and of a chaotic mass, which, by the draining of the waters on the second day, became the formed earth, it was thought necessary, in translating the Bible into Greek, and in opposition to the Greek cosmogony and polytheism, to lay great stress on the absolute unity of God and on the absolute creation from nothing. Hence the word **tyçar** had to be made independent of the following verses, and to be rendered *in the beginning*, **ἐν ἀρχῇ**
ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, instead of “in the beginning *when.*” This change the Talmud indicates by the pregnant construction **tyçarb arb myhl a**, thus placing **tyçarb**last, and precluding every other translation than *God created in the beginning* (Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 344, etc.).
2. ^{<0002>}Genesis 1:26, where we read “Let us make man in *our* Image (**wmml xb**), after *our* likeness (**wntwmdk**),” has been altered into “I will make man in the image (**ml xb**), and in the likeness (**twmdbw**),” to remove the appearance of polytheism.
3. ^{<0002>}Genesis 2:2, where “And he ended on the *seventh* (**y[ybçh]**) day” has been changed into (**yççh**) the *sixth* day, to avoid the apparent contradiction, since God did not work on the seventh day. This alteration is still to be found in our text of the Sept., and also in the Samaritan version (**htytç**), and in the Syriac (**aytytç**).
4. ^{<0002>}Genesis 5:2 (1:27), where “Male and female created he *them* (**parb mta arb**) has been altered into *created he him* (**warb**), to remove the apparent contradiction in the passage where the man and woman are spoken of as having been created together or simultaneously.
5. ^{<0002>}Genesis 11:7, for the same reason as in 2, the words “Let us go down, and let *us* confound” (**hl bww hdr**) have been changed into “I will go down and I will confound” (**hrra hl baw**

6. ^{<01812>}Genesis 18:12, “After my decay I had again pleasure” has been altered into (hnd[]yl htyh yTαβαρha, Οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν του νου), *after it had been thus with me hitherto*, to avoid the offensive application to the distinguished mother of Israel of the expression hl B; which is used for rotten old garments (comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 45 sq.).
7. ^{<0406>}Genesis 49:6, “In their anger they slew a man, and in their self will they hamstring an ox,” has been altered into “In their anger they slew an ox (r/ç), and in their self will they hamstring a fatted bull (swba),” to do away with the wholesale slaughter of men.
8. ^{<0003>}Exodus 4:20, the word rwmj , ass, is altered into ὑποζύγια, *beasts of burden*, because of the reluctance which the translators had to mention the name of this beast. This alteration is still preserved in our text of the Sept.
9. In ^{<0224>}Exodus 12:40, *and all other lands*, i.e. “the land of Canaan,” has been added in order to remove the apparent contradiction, since the Israelites did not sojourn four hundred and thirty years in Egypt.
10. ^{<0245>}Exodus 24:5, 11, yr [n and yl yxa are changed into yfwf [z (=ζητητής; i.e. *worthy, or searchers after wisdom*), because it was not thought becoming to say that at his great revelation *boys or youths* (myr [n) were brought as sacrifices.
11. In ^{<01106>}Leviticus 11:6 and ^{<0547>}Deuteronomy 14:7, tbnra=λαγός, *a hare*, has been altered into χοιρογρούλλος, *porcupine or hedgehog*, to avoid giving offense to the Ptolemy family, whose name was *Lagos*.
12. ^{<0465>}Numbers 16:15, rmj , *ass*, was changed into ἐπιθύμημα=dmj , *a desirable thing*, for the same reason as given under 8. This alteration is still in our text of the Sept.
13. ^{<0349>}Deuteronomy 4:19, the word ryahl =διακοσμέω *to shine*, has been inserted so as to avoid the idolatry of the heathen being ascribed to God.
14. ^{<0573>}Deuteronomy 17:3, where we read that God had not commanded *the Israelites* to worship other gods (in accordance with ^{<0349>}Deuteronomy 4:19), has been altered to (ytywx al rça db[l twmwal) *which I have*

forbidden the nations to worship, to preclude the possibility of ascribing the origin of idolatry to the God of Israel.

This much for the alterations. But there are two other very important notices, viz. “that the day on which the translation of the Bible into Greek was made was regarded as a great calamity equal to that of the worship of the golden calf” (*Sopherim*, 1, 7); and “the day on which it was accomplished was believed to have been the beginning of a preternatural darkness of three days’ duration over the whole world, and was commemorated as a day of fasting and humiliation” (comp Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, 3, 214-216). The Samaritans took the same view on account of their hatred of the Jewish translation (comp. Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3, 537). Says dean Stanley, “It needs but slight evidence to convince us that such a feeling, more or less widely spread, must have existed. It is the same instinct which to this hour makes it a sin, if not an impossibility. in the eyes of a devout Mussulman, to translate the Koran; which in the Christian Church assailed Jerome with the coarsest vituperation for venturing on a Latin version which differed from the Greek; which at the Reformation regarded it as a heresy to translate the Latin Scriptures into the languages of modern Europe; and which, in England, has in our own days regarded it in the English Church as a dangerous innovation to revise the Authorized Version of the 17th century, or in the Roman Church to correct the barbarous dialect of the Douay translation of the Vulgate, or to admit of any errors in the text or in the rendering of the Vulgate itself. In one and all of these cases the reluctance has sprung from the same tenacious adherence to ancient and sacred forms — from the same unwillingness to admit of the dislodgment even of the most flagrant inaccuracies when once familiarized by established use. But in almost all these cases, except, perhaps, the Koran, this sentiment has been compelled to yield to the more generous desire of arriving at the hidden meaning of sacred truth, and of making that truth more widely known. So it was, in the most eminent degree, in the case of the Septuagint” (*Jewish Church*, 3, 286 sq.). While we agree in the main with the learned dean, yet in the case of the Sept. the explanation of the above given Talmudic statement must be sought for somewhere else. It is known that most of the early controversies with the Jews were conducted in the Greek language, and on the common ground of the faithfulness of the Sept. version, which was quoted alike on both sides. And so it continued to be respected during the age of the writers of the New Test. and the 1st

century of the Christian era. As, however, the version grew into use among Christians, it gradually lost the confidence of the Jews, especially when it was urged against them by the Christians. The first signs of this appear in the works of Justin Martyr, in the 2d century. *His Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* professes to be the account of a discussion which actually took place, and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4, 18) places the scene of it at Ephesus. The *Dialogue* abounds in citations from the Old Test.; and even such passages are quoted as are not to be found in the Hebrew. The latter circumstance made Justin charge the Jews with removing especially four prophecies of Christ from their copies. The first of these is: “And Ezra said unto the people, This passover is our Savior and our refuge; and if ye consider and it enter into your heart that we shall, by a figure (ἐνσημείω, i.e. the cross), afflict him — and afterwards hope in him, this place shall not be made desolate to all time, saith the Lord God of Hosts. But if ye believe him not, and hear not his preaching, ye shall become a spoil for the Gentiles” (*Dial.* c. 72). This passage, which is also quoted by Lactantius (*Instit. Divin.* 4, c. 18), is not to be found in the book of Ezra, and may probably have been interpolated according to the Apocryphal Ezra (6:21) into the copies of the Sept. by some Christian. The second (from ~~2119~~ Jeremiah 11:19) had, he said, been but recently erased from certain copies, and was retained in others which were preserved in the synagogues. This, however, is found entire in all our present copies. The third passage is said to be taken also from Jeremiah: “And the Lord God remembered his dead, who were fallen asleep in the dust of their tombs, and descended to them to declare unto them the good tidings of his salvation.” These words are remarkable from their resemblance to those of ~~4046~~ 1 Peter 4:6 (νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη. The passage of Jeremiah, as alleged by Justin Martyr, read κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι). “If a genuine passage,” says Churton, “the apostle’s words seem to contain an allusion to them as well as to the doctrine enunciated in the preceding chapter of his epistle. If interpolated by a Christian convert from some traditional saying of the prophet, or adapted from Peter’s words, it seems that the person who introduced them into the text of the Sept. took the words of the apostle in their literal sense, and not as later commentators have conjectured, that the persons called νεκροί were alive at the time of the preaching.” The fourth and last passage is from ~~3960~~ Psalm 96:10, “Declare among the heathen that the Lord hath reigned from the tree” (*Dial.* c. 73). Out of this passage the Jews are accused of having erased the last words, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. The words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου are quoted again by Justin Martyr in his *Apology*;

they are also quoted by Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* c. 10), Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Gregory, and others. Yet the words occur in no Greek or Hebrew MS., and the probability is that they were added by some Christian. Under these circumstances we can very well understand the feeling of the Jews towards a version which brought such accusations against them; and this, it seems, gives us the real clue to the Talmudic passage which regarded the day of the translation of the Bible into Greek as a great calamity. See Frankel, *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta*, p. 25 sq.; Geiger, *Urschrift der Bibel*, p. 439 sq.; *Masechet Soferim* (ed. Müller, Leips. 1878), p. 12 sq.; Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible*, p. 70 sq.; Churton, *The Influence of the Septuagint Version*, p. 41 sq.; Reinke, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Alten Testaments*, 7, 292 sq.; Friedlander, *Patristische und talmudische Studien* (Vienna, 1878), p. 133 sq. (B.P.)

Septum

a term used by certain 17th-century Anglican writers for the fixed or movable *rail* placed on each side of the entrance of the sanctuary to support the communicants when they knelt to receive the Lord's body and blood.

Sepulchre

(*rbq*, *kber*, or *hrWbq*] *keburah*, a burying place or grave, as sometimes rendered; *τάφος*, a tomb, as elsewhere rendered; also *μνήμα* or *μνημείον*, a monument, likewise rendered "grave" or "tomb"). Mankind in all ages have been careful, indeed of necessity, to provide suitable resting places for the dead. In treating of the Hebrew usages in this respect, we will adduce whatever elucidation modern research has contributed to them. *SEE BURIAL.*

I. General Principles of Sepulture. —

1. The Duty. The Jews uniformly disposed of the corpse by entombment where possible, and, failing that, by interment; extending this respect to the remains even of the slain enemy and malefactor (¹1 Kings 11:15; ¹²²³Deuteronomy 21:23), in the latter case by express provision of law. Since this was the only case so guarded by Mosaic precept it may be concluded that natural feeling was relied on as rendering any such general injunction superfluous. Similarly, to disturb remains was regarded as a barbarity, only justifiable in the case of those who had themselves outraged

religion (^{<12316>}2 Kings 23:16, 17; ^{<181>}Jeremiah 8:1, 2). The rabbins quote the doctrine “dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” as a reason for preferring to entomb or inter their dead; but that preferential practice is older than the Mosaic record, as traceable in patriarchal examples, and continued unaltered by any Gentile influence; so Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 5) notices that it was a point of Jewish custom *potius corpora condere quam cremare*. **SEE CORPSE.**

The precedent of Jacob’s and Joseph’s remains being returned to the land of Canaan was followed, in wish at least, by every pious Jew. Adopting a similar notion, some of the rabbins taught that only in that land could those who were buried obtain a share in the resurrection which was to usher in the Messiah’s reign on earth. Thus that land was called by them “the land of the living,” and the sepulchre itself “the house of the living.” Some even feigned that the bodies of the righteous, wherever else buried, rolled back to Canaan underground, and found there only their appointed rest (Nicolaus, *De Sepult. Heb.* 13, 1). Tombs were, in popular belief, led by the same teaching, invested with traditions. Thus Machpelah is stated (Lightfoot, *Centuria Chorographica*, s.v. “Hebron”) to have been the burial place not only of Abraham and Sarah, but also of Adam and Eve; and there was probably at the time of the New Test. a spot fixed upon by tradition as the site of the tomb of every prophet of note in the Old Test. To repair and adorn these was deemed a work of exalted piety (^{<1239>}Matthew 23:29). The scruples of the scribes extended even to the burial of the ass whose neck was broken (^{<1234>}Exodus 34:20), and of the first born of cattle (Maimon. *De Primogen.* 3, 4, quoted by Nicolaus, *De Sepult. Heb.* 16:3, 4). **SEE GRAVE.**

2. Rites. — On this subject we should remember that our impressions, as derived from the Old Test., are those of the burial of persons of rank or public eminence, while those gathered from the New Test. regard a private station. But in both cases “the manner of the Jews” included the use of spices where they could command the means. Thus Asa lay in a “bed of spices” (^{<1464>}2 Chronicles 16:14). A portion of these were burned in honor of the deceased, and to this use was probably destined part of the one hundred pounds’ weight of “myrrh and aloes” in our Lord’s case. On high state occasions the vessels, bed; and furniture used by the deceased were burned also. Such was probably the “great burning” made for Asa. If a king was unpopular or died disgraced (e.g. Jehoram, ^{<1619>}2 Chronicles 31:19; Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 5, 3), this was not observed. In no case, save that of Saul

and his sons, were the bodies burned, nor in that case were they so burned as not to leave the “bones” easily concealed and transported, and the whole proceeding looks like a hasty precaution against hostile violence. Even then the bones were interred and re-exhumed for solemn entombment. The ambiguous word in ^{<3160>}Amos 6:10, **וּפְרִי־שֵׁמֶן** rendered in the A.V. “he that burneth *him*,” possibly means “the burner of perfumes in his honor,” i.e. his near relation, on whom such duties devolved; rather than, as most think, “the burner of the *corpse*.” For a great mortality never causes men to burn corpses where it is not the custom of the country; nor did the custom vary among the Jews on such an occasion (^{<3592>}Ezekiel 39:12-14). It was the duty of the next of kin to perform and preside over the whole funereal office; but a company of public buriers, originating in an exceptional necessity (Ezekiel *loc. cit.*), had become, it seems, customary in the times of the New Test. (^{<4116>}Acts 5:6, 10). The closing of the eyes, kissing, and washing the corpse (^{<0440>}Genesis 46:4; 1:1; ^{<4087>}Acts 9:37) are customs common to all nations. Coffins were but seldom used, and, if used, were open; but fixed stone sarcophagi were common in tombs of rank. The bier, the word for which in the Old Test. is the same as that rendered bed, **SEE BED**, was borne by the nearest relatives, and followed by any who wished to do honor to the dead. The grave clothes (**ὀθόνια, ἐντάφια**) were probably of the fashion worn in life, but swathed and fastened with bandages, and the head was covered separately. Previously to this being done, spices were applied to the corpse in the form of ointment, or between the folds of the linen; hence our Lord’s remark that the woman had anointed his body **πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάζειν**, “with a view to dressing it in these **ἐντάφια**,” not, as in the A.V., “for the *burial*.” For the custom of mourners visiting the sepulchre, **SEE MOURN**; for other usages, **SEE FUNERAL**.

3. The Site. — A natural cave enlarged and adapted by excavation, or an artificial imitation of one, was the standard type of sepulchre. This was what the structure of the Jewish soil supplied or suggested. A distinct and simple form of sepulture as contrasted with the complex and elaborate rites of Egypt clings to the region of Palestine, and varies but little with the great social changes between the periods of Abraham and the captivity. Jacob and Joseph, who both died in Egypt, are the only known instances of the Egyptian method applied to patriarchal remains. Sepulchres, when the owner’s means permitted it, were commonly prepared beforehand, and stood often in gardens, by roadsides, or even adjoining houses. Kings and

prophets alone were probably buried within towns (^{<1020>}1 Kings 2:10; 16:6, 28; ^{<1205>}2 Kings 10:35; 13:9; ^{<4464>}2 Chronicles 16:14; 28:27; ^{<0201>}1 Samuel 25:1; 28:3). Sarah's tomb and Rachel's seem to have been chosen merely from the accident of the place of death; but the successive interments at the former (^{<0481>}Genesis 49:31) are a chronicle of the strong family feeling among the Jews. It was the sole fixed spot in the unsettled patriarchal life; and its purchase and transfer, minutely detailed, are remarkable as the sole transaction of the kind, until repeated on a similar occasion at Shechem. Thus it was deemed a misfortune or an indignity, not only to be deprived of burial (^{<2140>}Isaiah 14:20; Jeremiah *passim*; ^{<1190>}2 Kings 9:10), but, in a lesser degree, to be excluded from the family sepulchre (^{<1132>}1 Kings 13:22), as were Uzziah, the royal leper, and Manasseh (^{<4623>}2 Chronicles 26:23; 33:20). Thus the remains of Saul and his sons were reclaimed to rest in his father's tomb. Similarly, it was a mark of a profound feeling towards a person not of one's family to wish to be buried with him (^{<0817>}Ruth 1:17; ^{<1131>}1 Kings 13:31), or to give him a place in one's own sepulchre (^{<0205>}Genesis 23:6; comp. ^{<4246>}2 Chronicles 24:16). The head of a family commonly provided space for more than one generation; and these galleries of kindred sepulchres are common in many Eastern branches of the human race. Cities soon became populous and demanded cemeteries (comp. *πολυάνδριον*, Sept. at ^{<2595>}Ezekiel 39:15), which were placed without the walls; such a one seems intended by the expression in ^{<1236>}2 Kings 23:6, "the graves of the children of the people," situated in the valley of the Kedron or of Jehoshaphat. Jeremiah (7:32; 19:11) threatens that the eastern valley, called Tophet, the favorite haunt of idolatry, should be polluted by burying there (comp. ^{<1236>}2 Kings 23:16). Such was also the "potter's field" (^{<4127>}Matthew 27:7) which had, perhaps, been wrought by digging for clay into holes serviceable for graves., *SEE CEMETERIES.*

II. *Explicit Information from Ancient Sources as to the Style of Sepulchres.* —

1. From a Comparison with Early Heathen Nations. — It has been too much the fashion to look to Egypt for the prototype of every form of Jewish art. The Egyptian tombs at Thebes were extensive excavations in the barren, mountains which skirted the city on the west. In like manner, the magnificent tombs in the necropolis of Sela, in Arabia Petraea, were sculptured out of the sides of the rock surrounding the ancient city. *SEE PETRA.* The Edomites and the Egyptians seem to have regarded the habitations of the living merely as temporary resting places, while the

tombs are regarded as permanent and eternal mansions; and, while not a vestige of a habitation is to be seen, the tombs remain monuments of splendor and magnificence, perhaps even more wonderful than the ruins of their temples. Funeral urns or vases are found in great numbers on the plains and mounds of Assyria and Mesopotamia containing human skeletons or fragments of bones which appear to have been calcined.

Picture for Sepulchre 1

But in Jewish history there is a total diversity from these customs in the matter of tombs. From the burial of Sarah in the cave of Machpelah (^{<0239>}Genesis 23:19) to the funeral rites prepared for Dorcas (^{<4037>}Acts 9:37) there: is no mention of any sarcophagus, or even coffin, in any Jewish burial. No pyramid was raised — no separate hypogeum of any individual king, and, what is most to be regretted by modern investigators, no inscription or painting which either recorded the name of the deceased or symbolized the religious feeling of the Jews towards the dead. It is true, of course, that Jacob, dying in Egypt, was embalmed (^{<0002>}Genesis 1:2), but it was only in order that he might be brought to be entombed in the cave at Hebron, and Joseph, as a naturalized Egyptian and a ruler in the land, was embalmed”; and it is also mentioned as something exceptional that he was put into a coffin, and was so brought by the Israelites out of the land and laid with his forefathers. But these, like the burning of the body of Saul, were clearly exceptional cases. *SEE EMBALMING.*

Still less were the rites of the Jews like those of the Pelasgi or Etruscans. With that people the graves of the dead were, or were intended to be, in every respect similar to the homes of the living. The lucumo lay in his robes, the warrior in his armor on the bed on which he had reposed in life, surrounded by the furniture, the vessels, and the ornaments which had adorned his dwelling when alive, as if he were to live again in a new world with the same wants and feelings as before. Besides this, no tall stele and no sepulchral mound has yet been found in the hills or plains of Judaea, nor have we any hint either in the Bible or Josephus of any such having existed which could be traced to a strictly Jewish origin. In very distinct contrast to all this, the sepulchral rites of the Jews were marked with the same simplicity that characterized all their religious observances. The body was washed and anointed (^{<4148>}Mark 14:8; 16:1; ^{<5593>}John 19:39, etc.), wrapped in a clean linen cloth, and borne without any funeral pomp to the grave, where it was laid without any ceremonial or form of prayer. In addition to

this, with kings and great persons there seems to have been a “great burning” (~~464~~ 2 Chronicles 16:14; 21:19; ~~2615~~ Jeremiah 34:5), all these being measures more suggested by sanitary exigencies than by any hankering after ceremonial pomp.

Picture for Sepulchre 2

2. *Normal Style.* — This simplicity of rite led to what may be called the distinguishing characteristic of Jewish sepulchres — the *deep loculus* — which, so far as is now known, is universal in all purely Jewish rock cut tombs, but hardly known elsewhere. Its form will be understood by referring to the annexed diagram, representing the forms of Jewish sepulture. In the apartment marked A, there are twelve such loculi about two feet in width by three feet high. On the ground floor these generally open on the level of the floor; when in the upper story, as at C, on a ledge or platform, on which the body might be laid to be anointed, and on which the stones might rest that closed the outer end of each loculus. The shallow loculus is shown in chamber B, but was apparently only used when sarcophagi were employed, and therefore, so far as we know, only during the Graeco-Roman period, when foreign customs came to be adopted. The shallow loculus would have been singularly inappropriate and inconvenient where an unembalmed body was laid out to decay, as there would evidently be no means of shutting it off from the rest of the catacomb. The deep loculus, on the other hand, was as strictly conformable with Jewish customs, and could easily be closed by a stone fitted to the end and luted into the groove which usually exists there. This fact is especially interesting, as it affords a key to much that is otherwise hard to be understood in certain passages in the New Test. Thus in ~~8113~~ John 11:39, Jesus says, “Take away the stone,” and (ver. 40) “they took away the stone,” without difficulty, apparently; which could hardly have been the case had it been such a rock as would be required to close the entrance of a cave. Also in 20:1 the same expression is used, “the stone is taken away;” and though the Greek word in the other three Evangelists certainly implies that it was *rolled* away, this would equally apply to the stone at the mouth of the loculus, into which the Marys must have then stooped down to look in. In fact, the whole narrative is infinitely more clear and intelligible if we assume that it was a stone closing the end of a rock cut grave than if we suppose it to have been a stone closing the entrance or door of a hypogeum. In the latter case the stone to close a door — say six feet by three feet — could hardly have weighed less than three or four tons, and

could not have been moved without machinery. There is one catacomb — that known as the “Tombs of the Kings” (see below) — which is closed by a stone rolling across its entrance; but it is the only one, and the immense amount of contrivance and fitting which it has required is sufficient proof that such an arrangement was not applied to any other of the numerous rock tombs around Jerusalem, nor could the traces of it have been obliterated had it anywhere existed. From the nature of the openings where they are natural caverns, and the ornamental form of their doorways where they are architecturally adorned, it is evident, except in this one instance, that they could not have been closed by stones rolled across their entrances; and consequently it seems only to be to the closing of the loculi that these expressions can refer. But until a more careful and more scientific exploration of these tombs is made than has hitherto been given to the public, it is difficult to feel quite certain on this point.

Although, as we have seen, the Jews were singularly free from the pomps and vanities of funereal magnificence, they were at all stages of their independent existence an eminently burying people. From the time of their entrance into the Holy Land till their expulsion by the Romans they seem to have attached the greatest importance to the possession of an undisturbed resting place for the bodies of their dead, and in all ages seem to have shown the greatest respect, if not veneration, for the sepulchres of their ancestors. Few, however, could enjoy the luxury of a rock cut tomb. Taking all that are known, and all that are likely to be discovered, there are not probably 500, certainly not 1000, rock cut loculi in or about Jerusalem; and as that city must in the days of its prosperity have possessed a population of from 30,000 to 40,000 souls, it is evident that the bulk of the people must then, as now, have been content with graves dug in the earth, but situated as near the holy places as their means would allow their obtaining a place. The bodies of the kings were buried close to the Temple walls (²⁶⁸⁰Ezekiel 43:7-9), and, however little they may have done in their life, the place of their burial is carefully recorded in the Chronicles of the Kings, and the cause why that place was chosen is generally pointed out, as if that record was not only the most important event, but the final judgment on the life of the king.

3. Talmudical Statements. — The Mishnic description of a sepulchre, complete according to Rabbinical notions, is somewhat as follows, and serves to illustrate the above plan: a cavern about six cubits square, or six by eight, from three sides of which are recessed longitudinally several

vaults, called $\mu\gamma\kappa\omega\kappa$, each large enough for a corpse. On the fourth side the cavern is approached through a small open covered court or portico, $\Gamma\chi\text{J}$, of a size to receive the bier and bearers. In some such structures the demoniac may have housed. The entry from the court to the cavern was closed by a large stone, called I l g , as capable of being rolled, thus confirming the Evangelistic narrative. Sometimes several such caverns, each with its recesses, were entered from the several sides of the same portico (Mishna, *Baba Bathra*, 6, 8, quoted by J. Nicolaus, *De Sepulchris Hebroeorum*). Such a tomb is that described in Buckingham's *Travels in Arabia* (p. 158), and those known to tradition as the "Tombs of the Kings" (above referred to). But earlier sepulchres were doubtless more simple, and, to judge from ^{<1231>}2 Kings 13:21, did not prevent mutual contact of remains. Sepulchres were marked sometimes by pillars, as that of Rachel, or by pyramids, as those of the Asmonseans at Modin (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 6, 7), and had places of higher and lower honor. Like temples, they were, from their assumed inviolability, sometimes made the depositories of treasures (De Saulcy, 2, 183). We find them also distinguished by a "title" (^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:17). Such as were not otherwise noticeable were scrupulously "whited" (^{<1231>}Matthew 23:27) once a year, after the rains before the Passover, to warn passers by of defilement (Hottinger, *Cippi Hebr.* p. 1034; Rossteusch, *De Sepul. Calce Notat.* in Ugolino, 33).

III. Historical Notices of Hebrew Sepulchres, Illustrated from certain Antique Jewish Tombs still Extant.

1. *Sepulchres of the Patriarchs and other Early Personages.* — We find that one of the most striking events in the life of Abraham is the purchase of the field of Ephron the Hittite at Hebron, in which was the cave of Machpelah, in order that he might therein bury Sarah, his wife, and that it might be a sepulchre for himself and his children. His refusing to accept the privilege of burying there as a gift shows the importance Abraham attached to the transaction, and he insisted on purchasing and paying for it (^{<1231>}Genesis 23:20), in order that it might be "made sure unto him for the possession of a burying place." There he and his immediate descendants were laid 3700 years ago, and there they are believed to rest now; but no one in modern times has seen their remains, or been allowed to enter into the cave where they repose. A few years ago, Signor Pierotti says, he was allowed, in company with the pasha of Jerusalem, to descend the steps to the iron grating that closes the entrance and to look into the cave. What he

seems to have seen was that it was a natural cavern, untouched by the chisel and unaltered by art in any way. Those who accompanied the prince of Wales in his visit to the mosque were not permitted to see even this entrance. All they saw was the round hole in the floor of the mosque which admits light and air to the cave below. The same round opening exists at Neby Samwil in the roof of the reputed sepulchre of the prophet Samuel, and at Jerusalem there is a similar opening into the tomb under the dome of the rock. In the former it is used by pious votaries to drop petitions and prayers into the tombs of patriarchs and prophets. The latter having lost the tradition of its having been a burying place, the opening now only serves to admit light into the cave below. Unfortunately, none of those who have visited Hebron have had sufficient architectural knowledge to be able to say when the church or mosque which now stands above the cave was erected; but there is no great reason for doubting that it is a Byzantine church erected there between the age of Constantine and that of Justinian. From such indications as can be gathered, it seems of the later period. On its floor are sarcophagi purporting to be those of the patriarchs; but, as is usual in Eastern tombs, they are only cenotaphs representing those that stand below, and which are esteemed too sacred for the vulgar to approach. Though it is much more easy of access, it is almost as difficult to ascertain the age of the wall that encloses the sacred precincts of these tombs. From the account of Josephus (*War*, 4, 7), it does not seem to have existed in his day, or he surely would have mentioned it; and such a citadel could hardly fail to have been of warlike importance in those troublous times. Besides this, we do not know of any such enclosure encircling any tombs or sacred place in Jewish times, nor can we conceive any motive for so secluding these graves. There are not any architectural moldings about this wall which would enable an archaeologist to approximate its date; and if the beveling is assumed to be a Jewish arrangement (which is very far from being exclusively the case), on the other hand it may be contended that no buttressed wall of Jewish masonry exists anywhere. There is, in fact, nothing known with sufficient exactness to decide the question, but the probabilities certainly tend towards a Christian or Saracenic origin for the whole structure, both internally and externally. *SEE MACHPELAH.*

Picture for Sepulchre 3

For *Joseph's Tomb* and *Rache's Tomb*, see those articles respectively.

Aaron died on the summit of Mount Hor (^{<0108>}Numbers 20:28; 33:39), and we are led to infer he was buried there, though it is not so stated; and we have no details of his tomb which would lead us to suppose that anything existed there earlier than the Mohammedan Kubr that now crowns the hill overlooking Petra, and it is, at the same time, extremely doubtful whether *that* is the Mount Hor where the high priest died. *SEE HOR.*

Moses died in the plains of Moab (^{<0346>}Deuteronomy 34:6), and was buried there, “but no man knoweth his sepulchre to this day,” which is a singular utterance, as being the only instance in the Old Test. of a sepulchre being concealed, or of one being admitted to be unknown. *SEE NEBO.*

Joshua was buried in his own inheritance in Timnathserah (^{<0340>}Joshua 24:30), and Samuel in his own house at Ramah (^{<0250>}1 Samuel 25:1), an expression which we may probably interpret as meaning in the garden attached to his house, as it is scarcely probable it would be the dwelling itself. We know, however, so little of the feelings of the Jews of that age on the subject that it is by no means improbable that it may have been in a chamber or loculus attached to the dwelling, and which, if closed by a stone carefully cemented into its place, would have prevented any annoyance from the circumstance. Joab (^{<1023>}1 Kings 2:34) was also buried “in his own house in the wilderness.” In fact, it appears that from the time when Abraham established the burying place of his family at Hebron till the time when David fixed that of his family in the city which bore his name, the Jewish rulers had no fixed or favorite place of sepulture. Each was buried on his own property, or where he died, without much caring either for the sanctity or convenience of the place chosen.

2. Sepulchre of David. — Of the twenty-two kings of Judah who reigned at Jerusalem from 1048 to 590 B.C., eleven, or exactly one half, were buried in one hypogeum in the “city of David.” The names of the kings so lying together were David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijab, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Ahaziah, Amaziah, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah, together with the good priest Jehoiada. Of all these it is merely said that they were buried in “the sepulchres of their fathers” or “of the kings” in the city of David, except of two — Asa and Hezekiah. Of the first it is said (^{<4164>}2 Chronicles 16:14), “they buried him in his own sepulchres which he had made for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed [loculus?], which was filled with sweet odors, and divers spices prepared by the apothecaries’ art: and they made a very great burning for him.” It is not

quite clear, however. whether this applies to a new chamber attached to the older sepulchre, or to one entirely distinct, though in the same neighborhood.. Of Hezekiah it is said (^{<4433>}2 Chronicles 32:33), they buried him in “the chiefest [or highest] of the sepulchres of the sons of David,” as if there were several apartments in the hypogeum, though it may merely be that they excavated for him a chamber above the others, as we find frequently done in Jewish sepulchres. Two more of these kings (Jehoram and Joash) were buried also in the city of David, “but not in the sepulchres of the kings;” the first because of the sore diseases of which he died (^{<4277>}2 Chronicles 21:20); the second apparently in consequence of his disastrous end (^{<4425>}2 Chronicles 24:25); and one king, Uzziah (^{<4433>}2 Chronicles 26:23), was buried with his fathers in the “field of the burial of the kings,” because he was a leper. All this evinces the extreme care the Jews took in the selection of the burying places of their kings, and the importance they attached to the record. It should also be borne in mind that the highest honor which could be bestowed on the good priest Jehoiada (^{<4246>}2 Chronicles 24:16) was that “they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both towards God and towards his house.”

The passage in ^{<4416>}Nehemiah 3:16, and in ^{<3637>}Ezekiel 43:7, 9, together with the reiterated assertion of the books of Kings and Chronicles, that these sepulchres were situated in the city of David, leave no doubt that they were on Zion (q.v.). It is quite clear, however, that the spot was well known during the whole of the Jewish period, inasmuch as the sepulchres were again and again opened as each king died; and from the tradition that Hyrcanus and Herod opened these sepulchres (*Ant.* 13, 8, 4; 16, 7, 1). The accounts of these last openings are, it must be confessed, somewhat apocryphal, resting only on the authority of Josephus; but they prove at least that he considered there could be no difficulty in finding the place. It was a secret transaction, if it took place, regarding which rumor might fashion what’ wondrous tales it pleased, and no one could contradict them; but there having been built a marble stele (*Ant.* 16, 7, 1) in front of the tomb may have been a fact within the cognizance of Josephus, and would, at all events; serve to indicate that the sepulchre was rock cut, and its site well known. So far as we can judge from this and other indications, it seems probable there was originally a natural cavern in the rock in this locality, which may afterwards have been improved by art, and in the sides of which loculi were sunk, where the bodies of the eleven kings and of the

good high priest were laid, without sarcophagi or coffins, but “wound in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury” (~~4394~~John 19:40).

Picture for Sepulchre 4

Modern tradition has assigned the name of the *Tomb of David* (also of Solomon) to a structure still standing on Mount Zion outside the present city walls, otherwise called the *Caenaculum*, from the tradition that it was likewise the building in which the Lord’s supper was instituted. From the time of the notice by the apostle Peter (~~4423~~Acts 2:29), which shows that the true site was then well known, the royal tombs appear to have been forgotten, or at least they are not mentioned till the close of the 11th century, when Raymond d’Agiles, one of the historians of the first crusade, says regarding the Coenaculum, “There are also in that church...the sepulchres of king David and Solomon, and of the holy protomartyr Stephen” (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 174). In the next century Benjamin of Tudela visited the holy city, and wrote the following singular story, which has perhaps some foundation in fact: “On Mount Zion are the sepulchres of the house of David, and those of the kings who reigned after him. In consequence of the following circumstance, this place is hardly to be recognized. Fifteen years ago one of the walls of the church on Zion (the Coenaculum) fell down, and the patriarch commanded the priest to repair it. He ordered stones to be taken from the original wall of Zion for that purpose, and twenty workmen were hired at stated wages, who broke stones taken from the very foundation of the wall of Zion. Two laborers thus employed found a stone which covered the mouth of a cave. This they entered in search of treasures, and proceeded until they reached a large hall, supported by pillars of marble, encrusted with gold and silver, and before which stood a table with a golden scepter and crown. This was the sepulchre of David; to the left they saw that of Solomon in a similar state; and so on the sepulchres of the other kings buried there. They saw chests locked up, and were on the point of entering when a blast of wind like a storm issued from the mouth of the cave with such force that it threw them lifeless on the ground. They lay there until evening, when they heard a voice commanding them to go forth from the place. They immediately rushed out and communicated the strange tale to the patriarch, who summoned a learned rabbi, and heard from him that this was indeed the tomb of the great king of Israel. The patriarch ordered the tomb to be walled up so as to hide it effectually.” The narrator closes by the statement,

“The above mentioned rabbi told me all this.” About the middle of the 15th century the tombs are mentioned by several travelers, and one (Tucher of Nuremberg, A.D. 1479) says that the Moslems had converted the crypt, or lower story of the Coenaculum, into a mosque, within which were shown the tombs of David, Solomon, and the other kings. In the following century, Firer, a German traveler, professes to have visited the tombs, and gives a brief description. “On the left of the Coenaculum, under the choir, is a large vaulted cave; from it we come by a narrow passage, shut in by wooden rails, to an arch on the left, in which is a very long and lofty monument cut entirely out of the rock, with carving admirably executed. Under this are buried David, Solomon, and the other kings of Judah.” This account also partakes of the marvelous, and must be received with caution. It is a fact, however, that Jews, Christians, and Moslems have now for more than four centuries agreed in regarding the Coenaculum as the spot beneath which the dust of the kings of Judah lies. Numbers of Jews maybe often seen standing close to the venerable building, looking with affectionate sadness towards the spot. In 1839 Sir Moses Montefiore and his party were admitted to the mosque. They were led to a trellised doorway, through which they saw the tomb, but they were not permitted to enter. A few years ago an American lady, daughter of Dr. Barclay, was enabled, through the kindness of a Mohammedan lady friend, to enter and sketch the sacred chamber. She says, “The room is insignificant in its dimensions, but is furnished very gorgeously. The tomb is apparently an immense sarcophagus of rough stone, and is covered by green’ satin tapestry richly embroidered with gold. A satin canopy of red, blue, green, and yellow stripes hangs over the tomb; and another piece of black velvet tapestry embroidered in silver covers a door in one end of the room, which, they said, leads to a cave underneath. Two tall silver candlesticks stand before this door, and a little lamp hangs in a window near it, which is kept constantly burning” (*City of the Great King*, p. 212). The real tomb, if it be in this place, must be in the cave below. The structure covered with satin and described by Miss Barclay is merely a cenotaph, like those in the mosque at Hebron. When both mosque and cave are thrown open, and full opportunity given for the search, then, and not till then, can it be satisfactorily established that the royal tombs are or are not in this place (Porter, *Handbook for Palestine*, p. 181 sq.).

Besides the kings above enumerated, Manasseh was, according to the book of Chronicles (^{12 Chronicles 33:20) buried in his own house, which the}

book of Kings (^{<1218>}2 Kings 21:18) explains as the “garden of his own house, the garden of Uzza,” where his son Amon was buried, also, it is said, in his own sepulchre (ver. 26); but we have nothing that would enable us to indicate where this was; and Ahaz, the wicked king, was, according to the book of Chronicles (^{<1227>}2 Chronicles 28:27), “buried in the city, even in Jerusalem, and they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel.” The fact of these last three kings having been idolaters, though one reformed, and their having all three been buried apparently in the city, proves what importance the Jews attached to the locality of the sepulchre, but also tends to show that burial within the city, or the enclosure of a dwelling, was not so repulsive to their feelings as is generally supposed. It is just possible that the rock cut sepulchre under the western wall of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre may be the remains of such a cemetery as that in which the wicked kings were buried.

For the sepulchres of the Maccabees, see MODIN. For the modern or traditionary “Tombs of the Kings” near Jerusalem, see below.

Picture for Sepulchre 5

3. *The “Tombs of the Prophets.”* — The neighborhood of Jerusalem is thickly studded with tombs, many of them of great antiquity. A succinct but valuable account of them is given in Porter’s *Handbook* (p. 143 sq.); but it is only necessary in this article to refer to two or three of the most celebrated. The only important hypogeum which is wholly Jewish in its arrangements, and may consequently belong to an earlier, or to any epoch, is that known as the Tombs of the Prophets in the western flank of the Mount of Olives. *SEE OLIVET*. “Through a long descending gallery, the first part of which is winding, we enter a circular chamber about twenty-four feet in diameter and ten high, having a hole in its roof. From this chamber two parallel galleries, ten feet high and five wide, are carried southwards through the rock for about sixty feet; a third diverges southeast, extending forty feet. They are connected by two cross galleries in concentric curves, one at their extreme end, the other in the middle. The outer one is 115 feet long and has a range of thirty niches on the level of its floor, radiating outwards. Two small chambers with similar niches also open into it.” This tomb, or series of tombs, has every appearance of having originally been a natural cavern improved by art, and with an external gallery some 140 feet in extent, into which twenty-seven deep or Jewish loculi open. Other chambers and loculi have been commenced in

other parts, and in' the passages there are spaces where many other graves could have been located, all which would tend to show that it had been disused before completed, and consequently was very modern. But, be this as it may, it has no architectural moldings, no sarcophagi or shallow loculi, nothing to indicate a foreign origin, and may therefore be considered, if not an early, at least as the most essentially Jewish of the sepulchral excavations in this locality — every other important sepulchral excavation being adorned with architectural features and details betraying most unmistakably their Greek or Roman origin, and fixing their date, consequently, as subsequent to that of the Maccabees; or, in other words, like every other detail of pre-Christian architecture in Jerusalem, they belong to the 140 years that elapsed from the advent of Pompey till the destruction of the city by Titus.

Picture for Sepulchre 6

4. *The “Tombs of the Kings.”* — The most important of the great groups in the vicinity of Jerusalem is that known as *Kebur es-Sultan*, or the *Royal Caverns*, so called because of their magnificence, and also because that name is applied to them by Josephus, who, in describing the third wall, mentions them (σπήλαια βασιλικά [*War*, 5, 4, 2]). By some, however, they are identified with the *Monument of Herod* (*ibid.* 3, 2; 12, 2); by others, as Robinson and Porter, with the tomb of Helena, the widowed queen of Monobazus, king of Adiabene. She became a proselyte to Judaism, and fixed her residence at Jerusalem, where she relieved many of the poor during the famine predicted by Agabus in the days of Claudius Caesar (⁴¹¹²⁸Acts 11:28), and built for herself a tomb, as we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* 20, 2, 1 sq.; 4, 3; *War*, 5, 2, 2; 4, 2; Pausan. 8, 16, 5; Euseb. ii, 12; Jerome, *Epit. Paulae*). *SEE JERUSALEM*. Into the question of the origin of these tombs it is, however, unnecessary to enter; but their structure claims our attention. They are excavated out of the rock. The traveler passes through a low arched doorway into a court ninety-two feet long by eighty-seven wide. On the western side is a vestibule or porch thirty-nine feet wide. The open front was supported by two columns in the middle. Along the front extend a deep frieze and cornice, the former richly ornamented. At the southern side of the vestibule is the entrance to the tomb. The architecture exhibits the same ill-understood Roman-Doric arrangements as are found in all these tombs, mixed with bunches of grapes, which first appear on Maccabean coins, and foliage which is local and peculiar, and, so far as anything is known elsewhere, might be of any

age. Its connection, however, with that of the tombs of Jehoshaphat and the Judges fixes it to the same epoch. The entrance doorway of this tomb is below the level of the ground, and concealed, so far as anything can be said to be which is so architecturally adorned; and it is remarkable as the only instance of this quasi-concealment at Jerusalem. It is closed by a very curious and elaborate contrivance of a rolling stone, often described, but very clumsily answering its purpose. This, also, is characteristic of its age, as we know from Pausanias that the structural marble monument of queen Helena of Adiabene was remarkable for a similar piece of misplaced ingenuity. Within, the tomb consists of a vestibule or entrance hall about twenty feet square, from which three other square apartments open, each surrounded by deep loculi. These again possess a peculiarity not known in any other tomb about Jerusalem, of having a square apartment either beyond the head of the loculus or on one side: as, for instance, A A have their inner chambers, A' A', within, but B and B, at B' B', on one side. What the purpose of these was it is difficult to guess, but, at all events, it is not Jewish. But perhaps the most remarkable peculiarity of the hypogeum is the sarcophagus chamber D, in which two sarcophagi were found, one of which was brought home by De Saulcy, and is now in the Louvre.

Picture for Sepulchre 7

Picture for Sepulchre 8

5. *The "Tombs of the Judges."* — The hypogeum now known by this name is one of the most remarkable of the catacombs around Jerusalem, containing about sixty deep loculi, arranged in three stories; the upper stories with ledges in front to give convenient access, and to support the stones that closed them; the lower flush with the ground: the whole, consequently, so essentially Jewish that it might be of any age if it were not for its distance from the town, and its architectural character. The latter, as before stated, is identical with that of the Tomb of Jehoshaphat, and has nothing Jewish about it. It might, of course, be difficult to prove this, as we know so little of what Jewish architecture really is; but we do know that the pediment is more essentially a Greek invention than any other part of their architecture, and was introduced at least not previously to the age of the Cypselidae, and this peculiar form not till long afterwards, and this particular example not till after an age when the debased Roman of the Tomb of Absalom had become possible.

Picture for Sepulchre 9

Picture for Sepulchre 10

6. *Tombs in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.* — There are three conspicuous sepulchres here, which we briefly describe in the order in which they occur, beginning at the south. *SEE JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.*

Picture for Sepulchre 11

Picture for Sepulchre 12

(1.) The so called “Tomb of Zechariah,” said to have been constructed in honor of Zechariah, who was slain “between the temple and the altar” Joash (2 Chronicles in the reign of 24:21; ~~4235~~ Matthew 23:35), is held in great veneration by the Jews. It is doubtful, however, whether it be a tomb at all, and the style of architecture can scarcely be earlier than our era. It bears a considerable resemblance to the so called Tomb of Absalom, the northernmost of the three. It consists of a square solid basement, measuring eighteen feet six inches each way, and twenty feet high to the top of the cornice. On each face are four engaged Ionic columns between antae, and these are surmounted, not by an Egyptian cornice, as is usually asserted, but by one of purely Assyrian type, such as is found at Khorsabad.

As the Ionic or voluted order came also from Assyria, this example is, in fact, a purer specimen of the Ionic order than any found in Europe, where it was always used by the Greeks with a quasi-Doric cornice. Notwithstanding this, in the form of the volutes — the egg-and-dart molding beneath, and every detail — it is so distinctly Roman that it is impossible to assume that it belongs to an earlier age than that of their influence. Above the cornice is a pyramid rising at rather a sharp angle, and hewn, like all the rest, out of the solid rock. It may further be remarked that only the outward face, or that fronting Jerusalem, is completely finished, the other three being only blocked out (De Saulcy, 2, 303), a circumstance that would lead us to suspect that the works may have been interrupted by the fall of Jerusalem, or some such catastrophe; and this may possibly also account for there being no sepulchre on its rear, if such be really the case. To call this building a tomb is evidently a misnomer, as it is absolutely solid hewn out of the living rock by cutting a passage around it. It has no external chambers, nor even the semblance of a doorway. From

what is known of the explorations carried on by M. Rénan about Byblus, we should expect that the tomb, properly so called, would be an excavation in the passage behind the monolith — but none such has been found (probably it was never looked for) — and that this monolith is the stele or indicator of that fact. If it be so, it is very singular, though very Jewish, that any one should take the trouble to carve out such a monument without putting an inscription or symbol on it to mark its destination or to tell in whose honor it was erected.

Picture for Sepulchre 13

(2.) The middle tomb of this group, called that of St. James, is of a very different character. It consists of a veranda with two Doric pillars *in antis*, which may be characterized as belonging to a very late Greek order rather than a Roman example. Behind this screen are several apartments, which in another locality we might be justified in calling a rock cut monastery appropriate to sepulchral purposes, but in Jerusalem we know so little that it is necessary to pause before applying any such designation. In the rear of all is an apartment, apparently unfinished, with three shallow loculi, meant for the reception of sarcophagi, and so indicating a post-Jewish date for the whole, or at least for that part, of the excavation.

Picture for Sepulchre 14

(3.) The remaining or so called Tomb of Absalom is somewhat larger, the base being about twenty-one feet square in plan, and probably twenty-three or twenty-four to the top of the cornice. Like the other, it is of the Roman-Ionic order, surmounted by a cornice of Ionic type; but between the pillars and the cornice a frieze, unmistakably of the Roman-Doric order, is introduced, so Roman as to be in itself quite sufficient to fix its epoch. It is by no means clear whether it had originally a pyramidal top like its neighbor. The existence of a square blocking above the cornice would lead us to suspect it had not; at all events, either at the time of its excavation or subsequently this was removed, and the present very peculiar termination erected, raising its height to over sixty feet. At the time this was done a chamber was excavated in the base, we must assume for sepulchral purposes, though how a body could be introduced through the narrow hole above the cornice is by no means clear, nor, if inserted, how disposed of in the two very narrow loculi that exist. The great interest of this excavation is, that immediately in rear of the monolith we do find just such a

sepulchral cavern as we should expect. It is called the Tomb of Jehoshaphat, with about the same amount of discrimination as governed the nomenclature of the others, but is now closed by the rubbish and stones thrown by the pious at the Tomb of the Undutiful Son, and consequently its internal arrangements are unknown; but externally it is crowned by a pediment of considerable beauty, and in the same style as that of the Tombs of the Judges, mentioned above — showing that these two, at least, are of the same age, and that this one, certainly, must have been subsequent to the excavation of the monolith; so that we may feel perfectly certain that the two groups are of one age, even if it should not be thought quite clear what that age may be. *SEE ABSALOMS PILLAR.*

7. Other Graeco-Roman Tombs. — Besides the tombs above enumerated, there are around Jerusalem, in the valleys of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, and on the plateau to the north, a number of remarkable rock cut sepulchres, with more or less architectural decoration, sufficient to enable us to ascertain that they are all of nearly the same age, and to assert with very tolerable confidence that the epoch to which they belong must be between the introduction of Roman influence and the destruction of the city by Titus. The proof of this would be easy if it were not that, like everything Jewish, there is a remarkable absence of inscriptions which can be assumed to be original. The excavations in the Valley of Hinnom with Greek inscriptions are comparatively modern, the inscriptions being all of Christian import, and of such a nature as to render it extremely doubtful whether the chambers were sepulchral at all, and not rather the dwellings of ascetics, and originally intended to be used for this purpose. These, however, are neither the most important nor the most architectural — indeed, none of those in that valley are so remarkable as those in the other localities just enumerated. The most important of those in the Valley of Hinnom is that known as the “Retreat place of the Apostles.” It is an unfinished excavation of extremely late date, and many of the others look much more like dwellings for the living than resting places of the dead.

Picture for Sepulchre 15

In the village of Siloam there is a monolithic cell of singularly Egyptian aspect, which De Saulcy (*Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*, 2, 306) assumes to be a chapel of Solomon’s Egyptian wife. It is probably of very much more modern date, and is more Assyrian than Egyptian in character; but as he is probably quite correct in stating that it is not sepulchral, it is

only necessary to mention it here in order that it may not be confounded with those that are so. It is the more worthy of remark, as one of the great difficulties of the subject arises from travelers too readily assuming that every cutting in the rock must be sepulchral. It may be so in Egypt, but it certainly was not so at Cyrene or Petra, where many of the excavations were either temples or monastic establishments; and it certainly was not universally the case at Jerusalem, though our information is frequently too scanty to enable us always to discriminate exactly to which class the cutting in the rock may belong.

Picture for Sepulchre 16

The same remarks as are above made respecting the “Tombs of the Judges” apply to the tomb without a name, and merely called “a Jewish tomb,” in their neighborhood, with beveled facets over its facade, but with late Roman-Doric details at its angles, sufficient to indicate its epoch; but there is nothing else about these tombs requiring especial mention (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 492).

Picture for Sepulchre 17

The comparative lateness of the so called sepulchre of Gamaliel and other rabbins at Meiron is proved by the presence of sarcophagi still within them (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 433).

Picture for Sepulchre 18

Since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, none of the native inhabitants have been in a position to indulge in much sepulchral magnificence, or perhaps had any taste for this class of display; and we in consequence find no rock cut hypogea, and no structural monuments that arrest attention in modern times.

Picture for Sepulchre 19

IV. Comparison with Modern Oriental Tombs. — The style of the public cemeteries around the cities of ancient Palestine in all probability resembled that of the present burying places of the East, of which Dr. Shaw gives the following description: “They occupy a large space, a great extent of ground being allotted for the purpose. Each family has a portion of it walled in like a garden, where the bones of its ancestors have remained undisturbed for many generations. For in these enclosures the graves are all

distinct and separate; each of them having a stone placed upright, both at the head and feet, inscribed with the name or title of the deceased; while the intermediate space is either planted with flowers, bordered round with stone, or paved with tiles." Examples of these tombs are given in the accompanying cuts. By these it is seen that, as among people in good circumstances, the monumental stones are placed upon quadrangular tombs, in the center of which evergreen or flowering shrubs are often planted, and tended with much care. There were other sepulchres which were private property, erected at the expense and for the use of several families in a neighborhood, or provided by individuals as a separate burying place for themselves. These were situated either in some conspicuous place, as Rachel's on the highway to Bethlehem (⁽⁴¹⁵⁹⁾Genesis 35:19), or in some lonely and sequestered spot, under a wide-spreading tree (ver. 8) in a field or a garden. Over such garden tombs, especially when the tomb is that of some holy person, lamps are sometimes hung and occasionally lighted. The graves of the most eminent Mohammedan saints are each covered with a stone or brick edifice called *wely*. It has a dome or cupola over it, varying in height from eight to ten feet. Within lamps are often hung, and the grave proper is covered with carpet and strings of beads. Sometimes more costly ornamentation is used. In common cases, sepulchres were formed by digging a small depth into the ground. Over these, which were considered an humble kind of tomb, the wealthy and great often erected small stone buildings, in the form of a house or cupola, to serve as their family sepulchre. These are usually open at the sides. Sometimes, however, these interesting monuments are built up on all sides, so that the walls are required to be taken down, and a breach made, to a certain extent, on each successive interment. "This custom," says Carne, "which is of great antiquity, and particularly prevails in the lonely parts of Lebanon, may serve to explain some passages of Scripture. The prophet Samuel was buried in his own house at Ramah, and Joab was buried in his house in the wilderness. These, it is evident, were not their dwelling houses, but mansions for the dead, or family vaults which they had built within their own precincts." Not unfrequently, however, those who had large establishments, and whose fortunes enabled them to command the assistance of human art and labor, purchased, like Abraham, some of the natural caverns with which Palestine abounded, and converted them by some suitable alterations into family sepulchres; while others, with vast pains and expense, made excavations in the solid rock (⁽⁴¹⁷⁶⁾Matthew 27:60). These, the entrance to which was either horizontal or by: a flight of

steps, had their roofs, which were arched with the native stone, so high as to admit persons standing upright, and were very spacious, sometimes being divided into several distinct apartments; in which case the remoter or innermost chambers were dug a little deeper than those that were nearer the entrance, the approach into their darker solitudes being made by another descending stair. Many sepulchres of this description are still found in Palestine; but the descent into them is so choked up with the rubbish of ages that they are nearly inaccessible, and have been explored only by a few indefatigable hunters after antiquities. Along the sides of those vast caverns niches were cut, or sometimes shelves ranged one above another, on which were deposited the bodies of the dead, while in others the ground-floor of the tomb was raised so as to make different compartments, the lowest place in the family vaults being reserved for the servants. Some of those found near Tyre, and at Alexandria, are of the round form shown in Fig. 1, but these seem exceptions; for the tombs at Jerusalem, in Asia Minor, and generally in Egypt and the East, offer the arrangements shown in Fig. 2.

Picture for Sepulchre 20

On modern Oriental usages, see Hackett, *Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 97-100; De Saulcy, *Dead Sea*, 2, 103-165, 170; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 148 sq.; Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 579 sq.; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, 1, 267, 359, etc.; and on ancient sepulture, the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 49, 66, 67; and Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 217; and those referred to under FUNERAL *SEE FUNERAL* .

Sepulchre Of Christ.

This has. been alluded to in the foregoing article, but the interest of the subject demands a fuller treatment. The traditional 'site is now occupied by the "Church of the Holy Sepulchre," and the question of the identity of the locality is fully discussed under CALVARY; GOLGOTHA. Its general position is sufficiently indicated under JERUSALEM, and in the maps accompanying that article and PALESTINE. A full description of the building is given by Porter, *Handbook for Palestine*, p. 155 sq.; also in the various books of travels in the Holy Land. We have only space for a brief outline of this extensive and interesting structure, which will be intelligible by the aid of the annexed plan.

1. Exterior. — The approach to it from every direction lies through narrow, filthy lanes, and small bazaars generally filled with ragged Arab women, the venders of vegetables and snails, the latter of which are much eaten here, especially during Lent. After many crooked turnings we arrive in the large square court in front of the church. Here the scene exhibited, in the height of the pilgrim season, is of the most motley and extraordinary appearance. On the upper raised steps are tables spread with coffee, sherbet, sweetmeats, and refreshments; throughout the court are seated peddlers and the Bethlehemite venders of holy merchandise, such as crosses, beads, rosaries and amulets, and mother-of-pearl shells, which are generally brought from the Red Sea, and engraved with religious subjects chiseled in relief; models of the Holy Sepulchre in wood inlaid with mother-of-pearl, and drinking cups from the deposits of the Jordan, with verses from the Bible engraved on them; they are nearly as black as ebony, and take a fine polish. Through these wares hundreds of persons pass and repass — pilgrims of many nations in their different costumes; Latin, Armenian, Russian, Greek, and Coptish friars, with Turkish, Arnaout, and Arab soldiers — all forming the most extraordinary scene that could be found in any spot upon the globe; and a polyglot language is heard such as few other places in the world could exhibit.

The key of the church is kept by the governor of the city; the door is guarded by a Turk, and opened only at fixed hours, and then only with the consent of the three convents and in the presence of the several dragomans, an arrangement which often causes great and vexatious delays to such as desire admittance. This formality was probably intended for solemnity and effect, but its consequence is exactly the reverse; for as soon as the door is opened the pilgrims, who have almost all been kept waiting for some time and have naturally become impatient, rush in, struggling with each other, overturning the dragomans, and are thumped by the Turkish doorkeeper, and driven, like a herd of wild animals, into the body of the church.

2. First Interior Room. — Supposing, then, the rush over, and the traveler to have recovered from its effects, he will find himself in a large apartment, forming a sort of vestibule; on the left, in a recess in the wall, is a large divan, cushioned and carpeted, where the Turkish doorkeeper is usually sitting with half a dozen of his friends, smoking the long pipe and drinking coffee, and always conducting himself with great dignity and propriety. Directly in front, within the body of the church, having at each end three enormous wax candles more than twenty feet high, and a number of silver

lamps suspended above it of different sizes and fashions — gifts from the Catholic, Greek, and Armenian convents — is a long flat stone called the “Stone of Unction,” and on this it is said the body of our Lord was laid when taken down from the cross and washed and anointed in preparation for sepulture. This is the first object that arrests the pilgrims on their entrance, and here they prostrate themselves in succession, the old and the young, women and children, the rich man and the beggar, and all kiss the sacred stone. It is a slab of polished white marble, and only does duty as a substitute for the genuine stone, which is said to be beneath it: but this consideration in no degree affects the multitude or the fervor of the kisses it receives. As you advance towards the stone you have Mount Calvary immediately on your right hand.

Beyond the Stone of Unction the traveler finds himself in the body of the church, a space of about 300 feet in length and 160 in breadth. In front his progress is arrested by the southern exterior of the Greek Chapel, which occupies more than half the great area; on his left, at the western end, is a circular space about 100 feet in diameter, surrounded by clumsy square columns, which support a gallery above, and a dome 150 feet high, of imposing appearance and effect. This is the Latin Chapel, in the center of which, immediately below the aperture that admits light through the dome, rises a small oblong building of marble, twenty feet long, twelve broad, and about fifteen feet in height, surmounted by a small cupola standing on columns. This little building is circular at the back, but square and finished with a platform in front. Within it is what passes for the Holy Sepulchre. We reserve its description for the last.

Picture for Sepulchre of Christ 1

3. *Holy Objects in Detail.* — Leaving for a moment the throng that is constantly pressing at the door of the sepulchre, let us make the tour of the church, beginning from the southwest and proceeding by the north to the east, and so round to our starting point. The church, be it observed, faces the four cardinal points.

The first object we have to notice is an iron circular railing, in the shape of a large parrot’s cage, having within it a lamp, and marking the spot where Mary watched the crucifixion “afar off.” In the arcades round the Latin dome are small chapels for the Syrians, Maronites, and other sects of Christians, who have not, like the Catholics, Greeks, and Armenians, large chapels in the body of the church. The poor Copts have nothing but a

nook, about six feet square, in the western end of the sepulchre, which is tawdrily adorned in the manner of the Greeks. The Syrians have a small and very shabby recess, containing nothing but a plain altar; in the side there is a small door opening to a dark gallery, which leads, as the monks say, to the tombs of Joseph and Nicodemus, between which and that of the Savior there is a subterranean communication. The tombs are excavated in the rock which here forms the floor of the chamber.

Farther on, and nearly in range of the front of the sepulchre, is a large opening, forming a sort of court to the entrance of the Latin Chapel. On one side is a gallery containing a fine organ; and the chapel itself is neat enough, and differs but little from those in the churches of Italy. The chapel in which the organ stands is called the "Chapel of the Apparition," where Christ appeared to the Virgin. Within the door on the right, in an enclosure completely hidden from view, is the Pillar of Flagellation, to which our Savior was tied when he was scourged, before being taken into the presence of Pontius Pilate. As in this instance the holy object cannot be reached by the lips of the faithful, it is deemed equally efficacious to kiss it through another medium. A monk stands near the rail, and, touching the pillar with a long stick that has a piece of leather at the point of it, like a billiard cue, stretches it towards the lips that are ready pouting to receive it. Only half the pillar is here; the other half is in one of the churches in Rome; where may also be seen the table on which our Savior ate his last supper with his disciples, and the stone on which the cock crowed when Peter denied his Master.

Leaving the Chapel, of the Apparition and turning to the left with our faces due east, we have on the right hand the outside of the Greek Chapel, which occupies the largest space in the body of the church, and on the left is a range. of chapels and doors, the first of which leads to the prison where they say our Savior was confined before he was led to the crucifixion. In front of the door is an unintelligible machine, described as the stone on which he was placed when put in the stocks.

In the semicircle at the eastern part of the church there are three chapels: one of these contains the stone on which our Lord rested previously to ascending Mount Calvary; another is the place where the soldiers parted his raiment among them; and the third marks the spot where Longinus, the soldier who pierced his side, passed the remainder of his days in penance. Beneath one of the altars lies a stone having a hole through it, and placed

in a short trough, so that it seems impossible for anything but a specter to pass through the hole. Nevertheless, the achievement was a customary penance among the Greeks, and called by them “purgatory;” but latterly the Turks have in mercy guarded the stone by an iron grating.

In this part also is the entrance to one of the most holy places in the church, the Chapel of the Cross. Descending twenty-eight broad marble steps, the visitor comes to a large chamber eighteen paces square, dimly lighted by a few distant lamps; the roof is supported by four short columns with enormous capitals. In front of the steps is the altar, and on the right a seat on which the empress Helena, advised by a dream where the true cross was to be found, sat and watched the workmen who were digging below. Descending again fourteen steps, another chamber is reached, darker and more dimly lighted than the first, and hung with faded red tapestry; a marble slab, having on it a figure of the cross, covers the mouth of the pit in which the true cross was found.

Picture for Sepulchre of Christ 2

On reascending into the body of the church and approaching the vestibule through which we first entered, we find Mount Calvary on our left. This we ascend by a narrow marble staircase of eighteen steps, formed of a single stone, a fact to which the pilgrim’s attention is solicited by the monks as a proof that the chapel at the top is really founded on the natural rock. But this fact would prove nothing; for there is a staircase in the Ruspoli Palazzo at Rome of one hundred and twenty steps, cut from a single block of white marble. Every visible part of the chapel is a manifest *fabric*. To this objection it is answered that “the stonework cases the rock,” which may or may not be true; but wherever examination might be allowed it seems to be purposely withheld. The chapel is about fifteen feet square, paved with marble in mosaic, and hung on all sides with silken tapestry and lamps dimly burning; it is divided by two short pillars, hung also with silk and supporting quadrangular arches. At the extremity is a large altar, ornamented with paintings and figures, and under the altar a circular silver plate with a hole in the center, indicating the spot in which rested the step of the cross. Behind the altar and separated from it by a thin wall is a chapel, in the center of which is a stone marking the exact spot where Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac; and the monks state that when the cross was laid down, before it was raised, our Lord’s head rested

upon this point; they seem to consider the establishment of this fact necessary to the complete fulfilment of the type.

Descending to the floor of the church, we are shown another rent in the rock, said to be a continuation of the one above, but so guarded by an iron grating that examination is out of the question, as it can only be examined by thrusting a taper through the bars. Directly opposite the fissure is a large monument over the head of Adam.

The little chapel on the spot where Mary stood when St. John received our Lord's dying injunction to protect her as his mother is an appendage to Mount Calvary.

Picture for Sepulchre of Christ 3

4. *The Tomb itself.* — The reader will probably think that all these things are enough, and more than enough, to be comprised under one roof. Having finished the tour of the church, let us return to the great object of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem — the Holy Sepulchre. Taking off the shoes on the marble platform in front, the visitor is admitted by a low door, on entering which the proudest head must needs do reverence. In the center of the first chamber is the stone which was rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre — a square block of marble cut and polished; and, though the Armenians have lately succeeded in establishing the genuineness of the stone in their chapel on Mount Zion (the admission by the other monks, however, being always accompanied by the assertion that they stole it), yet the infatuated Greek still kisses and adores the block of marble as the very stone on which the angel sat when he announced to the women, “He is not dead; he is risen; come and see the place where the Lord lay.” Again bending the head, and lower than before, the visitor enters the inner chamber, the holiest of holy places. The sepulchre “hewn out of the rock” is a marble sarcophagus, somewhat resembling a common bathing tub, with a lid of the same material. Over it hang forty-three lamps, which burn without ceasing night and day. The sarcophagus is six feet one inch long, and occupies about one half the chamber; and, one of the monks being always present to receive the gifts or tribute of the pilgrims, there is only room for three or four at a time to enter. The walls are of a greenish marble, usually called verd-antique, and this is all. It will be borne in mind that all this is in a building above ground, standing on the floor of the church.

Sepulchre, Church Of The Holy

See the preceding article and JERUSALEM.

Sepulchre, The Easter

a representation of the entombment of our Savior, set up in Roman Catholic churches at Easter, on the north side of the chancel, near the altar. In England, previous to the Reformation, it was most commonly a wooden erection, and placed within a recess in the wall or upon a tomb; but several churches still contain permanent stone structures that were built for the purpose, some of which are very elaborate, and are ornamented with a variety of decorations, as at Navenby and Heckington, Lincolnshire, and Hawton, Nottinghamshire, all of which are beautiful specimens of the Decorated style. Sepulchres of this kind also remain in the churches at Northwold, Norfolk; Holcombe Burnell, Devonshire, and several others. The crucifix was placed in the sepulchre with great solemnity on Good Friday, and continually watched from that time till Easter day, when it was taken out and replaced upon the altar with especial ceremony.

Sepulchre, Ecclesiastical

a receptacle for the blessed sacrament which is reserved, among the Latins, from the mass of Maundy Thursday. There is a good example of an Eastern sepulchre in the north chapel of the Church of St. Mary, Haddenham, in Buckinghamshire, England.

Sepulchre, Regular Canons Of

a religious order said to have been founded by Godfrey on the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. Many of these canons journeyed into Europe; but the order was suppressed by pope Innocent VIII, and its revenues were ultimately bestowed on the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. According to Broughton, the suppression of the order did not extend to Poland.

Sepulveda, Juan Ginez De

a Spanish writer, was born at Cordova in 1491 (or 1490). He assisted cardinal Cajetan at Naples in the revision of the Greek Testament. In 1529 he went to Rome, and in 1536 was appointed chaplain and historiographer to Charles V. He is memorable for writing a *Vindication of the Cruelties of the Spaniards against the Indians*. Charles V suppressed the publication of

the work in his dominions, but it was published in Rome. He died at Salamanca in 1572. He was the author of various works besides the one mentioned, in particular of some *Latin Letters: A Translation from Aristotle, with Notes: — A Life of Charles V and Philip. II.*, printed together at Madrid (1780, 4 vols. 4to).

Sequence

1. The later name of the *pneuma*, a melodious and varied prolongation of the Hallelujah.
2. The announcement of the Gospel of the day when taken from the middle of the Gospels, but called *initium* when the opening words were to follow. On the four days of Holy Week the words "The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ" replaced the ordinary sequence, or initial.
3. The name for a hymn in meter. *SEE PROSE; SEE SEQUENCES.*

Sequences

In chanting the *Graduale* in the Mass it was customary to prolong the last syllables of the Hallelujah through a succession of notes without words, which were termed *sequences*, when considered in their combination, and *jubila or jubilationes* with reference to their character. They were intended to indicate that feeling had reached a point at which it was too strong for expression. The difficulty of retaining a long series of notes in the memory led to efforts for devising mnemonic helps, which eventually resulted in the adoption of suitable rhythmical language in Latin *prose* to fit the music — Notker Balbulus (q.v.; died 912), a monk of St. Gall, being especially distinguished in accomplishing this kind of work. The idea was suggested to him by some verses which were modulated or fitted to the series of tones in an antiphonarium belonging to a fugitive priest of Gimedia. He attempted to improve on them, and with such success that his teacher, Marcellus, a Scotchman, had his verses collected and sung by his pupils; and also persuaded Notker to dedicate his work to some prominent personage and give it to the world. Notker thus became the originator of an edifying element of worship, which was approved by the popes and speedily introduced into wider circles; and as he not only used the succession of tones already current — the *mettensis major* and *minor*, the *Romana* and *Amoena* — but also composed new series of notes, he became the creator of an elevating, melodious choir music which was

inserted in the Mass. Each piece was divided into several parts and provided with an appropriate conclusion; and, in like manner, the text, which was everywhere adapted to the melody, consisted of a number of shorter or longer sections. A poetic character was thus naturally given to the text, and such compositions were consequently called “hymns” — a term that is not misplaced when applied to those written by Notker. They were hymns of praise in which the leading features of a festival, the faithful support of the Almighty God, the Redeemer’s merits, the dignity of the Blessed Virgin, etc., are fervently presented; while in their intent they were a continuation of the Hallelujah in the Gradual, though they might also be separately employed.

These sequences were introduced into use in Germany, England, France, and other countries. Notker’s works became the type, and imitations in great number followed, until they were employed to edify the people at every festival; and more than one hundred were contained in the mass books. The revised Roman Missal contains but five — viz. one to the Paschal lamb, intended for Easter; one for Pentecost (*Veni Sancte Spiritus*); one for Corpus Christi Day (*Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem*, by Thomas Aquinas); one intended to glorify the Mater Dolorosa (the celebrated *Stabat Mater* by Jacoponus); and one for use in masses *pro defunctis*, Thomas de Celano’s judgment hymn *Dies Iroe*. The last two are most unlike the early sequences, as the Hallelujah could not be chanted with them; but they are at bottom jubilee hymns like the others.

Sequentiale

is the name given to the book in which the sequences (q.v.) were contained. It was necessary to the Church so long as a complete missal comprehending all parts of the mass was not in use; after this had been provided the *sequentiale* was required only by the singers.

Sequestration

a term employed to signify the separating or setting aside of a thing in controversy from the possession of both parties who contend for it. It is twofold — voluntary and necessary. *Voluntary* sequestration is that which is done by consent of each party; *necessary* is that which the judge, of his own authority, does, whether the party consents or not. Sequestration is also a kind of execution for debt on a benefice, issued by the bishop, by which the profits are to be paid to the creditor.

Sequestration, English

When a judgment has been obtained against a beneficed clergyman, and that judgment remains unsatisfied, the party entitled to the fruits of the judgment is obliged to levy the sum recovered by an execution. In the first instance he issues the ordinary writ of execution, called a *fieri facias*, to which all persons are subject, directing the sheriff to levy the amount upon the goods and chattels of the defaulter. If the sheriff, is able to do so, the amount is levied, and there is an end of the matter; if, on the other hand, he cannot find goods and chattels sufficient, he returns the writ to the court, stating his inability, and certifying that the individual has a rectory or other ecclesiastical benefice, as the case may be, in the county. Upon this return a writ of sequestration, called either a *levari facias de bonis ecclesiasticis*, or a *sequestrari facias*, according to the mode in which it is drawn up, issues to the bishop of the diocese, requiring him to levy the amount upon the ecclesiastical goods of the clergyman. Upon this writ the bishop or his officer makes out a sequestration, directed to the church wardens or persons named by the bishop, or, upon proper security, to persons named by the party who issues the writ, requiring them to sequester the tithes and other profits of the benefice; which sequestration should be forthwith published, not by reading it in church during divine service (a ceremony which is, in our opinion, abolished by the second section of 7 William IV, and 1 Victoria, c. 45), but by affixing a notice of its contents at or near the church door before the commencement of the service, as required by that statute. The sequestration is a continuing charge upon the benefice, and the bishop may be called upon from time to time to return to the court an account of what has been levied under it. The court has the same power over the bishop that it has over a sheriff in respect of ordinary writs of execution; and if the bishop is negligent in the performance of his duty, or returns an untrue account of the proceedings under the writ, he is liable, in the same way as the sheriff is liable, to an action at the suit of the party damnified thereby. Sequestration is also a process of the ecclesiastical courts. When a benefice is full, the profits may be sequestered if the incumbent neglects his cure; and if there be a vacancy, the profits are to be sequestered, and to be applied so far as necessary in providing for the service of the cure during the vacancy, the successor being entitled to the surplus.

Se'rah

(Heb. *Se'rach*, **הרע** perhaps *overflow*; Sept. in Genesis **Σάρα** [v.r. **Σορέ**], but in Chronicles **Σαράί** [v.r. **Σαάπ**]; also written “Sarah” [q.v.] in ^{<0436>}Numbers 26:46), the daughter of Asher, son of Jacob (^{<0467>}Genesis 46:17; ^{<0346>}Numbers 26:46; ^{<1070>}1 Chronicles 7:30). B.C. cir. 1864. The mention of a female in a list of this kind, in which no others of her sex are named, and contrary to the usual practice of the Jews, seems to indicate something extraordinary in connection with her history or circumstances. This has sufficed to excite the ever active imaginations of the rabbins; and the Jews fable that she was very remarkable for piety and virtue, and was therefore privileged to be the first person to tell Jacob that his son Joseph was still living (^{<0455>}Genesis 45:26), on which account she was translated alive (like Enoch) to paradise, where, according to the ancient book Zohar, are four mansions or palaces, each presided over by an illustrious woman, viz. Sarah, daughter of Asher, the daughter of Pharaoh who brought up Moses; Jochebed, mother of Moses; and Deborah the prophetess.

Serai'ah

(Heb. *Serayah'*, **הרע** [once in the prolonged form, *Seraya'hu*, **והרע** ^{<2825>}Jeremiah 36:26], *warrior of Jehovah*; Sept. **Σαράϊας** or **Σεράϊα**, but with many v.r.), the proper name of eight men.

1. Second named son of Kenaz, and father of a Joab who was head of a family of the tribe of Judah in the valley of the Charashim (^{<1043>}1 Chronicles 4:13, 14). B.C. cir. 1560.
2. The scribe or secretary of David (^{<1087>}2 Samuel 8:17). B.C. cir. 1015. This person's name is in other places corrupted into *Sheya'*, **אש** A.V. “Sheva” (^{<1025>}2 Samuel 20:25), “Shisha,” **אש** ^{<1043>}1 Kings 4:3), and “Shavsha,” **אש** ^{<1386>}1 Chronicles 18:16).
3. Son of Asiel and father of Josibiah of the tribe of Simeon (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 4:35). B.C. ante 720.
4. The son of Azriel, and one of the persons charged with the apprehension of Jeremiah and Baruch (^{<2825>}Jeremiah 36:26). B.C. 606.
5. The son of Neriah and brother of Baruch (^{<2519>}Jeremiah 51:59, 61). He held a high office in the court of king Zedekiah, the nature of which is

somewhat uncertain. In the A.V. we have, “This Seraiah was a *quiet prince*,” *h3 Wnm]rci* which, according to Kimchi, means a *chamberlain*, or one who attended the king when he retired to rest (i.e. prince of rest); but better, perhaps, according to Gesenius, “chief of the quarters” for the king and his army, that is, *quartermaster-general*, after the meaning of *menuchah* as a halting place of an army (^{<0418>}Numbers 10:33). The suggestion of Maurer, adopted by Hitzig, has more to commend it, that he was an officer who took charge of the royal caravan on its march, and fixed the place where it should halt. Hiller (*Onomast.*) says Seraiah was prince of Menuchah, a place on the borders of Judah and Dan, elsewhere called Manahath. This Seraiah was sent by Zedekiah on an embassy to Babylon, probably to render his submission to that monarch, about four years before the fall of Jerusalem. B.C. 594. He was charged by Jeremiah to communicate to the Jews already in exile a book in which the prophet had written out his prediction of all the evil that should come upon Babylon (^{<2514>}Jeremiah 51:60-64). It is not stated how Seraiah acquitted himself of his task; but that he accepted it at all shows such respect for the prophet as may allow us to conclude that he would not neglect the duty which it imposed.

6. The high priest at the time that Jerusalem was taken by the Chaldeans. B.C. 588. He was sent prisoner, to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, who put him to death (^{<12518>}2 Kings 25:18; ^{<13164>}1 Chronicles 6:14; ^{<24524>}Jeremiah 52:24; ^{<13101>}Ezra 7:1).

7. The son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, and one of those to whom Gedaliah promised security (^{<12523>}2 Kings 25:23; ^{<24108>}Jeremiah 40:8). B.C. 587.

8. A priest, the son of Hilkiah, who returned from exile (^{<13110>}Ezra 2:2 ^{<13102>}Nehemiah 10:2; 11:11 12:1, 12). He is called Azariah (q.v.) in ^{<13107>}Nehemiah 7:7. B.C. 536.

Seraphic Doctor

SEE *BONAVENTURA*.

Seraphic Hymn

the *Ter-sanctus*, or “Holy, holy, holy,” which concludes the preface in the communion service. Its basis is found in ^{<23118>}Isaiah 6:3. The hymn itself

occurs in every ancient liturgy. It must not be confounded with the *Trisagion* (q.v.).

Ser'aphim

(Heb. *Seraphim'*, ⲙⲣⲁϥ] Sept. Σεραφίμ, or *Seraphs*; the plural of the word ⲁⲣϥ; *saraph*), celestial beings described in Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ Isaiah 6:2-6 as an order of angels or ministers of God, who stand around his throne, having each six wings, and also hands and feet, and praising God with their voices. They were therefore of human form, and, like the Cherubim, furnished with wings as the swift messengers of God. Some have indeed identified the Cherubim and Seraphim as the same beings, but under names descriptive of different qualities: *Seraphim* denoting the burning and dazzling appearance of the beings elsewhere described as *Cherubim*.

It would be difficult either to prove or disprove this; but there are differences between the Cherubim of Ezekiel and the Seraphim of Isaiah which it does not appear easy to reconcile. The “living creatures” of the former prophet had four wings; the “Seraphim” of the latter, six; and while the Cherubim had four faces, the Seraphim had but one (comp. Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ Isaiah 6:2, 3; Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ Ezekiel 1:5-12). If the figures were in all cases purely symbolical, the difference does not signify (see Hendewerk, *De Seraph. et Cherub. non Diversis* [Reg. 1836]). **SEE CHERUBIM**. There is much symbolical force and propriety in the attitude in which the Seraphim are described as standing, while two of their wings were kept ready for instant flight in the service of God; with two others they hid their face to express their unworthiness to look upon the Divine Majesty (see Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ Exodus 3:6; Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ 1 Kings 19:13; comp. Plutarch, *Quoest. Romans* vol. 10), and with two others they covered their feet, or the whole of the lower part of their bodies — a practice which still prevails in the East when persons appear in a monarch’s presence (see Lowth, *ad loc.*). Their occupation was twofold — to celebrate the praises of Jehovah’s holiness and power (Ⲛⲓⲃⲏ Isaiah 6:3), and to act as the medium of communication between heaven and earth (ver. 6). From their antiphonal chant (“one cried unto another”) we may conceive them to have been ranged in opposite rows on each side of the throne. As the Seraphim are nowhere else mentioned in the Bible, our conceptions of their appearance must be restricted to the above particulars, aided by such uncertain light as etymology and analogy will supply. We may observe that the idea of a winged human figure was not peculiar to the Hebrews: among the sculptures found at Mourghaub, in Persia, we meet

with a representation of a man with two pairs of wings springing from the shoulders and extending, the one pair upwards, the other downwards, so as to admit of covering the head and the feet (Vaux, *Nin. and Persep.* p. 322). The wings in this instance imply deification; for speed and ease of motion stand, in man's imagination, among the most prominent tokens of divinity. The meaning of the word "seraph" is extremely doubtful; the only word which resembles it in the current Hebrew is *saraph*, אֲרָפַח; "to burn," whence the idea of *brilliancy* has been extracted. Such a sense would harmonize with other descriptions of celestial beings (e.g. אֲרָפַח Ezekiel 1:13; אֲרָפַח Matthew 28:3); but it is objected that the Hebrew term never bears this secondary sense. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1341) connects it with an Arabic term signifying *high* or *exalted*, and this may be regarded as the generally received etymology; but the absence of any cognate Hebrew term is certainly worthy of remark. It may be seen in the article SERPENT *SEE SERPENT* that a species of serpent was called *saraph*, and this has led some to conceive that the Seraphim were a kind of basilisk-headed Cherubim (Bauer, *Theolog. A.T.* p. 189); or else that they were animal forms with serpent's heads, such as we find figured in the ancient temples of Thebes (Gesen. *Comment. in Jes.*). Hitzig and others identify the Seraphim with the Egyptian Serapis; for although it is true that the worship of Serapis was not introduced into Egypt till the time of the Ptolemies (Wilkinson, *Anc. AEgypt.* 4, 360 s. q.), it is known that this was but a modification of the more ancient worship of Kneph, who was figured under the form of a serpent of the same kind, the head of which afterwards formed the crest of Serapis. But we can hardly conceive that the Hebrews would have borrowed their imagery from such a source. Knobel's conjecture that Seraphim is merely a false reading for *sharathim* (שָׂרָתִים), "ministers," is ingenious, but the latter word is not Hebrew. See the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1844, 2, 454. *SEE ANGEL; SEE CHERUB; SEE LIVING CREATURE; SEE TERAPHIM.*

Seraphina

a keyed wind instrument, the tones of which are produced by the play of wind upon metallic reeds, as in the accordion. It consists, like the organ, of a keyboard, wind chest, and bellows.

Serapion

bishop of Thumeos, in Egypt, called *Scholasticus* because of his eloquence and dialectical keenness, is said by Rufinus to have been abbot of numerous monasteries, and to have exercised rule over some ten thousand hermits, whom he employed in reaping at harvest time, in order that their earnings might aid in supporting impoverished Christians about Alexandria.

Antonius and Athanasius are reported to have been his intimate friends and counselors, the latter having secured his elevation to the bishopric. In 348 Serapion attended the Council of Sardica, and helped to procure the acquittal of Athanasius from the charges under which he lay; and when the latter had again fallen under the displeasure of the emperor Constantius, Serapion was one of the five bishops who were delegated to attempt his restoration to favor. He died A.D. 358. See Socrates, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* 4, 23.

Chrysostom's deacon at Constantinople, under Honorius and Arcadius, was another Serapion, who aided that father ill enforcing a thorough discipline among the clergy, of whom he said that only the utmost strictness could secure their improvement. The clergy were exasperated by his words and actions, and sought to excite the opposition of the populace against both reformers, but in vain; and Chrysostom ultimately made Serapion bishop of Heraclea in Thrace.

Serapis,

Picture for Serapis

In Egyptian mythology, was a highly venerated god of Alexandria, whose origin was rather Grecian, however, than Egyptian. He was the Greek god of the underworld — Pluto, the giver of blessings on whose head was placed a bushel, to denote that the ruler of the underworld causes man's nourishment to spring from the earth. He was transferred to Alexandria in the time of the Ptolemies, and unwillingly accepted by the inhabitants; but eventually forty-two temples of Serapis were enumerated in Egypt. The following fable in relation to his importation was in circulation: A beautiful youth appeared to Ptolemy I in a dream, and commanded the king to bring his statue from Sinope, revealing, at the same time, that he was Serapis, the god who gives blessings or curses. After the surmounting of many difficulties, the enterprise was at length accomplished — the god contributing to that result by going from his temple to the ship. The city of

Alexandria erected to him a temple in the place Rhacotis. Political reasons may have determined this transfer from Asia to Egypt — e.g. the importance of making the new capital the central seat of religion; and this latter end was completely realized, inasmuch as Serapis took the place of Osiris, with the exception that he was never conceived of as suffering and dying. He was regarded as consort to Isis, as the sun and Nile god, and as the supreme god. The sick, also, invoked his aid, with the result that he was, in the end, confounded with AEsculapius. A marble bust in the Vatican represents him as a bearded, earnest man, with rays surrounding, and a grain measure surmounting, his head.

Serarius, Nicholas

a learned Jesuit and commentator on the Scriptures, was born in, 1555 at Rambervillers, in Lorraine. After studying the languages, he taught ethics, philosophy, and theology at Würzburg and Mentz, in which last city he died, May 20, 1610, leaving many works, of which the following are the principal: *De Phariseorum, Sadducoeorum, et Essenorum Sectis* (Franeker, 1603; Mentz, 1604): — *Commentarius in Libros Jos., Jud., Ruth., Reg., et Paralip.* (ibid. 1609-10, 2 pts. fol.): — *Prolegomena Biblica* (ibid. 1612): — *Rabbini et Hierodes* (ibid.): — *Opuscula Theologica* (3 tom. fol.): — and others which are collected in 16 vols. fol. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 316; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur.*

Se'red

(Heb. *id.* דרס, *fear*; Sept. Σέρεδ v.r. Σαρέδ), the first named of three sons of Zebulon (⁻⁰⁴⁶⁴Genesis 46:14), and head of the family of the *Sardites* (⁻⁰²⁵⁵Numbers 26:26). B.C. cir. 1864.

Serestus

in Greek mythology, was a companion of AEneas, who gathered up the armor of Haemonides, the priest of Apollo whom Euneas had slain, and who erected a column of victory to Mars Gradivus.

Serge

(Lat. *cereus*, a wax taper). Those in a low basin were called mortars, and burned during matins at the choir door. Lyndwood says that in very many churches the two (i.e. on the altar) were furnished by the curate.

Sergeant

Picture for Sergeant

(ῥαβδοῦχος, literally *rod-holder*, ^{<4165>}Acts 16:35), properly a Roman *licitor*, the public servant who bore a bundle of rods before the magistrates of cities and colonies as insignia of their office, and who executed the sentences which they pronounced.

Sergeant, John

a Congregational minister, was born in Newark, N.J., in 1710. He graduated at Yale College in 1729, and was appointed tutor in 1731. The Commissioners for Indian Affairs having found the Indians living at *Skatekook* and *Unahktukook*, on the Housatonic River, disposed to receive a missionary, chose Mr. Sergeant for that position; and he went in October, 1734, to examine his field of labor. In August, 1735, he was ordained at Deerfield, and labored with the Indians until his death, July 27, 1749. He translated into the native language parts of the Old and all the New Test. excepting the book of Revelation. During his life one hundred and twenty-nine savages were baptized, and forty-two became members of the Church. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 388.

Sergestus

in Grecian mythology, was a companion of AENEAS, who is named in connection with the sailing match instituted by AENEAS. His vessel stuck fast on a rock; but he was nevertheless rewarded with the gift of a female slave from the hero (Virgil, *L'Eneid*, 1, 510; 5, 121, etc.).

Sergiots

(SERGIETS, or SERGISTS), a section of the Paulicians who held in veneration the memory and writings of one Sergius, who lived at the beginning of the 9th century. His efforts led to a division — his followers being known as Sergiots, and his opponents Baanites, after the name of their leader, Baanes. *SEE PAULICIANS*.

Ser'gius Paulus

(Graecized Σέργιος Παῦλος, a Latin name), a Roman proconsul in command at Cyprus who was converted by the preaching of Paul and

Barnabas (^{<4137>}Acts 13:7). A.D. 44. Sergius is described by the evangelist as a "discreet" or "intelligent" man; by which we are probably to understand that he was a man of large and liberal views, and of an inquiring turn of mind. Hence he had entertained Elymas, and hence also he became curious to hear the new doctrine which the apostle brought to the island. The strongest minds at that period were drawn with a singular fascination to the occult studies of the East; and the ascendancy which Luke represents the "sorcerer" as having gained over Sergius illustrates a characteristic feature of the times. For other examples of a similar character, see Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1, 177 sq. But Sergius was not effectually or long deceived by the arts of the impostor; for, on becoming acquainted with the apostle, he examined at once the claims of the Gospel, and yielded his mind to the evidence of its truth. Nothing of his history subsequent to his conversion is known from Scripture. There is no reason to suppose that he abandoned his post as governor of Cyprus; but the legends assert that he did so, and followed Paul; and that eventually he went with the apostle into Spain, and was left by him at Narbonne, in France, of which he became the bishop, and died there.

The title (inaccurately rendered "deputy" [q.v.]) given to this functionary exhibits one of those minute accuracies which, apart from their inspiration, would substantiate the sacred book as a genuine and contemporary record. Cyprus was originally a *proetorian* province (**στρατηγική**), and *not proconsular*; but it was left by Augustus under the senate, and hence was governed by a proconsul (**ἀνθύπατος**), as stated by the evangelist (^{<4136>}Acts 13:6, 8, 12; see Dion Cass. 54, 523; Kuinol, *on* ^{<4137>}Acts 13:7. For the value of this attestation to Luke's accuracy, see Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel Narrative*, 1, 32 sq.). Coins, too, are still extant on which this very title, ascribed in the Acts to Sergius Paulus, occurs as the title of the Roman governors of Cyprus (see Akerman, *Numismatic Illustrations*, p. 41; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1, 176, 187).
SEE CYPRUS.

Sergius, St.

Several saints and martyrs occur who bear this name.

1. One is usually associated with a martyr named Bacchus, like himself a native of Rome. It is related that they were accused of being Christians, and exiled by the emperor Maximian. When nothing could

induce them to sacrifice to idols, Bacchus was tortured to death and his body thrown to wild beasts, who, however, would not harm it. Sergius was then taken to Rosaph, in Syria, and tortured, but comforted by an apparition of Bacchus, while his wounds were healed by an angel. He was beheaded in 290; and the emperor Justinian is credited with having changed the name of Rosaph to Sergiopolis, while the martyr's relics were preserved in the church of that town. Oct. 7 was set apart for the commemoration of Sergius and Bacchus.

2. Another Sergius, whose day occurs on Jan. 23, is said to have been martyred under Diocletian; and a third was a monk in the Convent of Mar Saba, in Palestine, and, together with other monks, was attacked and slain by robbers in the year 797. His day is on March 30.

3. Sergius, surnamed *the Confessor*, was born at Constantinople, lived in the former half of the 9th century, and wrote *De Rebus in Re Publica et Ecclesia Gestis* — a history of the iconoclastic controversy from the Romish point of view, which embraced the period from Constantine Copronymus to Michael II Balbus, but is now lost. He was taken prisoner while defending the worship of images (according to some statements, in the reign of Leo the Isaurian; according to others, in that of Theophilus), deprived of his goods, and exiled; for which reason Photius termed him the Confessor. The saints' calendar of the Greek Church assigns May 13 as his day. See *Ausführl. Heiligen-Lexikon nebst beigefigt. Heil.-Kalender* (Cologne and Frankfort, 1719), p. 2006 sq.

Sergius

the name of several Roman Catholic pontiffs.

I, pope from 687 to 701, contemporary with the Venerable Bede, was born at Antioch and reared at Palermo. The most noteworthy event of his administration was a dispute with the Eastern Church, which ultimately led to the separation of the East from the West. The emperor Justinian II had convoked an ecumenical council (*Concilium Quinsexturn*) at Constantinople, and legates were sent to attend it by Sergius, who signed its decrees; but, as six decrees had been passed which were contrary to the practice of Rome (e.g. omitting nearly all the Latin councils and papal decretals from the list of authentic sources of Church law, acknowledging

the validity of the whole eighty-five *canones apostolici*, denouncing the celibacy of the clergy, prohibiting fasting on Saturdays during Quadragesima, making the patriarch of Constantinople equal to the pope, etc.), the pope forbade their promulgation. The emperor ordered the imprisonment of the refractory pope, but was himself dethroned after a revolt in his army. Rome continued to reject this council, and this occasioned the disputes which subsequently divided the Church. Sergius succeeded, on the other hand, in restoring the communion with Rome of the churches which had been alienated through the *Controversy of the Three Chapters*. The other prominent incidents of his pontificate were the founding of the bishopric of Utrecht by Willibrod, and the issuing of an ordinance by which the *Agnus Dei* was required to be sung three times before the communion in the service of the mass. Oct. 9 was set apart in commemoration of this pope.

II, pope from 844 to 847. He contributed materially to the exaltation of the papacy by daring to disregard the requirement of seeking the confirmation of his accession and consecration by the civil power, and by maintaining his position in the face of the protest raised by the emperor Lothaire against this infraction of the law of the realm. The controversy of Paschasius Radbertus respecting the Lord's supper was begun in the reign of this pope.

III, pope from 904 to 911, who owed his elevation to the influence of the shameless Theodora and her no less shameless daughters Marozia and Theodora, the actual rulers of the time in Rome. He was grossly immoral, and lived in licentious relations with Marozia, who bore him several children, among them the future pope John XI, though the latter statement is denied by many respectable authorities. The only noteworthy events of his pontificate were his approval of the fourth marriage of the emperor Leo Philosophus, which a subsequent synod at Constantinople (920) condemned, and the renewed introduction of the Benedictine rule at Clugny by the abbot Berno.

IV, pope from 1009 to 1012, previously bishop of Alba. With him began the custom that the popes should adopt a new name on assuming the tiara. The story has it that Sergius was formerly called *Bocca di Porco*, i.e. swine's snout. Being ashamed of the name, he assumed that of Sergius, and thus introduced a custom which has been followed by all subsequent popes.

Seripandi, Girolamo

an Italian theologian, was born at Naples, May 6, 1493. On the death of his father, he entered the order of the Augustines, in 1507, and made such rapid progress in study that he was appointed reader at Sienna in 1515, professor of theology at Bologna in 1517, and vicar-general in 1523. He then gave himself to preaching with great success; but in 1539 he was elected general of his order, and in 1547 was reelected. He declined the bishopric of Aquilas in 1551; but was drawn from retirement. by a mission from the city of Naples to the emperor in 1554, whereupon he was appointed archbishop of Salerno. In 1561 he was made cardinal, and designated as one of the papal legates to the Council of Trent, where he died, March 17, 1563, worn out with toil. His character was one of singular piety, benevolence, and modesty. He wrote a number of ecclesiastical works and sermons, besides a commentary on Romans and Galatians. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Serjeants

servants in monastic offices: those of the church, the guest house, refectory, and infirmary were subordinate officers. The first was the bell ringer, except for high mass, vespers, matins, and obits. The candle lighter, except round the high altar (he also laid out the vestments for the celebrant at the high altar), was the chandler, who made all the wax candles, and assisted the subsacrist in baking the hosts. The serjeant of the infirmary was the barber, and, with the clerk and cook, waited on the monks who were sick or aged.

Sermon

(Lat. *sermo*, “a discourse”), a discourse delivered in public religious services. In the early Church sermons were called *tractates* (expository), *disputations* (argumentative and controversial), *allocutions*, and by the Greeks **διδασκαλίαι** (doctrinal), or *homilies* (familiar addresses). The *place* of the sermon in the service was immediately after the reading of the psalms and lessons out of the Scriptures, before the catechumens were dismissed. The *person* whose duty it was to deliver the sermon was the bishop, when he was present, or one of his presbyters in any church from which he was absent: then it was considered as the bishop preaching by proxy. In some cases a special commission was given to a layman to deliver a sermon, and then he might do it by the authority of the bishop’s

commission for that time. This applied to the public services in the churches, and was not necessary when laymen did it in a private way as catechists in their catechetical schools, as at Alexandria and elsewhere. Sometimes it happened that two or three sermons would be preached in the same assembly, first by the presbyters and then by the bishop. Or, if more than one bishop were present, several of them would preach one after another, reserving the last place for the most honorable person. In some places sermons were preached every day, especially in Lent and the festival days of Easter. In larger towns and cities, it seems probable that two sermons were delivered on Sunday; but this custom did not prevail in the country parishes. The sermon was either, 1, an exposition of Scripture; 2, a panegyric discourse upon some saint or martyr; 3, a sermon upon some particular time, occasion, festival; or, 4, a sermon upon a particular doctrine, against heresy, or to recommend the practice of virtue. All of these have examples in the sermons of Chrysostom and Augustine. Origen appears to have been the first to deliver his sermons extempore, it having been the general practice to carefully compose and write them beforehand. It was customary to introduce the sermon with a short prayer for divine assistance for the preacher and his hearers; and sometimes, if occasion required, this prayer was said in the middle of the discourse. It was usual in many places, before beginning the sermon, for the preacher to use the common salutation *Pax vobis*, "Peace be unto you," or "The Lord be with you." There was no general rule as to the length of the sermon, that being doubtless determined by the circumstances of the occasion, e.g. whether one or more sermons were to be delivered. Scarcely any of them would take an hour in delivery, and many of them not more than half that time. It was not considered, by many in the ancient Church, to be improper for the preacher to deliver a sermon prepared by another person, they holding that it is "lawful for a man to preach the compositions of more eloquent men, provided he compose his own life answerable to God's Word." The sermon was always concluded with a doxology to the Holy Trinity. The posture of preacher and hearers was generally the reverse of that prevalent now, for then the preacher sat and his hearers stood. It was a peculiar custom in the African Church, when the preacher chanced to cite some remarkable text of Scripture in the middle of his sermon, for the people to join with him in repeating the remainder of it. This was, no doubt, done to encourage the people to hear, read, and remember the Scriptures. It was a very general custom for the people to show their appreciation of the sermon by public applause, manifested by words (as "orthodox"), or signs,

or clapping of hands. We notice also the custom, prevailing among many ancient hearers, of writing down the sermons, word for word, as they were delivered, and by this means some extempore discourses were handed down to posterity. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 705 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.

Sermon On The Mount

the common name of a discourse delivered by Jesus to his disciples and a multitude on a mountain near Capernaum, A.D. 27, perhaps in May, early in the second year of his public ministry. It is a complete system of *the moral law*, in the spiritual form which it assumes under the Christian dispensation, and has deservedly been made the subject of much study and learned exposition (Matthew 5, 6, 7; ~~4161~~ Luke 6:20 sq. Comp. ~~4107~~ Mark 9:47 sq.; ~~4188~~ Matthew 18:8, 9). The best complete exposition is certainly that of Tholuck, *Bergpredig.* (4th ed. 1856). An earlier edition has been translated into English (1843, 2 vols.). See also Valenti, *Commentar ib. d. Bergpred.* (Basel, 1849); Mackintyre, *Expos. of the Sermon on the Mount* (Lond. 1854); Pitman, *Comment. on the Sermon on the Mount* (ibid. 1852); Todd, *id.* (ibid. 1856); Trench, *Expos. of the Sermon on the Mount* (ibid. 1851); and the literature cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 32; and Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 121. **SEE JESUS.**

Sermon On The Mount, The, And The Talmud.

In the essay prepared by the late E. Deutsch entitled *The Talmud*, among other daring statements we find also the following: "We need not urge the priority of the Talmud to the New Test.... To assume that the Talmud has borrowed from the New Test. would be like assuming that Sanskrit sprang from Latin, or that French was developed from the Norman words found in English." Similar is the remark of Rénan: "It is sometimes supposed that, the compilation of the Talmud being posterior to that of the Gospels, appropriations might have been made by the Jewish compilers from the Christian morality. But that is inadmissible; there was a wall of separation between the Church and the synagogue" (*Life of Jesus*, p. 108). Statements like these have been, and will be, taken as true, especially by those who have not taken the pains of examining for themselves; but sober-minded scholars have arrived at different results. Says Mr. Farrar: "Some excellent maxims — even some close parallels to the utterances of Christ may be quoted, of course, from the Talmud, where they lie imbedded like pearls in

‘a sea’ of obscurity and mud. It seems to me indisputable, and a matter which every one can now verify for himself, that these are amazingly few, considering the vast bulk of national literature from which they are drawn. And, after all, who shall prove to us that these sayings were always uttered by the rabbins to whom they are attributed? Who will supply us with the faintest approach to a proof that, when not founded on the Old Test., they were not directly or indirectly due to Christian influence or Christian thought?” (*Life of Christ*, 2, 486.) According to our judgment, there is only one way of arriving at a just estimate as to which copied, and this is to give the parallel passage of the Talmud with the author who uttered the sentence, and the time in which he lived. The date of the author must settle the question once for all, and this is our purpose in the sequel.

Matthew 5:3:

“Blessed are the poor in *spirit*.” — *Sanhedrin* fol. 43 b: “R. Joshua en-Levi [A.D. 219-2191 said, Behold, how acceptable before the Lord are the humble. While the temple stood, meat offerings and sacrifices were offered in expiation for sins committed; but an humble spirit, such a one as immolates the desires of the flesh and the inclination of the heart on the altar of his duty to his God, is accepted in place of sacrifices, as the psalmist says (51:19), ‘The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit’” (comp. *Sotah*, fol. 5).

Matthew 5:7:

“Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.” — Sabbath, fol.151 b: “R. Gamaliel II [A.D. 80-118] said, He who is merciful towards his fellow creatures shall receive mercy from heaven above.”

Matthew 5:10:

“Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake,” etc. — *Baba Kamma*, fol. 93 a: “Rabbi Abbahu [A.D. 279-320] said, Be rather one of the persecuted than of the persecutors.”

Matthew 5:19:

“Whosoever, therefore, shall break one,” etc. *Pirke Aboth*, 2, 1: “Rabbi [i.e. Judah hak-Kodesh, d. A.D. 190] said, Be equally attentive to the light and to the weighty commandments.”

⚭**Matthew 5:22:**

“But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother,” *etc.* — *Sanhedrim* fol. 58 b: “Resh Lakish [A.D. 219-280] said, Whosoever lifts up his hand against his neighbor, though he do not strike him, is called an offender and sinner.”

⚭**Matthew 5:24:**

“Leave thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled,” *etc.* — Mishna, *Yoma*, 8, 9 “R. Eleazar ben-Azariah [d. A.D. 82] says, The transgression which a man commits against God, the day of atonement expiates; but the transgression which he commits against his neighbor it does not expiate, unless he has satisfied his neighbor.”

⚭**Matthew 5:28:**

“But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, committeth adultery,” *etc.* — *Berachoth*, fol. 24 a: “Rabbi Shesheth [flourished cir. A.D. 285] says, Whosoever looketh on the little finger of a woman with a lustful eye is considered as having committed adultery.”

⚭**Matthew 5:40:**

“And take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.” — *Baba Kamma*, fol. 92, Colossians 2: “Rabba [A.D. 320-363] said to Ralbba the son of Mar, How is that popular saying? — If any one ask for thy ass, give him the saddle also.”

⚭**Matthew 5:44:**

“Bless them that curse you.” — *Sanhedrin*, fol. 48 b and 49 a: “R. Jehudah [d. A.D. 190] said, Be rather of the accursed than of those that curse.”

⚭**Matthew 6:1:**

“Take heed that ye do not your alms before men to be seen of them.” — *Chagiga*, fol. 5, Colossians 1: “Rabbi Yanai [cir. A.D. 120] said to a man who gave alms in such a public manner, You had better not given him anything; in the way you gave it to him you must have hurt his feelings.”

⚭**Matthew 6:26:**

“Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not,” *etc.* — *Kiddushin*, fol. 82, Colossians 2: “R. Simon ben-Eleazar [who lived in the 3d century A.D.]

said, Hast thou ever seen a beast or a bird that followed a trade? and yet they are fed without toil. But these were only created to minister to me, while I was created to minister to my Maker. Was it not right, then, that I should be supported without toil? But I have marred my work and forfeited my support.”

ⓂⓂ Matthew 7:2:

“With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you *again*.” — *Sanhedrin*, fol. 100, ⓂⓂ Colossians 1: “Rabbi Meir [q.v.] said, With what measure man metes it shall be measured to him from heaven.”

ⓂⓂ Matthew 7:4:

“Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye,” *etc.* — *Baba Bathra*, fol.15, col. 2: “R. Jochan an [A.D. 199-279], surnamed Bar-Nap’ha, said, Do they say, Take the splinter out of thine eye, he will answer, Remove the beam out of thine own eye.”

It is strange that, concerning this Talmudic quotation (in the *Hebraica*, N.Y., March 1879), a rabbi should have said, The familiar proverb in Matthew and ⓂⓂ Luke 6:42 ... is, as is well known (*sic!*), like most sentences of that kind in the New Test., borrowed from contemporaneous Jewish literature.” But the chronological date of the author of that sentence is the best proof for the superficiality of statements made by men who, for the sake of the Talmud, try to disparage the New Test. The New Test. sentence is also illustrated in *Erachin*, fol. 16, col. 2, where R. Tarphon [cir. A.D. 120] says, “It would greatly astonish me if there could be found any one in this age who would receive an admonition. If he be admonished to take the splinter out of his eye, he would answer, Take the beam out of thine own.”

ⓂⓂ Matthew 7:5:

“Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see,” *etc.* — In *Baba Metsia*, fol. 107, col. 2, and *Baba Bathra*, fol. 60, Colossians 2, we read: “Resh Lakish [cir. A.D. 275] said, What is the meaning of the passage ‘Examine yourself and search?’ (ⓂⓂ Zephaniah 2:1). He who will reprove others must himself be pure and spotless.”

ⓂⓂ Matthew 7:12: “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.” *Sabbath*, fol. 31, col. 1: “Hillel [q.v.] said, *ayh wz dyb[t*

al rbj l ynsi [d awh hçwrrpdyaw hl wk hrwth l k: i.e. “Whatever you should not like to be done unto you, do not to others. This is the essence of the divine law; all the rest is commentary only.”

Since this sentence of Hillel has become the hobby of modern Jewish Talmudists, as Deutsch and others, and of Christian writers who, like Rénan, follow their Jewish leaders unthinkingly, we must speak a few words concerning it. In his lectures on *Judaism and its History*, the late rabbi Geiger, of Berlin, boldly affirms that Jesus was a Pharisee and a follower of Hillel, who never gave utterance to a new idea (“Einen neuen Gedanken sprach er keinesweges aus”). “Hillel,” he says, “was a genuine reformer;” but wherein this reformation consisted Dr. Geiger did not tell. It was not necessary, for Geiger’s attempt was to disparage Jesus; and the idea that Hillel was a genuine reformer, and Jesus merely an imitator, must have been as striking as the smoke utterance of the Pythian oracle.

As to Rénan and Deutsch, we will quote the remark of Dr. Liddon in his *Bampton Lectures* for 1866 (N.Y. 1869, 4th ed. p. 107): “Rénan suggests, not without some hesitation, that Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus” (“Hillel fut le vrai maitre de Jesus, s’il est permis de parler de maitre quand il s’agit d’une si haute originalité” [*Vie de Jesus*, p. 35]). “As an instance,” says Dr. Liddon (in a footnote), “of our Lord’s real independence of Hillel, a single example may suffice. A recent writer on the Talmud gives the following story: ‘One day a heathen went to Shammal, the head of the rival academy, and asked him, mockingly, to convert him to the law while he stood on one leg. The irate master turned him from the door. He then went to Hillel, who gave him that reply — since so widely propagated — Do not unto another, etc. This is the whole law; the rest is merely commentary’” (*Literary Remains* [N.Y. 1874], p. 317). The writer in the *Quarterly Review* (October, 1867, p. 441, art. “The Talmud”) appears to assume the identity of Hillel’s saying with the precept of our blessed Lord (^{<4072>}Matthew 7:12; ^{<4068>}Luke 6:31). Yet, in truth, how wide is the interval between the merely *negative* rule of the Jewish president and the positive precept — ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς of the Divine Master.”

But whatever may be said of the precept (^{<4072>}Matthew 7:12) as to its being considered as a fresh discovery in moral science, most certainly Hillel cannot claim the merit of originality in respect to it. It existed long before his time. In the Apocryphal book Tobit we read words like those which he

used (4, 15): ὃ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσης (“Do that to no man which thou hatest”)’ and in Ecclesiastes 31:15: νόει τὰ τοῦ πλησίου ἐκ σεαυτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντι πράγματι διανοοῦ (i.e. “Judge of the disposition of thy neighbor by thyself”). Ancient history bears ample testimony to the existence of this maxim among the ancient Greeks long before the time of Hillel. Thus Diogenes Laertius relates that Aristotle, being asked how we ought to carry ourselves to our friends, answered, “As we wish they would carry themselves to us.” Isocrates, who lived four hundred years before the publication of the Gospel, said: ἅ πάσχοντες ὑφ’ ἐτέρων ὀργίσεσθε ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε — i.e. “We must not do to others that which would cause anger if it were done to ourselves.” In its negative form the golden rule of our Savior, which Locke designates as the foundation of all social virtue, is also found among the sayings of Confucius: “What you do not wish done to yourselves, do not do to others;” or, as in the *Conversations* (bk. 15, ch. 23), where it appears condensed like a telegram: *Ki su pok iuk uk sic u ing* — i.e. “Self what not wish, not do to man.”

~~1024~~ Matthew 7:24-27:

“Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock,” *etc.* — *Pirke Aboth*, 3, 17: “R. Eliezer ben-Azariah [d. A.D. 82] said, He whose knowledge surpasses his good deeds may be compared to a tree with many branches and a scanty root — every wind shakes and uproots it. But he whose good deeds excel his knowledge may be compared to a tree with a few branches and strong roots: if all the hurricanes in the world should come and storm against it, they could not move it from its place.”

Aboth di R. Nathan, c. 24, Elisha ben-Abuyah [cir. A.D. 138] said: “A man who studies the law, and acts in accordance with its commandments, is likened unto a man who builds a house the foundation of which is made of freestone, and the superstructure of bricks. Storm and flood cannot injure the house. But he who studies the law, but is destitute of good actions, is likened unto the man who builds the foundation of his house of brick and mortar and raises the upper stories with solid stone. The flood will soon undermine and overturn the house.” From these parallels, which could be, perhaps, somewhat increased, the impartial critic will make his own inferences. From the nature of the case, it would be impossible to give a parallel to each sentence of the Sermon on the Mount; for, in the first

place, it contains many allusions to the manner in which Pharisaism discharged the religious duties, and, in the second place, our aim was to give the authority of the parallel passage in order to fix the chronology. The date added to each rabbi is the same as that fixed by the Jewish historian Dr. Grätz; and the claim that the New Test. copied the Talmud must accordingly be stigmatized, once for all, as a vain glorification of reformed Judaism, which, on the one hand, rejects the Talmud as a religious code, but, on the other, makes use of it for controversial purposes. (B.P.)

Sermonizing

the act or system of constructing sermons. While other forms of religious address have had their successive periods of predominance, the sermon has maintained the rank of preeminent importance since the time when our Lord delivered his sermon on the Mount..

I. History of the Subject. — The age of the Church fathers was that in which the *homily* most prevailed. The mediæval period was that of postils. During both these periods the quality and character of religious discourses greatly declined, and the true idea of Christian preaching became at length nearly lost. To speak in the most guarded manner, it was overshadowed amid the ceremonials of worship and the abounding spirit of worldliness.

The reformers availed themselves of preaching as the means of combating the errors and superstitions into which the Church had fallen. They set themselves diligently to proclaiming the essential truths of God's Word, and by them the sermon was restored to its original importance. That importance has been so fully recognized in modern times that the sermon has come to be generally regarded as the correlate of preaching itself. The exhortation and the homily still have a place among religious addresses, but it is not said of ministers of the Gospel that they preach exhortations or homilies. If they preach, in any proper sense, they preach sermons. Hence none who regard themselves the subjects of the Savior's injunctions, "As ye go, preach," "Preach the Gospel to every creature," and of the apostolic precept "Preach the Word," can be indifferent as to the best methods of constructing sermons.

II. Rules. — Sermonizing may be said to embrace the two important particulars of plan and style.

1. Plan. — Little is hazarded in saying that a good plan is essential to a good sermon. It is by no means essential that the plan be formally stated or even made perceptible to the hearer, but it is needed to guide the thought and accomplish the aim of the speaker. The preacher who has no plan is liable to wander from his proper line of thought, to repeat himself, to confuse his hearers, and to fail in all the important objects of a sermon. Superficial readers have imagined and sometimes asserted, that the sermons of Christ and his apostles were uttered without plan. Careful analysis will, however, reveal in every instance an underlying or pervading plan well adapted to the object in view. Still it is proper to acknowledge, judging from the reports that have come down to us, that not only during the New Test. period, but during the early Christian centuries, but little, if any, attention was given to artificial or minutely drawn plans. The style of preaching during the patristic age being for the greater part expository, preachers were naturally held to the order of the portions of Scripture expounded. To whatever extent panegyrics were introduced in the 4th and 5th centuries, in imitation of the Greek orators, the order of narration was naturally followed. Rarely were the formal parts of an oration, as described by the Greek and Roman rhetoricians, distinctly developed in sermons. It was reserved for the schoolmen of the 12th century and later to apply the minutiae of ancient rhetoric and logic to the framework of sermons. That application was, however, so ingeniously made by them as to project its influence downward through successive centuries. That influence may be traced in the preaching of both Catholics and Protestants of various countries even down to the present time. The prevailing fault of what maybe termed the scholastic method of sermonizing has been that of excess in detail. By not a few authors it has been drawn out into a minuteness of division and subdivision, and, in short, an extreme of artificiality sufficient to destroy all freedom of thought and expression. Not only professed scholastics, but various writers of comparatively recent date, have bewildered themselves and their readers with their tedious and multiplied schemes of suggestion and division. Whoever has the curiosity to see this statement illustrated may find ample material in a joint comparison of bishop Wilkins's *Gift of Preaching*, Claude's *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon*, and G.W. Hervey's *Christian Rhetoric*. While it may be said that in some sense these three books represent England, France, and the United States of America, and also the 17th, the 18th, and the 19th centuries, it would be more proper to say that they represent an antique

fashion, together with the action of a certain class of minds, of which more or less appear in every age.

Wilkins, seeking to simplify the detailed processes of preceding writers, so as to enable preachers to “teach clearly, convince strongly, and persuade powerfully,” gives schemes of explication, confirmation, and application which cover six continuous duodecimo pages.

Claude, in order to help preachers avoid “poor, dry, and spiritless observations,” and also to reduce “obscure matters to a natural, popular, and modern air,” prescribes twenty-seven different sources of observations, designed to aid thought and facilitate invention. They are practically copied from the *Loci Communes*, or *Commonplaces*, of Aristotle, one only of his twenty-eight being omitted.

Hervey, in the modest endeavor to do what he thinks all other American writers have failed to do — namely, “to find the true ground works of homiletics, and to reduce the science to something like a clear and sufficient system” — not only repeats the twenty-seven topics of Claude, but, on his own account, enumerates and exemplifies forty-one kinds of topical division!

It is not surprising that such excesses have called forth both opposition and ridicule, and have even provoked some minds to the rejection, if not of all plans, yet of all divisions of a sermon. Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, represented the opposition of his period to the scholastic system in his *Dialogues concerning Eloquence*. He said, “For the most part, divisions give only a seeming order, while they really mangle and clog a discourse by separating it into two or three parts, which must interrupt the orator’s action and the effect it ought to produce. There remains no true unity after such divisions, seeing they make two or three different discourses, which are joined into one only by an arbitrary connection. Three sermons preached at different times, if they be formed upon some regular concerted plan, make one piece or entire discourse as much as the three points of any of these sermons make one whole by being joined and delivered together.” That Fenelon, in the above quotation, was arguing against the abuses of division, rather than against proper plans of discourse, is sufficiently obvious from his own subsequent directions as to the plan and development of a sermon. “We ought,” said he, “at first to give a general view of our subject, and endeavor to gain the favor of the audience by a modest introduction, a respectful address, and the genuine marks of candor

and probity. Then we should establish those principles on which we design to argue, and in a clear, easy, sensible manner, propose the principal facts we are to build on, insisting chiefly on those circumstances of which we intend to make use afterwards. From these principles and facts we must draw just consequences, and argue in such a clear and well-connected manner that all our proofs may support each other, and so be the more remembered. Every step we advance, our discourse ought to grow stronger, so that the hearers may gradually perceive the force and evidence of the truth; and then we ought to display it in such lively images and movements as are proper to excite the passions." A following sentence discloses more definitely the view of Fenelon: "We ought to choose some method, but such a method as is not discovered and promised in, the beginning of our discourse." In this he admits the importance, if not the necessity, of a plan, but denies the propriety of stating the plan in advance. In respect to the latter item, it is safe to believe that different subjects and occasions may make different requisitions of the preacher — circumstances not seldom occurring in which a lucid statement of plan may conduce greatly to the appropriate objects of a sermon. At other times and on other subjects, it may be better to carry the hearers insensibly along to conclusions, without disclosing the processes or marking the steps by which the conclusions are reached. The governing principle in this matter should be that of adaptation. Hence any attempt to fix arbitrary and unvarying rules must result in failure. But the preacher should not, on this account, make the mistake of attempting to prepare and deliver sermons without plan. He should rather accustom himself to habits and forms of close logical analysis and synthesis, studying carefully the adaptation of the most available forms to different classes of subjects and occasions. By this means, he may rise above the necessity of loading down his mind with numerous rules, and attain not only facility, but correctness of mental action in shaping his addresses to the comprehension and the persuasion of his hearers. On this plan, an essential and ever increasing variety, both in the form and matter of his discourses, maybe secured; while without it, or some similar mode of procedure, there is great danger of falling into ruts or grooves of thought which, however easy to the preacher, become trite and wearisome to hearers. If, then, his logical plans be set on fire with evangelical love and a consuming zeal in behalf of the souls of men, he will be able to produce sermons of the highest rhetorical power.

According to all the best authorities, a sermon should have an organic structure — at least an introduction, an argument, and a conclusion. In cases of extreme brevity, the beginning and end of the argument may serve as the introduction and conclusion of the sermon. Whether and to what extent the principal and essential parts of a sermon should be marked with divisions and subdivisions should be determined with reference to the probability of oratorical effect. If they can be made to secure greater attention on the part of hearers, and to fasten clearer and deeper impressions on their minds, it would be prudery to reject them. If, on the other hand, they would break the course of thought or mar the unity of the sermon, it would be folly to employ them. So of any style of division, if found helpful and auxiliary to good results, it is to be cultivated. If it seem artificial, redundant, or otherwise a hindrance to oratorical power, let it be sternly rejected.

2. *Style.* — The impracticability of prescribing fixed and arbitrary rules as to the language to be employed in preaching is quite as great as in reference to plans of discourse. Nevertheless, there are not wanting important principles to guide the composers of sermons, whether written or oral.

(1.) The language of a sermon should be prose, and not poetry.

(2.) All the essential qualities of a good prose style should be found in every sermon. Summarily stated, those qualities are purity, precision, perspicuity, unity, harmony, and strength. The lack of any one of those qualities may justly be counted as a defect in the style of any sermon. It belongs to the science of rhetoric to define and illustrate them severally, and also to give suggestions as to their attainment, their laws, and their special uses.

(3.) Superadded to the general qualities of a good style, a few special characteristics may be named as highly desirable in the style of sermons, although with some variation of degree in accordance with subjects and occasions.

No discriminating criticism of sermons can be made, apart from a proper classification of each particular sermon, on the basis of its subject or special design. By such a classification, sermons are usually distributed into five classes, viz. expository, hortatory, doctrinal, practical, and miscellaneous or occasional. The last named class requires a somewhat

extended subclassification with reference to special topics and occasions, e.g. *a*, missions; *b*, education; *c*, temperance; *d*, charity; *e*, funerals; *f*, ordinances; *g*, festivals, etc.

To a thoughtful mind, the law of adaptation will hardly fail to suggest important, though not easily described, variations in the style to be employed in treating topics so different in character. Yet a sermon on any one of these subjects, or, in fact, on any subject appropriate for discussion in a Christian pulpit, will fall short of the highest excellence if lacking in such qualities of style as the following:

- 1.** A combination of simplicity with dignity. It is essential that a sermon embody such a choice of language as will tend to make wise the simple; yet, in his effort to be plain, the preacher must avoid triviality. He must employ words and present images corresponding to the grandeur of the truth which he proclaims, and which may also be understood by the unlearned. Simplicity in the sense recommended is opposed to the affectation of elegance and the straining after pompous words and unusual expressions. It employs the language of the people, but makes it the instrument of elevating their thoughts and ennobling their character.
- 2.** It is incumbent on preachers to make frequent use of scriptural quotations and allusions as a means of declaring and illustrating God's message in its proper form and spirit. Hence the style of their sermons should be in harmony with the tenor and spirit of the Holy Scriptures. The peculiar quality hereby indicated, and which the quotations themselves do not supply, is sometimes called scriptural congruity. It is the picture or framework of silver in which the apples of gold may be fitly set.
- 3.** Another peculiar quality of style demanded in sermons is directness of address. It is the province of poetry to sweep circles and various curvilinear lines of beauty through the realms of thought. Its objects may be well accomplished by exciting admiration and emotions of pleasure. True preaching has a higher aim, and consequently needs to focalize its power in order to produce conviction in the mind and proper emotions in the heart. Hence a good pulpit style tolerates neither the indirectness of an essay nor any rhetorical embellishments which are not auxiliary to directness of address. It rejects circumlocutions and demands those forms of expression that make hearers feel that they are personally the objects of the sacred message. As a good portrait looks every person calmly in the eye, so a good sermon seems to speak directly to every hearer. When, in

connection with a just reference to the principles above stated, preachers severally maintain their individuality of thought and expression, they will find sermonizing not only a fascinating engagement, but one full of encouragement from the happy results following.

So far as this subject has a literature, it is found in works on homiletics and preaching (q.v.). (D.P.K.)

Se'ron

(Σήρων; in Syr. and one Gr. MS. Ἡρων; Vulg. *Seron*), a general of Antiochus Epiphanes, in chief command of the Syrian army (1 Macc. 3:13, ὁ ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεως Συρίας), who was defeated at Beth-horon by Judas Maccabaeus (B.C. 166), as in the day when Joshua pursued the five kings “in the going down of Bethhoron” (1 Macc. 3:24; <GRI> Joshua 10:11). According to Josephus, he was the governor of Coele-Syria and fell in the battle (*Ant.* 12, 7,1), nor is there any reason to suppose that his statements are mere deductions from the language of 1 Macc.

Serosh

in Persian mythology, was one of the mightiest of Ormuzd's genii, king of the earth, and director of all things in it. He was not, however, one of the seven amshasponds, but only an assistant to Ardibehesht, one of their number.

Serpent

The frequent mention of this creature in the Bible, together with the important part which it plays in early mythology, justifies a fuller treatment of the subject here than could well be given under the special terms by which the several species are designated. To these, however, we also refer as affording further details on certain points.

I. Bible Names. — The following are the Heb. and Gr. words by which either the serpent in general or some particular kind is represented in the A.V. with great variety and little precision.

1. Nachash (נָחָשׁ; so called probably from its *hissing*; Sept. and New Test. ὄφις) the generic name of any serpent, occurs frequently in the Old Test. The following are the principal Biblical allusions to this animal: Its subtlety is mentioned in <GRI>Genesis 3:1; its wisdom is alluded to by our Lord in

Matthew 10:16. The poisonous properties of some species are often mentioned (see Psalm 58:4; Proverbs 23:32); the sharp tongue of the serpent, which it would appear some of the ancient Hebrews believed to be the instrument of poison, is mentioned in Psalm 140:3; Job 20:16, “the viper’s tongue shall slay him;” although in other places, as in Proverbs 23:32; Ecclesiastes 10:8, 11; Numbers 21:9, the venom is correctly ascribed to the bite, while in Job 20:14 the gall is said to be the poison. The habit serpents have of lying concealed in hedges is alluded to in Ecclesiastes 10:8, and in holes of walls, in Amos 5, 19; their dwelling in dry, sandy places, in Deuteronomy 8:15. Their wonderful mode of progression did not escape the observation of the author of Proverbs 30 who expressly mentions it as “one of the three things which were too wonderful for him” (ver. 19).. The oviparous nature of most of the order is alluded to in Isaiah 59:5, where the A.V., however, has the unfortunate rendering of “cockatrice.” The art of taming and charming serpents is of great antiquity, and is alluded to in Psalm 58:5; Ecclesiastes 10:11; Jeremiah 8:17, and doubtless intimated by James (James 3:7), who particularizes serpents among all other animals that “have been tamed by man.” *SEE SERPENT CHARMING.*

2. Sardah (*ārc*; prob. *burning*, *SEE SERAPH*; Sept. ὄφις or δράκων; A.V. “fiery”) occurs generally in connection with the above term (Numbers 21:6; Deuteronomy 8:15), but occasionally alone (Numbers 21:8; Isaiah 14:29; 30:6), as some peculiarly venomous species.

Much has been written on the question of the “fiery serpents” (*μυρᾶχι μυνῃλι*) of Numbers 21:6, 8, with which it is usual to identify the “fiery flying serpent” of Isaiah 30:6 and 14:29. In the transaction recorded (Numbers *loc. cit.*; Deuteronomy 8:15) as having occurred at the time of the Exodus, when the rebellious Israelites were visited with a plague of serpents, there is not a word about their having been “flying” creatures; there is therefore no occasion to refer the venomous snakes in question to the kind of which Niebuhr (*Descript. de l’Arab.* p. 156) speaks, and which the Arabs at Basra denominate *heie sursurie*, or *heie thiare*, “flying serpents,” which obtained that name from their habit of “springing” from branch to branch of the date trees they inhabit. Besides these are tree serpents (*dendrophidoe*), a harmless family of the colubrine snakes, and therefore quite out of the question. The Heb. term rendered “fiery” by the

A.V. is by the Alexandrine edition of the Sept. represented by **θανατοῦντες**, “deadly.” Onkelos, the Arabic version of Saadiah, and the Vulg. translate the word “burning,” in allusion to the sensation produced by the bite; other authorities understand a reference to the bright color of the serpents. It is impossible to point out the species of poisonous snake which destroyed the people in the Arabian desert. Niebuhr says that the only truly formidable kind is that called *boetan*, a small slender creature spotted black and white, whose bite is instant death, and whose poison causes the dead body to swell in an extraordinary manner (see Forskal, *Descript. Animal.* p. 15). It is obvious that either the *cerastes* or the *naja haje*, or any other venomous species frequenting Arabia, may denote the “serpent of the burning bite” which destroyed the children of Israel. See Ziegra, *De Serpentina Ignitis* (Jena, 1732).

Picture for Serpent 1

The “fiery flying serpent” of Isaiah (*loc. cit.*) can have no existence in nature if taken in strict literalness, though it is curious to notice that Herodotus (2, 75; 3, 108) speaks of serpents with wings whose bones he imagined he had himself seen near Buto in Arabia. Monstrous forms of snakes with birds’ wings occur on the Egyptian sculptures; it is probable that some kind of flying lizard (*Draco*, *Dracocella*, or *Dracunculus*) may have been the “flying serpent” of which Herodotus speaks; and perhaps, as this animal, though harmless, is yet calculated to inspire horror by its appearance, it may denote the flying serpent of the prophet, and may have been regarded by the ancient Hebrews as an animal as terrible as a venomous snake. Accordingly, Hamilton Smith is disposed to take the *saraph*, or supposed winged serpent, to be a *haje*, one of the more Eastern species or varieties of the cobra or *naja*, which have the faculty of actually distending the hood, as if they had wings at the side of the head, and are the same as, or nearly allied to, the well known spectacle snake of India; and this interpretation seems to accord with the words of Moses, *the serpents, the burning ones* (⁰²¹⁶Numbers 21:6). The serpent may exhibit this particular state of irritation when it stands half erect with its hood distended, or it may be that variety which is possessed of this faculty to the greatest extent. *Naja. reflectrix*, the *pof* or *spook adder* of the Cape colonists, is reported by Dr. Smith to be scarcely distinct from the Egyptian *naja haje*. With regard to the faculty of flying, the lengthened form, the muscular apparatus, the absence of air cells, and the whole osteological structure are all incompatible with flight or the presence of

wings: hence Herodotus, in his search for flying serpents at Buto, may have observed heaps of exuviae of locusts cast on shore by the sea — a phenomenon not unfrequent on that coast — but most assuredly not heaps of bones and ribs of serpents. As for those of Plutarch, they may have been noxious sand flies. Flying serpents are only found represented in the symbolical pictures of Egypt, where they occur with birds' wings. Those of history, and of barbarous nations excessively habituated to figurative forms of speech, are various; some being so called because of their rapid motion, others on account of a kind of spring they are said to make at their victims, and a third class because they climb trees, and are reported to swing themselves from thence upon their victims, or to other trees. Now, many species of serpents are climbers; many hang by the tail from slender branches of low trees in highly heated glens, snapping at insects as they wheel around them; but all are delicately jointed, and if any should swing further than merely to change their hold, and should miss catching a branch, they would most certainly be dislocated, and, if not killed, very seriously injured. From personal experiments, we can attest that serpents are heavy in proportion to their bulk, and without the means of breaking their fall; that few, large or small, could encounter the shock of twelve or fourteen feet elevation without fracturing many spinous processes of their vertebrae, and avoid being stunned for a length of time, or absolutely crushed to death. Being instinctively conscious of the brittleness of their structure, nearly all snakes are timid, and desirous of avoiding a contest unless greatly provoked. This remark applies, we believe, to all innocuous serpents, the great boas perhaps excepted, and to most of the poisonous, exclusive of several species of viper and cobra-de-capello (comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 333). Of the so called flying, or rather darting, serpents, Niebuhr found near Basra a venomous species called *heie sursurie* and *heie thiare* — that is, “flying serpent” — because it was said to fling itself from one tree to another. Admiral Anson heard, at the island of Quibo, of snakes flying without wings: we may notice the *Acontias* and *Prester*, that fell like arrows from the tops of trees, and the green *AEtula* of Ceylon, said to spring from trees at the eyes of cattle — an accusation repeated of more than one species in tropical America. Next we have the *uler tampang hari*, seen in a forest near the river Pedang Bessie, somewhere, we believe, in the Australasian islands, under circumstances that most certainly require confirmation; since this fiery serpent, so called from the burning pain and fatal effect of its bite, swung itself from one tree to another, 240 feet distant, with a declination to the horizon of only about

fifteen degrees. We may thus refer the “winged” or “flying” serpent to the *Naja tripudians*, in one of its varieties, because, with its hood dilated into a kind of shining wing on each side of the neck, standing, in undulating motion, one half or more erect, rigid, and fierce in attack and deadly poisonous, yet still denominated “good spirit,” and in Egypt ever figured in combination with the winged globe, it may well have received the name of *saraph*, and may thus meet all the valid objections and conciliate seemingly opposite comments (see ^{<0206>}Numbers 21:6, 8; ^{<0805>}Deuteronomy 8:15; ^{<2302>}Isaiah 16:29; 30:6; and Paxton’s *Illustrations*), excepting the authority of Herodotus, Pausanias, and Bochart, which, with all the respect due to their names, is not now sufficient to establish the existence of a kind of serpent whose structure is contrary to the laws of zoological organization. In ^{<2302>}Isaiah 14:29, and 30:6, the epithet אֲפֹרֹתַי *meophaph*, *vibrating* (rendered “flying” in the A.V.), is another form for “winged,” and occurs in passages unconnected with the events in Exodus. Both bear metaphorical interpretations. A further confirmation of the “fiery serpents,” or “serpents of the burning bite,” being najas, occurs in the name *Ras om-Haye* (Cape of the Haje serpents), situated in the locality where geographers and commentators agree that the children of Israel were afflicted by these reptiles. Should it be objected that these are the haje and not the spectacle snake, it may be answered that both Arabs and Hindus confound the species.

3. Akshub (אֲכַשְׁבִּי | Sept. ἀσπίς, A.V. “adder”) is found only in ^{<0808>}Psalms 140:3, “They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders’ poison is under their lips.” The latter half of this verse is quoted by Paul from the Sept. in ^{<0813>}Romans 3:13 (“asp”). The poison of venomous serpents is often employed by the sacred writers in a figurative sense to express the evil tempers of ungodly men; that malignity which, as bishop Horne says, is “the venom and poison of the intellectual world” (comp. ^{<0823>}Deuteronomy 32:33; ^{<0804>}Job 20:14, 16).

It is not possible to say with any degree of certainty what particular species of serpent is intended by the Hebrew word; the ancient versions do not help us at all, although nearly all agree in some kind of serpent, with the exception of the Chaldee paraphrase, which understands a *spider* by *akshub*, interpreting this Hebrew word by one of somewhat similar form (אֲכַבִּישׁ | *akkabish*). The etymology of the term is not ascertained with sufficient precision to enable us to refer the animal to any determinate

species. Gesenius derives it from two Hebrew roots (**vk**⌒; *akash*, “to turn backward,” and **bq**⌒; “to lie in wait”), the combined meaning of which is “rolled in a spire and lying in ambush;” a description which would apply to almost any kind of serpent.

The number of poisonous serpents with which the Jews were acquainted was in all probability limited to some five or six species, and it is not improbable that the *akshub* may be represented by the *Toxicoa* of Egypt and North Africa. At any rate, it is unlikely that the Jews were unacquainted with this kind, which is common in Egypt and probably in Syria. *SEE ADDER*.

Picture for Serpent 2

4. *Pethen* (⌒tP, from an obsolete root prob. signifying *to twist or to be strong*; Sept. ἄσπις, δράκων, βασιλίσκος), The Hebrew word occurs in the six following passages: ^{<1623>}Deuteronomy 32:33; ^{<1616>}Psalms 58:5; 91:13; ^{<1614>}Job 20:14, 161 ^{<2118>}Isaiah 11:8. It is expressed in the passages from the Psalms by “adder” in the text of the A.V. and by “asp” in the margin; elsewhere the text of the A.V. has “asp” as the representative of the original word *pethen*.

That some kind of poisonous serpent is denoted by the Hebrew word is clear from the passages quoted above. We further learn from ^{<1616>}Psalms 58:5 that the *pethen* was a snake upon which the serpent charmers practiced their art. In this passage the wicked are compared to “the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear, which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely;” and from ^{<2118>}Isaiah 11:8, “the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp,” it would appear that the *pethen* was a dweller in holes of walls, etc. The question of identity is one which it is by no means easy to determine. Bochart contributes nothing in aid to a solution when he attempts to prove that the *pethen* is the *asp* (*Hieroz.* 3, 156), for this species of serpent, if a species be signified by the term, has been so vaguely described by authors that it is not possible to say what known kind is represented by it. The term *asp* in modern zoology is generally restricted to the *Vipera aspis* of Latreille; but it is most probable that the name, among the ancients, stood for different kinds of venomous serpents. Solinus (c. 27) says, “plures diversaeque sunt aspidum species;” and Aelian (*N. Anim.* 10, 31) asserts that the Egyptians enumerate sixteen kinds of *asp*. Bruce thought that the *asp* of the ancients should be referred

to the *cerastes*, while Cuvier considered it to be the Egyptian cobra (*Naja haje*). Be this, however, as it may, there can be little doubt that the Hebrew name *pethen* is specific, as it is mentioned as distinct from *akshub*, *shephiphon*, *tsiphoni*, etc., names of other members of the *Ophidia*.

Oedman (*Vermisch. Samml.* 10, 81) identifies the *pethen* with the *Coluber lebetinus*, Linn., a species described by Forskal (*Desc. Anim.* p. 15). Rosenmüller (*Not. ad Hieroz.* 3, 156), Dr. Lee (*Heb. Lex.* s.v. $\hat{\text{t}}\text{P}$), Dr. Harris (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*, art. “Asp”), Col. H. Smith (*Encyc. Bib. Lit.*, art. “Serpent”), believe that the *pethen* of Scripture is to be identified with the *Coluber boetan* of Forskal. Oedman has no hesitation in establishing an identity between the *C. lebetinus* and the *C. boetan*; but from Forskal’s descriptions it is most probable that the two species are distinct. The whole argument that seeks to establish the identity of the *C. boetan* with the *pethen* of Scripture is based entirely upon a similarity of sound. Rosenmüller thinks that the Arabic word *boetan* ought to be written *poetan*, and thinks there can be no doubt that this species represents the *pethen* of Scripture. Oedman’s argument, also, is based on a similarity of sound in the words, though he adduces an additional proof in the fact that, according to the Swedish naturalist quoted above, the common people of Cyprus bestow the epithet of *kouphe* ($\kappa\omicron\upsilon\delta\phi\eta$), “deaf,” upon the *C. lebetinus*. He does not, however, believe that this species is absolutely deaf, for he says it can hear well. This epithet of deafness attributed to the *C. lebetinus* Oedman thinks may throw light on the passage in ¹⁵⁸¹⁶Psalm 58:5, about “the deaf adder.” As regards the opinion of Rosenmüller and others who recognize the *pethen* under the *boetan* of Forskal, it may be stated that, even if the identity is allowed, we are as much in the dark as ever on the subject, for the *C. boetan* of Forskal has never been determined. If *C. boetan* be the same as *C. lebetinus*, the species denoted may be the *Echis arenicola* (*Toxicoa*) of Egypt (*Catalogue of Snakes in Brit. Mus.* 1, 29). Probably all that naturalists have ever heard of the *C. boetan* is derived from two or three lines of description given by Forskal. “The whole body is spotted with black and white; it is a foot in length, and of the thickness of two thumbs; oviparous; its bite kills in an instant, and the wounded body swells.” The evidence afforded by the *deaf* snake of Cyprus, and adduced in support of his argument by Oedman, is of no value whatever; for it must be remembered that audition in all the *Ophidia* is very imperfect, as all the members of this order are destitute of a tympanic cavity. The epithet “deaf,” therefore, so far as relates to the power all

serpents possess of hearing *ordinary* sounds, may reasonably be applied to any snake. Vulgar opinion in many countries attributes “deafness” to the adder; but it would be very unreasonable to infer from thence that the common adder (*Pelias berus*) is identical with the “deaf adder” of the 58th Psalm. Vulgar opinion in Cyprus is of no more value in the matter of identification of species than vulgar opinion elsewhere. A preliminary proof; moreover, is necessary for the argument. The snake of Cyprus must be demonstrated to occur in Egypt or the Holy Land: a fact which has never yet been proved, though. as was stated above, the snake of Cyprus (*C. lebetinus*) may be the same as the *Echis arenicola* of North Africa.

Very absurd are some of the explanations which commentators have given of the passage concerning the “deaf adder that stoppeth her ears;” the rabbi Solomon (according to Bochart, 3, 162) asserts that “this snake becomes deaf when old in one ear; that she stops the other with dust, lest she should hear the charmer’s voice.” Others maintain that “she applies one ear to the ground and stops the other with her tail.” That such errors should have prevailed in former days, when little else but foolish marvels filled the pages of natural history, is not to be wondered at, and no allusion to them would have been made here if this absurd error of “the adder stopping her ears with her tail” had not been perpetuated in our own day. In Bythner’s *Lyre of David*, p. 165 (Dee’s translation, 1847), the following explanation of the word *pethen*, without note or comment, occurs: “*Asp*, whose deafness marks the venom of his malice, as though impenetrable even to charms; it is deaf of one ear, and stops the other with dust or its tail, that it may not hear incantations.” Dr. Thomson also (*Land and Book*, 1, 221) seems to give credence to the fable when he writes: “There is also current an opinion that the adder will actually stop up his ear with his tail to fortify himself against the influence of music and other charms.” It is not then needless to observe, in confutation of the above error, that no serpent possesses external openings to the ear. The true explanation of ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 58:5 is simply as follows: There are some serpents, individuals of the same species perhaps, which defy all the attempts of the charmer — in the language of Scripture such individuals may be termed *deaf*. The point of the rebuke consists in the fact that the *pethen* was capable of hearing the charmer’s song, but refused to do so. The individual case in question was an exception to the rule. If, as some have supposed; the expression “deaf adder” denoted some species that was incapable of hearing, whence it had its specific name, how could there be any force in the comparison which

the psalmist makes with wicked men? Serpents, though, comparatively speaking, deaf to ordinary sounds, are no doubt capable of hearing the sharp, shrill sounds which the charmer produces either by his voice or by an instrument; and this comparative deafness is, it appears to us, *the very reason* why such sounds as the charmer makes produce the desired effect in the subject under treatment. As the Egyptian cobra is more frequently than any other species the subject upon which the serpent charmers of the Bible-lands practice their science, as it is fond of concealing itself in walls and in holes (^{<2108>}Isaiah 11:8), and as it is not impossible that the derivation of the Hebrew word *pethen* has reference to the expanding powers of this serpent's neck when irritated, it appears to us to have at least as good a claim to represent the *pethen* as the very doubtful species of *Coluber boetan*, which on such slender grounds has been so positively identified with it. *SEE SERPENT CHARMING.*

5. *Epheh* (ἡ [ραῆ Sept. ὄφης, ἄσπης, βασιλίσκος) occurs in ^{<8316>}Job 20:16; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 30:6; and 54:5, in all of which passages the A.V. has "viper." There is no scriptural allusion by means of which it is possible to determine the species of serpent indicated by the Heb. term, which is derived from a root which signifies "to hiss." Shaw (*Trav.* p. 251) speaks of some poisonous snake which the Arabs call leffah (*el-effah*): "it is the most malignant of the tribe, and rarely above a foot long." Jackson also: (*Morocco*, p. 110) mentions this serpent; from his description it would seem to be the Algerine adder (*Echidna arietans* var. *Mauritanica*). The snake (ἔχιδνα) that fastened on Paul's hand when he was at Melita (^{<423>}Acts 28:3) was probably the common viper (*Pelias bertus*), which is widely distributed throughout Europe and the islands of the Mediterranean, or else the *Vipera aspis*, a not uncommon species on the coasts of the same sea. See VIPER.

6. *Tsepha*, or *Tsiphoni* ([ρικ, γινῶρ] Sept. ἔκγονα ἄσπίδων, κεράστης), occurs five times in the Hebrew Bible. In ^{<1232>}Proverbs 23:32 it is translated "adder," and in the three passages of Isaiah quoted above, as well as in ^{<2187>}Jeremiah 8:17, it is rendered "cockatrice." The derivation of the word from a root which means "to hiss" does not help us at all to identify the animal. From Jeremiah we learn that it was of a hostile nature, and from the parallelism of ^{<2108>}Isaiah 11:8 it appears that the *tsiphoni* was considered even more dreadful than the *pethen*. Bochart, in his *Hieroz.* (3, 182, ed. Rosenmüller), has endeavored to prove that the *tsiphoni* is the

basilisk of the Greeks (whence Jerome in Vulg. reads *regulus*), which was then supposed to destroy life, burn up grass, and break stones by the pernicious influence of its breath (comp. Pliny, *H.N.* 8, 33); but this is explaining an “ignotum per ignotius.”

The whole story of the basilisk is involved in fable, and it is in vain to attempt to discover the animal to which the ancients attributed such terrible power. It is curious to observe, however, that Forskal (*Descr. Animal.* p. 15) speaks of a kind of serpent (*Coluber holleik* is the name he gives it) which he says produces irritation on the spot touched by its breath; he is quoting, no doubt, the opinion of the Arabs. Is this a relic of the basiliskan fable? This creature was so called from a mark on its head, supposed to resemble a kingly crown. Several serpents, however, have peculiar markings on the head — the varieties of the spectacle cobras of India, for example — so that identification is impossible. As the Sept. makes use of the word basilisk (¹⁹⁰³Psalm 90:13; 91:13 A.V.), it was thought desirable to say this much on the subject. The basilisk of naturalists is a most forbidding looking yet harmless lizard of the family *Iguanidoe*, order *Sauria*. In using the term, therefore, care must be taken not to confound the mythical serpent with the veritable Saurian. Basilisk is an indefinite English name, which belongs to no identified serpent, and now appears only in the works of ancient compilers and heralds, where it is figured with a crest, though there is no really crested or frilled species known to exist in the whole Ophidian order. Crested serpents occur, it is true, on Greek and Etruscan vases; but they are invariably mythological representations, probably derived from descriptive rumors of the hooded *najas*, *cerastes*, and perhaps *muroenoe*; the first of these having what may be likened to a turbaned, the other to a coronated head, and the third fins at the operculum. But it is from the apparently crowned form that the denominations of basilisk and *regulus* were derived. **SEE BASILISK.**

It is possible that the *tsiphoni* may be represented by the Algerine adder (*Clotho Mauritanica*), but it must be confessed that this is mere conjecture. Dr. Harris, in his *Natural History of the Bible*, erroneously supposes it to be identical with the *Rajah zephen* of Forskal, which, however, is a fish (*Trigon zephen*, Cuv.), and not a serpent. **SEE COCKATRICE.**

Picture for Serpent 3

7. *Shephiphon* (שֶׁפִּיפּוֹן Sept. ἐγκαθήμενος) occurs only in ^{Q497}Genesis 49:17, where it is used to characterize the tribe of Dan: “Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse’s heels, so that his rider shall fall backwards.” Various are the readings of the old versions in this passage: the Samaritan interprets *shephiphon* by “lying in wait;” the Targums of Jonathan, of Onkelos, and of Jerusalem, with the Syriac, “a basilisk” (ܡܪܘܝܚܐ, *churmon*, *destructive*) The Arabic interpreters Erpenius and Saadias have “the horned snake;” and so the Vulg. *cerastes*. The Sept., like the Samaritan, must have connected the Hebrew term with a word which expresses the idea of “sitting in ambush.” The original word comes from a root (שָׁפַח) which signifies “to prick,” “pierce,” or “bite.”

Picture for Serpent 4

The habit of the *shephiphon* alluded to in Jacob’s prophecy — namely, that of lurking in the sand and biting at the horse’s heels — suits the character of a well known species of venomous snake, the celebrated horned viper, the asp of Cleopatra (*Cerastes Hasselquistii*), which is found abundantly in the sandy deserts of Egypt, Syria, and Arabia. The Hebrew word *shephiphon* is no doubt identical with the Arabic *siffon*. If the translation of this Arabic word by Golius be compared with the description of the *cerastes* in the British Museum, there will appear good reason for identifying the *shephiphon* of Genesis with the *cerastes* of naturalists: “*Siffon*, serpentis genus leve, punctis maculisque distinctum” — “a small kind of serpent marked with dots and spots” (Golius, *Arab. Lex.* s.v.). “The *cerastes* (*Cerastes Hasselquistii*) is brownish white, with pale-brown, irregular unequal, spots” (*Catalogue of Snakes in Brit. Mus.* 1, 29). It is not pretended that the mere fact of these two animals being *spotted* affords sufficient ground, when taken alone, for asserting that they are identical, for many serpents have this character in common; but when taken in connection with what has been adduced above, coupled with the fact that this spotted character belongs only to a very few kinds common in the localities in question, it does at least form strong presumptive evidence in favor of the identity of the *shephiphon* with the *cerastes*. The name of *cerastes* is derived from a curious horn like process above each eye in the male (and occasionally, it would seem, in the female likewise), which gives it a formidable appearance. Bruce, in his *Travels in Abyssinia*, has given a

very accurate and detailed account of these animals. He observes that he found them in great numbers in those parts which were frequented by the jerboa, and that in the stomach of a *cerastes* he discovered the remains of a jerboa. He kept two of these snakes in a glass vessel for two years without any food. Another circumstance mentioned by Bruce throws some light on the assertions of ancient authors as to the movement of this snake; Aelian (*De Anim.* 15, 13), Isidorus, Aëtius, have all recorded of the *cerastes* that, whereas other serpents creep along in a straight direction, this one and the *hoemorrhous* (no doubt the same animal under, another name) move sideways, stumbling, as it were, on either side (and comp. Bochart). Let this be compared with what Bruce says, “The *cerastes* moves with great rapidity and in all directions, forwards, backwards, *sideways*; when he inclines to surprise any one who. is too far from him, he *creeps with his side towards the person*,” etc. The words of Ibn-Sina, or Avicenna, are to the same effect. It is right, however, to state that nothing unusual has been observed in the mode of progression of the *cerastes* in the gardens of the Zoological Society; but, of course, negative evidence in the instance of a specimen not in a state of nature does not invalidate the statement of so accurate an observer as Bruce. The celebrated John Ellis seems to have been the first Englishman who gave an accurate description of the *cerastes* (see *Philosoph. Transact.* 1760). Hasselquist minutely describes it (*Itin.* p. 241, 365). The *cerastes* is extremely venomous; Bruce compelled one to scratch eighteen pigeons upon the thigh as quickly as possible, and they all died nearly in the same interval of time. It averages from twelve to fifteen inches in length, but is occasionally found larger. It belongs to the family *Viperidae*, order *Ophidia*. This is a dangerous species, usually burrowing in sand near the holes of jerboas, and occasionally in the cattle paths; for there are now few or no ruts of cart wheels, where it is pretended they used to conceal themselves to assault unwary passers. It is still common in Egypt and Arabia.

Another kind of horned serpent is the *Eryx cerastes* of Daudin, also small, having no movable poison fangs, but remarkable for two very long back teeth in the lower jaw, which pass through the upper jaw, and appear in the shape of two white horns above its surface. It is known to the Egyptian Arabs by the name of *harbagi*, which may be a distortion of οὐβαῖος in Horapollo, and is classed by Hasselquist among slowworms, because in form the tail does not taper to a point. Its colors are black and white marblings, and the eyes are lateral and very near the snout. See ASP.

8. *Tsimmaon* ($\hat{\omega}aMx\grave{a}e$ ^{<1815>} Deuteronomy 8:15) appears to be a serpent, though rendered by drought” in the A.V. and others, so called because of the intolerable *thirst* occasioned by its bite. If this translation be correct, it will form in modern nomenclature one of the genus *Hurria*, and subgenus *Dipsas* or *Bongarus*. But no species of this division of snakes has yet been found in Western Asia, albeit there are several in India; and Avicenna locates the *Torrída dipsas* in Egypt and Syria; whereupon Cuvier remarks that Gesner’s figure of *Dipsas* belongs precisely to the subgenus here pointed out. As one of the colubrine family, it should not be venomous; but the last mentioned writer remarks that several of these are regarded in their native localities with great dread; and on examination it is found that, although they have no erectile tubercular fangs, with a poison bag at the roots, there is on the long back teeth a groove, and a large gland at the base of the maxilla, which it is not unlikely contains, in some at least, a highly venomous poison. *SEE DROUGHT.*

9. *Zochel* ($l\ j\ w$, literally a *crawler*) occasionally stands (^{<1824>}Deuteronomy 32:24,” serpent;” ^{<300>}Micah 7:7,” worm”) as a general term for the serpent tribe. See WORM.

10. *Tannin* ($\gamma\theta\epsilon\grave{a}$ “serpent,” ^{<1810>}Exodus 7:9, 10, 12; elsewhere usually “dragon”) seems in the above instances to denote a venomous reptile (^{<1823>}Deuteronomy 32:33); but of a vague character. *SEE SEA MONSTER.*

11. The usual and proper term for “serpent” in the New Test. Is ὄφις, a *snake* of any kind; but once (^{<500>}James 3:7) ἔρπετόν (elsewhere “creeping thing”) is thus rendered. More specific terms, noticed above, are ἀσπίς, ἔχιδνα, δράκων.

II. *Scientific Classification and Characteristics.* —

1. Systematical nomenclators and travelers enumerate considerably more than forty species of serpents in Northern Africa, Arabia, and Syria. Of these it is scarcely possible to point out with certainty a single one named in the Bible, where very few descriptive indications occur beyond what in scientific language would now be applied generically. It is true that, among the names of the list, several may be synonyms of one and the same species; still none but the most recent researches give characters sufficient to be depended upon, and as yet nothing like a complete herpetology of the regions in question has been established. For, snakes being able to resist a

certain degree of cold, and also the greatest heat, there are instances of species being found, such as the *hajes*, precisely the same, from the Ganges to the Cape of Good Hope; others, again, may be traced from Great Britain to Persia and Egypt, as is instanced in the common viper and its varieties. Instead, therefore, of making vain efforts at identifying all the serpents named, it will be a preferable course to assign them to their proper families, with the exception of those that can be pointed out with certainty; and in so doing it will appear that even now species of importance mentioned by the ancients are far from being clearly established.

Serpents may be divided generally into two very distinct sections — the first embracing all those that are provided with movable tubular fangs and poison bags in the upper jaw; all regarded as ovo-viviparous, and called by contraction *vipers*: they constitute not quite one fifth of the species hitherto noticed by naturalists. The second section, much more numerous, is the *colubrine*, not so armed, but not therefore always entirely innocuous, since there may be in some cases venomous secretions capable of penetrating into the wounds made by their fixed teeth, which in all serpents are single points, and in some species increase in size as they stand back in the jaws. The greater part, if not all of these comparatively innocuous species are oviparous, including the largest or giant snakes, and the *pelamis* and *hydrophis*, or water serpents, among which several are venomous.

If we are right in the above identification, one class of serpents, the cobra tribe, may be regarded as the type of the most venomous in the East. The genus *Naja* — *Haridi* (?) of Savary — is distinguished by a plaited head, large, very venomous fangs, a neck dilatable under excitement, which raises the ribs of the anterior part of the body into the form of a disk or hood, when the scales, usually not imbricated, but lying in juxtaposition, are separated, and expose the skin, which at that time displays bright iridescent gleams, contrasting highly with their brown, yellow, and bluish colors. The species attain at least an equal, if not a superior, size to the generality of the genus viper; are more massive in their structure; and some possess the faculty of self inflation to triple their diameter, gradually forcing the body upwards into an erect position, until, by a convulsive crisis, they are said suddenly to strike backwards at an enemy or a pursuer. Capt. Stevens, of the Royal Marines, in order to ascertain the truth of the universal report concerning the mode of striking back ascribed to the serpent, had a quill introduced into the vent of one lying dead on the table, and blown into. The skin distended till the body rose up nearly all its

length; he then caused the experiment to stop, from the alarming attitude it assumed.

2. Among the various tribes of animals which are inimical to man, there is none that can compare with the venomous snakes for the deadly fatality of their enmity: the lightning stroke of their poison fangs is the unerring signal of a swift dissolution, preceded by torture the most horrible. The bite of a vigorous serpent has been known to produce death in two minutes. Even where the consummation is not so fearfully rapid, its delay is but a brief prolongation of the intense suffering. The terrible symptoms are thus described: A sharp pain in the part, which becomes swollen, shining, hot, red, then livid, cold, and insensible. The pain and inflammation spread, and become more intense; fierce shooting pains are felt in other parts, and a *burning fire pervades the body*. The eyes water profusely; then come swoonings, sickness, and bilious vomitings, difficult breathing, cold sweats, and sharp pains in the loins. The skin becomes deadly pale or deep yellow, while a black watery blood runs from the wound, which changes to a yellowish matter. Violent headache succeeds, and giddiness, faintness, and overwhelming terrors, *burning thirst*, gushing discharges of blood from the orifices of the body, intolerable fetor of breath, convulsive hiccoughs, and *death*.

The agent of these terrible results is an inodorous, tasteless, yellow fluid, secreted by peculiar glands seated on the cheeks, and stored for use in membranous bags, placed at the side of each upper jaw, and enveloping the base of a large, curved, pointed tooth, which is tubular. These two teeth, or fangs, are capable of being erected by a muscular apparatus under the power of the animal, when they project at nearly a right angle from the jaw.

Picture for Serpent 5

The manner in which the deadly blow is inflicted is remarkable, and is alluded to in Scripture. When the rage of the snake is excited, it commonly throws its body into a coil more or less close, and raises the anterior part of its body. The neck is now flattened and dilated, so that the scales, which ordinarily lie in close contact, are separated by wide interspaces of naked skin. The neck is bent more or less back, the head projecting in a horizontal position. In an instant the whole fore part of the animal is launched forward towards the object of its anger, the erected tooth is forcibly struck into the flesh, and withdrawn with the velocity of a thought. No doubt the rage which stimulates the action calls forth an increased action of the poison

glands, by which the store sac is filled with the secretion. The muscular contraction which gives the rapid blow compresses at the same instant the sac; and as the acute point of the fang enters the flesh, the venom is forced through the tubular center into the wound.

3. Scripture History. — It was under the form of a serpent that the devil seduced Eve; hence in Scripture Satan is called “the old serpent” (~~661B~~ Revelation 12:9, and comp., ~~471B~~ 2 Corinthians 11:3). On this metaphorical use of the word, see the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1852, p. 351 sq.; comp. *Biblioth. Sacra*, Jan. 1864.

The part which the serpent played in the transaction of the fall must not be passed over without some brief comment, being full of deep and curious interest. First of all, then, we have to note the subtlety ascribed to this reptile, which was the reason for its having been selected as the instrument of Satan’s wiles, and to compare with it the quality of wisdom mentioned by our Lord as belonging to it, “Be ye wise as serpents” (~~400G~~ Matthew 10:16). It was an ancient belief, both among Orientals and the people of the Western world, that the serpent was endued with a large share of sagacity. The Hebrew word מַחֲרִיץ [; translated “subtile,” though frequently used in a good sense, implies, it is probable, in this passage, “mischievous and malignant craftiness,” and is well rendered by Aquila and Theodotion by *πᾶνοῦργος*, and thus commented upon by Jerome, “Magis itaque hoc verbo calliditas et versutia quam sapientia demonstratur” (see Rosenmüller, *Schol. ad loc.*). The ancients give various reasons for regarding serpents as being endued with wisdom, as that one species, the *cerastes*, hides itself in the sand and bites the heels of animals as they pass, or that, as the head was considered the only vulnerable part, the serpent takes care to conceal it under the folds of the body. Serpents have in all ages been regarded as emblems of cunning craftiness. The particular wisdom alluded to by our Lord refers, it is probable, to the sagacity displayed by serpents in avoiding danger. The disciples were warned to be as prudent in not incurring unnecessary persecution.

It has been supposed by many commentators, that the serpent, prior to the fall, moved along in an erect attitude, as Milton (*P.L.* 9, 496) says —

*Not with indented wave
Prone on the ground, as since, but on his rear,
Circular base of rising folds that tower’d
Fold above fold, a surging maze.”*

Comp. also Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 1, 4), who believed that God now for the first time inserted poison under the serpent's tongue, and deprived him of the use of feet, causing him to crawl low on the ground by the undulating inflections of the body (κατὰ τῆς ἰλυσπώμενον). Patrick (*Comment.* ad loc.) entertained the extraordinary notion that the serpent of the fall was a winged kind (*saraph*), and Adam Clarke has been the laughing stock of exegetes ever since for maintaining that the serpent of the garden was an *orang-outang* (*Comment.* ad loc.).

It is quite clear that an erect mode of progression is utterly incompatible with the structure of a serpent, whose motion on the ground is so beautifully effected by the mechanism of the vertebral column and the multitudinous ribs, which, forming as it were so many pairs of levers, enable the animal to remove its body from place to place; consequently, had the snakes before the fall moved in an erect attitude, they must have been formed on a different plan altogether. It is true that there are saurian reptiles, such as the *Saurophis tetradactylus* and the *Chamoesaura anguina* of South Africa, which in external form are very like serpents, but with quasifeet; indeed, even in the boa constrictor, underneath the skin near the extremity, there exist rudimentary legs. Some have been disposed to believe that the snakes before the fall were similar to the *Saurophis*. Such a hypothesis, however, is untenable, for all the fossil *Ophidia* that have hitherto been found differ in no essential respects from modern representatives of that order: it is, moreover, beside the mark, for the words of the curse, "upon thy belly shalt thou go," are as characteristic of the progression of a saurophoid serpent before the fall as of a true ophidian after it. There is no reason whatever to conclude, from the language of Scripture, that the serpent underwent any change of form on account of the part it played in the history of the fall. The sun and the moon were in the heavens long before they were appointed "for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years." The typical form of the serpent and its mode of progression were, in all probability, the same before the fall as after it; but subsequent to the fall its form and progression were to be regarded with hatred and disgust by all mankind, and thus the animal was cursed "above all cattle," and a mark of condemnation was forever stamped upon it. There is no necessity to show how that part of the curse is literally fulfilled which speaks of the "enmity" that was henceforth to exist between the serpent and mankind; and though, of course, this has more especial allusion to the devil whose instrument the serpent was in his deceit, yet it is

perfectly true of the serpent. Few will be inclined to differ with Theocritus (*Id.* 15, 58) —

τὸν ψυχρὸν ὄφιν ταμάλισσα δεδοίκω Ἐκ παιδός.

Serpents are said in Scripture to “eat dust” (see ^{<0084>}Genesis 3:14; ^{<280>}Isaiah 55:25; ^{<307>}Micah 7:17); these animals, which, for the most part, take their food on the ground, do consequently swallow with it large portions of sand and dust (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 332).

IV. Mythology. — As already seen, scriptural evidence attests the serpent’s influence — on the early destinies of mankind; and this fact may be traced in the history, the legends, and creeds of most ancient nations. It is far from being obliterated at this day among the pagan, barbarian, and savage tribes of both hemispheres, where the most virulent and dangerous animals of the viviparous class are not uncommonly adored, but more generally respected, from motives originating in fear; and others, of the oviparous race, are suffered to abide in human dwellings, and are often supplied with food, from causes not easily determined, excepting that the serpent is ever considered to be possessed of some mysterious superhuman knowledge or power. Hence, besides real species, ideal forms, taken from the living, but combining other or additional properties, occur, at the most early periods, as metaphorical types, in fable and history, and in the hieroglyphics and religious paintings of many nations. Such are the innumerable fables in Hindu lore of Nagas and Naga kings; the primeval astronomy which placed the serpent in the skies, and called the Milky Way by the name of Ananta and Sesha Naga; the pagan obscure yet almost universal record of the deluge typified by a serpent endeavoring to destroy the ark, which astronomy has likewise transferred to the skies in the form of a dragon about to devour the moon, when, in an eclipsed state, it appears in the form of an amphipromnos or crescent-shaped boat; and, strange as it may seem, lunar eclipses still continue to be regarded in this character, and to excite general apprehension in Central Africa as well as in China, in the South Sea Islands as well as in America. *SEE DRAGON.* The nations of the North once believed in the Jormunds Gander, or Kater serpent of the deep; and they, together with the Celts and Basques and all Asia, had legends of the Orm, the Paystha, the dragon guardian of riches, brooding on gold in caverns deep below the surface of the earth, or lying in huge, folds on dreary and extensive heaths. These fables were a residue of that antique dragon worship which had its temples from High Asia and

Colchis to the north of Great Britain, and once flourished both in Greece and Northern Africa — structures with avenues of upright stones of several miles in length, whereof the ruins may still be traced at Carnak in Brittany, Abury in Wiltshire, and Redruth in Cornwall — the two last mentioned more particularly showing their connection with the circle constituting a form of the mundane egg, which again was an emblem of the deluge and the ark. The Hesperian, Colchian, and Lernaean dragons are only Greek legends of the same doctrine, still more distorted, and affording ample proof how far the pagan world had departed from the simplicity of scriptural truth, from the excessive use of metaphorical descriptions and fanciful symbols. In Egypt, the early center of ophiolatry, this debasing service was so deeply rooted that a Christian sect of heretics, called Ophitae, or, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, Ophiani, arose in the 2d century of our era. As an emanation of the Gnostics, their errors are particularly noticed by Tertullian, and form a signal instance of human perverseness ingeniously misleading itself and others by the abuse of symbols; yet, when the anguine type did not pass into long, distorted legends, it is evident, from the brazen serpent raised by Moses in the wilderness, that it was correctly appreciated by the people as a sign, not in itself a power, of divine aid; and that its true symbolical meaning did not escape even pagan comprehension appears from profane history, in Meissi, the good serpent, being likewise properly understood by the Egyptians, until idolatry distorted all the national reminiscences, and the promise of what was not fully revealed till the Savior appeared on earth was obliterated. Ob, Oub, the Coptic Hof, Obion in Kircher, was, however, the general name for serpents in Egypt; and Kneph, or Cnuphis, or Ih-Nuphi, the good genius, always figured as the Nachash or Thermuth, is, therefore, the same as Naga Sahib, or lord serpent of India, and still a personification of the vanquisher of the deluge — Vishnu and many others being pagan denominations of Noah. In this sense the good genius Cnuphis was a type of the Savior of men, and called by them the spirit pervading nature, the creator from whose mouth proceeded the mundane egg; being referred, after the loss of the true interpretation, to any typical form of the patriarch, the events of the deluge and the creation, thus confounding the operations of the Almighty with the ministry of his servant. (See Deane, *The Worship of the Serpent traced throughout the World* [Lond. 1833].) **SEE SERPENT WORSHIP.**

Picture for Serpent 6

There was, however, another idolized snake of the great destroyer Python tribe, which devour even each other; it is represented on Egyptian monuments bearing a mummy figure on its tail, and gliding over a seated divinity with an egg on the head, while human sacrifice by decapitation is performed before it. This serpent is so carefully drawn that we recognize the Thaibanne, *Ophites Thebanus*, which grows to twelve or more feet in length, is still found in Upper Egypt, and is a congener, if not the same as *Python tigris albicans*, the great snake even at present worshipped in Cutch: it may be the Aphophis of the Egyptians. To descant further on this subject would lead us too far from our purpose; but the Egyptian Python here noticed, changing its character from being a type of the deluge to that of an emblem of the ark carrying the spirit of human life within or upon it, was not without its counterpart in England, where lately, in digging out the deep, black mud of a ditch, a boat-shaped Python, carrying the eight Eones (?) or Noachidae, has been discovered, with emblems that denote them to be the solar regenerators of mankind. Thus, as is ever the case in polytheistical legends, the type disappears through multiplied transitions and the number of other symbols and personifications characterized by the same emblem. It was so in this instance, when the snake form was conferred also on abstractions bearing the names of divinities, such as Ranno, Hoph, Bai, Hoh or Hih, and others.

Picture for Serpent 7

The asserted longevity of the serpent tribe may have suggested the representation of the harmless house snake biting its tail as typical of eternity; and this same quality was, no doubt, the cause why this animal, entwined round a staff, was the symbol of health and the distinctive attribute of the classical AEsculapius and Hygeia. There are species of this genus common to Palestine and the southern parts of continental Europe. They were domesticated in Druidical and other pagan sanctuaries, and were employed for omens and other impostures; but the mysterious Ag or Hagstone was asserted to be produced by the venomous viper species. With such powers of destroying animal life, and with an aspect at once terrible and resplendent, it may easily be imagined how soon fear and superstition would combine, at periods anterior to historical data, to raise these monsters into divinities, and endeavor to deprecate their wrath by the blandishments of worship; and how design and cupidity would teach these

very votaries the manner of subduing their ferocity, of extracting their instruments of mischief, and making them subservient to the wonder and amusement of the vulgar by using certain cadences of sound which affect their hearing, and exciting in them a desire to perform a kind of pleasurable movement that may be compared to dancing. Hence the Nagas of the East, the Hagworms of the West, and the Haje have all been deified, styled *agathodoemon*, or good spirit; and figures of them occur wherever the superstition of pagan antiquity has been accompanied by the arts of civilization.

Picture for Serpent 8

“Almost throughout the East,” writes Kalisch (*Hist. and Crit. Comment. Genesis 3, 1*) “the serpent was used as an emblem of the evil principle, of the spirit of disobedience and contumacy. A few exceptions only can be discovered. The Phoenicians adored that animal as a beneficent genius; and the Chinese consider it as a symbol of superior wisdom and power, and ascribe to the kings of heaven (*tien-hoangs*) bodies of serpents. Some other nations fluctuated in their conceptions regarding the serpent. The Egyptians represented the eternal spirit Kneph, the author of all good, under the mythic form of that reptile; they understood the art of taming it, and embalmed it after death; but they applied the same symbol for the god of revenge and punishment (Tithrambo), and for Typhon, the author of all moral and physical evil; and in the Egyptian symbolical alphabet the serpent represents subtlety and cunning, lust and sensual pleasure. In Greek mythology it is certainly, on the one hand, the attribute of Ceres, of Mercury, and of AEsculapius, in their most beneficent qualities; but it forms, on the other hand, a part of the terrible Furies, or Eumenides: it appears in the form of a Python as a fearful monster, which the arrows of a god only were able to destroy; and it is the most hideous and most formidable part of the impious giants who despise and blaspheme the power of Heaven. The Indians, like the savage tribes of Africa and America suffer and nourish, indeed, serpents in their temples, and even in their houses. They believe that they bring happiness to the places which they inhabit; they worship them as the symbols of eternity, but they regard them also as evil genii, or as the inimical powers of nature, which is gradually depraved by them, and as the enemies of the gods, who either tear them to pieces or tread their venomous head under their all-conquering feet. So contradictory is all animal worship. Its principle is, in some instances, gratitude, and in others fear; but if a noxious animal is very dangerous, the

fear may manifest itself in two ways — either by the resolute desire of extirpating the beast, or by the wish of averting the conflict with its superior power: thus the same fear may, on the one hand, cause fierce enmity, and, on the other, submission and worship.” See, on the subject of serpent worship, Vossius, *De Orig. Idol.* 1, 5; Bryant, *Mythology*, 1, 420-490: it is well illustrated in the apocryphal story of “Bel and the Dragon;” comp. Steindorf; *De Ὀφιολατρείᾳ*; *Winer, Bib. Realwört.* 2, 488.

Picture for Serpent 9

From a modification, perhaps, of this idea of a tutelary genius, in Egypt and other Oriental countries a serpent was the common symbol of a powerful monarch. It was embroidered on the robes of princes and blazoned on their diadems to signify their invincible might; and that, as the wound inflicted by them is incurable, so the fatal effects of royal displeasure were neither to be averted nor endured.

The evil spirit in the form of a serpent appears in the Ahriman, or lord of evil, who, according to the doctrine of Zoroaster, first taught men to sin under the guise of this reptile (*Zendavesta* [ed. Kleuk.], 1, 25; 3, 84; see Rus, *De Sepente Seductore non Naturali sed Diabolo* [Jen. 1712], and Grapius, *De Tentatione Evae et Christi a Diabolo in Assumpto Corpore Facta* [Rostoch. 1712]). But compare the opinion of Dr. Kalisch, who (*Comment. on Genesis* 3, 14, 1-5) says “the serpent is the reptile, not an evil demon that had assumed its shape.... If the serpent represented Satan, it would be extremely surprising that the former only was cursed, and that the latter is not even mentioned.

Picture for Serpent 10

It would be entirely at variance with the divine justice forever to curse the animal whose shape it had pleased the evil one to assume.” According to the Talmudists, the name of the evil spirit that beguiled Eve was Sammael (I am s): “R. Moses ben-Majemon scribit in More (lib. 2, c. 30), Sammaelem inequitasse serpenti antique et seduxisse Evam. Dicit etiam nomen hoc absolute usurpari de Satana, et *Sammaelem nihil aliud esse quam ipsum Satanam*” (Buxtorf, *Lex.-Talm.* col. 1495).

It is of more importance to remark that in the traditions of most pagan nations, which have been embodied in their mythology, the serpent appears as the enemy of man, and a triumph over this enemy is usually described as

the greatest achievement of a popular deity. The Egyptian Horus is frequently represented piercing the head of some terrific serpent with his spear. From this source the Greeks and Romans adopted the fable of Apollo and the serpent Python, which is thus narrated by Ovid:

“Of new monsters earth created more
Unwillingly, but yet she brought to light
Thee, Python, too, the wondering world to fright
And the new nations with so dire a sight:
So monstrous was his bulk, so large a space
Did his vast body and long train embrace.
Him Phoebus basking on a bank espied,
And all his skill against the monster tried;
Though every shaft took place, he spent the store
Of his full quiver, and ‘twas long before
The expiring serpent wallowed in his gore.”

Lok, one of the favorite heroes of the Northern mythology, is represented as a destroyer of serpents, and a legend similar to the classic story just quoted represents him as destroying a monstrous serpent with his hammer or mace. The similarity of all these accounts to the scriptural narrative is obvious; but a still more striking parallel has been discovered in the Mexican mythology by baron Humboldt. He says:

“The group represents the celebrated serpent woman Chinacohuatl, called also Quilaztli, or Tonacacihua, ‘Woman of our flesh;’ she is the companion of Tonacatenetli. The Mexicans considered her as the mother of the human race, and after the god of the celestial paradise, Ometenetli, she held the first rank among the divinities of Anahual. We see her always represented with a great serpent. Other paintings exhibit to us a feather headed snake cut in pieces by the great spirit Tezcatlipoca, or by the sun personified, the god Tonatinh. These allegories remind us of the ancient traditions of Asia. In the woman and serpent of the Aztecs we think we perceive the Eve of the Shemitic nations, in the snake cut in pieces the famous serpent Raliya, or Kalinaga, conquered by Vishnu when he took the form of Krishna. The Tonatiuh of the Mexicans appears also to be identical with the Krishna of the Hindus, recorded in the *Bhagavata-Purana*, and with the Mithras of the Persians. The most ancient traditions of nations go back to a state of things when the earth, covered by bogs, was inhabited by snakes and other animals

of gigantic bulk. The beneficent luminary, by drying up the soil, delivered the earth from these aquatic monsters. Behind the serpent, who appears to be speaking to the goddess Chinacohuatl, are two naked figures; they are of different color, and seem to be in the attitude of contending with each other. We might be led to suppose that the two vases which we see at the bottom of the picture, one of which is overturned, is the cause of this contention. The serpent woman was considered at Mexico as the mother of two twin children. These naked figures are, perhaps, the children of Chinacohuatl. They remind us of the Cain and Abel of Hebrew tradition.”

An extraordinarily clear tradition of the agency of the serpent in the fall has lately been brought to light in the Assyrian tablets, being the story of the water dragon as read by the late George Smith (*Chaldoean Account of Genesis*, p. 91):

“The dragon, which in the Chaldean account of the creation leads man into sin, is the creature of Tiamat, the living principle of the sea and of chaos, and he is the embodiment of the spirit of chaos, or disorder, which was opposed to the deities at the creation of the world. It is clear that the dragon is included in the curse after the fall, and that the gods invoke on the head of the human race all the evils which inflict humanity. Wisdom and knowledge shall injure him (line 22); he shall have family quarrels (line 23); he shall submit to tyranny (line 24); he will anger the gods (line 25); he shall not eat the fruit of his labor (line 26); he shall be disappointed in his desires (line 27); he shall have trouble of mind and body (lines 29 and 31); he shall commit future sin (line 32). No doubt subsequent lines continue these topics, but again our narrative is broken, and it only reopens where the gods are preparing for war with the powers of evil, which are led by Tiamat, which war probably arose from the part played by Tiamat in the fall of man.” *SEE SNAKE.*

Serpent, Christian Symbolism Of

As a symbol, the serpent was used by the early Christians in three different senses.

1. To signify the victory of Jesus Christ over the devil.. This was represented by a coiled serpent at the foot of the monogram on the cross to

show “ut qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur.” Antique gems bearing this device have been discovered, but their date cannot be earlier than the time of Constantine. The type is somewhat altered on medals of this emperor, having a dragon pierced by the staff of the labarum.

Ancient iconography often represented the saints as treading upon the serpent to express their victory over the spirit of darkness.

2. The figure of the serpent was also employed to signify the virtue of prudence or wisdom as commanded by Christ, “Be ye wise as serpents;” and as it was supposed that bishops should exemplify this virtue in its highest form (^{<SARD>}1 Timothy 3:2), we often find the pictures of early bishops surrounded by a serpent as by a frame. For the same reason, in the early Latin Church the pastoral staff was terminated at the top by a serpent’s head.

3. The serpent was used as a symbol of the cross and of Christ himself. These allegories have been developed by Gretzer and Giacomo Bosio in their works on this subject (*De Cruce* and *De Cruce Triumphale*). This use of the symbol, derived from the teachings of Christ (^{<R1B4>}John 3:14), soon degenerated into a worship of the serpent itself. This reached its climax among the Ophites (q.v.), who set it in the place of Christ himself (Augustine, *De Hoeres.* c. 17, 46).

In times of persecution, when the exhibition of the cross was interdicted, the early Christians made use in its stead of the emblem of the serpent, as of the lamb, the good shepherd, and many others. These they wore as amulets and in other ways to show their confidence in the Savior which they typified. They are found made of precious stones, on some of which is cut the figure of Moses, a rod in his hand, and an enormous serpent before him; a second person on the other side of the serpent represents the Jewish people. In the commentary upon the 37th Psalm, Ambrose makes use of the type of the serpent principally as a symbol of the resurrection and of immortality.

Serpent of Brass

(^{<TVJ N̄hivj ñ̄}) Sept. ὄφις ὁ χαλακοῦς, ^{<O2IO>}Numbers 21:9; ^{<I2RO>}2 Kings 18:4). In addition to the treatment of this subject under BRAZEN SERPENT and NEHUSHTAN, some important particulars may here be enumerated. The familiar history of the brazen serpent need not be repeated here. The nature

of the fiery snakes by which the Israelites were attacked has been discussed under SERPENT. The scene of the history, determined by a comparison of ^{<0203>}Numbers 21:3 and 33:42, must have been either Zalmonah or Punon. The names of both places probably connect themselves with it, Zalmonah as meaning “the place of the image,” Punon as probably identical with the **Φαινοί** mentioned by Greek writers as famous for its copper mines, and therefore possibly supplying the materials (Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2, 3, 13). **SEE PUNON; SEE ZALMONAH.** The chief interest of the narrative lies in the thoughts which have at different times gathered round it. We meet with these in four distinct stages, embodied in as many widely separated passages of Scripture. We have to ask by what associations each was connected with the others.

1. The Formation of the Object (^{<0203>}Numbers 21:8, 9). — The truth of the history will, in this place, be taken for granted. Those who prefer it may choose among the hypotheses by which men halting between two opinions have endeavored to retain the historical and to eliminate the supernatural element. The theory which ascribes the healing to mysterious powers known to the astrologers or alchemists of Egypt may be mentioned, but hardly calls for examination (Marsham, *Can. Chronicles* p. 148, 149; R. Tirza, in Deyling, *Exercitt. Sacr.* 2, 210). Unbelievers may look on the cures as having been effected by the force of imagination, which the visible symbol served to heighten, or by the rapid rushing of the serpent bitten from all parts of the camp to the standard thus erected, curing them, as men are said to be cured of the bite of the tarantula by dancing (Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* 2, 320; Paulus, *Comm.* 4, 1, 198). They may see in the serpent the emblematic signpost, as it were, of the camp hospital to which the sufferers were brought for special treatment, the form in this instance, as in that of the rod of AEsculapius, being a symbol of the art of healing (Hoffmann, in Scherer, *Schrift. Forsch.* 1, 576). Leaving these conjectures on one side, it remains for us to inquire into the fitness of the symbol thus employed as the instrument of healing. To most of the Israelites it must have seemed as strange then as it did afterwards to the later rabbins that any such symbol should be employed. One of the Jewish interlocutors in the dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho (p. 322) declares that he had often asked his teachers to solve the difficulty, and had never found one who explained it satisfactorily. Justin himself, of course, explains it as a type of Christ.

The second commandment appeared to forbid the likeness of any living thing. The golden calf had been destroyed as an abomination. Now the colossal serpent (the narrative implies that it was visible from all parts of the encampment), made, we may conjecture, by the hands of Bezaleel or Aholiab, was exposed to their gaze, and they were told to look to it as gifted with a supernatural power. What reason was there for the difference? In part, of course, the answer may be that the second commandment forbade, not all symbolic forms as such, but those that men made for themselves to worship; but the question still remains, Why was *this* form chosen?

It is hardly enough to say, with Jewish commentators, that *any* outward means might have been chosen, like the lump of figs in Hezekiah's sickness, the salt which healed the bitter waters, and that the brazen serpent made the miracle yet more miraculous, inasmuch as the glare of burnished brass, the gaze upon the serpent form, were, of all things, most likely to be fatal to those who had been bitten (Gem. Bab. *Yomna*; Aben-Ezra and others, in Buxtorf, *Hist. Ein. Serp.* c. 5). The fact is doubtful, the reason inadequate. Another view, verging almost on the ludicrous, has been maintained by some Jewish writers. The serpent was set up *in terrorem*, as a man who has chastised his son hangs up the rod against the wall as a warning (Otho, *Lexic. Rabbin.* s.v. "Serpens").

It is hardly enough again to say, with most Christian interpreters, that it was intended to be a type of Christ. Some meaning it must have had for those to whom it was actually presented; and we have no grounds for assuming, even in Moses himself, still less in the multitude of Israelites slowly rising out of sensuality, unbelief, rebellion, a knowledge of the far off mystery of redemption. If the words of our Lord in ^{<R1B4>}John 3:14, 15, point to the fulfilment of the type, there must yet have been another meaning for the symbol. Taking its part in the education of the Israelites, it must have had its starting point in the associations previously connected with it. Two views, very different from each other, have been held as to the nature of those associations. On the one side it has been maintained that, either from its simply physical effects, or from the mysterious history of the temptation in ^{<R1B1>}Genesis 3, the serpent was the representative of evil. To present the serpent form as deprived of its power to hurt, impaled as the trophy of a conqueror, was to assert that evil, physical and spiritual, had been overcome, and thus help to strengthen the weak faith of the Israelites in a victory over both. The serpent, on this view, expressed the same idea

as the dragon in the popular representations of the archangel Michael and St. George (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 2, 228). To some writers, as to Ewald, this has commended itself as the simplest and most obvious view. It has been adopted by some orthodox divines who. have been unable to convince themselves that the same form could ever really have been at once a type of Satan and of Christ (Jackson, *Humiliation of the Son of God*, ch. 31; Patrick, *Comm.* ad loc.; Espagnaeus, Burmann, Vitringa, in Deyling, *Observatt. Sac.* 2, 15). Others, again, have started from a different ground. They raise the question whether ~~<000E>~~Genesis 3 was then written, or, if written, known to the great body of the Israelites. They look to Egypt as the starting point for all the thoughts which the serpent could suggest, and they find there that it was worshipped as an *agathodoemon*, the symbol of health and life (comp. *SEE SERPENT*, and, in addition to the authorities there referred to, Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 2, 134; 4, 395; 5, 64, 238; Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant* [Eng. transl.], 3, 348; Witsius, *AEgyptiaca*, in Ugolino, 1, 852). This, for them, explains the mystery. It was as the known emblem of a power to heal that it served as the sign and sacrament on which the faith of the people might fasten and sustain itself.

Contrasted as these views appear, they have, it is believed, a point of contact. The idea primarily connected with the serpent in the history of the fall, as throughout the proverbial language of Scripture, is that of wisdom (~~<000E>~~Genesis 3:1; ~~<0006>~~Matthew 10:16; ~~<4710B>~~2 Corinthians 11:3). Wisdom, apart from obedience to a divine order, allying itself to man's lower nature, passes into cunning. Man's nature is envenomed and degraded by it. But wisdom, the self same power of understanding, yielding to the divine law, is the source of all healing and restoring influences, and the serpent form thus becomes a symbol of deliverance and health. The Israelites were taught that it would be such to them in proportion as (they ceased to be sensual and rebellious. There were facts in the life of Moses himself which must have connected themselves with this twofold symbolism. When he was to be taught that the divine wisdom could work with any instruments, his rod became a serpent (~~<000E>~~Exodus 4:1-5). (Comp. Cyril. Alex. *Schol.* 15; *Glaphyra in Exodus* 2. The explanation given by Cyril is, as might be expected, more mystical than that in the text. The rod transformed into a serpent represents the Divine Word taking on himself the likeness of sinful flesh.) When he and Aaron were called to their great conflict with the perverted wisdom of Egypt, the many serpents of the magicians were

overcome by the one serpent of the future high priest. The conqueror and the conquered were alike in outward form (⁽¹⁸⁷⁰⁾Exodus 7:10-12).

2. *The Destruction of the Object* (⁽¹⁸⁰⁴⁾2 Kings 18:4). — The next stage in the history of the brazen serpent shows how easily even a legitimate symbol, retained beyond its time, after it had done its work, might become the occasion of idolatry. It appears in the reign of Hezekiah as having been, for some undefined period, an object of worship. The zeal of that king leads him to destroy it. It receives from him, or had borne before, the name Nehushtan (q.v.). We are left to conjecture when the worship began, or what was its locality. Ewald's conjecture (*Geschichte*, 4, 622) that till then the serpent may have remained at Zalmonah, the object of occasional pilgrimages, is probable enough. It is hardly likely that it should have been tolerated by the reforming zeal of kings like Asa and Jehoshaphat. It must, we may believe, have received a fresh character and become more conspicuous in the period which preceded its destruction. All that we know of the reign of Ahaz makes it probable that it was under his auspices that it received a new development, that it thus became the object of a marked aversion to the iconoclastic party who were prominent among the counselors of Hezekiah. Intercourse with countries in which ophiolatry prevailed — Syria, Assyria, possibly Egypt also — acting on the feeling which led him to bring together the idolatries of all neighboring nations, might easily bring about this perversion of the reverence felt for the time honored relic.

Here we might expect the history of the material object would cease, but the passion for relics has prevailed even against the history of the Bible. The Church of St. Ambrose at Milan has boasted for centuries of possessing the brazen serpent which Moses set up in the wilderness. The earlier history of the relic, so called, is matter for conjecture. Our knowledge of it begins in the year A.D. 971. when an envoy was sent by the Milanese to the court of the emperor John Zimrises at Constantinople. He was taken through the imperial cabinet of treasures and invited to make his choice, and he chose this, which, the Greeks assured him, was made of the same metal as the original serpent (Sigonius, *Hist. Regn. Ital.* bk. 7). On his return it was placed in the Church of St. Ambrose, and popularly identified with that which it professed to represent. It is, at least, a possible hypothesis that the Western Church has in this way been led to venerate what was originally the object of the worship of some Ophite sect.

3. *The Apocryphal Notices of the Object.* — When the material symbol had perished, its history began to suggest deeper thoughts to the minds of men. The writer of the book of Wisdom, in the elaborate contrast which he draws between true and false religions in their use of outward signs, sees in it a *σύμβολον σωτηρίας, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου*; “he that turned himself was not saved by the thing that he saw (*διὰ τὸ θεωρουμένον*), but by thee that art the Savior of all” (Wisd. 16, 6, 7). The Targum of Jonathan paraphrases ^{<OR>}Numbers 21:8, “He shall be healed if he direct his heart unto the Name of the Word of the Lord.” Philo, with his characteristic taste for an ethical, mystical interpretation, represents the history as a parable of man’s victory over his lower, sensuous nature. The metal, the symbol of permanence and strength, has changed the meaning of the symbol, and that which had before been the emblem of the will, yielding to and poisoned by the serpent pleasure, now represents *σωφροσύνη*, the *ἀντιπαθὲς ἀκολαδίας φάρμακον* (*De Agricult.*). The facts just stated may help us to enter into the bearing of the words of ^{<OR>}John 3:14, 15. If the paraphrase of Jonathan represents, as it does, the current interpretation of the schools of Jerusalem, the devout rabbi to whom the words were spoken could not have been ignorant of it. The new teacher carried the lesson a step further. He led him to identify the “Name of the Word of the Lord” with that of the Son of man. He prepared him to see in the lifting up of the crucifixion that which should answer in its power to heal and save to the serpent in the wilderness.

4. *Our Lord’s Allusion to the Object* (^{<OR>}John 3). — A full discussion of the typical meaning here unfolded belongs to exegesis rather than to a dictionary. It will be enough to note here that which connects itself with facts or theories already mentioned. On the one side the typical interpretation has been extended to all the details. The pole on which the serpent was placed was not only a type of the cross, but was itself crucial in form (Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 322). The serpent was nailed to it as Christ was nailed. As the symbol of sin, it represented his being made sin for us. The very metal, like the fine brass of ^{<OR>}Revelation 1:15, was an emblem of the might and glory of the Son of Man (comp. Lampe, *ad loc.*). On the other, it has been maintained (Patrick and Jackson, *ut supra*) that the serpent was from the beginning, and remains still, exclusively the symbol of evil; that the lifting up of the Son of man answered to that of the serpent because on the cross the victory over the serpent was accomplished. The point of comparison lay not between the serpent and

Christ, but between the look of the Israelite to the outward sign and the look of a justifying faith to the cross of Christ. It will not surprise us to find that in the spiritual, as in the historical interpretation, both theories have an element of truth. The serpent here also is primarily the emblem of the “knowledge of good and evil.” To man, as having obtained that knowledge by doing evil, it has been as a venomous serpent, poisoning and corrupting. In the nature of the Son of Man it is once more in harmony with the divine will, and leaves the humanity pure and untainted. The crucifixion is the witness that the evil has been overcome by the good. Those who are bitten by the serpent find their deliverance in looking to him who knew evil only by subduing it, and who is therefore mighty to save. Well would it have been for the Church of Christ if it had been content to rest in this truth. Its history shows how easy it was for the old perversion to reproduce itself. The highest of all symbols might share the fate of the lower. It was possible even for the cross of Christ to pass into a Nehushtan (comp. Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, on John 3, and Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant* [Eng. transl.], 3, 344-358).

What, then, are the particulars in which these acts in the Old and in the New Test. correspond; or what are the points of resemblance implied in our Lord’s words — *as* and *even so*? In our answer we must avoid the error of trying to reckon up a number of these resemblances; and, indeed, we must look to essential correspondence, not to any fanciful likeness on the surface. This we must do in agreement with the principle that the relation is the same between the bitten Israelites and the serpent lifted up for them to look at as between perishing sinners and the crucified Savior who is offered to them. There are three such correspondences:

(1) There is “*the serpent*” which Moses lifted up in the wilderness, and there is “*the Son of Man*,” lifted up in due time on the cross. It is in stating this point of resemblance, however, that there have been most extravagance and error, which have disgusted some sober thinkers, and induced them to deny it altogether — a denial which we think unwarrantable, when we observe the manner in which the two objects are singled out and placed together. The reference is certainly not at all to heathenish notions of the serpent as possessed of a healing power. Nor even is it directly to the old serpent, on whom Christ has inflicted a fatal wound, and made a show of him openly, triumphing over him in his cross. It is better to say that the brazen serpent had the form indeed of the serpents that actually wrought the mischief, but yet a serpent destitute of

venom and impotent for evil; and that so God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without sin. We prefer, however, to say that the brazen serpent seemed a most improbable means of curing the serpents' bites; and so he who was condemned and crucified as a malefactor seemed most unsuitable to save condemned and perishing men.

(2) There is the lifting up of the serpent upon the pole, no doubt in such a way as to render it conspicuous to the farthest extremities of the camp, which would be the more easily effected on account of its metallic brilliancy. Corresponding to this there is the lifting up of the Son of man, who says, "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth" (^{<BIB>}Isaiah 45:22); as the apostle says to those who have heard the Gospel, "Before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you" (^{<BIB>}Galatians 3:1). It is impossible to overlook this comparison, except by misinterpreting the expression "the Son of Man must be lifted up;" though there is no room for mistake when we have our Lord's own words, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," by which phrase he signified the manner of his death, and was understood as doing so (^{<BIB>}John 12:32-34).

(3) There is the healing of the physical wound by the bodily eye looking to the serpent, and the corresponding spiritual healing by looking to the crucified Son of Man with the eye of faith — the natural life in the one case having that relation to the everlasting life in the other which the type always bears to the antitype.

Serpent charming.

Picture for Serpent-charming

There can be no question at all of the remarkable power which from time immemorial has been exercised by certain people in the East over poisonous serpents. The art is most distinctly mentioned in the Bible, *SEE CHARM*, and probably alluded to by St. James (^{<BIB>}James 3:7). The usual species operated upon, both in Africa and India, are the hooded snakes (*Naja tripudians*, and *Naja haje*) and the horned *cerastes*. The skill of the Italian *marsi* and the Libyan *psylli* in taming serpents was celebrated throughout the world; and to this day, as we are told by Sir G. Wilkinson (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 3, 124, note, ed. 1862), the snake players of the coast of Barbary are worthy successors of the *psylli* (see Pliny, 8, 25; 11, 25; and especially Lucan's account of the *psylli* [*Pharsal.* 9, 892.]). See

numerous references cited by Bochart (*Hieroz.* 3, 164, etc.) on the subject of serpent taming. Multitudes of modern observers have described the practices of the snake charmers in such terms as to leave no doubt of the fact. One instance may suffice for illustration. Mr. Gogerly, a missionary in India, says that some persons, being incredulous on the subject, after taking the most careful precautions against any trick or artifice being played, sent a charmer into the garden to prove his powers: "The man began to play upon his pipe, and, proceeding from one part of the garden to another for some minutes, stopped at a part of the wall much injured by age, and intimated that a serpent was within. He then played quicker, and his notes were louder, when almost immediately a large cobra-de-capello put forth its hooded head, and the man ran fearlessly to the spot, seized it by the throat, and drew it forth. He then showed the poison fangs, and beat them out; afterwards it was taken to the room where his baskets were left and deposited among the rest.... The snake charmer," observes the same writer, "applies his pipe to his mouth and sends forth a few of his peculiar notes, and all the serpents stop as though enchanted; they then turn towards the musician, and, approaching him within two feet, raise their heads from the ground, and, bending backward and forward, keep time with the tune. When he ceases playing, they drop their heads and remain quiet on the ground." That the charmers frequently, and perhaps generally, take the precaution of extracting the poison fangs before the snakes are subjected to their skill there is much probability for believing, but that this operation is not always attended to is clear from the testimony of Bruce and numerous other writers. "Some people," says the traveler just mentioned, "have doubted that it was a trick, and that the animals so handled had been first trained and then disarmed of their power of hurting, and, fond of the discovery, they have rested themselves upon it without experiment, in the face of all antiquity. But I will not hesitate to aver that I have seen at Cairo a man ... who has taken a *cerastes* with his naked hand from a number of others lying at the bottom of the tub, has put it upon his bare head, covered it with the common red cap he wears, then taken it out, put it in his breast, and tied it about his neck like a necklace, after which it has been applied to a hen and bit it, which has died in a few minutes." Dr. Davy, in his *Interior of Ceylon*, speaking of the snake charmers, says on this subject: "The ignorant vulgar believe that these men really possess a charm by which they thus play without dread, and with impunity, from danger. The more enlightened, laughing at this idea, consider the men impostors, and that in playing their tricks there is no danger to be avoided, it being removed by

the abstraction of the poison fangs. The enlightened in this instance are mistaken, and the vulgar are nearer the truth in their opinion. I have examined the snakes I have seen exhibited, and have found their poison fangs in and uninjured. These men do possess a charm, though not a supernatural one, viz. that of confidence and courage... They will play their tricks with any hooded snakes (*Naja tripudians*), whether just taken or long in confinement, but with no other kind of poisonous snake.” (See also Tennent, *Ceylon*, 3d ed. 1, 199.) Some have supposed that the practice of taking out or breaking off the poison fangs is alluded to in ¹⁸⁸⁶Psalm 58:6, “Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth.” The serpent charmer’s usual instrument is a flute. Shrill sounds, it would appear, are those which serpents, with their imperfect sense of hearing, are able most easily to discern; hence it is that the Chinese summon their tame fish by whistling or by ringing a bell. The reader will find much interesting matter on the art of serpent charming, as practiced by the ancients, in Bochart (*Hieroz.* 3, 161); in the dissertation by Böhmer entitled *De Psyllorum, Marsorum, et Ophiogenum adversus Serpentes Virtue* (Lips. 1745); and in Kämpfer, *Amoenitates Exoticoe*, 3, 9; 565; see also Broderip, *Notebook of a Naturalist*, and *Anecdotes of Serpents*, published by Chambers; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, 2, 106. Those who professed the art of taming serpents were called by the Heb. *menachashim* (מנחשים), while the art itself was called *lachash* (לחש), ²¹⁸⁷Jeremiah 8:17; ²¹¹¹Ecclesiastes 10:11; but these terms were not always used in this restricted sense. *SEE DIVINATION.*

In general, these serpent charmers were, and are, distinct tribes of men in their several countries, professing the power they claim to be an inherent and natural function. The most famous serpent charmers of antiquity were the Psylli, a people of Cyrenaica; and that theirs was believed to be a natural power appears from the story told by Pliny, that they were accustomed to try the legitimacy of their newborn children by exposing them to the most cruel and venomous serpents, who dared not molest or even approach them unless they were illegitimate. He thinks their power resided in some peculiar odor in their persons, which the serpents abhorred (*Hist. Nat.* 7, 2). Lucan says the same; and the passage in which that poet speaks of them affords a complete exposition of the ancient belief concerning the charming of serpents. He chiefly describes the measures which they took to protect the Roman camp. When the encampment was marked out, they marched around it chanting their charms, the “mystic sound” of which chased the serpents far away. But not trusting entirely to

this, they kept up fires, of different kinds of wood, beyond the farthest tents, the smell of which prevented the serpents from approaching. Thus, the camp was protected during the night. But if any soldier, when abroad in the daytime, happened to be bitten, the Psylli exerted their powers to effect, a cure. First they rubbed the wounded part around with saliva, to prevent, as they said, the poison from spreading while they assayed their arts to extract it (*Pharsalia*, 9). *SEE ENCHANTMENT*.

In this account we find the voice repeatedly mentioned; and it is to “the voice of the charmer” that the Psalmist refers. We may suppose that, as in the passage we have quoted, the charmers use a form of words — a charm — or else chanted a song in some peculiar manner. So Eusebius, in mentioning that Palestine abounded in serpent charmers in his time, says that they usually employed a verbal charm. This is still one of the processes of the Oriental serpent charmers. Roberts says that the following is considered in India the most potent form of words against serpents: “Oh, serpent! thou who art coiled in my path, get out of my way; for around thee are the mongoos, the porcupine, and the kite in his circles is ready to take thee!” The Egyptian serpent charmer also employs vocal sounds and a form of words to draw the venomous creatures from their retreats. Mr. Lane says, “He assumes an air of mystery, strikes the walls with a short palm stick, whistles, makes a clucking noise with his tongue, and spits upon the ground; and generally says, I adjure you by God, if ye be above, or if ye be below, that ye come forth; I adjure ye by the most great name, if ye be obedient, come forth; and if ye be disobedient, die! die! die!” (*Modern Egyptians*, 2, 104). *SEE ADDER*.

With regard to the manipulation of serpents by the Egyptian magicians (^{<0000>}Exodus 4), we may remark that in modern times the psylli, or charmers, by a particular pressure on the neck of the cobra or *haje*, have the power of rendering the inflation of the animal — which is a character of the genus — so intense that the serpent becomes rigid, and can be held out horizontally as if it were a rod. This practice explains what the soothsayers of Pharaoh could perform when they were opposing Moses, and reveals one of the names by which the Hebrews knew the species; for although the text (^{<0000>}Exodus 4:3) uses, for the rod of Aaron converted into a serpent, the word **vj n**, *nachash*, and subsequently (^{<0075>}Exodus 7:15) **^ynt**, *tannin*, it is plain that, in the second passage, the word indicates “monster,” as applied to the *nachash* just named — the first being an appellative, the second an epithet. That the rods of the magicians of Pharaoh were of the

same external, character is evident from no different denomination being given to them; therefore we may infer that they used a real serpent as a rod — viz. the species now called *haje* — for their imposture, since they no doubt did what the present serpent charmers perform with the same species by means of the temporary *asphyxiation*, or suspension of vitality, before noticed, and producing restoration to active life by liberating or throwing down. Thus we have the miraculous character of the prophet's mission shown by his real rod becoming a serpent, and the magicians' real serpents merely assuming the form of rods; and when both were opposed, in a state of animated existence, by the rod devouring the living animals, conquering the great typical personification of the protecting divinity of Egypt. *SEE SERPENT.*

Serpentinians

SEE OPHITES.

Serpent worship

The extent to which this species of idolatry has prevailed is very remarkable. From the fact that Satan assumed the form of a serpent, in his temptation of our first parents, it has been adopted as the symbol of Typhon, or the evil deity of the ancient Egyptians; of Ahriman among the Persians; and of the spirit of evil in the hieroglyphics of the Chinese and Mexicans. The serpent whose head the Messiah was to crush was transformed, in heathen fable, into the hydra which Hercules vanquished, and in India into that over which Krishna triumphed; into *Horus* in Egypt, *Siegfried* among the Germans, and *Crac* in Poland. We have also the serpent Python slain by Apollo, and the hundred-headed snake destroyed by Jupiter. The serpent was anciently worshipped in Chaldaea and in several other nations of the East. Servius tells us that the ancient Egyptians called serpents good daemons. The asp was the emblem of the goddess Ranno, and was supposed to protect the houses, or the gardens, of individuals, as well as the infancy of a royal child. This serpent was called Thermuthis, and with it the statues of Isis were crowned as with a diadem. The snake Bai also appears to have figured as a goddess; and another snake-headed goddess had the name of Hoh or Hih. The Typhon of the Egyptians had the upper part of his person decorated with a hundred heads like those of a serpent or dragon.

In the religions of all the Asiatic nations the serpent is regarded as a wicked being who brought evil into the world. As such it became, in course of time, an object of religious worship in almost every part of heathendom, the worship being, inspired rather by the desire to avert evil than to express reverence or gratitude. The Hindu serpent is the type and emblem of the evil principle in nature; and as such we see it wrestling with the goddess Parvati, or writhing under the victorious foot of Krishna, when he saves from its corrupting breath the herds that pasture near the waters of the Yamuna. "As a further illustration of this view, it is contended that many Hindus, who feel themselves constrained to pay religious worship to the serpent, regard it, notwithstanding, as a hideous reptile, whose approach inspires them with a secret awe and insurmountable horror." In the symbolic language of antiquity the serpent occupies a conspicuous place. . In ~~Gen~~ Genesis 3:1 we are told that "the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." In consonance with this view the Chinese regard *Long*, or the winged dragon, as the being who excels in intelligence. The supreme god of the Chaldaeans, *Bel*, was adored under the form of a serpent or dragon; hence the Apocryphal book. *Bel and the Dragon*. To represent the Almighty upholding the world by his powerful Word, the Hindus describe it as resting upon a serpent which bites its own tail; and the Phoenicians entwine the folds of a serpent around the cosmic egg. On the Egyptian monuments Kneph is seen as a serpent carried upon two legs of a man, or a serpent with a lion's head. The Siamese, while they are afraid of venomous serpents, never dare to injure them; but, on the contrary, they consider it a lucky omen to have them in or near their houses. Among the Chinese the serpent is a symbolic monster, dwelling in spring above the clouds to give rain, and in autumn under the waters.

Among the North American Indians the serpent was formerly held in great veneration; the Mohicans paying the highest respect to the rattlesnake, which they called their grandfather. Many primitive nations, however, looked upon the serpent as the personification of the evil principle. Among the idolatrous nations who descended from Ham this species of idolatry was universally practiced, and has sometimes been alleged to have been the most prevalent kind of worship in the antediluvian world. See Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship* (Lond. 1869, 4to). *SEE SERPENT*.

Serrad, Giovanni Andrea

an Italian prelate, was born at Castel Monardo (now Filadelfia), Feb. 4, 1731, and studied for the priesthood twelve years at Rome under the best teachers. He reorganized the Seminary of Tropea in 1759, and then went to Naples in connection with marquis Fraggianni, whose life he wrote, and also with abbe Genovesi, who procured him the chair of history in the Royal University, and afterwards that of theology in the College of the Savior (1768). He was appointed bishop of Potenza in 1782, but was not consecrated till a year later, owing to some technical opposition. At the reorganization of the Royal Academy of Naples in 1778, he was chosen one of its perpetual secretaries. He was massacred Feb. 24, 1799, during the revolution which followed the French army. He wrote several works on local ecclesiastical history, in Latin and Italian, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Serres (Lat. Serranus), Jean De

, a French Protestant historian and theologian, was born at Villeneuve de Berg about 1540, and educated at Lausanne, especially in ancient languages and philosophy. He early distinguished himself by his learned historical writings. In 1578 he was called to Nismes as rector of the academy and principal of the College of Arts. He was very active and conspicuous in the ecclesiastical affairs of the times, especially by his writings and the part he took in public religious bodies. He died at Geneva, May 31, 1598. For his extensive works, chiefly embracing Church history and polity, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Serry, Francois Jacques Hyacinthe

a French theologian, was born at Toulon in 1659. He early entered the Order of St. Dominic, and was sent to Paris for an education, where he applied himself to philosophy and began preaching. In 1690 he went to Rome, and became theologian to cardinal Altieri, and was engaged on the *Index*. He returned to Paris in 1696, and the next year took the degree of doctor, and was called as professor of theology to Padua, where he died, March 12, 1738. His works on ecclesiastical history and theology are enumerated in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v. Among them are, *De Christo ejusque Virgine Matre* (Venice, 1719): — *Historia Congregationum de Aux. Div. Grat. sub Summis Pontiff. Clem. VIII et*

Paulo V (in 4 libr. distributa, Louvain, 1700; Antw. 1709, fol.). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 317; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*.

Se'rug

(Heb. *Serug'*, גִּרְעֻג *branch* [Gesén.], or *strength* [Fürst]; Sept. Σερούχ; New Test. Σαρούχ, “Saruch,” ^{<1085>}Luke 3:35; Josephus Σερούχος, *Ant.* 1, 6, 5), one of the postdiluvian patriarchs, being the son of Reu, and the father of Nahor the grandfather of Abraham (^{<1112>}Genesis 11:20; ^{<1006>}1 Chronicles 1:6). B.C. 2352-2122. His age is given in the Hebrew Bible, at the above passages, as 230 years — thirty years before he begat Nahor and two hundred years afterwards. But in the Sept. 130 years are assigned to him before he begat Nahor (making his total age 330), being one of its systematic variations in the ages of the patriarchs between Shem and Terah. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2, 114) conjectures that the town of *Seruj*, a day's journey from Charrse, in Mesopotamia, was named from this patriarch. Suidas and others ascribe to him the deification of dead benefactors of mankind. Epiphanius (*Adv. Hoeres.* 1, 6, 8), who says that his name signifies “provocation,” states that, though in his time idolatry took its rise, yet it was confined to pictures; and that the deification of dead men, as well as the making of idols, was subsequent. He characterizes the religion of mankind up to Serug's days as Scythic; after Serug and the building of the Tower of Babel, the Hellenic or Greek form of religion was introduced, and continued to the writer's time (see Petavius, *Anim. adv. Epiph. Oper.* 2:13). The account given by John of Antioch is as follows: Serug, of the race of Japhet, taught the duty of honoring eminent deceased men, either by images or statues (εἰκόνας) and ἀνδρίαντες, which, however, may here be used of *pictures*), of worshipping them on certain anniversaries as if still living, of preserving a record of their actions in the sacred books of the priests, and of calling them *gods* as being benefactors of mankind. Hence arose polytheism and idolatry (see *Fragm. Historic. Groec.* 4, 345, and note). It is in accordance with his being called of the race of Japhet that Epiphanius sends Phaleg and Reu to Thrace (*Epist. ad Descr. Paul.* § 2). There is, of course, little or no historical value in any of these statements, beyond the fact that the charge of idolatry is brought against Terah and the fathers beyond the Euphrates in ^{<1641>}Joshua 24:2.

Seruk Menachem

SEE SARUK.

Serunner

In Norse mythology, was the beautiful hall in Freya's dwelling of Folkwang, where she gathered about herself, in the service of love and for the enjoyment of all the pleasures of life, half the heroes of the earth. The abode of all the Einherjars is either here or in the Valhalla. — Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* s.v.

Servant

(usually **db**], *ebed*, **δοῦλος**, which are invariably rendered thus in the A.V. or else “bondman;” but “servant” is occasionally the rendering of **r** [**h**] *na'ar*, properly a *lad* or “young man;” or **t** **r** **m**] *meshareth* [^{<0231>}Exodus 33:11; ^{<0412>}Numbers 11:28; ^{<1037>}2 Samuel 13:17, 18; ^{<1092>}Proverbs 29:12], a *minister*, as elsewhere rendered; Gr. in like manner sometimes **παῖς**, **διάκονος**, etc.). SEE *EBED*. The Hebrew terms *na'ar* and *meshareth*, which alone answer to our “servant,” in so far as this implies the notions of liberty and voluntariness, are of comparatively rare occurrence. On the other hand, *ebed*, which is common in the A.V., properly means a *slave*. In many passages the correct reading would add considerable force to the meaning — e.g. in ^{<0025>}Genesis 9:25, “Cursed be Canaan; a slave of slaves shall he be unto his brethren;” in ^{<0515>}Deuteronomy 5:15, “Remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt;” in ^{<1819>}Job 3:19, “The slave is free from his master;” and particularly in passages where the speaker uses the term of himself, as in ^{<0183>}Genesis 18:3, “Pass not away, I pray thee, from thy slave.” Slavery was, in point of fact, the normal condition of the underling in the Hebrew commonwealth, while the terms above given refer to the exceptional cases of young or confidential attendants. Joshua, for instance, is described as at once the *na'ar* and *meshareth* of Moses (^{<0231>}Exodus 33:11); Elisha's servant sometimes as the former (^{<1042>}2 Kings 4:12; 5, 20), sometimes as the latter (4:43; 6:15). Amnon's servant was a *meshareth* (^{<1037>}2 Samuel 13:17, 18), while young Joseph was a *na'ar* to the sons of Bilhah (^{<0372>}Genesis 37:2, where instead of “the lad was with,” we should read “he was the *servant boy* to” the sons of Bilhah). The confidential designation *mesharath* is applied to the priests and Levites in their relation to Jehovah (^{<1317>}Ezra 8:17; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 61:6;

^{<5411>}Ezekiel 44:11), and the cognate verb to Joseph after he found favor with Potiphar (^{<1304>}Genesis 39:4), and to the nephews of Ahaziah (^{<4218>}2 Chronicles 22:8). In ^{<1114>}1 Kings 20:14, 15, we should substitute “servants” (*na’ar*) for “young men.” *SEE HIRELING; SEE SLAVE.*

Servant of Jehovah

(**h2Ewby**]db[, **δοῦλος τοῦ Κυρίου**, “servant of the Lord,” also in the phrase “my servant,” etc.), a term used tropically in several senses.

1. A *worshipper* of God (^{<6110>}Nehemiah 1:10); so the Israelites in general (Ezra 5, 11), and Daniel in particular (^{<2021>}Daniel 6:21). In this sense it is applied as an epithet to the pious: e.g. to Abraham (^{<9436>}Psalms 105:6, 42), Joshua (^{<629>}Joshua 24:29; ^{<0118>}Judges 2:8), Job (^{<8008>}Job 1:8, etc.), David (^{<9801>}Psalms 18:1, etc.), Eliakim (^{<2320>}Isaiah 22:20), Zerubbabel (^{<3111>}Haggai 2:24), and to saints in general (^{<1342>}Psalms 34:23, etc.; ^{<2547>}Isaiah 54:17, etc.). *SEE SAINT.*

2. A *minister* or ambassador of God, called and sent to perform any service (^{<2346>}Isaiah 49:6), e.g. Nebuchadnezzar, whom God used as his instrument in chastising his people (^{<2026>}Jeremiah 27:6; 43:10); but usually some favorite servant, as the angels (^{<8048>}Job 4:18), or prophets (^{<3117>}Amos 3:7; ^{<3425>}Jeremiah 7:25, etc.; ^{<2106>}Daniel 9:6; ^{<4591>}Ezra 9:11), especially Moses (^{<6345>}Deuteronomy 34:5; ^{<1101>}Joshua 1:1, 13, 15; ^{<9436>}Psalms 105:26), and Isaiah (^{<2318>}Isaiah 20:3). Sometimes the two ideas of a pious worshipper of God and a special messenger sent by him seem to have coalesced, as in the passages relating to Abraham and Moses, and particularly in those where Israel or Jacob, i.e. the people of Israel, is addressed by this honorable and endearing appellation (as ^{<2408>}Isaiah 41:8, etc.; ^{<4900>}Jeremiah 30:10, etc.; ^{<3825>}Ezekiel 28:25; 37:25; comp. ^{<2810>}Hosea 11:1).

3. Peculiarly the *Messiah* is thus typified, especially in the latter chapters of Isaiah (more particularly 42:1; 52:13; comp. ^{<4023>}Matthew 12:13), as preeminently Jehovah’s chosen servant for accomplishing the work of redemption. See Gesenius, *Comment. in Jesa.* ad loc.; Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, 2, 566 [Am. ed.]; Steudel, *De y8 8y db]*, (Tüb. 1829); Umbreit, *Der Knecht Gottes* (Hamb. 1840); Schmutz, *Le Serviteur de Jehovah* (Strasb. 1858); Oehler, *Knecht Jehovah’s* (Stuttg. 1865); Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah* (Edinb. 1877). *SEE DOUBLE SENSE.*

Servants

SEE SLAVES.

Servator

in Roman mythology, was a surname of Jupiter, signifying *the preserver*.

Server

one who assists the priest at the celebration of the holy eucharist by lighting the altar tapers, arranging the books, bringing bread, wine, and water for the sacrifice, and by making the appointed responses in the name and behalf of the assembled congregation. He was sometimes called “adjutor.” The Clugniacs allowed one server, but the Cistercians, in obedience to pope Soter’s injunction and the plural wording of the *Dominus vobiscum*, required always two.

Servetus, Michael

(*Serveto*, surnamed *Reves*, known in France as *Michel de Villeneuve*), unquestionably the leading Antitrinitarian in the period of the Reformation, was born at Villaneuva, in Arragon, in 1509 or 1511, and belonged to an ancient Christian family of prominence, perhaps of noble rank. His father was a jurist and notary, and Michael was sent at an early age to Toulouse in preparation for a similar career; but his impetuous and imaginative spirit was not attracted by the dry study of jurisprudence, and turned with preference towards theological investigations, prompted, perhaps, by the fact that at Toulouse he first became acquainted with the Bible. The above statements are taken from his own testimony at the Geneva trial, and are probably truthful in the main; but it is difficult to harmonize them with his declarations at Vienne, according to which he entered the service of father Quintana, the confessor of Charles V, at the early age of perhaps fourteen or fifteen years, and with his master accompanied the court to Italy on the occasion of the emperor’s coronation at Bologna, and to Germany on its return. The further statement that he remained with Quintana in Germany until the death of the latter in 1532 is known to be positively untrue, since he was at Basle, and alone, by the close of the summer of 1530; and the Geneva testimony recites that he came to Basle direct from Toulouse, by way of Lyons and Geneva, without referring in any way to travels in Italy or Germany. When Servetus came to Basle he was without experience in

the Christian life, and his moral consciousness was undeveloped. Religion was not to him an answer to the questionings of the human heart — a dissolving of doubts in the field of morals, a deliverance from internal conflicts. The unmistakably speculative tendency of his mind led him to conceive of Christianity as being first of all a system of doctrine, and he had already developed a scheme in which the doctrines of God and of his manifestation in Christ, in their speculative aspects, were regarded as constituting its essential basis. The object of his visit was to find a publisher for the book in which he had embodied his views, and to secure the favorable regards of the Swiss reformers in behalf of the modifications he proposed to introduce into the teaching of the Reformation.

OEccolampadius, however, found his statements of doctrinal views obscure and misleading, contrary to the Scriptures, and even blasphemous, as being directed against the eternal godhead of Christ; and when the book finally appeared in 1531 from the press of Conrad Rous, of Hagenau and Strasburg (under the title *De Trinitatis Erroribus Libri Septem*, etc., 15 sheets, 8vo), it was condemned on every hand. Bucer declared its author to be deserving of death; and when Servetus brought a portion of the edition to Basle, it would seem that the town council confiscated the book and required from him a retraction of its teachings. A second work from the same press in 1532 (*Dialog. de Trinit. Libr. II, de Just. Regni Christi Capit. 4*, 8 sheets, 8vo) begins with a retraction of the former book, but on the ground of its immaturity rather than substantial error. This work produced no impression whatever, and Servetus was obliged to renounce the hope of exercising a determining influence over the progress of the Reformation in Germany. He withdrew to France, assumed the name of De Villeneuve, and entered on the study of mathematics and medicine, and also that of philosophy, particularly of theosophic Neo-Platonism, at Paris. At this time he first sought the acquaintance of Calvin, but failed to attend an interview granted at his solicitation by the latter. The life of Servetus while in France was unsettled; the first six years being spent in Paris, Orleans, Lyons, Paris again, where he taught mathematics in the Lombard College, Avignon, and Charlieu; and it was disturbed with frequent disputes, which occasionally involved serious consequences for him. One of these quarrels determined him to leave Paris forever. He had acquired considerable knowledge in medical science — as is attested by his observation of the circulation of the blood, long before Harvey's discovery — and was a zealous student of astrology; but his vanity led him to speak disparagingly of other physicians, and brought on him the opposition of the

medical faculty and of the entire university. He was condemned by the Parliament to destroy all the copies of an apology which he had written to substantiate his position, and to abstain from meddling with astrology except in so far as the *natural* influence of the stars upon human affairs might be concerned. He ultimately settled at Vienne in response to the invitation of his patron and former pupil, the archbishop P. Paulmier, and spent twelve years in that town in the practice of medicine and in intercourse with the leading clergy; but he still found time for learned labors, both in the line of his own profession and in other departments, one of the results being a new edition of the Latin version of the Bible by Sanctes Pagninus (Lugd. ap. Hug. a Porta, 1542, fol.), with notes. This work was but carelessly done; the few notes from his pen being chiefly attached to the Messianic prophecies, and aiming to show that such prophecies invariably referred in the minds of the prophets to historical personages and events in the immediate future, and that they had only a typical reference to Christ. The work was accordingly placed in Spain and the Netherlands on the *Index Expurgandorum*. Servetus had by no means given up his theological speculations, though he accommodated his habits in all respects to his Roman Catholic surroundings. He believed himself called to effect a restoration of true Christianity, which had been obscured and even lost to the world since the beginning of the 4th century, and to promote his ends he opened a correspondence with the Reformed leaders Viret and Calvin. The latter responded, and at first with moderation; but as Servetus assumed a depreciatory attitude, and persisted in the endeavor to contradict the responses made to his inquiries, the reformer eventually refused to continue the correspondence, and referred to his *Institutes* for further information.. Servetus now resolved to bring before the public the work in which he had laid down the results of his long continued cogitations, and, in utter disregard of the warnings already received from Calvin, as well as of the dangers clearly recognized as impending by his own mind, he carried forward the project to its conclusion. The rashness and almost fanatical tenacity of his natural temper are well illustrated in this undertaking; but the method by which it was accomplished serves to show with equal clearness that he was not above the use of caution, artifice, and even duplicity, when needed to secure himself against the consequences of his action. The bookseller Arnoullet, of Vienne, was secured by the use of money and the false assurances of a friend; the printing was conducted with the utmost secrecy and haste, and immediately on its completion the book was sent to Lyons, Chatillon, Geneva, and Frankfort, without the

knowledge of persons resident in Vienne. It appeared early in 1553, and bore the title *Christianismi Restitutio*, etc. The author's name is indicated at the end by the letters "M.S.V." and the name of the publisher and the place of printing are not given.

This most extensive of the works of Servetus (734 pp. 8vo) presents no thorough elaboration and systematic statement of his ideas, but consists rather of a series of disconnected papers, some of them new and others emendations of earlier productions from his pen. It contains seven books *De Trinitate Divina*; three books *De Fide et Justitia Regni Christi, et de Caritate*; five books *De Regeneratione et Manducatione Superna et de Regno Antichristi; Epistoloe Triginta ad. Jo. Calvinum; Signa Sexaginta Regni Antichristi et Revelatio ejus jam nunc Proesens*; and *De Mysterio Tinitatis et Veterum Disciplina ad Ph. Melancthonem*, etc., *Apologia*. The attitude of the author towards the dogma of God, the Father, Son, and Spirit, as held by the Church, is that of uncompromising hostility. He regards it as of necessity involving tritheism and polytheism, and even atheism; or, on the other hand, as inconceivable; and he finds it significant that this doctrine began to prevail at the very time from which the Church must date its growing degeneracy. But, while rejecting a trinity of essence in the Godhead, he insists on a trinity of manifestation; the fundamental principle that God is one and undivided leads to a second principle — namely, that everything which comes to pass in or with the divine nature is but a *disposition*, which does not affect the divine essence, but must be regarded somewhat as one of its accidents. God is able to dispose and manifest himself because he is not an abstract unit, a bare mathematical point, but rather an infinite Spirit, an infinite ocean of substance which fashions all forms and bears them within itself. His manifestation of himself results from the act of his will, rather than from any necessity lying in his nature, and takes place because without such revelation of himself he could not be known by his creatures. The mode of manifestation is likewise wholly subject to his will, and he is by no means limited to only two revelations of himself; his incorporation in Christ was determined simply by the needs of the world he has chosen to create and those of the human race. It pleased him, consequently, to dispose himself to a twofold manifestation, the one a *mode of revelation by the Word*, the other a *mode of impartation by the Spirit*. The Word, however, was not merely an empty articulate sound, but, in harmony with the nature of God, an uncreated light. The Logos is the Eternal Thought, the Eternal Reason, the Ideal

World, the Archetype of the world in which the original types of all things are contained. In this Divine Light was already manifested the form of the future Christ, not ideally alone, but actually and visibly; and from this original type and mode of divine revelation proceed all the modifications of the Deity. The creation of the world, for example, was the necessary condition for the incarnation of the Christ who was preformed in the Eternal Light, which incarnation had been decreed by the will of God; so that the world came into being through Christ, and solely to admit of his becoming man, and it has no significance aside from him who should appear in it and reign. But as a vapor rises with the utterance of a word, so the spirit of God came forth on the utterance of the Creative Word, and the second mode of revelation and disposition was given, in intimate combination with the first. That spirit is more immediately the spirit of natural life, which moves on the waters and breathes in the air — the world soul, by which in respiration the living soul is first given to man. The incarnation of Christ was delayed and obscured by man's fall into sin, but he nevertheless revealed himself in many though imperfect forms. Adam was created in *his* image; angels and theophanies were his shadows, the cloud of light in the wilderness was the reflection of the heavenly light. The spirit, too, was in the world, but only as a spirit of law and terror. The truth, and God himself; attained to a full manifestation and revelation for the first time in the *man* Jesus, in whom the Eternal Word became incarnate in time. The generation of this man is to be conceived of as literal, the Deity which formed the substance of the Logos in the Uncreated Light taking the place of the paternal seed, and the three superior elements contained in that, light — fire, air, and water — combined with the Christ idea and the Life spirit, uniting with the blood and earth substance of the Virgin to form a real man; but the man is so penetrated by the Deity that he becomes God in his flesh and blood, his body, soul, and spirit; he was such while in the embryo, and continues to bear the substantial form of the Godhead when in the grave. The Word, accordingly, did not assume flesh, but became flesh. By virtue of this nature Christ is the Son of God — the only Son, especially the only eternal Son. The eternal generation of the Son within the Godhead is a simple monstrosity, since generation is a function of the flesh alone; an ante-mundane *person* is conceivable only as it signifies the image or form of Christ as the pre-existing Word, who first became the actual Son of God, however, when he appeared in time and in the nature of man. The manifestation of the divine glory in the person of Christ was, moreover, a gradual process, not fully realized so far as his

body is concerned until the resurrection, when he returned into the divine idea as he had previously come out from that idea into corporeal existence. He is now Jehovah — not Elohim, the God who may appear — and as such is seen by the eye of faith and participates in all the creative power, honor, and dominion of God, with whom he is identified. The *Holy Ghost*, too, is dependent on the resurrection of Christ for the consummation of his character and his truth. The fullness of the Divine Spirit was, imparted in connection with the Word to the soul of Christ on his becoming incarnate, the two constituting but a single and indivisible substance; but the soul included corruptible elements of blood and created light down to the experience of the resurrection. In that experience he was, so to speak, born again; the creature element was laid aside his human spirit was wholly absorbed into the Spirit of God, and the resultant combination forms the true *Holy Spirit*, the principle of all regeneration, which proceeds from the mouth of Christ. In this way the real Trinity is constituted — a trinity not of things or so called persons in the divine essence, but a threefold manifestation of himself by the one and indivisible God.

Such was the teaching which Servetus presented to the world as the restored truth of Christianity. He, was incapable, from the tendency of his mind, of admitting the importance of the element of practical ethics in the scheme of Christianity, and regarded the latter as preeminently a system of doctrine. He speaks constantly of the person of Christ, but rarely of his work of redemption. Faith is represented as the central and fundamental element, but rather in the character of apprehension and assent than of trust. The ideas of sin and guilt are scarcely recognized, and are confined to wicked actions; and the results of such actions are held to be not unto death in the case of persons under twenty years of age. The baptism of children is accordingly condemned, and is even characterized as being a principal source of the corruption of the Church. Baptism should not be conferred until persons have reached the age of thirty years, and have been prepared by preaching, careful instruction, repentance, and faith. The Lord's supper should be administered immediately after baptism, since the new man will at once require sustenance. Good works and holy living do not necessarily spring from faith, but they are not beyond the ability of mankind, even in the heathen state. By them a higher degree of blessedness may be attained, and they are useful to strengthen faith and guard against reactions of the flesh; for which reason such works as will subdue the flesh are recommended, and such others as will *satisfy* the claims of justice

(prayer, almsgiving, voluntary confession, etc.) so far as to wholly or partially deliver from the *purgatorial fires* which await even the faithful and the baptized in the region of the dead.

The measures by which it was hoped to conceal the author of this book proved insufficient, and Servetus was denounced to the archiepiscopal tribunal of Lyons. Evidence to substantiate the charge was obtained, and the governor-general of Dauphiny ordered his apprehension and trial; and having allowed himself to be entrapped into an acknowledgment of the offense, he was on June 17 condemned to death by fire. He was enabled to effect an escape before the conclusion of the trial, evidently through the assistance of powerful friends, and was accordingly burned in effigy. The sentence of the spiritual court was not pronounced until after his death.

The first intention of Servetus was to escape into Spain, but he soon turned towards Switzerland in the hope of being ultimately able to reach Naples. He arrived at Geneva in the middle of July, and remained about a month in the public hostelry, when Calvin learned of his presence and caused him to be apprehended (Aug. 13). As the laws required that a civilian should appear as the accuser, Nicholas de la Fontaine, Calvin's pupil and amanuensis, acted in that relation, and charged Servetus with having disseminated grossly erroneous teachings, on account of which he had already been imprisoned and was now a fugitive. Thirty-eight articles were attached to this charge, which had been drawn up by Calvin, and to which the accused was required to render categorical answers. Servetus bore himself quietly, and answered with considerable frankness, but the council nevertheless ordered the case to proceed to trial. In a subsequent examination, the accused conceded his rejection of certain orthodox doctrines, and claimed the privilege of publicly and in the Church convincing Calvin, in whom he recognized his principal antagonist, that such doctrines were unscriptural and erroneous. The action of Philibert Berthelier, a declared enemy to Calvin and leader of the libertine party, who openly sought to protect Servetus, led the reformer to declare himself the real accuser, and he was accordingly admitted to the sessions of the court and allowed to take part in the proceedings. The presence of Calvin, and his own confidence in the protection of powerful supporters, influenced Servetus to display more arrogance in his replies, until in the heat of argument he gave utterance to strong and unequivocally pantheistic assertions. It now appeared that his guilt in the principal matter was proved, and the determination of his punishment alone remained to be

settled. The procurator-general (Aug. 23) brought forward thirty new questions relating to the circumstances of the prisoner's life, his designs, and his intercourse with other theologians, and the warnings he had received from them, to which Servetus responded with greater moderation, though not without doing violence to the truth. He also petitioned that he might be discharged from trial under criminal process, since such action had never been usual in matters concerning the faith before the time of Constantine, and was the more unreasonable in his case, as his views had been made known to a few scholars only, and he had nothing in common with the rebellious Anabaptists; and he requested, further, that he be furnished with legal counsel as especially necessary to a stranger in his situation. His petition was denied on the recommendation of the procurator-general, to which it is supposed that Calvin was no stranger; but his earlier request for a discussion with Calvin was granted, with the modification that it should take place before the council rather than in the Church. Servetus, however, suddenly changed his tactics, and instead of entering on a discussion with Calvin at their meeting on Sept. 1, he proceeded to deny the competency of civil tribunals to deal with questions of faith; and on the ground that the Church of Geneva could not impartially determine in matters at issue between Calvin and himself, he appealed to the judgment of the churches in other places. As this appeal corresponded with a resolution already reached in the council, it was entertained, and the matter referred to the authorities of the four evangelical cities of Switzerland; and it was determined that all further transactions should be conducted in writing and in the Latin language. Calvin accordingly extracted from the works of Servetus their most hurtful teachings, and submitted them, accompanied with remarks intended to show their blasphemous and dangerous character, on Sept. 5. Servetus responded with complaints about the treatment he was obliged to undergo, and appealed from the smaller council to the Council of the Two Hundred, many of whose members, as he knew, were hostile to Calvin; but finding it necessary to reply to Calvin's allegations, he permitted himself the use of violent attacks and reproaches against his opponent, while at the same time presenting more clearly, and with less dissimulation than before, the meaning and tendencies of his views. A comprehensive reply by Calvin and his colleagues was met with further insult, though a private communication intended to instruct the former in certain principles of philosophy and other matters was written in a spirit of greater moderation. A messenger from the council conveyed the writings exchanged between the respective parties,

and a copy of the principal work written by Servetus to the councillors and the clergy of Zurich, Berne, Basle, and Schaffhausen. Calvin (did not neglect to influence his friends by means of his private correspondence in the endeavor to secure an approval of his course; and Servetus, in the meantime, directed a complaint against Calvin as a false accuser, and demanded that he should be imprisoned and tried, the prosecution to continue until one of the antagonists should be sentenced to suffer death or some other punishment.

The opinions of the cities had all been received by Oct. 22, and were unanimous in condemning the false teachings of Servetus as not to be tolerated in the Church. The Council of Berne especially urged the use of severe measures to prevent the introduction of such errors, while the clergy of that city sought to moderate the force of that recommendation by a warning against indiscretion. Calvin and his associates were decidedly of the opinion that the penalty of death should be inflicted on the accused, and so expressed themselves, though averse to death by fire as involving unnecessary cruelty. When the council met to determine the penalty to be imposed (Oct. 23), opinions were divided, and several councillors were absent. A recess was therefore taken until Oct. 26. The syndic A. Perrin, a zealous opponent of Calvin, then proposed; first, an acquittal of the accused, and afterwards a reference of the matter to the Council of the Two Hundred, but in each case without success. The sentence of death by fire was pronounced in conformity with the laws of the empire. The condemned man was profoundly moved, and pleaded earnestly for mercy, but he could not be persuaded to recant. He died Oct. 27, 1553, without having changed his views in any important particular, but not without exhibiting the marks of a Christian spirit.

It is not possible to regard the character of Servetus as favorably as it has been described by the opponents of Calvin. He was not pure and great, and though he *ultimately* died for his convictions, he was by no means a *martyr* for the truth. He concealed his beliefs and attended mass in France during more than twenty years at a time when multitudes chose death or the loss of country and prospects rather than deny their faith. He availed himself unhesitatingly of falsehood and perjury, especially in the trial at Vienne. He certainly did not possess a high degree of moral earnestness. As a *thinker*, he was noticeable for originality and ingenuity, for speculative depth and a wealth of ideas, though the very number of ideas prevented him from presenting them with adequate clearness. His theological and christological

system rested to a much greater extent than he imagined upon hypotheses and theories in natural philosophy, and to a much smaller extent upon the Bible. His one-sided intellectualism, finally, afforded no satisfaction to the religious sense in man, while his strongly pantheistic leanings and his irreverent polemics necessarily offended the religious consciousness. His pyre unfortunately did more to enlighten the world than all his books. His teachings were scarcely understood until the most recent times. His so called followers, the later Antitrinitarians, failed to comprehend either their organic unity or their fullness and depth, and, while they appropriated. surface ideas, were unable to appreciate what is really speculative in his books. Gribaldo and Gentile, for example, sensualize the twofold manifestation of God into an essentialization of subordinate deities, and Socinus degrades the real Sonship and Deity of Christ as taught by Servetus until nothing beyond his essential manhood remains.

The course pursued by Calvin in the trial of Servetus has been the subject of incessant dispute from his own day until now. His contemporaries already condemned his action, though the most eminent orthodox thinkers and theologians approved his course; and though the argument has been renewed as often as occasion offered, the Christian world is not yet able to agree upon a judgment which shall afford universal satisfaction. The facts upon which a decision must be based are as follows:

1. Calvin was thoroughly convinced that the welfare of the Church demanded the death of Servetus as an incorrigible heretic, and never hesitated to acknowledge that conviction. When Servetus requested that Calvin should protect him during a proposed visit to Geneva, the latter refused, and wrote to Farel, under date of Feb. 7, 1546, "If he [Servetus] should come hither, I will not permit him to escape with his life, if my authority has any weight" (Henry, *Leben J. Calvin's*, 3, 66, appendix). His views upon the subject never changed, as appears from his correspondence while the trial was in progress, e.g. the letter of Sept. 14, 1553 (*Ep. et Resp.* fol. 127), in which Bullinger urges Calvin not to leave Geneva even though Servetus should not be punished with death. The absence of such facts from the records of the trial is sufficiently explained by the consideration that they were not matter for public record; and the *Fidelis Expositio Errorum M. Serveti*, etc., written to explain his conduct in that unhappy business, does not justify the argument sometimes based on it to show that Calvin did not desire the death of Servetus, since the book was

intended to show, first, that incorrigible heretics ought to be punished by the secular arm; and, second, that Servetus was such a heretic.

2. In obedience to such convictions, Calvin caused the imprisonment of Servetus as soon as he learned that the latter was in Geneva, and personally directed the prosecution of the trial. Both statements rest on his own repeated acknowledgments in letters to his friends and in his *Refutatio*, and are substantiated by the public records.

3. While Calvin wished Servetus to die, he did not favor his being burned at the stake (comp. the letter to Farel of Aug. 20, 1553 [*Ep. et Resp.* fol. 114], and Beza, *Joan. Calv. Vita*).

It is no longer possible to undertake an unconditional defense of the opinions by which Calvin was governed in this matter, nor of the action which resulted. Unbiased minds are compelled to see that the reformer not only failed in this respect to rise above the errors of his time, but that in his management of the case he was guilty of evasions and exaggerations which form a real blot on his record; but there is no reason to doubt that his course was dictated by his sense of the duty he owed to God, to the Church in general, and to the Church of Geneva in particular; and this forms the only explanation which will justify his action in any degree to candid minds. His failure to save his antagonist from the cruel death by fire was doubtless owing to his difficult position at this very time. The ruling party in Geneva was opposed to Calvin, and had neutralized his measures in some instances insomuch that he declared his intention of leaving that city unless such action should cease; the Council of the Two Hundred was strongly hostile to him; and in the smaller council, before which Servetus was tried, measures were passed of which Calvin did not approve (e.g. the resolution to consult with the authorities of other cities), and direct efforts were made to save the accused from his impending doom. He could not suggest before the council that a different form of capital punishment from that prescribed by law should be inflicted, lest his own sincerity should be impugned by his opponents; and it is not difficult to discover reasons which may have neutralized whatever private efforts he employed. There is, at all events, no sufficient reason for doubting his own explicit statements on the matter. *Sources.* — *The Works of Servetus and Calvin's Refutation*; *Calvini Ep. et Resp.*; Mosheim, *Vers. ein. vollst. u. unpart. Ketzergesch.* (Helmst. 1748); id. *Neue Nachr. v. d. beruhmt. span. Arzte M. Serveto* (ibid. 1750); Trechsel, *M. Servet u. seine Vorgänger* (Heidelb. 1839);

Henry, *Leben J. Calvin's*, 2, 95 sq., and *Beilagen*, p. 49 sq. On the teachings of Servetus, see Heberle, *M. Servet's Trinitatslehre u. Christologie*, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1840, No. 2; Baur, *Christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes*, 3, 54 sq.; Dorner, *Person Christi*, 2, 649 sq.; Meier, *Lehre v. d. Trinitat in ihrer histor. Entw.* 2, 5 sq. On the Genevan trial of Servetus, see Rilliet, *Relation du Proces contre M. Servet*, etc. (Genèv. 1844). See also Galiffe, *Notices Geneal. sur les Familles Genev.* and *Nouvelles Pages d'Histoire Exacte*; Stähelin, *J. Calvin, Leben u. ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld, 1860-63, 2 vols.).

Servia

(Turkish, *Sirb Vilayeti*), a state of Europe, bounded north by Slavonia and Hungary proper, east by Roumania and Bulgaria, south by Roumelia, and west by Bosnia. Until 1878, Servia was a dependency of Turkey, but in that year the treaty of Berlin established its entire independence. The Servian nationality extends far beyond the boundaries of the principality of Servia. Servians constitute nearly the entire population of Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzegovina; they constitute ninety-five percent of the population in the former kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia, ninety percent in Dalmatia, and eighty percent in the former military frontier. Including all these districts, the Servians occupy a territory of about 69,000 square miles, with a compact population numbering more than 6,000,000 persons. The majority of all the Servians belong to the Orthodox Eastern (or Greek) Church. The following article refers to the principality of Servia exclusively. **SEE AUSTRIA; SEE HUNGARY; SEE MONTENEGRO; SEE TURKEY.**

1. Area, Population, etc. — Servia contained before the treaty of Berlin 16,817 square miles. Its population in 1885 was 1,902,419, all Serbs of Slavic origin, excepting about 140,000 Wallachs, 25,000 Gypsies, and 15,000 Turks, Bulgarians, Jews, Germans, and Hungarians. By the treaty of Berlin in 1878 a territory formerly belonging to Turkey was annexed to Servia, and the area of the principality raised to 18,687 square miles, with a population of 1,720,000 inhabitants. The country is mountainous and densely wooded. From the interior numerous chains proceed northward, forming massive barriers both on the eastern and western frontiers, and sloping pretty steeply towards the swampy plains along the Save and the Danube. The principal rivers are the Morava and Timok, affluents of the Danube, and the Kolubara, an affluent of the Save, which itself falls into

the Danube at Belgrade. The principal towns are Belgrade (the capital), Kraguyevatz, Semendria, Uzhitza, and Shabatz, and in the new districts Nish and Vrania. The climate is temperate and salubrious, but somewhat cold in the higher regions. The soil in the valleys is fertile, and cereals are raised in abundance. The mountains are believed to be rich in valuable minerals, but mining is almost unknown, and manufacturing industry is in the most backward condition. There is no nobility, and the peasants are free householders.

2. Church History. — The original inhabitants of Servia were principally Thracians. Conquered, shortly before Christ, by the Romans, it formed part of Illyricum, under the name of Moesia Superior. Overrun by the Huns, Ostrogoths, Longobards, etc., it came under Byzantine rule about the middle of the 6th century, but was wrested therefrom early in the 7th century by the Avars. These latter were driven out by the Serbs, then living north of the Carpathians, who themselves spread over the country in great numbers. About the middle of the 9th century they were converted to Christianity by missionaries sent by the emperor Basil. For about 200 years they were almost constantly at war with the neighboring Bulgarians, but in 1043 Stephen Bogislas broke their power. His son Michael (1050-80) took the title of king, and was recognized as such by pope Gregory VII. A struggle of nearly a hundred years resulted in the maintaining of their independence, and in 1165 Stephen Nemanja founded a dynasty which lasted for two centuries. During this period the kingdom attained the acme of its power and prosperity, embracing, under Stephen Dushan (1336-56), the whole of Macedonia, Albania, Thessaly, Northern Greece, and Bulgaria. At the request of king Stephen II, son of Stephen Nemanja, the bishops of Servia were in 1221 authorized by the patriarch of Constantinople to elect their metropolitan on condition that he be confirmed by the patriarch. The brother of the king, St. Sabbas, became the first archbishop of Uzhitza and all Servia. Stephen Dushan, in 1351, convoked the synod at Seres, which raised the metropolitan of Servia to the dignity of a patriarch, and declared him independent of the patriarch of Constantinople. The jurisdiction of the Servian patriarch extended not only over Servia and Bulgaria, but also over a large portion of Macedonia. He had his residence near Ipek, at the termination of the Streta Gora Mountains in Albania. In consequence of this measure, the patriarch of Constantinople pronounced the anathema against the Servian patriarch, but this was revoked in 1379.

The progress of the Turkish arms proved fatal to the welfare of Servia. In 1389 Lazarus I was defeated at Kossovopolje, and his son and successor, Stephen, became a vassal of Turkey. In 1459 Mohammed II incorporated Servia with Turkey, excepting Belgrade, which was held by the Hungarians until 1521. By the treaty of Passarowitz (1718) a considerable portion of the country was made over to Austria, but in 1739 it reverted to Turkey. During all this time the Turkish government had allowed the patriarchate to continue. Even when, in 1690, patriarch Arsenius III, after the failure of the Servian insurrection which the Austrians had instigated against Turkish rule, had emigrated with 37,000 Servian families to Austrian territory, the patriarchate of Ipek was not interfered with, but the appointment was always conferred upon a Greek, who purchased the position from the divan of Constantinople; In 1765 (according to another statement in 1769) this patriarchate was abolished and united with that of Constantinople. The last patriarch (Basil) fled to Russia, where he died, in St. Petersburg. Four metropolitans, generally Greeks, were now appointed for Servia, the sees of whom were Belgrade, Nish, Uzhitza. and Novi-Bazar, and none of whom had a suffragan. After sixty years of oppression, the people, under George Czerny, rebelled, and, with the assistance of Russia, triumphed, and Czerny was elected by the people prince of Servia. Deserted by Russia and France, the Turks again became masters of the country (1813). But two years after, under Milosh Obrenovitch, the people won back their liberties. Milosh was chosen prince of Servia (1817), and subsequently recognized by the sultan. After the election of Czerny, the metropolitan of Carlovitz, in Austria, had been recognized as the head of the Servian Church; but in 1830 Milosh again appointed a metropolitan for Servia. In 1834 Turkey restored six Servian districts which she had retained since 1813, and in the spring of 1872 relinquished a few additional localities, though not all that Servia claimed as her own. The seat of the legislature, which had always been at Kraguyevatz, was removed to Belgrade in October, 1875.

3. Religion, etc. — The inhabitants nearly all belong to the Greek Church, but are independent of the patriarch of Constantinople.

The hierarchy of the Church of Servia consists at present (1879) of a metropolitan and five bishops. The metropolitan is elected by the prince and the Servian bishops. He resides at Belgrade, and, according to the regulations of 1839, is assisted in the government of the Church by a titular bishop and several protopresbyters and presbyters. The titular bishop and

the other diocesan bishops constitute, at the same time, the Synod of the Metropolitan, to which are referred all marriage affairs, as well as all complaints of the administration and government of the Church by the metropolitan. The metropolitan receives fees for the ordination of presbyters, the consecration of churches, etc., and a fixed annual income of 6000 florins (about \$2400). He also possesses some real estate, especially vineyards near Semendria. The bishops are elected by the people, under the superintendence and guidance of the minister of justice, and ordained by the metropolitan. They have an unlimited jurisdiction in all matters purely ecclesiastical. All churches and ecclesiastical institutions are under the superintendence of the minister of justice, who makes the necessary arrangements conjointly with the elders of the Church. Servia has now five diocesan bishops, namely, the bishop of Shabatz, the bishop of Uzhitza (who resides at Karanovatz), the bishop of Negotin, and in the districts annexed in 1878 to Servia the bishops of Nish and Vrania. Each of them has a fixed income of 4000 florins (about \$1600). He also receives fees for ordinations, consecration, and other ecclesiastical functions. In regard to fees for burials, the bishop has to come to an understanding with the family of the deceased. All other fees were abolished in 1822, although voluntary gifts are still frequently made and accepted. The bishops have to pay from their income their archdeacons and secretaries. The secular clergy number about nine hundred members. The clergymen in the town receive fixed salaries, while those in the rural districts only receive fees. Every parish priest is obliged to keep accurate lists of births, marriages, and deaths..

Servia has many convents, most of which, however, have only a small number of inmates. Many of the convents have been wholly abandoned; others are hermitages, near which lodging houses are erected at the time of pilgrimages. The convent Sweti Kral (*holy king*) at Studenitza contains the bones of king Stephen Nemanja, by whom it was founded, and who in 1200 died as monk of one of the convents on Mount Athos. His son Rastka, better known in Servian history as St. Sabbas, the first archbishop of Uzhitza, transferred the bones of his father in 1203 to the Convent of Studenitza; which after the cloister name of king Stephen is sometimes called the Laura of St. Simon.

A Roman Catholic bishopric was established by pope Innocent X in 1644 at Belgrade. In 1728 the see was transferred from Belgrade to Semendria, and the name of the diocese is now Belgrade and Semendria. The bishop is a suffragan of the archbishop of Antivari, in Albania. The number of

Roman Catholics is small. In 1861 some accounts claimed a population of 30,000, but the Roman statistician Petri (*Prospetto della Gerarchia Episcopale* [Rome, 1850]) says nothing of the Roman Catholic population of the diocese. The official statistical bureau of Belgrade gave the number of Roman Catholics in 1874 as 4161. In 1852, the papal 'nuncio of Vienna, Viale Prela, visited Belgrade in order to reorganize the diocese, but no account of the results of his mission has ever been published. The Protestants numbered in 1874, according to the official statistical report of the government, 463, the Jews 2049, and the Mohammedans 6306. In the districts annexed in 1878 there are estimated to be 75,000 Mohammedans. Secession from the State Church is rigorously forbidden, but otherwise all the other religious denominations enjoy entire religious liberty.

Education is making rapid progress in Servia. Fifty years ago there was no public primary school; now education is compulsory, and for its management a special ministry of education has been organized. In 1874 there were 517 public schools, with 23,000 pupils. The first gymnasium was established in 1830, and in 1874 the principality had two complete gymnasia and five progymnasia, with an aggregate attendance of 2000 students. A normal school was established in 1872. The high school in Belgrade contains three faculties, and has about 200 students.

4. Character. — The Servians are distinguished for the vigor of their frame, their personal valor, love of freedom, and glowing poetical spirit. Their manners and mode of life are exceedingly picturesque, and strongly prepossess a stranger in their favor. They rank among the most gifted and promising members of the Slavic family. See Ranke, *Die serbische Revolution* (Hamburg, 1829; 2d ed. 1844); Milutinovitch, *Gesch. Serbiens von 1389-1815* (Leipsic, 1837); Cunibert, *Essai Historique sur les Revolutions et l'Independance de la Serbie depuis 1804 jusqu'a 1850* (ibid. 1855, 2 vols.); Hilferding, *Gesch. der Serben und Bulgaren* (Bautzen, 1856) Denton [Rev. W.], *Servia and the Servians* (Lond. 1862); Elodie Lawton Mijatovics (Wm. Tweedie), *Hist. of Modern Servia* (ibid. 1874); Saint-René Taillandier, *La Serbie au 19e Siecle, Kara George et Milosch* (Paris, 1875); Grieve, *The Church and People of Servia* (Lond. 1864); Jakshich, *Recueil Statistique sur les Contrées Serbes* (Belgrade, 1875).

Servian Version

SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

Service

(properly hdwb[] δουλεία, i.e. *bondage*; but the rendering in the A.V. in many places of less severe words, as drcaebx; διακονία, λατρεία, etc.). *SEE SERVITUDE*.

Service, The

SEE LORDS SUPPER.

Service Of The Church

It appears that there was a daily celebration of divine worship in the time of Cyprian; and it has been supposed that the practice of offering public prayer every morning and evening was established during the 3d century. The order of the daily morning and evening services, as they undoubtedly obtained in the 4th century was as follows: The *morning* service began with the reading of ¹⁸⁵¹Psalm 63, followed by prayers for the catechumens, energumens, candidates for baptism, and penitents; for the faithful, the peace of the world, and the state of the Church. Then followed a short prayer for preservation during the day, the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, the imposition of hands, or bishop's benediction, concluding with the dismissal of the congregation with the usual form, Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ "Depart in peace." The *evening* service (called *hora lucernaris*, because it began at the time of lighting candles) was in most parts the same with that of the morning, except with such variation of psalms, hymns, and prayers as were proper to the occasion. 1. The psalm was the one hundred and forty-first; 2. Proper prayer for the evening; 3. The evening hymn. In some churches the Lord's Prayer was always made a part of the daily worship both morning and evening (see Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* 13, 10, 11). At the Reformation, in order to supply the absence of a vain and idolatrous worship by a scriptural and reasonable service, it was appointed that the "morning and evening service" should be "said daily throughout the year." This order is observed in cathedral and collegiate churches, in the universities, and in some parishes, but has not been generally followed in parochial churches.

Service book

a book of devotion, of prayer.

That of the Church of England contains the Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church. *SEE COMMON PRAYER.*

The service books of the Latin Church include the Missal, the Pontifical, the Day Hours, the Breviary, the Ritual, the Processional, the Ceremonial for Bishops, the Benedictional.

Those of the Greek Church are, (1) the Euchologion, corresponding to the Missal; (2) the Menoea, answering to the Breviary, without the ferial offices, and full of ecclesiastical poetry in measured prose; (3) Paracletice, or great Octoechus, the ferial office for eight weeks, mainly the work of Joseph of the Studium; (4) Triodion, the Lent volume, from the Sunday before Septuagesima to Easter; and (5) the Pentecostarion, the office for Eastertide.

Services

an ecclesiastical name for arrangements of the Canticles, *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Benedicite*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, and the psalms sung by substitution for them, consisting of a succession of varied airs, partly verse and partly chorus, sung in regular choirs, of which, probably, the germ is to be found in the Ambrosian *Te Deum*, a succession of chants which is mentioned first by Boethius, who lived a century after Augustine. The simplified notation of this music, as used in the Salisbury and Roman breviaries, was composed by Marbecke. Tallis's service is an imitation, rather than an adaptation, of the original arrangement. Probably the first was the setting of the *Venite* by Causton in the time of Henry VIII. In 1641 complaint was made of "singing the *Te Deum* in prose after a cathedral church way." There are two classes:

- (1) full services, which have no repetitions, and are sung with an almost regular alternation by the two choirs:
- (2) verse services, which have frequent repetitions, no regular alternations, and are full of verses, either solos or passages sung in slower time by a selected number of voices.

Services, Domestic

The domestic officers (*servitia*) of a monastery were the cook, baker, brewer, laundryman, and tailor. At Rochester these were appointed by the bishop.

Serving Dress or Robe

SEE SURPLICE.

Serving Tables

one of the parts of the Presbyterian sacramental service. Where the Presbyterians have not adopted the Congregational mode of partaking of the sacrament, the following is the order: "The table on which the elements are placed, being decently covered, the bread in convenient dishes, and the wine in cups, and the communicants orderly and gravely sitting around the table or in their seats before it, the minister sets the elements apart by prayer and thanksgiving," etc. The whole of the communicants not partaking at once, it is found necessary to continue the distribution of the elements, with intervals of psalm singing; during which those who have eaten leave the table to give place to a fresh set of communicants. The distribution of the bread and wine and the delivery of an address are what constitutes *serving the table*. The number of tables varies from four to eight, and each address occupies ten minutes or a quarter of an hour. The minister of the place serves the first table; the rest are served by his assisting brethren.

Servites, Or Servants Of The Blessed Virgin Mary

an order of monks in the Roman Catholic Church founded (1233) in Florence by seven rich Florentine merchants. Their main object was to propagate devotion to the Virgin Mary. They lived at first as hermits, but, becoming a monastic order, adopted the rule of St. Augustine and obtained from pope Martin V the privileges of a mendicant order. The order having become relaxed, it was reestablished in 1593 in its original strictness as "Servites Eremites." This order has produced a large number of distinguished men, among whom may be mentioned father Paul Sarpi, author of the *History of the Council of Trent*, and St. Philip Benizi (died 1285), one of the apostles of Western Europe in the 13th century. The Servites were extremely popular during the 16th century because of their

many works of charity. Their dress was a cassock of serge, a cloak, a scapular, and an alms bag.

There were also female Servites, who were never very numerous, and a large body of Tertiarians (q.v.). The order, in 1870, was divided into twenty-seven provinces, the central house being the monastery of the Annunziata in Florence. They were involved in the decrees suppressing religious orders in Italy and Germany. They were introduced into the United States in 1870 by bishop Melcher of Green Bay, Mich. There was a similar order founded in Naples in 1243.

Servitor

(**trom**] *meshareth*, a *minister*, as elsewhere rendered), a personal attendant, but not in a menial capacity (^{<0046>}2 Kings 4:43). *SEE SERVANT*.

Servitude

(**hdbφ**). The servants of the Israelites were slaves, and usually foreigners (^{<0123>}1 Chronicles 2:34), who were required to be circumcised (comp. ^{<0173>}Genesis 17:23, 27). Servants of both sexes were acquired (comp. Mishna, *Kiddushin*, 1, 2 sq.), sometimes as prisoners of war, whose lives were spared (comp. ^{<0826>}Numbers 31:26 sq.), sometimes by purchase in peace (these were called *miknath keseph*, "purchased," Judith 4:10; comp. Livy, 41, 6; see ^{<0173>}Genesis 17:23; ^{<0207>}Exodus 21:7; 22:2; ^{<0254>}Leviticus 25:44; and on their purchase in Abyssinia now, see Russegger, *Reis.* 1, 156). But foreign servants who had escaped could neither be enslaved nor given up to their masters (^{<0235>}Deuteronomy 23:15 sq.). The children of slaves were of course the property of the master (comp. ^{<0173>}Genesis 17:23; ^{<0204>}Exodus 21:4). These were generally considered most faithful (Horace, *Ep.* 2, 2, 6). At the legal valuation, perhaps an average, thirty silver shekels were given for a servant (^{<0232>}Exodus 21:32), while a free Israelite was valued at fifty (^{<0273>}Leviticus 27:3 sq.). On the price of remarkable servants in Egypt under the Ptolemies, see Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 4, 9). A moderate price for a Jewish slave was one hundred and twenty drachms (*ibid.* 12, 2, 3). An Israelite could become by purchase the property of another (^{<0202>}Exodus 21:2; ^{<0512>}Deuteronomy 15:12) if he was compelled by poverty to sell himself (^{<0239>}Leviticus 25:39), but he could not, according to the law, be treated as a slave, and in any case he obtained his freedom again, without ransom, after six years of service, or in the year of jubilee

(^{<0210>}Exodus 21:2 sq. ^{<0259>}Leviticus 25:39, 40 sq.), if he were not ransomed earlier (ver. 48 sq.). Perhaps the case was different with him who was sold for theft (^{<0218>}Exodus 22:3). Even this sale was always to an Israelite. (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 1, 1), though whether to the injured man or to the highest bidder is doubtful (*ibid.* 4, 8, 27). It seems that hard creditors could sell insolvent debtors or their families (2 Kings 4 1; Isaiah 1, 1; ^{<0185>}Nehemiah 5:5; ^{<0185>}Matthew 18:25), but perhaps not legally, as sometimes among the Greeks (Becker, *Charik.* 2, 32). Parents were permitted to sell daughters (^{<0207>}Exodus 21:7), but the law showed much favor to such servants (ver. 8 sq.), for, though there is difficulty in the statements, it is plain that they were protected against violence (see Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* 2, 438 sq., whom Kurtz, *Mos. Opfer*, p. 216, contradicts without reason). It is plain that servants could not have been dispensed with among a people where almost every man was an agriculturist, and where there were few of a lower class to work for hire (yet comp. ^{<0193>}Leviticus 19:13; ^{<0244>}Deuteronomy 24:14; ^{<0102>}Job 7:2; also Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 8, 38); and, indeed, the ancestors of the Israelites, the nomadic patriarchs, had numbered slaves among their valuable possessions (^{<0126>}Genesis 12:16; 24:35; 30:43; 32:5). These were very numerous (^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14), and, in case of need, served as an army for defense (ver. 14 sq.). When a daughter of the family married a stranger, a female servant accompanied her to her new home (^{<0294>}Genesis 29:24, 29). The Mosaic law sought to establish on just principles a permanent relation between master and servant, and conferred many favors on the servants. They not only enjoyed rest from all work every seventh day (^{<0210>}Exodus 20:10); not only was it forbidden to punish a slave so severely that he should die on the spot (21:20), or to mutilate him (ver. 26 sq.), on penalty, in the former case, of suffering punishment (not death, perhaps, as the rabbins say; comp. Koran, 2, 179); in the latter, of the freedom of the slave (less protection than this was given to the Greek and Roman slaves; see Becker, *Charik.* 2, 48; *Röm. Alter.* 2, 1, 58 sq.); not only were they to be admitted to certain festivals (^{<0122>}Deuteronomy 12:12, 18; 16:11, 14, comp. Athen. 14, 639; Buttman, *Myth.* 2, 52 sq.), but every slave of Hebrew descent obtained his freedom after six years' servitude (^{<0210>}Exodus 21:2 sq.; ^{<0152>}Deuteronomy 15:12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 1, 1; including females, ^{<0152>}Deuteronomy 15:12); yet without wife or child, if these had come to him in the house of his master (^{<0203>}Exodus 21:3 sq.); and the year of jubilee emancipated all slaves of Hebrew descent (^{<0154>}Leviticus 25:41; ^{<0188>}Jeremiah 34:8 sq.; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 12, 3). If a slave would not

make use of the legal freedom granted him in the seventh year, but wished to remain in his master's house, then he was led to the judge, and his ear was bored (^{<1216>}Exodus 21:6; ^{<617>}Deuteronomy 15:17. So the *bored ears* among other nations were a proof of servitude — as the Arabians [Petron, *Satir.* 102], the Lydians, Indians, and Persians [Xenoph. *Anab.* 3, 1, 31; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 2, 1, 4];. yet comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 2, 70 sq., and on the symbolic customs at manumission by the Romans, see Becker, *Rom. Alter* 2, 1, 66 sq. Plautus [*Poen.* 5, 2, 21] shows that the wearing of earrings was a mark of a slave). There is no other kind of manumission mentioned in the Old Test. (see Mishna, *Maas. Sheni*, 5, 14). It was at least allowed to slaves of Israelitish descent to acquire some property (^{<1259>}Leviticus 25:49; comp. Arvieux, 4, 3 sq.); and though, on the whole, the servants were required to labor diligently (^{<1012>}Job 7:2; Sir. 33, 26, 28), and the masters required attention and obedience in service (^{<1312>}Psalms 123:2), inflicting corporal punishment when necessary (^{<1199>}Proverbs 29:19, 21; Sir. 23, 10; 33, 10), yet the lot of Israelitish servants seems to have been more tolerable than that of those in Rome (Becker, *Gallus*, 1, 128 sq.) and of the modern slaves in the East; yet the tatter, even among the Turks, are not treated so inhumanely as is often thought (comp. Arvieux, 3, 385; Burckhardt, *Reise durch Arabien u. Nubien*, p. 232 sq.; Wellsted, 1, 273, Russegger, 2, 2, 524. On the mild treatment of slaves in ancient India, see Von Bohlen, *Indien*, 2, 157 sq.). Hebrew slaves sometimes married their masters' daughters (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 2:35; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 3, 253 sq.). It was more usual for the masters to give Israelitish slaves as wives to their sons, by which they acquired the rights of daughters (^{<1219>}Exodus 21:9; comp. ^{<1318>}Genesis 30:3; Chardin, *Voyage*, 2, 220). The relation of chief servant, or head of the house, in whom the master reposed full confidence, may have continued in the more important families from patriarchal times (^{<1242>}Genesis 24:2; comp. 15:2; 39:2; and for a modern parallel, Arvieux, 4, 30) and slaves seem even to have been employed to educate the sons of the house ($\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{o}\iota$, ^{<1313>}Galatians 3:24 sq.; see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* 2, 368). The common slaves were required to do field and house work (^{<1177>}Luke 17:7 sq.), and, especially the females, to turn the hand mill, and to take off or carry the master's sandals, etc. None but the Essenes, among the Jews, rejected all slavery, as contradicting the natural freedom of men (Philo, *Op.* 2, 458, etc.; so the Therapeutae, *ibid.* 2, 482).

It is well known that in war with foreign nations many Jews were sold abroad as slaves (^{<ARL>}Joel 3:11; Amos 1:6, 9; 1 Macc. 3:41; 2 Macc. 8:11, comp. ^{<RBS>}Deuteronomy 28:68). This happened, especially in the wars with Egypt (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 2, 3) and Syria, then with Rome; and after the destruction of Jerusalem ninety-seven thousand Jews fell into the power of the victorious enemy (id. *War*, 6, 9, 2). The Jewish community at Rome consisted, in great measure, of freed slaves. See, in general, Pignoria, *De Servis et eor. ap. Vet. Minister.* (Patav. 1694, and often); Mos. Maimon. *De Servis et Ancillis* (tract. c. vers. et not. Kall, Hafn. 1744); Abicht, *De Servor. Hebr. Acquis. atq. Serv.* (Lips. 1704); Altling., *Opp.* 5, 222 sq.; Mieg, *Constitut. Servi Hebr. ex Script. et Rabbin. Collect.* (Herborn, 1785); Michaelis, *Mos. Rit.* 2, 358 sq.; *Amn. Bib. Repos.* 2d Ser. 11, 302 sq. *SEE NETHINIM; SEE SLAVE.*

Servus Servorum Dei

(*Servant of the servants of God*), an official title of the Roman pontiffs, in use since the time of Gregory the Great, by whom, according to his biographer, Paul the Deacon, it was assumed as a practical rebuke of the ambitious assumption of the title of “OEcumenical (or universal) Patriarch” by John, surnamed Nestentes, or the Faster, contemporary patriarch of Constantinople. Other Christian bishops previous to Gregory had employed this form, but he was doubtless the first of the bishops of Rome to adopt it as a distinctive title. It is found in all the letters of Gregory preserved by the Venerable Bede in his history.

Sescuplum

(*taken once and a half*), that sort of usury which consisted in making loans at fifty percent interest. Being a grievous extortion and great oppression, it was condemned in the clergy by the councils of Nice and Laodicea, under the name of ἡμιολία; and also in laymen by the law of Justinian, which allows nothing above centesimal interest in any case. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* 6, 2, 6. *SEE USURY.*

Sesha

is, in Hindu mythology, the great king of the serpent race, on whom Vishnu reclines on the primeval waters. He has a thousand heads, which serve as a canopy to Vishnu; and he upholds the world, which rests on one

of his heads. His crest is ornamented with jewels. Coiled up, Sesha is the emblem of eternity. He is often also called *Vasuki* or *Ananta*, “the eternal.”

Se'sis

(**Σεσίς** v.r.**Σεσσείς**) a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:34) of the name SHESHAI *SEE SHESHAI* (q.v.), in the Hebrew list (^{<500>}Ezra 10:40).

Session Of Christ

the perpetual presence of our Lord's human nature in the highest glory of heaven. The statement of the fact appears in all the Latin forms of the Creed; its earlier words being “Sedet ad dexteram Patris,” which developed into “Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis” at some time not later than the 6th century. The article does not appear in the Creed of Nicaea, but in the Constantinopolitan expansion of that formulary it is given in words which are similar to those of the ancient Latin Church, **καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός**. Naturally two questions suggest themselves for consideration:

1. What does this exaltation of Christ's human nature imply? We answer, An actual translation of his body and soul to heaven and their actual continued abode there, and that in uninterrupted identity with the body and soul which had been born of Mary. This identity was historically established by the chosen witnesses of the resurrection, who saw his ascension and heard the words of the angels, “This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven,” etc. (^{<4011>}Acts 1:11); and not long after by the declaration of Stephen (^{<4056>}Acts 7:56). Although the body of Christ has doubtless undergone a change so that it is a spiritual body, yet locality may be predicated of it now as well as previous to his death. It is an error, therefore, to suppose that the bodily presence of Christ is that of the omnipresent Deity, as is maintained by the Ubiquitarians (q.v.). Because of this local bodily presence Christ sends his Holy Spirit to men..

2. What is the result of this exaltation? It was accomplished partly with reference to the glory of his own person, and partly with reference to his work as the Savior of mankind. The human nature which, united with the divine nature, accomplished the purpose of God was fittingly raised up to the highest glory — “Wherefore God highly exalted him,” etc. The ultimate object of the Incarnation was to bring us to God, into the divine presence. By this exaltation of our nature in the person of Christ a capacity was

originated for its exaltation in ourselves. And, being the firstborn among many brethren, he carried out humanity into heaven as the “Forerunner” of those who are united to him, as he said, “that where I am, there ye may be also” (^{<B14D>}John 14:2, 3). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. “Stand Christi;” Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. Theology*, s.v. **SEE INTERCESSION**; **SEE RESURRECTION**.

Ses’thel

(Σεσθήλ), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 9:31) of the Hebrew name BEZALEEL **SEE BEZALEEL** (q.v.), of the “sons” of Pahath-moab (^{<B50B>}Ezra 10:30).

Sesuto (Or Sisuta) Version Of The Holy Scriptures

The Sesuto belongs to the African languages, and is spoken by the Basutos, who form a part of the Bechuana nation, dwelling between the Winterberg mountains and the higher branches of the Yellow River. For this people of South Africa the Gospel of Matthew was translated and printed in 1837. In 1839 the gospels of Mark and Luke, as translated by the French missionaries Pelissier, Arbousset, and Casalis, were printed in Cape Town, to which in 1849 the Gospel of John was added. Since that time not only the rest of the New Test., but also parts of the Old Test., have been added, and it is hoped that very soon this people will have the whole Bible in their own vernacular. Up to March 30, 1878, about 25,532 copies of portions of the Scriptures had been circulated among them. See *The Bible of Every Land*, but more especially the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society since 1860. (B.P.)

Seth

(Heb. *Sheth*, תְּשֵׁי.e. *compensation*; Sept. and New Test. Σῆθ; Josephus, Σῆθος [*Ant.* 1, 2, 3]; A.V. “Sheth” in ^{<B30B>}1 Chronicles 1:1; ^{<B447>}Numbers 24:7), the third son of Adam (born B.C. 4042), and the father of Enos (when 105 years old); he died at the age of 912 (^{<B005>}Genesis 4:25, 26; 5, 3-8; ^{<B30B>}1 Chronicles 1:1; ^{<B478>}Luke 3:38). The signification of his name (given in ^{<B005>}Genesis 4:25) is “appointed” or “put” in the place of the murdered Abel, and Delitzsch speaks of him as the second Abel; but Ewald (*Gesch.* 1, 353) thinks that another signification, which he prefers, is indicated in the text, viz. “seedling,” or “germ.” The phrase “children of Sheth” (^{<B447>}Numbers 24:17) has been understood as equivalent to all mankind, or as denoting the tribe of some unknown Moabitish chieftain; but later

critics, among whom are Rosenmüller and Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 346), bearing in mind the parallel passage (²⁴⁸⁵Jeremiah 48:45), render the phrase “children of noise, tumultuous ones,” i.e. hostile armies. *SEE SHETH.*

In the 4th century there existed in Egypt a sect calling themselves Sethians, who are classed by Neander (*Ch. Hist.*, 2, 115, ed. Bohn) among those Gnostic sects which, in opposing Judaism, approximated to paganism. (See also Tillemont, *Memoires*, 2, 318.) Irenaeus (1, 30; comp. Massuet, *Dissert.* 1, 3, 14) and Theodoret (*Hoeret. Fab.* 14, 306), without distinguishing between them and the Ophites, or worshippers of the serpent, say that in their system Seth was regarded as a divine effluence or virtue. Epiphanius, who devotes a chapter to them (*Adv. Hoer.* 1, 3, 39), says that they identified Seth with our Lord. See Quandt, *De Christo in Nomine Sethi Adumbrato* (Regiom. 1726).

Seth, Traditions Concerning

There are many traditions concerning Seth (q.v.), not only in Rabbinic, but also in Christian, writings. According to the Rabbinic traditions, Seth was one of the thirteen who came circumcised into the world. The rest were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Terak, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah (*Midrash Tillim*, fol. 10, col. 2). The book *Shene Luchoth* says that the soul of the righteous Abel passed into the body of Seth, and afterwards this same soul passed into Moses; thus the law, which was known to Adam and in which Abel had been instructed, was not new to Moses (Eisenmenger, *Neuentdecktes Judenthum*, 1, 645). Josephus relates that after the things that were to take place had been revealed to Seth how the earth was to be destroyed, first with water and then with fire lest those things which he had discovered should perish from the memory of his posterity, he set up two pillars, one of brick, the other of stone, and he wrote there on all the science he had acquired, hoping that, in the event of the brick pillar perishing by the rain, the stone would endure (*Ant.* 1, 2). Suidas (s.v. Σήθ) says, “Seth was the son of Adam of him it is said the sons of God went in unto the daughters of men — that is to say, the sons of Seth went in unto the daughters of Cain; for in that age Seth was called God, because he had discovered Hebrew letters and the names of the stars, but especially on account of his great piety, so that he was the first to bear the name of God.” Anastasius Sinaita (q.v.) in his *Ὁδηγός*, p. 269 (ed. Gretser. Ingolst. 1606)], says that when God created Adam after his image and likeness, he breathed into him grace and illumination and a ray of the

Holy Spirit. But when he sinned this glory left him, and his face became clouded. Then he became the father of Cain and Abel. But afterwards, it is said in Scripture, “he begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth,” which is not said of Cain and Abel; and this means that Seth was begotten in the likeness of unfallen man, and after the image of Adam in paradise; and he called his name Seth — that is, by interpretation, “resurrection,” because in him he saw the resurrection of his departed beauty and wisdom and glory, and radiance of the Holy Spirit. And all those then living, when they saw how the face of Seth shone with divine light, and heard him speak with divine wisdom, said, “He is God.” Therefore his sons were commonly called the sons of God. That Seth means “resurrection” is also the opinion of Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*, 15, 17, 18): “Ita Seth, quod interpretatur resurrectio.”

The most remarkable of the traditions, however, is undoubtedly the one which we read in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, c. 19:

“While John, therefore, was thus teaching those in Hades, the first created and forefather Adam heard and said to his son Seth, My son, I wish thee to tell the forefathers of the race of men and the prophets all that thou heardest from Michael, the archangel, when I sent thee to the gates of Paradise to implore God that he might send thee his angel to give thee oil from the tree of mercy, with which to anoint my body when I was sick. Then Seth said, Prophets and patriarchs, Hear. When my father Adam, the first created, was about to fall, once upon a time, into death, he sent me to make entreaty to God, very close by the gate of Paradise, that he would guide me by an angel to the tree of compassion, and that I might take oil and anoint my father, and that he might rise up from his sickness, which thing, therefore, I then did. And after the prayer an angel of the Lord came and said to me, What, Seth, dost thou ask? Dost thou ask oil which raiseth up the sick; or the tree from which this oil flows on account of the sickness of thy father? This is not to be found now. Go, therefore, and tell thy father that after the accomplishing of 5500 years from the creation of the world, then shall come into the world the only-begotten Son of God, being made man; and he shall anoint him with this oil, and shall raise him up, and shall baptize with water and with the Holy Spirit both him and those out of him, and then shall he be healed of every disease

but now this is impossible. When the prophets and the patriarchs heard these words, they rejoiced greatly.”

In the Apocryphal literature Seth plays a prominent role, and even in *Reynard the Fox* Seth is mentioned as seeking for the oil of compassion:

**“Die drei gegrabenen Namen
Brachte Seth der Fromme vom Paradiese hernieder,
Als er das Oel der Barmherzigkeit suchte.”**

See Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr.* V.T. 1, 139 sq.; 2, 49 sq.; Syncellus, *Chronogr.* p. 10; Selden, *Diss. de Horto Hedenis* in his *Otia Theolog.* p. 600; Baring-Gould, *Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 81 sq. (B.P.)

Sethians, Or Sethites

a sect of the Ophites (q.v.), of the 2d century, who paid divine honor to Seth, believing him to have reappeared in the person of Jesus Christ. They taught that Seth was made by a third divinity, and substituted in the room of the two families of Abel and Cain, destroyed by the deluge. They were thus distinguished from the Cainites (q.v.), who assigned the highest place to Cain. The Sethians regarded Cain as a representative of the Hylic, Abel of the Psychical, and Seth, who was finally to reappear in the person of the Messiah, of the Pneumatic principle. See Neander, *Church Hist.* (Torrey), 1, 448.

Se'thur

(*Heb.* *Sethur'*, *rWts]* hidden; *Sept.* *Σαθούρ*), the son of Michael, of the tribe of Asher, and one of the twelve spies sent by Moses to view the promised land (^{<Q483>}Numbers 13:13). B.C. 1657. See Van Sarn, *Obs. Lightfootiana de Nomine Sethur* (in the *Miscell. Duisb.* 1, 482 sq.).

Set Off (Or Offset),

Picture for Set-off

The part of a wall, etc., which is exposed horizontally when the portion above it is reduced in thickness. Set offs are not unfrequently covered, and in great measure concealed, by cornices or projecting moldings, but are more usually plain. In the latter case, in classical architecture, they are generally nearly or quite flat on the top, but in Gothic architecture are

sloped, and in most instances have a projecting drip on the lower edge toe prevent the wet from running down the walls: this is especially observable in the set offs of buttresses.

Se Ton Aphthiton Monarchen

(Σὲ τὸν ἀφθίτον μονάρχην, *Thee the Everlasting King*) is the beginning of a hymn written εἰς Χριστόν (to Christ) by Gregory of Nazianzum (q.v.). The first few lines of this hymn run thus in Mrs. Charles's version:

“Hear us now, Eternal Monarch,
Grant us now to hymn and praise thee —
Thee the King, and thee the Master!
By whom are our hymns and praises,
By whom are the choirs of angels,
By whom flow the ceaseless ages,
By whom only shines the sun,
By whom walks the moon in brightness,
By whom smile the stars in beauty,
By whom all the race of mortals
Have received their godlike reason
And thine other works outshone.”

For the original Greek, together with a German translation, comp. Bässler, *Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder*, p. 10, 156, Rambach, *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge*, 1, 48 sq.; Fortlage, *Gesänge christlicher Vorzeit*, p. 23, 361; Mrs. Charles, *The Voice of Christian Life in Song*, p. 62 sq. (B.P.)

Seton, Elizabeth Ann

founder of the Sisters of Charity in the United States, was born in New York city, Aug. 28, 1774. She was the daughter of Dr. Richard Bayley, and in her twentieth year married William Seton, whom she accompanied to Italy in 1803. Upon his death, in Pisa, in 1804, she returned to New York and entered the Roman Catholic Church, March 14, 1805. Left, by her husband's misfortunes, without resources, she opened a school in Baltimore in 1805-08. With her sisters-in-law, Harriet and Cecilia Seton, she took the veil as Sister of Charity, Jan. 1, 1809, at Emmettsburg, Md. (being the first members of that order in the United States). A conventual establishment was opened at Emmettsburg, July 30, 1812, with “Mother Seton” as superior-general. She died at Emmettsburg, Jan. 4, 1821. See

White, *Life of Eliz. A. Seton* (N.Y. 1853; 5th ed. Baltimore, 1865); Seton [Rev. Robert], *Memoir, Letters, etc., of E.A. Seton* (N.Y. 1869, 2 vols.).
SEE SISTERS OF CHARITY.

Settlements, Violent

took place when a patron in Scotland presented a clergyman whom the people would not have, but whom the ecclesiastical courts were determined, in spite of all opposition, to ordain. In such cases the parish sometimes rose to oppose the settlement by force, and obstructed the presbytery. The military were occasionally called to protect the presbytery. Such scenes happened in many parts of the country.

Seven

([*biv*, *sheba*). The frequent recurrence of certain numbers in the sacred literature of the Hebrews is obvious to the most superficial reader; and it is almost equally obvious that these numbers are associated with certain ideas, so as in some instances to lose their numerical force, and to pass over into the province of symbolic signs. This is more or less true of the numbers three, four, seven, twelve, and forty; but seven so far surpasses the rest, both in the frequency with which it recurs, and in the importance of the objects with which it is associated, that it may fairly be termed the *representative* symbolic number. It has hence attracted considerable attention, and may be said to be the keystone on which the symbolism of numbers depends. The origin of this symbolism is a question that meets us at the threshold of any discussion as to the number seven. Our limits will not permit us to follow out this question to its legitimate extent, but we may briefly state that the views of Biblical critics may be ranged under two heads, according as the symbolism is attributed to theoretical speculations as to the internal properties of the number itself, or to external associations of a physical or historical character. According to the former of these views, the symbolism of the number seven would be traced back to the symbolism of its component elements three and four, the first of which = Divinity, and the second = Humanity, whence seven = Divinity + Humanity, or, in other words, the union between God and man, as effected by the manifestations of the Divinity in creation and revelation. So again the symbolism of twelve is explained as the symbolism of 3×4 , or a second combination of the same two elements, though in different proportions, the representative number of Humanity, as a multiplier, assuming a more

prominent position (Bähr, *Symbolik*, 1, 187, 201, 224). This theory is seductive from its ingenuity and its appeal to the imagination, but there appears to be little foundation for it. For

(1) we do not find any indication, in early times at all events, that the number seven was resolved into three and four, rather than into any other arithmetical; elements, such as two and five. Bengel notes such a division as running through the heptads of the Apocalypse (*Gnomon*, at Revelation 16:1), and the remark undoubtedly holds good in certain instances, e.g. the trumpets, the three latter being distinguished from the four former by the triple “woe” (Revelation 8:13); but in other instances, e.g. in reference to the promises (*Gnomon*, at Revelation 2:7), the distinction is not so well established; and even if it were, an explanation might be found in the adaptation of such a division to the subject in hand. The attempt to discover such a distinction in the Mosaic writings — as, for instance, where an act is to be done on the third day out of seven (Numbers 19:12) appears to be a failure.

(2) It would be difficult to show that any associations of a sacred nature were assigned to three and four previously to the sanctity of seven.. This latter number is so far the sacred number *κατ' ἕξοχήν* that we should be less surprised if, by a process the reverse of the one assumed, sanctity had been subsequently attached to three and four as the supposed elements of seven. But

(3) all such speculations on mere numbers are alien to the spirit of Hebrew thought; they belong to a different stage of society, in which speculation is rife, and is systematized by the existence of schools of philosophy.

We turn to the second class of opinions, which attribute the symbolism of the number seven to external associations. This class may be again subdivided into two, according as the symbolism is supposed to have originated in the observation of purely physical phenomena, or, on the other hand, in the peculiar religious enactments of Mosaism. The influence of the number seven was not restricted to the Hebrews; it prevailed among the Persians (Esther 1:10, 14), among the ancient Indians (Von Bohlen, *Alt. Indien*, 2, 224 sq.), among the Greeks and Romans to a certain extent, and probably among all nations where the week of seven days was established, as in China, Egypt, Arabia, etc. (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1, 88, 178; 2, 473). Cicero calls it the knot and cement of all things, as being that by which the natural and spiritual world are comprehended in one idea (*Tusc.*

Quoest. 1, 10). The wide range of the word *seven* is in this respect an interesting and significant fact with the exception of “six,” it is the only numeral which the Shemitic languages have in common with the Indo-European; for the Hebrew *sheba* is essentially the same as ἑπτὰ, *septem*, *seven*, and the Sanskrit, Persian, and Gothic names for this number (Pott, *Etyim. Forsch.* 1, 129). In the countries above enumerated, the institution of seven as a cyclical number is attributed to the observation of the changes of the moon or to the supposed number of the planets. The Hebrews are held by some writers to have borrowed their notions of the sanctity of seven from their heathen neighbors, either wholly or partially (Von Bohlen, *Introd. to Genesis* 1, 216 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Balaam* [Clark’s ed.], p. 393); but the peculiarity of the Hebrew view consists in the special dignity of the *seventh*, and not simply in that of *seven*. Whatever influence, therefore, may be assigned to astronomical observation or to prescriptive usage, in regard to the original institution of the week, we cannot trace back the peculiar associations of the Hebrews further than to the point when the seventh day was consecrated to the purposes of religious rest.

Assuming this, therefore, as our starting point, the first idea associated with seven would be that of *religious periodicity*. The Sabbath, being the seventh day, suggested the adoption of seven as the *coefficient*, so to say, for the appointment of all sacred periods; and we thus find the seventh month ushered in by the Feast of Trumpets, and signalized by the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles and the great Day of Atonement; seven weeks as the interval between the Passover and the Pentecost; the seventh year as the sabbatical year; and the year succeeding 7 x 7 years as the jubilee year. From the idea of periodicity it passed, by an easy transition, to the *duration* or *repetition* of religious proceedings; and thus seven days were appointed as the length of the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles; seven days for the ceremonies of the consecration of priests: seven days for the interval to elapse between the occasion and the removal of various kinds of legal uncleanness, as after childbirth, after contact with a corpse, etc.; seven times appointed for aspersion either of the blood of the victim (e.g. <0906> Leviticus 4:6; 16:14) or of the water of purification (14:51; comp. <1250> 2 Kings 5:10, 14); seven things to be offered in sacrifice (oxen, sheep, goats, pigeons, wheat, oil, wine); seven victims to be offered on any special occasion, as in Balaam’s sacrifice (<0201> Numbers 23:1), and especially at the ratification of a treaty, the notion of seven being embodied in the very term ([Biv] <0201> [Biv]), signifying to swear, literally meaning to *do seven*

times (^{<0128>}Genesis 21:28; comp. Herod. 3, 8 for a similar custom among the Arabians). The same idea is further carried out in the vessels and arrangements of the Tabernacle — in the seven arms of the golden candlestick, and the seven chief utensils (altar of burned offerings, laver, showbread table, altar of incense, candlestick, ark, mercy seat).

The number seven, having thus been impressed with the seal of sanctity as the symbol of all connected with the Divinity, was adopted generally as a *cyclical* number, with the subordinate notions of perfection or completeness. It hence appears in cases where the notion of satisfaction is required, as in reference to punishment for wrongs (^{<0045>}Genesis 4:15; ^{<0338>}Leviticus 26:18, 28; ^{<0792>}Psalms 79:12; ^{<0161>}Proverbs 6:31), or to forgiveness of them (^{<0182>}Matthew 18:21). It is again mentioned in a variety of passages too numerous for quotation (e.g. Job 5, 19; ^{<2450>}Jeremiah 15:9; ^{<0125>}Matthew 12:45) in a sense analogous to that of a “round number,” but with the additional idea of sufficiency and completeness. To the same head we may refer the numerous instances in which persons or things are mentioned by sevens in the historical portions of the Bible e.g. the seven kine and the seven ears of corn in Pharaoh’s dream, the seven daughters of the priest of Midian, the seven sons of Jesse, the seven deacons, the seven sons of Sceva, the twice seven generations in the pedigree of Jesus (^{<0017>}Matthew 1:17); and, again, the still more numerous instances in which periods of seven days or seven years are combined with the repetition of an act seven times; as, in the taking of Jericho, the town was surrounded for seven days, and on the seventh day it fell at the blast of seven trumpets borne round the town seven times by seven priests; or, again, at the flood, an interval of seven days elapsed between the notice to enter the ark and the coming of the flood, the beasts entered by sevens, seven days elapsed between the two missions of the dove, etc. So, again, in private life, seven years appear to have been the usual period of a hiring (^{<0128>}Genesis 29:18), seven days for a marriage festival (ver. 27; ^{<0742>}Judges 14:12), and the same, or in some cases seventy days, for mourning for the dead (^{<0503>}Genesis 50:3, 10; ^{<0813>}1 Samuel 31:13).

The foregoing applications of the number seven become of great practical importance in connection with the interpretation of some of the prophetic portions of the Bible, and particularly of the Apocalypse. For in this latter book the ever-recurring number seven both serves as the mould which has decided the external form of the work, and also, to a certain degree, penetrates into the essence of it. We have but to run over the chief subjects

of that book — the seven churches, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven vials, the seven angels, the seven spirits before the throne, the seven horns and seven eyes of the Lamb, etc. — in order to see the necessity of deciding whether the number is to be accepted in a literal or a metaphorical sense — in other words, whether it represents a number or a quality. The decision of this question affects not only the number seven, but also the number which stands in a relation of antagonism to seven, viz. the half of seven, which appears under the form of forty — two months, =3 ½ years (^{<6635>}Revelation 13:5); twelve hundred and sixty days, also =3 ½ years (11:3; 12:6); and, again, a time, times, and half a time, =3 ½ years (12:14). We find this number frequently recurring in the Old Test., as in the forty-two stations of the wilderness (^{<0830>}Numbers 33); the three and a half years of the famine in Elijah's time (^{<0425>}Luke 4:25); the “time, times, and the dividing of time;” during which the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes was to last (^{<2075>}Daniel 7:25), a similar period being again described as “the midst of the week,” i.e. the half of seven years (^{<2097>}Daniel 9:27); “a time, times, and a half” (Daniek 12:7); and again, probably, in the number of days specified in ^{<2784>}Daniel 8:14; 12:11, 12. If the number seven express the notion of completeness, then the number half-seven =incompleteness and the secondary ideas of suffering and disaster: if the one represent divine agency, the other we may expect to represent human agency. Mere numerical calculations would thus, in regard to unfulfilled prophecy, be either wholly superseded, or, at all events, take a subordinate position to the general idea conveyed. See *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1851, p. 134 sq.; *New-Englander*, No. 1858. *SEE NUMBER.*

Seven Capital Sins

SEE SEVEN DEADLY SINS.

Seven Chief Virtues

THE. According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, these virtues are faith, hope, charity, prudence, temperance, chastity, and fortitude.

Seven Days After

the term by which the octave of a festival is described in the Book of Common Prayer. Thus the proper prefaces in the communion service,

except that for Trinity Sunday, are to be said upon certain days, and, likewise, during seven days afterwards.

Seven Deadly Sins

THE, as defined by the Romish Church, are pride, anger, envy, sloth, lust, covetousness, and gluttony.

Seven Dolors Of The Blessed Virgin Mary Feast Of

a modern festival of the Roman Catholic Church, which, although bearing the name of devotion to the Virgin Mary, in reality regards those incidents in the life and passion of Christ with which his mother is most closely associated. This festival is celebrated on the Friday preceding Palm Sunday (q.v.), The “Dolors,” or sorrows, of the Blessed Virgin, have long been a favorite theme of Roman Catholic devotion, of which the pathetic *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* is the best known and most popular expression; and the festival of the Seven Dolors is intended to individualize the incidents of her sorrows, and to present them for meditation. The seven incidents referred to under the title of “Dolors” are: 1. The prediction of Simeon (^{<41234>}Luke 2:34); 2. The flight into Egypt; 3. The loss of Jesus in Jerusalem; 4. The sight of Jesus bearing his cross towards Calvary; 5. The sight of Jesus upon the cross; 6. The piercing of his side with the lance; 7. His burial. This festival was instituted by pope Benedict XIII in 1725.

Seven Heroes Of Thebes

SEE THEBES, SEVEN HEROES OF.

Seven Sacraments

The Council of Trent session 7, canon 1, says, “If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than *seven* — to wit, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony — or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema.” *SEE SACRAMENT.*