

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Slavery, Biblical - Spain

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

Slavery, Biblical.

In the discussion of this question we endeavor to bring together all the ancient information together with the best results of modern examination.

I. Terms Employed to Designate this Condition. — The word “slavery” does not occur in the English Bible, and the word “slave” is but rarely used, once (in italics) to supply a noun to the adj. phrase *tyBedyl bēyelia beyth*, “home-born” (^{<2124>}Jeremiah 2:14, “servant” having been already used in the former clause); once (^{<6683>}Revelation 18:13) by way of paraphrase for the peculiar use of *σῶμα*, *body*, i.e. person; and four times in the Apocrypha (Judith 5:11; 14:13, 18; 1 Macc. 3:41) for *δοῦλος*, which is then appropriate classical word. The Hebrew and Greek terms designating servitude are, for the male, *db̄*, *ebed*, *δοῦλος*; for the female, *h̄mā*; *amah*, or *h̄j p̄vāshiphkah*, *δούλη*, usually rendered “bondman,” “servant, etc., which our translators have instinctively felt were more euphonious and appropriate words. Indeed, the regular term for *bondman* in the Hebrew tongue, *db̄*, (*ebed*), is used in a far greater variety of applications than our word *slave*; and collateral circumstances are always needed to determine the nature and extent of the service which it denotes. The term is used to describe individuals viewed as the servants of God, as when David and Daniel, speaking of themselves in prayer to the Most High, say, “Put not away thy servant in anger” (^{<3270>}Psalm 27:9); “Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant” (^{<2097>}Daniel 9:17). It is also applied to the relation of men to one another who occupied high positions, as to Eliezer, who had a place in Abraham’s household something similar to that of a prime minister at court (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2; 24:2), and to Jacob with reference to his brother Esau (^{<0335>}Genesis 33:5). See the *Bibl. Sac.* 12, 740-743; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 978, 979.

It thus appears that the term slavery, though frequently applied to the Jewish system of servitude, is not wholly appropriate. Among the Greeks and Romans it properly expressed the legal condition of captives taken in war, or the victims of the existing slave trade and the offspring of female slaves. Those slaves were held to be the absolute property of their masters, and their slavery was regarded as perpetual and hereditary. Nor does Jewish servitude bear any resemblance to modern slavery, which, however it may differ from the Greek and Roman in some of its minor incidents, resembles it in its essential principles. If under the Roman law slaves were

held “pro nullis, pro mortuis, pro quadrupedibus,” so, until lately, under the laws of several of the United States, they were adjudged to be chattels personal in the hand of their owners, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever; and their slavery, like that of the ancient Romans, was, as a necessary consequence, perpetual and hereditary.

In the heat of modern controversy, indeed, some writers have been led to deny that the Hebrew and Greek words noticed above necessarily, or in point of fact ever do, designate a condition of absolute bondage; but whatever may be said of **db**⌋, it is certain that **δοῦλος**, both from its etymological signification (from **δέω**, *to bind*), and its, classical usage, is the prevalent and appropriate word for *slave* in the current acceptation of the term. *SEE SERVITUDE.*

II. Forms of Scriptural Slavery. — It is difficult to trace the origin of slavery. It may have existed before the Deluge, when violence filled the earth, and drew upon it the vengeance of God. But the first direct reference to slavery, or rather slave trading, in the Bible is found in the history of Joseph, who was sold by his brethren to the Ishmaelites (^{<01372>}Genesis 37:27, 28). In ^{<0572>}Ezekiel 27:12.13 we find a reference to the slave trade carried on with Tyre by Javan, Tubal, and Meshech. In the Apocalypse we find enumerated in the merchandise of pagan Rome (the mystic Babylon) *slaves* (**σώματα**) and the souls of men (^{<06183>}Revelation 18:13). The sacred historians refer to various kinds of bondage:

1. Patriarchal Servitude. — The exact nature of this service cannot be defined there can be no doubt, however, that it was regulated by principles of justice, equity, and kindness. The servants of the patriarchs were of two kinds, those “born in the house” and those “bought with money” (^{<0173>}Genesis 17:13). Abraham appears to have had a large number of servants. At one time he armed three hundred and eighteen young men, “born in his own house,” with whom he pursued the kings who had taken “Lot and his goods, and the women also, and the people,” and recaptured them (^{<0146>}Genesis 14:16). The servants born in the house were, perhaps, entitled to greater privileges than the others. Eliezer of Damascus, a home born servant, was Abraham’s steward, and, in default of issue, would have been his heir (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2-4). This class of servants was honored with the most intimate confidence of the masters. and was employed in the most important services. An instance of this kind will be found in ^{<0241>}Genesis 24:1-9, where the eldest or chief servant of Abraham’s house, who ruled

over all that he had, was sent to Mesopotamia to select a wife for Isaac, though then forty years of age. The authority of Abraham was that of a prince or chief over his patriarchate or family, and was regulated by usage and the general consent of his dependents. It could not have been otherwise in his circumstances; nor, from the knowledge which the Scriptures give of his character, would he have taken advantage of any circumstances to oppress or degrade them: “For I know him,” saith the Lord, “that he will command his children and his household after him and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him” (^{<0189>}Genesis 18:19), The servants of Abraham were admitted to the same religious privileges with their master, and received the seal of the covenant (^{<0170>}Genesis 17:9, 14, 24, 27).

There is a clear distinction made between the “servants” of Abraham and the things which constituted his property or wealth. Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:2, 5). But when the patriarch’s power or greatness is spoken of, then servants are spoken of as well as the objects which constituted his riches (^{<0124>}Genesis 24:34, 35). It is said of Isaac, “And the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew until he became *very great*, for he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of *servants*” (^{<0126>}Genesis 26:13, 14, 16, 26, 28, 29). When Hamor and Shechem speak to the Hivites of the riches of Jacob and his sons, they say, “Shall not their cattle and their substance and every beast of theirs be ours?” (^{<0123>}Genesis 34:23). Jacob’s wives say to him, “All the *riches* which God hath taken from our father, that is ours and our children’s.” Then follows an inventory of property: “all his cattle,” “all his gods,” “the cattle of his getting.” His numerous servants are not included with his property (comp. ^{<0134>}Genesis 31:43, and also ver. 16, 18). When Jacob sent messengers to Esau, wishing to impress him with an idea of his state and sway, he bade them tell him not only of his riches, but of his *greatness*, and that he had oxen and asses and flocks, and men servants and maid servants (^{<0130>}Genesis 32:4, 5). Yet in the present which he sent there were no servants, though he manifestly selected the most valuable kinds of property (ver. 14, 15; see also ^{<0123>}Genesis 34:23; 36:6, 7). In no single instance do we find that the patriarchs either gave away or sold their servants, or purchased them of *third* persons. Abraham had servants “bought with money.” It has been assumed that they were bought of third parties, whereas there is no proof that this was the case. The probability is

that they sold themselves to the patriarch for an equivalent; that is to say, they entered into voluntary engagements to serve him for longer or shorter period of time, in return for the money advanced them. It is a fallacy to suppose that whatever *costs* money *is* money or property. The children of Israel were required to purchase their firstborn (^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15, 16; 3:45, 51; ^{<0213>}Exodus 13:13; 34:20). They were, moreover, required to pay money for their own souls; and when they set themselves or their children apart by vow unto the Lord, the price of release was fixed by statute (^{<0272>}Leviticus 27:2-8). Boaz bought Ruth (^{<0440>}Ruth 4:10). Hosea bought his wife (^{<0392>}Hosea 3:2). Jacob bought his wives Rachel and Leah, and, not having money, paid for them in labor, seven years apiece (^{<0296>}Genesis 29:16-23). That the purchase of wives, either with money or by service, was the general practice is plain from such passages as ^{<0227>}Exodus 22:17 and ^{<0925>}1 Samuel 18:25. But the idea of property does not appear in any of these purchases. For the various ways in which the terms “bought,” “buy,” and “bought with money” are used, consult ^{<1618>}Nehemiah 5:8; ^{<0478>}Genesis 47:18-26, etc. In ^{<0257>}Leviticus 25:47 will be found the case of the Israelite who became the servant of the stranger. The words are, “If he *sell himself* unto the stranger.” Yet the 51st verse says that this servant was “bought,” and, that the price of the purchase was paid to *himself*. For a further clue to Scripture usage, the reader is referred to ^{<1217>}1 Kings 21:20, 25; ^{<1277>}2 Kings 17:17; ^{<2801>}Isaiah 55:1; 52:3; see also ^{<2644>}Jeremiah 34:14; ^{<0166>}Romans 6:16; 7:14; ^{<0034>}John 8:34. Probably Job had more servants than either of the patriarchs to whom reference has been made (^{<1800>}Job 1:2, 3). In what light he regarded, and how he treated, his servants, may be gathered from ^{<0813>}Job 31:13-23. That Abraham acted in the same spirit we have the divine testimony in ^{<1215>}Jeremiah 22:15, 16, 17, where his conduct is placed in direct contrast with that of some of his descendants, who used their neighbor’s service without wages, and gave him not for his work (ver. 13).

2. Egyptian Bondage. — The Israelites were frequently reminded, after their exode from Egypt, of the oppressions they endured in that “house of bondage,” from which they had been delivered by the direct interposition of God. The design of these admonitions was to teach them justice and kindness towards their servants when they should have become settled in Canaan (^{<0615>}Deuteronomy 5:15; 8:14; 10:19; 15:15; 23:7, etc.), as well as to impress them with gratitude towards their great deliverer. The Egyptians had domestic servants, who may have been slaves (^{<0194>}Exodus 9:14, 20, 21; 11:5). But the Israelites were not dispersed among the families of

Egypt; they formed a special community (^{<04634>}Genesis 46:34; ^{<0000>}Exodus 2:9; 4:29; 6:14; 8:22, 24; 9:26; 10:23; 11:7; 16:22; 17:5). They had exclusive possession of the land of Goshen, “the best part of the land of Egypt.” They lived in permanent dwellings, their own houses, and not in tents (12:22). Each family seems to have had its own house (ver. 4; comp. ^{<4071>}Acts 7:20); and, judging from the regulations about eating the Passover, the houses could scarcely have been small ones (Exodus 12, etc.). The Israelites appear to have been well clothed (ver. 11). They owned “flocks and herds, and very much cattle” (ver. 4, 6, 32, 37, 38). They had their own form of government, and although occupying a province of Egypt and *tributary* to it, they preserved their tribes and family divisions, and their internal organization throughout (^{<0000>}Exodus 2:1; 3:16, 18; 5:19; 6:14, 25; 12:19, 21). They had to a considerable degree the disposal of their own time (^{<0000>}Exodus 2:9; 3, 16, 18; 4:27, 29, 31; 12:6). They were not unacquainted with the fine arts (^{<02304>}Exodus 32:4; 35:22, 35). They were all armed (^{<02327>}Exodus 32:27). The women seem to have known something of domestic refinement. They were familiar with instruments of music, and skilled in the working of fine fabrics (15:20; 35:25, 26); and both males and females were able to read and write (^{<05118>}Deuteronomy 11:18, 20; 17:19; 27:3). Their food was abundant and of great variety (^{<02163>}Exodus 16:3; ^{<00104>}Numbers 11:4, 5; 20:5). The service required from the Israelites by their taskmasters seems to have been exacted from males only, and apparently a portion only of the people were compelled to labor at any one time. As tributaries, they probably supplied levies of men, from which the wealthy appear to have been exempted (^{<0000>}Exodus 3:16; 4:29; 5, 20). The poor were the oppressed, “and all the service wherewith they made them serve was with rigor” (1:11-14). But Jehovah saw their “afflictions and heard their groanings,” and delivered them after having inflicted the most terrible plagues on their oppressors,

3. Jewish Slavery. — The institution of slavery was recognized, though not established, by the Mosaic law with a view to mitigate its hardships and to secure to every man his ordinary rights. Repugnant as the notion of slavery is to our minds, it is difficult to see how it can be dispensed with in certain phases of society without, at all events, entailing severer evils than those which it produces. Exclusiveness of race is an instinct that gains strength in proportion as social order is weak, and the rights of citizenship are regarded with peculiar jealousy in communities which are exposed to contact with aliens. In the case of war carried on for conquest or revenge,

there were but two modes of dealing with the captives, viz. putting them to death or reducing them to slavery. The same may be said in regard to such acts and outrages as disqualified a person for the society of his fellow citizens. Again, as citizenship involved the condition of freedom and independence, it was almost necessary to offer the alternative of disfranchisement to all who through poverty or any other contingency were unable to support themselves in independence. In all these cases slavery was the mildest of the alternatives that offered, and may hence be regarded as a blessing rather than a curse. It should further be noticed that a laboring class, in our sense of the term, was almost unknown to the nations of antiquity. Hired service was regarded as incompatible with freedom; and hence the slave in many cases occupied the same social position as the servant or laborer of modern times, though differing from him in regard to political status. The Hebrew designation of the slave shows that service was the salient feature of his condition; for the term *ebed*, usually applied to him, is derived from a verb signifying, “to work,” and the very same term is used in reference to offices of high trust held by free men. In short, service and slavery would have been to the ear of the Hebrew equivalent terms, though he fully recognized grades of servitude, according as the servant was a Hebrew or a non-Hebrew, and, if the latter, according as he was bought with money (^{<0172>}Genesis 17:12; ^{<0124>}Exodus 12:44) or born in the house (^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14; 15:3; 17:23). We shall proceed to describe the condition of these classes, as regards their original reduction to slavery, the methods by which it might be terminated, and their treatment while in that state.

(I.) *Hebrew Slaves.* —

(1.) The circumstances under which a Hebrew might be reduced to servitude were (a) poverty; (b) the commission of theft; and (c) the exercise of paternal authority. In the first case, a man who had mortgaged his property, and was unable to support his family, might sell himself to another Hebrew, with a view both to obtain maintenance and perchance a surplus sufficient to redeem his property (^{<0225>}Leviticus 25:25, 39). It has been debated whether, under this law, a creditor could seize his debtor and sell him as a slave. The words do not warrant such an inference for the poor man is said in ^{<0239>}Leviticus 25:39 to *sell himself* (not as in the A.V., “be sold;” see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 787); in other words, to enter into *voluntary* servitude, and this under the pressure, not of debt, but of *poverty*. The instances of seizing the children of debtors in ^{<1200>}2 Kings 4:1

and ^{<1615>}Nehemiah 5:5 were not warranted by law, and must be regarded as the outrages of lawless times, while the case depicted in the parable of the unmerciful servant is probably borrowed from Roman usages (^{<1825>}Matthew 18:25). The words in ^{<2300>}Isaiah 1:1, "Which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you?" have a *prima facie* bearing upon the question, but in reality apply to one already in the condition of slavery. The commission of theft rendered a person liable to servitude, whenever restitution could not be made on the scale prescribed by the law (^{<1221>}Exodus 22:1, 3). The thief was bound to work out the value of his restitution money in the service of him on whom the theft had been committed (for, according to Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 1, 1, there was no power of selling the person of a thief to a foreigner); when this had been effected he would be free, as implied in the expression "sold for his theft," i.e. *for the amount* of his theft. This law contrasts favorably with that of the Romans, under which a thief became the actual property of his master. The exercise of paternal authority was limited to the sale of a daughter of tender age to be a maid servant, with the ulterior view of her becoming a concubine of the purchaser (^{<1217>}Exodus 21:7). Such a case can perhaps hardly be regarded as implying servitude in the ordinary sense of the term.

(2.) The servitude of a Hebrew might be terminated in three ways: (a) by the satisfaction or the remission of all claims against him; (b) by the recurrence of the year of Jubilee (^{<1354>}Leviticus 25:40), which might arrive at any period of his servitude; and (c), failing either of these, the expiration of six years from the time that his servitude commenced (^{<1212>}Exodus 21:2; ^{<1512>}Deuteronomy 15:12). There can be no doubt that this last regulation applied equally to the cases of poverty and theft, though Rabbinical writers have endeavored to restrict it to the former. The period of seven years has reference to the sabbatical principle in general, but not to the sabbatical year, for no regulation is laid down in reference to the manumission of servants in that year (^{<1321>}Leviticus 25:1 sq.; ^{<1515>}Deuteronomy 15:1 sq.). We have a single instance, indeed, of the sabbatical year being celebrated by a general manumission of Hebrew slaves, but this was in consequence of the neglect of the law relating to such cases (^{<2444>}Jeremiah 34:14). To the above modes of obtaining liberty the Rabbinitists added, as a fourth, the death of a master without leaving a son, there being no power of claiming the slave on the part of any heir except a son (Maimonides, *Abad.* 2, § 12).

If a servant did not desire to avail himself of the opportunity of leaving his service, he was to signify his intention in a formal manner before the judges

(or, more exactly, *at the place of judgment*), and then the master was to take him to the door post, and to bore his ear through with an awl (^{<0206>}Exodus 21:6), driving the awl into or “unto the door,” as stated in ^{<0517>}Deuteronomy 15:17, and thus fixing the servant to it. Whether the door was that of the master’s house, or the door of the sanctuary, as Ewald (*Alterth.* p. 245) infers from the expression *el ha-elohim*, to which attention is drawn above, is not stated; but the significance of the action is enhanced by the former view; for thus a connection is established between the servant and the house in which he was to serve. The boring of the ear was probably a token of subjection, the ear being the organ through which commands were received (^{<0406>}Psalm 40:6). A similar custom prevailed among the Mesopotamians (Juvenal, 1, 104), the Lydians (Xenophon, *Anab.* 3, 1, 31), and other ancient nations. A servant who had submitted to this operation remained, according to the words of the law, a servant “forever” (^{<0206>}Exodus 21:6). These words are, however, interpreted by Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 8, 28) and by the Rabbinites as meaning until the year of Jubilee, partly from the universality of the freedom that was then proclaimed, and partly perhaps because it was necessary for the servant then to resume the cultivation of his recovered inheritance. The latter point no doubt presents a difficulty, but the interpretation of the word “forever” in any other than its obvious sense presents still greater difficulties.

(3.) The condition of a Hebrew servant was by no means intolerable. His master was admonished to treat him, not “as a bond servant, but as a hired servant and as a sojourner;” and again, “not to rule over him with rigor” (^{<0259>}Leviticus 25:39, 40, 43). The Rabbinites specified a variety of duties as coming under these general precepts for instance, compensation for personal injury, exemption from menial duties, such as unbinding the master’s sandals or carrying him in a litter; the use of gentle language on the part of the master; and the maintenance of the servant’s wife and children, though the master was not allowed to exact work from them (Mielziner, *Sklaven bei den Hebr.* p. 31). At the termination of his servitude the master was enjoined not to “let him go away empty,” but to remunerate him liberally out of his flock, his floor, and his wine press (^{<0513>}Deuteronomy 15:13, 14). Such a custom would stimulate the servant to faithful service, inasmuch as the amount of the gift was left to the master’s discretion; and it would also provide him with means wherewith to start in the world afresh.

In the event of a Hebrew becoming the servant of a “stranger,” meaning a non-Hebrew, the servitude could be terminated only in two ways, viz. by the arrival of the year of Jubilee, or by the repayment to the master of the purchase money paid for the servant, after deducting a sum for the value of his services proportioned to the length of his servitude (⁽¹⁸⁵⁷⁾Leviticus 25:47-55). The servant might be redeemed either by himself or by one of his relations, and the object of this regulation appears to have been to impose upon relations the obligation of effecting the redemption, and thus putting an end to a state which must have been peculiarly galling to the Hebrew.

A Hebrew woman might enter into voluntary servitude on the score of poverty, and in this case she was entitled to her freedom after six years’ service, together with the usual gratuity at leaving, just as in the case of a man (⁽¹⁸¹²⁾Deuteronomy 15:12, 13). According to Rabbinical tradition, a woman could not be condemned to servitude for theft; neither could she bind herself to perpetual servitude by having her ear bored (Mielziner, p. 43).

Thus far we have seen little that is objectionable in the condition of Hebrew servants. In respect to marriage, there were some peculiarities which, to our ideas, would be regarded as hardships. A master might, for instance, give a wife to a Hebrew servant for the time of his servitude, the wife being in this case, it must be remarked, not only a slave, but a non-Hebrew. Should he leave when his term had expired, his wife and children would remain the absolute property of the, master (⁽¹²⁰⁴⁾Exodus 21:4, 5). The reason for this regulation is, evidently, that the children of a female heathen slave were mere slaves; they inherited the mother’s disqualification. Such a condition of marrying a slave would be regarded as an axiom by a Hebrew, and the case is only incidentally noticed. Again, a father might sell his young daughter to a Hebrew, with a view either of the latter’s marrying her himself or of his giving her to his son (ver. 7-9). It diminishes the apparent harshness of this proceeding if we look on the purchase money as in the light of a dowry given, as was not unusual, to the parents of the bride; still more, if we accept the Rabbinical view (which, however, we consider very doubtful) that the consent of the maid was required before the marriage could take place. But even if this consent were not obtained, the paternal authority would not appear to be violently strained; for among ancient nations that authority was generally held to extend even to the life of a child, much more to the giving of a daughter in marriage. The female

slave was in this case termed *hama*; as distinct from *hja pva* applied to the ordinary household slave. The distinction is marked in regard to Hagar, who is described by the latter term before the birth of Ishmael, and by the former after that event (comp. ^{<0100>}Genesis 16:1; 21:10). The relative value of the terms is expressed in Abigail's address, "Let thine handmaid (*amah*) be a servant (*shiphkah*) to wash," etc. (^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:41). The position of a maiden thus sold by her father was subject to the following regulations:

[1] She could not "go out as the men servants do;" i.e. she could not leave at the termination of six years, or in the year of Jubilee, if (as the regulation assumes) her master was willing to fulfil the object for which he had purchased her.

[2] Should he not wish to marry her, he should call upon her friends to procure her release by the repayment of the purchase money (perhaps, as in other cases, with a deduction for the value of her services),

[3] If he betrothed her to his son, he was bound to make such provision for her as he would for one of his own daughters.

[4] If either he or his son, having married her, took a second wife, it should not be to the prejudice of the first.

[5] If neither of the three above specified alternatives took place, the maid was entitled to immediate and gratuitous liberty (^{<0207>}Exodus 21:7-11).

The custom of reducing Hebrews to servitude appears to have fallen into disuse subsequently to the Babylonian captivity. The attempt to enforce it in Nehemiah's time met with decided resistance (^{<0405>}Nehemiah 5:5), and Herod's enactment that thieves should be sold to foreigners roused the greatest animosity (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 1, 1). Vast numbers of Hebrews were reduced to slavery as war captives at different periods by the Phoenicians (^{<0216>}Joel 3:16), the Philistines (*ibid.*; Amos 1:6), the Syrians (1 Macc. 3:41; 2 Macc. 8:11), the Egyptians (Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 2, 3), and, above all by the Romans (*War*, 6, 9, 3). We may form some idea of the numbers reduced to slavery by war from the single fact that Nicanor calculated on realizing 2000 talents in one campaign by the sale of captives at the rate of ninety for a talent (2 Macc. 8:10, 11), the number required to fetch the sum being 180,000. The Phoenicians were the most active slave dealers of ancient times, purchasing of the Philistines (Amos 1:9), of the

Syrians (2 Macc. 8:21), and even of the tribes on the shores of the Euxine Sea (^{<3713>}Ezekiel 27:13), and selling them wherever they could find a market about the shores of the Mediterranean, and particularly in Joel's time to the people of Javan (^{<2916>}Joel 3:6), it being uncertain whether that name represents a people in South Arabia or the Greeks of Asia Minor and the peninsula. It was probably through the Tyrians that Jews were transported in Obadiah's time to Sepharad, or Sardis (^{<3101>}Obadiah 20). At Rome vast numbers of Jews emerged from the state of slavery and became freedmen. The price at which the slaves were offered by Nicanor was considerably below the ordinary value either in Palestine or Greece. In the former country it stood at thirty shekels (=about \$18), as stated below; in the latter at about one and a quarter mina (=about \$20), this being the mean between the extremes stated by Xenophon (*Mem.* 2, 5, 2) as the ordinary price at Athens. The price at which Nicanor offered them was only about \$12 a head. Occasionally slaves were sold as high as a talent (about \$1058) each (Xenophon, *loc. cit.*; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 4, 9).

(II.) *Non-Hebrew Slaves.* —

(1.) The majority of non-Hebrew slaves were war captives, either the Canaanites who had survived the general extermination of their race under Joshua, or such as were conquered from the other surrounding nations (^{<03125>}Numbers 31:26 sq.). Besides these, many were obtained by purchase from foreign slave dealers (^{<12544>}Leviticus 25:44, 45); and others may have been resident foreigners who were reduced to this state either by poverty or crime. The Rabbinitists further deemed that any person who performed the services of a slave became *ipso facto* a slave (Mishna, *Kedush.* 1, 3). The children of slaves remained slaves, being the class described, as "born in the house" (^{<01444>}Genesis 14:14; 17:12; ^{<21017>}Ecclesiastes 2:7), and hence the number was likely to increase as time went on. The only statement as to their number applies to the post-Babylonian period, when they amounted to 7337, or about one to six of the free population (^{<13115>}Ezra 2:65). We have reason to believe that the number diminished subsequently to this period, the Pharisees in particular being opposed to the system. The average value of a slave appears to have been thirty shekels (^{<02132>}Exodus 21:32), varying, of course, according to age, sex, and capabilities. The estimation of persons given in ^{<13212>}Leviticus 27:2-8 probably applies to war captives who had been dedicated to the Lord, and the price of their redemption would in that case represent the ordinary value of such slaves.

(2.) That the slave might be manumitted appears from ^{<1276>}Exodus 21:26, 27; ^{<1881>}Leviticus 19:20. As to the methods by which this might be effected, we are told nothing in the Bible; but the Rabbinites specify the following four methods:

- [1] redemption by a money payment;
- [2] a bill or ticket of freedom;
- [3] testamentary disposition; or
- [4] any act that implied manumission, such as making a slave one's heir (Mielziner, p. 65, 66).

(3.) The slave is described as the "possession" of his master, apparently with a special reference to the power which the latter had of disposing of him to his heirs as he would any other article of personal property (^{<1255>}Leviticus 25:45, 46); the slave is also described as his master's "money" (^{<1221>}Exodus 21:21), i.e. as representing a certain money value. Such expressions show that he was regarded very much in the light of a *mancipium*, or chattel. But, on the other hand, provision was made for the protection of his person wilful murder of a slave entailed the same punishment as in the case of a free man (^{<1347>}Leviticus 24:17, 22). So, again, if a master inflicted so severe a punishment as to cause the death of his servant he was liable to a penalty, the amount of which probably depended on the circumstances of the case; for the Rabbinical view that the words "he shall be surely punished," or, more correctly, "it is to be avenged," imply a sentence of death, is wholly untenable (^{<1221>}Exodus 21:20). No punishment at all was imposed if the slave survived the punishment for a day or two (ver. 21), the loss of the slave being regarded as a sufficient punishment in that case. There is an apparent disproportion between this and the following regulation, arising probably out of the different circumstances under which the injury was effected. In this case the law is speaking of legitimate punishment "with a rod;" in the next, of a violent assault. A minor personal injury, such as the loss of an eye or a tooth, was to be recompensed by giving the servant his liberty (ver. 26, 27). The general treatment of slaves appears to have been gentle --occasionally too gentle, as we infer from Solomon's advice (^{<1299>}Proverbs 29:19, 21), nor do we hear more than twice of a slave running away from his master (^{<1250>}1 Samuel 25:10; ^{<1029>}1 Kings 2:39). The slave was considered by a conscientious master as entitled to justice (^{<1313>}Job 31:13-15) and honorable treatment (^{<1300>}Proverbs 30:10). A slave, according to the Rabbinites, had no power of acquiring property for himself; whatever he might become

entitled to, even by way of compensation for personal injury, reverted to his master (Mielziner, p. 55). On the other hand, the master might constitute him his heir either wholly (^{<0153>}Genesis 15:3), or jointly with his children (^{<0170>}Proverbs 17:2); or, again, he might give him his daughter in marriage (^{<0125>}1 Chronicles 2:35).

The position of the slave in regard to religious privileges was favorable. He was to be circumcised (^{<0172>}Genesis 17:12), and hence was entitled to partake of the Paschal sacrifice (^{<0244>}Exodus 12:44) as well as of the other religious festivals (^{<0522>}Deuteronomy 12:12, 18; 16:11, 14). It is implied that every slave must have been previously brought to the knowledge of the true God, and to a willing acceptance of the tenets of Judaism. This would naturally be the case with regard to all who were “born in the house,” and who were to be circumcised at the usual age of eight days; but it is difficult to understand how those who were “bought with money,” as adults, could always be induced to change their creed, or how they could be circumcised without having changed it. The Mosaic law certainly presupposes a universal acknowledgment of Jehovah within the limits of the promised land, and would therefore enforce the dismissal or extermination of slaves who persisted in heathenism.

The occupations of slaves were of a menial character, as implied in ^{<0259>}Leviticus 25:39, consisting partly in the work of the house and partly in personal attendance on the master. Female slaves, for instance, ground the corn in the handmill (^{<0115>}Exodus 11:5; ^{<0310>}Job 31:10; ^{<0370>}Isaiah 47:2), or gleaned in the harvest field (^{<0015>}Ruth 2:8). They also baked, washed, cooked, and nursed the children (Mishna, *Kethub.* 5, 5). The occupations of the men are not specified; the most trustworthy held confidential posts, such as that of steward or major-domo (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2; 24:2), of tutors to sons (^{<0170>}Proverbs 17:2), and of tenants to persons of large estate; for such appears to have been the position of Ziba (^{<0020>}2 Samuel 9:2, 10).

In Mohammedan Asia the slaves termed “houseborn” are regarded with peculiar esteem. They form part of their master’s family, and their welfare is an object of his peculiar care. They are the most attached of his adherents, and often inherit a large share of his wealth. It is sometimes the practice of childless persons to adopt a favorite slave of this class as their own child and heir, or sometimes they purchase promising boys when young; and, after having brought them up in their own faith, formally adopt them as their children.

4. Gibeonitish Servitude. — The condition of the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim, under the Hebrew commonwealth, was not that of slavery; it was voluntary (^{<4698>}Joshua 9:8-11). They were not employed in the families of the Israelites, but resided in their own cities, tended their own flocks and herds, and exercised the functions of a distinct, though not independent, community (^{<4606>}Joshua 10:6-18). The injuries inflicted on them by Saul were avenged by the Almighty on his descendants (^{<4201>}2 Samuel 21:1-9). They appear to have been devoted exclusively to the service of the “house of God,” or the Tabernacle; and only a few of them, comparatively, could have been engaged at any one time. The rest dwelt in their cities, one of which was a great city, as one of the royal cities. The service they rendered may be regarded as a natural tribute for the privilege of protection. No service seems to have been required of their wives and daughters. On the return from the Babylonian captivity they dwelt at Ophel (^{<4195>}Nehemiah 3:26; see also ^{<4302>}1 Chronicles 9:2; ^{<4504>}Ezra 2:43; ^{<4674>}Nehemiah 7:24; 8:17; 10:28; 11:21). *SEE NETHINIM.*

5. Roman Slavery. — Our limits will not allow us to enter into detail on the only kind of slavery referred to in the New Test., for there is no indication that the Jews possessed any slaves in the time of Christ. Suffice it, therefore, to say that, in addition to the fact that Roman slavery was perpetual and hereditary, the slave had no protection whatever against the avarice, rage, or lust of his master. The bondman was viewed less as a human being, subject to arbitrary dominion, than as an inferior animal, dependent wholly on the will of his owner. The master possessed the uncontrolled power of life and death over his slave — a power which continued, at least, to the time of the emperor Hadrian. He might, and frequently did, kill, mutilate, and torture his slaves, for any or for no offense, so that slaves were sometimes crucified from mere caprice. He might force them to become prostitutes or gladiators; and, instead of the perpetual obligation of the marriage tie, their temporary unions (*contubernia*) were formed and dissolved at his command, families and friends were separated, and no obligation existed to provide for their wants in sickness or in health. But, notwithstanding all the barbarous cruelties of Roman slavery, it had one decided advantage over that which was introduced in modern times into European colonies — both law and custom being decidedly favorable to the freedom of the slave (Blair, *Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans* [1833]). The

Mohammedan law, also, in this respect, contrasts favorably with those of the European settlements. Although the condition of the Roman slaves was no doubt improved under the emperors, the early effects of Christian principles were manifest in mitigating the horrors, and bringing about the gradual abolition, of slavery. Onesimus, according to the concurrent testimony of antiquity, was liberated by Philemon (ver. 21); and in addition to the testimonies cited in Wright's *Slavery* (*ut infra*, p. 60), see the preface of Euthalius to this epistle. The servile condition formed no obstacle to attaining the highest dignities of the Christian priesthood. Our space will not allow us to pursue this subject. "It was," says M. Guizot, "by putting an end to the cruel institution of slavery that Christianity extended its mild influence to the practice of war; and that barbarous art, softened by its humane spirit, ceased to be so destructive" (Milman's Gibbon, 1, 61). "It is not," says Robertson, "the authority of any single detached precept in the Gospel, but the spirit and genius of the Christian religion, more powerful than any particular command, which has abolished the practice of slavery throughout the world." Although, even in the most corrupt times of the Church, the operation of Christian principles tended to this benevolent object, they unfortunately did not prevent the revival of slavery in the European settlements in the 16th and 17th centuries, together with that nefarious traffic the suppression of which has rendered the name of Wilberforce forever illustrious. Modern servitude had all the characteristic evils of the Roman, except, perhaps, the uncontrolled power of life and death, while it was destitute of that redeeming quality to which we have referred, its tendency being to perpetuate the condition of slavery. It has also been supposed to have introduced the unfortunate prejudice of color, which was unknown to the ancients (Linstant, *Essai* [1841]). It was the benevolent wish of the philosophic Herder (*History of Man* [1788]) that the time might come "when we shall look back with as much compassion on our inhuman traffic in Negroes as on the ancient Roman slavery or Spartan helots." This is now legally, if not actually, the case in all civilized countries. *SEE SLAVERY, MODERN.*

III. Ethical Considerations. — These have been incidentally touched upon in the foregoing discussion; but their importance in connection with the occurrence of slavery in the Bible requires a fuller notice, especially as it has been boldly claimed that the above facts justify the detention of human beings in menial servitude.

1. The circumstances of patriarchal slavery were so very different from those of modern times that no argument in this regard can fairly be drawn from a comparison of the two. It is obvious, for example, that if Abraham's "servants" had chosen to run away, there was no power by which they could have been compelled to return. But even if there had been, and if their state could be proved to be ever so severe, there is no evidence that this condition of society had the approval, much less the authority, of God, either in its institution or its continuance. There were many social usages in those days which were only tolerated for a time, until a better economy should supervene.

2. This last consideration likewise applies, in part, to the whole system of Jewish slavery. But we are not left to this mode of vindicating Mosaism on the point in question. The moral law is a revelation of great principles. It requires supreme love to God and universal love among men; and whatever is incompatible with the exercise of that love is strictly forbidden and condemned. Hence, immediately after the giving of the law at Sinai, as if to guard against all slavery and slavetrading on the part of the Israelites, God promulgated this ordinance: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death" (^{<02216>}Exodus 21:16; ^{<02007>}Deuteronomy 21:7). The crime is stated in its threefold form--*man-stealing, selling, and holding* the penalty for either of which was *death*. The law punished the stealing of mere property by enforcing restitution; in some cases twofold, in others fivefold (^{<02214>}Exodus 22:14). When property was stolen the legal penalty was compensation to the person injured; but when a man was stolen no property compensation was allowed: death was inflicted, and the guilty offender paid the forfeit of his life for his transgression, God thereby declaring the infinite dignity and worth of man and the inviolability of his person. The reason of this may be found in the great fact that God created man in his own image (^{<00026>}Genesis 1:26-28)--a high distinction, more than once repeated with great solemnity (5:1; 9:6). Such was the operation of this law, and the obedience paid to it, that we have not the remotest hint that the sale and purchase of slaves ever occurred among the Israelites. The cities of Judea were not, like the cities of Greece and Rome, slave markets, nor were there found throughout all its coasts either helots or slaves.

3. It has been made a question whether servitude, even of the modified kind described in the Old Test., existed in Palestine in the days of our Lord. There is some reason to believe that after the return from Babylon the

system gradually lost ground and disappeared. Certainly there is nothing in the Gospel history to indicate the existence of what could with any propriety be called slavery. It admits of no doubt, however, that slavery of the most obnoxious type did prevail in Italy and Greece and Asia Minor; and it has been argued that since the apostles did not everywhere openly denounce it, therefore it cannot be viewed as inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel. But there is a wide, unbridged interval here between the premises and the conclusion. The whole spirit and precepts of Christianity are quite opposed to the idea of the subjugation of one man to the arbitrary will of another. The mutual love which it enjoins, the brotherhood of believers which it establishes, the golden rule of doing to other's as we would have them do to us, the model of self-sacrificing love exhibited by the blessed Savior himself, are all utterly repugnant to the practice of stealing men, buying and selling them, and holding them to enforced labor; and accordingly it has ever been found that just in proportion to the footing which the Gospel has obtained in any country the system of slavery has declined and in the end died out. This unjust system has its root in the evil passions of depraved human nature, and in certain states of society it flourishes but the moral and spiritual renovation effected by the merciful religion of Jesus gradually brings a withering blight upon it which ultimately quite destroys it.

Why, then, it may be asked, did not the apostles place themselves in more direct and obvious opposition to it while visiting the cities and countries of heathen nations? Why did they not everywhere denounce it and command the whole world to relinquish it? Now such questions betray a total ignorance of the whole circumstances of the case. Who were the apostles in the estimation of mankind in that age? They were men of no worldly influence, few, and poor, and despised, strangers wherever they appeared; and the effect of their entering into a hand-to-hand fight with any of the institutions of society would have been to throw an insuperable barrier in the way of the progress of the Gospel. This course, moreover, would have manifested the folly of expecting to reap before the seed was sown. First of all, it was indispensable that men's moral notions should be rectified; that the principles of love and universal brotherhood should be inculcated upon them; that they should discover in the one sacrifice of Christ for rich and poor, for bond and free, for men of all colors and climes, that God looked upon them all with equal favor; and not until these ideas were embraced by multitudes, and, in fact, permeated the great mass of society, was it

possible that a system so rooted as slavery could be plucked up or even much changed.

The laws which the great Deliverer and Redeemer of mankind gave for the government of his kingdom were those of universal justice and benevolence, and as such were subversive of every system of tyranny and oppression. To suppose, therefore, as has been rashly asserted, that Jesus or his apostles gave their sanction to the existing systems of slavery among the Greeks and Romans is to dishonor them. That the reciprocal duties of masters and servants (δοῦλοι) were inculcated admits, indeed, of no doubt (^{<5122>}Colossians 3:22; 4:1; ^{<6109>}Titus 2:9; ^{<6128>}1 Peter 2:18; ^{<4065>}Ephesians 6:5-9). But the performance of these duties on the part of the masters, supposing them to have been slave masters, would have been tantamount to the utter subversion of the relation. There can be no doubt either that “servants under the yoke,” or the slaves of heathens, are exhorted to yield obedience to their masters (^{<5018>}1 Timothy 6:1). But this argues no approval of the relation; for

(1) Jesus, in an analogous case, appeals to the paramount law of nature as superseding such temporary regulations as the “hardness of men’s hearts” had rendered necessary (see Wright [Rev. W.], *Slavery at the Cape of Good Hope* [1831], p. 58); and

(2) Paul, while counselling the duties of contentment and submission under inevitable bondage, inculcates at the same time on the slave the duty of adopting all legitimate means of obtaining his freedom. (^{<4078>}1 Corinthians 7:18-20). We are aware that the application of this passage has been denied by Chrysostom, Photius, Theodoret, and Theophylact, who maintain that it is the state of slavery which Paul here recommends the slave to prefer. But although this interpretation is indeed rendered admissible by the context, yet the more received meaning, or that which counsels freedom, is both more easily connected with the preceding phrase, “if thou mayest he made free, use it rather,” and is, as Neander observes, “more in accordance with the liberal views of the free-minded Paul” (Bilroth, *Commentary on Corinthians*, in *Bib. Cab.*). Besides, the character of the existing slavery to which we now refer was utterly inconsistent with the entire tenor of the moral and humane principles of the precepts of Jesus.

But it has been alleged that as Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon, he thus not only testified his approbation of slavery, but even countenanced the principles of modern fugitive-slave law. This is one of the weakest

arguments that could well be employed. Did Paul send back Onesimus against his will, bound hand and foot, and labelled as a piece of property? On the contrary, he sent him as one brother to another — a convert, like his master, to Christianity; and the whole epistle implies that Onesimus returned with his own free consent, because persuaded that he would now be more happy with Philemon than anywhere else. What countenance is there here for a fugitive-slave law to enforce the restoration of runaways? Can we imagine that Paul would have spontaneously acted upon the principle of such a law when it was in direct contradiction to the religion he had been reared in, which expressly forbade that any servant who had fled from his master should be sent back to him? This would have been not only to ignore the benign spirit of the Gospel, but even to fall below the lower platform of the preparatory dispensation. This would have been to follow the advice of the foolish counsellors of Rehoboam, and to exchange the whip of Solomon's gentle reign for the scorpion of intolerable oppression. The return of Onesimus to Philemon was the return of one friend to another with the congratulations of a common friend who was unspeakably dear to both. Slavery finds no support at all in the Word of God, and the attempt to deduce its principles from Scripture does the utmost dishonor to the benign and merciful spirit of the Gospel.

IV. Literature. — A calm and complete view of Hebrew servitude is given in the above-mentioned treatise of Mielzin.er, *Die Verhältnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebrlern, nach biblischen und talmudischen Quellen dargestellt* (Copenhag. and Leips. 1859), which was translated by Prof. Schmidt in the (Gettysburg) *Evangelical Review*, Jan. 1862, p. 311-355. Older treatises are those of Abicht, *De Servis Hebr.* (Lips. 1704); Mieg, *Constitutiones Servi Heb. ex Script. et. Rabbin.* (Herb. 1785). See also Barnes, *Scriptural Views of Slavery* (Phila. 1846); Raphall, *Bible View of Slavery* (N.Y. 1861); *Tour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1859; Jan. 1860; *New Englander*, May, 1860; *Amer. Theol. Rev.* April, 1861; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July, 1861; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. and July, 1862; Row, *Bampton Lectures* for 1878, p. 147. Comp. the numerous earlier controversial articles cited by Poole, *Index*, s.v. See also the two articles immediately following.

Slavery, Modern.

Ancient slavery, especially among the Romans and Greeks, became a system of extreme cruelty. Christianity, though it did not do away with

slavery, tended to ameliorate the condition of the slave. *SEE SLAVERY, RELATION OF, TO CHRISTIANITY.*

1. In Asia and Europe. — Justinian did much to promote the eventual extinction of slavery, and the Church excommunicated slave owners who put their slaves to death without warrant from the judge. But the number of slaves again increased, multitudes being brought by the barbarian invaders, and in the countries which had been provinces of the empire slavery continued long after the empire had fallen to pieces. It eventually merged into the mitigated condition known as serfdom, which prevailed all over Europe in the Middle Ages. The contact between Christianity and Mohammedanism during the Crusades gave a new impulse to slavery, neither party having scruples about the enslaving of those belonging to the other. From the 10th to the 14th century there grew up a considerable slavetrade, of which Rome was the center. The great commercial republics of Italy engaged largely in slavetrading, the Venetians even selling Christians to Moslems. Slavery also existed in Florence, the slaves being, however, mostly Moslems and other unransomed prisoners of war. Under the Saxons, the slave trade flourished in England, Bristol being the chief market, whence many slaves were exported to Ireland. But in England slavery was never very popular, and the Irish early emancipated their bondmen. Slavery still exists in most Mohammedan countries, but in a very mild form. It being a political rather than a social institution, it is possible for the slave not only to obtain liberty, but also to secure the highest social position. For a long time the Algerine corsairs took large numbers of captives from among the Christian nations around the Mediterranean, and sailed as far north as Ireland, seizing people whom they reduced to slavery. The European powers made frequent wars on the Barbary states, and the United States also resorted to force to secure the liberty and commerce of its citizens. The successful bombardment of Algiers in 1816 by an English fleet commanded by lord Exmouth put an end to white slavery in Barbary.

2. Negro Slavery. — The slave trade in negroes existed three thousand years ago, at least, and the Carthaginians brought numbers of black slaves from Central and Southern Africa. The Venetians, no doubt, distributed some negro slaves over the various European nations which they visited. Black slaves have been found in Mohammedan countries since the time of the prophet, but they have often risen very high, both in the state and in the household. The negro formerly was sold, not because he was a negro, but under the same conditions as the Greek or rab. The initiative in the African

slave trade was taken by the Portuguese, who in 1444 formed a company at Lagos, although it is doubtful whether it was organized expressly for the trade in men. In 1445 four negroes were taken by the Portuguese, but rather accidentally than of set purpose to make them slaves. The trade quickly increased, and another factory was established in one of the Anguin islands, which sent from seven to eight hundred black slaves to Portugal every year. The discovery of America (1492) gave a new impetus to the trade, which had declined fully one half. The Spaniards, finding the Indians unable to do the work required of them, soon began to import negroes into the New World, and were encouraged by the priest. Las Casas and other Roman Catholic leaders on the plea of preventing the extinction of the natives. The trade, under the stimulus afforded by the American demand, rapidly increased, and was engaged in by the English, who had already brought negroes into their own country and sold them as early as 1553. In the time of the Stuarts four companies were formed for carrying on the traffic, which furnished negroes to America. In 1713 the privilege of supplying negroes to the Spanish colonies was secured by the English for thirty years, during which time 144, 000 were to be landed. Other European nations engaged in the commerce, and the first slaves brought to the old territory of the United States. were sold from a Dutch vessel. which landed twenty at Jamestown, Va., in 1620. The Continental Congress, in 1776, resolved that no more slaves should be imported; but when the American Constitution was formed, in 1788, Congress was prohibited from interfering with the traffic until 1808, at which time it was abolished. In 1820 it was declared to be piracy. The State of Georgia prohibited the traffic in 1798. In England, as early as 1702, chief-justice Holt ruled that “as soon as a negro comes into England he is free: one may be a ville in England, but not a slave;” and later, “In England there is no such thing as a slave, and a human being never was considered a chattel to be sold for a price.” In 1772 lord Mansfield decided, in the case of *Sharp vs. Somerset* *SEE SHARP, GRANVILLE*, that a slave could not by force be compelled to go out of the kingdom. The first legislative action in favor of the abolition of the slave trade was in 1793, when the Commons passed an act for its gradual abolition, which failed in the House of Lords. In 1806 abolition was brought forward as a government measure, and was carried in 1807. It received. the royal assent on March 25, and made all slave trading illegal after Jan. 1, 1808. British subjects, however, continued to carry on the trade under cover of the Spanish and Portuguese flags. The ships were more crowded than ever, through fear of capture; and the

negroes were often thrown overboard when the vessel was pursued. In 1811 an act of Parliament made the trade felony, punishable with fourteen years' transportation, or from three to five years' imprisonment with hard labor. An act of 1824 declared it piracy, and as such a capital crime if committed within the admiralty jurisdiction, but the statute of 1837 left it punishable with transportation for life. In the course of time the slave trade was abolished by Venezuela, Chili, Buenos Ayres, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and France. The accession of Portugal and Spain to the principle of abolition was obtained by the treaties of 1815 and 1817; and by a convention concluded with Brazil in 1826 it was declared piratical for the subjects of that country; to be engaged in the slavetrade after 1830. By treaties with different countries various steps have been taken for its suppression, which have resulted in its almost entire extinction.

Having secured the suppression of the slave trade, philanthropists turned their attention to efforts to secure the emancipation of the slave himself. After considerable agitation, an emancipation bill passed both houses of the English Parliament, and obtained the royal sanction Aug. 28, 1833. Slavery was to cease Aug. 1, 1834, but the slaves were for a certain duration of time to be apprenticed laborers to their former owners. This was objected to and the complete disfranchisement took place in 1838. The slave owners were indemnified in the sum of £20,000,000. The French emancipated their negroes in 1848, as did most of the new republics of South America at the time of the Revolution, while the Dutch slaves received their freedom in 1863. In Hayti slavery ceased in 1791, its abolition being the result of an insurrection of that year. In Brazil a law for the gradual emancipation of slaves was passed in 1871. A recent treaty between Great Britain and the sultan of Zanzibar secures in promise the speedy abolition of the slave trade on the opposite eastern coast of Africa. In the United States the feeling was generally averse to slavery at the time of their founding, and in some of the Southern states that feeling was stronger than in most of the Northern. Vermont abolished slavery in 1777, before she joined the Union; Pennsylvania, in 1780, provided for general emancipation. In Massachusetts the abolition of slavery was provided for by the constitution of 1780. Rhode Island gradually emancipated her slaves, and had but five left in 1840; New York adopted a gradual emancipation act in 1799, and in 1817 passed another act declaring all her slaves free on July 4, 1827. New Jersey pursued the same course in 1804. The increase in the demand for cotton and the invention of the cotton-gin

made slavery very profitable, and probably prevented voluntary emancipation by the Southern states. In 1820, when Missouri was admitted into the Union as a slave state, the "Missouri Compromise" was entered into, by which slavery was legalized to the south, but prohibited to the north, of 36° 30' N. lat. The South obtained in compensation an amendment of the Fugitive slave Law, making it penal to harbor runaway slaves or aid in their escape. In Boston, Mass., Jan. 1, 1831, William Lloyd Garrison began to oppose slavery in *The Liberator*, and on Jan. 1, 1832, the first emancipation society was formed, on the basis that "slaveholding is a sin against God and a crime against humanity; that immediate emancipation was the right of every slave and the duty of every master." This society was organized in Boston, by twelve men, with Arnold Buffum as president. Very soon the results of their efforts were manifest in the religious sects and parties. In 1840 some of its members seceded and formed the "American and Foreign Antislavery Society," and the same year the "Liberty party" was organized, which was mostly absorbed by the "Free-soil party" in 1848. This party was in turn absorbed by the Republican party, which in 1860 elected Abraham Lincoln president. The "American Abolition Society" was formed in Boston in 1855, to advocate the view that the national government had the constitutional right to abolish slavery from every part of the Union. In 1859 the "Church Antislavery Society" was organized for the purpose of convincing ministers and people that slavery was a sin. In the same year an attempt was made by John Brown and his followers to subvert slavery, but it was defeated. The secession of the states forming the Confederate States (1861) wholly changed the relation of the government towards slavery. War soon followed, notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Lincoln of his purpose to abide faithfully by all constitutional compromises relating to slavery. In May, 1861, major-general Butler, of the department of Eastern Virginia, declared all slaves who had, been employed for military purposes of the confederacy to be contraband of war. The president recommended, March 2, 1862, that Congress adopt a resolution "that the United States, in order to cooperate with any state which may adopt gradual abolition of slavers, give to such state pecuniary aid, to be used by such state in its discretion, to compensate it for the inconvenience, public and private, produced by such change of system." The resolution was adopted, but produced no effect., Mr. Lincoln issued a proclamation on Sept. 22, 1862, declaring his intention to announce that on Jan. 1, 1863, all persons held by any state, or part of a state, which should then be in rebellion, should be free. The final

proclamation of freedom was issued Jan. 1, 1863. On June 9, 1862, Congress passed an act declaring that “from and after the passage of this act there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the territories now existing,” etc. On June 23, 1864, all laws for the rendition of fugitive slaves to their masters were repealed. On Jan. 31, 1865, the vote was taken submitting to the several states for ratification the 13th amendment to the Constitution: “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.” This amendment was approved by twenty-seven of the states, and consequently adopted. The 14th amendment, adopted in 1867-68, absolutely forbade compensation for loss of slaves being made either by the United States or by any state.

3. In Egypt and Africa. — Slavery has existed in Egypt through all its known history. In modern slavery there has not been very great severity, the male black slave being treated with more consideration than the free servant. He leads a life well suited to his lazy disposition, and if discontented with his situation, can easily compel his master to sell him. The female slaves are generally negroes, Abyssinians, Georgians, or Greeks. They occupy all positions from that of the lowest menial to the favorite companion, and, even wife, of the master (Lane, *Manners and Customs of Modern Egyptians*, 1, 275 sq.). Slavery has been nominally abolished in Egypt, although it still exists to a large degree in Nubia and Upper Egypt. In the interior of Africa the slave-traffic is still carried on with much severity, principally by Arab traders. See *Chambers’s Encyclop. s.v.*; *Johnson’s Cyclop. vs.* For literature, see *Appletons’ Cyclop. s.v.*

Slavery, Relation Of, To Christianity.

This topic has necessarily been touched upon in the preceding articles, but its importance justifies a fuller consideration separately. (In doing this we avail ourselves in part of the treatment in Herzog’s *Real Encyklop.*)

The New Test. teaches that salvation is the common privilege of all mankind, and that all men have an equal right to the benefits it confers (^{<5021>}Titus 2:11; ^{<5004>}1 Timothy 2:4). This principle alone would, of necessity, determine the Christian view of slavery and lead to the extinction of that state (^{<4833>}Galatians 3:28; ^{<5031>}Colossians 3:11). Christianity, moreover, does not deal with nations and masses of people, but with individuals, whom it severally invites, exhorts, and receives into its

communion. It sets forth faith as an inward liberating life principle (^{<B186>}John 8:36), through which the individual lays hold on Christ and becomes united with him. This involves a recognition of the rights of the *inner man*, which the heathen nations never apprehended, and which were veiled from sight even in the Old Test., though clearly stated in the New (^{<B129>}Galatians 2:19-21; ^{<B111>}Acts 2:41; 13:46), and which in their progress and complete realization under Protestantism must ultimately bring about the utter extirpation of slavery from the earth. Christ postulated the law of *liberty*, and made freedom the privilege of believers (^{<B182>}John 8:32; ^{<B125>}James 1:25; 2:12; ^{<B182>}Romans 8:2), thereby accomplishing the predictions of the Old Covenant (comp. ^{<B118>}Luke 4:18-21 with ^{<B101>}Isaiah 61:1 sq.); and, though the proclamation of liberty by the apostles had primary reference to the inward states of the soul (^{<B123>}1 Corinthians 7:23; ^{<B181>}Galatians 5:1; ^{<B126>}1 Peter 2:16; comp. ^{<B111>}Galatians 2:4, 5, 13; ^{<B129>}2 Peter 2:19), it necessarily led to the great principle that with Christ liberty in general had come to man (see ^{<B119>}Luke 1:79; ^{<B117>}2 Corinthians 3:17). They taught that while freedom begins in the religious consciousness, it is not restricted to that field, but involves consequences in other departments of human life as well, even as the saving of the soul involves that of the body likewise (^{<B183>}Romans 8:23); and that the Christian is a freeman, and entitled to all the blessings which God sheds abroad in the earth (^{<B121>}1 Corinthians 3:21-23). The realization of that ideal, however, was shown to be the work of a progressive Christianity, advancing in knowledge and in influence over the conditions of the world; and they consequently discountenanced all tendency to rebellion against the properly constituted and existing authorities of the nations of the earth. It is evident from ^{<B113>}Romans 13:1 sq. that a disposition to refuse obedience to governments existed to some extent in apostolic times, and, from the case of Onesimus, that bondmen sometimes broke away from their masters' rule. In the latter instance Paul succeeded in effecting the voluntary return of the fugitive Christian slave by imparting to him a deeper and more correct knowledge of the nature and aims of Christianity (^{<B110>}Philemon 1:10-16). A similar principle is embodied in the important passage ^{<B122>}2 Corinthians 7:21: existing conditions, however adverse to the spirit of Christianity, are not to be subverted by outward force, but are to be displaced by new conditions whose root is the principle of Christian freedom implanted in the human heart. As a rule, converts to Christianity are exhorted to continue in the station and condition of life to which the Providence of God has assigned them. The argument by which that rule is enforced, that the present is a

time of distress in which it becomes prudent for the unmarried to retain their virgin:state and the slave to remain contentedly in his bondage, indicates its primary reference to the Corinthian Christians of that day; but the further considerations adduced, that the time is short, the work to be done is all-important, and the grand catastrophe through which the world's conditions shall be changed is drawing near, have universal force, and adapt the rule to the conditions of all Christians. It is, however, evident that the apostle does not strike at the right to liberty and personal independence in these instructions. ~~4023~~1 Corinthians 7:23 asserts that right most forcibly, and shows that the saving grace of the Lord involves a setting-aside of all human bondage. A denial of that right would bring him into conflict with his own claim to freedom (~~4001~~1 Corinthians 9:1), and with his fundamental statement that in Christ all things shall become *new* (~~4057~~2 Corinthians 5:17).

From the opposite point of view, Christianity is seen to be equally opposed to slavery. Masters are to treat their slaves kindly, and as brothers (~~4019~~Ephesians 6:9; ~~5001~~Colossians 4:1; ~~5016~~Philemon 1:16). In practice, the early Christians were accustomed to give freedom to their slaves, and to purchase the freedom of the slaves of others: witness the action of Gregory the Great in the 6th century in purchasing a number of British captives and returning them in freedom to their native land, that they, aided by the monk Augustine, might carry the blessings of Christianity to their countrymen. Where slavery exists in a Christian land in any pronounced form, it is because Christianity itself has remained in a low state of development — as, for instance, in Russia — or because it has relapsed into such a state, as was the case in Europe during the Middle Ages. In its fundamental nature, Christianity is the law of liberty. and, therefore, opposed to the enslaving of individual men, on the one hand, and to the exercise of absolutism and despotism in the government of states, on the other.

The extirpation of slavery has been made a part of the mission of Protestantism. It is among Evangelical Christians alone that the evils of slavery have arrested attention, and it is chiefly through their influence that its sway has been contested. The attitude of the Papal Church has been that of indifference or of impotency. The first place among the opponents of human slavery belongs to Great Britain, whose West Indian colonies and naval supremacy compelled a recognition of responsibility in the matter; but the Christian spirit ruling in Protestant lands will allow none of the

nations which they shelter to rest until the last vestige of human slavery is wiped from the face of the earth.

The earliest endeavors for the overthrow of slavery date back to A.D. 1270, when an alliance between England and France was formed to punish the pirates of the Barbary states. The object was to compel the liberation and subsequent immunity from slavery of *white* persons. Philip the Bold attacked Tunis with this intention, and England repeated the attack in 1389, in each instance compelling the liberation of all Christian slaves; but the states of Oran, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, nevertheless, devoted themselves, from the close of the 15th. century, to piracy as their leading industry. Repeated inflictions of punishment were received by them at the hands of England, France, and America; but they continued at the same time to exact tribute and ransom from the subjects of those powers. The first effectual hindrance to this business was realized in the present century through the conquest and colonization of Algiers by the French.

The idea of breaking up the trade in *negro* slaves is of much more recent birth. The Pennsylvania Quakers passed resolutions against slavery in 1696. and repeatedly afterwards, and enforced them practically since 1727. George Fox and William Penn. were especially active in this movement. The earliest authors who wrote against slavery were William Burlin (1718) and afterwards Thomas Lay. John Woolman became prominent in this work, as did his friend Anthony Benezet, who was connected with John Wesley, George Whitefield, and the Countess of Huntingdon. In 1751 the Quakers gave up the trade in slaves among themselves, which led Sidmouth, Wellesley, and others to advocate in Parliament the abrogation of trade in negroes generally. It was, however, chiefly, through the efforts of Granville Sharp that the principle was established, in 1772, that "a slave who treads on English soil is free." Public opinion was now with him, and Sharp; proceeded to demand the closing of the slavetrade, and the liberation of the slaves in all the colonies of England. Clarkson's prize-essay on the question "Is it right to make slaves against their will?" appeared in 1785. Wilberforce, Pitt, and Fox were gained over to the cause of abolition soon afterwards; and in 1788 a petition by the first of these men led to an official inquiry into the slave trade and its consequences by a commission raised by the privy-council. Facts were accumulated which caused the passage of the first bill for the restriction of the slave trade in 1789. The Commons passed a bill for the abolition of slavery in 1792 by a majority of nineteen votes; and in 1807 the definitive

“Abolition Act of Slavery” became a law. In 1811 conscious participation in the slave trade. was made a penal offense, to be punished with banishment, or hard labor for fourteen years and in 1827 Canning’s resolution, which declares the slave trade to be piracy, was adopted. Treaties for the suppression of the traffic were entered into at various times with other nations; expeditions were repeatedly sent into the heart of the African continent charged to make every effort to secure the cooperation of the native kings in the work of stopping the supply of slaves; and fleets were sent out and kept on the African coast,. at great expense, to prevent their exportation. Negroes rescued from their captors were sent to the colony of Sierra Leone, where they have made most rapid progress in civilization under the influence of Christian teaching. Denmark and France were equally prompt in their action. The former in 1793 restricted the slave trade in its West-Indian colonies, and in 1804 forbade it entirely; and the latter liberated all slaves within its colonial territories by act of the National Convention. The earliest negro slaves were introduced into Europe by the Portuguese, though Spanish historians claim the unenviable distinction for their own nation; and these nations likewise introduced them into America. The first slaves found in an English colony were obtained by Virginia from a Dutch vessel in 1620. The Puritans in the Northern colonies enslaved the native Indians at first, and displayed no repugnance to the idea of negro slavery, though the nature of their soil and the conditions of their life prevented any considerable employment of such bondmen. In the South, James Oglethorpe, the founder of the colony of Georgia, interdicted the holding of slaves; but when, in 1752, Georgia became a royal colony, its inhabitants were freed from all restrictions of this kind, and slave holding became general. After the Revolutionary War, in 1790, the census reported 657,527 slaves in the United States,. of whom 40,370 were in the North; but in the latter section interest combined with a growing moral sentiment to excite hostility against any increase in the number of slaves or the permanent retention of slavery as an institution. The situation of the Southern States, on the other hand, was entirely favorable to the development of slavery. The cultivation of tobacco and cotton, the great staples of that section, afforded opportunity for the profitable employment of the slaves. Gradually the dislike of slavery felt by the more intelligent of the early Southern statesmen and clergymen. died out, and a sentiment favorable to its existence arose; and the reaction was carried so far that the pulpits devoted their powers to the demonstration of a divine origin and a divine character for slavery. The slave trade had, however, come to a close

by act of Congress on Jan. 1, 1808 — the passing of the measure preceding that of the British Parliament by seven days. But the interstate trade in slaves continued. The breeding of negroes for the slave market became a regular business, whose proportions enlarged with the extension of the slave using territory. The political measures of the Southern States were wholly designed to promote the interests and the extension of slavery, culminating in the Fugitive slave Law of 1850, by which any slave-owner was authorized to follow an escaped slave into any part of the Union, and compel the assistance of citizens for the recovery of the bondman. The operation of this law outraged the moral sense of the world, and led to the initiation of antislavery efforts by which the sentiment of the *free states* was thoroughly revolutionized. In these agitations the names of Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and others became prominent as the leaders of the abolition movement. which realized its object when, on Jan. 1, 1863, the emancipation of slaves went into effect wherever the authority of the United States was recognized. The success of the Northern arms soon made that proclamation universally prevalent.

The relation of the churches to the question of slavery involved grave inconsistencies of practice, among Evangelicals, at least. The Roman Catholic and Protestant Episcopal churches never expressed an authoritative condemnation of slavery, and in the war for the Union the influence of the Papal Church was emphatically favorable to the South; but other churches were opposed in principle to slavery, while they tolerated it in practice, and tried hard to persuade themselves that slavery is right. The Methodist Episcopal Church was set right by the separation of 1844; the Presbyterian Church by the New school Assembly's declaration of 1857, and by the separation, consequent on the war, in 1861. In each denomination of Protestants, except the Protestant Episcopalian, the remarkable fact came to pass that the churches in slave holding communities became the defenders, while those in free territory became the determined opponents, of slavery. The progress of events has, however, wrought a great change of opinion among the more influential classes of the South. The extinction of slavery in the United States is, at any rate, a fact whose influence over the ideas of the people cannot be resisted. For the attitude of each: particular Church towards this subject, see the articles devoted to the several denominations.

The latest aspect of the relation of slavery to Christianity appears in connection with the planting of Christian missions in the interior of Africa,

as one of the consequences of the recent explorations of Livingstone, Stanley, and others. The Christian communities of Liberia and Sierra Leone afford opportunity for an invasion of African heathendom from the west, which is expected to be made sooner or later. The day is evidently near when the superior might of Christian principles shall control the world, to the exclusion of all trade in human flesh when it shall be impressed on the entire human family that to every individual man belongs the right "to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

See Hune, *Vollst. Darstellung aller Verander. d. Negersklavenhandels* (Gott. 1820); Wadstrom, *Observations of the Slave trade*; Clarkson, *Hist. of the Abolition of the Slave trade*; Burkhardt, *Evangel. Mission unter d. Negern in West-Afrika* (Bielefeld, 1859); Wilson, *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*; Greeley, *The American Conflict* (Hartford, 1866).

Slaves In The Early Christian Church

labored under several disabilities as regarded their Church relations and privileges. This did not arise from any hostility or desire to oppress on the part of the Church, but rather from the necessity of respecting the legal rights of the master.

- 1.** They were debarred from the privilege of ordination, for the reason that; being originally tied by birth or purchase to their patron's or master's service, they could not be legally ordained; the service of the Church being incompatible with their other duties, and no man was to be defrauded of his right under pretence of ordination. If, however, a slave was found worthy, and his master gave consent, then he might be ordained.
- 2.** If the master of a slave was a Christian, his testimony concerning the life and conversation of the slave was required before the latter could be admitted to the privilege of baptism. The design of this course was to enlist the interest of the master, and prevent the over-hasty admission of unfit persons.
- 3.** The slave could not marry without his master's consent. being. looked upon in this respect as a child; nor could he enter a monastery without this permission, because this would deprive his master of his legal right of service.

4. The privilege of sanctuary was also denied them if it would excuse them from the proper duties of their station. If they fled to a church, they might be reclaimed and brought out immediately. Other facts relating to slaves may not be uninteresting: e.g. exception was made in their favor so that the judge might on Sunday go through the civil process of law necessary for their emancipation. It was thought a highly proper and commendatory act to celebrate Easter by granting freedom to slaves. Further, if the slave of an apostate or a heretic fled from his master and took sanctuary in the church, he was not only to be protected, but to have his manumission or freedom granted him likewise. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.*

Slavic Mythology.

This term may cover the religions of the early Poles, Russians, Wends, Bohemians, Moravians, Servians, Masuri, and Silesians. The teaching of these systems is based on the idea of dual principles, a race of good and another of evil deities, with whom are associated numerous inferior gods. The principal divinities may be connected with a tree whose root is God — called Bog or Swantewit. All the subordinate gods are in pairs, as Belbog and Czernebog, *good* and *evil*, and Razi and Zirnitra, *counsellors* and *magicians*, as follows:

Picture for Slavic

This plan assumes that the principal seat of the Slavonic religions was at Arcona, since *Swantewit* was there only venerated as the supreme divinity; at Kief and Romowa the lightning darting *Perun*, or *Perkun*, stood first, and at Rhetra *Radegast*; but *Swantewit* was at all events the chief deity worshipped among all the Western Slavs, and was esteemed as one of the chief gods among the Eastern Slavs as well. The Russians and the Poles residing nearest to Kief or Novogorod distinguished the gods into four classes, which contrasted with each other, and whose respective members were similarly various in their natures. There were, for instance, gods of men and of beasts. In the former class, were found gods of love and of pain; in the latter, gods of growth and of destruction. The other classes were that of the nation and that of inanimate nature — the one including gods of war and of peace; the other, gods of the land and of the water, of the house and of the field. To these deities of the general populace must be added innumerable private and local gods, especially among the Poles, each tribe, town, or institution having its own patron divinity, and each one

regarding its own god as superior to others of his class. The most insignificant duties, such as the lighting of lamps, the cutting of bread, the tapping of a fresh barrel, etc., were under the guidance of the gods. A numerous priesthood conducted the religious rites, which generally took place in front of the temples, and sometimes involved bloody sacrifices of human beings. Princes were accustomed to devote prisoners of war in this way, though the interested priests would sometimes spare the latter for a life of servitude; and the people were in the habit of contributing material of every kind and in lavish quantity to the support of their religion. Such contributions afforded the support by which the priestly class was sustained. The temples were rude structures of logs and were surrounded by hanging cloths. The devastating campaigns of Henry the Lion destroyed the temples of the western Slavonian tribes and brought the prevalent paganism to an end, though certain superstitious customs have been preserved in the regions of their former occupancy to this day.

Slavonians

is the general designation of a race of great antiquity, who were found on the Don among the Goths, and afterwards on the Danube among the Huns and the Bulgarians. Their ancient religion was a system of unmixed paganism, their chief god being Perun (*thunder*), while the other principal deities were Lada (goddess of love and pleasure), Kupala (god of the fruits of the earth), and Koleda (god of festivals). From Procopius we learn that they worshipped also rivers, nymphs, and other deities, to whom they offered sacrifices, making divinations at the same time. The most celebrated deity of the Baltic Slavonians was Swantewit, whose temple was at Arcoha, the capital of Rigen. For a lengthened and graphic account of the temple and worship of Swantewit, see Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v. Each of the different Slavoniai nations had its own special deities. At Plon, in Holstein, there was an idol called Podaga, and at Stettin there was a temple dedicated to the Slavic god Triglaf, whose image was triple-headed. Notwithstanding the numbers of their deities the Slavonians seem to have believed in a supreme God in heaven, and held that all other gods issued from his blood. In addition to their gods, they believed in good and evil spirits and daemons of different kinds, in the immortality of the soul, and in a retribution after death. Worship was held in forests and temples, and sacrifices of cattle and fruit were offered. The dead were burned and their ashes preserved in urns. For literature, see Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen* Wien, 1852-71); Naake, *Slavonic*

Fairy Tales (Lond. 1874); Schafarik, *Slavische Alterthumer* (Leips. 1843, 2 vols.); Talvi, *Historical View of the Languages and Literature of the Slavic Nations* (N.Y. 1850). *SEE SERVIA.*

Slavonic Versions.

Under this head. we shall have to speak of different versions, all belonging to one and the same family. The oldest of these is —

1. *The Slavonic Version*, which was executed during the 9th century by Cyril (q.v.) and Methodius. (q.v.), the first missionaries to the Slavonians, and who, contrary to the course pursued by Xavier but anticipating the labors of modern and Protestant missions and Bible societies, conferred on that half savage nation the inestimable blessing of a valuable translation of the Bible. The first portion of the Slavonic version which was printed was the Psalter, published in 1491 at Cracow, Poland; and reprinted in 1495 in Montenegro, The four gospels were printed in 1512 at Ugrovallachia, which edition was followed by another in 1552 at Belgrade, and a third, in Montenegro, in 1562. In 1581 the first edition of the Slavonic Bible was published, at Ostrog, a number of Greek MSS. having been used for this edition. In 1633 a second edition of the Bible was published at Moscow. In 1712 the czar Peter the Great issued a ukase ordering the printed Slavonic text to be carefully compared, with the Greek of the Sept., and rendered in every respect conformable to it. The revision was not completed till the year 1723, having occupied nearly twelve years. In the following year Peter the Great ordered the revised copy to be put to press, but his death in that year greatly retarded the progress of its publication. Besides the death of the czar, other obstacles occasioned still further delay, and it was not till 1751 that this revised edition was published in a ponderous folio form, containing, besides the text, long and elaborate prefaces, with tables of contents and other useful additions. This edition, which served as the basis of all subsequent ones, has often been printed by the Russian Bible Society; and up to the year 1816 not fewer than twenty-one editions of the whole Bible, besides many others of the New Test., were put into circulation. According to the last report (1878) of the British and Foreign Bible Society, about 246,418 copies of the Bible have been distributed. Owing to the comparatively late date of this version, it has no claim as a critical authority. Of late, parts of the New Test. have been published based on the oldest manuscript text, as *Ostromirovo Evangelie*, edited after a MS. of 1056 by Vostokov (St. Petersburg, 1843); *Evangelium Matthei*

Palaeoslovenioe, e codd. ed. Fr. Miklosich (Vindob. 1856); Mark 1-10, by the same, in *Altslovenische Formenlehre* (ibid. 1874); John, by Leskien, in *Handbuch der altslawischen Sprache* (Weimar, 1871). See the *Introductions* by Hug, Eichhorn, Kaulen, Scholz; the art. "Slavonic Version" in Kitto's *Cyclop.* and Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*; Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*, p. 238 sq.; Kohl, *Introductio in Hist. et Rem Litt. Slavorum*; Dobrowsky, *Slavin: Beitrage zur Kenntniss der slavischen Literatur* (Prague, 1808); *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 292 sq.; Dalton, *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 37 sq.

2. Russian Version (q.v.).

3. *Polish Version.* — A translation of the Scriptures into Polish is said to have been made prior to 1390 by order of queen Hedwig, the first wife of Jagello. Since the middle of the 16th century no fewer than six different versions have been executed. The first in order of time was a translation of the New Test., made by Seklucyan, a Lutheran, and a competent Greek scholar. It was printed at Konigsberg in 1551, and was thrice reprinted before 1555. The first version of the entire Old Test. appeared at Cracow in, 1561. It was translated from the Vulg. by Leonard, and reprinted in 1575 under the title *Biblia, to jest Ksiegi Starego y Nowego Zakonu, na Polski jezyk*, etc.; w Krakowie. w druk. Mik. Szarffenbergera (1575, and again in 1577). Although designed for Roman Catholics, it never received the sanction of the pope, because many passages had been taken from the Bohemian Bible. It is known as the "Old Cracow Bible," and copies are now very rare. The New Test. of this version first appeared at Cracow in 1556, and in the course of time other translations were published. Thus in 1563 the famous Radziwill Bible was published at Brzesc, under the title *Biblia Swieta, to jest, Ksiegi Starego y Nowego Zakonu, wlasnie z Zydowskiego, Greckiego, y Latinskiego, nowo na Polski jezyk z pilnoscia y wiernie wylozone*. This edition was executed from the original texts by an anonymous translator for the Calvinists, and printed at the expense of prince Radziwill; but his son, who became a Roman Catholic, carefully bought up all the copies he could find and burned them. In 1570 the Socinian Bible, translated from the original texts by Budny, a Unitarian clergyman, was published at Nieswicz, in Lithuania, and was reprinted at the same place in 1572. Only three copies are said to be extant. The authorized Polish Bible was first printed in Cracow in 1599, with the title *Biblia, to jest Ksiegi Starego y Nowego testamento; przez D. Jak. Woyka, w Krakowie, w druk. Lazarzowey* (1599, fol). This edition, having been

designed for Roman Catholics, was sanctioned by Clement VIII. The translation is accounted one of the best of European versions of the Vulg. the language being pure and classical, though in some places slightly antiquated. It was executed by the Jesuit Jacob Wuyck. At present a copy of this edition is sold at Leipsic for 360 marks, or about \$90. Two other editions followed in 1740 and 1771. In 1632 the Dantzic Bible, translated by Paliurus, Wengierscius, and Micolaiievius, from the original texts, was sent forth by the Reformed Church at Dantzic, under the title *Biblia Sacra, to jest Ksiegi Starego y Nowego Przymierza z Zydowzskiego y Greckiego jezyka na Polski pilnie y wiernie przetlumaczone*; we Gdansku w druk. Andrzeja Hunefeldta. This Bible had passed through many editions before the British and Foreign Bible Society commenced its operations. In 1808 the Berlin Bible Society projected an edition of the Polish Scriptures. The text selected was that of the Dantzic edition. In 1813 the St. Petersburg Bible Society commenced an edition of the New Test. from the text of Jacob Wuyck. Other editions from both of the above texts were issued by the Berlin society with the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which are at present in circulation. According to the latest report (1878) of the latter society, a revision committee is engaged to prepare a translation of the New Test. from the original, the work to be completed in three years.

4. Bohemian Version. — It seems that the greater part of a Bohemian version of the Scriptures was extant at the close of the 14th century. When Huss began to preach against the evils of Rome, the several portions of Scripture that had been translated into Bohemian were. for the first time collected together. After his martyrdom, in 1415, copies of this Bible were greatly multiplied by his followers, and from A.D. 1410 to 1488 (when this Bible was first printed), no less than four different recensions of the entire Scriptures can be distinctly traced, and many more of the New Test. From the date of the first publication of this Bible in 1488 to the year 1804, fourteen editions of the same left the press. Between the years 1579 and 1601, a version of the Scriptures executed by the United (or Moravian) Brethren from the original texts was published in six quarto volumes at Kralitz, in Moravia: *Biblij Ceske dil prvnisetsy*. Fourteen translators are said to have been engaged on this splendid work (the price of which is given in a Leipsic catalogue at 510 marks, or about \$128), and the whole was executed at the expense of baron John Zerotimus. This edition is now very scarce, most of its copies having been destroyed by the Jesuits. As to

the translation and the notes accompanying the same, Schafarik has remarked that “they contain a great deal of that which, two hundred years later, the learned coryphaei of exegesis exhibited to the world as their own profound discoveries.” A third edition of this Kralitz Bible was published in 1613 under the title *Biblij Svate, to jest, Kniha, v niz se vsecka Pjsma S. Stareho y Noveho Zakona obsahuji*; v nove vytistena, a vydana, which is also remarkable for its high price (\$90) given in a Leipsic catalogue. In addition to the two versions above mentioned, a translation of the entire Scriptures from the Vulg. into Bohemian was published in 1804 by Prochazka and Durich, under the title *Biblij Ceska.... podle stareho obecneho Latinskeho od svate rjmske Katolicke Cyrkve ivdleneho vikladu* (Prague, 2 vols.). The design of issuing an edition of the Bohemian Bible was entertained by the Berlin society as early as 1805. The current of political events, however, impeded the progress of the edition, which was not completed till 1807. In 1808 an edition of the Bible, carefully printed from the text of 1593, was edited by Prof. Palkovitch, of Hungary, with a list of obsolete words. After one hundred copies had been circulated, the British and Foreign Bible Society purchased in 1812 the whole stock for distribution. Numerous other editions have been issued since that time by the same society, and, in spite of the great opposition to the circulation of the Scriptures among the Bohemians, the latest report (1878) of that society shows that up to March 30, 1878, all in all, 402,096 portions of the Holy Scriptures have been disseminated.

5. Servian Version. — The Servian approximates more closely to the Old Slavonic than to any modern idiom, and its chief characteristic is the softness of its sound. Schafarik, in comparing the various Slavonic languages, fancifully but truly said, “Servian song resembles the tone of the violin; Old Slavonic, that of the organ; Polish, that of the guitar. The Old Slavonic, in its psalms, sounds like the loud rush of the mountain-stream; the Polish, like the bubbling and sparkling of a fountain; and the Servian, like the quiet murmuring of a streamlet in the valley.” As to the version into that language, it is of a comparatively recent period, since the ancient Slavonic version, more intelligible to the Servians than to any other members of the Slavonic family, has always been in use. We are told that in 1493 a translation of the Pentateuch into Servian was printed at Zenta, in Herzegovina; but it is probable that the language of this version approached nearer to the Old Slavonic than to the modern idiom. In 1815 a communication from Mr. Kopitar, of Vienna, was addressed to the

committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society through baron De Sacy, of Paris, calling attention to the necessity of furnishing Servia with a version intelligible to the mass of the people. A Servian, by name Vuc Stephanovitch, was engaged to prepare an edition of the New Test. in Servian, which was not completed at press until 1824. As his translation was written in the common dialect of the people, many objections were made to it by those who preferred a more elevated style, bearing a stricter conformity to the Old Slavonic idioms. Soon after the appearance of this version, Prof. Stoikovitch was appointed by a committee of the St. Petersburg society to prepare a new version, holding a middle course between the common and the more ancient and classical phraseology of the language. This edition was printed at St. Petersburg. When a second edition of the New Test. became necessary for Servia, the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, having ascertained that the latter edition proved more acceptable to the people, resolved to take Stoikovitch's text, and issued an edition of 2000 copies at Leipsic in 1830, which was followed by other editions published at different times. In 1864 the same society purchased the manuscript translation of the Psalms prepared by Prof. Danipi9, which was published in 1865. From that time on, different parts of the Old Test. were published as soon as their translation was approved, and in 1869 the Servian Bible was completed. As to the merit of this translation, we will mention the fact that the bishop of Pakrac, in Slavonia, the most talented of the Servian hierarchy, and in former days a strong opponent, has written to Mr. Danipic, the translator, in the following terms: "I am more pleased with your translation of the Bible than with any other. I only regret that I cannot express my approbation of your glorious work as freely as you deserve and as I wish." "Danicic's version," as the *Zagrebacki Katholiqke List* (a Roman Catholic periodical) states, "is a valuable addition to our national literature. The clergy of both churches (Greek and Roman) can avail themselves of it with advantage; but, although the translation is an honest one, neither the Greek Oriental nor the Catholic Church can approve of it in its present state, nor can it be recommended to the people. What is to be done in the case? The Greek Oriental Church, unless it desire to abide by its custom of using the ancient Slavonic and quoting from that, might easily bring Danicic's version into conformity with its rules. The Catholic Church may do the same. It is not worthy of praise that, with so many bishops of both churches, it should have been left to the British and Foreign Bible Society to produce a more popular translation than we have had hitherto. If things are allowed to

remain as they are now, no prohibitions will be of any avail. The people will grasp at this translation, unless an authentic one be provided for them. That the writer in that journal was correct in his anticipation may be seen from the fact that up to March 30, 1878, 132,109 copies of the Servian version had been distributed.

6. Croatian Version. — The Servians and Croatians. speak the same language, the only difference being in the written characters. The Servians belong almost without exception to the Greek Church, and use a modified Cyrillian character, while the Croats, having received instruction in the Christian religion originally from Latin priests, belong in general to the Roman Catholic Church, and use the Roman character. A translation of the gospels into Croatian, or Dalmato-Servian, by Bandulovitch, appeared at Venice in 1613, but never obtained much circulation. In 1640 a Jesuit, by name Bartholomew Cassio, prepared a translation of the entire Scriptures, but it never was printed. After the lapse of another century, Stephen Rosa, a Roman Catholic priest, executed a new translation, which he forwarded to the pope with the request that it might be used in all the churches instead of the Old Slavonic version; but at the consideration of a committee appointed by the pope, the project was formally rejected in 1754. At length, in 1832, by the renewed efforts of the Romish Church and the zealous aid of the deceased primate of Hungary, cardinal Rudnay, another version was completed and permitted to pass through the press. It was printed in Roman letters, and was at once adopted by the Roman Catholics of Dalmatia and Croatia. This version, translated from the Vulg., and rendered conformable in all points to the dogmas of the Romish Church, was executed by Katancsich, a Franciscan monk and professor. An entire new translation was commenced by Mr. Karadacic, completed by Mr. Danicic in 1868, and published in 1869. In 1877 an edition of the Old and New Tests. was commenced by Dr. Sulek, with the orthography revised and obsolete words changed. Of this revised edition the New Test. was published in 1878, which proves to be more acceptable because more intelligible than formerly. Altogether the British and Foreign Bible Society had circulated up to March 30, 1878, 52,025 copies of the Croatian version.

7. Slovenian Version. — Slovenian is a dialect spoken in the Austrian provinces of Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria, and has been the vernacular of these regions since the 5th century, but was never embodied in a written form till towards the epoch of the Reformation. The first who wrote in this

dialect was Truber, a canon and curate of several places in Carniola and Carinthia. In his endeavors to give to his people the Bible in the vernacular, he met with so much discouragement and opposition that he was obliged to take refuge with Christopher, duke of Wurtemberg. Here he completed his translation, the first portion of which was the Gospel of Matthew, published at Tubingen in Roman letters in 1555, while the entire New Test. was completed at press in 1557. Dalmatin, who assisted Truber, translated the Old Test., and an edition of the entire Scriptures in Slovenian was printed under his direction, with the aid of Melancthon, in 1584. This edition was designed for the Protestants of Carinthia and Carniola, who were then very numerous; but they have been exterminated by the Jesuits, and almost all the copies of this edition seem to have been destroyed. In 1784 a version of the Scriptures for the use of Roman Catholics was printed at Laybach, it being executed from the Vulg. by George Japel. This version has since, been reprinted. About the year 1817 another version is said to have been prepared by Ravnikar, a Roman Catholic divine at Laybach. Of late, however, the British and Foreign Bible Society has undertaken a new translation of the New Test. into this dialect, made directly from the Greek. In 1870 the sixty-sixth *Annual Report* of that society announced the publication of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. Although the most violent opposition has been awakened by the circulation of these gospels, not a word has been uttered which could lead to the supposition that the translation is in any degree a failure. In 1871 an edition of the four gospels and the Acts of the Apostles was published, which was followed in 1875 by an edition of 2000 copies of the Epistle to the Romans, and in 1877 by the publication of three additional epistles. Of the Old Test. the Psalms are prepared for publication. Altogether the British and Foreign Bible Society has circulated in about eight years 23,500 copies of the New Test., the best evidence of the timely undertaking of this version.

8. *Slovakian Version.* — This dialect is spoken in the northwest of Hungary. It approximates closely to the Servian, but has been greatly influenced by the Bohemian, which the Slovaks have adopted as their literary language. A translation of the Bible, made by the canon G. Palkowic, was printed in 1831.

9. *Bulgarian Version.* — The first translation into this dialect was commenced in 1820 by the archimandrite Theodoseos, and completed in 1822. Only the Gospel of Matthew was printed at St. Petersburg in 1823.

In 1827 another translation of the New Test. was completed by Sapounoff, of which the four gospels only were printed. In 1836 the British and Foreign Bible Society set an entirely new translation on foot, and the complete New Test. was published at Smyrna in 1840. Other editions have since been issued from the London press, and up. to March 30, 1878, 51,918 copies of the New Test. had been distributed. The earnest demand for the Word of God evinced by the Bulgarian population encouraged the British and Foreign Bible Society to take steps for obtaining a translation of the entire Old Test., and this work was completed in 1858, under the superintendence of Dr. Riggs, of the American mission. It was printed at Smyrna, and left the press in September, 1863. In 1873 the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society stated that a new edition of the Bulgarian Bible was in course of preparation by the Rev. Dr. Long, introducing some small corrections in order to make the whole work uniform in: style and phraseology. Since 1875 this. new edition has been in circulation.

10. Wendish Version. — The Latin term *Venedi*, German *Wenden*, is the specific appellation of a Slavonic tribe located in Upper and Lower Lusatia. Two dialects are predominant among them—that of Upper Lusatia and that of Lower Lusatia, the former resembling more the Bohemian, the latter the Polish. At an early period attempts seem to have been made to translate portions of the Bible into Wendish. In 1728 a version of the entire Scriptures in Upper Wendish appeared at Budissen, or Bautzen, in Upper Lusatia, which was followed by an emended edition in 1742, and a third edition in 1797. All these editions strictly follow the German version of Luther. With the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Dresden society published an edition of 3000 copies of the version of 1728 in 1817. For Lower Lusatia an edition was also published in 1818. New editions soon followed, and in 1860 an edition of 5000 copies, carefully revised by the Rev. Mr. Teschner, was published at Berlin.

11. Wendish-Hungarian Version. — A peculiar dialect of the Wendish is spoken by about 15,000 Protestant Slavonians in the Szala and other districts of Hungary. The New Test. has been translated for this race by Stephen Kuznico, or Kugmits, an edition of which has been printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society, together with a version of the Psalms by the Rev. Mr. Trplan.

12. Lettish or Livonian Version. — The maritime portion of Livonia bordering on the Baltic, and also part of Courland, are occupied by a small

nation to whom this dialect is vernacular. According to Dalton, their number amounted in 1870 to about 900,000 souls, of whom 150,000 belong to the Church of Rome and the remainder to the Lutheran Church. The Livonians are indebted for their version of the Bible to Ernest Glick, dean of the Lutheran Church in Livonia. He was a native of Saxony, and bestowed eight years upon this version. After it was revised by John Fischer, a German professor of divinity and general superintendent of Livonia, it was printed at the command and expense of Charles XI in 1689. This edition was so favorably received that a second was soon demanded, and in 1739 a second and revised edition, consisting of 9000 copies, was printed at Königsberg, the New Test. having previously been published at Riga in 1730. In 1815 another impression of the New Test., according to the received edition of Fischer, was printed by the Courland section of the St. Petersburg Bible Society at Mittau, consisting of 15,000 copies. Numerous copies of the Lettish Testament have also within a recent period been distributed in the province by the agency of the American Bible Society. An edition of 20,500 New Tests. was printed in 1854 at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1866 another edition, together with the Psalms, was issued, under the title *Ta Jauna Derriba muhsu Kunga Jesus Kristus jeb Deewa swehti wahrdi Kas pehz ta Kunga Jesus Kristus peedsimschanas no teem swehteem preezas-mahzitajeem un Apustuteem irr usrakstiti*. The seventieth report (1874) of the British and Foreign Bible Society stated that “a revision of the Lettish Scriptures is in progress, partly at the expense of the Livonian and Courland synods, the principal reviser being Prof. Bielenstein. The committee have ordered an edition of the New Test. according to this version. It is expected that the Old Test will also be revised shortly.” Altogether, the British and Foreign Bible Society had distributed up to March 30, 1878, 158,750 New Tests. with Psalms.

13. Lithuanian Version. — The Lithuanian dialect is now spoken only by the peasantry, Polish being the language of the middle and upper classes. It is interesting that the dialect used by the Protestant Lithuanians differs from that spoken by the Roman Catholic Lithuanians. This difference is not to be traced back to any confessional quarrel, but rather to territorial influences — the Lutherans and Reformed living more in the northern part (Kovno, Wilna, Courland), the Catholics more in the southern part (Poland). Hence Lithuanian proper is spoken by the former, while the latter use the Shamaitic or Samogitian dialect. *SEE SAMOGITIAN VERSION.*

The first translation into this dialect was made at the close of the 16th century by John Bretkuis, of Bammeln, near Friedland, and pastor of Labiau. He afterwards became pastor of the Lithuanian Church at Konigsberg, and there he commenced his version in 1579, which he completed in 1590. From the MS., which was deposited in the Royal Library at Konigsberg, the New Test. was printed at Strasburg in 1700, by order of Frederick I, king of Prussia. A new translation was undertaken by Rev. John Jacob Quandt, at the order of Frederick William, king of Prussia. The New Test. and the Psalms were completed in 1727, and the entire Bible in 1735, in which year it was also printed, with the title *Biblia, tai esti: Wissas szwentas rasztas, seno ir Naujo Testamento*. A second edition of the Bible, with Luther's German text, was published at Konigsberg in 1755. In 1806 the British and Foreign Bible Society was informed that, although the province of Lithuania possessed 74 churches and 460 schools, the people were almost destitute of the Scriptures. An edition of 3000 copies of the Bible was accordingly printed by the society at Konigsberg in 1816, which was followed by other issues. The New Test. now in circulation has the title *Naujas Testamentas musit Wieszpaties ir Iszganytojo lezaus Kristaus i sietuwiszckje Kalba iszwerstas*. Up to March 30, 1878, the British and Foreign Bible Society had distributed 13,000 Bibles and 53,111 New Tests. with the Psalms.

14. *Samogitian Version* (q.v.). See *The Bible of Every Land*; Dalton, *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*; but more especially the *Annual Reports* of the British and Foreign, Bible Society. (B.P.)

Sleep

(properly **ⵅⵓ**; **καθεύδω**) is taken in Scripture either (1) for the sleep or repose of the body (**<3005>**Jonah 1:5, 6; **<3008>**Psalms 4:8) or (2) the sleep of the soul, i.e. supineness, indolence, or stupid inactivity of the wicked (**<4511>**Romans 13:11, 12; **<4054>**Ephesians 5:14; **<4653>**1 Corinthians 15:34), whose “damnation slumbereth not” (**<3008>**2 Peter 2:3); or (3) for the sleep of death (**<2653>**Jeremiah 51:39; **<2702>**Daniel 12:2; **<3111>**John 11:11; **<4651>**1 Corinthians 15:51; **<3043>**1 Thessalonians 4:13, 14). **SEE DEATH**. The early Christians looked upon the death of the body as a sleep from which they should awake to inherit glory everlasting. In the Greek word *cemetery*, signifying *a sleeping place*, applied by them to the tomb, there is a manifest sense of hope and immortality, the result of Christianity. In the catacombs of Rome, where multitudes of the early Christians rest in hope, among the

inscriptions may be read, in a Latin dress, “Victorina Sleeps;” “Zoticus laid here to Sleep;” “The Sleeping place of Elpis;” “Gemella sleeps in Peace.” Emblems of their sure and certain hope of a resurrection abound; such as a vessel supporting a burning flame, and the palm branch and wreath; signifying victory over death. *SEE INSCRIPTIONS.*

The manner of sleeping in Eastern climates is very different from that in colder regions. The present usages appear to be the same as those of the ancient Jews. Beds of feathers are altogether unknown, and the Orientals generally lie exceedingly hard. Poor people who have no certain home, or when on a journey, or employed at a distance from their dwellings, sleep on mats, or wrapped in their outer garment, which, from its importance in this respect was forbidden to be retained in pledge over night (D’Arvieux, 3, 257; ^{<0021>}Genesis 9:21, 23; ^{<0226>}Exodus 22:26, 27; ^{<0342>}Deuteronomy 24:12, 13). Under peculiar circumstances a stone covered with some, folded cloth or piece of dress is often used for a pillow (^{<0281>}Genesis 28:11). The wealthy classes sleep on mattresses stuffed with wool or cotton, which are often no other than a quilt thickly padded, and are used either singly or one or more placed upon each other. A similar quilt of finer materials forms the coverlet in winter, and in summer a thin blanket suffices; but sometimes the convenient outer garment is used for the latter purpose, and was so among the Jews, as we learn from ^{<0913>}1 Samuel 19:13, where Michal covers with a cloak or mantle (corresponding to the modern *abba* or *hyk*) the im, age which was to represent her husband sleeping. *SEE BOLSTER.* The difference of use here is, that the poor *wrap themselves up* in it, and it forms their whole bed; whereas the rich employ it as *a covering* only. A pillow is placed upon the mattress, and over both, in good houses, is laid a sheet. The bolsters are more valuable than the mattresses, both in respect of their coverings, and material. They are, usually stuffed with cotton or other soft substance (^{<0318>}Ezekiel 13:18, 20); but instead of these, skins of goats or sheep appear to have been formerly used by the poorer classes and in the hardier ages. These skins were probably sewed up in the natural shape, like water skins, and stuffed with chaff or wool (^{<0913>}1 Samuel 19:13). *SEE PILLOW.*

It is evident that the ancient Jews, like the modern inhabitants of their land, seldom or never changed their dress on going to bed. Most people only divest themselves of their outer garment, and loosen the ligatures of the waist, excepting during the hottest part of the summer, when they sleep almost entirely unclad. *SEE COUCH.*

As the floors of the better sort of Eastern houses were of tile or plaster and were covered with mats or carpets, and as shoes were not worn on them, and the feet were washed, and no filthy habits of modern times prevailed, their floors seldom required sweeping or scrubbing; so that frequently the thick, coarse mattresses were thrown down at night to sleep upon (Hackett, *Illust. of Script.* p. 104). *SEE BEDCHAMBER*. The poorer people used skins for the same purpose, and frequently they had but a simple mattress, or a cloak, or a blanket, which probably also answered to wrap themselves in by day (^{<1226>}Exodus 22:26, 27; ^{<6242>}Deuteronomy 24:12, 13). Hence it was easy for the persons whom Jesus healed “to take up their beds and walk” (^{<4096>}Matthew 9:6; ^{<4019>}Mark 2:9; ^{<878>}John 5:8). *SEE BEDSTEAD*.

To be tormented in bed, where, men seek rest, is a symbol of great tribulation and anguish of body and mind (^{<8339>}Job 33:19; ^{<9403>}Psalm 41:3; ^{<2330>}Isaiah 28:20). *SEE BED*.

Sleeper, Joseph Jonathan,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Vincenttown, N.J., Jan. 24, 1793, and was converted Aug. 31, 1812, uniting with the Methodist Episcopal Church in Burlington. In 1823 he received a local preacher’s license, and in 1837 was admitted into the New Jersey Conference. In 1857 he took a supernumerary relation, in which, and that of a superannuate, he remained until his death in Pemberton, N.J., Feb. 27, 1873. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 25.

Sleepers, Seven, The.

SEE SEVEN SLEEPERS.

Sleidan (Originally Philipppson), Johann,

a celebrated historian of the Reformation in Germany, and an actor in the scenes he describes, was born in 1506 at Schleiden, in the present governmental district of Aix-la-Chapelle, Prussia, and educated at Liege and Cologne. At the age of eighteen he became private tutor to a son of count Mandersheid, in whose domain the village of Schleiden was situated, and in that capacity visited France, where he devoted himself to the study of jurisprudence and became licentiate of that faculty (at Orleans, 1525). Through the influence of cardinal John du Bellay of Paris, Sleidan was appointed by king Francis I interpreter to the embassy which attended the

diet at Hagenau in 1540; and in the following year the landgrave Philip of Hesse secured his appointment as messenger, interpreter, and historiographer to the Smalcald League (see Von Rummel, *Philipp d. Grossmiithige*, etc. [Giessen, 1830], 2, 439). It is evident, therefore, that Sleidan was by that time an adherent of the evangelical faith; and he soon afterwards proved himself a determined opponent of the Church of Rome by publishing two addresses, the one to the princes of the empire and the other to the emperor (*Orationes Dues* [Argent. 1544, and in German, 1567]). He also left the service of king Francis, and established his home permanently at Strasburg. In 1545 he published a Latin version of Philip Comines history of Louis XI and of the duke Charles of Burgundy; and in the same year he was instructed by the Smalcald League "to write a complete history of the renewed religion." He therefore began his famous work *De Statu Relig. et Reipubl. Carolo Quinto Cesare Commentarii*. He also, in that year, accompanied the Protestant embassy to England, in order to negotiate a peace with France, and on his return in 1546 he married Jola von Nidbruck, who bore him three daughters and lived with him in wedlock to her death, in 1555. In 1548 he published a Latin edition of Comines' Charles VIII, and in 1550 a *Summa Doctr. Platon. de Republica et Legibus* (Argent.), and a Latin edition of De Seysel on the French State and the duty of kings. He attended the Council of Trent in 1551 in the capacity of representative of the city of Strasburg, but was not received, and in 1552 he went to the camp of king Francis, near Saverne, for the purpose of inducing the king to modify his demands for the support of the army. In 1554 he visited the Conrent of Naumburg as the ambassador of Strasburg (Salig, *Hist. d. Augsb. Conf.* 1, 682; 2, 1043). The somewhat noted work *De Quatuor Summis Imperiis Libri Tres* (Argent. 1557) was probably written in the last year of the author's life. He died in 1556. Sleidan was characterized by frankness and a love for the truth. His style as an author was natural and easy, his Latin classical; his sources well chosen. His works accordingly commanded attention at an early period. and will always be important for the history of the Reformation. They were published in numerous editions, that of 1785 and 1786 (Frankfort-on-the-Main) being the best in German. See Dr. Theod. Paur, *J. Sleidan's Comment. uber d. Regierungszeit Karls V*, etc. (Leips. 1843), where a rich literature relating to Sleidan is given.

Sleipner,

in Norse mythology, was the famous eight-footed horse of Odin. *SEE SVADILFAR.*

Sleipnisfraendi,

in Norse mythology, was a surname of *Loke*, who assumed the form of a mare and enticed the steed Svadilfar away from his lord, afterwards giving birth to the eight-footed horse Sleipner (q.v.).

Slicer, Henry, D.D.,

a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Annapolis, Md., March 27, 1801. He joined the Church in Baltimore in his seventeenth year, and was licensed to preach in his twentieth year. He was received into the Baltimore Conference in 1822, and his appointments (from 1822 to 1874) may be thus classified: seven years on circuits; twenty years in stations; two years agent of the Metropolitan Church, Washington, D. C.; eight years chaplain of the Seamen's Union Bethel, Baltimore; and fifteen years as presiding elder. He was a member of eight General Conferences — namely, 1832, 1840, 1844, 1852, 1856, 1860, 1868, 1872. When the East Baltimore Conference was formed he became a member of it, and continued such until 1868, when he returned to the Baltimore Conference. He died April 23, 1874. Mr. Slicer was a man of vigorous intellect, self reliant and indefatigable. His ministry is an instructive example of devotion to primitive Methodist usage, of sympathy with judicious changes, and of punctilious discharge of official duties. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 16.

Slidrugtanni,

in Norse mythology, was a surname of the golden boar, *Gullin Bursti*, made by the dwarfs.

Slidur,

in Norse mythology, was one of the Elivogs, rivers which flow from the well Hoergelmer.

Slime

is the constant rendering in the A.V. of the Heb. **רמג** *echenmir*, the *hommar* of the Arabs, translated ἄσφαλτος by the Sept., and *bitumen* in the Vulg. That our translators understood by this word the substance now known as bitumen is evident from the following passages in Holland's Pliny (ed. 1634): "The very clammy *slime* Bitumen, which at certaine times of the yere floteth and swimmeth upon the lake of Sodom, called Asphaltites in Jury" (7, 15; vol. 1, p. 163). "The Bitumen whereof I speake is in some places in manner of a muddy *slime*; in others, very earth or mineral" (35, 15; vol. 2, p. 557).

The three instances in which it is mentioned in the Old Test. are abundantly illustrated by travelers and historians, ancient and modern. It is first spoken of as used for cement by the builders in the plain of Shinar, or Babylonia (^(**Q11B**)Genesis 11:3). The bitumen pits in the vale of Siddim are mentioned in the ancient fragment of Canaanitish history (14:10); and the ark of papyrus in which Moses was placed was made impervious to water by a coating of bitumen and pitch (^(**Q11B**)Exodus 2:3).

Herodotus (1, 179) tells us of the bitumen found at Is, a town of Babylonia, eight days' journey from Babylon. The captive Eretrians (Herod. 6, 119) were sent by Darius to collect asphaltum, salt, and oil at Ardericca, a place two hundred and ten stadia from Susa, in the district of Cissia. The town of Is was situated on a river or small stream of the same name which flowed into the Euphrates and carried down within the lumps of bitumen which were used in the building of Babylon. It is probably the bitumen springs of Is which are described in Strabo (16, 743).

Eratosthenes, whom he quotes, says that the liquid bitumen, which is called naphtha, is found in Susiana, and the dry in Babylonia. Of the latter there is a spring near the Euphrates, and when the river is flooded by the melting of the snow the spring also is filled and overflows into the river. The masses of bitumen thus produced are fit for buildings which are made of baked brick. Dioodrus Siculus. (2, 12) speaks of the abundance of bitumen in Babylonia. It proceeds from a spring, and is gathered by the people of the country, not only for building, but, when dry, for fuel instead of wood. Ammianus Marcellinus (23, 6, 23) tells us that Babylon was built with bitumen by Semiramis (comp. Pliny, 35, 51; Berosus, quoted by Josephus, *Ant.* 10, 11, 1; *Contra Apion.* 1, 19; Arrian, *Excp. A.* 7, 17, 1, etc.). The town of Is, mentioned by Herodotus, is, without doubt, the modern *Hit*, on

the west, or right, bank of the Euphrates, and four days' journey northwest, or rather west northwest, of Bagdad (Sir R. Ker Porter, *Trav.* 2, 361, ed. 1822). The principal bitumen pit at Hit, says Mr. Rich (*Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon*, p. 63, ed. 1815), has two sources, and is divided by a wall in the center, on one side of which the bitumen bubbles up, and on the other the oil of naphtha. Sir R. K. Porter (2, 315) observed "that bitumen was chiefly confined, by the Chaldmean builders, to the foundations and lower parts of their edifices, for the purpose of preventing the ill effects of water." "With regard to the use of bitumen," he adds, "I saw no vestige of it whatever on any remnant of building on the higher ascents, and therefore drier regions." This view is indirectly confirmed by Mr. Rich, who says that the tenacity of bitumen bears no proportion to that of mortar. The use of bitumen appears to have been confined to the Babylonians, for at Nineveh, Mr. Layard observes (*Nin. and Bab.* 2, 278), "Bitumen and reeds were not employed to cement the layers of bricks as at Babylon; although both materials are to be found in abundance in the immediate vicinity of the city." At Nimrud bitumen was found under a pavement (*ibid.* 1, 29), and "the sculpture rested simply upon the platform of sun-dried bricks without any other substructure, a mere layer of bitumen about an inch thick having been placed under the plinth" (*ibid.* p. 208). In his description of the firing of the bitumen pits at Nimrud by his Arabs, Mr. Layard falls into the language of our translators. "Tongues of flame and jets of gas, driven from the burning pit, shot through the murky canopy. As the fire brightened, a thousand fantastic forms of light played amid the smoke. To break the cindered crust and to bring fresh *slime* to the surface, the Arabs threw large stones into the spring. In an hour the bitumen was exhausted for the time, the dense smoke gradually died away, and the pale light of the moon again shone over the black *slime pits*" (*ibid.* p. 202). **SEE BABYLON.**

The bitumen of the Dead Sea is described by Strabo, Josephus, and Pliny. Strabo (16, 763) gives an account of the volcanic action by which the bottom of the sea was disturbed and the bitumen thrown to the surface. It was at first liquefied by the heat, and then changed into a thick, viscous substance by the cold water of the sea, on the surface of which it floated in lumps (βῶλοι). These lumps are described by Josephus (*War*, 4, 8, 4) as of the size and shape of a headless ox (comp. Pliny, 7, 13). The semi-liquid kind of bitumen is that which Pliny says is found in the Dead Sea, the earthy in Syria about Sidon. Liquid bitumen, such as the Zacynthian, the

Babylonian, and the Apolloniatic, he adds, is known by the Greeks by the name of pis-asphaltum (comp. ^{<1111>}Exodus 2:3, Sept.). He tells us, moreover, that it was used for cement. and that bronze vessels and statues and the heads of nails were covered with it (Pliny, 35:51). The bitumen pits by the Dead Sea are described by the monk Brocardus (*Descr. Terr. Sanct.* c. 7, in Ugolino, 6, 1044). The Arabs of the neighborhood have perpetuated the story of its formation as given by Strabo. "They say that it forms on the rocks in the depths of the sea, and by earthquakes or other submarine concussions is broken off in large masses and rises to the surface" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 336). They told Burckhardt a similar tale. "The asphaltum, *hommar*, which is collected by the Arabs of the western shore is said to come from a mountain which blocks up the passage along the eastern Ghor, and which is situated at about two hours south of Wady Mojeb. The Arabs pretend that it oozes up from fissures in the cliff, and collects in large pieces on the rock below, where the mass gradually increases and hardens until it is rent asunder by the heat of the sun with a loud explosion, and, falling:into the sea, is carried by the waves in considerable quantities to the opposite shores" (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 394). Dr. Thomson tells us that the Arabs still call these pits by the name *biaret hummar*, which strikingly resembles the Heb. *beeroth chemar* of ^{<1140>}Genesis 14:10 (*ut sup.*). **SEE SALT SEA.**

Strabo says that in Babylonia boats were made of wicker work and then covered with bitumen to keep out the water (16, 743). In the same way the ark of rushes or papyrus in which Moses was placed was plastered over with a mixture of bitumen and pitch or tar. Dr. Thomson remarks (p. 224): "This is doubly interesting, as it reveals the process by which they prepared the bitumen. The mineral, as found in this country, melts readily enough by itself; but then, when cold, it is as brittle as glass. It must be mixed with *tar* while melting, and in that way forms a hard, glossy wax perfectly impervious to water." We know from Strabo (16, 764) that the Egyptians used the bitumen of the Dead Sea in the process of embalming, and Pliny (6, 35) mentions a spring of the same mineral at Corambis in Ethiopia. **SEE BITUMEN.**

Sling

([| ḳ, *kela*; Sept. **σφεδόνη**; Vulg. *funda*), an implement which has in all ages been the favorite weapon of the shepherds of Syria (^{<1174>}1 Samuel 17:40), and hence was adopted by the Israelitish army as the most effective

weapon for light armed troops. The Benjamites were particularly expert in their use of it; even the left handed could “sling stones at a hair and not miss” (^{<0216>}Judges 20:16; comp. ^{<0312>}1 Chronicles 12:2). According to the Targum of Jonathan and the Syriac, it was the weapon of the Cherethites and Pelethites. It was advantageously used in attacking and defending towns (^{<0101>}2 Kings 3:25; Josephus, *War*, 4, 1, 3), and in skirmishing (*ibid.* 2, 17, 5). Other eastern nations availed themselves of it, as the Syrians (1 Macc. 9:11), who also invented a kind of artificial sling (1 Macc. 6:51), the Assyrians (^{<0007>}Judges 9:7; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 2, 344), the Egyptians (Wilkinson, 1, 357), and the Persians (Xenophon, *Anab.* 3, 3, 18). The construction of the weapon hardly needs description. It consisted of a couple of strings of sinew, or some fibrous substance, attached to a leathern receptacle for the stone in the center, which was termed the *kaph* (אֶכָּף), i.e. pan (^{<0229>}1 Samuel 25:29). The sling was swung once or twice round the head, and the stone was then discharged by letting go one of the strings. Sling stones (אֶבְנֵי אֶכָּף) were selected for their smoothness (^{<0174>}1 Samuel 17:40), and were recognized as one of the ordinary munitions of war (^{<0014>}2 Chronicles 26:14). In action the stones were either carried in a bag round the neck (^{<0174>}1 Samuel 17:40), or were heaped up at the feet of the combatant (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 2, 344). The violence with which the stone was projected supplied a vivid image of sudden and forcible removal (^{<0108>}Jeremiah 10:18). The rapidity of the whirling motion of the sling round the head was emblematic of inquietude (^{<0229>}1 Samuel 25:29, “the souls of thine enemies shall he *whirl round* in the midst of the pan of a sling”), while the sling stones represented the enemies of God (^{<0115>}Zechariah 9:15, “they shall tread under foot the sling stones”). The term *margemah* (מַרְגֵּמָה) in ^{<0108>}Proverbs 26:8 is of doubtful meaning. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1263) explains of “a heap of stones,” as in the margin of the A.V., the Sept.; Ewald and Hitzig, of “a sling,” as in the text. The simple weapon with which David killed the giant Philistine was the natural attendant of a shepherd, whose duty it was to keep at a distance and drive off anything attempting to molest his flocks. The sling would be familiar to all shepherds and keepers of sheep, and, therefore, the bold metaphor of Abigail has a natural propriety in the mouth of the wife of a man whose possessions in flocks were so great as those of Nabal (^{<0229>}1 Samuel 25:29).

Picture for Sling 1

Later in the monarchy, slingers formed part of the regular army (¹2 Kings 3:25), though it would seem that the slings there mentioned must have been more ponderous than in earlier times, and that those which could break down the fortifications of so strong a place as Kir-haraseth must have been more like the engines which king Uzziah contrived to “shoot great stones” (¹2 Chronicles 26:15). In ver. 14 of the same chapter we find an allusion (concealed in the A.V. by two interpolated words) to stones specially adapted for slings, “Uzziah prepared throughout all the host shields and spears, bows and sling stones.”

Picture for Sling 2

Shepherd life in Syria and Arabia affords peculiar facilities for the cultivation and acquirement of this art; and Burckhardt notes of the modern Bedawin that “the shepherds who tend flocks at a distance from the camp are armed with short lances, and also with slings, which they use very dexterously in throwing stones as large as a man’s fist” (*Notes on the Bed.* 1, 57). Thomson speaks of the extraordinary skill of the lads of Hasbeya with this weapon (*Land and Book*, 2, 372). In various other countries the use of the sling was much practiced in ancient times; the inhabitants of the Baleares (Majorca and Minorca) were particularly distinguished for it. **SEE ARMOR.**

Slith,

in Norse mythology, was one of the thirty-seven rivers of Hell, which rise in the well Hoergelmer, and flow around Niflheim.

Sloane Codex (Heb.).

This codex, formerly known as Kenn. 126, is now designated as *Sloane* 4708. It originally belonged to Da Costa of Amsterdam, and is now in the library of the British Museum. It contains the later prophets. It has no Masoretic notes; but the Keri, vowels, and accents have been added by a later hand. According to Heidenheim, this codex was written between the 6th and 8th centuries; but Strack says, “Hunc codicem esse antiquum libenter concedimus, minime vero plus undecim saecula eum habere demonstratum est, cum e sola literarum figura de librorum Hebraicorum aetate accurate concludi nequeat.” Whatever may be the age, the Sloane

codex contains a great many various readings as well as omissions. Thus, e.g., we notice:

- 2303> Isaiah 1:30, hyl [, V.D.H. hl [.
- 2306> Isaiah 2:6, ydl ykw, V.D.H. ydl ybw.
- 2306> Isaiah 3:6,!ydy, V.D.H.!dy.
- 2308> Isaiah 3:18, hwby rsys ynda rsys
- 2304> Isaiah 4:4, ynda hwby, V.D.H. ynda.
- 2305> Isaiah 6:5, ytpç amfµ [ytw omitted.
- 2374> Isaiah 7:14, hnh omitted.
- 2311> Isaiah 11:11, ynda omitted.
- 2370> Isaiah 17:10, ynwm[n, V.D.H., ynm:[n.
- 2301> Isaiah 20:1, ygrs omitted.
- 2351> Isaiah 25:11, hj çh omitted.
- 2370> Isaiah 27:9, bq[y omitted.
- 2308> Isaiah 51:18, hdl y rça, V.D.H. hrdy.
- 2351> Isaiah 53:11, hary and qydx omitted.
- 2302> Isaiah 56:2, yl l j m tbç rmwç omitted.
- 2307> Isaiah 56:7, tyb omitted.
- 2301> Isaiah 56:11, w[dy al µ y[d hmhw h[bç omitted.
- 2307> Isaiah 57:7, ç, V.D.H. tmç.
- 2375> Isaiah 57:15, bl omitted.
- 2378> Isaiah 57:18, wl omitted.
- 2300> Isaiah 60:10,!nwtrçy omitted.
- 2309> Isaiah 60:19,!l omitted.
- 2308> Isaiah 64:8, hn omitted.
- 2303> Isaiah 65:3, yta omitted.
- 2308> Isaiah 65:8, ydb[omitted.

These readings we have taken from Heidenhem's *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für englisch-theologische Forschung und Kritik*, where in 1, 268-274, 398-405, 553-562; 2, 73-79, the variations and omissions of this codex are noted down. See also Strack, *Prolegomena Critica* (Lips. 1873), p. 47. (B.P.)

Sloss, James Long,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in the parish of Bellaghy, County of Derry, Ireland, March 13, 1791. He enjoyed good opportunities for early education in his native country, emigrated to the United States with his father's family in 1803, and settled in Lexington, Va. He was apprenticed to the printer's trade for seven years; after this he pursued his studies under private instruction, at the same time teaching as an assistant, and completed his preparatory course for the ministry under the care of Rev. Dr. Moses Waddel, of Willington, S.C. He was licensed by the Presbytery of South Carolina Nov. 18, 1817; the next day received a commission as a missionary through portions of Georgia and the newly formed settlements of the then Alabama Territory; and was ordained Oct. 3, 1818. Subsequently he became pastor of the following charges: The Church at St. Stephens, Clarke Co., Ala., for three years; the three churches of Selma, Pleasant Valley, and Cahawba, three years; at Somerville, Morgan Co., six years; at Florence, Lauderdale Co., eleven years, where he died, Aug. 5, 1841. Mr. Sloss was a man of fine intellectual abilities — every exercise of his mind evincing a clear, logical, and discriminating judgment. As a pastor he had few, if any, equals, being always intensely devoted to the spiritual interests of his people. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4, 581. (J.L.S.)

Slovenian Version.

Slovenian is a South-Slavic dialect, spoken in parts of Styria, and in Carinthia, Carniola, Croatia, etc. In all the southern provinces of the present empire of Austria, the doctrines of the Reformation made rapid progress in the beginning of the 16th century. In 1599, according to a letter written by a Romish bishop to pope Paul V, only one fifth of the population of the capital city of Laybach was left to the Romish Church, and that small portion consisted mainly of the poor and ignorant. In 1572 primus Truber, once a Romish priest, afterwards a minister of the Gospel, completed the first translation of the New Test. into the Slovenian, which was published in 1577. In 1584 Truber's successor, George Dalmatin, published at Wittenberg the first entire Slovenian Bible, based on Luther's translation. In 1628 the empress of Austria peremptorily ordered "all non-Catholic gentlemen and farmers, and all nobles (male and female)," to leave the realm within the space of one year. This was the end of the Reformation in those parts, and Rome succeeded in putting out the light of

the glorious Gospel. The Slovenian language, never fully developed, but since then greatly neglected, has of late years revived in a remarkable degree. One sign of this revival appears in the translation into this dialect of the gospels of Matthew and Mark, which were printed in 1869. The Roman Catholic priests, who for the last two hundred years have had things all their own way, did certainly not look with a kindly eye on this small book; but the success which attended the circulation of these two gospels encouraged the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society to go on, and subsequently, in 1871, the remaining gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, forming together the first volume of the New Test., were added. As to the translation itself, and its effect, the sixty-seventh *Annual Report* (1871) of the British and Foreign Bible, Society states: It would be idle to set up a plea for perfection in a first translation; but the fruits of honest and competent criticism will be available for improvement in subsequent editions, which, it is hoped, may be speedily in demand. The appearance of the version has produced some consternation, and it is regarded as an uncomfortable sign that, after the Bible had been successfully suppressed for ages, it should again emerge in the 19th century clothed in the vernacular of the Slovenian race.” But the consternation thus produced seems to be without any effect upon the arduous and important task of rekindling this lamp of life; for not only is the New Test. almost complete, but the Psalms also are in preparation. That there is a great demand for this translation may be seen from the fact that from the publication of the parts of the New Test. up to March 30, 1878, 23, 500 copies had been disposed of. For this version comp. the *Annual Reports* of the British and Foreign Bible Society since 1869. (B.P.) **SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.**

Sluice

is in ^{<2910>}Isaiah 19:10 the improper rendering of the A.V. for **rkç**, *seker*, *hire* (“reward,” in ^{<0118>}Proverbs 11:18).

Sluyter, Richard,

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, born at Nassau, N.Y., 1787. He graduated at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1815, and became pastor at Claverack, Columbia Co., N.Y., from 1816 to 1843, when he died. He served also, in connection with his Claverack Church, one or two neighboring churches for some years. He was eminent as an

apostolic spirit, and for the numerous remarkable revivals that blessed his labors. In some of these the converts were numbered by hundreds. He wore himself out in the work. His memory, as a man of God, is still fresh in the hearts of the people of all that region, which was spiritually transformed by his labors." He had "a fine, and even martial, appearance, great conversational powers, energy, hopefulness, courage, simplicity, and generosity. He was an unusually excellent singer. He was incessantly visiting his people and talking about their souls. He was active, self denying, in the establishment of new churches, in whole or part formed out of his own. His death bed was a scene of great spiritual beauty and power." His *Memoir* was prepared by Rev. R.O. Currie, D.D. See Corwin, *Manual*, p. 209. (W.J.R.T.)

Smalbroke, Richard,

an English prelate, was born at Birmingham in 1672, and graduated from Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1694. He took his degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 1706 and of Doctor of Divinity in 1708. He was chaplain to archbishop Tenison, treasurer of Llandaff in 1712, and afterwards prebendary of Hereford. He was consecrated bishop of St. David's Feb. 2, 1723; whence he was translated to the see of Lichfield and Coventry Feb. 20, 1730. He died Dec. 12, 1749. He published, *Inquiry into the Authority of the Primitive Complutensian Edition of the New Test.* (Lond. 1722, 8vo): — *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's Conduct*: — and *Animadversions on the New Arian Reproved*. His great work was *A Vindication of our Savior's Miracles* (ibid. 1728, 8vo): — also *Sermons and Charges* (ibid. 1706-32). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Lardner, *Works*; *London Gent. Mag.* 75; Nichol, *Lit. Anec.*; Shaw, *Staffordshire*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smalcald, Articles of.

SEE ARTICLES OF SCHMALKALD.

Smalcald, League of.

SEE SCHMALKALD, LEAGUE OF.

Small, Arthur M.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Charleston, S.C. He was converted in early life, and, after an academical training in his native city, he graduated

at Oglethorpe University, Milledgeville, Ga.; studied theology in the Columbia Seminary, S.C.; was licensed by Charleston Presbytery in 1854, and ordained by Harmony Presbytery in 1857. He preached for some time at Liberty Hill, S.C., then two years at Tuskegee, Ala., and finally at Selma, in the bounds of South Alabama Presbytery. During one of the raids made by portions of the United States army in the suppression of the rebellion, the town of Selma was attacked, and, with others, Mr. Small Tallied to its defense, and was instantly killed in the fight, on April 2, 1865. Mr. Small's talents were of a high order. As a preacher of the Gospel, he was universally and greatly admired, always aiming to present its plain, simple truths with great distinctness. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 362. (J.L.S.)

Small, Samuel M.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born a slave in Maryland about 1803. He was converted when twenty-six, and in 1836 was taken to New Orleans, where, in 1850, he was licensed to preach by the Rev. (now bishop) N.H. M'Tyeire, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. During the war he was removed to Alabama, but returned to New Orleans when peace was restored. He was sent by the Rev. J.P. Newman as a missionary among the freedmen, and upon the organization of the Louisiana Conference in 1865 was admitted on trial. In 1871 he was granted a superannuated relation, and settled in East Feliciana Parish, where he died, Oct. 12, 1873. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 16; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Smalley, Elam, D.D.,

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Dartmouth, Mass., Oct. 27, 1805. He graduated at Brown University, Providence, R.I., studied theology privately, was licensed by the Mendon Congregational Association of Massachusetts, and ordained, June 17, 1829, as colleague with the Rev. Dr. Emmons, over the Church at Franklin, Mass. In 1838 he became pastor of Union Church, Worcester, Mass., and in 1854 of the Second Presbyterian Church, Troy, N.Y., as successor of the Rev. Charles Wadsworth. He died July 30, 1858. Dr. Smalley was a man of decided piety and ability, and was the author of *The Worcester Pulpit, with Notices Historical and Biographical* (Boston, 12mo). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist.*

Almanac, 1860, p. 78; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.L.S.)

Smalley, Henry,

a Baptist preacher, was born in Piscataway, N.J., Oct. 23, 1765, and was admitted by baptism to the communion of the Baptist Church there when about sixteen years old. He was educated first at Queen's College, New Brunswick, and then at Princeton, where he graduated in 1786. He was licensed to preach in 1788, and in 1790 he began to preach for the Cohalsey Baptist Church, Cumberland Co., N.J., and on Nov. 8 of the same year was ordained its pastor. In this charge he continued forty-nine years, until removed by death, Feb. 11, 1839. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6, 281.

Smalley, John, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., June 4, 1734; graduated at Yale College in 1756; studied theology under the Rev. Joseph Bellamy; was ordained pastor of the New Britain Society, Berlin, Conn., April 19, 1758; and died June 1, 1820. He was a distinguished theologian, and a faithful and successful preacher. He published, *Sermons on Natural and Moral Inability* (1769): — *Eternal, Salvation not a Just Debt* (1785), against John Murray: *Concio ad Clerum: At the Election* (1800): — *Sermons, on Connected Subjects* (1803): — *Sermons* (1814). See, Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 559.

Smalridge, George,

a learned English prelate, was born in Lichfield, Staffordshire, in 1663. He was sent to Westminster School in 1678 by Ashmole, the celebrated antiquary. In May, 1682, he was elected to Christ Church, Oxford, where, having taken his degree of B.A., he became tutor. In July, 1689, he entered holy orders, and about 1692 was appointed minister of Tothill Fields Chapel. In 1693 he was collated to a prebend in the cathedral of Lichfield. He was chosen lecturer of St. Dunstan's in the West, London, in 1708, which he resigned in 1711, when he was made one of the canons of Christ Church, and succeeded Atterbury in the deanery of Carlisle, as he did likewise in the deanery of Christ Church in 1713. In 1714 he was consecrated bishop of Bristol, and queen Anne soon after appointed him her lord-almoner, in which capacity he for some time served her successor,

George I. Refusing to sign the declaration which the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops in and about London had drawn up against the rebellion in 1715, he was removed from that place. He soon regained the favor of the princess of Wales, afterwards queen Caroline, who was his patron until his death, in 1719. He published, *Animadversions on the Eight Theses*, etc., in 1687, having for its full title *Church Government, Part V, a Relation of the English Reformation, : etc. : — Actio Davisiana* (1689, 4to): — *-Twelve Sermons* (1717, 8vo). Also *Sixty Sermons* published by his widow (1726 fol.; 2d ed. 1727; new ed. Oxf. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smaltz, John H.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Feb. 17, 1793. He enjoyed the advantages of an early religious training; graduated at Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J.; studied theology in the seminary in that place; was licensed by the Classis of New Brunswick, May 27, 1819; entered upon his work as a missionary in New Jersey, and for three years performed the toilsome duties of his calling. In 1822 he connected himself with the Presbyterian Church; was ordained by the Philadelphia Second Presbytery over the Third Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., and subsequently was settled in Germantown, Pa.; Frederick City, Md.; Trenton, N.J.; and Harrisburg, Pa. He died July 30, 1861. Mr. Smaltz was a plain, practical preacher, and conscientious in the discharge of all his duties. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 118. (J.L.S.)

Smara,

in Hindu mythology, is a surname of the love god, *Kamadeva*. **SEE KAMA.**

Smaragdus,

the name of several monkish writers in the Middle Ages.

1. An abbot of the Convent of St. Michael, in the diocese of Verdun, who was one of the most learned of Frankish theologians in the Carolingian period. He stood high in the regard of the emperor Charlemagne, as appears from the fact that in A.D. 810 he was associated with a commission to convey to pope Leo III the decisions of the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle of 809 with regard to the *Filioque* dispute, and served as its

secretary (comp. the record from his pen entitled *Acta Collationis Romanoë*, in Baronius, *Ann.* ad ann. 809, No. 54-63; Labbe, *Coll. Concil.* tom 7; and in Migne's complete ed. of Smaragdus [Paris, 1852], p. 971 sq.). Louis the Pious also esteemed Smaragdus highly, and not only gave donations and immunities to St. Michael's Convent (see the *Chartoe Ludovici... et Lotharii... pro Monast. S. Michaelis*, in Baluze, *Miscell.* lib. 4, and Migne, p. 975 sq.), but also constituted him one of the arbitrators in the quarrel of the abbot Ismund of Milan with his monks (see the *Epist. ad Ludov. August.* in Duchesne, *Script. Rer. Franc.* 2, 71 sq.). The year of Smaragdus's death is not known, though he does not seem to have outlived the king, Louis the Pious. His writings, now very largely accessible in Migne, as above, give evidence of considerable familiarity with patristical lore and of a pious and practical mind, somewhat influenced by the healthful and sober tendency of the Frankish-German theology of the time. There is, however, no sign of originality in them. His principal exegetical work the *Comment. s. Collect. in Evangel. et Epist.* etc. (1st ed. Strasburg, 1594) — is a mere compilation, without other method than the mere concatenation of opinions expressed by older writers, and without a definite adhesion to either historico-grammatical interpretation or excessive allegorizing. His second important work — *Expositio s. Comment. in Reg. S. Bened.* — is more independent. In it Smaragdus appears as a supporter of the strict principles of monastic reform advocated by his contemporary Benedict of Aniane. A similar tendency is displayed, in *Diadema Monachorum*, a collection of ascetic rules for the government of monks, compiled from the Church fathers. The *Via Regia* is essentially an extract from the last mentioned work. The above, with others of minor importance, are printed in Migne; and, together with certain unprinted manuscripts (concerning which, see Mabillon, *Annal.* p. 350 sq.), constitute all of the works of Smaragdus which have been preserved to us.

2. A friend and pupil of Benedict of Aniane, whose real name was *Ardo*. Having witnessed the death of Benedict, he was appointed to write his biography (see the work, *Vita S. Benedicti Anianensis*, in Mabillon, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* Saec. 4, pt. 1, p. 191 sq.; and Migne, pt. 103, p. 354 sq.). Smaragdus died in 843, aged sixty years.

3. The abbot of a monastery at Luneburg, Saxony, which was founded in 972 by the duke Hermann Billung, so that he could not belong to a period earlier than about A.D. 1000. Nothing is known with regard to literary labor performed by his hand, though he may be the author of a

Grammatica Major s. Comment. in Donatum, from which Mabillon gives citations (*Annal.* p. 358 sq.), and which is sometimes ascribed to Smaragdus No. 1. See D'Achery, *Spicileg.* 1, 238.

Smart, James P.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntingdon, Pa., July 14, 1814. He received a careful home training, graduated in Jefferson College, Pa., studied divinity in the Associate Seminary in Canonsburg, was licensed by the Chartiers Presbytery and ordained by the Miami Presbytery in 1839, and his first and only charge was Massey's Creek, O. Here he labored with true apostolic zeal and earnestness, and died Feb. 28, 1861. Mr. Smart was a man of vigorous mind and noble heart. He was for many years stated clerk of the Xenia Presbytery. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 235. (J.L.S.)

Smart, John G., D.D.,

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Huntingdon, Pa., Aug. 3, 1804. He graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1826, studied theology privately, was licensed by the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, Aug. 17, 1826, and ordained pastor of the Associate Church in Johnstown, N.Y., Nov. 5, 1829, where he continued to labor until 1837, when he removed to Baltimore, Md., and in 1838 was installed pastor of the Church in that city. This relation was dissolved in 1850, and he removed to Cambridge, N.Y., where he continued without a charge, but was engaged in preaching almost constantly in the many vacancies which occurred in the Presbytery of Cambridge, to which he belonged. He died July 8, 1862. Dr. Smart was a man of very superior mental power. He was well skilled in the languages, particularly the Latin, and while a student of theology edited the *Orations of Cicero* for Tower & Hogan, publishers in Philadelphia. His distinguishing characteristic was his acquaintance with the rules of Church order. Such was his reputation as an ecclesiastical disciplinarian that he was chosen by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church as chairman of the committee to draft a book of discipline. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 363; *The Evangelical Repository*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v. (J.L.S.)

Smectymnuus,

an answer to bishop Hall's remonstrance to Parliament in defense of his book *Episcopacy of Divine Right*. The name of the treatise is fictitious, made up of the initial letters of the authors, viz. Stephen Marshal, Edward Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcornen, and William Spurston. When the bishop replied to their book, these divines published a vindication of their answer to the *Humble Remonstrance*. This being an appeal to the legislature on both sides, may be supposed to contain the merits of the controversy. The debate was upon these two heads — (1) of the antiquity of liturgies, or forms of prayer; (2) of the apostolical institution of diocesan episcopacy.

Smell

(μ $v\beta$ or j yr] *fragrance*; $v\omega\beta$ *stench*). Jacob said to his sons, after the slaughter of the Shechemites (^{<0340>}Genesis 34:30), “Ye have troubled me, to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land” Ye have given me an ill scent, or smell among this people. The Israelites, in a similar manner, complained to Moses and Aaron (^{<0321>}Exodus 5:21), “The Lord look upon you, and judge, because you have made our savor to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants.” This manner of speaking occurs frequently in the Hebrew. In a contrary sense, Paul says (^{<0215>}2 Corinthians 2:15, 16), “We are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish; to the one we are the savor of death unto death, and to the other the savor of life unto life.” In the sacrifices of the old law, the smell of the burned offerings is represented in Scripture as agreeable to God (^{<0021>}Genesis 8:21), “And thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar; it is a burned offering unto the Lord; it is a sweet savor, an offering made by fire unto the Lord.” The same thing, by analogy, is said of prayer (^{<0312>}Psalms 141:2), “Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting-up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.” So John, in allusion to this service of the Old Test., represents the twenty-four elders with “golden, vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints” (^{<0618>}Revelation 5:8).

Smernitza,

in Slavic mythology, was an apparition whose coming always occasioned the decease of persons who were sick. The phantom was invisible to the

dying themselves, but neighbors might observe it skulking about and finally entering the house of the victim, whose fate was then inevitable. The spasmodic twitchings and the throat rattle of the last hour were evidences of the force which Smernitza employed to separate the soul from the body.

Smet, Hans Von Der Ketten,

son of the Dutch antiquarian of the same name, was born in Nimeguen about 1630, and was pastor at Alkmaer until 1684, when he received a call to Amsterdam, where he died May 23, 1710, leaving several religious works.

Smet, Peter John de,

a Roman Catholic missionary, was born in Dendermonde, Belgium, Dec. 31, 1801. He came to the United States in August, 1821; entered the Jesuit novitiate at Whitemarsh, Md.; went to Missouri in 1823, and aided in founding the University of St. Louis, in which he labored until 1838. He was then sent to found a mission among the Pottawattomies, afterwards laboring among the Flatheads and the Blackfeet. Taking a general superintendence of these missions, he traveled to collect money for them. He died in St. Louis, May 23, 1873. His principal works are, *Letters, Sketches, and Residence in the Rocky Mountains* (Phila. 1843, 12mo): — *Oregon Missions and Travels over the Rocky Mountains* (N.Y. 1847): — *Western Missions and Missionaries* (1863, 12mo): — *Reisen in den Felsengebirgen*, etc. (St. Louis, 1865). See *Appletons' Cyclop.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Smeton, Thomas,

a learned Scotch divine and educator, was born in Gask, near Perth, in 1536. He was educated at the University of St. Andrew's, and afterwards studied in Paris. He went to Rome, and entered the Society of Jesuits; but, going to Geneva, he was confirmed in his intention of leaving the Church of Rome. From Geneva he went to Paris, where he narrowly escaped the massacre. Arriving in London, he publicly renounced popery, and settled at Colchester, Essex, as a schoolmaster. In 1578 he returned to Scotland, joined Knox and the other Reformers, was appointed minister of Paisley and member of the General Assembly which met at Edinburgh the same year, and was chosen moderator in the Assembly of 1579. He was soon after made principal of the College of Glasgow, and died in 1583. His only

publication is entitled *Responsio ad Hamiltonii Dialogum* (Edinb. 1579, 8vo), a defense of the Presbyterians, to which is added *Eximii Viri Joannis Knoxii, Scoticanoe Ecclesioe Instauratoris*, etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smiglecius, Martin,

a learned Jesuit, was born in Poland in 1562. He entered the Society of Jesuits in Rome in 1581, and after making great progress in his studies was sent back to Poland, and taught philosophy at Wilna for four years and divinity for ten. He became rector of several colleges and superior of the convent at Cracow. He died July 26, 1618. He published many works against the Protestants, but his principal work is his *Logic* (Ingolst. 1618, 2 vols. 4to).

Smik,

in Lettish mythology, was a god of the Lithuanians, to whom they dedicated the first furrow turned up by the plough, and whatever should grow on it. To cross such a furrow was regarded as an insult to the god.

Smilax,

a young girl in Grecian mythology who tenderly loved Crocus. As their love was hopeless, the gods changed them into flowers bearing their respective names.

Smintheus,

in Grecian mythology, is a surname given to *Applo* in the Troad, from the town of Sminthe. It is derived, by some, from *sminthos*, a mouse.

Smite

(*hkn*; ‘*τύπτω*, etc.), *to stike*, is often used in Scripture for *to kill*. Thus David smote the Philistine, i.e. he killed Goliath. The Lord smote Nabal and Uzziah, i.e. he put them to death. To smite an army is to conquer it, to rout it entirely. To smite with the tongue is to load with injuries and reproaches, with scandalous reflections. To smite the thigh denotes indignation, trouble, astonishment (²⁴¹⁹Jeremiah 31:19).

Smith

(*vrj* ; *charash*), a workman in stone, wood, or metal, like the Lat. *faber*, but sometimes, more accurately defined by what follows, as *l zrbivrvj* ; a workman in iron, a smith; Sept. τέκτων, τέκτων σιδήρου, χαλκεύς, τεχνίτης; Vulg. *faber* and *faberfjrrari-us* (^{<0139>}1 Samuel 13:19; ^{<2342>}Isaiah 44:12; 54:16; ^{<1244>}2 Kings 24:14; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2). In ^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 24:12 “workers in iron and brass” are mentioned, The first smith mentioned in Scripture is Tubal-cain, whom some writers, arguing from the similarity of the names, identify with Vulcan (Gerh. Vossius, *De Orig. Idolol.* 1, 16). He is said to have been “an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron” (^{<0102>}Genesis 4:22), or, perhaps more properly, a whetter or sharpener of every instrument of copper or iron. So Montanus, “acuentem omne artificium eris et ferri;” Sept. σφυροκόπος χαλκεύς χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου; Vulg. “fuit malleator et faber in cuncta opera seris et ferri.” Josephus says that he first of all invented the art of making brass (*Ant.* 1, 2, 2). As the art of the smith is one of the first essentials to civilization, the mention of its founder was worthy of a place among the other fathers of inventions. So requisite was the trade of a smith in ancient warfare that conquerors removed these artisans from a vanquished nation, in order the more effectually to disable it. Thus the Philistines deprived the Hebrews of their smiths (^{<0139>}1 Samuel 13:19; comp. ^{<0188>}Judges 5:8). So Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, treated them in later times (^{<1244>}2 Kings 24:14; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2). With these instances the commentators compare the stipulation of Porsenna with the Roman people after the expulsion of their kings “Ne ferro, nisi in agricultura, uterentur” (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 31, 14). Cyrus treated the Lydians in the same manner (Herodotus, 1, 142). **SEE HANDICRAFT.**

rGsjh *masger, smith*, occurs in ^{<1244>}2 Kings 24:14, 16; Sept. συγκλείων; ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2; Vulg. *clusor*, or *inclusor*. Buxtorf gives “claustrarius, faber ferrarius.” The root *rgs*, to close, indicates artisans “with busy hammers closing rivets up,” which suits the context better than other renderings, as setters of precious stones, seal engravers, etc.:

In the New Test. we meet with Demetrius, “the silversmith,” at Ephesus, ἀργυροκόπος, “a worker in silver;” Vulg. *argentarius*; but the commentators are not agreed whether he was a manufacturer of small silver models of the Temple of Diana, ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς, or, at least, of the

chapel which contained the famous statue of the goddess, to be sold to foreigners, or used in private devotion, or taken with them by travelers as a safeguard; or whether he made large *coins* representing the temple and image. Beza, Scaliger, and others understand a coiner or mint master (see Kuinol, *ad loc.*). That the word may signify a *silver founder* is clear from the Sept. rendering of ^{<2462>}Jeremiah 6:29. From Plutarch (*Opp.* 9, 301, 473, ed. Reisk.) and Hesychius it appears that the word signifies any worker in silver or money. A *coppersmith* named Alexander is mentioned as an opponent of Paul (^{<5044>}2 Timothy 4:14).

Other Heb. terms substantially indicating the handicraft of a smith are: **ⲡⲓⲃ**, *lotesh*; Sept. **σφυροκόπος**; Vulg. *malleator*, a *hammerer* (A.V. “instructor”); a term applied to Tubal-cain in ^{<0042>}Genesis 4:22 (see Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 530, 755; Saalschutz, *Arch. Hebr.* 1, 143); and, **ⲗⲃ**, *holem*; Sept. **ὁ τύπτων**, *he that smites* (A.V. “smootheth”) the anvil (**ⲙⲓⲠⲓⲥⲟⲩ**, *incus*), ^{<2407>}Isaiah 41:7, A description of a smith’s workshop is given in Ecclus. 28:28. **SEE MECHANIC.**

Smith, Albert, D.D.,

a Congregational minister and teacher, was born in Milton, Vt., Feb. 15, 1804. In 1826 he went to Hartford, Conn., and began a course of study preparatory to entering upon the profession of the law. He soon after experienced a change of heart, which also brought a change in his views of life, and led him to turn his attention to the ministry. He graduated at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1831; also at Andover Theological Seminary in 1835; and in 1836, having been licensed by Andover Congregational Association, he was ordained by the Congregational Council, and became pastor of the Congregational Church at Williamstown, Mass. In 1839 he was called to the professorship of languages in Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., and in 1841 to the chair of rhetoric and oratory in his alma mater at Middlebury, Vt. In 1845 he returned to the ministry, and became pastor of the Church in Vernon, Conn., where he remained till 1854, when, compelled by declining health, he removed to Peru, Ind. In the summer of 1855 he was employed in Duquoin, in the southern part of Illinois, in the service of the Home Missionary Society; and in the fall of that year he settled at Monticello, Ill., where he died, April 24, 1863. Dr. Smith was a man of uncommon intellectual power. He was an accurate and eloquent writer, an acute and profound theologian, and a wise, faithful, and

affectionate pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 321; *Congregational Quarterly*, 1863, p. 349. (J.L.S.)

Smith, A.B.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born on Bell Creek, Fayette Co., West Va., June 13, 1829. He joined the Church in his thirteenth year. He was received into the West Virginia Conference in the spring of 1859, took a superannuated relation in 1862, but was ordained elder in 1863. He was made effective in 1868, but died in the spring of 1870. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 40.

Smith, Alexander J.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in South Carolina in 1831. He united with the Church when nine years of age, and was licensed to preach and admitted on trial in the Mississippi Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1855. After being ordained elder, he was located at his own request. He was admitted into the Arkansas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1869, and labored faithfully until his death, Feb. 2, 1875. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 158.

Smith, Alexander. L.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Marlborough District, S.C., Dec. 5, 1823, and was received into the South Carolina Conference in 1847. He remained effective for twenty years, supernumerary one year, and superannuated for nearly four years. He died in Spartanburg, S.C., Aug. 25, 1872. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch., South*, 1872, p. 671.

Smith, Amos,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Frederick County, Va., April 30; 1795, and professed conversion in 1811. He served as a soldier during the war of 1812, after which he studied in Asbury College, Baltimore. In 1820 he was admitted on trial into the Baltimore Conference, and thus commenced a long life of usefulness. He was ordained deacon Sept. 29, 1822, and elder April 10, 1825. In 1839 he was appointed to the office of presiding elder, but was compelled to resign, on account of ill health, in the winter of 1841-42. He became a member of the

East Baltimore Conference upon its formation in 1857, and in 1863 was a superannuate, continuing, however, to preach frequently. He died Jan. 20, 1868. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868, p. 29.

Smith, Anson C.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bridgewater, N.H., Dec. 20, 1810, and made profession of religion in 1831. He entered the ministry in 1834 as local preacher, and was admitted into the New Hampshire Conference in 1835, receiving ordination as deacon in 1837, and as elder in 1839. His health failed in 1859, and he died April 23, 1862. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1863, p. 103.

Smith, Archer B.,

a Baptist minister, was born in Georgetown, S.C., and graduated at Brown University in the class of 1828, and pursued his theological studies at Newton. His ministerial life was spent at the South, chiefly in Virginia, where he was highly respected. He died at his residence at Auburn Mills, Hanover Co., Va., Dec. 5, 1877. (J.C.S.)

Smith, Archibald G.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New York in 1826, and was admitted into full connection in the Rock River Conference in 1856. He sustained an effective relation for eleven years, and was superannuated four years. He died at Shell Bark, Butler Co., Ill., August, 1870. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 275.

Smith, Asa,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1800, and appointed to the Northumberland and Wyoming Circuit. He subsequently traveled Salem, Freehold, Gloucester, Bristol, Cecil, Chester, Bohemia, Kent, Dover, Queen Ann's, Lancaster, Northampton, Essex, Staten Island, Somerset, Snow Hill, Annapolis, Dorchester, Accomac, and Salisbury circuits, which terminated his active ministry. He died in April, 1847. Mr. Smith was abundant in labors, and was often denominated "a son of thunder." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4, 203.

Smith, Asa D., D.D., LL.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amherst, Mass., Sept. 21, 1804. At the age of seventeen, while living at Windsor, Vt., he was called by divine grace to a new life, and there he consecrated himself with all his characteristic earnestness to the service of Christ. The vows he then took he most sacredly kept, nor ever turned aside from the one great purpose God had wrought in his soul. He very soon commenced a preparatory study for the work of the ministry, and entered Dartmouth College in 1826. Here the traits of character which distinguished him in after life industry, energy, fidelity, and singleness of purpose to the one great object of his early consecration were made conspicuous. His remarkable power of extemporaneous speech drew to him the marked and admiring attention of the students. He ranked very high as a scholar, and was among the very first in his class; in some respects he had no superior. He was a decided Christian, and knew the secret, which so many fail to learn, of living a decidedly godly life at college. He never was more active, or accomplished more for the salvation of souls in his after life, than during his college course of four years. After leaving college he taught an academy one year in Maine. During that year the school was blessed with a revival of religion. From Maine he went to the Theological Seminary at Andover. After completing the course he was ordained to the ministry, and settled as pastor over a church in New York city, in which charge he continued for thirty years. While in that city he was associated with its leading men in all the public, benevolent, and religious movements of the time. His prominent position in the literary and religious world brought many applications for him to leave the pulpit for services in colleges and seminaries for which he was regarded as so eminently fitted. From the retirement of Dr. Lord from the presidency of Dartmouth College, attention was directed to him as his successor. He received a unanimous call from the trustees of the college, which, after prayerful deliberation, he accepted. Dr. Smith entered upon his work in the full maturity of life with all the fire and energy of youth. Endowed with every quality which the highest mental culture could give, and freighted with an experience rich in every department of literary, social, and religious life. he resolved to carry out the design of the founders of the college to impart a sanctified learning to all who should gain access to its halls. So thoroughly was he devoted to his great work that every moment was consecrated to the interests of the institution. He knew but one work, and every interest in which he took a part was made to

contribute to the welfare of the college. His life as a pastor was, as it were, acted over again, for, while his care extended to the temporal welfare of his flock, he was, if possible, more anxious about their salvation. He improved occasions to converse with them on the subject of religion, and prayed much for them, while he asked for them an interest in the prayers of others. Dr. Smith not only took an interest in the affairs of the college, but in all things that pertained to the welfare of the community. As a citizen he was public-spirited, always earnest for improvements, quite up to the means of securing them, always willing to bear his full share of labor or expense. No one in the community was more free, more generous in aid of every good cause, or more ready to contribute of his substance to those in need. By over-exertion his health became somewhat impaired and it was necessary for him to remain abroad during the winter and spring of 1870. With that exception he was rarely laid aside from labor during the thirteen years of his connection with the college. In November of the last year, near the close of the fall term, he was suddenly stricken down by acute disease, and from that blow he never fully recovered, nor had sufficient strength to attend to his official duties. Following the advice of his physician and his own judgment, he tendered, early in the winter, his resignation of the presidency. It was accepted with reluctance on the part of the trustees, but only when they saw there was no hope of his final recovery. He was grateful to God for having permitted him to render so long a service, and, though he could have wished it protracted, yet he was resigned to the divine will. During the last few days he was extremely weak, and at the close, without pain, he gently fell asleep in Jesus to enjoy the "rest that remains for the people of God," Aug. 17, 1877. Dr. Asa D. Smith was author of the following: *Letters to a Young Student*: — *A Memoir of Mrs. L. A. Leavitt*: — *Importance of a Scriptural Ministry*: — *A Discourse on the Life and Character of Charles Hall, D.D.*: — *The Puritan Church's Stewardship*: — *Beneficence our Life Work*: — *Two Baccalaureate Discourses*: — *Obedience to Heaven's Law*: — *Death Abolished*: — *Introduction to Pioneer American Missions in China*: — with numerous articles in the *American Theological Review* and *Biblical Repository*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Author's*, s.v. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Azariah, M.D.,

a minister of the Congregational Church, was born in Manlius, N.Y., Feb. 16, 1817. From a very early age he was kept at school; studying, in addition to the ordinary branches, algebra, Latin, and Greek. In the spring

of 1834 he entered the freshman class in Yale College. In 1835, during a revival, he was the subject of converting grace. Soon after his conversion he became interested in the subject of missions, and made his impressions known to Dr. Armstrong, one of the secretaries of the American Board. Immediately after graduation he went to Geneva, N.Y., where he pursued the study of medicine in the office of Prof. Spencer, attending six lectures a day. He engaged in Sunday school work and was secretary of the village Tract Society. In 1839 he went to Philadelphia, where he spent three months, enjoying, under the special favor of Prof. Hodge, access to the Pennsylvania Hospital and also to the dispensary and almshouse. In October he entered the Theological Seminary at New Haven. During the winter he kept up his medical as well as theological studies, and received from the medical school connected with the college the degree of M.D., Jan. 24, 1840. He also, day by day, attended the lectures of the law school on Blackstone's *Commentaries*. His was not a mere smattering; but his application was such that he thoroughly mastered what he undertook. On Aug. 30, 1842, he was ordained at Manlius, and he embarked for Western Asia in November following, arriving at Smyrna after a voyage of fifty-three days. After residing at Brusa and Constantinople for a few months, he proceeded to Trebizond, where he remained five months, spending the most of his time in studying Turkish and practicing medicine. In 1844 he visited Smyrna, Rhodes, Cyprus, and Beirut, and made a tour in the interior to Aleppo, Orfa, Diarbekir, and Mosul. He was at Mosul when Botta was disintombing one of the palaces of Nineveh; he also traveled for a time with Mr. Lavard. At Mosul it was his sorrowful privilege to attend the dying couch of the excellent Dr. Grant. This year he made a trying and dangerous tour in the mountain Nestorian districts of Kurdistan, going, through much peril, as far north as Julamerk, returning to Mosul, and thence to Alexandretta. In 1845 he traveled extensively after visiting Constantinople, including a visit to Trebizond and Erzerum, where he remained a year and a half. This year he was mobbed for affording protection to an Armenian priest who had fled to his house, but by his determined courage and perseverance the offenders were punished and damages were recovered from the Turkish government. His travels were extensive, and he often went many miles out of his way to administer medicine for the cholera at different missionary stations. What was so widely known and extensively used in this country in 1849 as "Dwight's Cholera Mixture" was his own preparation. Once he was attacked with this disease in the wilderness, his only attendant forsaking him through fear; but

after two days' suffering he recovered sufficiently to proceed on his journey. At length, in 1848, he arrived at Aintab, seventy miles north of Aleppo, which he made his missionary home. It had a population of Armenian Christians amounting to 12,000, twice that of the Mohammedan "residents a field large enough to wear out the most untiring energy. He returned to America the same year, was married, and went back to his field. Everything he knew, he knew thoroughly; and everything he did, it was with all his might. As the author of valuable papers on meteorology, Syrian antiquities, and natural history, published in the *American Journal of Science*, he at once took rank with the best scholars of his own land, thus confirming the declaration that "none have made richer contributions to the material of the naturalist and geographer than are being made by the missionaries of the Cross." He who lived and labored so faithfully for others was not forgotten by his Lord in the trying hour. When death came, June 3, 1851, it found him prepared. In the midst of painful struggles which amounted almost to agony, he uttered, in Turkish his last words — "Joy, joy! praise, praise!" (W.P.S.)

Smith, Bela,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1784, converted when about eighteen years of age, and admitted on trial by the New York Conference in 1809. In 1810 he was ordained deacon as a missionary to Canada; in 1811 admitted into full connection and appointed to Ulster Circuit. He was ordained, in 1812, elder, and appointed to Delaware Circuit; 1813, Newburg Circuit; 1814-15, New Windsor; 1816, Delaware; 1817, Schenectady; 1818, Albany; 1819, Pittsfield; 1820-21, Stratford. In 1822, owing to failing health, he took a superannuated relation, in which he continued to the termination of his life, July 2, 1848. He was a faithful and successful ambassador for Christ, and in all the relations of life he was highly valued and universally esteemed. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4, 223.

Smith, Benjamin A.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Warren Co., Ga., in 1813. He embraced religion in his seventeenth year and united with the Church. He was licensed to preach in 1848, and in 1849 was admitted into the Georgia Conference. His brief ministry was closed by

death June 13, 1850. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch., South*, 1851, p. 304.

Smith, Benjamin Coleman,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Windsor, Vt., May, 1800. He was educated in the Bloomfield Academy, N. J.; graduated at the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N.Y.; and was licensed by Windsor Congregational Association, Vt., and ordained by the same in 1836. He was chaplain of the state prison at Auburn for twelve years, agent for the Western Educational Society for two years, and in 1844 was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Prattsburgh, N.Y., by Bath Presbytery, which relation existed until 1859, when he was disabled by paralysis, and died Oct. 17, 1861. Mr. Smith was a good preacher, decidedly Calvinistic; an excellent pastor, a godly man. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 206. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Benjamin P.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Hardin County, Tenn., Oct. 28, 1830. He was brought into the Church in 1848, and admitted into the Tennessee Conference in 1857. During the year 1862 he enlisted in the Confederate army and was killed at Jackson, Tenn., July 13, 1863. "He was a man of sound judgment, deep piety, and a promising preacher." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch., South*, 1865, p. 545.

Smith, Caleb,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brookhaven, L.I., Dec. 29, 1723. He received good preparatory training, graduated at Yale College in 1743, remained at college for some time as a resident graduate, gave instruction in the languages at Elizabethtown, N.J., and at the same time studied theology under the direction of the Rev. Jonathan Dickinson. He was licensed to preach in April 1747, and was ordained and installed pastor of Newark Mountains (now Orange), N.J., Nov. 30, 1748. In 1750, shortly after his settlement in the ministry, he was appointed a trustee of the College of New Jersey and clerk of the board, and continued as such officer till the removal of the college to Princeton. After the death of president Edwards he was chosen president *pro tempore*, and for several months continued to discharge the duties of that important position with much dignity and ability. He was for many years stated clerk of the

presbytery, and usually conducted its correspondence. He died Oct. 22, 1762. Mr. Smith ranked among the more popular preachers of his day. His only publication was a *Sermon on the Death of Aaron Burr* (1757). *A Brief Account of his Life from his Diary*, etc., was published at Woodbridge, N.J. in 1763. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 146; Steam, *Hist. of First Church, Newark*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Carlos, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hopkinton, N.H., July 17, 1801. He was graduated at Union College in 1822. He became a teacher in Petersburg, Va., and in Thetford, Vt., going from the latter place to Catskill, N.Y., where he taught six years. He was ordained by Oneida Presbytery at Utica, N.Y., in 1832, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Manlins, N.Y. He remained in this charge four years, and then removed to Painesville, O where he was pastor eight years. He next took charge of the Massillon Church, O., where he continued three years. He then accepted a call to Tallmadge, O., and was pastor of that Church fourteen years. His next and last charge was Akron, O., where he remained eleven years, after which he was without charge. Dr. Smith died at Akron, April 22, 1877. He published, *Progress and Patience* (1847): — *God's Voice Misunderstood*: — *The Pulpit Theme* (1854): — *Eyes and No Eyes* (1855): — *Spiritualism, or the Bible a Sufficient Witness* (1856): — *God's Call to the Nation* (1861): — *The Memory of Our Noble Dead* (1864): — *Christ in the Bible* (1870): — *Selling of Intoxicating Drinks Immoral* (1872): *Roman and Grecian Civilization*: — *To Young Men* (1872): — *Value of a Good Man* (1873): — *Historical Discourse* (1875): — *An Adventure at Sea*: — and several minor articles. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Charles A., D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born, in the city of New York in 1809. He received a classical education in the Hartwick Seminary, and subsequently passed through a theological course. His early labors were in the Lutheran Church, and at the age of twenty-one he was ordained and installed pastor of the Palatine Church on the Mohawk River, west of Albany. After seven years' service he was called to take charge of a new Church enterprise in Baltimore, Md. While there he was a contributor to the *Southern Observer*, and in connection with Dr. J.G. Morris he prepared and published a

Popular Exposition of the Gospel in four volumes. He was next called to the rural parish of Wurtemberg and Rhinebeck on the Hudson, where he remained nine years, during which he conducted successfully several controversies in behalf of evangelical religion in opposition to a dead formality. Many, through his faithful ministrations, were brought to a saving knowledge of the truth. After this, he received a call to Christ Church, Easton, and after a few years of successful labor was called to St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia. Here he accepted a call to the Western Presbyterian Church in that city. In this Church he remained seven years, doing effective service. From this charge he was called to the Presbyterian Church at East Orange, N.J. After a successful pastorate of five years, he resigned his charge and returned to Philadelphia, where one of his sons, Rev. Henry A. Smith, has for a long time been pastor of a flourishing Presbyterian Church (Northminster), and another son, E.C. Smith, has for twelve years proved his excellent qualities as an educator as principal of Rugby Academy. Dr. Smith died in Philadelphia, Feb, 15, 1879. He was, in the judgment of those who knew him best, a man of rare attainments. He was frank, ingenuous, unpretending, and manly. His writings were numerous, and his style, especially in translations from the German and in his descriptive works, was remarkably happy. Among these works, besides those already mentioned, were a translation of *Krummnacher's Parables*: — *Illustrations of Faith*: — *Men of the Olden Time*: — *Familiar Talks about the Five Senses*: — *Among the Lilies*: — and last, perhaps best of all, *Stoneridge*, made up of pastoral sketches and scenes from his early ministry. His contributions to the periodical press were numerous. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Charles Mouzon,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born June 28, 1841, and joined the Church when he was sixteen. He was licensed to preach in 1859, and the same year entered the Georgia Conference. In 1862, because of the absence of his senior preacher, a chaplain in the Southern army, he was overtaxed, and was taken with a violent hemorrhage of the lungs. From this he never recovered. He was made a superannuate in, 1862, and died Oct. 9, 1863. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1863, p. 454.

Smith, Clark A.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Salem, Washington Co., N.Y., Dec. 3, 1810; converted Sept. 14, 1828; licensed to exhort in 1830, and as local preacher in 1835; received on trial soon after, and traveled Lawrenceville, Loyalsock, Chemung, Towanda, Fairport, and Millmont circuits. He died Sept. 13, 1844. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 643.

Smith, Cotton Mather,

a Congregational minister, was born in Suffield, Conn., Oct. 26, 1731, and graduated at Yale College in 1751. He studied theology under the direction of the Rev. T. Woodbridge, of Hatfield, but before his course was completed he took charge of a school among the Indians at Stockbridge. He resumed his theological studies at Hatfield, and was licensed to preach in 1753. He was installed pastor of the First Church, Sharon, Conn., Aug. 28, 1755. Mr. Smith served as chaplain in the campaign of general Schuyler in 1755. He preached his last sermon on the first Sunday in January, 1806, but lingered for several months, dying Nov. 27, 1806. He published single *Sermons* (1770, 1771, 1793). "Mr. Smith was not only a polished gentleman, and a discreet and affectionate pastor, but a devout and earnest Christian, and an instructive and animated preacher." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 500.

Smith, Daniel (1),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia in 1769. Although his early educational advantages were small, he had a great taste for knowledge, and acquired a considerable stock of useful information. He was admitted into the travelling connection in 1789, and in 1790 was appointed to Boston with Jesse Lee. In 1791 he was admitted into full connection by the conference. In 1794 Mr. Smith located, and continued in that relation till the close of his life. He settled in New York city, and engaged to some extent in secular business; but continued in the vigorous exercise of his ministry till the close of life. He died Oct. 23, 1815. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer Pulpit*, 7, 172.

Smith, Daniel (2),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Salisbury, Conn., Sept. 26, 1806. When nineteen years of age he was converted, and shortly after began to study at the Wilbraham Academy. In 1831 he was admitted on trial into the New York Conference. He labored on the Derby Circuit; at Sag Harbor; Winstead, Conn.; Forsyth Street, New York; Bridgeport, Reading, and Stratford, Conn.; Tarrytown; Seventh Street and Green Street, New York; and at Kingston, N.Y. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1848, and a reserve in 1852. He died June 23, 1852. He was a plain, practical, earnest preacher. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1853, p. 192.

Smith, Darius,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pittsford, N.Y., July 19, 1805, and united with the Church in April, 1827. He was licensed to preach in May, 1833, and in 1835 was received on trial by the Pittsburgh Conference. After laboring, with the exception of one year (superannuated), until 1874, he became superannuated, and died in Saybrook, O., May 12, 1875. He was at the time of his death a member of the Erie Conference. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 139.

Smith, David,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wilmington, Del., about the year 1772; graduated at Hampden Sidney College in 1791; studied theology privately; was licensed by Redstone Presbytery Nov. 14, 1792; was ordained and installed by the same presbytery as pastor of the congregations of George's Creek and the Tent in Fayette Co., Pa., Aug. 20, 1794, and of the congregations of Rehoboth and Roundhill. Westmoreland Co., in 1798, where he remained until his death, Aug. 24, 1803. Mr. Smith was a well-read divine, and an earnest and faithful preacher. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 280, note. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Eben,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lenox, Berkshire Co., Mass., July 18, 1774. His parents were religious persons, and members of the Baptist Church. He was converted at the age of thirteen years, was licensed to preach in 1801, began his itinerant labors in the Litchfield Circuit, Conn.

in November, 1803, was admitted on trial in the New York Conference in 1804, and appointed to Litchfield Circuit. He continued to fill appointments until 1819, when he was made presiding elder of the Hudson River District. In 1823 he was appointed presiding elder of the Saratoga District; in 1826 without an appointment; six of the years between 1827 and 1840 he held an effective relation and received appointments; seven of these years he was a supernumerary; and from 1840 until his death, May 18, 1844, he was superannuated. Mr. Smith was a member of the General Conference in the years 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824. He was a man of much zeal, diligence, and usefulness, and a great lover of Methodism. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 473; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 2, 305; 3, 33. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Edward,

an Irish prelate, was born in Lisburn, County of Antrim, in 1665, and was educated at the University of Dublin of which he was elected a fellow in 1684. In 1689 he went for safety to England, and was recommended and appointed chaplain to the factories of the Smyrna Company at Constantinople and Smyrna. In 1693 he returned to England, and was made chaplain to William III, whom he attended four years in Flanders. He was promoted to the deanery of St. Patrick's, Dublin, in 1695, and advanced to the bishopric of Down and Connor in 1699, being soon after admitted to the Privy Council. He died at Bath in October, 1720. In 1695 he was elected a member of the Royal Society of London, and contributed papers upon various subjects. He also printed four *Sermons*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Edward. Parmelee,

a Congregational minister, was born in South Britain, Conn., June 8, 1827. He graduated at Yale College in 1849, and went thereafter to Mobile, Ala., where he engaged in teaching, and continued in that occupation for three years, when he returned and entered the New Haven Theological Seminary. After remaining one year, he entered the Union Theological Seminary, which he left in 1854 for the Andover Theological Seminary, where he finished his somewhat erratic course. He was ordained and installed pastor of the Congregational Church in Pepperell, Mass., in 1856, and continued in this relation for six years, when he resigned and became field agent for the United States Christian Union, Philadelphia, Pa. In 1866

he became field agent for the American Missionary Association, and remained such until 1871, when he received the appointment from government of Indian agent in Minnesota. In 1873 he was appointed United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs. From the year last named he was president of Howard University, and continued such until 1876, when he took a voyage to Africa. He died at Accra, Western Africa, June 15, 1876, after a laborious and useful life spent in the service of God and his country. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Eli, D.D.,

an eminent scholar and missionary, was born in Northfield, Conn., Sept. 13, 1801. He graduated at Yale College in 1821, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1826. In May of the same year he embarked on his mission to the East, to take charge of the printing establishment of the American Board at Malta. In 1827 he went to Beirut to study Arabic, and in 1828 returned to his work at Malta. In 1829 he made a tour with Dr. Anderson through Greece, and in 1830-31, with Dr. Dwight, of Constantinople, through Armenia and Georgia to Persia, opening the way for the Nestorian mission at Urumiah. He returned to the United States in 1832, and embarked on his return to Syria in September, 1833. Mrs. Smith died at Smyrna, Sept. 30, 1836. Until 1841, with the exception of a second visit to the United States, he was actively engaged in missionary duty, and in the critical study of the Arabic language. Among other important services performed by him in this period was the production of a new and improved font of Arabic type, conformed to the calligraphy of a first-rate manuscript of the Koran, the types being made by Mr. Homan Hallock, the ingenious printer for the mission, from models prepared by Dr. Smith. The first font was cast by Tauchnitz, at Leipsic, under Dr. Smith's superintendence, and others of different sizes have since been cut and cast by Mr. Hallock in the United States. He resumed his missionary work in Syria in the summer of 1841. In the autumn of 1846 he commenced the translation of the Scriptures into the Arabic language. The importance of this work is seen in the fact that that language is spoken by more than sixty millions of the human family. After more than eight years of exhausting and incessant toil, he completed the New Test., the Pentateuch, the minor prophets from Hosea to Nahum, and the greater part of Isaiah. At this stage of the enterprise, he was called from the scene of his earthly labors to his heavenly reward. He died at Beirut on Sabbath, Jan. 11, 1857. Dr. Smith was a thorough scholar and a most laborious missionary. By his wise

counsels and practical and comprehensive views, he, independently of his labors as translator, tendered important service to the American Board, with the operations of which in the Levant he was identified for a quarter of a century. The value and completeness of Dr. E. Robinson's *Researches in Palestine* are largely due to Dr. Smith's cooperation. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Smith, Eli. Burnham, D.D.,

a distinguished minister of the Baptist denomination, was born in Shoreham, Vt., April 16, 1803, and was a graduate of Middlebury College in the class of 1823. He pursued his theological studies at Andover and Newton, Mass., where he was graduated in the class of 1826. He was ordained as pastor of the Baptist Church in Buffalo, N.Y., where he remained three years, and then was pastor at Poultney, Vt., for four years. He was elected president of the New Hampton Literary and Theological Institution (now Fairfax Institution) in 1833. Here he remained for nearly twenty-eight years — 1833-61. In this position he devoted himself with great zeal and self-denial to his work, and sent forth from the seminary under his charge a large number of ministers, who have done good service in the cause of Christ. President Smith died at Colchester, Vt., Jan. 5, 1861. (J.C.S.)

Smith, Elijah,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newport, N.Y., Sept. 4, 1797. He united with the Church in 1820, and in 1832 was admitted on trial into the Oneida Conference. His effective ministry closed in 1855. He was a member of the Black River Conference at the time of his death, which occurred in Le Roy, N.Y., Sept. 30, 1870. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 144.

Smith, Ethan,

a Congregational minister, was born Dec. 19, 1762, in Belchertown, Mass. He learned the shoemaker's trade, and entered the army in 1780; but after leaving it was converted and determined to preach. Having prepared for college, he entered Dartmouth, and graduated in 1790. He was ordained pastor at Haverhill, N.H., early in 1791, where he remained until 1799, when he was settled in Hopkinton, which place he left in 1818 and became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Hebron, N.Y. From the latter place he

went to Poultney, Vt., and remained five years as pastor of the Congregational Church, when he went to Hanover, Mass., but left in a short time, and was appointed city missionary in Boston. He died in Boylston, Mass., Aug. 29, 1849. He published, *A Dissertation on the Prophecies* (1809): — *A Key to the Figurative Language of the Prophecies* (1814): — *A View of the Trinity, Designed as an Answer to Noah Worcester's Bible News* (1824): — *A View of the Hebrews, Designed to Prove, among other Things, that the Aborigines of America are Descended from the Ten Tribes of Israel* (1825): — *Memoirs of Mrs. Abigail Bailey*: — *Four Lectures on the Subject and Mode of Baptism*: — *A Key to the Revelation* (1833): — *Prophetic Catechism to Lead to the Study of the Prophetic Scriptures* (1839): — and a number of occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 296.

Smith, Fieldon M.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Hodgenville, Hardin Co., Ky., June 16, 1833, but removed to Warren Co., Ill., with his father in 1840. He joined the Church Jan. 5, 1851, and was licensed to preach in the conference year 1853-54. He was received on trial by the Rock River Conference in September, 1854, and was ordained deacon at the first session of the Central Illinois Conference in 1856, and elder in 1858. He was superannuated in 1862, but became effective in 1864, and so continued until his death, in Avon, Ill., Dec. 20, 1868. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868, p. 285.

Smith, Francis,

a Baptist minister, was born in Wakefield, Mass., July 12, 1812, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1837, and of the Newton Theological Institution in the class of 1840. He was ordained in Providence, R.I., as pastor of the Fourth Baptist Church, and remained there thirteen years — 1841-54. He supplied the Baptist Church in Rutland, Vt., for some time, and then accepted an appointment as district secretary of the American Baptist Publication Society. Having resigned this position, he acted for some time as missionary of the Rhode Island State Convention. He died in Providence, Jan. 29, 1872. (J.C.S.)

Smith, Friend W.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Lenox, Bucks Co.; Mass., Dec. 4, 1799. He entered the ministry in 1821, and continued to perform efficient service until the day before his semi-centennial conference, when he suddenly died, April 4, 1871. Mr. Smith was attractive and useful in his services, even to the last. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 102.

Smith, Gad,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Goshen, Litchfield Co., Conn., in 1788; converted in 1807; approved of as an exhorter in 1810; licensed as a local preacher in 1811; received into the itinerancy on trial in June, 1812, and into full connection in 1814, and was stationed as follows: Middletown Circuit; Litchfield Circuit, 1812; New Haven, 1813-14; Hotchkissville, 1815. He died Sept. 24, 1817. He was a man of deep piety, good natural and acquired abilities, and sound and acceptable preaching talents. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 309; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 4, 324; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 3, 79.

Smith, Gad N.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sharon, Litchfield Co., Conn., Dec. 25, 1812; converted in his eighteenth year; received on trial in the New York Conference in June, 1836, and was appointed to Wethersfield Circuit. He subsequently preached at Litchfield in 1837-38; in Burlington Circuit in 1839-40; at Norwalk, Conn., in 1841; supernumerary in 1842; at Sullivan Street Church, New York, in 1843; at Seventh Street Church, New York, in 1845, where he died, Oct. 22 of the same year. Mr. Smith, as a man, was amiable, modest, and unassuming in manners. His preaching was solid and instructive. As a pastor he excelled, always faithful to the personal interests of every one of his flock. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4, 30.

Smith, George (1),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Litchfield, Conn., in 1801. Of Presbyterian parentage, he, nevertheless, joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in Chenango County, N.Y., in November, 1817. He joined the Pittsburgh Conference in 1832, and was

ordained deacon in 1834 and elder in 1836. He afterwards went West and joined the Missouri Conference. He died Sept. 1, 1872. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1872, p. 737.

Smith, George (2),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Hampshire Co., Va., in 1810, but was removed in early life to Ohio. In 1830 he was licensed as a local preacher, and joined the Ohio Conference in 1833. He was ordained deacon in 1835 and elder in 1836, at the first session of the Detroit Conference. He served the Church thirty-five years, twenty-two as presiding elder, and died May 4, 1868. He was a member of the General Conference of 1844. He was a man of sound judgment, comprehensive views, and eminently earnest and practical as a preacher. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868, p. 175.

Smith, George R.W.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Lincoln Co., Ga., Aug. 8, 1820; converted in October, 1832; licensed to exhort in 1838, and as local preacher in 1839. He was received on trial in the Alabama Conference in January, 1840, and sent to the Tombigbee Circuit; in 1841, the Coosa Circuit. In 1842 he was received into full connection and sent to Pensacola; in 1843 to Apalachicola, where he organized a Church and began the building of a house of worship. He died April 16, 1843. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 462.

Smith, George W.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Nelson, Madison Co., N.Y., in August, 1816, and was licensed to preach in 1854. In 1855 he entered the Oneida Conference; was superannuated in 1858 and made effective in 1859; was appointed in 1863 to the Oneida Indian Mission, and labored efficiently until 1872, when he was granted a superannuated relation, being at the time a member of the Central New York Conference. He died May 12, 1873. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 130.

Smith, Giles Chapman,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union District, S.C., July 9, 1805. When four years of age his parents settled in Wayne

Co., Ind. He studied one year in Harpeth Academy, Tenn., and graduated at Columbia (now Jackson) University April 3, 1830. His conversion took place while at college, and his ministry was spent in the Indiana and afterwards in the Southeastern Indiana Conference. In 1865 ill health compelled him to take a superannuated relation, and he made his home in Brownstown, Ind., where he resided until his death, April 12, 1870. He represented his conference in the General Conference in 1864. His writings were published in the periodicals of the day. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 192.

Smith, Griffin,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Upper Canada May 14, 1814. Previous to his conversion he was a practicing physician, but was admitted to the ministry by the Genesee Conference in October, 1853. In 1866 he took a superannuated relation, but in 1867 accepted an appointment in Scottsville, Monroe County, N.Y. Here he died April 29, 1868. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868, p. 273.

Smith, Harvey S.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Monkton, Vt., in 1820. He was received on trial in the Troy Conference in 1843, and labored faithfully wherever appointed. His work, however, was short, for death overtook him at the early age of thirty-five years. He died in Albany, April 8, 1855. Mr. Smith was deeply pious, an industrious student and a devoted pastor. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1855, p. 539.

Smith, Henry (1),

an English clergyman, was born in Withcock, Leicestershire, in 1550, and after pursuing his studies at Oxford entered the Church. His scruples, however, as to subscriptions and ceremonies were such that he resolved not to undertake a pastoral charge, but accepted the office of lecturer of the Church of St. Clement Danes, London. The circumstances of his death are unknown; Fuller thinks that he died about 1600, Wood in 1593. Granger says that "he was called the Silver-tongued Preacher." His sermons and treatises, published at various times about the close of the 16th century, were collected in one volume, 4to, in 1675, with a life of the author by Fuller. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Henry (2),

a veteran minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Frederick City, Md., April 23, 1769. He was admitted into the Church as a seeker of religion in 1790, and soon after experienced a change of heart. In August, 1793, he was licensed to preach, and in the following October was admitted on trial into the conference held in Baltimore. For about ten years he labored in Western Virginia, Kentucky, and the Northwest, in the face of dangers, loss, and extreme hardships. Mr. Smith was actively employed in the work of a travelling preacher forty-two years. In 1835 he took a superannuated relation, and settled in Hookstown, Baltimore Co., Md., where he continued to reside until his death, Dec. 7, 1862. Mr. Smith published an autobiography, *An Old Itinerant Preacher* (New York, 12mo). See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1863, p. 17.

Smith, Henry Boynton, D.D., LL.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian minister and educator, was born in Portland, Me., Nov. 21, 1815. He graduated at Bowdoin College in 1834, and remained as tutor in the same for some time. He prosecuted his theological studies at Bangor and at the Andover Theological Seminary. Desiring to pursue them still further, he went to Halle and Berlin, Germany. Here he developed his peculiarly Germanic conception of scholarship in the breadth of scope, and that critical accuracy, that patient and laborious research of study, which marked him so strongly even among the conspicuous American students of that day. In 1842 he became pastor of the Congregational Church at West Amesbury, Mass., which position he held for five years, enjoying happy and affectionate relations with the congregation. Two years from the above time, he filled the chair of Hebrew in the Andover Seminary in connection with his pastoral duties. In 1847 he accepted the professorship of mental and moral philosophy in Amherst College, whence, after a service of three years, he went, at the anxious solicitation of Dr. Adams and the trustees and faculty, to the Union Theological Seminary, New York city. He was called originally to the professorship of Church history, but it was subsequently exchanged for the chair of systematic theology in 1855, which he held until 1873, a period of eighteen years, when, broken down by unremitting toil, he retired from the chair, but was still retained in connection with the faculty as emeritus professor of apologetics until his death, Feb. 7, 1877. In speaking of himself he said, "My life has been given to the seinary," and it may be added that it was characterized by a lucid

intensity. To strangers he seemed distant and unapproachable. He was not in any sense of the word magnetic; yet though he did not seem to draw, he never repelled. He took a deep and abiding interest in the students, and held them “with hooks of steel.” He was punctual in his attendance at church, being latterly a member of Dr. Prentiss’s Church of the Covenant, which he was principally instrumental in organizing in 1862, where on Sabbath and at the week day prayer meetings he was always found, taking an active part when his health would permit. His piety was of a pure, deep, and even kind. He entered into the discussions of the higher judicatories of the Church. In all matters of Church polity he was at home, and in the discussions relating to the contemplated reunion of the New and Old School branches of the Church he took an active interest. As moderator of the New-school General Assembly in 1864, his utterances on Christian union were in the highest degree impressive, and conduced greatly to bring about the happy result which four years later was so successfully accomplished. As a delegate to the General Assembly in 1867 his sound sense as well as modesty was made apparent. On the presentation of the plan of reunion there wanted but a few lines to bind it stronger, and the two lines offered by Prof. Smith and sent up to the Assembly of 1868 became one of the strongest strands of the bond of union. The words were, “It being understood that this confession is received in its proper — that is, historical — *Calvinistic or Reformed sense*.” Dr. Jessup, writing from Beirut in 1877, thus speaks of a visit made by Prof. Smith to Syria a few years before: “As I write there rises a vision before my mind of two of the Lord’s eminent saints who met on yonder heights of Lebanon, and are now walking the golden streets in the New Jerusalem. I refer to Simeon B. Calhoun and Henry B. Smith. When Profs. Smith, Park, and Hitchcock visited this land a few years ago, they came up to Abeih, on Mt. Lebanon, to meet Mr. Calhoun. Prof. Smith was my guest, and it was a rich treat to me to have a visit from my old teacher. At the time of my graduation in 1855, our class invited him to a social gathering one evening. He made a brief address, but so sententious that it seemed apostolic. He said, ‘When I went to Germany, I passed through an intense struggle with rationalistic doubt and unbelief. But in the midst of it all there came before me a vision of Christ, so distinct, so sweet — of Christ as a Person, a living, divine, and human Savior — that all shadows were driven away, and I never doubted more. This vision of Christ we all must have. No man can be a true and living Christian until he has had this vision of a living Christ.’ The whole sentiment and substance of his theological lectures was permeated

with this glorious conception of Christ. He seemed to lift up his pupils to the same high plane on which he himself stood. It brings heaven nearer to think that such men as Calhoun and Smith are actually *there*, for heaven seemed to be in them while they were here." In the April number, 1877, of the *Princeton Review* is an editorial by Dr. Atwater on Prof. Smith, who was his colleague in the conduct of the *Review* for a period of nine years. This noble tribute is followed by one from Dr. Sherwood. It contains a reminiscence of Prof. Smith's labors as an editor of the *Review*, and the largest contributor to its columns. It contains a list of the titles of all his contributions to the several *Reviews* with which he was connected and the date of their appearance, making five pages of the *Review*. The record will prove of special interest to many who may wish to read or reread the always interesting, and often elaborate and powerful, productions of his pen. He bequeathed his large and valuable library to the Union Seminary. Dr. Smith's principal publications are as follows: *The Relations of Faith and Philosophy: — Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History: — Problem of the Philosophy of History: — The Reformed Churches of Europe and America in Relation to General Church History: — The Idea of Christian Theology as a System; an Argument for Christian Colleges: — History of the Church of Christ: — Chronological Tables: — A Synchronic View of the Events, Characters, and Culture of each Period, including the History of Polity, Worship, Literature, and Doctrines, together with a Supplementary Table on the Church in America, and an Appendix containing the Series of Councils, Popes, Patriarchs, and other Bishops, and a Full Index*, making matter for four large volumes of print: — *A Translation of Dr. Gieseler's Textbook of Church History: — Translation of Dr. Hagenbach's Christian Doctrines: — A Discourse on Christian Union and Ecclesiastical Reunion before the General Assembly of 1864: — State of Religion in the United States in a Report made to the Evangelical Alliance: — Numerous contributions to the American Theological Review and to the Bibliotheca Sacra. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (W. P.S.)*

Smith, Henry F.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Dec. 21, 1818, and entered the Florida Conference in 1857. He died in Ocola, Marion Co., Fla., June 12, 1864. He was a Christian of deep and ardent piety, and an excellent preacher. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Ch., South*, 1864, p. 521.

Smith, Henry H.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Benson, Vt., in 1801; and at the age of fifteen joined the Congregational Church. He prepared for college; but relinquished his studies because of failing health, and engaged in teaching and the study of medicine. In 1834 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, was licensed to exhort, and in 1835 joined the New England Conference on trial, and was ordained deacon in 1837. He became a member of the Providence Conference at its formation, laboring until 1870, when he superannuated. He died in South Yarmouth, Mass., Jan. 30, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 71.

Smith, Henry Ryan,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Canada, April 29, 1812. He was converted at an early age, and commenced to preach when about nineteen. At the age of twenty-six he entered the Genesee Conference; and his ministerial life was interrupted by but one year's superannuation (1847). He died at Wilson, N.Y., April 29, 1873. Before coming to the United States, Mr. Smith occupied an honorable position in his Conference in Canada, filling the two previous years one of the chief pulpits in Hamilton, Canada. He was a man of positive Christian conviction and masterly in his preaching. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 111.

Smith, Hervey,

a Congregational minister, was born in Granby, Mass., Sept. 19, 1793. He pursued his preparatory studies with Rev. Enoch Hale, of West Hampton; entered Williams College, and graduated in 1819, and studied theology with Mr. Hale and Rev. Moses Hallock, of Plainfield, Mass. He was ordained and installed over the First Church in Stafford, Conn., Oct. 9, 1822, and remained pastor of this Church eight years. He was called to the Feeding Hills Church, West Springfield, Mass., where he remained three years, and was installed pastor of Ireland Parish, now Holyoke, continuing such for eight years. He was without charge while residing at Granby, East: Hampton, and West Hampton until his death, June 4, 1877. For several years he was secretary of Hampden County Home Missionary Society. He published two *Sermons*, one preached after the death of his wife, and the other after the death of his only daughter. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Hezekiah, D.D.,

a Baptist minister, was born on Long Island, N.Y., April 21, 1737, and joined the Baptist Church in New York city in his nineteenth year. He began his education at Hopewell Academy, N.J., and graduated from Princeton in 1762. He was ordained in Charleston, S.C., where he preached until the spring of 1764, when he went to New England. He organized the First Baptist Church in Haverill, Mass., May 9, 1765; and was recognized as its pastor Nov. 12, 1766. In 1776 Mr. Smith was appointed chaplain in the American army, and continued to serve until the close of the war. He greatly assisted in the establishment and prosperity of Brown University, and continued to be pastor of the First Church, Haverill, for forty years, when, after preaching from ~~John~~ John 12:24, he was smitten with paralysis, and died, after a week's illness, Jan. 22, 1805. Dr. Smith was a man of commanding presence and winning manners, and was strictly evangelical. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6, 97.

Smith, Hugh, D.D.,

an Episcopal clergyman, was born near Fort Hamilton, L.I., Aug 29, 1795. He was trained for college at the Flatbush Academy; and, graduating from Columbia College, New York, in 1813, he pursued his theological studies under bishop Hobart, from whom he received deacon's orders in 1816 and priest's orders in 1819. In April 1817, he was appointed by Dr. Brown his assistant in Grace Church, and in the same year accepted the rectorship of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn. In 1819 he became rector of the Episcopal Church in Augusta, Ga. Resigning this charge in 1831, he returned to the North, and was called to the rectorship of Christ Church, Hartford, Conn., where he remained till 1833, when he became missionary of the Church of the Holy Evangelist in New York. St. Peter's Church, his last parish, was offered to him in 1836; and in the same year he became professor of Pastoral Theology and Pulpit Eloquence in the General Theological Seminary, New York.. He died in the St. Peter's rectory, March 25 1849. Dr. Smith published, *The Heart Delineated in its State of Nature, and as Renewed by Grace* (1834, 12mo): — also *Sermons* (1827, 1835). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5, 605.

Smith, Isaac (1),

an eminent early minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Kent Co., Va., Aug. 17, 1758. He had few early educational

advantages; and at the age of thirteen was apprenticed to a house carpenter. Previous to the Declaration of Independence he enlisted as a volunteer, and was for more than four years in active service; and received an honorable discharge at Goshen, N.Y., in August, 1779. At the age of twenty-five he made a public profession of faith, and immediately began to labor as exhorter; and in April, 1784, he was admitted to the travelling connection, on trial, in Virginia, and traveled that year the Salisbury Circuit, N.C.; Tar River Circuit in 1785; Charleston, S.C., in 1786; Santee Circuit in 1787; Edisto Circuit in 1789; Charleston in 1790; Broad River in 1791; Santee Circuit in 1792. He was presiding elder from 1793 to 1795. In 1796 he retired from active work on account of ill health, took a location, and went into the mercantile business. He made his residence at Camden, S.C., where he remained twenty-four years, when (1820) he was readmitted to the Conference. In 1822 he was appointed missionary to the Creek Indians, and remained among them five years. He took a superannuated relation in 1827, left the Creek Nation in February, 1828, and went to Mississippi, where he labored two or three years. He died in Monroe County, Ga., Jul 20, 1834. Mr. Smith was a man of sterling Christian character, and of a sweet and loving disposition. Believing every word of God, meek above the reach of provocation, and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of love and devotion, he was a saint indeed. As a preacher he was earnest in manner, and concise and energetic in language. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7, 102; *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 2, 346; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 2, 140; 3, 57, 384; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Smith, Isaac (2),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Wilmington, Vt., Nov. 1, 1817. He first joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, but relapsed into a backslidden state. At the age of twenty-one was reclaimed and united with the Baptist Church. He was educated at Oberlin, and at Newbury Seminary, Vt. While in the latter institution he reunited himself with the Methodist Church, and was licensed to preach. In 1843 he joined the New Hampshire Conference, and at its division became a member of the Vermont Conference. In 1852 he was transferred to the New England Conference, in which he continued to render effective service until a few months previous to his death, in Chicopee, Mass., July 16, 1860. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1861, p. 54.

Smith, Israel Bryant,

a Presbyterian minister, was born at West Hills or Huntington, Long Island, Sept. 12, 1822. At an early age his father removed to New York, and there the son united with Dr. Hattfield's Church in his fourteenth year. After three years spent in business pursuits he determined to study for the ministry, and with this end in view entered the New York University, from which he graduated in 1846. He then entered the Union Theological Seminary, and graduated in 1849. He was ordained July 12 1851; and, with the exception of three years at Mount Pleasant and Uniondale, Pa., he passed his entire ministerial life on Long Island. He supplied successively the churches at East Hampton, Fresh Pond, Northport, and Green Lawn. In 1875 he relinquished his charge, but continued to reside at Green Lawn until his death, which occurred suddenly after an illness of only a few days, July 6, 1878. He was an earnest, hard-working man, and his memory will be tenderly cherished by the churches. (W.P.S.)

Smith, James (1),

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia in 1782, converted in early youth, and in 1802 received as a travelling preacher into the Virginia Conference. He soon gave evidence of strong powers of mind, and evinced a taste and capacity for intellectual improvement.. On some occasions, especially, he was truly eloquent, and rose far above ordinary speakers in sublimity of sentiment and energy of thought and expression. He died in 1826. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 542; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 3, 401, 402; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7, 373-377; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 2, 307; 3, 371.

Smith, James (2),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Kent Co., Del., May 15, 1788. His conversion took place in 1804, and he, was received on trial into the Philadelphia Conference in 1811. He became supernumerary in 1830, but again entered the active work in 1833. He was also presiding elder of the North Philadelphia District and of the Wilmington District. He died March 30, 1852. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1852, p. 22.

Smith, James (3),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington Co., Pa., in 1791. He was converted in early life, and in 1818 was licensed to preach, and admitted on trial into the Ohio Conference. He was ordained deacon in 1820, and elder in 1822. For thirty years he rendered effective service, and when, in 1852, the conference was divided, he became a member of the Cincinnati Conference, and received a supernumerary relation, which he sustained until his decease. He died in Sidney, O., April 7, 1856. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1856, p. 152; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Smith, James (4),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Andover, N.Y., Jan. 21, 1807, and united with the Church in his seventeenth year. He entered the ministry in 1833, and for eighteen years did effective service, and then took a superannuated relation, which he held until his death, at Westfield, Vt., Nov. 20, 1875. He was a member of the Vermont Conference. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 85.

Smith, James (5),

a Presbyterian minister, was, born in Scotch Valley, Blair Co., Pa., Sept. 5, 1819. His father was an elder in the Church at Hollidaysburg, of which the son afterwards became a member. He was graduated at Jefferson College in 1843, and entered Princeton Theological Seminary in the autumn of the same year. After completing the course he graduated, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Huntingdon at Clearfield, Pa., Oct. 8, 1846. The following April he was dismissed to the Presbytery of Clarion, and was ordained as an evangelist by that presbytery Sept. 1, 1847. After preaching one year as an evangelist, he was again received into the Presbytery of Huntingdon in 1848, and in April, 1849, he was called to the pastorate of the Little Valley Church. He did not choose to be installed as pastor, but supplied the pulpit until 1855. Joining the Allegheny Presbytery, he was, soon after leaving his former charge, installed by the last-named presbytery over the Church at Bridgewater. In 1857 he again changed his relation, and was installed pastor of the Church at Mount Joy by the Donegal Presbytery. Here he continued to labor with great acceptability and usefulness among a people strongly attached to him, and he to them, for a period of ten years, when, owing to the failure of his health, he was obliged

to submit to the dissolution of the pastoral relation. For the last eight years of his life feeble health prevented him from performing ministerial duties, and he gradually declined until his death, Oct. 4, 1875. (W.P.S.)

Smith, James Bradford,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Warren Co., Ga., and united with the Church in 1836. He received license to preach in 1845, and in 1846 joined the Georgia Conference. His last appointment was Oglethorpe, where his brief ministry closed with death, July 7, 1853. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch., South*, 1853, p. 470.

Smith, James C.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Liberty, Lycoming Co., Pa., Aug. 31, 1824, and was converted at the age of nine. He was admitted into the Iowa Conference in 1846 (or 1847), and was transferred to the Missouri Conference in May, 1858. After serving in Jefferson City and St. Louis, he was appointed presiding elder of the Kansas City District. Persecuted in the war, he escaped with his family into Iowa, where he continued until the next session of the conference, when he was placed in charge of the St. Louis District. In 1865 he took a supernumerary relation, and died May 8, 1866. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1866, p. 264..

Smith, James M.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Jamaica, N.Y., in 1810. He entered Princeton Theological Seminary in 1837, and, after remaining one year, finished his theological studies in the Union Theological Seminary in 1840. He was ordained and installed-pastor of the Upper Ten-mile Creek and Mount Nebo churches, Pa., remaining such till 1843, when he resigned, and became a stated supply of the churches at Bethlehem and North Branch, Pa. He then became pastor of the Church at Tarentum, Pa., in 1844, and continued in this relation until 1853, a period of nine years, laboring with success and usefulness. He removed to Grand Spring, Wis., and remained without charge until his death, in 1854. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Jeremiah,

an English Dissenting minister, was born about 1653. It is not known where he received his education. He was first pastor of a Church at Andover, in Hampshire, and afterwards succeeded Mr. Spademan, as co-pastor with Mr. Rosewell, in Silver Street, where he was also one of the Friday-evening lecturers. Amid the theological contentions of the year 1719, he stood forward the champion of the Trinity. He continued to preach with great zeal the faith which others were attempting to destroy until the day of his death, Aug. 29, 1723. He was one of four who composed the work entitled *The Doctrine of the Trinity Stated and Defended. The Exposition of the Epistles to Titus and Philemon*, in the continuation of Henry's *Commentary*, was by his pen. He published several separate *Sermons* (1712 and 1713, 8vo): — *Four Sermons* (1715 and 1716, 8vo): — *On the Death of Sir Thomas Abney* (1722, 4to). See Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, 2, 349.

Smith, John (1),

an English clergyman, was born in Warwickshire in 1563, and elected in 1577 a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, where he also obtained a fellowship. He succeeded Dr. Lancelot Andrews as lecturer in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. In September, 1592, he was presented to the living of Clavering, Essex. He died in November, 1616. His works are, *The Essex Dove*, etc., in three treatises (1629, 4to): — *-Exposition on the Creed, and Explanation of the Articles of our Christian Faith*, in seventy-three sermons (1632, fol.).

Smith, John (2),

an English divine and instructor, was born in Achurch, near Oundle, in 1618. He entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1636, and in 1644 was chosen fellow of Queen's College. He died Aug. 7, 1652. Certain treatises by Mr. Smith were published by Dr. John Worthington (Cambridge, 1660, 4to) under the title of *Select Discourses*. A second edition, corrected, with a funeral sermon by Patrick, was published at Cambridge (1673, 4to). One of the discourses, that *Upon Prophecy*, was translated into Latin by Le Clerc, and prefixed to his *Commentary on the Prophets* (1731). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, John (3),

a learned English divine, was born in Lowther, Westmoreland, Nov. 10, 1659. After being under several teachers, he was for some time at the school of Appleby, whence he went to St. John's College, Cambridge, June 11, 1674. He took his degree of A.B. in 1677, and of A.M. in 1681, and was also ordained both deacon and priest. In the same year he was invited to Durham by Dr. Denis Granville, and in July, 1682, was admitted a minor canon of Durham. About the same time he was collated to the curacy of Croxdale, and in July, 1684, to the living of Witton Gilbert. In 1686 he went to Madrid as chaplain to lord Lansdowne, the English ambassador. In 1694 Crew, bishop of Durham, appointed him his domestic chaplain, collated him to the rectory and hospital of Gateshead in June, 1695, and to a prebend of Durham in September following. In 1696 he was created D.D. at Cambridge, and treasurer of Durham in 1699, to which bishop Crew, in July, 1704, added the rectory of Bishop Wearmouth. He died at Cambridge, July 30, 1715. Dr. Smith was learned, generous, and strict in the duties of his profession. Besides his edition of Bede's *History*, he published four single *Sermons*. See Allibone, . *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Biog. Brit.*; Hutchinson, *Durham*, 1, 61; Nicholson, *Letters*, 1, 224; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, John (4), D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Newbury (Byfield Parish), Mass., Dec. 21, 1752. He entered the junior class in Dartmouth College in 1771, graduating in 1773, and immediately after was appointed preceptor of Moor's School at Hanover. While occupying this position, he studied theology under the direction of president Wheelock. In 1774 he was appointed tutor in the college, continuing in that office until 1778, when he was elected professor of languages. This position he retained until the close of his life, April 30, 1809. He served as college librarian for thirty years (1779-1809). For two years he delivered lectures on systematic theology, and officiated as stated preacher in the village of Hanover. Dr. Smith prepared a *Hebrew Grammar* (dated May 14, 1772; revised Feb. 11, 1774). He also prepared a *Chaldee Grammar*: — a *Latin Grammar* (1802): — a *Greek Grammar* (1809): — an edition of *Cicero de Oratore*, and *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 90.

Smith, John (5),

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent Co., Md., March 10, 1758; converted June 9, 1780; received on trial in the travelling connection in 1784, and into full connection in 1786, and afterwards traveled the following circuits: New Hope, Redstone, Greenbrier, Cecil, Talbot, Milford, Somerset, Annessex (twice), Caroline, and Dover, when he became supernumerary for several years, and afterwards superannuated until his death, May 10, 1812. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 224; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 2, 147; 4, 281.

Smith, John (6), D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Belchertown, Mass., March 5, 1766. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1794, entered the ministry in 1796, and was ordained Jan. 4, 1797, copastor at Salem, N.H., but resigned his charge Nov. 21, 1816. He became pastor in Wenham, Mass., Nov. 26, 1817, but was dismissed Sept. 8, 1819, to accept the professorship of theology in the Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me., which he held until his death, April 7, 1831. He published, *Treatise on Infant Baptism: — Two Sermons on the National Fast* (1812), and a few occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 389.

Smith, John (7),

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hopewell, Pa., May 8, 1776. He was carefully educated by his parents, graduated at Dickinson College; studied theology privately at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery in 1809; and ordained by Oneida Presbytery as pastor of the Church at Cooperstown, N.Y., in 1810, where, for nearly a quarter of a century he went in and out as a true shepherd before his people. In 1834 he became principal of Cherry Valley Academy, at the same time preaching in the church at Middlefield, a distance of six miles. In 1836 he was stated supply of the Church at Painted Post, in Chemung Presbytery; in 1840 of the Church in Hammondsport, in Bath Presbytery, where he preached as opportunity and his increasing years would permit, until 1855, when he removed to Pen Yan and took up his residence with his son-in-law. He died here, June 17, 1860. On the announcement of Mr. Smith's death, the members of Bath Presbytery held a meeting and passed resolutions in view of his great worth as a Christian and minister. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 195. (J.L.S.)

Smith, John (8),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Kirby, Vt., in 1808. He was converted and joined the Church in 1824, was licensed to preach in 1827, and joined the New England Conference in 1829. He labored for about twenty years in the active ministry, and then, compelled by ill health, took a supernumerary relation, which he held until his death, March 27, 1872, in West Burke. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 58.

Smith, John Blair, D.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian divine and educator, and brother of Samuel Stanhope Smith, D.D., was born in Pequea, Lancaster Co., Pa., June 12, 1756. He very early evinced great thirst for knowledge and uncommon facility in acquiring it received most watchful and faithful parental training, and was converted when fourteen years of age. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1773 under Dr. Witherspoon; pursued his theological studies under the direction of his brother, was licensed by the Presbytery of Hanover, April 29, 1778, and ordained by the same presbytery, Oct. 26, 1779. He became successor to his brother as president of Hampden Sidney College in the same year, and in the spring of 1780 also as pastor of the churches of Cumberland and Briery, in Prince Edward Co., Va., where he became very popular, and before he left the state is said to have been "at once more attractive and powerful than any other clergyman in Virginia from the time of Samuel Davies." In 1789 he resigned his position as president of Hampden Sidney College, in 1791 became pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; in 1795 president of Union College, N.Y., and for three years presided over the infant institution with great credit and success. In May, 1799, he returned to his former charge in Philadelphia, where he died, Aug. 22, of the same year, of yellow fever. Dr. Smith was a fervent and eloquent preacher, earnestly devoted to his work, and drew immense congregations, which would hang upon his lips in breathless silence. As a patriot and a citizen he also exerted an important influence in the civil concerns of the state, especially as connected with the interests of religion. When the Legislature, in 1776, abolished the establishment of the Church of England in the state, they at the same time passed an act incorporating the Episcopal clergy, and giving them a right to the glebes and churches which had been procured by a tax upon the inhabitants in general, including Dissenters of every

description as well as Episcopalians. Another bill was introduced, but not yet passed, to extend the privileges of the Act of Toleration, as passed by William and Mary, to the State of Virginia. Dr. Smith framed a remonstrance against those acts, which he induced the Presbytery of Hanover to adopt and send to the Legislature, which was a very able State paper and had the desired effect. About this time another great excitement was raised in Virginia by a bill introduced in the Legislature for a general assessment for the support of religion, a scheme which was advocated by Patrick Henry and other popular politicians. An adverse petition was prepared, and it, together with a memorial from the presbytery, was presented to the Legislature by Dr. Smith (whose handwriting the papers show), who was heard for three successive days at the bar of the House in support of them. So decided was the influence of the struggle in Virginia as to procure the withholding from the Federal Constitution of all power to erect a religious establishment of any kind. Dr. Smith's only publication was *The Enlargement of Christ's Kingdom*, a sermon at Albany in 1797. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 397; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Davidson, *Hist. of Presb. Ch. in Kentucky*, p. 37-39; *Genesis Assemb. Miss. Mag.* 1805; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*; 1st series; *Life of Dr. Ashbel Green*; Graham, *Lett.* 7; Smyth, *Eccles. Republicanism*, p. 96-103; Baird, *Religion in America*, p. 109, 110; Lang, *Religion and Education in America*, p. 94, 115 Rice, *Evangel. Mag.* 9, 30, 33, 35, 42, 43. (J.L.S.)

Smith, John Blakely,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Charlotte, N.C., July 11, 1820. In 1843 he joined the Church, and in December, 1847, was admitted into the Georgia Conference. After its division he became a member of the South Georgia Conference. Besides serving as pastor, he was Sunday school agent of the latter conference, three years agent of the American Tract Society, and three years agent of the Wesleyan Female College. In 1850 he was elected conference secretary, and continued in office for twenty-two years. He died near Americus, Ga., Sept. 30, 1872. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of M.E. Ch., South*, 1872, p. 680.

Smith, John Cross, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Baltimore, Md., Oct. 29, 1803. He received his classical education in a private school. After studying theology under Dr. Duncan, he entered Princeton Seminary and remained one year. He was licensed in 1828, and soon after began to preach as an evangelist at Fortress Monroe, Va. While here he received a Call from Portsmouth, and he was ordained and installed over that Church. Here he labored with great zeal and success until 1832, when he accepted a call to the Bridge Street Church, Georgetown, D.C. He went to work in his new charge with zeal, clearing his Church of a heavy debt, and securing its prosperity and growth. In 1839 the pastoral relation was dissolved, and he became agent of the American Tract Society; but in a few months he was called to the Fourth Church in Washington, D.C., over which he was installed in September, 1839. Here he labored with untiring zeal and energy for thirty-eight years, and his Church was blessed with numerous and powerful revivals. He was quite successful in building churches free from debt, and still more successful in raising funds to liquidate the debts of others. In 1861 he offered his services gratuitously as chaplain in the Union army, and served with fidelity for more than a year. In 1876 he received an injury in the street from which he never recovered, and his system gradually gave way. He died in Washington, Jan. 23, 1878. (W.P.S.)

Smith, John Paris,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in York County, Pa., Jan. 29, 1822. He graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, in 1842, studied theology at Princeton, N.J., was licensed by Donegal Presbytery in 1844, and ordained and installed pastor of Owensborough (Ky.) Church. He preached successively at Bardstown, Ky.; Vincennes, Richmond, and Hopewell, Ind.; and afterwards undertook a temporary labor in behalf of the United States Christian Commission in the army, whence he returned sick, and died among his kindred in York, Pa., July 4, 1864. The Indianapolis Presbytery recorded the following minute: "Brother Smith was an honored and useful member of presbytery, was well known and greatly confided in in all our ecclesiastical councils. Taken off in the prime of life, while pastor of a flourishing Church, the lamentations of his people follow him to his grave." See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 120;. 1866, p. 170. (J.L.S.)

Smith, John G.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Marlborough, Ulster Co., N.Y., Sept. 30, 1809. He was licensed to preach at the age of twenty-two, and was also admitted into the New York Conference on trial. When this conference was divided, Mr. Smith being stationed at Willett Street, New York city, became a member of the New York East Conference. His last appointment was to the Second Church, New Haven, Conn., where his health failed. He removed to Warwick in July, 1854, and died Sept. 30, in the same year. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1855, p. 545.

Smith, John M.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., Oct. 10, 1795. He was converted in the spring of 1810, and immediately joined the Church; graduated at Columbia College in the city of New York; entered upon the study of medicine, but, becoming impressed that it was his duty to preach, relinquished that design and entered the itinerant ministry in 1817, and was stationed on Jamaica Circuit, L.I. He continued in this work until September, 1820, when he was elected by the New York Conference principal of the Wesleyan Seminary in New York city, in which he continued until that institution was removed to White Plains, of which he also took the oversight. From this he was transferred, in May, 1832, to the professorship of languages in the Wesleyan University. He entered upon the duties of his professorship with great ardor of mind and promising hopes of distinguished usefulness; but his days were soon cut off, and he died Dec. 27, 1832. Mr. Smith was a diligent and successful student; a fine classical scholar; sound and systematical as a preacher; meek, modest, and polished as a man. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 2, 216; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 4, 146-151. (J.L.S.)

Smith, John Pye, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.,

an eminent English Presbyterian divine, was born in Sheffield, May 25, 1774. He was educated at the Independent Academy at Rotherham, was ordained to the ministry in the Independent Church, and, without entering upon the regular work, he accepted the appointment of resident professor of classical literature and theology in the Theological Seminary at Homerton. Subsequently (in 1815) he became sole professor of divinity, and discharged his duties with acceptability, training hundreds of young

men for the ministry. In 1843 he resigned this post and became president of the institution, and again took the chair of classical literature, which he retained until 1850, when New College, St. John's Wood; was formed by the junction of Homerton, Highbury, and Coward colleges. Dr. Smith retired to private life aided by a testimonial fund of \$15,000. For forty-three years he was pastor of the celebrated Gravel Pits Chapel, Homerton. He took a great interest in scientific pursuits and was honored by a membership in the Royal and Geological societies. He died at Guildford, Surrey, Feb. 5, 1851. Dr. Smith wrote, *The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah* (1818-21, 2 vols. 8vo; 1829, 3 vols.; 1837, 3 vols.; 1847, 2 vols.): — *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ* (1828, 3d ed. 1847): — *Principles of Interpretation as Applied to the Prophecies of Scripture* (1829, 2d ed. 1831): — *The Relation between Holy Scripture and Some Parts of Geological Science* (1839, 8vo; 4th ed. 1848): — *Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit*: — *Mosaic Account of the Creation and Deluge*: — *Manual of Latin Grammar*: — *Synoptic Tables*: — *Reasons of the Protestant Religion*; besides many sermons, controversial pieces, and reviews. After his death appeared *First Lines of Christian Theology*, being notes of his lectures to his students (1854, 2d ed. 1860). He was one of the greatest Biblical scholars of his day; and the works above enumerated are full of most valuable criticism and exegesis. See Medway [J.], *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith* (1853); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Smith, Joseph (1),

an English clergyman, was born in Lowther, Westmoreland, Oct. 10, 1670, and was admitted to Queen's College, Oxford, May 10, 1689. In 1693, being chosen taberner, he took his first degree in arts, but was afterwards removed from college by Sir Joseph Williamson, who appointed him his deputy keeper of the Paper office at Whitehall; and soon after, being made plenipotentiary at Ryswick, he took Mr. Smith with him as secretary. He was created A.M. while abroad, March 1, 1696, and a fellow, Oct. 31, 1698. Desiring to enter the Church, he returned to Oxford in 1700 and was ordained by Dr. Talbot, bishop of Oxford. Not long after he was presented to the donative of Ifley, near Oxford, . and at the same time was appointed divinity lecturer in the college. In 1704 he served as senior proctor. In 1705 Dr. Lancaster presented him to Russel court Chapel, and then to the lectureship of Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street. Taking up his residence in London, he was soon after appointed chaplain to Edward Villiers, earl of

Jersey, and by him was presented at court. Made D.D. Nov. 2, 1708, he was presented by his college to the rectory of Knights-Emham, and the donative of Upton Gray, both in Southampton County. In 1716 he exchanged Upton Gray for the rectory of St. Dionis Back-church, London, over which he presided for forty years. On the accession of George I he was made chaplain to the princess of Wales. He was promoted to the prebend of Dunholm, Lincoln; and received the donative of Paddington, near London. He was also promoted to the prebend of St. Mary, Newington, in St. Paul's Cathedral. He was chosen lecturer of St. George's Church, Hanover Square. He had before resigned the lectureship of Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street, and in 1731 resigned also that of St. George's in consequence of having been, on Oct. 20, 1730, elected provost of Queen's College. His provostship, which lasted twenty-six years, was of great financial benefit to the college.. He died in Queen's College, Nov. 23, 1756. He published only two *Sermons*, and a pamphlet entitled *A Clear and Comprehensive View of the Being and Attributes of God*, etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Joseph (2),

one of the early ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Western Pennsylvania, was born in Nottingham, Pa., in 1736. Of his early education and religious convictions nothing is known. He graduated at Princeton in 1764; was licensed by the Presbytery of Newcastle at Drawyers, Aug. 5, 1767; was ordained and installed pastor of the Congregation of Lower Brandywine, April 19, 1769; of the united congregations of Wilmington, Del., and Lower Brandywine, Oct. 27, 1774; and of Buffalo and Cross Creek congregations in Westmoreland County, Pa., in December, 1780, where he spent the remainder of his life. He died April 19, 1792. Mr. Smith was an extraordinary preacher and laborious pastor. "I never heard a man," said the Rev. Samuel Porter, "who could so completely as Mr. Smith unbar the gates of hell and make me look far down into the abyss, or who could so throw open the gates of heaven and let me glance at the insufferable brightness of the great white throne." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 274. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Joseph (3), D.D.,

a minister of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Westmoreland County, Pa., July 15, 1796. He entered Jefferson College and was graduated in

1815. From thence he went to Princeton Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1819. He was ordained and commenced preaching in Virginia, where he remained several years. He was principal of the academy at Staunton, Va., and also of that at Frederick City, Md. He subsequently became president of Franklin College, O., and also of a college at Frederick City. After this he became general agent of the Presbyterian synods of Western Pennsylvania, Northern Virginia, and Eastern Ohio. He was pastor of the churches of Round Hill, and at Greensburg, Pa., at which latter place he died, Dec. 4, 1868. He was the author of *Old Red Stone* and a *History of Jefferson College*. He possessed great versatility of talent, and served the Church in the various relations he sustained to it with great acceptability and usefulness. See Plumley, *Presbyterian Church*, p. 296. (W. P.S.)

Smith, Joseph (4)

(Mormon prophet). *SEE MORMONS*.

Smith, Joseph (5),

a Baptist minister, was born in Hampstead, N.H., Jan. 31, 1808, and pursued his studies at the New Hampton and Newton institutions. Wishing to secure a full collegiate education, he entered Brown University and was graduated in the class of 1837, and was ordained Sept. 27, 1837. His pastorates were at Woonsocket and Newport. R.I., and at Grafton and North Oxford, Mass. In the latter place he died, April 26, 1866. (J.C.S.)

Smith, Josiah,

a Congregational minister, was born in Charleston, S.C., in 1704, and graduated at Harvard College in 1725. He began to preach within about a year of his graduation, and was ordained July 11, 1726. In 1729 he maintained a learned dispute with Rev. H. Fisher on the right of private judgment, and in 1740 he espoused the cause of Mr. Whitefield. In 1749 he received a stroke of palsy, from which he never recovered so far as to be able to articulate distinctly. He nevertheless continued writing sermons, many of which were published. Mr. Smith was an earnest friend of the cause of American independence, and on the surrender of Charleston became a prisoner of war, but was released on parole. In 1781 he was ordered out of Charleston, and landed in Philadelphia, where he died in October of that year. Mr. Smith was a respectable preacher, a learned

divine, and a writer of considerable reputation. He published, *Sermons* (1726-45): — *Sermons* (1752, 8vo): — *The Church of Ephesus Arraigned* (1765): — *Letters*, etc. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 351.

Smith, Josiah D., D.D.,

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Westmoreland County, Pa., Nov. 20, 1814. He was educated in South Hanover College, Ind., studied divinity in the South Hanover Theological Seminary, was licensed by the Madison Presbytery and ordained by the Columbus Presbytery, O., in 1841, and installed pastor of the Truro and Hamilton churches in that state. He subsequently became pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Columbus, where he died May 29, 1863. Dr. Smith was a man of high intellectual worth. He published, *Truth in Love: — Sermons* (Phila. 1864), with a biographical preface by the Rev. James M. Platt and an introduction by M. W. Jacobus, D.D. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 193; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Leonard,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ancaster, Wentworth Co., Canada, May 2, 1838, and joined the Church there in 1854. He was licensed to preach in 1857, and entered the Illinois Conference. in 1860. In 1873 he was granted a supernumerary relation. and held that position until his death, Nov. 18, 1874. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 133.

Smith, Matthew,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, near Belfast, Ireland, in 1825, where he received his early education. He studied theology at Paisley, Scotland, and was ordained and installed pastor of a Presbyterian church near Belfast in 1846. In 1850 he emigrated to America, and was stated supply for the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church at Milton, Pa., where he labored for more than a year, and afterwards removed to Wisconsin as an Associate Reformed missionary. In 1854 he accepted a commission from the American Home Missionary Society, and became stated supply of the Presbyterian Church at Centerville, Ia. He died Aug. 13, 1859. Mr. Smith was a faithful minister, attending diligently to all the

duties of his calling, and endearing himself to all his people. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 164. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Miles,

an English prelate, was born in the city of Hereford, and about 1568 entered Corpus Christi College, Oxford, but graduated at Brasenose. He afterwards became one of the chaplains or petty canons of Christ Church, where he took his bachelor of divinity degree. In due course he was preferred to the office of residentiary of Hereford Cathedral, was created doctor of divinity in 1594, and on Sept. 20, 1612, became bishop of Gloucester. His knowledge of the Oriental languages was so extraordinary that he was employed by James I upon the translation of the Bible. He began with the first, and was the last man engaged upon that work, having also written the preface. For this service he was appointed bishop of Gloucester, and had leave to hold *in commendam* his former livings, viz. the prebend of Hinton in the Church of Hereford; the rectories of Upton-upon-Severn and Hartlebury, in the diocese of Worcester; and the first portion of Ledbury, called Overhall. According to Willis, he died Oct. 20, but Wood says in the beginning of November, 1624, and was buried in his own cathedral. His published works are, *Sermons* (Lond. 1632, fol.): — *Sermon* (published without his consent by Robert Burhill, 1602). He was the editor of bishop Babington's works, to which he prefixed a preface. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Moses, D.D.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Chatham County, N.C., Feb. 28, 1817. When two years old, his parents moved to Highland County, O., where he was converted, and united with the Church. He graduated from Augusta College in August, 1842; was licensed to preach, Jan. 31, 1843, and admitted into the Ohio Conference on Sept. 27. His ordination as deacon took place in 1844, and that of elder in 1846. For twenty-seven years he was constantly engaged in the work. He died in Newton, Jasper Co., Ia., Aug. 25, 1869. He was twice a delegate to the General Conference. He wrote works on *Mental and Moral Science*, the former of which was published. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869, p. 282.

Smith, Noah,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was admitted into the Georgia Conference about 1837 or 1838. He was a very popular and useful preacher until 1858, when he took a superannuated relation. He died Sept. 14, 1860. Mr. Smith was a man of right principles, ardent piety, and indefatigable in his labors. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Ch., South*, 1860, p. 257.

Smith, Peyton Pierce,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Franklin County, Ga., Jan. 12, 1812, and joined the Church in September, 1826. He was licensed to preach by the Gwinnett Circuit Quarterly Conference, Nov. 12, 1831, and at the next session of the Georgia Annual Conference was received on trial. According to his journal, he was a travelling preacher for thirty years and four months, during which time he preached 4414 sermons, baptized 1529 persons, made 5979 visits, wrote 4941 letters, and traveled, chiefly by private conveyance, 123,623 miles. In 1863 he was returned to Madison district as presiding elder, where he labored until the day before his death, May, 1863. Mr. Smith was one of the oldest and most efficient members of the Georgia Conference, and as a minister was eminently successful. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1863, p. 466; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Smith, Philander, D.D.,

third bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada after the separate organization in 1828, was born in Delaware County, N.Y., in 1796. He was reared a Calvinist, and at an early age settled in Elizabethtown, near Brockville, Canada. He was converted in 1817 under the preaching of bishop George, and united with the Methodists. In 1820 he joined the Genesee Conference, and was duly ordained deacon and elder. In 1826 he was appointed presiding elder of the Upper Canada work, and labored regularly till the union of the Canada Conference with the British Wesleyans in 1833. Opposing this action, dissatisfied with the abandonment of the episcopacy, and with the terms of the union generally, he ceased travelling for a time. In 1836 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, which had again rallied, and in 1862 was elected to the episcopate, which office he held until his death, March 28, 1870. As a preacher he was earnest and effective; as an administrator he was calm and

judicious; as an overseer in the Church of Christ he was watchful, self-sacrificing, and laborious. See Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Smith, Reuben,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in South Hadley, Mass., Sept. 26, 1789. He enjoyed a good academical training, graduated at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1812, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., in 1816. Licensed by the New York Presbytery, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Ballston Center, N.Y., in 1816, by the Troy Presbytery. He afterwards labored in the Third Presbyterian Church at Albany for some years; in 1829 became pastor of a Congregational Church in Burlington, Vt.; in 1832 of the Church at Waterford, N.Y., where he remained sixteen years.; in 1848 again at Ballston Center. In 1854 he removed West, joining the Winnebago Presbytery, and living at Beaver Dam, Wis.; but increasing age prevented his taking that active part in the ministerial duties which marked his earlier years. He died Nov. 7, 1860. Mr. Smith was a man of deep, earnest piety, a close Biblical student, and in his prime an eloquent preacher. He was the author of *Africa Given to Christ* (Burlington, Vt., 1860), a sermon: — *The Pastoral Office, embracing Experiences and Observations from a Pastorate of Forty Years* (Phila. 18mo). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 119; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Richard (1),

a learned Roman Catholic divine of England, was born in Worcestershire in 1500, and educated at Oxford. In 1527 he was admitted a probationary fellow of Merton College, took his degree of A.M. in 1530, and was elected registrar of the university in the following year. He afterwards became rector of Cuxham, Oxfordshire; principal of St. Alban's Hall, divinity reader of Magdalen College, regius professor of divinity, and took his degree of D.D. in that faculty. In 1537 he was made master of Wittington College, London, but was deprived in the reign of, Edward VI. In the first year of that reign he recanted his opinions at St. Paul's Cross, but was obliged to resign his professorship at Oxford. He went to St. Andrew's, Scotland; thence to Paris in 1550, and then to Louvain, where he was made professor of theology. On the accession of queen Mary he returned to England, was restored to his professorship, made canon of Christ Church, and chaplain to her majesty. He was one of the witnesses

against Cranmer, and at the burning of Ridley and Latimer he preached, from ~~463B~~1 Corinthians 13:3, a sermon, lasting about fifteen minutes, full of invective against the martyrs. For this conduct he was deprived of all his preferments upon the accession of Elizabeth, and placed in the custody of archbishop Parker, by whose persuasion he recanted part of what he had written in defense of the celibacy of the clergy. He escaped to Dolay, Flanders, where he obtained the deanery of St. Peter's Church and a professorship. He died in 1563. Smith wrote about sixteen tracts in favor of popery: *The Assertion and Defense of the Sacraments* (Lond. 1546, sm. 8vo): — *A Defense of the Sacrifice of the Masse* (1546; 16mo; 1547, 8vo): — *Bouclier of the Catholike Fayth of Christe's Church* (2 pts. 8vo). The entire list may be seen in Dodd or Wood. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Richard (2),

an English Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Lincolnshire in 1566, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and afterwards at Rome. He then completed his studies in Spain, taking his doctor's degree at Valladolid, and in 1603 arrived in England as a missionary. He sided against the Jesuit party, and was opposed by them when named for the bishopric of Chalcedon. On Feb. 4 he was, however, appointed bishop of that diocese. A controversy shortly arose between him and the regulars of his own Church, and Smith was ordered to drop the title of Ordinary of England which he had assumed. In 1629 two proclamations were issued against him, which induced him to leave the kingdom and retire to France. There he exercised his jurisdiction over the English Romanists by vicars-general and other ecclesiastical officers. He experienced the kindness of cardinal Richelieu, who bestowed upon him the abbacy of Charroux; but his successor, Mazarin, withdrew his protection, and deprived him of that position. He afterwards retired to an apartment near the convent of some English nuns in the vicinity of Paris, where he died, March 18, 1655. Smith wrote several works in defense of himself and of popery in his dispute with the regulars. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Dodd, *Church History*, vol. 3; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.

Smith, Robert (1),

an English divine and educator, was born in 1689, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees of A.B. in 1711. A.M. in 1715, LL.D. in 1723, and D.D. in 1739. Information respecting Dr. Smith is very meager. He was mathematical preceptor to William, duke of Cumberland, and master of mechanics to George II. In 1716 he became Plumian professor at Cambridge, and afterwards succeeded Bentley as master of Trinity. He died in 1768. Smith's works are, *A Complete System of Optics* (1728, 2 vols. 4to), and *Harmonics, or the Philosophy of Musical Sounds* (1760). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer Authors*, s.v.; *Cambridge Graduates*; Cumberland, *Life*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Robert (2), D.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian divine, and father of the Revs. John Blair Smith, D.D., and Samuel Stanhope Smith, D.D., was born in Londonderry, Ireland, in 1723. His family came to America when he was seven years old, and settled at the headwaters of the Brandywine River, about forty miles from Philadelphia. At the age of fifteen his mind became deeply impressed with the subject of religion under the preaching of Whitefield, during his first visit to America, and he soon felt a strong desire to devote himself to the ministry. He accordingly placed himself under the instruction of the Rev. Samuel Blair, who was then conducting an institution for the education of young men for the ministry at Fagg's Manor, Chester Co., Pa. There he made very rapid improvement in both classical and theological knowledge; was licensed by the New Side Presbytery of Newcastle Dec. 27, 1749, and ordained and installed pastor of the churches in Pequea and Leacock, Pa., March 25, 1751. Shortly after his settlement he founded a school, designed chiefly for the instruction of youth in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, which was afterwards resorted to by many who were subsequently greatly distinguished in the different professions. In 1759 he resigned the care of the congregation of Leacock; in 1760 he received the degree of D.D. from the College of New Jersey, and in 1772 he was appointed one of its overseers, and held the office during the rest of his life. He was the second moderator of the General Assembly, and the last public act of his life was to attend a meeting of the board of trustees of the College of New Jersey. He died April 15, 1793. Dr. Smith was distinguished for his activity, being in labors most abundant. "Few men in the holy ministry have been more useful or more esteemed." He published a

sermon preached on the union of the Old and New Side Presbyteries of Newcastle, entitled *A Wheel in the Middle of a Wheel, or the Harmony and Connection of the Various Acts of Divine Providence: — Two Sermons on Sin and Holiness* (1767): — *A Sermon* (1774): — *Three Sermons on Saving Faith, in the Amer. Preacher*, vol. 4 (1791). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 172; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Genesis Assembly Miss. Mag.* vol. 2; Timlow, *Hist. Serm.* (J.L.S.)

Smith, Robert (3), D.D.,

an efficient Episcopal minister in America, and afterwards bishop of South Carolina, was born in Norfolk, England, Aug. 25, 1732. He passed A.B. and A.M. at Cambridge, of which he was also elected fellow, and was ordained in 1756. On his arrival in America he was successively assistant and rector of St. Philip's, Charleston, S.C., and was specially interested in the negro school. He exerted himself in favor of the American cause, and went to the lines as a common soldier at the siege of Charleston. During the Revolutionary war he was chaplain to the Continental Hospital, S.C., and had charge of St. Paul's, Queen Anne's Co., Md. He devoted the remainder of his life to teaching and the care and organization of the Episcopal Church. In 1789 he was made D.D. by the University of Pennsylvania, and in 1795 was elected bishop. He died Oct. 28, 1801. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5, 170.

Smith, Robert A.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Robertson County, Tenn., in 1809; converted in 1828, licensed as a local preacher in 1832, received on trial in the Tennessee Conference in the same year, transferred and stationed on Oakmulgee Circuit in 1833, at Jones's Valley in 1834-35, and admitted into full connection at Montgomery, in 1836, where he died, Oct. 25, 1836. He was a man of deep and ardent piety, a good preacher, and a most agreeable companion. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 2, 487.

Smith, Robert D.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Oct. 21, 1802. In 1813 his family removed to Champaign County, O., where he lived till 1824, when he went to Mississippi to teach school. There he was converted, and united with the

Church Nov. 9, 1824. He was licensed to preach in 1826, and preached under the presiding elder until 1828, when he was received on trial into the Mississippi Conference. He labored as missionary to the Choctaw nation for two years and six months. In 1831 he was stationed in Montgomery, Ala.; 1832, Mobile; 1833, Vicksburg; 1834, New Orleans; 1835, Natchez; 1836, Cole's Creek Circuit; 1837-38, Vicksburg District; 1839, Warren Circuit; 1840-41, appointed president of the Elizabeth Female Academy. at Washington; and in 1842 he was at Centenary College. In 1843-45 he labored as missionary among the colored people in Madison Parish, La., where he closed his life and work, May 16, 1845. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the ME. Church, South*, 1845, p. 33.

Smith, Samuel,

an English clergyman and popular writer of tracts, was born in or near Dudley, Worcestershire, in 1588, and studied for some time at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He left without taking a degree, and became beneficed at Prittlewell, Essex, and afterwards, as Wood says, in his own county; but, according to Calamy, he had the perpetual curacy of Cressedge and Cound, Shropshire. On the breaking out of the Rebellion he went to London, and sided with the Presbyterians. On his return to the country he was appointed an assistant to the commissioners for the ejection of scandalous and ignorant ministers and schoolmasters." At the Restoration he was ejected from Cressedge. The time of his death is unknown, but, according to Wood, he was living near Dudley in 1663. Smith's works are, *David's Blessed Man* (Lond. 8vo): — *The Great Assize* (12mo; thirty-one editions of which appeared before 1684): — *A Fold for Christ's Sheep* (printed thirty-two times): — *The Christian's Guide*: — besides other tracts and sermons. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Samuel Stanhope, D.D., LL.D.,

a distinguished divine and educator of the Presbyterian Church, and son of the Rev. Robert Smith, D.D., was born in Pequea, Lancaster Co., Pa., March 16, 1750. At a very early period he gave indications of possessing a mind of no common order. When he was only six or seven years old he commenced the study of the languages in his father's school. "He made the best of his opportunities, and was distinguished for his improvement in every branch to which he directed his attention." He became a

communicant in the Church under his father's care while he was yet under the paternal roof; and before he was eighteen years of age graduated at the College of New Jersey under circumstances the most honorable and gratifying. After graduation he returned to his father's house and spent some time "partly in assisting him in conducting his school, and partly in vigorous efforts for the higher cultivation of his own mind." In 1770 he became tutor of the classics and of belles lettres in the College of New Jersey, where he remained for upwards of two years, discharging his duties with great fidelity and acceptance, while at the same time he was pursuing a course of theological study privately. In 1773 he resigned the position of tutor, was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Newcastle, and immediately went as a missionary to the western counties of Virginia, where he soon became an almost universal favorite. So powerful an impression did he make that some of the most wealthy and influential persons soon set on foot a project for detaining him there as the head of a literary institution. A seminary was subsequently chartered under the name of Hampden Sidney College, and he took upon himself the double office of principal of the seminary and pastor of the Church, and the duties of both he discharged with the most exemplary fidelity. In 1779 he accepted the professorship of moral philosophy in the College of New Jersey. The college was then in ruins in consequence of the uses and abuses to which it had been subjected by both the British and American soldiers; its students were dispersed, and all its operations had ceased; but it is not too much to say that during this whole period, although Dr. Witherspoon's name could not fail to shed glory over the institution, and he was always intent upon the promotion of its interests, it was mainly by the energy, wisdom, and generous self devotion of Dr. Smith that the college was speedily reorganized and all its usual exercises resumed. In 1783 Yale College honored him with D.D., and in 1810 Harvard University with LL.D. In 1785 he was elected an honorary member of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia; and the same year was appointed to deliver their anniversary address, and he met the occasion in a manner which, of itself, would have conferred lasting honor upon his name. The address was afterwards published in the *Transactions* of the society, and subsequently in an enlarged and improved form in a separate volume. With this work his reputation as a philosopher both at home and abroad is, in no small degree, identified. In 1786 he was associated with several of the most distinguished and venerable men in the Presbyterian Church in preparing the *Form of Presbyterial Government*. In 1794; Dr. Witherspoon having died, he

became president of the College of New Jersey. He had now acquired a wide reputation as a pulpit orator. His baccalaureate discourses particularly attracted large numbers, even from remote parts of the country, to listen to them; but one of his most splendid performances was his oration, delivered at Trenton, on the death of Washington. The occasion roused his faculties to the utmost, and the result was a production of great beauty and power. In 1802 the college edifice was burned, together with the libraries, furniture, and fixtures of every description. The trustees resolved to rebuild it immediately. Dr. Smith made a begging tour through the Southern States, and returned in the following spring with about one hundred thousand dollars, which, with other liberal aid, enabled him to accomplish vastly more than he had ventured to anticipate. "This was his crowning achievement. He had won new honors and gained many new friends. The college was popular and prosperous, and numbered two hundred students. New buildings were soon erected, and several new professors were added to the faculty." During the whole period of his presidency he continued to contribute to the elevation of the college to a position of the highest usefulness, and ever proved himself to be one of the ablest and most successful disciplinarians of any age. In 1812, being too much enfeebled to discharge any longer the duties of his office, he tendered his resignation as president and retired to a place which the board of trustees provided for him, and there spent the remainder of his life. He died, in the utmost tranquillity, Aug. 21, 1819, and his remains were laid by the side of his illustrious predecessors. Dr. Smith was an indefatigable student; conversant with the literature, science, philosophy, and politics of ancient and modern times; a classical scholar in the highest acceptation of the phrase; and wrote and conversed in Latin with great facility and was a first-rate prosodist. As a preacher, the uniform testimony was that his eloquence in his best days had no parallel. His superior talents as professor and principal were everywhere spoken of and acknowledged. As a man, the saintly aspect, the tranquil resignation, the humble faith, the generous sympathy, the comprehensive charity, the modest, unpretending gentleness of his whole manner, all proclaimed the Christian gentleman and the mature and gifted good man. The following is a list of his publications: *Essay on the Causes of the Variety of Complexion and Figure of the Human Species*, etc. (Phila. 1787, 8vo; Edin. 1788, 8vo; Lond. 1799, 8vo; 2d ed. New Brunswick, N.J., 1810, 8vo): — *Sermons* (Newark, N.J., 1799, 8vo; Lond. 1801, 8vo): — *Lectures on the Evidences of the Christian Religion* (Phila. 1809, 12mo): — *Lectures on Moral and Political Philosophy*

(Trenton, N.J., 1812, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Comprehensive View of Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion* (New Brunswick, 1815, 8vo). He also published a number of single sermons, orations, and discourses (1781-1810). After his death appeared *Sermons, with a Brief Memoir of his Life and Writings* (Phila. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 335-345; *Life and Works of Philip Lindsey* (1866), 3, 652; *Life of Dr. Archibald Alexander*, p. 265; *New York Mfed. and Phys. Journ.* 1809; Mitchell [Dr. John], *Essay on the Causes of the Different Colors of People in different Climates*; *Aalec. Mag.* 15, 443; 16, 1; Ramsay [Dr. David], *Hist. of the United States, 1607-1808*; continued to the treaty of Ghent by S. S. Smith, D.D., LL.D., and other literary gentlemen; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*; Davidson, *Hist. of the Presb. Church in Kentucky*, p. 39; Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s.v. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Samuel W. (1),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in England in 1812, and began to preach at the age of nineteen. In 1834 he joined the itinerant ministry, in which he continued to labor until his death, March 16, 1858. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1858, p. 99.

Smith, Samuel W. (2),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of Ireland, and identified himself with the Wesleyan Methodists in Cork. On May 25, 1831, he reached Quebec, Ca., and shortly after removed to Point of Rocks, Md., still following his profession of teacher. He was licensed to preach in January, 1835, and was received on trial into the Baltimore Conference in March, 1838. After twenty years of active service, he was disabled by an accident, being struck by a fire engine, and soon after died, June 7, 1859. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1860, p. 19.

Smith, Seth,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bristol County, Me., Feb. 1, 1805, and was converted in Onondaga County, N.Y., June, 1829. He removed to Indiana in 1834, was licensed to preach in 1837, and joined the travelling connection in 1838. He was a member of the Southeast Indiana Conference, and labored faithfully until about a month previous to his death, Oct. 1, 1853. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1853, p. 290.

Smith, Socrates,

a minister of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Henniker, N.H., June 16, 1814. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1842 and entered the Union Theological Seminary, where he took the full course and graduated in 1845. He was soon thereafter ordained, and accepted a call Nov. 23, 1845, to Beardstown, Ill., as a stated supply. After remaining one year, he became a stated supply to the Panther Creek Church, Ill., where he remained until 1849, and then became teacher of a classical school in Greenville, Ill. He continued in this position until 1853, when he received a commission as home missionary, and labored at Jerseyville and Troy, Ill., to 1859. After this he resigned his commission and remained without charge in Greenville, where he died in 1869. (W.P.S.)

Smith, Stephen,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Hampshire County, Va., Nov. 1, 1802, and united with the Church in 1815. He was received into the Baltimore Conference in 1830. In 1844 he lost his voice while preaching in a new, damp church, and took a superannuated, and afterwards a supernumerary, relation. In 1867 he again became effective, so continuing until his death, Oct. 9, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1872, p. 648.

Smith, Sydney,

an English clergyman and celebrated humorist, was born in Woodford, Essex, in 1771, and was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, where, in 1790, he obtained a fellowship of one hundred pounds a year. Having entered the Church, he became, in 1794, curate of Amesbury, Wiltshire, but three years later went to Edinburgh as a private tutor to the son of the squire of his parish. During this time, he officiated in the Episcopal chapel there. In 1802, in connection with Jeffrey, Horner, Brougham, Dr. Thomas Brown, Playfair, and others, Smith started the *Edinburgh Review*, to the first number of which, as editor, he contributed seven articles. In 1803 he went to London, and was soon popular as a preacher, as a lecturer on moral philosophy (1804-6), and as a brilliant conversationalist. In 1806, during the short reign of the Whigs, he was presented by lord Erskine to the rectory of Foston-le-Clay, Yorkshire, worth about five hundred pounds a year. Failing to exchange this for some more desirable living, he built a pew rectory, and in 1814 moved into it

with his family. Some eighteen years afterwards the duke of Devonshire gave him the living of Londesborough (seven hundred pounds a year) to hold until Mr. Howard, son of the earl of Carlisle, came of age. In 1828 lord chancellor Lyndhurst presented him to a prebendal stall in Bristol, and enabled him to exchange Foston for Combe Florey, Somersetshire. In 1831 earl Grey appointed him one of the canons residentiary of St. Paul's. Having inherited considerable property from his brother Courtenay, he invested largely in the public stock of Pennsylvania; and the neglect of that state to pay the interest on her bonds called out his *Petition to Congress* and *Letters on American Debts*. He died in London, Feb. 22, 1845. Sydney Smith was not only the wittiest, but one of the wisest, men of his age. His life was devoted to the removal of great abuses, and to the exposure of public vices and crimes at a time when vice was enthroned in high places, and when so many perils environed the path of a reformer as to require, in even the mildest innovator, a large stock of humanity and an equal share of courage. Without the power and prestige which in England usually follow high birth or wealth, he exercised a greater influence over the public mind of his day than any man except, perhaps, lord Brougham. He erred at times in treating sacred subjects with levity and seeming irreverence; but this fault was one of natural temperament and had no root in infidelity. Although his Christianity partook of the temper of the time and circle in which he moved, and had, therefore, far less of the evangelical element than could be desired, it is yet clear that his life was mainly regulated by a strong sense of duty and that he found peace and comfort in his abiding faith in the great truths of religion. His writings are, *Six Sermons* (Edinb. 1800, small 8vo): — contributions to the *Edinburgh Review* (published 1839): — *Peter Plymley's Letters* (1807), to promote Catholic emancipation: — *Sermons* (1809, 2 vols.): — *Speeches on Catholic Claims and Reform Bill* (1825-31): — *Three Letters to Archdeacon Singleton on the Ecclesiastical Commission* (1837-39): — *The Ballot* (1837): — *Letter to Lord John Russell on the Church Bills* (1838): — *Letters on Railways* (1842): — *Letters on American Debts* (1843). After his death appeared, *Fragments on the Irish Roman Catholic Church* (Lond. 1845, 8vo): — *Sermons* (ibid. 1846, 8vo): — *Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy* (1850, 8vo). See *Memoir of Rev. Sydney Smith*, by his daughter, lady Holland (N.Y. 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Smith, Thomas (1),

a learned English divine and writer, was born in the parish of Allhallows, Barking, Essex, June 3, 1638, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, being elected fellow in 1666. In June, 1668, he, as chaplain, accompanied Sir Daniel Harvey, ambassador to Constantinople, and returned in 1671. In 1676 he traveled in France, and returning shortly he became chaplain to Sir Joseph Williamson, secretary of state. In 1683 he took the degree of D.D., and the year following was presented by his college to the rectory of Stanlake, diocese of Oxford, but resigned it in a month. In 1687 he was collated to a prebend in the Church of Heytesbury, Wilts. In August, 1688, he was deprived of his fellowship by Dr. Giffard because he refused to live among the new popish fellows of that college. He was, however, restored in October following; but afterwards, refusing to take the oaths to William and Mary, his fellowship was pronounced void, July 25, 1692. He died at London, May 11, 1710. Among his learned works are the following: *Diatriba de Chaldaicis Paraphrastis* (Oxon. 1662, 8vo): — *Syntagma de Druidum Moribus ac Institutis* (Lond. 1664, 8vo): — *Epistoloe Duoe*, etc. (Oxon. 1672, 8vo): — *De Grecoe Ecclesioe Hodierno Statu Epistola* (ibid. 1676, 8vo): — *Miscellanea* (2 vols. 12mo; vol. 1, 1686; vol. 2, 1690): — *Epistoloe et Annales Camdeni ab A.D. 1603 ad 1623*, etc. (1691, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, Thomas (2),

a Congregational minister, was born in Boston, Mass., March 10, 1702, graduated from Harvard in 1720, and was licensed to preach in April, 1722. On account of his youth he declined a call from the Church in Bellingham, Mass., but preached in various places as a supply. On March 8, 1727, a Church was constituted at Falmouth and Mr. Smith was ordained its pastor, and continued such until 1764, when, on account of infirmity, he received Rev. Samuel Deane as his colleague. He, however, preached in his turn till the close of 1784. His death took place May 23, 1795. The only publications of Mr. Smith are a *Sermon* (1756) at the ordination of Rev. Solomon Lombard, and a *Practical Discourse to Seafaring Men* (1771). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 326.

Smith, Thomas (3),

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Kent County, Md., June 3, 1776. He was converted in early life, began to preach in his eighteenth year, was received into the Philadelphia Conference May 20, 1798, and, “the demonstrations which had attended Abbott’s labors were repeated at almost all his appointments, and hundreds of souls were gathered into the societies.” He labored as follows: Caroline Circuit, 1798; Flanders Circuit, N.J., 1799; Northampton Circuit, Va., 1800-1; Dover, Del., 1802; Annessex, Md., 1803; Talbot Circuit, 1804; Seneca Circuit, N.Y., 1805; Burlington, N.J., 1806; Asbury, N.J., 1807; Lewiston, Del., 1808; St. George’s, Philadelphia, 1809; Cecil, Md., 1810; Smyrna, Del., 18; Kent, Md. 1812; Accomack, Va., 1813; from 1814 to 1816 he was allowed a respite on account of ill health; Kent Circuit, 1817; New Brunswick, 1818; Kensington, 1819; Kent, 1820-21; supernumerary in 1822, in which relation he continued until his death, in May, 1844. Mr. Smith was a man of unquestioned piety, a superior pastor, and a powerful preacher. He preached “with the utmost brevity, but with the utmost power.” He possessed a faith admirable in its earnestness and sublime in its power. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 595; *Experience and Ministerial Labors of the Rev. Thomas Smith*, edited by the Rev. David Daily (N.Y. 1848); Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 3, 379, 415; 4, 269. (J.L.S.)

Smith, Thomas (4),

a Congregational minister, was born in Litchfield, Me., Aug. 17, 1812. Converted at the age of twenty-one, he set out to prepare himself for the ministry, and, by his own exertions prepared for college, graduated at Bowdoin College in 1840, and at Bangor Theological Seminary in 1843. He preached in Maine at Cherryfield and Orrington, and in 1849 became pastor of Brewer Village, where he continued until his death, April 7, 1861. Mr. Smith was preeminently excellent as a pastor, and was much beloved by his people. He was much attached to his work, and pursued his objects with unconquerable energy. See *Congregational Quarterly*, 1861, p. 376.

Smith, Thomas C.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born Jan. 1, 1807, embraced religion in 1824, was admitted on trial in the South Carolina Conference Feb. 11, 1828, and appointed to Washington Circuit, Ga.; Reedy River Circuit in

1828; received into full connection in 1830, and sent to Morganton Circuit; Cooper River Circuit in 1831-32; supernumerary on Lancaster Circuit in 1833; returned effective and appointed to Lincolnton Circuit in 1834; superannuated in 1835, in which relation he continued until his death, Nov. 27, 1837. As a minister he possessed good preaching abilities, and was much beloved by those with whom he labored. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf.* 2, 575.

Smith, Thomas G.,

a Dutch Reformed minister, was born in Scotland in 1756, came to America in 1774, and enlisted actively in the cause of American independence. After, the Revolutionary war he studied for the ministry under Dr. John Mason, and obtained license to preach in 1791 from the Associate Reformed Church. His ministry covered the period of forty-six years, during most of which (1808 to 1837) he was pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church at Tarrytown, N.Y. He had previously been settled in the Associate Reformed Church in Orange County, and then in Ulster County, in the churches of Esopus, Bloomingdale, and Hurley. He was always a favorite preacher, popular in manner, evangelical in spirit, and Calvinistic in creed, and in the pulpit was particularly practical and experimental, He possessed a sound mind in a sound body, and a warm heart with a vigorous intellect. His ministry was discriminating, and in every respect useful and honored. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 219, 220. (W.J.R.T.)

Smith, Turner H.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Buncombe County, N.C., May 15, 1818, and moved to Missouri in 1833. He united with the Church in 1839, was licensed to preach in 1846, and entered the St. Louis Conference in 1851. He was ordained deacon Oct. 1, 1854; and elder Oct. 12, 1856. He died April 20, 1857. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1857, p. 744.

Smith (or Smyth), William (1),

an English prelate, was a native of Lancashire, and born about the middle of the 15th century. He took his LL.B. degree at Oxford before 1492, when he was presented to the rectory of Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, by the countess of Richmond. Previous to this (Sept. 20, 1485) he was appointed

clerk of the hanaper, and a few years after was promoted to the deanery of St. Stephen's, Westminster. In 1493 he was consecrated bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. He was shortly afterwards made president of the prince's council within the marches of Wales. There was a renewal of this commission in the seventeenth year of Henry VII, of which Smith was again lord-president. In 1495 he rebuilt the hospital of St. John, Lichfield, and gave a new body of statutes for the use of the society. Bishop Smith was translated to the see of Lincoln in November, 1495. In 1500 he was elected chancellor of Oxford, and in 1507-8 he concerted the plan of Brasenose College, along with his friend Sir Richard Sutton, and lived to see it completed. He died at Buckden, Jan. 2, 1513 (1514), and was interred in Lincoln Cathedral. See Churton, *Lives of the Founders*; Chalmers, *Hist. of Oxford*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, William (2),

a learned English divine, was born in Worcester in 1711, and educated at the grammar school of that city, and afterwards at New College, Oxford, from which he graduated in 1732. In 1735 he was presented by James, earl of Derby, to the rectory of Trinity Church; Chester, and by his son to the deanery of Chester in 1758. He held the mastership of Brentwood School, Essex, for one year, 1748; and in 1758 was nominated one of the ministers of St. George's Church, Liverpool, which he resigned in 1767. With his deanery he held the parish churches of Handley and Trinity, but in 1780 resigned the last for the rectory of West Kirkby. He died Jan. 12, 1787. He is known in the literary world chiefly by his valuable translation of *Longinus on the Sublime* (1738, 8vo): — *Thucydides* (1753, 2 vols. 4to; reprinted in 1781, 8vo): — *Xenophon's History of the Affairs of Greece* (1770, 4to): — *Nine Sermons on the Beatitudes* (1782, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 61; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Smith, William (3), D.D.,

an Episcopalian clergyman, was born in Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1727, and was graduated at the college in his native city in 1747. For three years he taught a parochial school, and in 1750 came to the United States. He acted as private tutor in the family of Gov. Martin, on Long Island, for two years, when he was invited to take charge of the Seminary in Philadelphia, which has since become the University of Pennsylvania. He accepted, went

to England for holy orders, and being ordained in December, 1753, returned, and in the May following took charge of the institution. In 1759 he returned to England and received his degree of D.D. from the University of Oxford, and about the same time from Aberdeen College. A few years after the same degree was conferred upon him by Trinity College, Dublin. In 1766 the mission in Oxford being vacant, Dr. Smith undertook to supply it twice in three weeks, and was placed by his own request on the list of the society's missionaries the next year. Dr. Smith held a somewhat indecisive attitude in the contest that resulted in the nation's independence. The charter of the College of Philadelphia being taken away in November, 1779, Dr. Smith became rector of Chester Parish, Md. and established a classical seminary, which in June, 1782, was chartered as Washington College, of which he became president. He was president of the convention which organized the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in June following was elected bishop of Maryland; but finding strong opposition to an episcopate in that state, and others elsewhere opposed to his consecration, he gave up the matter altogether. In 1783 he took charge also of St. Paul's Parish, Kent Co., which he held for two years. He was on the committee appointed in 1785 to revise the Prayer book. In 1789, the charter of the College of Philadelphia having been restored, he again became its president. He died at Philadelphia, May 14, 1803. "Dr. Smith was a learned scholar, an eloquent and greatly popular preacher, and distinguished as a teacher of the liberal sciences, and an astronomer." He was the author of many occasional sermons, addresses, letters, pamphlets, etc., of which a selection was published, with a preface by bishop White, under the title of *The Works of William Smith, D.D.* (Phila. 1803, 2 vols. 8vo). For a complete list of these works, see Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5, 161; also Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of Amer. Lit.* 1, 388; Rich, *Bibl. Amer. Nova*, 1, 111, 129, 225, 245, 379.

Smith, William (4), D.D.,

an Episcopal clergyman, was born in Scotland about 1754, and came, an ordained minister, to the United States in 1785. Shortly after he was settled in Stepney Parish, Md., and after remaining there two years became rector of St. Paul's Church, Narraganset, R.I. He left Jan. 28, 1790, to assume the rectorship of Trinity Church, Newport, R.I. He was instrumental in organizing the Church in Rhode Island. He left Newport April 12, 1797, to take charge of St. Paul's Church, Norwalk, Conn., where he remained until

1800, when he removed to New York, where he opened a grammar school. In 1802 he became principal of the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire, N.Y., which he left in 1806, and returned to New York, where he died, April 6, 1821. He was author of *The Reasonableness of Setting Forth the Praises of God* (N.Y. 1814, 12mo): — *Essays on the Christian Ministry: — Chants for Public Worship: — Office of Institution of Ministers*, in the American Prayer book: — also occasional sermons and articles in periodicals. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5, 345.

Smith, William (5), D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Harrisburg, Pa., July 17, 1793, He entered Jefferson College, and after his graduation was appointed to a tutorship in the same. In 1821 he was inducted into the professorship of ancient languages. He held this position with marked ability for a quarter of a century, when, on the division of the chair and the appointment of a professor of the Latin language, he was made vice-president of the college and professor of the Greek language and literature. Such he continued at the union of the Canonsburg and Jefferson colleges in 1865. Dr. Smith was a profound linguist, and an able teacher of the languages. Preferring retirement after so long a service, he resigned, and was made emeritus professor, the college being unwilling to part with a man of such eminent attainments. He died at Canonsburg, July 17, 1878. (W.P.S.)

Smith, William (6),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1802, was ordained deacon in 1804, and elder in 1806. He located in 1819, but in 1825 his name appears on the *Minutes* as supernumerary, which relation he held until 1832, when he became superannuated, and so continued until his death at Long Branch, N.J. April 8, 1854. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1854, p. 352.

Smith, William (7),

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Niagara, Upper Canada, March 26, 1802, was converted when about twenty years of age, joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, and prepared himself for the ministry in Cazenovia (N.Y.) Seminary. He was admitted to the Canada Conference in 1827, which he served with fidelity and acceptance during a

period of eight years, filling such responsible stations as Brockville, Kingston, and Toronto. In 1835 he removed to New England, and in 1836 was received into the New England Conference, and preached successively at Williamsburg, Westfield, Charlestown, Lynn, Wood End, and Church Street, Boston, where he died, March 30, 1843. He was a good man, and benevolence, faithfulness, and conscientiousness were among the traits of his character. In doing the work of a pastor he shone preeminently bright. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 450.

Smith, William (8),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Kenilworth, England, Feb. 26, 1826, was converted at the age of eleven, and was licensed to preach when but sixteen. He came to the United States in 1857, and was received on trial by the Upper Iowa Conference in 1858. In 1871 he was appointed presiding elder, but was prevented from completing his term of four years' service by death, May 20, 1875. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 128.

Smith, William (9),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was converted and united with the Mount Pleasant (Pa.) Church, Radnor Circuit. In 1856 he was licensed to preach, and received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference. In 1864 his health declined, and he was superannuated. He died June 7, 1864, aged thirty-one. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf.* 1865, p. 35.

Smith, William Andrew,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Fredericksburg, Va., Nov. 29, 1802. He received a good English education in Petersburg, united with the Church at the age of seventeen, and was admitted into the Virginia Conference in February, 1825. In 1833 he became agent for the Randolph Macon College, and afterwards continued to fill the chief stations in his conference until 1846, when he accepted the presidency of the college. This office he held for twenty years, and acted also as professor of rhetoric, logic, and mental and moral philosophy. In 1866 he resigned the presidency, and was transferred to the St. Louis Conference. He was elected president of Central College, Mo., in 1868. In October of the same year he became the subject of a disease that eventually caused his death, March 1, 1870. Mr. Smith was one of the leading minds

of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1870, p. 479.

Smith, William R.,

a Presbyterian minister, and son of Robert Smith; D.D., was born in Pequea, Pa., May 10, 1752. He graduated at Princeton, N.J., in 1773, was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Newcastle, Del., in 1776, and was settled as pastor of the Second Church in Wilmington about 1786. He resigned his charge in 1796, and became pastor of the Reformed Dutch churches of Harlingen and Shannock, N.J., in which relation he died, about the year 1815. The Rev. Dr. Thomas Dewitt writes, "I remember him while I was studying theology at New Brunswick, 1810-12. He was plain in his manners, a judicious and instructive preacher, without much power of elocution; a faithful pastor, and amiable and exemplary in his spirit and deportment." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 173.

Smith, Worthington, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Hadley, Mass., 1795. He graduated at Williams College in 1816, studied theology at Andover, and was licensed to preach in 1819. He was minister at St. Albans, Vt., 1823-49, and was president of the University of Vermont from 1849 until his death at St. Albans, Feb. 13, 1856., He published separate *Sermons* (1846, 1848, 1849): — and a volume of *Sermons*, with a *Memoir of his Life* by Rev. Joseph Torrey (Andover, 1861, 12mo).

Smithers, William Collier, D.D.,

an English clergyman, was born in 1796, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He served the cure of St. Alphage, Greenwich, for eighteen years, that of Charlton for five years; and was also principal of a school. He died at Maize Hill, Greenwich, Feb. 19, 1861. His works were principally educational, as, *The Classical Student's Manual: — On the Particles, the Middle Verb*, etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s..v.

Smoke

(usually]ν[; *ashan*, **καπνός**; but in ^{<1152>}Genesis 19:28; ^{<1383>}Psalms 119:83, the stronger word **ρωγγα** *aitor*, is used, like **τύφομα**, ^{<121>}Matthew

12:20). On the expression “pillars of smoke” (~~2023~~ Joel 2:30, 31; ~~4119~~ Acts 2:19, 20) Thomson remarks (*Land and Book*, 2, 311) that they “are probably those columns of sand and dust raised high in the air by local whirlwinds, which often accompany the sirocco. On the great desert of the Hauran I have seen a score of them moving with great rapidity over the plain.” *SEE WHIRLWIND*.

Smotherman, Jesse S.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was admitted into the Memphis Conference in 1854. He labored in the regular work of the ministry (with the exception of one year’s service in the army during the rebellion) until his death, in 1863. *See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1863, p. 435.

Smyrna,

in Grecian mythology, was (1) the mother of Adonis, commonly called *Myrrha*; (2) one of the Amazons from whom the town in Asia Minor derived its name.

Smyr’na

(*Σμύρνα*, *myrrh*), a city which derived its Biblical importance from its prominent mention as the seat of one of the Apocalyptic churches of Asia Minor (~~618~~ Revelation 2:8-11). In the following account we freely condense the ancient and modern information on the subject.

I. History. — This celebrated commercial city of Ionia (Ptol. 5, 2) is situated near the bottom of that gulf of the Aegean Sea which receives its name from it (Mela, 1, 17, 3), at the mouth of the small river Meles, and 320 stadia north of Ephesus (Strabo, 15, 632). It is in N. lat. 38° 26’, E. long. 27° 7’. Smyrna is said to have been a very ancient town founded by an Amazon of the name of Smyrna, who had previously conquered Ephesus. In consequence of this, Smyrna was regarded as a colony of Ephesus. The Ephesian colonists are said afterwards to have been expelled by Aeolians, who then occupied the place, until, aided by the Colophonians, the Ephesian colonists were enabled to reestablish themselves at Smyrna (ibid. 14, 633; Steph. B. s.v.; Pliny, 5, 31). Herodotus, on the other hand (1, 150), states that Smyrna originally belonged to the Aeolians, who admitted into their city some Colophonian

exiles; and that these Colophonians afterwards, during a festival which was celebrated outside the town, made themselves masters of the place. From that time Smyrna ceased to be an Aeolian city, and was received into the Ionian confederacy (comp. Paus. 7, 5, 1). So far, then, as we are guided by authentic history, Smyrna belonged to the Aeolian confederacy until the year B.C. 688, when, by an act of treachery on the part of the Colophonians, it fell into the hands of the Ionians and became the thirteenth city in the Ionian League (Herod. *loc. cit.*; Paus. *loc. cit.*). The city was attacked by the Lydian king Gyges, but successfully resisted the aggressor (Herod. 1, 14; Paus. 9, 29, 2). Alyattes, however, about B.C. 627, was more successful; he took and destroyed the city, and henceforth, for a period of 400 years, it was deserted and in ruins (Herod. 1, 16; Strabo, 14, 646), though some inhabitants lingered in the place, living *κωμηδόν*, as is stated by Strabo, and as we must infer from the fact that Scylax (p. 37) speaks of Smyrna as still existing. Alexander the Great is said to have formed the design of rebuilding the city (Paus. 7, 5, 1) soon after the battle of the Granicus, in consequence of a dream when he had lain down to sleep after the fatigue of hunting. A temple in which two goddesses were worshipped under the name of Nemeses stood on the hill, on the sides of which the new town was built under the auspices of Antigonus and Lysimachus, who carried out the design of the conqueror after his death. The new city was not built on the site of the ancient one, but at a distance of twenty stadia to the south of it, on the southern coast of the bay, and partly on the side of a hill which Pliny calls Mastusia, but principally in the plain at the foot of it extending to the sea. After its extension and embellishment by Lysimachus, new Smyrna became one of the most magnificent cities, and certainly the finest in all Asia Minor. The streets were handsome, well paved, and drawn at right angles, and the city contained several squares, porticos, a public library, and numerous temples and other public buildings; but one great drawback was that it had no drains (Strabo, *loc. cit.*; *Marm. Oxon.* No. 5). It also possessed an excellent harbor which could be closed, and continued to be one of the wealthiest and most flourishing commercial cities of Asia. It afterwards became the seat of a *conventus juridicus* which embraced the greater part of Aeolis as far as Magnesia, at the foot of Mount Sipylus (Cic. *Pro Flacc.* p. 30; Pliny, 5, 31). During the war between the Romans and Mithridates, Smyrna remained faithful to the former, for which it was rewarded with various grants and privileges (Liv. 35:42; 37:16, 54; 38:39). But it afterwards suffered much when Trebonius, one of Caesar's murderers, was

besieged there by Dolabella, who in the end took the city, and put Trebonius to death (Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Cic. *Phil.* 11, 2; Liv. *Epit.* 119; Dion Cass. 47, 29). In the reign of Tiberius, Smyrna had conferred upon it the equivocal honor of being allowed, in preference to several other Asiatic cities, to erect a temple to the emperor (Tac. *Ann.* 3, 63; 4, 56). During the years 178 and 180 Smyrna suffered much from earthquakes, but the emperor M. Aurelius did much to alleviate its sufferings (Dion Cass. 71, 32). It is well known that Smyrna was one of the places claiming to be the birthplace of Homer, and the Smyrnaeans themselves were so strongly convinced of their right to claim this honor that they erected a temple to the great bard, or a Ὁμήρειον, a splendid edifice containing a statue of Homer (Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Cic. *Pro Arch.* 8): they even showed a cave in the neighborhood of their city, on the little river Meles, where the poet was said to have composed his works. Smyrna was at all times not only a great commercial place, but its schools of rhetoric and philosophy also were in great repute. The Christian Church also flourished through the zeal and care of its first bishop, Polycarp, who is said to have been put to death in the stadium of Smyrna in A.D. 166 (Iren. 3, 176). Under the Byzantine emperors the city experienced great vicissitudes. Having been occupied by Tzachas, a Turkish chief, about the close of the 11th century, it was nearly destroyed by a Greek fleet, commanded by John Ducas. It was restored, however, by the emperor Comnenus, but again subjected to severe sufferings during the siege of Tamerlane. Not long after, it fell into the hands of the Turks, who have retained possession of it ever since.

Picture for Smyrna 1

II. Characteristics. — Smyrna contained a temple of the Olympian Zeus, with whose cult that of the Roman emperors was associated. Olympian games were celebrated here, and excited great interest. On one of these occasions (in the year 68), a Rhodian youth of the name of Artemidorus obtained greater distinctions than any on record, under peculiar circumstances which Pausanias relates. He was a pancratiast, and not long before had been beaten at Elis from deficiency in growth. But when the Smyrnan Olympia next came round, his bodily strength had so developed that he was victor in three trials on the same day — the first against his former competitors at the Peloponnesian Olympia, the second with the youths, and the third with the men; the last contest having been provoked by a taunt (Paus. 5, 14, 4). The extreme interest excited by the games at

Smyrna may perhaps account for the remarkable ferocity exhibited by the population against the aged bishop Polycarp. It was exactly on such occasions that what the pagans regarded as the unpatriotic and anti-social spirit of the early Christians became most apparent; and it was to the violent demands of the people assembled in the stadium that the Roman proconsul yielded up the martyr. The letter of the Smyrnaeans, in which the account of his martyrdom is contained, represents the Jews as taking part with the Gentiles in accusing him as an enemy to the state religion-conduct which would be inconceivable in a sincere Jew, but which was quite natural in those which the sacred writer characterizes as “a synagogue of Satan” (Ⓜ Revelation 2:9).

In the vicinity of Smyrna was a Macedonian colony settled in the country under the name of Hyrcani. The last are probably the descendants of a military body in the service of Seleucus, to whom lands were given soon after the building of new Smyrna, and who, together with the Magnesians, seem to have had the Smyrnan citizenship then bestowed upon them. The decree containing the particulars of this arrangement is among the marbles in the University of Oxford. The Romans continued the system which they found existing when the country passed over into their hands. Not only was the soil in the neighborhood eminently productive, so that the vines were even said to have two crops of grapes, but its position was such as to render it the natural outlet for the produce of the whole valley of the Hermus. The Pramnean wine (which Nestor, in the *Iliad*, and Circe, in the *Odyssey*, are represented as mixing with honey, cheese, and meal, to make a kind of salad dressing) grew even down to the time of Pliny in the immediate neighborhood of the temple of the Mother of the Gods at Smyrna, and doubtless played its part in the orgiastic rites both of that deity and of Dionysus, each of whom in the times of imperial Rome possessed a guild of worshippers frequently mentioned in the inscriptions as the **ἱερὰ σύνοδος μυστῶν μητρὸς Σιπυληνῆς** and the **ἱερὰ σύνοδος μυστῶν καὶ τεχνίτων Διονύσου**. One of the most remarkable of the *chefs-d'oeuvre* of Myron which stood at Smyrna, representing an old woman intoxicated, illustrates the prevalent habits of the population.

The inhabitants of new Smyrna appear to have possessed the talent of successfully divining the course of events in the troublous times through which it was their destiny to pass, and of habitually securing for themselves the favor of the victor for the time being. Their adulation of Seleucus and his son Antiochus was excessive. The title **ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ** is given to

the latter in an extant inscription; and a temple dedicated to his mother, Stratonice, under the title of **Ἀφροδίτη Στρατονικής**, was not only constituted a sanctuary itself, but the same right was extended in virtue of it to the whole city. Yet when the tide turned, a temple was erected to the city of Rome as a divinity, in time to save the credit of the Smyruaeans as zealous friends of the Roman people. Indeed, though history is silent as to the particulars, the existence of a coin of Smyrna with the head of Mithridates upon it indicates that this energetic prince also, for a time at least, must have included Smyrna within the circle of his dependencies. However, during the reign of Tiberius, the reputation of the Smyrnaeans for an ardent loyalty was so unsullied that on this account alone they obtained permission to erect a temple, in behalf of all the Asiatic cities, to the emperor and senate, the question having been for some time doubtful as to whether their city or Sardis (q.v.) — the two selected out of a crowd of competitors — should receive this distinction. The honor which had been obtained with such difficulty was requited with a proportionate adulation. Nero appears in the inscriptions as **σωτήρ τοῦ σύμπαντος ἀνθρωπέιου γένους**.

It seems not impossible that just as Paul's illustrations in the Epistle to the Corinthians are derived from the Isthmian games, so the message to the Church in Smyrna contains allusions to the ritual of the pagan mysteries which prevailed in that city. The story of the violent death and reviviscence of Dionysus entered into these to such an extent that Origen, in his argument against Celsus, does not scruple to quote it as generally accepted by the Greeks, although by them interpreted metaphysically (4, 171, ed. Spence). In this view, the words **ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸ καὶ ἔζησεν** (**ῥῆθ** Revelation 2:8) would come with peculiar force to ears perhaps accustomed to hear them in a very different application. The same may be said of **δώσω σοι τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς**, it having been a usual practice at Smyrna to present a crown to the priest who superintended the religious ceremonial, at the end of his year of office. Several persons of both sexes have the title of **στεφανηφόροι** in the inscriptions; and the context shows that they possessed great social consideration. These allusions derive additional force from the superstitious regard in which the Smyrneans held chance phrases (**κληδόνες**) as a material for augury. They had a **κληδόνων ἱερόν** just above the city outside the walls, in which this mode of divination was the ordinary one (Pausan. 9, 11, 7).

III. Present Condition. — From the convenience of its situation, Smyrna has still maintained its rank as a great city and the central emporium of the Levantine trade; and seeing the terrible decay which has fallen upon the numerous great and beautiful cities of Asia Minor, its relative rank among the existing cities of that region is probably greater than that which it anciently bore. The Turks call it *Izmir*. It is a better built town than Constantinople, and in proportion to its size there are few places in the Turkish dominions which have so large a population. It is computed at from 180, 000 to 200, 000, according to the season of the year; and the Franks compose a far greater proportion than in any other town of Turkey; and they are generally in good circumstances. Next to the Turks the Greeks form the most, numerous class of inhabitants, and they have a bishop and two churches. The unusually large proportion of Christians in the town renders it peculiarly unclean in the eyes of strict Moslems, whence it has acquired among them the name of Giaour Izmir, or Infidel Smyrna. There are in it 20, 000 Greeks, 8000 Armenians, 1000 Europeans, and 9000 Jews: the rest are Moslems.

Picture for Smyrna 2

The prosperity of Smyrna is now rather on the increase than the decline; houses of painted wood are giving way in all directions to mansions of stone; and probably not many years will elapse before the modern town may not unworthily represent that city which the ancients delighted to call “the lovely — the crown of Ionia the ornament of Asia.” It is the seat of a pashalik, and is the center of all important movements in Asia Minor.

Picture for Smyrna 3

Smyrna stands at the foot of a range of mountains which enclose it on three sides. The only ancient ruins are upon the mountains behind the town, and to the south. Upon the highest summit stands an old dilapidated castle, which is supposed by some to mark the previous (but not the *most* ancient) site of the city; frequent earthquakes having dictated the necessity of removing it to the plain below, and to the lower declivities of the mountains. Mr. Arundell says, “Few of the Ionian cities have furnished more relics of antiquity than Smyrna; but the convenience of transporting them, with the number of investigators, has exhausted the mine. It is therefore not at all wonderful that of the stoas and temples the very ruins have vanished; and it is now extremely difficult to determine the sites of

any of the ancient buildings, with the exception of the stadium, the theater, and the Temple of Jupiter Acraeus, which was within the acropolis” (*Discoveries in Asia Minor*, 2, 407). Of the stadium here mentioned the ground plot only remains, it being stripped of its seats and marble decorations. It is supposed to be the place where Polycarp, the disciple of John, and probably “the angel of the Church of Smyrna” (~~Rev~~ John 2:8), to whom the Apocalyptic message was addressed, suffered martyrdom. The Christians of Smyrna hold the memory of this venerable person in high honor, and go annually in procession to his supposed tomb, which is at a short distance from the place of martyrdom.

Smyrna has a deep interest to Christians from this fact. During one of the Roman persecutions many Christians suffered the most dreadful torments here. They were put to death at the stake, or by wild beasts in the amphitheater; and the only test applied to them was whether they would throw a few grains of incense into the fire as a sacrifice to the genius of the emperor, or whether they would refuse. A circular letter addressed to the churches in the Christian world from that of Smyrna gives a most interesting account of Polycarp’s death, and Neander has admirably translated, abridged, and systematized it. The proconsul before whom Polycarp was accused did all he could to save the venerable bishop, now in his ninetieth year; and when, like Pontius Pilate before him, he found it impossible to restrain the popular fury, he refused to allow any wild beasts to be let loose, and Polycarp, abandoned to the populace, was fastened to a stake and soon surrounded with flames. An old tradition states that the flames formed an arch above the head of the martyr, and left him uninjured; seeing this, a Roman soldier pierced him to the heart with a spear, and the fire then did its office, and consumed the lifeless body. It is, however, as Neander observes, more rational to believe that Polycarp died as Ridley and Latimer have done in more modern times. It is by no means improbable that Polycarp was confined in some one of the arched vaults within the acropolis, which remain to this day. An ancient mosque is also standing, which is said to have been the Church of St. John; but tradition is not much to be depended upon for assigning the correct site to such buildings, and the edifices of Smyrna are constructed of a white and peculiarly friable marble not adapted for great permanency. The Apocalyptic message to the Church at Smyrna is one which conveys no reproach, and, it has been often brought forward as a proof of the inspiration of the book in which it is found, that Smyrna has been always a flourishing city, and that there has

been, ever since the days of the apostle, a numerous congregation of Christians among her inhabitants. This, however, has not been, strictly speaking, the case, and it is easy to carry such a mode of proving the truth of Scripture too far; but it is satisfactory to know that true religion is greatly on the increase in this important city, and that the labors of Protestant missionaries have been abundantly successful.

IV. *Authorities.* —

1. *Ancient* — Strabo, 14, 183 sq.; Herodotus, 1, 16; Tacitus, *Annal.* 3, 63; 4, 56; Pliny, *H.N.* 5, 29; Bockh, *Inscript. Groec.* “Smyrnaean Inscriptions,” especially Nos. 3163-3176; Pausanias, *loc. cit.*, and 4, 21, 5; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1, 18.

2. *Modern.* — Rosenmuller, *Alterthumsk.* 1, 2, 224 sq.; Turner, *Travels*, 3, 138-141, 285-291; Arundell, *ut sup.*; Richter, p. 495; Schubert, 1, 272-283; *Narrative of Scottish Mission*, p. 328-336; *Eothen*, ch. 5; M'Farlane, *Progress of the Turkish Empire*; Prokesch, in the *Wiener Jahrb. d. Literatur*, 1834; Wrangel, *Skizzen aus d. Osten* (Dantz. 1839); Murray, *Handbook for Turkey in Asia*, p. 262 sq. **SEE ASIA MINOR.**

Smyth, Thomas, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Belfast, Ireland, June 14, 1808. He was educated at Belfast and at London, and came to the United States in 1830. He was graduated at Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., after which he was pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church at Charleston, S.C., from 1832 until his death, Aug. 20, 1873. He was the author of numerous works, chiefly in illustration and defense of the Presbyterian form of Church government; also of *The Unity of the Human Race Proved to be the Doctrine of Scripture, Reason, and Science* (1850), and *The True Origin and Source of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence*. (W.P.S.)

Smyth, William.

SEE SMITH, WILLIAM (1).

Smytonite Controversy

was a dispute which arose in the Secession Kirk about the middle of the 18th century respecting the elevation of the elements in celebrating the

Lord's supper. One of the ministers of that body, Mr. Smyton, of Kilmaurs, considered such elevation an essential part of the ordinance, but the synod determined that it should be left an open question.

Snail

Picture for Snail

is the representative in the A.V. of two Hebrew words, which are certainly the names of very different animals.

1. *Chomet* (fmj םSept. **סָאָרָא**; Vulg. *lacerta*) occurs only as the name of some unclean animal in ^{<BIB>}Leviticus 11:30. The Sept. and Vulg. understand some kind of *lizard* by the term; the Arabic versions of Erpenius and Saadias give the *chameleon* as the animal intended. The Veneto-Greek and the rabbins, with whom agrees the A.V., render the Heb. term by "snail." Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2, 500) has endeavored to show that a species of small sand lizard, called *chulaca* by the Arabs, is denoted; but his argument rests entirely upon some supposed etymological foundation. The word *chomet* in Chaldee is said to signify "to bow down," and therefore "suggests the *Lacerta stellio*, which is noted for bowing its head, insomuch that the followers of Mohammed kill it, because they say it mimics them in the mode of repeating their prayers. It is about a foot in length, and of an olive color shaded with black" (Kitto, *Pict. Bib.* ad loc.). The lizard referred to appears to be the skink (*Scincus officinalis*), which is very abundant throughout Northern Africa, Arabia, and Syria. MM. Dumeril and Bibron, in their elaborate work on reptiles, give us the following information of the species: "M. Lefebvre, who collected several of these animals during his excursion to the oasis of Barhriah, has communicated to us several observations on the habits of this species which we cannot omit. According to this zealous entomologist, the skink is found on hillocks of fine light sand, which the south wind accumulates at the bottom of hedges that border on cultivated grounds, and around the roots of tamarisk trees, which grow on the confines of the desert. It may be there seen basking in the rays of the sun, when the heat is intense, and, from time to time, giving chase to beetles and other insects which happen to pass near it. It runs with considerable rapidity, and when alarmed it buries itself in the sand with singular quickness, burrowing in a few moments a gallery of many feet in depth. When caught it struggles to escape, but neither attempts to bite nor to defend itself with its claws." Col.

H. Smith, without specifying his reasons, takes the *chomet* to be the true lizard (that is, we presume, the genus *Lacerta*) as restricted in modern herpetology “several (probably many) species existing in myriads on the rocks in sandy places and in ruins in every part of Palestine and the adjacent countries. There is one species particularly abundant and small, well known in Arabia by the name of *sarabandi*.” Of these Lord Lindsay says, speaking of his approach to Sinai, “hundreds of little lizards, of the color of the sand, and called by the natives *sarabandi*, were darting about.”

In the present imperfect state of our acquaintance with the reptiles of Western Asia, it is perhaps impossible to determine with satisfaction the actual species intended by some of the ancient Hebrew names. That the *chomet* was some one or other of the commoner kinds there can be little doubt, and this is all we can venture to say. Lizards of many sorts abound in these lands; they delight in a burning sun, in a dry sandy soil, in stony deserts, in ruined edifices. Moore’s picture of

*“Gay lizards glitt’ring on the walls
Of ruin’d fanes, busy and bright,
As they were all alive with light,”*

is intensely true, and highly characteristic of the sun-scorched East. All travelers are struck with this element of the scene. Major Skinner says of the Syrian desert, “The ground is teeming with lizards: the sun seems to draw them from the earth, for sometimes, when I have fixed my eye upon one spot, I have fancied that the sands were getting into life, so many of these creatures at once crept from their holes.” Lord Lindsay describes the ruins at Jerash as “absolutely alive with lizards.” Bruce says, “I am positive that I can say without exaggeration that the number I saw one day in the great court of the Temple of the Sun at Baalbec amounted to many thousands: the ground, the walls, the stones of the ruined buildings, were covered with them; and the various colors of which they consisted made a very extraordinary appearance glittering under the sun, in which they lay sleeping and basking.” *SEE LIZARD.*

2. *Shablul* (𐤑 𐤍 𐤁𐤍𐤏; Sept. κηρός; Aq. ἔντερον; Sym. χόριον; Vulg. *cera*) occurs only in ^{<1809>}Psalm 58:9 (8, A.V.): “As a *shablul* which melteth let [the wicked] pass away.” There are various opinions as to the meaning of this word, the most curious, perhaps, being that of Symmachus. The Sept. reads “melted wax,” similarly the Vulg. The rendering of the A.V. (“snail”) is supported by the authority of many of the Jewish doctors, and is

probably correct. The Chaldee Paraphr. explains *shablul* by *thiblala* (אל לבת), i.e. “a snail or a slug,” which was supposed by the Jews to consume away and die by reason of its constantly emitting slime as it crawls along. See *Schol. ad Gem. Moed Katon*, . fol. 6 B, as quoted by Bochart (*Hieroz.* 3, 560) and Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 212). Snails and slugs are not very common in countries so dry in summer as Palestine. Hence, perhaps, the fact that there is only one allusion to them in Scripture, where the figure seems to be more significant if understood of snails without shells, i.e. slugs, rather than shell snails, though true of both. The name itself, *shablul*, from a verb signifying “to smear” or “soil,” has reference to the slime and moisture of this animal (like λείμαξ, from λείβω). Probably some species of slug (*Limax*) is intended which differs from the snails proper (*Helix*) in being unprotected by an external shell. The slugs delight in dampness, and hence dewy nights and rainy weather are the seasons of their activity. Over a dry surface they cannot crawl without pouring out that copious effusion of mucus which constitutes their shining trail; and every one must have seen some miserable slug which, roving over a stone pavement in the dewy night, has been overtaken by the morning sun. The absorbent surface rapidly becomes dry; in vain the wretched creature pours out its slimy secretion, the sun is drying up its moisture, which at every moment becomes less and less copious with the demands made upon it, and it “melts away as it goes.” We possess no information respecting the *pulmoniferous mollusca* of Palestine. They do not present many attractions to general travelers, and doubtless are rarely seen. In so dry a country probably the species are few; and it is only in situations permanently humid, and during the night, that they would be likely to occur, at least in any abundance.

Snake

(**vj n**; A.V. “serpent”), a creature found in Palestine (Robinson saw some there six feet long [*Bibl. Res.* 2, 154]), but still more abundantly in the neighboring countries, especially Egypt (Ammian. Marcell. 22, 15; p. 324 ed. Bip.) and Arabia (Herod. 2, 75; 3, 109; Aelian, *Anim.* 2, 38; Strabo, 16, 759, 778; Diod. Sic. 3, 47; Agatharc. in *Phot. Cod.* 250, p. 1376; comp. ⁹²⁰⁶Numbers 21:6 sq.; ²³¹⁶Isaiah 30:6; see Prosp. Alpin. *Rer. AEgypt.* 4, 4; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2, 814; Tischendorf, *Reise*, 1, 261; Russell, *Aleppo*, 2, 120 sq.; Schubert, 3, 120; Forskal, *Descr. Anim.* p. 13 sq.); sometimes in the deserts, frequently of poisonous species. They belonged to unclean

animals according to the Mosaic classification (^{<B110>}Leviticus 11:10, 41 sq.). The scientific investigation of the different species in the East is not sufficiently accurate to enable us to determine with any certainty the various kinds mentioned in Scripture. *SEE SERPENT.*

Snape, Andrew,

a learned English divine, was born at Hampton Court, and educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge, where he received his degree of A.B. in 1693, of A.M. in 1697, and a fellowship. He went to London, was elected lecturer of St. Martin's in-the-Fields, and afterwards held the rectory of St. Mary-at-Hill. He was created D.D. in 1705, and represented Cambridge in that faculty at the Jubilee at Frankfort in 1707. In this year, on the breaking out of the Bangorian controversy, he took part against Hoadly; but the latter's interest at court prevailed, and Dr. Snape was removed from the office of chaplain to the king. He had been installed a canon of Windsor in 1713 and on Feb. 21, 1719, was elected provost of King's College. In 1723 he served as vice-chancellor of the university. He was for a short time rector of Knebworth, Hertfordshire, and afterwards (1737) of West Ildesley, Berkshire, which latter he retained until his death, Dec. 30, 1742. Dr. Snape was for several years headmaster of Eton school. He was a man of great learning, of an amiable temper, and had a great zeal for the principles of the Church of England. He was the editor of dean Moss's *Sermons*: — the author of a *Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*, during the Bangorian controversy, which passed through seventeen editions in a year: — *Sermons* (1745, 8vo), by Drs. Berriman and Chapman. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Snare

(usually the rendering in the A.V. of **vwq vqji** or **vqih**; all kindred roots signifying to *catch by the foot* in a spring noose; occasionally of **j Pj** etc.; **βρόχος, παγίς**), a gin, net, or trap, especially of the fowler (^{<B184>}Isaiah 8:14; Amos 3, 5); also such a one as seizes and holds beasts or men by the foot (^{<B180>}Job 18:9; ^{<B182>}Jeremiah 18:22). They were set in the path or hidden in the ground (^{<B173>}Proverbs 7:23; 22:5; ^{<B185>}Psalms 140:5; 119:110; ^{<B182>}Jeremiah 18:22). The form of this spring or trap net appears from the original word *pach* (^{<B185>}Amos 3:5; ^{<B182>}Psalms 69:23). It was in two parts, which, when set, were spread out upon the ground and slightly fastened with a stick (trap stick), so that as soon as a bird or beast touched the

stick, the parts flew up and enclosed the bird in the net or caught the foot of the animal. (^{<1818>}Job 18:9). In ^{<1923>}Psalm 69:23, “Let their table before them become a net,” here the *shulchan* is the Oriental cloth or leather spread upon the ground like a net. The original term is figuratively put for any *cause of destruction* (^{<6213>}Joshua 23:13; ^{<2105>}Hosea 5:1; ^{<18210>}Job 22:10). Thus is usually rendered ^{<19106>}Psalm 11:6, “Upon the wicked God shall rain snares, fire, and brimstone.” But the Hebrew word might here be rendered coals, burning coals, and then *lightning*. Still the significations *nets*, *snares*, may here well be retained as an emblem of destruction to the wicked. The “snares of death” (^{<10216>}2 Samuel 22:6; ^{<191875>}Psalm 18:5) are poetically put in apposition with the *cords* (A.V. improperly “sorrows”) of Sheol. **SEE NET.**

Sneath, Richard,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Ireland, Dec. 2, 1751. He emigrated to America in 1774, embraced religion in 1782, and entered the itinerancy in 1796. For twenty-eight years his labors were unremitting, and he ceased not until he was literally worn down in the glorious work. He died Oct. 24, 1824. He was known for his integrity, benevolence, and Christian character. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 475; *Meth. Mag.* 8, 287; Bangs, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 2, 307.

Sneed, George W.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Davidson County, Tenn., Dec. 26, 1799, and professed faith in Christ in 1822. Some years subsequently he received a license to preach, and joined the Tennessee Conference within its bounds he labored for many years, and became superannuated about 1848. Removing to Texas, his health failed, and he died suddenly about 1851. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South*, 1851, p. 337.

Snell, Thomas, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in Cummington, Mass., Nov. 21, 1774; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1795, and was ordained pastor at North Brookfield, Mass., in 1798, where he continued pastor until his death, May 4, 1862. Dr. Snell’s influence upon the Church, town, and brethren in the ministry was much felt. He was a pioneer in temperance and slavery reform, and was much interested in missionary and educational

movements. He published several sermons, conversations on baptism, etc. See *Congregational Quarterly*, 1862, p. 317-332.

Snethen, Nicholas,

an influential minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born at Fresh Pond (now Glen Cove), L.I., Nov. 15, 1769. Removing to Belleville, N.J., he there experienced religion, and began to speak and pray in public. In 1794 he entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and preached for four years in Connecticut, Vermont, and Maine. In 1798-99 he preached in Charleston, S.C., and in 1800 was chosen as travelling companion to bishop Asbury. He was elected secretary of the General Conference of 1800, and was also a member in 1804 and 1812. He took a prominent part in favor of limiting the episcopal prerogative, a delegated General Conference (his plan for which was adopted in 1808), and was an early advocate of anti-slavery principles. He located in 1806, and removed to his farm on Longanore, Frederick Co., Md. By his marriage he became the holder of slaves, whom he emancipated as soon as the law would permit (1829). In 1809 he reentered the itinerancy, and was stationed in Baltimore, Georgetown, and Alexandria, and while at Georgetown was elected chaplain of the House of Representatives. He located again in 1814. In 1829 he removed to Indiana, and upon the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church (q.v.) he united with it, and in connection with it continued to travel and preach till within a short time of his death. In 1834 he became one of the editors of *The Methodist Protestant*, in Baltimore. In 1836 the Methodist Protestants started a college in New York, of which Mr. Snethen took charge. The enterprise did not succeed, and in 1837 he returned to the West and took charge of a Manual Labor Ministerial College at Lawrenceburg, Ind., but that institution also failed. Much of his subsequent labor was performed in Cincinnati. He died May 30, 1845. Mr. Snethen was a clear and forcible writer and an eloquent minister. He became a contributor to *The Wesleyan Repository* in 1821, and afterwards to its successor, *The Mutual Rights*. In 1800 he wrote a *Reply to O'Kelly's Apology*, and in 1801 his *Answer to O'Kelly's Rejoinder*: — *Funeral Oration on Bishop Asbury* (1816): — *Lectures on Preaching* (1822): — *Essays on Lay Representation* (1835): — *Lectures on Biblical Subjects* (1836): — *Sermons* (1846), edited by W. G. Snethen.

Snio

(*snow*), in Norse mythology, was one of the Fornjot nature gods, whose father was Froste (*cold, frost*), grandfather Kare (*air*), and great-grandfather Fornjoter, the oldest of gods. He was also named *Snaer*.

Snoddy, Robert H.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Jefferson County, Tenn., in 1800. After the usual training in academical schools, he graduated at the college at Maryville, Tenn., and also at the Southwestern Theological Seminary at Maryville; was licensed by Union Presbytery in 1831; was ordained in 1833, and preached for Lebanon and Eusebia churches; took charge of New Prospect Church in 1836. Having organized Spring Place Church, he added that to his other places of preaching till 1853. He took charge of Ebenezer Church in 1855, where he labored until his death, June 22, 1859. Mr. Snoddy was a faithful and devoted minister of the Gospel. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 192.

Snotr,

in Norse mythology, was the goddess of virtue and modesty, and the protectress of virtuous men.

Snow

Picture for Snow

(*gl* *v*, *sheleg*, so called probably from its *glistening*; Sept. and New Test. *χιών*; but *δρόσος* in ^{<1801>}Proverbs 26; Vulg. *nix*). The historical books of the Bible contain only two notices of snow actually falling (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 23:20; 1 Macc. 13:22), but the allusions in the poetical books are so numerous that there can be no doubt as to its being an ordinary occurrence in the winter months. Thus, for instance, the snowstorm is mentioned among the ordinary operations of nature which are illustrative of the Creator's power (^{<1976>}Psalms 147:16; 148:8). We have, again, notice of the beneficial effect of snow on the soil (^{<2850>}Isaiah 55:10). Its color is adduced as an image of brilliancy (^{<2100>}Daniel 7:9; ^{<1083>}Matthew 28:3; ^{<6014>}Revelation 1:14), of purity (^{<2018>}Isaiah 1:18; ^{<2047>}Lamentations 4:7, in reference to the white robes of the princes), and of the blanching effects of leprosy (^{<1046>}Exodus 4:6; ^{<0420>}Numbers 12:10; ^{<1127>}2 Kings 5:27). In the book of Job

we have references to the supposed cleansing effects of snow-water (~~Job~~ Job 9:30), to the rapid melting of snow under the sun's rays (~~Job~~ Job 24:19), and the consequent flooding of the brooks (~~Job~~ Job 6:16). The thick falling of the flakes forms the point of comparison in the obscure passage in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 68:14. The snow lies deep in the ravines of the highest ridge of Lebanon until the summer is far advanced, and indeed never wholly disappears (Robinson, 3, 531); the summit of Hermonu also perpetually glistens with frozen snow (ibid. 2, 437). From these sources probably the Jews obtained their supplies for the purpose of cooling their beverages in summer (~~Proverbs~~ Proverbs 25:13), as is still done (Hackett, *Illust. of Script.* p. 53). This allusion removes the apparent contradiction of this passage in ~~Proverbs~~ Proverbs 26:1. As snow — that is, a fall of snow — in summer is unnatural and ill-timed, so honor is not seemly for a fool; but it is quite out of character, out of season. The “snow of Lebanon” is also used as an expression for the refreshing coolness of spring water, probably in reference to the stream of Siloam (~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 18:14). Lastly, in ~~Proverbs~~ Proverbs 31:21, snow appears to be used as a synonym for winter or cold weather. The liability to snow must of course vary considerably in a country of such varying altitude as Palestine. Josephus notes it as a peculiarity of the low plain of Jericho that it was warm there even when snow was prevalent in the rest of the country (*War*, 4, 8, 3). At Jerusalem snow often falls to the depth of a foot or more in January and February, but it seldom lies long (Robinson, 1, 429). At Nazareth it falls more frequently and deeply, and it has been observed to fall even in the maritime plain at Joppa and about Carmel (Kitto, *Phys. Hist.* p. 210). A comparison of the notices of snow contained in Scripture and in the works of modern travelers would, however, lead to the conclusion that more fell in ancient times than at the present day. At Damascus snow falls to the depth of nearly a foot and lies at all events for a few days (Wortabet, *Syria*, 1, 215, 236). At Aleppo it falls, but never lies for more than a day. (Russell, 1, 69).

Scientifically, snow is nothing more than the frozen visible vapor of which the clouds are formed. A quantity of very minute crystals of ice having been formed, they are enlarged by the condensation and freezing of vapor, and, merging together, constitute flakes, which increase in size during their descent. In equatorial regions snow is unknown at the ocean level, and in all latitudes less than thirty-five degrees it is rare; but it is found in all latitudes in the higher regions of the atmosphere. It would scarcely be supposed that the broad flakes of snow which every blast of wind blows

hither and thither as it lists are perfectly formed collections of crystals, delicate in their structure, and regular in their measurement. Flakes of snow are best observed when laced upon objects of a dark color, cooled below the freezing point, a method first described by Kepler, who expressed the highest admiration of their structure. The minute crystals exhibit an endless diversity of regular and beautiful forms. Scoresby described ninety-six varieties of combination; and they probably amount to several hundreds. Snow flakes are understood to belong to the hexagonal system of crystals. Kemptz remarks that flakes which fall at the same time have generally the same form; but if there is an interval between two consecutive falls of snow, the forms of the second are observed to differ from those of the first, although always alike among themselves. The temperature and density of the atmosphere have doubtless an influence upon their structures. Some have thought that the expression “*treasures of the snow*” in ^{1882} Job 38:22 has reference to these variegated forms (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.).

The substance which has received the name of *red* or *crimson-colored snow* is common in all alpine districts; yet no one ever pretends to have seen this kind of snow fall. This substance has been observed by Ross, Parry, and others in the Arctic regions; and even green snow was observed about an inch beneath the white by the French Expedition at Spitzbergen. Prof. M. Ch. Martius and his companions in the French Expedition concluded generally that the red and green granules of colored snow are one and the same microscopic plant in different stages of development; that red is the color of the primitive state, which afterwards becomes green under the influence of light and air. This very minute red or crimson-colored plant, sometimes called the *Palmetto nivalis*, finds nourishment on the surface of the snow within the limits of perpetual congelation; it is also found covering long patches of snow in the Alps and Pyrenees. See Schlichter, *De Nive ejusque Usu Antiquo* (Hal. 1738). See FROST; ICE.

Snow, Jonathan M.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Montpelier, Vt., Oct. 30, 1809. He embraced religion and joined the Church when seventeen, and in 1838 was admitted into the Illinois Conference. In 1852 he located, but in 1859 he was admitted into the Wisconsin Conference and granted a superannuated relation, which continued until his death, in Chicago, April 30, 1862. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1862, p. 218.

Snow, William,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Providence, N.J., July 14, 1783. He joined the New York Conference in 1807; located in 1818; in 1831 reentered the itinerancy; but in 1835 became superannuated, and remained such until his death, in Genesee, N.Y., July 6, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 157.

Snow, William T.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Providence, R.I., about 1803. In 1826 he embraced religion, was licensed to preach, and soon after joined the Ohio Conference. For a number of years he labored in the mountains of Western Virginia, Southern Ohio, and the wilds of Michigan. In 1836-37 his health failed, and he retired from active work, residing in Oakland County, Mich., and preaching to the Indians as his strength permitted. He died Oct. 16, 1875. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf.* 1875, p. 146.

Snowden, James Ross, LL.D.,

an eminent elder of the Presbyterian Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., in 1810. For many years he was prominently connected with the affairs of Pennsylvania, having repeatedly been elected to the Legislature of the state, where he served two terms in the speaker's chair. He subsequently filled the positions of state treasurer, treasurer of the United States Mint, and assistant treasurer of the United States at Philadelphia. In 1858 he was appointed director of the United States Mint, and held that position till 1861. His connection with the mint led him to study numismatics with great thoroughness, and he was the author of several important works on the subject. In 1864 he published *The Coins of the Bible and its Money Terms*. In 1868 he contributed the article on the coins of the United States to Bouvier's *Law Dictionary*, also several addresses on currency, coinage, and other kindred subjects. He contributed a number of articles to the *New York Observer on The Coins of the Bible, Evidencing the Truth of the Scripture Testimony*. Mr. Snowden frequently represented the Philadelphia Presbytery in the General Assembly. He died in Hulmeville, Pa., in March, 1878. (W.P.S.)

Snowden, L.D.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Howard County, Md., in 1826. In 1867 he was admitted on trial in the Washington Conference; was ordained deacon in 1869, and elder in 1871. He died in Romney, West Va., Dec. 5, 1875. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 31.

Snowden, Samuel Finley,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Nov. 6, 1767. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1786; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach by the New Brunswick Presbytery, April 24, 1794; was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Princeton Nov. 25 of same year; resigned on account of ill health, April 29, 1801; was afterwards settled successively at Whitesborough, New Hartford, and Sackett's Harbor, N.Y.; and died in May, 1845. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 341, note.

Snuff dish

(**hTtṭḥi** *machtah*, ^{<1258>}Exodus 25:38; 27:23; Sept. **ὑπόθεμα**; Vulg. *vasum*; elsewhere “censer” or “fire-pan”), a *tray* for catching the snuff of the lamps of the golden candelabrum; resembling a fire pan or shovel, as the same Hebrew word elsewhere means (^{<15162>}Leviticus 16:12; ^{<1273>}Exodus 27:3; 38:3; ^{<1416>}Numbers 16:6 sq.; ^{<1175>}1 Kings 7:50, etc.). **SEE CANDLESTICK.**

Snuffer

Picture for Snuffer

(**trMzīm**] *mezammereth*, a *cutting* instrument; ^{<1175>}1 Kings 7:50; ^{<1214>}2 Kings 12:14; 25:14; ^{<1402>}2 Chronicles 4:22, ^{<1523>}Jeremiah 52:18; **μ yj ḳl ḥ**, *melkacha'yim*, ^{<1373>}Exodus 37:23; *tongs*, as elsewhere rendered), an implement for removing the snuff from the lamps of the sacred candelabrum. Judging from the latter of the above Hebrew terms, it was double, but not of the scissors form. Instruments like ours for *cutting* the wick of a lamp were not anciently known, unless the instrument represented in the cut, copied from one in the British Museum, may be supposed to have been used for such a purpose; but a sort of tweezers was employed to draw up the wick when necessary, and for *pinching off* any

superfluous portion. Everyone is aware that lamps when properly replenished with oil do not need snuffing, like candles. The sort of tweezers we have mentioned is still used in the East for trimming lamps. Snuffers are only known in those parts of Western Asia where candles are partially used during winter. Snuffers are candle, not lamp, instruments; and candles are but little used in any part of Asia, the temperature being generally too warm. *SEE CANDLESTICK.*

Snyder, George Niver,

a minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, was born in Honesdale, Pa., March 27, 1844. He graduated at Hamilton College, N.Y., in 1868, and entered Union Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1871. He was ordained, and became a stated supply of the Church at Elmsford, N.Y., and after remaining one year became pastor of the Church at White Plains, N.Y., where he died, Nov. 2, 1872. (W.P.S.)

Snyder, Henry (1),

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Schellsburgh, Bedford Co., Pa., Sept. 16, 1813. He was converted, and united with the Church Sept. 26, 1831. He was admitted on trial into the Pittsburgh Conference in 1848, ordained deacon in 1850, and elder in 1852. He continued in active labor until his death, Oct. 3, 1861. As a preacher he was eminently successful; gracious revivals attended his ministry wherever he went. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1862, p. 43.

Snyder, Henry (2),

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stephensburg, Frederick Co., Va., Dec. 2, 1814. He graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1838, studied theology privately, was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery, and in 1850 was ordained by the same presbytery as an evangelist. In 1841 he was appointed adjunct professor of mathematics in Jefferson College, Pa.; in 1843, professor of mathematics; in 1850, resigned; in 1851, professor of Latin in Center College, Danville, Ky.; in 1853, removed to Bridgeton, N.J.; in 1854, to Winchester, Va.; in 1856 was stated supply to the Church at Amelia Courthouse, Va.; in 1857, professor of mathematics in Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward Co., where he remained until the outbreak of the war, when he and his family were compelled to abandon everything and seek refuge in the North. After a time he obtained a chaplaincy, and

was stationed at Fort Richmond, S.I., New York Harbor. Here he remained until he was mustered out of the service, and was making arrangements to settle in Sharpsburg, Pa., to resume the work of teaching, when, on the evening of Feb. 22, 1866, he was drowned. Mr. Snyder was well read in English literature, a remarkable conversationalist, and possessed of a clear and logical mind, quick in discernment. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 198. (J.L.S.)

Snyder, Peter,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Schoharie, N.Y., Oct. 18, 1814. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1836; studied theology one year at Princeton Seminary, N.J., and two years at Union Seminary, New York city; was licensed by New York Third Presbytery in 1839, and in 1840 was ordained by Rockaway Presbytery, and afterwards labored two years at Whippany, N.J.; two years at New Rochelle, N.Y., then at Cairo, Greene Co., N.Y.; and the remainder of his ministerial service, sixteen years, at Watertown, N.Y., where he died, Dec. 13, 1863. Mr. Snyder was a thorough scholar, and his reading extensive, few men being better versed in current literature, and none more devoted to the moral, religious, and educational movements of the day. From his birth he suffered from an optical infirmity; but, although never using his own or another's pen in preparing for the pulpit, his discourses were always systematic, well digested, and specially eloquent. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 323. (J.L.S.)

So

Picture for So

(Heb. *S6*, אַשׁוּר; Sept. *Σηώρ*; Vulg. *Sua*), a king of Egypt whom Hoshea, the last king of Israel, called to his help against the Assyrians under Shalmaneser, evidently intending to become the vassal of Egypt, and therefore making no present, as had been the yearly custom, to the king of Assyria (^{<1270>}2 Kings 17:4). B.C. 726. The consequence of this step, which seems to have been forbidden by the prophets, who about this period are constantly warning the people against trusting in Egypt and Ethiopia, was the imprisonment of Hoshea, the taking of Samaria, and the carrying captive of the ten tribes. *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF*. It has been questioned whether this So was the same with *Sabaco* (Manetho *Sabacon*),

the first king of the Ethiopian dynasty in Upper Egypt, or his son and successor *Sevechus* (Manetho *Sebichos*), the second king of the same dynasty, and the immediate predecessor of Tirhakah. Winer hesitates between them, and Gesenius concludes for the latter. Sevechus reigned twelve years, according to Manetho, fourteen according to Syncellus. This name, in Egyptian *Sebech*, is also that of the god Saturn (Champollion, *Panth. Egypt.* No. 21, 22; *Winer, Real Worterb.* s.v.; Geseunius, *Comment. in Jes.* 1, 696). **SEE EGYPT.**

The accession of Teharka, the Tirhakah of Scripture, may be nearly fixed on the evidence of an Apis tablet, which states that one of the bulls Apis was born in his twenty-sixth year, and died at the end of the twentieth of Psammetichus I. This bull lived more than twenty years, and the longest age of any Apis stated is twenty-six. Supposing the latter duration, which would allow a short interval between Teharka and Psammetichus 2, as seems necessary, the accession of Teharka would be B.C. 695. If we assign twenty-four years to the two predecessors, the commencement of the dynasty would be B.C. 719. But it is not certain that their reigns were continuous. The account which Herodotus gives of the war of Sennacherib and Sethos suggests that Tirhakah was not ruling in Egypt at the time of the destruction of the Assyrian army, so that we may either conjecture, as Dr. Hincks has done, that the reign of Sethos followed that of Shebetek and preceded that of Tirhakah over Egypt (*Journ. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1853), or else that Tirhakah was king of Ethiopia while Shebetek, not the same as Sethos, ruled in Egypt; the former hypothesis being far the more probable. It seems impossible to arrive at any positive conclusion as to the dates to which the mentions in the Bible of So and Tirhakah refer, but it must be remarked that it is difficult to overthrow the date of B.C. 721 for the taking of Samaria. If we adopt the earlier dates, So must correspond to Shebek; if the later, perhaps to Shebetek; but if it should be found that the reign of Tirhakah is dated too high, the former identification might still be held. The name Shebek is nearer to the Hebrew name than Shebetek; and if the Masoretic points do not faithfully represent the original pronunciation, as we might almost infer from the consonants, and the name was Sewa or Seva, it is not very remote from Shebek. We cannot account for the transcription of the Sept.

From Egyptian sources we know nothing more of Shebek than that he conquered and put to death Bocchoris, the sole king of the twenty-fourth dynasty, as we learn from Manetho's list, and that he continued the

monumental works of the Egyptian kings. There is a long inscription at El-Karnak in which Shebek speaks of tributes from “the king of the land of Khala (Shara),” supposed to be Syria (Brugsch, *Hist. d’Egypte*, 1, 244). This gives some slight confirmation to the identification of this king with So, and it is likely that the founder of a new dynasty would have endeavored, like Shishak and Psammetichus I, the latter virtually the founder of the twenty-sixth, to restore the Egyptian supremacy in the neighboring Asiatic countries. The standard inscription of Sargon in his palace at Khorsabad states, according to M. Oppert, that after the capture of Samaria, Hanon, king of Gaza, and Sebech, sultan of Egypt, met the king of Assyria in battle at Rapih, Raphia, and were defeated. Sebech disappeared, but Hanon was captured. Pharaoh, king of Egypt, was then put to tribute (*Les Inscriptions Assyriennes des Sargonides*, etc. p. 22). This statement would appear to indicate that either Shebek or Shebetek, for we cannot lay great stress upon the seeming identity of name. with the former, advanced to the support of Hoshea and his party, and being defeated fled into Ethiopia, leaving the kingdom of Egypt to a native prince. This evidence favors the idea that the Ethiopian kings were not successive. *SEE TIRHAKAH.*

In a room in the ruins of the palace of Sennacherib at Koyunjik, Mr. Layard found a piece of clay upon which was impressed the signet of Sabak, or Sabaco, king of Egypt. On the same piece of clay is impressed an Assyrian seal, probably that of Sennacherib, with a device representing a priest ministering before the king, or perhaps the symbol of the high contracting parties. The original of this remarkable seal is now deposited in the British Museum. The Egyptian portion of it represents Sabak as about to smite an enemy, perhaps in sacrifice to Amun-Ra, with a kind of mace. Above and before him are hieroglyphs, expressing *Netr nfr nb ar cht Sabak*= “the perfect god, the lord who produces things, Sabak.” Behind him, *sha sanch-haf*= “life follows his head.” On the left edge, *ma na nak*= “I have given to thee.” This seal, impressed with the royal signets of the two monarchs, probably Sennacherib and Sabak, or So, appears to have been affixed to a treaty between Assyria and Egypt and deposited among the archives of the kingdom. As the two monarchs were undoubtedly contemporary, this piece of clay furnishes remarkable confirmatory evidence of the truth of Scripture history. *SEE PHARAOH.*

Soanen, Jean,

a French prelate, was born in Riom, Jan. 6, 1647, and entered the Congregation of the Oratory at Paris in 1661, where he chose father Quesnel for his confessor. Leaving that establishment, he taught ethics and rhetoric in several provincial towns, and devoted himself afterwards to the pulpit, for which he had great talents. Having preached at Lyons, Orleans, and Paris with applause, he was invited to court, preached there during Lent in 1686 and 1688, and was appointed bishop of Senes soon after. Appealing from the bull *Unigenitus* to a future council, and refusing to listen to any terms of accommodation on the subject, he published a *Pastoral Instruction*, giving an account to his diocesans of his conduct. This *Instruction* gave great offense, and occasioned the famous Council of Embrun (1727), in which M. de Tencin procured its condemnation as rash, scandalous, etc., and the bishop to be suspended from all episcopal jurisdiction and ecclesiastical functions. After this council, M. Soanen was banished to La Chaise Dieu, where he died, Dec. 25, 1740. His writings are, *Pastoral Instructions*: — *Mandates*: — and *Letters*. The *Letters* have been printed with his *Life* (6 vols. 4to, or 8 vols. 12mo). His *Sermons* were published in 1767 (2 vols. 12mo). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Soap

(**tyr** **Bo** **borith**; Sept. **πόα**) occurs in ^{<4122>}Jeremiah 2:22, “For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God;” and again in ^{<3982>}Malachi 3:2, “But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fullers’ soap.” From neither of these passages does it distinctly appear whether the substance referred to by the name of *borith* was obtained from the mineral or from the vegetable kingdom; but it is evident that it was possessed of cleansing properties, and this is confirmed by the origin and signification of the word, which is thus illustrated by Celsius: “A verbo **rrb**, *barar, purificavit*, quae vox etiam apud Chaldaeos, Syros, Arabes, in usu fuit, descendit nomen **rb**, *bor, puritas*” (*Hierobot.* 1, 449). So Maimonides, on the Talmud tract *Shemittah*, “Species ablutionibus aptae, uti sunt borith et ahal.” In fact, the simple **rBo** **bor**, itself denotes a vegetable alkali used for washing (^{<1838>}Job 9:30) and as a flux for metals (^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25). **SEE ALKALI.**

The word *borith* is very similar to the *boruk* of the Arabs, written *baurakh* in the Latin translations of Serapion and Avicenna, and translated *nitrum*, that is, natron, or carbonate of soda. *Boruk* appears, however, to have been used in a generic rather than in a specific sense, as in the Persian works on materia medica (derived chiefly from the Arabic) which have been collated we find that no less than six different kinds of *boruk* (Persian *bureh*) are enumerated, of which some are natural, as the Armenian, the African, etc., and others artificial, as that obtained from burning the wood of the poplar, also that employed in the preparation of glass. Of these it is evident that the last two are chemically nearly the same, being both carbonates of alkalies. The incineration of most plants, as well as of the poplar, yields the carbonate of potash (commonly called potash, or pearlash); while carbonate of soda, or barilla, is the alkali used in the preparation of glass. Previous to the composition of bodies having been definitely ascertained by correct chemical analysis; dissimilar substances were often grouped together under one general term; while others, although similar in composition, were separated on account of some unimportant character, as difference of color or of origin, etc. It is unnecessary for our present purpose to ascertain the other substances included by the Arabs under the general term of *boruk* which may have been also included under the *nitrum* of the Greeks. It is evident that both the carbonate of soda and of potash were comprehended under one name by the former. It would be difficult, therefore, to distinguish the one from the other, unless some circumstances were added in addition to the mere name. Thus in the above passage of Jeremiah we have *neter* (nitre) and *borith* (soap) indicated as being both employed for washing or possessed of some cleansing properties, and yet, from occurring in the same passage, they must have differed in some respects. The term *natron*, we know, was in later times confined to the salt obtained chiefly from the natron lakes of Egypt, and *neter* may also have been so in earlier times. Since, therefore, the natural carbonate of soda is mentioned in one part of the verse, it is very probable that the artificial carbonates may be alluded to in the other, as both were in early times employed by Asiatic nations for the purposes of washing. The carbonate of potash, obtained from the burning of most plants growing at a distance from the sea or a saline soil, might not have been distinguished from the carbonate of soda, produced from the ashes of plants growing on the shores of the sea or of saltwater lakes. Hence it is probable that the ashes of plants, called *boruk* and *boreh* by Asiatic nations, may be alluded to under the name of *borith*, as there is no proof that soap

is intended, though it may have been known to the same people at very early periods. Still less is it probable that borax is meant, as has been supposed by some authors, apparently from the mere similarity of name.

Supposing that the ashes or juices of plants are intended by the word borith, the next point of inquiry is whether it is to be restricted to those of any particular plants. The ashes of the poplar are mentioned by Arabian authors and of the vine by Dioscorides; those of the plantain and of the *Butea frondosa* by Sanscrit authors — thus indicating that the plants which were most common, or which were used for fuel or other purposes in the different countries, had also their ashes, that is, impure carbonate of potash, employed for washing, etc. Usually the ashes only of plants growing on the seashore have been thought to be intended. All these, as before mentioned, would yield barilla, or carbonate of soda. Many of them have been burned for the soda they yield on the coasts of India, of the Red Sea, and of the Mediterranean. They belong chiefly to the natural family of the *Chenopodeoe* and to that of the *Mesembryanthemums*. In Arabic authors, the plant yielding soda is said to be called *ishnan*, and its Persian name is stated to be *ghasul*, both words signifying “the washer,” or “washing herb.” Rauwolf points out two plants in Syria and Palestine which yield alkaline salts. Hasselquist considered one of them to be a *Mesembryanthemum*. Forskal has enumerated several plants as being burned for the barilla which they afford, as *Mesembryanthemum geniculatum* and *nodiflorum*, both of which are called *ghasul*. *Salsola kali* and his *Suoeda monoica*, called *asul*, are other plants, especially the last named, which yield sal-alkali. So on the coasts of the Indian peninsula, *Salicornia Indica* and *Salsola nudiflora* yield barilla in great abundance and purity, as do *Salsola sativa kali*, and *tragus*, and also *Salicornia annua* on the coasts of Spain and of the south of France. In Palestine we may especially notice the plant named *hubeibeh* (the *Salsola kali* of botanists), found near the Dead Sea, with glass-like leaves, the ashes of which are called *el-Kuli* from their strong alkaline properties (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 1, 505); the *ajram*, found near Sinai, which when pounded serves as a substitute for soap (*ibid.* 1, 84); the *gillu*, or “soap plant” of Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 2, 106) and the heaths in the neighborhood of Joppa (Kitto, *Phys. Hist.* p. 267). From these sources large quantities of alkali have been extracted in past ages, as the heaps of ashes outside Jerusalem and Nablus testify (Robinson, *Bibl.*, *Res.* 3, 201, 299), and an active trade in the article is still prosecuted with Aleppo in one direction

(Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 79) and Arabia in another (Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1, 66). We need not assume that the ashes were worked up in the form familiar to us, for no such article was known to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 186).

The uses of soap among the Hebrews were twofold —

- (1) for cleansing either the person (^{<2022>}Jeremiah 2:22; ^{<1800>}Job 9:30, where for “never so clean” read “with alkali”) or the clothes;
- (2) for purifying metals (^{<2025>}Isaiah 1:25, where for “purely” read “as through alkali”). Hitzig suggests that *borith* should be substituted for *berith*, “covenant,” in ^{<1107>}Ezekiel 20:37 and ^{<1101>}Malachi 3:1.

Sobriety,

freedom from any inordinate passion that quiet self possession which enables one to devote himself to the matter in hand, whether prayer, meditation, study, forming schemes, laboring to carry them out, and which keeps the individual from undue elevation in prosperity or depression in case of failure. The necessity of sobriety is especially obvious:

- (1) In our inquiries after truth as opposed to presumption;
- (2) in our pursuit of this world as opposed to covetousness;
- (3) in the use and estimate of the things of this world as opposed to excess
- (4) in trials and afflictions as opposed to impatience;
- (5) in forming our judgment of others as opposed to censoriousness;
- (6) in speaking of one’s self as opposed to egotism.

Many motives might be urged to this exercise, as

- (1) the general language of Scripture (^{<1007>}1 Peter 4:7; 5:8; ^{<1005>}Philippians 4:5; ^{<1012>}Titus 2:12).;
- (2) our profession as Christians;
- (3) the example of Jesus Christ; and
- (4) the near approach of death and judgment.

Sochereth.

SEE MARBLE.

So'cho

(Heb. *Soko'*, **wbwa**, for **wbwa**, *bushy*; Sept. **Σωχών**; Vulg. *Socho*), the name of a town, which occurs in this form, among those settled by the sons of Ezra of the tribe of Judah (^{<13118>}1 Chronicles 4:18). It apparently was the same as the town of SOCOH **SEE SOCOH** (q.v.), in Judah, probably the one in the lowland, which was better known than the other, and in the vicinity of the associated places. It appears from its mention in this list that it was colonized by a man or a place named Heber. "The Targum, playing on the passage after the custom of Hebrew writers, interprets it as referring to Moses, and takes the names Jered, Soco, Jekuthiel, as titles of him. He was 'the rabba of Soco because he sheltered (**ks**) the house of Israel with his virtue.'" **SEE SHOCO**; **SEE SHOCHO**.

So'choh

(Heb. *Sokoh'*, **hka**, i.q. *Socho* and *Socoh*; Sept. **Σωχώ** v.r. **Σωχλώ**; Vulg. *Socho*), a town in Solomon's commissariat assigned to Hopher (^{<1040>}1 Kings 4:10); probably the same as the SOCOH **SEE SOCOH** (q.v.) in the lowland of Judah (^{<6155>}Joshua 15:35).

Socialism,

a general term applied to several schemes of social arrangement which advocate community of property, and abandon or modify individual industry, the rights of marriage, and of the family. In discussing the subject of Socialism, two elements are to be considered: (1) the judgment of socialism on existing institutions and practices and on their results; (2) the various plans which it has proposed for doing better. Socialism affirms that the evils it complains of are irremediable in the present constitution of society. In the opinion of Socialists, the existing arrangements of society in respect to property and the production and distribution of wealth are, as a means to the general good, a total failure. First among existing evils may be mentioned that of *poverty*. The institution of property is upheld and commended principally as being the means by which labor and frugality are insured their reward and mankind enabled to emerge from indigence. But Socialism urges that an immense proportion of the industrious classes are, at some period or other of their lives, dependent on legal or voluntary charity; that many are outstripped by others who are possessed of superior energy or prudence; that the reward, instead of being proportioned to the

labor and abstinence of the individual, is almost in the inverse ratio to it that the great majority are what they are born to be — some to be rich without work, others to become rich *by* work, but the great majority are born to hard work and poverty through life; that competition is, for the people, a system of extermination, resulting from the continual fall of labor. “Cheapness,” they say, “is advantageous to the consumer, at the cost of introducing the seeds of ruinous anarchy among the producers.” The Fourierists (M. Considerant, *Destinee Sociale* 1, 35-37) enumerate the evils of existing civilization in the following order: 1. It employs an enormous quantity of labor and of human power unproductively, or in the work of destruction, e.g. in sustaining armies, courts, magistrates, etc.; in allowing ‘good society,’ people who pass their lives in doing nothing, also in allowing philosophers, metaphysicians, political men, who produce nothing but disturbance and sterile discussions.

2. That even the industry and powers which, in the present system, are devoted to production do not produce more than a small portion of what they might produce if better directed and employed,” e.g. “the wastefulness in the existing arrangements for distributing the produce of the country among the various producers.” Socialism seeks to put an end to the vices and suffering of men, not by individual regeneration and reformation, but by a new social organization. It is the employment of political and economic measures for a moral purpose. Proceeding upon the supposition that the individual is wholly or largely the creature of circumstances, it seeks to make the latter as favorable as possible. Thus it makes a religion of social regeneration, and proposes to renovate the world by a new arrangement of property and industrial interests. Although in some measure anticipated by movements in the ancient world, socialism may be considered a product of the French Revolution, which was an anarchic attack on the social system that had its roots in the feudalism of the Middle Ages. The first to revive or bring socialistic ideas into general notice was Francois Noel Babeuf (1764-97), in his paper *Le Tribun du Peuple*. The idea from which he started was that of equality, and he insisted that there should be no other differences than those of age and sex; that men differed little in their faculties and needs, and consequently should receive the same education and food. After his death his system, Babouvism, was for some time entirely forgotten, until, in 1834, Buonarotti again attempted its propagation in the *Moniteur Republicain* and *Homme Libre*. The three most noted developments of Socialism are Communism, Fourierism, and

Saint-Simonism or Humanitarianism. The Nihilists of Russia at this time attract considerable attention because of the efforts made by the government towards their extinction. They believe that, in order to human progress, it is not only possible, but absolutely necessary, to begin at once with the present complicated social phenomena in the way of a sudden and complete social reform, or with a revolution. In April, 1879, an attempt was made by one of their number to assassinate the emperor. This has led to the arrest of hundreds, many of whom have been sent to Siberia. A number of Socialistic communities have been established in the United States, some of which have already been noticed. *SEE HARMONISTS; SEE SEPARATISTS; SEE SHAKERS.* Others will be treated in this article.

I. *The Amana Society.* — This society takes its name from the Bible (~~2048~~ Song of Solomon 4:8), and has its location in Iowa, in the town of Amana. The members call themselves the “True Inspiration Congregations” (*Wahre Inspirations Gemeinden*), and are Germans. They came from Germany in 1842, and settled near Buffalo, N.Y.; but in 1855 they removed to their present location. The “work of inspiration” began far back in the 18th century, an account of the journeys, etc., of “Brother John Frederick Rock” in 1719 being given in the *Thirty-sixth Collection of the Inspiration Record*. Finally, in 1816, Michael Krausert became what they call an “instrument,” and to him were added several others, among them Christian Metz, who was for many years, and until his death (1867), the spiritual head of the society. Another prominent “instrument” was Barbara Heynemann, whose husband, George Landman, became spiritual head of the society. The removal to this country was inaugurated by Metz, who professed to have a revelation so directing.

1. *Social Economy.* — The society was not communistic in Germany, and even after removal to this country the community intended to live simply as a Christian congregation. Being obliged to look after the temporal interests of each other, they built workshops, etc., out of a common fund, and thus drifted into their present practice. They have now seven villages, and carry on farming, woollen, saw, and grist mills. Each family has a house for itself; but the members eat in common, in cooking or eating houses, of which there are fifteen. Each business has its foreman; and these leaders, in each village, meet every evening to consult and arrange for the following day. The civil or temporal government is vested in thirteen trustees, chosen annually by the male members, the trustees choosing the president of the society. The elders are men of presumably deep piety, appointed by

inspiration, and preside at religious assemblies. The members are supplied with clothing and other articles, excepting food, by an annual allowance to each individual. Usually a neophyte enters on probation for two years, and, if a suitable person, is admitted to full membership; although some are received at once into full membership by "inspiration." They forbid the use of musical instruments (except a flute), and exclude photographs and other pictures, as tending to idol worship. Although not forbidding marriage, celibacy is looked upon as meritorious; and young men are not allowed to marry until twenty-four years of age. The society is financially prosperous, has no debt, has money at interest, and owned in 1874 about 25,000 acres of land, 3000 sheep, 1500 head of cattle, 200 horses, and 2500 hogs, with a population of about 1500.

2. Religion and Literature. — The society is pietistic, and believes in inspiration as a result of entire consecration to God. It accepts both the Old and the New Testament, but not to the exclusion of present inspiration. It does not practice baptism, but celebrates the Lord's supper whenever led by "inspiration." Inspiration is sometimes private, at other times public; and the warnings, reproofs, etc., thus received are written down in yearly volumes, entitled *Year-books of the True Inspiration Congregations*. When a member offends against the rules of society, he is admonished by the elders; and if he do not amend, expulsion follows. These rules are twenty-one in number, and encourage sobriety, reverence, honesty, and abstinence. They hold religious services on Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday mornings, and every evening. They keep New year's as a holiday, and Christmas, Easter, and Holy Week are their great religious festivals. At least once a year there is an "*Untersuchung*," or inquisition of the whole community, including children — an examination of its spiritual condition, in which each member is expected to make confession of sins. Their hymnology is found in *The Voice from Zion* (Ebenezer, 1851, pp. 958), and another hymn book in regular use, *Psalms after the Manner of David*, etc. (Amana, Ia., 1871). Among their books is *Innocent Amusement* (*Unschuldiger Zeitvertreib*), a mass of pious doggerel; *Jesus' A, B, C for his Scholars*, also in rhyme; *Rhymes on the Sufferings, Death, Burial, and Ascension of Christ*.

II. Perfectionists of Oneida and Wallingford. — This society is of American origin, having for its founder the present head, John Humphrey Noyes, born in Brattleborough, Vt., in 1811. He was educated at Dartmouth, Andover, and Yale. While in the latter institution he entered

upon a new experience and new views of the way of salvation, which took the name of Perfectionism. In 1834 he went to Poultney, Vt., and slowly gathered about him a small company of believers, and in 1847 had forty persons in his own congregation, besides small gatherings in other states who recognized him as leader. Not a Communist at first, Mr. Noyes, in 1845, made known his peculiar views, and began cautiously to practice them in 1846. The community were mobbed and driven from the place, and in 1848 settled in Oneida, Madison Co., N.Y. Other communities were established, but all were eventually merged in those of Oneida, N.Y., and Wallingford, Conn. After various reverses, they began to accumulate property, engaged in manufacture and the preserving of fruits, etc., and in 1874 had 640 acres of land near Oneida, with 240 at Wallingford. In ten years (1857-66) they had netted \$180,580, and were worth over \$500,000. The two communities must be counted as one, and the members are interchangeable at will. In February, 1874, they numbered 283 persons, 131 males and 152 females. The members are mostly Americans, largely recruited from New England.

1. *Daily Life*, etc. — The members live in one large building, the older people occupying separate chambers, the younger sleeping two together. There is no regulation style of dress, although plainness is expected of all. They have twenty-one standing committees on finance, amusements, arbitration, etc.; and, besides this, the duties of administration are divided among forty-eight departments, as publication, education, agriculture, manufacture, etc. Every Sunday morning a meeting is held of the “Business Board,” composed of the heads of all the departments, and any members of the community who choose to attend. The children are left to the care of their mothers until weaned, when they are placed in the general nursery, under “caretakers,” who are both men and women. They have no sermon or public prayers, and address one another as Mr. or Miss, except when the women were married before they entered the society. An annual allowance of thirty-three dollars is made to each woman, the men ordering clothes when in need. In the school the Bible is the prominent textbook, but a liberal education is encouraged. They receive members with great care, but exact no probation.

2. *Religious Belief* — The Perfectionists hold to the Bible as the “textbook of the spirit of truth,” to Jesus Christ as “the eternal Son of God,” and to “the apostles and Primitive Church as the exponents of the everlasting Gospel.” They believe that the second advent of Christ took place at the

period of the destruction of Jerusalem; that the final kingdom of God then began in the heavens; that the manifestation of the kingdom in the visible world is now approaching; that its approach is ushering in the second and final resurrection and judgment; that a Church on earth is now rising to meet the approaching kingdom in the heavens, and to become its duplicate and representative; that inspiration, or open communication with God and the heavens, involving perfect holiness, is the element of connection between the Church on earth and the Church in the heavens, and the power by which the kingdom of God is to be established and to reign in the world. They also teach that “the Gospel provides for complete salvation from sin,” which, they say, “is the foundation needed by all other reformers.” Community of goods and of persons they believe to have been taught by Jesus, and hold that communism is “the social state of the resurrection.” In their system, “complex marriage takes the place of simple,” they affirming that there is no intrinsic difference between property in person and property in things; and that the same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope for it, exclusiveness in regard to women and children. “Complex marriage” means that, within the limits of their community, any man and woman may freely cohabit, having gained each other’s consent through a third party. They are firm believers in the efficacy of the “faith cure,” and quote instances in which invalids have been *instantly* restored to perfect health in answer to prayer.

This community has lately taken an important step towards reorganization by formally abandoning the system of complex marriage that father John Humphrey Noyes has consistently advocated for so many years. Considerable opposition having been experienced because of the promiscuous commerce of the sexes asserted to exist, father Noyes has decided to abandon his scheme called stirpiculture in practice, while retaining it in theory. He accordingly wrote (Aug. 20, 1879) a message to the community, containing modifications in their platform, of which the following is a summary:

- I.** To give up the practice of complex marriage, not as renouncing belief in the principles and prospective finality of that institution, but in deference to the public sentiment evidently rising against it.
- II.** To place themselves as a community, not on the platform of the Shakers, on the one hand, nor on that of the world, on the other, but on

Paul's platform, which, while allowing marriage as a concession to human weakness, prefers celibacy as the holier and more perfect state.

III. To continue to hold their business and property in common; to continue to live together, and to eat at the same table; to retain the common department for infants and juveniles, and to maintain the practice of regular evening meetings for mutual criticism.

The platform contained in the communication was adopted by a formal vote on the evening of Tuesday, Aug. 26, abolishing the offensive abomination of complex marriage at a stroke. The society will hereafter, therefore, consist of two classes of members — celibates, and married persons living together as husband and wife under the laws of marriage as generally understood. The family idea is left, it is true; but with permanent families within the community family it is shorn of its main significance, and takes the form of a common work, a common interest in commercial ventures, and a common property. Among the literary productions of this community are, *Paul not Carnal*; *The Perfectionist*; *The Way of Holiness*; *Berean Witness*; *Spiritual Magazine*; *Free Church Circular*; *Bible Communism*; *History of American Socialism*; and *Essay on Scientific Propagation* (the latter two by J.H. Noyes).

III. *Aurora and Bethel Communes.* — The founder and present ruler of these communities is Dr. Keil, a Prussian, born in 1811. At first a man-milliner, he became a mystic, and afterwards, at Pittsburgh, made open profession of his belief. He gathered a number of Germans about him, to whom he represented himself as a being to be worshipped, and later as one of the two witnesses in the Book of Revelation. He began to plan a communism somewhat resembling that of Rapp, but without the celibate principle. His followers, in 1844, removed to Bethel, Mo., and took up four sections of land, or 2560 acres, to which they added from time to time, until they possessed 4000 acres. In 1874 they numbered about 200 persons. In 1855 Dr. Keil, with about 80 persons, removed to Oregon, and the following year settled at Aurora. They numbered in 1874 nearly 400 people, and owned about 18,000 acres of land.

The government at Aurora is vested in Dr. Keil, who is both president and preacher, and has for his advisers four of the elder members, chosen by himself. The preacher and head of the Bethel Commune is Mr. Giese, with six trustees, chosen by the members. The people of both communes are

plain, frugal, industrious Germans, with simple tastes, and seem contented and happy. They hold to principles which are chiefly remarkable for their simplicity.

1. That all government should be parental, to imitate the parental government of God.
2. That society should be formed upon the model of the family, having all interests and property absolutely in common.
3. That neither religion nor the harmony of nature teaches community in anything further than property and labor. Hence the family life is strictly maintained, and all sexual irregularities are absolutely rejected. Religious service is held twice a month, and after the Lutheran style.

IV. Icarians. — This community was the offspring of the dreams of Etienne Cabet, who was born in Dijon, France, in 1788. Cabet was educated for the bar, but became a politician and writer. He was a leader of the Carbonari, a member of the French Legislature, wrote a history of the French Revolution of July, was condemned to two years' imprisonment, but fled to London, where he wrote the *Voyage to Icaria*. In this book he described a communistic Utopia, and in 1848 set sail, with a number of persons, for Texas, where he started an actual Icaria. Sixty-nine persons formed the advance guard, which was attacked by yellow fever, and disorganized by the time Cabet arrived in the next year. They went to Nauvoo, Ill., and were established in that deserted Mormon town, May, 1850. They numbered here, at one time, not less than 1500 persons, and labored and planted with success; but Cabet developed a dictatorial spirit, which produced a split in the society. He and some of his followers went to St. Louis, where he died in 1856. Shortly after, the Illinois colony came to an end, and between fifty and sixty settled upon their Iowa estate, about four miles from Corning. They own at the present time 1936 acres of land; number 65 members and 11 families, most of whom are French. They live under the constitution prepared by Cabet, which lays down the equality and brotherhood of mankind and the duty of holding all things in common, abolishes servitude and servants, commands marriage under penalties, provides for education, and requires that the majority shall rule. In practice they elect a president once a year, who is the executive officer, but whose powers are strictly limited. They have also four directors, who carry on the

necessary work and direct the other members. They have no religious observances. Sunday is a day of rest and amusement.

V. *Bishop Hill Commune*, now extinct, was formed by Swedish pietists, who settled in Henry County, Ill., October, 1846. Others followed, until, by the summer of 1848, they numbered 800 persons. At first they were very poor, living in holes in the ground and under sheds; but by industry and economy they prospered, so that, in 1859, they owned 10,000 acres of land and a town. Their religious life was very simple. Two services were held on Sunday and one each week night. They discouraged amusements as tending to worldliness, and after a while the young people became discontented with the dull community life. It was determined, in the spring of 1860, to divide the property, which was done. Dissensions still continuing, a further division was made, each family receiving its share, and the commune ceased to exist.

VI. *Cedar Vale Community* is a communistic society near Cedar Vale, Howard Co., Kansas, and was begun in January, 1871. Its members were recruited from among two essentially different classes of Socialists — the Russian Materialists and American Spiritualists. They numbered in 1874 four males, one female, one child; and on probation, two males, one female, and one child. They are organized under the name of the PROGRESSIVE COMMUNITY, and hold to community of goods and to entire freedom of opinion.

VII. *Social Freedom Community* is a communistic society established early in 1874, in Chesterfield County, Va. It has two women, one man, and three boys as “full members,” with four women and five men as “probationary members.” They own a farm of 333 acres, and are attempting general farming, sawing, grinding, etc. The members are all Americans. They hold to “unity of interests, and political, religious, and social freedom; that every individual shall have absolute control of herself or himself.” They have no constitution or by laws; ignore man’s total depravity, and believe that all who are actuated by a love of truth and a desire of progress can be governed by love, and moral suasion.

See Holyoake, *History of Co-operation* (1875); Noyes, *History of American Socialism* (1870); Stein, *Der Socialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs* (1844), and *Geschichte der socialen Bewegungen in Frankreich* (1849-51). For information as to societies

mentioned in this article we are largely indebted to Nordhoff, *Communitic Societies of the United States* (N.Y. 1875).

Socialists.

SEE SOCIALISM.

Society,

a combination of persons uniting in a *fellowship* for any purpose whatever, and having common objects, principles, and laws. Many such combinations have been made of late years for the purpose of promoting different religious objects, among the earliest of which are the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, for the circulation of Bibles, prayer books, and tracts, founded in 1698; the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for carrying Christianity to the colonies and other dependencies of the British empire, established in 1701; and others, most of which will be found under their appropriate heads, as *SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES*, etc. Since convocations and diocesan synods have fallen into disuse, the duty of providing for missions, the circulation of the Scriptures, the preparation and publication of devotional works, and similar objects, have devolved upon voluntary associations. These societies, being formed independent of ecclesiastical authority, are necessarily free from ecclesiastical rule or regulation, and their constitution is thus determined by the nature of their object. In the Church of England a controversy has arisen in relation to these societies, respecting the necessity of members of the Church having the sanction of their diocesan before joining such associations. The real question is, whether any such society involves in its constitution or practices a violation of canonical law or established discipline. The matter was finally left to the judgment of the individual. In the United States such societies are often organized by the authorities of the Church they represent, or are endorsed by several churches, and thus become their acknowledged agency in that direction. Of the latter the American Bible Society is a notable example.

Society People,

a name given to the Covenanters in Scotland by Wodrow (3, 357) and others, because they formed themselves into societies for mutual religious intercourse and edification.

Socinianism,

a development of the Arian heresy, has for its leading feature the denial of our Lord's divine nature, with the belief that he was a typical and unique man, displaying in so unprecedented a manner those higher characteristics of human nature which make it a shadow of the divine nature that he was *called* the Son of God. *SEE SOCINUS.*

I. *System of Theology.* — Socinianism represents Jesus as having been born of the Virgin Mary by a supernatural interposition of the Holy Ghost, in consequence of which he was a man free from original sin and its evil inclinations, but only a man. He was outwardly anointed prophet, priest, and king at his baptism by a material descent of a divine force and efficacy upon him in the form of a dove; but his full commission was given to him during some one or more interviews which he had with God when rapt up into heaven; probably during the forty days in the wilderness. He was (shutting out any idea of deity) the anointed Son of God, and was established in the fulness of his dominion by God, who raised him (not by any cooperation of his own) from the dead, and delegated to him a supreme authority over men and angels. But in all this he is only a created being, and worship rendered to him should only be given to him as the representative of God, not as his own right. The Socinian system discards altogether the idea of union between divine and human nature, alleging that the two are so infinitely removed from each other that union between them is an impossibility. Its later development does not recognize Christ as, in any sense, an object of worship, denies the supernatural origin which was attributed to him by the earlier form of the heresy, and looks upon him only as a very exalted saint and moral teacher.

Socinianism, however, is not merely a system of negations, but includes positive propositions. It not only denies the doctrine of the Trinity, but positively asserts that the Godhead is one in person as well as in essence. It not only denies the proper divinity of Jesus Christ, but positively asserts that he was a mere man — that is, a man, and nothing else or more than a man. It not only denies the vicarious atonement of Christ, but it asserts that men, by their own repentance and good works, procure the forgiveness of their sins and the enjoyment of God's favor; and thus, while denying that, in any proper sense, Christ is their Savior, it teaches that men save themselves — that is, in so far as they need salvation. It denies that the Spirit is a person who possesses the divine nature, and teaches that the

Holy Ghost in Scripture describes or expresses merely a quality or attribute of God.

In its theology Socinianism represents God as a being whose moral character is composed exclusively of goodness and mercy, desiring merely the happiness of his creatures; thus virtually excluding from his character that immaculate holiness which leads him to hate sin, and that inflexible justice which constrains him to inflict upon the impenitent the punishment they deserve. It also denies that God foresees the actions of his creatures, or knows anything about them until they come to pass; except in some special cases in which he has foreordained the event, and foresees it *because* he foreordained it. That they may not seem to derogate from God's omniscience, they admit that God knows all things that are knowable; but they contend that contingent events are unknowable, even by an infinite being.

In its anthropology Socinianism denies, in substance, the fall of man, and all original depravity, and asserts that men are now, as to all moral qualities, tendencies, and capacities, in the same condition as when the race was created. Having no original righteousness, Adam, when he sinned, did not lose any quality of that sort. He simply incurred the divine displeasure, but retained the same moral nature with which he was created. Created naturally mortal, he would have died whether he had sinned or not. Men are now, in their moral nature and tendencies, just as pure and holy as Adam when created; without, however, any positive tendency towards God or towards sin. Men are now under more unfavorable circumstances than Adam was, because of the many examples of sin, which increase the probabilities of actually falling into sin.. Some avoid sin altogether, and obtain eternal blessedness as a reward; others sin, but there is no difficulty in obtaining forgiveness from God, and thus escaping the consequences of transgression.

In its Christology this system naturally denies the necessity of an atonement, and declares that Christ had nothing to do in the world for the fulfilment of his mission but to communicate fuller and more certain information about the divine, character and government, the path or duty and future blessedness, and to set before men an example of obedience to God's law and will. The old Socinians rejected, therefore, the priestly office of Christ altogether, or conjoined and confounded it with the kingly one; while the modern Socinians abolish the kingly office and resolve all

into, the prophetic. His suffering of death, of course, did not belong to the execution of the priestly, but of the prophetic office; in other words, its sole object and design were confined within the general range of serving to declare and confirm to men the will of God. Thus was revealed an immortality beyond death, of which no certainty had been given to men before Christ's death.

With respect to eschatology, Socinianism denies the resurrection of the body as a thing absurd and impossible. It holds to what is called a resurrection, which is not a resurrection of the *same* body, but the formation and the union to the soul of a different body. It repudiates the doctrine of eternal punishment; but Socinians are divided between the two theories of the annihilation of the wicked (held by older Socinians) and the final restoration of all men (adopted by modern Socinians).

As regards the Church and its sacraments, Socinianism teaches that the Church is not, in any proper sense, a divine institution, but is a mere voluntary association of men, drawn together by similarity of views and a desire to promote one another's welfare. The object of the sacraments is to *teach* men, and to impress divine truth upon their minds; and they are in no way whatever connected with any act on God's part in the communication of spiritual blessings.

II. *The Sect.* — Laelius Socinus (q.v.) is usually regarded as the true founder of the Socinian system, though his nephew, Faustus, was its chief defender and promulgator. The origin of the sect is usually traced by their own writers to the year 1546, when colleges or conferences of about forty individuals were in the habit of meeting, chiefly at Vicenza, in the Venetian territory, with a view of introducing a purer faith by discarding a number of opinions held by Protestants as well as Papists — although this account is discredited by Mosheim and others. The first catechism and confession of the Socinians was printed at Cracow, Poland, in 1574, at which time the sect received the name of Anabaptists. *SEE CATECHISM*, 2, 8. George Schomann is believed to have been the author of this early Socinian creed. This catechism was, however, supplanted in the 17th century by the Racovian Catechism, composed by Schmalz, a learned German Socinian, who had settled in Poland. From Poland, Socinian doctrines were carried, in 1563, into Transylvania, chiefly through the influence and exertions of George Blandrata, a Polish physician. For upwards of a hundred years Poland was the stronghold of this sect; but in 1658, by a decree of the diet

of Warsaw, they were expelled from the kingdom; and this severe edict being repeated in 1661, they were completely rooted out from the country. The father of Socinianism in England was John Biddle, who, towards the middle of the 17th century, was the first who openly taught principles subversive of the received doctrine of the Trinity. The publication of Biddle's *Twofold Catechism* caused great excitement both in England and on the Continent. Various answers to this Socinian pamphlet appeared; but the most able was that of the celebrated Dr. John Owen, in his *Vindicioe Evangelicoe*. The Biddelians were never numerous, and speedily disappeared. The modern Socinians, who took the name of Unitarians (q.v.), were not a conspicuous party in England till the close of the 18th century, when Priestley and others publicly avowed and propagated antitrinitarian sentiments. A considerable difference, however, exists between the opinions of the ancient and those of the modern Socinians. Both the Socini, uncle and nephew, as well as their immediate followers, admitted the miraculous conception of Christ by the Virgin Mary, and that he ought to be worshipped, as having been advanced by God to the government of the whole created universe doctrines usually rejected by the modern Socinians. These latter are now, at least in the United States, quite generally substituting, for Socinianism proper, the pantheistic infidelity of Germany, though under a sort of profession of Christianity.

See Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, 2; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Cottle, *Essays on Socinianism*; Best, *Letters on Socinianism*; Fuller, *Socinian and Calvinistic Systems* (8vo); Groves, *Lines to a Socinian Friend*; *Socinianism, Rise, Growth, and Danger of*, in the *Christian Disciple*, 3, 429; also the list in Malcom, *Theological Index*, s.v.

Socinians.

SEE SOCINIANISM.

Socinus, Faustus (Fausto Sozzini),

the real founder of the Socinian sect, was the nephew of Laelius Socinus (q.v.), and was related, through his mother, with the famous race of the Piccolomini. He was born in Sienna, Italy, Dec. 5, 1539, and was orphaned at a tender age. His early training was neglected, and his education irremediably defective. Theological questions engaged his mind while he was yet employed in the study of jurisprudence on which he had entered, and his conclusions were largely determined by the anti-Roman training he

received, his uncle Laelius acting as his principal instructor. In 1562 the papers of Laelius, then recently deceased, came into the possession of Faustus, and their study confirmed the opinions held by him, so that they became convictions. He was wont to declare that, aside from the Bible, his only instructor had been his uncle Laelius.

I. *Life and Labors.* — The literary life of Socinus began in 1562 with the publication of a work entitled *Explicatio Primae Partis Primi Capituli Evang. Joannis* — in effect a declaration of antitrinitarian principles; but twelve years of courtier life in Florence interrupted his activity in this direction. A single minor work, *De S. Script. Autoritate*, belongs to this period. He subsequently devoted four years (1574 to 1578) to the perfecting of his system and the propagating of his views, his residence being at Basle; and at this time he wrote two of his most important works, the *De Jesu Christo Servatore* and the *De Statu Primi Hominis ante Lapsum*. From Basle he went to Transylvania, and thence, in 1579, to avoid the plague, to Poland, where he spent the remainder of his life.

Socinus now undertook the work of unifying and organizing the scattered Unitarian elements which existed, especially among the upper classes of Polish society; but his success was not at first encouraging. Anabaptist views prevailed to a degree which prevented his own admission into the Unitarian society at Cracow during four years, because he declined rebaptism as a needless ceremony. He came, however, to be in time regarded as the recognized and principal champion of the sect. His discussions and writings secured to it prominence and reputation, and gradually produced a measure of agreement in the views of its adherents. In 1603 the Synod of Rakov, or Racovia, settled the specially controverted question of rebaptism by approving the teachings of Socinus.

But few events belong to Socinus's private life which claim notice in this place. He left Cracow in 1583 to avoid persecution by the king, Stephen Bathori, and settled in the adjoining village of Pawlikowice, where he married a lady of noble rank, the daughter of Christoph Morsztyn. At the same time he became impoverished through the loss of his Italian properties. He soon returned to Cracow. In 1588 he secured the favor of the Lithuanian Unitarians, whose synod he visited at Brzesc. The other features of his history are simply illustrative of the bigotry of his age. He was exposed to frequent persecution, now at the hands of a military mob (1594), then through the fanaticism of the students of Cracow, who were

incited to their action by Romish priests (1598). They dragged him from a sick bed to the streets, beat him, sacked his house, and burned his books and writings. To avoid his foes he again left Cracow, and lived in a neighboring village, Luclawice, until he died March 3, 1604. His works were collected and published in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, vol. 1 and 2. They also bear the title *Fausti Sinensis Opera Omnia in Duos Tomos Distincta*. They include expositions of Scripture; polemics against Romanists, Protestants, and Unitarians; and dogmatical writings. The more important are the *Proelectiones Theologicae* and the *Christianoe Religionis Brevissima Institutio per Interrog. et Respons.*, etc., to which may be added a *Fragmentum Catechismi Prioris F. L. S. qui periit in Cracoviensi Rerum ejus Direptione*.

Immediately after Socinus's death the *Racovian Catechism*, which had been prepared by him, but which was completed by Schmalz, Moskorzowski, and Volkel, was published in the Polish language (1605). A German edition appeared in 1608, and one in Latin, with notes and additions, in 1609. Oeder brought out a new edition in 1739, which was based on that of 1609, and which affords a good compendium of Socinian theology. It is accompanied with a refutation by the editor.

II. Followers. — Numerous congregations of Unitarians, whose members were chiefly of noble rank, had been formed in Poland by the time Socinus died, that at Rakov being the largest. They supported many schools, to which the most capable teachers were appointed, and in which the most prominent theologians delivered occasional lectures. A press connected with the establishment at Rakov promoted the dissemination of the principal writings of Socinian authors. A general synod, which met annually at Rakov, and subordinate particular synods, furnished an effective organization which contributed greatly to the progress of the Socinian cause. But the most influential factor at work in securing this result is to be found in the large number of distinguished pastors, theologians, and scholars which the community produced. The names of Valentin Schmalz, Jerome Moscorovius (Moskorzowski), Johann Crell (q.v.), and others, are recognized as those of men who in their time exercised a most powerful influence over the history of the Polish Church and State. The progress of Socinianism was, however, stopped, and its very existence assailed, by the Romish reaction under Sigismund II of Poland and his son, Vladislav IV. An insult offered to the crucifix by some pupils of the Rakov school furnished the occasion for a complaint of

sacrilege, which involved the whole community of Unitarians. In violation of law, and in disregard of the facts of the case, they were condemned. The school at Racovia was destroyed, the church transferred from the possession of its Arian owners, and the clergy and teachers declared infamous and outlawed. Other schools and churches were afterwards involved in similar ruin. The decisive blows of Jesuitism against the Unitarian sect were not inflicted; however, until after the accession of John Casimir — a Jesuit and cardinal — in 1648. The Cossack wars which raged in Southern Poland ruined many congregations; and when the Swedes invaded the country, many Socinians, as well as others, joined their party. This was made the occasion for treating them as traitors to the country. The Diet of Warsaw in 1658 decreed their banishment, to take effect within three years, and this term was afterwards shortened to two years. The protests of Socinian delegates, and likewise those of Electoral Brandenburg and Sweden, were disregarded, and the edict was rigorously executed.

In Germany, Socinianism had established itself in the University of Altorf through the influence of Prof. Ernst Soner (died 1612); but when its existence was discovered the authorities of Nuremberg effected its overthrow. Polish exiles settled in Silesia, and held synods in 1661 and 1663; but their efforts to gain proselytes led to unfavorable action on the part of the State, and to their eventual removal in 1666. Certain departments of Brandenburg contained numerous Socinian congregations and communities during the last decades of the 16th century. Everywhere, however, they were merely tolerated. Often they were persecuted. The repeated efforts to extirpate them were so far successful that in 1838 only two Socinians were found in Prussia, both of them old men.

In the Netherlands, antitrinitarianism was at first connected with the Anabaptist movement. An Antitrinitarian, Herman van Vleckwyck, was burned at the stake at Bruges in 1569. Amsterdam and Leyden each contained a band of Socinians at the close of the 16th century, whose expulsion was attempted by the States-General, though not with entire success. The sect continued to grow, even in the face of the active efforts of the orthodox synods to bring about its extirpation. The influx of Polish coreligionists, who were banished from their native country, greatly strengthened its numbers. Constant repression of its worship and interference with its tenets eventually produced the intended effect, however; the Socinian party gradually melted away, and its members were

absorbed by the Remonstrants, the more liberal Anabaptists, and the Collegiants.

Antitrinitarian ideas found reception in England as early as the reign of Henry VIII, and furnished numerous martyrs. So late as the time of James I three Antitrinitarians were burned at the stake. The Polish Socinians forwarded a copy of their Catechism to the latter monarch, which was not favorably received, but proved the first of an uninterrupted series of Socinian writings which circulated from that time. John Biddle (q.v.) became the prominent advocate of a modified Socinianism, and the rise of deism secured to it a widespread existence, even though it was excluded from the Acts of Toleration, and was under the ban of stringent laws; and it became a tendency among the clergy of the Established Church. Lindsey and Priestley eventually brought about a breach with the Church. The old repressive laws were finally repealed in 1813. For the present status of Unitarianism in England, recourse must be had to the census tables of 1851, the census of 1861 not giving information respecting the creed of the inhabitants. In 1851 Great Britain contained 239 Unitarian churches, which afforded 68, 554 sittings, and attracted 37,156 attendants — nearly all of them being in England.

Unitarianism was planted in North America in the middle of the 18th century, and obtained its first American church in November, 1787, when James Freeman (q.v.) was ordained pastor over the King's Chapel congregation in Boston. The movement spread in secret, care being taken by its supporters to avoid alarming the orthodox part of the population; so that when the state of affairs was finally understood, nearly every Congregational Church in Boston had become Unitarian, and many churches in other parts of New England had adopted Unitarian views. A controversy growing out of the publication in 1815 of a pamphlet entitled *American Unitarianism* led to the withdrawal of Unitarians from the orthodox, and their separate organization. Channing (q.v.) became the foremost representative of the new sect. The American Unitarian Association, founded in 1825, became its center, and the *Christian Examiner* its leading periodical. It has now fewer than 300 churches, about 350 ministers, a membership estimated at about 30,000, two theological schools, and a number of benevolent and other societies. The Socinian view has many supporters, besides, in the *Christian* churches (q.v.) and among the Universalists.

See Fock, *Der Socinianismus nach seiner Stellung in d. Gesamtentwicklung des christl. Geistes, n. seinem hist. Verlauf u. n. seinem Lehrbegriff* (Kiel, 1847); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, ch. 23; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 358-365; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Compend.* 1, 334; *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, etc. (Amst. 1626, 6 vols. fol.); Lindsey, *Historical View of Unitarianism from the Reformation* (Lond. 1783); Belsham, *Memoir of Lindsey* (1812); Reez, *Racovian Catechism*, with historical introduction (Lond. 1818, etc.). **SEE SOCINIANISM.**

Socinus, Laelius

(*Lelio Sozzini*), a noted Italian heresiarch, uncle of the preceding, was born in Sienna in 1525, being the son of Mariano Sozzini, Jun., a lawyer, of a family that made considerable pretensions to learning. Lelio gave himself to the study of theology, then quickened by the discussions of Luther, and for this purpose read the Bible in the original tongues. This made him suspected by the Church authorities, and he left Italy about 1544, and wandered for four years over France, England, the Netherlands, and Germany in search of knowledge. He at last settled at Zurich, where his erudition and personal qualities at first gained him consideration, and there entered upon a series of investigations and a course of correspondence which resulted in undermining his belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ. These convictions rendering him unpopular at Zurich, he retired, after the death of his father, in 1558 or 1559, to Poland, where Sigismund II received him favorably, and gave him letters that enabled him to return with prestige to Zurich; and he spent the remainder of his days there in peace, dying May 16, 1562. He left the following works: *Dialogus inter Caivinum et Vaticanum* (s.l. 1612, 8vo), in which he opposes the punishment of heretics: — *De Sacramentis* and *De Resurrectione Corporum*, both inserted in *Fausti et Loelii Socini Tractatus* (Eleutheropolis [Holland], 1654). Sand (*Biblioth. Antittrin.* p. 18-25) speaks of some other doubtful writing attributed to Laelius Socinus.

Socket

(*ἑδα, e'den*), the *base*, e.g. of the planks of the tabernacle (^{<1759>}Exodus 26:19, etc.), the *pedestal* of a pillar (38:10 sq.; ^{<2155>}Song of Solomon 5:15); the “foundation” of a building (^{<1806>}Job 38:6). **SEE COLUMN.**

So'coh

(Heb. *Sokoh*, *hkō*, ^{<0655>}Joshua 15:35, 48 [marg. *Soko*', /k/c, which occurs in the text at ^{<0308>}1 Chronicles 4:18, "Socho;" ^{<4107>}2 Chronicles 11:7, "Shoco;" 28:18, "Shocho;" "Shochoh," ^{<0970>}1 Samuel 17:1 twice], or *hko*, ^{<1040>}1 Kings 4:10, "Sochoh;" another form for *Socho* [q.v.]), the name of two towns, both in the tribe of Judah (q.v.).

1. (Sept. *Σαωχώ* v.r. *Σωχώ*; *Vulg. Soccho*.) A place in the district of the lowland or Shephelah (^{<0655>}Joshua 15:35). It is a member of the same group with Jarmuth, Azekah, Shaaraim, etc., which were located in the N.W. corner (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). The same relative situation is implied in the other passages in which the place (under slight variations of form) is mentioned. At Ephes-dammim, between Socoh and Azekah (^{<0970>}1 Samuel 17:1), the Philistines took up their position for the memorable engagement in which their champion was slain, and the wounded fell down in the road to Shaaraim (ver. 54). Socho, Adullam, Azekah, were among the cities in Judah which Rehoboam fortified after the revolt of the northern tribes (^{<4107>}2 Chronicles 11:7), and it is mentioned with others of the original list as being taken by the Philistines in the reign of Ahaz (28:18). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* "Soccho") it bore the name of *Soechoth* (*Σονχώθ*), and lay between eight and nine Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, on the road to Jerusalem. Paula passed through it on her way from Bethlehem (?) to Egypt (Jerome, *Ep. Pauloe*, § 14). As is not unfrequently the case in this locality, there were then *two* villages, an upper and a lower (*Onomast.*). Dr. Robinson's identification of Socoh with *esh-Shuweikeh* (a diminutive of *Shaukeh*) in the western part of the mountains of Judah is very probable (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 21). It lies about one mile to the north of the track from Belt Jibrin to Jerusalem, between seven and eight English miles from the former. To the north of it, within a couple of miles, is Yarmuk, the ancient Jarmuth. Damun, perhaps Ephes-dammim, is about the same distance to the east, and Azekah and Shaaraim, no doubt, were in this neighborhood. To complete the catalogue, the ruins which must be those of the upper one of Eusebius's two villages stand on the southern slope of the Wady es-Sumt, which with great probability is the Valley of Elah, the scene of Goliath's death (see Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 122). The ruins are extensive, with many caverns, "nearly half a mile above the bed of the wady, a kind of natural terrace covered with green fields (in spring), and dotted with gray ruins" (Porter, *Handb.* p. 249).

From this village probably came “Antigonus of Soco,” who lived about the commencement of the 3d century B.C. He was remarkable for being the earliest Jew who is known to have had a Greek name; for being the disciple of the great Simon, surnamed “the Just,” whom he succeeded as president of the Sanhedrim; for being the master of Sadok, the reputed founder of the Sadducees; but most truly remarkable as the author of the following saying which is given in the Mishna (*Pirke Aboth*, 1, 3) as the substance of his teaching, “Be not ye like servants who serve their lord that they may receive a reward. But be ye like servants who serve their lord without hope of receiving a reward, but in the fear of heaven.” Socoh appears to be mentioned under the name of *Sochus* in the acts of the Council of Nice, though its distance from Jerusalem as there given is not sufficient for the identification proposed above (Reland, *Palest.* p. 1019).

2. (Sept. Σωχά v.r. Σωχώ; Vulg. *Soccho*.) Also a town of Judah, but in the mountain district (⁽⁶¹⁵⁸⁾Joshua 15:48). It is one of the first group, and is named in company with Anab, Jattir, Eshtemoh, and others. It has been discovered by Dr. Robinson, (*Bibl. Res.* 1, 494) in the Wady el-Khalil, about ten miles S.W. of Hebron; bearing, like the other Socoh, the name of *esh-Shuweikeh*, and, with Anab, Semoa, ‘Attir, within easy distance of it.

Socordia,

in Roman mythology, was the daughter of Aether and the Earth; a personification of *dulness*.

Socrates,

the most notable and the best known of all the Greek philosophers, to whom the designation of “the Father of Philosophy” (*parens philosophiae*) has been deservedly given. His prominence during life, his influence after death, and his notoriety through his death affected the character and development of speculation more than they have ever been affected by any other philosopher. It is the impress of his own heart and mind upon the growing thought of the world the impulse and direction which he gave to intellectual inquiry and to moral action — much more than any special doctrine, which have insured to his name the distinction and affectionate reverence that have attended it through all the ensuing centuries. Even if no regard should be paid to the peculiarities of his philosophical doctrine, the career and the character of Socrates would merit the highest admiration in any age. They were singularly remarkable in a pagan age, and amid all the

corruptions, the sophistries, and the brilliant license of Athens during the Peloponnesian war. He was a heathen, with many of the virtues and more, of the aims of Christianity. In a period of unrestrained ochlocracy, of eager ambition, of greed, of self-seeking, and of rapacity, he, though conscious of the highest intellectual vigor, and associating with the ablest public men, was content with the humble station in which he was born, and never sought office or command. Surrounded with opportunities for acquiring wealth and luxurious indulgences, he was heedless of poverty, hunger, exposure, and all hardships. He was at all times patriotic, and observant of law in matters religious, political, and social. He was without superstitions other than those inseparable from his time and country. He was faithful and fearless in the discharge of every public and private duty. He gave his thought, his heart, his energies, to the improvement of his fellow citizens, and spent his life as a missionary of moral and intellectual reformation. His temperament, at least in his later years, was withal so serene; his disposition so amiable, earnest, and unaffected; his manner so sincere and winning; his intercourse so kindly and sportive; his resolution so steadfast; his heart at all times so simple and devoid of selfishness or guile, that he might well appear to Alcibiades and the contemporaries of Alcibiades such a man as was not elsewhere to be encountered. "We shall not look upon his like again." He will remain, as he has remained, a unique exemplar in the history of humanity. In accounting for the unequalled fascination which Socrates since death, as in life, has exercised upon all intellectual and cultivated men, to the merits and charms and singularities of his career must be added the quiet and unostentatious grandeur of his death, when he freely surrendered life under an undeserved sentence, in order to maintain the laws of his country, though misapplied, and to seal his doctrine and his practice with the most solemn of all signatures. As a missionary, and as a zealous, self-abnegating and untiring moralist, Socrates suggests a comparison with the apostles and martyrs of Christianity, and with the founders of monastic communities in the dissolute and stormy Middle Age. As a preacher and teacher of moral regeneration, he provokes, though with reverential assertion of the vast interval, a more daring comparison, which has impressed devout Christians no less than unbelievers and misbelievers like Rousseau and Baur. It adds new dignity and a loftier interest to the life and death of Socrates to contemplate his career as an essential part of the providential and patient preparation of the civilized world for the acceptance of Christianity.

I. Life. — It is peculiarly needful, in the case of Socrates, to pay careful attention to the course and circumstances of his life, because his remarkable personality is so strongly and so strikingly impressed upon his doctrine and upon the whole tenor of his procedure. The Socratic philosophy, in its active development and in its theoretic import, is distinctly the product of the idiosyncrasies of Socrates, and of the requirements and tendencies of the memorable age in which he lived, and which he rendered more illustrious by his life. This has been fully recognized by Ritter, by Zeller, by Grote, and by other historians of philosophy and historians of Athens. It may be thought that they have overlooked some considerations not less weighty and significant than any that they have adduced. But they have not failed to note the intimate correspondence between the man and his doctrine, between his teachings and his times. His life is his philosophy, his philosophy the refecation of his life. Yet it is difficult to present a true portrait of the great teacher, or a just biography of him. The materials are abundant are, indeed, redundant; but they are all presented “in such questionable guise” as to be of doubtful credibility. Socrates reappears in nearly all later writers, Greek or Roman, whose subjects allowed any reference to him, or who sought “to point a moral or adorn a tale.” Incident and anecdote, text and comment, are multiplied indefinitely; but no confidence can be accorded to the traditions reported or repeated by Cicero, Seneca, or Quintilian, by Plutarch or Diogenes Laertius, or by other authorities having still less claim on our belief. Reverent conjecture invented, credulous admiration accepted, eager tradition expanded, and curious repetition distorted or transmuted detail after detail, till the genuine Socrates of the 5th ante-Christian century became an accumulation of myths. This process of transfiguration commenced, in no respectful way, in the lifetime of the sage. Aristophanes, in his *Clouds*, and Ameipsias, in his *Connus*, exposed to immortal laughter his appearance, his rags, his manners, and his speculation. Yet the caricature of the comedians may be welcomed as a likeness with almost as much security as the delineations of his disciples. It is fortunate that we possess the *Memorabilia* and the *Synposium* of Xenophon and the *Dialogues* of Plato. But both these biographers were manifest writers of fiction, and all their productions were dyed in the brighter or more subdued colors of fancy. The author of the *Memorabilia* composed the *Cyropoedia*, the *Agesilaus*, and the *Hiero*. The author of the exquisite *Apologia* was also the dreamer of the *Republic* and the *Laws*. All the writings of both these glories of Attic literature may be included under Pindar’s category:

δεδαίδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ... μῦθοι. Aristippus wrote to Plato repudiating his representations of their common teacher (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2, 23), and Demochares denied Plato's statements regarding the exploits of Socrates at Delium and Amphipolis. The contrasts and discrepancies between Xenophon and Plato have been long and prominently noted. They have been explained by diversity of aim, difference of intellectual susceptibilities, and disparity of talents. It has been held by Zeller, by Grote, by Mason, in an able article in Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*, that the apparent contradictions may be reconciled. It is alleged that Xenophon regarded only the practical side of the Socratic instructions, and sought to convince the Athenians of the innocence of the master; while Plato was always contemplating the speculative import of the Socratic doctrine, and sublimating teaching and teacher in accordance with his own philosophical fantasy. This may be freely admitted, but it does not leave a sufficient or a safe basis for accurate biography: "The trail of the serpent is over it all." Even those who espouse this scheme of conciliation are compelled to exclude from the *Memoires pour servir* the greater and the more characteristic part of the Platonic *Dialogues*, in which Socrates is evidently a mere lay figure, or, rather, a tailor's manikin for the exhibition of the Platonic robes and other finery. Agreement may be imagined between the representations of Xenophon and Plato by considering them as different views of the same personage. Such agreement, however, is not inconsistent with a lavish employment of decoration by each; since all forms of flattery and of caricature require some observance of characteristic features. Yet it may reasonably be concluded that the Socrates of Xenophon as well as of Plato is posing or attitudinizing, though there be great difference in the grace and fascination of the two figures. Still Xenophon and Plato are our best, and almost our only real, authorities for the life and opinions of Socrates. They must be accepted as nearly our sole genuine sources of information. Due caution must be shown in their employment; and it must be remembered that something of coherence and consistency, the softening of some asperities, and the exaggeration of some angularities, which were originally due to the fictitious ingredient, will remain after all our care. There may be little real ground for regret in the want of perfect assurance of the literal truth of the portraiture. There is a hazy conception, and an exaggeration through the haze, of all the images of the past. There will be a general truth of presentation, resulting from the affectionate and admiring pictures of dissimilar followers, which will be more impressive and inspiring than any

mechanical though faithful daub could be. At any rate, Xenophon and Plato furnish forth the Socrates who kindled, guided, charmed, the later world. Those who are satisfied of the substantial agreement of the two contemporary biographers introduce Aristotle to check or to confirm their statements. The indications of Aristotle are eminently valuable. They are rarely biographical. They do not diminish the regret that all the works of the censors and even calumniators of Socrates, except the *Clouds*, and all the sources whence Athenieus drew his discrediting reports, have been utterly lost, but lost without having influenced the general judgment of men.

Socrates was born at Athens in B.C. 468 or 469; before 469 says Ueberweg, with great plausibility. His birthday was in later times commemorated as a sacred day on the 6th of Thargelion, which would fall in May. His father, Sophroniscus, was a sculptor or statuary, in humble circumstances; not a common stonemason, if his distinguished son, who learned and practiced the father's art, produced the Graces in front of the Acropolis, which were seen and noted by Pausanias (1, 22, 8; 9, 35, 1). His mother was Phaenarete, a midwife, whose occupation he often employed to illustrate his own intellectual procedure, which may have been confirmed or suggested by it. The father's condition did not allow the son any special advantages of education. The statement that Socrates was the pupil of Anaxagoras and Prodicus can have no other meaning than that he may have read the works of the former, and may have conversed with both. They, as well as Gorgias and Parmenides, were at Athens during his early or mature manhood. The ordinary education of an Athenian, with the varied aids and stimulations which rendered the average Athenian more than equal to an average member of the British Parliament, were open to him, and were doubtless turned to the best account. He would learn music and gymnastics, and these were, probably, his only school acquirements; but music and gymnastics embraced the elements of all intellectual and physical training. He has expressed, through Plato, his obligations for his public education (*Crito*, 12). The free intercourse of a democracy, and of such a democracy as that of Athens in the age of Pericles, with its boast of freedom of speech and of association, would afford Socrates, who ever sought intimacy with noted persons, every chance of instruction and information that could be desired. The education of living communion far transcends all that can be learned from books. Socrates himself professes to have been self educated in philosophy (Xenophon, *Symp.* 1, 5), and the

profession is just, for he had none to point the way which he pursued. He might also have claimed self education in other respects, but it was an education resulting from habitual intercourse with the most intelligent and the best informed of all classes and of both sexes — with the associates of Pericles and Phidias, with Aspasia and Diotima, as well as with poets, artists, sophists, and artisans. His indefatigable pertinacity and curiosity would enable him readily to acquire the extensive knowledge ascribed to him by Xenophon.

There are no authentic details of the first half of the life of Socrates. To Plato and to Xenophon he was always an old man. Is there not room here for suspecting that the tenets and, inquiries and practices which were ridiculed by Aristophanes and Ameipsias, before an audience familiar with the object of caricature, may have been the pursuits and investigations of Socrates in his earlier years, while groping his way towards his ultimate vocation? This suspicion merits examination. It may, however, be fairly inferred from the tenor of Xenophon's and of Plato's remarks that Socrates pursued the simple path of his obscure life, in the performance of every public and private duty, without failure and without blame. He discharged the civil functions devolving on every Athenian faithfully, but without thought of advancement. He rendered the regular military service without seeking or holding command. He distinguished himself, or is said to have done so, at Potidaea, Delium, and Amphipolis by his courage, patience, and endurance. The story of the rescue of Alcibiades by Socrates at Potidaea is incredible, for the former was barely fifteen years of age at the time. The compensating story that Alcibiades afterwards rescued Socrates has the air of fiction about it. These military expeditions were the only occasions of absence from Athens, except one visit to the Isthmus, to which Aristotle adds a visit to Delphi (*Frag.* 3). Socrates loved Athens, loved its scenes, its bustle, and its people. He married and had children, but he was happy neither in his wife nor his children. Xanthippe had the reputation of a shrew throughout all antiquity; and the sons of Cimon, Pericles, and Socrates are commemorated together as worthless (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2, 15). It may easily be credited that Socrates neglected wife and family while interminably discussing and debating throughout the livelong day. It is a question whether he had one or two wives the much known Xanthippe, the mother of his daughter, and Myrto, the daughter or descendant of Aristides the Just. This bigamy, or matrimonial duplicity, is repudiated by Athenaeus (13, 2), by Grote, Zeller, and nearly all the moderns. Athenaeus says that

the allegation rests upon the authority of Callisthenes, Demetrius Phalereus, Satyrus, and Aristoxenus. This is early testimony, and in the main reputable. It rests also on the higher evidence of Aristotle (*Fra.* 84), as reported by Diogenes Laertius, but the reporter may be suspected.

We may believe that Socrates displayed the highest civic virtue and the highest moral courage on the only two occasions when he is stated to have been clothed with an official character. He was at all times averse to political employment, and avoided it as unsuited to his temperament and habitudes; but he renounced no duty. As presiding member of the Prytany, he refused to put to the vote the iniquitous decree against the generals inculpated at Arginusae; and, under the Thirty Tyrants, he opposed the execution of the infamous order for the arrest of Leon the Salaminian. In one case he braved the furious mob, in the other the despotic oligarchs. The vocation of Socrates lay not in art, nor in litigation, nor in war, nor in politics. His mission was that of a reformer of morals and of speculation, and was created by and for himself. At what time he entered upon this career it is impossible to ascertain. It probably grew upon him gradually, and strengthened and shaped itself as it grew, until at length it became recognized as a definite and irrecusable duty. There is so much in both method and doctrine that springs from the peculiarities of the man, so much in the fashion of his apostolate that reflects and elucidates any possible interpretation of his character, that his marvellous career must be deemed primarily spontaneous and unconscious. The deliberate and systematic prosecution of his high vocation must have begun soon after the death of Pericles, though it probably did not assume its characteristic form till a later time. He must have attained public notoriety in those years, for Aristophanes and Ameipsias offered him to the merciless ridicule of the Athenian people in the spring after the battle of Delium. The new teacher presented as curious a spectacle as the fancy of a caricaturist could devise. He was earnest, enthusiastic, untiring, pertinacious; pressing forward, "in season and out of season," with "line upon line and precept upon precept;" tackling everybody, high and low, at work or at recreation, in street and temple, theater and banquet hall, court, dockyard, and grove; in school, workshop, conference, and assembly. He claimed to be impelled to catechise, and to expose ignorance, under the solemnity of a divine call. But the missionary was grotesque in all respects, repulsive in many. He was garrulous beyond measure, an interminable disputant; boring everybody with an unceasing and pitiless storm of questions, and

answering others only with a fresh shower of questions. This concorporated note of interrogation was ugly beyond known examples of human ugliness, with short, squat figure, fat, round belly, goggle eyes, thick lips, big mouth, pug nose, transcending in its *pug-nasi-ty* all observed puggishness. Even friends and admirers called him a satyr, and compared him to the comic masks of Silenus. Rabelais wittily assimilated him to a patent physic bottle. He was habitually unwashed and unshod, and clothed with an old, worn, greasy chlamys. His manners tended to increase repugnance. His speech was rude and inelegant, his voice grating, his immediate topics and examples humble, if not positively vulgar; his bearing was obtrusive, without being presumptuous; his address plain and unpolished, though not discourteous. His manners were termed coarse and clownish by Aristoxenus. Politicians, legists, orators, philosophers, sophists, magistrates, generals, and citizens were decried by him as fools and knaves, and compelled to gaze in the mirror held before them, that they might recognize their own folly, fraud, and ignorance. This drastic medicine was forced upon those who enjoyed the discomfiture of others, but not their own, by the quaint personage who could stand, and keep others standing, from morning to night, and who talked without intermission, though able sometimes to listen with the utmost patience. Nevertheless, this portentous mouthpiece of the gods had strange powers of enchantment, and lulled those on whom he fastened like a vampire, fanning them while sucking their blood, or held them, like the skinny finger of the Ancient Mariner, so that “they could not choose but hear.” The lustre of another world broke forth in his speech, like the moon emerging from a shapeless bank of clouds, and revealed a tenderness of sentiment, a purity of feeling, a depth of thought, a fertility of illustration, an overflowing humor, a playful and penetrating wit, a wealth of knowledge, an ingenuity of argument, and a concentration of noble aims. His magic wrought like the Vice of the poet:

*“A monster of so frightful mien
As, to he hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.”*

It could scarcely increase the favor of Socrates with the multitude, who knew him only by sight, to see him attended by Critias, Alcibiades, Charmides, Xenophon, Aristippus, etc., and to hear that this zealot of a new doctrine, who condemned present conduct and current opinion,

professed to keep a little divinity of his own, and was declared by the Delphic oracle to be the wisest of men. The humility of his interpretation of the oracle might be unknown, or might seem a mock humility, correspondent to his familiar and habitual irony. The only ground of the oracular utterance, he said, was that he knew that he knew nothing, while others mistook their own ignorance for knowledge. There is more wit than reason in the remark of Athenseus (5, 60), "If knowing nothing is wisdom, knowing all things must be folly." He proceeds to say that Socrates was worthy of belief when he professed himself "not to be wise;" and that it was as needless to consult the god on this point as to ask "whether any one was more pug nosed than Socrates."

Such, then, was the reformer who undertook to convert the Athenians from the error of their ways. He was more frugal than a Neapolitan lazzarone or a Greek mendicant — *Groeculus esuriens*. He was abstemious, given neither to wine nor to pleasure. He was able and willing to drink more than any of his *compotators*; yet "no man ever saw Socrates drunk" (Plato, *Symp.* p. 220). He was ascetic, inviting hardships and careless of pain, like the Coenobites of the desert or the founders of mediaeval fraternities. He declined the invitations of princes and potentates because he could not return their favors. He refused to take money for his instructions, denounced the Sophists for their mercenary practice, and sent back to Aristippus the gains which he desired to share with him. He condemned existing usages, procedures, and theories; derided the political institutions of Athens; invited all to abandon their delusive and pernicious doctrines and reasonings; attached him self specially to the young for the conversion of the rising generation; yet was himself observant of established customs and prescription in religion, in law, in political and social conduct.

A character like this could hardly receive due appreciation in the lively and captious community in which he lived and moved without resting, and which he tormented through all ranks without ceasing. How difficult the appreciation must have been may be estimated from the diverse portraits drawn by his friends and pupils, Xenophon and Plato, without either achieving a fair picture. Socrates might win the admiration of many by his brilliant display of dialectical ingenuity and intellectual power; he might attract ambitious politicians by the hope of acquiring his arts; but he could secure the devotion only of the few who caught glimpses of his purpose and desired to share his aims. To the populace and to the upper multitude

he must have seemed a strange and unwelcome phenomenon. He must have gone about multiplying dislikes, nursing enmities and antagonisms, and storing up wrath against the day of wrath. In the Platonic *Apology* he expresses greater apprehension of chronic misconception and calumny and odium than of the immediate capital charge. This is consonant with probability. The distinct reference to Aristophanes is a Platonic device, and excites a suspicion that there is as little authentic and uncolored fact as in the Latin *Panegyrica*, or the *Diogenes* of Dion Cassius.

Full acquiescence may be accorded to Grote's remark that the indictment and condemnation of Socrates are less surprising than his long escape from prosecution. For twenty or thirty years he had been suffered, without molestation, to infest the streets of Athens, to consort with oligarchs and tyrants, to preach novel doctrines to idlers, to interrupt and deride every one, and to offend prevailing sentiment. The Jews would have stoned such a prophet without such patient endurance.

At length, in B.C. 399, after the restoration of the democracy and the reestablishment of the old constitution, Socrates was indicted. His accusers had little obvious reason for personal enmity. Meletus, or Melitus, was a youthful poet, otherwise almost unknown. Anytus was a wealthy tradesman and active politician, who had cooperated efficiently with Thrasybulus in the recent overthrow of the Thirty, and whose son had been dissuaded from following his father's trade. Lycon was a professional rhetorician, and was thus involved in the Socratic censure of the Sophists. Anytus alone had any personal grievance. It was very slight, but it concurred with a general antipathy to Socrates. The charge was that Socrates neglected his country's gods, introduced new divinities, and corrupted the Athenian youth. These charges may now be admitted to be substantially unjust; but they were then very plausible, and gave utterance to what may well have been the common impression in regard to the tenor and tendency of his disputations. The purity of the motives, designs, and conduct of Socrates none will now gainsay. None will now repeat the fatal accusations with any thought that Socrates could conceive them to be just. His strict observance of the religious rites of his country is insisted upon in both the *Apologies* written after the event. He will not be less revered now from a conviction that his religious views inclined vaguely to the assertion of monotheism and to the adoration of "the unknown God." This would result in the negation of existing superstitions and creeds, and would sustain the allegation of the introduction of new divinities. This allegation

would be confirmed by his claim of special inspiration, and by the announcement of his mysterious and divine counsellor, whose essential character has not yet been satisfactorily explained. The third charge of corrupting young men would be even more plausible among the ancient Athenians than the other two. The Socratic method contemplated the compulsory confession of ignorance, and proceeded by a perplexing series of questions and constrained answers, designed to remove the false conceit of knowledge in order to prepare the way for a careful and unprejudiced investigation of truth. Most of the sufferers would stop with the negative result, as Socrates himself appears practically to have done. Others, who did not understand the process and could not appreciate the design, would conclude that the purpose as well as the effect of the Socratic *elenchus* was to unsettle belief in accredited institutions no less than in established convictions. This apprehension would be aggravated by remembering that Alcibiades, Critias, and Charmides had been among his most cherished associates; that his chief disciple, Plato, perhaps not yet prominent, was the nephew of Charmides, one of the Thirty, and had recently been active in aristocratical opposition; that Socrates had always disapproved the existing modes of appointment to office; and that he had displayed a constant distrust and disapproval of democratic institutions a censure which democracies always jealously and passionately resent.

Socrates was brought to trial. His divine monitor forbade his making a defense in the customary spirit. If he spoke what is reported by Plato, his *Apology* was calculated only to irritate his judges. There was no fixed or systematic law at Athens, especially in criminal matters. Every indictment was a bill of attainder. Nevertheless, Socrates was condemned by a majority of only five or six voices in a dicastery of more than five hundred. After the condemnation the penalty had to be determined. Athenian procedure required the accusers to name a penalty and the accused to offer an alternative satisfaction. The accusers had specified death. The alternative proposed by Socrates was a virtual negation of the verdict by substituting for death public support in the Prytaneum, the highest honor that could be bestowed; or, in deference to the urgency of his friends, a fine of thirty minae (about seven hundred dollars). The jury could choose only one or other of these penalties. Socrates had already been declared guilty. The sentence could scarcely be other than — death.

Polycrates among the Greeks, and Cato among the Romans, justified the condemnation of Socrates. Lelut and Forchhammer did the same thing

forty years ago, and Dresig preceded them by a century. Grote holds the balance even between the judges and the judged. The judgment of Polycrates may have been merely a rhetorical exercise, an intellectual *tour de force*; or it may have been serious, and may have called out the *Apologia* of Xenophon as a reply. It was recognized by friends and contemporaries, it was generally recognized in antiquity, it has usually been recognized by the moderns, that the condemnation and death of Socrates were his own act. He did not desire to live. His work was done, his career was bending to its close. He was willing, if not eager, to perpetuate his influence and to confirm his life and doctrine by his death. Nothing can be more exquisitely touching, more ennobling, or more memorable than the account given by Plato of the last days of Socrates, and of the cheerful, playful serenity with which he welcomed the hastening term of life. The closing scenes are among the noblest exhibitions of human, and almost of superhuman, virtue. That there is much of Plato in the pathetic story is indubitable. The artistic arrangement of details, the subdued coloring, the solemn calm, the dramatic presentation, are all Plato's; but the substantial significances may be confidently ascribed to the genuine Socrates. We shall not repaint the rose or reperfume the lily. The tale must be read in the pages of the reverent disciple and consummate artist.

Socrates should have drunk the fatal hemlock the day after the sentence. But the sacred embassy had just sailed for Delos, and capital punishments were suspended till its return. Socrates lay in prison for a month, suffering, perhaps, the indignity of fetters, surrounded by sorrowing friends, to whom he repeated the instructions of his life. Provision was made for his escape. He refused such release because firm in his obedience to the laws, whether just or unjust in their operation upon him. At the appointed time, towards the end of May, he drank the deadly cup with perfect composure, and welcomed death in the hope, but without the confident expectation, of a tranquil immortality.

The death of Socrates scattered his disciples: he never formed a school. The dispersion of the disciples disseminated his doctrine and method. Many years elapsed before philosophy revisited Athens. A long and troubled time intervened before Plato returned to renew with caution, and to remodel, expand, and transfigure the speculations of his master.

The Athenians have been alleged to have soon repented of the condemnation and execution of Socrates, and to have prosecuted his

accusers capitally. There is neither valid evidence for this nor inherent probability in it. The supposed remorse of Elizabeth for the execution of Essex is not more fanciful. There was occasion for deep regret; there was none for repentance. Socrates had left his judges little room for hesitation. There is no reason to suppose that they had decided contrary to their convictions of right and of law. Moreover, the Athenians were oblivious of past incidents and of melancholy events. They were always engrossed with the enjoyment or the expectation of something new. No reaction was known when Demosthenes and Aeschines were rival orators, nor, previously, to Xenophon or Plato. A statue made by Lysippus in Macedonian times is said to have been erected at Athens in memory of Socrates. This may be questioned; yet from this tribute, or from the belief in such a tribute, the legend of the repentance may have arisen.

II. Philosophy. — There is no such thing, properly speaking, as a Socratic philosophy. There was a Socratic impulse, a Socratic method, a Socratic inquiry, but no positive or systematic Socratic speculation. He planted the vigorous seed; he did not cultivate the plant or gather the harvest. He was the father of all wholesome investigation by indicating, not by constructing, the route. Like Bacon, he was the herald of conquest, not the conqueror. *Potest videri ostendisse posteris, non tradidisse.* “Still, enough remains to stamp him as the originator of the philosophy of conceptions, as the reformer of method, as the first founder of a scientific doctrine of morals.” The characteristic and essential features of the philosophical career of Socrates were his aim and method. These determined all his philosophical developments, and were themselves determined by the complexion and requirements of his time. Pericles, during his long ascendancy, had “wielded at will the fierce democratic,” and had restrained the violent, excessive appetencies of a capricious and domineering populace and of their ambitious and unscrupulous guides. Yet the agitations of demagogues, the disappointments, disasters, and sorrows of the opening years of the Peloponnesian war, the distress and demoralization produced by the plague, had gravely shaken his control in his latter life. After his death the political conflict lay between the wealthy but weak and superstitious Nicias and the turbulent, boastful, and rapacious Cleon. The voting and dicastic mass of the people were gravely debauched and completely misled by noisy bawlers and greedy flatterers. The corrosion of public, and, to a great extent, of private morals was fearfully aggravated by the destruction of all political, jural, ethical, and speculative principles

through the harangues on the bema, the arguments in the courts, the predominance of rhetorical ingenuity, and the sophistries of brilliant and mercenary teachers, who reduced all truth to semblance, all discussion to a conflict of showy words and dazzling plausibilities. The Athenians had been brought to accept that most pernicious of all delusions — “There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so” (see Protag. ap. Aristot. *Met.* 3, 5; Plato, *Sophist.* 47; Erasmus, *Chil.* — “Non est beatus, esse qui se nesciat;” “Nil passus es mali si dissimulaveris”). It was in this condition of the State and of Greek society that Socrates felt himself urged, as by a divine voice, to interpose for the reclamation and regeneration of his countrymen, and to appear as a persistent missionary in the cause of justice, honesty, and truth (Plato, *Apolog.* 22). It has already been observed that his career must have been gradually developed. He may have proceeded at first in an intuitive, unconscious, tentative sort of way, following his natural impulse to inquiry, to the pursuit of information, to love of company and conversation, till his course shaped itself out before him, beset him as the special duty of his life, and assumed the imperative form of a divine monition. The increasing perception of the decline of public and private faith and morals would conduce to such a result in a nature highly sensitive to all intellectual and moral demands. Whatever opinion may be entertained of the claim of the Platonic *Apology* to be regarded as a just representation of the actual defense made by Socrates, it is very remarkable that Plato puts into the mouth of the accused the distinct declaration that he had received his mission from the divinity, and that if his life were taken another divine messenger might be sent (*Apolog.* 18). This special and controlling influence is familiarly known as the *daemon* of Socrates. What that daemon was is still under discussion. Some critics, commentators, and historians of philosophy conceive it to have been a personal genius, or, at least, to have been so regarded by Socrates. Others look upon it as simply a divine pressure or mysterious suggestion. Those who recognize the direct action of the Holy Spirit and the divine call to Christian believers cannot utterly reject the possibility of the like agency even in pagan times (⁴⁰¹⁵Romans 2:15). Others, again, consider the Socratic δαίμωνιον to have been “the still, small voice of conscience” gradually transmuting itself into a prepossession. Others, finally, regard the allegation of such divine guidance or restraint as hallucination, hypocrisy, or pretence. Neither pretence nor hypocrisy would have been apt to assume such a form in those skeptical times, and would be at variance with any plausible or consistent conception of the character of Socrates. Pure

hallucination is not consonant with the singular sobriety of mind and sentiment which distinguished him from all other enthusiasts. That this daemon was sometimes regarded by him and by his disciples as personal cannot be denied. As Socrates says that every earnest servant of the gods may have a like divine illumination, as Plato speaks of the daemon of everyman leading him after death to the judgment (*Phaed.* 55), it is apparent that it was regarded, at an early period, as a guardian or attendant angel. This conclusion scarcely militates against the second supposition, which will not appear extravagant or unreasonable to those who remember the numerous echoes, through all ages and all creeds, and from the most eminent men in all lines of thought, of the Homeric phrase ἐνέπνευσε φρεσὶ δαίμων (*Odys.* 19, 138). Says Cicero (*De Nat. Deor.* 2, 66, 167), “Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo divino afflatu umquam fuit.” The testimonies are endless, and from sources that would not be anticipated; but there is no room to cite them. Waiving, however, such transcendental speculations, and admitting that there may be delusion in imagining any special inspiration, it will not do to resolve the Socratic *doemonism* into practical wisdom with Grote, or into moral tact with Ueberweg. These might be the results of the monitions of the demon, or independent of them; but they are wholly distinct from them. There is a curious psychological phenomenon, rarely noted because of infrequent occurrence and less frequently subjected to critical observation, which merits grave estimation in this connection. A mind and nature quick, earnest, comprehensive, and impressible — with unusual faculties of intuition — fervently occupied with any serious moral or intellectual pursuit, has visions of the day “which have elsewhere their rising,” and spring neither from the reason nor from the volition; hears voices in the silence which others never hear; has sudden convictions which descend upon him without logical inducement or antecedent evidence; has firm assurances which rest upon inexplicable faith; and is led reverently to presume that “it is the Lord which giveth him understanding” by an immediate revelation. Of such men was Socrates.

In the assurance of a heavenly vocation, Socrates put aside all other thoughts, cares, interests, employments, aims, and devoted himself exclusively to the task of reforming his fellow citizens by disclosing their intellectual procedure and by enlightening their consciences. He pretended to be seeking everywhere for knowledge to improve himself and to acquire fixed knowledge. He disclaimed any pretence of teaching, for ignorance

was his profession and the ground, as he alleged, of his being declared by Apollo “the wisest of men.” He spent the whole day and every day, from early morn till set of sun, amid the gatherings of men, inquiring into the opinions, and the grounds of their opinions, of persons in every profession and of every grade. He was never tired of asking questions, and he did nothing but ask questions, drawing out by the answers obtained the fallacy and inconsistency of dogmas, and making every one confute himself and apprehend the baselessness of his supposed knowledge. Hence he always professed to do nothing more than practice intellectual obstetrics, and to deliver men of their own intellectual progeny, for the most part monstrously deformed. This was the method of Socrates, and his method was his whole philosophy. The curtain was the picture. Yet this method was productive of nearly all the philosophy that followed, and was then the one thing needful — the effectual exposure of the false conceit of knowledge. “Dum falsas mentis vires mirantur homines et celebrant, veras ejusdem, quae esse possint,... praetereunt et perdunt. Restabat illud unum, ut res de integro tentetur, melioribus praesidiis” (Bacon, *Nov. Org. Monitum*; comp. *I Aph.* 9, 31). To those who were subjected to this catechising process it may have appeared a preconcerted scheme for their confusion. Such it may ultimately have become, being scarcely disguised by the pretension of ignorance and the solicitude for enlightenment. So the practice was regarded and presented by Xenophon and Plato. So it has been universally esteemed by later writers, who have explained it by the Socratic irony. Is it not more reasonable and more consistent with every probability to suppose that this interrogatory inquisition was begun in simple honesty with the view of gaining information, and that it assumed its definite purpose as a *criterium falsitatis* only after those who were consulted were found to be without settled principles or tenable doctrines? With the prevalent arrogance of knowledge which was no knowledge, with the consequent substitution of blunt assurance for intelligent investigation, with such a blind indifference to logical proof that the possibility of either rational or moral principles was often theoretically denied, with the vitiation of all intellectual procedure and of all authoritative rules of moral conduct thence ensuing, the first duty of the reforming missionary was to discover the reality and the basis of truth. What is truth? was the great question. What is true? was the question that Socrates propounded. There was, however, a preliminary task to be performed before such inquiries could be hopefully prosecuted. It was necessary to purge the minds of the inquirers, to disclose the nature and the sources of uncertainty, to reveal

the hollowness and fallacy of current maxims, postulates, deductions, and argumentations, to expose the ambiguity and deception of popular phrases and received terms, and to establish the elementary principles of valid reasoning: *διαλεκτικὴ γὰρ ἰσχυρὸς οὐπω τότ' ἦν* (Aristot. *Metaph.* 13, 4). Socrates never got beyond the preliminary task. His whole life was engrossed with it. He only laid the foundations and discovered the elements of dialectical science.

Socrates thought — at first, perhaps, only instinctively felt or ascertained by experience — that any hope of moral reform must be preceded or accompanied by intellectual reform. He examined himself, he examined others, and discerned that received doctrine was nothing better than ingenious fantasy or unauthenticated opinion. The first effort, then, was to remove delusion, prejudice, presumption, and what Grote calls “the conceit of knowledge.” The humble confession of ignorance was the indispensable preparation for a candid and hopeful search for truth. Grote has acutely and ingeniously compared the procedure of Socrates with that of Bacon. It may be as justly compared to that of Descartes. Hence the Delphic *Nosce teipsum* became the point of departure (Aristot. *Fragm.* 4), and both in his own case and in the case of all with whom he conversed his effort was to unveil ignorance under the presumption of knowledge. This was his special function with all who approached him — friends and opponents, young and old, notable and simple; for school and scholars he had none. This was his unpaid office, for which he would take no pay. Why should he take pay when he disclaimed teaching or having anything to teach? Why should he seek gain when the teaching for gain and the pursuit of gain had engendered the mental and moral diseases which he attempted to cure? In accordance with his function, he required those whom he catechised to examine the precise import of their terms and propositions. By a succession of adroit cavils he compelled them to apprehend the absence of precision and consistency in the vague phraseology which they employed and the hazy meaning which they attached to their statements. It was purely an inquisitive or investigative process — an examination of mind and conscience, confined to negative results, the recognition and admission of ignorance, or of false knowledge, which was worse than ignorance. These negative results involved living germs of positive and active growth. Much, too, was learned by the way. The investigation of duplicities of expression and of the derivative fallacies and discords compelled attention to the meaning and to the strict use of language. It compelled the habit of strict

definition and regard to the comprehension of terms and the limitation of conceptions. It compelled also habitual observation and observance of the just processes of reasoning, and thus introduced dialectics. The purpose and results of the method of Socrates may be fitly compared with the tenor of John Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding*, which is occupied with the legitimate import of words and the cautions needful in their employment. Aristotle says (*Metaph.* 13, 4) that Socrates deserves the credit of two inventions the definition of general terms and the introduction of inductive (or analogical) reasoning. It was necessary to induce men to look into their own minds, to dissect their own thoughts, to test their own language, that they might detect their own meaning, or want of meaning, and thus arrive at actual knowledge, or at the conditions precedent to any valid knowledge. This lesson once taught was taught forever. The character of the day, the character of the habits, doctrines, speculations of the day, no less than his own temperament and gradual self development, inevitably led Socrates to adopt this procedure. It was not deliberately chosen; it was forced upon him. Some influence may be ascribed to the outdoor life of the Athenians, and to their addiction to free converse, inquiry, and disputation. The process, it will be seen, was not adapted to instruction, but to compulsory introspection. In the exercise of his peculiar vocation, Socrates furnished continual illustrations of ingenious cross examination to those who sought dexterity in eristic arts. He irritated many, and among them persons of note, whose ignorance and sophistries were skilfully exposed by him; but in others — sages, anxious for knowledge, for improvement, for intellectual and moral growth — he kindled a zeal, an enthusiasm, and an affectionate admiration which no other education has ever equalled (Plato, *Symp.* p. 219). It must be manifest how effectual this continual introspection, this constant testing of terms and torturing of significances, this inspection of the interdependence of thoughts, must have been in clearing the ground for healthy inquiry and in stimulating wholesome investigation. Socrates thus inaugurated genuine philosophy, or the earnest search for truth simply as truth; and communicated the impulse whence all real Hellenic philosophy proceeded.

The primary and abiding purpose of Socrates to promote moral regeneration through intellectual reform inclined his thoughts almost exclusively to ethical speculation. He was dissatisfied with the development of the physical theories of Anaxagoras, which he studied in early life; but he was dissatisfied on grounds whose invalidity Bayle has pointed out

(*Hist. Crit. Dict.* “Anaxagoras,” note R). He rejected physical inquiries entirely, deeming them beyond human apprehension and human application: “Quod supra nos nihil ad nos.” Grote thinks that he excluded physics only provisionally, and that he contemplated such studies as an ultimate portion of his scheme. But he had no system, and could have no system; and Grote is directly contradicted by Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1, 6; 13, 4). Ethics, in the widest sense of the term, was the special and peculiar domain of Socrates. He deserves Grote’s designation as “the first of ethical philosophers.” This commendation had been anticipated by Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, 8, 3): “Socrates primus universam philosophiam ad corrigendos componendosque mores flexisse memoratur.” Hence he is said to have been the first to draw down philosophy from heaven to dwell with men (*Cicero, Tusc. Disp.* 5, 4). But there was no systematic doctrine; there were principles and tendencies which might be developed into a system, or into several systems, but they were not adapted by him for the places which they might occupy in such systems. They were undeveloped and disconnected; not inharmonious, but unharmonized; requiring explanation and discussion to be understood in their true bearing. Thus he holds that all virtue is knowledge, and may be acquired by instruction — a doctrine accepted and partially developed by Plato, and corrected by Aristotle. His test of good is practical utility — a narrow and dangerous principle, which he was far from acting on himself. In government he advocated the rule of the best and most instructed — an optimist delusion — without showing, or being able to show, how the best and most competent were to be discovered, or to secure obedience. He censured democratic elections and appointments by lot; and, with good reason, condemned the contemporaneous practices in his own State. However wise in purpose, Socrates was a dreamer in practical affairs, despite Xenophon’s admiration of his sagacity in counsel. In that higher department of ethics which consists of theology he manifested an inclination towards monotheism, though maintaining the formal observance of the religious ceremonial and worship of his country. Like the best of the ancients, he had not attained to the conviction of the immortality of the soul. It was a wish, a hope, a probability, not an assured belief. It must be remembered, however, that everything we seem to know of Socrates, of his tenets, and of his instructions is seen through stained glasses, and glasses of a wonderfully magnifying and distorting power. We cannot safely trust either Xenophon or Plato, and there is none other whom we can trust except Aristotle; and his indications are loose and rare. The number of coincidences between the

alleged Socratic utterances and the precepts of Scripture, under both the first and the second covenant, are singularly noteworthy. These precepts may or may not be the real expressions of Socrates; they may be eagerly accepted as such, but some doubt must always remain. After all uncertainties are entertained, and all reasonable deductions made, there can be no reluctance to reverence Socrates as one of the most memorable, best, and wisest of men: “Bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter.” Erasmus declared that he was often tempted to exclaim, “Sancte Socrate, ora pro nobis!” and his impulse may excite sympathetic appreciation in others. The highest attestation of the moral excellence, the sublime purpose, and the intellectual greatness of Socrates is to be found not in the beautiful biographical notices of his loving disciples Xenophon and Plato, which have the taint of fiction on them, but in the reputation which he left permanently behind; in the universal reverence early and always accorded to his name; in the volume of philosophy which traced its descent from him; and in the broader, loftier, healthier, soberer spirit which animated all subsequent speculation.

III. *Influence of Socrates.* — The unquestioned influence of Socrates was not revealed by any marked improvement in, the political or private morals of the contemporary and succeeding generations, but in the changed tone of thought and sentiment among the higher natures of the following times, and pre-eminently in the enlargement and more sedate and rational development of philosophy. Xenophon and Plato, Euclid and Phaedo, Antisthenes and Aristippus, were his immediate disciples, and from them proceeded all the great sects of the Greek philosophers, with the exception of Epicurus — and the morals of Epicurus accorded with Socratic purity. It is useless to add that from this Hellenic philosophy issued all Roman, and nearly all that is valuable in mediæval or modern philosophy, so far as these have been independent of revelation. No such extensive and enduring influence has ever been, or can ever again be, exercised upon the world by any other uninspired teacher. No such unending influence could have been exercised by any system or by any founder of a system.

IV. *Literature.* — Dresig, *De Socrate juste Damnato* (Lips. 1732); Freret, *Observations sur les Causes et sur quelques Circonstances de la Condamnation de Socrate* (1736; Paris, 1809); Wiggers. *Sokrates, als Mensch, Burger u. Philosoph* (Rost. 1807); Schleiermacher, *Ueber den Werth des Sokrates*, etc. (Berlin, 1815); Meiners, *Ueber den Genius des*

Sokrates; Brandis, *Ueber die Grundlinien der Lehre des Sokrates* (Rhein. Mus. 1817); Lelut, *Le Demon de Socrate* (Paris, 1836); Baur, *Sokrates und Christus*, in the *Tub. Zeitschrift*, 1837; Forchhammer, *Die Athener und Sokrates*, etc. (Berlin, 1837); Van Limburg Brower, *Apologia contra Meliti Redivivi Calumniam* (Groningen, 1838); Grote, *History of Greece*, ch. 68; Hanne, *Sokrates als Genius der Humanitat* (Brunsw. 1841); Brikler, *Sokrates und sein Zeitalter* (Ellw. 1848); Hurndall, *De Philosophia Morali Socratis* (Heidelb. 1853); Lasaulx, *Des Sokrates Leben, Lehre und Tod* (Munich, 1859); Volquardsen, *Das Damonium des Sokrates* (Kiel, 1862); Higl, *Das Damonium des Sokrates* (Berne, 1864); Zeller, *Socrates and the Socratic School* (Lond. 1868); Alberti, *Sokrates* (Gotting. 1869); Nietzsche, *Sokrates*, etc. (Basel, 1871); Labriola, *La Dottrina di Socrate* (Naples, 1871). (G.F.H.)

Socrates, Scholasticus,

an ecclesiastical historian, was born at Constantinople towards the end of the 5th century. He studied grammar and rhetoric under Ammonius and Helladius, of Alexandria, and afterwards followed the profession of advocate or *scholastic*. He appears, however, to have abandoned this profession in order wholly to devote himself to the study of ecclesiastical history. In the latter part of his life he undertook to write the history of the Church, beginning at 309, where Eusebius ends, and continued it down to 440, in seven books. He is generally considered the most exact and judicious of, the three continuators of the history of Eusebius, being less florid in his style and more careful in his statements than Sozomen, and less credulous than Theodoret. "His impartiality is so strikingly displayed," says Waddington, "as to make his orthodoxy questionable to Baronius, the celebrated Roman Catholic historian; but Valesius, in his life, has shown that there is no reason for such suspicion. He is generally suspected of being a Novatian, though he shows but little knowledge upon the subject, and confounds Novatian, a priest at Rome, with Novatus of Africa." His history has been abridged by Epiphanius, the scholastic, in his *Historia Tripartita*, and was published for the first time as a continuation of Eusebius by Robert Stephens (Paris, 1544, fol.). There was an edition with notes, published by Reading (Lond. 1720, 3 vols. fol.), and an English edition (Cambridge, 1683, fol.). There is a good French translation of it by the president Cousin. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Socratitae,

a local name for the *Gnostics*, which is to be found under the number 26 in St. John Damascene's treatise *On Heresies*.

Sodalities

(Lat. for *societies*), a term applied to certain associations in the Roman Catholic Church. These are composed of laymen, and are instituted for the encouragement of devotion, or for promoting certain works of piety, religion, and charity, under some rules or regulations, though without being tied to them so far as that the breach or neglect of them would be sinful. An example is afforded by the Sodality of the Living Rosary. Fifteen persons form a company or circle, each taking by lot one of the fifteen "Mysteries of the Rosary" and reciting its decade (=ten Hail Marys, with a Lord's Prayer before it, and a Gloria Patri) every day. A number of circles, united under a clergyman as director, constitute a sodality.

Soder.

SEE SOLDER.

So'di

(Heb. *Sodi'*, **ydws**, *intimate*; Sept. **Σουδί**), father of the Zebulunite spy Gaddiel at the Exode (⁴¹³⁰Numbers 13:10). B.C. ante 1657.

Sod'om

(Heb. *Sedom'*, **dsj** meaning uncertain [see below]; Sept. and New Test. **[τά] Σόδομα**; Josephus, **Σόδομα**, *Ant.* 1, 9, 1; Vulg. *Sodoma*), an ancient city in the vale of Siddim, where Lot settled after his separation from Abraham (⁴¹³²Genesis 13:12; 14:12; 19:1). It had its own chief or "king," as had the other four cities of the plain (14:2, 8, 10), and was along with them, Zoar only excepted, destroyed by fire from heaven on account of the gross wickedness of the inhabitants; the memory of which event has been perpetuated in a name of infamy to all generations (ch. 19). In the following account of this remarkable place we digest the ancient and modern information on the subject. SEE SODOMITISH SEA.

I. The Name. — The word *Sedom* has been interpreted to mean "burning" (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 939a), taking, **dsj**= **hmdw**] and that as= **hpdw**]

This is possible, though not at all certain, since Gesenius himself hesitates between that interpretation and one which identifies it with a similar Hebrew word meaning “vineyard,” and Furst (*Handwb.* 2, 72), with nearly equal plausibility, connects it with an Arabic root meaning *to enclose* or fortify (𐤃𐤃𐤍, as the base also of *Siddim*), a view in which Muhlau coincides. Simonis, again (*Onomast.* p. 363), renders it “abundance of dew or water,” Hiller (*ibid.* p. 176), “fruitful land,” and Chytraeus, “mystery.” In fact, like most archaic names, it may, by a little ingenuity, be made to mean almost anything. Stanley (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 289) notices the first of these interpretations, and, comparing it with the “Phlegræan fields” in the Campagna at Rome, says that “the name, if not derived from the subsequent catastrophe, shows that the marks of fire had already passed over the doomed valley.” Apparent “marks of fire” there are all over the neighborhood of the Dead Sea. They have been regarded by many travelers as tokens of conflagration and volcanic action, and in the same manner it is quite possible that they originated the name *Sedom*, for they undoubtedly abounded on the shores of the lake long before even Sodom was founded.

II. Historical Notices. — Sodom is commonly mentioned in connection with Gomorrah, but also with Admah and Zeboim, and on one occasion (^{<0140>}Genesis 14) with Bela or Zoar. Sodom was evidently the chief town in the settlement. Its king takes the lead, and the city is always named first in the list, and appears to be the most important. The four are first named in the ethnological records of ^{<0109>}Genesis 10:19 as belonging to the Canaanites: “The border of the Canaanite was from Zidon towards Gerar unto Azzah, towards Sedom and Amorah and Admah and Tseboim unto Lasha.” The meaning of this appears to be that the district in the hands of the Canaanites formed a kind of triangle — the apex at Zidon, the southwest extremity at Gaza, the southeastern at Lasha.

The next mention of the name of Sodom (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:10-13) gives us more definite information as to the city. Abram and Lot are standing together between Bethel and Ai (ver. 3), taking, as any spectator from that spot may still do, a survey, of the land around and below them. Eastward of them, and absolutely at their feet; lay the “circle (𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤍) of Jordan,” i.e. the *ghor*. It was in all its verdant glory — that glory of which the traces are still to be seen, and which is so strangely and irresistibly attractive to a spectator from any of the heights in the neighborhood of Bethel — watered in the northern portion by the copious supplies of the Wady Kelt, the Ain

Sultan, the Ain Duk, and the other springs which gush out from the foot of the mountains; and in the southern part by Wady Tufileh, and the abundant brooks of the Ghor es-Safieh. These abundant waters even now support a mass of verdure before they are lost in the light, loamy soil of the region. But at the time when Abram and Lot beheld them, they were husbanded and directed by irrigation, after the manner of Egypt, until the whole circle was one great oasis — “a garden of Jehovah” (ver. 10). In the midst of the garden the four cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim appear to have been situated. To these cities Lot descended, and retaining his nomad habits among the more civilized manners of the Canaanitish settlement, “pitched his tent” by (d[i at, not “towards”) the chief of the four. At a later period he seems to have been living within the walls of Sodom. It is necessary to notice how absolutely the cities are identified with the district. In the subsequent account of their destruction (ch. 19), the topographical terms are employed with all the precision which is characteristic of such early times. “The *Ciccar*” (q.v.), the “land of the *Ciccar*,” “*Ciccar* of Jordan,” recurs again and again both in ch. 13 and 19, and “the cities of the *Ciccar*” is the almost technical designation of the towns which were destroyed in the catastrophe related in the latter chapter. *SEE JORDAN*.

The remaining passages of Scripture respecting Sodom relate merely to the event of its destruction (Genesis 19), and to its perpetual desolation: “Brimstone, and salt, and burning not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein” (^{<1832>}Deuteronomy 29:22); “Never to be inhabited, nor dwelt in from generation to generation; where neither Arab should pitch tent nor shepherd make fold” (^{<2339>}Isaiah 13:19); “No man abiding there, nor son of man dwelling in it” (^{<2498>}Jeremiah 49:18; 50:40); “A fruitful land turned into saltness” (^{<1973>}Psalms 107:34); “Overthrown and burned” (^{<3041>}Amos 4:11); “The breeding of nettles and salt pits, and a perpetual desolation” (^{<3119>}Zephaniah 2:9); “A waste land that smoketh, and plants bearing fruit which never cometh to ripeness” (Wisd. 9:7); “Land lying in clods of pitch and heaps of ashes” (2 Esdr. 2:9); “The cities turned into ashes” (^{<6016>}2 Peter 2:6), where their destruction by fire is contrasted with the deluge. The miserable fate of Sodom and Gomorrah is held up as a warning in these and other passages of the Old and New Tests. By Peter and Jude it is made “an ensample to those that after should live ungodly,” “and to those” denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ” (^{<6016>}2 Peter 2:6; ^{<6004>}Jude 1:4-7). Our Lord himself, when describing the fearful punishment that will befall those that reject his disciples, says that

“it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city” (^{<4061>}Mark 6:11; comp. ^{<4005>}Matthew 10:15).

In agreement with the above Scripture accounts is the statement of Josephus (*War*, 4, 8, 4). After describing the lake, he proceeds: “Adjoining it is Sodomitis, once a blessed region abounding in produce and in cities, but now entirely burned up. They say that it was destroyed by lightning for the impiety of its inhabitants. And even to this day the relics of the divine fire and the traces of five cities are to be seen there, and, moreover, the ashes reappear even in the fruit.” Josephus regarded this passage as his main statement of the event (see *Ant.* 1, 11, 4). In another passage (*War*, 5, 13, 6) he alludes incidentally to the destruction of Sodom, contrasting it, like Peter, with a destruction by water. By comparing these passages with *Ant.* 1, 9, it appears that Josephus believed the vale of Siddim to have been submerged, and to have been a district adjoining Sodom. Similar are the accounts of heathen writers, as Strabo and Tacitus; who, however vague their statements, are evidently under the belief that the remains of the towns were still to be seen. These passages are given at length by De Saulcy (*Narr.* 1, 448). There is a slight variation in the account of the Koran (11, 84): “We turned those cities upside down, and we rained upon them stones of baked clay.”

The name of the bishop of Sodom, “Severus Sodomorum,” appears among the Arabian prelates who signed the acts of the first Council of Nice. Reland remonstrates against the idea of the Sodom of the Bible being intended, and suggests that it is a mistake for Zuzumaon or Zoraima, a see under the metropolitan of Bostra (*Palœst.* p. 1020), This De Saulcy (*Narr.* 1, 454) refuses to admit. He explains it by the fact that many sees still bear the names of places which have vanished, and exist only in name and memory, such as Troy. The Coptic version to which he refers, in the edition of M. Lenormant, does not throw any light on the point.

III. *Physical Means of the Catastrophe to the City.* The destruction of Sodom claims attention from the solemnity with which it is introduced (^{<4080>}Genesis 18:20-22); from the circumstances which preceded and followed the intercession of Abraham, the preservation of Lot, and the judgment which overtook his lingering wife (ver. 25-33; 19); and from the nature of the physical agencies through which the overthrow was effected. Most of these particulars are easily understood; but the last has awakened much discussion, and may therefore require a larger measure of attention.

The circumstances are these. In the first place, we learn that the vale of Siddim, in which Sodom lay, was very fertile, and everywhere well watered — “like the garden of the Lord;” and these circumstances induced Lot to fix his abode there, notwithstanding the wickedness of the inhabitants (13:10, 11). Next it appears that this vale was full of “slime pits.” This means sources of bitumen, for the word is the same as that which is applied to the cement used by the builders of Babylon, and we know that this was bitumen or asphaltum (14:10; comp. 11:3). These pits appear to have been of considerable extent; and, indeed, it was from them doubtless that the whole valley derived its name of Siddim (μ ydç). At length, when the day of destruction arrived, “the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of those cities, and that which grew upon the ground” (19:24, 25). In the escape from this overthrow, the wife of Lot “looked back, and became a pillar of salt” (ver. 26). When Abraham, early that same morning, from the neighborhood of his distant camp, “looked towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and towards all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace” (ver. 27). These are the simple facts of the case. The following are the naturalistic explanations that have been attempted of the phenomena:

1. It has usually been assumed that the vale of Siddim occupied the basin of what is now the Dead Sea, which did not previously exist, but was one of the results of this catastrophe (see Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 1, 15 sq.). It has now, however, been established that a lake to receive the Jordan and other waters must have occupied this basin long before the catastrophe of Sodom, as all the geological characteristics of the region go to show that its present configuration is in its main features coeval with the present condition of the surface of the earth in general, and is not the effect of any local catastrophe at a subsequent period (Dr. Buist, in *Trans. of Bombay Geogr. Soc.* 12, p. 16). *SEE DEAD SEA.*

2. But although a lake must then have existed to receive the Jordan and other waters of the north, which could not have passed more southward, as was at one time supposed, and which must even, as is now proved, have received the waters of the south also, we are at liberty to assume, and it is necessary to do so, that the Dead Sea anciently covered a much less extent of surface than at present. The cities which were destroyed must have been situated at the edge of the lake as it then existed, for Lot fled to Zoar,

which was near Sodom (~~(Gen)~~ Genesis 19:20). This view has the support of several incidental circumstances. Thus the abundant water supply (as above noticed) still exists at both ends of the lake. "Even at the present day," says Robinson, "more living streams flow into the Ghor, at the south end of the sea, from wadys of the eastern mountains than are to be found so near together in all Palestine; and the tract, although now mostly desert, is still better watered through these streams and by the many fountains than any other district throughout the whole country" (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 603). The slime pits, or wells of asphaltum, are no longer to be seen; but it seems that masses of floating asphaltum occur only in the southern part of the lake; and as they are seen but rarely, and immediately after earthquakes, the asphaltum appears to be gradually consolidated in the lake, and not being able to flow off, forms by consequence a layer at the bottom, portions of which may be detached by earthquakes and other convulsions of nature, and then appear on the surface of the water or upon the shore. The eminent geologist Leopold von Buch, in his letter to Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 606-608), thinks it quite probable that this accumulation may have taken place in remote times as well as at the present day. Thus another circumstance of importance is produced in coincidence with the sacred accounts, especially with reference to the southern portion of the *present* lake, suggesting the probability that the remarkable bay, or "backwater," at its southern extremity, is the portion of it which did not in ancient times exist — that it, in fact, covers the more fertile vale of Siddim, and the site of Sodom and the other cities which the Lord destroyed; and that, in the words of Dr. Robinson, "by some convulsion or catastrophe of nature connected with the miraculous destruction of the cities, either the surface of this plain was scooped out or the bottom of the sea was heaved up so as to cause the waters to overflow and cover permanently a larger tract than formerly. The country is, as we know, subject to earthquakes, and exhibits also frequent traces of volcanic action. It would have been no uncommon effect of either of these causes to heave up the bottom of the ancient lake, and thus produce the phenomenon in question. But the historical account of the destruction of the cities implies also the agency of fire. Perhaps both causes were therefore at work, for volcanic action and earthquakes go hand in hand, and the accompanying electric discharges usually cause lightnings to play and thunders to roll. In this way we have all the phenomena which the most literal interpretation of the sacred records can demand." The same writer, with the geological sanction given above, repeats the conjecture of Le Clerc and others that the bitumen had become

accumulated around the sources, and had perhaps formed strata, spreading for some distance upon the plain; that possibly these strata in some parts extended under the soil, and might thus approach the vicinity of the cities: “If, indeed, we might suppose all this, then the kindling of such a heap of combustible materials, through volcanic action or lightning from heaven, would cause a conflagration sufficient not only to engulf the cities, but also to destroy the surface of the plain, so that the smoke of the country would go up as the smoke of a furnace, and the sea rushing in, would convert it to a tract of waters. The supposition of such, an accumulation of bitumen, with our present knowledge, appears less extraordinary than it might in former times have seemed, and requires nothing more than nature presents to our view in the wonderful lake, or rather tract, of bitumen in the island of Trinidad. The subsequent barrenness of the remaining portion of the plain is readily accounted for by the presence of the masses of fossil salt which now abound in its neighborhood, and which were perhaps then, for the first time, brought to light. These, being carried by the waters to the bottom of the valley, would suffice to take away its productive power. In connection with this fact, the circumstance that the wife of Lot ‘became a pillar of *salt*’ is significant and suggestive, whatever interpretation we may assign to the fact recorded” (see Baier, *De Excidio Sodomoe* [Francf. 1695]). **SEE LOT.**

This view of the catastrophe of the cities of the plain has, however, not passed without the dissent of some writers. It was easy to explode the opinion long current that when the five cities were submerged in the lake their remains — walls, columns, and capitals — might still be discerned below the water, for exploration has discovered no such relics. Not content with this, Reland led the way in modern times in attacking the whole theory in question of the meteorological and geological agencies employed in the event (*Paloest.* p. 257), and De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, 1, 370, Amer. ed.) and Stanley (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 289) have followed in the same line. Their arguments are the following:

(1.) Only two words are used in Genesis 19 to describe what happened: **tyj** ~~shat~~ to throw down, to destroy (ver. 13, 14), and **Ēph**; to overturn (ver. 21, 25, 29). In neither of these is the presence of water — the submergence of the cities or of the district in which they stood — either mentioned or implied. This would perhaps be a valid objection if the submersion were regarded as the principal cause of the destruction; but as, under the above statement, it comes in merely as a consequence of that

event (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.), the argument hardly applies. Moreover, in the latter of the two terms employed (Ēph; *haphak*, to overturn) there does seem to be a covert allusion to the undermining action of a subterranean force; and perhaps in the former (tyj ~~ach~~ *achishith*, to wipe out) there is implied the erasive violence of a rush of water. Certainly these terms do not forbid such an explanation of the mode of destruction; and in the confessed inability of the opponents of this view to suggest any other natural means, we may well acquiesce in this as the most plausible hitherto found.

(2.) “The geological portion of the theory does not appear to agree with the facts. The whole of the lower end of the lake, including the plain which borders it on the south, has every appearance not of having been lowered since the formation of the valley, but of undergoing a gradual process of filling up. This region is, in fact, the delta of the very large, though irregular, streams which drain the highlands on its east, west, and south, and have drained them ever since the valley was a valley. No report by any observer at all competent to read the geological features of the district will be found to give countenance to the notion that any disturbance has taken place within the historical period, or that anything occurred there since the country assumed its present general conformation beyond the quiet, gradual change due to the regular operation of the ordinary agents of nature, which is slowly filling up the chasm of the valley and the lake with the washings brought down by the torrents from the highlands on all sides. The volcanic appearances and marks of fire, so often mentioned, are, so far as we have any trustworthy means of judging, entirely illusory, and due to ordinary, natural causes.” On the contrary, we have adduced above the testimony of travelers and the opinion of competent scientists to sustain the convulsive character of the region in modern times. Until counter evidence shall have been brought forward of a more decided character than merely round assertions and general inferences, we may rest the case upon these grounds. Prof. Hitchcock shows (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, p. 469 sq.) that the present geological features of the region confirm the Scriptural account of the fate of the cities of the plain where Sodom stood.

(3.) “The plain of the Jordan, in which the cities stood (as has been stated), can hardly have been at the south end of the lake.” This position of Sodom favors, indeed, the foregoing theory, by reason of the comparative shallowness of the water in the southern end of the Dead Sea; but it is not

essential to the mechanical agencies employed, whether volcanic, meteorological, or fluvial. As, however, the two questions have been involved in each other, we will proceed to consider.

IV. *The Location of the City.* — Until a very recent period it has universally been held that the cities of the plain were situated at the *southern* end of the Dead Sea. Josephus, although he speaks indefinitely about the position of Sodom, expressly fixes Zoar (*Ant.* 1, 11; *War.* 4, 8) in Arabia, under which name he was in this case referring to the southeast end of the Salt Sea; and to the same effect is the testimony of Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v.) and of Jerome (*Ep.* 108, 11; *Comment. in Esa.* 15, 5). This view seems to have been universally held by the medieval historians and pilgrims, and it is adopted by modern topographers, almost without exception. In the words of one of the most able and careful of modern travelers, Dr. Robinson, “the cities which were destroyed must have been situated on the south end of the lake as it then existed” (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 188). This is also the belief of De Saulcy, except with regard to Gomorrah; and, in fact, is generally accepted. Besides the above arguments in favor of the submersion beneath the shallow waters of the south end of the sea, a consideration of much force is the existence of similar names in that direction. Thus, the name *Usdum*, attached to the remarkable ridge of salt which lies at the southwestern corner of the lake, is usually regarded as the representative of Sodom (Robinson, Van de Velde, De Saulcy, etc.), notwithstanding a slight difference between the two words. **SEE SODOMITISH SEA.** The name ‘*Amrah*, which is attached to a valley among the mountains south of Masada (Van de Velde, 2, 99, and map), is an almost exact equivalent to the Hebrew of, Gorrhorrha (‘*Amorah*). The name *Dra’a*, and nearly as strongly that of *Zoghal*, recall Zoar. The frequent salt pinnacles in the same vicinity are likewise a striking memento of the saline incrustation which overtook Lot’s wife, although, from the miraculous character of the latter incident, we are not inclined to press this coincidence. **SEE LOTS WIFE.**

On the other hand, Mr. Tristram, who has explored the lake neighborhood more carefully than any previous investigator, strenuously contends for the northern location of Sodom with its neighboring cities, chiefly on account of the following considerations:

(1.) When it is said that Lot encamped “at” (not “towards”) Sodom (⁽⁻⁰¹³²⁾Genesis 13:12; Sept. ἐν Σοδόμοις), the statement is made in such a

connection with the “*Ciccar*,” or circle, of Jordan as to imply that Sodom was in it. Now this *Ciccar* was in view from a mountain on the east of Bethel (^(Q12B)Genesis 12:8; 13:3, 10), whence no portion of the south end of the lake can be discerned; the headland of Feshkah shuts out the view in that direction. There is good reason to believe, however, that the *Ciccar*, or circle, of the Jordan comprehended the whole crevasse on both ends of the Dead Sea (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1866, p. 36 sq.), and in the above passages it is not expressly said that Zoar itself was visible from Abraham’s encampment at Bethel. Similarly, in the account of Abraham’s view of the plain from the place of his intercession with Jehovah (^(Q18G)Genesis 18:16; 19:27, 28), the cities themselves are not said to be in sight, but only glimpses of the general Ghor, such as are still attainable through the mountain gaps from the traditionary spot near Hebron (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 189).

(2.) In the account of the invasion of Chedorlaomer (^(Q14E)Genesis 14) he is described as marching from Mount Seir to Hazezon-tamar (Engedi); and it is said that afterwards he met the king of Sodom and his confederates in the vale of Siddim. Now, as Mr. Tristram urges, “had Sodom and the other cities been situated at the south end of the sea, it was certainly not after smiting the Amalekites and Amorites at Engedi that they would have met the invader, but long before he reached Hazezon-tamar. But when we place these cities in the plain (circle) of the Jordan, there is a topographical sequence in the whole story, while Abraham and his allies hurriedly pursue the plunderers up the Ghor without delay or impediment until they overtake them at the sources of the Jordan” (*Land of Israel*, p. 362). On the contrary, it is impossible to proceed directly from Engedi to the plain of Jericho, owing to the impassable heights of Ain Feshkah, whereas the way is open along the whole shore of the Dead Sea southerly. It was from Kadesh, on the western side of the Arabah, that Chedorlaomer passed northerly through the Negeb, or south of Palestine, and then came down upon the Dead Sea by the pass of Engedi, where he could have encountered the natives only from the southern Ghor.

(3.) The location of Zoar at the southeastern end of the Salt Sea is inconsistent with the statement that Moses beheld it in his view from Mount Nebo (^(Q34B)Deuteronomy 34:3); for only the western outline of the lake can be seen from the most commanding position among those heights, one of which must be the mount in question. To this argument the same reply may be made as in the above (No. 1), namely, that Zoar itself is not

said in this passage to be seen, but only “the plain,” or Ghor. We have had occasion under the article PISGAH to notice the sweeping character of the panorama there disclosed to Moses — one doubtless of miraculous extent; and the discussion of the location of the guilty cities will be resumed under ZOAR. For the present we may say that, although Tristram has reiterated his views on this subject in his *Land of Moab* (p. 343, Am. ed.), yet it is privately understood that he has since changed his mind, and now adheres to the traditionary opinion. Dr. Merrill revives the arguments in favor of the northern position of Zoar (*Bulletin of the American Geographical Society*, condensed in the *Quar. Statement of the “Palestine Exploration Fund,”* July, 1879, p. 144). *SEE SIDDIM*.

Sodom, Fruit Of.

SEE APPLES OF SODOM; SEE VINE OF SODOM.

Sod’oma

(Σόδομα), the Greek form (^{<612>}Romans 9:29) of the name elsewhere Anglicized SODOM *SEE SODOM* (q.v.).

Sod’omite

(^{<vdeq>}*kadesh*, i.e. *consecrated*; Vulg. *scortator, effeminatus*). This word does not denote an inhabitant of Sodom (except only in 2 Esdr. 7:36), nor one of their descendants; but is employed in the A.V. of the Old Test. for those who practiced as a religious rite the abominable and unnatural vice from which the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah have derived their lasting infamy. It occurs in ^{<6217>}Deuteronomy 23:17; ^{<1149>}1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; ^{<12217>}2 Kings 23:7; and ^{<1854>}Job 36:14 (margin). The Hebrew word *kadesh* is said to be derived from a root *kadash*, which (strange as it may appear) means “pure,” and thence “holy.” The words *sacer* in Latin, and “devoted” in our own language, have also a double meaning, though the subordinate signification is not so absolutely contrary to the principal one as it is in the case of *kadesh*. “This dreadful ‘consecration,’ or rather desecration, was spread in different forms over Phoenicia, Syria, Phrygia, Assyria, Babylonia. Ashtaroth, the Greek Astarte, was its chief object.” It appears also to have been established at Rome, where its victims were called Galli (not from Gallia, but from the river Gallus in Bithynia). There is an instructive note on the subject in Jerome’s *Comment.* on ^{<3014>}Hosea 4:14. *SEE SODOMY*.

The translators of the Sept., with that anxiety to soften and conceal obnoxious expressions which has often been noticed as a characteristic of their version, have, in all cases but one, avoided rendering *kadesh* by its ostensible meaning. In the first of the passages cited above they give a double translation, **πορνεύων** and **τελισκόμενος** (initiated). In the second, **σύνδεσμος** (a conspiracy, perhaps reading **ρνρ**); in the third, **τὰς τελετάς** (sacrifices); in the fourth the Vat. MS. omits it, and the Alex. has **τοῦ ἐνδιηλλαγμένου**; in the fifth, **τῶν Καθησίμ**; and in the sixth, **ὑπὸ ἄγγέλων**. There is a feminine equivalent to *kadesh*, viz. *kadeshdh*. This is found in ^{<132>}Genesis 38:21, 22; ^{<137>}Deuteronomy 23:17; and ^{<144>}Hosea 4:14. In each of these cases it throws a new light on the passage to remember that these women were (if the expression may be allowed) the priestesses of a religion, not plying for hire, or merely instruments for gratifying passing lust. Such ordinary prostitutes are called by the name *zonah*. In ^{<128>}1 Kings 22:38 the word *zonoth* is rendered “armor.” It should be “harlots” — “and the harlots washed themselves there” (early in the morning, as was their custom, adds Procopius of Gaza). The Sept. has rendered this correctly. The “strange women” of ^{<126>}Proverbs 2:16, etc., were foreigners, *zaroith*. **SEE HARLOT.**

Sodomi'tish Sea

Picture for Sodomitish

(*Mare Sodomiticum*), a name once given in the Apocrypha (2 Esdr. 5:3) to the Dead Sea (q.v.) evidently from its supposed connection with the overthrow of Sodom. A striking illustration of this coincidence in name (which in some form has ever since clung to that lake) is found in the names of one or two natural features of that region. **SEE SODOM.**

(1.) At the southwest corner of the lake, below where the wadys Zuweirah and Mahauwat break down through the enclosing heights, the beach is encroached on by the salt mountain or ridge of *Khashm Usdum*. This remarkable object is hitherto but imperfectly known. It is said to be quite independent of the western mountains, lying in front of and separated from them by a considerable tract filled up with conical hills and short ridges of the soft, chalky, marly deposit just described. It is a level ridge or dike several miles long. Its northern portion runs south-southeast; but after more than half its length it makes, a sudden and decided bend to the right, and then runs southwest. It is from three to four hundred feet in height, of

inconsiderable width. There is great uncertainty about its length. Dr. Robinson states it at five miles and “a considerable distance farther” (2, 107, 112). Van de Velde makes it ten miles (2, 113), or three and a half hours (p. 116). But when these dimensions are applied to the map they are much too large, and it is difficult to believe that it can be more than five miles in all. Dr. Anderson (p. 181) says it is about two and a half miles wide; but this appears to contradict Dr. Robinson’s expressions (2, 107). The latter are corroborated by Mr. Clowes’s party. They also noticed salt in large quantities among the rocks in regular strata some considerable distance back from the lake. The mountain consists of a body of crystallized rock salt, more or less solid, covered with a capping of chalky limestone and gypsum. The lower portion — the salt rock — rises abruptly from the glossy plain at its eastern base, sloping back at an angle of not more than 45°, often less. It has a strangely dislocated, shattered look, and is all furrowed and worn into huge angular buttresses and ridges, from the face of which great fragments are occasionally detached by the action of the rains, and appear as “pillars of salt,” advanced in front of the general mass. At the foot the ground is strewn with lumps and masses of salt, salt streams drain continually from it into the lake, and the whole of the beach is covered with salt — soft and sloppy, and of a pinkish hue in winter and spring, though during the heat of summer dried up into a shining, brilliant crust. An occasional patch of the Kali plant (*Salicornioe*, etc.) is the only vegetation to vary the monotony of this most monotonous spot. It is probable that from this mountain rather than from the lake itself was anciently procured the so called “salt of the Dead Sea,” which was much in request for use in the Temple service. It was preferred before all other kinds for its reputed effect in hastening the combustion of the sacrifice, while it diminished the unpleasant smell of the burning flesh. Its deliquescent character (due to the chlorides of alkaline earths it contains) is also noticed in the Talmud (*Menachoth*, 21, 1; *Jalkut*). It was called “Sodom salt,” but also went by the name of the “salt that does not rest” (טַבְּוֹחַ־נָּאֵץ־יָלֵם), because it was made on the Sabbath as on other days, like the “Sunday salt” of the English salt works. It is still much esteemed in Jerusalem. *SEE SALT SEA.*

(2.) Between the north end of Khashm Usdum and the lake is a mound covered with stones and bearing the name of *um-Zoghal* (Robinson, 2, 107). By De Saulcy the name is given Redjom el-Mezorrahl (the gh and rr are both attempts to represent the *ghain*). The “Pilgrim” in *Athenoeum*,

April 2, 1854, expressly states that his guide called it *Rudjeim ez-Zogheir*. It is about sixty feet in diameter and ten or twelve high, evidently artificial, and not improbably the remains of an ancient structure. A view of it, engraved from a photograph by Mr. James Graham, is given in Isaacs's *Dead Sea* (p. 21). This heap De Saulcy maintained to be a portion of the remains of Sodom. Its name is more suggestive of Zoar, but there are great obstacles to either identification. *SEE ZOAR.*

Sodomy,

an unnatural crime, consisting of the defilement of man with man, and thus differing from bestiality, which is the defilement of man with brutes. The name is derived from Sodom, in which city the crime was frequent. Sodomy was strictly forbidden in the Mosaic law, and was punishable with death (^(~~ROMS~~) Leviticus 20:13). Among the pagan nations of antiquity, as still in many heathen countries, this was a very common vice (^(~~ROMS~~) Romans 1:27); the Greeks and Romans designated it by the term *poederasty* (see Wilcke, *De Satyricis Romanis* [Viteb. 1760]). In the early Church this was considered, not an ordinary, but a monster crime. The Council of Ancyra has two canons relating to this and similar crimes, imposing heavy ecclesiastical penalties upon offenders. St. Basil (Can. 62, 63) imposes the penalty of adultery, viz. twenty years' penance; and the Council of Eliberis refused communion, even at the last hour, to those guilty of this crime with boys. There was an old Roman law against it, called the *Lex Scantinia*, mentioned by Juvenal (*Sat.* 2, 44) and others; but it lay dormant until revived by Christian emperors. Constantius made it a capital offense, and ordered it to be punished with death by the sword; while Theodosius decreed that those found guilty should be burned alive. According to modern legislation, it is considered a very heinous crime, and severely punished. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 16, ch. 11, p. 9.

Sodor And Man, Diocese Of.

The Norwegians and Danes, who in ancient times occupied the Orkneys and other islands on the coast of Scotland, divided these islands into two groups: to the former they gave the name of *Nordureyar*, or Northern Isles; and to the latter, which included the western islands, that of *Surdureyar*, or Southern Isles. By *Sodor*, therefore, is meant the western islands of Scotland, especially those most contiguous to the Isle of Man, which, with them, formed a diocese.

Soffit

Picture for Soffit

(erroneously *Sopheat*), a ceiling. The word is seldom used except in reference to the subordinate parts and members of buildings, such as staircases, entablatures, archways, cornices, etc., the undersides of which are called the soffit.

Sogane

(*Σωγανή*, Suidas *Σωγάνη*), the name of two towns in Palestine.

1. A city of Galilee (Josephus, *Life*, p. 51; *War*, 2, 20, 6), situated twenty stadia from Araba, and the same distance from Gabara (Reland, *Palest.* p. 1021); now *Sukhnim*, a village in the center of Galilee, first visited by G. Schultz, and identified by Grossz (Ritter, *Erdk.* 16, 768; see also Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 83, 85). There are at Sukhnim graves of some famous Jewish rabbins (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 188).

2. A city of Gaulonitis (Josephus, *War*, 4, 1, 1; Reland, *Palest.* p. 1021), discovered by Dr. Thomson (*N.Y. Observer*, Oct. 15, 1857) in a ruin by the name of *Sujan*, on the high brow of the mountains that rise above the Huleh marshes on the eastern side. See Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 350.

Sohar.

SEE ZOHAR.

Sohn, Georg,

a theologian of Hesse, was born in Rossbach, Dec. 31, 1551. In 1571 he obtained the degree of master of liberal arts at Wittenberg, and in the following year began to teach at Marburg. In 1574 he entered the faculty, and was intrusted with the exposition of Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, and soon afterwards with the professorship of Hebrew. In 1578 he was made doctor of theology. A constant attendance on the synods of 1578 and 1582 involved Sohn in the controversies of the time. Egidius Hunnius was the strenuous advocate of strict Lutheranism in the Marburg faculty, while Sohn ranked as the leading supporter of the Melancthonian doctrine in the Hessian Church, and this led to his final removal from Marburg: The landgrave William of Hesse-Cassel vented his anger on Hunnius as the

disturber of the Church, and the landgrave Louis, at Marburg, retaliated by holding Sohn responsible for the existing troubles. The latter was accordingly prepared to seek a new field, when he was called in 1584 to the University of Herborn, in Nassau, and to that of Heidelberg. He accepted the latter call, and delivered his inaugural address as professor of theology on July 18 of that year. Four years later he became a regular member of the Church Council. He died April 23, 1589. The works of Sohn are chiefly doctrinal, and of the Melancthonian type. A complete list is given in Strider, *Grundlage einer hess. Gelehrten-gesch.* 15, 109-112. The more important works were published in 4 vols. at Herborn in 1591, and in a third edition in 1609. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Soissons, Councils Of

(*Concilium Suessionense*), were held in the town of Soissons, department of Aisne, France;

I. Held March 3, 744, by order of Pepin. Twenty-three bishops were present. The heretic Adelbert was condemned in this council, and ten canons were published.

- 1.** Recognizes the Nicene Creed.
- 4.** Forbids fornication, perjury, and false witness to the laity; orders all priests to submit to their bishop, to render an account to him every year of their conduct, to receive him when making his visitations, and to obtain from him the holy rite and chrism.
- 5.** Forbids to receive strange clerks.
- 6.** Directs bishops to take all possible measures for the extirpation of paganism.
- 7.** Orders that the crosses which Adelbert had set up in his diocese should be burned.
- 8.** Forbids clerks to retain any women in their houses, except their mother, sister, or niece.
- 9.** Forbids lay persons to retain in their houses women consecrated to God; forbids them also to marry the wife of another man in his lifetime, since no man may put away his wife except for adultery. See Mansi, 6, 1552.

II. Held April 26, 853, in the monastery of St. Medard, under Hincmar of Rheims, composed of twenty-six bishops, from five provinces. The king, Charles the Bald, was present during the deliberations of the Council, which lasted through eight sessions. Thirty canons were published.

1. Recapitulates and confirms the judgment pronounced against Ebbo and the clerks whom he had ordained; also confirms the elevation of Hincmar to his see.

2. Relates to the case of Heriman, bishop of Nevers, at the time out of his mind, whose church was committed to the care of his archbishop.

4. Orders Amaury, archbishop of Tours, to take charge of the bishopric of Mans, the bishop, Aldricus, being afflicted with paralysis, having addressed a letter to the synod for assistance, asking for their prayers during his life and after his decease.

7. Orders that the king be requested to send commissioners, who should reestablish divine service in the monasteries. Mansi adds three other canons (1, 929; 8, 79).

III. Held Aug. 18, 866, by order of Charles. Thirty-five bishops attended. The clerks ordained by Ebbo, and who had been deposed in the Council of 853, were, by indulgence, reestablished. Vulgude, one of the number, was in this same year consecrated archbishop of Bourges. See Hincmar, *Opusc.* vol. 18; Mansi, 8, 808.

IV. Held in 1092 or 1093 by Raynaldus, archbishop of Rheims, against Roscelin the Tritheist. Fulco, bishop of Beauvais, attended in behalf of Anselm, abbot of Bec (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury), whom Roscelin, both in private and in his writings, had falsely charged with holding the same opinions as himself, viz. that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were three distinct beings, existing separately, and that it might be said that there were three Gods, were not the expression harsh, and contrary to the phraseology in use. Being questioned before the assembly, Roscelin explained his views, and abjured the heresy imputed to him; but no sooner was the council dissolved than he recanted; declaring that he had made his abjuration before the synod merely through fear of being assassinated by the ignorant populace unless he did so. Upon this Anselm wrote his tract *De Incarnatione*, which he dedicated to Urban II. Subsequently Roseelin, finding himself regarded by all Catholics as a

heretic and avoided, betook himself to Ivo, bishop of Chartres, imploring his assistance, and abjuring again all his errors. At last he died in retreat in Aquitaine. See Pagi, in Baronius, A.D. 1094; Mansi, 10, 494.

V. Held in 1115 by Conon, bishop of Praeneste. From this council deputies were sent to the Carthusians, entreating and commanding them to send back into his diocese Godfrey, bishop of Amiens, who had retired among them. This command was executed in the beginning of Lent. Another council was held in the same year at Rheims upon the same subject by the legate Conon. See Mansi, 10, 801.

VI. Held in February, 1121, by Conon, bishop of Praeneste and legate. In this council Abelard was compelled to burn his book upon the subject of the Blessed Trinity, and was desired to make a confession of faith; he accordingly, with many tears and much difficulty, read the Creed of St. Athanasius. He was then sent to the monastery of St. Medard at Soissons, and subsequently to that of St. Denys. See Mansi, 10, 885.

VII. Held July 11, 1456, by John, archbishop, of Rheims, who presided. The execution of the decrees of Basle was ordered, and the acts of the Assembly of Bourges were confirmed. Several other canons were enacted, which relate, among other things, to the dress of bishops, the approval of confessors, the preaching of indulgences, etc. See Mansi, 13, 1396.

Sojourning

(*bv/m*, a residence; ^{<0240>}Exodus 12:40; elsewhere “dwelling,” “habitation,” etc.; *παροιμία*, ^{<0117>}1 Peter 1:17; so the verb and noun, *παροικέω* and *πάροιχος*). The 430 years of the “sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt” (^{<0817>}Galatians 3:17) may be reckoned thus:

From the call of Abraham (^{<0472>}Acts 7:12) till the removal from Haran (^{<0125>}Genesis 12:5), about..... 5

In Canaan before the birth of Isaac (^{<0205>}Genesis 21:5)....25

Till the birth of Jacob (Genesis 25:6)..... 60

Till the migration into Egypt (^{<0470>}Genesis 47:9) 130

The time passed in Egypt, only 210

The whole period of sojourning (^{<0240>}Exodus 12:40).... 430

Deduct 5 years in Haran + 25 till Isaac’s birth..... 30

The sojourning of the “seed” (^{<0153>}Genesis 15:13; ^{<0406>}Acts 7:6) 400

*SEE CHRONOLOGY.***Sol,**

in Roman mythology, is the Latin name for *Helios, the sun.*

Sola

(*alone*), a term used in old English registers to designate a *spinster* or unmarried woman.

Sola, David Aaron De,

senior minister of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation in London, England, was born Dec. 26, 1796, in Amsterdam. Having been duly prepared in his native country for the Jewish ministry, besides having studied several modern languages, he came to England, having been elected minister of the Sephardi Congregation of London. In 1831 he began to preach in the Portuguese synagogue, and his sermons were in all probability the first ever delivered in the English tongue in those precincts. He died Oct. 29, 1860. Besides some sermons, he published *A Historical Essay on the Poets, Poetry, and Melodies of the Sephardic Liturgy*, to E. Aguilar's ancient melodies of the liturgy of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews (London, 1857): — *Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna*, translated in connection with M.J. Raphall (q.v.) (ibid. 1845, 2d ed.): — *The Festival Prayers according to the Custom of the German and Polish Jews*, the Hebrew text with an English translation (ibid. 1860, 6 vols.). See Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo Jewish History* (ibid. 1875), p. 359 sq.; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 349. (B.P.)

Solar, Soller

(Lat. *solarium*), a loft, garret, or upper chamber. In a mediaeval house it was *usually* situated behind the dais, separated from it by the end of the hall, and had a cellar under it; these two stories together were not so high as the hall, leaving the gable of the lofty roof with the window in it free above them. This was the lord's chamber, and there generally was a small opening from the solar into the hall, from which the lord could overlook the proceeding, and hear all that passed. The term solar is also used for the rood loft (q.v.) of a church. In Norfolk, Forby observes that the belfry loft is termed the soller, or the bellsoller.

Solares, Or Chamsi,

a small sect inhabiting a certain district of Mesopotamia, and supposed by some to be descendants of the Samsacans mentioned by Epiphanius. Hyde (*History of the Ancient Religion of the Persians*) describes them as amounting to not more than a thousand souls; having no priests nor doctors, and no places of meeting except caves, where they perform their religious worship, the mysteries of which are kept so secret that they have not been discovered even by those who have been converted to the Christian religion. Being compelled by the Mohammedans to declare themselves members of some Christian communion, they chose the Jacobite sect, baptizing their children and burying their dead according to the custom of these Christians. They are considered by some to be the same as the ELKESAITES *SEE ELKESAITES* (q.v.). See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 3, 124.

Solari, Andrea,

surnamed *del Gobbo*, an Italian painter, flourished in the former half of the 16th century. He was a good colorist, and evidently belonged to the school of Da Vinci. He painted the members of the Holy Family for various museums, and took part in the decoration of the castle of Gaillon.

Solari, Cristoforo,

surnamed *il Gobbo*, an Italian sculptor and architect, brother of the preceding, flourished in the latter part of the 15th century. He was one of the most illustrious artists that worked at Chartreuse and Pavia, and on the cathedral of Milan. It is difficult to distinguish his pieces, except some sacred figures in Milan.

Solder

(**qbd**, *debeq*, from **qbd**; *to stick*), *welding of metal* (²³⁴⁰⁷Isaiah 41:7). The same Heb. word likewise denotes a “*joint*” of a coat of mail (1 Kings 23:24; ⁴⁸⁸³2 Chronicles 18:33).

Soldier

(in Heb. only collect. for **abx**; an *army*; or by periphrase; **στρατιώτης**).
SEE ARMY.

Soldier Of Christ,

an expression borrowed from a well known Scripture simile, and frequently introduced or alluded to in the Prayer book (see *Offices for Baptism*). In some of the older writers of the Church of England the word “knight” was used in the same sense; “The fourth gift of the Holy Spirit is the gift of strength which armeth God’s knight, and maketh his soul hardy and strong to suffer divers diseases to God’s love” (Wycliffe).

Soldins,

a Christian’s sect, so called from their leader, one *Soldin*, a Greek priest. They appeared about the middle of the 5th century in the kingdoms of Saba and Godolia. They altered the manner of the sacrifice of the mass; their priests offered gold, their deacons incense, and their subdeacons myrrh; and this in memory of the like offerings made to the infant Jesus by the wise men. Very few authors mention the Soldins, neither do we know whether they still subsist.

Sole

(*ἄκῆ* prop. the *palm* of the hand). *SEE FOOT*.

Solea

(*σωλᾶα, σολία*), a part of the church respecting which ecclesiastical writers are not agreed. Latin writers use the word *solea*. It is supposed to denote certain seats at the entrance of the chancel appropriated to the use of emperors, kings, magistrates, or other persons of distinction. The seats of the inferior clergy and monks are sometimes designated by the same name. According to Walcott (*Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.) it was the space in a Greek church between the ambon and sanctuary; in a Latin church between the choir and presbytery. In the basilica it was raised several steps above the ambon and the choir of minor clerks. Here the communion was given to all but the clergy, and subdeacons and readers sat, and the candidate for the priesthood was led from this part to the altar.

Solemn League and Covenant.

SEE COVENANT (SOLEMN LEAGUE AND).

Solemn Service,

a modern Anglican term used to signify a choral celebration of the holy eucharist with priest, deacon, and subdeacon, or with music. It is equivalent to the “high mass” or “solemn mass” of the Roman Catholics, and if used of evening service is the same as “solemn vespers.”

Solemnities, The,

was an ancient term to designate the *holy eucharist*.

Solicitant,

one who, abusing the privacy of the confessional, tempts women to a violation of chastity. This kind of solicitation became so common in Spain that pope Paul IV promulgated a bull against solicitants. Nor was this custom confined to Spain; it was rife in Portugal, England, France, and Germany. A German council held A.D. 1225 charged the priests with unchastity, voluptuousness, and obscenity. Gregory XV issued a bull on this accursed practice in 1622, bearing the title *Universi Domini*, which was confirmed by Benedict XIV, June, 1741. Another bull was also issued by the same pontiff in 1745.

Solifidianism,

the doctrine that faith is the whole of religion, such doctrine being preceded by an erroneous description of faith. There are two forms of Solifidianism — one resting the whole of religion in the reception by the intellect of correct dogma; the other in an inner sense or persuasion of the man that God’s promises belong to him. Those who hold the latter view are called also *Fiduciaries*. It is easily seen that Solifidianism, in both its forms, destroys the nature of faith. The former refers faith to the intellect alone, with a suppression or entire exclusion of the grace of God and the renewed will, and tends to the superseding of good works; the latter suppresses the action of the reason and understanding, and substitutes for a reasonable faith an unreasoning and groundless persuasion.

The former error may take the shape of a maintenance of orthodoxy, which, however, will be found to be an extremely deficient representation of Christian doctrine, omitting those doctrines which have most power to move the will, and striving to bring others within the comprehension of man’s understanding. The more common form is that of advancing the

doctrine of justification by faith into the substance of the Gospel. Such Solifidians teach that good works are not necessary to justification.

The second form of Solifidianism generally connects itself with a one-sided or perverted view of the doctrine of election. It advances the error that Christ died only for the elect, and that the elect cannot fall from grace, and it rests on an inward sense or persuasion of one's own election. It speaks of faith, but makes *fides* the same *fiducia*; and the latter it makes to be, not the witness of the Spirit with our spirits, i.e. with an enlightened conscience and understanding, but a mere inner sense or persuasion, held without appeal to the conscience. Both forms of Solifidianism lead to Antinomianism.

Solifidians,

those who maintain the principles of SOLIFIDIANISM *SEE SOLIFIDIANISM* (q.v.).

Solimena, Francesco,

an Italian painter, was born Oct. 4, 1657, near Naples, and studied first under his father, Angelo, but was afterwards sent by cardinal Orsini to Naples, where he studied under various eminent painters. He became in some sort a universal artist, but executed several sacred designs, which are found in the churches of Naples. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Solis, Antonio De,

a Spanish ecclesiastic and poet, was born at Placenza, in Old Castile, July 18, 1610, and was sent to Salamanca to study law. His preference, however, was for poetry, which he cultivated with great success, so that he was considered by Corlero to have been the best comic poet that Spain ever saw. He became secretary to the count de Oropesa, and in 1642 Philip IV made him one of his secretaries. After Philip's death the queen-regent made him first historiographer of the Indies, a place of great profit as well as honor. Eventually Solis resolved to dedicate himself to the service of the Church, and was ordained a priest at the age of fifty-seven. He now wrote nothing but some dramatic pieces upon subjects of devotion, which are represented in Spain on certain festivals. He died April 19, 1686. His *Comedies* were printed at Madrid (1681. 4to): — his *sacred and profane poems* at the same place (1716, 4to): — his *History of Mexico* often, but

particularly at Brussels (1704, fol.). There is also a collection of his *Letters*. (Madrid, 1737). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Solitaires,

nuns of the Order of St. Peter of Alcantara, instituted by cardinal Barberini in 1670. They imitate the austere practices of their patron saint, observe perpetual silence, and employ their time wholly in spiritual exercises. They go barefoot, gird themselves with a linen cord, and wear no linen.

Solitaires,

a term which designates such as addict themselves to a retired or solitary life. It was originally applied not only to such as retired to absolute solitude in caves and deserts, but also to such as lived apart from the world in separate societies.

Solitarii,

a branch of the MANICHAEANS (q.v.). While the Theodosian Code decreed capital punishment upon some of the other branches of this obnoxious sect, the Solitarii were only punished with confiscation.

Sol'omon

(Heb. *Shelomoh'*, **hmbv]** *peaceful*; Sept. **Σαλωμών**; New Test. and Josephus, **Σολομών**; Vulg. *Solomo*), the son of David by Bathsheba, and his successor upon the throne. B.C. 1013- 973. The importance of his character and reign justify a full treatment here, in which we present a digest of the Scriptural information with modern criticism. **SEE DAVID**.

I. Sources. —

1. The comparative scantiness of historical data for a life of Solomon is itself significant. While that of David occupies **<961>** 1 Samuel 16-31, **<1001>** 2 Samuel 1-24, **<1002>** 1 Kings 1:2, **<3001>** 1 Chronicles 10-29, that of Solomon fills only the eleven chapters **<10001>** 1 Kings 1-11 and the nine **<4001>** 2 Chronicles 1-9. The compilers of those books felt, as by a true inspiration, unlike the authors of the Apocryphal literature cited below, that the wanderings, wars, and sufferings of David were better fitted for the instruction of after ages than the magnificence of his son. They manifestly give extracts only

from larger works which were before them, “The book of the acts of Solomon” (^{<1114>}1 Kings 11:41); “The book of Nathan the prophet, the book of Ahijah the Shilonite, the visions of Iddo the seer” (^{<402>}2 Chronicles 9:29). Those which they do give bear, with what for the historian is a disproportionate fulness, on the early glories of his reign, and speak but little (those in 2 Chronicles not at all) of its later sins and misfortunes, and we are consequently unable to follow the annals of Solomon step by step.

2. Ewald, with all his usual fondness for assigning different portions of each book of the Old Test. to a series of successive editors, goes through the process here with much ingenuity, but without any very satisfactory result (*Gesch. Isr.* 3, 259-263). A more interesting inquiry would be to which of the books above named we may refer the sections that the compilers have put together. We shall probably not be far wrong in thinking of Nathan, far advanced in life at the commencement of the reign, David’s chief adviser during the years in which he was absorbed in the details of the Temple and its ritual, himself a priest (^{<1015>}1 Kings 4:5 [Heb.]; comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 116), as having written the account of the accession of Solomon and the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings 1-8:66, 2 Chronicles 1-8:15). The prayer of Solomon, so fully reproduced and so obviously precomposed, may have been written under his guidance. To Ahijah the Shilonite, active at the close of the reign, alive some time after Jeroboam’s accession, we may ascribe the short record of the sin of Solomon, and of the revolution to which he himself had so largely contributed (^{<1100>}1 Kings 11). From the book of the acts of Solomon probably came the miscellaneous facts as to the commerce and splendor of his reign (9:10-10:29).

3. Besides the direct history of the Old Test., we may find some materials for the life of Solomon in the books that bear his name, and in the psalms which are referred by some to his time (Psalm 2, 45, 72, 127). Whatever doubts may hang over the date and authorship of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, we may at least see in them the reflection of the thoughts and feelings of his reign. If we accept the latest date which recent criticism has assigned to them, they elaborately work up materials which were accessible to the writers and are not accessible to us. If we refer them in their substance, following the judgment of the most advanced Shemitic scholars, to the Solomonic period itself, they then come before us with all the freshness and vividness of contemporary evidence (Renan, *Hist. des Langues Semit.* p. 131).

4. Other materials are very scanty. The history of Josephus is, for the most part, only a loose and inaccurate paraphrase of the Old Test. narrative. In him, and in the more erudite among early Christian writers, we find some fragments of older history not without their value — extracts from archives alleged to exist at Tyre in the first century of the Christian era, and from the Phoenician histories of Menander and Dius (*Ant.* 8, 2, 6; 5, 3), from Eupolemus (Euseb. *Proep. Evang.* 9, 30), from Alexander Polyhistor, Menander, and Laitus (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 21). Writers such as these were of course only compilers at second hand, but they probably had access to some earlier documents which have now perished.

5. The legends of later Oriental literature will claim a distinct notice. All that they contribute to history is the help they give us in realizing the impression made by the colossal greatness of Solomon, as in earlier and later times by that of Nimrod and Alexander, on the minds of men of many countries and through many ages.

II. *Early Life.* —

1. The student of the life of Solomon must take as his starting point the circumstances of his birth. He was the child of David's old age, the last born of all his sons (~~1~~¹ *Chronicles* 3:5). B.C. 1034. The narrative of ~~2~~² *Samuel* 12 leaves, it is true, a different impression. On the other hand, the order of the names in ~~1~~¹ *Chronicles* 3:5 is otherwise unaccountable. Josephus distinctly states it (*Ant.* 7, 14, 2). His mother had gained over David a twofold power — first, as the object of a passionate though guilty love; and, next, as the one person to whom, in his repentance, he could make something like restitution. The months that preceded his birth were for the conscience stricken king a time of self abasement. The birth itself of the child who was to replace the one that had been smitten must have been looked for as a pledge of pardon and a sign of hope. The feelings of the king and of his prophet guide expressed themselves in the names with which they welcomed it. The yearnings of the “man of war,” who “had shed much blood,” for a time of peace yearnings which had shown themselves before, when he gave to his third son the name of Absalom (=father of peace) now led him to give to the newborn infant the name of Solomon (Shelomoh= the peaceful one). Nathan, with a marked reference to the meaning of the king's own name (=the darling, the beloved one), takes another form of the same word, and joins it, after the growing custom of the time, — with the name of Jehovah. David had been the darling

of his people. Jedid-jah (the name was coined for the purpose) should be the darling of the Lord (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 12:24, 25, see Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 215). *SEE JEDIDIAH*. According to the received interpretation of ^{<1301>}Proverbs 31:1, his mother also contributed an ideal name, Lemuel (=to God, Deodatus), the dedicated one (comp. Ewald, *Poet. Buch.* 4, 173). On this hypothesis the reproof was drawn forth by the king's intemperance and sensuality. In contrast to what his wives were, she draws the picture of what a pattern wife ought to be (Pineda, *De Reb. Sol.* 1, 4).

2. The influences to which the childhood of Solomon was thus exposed must have contributed largely to determine the character of his after years. The inquiry what was the education which ended in such wonderful contrasts — a wisdom then, and perhaps since, unparalleled, a sensuality like that of Louis XV — cannot but be instructive. The three influences which must have entered most largely into that education were those of his father, his mother, and the teacher under whose charge he was placed from his earliest infancy (^{<1025>}2 Samuel 12:25).

(1.) The fact just stated that a prophet priest was made the special instructor indicates the king's earnest wish that this child at least should be protected against the evils which, then and afterwards, showed themselves in his elder sons, and be worthy of the name he bore. At first, apparently, there was no distinct purpose to make him his heir. Absalom is still the king's favorite son (^{<1037>}2 Samuel 13:37; 18:33) — is looked on by the people as the destined successor (^{<1043>}2 Samuel 14:13; 15:16). The death of Absalom, when Solomon was about ten years old, left the place vacant, and David, passing over the claims of all his elder sons, those by Bathsheba included, guided by the influence of Nathan, or by his own discernment of the gifts and graces which were tokens of the love of Jehovah, pledged his word in secret to Bathsheba that he, and no other, should be the heir (^{<1013>}1 Kings 1:13). The words which were spoken somewhat later express, doubtless, the purpose which guided him throughout (^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 28:9, 20). The son's life should not be as his own had been, one of hardships and wars, dark crimes and passionate repentance, but, from first to last, be pure, blameless, peaceful, fulfilling the ideal of glory and of righteousness, after which he himself had vainly striven. The glorious visions of Psalm 72 may be looked on as the prophetic expansion of those hopes of his old age. So far, all was well. But we may not ignore the fact that the later years of David's life presented a change for the worse as well as for the better. His sins, though forgiven, left behind it the Nemesis of an

enfeebled will and a less generous activity. The liturgical element of religion becomes, after the first passionate outpouring of ^{<4510>}Psalm 51, unduly predominant. He lives to amass treasures and materials for the Temple which he may not build (22:5, 14). He plans with his own hands all the details of its architecture (28:19). He organizes on a scale of elaborate magnificence all the attendance of the priesthood and the choral services of the Levites (chapters 24, 25). But, meanwhile, his duties as a king are neglected. He no longer sits in the gate to do judgment (^{<1052>}2 Samuel 15:2, 4). He leaves the sin of Amnon unpunished “because he loved him, for he was his first born” (Sept. at ^{<1021>}2 Samuel 13:21). The hearts of the people fall away from him. First Absalom and then Sheba become formidable rivals (^{<1056>}2 Samuel 15:6; 20:2). The history of the numbering of the people (24; 1 Chronicles 21) implies the purpose of some act of despotism — a poll-tax or a conscription (^{<1019>}2 Samuel 24:9 makes the latter the more probable) — such as startled all his older and more experienced counsellors. If in “the last words of David” belonging to this period there is the old devotion, the old hungering after righteousness (23:2-5), there is also — first generally (ver. 6, 7), and afterwards resting on individual offenders (^{<1018>}1 Kings 2:5-8) — a more passionate desire to punish those who had wronged him, a painful recurrence of vindictive thoughts for offenses which he had once freely forgiven, and which were not greater than his own. We cannot rest in the belief that his influence over his son’s character was one exclusively for good.

(2.) In Eastern countries, and under a system of polygamy, the son is more dependent, even than elsewhere, on the character of the mother. The history of the Jewish monarchy furnishes many instances of that dependence. It recognizes it in the care with which it records the name of each monarch’s mother. Nothing that we know of Bathsheba leads us to think of her as likely to mold her son’s mind and heart to the higher forms of goodness. She offers no resistance to the king’s passion (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 211). She makes it a stepping stone to power. She is a ready accomplice in the scheme by which her shame was to have been concealed. Doubtless she, too, was sorrowful and penitent when the rebuke of Nathan was followed by her child’s death (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 12:24), but the after history shows that the grand-daughter of Ahithophel had inherited not a little of his character. A willing adulteress, who had become devout, but had not ceased to be ambitious, could hardly be more, at the best, than the Madame de Maintenon of a king whose contrition and piety were rendering

him, unlike his former self, unduly passive in the hands of others. *SEE BATHSHEBA.*

(3.) What was likely to be the influence of the prophet to whose care the education of Solomon was confided? (Heb. of ^{<1025>}2 Samuel 12:25). We know, beyond all doubt, that he could speak bold and faithful words when they were needed (^{<1070>}2 Samuel 7:1-17; 12:1-14). But this power, belonging to moments or messages of special inspiration, does not involve the permanent possession of a clear-sighted wisdom or of aims uniformly high, and, we in vain search the later years of David's reign for any proof of Nathan's activity for good. He gives himself to the work of writing the annals of David's reign (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 29:29). He places his own sons in the way of being the companions and counsellors of the future king (^{<1045>}1 Kings 4:5). The absence of his name from the history of the "numbering," and the fact that the census was followed early in the reign of Solomon by, heavy burdens and a forced service, almost lead us to the conclusion that the prophet had acquiesced in a measure which had in view the magnificence of the Temple, and that it was left to David's own heart, returning to its better impulses (^{<1040>}2 Samuel 24:10), and to an older and less courtly prophet, to protest against an act which began in pride and tended to oppression. Josephus, with his usual inaccuracy, substitutes Nathan for Gad in his narrative (*Ant.* 7, 13, 2).

3. Under these influences the boy grew up. At the age of ten or eleven he must have passed through the revolt of Absalom and shared his father's exile (^{<1056>}2 Samuel 15:16). He would be taught all that priests or Levites or prophets had to teach; music and song; the book of the law of the Lord in such portions and in such forms as were then current; the "proverbs of the ancients," which his father had been wont to quote (^{<0213>}1 Samuel 24:13); probably also a literature which has survived only in fragments; the book of Jasher, the upright ones, the heroes of the people; the book of the wars of the Lord; the wisdom, oral or written, of the sages of his own tribe, Heman, and Ethan, and Calcol, and Darda (^{<1326>}1 Chronicles 2:6), who contributed so largely to the noble hymns of this period (Psalm 88, 89), and probably were incorporated into the choir of the tabernacle (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 355). The growing intercourse of Israel with the Phoenicians would naturally lead to a wider knowledge of the outlying world and its wonders than had fallen to his father's lot. Admirable, however, as all this was, a shepherd life, like his father's, furnished, we may believe, a better education for the kingly calling (^{<1980>}Psalm 78:70, 71). Born to the purple,

there was the inevitable risk of a selfish luxury. Cradled in liturgies, trained to think chiefly of the magnificent “palace” of Jehovah (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 29:19) of which, he was to be the builder, there was the danger first of an esthetic formalism and then of ultimate indifference.

III. Accession. —

1. The feebleness of David’s old age led to an attempt which might have deprived Solomon of the throne his father destined for him. Adonijah, next in order of birth to Absalom, like Absalom, “was a goodly man” (^{<1006>}1 Kings 1:6), in full maturity of years, backed by the oldest of the king’s friends and counsellors, Joab and Abiathar, and by all the sons of David, who looked with jealousy the latter on the obvious though not as yet declared preference of the latest born, and the former on the growing influence of the rival counsellors who were most in the king’s favor, Nathan, Zadok, and Benaiah. Following in the steps of Absalom, he assumed the kingly state of a chariot and a bodyguard; and David, more passive than ever, looked on in silence. At last a time was chosen for openly proclaiming him as king. A solemn, feast at En-rogel was to inaugurate the new reign. All were invited to it but those whom it was intended to displace. It was necessary for those whose interests were endangered, backed apparently by two of David’s surviving elder brothers (^{<1023>}1 Chronicles 2:13, 14; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 266), to take prompt measures. Bathsheba and Nathan took counsel together. The king was reminded of his oath. A virtual abdication was pressed upon him as the only means by which the succession of his favorite son could be secured. The whole thing was completed with wonderful rapidity. Riding on the mule well known as belonging to the king, attended by Nathan the prophet and Zadok the priest, and, more important still, by the king’s special company of the thirty Gibborim, or mighty men (^{<1010>}1 Kings 1:10, 33), and the bodyguard of the Cherethites and Pelethites (mercenaries, and therefore not liable to the contagion of popular feeling) under, the command of Benaiah (himself, like Nathan and Zadok, of the sons of Aaron), he went down to Gihon and was proclaimed and anointed king. (According to later Jewish teaching, a king was not anointed when he succeeded to his father, except in the case of a previous usurpation or a disputed succession [Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* s.v. “Rex”].) The shouts of his followers fell on the startled ears of the guests at Adonijah’s banquet. Happily they were as yet committed to no overt act, and they did not venture on one now. One by one they rose and departed. The plot had failed. The counter *coup d’etat* of

Nathan and Bathsheba had been successful. Such incidents are common enough in the history of Eastern monarchies. They are usually followed by a massacre of the defeated party. Adonijah expected such an issue, and took refuge at the horns of the altar. In this instance, however, the young conqueror used his triumph generously. The lives both of Adonijah and his partisans were spared, at least for a time. What had been done hurriedly was done afterwards in more solemn form. Solomon was presented to a great gathering of all the notables of Israel with a set speech, in which the old king announced what was, to his mind, the program of the new reign, a time of peace and plenty, of a stately worship, of devotion to Jehovah. A few months more and Solomon found himself, by his father's death, the sole occupant of the throne.

2. The position to which he succeeded was unique. Never before, and never after, did the kingdom of Israel take its place among the great monarchies of the East, able to ally itself or to contend on equal terms with Egypt or Assyria, stretching from the river Euphrates to the border of Egypt, from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Akaba, receiving annual tributes from many subject princes (see Hase, *Regni Salom. Descriptio* [Norimb. 1739]). Large treasures accumulated through many years were at his disposal. The sums mentioned are (1) the public funds for building the Temple, 100,000 talents (*kikarin*) of gold and 1,000,000 of silver; (2) David's private offerings, 3000 talents of gold and 7000 of silver. Besides these, large sums of unknown amount were believed to have been stored up in the sepulchre of David. 3000 talents were taken from it by Hyrcanus (Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 15, 3; 13, 8, 4; 16, 7, 1). The people, with the exception of the tolerated worship in high places, were true servants of Jehovah. Knowledge, art, music, poetry, had received a new impulse, and were moving on with rapid steps to such perfection as the age and the race were capable of attaining. We may rightly ask what manner of man he was, outwardly and inwardly, who at the age of about twenty was called to this glorious sovereignty? We have, it is true, no direct description in this case as we have of the earlier kings. There are, however, materials for filling up the gap. The wonderful impression which Solomon made upon all who came near him may well lead us to believe that with him, as with Saul and David, Absalom and Adonijah, as with most other favorite princes of Eastern peoples, there must have been the fascination and the grace of a noble presence. Whatever higher mystic meaning may be latent in Psalm 45, or the Song of Songs, we are compelled to think of them as having

had, at least, a historical starting point. They tell us of one who was, in the eyes of the men of his own time, “fairer than the children of men,” the face “bright and ruddy” as his father’s (^{<2150>}Song of Solomon 5:10; ^{<0172>}1 Samuel 17:42), bushy locks, dark as the raven’s wing, yet not without a golden glow (possibly sprinkled with gold dust, as was the hair of the youths who waited on him [Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 7, 3], or dyed with henna [Michaelis, note in Lowth, *Proel.* 31]), the eyes soft as “the eyes of doves,” the “countenance as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars,” “the chiefest among ten thousand, the altogether lovely” (^{<2150>}Song of Solomon 5:9-16). Add to this all gifts of a noble, far-reaching intellect, large and ready sympathies, a playful and genial humor, the lips “full of grace,” the soul “anointed” as “with the oil of gladness” (^{<0981>}Psalms 45), and we may form some notion of what the king was like in that dawn of his golden prime.

3. The historical starting point of the Song of Songs just spoken of connects itself, in all probability, with the earliest facts in the history of the new reign. The narrative, as told in ^{<1101>}1 Kings 2, is not a little perplexing. Bathsheba, who had before stirred up David against Adonijah, now appears as interceding for him, begging that Abishag the Shunammite, the virgin concubine of David, might be given him as a wife. Solomon, who till then had professed the profoundest reverence for his mother, his willingness to grant her anything, suddenly flashes into fiercest wrath at this. He detects what her unsuspecting generosity had not perceived. The petition is treated as part of a conspiracy in which Joab and Abiathar are sharers. Benaiah is once more called in. Adonijah is put to death at once. Joab is slain even within the precincts of the tabernacle, to which he had fled as an asylum. Abiathar is deposed and exiled, sent to a life of poverty and shame (^{<1123>}1 Kings 2:31-36), and the high priesthood transferred to another family more ready than he had been to pass from the old order to the new, and to accept the voices of the prophets as greater than the oracles which had belonged exclusively to the priesthood. *SEE URIM AND THUMMIM.* Abiathar is declared “worthy of death,” clearly not for any new offenses, but for his participation in Adonijah’s original attempt; and Joab is put to death because he is alarmed at the treatment of his associates (^{<1123>}1 Kings 2:26-29), which implies collusion on his part. The king sees in the movement a plot to keep him still in the tutelage of childhood, to entrap him into admitting his elder brother’s right to the choicest treasure of his father’s harem, and therefore virtually to the throne, or at least to a regency in which he would have his own partisans as counsellors. With a

keen sighted promptness he crushes the whole scheme. He gets rid of a rival, fulfils David's dying counsels as to Joab, and asserts his own independence. Soon afterwards an opportunity is thrown in his way of getting rid of one, *SEE SHIMEI*, who had been troublesome before and might be troublesome again. He presses the letter of a compact against a man who by his infatuated disregard of it seemed given over to destruction (^{<1125>}1 Kings 2:36-46). (An elaborate vindication of Solomon's conduct in this matter may be found in Menthen, *Thesaur.* vol. 1; Slisser, *Diss. de Salom. Processu contra Shimei.*) There is, however, no needless slaughter. The other "sons of David" are still spared, and one of them, Nathan, becomes the head of a distinct family (^{<3822>}Zechariah 12:12) which ultimately fills up the failure of the direct succession (^{<4031>}Luke 3:31). As he punishes his father's enemies, he also shows kindness to the friends who had been faithful to him. Chimham, the son of Barzillai, apparently receives an inheritance near the city of David, and probably in the reign of Solomon displays his inherited hospitality by building a caravansary for the strangers whom the fame and wealth of Solomon drew to Jerusalem (^{<1031>}2 Samuel 19:31-40; ^{<1117>}1 Kings 2:7; ^{<3417>}Jeremiah 41:17; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 247; *Proph.* 2, 191).

IV. Foreign Policy. — The want of sufficient data for a continuous history has already been noticed. All that we have are

(a) The duration of the reign, forty years (^{<1114>}1 Kings 11:42). (Josephus, again inaccurate, lengthens the reign to eighty years, and makes the age at accession fourteen [*Ant.* 8, 7, 8].)

(b) The commencement of the Temple in the fourth, its completion in the eleventh year of his reign (6, 1, 37, 38).

(c) The commencement of his own palace in the seventh, its completion in the twentieth year (7, 1; ^{<3401>}2 Chronicles 8:1).

(d) The conquest of Hamath-zobah, and the consequent foundation of cities in the region north of Palestine after the twentieth year (ver. 1-6). With materials so scanty as these, it will be better to group the chief facts in an order which will best enable us to appreciate their significance.

1. Egypt. — The first act of the foreign policy of the new reign must have been to most Israelites a very startling one. He made affinity with Pharaoh, king of Egypt. He married Pharaoh's daughter (^{<1101>}1 Kings 3:1). Since the

time of the Exode there had been no intercourse between the two countries. David and his counsellors had taken no steps to promote it. Egypt had probably taken part in assisting Edom in its resistance to David (^{<13123>}1 Chronicles 11:23; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 182), and had received Hadad, the prince of Edom, with royal honors. The king had given him his wife's sister in marriage, and adopted his son into his own family (^{<11114>}1 Kings 11:14-20). These steps indicated a purpose to support him at some future time more actively, and Solomon's proposal of marriage was probably intended to counteract it. It was at the time, so far successful that when Hadad, on hearing of the death of the dreaded leaders of the armies of Israel, David and Joab, wished to seize the opportunity of attacking the new king, the court of Egypt rendered him no assistance (11:21, 22). The disturbances thus caused, like those of a later date in the north, coming from the foundation of a new Syrian kingdom at Damascus by Rezon and other fugitives from Zobah (ver. 23-25), might well lead Solomon to look out for a powerful support, to obtain for a new dynasty and a new kingdom a recognition by one of older fame and greater power. The immediate results were probably favorable enough. The new queen brought with her as a dowry the frontier city of Gezer, against which, as threatening the tranquillity of Israel, and as still possessed by a remnant of the old Canaanites, Pharaoh had led his armies. She was received with all honor, the queen-mother herself attending to place the diadem on her son's brow on the day of his espousals (^{<21311>}Song of Solomon 3:11). Gifts from the nobles of Israel and from Tyre (the latter offered perhaps by a Tyrian princess) were lavished at her feet (^{<19512>}Psalms 45:12). It is to be remarked that the daughter of Pharaoh appears to have conformed to the Hebrew faith, for she is mentioned as if apart from the "strange women" who seduced Solomon into the toleration or practice of idolatry (^{<11101>}1 Kings 11:1), and there are no accounts of any Egyptian superstitions being introduced during his reign. The Egyptian queen dwelt in a separate portion of the city of David till a palace was reared — the presence of the ark on Zion precluded the near residence of such a foreigner, though she might have abandoned her national gods (^{<14811>}2 Chronicles 8:11). She dwelt there apparently with attendants of her own race, "the virgins that be her fellows," probably conforming in some degree to the religion of her adopted country. According to a tradition which may have some foundation in spite of its exaggerated numbers, Pharaoh (Psusennes, or, as in the story, Vaphres) sent with her workmen to help in building the Temple to the number of 80,000 (Eupolemus, in Euseb. *Proep. Evang.* 2,

30-35). The “chariots of Pharaoh,” at any rate, appeared in royal procession with a splendor hitherto unknown (^{<2100>}Song of Solomon 1:9).

The ultimate issue of the alliance showed that it was hollow and impolitic. There may have been a revolution in Egypt, changing the dynasty and transferring the seat of power to Bubastis (Ewald, 3, 389). There was at any rate a change of policy. The court of Egypt welcomes the fugitive Jeroboam when he is known to have aspirations after kingly power. There, we may believe, by some kind of compact, expressed or understood, was planned the scheme which led first to the rebellion of the Ten Tribes, and then to the attack of Shishak on the weakened and dismantled kingdom of the son of Solomon. Evils such as these were hardly counterbalanced by the trade opened by Solomon in the fine linen of Egypt, or the supply of chariots and horses which, as belonging to aggressive rather than defensive warfare, a wiser policy would have led him to avoid (^{<1100>}1 Kings 10:28, 29).

2. Tyre. — The alliance with the Phoenician king rested on a somewhat different footing. It had been part of David’s policy from the beginning of his reign. Hiram had been “ever a lover of David.” He, or his grandfather (comp. the data given in ^{<1051>}2 Samuel 5:11; Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 3, 2; 8, 5, 3; *Cont. Ap.* 1, 18; and Ewald, 3, 287), had helped him by supplying materials and workmen for his palace. As soon as he heard of Solomon’s accession he sent ambassadors to salute him. A correspondence passed between the two kings, which ended in a treaty of commerce. (The letters are given at length by Josephus [*Ant.* 8, 2, 8] and Eusebius [*Prscep. Evang.* loc. cit.].) Israel was to be supplied from Tyre with the materials which were wanted for the Temple that was to be the glory of the new reign. Gold from Ophir, cedar wood from Lebanon, probably also copper from Cyprus, and tin from Spain or Cornwall (Niebuhr, *Lect. on Anc. Hist.* 1, 79), for the brass which was so highly valued, purple from Tyre itself, workmen from among the Zidonians — all these were wanted and were given. The opening of Joppa as a port created a new coasting trade, and the materials from Tyre were conveyed to it on floats, and thence to Jerusalem (^{<4026>}2 Chronicles 2:16). The chief architect of the Temple, though an Israelite on his mother’s side, belonging to the tribe of Dan or Naphtali, **SEE HIRAM**, was yet by birth a Tyrian, a namesake of the king. In return for these exports, the Phoenicians were only too glad to receive the corn and oil of Solomon’s territory. Their narrow strip of coast did not produce enough for the population of their cities, and then, as at a later;

period, “their country was nourished” by the broad valleys and plains of Samaria and Galilee (⁴¹²¹Acts 12:20).

The results of the alliance did not end here. Now, for the first time in the history of the Israelites, they entered on a career as a commercial people. They joined the Phoenicians in their Mediterranean voyages to the coasts of Spain. *SEE TARSHISH*. Solomon’s possession of the Edomitish coast enabled him to open to his ally a new world of commerce. The ports of Elath and Eziongeber were filled with ships of Tarshish, i.e. merchant ships, for the long voyages, manned chiefly by Phoenicians, but built at Solomon’s expense, which sailed down the Aelanitic Gulf of the Red Sea, on through the Indian Ocean, to lands which had before been hardly known even by name, to Ophir and Sheba, to Arabia Felix, or India, or Ceylon; and brought back, after an absence of nearly three years, treasures almost or altogether new gold and silver and precious stones, nard, aloes, sandalwood, almug trees, and ivory; and last, but not least in the eyes of the historian, new forms of animal life, on which the inhabitants of Palestine gazed with wondering eyes, “apes and peacocks.” The interest of Solomon in these enterprises was shown by his leaving his palaces at Jerusalem and elsewhere and travelling to Elath and Ezion-geber to superintend the construction of the fleet (¹⁴⁸⁷2 Chronicles 8:17); perhaps also to Sidon for a like purpose. (The statement of Justin Martyr [*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 34], *ἐν Σιδῶνι εἰδωλολάτρει*, receives by the accompanying *διὰ γυναικα* the character of an extract from some history then extant. The marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the king of Tyres is mentioned by Eusebius [*Proep. Evang.* 10, 11].) To the knowledge thus gained we may ascribe the wider thoughts which appear in the psalms of this and the following periods, as of those who “see the wonders of the deep and occupy their business in great waters” (¹⁴⁷³Psalms 107:23-30); perhaps also as an experience of the more humiliating accidents of sea-travel (¹²³⁴Proverbs 23:34, 35). (See the monographs *De Navig. Salom.* by Wichmannshausen [Viteb. 1709], Huetius [in Ugolino, vol. 7], Konigsmann [Slesv. 1800], and Reill [in Germ.] [Dorp. 1834].)

According to the statement of the Phoenician writers quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* 8, 5, 3), the intercourse of the two kings had in it also something of the sportiveness and freedom of friends. They delighted to perplex each other with hard questions, and laid wagers as to their power of answering them. Hiram was at first the loser and paid his forfeits; but afterwards, through the help of a sharp-witted Tyrian boy, Abdemon, he solved the

hard problems, and was in the end the winner. (The narrative of Josephus implies the existence of some story, more or less humorous, in Tyrian literature, in which the wisest of the kings of earth was baffled by a boy's cleverness. A singular pendant to this is found in the popular mediaeval story of Solomon and Morolf, in which the latter [an ugly, deformed dwarf] outwits the former. A modernized version of this work may be found in the *Walhalla* [Leipsic, 1844]. Older copies, in Latin and German, of the 15th century, are in the British Museum Library. The Anglo-Saxon Dialogue of Solomon and Saturn is a mere catechism of scriptural knowledge.) The singular fragment of history inserted in ^{<1091>}1 Kings 9:11-14, recording the cession by Solomon of sixteen cities, and Hiram's dissatisfaction with them, is perhaps connected with these imperial wagers. The king of Tyre revenges himself by a Phoenician bon mot. *SEE CABUL*. He fulfils his part of the contract, and pays the stipulated price.

3. These were the two most important alliances. The absence of any reference to Babylon and Assyria, and the fact that the Euphrates was recognized as the boundary of Solomon's kingdom (^{<4025>}2 Chronicles 9:26), suggest the inference that the Mesopotamian monarchies were at this time comparatively feeble. Other neighboring nations were content to pay annual tribute in the form of gifts (9:24). The kings of the Hittites and of Syria welcomed the opening of a new line of commerce which enabled them to find in Jerusalem an emporium where they might get the chariots and horses of Egypt (^{<1109>}1 Kings 10:29). This, however, was obviously but a small part of the traffic organized by Solomon. The foundation of cities like Tadmor in the wilderness, and Tiphseh (Thapsacus) on the Euphrates; of others on the route, each with its own special market for chariots or horses or stores (^{<4485>}2 Chronicles 8:3-6); the erection of lofty towers on Lebanon (^{<4001>}2 Chronicles *loc. cit.*; ^{<2104>}Song of Solomon 7:4), pointed to a more distant commerce, opening out the resources of Central, Asia, reaching, as that of Tyre did afterwards (availing itself of this very route), to the nomad tribes of the Caspian and the Black seas, to Togarmah and Meshech and Tubal (^{<3273>}Ezekiel 27:13, 14; comp. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 1, 270).

With the few exceptions above noted, the reign of Solomon verified his name. It was a time of peace: "he had peace on all sides round about him, and Judah and Israel dwelt safely" (^{<1024>}1 Kings 4:24, 25). The arms of David had won the empire which Solomon now enjoyed. It was an empire in the Oriental sense, extending from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean,

from Thapsacus to Gaza. The outlying territories paid tribute to their suzerain; “they that dwell in the wilderness bowed before him; the kings of Tarshish and of the isles brought presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba offered gifts;” the Syrian tribes beyond Lebanon and as far as Damascus, with Moab, Ammon, and Edom, the Arabian clans, the surviving aborigines, and the Philistines, did homage and paid tribute — “they brought presents, and served Solomon all the days of his life.” At the same time proper measures or precautions were taken to preserve peace. Fortresses seem to have been built along the ridges of Lebanon, and on the frontiers “were chariot cities, and cities of horsemen.” The two Beth-horons, on the boundary line of the great and uneasy tribe of Ephraim, and on the high-road between Jerusalem and the seacoast, as well from the east as from Philistia and Egypt, were strongly fortified — became “fenced cities, with walls, bars, and gates” (^{<HRB>}2 Chronicles 8:5). For a similar reason the old city of Gezer, on the Philistine border, was rebuilt and garrisoned; and Hazor and Megiddo, guarding the plain of Esdraelon from Syrian or Assyrian attack, rose into great fortifications. No doubt, also, on the south, and fronting Idumaea and the desert, similar military stations were placed at intervals. Such a congeries of kingdoms has but a loose coherence, and continues united only so long as the central controlling power maintains its predominance, so that Solomon’s empire, made up of those heterogeneous materials, fell to pieces at his death and the revolution that so closely followed it.

4. The survey of the influence exercised by Solomon, on surrounding nations would be incomplete if we were to pass over that which was more directly personal the fame of his glory and his wisdom. The legends which pervade the East are probably not merely the expansion of the scanty notices of the Old Test., but (as suggested above), like those which gather round the names of Nimrod and Alexander, the result of the impression made by the personal presence of one of the mighty ones of the earth. Cities like Tadmor and Tiphseh were not likely to have been founded by a king who had never seen and chosen the sites. ^{<HRB>}2 Chronicles 8:3, 4, implies the journey which Josephus speaks of (*Ant.* 8, 6, 1), and at Tadmor Solomon was within one day’s journey of the Euphrates, and six of Babylon. (So Josephus, *loc. cit.*; but the day’s journey must have been a long one.) Wherever the ships of Tarshish went, they carried with them the report, losing nothing in its passage, of what their crews had seen and heard. The impression made on the Incas of Peru by the power and

knowledge of the Spaniards offers perhaps the nearest approach to what falls so little within the limits of our experience, though there was there no personal center round which the admiration could gather itself. The journey of the queen of Sheba, though from its circumstances the most conspicuous, did not stand alone. The inhabitants of Jerusalem, of the whole line of country between it and the Gulf of Akaba, saw with amazement the “great train;” the men with their swarthy faces, the camels bearing spices and gold and gems, of a queen who had come from the far South, because she had heard of the wisdom of Solomon, and connected with it “the name of Jehovah” (¹⁰⁰⁰1 Kings 10:1). She came with hard questions to test that wisdom, and the words just quoted may throw light upon their nature. Not riddles and enigmas only, such as the sportive fancy of the East delights in, but the ever old, ever new, problems of life, such as, even in that age and country, were vexing the hearts of the speakers in the book of Job, were stirring in her mind when she communed with Solomon of “all that was in her heart” (⁴⁰⁰2 Chronicles 10:2). She meets us the representative of a body whom the dedication prayer shows to have been numerous, the strangers “coming from a far country” because of the “great name” of Jehovah (¹⁰⁸⁴1 Kings 8:41), many of them princes themselves, or the messengers of kings (⁴⁰²³2 Chronicles 9:23). The historians of Israel delighted to dwell on her confession that the reality surpassed the fame, “the one half of the greatness of thy wisdom was not told me” (ver. 6; Ewald, 3, 353). (See Schramm, *De Fama Salom.* [Herb. 1745].)

The territory of Sheba, according to Strabo, reached so far north as to meet that of the Nabathaeans, although its proper seat was at the southernmost angle of Arabia. The very rich presents made by the queen show the extreme value of her Commerce with the Hebrew monarch; and this early interchange of hospitality derives a peculiar interest from the fact that in much later ages — those of the Maccabees and downward — the intercourse of the Jews with Sheba became so intimate, and their influence, and even power, so great. Jewish, circumcision took root there, and princes held sway who were called Jewish. The language of Sheba is believed to have been strongly different from the literate Arabic; yet, like the Ethiopic, it belonged to the great Syro-Arabian family, and was not alien to the Hebrew in the same sense that the Egyptian was; and the great ease with which the pure monotheism of the Maccabees propagated itself in Sheba gives plausibility to the opinion that even at the time of Solomon the people of Sheba had much religious superiority over the Arabs and

Syrians in general. If so, it becomes clear how the curiosity of the southern queen would be worked upon by seeing the riches of the distant monarch, whose purer creed must have been carried everywhere with them by his sailors and servants. *SEE SHEBA.*

V. *Internal History.* —

1. *Administrative Capacity.* We can now enter upon the reign of Solomon, in its bearing upon the history of Israel, without the necessity of a digression. The first prominent scene is one which presents his character in its noblest aspect. There were two holy places which divided the reverence of the people — the ark and its provisional tabernacle at Jerusalem, and the original tabernacle of the congregation, which, after many wanderings, was now pitched at Gibeon. It was thought right that the new king should offer solemn sacrifices at both. After those at Gibeon there came that vision of the night which has in all ages borne its noble witness to the hearts of rulers. Not for riches, or long life, or victory over enemies, would the son of David, then at least true to his high calling, feeling himself as “a little child” in comparison with the vastness of his work, offer his supplications, but for a “wise and understanding heart,” that he might judge the people.” The “speech pleased the Lord.” There came in answer the promise of a wisdom “like which there had been none before; like which there should be none after” (~~1~~1 Kings 3:5-15). So far all was well. The prayer was a right and noble one. Yet there is also a contrast between it and the prayers of David which accounts for many other contrasts. The desire of David’s heart is not chiefly for wisdom, but for holiness. He is conscious of an oppressing evil, and seeks to be delivered from it. He repents, and falls, and repents again. Solomon asks only for wisdom. He has a lofty ideal before him, and seeks to accomplish it; but he is as yet haunted by no deeper yearnings, and speaks as one who has “no need of repentance.”

The wisdom asked for was given in large measure, and took a varied range. The Wide world of nature, animate and inanimate, which the enterprises of his subjects were throwing open to him, the lives and characters of men, in all their surface weaknesses, in all their inner depths, lay before him, and he took cognizance of all. But the highest wisdom was that wanted for the highest work, for governing and guiding, and the historian hastens to give an illustration of it. The pattern instance is in all its circumstances thoroughly Oriental. The king sits in the gate of the city, at the early dawn, to settle any disputes, however strange, between any litigants, however

humble. In the rough-and-ready test which turns the scales of evidence before so evenly balanced, there is a kind of rough humor as well as sagacity specially attractive to the Eastern mind, then and at all times (^{<1016>}1 Kings 3:16-28).

But the power to rule showed itself not in judging only, but in organizing. The system of government which he inherited from David received a fuller expansion. Prominent among the “princes” of his kingdom, i.e. officers of his own appointment, were members of the priestly order: Azariah the son of Zadok, Zadok himself the high priest, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada as captain of the host, another Azariah and Zabud, the sons of Nathan — one over the officers (*Nitstsabim*) who acted as purveyors to the king’s household (^{<1010>}1 Kings 4:2-5), the other in the more confidential character of “king’s friend.” In addition to these, there were the two scribes (*Sopherim*), the king’s secretaries, drawing up his edicts and the like, **SEE SCRIBE**, Elihoreph and Ahiah, the recorder or annalist of the king’s reign (*Mazkir*), the superintendent of the king’s house and household expenses (^{<2225>}Isaiah 22:15), including probably the harem. The last in order, at once the most indispensable and the most hated, was Adoniram, who presided “over the tribute,” that word including probably the personal service of forced labor (comp. Keil, *Comm. ad loc.*, and Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 334).

2. Exchequer. — The last name leads us to the king’s finances. The first impression of the facts given us is that of abounding plenty. That all the drinking vessels of the two palaces should be of pure gold was a small thing, “nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon” (^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:21). “Silver was in Jerusalem as stones, and cedars as the sycamore trees in the vale” (10:27). The people were “eating and drinking and making merry” (4:20). The treasures left by David for building the Temple might well seem almost inexhaustible (^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 29:1-7). (We labor, however, under a twofold uncertainty, [1] as to the accuracy of the numbers, [2] as to the value of the terms. Prideaux, followed by Lewis, estimates the amount at £833,000,000, yet the savings of the later years of David’s life, for one special purpose, could hardly have surpassed the national debt of England [comp. Milman, *History of the Jews*, 1, 267].) The large quantities of the precious metals imported from Ophir and Tarshish would speak to a people who had not learned the lessons of a long experience of a boundless source of wealth (^{<1105>}1 Kings 9:28). All the kings and princes of the subject provinces paid tribute in the form of gifts, in money and in kind, “at a fixed rate year by year” (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:25). Monopolies of trade, then, as at all

times in the East, contributed to the king's treasury, and the trade in the fine linen and chariots and horses of Egypt must have brought in large profits (ver. 28, 29). The king's domain lands were apparently let out, as vineyards or for other purposes, at a fixed annual rental (^{<2081>}Song of Solomon 8:11). Upon the Israelites (probably not till the later period of his reign) there was levied a tax of ten percent on their produce (^{<0085>}1 Samuel 8:15). All the provinces of his own kingdom, grouped apparently in a special order for this purpose, were bound each in turn to supply the king's enormous household with provisions (^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21-23). The total amount thus brought into the treasury in gold, exclusive of all payments in kind, amounted to 666 talents (10:14). *SEE TAX.*

The profound peace which the nation enjoyed as a fruit of David's victories stimulated the industry of all Israel. The tribes beyond the Jordan had become rich by the plunder of the Hagarenes, and had a wide district where their cattle might multiply to an indefinite extent. The agricultural tribes enjoyed a soil and climate in some parts eminently fruitful, and in all richly rewarding the toil of irrigation; so that, in the security of peace, nothing more was wanted to develop the resources of the nation than markets for its various produce. In food for men and cattle, in timber and fruit trees, in stone, and probably in the useful metals, the land supplied of itself all the first wants of its people in abundance. For exportation, it is distinctly stated that wheat, barley, oil, and wine were in chief demand; to which we may conjecturally add, wool, hides, and other raw materials. The king undoubtedly had large districts and extensive herds of his own; but besides this, he received presents *in kind* from his own people and from the subject nations; and it was possible in this way to make demands upon them, without severe oppression, to an extent that is unbearable where taxes must be paid in gold or silver. He was himself at once monarch and merchant; and we may with much confidence infer that no private merchant will be allowed to compete with a prince who has assumed the mercantile character. By his intimate commercial union with the Tyrians, he was put into the most favorable of all positions for disposing of his goods. That energetic nation, possessing so small a strip of territory, had much need of various raw produce for their own wants. Another large demand was made by them for the raw materials of manufactures, and for articles which they could with advantage sell again; and as they were able to furnish so many acceptable luxuries to the court of Solomon, a most active change soon commenced. Only second in importance to this, and superior in fame, was

the commerce of the Red Sea, which could not have been successfully prosecuted without the aid of Tyrian enterprise and experience. The navigation to Sheba, and the districts beyond — whether of Eastern Arabia or of Africa — in spite of its tediousness, was highly lucrative, from the vast diversity of productions between the countries so exchanging; while, as it was a trade of monopoly, a very disproportionate share of the whole gain fell to the carriers of the merchandise. The Egyptians were the only nation who might have been rivals in the southern maritime traffic; but their religion and their exclusive principles did not favor, sea voyages; and there is some reason to think that at this early period they abstained from sending their own people abroad for commerce. The goods brought back from the south were chiefly gold, precious stones, spice, almug or other scented woods, and ivory, all of which were probably so abundant in their native regions as to be parted with on easy terms and of course, were all admirably suited for reexportation to Europe. The carrying trade, which was thus shared between Solomon and the Tyrians, was probably the most lucrative part of the southern and eastern commerce. How large a portion of it went on by caravans of camels is wholly unknown, yet that this branch was considerable is certain. From Egypt Solomon imported not only linen yarn, but even horses and chariots, which were sold again to the princes of Syria and of the Hittites; and were probably prized, for the superior breed of the horses, and for the light, strong, and elegant structure of the chariots. Wine, being abundant in Palestine, and wholly wanting in Egypt, was no doubt a principal means of repayment. Moreover, Solomon's fortifying of Tadmor (or Palmyra), and retention of Thapsacus on the Euphrates, show that he had an important interest in the direct land and river trade to Babylon; although we have no details on this subject. The difficulty which meets us is, to imagine by what exports, light enough to bear land carriage, he was able to pay for his imports. We may conjecture that he sent out Tyrian cloths and trinkets, or Egyptian linen of the finest fabric; yet in many of these things the Babylonians also excelled. On the whole, when we consider that in the case of Solomon the commercial wealth of the entire community was concentrated in the hands of the government; that much of the trade was a monopoly, and that all was assisted or directed by the experience and energy of the Tyrians, the overwhelming riches of this eminent merchant sovereign are perhaps not surprising.

It was hardly possible, however, that any financial system could bear the strain of the king's passion for magnificence. The cost of the Temple was, it is true, provided for by David's savings and the offerings of the people; but even while that was building, yet more when it was finished, one structure followed another with ruinous rapidity. A palace for himself, grander than that which Hiram had built for his father; another for Pharaoh's daughter; the house of the forest of Lebanon, in which he sat in his court of judgment, the pillars all of cedar, seated on a throne of ivory and gold, in which six lions on either side, the symbols of the tribe of Judah, appeared (as in the thrones of Assyria, Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 2, 300) standing on the steps and supporting the arms of the chair (^{<100>}1 Kings 7:1-12; 10:418-20); ivory palaces and ivory towers, used apparently for the king's army (^{<95>}Psalm 45:8; ^{<200>}Song of Solomon 4:4; 7:4); the ascent from his own palace to the house or palace of Jehovah (^{<100>}1 Kings 10:5); a summer-palace in Lebanon (9:19; ^{<200>}Song of Solomon 7:4); stately gardens at Etham, *paradises* like those of the great Eastern kings (Eccles. 2:5, 6; Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 7, 3), **SEE PARADISE**; the foundation of something like a stately school or college; costly aqueducts bringing water, it may be, from the well of Bethlehem, dear to David's heart, to supply the king's palace in Jerusalem (Ewald, 3, 323); the fortifications of Jerusalem completed, those of other cities begun (^{<100>}1 Kings 9:15-19); and, above all, the harem, with all the expenditure which it involved on slaves and slave-dealers, on concubines and eunuchs (^{<90>}1 Samuel 8:15; ^{<300>}1 Chronicles 28:1), on men singers and women singers (^{<200>}Ecclesiastes 2:8) — these rose before the wondering eyes of his people and dazzled them with their magnificence. All the equipment of his court, the "apparel" of his servants, was, on the same scale. If he went from his hall of judgment to the Temple, he marched between two lines of soldiers, each with a burnished shield of gold (^{<100>}1 Kings 10:16, 17; Ewald, 3, 320). If he went on a royal progress to, his paradise at Etham, he went in snow-white raiment, riding in a stately chariot of cedar, decked with silver and gold and purple, carpeted with the costliest tapestry worked by the daughters of Jerusalem (Song of Solomon. 3:9, 10). A bodyguard attended him, "threescore valiant men," tallest and handsomest of the sons of Israel, in the freshness of their youth, arrayed in Tyrian purple, their long black hair sprinkled freshly every day with gold dust (ver. 7, 8; Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 7, 3). Forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, made up the measure of his magnificence (^{<100>}1 Kings 4:26). If some of the public works had the plea of utility — the fortification of some

cities for purposes of defense (Millo j[the suburb of Jerusalem], Hazor, Megiddo, the two Beth-horons); the foundation of others (Tadmor and Tiphseh) for purposes of commerce—these were simply the pomps of a selfish luxury; and the people, after the first dazzle was over, felt that they were so. As the treasury became empty, taxes multiplied and monopolies became more irksome. Even the Israelites, besides the conscription which brought them into the king's armies (^{<1022>}1 Kings 9:22), were subject, though for a part only of each year, to the *corvée* of compulsory labor (^{<1013>}1 Kings 5:13). The revolution that followed had, like most other revolutions, financial disorder as the chief among its causes. The people complained, not of the king's idolatry, but of their burdens, of his "grievous yoke" (^{<1024>}1 Kings 12:4). Their hatred fell heaviest on Adoniram, who was over the tribute. If, on the one side, the division of the kingdom came as a penalty for Solomon's idolatrous apostasy from Jehovah, it was, on another, the Nemesis of a selfish passion for glory, itself the most terrible of all idolatries.

3. Structures. — It remains for us to trace that other downfall, belonging more visibly, though not more really, to his religious life, from the loftiest height even to the lowest depth. The building and dedication of the Temple are obviously the representatives of the former. That was the special task which he inherited from his father, and to that he gave himself with all his heart and strength. He came to it with all the noble thoughts as to the meaning and grounds of worship which his father and Nathan could instil into him. We have already seen in speaking of his intercourse with Tyre, what measures he took for its completion. All that can be said as to its architecture, proportions, materials, and the organization of the ministering priests and Leviites will be found elsewhere. *SEE TEMPLE*. Here it will be enough to picture to ourselves the feelings of the men of Judah as they watched, during seven long years, the cyclopean foundations of vast stones (still remaining when all else has perished [Ewald, 3, 297]) gradually rising up and covering the area of the threshing floor of Araunah, materials arriving continually from Joppa, cedar and gold and silver, brass "without weight" from the foundries of Succoth and Zarethan, stones ready hewn and squared from the quarries. Far from colossal in its size, it was conspicuous chiefly by the lavish use, within and without, of the gold of Ophir and Parvaim. It glittered in the morning sun (as has been well said) like the sanctuary of an El Dorado (Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 1, 259).

Throughout the whole work the tranquillity of the kingly city was unbroken by the sound of the workman's hammer.

“Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung.”

We cannot ignore the fact that even now there were some darker shades in the picture. Not reverence only for the holy city, but the wish to shut out from sight the misery he had caused, to close his ears against cries which were rising daily to the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, led him probably to place the works connected with the Temple at as great a distance as possible from the Temple itself. Forgetful of the lessons taught by the history of his own people, and of the precepts of the law (^{<1022>}Exodus 22:21; 23:9 *et al.*), following the example of David's policy in its least noble aspect. (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 22:2), he reduced the “strangers” in the land, the remnant of the Canaanitish races who had chosen the alternative of conformity to the religion of their conquerors, to the state of helots, and made their life “bitter with all hard bondage.” *SEE PROSELYTE.*

Copying the Pharaohs in their magnificence, he copied them also in their disregard of human suffering. Acting, probably, under the same counsels as had prompted that measure, on the result of David's census, he seized on these “strangers” for the weary, servile toil against which the free spirit of Israel would have rebelled. One hundred and fifty-three thousand, with wives and children in proportion, were torn from their homes and sent off to the quarries and the forests of Lebanon (^{<1155>}1 Kings 5:15; ^{<1417>}2 Chronicles 2:17, 18). Even the Israelites, though not reduced permanently to the helot state (8:9), were yet summoned to take their share, by rotation, in the same labor (^{<1153>}1 Kings 5:13, 14). One trace of the special servitude of “these hewers of stone” continued long afterwards in the existence of a body of men attached to the Temple, and known as Solomon's servants (q.v.).

Besides the great work which has rendered the name of Solomon so famous — the Temple at Jerusalem — we are informed of the palaces which he built, viz. his own palace, the queen's palace, and the house of the forest of Lebanon, his porch (or piazza) for no specified object, and his porch of judgment, or law court. He also added to the walls of Jerusalem, and fortified Millo (“in the city of David,” ^{<1431>}2 Chronicles 32:5) and many other strongholds. The Temple seems to have been of very small dimensions — sixty cubits long, twenty broad, and thirty high (^{<1113>}1 Kings 6:3) — or smaller than many moderate-sized parish churches; but it was

wonderful for the lavish use of precious materials. Whether the three palaces were parts of the same great pile remains uncertain. The house of the forest of Lebanon, it has been ingeniously conjectured, was so called from the multitude of cedar pillars, similar to a forest. That Solomon's own house was of far greater extent than the Temple appears from its having occupied thirteen years in building, while the Temple was finished in seven. In all these works he had the aid of the Tyrians, whose skill in hewing timber and in carving stone, and in the application of machines for conveying heavy masses, was of the first importance. The cedar was cut from Mount Lebanon and, as would appear, from a district which belonged to the Tyrians; either because in the Hebrew parts of the mountain the timber was not so fine, or from want of roads by which it might be conveyed. The hewing was superintended by Tyrian carpenters, but all the hard labor was performed by Hebrew bondmen. This circumstance discloses to us an important fact — the existence of so large a body of public slaves in the heart of the Israelitish monarchy, who are reckoned at 153,600 in ^{<407>}2 Chronicles 2:17 see also ^{<100>}1 Kings 9:20-23. During the preparation for the Temple, it is stated (ver. 13-18) that 70,000 men were employed to bear burdens, 80,000 hewers of wood in the mountains, besides 3300 overseers. The meaning of this, however, is rather obscure; since it also states that there was a "levy" of 30,000, of whom 10,000 at a time went to Lebanon. Perhaps the 150,000 was the whole number *liable to serve*, of whom only one fifth was actually called out. From the large number said to "bear burdens," we may infer that the mode of working was very lavish of human exertion, and little aided by the strength of beasts. It is inferred that at least the Hittites had recognized princes of their own, since they are named as purchasers of Egyptian chariots from Solomon; yet the mass of these nations were clearly pressed down by a cruel bondage, which must have reacted on the oppressors at every time of weakness. The word **sm**, which is translated "levy" and "tribute," means especially the personal service performed by public slaves, and is rendered "task" in ^{<011>}Exodus 1:11, when speaking of the Israelites in Egypt.

Until the Temple was finished, the tabernacle appears to have continued at Gibeon, although the *ark* had been brought by David to Zion (^{<408>}2 Chronicles 1:3, 4). David, it appears, had pitched a tent on purpose to receive the ark, where Asaph and his brethren the Levites ministered before it with singing, while Zadok and his brethren the priests ministered before the tabernacle at Gibeon with sacrifices (^{<356>}1 Chronicles 15:16-24; 16:37-

40). This shows that even in David's mind the idea of a single center of religious unity was not fully formed, as the coordinate authority of Abiathar and Zadok indicates that no single high priest was recognized. But from the time of the dedication of the Temple, not only the ark, but all the holy vessels from the tabernacle were brought into it (~~1~~¹ Kings 8:4), and the highpriest naturally confined his ministrations to the Temple, Zadok having been left without an equal by the disgrace of Abiathar. Nevertheless, the whole of the later history of the Jewish monarchy, even under the most pious kings, proves that the mass of the nation never became reconciled to the new idea, that "in Jerusalem (alone) was the place where they ought to worship." The "high places," at which Jehovah was worshipped with sacrifice, are perpetually alluded to in terms which show that, until the reign of Josiah, it was impossible for kings, priests, or prophets to bring about, a uniformity and central superintendence of the national religion.

After seven years and a half the work on the Temple was completed, and the day came to which all Israelites looked back as the culminating glory of their nation. Their worship was now established on a scale as stately as that of other nations, while it yet retained its freedom from all worship that could possibly become idolatrous, Instead of two, rival sanctuaries, as before, there was to be one only. The ark from Zion, the tabernacle from Gibeon, were both removed (~~2~~² Chronicles 5:5) and brought to the new Temple. The choirs of the priests and Levites met in their fullest force arrayed in white linen. Then, it may be for the first time, was heard the noble hymn "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in" (Milman, *Hist. of Jews*, 1, 263). The trumpeters and singers were "as one" in their mighty hallelujah — "O praise the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth forever" (~~2~~² Chronicles 5:13). The ark was solemnly placed in its golden sanctuary, and then "the cloud," the "glory of the Lord," filled the house of the Lord. The two tables of stone, associated with the first rude beginnings of the life of the wilderness, were still, they and they only, in the ark which had now so magnificent a shrine (ver. 10). They bore their witness to the great laws of duty towards God and man, remaining unchangeable through all the changes and chances of national or individual life, from the beginning to the end of the growth of a national religion. Throughout the whole scene the person of the king is the one central object, compared with whom even priests and prophets, are for the time subordinate. Abstaining,

doubtless, from distinctively priestly acts, such as slaying the victims and offering incense, he yet appears, even more than David did in the bringing up the ark, in a liturgical character. He, and not Zadok, blesses the congregation, offers up the solemn prayer, dedicates the Temple. He, and not any member of the prophetic order, is then, and probably at other times, the spokesman and “preacher” of the people (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 320). He takes, at least, some steps towards that far off (~~<400>~~Psalm 110:1) ideal of “a priest after the order of Melchizedek,” which one of his descendants rashly sought to fulfil, *SEE UZZIAH*, but which was to be fulfilled only in a Son of David, not the crowned leader of a mighty nation, but despised, rejected, crucified. From him came the lofty prayer — the noblest utterance of the creed of Israel — setting forth the distance and the nearness of the eternal God, one, incomprehensible, dwelling not in temples made with hands; yet ruling men, hearing their prayers, giving them all good things — wisdom, peace, righteousness.

The solemn day was followed by a week of festival, synchronizing with the Feast of Tabernacles, the time of the completed vintage. Representatives of all the tribes, elders, fathers; captains, proselytes, it may be, from the fiewly acquired territories in Northern Syria (2 Chronicles 6; 32; 7:8) — all were assembled, rejoicing in the actual glory and the bright hopes of Israel. For the king himself then, or at a later period (the narrative of ~~<400>~~1 Kings 9 and ~~<400>~~2 Chronicles 7 leaves it doubtful), there was a strange contrast to the glory of that day. A criticism, misled by its own acuteness, may see in that warning prophecy of sin, punishment, desolation, only a *vaticinium ex eventu*, added some centuries afterwards (Ewald, 3, 404). It is open to us to maintain that, with a character such as Solomon’s, with an irreligious ideal so far beyond his actual life, such thoughts were psychologically probable, that strange misgivings, suggested by the very words of the jubilant hymns of the day’s solemnity, might well mingle with the shouts of the people and the hallelujahs of the Levites. It is in harmony with all we know of the work of the Divine Teacher that those misgivings should receive an interpretation, that the king should be taught that what he had done was indeed right and good; but that it was not all, and might not be permanent. Obedience was better than sacrifice. There was a danger near at hand.

4. Idoldtry. — The dagger came, and, in spite of the warning, the king fell. Not very long afterwards the priests and prophets had to grieve over rival temples to Moloch, Chemosh, Ashtaroth; forms of ritual not idolatrous

only, but cruel, dark, impure. This evil came, as the compiler of ^{<11100>}1 Kings 11:1-8 records, as the penalty of another. Partly from policy, seeking fresh alliances, partly from the terrible satiety of lust seeking the stimulus of change, he gave himself to “strange women.” He found himself involved in a fascination which led to the worship of strange gods. The starting point and the goal are given us. We are left, from what we know otherwise, to trace the process. Something there was perhaps in his very “largeness of heart,” so far in advance of the traditional knowledge of his age, rising to higher and wider thoughts of God, which predisposed him to it. His converse with men of other creeds and climes might lead him to anticipate, in this respect, one phase of modern thought, as the confessions of the preacher in Koheleth anticipate another. In recognizing what was true in other forms of faith, he might lose his horror at what was false — his sense of the preeminence of the truth revealed to him — of the historical continuity of the nation’s religious life. His worship might go backward from Jehovah to Elohim, from Elohim to the “gods many and lords many” of the nations around. Jehovah, Baal, Ashtaroath, Chemosh, each form of nature worship, might come to seem equally true, equally acceptable. The women whom he brought from other countries might well be allowed the luxury of their own superstitions; and, if permitted at all, the worship must be worthy of his fame and be part of his magnificence. With this there may, as Ewald suggests (3, 380), have mingled political motives. He may have hoped, by a policy of toleration, to conciliate neighboring princes, to attract a larger traffic. But probably also there was another influence less commonly taken into account. The widespread belief of the East in the magic arts of Solomon is not, it is believed, without its foundation of truth. On the one hand, an ardent study of nature in the period that precedes science, runs on inevitably into the pursuit of occult, mysterious properties. On the other, throughout the whole history of Judah, the element of idolatry which has the strongest hold on men’s minds was the thaumaturgic soothsaying, incantations, divinations (^{<12000>}2 Kings 1:2, ^{<23016>}Isaiah 2:6; ^{<14316>}2 Chronicles 33:6 *et al.*). The religion of Israel opposed a stern prohibition to all such perilous yet tempting arts (^{<61810>}Deuteronomy 18:10 *et al.*). The religions of the nations around fostered them. Was it strange that one who found his progress impeded, in one path should turn into the other? So, at any rate, it was. The reign which began so gloriously was a step backward into the gross darkness of fetich worship. As he left behind him the legacy of luxury, selfishness, oppression, more than counterbalancing all the good of higher art and wider knowledge, so he left this, too, as an ineradicable

evil. Not less truly than the son of Nebat might his name have been written in history as Solomon the son of David who “made Israel to sin.” The idolatry of Solomon is commemorated in the traditionary name of “the Mount of Offense,” given to the southernmost peak of the range of which Olivet (q.v.) forms a part. (See Brucker, *De Salom. Idololatria* [Lips. 1755]; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 4, 562 sq.)

Disasters followed before long, as the natural consequence of what was politically a blunder as well as religiously a sin. The strength of the nation rested on its unity, and its unity depended on its faith. Whatever attractions the sensuous ritual which he introduced may have had for the great body of the people, the priests and Levites must have looked on the rival worship with entire disfavor. The zeal of the prophetic order, dormant in the earlier part of the reign, and, as it were, hindered from its usual utterances by the more dazzling wisdom of the king, was now kindled into active opposition. Ahijah of Shiloh, as if taught by the history of his native place, was sent to utter one of those predictions which help to work out their own fulfilment, fastening on thoughts before vague, pointing Jeroboam out to himself and to the people as the destined heir to the larger half of the kingdom, as truly called as David had been called to be the anointed of the Lord (^{<11128>}1 Kings 11:28-39). The king in vain tried to check the current that was setting strong against him. If Jeroboam was driven for a time into exile, it was only, as we have seen, to be united in marriage to the then reigning dynasty, and to come back with a daughter of the Pharaohs as his queen (Sept. *ut sup.*). The old tribal jealousies gave signs of renewed vitality. Ephraim was prepared once more to dispute the supremacy of Judah, needing special control (^{<11128>}1 Kings 11:28). With this weakness within there came attacks from without. Hadad and Rezon — the one in Edom, the other in Syria who had been foiled in the beginning of his reign, now found no effectual resistance. The king, prematurely old (about sixty-one), must have foreseen the rapid breaking up of the great monarchy to which he had succeeded. Rehoboam, inheriting his faults without his wisdom, haughty and indiscreet, was not likely to avert it.

5. Writings. — Of the inner changes of mind and heart which ran parallel with this history Scripture is comparatively silent. Something may be learned from the books that bear his name, which, whether written by him or not, stand in the canon of the Old Test. as representing, with profound, inspired insight, the successive phases of his life; something, also, from the fact that so little remains out of so much — out of the songs, proverbs,

treatises, of which the historian speaks (^{<1062>}1 Kings 4:32, 33). Legendary as may be the traditions which speak of Hezekiah as at one and the same time preserving some portions of Solomon's writings (^{<1101>}Proverbs 25:1) and destroying others, a like process of selection must have been gone through by the unknown rabbins of the Great Synagogue after the return from the exile. Slowly and hesitatingly they received into the canon, as they went on with their unparalleled work of the expurgation by a people of its own literature, the two books which have been the stumbling blocks of commentators — Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs (Ginsburg, *Koheleth*, p. 13-15). They give *excerpta* only from the 3000 proverbs. Of the thousand and five songs (the precise number indicates a known collection) we know absolutely nothing. They were willing to admit Koheleth for the sake of its ethical conclusion; the Song of Songs, because at a very early period, possibly even then, it had received a mystical interpretation (Keil, *Einleit. in das Alte Test.* § 127) — because it was, at any rate, the history of a love which, if passionate, was also tender and pure and true. But it is easy to see that there are elements in that poem — the strong delight in visible outward beauty, the surrender of heart and will to one overpowering impulse — which might come to be divorced from truth and purity, and would then be perilous in proportion to their grace and charm. (But see Rollin *Salom. a Scepticismo Defensus* [Rost. 1710].) Such a divorce took place, we know, in the actual life of Solomon. It could not fail to leave its stamp upon the idyls in which feeling and fancy uttered themselves. The poems of the son of David may have been like those of Hafiz. The scribes who compiled the canon of the Old Test. may have acted wisely, rightly, charitably to his fame in excluding them.

The wisdom of Solomon is specially dwelt on in Scripture — “God gave him wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand which is on the sea shore.” The term “heart” is often used for “mind,” and the meaning is, that Solomon was endowed with great faculties and capacities; and that his intellect was not only stored with vast and varied information, but was so active, shrewd, and penetrating as to be successful in its studies and investigations. He had at once an unwearying eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge, and he had also the creative power of genius. Nature and man were his study; botany and zoology shared his attention with men and manners; and his spirit gave utterance to its thoughts and emotions in poetry. He was a sage, a poet, and a naturalist — “he spake three thousand proverbs: and his songs were a thousand and

five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes” (^{<100B>}1 Kings 4:32, 33). The value of his zoological or botanical researches we know not. No doubt his knowledge took minute cognizance more of external peculiarity than of inner structure, but it may have had the rudiments of a science, though he may not be compared to Linnaeus or Hooker, Cuvier or Owen. He was not so absorbed in royal cares or royal state and luxury as to forget mental culture. Amid much that was weak and wrong, he was “yet acquainting his heart with wisdom” (^{<200B>}Ecclesiastes 2:3). The “wisdom of Egypt” was proverbial in geometry, astronomy, and medicine; but Solomon outstripped it. Arabia was the home of that sagacity that clothes itself in proverbs and of that subtlety which created riddles and queries; but “Solomon’s wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country.” There had been men of noted intelligence in his own country, such as Ethan, who had charge of the temple music in David’s time; Heman, one of the famous singers and “the king’s seer in the words of God;” and Chalcol and Darda; but Solomon was “wiser than all men” (^{<100B>}1 Kings 4:29-31). (See the monographs *De Sap. Sal.* by Moller [Kil. 1703], Lund [Upsala, 1705], and Scherer [Argent. 1770].)

The books that remain meet us, as has been said, as at any rate representing the three stages of his life. The Song of Songs brings before us the brightness of his youth; the heart as yet untainted; human love passionate, yet undefiled, and therefore becoming, under a higher inspiration—half consciously, it may be, to itself, but, if not, then unconsciously for others — the parable of the soul’s affections. (See Krummacher, *Solomon and Shulamith* [Lond. 1838].) Then comes in the Book of Proverbs, the stage of practical, prudential thought, searching into the recesses of man’s heart, seeing duty in little things as well as great, resting all duty on the fear of God, gathering, from the wide lessons of a king’s experience, lessons which mankind could ill afford to lose. Both in Ecclesiastes (^{<200B>}Ecclesiastes 2:12) and yet more in Proverbs (^{<300B>}Proverbs 1:11-17; 7:6-23) we may find traces of experiences gained in other ways. The graphic picture of the life of the robbers and the prostitutes of an Eastern city could hardly have been drawn but by one who, like Haroun al-Rashid and other Oriental kings, at times laid aside the trappings of royalty and plunged into the other extreme of social life, that so he might gain the excitement of a fresh sensation. The poet has become the philosopher, the

mystic has passed into the moralist. But the *man* passed through both stages without being permanently the better for either. They were to him but phases of his life which he had known and exhausted (²⁰⁰⁰Ecclesiastes 1:2). Therefore there came, as in the Confessions of the Preacher, the great retribution. The “sense that wore with time” avenged “the crime of sense.” There fell on him, as on other crowned voluptuaries, the weariness which sees written on all things, Vanity of vanities. Slowly only could he recover from that “vexation of spirit;” and the recovery was incomplete. It was not as the strong burst of penitence that brought to his father David the assurance of forgiveness. He could not rise to the height from which he had fallen, or restore the freshness of his first love. The weary soul could only lay again, with slow and painful relapses, the foundations of a true morality. *SEE ECCLESIASTES.*

Here our survey must end. We may not enter into the things within the veil, or answer either way the doubting question, Is there any hope? Others have not shrunk from debating that question, deciding, according to their formulae, that he did or did not fulfil the conditions of salvation so as to satisfy them, were they to be placed upon the judgment seat. It would not be profitable to give references to the patristic and other writers who have dealt with this subject. They have been elaborately collected by Calmet. (*Dict.* s.v. “Salomon, Nouvelle Dissert. de la Salut du Sal.”). It is noticeable and characteristic that Chrysostom and the theologians of the Greek Church are, for the most part, favorable, Augustine and those of the Latin, for the most part, adverse, to his chances of salvation. (See Petersen, *De Salute Salomonis* [Jen. 1665]; Reime, *Harmonia Vitse Salomonis* [ibid. 1711]; Ewald, *Salomo* [Gera, 1800].)

VI. *Legends.* — The impression made by Solomon on the minds of later generations is shown in its best form by the desire to claim the sanction of his name for even the noblest thoughts of other writers. Possibly in Ecclesiastes, certainly in the Book of Wisdom, we have instances of this, free from the vicious element of an Apocryphal literature. Before long, however, it took other forms. Round the facts of the history, as a nucleus, there gathers a whole world of fantastic fables, Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan refractions, colored and distorted according to the media through which they pass, of a colossal form. Even in the Targum of Ecclesiastes we find strange stories of his character. He and the rabbins of the Sanhedrim sat and drank wine together in Jabne. His *paradise* was filled with costly trees which the evil spirits brought him from India. The

casuistry of the rabbins rested on his *dicta*. Ashmedai, the king of the demons, deprived him of his magic ring, and he wandered through the cities of Israel weeping, and saying, I, the preacher, was king over Israel in Jerusalem (Koran, sur. 38; Ginsburg, *Koheleth*, app. 1, H). He left behind him spells and charms to cure diseases and cast out evil spirits; and for centuries incantations bearing his name were the special boast of all the “vagabond Jew exorcists” who swarmed in the cities of the empire (Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 2, 5; Just. Mart. *Respons. ad Orthod.* 55; Origen, *Comm. in Matthew.* 16:3). His wisdom enabled him to interpret the speech of beasts and birds, a gift shared afterwards, it was said, by his descendant Hillel (Koran, sur. 37; Ewald, 3, 407). He knew the secret virtues of gems and herbs (Fabricius, *Codex Pseudep. V. T.* p. 1042). The name of a well known plant, Solomon’s eal (*Convallaria majalis*), perpetuates the old belief. He was the inventor of the Syriac and Arabian alphabets (*ibid.* p. 1014).

2. Arabic imagination took a yet wilder flight. After a long struggle with the rebellious Afrits and Jinns, Solomon conquered them and cast them into the sea (Lane, *Arabian Nights*, 1, 36). The remote pre-Adamite past was peopled with a succession of forty Solomon’s ruling over different races, each with a shield and sword that gave them sovereignty over the Jinns. To Solomon: himself belonged the magic ring which revealed to him the past, the present, and the future. Because he stayed his march at the hour of prayer, instead of riding on with his horsemen, God gave him the winds as a chariot, and the birds flew over him, making a perpetual canopy. The demons, in their spite, wrote books of magic in his name; but he, being aware of it, seized them and placed them under his throne, where they remained till his death, and then the daemons again got hold of them and scattered them abroad (Koran, sur. 21; D’Herbelot, s.v. “Soliman ben Daoud”). The visit of the queen of Sheba furnished some three or four romances. The Koran (sur. 27) narrates her visit, her wonder, her conversion to the Islam, which Solomon professed. She appears under three different names — Nicaule (Calmet, *Dict.* s.v.), Balkis (D’Herbelot, s.v.), Makeda (Pineda, 5, 14). The Arabs claim her as belonging to Yemen; the Ethiopians as coming from Meroe. In each form of the story a son is born to her, which calls Solomon its father-in the Arab version, Meilekh; ill the Ethiopian, David, after his grandfather, the ancestor of a long line of Ethiopian kings (Ludolf, *Hist. Ethiop.* 2, 3-5). Twelve thousand Hebrews accompanied her on her return home, and from them were descended the

Jews of Ethiopia, and the great Prester John (Presbyter Joannes) of medieval travelers (D'Herbelot, *loc. cit.*; Pineda, *loc. cit.*; Corylus, *Diss. de Regina Austr.* in Menthen's *Thesaurus*, vol. 1). She brought to Solomon the self same gifts which the Magi afterwards brought to Christ. See MAGI. One, at least, of the hard questions with which she came was rescued from oblivion. Fair boys and sturdy girls were dressed up by her exactly alike, so that no eye could distinguish them. The king placed water before them and bade them wash; and then, when the boys scrubbed their faces and the girls stroked them softly, he made out which were which (Glycas, *Annal.* in Fabricius, *loc. cit.*). Versions of these and other legends are to be found also in Well, *Bibl. Legends*, p. 171; Furst, *Perlenschnure*, ch. 36.

3. The fame of Solomon spread northward and eastward to Persia. At Shiraz they showed the Meder-Suleiman, or tomb of Bath-sheba, said that Persepolis had been built by the Jinns at his command, and pointed to the Takht-i-Suleiman (Solomon's throne) in proof. Through their spells, too, he made his wonderful journey, breakfasting at Persepolis, dining at Baalbek, and supping at Jerusalem (Chardin, 3, 135, 143; Ouseley, 2, 41, 437). Persian literature, while it had no single life of David, boasted of countless histories of Solomon; one, the *Suleiman-Nameh*, in eighty books, ascribed to the poet Firdusi (D'Herbelot, *loc. cit.*; Chardin, 3, 198). In popular belief he was confounded with the great Persian hero Jemshid (Ouseley, 2, 64).

4. As might be expected, the legends appeared in their coarsest and basest form in Europe, losing all their poetry, the mere appendages of the most detestable of Apocrypha, books of magic, a Hygromanteia, a Contradictio Salomonis (whatever that may be) condemned by Gelasius, Incantationes, Clavicula, and the like. Two of these strange books have been reprinted in facsimile by Scheibel (*Kloster*, v). The *Clavicula Salomonis Necromantica* consists of incantations made up of Hebrew words; and the mightiest spell of the enchanter is the *Sigillum Salomonis*, engraved with Hebrew characters, such as might have been handed down through a long succession of Jewish exorcists. It is singular (unless this, too, was part of the imposture) that both the books profess to be published with the special license of popes Julius II and Alexander VI. Was this *the* form of Hebrew literature which they were willing to encourage? A pleasant Persian apologue teaching a lesson deserves to be rescued from the mass of fables. The king of Israel met one day the king of the ants, took the insect on his

had, and held converse with it, asking, Croesus like, "Am not I the mightiest and most glorious of men?" "Not so," replied the ant king. "Thou sittest on a throne of gold, but I make thy hand my throne, and thus am greater than thou" (Chardin, 3, 198). One pseudonymous work has a somewhat higher character, the *Psalterium Salomonis*, altogether without merit, a mere *cento* from the Psalms of David, but not otherwise offensive (Fabricius, 1, 917; Tregelles, *Introd. to the New Test.* p. 154), and therefore attached sometimes, as in the great Alexandrian Codex, to the sacred volume. One strange story meets us from the omnivorous *Note-book* of Bede. Solomon did repent, and in his contrition he offered himself to the Sanhedrim, doing penance, and they scourged him five times with rods, and then he traveled in sackcloth through the cities of Israel, saying as he went, "Give alms to Solomon" (Bede, *De Salom.* ap. Pineda).

VII. New-Testament Views. — We pass from this wild farrago of Jewish and other fables to that which presents the most entire contrast to them. The teaching of the New Test. adds nothing to the materials for a life of Solomon. It enables us to take the truest measure of it. The teaching of the Son of Man passes sentence on all that kingly pomp. It declares that in the humblest work of God, in the lilies of the field, there is a grace and beauty inexhaustible, so that even "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these" (⁽⁴¹⁶⁾Matthew 6:29). It presents to us the perfect pattern of a growth in wisdom, like, and yet unlike, his, taking, in the eyes of men, a less varied range; but deeper, truer, purer, because united with purity, victory over temptation, self sacrifice, the true large heartedness of sympathy with all men. On the lowest view which serious thinkers have ever taken of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, they have owned that there was in him one "greater than Solomon" (⁽⁴¹²⁾Matthew 12:42). The historical Son of David, ideally a *type* of the Christ that was to come, was in his actual life the most strangely contrasted. It was reserved for the true, the later, Son of David, to fulfil the prophetic yearnings which had gathered round the birth of the earlier. He was the true Shelomoh, the prince of peace, the true Jedid-jah, the well beloved of the Father. (See De Pineda, *De Rebus Salomonticis* [Cologne, 1613, 1686]; Hess, *Gesch. Salomons* [Zur. 1785]; Miller, *Lectures on Solomon* [Lond. 1838].)

Solomon's Gardens.

(⁽²¹¹⁵⁾Ecclesiastes 2:5). *SEE GARDEN.*

Solomon's Pools

Picture for Solomon's

(^{<2116>}Ecclesiastes 2:6). Of the various pools mentioned in Scripture, or usually regarded as such, perhaps the most celebrated are the Pools of Solomon in Wady Urtas, between Hebron and Bethlehem, called by the Arabs *el-Burak*, from which an aqueduct was carried which still supplies Jerusalem with water (Ecclus. 24:30, 31). They are three in number, partly hewn out of the rock, and partly built with masonry, but all lined with cement, and formed on successive levels, with conduits leading from the upper to the lower, and flights of steps from the top to the bottom of each (Sandys, *Trav.* p. 150). They are all formed in the sides of the valley of Etham, with a dam across its opening, which forms the east side of the lowest pool. Their dimensions are thus given by Dr. Robinson (*Bibl Res.* 1, 348, 374):

- (1.) Upper pool length 380 feet; breadth at the east 236 feet, at the west 229 feet; depth at the east 25 feet; distance above the middle pool 160 feet.
- (2.) Middle pool: length 423 feet; breadth at the east 250 feet, at the west 160 feet; depth 39 feet; distance above the lower pool 248 feet.
- (3.) Lower pool: length 582 feet; breadth at the east 207 feet, at the west 14.8 feet; depth 50 feet. They appear to be supplied in part from a spring in the ground above (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 311), but they are evidently filled mostly by surface water in the rainy season, as they drain the neighboring hillsides. The aqueduct has two lines, an upper and a lower level; the former tunnelling the hill, and the latter passing near the surface by way of Bethlehem (see *Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem*, Notes, p. 80 sq.). *SEE POOL.*

Solomon's Porch,

a name given in Scripture to two very different structures in Jerusalem:

- (a) The "porch of judgment" attached to the palace (^{<1007>}1 Kings 7:7), for which *SEE PALACE*; and
- (b) "Solomon's Porch," or portico (στοὰ Σολομῶνος), the outer eastern corridor of the Temple (^{<4302>}John 10:23; ^{<4311>}Acts 3:11; 5:12), for which *SEE TEMPLE.*

Solomon's Psalter.

SEE PSALTER OF SOLOMON.

Solomon's Servants

(*hmbv*]ydb]i Sept. υἱοὶ Ἀβδησελμά, ^{<4128>}Ezra 2:58; υἱοὶ δούλων Σαλωμών, ver. 55; ^{<4075>}Nehemiah 7:57, 60; Vulg. *fili servorum Salomonis*). The descendants ("sons") of persons thus named appear in the lists of the exiles who returned from the captivity. They occupy all but the lowest places in those lists, and their position indicates some connection with the services of the Temple. First come the priests, then Levites, then Nethinim, then "the children of Solomon's servants." In the Greek of 1 Esdr. 5:33, 35, the order is the same, but instead of Nethinim we meet with ἱερόδουλοι, "servants" or "ministers" of the Temple. In the absence of any definite statement as to their office, we are left to conjecture and inference.

(1.) The name, as well as the order, implies inferiority, even to the Nethinim. They are the descendants of the *slaves* of Solomon. The servitude of the Nethinim, "given to the Lord," was softened by the idea of dedication.

(2.) The starting point of their history is probably to be found in ^{<4053>}1 Kings 5:13, 14; 9:20, 21; ^{<4407>}2 Chronicles 8:7, 8. Canaanites, who had been living till then with a certain measure of freedom, were reduced by Solomon to the helot state, and compelled to labor in the king's stone quarries, and in building his palaces and cities. To some extent, indeed, the change had been effected under David, but it appears to have been then connected specially with the Temple, and the servitude under his successor was at once harder and more extended (^{<4320>}1 Chronicles 22:2).

(3.) The last passage throws some light on their special office. The Nethinim, as in the case of the Gibeonites, were appointed to be hewers of wood (^{<4023>}Joshua 9:23), and this was enough for the services of the tabernacle. For the construction and repairs of the Temple another kind of labor was required, and the new slaves were set to the work of hewing and squaring stones (^{<4057>}1 Kings 5:17, 18). Their descendants appear to have formed a distinct order, probably inheriting the same functions and the same skill. The prominence which the erection of a new Temple on their return from Babylon would give to their work accounts for the special

mention of them in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah. Like the Nethinim, they were in the position of proselytes, outwardly conforming to the Jewish ritual, though belonging to the hated race, and, even in their names, bearing traces of their origin (^{<1925>}Ezra 2:55-58). Like them, too, the great mass must either have perished, or given up their position, or remained at Babylon. The 392 of ^{<1925>}Ezra 2:55 (Nethinim included) must have been but a small fragment of the descendants of the 150,000 employed by Solomon (^{<1925>}1 Kings 5:15). *SEE NETHINIM.*

Solomon's Song.

SEE CANTICLES.

Solomon, Wisdom Of.

SEE WISDOM, BOOK OF.

Solomon Ben-Gebirol.

SEE IBN-GEBIROL.

Solomon Ben-Isaac.

SEE RASHI.

Solotaja Baba

(*the golden woman*), a deity of the Slavic mythology, who was worshipped in the extreme east of European Russia, and whose image was covered with gold. The nomads and hunters of the steppes offered her beasts taken from their herds, or the skins of animals taken in the chase. The hollow statue of the goddess was occupied by the priest who was selected to pronounce her oracles; and the opportunity so afforded was largely used to persuade the assembled shepherds to make more liberal offerings. The blood of the sacrifices was used to smear the eyes and mouth of the goddess, and what remained of the animal became the property of the servants.

Solus

(*alone*), a term used in old English registers to designate an unmarried man.

Soluta

(*free*), a term sometimes used in old English registers to designate a spinster.

Soma,

in Hindu mythology, the *moon*; also termed *Chandra*, was (1) an entire dynasty of Hindu kings who bore the title “children of the moon;” (2) the *moon-plant* (*Asclepias acida*), from which a milky juice was extracted, that, when mixed with barley and fermented, formed an intoxicating drink much used in the ancient Vedic worship. This plant was held sacred and worshipped by the Hindus of the Vaidic period. The hymns comprising one whole section of the Rig Veda are addressed to the Soma, and its deification is still more prominent in the Sama-Veda. As early as the Rig-Veda, the Soma sacrifice is called *amrita* (immortal), and in a secondary sense, the liquor which communicates immortality. It was the more important part of the ancient daily offering among the Hindus. The plants were gathered on the hills by moonlight, and brought home in carts drawn by rams; the stalks are bruised with stones and placed with the juice in a strainer of goat’s hair, and further squeezed by the priest’s ten fingers, ornamented by rings of flattened gold. Lastly, the juice, mixed with barley and clarified butter, ferments, and is then drawn off in a scoop for the gods, and in a ladle for the priests. They finally say to Indra (its discoverer), “Thy inebriety is most intense, nevertheless thy acts are most beneficent.” See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.; Butler, *Land of the Veda*, Glossary; Vollmer, *Wörterb. d., Mythol.* s.v.

Somaschians, The Order Of.

The Somaschians are a religious order in the Church of Rome, and their congregations rank with the most important institutions called into being by the effort to retard the progress of the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century. The name is derived from the solitary hamlet of Somascho, between Milan and Bergamo, where Girolamo Miani (Hieronymus Aemilianus), the founder, undertook the definitive organization of the order and wrote its first rule. Miani was a noble Venetian who served with distinction against Charles VIII and Louis XII, and who was given over to frivolity and worldliness until the capitulation of Castelnuovo, near Treviso, where he commanded, made him the prisoner of the Germans under Maximilian I (1508). He was thrown into a dark dungeon and there

abjured his sins, and vowed a thorough reformation, of life to God if he should once more become free. It is related that his prayers were heard, and that the Blessed Virgin caused his shackles to fall from his limbs and led him through the midst of the guard to freedom. He now renounced the dignity of podesta of Castelnuovo, given him in recognition of his bravery, and accepted an inferior position in Venice itself, where he displayed great benevolence in caring for the poor and the sick, especially during a famine and pestilence in 1528. Eventually, he devoted himself chiefly to the care of poor orphan children and fallen women. He founded an orphan asylum in connection with the Church of St. Roch in Venice, in 1528, and afterwards others in Verona, Bergamo, and Brescia. In 1532 he established a magdalen asylum in Venice; and finally he united with a number of like minded clergymen in founding a congregation for the care and administering of the institutions he had established, and for the training of young persons to succeed in that work. Pope Clement VII highly approved of this benevolent order, and favored it. Its seat was fixed at Somascho, though other houses were subsequently established at Pavia and Milan. Miani died Feb. 8, 1537. He was succeeded by Angelus Marcus Gambarana, under whose administration the community was solemnly constituted an order of regular clergy under the rule of St. Augustine, and denominated *Clerici Regulares S. Majoli Papioe Corigregationis Somaschae*, from a church in Pavia presented to them by archbishop Charles Borromeo of Milan. The order was afterwards temporarily united with the *Theatines* (1546-55), and with the *Fathers of Christian Doctrine* in France (1616-47), and increased largely in numbers and influence, so that in 1661 Alexander VII approved its division into three provinces — Lombard, Venetian, and Roman. It sustained numerous colleges, and was earnestly devoted to the instruction of the young. A French province was subsequently added.

The constitutions of the order are based on the ideas of its founder as collected by the procurator-general, Ant. Palinus, and approved by pope Urban VIII, and they have continued without essential change until now. They prescribe simple and poor clothing, in all respects like that of the regular clergy, simple food, frequent prayers by day and night, fastings, bodily mortifications, manual labor, care of the sick and of orphans, and the instruction of the young. They may be seen in Holstenius, *Cod. Reg. Mon.*, 3, 199-292; comp. also the Bollandists *Vita Hieronymi, Aemiliana*,

February, vol. 2; Helyot, *Gesch. d. Klosteru. Ritterorden*, 4, 263 sq.; Fehr, *Gesch. d. Monchsorden*, 2, 41 sq.,

Somasquo, Fathers Of.

SEE CLERKS OF ST. MAJOLUS; SEE SOMASCHIANS.

Somatist,

one who denies the existence of spiritual substances, and admits that of corporeal or material beings only. *SEE MATERIALISM.*

Somatology,

the doctrine of bodies or material substances.

Somerville, Mrs. Mary,

a distinguished scientist and mathematician, whose studies tended to the advancement of Christian learning, was born in Jedburgh, Scotland, Dec. 26, 1780, and was the daughter of admiral William Fairfax. In her early childhood she gave no promise of genius, but was apparently beneath mediocrity. Her mind was awakened to higher aspirations and endeavors by a slow and spontaneous process. At the age of eleven, while spending a vacation at Burned Island, she occupied her time gathering sea shells, the beginning of her knowledge of natural history. From her father she inherited a passion for flowers, and turned the garden of her home into a studio, the beginning of her love of botany. Two small globes in the house attracted her attention, and thus began her study in geography and astronomy. She soon learned to play on the piano, and in a little while became an accomplished painter, studying under Nasmyth in Edinburgh. The love of knowledge became an irrepressible passion. She took up Euclid alone, which she soon mastered; studied navigation, and taught herself Latin enough to read Caesar's *Commentaries*. In 1804 she was married to Samuel Greig, and resided in London. After three years she returned a widow with two children, to Burned Island, where she resumed her studies with more diligence than ever. Prof. Wallace, of Edinburgh University, gives the following catalogue of books which she mastered: Francour's *Pure Mathematics, Elements of Mechanics*; Lacroix's *Algebra, Differential Calculus, Finite Differences and Series*; Biot's *Analytical Geometry and Astronomy*; Poisson's *Treatise on Mechanics*; La Grange's *Theory of Analytical Functions*; Euler's *Algebra, Isoperimetrical*

Problems (in Latin.); Clairault's *Figure of the Earth*; Monge's *Application of Analysis to Geometry*; Callet's *Logarithms*; La Place's *Mecanique Celeste*, and *Analytical Theory of Probabilities*. In 1812 she married her cousin, Dr. William Somerville, who deeply sympathized with her in her studies. She soon became a correspondent of such men as Faraday and La Place, and was elected a member of most of the learned societies of Europe. Losing her fortune, she was dependent upon a government pension, first of one thousand, later of fifteen hundred pounds, and lived, for economy, many years in Italy. Mrs. Somerville continued to keep up her studies in her advanced years, working from 8 A.M. till 12 or 1 P.M., even in her ninetieth year. She died Nov. 29, 1872. Her works are, *Mechanism of the Heavens* (Lond. 1831, 8vo; Phila. 1832, 18mo): — *On the Connection of the Physical Sciences* (Lond. 1834, 12mo; 8th ed. 1849, 8vo; completely revised, 1859, 8vo; American editions, N.Y. 1846, etc. 12mo): — *Physical Geography* (Lond. 1848, 2 vols. 12mo; 2d ed. 1849; 3d ed. 1851; 4th ed. 1858, 8vo; 5th ed. 1862, 8vo; American editions, Phila. 1848, 1850, 1853, 1856, 12mo): — *On Molecular and Microscopic Science* (Lond. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo).

Sommer Or Summer Beam,

a main beam or girder in a floor, etc.; a name now seldom used except in the compound *breast summer*.

Sommer, Peter Nicholas,

a Lutheran minister, was born in Hamburg, Germany, Jan. 9, 1709. He received a thorough classical and professional education, and on the completion of his course was licensed as a theological candidate. He received a call from a Church in Schoharie County, N.Y., left for America Oct. 24, 1742, and arrived at his destination, May 25, 1743. Here for nearly fifty years he labored, having, a wide field, often travelling from thirty to fifty miles to care for destitute Lutheran settlements. In 1768 he was suddenly smitten with blindness, but still continued to serve the Church for about twenty years, when his sight was as unexpectedly restored. In 1788 he retired from the active ministry and removed to Sharon, Schoharie Co., N.Y., where he remained until his death, Oct. 27, 1795. "Mr. Sommer held a high rank in his denomination, as an able, earnest, laborious, and successful minister." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9, 13.

Sommier, Jean Claude,

a French prelate, was born July 22, 1661, at Vauvillers, and studied at Besancon, where he became doctor in theology and law. He was first curate of Girancourt, and afterwards (1696) at Champs. He became preacher to Leopold I of Lorraine, and was engaged in several important negotiations of state. Benedict XIII made him archbishop of Caesarea and prothonotary apostolic in 1725, and the same year he received the provostship of St. Die and other ecclesiastical honors. His zeal for clerical privileges involved him in a controversy with the bishop of Toul, which continued till his death, Oct. 3, 1737. He is the author of several works on local Church history, for which see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Sommonacodom,

in Siamese mythology, was a most wise legislator, who was conceived by his virgin mother from the sun. He traversed the world passing through repeated births until he had occupied five hundred and fifty bodies, and blesses the world with his teachings until his mission is accomplished and the earth is free from sin. He trained many pupils, and died from eating the flesh of a hog which contained the soul of an evil genius whom he had once conquered. Temples and numerous statues were erected in his honor throughout Siam.

Somnia (Dreams),

in Roman mythology, were children of Erebus and Night, whose palace in Tartarus had two gates, the one of ivory and the other of bone. From the latter issued the truthful, from the former the fanciful and deceptive, dreams.

Somnists,

a name for those who maintain that the soul is in an unconscious state from the time of death until the resurrection; called also *Soul Sleepers* (q.v.).

Somnus, Or Hypnos,

in Roman and Grecian mythology, was the god of *sleep*.

Somoda,

in Hindu mythology, is one of the most attractive of female genii, belonging to the race of the Gantharvas; a servant of the holy Tshuli.

Somovansham,

in Hindu mythology, is the famous family of kings which claimed descent directly from the moon (Soma or Chandra), and assumed the title of *Children of the Moon*.

Sompnour

(i.e. *summoner*), a term found in Chaucer and other of our older writers to designate the officer who is now called an apparitor, whose duty it is to *summon* delinquents to appear in ecclesiastical courts.

Son,

properly **Bēben** (often rendered in the plural “children”), **υἱός**. From the root **hnB**; *to build*, are derived both **B**; *son*, as in Ben-hanan, etc., and **tBj** *daughter*, as in Bath-sheba. The Chald. also **rBj** *son*, occurs in the Old Test., and appears in the New Test. in such words as Barnabas, but which in the plural **ˆynB** (^{<1366}Ezra 6:16) resembles more the Hebrew. Cognate words are the Arabic Beni, *sons*, in the sense of descendants, and Benat, *daughters* (Gesenius, *Theo. Hebr.* p. 215, 236; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 8). **SEE BAR**; **SEE BEN**.

1. The word “son” is used with a great variety and latitude of significations both in the Old and the New Test., especially in the former, some of which often disappear in a translation. The following is a summary of these applications: It denotes

(1) the immediate offspring.

(2.) Grandson: so Laban is called son of Nahor (^{<1026}Genesis 29:5), whereas he was his grandson, being the son of Bethuel (24:29); Mephibosheth is called son of Saul, though he was the son of Jonathan, son of Saul (^{<1024}2 Samuel 19:24).

(3.) Remote descendants: so we have the sons of Israel, many ages after the primitive ancestor.

(4.) Son-in-law: there is a son born to Naomi (<6047>Ruth 4:17).

(5.) Son by adoption, as Ephraim and Manasseh to Jacob (Genesis 48).
SEE ADOPTION.

(6.) Son by nation: sons of the East (<1083>1 Kings 4:30; <8008>Job 1:3).

(7.) Son by education, that is, a disciple: Eli calls Samuel his son (<9876>1 Samuel 3:6). Solomon calls his disciple his son in the Proverbs often, and we read of the sons of the prophets (<1135>1 Kings 20:35, *et al.*), that is, those under a course of instruction for ministerial service. In nearly the same sense a convert is called son (<5002>1 Timothy 1:2; <5004>Titus 1:4; <5010>Philemon 1:10; <4045>1 Corinthians 4:15; <40513>1 Peter 5:13). *SEE PROPHET.*

(8.) Son by disposition and conduct, as sons of Belial (<0792>Judges 19:22; <4022>1 Samuel 2:12), unrestrainable persons; sons of the mighty (<4920>Psalm 29:1), heroes; sons of the band (<4253>2 Chronicles 25:13), soldiers, rank and file; sons of the sorceress, who study or practice sorcery (<2578>Isaiah 57:3).

(9.) Son in reference to age: son of one year (<0215>Exodus 12:5), that is, one year old; son of sixty years, etc. The same in reference to a beast (<3086>Micah 6:6).

(10.) A production or offspring, as it were, from any parent: sons of the burning coal, that is, sparks which issue from burning wood (<8870>Job 5:7). “Son of the bow,” that is, an arrow (4:19), because an arrow issues from a bow; but an arrow may also issue from a quiver, therefore, son of the quiver (<2883>Lamentations 3:13). “Son of the floor,” threshed corn (<2210>Isaiah 21:10). “Sons of oil” (<3890>Zechariah 3:14), the branches of the olive tree.

(11.) Son of beating, that is, deserving beating (<4278>Deuteronomy 25:3). Son of death, that is, deserving death (<3028>2 Samuel 12:3). Son of perdition, that is, deserving perdition (<6372>John 17:12).

(12.) Son of God (q.v.), by excellence above all; Jesus the Son of God (<4001>Mark 1:1; <4015>Luke 1:35; <40134>John 1:34; <4004>Romans 1:4; <3044>Hebrews 4:14; <4028>Revelation 2:18). The only begotten; and in this he differs from Adam. who was son of God by immediate creation (<4018>Luke 3:18).

(13.) Sons of God (q.v.), the angels (^{<38006>}Job 1:6; 38:7), perhaps so called in respect to their possessing power delegated from God; his deputies, his vice regents; and in that sense, among others, his offspring.

(14.) Genuine Christians, truly pious persons; perhaps also so called in reference to their possession of principles communicated from God by the Holy Spirit, which, correcting every evil bias, and subduing every perverse propensity, gradually assimilates the party to the temper, disposition, and conduct, called the image, likeness, or resemblance of God. Believers are sons of God. (See ^{<38012>}John 1:12; ^{<38045>}Philippians 2:15; ^{<38084>}Romans 8:14; ^{<38081>}1 John 3:1.)

(15.) Sons of this world (^{<2068>}Luke 16:8) are those who, by their overweening attention to the things of this world, demonstrate their principles to be derived from the world; that is, worldly minded persons. Sons of disobedience (^{<38002>}Ephesians 2:2; 5:6) are persons whose conduct proves that they are sons of Belial, of unrestrainableness, sons of libertinism. Sons of hell (^{<38235>}Matthew 23:5). Sons of the devil (^{<38330>}Acts 13:10).

In addition to these senses in which the word son is used in Scripture, there are others which show the extreme looseness of its application. So when we read of sons of the bride chamber. (^{<38095>}Matthew 9:15; ^{<38029>}Mark 2:19) it merely indicates the youthful companions of the bridegroom, as in the instance of Samson. And when the holy mother was committed to the care of the apostle John (^{<38036>}John 19:36), the term son is evidently used with great latitude. *SEE DAUGHTER*, etc.

2. The blessing of offspring, but especially, and sometimes exclusively, of the male sex, is highly valued among all Eastern nations, while the absence is regarded as one of the severest punishments (Herod. 1, 136; Strabo, 15, 733; See ^{<38062>}Genesis 16:2 29:31; 30:1, 14; ^{<38074>}Deuteronomy 7:14; ^{<38006>}1 Samuel 1:6; 2, 5; 4:20; ^{<38063>}2 Samuel 6:23; 18:18; ^{<38044>}2 Kings 4:14; ^{<38079>}Isaiah 47:9; ^{<38005>}Jeremiah 20:15; ^{<38094>}Hosea 9:14; ^{<38051>}Esther 5:11 ^{<38078>}Psalms 127:3, 5; ^{<38008>}Ecclesiastes 6:3. Comp. Drusius, *Proverbs Ben-Siroe*, in *Crit. Sacr.* 8, 1887; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1, 208, 240; Poole [Mrs.], *Englishw. in Egypt*, 3, 163; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Ar.* p. 67; Chardin, *Voy.* 7, 446; Russell, *Nubia*, p. 343). Childbirth is in the East usually, but not always, attended with little difficulty, and accomplished with little or no assistance (^{<38057>}Genesis 35:17; 38:28; ^{<38019>}Exodus 1:19; ^{<38049>}1 Samuel 4:19, 20; see Burckhardt, *Notes on Bedouins*, 1, 96; Harmer, *Obs.* 4, 425;

Montagu [Lady M.W.], *Letters*, 2, 217, 219, 222). As soon as the child was born, and the umbilical cord cut, it was washed in a bath, rubbed with salt, and wrapped in swaddling clothes. Arab mothers sometimes rub their children with earth or sand (^{<2364>}Ezekiel 16:4; ^{<1889>}Job 38:9; ^{<4117>}Luke 2:7; see Burckhardt, *loc. cit.*). On the eighth day the rite of circumcision in the case of a boy was performed, and a name given, sometimes, but not usually, the same as that of the father, and generally conveying some special meaning (^{<0204>}Genesis 21:4; 29:32, 35; 30:6, 24; ^{<0823>}Leviticus 12:3; ^{<2174>}Isaiah 7:14; 8:3; ^{<0159>}Luke 1:59; 2:21). Among Mohammedans, circumcision is most commonly delayed till the fifth, sixth, or even the fourteenth year (Spencer, *De Legg. Hebr.* 5, 62; Strabo, 17, 824; Herod. 2, 36, 104; Burckhardt, *ut sup.*; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1, 87; Poole [Mrs.], *Englishw. in Egypt*, 3, 158; Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 70). **SEE CIRCUMCISION.** After the birth of a male child the mother was considered unclean for 7+33 days; if the child was a female, for double that period, 14+66 days. At the end of the time she was to make an offering of purification of a lamb as a burned offering, and a pigeon or turtle dove as a sin offering; or, in case of poverty, two doves or pigeons, one as a burned offering; the other as a sin offering (^{<0823>}Leviticus 12:1-8; ^{<0122>}Luke 2:22). The period of nursing appears to have been sometimes prolonged to three years (^{<2495>}Isaiah 49:15; 2 Macc. 7:27; comp. Livingstone, *Travels*, 6, 126; but Burckhardt leads to a different conclusion). The Mohammedan law enjoins mothers to suckle their children for two full years if possible (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1, 83; Poole [Mrs.], *Englishw. in Egypt*, 3, 161). Nurses were employed in cases of necessity (^{<0259>}Genesis 24:59; 35:8; ^{<0109>}Exodus 2:9; ^{<0104>}2 Samuel 4:4; ^{<2102>}2 Kings 11:2; ^{<0221>}2 Chronicles 22:11). The time of weaning was an occasion of rejoicing (^{<0208>}Genesis 21:8). Arab children wear little or no clothing for four or five years. The young of both sexes are usually carried by the mothers on the hip or the shoulder, a custom to which allusion is made by Isaiah (^{<2422>}Isaiah 49:22; 66:12; see Lane, *Mod., Egypt.* 1, 83). Both boys and girls in their early years, boys probably till their fifth year, were under the care of the women (^{<0100>}Proverbs 31:1; see Herod. 1, 136; Strabo, 15, 733; Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 24). Afterwards the boys were taken by the father under his charge. Those in wealthy families had tutors or governors (μὴτρος, παιδαγωγός), who were sometimes eunuchs (^{<0412>}Numbers 11:12; ^{<0201>}2 Kings 10:1, 5; ^{<2423>}Isaiah 49:23; ^{<0124>}Galatians 3:24; ^{<0100>}Esther 2:7; See Josephus, *Life*, § 76; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1, 83). Daughters usually remained in the women's apartments till marriage, or, among the poorer classes, were employed in household work (^{<0209>}Leviticus 21:9; ^{<0424>}Numbers

12:14; <0911>1 Samuel 9:11; <3819>Proverbs 31:19, 23; Ecclus. 7:25; 42:9; 2 Macc. 3:19). The example, however, and authority of the mother were carefully upheld to children of both sexes (<0211>Deuteronomy 21:20; <3101>Proverbs 10:1; 15:20; <1129>1 Kings 2:19).

The first born male children were regarded as devoted to God, and were to be redeemed by an offering (<0233>Exodus 13:13; <0485>Numbers 18:15; <0322>Luke 2:22). Children devoted by special vow, as Samuel was, appear to have been brought up from very early years in a school or place of education near the tabernacle or temple (<0024>1 Samuel 1:24, 28). *SEE EDUCATION.*

The authority of parents, especially the father, over children was very great, as was also the reverence enjoined by the law to be paid to parents. The disobedient child, the striker or reviler of a parent, was liable to capital punishment, though not at the independent will of the parent. Children were liable to be taken as slaves in case of non-payment of debt, and were expected to perform menial offices for them, such as washing the feet, and to maintain them in poverty and old age. How this last obligation was evaded, *SEE CORBAN*. The like obedience is enjoined by the Gospel (<0324>Genesis 38:24; <0209>Leviticus 21:9; <0424>Numbers 12:14; <0346>Deuteronomy 24:16; <1129>1 Kings 2:19; <1246>2 Kings 14:6; 4:1; <2101>Isaiah 1:1; <4185>Nehemiah 5:5; <0349>Job 24:9; <3101>Proverbs 10:1; 15:20; 29:3; <3131>Colossians 3:20; <0001>Ephesians 6:1; <5019>1 Timothy 1:9. Comp. Virg. *Aen.* 6, 609; and Servius, *ad loc.*; Aristoph. *Ran.* 146; Plato, *Phoedo*, 144; *De Legg.* 9. See Drusius, *Quoest. Hebr.* 2, 63, in *Crit. Sacr.* 8, 1547),

The legal age was twelve, or even earlier, in the case of female, and thirteen for a male (Maimon. *De Pros.* c. 5; Grotius and Calmet, *On* <0321>*John* 9:21).

The inheritance was divided equally between all the sons except the eldest, who received a double portion (<0217>Deuteronomy 21:17; <0251>Genesis 25:31; 49:3; <4385>1 Chronicles 5:1, 2; <0712>Judges 11:2, 7). Daughters had by right no portion in the inheritance; but if a man had no son, his inheritance passed to his daughters, but they were forbidden to marry out of their father's tribe (<0270>Numbers 27:1, 8; 36:2, 8) *SEE CHILD.*

Son,

in Norse mythology, was one of the barrels in which Fialar and Galar caught the blood of the white Quasar, in order to brew from it the mead which produced poetic intoxication.

Son of God.

This expression occurs, and even with some frequency, in the plural before it is found in the singular; that is, in the order of God's revelations it is used in a sense applicable to a certain class or classes of God's creatures prior to its being employed as the distinctive appellation of One to whom it belongs in a sense altogether peculiar. It seems necessary, therefore, in order to obtain a natural and correct view of the subject, that we first look at the more general use of the expression, and then consider its specific and higher application to the Messiah.

1. SONS OF GOD viewed generally. We first meet with this designation in a passage which has from early times been differently understood. It is at ^{<0064}Genesis 6:14, where, in reference to the growing corruption of antediluvian times, it is said, "The sons of God (*bene Elohim*) saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose" (that is, having regard only to natural attraction). And again, "There were giants in the earth (literally, the nephilim were on the earth") in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare [children] unto them, these were the mighty men (the heroes, ^{yr Esh}) who were of old, men of renown." The sons of God in these verses, say many of the Jewish interpreters, were persons of quality, princes and nobles, and the daughters of men they married were females of low birth as if the climax of disorder and corruption in the Bible sense were marrying below one's rank! Such a view carries improbability in its very front, and is without any support in the general usage of the terms. In the Apocryphal book of Enoch, then by many of the fathers, and in later times not a few Catholic and Lutheran theologians (including among the last. class Stier, Hofmann, Kurtz, Delitzsch), the sons of God is a name for the angels, in this case, of course, fallen angels; who they think form the only proper contrast to the daughters of men. In other passages, also, angels are undoubtedly called "sons of God" (^{<0065}Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; ^{<0065}Daniel 3:25) and "sons of Elim," or the Mighty (^{<0065}Psalms 29:1; 89:7). There are, however, other passages

in which men standing in a definite relation to God, his peculiar people, are so called. Israel, as the elect nation, is called his son, his first born (^{<002>}Exodus 4:22); but within this circle a narrower circle still bore the name of his sons, as contradistinguished from those who corrupted themselves and fell away to the world (^{<035>}Deuteronomy 32:5); and those who had backslidden, but again returned, were to be designated sons of the living God (^{<010>}Hosea 1:10). Also in ^{<017>}Psalm 80:17, Israel in the stricter sense, as the elect seed, is named the son whom God (Elohim) made strong for himself. There seems no reason, therefore, for supposing that the expression “sons of God” should be understood of angels any more than of men. Its actual reference must be determined from the connection, and in the case under consideration angels are on various accounts necessarily excluded. For

- (1) the procedure ascribed to those sons of God — choosing beautiful women for wives and marrying them — cannot, without the greatest incongruity, be associated with angelic natures, among which there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage (^{<035>}Luke 20:35, 36). Even carnal intercourse between such parties was impracticable; but the actual taking of wives (the term, used being that uniformly employed to denote the marriage relationship) is still more abhorrent to the ideas set forth in Scripture as to the essential distinctions between the region of spirits and the world of sense.
- (2.) If a relation of the kind had been possible, it would still have been entirely out of place in such a narrative, where the object of the historian manifestly is to trace the progress of *human* corruption—implying that the prominent actors in the drama were men, and not beings of another sphere. Hence, immediately after the first notice of the angels of God marrying the daughters of men, the Lord says, “My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh” (^{<003>}Genesis 6:3); as if the whole quarrel were with the partakers of flesh and blood.
- (3.) The moral bearing and design of the narrative also point in the same direction, which undoubtedly aimed at presenting, from the state of things which drew on the Deluge, a solemn warning to the Israelites against those heathen marriages which brought incalculable mischief on the covenant people.
- (4.) In like manner, the allusion of our Lord to the marrying and giving in marriage before the Flood as things which were going to be repeated after

the same fashion before the second advent (~~Q177~~ Luke 17:27) requires them to be understood of earthly relationships, otherwise the allusion could have furnished no proper parallel to the state of things anticipated in the last days, and would have been beside the mark. (See Stosch, *De Filiis Dei* [Lingae, 1749]; Quintorp, *ibid.* [Rost. 1751]; Scholz, *Ehe d. Sohne Gottes*, etc. [Ratisb. 1866].)

We are therefore decidedly of opinion that by “Sons of God” in the narrative of Genesis is meant, as the great body of the best interpreters have understood it, a select class of men on earth, those who belonged to the line that had maintained in a measure the true filial relationship to God (the Sethites). Though fallen and sinful, yet, as children of faith and heirs of promise, they were the spiritual as well as natural offspring of one who was originally made in God’s image, and who still through grace could look up to God as a father. From this select class the Cainites were cut off, the unbelieving and godless spirit they manifested showing them to be destitute of the childlike spirit of faith and love; whence Adam and Eve, by reckoning their seed only through Seth, had in a manner disowned them. Alienated from God, the offspring of Cain were merely sons of men, and their daughters might fitly be called in an emphatic sense the daughters of men, because knowing no higher parentage. But the other class contained members of a family of God on earth; for, if in that olden time there were pious men, who, like Enoch and Noah, walked with God, or who, even if they did not stand in this close, priestly relation to God, made the divine image a reality through their piety and fear of God, then these were sons of God (Elohim), for whom the only correct appellation was ‘sons of Elohim,’ since sonship to Jehovah was only introduced with the call of Israel” (Keil). The name in question, “sons of God,” was made prominent at the critical time when it was on the eve of becoming altogether inapplicable in order the more distinctly to show how willing God was to own the relationship as long as he well could, and how grievous a degeneracy discovered itself when the distinction belonging to them as God’s elect began practically to be obliterated by their ungodly alliances with the world. It is impossible here to enter into the collateral arguments urged by those who oppose the view given in the text and understand by “sons of God” the fallen angels. They are chiefly two. They conceive the *nephilim* (q.v.), the men of gigantic energy, or superhuman might, mentioned in ~~Q004~~ Genesis 6:4, to be the product of those unnatural connections, and a proof of it. But the text speaks of the nephilim as being on the earth before the improper marriages

in question were formed; and it is not at all clear that the *gibborim*, or “mighty men” subsequently referred to, were the same or similar persons (see Keil, *On* ^{<0004>}*Genesis* 6:4). The other line of support is derived from the supposed reference, in *Jude* 6:7, to the wickedness of the fallen angels in a lustful and fleshly direction, as, if they left their proper habitation to mingle in the pollutions of sensual indulgence here; but this is quite a fanciful interpretation. The sensuality and defiling of the flesh spoken of have reference, not to them, but to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, who indulged in wanton and rebellious courses like the angels, but in these took, of course, a different direction. Going after fornication, or strange flesh, implies, as Keil remarks, a flesh of one’s own (*ἴδια σάρξ*), which the angels had not.

It was thus plainly in reference to men’s moral state and relationship that the epithet “sons of God” was applied to some before the Deluge; and so was it ever afterwards. In a mere physical sense, as having derived their being from God, men are not in Scripture designated his sons; though there is an approach to it in the appropriation by Paul of a passage from a heathen poet (“We are also his offspring,” ^{<4178>}*Acts* 17:28), in order to give it a higher application. Israel, when about to be called out of Egypt, or when actually delivered, was called collectively the son of Jehovah, or, in the-plural, sons (^{<0102>}*Exodus* 4:22,;23; *Deuteronomy* 14:1; ^{<2100>}*Hosea* 11:1); and this because they were by special election and privilege called to be “a holy people unto Jehovah their God, and Jehovah had chosen them to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth” (^{<0142>}*Deuteronomy* 14:2; ^{<0215>}*Exodus* 19:5, 6). In this sense .are to be understood all the passages which speak of God as the Father, the Former, or Begetter, of Israel (^{<0528>}*Deuteronomy* 32:18; ^{<0427>}*Jeremiah* 2:27; ^{<2618>}*Isaiah* 64:8; ^{<3105>}*Malachi* 1:6; 2, 10). The sonship they indicate is one of a moral or spiritual nature, having its origin in the free grace of God. and its visible manifestation in the peculiar relation of Israel to the knowledge, service, and blessing of Jehovah. They are also called God’s first born, because the distinction thus conferred upon them was not to, be theirs exclusively; they only took precedence of others, and received their place and privileges in order that through them all the nations of the earth might be similarly blessed. But from the manifest failing, on the part of the great body of the people, to fulfil their calling and destiny, the sonship was again, as it were, denied of the collective Israel, and limited to the better portion of them. The one had not the marks of true children (^{<0535>}*Deuteronomy* 32:5), and

the other alone could properly call God Father, or be owned by him as sons (^{<249B>}Jeremiah 3:4; ^{<281D>}Hosea 1:10). And even in their case all was imperfect, and could not but be till “the time of reformation,” when God’s purpose of grace reached its full development, and the partakers of it attained to a far higher position in the gifts and blessings of the divine; kingdom. From that time it was formally as the regenerate, those who have been born again of God or have received from him the adoption, that they become members of the kingdom (^{<481D>}John 1:12, 13; 3:3, 5; ^{<488F>}Galatians 3:5, etc.); and the Spirit is conferred upon them, not with a kind of secrecy and reserve, but in the full plenitude of grace, and expressly as the spirit of sonship or adoption, leading them to cry in a manner altogether peculiar, “Abba, Father” (^{<481S>}Romans 8:15). As compared with this higher stage of sonship, those who lived in earlier times, while they enjoyed the reality, scarcely knew how to use it. In the tone of their spirits and the general environments of their condition they approached al; nearer to the state of servants than that of sons. *SEE ABBA.*

2. SON OF GOD, in its special application to Jesus Christ. Even in Old-Test. Scripture, and with respect to the participation of sonship by the common members of the covenant, there was, as already stated, a narrowing of the idea of sonship to those in whom it was actually realized: But within that narrow circle there was a narrower still of which divine sonship was predicated, and this in connection with the family of David, the royal house. Even in the first formal announcement of God’s mind on the subject, when the prophet Nathan declared so distinctly that David’s son should also be God’s son, and that the throne of his son’s kingdom should be established forever (^{<10714>}2 Samuel 7:14-16), there was an elevation of the idea of sonship beyond what had yet been given in the revelations of God to his people. The king on the throne of Israel in David’s line was to be in the most emphatic sense God’s son — combining, therefore, royalty and sonship and this associated with actual perpetuity. Could such things be supposed to have their full accomplishment in a son who had about him only the attributes of humanity? Must not the human, in order to their realization, be in some peculiar manner interpenetrated with the divine? Thoughts of this description could scarcely fail to occur to contemplative minds from the consideration of this prophecy alone; but other and still more explicit utterances were given to aid, their contemplations and render their views in this respect more definite. For David himself in ^{<481D>}Psalm 2 speaks of the future God-anointed king of

Zion as so anointed and destined to the irreversible inheritance of the kingdom, just because he was Jehovah's son and had a right to wield Jehovah's power and exercise his sovereignty to the utmost bounds of the earth. This seemed to bespeak for him who was to be king by way of eminence an essentially divine standing; and in ^{<BIB>}Psalm 45 he is addressed formally as God, whose throne should be for ever and ever. The same strain was caught up at a later period by Isaiah (^{<BIB>}Isaiah 7:14), where it is said of the child one day to be born in the house of David of a virgin that he should be Immanuel (God with us), and, again, in 9:6, that the child so singularly to be given should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God (literally, the God here), the Everlasting Father the Prince of Peace" — epithets which had been unmeaning, or at least extravagantly hyperbolic, if the destined bearer of them had not been possessed of strictly divine attributes. So, also, in the prophet Micah, the contemporary of Isaiah, it is affirmed of the future ruler of Israel, whose birth was to throw a peculiar glory around the little town of Bethlehem, that his goings-forth have been from old, from everlasting (5:2). It is but to give a specific application to these prophecies, and to many besides that spoke of the glorious powers and prerogatives of Him who should come as the angel or messenger of the covenant to redeem his people and rectify the affairs of the divine kingdom, when at the beginning of the Gospel era the birth was announced of one who should be called the Son of the Highest, and who should sit on the throne of David (^{<BIB>}Luke 1:32); and when this same person, as soon as he had begun to manifest himself to the people, was acknowledged as at once "the King of Israel and the Son of God" (^{<BIB>}John 1:49).

Nothing, however can be more clear from the records of New Test. Scripture than that the Jews, while they expected a Messiah who should be king of Israel, were all but unanimous in the rejection of the idea that he should be possessed of a nature essentially divine. They could scarcely doubt that he was to enjoy in a very peculiar manner the favor and help of God so as to occupy the very highest rank among God's messengers to men; but there is no evidence that they carried the matter higher (Schottgen's proofs [*De Messia*, vol. 3] to the contrary are insufficient); and, accordingly, whenever our Lord made declarations which amounted to an assumption of proper divinity, he was always met by an uncompromising opposition, except within the circle of his immediate disciples. Once and again, when he spoke in such a way as to convey the

impression that God was his own (ἰδιος) Father — Father in a sense that implied equality of nature — the Jews proceeded to deal with him as a blasphemer (^{}John 5:18; 8:59; 10:30-33). When assuming the divine prerogative of forgiving sins, they charged him in their hearts with blasphemy (^{}Matthew 9:3) but, so far from desisting from the claim, he appealed on the spot to what should have been regarded as an incontrovertible proof of his right to maintain it — his power and capacity to perform an essentially divine work. When at a later period he challenged them, to reconcile their belief in the fact as to the Christ being David's son with David's own recognition of him as his Lord, they were unable to meet it (^{}Luke 20:41-44), plainly because they were unprepared to allow any strictly divine element in the constitution of Christ's person. Finally, when driven from all other grounds of accusation against Jesus, they at last found their capital charge against him in his confession that he was the Son of the living God (^{}Matthew 26:63-66). In all the passages referred to, and very specially in the last, it admits of no doubt both that Jesus claimed a really divine character and that his adversaries rejected the claim and held the very making of it to be a capital crime. Jesus knew perfectly that they so understood him, and yet he deliberately accepts their interpretation of his words, nay, consents to let the sentence pronounced against him run, its course rather than abandon or modify the claim to divinity on which it was grounded. The conclusion is inevitable on both sides: on the side of the Jewish authorities that the idea of divine sonship was utterly abhorrent to their view of the expected Messiah, while in the mind of Jesus it was only as possessing such a sonship that the real characteristics of the Messiah could be found in him. Stier, however, has conclusively shown (*Words of the Lord Jesus*, on ^{}John 9:36) that the title "Son of God" was not a mere equivalent for "Messiah."

The mistake of the Jews respecting the person of Christ did not come of itself; it sprang from superficial views of the work of Christ. The national king of Israel, such as they had come to anticipate in the Messiah, might have been a mere man only specially assisted by God. There was nothing in the contemplated office which lay above the reach of human capacity or prowess, and it could not appear otherwise than blasphemy to associate with it an incarnation of Deity. Had they seen the more essential part of the work to lie in the reconciliation of iniquity, and laying open, through an atonement of infinite value and a righteousness all perfect and complete, the way to eternal life for a perishing world, they would have seen that

unspeakably higher than human powers were needed for the task. Misapprehending the conditions of the great problem that had to be solved, they utterly mistook the kind of qualifications required for its solution, and remained blind to the plainest testimonies of their own Scriptures on the subject. They alone saw it who came to know Jesus as the Savior of sinners, the Redeemer of the world; and their testimony to his divine character was, like his own, explicit and uniform. If, as has been well said gathering up the substance of their statements and our Lord's own on the subject — “if the only begotten and we beloved Son of God, who always was, and is to be, in the bosom of the Father, in the nearness and dearness of an eternal fellowship and an eternal sonship; who is the manifestation, the expression, the perfect image of God, such a reflection of his glory and express image of his person that whoever has seen the Son has seen the Father also; who is the agent and representative of God in the creation and preservation of the material and the spiritual universe, in the redemption of the Church and the reconciliation of the world and the government of both, in the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment of men and angels, in all divine attributes and acts, so that he is manifestly the acting Deity of the universe if he is not God, there is no actual or possible evidence that there *is* any God” (Dr. Tyler, in *Bibl. Sacra* for October, 1865). *SEE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.*

Son of Man.

This designation, which, like the Son of God, is now chiefly associated with Christ, has also an Old as well as a New Test. usage; it had a general before it received a specific application. In a great variety of passages it is employed as a kind of circumlocution for *man*, with special reference to his frail nature and humble condition; as, when speaking of God, it is said, “He is not the son of man that he should repent” (⁴⁰²³⁹Numbers 23:19); and “What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?” (⁴⁹⁸⁰Psalms 8:4). For some reason not certainly known, but probably from its being either a mere adoption of Chaldaean usage, or its possessing a sort of poetical and measured form, the designation “son of man” is the style of address commonly employed in Ezekiel's writings when he was called to hear the word of God (⁴³⁰¹Ezekiel 2:1; 3:1, etc.). That Chaldaean usage had, at least, something to do with it may be inferred from its similar employment by Daniel; as, when speaking of a heavenly messenger appearing to him in the visions of God, he describes the appearance as being of one, not simply like a man, but “like the similitude

of the sons of men” (^{<3106>}Ezekiel 10:16), while in other parts of the description this is interchanged with the simple designation or appearance of a man (^{<3101>}Ezekiel 5:18). Nor have we any reason to think that, as regards the expression itself, anything else is indicated by “son of man” in the vision of Daniel which most directly points to New Test. times and relations. In that vision, after beholding successively four different monstrous and savage forms imaging so many earthly monarchies, the prophet saw “like a son of man came with the clouds, of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him” (7:13, 14). The expression here, “like a son of man,” is evidently equivalent to one having a human aspect, and as such differing essentially from those beastly and rapacious natures that had already passed in vision before him. The kingdoms represented by such natures, though presided over by human beings, were to be characterized by the caprice, selfishness, and cruelty — which were instinctively suggested by those ideal heads; while in the higher kingdom that should come after them, and which was really to attain to the universality and perpetuity that they vainly aspired after, there were to be the possession and display of qualities distinctively human — those, namely, which are the image and reflex of the divine. This, however, it could only be by the head of the kingdom himself occupying a higher platform than that of fallen humanity, and being able to pervade this lower sphere with the might and the grace of Godhead. Hence in the vision, not only is ideal humanity made to image the character of the kingdom, but the bearer of it appears coming in the clouds of heaven, the proper chariot of Deity — as himself being from above rather than from beneath — emphatically, indeed, the Lord from heaven. It may be regarded as certain that in so frequently choosing for himself the designation of “the Son of man” (in all fully fifty times), our Lord had respect to the representation in Daniel. It was the title under which, with a few rare exceptions, he uniformly spoke of himself; and it is remarkable how, when acquiescing in his right to be acknowledged by others in the most peculiar sense “the Son of God,” he sometimes immediately after substituted for this the wonted designation of “the Son of man” (^{<3149>}John 1:49-51; ^{<1163>}Matthew 26:63, 64), as if to show that what belonged to the Son of God might equally be affirmed (when the terms were rightly understood) of the Son of man. This comes out with peculiar force in the latter of the two passages referred to; for no sooner had our Lord confessed to the adjuration of the high priest as to his being the Son of God than he added, “Hereafter ye shall see the Son

of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven,” appropriating the very language in Daniel’s vision, and asserting of himself as Son of man what belonged to him as the fellow of Godhead. Along with and behind the attribution of humanity, which he loved to place in the foreground, there lay the heavenly majesty. Hence, while the epithet in question may well enough be understood to imply that Jesus was “the ideal man” (which is all that rationalistic interpreters would find in it), it includes much more than that it makes him known as the new man, who had come from heaven, and in whom, because in him the Word was made flesh, manhood had attained to the condition in which it could fulfil the high destiny of exercising lordship for God over “the world to come” (~~8015~~ Hebrews 2:5).

By this title, then, to use the words of Luthardt, “Jesus, on the one side, includes himself among other men — he is one of our race; while, on the other, he thereby exalts himself above the whole race besides, as in a truly exclusive sense the Son of mankind, its genuine Offspring — the one Man towards whom the whole history of the human race was tending, in whom it found its unity, and in whom history finds its turning point as the close of the old and the commencement of the new era.” But this, coupled with the authority and power of judgment which he asserts for himself over all flesh as the Son of man, bespeaks his possession of the divine as well as of the human nature. “No rationalistic ideal of virtue can avail us here. To call Jesus the mere prototype, and prefigurement of mankind, will not suffice to justify such language; we are constrained to quit the limits of humanity, and to look for the root of his being, the home of his nature and life, in God himself to explain, the possibility of such declarations. The absolute relation to the world which he attributes to himself demands an absolute relation to God. The latter is the necessary postulate of, the former, which cannot be properly understood but from this point of view. Only because Jesus is to God what he is can he be to us what he says. He is the Son of man, the Lord of the world, its judge, only because he is the Son of God” (*Fundamental Truths of Christianity*, p. 289, 290). For literature, see Hase, *Leben Jesu*. p. 127.

Sonargaultr,

in Norse mythology, was the great golden boar which was placed on the table of the heroes on every recurring Juel evening, and upon whose back

they placed their hands while making the vows which were to bind them during the ensuing year.

Soncino.

This appellation designates a Jewish family who won a lasting name by their early and extensive enterprises in Hebrew typography. They were of German origin, and may be traced to the city of Spire, but take the name by which they are best known from Soncino, a small town in Lombardy, where they established a press, from which issued a number of valuable works in Hebrew literature, more especially some of the earliest printed Hebrew Bibles. The first production of the Soncino press is the treatise *Berakoth*, dated 1484, a full description of which is given by De Rossi in *Annales Hebreo-Typographici*, Sec. 15 (Parmae, 1795), p. 28 sq. The printer was Joshua Solomon ben-Israel Nathan, who was the head of the family, and with him was associated his brother Moses, whose son Gerson established a press at Constantinople. In the preface the printer speaks of himself as "Gerson, a man of Soncino, the son of R. Moses, the son of the wise and excellent R. Israel Nathan ben-Samuel ben-Rabbi Moses, being of the fifth generation from the rabbi Moses of Spirah." Soon after the printing of the treatise *Berakoth* this press issued the *former* and *later* prophets (i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets), with Kimchi's commentary. The whole comprises 459 leaves. The first word in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel (**whyw**) is printed in large letters; in the greater and smaller prophets the first word is wanting, but a great space is left. Neither pages, chapters, nor verses are numbered; above the text the name of the book is printed. Each page is divided into two columns; the commentary stands below the text, which has no minuscular or majuscular letters, no vowels or accents. A full description of this part of the Old Test. (Soncino, 1485-86) is given in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 8, 51 sq., together with its variations. At the same time (1486) there appeared the five Megilloth, i.e. Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, and also the Psalter; and two years later (1488) the *Biblia Hebraica Integra, cum Punctis et Accentibus* (fol.). This is the first complete Hebrew Bible with vowel points and accents. This Bible is very rare; only nine copies are known to be extant, viz. one at Exeter College, Oxford, two at Rome, two at Florence, two at Parma, one at Vienna, and one in the Baden-Durlach Library. It has a title, but at the end of the Pentateuch we find a postscript, which seems to have been

added after the completion of the twenty-four books. According to Kennicott, this edition is said to contain more than 12,000 variations, which is probably an exaggeration. The firm of the Soncini extended their operations by erecting presses at Naples, Brescia, Fano, and other places; and to their operations Jewish literature is greatly indebted. For a list of the works edited by the Soncini, see Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 352 sq. (B.P.)

Song

(prop. *ryvashir*, (שִׁיר)). Songs were generally used on occasions of thanksgiving and triumph, as the song of Moses at the deliverance from Pharaoh and his host (^{<0217>}Exodus 15:1); the song of Israel at the well of Beer (^{<0217>}Numbers 21:17); the song of Moses, in ^{<0531>}Deuteronomy (ch. 32); that of Deborah (^{<0512>}Judges 5:12); that of David on bringing up the ark (^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 13:8); of Hannah (^{<0911>}1 Samuel 2); of the Virgin (^{<0146>}Luke 1:46); of the four-and-twenty elders (^{<0618>}Revelation 5:8); of Moses and the Lamb (^{<0618>}Revelation 15:3). But a few also were sung on occasions of sorrow, such as that of David on Saul and Jonathan (^{<0018>}2 Samuel 1:18, etc.); the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the song he composed on the death of Josiah (^{<4825>}2 Chronicles 35:25). It is said of Tyre, in ^{<0363>}Ezekiel 26:13, as one mark of her desolation,

*“I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease,
And the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard.”*

Songs and viols were the usual accompaniments of sacrifices among the Jews and heathens (^{<0123>}Amos 5:23).

*“Sacrifica, dulces tibia effundat modos,
Et nivea magna victima ante aras cadat.”
(Senec. Troad.)*

^{<2104>}Ecclesiastes 11:4, “And all the daughters of song shall be brought low,” i.e. all the organs which perceive and distinguish musical sounds, and those also which form and modulate the voice; age producing incapacity of enjoyment, as old Barzillai remarks (^{<0195>}2 Samuel 19:35); and as Juvenal notices, thus translated by Dryden:

*“What music or enchantilg voice can cheer
A stupid, old, impenetrable ear?”*

Psalm 68 describes the manner of Jewish musical festivities:

*“The singers went before,
After came the players on instruments,
Between the damsels playing on timbrels.”*

In ^{<8015>}Hosea 2:15 *singing* implies the manifestation of the divine favor, where the Targum says, “I will work miracles for them, and perform great acts, as in the day when they ascended up out of the land of Egypt.” In this sense a song denotes a great deliverance and a new subject of thanksgiving; so a new song, as in ^{<1911B>}Psalm 40:3; ^{<611B>}Revelation 5:9, and elsewhere, implies a new work of salvation and favor, requiring an extraordinary return of gratitude and praise. *SEE HYMN; SEE PSALM; SEE SINGING.*

Song Of Degrees.

SEE DEGREES, SONG OF; SEE GRADUAL.

Song Of Solomon, Or Song Of Songs.

SEE CANTICLES.

Song Of The Three Holy Children

is the title of one of the minor pieces found in the Apocrypha, and placed in the English Version immediately after the book of Baruch. *SEE APOCRYPHA.* The full caption of the translators is as follows: “The Song of the Three Holy Children, which followeth in the third chapter of Daniel after this place — *fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace*, ver. 23. That which followeth is not in the Hebrew, to wit, *And they walked* [the first words of the piece in question] — unto these words, *Then Nebuchadnezzar*, ver. 24.” It contains sixty-eight verses.

I. *Title and Position.* — This piece is generally called *The Song*, or *Hymn*, of the Three Holy Children because ver. 28 says that “the three, as out of one mouth, praised, glorified, and blessed God,” though it ought rather to be denominated *The Prayer of Azarias, and the Song of the Three Holy Children*; inasmuch as nearly half of it is occupied with the prayer of Azarias. Originally it was inserted in the 3d chapter of Daniel, between the 23d and 24th verses; but, being used liturgically in connection with similar fragments, it was afterwards transposed to the end of the Psalms in the Codex Alexandrinus as Hymn 9 and 10, under the titles of “The Prayer of Azarias,” and “The Hymn of our Fathers.” It occupies a similar position in

many of the Greek and Latin psalters, and most probably was so placed already in the old Latin version.

II. Design. — This piece is evidently liturgical in its purpose, being suggested by the apparent abruptness of the narrative in Daniel (^{20RB}Daniel 3:23), as well as by the supposition that these confessors, who so readily submitted to be thrown into a fiery furnace, in which they remained some time, would employ their leisure in prayer to the God whom they so fearlessly confessed. Accordingly, Azarias is represented as praying in the furnace (ver. 2-22), and, in answer to his prayer, we are told that the angel of the Lord appeared, who, notwithstanding the increased heat of the furnace, cooled the air like “a moist whistling wind” (ver. 26, 27); whereupon all the three martyrs burst into a song of praise (ver. 28-68), thus affording an example of prayer and thanksgiving to the afflicted and delivered Church, which she has duly appreciated by having used it as a part of her service ever since the 4th century, and by its being used in the Anglican Church to the present day.

III. Unity, Author, Date, and Original Language. There is hardly any connection between the prayer of Azarias and the song of the Three Holy Children. The former does not even allude to the condition of the martyrs, and is more like what we should expect from an assembly of exiled Jews on a solemn fast day than from confessors in a furnace. This want of harmony between the two parts, coupled with the fact that ver. 14, which tells that the Temple and its worship no longer exist, contradicts ver. 30, 31, 61, 62, where both are said to exist, and that the same author would not have put the prayer into the mouth of *Azarias alone*, shows that the two parts proceed from different sources. Those who are acquainted with the multifarious stories wherewith Jewish tradition has embalmed the memory of scriptural characters well know that it is almost impossible to trace *the authors* or dates of these sacred legends. Neither can the language in which they were originally written be always ascertained. These legends grew with the nation; they accompanied the Jews into their wanderings, assumed the complexions and were repeated in the languages of the different localities in which the Jews colonized. An Apocryphal piece may, therefore, have a Palestinian or Babylonian origin, and yet have all the drapery of the Alexandrian school.

De Wette (*Lehrbuch*) conceives that the prayer and the hymn betray marks of two different authors (^{20RB}Daniel 3:38; comp. with ver. 53, 55, 84,

85, Stephen's *Division*), and that the latter has the appearance of being written with a liturgical object. Certain it is that, from a very early period, it formed part of the Church service (see Rufinus, in *Symbol. Apost.*, who observes that this hymn was then sung throughout the Whole Church; and Athanasius, *De Virginitate*). It is one of the canticles still sung on all festivals in the Roman, and retained in the daily service of the Anglican, Church. In its metrical arrangement it resembles some of the ancient Hebrew compositions. De Wette adduces (*loc. cit.*) several proofs from the style to show that it had a Chaldee original, and had undergone the labors of various hands. It is maintained by those who contend for the divine authority of this hymn that the context requires its insertion, as without it there would be an evident hiatus in the narrative (²⁰²³Daniel 3:23). "Then these men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace," after which we find immediately (ver. 24, Heb.), "then Nebuchadnezzar was astonished," etc. The cause of this astonishment is said to be supplied by the Greek translation — "And they walked in the midst of the fire praising God, and blessing the Lord (ver. 1, A.V. Apocr.) but the angel of the Lord came down into the oven," etc. (ver. 27). But this addition seems by no means necessary in order to account for Nebuchadnezzar's astonishment, as the cause of it is given in Daniel, ver. 92 (ver. 25 in the Heb. and A.V.). *SEE DANIEL, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO.*

Sonna,

in Mohammedan law, is, according to the *Book of Definitions*, the observance of religion in matters respecting which there is no positive and necessary command; also the general practice of the prophets, with some few exceptions. Now this general practice in matters of religion is called the *Sonna* of guidance, but in those of common occurrence the *Sonna* of excess. The *Sonna* of *guidance* is that by the due performance of which religion is rendered complete, and the dereliction of which is either detestable or sinful. The *Sonna* of *excess* is that to embrace which constitutes guidance; that is, it performs, insures good works, but the dereliction of which is neither detestable nor sinful; as, for instance, the custom of the prophet in rising, sitting, putting on his clothes, etc., is not binding, but if followed is meritorious. The *Sonna*, therefore, comprises the Mohammedan traditions. *SEE SUNNA.*

Sonnites

are the orthodox Mohammedans who rigidly adhere to the traditions, and are famous for their opposition to the several heretical sects, especially the *Shiites* (q.v.), who reject the traditions. The Turks belong to the former, the Persians to the latter sect. They regard the Sonna (q.v.), or traditions, as of equal authority with the Koran, but still do not undervalue the latter. They are accounted orthodox Mohammedans, and recognize the Ottoman emperor as the caliph and spiritual head of Islam. There are four orthodox sects of Sonnites, who agree in points of dogmatic and speculative theology, but differ on ceremonial points and questions of civil and political administration. These sects all unite in hostility to the house of Ali, and to the Shiites, who support his cause.

Sonntag, Christoph,

a German Lutheran theologian, was born Jan. 28, 1654 at Weyda. In 1676 he was called to the pastorate of Oppurg, in 1686 he was made superintendent at Schleusingen, and four years later he was appointed professor of theology at Altdorf, where he died, July 6, 1717. He wrote, *Disputatio de Allegatis Apocryphis in Codioe IV Evangeliorum* (Altdorf, 1716): *Scrutinium Biblicum* (ibid. 1703): — *Ennea Periocharum Philoniarum* (ibid. 1713): — *De Sacerdotum Vet. Test. Ephemeris* (ibid. 1691): — *Miculoe 20 Authentioe Chaldaicoe* (ibid. 1703): — *Dissertatio in Vatic. Esaioe 53, 11* (ibid. 1692): — *Triadologia Vet. Test. Catholica* (ibid. 1698): — *Tituli Psalmorum in Methodum Anniversarium Redacti* (1687). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 355 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Lit.* s.v.; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, 5, 419. (B.P.)

Sons Of God.

SEE SON OF GOD, 1.

Sons Of Thunder.

SEE BOANERGES.

Sonship of Christ.

The Creed of Nice declares, "We believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not

made, of one essence with the Father.” These sentiments have been the faith of the Church in every age, but they have been in many instances explained by unjustifiable imagery and language, often taken in the earlier centuries from the Platonic ontology, and drawn in later times from material sources. The two constituent elements of the divine sonship are, the Son’s consubstantiality with the Father, and his peculiar ante-mundane origin in the Father.

1. Dependence of the Son. — The name implies the Son’s dependence: on the Father, and this relation of dependence lies also at the basis of other scriptural expressions relating to Father and Son, e.g. “Image of the invisible God,” “Word of God,” etc. The dependence of Jesus on the Father is expressly taught in ^{<4123>}1 Corinthians 3:23 and 11:3: “Ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s;” “The head of Christ is God.” But it would be opposed to the central idea of Christian doctrine to maintain a dependence of the Son on the Father inconsistent with his true divinity. By “dependence” in this relation is only meant that relation by which the second Person in the Trinity derives his godhead in virtue of his unity of nature with the Father. It is because he is the Son of God that he is himself likewise fully and truly God. There is no inequality or inferiority implied in this expression. The dependence is one of essence, of nature, and not of creation, production, or emanation. Precisely in the same way the Holy Spirit is said to “proceed” from the Father and the Son; i.e. he is an outflow of the same essential being, but a different personality. The language employed on this subject must necessarily be mysterious, as the theme itself transcends human thought. *SEE PERSON.*

2. Consubstantiality. — Here we set out with the words of Christ himself, “As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” (1 ^{<4123>}John 5:26). As the fountain of life, as the independent dispenser of life, the Son is entitled to the appellation of Lord in conjunction with the Father. The world has its existence only in him who upholds and fills it with his gifts; in God only man lives, moves, and has his being (^{<4173>}Acts 17:28). But the world has its being in the son. He is not only living, but the fountain of life. Sonship we understand to mean similarity of essence, and not a procreation as among men. Not only is the Son of the same essence with the Father, but he is also *αὐτόθεος* — God in and from himself. Sonship appears to mean not a distinction of essence, but of existence — not of being in itself, but of being in its relations. The term does not characterize a separation of nature so much as personality.

But such difference of position is not inequality of essence, and when rightly understood will be found as remote from the calumnious imputation of Tritheism as from the heresy of Modalism or Sabellianism.

3. *Eternity of Sonship.* — This element in the substance of the Son is expressed in Christ's own words: And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (~~17:5~~ John 17:5). These words evidently imply that Christ was conscious of having a life that had no beginning, and the self designation of Jesus, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending" (~~1:8~~ Revelation 1:8), teaches the same truth. The Son, as superior to time, is distinct from the world in a threefold sense: (a) he is above the necessity of change, while the world is in a constant change; (b) he knows no end, while the world will come to an end; (c) his existence has not been preceded by a state of non-existence, as has been the case with the world. The life of the Son is exalted above time, without beginning, exempt from subjection to change and decay.

4. *Begetting of the Son.* — A misconception of the eternal generation of the Son must be guarded against. According to our present mode of thinking, generation seems to be identical with calling into existence what did not exist before. But how is it with the thoughts and self consciousness of God? They are called forth by God, and yet there never was a time when God was without self consciousness and without thoughts. Hence it must be evident that there must be in God a producing not subject to time, and productions which have no beginning; and, if so, the eternal generation of God offers no insurmountable difficulties. That Jesus Christ was not called the "Son of God" because of the miraculous conception seems to be clearly shown by Watson (*Exposition*, at ~~1:35~~ Luke 1:35): "First, we have the act of the Holy Ghost, producing that *Holy Thing* which was to be born of the Virgin, and we have the distinct act of *the power of the Highest* uniting himself, the eternal Word, to that which was so formed in the womb of the Virgin. From these two acts all that the angel mention followed. It followed that that should be *Holy Thing* which should be born of Mary, as being produced immediately by the Holy Ghost; and it followed that this *Holy Thing* should be called the Son of God. That *power of the Highest* which overshadowed, exerted his influence upon the Virgin, took the *Holy Thing* into personal union with himself, who was in his divine nature the Son of God, and this became the appellation of the one undivided Christ, but wholly by Virtue of the hypostatical union. The mode of expression by

which the concluding clause is introduced leads also to the same conclusion. The particle **διό**, therefore, is consequential, and is not to be understood as if the angel were giving a reason why Christ should become the Son of God, but why he should be owned and acknowledged as such. We have also the addition of **καί** in the sense of *also*; ‘Therefore, also, that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God; it shall not merely be called *holy*, which would follow from its being the immediate production of the Holy Ghost, but, more than that, it shall be called the Son of God, because of another and an additional circumstance — the union of the two natures. For since human nature was united to the Son of God, it was to bear the same name as being in indissoluble union with him.’ It is the eternal Logos, and not merely the human Jesus, that is and ever was the Son of God. See Gess, *Person of Christ* (transl. by J.A. Reubelt, Andover, 1870); Kidd, *Christophany* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Sartorius, *Lehre von Christi Person und Wort* (Hamb. 1841, 8vo; Engl. transl. Boston, 1849, 12mo). *SEE TRINITY.*

Soofes.

SEE SUFIS.

Sool.

SEE SUNNA.

Soothsayer

(**μ** **σερ** **κοσημ**, Joshua 13: 22; elsewhere “diviner;” **ἰνῆμ**] *meonen*, ^{<3316>}Isaiah 2:6; ^{<3352>}Micah 5:12 [Heb. 11]; elsewhere “enchanter,” “sorcerer;” Chald. **zrē** **garez**, ^{<3027>}Daniel 2:27; 4:7; 5, 7, 11; **μαντεύομαι**, “soothsaying,” ^{<4166>}Acts 16:16). *SEE DIVINATION.*

Soothsaying In Christian Times.

Although Christianity was a professed enemy to soothsaying and its kindred practices, yet the remains of such superstition continued in the minds of many in the Church. The Church was therefore obliged to make severe laws to restrain them. The Council of Eliberis (can. 62) makes the renunciation of this art a condition of baptism, and a return to its practice was followed by expulsion from the Church. This was the rule in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. 8, cap. 32), and the councils. of Agde (can.

42), Vannes (Conc. Venet. can. 16), Orleans (Conc. Aurel. 1, can. 30), and several others. A peculiar sort of augury was condemned by the French councils last named, under the name of *sortes sacroe*, divination by holy lots. It is also known as *sortes Biblicoe*, Bible lots. The practice of the Romans in opening a book of Virgil and taking the first passage that appeared as an oracle was imitated by many superstitious Christians. These used the Bible to learn their fortune by “sacred lots,” taking the first passage that presented itself to make their divination and conjecture upon. This was also called “The Lot of the Saints,” and was practiced for gain by some of the French clergy; but it was decreed by the Council of Agde that any who “should be detected in the practice of this art, either as consulting or teaching it, should be cast out of the communion of the Church.” The custom of using the Bible in this way still lingers in England, Scotland, and other countries, more, however, as sport for children. See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. 16, ch. 5, § 2. **SEE SUPERSTITION.**

Sop

(*ψωμίον*, *a morsel*), a piece of bread dipped into sauce (^{<4136>}John 13:26-30).

So'pater

(*Σώπατρος*, i.e. *savior of his father*, a common Greek name), the son of Pyrrhus of Beroea, was one of the companions of Paul on his return from Greece into Asia as he came back from his third missionary journey (^{<4204>}Acts 20:4). A.D. 55. Whether he is the same with SOSIPATER **SEE SOSIPATER** (q.v.) mentioned in ^{<4512>}Romans 16:21 cannot be positively determined. The name of his father, Pyrrhus, is omitted in the received text, though it has the authority of the oldest MSS., A, B, D, E, and the recently discovered *Codex Sinaiticus*, as well as of the Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, Philoxenian-Syriac, Armenian, and Slavonic versions. Mill condemns it, apparently without reason, as a traditional gloss.

Sope.

SEE SOAP.

Sopher.

SEE SCRIBE.

Sophe'reth

(Heb. *id.* **trpso**writing; Sept. **Σεφηρά, Σαφαράτ**, v.r. 'Ασεφοράθ, **Σαφαράθ**), one whose children were a family that returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel among the descendants of Solomon's servants (**<1825>** Ezra 2:55; **<1075>** Nehemiah 7:57). B.C. ante 536.

Sopherim

is the title of a Talmudic treatise, which is generally found at the end of the ninth volume of the Babylonian Talmud, together with other treatises which belong to the post-Talmudic period. The whole consists of twenty-one chapters, and is divided into three parts, the first of which has given the title *Sopherim* to the whole treatise. Part first, comprising ch. 1-4 contains directions for the copyist of the Holy Writings. With this part corresponds what we read in the treatise *Sepher Torah* (edited by R. Kirchheim, Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1851), in the *Septem Libri Talmudici Parvi Hierosolymitani*. Part second, comprising ch. 6-9, contains the Masoretic part of the book, and treats of the ten words of the Pentateuch which have the *puncta extraordinaria*, viz. **<0145>** Genesis 16:5; 18:9; 19:33; 33:4; 37:12; **<0483>** Numbers 3:39; 9:10; 21:30; 29:15; **<1228>** Deuteronomy 29:28; of the *Keri* and *Kethib*, the variations between **<9801>** Psalm 18 and **<1221>** 2 Samuel 22, between **<2301>** Isaiah 36 sq. and **<2801>** 2 Kings 18 sq. The enumeration of the words, which are written, but not read, and of those portions which are not to be read publicly, leads us to the third part, which is subdivided into two sections, viz. ch. 10-16 which treat of the laws for the public reading in general, while ch. 17-21 treat of the holy days. From the contents we see the importance of this treatise for the text of the Old Test. Its redaction probably belongs to the 9th century; in the 12th century it is cited by the school of Southern France. This treatise has often been commented upon thus by A.L. Spira, who published the text with the commentary **twyra'y[mw l ayra tl j n** (Dyrhenfurt, 1732), and by Jac. Naumburg, in his **bq[y tl j ¶** (Furth, 1793). The first part (ch. 1-5) has been edited, together with a Latin translation, by J.G. Chr. Adler, in his *Judaeorum Codicis Sacri Rite Scribendi Leges* (Hamb. 1779). Of late the treatise *Sopherim* has been published by J. Muller (Leips. 1878), under the title *Masechet Sopherim, der talmudische Tractat der Schreiber, eine Einleitung in das Studium der althebraischen Graphik, der Masora und der altjudischen Liturgie*. This edition contains, besides the Hebrew text,

explanations in German, which are very valuable in spite of the many mistakes which we often find in the writing of proper nouns, as Kennikut for Kennicott, etc. For a review of Miller's edition, see Schurer, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 626 sq.; *Judisches Literaturblatt*, 1879, p. 53 sq.; 61 sq. *SEE TALMUD*. (B.P.)

Sophia.

This name occurs frequently in the catalogies of saints and martyrs of the ancient Church, but in no instance with historical authentication.

1. A Christian widow, living at Rome under Hadrian, about A.D. 120, with her daughters Fides, Spes, and Charitas. Accused before the praefect Antiochus, they made joyous confession of their faith. The daughters were condemned to be thrown into a fire of pitch and sulphur, but as they remained uninjured in the fire, they were taken out and beheaded. The mother was temporarily released, and buried her children, but after three days she, too, sealed her faith with her blood. Her day is Sept. 30, or, according to other authorities, Aug. 1. The legend is found in Simeon Metaphrastes and later collections (ap. Lipom. tom. 6, ap. Sur. tom. 4; Mombrit. tom. 2; *Acta S. ad 30 Sept.*).

2. A virgin martyred under Decius at Fermo, in Picenum, April 30, and buried in the church of that town. The *Fasti Westphalice*, however, commemorate a Sophia on the same day at Minden (*Martyr. Rom.* [ed. aron.]; Ferrariusi in *Catal. SS.*; *comp. Acta SS. ad 30 April.*)

3. Mentioned in Roman (*Martyrol. Rom.* [ed. Baron.]) and Greek (*Menolog. Sirletian.*) lists as having been beheaded at Milan, Sept. 18.

4. An Egyptian, whose daughters were named Dibamona and Bistamona (*Fasti Habessinorum*), and with whom were associated a St. Varsenopha and her mother. Their natalities are assigned to June 4 (*Acta SS.*), their time is uncertain.

5. *Sophia Senatrix*, a nun of Aenos, in Thrace, the widow of a senator at Constantinople, who returned to Thrace after the death of her six children in order to devote herself exclusively to; works of Christian love. She died June 4, in the 10th or 11 century. The *Acta SS. ad h. d.* furnish a brief description of her life in Greek, taken from a *Synaxarium Divionense*.

Sophists

is a title given to the leading public teachers in ancient Greece during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. The most noted of these were Gorgias of Leontium and Protagoras of Abdera. The foundation of their doctrine was laid in scepticism, absolute truth being denied, and only relative truths being admitted as existing for man. Gorgias attacked the existence of the finite, but at the same time he maintained that all notion of the infinite is unattainable by the human understanding. He expressed his nihilism in three principal propositions: (a) nothing exists; (b) if anything existed, it would be unknowable; (c) if anything existed and were knowable, the knowledge of it could, nevertheless, not be communicated to others. The doctrine of Protagoras was that the phenomena both of external nature and of the processes of mind are so fluctuating and variable that certain knowledge is unattainable. He held that nothing at any time exists, but is always in a state of *becoming*. Man, he declared, is the measure of all things. Just as each thing appears to each man, so it is for him. All truth is relative. The existence of the gods, even, is uncertain. Thus this leading sophist succeeded in annihilating both existence and knowledge. He founded virtue on a sense of shame and a feeling of justice seated in the human constitution. The sophists made use of their dialectic subtleties as a source of amusement, as well as intellectual exercise, to the youth of Greece. They were opposed by Socrates (q.v.) and Plato, and Aristotle defines a sophist as an imposturous pretender to knowledge — a man who employs what he knows to be fallacy for the purpose of deceit and of getting money.” Mr. Grote contends that, so far from this being true, the morality of the Athenian public was greatly improved at the end of the 5th century as compared with the beginning of the century.

Sophoni'as

(*Sophonias*), a Greek (or rather Latin) form (2 Esdr. 1:40) of the name of the prophet ZEPHANIAH *SEE ZEPHANIAH* (q.v.).

Sophronius.

1. A contemporary and friend of Jerome in Palestine about the close of the 4th century. He would seem to have been a Greek, who composed original works, and also translated a portion of Jerome's Latin version of the Scriptures into Greek. He is mentioned in the *De Viris Illustr.* c. 134. See Cave, *De Script. Eccl.* p. 236; Fabric. *Bibl. Eccl.* p. 11; Vallarsii *Opp.*

Hieron. (ed. Alt.), 2, 2, 818; *Fabric. Bibl. Groec.* (ed. Harl.), 9, 158; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 2, 132.

2. A monk of Damascus, who was termed a scholar or sophist, and who became patriarch of Jerusalem in A.D. 634. He opposed the endeavors of Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, to secure the general acceptance of Monothelite views, and though temporarily induced, in a conference with Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, and with Cyrus, to consent to the phrase **θεανδρική ἐνέργεια** without insisting further on the consequences therefrom in favor of a dual nature in Christ, he refused to be intimidated after he became patriarch. In a circular letter addressed to Sergius and Honorius of Rome, he gave a detailed exposition of the doctrine of Christ's person, and demanded that no further concessions should be made to Monothelitism. The emperor Heraclius issued his edict *Ecthesis* (q.v.) in 638 with the design of putting an end to the discussion; and as Jerusalem had fallen into the possession of the Saracens two years earlier, Sophronius was no longer able to bring any considerable influence to the support of his cause. The *pistola encyclica* referred to above given in Hardouin, *Acta Conc.* 3, 1258, 1315. (*Conc. Oecumen.* 6, 11 et *Acta* 12). The work by Joannes Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* (**Λειμὸν Πνευματικός**), is frequently cited under the name of Sophronius. It was perhaps dedicated to Moschus, or composed by Sophronius and Moschus together. Several additional writings by Sophronius exist in MS. or in Latin editions (comp. Cave, *De Script. Eccl.* p. 451; Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzereien*, 9, 17, 37, 115 sq.; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* 3, 248). The *Menologium Groecorum* (Urbini, 1727) cites this Sophronius as a saint, and fixes his day on March 11.

3. Possibly identical with No. 1, is mentioned in Photius's *Bibl. Cod.* 5 as having written a *Liber pro Basilio adv. Eunomium*. The name is also found in lists of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople. See *Fabric. Bibl. Groec.* (ed. Harl.), 9, 158 sq.

Sor,

in Persian mythology, is the personification of a deadly drought and heat. He is an evil deva, created by Ahriman and opposed to the devas of Ormuzd, for the purpose of hindering the growth of plants, and thus to cause famine and miser.

Sora,

called also *Matta Mechassio*, a town on the Euphrates, about twenty-two parasangs south of Pumbaditha, is famous in Jewish history as the seat of a renowned academy, which was inaugurated A.D. 219 by *Abba Areka*, more commonly known by his scholastic title of Rab (q.v.). Rab died in 247 at Sora, where for twenty-eight years he had presided over the Soranic school, remarkable for the pleasantness of its site and accommodations, and numbering, at times, from a thousand to twelve hundred students. Rab's successor in Sora was R. *Huna* (born about 212; died in 297), a distinguished scholar of Rab's. His learning contributed to sustain the reputation of the school, which could, under him, yet number eight hundred students. After an administration of forty years Huna died, and the rectorship was filled by *Jehudah bar-Jecheskel*, who died in 299. Bar-Jecheskel was succeeded by R. *Chasda* of Kaphri (born in 217; died in, 309), a scholar of Rab. Although the colleague of Huna for many years, he was far advanced in life — eighty years of age — when he attained the rectorship, the duties of which he discharged for ten years, and died in 309 at the age of ninety-two. Chasda, who was the last of the men who had been personally instructed by Rab, was succeeded by a scholar of his own,

Rabba bar-Huna Mare, in the rectory, and when A.D. he died the college was without a rector for nearly fifty years 309-320

Ashi ben-Simai, surnamed *Rabbana* (our teacher), resuscitated the college of Sora, and was its rector fifty-two years, during which time seven rectors died in Pumbaditha. Ashi immortalized his name by collecting the Babylonian Talmud..... 375-427

R. Jemar, or *Mar-Jemar*, contracted *Maremar*, succeeded R. Ashi as rector of the college..... 427-432

R. Idi bar-Abin, his successor 432-452

R. Nachman bar-Huna, who is not once mentioned in the Talmud, held the office..... 452-455

Mar bar-R. Ashi, continued collecting the Talmud, which his father began, and officiated..... 455-468

Rabba Tusphah succeeded Mar bar-R. Ashi..... 468-474

Sora, where one of the oldest Jewish academies stood, was now destroyed by the Persian king Firuz.

After the death of Firuz (485), the academy was reopened, and Rabina occupied the rectory of Sora 488-499

In connection with R. Jose of Pumbaditha, and other scholars of that time, they completed the Talmud Dec. 2, 499. For the next one hundred and fifty years Jewish chronology leaves us in the lurch, as this period was rather troublesome for the Jews; and from the middle of the 7th century the presidents of the Soranic school are styled *Gaon* — i.e. Excellence — a word which is either of Arabic or Persian origin. The first gaon is—

Mar Isaac — cir. 65-670

He was succeeded by—

Huna — 670-60

Mar Sheshna ben-Tachlipha. — 680-689

Mar Chaninai of Nehar Pakoir — 689-697

Nahilai Halevi of Nares — 697-715.

Jacob of Nahar-Pakor — 715-732

Mar ben-Samuel — 733-751

Mari Ha-kohen — 751-759

R. Acha — a few months

R. Jehudah the Blind — 759-762

Achunai Kahana ben-Papa — 762-765

Chaninai Kahana ben-Huna — 765-775

Mari Ha-Levi ben-Mesharhaja — 775-778

Bebai Halevi ben-Abba — 778-788

Hilai ben-Mari — 788-797

Jacob ben-Mardocai — 797-811

Abumai ben-Mardocai — 811-819

Zadok, or Isaac ben-Ashi — 819-821

Halia ben-Chaninai — 821-824

Kirnoj ben-Ashi — 824-827

Moses ben-Jacob — 827-837

Interregnum — 837-839

Mar Cohen Zedek I, ben-Abimal — 839-849

the author of the first collection of the Jewish order of prayers ([rwdyf](#)).

Mar Sar-Shalom ben-Boas — 849-859

Natronai II, ben-Hilai, the first gaon who used the Arabic language in his correspondence — 859-869

Mar Amram ben-Sheshna — 869-881

Nachshon ben-Zadok (q.v.) — 881-889

Mar Zemach ben-Chajim — 889-895

R. Malchija — only one month

Hai ben-Nachshon — 895-906

The Soranic academy loses its importance under the next president—

Hilai ben- Mishael — 906-914

It lingers on, but without any outside influence. The study of the Talmud had so diminished at this academy that there was no Talmudic authority worthy of being invested with the gaonate, or presidency. In order not to give up this school entirely,

Jacob ben-Natronal-Amram was elected — 914-926

For want of a learned man, a weaver was elected as the next incumbent —

Jom-Tob Kahana ben-Jacob-Hai-ben-Kimai — 926-928

Against the customary usage, after *Jom-Tob's* death, an outsider was elected for the rectorship,

Saadia ben-Joseph (q.v.);..... 928-932

Under *Saadia* the Soranic high school revived again. *Saadia*, unwilling to become a blind tool in the hands of those who called him to his position, was deposed in 930 through the jealousy of others and his own unflinching integrity; and an *anti-gaon* in the person of

Joseph ben-Jacob ben-Satia was elected — 930-932

Saadia, however, retained his office in the presence of an anti-gaon for nearly three years more (930-933), when he had to relinquish his dignity altogether. His opponent,

Joseph ben-Jacob ben-Satia was now sole gaon — 933-937

but when deposed in 937,

Saadia ben-Joseph was again incumbent — 937-949

When Saadia died, the deposed anti-gaon was again elected —
942-948

But with Saadia's death the last sunset light of the Soranic academy had passed away; and the dilapidated state of that once so famous school obliged Joseph ben-Satia to relinquish Sora, and to emigrate to Bassra, in 948. The school founded by Rab, after it had flourished for more than seven hundred years, was now closed. But the Soranians, it seems, could not get over the downfall of the venerable academy, and used all their endeavors to continue the same. They sent four famous Talmudists outside of Babylonia to interest the Jewish congregations for this old *alma mater*. But these messengers never returned; they fell into the hands of a Spanish corsair. Among these captives was *Moses ben-Chanoch* (q.v.), who was brought to Spain, where he propagated Jewish learning on the peninsula. In the meantime there was an

Interregnum at Sora from — 948-1009

when Samuel ben-Chofni — 1009-1034

was elected to the presidency, to close up the list of presidents of that old school.

See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4, 5, 6. *SEE SCHOOLS, JEWISH*. (B.P.)

Soranus,

in old Italian mythology was a name of *Pluto* in use among the Sabines. Roman poets sometimes identified Soranus with the Greek *Apollo* (Virgil, *Aeneid*, 11, 786).

Soracte,

a mountain in ancient Italy which, according to Servius, was sacred to the infernal gods, especially to Diespiter. It was a custom among the Hirpi (or Hirpini) that at a festival held on Mount Soracte they walked with bare feet upon glowing coals of fir wood, carrying about the entrails of victims which had been sacrificed. This ceremony is connected by Strabo with the worship of Feronia.

Sorbin, De Sainte-Foi, Arnaud,

a French prelate, was born at Montech-en-Querci, July 14, 1537. From a child he possessed an insatiable thirst for knowledge, which he pursued at Toulouse, where he finally became doctor of theology; and in 1557 he obtained the neighboring curacy of Sainte-Foi de Peyrolieres. At the invitation of the archbishop of Auch he preached in the churches of Toulouse, Narbonne, Lyons, and Paris; and in 1567 became court preacher of Catherine de Medicis. He spent a laborious life in public labors, controversies, and historical writings (a list of which is given in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.), and died at Nevers, March 1, 1606.

Sorbon, Robert De,

founder of the famous French institute of the *Sorbonne* (q.v.), was born at Sorbon, Oct. 9, 1201. From the position of an almoner student he became successively priest, doctor of theology, and canon of the Church of Cambrai. His piety and sermons gained him the notice of Louis IX, who made him his chaplain and confessor. For the aid of poor students he formed a society of secular ecclesiastics, who lived in common, and gave gratuitous instruction. Out of this, under royal and papal patronage; eventually grew the school of theology known by his name. He died at Paris, Aug. 15, 1274, leaving all his property to the institution. The Sorbonne formed one part only of the faculty of theology in the University of Paris; but its name became so famous that it was often given to the whole, and graduates were proud to name themselves of the Sorbonne rather than the university. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Sorbonne, The, Of Paris,

originally a seminary for indigent young men preparing for the secular priesthood, but in course of time a college of learned men whose influence over theological thought was widely recognized. This body of scholars has frequently, but erroneously, been identified with the theological faculty of the University of Paris, and also with the university itself.

The University of Paris may trace its origin to the time of Alcuin, inasmuch as an uninterrupted current of teaching extends from that period until the present. But there was then no organization of faculties. William of Champeaux and Abelard taught philosophy and theology, and especially dialectics, at the beginning of the 12th century, but in any place where

opportunity was afforded. During that century the *Corpus Universitatis* was founded, and it was fully organized, being divided into three faculties, etc., when the *Sorbonne* was opened. The founder of this college, the canon Robert of Sorbon or Sorbonne, in Champagne, was chaplain to Louis IX. His purpose was to assist poor young men in securing a theological education by affording them free tuition and training for the service of the Church. He obtained a site with a few buildings from the crown domains in the street Coupe-gorge, and there built his school. The proper spiritual authorities granted the necessary license for the institution of a *Congregatio pauperum magistrorum studentium in theologica facultate*, and pope Clement confirmed it in A.D. 1268. The school began with sixteen students, four taken from each of the four parts into which the university was divided; but its fame grew so rapidly that in a brief time over four hundred pupils thronged its halls. Eminent men were called to occupy its theological chairs, the first being William of Saint-Amour, Endes of Douai, and Laurent L'Anglois; and finally a preparatory school was added, called the *College de Calvi*, and more generally known as *the Little Sorbonne*, designed for five hundred boys.

The principal source of the reputation in which the school was held, and of the influence it exercised over school, Church, and State, and particularly over theology and philosophy, is to be found in the fact that many *docteurs* and *bacheliers* of the house associated themselves with the teachers as resident guests, and joined in the harmonious and earnest pursuit of a common object, thus constituting a compact society for the promotion of learning. The union of powers in the association of the Sorbonne was perfect, and the government firm. A *provisieur* had control of general and external affairs, and regulated the intercourse with the outer world, with the university, and with all authorities. Though subordinated to the university, the *provisieur* held a position of such dignity that none ventured to infringe upon his rights. He was at first chosen from among the professors, but later from the number of most eminent prelates, and was consequently able to afford protection and impart lustre to the institution over which he presided. Internal matters were regulated by a *senieur des docteurs*.

For admission to a permanent residence in the Sorbonne it was required of a *baccalaureus artium* that he should teach philosophy in any college of the university, and that he should defend the *These Robertine*, even before he could obtain the *licence en Theologie*. Once admitted, the associates

were divided into two classes, *the fellows and the guests*, the latter being affiliated, but not incorporated, with the house. The privilege of such residence was eagerly sought after. It appears, however, that doctors of theology connected with other colleges were also called *docteurs en Sorbonne*, perhaps because the theological faculty was accustomed to hold its regular meetings in the halls of the Sorbonne, and they actually were doctors of the Sorbonne, inasmuch as they had there acquired their title by defending a thesis. If to all this be added the fact that the theological professors of several colleges were invariably taken from the Sorbonne, it will be easy to understand how the mistake of identifying the Sorbonne with the theological faculty of the university originated.

The Sorbonne has during its career pursued two leading tendencies — that of reconciling theology with philosophy, and that of preserving theology in orthodox purity and unquestioned supremacy. Philological and philosophical studies were taught in its halls; but its spirit and importance, as well as its true merit, are to be sought in its theological effectiveness alone. The apparatus of learning was at first too meager to admit of noticeable results. Down to the 14th century the study of Latin constituted the whole of philology. Philosophy stimulated theological inquiry, but theology could lay no claim to a scientific character. It had no exegesis, and could not presume to a knowledge of dogmatics. The students lacked books, the teachers acquaintance with the most necessary languages. But under the circumstances, and according to its opportunity, the Sorbonne watched over the orthodoxy of theology according to the councils and the fathers, though such supervision belonged to the diocesan. Its influence was, however, exercised indirectly over the theological faculty, the university, and even the *conseils du roi*. The Sorbonne as an association did not appear publicly in defense of doctrine, or send representatives to Church councils, or take part in political meetings. Statements made to that effect must be understood as referring to the university or the theological faculty rather than the Sorbonne; though the fact that all the principal doctors belonged to the Sorbonne assured her practical participation in all important affairs. More than once it opposed the collection of Peter's pence and the Inquisition. In April, 1531, it condemned several tenets taken from Luther's writings, and during the Reformation of the 16th century it laid under the ban of its censure a long list of writings by different authors, some of them even the works of eminent bishops, and one of them the Catholic version of the Bible by Rene Benoit.

It is to be noted that in all this the Sorbonne was not a blind agent of the Church. It contended against all Protestant aspirations, but also against all Jesuitical assumptions. It was the earliest defender of the Gallican liberties and of the accepted doctrines of the Church. When the cardinal of Lorraine had procured from Henry II the right to build a Jesuits college in Paris, the Sorbonne declared the Order of Jesuits dangerous, to the faith, the peace of the Church, and the monastic discipline. When Martin Becan published his *Controversia Anglicana de Potestate Regis et Pontificis* (1612), and queen Marie de Medicis forbade the intervention of the Sorbonne, the latter, nevertheless, denounced the book as dangerous to morality, etc. It defended the purity of the received doctrines against even the pope and the curia. Of 128 doctors, only forty-nine were ready to accept the bull *Unigenitus* without protest, though the absolute king Louis XIV favored it and many declared themselves directly opposed to its reception.

The Sorbonne, i.e. the theological faculty, considered itself the guardian of a pure faith and the scientific organ of the Church down to the beginning of the 18th century. In 1717 it put forth an effort, on the occasion of the presence of Peter the Great in Paris, to bring about the union of the Greek and Roman churches. It was at the time the highest authority in the Gallican Church in matters of theology. Political interferences, which could not be wholly avoided in the condition of affairs, finally undermined its influence. It released the subjects of Henry III from their allegiance, and its preachers counselled resistance, to the degree of regicide. It declared Henry IV, the legitimate heir to the crown, unworthy, and debarred because of obstinate persistence in heresy. Still more was done by its mistakes in philosophy to hasten its ruin. In 1624 it secured from the Parliament a decree forbidding any person to teach contrary to the doctrines of approved authors — the resolution being aimed at Des Cartes, in defense of Aristotle. Neither the *Meditations* of Des Cartes nor the works of Malebranche, Fenelon, Bossuet, and Leibnitz could arouse the slumbering intelligence of the learned faculty. But the issuing, by Boileau, of the burlesque *Arret donne en la Grande Chambre du Parnasse* exposed the position of the Sorbonne to ridicule, and rendered any further invoking, of legal aid to the defense of Aristotle impossible. This was followed, in 1751, by Voltaire's *Le Tombeau de la Sorbonne Oeuvres de Voltaire*, par Chr. Beuchot, 39, 534). In this work special emphasis was laid on the fact that Des Cartes' *Idees Innees* were now defended by the Sorbonne as a bulwark of religion, though he had been at first denounced by the same

authority as a most destructive heretic, etc. The position became more difficult with every day, until the decrees of 1789 and 1790 confiscated the property and financial resources of the Sorbonne for the benefit of the nation. About two thousand manuscripts were transferred to the Bibliotheque Nationale, while the printed works were distributed among different libraries in the metropolis. The buildings came into the possession of the imperial university in 1807, and have been used as residences for professors, deans, rectors, etc. The three faculties, *Theologie*, *Lettres*, and *Sciences*, delivered their lectures and held their examinations, and the minister of public instruction distributed the annual prizes of the *concours general* in the halls of the Sorbonne. The monument of Richelieu still adorns the chapel. He was a former pupil, and had caused the ancient and narrow rooms to be replaced with the modern palace like edifices which are yet remembered. The modern Bibliotheque de la Sorbonne, or de l'Universite, possesses nothing whatever of the former library. Even the homilies of Robert of Sorbon, written by his own hand, are in the National Library. Theology, philosophy, and philology still meet within its walls, and perhaps each retains some measure of the former spirit; but the substance and form are of the 19th century. The course of many prominent professors of the Sorbonne, following the example of Laromiguere and Royer-Collard, in connection with the political and social revolutions of the period from 1817 to 1830, is familiarly known. No other school in Europe has played such a role as the Sorbonne. In the domains of politics and the Church its influence was perhaps too prominently exercised, and perhaps no adequate results were produced in philosophy, theology, and science generally, in comparison with the means and opportunity enjoyed.

See Bulaeus, *Hist. Universit. Paris.* (Paris, 1665, and often, 6 vols. fol.), censured by the Sorbonne; Crevier, *Hist. de l'Univers. de Paris* (ibid. 1761, 7 vols. 12mo), extracted from Bulaeus, and extending only to A.D. 1600; Duvernet, *Hist. de la Sorbonne.* etc. (ibid. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo), declamatory; Dubarle, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris* (ibid. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Prat, *Maldonat et l'Univ. de Paris au 16e Siecle* (ibid. 1856, 8vo); *Encycl. des Sciences et des Arts* (Neuchatel, 1775), tom. 15; Bergier, *Dict. de Theol.* s.v.; "Sorbonne" in the *Encycl. Methodique*, tom. 3 (Paris, 1790); *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. 12, liv. 34, to A.D. 1272. See also *Vies des Peres et des Martyrs*, 7, 625; Saint-Savin, *Oeuvres de Boileau-Despreaux*, etc. (Par. 1821), 3, 111; Beuchot [Chr.], *Oeuvres de Voltaire*, 39, 534.

Sorcerer, Sorcery

(usually some form **āvk**; *kashaph*, to *mutter* incantations). **SEE DIVINATION.**

Sorcery In Christian Countries.

In early times those who gave themselves to magic and sorcery were usually termed *venefici* and *malefici*, because either by poison or by means of fascination they wrought pernicious effects upon others. The laws of the *Theodosian Code* (lib. 9 tit. 16, *De Meficiis*) frequently brand them with this name of *malefici*. Constantius (*Cod. Theod.* leg. 5) charges them with disturbing the elements or raising of tempests, and practicing abominable arts in the evocation of the infernal spirits to assist men in destroying their enemies. These he therefore orders to be executed, as unnatural monsters, and quite divested of the principles of humanity. They were also excepted at the granting of indulgence to criminals at the Easter festivals, as guilty of too heinous a crime to be comprised within the general pardon granted to other offenders. The Council of Laodicea (can. 36) condemns them under the name of magicians and enchanter, and orders their expulsion from the Church. Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 16, ch. 5, § 5.

The early Christians were derided as sorcerers in accordance with the impious charge brought by Celsus and others against our Lord, that he practiced magic, which they supposed him to have studied in Egypt. Augustine (*De Consens. Evang.* 1, 9) says that it was generally believed among the heathens that our Savior wrote some books upon magical arts, which he delivered to Peter and Paul for the use of the disciples.

So'rek

(Heb. *Sorek'*, **qrw**, *red*; Sept. **Σωρήκ** [in some copies compounded with a part of the preceding word]), the name of a valley (**l j ĩ**, *wady*) in which lay the residence of Delilah (^(~~Q1768~~)Judges 16:4). It appears to have been a Philistine place, and possibly was nearer Gaza than any other of the chief Philistine cities, since thither Samson was taken after his capture at Delilah's house. Beyond this there are no indications of its position, nor is it mentioned again in the Bible. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* **Σωρήκ**) state that a village named *Capharsorech* was shown in their day "on the north of Eleutheropolis, near the town of Saar (or Saraa), i.e. Zorah, the

native place of Samson.” Zorah is now supposed to have been fully ten miles north of Beit-Jibrin, the modern representative of Eleutheropolis, though it is not impossible that there may have been a second further south. Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 350) proposes *Wady Simsim*, which runs from near Beit-Jibrin to Askulan; but this he admits to be mere conjecture. On the south side of the ridge on which the city of Zorah stood, and between it and Bethshemesh, runs a wide and fertile valley, whose shelving sides of white limestone are admirably adapted for the cultivation of the vine. It winds away across the plain, passing the sites of Ekron and Jabneel. This may possibly be the valley of Sorek. Its modern name, *Wady es-Surar*, bears some remote resemblance, at least in sound, to the Biblical Sorek (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 282). “The view up this valley eastward is picturesque. The vale, half a mile across, is full of corn, and in the middle runs the white shingly bed of the winter torrent. Low white hills flank it on either side, and the high rugged chain of the mountains. of Judah forms a pretty background” (Conder, *Tent Work in Palest.* 2, 175).

The word *Sorek* in Hebrew, signifies a peculiarly choice kind of vine, which is said to have derived its name from the dusky color of its grapes, that perhaps being the meaning of the root (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1342). It occurs in three passages of the Old Test. (^{238D}Isaiah 5:2; ^{242D}Jeremiah 2:21; and, with a modification, in ¹⁴⁹¹Genesis 49:11). It appears to be used in modern Arabic for a certain purple grape, grown in Syria, and highly esteemed, which is noted for its small raisins and minute soft pips, and produces a red wine. This being the case, the valley of Sorek may have derived its name from the growth of such vines, though it is hardly safe to affirm the fact in the unquestioning manner in which Gesenius (*ibid.*) does. Ascalon was celebrated among the ancients for its wine; and, though not in the neighborhood of Zorah, was the natural port by which any of the productions of that district would be exported to the west. *SEE VINE.*

Sorores (Sisters).

SEE AGAPETAE.

Sorores Ecclesiae (Sisters Of The Church),

a name given in early times to *nuns*.

Sororia,

in Roman mythology, was a surname of *Juno*. The sole survivor of the famous contest of the Horatii and the Curiatii is said to have erected an altar to the goddess, under this name, after he had been purified of the murder of his sister (Livy, 1, 26).

Sorrow

(representing in the A.V. many Hebrew and several Greek words), mental pain or grief, arising from the privation of some good we actually possessed. It is the opposite to joy. This passion contracts the heart, sinks the spirit, and injures the health. Scripture cautions against it (^{<1053>}Proverbs 25:20; Ecclesiastes 14:13; 30:24, 25; ^{<1043>}1 Thessalonians 4:13, etc.), but Paul distinguishes two sorts of sorrow — one a godly, the other a worldly sorrow (^{<1070>}2 Corinthians 7:10): “Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death.” So the wise man (^{<1003>}Ecclesiastes 7:3) says that the grave and serious air of a master who reproves is more profitable than the laughter and caresses of those who flatter. Our Lord upbraided that counterfeit air of sorrow and mortification which the Pharisees affected when they fasted, and cautioned his disciples against all such affectation which proposes to gain the approbation of men (^{<1066>}Matthew 6:16). **SEE GRIEF.** Though sorrow may be allowable under a sense of sin, and when involved in troubles, yet we must beware of an extreme. Sorrow, indeed, becomes sinful and excessive when it leads us to slight our mercies, causes us to be insensible to public evils; when it diverts us from duty, so oppresses our bodies as to endanger our lives, sours the spirit with discontent, and makes us inattentive to the precepts of God’s Word and to the advice of our friends. In order to moderate our sorrows, we should consider that we are under the direction of a wise and merciful Being; that he permits no evil to come upon us without a gracious design; that he can make our troubles sources of spiritual advantage; that he might have afflicted us in a far greater degree; that though he has taken some, yet he has left many other comforts; that he has given many promises of relief; that he has supported thousands in as great troubles as ours; finally, that the time is coming when he will wipe away all tears, and give to them that love him a crown of glory that fadeth not away. **SEE RESIGNATION.**

Sortes Biblicae.

SEE SOOTHSAYING.

Sortes Sacrae (*holy lots*),

a species of divination which existed among some of the ancient Christians.

SEE SOOTHSAYING.

Sortilegi,

a name for those among the ancient heathens. who foretold future events by the *sortes*, or lots.

Sosano Vono Mikoto,

in Japanese mythology, is the moon god, who begot of the sun goddess, Inadahime, eight children, generally symbolized under the figure of an eight-headed dragon. Temples were erected to these two deities in the sacred garden of Miako, and in them a number of festivals are held each year in their honor.

Sosianus,

in Greek mythology, is a surname of *Apollo* at Seleucia, or, according to others, at Rome, where the name was derived from the statue of that god which the quaestor C. Sosius brought from Seleucia (Cicero, *Ad Att.* 8, 6; Pliny, *H.N.* 13, 5; 36, 4).

Sosip'ater

(*Σωσίπατρος*, *saver of his father*, common Greek name), the name of two men in the Apocrypha and New Test.

1. A general of Judas Maccabeus who, in conjunction with Dositheus, defeated Timotheus and took him prisoner (2 Macc. 12:19-24). B.C. cir. 164.
2. A kinsman or fellow tribesman of Paul, mentioned as being with him in the salutations at the end of the Epistle to the Romans (⁵¹⁶²Romans 16:21). A.D. 54. He is probably the same person as SOPATER *SEE SOPATER* (q.v.) of Beroea (⁴¹⁰⁰Acts 20:4).

Sosipolis,

in Grecian mythology, was a patron god of the State, venerated among the Eleans. His worship originated, as it is fabled, at a time when the Arcadians had invaded Elis. A woman appeared among the Eleans, and related that in a dream the child at her breast had been pointed out to her as the savior of the State. The leaders thereupon placed the child naked before their ranks, and when the battle began it was metamorphosed into a serpent, which frightened the Arcadians and won the victory. After the battle the snake disappeared, and on the spot where it was last seen a temple was erected to the child and his mother, Eileithyia (Pausan. 6, 20, 2; 3, 25, 4). See Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Vollmer, *Worterb. d. Mythol.* s.v.

Sospita,

in Roman mythology, was a surname of *Juno*, especially at Lanuvium.

Sos'thenes

(*Σωσθένης*, perhaps for *Σωσι-έθνης*, *saver of his nation*; a not infrequent Greek name) was a Jew at Corinth who was seized and beaten in the presence of Gallio, on the refusal of the latter to entertain the charge of heresy which the Jews alleged against the apostle Paul (see ^{<41812>}Acts 18:12-17). A.D. 49. His precise connection with that affair is left in some doubt. Some have thought that he was a Christian, and was maltreated thus by his own countrymen because he was known as a special friend of Paul. But it is improbable, if Sosthenes was a believer, that Luke would mention him merely as “the ruler of the synagogue” (*ἀρχισυνάγωγος*), without any allusion to his change of faith. A better view is that Sosthenes was one of the bigoted Jews, and that “the crowd” (*πάντες* simply, and not *πάντες Ἕλληνες*, is the true reading) were Greeks who, taking advantage of the indifference of Gallio, and ever ready to show their contempt of the Jews, turned their indignation against Sosthenes. In this case he must have been the successor of Crispus (ver. 8) as chief of the synagogue (possibly a colleague with him, in the looser sense of *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι*, as in ^{<41012>}Mark 5:22), or, as Biscoe conjectures, may have belonged to some other synagogue at Corinth. Chrysostom’s notion that Crispus and Sosthenes were names of the same person is arbitrary and unsupported.

Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians jointly in his own name and that of a certain Sosthenes whom he terms “the brother” (^{<41012>}1 Corinthians

1:1). A.D. 54. The mode of designation implies that he was well known to the Corinthians; and some have held that he was identical with the Sosthenes mentioned in the Acts. If this be so, he must have been converted at a later period (Wettstein, *N. Test.* 2, 576), and have been at Ephesus, and not at Corinth, when Paul wrote to the Corinthians. The name was a common one, and but little stress can be laid on that coincidence. Eusebius says (*H.E.* 1, 12, 1) that this Sosthenes (~~<400>~~1 Corinthians 1:1) was one of the seventy disciples, and a later tradition adds that he became bishop of the Church at Colophon, in Ionia.

Sos'tratus

(**Σώστρατος**, probably a contraction for **Σωσίστρατος**, a common Greek name), a commander of the Syrian garrison in the Acra at Jerusalem (**ὁ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἑπαρχος**) in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. 4:27, 29). B.C. cir. 172.

Sotah.

SEE TALMUD.

So'tai

(Heb. *Sotay'*, **יִפְתָּס**, *my turners*, or *changeful*; Sept. **Σωταί**, **Σουτεΐ**, v.r. **Σουτιεΐ** in Neh.), a person whose "children" were a family of the descendants of Solomon's servants that returned with Zerubbabel (~~<400>~~Ezra 2:55; ~~<400>~~Nehemiah 7:77). B.C. ante 536.

Sotamtambu,

in Lamaism, is a region in hell where the damned are tormented with unbearable cold.

Soteira

(*the saving goddess*) was a surname in Grecian mythology of *Diana* at Pegae in Megaris, at Troezene, at Boeae in Laconia, and near Pellene; of *Proserpine* in Laconia and Arcadia; and of *Minerva* and *Eunomia*.

Soter

(**Σωτήρ**, *Savior*), in Grecian mythology, was a surname of *Jupiter*, and also of *Bacchus* and *Helios* (Pausan. 2, 20, 5; 31, 4; 3, 23, 6; 4, 31, 5; 8, 9, 1;

30, 5; 31, 4; Aristoph. *Ran.* 1433; Pliny, *H. N.* 34, 8; Plutarch, *Aratus*, 53; Lycop. 206). It was a title likewise assumed by some of the Ptolemies and Syrian kings.

Soter,

pope from A.D. 168 to 176 or 177, is said to have been a native of Campania, and to have written against the Montanists his work eliciting a reply from Tertullian. A letter to the Corinthians, now lost, but used for reading in the Sunday worship of the Church, is also attributed to him. Decretals said to have been issued by him are not genuine. Some authorities report that he died a martyr's death.

Soteriology

(Gr. **σωτηρίας λόγος**, *doctrine of salvation*) treats of the work of Christ as man's Redeemer, and its logical study requires that we should consecutively look at the deeds. Christ has wrought for the salvation of the world, and at their application, through faith, to individuals. The former is called Objective Soteriology, the latter Subjective Soteriology.

a. Objective. — Under this head are included the incarnation of Christ, his holy life, obedience unto death, the intermediate state, resurrection, exaltation to heaven. Christ's coming again, the threefold office of Christ, and the work of the Holy Ghost — all of these entering into the work of atonement.

b. Subjective. — Under this head are discussed the several steps which constitute the way of salvation, the demands upon the sinner, and how he is enabled to satisfy these demands. These are, desire for salvation, saving faith, true repentance, good works, Christian sanctification, the work of grace (necessity, extent, character, result).

Soteriology received little theoretical investigation in the ancient Church compared with that bestowed upon the Trinity and original sin. The chief defect in the patristic soteriology is that the distinction between justification and sanctification was not always so carefully drawn as to preserve the doctrine of atonement in its integrity. The holiness of the Christian is sometimes represented as cooperating with the death of Christ in constituting the ground of the remission of sin.

The papal statements during the Middle Ages were too influential to allow of an improvement in soteriology, and the Church was holding a theory of salvation wholly opposed to that which prevailed in the fourth century. Anselm interrupted this dogmatic decline, and set the Church once more upon the true path of investigation. The leading features of his theory are:

1. Sin is an offense against the divine honor.
2. This offense cannot be waived, but must be satisfied for.
3. Man cannot make this satisfaction except by personal endless suffering.
4. God must, therefore, make it for him, if he is to be saved.

5. God does make it in the incarnation and atonement of the Son of God. The soteriology of Anselm exerted but little influence upon Roman Catholic Christendom, but Luther's assertion of justification by faith alone caused soteriology to become the center of dogmatic controversy between Protestant and Papist. The principal point of dispute between the Council of Trent and the Protestant theologians related to the appropriate place of sanctification. The Roman divine maintained that holiness of heart is necessary to the forgiveness of sin, as a meritorious cause; while the Protestant threw out the human element altogether, and claimed that the blood of Christ is the only meritorious cause and ground of forgiveness.

In the Protestant Church discussions have been excited by the Socinian opposition and the Grotian modification.

For the historical examination of this subject, see Baur [F.C.], *Die christl. Lehre von der Versöhnung* (1838); Ritschi, *Die christl. Lehre von der Rechtf. und Versöhnung* (1870), vol. 1. For other phases, see the *Dogmatics* of Lange, Martensen, Nitzsch; *Evangelical Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1868; Edwards, *Justification and Wisdom in Redemption*; Hodge, *Theology*, vol. 2; Grotius, *Sacrifice of Christ*; Pressensd, *Sur la Redemption*, in *Bulletin Theol.* 1867, 1 sq.; Schoberlein, art. *Erlosung*, in Herzog, 4, 129-140; Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* p. 201-386.

Sothis,

the name given by the Egyptians to the *dog star*, or Sirius. Their year began with the rising of this star, and the coincidence of the latter phenomenon with the new moon marked the great sidereal or world year

of 1461 civil years. So this was also, in Egyptian mythology, a designation of Isis, and the star Sirius was accordingly sacred to that divinity.

Soto, Francisco Domingo de,

a monk and theologian, was born of poor parents, in A.D. 1494, at Segovia. He began life as a sacristan at Orcharado. and after a severe struggle with difficulties growing out of his indigent condition, he entered the University of Alcala, where he was the pupil of Thomas de Villanova, and afterwards the University of Paris. In 1520 he became teacher of philosophy at Alcala, and took ground as a victorious opponent of the nominalism then prevalent in the university. He wrote a *Comment. in Aristotelis Dialecticam* (Salam. 1544, and often): — *Categorioe* (Venet. 1538): — *Libri 8 Physicorum* (Salam. 1545): and *Summuloe* (1575). He was suddenly induced to become a monk, and entered first at Montferrat, but finally became a Dominican at Burgos in 1524. At Burgos he taught philosophy and theology until 1532, when he removed to Salamanca, and was associated with John Victoria and Melchior Canus in the promulgation of scholastic theology. In 1545 he was appointed by Charles V to participate in the Council of Trent, and at once took prominent rank. In the first four sessions he represented his order, and in the fifth and sixth filled the place of the new general of the Dominicans, Fr. Romeo. He also contributed much towards the settling of the canons of the fifth and sixth sessions was spokesman of the Thomist school, and met with determined opposition from the Scotist Ambrosius Catharinus; their disputations dealing with the doctrines of original sin, the condition of the human will after the fall, justification, grace and predestination, the works of unbelievers, and similar matters. These controversies gave occasion for his works *De Natura et Gratia Lib. III*, etc. (Venet. 1547; Antwerp, 1550): — *Apologia, qua Episcopo Minorensi de Certitudine Gratiae respondet* D.S. (Venet. 1547): — *Discept. F. Ambr. Catharini Episc. Minor. ad Dom. de Soto, Ord. Proedic. super Quinque Articulis Liber* (Rom. 1552). On the removal of the council to Bologna, Soto returned to the court of Charles V. He became confessor to the emperor and archbishop of Segovia in 1549, but renounced both dignities, and went back to the monastery of Salamanca, where he became prior in 1550. At this time he wrote, against Protestantism, *Comment. in Epist. Pauli ad Romanos* (Antwerp, 1550; Salam. 1551). After two years' service as prior, he resumed a professorship in the University of Salamanca, and wrote *De Ratione Tegendi et Detegendi Secretum Relectio Theologica* (Salam. 1552): — *Annot. in J.*

Feri Francisc. Mogunt. Comment. super Evang. Johannis (Salam. 1554). Four years after resuming the professor's chair, he returned to the convent, was reelected prior, and died Nov. 15, 1560. In addition to a number of minor works, he composed, besides those already given, *De Justitia et Jure Libri 7*, etc. (Salam. 1556): — *Sententiarum C Comment. s. de Sacramentis* (1557 and 1560): — a *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, not printed: — a treatise *De Ratione Promulgandi Evangelium*, etc. See Antonio [Nicolao], *Biblioth. Ispanicra*, etc. (Rom. 1672), 1, 255-258.

Soto, Pedro de,

a Dominican theologian and bitter foe of German Protestantism. was born of aristocratic parentage, at Cordova, and in 1519 became a monk. He gradually obtained the reputation of great learning, particularly in scholastic theology, where he took ground as a staunch Thomist. Charles V appointed him privy councillor and father confessor, and his order appointed him vicar of the province of Low Germany. In this capacity he accompanied the emperor to Germany, but there exchanged the emperor's service for that of the seminary at Dillingen, where he became a teacher of theology, and began his literary activity by writing his Romish *Institutiones Christianoe* (Aug. Vind. 1548, and afterwards): — *Method. Confessionis s. Doctr. Pietatisque Christ. Epitome* (Antwerp, 1556): — *Tractat. de Institut. Sacerdotum*, etc. (Dill. 1558), a sort of pastoral theology. The *Assertio Catholicoe Fidei*, etc., involved him in a controversy with Brentius (q.v.), which called forth the further work *Defensio Cathol. Confessionis*, etc. (Antw. 1557). He also came into contact with cardinal Pole (q.v.) at Dillingen. After a time he accompanied Philip II to England, and was employed by queen Mary to restore Romanism and teach theology in the University of Oxford. In 1558, on Mary's death, he returned to Dillingen, and in 1561 accepted the call of pope Pius IV to Trent, in order to participate in the reopened council. Soto died April 20, 1563. See *Biblioth. Hisp.*, etc. (Rom. 1672), 2, 193 sq.

Sotwell (Properly Southwell, Lat. Sotwellus), Nathaniel,

an English Jesuit of the 17th century, is entitled to notice as one of the historians of his order; but particulars of his life are wanting. Being employed to write the lives of eminent authors among the Jesuits, he carried on the plan of Ribadeneira and Alegambe down to his own times.

His improved edition was published under the title of *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu, Opus inchoatum a R.P. Petro Ribadeneira, et productum ad annum 1609, etc., a Nathanaelo Sotwello* (Rome, 1676, fol).

Souchai (Or Souchay), Jean Baptiste,

a French ecclesiastic and writer, was born at Saint-Amand, near Vendome, in 1688, and was educated by his uncle. Removing to Paris, he gained the applause and esteem of all the learned, and in 1720 was elected a member of the Academy of Inscriptions. He was also made canon of Rodez, counsellor to the king, and reader and professor of eloquence to the College Royal. He died at Paris, Aug. 25, 1746. He wrote, *Tarsis et Zelig* (1720): — *Ausone*, Latin text (1730, 4to): — *Astree, par d'Ur'e* (1733): (*Euvres Diverses de Pellisson* (1735, 3 vols. 8vo): — (*Euvres de Boileau* (1735, 1745, 12mo; 1740, 2 vols. fol. and 4to): — *Avec des Eclaircissements Historiques, Joseph, trad. par Arnauld d'Audilly* (1744, 6 vols. 12mo): — translation into French, *L'Essai sur les Erreurs Populaires de Th. Brown* (Paris, 1738): — six *Dissertations*. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Souchon, Adolf Friedrich,

a German theologian, was born at Magdeburg, Aug. 10, 1807. He studied theology at Berlin, and in 1830 he entered upon his first ministerial duties in Strasburg in the Uckermark. In 1834 he was called to Berlin, first as pastor of the French Church in the Luisenstadt, and in 1854 as pastor of Trinity Church, where Schleiermacher and Krummacher preached before him. Soon after 1854 he was also made a member of consistory. Early in 1878 he was obliged to retire from the ministry on account of bodily infirmities, and died at Mirow, in Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Aug. 27, 1878. Souchon was one of the most prominent ministers of Berlin, and enriched the homiletical literature by his collections of sermons on the gospels and epistles of the Christian year, his sermons on the passion of Christ, and other sermons. See Zuchold, *Biblioth. Theologica*, 2, 1241 sq. (B.P.)

Souchon, Francois,

a French painter, was born at Alais, Nov. 19, 1785, and was early sent by his parents, who were simple artisans, to Paris, in order to improve his talents under the tuition of David, and afterwards of Gros. He soon began

to paint sacred subjects for a livelihood, and in 1823 accompanied his friend Sigalon to Rome, where he aided Michael Angelo on his, cartoons. In 1838 he was made professor in the school of design at Lille, but retired in 1853, and died April 5, 1857. His works are of moderate merit. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Soufflot, Jacques Germain,

a French architect, was born at Trenci, near Auxerre, in 1713 (or 1714). His father desired him to study law, but he evinced so strong a taste for architecture that he was allowed to choose that profession. Travelling in Italy to pursue his studies, his assiduity and talents recommended him to the duke of St. Aignau, ambassador of France to the Holy See, who secured him favors. Returning to France, he was engaged by the magistrates of Lyons as architect, and built the Hotel-Dieu, Exchange, Concert-room, and Theater. He was shortly after appointed comptroller of the buildings of Marli and the Tuileries, besides being the recipient of many other honors. The commission to rebuild the Church of St. Genevieve was given him, and the foundation was laid in 1756. In the following year he received the Order of St. Michel, and was nominated commissioner and general superintendent of the public buildings. Envy endeavored to destroy the fame of Soufflot, and so vexed him that he was hastened, before the completion of the Church of St. Genevieve, to his death, Aug. 29 (30), 1780. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v., Cresy, *Lives of Architects*, s.v.

Soul

(prop. $\psi\upsilon\lambda\eta$, $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$, the *rational* spirit; but occasionally $\nu\pi\eta$, $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$, the *animal* principle of life), that vital, immaterial, active substance, or principles in man whereby he perceives, remembers, reasons, and wills. The rational soul is simple, uncompounded, and immaterial, not composed of matter and form; for matter can never think and move of itself as the soul does. In the fourth volume of the *Memoirs* of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester the reader will find a very valuable paper by Dr. Ferrier, proving, by evidence apparently complete, that every part of the brain has been injured without affecting the act of thought. It will be difficult for any man to peruse this without being convinced that the modern theory of the Materialists is shaken from its very foundation. *SEE MATERIALISM.*

The soul is rather to be described as to its operation than to be defined as to its essence. Various, indeed, have been the opinions of philosophers concerning its substance. In the second book of his treatise *Περὶ Ψυχῆς*, Aristotle has given two definitions of it. In the first of these he calls it “the Entelechy (Ἐντελέχεια), or first form of an organized body which has potential life.” The Epicureans thought it a subtle air, composed of atoms, or primitive corpuscles. The Stoics maintained it was a flame, or portion of heavenly light. The Cartesians make thinking the essence of the soul. Critics, a Sophist, regarded the blood as the seat and substratum of the soul. According to Plato, “The first or invisible element of the soul in man is the instrument of rational cognition, the other element is the organ of perception and representation. With this soul, having its seat in the head, are combined the courageous and the appetitive souls, the whole resembling the composite force of a driver and two steeds.” Aristotle distinguished several forms of soul, viz. the *rational*, which is purely spiritual; and infused by the immediate inspiration of God; the *appetitive*, which was the source of desire and will — the *motive* of locomotion; the *sensitive*, which, being common to man and brutes, is supposed to be formed of the element, and is the cause of sensation and feeling and, lastly, the *vegetative* soul, or principle of growth and nutrition, as the first is of understanding, and the second of animal life.

Modern philosophy has made many attempts to define the soul, of which we give the following resume. “It is not *I* that thinks, but *it* thinks in me; and it is not *I* that am, but *it* is something in me” (Baggesen, *Zeitschr. von Fichte*, 34, 153). “Spirit is a substance, immediately immanent in thinking, or of which thinking is immediately the form of activity. Spirit is thinking substance, the soul is dynamically present in the entire organism” (Chalybais, *ibid.* 20, 69). “We are compelled to suppose that there must be a real essence as the substantial bearer of all psychical conditions. This essence is the soul. It must stand with other real essences in causal relation, in order to the generation in it of manifold internal conditions. In brief, the soul needs the body, the body needs the soul” (Cornelius, *Zeitschr. für exacte Philosophie*, 4, 99-102). “In the organism formed of atoms, which are spiritual essences, one unfolds its spiritual force to the point of self-consciousness; this atom, which as gas form atom interpenetrates the entire organism and occupies space as a center, is the soul” (Drossbach, *Harmonie der Ergebnisse d. Naturforschung*, p. 101-129, 229). “The phenomena of body and soul hang together as internal and external

phenomena of the same essence. This primary essence is, however, nothing more than the conjunction of phenomena themselves in the unity of the general consciousness. The soul becomes aware only of its own proper phenomena, the body becomes aware only through that which appears of it to the soul itself. It is a common essence which appears externally as body, internally as soul” (Fechner, *Physical. und philosoph. Atonzenlehre*, 2d ed. p. 258, 259). “The soul is no more than nature; it is a phenomenon of the internal sense” (J.G. Fichte, *Grundlage d. ges. Wissenschaftslehre*, 1794, 1802). “The fact of self consciousness can only be explained on the supposition that the soul is a real essence, distinct from the organism, capable of reflection upon itself, that is, of consciousness. “Soul and body are diverse substances, but in the most intimate union and mutual interpenetration. It is the idea of its body.” “Every soul acquires for itself an organic body. The external material body is but the changing image of the internal process of soul and life” (I.H. Fichte, *Zeitschr.* 12, 246; 25, 176-178). “Spirit is but a higher potency, a mere continuation of development of the animal soul, and the animal soul itself is a mere exaltation of the vital force of the plant. These three principles are in man, in virtue of his self consciousness, comprehended in one and the same Ego” (Fischer, *Metaphysik*, p. 36-38; *Sitz der Seele*, p. 8, 16). “The soul is a substantial essence. The inmost essence, the Ego, is unattainable to our cognition” (Frohschammer, *Atheismus*, 2, 116, 119). “The body is the same life as the soul, and yet they may be spoken of as lying asunder. A soul without body would be nothing living, and the converse is true. The soul posits and produces itself; it has a body in itself, not without which it composes one total and actual, and in which it is omnipresent” (Hegel, *Werke*, 5, 16; 8, 22, 23; 15, 339; 18, 29, 93). “We have no cognition of what is strictly the essence of our soul. We cannot reach the Ego itself with our consciousness; we can only reach it in the constantly shifting modifications, as it thinks, feels, wills, especially as it possesses the power of representation.” “The soul is a simple essence without parts, and without plurality in its quality, whose intellectual manifoldness is conditioned by a varied concurrence with other and yet real essences” (Herbart, *Werke*, 1, 193, etc.). “The Ego is an absolute unity, and, as it is no object of outward sense, is immaterial; and though it is present in space, and operates in it, occupies no space and has no special place in the body. The body is, rather, but the form of the soul; and birth, life; and death are but the diverse conditions of the soul. The conception of soul can only be reached by deductions” (Kant, *Vorlesungen über Metaphysik*, p. 133-254;

Werke, 7, 60-78). “The *what* of the soul, its nature, comes as little into view as does the essential nature of things in general; the essential nature of the soul in itself remains unknown to us before it comes into a situation within which alone its life unfolds itself. The soul is also the focus into which flow together the movements of the bodily life that play hither and thither. The soul neither arises from the body nor from nothing, but goes forth from the substance of the infinite with the same substantiality which pertains to all the actual in nature that has sprung from the same infinite source. Our personality is not composed of body and soul; rather does our true essence lie exclusively in the soul. The spirit is something higher than the soul. In the spirit is the unity of our being, our true Ego. The soul is but an element in its service. At death the soul passes away, the spirit ripens to a new existence” (Lotze, *Mikrokosmos; Sfreitschriften*, 1, 138). “The soul, the consciousness *a posteriori*, is nothing but the individual being, so far as it is conscious, and can neither be, nor be thought of, apart from that individual being” (Schellwien, *Seyn und Bewusstseyen*, p. 117, 122). “The Ego which now apprehends itself as sentient or percipient, now as putting forth effort, willing, etc., knows itself at the same time as one and the same, the same abiding self. It is but an expression of this consciousness of unity when we speak of our own soul, and impute to it this or that predicate; that is, when we distinguish our own soul, with its manifold characteristics, from ourselves, and in this act implicitly contrast ourselves as unity with the mutation and manifoldness of our intellectual life” (Ulrici, *Glauben und Wissen*, p. 64-66; *Zeitschr. von Fichte*, 36, 232; *Gott u. die Natur*, p. 414-417).

Modern philosophers in Germany thus make a distinction between $\Psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ (*Seele*) and $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$ (*Geist*), or spirit and soul; but they reverse the relative significance of these terms. Prof. G.H. Schubert says that the *soul* is the inferior part of our intellectual nature, while the *spirit* is that part of our nature which tends to the purely rational, the lofty and divine. The doctrine of the *natural* and the *spiritual* (q.v.) man, which we find in the writings of Paul, may, it has been thought, have formed the basis upon which this mental dualism has been founded. The plainest and most common distinction taken in the use of the words soul and mind is, that in speaking of the *mind* of man we refer more to the various powers which it possesses, or the various operations which it performs; and in speaking of the *soul* of man we refer rather to the nature and destiny of the human being. The following distinguishing features of spirit, mind, and soul have

been given: “The first denotes the animating faculty, the breath of intelligence, the inspiring principle, the spring of energy, and the prompter of exertion; the second is the recording power, the preserver of impressions, the storer of deductions, the nurse of knowledge, and the parent of thought; the last is the disembodied, ethereal, self-conscious being, concentrating in itself all the purest and most refined of human excellences, every generous affection, every benevolent disposition, every intellectual attainment, every ennobling virtue, and every exalting aspiration” (*The Purpose of Existence* [1850, 12mo], p. 79). **Ψυχή**, *spirit*, when considered separately signifies the principle of *life*; **νοῦς**, *mind*, the principle of *intelligence*. According to Plutarch, *spirit* is the cause and beginning of motion, and *mind* of order and harmony with respect to motion. Together they signify an intelligent soul. Thus we say the “immortality” of the *soul*, and the “powers” of the *mind* (Fleming, *Vocabulary of Science*, s.v.). **SEE MIND**.

In the Holy Scriptures three principles are recognized (see especially ^{<1>}Thessalonians 5:23) as essential components of man — the *soul* (ἰ ψρ, **πνεῦμα**), the *spirit* (νρη, **Ψυχή**), and the *body* (ρσβ; **σάρξ**, or **σῶμα**); but these are not accurately, much less scientifically, defined. The first and the last of these elements clearly correspond to the material or physical and the immaterial or spiritual parts of man’s nature, i.e. the soul and the body, as ordinarily defined by modern philosophers and scientists; but the middle term, the “spirit,” is hard to be distinguished. Yet in all earthly creatures, even in the lowest forms of animals, there is clearly observable a principle, inherent indeed in the body, and yet distinct from the rational faculty of man or the instinctive intelligence of brutes. This is usually styled “the animate principle,” or briefly *life*. It is this which molds the whole physical organism, and for this end controls, and to a large degree overrides, mere chemical and inorganic laws, producing combinations and results impossible to unvitalized substance. This power or essence — for it has not yet been determined whether it be distinct from or a mere result of the combination of soul and body — has hitherto eluded the analysis of scientific and philosophical research, and it will probably remain an inscrutable secret; but it is a sufficiently separate element of human and animal nature to warrant the distinctive use of a special term for it by the Biblical writers (which is carefully observed by them in the original, although frequently obscured in the English version). Thus *spirit* (νρη, **ψυχή**) is never applied to God or to angelic beings, who are incorporeal;

nor, on the other hand, is *soul* (ἰ ψρ, πνεῦμα) ever used of beasts (except in ^{<2189>}Ecclesiastes 3:19, 21, where it is evidently employed out of its proper sense for the sake of uniformity). Yet *life* (ἡΰj ἰ) is ascribed equally to all these classes of *existence*, although those only who have bodies are endowed with the organic locomotive principle (^{<0002>}Genesis 1:20; 2:7).
SEE PSYCHOLOGY.

On the general subject, see Baxter, *On the Soul*; Drew, *Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul*; Doddridge; *Lectures*, p. 92-97; Flavel, *On the Soul*; Locke, *On the Understanding*; oore, *Immortality of the Soul*; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*. **SEE SPIRIT.**

Soul, Immateriality Of.

SEE IMMATERIALITY.

Soul, Immortality Of.

SEE IMMORTALITY.

Soul, Origin Of.

Respecting the manner of the propagation of the soul among the posterity of Adam, the sacred writers say nothing. The text. (^{<2127>}Ecclesiastes 12:7) gives us, indeed, clearly to understand that the soul comes from God in a different manner from the body, but what this manner is it does not inform us. The texts (^{<2405>}Isaiah 41:5; ^{<8220>}Job 12:10).which are frequently cited in this connection merely teach that God gave to man *breath* and *life*, and so do not relate to this subject. Nor can anything respecting the manner of the propagation of the soul be determined from the appellation *Father of spirits*, which was commonly given to God among the Jews, and which occurs in ^{<8229>}Hebrews 12:9 (see Wettstein, *ad loc.*). This appellation implies nothing more than that as man is the father of an offspring of the same nature with himself, so God, who is a Spirit, produces spirits. It is doubtless founded upon the description of God (^{<0462>}Numbers 16:22) as “the God of the spirits of all flesh.” The whole inquiry, therefore, with regard to the origin of human souls is exclusively philosophical, and scriptural authority can be adduced neither for nor against any theory which we may choose to adopt. But notwithstanding the philosophical nature of this subject, it cannot be wholly passed by in systematic theology, considering the influence which it has upon the statement of the doctrine of

original sin. It is on account of its connection with this single doctrine (for it is not immediately connected with any other) that it has been so much agitated by theologians, especially since the time of Augustine. They have usually adopted that theory respecting the origin of the soul which was most favorable to the views which they entertained respecting the native character of man. Hence the followers of Augustine and of Pelagius, the advocates and opponents of the doctrine of native depravity, are uniformly ranged on opposite sides of the question concerning the origin of the soul. There have been three principal hypotheses on this subject, which will now be stated.

1. *The Hypothesis of the Pre-existence of Souls.* Those who support this hypothesis, called *Proeexistiani*, affirm that God at the beginning of the world, created the souls of all men, which, however, are not united with the body before man is begotten or born into the world. This was the opinion of Pythagoras; Plato, and his followers, and of the, Cabalists among the Jews. Among these, however, there is a difference of opinion, some believing that the soul was originally destined for the body, and unites with it of its own accord; others, with Plato, that it pertained originally to the divine nature, and is incarcerated in the body as a punishment for the sins which it committed in its heavenly state. This hypothesis found advocates in the ancient Christian Church. Some Christians adopted the entire system of the Platonists, and held that the soul was a part of the divine nature, etc. Priscillianus and his followers either held these views or were accused of holding them by Augustine (*De Hoeres. c. 70*). All who professed to believe in the pre-existence of the soul cannot be proved to have believed that it was a part of the divine nature. This is true of Origen, who agreed with the Platonists in saying that souls sinned before they were united with a body, in which they were imprisoned as a punishment for their sins (see Huetius, in his *Origenianae*, lib. 2, c. 2, quaest. 6). The pre-existence of the soul was early taught by Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryphone Jud.*). This has been the common opinion of Christian mystics of ancient and modern times. They usually adhere to the Platonic theory, and regard the soul as a part of the divine nature; from which it proceeds and to which it will again return. This doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul is, however, almost entirely abandoned, because it is supposed irreconcilable with the doctrine of original sin. If the mystics be excepted, it has been left almost without an advocate ever since the time of Augustine.

2. *The Hypothesis of the Creation of the Soul.* — The advocates of this theory, called *Creatiani*, believe that the soul is immediately created by God whenever the body is begotten. A passage in Aristotle (*De Gener.* 2, 3) was supposed to contain this doctrine — at least, it was so understood by the schoolmen; and in truth, Aristotle appears not to be far removed from the opinion ascribed to him. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret, among the fathers in the Greek Church, were of this opinion, and Ambrose, Hilary, and Jerome in the Latin Church. The schoolmen almost universally professed this doctrine, and generally the followers of Pelagius, with whom the schoolmen, for the most part, agreed in their views with regard to the native character of man; for these views derived a very plausible vindication from the hypothesis that the soul was immediately created by God when it was connected with the body. The argument was this: If God created the souls of men, he must have made them either pure and holy or impure and sinful. The latter supposition is inconsistent with the holiness of God, and consequently the doctrine of the native depravity of the heart must be rejected. To affirm that God made the heart depraved would be to avow the blasphemous doctrine that God is the author of sin. The theory of the *Creatiani* was at first favored by Augustine, but he rejected it as soon as he saw how it was employed by the Pelagians. It has continued, however, to the present time to be the common doctrine of the theologians of the Romish Church, who in this follow after the schoolmen, like them making little of native depravity, and much of the freedom of man in spiritual things. Among the Protestant teachers, Melancthon was inclined to the hypothesis of the *Creatiani*, although, after the time of Luther, another hypothesis, which will shortly be noticed, was received with much approbation by Protestants. Still many distinguished Lutheran teachers of the 17th century followed Melancthon in his views concerning this doctrine — e.g. G. Calixtus. In the Reformed Church, the hypothesis which we are now considering has had far more advocates than any other, though even they have not agreed in the manner of exhibiting it. Luther would have this subject left without being determined, and many of his contemporaries were of the same opinion.

3. *The Hypothesis of the Propagation of the Soul.* According to this theory, the souls of children, as well as their bodies, are propagated from their parents. These two suppositions may be made: Either the souls of children exist in their parents as *real beings* (*entia*)-like the seed in plants, and so have been propagated from Adam through successive generations,

which is the opinion of Leibnitz, in his *Theodicee*, 1, 91 or they exist in their parents *merely potentially*, and come from them *per propaginem* or *traducem*. Hence those who hold this opinion are called *Traduciani*. This opinion agrees with what Epicurus says of human seed, that it is **σώματος τὲ καὶ ψυχῆς ἀπόσπασμα**. This hypothesis formerly prevailed in the ancient Western Church. According to Jerome, both Tertullian and Apollinaris were advocates of this opinion, and even: “maxima pars Occidentalium” (see *Epist. ad Marcellin.*). Tertullian entered very minutely into the discussion of this subject in his work *De Anima*, c. 25 sq., where he often uses the word *tradux*; but he is very obscure in what he has said. This is the hypothesis to which the opponents of the Pelagians have been most generally inclined (see No. 2), though many who were rigorously orthodox would have nothing definitely settled upon this subject. Even Augustine, who in some passages favored the *Creatiani*, affirmed in his book *De Origine Animoe* “nullum (sententiam) temere affirmare oportebit.” Since the Reformation this theory has been more approved than any other, not only by philosophers and naturalists, but also by the Lutheran Church. Luther himself appeared much inclined towards it, although he did not declare himself distinctly in its favor. But in the *Formula Concordioe* it was distinctly taught that the soul, as well as the body, was propagated by parents in ordinary generation. The reason why this theory is so much preferred by theologians is that it affords the easiest solution of the doctrine of native depravity. If in the souls of our first progenitors the souls of all their posterity existed potentially, and the souls of the former were polluted and sinful, those of the latter must be so too. This hypothesis is not, however, free from objections, and it is very difficult to reconcile it with some philosophical opinions which are universally received. We cannot, for example, easily conceive how generation and propagation can take place without *extension*, but we cannot predicate extension of the soul without making it a material substance. Tertullian and other of the fathers affirm, indeed, that the soul of man, and that *spirit* in general, is not perfectly pure and simple, but of a refined material nature, of which, consequently, *extension* may be predicated. With these opinions the theory of the propagation of the soul agrees perfectly well, certainly far better than with the opinions which we entertain respecting the nature of spirit, although even with these opinions we cannot be sure that a spiritual generation and propagation are impossible; for we do not understand the true nature of spirit, and cannot therefore determine with certainty what is or is not possible respecting it.

There are some psychological phenomena which seem to favor the theory now under consideration; and hence it has always been the favorite theory of psychologists and physicians. The natural disposition of children not unfrequently resembles that of their parents, and the mental excellences and imperfections of parents are inherited nearly as often by their children as any bodily attributes. Again, the powers of the soul, like those of the body, are at first weak, and attain their full development and perfection only by slow degrees. Many more phenomena of the same sort might be mentioned. But after all that may be said, we must remain in uncertainty with regard to the origin of the human soul. Important objections can be urged against these arguments and any others that might be offered. If the metaphysical theory of the entire simplicity of the human soul be admitted, the whole subject remains involved in total darkness.

Soul, Pre-Existence Of.

SEE PRE-EXISTENTS.

Soul bell,

the knell tolled on the decease of a person. *SEE PASSING BELL.*

Soul cakes,

a term used for the gifts of sweetened bread, anciently distributed at the church doors on All-souls'-day (Nov. 2) by the rich to the poor. They were frequently stamped with the impression of a cross, or were triangular in form. They were given away with inscriptions on paper or parchment, soliciting the prayers of the receivers for the souls of certain departed persons, whose names were thus put on record. Some of the earliest specimens of block printing consist of "soul papers," as they were termed.

Soul chime,

the ringing of the passing or soul bell.

Soul mass,

mass for the dead.

Soul papers.

SEE SOUL CAKES.

Soul's Cot, Or Soul's Scot,

the payment made at the grave to the parish priest in whose church the service for the departed had been said.

Soul seat,

that place where the friends of a departed Christian, in the Middle Ages, offered alms, at or near the high altar, for the use of the clergy, the benefit of the Church, and for the good estate of the departed soul. While offering; they recited the psalm *De Profundis*, and then a versicle and response, asking for eternal rest and peace for the person passing away.

Soul Service,

mass for the departed. Soul sleep is the name given to one among the many conceptions entertained by the human mind with respect to the state of the soul after the death of the body. It assumes that the soul sleeps so long as the body lies in the grave, and that it will arise together with the body at the Resurrection. The term *psychopannychism* (q.v.) has been applied to this doctrine because it teaches a continuous night for the soul "until the day dawn and the, day star arise" (⁶⁰¹⁹2 Peter 1:19), or until the eternal day shall begin in which there is no more alternation of light and darkness (⁶⁰²⁵Revelation 21:25; 22:5). The doctrine of psychopannychism originated in the East among the Arabian and Armenian sects and from thence spread into the West of Europe. Traces of it are found with several of the Church fathers. It was condemned by the Councils of Ferrara (1438) and of Florence (1439), earlier by that of Lyons (1274), and later, in the 16th century, by the Council of Trent (sess. 6, 25). Pope John XXII (died 1304), however, held the doctrine of the soul's sleep himself, and openly promulgated the view that the souls of the pious dead do not see the face of God until after the body has been raised. Later, after the rise of Protestantism, certain of the Socinians and also of the Arminians showed themselves inclined to hold an indefinite, not thoroughly apprehended, psychopannychism; and the Anabaptists (q.v.) allowed the doctrine to attain to its complete development among their adherents. Calvin repeatedly rejected it, first in his treatise *De Psychopannychia* (1534), and afterwards in his *Tractatus Vat.* 2, 449 sq. etc. Luther, on the other hand, was inclined to accept the doctrine of the soul's sleep as correct. A related error is that of the *soul's death*, which was taught as early as A.D. 248 by the Arabian *Thetopsychites* (q.v.). Peter Pomponatius (died 1525) became

especially prominent among the advocates of this doctrine, and his activity led pope Leo X to condemn this and other similar errors disseminated since the time of Averroes.

The errors in question are based in part upon certain expressions in the Scriptures (see ^{<8441>}Job 14:11, 12; ^{<9085>}Psalms 6:5; 88:11; 115:17, 18; ^{<2388>}Isaiah 38:18; ^{<5043>}1 Thessalonians 4:13-15; 5, 10). The exposition of such passages by which soul sleep is proved certainly rests on a misconception, since the New-Test. language does not refer to the soul's sleep nor to the soul's death, but simply to the soul's *rest* (see ^{<6443>}Revelation 14:13, where the *dead* are described as *blessed*). The Old Test. language usually referred to in behalf of this theory merely regards the life of this earth as a period of gracious opportunity and privilege which comes to end at death (see ^{<8027>}Hebrews 9:27; ^{<8006>}John 9:4). It must be conceded that the Old Test. revelation was incomplete; it does not disclose everything with reference to eschatological questions, as in other departments of inquiry, and much is left for the New Test. revelation to perfect. But the earlier revelation contains no error that might contradict New Test. truth.

The principal basis for the soul sleep view is found, however, not in the Scriptures, but in the assumption that death causes a complete disintegration of the constituent parts of the human being. This point has been met by regarding the *living soul* (^{<0007>}Genesis 2:7) as a concrete real, and not simply abstract being; but more satisfactorily by the scriptural statement of the blessedness of the soul after *death, from henceforth* (^{<6443>}Revelation 14:13) in other words, by the *intermediate state*, which is to continue until the final reintegration of the *entire* man and of the race at the day of the general resurrection. This latter doctrine is expressly taught by Calvin, *Institutes*, 3, 25. (See also Ursinius, *Mittelzustand der Seelen*; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* [Leips. 1859], p. 389-394.)

The idea of soul sleep has, nevertheless, a measure of truth belonging to it, inasmuch as death may really be likened to sleep as it stands related to a future resurrection. It actually does lead pious souls to a sabbatism of rest, i.e. to the *katapausis* (^{<8049>}Hebrews 4:9-11) and the *anapausis* (^{<6443>}Revelation 14:13). Nor is it accidental that the God man rested in the grave *on the Sabbath*, and arose on the first day of the week. Finally, the soul sleep theory claims in its behalf the idea that the night of death is to the sleepers but as a moment, however long it may seem to us who have

not entered on its experience. The views entertained by the adherents of the theory are not constant, however, and they are found sometimes to postulate a distinction between soul and spirit (²¹¹⁷Ecclesiastes 12:7), and at other times to ignore it.

Bordering on the errors of soul sleep and soul death is the monstrous doctrine of a soul migration, or *metempsychosis* (q.v.), accompanied by no recollections of any former state, inasmuch as it postulates a previous sleep, or even death (see Lange [J.P.], *Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1258, etc.). This conception transcends the limits of Christian thought. Sleep and night, death and Sheol, are rest compared with such a migratory state. The theory, associated with that of pre-existence, occurs chiefly, however, in Gnosticism and the CabaIa.

In addition to works already mentioned, see Backer, *Mittheilungen aus Lescher's Samml. aus d. 17ten u. 18ten Jahrhundert lib. d. Zustand d. Seelen nach d. Tode* (1835, 1836), 1, 2; Frantz, *Gebet fur d. Todten im Zusammenhang mit Cultus u. Lehre* (Nordh. 1857); Hahn, *Lehre d. christl. Glaubens* (1858), p. 20, 425 sq.; Goschel, *Lehre v. d. letzten Dingen* (Berlin, 1850); Id. *Der Mensch, nach Leib, Seele, u. Geist* (Leips. 1856).
SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE; SEE METEMPSYCHOSIS.

Soule, George,

a Congregational minister, was born at Willington, Conn., Oct. 12, 1823. He studied at Amherst College, and, completing the course, graduated in 1847. Soon after he entered the East Windsor Theological Seminary, Conn., where he remained two years, and then went to the Union Theological Seminary, where he remained one year, and returned to the East Windsor Seminary, where he graduated in 1851. He was ordained Oct. 18, 1851, and became a stated supply of the Congregational Church at Ashford, Conn., where he remained two years; after which he supplied the pulpit of the church at Hampton, and was installed pastor in 1853, and continued in this relation, honored, beloved, and successful, until his death, Oct. 4, 1867. (W.P.S.)

Soule, Justus,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Columbia County, N.Y., Sept. 1, 1807. He was licensed to preach in 1835, and was admitted into the Oneida Conference on trial in 1837. He received his

ordination as deacon in 1839, and elder in 1841. He was transferred to the Peoria (afterwards the Central Illinois) Conference in 1856. He died while laboring at Molhle, Oct. 25, 1859. "He was a useful minister and a faithful pastor." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1860, p. 259.

Soule, Joshua,

a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Bristol, Hancock Co., Me., Aug. 1, 1781. He was converted in June, 1797, and began to travel in 1798 with Joshua Taylor, a presiding elder, and was admitted into the New England Conference the next year. In 1804 he was appointed presiding elder, and served as such (with one year's exception) until 1816, when he was appointed book agent in New York. In 1820 he was stationed in New York city, spent the next two years in Baltimore, and in 1824 was elected to the episcopacy. When the Church divided in 1845, he identified himself with the Southern section, continuing in the bishopric. He died near Nashville, Tenn., March 6, 1867. Mr. Soule was for four years (1816-19) editor of the *Methodist Magazine*, and in 1808 drew up the plan of a delegated General Conference, which now appears in the *Discipline*. "In the pulpit he was slow, elaborate, almost entirely destitute of imagination or figurative illustrations, but strongly fortified in the main positions of his subject and vigorous in style. His discourses showed more breadth than depth, but were often overwhelmingly impressive." See Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Ch.* 4, 44-49.

Souls, Cure Of.

the technical term by which the canon law describes the charge which is given to a pastor, no matter of what degree of divinity, over the spiritual concerns of a flock; and the words especially imply the right of administering the sacraments. In this sense, the phrase is used to mark an important distinction between two classes of benefices, or church livings "benefices with," and "benefices without," the cure of souls. Of the latter class are canonries, prebends, and the whole class known in the canon law as "simple benefices." Of the former are parochial cures, vicarial cures, and, still more, the higher charges of archbishop, bishop, etc.

Sound holes,

perforations in the wooden shutters of the belfry windows in church towers, for the emission of the sound of the bells. In early times they were

simply horizontal divisions obtained by the arrangement of the planks. Afterwards the perforations were ornamental in character, shaped like a trefoil or quatrefoil, and harmonized with the character of the structure.

Sounding board,

a board or structure, canopy or tester, with a flat surface, suspended over a pulpit to prevent the sound of the preacher's voice from ascending, and thus sending it out farther in a horizontal direction.

Sourdis, Franlois D'escoubleau, Cardinal Of,

was born in 1575 at Bordeaux, of a noble house, originally from Poitou. In youth he accompanied the duke of Nevers to Rome in a military capacity, but suddenly entered holy orders under the good graces of Clement VIII, and was furnished with the rich deanery of Aubrac. By solicitation of Henry IV, he was made cardinal at the age of twenty-three (March 3, 1598); and was nominated as archbishop of Bordeaux in 1599, while yet a deacon. He established a great number of religious houses, and assisted at the elections of popes Leo XI and Paul V. He eventually became embroiled with the civil authorities, and died Feb. 8, 1628. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Sourdis, Henri D'escoubleau De,

a French prelate, brother of the preceding, was born in 1593, and was early provided with several considerable benefices, and in 1629 succeeded his brother as archbishop of Bordeaux. He was associated with Richelieu in State affairs, but ultimately, became involved in troubles which ended only with Richelieu's death (Dec. 4, 1642), when De Sourdis returned to his see. He died at Auteuil, near Paris, June 18, 1645. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Souse,

an ancient term for a CORBEL *SEE CORBEL* (q.v.).

South,

Picture for South

the country or quarter of the heavens which the Shemite, standing with his face to the east, supposes to be on his right hand. It is denoted by seven

Hebrew words, nearly all of which refer to some characteristic of the region to which they are respectively applied.

1. **bgn**, *negeb* (root **bgn** in Syr. and Chald. *to be dry*), probably derived its name from the hot drying winds which annually blow into Syria, over Africa and Arabia. “In March,” says Volney, “appear in Syria the pernicious *southerly* winds with the same circumstances as in Egypt; that is to say, their *heat*, which is carried to a degree so excessive that it is difficult to form an idea of it without having felt it; but one can compare it to that of a great oven when the bread is drawn out” (*Voyage en Syrie et. Aegypte*, 1 297; comp. ^{<0275>}Luke 12:55. “When ye see the south wind blow, ye say there will be heat” and see Kitto, *Physical Hist. of Palestine*, month of March, p. 221, 222). The word is occasionally applied to a parched or dry tract of land. Caleb’s daughter says to her father, “Thou hast given me a south,” or rather “dry land;” **bgNhi/ra**, (Vulg. *terram arentem*); “give me also springs of water” (^{<0115>}Judges 1:15; comp. ver. 9). At other times the word refers to those arid regions, notwithstanding their occasional fertility, over which the south wind blows into Syria. So the Sept. and Vulg. understood the “whirlwinds from the south” (^{<2201>}Isaiah 21:1 **δι ἐρήμου**, *turbines ab Africo*). “The burden of the beasts in the south” is rendered **τῶν τετραπόδων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ** (30:6). At other times the word is rendered by **νότος** and **λίψ**, which latter is the Hellenized form of Libs, *ventus ex Libya*; the southwest wind, and, by metonymy, the quarter whence it blows. In several instances the Hebrew word is simply put into Greek letters, thus, **τὸν Ναγέβ** (^{<0600>}Joshua 10:40); **τὴν γῆν Ναγέβ**; Alex. **τὴν Ναγέβ**, *al. Νεγέβ* (11:16); **Ναγέβ** v.r. **Αγέβ** (^{<3019>}Obadiah 1:19, 20); and once, probably by a corruption, it is **ἀργάβ** (^{<0241>}1 Samuel 20:41), v.r. **νεγήβ**, **νεγέβ**, **ἐργάβ**. The Vulg. renders the word by “meridies,” “australis plaga,” “terra meridiana,” “auster ab Aphrico,” “terra australis.” More than once the Sept. differs widely from the present Hebrew text; thus in ^{<3204>}Ezekiel 21:4 [9] it renders **wpX; bgNma** by **ἀπὸ ἀπηλιώτου ἕως βορρᾶ**; Vulg. “ab austro usque ad aquilonem;” so also in ^{<0268>}Exodus 26:18 **hBgj, taPj** is rendered **πρὸς βορρᾶν**; Vulg. “ad austrum.” It is also used in the geographical sense in ^{<0648>}Numbers 34:3; ^{<0652>}Joshua 15:2; ^{<0304>}1 Chronicles 9:24; ^{<1404>}2 Chronicles 4:4; ^{<3402>}Ezekiel 40:2; 46:9, etc. But a further and important use of the word is as the name or designation of the desert regions lying at the south of Judsea, consisting of the deserts of Shur, Zin, and Paran, the mountainous country of Edom or Idumrea, and

part of Arabia Petrsea. (comp. ^{<3008>}Malachi 1:3; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 438). Thus Abraham, at his first entrance into Canaan, is said to have “gone on towards the south” (^{<0129>}Genesis 12:9), Sept. ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Aquila νότονδε, Symmachus εἰς νότον, and upon his return from Egypt into Canaan he is said to have gone “into the south” (13:1); Sept. εἰς τὴν ἔρημον; Vulg. “ad australem plagam,” though he was in fact then travelling northward. Comp. ver. 3, “He went from the south to Bethel;” Sept. εἰς τὴν ἔρημον; Vulg. “a meridie in Bethel.” In this region the Amalekites are said to have dwelt, “in the land of the south,” when Moses sent the spies to view the land of Canaan (^{<0433>}Numbers 13:29), viz. the locality between Idumaea and Egypt, and to the east of the Dead Sea and Mount Seir. **SEE AMALEKITE**. The inhabitants of this region were included in the conquests of Joshua (^{<0500>}Joshua 10:40). Whenever the Sept. gives the Hebrew word in the Greek letters, Ναυγέβ, it always relates to this particular district. To the same region belongs the passage “Turn our captivity as the streams in the south” (^{<3034>}Psalms 126:4); Sept. ὡς χειμάρρους ἐν τῷ Νότῳ, “as winter torrents in the south” (Vulg. “sicut torrens in Austro”), which suddenly fill the wadys or valleys during the season of rain (comp. ^{<2468>}Ezekiel 6:3; 34:13; 35:8; 36:4, 6). These are dry in summer (^{<0865>}Job 6:15-18). The Jews had, by their captivity, left their country empty and desolate, but by their return would “flow again into it.” Through part of this sterile region the Israelites must repress in their vain application to Egypt (^{<2306>}Isaiah 30:6; comp. ^{<0885>}Deuteronomy 8:15). It is called the Wilderness of Judaea (^{<0101>}Matthew 3:1; ^{<0658>}Joshua 15:61; comp. ^{<0886>}Psalms 85:6, Heb. or margin; see also ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 17:26; 32:44; 33:14; Ezra 20:46, 47; 21:4; comp. ^{<3019>}Obadiah 1:19, 20; ^{<3007>}Zechariah 9:7). Through part of this region lay the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, “which is desert” (^{<0186>}Acts 8:26). Thus as Drusius observes, the word often means not the whole southern hemisphere of the earth, but a desert tract of land to the south of Judaea. Sometimes it is used in a relative sense; thus the cities of Judah are called “the cities of the south” (^{<2439>}Jeremiah 13:19), relatively to Chaldaea, expressed by “the north” (1:14; comp. 4:6; 6:1). Jerusalem itself is called “the forest of the south field” or *country*, like the Latin *ager* (^{<2306>}Ezekiel 20:46; comp. ^{<0147>}Genesis 14:7). **SEE FOREST**. Egypt is also called “the south” thus, “the king of the south” (^{<2715>}Daniel 11:5) is Ptolemy Soter and his successors; comp. ver. 6, 9, 11, 15, 25, 29, 40; but in the last-named verse Mede understands the Saracens from Arabia Felix (*Works*, p. 674, 816). **SEE SOUTH COUNTRY**.

2. **μωσD**; *darom*, which, according to Gesenius, is a word of uncertain derivation. It is in the Sept. rendered by **λίψ**, ^{<0523>}Deuteronomy 33:23; by **νότος**, ^{<2006>}Ecclesiastes 1:6; 11:3; ^{<3414>}Ezekiel 40:24, 27, 28, 44, 45; 41:11; and by **θάλασσα**, ^{<3538>}Ezekiel 43:18; Vulg. “meridies,” “auster,” “australis,” “ventus australis.” This word as a proper name is usually understood to be applied to the southernmost part of Judaea in ^{<8777>}Job 37:17; ^{<2006>}Ecclesiastes 1:6; ^{<3212>}Ezekiel 21:2; 40:24. Hence the name of “Daroma” is given by Eusebius and Jerome to the region which they describe as extending about twenty miles from Elettheropolis on the way towards Arabia Petraea, and from east to west as far as from the Dead Sea to Gerara and Beersheba. A little to the south of Gaza there is now a spot called Bab ed-Daron, a name probably derived from the fortress Daron, celebrated in the time of the Crusades. That fortress was built on the ruins of a Greek convent of the same name which, being traced so far back, may well be identified with Darom as the ancient name of this territory. In ^{<0523>}Deuteronomy 33:23 the Hebrew word is applied to the sunny southern slope of Naphtali towards the Lake Huleh. **SEE DAROM.**

3. **myTε***Teyman*, and its adverb **hnyTε**strictly what lies to the *right*; Sept. **νότος**, **λίψ**; and sometimes the word is simply put into Greek letters; thus, **Θαιμάν** (^{<3113>}Habakkuk 3:3). Indeed, all the three preceding words are so rendered (^{<3516>}Ezekiel 20:46 [21:2]), **Υιὲ ἀνθρώπου, στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ θαιμάν, καὶ ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ δαρóm, καὶ προφήτευσον ἐπὶ δρυμὸν ἡγούμενον ναγέβ**, where perhaps the vocabulary of the translator did not afford him sufficient variety. The Vulg. here gives “viam austri,” “ad aphricum,” “ad saltum agri meridiani,” and elsewhere renders the Hebrew word by “meridiana plaga,” “ad meridiem.” It occurs in ^{<0235>}Exodus 26:35; ^{<0420>}Numbers 2:10; 3:29; 10:6; ^{<3019>}Job 9:9; 39:26; ^{<0736>}Psalms 78:26; ^{<2016>}Song of Solomon 4:16; ^{<3316>}Isaiah 43:6; ^{<3113>}Habakkuk 3:3; ^{<3014>}Zechariah 9:14; 14:4. In ^{<3816>}Zechariah 6:6 it denotes Egypt. It is poetically used for the south wind, like Shakspeare’s “sweet *south*,” ^{<0712>}Psalms 77:26, **νότον**, *africum*, and ^{<2016>}Song of Solomon 4:16, **νότε**; for the explanation of the latter **SEE NORTH.** Observe that **hnyTε** and **bnη**, are interchanged in ^{<0238>}Exodus 26:18; 36:23; ^{<3470>}Ezekiel 47:1. **SEE TEMAN.**

4. **ymæ***yamin*, also meaning the *right* side and south. Thus, ^{<3812>}Psalms 89:12, Thou hast made the north and the south;” Sept. **θάλασσα**; Vulg.

mare. The word is evidently here used in its widest sense, comprehending not only all the countries lying south, but also the Indian Ocean, etc., the whole hemisphere. Aquila has Βορρῶν καὶ δεξιάν; Theodotion, Βορρῶν καὶ Νότον. In some passages where our translation renders the word *right*, the meaning would have been clearer had it rendered it *south* (^{<0239>}1 Samuel 23:19, 24; ^{<0245>}2 Samuel 24:5; ^{<8219>}Job 23:9).

5. ρδβ̄ēcheder, “Out of the south cometh the whirlwind” (^{<8579>}Job 37:9), literally “chamber” or “storehouse,” ἐκ ταμιείων, *ab interioribus*. The full phrase occurs in ^{<8909>}Job 9:9, [m;Teyre] ! ταμεία νότου, *interiora austri*, the remotest south; perhaps in both these passages the word means the chambers or storehouses of the south wind.

6. ρBd̄īn̄āmidbar, “Promotion cometh not from the south” (^{<0756>}Psalms 75:6), literally “wilderness,” ἀπὸ ἐρήμων, *desertis montibus*. *SEE DESERT*.

7. μ ym̄ī mayim, water, “And gathered them out of the sands, and from the south” (^{<0473>}Psalms 107:3), θάλασσα, *mare*; where Gesenius contends that it ought to be translated “west,” though it stands opposed to ωρξ; as it is indeed so translated under exactly the same circumstances in ^{<2492>}Isaiah 49:12. He refers to ^{<6323>}Deuteronomy 33:23, and ^{<3182>}Amos 8:12. It is also thus rendered in our version of the first of these references, and on the latter we can only refer to archbishop Newcome’s *Version of the Minor Prophets* (Pontefract, 1809), p. 51, 52.

In the New Test. we have νότος in the geographical sense, βασίλισσα νότου, *regina:austri*, ^{<0124>}Matthew 12:42, *SEE SHEBA* and ^{<0139>}Luke 13:29; ^{<0213>}Revelation 21:13. The word μεσημβρία is also translated “south” in ^{<4025>}Acts 8:26, κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, *contra meridianum*. It is used in the same sense by Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 5, 2). In Symmachus (^{<0244>}1 Samuel 20:41) for βρη. Hesychius defines Μεσημβρία τὰ τοῦ Νότου μέρη καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας μέσον. The southwest λίψ occurs in Paul’s dangerous voyage (^{<4272>}Acts 27:12), “a haven of Crete,” βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα, *respicientem ad africanum*, by metonymy the *wind* for the quarter whence it blows. The south wind is mentioned ver. 13, νότος, *auster*, and 28:13. *SEE WIND*.

Egypt and Arabia lay south in respect of Canaan, and were therefore frequently mentioned by that designation. But from the Egyptians they may have learned the existence of nations living still farther to the southward,

for representations of victories over the negroes, and of negro captives, are not uncommon on the tombs in the valley of the Nile. One which is here copied represents the triumph of one of the Pharaohs over a negro chief, probably designed to be the type of his nation. It is evident that the figure exhibits the usual characteristics of the negro features as strongly as they are found at the present day. *SEE ETHIOPIA.*

South Country

(*bgn*, *Negeb*, *south*, or, according to Buxtorf, Parkhurst, and Gesenius, *arid* or *dry country*). There was a certain tract of country or portion of Palestine which was variously designated as “the South,” “the South Country,” or “the Land of the South.” It was so called whether it lay to the south or to the north of the point from whence reference was made to it, i.e. by persons who stood to the south of it or were approaching it from the south, as well as by those who lived to the north of it or were approaching it from the north. Thus Abraham, not only when he was journeying towards the south, as he proceeded southward from Bethel and from Hebron (^{<017>}Genesis 12:9; 20:1), but when he was travelling *northward*, is said to go into “the south:” “Abraham went up out of Egypt into the south,” that is, into the South Country, or that part of the land of Canaan which was called “the south,” and then “went on his journeys from the south,” or South Country, “even to Bethel” (13:1, 3). When Moses sent the spies from Kadesh to search the land, he said into them, “Get you up this way *southward*;” not towards the south, or that point of the compass, according to the obscure rendering of the English translation, which he could not mean when he was directing them *northward*, but, according to the Hebrew, into the *Negeb*, or the south, i.e. the South Country, or that part of the Land of Promise which was so called; and then it is said that “they ascended by the south,” that is, by or through the South Country, “and came into Hebron” (^{<017>}Numbers 13:17, 22). It was the abode of the Amalekites at the time that the spies searched the land, for in their report they said, “The Amalekites dwell in the land of the south” (ver. 29), and when Israel came by the way of the spies, or the second time to Kadesh, king Arad, who had come out against them, is said to have dwelt in the south, i.e. in the South Country, when his seat lay at the time to their north (21:1).

This district or tract of country was evidently the south part of Judaea, or the southern portion of the Land of Promise. It is spoken of in ^{<016>}Judges

1:16 as “the wilderness of Judah, south of Arad;” and it is found to be, according to the meaning of the word *wilderness*, a hilly region, a strip of hilly country, running from the Dead Sea westward across the land of Palestine, or somewhat obliquely to the southwest, rising abruptly in grand precipices from the shore of the Dead Sea; next forming a high and extensive elevated plateau, intersected towards the west by one or two ranges of mountains; and finally sloping westward or sinking gradually into the land of Gerar, or the great plain south and southeast of Gaza. It constituted in general the portion of Judah (q.v.) that was set off to the tribe of Simeon (q.v.), and its boundaries (which have been inordinately extended by some, e.g. Wilton, *The Negeb* [Lond. 1863]) are to be defined by the cities specified in ^{<1652>}Joshua 15:21-32; 19:1-6. *SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.*

South End,

the end of an altar on the south or epistle side; that is, on the right-hand side of a person looking eastward towards it. *SEE SOUTH SIDE.*

South, Queen Of The.

SEE SHEBA.

South Ra'moth

(^{<1617>}1 Samuel 30:27). *SEE RAMOTHNEGEB.*

South, Robert, D.D.,

an English clergyman, was born at Hackney, Middlesex, in 1633, and became a king's scholar at Westminster at the age of fourteen. In 1651 he was admitted a student of Christ Church, Oxford, under the care of his relative Dr. John Smith. In 1655 and 1657 successively he took his degrees of A.B. and A.M. Mr. Smith was privately ordained in 1658 by one of the deprived bishops. At the restoration of Charles II, the opportunity was afforded him of showing his peculiar eloquence. In August, 1660, he was chosen public orator in his university, and presently after preached before the king's commissioners. Clarendon appointed him, without delay, his domestic chaplain. On the disgrace of that minister he was nominated to the same office in the family of the duke of York; the king, in the meantime, placing him on the list of royal chaplains. He was installed prebendary of Westminster in March, 1663, and on Oct. 1 following was

admitted to the degree of D.D. Afterwards he had a sinecure in Wales bestowed upon him by his patron, the earl of Clarendon, and in 1670 was installed canon of Christ Church. In 1676 he attended, as chaplain, Laurence Hyde, ambassador extraordinary to the king of Poland. Upon his return he was presented, in 1678, by the dean and chapter of Westminster to the pleasant rectory of Islip, near Oxford. To this Church he became a considerable benefactor — rebuilding the chancel in 1680, allowing £100 a year to his curate, and spending the rest in educating the poorer children of the parish. After the Revolution, South took the oath of allegiance to the new king and queen, and is said to have declined the offer of a great dignity vacated by one who refused the oaths. It was at this time that he became engaged in the violent controversy with Dr. Sherlock, dean of St. Paul's. Sherlock's *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* appeared in 1690, and was answered by South in his *Animadversions*. Sherlock replied in 1694 in a *Defense*, which was replied to by South in *Tritheism*, etc. This was a sharp contest, and men of great note espoused the cause of each. During the greatest part of queen Anne's reign, South was a severe sufferer from illness; and he did little as minister, save attending divine service at Westminster Abbey. He was offered the bishopric of Rochester with the deanery of Westminster; but declined to leave his private station. He died July 8, 1716, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. Dr. South was a man of uncommon abilities and attainments; of judgment, wit, and learning. His wit was his bane, for he could not repress it, even on the most solemn occasions. His works are, *Musica Incantans, sive Poema Experimens Musicoe Fires*, etc. (1655; 1667, 4to): — *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book entitled A Vindication of the Holy and Everblessed Trinity* (1693): — *Tritheism Charged upon Dr. Sherlock's New Notion of the Trinity* (1695). He published a number of his *Sermons* singly, and a collective edition (1692, 6 vols. 8vo; other editions in 1697, 1704, 1715, 1722, 1727). To these were added (1744) 5 vols. 8vo. These eleven volumes were republished at Oxford (1823, 7 vols. 8vo). They have been reprinted in Philadelphia (4 vols. in 2 vols. 8vo), in New York (4 vols. 8vo), and by Hurd and Houghton (1867, 5 vols. 8vo). See Cattermole, *Literature of the Church of England*, 2, 442-463; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

South Side,

the side of an altar on the south or epistle side: that part of the altar at which the priest, during the Mass, says or sings the collects and the epistle for the day. *SEE SOUTH END.*

Southcott, Joanna,

a noted enthusiast, was born about 1750 at Gittisham, in Devonshire. She was the daughter of a farmer at St. Mary Ottery's, in Devonshire, and, until her name became celebrated, she obtained her living as a domestic servant. Her case is a very curious one, both in the history of psychology and of religious enthusiasm. From her mother, who lived till Joanna had reached the age of womanhood, she received the most exalted religious ideas, the exuberance of which her father often felt himself called upon to check: she was still, however, a sober member of the Church of England. At length she joined the early morning and evening meetings of the Wesleyans, and in 1792 associated exclusively with that body; but she was soon expelled from it on account of her pretended visions. The religious exercises to which Joanna was thus introduced seem to have, produced, as exciting causes, her remarkable visions and dreams, which soon took the form of prophecies, and commanded universal attention. Some of her predictions received a remarkable fulfilment, especially that which she published immediately after the conclusion of the Peace of Amiens, in 1801; for she then derided the joy of the nation, and gave the solemn assurance that a calamitous series of wars were about to break out, the events of which would be more terrible than any on record. At a later period, she as solemnly asserted that Napoleon would never land in England, and that his power would be overthrown. The visions which formed the ground of these prophecies are often very striking as dramatic pictures, and the rude doggerel of her prophetic chants as frequently becomes picturesque, if once the cultivated mind can overcome the disgust first excited by their uncouthness, and their deficiency in common grammatical correctness. She began the publication of her prophetic pamphlets in 1794, and about 1804 was brought up to London and lodged at the West End by some of her admirers, many of whom were persons of consideration in society. Soon after this event, an old man named Thomas Dowland and a poor boy named Joseph also had visions, and a paper manufacturer named Carpenter (in whose employment they were) finally published many of them. We mention them here, however, because this Carpenter, conceiving himself to

be the “right man” of Joanna’s prophecies, finally took her place as the chief of the sect who followed her, having first led the secession. When she was believed by the more enlightened of her followers to have fallen under a delusion. That delusion consisted in the belief that she was destined to bring forth Shiloh, or the Messiah, and its origin is explained by Carpenter as the result of her believing that she was the Church, or bride, itself, instead of its shadow or representative. We may here mention that previous to its arrival at this idolatrous pitch, which it is still painful to contemplate, Joanna had occupied a year in “sealing” her followers, generally but most unjustly regarded as a mere trick to make money. The old man Dowland expired in 1804, ten years after the commencement of his, Joseph’s, and Joanna’s prophecies, and 1814 was fixed upon by her for the birth of Shiloh. She was deceived by appearances, and expired on the 27th of December in that year, having previously declared her conviction that “if she was deceived, she had, at all events, been the sport of some spirit, good or evil.” The whole case, like many others of the kind, may be explained by the easily ascertained laws of psychology. The appearance which Joanna mistook for pregnancy was the result of a diseased condition, explained when her body was opened. The prevailing thought of her writings is the redemption of man by the agency of *woman*, the supposed cause of his fall. *SEE SOUTHCOTTIANS.*

Southcottians, Or Southcotters,

Picture for Southcottians

the followers of Joanna Southcott (q.v.), who in 1792 professed to be a prophetess. The book in which Joanna published her prophecies is dated London, April 25, 1804; and she begins by declaring that she herself did not understand the communications given her by the Spirit till they were afterwards explained to her. In November, 1803, she was told to mark the weather during the twenty-four first days of the succeeding year, and then the Spirit informed her that the weather each day was typical of the events of each succeeding month: New year’s day to correspond with January, January 2 with February, etc. After this she relates a dream she had in 1792, and declares she foretold the death of bishop Buller, and appeals to a letter put into the hands of a clergyman whom she names. One night she heard a noise as if a ball of iron were rolling down the stairs three steps, and the Spirit afterwards, she says, told her this was a sign of three great evils which were to fall upon the land — the sword, the plague, and the

famine. She affirms that the then late war and the extraordinary harvest of 1797 and 1800 happened agreeably to the predictions which she had previously made known; and particularly appeals to the people of Exeter, where it seems she was brought up from her infancy. In November, 1803, she says she was ordered to open her Bible, which she did at ~~2009~~ Ecclesiastes 1:9; and then follows a long explanation of that chapter. In March, 1805, we find Joanna published a pamphlet in London, endeavoring to confute "Five Charges" against her which had appeared in the *Leeds Mercury*, and four of which, she says, were absolutely false. The first charge was respecting the sealing of her disciples; the second, on the invasion; the third, on the famine; the fourth, on her mission; the fifth, on her death. Sealing is the grand peculiarity and ordinance of these people. Joanna gave those who professed belief in her mission and who subscribed to the things revealed in her "Warning" a sealed written paper with her signature, for which they had to pay half a crown, and by which they were led to think that they were sealed against the day of redemption, and that all those who were possessed of these seals would be signally honored by the Messiah when he comes again. This seal was affixed to most of the voluminous writings which she printed, but the papers given to her disciples generally contained the words "The sealed of the Lord — The Elect Precious Man's Redemption — To inherit the Tree of Life — To be made heirs of God and joint heirs of Jesus Christ." It is said they looked upon Joanna as the bride, the Lamb's wife; and that as man fell by a woman, he will be restored by a woman. Some of her followers pretended also to have visions and revelations. Joanna went so far at last, when past sixty years of age, as to declare herself pregnant with another Messiah, who was to be called Shiloh. Her followers made costly preparations for the birth of their expected prince, and had a cradle constructed at an expense of two hundred pounds. The disease by which she was deceived terminated in her death; but her deluded disciples, after having been compelled to inter her, persisted in the belief that she was to bear the Shiloh, and gave out that she would rise again with the child in her arms. The members of her society have been gathered chiefly from among the more ignorant members of the seceding denominations, especially the Wesleyans, with whom she had once been associated, and of the Established Church. Mr. Foley, rector of Old Swinford, near Stourbridge, was said to be a firm believer in the resurrection of the prophetess; and another clergyman used to go regularly to expound her writings at Bristol. The Southcotters abound principally in the northern counties. At Ashton-

under-Lynle they have a splendid temple, which cost them nine thousand pounds. Their worship is described as awfully wild and tumultuous. The men are known by their wearing long beards and brown hats. At present, it seems, both warning and sealing have subsided; they are waiting in awful suspense for the commencement of the thousand years' reign on the earth. Yet it is said they do not mean that Christ will come in person, but in spirit, and that the sealed who are dead before that time will be raised from their graves to partake of this happy state.

Southgate, Richard,

an English divine, was born at Alwalton, Huntingdonshire, March 16, 1729, and was educated partly at Uppingham, but chiefly at Peterborough, under Rev. T. Marshall. He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1745, and took his degree of A.B. in 1749. Retiring to his father's house, on account of some unpleasant family occurrence, he continued his studies; was ordained deacon September, 1752, and priest September, 1754, by Dr. Thomas, bishop of Lincoln. In the last year he was presented with the rectory of, Woolley, in Huntingdonshire, but resigned it when Mr. Peacock, the patron, took orders. On Jan. 2, 1763, he went to London, and became a subcurate of St. James's, and served that cure until 1766. In December, 1765, he entered upon the curacy of St. Giles's, which he retained throughout his life. He received May, 1783, the small rectory of Little Steeping, in Lincolnshire; and the following year was appointed assistant librarian of the British Museum. In 1790 he was presented with the living of Warsop, Nottinghamshire, and in the same year became a member of the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge; in 1791, a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and afterwards of the Linnean Society. He died Jan. 25, 1795. Mr. Southgate never committed any of his writings to the press, although he was thoroughly qualified, and did make preparations for a new *History of the Saxons and Danes in England*. He was a distinguished antiquarian, and left a choice and valuable collection of books, coins, medals, shells, etc., which were sold at auction. His *Sermons* (1798, 2 vols.) were published by Dr. Gaskin. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

South sea Islanders.

SEE POLYNESIA.

Southwell, Nathaniel.

SEE SOTWELL, NATHANIEL.

Southwell, Robert,

an English Jesuit, was born at Horsham, St. Faith's, Norfolk, in 1560. He was educated at Douai, and became a Jesuit at Rome in October, 1578. In 1585 he was appointed praefect of the English college there, and the next year was sent as a missionary to England. He resided principally with Anne, countess of Arundel, secretly ministering to the scattered Roman Catholics. Apprehended in 1592, he was imprisoned in the Tower, and several times subjected to torture to make him disclose a plot against queen Elizabeth. In February, 1595, he was tried at the bar of the King's Bench, Westminster, and executed the next day (Feb. 21) at Tyburn. He was much revered among Roman Catholics for his gentleness and purity of life, and his name has lately been introduced for canonization in the Roman ecclesiastical courts. He wrote, *St. Peter's Complaint*, with other poems (Lond. 1593, 4to; last edition, with sketch of life, by W.J. Walter, 1817): — *Supplication to Queen Elizabeth* (ibid. 1593): — *Moeonioe or Certain Excellent Poems*, etc. (ibid. 1595, 4to). His chief prose works are, *Triumph over Death* (ibid. 1595): — *Epistle of Comfort to those Catholics who Lie under Restraint* (1605, 8vo): — *Marie Magdalen's Funeral Teares* (ibid. 1609, 1772; new ed. 1823): — *Rules of a Good Life*, etc. Collective editions of his works were published in 1620, 1630, 1634, 1637, and 1828; and a complete edition of his poetical works in 1856. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Southworth, Alanson,

a Congregational minister, was born at Winthrop, Me., Aug. 16, 1826. He studied law at Lowell, Mass., was converted in 1853, and entered Bangor Theological Seminary, graduating in 1858. He labored at Otisfield for a year, and was ordained at South Paris, Me., in 1859, where his ministry of nearly six years was very useful. After returning from a voyage to Cuba for his health, he entered the service of the Christian Commission, and labored with great assiduity in ministering to the bodies and souls of the soldiers in the Army of the Potomac. He returned to South Paris, and was soon stricken down with typhoid fever, of which he died, March 25, 1864. Mr. Southworth was an earnest, unselfish worker for Christ, and endowed with true nobility of soul. In 1863 he published a small but valuable book on

Universalism. Two of his brothers entered the ministry. See *Congregational Quarterly*, 1865, p. 205.

Southworth, Tertius Dunning,

a Congregational minister, was born at Rome, N.Y., July 25, 1801. He entered Hanover College and pursued his studies, only taking a partial course. He received the degree of A.M. from that institution in 1831. He spent one year in Auburn Theological Seminary, and graduated at Andover Seminary in 1829. He commenced his labors in Paris, N.Y., where he preached two years. He was ordained at Utica, N.Y., Oct. 7, 1832, and installed at Claremont, N.H., June 18, 1834. He remained there until 1838. While there he received a call from Franklin, Mass., which he accepted, and was installed in January, 1839, in a pulpit made famous by the long occupancy of the same by Dr. Emmons. After remaining there eleven years the pastorate was dissolved, and he was called to take charge of the Church in Lyndon, Vt., where he remained four years, and accepted a call to the pastorate of Pleasant Prairie, Kenosha, Wis., in March, 1859. He remained at this post until 1868, and in the following year returned to his home in Bridgewater, N.Y. He was a man of fine presence and impressive delivery. His thinking was clear, and his sermons were logical and pithy. As a successor of Dr. Emmons, it is enough to say he filled the pulpit to the entire satisfaction of the people. He died at Bridgewater Aug. 7, 1874. (W.P.S.)

Sovereignty Of God

is his power and right of dominion over his creatures, to dispose and determine them as seemeth him good. This attribute is evidently demonstrated in the systems of creation, providence, and grace; and may be considered as absolute, universal, and everlasting (²⁰¹⁵Daniel 4:35; ⁴⁰¹¹Ephesians 1:11). See Cole, *On the Sovereignty of God*; Charnock, *On the Dominion of God in his Works*, 1, 690; Edwards, *Sermons*, ser. 4; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1855. **SEE POWER OF GOD; SEE THEODICY.**

Sow.

SEE SWINE.

Sowan,

the first of the four paths an entrance into which secures, either immediately or more remotely, the attainment of the Buddhist *Nirvana* (q.v.). The path Sowan is divided into twenty-four sections, and after it has been entered there can be only seven more births between that period and the attainment of the Nirvana, which may be in any world but the four hells. This is the second gradation of being. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

Sower, Sowing

(usually some form of [ῥῆ; *zara*, σπείρω). The operation of sowing with the hand is one of so simple a character as to need little description. The Egyptian paintings furnish many illustrations of the mode in which it was conducted. The sower held the vessel or basket containing the seed in his left hand, while with his right he scattered the seed broadcast (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. 2, 12, 18, 39). The “drawing out” of the seed is noticed, as the most characteristic action of the sower, in ^{<806>}Psalm 126:6 (A.V. “precious”) and ^{<320>}Amos 9:13: it is uncertain whether this expression refers to drawing out the handful of seed from the basket, or to the dispersion of the seed in regular rows over the ground (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 827). In some of the Egyptian paintings the sower is represented as preceding-the plough: this may be simply the result of bad perspective, but we are told that such a practice actually prevails in the East in the case of sandy soils, the plough serving the purpose of the harrow for covering the seed (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 74). In wet soils the seed was trodden in by the feet of animals (^{<320>}Isaiah 32:20), as represented in Wilkinson’s *Anc. Egypt*. 2, 12. The sowing season commenced in October and continued to the end of February, wheat being put in before and barley after-the beginning of January (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 74). The Mosaic law prohibited the sowing of mixed seed (^{<806>}Leviticus 19:19; ^{<670>}Deuteronomy 22:9): Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 8, 20) supposes this prohibition to be based on the repugnancy of nature to intermixture, but there would appear to be a further object of a moral character, viz to impress on men’s minds the general lesson of purity The regulation offered a favorable opportunity for Rabbinical refinement, the results of which are embodied in the treatise of the Mishna entitled *Kilaim*, § 1-3. That the ancient Hebrews did not consider themselves prohibited from planting several kinds of seeds in the same field appears from ^{<325>}Isaiah 28:25. A distinction is made in

~~48157~~Leviticus 11:37, 38, between dry and wet seed, in respect to contact with a corpse; the latter, as being more susceptible of contamination, would be rendered unclear thereby, the former would not. The analogy between the germination of seed and the effects of a principle of a course of action on the human character for good or for evil is frequently noticed in Scripture (~~40118~~Proverbs 11:18 ~~4039~~Matthew 13:19, 24; ~~4006~~2 Corinthians 9:6; ~~4007~~Galatians 6:7). *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Sozomen, Salamanes Hermias,

a Greek writer of Church history, almost contemporary with Socrates as an author, was born at Bethelia, a town of Palestine. After being liberally educated, he studied law at Berytus, in Phoenicia, and then pleaded at the bar in Constantinople. He afterwards applied himself to the writing of ecclesiastical history, and drew up a compendium in two books, from the ascension of Christ to A.D. 323; but this is lost. Then he continued his history in a more circumstantial manner to A.D. 440 and this part is extant in nine books. A comparison renders it probable that Sozomen was acquainted with the work of Socrates, his own additions and enlargements being more important with regard to volume than quality, and relating principally to hermits and monks. For those recluses he had a high veneration so that he frequently extolled the monastic life in hymns. His vision saw only what was extreme and imposing, so that he was not able to appreciate the more moderate phases of life, and the ordinary conflict between virtue and vice. In point of style he is superior to Socrates, as was already seen by Photius (*ἐν τῇ φράσει βελτίων*), but in every other respect he is inferior. Attention has often been called to material misapprehensions in his statements, e.g. by Dupin (*Nouvelle Bibliothque*, 4, 80). An edition of Sozomen, bound with Eusebius and Socrates, was published by Valesius in 1659, and often republished. See Dupin, as above Schrickh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. 7; Holzhausen, *De Fontibus quibus Socrates, Soz., et Theod. usi sunt* (Götting 1825); Baur, *Epochen d. kirchl. Geschichtschreibung* Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Spadisir,

in Norse mythology, is a name of the norns, a class of goddesses represented by the skalds as being beneficent and wise, and as employed in directing the way of heroes and exalted personages through life and in

securing the prosperity of such favorites through the means of prudent counsel.

Space

(Lat. *spatium*) is a term which, taken in its most general sense, comprehends whatever is extended and may be measured by the three dimensions, length breadth, and depth. In this sense it is the same with *extension*. Space, in this large significance, is either occupied by body or it is not. If it be not, but is void of all matter and contains nothing, then it is *space* in the strictest meaning of the word. This is the sense in which it is commonly used in English philosophical language, and is the same with what is called a *vacuum*.

Very many theories have been held respecting space a few of which are mentioned below. Zeno of Elea argues against the reality of space, and says, "If all that exists were in a given space, this space must be in another space, and so on *ad infinitum*." Melissus of Samo, declares that "there exists no empty space, since such a space, if it existed, would be an existing nothing."

The Atomists, on the other hand, held to an empty space, arguing

- (1) that motion requires a vacuum;
- (2) that rarefaction and condensation are impossible without empty intervals of space; and
- (3) that organic growth depends on the penetration of nutriment into the vacant spaces of bodies. Aristotle held that; space is limited; the world possesses only a finite extension; outside of it is no place.

The place of anything, he defines, "is the inner surface of the body surrounding it, that surface being conceived as fixed and immovable. As nothing exists outside of the world except God, who is pure thought and not in space, the world naturally cannot be in space, i.e. its *place* cannot be defined." The Stoics believed that "beyond the world exists an unlimited void." According to Epicurus, "space exists from eternity, and that in the void spaces between the worlds the gods dwell." Arnobius, the African, asserted that God is "the place and space of all things." Space, as containing all things, was by Philo and others identified with the infinite. So the text (^{<41728>}Acts 17:28) which says that "in God we live, and move, and

have our being” was interpreted to mean that space is an affection or property of the Deity. Eckhart declares that “out of God the creature is a pure nothing; time and space, and the plurality which depends on them, are nothing in themselves.” According to Campanella (1568-1639), God produced space (as well as ideas, angels, etc.) “by mingling in increasing measures nonbeing with his pure being. Space is animate, for it dreads a vacuum and craves replenishment.” Newton regards space as infinite, the sensorium of the Deity. Leibnitz defines space as “the order of possible coexisting phenomena.” Locke has attempted to show that “we acquire the idea of space by sensation, especially by the senses of touch and sight.” In the philosophy of Kant, “space and time are mere forms of the sensibility, the form of all external phenomena; and as the sensibility is necessarily anterior in the subject to all real intention, it follows that the form of all these phenomena is in the mind *a priori*. There can, then, be no question about space or extension but in a human or subjective point of view. The idea of space has no objective validity; it is real only relatively to phenomena, to things, in so far as they appear to us; it is purely ideal in so far as things are taken in themselves and considered independently of the forms of sensibility,” Herder says that “space and time are empirical conceptions.” Schopenhauer teaches, with Kant, that “space, time, etc., have a purely subjective origin, and are only valid for phenomena, which are merely subjective representations in consciousness. Space and time have the peculiarity that all of their parts stand to each other in a relation, with reference to which each of them is determined and conditioned by another. In *space* this relation is termed position, in *time* it is termed sequence.” Herbart holds that extension in space involves a contradiction. Extension implies prolongation through numerous different and distinct parts of space, but by such prolongation the one is broken up into the many, while yet the one is to be considered as identical with the many. Trendelenburg seeks to show that space is a product or phase of motion, its, immediate external manifestation. In the philosophy of Thomas Reid (1785), “space and its relations, with the axioms concerning its existence and its relations, are known directly in connection with the senses of touch and sight, but not as objects of these senses.” James Mill thus explains infinite space: “We, know no infinite line, but we know a longer and a longer In the process, then, by which we conceive the increase of a line the idea of one portion more is continually associated with the preceding length, and to what extent soever it is carried the association of one portion more is equally close and irresistible. This is what we call the idea

of infinite extension, and what some people call the *necessary* idea.” According to lord Monboddo, place is space occupied by body. It is different from body as that which contains is different from that which is contained. Space, then, is place *potentially*; and when it is filled with body, then it is place *actually*. See Krauth’s Fleming, *Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences*, s.v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index).

Spada, Bernardino,

an Italian cardinal, was born at Brisighella, in Romagna, April 21, 1594, of an obscure family. After studying the humanities with the Jesuits in Rome, he applied himself to ecclesiastical jurisprudence, in which he acquired considerable reputation. He was honored with several dignities by Paul V and Gregory XV, and afterwards by Urban VIII, who sent him on various commissions to France and Parma, and gave him the archbishopric *in partibus* of Damietta, the cardinalate in 1626, and the legation to Bologna in 1627. He was a patron of the fine arts, and left some *Poems* and *Letters* addressed to Mazarin. Spada died in Rome, Nov. 10, 1661.

Spada, Fabrizio,

nephew of Bernardino, born March 18, 1643, was made archbishop of Patras, nuncio to Savoy and France, and cardinal in 1675. He died June 15, 1717.

Spada, Giambattista,

brother of Bernardino, born at Lucca, Aug. 27, 1597, likewise became an ecclesiastic, and was made governor of Rome in 1635, president of the Romagna in 1644, cardinal in 1652, and bishop of Rimini and Palestrina. He died in Rome, Jan. 23, 1675.

Spada, Orazio Filippo,

brother of Fabrizio, became bishop of Osimo and papal nuncio to Poland, and was made cardinal in 1706. He died June 24, 1724.

Spafford, William M.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was admitted into the North Ohio Conference on trial in 1841. He labored effectively until 1865, when he took a supernumerary relation. In 1868 he became superannuated, and

so continued until his death, in Effingham County, Ill., in 1876. Mr. Spafford was a man of brilliant intellect, but of peculiar sensitiveness. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 111.

Spahr, William E.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Greene County, O., Aug. 1, 1843, and united with the Church at fourteen years of age. He received a license to preach in 1861, and in the fall of 1863 entered the Cincinnati Conference. He was ordained deacon in 1865, but consumption had seized upon him, and he died Nov. 30. He was humble, modest, teachable, and kind. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1866, p. 150.

Spain

(**Σπανία**, ^{<61524>}Romans 15:24, 28; **Ισπανία**, 1 Macc. 8:3; Vulg. *Hispania*). This name was anciently applied to the whole peninsula which now comprises Spain and Portugal (Cellar. *Notit.* 1, 51 sq.). The early history of Spain is enveloped in great obscurity. The natives were called Iberians, the country Iberia, and one of the chief rivers the Iberus (the Ebro); and William von Humboldt has shown that the Iberian language was the same in every part of the country, and that it exists with certain modifications in the modern Basque. The Carthaginians, during the flourishing times of their republic, established many settlements upon the Spanish coast, such as Carthago (now Cartagena), and Malacca, the royal city (now Malaga). Gades (now Cadiz) was a Phoenician settlement, probably coeval with Carthage itself, was never subject to Carthaginian rule, and during the Punic war embraced the side of the Romans. Under the management of Hamilcar Barcas and Hannibal, a considerable part of Spain became a Carthaginian colony. It gradually passed under the power of the Romans, and in the apostolic period formed no inconsiderable portion of the Roman empire. See Smith, *Dict. of Geog.* s.v. "Hispania."

The Hebrews were acquainted with the position and the mineral wealth of Spain from the time of Solomon, whose alliance with the Phoenicians enlarged the circle of their geographical knowledge to a very great extent.

SEE TARSHISH. The local designation, Tarshish, representing the *Tartessus* of the Greeks, probably prevailed until the fame of the Roman wars in that country reached the East, when it was superseded by its classical name, which is traced back by Bochart to the Shemitic *tsaphan*, "rabbit," and by Humboldt to the Basque *Ezpain*, descriptive of its

position on the *edge* of the continent of Europe. The Latin form of this name is represented by the above passages which contain all the Biblical notices of Spain: in the former the conquests of the Romans are described in somewhat exaggerated terms; for though the Carthaginians were expelled as early as B.C. 206, the native tribes were not finally subdued until B.C. 25, and not until then could it be said with truth that “they had conquered all the place” (1 Macc. 8:4). It seems clear from ~~45134~~ Romans 15:24, 28, that Paul formed the design of proceeding to preach the Gospel in Spain. That he ever executed this intention is necessarily denied by those who hold that the apostle sustained but one imprisonment at Rome — namely, that in which the Acts of the Apostles leave him; and even those who hold that he was released from this imprisonment can only conjecture that in the interval between it and the second he fulfilled his intention. There is, in fact, during the three first centuries no evidence on the subject beyond a vague intimation by Clement, which is open to different explanations; and later traditions are of small value. *SEE PAUL*. The mere intention, however, implies two interesting facts, viz. the establishment, of a Christian community in that country, and this by means of Hellenistic Jews resident there. We have no direct testimony to either of these facts; but as the Jews had spread along the shores of the Mediterranean as far as Cyrene in Africa and Rome in Europe (~~4420~~ Acts 2:10), there would be no difficulty in assuming that they were also found in the commercial cities of the eastern coast of Spain. The early introduction of Christianity into that country is attested by Irenaeus (1, 3) and Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* 7). An inscription, purporting to record a persecution of the Spanish Christians in the reign of Nero is probably a forgery (Gieseler, *Church Hist.* 1, 82, note 5).